

Durham E-Theses

The feast of the Encaenia in the fourth century and in the ancient liturgical sources of Jerusalem

Michael Alexander Fraser

How to cite:

Fraser, Michael Alexander (1995) The feast of the Encaenia in the fourth century and in the ancient liturgical sources of Jerusalem. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/5431/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Michael Alexander Fraser

**The Feast of the Encaenia in the Fourth Century and in the Ancient
Liturgical Sources of Jerusalem**

Doctor of Philosophy

1995

ABSTRACT

The central concept in this thesis is the Encaenia, particularly the Jerusalem Encaenia of the Martyrium Basilica and the anniversary feast of the same name, but also other, lesser known, inaugurations of churches which occurred in the fourth century. The thesis commences with a review of the recent scholarship on early Christian buildings, the Holy Land, and the Jerusalem Encaenia feast. Chapter two discusses the appearance of "ἐγκαίνια" in the Septuagint and early Christian literature before considering the first documented occasion of an encaenia feast, the inauguration of the basilica in Tyre. Chapter three is a detailed study of Constantine's 'New Jerusalem' from the finding of the Cross to the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica in 335. A distinction is drawn between the work of Constantine and the interpretation of Eusebius. The subsequent chapter draws attention to the growth and uniform pattern of imperial involvement in the inauguration of churches under Constantius, paying particular attention to the alleged Encaenia of an Alexandrian basilica by Athanasius without imperial consent.

The study of the Jerusalem Encaenia, the anniversary of the Martyrium inauguration, commences in chapter five with an analysis of the feast in the Journal of Egeria and the brief account recorded by Sozomen. Both writers portray the Encaenia as a pilgrim feast. Chapter six examines the liturgical content of the feast reconstructed from the earliest Jerusalem lectionaries and calendar. The theology of the feast is discerned from the biblical texts prescribed for the liturgy. Many of the observations made in previous chapters are drawn together in chapter eight which proposes the Encaenia as a Christian interpretation of the Jewish feast of Tabernacles. The conclusion to the thesis discusses the prominence of the Jerusalem Encaenia in the liturgical calendar, and locates the rite and feast of the Encaenia within the wider context of the dedication of churches in the east and western liturgy. Further avenues of research are outlined regarding the rites and surviving homilies for the dedication of a church.

The Feast of the Encaenia in the Fourth Century and in the Ancient Liturgical Sources of Jerusalem

Michael Alexander Fraser

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Durham

Department of Theology

1995



22 MAY 1996

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	5
Declaration	6
Abbreviations	6
Chapter One: Introduction	7
The dedication of churches	7
The encaenia and the emperor	8
The Encaenia and the liturgical memory	9
Early Christian Places of Assembly	10
From Domus Dei to Basilica	11
Holy Places and Pilgrimage	17
The Holy Land	21
Holy Places	22
The Feast of the Encaenia	24
The sources	24
Matthew Black and the Encaenia	25
Hilarius Emonds	26
Recent scholarship	27
The present study	29
Chapter Two. The Feast of the Encaenia in Tyre, 315AD	30
Introduction	30
Eusebius and the Events of 313	30
The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius	33
Book Ten of the History	34
The 'ἐγκαινίων ἑορταί'	37
The Septuagint	37
The New Testament	39
The interpretation of Eusebius	40
The Feast of the Encaenia at Tyre	42
Eusebius' panegyric	42
The great victory	44
The restoration of the church at Tyre	45
The new church of Tyre	46
The spiritual building	47
P. Aelius Aristides' Oration in Cyzicus: A comparative view	50
Classical praise of architecture	50
Aristides and the temple of Asclepius	52
Conclusions	54
An imperial foundation?	55
A feast of unity	58
Chapter Three. Constantine, the Cross and the Encaenia in Jerusalem	59
Introduction	59
Eusebius, Constantine and the Saving Trophy	61
The Saving Sign and Constantine's victory over Maxentius ...	62
The military context of the trophy of victory	67
Constantine's interpretation of the sign	69
Eusebius' interpretation of the sign	70
Constantine and the vision of Apollo	70
The deliberate ambiguity	71



Eusebius' sources for the labarum and vision of Constantine .	72
The Finding of the Saving Sign.....	74
Jan Willem Drijvers and Stephan Borgehammar.....	74
Imperial movements 324-326 and Helena's tour	75
The destruction of pagan shrines.....	81
The Cross and Constantine's Christian development.....	83
John Henry Newman and the Finding of the Cross.....	84
Using Eusebius to discern Constantine's interpretation of the Cross	85
Constantine at Nicaea	86
Images of the Saving Sign at Constantinople	88
The Oration on the Holy Sepulchre and the Laus Constantini.....	89
Differences regarding the Saving Sign in the Laus and the Oratio	90
The different contexts of the Laus and the Oratio.....	91
The Vita Constantini.....	93
The uncovering of Christ's tomb	93
Constantine's letter to Macarius.....	95
The position of the basilica in relation to the tomb and Golgotha.....	95
Recent scholarship and the Finding of the Cross	98
Eusebius' theology of the Cross.....	100
The Buildings of the New Jerusalem	102
The constituent parts of the basilica	102
The basilica and the Hadrianic structures	104
The Feast of the Encaenia	106
The Bordeaux pilgrim.....	106
The emperor, the bishop, and the architects	107
The church and empire between 326-335.....	108
The see of Antioch and the council of Nicomedia.....	108
Athanasius and the Meletians.....	109
The council of Tyre	111
The council and encaenia in Jerusalem.....	112
Eusebius' role at the encaenia: the oration on the Holy Sepulchre.....	114
Eusebius' oration at Tyre and his oration at Jerusalem.....	116
The imperial offerings for the new basilica.....	117
The Date of the Encaenia	119
The Roman calendar of 354.....	121
The Encaenia and the Day of Atonement	123
Constantine and the Jerusalem Encaenia: conclusions.....	126
Chapter Four. Constantius and the Encaenia.....	129
Introduction	129
Providing the Context: Constantius and the Church.....	130
The personality of Constantius.....	130
The rebellion of Magnentius	132
The Council of the Encaenia at Antioch	133
The date of the Antioch encaenia.....	134
The council of Antioch	136

Constantius and Jerusalem	137
The significance of the apparition for Cyril and Constantius ..	139
Constantius, the Caesareum and Athanasius	141
The Caesareum temple complex	142
The charge of holding a premature encaenia	143
Biblical precedents for holding worship before an encaenia ...	147
The rites of encaenia and of consecration	148
The Caesareum after 354	148
The Inauguration of the Great Church in Constantinople	152
The Constantinople encaenia	153
Conclusion	154
The encaenia and episcopal councils	154
Chapter Five. The feast of the Encaenia in the Journal of Egeria and the	
Church History of Sozomen	155
Introduction	155
The Journal of the Pilgrim Egeria	155
The dating of Egeria's Journal	157
The identity of Egeria	158
Egeria's movements after Jerusalem	160
The record of the liturgical year in Jerusalem	161
The description of the Encaenia	162
The constituent parts of the Martyrium-Anastasis site	163
The Encaenia and the feast of the Cross	166
The Encaenia and the temple of Solomon	167
The octave of the Encaenia	168
The stations of the Encaenia	170
The Encaenia as a pilgrim festival	172
Conclusion	174
The Feast of the Encaenia in the Church History of Sozomen	175
The Church History of Sozomen	176
Sozomen's description of the feast of the Encaenia	177
The Encaenia and baptism	178
The eschatological perspective of Sozomen's description	178
Conclusion	179
Chapter Six. The Feast of the Encaenia in the Ancient Liturgical Sources of	
Jerusalem	181
Introduction	181
The Armenian-Jerusalem Lectionary	182
Dating the Lectionary	182
The Encaenia in the Armenian Lectionary	186
Two days or an octave?	187
The Encaenia and the Cross	189
The theology of the Encaenia	190
The dedication of all altars	192
The Georgian-Jerusalem Lectionary	194
The Georgian-Jerusalem lectionary sources	195
The Georgian-Jerusalem Calendar	195
The Georgian Index of Gospel readings	197
The Georgian chantbooks	198

The Feast of the Encaenia in the Georgian Sources	199
The second day of the Encaenia	203
Days three to eight of the Encaenia	205
Conclusions	212
The liturgical development of the Encaenia and the feast of the Cross	213
The feast of the Cross in the Western liturgy	214
Chapter Seven. The Feast of Encaenia and the Feast of Tabernacles.....	216
The Encaenia and the Feast of Tabernacles	218
Zach 14:16 and the Encaenia.....	220
Jewish practices and Christian self-identity	222
The Christian appropriation and re-interpretation of Jewish feasts.....	225
Chapter Eight. Conclusion.....	231
Encaenia Encaeniorum.....	231
The Encaenia and the rite for the dedication of churches.....	234
Appendix. The Octave of the Encaenia	240
List of Sources Consulted.....	242
Principal Primary Sources.....	242
Secondary Sources	247

Acknowledgements

Although this thesis would not have been possible without funding from the Isle of Man Department of Education, it is equally true that the thesis would not have been completed without the support and assistance of family, friends, and numerous other people in the Universities of Durham and Oxford.

I am profoundly grateful to Dr Tony Gelston who gave this thesis his careful supervision over the course of three years. Without his close reading of each chapter, noting the numerous typing errors and pointing out flaws in argument, this thesis would have many more errors and omissions than it presently does. All the members of staff in the Department of Theology have, at one time or another, shown valuable friendship, support, and interest in my work which prevented me from receding into the often lonely, narrow corridors of research. Whilst the academic staff of the department provided me with a fertile environment in which to continue my research and develop other interests, Margaret Parkinson, in particular, kept my mind in reality with many canny chats and encouraging words. To the whole Department, from which it was difficult to tear myself away, I say thank you.

The completion of a PhD requires libraries. Uppermost in my thoughts are the staff of Palace Green Library who provided me with an office, conveniently near the appropriate stacks, and who never failed to be both kind and helpful. I am grateful to the staff of the Inter-Library Loans desk of the University Library for their friendly efficiency in obtaining numerous books and articles for me. In Oxford the Theology Faculty library and the Ashmolean Library gave me access to their holdings, a boon when there's no college library to which I might turn.

I have been fortunate to have had many friends who have encouraged and assisted me in the production of this work. I cannot name them all here but at various times they could be found in the bar of St John's College, Trevelyan College MCR, Ushaw College, in the Theology Department's computer room, kitchen and staff room, and, not least, in the Humanities Computing Unit at Oxford. Special thanks, however, to William, Helen, Bridget, Derek, Joe, and Natalie whose continual friendship, genuine curiosity in my work, and more, made me glad to be in Durham.

Finally, my parents made all this possible by the loving support they gave to each decision I made. It is to them I dedicate this small offering.

Declaration

I confirm that no part of this thesis has been submitted for a degree in this or any other university. I also confirm that the thesis conforms to the word limit set out in the Degree Regulations.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

Abbreviations

CCL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (Turnhout, 1953-)
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (Berlin, 1862-)
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium (Louvain, Paris, etc., 1903-)
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (Vienna, 1866-)
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten (drei) Jahrhunderte (Leipzig & Berlin, 1897-)
PG	Patrologia Graeca, ed. J. Migne (Paris, 1857-)
PL	Patrologia Latina, ed. J. Migne (Paris, 1844-)
SC	Sources chrétiennes (Paris, 1940-)

Chapter One Introduction

The dedication of churches

The roots of this study lie in an attempt to trace the early history and theology of the rites for the dedication of a church. These rites, with their processions, exorcisms, and anointings, are amongst the most dramatic that the Church possesses. Whether in the east or in the west the rite encapsulates a rich theology of space which describes the relation of the building of stone to the church of souls and the church of heaven. The rite recreates, or even rebuilds, the physical building as copy of the spiritual model. This re-creation succeeds in making quite distinct the sacred and the profane, what is in the church and what is not. The physical building, rendered sacred by the rites of the universal church, becomes an effective symbol of the Church with boundaries between the earthly and the spiritual, a linear movement towards areas of increasing holiness, and a place where the divine presence can be found par excellence.

Extant rites of church dedication do not survive much earlier than the eighth century. Christian buildings exist, however, which can be dated earlier than the surviving rites. We know that from the earliest times Christians assembled in rooms or buildings set aside for the purpose of performing the liturgy. The same literature which describes the Christian place of assembly remains silent on the means by which these spaces were set aside for liturgical use. The earliest reference we have to any specific feast or rite which celebrated a new church is preserved by Eusebius in his narration of the dawn of peace which fell upon the Church after the edicts of toleration. This new age, as is well known, brought with it a flowering of Christian architecture on a scale as substantial as the temples, basilicas and forums of the empire. Constantine's conversion is often given as the primary cause of the development of a distinct and highly visible Christian architecture. During this period a theology of "consecrated space" flourished. One particular area of the empire extended the idea of a sacred space beyond the single building to encompass a geographical region. Eusebius' joyful acclamations merged together three distinct elements associated with sacred space: church building, the rites of consecration, and the development of the Holy Land. At the centre of each of these appears the emperor Constantine.

The encaenia and the emperor

This thesis is about a single Greek word which is related to all three elements. The ἑγκαίνια was a rite which inaugurated and consecrated Christian buildings and it was also a local feast which celebrated the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica, the site of Christ's death and resurrection. The inauguration of the Martyrium basilica, timed as it was with the celebration of Constantine's glorious thirty year reign, was the inauguration of the Christian Holy Land. The Encaenia, to give it the latinized name by which it is better known, was a most splendid local feast which never entered the universal liturgical calendar. The western Church retains the dedication of the Lateran basilica in its liturgical calendar whilst the East continues to mark the feast of the Encaenia each September. The dedication of St John in the Lateran, however, was never viewed as significant enough simply to be referred to as the Dedication. The Encaenia, used without mention of a specific church, referred only to the Encaenia of the Martyrium. The Dedication of the Lateran basilica lost its association with Constantine in the liturgical calendar. The Encaenia continues to be associated with Constantine and his mother Helena in the Eastern liturgy where emperor and mother are included amongst the saints.

The Encaenia was not only a particular feast; it was a general feast celebrated at the inauguration of a church building. There is hardly a mention of such a feast occurring before the age of Constantine. Eusebius tantalisingly alludes to its celebration before the persecution under Licinius and the subsequent edicts of toleration. This thesis seeks to examine in closer detail the instances at which the term does arise. In doing so we hope to demonstrate that a consistent pattern emerges of events which are associated with the encaenia. At the centre of each encaenia, whether the great Encaenia in Jerusalem, or the smaller affair in Constantinople, stands the emperor. The encaenia is an imperial feast. It is an imperial feast because the emperor became the builder of churches. In the extant literature, on the few occasions when we are fortunate to have a reference to an encaenia, it is only associated with the presence of the emperor. Was it only the emperor who built churches in this time? Or is it because the emperor built churches that such references were preserved? If it should be concluded that the encaenia belongs to the builder of churches whether bishop or emperor then it is a feast whose celebration took place at the behest of the church's patron. Whether emperor alone or emperor and forgotten others, the encaenia bore more than a passing resemblance to the lawful consecration of temples and other public

buildings in the empire. If, then, it is a feast which also bestowed some legal status upon the building, then it is not too surprising that we find no mention of such an occasion before Constantine, or that Eusebius should only allude to the pre-Constantinian encaenia immediately before the persecution under Licinius, a time which has been referred to as the 'little peace' of the Church. Nor can it be much of a surprise to find the emperor at the centre of each preserved encaenia. The emperor was the builder and custodian of significant public buildings in the empire. All the churches associated with Constantine were considered significant. Undoubtedly, even those which could be reckoned fairly insignificant by later standards, had an intrinsic significance in the first half of the fourth century because such a building programme so closely associated with the state had never before occurred.

The Encaenia and the liturgical memory

This study, however, particular (and obscure) as it might seem, has a far wider context. The encaenia acts as a concept and an event upon which we might focus more than one lens. Intrinsic to the encaenia was the Christian place of assembly. Whilst the surviving evidence only permits us to begin the study with church buildings in the reign of Constantine, part of the wider context of this study consists of the development, or at least the surviving fragments, of places of assembly. The Jerusalem Encaenia, this study will observe, was the pilgrim festival in the city and, as such, cannot be divorced from the rapid growth of pilgrimage in this period. Underlying the chapters on the Jerusalem feast is an attempt to examine more closely how the liturgy seeks to re-present historical events at the very place at which they occurred.

The Encaenia in Jerusalem, unlike the other celebrations we shall examine, preserved and celebrated the memory of two events. First, it preserved the memory of the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica and, it shall be argued, embedded within the feast some reflection of the historical situation of Jerusalem in the fourth century. This was not, however, a permanently fixed reflection, for the liturgy gradually evolved to comment upon later, less joyful, times in the city. Second, the Encaenia in Jerusalem celebrated the memory of the events which the buildings themselves were designed to commemorate, namely the death and resurrection of Christ. That place and event are so closely entwined is the motivation underlying all concepts of pilgrimage. The closest that one can get to the historical event is to stand on the very spot at which the events occurred and

to exercise the imagination in a reconstruction of the events. The liturgy, particularly in the case of the Encaenia, acts as the communal imagination. The Encaenia, therefore, becomes another Easter and this is reflected in the liturgy by, amongst other things, the selection of psalms and readings from the liturgy of Easter. It was not, however, only a second Easter; for the feast reflects its own historical situation in Jerusalem. The final conclusions to this study will bring together the various historical and theological factors and suggest that the Encaenia, as it was celebrated in Jerusalem, was designed to be the Christian interpretation of the Jewish feast of Tabernacles. This interpretation was partly due to Constantine's own sense of the importance of the Cross, and partly the result of Jewish-Christian relationships in the area. This was a period in which Christians appropriated all things Jewish ranging from the city of Jerusalem itself, the tombs of Patriarchs to the Jewish feasts (particularly those feasts which did not already have an obvious Christian counterpart).

This chapter serves as an introduction to the various elements we have mentioned above. It will provide an overview of recent scholarship on the development of Christian architecture and the landmark of the Constantinian basilica, and the growth of pilgrimage to the holy sites in Jerusalem, and finally review the small amount of literature which exists specifically on the Encaenia (Jerusalem or otherwise).

Early Christian Places of Assembly

In a recent work on the study of early Christian liturgy Paul Bradshaw quoted Robert Wright's statement that in comparative linguistics there were two sorts of people, the 'lumpers' and the 'splitters'. These categories, he wrote, were particularly relevant for liturgical studies.¹ Simply speaking, the 'lumpers' attempt to arrange the many fragments of evidence into a single coherent picture. The 'splitters' have a tendency to deconstruct this picture into its constituent and independent parts. Anyone who wishes to study the early history of Christian architecture or Christian places of assembly would be well advised to bear these two titles in mind.

The surviving evidence for Christian places of worship before the reign of Constantine, archaeological or literary, is fragmentary. On the one hand, it is difficult to piece the fragments of evidence together and develop a model for

¹ Paul Bradshaw. The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship. (London, 1992) ix.

early Christianity, whilst on the other hand this is precisely what many scholars have attempted to do. Tracing the development of Christian architecture or places of worship is not unlike attempts to describe the formation of the Eucharistic liturgy or the relationship between the Christian liturgy and its Jewish origins. It is difficult in both cases to decide whether the evidence is distinctly regional and does not reflect wider usage or whether the evidence points to the state of affairs throughout the Church at a given time (quite apart from the difficulties associated with the dating of evidence).

From Domus Dei to Basilica

Most scholars now hold the opinion that the era of Constantine brought with it a new age of Christian architecture divorced at least in architectural form from what had previously been the case. Judgements which conclude that the Constantinian basilica was a good or a bad thing for Christianity tend to be based on subjective criteria rather than on any evidence contemporary with the era. In effect some writers have sought to answer the question of whether the basilica was an imperial imposition (with the implication that it was inherently pagan), or whether it was a part of the natural evolution of the previous state of affairs (i.e. truly Christian). Friedrich Wilhelm Deichmann was of the opinion that the Christian concept of space (unconsecrated and spiritual) was slowly replaced with a pagan perception of space (physical and consecrated).² A view which polarises perceptions of space into pagan and Christian in this manner has the unavoidable tendency to divide Jewish liturgical practice between temple and synagogue, with the result that the temple is viewed in pagan terms and the synagogue is seen as the roots of Christian practice. This search for what is authentically Christian, as opposed to what might be pagan or belonging to the Old Testament, reflects more the views of the Reformation than it does the surviving evidence.³ Inevitably in this framework the fourth century, with its monumental architecture and sites of pilgrimage, fares rather badly, slowly slipping into the pagan world until the restoration of the meeting house, the authentic Christian building, in the sixteenth century.

² F. W. Deichmann. "Vom Tempel zur Kirche." *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser*. (Münster, 1964), discussed in Paul Corby Finney. "Early Christian architecture: The beginnings (A review article)." *Harvard Theological Review* 81.3 (1988): 320. See also, H. W. Turner. *From Temple to Meeting House: The Phenomenology and Theology of Places of Worship*. (Berlin, 1979).

³ An opinion held by Paul Corby Finney, "Early Christian architecture", 325, 327.

It is from Adolf von Harnack that we have received the terminology of domus ecclesiae, domus dei and dominicum to describe Christian meeting places before Constantine.⁴ His detailed attempt to trace the expansion of Christianity in local regions and in actual numbers is still considered of value today.⁵ By the close of the second century congregations had grown to the extent that special places of assembly were required, something for which there is no evidence prior to the reign of Commodus. The development of catholicity, expressed in the writings of Cyprian for example, presupposed the parallel development of edifices set aside for liturgical use. Harnack cites as evidence the remark of Porphyry in the middle of the third century that Christians built large buildings imitating the pagans, and the reference to the destruction of a Christian 'temple' of Edessa in 201.⁶

Harnack's model is an evolutionary one, largely dependent upon the size of a congregation in any given area, but also a natural consequence of an ecclesiology and liturgy which emphasised the unity of the Church and the centrality of the bishop. Within this framework is included the fourth century basilica church. The basilica, argued Harnack, was a natural development from the hall churches which were constructed in the peaceful reign of Gallienus,

Naturally, it was not done all at once; it was very gradual, so much so that even decades afterwards many congregations had only quite modest buildings. The basilica was not a product of the age of Constantine; it had already made its appearance within Christian architecture...the basilica itself rested on the hall-church, just as that in its own turn went back to the simple chamber or atrium.⁷

The reign of Constantine simply enabled larger, more sumptuous versions of the same thing.⁸

⁴ Adolf Harnack. The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Vol. II (London, 1908) 86.

⁵ "For the expansion of Christianity in terms of establishing new bishoprics and congregations, Adolf von Harnack's work remains fundamental", W. H. C. Frend. The Rise of Christianity. (Philadelphia, 1984) 444.

⁶ Porphyry, Adversos Christianos frag. 76; cited Harnack, Mission and Expansion, II:87.

⁷ Harnack, Mission and Expansion, 88; based largely on the evidence of Eusebius, H.E. 7.

⁸ This is a position which Gregory Dix found appealing. He rejected any idea that the Constantinian basilica was "a proof of the instant corruption wrought by imperial patronage" but rather suggested that "all Constantine provided was the opportunity and in some cases the means for free development", The Shape of the Liturgy. 2nd ed. (Westminster, 1945) 311. It is disconcerting for many, he writes, to learn that the early Church did not share the English Puritans' crusade against beauty in worship (312).

The evolution of the basilica church from previously existing structures was not an opinion to which Richard Krautheimer subscribed. His work has been instrumental in attempting an overall history of Christian buildings from the surviving evidence. Much of Krautheimer's work is centred around the excavations and interpretation of data at the earliest churches in Rome.⁹ The model of development which he employs is not unlike Harnack's. Drawing upon historical texts and liturgical references as well as the archaeological evidence, he puts forward a tripartite model consisting of three distinct periods of Christian architecture.¹⁰ In the period until 200 AD there was no discernible Christian architecture. This was the period of the 'house church' which had its roots in the domestic arrangements alluded to by Paul and described in the Acts of the Apostles. Certainly, no archaeological evidence exists to suggest otherwise. The second period, lasting until around 250 AD, reflected the expansion of Christianity in numbers and in influence. During this period Christian communities rather than individuals owned property. The numbers and the liturgy demanded a regular meeting house, defined in terms of Harnack's domus ecclesiae or, in Rome, the titulus. Gradually larger buildings came to replace these essentially private dwellings, particularly in the peaceful times of 250-303. The basilica, argues Krautheimer, was not a natural part of this process but was the direct result of Constantine's proactive attitude towards Christianity.¹¹ There was no architectural precedent for the construction of churches in the style of the imperial basilica. Thus it is justifiable to maintain that Constantine acts as a watershed between places of Christian assembly which were essentially functional, with any expansion directly related to growth in congregations, and the development of a Christian architecture which was monumental, public, and the size of which expressed less about the local congregation than it did about the place of Christianity. It is with broad brush strokes that Krautheimer paints a survey of Christian meeting places to the reign of Constantine, basing his reconstruction largely on the tituli in the Roman tenement blocks.

If Krautheimer and others before him are 'lumpers', using the meagre evidence to develop an overall picture of development, then Lloyd M. White is to

⁹ Richard Krautheimer, et al. Corpus Basilicarum Christianorum Romae: the early Christian basilicas of Rome. (Vatican City, 1977).

¹⁰ Richard Krautheimer. Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture. (Harmondsworth, 1981).

¹¹ In this Krautheimer follows J. B. Ward-Perkins. "Constantine and the origins of the Christian basilica." Papers of the British School at Rome 22 (1954): 69-90. The place of the Tyre cathedral which was completed before Constantine's reign in the East is discussed in the following chapter.

some extent the 'splitter' of Christian architectural history. Rather than putting forward distinct stages of development he seeks to show that Christian places of assembly underwent adaptation on a local level within the surrounding culture (rather than independently from it).¹² White is critical of earlier models which tried to draw a continuous line of development from the New Testament house church to the Constantinian basilica. Rather, each piece of archaeological or literary evidence must be examined in its own right and with reference to the environment from which it came. Whilst White accepts that the basilica form has little in common with the *domus ecclesiae* he is not convinced by theories which put forward models containing distinct historical periods. His idea of development is similar to that of Harnack, except that it applies to the development of the *domus ecclesiae* rather than to the basilical form. The value of this work lies in the attempt to relate Christian adaptation of existing buildings to similar developments found amongst other social groups, particularly when it occurs in the same local area. The best examples of this local process of adaptation are the Christian, Jewish, and Mithraic meeting places which existed alongside each other at Dura-Europos. Dura-Europos is particularly attractive since the evident adaptations made to the buildings were contemporary. This process of construction, renovation and adaptation was common throughout the empire where just about everything was built upon or from something earlier.¹³ Such a process sought to epitomise an ever-living and growing empire. The *domus ecclesiae* at Dura was adapted from a private dwelling. There is no evidence that it was ever anything else before the building work began. The renovation, which can be dated to 240/41, occurred at the same time that the synagogue was undergoing a similar expansion, transformed the house into a single assembly room. White notes that this transformation cannot have gone unnoticed by the local community. The choice of a private house for a church was not decided on grounds of discretion. It was simply an adaptation which paralleled the choice of a disused public baths for a synagogue in Sardis and the presence of Mithraea in warehouses, underground chambers or private dwellings.¹⁴

The Christian meeting place in the third century at least cannot have been perceived as an anti-social structure. The renovation and adaptation of buildings occurred in a period of prosperity, the 'building-boom' described by Eusebius in

¹² Lloyd Michael White. *Domus Ecclesiae - Domus Dei: Adaptation and development in the setting for early Christian assembly*. (New Haven, 1982).

¹³ White, *Domus Ecclesiae - Domus Dei*, 27.

¹⁴ White, *Domus Ecclesiae - Domus Dei*, 121.

the mid-third century.¹⁵ It is likely that the first steps of adaptation occurred in buildings where Christians already assembled. This, for example, was probably the situation at the Titulus Clementis in Rome the origins of which can be traced back to the first century (and so probably to Clement himself). By the fifth century a basilica stood on the site.¹⁶

Lloyd M. White's work is persuasive in the sense that it maintains an emphasis on the local social context in which the evidence is located. This may be at the loss of a wider perspective on the empire and the effect of times of peace as well as upheaval, but it does ensure that little attempt is made to impose one uniform model of development upon the empire. Although White does not extend the process of adaptation to the basilica, there is an argument for doing so. Much of White's book seeks to demonstrate that architectural modification was incremental and subtle, much like Harnack's view of the development of the basilica. Most of this adaptation occurs in already existing buildings with little external modification. The Christian structures are favourably compared with the private or non-public activities of the synagogue and the cult of Mithras. The construction of the basilica appears to be a rude and loud interruption into the discrete collegiate gatherings. The basilica was public, monumental and imperial. On the other hand Eusebius describes new buildings erected on the sites of old (and these were not old buildings torn down as a result of malicious persecution). This episode is defined by White as a short period which saw the development of the aula ecclesiae, or the hall of the assembly. "This term is intended", writes White, "to connote a direct continuity with the domus ecclesiae, from which it evolved through a continued, natural course of adaptation."¹⁷ Although White argues from archaeological evidence that this was not the building of basilical type buildings, it is difficult not to conclude that basilica was a natural development from the "hall" in the same sense that the hall was in continuation from the domus ecclesiae. The one building which epitomises the ambiguity inherent in making a distinction between the aula and the basilica is the cathedral at Tyre. The inauguration of this building, which was also located on the site of an earlier church, is the first instance we have of the encaenia. The following chapter will discuss in some detail not only the feast but also the nature of the building. For the present it should be noted that scholars who insist on a distinct

¹⁵ White, Domus Ecclesiae - Domus Dei, 127. White notes that Eusebius describes new, spacious churches being built "from the foundations" (H.E. 8.1), interpreted to mean on the site of the earlier churches.

¹⁶ White, Domus Ecclesiae - Domus Dei, 114. See Krautheimer, Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture, 29ff.

¹⁷ White, Domus Ecclesiae - Domus Dei, 128.

difference of architecture before and after the conversion of Constantine have to either argue that the church at Tyre was not a basilica (as White does¹⁸), or agree it was a basilica, but funded by the emperor like all the others (as Krautheimer suggests).

Although White began his work accepting that the basilica church was distinct in development from the *domus ecclesiae* (and ultimately the house church), he ends the study with the conclusion that,

The Constantinian innovation of basilical architecture, therefore, seems less abrupt. Although it represents a radically new imposition of scale and style on the architecture and aesthetic, it still depended on some continuity with earlier church buildings. The basilica may be seen as a further adaptation, monumentalization, and ultimately a standardization of diverse pre-Constantinian patterns of development.¹⁹

It would be a mistake to believe that the Constantinian 'revolution' occurred over night. Indeed, White himself presents examples of buildings which existed as churches before and after Constantine. Not every church became a basilica. Nor, as we shall see, was there a uniform design or size of secular basilica. Christian architecture, like Christian liturgy, retained essential elements which one would expect to find wherever there was a Christian congregation. It also reflected its local environment in style as well as adaptation. Development was more rapid in some areas than in others. When talking of development, we should beware of suggesting that Christian architecture evolved towards some ideal. There never was an ideal place of assembly, neither in Apostolic times, nor in the fourth century. Local communities adapted and adopted as White describes, and in some instances this included the basilical form. In other cases it would appear that the basilica or at least a monumental building was 'imposed' by the emperor and on places where there is little evidence of a previous Christian place of assembly (but frequently replacing some other place of worship). Not least in this regard is the basilica of the Martyrium, the discussion of which forms the central section of this thesis. How this imperial imposition was accepted by the local community is preserved in the literature describing the liturgy of the *Encaenia*.

¹⁸ White, *Domus Ecclesiae - Domus Dei*, 136.

¹⁹ White, *Domus Ecclesiae - Domus Dei*, 139.

Holy Places and Pilgrimage

The Constantinian building programme, even if it was not a wholly new style of church architecture, presented a new opportunity for Christians to express their faith in the historical events of the Incarnation. The fourth century is remembered most by ecclesiastical historians for its theological controversies. At the centre of the Trinitarian and Christological controversies were the bishops and, on occasions, the emperor. The surviving literature details the actions and speeches of great bishops or the decisions of ecumenical councils. There are few references to Christians placed lower down the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The fourth century, however, was not all theological debate and disruption. The reigns of Constantine and later Theodosius, are also remembered for the rapid development of pilgrimage to specific sites in Jerusalem and the surrounding region. The churches erected from imperial funds in Jerusalem, Bethlehem and at Mambre positively encouraged Christians to visit the actual places mentioned in the Gospels and in the Old Testament. In Jerusalem they could stand where Christ had stood, they could look upon Golgotha as the women had done, and they could rise from the waters of baptism in view of the tomb from which Christ had risen on the first Easter morning. Journeying to the holy places appealed to Christians of different status. The wandering pilgrim Egeria bears witness to the crowds at Easter and at the feast of the Encaenia. Gregory of Nyssa, who had remarked that it was impossible to buy groceries without being accosted by Christological doctrine,²⁰ describes the variety of people one could encounter in the city of Jerusalem. Similar ambivalent opinions were held by Jerome as he attempted a quiet scholarly life on the outskirts of Bethlehem.

In recent years a number of works have appeared on the subject of the holy places, the development of the holy land and the subsequent pilgrimages there. David Hunt's work, Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire, AD 312-460 brings together the buildings, the journey, the pilgrims' liturgy, and contemporary views of pilgrimage into one volume.²¹ This is a careful treatment of the primary sources which reflects traditional scholarly conclusions on, for example, the visit of Helena to Palestine (as the archetypal pilgrim), the dating of the relics of the Cross (after the death of Constantine), and the impetus for the uncovering of the tomb and the building of the basilica (Macarius at Nicaea). Regarding the feast of the Encaenia Hunt suggests a development sometime in the

²⁰ Gregory of Nyssa, *De Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti*; PG 46.557.

²¹ E. D. Hunt. Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire A.D. 312-460. (Oxford, 1982).

last quarter of the fourth century which established the original celebration of Constantine's achievement in 335 as an annual feast in the Jerusalem liturgical calendar.²² It is not clear if Hunt is suggesting that the annual celebration was in fact a later development and not continuous from the single event of September 335. He does, however, draw attention to the biblical parallels of the *Encaenia* with the dedication of Solomon's temple and the festival of Dedication mentioned in John's Gospel,

Despite its roots in the reign of Constantine, the *Encaenia* had thus readily assumed links with biblical antiquity. In common with the rest of the liturgy evolving at Jerusalem, it both drew its inspiration from, and was expressed through, the reading of the Bible.²³

This present study includes an exegesis of the biblical texts as they are found in the *Encaenia* and this exegesis is used to cast further light upon the development of the feast as a Christian alternative to the feast of tabernacles, a feast which was intimately associated with both the dedication of Solomon's temple and the Maccabean feast of Hanukkah.

Caesarea and Jerusalem, Eusebius and Cyril

David Hunt's work is primarily one of the history of the development of pilgrimage. In 1990 P. W. L. Walker published a theological study of the fourth century holy places which consisted of a comparison between the attitudes of Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem to the newly-founded sites.²⁴ The wider purpose of *Holy City, Holy Places?* is to attempt an answer to how Christians should view the holy places; what constitutes a Christian attitude to Jerusalem. Obviously, such an answer is not required to be confined to the fourth century but continues to have some relevance today. Walker follows recent scholars who draw attention away from viewing Eusebius as the primary creator of the Holy Land. A work which is devoted to the comparison of two individuals can allocate sufficient space for a close examination of their respective writings. Whilst the *Vita Constantini* is usually the central focus of a study of Eusebius and the holy places, Walker pays particular attention to the *Praeparatio Evangelica*, the *Demonstratio Evangelica* and especially the *Theophany*. Indeed, a large

²² E. D. Hunt. *Holy Land Pilgrimage*, 108.

²³ E. D. Hunt. *Holy Land Pilgrimage*, 110.

²⁴ P. W. L. Walker. *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century*. (Oxford, 1990). An outline of the work appears in "Eusebius, Cyril and the holy places." *Studia Patristica* 20 (1989): 306-14.

percentage of the sections on Eusebius comprise a contrast between Eusebius' theology before 325 and his theology after the victory of Constantine. The insignificance of Jerusalem prior to Constantine is contrasted with its importance after Constantine had turned his face towards the city; a factor which only enhanced the traditional rivalry between the sees of Jerusalem and Caesarea.

It is, however, Eusebius' theological views, rather than political concerns, which receive the most attention in Holy City, Holy Places?. Eusebius' theology of the Incarnation, argues Walker, underpins his attitude to the historical sites in Jerusalem. Eusebius understands the Incarnation to be the ultimate revelation of God, the purpose of which was to lead the believer from the physical world into the spiritual realms. As a revelation the Incarnation was a theophany of the Logos but not the only theophany of the Logos and not necessarily the last. This expression of the Incarnation is found most clearly in the appropriately titled work, The Theophany. Since this work was also the basis for the oration which Eusebius delivered at the Encaenia of the Martyrium basilica it will be discussed further in this study. Its theology, and Eusebius' refusal to give the earthly city of Jerusalem a special status, prompts Walker to conclude that, "it was really the emperor, and not Eusebius, who was the person with a convinced devotion to 'holy places'".²⁵

Eusebius and Cyril of Jerusalem are firmly contrasted by Walker. Eusebius limited his affirmation of the holy places to a distinct triad of sites which he describes as caves. The three, Bethlehem, the tomb, and the cave on the Mount of Olives, proclaim a basic creed of birth, resurrection and the ascension.²⁶ Walker believes this idea of a triad to be Eusebius' own creation in the sense that he was the Constantine's "chief advisor".²⁷ The cave frequently featured in pagan popular religion as the place of divine revelation. Each of the three caves emphasised by Eusebius bore witness to a theophany of the Incarnate Logos. It is not implausible to suggest that rather than encouraging Constantine to create a triad of sites, this triad was Eusebius' own theological interpretation of three significant sites selected from a number of other developing places. Holy City, Holy Places? is a work of contrasts. If we were to understand that Eusebius instigated this project and that there were three central, well-defined, sites then

²⁵ Walker, Holy City, Holy Places?, 111.

²⁶ Eusebius speaks of the "cave of the Ascension" and is the only one to do so. Cyril speaks with a greater precision of the cave of teaching and the summit of the ascension (Walker, Holy City, Holy Places?, 188, 213).

²⁷ Walker, Holy City, Holy Places?, 188.

we might conclude that the Cyril described by Walker, belonged to a different age.

The weakness in Walker's study is that the contrast made between Eusebius and Cyril is based solely upon their extant work. Eusebius is described as the academic, Cyril as the pastor; Cyril is imaginative, whilst Eusebius is systematic. Eusebius omits the finding of the Cross because he doubted its historical authenticity whereas Cyril would have been excited by the very prospect of finding the cross. This contrast is the product of comparing the surviving works of Cyril, which are catechetical in nature, with the theological or apologetic works of Eusebius. Both authors wrote for different audiences. Those works of Eusebius in which we find any reference to his theology of place tend to be those he wrote with a wider audience in mind than simply the local congregation. Conversely, Cyril addressed his catechetical lectures to new Christians at the sacred sites themselves. If Cyril had not been imaginative and enthusiastic about the places in which he was standing, encouraging the newly baptised, one wonders if any one would have seen fit to preserve his lectures. One would have also thought that the bishop of Caesarea occasionally addressed the newly baptised and one might speculate what the content of his lectures would have been if he were to address them in the Martyrium basilica.

Part of this thesis will compare the two surviving orations of Eusebius, one which was delivered at the encaenia of the church in Tyre, and the other which Eusebius addressed to the absent Constantine in Jerusalem. The former is not examined by Walker, perhaps because it does not concern a traditional holy place. It would be difficult to contrast rather than to compare the content of this oration with the utterances of Cyril. It is certainly not a dry and academic theological presentation but rather infectious with its joy, and there are numerous leaps of the imagination throughout. The address given in Jerusalem in 335 is more formal, an address to the emperor and a reproduction of chapters from his earlier and complex Theophany. The intended audience of this oration was wider than that of the one which he had given at Tyre. The comparison which we shall make between the two, however, will demonstrate how appropriate the Tyre oration might have been for the similar event in Jerusalem. There are many ways in which to approach the literary works of an individual. Increasingly the emphasis has shifted away from the interpretation intended by the author to the interpretation received by the audience. In a study such as Holy City, Holy Places? which sets out to examine the personal theology of two prominent theological figures from their writings, the two concerns should be kept together.

Whilst Walker concentrates on the content of each work and the author's interpretation, I am not convinced that he pays enough attention to the intended audience and how this may have influenced the content of the work. Walker demonstrates that Eusebius did not hold a consistent theology during the period before and after the succession of Constantine; the *Ecclesiastical History*, for example, underwent a number of revisions to reflect the historical changes taking place. Any such contrast within Cyril's surviving works is far less apparent.²⁸ His audience, it could be argued, and his literary intentions, were less complex, less academic, than those of Eusebius. Cyril wrote in Jerusalem as bishop of Jerusalem and for a Jerusalem audience. He could afford the luxury of claiming Jerusalem as the centre of the world, of emphasising its sanctity and continuity with the Jerusalem of Jesus because "here" took place the events of salvation and those events endorsed its holiness. Eusebius was not bishop of Jerusalem, wrote for an audience far wider than the boundaries of his own metropolitan and wrote to persuade pagans and Jews of the veracity of the Gospel where the holy city could not simply be the local Jerusalem but had somehow to refer to the worldwide assembly of Christians. We are fortunate that Cyril's lectures were preserved, local as they were. It would have been a greater surprise if Eusebius' works had not been disseminated to their intended audience and we may ask ourselves what became of the pastoral writings of Eusebius. Why did no one see fit to copy down the words of Eusebius addressed to the congregation in Caesarea?

The Holy Land

David Hunt and P. W. L. Walker have written works on pilgrimage and the theology of the holy places respectively. The gap which lies between such works is the wider concept of a holy land and the Christian appropriation of the land of Israel. An attempt to fill such a gap is found in Robert L. Wilken's *The Land Called Holy*.²⁹ This work is a detailed study of the history and the primary sources from the Hebrew bible through to the Muslim invasion in 634. The study moves from the Jewish justification for possessing the land and the first use of the term 'holy land' in 2 Maccabees, the spiritualisation of the land by Origen in the

²⁸ Edward Yarnold notes one or two developments in Cyril's theology in the period between the Catechetical lectures and Mystagogic catecheses; "The authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem." *The Heythrop Journal* 19 (1978): 143-61.

²⁹ Robert L. Wilken. *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian history and thought*. (New Haven, 1992).

third century and the modifications made to the thoughts of Origen by Eusebius in the light of Constantine's conversion. In the Jerusalem of the fourth century Wilken concentrates on the Christian envy of the temple. The Encaenia feast is mentioned, though in this context, not discussed in any detail. The comparison of the new Christian temple with the temple in Ezekiel is examined as is the shifting of the centre of the earth and the grave of Adam from the Jewish temple to the mount of Golgotha. Wilken does not, however, divorce Christian commentary from the contemporary Jewish literature, a particular strength of the work. Origen's spiritualisation of Jerusalem and the land is compared with the third century Jewish growth in Palestine and an optimistic belief in the restoration of the land. Likewise Wilken draws attention to the context of Jerome's writings on the Jewish interpretation of Ezekiel and Isaiah, the prayers in the synagogue for the restoration of Jerusalem, and finally the attempt of the emperor Julian to fulfil Jewish hopes. These factors, important to Wilken's book, are also significant in deciding the interpretation that should be given to the celebration of the feast of the Encaenia, a feast which itself was a comment upon the Christian possession of Jerusalem and the fulfilment of the Jewish prophecies.

The works outlined above do not include much, if any, discussion on whether the holy places were indeed the actual sites at which the events happened which they claim to mark. As in this thesis, the concern is usually with the theological interpretation of the places and not whether the theologians and the congregations were sadly mistaken about the location of each site. Certainly, such assumptions have not gone unquestioned but, in recent years, such debate has tended not to overlap with works concerned primarily with the theology of the places. These are usually satisfied to begin from the premise that at a certain place certain events were believed to have occurred, without feeling it either necessary or relevant to question this assumption.

Holy Places

A recent work which does examine and question the assumption that the holy places are located at the historical sites is Joan Taylor's, Christians and the Holy Places.³⁰ This work is important for the present study, not because Taylor accepts or denies the legitimacy of Christians paying homage at specific sites, but because the arguments which lead to her conclusions include an examination of

³⁰ Joan E. Taylor. Christians and the Holy Places: the myth of Jewish-Christian origins. (Oxford, 1993).

the motives which guided Constantine's building of the Martyrium basilica. The underlying thesis to Taylor's study is that the Franciscans Bellermino Bagatti and Emmanuele Testa were mistaken in their arguments that Christian holy places are genuine because their location had been remembered and correctly identified by Jewish Christians. The existence of Jewish Christians cannot be proved by the extant literary evidence nor by the distribution of religious groups in Palestine in the first three centuries. Taylor proceeds to examine the evidence for each major fourth century site beginning with Mamre, through to Bethlehem, Golgotha, Mount of Olives, Mount Zion, and Capernaum. At each she concludes, for the most part, that there is little evidence that Christians (particularly Jewish Christians) either preserved or worshipped at the site before Constantine. In the case of Golgotha and the Tomb, which we shall examine in greater detail in chapter 3, Taylor argues that Constantine effectively shifted the site to that of Hadrian's temple.³¹ The chapter on Bethlehem is intriguing in so far as Taylor suggests that Christians only selected the site they did to mark Christ's nativity because pagans were already worshipping there and in fact deliberately misleading Christians into believing their god was born there (a mischief which was turned against the worshippers of Adonis when Constantine appropriated this site for Christianity).³² The unusual cave on the Mount of Olives which, from Eusebius' evidence, appears to have been an ancient site of worship, was preserved, according to Taylor, not by Jewish Christians but by those of a Gnostic orientation.³³ This is the only exception to the statement that there is no evidence to support the notion Christians venerated at sites before the fourth century. The development of the holy places, like the development of the basilica, becomes another Constantinian foundation. Not, however, the gift of a particularly Christian Constantine either, but rather imbued with pagan concepts of holiness and festivity; "in constructing temples to his God, Constantine was simply being traditional".³⁴

The role of the emperor in constructing Christian buildings is one aspect of the present thesis. The feast of the Encaenia, whether in Jerusalem or in one of the other cities, acts as the meeting point between emperor and Christians in the inauguration of the buildings. Whilst Taylor is, to some extent correct to conclude that Constantine's building programs were little different to those of his predecessors, it is also important to examine how his actions were interpreted by

³¹ Joan E. Taylor. Christians and the Holy Places, 141

³² Joan E. Taylor. Christians and the Holy Places, 104.

³³ Joan E. Taylor. Christians and the Holy Places, 146.

³⁴ Joan E. Taylor. Christians and the Holy Places, 309.

the recipients of his gifts. Once again, it is really of little consequence if the Constantinian basilica did not mark the site of the death and resurrection of Christ; the fact remains that the dissenting voices are not heard until centuries later. Likewise it was not viewed as particularly significant that Constantine was acting out the role of a traditional emperor. The Encaenia, for example, preserved the memory of Constantine's actions not as those of a traditional emperor but those of a Christian saint.

The Feast of the Encaenia

The sources

This thesis is not simply about the feast of the Encaenia which occurred in Jerusalem in 335. There is not a great deal of commentary on this particular feast but there is even less on the other occurrences of the encaenia either collectively or as individual events. The reasons for a lack of scholarly literature on the encaenia are probably varied. Not least is the fact that the encaenia by itself might appear to be a rather obscure, isolated topic for a single study. One might expect such a topic to have received more attention in histories of church dedication rites. However, as indicated at the beginning of this chapter, such studies are few and those which do exist tend to begin with the rites of later centuries and include only a paragraph or two on the first mention of such rites in Eusebius, by way of an introduction. A third reason for an apparent lack of interest in the Encaenia are the sources. It is especially unfortunate, for example, that the manuscript with the journal of Egeria abruptly ends just as Egeria reaches the fourth day of the eight day feast. Another folio and we may have learned a great deal more about the contents and interpretation of the feast at the end of the fourth century. The liturgical sources are not the easiest with which to work. Athanase Renoux has produced a full critical edition of the ancient Armenian lectionary but there is no easily accessible equivalent for the Georgian-Jerusalem lectionary (which itself is a reconstruction from a number of manuscripts). Apart from the Martyrium basilica, the churches at which the encaenia was celebrated (and of which we have some record) are not in themselves particularly significant. The focus of interest has always been the councils which occurred at the same time. It has not usually been noted that the celebration of the encaenia on each of these occasions provided the opportunity for a council to take place rather than the other way around (this was as true at Jerusalem in 335 as it was at

Antioch in 341). This present study, whilst claiming to make only a small contribution to knowledge, attempts to be not simply a descriptive study of each celebration of the encaenia but to place each occasion firmly in its historical, theological and liturgical context.

Matthew Black and the Encaenia

Matthew Black published a seminal article on the Encaenia which examined its place in the liturgical calendars of the Eastern churches.³⁵ He observed that there was an ancient festival of the East Syrian (or Nestorian) church which opened the liturgical year. Rather than being an encaenia of a particular church this feast was the encaenia of the Church, celebrated in November over four successive Sundays. What, asks Black, is the relation of this Syrian festival to the Encaenia of the Jerusalem church? The obvious answer is that the feast was transferred from the Jerusalem calendar and took on a more general celebration once outside of its intended context. Its celebration as an independent festival, however, may lie in its emphasis on the church as the legitimate successor of the temple as well as the date and length of the Syrian feast. This leads Black to suggest that both the Jerusalem Encaenia and the Syrian feast descended from a common source or that "an old Eastern Christian festival of encaenia [was] simply redated to accord with the emperor's tricennalia".³⁶ If there was a feast older still, then such a feast, celebrated in the winter months, may have had an intended connection with the Jewish feast of the Encaenia (Hanukkah) instituted by Judas Maccabaeus and celebrated in 25 Chislev.

It is beyond the scope of this study to make a detailed examination of the Syrian feast which Black compares with the Jerusalem Encaenia.³⁷ Although Black draws attention to an Armenian calendar he did not have the benefit of Renoux's edition of the Armenian-Jerusalem lectionary nor does he mention the Georgian-Jerusalem liturgical sources. Black concentrates on the one celebration of the encaenia in Jerusalem but does not take into account the fact that this is not the only feast of the encaenia in the fourth century which was associated with a

³⁵ M. Black. "The festival of Encaenia Ecclesiae in the ancient Church with special reference to Palestine and Syria." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954): 78-85.

³⁶ Black, "The festival of Encaenia Ecclesiae", 84.

³⁷ A study of the feast has been made by J. Theckeneth. "The Church Bride of Christ: Historical, analytical and theological study of the season of the consecration of the church in the East Syrian tradition." Ph.D. Pontifical College of St Anselm, 1987. See also G. Khouri-Sarkis. "L'église dans l'année liturgique Syrienne." *Irenikon* 28 (1955): 186-93.

particular church. The Syrian feast was in all likelihood, as Black suggests, descended from a different tradition. The Jerusalem, Antioch or Constantinople feasts of the encaenia were the inauguration of particular buildings, the equivalent to their consecration. The Syrian feast, the encaenia of the whole church, was celebrated with elements taken from the consecration of specific buildings (the anointing of the altar and pillars, for example). The terminology of encaenia is found not only in the feast of Jerusalem or in other such celebrations but also within the extant rites for the consecration of a church (or, as the Greek suggests, a temple). There is, then, an apparent relationship between the Jerusalem Encaenia, the Syrian Encaenia, and the rites of the consecration of Churches but its relationship may be one of common themes and language rather than definite lines of relationship. The origins of the Christian encaenia, in whatever form, probably lie not only in the Maccabean encaenia but also in the Old Testament inauguration of the altar detailed in the book of Numbers. This study will hopefully show that the reasons for celebrating the Encaenia in September were more carefully thought through than simply the transference of an already existing feast (for which no evidence remains) to coincide with an imperial anniversary. The Jerusalem encaenia, although the best remembered, should be studied alongside the lesser celebrations to ensure, if nothing else, that the Jerusalem encaenia is not viewed as the only occurrence of this type of encaenia in the fourth century.

Hilarius Emonds

Around the same time as Black's article H. Emonds produced a study of the terminology associated with the encaenia.³⁸ His article is an overview of the Greek "ἐγκαίνια" and the various forms which appear in the Septuagint, the New Testament, and commentators from the fourth century onwards. This study of the term leads Emonds to conclude that its meaning could vary from construction to renovation and consecration. He draws attention to its use in the sixth century for the renovation, rather than the consecration, of a city whilst its use in the Chronicon Paschale always suggests the consecration of a church.³⁹ On its use with reference to a feast, the question remains open (in the Septuagint at least) whether this was the rite itself or an anniversary feast. Much of Emonds' article concerns the interpretation of its appearance in Jn 10:22. This is usually assumed

³⁸ H. Emonds. "Enkainia: Weihe und Weihegedächtnis." Enkainia: Gesammelte Arbeiten zum 800 jährigen Weihegedächtnis der Abteikirche. (Dusseldorf, 1956) 30-56.

³⁹ H. Emonds, Enkainia, 37.

by Patristic and Medieval commentators to refer to the feast instituted by Judas Maccabaeus. One or two, however, interpret it as either the feast of Solomon's temple or the temple restored after the Babylonian captivity. Emonds concludes that the encaenia made its way into the writings of the ecclesiastical authors directly from the Septuagint usage (and its transcription in the Vulgate). It is either used for the construction or the renewal of the Jewish temple or for the consecration of Christian churches.⁴⁰ Emond's survey holds few surprises and his conclusions accord with our findings in the next chapter. Although he speaks of the consecration of Christian churches (including the Greek rites of consecration) he has little to say on the interpretation of the Christian feast itself. In this respect his article complements that of Matthew Black, which did not examine the origin and interpretation of the term in Jewish or Christian writings.

Recent scholarship

The encaenia has not received much recent attention. Two authors, however, have made comments on the Jerusalem feast which are worth drawing attention to here, though more detailed comments on both may be found elsewhere in this study. John Wilkinson is well known for his study of fourth century Jerusalem, particularly in connection with his commentary and translation of Egeria's journal. From his study of the fourth century liturgy of Jerusalem Wilkinson concluded that the Jerusalem church arranged its liturgical calendar to parallel the Jewish calendar.⁴¹ This arrangement applied not only to the liturgy itself but also to the architecture of the Martyrium basilica. He compares the daily liturgy of the Jewish temple with Egeria's description of the services held in the Martyrium and Anastasis buildings. Wilkinson gives no reasons why the Jerusalem church should choose to make the liturgy correspond with that of the (abandoned) Jerusalem temple. He concludes that it was Eusebius who worked out an analogy between the Jewish temple and the Christian replacement: "we believe he applied this analogy in the advice he gave Constantine over the buildings of Golgotha, in the formation of a new liturgical programme for Jerusalem".⁴² Although the role granted to Eusebius by Wilkinson is not one which more recent scholars would care to admit, there is sufficient evidence to suggest some correlation between the Jewish temple and the liturgy of the

⁴⁰ H. Emonds, *Enkainia*, 54.

⁴¹ John Wilkinson. "Jewish influences on the early Christian rite of Jerusalem." *Le Muséon* 92 (1979): 347-59.

⁴² Wilkinson, "Jewish influences", 359.

Martyrium basilica. Wilkinson mentions the timing of the Encaenia with the feast of Tabernacles, a subject to which we will turn in chapter seven. There is, however, a difference of interpretation between the Jewish and Christian feasts which Wilkinson does not mention. This difference of interpretation applied not only to the Martyrium-Anastasis site but also to the liturgical content. As we shall see, the outward structure of the liturgy might correspond with a Jewish feast but the internal content, marked by the Scripture passages and rubrics, could serve to give a specifically Christian interpretation of the place of the temple, the Jewish liturgy and the Jewish people.

The most recent study of the Encaenia is by Joshua Schwartz.⁴³ His article is a natural development from Black's study and Wilkinson's conclusions concerning the Christian liturgy; "few scholars, however, have thought to ask what the Jews thought about all of this".⁴⁴ The problem is that it is particularly difficult to unravel what Jewish writers might have thought about anything in the fourth century. Schwartz draws attention to the familiar motifs of the Martyrium basilica as the new temple and the eight day celebration of the Encaenia in the style of Tabernacles. "It is most likely", he writes, "that the transference of both these motifs...would not have met with Jewish approval".⁴⁵ It is not until quite late in the article that Schwartz uncovers a distinctively Jewish voice speaking against the Holy Sepulchre, a selection of passages found in the *Pesikta Rabbati*, compiled in the sixth or seventh centuries from earlier material.⁴⁶ The discourse in question examines the completion of the Solomon's temple and the period of waiting until the dedication. The author of this passage, argues Schwartz, wished to demonstrate how the Christians had got it wrong concerning the dedication of Solomon's temple in Tishri (the month of the Encaenia). The Christians cannot lay claim to Solomon because they do not possess the correct interpretation of the biblical verses, available only to those who possess the *Mishnah*.⁴⁷ There is little doubt that Schwartz is correct to assume some anti-Christian sentiment on the part of Jews against the building of the Martyrium basilica and the appropriation of Jewish motifs and sites. It is plausible that the passages to which Schwartz draws attention were written at least to reassure Jewish readers that the Christians could never correctly interpret Jewish scriptures; especially after Julian's spectacular failure to rebuild the temple, seemingly in fulfilment of Christian

⁴³ Joshua Schwartz. "The Encaenia of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, the temple of Solomon and the Jews." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 43.3 (1987): 265-81.

⁴⁴ Schwartz, "The Encaenia", 265.

⁴⁵ Schwartz, "The Encaenia", 270.

⁴⁶ Schwartz, "The Encaenia", 275.

⁴⁷ Schwartz, "The Encaenia", 278 (citing *Pesikta Rabbati*, *Piska* 5, 14b).

prophecies. The texts are, however, too general to be precisely dated to the age of Constantine (which Schwartz does not attempt to do) and could as easily reflect the age of Justinian with its well-developed appropriation of Jewish traditions.

The present study

This study of the Encaenia in the fourth century and in the ancient liturgical sources of Jerusalem falls into two sections. The first section discusses the rite or the action of the encaenia in the fourth century beginning with the inauguration of the church in Tyre and ending with the encaenia in Jerusalem. The latter is particularly detailed since it sets out to discover the answers to a number of questions which determine the nature of the subsequent anniversary feast. The feast itself is the subject of the second section. This is a study of the internal content and structure of the feast and its relationship to the historical context of the texts in which the liturgy appears. The final section, having examined the feast in the writings of Egeria and Sozomen, and in the Armenian and Georgian sources, concludes with a chapter which draws out an interpretation of the feast appropriate only for the city of Jerusalem; an interpretation determined by the motives underlying the first celebration of the Encaenia in Jerusalem, by subsequent events, and by an ambivalent attitude to the Jewish religion. The conclusion suggests ways in which this study might be developed, particularly regarding the reception of the Encaenia in the Western liturgy and also the relationship of the encaenia to the extant rites of church consecration.

Chapter Two

The Feast of the Encaenia in Tyre, 315AD

""What is holy?' Goethe asks once in a distich, and answers: 'What links many souls together'"⁴⁸

Introduction

This chapter takes us from the 'dark ages' of Christian buildings into a period of visible architecture never before seen in Christian history. The fact that much of fourth century architecture remains today only enhances the popular perception that before Constantine there was nothing of significance whereas from Constantine onwards there was a frenzy of building activity, much of which was alien to Christianity. It is, however, a conclusion based on negative evidence. We are forced to conclude that there is little that can be generalised about Christian places of assembly from the surviving evidence. There was no universal building type in the first three centuries. The style of Christian buildings depended upon the local situation of the Church in the empire. From the evidence we do have, however, it is possible to suggest that in many places Christian architecture strove towards something which resembled the actual buildings erected in the reign of Constantine and later. Within the liturgical sources and from some of the surviving archaeological evidence are the seeds of the great basilicas. The peaceful and stable effects of a Christian emperor upon the Church permitted these buds to flower without shrinking. Certainly, there are no contemporary objections to the Constantinian basilica, only words of wonderment.

Eusebius and the events of 313

The years immediately preceding 313 were a complex period in the history of the empire. The size of the empire combined with threats posed by hostile armies on the borders in both the east and the west necessitated a dividing of the empire between two or three co-rulers one of whom was considered the senior Augustus. The matter was further complicated by the means of ensuring succession whereby Caesars were appointed who were expected to assume power on the demise of their superiors. More often than not these junior members had

⁴⁸ G. W. F. Hegel, *Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art*. Vol II (Oxford, 1975) 638

some family connection either through birth or through marriage. Marriages within the imperial college to maintain political harmony were frequent.

In 305, on the retirement of the emperors Diocletian in the East and Maximian in the West, Constantius and Galerius assumed the purple attire of the Augusti. The Caesars appointed were Severus and Maximinus (Galerius' nephew).⁴⁹ In York the following year Constantius died in the presence of his son Constantine. On 25 July, the army hailed Constantine as the new Augustus. Seizing the advantage Maxentius, the son of Maximian, proclaimed himself prince in Rome. Galerius, now fellow Augustus with Severus, reluctantly accepted Constantine as Caesar.⁵⁰ Maxentius, from his station in Italy, continued to challenge the position of Severus. Maxentius' father Maximian suspended his retirement to support his son. In the years 306 and 307 first Severus and then Galerius invaded Italy. Severus died in defeat and Galerius was forced into retreat. Meanwhile, in 307, Constantine accepted Fausta, the daughter of Maximian, in marriage, which effectively allied Constantine and Maxentius against Galerius. The balance was redressed at a conference at Carnuntum in 308 where Licinius was appointed the fellow-Augustus of Galerius. It was also of some help to Galerius that Maxentius quarrelled with his father Maximian who fled to Constantine. Foolishly Maximian attempted a coup against Constantine, resulting in his suicide that same year. Constantine had strengthened his position in Britain, Spain and Gaul, whilst Licinius was based in the Balkans. Maximinus ruled in the East, residing for the most part in Antioch, whilst Galerius was in neighbouring Asia Minor.

Galerius came to a slow and grisly end in 311. Maximinus invaded Asia Minor and seized his territories. Residing at the imperial palace in Nicomedia Maximinus resumed the Christian persecution begun by Diocletian in 303. Meanwhile, in the Western half of the empire Maxentius continued to challenge the imperial college by declaring war on Constantine. To prevent an allegiance between Maxentius and Licinius Constantine offered in marriage the hand of his sister Constantia to Licinius. Then in 312 he marched upon Maxentius in Italy resulting in the victorious battle at Milvian Bridge on October 12. Constantine wrote to Maximinus announcing his defeat of Maxentius and notified him that he, Constantine, had been proclaimed by the senate as the senior Augustus. With this

⁴⁹ The appointment of these two as caesars alienated the two men who seemed to have been prepared for the office themselves, Constantine and Maxentius (Timothy D. Barnes. Constantine and Eusebius. (Cambridge, Mass, 1981) 26).

⁵⁰ Although Constantine effectively remained Augustus over his own territories of Britain, Gaul, and Spain (Barnes. Constantine and Eusebius, 32).

authority Constantine ordered Maximinus to cease his persecution of the Christians. In January 313 Constantine travelled to North Italy to witness the marriage of Licinius to his sister which took place in Milan. It was at this meeting that Constantine urged Licinius to extend similar rights to Christians in his provinces which had been implemented in the West since 306. The two emperors also decided that Maximinus had to go and the meeting closed with a declaration of war on Maximinus. The latter was finally defeated at Adrianople by Licinius on April 30, 313 and committed suicide in July of that year. On June 13, 313 the governor of each eastern province was sent a letter signed by both Licinius and Constantine defining the legal position of Christians. It is this letter, with its mention of the meeting of the two emperors in Milan, which is more commonly known as the 'Edict of Milan'.⁵¹

The letter of the emperors preserved by Lactantius in the original Latin and by Eusebius in Greek translation proclaims religious freedom for all. It is clear that subjects of the empire may worship whatever divinity is believed to reside in heaven. The intention is to encourage the divinity to look favourably upon the emperors and the empire.⁵² The implication of the letter is that the empire no longer holds one set of gods to be the official guardians of the empire. Subjects are now informed that they are also permitted to change religion, again for the divine protection of the empire. This policy reflects the doubt created by the victory of Constantine over the tyrant Maxentius under the 'saving sign'⁵³ and the different religious positions of the two emperors. With regard to the Christian religion, the letter commands the restoration of Christian property, not only places of assembly but all other property which belonged to the Christian 'society'. Funds are made available from the imperial treasury to compensate those who are forced to return property which they may have acquired quite legally. The letter contains no reference to making such funds available to Christians. No mention is made, either, about the rebuilding of property destroyed in the persecution (though the land on which it stood would be returned). Eusebius, however, does preserve an edict issued by Maximinus immediately prior to his defeat at Adrianople. In it Maximinus states that,

⁵¹ The Greek translation is preserved by Eusebius (H.E. 10.5.2) and a Latin version by Lactantius (De Mortibus Persecutorum 48.2). There are few differences between the two.

⁵² Interesting, since the excuse for the persecution of Christians was so often that their activities threatened the peace of the empire and angered the gods. The recognition that the Christian god might be able to create the harmony of the empire is the real triumph of Christianity in the empire.

⁵³ See H.E. 9.9.11

It is also granted them to build Lord's houses. But that this grant of ours may be the greater, we have thought good to decree also that if any houses and lands before this time rightfully belonged to the Christians...that all these should be restored to their original possession.⁵⁴

This edict and the subsequent letter of Licinius gave the signal that the people of Tyre might begin the rebuilding of their church. This is confirmed by Eusebius who, towards the end of Book nine of his Church History, writes,

Thus when Maximinus, who alone had remained of the enemies of religion and had appeared the worst of them all, was put out of the way, the renovation of the churches from their foundations was begun by the grace of God the Ruler of all, and the word of Christ, shining unto the glory of the God of the universe, obtained greater freedom than before, while the impious enemies of religion were covered with extreme shame and dishonour.⁵⁵

The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius

The turning of Constantine and Licinius towards Christianity marks the climax of Eusebius' Church History. It marks the climax, that is, of the last major revision of the work for it is now generally accepted that the first edition ended with book seven documenting the calm before the Great Persecution.⁵⁶ This is a time when, in some regions, the Church developed a more overt visibility with regard to her architecture and her integration within the empire. The persecutions in the age of the tetrarchy, therefore, came as a sudden shock in their ferocity. Eusebius recorded the first edition of the Martyrs of Palestine in the short peace between Galerius' death-bed edict of toleration and Maximinus' resumption of persecution at the beginning of 312.⁵⁷ Book nine documents the last phase of this persecution under Maximinus before his defeat by Licinius at Adrianople in April 313, ending with the above passage and an affirmation of Constantine and

⁵⁴ H.E. 9.10.7f.

⁵⁵ H.E. 9.11.1; NPNF 1.367.

⁵⁶ See Timothy D. Barnes. Constantine and Eusebius, 128f. A. Louth makes an alternative suggestion that the first edition did, in fact, include the persecution and deliverance rather than simply ending with the edict of Galerius; "The date of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*." Journal of Theological Studies 41 (1990): 111-23.

⁵⁷ Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, 149. He argues that the first edition of the Martyrs of Palestine (surviving only in Syriac) envisaged the persecution ending in 311. In 313 Eusebius had to re-write the work to take account of renewed persecution which he did by abbreviating it and attaching it to book eight of the Historia Ecclesiastica. A. Louth, however, argues that this process fails to take account of H.E. 8.13.7 which refers to an written Martyrs of Palestine (Louth, "The date of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*", 116).

Licinius who, "showed their love of truth and their love of God, their piety and their gratitude to the Deity by their legislation in favour of Christians".⁵⁸

Book Ten of the History

Around 316 Eusebius added the final book of his History in which he recorded the effects of the imperial peace upon the Church. The book is dedicated to Paulinus the bishop of Tyre.⁵⁹ This is appropriate, if for no other reason, because the book really consists of an oration delivered at the inauguration of the Tyre Basilica with an appendix of imperial letters concerning the emperor's arrangements for the Christians. About Paulinus not a great deal is known.⁶⁰ We only assume that he was the same Paulinus, bishop of Tyre, present during the Arian controversy. This Paulinus was a priest in Antioch before assuming his seat in Tyre⁶¹ and was probably the successor to Tyrannion who was martyred in the persecution.⁶² If scholars are correct in their dating of the various editions of the Church History then book ten was written three years after the arrival of peace in the eastern half of the empire. The different tone of the book from the preceding nine is obvious and Eusebius himself draws attention to it. "We will fitly add", he writes to Paulinus, "on a perfect number the perfect panegyric upon the rebuilding of the churches."⁶³ In this context "perfect" has the sense of fulfilled or completed. The "perfect number" probably refers to the number ten and the perfect panegyric, whilst indicating what follows, can also be understood as viewing the restoration of the churches as a symbol for the fulfilment of the Church itself. The church building as a microcosm of the church society is a theme which we will encounter within the panegyric. Centred around the rebuilding of the churches book ten becomes a "new song to the

⁵⁸ H.E. 9.11.9 (SC 55.75).

⁵⁹ Eusebius also dedicated his *Onomasticon* to Paulinus, "ἱερὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπε Παυλῖνε" (207).

⁶⁰ A reconstruction of the career of Paulinus and a discussion of his accession to the see of Antioch can be found in Gustave Bardy, "Sur Paulin de Tyre." *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 2 (1922): 35-45.

⁶¹ See Eusebius, *Contra Marcellum* 1.4.19; Theodoret, H.E. 1.5 preserves a letter from Eusebius of Nicomedia to Paulinus of Tyre identifying him with the theological opinions of Eusebius of Caesarea and others whom Arius in a previous letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia had described as condemned because they held the existence of God prior to his son. Paulinus probably became bishop in Tyre in 313 which was the same year when Eusebius assumed the bishopric of Caesarea.

⁶² See H.E. 8.13.3

⁶³ H.E. 10.1.3, "...εἰκότως δ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ τελείῳ τὸν τέλειον ἐναῦθα καὶ πανηγυρικὸν τῆς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἀνανεώσεως λόγον κατατάξομεν..."; SC 55,77.

Lord".⁶⁴ This book will celebrate things that 'truly righteous men and martyrs of the Lord before us desired'.⁶⁵ The Church History of Eusebius was the first work of its kind. The ten books were not written together at one particular moment and the work as a whole was certainly not written in the light of the rise of Constantine. There is, however, a sense in which Eusebius desires to end the History on a positive note, almost an eschatological note. The first edition of the work, ending at book seven, documents a time of peace prior to Diocletian's persecution. Eusebius, in the beginning of book eight, describes the years leading up to the 303 as years where the Church existed without hindrance. So much so, in fact, that the persecution is portrayed as a divine punishment for the complacency of the Church as it fell into laziness and division.⁶⁶ The framework into which Eusebius moulds the effects of the persecution is that of Israel's self-reflections on the exile. Thus, in book eight, Eusebius quotes the words of Lamentations, "The Lord overwhelmed all the beautiful things of Israel, and threw down all his strongholds" and those of Ps 88, "He has made void the covenant of his servant, and profaned his sanctuary to the earth."⁶⁷ From here until the end of book nine (and in the separate work, The Martyrs of Palestine) Eusebius describes to the reader the terrible events of the following ten years.

The subsequent description by Eusebius of the journey of the Church from gloom into light contains a number of appropriate biblical allusions. Clearly evident is his surprise at the way in which he is able to end his History,

But, acknowledging that even these things are greater than we deserve, we have been astonished at the grace manifested by the author of the great gifts...

If book ten is the perfect completion of the work as a whole then the events which it describes are portrayed by Eusebius as the fulfilment of particular Old Testament passages. "Come and see the works of the Lord...he removes wars to the ends of the world..." proclaim Psalm 45. These words, writes Eusebius, are "clearly fulfilled in our day".⁶⁸ And again, another 'divine utterance' has its fulfilment, "I have seen the impious highly exalted...I have passed by, and

⁶⁴ H.E. 10.1.4. Eusebius quotes Ps 97.1,2 including the words, "his righteousness he has revealed in the presence of the nations". Psalm references in this chapter and throughout the thesis follow the Septuagint numbering.

⁶⁵ 10.1.4

⁶⁶ H.E. 8.1.7.

⁶⁷ Lam 2.1,2; Ps 88.40; H.E. 8.1.9.

⁶⁸ H.E. 10.1.6

behold, he was not".⁶⁹ The destruction of the enemies of Christianity is followed by the dawning of a day with distinctly eschatological overtones,

And finally a bright and splendid day, overshadowed by no cloud, illuminated with beams of heavenly light the churches of Christ throughout the entire world.⁷⁰

The extending of the day of light to the entire world by Eusebius ignores, probably deliberately, the existence of religious freedom in the western empire since 306. From the standpoint of Eusebius, who early in his history described how the spread of the Gospel "like the rays of the sun quickly illumined the whole world"⁷¹, the new recognition granted to Christianity is of such significance that even the scriptures can be said to speak of it and the same passages tell of signs revealed to all nations, i.e. to the whole world.

From general statements about the death of the Church's enemies Eusebius moves towards the climax of his introduction to book ten. Having began his account of the persecution with the "houses of prayer thrown down to the very foundations" which "we saw with our own eyes" Eusebius now joyfully describes how,

a certain inspired joy bloomed for all of us, when we saw every place which shortly before had been desolated...reviving as if from a long and death-fraught pestilence, and temples again rising from their foundations to an immense height, and receiving a splendour far greater than that of the old ones which had been destroyed.⁷²

The parallel between the two accounts are obvious. And, just as the persecution was permitted by God as a punishment for the divided Church so too the favourable legislation and the monetary gifts from the 'supreme rulers' are ultimately a confirmation of the 'munificence of God'.⁷³ And now that the temples have been raised once again Eusebius reaches the height of his narrative with the first recorded description of the feast of the Encaenia,

After this, we were granted the sight desired and prayed for by us all: feasts of encaenia in each city, and consecrations of newly-built houses of prayer, assemblies of bishops united for this purpose, gathering together of foreigners from far and wide, sentiments of love by the

⁶⁹ H.E. 10.1.7

⁷⁰ H.E. 10.1.8

⁷¹ H.E. 2.3.1

⁷² H.E. 10.2.1 (compare with Ezekiel 36:33-37).

⁷³ H.E. 10.2.2

people for the people, the union of the members of the body of Christ in one complete harmony of assembled people.⁷⁴

This gathering together of the Church to these feasts (although described as if one feast) is seen by Eusebius in Ezekielian terms of a return from the exile and oppression of the persecution. What he has described is, writes Eusebius, the mystical joining of "bone to bone, and joint to joint". Eusebius successfully intermingles the Pauline theme of the Body of Christ with the bodily rejuvenation images of Ezekiel 37. Both images are linked by Eusebius with the image of one Divine spirit 'flowing throughout all the limbs'. The rejuvenation of the Body of Christ parallels the rebuilding of the churches, celebrated by the assemblies for the feasts of the encaenia. Although Eusebius does not record any great detail about the encaenia he does present us with some general elements. The 'sacred rites' conducted by the priests and shown in the church by "the singing of psalms and reading of the Scriptures, the performing of the divine and mystical services, the inexpressible symbols of the Passion of the Saviour". The general content of the feast thus follows the broad outline of the Eucharistic assembly; the liturgy of the Word followed by the liturgy of the Eucharist. The mention of both the 'priestly worship' and the 'venerable institutions of the Church' may hint at other rites particular to this celebration but of their content Eusebius makes no mention.

The "ἐγκαινίων ἑορταὶ"

The Septuagint

Before we proceed further with the content of Book ten it is necessary first to discuss the apparent distinction Eusebius makes between the "ἐγκαινίων ἑορταὶ" and those of "ἀφιερώσεις". Translations tend towards defining the former as 'dedication' and the latter 'consecration'.⁷⁵ An examination of the usage of the root ἐγκάιν- in comparable literature establishes that a finer definition than simply 'dedication' is required. The word is rare in Greek literature. The root most frequently occurs in the Septuagint and usually in the verbal form. The noun "ἐγκαινία" hardly occurs at all. The usage of ἐγκάιν- in

⁷⁴ H.E. 10.3.1

⁷⁵ NPNF 1.370; "feasts of dedication in the cities and consecration of newly built houses of prayer". SC 55.80; "fêtes de dédicaces dans chaque ville, consécutions d'églises récemment construites". The most recent English edition of the Church History also renders this phrase as "dedication festivals in the cities and consecrations of the newly built places of worship." The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine. (London, 1989).

the Septuagint is invariably connected with the completion of a new object, particularly one associated with the liturgy. In Num. 7:10 the leaders of Israel are described as making an offering at the ἐγκαίνισμὸν of the altar. This action takes place on the same day as the anointing and consecration of the altar and yet appears to be a distinct rite in itself.⁷⁶ The rite in this case involves the bringing of gifts by the twelve leaders to the altar. It is this ritual action which inaugurates the altar as a place of sacrifice. The same ἐγκαίνισμὸν of the altar occurs at 2 Chron 7:9. Here the Chronicler describes the rite as being kept for seven days whilst the 'feast' instituted by Solomon was kept for a further seven days. The latter feast is that of Tabernacles whereas the completion of the temple coincided with the day of atonement (10 Tishri).⁷⁷

The Septuagint also speaks of ἐγκαίνισμὸν in terms of restoration. Asa, in 2 Chron 15:8, "ἐνεκαίνισεν the altar of the Lord" which implies he did more than merely 'repair' it. The subsequent verses describe Asa's restoration of the altar with an account of a seven thousand sheep being sacrificed. The same idea occurs in the Book of Ezra where on their return the people of Israel, "made the ἐγκαίνια of the house of God in joy". Once again the narrative includes a large sacrifice as part of the celebrations. The majority of the references connecting the encaenia with the altar in the Septuagint are to be found in the Book of Maccabees. A new altar was built and inaugurated by Judas Maccabaeus in his task to purify and "ἐγκαίνισαι" the holy things. The account of the purification of the temple suggests that it centres around the inauguration of the new altar which in turn purifies the temple. The feast to be celebrated on the anniversary of this particular encaenia is Hanukkah. It is, though, a feast claimed by the text to stand in succession to the encaenia of the temple under Solomon and Nehemiah. Furthermore, although the feast of Hanukkah occurs on 25 Chislev, the Jewish community in Alexandria are instructed to keep it as "the day of tabernacles".⁷⁸

⁷⁶ Num 7:10, "And the leaders offered offerings for the dedication (ἐγκαίνισμὸν) of the altar on the day it was anointed." Num 7:1 reads, "On the day when Moses had finished setting up the tabernacle, and had anointed and consecrated it...and had anointed and consecrated (ἡγίασεν) the altar with all its utensils..."

⁷⁷ 2 Chron. 7:9-10 states that Solomon dismissed the people on the 23 Tishri having kept the dedication for seven days and the feast seven days. Counting back brings us to the 10 Tishri, the day of Atonement. The coincidence of the three feasts of Atonement, Tabernacles, and Encaenia will occur again in the history of the Christian Encaenia.

⁷⁸ See 2 Macc 1:9, 18.

The sense of encaenia as a rite of inauguration is confirmed by Septuagint passages where the term is used without reference to an altar. The clearest instance is Deut 20:5 which reads,

What man is there who has built a new house and has not ἐνεκαίνισεν it? Let him go and return to his house, lest he be killed in battle and another man ἐγκαίνιεῖ it. ...And what man is there that has betrothed a wife and has not taken her? Let him go and return to his house, lest he be killed in battle and another man takes her.

The context is things newly built or acquired. The verbal form of ἐγκαίνι- continues the sense of inauguration or performing some act which effects the use of the thing (as with the first offering of sacrifice on a newly built altar).⁷⁹

The New Testament

In the New Testament the noun form occurs only once, in Jn 10:22, where it is a reference to the feast instituted by Judas Maccabaeus.⁸⁰ What, in the Septuagint, was a term used to describe the inauguration of a new altar, has by the first century become the proper name for a particular feast. The same transformation occurs regarding the Christian Encaenia; initially a rite of inauguration and then both a rite and a particular feast. The Latin translation of the New Testament retains the Greek word, transliterating it into the more common 'encaenia'. This meant, for example, that commentators on Jn 10:22 were obliged to render some meaning to the term for their readers or audience. Augustine, for example, writes,

The encaenia was the dedication of the temple. In Greek it is καινόν, that is to say, 'new'. Whenever something new is to be dedicated, it is called encaenia. So this word has another use, if a new tunic is worn, it

⁷⁹ Other examples to note are 1 Sam 11:14 (the inauguration (ἐγκαίνισωμεν) of the kingdom by the proclamation of Saul as the first king of Israel) and Neh 12:27 (the inauguration (ἐγκαίνιουσ & ἐγκαίνια) of the walls of Jerusalem with gladness and great sacrifice).

⁸⁰ The verbal form occurs at Heb 10:20, "...the new and living way he [Christ] initiated (ἐνεκαίνισεν) for us through the curtain...". John Chrysostom, commenting on this verse, confirms that the term was understood in the late fourth century in a similar manner to the usage of the word in the Septuagint. He writes, "Ὡς ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν: That is, which he constructed, and which he began, for "ἐγκαίνισμός" is said to be the beginning of use from then on (ἀρχὴ χρήσεως λοιπὸν); 'which he built', indeed, also through which he entered the flesh first cut that way, as it says, 'ἐγκαίνισαι', by which he was also worthy to enter through." (*In Ep. Ad Hebraeos*, Hom. 19; PG 63.139).

is said to be encaeniare. So that day when the temple was dedicated, the Jews celebrated solemnly.⁸¹

The interpretation of Eusebius

That ἐγκαίνια in late antiquity is understood in a similar fashion to its appearance in the Septuagint can also be gathered from the Greek commentaries on the scripture passages where the term appears. For example, the title to Ps 29, "A psalm of poetry for ἐγκαίνισμός of the house", is invariably interpreted by the commentators with reference to the inauguration of the temple of the soul by the presence of the Holy Spirit.⁸² There is another theme to which ἐγκαίνια is frequently connected, that of resurrection. This is a theme to which we will return since it is the Christian resurrection which underlies the feast of the Encaenia. For the present it is sufficient to note that Epiphanius views the title to Psalm 29 as signifying the bodily resurrection of the individual⁸³ and Gregory of Nazianzus devotes an oration entitled 'On the New Lord's Day' to the theme of encaenia in the resurrection of Christ (which inaugurated a new creation) and the individual's own encaenia in baptism.⁸⁴

The meaning which Eusebius gives to encaenia is very similar to how it is found in the Septuagint. With its idea of inauguration, including the later theology of resurrection, the term fits well into the book which describes the inauguration of a new age or, in the words of Eusebius, a new song. We have no surviving evidence of "encaenia" being applied to the completion of a church before Eusebius. However, Eusebius himself makes no suggestion that he is coining a new word but rather states that the feasts had been desired and prayed for by all. At Tyre this desire was fulfilled soon after peace had descended.

How then was the encaenia distinct from the "ἀφιέρωσις" which Eusebius also mentions? If Eusebius' usage of encaenia can be traced back to the

⁸¹ Augustine, Tract. in Joh. 48.2; CCL 36.413. The tract is said to have been delivered on the 23rd Sunday after Pentecost, 2nd November 413.

⁸² Eusebius, Comm. Ps. 29, suggests that to reconcile the mention of both David and a temple one should look towards an interpretation of the title as the 'house of his spirit' (PG 23.257). Athanasius, Ep. ad Marcellinum, advises that the words refer to the soul "where the Lord is received" (PG 27.29). Basil of Caesarea, Hom. in Ps 29, directs the meaning of the psalm to the Incarnation. He retains the meaning of "ἐγκαίνισμός" in this context as inauguration by the indwelling of the spirit but expands the commentary from the single soul to the spiritual building of the Church. The Church, however, he writes, requires no inauguration because it is already the temple of the incarnate Word, but each mind or soul joined to the Body of Christ does require an ἐγκαίνισμός (PG 29.305).

⁸³ Epiphanius, Adv. Haereses 64; PG 41.1194.

⁸⁴ Gregory Naz. Oratione 44; PG 36.608-621.

Septuagint then this cannot be said for the form ἀφιέπω, which does not appear in the Septuagint or the New Testament.⁸⁵ Eusebius himself uses the word to describe the consecration of the Martyrium basilica in 335. Since it was this event which gave rise to the anniversary feast of the Encaenia it seems reasonable to suggest that the two words could be interchangeable. However, whereas the encaenia was the name given to the specific feast celebrated at the inauguration of the church building (especially the altar), ἀφιέρωσις has a more general sense of consecration which is used not only with reference to Christian buildings but also Greco-Roman temples. Ἐγκαίνια (or other forms) as far as it is possible to tell, does not occur in a non-Christian context. The term ἀφιέρωσις and the related ἀφιερῶματα, on the other hand, are used by Eusebius with reference to both Christian and non-Christian sacred sites.⁸⁶ In addition Eusebius quotes the verb ἀφιέπω with reference to pagan customs in his work *Praeparatio Evangelica*.⁸⁷ When Eusebius tells of the "consecration of newly-built houses of prayer" in book ten of the *History* he is describing the completion of sacred buildings in the same manner of speaking as might be used about the completion of temples to the Greco-Roman gods. The feasts of encaenia which he describes in greater detail are the particular Christian ceremonies associated with the consecration of a place of worship. The encaenia investigated in the first part of this thesis are all of major churches. In addition, with the possible exception of the Tyre basilica, the funding and sometimes the initiative for the basilica comes from the emperor. Was the feast of the encaenia celebrated at the consecration of every Christian church? Was it only the encaenia of the major basilicas which the narrators saw fit to record? Or was the encaenia a feast particularly associated with the consecration of imperial basilicas? No definite answer can be given to any of these questions. However, it is possible to present from the surviving evidence a consistent pattern of what the encaenia consisted. This pattern, as we will see, is continued in the accounts of the anniversary feast of the Encaenia of the Martyrium basilica. It is our task now to begin this process with an investigation into the consecration and encaenia of the basilica in Tyre.

⁸⁵ There is one occurrence of the word in 4 Macc 13:13, "With all our hearts let us consecrate (ἀφιερῶσωμεν) ourselves to God". See the translation and introduction by H. Anderson in James H. Charlesworth, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. (New York, 1985) 531-64.

⁸⁶ Regarding Christian shrines see for example, the consecration of the Martyrium basilica (*V.C.* 4.40, 44) and the arising of altars and churches since Constantine (*LC* 16.10). Eusebius mentions the destruction of pagan ἀφιερῶματα in *L.C.* 9.7.

⁸⁷ The consecration of a temple near Mount Cassius (*P.E.* 1.10.20), the Phoenicians 'consecrate' (ἀφιέρωσαν) the fruits of the earth (*P.E.* 1.9.5), and the goddess Astarte consecrated the island of Tyre with a star (*P.E.* 1.10.31).

The Feast of the Encaenia at Tyre

The date of the Tyre encaenia is not entirely certain. We can suppose that the building of the church at Tyre did not begin until after the edict of toleration in 313. The oration mentions in the plural the emperors as "supreme rulers...recording in imperial letters...His righteous deeds." In 316 Constantine was in Southern Gaul preparing for war against Licinius. In March 317 the two emperors made a reluctant treaty at Serdica where Licinius lost the European territory he had held and Constantine's sons were proclaimed Caesars. There is no hint of an imperial division in the oration, both receiving equal praise from the speaker, and so it may be concluded that the emperors are, at least to Eusebius' knowledge, still on friendly terms.⁸⁸ The year 315 then seems a probable date for the Tyre encaenia.⁸⁹ In this year Constantine spent the winter in Trier before entering Rome for the celebration of his Deccanalia.⁹⁰ It was at this time that the famous triumphal arch in Rome was dedicated. The co-emperor, Licinius, towards the end of 315 was busy fighting the Goths.⁹¹ Although his territory was the Eastern half of the empire, Licinius actually took up residence near the Danube. Both emperors, therefore, in 315 were far from the city of Tyre.

Eusebius' panegyric

In Tyre the event was of some significance. In his description of the feast of the encaenia Eusebius recounts that bishops, many foreigners and people of every age assembled for the feast. The style of Eusebius' description, although intended to be read as an account of the general practice of the feast in the cities, gives the impression that Eusebius is in fact describing one particular encaenia which he witnessed.⁹² From this one feast, the encaenia at Tyre, Eusebius makes the general assumption that this was the practice throughout the empire. There is, however, no surviving evidence of such gatherings occurring at this time in other

⁸⁸ Which Timothy Barnes calls, "A comforting simplification of the truth." (1981): 163

⁸⁹ This is the conclusion of Barnes, (1981): 162.

⁹⁰ See *Codex Theodosius* 1.35.1; 1.2.1 and *CIL* 1.2, 268, 272; Cited Barnes, (1981): 65.

⁹¹ It is possible that Licinius arrived at the Danube having battled with the Persians in 313/14. Barnes draws attention to the account of a council at Caesarea in Cappadocia in 314 where Gregory was consecrated bishop of Armenia who in turn entered Armenia and baptised the king. For the sources of this event see Barnes (1981): 65.

⁹² Eusebius begins his account telling of "feasts of inauguration in the cities" but moves from this general statement to a more specific description of the content of the feast which ends with the statement, "And each of the leaders present delivered panegyrics, to the best of his ability, inspiring the festal assembly." Note that Eusebius begins with the plural ἑορταὶ but ends with the singular πανήγυριν.

cities. The account provided by Eusebius including the panegyric delivered on the day, is the only record we have of a church completed and inaugurated so soon after the edicts of toleration.

The panegyric itself forms, therefore, a continuous narrative with chapter 3 of book ten. There is little doubt in the minds of commentators that the unnamed one who delivered the panegyric in Tyre was Eusebius who was evidently one of the many bishops who gathered at Tyre for the event. The very fact that the orator is anonymous and yet the whole of the oration is reproduced (which, after all, was only one of a number delivered at the feast) strongly suggests that the speaker was indeed Eusebius. There are, in any case, a number of similarities between this oration and the one Eusebius delivered in honour of the Martyrium basilica which is examined in the next chapter.

The panegyric is the earliest surviving detailed description of a Christian church. Although Eusebius spends some time observing with wonder the various parts of the building, the oration is less a review of Paulinus' building endeavours (which the assembly could see for themselves) than it is a theology of the spiritual church. Eusebius intermingles biblical allusion and quotation with the Platonic theme of the building as a microcosm of the universe. It is within this style that he begins the oration. First he addresses the clergy present whom he describes as a heavenly crown of glory, an inspired anointing, and the sacerdotal garment of the Holy Spirit. All three of these themes emphasise Eusebius' earlier stress on the new-found harmony of the members of the Body of Christ. Then he turns to Paulinus, bishop of Tyre (although not named), who received the distinguished honour of building and renewing this material building for Christ and his bride, the Church. For this Paulinus is named as another Beseleel, another Solomon and another Zerubbabel. Eusebius addresses next the congregation, the nurslings, the school of wisdom and the pious hearers of religion. Then follows a large section which reviews, with biblical quotation and rhetoric, the works of the Lord in their time. Now is the time of fulfilment of each of the biblical passages he cites. First, the reconstruction of the churches and the unity of the Church (both, for Eusebius, significant effects of the toleration) show forth the city of God (Pss 47:8; 86:3), a newly built and divinely constructed city (I Tim 3:15). Once again, in the House of the Lord, is to be sung a 'new song' praising the works of the Lord who, amongst other things is the 'slayer of tyrants', the 'destroyer of the impious' which recalls for the hearer the recent deaths of Galerius, Maximinus and Maxentius.

The great victory

The recent persecution, which earlier Eusebius had described as a divine punishment, takes on a cosmic significance. Christ the incarnate Physician descended to the human race which lay in the depths of darkness. The rays of Christ's light loosed the cords of sin as if wax. But, on seeing such kindness, the 'evil-loving demon' burst forth and,

levelled his ferocious madness at the stones of sanctuaries and at the lifeless material of the houses, and desolated the churches, -at least as he supposed,- and emitted terrible hissings and snake-like sounds, now by the threats of impious tyrants, and again by the blasphemous edicts of profane rulers, vomiting forth death...and almost slaying [the souls] by his death-fraught sacrifices of dead idols...⁹³

The ten year persecution is presented as the devil's response to the Incarnation. The impious, the imperial tyrants are but puppets and the persecuted are powerless to respond. Such a narrative would be redundant if Eusebius did not present to his hearers the supernatural response. The divine response in this cosmic battle comes in the form of the "Angel of great counsel, the great Captain of God" who,

suddenly appeared anew, and blotted out and annihilated his enemies and foes, so that they seemed never to have even a name. But his friends and relatives he raised to the highest glory, in the presence not only of men, but also of celestial powers, of sun and moon and stars, and of the whole heaven and earth, so that now, as has never happened before, the supreme rulers, conscious of the honour which they have received from him, spit upon the faces of dead idols, trample upon the unholy rites of demons...and acknowledge only one God, the common benefactor of all, themselves included.⁹⁴

The Christ of whom Eusebius speaks is Christ the emperor whose empire, the Church, is "spread abroad everywhere under the sun". Christ performs the functions we would expect of an emperor: the construction of trophies of victory - symbols of his continued reign- throughout his empire. This particular imperial task brings Eusebius from encompassing the cosmos, step by step, to the church of Tyre;

What king...sets up trophies over his enemies, and fills every place, country and city...with this royal dwellings, even divine temples with their consecrated offerings, like this very temple with its superb

⁹³ H.E. 10.4.14; NPNF 1.372

⁹⁴ H.E. 10.4.16; NPNF 1.372.

adornments and votive offerings...clear signs of the sovereignty of our Saviour?...For what was there to resist the nod of the universal King and Governor and Word of God himself?⁹⁵

But, superbly adorned as the basilica is, it is not the greatest sanctuary. For this belongs to the spiritual temple which in this interpretation is the Church of Christ, constructed from living stones, each one of which is a sanctuary in its own right. Continually Eusebius shifts the attention of his audience from material to spiritual and back again, maintaining this conjunction between the earthly and the heavenly. The basilica of Tyre, "this magnificent temple of the highest God", is itself a symbol of the spiritual. Like the first Ark, Paulinus the new Beseleel has constructed it "after heavenly types given in symbols".

The restoration of the church at Tyre

It is at this point that Eusebius gives us some hint of the situation in Tyre before the present feast. The church built by Paulinus was built upon the site of an earlier building. First, the site had been covered in rubbish by the pagan enemies. Secondly, Paulinus was obviously determined to build on this site despite the fact that other suitable places existed in the city.⁹⁶ This covering in rubbish is implied to have been a deliberate act. When we discuss Eusebius' narrative of the uncovering of the Holy Sepulchre, we will observe that this too is described as being covered in rubbish, in this case a temple to Aphrodite and a statue to Jupiter.⁹⁷ The significance is that in the latter and perhaps in the former Eusebius intends to make it appear that the pagans knew of the site's significance and made every effort to cover it up. Regarding Tyre, this site was undoubtedly the place of the original church building which was demolished in the persecution and very likely the place was strewn with rubble and perhaps became a dumping ground for city waste. Yet again Eusebius draws upon his large stock of biblical imagery in presenting the rebuilding as part of the cosmic battle. The portrayal of

⁹⁵ H.E. 10.4.20; NPNF 1.373.

⁹⁶ During the peace which existed before the persecution Eusebius describes how large churches were 'erected from the foundations' of ancient, smaller, buildings. It seems plausible that the new church in Tyre was also built on the foundations of the original church. Evidently, the preservation of the site of a building could be more important than the building itself (especially where the church had been constructed over the tomb of a martyr). The Epitaph of Bishop Eugenius (c.330) records that the bishop rebuilt the church of Laodiceia "from its foundations". This church was also comprised of porticoes, atrium, fountain, and also mosaics (Cyril Mango. The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453: sources and documents. (Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ, 1972) 14).

⁹⁷ Interestingly, a parallel may be found in 2 Kings 10:27 which describes how Jehu desacralized the shrine to Baal by demolishing it and turning it into a public toilet.

Paulinus as a bishop who succeeded in uniting the people after the end of the persecution is submerged under the annihilation of the enemy and the flourishing of the Church in these desert places. The city of Tyre is a microcosm of the world. Imperial officials in the city tore down the church and persecuted the Christians. But fulfilled are the words, "O Lord, in your city you shall set at nought their image."⁹⁸ And Paulinus, the representative of Christ, has arisen like a new Zerubbabel to rebuild the fallen temple;

This our new and excellent Zerubbabel, having heard the word which announced beforehand, that she who had been made a desert on account of God should enjoy these things after the bitter captivity and the abomination of desolation, did not overlook the dead body; but first of all with prayers and supplications propitiated the Father with the common consent of all of you, and invoking the only one that gives life to the dead as his ally and fellow-worker, raised her that was fallen...'And the latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former'.⁹⁹

Thus, the building raised up in the desert of persecuted Tyre is a symbol of the flourishing spiritual church in the empire, of which too the latter glory shall be greater than the former. But the church of Tyre operated as a symbol on another level; as a symbol of the spiritual church it also reflected the sanctuary of its architect's soul, one of the living stones of the spiritual church.

The new church of Tyre

Having unfolded the symbolism associated with the clearing of the site for the basilica Eusebius progresses to the building itself. The basilica is far larger than the building which previously stood there and this one has an outer court with a fortified external wall. In the eastern side of this perimeter wall is the entrance. Through the entrance one proceeds into the colonnaded court in which are set fountains. To the west of the court is the 'temple' itself with three doors facing east, the third door larger than the other two. The basilica and court has been designed so that it is possible to see within the whole basilica whilst standing in the court which itself is perhaps designed for the instruction of catechumens.¹⁰⁰ A central aisle sweeps on to a raised sanctuary in the midst of

⁹⁸ Ps. 72:20, cited *H.E.* 10.4.30

⁹⁹ *H.E.* 10.4.36; *NPNF* 1.375.

¹⁰⁰ *H.E.* 10.4.40, "...and to those who still need elementary instruction a fitting station."

which is the 'holy of holies', the altar.¹⁰¹ Access to the sanctuary is prevented to the unauthorised by an encircling wooden wall. On either side of the aisle are colonnades with a wooden roof and side-rooms including a baptistery. Provision is made for the celebrants of the liturgy with 'lofty thrones'. Eusebius' description can be said to broadly follow the temple narratives in Chronicles, Ezekiel and Josephus.¹⁰² There are significant differences, not least that Eusebius is presenting an oration to an audience who were present in the very building that he was describing. Nor is his description an end in itself but acts as a foundation on which to build the remainder of his narrative. He has no intention of preserving the measurements of the building, something which is a particular concern of the other narratives.

The spiritual building

The building, says Eusebius, is wonderful enough as it is. The various elements of the building are simply noted in preparation for the main vision he has prepared for the assembled crowd. For even more wonderful are the

archetypes and their mental prototypes and divine models; I mean the reproductions of the inspired and rational buildings in our souls.¹⁰³

Once again the building is the soul writ large in symbolic stones. The building is an image of the soul, the soul bears the image of the Logos. Just as the sacred buildings were destroyed so too the soul fell and the deity vacated the sanctuary. So too the restoration of the building is a symbol of the in-dwelling once again of the Logos in the soul. And Eusebius draws attention to two souls in particular saved by the Logos, those of Constantine and Licinius,

Having won over first the souls of the highest rulers, he purified, through the agency of those most divinely favoured princes, the whole earth from all impious destroyers.¹⁰⁴

Once again Eusebius returns to his favourite theme, the rising of the Church after the darkness of the persecution. The parallel in this section with the rising of the

¹⁰¹ Compare with Josephus' description of the holy of holies, "In this stood nothing whatever: unapproachable, inviolable, invisible to all, it was called the Holy of Holy" (*War* 5.219). See also the equivalent in Eusebius' vision of the spiritual temple, *H.E.* 10.4.68.

¹⁰² Josephus (*War* 5.184-227) does occasionally provide the reader with comments which serve to interpret certain elements of the temple. For example, when he describes the gates into the temple he says of the diversity of materials which decorate the gates, "it typifies the All" (213).

¹⁰³ *H.E.* 10.4.56; NPNF 1.377.

¹⁰⁴ *H.E.* 10.4.60; NPNF 1.377.

Tyre basilica from the rubbish heap is obvious. The Word of God brought out into the light those concealed in shelter. He cleaned with spades the souls which had been "covered with filth and burdened with every kind of matter and rubbish of impious ordinances." Eusebius continues this building metaphor and speaks of the construction of the spiritual edifice just as he described the Tyre basilica. The audience are asked to transfer what they see around them at Tyre to a vision of a building composed of souls. So too the spiritual building has an outer wall composed of the faithful who can bear no greater weight. Eusebius' description moves from the outer wall into the building where there are anterooms, pillars in a quadrangular hall representing the letter of the four gospels, catechumens making up the outer walls of the basilica and inside pure souls supported by pillars of the inner teaching of Scripture;

And having selected from every quarter the living and moving and well-prepared stones of the souls, he constructs out of them all the great and royal house (βασιλικὸν οἶκον), splendid and full of light both within and without; for not only soul and understanding, but their body also is made glorious by the blooming ornament of purity and modesty.¹⁰⁵

Each part of Eusebius' vision of the spiritual temple corresponds with the narrative describing the material basilica of Tyre. The above passage, for example, falling as it does between Eusebius' description of the outer parts of the basilica and that of the inner sanctuary parallels Eusebius' praise of Paulinus' construction at the same point;

But the royal house (βασιλείον οἶκον) he has furnished with more beautiful and splendid materials, using unstinted liberality in his disbursements".¹⁰⁶

The comparison continues in the following narrative. Just as the basilica description moved from observing the thrones to the focal point of the building, the altar, so too the narrative of the spiritual temple. From the thrones on which sit the gifts of the Holy Spirit the oration carries the hearer nearer to the altar, "the pure holy of holies of the soul of the common priest of all." Standing to the right is the great High Priest accepting the 'bloodless sacrifice' and offering it to the God of the universe:

Such is the great temple which the great Creator of the universe, the Word, has built throughout the entire world, making it an intellectual image upon earth of those things which lie above the vault of heaven...But the region above the heavens, with the models of earthly

¹⁰⁵ H.E. 10.4.65; NPNF 1.378.

¹⁰⁶ H.E. 10.4.42; NPNF 1.375.

things which are there, and the so-called Jerusalem above, and the heavenly Mount of Zion, and the supramundane city of the living God, in which the innumerable choirs of angels...praise their Maker and the Supreme Ruler of the universe...¹⁰⁷

Throughout his oration Eusebius has shifted between the things in heaven and the things in Tyre. The city he viewed as a microcosm of the world with its persecution of the Church not only narrated as a historical fact but also symbolised in the destruction and abandonment of the Tyre church building. The subsequent clearing of the rubble and the raising of Paulinus' basilica epitomised the victory which Christ had won for his Church in the empire. The feast was the inauguration of the basilica and forms the pivotal point of book ten of the History. In the light of the oration delivered at the feast Eusebius presents the inauguration of the Tyre Basilica (and by extension the inauguration of churches throughout the cities) as the inauguration of the Body of Christ, the Church. The importance for Eusebius of the restoration of the churches after their destruction in the persecution should not be underestimated. Here, and in the texts regarding Constantine's church building programme, the houses of prayer confirm the age of peace. They are the 'trophies of victory', the Christian equivalent of the triumphal arch. But, such Christian architecture is not merely a sign of an earthly victory. The buildings themselves are but symbols of a higher reality. The visible architecture stands as a focal point for two 'other realities'. The true temple is that place where dwells the Godhead. A note above drew attention to the Patristic commentary on the title to Ps 29, the inauguration of the house of the Lord, which more often than not was interpreted as the individual soul. It is the soul as temple which underlies much of Eusebius' encaenia oration. Each individual soul, however, is a living stone of the greater temple which the visible building also represents. This is the heavenly and spiritual church of which the earthly building is but a type. Following this Platonic portrayal of earthly and spiritual realities would permit Eusebius to apply what he says about the basilica in Tyre to any house of prayer on earth. All Christian architecture points beyond

¹⁰⁷ H.E. 10.4.69-70; NPNF 1.378. In this section Massey H. Shepherd suggests that Eusebius' use of the phrase 'bloodless and immaterial sacrifice' and the citations from Heb. 12:22-23; I Cor 2.9 and Ps 103.10 point to his following the liturgy of St James. The biblical passages all appear in this anaphora. Since Eusebius has reached the heavenly altar in this narrative this appears to be an appropriate place to allude to the eucharistic prayer. See "Eusebius and the Liturgy of St James." Yearbook of Liturgical Studies 4 (1964): 109-123. Andrew Louth adds a more general comment to Eusebius liturgical presentation, "[The panegyric] presents an understanding of Christian worship that was not to last the century: the worship of the Church on earth led by the bishop in his basilica is a copy of the worship of the Church in heaven led by Christ himself". The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine., xxxiii.

itself to the one heavenly reality. Yet, the physical building itself can share in the sanctity of the spiritual reality, partly because within it is assembled the sanctuary of the souls and partly because within the sanctuary is the 'holy of holies the altar' where the Father is propitiated with the united prayers and supplications of that type of Christ, another Aaron or Melchizedech.¹⁰⁸

P. Aelius Aristides' Oration in Cyzicus: A comparative view

It is frequently observed that Eusebius' oration is the first that appears in Christian literature. Assuming that Eusebius himself was unaware of a precedent on such a significant scale, it is appropriate to ask on what general style of oration Eusebius based his Tyre panegyric. How unique, in the wider framework of the Greco-Roman world was this style of oration? Little scholarly attention has been paid to the Tyre oration as a whole. It has its attractions as the first description of a Christian basilica and this is where many of the references to the oration begin and end. There is little of significance which attempts to place the oration within its context of the encaenia feast and the restoration of the churches. Neither have scholars paid much attention to the architectural theology contained within the oration. This chapter has made some attempt to examine the content of the oration as a whole, reflecting less on the description of the physical building presented by Eusebius than on those things of greater significance to which the building points.

Classical praise of architecture

In an article which is probably unique in its serious attempt to place the Tyre oration within a wider cultural context Christine Smith compares the oration with the Greco-Roman tradition. The comparison she draws is between Eusebius' oration and the Laus Urbis, a particular literary type of oration praising the public

¹⁰⁸ See H.E. 10.4.24, 36. It is interesting to compare the theology of architecture expressed in this oration with the remarks of Hegel, a citation from whom heads this chapter. On the question of Christian symbolic architecture in the age of Romanticism Hegel writes, "Just as the Christian spirit concentrates itself in the inner life, so the building becomes the place shut in on every side for the assembly of the Christian congregation and the collection of its thoughts. The spatial enclosure corresponds to the concentration of mind within, and results from it. But the worship of the Christian heart is at the same time an elevation above the finite so that this elevation now determines the character of the house of God." G. W. F. Hegel, Aesthetics: Lectures on Fine Art. Vol II. (Oxford, 1975) 685.

monuments in a city.¹⁰⁹ The examples given of this panegyric include Pliny's praise of the public buildings of Trajan where the buildings are reflections of the emperor's own standing and Lucian's presentation of architecture as the manifestation of an intellectual idea. Both these points we have observed in Eusebius' oration.¹¹⁰ Smith, however, concentrates less on the classical idea than she does on the Jewish exegetical tradition.¹¹¹ The latter is really a study of the allegorical tradition of Philo, an author with whom Eusebius was especially familiar.¹¹² The Platonic style of the physical always referring to some spiritual entity is continued by, amongst others, Origen who dictated that all Old Testament references to Jerusalem should be considered as references to the heavenly Jerusalem.¹¹³ Of course, Eusebius himself, through a selective choice of citations, reminds the hearer that the heavenly city was itself a theme in the Old Testament.

The classical rhetorical tradition is discussed by Sabine MacCormack. Although MacCormack's interest is in the handbooks which were written as guides to the structure of the panegyric she does make the point that the panegyric required an architectural setting in which it was delivered, something which the orator often drew attention to.¹¹⁴ It is however, writes MacCormack, a mistake to generalise where panegyrics are concerned since each panegyric is written for a particular event.¹¹⁵ The textual picture advanced in orations associated with architecture is discussed by Averil Cameron in an important work which examines rhetorical devices and themes employed by Christian writers

¹⁰⁹ Christine Smith, "Christian rhetoric in Eusebius' panegyric at Tyre." *Vigiliae Christianae* 43.3 (1989): 226-247.

¹¹⁰ Smith (1989), 229, 231. See *H.E.* 10.4.26.

¹¹¹ This is also the approach of John Wilkinson, "Paulinus' temple at Tyre." *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 32.4 (1981): 553-61. Wilkinson, however, is more interested in the physical building and Eusebius' terminology to describe the building.

¹¹² Compare, for example, Eusebius on the reception of the heavenly pattern by Paulinus with Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2.76 on the making of the tabernacle, "So the shape of the model was stamped upon the mind of the prophet, a secretly painted or moulded prototype, proclaimed by immaterial and invisible forms; and then the resulting work was built in accordance with that shape by the artist impressing the stampings upon the material subjects required in each case."

¹¹³ Origen, *De Principiis* 1.4 ; Cited Smith (1989) 235.

¹¹⁴ Sabine MacCormack. "Latin prose panegyrics: tradition and discontinuity in the later Roman Empire." *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 22 (1976): 29-77. For example, the panegyrics delivered at the imperial palaces of Trier, Aquila or Milan might refer to the particular buildings as is evident from *Pan. Lat.* 7.22.5 (cited p.42) where the orator compares the buildings of Trier to those of Rome. A particular interest of MacCormack's is the adventus ceremony where the architectural setting was of especial significance. She develops this in greater detail in *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*. (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1981).

¹¹⁵ MacCormack (1976): 55.

within and with reference to the empire.¹¹⁶ Although Cameron concentrates a section of her work on Eusebius' *Vita Constantini*, the observations she makes about Eusebius' choice of words are relevant to the Tyre oration.¹¹⁷ Eusebius, she notes, has commonly been portrayed as one hostile to Christian art.¹¹⁸ On the other hand, the evidence for this conclusion (slight as it is) is undermined somewhat by the language rich in visual imagery employed by Eusebius. This language is present throughout Eusebius' *Life of Constantine* and, as we have observed, the success of the Tyre oration depends upon the hearer being able to imagine the heavenly reality symbolised by the very visible basilica.¹¹⁹

Aristides and the temple of Asclepius

Mentioned by Christine Smith, although in no great detail, is an oration delivered by the public orator P. Aelius Aristides (117-187) at the festival for the temple at Cyzicus. This temple was begun under Hadrian and completed probably in the reign of Antoninus Pius (138-161). An earthquake damaged the temple in 161 AD necessitating repairs which were completed in 166AD. The feast of the temple was held in September and Aristides felt compelled by the god Asclepius to attend and deliver the surviving oration.¹²⁰

Aristides commences his oration with an apologetic explaining that he has been compelled to speak by Asclepius despite the fact that he is unprepared to speak at so great an event. He quickly moves on, though, to begin first the praise of the city in which the temple is located and then the building which he describes as best epitomising the founder. The city, he proclaims, is the work of a god. The temple itself is equal to the mountains and acts as a beacon to all who enter the city's harbour. The temple epitomises the city and its beauty exceeds its size,

¹¹⁶ Averil Cameron. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*. (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1991).

¹¹⁷ Cameron (1991), esp. 47-88, "Showing and telling: the power of signs".

¹¹⁸ On Eusebius and art see the article by Sr. Charles Murray. "Art and the Early Church." *Journal of Theological Studies* 28 (1977): 303-345 and the critical reply by Stephen Gero. "The true image of Christ: Eusebius' letter to Constantia reconsidered." *Journal of Theological Studies* 32 (1981): 460-470.

¹¹⁹ Epitomised perhaps by Eusebius' words, "The evidence of our eyes makes instruction through the ears unnecessary" (*H.E.* 10.4.42).

¹²⁰ P. Aelius Aristides. "Oration 27: Panegyric in Cyzicus." *The Complete Works*. (Leiden, 1981) 98-106. Behr also provides a short introduction and notes on which the above is based.

You would say that each of the stones was meant to be the whole temple, and the temple the whole precinct, and again the temple's precinct was big enough to be a city.¹²¹

Aristides, like Eusebius, compares the smallest parts of the temple as microcosms of a far greater structure. Whereas for Eusebius the Tyre basilica could be compared to the structure of the Church (which was the heavenly city of Jerusalem), Aristides views the temple as comparable to an earthly city.

But, the message of both orators is not concerned merely with the beauty of the building before them. Eusebius exclaimed that his audience could see for themselves what he was talking about. Aristides informs his listeners that he will leave the technical details of the temple to those who know about such things - it is enough to admire the engineering equipment required to build the temple. Thus, he moves nearer to the core of his oration. The name of Hadrian, the best emperor, is inscribed on the temple and the temple was erected by him as 'so great a thank offering to the gods'.¹²² Aristides turns at this point to praise the emperor especially his choice to take a partner which he calls "a single resolve established in two bodies and two souls."¹²³ The harmony between the two emperors is a reflection of that which unites the gods and so the whole universe. Once again we find the orator moving from the particular to the universal. That the harmony of the empire depends upon the harmony of the imperial house which in turn is a reflection of heavenly unity is a theme which reoccurs in the writings of Eusebius. For Aristides, and so also Eusebius, the harmony of such relationships is epitomised by the architecture before them;

These adornments of construction are fair and exercise a remarkable persuasion over the masses. But what is perfect and truly the gift of some god occurs whenever both adornments are in harmony, that in the soul and that of construction. For just as we praise the harmony in the latter and the fact that each element preserves its proper relationship, so it is fitting to think that a well lived life takes place whenever harmony and order prevail throughout. This adornment is truly proper to cities. This preserves both individual man and city...Each man need only persuade himself to take the better course.¹²⁴

The association made by Aristides between the soul and the building is comparable to the relationship developed by Eusebius between the temple of the soul and the basilica of Tyre on one hand and the link between the basilica and

¹²¹ Aristides, *Oration* 27.19; Behr (1981): 101.

¹²² *Oration* 27.22; Behr (1981): 102.

¹²³ This refers to the co-emperors Marcus Aurelius (161-80) and Lucius Verus (161-9).

¹²⁴ *Oration* 27.40-41; Behr (1981): 105-6.

the spiritual society of the Body of Christ on the other. The persecution, we should remember, occurred according to Eusebius because the members of the Church were not in harmony with one another. The destruction of the church buildings symbolised the divine retribution just as their restoration to houses 'greater than the former' provided the model for the new peace and harmony experienced by the Church under the combined rule of Constantine and Licinius.

Just as it was natural for Christianity to appropriate the basilical form to epitomise a visible religion, so too it adopted elements of the rites associated with these public buildings. Orations for the consecration of a temple were common events and in this sense the oration at Tyre cannot be considered peculiarly Christian. The content, however, with its rich biblical allusion and quotation ensures that it stands within the Judaeo-Christian tradition. The general form of the oration, particularly with the movement from the physical to the spiritual and from the particular to the universal owes more to the rhetoric of its time than to Eusebius' own theology of place. It is reasonable to suggest that the larger and more grand the church building the more easily it was to view the building as a microcosm of the Church.

Conclusions

The encaenia is portrayed by Eusebius as an event which made no attempt to hide its prominence with the gathering of crowds in a city of some imperial significance.¹²⁵ The oration is heard in a church built in a form of architecture generally reserved for public imperial buildings. In the secular basilica were performed ritual ceremonies recognised by the state.¹²⁶ The imperial association of the basilica is preserved by Eusebius who casts Christ as the heavenly emperor, the one setting up the trophies of victory, the king and governor of the universe.¹²⁷ There is, as we shall see, little difference between the description of the encaenia at Tyre and that of the Martyrium basilica 20 years later. The one significant omission is any mention of the direct involvement of the emperor in either the founding or the inauguration of the basilica. Although the oration and the building itself contains a number of imperial themes or references, Eusebius describes the building as the work of Paulinus alone. No explicit mention is

¹²⁵ Tyre was the home of the purple dye factory which supplied the imperial court. Eusebius tells of Dorotheus, a devout priest, who was honoured by the emperor (probably Diocletian) and appointed procurator of the dye-works (*H.E.* 7.32.3).

¹²⁶ This point is made by Ludwig Voelkl in *Die Kirchenstiftungen des Kaisers Konstantin im Lichte des römischen Sakralrechts*. (Köln, 1964) 29.

¹²⁷ So *H.E.* 10.4.20, quoted above.

made of how such a building was funded. The edict of toleration which gave the impetus to construct the basilica talks only of the restoration of lands or buildings to the Church. It does not dictate that any compensation was to be paid to communities whose church had been destroyed. Rather, any compensation available was for those who had legally obtained Christian property during the persecution and were now forced to hand it back. However, Eusebius does record a general reference of imperial gifts in book ten. Having stated that temples once again rose from the ground he declares that "personal letters of the emperor were sent to the bishops, with honours and gifts of money".¹²⁸ Paulinus, though, does not appear to have received one of these letters since Eusebius promises to attach such documents to the end of the book. The only personal letter granting funds towards the building of a church is addressed by Constantine to Caecilianus, the bishop of Carthage, dated to around 313.¹²⁹ Any similar letter addressed to Paulinus would have come from the office of Licinius who, one might expect, would not have been overly enthusiastic to fund a Christian basilica on the scale of Tyre.¹³⁰

An imperial foundation?

That the basilica at Tyre was somehow self-funded by the Tyre community is not the opinion of Richard Krautheimer. He argues that from Eusebius' description of the basilica and from the style of the oration that the Tyre basilica belongs to the group of churches founded by the emperor.¹³¹ First, particular elements of the basilica, especially the atrium, colonnade (propylaeum) and the raised aisle, are commonly found in imperial palace architecture. Second, Krautheimer draws attention to Eusebius' emphasis on the presence of the sun's

¹²⁸ H.E. 10.2.2. It is, therefore, doubtful if a letter to a provincial governor would have been the place to offer funding for the building of churches. Church patronage usually involved direct correspondence between the emperor and the bishop concerned with the funds coming out of the imperial *fiscus*.

¹²⁹ H.E. 10.6. See the discussion of this letter by Fergus Millar in *The Emperor in the Roman World (31BC - AD337)*. (London, 1977) 583. The letter should also be set in the context of Constantine's eagerness to quell the emerging Donatist controversy (see Optatus, *De Schismate Donatistarum*, Ap. 7).

¹³⁰ As if attempting to answer the question of destroyed churches Lactantius follows his copy of the letter of toleration with, "After publishing this letter, Licinius also urged by word of mouth that the meeting places should be restored to their original state" (*De Mortibus Persecutorum* 48.13). No mention, though, is made of whether the emperor was prepared to fund restoration. For a reconstruction of edicts issued by Licinius in this period see, Simon Corcoran, "Hidden from history: the legislation of Licinius." *The Theodosian Code*. Ed. Jill Harries and Ian Wood. (New York, 1993) 97-119.

¹³¹ Richard Krautheimer. *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, 45-46.

rays in the atrium, on the doors, and through the roof. The sun's rays penetrating the gloom is a common metaphor in Eusebius for the victory of Christ. It is, writes Krautheimer, also a frequent symbol of the emperor as the invincible sun or sun of justice. An architectural emphasis on the flood of light can be viewed at the imperial basilica at Trier and in the audience hall of the Piazza Armerina. These architectural elements, implies Krautheimer, are necessary only for a basilica which had some association with the emperor and, he writes,

connotations of the imperial cult are most patent in churches subsidised by the imperial house.¹³²

Ludvig Voelkl also notes the imperial language within Eusebius' oration. The basilica of Tyre for Voelkl belongs in the same category of church detailed in the Liber Pontificalis.¹³³ On the other hand Suzanne Spain Alexander assumes that the Tyre basilica was not funded from the imperial treasury. Although she observes that the atrium is primarily found in buildings of imperial patronage she states that Tyre was the exception (whereas Krautheimer had used the evidence of the atrium as one reason why Tyre should be considered an imperial basilica).¹³⁴ This assumption leads her to the conclusion that the basilica church complete with atrium, in the east at least, predates the accession of Constantine.

Putting to one side the architectural evidence, the literary sources are reasonably clear that the Tyre community paid for the basilica. First, it would be astonishing, given the tone of book ten, if Eusebius had failed to mention that the emperor had generously aided the building of the basilica. Rather, the oration is in honour of Paulinus not Licinius or Constantine who receive a mention only in so far as they have been the agents of freedom. Secondly, Eusebius actually praises Paulinus and the congregation for their contributions,

Thus this one [Paulinus]...has formed this magnificent temple of the highest God...it is impossible to say with what greatness of soul, with what wealth and liberality of mind, and with what emulation on the part of all of you, shown in the magnanimity of the contributors who have

¹³² Krautheimer (1981): 46. See further R. Krautheimer. "The Constantinian basilica." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 21 (1967): 115-40. Especially p.124f where Krautheimer describes the development of the basilica in the 3rd-4th centuries as becoming more closely associated with the imperial cult. No mention, though, is made of the Tyre basilica though he argues that the basilica type of building was generally reserved for public buildings and was the responsibility of the emperor.

¹³³ Voelkl (1964): 31-32.

¹³⁴ S. Spain Alexander. "Studies in Constantinian Church Architecture (Part 2)." Revistia di archeologia cristiana 49 (1972): 33-44 (esp. 34-35).

ambitiously striven in no way to be left behind by him in the execution of the same purpose.¹³⁵

Whilst Constantine was founding churches in Rome, the Church in Tyre was raising money and organising the "technical and scientific knowledge" to build the finest basilica in Phoenicia.

This still leaves us with the matter of the imperial elements apparent in both the basilica and in Eusebius' interpretation of the oration. The basilical shape was not simply confined to grand public buildings.¹³⁶ Evidence exists that a smaller version of the basilica could be found in earlier Jewish and Christian architecture.¹³⁷ The seeds of Constantinian church architecture were already present before the accession of Constantine (in, for example, the *aula ecclesiae*). The basilica at Tyre (and the fact that it was a basilica is agreed by most if not all scholars¹³⁸) was the clearest example of this line of development because there is no evidence for the direct influence of the emperor. It is perhaps not so strange that the Church should decide to appropriate an architectural form so associated with the imperial cult. Rather than viewing it as part of the integration of Church and state it is perhaps better to see it in terms of Christianity's own mission to, in some sense, blend the conversion of the empire with her own imperial theology. Eusebius, we should remember, draws attention to both the physical and the spiritual building as a "βασιλικὸν οἶκον" or a royal house. It is the house, not of the emperor and his cult, but of the 'universal King (παμβασιλέως)', 'the Master (δεσπότης) of all' and 'universal Governor' (πανηγεμόνος). A whole section of the oration is comprised of questions which begin, "What king (βασιλέων) would...?" Eusebius' description of the acts of the only true king occupies more space than one might expect in an oration praising the inauguration of a church building. But, it is because the building in question is a

¹³⁵ H.E. 10.4.26; NPNF 1.373.

¹³⁶ Richard Krautheimer emphasises the variety of basilical forms in *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, 42. A discussion of the functions associated with the basilica can be found in J. B. Ward-Perkins, "Constantine and the origins of the Christian basilica." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 22 (1954): 78.

¹³⁷ For descriptions of early synagogues (especially the basilica-like synagogue of Alexandria destroyed in 116) see H. L. Gordan. "The basilica and the stoa in Rabbinical literature." *Art Bulletin* 13 (1932): 353-75; Eric M. Meyers. "The current state of Galilean synagogue studies." *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*. Ed. Lee I. Levine. (Philadelphia, 1987) 127-137; Marilyn J. S. Chiat, and Marchita B. Mauck. "Using archaeological sources." *The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship*. Ed. P.F. Bradshaw and L.A. Hoffman. (Notre Dame, 1991) 69-92.

¹³⁸ L. Michael White states that the church in Tyre is wrongly assumed to be a basilica. He thinks it was probably an elaborate form of the *aula ecclesiae* (*Building God's House in the Roman World*, 136). However, as we have previously stated there is really very little to separate the *aula* from the basilica.

basilica, the first visible basilica in the East, that the oration is immersed in Christian imperial language. The Tyre encaenia was the first opportunity for Eusebius to express the sense of fulfilment with which he commences book ten. The triumph of Christianity is her appropriation of not only imperial architecture and images but also the emperors themselves.

A feast of unity

The first recorded encaenia was a triumphant occasion celebrating the inauguration of Paulinus' new and splendid basilica. It was an event at which a number of bishops were present as well as crowds from the surrounding regions. The presence of other bishops, for many probably the first time they had been permitted to openly travel for ten years, symbolised the unity of the Church and emphasised the significance of the event. We have no record of the subject matter of the other panegyrics delivered at this feast but the one delivered by Eusebius ensures that the feast rose to another level, becoming a celebration of the inauguration of the restored Church, the spiritual edifice. The theme of inauguration is implicitly extended from the Church to the empire as a whole. The crushing of the enemies of the Church and the recognition of Christianity by the emperor, the living microcosm of the empire, signified for Eusebius the closing of one chapter in the age of the empire and the opening of another.

Chapter Three

Constantine, the Cross and the Encaenia in Jerusalem

Introduction

The special focus of this chapter is the Martyrium basilica in Jerusalem (better known as the basilica of the Holy Sepulchre). This building itself, as one might expect, has come under a great deal of scrutiny. However, for the most part, studies have tended to concentrate on the history and archaeology of the site rather than on the factors which motivated Constantine's enthusiasm for Jerusalem and the places associated with Christ's death and resurrection.

The main source for the study of Constantine's place in the creation of a Christian Jerusalem is Eusebius' Vita Constantini. Unfortunately, this work was never finished. We also lack a more detailed description of the Martyrium site which Eusebius, in the Vita, indicated he had produced.¹³⁹ The Vita cannot be treated as, nor does it claim to be, a complete record of the deeds of Constantine. Rather, it is a eulogy which praises Constantine with reference mainly to his favourable encounters with Christianity. The work represents Eusebius at his most creative. It is not a mere linear reproduction of events. The Vita can best be described as a work of art. It is a portrait of Constantine which provides the reader with vivid images and visual allusions to biblical and Christian individuals and events.¹⁴⁰ Eusebius' imaginative writing is present in the Vita more so than in the History (with the exception of book ten), and in parts Eusebius projects more about his own ideals than the realities of Constantine's reign.

The Laus Constantini and the appended oration on the Holy Sepulchre (delivered in Constantinople) are two orations written by Eusebius which, apart from the work of H. A. Drake, have been largely neglected; probably because they offer little of great interest for historians of the period and few have seen fit to treat the two orations as texts appropriate for study in their own right. As orations addressed to the emperor, one of which was delivered at the inauguration of the Martyrium, they at least offer the possibility that Eusebius is proclaiming

¹³⁹ Discussed more fully below, p. 114f.

¹⁴⁰ Averil Cameron comments that although Eusebius has often been portrayed as opposed to art the Vita is a particularly figurative piece of writing, especially the "word picture" of Constantine in V.C. 1.10; Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire. (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1991) 53-54.

subject matter which the emperor desired to hear as well as offering the audience Constantine's interpretation of the churches in Palestine.

The feast of the Encaenia, that is, the calendar feast kept by the Jerusalem church celebrating the anniversary of Constantine's inauguration, is always intimately linked with the finding of the Cross. That which the liturgy remembers does not, at first sight, appear to be what the literary sources recall. The problems associated with the nature of the Eusebian sources are compounded by Eusebius' silence on the discovery of the Cross, whether around the time when the Sepulchre was uncovered or at any point in the subsequent years. The debate concerning the dating of the accounts of the finding of the Cross and the connection with Helena, Constantine's mother, is an old one. Only in recent years has there been a convergence towards some explanation of the apparent contradictions between the liturgical memory, the late fourth century sources, and Eusebius.

The question of Constantine and the Cross will form a significant section of this chapter. It is suggested that the Cross (and the place of crucifixion) rather than the cave of resurrection played a larger role in Constantine's decision to transform the Jerusalem site than is evident either in Eusebius' account or in commentaries on Constantine's actions in Jerusalem. The liturgical memory, it will be argued, in this case is more accurate than Eusebius. Without the Cross, the Martyrium basilica stands disconnected from both the Sepulchre and the rock of Golgotha.

The second part of this chapter concerns the distinct role the emperor Constantine played in the final inauguration of the basilica. The correspondence preserved between Constantine and Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem, concerning the preparations for the building of the basilica and the accounts of the inauguration are the first detailed records we have of the close involvement of the emperor not only in founding and financing the building but in the rites of inauguration itself. Constantine's building of the Martyrium, and the subsequent Encaenia follows the tradition of Roman emperors in instigating public building programmes in the empire as signs of triumph and unity. Constantine's actions follow in the same tradition of the emperor Hadrian two hundred years previously. Hadrian rebuilt Jerusalem against the Jews and two hundred years later Constantine is about to initiate the same process.

Eusebius, Constantine and the Saving Trophy

The feast of the Encaenia is the celebration of more than one event. The central act it remembers is Constantine's inauguration of the Martyrium basilica. But, as the liturgical sources testify, the feast also celebrates the finding of the Cross. The inauguration and the finding are two distinct events; and yet, their celebration in the East fell within the same feast. In Part Two we shall examine the liturgical sources in more detail. However, since these historical events are intrinsic to the annual celebration of the feast, it is necessary to examine the nature of the events and buildings, which the feast claims to celebrate, in some detail. An analysis of both the historical and liturgical sources associated with the Encaenia should aid us in understanding not only the significance of the feast itself but also the important role played by the emperor Constantine in the first Encaenia of the Martyrium basilica.

Whilst the conclusions to the thesis hope to present the relationship of the theology of the feast to the buildings in Jerusalem, this chapter in particular will attempt to lay the historical framework out of which the feast arose. The central importance of Constantine cannot be denied. Attempting to discern the reasons for the building of a structure which included a basilica, the rock of Golgotha and the empty tomb is more difficult than it might at first appear. The problem lies not so much in reconstructing the outline of the first Encaenia or even describing the original buildings. Rather, the problem consists of determining whether there is any connection to be made between the significance of the cross in the reign of Constantine and the inclusion of the finding of the cross in the feast of the Encaenia.

There is an apparent missing link between Constantine, the Cross and the building of the Martyrium basilica. There is no account in Eusebius of the finding of the Cross in the reign of Constantine. Reference to this event is also omitted from the anonymous pilgrim of Bordeaux's itinerary. On the other hand it cannot be denied that the sign of the Cross was of some significance to Constantine, the accounts of which are enthusiastically preserved by Eusebius.

The Saving Sign and Constantine's victory over Maxentius

According to Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History Constantine's association with the Christian symbol of salvation began immediately after his victory over Maxentius. The narrative of the final battle is cast by Eusebius within the framework of Moses' triumphant escape from the armies of the Pharaoh. Constantine's reception in Rome is nothing less than a city welcoming her saviour, "the whole Roman people...received him as their deliverer, their saviour and their benefactor, with shining eyes and with their whole souls."¹⁴¹ In this narrative Constantine points away from himself to the true source of his victory. Where a pagan orator might describe the emperor going up to offer sacrifice on the altar of Victory, Eusebius recounts the placing of "the saving sign of the cross" in the right hand of Constantine's statue with the inscription, "By this saving sign, the true proof of bravery, I have saved and freed your city..."¹⁴²

The account of the same events in the later Vita Constantini is significantly different. If the reader of the History was wondering how Constantine managed to understand the cause of his victory over Maxentius as the Christian God and the Cross then the Vita provides the explanation. It is in the Vita that Eusebius first mentions the famous vision of Constantine before the final battle. Eusebius draws no parallels with the Pauline visionary narrative.¹⁴³ Constantine is not portrayed as a persecutor who becomes a missionary. Rather, before the vision Constantine is described as following the example of his father Constantius I. Constantine chose his deity on the battlefield and his choice depended upon considering the one most likely to bring him victory.¹⁴⁴ First, however, he desires a sign. This he received in the form of a cross with the famous inscription, "τούτω νικά". The reader receives the distinct impression

¹⁴¹ H.E. 9.9.9. This sense of a united people joyfully receiving a larger-than-life emperor is also found in the panegyric on Constantine's entry into Rome. See Pan. Lat. 4.30.4-31; 12.19.

¹⁴² H.E. 9.9.11; "Τούτω τῷ σωτηριῶδει σημείῳ, τῷ ἀληθεῖ ἐλέγχῳ τῆς ἀνδρείας τὴν πόλιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ ζυγοῦ τοῦ τυράννου διασωθεῖσαν ἡλευθέρωσα...".

¹⁴³ Such a parallel is drawn by Dimitris J. Kyrtatas. The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities. (London, 1987) 136-7 and P. Keresztes. "Constantine: called by divine providence." Studia Patristica 18.1 (1985): 47-53.

¹⁴⁴ This, according to Eusebius, is a result of reflecting upon the demise of past emperors who had followed the traditional Roman religion compared with the success of his father who had "honoured the one Supreme God". This reflection is, of course, the underlying message of both Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History and Lactantius' De Mortibus Persecutorum.

that Eusebius himself had doubts about this account.¹⁴⁵ Any misgivings, however, are submerged under the authority with which Eusebius grants the narrative. The account, he claims, was personally narrated to him by Constantine himself "long afterwards". This, it seems, would account for its omission in the earlier work. Within Eusebius' account the vision initially does not carry an obvious meaning for Constantine. The connection between the vision of the cross and the Christian religion occurs in another manifestation, the dream of Constantine. Christ appears to Constantine in his sleep, bearing the very sign which had been spread across the sky. Constantine is commanded to make a likeness of the sign for use as a safeguard against his enemies.

We have already noted that Constantine is portrayed as a new Moses delivering the people of Rome from Maxentius the Pharaoh-Tyrant. In the previous chapter we observed that the defeat of Maxentius and the subsequent decrees of toleration for the Church marked for Eusebius a new age and a new song. The narrative in the *Vita Constantini* extends this Mosaic framework to include the activity of Constantine prior to the battle of the Milvian Bridge. It is difficult not to compare Constantine's vision of the cross with Moses and the burning bush. Both Moses and Constantine failed to grasp the meaning of the sign and for both an additional divine manifestation was necessary. The Israelites are led through the wilderness by the tabernacle which Moses had made according to a likeness shown to him by God. Constantine leads his army with the standard of the cross made according to a likeness shown to him by Christ. Eusebius' detailed description of the making of the standard or labarum parallels the description of the cultic objects.¹⁴⁶

Lactantius and the dream of Constantine

Of course, this account is not the earliest extant report of the vision. Around the time that Eusebius was completing the earlier edition of his History Lactantius had incorporated a version of Constantine's personal encounter with

¹⁴⁵ *V.C.* 1.28, an account "which might have been hard to believe had it been related by any other person".

¹⁴⁶ The appropriateness of comparing Constantine to Moses has been discussed in some detail by Michael J. Hollerich in "Myth and history in Eusebius' 'de Vita Constantini': Vita Constantini I,12 in its contemporary setting." *Harvard Theological Review* 82.4 (1989): 421-445 and in "The comparison of Moses and Constantine in Eusebius of Caesarea's Life of Constantine." *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989): 80-85. Similar points were made by Anna Wilson, "Biographical models: the Constantinian period and beyond" at "Constantine and the Birth of Christian Europe", a symposium held at the University of Warwick in April 1993.

the cross into his De Mortibus Persecutorum. Lactantius describes no public vision but rather states that Constantine was directed in a dream to place the 'heavenly' sign on the shields of his soldiers.¹⁴⁷ Why Lactantius refers to the cross as a 'celeste signum' is not explained. It may well be an allusion to the vision of Constantine, the details of which may have been preserved in the source Lactantius was using for his own account. Lactantius' account is a mere summary compared to the extended narrative of Eusebius. Apart from the unexplained 'heavenly sign' he does not state who directed the inscribing of the sign on the shields. J. L Creed comments that Lactantius' account, as well as being closer to the event, may well have originated from someone present at the final battle.¹⁴⁸ If this is so then either Lactantius' source knew only the barest details or Lactantius chose to set aside the more vivid details which we find in Eusebius. The latter course of action seems perfectly reasonable if Lactantius composed his work around 314 when Constantine's activities, unlike those after 324, might be viewed with suspicion by some. The inclusion of an extended dream or vision narrative would grant Constantine a divine authority, something which Lactantius was not yet prepared to do.¹⁴⁹ Sozomenus, on the other hand, reproduces two different accounts of the vision. In the first the Eusebian narrative has been expanded to include the presence of angels who declare, "Constantine, by this symbol, conquer!"; the second is a reproduction of Eusebius' own narrative including his testimony that he heard the Emperor swear on oath the veracity of the events.

In all these accounts the context of the saving sign, which the writers interpret to be the Christian cross, is a military one. Constantine constructs the Labarum in the form of this sign for the express purpose of leading his army.¹⁵⁰ He also inscribes the sign upon the helmets and shields of his soldiers. It is immediately after his military triumph in Rome that he places the spear and

¹⁴⁷ Lactantius, De Mortibus Persecutorum 44.5, "Commonitus est in quiete Constantinus, ut caeleste signum dei notaret in scutis atque ita proelium committeret."

¹⁴⁸ Creed, Lactantius: De Mortibus Persecutorum. (Oxford, 1984) 119 n.8

¹⁴⁹ In the preface to his work Lactantius informs the reader he intends to bear witness to the martyrs in the persecutions and how God destroyed the anti-Christian emperors. The victory of Constantine occurs towards the end of the work. Unlike Eusebius there is no hint of a biblical or Christian framework. Lactantius is still quoting the Aeneid in the midst of the battle. His description of the dream of Licinius (46.3-6), on the other hand, is more descriptive than that of Constantine. The end of the work attributes no credit to either Constantine or Licinius even as God's agents, it is solely the 'triumph of God (triumphum dei)...the victory of the Lord (victorium domini)' (52.4).

¹⁵⁰ As recorded by Eusebius, "The emperor constantly made use of this sign of salvation as a safeguard against every adverse and hostile power, and commanded that others similar to it should be carried at the head of all his armies" (V.C. 1.31; NPNF 1.491).

inscription on his statue in the forum. The narrative of the battle is cast as a victory for the Supreme God whose participation in the battle, writes Eusebius, was comparable to the Exodus account. The cross, then, almost parallels the role of the Ark in the Israelite conquest as an effective symbol of divine protection.

The Trophy of Victory and the defeat of Licinius

The theme of the cosmic battle takes on a new intensity in the writings of Eusebius when he describes the deterioration of relations between Constantine and Licinius. Licinius is placed by Eusebius among the persecuting God-hating emperors. Constantine, on the other hand, perceives himself as saving the Eastern empire by the disposal of one individual, a task for which he believed he had the co-operation of God. Eusebius is, of course, writing the narrative long after the events which gave Constantine sole rule of the empire. Thus, the war between Constantine and Licinius is compacted into one significant battle. On one side stood Constantine with the standard, "the symbol of his full confidence in God, surrounded by his priests, "the guardians of the soul" with their effective prayers.¹⁵¹ On the other was Licinius with a variety of soothsayers, priests and prophets. The speech of Licinius makes it quite clear that this is a battle between the gods of the Roman ancestors and "some strange and unheard-of deity". If the single deity should be victorious then a farewell would be bid to the old gods. If, as was expected, traditional Roman religion triumphs then the followers of the new religion will be crushed.¹⁵²

The victory against Licinius, as narrated by Eusebius, belongs to the saving trophy. More effective than the Ark (which was captured by the Philistines) the Constantinian standard caused the troops of Licinius army to flee. In fact, Eusebius states that, recognising this power inherent in the symbol, Constantine incorporated the Cross into his military plan, ordering that the labarum should be re-positioned to places where his troops were under pressure from the opposing forces.¹⁵³ Eusebius mentions the 'tabernacle of the cross' which is pitched in the same fashion as the tent of meeting, outside the camp.¹⁵⁴ Constantine's attitude to the standard, relates Eusebius, reaches such a peak that he not only warns his soldiers never to direct their attack towards the standard but not even to stare at it, such was the awesome power inherent in it. The final

¹⁵¹ V.C. 2.4

¹⁵² V.C. 2.5.

¹⁵³ V.C. 2.7.

¹⁵⁴ V.C. 2.12. See Ex. 33:7.

battle lines are drawn with Licinius and his lifeless statues and Constantine with the life-giving sign. Constantine's victory is rooted in the cross which itself has become the effective symbol of the Christian faith. After the decisive victory, those who survived on the side of Licinius acknowledged the source of Constantine's victory and professed belief in the supreme God.

The only imperial title which Eusebius assigns to Constantine in the Vita is VICTOR. Constantine is referred to in this manner immediately after the narrative of the victory over Licinius. It is not, however, without qualification. For the reader is left without doubt that the source of Constantine's triumph lies in the Christian God. The overriding theme of this chapter is unity. The east and west sections of the empire are now one, ruled by a single ruler "whose sole authority pervaded the whole". Constantine appropriated the title victor, according to Eusebius, "to express the victory which God had granted him". The union of the empire is described as a 're-unification'; a single empire as in the days before the tetrachy (and by implication, before the days of persecution). Constantine, unlike the former sole-rulers of the empire, was the first to symbolise the sole authority of God. This chapter ensures that the reader understands the correct order of authority,

With processions and hymns of praise they first of all, as they were told, ascribed the supreme sovereignty to God, as in truth the King of kings; and then to the victorious emperor, and the Caesars, his most discreet and pious sons.¹⁵⁵

The all-ruling God and his agent on earth cast as the rising sun dispelling the dark clouds of tyranny and persecution can be paralleled to the similar passage we noted in book ten of the Ecclesiastical History. The vivid sense of relief, of a new day and a time of peace stands almost as the eschatological dawning of the new age after the days of darkness. It is the Christian parallel to the Israelite conquest story, except in this case the new Moses actually enters and forms the promised land. The formation of the new age is thus described by Eusebius in the remaining books of the Vita.

¹⁵⁵ V.C. 2.19. Constantine appointed Constantius Caesar in November 324. Crispus and Constantinus had been made Caesar in 317. On 25 December 333 Constantine would receive this honour at the age of 13; André Chastagnol. L'Evolution Politique, Sociale et Economique du Monde Romain 284-363. (Paris, 1982) 128.

The military context of the trophy of victory

The context of the 'saving trophy' or sign described above has invariably been military. Constantine's trust in the sign of the cross originates on the battlefield. His acceptance of the Christian religion is portrayed as a direct result of his victory against Maxentius and later Licinius. The term used by Eusebius, the 'τροπαίον', is the name given to the military signs of victory which appeared on various coins, pillars, and artefacts after an imperial triumph.¹⁵⁶ Eusebius gives the reader the impression that the cross as a trophy of victory had its roots in the vision of Constantine and the subsequent labarum. This theme, however, appears in writings earlier than the vision of Constantine.

The Roman trophies were the standards or public signs of military victory. The cross was also thought of in these terms, as is apparent from the writings of Justin Martyr and Tertullian. Justin, writing around the middle of the second century, proclaims that the presence of the cross is already to be found on the Roman standards,

But never was the crucifixion imitated in the case of any of the sons of Zeus...Yet as the prophet [Isaiah] predicted it [the Cross] is the greatest symbol of his power and authority, as shown from the things you can see. For the sea cannot be transversed unless this trophy¹⁵⁷, which is called a sail, remain fast in the ship...The human figure differs from the irrational animals precisely in this, that man stands erect and can stretch out his hands, and has on his face, stretched down from the forehead, what is called the nose...and this exhibits precisely the figure of the cross...Even your own symbols display the power of this figure - on the standards and trophies, with which you make all your solemn processions, using these as signs of authority even though without understanding what you are doing. Then you set up the images of your deceased emperors on this figure, and in the inscriptions call them gods.¹⁵⁸

Tertullian approaches the subject from a slightly different angle. He is concerned in both the *Apologia* and the *Ad Nationes* to reject the view that Christianity was "the priesthood of a cross". It is the pagan religions, writes Tertullian, which should be described as "all cross". The statues of the deities are first constructed

¹⁵⁶ See R. H. Storch. "The Trophy and the Cross: Pagan and Christian symbolism in the fourth and fifth centuries." *Byzantion* 40 (1970): 110, 115.

¹⁵⁷ "τροπαίον", translated by E. Rochie Hardy as "the sign of victory".

¹⁵⁸ Justin Martyr, 1 *Apology* 55. The Library of Christian Classics Vol 1: Early Christian Fathers, Trans. E. Rochie Hardy. (London, 1953).

in the form of a cross before being covered in clay. Tertullian, like Justin, draws attention to the Roman standards,

The frames on which you hang up your trophies must be crosses: these are, as it were, the very core of your trophies (*tropaeorum*). Thus in your victories, the religion of your camp makes even crosses objects of worship; your standards (*signa*) it adores, your standards are the sanction of its oaths; your standards it prefers before Jupiter himself. But all that parade of images, and that display of pure gold, are (as so many) necklaces of the crosses. In like manner also, in the banners and ensigns, which your soldiers guard with no less sacred care, you have the streamers and vestments of your crosses. You are ashamed, I suppose, to worship unadorned and simple crosses.¹⁵⁹

Tertullian does not deny that Christians offer reverence to the cross. He is concerned to point out that the same accusation may be aimed back at his accusers and furthermore, as noted by Justin, the pagans use imperfect forms of the cross in religion without attempting to understand their significance. Hippolytus too, has this ability to see the figure of the cross in his everyday surroundings. He, like Justin, views the mast of a ship as a particularly appropriate sign of the cross,

But we who hope for the son of God are persecuted and trodden down by these unbelievers. For the wings of the vessels are the churches; and the sea is the world, in which the Church is set, like a ship tossed on the deep, but not destroyed; for she has with her the skilled pilot, Christ. And she bears in her midst also the trophy over death (*τὸ τρόπαιον τὸ κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου*); for she carries with her the cross of the Lord.¹⁶⁰

The image of the Cross standing high as a trophy of victory affording protection to those associated with it is naturally compared with the sign of the serpent which Moses set up in the wilderness. Justin, for example, explains to Trypho that Christ, by the sign of Moses, brought salvation to believers from the bite of the first serpent. The saving sign of Moses thus corresponds with the saving sign of the cross.¹⁶¹ Eusebius, in his description of the setting up of the Constantinian labarum, writes that when Constantine sought an interpretation of the vision he was advised, by those acquainted with Christian doctrine, that the

¹⁵⁹ Tertullian, *Ad Nationes* 1.12 (CCL 1.32). Compare with the *Apologia* 16, "The camp religion of the Romans is all through a worship of the standards, a setting the standard above all gods...I praise your zeal: you would not consecrate crosses unclothed and unadorned" (ANF 3.31).

¹⁶⁰ Hippolytus, *De Antichristo* 59 (ANF 5.216; GCS: Hippolytus 1).

¹⁶¹ Justin, *Dialogue* 94. See also 90-91 where Justin lists the biblical texts which prefigure the crucifixion and the sign of the cross.

sign which he had seen was the "trophy of victory over death".¹⁶² If the instruction which Constantine received is placed alongside the description of him recognising the inherent power of the sign then it is not implausible to suggest that Constantine himself was aware of the comparison between his sign and that of Moses.

Constantine's interpretation of the sign

In his earliest account of Constantine's triumphal entry into Rome Eusebius describes how Constantine placed in the hand of his statue, "a trophy of the Saviour's passion". Explicitly linked with the cross, the trophy is the visible evidence of Christ's victory, the spoils of battle. It is this visible aspect of the sign which Eusebius emphasises throughout the descriptions of the Constantinian standard. Justin and Tertullian, however, have already emphasised its visible presence in the Roman standards. Neither of them claim that the cross should merely be a picture of the imagination or a literary description, nor do they deny the value of the Cross as a visible sign. Tertullian attests to its sign value in *De Corona* where he describes the frequent occasions when Christians trace the sign of the cross on their foreheads.¹⁶³

In the second description of Constantine's statue found in the *Vita* Eusebius changes the description of the cross from a "trophy of the Saviour's passion" to "this great trophy of victory". Eusebius repeats the words of Constantine that it is a "saving sign" (σωτήριον σημεῖον). There are then, two distinct though not unconnected, images of the cross present in Eusebius' narrative. First, the cross is a trophy and second, it is a 'saving sign'. Neither of these images have their source in Eusebius. Both are used by Constantine. The former can be identified with the actual visible trophy erected by Constantine whilst the second forms part of the wording Constantine inscribed on his statue. As far as Constantine was concerned the vision and the incorporation of the cross into a battle standard was the cause of military success. There is no apparent evidence to suggest that Constantine saw much beyond the actual image he created. If anything, his use of the sign is more in accordance with Moses'

¹⁶² Eusebius, *V.C.* 1.32, "τὸ δὲ σημεῖον τὸ φανὲν σύμβολον μὲν ἀθανασίας εἶναι, τρόπαιον δ' ὑπάρχειν τῆς κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου νίκης". This phrase is also found in Hippolytus, *Comm. in Daniele* 4.9.3.

¹⁶³ Tertullian, *De Corona* 3.

construction of the serpent on a pole. The inscription on the statue ascribing the liberation of Rome to "this saving sign", together with the anecdotal evidence of Constantine deploying the standard in his battle plan, seem to confirm that sign and reality are blurred in the mind of Constantine.

Eusebius' interpretation of the sign

It is Eusebius who provides the 'acceptable' Christian interpretation of Constantine's actions. Constantine may have been aware of the events associated with the life of Moses but it is Eusebius who explicitly compares Constantine with Moses from the beginning of his narrative. The parallel with Moses begins and ends with Constantine's military victories against Maxentius and Licinius, the very narratives which contain the vision and origins of the Constantinian labarum. It is also the commentary of Eusebius which ensures that when Constantine states that he triumphed "by this saving sign" the reader understands that Constantine "presented a thanksgiving to [God] as the Author of his victory" and whilst "glorying in the confession of the victorious cross" also "proclaimed the Son of God to the Romans". In other words, Eusebius ensures that three things are understood by the reader, first that the use of the cross as a military standard gained its authority from a divine vision; second, that it has a biblical parallel in the life of Moses; and third, that Constantine looked beyond the physical sign of the cross to the divine reality.

Constantine and the vision of Apollo

The physical sign itself was, as various scholars have observed, ambiguous to say the least. The descriptions of the standard recorded by Lactantius and Eusebius are not of a simple cross, but rather a version of the so-called 'chi-rho' sign. The similarity of this depiction to symbols associated with worshippers of the sun deity Sol Invictus has been noted. In addition to the Christian descriptions of the standard we may also be reminded that the vision of Constantine prior to the battle of the Milvian Bridge was not his first supernatural experience. In 310, whilst on route to defeat Maximian at Massilia Constantine paid a visit to the temple of Apollo at Grand in Gaul.¹⁶⁴ There, records the pagan orator, Constantine was honoured with a visit from Apollo, the traditional

¹⁶⁴ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 36.

personification of the sun.¹⁶⁵ The orator describes Apollo as "your protector", accompanied by Victory. The vision, like the Christian equivalent, gave divine authority to the rule of Constantine. Whilst the Christian sign was accompanied with a promise of military victory, the Apollo vision came with the laurel crowns of a lengthy reign. The orator reminds Constantine that as a result of this vision he "honoured that great temple with offerings so rich" and hints that "all the temples call you with their voices, in particular that of our Apollo...".¹⁶⁶ After 310, the year in which Maximian was defeated and Apollo promoted as his patron, Constantine's coins ceased to depict Mars and replaced this deity with Sol.¹⁶⁷ This was the religion of his father, Constantius I and also the favourite deity of Augustus.¹⁶⁸ The depiction of Sol on coins also increased significantly after 313. The triumphal arch in Rome with its vague "instinctu divinitatis" and reliefs purloined from earlier generations has no image of the chi-rho or labarum. It does, however, include Sol-Invictus and figures of Constantine with his arm raised in Sol-like fashion.¹⁶⁹

The deliberate ambiguity

Constantine's visible Christianity in the years following the defeat of Maxentius was ambiguous. On the one hand we have the Eusebian narrative which portrays a distinctively Christian Constantine, devoted to the Cross of Christ whilst on the other hand we see little evidence of pure Christianity in the symbols of the empire, the triumphal arch, the coins and even the labarum itself. There were good reasons for an ambiguity in the affairs of religion. When Constantine entered Rome in 312 he still had to ensure that his position in the empire was firmly established. The triumphal ceremonies, including the arch, were granted by the Roman senate. Constantine entered Rome as the liberator and protector of Roman tradition. One sign of this which Constantine gave was his preference for the administration of the empire to be handled by the Senate. With some relief the Senate heard that Constantine had no intentions to execute

¹⁶⁵ *Pan. Lat.* 7.21.3-6 delivered in Autun. B. Saylor Rodgers presents a detailed commentary on this vision, drawing attention to both the affirmation of Constantine's right to rule and also the comparison between the Constantine of the oration and the Augustus of Virgil's *Aeneid*. See "Constantine's pagan vision." *Byzantion* 50 (1980): 259-78.

¹⁶⁶ *Pan. Lat.* 7.22.7.

¹⁶⁷ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 36.

¹⁶⁸ Augustus erected a temple to Apollo on the Palatine complete with a solar chariot on the roof; see Miranda Green, and John Ferguson. "Constantine, sun-symbols and the Labarum." *Durham University Journal* 80.1 (1987): 13.

¹⁶⁹ Philip Peirce. "The Arch of Constantine: propaganda and ideology in late Roman art." *Art History* 12 (1989): 406.

the supporters of Maxentius. Constantine's entry into Rome marked a new beginning whilst the figure of Maxentius epitomised the faults of the past. A favourable Senate strengthened Constantine's position both in Italy and throughout the empire by appointing him as the senior Augustus over Licinius.¹⁷⁰ The ambiguity of Constantine's religious position ensured that the Senate, comprised of conservative Romans, did not become alienated. The vagueness which characterises the inscription on the arch and the ambivalence of the military standard which could be a Christian cross or could be the fiery wheel of Sol Invictus is present also in the post-312 orations delivered by the traditional Roman orator. At an official level no-one, including the emperor himself it appears, is willing to put the emperor and empire into a unretractable religious position. As H. A. Drake writes,

What in fact has happened is that we have reached the meeting ground between pagan and Christian thought in the early fourth century, that strange shadow world...wherein monotheists could be Christian or pagan, a world wherein the Father and the Son, the Supreme Being and the Logos, were concepts not yet monopolized by one faith. Through this meeting ground there was a bridge, lighted by the "Heavenly Sign." Unquestionably it was Constantine's bridge...¹⁷¹

Constantine saw a vision of a cross superimposed upon the sun. The vision itself is a symbol of Constantine's subsequent interpretation. His Christian advisors, whoever they were, drew his attention to the Cross of Christ. If Constantine thought the vision of the sun was somehow connected with Apollo then his advisors could point to the Christian day of the sun, the sun of justice who was Christ, and the text of Matt. 24:30. Behind Apollo stood Christ and the forthcoming battle would be the test.

Eusebius' sources for the labarum and vision of Constantine

The narratives of the vision and the Labarum in the *Vita* were compiled nearly twenty-five years after the event. As we noted above, the bejewelled labarum described by Eusebius is hardly the labarum constructed on the

¹⁷⁰ See Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 45-46.

¹⁷¹ H. A. Drake. *In Praise of Constantine*. Berkeley, 1976) 74. But also see Timothy Barnes treatment of Constantine's religion in *Constantine and Eusebius*. Barnes has little discussion of the various interpretations of the vision of Constantine. Averil Cameron is particularly critical of Barnes on this point in her review article, "Constantinus Christianus." *Journal of Roman Studies* 73 (1983): 184-90.

battlefield.¹⁷² Eusebius himself states that this description is of one he had seen himself.¹⁷³ The time and place when Eusebius viewed such a construction is not mentioned. Eusebius was in the presence of Constantine on only four occasions. Any information that Eusebius claims to have received from the mouth of Constantine or any eye-witness reports must have occurred on one of these occasions. These four meeting points were, the Council of Nicaea in June 325, the council of Nicomedia in December 327, Constantinople in November 335 and again in 336 (for the Tricennalia).¹⁷⁴ Surviving coins on which the labarum is clearly depicted are rare and date from the time of Constantine's sole rule.¹⁷⁵ There is no extant evidence, other than Eusebius' account, to suggest that the Labarum was in existence in the form described by Eusebius before Constantine's victory over Licinius.¹⁷⁶

Although Eusebius describes the making of the labarum within the narrative of Constantine and Maxentius, its miraculous effects are not felt until the battle of 324. Eusebius claims that the miraculous properties concerning the labarum were in fact related to him personally by the emperor "long after the occurrence of the events". It is not implausible to suggest that Eusebius first set eyes on the labarum around the same time when he was researching the *Vita*, whilst in Constantinople in 335 or 336.¹⁷⁷ Perhaps it was also at this time that

¹⁷² Barnes gives the best explanation of the origin of the term "labarum" as a Celtic term which goes no further back than 312 when Constantine invaded Italy with an army largely composed of Gallic soldiers; T. D. Barnes. "The conversion of Constantine." *From Eusebius to Augustine: selected papers, 1982-93*. (Aldershot, 1994) III:387.

¹⁷³ *V.C.* 1.30.

¹⁷⁴ Eusebius may have been in Constantinople in May 337 at the death of Constantine; see Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 266-67; H. A. Drake. "What Eusebius knew - The genesis of the 'Vita Constantini'." *Classical Philology* 83.1 (1988): 20-38, esp. 30-31.

¹⁷⁵ C.f. Patrick Bruun. "The Christian signs on the coins of Constantine." *Arctos* (n.s.) 3 (1962): 19-35, especially p.27 where Bruun states that the rare *spes publica* coins of Constantinople date from 326-330, coinciding with Constantine's Vicennalia celebrations.

¹⁷⁶ Lactantius says nothing about a standard. Rather the 'heavenly sign' is marked on the soldiers' shields, *De Mort.* 44.5. The statue in Rome held not a labarum but a spear in the form of a cross (*V.C.* 1.40). Amongst the various Constantinian documents that Eusebius saw fit to preserve he includes Constantine's manifesto addressed to the Eastern provinces soon after the defeat of Licinius which Eusebius claims to have translated from the Latin. This letter contains, to a certain extent, a summary of Constantine's religious policy and, like the oration, parts of it are addressed to God including the following, "Under thy guidance have I devised and accomplished measures fraught with blessings: preceded by thy seal (σφραγίδα) I have led thy armies to victory: and still, on each occasion of public danger, I follow the same signs (συνθήμασιν) of thy perfections while advancing to meet the foe" (*V.C.* 2.55; NPNF 1.513). These are the earliest recorded words of Constantine which allude to the Labarum or military standard.

¹⁷⁷ According to Drake Eusebius approached the emperor about a 'bios' in the autumn of 335, in Constantinople when he was summoned there with the other bishops from Tyre; "What Eusebius Knew", 36.

Eusebius received the emperor's account of the heavenly vision.¹⁷⁸ Therefore, the description of the standard and its employment in battle is (as Eusebius admits) a great deal later than the events themselves. Between the vision of the cross, the modification of the Roman standard and the Tricennalia there occurred one other significant event which revolved around the saving sign. This was the finding of the cross, about which Eusebius says nothing.

The Finding of the Saving Sign

Jan Willem Drijvers and Stephan Borgehammar

In recent years the narratives of the finding of the Cross have been studied in some detail. Two particular scholars, Jan Willem Drijvers¹⁷⁹ and Stephan Borgehammar,¹⁸⁰ have produced monographs on the subject. In addition, H.A. Drake has written on the silence of Eusebius concerning the finding of the Cross and Helena's presence in Jerusalem. Drijvers' work compares the narratives of the finding with the historical life of the empress Helena. Borgehammar, whilst using much of the same material and argument, presents a slightly wider perspective with less focus on Helena and more on the reign of Constantine. Both authors, however, analyse the relationship of the late fourth century narratives to the contemporary historical sources. Both authors also have to contend with the gap between the history and the narrative, the silence of Eusebius. The division of Drijvers' work into two sections entitled, "History" and "Legend" is telling. The latter contains the narratives of the finding of the Cross, beginning with Gelasius the bishop of Caesarea in 367, whilst the former extends from the birth of Helena up to her death around 328/29. There is, of course,

¹⁷⁸ Although it is also possible that Constantine publicly recounted his experience at Nicaea (so Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 266).

¹⁷⁹ Jan Willem Drijvers. *Helena Augusta: the mother of Constantine the Great and the legend of the finding of the true cross*. (Leiden, 1992). The work was first published in 1989 as Drijvers' doctoral thesis for the Rijksuniversiteit, Groningen.

¹⁸⁰ Stephan Borgehammar. *How the Holy Cross was Found: from event to medieval legend: with an appendix of texts*. (Stockholm, 1991). The aim of the study is announced on page 9. In addition see Stefan Heid. "Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalems." *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 32 (1989): 41-71. Both Drijvers and Borgehammar draw upon this article though neither agree with its conclusion that the source of the legend is to be found in the liturgy of Jerusalem and the necessity to explain the finding of the cross to pilgrims. The great attraction the feast of the Encaenia had for pilgrims is noted by Heid (49) and it is, he argues, the feast of the Cross which gives the legend of the Finding its "Sitz im Leben" (62-64). The legend was constructed to be read in the liturgy itself, the closest to the original being the account preserved by Rufinus (70).

additional material which assumes the finding of the cross but which does not attribute the finding to Helena. This material, which includes Cyril of Jerusalem, Drijvers also places in the section of legends.

The development of the narrative of the cross, however, does not depend on the presence of Constantine's mother. Rather, as the earliest sources testify, it was Constantine, not his mother, who was most concerned with the building and subsequent inauguration of the Martyrium basilica. As we have already made clear, the symbol of the cross (with or without an attached theology) was of some significance to Constantine. It is perhaps strange that Helena was connected with the finding of the cross at all if it was not for the fact that there is no evidence that Constantine himself set foot in Jerusalem. Helena herself, therefore, provides the missing link between Constantine, the saving sign, and the finding of the cross.

Imperial movements 324-326 and Helena's tour

The fact that so little can be concluded about the historical finding of the cross is also demonstrated in the disagreement over chronology between Drijvers and Borgehammar. Drijvers follows Timothy Barnes and others in placing Helena's pilgrimage to Jerusalem in late 326 after the deaths of Crispus and Fausta, and after Constantine's Vicennalia celebrations.¹⁸¹ According to Drijvers, however, the building of the Martyrium basilica commenced after the council of Nicaea (where Constantine may have been approached by Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem) and is linked with Constantine's desire for unity in religion throughout the empire after the demise of Licinius.¹⁸² On the whole this chronological framework follows the order of material in Eusebius' *Vita*.¹⁸³ Eusebius, however, presents a loose chronology and prefers to place related material together. Thus, the narrative relating to the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre includes not only Constantine's letter to Macarius but also a full description of the finished buildings which would, in a strict chronology, belong with the material detailing the basilica's inauguration. In addition, the letter to Macarius concerning a church at Mamre appears after the description of

¹⁸¹ Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 59. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 221.

¹⁸² Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 64 n.45.

¹⁸³ Eusebius' order is as follows (V.C. 3.6-54): Council of Nicaea - Constantine orders the building of a church in Jerusalem - discovery of Holy Sepulchre - pilgrimage of Helena - Churches in Constantinople and elsewhere - Letter of Constantine concerning Mamre - Destruction of pagan shrines everywhere.

Constantine's work in Constantinople, a city which was officially completed in 330.

Stephan Borgehammar, like Drijvers, sees the destruction of pagan shrines in the east as commencing immediately after the defeat of Licinius, but dates Constantine's subsequent letter to Macarius before the council of Nicaea to 324/25,¹⁸⁴ meaning that the building of the Martyrium basilica was already underway by Nicaea. If, like Borgehammar, we argue that the primary motivation for the construction of the Martyrium basilica was the Saving sign and not, as Eusebius suggests, the Holy Sepulchre, then any miraculous discovery of the Cross also occurred at this time, before Nicaea. If Helena is also to be connected with the discovery of the Cross in history as well as in legend then her visit to Palestine must be placed at an earlier date. This is what Borgehammar does, arguing that Helena started her journey to Palestine in 324 and arrived there sometime between January and March 325.

Borgehammar is not the only scholar to suggest that Helena's journey occurred before Nicaea. Joan Taylor in her recent work, Christians and the Holy Places, draws attention to the sometimes forgotten visit of Constantine's mother-in-law, Eutropia, to Palestine. Immediately before Constantine's visit to Rome in July 326 he put to death his son Crispus. His wife, Fausta who was entangled in the accusations made against Crispus, herself died by intent or by accident whilst Constantine was in Rome.¹⁸⁵ Eutropia was the mother of Fausta and her position in the Constantinian court must have been in some doubt after the death of

¹⁸⁴ Borgehammar dismisses the idea that Macarius approached Constantine at Nicaea on the subject of Jerusalem as a "myth of scholarship". I am inclined to agree. (Borgehammar, How the Holy Cross was Found, 125).

¹⁸⁵ Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, 220-221. Constantine married Fausta, the daughter of Maximian, in 307. A coin issued in Trier in 307/8 depicts on one side FAUSTAE NOBLISSIMAE FEMINAE and on the reverse, a seated Venus (R.A.G. Carson. Principal Coins of the Romans. III: 21, no.1231). These events are, not surprisingly, omitted by Eusebius. Sozomenus, whilst denying that Constantine favoured Christianity through its power to forgive him the murder of his own son, does not deny the execution of Crispus by Constantine (H.E. 1.4; see also Philostorgius, 2.4). See the discussion in Drijvers, Helena Augusta, 60-62. Although the most accepted explanation of the deaths of Crispus and Fausta is that presented in Zosimus (Hist. Nova 2.29.1-2), we will probably never be able to arrive at a satisfactory explanation for Constantine's actions (so Drijvers, Helena Augusta, 62). This has not prevented, for example, J. Bulloch from drawing lessons from the tale which reveal more about the author than about the situation in 326, "There is a strange contrast between the terrible story of the execution of his wife Fausta and the death of his own son Crispus, and the indifference of Marcus Aurelius to his nymphomaniac wife and his monstrous son. Rome had treated marriage as a social contract. She had been the model for the permissive society of the twentieth century in her acceptance of prostitution, concubinage, homosexuality, pornography, paederasty, divorce and abortion, even if it has not yet occurred to any modern Chancellor of the Exchequer to follow her example in taxing prostitution" (Pilate to Constantine. (Edinburgh, 1981) 315).

Fausta, it is thus unlikely that she made any visits of an imperial nature after 326.¹⁸⁶ Constantine, in a letter to Macarius and the other bishops of the regions¹⁸⁷ refers to Eutropia as, "my most religious κηδεστρίας", something which he was unlikely to do if he had been involved in the death of Crispus and her daughter.¹⁸⁸ It is more likely, writes Taylor, given the amount of organisation and expense an imperial tour involved, that Eutropia travelled with Helena Augusta and that she did so sometime after October 324 when Helena and she were both promoted to Augusta¹⁸⁹ but before July 326 when Constantine was in Rome and Fausta met her death.¹⁹⁰

Another reason for suggesting an earlier date for Helena's visit to Palestine has to do with the nature of the visit. Christian narratives are keen to

¹⁸⁶ Joan E. Taylor. *Christians and the Holy Places*, 310; on the site of Mamre which Eutropia brought to Constantine's attention, see 89-91. Ze'ev Rubin, to whom Taylor makes no reference in this work (but see her review of Drijvers and Borgehammar in the *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 12 (1992-93): 52-60), also concluded that the visit of Eutropia occurred sometime in 324-325 ("The church of the Holy Sepulchre and the conflict between the sees of Caesarea and Jerusalem." *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 2 (1982): 90). He does not, however, suggest that this was also the date of Helena's tour. Drijvers is rather sceptical of any suggestion that Eutropia's relationship to Fausta would have prevented her journey after 326. Rather, he states, Eutropia "would have been presented as the emperor's mother-in-law to distract attention from the recent misfortunes in Constantine's house and to pretend that nothing had happened" (*Helena Augusta*, 71 n.72). It is, I believe, Eusebius rather than Constantine who pretends nothing had happened by placing the material relating to the imperial visit after the council of Nicaea. Note, however, that Eusebius makes no mention of Eutropia by name and firmly attributes the founding of the church at Mamre to Constantine alone, associating it not with the churches founded by Helena but with Constantine's churches of Constantinople, Nicomedia and Antioch.

¹⁸⁷ *V.C.* 3.52, "Νικητῆς Κωνσταντίνος, Μέγιστος Σεβαστὸς, Μακαρίῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἐπισκόποις Παλαιστίνης".

¹⁸⁸ The letter also mentions the *comes* Acacius whose name also appears in his letter to Antioch where he is one of those who kept Constantine informed about the dispute over the succession to the episcopate there. *Codex Theodosianus* 11.3.2 titles him as *comes* of Macedonia in 327. Barnes reports the visit of Eutropia but makes no comment on the date or travelling companions (Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 248).

¹⁸⁹ Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 41

¹⁹⁰ This is not the view of David Hunt who states, "For it is safely beyond doubt that her [Helena] journey was in some way inspired by the mysterious domestic turmoil which ravaged the house of Constantine", *Holy Land Pilgrimage*, 32. On the presence of Eutropia Hunt does not reject the idea that both women travelled together but does present their journey as chiefly one of pilgrimage, the cause of which was the death of Crispus and Fausta, "Clearly whatever had transpired in the court was sufficiently appalling to provoke the (surviving) imperial women into this combined reaffirmation of an unambiguous piety" (34). The surviving evidence, unfortunately, does not put the date of the tour beyond doubt nor can it be said with any clarity what motivation lay behind the tour (though it certainly was not simply an act of piety).

stress that the visit was a pilgrimage to the holy places.¹⁹¹ Eusebius, as we would expect, describes in some detail Helena's founding of the churches at Bethlehem and on the Mount of Olives.¹⁹² But, Helena's visit was not simply to build churches and it was not only confined to the province of Palestine. Helena is described as visiting the Eastern provinces and cities which, of course, included Palestine. In addition to founding churches Eusebius praises Helena's generosity,

On the occasion of a circuit which she made of the eastern provinces, in the splendor of imperial authority, she bestowed abundant proofs of her liberality as well on the inhabitants of the several cities collectively, as on individuals who approached her, at the same time that she scattered largesses among the soldiery with a liberal hand...she bestowed gifts on the poor...she liberated some from imprisonment, or from the mines...others again she restored from exile.¹⁹³

This is not a description of an imperial lady on pilgrimage. This is the description of an empress conducting an official tour of the eastern provinces. Such a tour is entirely appropriate in the circumstances. Helena moves around the territory which, until recently, was under the rule of Licinius. Helena's visit not only confirmed Constantine's victory but also may have calmed unrest created by the defeat of Licinius, and Constantine's religious policy.¹⁹⁴ The scattering of

¹⁹¹ The idea that Helena went on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem in reparation for the terrible deeds of her son is perhaps alluded to by Ambrose, *De Obitu Theodosii* 41 where he states Helena went to Palestine in anxiety about Constantine. Eusebius also mentions prayers made by Helena for Constantine and his sons (V.C. 3.42) though it would be a quite natural act for the mother of the emperor to do. Helena serves primarily as a model of Christian pilgrimage, an image which has been produced from the careful selection and preservation of Helena's movements in Palestine.

¹⁹² V.C. 3.43.

¹⁹³ V.C. 3.44, "Τὴν γάρ τοι σύμπασαν ἑώραν μεγαλοπρεπεῖα βασιλικῆς ἐξουσίας ἐμπεριελθοῦσα, μυρία μὲν ἀθρόως τοῖς κατὰ πόλιν ἐδωρεῖτο δῆμοις ἰδίᾳ τε τῶν προσιόντων ἐκάστω, μυρία δὲ καὶ τοῖς στρατιωτικοῖς τάγμασι δεξιᾷ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ διένεμε, πλεῖστά θ' ὅσα πένησι γυμνοῖς καὶ ἀπεριστάτοις ἐδίδου, τοῖς μὲν χρημάτων δόσεις ποιουμένη, τοῖς δὲ τὰ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ σώματος σκέπην δαψιλῶς ἐπαρκοῦσα, ἐτέρους ἀπῆλλατε δεσμῶν μεταλλῶν τε κακοπαθεῖα ταλαιπωρουμένους, ἡλευθέρου τε πλεονεκτουμένους, καὶ πάλιν ἄλλους ἐξορίας ἀνεκαλεῖτο."

¹⁹⁴ That there was the threat of rebellion in the East due to Constantine's pro-Christian stance is the view of Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 65-71. Kenneth Holum compares Helena's wanderings with those of Hadrian (who built something in every city he visited) and argues the tour was arranged to advertise a particular conception of the empire; "Hadrian and St. Helena: Imperial travel and the origins of Christian Holy Land pilgrimage." *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*. (Chicago, 1990) 66-81.

liberalitas to the soldiers as well as to the poor and destitute cannot be simply described as acts of Christian charity.¹⁹⁵

Helena and Fausta were not the only members of the imperial family to conduct tours of the East. Constantine himself testifies to embarking on a journey around his new territories soon after his victory.¹⁹⁶ Therefore, we have a record of three apparently separate imperial journeys around the East. Is it reasonable to conclude that the most significant members of the imperial family travelled together? If they did, then they did so for only part of the journey. For Constantine abruptly cut short his tour before he arrived anywhere near Palestine. We are informed of this fact in a letter preserved by Eusebius which is addressed to Arius and Alexander. Stuart Hall, however, puts forward persuasive arguments for reading it as a letter addressed to the Church of Antioch.¹⁹⁷ In this letter Constantine writes that he had intended to travel eastward from Nicomedia (from where he is writing this letter),

I was already intent on visiting you and a large part of me was already with you, when the news of this business put a stop to my plans, so that

¹⁹⁵ Drijvers concludes that the inclusion of the army in the imperial generosity was comparable to buying the loyalty of the soldiers. He rejects any link between the bestowal of gifts and Constantine's Vicennalia as these celebrations had been completed (*Helena Augusta*, 68). On this point Drijvers is assuming 326 as the date of Helena's tour. If the tour occurred in 325 then it is quite possible that the imperial gifts (and indeed the whole tour) was associated with Constantine's anniversary. Eusebius' depiction of Helena Augusta may be coloured by the story of another Helena who was remembered for her generosity towards the inhabitants of Palestine. This was Helena queen of the Adiabene. Eusebius gives a brief mention of her distributing grain to Judaea in time of famine and remarks that "splendid monuments of this Helen...are still shown in the suburbs of the city which is now called Aelia" (H.E. 2.12). The full account (which was Eusebius' source) is in Josephus' *Antiquities* 20.17-53. We learn that Helena had received instruction in the Jewish religion (35), her son, the king, converted (much to everyone's consternation) (46), Helena wished to worship in Jerusalem and her son escorted her part of the way (49-50), and whilst in Jerusalem she distributed grain amongst the needy, leaving behind in Jerusalem, "a very great name that will be famous forever among our whole people for her benefaction" (52). I am not aware of any serious study which has compared the accounts of Helen of Adiabene with her Christian counterpart but certainly the elements of royal conversions, pilgrimage, and charitable deeds are present in both legends. If Eusebius did have Helen of Adiabene in mind when he wrote about Helena Augusta then it appears to be another case of creating a Christian version of an already existing Jewish rival. I am grateful to Dr Helen Bond for pointing me to these texts.

¹⁹⁶ *V.C.* 2.72.

¹⁹⁷ Stuart Hall. "Some Constantinian documents in the *Vita Constantini*." delivered at "Constantine and the Birth of Christian Europe". Warwick University, 1993 (as far as I know still unpublished). The case for the letter being addressed to Antioch rather than to Arius and Alexander is based on a) the reference to "some of you", b) the reference to "the bosom of the east" - not Alexandria but Antioch, c) the expression "the road to the east" which more naturally refers to a route from Nicomedia to Antioch than to Alexandria and d) references which Hall reads as referring to a synod rather than to individuals. I am very grateful to Stuart Hall for giving me a copy of his paper.

I might not be obliged to see with my eyes what I had not thought it possible I would even hear reported verbally.¹⁹⁸

"This business" to which Constantine refers is the Trinitarian controversy well underway between the parties of Arius and Alexander. Such discord deterred Constantine from continuing his travel because, as he tells us, the purpose of his tour of the provinces was thanksgiving to God for "the general concord and liberation of all". The discord in Egypt, Palestine, and Antioch gave Constantine no grounds for thanksgiving.

It would be naïve to believe that the only reason Constantine wished to tour the former provinces of Licinius was to give thanks. If Helena toured the Eastern provinces to reassure the army and to shower the people with imperial generosity then there is little reason to doubt that Constantine's motives were the same. If, then, Eutropia travelled with Helena and if the same motives were behind the journeys of Constantine and Helena (in the wake of the victory over Licinius) then it is highly probable that the imperial family travelled together. At least, that was the intention. Constantine, as we know, cut short his part of the imperial tour, probably never having got further than Antioch (if indeed he got that far at all).¹⁹⁹ Potential rebellion still required quelling and the former subjects of Licinius still needed a reassuring imperial presence. Did Constantine then send on his mother and mother-in-law to ensure the completion of the itinerary? Eusebius, we noted, whilst concentrating on Helena and Eutropia's visit to Palestine, informs us that Helena herself visited the Eastern provinces. He

¹⁹⁸ V.C. 2.72, "σπεύδοντι δὴ μοι ἤδη πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ τῷ πλείονι μέρει σὺν ὑμῖν ὄντι ἢ τοῦδε τοῦ πράγματος ἀγγελία πρὸς τὸ ἔμπαλιν τὸν λογισμὸν ἀνεχαίτισεν, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁρᾶν ἀναγκασθῇν, ἃ μὴδὲ ταῖς ἀκοαῖς προαισθῆσθαι δυνατόν ἦγούμην" (translated by Stuart Hall).

¹⁹⁹ Barnes draws attention to two coins issued at Antioch which are dated to 324/5 which testify to Constantine's presence in the city (Constantine and Eusebius, 212. Constantine's visit to Antioch concluded to be December 324 by T. G. Elliott. "Constantine's Preparations for the Council of Nicaea." Journal of Religious History 17.2 (1992): 133. Stuart Hall is willing to allow Constantine's presence in Antioch between November 324 and February 325 so long as it is recognised that he later wrote to Antioch from Nicomedia (the intention of Constantine was to travel "east", which does not fit a journey from Antioch to Egypt). Henry Chadwick uses the date of Helena's tour (326) to date the fall of Eustathius, the bishop of Antioch (Henry Chadwick. "The fall of Eustathius of Antioch." Journal of Theological Studies 49 (1948): 27-35). Athanasius records that Eustathius was accused of insulting Helena (Historia Arianorum 4) which Chadwick concludes was when Helena was in Palestine. This reconstruction is challenged by a more recent article in which R. P. C. Hanson argues that 326 is too early for the demise of Eustathius. On the evidence drawn from Helena's tour, he states that the idea that Helena went on a "pilgrimage of reparation" is "fantastic" (177). If Eustathius did insult Helena there is no evidence that it was in 326 ("The fate of Eustathius of Antioch." Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 95 (1984): 171-79).

makes no mention of the presence of Constantine, he having returned somewhat disillusioned to Nicomedia.

The destruction of pagan shrines

The Constantinian presence in the East was felt not only through imperial visitations but also in the demolition of the pagan sanctuaries which, according to Borgehammar's chronology, occurred almost immediately after the defeat of Licinius. Eusebius gives the reader the impression that the destruction was on a universal scale. A closer reading, however, reveals that Eusebius only tells the reader of temples and idols destroyed of which he was most likely to have heard. The examples are relatively few. Constantine was, after all, still the Pontifex Maximus. Eusebius claims Constantine abolished the practice of sacrifice; other evidence strongly suggests that even if Constantine did enact such a law, then it was not successfully applied in his reign.²⁰⁰ Of the few specific examples of temple destruction which Eusebius presents to the reader we may divide them into sites which caught the attention of Constantine and cults which were found to be especially offensive. At Aphaca, on Mount Lebanon, Constantine destroyed a shrine to Venus. This was, as Eusebius states, an obscure and hidden shrine; hardly one which could be described as public. The reason for its destruction is clear, it was a location where "men undeserving of the name forgot the dignity of their sex" and where "unlawful commerce of women and adulterous intercourse" occurred.²⁰¹ Another shrine to Venus was replaced with a church and bishop in the city Heliopolis, again because the cult involved "shameless fornication". In this case Eusebius explicitly links the destruction of the temple with an enactment by Constantine forbidding "the continuance of former practices" and instructing

²⁰⁰ The debate regarding Constantine and sacrifice continues. Timothy Barnes presented a picture which followed the account of Eusebius (Constantine and Eusebius, 210). He has been criticised by H.A. Drake (in his review of Constantine and Eusebius, American Journal of Philology 103 (1982): 462-66) and Averil Cameron ("Constantinus Christianus," Journal of Roman Studies 73 (1983): 184-90.). Barnes replied to Drake in his article, "Constantine's prohibition of pagan sacrifice," American Journal of Philology 105.1 (1984): 69-72. Drake receives support from R. M. Errington. "Constantine and the pagans," Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies 29.3 (1988): 309-318. See also Robin Lane Fox, Pagans and Christians, 667.

²⁰¹ V.C. 3.55. Since Eusebius states that Constantine had the forethought to inspect it himself (in all probability having received a report) before giving orders for its destruction, it is possible that this event occurred around the same time as the destruction of the shrine at Mamre.

all in the "principles of celibacy".²⁰² In Cilicia Constantine tore down a temple of Asclepius. The motivation for such an act was not simply because the cult was unchristian, but rather that the cult posed a threat to the local Christian community. Asclepius, the god of healing, "drew his easily deluded worshippers from the true Saviour".²⁰³

The third temple to Venus which met with destruction by the direct orders of Constantine was the shrine under which lay relics of death and resurrection. This was the temple erected by Hadrian in his attempt to ensure that Jerusalem, which he renamed Aelia Capitolina, retained nothing of its Jewish identity. In addition to the temple Jerome also mentions a statue to Jupiter who, along with Juno and Minerva, made up the gods of the Capitoline mount.²⁰⁴ Any temple to Venus could be destroyed on the pretext that the cult was anti-social. In this case

²⁰² V.C. 3.58. A law dated to 320 permits unmarried men and women to benefit from inheritances and legacies (Codex Theodosianus 8.16.1. See V.C. 4.26). On Eusebius' understanding of the law see B. H. Warmington. "Eusebius of Caesarea's versions of Constantine's laws in the codes." Studia Patristica 24 (1993): 201-207. Constantine's strict upholding of the Augustan law (the so-called lex Julia) concerning the capital crime of adultery has often been noted (though usually without much reference to the Augustan law itself). Codex Theodosianus 9.7.1, dated February 326, exempts barmaids from the crime of adultery (but not the tavern landlady). In April of the same year a more detailed law was issued which determined who might be the accuser of adultery. Husbands might accuse on suspicion alone (as was the position of the Augustan law). Although adultery was a capital crime, an earlier law of Constantine stipulates that a capital sentence should not be passed unless the accused has confessed and there is adequate testimony from witnesses so that "the accused shall be so detected in the crime charged that even he himself can scarcely deny the crime" (Codex Theod. 9.40.1 (314). See further Judith Evans Grubbs. "Constantine and imperial legislation on the family." The Theodosian Code. Ed. Jill Harries and Ian Wood. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993. 120-142. Both Susan Treggiari. Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian. (Oxford, 1991) 262-319, and Percy Ellwood Corbett. The Roman Law of Marriage. (Oxford, 1930) 133-146 discuss the background to the Lex Julia and Constantine's revisions. Timothy Barnes inserts his own comments on Constantine's laws on sexual crimes, "The law is morbid and unwholesome. It disregards the natural appetites of men and women in favor of an abstract ideal of purity, deduced from Christian tenets of asceticism. More dangerous it rendered criminal the normal behavior of many Roman aristocrats" (Constantine and Eusebius, 220).

²⁰³ V.C. 3.56.

²⁰⁴ Jerome, Ep. 58.3. The sepulchre, states Jerome, was covered by a statue to Jupiter whilst on Golgotha sat a shrine to Venus. Gibson and Taylor believe that the temple of Venus encompassed the whole area of the tomb and Golgotha and consisted of a number of statues. The actual Capitoline temple, however, they locate north of the temple mount (the former fortress of Antonius); Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Jerusalem: the archaeology and early history of traditional Golgotha. (London, 1994) 68-72. On the general significance of Jupiter, Hadrian and the Capitoline see, J. R. Fears. "The cult of Jupiter and Roman imperial ideology." Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. II.17.1: 3-14. For Hadrian and Aelia Capitolina see David Golan. "Hadrian's decision to supplant 'Jerusalem' by 'Aelia Capitolina'." Historia 35.2 (1986): 226-239 who argues that Hadrian knew the significance that Jerusalem held for Christians as well as Jews. See also K. G. Holum. "Hadrian and St. Helena: Imperial travel and the origins of Christian Holy Land pilgrimage." The Blessings of Pilgrimage, 66-81, especially 73-74.

the evidence also suggests that Constantine was interested in creating a religious centre in Jerusalem (and the surrounding area) regardless of what might be uncovered there.²⁰⁵ Jerusalem and Palestine was a favourable environment in which to formulate an imperial Christian building policy. We may add the following additional ingredients: the letter of Constantine to the Eastern bishops instructing them to rebuild, expand or, where necessary, build new churches paid for from imperial funds;²⁰⁶ the tour of Helena, if it occurred at this time, and the experience of Eutropia at Mamre; the primacy of honour afforded to Jerusalem at the council of Nicaea; and, not least, the connection between the Saving sign and the place most closely associated with the historical event. All these elements can be dated between 324 and 326.

The Cross and Constantine's Christian development

We might have expected the Saving sign to have been one of the chief motives for the building of a basilica in Jerusalem. Constantine, freely relates Eusebius, attached intrinsic holiness to the sign itself as a protector in battle. Constantine was not endowed with the fullness of Christian teaching and history at the time of his vision in 312. The ambiguity of the Sign and its general absence in public settings is evidence for not only Constantine's deliberate discretion but also perhaps his own interpretation of the Christian religion. By 324, however, Constantine had the benefit of Christian bishops at court and his own son, Crispus, was being instructed by Lactantius in Trier.²⁰⁷ In other words, by 324, the saving sign which Constantine had taken on its own merits in 312, would have been more firmly placed within Christian salvation history. We would expect Constantine to take some interest in the historical tradition out of which the Roman sign of death had become a Christian (and now a Roman) sign of victory. The trophy of victory originated not in myth but in a historical event which occurred in a city over which Constantine ruled. It is unlikely that it would require the urging of the bishop of that city to persuade Constantine of Jerusalem's significance for the partnership between the emperor, empire and Christian God. The God of the Saving sign had triumphed over the gods of old. It was fitting that this should be symbolised in the destruction of the altar of the gods in the actual city which bore witness to the original victory of Christ.

²⁰⁵ Eusebius says as much when he states that Constantine turned his attention to Jerusalem and subsequently, with great surprise, uncovered the sepulchre of Christ (*V.C.* 3.25, see below).

²⁰⁶ *V.C.* 2.46.

²⁰⁷ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 13; Jerome, *Chronicon*, 274.

It is at this point that we meet the narrative of Eusebius. The trophy of victory, rooted in a historical event, which Eusebius proclaims, is not the trophy of the cross but rather the cave of the resurrection. Theologically, of course, the two were but sides of one coin. The cross was only the trophy of victory through the eyes of the resurrection. The significance of the empty cave depends upon the death of Christ. The Easter liturgy celebrated death and resurrection together. It was Constantine's building work which firmly attached Easter to its historical setting, giving us the present day form of the Triduum.²⁰⁸ In 324, however, the theology of the death and resurrection of Christ, although rooted in a historical event, was not liturgically associated with a particular place. Constantine's building of a basilica in Jerusalem identified the event and place in a way in which the Church had never before been able to, or even seen as necessary. Constantine's reasons for raising a basilica lay in a desire to erect public monuments which epitomised the triumph of Christianity. Such a monument was quite fitting at the place of the Cross, the symbol which had proclaimed him a divine agent and confirmed the legitimacy of his rule. What, however, if not the symbol but the reality should be revealed to Constantine? It is one thing for Eusebius to describe Constantine marching into battle with the symbol (however ambiguous) and another thing to describe the building of a basilica in honour of the cave of the resurrection. There need not be a direct association between the two and Eusebius does not make one. The missing link between the Saving sign, especially the Labarum, and the founding of the Martyrium basilica is the finding of the Cross. It is a link which is preserved in the feast of the Encaenia, with or without the mention of Helena, as well in the later fourth century sources. Are there, however, fragments of such an association in the writings of Eusebius?

John Henry Newman and the Finding of the Cross

The argument that wood, thought to be that of the cross, was indeed discovered in the reign of Constantine is not a recent one. In 1842 John Henry Newman appended to an edition of The Ecclesiastical History of M. L'Abbé Fleury an essay on ecclesiastical miracles.²⁰⁹ Within this essay is a section discussing the discovery of the Cross. It is worth briefly summarising the evidence and arguments accumulated by Newman in favour of the finding of the Cross since

²⁰⁸ See further, Thomas Talley, The Origins of the Liturgical Year, 31-56.

²⁰⁹ The Ecclesiastical History of M. L'Abbé Fleury 2 Vols. (Oxford, 1842). The essay on miracles is found on pages xi-ccxv occupying nearly half of the first volume. The essay was later re-issued along with an earlier essay on miracles in Two Essays on Biblical and Ecclesiastical Miracles. (London, 1870).

many of these observations re-surface in the modern commentaries. Newman commences with the general picture of Helena journeying to Palestine on pilgrimage with the purpose of visiting the holy places and to search for the holy Cross, and how she consulted with Christians and Jews on this matter. However, Newman observes, if we were to read Eusebius alone then we would conclude that Helena visited everywhere except Jerusalem and that the Holy Sepulchre and not the cross was discovered. But the silent voice of Eusebius is interrupted by the letter of Constantine to Macarius, which Newman describes thus,

This letter does not contain any express mention of the Cross; and yet, did we read it without knowing the fact of the historian's silence when writing in his own person, we certainly should have the impression that of the Cross Constantine was speaking.²¹⁰

Constantine's letter to Macarius is accepted as being preserved unaltered by Eusebius.²¹¹ Eusebius is concerned that the reader receives the correct interpretation of the events and documents he records.²¹² It was Constantine, not Eusebius, who was responsible for the planning and construction of the buildings in Jerusalem.²¹³ Therefore, it is necessary to attempt at least a view of the matter from Constantine's perspective rather than through the interpretative window of Eusebius.

Using Eusebius to discern Constantine's interpretation of the Cross

We shall, however, leave the letter of Constantine to Macarius aside for the present. It is customary to begin with the evidence of the *Vita* and then to add further evidence from the orations delivered by Eusebius. This at first seems logical since the *Vita* is generally treated as a history of Constantine with the orations tagged on to the end. The *Vita*, however, was the last work composed by Eusebius, and whilst it contains earlier material, it is an interpretation of the life of Constantine. The letter to Macarius, for example, can be considered earlier

²¹⁰ Newman, *Ecclesiastical History*, cxlvi.

²¹¹ Although see Léon Parmentier. "La lettre de l'empereur Constantin au sujet de la construction de l'église du Saint-Sépulcre, à Jérusalem." *Revue Archéologique* 14 (1909): 42-51 for a comparison of Eusebius with the version preserved in Theodoret (*H.E.* 1.16). Theodoret may preserve a more primitive edition (though for our purposes the differences are slight).

²¹² This is also evident from Eusebius' own words at the beginning of the address to Constantine on the Holy Sepulchre, "I pray that I may be a kind of interpreter (ὁφειληνενεργής) of your intentions and become the reporter of your devout soul..." (*L.C.* 11.7). Eusebius also outlines the reasoning behind the selection of material for the *Vita* in *V.C.* 1.11.

²¹³ A point which is made by Edward J. Yarnold. "Who planned the churches at the Christian holy places in the Holy Land?" *Studia Patristica* 18.1 (1985): 105-109.

than the interpretation with which Eusebius surrounds it. In this chapter we are seeking to recover something of Constantine's (rather than Eusebius') interpretation of the Cross so that we might be able to understand better the significance attached by Constantine to the place of Christ's death and resurrection.

We have already examined in some detail the military significance of the Cross for Constantine in the narratives regarding his victories over Maxentius and Licinius. We noted the references to the cross as a saving sign of Christ's victory over death and how the miraculous powers of this sign were recognized by Constantine on the battlefield. Constantine's first public affirmation of the Saving sign was the gigantic statue of himself holding a cross which was erected in the basilica of Maxentius in Rome. These narratives, expanded from Eusebius' earlier accounts of Constantine's victory in 312, are preserved in the one work still in an unfinished form at Eusebius' death in 338/9. Eusebius claims, in distinction from the *Ecclesiastical History*, to have heard Constantine himself recounting how he came to employ the Christian sign in this way. This military use of the cross seems quite far removed from any Christian theology of the Christ's death and resurrection or from the feast of the Encaenia. It is possible, however, to catch hints of a development in Constantine's own theology of the Cross between the defeat of Licinius and the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica. Much of the theology could be ascribed to Eusebius rather than to the emperor himself. However, Constantine speaks in both the letters which Eusebius preserved intact, in the buildings he erected, and also in the orations addressed to the emperor in which we might expect Eusebius to reflect the emperor's own thinking.

Constantine at Nicaea

Towards the end of 324 Constantine marked out the boundaries of a new city which was to known as the city of Constantine or Constantinople.²¹⁴ The later historians suggest that the name of the city was originally intended to be the 'second Rome'.²¹⁵ The ceremonies marking its completion were celebrated on

²¹⁴ November 8 - see Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 212 and Fergus Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World*, 54. The marking out of the city is also described in the epitome of Philostorgius, 2.9.

²¹⁵ "δευτέρα Πόμην", Socrates, *Ecclesiastical History* 1.16 *Codex Theod.* 13.5.7 records the name of the city as "Eternal" (dated 334) or "Alma Roma" in the epitome of Philostorgius, 2.9.

May 11, 330.²¹⁶ In the summer of 325 Constantine attended the council of Nicaea where, among other things, the council determined the date on which Easter was to be celebrated each year. After the council Constantine issued a letter addressed to the bishops who had been absent. This letter says far more about the unity achieved in the liturgical celebration of Easter than it does about the relationship of the Father and Son.²¹⁷ Constantine describes the day of Easter as that day on which hopes of immortality are grounded, "one feast in commemoration of the day of our deliverance, I mean the day of his most holy passion."²¹⁸ The letter views Easter as both the resurrection and death of Christ. It is a process from suffering and death through resurrection to immortality.²¹⁹

Nicaea has often been seen as the context of Constantine's initial interest in Jerusalem. It has been suggested that Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem,

²¹⁶Gilbert Dagron. *Naissance d'une Capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*. (Paris, 1974) 37-42.

²¹⁷ The letter is preserved by Eusebius, *V.C.* 3.17. Constantine's emphasis on unity in liturgical practice (i.e. visible religion) should be compared with the letter addressed to Arius and Alexander (*V.C.* 2.70).

²¹⁸ *V.C.* 3.18, "...τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην, παρ' ἧς τὴν τῆς ἀθανασίας εἰλήφαμεν ἐλπίδα...καὶ τοιαύτη θρησκείας ἑορτὴ διαφωνίαν ὑπάρχειν ἐστὶν ἀθέμιτον. μίαν γὰρ ἡμῖν τὴν τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐλευθερίας ἡμέραν, τοῦτέστιν τὴν τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου πάθους."

²¹⁹ This process is also evident in the address given by Constantine which Eusebius saw fit to attach to the *Vita*, entitled *The Oration to the Assembly of the Saints*. The date and place of its delivery are still debated but it seems likely it was before 326 and perhaps to an assembly of Christians (including the bishop) at Easter in Antioch (though not to the council of Antioch; see S. Hall against R. Lane Fox below). Chapter one of the Oration refers to the arrival of the "day of passion", which is the "first pledge of resurrection" (NPNF 1.561). As befits the season in which this oration was delivered an underlying theme is the goal of immortality, the evidence of which is the resurrection of Christ (12, 15, 20). In chapter 23 Constantine defines his understanding of the Christian religion contrasted with that of the ungodly. His is one of peace, love and faith towards God, faithfulness between people and the acknowledgement of God's sovereignty. This, he says, is the path to immortality and eternal life. The Oration concludes with a proclamation suited to imperial concerns, "For he is the invincible ally and protector of the righteous: he is the supreme judge of all things, the prince of immortality, the giver of everlasting life" (26). These words are consistent with the response attributed by Eusebius to Constantine at his baptism, "Now I know that I am truly blessed: now I feel assured that I am counted worthy of immortality, and am made a partaker of Divine light" (*V.C.* 4.63).

The Oration has only recently been the subject of detailed study. See Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 74-75 and the relevant notes; D. Ison. "The Constantinian Oration to the Saints: Authorship and Background." Ph.D. Kings College London, 1985; H. A. Drake. "Suggestions of date in Constantine's Oration to the saints." *American Journal of Philology* 106 (1985): 235-49; H. A. Drake. "Suggestions of date in Constantine's Oration to the Saints." *American Journal of Philology* 106 (1985): 335-49; R. Lane Fox. *Pagans and Christians*. (London, 1986) 631-54; Stuart Hall. "Some Constantinian documents in the *Vita Constantini*". The Trinitarian theology of the Oration has been examined by P. S. Davies. "Constantine's editor." *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 610-18 and D. Ison. "Pais-Theoi in the age of Constantine." *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1987): 412-419. See also D. E. Wright. "Constantine and the 'Mother of God': Oratio ad Sanctorum Coetum 11:9." *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993): 355-59.

approached Constantine at the council.²²⁰ There is no evidence for such a conversation. However, the same council which decided when the feast of Christ's death and resurrection should be celebrated also extended to the bishopric of Jerusalem a primacy of honour.²²¹ Constantine had arrived at the Council barely a year after the defeat of Licinius when the labarum of the Saving sign was established. He was present throughout the deliberations of the council and thus it may be assumed that he was present when the question of Jerusalem's status arose. If Helena visited the city during the year of the council then it is tempting to suggest that the city received this honour because of the imperial attention and the discoveries made there. On the other hand, if the journey of Helena did occur after Nicaea then perhaps the Easter debate and the Jerusalem discussion served to consolidate the importance of Jerusalem in the mind of the emperor.

Images of the Saving Sign at Constantinople

Between the council of Nicaea and his visit to Rome in July 326 Constantine spent some time in Constantinople.²²² In 327 a coin was issued from the Constantinople mint. It depicted, as far as we know for the first time, the labarum described by Eusebius. On the top of the standard is mounted a distinctive chi-rho sign whilst the bottom of the standard impales a serpent. Through the middle runs the inscription SPES PUBLICA.²²³ Eusebius, who makes little mention of coins,²²⁴ does describe a painting which Constantine mounted in front of his palace. It depicted an image of Constantine, above which was the

²²⁰ For example, Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?*, 276; Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage*, 7. Martin Biddle also believes Macarius took the leading role in asking Constantine at Nicaea, "Makarios dug in hope against hope and was, to Eusebius' surprise, proved 'right'" ("The tomb of Christ", 101).

²²¹ Canon 7, "Ἐπειδὴ συνήθεια κεκράτηκε καὶ παράδοσις ἀρχαία, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Αἰλίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον τιμᾶσθαι, ἔχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς, τῇ μητροπόλει σωζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος" (C. H. Hefele. *A History of the Christian Councils to the Close of the Council of Nicaea AD 325*. (Edinburgh, 1871) 404). The previous canon defines the jurisdiction of Alexandria, Rome and Antioch as the principle sees and canon 7 should be read in conjunction with this. Jerusalem falls under the jurisdiction of Caesarea which in turn is responsible to Antioch.

²²² Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 219. The *Codex Theodosianus* attests his presence at Constantinople in March 326 (*Codex Theod.* 2.10.4).

²²³ The coin is illustrated and described in C.H.V. Sutherland. *Roman Coins*. (London, 1974) 267. See also R.A.G. Carson. *Principal Coins of the Romans*. Volume III. (London, 1981) 36, no.1309.

²²⁴ He only notes that the likeness of Constantine appeared on coins with his eyes raised to heaven (*V.C.* 4.15). He also describes the coins issued immediately after Constantine's death which depicted him ascending to the heavens where a hand reached down to receive him (*V.C.* 4.73).

Saving Sign, and below Licinius, the dragon, falling into destruction pierced by an arrow.²²⁵ Eusebius does not specify at which palace this image was to be found. He places the narrative at the conclusion of the victory over Licinius but there is no need to suppose that the palace had to be in Nicomedia or Rome. The description of the picture is close enough to that described on the coin to suggest that they are connected in time and by theme.

Eusebius was present in Constantinople for Constantine's Tricennalia. It was whilst he was in the city that he recorded the details of Constantine's veneration of the Cross. The description of the labarum, we have already noted, was a result of a tour of the imperial palace. In addition, Eusebius describes a large central ceiling panel in the hall of the imperial palace where Constantine had placed a rich jewel encrusted "symbol of the saving passion". Eusebius, significantly, adds that, "This symbol he seemed to have intended as the safeguard of the empire itself."²²⁶ It is possible that it was here that he also viewed at the entrance to the palace the picture of Constantine slaying the dragon.

The Oration on the Holy Sepulchre and the *Laus Constantini*

During two of his visits to Constantinople Eusebius addressed an oration to the emperor. From both these orations which predate the *Vita* we can accumulate further pieces of a jigsaw demonstrating how the significant the idea of the cross preserving the empire was for Constantine. In the oration entitled, *Laus Constantini*, Eusebius devotes an entire section to Constantine and the Saving sign. Within this context Eusebius describes how Constantine bestowed his favour on two particular places in the empire. One is Antioch and the second is Jerusalem (he has already made reference to Constantinople). The centrality of the Martyrium basilica is no more apparent than in this passage,

²²⁵ *V.C.* 3.3. Eusebius is even more concerned than usual that the reader should believe his interpretation of this image. Within this chapter he actually repeats the description in three different ways, claiming twice that the dragon depicted was synonymous with the dragon mentioned in the prophets (especially Isa 27:1): "This was of which the emperor gave a true and faithful representation in the picture above described." Perhaps Eusebius wished to ensure that the image was not associated with Apollo who was occasionally depicted slaying the dragon known as the Python.

²²⁶ *V.C.* 3.49, "τοσοῦτος δὲ θεῖος ἔρως τὴν βασιλέως κατειλήφει ψυχὴν, ὥς ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἀνακτόροις τῶν βασιλείων, κατὰ τὸν πάντων ἐξοχώτατον οἶκον τῆς πρὸς τῷ ὁρόφῳ κεχρυσωμένης φατνώσεως κατὰ τὸ μεσαίτατον, μεγίστου πίνακος ἀνηπλωμένου μέσον ἐμπεπῆχθαι τὸ τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους σύμβολον ἐκ ποικίλων συγκεῖμενον καὶ πολυτελῶν λίθων ἐν χρυσῷ πολλῷ κατειργασμένων. φυλακτήριον δὲ δοκεῖ τοῦτο αὐτῆς βασιλείας τῷ θεοφιλεῖ πεποιῆσθαι."

In the Palestinian nation, in the heart of the Hebrew kingdom, on the very site for the evidence of salvation, 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 all description.²²⁷

Eusebius continues, with a description of the Constantinian structures at Bethlehem and on the Mount of Olives. All three churches are claimed to bear witness to the Saving Sign, the importance of which is emphasised by Eusebius. The Sign, "augments his entire house and line, and strengthens the throne of his kingdom for long cycles of years...Thus have the deeds of God become clear through the divine efficacy of the Saving Sign." The *Laus Constantini* was delivered in 336. Constantine died in 337 and Eusebius died in 338 whilst still working on the *Vita*. The quotation from the oration makes it quite clear that the basilica was built in honour of the Cross, a sign which in 335 was still considered by Constantine to be of great significance and, according to Eusebius, the source of his long reign.²²⁸

Differences regarding the Saving Sign in the Laus and the Oratio

The tenor of the oration which Eusebius delivered at the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica September 335 is significantly different. First, whereas the *Laus* culminates in the proclamation of the Saving Sign, the oration on Christ's Sepulchre concentrates on the incarnation, death and resurrection of the Logos. Second, although the oration on the Sepulchre is addressed to

²²⁷ *L.C.* 9.16. The translation is taken from H. A. Drake. *In Praise of Constantine*. 101. The Greek reads, "τάδε μὲν οὖν ὧδε συνετελείτο, τὰ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦ Παλαιστινῶν ἔθνους τῆς Ἑβραίων βασιλικῆς ἐστίας ἐν μέσῳ κατ' αὐτὸ δὴ τὸ σωτήριον μαρτύριον οἶκον εὐκτήριον παμμεγέθη νεῶν τε ἁγίων τῷ σωτηρίῳ σημεῖω πλουσίαις καὶ δαψιλέσι κατεκόσμηι φιλοτιμίαις, μνήμᾳ τε μνήμης αἰωνίου γέμον αὐτὰ τε τοῦ μεγάλου σωτῆρος τὰ κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου τρόπαια λόγου παντὸς κρείττοσιν ἐτίμα καλλωπίσασιν."

²²⁸ The pagan oration delivered in 310 recounted how, at the vision of Apollo to Constantine, he would be promised thirty years (symbolised in the form of three laurel crowns of victory). Whilst Eusebius might be ensuring a Christian interpretation of this promise, the fact of the matter might only confirm for Constantine the close association between the sun deity and the Saving Sign as we discussed above. The *Laus Constantini* is treated rather amusingly by Alistair Kee in his Marxist approach to the relationship of Constantine to Christianity. At one point Kee asks what the reaction of the audience was to the *Laus* to which he answers, "We do not know. We do not know! Eusebius has just painted a picture of the emperor which makes Flash Gordon look like a part-time social worker, and we do not know!" (*Constantine versus Christ: The triumph of ideology*. (London, 1982) 47). A better analysis of the oration remains, N. Baynes. "Eusebius and the Christian empire." *Byzantine Studies and other Essays*. (Westport, Conn., 1955) 168-172.

Constantine, it makes comparatively little mention of the emperor's deeds.²²⁹ Rather the erection of churches, described as trophies of victory, are attributed to the Supreme God alone. At one point Eusebius defines the trophy of victory as Christ's resurrected body rather than the cross (which is perhaps more theologically consistent with references to church buildings as trophies of victory).²³⁰ The oration is bracketed by Eusebius' statements that what the Emperor is about to hear and has just heard is really superfluous to Constantine's own theological knowledge and experience of the divine.²³¹ It is the presence of these statements and their position at the beginning and the end of the oration which makes one suspect that Eusebius does intend to teach Constantine something but he must ensure that he does not appear to be doing so.

The different contexts of the Laus and the Oratio

The oration on the Holy Sepulchre was delivered in the Martyrium basilica to a congregation which included numerous bishops who had come to Jerusalem immediately after the council of Tyre. The *Laus* on the other hand was delivered only in Constantinople and, as the title suggests, was delivered in honour of Constantine at his Tricennalia and probably to an audience of pagans and Christians.²³² The references to Constantine's work in Jerusalem are part of a much broader sweep of the imperial reign. The oration on the Holy Sepulchre was, on the other hand, an integral part of the inaugural celebrations though much of the content is less appropriate to the occasion than the oration Eusebius delivered at Tyre. On the few occasions in the oration when Eusebius explicitly makes mention of the context in which he delivered it, invariably the allusion is to the Sepulchre and not to the Cross. This need not surprise us for this is precisely what Eusebius does in the *Vita*. Just as Eusebius intends to direct his readers' attention away from the finding of the Cross to the finding of the Sepulchre in the *Vita*, so too he intends to counter-balance a basilica erected in honour of the Saving Sign with a basilica erected in honour of the Holy Sepulchre. The title which has been ascribed to this 'missing' oration says as much. Thus we find that Eusebius refers to Constantine's "zeal for the memorial of the saving immortality", proclaims that the body of Christ was raised "as a trophy of victory over death", states that the "salutary instrument" is the "All-

²²⁹ It was not unusual for an oration to be addressed to an absent emperor, Drake, *In Praise of Constantine*, 45 n.53.

²³⁰ *L.C.* 15.13.

²³¹ *L.C.* 11.6; 18.1.

²³² Drake, *In Praise of Constantine*, 51-52.

trophy of victory over death", states that the "salutary instrument" is the "All-Holy Body of Christ", and finally Eusebius ends the oration with a quite unambiguous interpretation of the basilica,

For all these reasons, then, it is reasonable that you have heeded these manifest proofs of the Savior's power and have displayed to all men, believers and non-believers alike, a house of prayer as a trophy of His victory over death, a holy temple of a holy God, and splendid and great offerings to the immortal life and the divine kingdom - memorials of the All-Ruling Savior entirely fitting and suitable for a victorious sovereign. This you have put round the Sepulchre that bears witness to the immortal life, impressing on the Heavenly Logos of God the imperial seal as victor and triumphant one, and in clear-cut and unambiguous terms making unto all peoples, by deed as well as by word, a pious and devout confession.²³³

Eusebius in this oration, delivered on the site of the death and resurrection of Christ, has concentrated on the incarnation and the death of Christ leading to the resurrection of Christ. There is a historical lineage to the earthly life of the Logos and, for Eusebius, the crown lies in the resurrection. Here the risen body of Christ, not the wood of the Cross, is the true trophy of victory, and the churches, also trophies of victory, bear witness to this. If the Constantinian focus of the Martyrium basilica was the Saving sign, and if this was re-enforced by the discovery of the relics, then Eusebius perceived that the theology of the place risked neglecting the death of Christ as a means to the resurrection. The death of Christ was indeed a historical fact but, for Eusebius, the resurrection witnessed both to the death which it presumes and to the immortality which it promises. The wood of the Cross (and the place of crucifixion) were of no benefit in themselves unless they pointed to the empty cave of the Holy Sepulchre. Had St Paul not said as much?²³⁴

²³³ L.C. 18.3, "ὦν δὴ χάριν ἀπάντων εἰκότως, αὐτοῖς δὴ τοῦτοις λαμπροῖς τεκμηρίοις τῆς σωτηρίου δυνάμεως χρησάμενος, οἶκον εὐκτῆριον τρόπαιον τῆς κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου νίκης αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις πιστοῖς ἅμα καὶ ἀπίστοις ἀνέδειξας, νεῶν τε ἁγίου ἁγίου θεοῦ, ζωῆς τε ἀθανάτου καὶ βασιλείας ἐνθέου λαμπρὰ καὶ μεγάλα [περικαλλῆ] ἀφιερῶματα, [τὰ] πρέποντά γε εἰς μάλα καὶ οἰκεῖα βασιλεῖ νικητῇ, τοῦ παμβασιλέως σωτῆρος ἀναθήματα ἃ δὴ τῷ τῆς ἀθανάτου ζωῆς μαρτυρίῳ τε καὶ μνήματι περιβέβληκας, τὸν οὐράνιον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγον νικητὴν καὶ τροπαιοῦχον βασιλικοῖς χαρακτῆρσιν ἐκτυπούμενος, πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι λαμπραῖς καὶ ἀνεπισκιάστοις φωναῖς, ἔργῳ τε καὶ λόγῳ, τὴν εὐσεβῆ καὶ φιλόθεον ὁμολογίαν προκηρύττων".

²³⁴ 1 Cor 15. Also Cyril of Jerusalem, though in reverse order, "I confess the cross, because I know of the resurrection...now that the resurrection has followed the cross, I am not ashamed to declare it" (Cat. 13.4) and "If the cross is fancy, the resurrection is fancy also" (13.37). Cyril is speaking against those who deny the crucifixion.

The Vita Constantini

The uncovering of Christ's tomb

Now we can turn to the Vita, the last of the works to be written by Eusebius. It is here that we find the narratives describing the uncovering of the tomb, narratives written at least ten years after the events they describe and after both the orations examined above. The Vita, as Harold Drake mentions, was put together after the death of Constantine and thus Eusebius did not feel obligated to ensure his version of events accorded with the Emperor's.²³⁵ The discovery of Christ's tomb is to be found in book 3 of the Vita. This section is placed after the description of the council of Nicaea, after which, states Eusebius, "the pious emperor addressed himself to another work...to render the blessed locality of our Saviour's resurrection an object of attraction and veneration to all."²³⁶ Then follows the step by step description of the uncovering of the sepulchre, hidden from view by the evil intentions of impious men who built there a shrine to Venus. The whole narrative is one of resurrection. It is similar to the other narratives in Eusebius which involve a movement from darkness into light. It is a 'dreadful sepulchre of souls', a 'gloomy shrine' which hides the sacred cave. But, their attempts were in vain,

They were unable to comprehend how impossible it was that their attempt should remain unknown to him who had been crowned with victory over death, any more than the blazing sun, when he rises above the earth, and holds his wonted course through the midst of heaven, is unseen by the whole race of mankind. Indeed, his saving power, shining with still greater brightness, and illumining, not the bodies, but the souls of men, was already filling the world with the effulgence of its own light.²³⁷

There are echoes in this passage of the oration on the Holy Sepulchre (and of Paulinus' efforts to rebuild the church of Tyre). The description of Christ as one 'crowned with victory over death' (κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου) recalls the trophy of victory over death, the risen body of Christ. Eusebius found the contrast between night and day as an analogy for the victory of Christ attractive. Thus, he is able to compare the uncovering of the tomb (and here the resurrection of Christ) with the rising of the sun. Christ had been buried and risen again, the tomb was buried and now had arisen. The sun descends and no one doubts its rising. Christ,

²³⁵ In Praise of Constantine, 10.

²³⁶ V.C. 3.25; NPNF 1.527.

²³⁷ V.C. 3.26; NPNF 1.527.

however, shines more brightly than the sun and illumines the spiritual interior rather than merely the flesh.²³⁸ Such solar imagery occurred in the Oration of the Holy Sepulchre where Eusebius describes Christ as enlightening the whole earth with the rays of his teaching.²³⁹ The tomb is described by Eusebius as the 'saving cave' (τὸ σωτήριον ἄντρον), a phrase which recalls the saving sign. The cave of the tomb is described by Eusebius as something intrinsically holy. The event of the resurrection has rendered sacred the place of the resurrection.

The order of the text in the *Vita* concerning the uncovering of the tomb is rather peculiar. First, Eusebius describes the emperor's intention to make the place of the resurrection an object of veneration. Then he inserts the narrative we have just discussed, which parallels the uncovering of the tomb with the resurrection of Christ, whilst its real intent is to describe the demolition of the pagan shrines. Constantine is described as not satisfied with merely clearing the site but proceeds to remove the top-soil. It is at this point that Eusebius proclaims that "immediately and contrary to all expectation, the venerable and hallowed monument of our Saviour's resurrection was discovered";²⁴⁰ a place which provided "a clear and visible proof...a testimony to the resurrection of the Saviour". Eusebius, at the beginning of this narrative, stated quite clearly that after the Council of Nicaea Constantine turned towards Palestine, where he "issued immediate injunctions for the erection in that spot of a house of prayer". Now, however, Eusebius describes the injunctions to build a house of prayer as being issued by Constantine "immediately after the transactions I have recorded", that is, after the discovery of the tomb. There is a contradiction here. In both instances the house of prayer to be built is associated by Eusebius with the place of the resurrection. But, if Constantine did not expect to find the tomb (that is, he was not seeking it when demolishing the shrines and removing the top-soil) then his original intention to build a house of prayer at this place would seem to have been for another reason undeclared by Eusebius.

²³⁸ A discussion of the cosmic-mythological framework in which Eusebius places the uncovering of the sepulchre may be found in Jonathan Z. Smith. *To Take Place: toward theory in ritual*. (Chicago, 1987) 80-82. See also Joachim Jeremias. *Golgotha*. (Leipzig, 1926) 28-33.

²³⁹ *L.C.* 17.13; see also 12.8, 12.16.

²⁴⁰ *V.C.* 3.28, "...αὐτὸ δὴ λοιπὸν τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ πανάγιον τῆς σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως μαρτύριον παρ' ἐλπίδα πᾶσαν ἀνεφαίνετο..."

Constantine's letter to Macarius

The discovery of the tomb is a surprise for Eusebius. It does not seem to have had quite the same effect on Constantine. What Constantine considered important, the reason why he issued injunctions to build a house of prayer, is the subject discussed by Newman and more recent writers. The evidence for Constantine's view of the matter lies in the letter he wrote to Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem. Eusebius has declared that the emperor, whether before or after the discovery of the tomb, ordered a church to be constructed at the location of the tomb. Constantine, writing to Macarius, expresses wonder at the discovery of something which had been buried so long ago. It is not the tomb, however, of which Constantine speaks but "the monument of his most holy passion".²⁴¹ He continues,

...I have no greater care than how I may best adorn with a splendid structure that sacred spot, which under Divine direction, I have disencumbered as it were of a heavy weight of foul idol worship; a spot which has been accounted holy from the beginning in God's judgement, but which now appears holier still, since it has brought to light a clear assurance of the Saviour's passion.²⁴²

The tomb, as Newman observes, can hardly be considered an assurance of the Saviour's passion, but surely, as Eusebius has stated before, an assurance of his resurrection. The proof of Christ's passion, that is his suffering and death, would be the cross of Christ. The discovery of the cross would indeed be viewed by Constantine as a particularly appropriate miracle for he who had conquered by this very sign. It was under divine direction that Constantine inscribed the trophy of victory on the shields of his soldiers and later modified the Roman standard as a powerful military deterrent. It was, states Eusebius, divine instruction which inspired Constantine to construct a basilica in the first place.²⁴³

The position of the basilica in relation to the tomb and Golgotha

Precisely where Constantine constructed this basilica at first sight appears to be quite plain to the reader of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers translation,

²⁴¹ V.C. 3.30, "τὸ γὰρ γνῶρισμα τοῦ ἀγιωτάτου ἐκείνου πάθους..."

²⁴² V.C. 3.30, especially the phrase, "...ἀγιώτερον δ' ἀποφανθέντα ἀφ' οὗ τὴν τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους..."

²⁴³ V.C. 3.25, "...and this he did, not on the mere natural impulse of his own mind, but being moved in spirit by the Saviour himself."

"on the very spot which witnessed the Saviour's sufferings...he began to rear a monument to the Saviour's victory over death".²⁴⁴ This is not, however, a literal translation of the Greek but rather an interpretation. The Greek of the first half of the statement reads, "κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ σωτήριον μαρτύριον". This phrase also appears in the *Laus* (9.16) where it is confusingly translated as "on the very site of the Lord's *sepulchre*".²⁴⁵ Eusebius himself makes it clear that the position of the basilica related to the Sepulchre rather than the Cross in an earlier passage where he refers to, "πανάγιου τῆς σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως μαρτύριον"²⁴⁶ It is probable that Eusebius was deliberately ambiguous in the *Laus*, an ambiguity which H. A. Drake preserves in his translation with, "on the very site for the evidence of salvation". This maintains something of the connection between Eusebius' use of "μαρτύριον" and the name by which the church came to be known, the Martyrium basilica.²⁴⁷ If Eusebius, in the *Vita*, is drawing upon earlier material he composed for the *Laus* where overall he places the basilica in connection with the Cross, then here in *Vita* he reinterprets a phrase which for the audience of the *Laus* had referred to the Saving sign. In the *Vita* Eusebius has shifted its meaning to refer specifically to the Sepulchre.

Further on, having described in some detail both the adornment of the cave and the great church, he concludes that "this temple, then, the emperor erected as a conspicuous monument of the Saviour's resurrection".²⁴⁸ Is Eusebius really speaking only of the tomb? The trophy of the victory over death is, with the exception of the oration on the Holy Sepulchre, the symbol of the cross. It does seem reasonable to conclude from the evidence presented here (as well as

²⁴⁴ *V.C.* 3.33 (NPNF 1.529); "κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ σωτήριον μαρτύριον", "ταύτης δ' οὖν ἀντικρυς βασιλεὺς τὴν κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου σωτήριον νίκην".

²⁴⁵ NPNF 1.594. Alistair Kee also criticises the NPNF translation of the *Vita*, remarking that it did more for the Christianization of Constantine than Eusebius! (*Constantine versus Christ*, 66).

²⁴⁶ *V.C.* 3.28, which the NPNF translator renders as, "the hallowed monument of our Saviour's resurrection".

²⁴⁷ Cyril of Jerusalem (*Cat.* 14.10) defines the Martyrium as the place of Golgotha and the place of the resurrection. The name, he notes, has its source in Zeph. 3:8, "...ἐς ἡμέραν ἀναστάσεως μου ἐῖς μαρτυριον." On the term 'martyrion' see further A. Grabar. *Martyrium: Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique*. Vol. I (Paris, 1946) 240ff. Grabar is criticised for over simplifying the sources of the martyrion structure by J. B. Ward-Perkins in "Memoria, martyr's tomb, and martyr's church." *Congressio internazionale di archeologia cristiana*. Trier: Pontificio istituto di archeologia cristiana, 1965: 3-24. See also R. Ousterhout. "The Temple, the Sepulchre, and the Martyrion of the Savior (the relationship of the Holy Sepulcher and the Temple of Jerusalem manifested in writings, ceremonies and architecture)." *Gesta: International Center of Medieval Art* 29.1 (1990): 44-53.

²⁴⁸ *V.C.* 3.40, "Τόνδε μὲν οὖν τὸν νεῶν, σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως ἐναργὲς ἀνίστη μαρτύριον βασιλεὺς".

the statements made in the Laus) that the basilica was erected with a closer association with the place of Christ's death than his resurrection.

The Martyrium basilica, as Constantine designed it, lends itself to this two-fold interpretation. Whether related to the Cross, Golgotha or to the Sepulchre depends upon the context of Eusebius' writings. In the work identified as the oration on the Holy Sepulchre the basilica belongs to the sepulchre. This was a work, we noted, which was delivered within the basilica itself to an audience comprising theologically-aware bishops. If the Martyrium basilica itself contained some visual representation of the Cross, contained the relics of the cross, or had become known as the basilica of the Cross, then Eusebius' oration balances the visual and the common perception. The Laus, addressed to a mixed audience, marked the Tricennalia of the emperor. It is, therefore, emperor oriented and we may expect it to at least say nothing which contradicted the policies of Constantine. The emphasis on the Saving Sign, particularly in the account of the churches in Palestine, is consistent with the emperor's policy detailed by Eusebius in the earlier part of the Vita. The words of Eusebius in this section of the Laus as well as in the Vita have less to do with a theological interpretation of the emperor than to mirror the imperial thoughts. In other words, the Laus tends towards a reflection of Constantine rather than Eusebius. The Encaenia oration and the Vita, on the other hand, tends towards a projection of Eusebius' own theology of the death and resurrection of Christ. Thus, by careful commentary and re-interpretation of certain phrases, Eusebius is able to shift the meaning of the basilica away from the Saving Sign towards the theological trophy of victory, the empty tomb pointing to the risen Christ.

Continuing on the question of the Cross, Newman draws attention to the references to the Cross in the writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, including the letter of Cyril to Constantius in 351. He concludes that the discovery of the Cross was an accepted fact twenty years after Helena's visit to Palestine. As far as Newman is concerned the silence of Eusebius on this matter, which he admits cannot be satisfactorily accounted for, should not be considered a proof in itself,

We should ask ourselves what it is that his silence is taken to prove; not that he had not heard of the alleged discovery, for that it was alleged is undeniable; it can only be taken to shew that he did not believe in it.²⁴⁹

As for the distinction to be made between the actual discovery of the Cross and the part played by the empress, Newman freely admits that "perhaps it is right to

²⁴⁹ Newman, Ecclesiastical History, cl (emphasis his).

draw a line between the above testimony and the evidence which follows at a later date...except so far as the later evidence happens to be confirmatory of the earlier."²⁵⁰ The later evidence to which he refers consists of the accounts found in, for example, Gelasius, Rufinus, Ambrose, Sozomenus and Chrysostom.²⁵¹ They only present 'additions' to the legend such as three crosses instead of one, Pilate's titulus and the accompanying miracles.²⁵² Finally Newman remarks that the liturgical commemoration of the cross both in the East and West should not be ignored.²⁵³

Recent scholarship and the Finding of the Cross

More recent scholars have also taken up the challenge to recover the finding of the Cross. In 1982 Ze'ev Rubin argued that Eusebius deliberately obscured the discovery of the Cross and the presence of Helena in Jerusalem to diminish the status of a city which posed a direct threat to the authority of Caesarea.²⁵⁴ Three years later H. A. Drake wrote that although the legends of Helena might be dismissed the evidence for the discovery itself should be considered more promising.²⁵⁵ This article re-examines much of the literary

²⁵⁰ Newman, *Ecclesiastical History*, cli

²⁵¹ Helena is not connected with the finding of the cross until the late fourth century in the lost history of Gelasius of Caesarea. Gelasius was the nephew of Cyril of Jerusalem and promoted to the see of Caesarea in about 367, was present at the 381 council of Constantinople and was dead by the year 400 (Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was Found*, 11). Parts of Gelasius' history can be reconstructed from the works of Rufinus and Cyzicus as well as from Socrates and Theodoret. This in effect means that the narrative of the cross recorded by Ambrose (*De Obitu Theodosii* 40) can no longer be considered the oldest version of the legend which now has its roots firmly in the East, appropriately enough, in Jerusalem. The problem, of course, is not helped by Cyril forgetting to note Helena's involvement in the city in the same breath as his observation of the world-wide circulation of the relics. Thus, the only sure conclusion is that Helena was only later associated with the finding of the cross.

²⁵² The later narratives of Helena's finding of the cross record that the empress sent part of the relic to Constantine in Constantinople. In this version of the event Constantine places the relic in a statue of himself mounted in the city's forum. The statue itself is described, without reference to the cross, in the *Chronicon Paschale* and the *Chronicle* of John Malalas (*Chron. Pasch.* 328; Malalas, *Chronicle* 13.7. See also Theodoret, *Ecclesiastical History*, 1.32). It is a statue, said to have originated from Phrygia, which depicted Constantine as standing with the rays of the sun emanating from his head. It was, as Krautheimer describes it, Constantine as the epiphany of Helios (Krautheimer, *Three Christian Capitals*, 61).

²⁵³ "It seems hardly safe absolutely to deny what is thus affirmed by the whole Church; whether however miracles accompanied the discovery, must ever remain uncertain" (cli). Newman devotes the remainder of this section to the question concerning the discovery of the Holy Sepulchre. He addresses the accusation that Helena got its position wrong.

²⁵⁴ Z. Rubin. "The church of the Holy Sepulchre and the conflict between the sees of Caesarea and Jerusalem." *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 2 (1982): 79-105.

²⁵⁵ H. A. Drake. "Eusebius on the True Cross." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 36.1 (1985): 1-22.

evidence already presented in Newman's essay. Newman's observations also re-appear in both Drijvers²⁵⁶ and Borgehammar's²⁵⁷ monographs. The consensus, it seems, is that wood was indeed discovered in Jerusalem during the reign of Constantine which was interpreted to be the remains of the cross on which Christ hung.²⁵⁸

We could conclude with Newman that Eusebius' silence cannot be satisfactorily explained. Other scholars have attempted a variety of explanations. Rubin, referring to the political rivalry between Eusebius and Macarius, argued that Eusebius carefully underestimates the role of Macarius in the development of the holy places. It is for this reason that Eusebius omits any mention of Helena in Jerusalem, and why he states that the letter from Constantine to Macarius on the question of Mamre was addressed to him rather than to Macarius (despite its condemnatory tone).²⁵⁹

The way in which Eusebius has preserved the letter of Constantine to Macarius concerning the Martyrium basilica suggests that Macarius was a passive recipient of imperial orders and not at all involved in the initial discoveries going on in his city. This is not how the earliest narrative of the finding of the Cross presents the role of the bishop where Helena and Macarius together discover the true cross through a healing miracle.²⁶⁰ However, it is curious that Eusebius has to omit a whole section of Helena's visit to Palestine simply in order to play down the role of Macarius. Eusebius is certainly not anti-Jerusalem per se, as witnessed

²⁵⁶ Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 85.

²⁵⁷ Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was Found*, 105-106.

²⁵⁸ Timothy Barnes makes no comment on the historical discovery of the cross stating, without comment, that "Excavations were made under the ruins [of the shrine of Aphrodite] until a tomb was discovered, which appears to have contained not a body, but some wood, which its finders identified as the cross on which Christ was crucified. Constantine and Christians in general, hailed the discovery as manifest proof of Christ's death, burial and resurrection" (*Constantine and Eusebius*, 248). Perhaps strangely, given the subject of the work, Barnes does not mention the silence of Eusebius on this matter. In a recent article he entitles *V.C.* 3.25-39, "The finding of the holy cross and the construction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre" ("The two drafts of Eusebius' Life of Constantine." *From Eusebius to Augustine: selected papers, 1982-1993*, XII:1-11.). Alistair Kee does not see a problem at all in Eusebius' silence about the cross, "It [the Cross] is not included by Eusebius, but his summary reference to the cross indicates that he was not only well aware of it, but thought it necessary only to mention it in passing, so well would it be known to his contemporaries" (*Constantine versus Christ*, 60).

²⁵⁹ This is also accepted by Barnes, "Eusebius' silence, which has puzzled so many modern scholars, is due to his resentment towards Macarius, who undoubtedly used his discovery to bolster his claims to episcopal primacy within Palestine over the metropolitan bishop of Caesarea" (T. D. Barnes. "Panegyric, history and hagiography in Eusebius' Life of Constantine." *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*. Ed. Rowan Williams. (Cambridge, 1990) 120 n.59).

²⁶⁰ See Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 98.

by his description of Constantine's buildings. If he merely wished to diminish the role of Macarius there is no real reason why he should not have described the finding of the cross within the narrative of the finding of the tomb. The motivation behind the hiding of the cross is more complex than inter-diocesan rivalry.

Eusebius' theology of the Cross

Any attempt to explain Eusebius' silence has to take into account his theology of the cross as sign. After all, 'saving sign' is a term distinctive of Eusebius. A sign such as this acts as a pointer to some other reality, the sign is never the reality itself. Thus the Saving sign is a path to a final destination. This is also true of the other phrase used by Eusebius, the 'trophy of victory'. The trophy is a visible sign of a victory, in this case, Christ's victory over death, his resurrection. Peter Walker views as significant in this context Eusebius' emphasis on the Logos theology and the theophany.²⁶¹ For Eusebius the cave in which some revelation occurred is of great importance. Thus he concentrates on the triad of caves which comprised the place of the nativity, the cave on the Mount of Olives where Christ instructed his disciples, and the cave of the resurrection.²⁶² Each of these were historical places, the importance of which depended upon some divine revelation in the past which in turn had witnessed to the proof of the gospel. The incarnation served as a focus in this scheme but not necessarily as a unique event.²⁶³ It did not exclude the possibility of the Logos revealing himself at other times and in other places.²⁶⁴ The focus on theophany and especially the resurrection meant that Eusebius did not view the cross and the death of Christ as the point of redemption but rather as the means to immortality. The cross was not in itself a place of revelation; the cave of the resurrection supersedes the cross

²⁶¹ Some of Peter Walker's discussion was anticipated by Joachim Jeremias who interpreted the accounts of the discovery of the tomb in terms of "Rekonstruktionstheophanie", a renewal of the original event which the place signifies; *Golgotha*, 25-33.

²⁶² Summarised in *Holy City, Holy Places?*, 184-94.

²⁶³ Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?*, 80-92. Walker's interpretation of Eusebius is that the incarnation was intended to end the tendency of fallen humanity to search for the divine in the material world. The incarnate Logos was a pointer to the heavenly reality of divine life and it was the risen, heavenly Christ who was the true object of devotion (86). Thus, not incarnation but rather theophany; "[his] fondness for the this term had many advantages, but above all it reflected his conviction that the purpose of the Incarnation was primarily, almost exclusively, for the revelation of the spiritual realm. Eusebius was not strictly a theologian of the Incarnation at all; he was a theologian of theophany" (88).

²⁶⁴ Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?*, 90, 115. The Incarnation was a 'return' of the Logos. The site at Mamre was especially sacred as a place where a divine theophany of the Logos occurred to Abraham.

of death.²⁶⁵ Drake also draws attention to the importance of the cave of resurrection but he does so in order to argue that Eusebius drew attention away from the cross to the tomb to prevent the relic of the cross being confused with the imperial standard. That is, Eusebius wished to avoid political undertones being attached to the cross, a fear that the cross might become a symbol of the empire. The empty tomb, however, was a uniquely Christian symbol and represented the final destination of the symbol of the cross.²⁶⁶

Eusebius is not, however, reluctant to put forward the symbol of the cross as an imperial standard and ensures that the reader knows that Constantine did so on divine authority. In the Laus Eusebius makes it clear that the churches constructed by Constantine were in honour of the Saving sign. The cross has in effect become a symbol of the empire and Eusebius says as much when he describes it as a safeguard of the empire. The distinction between symbol and reality in Eusebius, however, remains important to any discussion of Eusebius and the cross. The labarum itself was a sign, not only in its significance as a trophy of victory, but also because it was constructed according to a heavenly reality. The basilica at Tyre, we noted, was also described as conforming to a heavenly ideal. The tomb of Christ acted as a symbol of the risen, heavenly Christ, precisely because it was empty. This is what Eusebius means by describing it as the 'evidence for our salvation'. The relic of the cross, however, could act to confuse this sign-reality pattern. Constantine's appropriation of the cross as an imperial standard occurred before his building policy in Jerusalem. The cross was a 'saving sign', a pointer to some other reality. The claim to have found the relics of the cross, however, was a claim to have found the reality to which artistic representations of the cross pointed. The later narratives of the discovery of the cross claim that Constantine had part of the cross mounted in Constantinople, and that he incorporated the nails into the bridle of his horse.²⁶⁷ Constantine's letter to Macarius refers to the cross; the Laus claims he built "a temple sacred to the saving sign"; and it seems no coincidence that the Chronicon Paschale refers to the basilica as the "church of the Holy Cross".²⁶⁸ Constantine's enthusiasm risked missing the point of the cross as a sign and a trophy of victory.

²⁶⁵ Walker, Holy City, Holy Places?, 256.

²⁶⁶ Drake, "Eusebius and the true cross", 18-19.

²⁶⁷ See, for example, Socrates, H.E. 1.17 who writes that Constantine enclosed a portion of the cross in a statue in the forum of Constantinople. The nails were made into bridal-bits and mounted on a helmet. Sozomenus adds that the making of a bridle fulfilled the words of Zachariah 14:20, "that which shall be upon the bit of the horse shall be holy to the Lord Almighty". (2.1).

²⁶⁸ Chronicon Paschale, 334.



It is difficult to incorporate relics of the crucifixion into a theology of redemption when the emperor purloins the relics for the battle field.²⁶⁹ The theology of the place must accord with the theology of the event. Eusebius in the basilica of the cross surrounds the visible evidence of the cross with an oration on the resurrection and surrounds Constantine's written proclamation of the cross with words of resurrection. He does not change Constantine's letter, nor does he deny the presence of the cross, he simply supplies what he regarded as missing whilst remaining silent on what he viewed as already present.²⁷⁰

The Buildings of the New Jerusalem

The constituent parts of the basilica

The differing interpretations of the Martyrium basilica partly arise because of the structure of the site. If, as at Bethlehem, the basilica encompassed the cave of the resurrection then there would be little question that the prime focus of the building was the resurrection. On the other hand the basilica could have included the rock of Golgotha, but it did not. Thus, structurally the basilica itself stands apart from both the place of resurrection and the place of crucifixion. As we might expect Eusebius has a particular interpretation of the site which lays its emphasis firmly on the cave of the resurrection.²⁷¹ The description of the site in the *Vita* is a process, rather like the description of the basilica at Tyre, which takes the reader from one end of the site to the other. In the Tyre Oration the listener was moved from outer parts to areas of increasing holiness. We might have expected Eusebius to do the same in his description of this site but he does not. Instead he first described the "chief part of the whole", the "sacred cave itself", which apparently drew Constantine's attention first. Then he describes the space between the cave and basilica before turning his attention to the church

²⁶⁹ The fulfilment of the Zach. 14:20 was, for Ambrose, however, the most significant factor of the whole discovery. It was the nails rather than the cross which establishes the Christian empire (*De Obitu Theodosii* 47). For the opinion that Ambrose was attempting to reduce the absolute rule of the State in favour of the Church see E. T. Brett. "Early Constantine Legends - A Study in Propaganda." *Byzantine Studies* 10.1 (1983): 52-70. See also Drijver's commentary in *Helena Augusta*, 112-13.

²⁷⁰ Peter Walker suggests it is a combination of the above factors which explains Eusebius' silence, but places the emphasis on the theological arguing that Eusebius was a "theologian of theophany and apologist of the spiritual" (129). It is Eusebius' focus on the three caves of theophany (Nativity, Eleona and Sepulchre) that directed him to use much of the material from his work *Theophania* in the *Laus Constantini*.

²⁷¹ Eusebius' description of Constantine's building may be found in *V.C.* 3.34-40

itself. Despite referring to the cave as the centre of attention, the greater part of his description is taken up by the section devoted to the basilica. It was, as Constantine intended, a church which surpassed others in beauty with marbled floors, a golden panelled roof and aisles on either side of the building.

The basilica apparently had its own "crowning part of the whole", the hemisphere, which was encircled by twelve columns each bearing a great silver bowl.²⁷² Assuming the altar was also located in this space it made for a particularly crowded apse.²⁷³ The final section of the site is the atrium leading to the basilica entrance. Thus the description presented by Eusebius is a reversal of the natural order not only of what a visitor to the basilica would have seen but also the historical order of death and resurrection. Eusebius' intention is not to describe the order of the site as it stood after completion but rather the order in which Constantine constructed each section. In this way Eusebius implies an order of priority and thus places the tomb at the head of the list. The cave may be at the head of the list but it is not the only centre of the site. Eusebius' way of describing the site is particularly visual, always moving outwards to inwards for each distinct section. Eusebius cannot help but suggest that the actual centre of the site is the hemisphere which is probably why he repeats the statement that the cave is the "chief part of the whole". Just so that the reader is left in no doubt about the relation of the basilica to the cave Eusebius ends with, "this temple, then, the emperor erected as a conspicuous witness of the Saviour's resurrection".²⁷⁴ There is some uncertainty, however, about the visual significance of the cave in the Constantinian buildings. Charles Coüsanon, followed by John Wilkinson, argued that the rotunda alluded to by Cyril and described by the pilgrim Egeria was not completed until after Constantine's death. At the time of Eusebius' writing the cave was surrounded by the pillars he mentions but left open to the sky.²⁷⁵ The more recent study by Virgilio Corbo

²⁷² V.C. 3.38, "Τούτων δ' ἀντικρὺν, τὸ κεφάλαιον τοῦ παντός ἡμισφαρίου ἦν..."

²⁷³ A point made by Charles Coüsanon. *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem*. (London, 1974) 42. Richard Krautheimer suggested that the description of the hemisphere belonged not with the basilica but with the cave, Eusebius having switched back to describing the sepulchre (*Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*: 63). Attractive a solution as this might be, it does not fit with the way in which Eusebius presents his material. The hemisphere is described as opposite the doors of the basilica, "ἐπ' ἄκρου τοῦ βασιλείου ἐκτεταμένον". For the same reason it is unlikely that André Piganiol is correct to suggest that the hemisphere is an "omphalos" marking the place of Christ's death (*L'Empire Chrétien (325-395)*). (Paris, 1972) 42).

²⁷⁴ V.C. 3.40, "Τόνδε μὲν οὖν νεῶν, σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως ἐναργὲς ἀνίστη μαρτύριον βασιλεὺς".

²⁷⁵ Charles Coüsanon. *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem*, 17; J. Wilkinson. *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land*, 40. This view is also accepted without comment by Joan Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places*: 138.

states that the twelve columns which encircled the cave were originally part of six larger columns "belonging to the facade of the Hadrianic Capitolium".²⁷⁶ The Martyrium basilica itself is still described as having an apse with twelve columns and Corbo's reconstruction accords with the general outline of Eusebius' description of the various elements.

The basilica and the Hadrianic structures

What is particularly significant about Corbo's analysis of the site is the material which he has identified as being originally part of the pre-Constantinian structures erected by Herod and Hadrian. Eusebius stresses that Constantine demolished entirely the Hadrianic structures, even going as far as removing the top soil. It was whilst doing so that the tomb of Christ was uncovered. Earlier we noted that Eusebius' own account of the events suggested that Constantine had some other motive for destroying the temple other than to uncover the tomb. This motive we suggested was partly to rid Jerusalem of an unacceptable cult, an action which he performed elsewhere. The secondary motive was more than likely associated with the historical significance of the city for the death of Christ. Clearly, then Constantine did not remove all traces of the Hadrianic temple but on the contrary used the plan of the temple to decide the basic outline of the Christian replacement. Corbo has identified not only the columns in the rotunda as being of Hadrianic origin but also blocks in the Atrium which separated the basilica from the roadway as belonging to the time of Herod which were reused by Hadrian and then Constantine.²⁷⁷

A question which arises from this, and which Joan Taylor has attempted to answer is: if Constantine desired to build a basilica in place of the temple to Aphrodite and the shrine to Jupiter, was it coincidence that this place was revealed also as the place of Christ's death and resurrection? If not, were Eusebius and Jerome correct then in proclaiming that Hadrian had deliberately covered the site with a temple and this temple had (ironically) acted as a signpost pointing to the sacred site? David Hunt argued that the site was indeed kept in memory by the Jerusalem Christians before Constantine who assembled in a church on Mount Sion. Melito of Sardis is cited as the first documented pilgrim to the holy places and the fact that he described Christ as being crucified "in the middle of the city",

²⁷⁶ Virgilio C. Corbo. Il Santo Sepolcro di Gerusalemme: aspetti archeologici dalle origini al periodo crociato. Vol 1. (Jerusalem, 1981) 224.

²⁷⁷ V. Corbo, Il Santo Sepolcro di Gerusalemme: 227.

is cited as evidence that the place of crucifixion was preserved within an expanding city.²⁷⁸ Other references from Origen, for example, also point to pilgrimage before Constantine.²⁷⁹ With this view of affairs Joan Taylor does not agree. In her recent work, Christians and the Holy Places, she argues that no such group of Christians kept the memory of the sacred places.²⁸⁰ As for Melito, Taylor examines more closely the phrase he used to describe the place of Christ's death, "ἐπὶ μέσης πλατείας". This, she argues, has a technical meaning referring to a colonnaded street, such as one might find around the forum. Eusebius uses the same term to describe the main street, or *Cardo Maximus*, which ran beside the entrance to the Martyrium basilica.²⁸¹ Taylor argues that Melito is too specific when the other sources, including the Gospels, refer to the place of crucifixion as a region rather than a precise location.²⁸² If Melito was correct in his observation, then Constantine missed the location of the crucifixion when he assumed it was under the temple of Aphrodite. In addition, no pre-Constantinian source mentions the presence of the temple in the same breath as either Golgotha or the tomb. The central argument of this section of Taylor's work (which is admittedly attractive for this study) is that Constantine's prime motivation was to overturn the work of Hadrian and replace his temple with a basilica in honour of the Sacred Sign.²⁸³ The place of Golgotha was known to be in this area and it was fortuitous that wood was found and identified as the cross of Christ and also an empty tomb uncovered in the same area. This argument does make better sense of the material in Eusebius and also accounts for his surprise at the uncovering of the tomb and the emperor's joy at discovering the

²⁷⁸ E. D. Hunt. Holy Land Pilgrimage, 3; Melito of Sardis. On Pascha and Fragments. (Oxford, 1979) 94.

²⁷⁹ E. D. Hunt. Holy Land Pilgrimage, 101.

²⁸⁰ Joan E. Taylor. Christians and the Holy Places: 295, "From our archaeological and historical examination of the important holy places...we have seen that there is no evidence at all that Jewish-Christians, or any other kind of Christians, venerated sites as sacred before the beginning of the fourth century".

²⁸¹ Martin Biddle points out that it could also mean a square or piazza, "The tomb of Christ", 98.

²⁸² Christians and the Holy Places: 117. A. Linder also argues for a continuity between the Hadrianic temple and the basilica, suggesting that the Holy Sepulchre may have symbolised the legitimacy of the Roman government in the city just as Hadrian's temple had done; A. Linder. "Ecclesia and Synagoga in the Medieval myth of Constantine the Great." Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire 54 (1976): 1026.

²⁸³ Christians and the Holy Places: 141, "With Constantine came a relocation of Golgotha. The emperor made the identification of the site as actually lying under the temple of Venus. He wished to destroy this and replace it with a new Christian temple in honour of the 'saving sign', the cross, which had proved to be the instrument of his success". This theory is further elaborated by Gibson & Taylor, Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, 65-80. The 'relocation' of Golgotha is rejected by Martin Biddle as partly based on a misreading of Golgotha in the Onomasticon. He dismisses Taylor's thesis as part of an anti-ancient tradition ("The tomb of Christ", 100-103).

reality behind his sign. The Martyrium basilica was constructed as distinct from the cave of the resurrection and from the rock of Golgotha because Constantine had already planned to construct it in the first place with or without miraculous discoveries. Constantine's symbol of the triumph of Christianity was a basilica better than any other, especially better than Hadrian's temple to the Capitoline triad.

The Feast of the Encaenia

The Bordeaux pilgrim

In 333 a pilgrim who travelled from the city of Bordeaux recorded having seen the mount of Golgotha and, a stone's throw away, the tomb. On the orders of Constantine, records the pilgrim, a basilica was constructed, of wonderful beauty with cisterns of water and a baptistery where infants are baptised.²⁸⁴ The anonymous pilgrim from Bordeaux bears witness to the basilica being in use as a place of worship and initiation before its official inauguration two years later. We do not know, then, how long it took to construct the various elements of the site including cutting away much of the rock of Golgotha and making the cave more prominent.²⁸⁵ Certainly, by the time the Bordeaux pilgrim arrived the city was well developed as a place of notable Jewish and Christian sites. These ranged from the vault where Solomon tortured demons, the column at which Christ was scourged, the tombs of Isaiah and Hezekiah, the basilica on the Mount of Olives, and further away, the basilica of the Nativity. The pilgrim gives no

²⁸⁴ *Itinerarium Burdigalense*, 594.1-4. On the baptistery see Alexis Doval. "The location and structure of the baptistery in the Mystagogic Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem." *Studia Patristica* 26 (1993): 1-13. The pilgrim makes no mention of the relics of the Cross. He provides only superficial details about the site. Although he mentions the beauty of the basilica, and the cisterns, it is a description of one passing by. There is no indication that he actually entered the basilica. This may have been because it was as yet unfinished (so any relics would not have been present anyway), or perhaps he was unable, for some other reason, to enter the basilica and see for himself.

²⁸⁵ A detailed description of the process may be found in Charles Coüasnon, *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem*, 12ff and H. Vincent, and F. M. Abel. *Jérusalem: Recherches de Topographie d'archéologie et d'histoire*. Vol. II (Paris, 1914) 164-80. Eusebius appears to describe the cave before work began on the buildings in the *Theophania* where he says, "It is marvellous to see even this rock, standing out erect and alone in a level land, and having only one cavern in it; lest, had there been many, the miracle of Him who overcame death should be obscured" (3.61, cited in Walker, *Holy City, Holy Places?* 104). This implies that other tombs were present in the area which the workmen removed, such was the certainty which tomb belonged to Christ. The *Theophania* is generally accepted to have been written around 324/25 (Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 186).

indication that the building work was still in progress despite the fact that the basilica of the Nativity in Bethlehem was not inaugurated until May 339.²⁸⁶ The only hint that we have that the development of Jerusalem into a city of biblical events was still underway is that the pilgrim notes that on the site of the temple two statues of Hadrian stand there near the blood of Zacharias and the stone mourned over by the Jews each year.²⁸⁷ However, a statue of Hadrian was still there in the days of Jerome.²⁸⁸

The emperor, the bishop, and the architects

The planning of the Martyrium site is contained in Constantine's letter to Macarius. The bishop is appointed to oversee and make the necessary arrangements.²⁸⁹ Macarius in turn is to advise the provincial governor and Dracilianus, the deputy of the Praetorian Prefects what is required regarding builders and designers.²⁹⁰ It is also up to the bishop to make written requests for specific materials, presumably columns and marbles which could not be obtained locally.²⁹¹ For all the emphasis there has been on the involvement of Constantine in choosing to build a basilica here, the impression left is that Constantine has put the design of the building in the hands of the bishop; it is he who is to advise Constantine whether the ceiling should be panelled or otherwise. The latter advice together with a proposed budget and requisition orders are to be submitted to Constantine without delay.²⁹² Of course, this should be considered perfectly normal. Before the interest of Constantine in Christian buildings it would doubtless have been the local bishop who arranged all the matters which Constantine demanded of Macarius. Eusebius, we should remember, gave

²⁸⁶ Cited Wilkinson 162 - see *Revue Biblique* 67 (1960), 572. The Georgian Lectionary and other liturgical sources state 31 May was the dedication of the Nativity in Bethlehem.

²⁸⁷ *Itinerarium Burdigalense* 591.

²⁸⁸ Jerome, *Comm. in Matheum*, 4, 24.15, "...de Adriani equestri statua quae in ipso sancto sanctorum loco usque in praesentem diem stetit" (CCL 77.226).

²⁸⁹ Macarius never saw the inauguration of the basilica which he had helped design. He died in 333, the same year in which the Bordeaux pilgrim was in the city. Sozomenus records the process by which a successor came to be appointed in the city. The people apparently desired Maximus whom Macarius had placed over the church of Diospolis. Such was the popularity of Maximus that he had to remain in Jerusalem with Macarius until the latter's death. Sozomenus comments that Macarius regretted that he had ever ordained Maximus to anywhere else except Jerusalem. He dreaded an Arian candidate taking the see (*H.E.* 2.20). Maximus died around 350.

²⁹⁰ Dracilianus is mentioned as acting Praetorian Prefect in 325 (*Codex Theodosianus* 2.33.1). He was still around the following year (*Codex Theodosianus* 16.5.1).

²⁹¹ *V.C.* 3.31.

²⁹² *V.C.* 3.32.

Paulinus the credit for the design of the basilica in Tyre. The latter basilica was the first of its kind in the East and since Tyre was conveniently close to Jerusalem it is not surprising that there are notable similarities between it and the Martyrium basilica. The later sources suggest that Macarius did not have sole control over the design of the site. The names of two architects have been recorded as Zenobius, possibly from Syria, and Eustathios of Constantinople.²⁹³ The latter, at least, should be considered an imperial appointment and was probably one of the leading architects of the imperial city.

The Church and Empire Between 326-335

During the years between the building and the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica, Constantine had other concerns on his mind which to some extent may account for the apparently long stretch of time. There were approximately three or four years between the commencement of building and the inauguration of the Tyre basilica. The demolition of the temple of Venus and the uncovering of cross and tomb occurred before Constantine's letter to Macarius. All other things being equal we might expect the site to be ready by 330 and certainly, as we suggested, by the time the Bordeaux pilgrim viewed it in 333.²⁹⁴

The see of Antioch and the council of Nicomedia

Neither the Church nor the empire was at peace in the years leading up to 335. The council of Nicaea did not, as Constantine had hoped, settle the dispute over the relationship of the Logos-Christ to the Father. The death of the bishop in Antioch divided the inhabitants over the choice of a successor. The dispute spilled over into other areas of the Eastern empire. A council convened in Antioch chose Eusebius as a successor. Eusebius wisely refused to be transferred from his see to Antioch (however prestigious a position might have been) and

²⁹³ Prosper of Aquitaine, *Chronicon Integrum*, "Eustathius Constantinopolitanus presbyter innotescit, cuius industria Hierosolimis martyrium constructum est" (PL 51.576; also in Jerome, *Chronicon*, 278); Theophanes, *Chronographia* p.33.

²⁹⁴ By this time Constantine's building program in the East was putting a strain on the resources of the Empire. An edict issued in 334 to the Praetorian Prefect exclaims, "We need as many architects as possible, but because they do not exist [you] shall urge to this study youths in the African provinces..." (*Codex Theodosianus* 13.4.1). The students and their parents are rewarded with exemption from certain public duties and the provision of scholarships. A similar edict in 337 exempts artisans (including makers of panelled ceilings, builders and marble-masons) from compulsory public services (13.4.2).

received the praise of the emperor for doing so.²⁹⁵ The mediation of Constantine was also required to bring Eusebius of Nicomedia and Arius back into communion, especially with the bishop of Alexandria. Having summoned Arius to court in 327 Constantine was satisfied that Arius had subscribed to the faith of Nicaea.²⁹⁶ He required, however, a council to confirm this and a council met in Nicomedia (where Constantine was present) in late 327.²⁹⁷ The restoration of Arius by this council resulted also in the rehabilitation of Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis, the bishop of Nicaea. Alexander of Alexandria refused to re-admit Arius and, despite the pleas of the emperor, remained in this position until his death in April 328. The death of Alexander left vacant the see of Alexandria. Athanasius was a likely candidate and, before a rival could be elected, he had written to Constantine enclosing a decree of the city appointing him to the see.²⁹⁸ Constantine, drawn deeper into the proceedings of the church of Alexandria, confirmed Athanasius' appointment only to be faced with the Meletians duly electing a rival. Between 328 and 335 Athanasius and his rival attempted to displace each other, Athanasius by far gaining the support of the people.²⁹⁹ Meanwhile Athanasius followed the example of his predecessor and refused any communion with the followers of Arius. On the other front, in 330, the Meletians allied themselves with Eusebius of Nicomedia whilst attempting to gain access to Constantine's ear. Eusebius of Nicomedia was in a prime position to influence the emperor and he agreed to petition the emperor on their behalf if they admitted Arius to communion.

Athanasius and the Meletians

It was at this point that the squabble reached a new level. Accusations of a criminal nature were levelled at Athanasius by the Meletians (through Eusebius of Nicomedia). Constantine summoned Athanasius who was then faced with a number of charges varying from being too young to have been made a bishop to treason itself.³⁰⁰ Constantine was not convinced, acquitted Athanasius and wrote a letter to Alexandria pleading for peace. The year was 332 and Athanasius

²⁹⁵ V.C. 3.59-62; Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 228.

²⁹⁶ The correspondence which went back and forth between Constantine and the various parties is detailed by T. G Elliott. "Constantine and 'the Arian reaction after Nicaea'." *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 43 (1992): 169-94.

²⁹⁷ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 229.

²⁹⁸ Philostorgius 2.11. See the discussion in Duane Wade-Hampton Arnold. *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria*. (Notre Dame, 1991) 25-36.

²⁹⁹ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 230.

³⁰⁰ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 232.

returned to Alexandria in triumph. In the winter of the same year Constantine waged a successful campaign against the Goths.³⁰¹ As long as Arius and his followers remained out of communion with Alexandria then the council of Nicaea had failed in its original purpose. Athanasius held firm to his refusal to have anything to do with Arius and the latter continued to petition the emperor to intervene, threatening to form a separate church altogether. If the rest of the Church was managing to exist in relative peace then Constantine was probably not aware of it compared with the strife he received from the Meletians on the one hand and Arius on the other. No doubt the bishop of Nicomedia who appears to have had a semi-permanent presence at the court of Constantine reminded the emperor of his involvement in these ecclesiastical disputes. Constantine finally denounced Arius himself in a letter to Alexandria and moreover penalised his followers with fines and lifted their exemption from public service. This, he hoped, would end the matter once and for all.

Whilst the people of Alexandria were hearing Constantine's opinions of Arius the Bordeaux pilgrim was admiring the Martyrium basilica in Jerusalem. Macarius, who had been given responsibility for the completion of the basilica in the first place, died around this time.³⁰² It is possible by this time that Constantine had already decided that he would leave the inauguration of the basilica until the beginning of the celebrations for his Tricennalia. These promised to be on a grand scale since no other emperor, save Augustus himself, had managed to stay in power for so long. The Meletians once again rose to accuse Athanasius, repeating an earlier accusation of chalice breaking and adding the infamous charge of the murder of Arsenius, a bishop in Upper Egypt. Constantine instructed his half-brother, Dalmatius, in Antioch to investigate.³⁰³ Meanwhile Athanasius set himself the task of locating Arsenius before he himself was located by the censor from Antioch. Constantine then, in 334, the same year in which he was on the battlefield against the Sarmatians,³⁰⁴ summoned a council to meet in Caesarea.³⁰⁵ Athanasius was absent and was subsequently denounced. He, however, had by now located the missing Arsenius alive and well. It was

³⁰¹ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 250; Arnold, *The Early Episcopal Career*, 115; *V.C.* 4.5.

³⁰² See Sozomenus, *H.E.* 2.20 for the account of how Maximus came to succeed Macarius as bishop of Jerusalem.

³⁰³ Arnold, *The Early Episcopal Career*, 131.

³⁰⁴ Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 250; *V.C.* 4.6.

³⁰⁵ Eusebius of Caesarea may have chaired the synod. Barnes states that Dalmatius, the state Censor, acted at this synod as Constantine had at Nicaea; *Constantine and Eusebius*, 234. What is not disputed is that the synod was summoned by imperial letters rather than by episcopal initiative.

now the turn of the Meletians to meet the wrath of the emperor who threatened them with criminal proceedings should they bring further false accusations.³⁰⁶

The council of Tyre

If it was not for the influence of Eusebius of Nicomedia and his continued desire to see the decision of the council of Nicomedia implemented, the accusations against Athanasius might well have faded away at this point. The Meletians were once again persuaded by this bishop, along with the supporters of Arius and Colluthus, to write to Constantine with a fresh set of accusations. Constantine, in an attempt to end it once and for all, handed the whole affair over to a council which he decreed would take place in the city of Tyre. Constantine announced the council at the latest in May 335.³⁰⁷ The beginning of the Tricennalia would have occurred in July of that year, the month in which the council convened. Present at the council were all the characters we have mentioned above, along with Eusebius of Caesarea, over forty bishops from Egypt,³⁰⁸ and the comes Flavius Dionysius, the former governor of Syria. The latter was appointed to act as Constantine's personal representative, presiding over the council.³⁰⁹ The council opened with a proclamation from Constantine defining the purposes of the council, of which the chief one was to "restore to so many provinces that due measure of concord which, strange and sad anomaly, the arrogance of a few individuals has destroyed." Since Constantine has done everything requested of him, "no proof of pious zeal on my part shall be wanting", anyone bound to attend the synod who does not materialise shall be

³⁰⁶ Duane Arnold remarks that Constantine desired to maintain a good relationship with Athanasius since the grain fields of Egypt were important for the well-being of Constantinople (particularly since Constantine had begun the distribution of free grain there in 332); The Early Episcopal Career, 125. A further accusation which would be brought against Athanasius in 335 was that he had disrupted the grain supply, a treasonable offence.

³⁰⁷ Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, 236.

³⁰⁸ Athanasius' attempt to ensure that he had certain supporters at a Council which he considered to have been stage-managed by Eusebius of Nicomedia and his followers (Apol. c. Arianos 78.1); see Arnold, The Early Episcopal Career, 146; Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, 236.

³⁰⁹ The importance of this council, except for its aim to restore some semblance of peace to the Church in Alexandria, Antioch, and Nicomedia, was that the emperor had chosen to intervene and had appointed an imperial official, rather than a bishop, to preside over the proceedings. At Tyre the emperor had crossed the boundary which lay between making it as convenient as possible for an ecclesial council to meet and actually intervening to summon, set the agenda, and implement the decisions of a council. See further, Duane Arnold, The Early Episcopal Career, 143 and W. H. C. Frend, The Rise of Christianity. (Philadelphia, 1984) 527.

exiled, "to teach him that it does not become him to resist an emperor's decrees when issued in defence of truth".³¹⁰

The debates at the synod were heated as Athanasius defended each of the charges. Arsenius, of whose murder he had been accused, was triumphantly produced in good health from a tavern.³¹¹ The one charge which remained which was not so easily refuted was that Macarius, an ex-Meletian priest, had broken a chalice of Ischyrras, a priest whom Athanasius had ordered to appear before him in Alexandria. Athanasius was held responsible for this affair. The dispute was confused by Ischyrras renouncing an earlier declaration of loyalty to Athanasius whilst Macarius denied the whole affair. Thus, Dionysius agreed that an inquiry should be set up which would visit the Mareotis where the affair had allegedly occurred and conduct a fact-finding mission. Athanasius, as one would expect, agreed on the condition that the members of the commission be impartial. The appointed members were anything but impartial to the case of Athanasius and included Theognis of Nicaea, Ursacius of Singidunum and Valens of Mursa, all who had been openly opposed to Athanasius and favourable to Arius.³¹² The actions of the commission whilst in the Mareotis led the clergy there to write to the synod complaining of their obvious bias.³¹³ Athanasius, for his part, made an official complaint to Dionysius as did the Egyptian bishops.³¹⁴

The council and encaenia in Jerusalem

It was whilst the commission was away in the Mareotis that Constantine once again wrote to the synod. This time it is an invitation for the synod to make their way to Jerusalem for the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica.³¹⁵

³¹⁰ Eusebius, *V.C.* 4.42; NPNF 1.551. Hefele paints a colourful image of the potential attraction the council of Tyre held for Constantine, "...and just now, at the time of Constantine's thirtieth anniversary, the great Church of the Resurrection built by him at Jerusalem was to be consecrated in the presence of many bishops, the Eusebians represented to him how glorious it would be if, before the commencement of this solemn act, all the bishops could be united, and the ecclesiastical strife in Egypt be set at rest. This proposition was too closely allied to Constantine's darling plan not to meet with his approval, and he therefore arranged that the bishops should first assemble in Tyre, and then, with united and reconciled hearts, proceed to the great festival at Jerusalem" (*A History of the Councils of the Church AD 326-AD429*. (Edinburgh, 1876) 17).

³¹¹ Socrates, *H.E.* 1.30.

³¹² Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 237; Arnold, *The Early Episcopal Career*, 157-60.

³¹³ The complaint was lodged on September 8th 335 as recorded by Athanasius, *Apol. c. Arianos*, 76.5

³¹⁴ Athanasius, *Apol. c. Arianos*, 77-79.

³¹⁵ *V.C.* 4.43. See also Sozomenus, *H.E.* 2.26.

Constantine evidently thought that the synod had completed the essential part of its business and he could wait no longer to accomplish the inauguration. If the synod at Tyre commenced in July 335 then it coincided with the beginning of the Tricennalia celebrations just as Nicaea marked the emperor's Vicennalia. At the end of Nicaea the bishops attended a splendid feast. The synod of Tyre, unfortunately had not completed its business but Constantine was not to delay the inauguration any longer. As Eusebius makes clear the participants were to hurry to Jerusalem without delay.³¹⁶ Socrates explicitly states that the synod had been convened as a "secondary matter" to the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica, so that "all causes of contention being removed there, they might the more peacefully perform the inaugural ceremonies in the dedication of the church of God."³¹⁷ Socrates, like Eusebius, also refers to Constantine's letters urging the synod to move with haste to Jerusalem. Sozomenus' account is similar, stating that the inauguration had been "previously determined" and that Constantine thought it necessary that discord should be resolved before the inauguration.³¹⁸

There in Jerusalem the numerous bishops were met by a civil servant who has been identified as the notary Marianus.³¹⁹ The hospitality offered to the bishops by this imperial representative excelled that which they received at Nicaea. The celebrations in Jerusalem are associated by Eusebius with the Tricennalia and as we might expect, include banquets for the bishops, money and clothes for the impoverished, and rich offerings for the basilica itself.³²⁰ The

³¹⁶ V.C. 4.43, "Ἐπεὶ δὲ δι' ἔργων ἐχώρει τὰ προστεταγμένα, κατελάμβανεν ἄλλος βασιλικὸς ἀνὴρ, ἐπισπέρχων τὴν σύνοδον σὺν γράμματι βασιλικῷ, σπεύδειν μὴδὲ ἀναβάλλεσθαι τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα παρορμῶν γε πορείαν".

³¹⁷ H.E. 1.28; NPNF 2.30.

³¹⁸ H.E. 2.26.

³¹⁹ He is named as such in the chapter heading to V.C. 4.43. Sozomenus (2.26) mentions him in the body of the text. On Eusebius' general reluctance to name individuals see, R. T. Ridley. "Anonymity in the *Vita Constantini*." Byzantion 50 (1980): 241-58. It has also been suggested that this mysterious Roman official may have been a source for the imperial documents preserved in the *Vita*, B. Warmington. "The sources of some Constantinian documents in Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History and Life of Constantine*." Studia Patristica 18.1 (1985): 95. The role of the notary is described by Fergus Millar, The Emperor in the Roman World, 107-108.

³²⁰ Eusebius, V.C. 4.44, "[Marianus] enriched and beautified the church throughout with offerings (ἀναθήμασι) of imperial magnificence, and thus fully accomplished the service he had been commissioned to perform". The significance of the inauguration occurring in the thirtieth year has also been noted by David Hunt, Holy Land Pilgrimage, 25-26. Both Socrates and Sozomenus refer to the thirtieth year of the emperor's reign when describing the occasion of the council and the subsequent inauguration. The actions of Marianus are not so different from those of Helena who, as we have discussed previously, may have made her tour as part of the Vicennalia celebrations. The emperor's generosity was apparent at festivals other than anniversaries of his reign. Eusebius gives a similar description of Constantine's liberalitas at the wedding of his son Constantius Caesar (V.C. 4.49). See further Fergus Millar, The Emperor in the Roman World, 135-39.

inauguration of the basilica in Tyre involved the gathering of neighbouring bishops and clergy and doubtless included at least one banquet. The involvement of the emperor and the emphasis that the Martyrium basilica was an imperial construction resulted in elements of festivity being transferred to the inauguration of a Christian building which were usually associated with the celebrations of the emperor himself. This, the first imperial encaenia, was a public festival which affected citizens of the city at every social level.³²¹

Eusebius' role at the encaenia: the oration on the Holy Sepulchre

We have very few details of the rite of the Encaenia, the process by which the Martyrium was formally inaugurated.³²² In Eusebius' description every bishop was expected to play a role in the grandeur of the festival. Prayers, orations expounding doctrine and Scripture, and the offering of intercessions were delivered by those present according to their ability. Eusebius himself admits to delivering more than one oration. By these orations (or one oration delivered more than once) he both explained the details of the basilica and drew attention to relevant material from the "prophetic visions".³²³ Eusebius adds that he has written a separate work detailing the beautiful offerings in the basilica which he will add to the *Vita* along with the oration he delivered for the Tricennalia in Constantinople.

The above statements are comparable to his description of the inauguration of the Tyre basilica where he also delivered an oration with a similar structure to the one he claims to have delivered in Jerusalem. The oration of Tyre survived and is easily accessible in book ten of the *Ecclesiastical History*.

³²¹ Eusebius' description of Constantine favouring the poor with money and clothes need not be seen as a particularly Christian action. Fergus Millar writes that the range of imperial gifts "affected all the classes of persons with whom he had contact" and notes that "the notion that the reception of gifts was something which resulted especially, but not only, from personal contact with the emperor remained essential to men's conception of his role, and was easily clad in a Christian garb by Eusebius" (*The Emperor in the Roman World*, 138).

³²² Eusebius does not use the term Encaenia to describe the inauguration of the basilica but rather ἀφιέρωσις (*V.C.* 4.40; 4.45 where it is a "ἡ τῆς ἀφιέρωσεως ἑορτὴ"). This is also the term used in the letter from the council of Jerusalem preserved by Athanasius (*Apol. C. Arianos*, 84). The word, "ἐγκαινία" appears in the headings to *V.C.* 4.43 and 4.47. It is generally agreed that the chapter headings were added by a later editor (Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 265). R. T. Ridley also argues for a later editor on the basis that the titles betray figures which Eusebius intended to remain anonymous in the *Vita* ("Anonymity in the *Vita Constantini*", 258. Marianus is a case in point). It is possible that the editor was Eusebius' successor, Acacius.

³²³ *V.C.* 4.45.

Unfortunately, Eusebius' death before he completed the Vita has given rise to some confusion as to what works were preserved with the Vita. In recent years the major work of distinguishing the various orations and works written and delivered by Eusebius at this time has been undertaken by H.A. Drake and Timothy Barnes. The oration which Eusebius delivered in Constantinople for the Tricennalia poses few problems; it has been identified as the Oratio de laudibus Constantini.³²⁴ However, it is generally agreed that the Laus, as it has been handed down, is made up of two distinct works. The first is the Tricennalia oration and the second is one Eusebius delivered in connection with the Martyrium.³²⁵ According to the Vita the work on the sacred cave was a description of the "numberless offerings". The second work which forms part of the Laus is nothing of the sort. However in V.C. 4.33 Eusebius states that the emperor had personally asked Eusebius to deliver an oration on the sepulchre in his presence. The emperor stood throughout in respect to the theological doctrines it contained. Is this, then, the work appended to the Laus? Drake thinks so, arguing that the orations mentioned in 4.33 and 4.46 refer to the same work, though with the physical description edited out and perhaps incorporated into the Vita itself.³²⁶ There is, then, no missing oration. Eusebius delivered an oration at the inauguration itself and then repeated its delivery when he and the other bishops journeyed to Constantinople in November 335.

Timothy Barnes is not altogether happy with this reconstruction. He prefers to argue that the speech appended to the Laus is one which Eusebius delivered at the inauguration but not before the emperor in the following November. The latter was the speech which Constantine stood for and included the physical description of the building as well as the theological interpretations, whereas the speech in September discussed the philosophical assumptions behind the Martyrium site. Eusebius intended to append the full speech delivered in November but subsequent to his death the wrong one was appended.³²⁷ Drake and Barnes thus agree that chapters 11-18 of the Laus are the oration delivered by Eusebius at the Inauguration. Where they differ is on whether there was a subsequent speech delivered before the emperor in the November or whether

³²⁴ The Greek title is more explicit, "Εἰς Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν βασιλέα τριακονταετηρικός", H. A. Drake. In Praise of Constantine, 30.

³²⁵ Drake, In Praise of Constantine, 31-40; T. D. Barnes. "Two speeches by Eusebius." Greek, Roman, Byzantine Studies 18 (1977): 341-42.

³²⁶ Drake, In Praise of Constantine, 42-45. Libanius tells of the sophist Bemarchius delivering an oration in praise of the Golden House basilica in Antioch which consisted of 1) an encomium of Christ and 2) a description of the church (Oration 1.39). This may have become the standard pattern for such panegyrics.

³²⁷ Barnes, "Two Speeches by Eusebius", 343-45.

Eusebius simply repeated his September oration. Drake's reply was that it was unlikely that Eusebius would write a new speech for his visit to Constantinople in November since that visit was quite unexpected.³²⁸ To a certain degree this is a small point since much of the oration on the Holy Sepulchre can be found in Eusebius' earlier work the Theophany.³²⁹ Its suitability for the Encaenia is shown by the emphasis on the resurrection of Christ as well as the opening and closing remarks which we have examined above. If anything should argue against it being the oration delivered at the Encaenia (or at least the only oration delivered by Eusebius) it is the difference between this and the oration Eusebius delivered at Tyre.

Eusebius' oration at Tyre and his oration at Jerusalem

Indeed, if the Tyre oration was taken out of its present context it might be tempting to suppose that this, and not the appendix to the *Laus*, was the oration Eusebius really should have delivered in Jerusalem. The Tyre oration is identified by its title. If this were lost then it would not be immediately obvious that Paulinus was the subject of the oration. Much of the content would be appropriate to Constantine. He would be described as being granted the honour of building and renewing the earthly house to Christ and to his holy bride. He would be named the new Bezalel, the new Solomon "king of a new and better Jerusalem", and a new Zerubbabel. The various biblical citations would seem especially appropriate to Jerusalem as well as to the Church. There is also a reference to the building which no longer stands (i.e. the temple) contrasted with the new building of the Church. A passage which is particularly striking is Eusebius' description of the site of the basilica before the building was constructed,

This one bearing in his soul the image of the whole Christ...has formed this magnificent temple of the highest God, corresponding to the pattern of the greater as a visible to an invisible...And this place which had been covered with all sorts of rubbish by the artifices of our enemies he did not overlook, nor did he yield to the wickedness of those who had brought about that condition of things, although he might have chosen some other place...For he thought that this church, which had been

³²⁸ H. A. Drake. "What Eusebius knew - The genesis of the 'Vita Constantini'." *Classical Philology* 83.1 (1988): 24.

³²⁹ The Theophany survives only in Syriac and is dated to between 324-26. The Oration on the Holy Sepulchre is reproduced from the first three books of this work (Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 187-88).

especially besieged by the enemy, which had first suffered and endured the same persecutions with us, and for us...should rejoice with us.³³⁰

This excerpt is not so far removed from Eusebius' narrative describing the uncovering of the Sepulchre in the *Vita*. Neither the one to whom this oration is addressed nor Constantine would "yield to the malice of those who had contracted this guilt".³³¹ Further biblical references such as Hag. 2:9 would have a suitable place in an oration on the New Jerusalem. It was a "peaceful Solomon" who adorned the Tyre basilica with "more beautiful and splendid materials, using unstinted liberality in his disbursements".³³² It is themes such as these which are missing from the surviving oration of September 335. Neither Drake nor Barnes comment on Eusebius' claim that he delivered more than one oration but it would be surprising if Eusebius did not consider themes from the Tyre oration as suitable for the New Jerusalem and her builder, the new Solomon.³³³

The imperial offerings for the new basilica

The offerings or "ἀναθήματα" which Constantine bestowed upon the basilica at the time of the inauguration were an integral part of the official inauguration of a Christian basilica or a Roman temple.³³⁴ Eusebius mentions the silver bowls which adorned the columns of the hemisphere as an offering of the emperor but gives no further details except to say that the offerings were numberless, beautiful, of expensive materials and would take too long to

³³⁰ *H.E.* 10.4.26.

³³¹ *H.E.* 10.4.26, "οὐδὲ τῇ τῶν αἰτίων παραχωρήσας κακίᾳ"// *V.C.* 3.26 (the Greek is identical).

³³² *H.E.* 10.4.42,45, "ἀφθόνῳ φιλοτιμίᾳ τῶν ἀναλωμάτων χρώμενος", "ὁ εἰρηνικώτατος Σολομών".

³³³ Drake also notes striking parallels between Tyre and Jerusalem, especially Eusebius' recycling of phrases and ideas (*H.E.* 10.4.14//*L.C.* 9.13; *H.E.* 10.4.17//*L.C.* 16.8-9, 17.6; *H.E.* 10.4.29//*L.C.* 9.13, 16.11), *In Praise of Constantine*, 43-44 (144 n.48).

³³⁴ Eusebius refers to the offerings (ἀναθήματα) of the Tyre basilica (*H.E.* 10.4.20). The term is related to "ἀφιερώματα" which Eusebius uses in connection with both temples (*Praep. Evang.* 4.2.7; *L.C.* 9.7) and Christian churches (also *H.E.* 10.4.20; *L.C.* 11.2). The term was flexible, however, and could refer not only to the offerings in a holy building, but also the building itself (*V.C.* 3.55 where the ἀφιερώματα of a temple to Venus included its contents and four walls. See also *L.C.* 17.4). The Martyrium basilica itself is described as a peace-offering (ἀναθήμα εἰρήνης) to God. A biblical precedent may be found in the offerings brought to the encenia of the altar constructed by Moses (Num 7:10).

describe.³³⁵ Nearly a century later Sozomenus notes the emperor sent numerous "ornaments and gifts" which "are still preserved in the sacred edifice".³³⁶ We have some idea of the content of the imperial offerings from the lists of gifts Constantine made to the basilicas in Rome recorded in the Liber Pontificalis. These ranged from the silver fastigium in the Lateran basilica³³⁷, an amazing array of candelabra, to silver biblical figures.³³⁸ The Liber also records that each of the basilicas were granted income or relevant produce from various properties scattered throughout the empire. In Rome was a basilica known as the Sancta Cruce in Gerusalemme, attributed to the work of Constantine, which stood in the Sessorian Palace. The Liber claims that Constantine encased part of the cross of Christ in gold and jewels and named the basilica Jerusalem.³³⁹ The list of gifts included four candelabra standing before the wood, fifty chandeliers, a silver altar, and a number of chalices. The income which this basilica received totalled 1101 solidi.³⁴⁰ The offerings which Constantine bestowed on the Martyrium and other basilicas and the form of the records preserved in the Liber are equivalent to the Leges Templorum which were issued for each temple. Such inscriptions decreed a site sacred by law as well as recording the date and the emperor.³⁴¹ Temples were generally built to commemorate some historical event, military victories being especially common. The actual dedication of a temple was, as we

³³⁵ V.C. 3.38. In V.C. 3.40. Eusebius states that he has described the "numberless offerings in gold and silver, and precious stones" in a separate work which he promises to attach to the Vita. Unfortunately, no distinct work of this description was preserved. It is probable that Eusebius incorporated material from this work into the description of the Martyrium site which forms 3.34-39 of the Vita.

³³⁶ H.E. 2.26, "καὶ οἱ μὲν ἤκον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ τὸν ναὸν καθιέρωσαν καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἀποσταλέντα κειμήλιά τε καὶ ἀναθήματα, ἃ εἰσέτι νῦν ἐν τῷδε τῷ ἱερῷ οἴκῳ ἀνάκεινται...".

³³⁷ Liber Pontificalis 34.10 (L. Duchesne. Le Liber Pontificalis: texte, introduction et commentaire. Vol 1. (Paris, 1886) 172).

³³⁸ Such as the figures of Christ and John the Baptist which stood on either side of the font in the Lateran basilica or the golden cross in the basilica of St Peter.

³³⁹ If the Liber is correct in its record of this basilica then at least its name acts as an independent witness to the original association of the Martyrium basilica with the cross of Christ; Richard Krautheimer. Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture, 51. See also Richard Krautheimer, et al. Corpus Basilicarum Christianorum Romae: the early Christian basilicas of Rome. Vol. 1 (Vatican City, 1977) 165ff. The Sessorian Palace belonged to Helena although the name "Hierusalem" can only be traced with certainty to a fifth century mosaic. "Le dépôt d'un fragment de la vraie Croix dans la demeure d'une impératrice qui s'était tant occupée des lieux saints de Palestine est la chose la plus naturelle du monde" (L. Duchesne. Le Liber Pontificalis, 196 n.75). For the place of the Sancta Croce basilica in Rome's stational liturgy see John F. Baldovin. The Urban Character of Christian Worship (Rome, 1987) 147-66.

³⁴⁰ In comparison, the Lateran basilica was granted an income of 4150 solidi and St Peter's, 3708.

³⁴¹ A comparison between the classical forms of temple dedication and the Constantinian basilicas is made by Ludwig Voelkl. Die Kirchenstiftungen des Kaisers Konstantin im Lichte des römischen Sakralrechts. (Köln, 1964).

might expect, a time of festivity and ceremony, often on the feast of the deity to whom the temple was dedicated. An especially prestigious dedication might involve the hosting of games or some other activity in which the whole population might participate, at the very least a banquet.³⁴² These are the elements which we find in the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica. Eusebius in the *Vita* states that Constantine consecrated the basilica as "a peace-offering to God, the giver of all".³⁴³ Similar sentiments, we have noted, are also present in the *Laus*.

The Date of the Encaenia

There is, however, one element which we have not yet addressed, the date chosen for the inauguration. The year 335, as we have already noted, was the celebration of Constantine's thirty year reign and we suggested that Constantine deliberately waited until this year to hold the inauguration. The 13th September is the day on which the liturgical Encaenia, the anniversary of the inauguration in 335 took place. The *Chronicon Paschale* records September 17 as the day of the inauguration. Commentators on the historical events of the period tend to accept the day preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*.³⁴⁴ Liturgists, and others who are more interested in the Encaenia itself have preferred to accept the accuracy of the liturgical memory.³⁴⁵ The *Chronicon Paschale*, although compiled in Constantinople, used at least one Egyptian source as witnessed by the Egyptian months which occasionally appear.³⁴⁶ It is possible that the 17 September is given in error for the Egyptian date 17 Thout which is the day on which the

³⁴² Summarised from J. E. Stambaugh. "The functions of Roman temples." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.16.1 (1978) 554-608.

³⁴³ *V.C.* 4.47, "ἡ δὲ τῆς τρίτης δεκάδος τὴν περίοδον ἐκόσμει, τῷ πάντων ἀγαθῶν δοτῆρι θεῷ ἀμφὶ τὸ μνῆμα τὸ σωτήριον εἰρήνης ἀνάθημα τὸ μαρτύριον βασιλέως ἀφιεροῦντος". Aristides had described Hadrian erecting the temple in Cyzicus as a "thank offering to the gods" (*Oration* 27.22).

³⁴⁴ This is the date which Drake accepts though he does not explain how the liturgical anniversary became shifted to the 13 September; *In Praise of Constantine*, 142 n.6. 17 September also assumed by Frend, *The Rise of Christianity*, 527; Piganiol, *L'Empire Chrétien*, 66. Barnes (*Constantine and Eusebius*, 238) and Arnold (*The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius*, 161) both accept an eight day celebration (13-20 Sept) without question. Barnes also dates Eusebius' oration to 13 Sept in "Two speeches by Eusebius", 342.

³⁴⁵ For example, J. Schwartz, "The Encaenia of the church of the Holy Sepulchre", 266; M. Black. "The festival of Encaenia Ecclesiae in the ancient Church with special reference to Palestine and Syria." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 5 (1954): 78; Borgehammar, *How the Holy Cross was Found*, 99. Drijvers puts both the inauguration and the finding of the Cross on Sept. 14 (*Helena Augusta*, 89. Drake also states the liturgical feast was celebrated on this date.

³⁴⁶ For example, 295 (Athyr), 330 (Pharmuthi), 344 (Easter cycle) which all have some relevance to Alexandria.

Coptic Church celebrated the Finding of the Cross.³⁴⁷ The Chronicon would thus be quite correct to state that "thereafter began the Feast of the Invention of the Cross". Assuming that the feast did begin on September 13th, was this day chosen merely as convenient? Apparently not, if the urgency with which Constantine commanded the bishops to assemble in Jerusalem is something to be considered. The synod of Tyre had not accomplished all its business and, in fact, the bishops assembled in council whilst they were in Jerusalem to re-admit Arius to communion.³⁴⁸ The significance of September 13th as the natalis of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on the Capitoline hill in Rome was noted by Baumstark.³⁴⁹ It is an attractive suggestion that the Martyrium basilica was intended to rival the temple in Rome which epitomised the totality of Roman religion.³⁵⁰ Such a suggestion re-enforces the idea that the Martyrium basilica, built over a shrine to Jupiter, symbolised the triumph of the Supreme Christian God over his Roman counterpart.³⁵¹ An expression of victory over Jupiter recalled the victory over Licinius. Eusebius, we remember, had cast the battle between Constantine and Licinius as the final struggle of deities. By this time Constantine's chosen god was the Christian one. Licinius, on the other hand, had chosen the patronage of IOVI CONSERVATORI.³⁵² The victory which was Constantine's was won through the power of the Saving Sign. The Martyrium Basilica, consecrated to the Saving Sign, thus existed as a symbol of both Constantine's personal victory and the cosmic victory.³⁵³

³⁴⁷ This is a point also noted by Borgehammar, How the Holy Cross was Found, 100 (although he makes 17 Thout directly equivalent to 14 September whereas it is closer to September 27).

³⁴⁸ Athanasius, Apologia c. Arianos, 84; Barnes, Constantine and Eusebius, 238. This was with the encouragement of Constantine himself. The reception of Arius immediately before the Encaenia was at least a symbolic gesture of unity and peace in the Church. Unknown to Constantine, however, Athanasius was at that moment on route to Constantinople to petition the emperor personally about his treatment at the synod of Tyre (see H.A. Drake. "Athanasius' first exile." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 27 (1986): 193-204).

³⁴⁹ A. Baumstark, and B. Botte. Comparative Liturgy. (London, 1958) 183. This is also noted in greater detail by Stefan Heid. "Der Ursprung der Helenalegende", in a discussion on the Martyrium basilica replacing both the Jewish temple and the Roman Capitoline temple.

³⁵⁰ J. R. Fears states that Christians were taken to the Capitolina to prove their loyalty to Rome (Cyprian, De Lapsis 8.19). The significance of this temple led Cyprian to contrast it with the Church (Ep. 59.18), "The cult of Jupiter and Roman imperial ideology." Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II:17:1 (1981) 3-14. Constantine refused to offer the customary sacrifice at the temple after his triumphal entry into Rome (Zosimus, 2.29).

³⁵¹ Since Hadrian's reign Jerusalem was the only place outside of Rome which had the title Capitolina.

³⁵² Fears, "The cult of Jupiter", 119.

³⁵³ Imperial imagery is evident in Athanasius' reference to the Encaenia, "Πᾶσι μὲν ἡμῖν τοῖς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνελθοῦσιν ἐξ ἐπαρχιῶν διαφορῶν πρὸς τῇ μεγάλῃ πανηγύρει, ἣν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀφιέρωσει τοῦ σωτηρίου μαρτυρίου σπουδῇ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως Κωνσταντίνου τῷ πάντων βασιλεῖ θεῷ καὶ τῷ Χριστῷ αὐτοῦ κατασκευασθέντος ἐπετελέσαμεν..." (De Synodis Arimini 21.3).

The Roman calendar of 354

We are fortunate to have a calendar of the fourth century which preserves the Roman pagan anniversaries, celebrations and games.³⁵⁴ In the Calendar are a group of feasts which celebrate various imperial victories. The 18th to the 22nd September are marked as the Ludi Triumphales. These days celebrate Constantine's victory over Licinius at Chalcedon.³⁵⁵ Usually it was customary for the final day of the games to mark the actual anniversary of the victory. This would have meant the first day of the Ludi falling on the 13th September. The explanation why they begin on what should have been the last day is that they coincide with the earlier celebration we mentioned above, the Ludi Romani which lasted for the five days 13th to the 18th September.³⁵⁶ This was one victory which even Constantine could not take from Jupiter! Thus, the day on which the Encaenia occurred was what should have been the first day of the Ludi Triumphales. If, as is widely assumed, the Encaenia lasted for a number of days then it would have included (or perhaps have ended on) the 18th September, the anniversary of Constantine's victory over Licinius. This, surely, is a reasonable explanation for Constantine's concern that the Encaenia be celebrated on this day.

This might also explain Constantine's absence from Jerusalem. It is surprising that given the significance attached to the basilica that the emperor did not pay a visit to Jerusalem for that particular feast.³⁵⁷ Although he had convened the council of Tyre so that peace in the Church and empire might be restored, it is evident from Constantine's subsequent letter that he was not aware of what had occurred at the council. One suggestion is that Constantine chose to stay away for the same reasons that he turned back from visiting the East in

³⁵⁴ This is the Calendar of 354 which was a part of a much larger codex of assorted material dedicated to a Christian aristocrat called Valentinus. The most recent study is by Michele Renee Salzman. *On Roman Time* (Berkeley & Los Angeles, 1990). A good commentary is still H. Stern. *Le calendrier du 354: Étude sur son texte et sur les illustrations*. (Paris, 1953).

³⁵⁵ H. Stern. *Le calendrier du 354*, 82.

³⁵⁶ H. Stern. *Le calendrier du 354*, 81. Discussed by A. Degraffi. *Inscriptiones Italiae*. Vol. 13 (Rome, 1963) 509-511. September 18 was also the Triumphales Traiani.

³⁵⁷ Although this is not noticed by everyone; W.H.C. Frend, for example, places Constantine firmly in Jerusalem for the Encaenia in *The Rise of Christianity*, 527, "Constantine progressed triumphantly onward to Jerusalem. On 17 September 335 he inaugurated the new church of the Holy Sepulchre before a great concourse of bishops from all over the empire. Athanasius, meantime, set out for Constantinople to meet the emperor on his return and make one last appeal to him".

324/5, that there was no place for the emperor amidst disunity.³⁵⁸ It is also possible that Constantine chose to remain in Constantinople for this particular week precisely because it was his Tricennalia and the anniversary of the day on which he began his sole rule of the Eastern empire as well as the west. He chose to spend his Vicennalia in Rome. But in 325/6 Constantinople had not been built, in fact the city had only been marked out that year. Constantine's presence in the city of his name in 335 served to confirm that indeed it was a second Rome, a second capitol of the empire.³⁵⁹ One of the structures which drew particular attention was the large hippodrome which Constantine had built in his city.³⁶⁰ It is possible that this arena was used to celebrate the Ludi Triumphales in the same week in which the Martyrium basilica was being inaugurated. It would be unusual for the emperor to be absent from his city on such an occasion (it was probably unusual enough that he did not choose to spend the time in Rome). Constantine chose to remain in Constantinople and we know that on September 18 335 he raised his nephew Dalmatius to Caesar.³⁶¹ He deliberately chose this week for the inauguration of his basilica of thanksgiving to the Supreme God and the divine sign. The presence of Marianus ensured that he was not wholly absent. This is what we might have expected from Constantine. His presence in Jerusalem at this time would have allied him too closely with Christianity and he may not have been able to avoid the expressed intention to be baptised in the river Jordan.³⁶² And, as Eusebius described it, Constantine's baptism meant his resignation as emperor.³⁶³

³⁵⁸ That Constantine could not bring himself to see "ces querelles indécentes" is the opinion of André Piganiol. *L'Empire Chrétien (325-395)*, 66.

³⁵⁹ Coins were issued in Constantinople that year which proclaimed the population as "Populus Romanus" (Andrew Alföldi. *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*. (Oxford, 1948) 112).

³⁶⁰ *Chronicon Paschale* for 330 states Constantine held a chariot contest on the day of the city's inauguration. On each anniversary of the inauguration the chariot race was preceded by the procession of a gilded monument of the city's "Tyche" before the emperor and the crowds. A description of the hippodrome is found in Malalas, *Chronicle*, 13.7.

³⁶¹ *Chronicon Paschale* 335; see the discussion in Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 251. There is an allusion to the Caesars, including Dalmatius, in *L.C.* 3.2. This Dalmatius was the son of Constantine's half-brother whom Constantine put in charge of an investigation into the accusations against Athanasius in 333.

³⁶² *V.C.* 4.62.

³⁶³ *V.C.* 4.62, "At the conclusion of the [baptism] he arrayed himself in shining imperial vestments, brilliant as the light, and reclined on a couch of the purest white, refusing to clothe himself with the purple any more" (NPNF 1.556); Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius*, 260. see further, E. J. Yarnold. "The baptism of Constantine." *Studia Patristica* 26 (1993): 95-101.

The Encaenia and the Day of Atonement

So far, it appears that the date of the Encaenia had more to do with political events in the life of Constantine than with the historical events in the life of Christ which the site was supposed to honour. Did the 13th September also hold any theological significance? Is it the Saving Sign alone which links Constantine's victory over Licinius with the basilica of the death and resurrection? This question can be partly answered from Eusebius' interpretation of the building and from a piece of external evidence which appears not to have been previously considered.

In the *Vita* Eusebius describes the Martyrium site as the New Jerusalem. This "city" stood opposite the ruins of the Jewish temple, fulfilling, writes Eusebius, the prophecies predicting such a place.³⁶⁴ The most obvious biblical reference to a new Jerusalem is Rev. 21:2-4. Robert Wilken, however, persuasively argues that Eusebius had in mind Ezekiel's vision of a new temple.³⁶⁵ Thus, the building of the Martyrium marked the return of the glory of God to Jerusalem.³⁶⁶ The climax to Ezekiel's narrative is the saving river which Eusebius alludes to in the *Laus* describing how "a life-giving river gushed forth for all" from the Christian Palestine.³⁶⁷ Eusebius' description of the Constantinian buildings, moving from the outer to the inner, increasingly holy parts, can be favourably compared with the tour Ezekiel received of the new temple. Many of these themes, however, do re-appear in the Book of Revelation, including the life-giving river (Rev. 22:1) and in the Book of Zachariah (14).

³⁶⁴ *V.C.* 3.33; Socrates, *H.E.* 1.17.

³⁶⁵ *The Land Called Holy*, 93-100. The reluctance of Eusebius to use the Book of Revelation is discussed by Robert M. Grant. *Eusebius as Church Historian*. (Oxford, 1980) 126-130.

³⁶⁶ See Eusebius, *Demonstratio Evangelica* 6.18.288 where he interprets the departure of the glory of the Lord in terms of Jerusalem's destruction. He states that in his day the prophecy is fulfilled literally since "believers in Christ all congregate from all parts of the world, not as of old because of the glory of Jerusalem, nor that they may worship in the ancient temple at Jerusalem, but they rest there that they may worship at the Mount of Olives opposite to the city, to where the glory of the Lord migrated when it left the former city" (Translation from *The Proof of the Gospel* Vol 2. Ed. W. J. Ferrar. (London, 1920) 29).

³⁶⁷ *L.C.* 9.15, "...one in the Palestinian nation, inasmuch as in that place as from a fount gushed forth the life-bearing stream to all". Walker draws attention to a passage in the *Demonstratio Evangelica* (6.18.50) where the prophecy of Zach. 14:8 ("on that day living waters shall flow out of Jerusalem") is applied by Eusebius to Jerusalem itself. The parallel passage in the *Laus*, argues Walker, marks Eusebius' shift from viewing Jerusalem as the centre to Palestine as a whole (thus playing down the influence of Jerusalem), *Holy City, Holy Places?*, 108. Whether Jerusalem or Palestine if Eusebius is going to discuss the cave of the resurrection he cannot avoid Jerusalem.

Since Eusebius does not refer to any one prophet but rather "prophets" it is likely that he had in mind texts from Ezekiel, Isaiah, and Zachariah. The underlying theme to the prophetic texts is that a day will arrive when the land can truly be described as holy, not just the temple. That is, the holiness inherent to the temple would flow throughout the city and the surrounding area. Zachariah, for example, states that "every pot in Jerusalem and Judah shall be sacred to the Lord". The land shall be integrated with the temple. Eusebius, in describing the Martyrium site as the "New Jerusalem", appears to contract the city into the relatively small area of the Constantinian site. The emphasis is that it is this place, not the Jewish temple of which the prophets spoke, that would sanctify the land. He has, in effect, shifted the centre of the earth, a theme to which we shall return.³⁶⁸

The builder of the old Jerusalem was Solomon. Although Constantine is not described by Eusebius as another Solomon this notion is implied in crediting Constantine with the building of the second Jerusalem. Eusebius had no misgivings about comparing Constantine with Moses and a further comparison with Solomon, Zerubabel, or even Cyrus could not be far from his mind.³⁶⁹ This idea is particularly significant when we consider that less than fifty years later the pilgrim Egeria writes that the date of the Encaenia was also the day on which Solomon dedicated the temple.³⁷⁰ The ceremonies and feasts which comprised Solomon's dedication of the temple occurred from the 10th day of Tishri, which was the day of Atonement, until the final day of the feast of Tabernacles. It can surely be no coincidence that in 335 the 10th day of Tishri appears to have fallen on Saturday 13th September.³⁷¹ There could scarcely have been a better day on which the Church, now with her own Solomon, could inaugurate the nearest Christianity came to refounding the Jewish temple.³⁷² The importance of such a date lies not only in the Solomonic imagery which it naturally evokes but also in

³⁶⁸ See chapter 7 of this study. This was all part of the process of creating the Christian "holy land".

³⁶⁹ This is also the belief of Joshua Schwartz. "The Encaenia of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, the temple of Solomon and the Jews", 268.

³⁷⁰ Egeria, *Itinerarium* 48.1. Discussed in greater detail in chapter 5.

³⁷¹ Calculated using a piece of software known simply as "Hebrew Calendar", provided by Polyglot Solutions. Admittedly, it is difficult to confirm the accuracy of calendar software since it would appear to apply the calendar implemented by Hillel II on to the earlier years. However, the program either matches, or is accurate within a day, a selection of dates obtained from Jack Finegan. Handbook of Biblical Chronology: principles of time reckoning in the ancient world and problems of chronology in the Bible. (Princeton, 1964).

³⁷² Constantine may have been advised by someone in Jerusalem but equally anyone who had an interest in the Jewish calendar could have mentioned this to him, especially if the Encaenia was viewed as a splendid opportunity to demonstrate the Christian fulfilment of Judaism to any Jews living in the region and beyond.

the day of Atonement itself. That Christ himself accomplished the purpose of the day of Atonement is expounded most clearly in the Letter to the Hebrews.³⁷³ The argument of the author revolves around the distinction between heavenly realities and earthly copies. The man-made sanctuary, liturgical vessels and the people were sprinkled with blood on the day of Atonement, the only day on which the high priest could enter the holy of holies. These, says the writer, were earthly copies which required a continuous ritual of purification. Christ, however, appeared once and entered the heavenly sanctuary, offering himself as the perfect sacrifice. Once Christ had accomplished eternal redemption in this manner, the sanctuary made with hands was no longer necessary and thus it fell. Within this framework the Martyrium basilica, built as a symbol of the Cross, reflects the new Jerusalem, not only the city spoken of by the prophets but also that heavenly city which underlies the letter to the Hebrews.³⁷⁴ Eusebius, in the oration he delivered at the Encaenia, aims to give a number of reasons for the death of Christ. One of the three reasons is particularly appropriate for the day,

I may even offer you a third reason to account for the salutary death. He was a sacrifice offered up to the all-ruling God of the Universe on behalf of the entire human race, a victim consecrated on behalf of the flock of mankind, a sacrificial victim for averting demonic error. And in fact, once this one great sacrificial victim, the All-Holy Body of our Savior, had been slaughtered on behalf of the human race and atonement offered for all races formerly ensnared in the impiety of demonic error, thereafter all the power of the impure and unholy demons were destroyed...This, then, was the offering given over to death about which the words of Holy Writ proclaimed, here saying, "Behold, the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world."³⁷⁵

³⁷³ Eusebius interprets Christ's death in terms of atonement in Demonstratio Evangelica 10.1 with reference to 2 Cor 5:21.

³⁷⁴ The letter's interpretation of the concept of encaenia is found in Heb. 10:20, "Therefore brothers, since we have the confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way which he initiated (ἐνεκαίνισεν) for us". This passage is explained by fourth and fifth century exegetes as the crushing of the gates of Hades by the death, resurrection and ascension of Christ (Athanasius, De Incarnatione Verbi 25,6; PG 25,139, for example or Macarius, Hom. Spirituales 50; PG 34,760, Chrysostom, In Matt. Hom LIV (Matt 16:21); PG 58,537 and In Ep. Ad Hebraeos X. Hom xix; PG 63,139). It is also a passage which Cyril of Jerusalem cites at length in his catechetical lecture on the death and burial of Christ (Cat. 13.32). He also proclaims that Christ made peace through the blood of the Cross (13.33 citing Col 1:20) and in his burial "Christ made peace between heaven and earth" (14.3).

³⁷⁵ L.C. 15.11-12. Eusebius goes on to quote the words of Isa 53:4-7. This passage was not written especially for the day since it is almost word for word from the Theophania, 3.59. The coincidence of Atonement with the Encaenia may have influenced Eusebius' decision to speak with particular emphasis on the effects of Christ's death. The same themes occur in Cyril of Jerusalem's Catechetical Lecture 13.

Texts from the Letter to the Hebrews also feature in the later liturgical feast of the Encaenia. There the combination of Heb 8:7-9:10, 12:18-28, and 13:10-16 all serve to underline the Christian concept of the day of Atonement and the way opened by Christ to the heavenly reality.³⁷⁶ Eusebius does not state how long the feast lasted in 335 but bearing in mind the number of orations he mentions, the fact that the Ludi Triumphales lasted for five days, and that the subsequent feast was celebrated for eight days, it is likely that the Encaenia in 335 also coincided with the feast of Tabernacles that year, the first day of which was on 15 Tishri, September 18. As indicated above, this was also the anniversary of Constantine's victory over Licinius. The movement from Atonement to Tabernacles could only serve to underline the process from death to resurrection, the feast of Tabernacles embodying Jewish messianic hopes, resurrection, and universal worship of God in a new Jerusalem.

Constantine and the Jerusalem Encaenia: conclusions

Attempting to reconcile the liturgical memory of the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica in Jerusalem with the historical sources has not been an easy task. Much probing and reconstruction has been required, some of which has been built on foundations of shifting sand. The work of Eusebius, whilst always our chief source, has also proved to be responsible for most of the shifting. There is, as we indicated in the beginning, a deliberate gulf in Eusebius between the emperor with the miraculous standard on the battlefield and the emperor's construction work in Jerusalem. This gulf we argued originates in Eusebius' refusal to discuss the finding of Christ's cross, the reason, we suggested, because it led to a confusion between what the sign of the cross was intended to point towards, and the relic of the cross itself. The reality which Eusebius wished to emphasise was the resurrection which leads to immortality. This he did by surrounding allusions to the cross (whether written or visual) with texts of resurrection. This we found in the oration on the Holy Sepulchre, delivered in the basilica itself, and in the narrative of the amazing discoveries in Jerusalem.

³⁷⁶ There is a sermon on the Church attributed to John of Jerusalem which Michel van Esbroeck believes was delivered on September 15, 394 at the feast of the Encaenia (third day). The sermon amounts to a discourse on the day of the Atonement and the divine bridegroom. Van Esbroeck suggests that in 394 the feast of the Atonement coincided with the Encaenia, an event which would not be uncommon given the dates of the two feasts. For the text of the sermon see, "Une homélie sur l'église attribuée à Jean de Jérusalem." *Le Muséon* 86 (1973): 283-304. His comments can be found in, "Jean II de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix." *Analecta Bollandiana* 102 (1984): 99-134.

It is not a forced interpretation that Constantine constructed the Martyrium basilica in honour of the Cross. Eusebius, we have seen, says as much himself, we just need to know where to look. The development of Constantine's attitude towards the Saving Sign leads us to the historical places of Christ's death and resurrection. The evidence that he intended to build a basilica on a site dedicated to Jupiter and Venus, as well as recent archaeological investigation, point to Constantine's intention to do more than build a basilica over the cave of the resurrection or around the rock of Golgotha; both sites remained distinct from the basilica itself.

The timing of the inauguration is probably the most telling feature of Constantine's own interpretation of the site. Just as Eusebius had hinted, the basilica had inherent political motives, standing as a symbol of thanksgiving for his victory in 324 and the commencing of his sole reign. But there were also theological overtones which were brought together in the interpretation of the day of Atonement which the feast celebrated. The figure of Solomon united Constantine to this basilica. When Solomon inaugurated the temple the glory of the Lord filled the temple. Constantine's inauguration of the Martyrium, as far as those present were concerned, returned the glory of the Lord to this New Jerusalem, fulfilling the prophecies of Ezekiel.

The pattern of the Encaenia is similar to the inauguration of the basilica in Tyre. The Encaenia is primarily a festival of joy. It is also a conference of bishops. To Tyre Paulinus invited bishops from the neighbouring provinces. At Tyre Eusebius presented an oration in honour of the bishop and the new basilica, but an oration which also sought to place the physical building into the wider context of the spiritual church. The inauguration of a new basilica was not unlike the consecration of a new bishop.³⁷⁷ The presence of other bishops gave a sense of unity and ratified the building, often a cathedral, as a valid place of assembly for the people, almost confirming that indeed it had been constructed according to a heavenly pattern. This is the form of the Encaenia in Jerusalem. The main difference is that the date of the inauguration seems for the most part to have been decided by the emperor. It was he who issued the invitations, but then it was he who issued the initial command that it be built. Whether the bishops were assembled at Tyre in order to settle their differences before proceeding on to Jerusalem or whether they were conveniently near Jerusalem at the right time, it

³⁷⁷ Canon 4 of the council of Nicaea laid down that ideally all the bishops of a province should be present at the consecration of a new bishop, but certainly a minimum of three with the consent of the absent bishops.

remains that the presence of bishops was required for the Encaenia to proceed in Jerusalem.

The Encaenia in Jerusalem, given the significance of the building and of the date on which it was inaugurated, was an affair more splendid than the Encaenia at Tyre. The important factor to remember is that it was not without precedent and was not simply an imperial festival. Paulinus had demonstrated that it was possible to hold an Encaenia without an imperial presence. The Encaenia itself was an ecclesiastical feast which enwrapped itself around the perfectly natural desire of the emperor to erect grand public buildings in honour of the deity who favoured him. Just as the Martyrium was the Christian re-interpretation of the temple and this particular feast commented upon the day of Atonement, so too the Encaenia was the acceptable and distinctly Christian version of the imperial ceremonies of dedication which lay at its heart. In the next chapter we will see a continuation of this pattern under Constantius and meet a bishop who stood accused of holding an encaenia without the authority of the emperor.

Chapter Four

Constantius and the Encaenia

Introduction

The first solid evidence for the rite of the encaenia lies in the period immediately after Constantine's embrace of the Christian religion. Our description and analysis of the encaenia has concentrated on the inauguration of the basilica at Tyre after the joint decree of tolerance published by Licinius and Constantine, and the highly significant inauguration of the Martyrium basilica in Jerusalem as part of Constantine's triennial celebrations. It has been our aim to show as clearly as possible the similar structure of the encaenia in each case and the role of the emperor in the founding and subsequent inauguration of major basilicas. Further in this work we examine how the memory of Constantine's imperial patronage of the holy places of Jerusalem was kept alive in the feast which was named after the rite itself, the September feast of the Encaenia. The association of emperor and basilica did not end with the death of Constantine in 335; Constantine's active interest in both ecclesial buildings and theology set a precedent which was continued, one could say, with even greater fervour by his successor in the East, Constantius.

A large number of monographs and articles have been devoted to Constantius and the Arian crisis, and the changing attitudes of key figures to the emperor during his imperial office. The preoccupation with Constantius' 'theological meddling' has resulted in a neglect of his participation in and continuation of Constantine's church building patronage. The preservation of documents associated with the Arian crisis fortunately also give us a number of comparable insights into this emperor's involvement in the inauguration of basilicas. This chapter will examine in some detail the inauguration of three such basilicas which explicitly carry with them the concept of 'ἐγκαίνια'; the Domus Aurea in Antioch, the Alexandrian Caesareum, and the original St Sophia basilica in Constantinople. In addition we will briefly investigate Constantius' relationship with the Jerusalem church with regard to the apparition of the cross in 351. The final summary will argue that the involvement of the emperor in the founding and inauguration of churches is comparable to and associated with his similar involvement in the councils of the fourth century.

Providing the Context: Constantius and the Church

The reign of Constantius was a turbulent one. Not only did Constantius have to contend with the theological controversies of the time, but in addition there was the continual threat from the Persians in the East and the Germanic tribes in the West. Both the secular and sacred writers of the day converged in agreement that Constantius' hold on the empire was weak. He did not enjoy a firm belief in the loyalty of his army, nor did he feel himself able to trust even his own caesars. Whereas Constantine is portrayed by Christian writers as the new Moses, a Solomonic builder, Constantius (even during his reign) found himself compared to Pontius Pilate and the promised anti-Christ. Leaving aside the Christian historians we turn to Ammianus Marcellinus who served in Constantius' army in the East. Although more concerned to relate a military history of the period, he provides us with some interesting insights into the character of Constantius and a few observations concerning the Christian religion.

The personality of Constantius

In Book 21 of the *Res Gestae* we find Ammianus' obituary of Constantius.³⁷⁸ It can by no means be described as a typical funeral oration or panegyric. Rather, the obituary lists both Constantius' virtues and vices. The latter tend to outweigh the former. Reading the obituary one is left with the distinct impression that the good qualities of Constantius did not easily flow from quill to parchment. Constantius, writes Ammianus, did not court publicity; he was frugal in his style of living; he was exceptionally chaste; and he certainly never spat or wiped his nose in public. The empire, however, does not depend on such qualities in her emperors. The longer and undoubtedly more serious list of Constantius' vices has running through it a common theme. The single most damaging aspect to Constantius' personality was his paranoid tendencies. The smallest whisper, recounts Ammianus, resulted in endless investigations. He made a mountain of mischief out of a molehill of evidence, exceeded Caligula in destroying his own relatives, and yet was unduly influenced by his wives and the court eunuchs.³⁷⁹

³⁷⁸ Ammianus, 21.16-21.

³⁷⁹ Ammianus, 21.16.16, "Uxoribus et spadonum gracilentis vocibus et palatinis quibusdam nimium quantum addictus, ad singula eius verba paludentibus, et quid ille aiat aut neget (ut assentiri possint) observantibus". Similar sentiments are expressed by Zosimus, 2.55.

Ammianus could not avoid some comment on Constantius' relationship with the Church; "he confused the plain and simple Christian religion with old wives' fancies" and raised complicated issues which led only to further dissent.³⁸⁰ In his attempts to impose conformity in theology Constantius succeeded only in obstructing the pastoral service of the Church. The exile of prominent bishops and the frequent councils impinged on the secular life of the empire. Ammianus is critical of Constantius' policy of permitting bishops free use of the imperial transport system to continue their verbal battles.³⁸¹ In addition the prominence of Athanasius and the bishop of Rome, Liberius, results in an extended description by Ammianus of Constantius' treatment of Liberius in 355.³⁸² Liberius is described as summoned by the emperor for defying both the emperor and the decision of his "brother bishops". Ammianus places the cause of Liberius' disobedience firmly with Athanasius whom he describes as having had "thoughts above his station and to be prying into matters outside his province" (21.15.7) and was thus deposed by a synod of like-minded adherents. The charges described by Ammianus against Athanasius, however, are original; Athanasius' exile, he claims, was as a result of his interpretation of oracles and the flight of birds, foretelling the future and "other practices inconsistent with the principles of the faith of which he was the guardian" (21.15.7). It is plausible to suggest that these charges fall within the same category of 'superstitio' with which Ammianus charges Constantius in the obituary.³⁸³ The conclusion to the affair of Constantius and Liberius is quickly summarised as,

Constantius, who was always hostile to Athanasius, knew that the sentence had been carried out, but was extremely eager to have it confirmed by the higher authority of the bishop of the Eternal City.³⁸⁴

It is against this backdrop of antagonism that Athanasius felt compelled to write the Apologia and explain his use of the imperial church in Alexandria before the emperor had formally inaugurated it.

³⁸⁰ Ammianus, 21.16.18, "Christianam religionem absolutam et simplicem anili superstitione confundens, in qua scrutanda perplexius quam componenda gravius excitavit discidia plurima, quae progressa fusius aluit concertatione verborum...".

³⁸¹ The frequent trips back and forth, "rei vehicular succideret nervos" (21.16.18).

³⁸² Ammianus, 21.15.7f.

³⁸³ As noted by E. D. Hunt, "Christians and Christianity in Ammianus Marcellinus." Classical Quarterly 35 (1985): 186-200. See also John Matthews, The Roman Empire of Ammianus. (London, 1989) 441-449

³⁸⁴ Ammianus, 15.7.

The rebellion of Magnentius

Constantius' reign was plagued by rebellion. The threat to his power from within the empire can only have confirmed his distrust of individuals who were able to command the support of the army, cities or complete provinces. Such was the close relationship between church and emperor in this period that often ecclesiastical figures became caught up in seditious events. The proclamation of Magnentius as Augustus at Autun in 350 was the most serious revolt of Constantius' reign. Not content with seizing power in North Italy and proclaiming his brother caesar in Milan, Magnentius sent envoys to Athanasius in the form of two Gallic bishops. If Magnentius had won the support of the city of Alexandria, then into his hands would have been placed the vital grain supplies which served Rome and Constantinople.³⁸⁵ In the event Athanasius showed his public support for Constantius and vociferously denied the writing of treasonable letters to Magnentius.³⁸⁶ Three years later an investigation into potential treason at Antioch led to the torture and death of a deacon. The instigator of the investigation, Gallus Caesar, was himself later executed on suspicion of treason.³⁸⁷

Constantius and bishops

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to examine in any great detail the complex church-state relations in the time of Constantius. Secular politics inevitably impinged on the ecclesiastical life and conversely the affairs of the Church had their effect in the political life of the empire. No more striking example of the latter is found than in 345 when the Augustus Constans threatened war on his brother if Athanasius and Paul of Constantinople were not returned to

³⁸⁵ Athanasius had already been (falsely) accused of interfering with the grain supply in 335/6.

³⁸⁶ Timothy Barnes is rather cynical about Athanasius' reasons for denying Magnentius support. He notes that at the time of the revolt the Praetorian Prefect was on route to Alexandria to install George of Cappadocia as bishop and thus sees it as more than coincidence that the order was cancelled after the defeat of Magnentius. See T. D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and politics in the Constantinian empire*. (Cambridge, Mass., 1993) 101-108.

³⁸⁷ Ammianus comments that Gallus' own death was as a direct result of his own wicked deeds. In turn those who ensnared Gallus themselves died (deserving) agonising deaths. This chain of deserving deaths is, states Ammianus, the responsibility of Adrastia or Nemesis, the daughter of Justice (14.11).

their sees.³⁸⁸ Constantius' overly personal interest in the affairs of the church councils is demonstrated by his personal presence, or the presence of a representative, at all the major councils of his reign and his concern for a unity of belief (through compromise) throughout the empire. Although Timothy Barnes is eager to argue that no emperor or representative actually presided over a council in the reign of Constantine or Constantius, the involvement of the emperor and the influence of his officials certainly affected the conciliar decisions.³⁸⁹ The emperor did not, as Barnes suggests, simply effect the decisions of lawful ecclesiastical councils. This may have been the ideal but in reality one is left with the distinct impression that councils held without the permission of the emperor were supportive of Athanasius and the Nicene party or opposed to Constantius' own homoean standing and thus received no ratification of their decisions from the emperor. Inevitably, whether the emperor was perceived as interfering in affairs outside his jurisdiction or upholding lawful ecclesiastical decisions depended on whose side one was on. Bishop Ossius begs Constantius to emulate his brother Constans in giving the Church true independence whilst at the same time Donatus denounces Constans for his repression of the Donatists.³⁹⁰ It is with Constantius' obsession for knowledge of all ecclesiastical and secular activity in the empire lurking in the background that we turn to his involvement in the dedication of the imperial churches.

The Council of the Encaenia at Antioch

In 341 an episcopal council was held in Antioch. The name of this council is preserved in the historical records as the "Dedication Council", recalling the inauguration of the city's domed basilica, or Domus Aurea. The council of Tyre had been convened by Constantine with the Jerusalem encaenia in mind. The bishops who assembled at Antioch did so primarily for the

³⁸⁸ As noted by Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius, 165.

³⁸⁹ This is the major thesis of Athanasius and Constantius. However, Barnes is ambiguous concerning the interference of Constantine in the decision of the Council of Tyre in 335 to depose Athanasius suggesting that the council was considered unlawful and yet accepting the charges of violence made there against Athanasius. In addition, as Barnes himself admits, Constantius ensured that the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia in 359 subscribed to "the new homoean orthodoxy" even to the extent of detaining 400 western bishops at Ariminum until they accepted the imperial imposition. Constantius was present at earlier councils, especially Antioch (341), Arles (353) and Milan (355). At the latter two Constantius attempted to enforce the creed of Sirmium (351) which in turn reiterated the 341 Antiochene creed.

³⁹⁰ Alluded to but not explicitly stated by Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius, 174.

inauguration of the basilica. This episcopal gathering would appear to have provided an opportune moment to hold a doctrinal council.³⁹¹

The date of the Antioch encaenia

Although inaugurated by Constantius, the Antiochene basilica was actually founded by Constantine probably as part of the imperial palace.³⁹² The length of time which elapsed between the founding and inaugurating of the basilica is not simply the number of years spent building the basilica. As we observed with the inauguration of the Martyrium, both the year and the day were carefully chosen by Constantine to coincide with his Tricennalia celebration and the season of Solomon's dedication of the temple. Eusebius provides us with two almost identical descriptions of the basilica in Antioch in the *Vita Constantini* and the *Laus Constantini*. The latter describes how Constantine,

selected two places in the eastern division of the empire, the one in Palestine...the other in that metropolis of the East which derives its name from that of Antiochus; in which, as the head of that portion of the empire, he intended to consecrate to the service of God a church of unparalleled size and beauty. The entire building is encompassed by an enclosure of great extent, within which the church itself rises to a vast elevation, of an octagonal form, surrounded by many chambers and courts on every side, and decorated with ornaments of the richest kind.³⁹³

This version was delivered by Eusebius in Constantinople in July 336. The description provided in the *Vita* is almost word for word and since Eusebius was still working on the *Vita* at the time of his death, it is most likely that the description there is reproduced from this oration.³⁹⁴ If this is the case then Eusebius describes in some detail the basilica around six years before it was formerly inaugurated. In the *Laus Constantini* the basilica at Antioch was selected for especial mention by Eusebius with the Martyrium basilica in Jerusalem. It is possible that Eusebius himself had seen the plans for the

³⁹¹ Athanasius, *De Synodis* 25 (PG 26.725), "Ἦσαν δὲ οἱ συνελθόντες ἐν τοῖς Ἐγκαινίοις ἐπίσκοποι ἐνενήκοντα ὑπατεία Μαρκελλίνου καὶ Προβίνου ἰνδικτιῶνος ἰδ' ἐκεῖ ὄντος Κωνσταντίου τοῦ ἀσεβεστάτου." See also Socrates, *H.E.* 2.8 (discussed below).

³⁹² André Grabar, *Martyrium* I, 221f. The basilica held the title of "ὁμόνοια" (concordia), reflecting the union of the empire under Constantine.

³⁹³ *L.C.* 9.15.

³⁹⁴ *V.C.* 3.50. This description is slightly more precise, "The entire building was encompassed by an enclosure of great extent, within which the church itself rose to a vast elevation, being of an octagonal form, and surrounded on all sides by many chambers, courts, and upper and lower apartments; the whole richly adorned with a profusion of gold, brass, and other materials of the most costly kind." (NPNF 1.532).

Antiochene church.³⁹⁵ It is generally agreed that the building work began in Antioch around 327. This is the date preserved in Jerome's continuation of Eusebius' Chronicle.³⁹⁶ Assuming that the plans for the basilica were housed in Antioch, and if Eusebius was shown them, then in all probability it was in 326 or 327. At that time Eusebius became involved in the affairs of the Antiochene church at the fall of Eustathius, the bishop of the city. A council, presided over by Eusebius, was convened in Antioch and Eustathius was deposed. Eusebius' popularity in Antioch was such that a section of those gathered desired to have him as their successor. Eusebius declined and earned Constantine's praise for his wise judgement. Since around this time the building of both the Antiochene basilica and the Martyrium began (and Eusebius appears to have witnessed both) it is also possible that by 335 Eusebius assumed that, as the Martyrium was completed (with inauguration), so too the Golden House in Antioch might be complete (if not inaugurated). There was, as we noted in the previous chapter, an apparent delay between the completion of the Martyrium basilica and its official inauguration. This delay appears to have depended upon the timing of the inauguration decided by Constantine. In this case Constantine died before the completion of the basilica.³⁹⁷ In addition, the extensive building works continued to put a strain on the resources of the empire.³⁹⁸ Antioch also had problems of her own which might cause delays in the building work. The Persians posed a serious threat to stability in this part of the empire towards the end of Constantine's reign. As a result Constantine sent the young Constantius to Antioch in 333 to boost the morale of the troops stationed there.³⁹⁹ Antioch was ideally positioned to be the temporary headquarters of Constantius and he was still present in the city when Constantine died in 337.⁴⁰⁰ During that time

³⁹⁵ See Downey, Glanville, A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest. (Princeton, NJ, 1961) 343.

³⁹⁶ Jérôme, Chronicle Olym 276.3, "In Antiochia dominicum, quod vocatur aureum, aedificari coeptum". See also the Chronicle preserved in Chronicon miscellaneum, CSCO. Scriptores Syri Versio series tertia, tomus IV pars secunda III, "Antiochiaea Syriae ecclesia quae est σφαίροειδής ἐπληρώθη intra XV annos. eius dedicationem celebravit Constantius diebus episcopi Flaccilli, die Epiphaniae salvatoris nostri" (reproduced in Fragmente eines Arianischen Historiographen. GCS (Philostorgius). (Leipzig, 1913) 212). Socrates, however, describes the inauguration of the basilica as being ten years after its original founding (H.E. 2.8).

³⁹⁷ As recorded by John Malalas, Chronicle, 13.14.

³⁹⁸ C. Theod. 13.3.4.1 (already noted) and similar edicts in 337 and 344.

³⁹⁹ Glanville Downey. A History of Antioch, 354.

⁴⁰⁰ Zonaras, Epitome, 13.4.28

Constantius took an interest in the city and Antioch repaid his interest by referring to herself as "Antiochia Constantia".⁴⁰¹

The council of Antioch

Evidently the council of Antioch which met in winter 338/9 in the presence of Constantius and which deposed Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra was not seen as an opportune time to celebrate the encaenia of the basilica.⁴⁰² Between this time and the council of Antioch Constantius waged a number of campaigns against the Persians. In 340 Constantinus invaded the territory of Constans and was killed near Aquileia. Constantius was back in Antioch for the winter of 340/41. Early in 341 around ninety bishops convened in Antioch. On the surface, at least, the principal reason for this episcopal assembly was the inauguration of the basilica. The assembly, however, had a dual purpose of which Socrates, for example, writes;

Eusebius [bishop of Constantinople] could by no means remain quiet, but as the saying is, left no stone unturned, in order to effect the purpose he had in view. He therefore caused a synod to be convened at Antioch in Syria, under pretence of dedicating the church which the father of the Augusti had commenced, and which his son Constantius had finished in the tenth year after its foundations were laid, but with the real intention of subverting and abolishing the doctrine of the homoousion.⁴⁰³

The decision to convene a council appears to have been on the prompting of the bishop of Constantinople. No mention of the role of the bishop of Antioch (Flaccillus) has been recorded. The initial decision to inaugurate the basilica most likely came from the emperor himself, the patron of the basilica. The date chosen for the inauguration is significant, the feast of the epiphany (6th January).⁴⁰⁴ Since the mention of this encaenia is usually incidental to the council no record has been preserved of the ceremonies. However, John Malalas' account includes an inscription which he claimed could be found on the church. The inscription reads,

⁴⁰¹ So Julian spoke of Constantius, "I often hear that even Antioch now calls herself by your name. Her existence she does indeed owe to her founder, but her present wealth and increase in every sort of abundance she owes to you, since you provided her with harbours that offer good anchorage for those who put in there." (*Oration* 1.40).

⁴⁰² Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 45. The council met to overturn the edict of Constantinus to recall the exiled bishops after the death of Constantine. Gregory of Cappadocia was appointed to the see of Alexandria.

⁴⁰³ Socrates, *H.E.* 2.8. Sozomen also states that the completion of the church provided an opportune moment for the Eusebian party to convene a council (*H.E.* 3.5).

⁴⁰⁴ Day found in *Fragmente eines Arianischen Historiographen*, 212 (cited above).

For Christ Constantine wrought these beautiful dwellings in all ways like the vaults of heaven, brightly gleaming, with Constantius obeying the commands of the ruler; the comes Gorgonios carried out the function of cubicularius.⁴⁰⁵

The inscription gives the credit to Constantine whilst drawing attention to the domed roof of the basilica. It can probably be assumed that the role of Gorgonios was similar to that of Marianus at the encaenia in Jerusalem. Theodoret records that the expensive vessels had been bestowed on the church from the purse of Constantine and Constantius, just as Constantine (through Marianus) bestowed gifts on the Martyrium.⁴⁰⁶ The imperial significance of the building is further demonstrated by Libanius' description of Bemarchius the sophist who, disseminating Constantius' propaganda, travelled the Eastern Empire delivering a single lecture in praise of the basilica.⁴⁰⁷ The pattern of events on the feast of epiphany in 341 matched fairly well those of 13 September in 335. In both cases there is a close link between emperor, encaenia, and council.

Constantius and Jerusalem

The apparition of the Cross

The introduction to this chapter outlined the position of Constantius in the empire with regard to both the situation of the Church and secular politics. The peak of activity in both these spheres surely must be between 349 with another council of Antioch which once again deposed Athanasius, and 353 when the usuper Magnentius finally met his end. In 350 the emperor Constans was killed

⁴⁰⁵ Malalas, 13.17, "Χρίστῳ Κωνσταντίνος ἐπήρατα οἰκί' ἔτευξεν, οὐρανίαις ἀψίσι πανείκελα παμφανόωντα Κωνσταντίου ἀνακτος ὑποδρήσσαντος ἐφετμαῖς· Γοργόνιος δὲ κόμης θαλαμηπόλον ἔργον ὕφανε."

⁴⁰⁶ Theodoret, *H.E.* 3.8. Julian ordered the nailing up of the doors of the church and confiscated the vessels, returning them to the imperial treasury.

⁴⁰⁷ Libanius, *Orat.* 1.39, "Bemarchius had been a staunch supporter of Constantius and the profane crew about him, and by the rattle and clatter of his blasphemous oratory he had gained the reputation of a vigorous speaker...So he crossed the Bosphorus, 'glorying in his might, with head held high', uplifted by the applause and wealth he had amassed. he had travelled as far as Egypt, delivering just one oration, in which, although he personally was a worshipper of the gods, he spoke in praise of him who had set himself up against them, and had discoursed at length upon the church Constantius had built for him" and 1.41, "[Bemarchius] came again to avenge his defeat with the speech which had made his fortune. he rambled on and on about pillars, trellised courts, and intercrossing paths which came out of heaven knows where." (*Libanius Autobiography (Oration I)*. Ed. A. F. Newman (Oxford, 1965). See also Barnes, *Constantine*, 223. The structure of Bemarchius' oration, the praise of Christ followed by the description of the building, follows the pattern of the speech Eusebius delivered before the emperor in praise of the Martyrium.

in Gaul whilst in battle with Magnentius. The following year Gallus was made Caesar and sent to Antioch for the beginning of an embarrassing career and the support Athanasius continued to receive in Alexandria and Rome placed him under grave suspicion as a risk to what stability remained in the empire. In the midst of these years an event occurred which was all the more remarkable for the contrast it posed to the troubles with which Constantius was forced to contend. On 7th May 351 a massive cross of light appeared above Jerusalem. The newly appointed bishop of the city, Cyril, immediately saw in it a good omen for Constantius and his forthcoming conflict with Magnentius.⁴⁰⁸

The same event receives a brief mention in Socrates who links it with the entry of the newly created Caesar Gallus into Antioch.⁴⁰⁹ Sozomen preserves an additional source for the apparition.. His summary of events suggests that he was familiar with Cyril's letter. This familiarity probably came through the preservation of this event in the feast of the Apparition of the Cross. The Armenian-Jerusalem lectionary indicates that on this day (May 7th) the letter of Cyril was read in place of the scripture reading.⁴¹⁰ Both Cyril and Sozomen describe the "gigantic cross" as stretching from Golgotha to the Mount of Olives, both describe the fearful crowd as running for cover in the Martyrium, and Sozomen concludes,

The emperor was made acquainted with the occurrence, partly by numerous reports concerning it which were then current, and partly by a letter from Cyril the bishop. It was said that this prodigy was a fulfilment of an ancient prophecy contained in the Holy Scriptures. It was the means of conversion of many pagans and Jews to Christianity.⁴¹¹

⁴⁰⁸ The Greek text of the letter may be found in E. Bihain. "L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la vision de la croix (BHG(3) 413)." *Byzantion* 43 (1973): 264-296. The Syriac edition has been edited by J. F. Coakley. "A Syriac version of the letter of Cyril of Jerusalem on the vision of the Cross." *Analecta Bollandiana* 102 (1984): 71-84.

⁴⁰⁹ Socrates, *H.E.* 2.28.

⁴¹⁰ See A. Renoux, *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121* (1971), 333. The feast is further discussed in chapter six. For the moment it is sufficient to note that Sozomen's history is dated to the same period of the fifth century when the Greek original of the Armenian lectionary was in use in Jerusalem.

⁴¹¹ Sozomen, *H.E.* 4.5. There are similar accounts in Philostorgius, 3.26 and in the *Chronicon Paschale*. Both describe a large crown which surrounded the Cross, signifying, says Philostorgius, the victory of the emperor. Both agree on the third hour of the day of Pentecost. Both also extend the account stating that the vision was seen clearly by Constantius and his army whilst Philostorgius also mentions the army of Magnentius. Constantius was in Sirmium at this time (Socrates, *H.E.* 2.28; Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 221), located in Pannonia where the *Chronicon Paschale* states Constantius saw the vision).

In Cyril's letter the vision is portrayed as the fulfillment of Matt 24:30, "...then will appear the Son of man in heaven..and they will see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory" (which was also the Gospel reading in the Armenian Jerusalem lectionary). The ancient prophecy which Sozomen had in mind may have been Daniel 7:13.

The significance of the apparition for Cyril and Constantius

Cyril's recent elevation to the see of Jerusalem is perhaps indicated by his intention to offer what he witnessed to Constantius as a 'first-fruits offering'. The emperor might thus reflect upon the 'heavenly crowns' which the 'King of all' bestows on him, and be filled with courage in the face of his enemies.⁴¹² Cyril does not recall the apparition of the cross to Constantine but rather compares it with the finding of the relics of the cross.⁴¹³ Cyril does not associate Helena with the finding of the Cross but rather speaks of the finding in the days of Constantine, one who aspired to sanctity. The εὐλαβεία of Constantius is said to exceed the εὐσέβεια of his father. Proof of this is a sign which comes from heaven rather than from the earth;

The trophy of the victory over death of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, I mean the blessed cross, has been seen at Jerusalem blazing with refulgent light!⁴¹⁴

Constantine sought an interpretation of his vision, "the trophy of a cross of light".⁴¹⁵ The answer he received was that it was the "trophy of victory over

⁴¹² This phrase calls to mind the 'pagan vision' of Constantine described in *Panegyrici Latini* 7 where the orator describes how Constantine beheld Apollo offering him laurel crowns as a good omen for the Constantinian dynasty. If Cyril was familiar with this legend then he has ensured that Constantius receives the crown, not from Apollo, but from Christ.

⁴¹³ Anthony Stephenson remarks that declining to mention Constantine's vision was particularly tactful of Cyril since Constantius himself had not had the benefit of a personal apparition ("Letter to Constans." in *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem*. Vol 2. (Washington, 1970) 226).

⁴¹⁴ Letter 3, "...τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ κατὰ τῆς τοῦ θάνατου νικῆς τρόπαιον, ὁ μακάριος λέγω σταυρός, φωτὸς μαρμαρυγαῖς ἀπαστρέπτων ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ὤφθη." (Bihain, 288). The 'only-begotten Son' is the subject of Cyril's Catechetical lecture XI in which he puts forward arguments intended to combat those of both Paul of Samosata and the Arians. This lecture is one which betrays the greatest concern to combat certain theological theses of his day.

⁴¹⁵ VC 1.28, "...αὐτοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἰδεῖν ἔφη ἐν αὐτῷ οὐρανῷ ὑπερκείμενον τοῦ ἡλίου σταυροῦ τρόπαιον ἐκ φωτὸς συνιστάμενον γραφὴν τε αὐτῷ συνήφθαι λέγουσαν· τούτῳ νίκα.

death".⁴¹⁶ Cyril acts as the self-appointed interpreter of the latest vision for Constantius who received the same answer, the "τρόπαιον νικῆς τοῦ θάνατου".

Cyril's letter re-creates the most jubilant years of Constantine's reign with Magnentius taking the place of Maxentius. The cross once again will become a sign of military victory. It was a view shared by Constantius since coins survive from this period with the inscription, "HOC SIGNO VICTOR ERIS".⁴¹⁷ Cyril merges the apparition of the cross with the finding of the relics and, to complete the picture, he encourages Constantius to advance under the protection of the labarum;

...you will be filled with your usual courage as having God himself upon your side, and will the more readily advance under the trophy of the cross, using the sign that appeared in heaven as a crowning glory, in which heaven itself has gloried the more in showing forth its shape to men.⁴¹⁸

However, Cyril's letter is not simply a good omen for the imminent battle. Constantius is warned that the apparition is a prelude to the apocalyptic end. This a theme which occurs elsewhere in Cyril's writing, notable in Catechetical Lecture 15. Commenting on the words of the creed that the Christ shall come in glory, Cyril asks, what is the true sign of Christ's coming? He answers,

Now Christ's own true sign is the Cross; a sign of a luminous Cross shall go before the King...The sign of the Cross shall be a terror to his foes; but joy to his friends.⁴¹⁹

Is the cross of light an allusion to the vision of the cross in Jerusalem? There are other references to the present times in Cyril's lecture which itself is fervent in the belief that the second advent cannot be long in arriving.⁴²⁰ However, Cyril also speaks of the Antichrist as appearing to the Jews, "making it supposed that he is the man of the race of David, who shall build up the temple"; a reference which might easily have applied to Constantius' successor, the

⁴¹⁶ V.C. 1.32.

⁴¹⁷ Brass coins cast at Sirmium and Siscia with this legend portray the emperor standing holding the standard inscribed with the chi-rho monogram. On the right Victory offers a crown (Kent, The family of Constantine I, 368, 386).

⁴¹⁸ Cyril, Letter 5. The phrase 'a crowning glory' also appears in Cat. Lect. 13.1.

⁴¹⁹ Cyril, Cat. Lect. 15.22. Compare with 13.41, "This [the Cross] shall appear again with Jesus from heaven; for the trophy shall precede the king".

⁴²⁰ For example, the Persian wars (6), the hatred amongst bishops (7), the Arians as fore-runners of the Antichrist (9), and the general feeling of a declining empire (12).

emperor Julian.⁴²¹ Constantius, however, is urged to read the Gospel passage and its context (Matt 24) for himself. This plea has been interpreted as a veiled reference to the need for Constantius to seek baptism before the end appears.⁴²² The prospect of an imminent adventus is not a theme on which Cyril dwells. It is in fact rather diluted by his desire that God might "keep you and all your house, for many cycles of peaceful years, the boast of Christians and the pride of the whole world".⁴²³

There can little doubt that Cyril wrote to the emperor in effect to remind him of the status Jerusalem held in his father's reign.⁴²⁴ The letter acted as a piece of propaganda for Jerusalem and for Constantius. Magnentius was defeated at Mursa in Pannonia on 28 September 351 and finally committed suicide on August 10th 353. Constantius himself did not march under the standard of the Cross but remained in the relative safety of his imperial residence. He did, however, ensure that his soldiers were baptised before they entered the battle.⁴²⁵ Cyril's influence may have been negligible but his letter belongs in a time when already, it seems, there were some (including the emperor) who looked back upon the reign of Constantine for inspiration. Cyril's letter retained its own significance by virtue of its preservation in the liturgical memory where it became fixed in the calendar, joining the feast of the finding of the Cross, and the anniversary of Constantine's death.

Constantius, the Caesareum and Athanasius

Later in the year 351, after the battle of Mursa, the Council of Sirmium met and ratified the creed of Antioch, deposed Photinus, Macellus of Ancyra, and also Athanasius. Although the deposition of Athanasius is not in the record of the council Timothy Barnes suggests that it would serve to explain subsequent

⁴²¹ It is generally agreed that the Catechetical Lectures can be dated to around 348-51. Alexis Doval argues for 350 citing, for example, the reference in Cyril's letter to his recent appointment as bishop, and the reference in lecture 14 to its date of delivery (the month of Xanthicus, Monday of Holy Week, March 25). See Alexis Doval, "The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem." D.Phil. University of Oxford, 1993: Appendix II. Theodoret, who does not record the events of 351, tells of a cross which was shone brightly over Jerusalem for two nights after the earthquake which frustrated Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple (H.E. 3.15).

⁴²² Anthony Stephenson, "Letter to Constantius", 229.

⁴²³ Cyril, Letter 7.

⁴²⁴ Although there is no record of Constantius visiting Jerusalem Cyril may have hoped that he would have succeeded where his father had not and received baptism in the holy city. Around this time the rotunda around the Anastasis cave was completed, which probably continued to be funded from the fiscus.

⁴²⁵ Theodoret, H.E. 3.1

events.⁴²⁶ The theological response of Athanasius to the council of Sirmium was the work On the Council of Nicaea. Besides this work he also composed a more personal response to the accusations made against him, the Apologia ad Constantium imperatorem. The first edition of this document was sent to Constantius in the possession of Serapion of Thmuis and a group of Alexandrian clergy in May 353.⁴²⁷ In the Apologia Athanasius seeks to answer three specific accusations: that he provoked hostility between Constantius and his late brother Constans, that he wrote to the usurper Magnentius, and that he used the Great Church of the Caesareum in Alexandria before it been formally inaugurated. It is the latter charge which interests us the most.

The Caesareum temple complex

The Caesareum in Alexandria was a massive temple situated on the waterfront of the Great Harbour of the city. The original complex was constructed by Cleopatra VII (51 -30 BC) and further structures including gardens and a library, were subsequently added to it. Two tall obelisks stood on the seaward side placed there by Augustus who plundered them from Heliopolis. It was to the divine Augustus that the temple was initially dedicated. Epiphanius provides us with a convenient summary of the building's history;

There were several churches in Alexandria, the most recent called the Caesareum which was previously known as the Hadrianum then later the gymnasium of Licinius before it was a basilica. Then it pleased the emperor Constantius to build in it a church. And this [was begun] by Gregory of Melitus the Arian, [finished] by blessed Athanasius father of orthodoxy, and burnt under Julian.⁴²⁸

⁴²⁶ Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius, 110. Barnes bases this conclusion on a passage found in Sulpicius Severus (Chron. 2.37.5) and the observation that the deposition of Athanasius at Antioch in 349 had been overturned by Constantius in 350.

⁴²⁷ Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius, 112 and Appendix 3. The first version of the Apologia comprised sections 1-18 (i.e. the refutation of the three charges), whilst the second half, written in 357, comprised sections 19-35. Section 13, which alludes to the exile of Egyptian supporters of Athanasius in 357, also belongs to the second edition. See also J. M. Szymiak, ed. Deux Apologies à l'Empereur Constance pour sa fuite. (Paris, 1987) 57-60 who holds a slightly different view to Barnes, arguing that the dividing line between the editions should fall after section 21. If the Apologia was first written as a response to the council of Sirmium then Barnes' reconstruction of the first edition makes better sense. On the subsequent Council of Arles see, K. M. Girardot, "Constance II, Athanase et l'édit d'Arles (353). A propos de la politique religieuse de l'empereur Constance II." Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie. (Paris, 1974) 63-92.

⁴²⁸ Epiphanius, Haer. 69.2 (PG 42.204-205)

The Caesareum was a prominent pagan and civic monument. Its history demonstrates the close bond it maintained with the imperial cult in Alexandria.⁴²⁹ The change in function and dedication under succeeding emperors itself bears witness to the purpose of a deified imperial presence in the provincial city. The cults and dedications to individual emperors imply a ceaseless personal rule of the emperor. The succession of statues and additions to the building complex proclaim the continuing rule of the Roman empire. The cultic changes to the building reflect the stable transmission of power in the empire.⁴³⁰ The building, therefore, of a church in the Caesareum funded by the emperor, continued this sequence of adaptation and change.

The charge of holding a premature encaenia

It was a serious charge to be accused of using the imperial church without regard to the wishes of Constantius. The other two charges of which Athanasius was accused were treasonable offences. This charge, since the patron of the church was the emperor, also amounted to treason. The insecurity that permeated Constantius' reign was fortified by his tendency to trust the whispers of court eunuchs, the notorious chamberlain Eusebius being one such example.⁴³¹ Their intrigues led to the death of Gallus Caesar in 354 and the deposition of Liberius the following year. As Arian sympathisers they were the natural enemies of

⁴²⁹ The Caesareum also contained the mint in Alexandria (see Ammianus, 22.11.9 for the fate of an official who was accused of overturning an altar in the mint).

⁴³⁰ This theme is drawn out in some detail by S. R. F. Price, *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*. (Cambridge, 1984) 161.

⁴³¹ Athanasius, *History of the Arians* 35-38 describes the attempts by the eunuch Eusebius to persuade Liberius to renounce Athanasius and the influence of the court eunuchs, "...who indeed would believe it, were he to hear it, that eunuchs who are scarcely entrusted with household services...that these, I say, now exercise authority in ecclesiastical matters, and that Constantius in submission to their will treacherously conspired against all, and banished Liberius" (38; NPNF 4.283). Ammianus, 16.8 "Those who had influence at court sounded these warnings of unrest like so many trumpets, in the hope of incorporating the property of the condemned with their own...Under him the leading men of all classes were consumed by a passion for riches which knew no bounds..Among the civilian officials, Rufinus the praetorian prefect...there were also the grand chamberlain Eusebius and the quaestor...". Julian, *Letter to the Athenians*, "But it was to gratify a eunuch, his chamberlain who was also his chief cook, that Constantius gave over to his most inveterate enemies his own cousin.." (*The Works of the Emperor Julian*, Vol 2. Loeb Classical Library 1913, 253).

Athanasius and so it is of little surprise that Athanasius is found to be reluctant to meet with Constantius and prefers to send representatives to plead his cause.⁴³²

Compared with the two other charges of actively conspiring against the person of the emperor, the accusation concerning the Caesareum is the easier for Athanasius to defend. The answers to the former charges consist of an account of his movements and political loyalty, the latter requires primarily a theological answer. Thus Athanasius draws upon Scripture for precedents and draws important distinctions in the use of sacred space. To avoid the allegation of undermining the imperial presence in Alexandria Athanasius centres his defence around the claim that, contrary to his accusers, no ceremonies of inauguration took place in the church. Since the encaenia would have required the presence of the emperor or his representative, it was assumed by his accusers that, since there was no doubt that Athanasius had used the church, an unlawful encaenia must have occurred. If, as Athanasius argues, no inauguration took place, then should we accept that Athanasius conducted public liturgy in an unconsecrated church?

Athanasius commences his defence with an acknowledgement that a synaxis did take place in the church. He denies, however, that this was necessarily preceded by an encaenia.⁴³³ He willingly admits that it would have been 'unlawful' to celebrate this feast without the emperor's permission.⁴³⁴ An encaenia requires planning in advance. Athanasius denies that the liturgy held in the church was premeditated in any way. No invitations were issued to fellow bishops or clergy for the building itself, claims Athanasius, was incomplete. Thus far, the encaenia in Alexandria, had one taken place, would not have differed from Jerusalem or Antioch. The liturgy required the attendance of a number of bishops and also, in the case of churches where the patron was the emperor, an imperial presence.

⁴³² In the *Apologia* 19 Athanasius explains why he did not appear at Constantius' court in 353 when summoned. The reason, that the summons was in response to a claim for an audience that Athanasius never made, Barnes describes as "diplomatic evasion" (Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 114). It is likely that Constantius ordered the presence of Athanasius before he had seen the first edition of the *Apologia*.

⁴³³ Athanasius, *Apologia ad Constantium* 14, "...οὐκ ἐγκαινίων ἡμέραν ἐπετελέσαμεν." (SC 56, 114)

⁴³⁴ No formal record of this law has been preserved. The illegality of holding an encaenia without the patron may lie in the laws governing the founding and dedication of temples or public buildings. The solemn dedication of a temple included the promulgation of the *lex dedicationis* which laid down the boundaries of the sanctuary, rights of asylum, and temple regulations (J. E. Stambaugh. "The functions of Roman temples", 566).

Having established that the authority of the emperor had not been undermined by an encaenia held without his knowledge, Athanasius moves on to explain the circumstances of this spontaneous decision to worship in an unfinished church. It was Easter and the gathered multitude was greater than could be contained in the other churches of the city. The request to use the Caesareum, according to Athanasius, came from the people of Alexandria.⁴³⁵ In a flattering aside Athanasius adds that the ultimate desire of the people was to meet in a building where they might particularly pray for the emperor's safety.⁴³⁶ He continues, however, eager to show that the desire to use the Caesareum did not originate with him but with the people;

But I, I exhorted them to wait and to find, whatever the inconvenience, one of the other churches in which to hold the liturgy, but they would not listen to me and they were ready to go out of the city and meet in the desert under the full sun, thinking it better to endure the fatigue of the journey than to celebrate the feast in discomfort.⁴³⁷

The people had already experienced the discomfort of crowding into one building during the period of Lent. Easter was a time celebrated with joy when undoubtedly the congregation would further increase. The people thus began to murmur and demand the use of the Great Church.⁴³⁸ Athanasius succumbs to the wishes of the people, but not, he states, without precedent. He recounts how when a similar situation arose under his predecessor Alexander, the church of Theonas was put into service. The example perhaps misses the point since that church was not an imperial church, having been founded by Alexander in the late third century (282-300) as the principal church of Alexandria until the completion of the Caesareum.⁴³⁹ Two contemporary precedents are also cited, at Trier and at Aquileia. At the latter, Athanasius points out, Constantius' brother Constans was present when the liturgy was celebrated before the completion of the building.⁴⁴⁰

⁴³⁵ *Apologia* 14, "...θόρυδος ἦν οὐκ ὀλίγος, ἀξιούντων ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ συνελθεῖν..."

⁴³⁶ *Apologia* 14, "...εὐχεσθαι καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς σῆς σωτηρίας." SC 56,116 translates 'σωτηρίας' with 'salut' which indicates the idea of 'salvation' rather than 'safety' (NPNF 4,243).

⁴³⁷ *Apologia* 14.

⁴³⁸ *Apologia* 14. Whether intentional or not the murmuring (ἐγόγγυσαν) of the people recalls the murmuring of Israel against Moses in the desert (see for example Num 17:6 LXX, "Καὶ ἐγόγγυσαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τῇ ἐπαύριον ἐπὶ Μωϋσῆν καὶ Ααρων λέγοντες Ὑμεῖς ἀπεκτάγκατε τὸν λαὸν κυρίου").

⁴³⁹ Martin, A. "Les premiers siècles du christianisme à Alexandria: Essai de topographie religieuse (III-IV s.)." *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 30 (1984): 214

⁴⁴⁰ Constans interviewed Athanasius in Aquileia in April 345. It was at Easter in this month that Athanasius and Constans were present in the basilica. See *Apologia* 3.7; *Festal Index* 17, "Having travelled to Aquileia, he kept Easter there."

Once again Athanasius emphasises, "There was no encaenia but only a synaxis of prayer."⁴⁴¹

Athanasius appeals to the practical common-sense of Constantius; where is it preferable to pray, in the desert where any stranger passing by could hear, or in the building known from its founding as the "Κυριακόν"?⁴⁴² "I am sure," writes Athanasius with surprising familiarity, "that you prefer your own place; for you smile and that tells me so." The final objection to Athanasius' actions is that an unfinished church is an unconsecrated place and, it is implied, an unconsecrated place is little better than the desert. The "Κυριακόν", answers Athanasius has doors and walls and this "marks the difference between the prayerful and the profane."⁴⁴³ Athanasius argues that it is lawful to pray in the building whilst it would be irregular at least to hold meetings in the desert (unless there were no places of worship at all). The narrative abruptly changes at this point to a prayer addressed to Christ, "ruler and true king of kings, only-begotten from God, Word and Wisdom of the Father".⁴⁴⁴ It is a prayer cast in the style of an intercession to the emperor; a reminder to the emperor that his authority flows from the divine rule of heaven. In cases of dispute the laws of Christ take precedence over the imperial statutes. The preference of the church of Constantius over the desert was based on the divine law.⁴⁴⁵ Addressing a prayer to Christ rather than attempting to explain this to the emperor is a shrewd peice of diplomacy with which the emperor would find it difficult to object. It is not quite certain where Athanasius ends the prayer to the divine ruler and resumes correspondence with the emperor on earth, which gives the letter a further air of authority. Athanasius appeals to Constantius' religiosity. He is convinced that if

⁴⁴¹ *Apologia* 15, "...και γέγονεν οὐκ ἐγκαινια, ἀλλὰ σύναξις εὐχης".

⁴⁴² The use of "Κυριακόν" rather than "Καيسάρειαν" avoids the implicit references to the imperial cult. Athanasius, nevertheless, does note in the same sentence that the building bears the emperor's name.

⁴⁴³ *Apologia* 17, "Ὁ δὲ Κυριακὸς τόπος καὶ τετείχισται καὶ τεθύρωται, καὶ τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ τῶν βεδήλων δείκνυσιν."

⁴⁴⁴ *Apologia* 17, "O Christ, ruler and true King of kings, only-begotten from God, Word and wisdom of the Father, because my people addressed their prayer to Your Favour, because, by your mediation, they besought your Father, the God of all things, for the safety (salvation) of your servant, the very pious Constantius, I am accused! But thanks be rendered to your Excellence that it is for this I am accused, for the keeping of your laws! Since more grave would have been the accusation, and more true the charge, if we had passed by the place which the Emperor was building, and chosen the desert for prayer. How the accuser would have proclaimed, how with reason he would have said, 'He despised the place which you are building; he does not approve of your undertaking.'" (SC 56.122-124).

⁴⁴⁵ See the discussion of Athanasius' political theology in Kenneth M. Setton, *Christian Attitudes towards the Emperor in the fourth century*. (1967) 72-87. Also, L. W. Barnard, "Athanasie et les empereurs Constantin et Constance." *Politique et Théologie chez Athanasie d'Alexandrie*, 127-144.

he had bypassed the Caesareum in favour of the desert then his enemies would have (rightfully) accused the bishop of preventing the people praying. The ultimate blame, however, would have lain with Constantius. But he, unlike Darius,⁴⁴⁶ does not wish the people to be forbidden to pray but rather "wish all men to pray, knowing that the prayer of all is, that you may continue to reign in perpetual peace and safety."⁴⁴⁷

Diplomacy gives the impression that the primary reason to gather together in worship is for Constantius' benefit. It would be easy to forget that the initial reason that Athanasius gave for the impromptu use of the Caesareum was because it was Easter and that, although the final decision to use the Church lay with Athanasius, it was from the people that the request had come. Prayers for Constantius occur again in the final part of this section where Athanasius writes,

But you, God-loving Augustus, may you live many years more and come to celebrate the inauguration (ἐγκαίνια). For the prayers offered by all for your safety do not interfere with the celebration of the inauguration.⁴⁴⁸

To deny the premature use of the Caesareum would prevent prayers for the emperor's safety. What emperor embroiled in battles against Persians, Goths, and rebellion would agree to that?

Biblical precedents for holding worship before an encaenia

Athanasius turns his attention towards his accusers. He had justified his actions to Constantius partly by precedents recently created. To his accusers he justifies his actions by biblical precedent. He recounts how Joshua and Zerubbabel together ensured the keeping of the feast of tabernacles whilst the temple was being rebuilt so that "while they prayed the building of the house advanced."⁴⁴⁹ When the house was finished, without interruption to the prayer of the people, they

⁴⁴⁶ Dan 6:7-9. Darius only promulgated the law forbidding prayer except to himself under pressure from his ministers. There is perhaps an oblique reference to Constantius here. Athanasius must have heard echoes of his own situation from that of Daniel.

⁴⁴⁷ *Apologia* 17. Intercession for the emperor occurred during the anaphora in the liturgy of Jerusalem, Cyril, *Myst. Cat.* 5.8 (see further on this passage, C. Beukers. "For our emperors, soldiers and allies": an attempt at dating the twenty-third catechesis by Cyrillus of Jerusalem." *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961): 177-84; Edward Yarnold. "The authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem", 160.

⁴⁴⁸ *Apologia* 18.

⁴⁴⁹ *Apologia* 18.

celebrated the inauguration, and made the offerings for the inauguration and everyone kept the feast for the completion of the work. Again this the blessed Alexander and the other Fathers have done; continuing the gatherings, then on completion of the work, they rendered thanks to the Lord, celebrating the inauguration.⁴⁵⁰

The people in Alexandria have prayed, the place of worship is now ready and, writes Athanasius, it requires only the presence of Constantius for the formal inauguration.

The rites of encaenia and of consecration

The encaenia described by Athanasius is not the consecration of the building. He already considers the church in the Caesareum to have been made holy by the prayers offered in it.⁴⁵¹ This section of the *Apologia* gives us a glimpse into the possibility that the encaenia was a separate rite from the act of consecration (however defined) and referred precisely to the formal inauguration of the building. Under normal circumstances the encaenia would have been both the first liturgy offered in the building (thus consecrating it) and also its official inauguration. The premature use of the Caesareum, however, created a confusion between that which consecrates the building and that which declares it available for public service. The clarification introduced in the *Apologia* attempts to demonstrate from precedent and from Scripture the distinction between the two; a distinction which was ignored by his accusers and probably not fully understood by Constantius.

The Caesareum after 354

There is no extant record of the subsequent celebration of the encaenia of the church in the Caesareum. The deposition of Athanasius from his episcopal seat in Alexandria was re-enforced at the council of Arles in the winter of 353/4 and again at the council of Milan the following year. Meanwhile Athanasius remained in Alexandria defying attempts to have him removed. In January 355, however, the *Dux Syrianus* accompanied by troops marched into Alexandria. Athanasius objected that Constantius had promised no further action to evict him would take place and therefore demanded proof that the orders had directly come

⁴⁵⁰ *Apologia* 18.

⁴⁵¹ *Apologia* 18, "ἔτοιμος γὰρ ὁ τόπος προαγνισθεὶς ταῖς προγενομέναις εὐχαῖς".

from the emperor.⁴⁵² In February of that year Syrianus occupied the church of Theonas and Athanasius escaped to the desert.⁴⁵³

The attack on the church of Theonas and the subsequent departure of Athanasius set the scene for the infamous looting of the church of the Caesareum by a pagan mob in June 356. Constantius' attempts to crush disunity only resulted in assaults on both the Nicene party and pagans. From 353 to 356 Constantius enacted a series of laws against temples and sacrifice.⁴⁵⁴ In 357 he removed the altar of Victory from the senate building in Rome.⁴⁵⁵ The new prefect Cataphonius and the comes Heraclius arrived in Alexandria in June 356 to demand oaths of loyalty to the imperial nominee for the vacant see. These events, together with the recent "desecration" of the Caesareum by the construction of Constantius' church, acted as the catalyst for a riot. A pagan mob (ἀγοραῖοι) stormed the church, disrupting the end of the liturgy, beating the remaining members of the congregation, and shouting obscenities at the Virgins.⁴⁵⁶ Although Athanasius insists that the activity of the mob was supported by the Arian faction, the subsequent actions were of pagan not Arian significance. Having built a sizeable bonfire from the church furnishings on which they sprinkled incense, the mob then prepared to sacrifice a heifer in the adjoining garden. Only the offering of a bull was satisfactory to the cult of Serapis; the heifer escaped its fate by virtue of it being a cow. Meanwhile another group, followers of the god Dionysus, entered the church waving branches and shouting incantations associated with their rituals.⁴⁵⁷

The motivation for the attack on the Caesareum in 356 was twofold. First, it was a reaction against the Christian seizing of the Caesareum. At least three other churches were erected on the sites of temples or were temple conversions. There is evidence, for example, that the church of Alexander was

⁴⁵² See Historia Arianorum 4.30, 48. Constantius had written to Athanasius prior to his return from exile in 346. The text of the letter is reproduced in H.A. 3.24

⁴⁵³ This occurred at the same time as the bishop of Rome, Liberius, was arrested on the orders of Constantius, and bishops were exiled who refused to ratify the council of Milan.

⁴⁵⁴ C. Theod. 16.10.4-6. See the discussion in Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius, 102.

⁴⁵⁵ Recorded, for example, in Symmachus, Relatio 3.4, 7 (R. H. Barrow, Prefect and Emperor: The Relations of Symmachus AD 384. (Oxford, 1973) 34-47).

⁴⁵⁶ H.A. 4.55

⁴⁵⁷ These events are described in H.A. 4.56-57 and discussed in detail by Christopher Haas, "The Alexandrian riots of 356 and George of Cappadocia." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 32 (1991): 281-301. See also his doctoral dissertation from which this article is taken, John C. Haas, "Late Roman Alexandria: Social structure and intercommunal conflict in the entrepôt of the East." Ph.D. (University of Michigan, 1988) 230-235.

located on the site where once stood a temple to Kronos-Saturn,⁴⁵⁸ and Athanasius himself had a church constructed in the Mendideion where a temple stood, dedicated to the god Mendes.⁴⁵⁹ Second, the Caesareum, as we have already noted, was the temple of the imperial cult. An attack on a building which represented the imperial religion (Christian or otherwise) was surely a protest directed against the emperor himself. The conversion of part of the Caesareum to an exclusive religion, the recent anti-pagan legislation, and the continuing decline in Constantius' ability to govern the empire⁴⁶⁰, combined in the city of Alexandria, noted for its quarrelsome people⁴⁶¹, to produce the events of June 356. The exile of Athanasius, who was genuinely popular among pagans and (Nicene) Christians,⁴⁶² and the fact that the imperial nominee for the see did not actually arrive until 357, presented an immediate opportunity for the dissatisfied to vent their frustration.⁴⁶³

Constantius died in November 361. In 360 Julian recalled from exile a large number of bishops to their respective sees.⁴⁶⁴ In 362 Athanasius presided over a council in Alexandria which ensured that those on the extremities of the Arian party were alienated. The emperor Julian, realising that abandoning

⁴⁵⁸ See Socrates *H.E.* 7.13. The temple to Saturn was probably constructed in the reign of Cleopatra. Later the great temple site to Serapis (Serapaeum) was dedicated as a church to John the Baptist (post 391). See further A. Martin, "Les premiers siècles du christianisme à Alexandria", 211-235. For a more general discussion of the relationship of churches and temples in this period see G. Fowden, "Bishops and temples in the Eastern Roman empire AD 320-435." *Journal of Theological Studies* 29 (1978) 53-78; R. C. Hanson, "The transformation of pagan temples into churches in the early Christian centuries." *Studies in Christian Antiquity*. (Edinburgh, 1985) 347-58.

⁴⁵⁹ The consecration of the church took place on August 7th 370 (*Festal Index* 41, 42).

⁴⁶⁰ Gallus Caesar was executed in 354 on charges of treason. In 355 Silvanus rebelled in Cologne and was dragged by his executioners from the Christian chapel in which he was hiding, and in the same year Julian was appointed caesar and sent to quell turbulent Gaul (Ammianus 14.11; 15.5; 15.8). Constantius' unpopularity is outlined in John Matthews, *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*, 230ff and Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 144-151.

⁴⁶¹ See Ammianus, 22.16, "The people of Egypt are for the most part rather swarthy and dark and have a gloomy cast of countenance. They are lean and have a dried-up look, are easily roused to excitable gestures, and are quarrelsome and most persistent in pursuing a debt."

⁴⁶² See the description of Athanasius' return from exile in 346 provided by Gregory of Nazianzus *Orat* 21.29 and cited by Barnes, "his triumphant progress into Alexandria resembled less the return of an exiled bishop than the *adventus* of a Roman emperor" (*Athanasius and Constantius*, 92).

⁴⁶³ The chosen successor by Constantius was George of Cappadocia who managed to upset nearly every social section of Alexandria. He attacked or insulted civic temples, was attacked himself and practically driven out of the city in 358 and was finally murdered (by pagans) in 361 as soon as the city heard that Julian was Augustus (John C. Haas, *Late Roman Alexandria*, 236-238).

⁴⁶⁴ Barnes convincingly argues that the recall of bishops occurred before Constantius' death. It was an attempt by Julian, not to cause chaos in the church, but to foster allies and be seen as a champion of religious freedom which Constantius at this time was not, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 154.

Constantius' imposition of the homoean creed was only strengthening certain sections of the Church, published an edict ordering Athanasius to leave Alexandria. Julian's reign was short-lived and in the following year Athanasius sought an audience with the new emperor Jovian, resulting in his return to Alexandria. The Festal Index records that on his return in 364, "We received the Caesareum".⁴⁶⁵ However, it was a short stay since in 365 he was forced into hiding once again by a decree of Jovian's successor, Valens. During that year though, the help of the notary and the prefect "obtained an entrance for him into the church".⁴⁶⁶ But on July 21, 365, an earthquake caused a tidal wave to sweep across the city. The events of this day are vividly described by Ammianus who recounts how the

...roaring sea, as if indignant at its repulse, turned back, and rushed over the seething shoals to burst in fury upon islands and wide tracts of the mainland. Innumerable buildings in towns or wherever they were standing were levelled to the ground, and the whole face of the earth was changed by this mad conflict of the elements...Other great vessels, hurled along by the raging winds, landed on the roofs of the buildings, as happened at Alexandria, and some were carried nearly two miles inland...⁴⁶⁷

The Caesareum, situated on the waterfront of the Great Harbour, could not have been left undamaged. In the following year though, on the same date, the Festal Index describes an attack on the Caesareum by another pagan mob which resulted in the burning of the church. The perpetrators of these events were subsequently condemned and exiled.⁴⁶⁸ Although Timothy Barnes may be right to wonder whether the tidal wave and the burning of the Caesareum occurred in the same year,⁴⁶⁹ it is equally possible that, whilst the city had no patriarch,⁴⁷⁰ the "ἁγιοπαῖοι" marked the anniversary of the earthquake by burning one of the places in which the protector gods of the city had been usurped. Athanasius returned to the city later that year and on 1st May 368 he began the rebuilding of the Caesareum on the orders of Trajanus Dux.⁴⁷¹ The Festal Index describes the process of rebuilding as the clearing away of the burnt debris without any reference to the damage inflicted by the tidal wave in 365. There is no record, in

⁴⁶⁵ Festal Index 37.

⁴⁶⁶ Festal Index 37.

⁴⁶⁷ Ammianus, 26.10.

⁴⁶⁸ Festal Index 38.

⁴⁶⁹ Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 163.

⁴⁷⁰ At this time, under the rule of the emperor Valens, Athanasius was forced into hiding yet again.

⁴⁷¹ Festal Index 40.

the turbulent history of the Caesareum church, of the inauguration of the building either before or subsequent to its rebuilding.

The Inauguration of the Great Church in Constantinople

Shortly before his death Constantius was involved in one final inauguration of an imperial basilica. On February 15th in 360 the basilica of the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople was inaugurated.⁴⁷² The circumstances are similar to the inauguration of the Golden House in Antioch. Both coincided with a council of bishops, and at both the emperor was present. The council of Constantinople, convened by the newly consecrated bishop Eudoxius in January 360, was the climax to Constantius' attempts to impose the creed he had drawn up for the councils of Ariminum and Seleucia held the previous year. The council of Constantinople also deposed, amongst others, Basil of Ancyra and Cyril of Jerusalem.⁴⁷³ The compiler of the Chronicon Paschale claims that the building of the Hagia Sophia, like the Antiochene basilica, commenced in the reign of Constantine.⁴⁷⁴ Historians who tend to agree with the Chronicle draw attention to the orientation of the original church with regard to the Hippodrome, with the implication that the foundations of the basilica were laid at the same time as the founding of the city.⁴⁷⁵ It is, however, later sources which ascribe the initial construction to Constantine.⁴⁷⁶ Our earliest source for the construction of the Church is Socrates. He writes that in around 350,

The emperor built the great church now called Σοφία adjoining to that named Ειρήνη, which being originally of small dimensions, the emperor's father had considerably enlarged and adorned. In the present day both are seen within one enclosure, having the one name.⁴⁷⁷

⁴⁷² Chronicle Paschale; Chron. Hieron, "Constantinopoli ecclesiarum maxima dedicatur".

⁴⁷³ Socrates H.E. 2.42. Both Socrates and Sozomen relate how at the Encaenia of the Hagia Sophia the bishop Eudoxius commenced his oration with the infamous statement, 'The Father is impious, the Son is pious.' (Socrates, 1.43; Sozomen, H.E. 4.26)

⁴⁷⁴ Chronicon Paschale 35. Eusebius makes no mention of Constantine and the Hagia Sophia, only Constantine's building of the Basilica of the Apostles (V.C. 4.58-60).

⁴⁷⁵ See for example, Thomas F. Matthews, The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy. (University Park, 1971) 11-19.

⁴⁷⁶ For example George the Monk (de Boor 2, 627; cited Dagron, Naissance d'une Capitale, 397 where there is a short discussion of the sources).

⁴⁷⁷ Socrates, H.E. 2.16, "Κατὰ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τὴν μεγάλην ἐκκλησίαν ἐκτίζεν ἣτις 'Σοφία' μὲν προσαγορεύεται νῦν· συνήπται δὲ τῇ ἐπωνύμῳ Εἰρήνῃ ἣν ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ βασιλέως μικρὰν οὖσαν τὸ πρότερον εἰς κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος ἠύξησε καὶ νῦν εἰσὶν εἰς ἓνα περίβολον ἄμφω ὁράμεναι μιᾷς τὴν προσωνομίαν ἔχουσαι."

Socrates may well be the source of the later confusion about which emperor may have laid the foundations of the basilica. According to Socrates, Constantine enlarged the basilica dedicated to the Peace of God. By Socrates' day the basilica of the Wisdom of God encompassed the Constantinian church so that both became known as St Sophia.

The Constantinople encaenia

The Chronicon Paschale records that the inauguration of the St Sophia occurred thirty-four years after its foundation. This would place the start of building to around 326, the same time in which Constantine founded the city of Constantinople. It is probable that the Chronicler has conflated the founding of the St Sophia's basilica with the city's founding (or the founding of the church of the Apostles).⁴⁷⁸ What the Chronicler does provide us with, however, is a detailed report of the encaenia, informing us that,

At the inauguration the emperor Constantius Augustus presented many dedications, great gold and silver treasures, and many gemmed and gold-threaded cloths for the holy altar; in addition also, for the doors of the church diverse gold curtains...so he lavishly bestowed many gifts at that time on the entire clergy, and on the order of virgins and widows and on the hospices. And for the sustenance of the aforementioned and of the beggars, and orphans, and prisoners, he added a corn allocation of greater size than that which his father Constantine had bestowed.⁴⁷⁹

The similarities between this inauguration and that of the Martyrium are clear. The central action of the emperor is the bestowal of costly offerings for the building, and gifts for the clergy and religious. In addition, the impoverished receive an increase in the corn dole which, as the Chronicler notes, exceeded that presented by Constantine. The cost of the imperial offerings for St Sophia, just as for the Martyrium basilica, was borne by the public fiscus. The offerings are distinctly liturgical including altar cloths and luxurious curtains for both the doors of the iconostasis and the outer entrance ways. They may be compared with those bestowed by Constantine on the Roman churches and recorded in the Liber Pontificalis.

⁴⁷⁸ Dagron, Naissance d'une Capitale, 398.

⁴⁷⁹ Chronicon Paschale, Olymp. 285.

Conclusion

The encaenia and episcopal councils

At each of the cities which we have considered in this chapter we have noted the close involvement of Constantius in both the secular and ecclesiastical affairs of the city. The public inauguration of a basilica is one particular point when the state and church come together. The same requirements for the encaenia are present whether the city is Antioch or Alexandria. After the completion of the building, though not necessarily at the moment of completion, the inauguration is celebrated. On one occasion in Constantine's reign this was linked to a council of bishops. On at least two occasions under Constantius the encaenia provided the opportunity (or excuse even) for the invited bishops to convene a council.⁴⁸⁰ Without the requirement that surrounding bishops be invited to an encaenia, it would have proved difficult for Eusebius to have arranged the decisive council at Antioch in 341. The encaenia also demanded the imperial presence. Although there is no evidence he presided over the proceedings, the emperor had a specific role in overseeing the final offerings and finishing touches to the building. At Jerusalem, Antioch, Constantinople (and, all other things being equal, Alexandria) the emperor founded the basilica, funded its construction, and, on the day of its official inauguration, furnished it as well. An effective symbol of the integration of the emperor and religion was assured by the close proximity of a basilica to the imperial palace (as at Antioch) or within the precincts of the imperial cult.

⁴⁸⁰ Basil of Ancyra also invited surrounding bishops to his city for the dedication of a church at Easter 358. The resulting synod comprised only 12 bishops who sent a letter to Constantius attacking the antics of Eudoxius of Antioch (Sozomen H.E. 4.13; Barnes, Athanasius and Constantius, 139).

Chapter Five

The feast of the Encaenia in the Journal of Egeria and the Church History of Sozomen

Introduction

Other than in the ancient lectionaries of Jerusalem (which will be considered in the following chapters) we have only two reasonably detailed descriptions of the anniversary feast of the Encaenia. The first occurs in the fascinating journal of a pilgrimage kept by the pilgrim Egeria, and the second amounts to a digression in Sozomen's Ecclesiastical History. The former marks the abrupt end of the journal and the latter contains only the elementary details. Both, however, provide essential details for a better understanding of the nature of this feast when we turn to the lectionary evidence, and, although frustrating in their incompleteness, both strengthen the bond between the rite and the feast of the Encaenia.

The Journal of the Pilgrim Egeria

We are, it is frequently noted, extremely fortunate to have the Diary of the pilgrim now known as Egeria. Only one (incomplete) manuscript survives, copied at Monte Cassino in the eleventh century, bound with Hilary of Poitiers' *De Mysterioribus*, preserved in Arezzo first by the community of St Flora and then by the Pia Fraternita dei Laici, unearthed in 1884 by J. F. Gamurrini, the director of the Arezzo library, and published in 1887.⁴⁸¹ Since then numerous editions and commentaries have appeared.⁴⁸² The history of the interpretation of the Journal, to which we can do no justice here, is a subject worthy of a separate study.⁴⁸³

⁴⁸¹ J. F. Gamurrini. *S. Hilarii Tractatus de mysteriis et hymni et S. Silviae Aquitanae Peregrinatio ad loca sancta...* (Rome, 1887). Also published as "S. Silvae Aquitane; Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta." *Studi e documenti di Storia e Diritto* 9 (1888): 97-147.

⁴⁸² An edition of the Journal was translated into Russian by M. Cholodnik in 1891. The first English translation was by J. H. Bernard in 1891. The most recent edition is by Pierre Maraval. *Égérie: Journal de Voyage (Itinéraire)*. Sources Chrétiennes 296. (Paris, 1982).

⁴⁸³ Broad overviews are provided by, for example, J. Wilkinson. *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land*. Rev. ed. (Jerusalem, 1981); and by Émilien Lamirande. "La pèlerine Égérie: une grande dame de l'antiquité chrétienne." *Église et Théologie* 15 (1984): 259-91.

More than most sources the Journal has been exposed to speculative reconstructions, fortuitous discoveries, and intriguing theories. It must be every scholar's dream who has ever handled this source to one day unearth a complete edition answering once and for all the questions first posed by Gamurrini's discovery in 1884.⁴⁸⁴ The sole surviving manuscript of the Journal lacks an unknown number of folios which would comprise the first part of the Journal. There is, in the manuscript, no indication of the author's name, place of origin, or date of the journey.⁴⁸⁵ When the manuscript was first uncovered there was a rush to identify the author with some person whose existence was already known. Gamurrini selected Silvia of Aquitaine. C. Kohler, who inspected the manuscript himself in the same year as it was discovered, decided upon Galla Placidia, the daughter of Theodosius the Great.⁴⁸⁶ The name of the author was settled in 1903 by the marvellous connection made by Dom M. Férotin. The key to the identity of the author lay in a seventh century letter written by Valerius to the monks of Vierzo. The letter consists of a eulogy of the virgin Etheria, who Férotin argued could only be the author of the Journal.⁴⁸⁷ Joining an author and a name together also appeared to solve the pilgrim's place of origin. Since Valerius belonged to the Spanish region of Galicia, it seemed as if this might also be Etheria's home country. Certainly, Galicia fitted the observation of the bishop of Edessa that the pilgrim had come from the other end of the earth and Valerius himself testified that this noble woman was born on the far western coast of the empire.⁴⁸⁸ However, although scholars were considerably closer to putting a name to the Journal, the answer was not quite complete. The manuscripts of Valerius' letter

⁴⁸⁴ A search did uncover a series of topographical notes taken from Egeria's Journal in a manuscript of Toledo. The principal merit of these fragments was to at least establish the existence of another manuscript of the Itinerarium (even if this manuscript remains lost). Details in D. de Bruyne, "Nouveau fragments de l'Itinerarium Eucheriae." *Revue Bénédictine* 26 (1909): 481-87.

⁴⁸⁵ Scholars have attempted to reconstruct the lost section of the Journal from the description of the Holy Places compiled by Peter the Deacon who, it is believed, as a resident of Monte Cassino read the Journal of Egeria. His basic framework, however, is taken from Bede's work on the Holy Places. Interesting as it is to attempt a reconstruction of this section of the Journal from Peter's work, the personal character of the Journal (which is so essential) is omitted by Peter and so remains lost. See John Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land*, 179-210 for an annotated English translation of Peter the Deacon's description of the holy places.

⁴⁸⁶ C. Kohler. "Note sur un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque d'Arrezzo." *Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartres* 45 (1884): 141-51.

⁴⁸⁷ Férotin, M. "Le véritable auteur de la 'Peregrinatio Silvae', la vierge espagnole Éthérie." *Revue des Questions Historiques* 30 (1903): 367-397. The text of the letter, prepared by Manuel C. Diaz Y Diaz, may be found in SC 296 (1982).

⁴⁸⁸ *Itinerarium* 19.5; Valerius 5, "Que extremo occidui maris oceani litore exorta, Orienti facta est cognita." Férotin also pointed to a fifth century chronographer who was born in Galicia and wrote of it as, "Gallaeciam Wandali occupant et Sueui sitam in extremitate oceani maris occidua" (PL 51.877; "Le véritable auteur", 387).

preserved a number of variants of the pilgrim's name (Etheria, Eiheria, Egeria, Heleria, and Echeria). Férotin opted for Etheria as being the most natural choice.⁴⁸⁹ Others, however, preferred to refer to the pilgrim by one or another of the variants.⁴⁹⁰

The dating of Egeria's Journal

Although dating the Journal has presented its own set of difficulties, often the date is inextricably bound up with the identity of the author. From the beginning it was generally agreed that the pilgrimage was towards the end of the fourth century; Gamurrini had opted for the years 385-388, followed by Cabrol, and Férotin.⁴⁹¹ Two exceptions to this consensus were D. G. Morin and A. Lambert who redated the Journal on the basis of certain allusions in letters of St Jerome.⁴⁹² Paul Devos has been credited with determining the date of Egeria's movements with greater precision.⁴⁹³ Devos observed that Egeria, having spent

⁴⁸⁹ On the name Egeria Férotin wrote, "Mais il me semble que nous devons écarter l'Egeria du codex de Tolède: cela m'a tout l'air d'une réminiscence de la nymphe classique, échappée à la plume de quelque copiste plus lettré que la plupart de ses confrères" ("Le véritable auteur", 378-79).

⁴⁹⁰ The early discussion which took place on the name of the pilgrim is summarised by A. Lambert in "Egeria: mots critiques sur la tradition de son nom et celle de l'Itinerarium Egeriae." *Revue Mabillon* 26 (1936): 71-94. Egeria, despite Férotin's initial protestations is now the generally accepted title.

⁴⁹¹ F. Cabrol. *Les églises de Jérusalem, la discipline et la liturgie au IV^e Siècle*. (Paris, 1895) 173; Férotin, "Le véritable auteur", 392-93 (noting that Theodosius himself was born in Galicia, and prefect of the East from 383-88 was Cynegius, who may have originated from Spain).

⁴⁹² G. Morin. "Un passage énigmatique de S. Jérôme contre la pèlerine espagnole Euchéria?" *Revue Bénédictine* 30 (1913): 174-86. The passage in question was an obscure text in the letter *Ad Furiam* 54.13, "Vidimus nuper ignominiosum <quemdam> per totum Orientem volitasse <rumorem>; et aetas et cultus et habitus et incessus, <et> indescrcta societas, exquisitae epulae, regius apparatus Neronis et Sardanapali nuptias loquebantur." Morin proposed 394 as the date of the pilgrimage. A. Lambert, on the other hand, identified Egeria with the anonymous sister of the 'heretic' Galla, both Virgins from the church of Galicia (allusion in Jerome, *Letter* 133). On the death of Galla Egeria took refuge at the court of Constantinople under the patronage of her cousin Pulcheria. The latter seems to have been the same woman whom Edmond Bouvy identified as being Eucheria, the author of the Journal, and daughter of the consul Flavius Eucherius, uncle of Theodosius the Great ("Le pèlerinage d'Euchéria." *Revue Augustinienne* 3 & 4 (1903-4)). Lambert's reconstruction results in a pilgrimage dated to around 415 (A. Lambert. "Egeria, soeur de Galla." *Revue Mabillon* 27 (1937): 1-42; A. Lambert. "L'Itinerarium Egeriae, vers 414-16." *Revue Mabillon* 28 (1938): 49-69). Dom E. Dekkers, apparently confirming Lambert's theory, dated the pilgrimage to 417 as an explanation for Bethlehem being specified as a station for the feast of the Ascension. In 417 the feast of the Ascension fell on May 31, the same date on which the dedication of the church of the nativity was kept (E. Dekkers. "De datum der 'Peregrinatio Egeriae' en het feest van Ons Heer Hemelvaart." *Sacris Erudiri* 1 (1948): 181-205).

⁴⁹³ Paul Devos, "La date du voyage d'Égérie." *Analecta Bollandiana* 85 (1967): 165-194.

three years in Jerusalem,⁴⁹⁴ journeyed eventually to Carrae where she arrived in time for the feast of the martyr Helpidius and the commemoration of Abraham (23 April).⁴⁹⁵ Having this firm date, Devos then works backwards noting that Egeria spent three days in Edessa and that it was only a day's journey from Edessa to Carrae. Thus, he concludes that Egeria arrived in Edessa on 19 April. Edessa, however, is 25 staging posts from Jerusalem. Each staging post marked a day's journey which, counting the days back from 19 April, gives us a date of 25 March (including the day spent at Hierapolis⁴⁹⁶). Since Devos argues it would be extremely unlikely that Egeria would have left Jerusalem just before the celebration of Easter (and she makes no mention of Easter on route to Edessa), he narrows the year that Egeria left Jerusalem down to 384 when Easter fell on 24 March. Thus Egeria left Jerusalem on the Easter Monday for Antioch and then onto Edessa and Carrae. Since she spent three full years in Jerusalem her arrival in the holy city can be dated to 381, very likely in time for the Easter celebrations.⁴⁹⁷

The identity of Egeria

The name and the date now seem to be fixed, and most are prepared to acknowledge her Spanish origin.⁴⁹⁸ The character of Egeria, her identity beyond simply a name, is still a subject of debate. Two conclusions were apparent from the earliest commentaries on the Journal. One, that Egeria was a religious sister sending back to her Spanish community detailed reports of her experiences, and two, that somehow there was a connection with the imperial family of Theodosius

⁴⁹⁴ *Itinerarium* 17.1, "...cum iam tres anni pleni essent, a quo Ierusalimam venissem, visis etiam omnibus locis sanctis, ad quos orationis gratia me tenderam..."

⁴⁹⁵ *Itinerarium* 20.5, "...ut pridie martyrium die ibi veniremus, id est sancti ipsius Helpidii, nono k. Maias..."

⁴⁹⁶ *Itinerarium* 18.1.

⁴⁹⁷ Gregory of Nyssa was present in Jerusalem during this same year. His reflections, on Jerusalem, preserved in two of his letters, are far different to those of Egeria. Their respective motivations, however, were quite different. Whereas Egeria intended to view and recount her experiences of the holy places, Gregory's mission concerned ecclesiastical politics and the swarms of pilgrims served only to irritate him. There is no evidence that they ever met each other. A comparison of both voyages is made by Pierre Maraval, "Egérie et Grégoire de Nysse, pèlerins aux lieux saints de Palestine" *Atti del convegno Internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae*. (Arezzo, 1987) 315-331. On the transmission history of Gregory's second letter on pilgrimages to Jerusalem see, by the same author, "Une querelle sur les pèlerinages autour d'un texte patristique (Grégoire de Nysse, Lettre 2)." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 66 (1986): 131-146.

⁴⁹⁸ Attempts to suggest a place of origin on the basis of Egeria's Latin never resolved the question. Veikko Väänänen provides a succinct review of the linguistic interpretations of Egeria's latin in *Le Journal-Epître d'Egérie (Itinerarium Egeriae): Étude linguistique*. (Helsinki, 1987) 153f.

the Great. She has been described as "cette grande dame",⁴⁹⁹ an abbess,⁵⁰⁰ and more frequently, a consecrated virgin.⁵⁰¹ Pierre Maraval preferred to keep an open mind on the subject, suggesting that all we could really know about the pilgrim was that she came from a circle which tended towards the monastic life, who could not, strictly speaking, be called "religious".⁵⁰² More recently Hagith Sivan has attempted to argue that it was more likely that Egeria belonged to a lay, middle class, circle of pious women rather than travelling as an impoverished nun. Whilst accepting Devos' dating of the Journal, Sivan rejects Galicia as her home country and suggests Arles as a more likely place.⁵⁰³

There are certainly few personal references to the character of Egeria in the surviving part of the Journal and its style suggests that the author intended her own character to be distant from the work's overall aim to act as the eyes and ears of her community. Although Jerusalem was the summit of the pilgrimage, Egeria felt quite free to visit other places outside of the Holy Land, including Edessa, Antioch and Constantinople. The conclusion to the travelogue section of her Journal, written in Constantinople, explains her intention to travel on to Ephesus and, if still alive, to visit further places.⁵⁰⁴ This freedom to travel without apparent limits, and the supposed length of her travels (three years in Jerusalem alone), argues against the conclusion that Egeria left her community with a distinct timescale in mind. It is not unreasonable to suggest that the Journal originally commenced with little sense of a precise starting point. The Journal of

⁴⁹⁹ Férotin, "Le véritable auteur", 370.

⁵⁰⁰ On the basis of catalogue descriptions of her diary reading, for example, "Itinerarium Egerie abbatisse" (Cabrol, Les églises de Jérusalem, 174; Lambert, "Notes critiques", 83-85).

⁵⁰¹ This particularly after the connection made with the letter of Valerius which speaks of Egeria revisiting the land of her travels "cum sanctis virginibus" (Valerius, 6 see also chap 4; Férotin, "Le véritable auteur", 391). The title to the letter reads, "Epistola beatissime Egerie..", which may also denote a member of a religious order (though not an abbess - so Férotin).

⁵⁰² Maraval, Égérie: Journal de Voyage, 27; see also before him, Christine Mohrmann, "Égérie et le monachisme." Corona Gratiarum: miscellanea patristica, historica et liturgica Eligo Dekkers O.S.B. xii lustra complenti oblata. Vol. 1. (Brugge, 1975) 163-80.

⁵⁰³ Hagith Sivan, "Who was Egeria? Piety and pilgrimage in the age of Gratian." Harvard Theological Review 81.1 (1988): 59-72. Arles is chosen on the basis that Galicia had only recently been converted to Christianity. Egeria, on the other hand, presents us with an image of a woman who has a detailed familiarity with Christianity. In addition, Egeria had at least seen the Rhone which she compares with the Euphrates (Itinerarium 18.2). On the other hand, that may have been all she had done, rather than actually living in its vicinity. Sivan points out that Valerius' description of Egeria coming from the coast of the western ocean is no more precise than the bishop of Edessa's comments (perhaps rather surprising if Egeria was a compatriot of Valerius). Arles as the domicile of Egeria, however, seems more speculative than the Galicia of the careful scholarship of Férotin et alia. See also, by the same author, "Holy Land pilgrimage and western audiences: Some reflections on Egeria and her circle." Classical Quarterly 38.2 (1988): 528-535.

⁵⁰⁴ Itinerarium 23.10.

Egeria epitomises a wandering woman with no permanent home.⁵⁰⁵ Through the careful selection of observations and the repression of personal details, the author recreates for the reader an empathetic pilgrimage whereby Egeria's community travels with her and takes the place of the companions about whom she says so little. Thus, there is a sense in which the Journal intends the author's homeland to be irrelevant. The aim of the pilgrimage is to take the reader away from the earthly home to the "holy land" where every place and every moment is enwrapped in "sacred history" pointing towards the ultimate eschatological homeland.⁵⁰⁶

Egeria's movements after Jerusalem

Jerusalem was the object of Egeria's pilgrimage. It was from Jerusalem that Egeria ascended the holy mountains of Sinai and Nebo, visited Alexandria, Galilee and Carneas, returning to Jerusalem at each stage, and there fully participating in the liturgy of the holy city. When she finally left the city in 384 it was with the expressed intent of returning to her homeland.⁵⁰⁷ Once again, though, Egeria was distracted, being moved under divine influence to continue her journey to Edessa. There she could visit the tomb of the apostle Thomas and see the original letter of Christ to King Abgar. The letter, she discovered, was far more impressive than the one with which she was familiar.⁵⁰⁸ From Edessa she returned to Constantinople. If she finally decided to return home from there, then once again she altered her plans and 'in the name of Christ our God' formed the intention to travel to Ephesus.⁵⁰⁹ We have no record of Egeria's experiences beyond this point. We know not whether Egeria was able to return home and

⁵⁰⁵ The sense of continuous movement from one holy place to the next is developed by Judy Lynn Skeen, "A comparative study of the wandering people of Hebrews and the pilgrimage of Egeria." PhD. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993.

⁵⁰⁶ If the impression of the stationary liturgy given by Egeria is one of sanctifying present time with the events of the sacred past then so too, Egeria's wanderings are designed in a similar fashion. Each new site is a holy station where any liturgy celebrated is carefully noted and the commentary provided by the available guide or the biblical source becomes almost a ritual in itself. Valerius testifies to the eschatological role of Egeria's pilgrimage, "...she will return, with the holy virgins, to the same regions where in this life she had travelled on foot as a pilgrim, at the coming of the Lord, her lamp alight with the oil of bright holiness, in the middle of the air..." (6).

⁵⁰⁷ *Itinerarium* 17.1, "...et ideo iam revertendi ad patriam animus esset."

⁵⁰⁸ *Itinerarium* 19.19. Seeing this letter was of greater significance to Egeria. She was particularly grateful to be given a copy since, although she was already familiar with the text, the copy she received in Edessa was longer. See further Paul Devos, "Egérie à Edesse. S. Thomas l'Apôtre. Le Roi Abgar" *Analecta Bollandiana* 85 (1967): 381-400.

⁵⁰⁹ *Itinerarium* 23.10.

describe the remainder of her journey to her readers personally⁵¹⁰ or whether she perished somewhere on route.⁵¹¹

The record of the liturgical year in Jerusalem

Thus it was from Constantinople that Egeria sent back to her audience the report of her travels. The Journal falls into two distinct parts, the travel narrative and the description of the Jerusalem liturgical year. From the received text of the Journal it is reasonable to suggest that at one time these two parts formed two distinct documents which were joined together in their present form, either by Egeria in Constantinople, or by its recipients. As we have observed the travelogue ends with a plea that her community should remember her whether she be alive or dead. The description of the Jerusalem liturgy begins, however, with,

That your Affection might know what offices take place each day in the holy places, I must tell you, knowing you will be pleased to learn about them.⁵¹²

Egeria assumes that the reader will understand that the holy places are those of Jerusalem and the immediate surroundings despite the fact that she has just been describing the city of Constantinople including the churches and tombs there.⁵¹³ Another factor which suggests that the liturgical record originally belonged somewhere other than at the end of the travelogue is that Egeria launches immediately into the early morning liturgy in the Anastasis without an explanation of what the Anastasis was. It seems curious that Egeria repeatedly interprets the name of the Martyrium basilica or the basilica on the Mount of Olives, and yet says nothing about the Anastasis until the end of the surviving part of the manuscript when she describes the feast of the Encaenia. Since Egeria spent three years in the city and, as we do not have a record of the places Egeria visited within the city itself, it is possible that Egeria provided a fuller description in an earlier part of the Journal, perhaps soon after her arrival there. However, this does not sufficiently explain why she feels required to define all the sites except for the one site of the Anastasis for which she retains the Greek name.

⁵¹⁰ *Itinerarium* 23.10, "Si autem et post hoc in corpore fuero, si qua preterea loca cognoscere potuero, aut ipsa presens...vestrae affectioni referam aut certe, si aliud animo sederit, scriptis nuntiabo."

⁵¹¹ Egeria was not afraid of dying on pilgrimage. She refers to the possibility of her being *in corpore* or *extra corpus* (an allusion to 2 Cor 12:3). In either case she requests that her readers hold her in their memory.

⁵¹² *Itinerarium* 24.1.

⁵¹³ *Itinerarium* 23.9.

Egeria, if she did spend three full years in Jerusalem, arrived for Easter 381. Her liturgical narrative moves from the daily liturgy to the liturgical year beginning with the feast of Epiphany. The only full liturgical year in which she resided in Jerusalem was 383 and it seems natural that Egeria would make the greatest effort to record the liturgical details for this year.⁵¹⁴ However, it is the liturgical narrative which possibly says more about Egeria's selection of material and writing style than does the travelogue. As far as the reader is concerned Egeria visited only once the sacred sites surrounding Jerusalem and beyond. Concerning the liturgy, however, we may assume that Egeria attended the Easter celebrations on each of the three years, and attended perhaps twice the other major festivals as well as numerous daily and Sunday offices. The liturgical narrative reflects only a single year and Egeria never mentions any differences from one year to another, nor does she recall any particular individuals who may have been present in Jerusalem or preached at the liturgy. Not even the name of the bishop is mentioned. Instead Egeria presents the reader with a calendar which deliberately avoids the particularities of her time in Jerusalem (including the Sanctoral). Any sense of history which the narrative contains, as with the travelogue, concerns sacred history, how the holy places relate to sacred events. Thus the reader catches her wonderment at the appropriateness of the scripture readings for both the feast of the day and for the station at which the liturgy is celebrated.⁵¹⁵

The description of the Encaenia

The feast of the Encaenia, with which we are most concerned, is the final feast of the surviving manuscript. Indeed, since a feast on December 25th was

⁵¹⁴ The work of Paul Devos appears to confirm that this was indeed so. In 383 the fortieth day after Easter fell upon May 18, the same day on which was celebrated the commemoration of the infants slain at Bethlehem. This, explains Devos, is why Egeria describes a vigil for this day held at Bethlehem. See Devos, "Égérie à Bethléem: le 40^e jour après pâques à Jérusalem, en 383." *Analecta Bollandiana* 86 (1968): 87-108. If the vigil at Bethlehem was an exception in 383 then we should assume that Egeria was either absent from Jerusalem on this day in 381 or that she did not feel it necessary to record the liturgy of that year. An attempt to resolve the mystery of the Bethlehem station had been attempted by E. Dekkers, "De datum der 'Peregrinatio Egeriae'" (1948). J.G. Davies wrote in reply to Dekkers arguing that Bethlehem need not be viewed as an unusual station for the fortieth day, (J. G. Davies, "Peregrinatio Egeriae and the Ascension." *Vigilae Christianae* 8 (1954): 94-100).

⁵¹⁵ For example, *Itinerarium* 47.5, "Illud autem hic ante omnia valde gratum fit et valde admirabile, ut semper tam ymni quam antiphonae et lectiones nec non etiam et orationes, quas dicet episcopus, tales pronuntiationes habeant, ut et diei, qui celebratur, et loco, in quo agitur, aptae et convenientes sint semper."

not introduced in Jerusalem until after 451,⁵¹⁶ it is likely that the feast of the Encaenia was the final major feast Egeria describes. The description of the feast which Egeria provides makes it apparent that the Encaenia was local to Jerusalem. Egeria gives no indication that she is already familiar with the feast. Despite its local nature, Egeria feels it necessary to include it in her narrative since this was a celebration of the buildings most closely associated with the daily office and the Jerusalem liturgical year. The date also constituted a major feast celebrated on par with the universal Christian feasts of Epiphany and Easter.

Egeria makes no attempt to translate the Greek word "encaenia" as she does with other words or phrases such as lychnicon ("nam nos dicimus lucernare")⁵¹⁷ or Kyrie eleison ("quod dicimus nos: miserere Domine").⁵¹⁸ Where an equivalent term exists with which she feels her readers may be familiar she will translate Greek words or phrases.⁵¹⁹ Regarding the Encaenia, there is no directly equivalent feast with which she can compare it.⁵²⁰ It is for this reason that Egeria has to give an expanded explanation of the feast whereas no such explanation is necessary for the other (familiar) liturgies which she describes.

The constituent parts of the Martyrium-Anastasis site

The definition of the Encaenia provides us with Egeria's fullest description of the Martyrium-Anastasis complex,

The days called the Encaenia are when the holy church, which is on Golgotha, which they call the Martyrium, was consecrated to God; but also the holy church, which is at the Anastasis, that is in the same place

⁵¹⁶ Bishop Juvenal introduced a feast of the nativity after the council of Chalcedon. However the people of Jerusalem objected and the feast was suppressed sometime after his death in 460. By the mid-sixth century December 25th was reserved for the feast of David and St James. See further A. Renoux, Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121 (1969), 173. Also Thomas J. Talley, The Origins of the Liturgical Year, 139.

⁵¹⁷ Itinerarium 24.4.

⁵¹⁸ Itinerarium 24.5.

⁵¹⁹ There are a number of studies of the use of Greek words in Egeria. Surprisingly, a discussion of encaenia does not appear in any of the major linguistic studies, including in A. Ernout's long list of Greek words, "Les mots grecs dans la Peregrinatio Aetheriae." Emerita 20 (1952): 289-307, Donald C. Swanson's "A formal analysis of Egeria's (Silvia's) vocabulary." Glotta 44 (1966-67): 177-254 or the more recent analysis by Veikko Väänänen in Le Journal-Épître d'Égérie (Itinerarium Egeriae): Étude linguistique. The term is treated at some length, however, by A. A. R. Bastiansen, Observations sur le vocabulaire liturgique dans l'itinéraire d'Égérie. (Utrecht, 1962) 119-25

⁵²⁰ Augustine, in his commentary on Jn 10:22, finds it necessary to explain the term encaenia to his readers, "The festival of the Encaenia was the dedication of the temple. From the Greek 'kainon' which is 'new'." (In Iohannis Evang. 48.2; CCL 36, 413).

where the Lord rose after the Passion, on the same day it also was consecrated to God.⁵²¹

Here, towards the end of the liturgical year, Egeria defines for the first time the place of the Anastasis. In this description we note that there are two distinct sites, Golgotha and Anastasis. At both are churches, the Martyrium on Golgotha, and an unnamed church at the Anastasis.⁵²² Egeria herself appears to acknowledge this fact elsewhere in the liturgical narrative. On more than one occasion she describes the Martyrium basilica "quam fecit Constantinus" but allots no such description to the Anastasis.⁵²³ In addition, she finds it necessary to mark the site of the Martyrium basilica in relation to Golgotha, five times observing that the liturgy is celebrated "in ecclesia maiore, quae est in Golgotha post crucem"⁵²⁴ and yet is satisfied merely to state, where appropriate, that the people assembled "ad Anastasem". The preciseness of "in Golgotha", "ad Martyrium", "post Crucem" and "ad Anastasem" illustrates the complexity of the site and the relationship of the different elements to each other.

The Anastasis is both an ecclesia and a sacred place in its own right, thus "ad Anastasem" will refer to both without confusion. If "ad Martyrium" is to be understood in a similar fashion, then the Martyrium, like the Anastasis, is also a sacred site which happens to have the "ecclesia maior" built there. The

⁵²¹ *Itinerarium* 48.1, "item dies enceniarum appellantur quando sancta ecclesia, quae in Golgotha est, quam Martyrium vocant, consecrata est Deo; sed et sancta ecclesia, quae est ad Anastase, id est in eo loco ubi Dominus resurrexit post passionem, ea die et ipsa consecrata est Deo."

⁵²² The rotunda was probably not completed until after the death of Constantine (Cotiasnon, *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre*, 15, followed by: Gibson and Taylor, *Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre*, 77; not Corbo, however, who believes the entire structure was in place by Constantine's death).

⁵²³ See *Itinerarium* 25.1, "...in ecclesia maiore, quam fecit Constantinus, quae ecclesia in Golgotha est post crucem..."; *Itinerarium* 25.6, "...in ecclesia maiore procedatur, id est quae in Golgotha est, id est post Crucem, quam fecit Constantinus..."; and *Itinerarium* 25.9, "Nam quid dicam de ornatu fabricae ipsius, quam Constantinus sub presentia matris suae...tam ecclesiam maiorem quam Anastasium vel ad Crucem vel cetera loca sacra in Ierusalima?". Admittedly the latter is rather ambiguous. Is Egeria describing the Anastasis and other buildings as adorned by Constantine and Helena or should it be read that the other buildings were adorned in the same fashion as the one built by Constantine? Whereas Pierre Maraval translates this section as "Et que dire de la splendeur des édifices eux-mêmes, que Constantin, qui était représenté par sa mère...tant l'église majeure que l'Anastasis, la Croix et les autres..." (SC 296, 253), John Wilkinson prefers, "They are beyond description, and so is the magnificent building itself. It was built by Constantine, and under the supervision of his mother it was decorated... and this not only at the Great Church but also at the Anastasis and the Cross, and the other Jerusalem holy places..." (Wilkinson, *Egeria's Travels*, 127).

⁵²⁴ *Itinerarium* 25.1, 25.6, 27.3, 30.1, 48.1. On the other occasions she mentions the basilica it is invariably, "in ecclesia maiore, id est ad Martyrium" (30.3, 32.1 c.f. 30.2) or "in ecclesia maiore, quae est in Golgotha" (25.8, 25.10) but never simply "ad Martyrium" or "in ecclesia maiore".

Martyrium is "in Golgotha" but situated "post Crucem". The Martyrium, therefore, is not to be identified solely with the rock of Golgotha but is one part, of which the Crux is another. The latter is understood to refer to the spot at which Christ was crucified. How this place was marked was the subject of debate, whether by an actual cross⁵²⁵ or a separate chapel.⁵²⁶ Egeria's description of the veneration of the Cross on Holy Friday would seem to suggest a chapel with two sets of doors and an altar.⁵²⁷ If we assume that the pattern of movement described for the veneration of the Cross was similar to the other processions Egeria describes moving from ante Crucem to post Crucem, then we can visualise a procession which begins ante crucem, that is, in the courtyard separating the Anastasis from the Martyrium, and enters the basilica, passing the apse, and exits through another door, re-emerging in the courtyard but this time beside the visible rock of Golgotha, and so post crucem.⁵²⁸ Although this picture fits the description of the procession of the congregation entering through one door and exiting through another during the veneration of the Cross, it does not explain Egeria's assertion that the Holy Thursday offering took place post crucem. We should remember that Egeria describes the basilica itself as being post crucem, but also writes that the Holy Thursday offering was the only occasion at which the offering took place post crucem.

It is in attempting to reconcile these two references that the separate chapel referred to as the "Post Crucem" was proposed. However, since the Eucharist was celebrated in this area only once, could it not be also possible that on Holy Thursday a portable altar was erected? We recall that for the veneration of the Cross on the following day the bishop's chair is moved to post crucem, and a table set up on which to place the relics of the Cross. It is also possible that Egeria herself has confused the terminology. The most convenient site of the

⁵²⁵ See Itinerarium 37.1, "Et sic ponitur cathedra episcopo in Golgotha post Crucem, qua stat nunc." John Wilkinson revised his earlier opinion of uncertainty concerning an actual cross to one of certainty in the 1981 edition of Egeria's Travels, 313.

⁵²⁶ Pierre Maraval, following Wilkinson (1971) and Couâsnon, writes, "Au sud du Golgotha, une petite chapelle dite «derrière la Croix» était utilisée pour certaines cérémonies, entre autres pour l'adoration de la vraie croix et la vénération d'autres reliques conservées dans le Martyrium" (Égérie, 64).

⁵²⁷ Itinerarium 37.3, "...usque ad horam sextam omnis populis transit, per unum ostium intrans, per alterum perexiens, quoniam hoc in eo loco fit, in quo pridie, id est quinta feria, oblatio facta est." Couâsnon based his conclusion that there was a separate chapel between the Rock and the basilica on the evidence of Egeria (The Church of the Holy Sepulchre, 50-53).

⁵²⁸ This movement is described in greater detail by Francesco Tolotti. "Il S. Sepolcro di Gerusalemme e le coeve basiliche di Roma." Mitteilungen des Deutsche Archäologische Institut in Rom 93 (1986): 478-82. See also Pasquale Testini, "Egeria e il S. Sepulcro di Gerusalemme." Atti del convegno Internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae. (Arezzo, 1987). 215-30, esp. 223-227.

"Post Crucem" in this case would be the courtyard between the Anastasis and the basilica, i.e. ante Crucem, which is where it is designated in the Armenian Jerusalem lectionary.⁵²⁹ Egeria's terminology, then, may well reflect more the movement between stations rather than the actual stations. Her repeated descriptions of stations and of the basilica itself in relation to the Cross signifies the central place of the Golgotha rock.

The Encaenia and the feast of the Cross

The feast of the Encaenia not only marked the anniversary of the complex architecture of the sites of the death and resurrection of Christ, it was also a feast of the Cross itself,

The encaenia, therefore, of these holy churches is celebrated with great solemnity, since on this day the cross of the Lord was found. And for that reason on account of this it was established, that when the holy churches written about above were consecrated, that was when the cross of the Lord was found, so with joy they were celebrated together on the same day.⁵³⁰

The feast is given greater significance than its merely local character by the discovery of the cross of Christ, the universal symbol of redemption. The coincidence of the two feasts is, says Egeria, due to the coincidence of the anniversary of the finding of the cross and the inauguration of the basilica. As we argued in chapter three, it is likely that the relic believed to be that of the Cross was discovered in the reign of Constantine and Helena. Since the Martyrium basilica was built to house the relic, the inauguration of the basilica on 13 September 335 would have also marked the installation of the relic in the new basilica.⁵³¹ When, in the seventh century, the feast of the finding of the Cross

⁵²⁹ On Holy Thursday the eucharist is first offered in the Martyrium and then "before the Cross" or "before Holy Golgotha" (39). On Good Friday "the precious wood of the cross is placed before Holy Golgotha" (43) (A. Renoux, *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121* (1971)). This is also the opinion of Gibson and Taylor, *Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre*, 78-79.

⁵³⁰ *Itinerarium* 48.1; SC 296,316

⁵³¹ See Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 31.6 where he writes that the Martyrium basilica was founded on the place of the passion and contains the Cross contained in a *sacrarium*. (CSEL 29,273. Cited Maraval, *Égérie*, 66). If Egeria is correct in stating that the date of the inauguration coincided with the day for the finding of the cross rather than only the installation of the relic, then this suggests that between 325 and 335 there may have existed a separate feast of the finding of the cross. The dedication of the Church of St Stephen on 15 May 439 also marked the installation of his relics there (Paul Devos. "L'année de la dédicace de Saint-Étienne à Jérusalem: 439." *Analecta Bollandiana* 105 (1987): 265-278). The relics, however, had been discovered in 415 and their transferral to the diaconicon on Mount Sion on 26 December of that year renewed (or even initiated) the feast of the Proto-martyr (Renoux, *Le codex Arménien Jérusalem 121* (1969), 177).

was transformed into the Exaltation of the cross, it was a transformation which marked not the date on which Heraclius recovered (or "re-found") the cross from the Persians, but referred to the day on which the cross was triumphantly restored to the city of Jerusalem. The discovery of the Cross is intimately connected with the discovery of the rock of Golgotha and the cave of the Resurrection. All three form distinct liturgical stations and yet, once the relic of the cross was discovered, each would be incomplete without the others. The relic of the cross gave meaning to the rock of Golgotha, but the latter was of little value without the Anastasis. The continual movement described by Egeria between Martyrium, Cross and Anastasis ensures that the three sites are perceived as a unity. Thus, a feast of the Martyrium basilica is also a feast of the Cross and the Anastasis.

The Encaenia and the temple of Solomon

Throughout her Journal Egeria makes frequent reference to the biblical authority of the places she visits. The same holds true for her description of the liturgies in Jerusalem, often drawing attention to the appropriateness of a reading for the place or the feast she describes. Egeria's means of providing her readers with an explanation of the Encaenia is to note the celebration of a biblical feast of the same name,

And this is found in the Holy Scriptures, that it is also the day of the encaenia when holy Solomon, having completed the house of God, which he had built, stood before the altar of God and prayed, as it is written in the books of Paralipomenon.⁵³²

The transliteration of the Greek 'encaenia' was certainly found in the Vetus Latina version of Jn 10:22.⁵³³ Since evidence is lacking for the appearance of "encaenia" in the Vetus Latina version of 2 Chron 7 from where Egeria took her comparison of Solomon and Constantine, it seems fair to assume that Egeria was

⁵³² Itinerarium 48,2, "Et hoc per Scripturas sanctas invenitur, quod ea dies sit enceniarum, qua et sanctus Solomon consummata domo Dei, quam edificaverat, steterit ante altarium et oraverit, sicut scriptum est in libris Paralipomenon."

⁵³³ See Bastiansen, Observations, 120. Hence Augustine's need to provide a translation of the term in his commentary on Jn 10:22.

aware of the usage of the term in the Septuagint.⁵³⁴ At first one might have thought that Egeria would have preferred the Johannine text, over that of Chronicles. Jn 10:22 seems perfect for the occasion, "facta sunt autem encenia in Hierosolymis et hiemps erat et ambulabat Iesus in templo in portico Salomonis". However, although Jn 10:22 describes Jesus attending the Jewish feast of the Encaenia and walking in the general area of Solomon's temple, the Gospel also notes that the time of year was winter. 2 Chron. 7:8, however, describes the inauguration of Solomon's temple as coinciding with the feast of Tabernacles, one of the great Jewish autumnal feasts. Therefore, for Egeria at least, the celebration of the feast of the Encaenia on the week beginning 13 September had more in common with the Old Testament feast of the encaenia celebrated in the week beginning 15 Tishri than the encaenia feast in John's gospel identified with Hanukkah and celebrated in the winter month of Chislew.

The octave of the Encaenia

The second part of Egeria's description of the feast emphasises its importance. First, the feast is celebrated for eight days.⁵³⁵ The only other liturgies which Egeria describes as having octaves are Epiphany and Easter week.⁵³⁶ Both are Christocentric feasts. The first celebrates the incarnation and manifestation of the son of God. The second commemorates the central acts of the death and resurrection of Christ. The eighth day marked not only the last day of the feast, and the first day of a new week but, in a liturgical context, the first day of the new creation. The keeping of an octave was thus confined to feasts

⁵³⁴ The Septuagint reads, "...ἐγκαινισμὸν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου" (2 Chron. 7:9). The phrase "consummata domo Dei" does not appear in the Vulgate. Bastiensen argues that the phrase translates the Greek "τελειοῦν" (e.g. Ex 23:9) in the *Vetus Latina*. Jerome preferred "initiare" or "consecrare", though in 2 Maccabees which was not translated by Jerome we read "Salomon obtulit sacrificium dedicationis et consummationis templi" (2 Macc 2:9). It was from her *Vetus Latina* reading of 2 Chronicles that Egeria used 'consummata'. In addition, Egeria's description of Solomon "steterit ante altarium Dei et oraverit" is an allusion to 2 Chr. 6:12, "stetit ergo Salomon coram altari Dominus" (Vulgate and *Vetus*). Solomon's prayer follows (Bastiensen, *Observations*, 121-122). For a study of the scriptural allusions in the *Itinerarium* and the biblical editions familiar to Egeria see also J. Ziegler. "Die Peregrinatio Aetheriae und die hl. Schrift." *Biblica* 12 (1931): 162-98.

⁵³⁵ *Itinerarium* 49.1, "Hi ergo dies enceniarum cum venerint, octo diebus attenduntur." The verb "attendere" is used by Egeria as equivalent to "celebrare", appearing also in her description of the feast of St Helpidius (20.5), and the eight week Lent (27.1). See further Bastiensen, *Observations*, 63.

⁵³⁶ *Itinerarium* 25.11, "Ac sic ergo per octo dies haec omnis laetitia et is hornatus celebratur in omnibus locis sanctis, quos superius nominavi" (Epiphany); *Itinerarium* 39.1, "Octo autem illi dies paschales sic attenduntur quemadmodum et ad nos, et ordine suo fiunt missae per octo dies paschales, sicut et ubique fit per pascha usque ad octavas."

where creation and redemption were intimately connected.⁵³⁷ The Encaenia therefore was celebrated for eight days since to celebrate the places of death and resurrection, was to essentially remember the acts of death and resurrection. Place and deed cannot, in this case, be separated and so the feast of the Encaenia is but another Easter and another epiphany. This theological interpretation is alluded to by Egeria herself,

During the days of the Encaenia, the splendour of all the churches is the same as at Easter or at Epiphany, and so each day progresses at the diverse holy places, as at Easter or at Epiphany.⁵³⁸

The 'splendour' of the churches at Epiphany is described with wonder by Egeria in chapter 25 of the Journal,

And on this day the splendour of the church [Martyrium], or of the Anastasis, or of the Cross, or the one in Bethlehem, it would be superfluous to describe. When except for gold and gems or silk you can see nothing else; for if you see the awnings, they are of silk with gold stripes; if you see the curtains, they too are silk with gold stripes. All kinds of cultic objects used that day are of gold and gems. The number or weight of the candles, tapers or lamps, or the diverse items, surely it is impossible to estimate or to write about them?⁵³⁹

And, on describing the churches during the Easter octave, Egeria writes,

The splendour and order are for the eight days of Easter as they are for Epiphany, so in the Great Church as well as the Anastasis and the Cross or at Eleona, but also in Bethlehem, even in the Lazarium and everywhere...⁵⁴⁰

Common to all three feasts is the Martyrium, the Cross, and the Anastasis. The decorations are not particular to just these sites. Bethlehem, the station for the vigil at epiphany, receives a special mention. However, in her description of epiphany, Egeria continues to specify the station for each of the eight days,

⁵³⁷ The importance of the eight day feast is analysed by Alexander Schmemmann, Introduction to Liturgical Theology. (New York, 1975) 60-63. For its usage by Egeria see Bastiensen, Observations, 142-43 where he cites Augustine, Sermon 259 on the Sunday after Easter.

⁵³⁸ Itinerarium 49.3, "His ergo diebus enceniarum ipse ornatus omnium ecclesiarum est, qui et per pascha vel per epiphania, et ita per singulos dies diversis locis sanctis proceditur ut per pascha vel epiphania."

⁵³⁹ Itinerarium 25.8, "Ubi extra aurum et gemmas aut sirico nichil aliud vides; nam et si vela vides, auroclava oleserica sunt, si cortinas vides similiter auroclave olesericae sunt. Ministerium autem omne genus aureum gemmatum profertur illa die. Numerus autem vel ponderatio de ceriofalibus vel cicindelibus aut lucernis vel diverso ministerio nunquid vel extimari aut scribi potest?"

⁵⁴⁰ Itinerarium 39.1, "Hic autem ipse ornatus est et ipsa compositio et per octo dies paschae, quae et per epiphania, tam in ecclesia maiore quam ad Anastase aut ad Crucem vel in Eleona, sed et Bethlehem nec non etiam in Lazariu vel ubique, quia dies paschales sunt."

including Eleona, the Lazarium, and Sion. At Eleona, "everything is decorated [ornantur] and celebrated the same there."⁵⁴¹ Thus, at Epiphany as well as at Easter, it is reasonable to conclude that every station associated with the feast was made more ornate than was usual. We can expect the same to have been the case at the feast of the Encaenia.

The stations of the Encaenia

It is unfortunate that the manuscript of the Journal breaks at the end of Egeria's description of the third day of the Encaenia. No doubt, as she did for Epiphany and Easter, Egeria noted the stations for each day and any ritual particular to the feast. In the following chapters we will attempt a reconstruction of the Encaenia in the fourth century; for the present it is sufficient to note the stations which Egeria records for the first three days. The stations for the Encaenia follow a similar pattern to both Epiphany and Easter. The first two days of Encaenia are kept in the Martyrium basilica. For epiphany it is the first three days, with a procession from the Martyrium to the Anastasis mentioned on the first day of Epiphany. The first three days of Easter also begin in the Martyrium and on each day, there is the procession to the Anastasis. Although this latter element is not specified by Egeria for the Encaenia it appears to be inherent to major feasts and can be seen as a parallel to the normal Sunday liturgy. A procession to the Anastasis on the first days of the Encaenia would re-enforce the feast as a celebration of the Anastasis as well as the Constantinian basilica. However, as we have noted above, the designation of one station on the Golgotha site could hardly be viewed as the exclusion of the other two.

The next station specified for Epiphany and Easter is at Eleona. The third day of the Encaenia is also celebrated at this place. Egeria's description of the station at Eleona resembles the precise way in which she describes the Martyrium. It is rarely simply "in Eleona" but often "in Eleona, id est in ecclesia quae est in Monte Oliveti"⁵⁴² or "in Eleona...in qua est spelunca, in qua docebat Iesus discipulos".⁵⁴³ Two reasons may be put forward for the frequent extended definition of the Eleona. First, as with her interpretation of the Martyrium basilica, Egeria is anxious to translate or explain words which may be foreign to her readers. Secondly, the Mount of Olives, like the Golgotha site, was a place of

⁵⁴¹ *Itinerarium* 25.11.

⁵⁴² *Itinerarium* 25.11. See also 31.1, 43.5.

⁵⁴³ *Itinerarium* 39.3. See also 30.3, 35.2, 43.6.

more than one station of which the Eleona (like the Martyrium) was the most significant. Egeria's extended definition of the Eleona is frequently found in a context where the station known as the Imbomon is mentioned. The latter, as Egeria also explains, was the locus from which Christ ascended into heaven. This station is never referred to as a church but rather as the summit of the Mount of Olives.⁵⁴⁴ At the foot of the Mount of Olives lay the garden of Gethsemane in which she writes there was an ecclesia elegans.⁵⁴⁵ Leaving aside the latter station which appears only in the Holy Thursday liturgy, the liturgical movement on the Mount of Olives can be paralleled to that on Golgotha. That is, just as it would be impossible to visit the Anastasis without moving through the Martyrium, so too, a visit to the summit of the Mount of Olives, invariably included the Eleona on route.⁵⁴⁶ For the third day of the Encaenia, the station is the Eleona alone and her description in this context surpasses all other descriptions of the station in the rest of the Journal;

The third day is in Eleona, that is in the church, which is on the mount itself, from which the Lord ascended into heaven after the Passion, the church in which there is a cave, in which the Lord taught the disciples on the Mount of Olives.⁵⁴⁷

The repeated use of the relative clause in this passage presents the reader with a sense of movement to the central place. The reader is taken from the mountain which has both the Eleona and the Imbomon, to the church, and within the church, to the cave. A similar pattern of movement can be discerned in Egeria's description of the liturgies at the Anastasis and at Bethlehem.⁵⁴⁸ Eusebius focused on these three Constantinian stations as a Christocentric triad of caves. If

⁵⁴⁴ See Itinerarium 31.1, 35.4, 39.3, 43.5. For the arguments that there was no church at the place of the Ascension in the time of Egeria see, Paul Devos, "Égérie n'a pas connu d'Église de l'Ascension." Analecta Bollandiana 87 (1969): 208-212 (also J.G. Davies, "Peregrinatio Egeriae and the Ascension").

⁵⁴⁵ Itinerarium 36.1. This was a relatively small church. See the short discussion in J. F. Baldovin. The Urban Character of Christian Worship (Rome, 1987) 52-53

⁵⁴⁶ For example on Palm Sunday at the seventh hour the people assemble at Eleona, and at the ninth hour ascend to the Imbomon (Itinerarium 31.1), or during the Easter Octave, the bishop, clergy and newly-baptised go to the Eleona before continuing to the summit (Itinerarium 39.1). See also 35.3-4, and 43.5.

⁵⁴⁷ Itinerarium 49.3, "Item tertia die in Eleona, id est in ecclesia, quae est in ipso monte, a quo ascendit Dominus post passionem, intra qua ecclesia est spelunca illa, in qua docebat Dominus apostolos in monte Oliveti."

⁵⁴⁸ Egeria describes the Sunday liturgy as moving from the Martyrium to the Anastasis, once inside, "the bishop enters and at once goes inside the screen of the tomb, into the cave" (Itinerarium 25.3, "intrat episcopus et statim ingreditur intra cancellos martyrii speluncae"). Egeria perhaps alludes here to the Gospel account of the first entry into the empty tomb by the apostles, see Jn 20:3f. Egeria's description of the station at Bethlehem has a similar structure to her description of the Eleona, "Fiunt autem vigiliae in ecclesia in Bethlehem, in qua ecclesia spelunca est ubi natus est Dominus."

the extended definition of the Eleona can be paralleled with that of the Anastasis, then perhaps it is because the Encaenia not only celebrated the anniversary of the Martyrium-Anastasis complex but also the Eleona basilica, constructed in the same period of Constantine's reign. The celebration of the station itself (rather than merely a liturgy at the station) provides Egeria with a logical point at which to provide a more detailed description of each site, despite the fact that the Encaenia was probably the last major feast Egeria described in her Journal.

Holy Thursday was the only occasion on which an offering took place behind the Cross (post Crucem). The place of the Cross is also one of the stations which Egeria describes as decorated at Epiphany and Easter. Is it possible that Egeria may have described the Cross as a station at the Encaenia? Certainly it would be unusual if this station did not feature at all in the liturgy. The eighth day of Epiphany was kept, writes Egeria, ad Crucem.⁵⁴⁹ This station is designated also for the weekday evening service (Lucernare) where the catechumens are blessed. From the Cross the congregation process to post Crucem where Egeria writes, "the same is done as before the Cross."⁵⁵⁰ Thus, ad Crucem, is to be identified with ante Crucem. This area, as we have already observed, formed part of the atrium separating the Martyrium from the Anastasis. If the area known as the Cross was specified as a station in Egeria's description of the Encaenia, then the feast may well have climaxed in the veneration or display of the relic of the Cross, similar to the liturgy of Good Friday. If there was no such association then the feast was more concerned with the Constantinian buildings than with the finding of the Cross, a hypothesis which does not compare well with Egeria's opening statements.

The Encaenia as a pilgrim festival

When Egeria describes the Easter celebrations in Jerusalem she mentions only in passing the large numbers of people who came to the city especially for the feast.⁵⁵¹ Crowds do not feature in any great detail throughout Egeria's narrative⁵⁵² and when they do, there is no indication from where they may have

⁵⁴⁹ Itinerarium 25.11.

⁵⁵⁰ Itinerarium 24.7, "Et postmodum de Anastasim usque ad Crucem <cum> ymnis ducitur episcopus...Et post hoc denuo tam episcopus quam omnis turba vadent denuo post Crucem et ibi denuo similiter fit sicuti et ante Crucem."

⁵⁵¹ For example Itinerarium 36.2, 37.4.

⁵⁵² This is in contrast to the anti-pilgrimage writings of Gregory of Nyssa and Jerome who ensure that the reader is left in doubt about the heaving throngs of less than religious crowds in Jerusalem (Greg. Nyssa, Ep. 2; SC 363, 106-122 and Jerome, Ep. 46.12; NPNF 6, 64).

originated.⁵⁵³ In her description of the feast of the Encaenia, however, Egeria devotes a large proportion of the introduction to its significance for people outside Jerusalem;

For many days before, the crowds begin to assemble, not only monks or apotactites from the diverse provinces, that is from Mesopotamia or Syria or from Egypt or Thebaid, where many monks are, but also from every different place or province; Not one of them does not try to be in Jerusalem that day for these joyful and so solemn days; Laity, both men and women, of the same spirit of faith, gather together at Jerusalem on these days having come from every province for the holy day. Bishops too, although few in number, are in Jerusalem for these days, more than forty or fifty; and with them come many clergy. And what more? He considers himself to have incurred a great sin, the one who on these days was not at such a solemnity, unless there should be some contrary necessity preventing the man from a good intention.⁵⁵⁴

If Egeria describes any feast in her Journal as a pilgrims' feast then it is the feast of the Encaenia. From as far as Thebaid, beyond the Nile, came pilgrims lay and monastic. Easter and Epiphany were solemn feasts but they were not especially pilgrim feasts. That is to say, Easter and Epiphany were universal feasts celebrated throughout the Church. The Easter vigil, despite being in Jerusalem, was, writes Egeria, celebrated in a similar fashion to that practised by her community in the West.⁵⁵⁵ The Encaenia, however, was not a universal feast but particular to Jerusalem. Whereas it was more than enough to celebrate the theological content and historical events of Easter and Epiphany without being obliged to be at the actual historical sites,⁵⁵⁶ this was evidently not the case with a feast which was designed primarily to celebrate the historical place rather than

⁵⁵³ Perhaps an exception is Egeria's description of the monks of Mesopotamia who travel into Charra for the feast of Helpidius (*Itinerarium* 20.5).

⁵⁵⁴ *Itinerarium* 49.1.

⁵⁵⁵ *Itinerarium* 38.1, "Vigiliae autem paschales sic fiunt, quemadmodum ad nos..."

⁵⁵⁶ A point once again alluded to by both Gregory of Nyssa and Jerome, "For us in effect", writes Gregory, "that Christ appeared on earth as true God, we confessed before we arrived at the places [of Jerusalem], and our faith after that was never diminished nor added to" (*Ep.* 2.15; SC 363,120). Jerome to Paulinus writes, "Access to the courts of heaven is as easy from Britain as it is from Jerusalem; for 'the kingdom of God is within you'" (*Ep.* 58.3; NPNF 6,120). However contrast Jerome's sentiments here with his famous epistle to Marcella, "In speaking thus we do not mean to deny that the kingdom of God is within us, or to say there are no holy men elsewhere; we merely assert in the strongest manner that those who stand first throughout the world are here gathered side by side...yet we have come hither to see the first of all nations...Will the day never come when we shall together enter the Saviour's cave, and together weep in the sepulchre of the Lord with his sister and his mother?...We shall see Lazarus come forth...venerate the ashes of John the Baptist...And when, accompanied by Christ, we shall have made our way back to our cave...and those other places where churches are set up like standards to commemorate the Lord's victories, then we shall sing heartily...Wounded with the Saviour's shaft, we shall say one to another: "I have found him whom my soul loveth; I will hold him and not let him go" (*Ep.* 46.10,13; NPNF 6,64-65)

the theological event. Thus, above all others, the feast of the Encaenia is described by Egeria as a feast of pilgrimage. Jerusalem becomes the focal point for a large number of pilgrims from far outside the province, not only monks (whom we might expect) but also laity. But, more significantly, bishops also made the journey up to the holy city. Egeria considers forty or fifty bishops to be few in number. But, on the assumption that the bishop would be expected to celebrate the universal feasts in his own diocese, we think that forty or fifty bishops in Jerusalem to be the largest number of bishops the city would see for any single liturgical event.⁵⁵⁷ The exception is the one liturgy from which the feast of the Encaenia derived its origin, the rite of the encaenia. It is no coincidence that the description Egeria provides of the feast of the Encaenia carries a striking similarity to the descriptions we have examined of the rite of the encaenia. The same elements are present; the magnitude of the feast, the splendid decorations (the original imperial offerings) and the presence of bishops from the surrounding areas. In addition, there is evidence to suggest that visiting bishops could be invited to preach at some point within the octave. Epiphanius, for example, may have preached against the theology of Origen at the feast in 393.⁵⁵⁸ These are all the elements we found at the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica on 13 September 335.

Conclusion

The pilgrimage feast of the Encaenia celebrated the anniversary of the inauguration of the Martyrium-Anastasis site with a quasi re-enactment of the rite of the encaenia. The focus of the feast was the Constantinian buildings. The fact that the buildings enclosed the central places of Christian salvation ensured that

⁵⁵⁷ Forty or fifty bishops were more than twice as many present at some councils (see Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius*, 171-72).

⁵⁵⁸ Pierre Nautin, on the presupposition that bishops kept universal feasts in their own dioceses, concludes that when Jerome recounts Epiphanius (bishop of Salamis) preaching against Origen in the Anastasis (393), it was at the feast of the Encaenia, rather than at Easter as had previously been supposed. At Easter 393 Epiphanius was on Salamis, so too at Epiphany. The only other octave was the Encaenia where, as we have noted, bishops were free to attend (Pierre Nautin, "Études de Chronologie hiéronymienne (393-97)." *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 18 (1972): 209-18; Jerome, *Contra Ioh.* (PL 23.371-412)). The only remark Jerome makes about the liturgical content is when he recalls the popularity of Epiphanius with the people, "Nonne cum de Anastasi pergeretis ad Crucem, et ad eum omnis aetatis et sexus turba confluerat, offerens parvulos..." (PL 23.380B). According to Egeria the procession from the Anastasis to the Cross occurred each day after the evening service of Lucernare, "And afterwards the bishop is led from the Anastasis to the Cross with hymns, and all the people go with him. Arriving there, he says one prayer, then he blesses the catechumens; then he says another prayer, then he blesses the faithful" (*Itinerarium* 24.7). The offering of the little ones to Epiphanius probably occurred when the bishop blessed the people.

the feast could not be celebrated without reference to Epiphany or Easter. The significance of the feast parallels the structure of the Golgotha complex. At the centre stands the Cross of Christ, to one side the Martyrium basilica (the new temple), and to the other the Anastasis. At the centre of the Encaenia is the Cross. On one side of the Cross is the inauguration of the Anastasis (and the feast of Easter); on the other side is the inauguration of the Martyrium, recalling the inauguration of the Jewish temple. Egeria chose to apply the interpretation of the Encaenia found in Chronicles rather than in the Gospel of John, because the content of the feast mirrored Solomon's inauguration of the temple, foreshadowing, in this instance, Constantine's inauguration of the centre of the Christian world. Between both inaugurations and between both the Martyrium and the Anastasis stood the rock of Golgotha and the Cross of Christ.

The Feast of the Encaenia in the Church History of Sozomen

The historian Sozomen is our only other source for a direct description of the feast of the Encaenia subsequent to the rite in 335. The reason that Sozomen, rather than either Socrates before him or Theodoret after him, makes a special mention of the feast is because it is very likely that he himself had been present at the feast. Salaminus Hermias Sozomenus was born sometime after 380 and raised in the village of Bethelia in Gaza.⁵⁵⁹ Amongst the numerous digressions in Sozomen's history a number of them relate to monks and monasteries in Palestine. It is possible that Sozomen spent some time in his early years with a monastic community.⁵⁶⁰ Certainly towards the end of the fourth century there were a considerable number of monastic schools in Palestine (and the surrounding provinces). Amongst these was the Gaza school of rhetoric to which both Procopius of Gaza and Procopius of Caesarea attended.⁵⁶¹ Admittedly, we know very little concerning the life of Sozomen until his arrival in Constantinople in 443. Prior to this date we can establish that Sozomen was willing to travel in order to collect the reports for his forthcoming history. This included visits to Jerusalem,⁵⁶² Bithynia,⁵⁶³ and probably Cilicia.⁵⁶⁴

⁵⁵⁹ See Sozomen, *H.E.* 5.15, 6.32.

⁵⁶⁰ *H.E.* 1.1.18 "...nor is it misplaced in an ecclesiastical history, to recount also in this work, those who have been the fathers and originators of those called monks, and their successors, they are highly renowned, known to us from observation or good report".

⁵⁶¹ *SC* 306, 18.

⁵⁶² *H.E.* 2.20.

⁵⁶³ *H.E.* 9.5, "Of these [the tribe called the Sciri] a number was left unsold; and they were ordered to settle in different places. I have seen many in Bithynia, near Mount Olympus, living apart from one another, and cultivating the hills and valleys of that region".

The Church History of Sozomen

Sozomen compiled his History whilst in Constantinople. The work was originally intended to cover the years from the ascension of Christ to the reign of Constantine. However, it did not take Sozomen long to discover that suitable histories of this period already existed.⁵⁶⁵ Thus Sozomen's history begins in the reign of Constantine and ends, at book nine, with the reign of Theodosius II (401-50). It is generally agreed though, that the History as it survives today is incomplete. Sozomen announces his intention to devote the final book to the reign of Theodosius. In effect book nine is largely devoted to a lengthy eulogy on Pulcheria and the western part of Theodosius' empire. Not until chapter 16 does Sozomen return to the Eastern empire, having announced his intention to describe the discovery of the relics of Zachariah and Stephen the deacon. There is no account of the latter and the work abruptly ends. Its unfinished state was unlikely to have been because part of the original manuscript was lost, nor because the History was subjected to imperial censorship, but simply because at this point Sozomen fell ill and died, never having fulfilled his original intentions.⁵⁶⁶ If this was the case and Sozomen died in 448, then the dedication to Theodosius at the beginning of the work must have been written at an earlier stage. It is this dedication, in fact, that has provided commentators with the evidence for dating the time at which he commenced work on the History. In the dedication Sozomen refers to Theodosius' visitation to the city of Heraclea in Pontus via Bithynia. In 443 it is recorded that Theodosius "prēhn" undertook a trip to Heraclea in Bithynia and so it has been generally supposed that the dedication can be dated towards the end of 443 or the beginning of 444.⁵⁶⁷ However, Charlotte Roueché has recently rejected this in favour of a less precise dating.⁵⁶⁸ She observes that there is indeed a reference to Theodosius visiting Heraclea on 22nd May 443 in a novel ordering the return of civic lands in the possession of private individuals. The novel, however, was not issued in

⁵⁶⁴ Concerning the finding of the Apocalypse of Paul, "I have been informed that this report is false by Cilix, a presbyter of the church in Tarsus, a man of very advanced age as is indicated by his grey hairs, who says that no such occurrence is known among them, and wonders if the heretics did not invent the story" (H.E. 7.19).

⁵⁶⁵ See H.E. 1.12, "I had intended to write this history from the beginning. But having reflected that others had written on their own epoch - Clement and Hegesippus...Africanus, Eusebius...I intend to speak about what happened subsequently".

⁵⁶⁶ See the discussion regarding the end of Sozomen's history in the introduction by Bernard Grillet and Guy Sabbah, SC 306, 29-30.

⁵⁶⁷ So SC 306, 27.

⁵⁶⁸ Charlotte Roueché, "Theodosius II, the cities, and the date of the 'Church History' of Sozomen." Harvard Theological Review 81 (1988): 130-31.

Heraclea itself but from Aphodisius. The Heraclea to which the *novel* refers is not the same Heraclea mentioned in the dedication of Sozomen but rather Heraclea Salbake. Thus, unless Sozomen himself confused the two Heraclea, we are no clearer about the date of Theodosius' visit to Heraclea Pontus. Roueché thus leaves us with the rather vague dating of the history to somewhere between 439 (where the history ends) and 450 (the death of Theodosius). However, for our purposes a precise date is not required since we can conclude that Sozomen wrote his History in the same period in which the Armenian-Jerusalem lectionary was compiled. The significance of this fact will be developed in the next chapter.

Sozomen's description of the feast of the Encaenia

Book two of the History commences with the discovery of the relic of the Cross by Helena Augusta and the construction of the churches by Constantine. Following the structure, if not always the contents, of Eusebius' *Vita Constantini*, Sozomen narrates the inauguration of the Martyrium basilica after the council of Tyre. Here, we are interested in what Sozomen has to say concerning the subsequent feast of the Encaenia, a brief digression into which he enters immediately after describing the rite of the encaenia;

From that time the church of Jerusalem has with splendour kept the anniversary of this feast, performing initiation at it and assembling for eight continuous days, and multitudes congregate from every place under the sun, who for the history of the holy places come together from all sides for the time of this festal assembly.⁵⁶⁹

The enthusiasm with which Sozomen describes this feast suggests that he is drawing on his own experience. This implies that Sozomen attended the feast of the Encaenia whilst still residing in Palestine, sometime between 390 and 443 (perhaps when he consulted the archives concerning the episcopal succession of Maximus). There is no real reason to mention the feast of the Encaenia, it is a digression from the narrative which describes the condemnation of Athanasius and the early years of the Arian heresy. Sozomen wrote his History whilst in Constantinople and so the description of the feast is intended for the reader who may not be familiar with the Jerusalem liturgical year. Since the emphasis is on

⁵⁶⁹ H.E. 2.26.4, "ἐξ ἐκείνου δὲ ἐτήσιον ταύτην τὴν ἑορτὴν λαμπρῶς μάλα ἄγει ἡ Ἱεροσολύμων ἐκκλησία, ὡς καὶ μῆσεις ἐν αὐτῇ τελεῖσθαι, καὶ ὀκτὼ ἡμέρας ἐφεξῆς ἐκκλησιάζειν, συνιέναι τε πολλοὺς σχεδὸν ἐκ πάσης τῆς ὑπ' ἥλιον, οἱ καθ' ἱστορίαν τῶν ἱερῶν τόπων πάντοθεν συντρέχουσι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ταύτης τῆς πανηγύρεως."

the movement of people to Jerusalem we may infer that there was no festival of the Encaenia in Constantinople at this time.

The Encaenia and baptism

The most significant difference between the accounts of Sozomen and Egeria is his observation that baptism took place at the Encaenia, suggesting the feast was of some importance. Easter was the normal occasion on which baptism was performed. In some regions Epiphany, being the feast of the baptism of the Lord, was another occasion for baptism.⁵⁷⁰ These two feasts are the most significant in the church's liturgical year. It is with these two feasts that Egeria compares the Encaenia. It is not wholly unexpected, then, that the Encaenia provided another opportunity for the rites of initiation to be performed.⁵⁷¹

The eschatological perspective of Sozomen's description

The Encaenia continued, as Egeria has already informed us, for eight days. Sozomen, however, makes no mention of the association with the feast of the Cross despite having earlier narrated at some length Helena's finding of this relic. This placing of the feast with the inauguration of the Martyrium⁵⁷² rather than after the finding of the Cross associates the octave more closely with the building rather than the relic which it housed. His account of the finding of the Cross, on the other hand, eclipses the discovery of the tomb and the rock of Golgotha of which only very brief details are given.

Sozomen's enthusiasm for the feast centres around the centrality of Jerusalem. Within one sentence in this short narrative Sozomen uses three

⁵⁷⁰ See Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 40. Epiphany as the occasion for baptism is discussed by Thomas Talley, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*, 126-29.

⁵⁷¹ It is interesting to note the allusion to this in the seventh century Coptic legend of Eudoxia and the Holy Sepulchre; on discovering the tomb Eudoxia proclaims to Constantine, "My Lord and brother...publish throughout the whole world...that they celebrate a Pascha...For we have found the tomb, but we do not know where its entrance is'..Immediately the king wrote a paschal letter throughout all his kingdom, that [the Pascha] should be celebrated on the fifth day of Tobe and finished on the eleventh. This is the festival of Tobe, up to this day a festival of the entire country of the Romans." (*Eudoxia and the Holy Sepulchre: A Constantinian Legend in Coptic*, ed. T.Orlando. (Milan, 1980) 69. The month of Tobe corresponds to January and thus the finding of the tomb is linked here at least with the week of Epiphany.

⁵⁷² "...νεὸν περὶ τὸν τοῦ Κρανίου χώρον, ὃ μέγα μαρτύριον προσαγορεύεται", as Sozomen refers to it (*H.E.* 2.26.1).

different verbs to describe the people "assembling" for this feast.⁵⁷³ Egeria was quite specific in her observation that the pilgrims came from the surrounding provinces. Sozomen's description, on the other hand, is idealised, "from every place under the sun", and "from all sides" do they gather (literally, 'run together'). The focus of attention is not only the feast itself, but also the "ἱστορίαν τῶν ἱερῶν τόπων", educational visits to the sacred sites. The feast and the places associated with it are conjoined, not only within the liturgy itself, but throughout the eight days. It would be difficult to visualise the image Sozomen presents before us of Jerusalem as the central focal point of all nations without recalling texts such as Pss 64:5, 85:9 or Zach 16:14. Egeria, too, with her emphasis on the duty felt by the pilgrims to attend the feast presents the reader with an image of multitudes hastening to Jerusalem. Egeria, however, presents us with the realistic picture of no more than fifty bishops and pilgrims from no further than Theibald. Sozomen, writing from Constantinople, extends the image to include every nation under the sun, re-creating what should be a local feast into a universal and eschatological feast of the new Jerusalem.⁵⁷⁴

Conclusion

The feast of the Encaenia celebrates the events of 13 September 335. On one level it is simply an anniversary feast celebrating the construction of at least the Martyrium-Anastasis site. On another level, the intermingling of place and event ensures that any feast of the buildings on Golgotha will be a feast of the death and resurrection of Christ. Thus, we observed how Egeria in her Journal ranked the 'local' feast of the Encaenia alongside the universal feasts of Epiphany and Easter and that the practice of baptism at this feast noted by Sozomen only strengthened this association. However, the one difference between Encaenia and the other two major feasts was the crucial fact that the Encaenia could only be properly celebrated in Jerusalem. No one would suggest that Easter could only be kept at the historical site of the death and resurrection for the feast remembered the event first and foremost. It was only in Jerusalem that the Church could join the event to the place for this and other events in the liturgical year. Egeria, although herself a pilgrim, does not speak of the presence of other

⁵⁷³ ...καὶ ὁκτὼ ἡμέρας ἐφεξῆς ἐκκλησιάζειν, συνιέναι τε πολλοὺς σχεδὸν ἐκ πάσης τῆς ὑφ' ἡλίον, οἱ καθ' ἱστορίαν τῶν ἱερῶν τόπων πάντοθεν συντρέχουσι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ταύτης τῆς πανηγύρεως.

⁵⁷⁴ By the time of Sozomen the portrayal of Jerusalem as the centre of the world had been established. For example Cyril of Jerusalem, writing nearly a century earlier, applied Ps 73:12 to the rock of Golgotha (Cat 13.28).

pilgrims who came specially for Easter or Epiphany in Jerusalem. This is not so for the feast of the Encaenia where she writes of crowds who considered it a sin if they did not attend Jerusalem for the octave. And whereas Egeria names the regions from which the pilgrims travelled, Sozomen in his narrative transcends the geographical boundaries and describes the whole world ascending to Jerusalem for the feast.

Egeria's observation that the Jerusalem liturgy was especially good at providing appropriate scripture passages for both the event and the place will be confirmed in the following chapters. The pilgrim and eschatological framework with which Egeria and Sozomen overlay the feast was not particular to them alone. As we will discover it was intrinsic to the feast itself, confirmed by the readings chosen for the occasion.

Chapter Six

The Feast of the Encaenia in the Ancient Liturgical Sources of Jerusalem

Introduction

The description and analysis of the rite of the encaenia in the fourth century was made easier by the survival of contemporary ecclesiastical histories. A different task is presented by the extant liturgical sources for the subsequent feast of the encaenia. Save for the brief description narrated by Egeria there are no certain fourth century texts which specifically describe the liturgical practice of the Holy City. The liturgical language of Jerusalem in the fourth century was Greek. The surviving evidence, however, for the study of the Jerusalem liturgical calendar is mostly in Georgian or Armenian. The earliest date for the Armenian evidence is around 417AD, whereas the dating of the Georgian evidence is less clear and could be as late as the seventh or eighth centuries. Both groups are translations of Greek sources which have their origins in Jerusalem.

The problems with the liturgical sources are not confined to uncertain dating. The description of the encaenia in the Armenian lectionary conflicts with both the earlier description provided by Egeria, and the feast reproduced in the later Georgian lectionary. The latter lectionary, on the other hand, is a reconstruction from a number of manuscripts each with its own set of variants. Unfortunately, the major manuscript of the Georgian lectionary lacks the content for a significant number of days for the Encaenia. There will always be some uncertainty, then, as to exactly which elements of the feast, reconstructed from these sources, can be applied to our period of study.

Despite the problems inherent to the sources, the lectionaries are still our most important guide to the content of the Jerusalem liturgical calendar. Although the lectionaries may disagree amongst themselves on other elements, they do appear to agree on the major scripture readings employed throughout the feast. Therefore a substantial part of this chapter will examine the content and reasons behind the choice of certain biblical passages for the feast.

In the previous section we explored the historical connection between the uncovering of the Holy Sepulchre, the finding of the Cross, and the subsequent

building of the basilica. From our earliest liturgical source, through to the present day, the Eastern feast of the finding of the Cross has always been part of the liturgical celebration beginning on the 13th September, combining the finding of the cross with the dedication of the Constantinian edifice. Therefore it is my intention in examining the liturgical evidence to continue to keep the feast of the Cross and the feast of the Encaenia together and investigate the full octave.

The Armenian-Jerusalem Lectionary

Dating the Lectionary

The Armenian-Jerusalem lectionary is the oldest surviving liturgical book of the liturgy in Jerusalem. The ancient source became widely known when, in 1905, F. C. Conybeare published an English translation of the old Armenian lectionary as an appendix to his larger work, the *Rituale Armenorum*.⁵⁷⁵ Two manuscripts formed the basis for his reconstruction of the lectionary, Paris Biblio. Nationale Armenien 20 and Bodley Armenus d. 2. The former is dated to the ninth century (and better known as ms Paris 44⁵⁷⁶) whilst the latter is considerably later, sometime around 1359. The lectionary indicates its ultimate source as being from Jerusalem by the presence, amongst other things, of Jerusalem stations. Conybeare also recognised that in the old Armenian lectionary was a Jerusalem liturgy which was comparable to that recorded by Egeria.⁵⁷⁷ The dating of the lectionary was a little more difficult, although Conybeare attempted to solve it by comparing the Armenian and Julian calendars for the Marian feast on the 15 August. The Armenian commentaries tell of Gregory the Illuminator instituting the feast of the Theotokos on 15 Navasard. Since the Armenian calendar operated with a different system of months and days, it and the Julian calendar did not often coincide. In the old Armenian lectionary, however, the Theotokos is indicated for 15 August. Can the synchronism of the two calendars tell us anything about the year in which the lectionary was edited? Conybeare thought so. In the years 464-68 15 Navasard and 15 August fell on the same day. This he thought could well be the date of the

⁵⁷⁵ F. C. Conybeare, *Rituale Armenorum*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905).

⁵⁷⁶ See A. Renoux, "Un manuscrit du lectionnaire arménien de Jérusalem." *Le Museon* 74 (1961): 361, "Conybeare désigne le ms. par la côte qu'il avait alors: A.F. 20, avant la parution du catalogue de Macler."

⁵⁷⁷ *Rituale Armenorum*, 508.

original calendar.⁵⁷⁸ Conybeare's method of dating the lectionary was subsequently heavily criticised. With the publication of the text, however, he had set the ball rolling for further scholarship. His edition, constructed from only two manuscripts, was viewed as more faithful to the ancient original than the edition published by N. Adontz twenty years later.⁵⁷⁹ Although Adontz had consulted a large number of manuscripts, his edition tended to be treated as an approximation rather than a critical edition of the text.

Conybeare and Adontz spurred on the liturgical scholars B. Capelle and Bernard Botte to seek a more precise dating of the Jerusalem lectionary from which the Armenian text was copied. The dating of the lectionary continued to revolve around the feast of the Theotokos. Capelle, however, based his dating of the edition not only on the presence of this feast but also on further internal evidence. Conybeare's method of dating was rejected simply because if the lectionary was copied from a Jerusalem source then the Armenian calendar in this case was irrelevant. The Julian dates were the more primitive and any Armenian equivalents were added subsequently.⁵⁸⁰ It could easily be established that the Jerusalem source could not be dated before 417, the last bishop commemorated being John (386-417). Capelle then introduced a piece of external evidence, a homily on the Virgin attributed to Chrysippus who came to Jerusalem with the intention of founding a community there between 425 and 430. The homily is based upon the readings set for the feast, namely Psalms 131 and 44, and texts from Isaiah 7, Galatians 3, and Luke 2. These match almost exactly the readings indicated in the Armenian lectionary for the feast of the Theotokos.⁵⁸¹ Thus, on the basis of this evidence the Armenian lectionary can be dated to between 417 and Chrysippus' death in 479.

Bernard Botte was not convinced by Capelle's arguments. He was even less convinced that the Armenian lectionary was copied in order to be used in an Armenian community based in or around Jerusalem who wished to follow the city's liturgical year.⁵⁸² Botte sought to establish why and when the original

⁵⁷⁸ *Rituale Armenorum*, 511. Rather strangely in the light of the Council of Ephesus in 431, Conybeare remarked that these years are "somewhat early for us to find a feast of Mary".

⁵⁷⁹ N. Adontz, "Les fêtes et les saints de l'Église arménienne." *Revue de l'Orient chrétien* 6 (1927-28): 74-104; 225-278.

⁵⁸⁰ B. Capelle. "La fête de la Vierge à Jérusalem au V^e siècle." *Le Muséon* 56 (1943), 13.

⁵⁸¹ Cappelle, "La fête de la Vierge", 17. The Armenian Lectionary specifies the alleluia psalm as 104 rather than Ps 44.

⁵⁸² In private correspondence P. P. Peeters had suggested to Capelle that the lectionary had been arranged for an Armenian community based at a Greek monastery ("La fête de la Vierge", 14).

Jerusalem source was translated into Armenian. First, he noted that there was both Greek and Syriac influence on the Armenian Bible and liturgy. Botte suggests that the translation of the lectionary be attributed to Joseph and Eznik who were sent to Edessa by the patriarch Sahak sometime between 390 and 440 to translate into Armenian the works of the Fathers and other appropriate texts they might find there. It is possible, states Botte, that they found there a Syriac translation of the Jerusalem lectionary.⁵⁸³ The feast of the Theotokos Botte dates to after 422, when the Kathisma, the station for the feast, was constructed. He suggests that the incorporation of the feast into the Jerusalem calendar was a direct result of the council of Ephesus. Either the bishop of Jerusalem, Juvenal, instituted the feast immediately on his return from Ephesus (i.e. on August 15) or this feast was celebrated at Ephesus and subsequently incorporated into the calendar.⁵⁸⁴ The date of the Jerusalem lectionary, under Botte, has moved to between 417 and 434.

The name most closely associated with the old Armenian lectionary is Athanase Renoux. In 1961 he introduced a further manuscript, Jerusalem 121 from the Convent of St James in Jerusalem. This source formed the basis of his edition of the lectionary finally published in 1971.⁵⁸⁵ Renoux's edition repaired the deficiencies of the sources and translation of Conybeare's work. Renoux placed Jerusalem 121 in parallel with the two other manuscripts, Paris 44 and Erévan 985. The differences between Jerusalem 121 and Paris 44 are sufficient to suggest that there were at least two editions of the lectionary in the fifth century.⁵⁸⁶

Whilst Capelle and Botte had concentrated on the feast of the Theotokos to provide clues for the dating of the Jerusalem source Renoux shifts his attention to the cult of St Stephen. Anton Baumstark had taken the mention of the Martyrium of Stephen on the second day of Epiphany to refer to a church completed and inaugurated in 460.⁵⁸⁷ Heiming, whilst reviewing Botte's earlier article, redated to 439 the time when the church of Stephen first began to be

⁵⁸³ B. Botte. "Le lectionaire arménien et la fête de la Théotokos à Jérusalem au Ve siècle." *Sacris Erudiri* 2 (1949), 115-119.

⁵⁸⁴ Botte, *Le lectionaire arménien*, 121.

⁵⁸⁵ The manuscript is described by Renoux in *Le Muséon* 74 (1961) 361-85 and additional material is supplied the following year in *Le Muséon* 75 (1962) 385-398. The complete edition of the Jerusalem Lectionary with commentary can be found in A. Renoux, *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121*. *Patrologia Orientalis* 35/1, 36/2 (1969, 1971).

⁵⁸⁶ The differences between the manuscripts are described by Renoux in *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121* (1971), 157-60.

⁵⁸⁷ Anton Baumstark, *Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der syrischen Jakobiten*. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 3. Paderhorn: 1910), 95.

used.⁵⁸⁸ Renoux takes up this point and notes that the relics are recorded as having been discovered in December 415. The first Martyrium of Stephen, he argues, was not the subsequent church, but the diaconicon on Mount Sion where the relics were transferred by Bishop John.⁵⁸⁹ The incorporation of the diaconicon on Mount Sion is reflected in the lectionary not only by its presence as a station for the weeks of Epiphany and Easter but also by the suppression of one of the mystagogical catecheses.⁵⁹⁰ Further evidence is gleaned by Renoux from the homilies of Hesychius of Jerusalem, published by Michel Aubineau in 1978.⁵⁹¹ References in the homilies to the liturgical practice in Jerusalem during the episcopate of Hesychius compare favourably with the Armenian Lectionary. One of the homilies edited by Aubineau is for the feast of St Stephen, celebrated on 27 December.⁵⁹² No mention of the basilica of St Stephen is mentioned by Hesychius and the station for the day would appear to be Sion (as it is the Armenian Lectionary). The homily re-enforces the argument that the Lectionary should be dated to sometime before 438/9.

The lectionary records that on 6th July the Depositio Isaiah is celebrated. The history of this cult, like that of Stephen, gives Renoux further clues to the dating of the lectionary. The discovery of the relics of Isaiah is dated to 442 and were deposited by Juvenal in a martyrium in the Kedron valley. The subsequent feast of Isaiah, as witnessed to by the Georgian lectionary, was moved to 25 August where it was held in "the building of Juvenal".⁵⁹³ In the Armenian lectionary, however, the Depositio Isaiah is marked as 6 July, referring back to the tomb (and ancient burial) of Isaiah, rather than 25 August.⁵⁹⁴ The Lectionary would appear to be before the final depositions of Stephen and Isaiah. Adding the date of the death of bishop John (417), the last bishop mentioned, gives us a

⁵⁸⁸ Odilo Heiming, "Review of Botte, *Le lectionnaire arménien* (1949)." *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 3 (1956), 410. On the dating of the dedication of the church of St Stephen see Paul Devos, "L'année de la dédicace de Saint-Étienne à Jérusalem: 439." *Analecta Bollandiana* 105 (1987): 265-278.

⁵⁸⁹ Renoux, *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121* (1969), 176.

⁵⁹⁰ Renoux, *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121* (1969), 177.

⁵⁹¹ Charles Renoux, "Un document nouveau sur la liturgie de Jérusalem: les homélies festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem". *La Maison Dieu* 139 (1979): 139-164.

⁵⁹² Homily IX (Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Les Homélies Festales*. Vol 1. Ed. M. Aubineau (Brussels, 1978): 289-350.

⁵⁹³ GL 1176. Cited Renoux, *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121* (1969), 174.

⁵⁹⁴ The lectionary does not specify the station but the tomb of Isaiah was known by the Bordeaux pilgrim as on the Mount of Olives (*Itinerarium*, 593.3).

span of years between 417 and 439.⁵⁹⁵ The Armenian lectionary represented by ms Jerusalem 121 reflects the liturgy in Jerusalem in this period.⁵⁹⁶

The Encaenia in the Armenian Lectionary

Although the content of the Armenian manuscripts is commonly known as "The Armenian Lectionary", it is in fact more than a simple index of readings. J. Baldovin chooses to refer to it as "an embryonic form of the later typicon",⁵⁹⁷ The typicon was a far more detailed directory of liturgical rites and ceremonies, and like the Armenian manuscripts, indicated not only the lectionary but an annotated calendar and the relevant stations. The liturgical year in Jerusalem begins, in Jerusalem 121, with the octave of Epiphany. The next major feast is the 14th February, "The fortieth day of the Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ"⁵⁹⁸, before the beginning of the 19 catechetical readings and the six weeks of lent. This brings us into the Easter season. From May 1st until the end of the lectionary we have the bulk of the Sanctoral, interrupted by Pentecost, Ascension, and the Encaenia. Amongst the commemorations in this part of the calendar are a number which have been carried over from the Jewish liturgical year. These include the prophets Jeremiah (1st May), Zachariah (10th June), and Elisha (14th June), the Ark of the Covenant (2nd July), and the feast of Maccabees (1st August).

It is, however, another feast specific to the Jerusalem liturgy in which our interest lies, the feast of the encaenia or the dedication of the holy places of Jerusalem. Egeria describes the feast as lasting an octave. In the Armenian manuscripts, however, it extends over two days only. The translation of the text for the feast is as follows:

⁵⁹⁵ The Georgian lectionary preserves the names of subsequent bishops including Praylius (422), Juvenal (458) (GL 1183; 1068).

⁵⁹⁶ Ms Paris 44 represents a slightly later form of development. It is dated to after 439 since it mentions the church at the court of the high priest which was not constructed until that year (XLI). This remained Renoux's opinion, see "Liturgie arménienne et liturgie hiérsolymitaine." *Liturgie de l'église particulière et de l'église universelle*. (Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1976), 277.

⁵⁹⁷ J. F. Baldovin, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship*, 64. Renoux later referred to it simply as "the typicon" ("Liturgie arménienne et liturgie hiérsolymitaine", 276).

⁵⁹⁸ Jer 121, XIII.

Jerusalem 121 & Paris 44

Erévan 985

The 13th September,
dedication of the Holy Places
of Jerusalem.⁵⁹⁹ The first
day at the Holy Anastasis

The 13th September,
dedication of the Holy Places
of Jerusalem which one
makes for eight days. The
first day at the Holy
Anastasis.

Psalm 64. Antiphon: "To you, God, hymns are due, in Sion, and to you
are presented prayers in Jerusalem".

From the first letter of the Apostle Paul to Timothy (3:14-16): "I write
this to you, because I hope to come soon...he has been believed in the
world and he has been lifted in glory."

Alleluia, Psalm 147: "Praise the Lord Jerusalem."

Gospel from John (10:22-42): "It was the dedication at Jerusalem and it
was winter...But all that John said about this man is true. And many
believed in him."

The second day, on assembling at the Holy Martyrium the same canon is
performed. And, the same day, one displays the venerable cross to all
assembled.

Two days or an octave?

The following observations should first be noted. The two major
manuscripts of the lectionary give the Canon for only two days, whereas Egeria's
Journal would have described all eight days. Erévan 985 describes the feast as
eight days but then follows Jerusalem 121 and Paris 44 in providing only the first
two days. The evidence from between 380, when Egeria visited Jerusalem, and
417-439, suggests that the feast was reduced from eight days to two. In the
Georgian lectionary, however, it retains an eight day character. It is difficult to
conclude the reasons for the reduction. There is no evidence preserved in the
lectionary of another feast "impinging" on the octave; the neighbouring feasts are

⁵⁹⁹ Paris 44 assigns the date of the feast to 23rd September. This is probably a scribal
error ("La date du ms P est à nouveau erronée...", Renoux, Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121
(1971), 361).

on August 29th (John the Baptist) and November 15th (The Apostle Philip). Sozomen wrote his History in about 443, which makes it contemporary with the latest date of the Armenian sources. As we know he describes the annual feast of the encaenia in Jerusalem as lasting a full eight days. As a native of Palestine before his move to Constantinople this may well have been an eye-witness report. If Jerusalem 121 accurately reflects the rubrics for the 13th September in Jerusalem, then the change in the length of the feast must have occurred sometime after 425, the date Sozomen left Palestine for Constantinople.

Two stations are indicated for the two days, the Martyrium and the Anastasis. The Martyrium, by the time of Egeria, served as the central church in Jerusalem and place of the liturgy of the catechumens. The Sunday liturgy then moved from this place of the Cross to the Anastasis, the station for the second day of the encaenia. Whereas in Egeria the stational liturgy for the encaenia moved around the city, including the station on the Mount of Olives, in the Armenian translation the feast remains at the site most closely associated with Constantine's activities in Jerusalem. The title given to the feast in the Armenian lectionary is, "The dedication of the holy places of Jerusalem". The holy places of Jerusalem surely included more than the basilica of the Cross and the rotunda of the Resurrection? The eight day feast witnessed by Egeria moved from one holy place to another, taking in the primary holy places (Holy Sion, Eleona, and perhaps Bethlehem). The original Encaenia, celebrated on the command of Constantine in 335, was the consecration of the Martyrium and, by implication, the yet uncompleted Anastasis. The Bordeaux pilgrim describes the churches in the area which were present before the consecration of the Holy Sepulchre in 335. The pilgrim describes a basilica on the Mount of Olives (the Eleona), the basilica in Bethlehem, and one at the Oak of Mamre.⁶⁰⁰ Although Eusebius associated their founding with Helena or, in the case of Mamre, Eutropia, they do not seem to have been inaugurated until after the death of Constantine. The Encaenia of 335 concerned only the Martyrium basilica. There is no mention of the inauguration applying to the other churches constructed by Constantine. A small exception to this picture may be read in Theodoret's account which describes the bishops proceeding from Tyre to Jerusalem to consecrate the "churches" which

⁶⁰⁰ *Itinerarium Burdigalense* (CCL 175, 1-26); Mount of Olives: "In Montem Oliveti, ubi Dominus ante passionem apostolos docuit: ibi facta est basilica iussu Constantini" (18). Bethlehem: "Inde milia duo a parte sinistra est Bethleem, ubi natus est Dominus Iesus Christus; ibi basilica facta est iussu Constantini" (20). Mamre: "Inde Terebinto milia VIII, ubi Abraham habitavit et puteum fodit sub arbore terebintho et cum angelis locutus est et cibum sumpsit; ibi basilica facta est iussu Constantini mirae pulchritudinis" (20). All three are described as being built by Constantine, "facta est basilica iussu Constantini".

Constantine had erected there. However, his account of the feast refers only to the one "holy altar", one church, and does not venture outside the city of Jerusalem.⁶⁰¹ Eusebius himself, makes no mention of the length of the original festival and only refers to the church of the Holy Sepulchre. It is likely, therefore that the other Constantinian churches had either been inaugurated at some previous time (for which no evidence exists) or they still awaited an encaenia. The Georgian manuscripts preserve anniversaries of dedication for the basilica in Bethlehem (31 May), and the place of the Ascension (7 October). The church of the Nativity, for example, was inaugurated on 31 May 339. The church of Sion existed before the reign of Constantine and it was not until the end of the fourth century that a new basilica was constructed there.⁶⁰² The inauguration of the church of Eleona remains unknown though, like the Martyrium basilica, it must have been largely completed by the time of the Bordeaux pilgrim. It is possible, therefore, that the feast of the Encaenia was not changed from an octave into a two day feast, but rather that Jerusalem 121 preserves a far older celebration of the feast, reflecting a time between the reign of Constantius (when the Rotunda was completed) and the pilgrimage of Egeria. The feast was then perhaps lengthened into an octave to include amongst the stations the other significant holy places.⁶⁰³

The Encaenia and the Cross

The same canon is performed on each of the two days in the Armenian Lectionary. Egeria herself makes no comment on the content of the feast on any of the days. The second day in the Georgian lectionary is unfortunately garbled. The 14th September is normally specified as the feast of the finding of the Cross. Egeria identifies the feast of the Encaenia with both the finding of the Cross and the dedication of Solomon's temple. When we turn to the Armenian lectionary we observe that the second day of the feast, the 14th September, is not specified as the feast of the Cross. Renoux quite rightly notes that "la célébration de la

⁶⁰¹ Theodoret, *HE* 1.29.

⁶⁰² The construction of a church on Holy Sion took place in the episcopate of John II, sometime after 387. The construction is attributed to the emperor Theodosius. See Michel van Esbroeck, "Jean II de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix." *Analecta Bollandiana* 102 (1984): 99-134.

⁶⁰³ This (admittedly tentative) hypothesis does not necessarily negate an eight day celebration in 335. The latter, we saw, coincided with the days of the Ludi Triumphales. Although the following chapter discusses the influence of the feast of Tabernacles on the celebration of the Encaenia, the 335 celebration appears to have been influenced more by the day of Atonement. The date of the Encaenia, whether lasting two days or eight, ensured that it fell more often than not in the season of Atonement and Tabernacles.

croix n'a pas éclipsé la dédicace".⁶⁰⁴ This too indicates an early Greek source.⁶⁰⁵ The ancient connection of the Constantinian basilica and the finding of the cross is preserved in the Armenian lectionary with the rubric "And on the same day, one shows the venerable cross to all assembled."⁶⁰⁶

The theology of the Encaenia

The choice of psalms and readings for the feast of the encaenia provide one or two interesting observations about the theology of the feast. The structure of the canon follows the standard form in the Armenian lectionary. The synaxis begins with an introductory psalm and antiphon. The choice of text, as for many of the other elements of the canon, was for a variety of reasons. The antiphon tended to determine how the psalm should be understood thus determining to some extent the theme of the feast.⁶⁰⁷ During Lent, for example, the psalms characterise the idea of turning towards God. In other cases the psalm might have been determined by the station at which the canon was performed. The introductory psalm was followed by a reading drawn from either the Old or New Testaments, depending upon the feast being celebrated. The reasons behind the choice of readings are diverse. Feasts of the Lord tend to specify readings relevant to the celebration, and the readings for Lent and Easter broadly follow a *lectio continua*. Immediately before the Gospel reading occurs an "alleluia" and psalm reference. Renoux, with others, have concluded that the "alleluia" was the response to each line of the indicated psalm.⁶⁰⁸ As we have noted with other elements of the canon, the choice of the psalm could depend either on the station (Ps 131 for Holy Sion, for example) or the feast being celebrated (Ps 114 was a popular choice as the "Psalm of the Confessors").

⁶⁰⁴ *Jer 121*, LXVIII note 1.

⁶⁰⁵ The 335 Encaenia, as the inauguration of the basilica of the Cross, was bound up with the finding of the Cross in such a way that it would have been redundant to refer to the day as both the Encaenia of the Martyrium and the feast of the Cross. As the cult of the Cross flourished then it is likely that the day on which the cross was shown (the second day) became known as the day of the Cross. Thus, the Cross and the Encaenia slowly became separated until the feast of the Cross eclipsed the encaenia; a process which culminated in the institution of the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross in the seventh century.

⁶⁰⁶ *Jer 121*, LXVIII. It is not certain whether this rubric refers to the fragments of the True Cross or a sign of the cross. Although Egeria does not mention the showing of the Cross at the feast of the Encaenia, she does describe this rite on Good Friday (*Itinerarium* 36).

⁶⁰⁷ Renoux, *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121* (1971), 174. The Armenian word to indicate the antiphon (kc'urd), argues Renoux, probably meant a refrain which was sung after each verse of the psalm.

⁶⁰⁸ Renoux, *Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121* (1971), 176.

The Canon for the Encaenia begins with Psalm 64, with the second verse chosen as the antiphon, "Praise is due to thee in Sion, O God." Apart from this instance, this psalm and antiphon is only used within the Easter octave. The psalm describes both the happiness of the one led to the temple, and the happiness of those away from Jerusalem who recognise the signs of the Lord. The second section of the psalm is one of praise for the abundant harvest and fertility of the land. It is a psalm of praise for the "dread deeds" the Lord has done (v.5), seen in awe by those who dwell in far off lands (v.8). The choice of this psalm for Easter ensures the interpretation revolves around praise for the salvation initiated by the resurrection of Christ; verses 9 to 13 in this context recalls the theme of a new creation. Within the feast of the encaenia, the psalm works on two levels. At one level the references to "dwelling in thy courts" and being "satisfied with the goodness of thy house, thy holy temple" (v.4) can be appropriated to the basilica of the Martyrium itself, whilst the recognition of this psalm as an Easter song, serves as a reminder that the basilica complex (and the feast of its inauguration) points beyond itself to the "God of our salvation" (v.5).

In the Armenian sources the epistle reading (1 Tim 3:14-16) appears at only one other place, as the last text specified for the catechumenate readings.⁶⁰⁹ It is probable that this reading was chosen to end the catechumenate for the kerygmatic statement in verse 16.⁶¹⁰ For the Encaenia, however, the emphasis must lie in the words of verse 15, "the church of the living God.", that is, the "foundation and pillar of the truth." The text serves to remind the assembled people that they, not the magnificent basilica, form the *domus Dei*; a theme which ran through Eusebius' oration at Tyre. Having heard the spiritual meaning of the building, the "alleluia-psalm" seems to introduce a slight tension between the physical and the spiritual. Psalm 147 begins with "Praise the Lord Jerusalem...for he strengthens the bars of your gates." This psalm, like Ps 64, occurs only within the Easter octave and, with the exception of Easter Wednesday, in the liturgy at the Martyrium. There are similar themes in both the psalms, both emphasise the work of the Lord in natural signs and the universal nature of God's rule. It too recalls the presence of the risen Christ and the empty cave of the Anastasis. The Jerusalem of Ps 147 and the Sion of Ps 64 are thus transferred by their context to the "New Jerusalem" of the Constantinian edifice and the spiritual church it represents.

⁶⁰⁹ Jer 121, XVII.

⁶¹⁰ The catechetical readings follow the structure of the Jerusalem creed. 1 Tim 3:14-16 corresponds to "We believe...in one holy catholic church" (See Alexis Doval, "The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses", 50-55).

Psalm 147 acts also as the introduction to the Gospel. This is the only occasion on which the Gospel text of Jn 10:22-42 appears in the lectionary. The relevance of this text is primarily in the words of verse 22, "It was the feast of the encaenia in Jerusalem..." However the Gospel also continues the theme marking the deeds of the Lord found in the preceeding psalms. The gospel introduces an argument between Jesus and the crowd concerning Jesus' claim to be one with the Father. The argument centres around the true source of Christ's work. If the psalms made reference to "Jerusalem" and "the sons of Jacob", then the Gospel leaves no doubt about to whom these should now refer, "I told you, and you do not believe. The works that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness to me; but you do not believe because you do not belong to my sheep" (10:25). The text finishes with Jesus crossing the Jordan and "many believed in him there" (v.42). The liturgical exegesis of the texts chosen for the Encaenia shows the feast to be less about Constantine or his building program, than the Easter mystery and the spiritual Jerusalem, the Church.

The dedication of all altars

In the introduction we noted that Matthew Black suggested that the Jerusalem feast of the encaenia had its origins in a feast earlier than the 335 Encaenia. The source for the feast, he proposed, was the same source as for the Syrian feast of the dedication of the Church, a feast which he argued, in Jerusalem, predated the Constantinian feast of the Encaenia. This latter feast celebrated the Ecclesia Dei rather than any particular building. Although Black was aware of the Armenian sources he makes little comment on their content. A few years later Bernard Botte added to Black's rather scant evidence the peculiar feast known as "the dedication of all altars" and preserved in one of the Armenian manuscripts.⁶¹¹

The "dedication of all the altars" appears only in manuscript Paris 44 where it is inserted between the feast of St Andrew (Nov 30) and the feast of King David and St James (Dec 25).⁶¹² Botte observed that the feast of all the

⁶¹¹ B. Botte, "Les dimanches de la dédicace dans les églises syriennes." L'Orient Syrien 2 (1957): 65-70.

⁶¹² Jer 121, LXX. There is no reference to this feast in any other Armenian source. It may well have been omitted from Jer 121 because this Ordo appears to have been for a specific year with January 8th falling on a Sunday. There may have been no appropriate place in that year to celebrate this feast (see Renoux's comments, Le Codex Arménien Jérusalem 121 (1969), 196).

altars would be celebrated in Jerusalem around the same time when the Jews would traditionally be celebrating the feast of Hanukkah, the dedication of the temple (25 Kislev). Since the Jewish liturgical year depended upon the lunar calendar, the Christian feast would by necessity have to be mobile and not confined to one specific date, if it was to be celebrated at the same time. The introductory psalm refers to going before the "altar of God" (Ps 42:4), and the Alleluia-psalm tells of washing "my hands in innocence and go about thy altar" (Ps 25:6). As in the feast of the Encaenia these psalms are interpreted by the New Testament readings. The epistle is taken from the letter to the Hebrews (13:10-16) and makes it clear that the Christian altar has nothing to do with the Jewish sanctuary,

We have an altar from which those who serve the tent have no right to eat. For the bodies of those animals whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest as a sacrifice for sin are buried outside the camp. So Jesus also suffered outside the gate in order to sanctify the people through his own blood. Therefore let us go forth to him outside the camp and bear the abuse he endured. For we have no lasting city, but we seek the city which is to come.

This text with its anti-temple hermeneutic would have been an appropriate choice for a feast coinciding with the dedication of the temple. Its stress lies in the one sacrifice for sin made by Christ outside the city (and so the temple), and the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving made by Christians as a result (16). Just as we observed in the texts chosen for the Encaenia, there is an internal contrast or tension in the liturgy between the immediate context of the liturgy in Jerusalem (in view of the ruins of the temple) and the affirmation that this is not the city of Jerusalem sought by Christians. The Gospel text for the day confirms the anti-Jewish hermeneutic of this feast. It is the Matthean woes addressed to the scribes and Pharisees in which the key text is the castigating of those who swear not by the altar but by the gift upon it, "You blind men! For which is greater, the gift or the altar that makes the gift sacred?" (Matt 23:19). Both these texts reappear in the Georgian manuscripts for the feast of the Encaenia.

The same texts specified for the Dedication of the Altars reappear for the dedication of an altar in a Syriac lectionary published by F. C. Burkitt in 1923.⁶¹³ The compilation of this lectionary is dated to around 474. The influence of the liturgy of Jerusalem on this lectionary is indicated by the inclusion of the feast of the apparition of the Cross on 7 May which is appended to the end of the

⁶¹³ F. C. Burkitt. "The early Syriac lectionary system." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 10 (1923): 301-338. The lectionary has an additional text, 1 Kgs 8:1-53.

lectionary. Burkitt thought that the link between Edessa and Jerusalem may have been Rabbula, the bishop of Edessa from 411-435 who visited the city and was baptised in the Jordan.⁶¹⁴ It seems likely that the Syriac dedication of the altar had its origins in the dedication presented in the Paris 44.⁶¹⁵ The Armenian dedication of the altars need not be interpreted as an annual feast. Ms Paris 44 might in fact preserve the readings for a dedication of an altar when one should occur. This, it appears, is how the compiler of the Syriac lectionary interpreted the feast. The anti-Jewish emphasis of the feast suggests an origin in Jerusalem. It might also be the case that the time of Hanukkah was considered an appropriate time for the dedication or inauguration of an altar which would account for its place in the Armenian lectionary rather than an insertion at the end of the lectionary. A similar process is apparent in a comparison of the readings specified for the feast of the Encaenia and their re-appearance for the generic dedication of a church in the Armenian, Georgian, and Byzantine sources.

The Georgian-Jerusalem Lectionary

The work of Renoux has made the task of describing the Armenian-Jerusalem sources considerably easier. The equivalent Georgian sources, however, are a great deal more complicated. Just as there is an "Armenian lectionary" so too exists a "Georgian lectionary." However, the variety of manuscripts incorporated into the "standard" edition results in a reconstructed lectionary which unfortunately contains a number of corruptions and omissions (especially with regard to the feast of the Encaenia). In 1959 Michel Tarchnischvili published the results of his reconstruction in Le Grand Lectionnaire de l'Eglise de Jerusalem;⁶¹⁶ this remains the standard edition today although in the last two decades a number of articles supplement our knowledge of the influence of the Jerusalem liturgy on the Georgian church.⁶¹⁷

⁶¹⁴ Burkitt, "The early Syriac lectionary", 323.

⁶¹⁵ Although the Encaenia does not appear as part of the calendar, Jn 10:22-42 appears in the lessons for the dedication of a church.

⁶¹⁶ M. Tarchnischvili, Le Grand Lectionnaire de l'Eglise de Jérusalem (Ve-VIIIe S.). (Louvain, 1959-60) [henceforth GL].

⁶¹⁷ See the review by Michel van Esbroeck. "Le manuscrit Sinaïtique géorgien 34 et les publications récentes de liturgie palestinienne." Orientalia Christiana Periodica 46 (1980): 125-141.

The Georgian-Jerusalem lectionary sources

A partial edition of the Georgian lectionary was first published in 1912 by K. Kekelidze.⁶¹⁸ This was followed nearly five decades later by Tarchnischvili's full edition using two further manuscripts. Codex Georgian 3 from the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris forms the basis of this edition with variants noted from three other major manuscripts. These are, in order of significance, Codex 635 from the museum of Mestia commonly referred to as the Lathal Lectionary (tenth century and probably copied by John Zosimus)⁶¹⁹, Ms. Georgian 37 of the Monastery of St Catherine on Mount Sinai (dated 982, and also attributed to Zosimus), and a manuscript whose origins are in Kala (unknown hand, tenth century). Codex Georgian 3 has, according to H. Leeb, the possible marks of Palestinian origin.⁶²⁰ A clue to the original community from which the Greek source was copied, may be found under 17th January where it reads "In commemoration of our father Antony."⁶²¹ This is the feast of the Egyptian monk Antony, the life of whom Athanasius documented whilst in exile (356-362).

Whereas the date of the Greek source for the Armenian Lectionary can be fixed with some certainty, this is not true for the Georgian lectionary. As is evident from the title to his edition, Tarchnischvili places the date anywhere from the fifth to the eighth century. The problem is due to the fragmentary nature of the sources and the interpolation of Georgian or non-Jerusalem material.

The Georgian-Jerusalem Calendar

There are, however, additional Georgian sources to the Lectionary which aid us in description and analysis of the Encaenia. In 1958 G. Garitte published a Palestino-Georgian calendar based on the Georgian manuscript 34 from the monastery of St Catherine on Mount Sinai.⁶²² Like many of the Georgian manuscripts from this area, Sinai Georgian 34 is tenth century, and the copyist's hand is that of John Zosimus. A Georgian scribe, John Zosimus worked in

⁶¹⁸ K. Kekelidze, *Ierusalimskij Kanonar VII Vieka*. (Tiflis, 1912).

⁶¹⁹ This manuscript was discovered by M. Kekelidze in 1911 in the church of St George in Lathal.

⁶²⁰ H. Leeb, *Die Gesänge im Gemeindegottes dienst von Jerusalem (vom 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert)*. (Wien, 1970), 25.

⁶²¹ GL 145.

⁶²² Garitte, G. *Le Calendrier Palestino-Géorgien du Sinaiticus 34*. (Brussels, 1958).

Palestine from 973 to 986. The Calendar itself seems to have been written at the monastery of St Sebas near Jerusalem, sometime in the third quarter of the tenth century.⁶²³ The sources, however, are a great deal older. The descriptive title of the Calendar given in the manuscript is "Synaxes of the Months of the Year" and the Calendar fulfils its purpose in providing a number of feasts celebrated each day of the year from January 1st to December 31st. The Calendar also provides a brief description of the feast including any notable acts. Garitte draws our attention to a number of peculiarities, one of which is the date at which the lectionary begins. Usually, the first day of the liturgical year was a celebration of the nativity or epiphany as in the Armenian lectionary or in Paris Georgian 3. The Calendar, however, begins on 1st January, described as both the beginning of the year and the circumcision of the Lord (a feast not found in the other Georgian manuscripts). The Calendar also preserves the traditional beginning of the year on 1st September.⁶²⁴

There are also a number of feasts in the Calendar, accompanied by Palestinian place names, which are foreign to the Byzantine, Syrian, or Armenian liturgies. The principal sources for the Calendar are hinted at within the manuscript itself. A marginal note reads, "This synaxis is from four models described by me: from the principal canon, and the Greek, and Jerusalem, and Saint Sebas."⁶²⁵ It is a plausible argument posited by Garitte that the "principal source" refers to the lectionary of Jerusalem. This, as we have noted, was well known to Zosimus, portions of it being preserved by him in Codex Sinai Georgian 37. In addition, within the manuscripts that make up Tarnnischvili's edition of the Georgian lectionary are various marginal references to "kanoni" inserted by the scribes. The note, though, also mentions a "model" from Jerusalem. Since four models are specified, this source must be different from the "canon".⁶²⁶ Garitte suggests this may be an ancient hymnal. From the fourth source, that of the monastery of St Sebas, are derived feasts associated with the monastery which are not found in other similar manuscripts. Garitte concludes his introduction to the manuscript with the suggestion that the Calendar was thus an artificial compilation of a pre-Byzantine lectionary of Jerusalem, the monastery of Saint Sebas, and a Byzantine list of feasts. The calendar thus did not regulate the life of any one community.⁶²⁷

⁶²³ Garitte, *Le Calendrier*, 19

⁶²⁴ Garitte, *Le Calendrier*, 88 (translated by Garitte as "corona anni conversionis").

⁶²⁵ Cited Garitte, *Le Calendrier*, 23

⁶²⁶ Garitte, *Le Calendrier*, 33

⁶²⁷ Garitte, *Le Calendrier*, 37

The Georgian Index of Gospel readings

John Zosimus appears once again as the scribe of a Georgian index of Gospel readings for the Jerusalem liturgical year published by Garitte in 1972.⁶²⁸ This index is appended to a book of the four gospels reconstructed from the manuscripts Sinai Georgian 30 and 38. The index, like the Gospels of Luke and John, was copied in 979 by John Zosimus. The full title of the index is "An orderly arrangement of the Holy Gospels for the days and feasts of the year" which in effect allows the book of the Gospels to be used as a lectionary.⁶²⁹ The Index belongs to the same period of Zosimus' life as the Calendar. The principal source of the latter he claimed to be the Jerusalem lectionary, from which he translated or copied substantial portions in 982, so it is quite characteristic that the Index follows not the Byzantine rite, but the Jerusalem liturgical year. Unlike the Calendar, however, the Index begins with the feast of the nativity and ends with specifying the Gospel readings for various common liturgies. The main bulk of the manuscript corresponds with the Georgian-Jerusalem Lectionary and is an essential aid in completing the omissions and irregularities in the manuscripts that comprise the Georgian Lectionary.

To our list of Georgian manuscripts which preserve elements of the Jerusalem liturgy of the fourth century we should add Sinai Georgian 54.⁶³⁰ In 110 folios this manuscript presents us with fifty liturgical feasts. The manuscript originates from a monastic community in Palestine. The name of the scribe is, unfortunately, not preserved though the manuscript can be dated to the second half of the tenth century which places it within the working life of John Zosimus. The manuscript is divided into two sections. The first section, part of which has been lost, commences with the Liturgy of St James after the anaphora. This is followed by the liturgy of the pre-sanctified, an index of celebrations, and ends with a number of blessings. The lectionary lies within the second section of the manuscript (ff. 66-184). In effect this manuscript contains all that is necessary for the celebration of the Eucharist on the principal feast days of the year. In the

⁶²⁸ G. Garitte, "Un index géorgien des lectures évangéliques selon l'ancien rite de Jérusalem." *Le Muséon* 85 (1972): 337-398.

⁶²⁹ Garitte, "Un index", 337.

⁶³⁰ Outlined by Bernard Outtier, "Un témoin partiel du lectionnaire Géorgien ancien (Sinai Géorgien 54)." *Bedi Kartlisa* 39 (1981): 76-88.

opinion of Bernard Outtier the original may well have been used by a priest-monk in Palestine, either alone, or with a small group of companions.⁶³¹

The Georgian chantbooks

Details of the liturgical year survive not only in lectionary form but also in the chantbooks or the "tropologia". The most ancient tropologion is based on the Jerusalem lectionary-calendar, but composed of psalms and short poetic antiphons (troparion).⁶³² Peter Jeffrey, in 1991, made a detailed study of the Sunday Office of the Georgian equivalent of the Tropologion, the Iadgari.⁶³³ The edition of the Iadgari on which he based his article had been published by E. Metreveli and others in 1980.⁶³⁴ Copies of the manuscript on which his edition was based can be found among the Sinai manuscripts (especially Georgian 18, 40, & 41), all of which can be dated to the tenth century.⁶³⁵ Within the Iadgari are two different types of chant. The first is the "prokeimena" or the responsorial psalms. A few of these are indicated in the Armenian sources, though the Iadgari cannot be considered as ancient. The second form of chant is the troparion, a poetic chant which, with biblical allusion, emphasises some aspect of the feast. Many of the troparia found in the Iadgari are indicated in the Georgian Lectionary. Jeffrey suggests that the Iadgari, whilst not as ancient as the Armenian Lectionary, has a primitive form of the liturgy that certainly places it prior to the latest date of the Georgian lectionary. The Iadgari commences the liturgical year with the feast of the Nativity which places it in comparison with the Georgian lectionary. On the other hand, the feast of the Annunciation is positioned just prior to Christmas (despite the rubric indicating March 25th). This indicates evidence of the earlier celebration of the Annunciation in advent and so predating the reforms of Justinian in the 560's. Jeffrey concludes that the Iadgari falls within this period of reform and so chronologically between the Armenian and Georgian lectionary. Georgian literary centres flourished in Palestine between fifth to eighth centuries; it was during this period that the

⁶³¹ B. Outtier, "Un témoin partiel", 88.

⁶³² See Elene Metreveli, "Le plus ancien tropologion Géorgien." *Bedi Kartlisa* 39 (1981): 54-62.

⁶³³ Peter Jeffrey, "The Sunday office of seventh-century Jerusalem in the Georgian chantbook (Iadgari): A preliminary report." *Studia Liturgica* 21 (1991): 52-75.

⁶³⁴ E. Metreveli, C. Cankievi, L. Hevsuriani, *Udzvelesi Iadgari* (Tbilisi, 1980). A translation of the table of contents is provided by Andrew Wade in his review of the work, "The oldest Iadgari: The Jerusalem tropologion, V-VIII c." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 50 (1984): 451-56.

⁶³⁵ As described by Elene Metreveli, "Le plus ancien", 54-55.

Jerusalem liturgy was followed in Georgia (before the influence of Constantinople). The feast of the Encaenia in the Iadgari, as we might expect, falls on September 13th with the elevation of the Cross on the following day. The Georgian name for the feast, "Enkeiay", is simply a transliteration of the Greek "Ἐγκαίνια" though there is no mention of the Anastasis nor of Constantine.

The Feast of the Encaenia in the Georgian Sources

In the Armenian Lectionary the feast of the Encaenia appeared in relative isolation from other commemorations. In the Georgian Lectionary the situation is somewhat different. Nearly every day of the liturgical year is marked by a commemoration. For example, surrounding the Encaenia is September 12th, a feast of the Virgin at the Justinian basilica, Holy-Mary-the-Virgin, and (in the Lectionary of Lathal) on September 21st, "For the dedication of the New Sophia, where used to be the house of Pilate..." The Georgian lectionary for September 13th reads as follows:

The month of September 13. In the Anastasis, the Dedication, which are the [days of the] Encaenia.

Before at vespers:

Troparion: How innumerable are your...

Psalm, mode iv: All the earth adores... (Ps 65:4)

Stichus: Praise God all the earth (Ps 65:1)

At the Liturgy:

Troparion, mode i: More than the sun.

Psalm, mode iv: All the nations which you have made... (Ps 85:9)

Stichus: Because you O Lord, have comforted me... (Ps 85:17)

Reading I, The Wisdom of Solomon: Beginning. God our father and Lord (Wis. Sol. 9:1-8). As it comes in the dedication of a church.

Reading II. From the Prophet Zachariah: Thus says the Lord all-powerful, I have returned to Jerusalem with compassion... Therefore I will build a wall of fire around her and I will dwell with glory within her. (Zach 1:16-2:5)

Reading III, Paul to Timothy: This I am writing to you... As it comes in Lent, the fifth Thursday.

Alleluia, mode v: We shall be satisfied with the goodness... (Ps 64:5)

The Gospel of John: And they were celebrating the encaenia in Jerusalem and it was winter... I am the son of God. If my father does not perform the work... (Jn 10:22-37)

At this point the manuscript is corrupted, omitting mention of the beginning of the second day and commencing again with a reading from Isaiah 65:24. The

manuscript of Lathal, on the other hand, preserves the rubrics for the feast of the exaltation of the Cross. However September 14th did not become known as the Feast of the Exaltation until after the victory of Heraclius over the Persians and the triumphant restoration of the Cross to Jerusalem. The feast of the Exaltation was more a name change than anything else. The readings selected for this feast, remain as applicable to the finding of the cross as they are to its exaltation. The remaining six days are specified, not as days of the cross, but days "of the Dedication." Since in the Paris manuscript September 17th to 19th have been lost we shall depend, for the most part, upon the text preserved in the Lathal manuscript for these three days.

Returning to the first day of the Encaenia, we observe that the place of the liturgy is specified as the Anastasis. This follows the Armenian Lectionary. The loss in the Paris Georgian manuscript of the beginning of the second day means that we do not know for certain whether the second day was kept at the Martyrium. However, since September 14th was undoubtedly a feast of the Cross, and since the Martyrium was primarily the basilica of the Cross, it seems likely that this would have been the station for the second day. Attached to September 13th in the Georgian Lectionary is the psalm and chant for vespers on the evening prior to the feast. This element of the liturgy is omitted in both Egeria and the Armenian sources. The Armenian sources preserve three vigils which are in preparation for a major liturgy the following day (Epiphany, the night of holy Thursday, and the Paschal vigil), consisting of a number of readings and psalms. The service prescribed for the evening of September 12th cannot, though, be described as a vigil. On the other hand, the Armenian Lectionary never specifies a service of vespers to precede the liturgy of the next day. Vespers, celebrated at the tenth hour on the day itself, are preserved for the weeks of Lent where the station is Holy Sion. The structure of the vespers consists of three readings and a psalm which is also retained by the Georgian lectionary for the weeks of Lent and the vespers of Holy Thursday. The first vespers of the encaenia preserves only the chants and not the scripture texts. The "troparion" or entrance chant is taken from Ps 83:2, "How delightful are your dwelling places Lord of hosts".⁶³⁶ This same psalm reference occurs again on the fourth day of the feast and also within the Georgian rite for the dedication of a church preserved in the Paris Georgian 3. Psalm 65 is indicated for the psalm and "stichus". Like Ps 64, this psalm speaks of the dreadful deeds of the Lord which

⁶³⁶ For a commentary on the chants of the Georgian Lectionary see H. Leeb, *Die Gesänge*, 38ff.

have been observed by all nations (v.4) and the psalmist promises to offer burnt offerings in the house of the Lord (v.13). In addition to these texts Leeb reproduces the chant after the psalm for the vespers of the Encaenia, it reads

The Anastasis is the new temple, the image of the heavenly Jerusalem,
where the God of all nations is adored.⁶³⁷

Although this chant is relatively late it echoes the themes of 'temple', 'heavenly Jerusalem', and 'all nations' which we have noted in the writings of Eusebius and which will reappear throughout the eight day feast.

The liturgy for the Encaenia has expanded from the two psalms, epistle, and Gospel in the Armenian Lectionary, to two psalms, three readings and a Gospel. The introductory psalm is no longer Ps 64 but Ps 85, and Ps 64 has replaced Ps 147 as the Alleluia psalm. The extracts from the Letter to Timothy and the Gospel from John remain, but are supplemented by a reading from the Wisdom of Solomon and another from the prophet Zachariah. The choice of Ps 85:9, 17 for the chant indicates, once again, the emphasis on "all nations" coming to worship the Lord. This is a theology which sees the Church as the fulfilment of the times of the gentiles, and also sees this fulfilment in the conversion of the empire to Christianity.

Psalm 85 appears also in the common office of the Cross where a variant draws our attention to a feast entitled, "In Holy Golgotha, the apparition in heaven of the venerable Cross".⁶³⁸ This feast marks the apparition of the Cross in 351 which we described in chapter four. The feast also occurs in the Armenian lectionary where the letter of Cyril to Constantius is specified as a reading. In the Armenian and Georgian sources the emperor addressed is given as Constantine rather than Constantius.⁶³⁹ This change of address, which is also found throughout the Syriac sources, either reflects a genuine confusion between the vision of the Cross to Constantine and the 351 apparition or it is a deliberate change to blot out any mention of the unorthodox Constantius.⁶⁴⁰

⁶³⁷ H. Leeb, *Die Gesänge*, 164

⁶³⁸ GL 1446 for the common office of the Cross; GL 957 for the Feast of the Apparition.

⁶³⁹ *Jer 121*, LIV. The letter is appended to GL as Appendix IIA, 117-121. It describes the apparition as happening on May 7th 351 at the third hour. A cross of light in the sky stretched from Golgotha to the Mount of Olives. Cyril describes the apparition as greater, even, than the finding of the relics by Constantius' father Constantine; "Quoniam sub Deum amanti et beato Constantino patre tuo viva crux reperta est in Ierusalem gratia Dei et diligenti investigatione pietatis occulta sanctorum locorum largitus est ut invenirentur" (10).

⁶⁴⁰ J. F. Coakley, "A Syriac version of the letter of Cyril of Jerusalem", 72; F.C. Burkitt, "The early Syriac Lectionary", 313.

The reading from the Wisdom of Solomon on the first day of the Encaenia is noted as "coming in the dedication of a church" where it occurs within the liturgy of the Eucharist.⁶⁴¹ The passage was undoubtedly selected for the following verse which makes it particularly apt for the feast of the encaenia;

Thou hast given command to build a temple on thy holy mountain and an altar in the city of thy habitation, a copy of the holy tent which thou didst prepare from the beginning.⁶⁴²

The feast thus begins with the theme of the Martyrium complex as the new temple and the words of Solomon become the words of Constantine. The second reading, from Zachariah 1:16-2:5, builds upon this centrality of Jerusalem;

Therefore, says the Lord, I have returned to Jerusalem with compassion; my house shall be built in it, says the Lord of hosts, and the measuring line shall be stretched out over Jerusalem. Cry again, Thus says the Lord of hosts: My cities shall again overflow with prosperity, and the Lord will again comfort Zion and again choose Jerusalem...For I will be to her a wall of fire, says the Lord, and I will be the glory within her.⁶⁴³

This reading may have been viewed as being fulfilled in the present growth and prosperity of Jerusalem. However, it may also have been inserted after the destruction wrought in the city by the marauding Persians in which case, its appeal lay in the hope for a return to the days of Constantinian splendour.⁶⁴⁴

The place of 1Tim 3, Ps 64, and the text of Jn 10 in the feast of the encaenia was established in the Armenian Lectionary and so requires little discussion here.⁶⁴⁵ These three texts are the most ancient readings for the feast. The additional texts make more explicit the theological themes present in these three readings of the day. The evidence of Sinai Georgian 54 follows Paris Georgian 3 regarding Ps 85, I Timothy 3, and Ps 64. Thus, the two Old testament readings are omitted which places this source closer to the Armenian Lectionary. Gerogian 54 also records the display of the cross (as described in the Lectionary of Lathal) and preserves the full text of the chant for the offertory procession;

⁶⁴¹ GL 1150. The liturgy also commences with the tropion "More than the sun", and takes the gospel from the fifth day of the Encaenia.

⁶⁴² Wis. Sol. 9:8.

⁶⁴³ Zach. 1:16-17,2:5.

⁶⁴⁴ The Persians attacked and sacked Jerusalem in 614 under Khusrav II. By 629 they had been driven out and partial restoration work to the Holy Sepulchre, basilica of Sion, and the basilicas on the Mount of Olives commenced under bishop Modestus. On 21 March 630 Heraclius triumphantly entered the Golden Gate of Jerusalem bearing the recovered relic of the true cross.

⁶⁴⁵ The Gospel reading in Paris Georgian 3 terminates at v.37 rather than v.42. Ms Latal, however, preserves the text as it is found in the Armenian Paris 44.

Your temple, O Lord, has been filled with glory, in which the Lord of hosts is sat upon a raised throne and present, and around him the cherubim of numerous eyes and the seraphim of six wings with one unceasing voice sing: Holy, holy, holy is the Lord and the King of glory.⁶⁴⁶

The second day of the Encaenia

We now turn to the second day of the feast, September 14th. As we have previously noted the manuscript which forms the basis for Tarchnischvili's edition, Paris Georgian 3, lacks the opening text of the feast and commences with a reading from Isaiah 65. The manuscript of Lathal, however, preserves detailed rubrics for this day which include the showing of the Cross to the people. Since this liturgical action has its origins in the earliest celebration of the feast, it seems appropriate to reproduce a translation. The text reads as follows,

The Exaltation of the Cross...e) And they say the third prokeimenos mode II: Your cross, O Christ, we adore. Stichus: Show us a good sign (Ps 85:17). Have mercy. f) All accomplish the above order. After this they wash the cross, anoint it with perfume and they say the "hypakoi" of the cross; the cross is shown to the people, and again the cross is placed on the altar...g) After this they begin the canon of the sacrifice. Troparion, mode I: The seal of Christ. Psalm. Mode VIII: Show salvation, Lord, to your people and bless... (Ps 27:9). Stichus The Lord is the strength of his people (Ps 27:8). h) Reading from Proverbs beginning: She is the sign of life for all who flee to her and all who should believe in her...[until] that you shall walk in the hope of peace for all your life and your foot shall not stumble. (Prov. 3:18-23)

It is at this point, with the second reading from Isaiah 65:24, that the Paris manuscript recommences. When September 14th was celebrated as the finding of the Cross, rather than the exaltation, it is more probable that in Jerusalem the relics of the cross, rather than an image, were displayed.⁶⁴⁷ Proverbs 3:18-23 has been chosen for its reference to a "sign of life", i.e. the "saving sign" of the cross. The citation from Isaiah 65:24 is not so obvious. If the text was meant to include 65:25 then one could envisage it being selected to portray the Martyrium-site as the "holy mountain" ("They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain") or

⁶⁴⁶ Bernard Outtier, "Un témoin partiel", 86; H. Leeb, *Die Gesänge*, 113 describes this form of chant as often including angelic references. The allusion to Isaiah's vision in the temple is evident.

⁶⁴⁷ This rubric is found in the Armenian Erévan 985, "And on the same day, one shows the venerable, living, and holy cross to all those assembled." (*Jer* 121, LXVIII). Egeria describes the showing on Holy Friday, "stant in giro mensa diacones et affertur locus argenteus deauratus, in quo est lignum sanctum crucis, aperitur et profertur, ponitur in mensa tam lignum crucis quam titulus...unus et unus omnis populis veniens, tam fideles quam cathecumini, acclinantes se ad mensam, osculentur sanctum lignum et pertranseant." (*Itinerarium* 37).

we could speculate that the reading ran on further to include 66:1 "Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool; what is the house which you would build for me, and what is the place of my rest?". The manuscript of Lathal, however, specifies 65:22, which describes the long toil-free days of God's chosen people, in effect a period of sabbath. There is no ambiguity regarding the choice of the third Old Testament reading from Wisdom 14:1-7. The passage was undoubtedly selected for the final verse, "Blessed is the wood by which righteousness comes." The passage only occurs in the lectionary within this feast. The same applies to the final Old Testament reading, from Ezek 9:2-6. The theological message of this passage is quite blunt, the mark or sign of the Cross sets aside the righteous people of God and saves them from his wrath. As with the passage from Zachariah, one wonders if the text reflects seventh century events,

Now the glory of the God of Israel had gone up from the cherubim on which it rested to the threshold of the house; and he called to the man clothed in linen..."Go through the city, through Jerusalem, and put a mark upon the foreheads of the men who sigh and groan over all the abominations that are committed in [the house of the Lord]."⁶⁴⁸

This and the other Old Testament texts are omitted from the ordo preserved in Sinai Georgian 54 which suggests that they belong to a later date. The fifth reading in the Georgian Lectionary also occurs in Georgian 54. This text, from 1 Cor 1, is also prescribed for the liturgy of Good Friday. The reading echoes the sentiments implied in the previous reading, "For the word of the cross is folly to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God" (1:18). The Alleluia Psalm 45:11 reverts to the universalism of God's reign, similar to the themes of Pss 64 and 65. The Gospel reading, from John 19, like the epistle, occurs also on Good Friday and recounts the crucifixion and death of Christ. Hearing this in Jerusalem, it would not only serve as a reminder that the very cross on which Christ hung was within their sight, and that they themselves were standing on Golgotha, but also recall the discovery of both Pilate's titulus and the nails.⁶⁴⁹ This Gospel is also found for September 14th in Sinai Georgian 34⁶⁵⁰ whilst Sinai Georgian 54 however specifies Ps 44:7 for the Alleluia and Matt 24:27-35 for the Gospel.⁶⁵¹ Both of these occur in the Georgian office of

⁶⁴⁸ Ezek 9:3-4.

⁶⁴⁹ The Church historian Rufinus, writing around 402, in his description of the finding of the cross mentions that the titulus was separated from the cross. Prior to him, Gelasius (390's) had described the discovery of the nails. Ambrose's account of the *inventio* (in the obituary of Theodosius) remarks that the discovery of the *titulus* proved the discovery of Christ's cross. See J. W. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*, 101-111.

⁶⁵⁰ G. Garitte, "Le Calendrier", 374.

⁶⁵¹ Bernard Outtier, "Un témoin partiel", 86.

the cross and in the feast of the apparition (May 7th). Neither text, however, is specified for the octave in Paris Georgian 3 or the manuscript of Lathal. It would seem that in this instance that Sinai Georgian 54 is liturgically more consistent in retaining themes that appear in other feasts of the cross. There are, it emerges, two different emphases in the choice of these texts. Either the feast recalls the Good Friday liturgy, or as is more often the case, recalls the finding and apparition of the cross. There is almost an inherent tension between focusing on the Cross itself or the one who hung upon it. The motif of the "saving cross" and the "trophy of victory", however, permits the two to be interchangeable.

Thus we have the details for the two major days of the feast. On one hand, the liturgy of the encaenia makes explicit a theology which considers the Constantinian edifice to be a new temple, a replacement for the Jewish temple which lay in ruins opposite the basilica. The theology of the building is reflected in the use of the Encaenia, in the earliest Georgian sources, as the model for the dedication of a church. There are six references back to the feast of the encaenia in the first two days of dedication alone before the rubric states, "From the third day until the seventh the same canon is performed as in the days of the Encaenia."⁶⁵² Throughout the Georgian sources September 14th is a feast of the Cross with a definite emphasis on the cross as a sign or symbol of the saving work of the Lord. The underlying theme to both days is that the works of the Lord recalled in Jerusalem are seen by all the nations. The feasts of the encaenia and cross witness to the scripture prophecies that all nations will worship on the mountain of the Lord.

Days three to eight of the Encaenia

The remaining six days of the feast we shall discuss in a little less detail. Our sources for the remaining days are primarily the manuscript of Lathal, and Sinai Georgian 34. Paris Georgian 3 has the ordo for only days three, four, and eight, and Sinai Georgian 54 preserves the chants for the first two days. The station for day three in the liturgical sources is marked as Holy Sion. Egeria, however, specifies Eleona on the Mount of Olives which she describes as both the place of the Ascension and where Christ taught his Apostles.⁶⁵³ The psalms and

⁶⁵² GL 1558.

⁶⁵³ See *Itinerarium*, 49.3, "Item tertia die in Eleona, id est in ecclesia, quae est in ipso monte, a quo ascendit Dominus in caelis post passionem, intra qua ecclesia est spelunca illa, in qua docebat Dominus apostolos in monte Oliveti."

the Old Testament reading, however, reflect the station of Sion.⁶⁵⁴ The introductory psalm, Ps 147, as in the Armenian Lectionary, is an Easter text. It is employed on three separate occasions at the Sion station, and the first verse makes it particularly appropriate as an introductory psalm at this station, "Praise the Lord Jerusalem, praise your God, O Sion." The reading from Isaiah adds to this,

Look upon Sion, the city of our appointed feasts! Your eyes will see
Jerusalem, a quiet habitation, an immovable tent, whose stakes will
never be plucked up, nor will any of its cords be broken.⁶⁵⁵

The alleluia-psalm continues this theme of praise in Sion; "Praise is due to thee in Sion, O God" (Ps 64:2).⁶⁵⁶ The epistle and gospel for this day have a different emphasis. The epistle beginning from Hebrews 8:7 contrasts the new covenant with the old. The reading includes a description of the Jewish temple, contrasting the outer and inner sanctuaries. It is strange that the reading ends at 9:10 rather than the next verse which interprets the high priestly action of Christ. Ending at verse 10 almost reinterprets the passage as an explanation for the worship of the Jerusalem community in the present time; making the distinction between the basilica and the holy of holies where only the priests are permitted.⁶⁵⁷ The Gospel for this day suggests that we should include the Epistle among the polemical readings generally directed against the Jews. The Gospel is Matt 23:1-22, the condemnations of the scribes and Pharisees. This Gospel, as we noted in the previous section, appears in the Armenian translation of the movable "dedication of all altars". Just as the stationary liturgy is moved out from the central places of Jerusalem, so too the texts appear to look less at the place of the Christian Jerusalem in the world than at the relationship of the Church to Judaism.

The basilica known as the Holy Nea was consecrated by Justinian in 543. It was destroyed by an earthquake in 746. It is specified as the station for the

⁶⁵⁴ A seventh century sermon on the Encaenia by John of Bolnis describes how the 13 and 14 September mark the encaenia of the church of the resurrection and the church of the Cross. The 15 September, however, is "the encaenia of the holy and glorious Sion which is the mother of all churches, and in which the holy apostles gathered, erected by King Theodosius the Great..." (Michel van Esbroeck, *Les plus anciens homéliaires Géorgiens: étude descriptive et historique*. (Louvain, 1975), 314.

⁶⁵⁵ Isa 33:20. The only other occurrence of this text is in the Georgian "Litany of Isaiah" (GL 1566).

⁶⁵⁶ The emphasis on Sion as the dwelling place of God is also noted by H. Leeb, *Die Gesänge*, 96.

⁶⁵⁷ The text is appropriate however for the season of the Atonement, describing as it does, the only time the high priest enters the holy of holies. This text also appears on the "Birthday of the Holy birth-giver" (Sept. 8th).

fourth day of the Encaenia which, for this day, confirms the broad period into which this lectionary falls. Ms Sinai Georgian 34 specifies Holy Sion for this day and does not mention the station for September 15th and, although the Nea basilica appears as a station for September 12th (a feast of the Virgin to whom the basilica was dedicated), it is not chosen at all within the Encaenia octave. Unfortunately since the manuscript of Egeria breaks with the words, "Quarta autem die..." we do not have an independent witness to the station in the late fourth century. The readings in Paris Georgian 3 emphasise the relationship between "all nations" and Jerusalem under the new covenant. The introductory psalm tells of the Lord building up Jerusalem and gathering in her outcasts (Ps 146). In a short excerpt from Zachariah, the Old Testament reading provides a summary of Christian Jerusalem's self-perception;

Thus says the Lord of hosts: I will return to Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem, and Jerusalem shall be called the faithful city, and the mountain of the Lord of hosts, the holy mountain...Behold, I will save my people from the east country and from the west country; and I will bring them to dwell in the midst of Jerusalem; and they shall be my people and I will be their God, in faithfulness and in righteousness.⁶⁵⁸

Heard within the city itself, during the feast of the encaenia, these readings were intended to be heard as fulfilled texts. The inclusion of all nations in the city of Jerusalem is not, however, to the exclusion of the Jewish nation. The epistle reading, from Romans 11, clarifies the place of the Jews in salvation history and offers an answer to the "Jewish question". When the full number of gentiles have come in, writes St Paul, then Israel will be saved. This letter prepares for the Gospel reading which, although lost in Georgian 3, is attested to in both the manuscript of Lathal and the Georgian index as Mark 11:15-18, the clearing of the temple. Taking into account the previous reading and in addition the alleluia-psalm (Ps 83:2; "How lovely is your dwelling place"), the gospel continues in the same line of theology that Jerusalem, and the "new temple" in the city, is intended for the entire empire. There is the underlying implication that the city has been confiscated by the state for the use of the Empire in much the same way that the properties of criminals (and Christians prior to Constantine) were confiscated, becoming the property of the treasury. Before the reign of Constantine the destruction of Jerusalem was considered by Christian writers as punishment for the Jewish rejection of Christ. There was little concept, however, of Jerusalem being handed over to Christianity, rather the commentators looked towards a spiritual Jerusalem. This attitude changed with the advent of Constantine and his

⁶⁵⁸ Zach. 8:3,7-8.

policy to make Jerusalem the religious centre of the world. The liturgy of the Encaenia bears witness to a strand of theology which held that the city of Jerusalem rightfully changed ownership from the Jews, who made the temple into a "den of robbers", to the Christian religion which, as a religion inclusive of all the peoples of the empire, saw itself as fulfilling the prophecies of all nations one day ascending to the mountain of the Lord.

Whereas the manuscript of Lathal specifies Sion as the station for the fifth day, Georgian 34 has the place of the Ascension. The Lectionary of Lathal and Georgian 3 have already indicated Sion as a station for the third day. A rubric on October 7th in the Lathal lectionary indicates the liturgy for the fifth day of the encaenia, adding that the station is the place of the Ascension. Egeria had already indicated the station of Eleona, "a quo ascendit Dominus" as the station for the third day.⁶⁵⁹ Although the introductory psalm makes mention of Mount Sion, a connection is made with the feast of the Transfiguration in the choice of Heb 12 as the epistle reading. The feast of the Transfiguration (August 6th) in Lathal is celebrated "in the place of the Ascension, in Thabor."⁶⁶⁰ Hebrews 12 is the first text in the feast of the encaenia to stress the heavenly Jerusalem,

But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the innumerable angels in festal-gathering, and to the assembly of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven...Therefore let us be grateful for receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, and thus let us offer to God acceptable worship, with reverence and awe.⁶⁶¹

Ps 86 which follows this reading reiterates this theme with the verses, "On the holy mount stands the city he founded...glorious things are spoken of you, O city of God" (v.1,3). The comparison of the earthly city with the heavenly is a theme used by Eusebius in his oration at the dedication of the basilica in Tyre.⁶⁶² The Lectionary of Lathal specifies a Gospel from Matthew, the same, it states, as the fifth day of the seventh week after Easter. The gospel for this day, however is

⁶⁵⁹ The basilica on the summit of the Mount of Olives was probably completed in 384, after the departure of Egeria. Egeria would have been familiar with the other major basilica on the Mount of Olives, the basilica of the disciples, marking the site of the Lord's apocalyptic pronouncements to the disciples. For the dating of the basilica of the "Place of the Ascension" see P. Devos, "La 'servante de Dieu' Poemenia." *Analecta Bollandiana* 87 (1969): 189-212.

⁶⁶⁰ The link between the Transfiguration and the place of the Ascension had already been made by the Bordeaux pilgrim, "Inde non longe [montem Oliveti] est monticulus, ubi Dominus ascendit orare et apparuit illuc Moyses et Helias" (*Itinerarium Burdigalense* 595.6).

⁶⁶¹ Heb 12:22,28.

⁶⁶² In *H.E.* 10.4.6 Eusebius cites Ps 86 with reference to the basilica itself (see also 10.4.70). *V.C.* 3.33, of course, spoke of the Constantinian basilica in terms of a new Jerusalem spoken of in the prophets.

from St John and occurs in both the major Georgian manuscripts.⁶⁶³ The Index has also a Gospel from Matthew for the fifth day of the Encaenia, and in addition preserves Matthew 16:13-20 for the fifth day of the seventh week after Easter. Whereas the Lathal manuscript has Matt 16 for the encaenia, the Index has Matt 23:13-22.⁶⁶⁴ This is one particular example of the liturgy providing a new interpretation of a Gospel passage one might have considered as having a fixed interpretation. In this case Matt 16 has been chosen for its reference to the rock on which Christ will build the Church. Not Rome, however, but rather Sion in Jerusalem. Fitting also, perhaps, because Peter, like James, has some affinity with the community in Jerusalem (see, Gal. 2:7, for example). It is not certain whether this reading was a later addition or, perhaps omitted and Matt 23:13-22 selected to take its place.

With Ps 131 as the introduction to the sixth day of the Encaenia we return to familiar territory; "arise O Lord and go to thy resting place" sets the tone of the psalm. In the Lectionary of Lathal this psalm is a popular choice and it, with verse 8, is found at the feast of the nativity, the fourth day of epiphany, and the common of the Holy Birth-Giver. This psalm mostly occurs on days associated with the motherhood of Mary, chosen for its ample references to David and his anointed son. On this day, September 18th, the manuscript of Lathal indicates no station. However Sinai 34 names the station as Bethlehem which may point to the reason for the choice of Ps 131.⁶⁶⁵ Once again the epistle reading comes from the letter to the Hebrews, this time chapter 13. In the Georgian sources this reading occurs also at the "beginning of the year", January 1st.⁶⁶⁶ We might remember that this text forms part of the liturgy for the Armenian feast of the dedication of all the altars and as well as hinting Judeo-Christian relationships in Jerusalem also expresses a yearning for a heavenly city (as did Heb 12). The Gospel for the Armenian feast was Matt 23:13-22 which may point to this having originally been the Gospel in the Georgian sources for the fifth day of the Encaenia, though one cannot be sure. Fortunately, for the sixth day both the

⁶⁶³ However, the ordo of the fragment preserved in the 8th century manuscript H-1329 of Tiflis for the feast of the dedication of the church and commemoration of St George (10th November) indicates Matt 16:13ff for the Gospel "as coming on the Sunday of Pentecost, the fifth day". See GL 1392c and G. Garitte, "Index", 380.

⁶⁶⁴ This is the second section of the passage addressed against the scribes and Pharisees. Matt 23:1-12 was the Gospel for the third day in the Index; G. Garitte, "Index", 374-75. The complete text, Matt 23:1-22, occurs on the third day in the two major Georgian manuscripts.

⁶⁶⁵ *Le Calendrier*, 91.

⁶⁶⁶ GL 70. January 1st in the Georgian sources is the feast of the Circumcision of the Lord. Ms. Sinai 34 also marks it as within the octave of the nativity.

Index and the manuscript of Lathal agree that the Gospel was Mark 12 beginning at either verse 24 or 28.⁶⁶⁷ The heart of this Gospel is a summary of the Christian interpretation of the Jewish law, that to love God and to love one's neighbour is much greater than all burnt offerings and sacrifices (v.33). The Gospel also refers to David and the son of God and ends with the widow donating more to the treasury than the rich. The Gospel passage, although gathering together at least three themes, is Jerusalem-centred, and contrasts the teaching of the scribes with that of Jesus, a theme which is comparable to the text of Matthew 23.

In the Lathal source there are no stations indicated for the final two days of the feast. Turning to Sinai 34, however, we see that the feast culminates where it began, at Golgotha (day 7) and the Anastasis (day 8). The feast of the encaenia is described as the anniversary of the dedication of the holy places in Jerusalem. Our description has seen days celebrated not only at the Martyrium and the Anastasis, but also at Holy Sion, the Mount of Olives, and at Bethlehem. These five stations constitute the oldest stations in Jerusalem, with at least four of the five having their origin in the reign of Constantine.

The Lathal Lectionary opens the seventh day with Ps 86, "The Lord loves the gates of Sion". This psalm had previously been used as the alleluia-psalm on the fifth day where ms. Lathal had indicated Sion as the station. The epistle reading, from the letter to the Romans, once again addresses the question of the places of the Jews in salvation history;

For I could wish that I myself were accursed and cut off from Christ for the sake of my brethren, my kinsmen by race. They are Israelites, and to them belong the sonship, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises; to them belong the patriarchs, and of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever. Amen⁶⁶⁸

The alleluia-psalm for this day, Psalm 95, is particularly associated with feasts of the Apostles in the Georgian lectionary. Its selection for the feasts of the four evangelists (12th June), John the Evangelist (8th May), the feast of all Apostles (29th October), and the seventh day of the encaenia is the command to "declare his glory among the nations" (v.3) and "Say among the nations, 'The Lord reigns!'" (v.10). The looking beyond Jerusalem to the nations of the empire constantly reoccurs in the feast of the encaenia. It is partly a reflection of

⁶⁶⁷ Lathal begins at 12:28 (GL 1253g) and the Index at 12:24 (G. Garitte, "Index", 375).

⁶⁶⁸ Rom 9:3-5. The actual verses specified for this day are 1-5.

Jerusalem as the imperial centre of pilgrimage for all nations, and partly an attempt to contrast the inclusive Christian religion with the perceived exclusive Jewish religion. The tension between preaching to "all nations" and preaching to the Jews was an issue in the Jerusalem church from the beginnings of Christian missionary activity.

The gospel reading for this day is preserved in both the Index and in ms. Lathal. Taken from Jn 2:23-3:6 it relates to the conversation between Nicodemus, 'a ruler of the Jews' and Jesus. This passage appears on the eighth day of the Epiphany, the feast of Jesus' baptism, where the station is the Anastasis. Sozomen in his description of the feast of the encaenia describes the octave as a time when baptisms take place.⁶⁶⁹ The choice of Jn 3 may well be for this reason. The baptistry was located in a separate building adjacent to the Anastasis. Egeria describes the procession of the newly-baptised, led by the bishop, first to the Anastasis, then into the Martyrium where they join the congregation for the Divine Liturgy.⁶⁷⁰

The final day of the encaenia is preserved in ms Lathal with the Gospel reading for the day preserved also in the Index and in Paris Georgian 3. The introductory psalm is Ps 64 which opened the first and second day of the feast in the Armenian lectionary, and is also found for the third day in the Georgian sources. The epistle reading, as well as mentioning Mount Sion, is particularly concerned with the heavenly Jerusalem,

Now Hagar is Mount Sinai in Arabia; she corresponds to the present Jerusalem, for she is in slavery with her children. But the Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother.⁶⁷¹

This theme is parallel with the theology of Hebrews 12 and the longing for the heavenly Jerusalem. Texts such as Hebrews 12, 13 and Galatians 4 act in tension with texts that appear to be chosen with the earthly Jerusalem in mind (for example, Isa 33 or Zach 8). Regarding the city of Jerusalem there are two distinct levels in this feast; the city has been justly taken from the Jews and given for all nations, and secondly, the New Jerusalem is but a shadow of the celestial Jerusalem yet to come. The gospel reading, which appears in all the Georgian sources, serves as a final explanation of why the Jewish temple has been replaced

⁶⁶⁹ HE 2.26.

⁶⁷⁰ Itinerarium, 38.1. On the baptistry see Alexis Doval, "The location and structure of the baptistry in the Mystagogic Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem." Studia Patristica 26 (1993): 1-13.

⁶⁷¹ Gal 4:25-26. The full reading is Gal 4:18-26.

by the Christian equivalent, the Constantinian edifice; it is the parable of the tenants of the vineyard which ends,

But when the tenants saw [the son], they said to themselves, 'This is the heir; let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours.' And they cast him out of the vineyard and killed him. What then will the owner of the vineyard do to them? He will come and destroy those tenants, and give the vineyard to others."⁶⁷²

Hearing this in Jerusalem, on the feast of the dedication of the basilica which overlooked the ruins of the temple, few would hesitate to believe that this parable had been fulfilled in the days of Constantine. Outside of Jerusalem the parable had a far less parochial interpretation (which ultimately no doubt its selection for the Encaenia intended) that encompassed far more of the Jewish inheritance than merely the earthly city.

Conclusions

Two days only are set aside for the feast of the encaenia in the Armenian Lectionary. Dated to sometime between 417 and 439, the Lectionary is the oldest single witness we have to the texts of the liturgical year in Jerusalem. The feast of the encaenia itself bears witness to the age of the lectionary. The two-day celebration held at the foremost Constantinian construction has but an allusion to the feast of the Cross. The psalms and readings, repeated on the second day, place their emphasis on the feast's connection with Easter and the spiritual Church. The only text unique to the feast is Jn 10:22, chosen for its mention of the Jewish "encaenia" feast.

The Georgian lectionary, reconstructed from a number of manuscripts, and dotted throughout with a number of frustrating omissions and variants, bears witness to the later development of the feast. Celebrated for a full octave, the biblical texts reveal a number of consistent themes that establish the theology of the feast. Apart from the one day dedicated solely to the sign of the Cross, the feast comments upon Jerusalem as the restored dwelling place of the Lord, the confiscation of the city from the Jews for the Christian empire of "all nations", the ultimate salvation of the Jewish people, and the relationship of the earthly Jerusalem to the heavenly archetype.

⁶⁷² Lk 20:14-16. The Gospel reading is Lk 20:1-19.

The liturgical development of the Encaenia and the feast of the Cross

The feast of the Cross continues to be celebrated in the East and Western churches. The Armenian liturgical year sets aside three days devoted to the Cross. All three have their origins in fourth century Jerusalem. The feast of the exaltation of the Cross has developed over the ages from a brief allusion in the Armenian-Jerusalem lectionary to being celebrated on alternate days in the octave alongside the "feast of the church", The Gospel readings include Jn 19, and Matt 23. However, the allusions to the dedication of the church no longer refer to the Jerusalem holy places but rather to the vision of Gregory the Illuminator and subsequent dedication of the Armenian basilica of Ejmiacin. The other two feasts devoted to the Cross are the feast of the Apparition of the Cross still celebrated on May 7th, and finally the 'Ordo of the Crucifixion' performed at the sixth hour on Good Friday.⁶⁷³ The present Byzantine calendar, whilst still retaining the feast of the Encaenia, invariably celebrates September 13th as the "feast before the exaltation of the Cross". The liturgy of the exaltation of the cross maintains 1 Cor 1:18f for the epistle, and Jn 19:6f as the Gospel reading.⁶⁷⁴ The modern Coptic lectionary celebrates the feast of the cross on March 19th. The liturgy has retained Ps 64 in the synaxis and, more significantly, Jn 10:22-38 which has less to do with the feast of the Cross than it has with the original feast of the Encaenia. The commentary for this feast refers to the day as the "feast of the consecration of the Church of the Holy Cross" but concerning the Cross states, "On this holyday, Heracles, the king of Rome discovered the Cross in Persia."⁶⁷⁵ The deeds of Heraclius, from the seventh century, eclipsed the original finding of the Cross and so also concealed the close association between the dedication of the Martyrium basilica (transferred to an Armenian basilica in the modern liturgy) and the finding of the Cross which it was built to house.

⁶⁷³ The modern Armenian feasts are described in greater detail by A. Renoux, "La croix dans le rite arménien: histoire et symbolisme." *Melto* 5 (1969): 123-175. See also A. Kniazeff, "La spiritualité de la croix dans les offices byzantins des 13 et 14 Septembre." *Liturgie. Spiritualité. Cultures: Conférences Saint-Serge XXIXe Semaine d'études liturgiques*. Ed. A. M. Triacca and A. Pistoin. (Rome, 1983), 153-179.

⁶⁷⁴ I am grateful to Dr George Dragas for providing me with a modern edition of the calendar.

⁶⁷⁵ The celebration of the Exaltation of the Cross on March 19th is more faithful to the historical event which the liturgy now claims to celebrate, the "second finding" of the Cross by Heraclius on March 21st 630. These excerpts are taken from a translation of the Coptic Lectionary obtained from the electronic archives of Copt-Net at pharos.bu.edu (/CN/readings/07.Parmhat.txt). The original source of this work is not mentioned.

The feast of the Cross in the Western liturgy

The Western liturgical tradition has no feast of the Encaenia. It does, however, have a feast of the finding of the Cross (3/7 May) and a separate feast of the Exaltation of the Cross (14 Sept). Both feasts are present in the Gelasian Sacramentary.⁶⁷⁶ The link between the Western Exaltation of the Cross and Jerusalem lies in the institution of this feast in the West after the recovery of the Cross by Heraclius. Initially, the feast was not strictly a Mass of the Exaltation but rather a rite of adoration celebrated in the liturgy of Rome.⁶⁷⁷ Sometime towards the end of the eighth century the feast entered the Gallican liturgy.

The feast of the finding of the Cross, celebrated at the beginning of May appears to have sprung up in Gaul sometime in the eighth century. There is no direct line of development between this feast and the one celebrated in Jerusalem. Rather, the finding of the Cross seems to have arisen as a result of the legend of the Inventio which depicts the Judas Cyriacus, translated into Latin in the sixth century. In this legend Helena commands that the feast of the Cross should be kept year by year. In the Roman Rite the epistle for both the Inventio and the Exaltatio is Phil. 2:5-11. The Gospel for the Inventio is Jn 3:1-15 whilst for the Exaltation is specified Jn 12:31-36. Both passages have evidently been chosen for their reference to the "exaltation" of the Son of man on the Cross (3:14; 12:32). The Exaltation of the Cross appeared even later in the Mozarabic rites. The liturgical calendars used by Férotin in his edition of the Mozarabic Liber Ordinum make no mention of the feast on 14 September. All, apart from one, witness to a feast of the Inventio on 3 May.⁶⁷⁸

Anton Baumstark in Comparative Liturgy speaks of the development of "concomitant" feasts; celebrations which were dependent upon another. The Exaltation of the Cross, he states, is a concomitant feast for it is closely dependent upon the Encaenia.⁶⁷⁹ The finding of the Cross was a subsidiary feast of the Encaenia. Once it developed into the Exaltation and moved outside the immediate surroundings of Jerusalem the feast took on a significance which in

⁶⁷⁶ See Antoine Chavasse, Le sacramentaire Gélisien. (Tournai, 1957), 351-63 (from which much of this information is taken).

⁶⁷⁷ The seventh century Sacramentary of Padua entitles it as, "Oratio ad crucem salutandam in Sancto Petro" (Baumstark and B. Botte, Comparative Liturgy, 144).

⁶⁷⁸ Marius Férotin, Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'église Wisigothique et Mozarabe d'Espagne. (Paris, 1904), 462ff.

⁶⁷⁹ Baumstark, Comparative Liturgy, 183.

some liturgical books suggested that it and not the Encaenia was the superior feast. The only remnants of the Encaenia were preserved in the biblical passages specified for the liturgy. Out of the cave of the resurrection rose the relics of the Cross, is how the later legends depict its discovery. Out of the feast of the Encaenia, arose the feast of the Cross. A development which may have met with the approval of Constantine and Cyril of Jerusalem but certainly not Eusebius or Jerome.⁶⁸⁰

⁶⁸⁰ Jerome's commentary on Ps 95 may have been delivered as a sermon at the feast of the Encaenia. If it was then we have a discourse comparable to that delivered by Eusebius in 335. Jerome makes every effort to stress the spiritual nature of the building (with reference to the psalm's title). He rejects the growing cult devoted to the wood of the Cross ("Ego crucem dico, non lignum; sed passionem. Ceterum crux ista et in Britannia est, et in India est, et in universo orbe terrarum" - compare with Cyril, *Cat. Lect.* 4.10; 10.19; 13.4). Faithful, he says, is the one who carries the places of the cross and resurrection, the ascension, and Bethlehem, in his heart. The days of the Encaenia, he writes, are always in storms, in rain, and in winter (with reference to Jn 10:22 to which he adds, "quia hiemps erat et pluviae"). The discourse ends by interpreting the portico of Solomon as the peace of Christ, a place of shelter where the winter is past and the rains have stopped (Cant. 2:11). The text can be found in Jerome, *Tractatus de Psalmo XCV* (CCL 78, 149).

Chapter Seven

The Feast of Encaenia and the Feast of Tabernacles

The Christian Temple

In this chapter I hope to develop the theology of the feast of the Encaenia which I briefly outlined in the preceding chapters. It is a theology of identity which reflects both what is common and what is distinct in Christianity and Judaism. How was the city of Jerusalem interpreted, a city once Jewish, then gentile and now Christian? How did those who shaped the liturgy of Jerusalem integrate the traditions of this ancient and sacred city? The feast of the Encaenia, I believe, provides some answers to these questions.

Constantine's enthusiasm to rebuild Jerusalem as a Christian city provided a context in which writers, particularly those who dwelt in the region, attempted to re-create a theology of the city which in some sense 'Christianised' traditional Jewish or biblical images of Jerusalem.⁶⁸¹ This was particularly so regarding the place of Golgotha which overlooked the temple mount. Eusebius, we recall, interpreted the site as the 'new Jerusalem' predicted by the prophets.⁶⁸² This expression was reiterated in the Ecclesiastical History of Socrates.⁶⁸³ Jerome too, in his letter to Marcella praising the Holy Land, compares the tomb of Christ to the Ark and draws attention to the holy city in the book of Revelation.⁶⁸⁴ Later Theodoret in his commentary on Ezekiel contrasts the ruins of the temple with the prayers offered in the "church of the Cross, and the Anastasis, and the ascension, and the church on Sion, and holy Bethlehem, and the others"⁶⁸⁵. In Jewish tradition the holy of holies and the temple were considered the centre of the world.⁶⁸⁶ Fourth century Christian commentators, and not only those writing in the vicinity of Jerusalem, continued to place Jerusalem at the centre but, consistent with the interpretations noted above, shifted the central location to the

⁶⁸¹ On this subject see, for example, Robert Ousterhout, "The Temple, the Sepulchre, and the Martyrion of the Savior (the relationship of the Holy Sepulcher and the Temple of Jerusalem manifested in writings, ceremonies and architecture)." *Gesta* 29.1 (1990): 44-53.

⁶⁸² *V.C.* 3.33.

⁶⁸³ *H.E.* 1.17.

⁶⁸⁴ *Ep.* 46.5.

⁶⁸⁵ *In Ezek* 48:35 (PG 81.1254).

⁶⁸⁶ See m.Kelim 1.6; Midrash Tanhuma, Kedoshim 10; cited Wilken, *The Land Called Holy*, 94.

spot of Christ's crucifixion.⁶⁸⁷ Other traditional temple imagery also found itself re-located to the rock of Golgotha. On Mount Moriah, claimed certain Jewish texts, was the grave of Adam.⁶⁸⁸ From at least Origen, however, Christians sought to claim this distinction for the rock of Golgotha.⁶⁸⁹

Scripture passages selected for the octave of the Encaenia also allude to this transferral of imagery. The text of Hebrews 8, for example, indicated in the Georgian lectionary for the third day of the feast, reflects the rejection of the temple. The use of Ps 83, however, affirms that the dwelling place on the mountain of the Lord is the new temple. The parable of the wicked tenants (Lk 20:1-19), the gospel for the final day of the feast, provides the ultimate explanation of a ruined temple opposite the splendid Constantinian edifice.

Given the position and structure of the Martyrium basilica it is not at all surprising that it rivalled the Jewish temple. The building of the Martyrium basilica required the demolition of the forum and temple to Aphrodite and a statue to Jupiter. The finished buildings overlooked the ruins of the Temple, standing as a trophy of victory over both polytheism and the covenant of the Old Testament. Until the destruction of the temple Jerusalem belonged to the Jewish people. Even after the fall of the temple, the city retained a primarily Jewish ethos. After the second revolt in 135, however, Hadrian made great efforts to ensure that the city was unambiguously a Roman city. Renaming it Aelia Capitolina, reordering the whole city around the forum and erecting temples to Jupiter Capitolinus and Venus, guaranteed that both Jewish and Christian writers focused their attention on the eschatological Jerusalem, the heavenly city to come. The favourable disposition of Constantine towards the Christian religion

⁶⁸⁷ The scriptural justification for this was often Ps 73:12. See Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat* 13.28, "Τῆς γὰρ γῆς τὸ μεσώτατον ὁ Γολγοθᾶς οὗτός ἐστιν. Ὅυκ ἐμὸς ὁ λόγος προφήτης ἐστιν ὁ φήσας: Εἰργάσω σωτηρίαν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς." Also, Hilary: *Tract. in Ps.* 134.19 (PL 9.762); *Comm. in Matt.* 33.4 (PL 9.1073); Didymus Alex., *De Trinitate* 1.5 (PG 39.324); Ambrose: *Comm. in Cantica Cantic.* 5.32 (PL 15.1925); Jerome, *Comm. in Ezek.* 2.5 (PL 25.54).

⁶⁸⁸ See *Apoc. Moses* 40; *Vita Adae et Evae* 48 for example.

⁶⁸⁹ Origen, *In Matt. Comm. Serm.* 27:32-3 (PG 13.1777). Although Jerome appears to accept this idea in *Ep.* 46.17, he dismisses it as hearsay in *Matt* 4.27:33 (CCL 77.270). (see further Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places*, 127-30). The sacrifice of Isaac also came to be moved to the rock of Golgotha. Isaac often appears as a type of Christ (for example, Tertullian, *Adversus Iudeos* 13; Ambrose, *De Abraham* 1.8.72; Augustine, *Ennarationes in Psalmos* 30.2). The earliest reference to the altar of Abraham at the site of Golgotha appears in the sixth century *De Situ terrae sanctae* of Theodosius, "In ciuitate hierusalem ad sepulcrum domini ibi est caluariae locus; ibi abraham obtulit filium suum holocaustum, et quia mons petreus est, in ipso monte, hoc est ad pedem montis ipsius, fecit abraham altario; super altare eminet mons, ad quem montem per gradus scalatur; ibi dominus crucifixus est." (see also Breviarius, (CCL 175.110) and the comments of Jeremias, *Golgotha*, 48-49).

and his own theology of the Cross as the symbol of victory persuaded him to remove Jerusalem out of the realms of traditional Roman religion and re-create it as a Christian city. The success of Constantine's creation of a holy city with its surrounding holy land is partly confirmed by the emperor Julian's attempt to rival his predecessor by rebuilding the Jewish temple. If Julian had been successful then Jerusalem would have once again have been a city central to Judaism and one covenant would have stood uneasily next to another. Julian's spectacular failure to fulfil his ambition only confirmed for the Christian writers what they had always preached; the destruction of the temple had been a fulfilment of Christ's words that not a stone should be left standing (Matt 24:2). Worship would not take place on this mount but in spirit and in truth (Jn 4:23), redefining the temple as the body of Christ, the only dwelling place of the divine. However, despite the spiritualisation of the temple, Constantine's buildings in and around Jerusalem ensured that the events of Christ's life and particularly his death and resurrection, could not be disassociated from the historical places. If the new temple was the risen Christ (Jn 2:21) or the spiritual body of Christ then the cave from which he rose and the building in which the church assembled could share the attributes of the other.

The Encaenia and the Feast of Tabernacles

The great Jewish feasts of Passover and Pentecost developed into equivalent Christian feasts. One Jewish feast, however, for which there appears to be no Christian version, despite it being described as the feast by Josephus,⁶⁹⁰ is the feast of tabernacles. Attempts to explain this apparent omission in the Christian calendar have occupied the minds of scholars such as Jean Daniélou.⁶⁹¹ Daniélou and others concluded, quite persuasively, that the theological themes

⁶⁹⁰ Josephus, *Antiq.* 13.372. Josephus refers to Tabernacles simply as 'the festival' (from the Hebrew he-hag).

⁶⁹¹ Parallels between the biblical symbols of Tabernacles and their Christian equivalents can be found in, Jean Daniélou, *Bible et Liturgie*. (Paris, 1951) 449-69. Daniélou's major article on the subject is "Les quatre-temps de septembre et la fête des tabernacles." *La Maison Dieu* 46 (1956): 114-36. In addition see also J. Daniélou, "La fête des tabernacles dans l'exégèse patristique." *Studia Patristica* 1 (i) (1957): 262-79; Jean Daniélou, "The Palm and the Crown." in *Primitive Christian Symbols*. (London, 1964) 1-24. Much of Daniélou's work on Tabernacles draws material from E. C. Selwyn, "The feast of Tabernacles, Epiphany and Baptism." *Journal of Theological Studies* (1911): 225-36. Other sources to consider are, Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*. (New York, 1966) 123ff; E. Beaucamp, and J.-P. de Relles. "Où est, dans la liturgie chrétienne, la grande fête de l'automne?" *Bible et Vie Chrétienne* 65 (1965): 45-55; R. de Tryon-Montalembert, "Les fêtes d'automne et la liturgie chrétienne." *Rencontre* 62 (1979): 205-13.

most associated with the feast of tabernacles were transferred to the Christian feast of Epiphany. Remnants of an autumnal feast bearing some connection with Tabernacles, argued Daniélou, could also be found in the September Ember days.

These attempts to locate a Christian autumnal feast have tended to concentrate on the liturgy of the Church in the East and the West. Epiphany and Tabernacles do share common theological themes though it still may be questioned whether one evolved from the other. There is, I believe, a better chance of finding a Christian equivalent of Tabernacles in the local celebration of the Encaenia.⁶⁹² On one level there are obvious similarities between the two feasts. The feast of the Encaenia occurs in the month of September, around the time of the month of Tishri, and second, it is celebrated for eight days. The feast of Tabernacles is a seven day feast with an eighth day of assembly. It is the only feast in the Jewish calendar to be celebrated for a week and a day. Two other feasts are kept for seven days, the feast of Unleavened Bread and the feast of Hanukkah.⁶⁹³ The feast of the Encaenia also coincided with Solomon's dedication of the temple. Solomon began this feast on the day of Atonement, a day on which the Encaenia in 335 may have occurred. Solomon's celebrations lasted long enough to coincide with the feast of Tabernacles. If Constantine's dedication lasted as long then it too would have overlapped with Tabernacles. It is significant that every dedication feast of the temple described in the Old Testament is associated with the feast of Tabernacles.

The celebration of Tabernacles epitomised the messianic hopes of the Jewish people, a motif which was carried over into early Christian literature.⁶⁹⁴ As a messianic feast it was a feast of deliverance, expressed in the rites of the eighth day. On this day the people ceased from dwelling in the tents of the wilderness and go up to the altar of the Lord, processing around the altar bearing

⁶⁹² Brief notes on the comparison of the Encaenia and Tabernacles have also been made by J. van Goudoever. *Biblical Calendars*. (Leiden, 1959) 211-13; Joshua Schwartz. "The Encaenia of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, the temple of Solomon and the Jews", 269 and John Wilkinson, "Jewish influences on the early Christian rite of Jerusalem", 348. All are concerned with the timing of the feast and its association with the dedication of Solomon's temple.

⁶⁹³ All three share some common elements. The feast of Unleavened Bread recalls the Exodus of the Hebrews into the wilderness. The memory of the time spent in the wilderness is enacted by the making and dwelling in the tents of the feast of tabernacles (Lev 23:40). Philo compares the erection of tents at Tabernacles to the wilderness experience (*De Spec. Leg.* 2.206; see Josephus, *Antiq.* 3.245). The feast of Hanukkah celebrated the inauguration of the new altar under the rule of Judas Maccabeus. The letter written to the Jewish community in Egypt instructs them to celebrate on the 25 Chislel the feast of Tabernacles (2 Macc 1:18).

⁶⁹⁴ See especially, H. Ulfgard, *Feast and Future: Revelation 7:9-17 and the Feast of Tabernacles*. (Stockholm, 1989).

branches of myrtle, willow and the citron fruit.⁶⁹⁵ Philo, discussing the numerical significance of the week, observes that the feast of Tabernacles completes the liturgical year just as the eighth day completes the weekly cycle.⁶⁹⁶ The beginning and the end of the Jewish year coincide with the harvest and the ingathering of the first fruits.

Does the Encaenia have a similar sense of being an autumnal festival? There are one or two, albeit vague, references to the season of autumn within the feast, Ps 64: 9-13 for example.⁶⁹⁷ In addition, we may recall the difficulty we encountered in attempting to explain the presence of the single verse of Isa 65:22 for the second day of the Encaenia in the Georgian lectionary. This verse speaks of how "my chosen shall long enjoy the work of their hands." This verse, viewed within the context of Tabernacles, could well be an allusion to the days of rest effected by the messianic sabbath.⁶⁹⁸

Zach 14:16 and the Encaenia

The text of Zach 14:16 epitomises the eschatological significance of the feast of tabernacles.⁶⁹⁹ Its vision and interpretation of the feast are shared by readings indicated for the Encaenia and by the comments made by Egeria and Sozomen.⁷⁰⁰ The text of Zach 14:16 reads as follows,

⁶⁹⁵ See Josephus, *Ant.* 13.372.

⁶⁹⁶ Philo, *De Spec. Leg.* 2.210.

⁶⁹⁷ Ps 64:9-13, a significant psalm for the first day of Encaenia in both the Armenian and Georgian sources, proclaims, "Thou visitest the earth and waterest it,/ thou greatly enrichest it;/ the river of God is full of water;/ thou providest their grain,/ for so thou hast prepared it. / Thou waterest its furrows abundantly,/ settling its ridges,/ softening it with showers,/ and blessing its growth./ Thou crownest the year with thy bounty;/ the tracks of thy chariot drip with fatness./ The pastures of the wilderness drip,/ the hills gird themselves with joy,/ the meadows clothe themselves with flocks,/ the valleys deck themselves with grain,/ they shout and sing together for joy." See also Ps 147 (esp. v.3) which also appears on this day.

⁶⁹⁸ Methodius of Olympia in *The Banquet* also interprets Tabernacles as a feast of completion, "We celebrate the great feast of tabernacles in the new creation and without gloom, the fruits of the earth are accomplished" (Discourse 9.236 (SC 95, 264). Methodius understands the eschatological feast to have been inaugurated by the resurrection of Christ, corresponding to the seventh millennium.

⁶⁹⁹ On the inclusion of this text within the feast of Tabernacles see Ulfsgard, *Feast and Future*, 107, 127.

⁷⁰⁰ Zach 14:16 does not appear as reading in the surviving lectionary evidence. However, it could, for example, have been indicated for any one of the days 17-20th September where the Old Testament reading has been lost (in the Georgian sources). Zach 8:3-8 appears on 16th September so it is not implausible that Zach 14:16 could have formed one of the readings later in the feast especially, perhaps, on the final day.

Then shall those remaining from all the nations that have come against Jerusalem ascend every year to worship the King, the Lord all-mighty, and to celebrate the feast of tabernacles (LXX).⁷⁰¹

First, we may note that the text speaks of the gentile nations worshipping the Lord. Second, the nations will have to journey to Jerusalem in order to do so, and third, the feast at which the nations will worship is the feast of tabernacles. One theme that frequently appeared in the readings and psalms indicated for the Encaenia was the recognition of the works of the Lord by all nations. Ps 64 for example, speaks of those living in far off lands who will see the signs of the Lord and in Ps 65 (the first day in the Georgian Lectionary) all the earth is described as worshipping the Lord. There are other examples throughout the eight days where the emphasis is on the universal nature of God's rule.⁷⁰² The Encaenia was above all, a pilgrim feast and this element brings us to the second point in Zach 14, the journeying of the nations to the mountain of God. Egeria and Sozomen both emphasise the distance travelled by the pilgrims to the feast. Whilst Egeria confines herself to naming regions from which a pilgrim might realistically travel, Sozomen on the other hand writes that the participants gathered "ἐκ πάσης τῆς ὕφ' ἡλίου". Furthermore, the Encaenia is the only feast in which Egeria draws attention to the presence of pilgrims who, she says, would have considered it a sin to have missed such a solemnity. It would be hard not to think that Egeria and Sozomen's accounts had been influenced by the text of Zach 14:16.

In this context the theological exegesis of Zach 14:16 by Christian authors is important. The interpretation of this passage is almost always with reference to the resurrection. Methodius of Olympus (d. 311) sets the tone with his comments in The Banquet. The world, he writes, is now moving towards the eschatological harvesting of the fruits. The climax of this process will be in "the great day of the resurrection, the feast of our tabernacles."⁷⁰³ Methodius retains the sense of pilgrimage inherent in the text of Zachariah. Only those, he writes, who have celebrated the feast of tabernacles will arrive at the holy land (τὴν ἀγίαν...γῆν), progressing by stages to reach the temple and the city of God and so the millennium of rest with Christ.⁷⁰⁴ Didymus the Blind offers a similar

⁷⁰¹ The RSV and Vulgate translations are similar, though the LXX use of "ἀναβήσονται" perhaps expressed the better the idea of ascending the mount of the Lord. The vulgate translates it with "ascendent" (see also Ps 23:3; Isa 2:3; Mic 4:2; and Zech 8:3).

⁷⁰² See Ps 45:11 on the second day, Ps 146 (fourth day) and Ps 95:3,10 on the final day of the feast.

⁷⁰³ Methodius, The Banquet 9.3; SC 95,270.

⁷⁰⁴ Methodius, The Banquet 9.5; SC 95,278-80.

interpretation in his commentary on Zachariah. The tabernacle is analogous to the human body and the feast of tabernacles is celebrated par excellence at the moment of resurrection. This, according to Didymus, is also signified in the eighth day of Tabernacles which represents the day of the Lord.⁷⁰⁵ Jerome in his commentary on the same book, concentrates on the numerical significance of the feast of the seventh month and, like Methodius, applies it to the messianic millennium (although he explicitly avoids identifying Jerusalem with the Constantinian city but rather with the heavenly city of Gal 4:26 and Heb 12.22).⁷⁰⁶ Jerome also cites Zach 14:16 in his commentary on Isaiah where, in the context of Isa 66:23, he writes of that day for which people come great distances "year by year, this is the day of Easter or of tabernacles, just as it is said in Zachariah".⁷⁰⁷

An examination of Egeria's account of the Encaenia and internal evidence from the lectionary texts suggested that strong parallels may be drawn between the feast of the Encaenia and Easter. It is impossible for the liturgy which celebrates the place of resurrection to be dissociated from the event of the resurrection. Thus the feast of the Encaenia can quite rightly be described as another Easter. If pilgrims ascended to the Golgotha mount and to the Holy Sepulchre in the style of Zach 14 then it was as a symbol of their hope in the final resurrection, the predominant exegesis of the prophecy. The coincidence of the feast with the Jewish messianic feast of tabernacles, the eight day celebration (similar to both Tabernacles and Easter), lead us to believe that the liturgy of the feast was designed to allude to the fulfilment of the Tabernacles and point beyond the earthly temple of the Lord to the heavenly city of the resurrection.

Jewish practices and Christian self-identity

From the earliest days of Christian self-identity the Church has encountered the problem of the Christian who is overly attracted to the practices of Judaism. Theologically, Christianity perceived itself as the fulfilment of Judaism. Frequently there was the need to make quite clear the distinctions

⁷⁰⁵ Didymus, Comm. in Zacc. 14:16-19 (SC 85, 1060-1072). In the work De Trinitate 2.16 Didymus writes that the feast of tabernacles prefigures the "synaxes of the holy churches and martyria, that which by faith and good works in our heavenly tabernacles we carry..." (PG 39.721A).

⁷⁰⁶ Both these texts occur in the liturgy of the Encaenia (on the fifth and final days) and as we have discussed, represent the evident tension between the visible city of Jerusalem and the still hoped for spiritual city.

⁷⁰⁷ Jerome, In Esaiam 18.66:23; CCL 73A.797.

between the two paths, often in the form of polemic. Such rhetoric is encountered particularly in regions where Christians and Jews lived side by side, experiencing the beliefs and practices of the other. Antioch, Alexandria, Syria, and Palestine are examples of such areas in the fourth century. Here, we read of the existence of Christians attracted to the practices of Jews and to some extent, Jews who held a belief in Christ yet retained their Jewish traditions. In Palestine and Caesarea, for example, by the fourth century the Jewish community had reestablished itself as a sizable community, the evidence of which is the large number of synagogues which have been excavated.⁷⁰⁸ The laws of Constantine, whilst favourable to Christians and sometimes written in a language hostile to Jews, were themselves not unfavourable to Jews. For example, privileges were granted to Jewish ministers similar to those granted to their Christian counterparts.⁷⁰⁹ In addition, although Jerome claims that the act of Hadrian forbidding Jews from entering Jerusalem was still effective in his day, both he and the pilgrim of Bordeaux write that on the ninth day of Ab (July/August) Jews made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem to mourn the loss of the temple.⁷¹⁰

Jerome and John Chrysostom both write against those who participate in Jewish traditions. Jerome writes against baptised Jews who refuse to forsake the practices of their former religion⁷¹¹ and Christians who insist on imitating the rites of the synagogue.⁷¹² In Antioch Chrysostom warns those who "run to the synagogue" that they are forgetting that now they themselves are the temple of God.⁷¹³ He tells of the attraction that Jewish festivals held for some including the feast of Tabernacles with its erection of tents.⁷¹⁴ Robert Wilken in his detailed study of Chrysostom's attitude to the Jews of Antioch remarks that the liturgical calendar was the primary mark of religious identity. Where there was a choice between Jewish and Christian festivals there lay a genuine threat to the distinctiveness of Christianity. The nature of Christianity's relationship to

⁷⁰⁸ See Joan E. Taylor, *Christians and the Holy Places*, 48-85. Jerome witnesses to the presence of Jews in Bethlehem in *Ep.* 84.

⁷⁰⁹ *Codex Theod.* 16.8.2 makes Jewish ministers exempt from compulsory services. CT 16.8.3 permits senators to nominate Jews to the council. On the other hand Jews were not permitted to keep Christian slaves (CT 16.9.1) and protection was afforded to Jews who converted to Christianity (CT 16.8.5).

⁷¹⁰ Jerome, *In Soph.* 1.15; CCL 76A.673. *Itinerarium Burdigalense* (CCL 175.16). See also Jerome, *Ep. 22 ad Paulam* (cited S. Krauss, "The Jews in the works of the Church Fathers." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 6 (1894), 227). One of the best accounts of the Jewish community at this time is to be found in M. Avi-Yonah, *The Jews of Palestine*. (Oxford, 1976).

⁷¹¹ Jerome, *Ep. 112 ad S. Augustinum* (CSEL 55.367).

⁷¹² Jerome, *In Ezek.* 10.33.33 (CCL 75.478).

⁷¹³ John Chrysostom, *Adversus Iudaeos* 6.7 (PG 48.915).

⁷¹⁴ John Chrysostom, *Adversus Iudaeos* 1.1; 7.1.

Judaism meant that the pagan rites rarely held as great an attraction for Christians as did distinctively Jewish practices.⁷¹⁵ Christian writers exhort their readers to imitate Christ, but Christ himself was a Jew, and so those attracted to Jewish traditions proclaimed the imitation of the very Jewish practices that Christ himself had followed. The Gospels, for example, tell of Christ attending the Jewish festivals and the synagogue, "Christ was circumcised; therefore you should be circumcised", is how Epiphanius casts the call of the Judaizers.⁷¹⁶

The threat to Christian identity did not come only from the presence of Christian Jews or Christians who took too unhealthy an interest in Jewish practices. We should recall also the events of 363, the emperor Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem. The significance of this attempt, notes Wilken, should not be underestimated for Chrysostom still felt required to write against Julian over twenty years later.⁷¹⁷ In 363 Julian announced his intention to rebuild the temple so that the Jews might glorify God in the city of Jerusalem. Ammianus Marcellinus recounts how Julian made available funds and appointed Alypius, one time governor of Britain, as the project's director. The plan was abandoned after an earthquake devastated the area.⁷¹⁸ Ephrem the Syrian and Gregory of Nazianzus write that the primary purpose of the restoration was for the Jews once again to offer sacrifice.⁷¹⁹ The earthquake is dramatised by the Christian commentators. Gregory of Nazianzus adds that a cross of light appeared above Jerusalem whilst marks of the cross were also seen on the

⁷¹⁵ Robert Wilken, John Chrysostom and the Jews (Berkeley, 1983) 92-93.

⁷¹⁶ Epiphanius, Haer. 28.51; cited Wilken, John Chrysostom and the Jews, 93.

⁷¹⁷ Wilken, John Chrysostom and the Jews, 146.

⁷¹⁸ Ammianus, 23.1 mentions only fire balls. Rufinus also mentions the balls of fire but adds an earthquake (H.E. 10.39-40). There is evidence that an earthquake did occur on Monday 19 May, 363. An ancient letter attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem amounts to an independent source for the events in Jerusalem on this day. The letter was discovered and published by, S. P. Brock, "A letter attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem on the rebuilding of the temple." Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 40 (1977): 267-86. Archaeological evidence for the earthquake is described by Kenneth W. Russell, "The earthquake of May 19, AD 363." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 238 (1980): 47-64. Socrates preserves a link between the events and Cyril of Jerusalem writing that Cyril had spoken publically of the prophecies of Daniel and Matthew on the night before the earthquake (H.E. 3.20).

⁷¹⁹ Ephrem, Contra Julianum 1.16; 2.7. Cited Wilken, John Chrysostom and the Jews, 73. Gregory of Nazianzus, Orat 5: Contra Julianum II (PG 35.664-720). Socrates, Eccles. Hist. 3.13 tells of a heavy tax placed by Julian on Christians who refused to sacrifice. It is possible that when threatened with this tax certain Jews informed Julian that their reason for not offering sacrifice was for want of a temple. There is a chronicle entry which records that the Jews requested Julian's permission to rebuild the temple so that they might comply with the order to sacrifice (Chronicon anonymum ad annum 846. *Chronica minora*, 2 (CSCO Scr. Syr. 3), 199-200).

garments of the Jews in the city.⁷²⁰ John Chrysostom adds that the restoration of the temple would enable the Jews to fulfil the requirements of their law. Until their place of sacrifice was rebuilt the liturgy of the Jews would remain incomplete.⁷²¹

The failure of Julian to rebuild the temple, a project which seems to have been intended to rival Constantine's building of the Martyrium, was seized upon by writers like Chrysostom as proof of Christ's prophecy that no stone should be left standing, "Christ built the church and no one is able to destroy it; he destroyed the temple and no one is able to rebuild it."⁷²² The historian Socrates writes that the rebuilding of the temple (and so the legitimising of the Jewish religion) would have led to the expulsion of Christians from Jerusalem.⁷²³ Hadrian expelled the Jews and Constantine admitted the Christians to the city. One could imagine that Julian might have followed this tradition with the prohibition of Christians from Jerusalem.⁷²⁴

The Christian appropriation and re-interpretation of Jewish feasts

How, then, do the activities described above have any bearing on the feast of the Encaenia in Jerusalem? First, pilgrims to Jerusalem towards the end of the fourth century would look upon the ruins of the temple and undoubtedly be aware of Julian's spectacular failure to circumvent the prophecies of Christ. On the mount opposite stood the proof of the Gospel, the basilica and buildings of the cross and resurrection. In the city itself the pilgrim would see no synagogue and no pagan temple, but only Christian churches. The crowds present in Jerusalem were not speakers of Hebrew but of Latin, Greek and Syriac, the representative languages of the Roman empire. The gentiles had arrived at the city and ascended the holy mountain to worship the Lord; the mount of Golgotha, and the mount of Olives but not the mount of the temple. The irony of the Jews continuing to build their tents for the feast of tabernacles whilst the Christian

⁷²⁰ Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orat 5: Contra Julianum II*, 4. Sozomen is content to report the earthquake and subsequent fire. He notes though that others have written about the spontaneous appearance of crosses on clothing (*H.E.* 5.22).

⁷²¹ John Chrysostom, *Adv. Judaeos* 5.1.

⁷²² John Chrysostom, *Contra Judaeos et Gentiles* 16; PG 48.835. The texts of Mal 1:10-11; Zeph 2.11 and Jn 4:24 were also seen as prophecies of the destruction of the temple. All these texts point to the universal worship of God.

⁷²³ Socrates, *H.E.* 3.20.

⁷²⁴ On the other hand Julian made no moves against the Constantinian basilica. He was more concerned to re-establish the practice of sacrifice. Any interpretation of this as a direct attack on the Christian faith has its source in Christian writers.

pilgrim fulfilled the prophecy of Zachariah would not have been lost on the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The choice of lectionary readings for the feast of the Encaenia can be admired for their proclamation of this irony. Not only does the emphasis lie with the universal worship of God and the new dwelling places of the Lord, but the choice of Rom 9:3-5 (day 7) and Rom 11 (day 5) serve to reverse the Jewish interpretation of Zachariah's prophecy. The paradox is that now the fulfilment of the prophecy depends upon the refusal of the Jews to accept it. The words of St Paul would have resounded throughout the feast, "But through their trespass salvation has come to the nations, so as to make Israel jealous. Now if their trespass means riches for the world, and if their failure means more riches for the nations, how much more will their full inclusion mean!" (Rom 11:11).

We have already observed a tension in the feast between a theology of the earthly Jerusalem and that of the heavenly city still to come. This brings us to our second point which concerns a similar tension inherent in a pilgrimage to the holy places. Those who went on pilgrimage were in a sense like those who desired to imitate Christ in the participation of Jewish practices.⁷²⁵ The incorporation of Jewish elements into the Christian pilgrimage and liturgy did not end with the footsteps of Christ. A sizeable number of feasts in the Jerusalem lectionary are not uniquely Christian feasts at all. Rather, the lectionary bears witness to feasts of the prophets Zachariah (10 June), Elisha (14 June), the Ark (2 July), Isaiah (6 July), the Maccabean martyrs (1 August), and King David (25 December). Large sections of Egeria's Journal concern a number of sites associated with Old Testament events, for example, the Mount of God (Moses),⁷²⁶ Horeb (Elijah),⁷²⁷ "all the places where the sons of Israel had been from Ramases to the Red Sea",⁷²⁸ the Jordan plain and Mount Nebo (the Israelite encampment and Moses' tomb),⁷²⁹ Uz (tomb of Job),⁷³⁰ Sedima

⁷²⁵ In his letter to Marcella Jerome writes, "Will the day never come when we shall together enter the Saviour's cave, and together weep in the sepulchre of the Lord with his sister and his mother? ... We shall see Lazarus... We shall pray together in the mausoleum of David. We shall see the prophet Amos upon his crag... We shall make a pilgrimage to Samaria and side by side venerate the ashes of John the Baptist, of Elisha, and of Obadiah... We shall make our way to Tabor, and see the tabernacles there which the Saviour shares, not, as Peter once wished, with Moses and Elijah, but with the Father and with the Holy Spirit" (Ep. 46.13; NPNF 6.65).

⁷²⁶ Egeria, *Itinerarium* 2-3.

⁷²⁷ Egeria, *Itinerarium* 4.2. See 5.8, "And so all this which is written in the holy books of Moses, was shown to us, in this valley which, as I have said, lay beneath the mountain of God which is holy Sinai".

⁷²⁸ Egeria, *Itinerarium* 7.1.

⁷²⁹ Egeria, *Itinerarium* 10.2-12.2.

⁷³⁰ Egeria, *Itinerarium* 13.1. C.f. also 16.5.

(Melchisedech),⁷³¹ and Charra,⁷³² to name but a few examples. Admittedly there is a whole section of Egeria's manuscript which is lost in which she described her arrival at Jerusalem and no doubt there the places associated with the Gospels. Certainly Egeria, though, and her guides are eager to view the places mentioned in the Old Testament and rarely do we find places where events of both biblical books are mentioned in the same breath.⁷³³ A similar pattern is discovered in the earlier record of the unknown pilgrim from Bordeaux. Outside of Jerusalem places associated with the figures of Elijah, David, Abraham, Joseph, Jacob, and Jeroboam outnumber the two Gospel places mentioned (the Bath of Cornelius and the well of the Samaritan woman).⁷³⁴ Once in Jerusalem the pilgrim increases the number of references to Gospel events, though mention is also made of the work of Solomon, the palace of David and the tombs of Isaiah and Hezekiah. The general impression given is that in Jerusalem and the surrounding area sites representing events in both Testaments stand side by side.⁷³⁵ The apparently equal attention granted to monuments belonging to two different traditions parallels an attitude to the Bible which is reluctant to divide the two Testaments. If the Patristic exegetes could claim that the complete Bible belonged to Christianity (and so the events continued within) so too did the places associated with the events. The concept of a holy land is the result of an unavoidable integration of place and event. Thus, the essentially Jewish sites of the tombs of the prophets could be celebrated as Christian feasts and places. Even the ruins of the temple itself, to which we know Jews made pilgrimage, could be perceived as Christian in the sense that its continual destruction acted as a further witness to the words of Christ.

The feast of the Encaenia was part of this process of Christian appropriation of things Jewish. Outwardly it appeared as if a feast of Tabernacles. Inwardly, however, the feast, like the curious feast of the dedication of all altars, contrasted sharply with the Jewish equivalent. Chrysostom and others' objections to Christian participation in Jewish feasts were based on the fact that to recognise the validity of Judaism was to deny Christianity as its fulfilment. Thus, the Christian calendar, whilst having its origins and

⁷³¹ Egeria, *Itinerarium* 13.4.

⁷³² Egeria, *Itinerarium* 20.1.

⁷³³ One exception is Egeria's visit to the spot where Melchisedech and Abraham met where she remembers that John the Baptist baptised nearby. See *Itinerarium* 15.1.

⁷³⁴ *Itinerarium Burdigalense*, CCL 175.13-14.

⁷³⁵ For example, the river Jordan said to be the river where Christ was baptised and from where Elijah was taken up to heaven. On the road to Bethlehem was the tomb of Rachel, at Bethlehem the birthplace of the Lord, and "not far away" the tombs of Ezekiel, Asaph, Job, Jesse, David and Solomon.

development in Judaism presented a different interpretation of salvation history. The same is found to be true for the Christian attitude to the shrines of the holy land. The feast of the Encaenia is a Christian interpretation of the feast of Tabernacles. It presents the acceptable participation of Christianity in the Jewish heritage. Thus, we find no building of booths, no pouring of water, and no waving of palms. The feast of Encaenia was not presented as a Christian copy of Tabernacles where the two might become confused, but rather as the Christian fulfilment of the feast. The outward timing of the feast, its length, and the association with inauguration are enough to effect the link between the two feasts. The inward selection of texts on the other hand provide an interpretation of the Jewish messianic expectations associated with Tabernacles which, in effect, reverses them. This too is the context of the descriptions of the Encaenia provided by Egeria and Sozomen; that now is the time of the nations ascending the mount of the Lord to worship. The Patristic exegesis of Zach 14:16 is predominantly one pointing to the resurrection. The nations ascend the mount of the Lord to worship at the site of the first fruits from the dead. That the final fulfilment of tabernacles (so ultimately Zach 14:16) depends upon the inclusion of Judaism is the interpretation of Romans 9 as it is found within the feast of the Encaenia. The feast of the Encaenia, a celebration of the place of death and resurrection, becomes an effective symbol of the Christian interpretation of Tabernacles. The additional association of Encaenia with Epiphany and Easter by Egeria and the description of the Encaenia as an appropriate time for baptism by Sozomen only strengthen this association.

This interpretation of Zachariah's prophecy occurs without reservation in a fourteenth century manuscript. The manuscript itself preserves a copy of an Armenian Martyrology which was compiled in the eleventh century by a grand prince named Gregory Magistros who travelled far and wide translating into Armenian as many Greek manuscripts as he could find. The Martyrology, therefore, contains material of an earlier date. The entry for the 13 September, describing the vast assembly of bishops "who arrived [for the Encaenia of the Martyrium] from all parts of the universe", reads,

This same assembly of holy fathers established, by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, the celebration on the 13th each year, the commemoration of the consecration of the holy places and the exaltation, on the 14th of this month, on Holy Golgotha, of the Cross, the source of life, which the patriarch would expose to the view of the whole crowd of the faithful [coming] on this day, each year, from all parts of the earth, to see there the holy cross, as in the prophecies concerning Jerusalem: The pagan nations ascend each year to Jerusalem to celebrate the feast of

Tabernacles. And it is this which is fulfilled, not as in the old but as in the new covenant, because it does not speak of void feasts of tabernacles, but the good feasts of the consecration of the great temple built for the holy resurrection.⁷³⁶

The connection between inauguration and tabernacles is not confined solely to the Jerusalem feast of the Encaenia. In a short but interesting paper on the Transfiguration and church dedications J. E. Bickersteth observed that the gospel account of the transfiguration is indicated in a number of eighth century western lectionaries for the dedication of a church.⁷³⁷ He believes that the gospel was chosen for Peter's suggestion that he build tabernacles for Jesus and his heavenly companions to dwell in. In addition the rite of the Coptic church not only has all three accounts of the transfiguration for the dedication of a church but also Jn 10:22, the gospel text for the first day of the Encaenia.

Finally, we may note here the curious passage in Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People where he reproduces a letter from Pope Gregory to the Abbott Mellitus on the conversion of the English (601). In a section of the letter, explaining how best to effect the peaceful transition from paganism to Christianity, Pope Gregory writes,

Therefore, when you reach our most reverend brother, bishop Augustine, we wish you to inform him that we have been giving careful thoughts to the affairs of the English, and have come to the conclusion that the temples of the idols among that people should on no account be destroyed. The idols are to be destroyed, but the temples themselves are to be aspersed with holy water, altars set up in them, and relics deposited there. For if these temples are well built, they must be purified from the worship of demons and dedicated to the service of the true God...And since they have a custom of sacrificing many oxen to demons, let some other solemnity be substituted in its place, such as a day of dedication or the festival of the holy martyrs whose relics are enshrined there. On such occasions they might well construct shelters of boughs for themselves around the churches that were once temples, and celebrate the solemnity with devout fasting.⁷³⁸

Unfortunately we have no evidence that Gregory's carefully thought out plan was actually put into effect. The rite of aspersion, which takes place here before the construction of the altar, is one of purification. The practise of depositing relics

⁷³⁶ Le synaxaire Arménien de Ter Israel (II Mois de Hori). Ed. George Bayan. *Patrologia Orientalis* 6. (Paris, 1911) 216. The mention of the Exaltation certainly places the dating of this section after the recovery of the Cross by Heraclius in 630.

⁷³⁷ J. E. Bickersteth. "The Transfiguration and church dedications." Studia Patristica 5.3 (1959): 3-7.

⁷³⁸ Bede, A History of the English Church and People 1.30 (London, 1968) 86-87.

became well established in the Roman rite under Gregory the Great.⁷³⁹ The suggestion, though, that the English should build tents of branches is a unique idea and appears to have been thought up by Gregory himself. The model for Gregory's suggestion is Judas Maccabeus' rebuilding of the altar and the purification of the temple after its defilement by the gentiles and the connection made there between the purification and the feast of tabernacles. Such a suggestion would have been distasteful to John Chrysostom but for Gregory it was simply one means by which a festival with biblical precedence could be used to integrate Christianity into the English culture.⁷⁴⁰

⁷³⁹ See further G. G. Willis, Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy. London, 1968) 151ff.

⁷⁴⁰ The basis for Gregory's suggestion lies in his earlier (597) reply to Augustine's second question enquiring why customs vary in different churches when there is only one faith, "My brother, you are familiar with the usage of the Roman church, in which you were brought up. But if you have found customs, whether in the church of Rome or of Gaul or any other that might be more acceptable to God, I wish you to make a careful selection of them, and then teach the church of the English, which is still young in the Faith, whatever you have been able to learn with profit from the various churches...Therefore select from each of the churches whatever things are devout, religious and right; and when you have bound them, as it were, into a sheaf, let the minds of the English grow accustomed to it." (Bede, A History of the English Church and People 1.27; p.73. See also P. Meyvaert. "Diversity within Unity, A Gregorian theme." in Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others. (London, 1977) 141-162.

Chapter Eight

Conclusion

Encaenia Encaeniorum

The encaenia which occurred on 13 September 335 was one inauguration amongst others. When Matthew Black sought the roots of this feast of the Encaenia in some pre-existing feast of the Church he neglected the other occurrences of the church inauguration which were contemporary with this feast. The Jerusalem Encaenia rose to prominence in the East, not because it was the only feast of its kind, but for a number of other reasons. Its importance as an encaenia lay in the significance of the building it celebrated and, not least, the finding of the Cross. There were encaenia of other churches of less importance. Those which followed the Jerusalem encaenia, such as at Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople, shared many of the same elements; involvement of the emperor, an episcopal conference, offerings, and the such like. The fact that these were also recorded was usually as a result of some incidental mention of the encaenia whilst the true importance of the event was the council with which they were invariably associated. There must, then, have been other local encaenia which the historians and others never saw fit to preserve. Indeed, we may never have known what we do about the earliest encaenia at Tyre if Eusebius had not been invited to address the assembly. His discourse honoured Paulinus because he in effect was the founder and benefactor of the church. For much the same reasons Constantine received the praise of Eusebius and others at Jerusalem. The only real difference between each occasion was the relative importance of the buildings, not the content of the feast. Thus, we saw that many of the themes in the discourse at Tyre were equally appropriate for the Jerusalem encaenia. The case of Athanasius, Constantius and the Caesareum church in Alexandria demonstrated the proper relationship of the patron to his church. Athanasius was at pains to define what was intended by the encaenia; that an encaenia was not strictly necessary before the church could be used as a place of worship, and that the first use of a church should not presuppose the celebration of its inauguration. The fact that Athanasius had to cite biblical and contemporary precedents for his actions only goes to show that, though theologically he may well have been correct, they were the exception rather than the rule. The encaenia or inauguration of a church, having its basis in the inauguration of the altar of Moses, was its consecration by first use. When churches were funded from the imperial purse, then the act of consecration by first use included the presence of

the emperor or imperial representative. Athanasius is the first to make a distinction between consecration by first use and the involvement of the emperor in the celebrations.

The encaenia, whether in Tyre, Jerusalem, or elsewhere, could not help but have some reference to the Jewish Temple. Those who created the liturgies and the commentators had only the Old Testament practice as a legitimate source for the encaenia and the creation of sacred space. The temple is portrayed in the Old testament as the ultimate house of God. Its destruction and the subsequent spiritualisation of the temple and city paved the way for a strand of theology which looked towards a new Solomon, a new temple, and a new Jerusalem. This is quite explicit in, for example, the writings of Eusebius, Athanasius and in the liturgy of the Encaenia. The inauguration of buildings (and the subsequent anniversary celebrations) created an inevitable tension between the physical building and the spiritual church of the body of Christ. This tension was partly resolved by viewing the building itself and its constituent parts as symbols of the spiritual church where the altar, signifying Christ himself, was the focus both of the physical and spiritual buildings.

Whilst it was possible to project images associated with Jerusalem and the temple on to buildings constructed elsewhere in the Empire, within the city itself the situation was more complex. The city of Jerusalem could, even after the rise of Constantine, remain for many an ideal and a vision. In the city, however, the Christian community was confronted with the reality of Jerusalem. The victory of Constantine was expressed by Eusebius in terms of a new song, a new age of peace. These were messianic images which were associated with the final return of Christ. The eschaton included the heavenly Jerusalem of the books of Ezekiel and Revelation. The peace of Constantine led to the rebuilding of Jerusalem as a Christian city. Eusebius himself referred to the basilica of the Martyrium as the new Jerusalem foretold by the prophets. In those years it might well have appeared to some that the heavenly Jerusalem was becoming a reality, that the time of the Gentiles would be fulfilled in the creation of a new Jerusalem. The liturgy of the Encaenia in Jerusalem reflected its historical and theological situation. Whilst the numerous biblical references to the temple, Sion, and the Mount of Olives could be almost naturally appropriated for the Christian buildings, a sense was retained of the yearning for a future city associated with the eschaton. This tension between the present and the future is apparent within the liturgy itself and also in the discourses delivered at the feast of the Encaenia (by Eusebius, and later maybe John of Jerusalem and Jerome). The Christian

activity in the city also focused attention on the Jewish people. Jerusalem was, after all, the city of the Jews. It was their temple which lay in ruins and Egeria and other liturgical sources reflect the number of Jewish holy places in the city and surrounding area. The liturgy of the Encaenia attempted an answer to this question by, on the one hand, stressing the rejection of the Jews by God, yet, on the other hand, quoting the words of St Paul that it was their rejection of Christ which ultimately led to the success of the gentile Church. God's rejection would be reversed at the end of the ages.

The fulfilment of the ages was expressed in the feast of Tabernacles, a feast which pointed to the messianic sabbath. This feast was originally a Jewish pilgrim festival centred around the temple. In the Christian Jerusalem the feast took on an interpretation not found elsewhere in the Christian liturgy. The Encaenia in 335 was celebrated in the season of tabernacles, perhaps on the day of Atonement. Certainly the subsequent liturgy of the Jerusalem encaenia reflected many elements of the Jewish Tabernacles, not only in its time of celebration, but also in its liturgical exegesis of Scripture. The Encaenia was a Christian interpretation of Tabernacles which revolved around the resurrection. This was quite consistent with the Patristic exegesis of biblical passages most closely associated with the eschatological note of Tabernacles. The Encaenia in Jerusalem was itself a feast of the resurrection, naturally since the Martyrium basilica and the Anastasis marked the places of Christ's death and resurrection.

The Encaenia as a Christian celebration of Tabernacles only really held appeal within Jerusalem itself. The Encaenia, like Tabernacles, was a pilgrim feast (probably the only Christian pilgrim feast). Since it was a celebration of a specific place (as was every encaenia) its pre-eminent celebration was at that place. The Jerusalem encaenia, unlike the anniversaries of other encaenia, entered the liturgical calendars of communities outside Jerusalem. It did so because the feast was intertwined with the finding of the Cross. It was because the relics of the Cross were believed to have been found that Constantine erected the basilica in the first place. Here was the reality to which his heavenly saving sign had pointed. As far as Constantine had been concerned the Cross had been central to the Encaenia from the beginning. The Encaenia contained the feast of the Cross just as the Martyrium contained the relic of the Cross. This was the position until the seventh century. The Persian invasion and the subsequent recovery of the relic of the Cross by Heraclius resulted in a celebration of the Encaenia whereby the emphasis shifted from celebrating the buildings of the Martyrium-Anastasis complex to a celebration of the Cross itself. The Persian

invasion had damaged the Constantinian buildings and they were never restored to their original splendour. The relic of the Cross was moved to Constantinople only a couple of years after it had been restored to Jerusalem. The feast of the Cross was, in effect, divorced from the Encaenia. Although the Byzantine calendar kept the name of the Encaenia, the feast became an octave of the Cross, the exaltation or showing of the Cross to the people. The feast even found its way into the Western liturgy which hitherto had ignored the Jerusalem feast.

In some sense, then, the inauguration of the basilica in Jerusalem which became known as the Encaenia only did so because the buildings it commemorated continued to exist and because the feast was intimately associated with the Cross of Christ. This latter element as well as the general influence of the Jerusalem liturgy, catapulted the feast out of the local calendar into the calendars of the Eastern church. The Encaenia (though not the feast of the Cross) would doubtless have ceased to exist if it had been impossible to have restored the church of the Holy Sepulchre. The encaenia of the other churches we have examined in this study are remembered in no present liturgical calendar. The original churches have all ceased to exist. The Encaenia of the Holy Sepulchre church continues to be kept (in name if nothing else) because in Jerusalem, on the site of the death and resurrection of Christ, a basilica still stands which thousands of pilgrims continue to visit.

The West, however, did have its own equivalent of the encaenia. The Roman Rite included in its calendar the Dedication of the Church of St Michael (29 Sept) and the Dedication of the basilica of the Holy Saviour (9 Nov). The former, like the Exaltation of the Cross, has become divorced from the basilica and is in the Revised Roman Rite a general feast of St Michael and the Archangels. The latter, however, continues to be kept as the Dedication of St John Lateran, the 'mother' of the churches in Rome.⁷⁴¹

The Encaenia and the rite for the dedication of churches

Running through this study has been a concern to highlight the theology of the encaenia and relate it to a particular historical context. This task has been made easier by the infrequent references to the encaenia in the fourth century and

⁷⁴¹ On the anniversaries of Roman dedications see Willis, Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy, 171-73.

the significance of the occasions of which the writers saw fit to preserve some description. Any attempts to extend this study would lie in at least two areas. First to bridge the gap between the encaenia as we have discussed it, and the later extant rites of dedication and, second, to examine further the internal theology of the feast as represented, for example, in the surviving homilies for the dedication of a church. We should, however, heed the warnings of Paul Bradshaw, and take care not simply to attempt to trace some line of development between the encaenia and the western rites of dedication (whether Roman or Gallican). The feast of the Cross in the west, we noted, bore no real relation to its counterpart in Jerusalem. On the other hand we saw that the motif of Tabernacles was intrinsic to the inauguration of the Jerusalem temple, the Encaenia, and, in the mind of Gregory, to the dedication of churches in England.

Most commentators on the development of the dedication rites in the West begin with the letter of Pope Vigilius to Profuturus of Braga in 583 and its reference to the consecration of a church by the first Eucharist. Few, however, relate this letter to the letter from Gregory to Mellitus only a few years later and quoted in the previous chapter. The elements of the dedication mentioned by Vigilius reappear in Gregory's letter, namely the relics and the aspersion. Bernard Capelle argued, against Duchesne, that the aspersions mentioned by Vigilius were an integral part of the ceremonies associated with the deposition of the relics.⁷⁴² It is possible to see common elements between the various rites of dedication. Often the rite takes the form of three distinct elements: the consecration of the church, the consecration of the altar and the translation of the relics. To this general structure can be added particular items such as the alphabet ceremony (Gallican-Celtic), or the opening of the church doors (Byzantine-Gallican).

Attempting to discern a direct connection between the encaenia and the rites of dedication is not a simple process. One could examine in more detail the occurrence of the term "ἐγκαίνια" in the Greek rites (and translations). The ancient Byzantine rite preserved in the Codex Barberini Graecus 336, for example, makes a distinction between the encaenia of the temple and the consecration (καθιέρωσις) of the altar. The consecration of the altar comprises the washing and anointing of the altar, concluding with a prayer of dedication. The encaenia of the temple is connected with the temple of the church and is

⁷⁴² L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, 399; B. Capelle, "L'Aqua Exorcizata dans les rites romains de la dédicace au VI^e siècle." *Revue Bénédictine* 50 (1938): 306-8.

largely the translation of the relics.⁷⁴³ Relics, however, do not feature in the encaenia which we have examined (save, perhaps, for the relic of the Cross). The distinction between the consecration of the altar and that of the church, of which the deposition of the relics seems to provide the key, may have been the result of the Seventh Ecumenical Council which, amongst other things, decreed that relics were necessary for the valid consecration of a church.⁷⁴⁴ Relics, save perhaps for the relic of the Cross, did not feature in the fourth century encaenia we examined in this study and Athanasius still held to a consecration by first use modelled on that in Numbers 7. Admittedly, however, no writer furnishes us with the precise details of the Encaenia and no argument from silence will prove there was no anointing or aspersion of altar and building.

The Liber Sacramentorum Engolismensis preserves a reference to the encaenia which may be a import from an eastern rite. The prayer for the dedication of a new basilica reads in part, "Praesta Domine, ut haec basilica, cuius hodie iniciamus encenia..."⁷⁴⁵ This the only occurrence I could find of the term "encaenia" appearing in a western rite of church dedication.

Further parallels between the Encaenia and the dedication rites may be found in the specified biblical readings. We have already noted that the dedication liturgy preserved in the Georgian lectionary continuously refers back to the days of the Encaenia. We have also noted remnants of the Encaenia in the readings indicated for the Exaltation of the Cross. Jn 10:22f occurs, not surprisingly, rather frequently in the dedication rites.⁷⁴⁶ Another text which continuously appears in the Eastern rites is Matt 16:13-19 with its reference to the church built "on this rock". In the Georgian Lathal manuscript this was the gospel text of the fifth day of the Encaenia where it probably referred to a

⁷⁴³ The most recent edition of the text is provided by Vincenzo Ruggieri, "Consecrazione e dedicazione di chiesa, secondo il Barberinanus graecus 336." Orientalia Christiana Periodica 54 (1988): 79-118. The distinction between the consecration of the altar and the encaenia of the building is also preserved in the Rituale Melchitarum: A Christian Palestinian Euchologion. Ed. Matthew Black. (Stuttgart, 1938).

⁷⁴⁴ On the significance of the 7th canon of the 7th Ecumenical Council (787) and the formation of the 8th century rites of dedication see Chrysostome Konstantinidis, "L'ordo de la dédicace des églises selon le rite byzantin vers le milieu du VIII^e siècle." Πεπραγμένα του Θ' Διεθνούς Βυζαντινολογικού Συνεδρίου (Thessalonika, 12-19 April 1953). Vol 2. (Athens, 1956) 206-215.

⁷⁴⁵ Liber Sacramentorum Engolismenis, 1851.

⁷⁴⁶ In the Coptic rite it is specified for the consecration of the Church, in the Armenian rite as part of the laying of the foundation stone, and in the Syrian rite as part of the consecration of the altar. The Coptic rite is edited by G. Horner, The Service for the Consecration of a Church and Altar according to the Coptic Rite. (London, 1902). The Syrian rite is described and compared with the Coptic by R. Coquin, "La consécration des églises dans le rite copte, ses relations avec les rites syrien et byzantin." L'Orient Syrien 9 (1964): 149-87.

Christian interpretation of Mount Sion. The absence, however, of I Tim 3 (integral to the Encaenia) and the inclusion of Lk 19:1-10, for example, in most rites may suggest some independent line of development from the Encaenia.

What cannot be disputed is that there is a common theological Umwelt in which lie the encaenia and the dedication rites. The common source of this theology is the biblical precedent of the inauguration of a house of prayer. This theology is inevitably centred around a Christian interpretation of the inauguration of Moses' tabernacle or Solomon's temple. The rites of dedication become as Jerusalem centred as the feast of the Encaenia or Eusebius' oration at Tyre. This connection with the Jerusalem temple preserves the connection between the inauguration and the feast of Tabernacles. The earliest surviving Gallican liturgy, *Ordo XLI* edited by Michel Andrieu, and the *Missale Francorum*, both include the pouring of water at the base of the altar.⁷⁴⁷ This may be a deliberate allusion to the water ceremonies associated with the feast of Tabernacles, and it is almost certainly an interpretation of the consecration of the Tabernacle decreed in Exodus 29 and performed in Lev 8.⁷⁴⁸

The numerous surviving homilies preached at the dedication or anniversary of the dedication of a church invariably have some reference to the temple of Solomon and occasionally the Jerusalem encaenia of Jn 10. Bede, for example, writes that, "it seems to be in keeping with the celebration that we are holding to say some words about the building of the Temple and to investigate how appropriately its ornamentation applies to the Church."⁷⁴⁹ In another homily he parallels the celebration of the dedication of St Paul's church at Jarrow with the annual Jewish feast of the Encaenia, the latter serving as a reminder of Christ's resurrection.⁷⁵⁰ Homilies with similar sentiments may be found among the works attributed to Maximus of Tours and Rabanus Maurus. We should not forget, either, the tract on the dedication of a church by Remigius of Rheims which consists of an exegetical commentary on the Gallican rite itself.⁷⁵¹

⁷⁴⁷ M. Andrieu, *Les ordines romani du haut moyen-âge*. Vol. 4 (Louvain, 1956) 315; *Missale Francorum*. Ed. L. C. Mohlberg. (Rome, 1957) 18.

⁷⁴⁸ The parallels between the dedication rites and the consecration rites preserved in the Torah have been discussed by John Wilkinson, "New Beginnings and church dedications." *Creation and Liturgy: in honor of H. Boone Porter*. Ed. Ralph N. McMichael. (Washington, 1993) 251-64.

⁷⁴⁹ Bede, *Hom.* 2.25 (a translation of this homily was kindly provided by Mr Bernard Robinson of Ushaw College, Durham).

⁷⁵⁰ Bede, *Hom.* 2.24.

⁷⁵¹ Remigius, *Tract. de dedicatione ecclesiae* (PL 121.845).

This study has concerned itself with the history, liturgy, and theology of the "ἐγκαινία". The history has shown that the first recorded Christian usage of the term coincided with the rise of an emperor favourable to the Christian Church in the Eastern empire. The surviving records of the encaenia were most closely associated with imperial church patronage and with episcopal councils. Since the celebration of a major encaenia in the fourth century required both the presence of the emperor or his representative and the presence of neighbouring bishops it invariably provided the occasion for a council. The association of bishops and the encaenia continued in the celebration of the Jerusalem Encaenia as described by Egeria. The liturgy of the encaenia has concentrated on the celebration of the Jerusalem Encaenia, by far the most significant encaenia. The significance of the liturgy was comparable to both the feast of Tabernacles and to the celebrations of Easter and Epiphany. Whilst the actual rites of the encaenia in the fourth century remain unknown, there would appear to be a direct relationship between the fourth century encaenia and the Byzantine rites in which this terminology is continued. The Encaenia of Jerusalem, the other fourth century encaenia, certainly share a similar theology with the later rites of church dedication. The emphasis of this theology is on the Christian interpretation of the Temple and Solomon its builder. There are allusions to the feast of Tabernacles and, throughout the rites, a concern to ensure that the physical building is related to both the mystical body of Christ and to the in-dwelling presence of Christ within each individual. The Jerusalem Encaenia epitomised the Christian appropriation of the city of Jerusalem and the Temple. The Temple, however, once the unique dwelling place of God on earth, continued to be the model against which the Christian places of worship were measured. The Temple itself, like the city of Jerusalem before Constantine, was confined to the heavenly realms. Whilst the Christian theology of place could render sacred once again the earthly city of Jerusalem (though not without difficulty), this could never be possible for the Temple of Jerusalem. Lurking behind the triumphant claims of Chrysostom and others who wrote against the short-lived attempts of Julian, was a real fear that Julian might have been successful, resulting in the claim that the divine presence uniquely dwelt in Jerusalem. The development of theology, both Jewish and Christian, throughout the three hundred years since the fall of the Temple is something to be considered. Julian was no Messiah or Cyrus even, and now was not the time to lower the Temple from its heavenly position to the earthly city. Every synagogue might assume the future hope of the restoration of the Temple and every church might acknowledge the past existence of the Temple but, as Eusebius seemed to have believed about the relic of the Cross, the sign was not to

be confused with the reality. There are occasions when it is more appropriate for the reality to remain hidden and the hopes unfulfilled. The Cross may have been one occasion, and the Temple another.

Appendix

A Reconstruction of the Octave of the Encaenia

September 13th. Day one. The Anastasis.

Introductory Psalm: Ps 85
 [Old Testament reading I: Wis. Sol 9:1-8]
 [Old Testament reading II: Zach 1:16-2:5]
 Epistle reading: I Tim 3:14-16
 Alleluia-psalm: Ps 64
 Gospel: Jn 10:22-42 [= "Index" and AL]

September 14th. Day two. The feast of the Cross. The Martyrium.

Elevation and showing of the Cross [=AL & L]
 Introductory Psalm: Ps 85 [=Sin. Georg. 54] or Ps 27 [=L]
 [Old Testament reading I: Prov 3:18-23]
 [Old Testament reading II: Isa 65:24]
 Epistle reading: I Cor 1:18-25
 Alleluia-psalm: Ps 45
 Gospel: Jn 19:17-37 [= "Index" & Georg 3.] or Matt 24:27-35 [=Georg. 54]

September 15th. Day three. Holy Sion [Egeria = Eleona]

Introductory psalm: Ps 147
 Old Testament reading I: Isa 33:20
 Epistle reading: Heb 8:7-9:10
 Alleluia-psalm: Ps 64
 Gospel: Matt 23:1-22 [23:1-12 = "Index"]

September 16th. Day four. [Georg. 3 & L = Nea] [Georg.54 = Sion]

Introductory psalm: Ps 146
 Old Testament reading: Zach 8:3-8
 Epistle reading: Rom 11:25-27
 Alleluia-psalm: Ps 83
 Gospel: Mk 11:15-18

September 17th. Day five. Place of the Ascension [=Georg.34] [L=Sion]

Introductory psalm: Ps 124
 Old Testament reading: [Missing from L & Georg. 3]
 Epistle reading: Heb 12:18-28
 Alleluia-psalm: Ps 86
 Gospel: Matt 23:13-22 [= "Index"] or Matt 16:13-20 [=L]

September 18th. Day six. Bethlehem [=Georg. 34]

Introductory psalm: Ps 131
 Old Testament reading: [Missing from L & Georg. 3]
 Epistle reading: Heb 13:10-16
 Alleluia-psalm: Ps 44
 Gospel: Mk 12:24-44 [L=12:28-44]

September 19th. Day seven. Martyrium [= "Index"]

Introductory psalm: Ps 86

Old Testament reading: [Missing from L & Georg.3]

Epistle reading: Rom 9:1-5

Alleluia-psalm: Ps 95

Gospel: Jn 2:23-3:6

September 20th. Day eight. Anastasis [= "Index"]

Introductory psalm: Ps 64

Old Testament reading: [Missing from L & Georg.3]

Epistle reading: Gal 4:18-26

Alleluia-psalm: Ps 147

Gospel: Lk 20:1-19

List of Sources Consulted

Principal Primary Sources

ANONYMOUS

The Canons of Athanasius. Ed. W. Riedel, and W. E. Crum. London: Williams & Norgate, 1904.

Chronicon Paschale 284-628 AD. Translated Texts for Historians VII. Ed. Michael Whitby, and Mary Whitby. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.

Eudoxia and the Holy Sepulchre: A Constantinian Legend in Coptic. Ed. Tito Orlando. Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1980.

History of the Patriarchs of the Coptic Church of Alexandria. Patrologia Orientalis 1. Ed. B. Evetts. Paris, 1907.

Inscriptiones Italiae. Fasti et Elogia. Fasc. 2. Ed. A. Degrassi. Rome, 1963.

Le Liber Pontificalis: texte, introduction et commentaire. 3 vols. Ed. L. Duchesne. Paris: Ernest Thorin, 1886.

The Book of Pontiffs (Liber Pontificalis): the ancient biographies of the first ninety Roman bishops to AD 715. Translated Texts for Historians, Latin Series V. Ed. Raymond Davis. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1989.

Panégyriques Latins. 3 Vols. Trans. E. Galletier. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1955.

The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Ed. James H. Charlesworth. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1985.

The Theodosian Code. Ed. Clyde Pharr. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS

Ammianus Marcellinus. Loeb Classical Library. Trans. J. C. Rolfe. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956-58.

ANTIOCHUS OF PALESTINE

La prise de Jérusalem par les Perses en 614. CSCO 202, 203. Ed. G. Garitte. Louvain, 1960.

P. AELIUS ARISTIDES

The Complete Works. Trans. Charles A. Behr. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1981. 98-106.

ATHANASIUS OF ALEXANDRIA

Contra gentes and De Incarnatione. Ed. R.W. Thomson. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

Sur l'incarnation du verbe SC 199. Ed. C. Kannengiesser. Paris, 1973.

Apologia contra Arianos sive Apologia secunda. Athanasius Werke, 2.1. Ed. H.G. Opitz. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1940.

Historia Arianorum. Athanasius Werke, 2.1. Ed. H.G. Opitz. Berlin, 1940.

De synodis Arimini in Italia et Seleucia in Isauria. Athanasius Werke, 2.1. Ed. H.G. Opitz. Berlin, 1940.

Deux Apologies à l'Empereur Constance pour sa fuite. SC 56. Ed. J. M. Szymsiak. Paris, 1987.

Select Works and Letters. NPNF 4 (2nd ser.). Oxford: Parker, 1890.

BEDE

A History of the English Church and People. Trans. L. Sherley-Price. London: Penguin Books, 1968.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM

Procatechesis and Catechetical Lectures. PG 33.331-1064.

Cyrille de Jérusalem: Catéchèses Mystagogiques. SC 126. Ed. A. Piédagnel. Paris, 1966.

The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem. The Fathers of the Church 64. Trans. Anthony A. Stephenson. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1970.

Brock, S. P. "A letter attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem on the rebuilding of the temple." Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies 40 (1977): 267-86.

Coakley, J. F. "A Syriac version of the letter of Cyril of Jerusalem on the vision of the Cross." Analecta Bollandiana 102 (1984): 71-84.

EGERIA

S. Hilarii Tractatus de mysteriis et hymni et S. Silviae Aquitanae Peregrinatio ad loca sancta quae inedita ex codice Arretino deprompsit.. Biblioteca dell'Accademia storico-giuridica, 4. Ed. J. F. Gamurrini. Rome: 1887.

Diary of a Pilgrimage. Ancient Christian Writers 38. Ed. G. E. Gingras. New York: Newman Press, 1970.

Égérie: Journal de Voyage (Itinéraire). SC 296. Ed. Pierre Maraval. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1982.

Garcia, Z. "La lettre de Valérius aux moines du Vierzo sur la bienheureuse Aetheria." Analecta Bollandiana 29 (1910): 377-99.

Wilkinson, John. Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land. Revised ed. Jerusalem: Ariel Publishing House, 1981.

EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA

Praeparatio Evangelica. Eusebius Werke, Band 8 GCS 43.1 & 43.2. Ed. K. Mras. Berlin, 43.1, 1954; 43.2, 1956

Histoire ecclésiastique. 3 Vols. SC 31, 41, 55. Ed. G. Bardy. Paris, 1:1952; 2:1955; 3:1967.

The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine. Trans. G. A. Williamson; revised Andrew Louth. London: Penguin, 1989.

Die Demonstratio evangelica. Eusebius Werke, Band 6: GCS 23. Ed. I.A. Heikel. Leipzig, 1913.

The Proof of the Gospel being the Demonstratio Evangelica of Eusebius of Caesarea. Trans. W. J. Ferrar. 2 vols. London: SPCK, 1920.

Das Onomastikon. Eusebius Werke, Band 3.1: GCS 11.1. Ed. E. Klostermann. Leipzig, 1904.

Der Jesajakommentar. Eusebius Werke, Band 9. GCS. Ed. J. Ziegler. Berlin, 1975.

De Laudibus Constantini. Eusebius Werke, Band 1. GCS 7. Ed. I.A. Heikel. Leipzig, 1902.

In Praise of Constantine: a historical study and new translation of Eusebius' Tricennial orations. Classical Studies 15. Ed. H. A. Drake. Berkeley: University of California Publications, 1976.

Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin. Eusebius Werke, Band 1.1. GCS. Ed. F. Winkelman. Berlin, 1975.

Church History, Life of Constantine the Great, and Oration in Praise of Constantine NPNF 1 (2nd ser.). Oxford: Parker, 1890.

GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS

Contra Julianum imperatorem. PG 35: 532-720.

In novam Dominicam orat. 44. PG 36: 608-621.

Select orations of Saint Gregory Nazianzen. NPNF 7 (2nd ser.). Oxford: Parker, 1894.

GREGORY OF NYSSA

Epistulae. Gregorii Nysseni opera, 8.2. 2nd ed. Ed. G. Pasquali. Leiden: Brill, 1959

HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM

Les homélies festales. Ed. Michel Aubineau. 2 vols. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1978.

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

Adversus Judaeos orationes. PG 48: 843-942.

Discourses against Judaizing Christians. Fathers of the church 68. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1979.

FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS

Jewish Antiquities. Loeb Classical Library. Trans. H. St. J. Thackeray et al. London: Heinemann, 1969.

EMPEROR JULIAN I

The Works of the Emperor Julian. Loeb Classical Library. Trans. W. C. F. Wright. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.

LACTANTIUS

De Mortibus Persecutorum. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Ed. J. L. Creed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

JOHN MALALAS

Chronographia. Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae. Ed. L. Dindorf. Bonn: Weber, 1831

The Chronicle. Byzantina Australiensia 4. Trans. E. Jeffreys et al. Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986.

MELITO OF SARDIS

On Pascha and Fragments. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Trans. Stuart George Hall. Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.

PHILOSTORGIUS

Kirchengeschichte. 3rd ed. GCS. Ed. F. Winkelmann. Berlin, 1981.

Epitome of the Ecclesiastical History of Philostorgius. Trans. Edward Walford. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1855.

SOCRATES

Historia ecclesiastica. Socrates' Ecclesiastical history. 2nd ed. Ed. W. Bright. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1893.

Church history from A.D. 305-439. NPNF 2 (2nd ser.). Trans. A. C. Zenos. Oxford: Parker, 1890.

SOZOMENUS

Histoire Ecclésiastique, Livres I-II. SC 306. Trans. A-J Festugière. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1983.

Church History from A.D. 323-425. NPNF 2 (2nd Ser.). Trans. Chester D. Hartranft. Oxford: Parker, 1890.

THEODORET

Kirchengeschichte. GCS 44. Ed. L. Parmentier and F. Scheidweiler. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954.

The Ecclesiastical History, Dialogues, and Letters of Theodoret. NPNF 3. Oxford: Parker, 1893.

ZOSIMUS

New History. Byzantina Australiensia 2. Ed. Ronald T. Ridley. Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1982.

Histoire Nouvelle. 3 vols. Ed. F. Paschoud. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971;1979;1986.

Liturgical Sources

Burkitt, F. C. "The early Syriac lectionary system." Proceedings of the British Academy 10 (1923): 301-338.

Le Calendrier Palestino-Géorgien du Sinaiticus 34. Subsidia Hagiographica 30. Ed. G. Garitte. Brussels, 1958.

A Christian Palestinian Syriac Horologion. Ed. Matthew Black. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1954.

Didascalia Apostolorum. Ed. R. H. Connolly. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.

Euchologion, sive Rituale Graecorum. Reprint of 1730 ed. Ed. Jacques Goar. Graz: Akademische Druck -u. Verlagsanstalt, 1960.

Expositio Officiorum Ecclesiae. CSCO 76. Ed. R. H. Connolly. Louvain, 1953.

Le Grand Lectionnaire de l'Église de Jérusalem (Ve-VIIIe S.). CSCO 189, 205. Ed. Michel Tarchnischvili. Louvain, 1959-60.

Hippolytus, a text for students. Grove Liturgical Studies 8. Ed. Geoffrey Cuming. Bramcote, 1987.

“Un index géorgien des lectures évangéliques selon l'ancien rite de Jérusalem.”
Ed. G. Garitte. Le Muséon 85 (1972): 337-398.

Le Liber Ordinum en usage dans l'église Wisigothique et Mozarabe d'Espagne.
Ed. Marius Férotin. Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot, 1904.

Liber Sacramentorum Augustodunensis. CCL 159B. Ed. O. Heiming.
Turnhout: Brepols, 1984.

Liber Sacramentorum Engolismensis. CCL 159C. Ed. P. Saint-Roche.
Turnhout: Brepols, 1987.

Liber Sacramentorum Gellonensis. CCL 159. Ed. H. Dumas. Turnhout:
Brepols, 1981.

Missale Francorum. Rerum Ecclesiasticum Documenta, Fontes 11. Ed. L. C. Mohlberg. Rome, 1957.

Le Pontifical Romano-Germanique du Xe siècle. Ed. C. Vogel and R. Elze.
Vatican: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1963.

Rituale Armenorum. Ed. F. C. Conybeare. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1905.

Rituale Melchitarum: A Christian Palestinian Euchologion. Bonner
Orientalistische Studien 22. Ed. Matthew Black. Stuttgart, 1938.

The Service for the Consecration of a Church and Altar according to the Coptic Rite. Ed. G. Horner. London: Harrison & Sons, 1902.

Le Synaxaire Arménien de Ter Israel. Patrologia Orientalis VI. Ed. G. Bayan.
Paris, 1911.

Le Synaxaire Géorgien. Patrologia Orientalis 19. Ed. N. Marr. Paris, 1962.

Secondary Sources

Adler, M. “The Emperor Julian and the Jews.” The Jewish Quarterly Review 5 (1893): 591-651.

Adontz, N. “Les fêtes et les saints de l'Église arménienne.” Revue de l'Orient chrétien 6 (1927-28): 74-104; 225-278.

Alexander, S. Spain. “Studies in Constantinian Church Architecture (Part 1).” Revistia di archeologia cristiana 47 (1971): 281-330.

Alexander, S. Spain. “Studies in Constantinian Church Architecture (Part 2).” Revistia di archeologia cristiana 49 (1973): 33-44.

- Alföldi, Andrew. The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome. Trans. H. Mattingly. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.
- Anderson, W.J. "Fragments of an eighth century Gallican sacramentary." Journal of Theological Studies 29 (1928): 337-345.
- Andrieu, M. Les ordines romani du haut moyen-âge. Vol. 4: Ordines XXV-XLIX of Louvain: 1956.
- Armstrong, Gregory T. "Constantine's churches: Symbol and structure." Journal for the Society of Architectural Historians 30 (1974): 5-16.
- . "Constantine's Churches." Gesta 6 (1967): 1-9.
- . "Imperial church building and Church-State relations AD 313-363." Church History 36 (1967): 3-17.
- . "Imperial church buildings in the Holy land." Biblical Archaeologist 30 (1967): 90-102.
- . "Fifth and sixth century church buildings in the Holy Land." Greek Orthodox Theological Review 14 (1969): 7-30.
- Arnold, Duane Wade-Hampton. The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991.
- . "Plots and accusations: Athanasius and the death of Constantine." Studia Patristica 26 (1993): 347-53.
- Attridge, Harold W., and Gohei Hata, ed. Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992.
- Aujoulat, N. "Eusèbe, Hélène, et Julien: II: le témoignage des historiens." Byzantion 53 (1983): 421-452.
- . "Eusèbe, Hélène et Julien: I: Le témoignage de Julien." Byzantion 53 (1983): 78-103.
- Avi-Yonah, M. The Jews of Palestine: a political history from the Bar Kokhba war to the Arab Conquest. Oxford: Blackwell, 1976.
- Bagatti, P. Bellarmino. L'église de la gentilité en Palestine (Ie - XIe siècle). Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1968.
- Bagnall, Roger S. Egypt in Late Antiquity. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Bainton, R. "The origins of Epiphany." Early and Medieval Christianity: The Collected Papers. Boston: 1962. Series I: 22-28.
- Bakker, H., ed. The Sacred Centre as the Focus of Political Interest. Groningen Oriental Studies VI. Groningen: 1992.

- Baldi, Donato. Enchiridion Locorum Sanctorum: Documenta S. Evangelii Loca Respicientia. 2nd ed. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1955.
- Baldi, Paschal. The question of the Holy Places in general. New edition. Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 1955.
- Baldovin, J. F. "Worship in urban life: the example of medieval Constantinople." Civitas: religious interpretations of the city. Ed. P. S. Hawkins. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986. 57-67.
- Baldovin, John F. The Urban Character of Christian Worship: the origins, development, and meaning of stational liturgy. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 228. Rome: Pontificia Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1987.
- _____. Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem. Grove Liturgical Studies 9. 1989.
- Bardy, G. "Sur Paulin de Tyre." Revue des Sciences Religieuses 2 (1922): 35-45.
- Barnard, L. W. "Athanasios et les empereurs Constantin et Constance." Politique et Théologie chez Athanasios d'Alexandrie. Ed. C. Kannengiesser. Théologie Historique 27. Paris: Beauchesne, 1974. 127-144.
- Barnard, Leslie W. Studies in Athanasios' Apologia secunda. New York: P. Lang, 1992.
- Barnardi, E. "Le mot 'tropaion' appliqué aux martyrs." Vigilae Christianae 8 (1954): 174-75.
- Barnes, Timothy D. "The Emperor Constantine's Good Friday Sermon." Journal of Theological Studies 27 (1976): 414-23.
- _____. "Two speeches by Eusebius." Greek, Roman, Byzantine Studies 18 (1977): 341-45.
- _____. "Emperor and bishops AD 324-344: Some problems." American Journal of Ancient History 3 (1978): 53-75.
- _____. Constantine and Eusebius. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1981.
- _____. "Constantine's prohibition of pagan sacrifice." American Journal of Philology 105.1 (1984): 69-72.
- _____. "Some inconsistencies in Eusebius." Journal of Theological Studies 35 (1984): 470-475.
- _____. "Christians and pagans in the reign of Constantius." L'église et l'empire au IV^e siècle. Ed. Albrect Dihle. Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique Entretiens 34. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1989. 301-337.

- _____. "Panegyric, history and hagiography in Eusebius' Life of Constantine." The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick. Ed. Rowan Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 94-123.
- _____. "The Constantinian Settlement." Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism. Ed. Harold W. Attridge and Golei Hata. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992. 635-657.
- _____. Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and politics in the Constantinian empire. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- _____. "The conversion of Constantine." From Eusebius to Augustine: selected papers, 1982-93. Aldershot, Hamps: Variorum, 1994. III:371-91.
- _____. "The two drafts of Eusebius' Life of Constantine." From Eusebius to Augustine: selected papers, 1982-1993. Aldershot, Hamps.: Variorum, 1994. XII:1-11.
- Barrow, R. H. Prefect and Emperor: The Relations of Symmachus AD 384. Oxford: Clarendon, 1973.
- Bartelink, G. J. M. "'Maison de prière' comme denomination de l'église en tant qu'édifice, en particulier chez Eusèbe de Césarée." Revue des Études Grecques 84 (1971): 101-18.
- Bastiansen, A. A. R. Observations sur le vocabulaire liturgique dans l'itinéraire d'Égérie. Utrecht: 1962.
- Baumstark, Anton. Festbrevier und Kirchenjahr der syrischen Jakobiten. Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums 3. Paderhorn: 1910.
- _____. "Das Alter der Peregrinatio Aetheriae." Oriens Christianus N.S. 1 (1911): 32-76.
- _____, and B. Botte. Comparative Liturgy. Trans. F. L. Cross. London: Mowbray, 1958.
- Baynes, N. "Eusebius and the Christian empire." Byzantine Studies and other Essays. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1955. 168-172.
- Beaucamp, E., and J.-P. de Relles. "Ou est, dans la liturgie chrétienne, la grande fête de l'automne?" Bible et Vie Chrétienne 65 (1965): 45-55.
- Beck, E. "Le baptême chez saint Ephrem." L'Orient Syrien 1 (1956):
- Beukers, C. "For our emperors, soldiers and allies': an attempt at dating the twenty-third catechesis by Cyrillus of Jerusalem." Vigiliae Christianae 15 (1961): 177-84.

- Bickersteth, J. E. "The Transfiguration and church dedications." Studia Patristica 5.3 (1959): 3-7.
- Biddle, Martin. "The tomb of Christ: sources, methods and a new approach." 'Churches Built in Ancient Times': recent studies in early Christian archaeology. Ed. Kenneth Painter. London: The Society of Antiquaries & The Accordia Research Centre, 1994. 73-147.
- Bihain, E. "L'épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la vision de la croix (BHG(3) 413)." Byzantion 43 (1973): 264-296.
- Black, Matthew. "The festival of Encaenia Ecclesiae in the ancient Church with special reference to Palestine and Syria." Journal of Ecclesiastical History 5 (1954): 78-85.
- . "The Chi-Rho sign - Christogram and/or Staurogram?" Apostolic history and the Gospel: biblical and historical essays presented to F. F. Bruce on his sixtieth birthday. Ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970. 319-27.
- Bleckmann, B. "The Chronicle of John Zonaras and a pagan source for the history of Constantine." Historia: Zeitschrift Fur Alte Geschichte 40.3 (1991): 343-365.
- Blomme, Y. "La liturgie de Jérusalem et son influence sur les églises nestorienne et syrienne." Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (Jerusalem) 29 (1979): 221-237.
- Boak, A. E. R. Two Studies in Later Roman and Byzantine Administration. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series. Ann Arbor, 1924.
- Boeft, J. den. Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXI. Groningen: E. Forsten, 1991.
- Bonner, G., ed. Famulus Christi: Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the birth of the venerable Bede. London: SPCK, 1976.
- Bonsnes, Marjorie P. "The pilgrimage to Jerusalem a typological metaphor for women in early Medieval religious orders." Ph.D. New York University, 1982.
- Borgehammar, Stephan. How the Holy Cross was found: from event to medieval legend: with an appendix of texts. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1991.
- Bornet, R. "La célébration de la sainte croix dans le rite Byzantin." La Maison Dieu 75 (1963): 92-108.
- Botte, B. Les origines de la Noël et de l'Épiphanie: Étude historique. Louvain: Textes at Études Liturgiques 1, 1932.

- _____. "Le lectionnaire arménien et la fête de la Théotokos à Jérusalem au Ve siècle." Sacris Erudiri 2 (1949): 111-22.
- _____. "La formula d'ordination 'La grâce divine' dans les rites orientaux." L'Orient Syrien 2 (1957): 285-296.
- _____. "Les dimanches de la dédicace dans les églises syriennes." L'Orient Syrien 2 (1957): 65-70.
- Bouvy, Edmond. "Le pèlerinage d'Euchérie." Revue Augustinienne 3 & 4 (1903-04): 521-22.
- Bouyer, Louis. Liturgy and Architecture. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.
- Bradshaw, Paul. The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship. London: SPCK, 1992.
- Bresc-Bautier, Geneviève. "Les imitations du Saint-Sépulchre de Jérusalem (IX^e - XV^e siècles): Archéologie d'une dévotion." Revue d'Histoire de la Spiritualité 50 (1974): 319-342.
- Brett, E. T. "Early Constantine Legends - A Study in Propaganda." Byzantine Studies 10.1 (1983): 52-70.
- Brock, S. "Studies in the early history of Syrian Orthodox baptismal liturgy." Journal of Theological Studies 23 (1972): 16-64.
- Brooks, Neil Conwell. The sepulchre of Christ in art and liturgy; with special reference to the liturgic drama. New York: Johnson Reprint Corp., 1970.
- Broshi, Magen. "Evidence of earliest Christian pilgrimage to the Holy Land comes to light in the Holy Sepulchre Church." Biblical Archaeology Review 3.4 (1977): 42-44.
- Brown, Peter. The World of Late Antiquity. London: Thames and Hudson, 1971.
- _____. Religion and Society in the age of St Augustine. London: 1972.
- Bruun, Patrick. "The Christian signs on the coins of Constantine." Arctos (n.s.) 3 (1962): 5-35.
- Bruyne, D. de. "Nouveau fragments de l'Itinerarium Eucheriae." Revue Bénédictine 26 (1909): 481-87.
- Bryce, Jackson. "Lactantius' De Ave Phoenixe and the religious policy of Constantine the Great." Studia Patristica 19 (1989): 13-19.
- Bulloch, J. Pilate to Constantine. Edinburgh: St Andrew's Press, 1981.

- Cabrol, Ferdinand. Les églises de Jérusalem, la discipline et la liturgie au IV^e Siècle. Paris: 1895.
- . “Dédicace des églises.” Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie. Ed. F. Cabrol & H. Leclercq. Paris: 1920. 4:1:
- . “Les origines de la liturgie gallicane.” Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique 25 (1930): 951-62.
- Cameron, Averil. “Christianity and tradition in the historiography of the late empire.” Classical Quarterly 14 (1964): 316-28.
- . “Constantinus Christianus.” Journal of Roman Studies 73 (1983): 184-90.
- . “Eusebius of Caesarea and the rethinking of history.” Tria Corda. Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano. Ed. E. Gabba. Como: 1983. 71-88.
- . Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1991.
- . The Later Roman Empire, AD 284-430. London: Fontana Press, 1993.
- . The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity, AD 395-600. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Capelle, B. “L'Aqua Exorcizata dans les rites romains de la dédicace au VI^e siècle.” Revue Bénédictine 50 (1938): 306-8.
- . “La fête de la Vierge à Jérusalem au V^e siècle.” Le Muséon 56 (1943): 1-33.
- Cardini, Franco. “La Gerusalemme di Egeria e il pellegrinaggio dei christiani d'occidente in terrasanta fra IV e V secolo.” Atti del convegno Internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae. Accademia Petrarca di Lettere arti e Scienze Arezzo. 1987. 333-341.
- Cardman, Francine. “The rhetoric of holy places.” Studia Patristica 17.1 (1982): 18-25.
- Carra, Pietro. “La successione di Constantino.” Aevum 67 (1993): 173-80.
- Carson, R.A.G. Principal Coins of the Romans. Volume III: The Dominate AD 294-498. London: British Museum Publications, 1981.
- Chadwick, Henry. “The fall of Eustathius of Antioch.” Journal of Theological Studies 49 (1948): 27-35.

- Charlesworth, James H. "A Prolegomena to a study of the Jewish background of the Hymns and prayers in the New Testament." Journal of Jewish Studies 33 (1982): 269f.
- Chastagnol, André. L'Evolution Politique, Sociale et Economique du Monde Romain 284-363. Paris: SEDES, 1982.
- Chavasse, Antoine. Le sacramentaire Gélasien. Histoire de la Théologie 1. Tournai: Desclées, 1957.
- Chesnut, Glenn F. The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1977.
- Chiat, Marilyn J. S., and Marchita B. Mauck. "Using archeological sources." The Making of Jewish and Christian Worship. Ed. P.F. Bradshaw and L.A. Hoffman. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1991. 69-92.
- Coakley, J. F. "A Syriac version of the letter of Cyril of Jerusalem on the vision of the Cross." Analecta Bollandiana 102 (1984): 71-84.
- Cohen, Jeremy. "Roman imperial policy towards the Jews from Constantine until the end of the Palestinian Patriarchate." Byzantine Studies 3.1 (1976): 1-29.
- Cohen, Shaye J. D. "Pagan and Christian evidence on the ancient synagogue." The Synagogue in Late Antiquity. Ed. Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987. 159-81.
- Coleman-Norton, P. R. Roman State and Christian Church. Vol. I London: SPCK, 1966.
- Constanteios, D. J. "The Holy Scriptures in Greek Orthodox worship." Greek Orthodox Theological Review 12 (1966): 7-83.
- Coquin, R. "La consécration des églises dans le rite copte, ses relations avec les rites syrien et byzantin." L'Orient Syrien 9 (1964): 149-87.
- . "Les origines de l'Épiphanie en Egypte." Nöel, Épiphanie: Retour de Christ. Ed. B. Botte. Paris: Lex Orandi 40, 1967. 140-54.
- Corbett, Percy Ellwood. The Roman Law of Marriage. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.
- Corbo, Virgilio Canio. Il Santo Sepolcro di Gerusalemme: aspetti archeologici dalle origini al periodo crociato. Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (Jerusalem). Collectio maior n. 29. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 1981.

- Corcoran, Simon. "Hidden from history: the legislation of Licinius." The Theodosian Code. Ed. Jill Harries and Ian Wood. New York: Cornell University Press, 1993. 97-119.
- Cotiasnon, Charles. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Trans. J.-P. B. & Claude Ross. London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1974.
- . Analyse des éléments du IV^e siècle conservés dans la basilique du S. Sépulcre à Jérusalem. Congressio internazionale di archeologia christiana. Trier: Pontificio instituto di archeologia cristiana, 1965: 447-63.
- Croke, Brian, and Jill Harries. Religious Conflict in Fourth-Century Rome: A Documentary Study. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1982.
- Dagron, Gilbert. Naissance d'une Capitale: Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451. Bibliothèque Byzantine Études 7. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974.
- Dalmaï, I.-H. "La glorification de la sainte croix dans l'église copte." La Maison Dieu 75 (1963): 109-18.
- Daniélou, Jean. Bible et Liturgie: la théologie biblique des sacraments et des fêtes d'après les Pères de l'Église Lex Orandi 11. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1951.
- . "Les quatre-temps de septembre et la fête des tabernacles." La Maison Dieu 46 (1956): 114-36.
- . "La fête des tabernacles dans l'exégèse patristique." Studia Patristica 1:i (1957): 262-79.
- . Théologie du Judeo-Christianisme: Histoire des doctrines Chrétiennes avant Nice. Tournai: Desclee, 1958.
- . Primitive Christian Symbols. Trans. D. Attwater. London: Burns and Oates, 1964. 1-24.
- . Études d'exégèse judéo-chrétienne. Théologie Historique 5. Paris: Beauchesne, 1966.
- Davies, J. G. "Peregrinatio Egeriae and the Ascension." Vigilae Christianae 8 (1954): 94-100.
- Davies, P. S. "Constantine's editor." Journal of Theological Studies 42 (1991): 610-18.
- Decker, D. de, and G. Depuis-Masay. "L'épiscopat de l'empereur Constantin." Byzantion 50 (1980): 118-157.

- Deichmann, F. W. "Vom Tempel zur Kirche." Mullus; Festschrift Theodor Klauser. Münster: Aschendorff, 1964.
- Dekkers, E. "De datum der 'Peregrinatio Egeriae' en het feest van Ons Heer Hemelvaart." Sacris Erudiri 1 (1948): 181-205.
- Devos, Paul. "La date du voyage d'Égérie." Analecta Bollandiana 85 (1967): 165-194.
- _____. "Égérie à Bethléem: le 40^e jour après pâques à Jérusalem, en 383." Analecta Bollandiana 86 (1968): 87-108.
- _____. "Égérie n'a pas connu d'Église de l'Ascension." Analecta Bollandiana 87 (1969): 208-212.
- _____. "La 'servante de Dieu' Poemenia." AB 87 (1969): 189-212.
- _____. "Silvie la sainte pèlerine (I)." Analecta Bollandiana 91 (1973): 105-117.
- _____. "Silvie la sainte pèlerine (II)." Analecta Bollandiana 92 (1974): 321-43.
- _____. "Une nouvelle Égérie." Analecta Bollandiana 101 (1983): 43-66.
- _____. "Egeriana (II): Études linguistiques et autres." Analecta Bollandiana 105 (1987): 415-24.
- _____. "Egeriana: nouvelle édition catalane et commentaires divers." Analecta Bollandiana 105 (1987): 159-166.
- _____. "L'année de la dédicace de Saint-Étienne à Jérusalem: 439." Analecta Bollandiana 105 (1987): 265-278.
- _____. "Egeriana III." Analecta Bollandiana 109 (1991): 363-81.
- _____. "Perlustris/praelustris: Égérie et l'eau." Eulogia : mélanges offerts à Antoon A.R. Bastiaensen à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire. Ed. G. J. M. Bartelink, A. Hilhorst and C. H. Kneepkens. The Hague: Nijhoff, 1991. 77-88.
- Devresse, R. "L'édition du commentaire d'Eusèbe de Césarée sur Isäie." Revue Biblique 42 (1933): 540-55.
- Dix, Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. 2nd ed. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945.
- Doval, Alexis. "The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem." D.Phil. University of Oxford, 1993.
- _____. "The location and structure of the baptistery in the Mystagogic Catecheses of Cyril of Jerusalem." Studia Patristica 26 (1993): 1-13.

Downey, Glanville. "On some post-classical Greek architectural terms."

Transactions of the American Philological Association 77 (1946): ?

_____. A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961.

_____. "Constantine's churches at Antioch, Tyre and Jerusalem (Notes on architectural terms)." Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph 38 (1962): 191-96.

_____. "From the pagan city to the Christian city." Greek Orthodox Theological Review 10.1 (1964): 121-39.

Drake, H. A. "When was the De Laudibus Constantini delivered?" Historia 24 (1975): 345-56.

_____. "Review of Barnes, 'Eusebius and Constantine'." American Journal of Philology 103 (1982): 462-66.

_____. "The return of the Holy Sepulchre." Catholic Historical Review 70 (1984): 263-67.

_____. "Eusebius on the True Cross." Journal of Ecclesiastical History 36.1 (1985): 1-22.

_____. "Suggestions of date in Constantine's 'Oration to the Saints'." American Journal of Philology 106 (1985): 235-49.

_____. "Athanasius' first exile." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 27 (1986): 193-204.

_____. "What Eusebius knew - The genesis of the 'Vita Constantini'." Classical Philology 83.1 (1988): 20-38.

Drijvers, Hans. J. W. "Syrian Christianity and Judaism." The Jews Among Pagans and Christians. Ed. Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak. London & New York: Routledge, 1992. 124-146.

_____. Helena Augusta: the mother of Constantine the Great and the legend of the finding of the true cross. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.

_____. "Helena Augusta: exemplary Christian empress." Studia Patristica 24 (1993): 85-90.

Drinkwater, J. F. "The 'pagan underground': Constantius II's 'secret service', and the survival, and usurpation of Julian." Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History. Ed. C. Deroux. Coll. Latomus 180. Brussels: 1983. III: 348-387.

Driver, G. R. The Judaeen Scrolls: the problem and the solution Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1965.

- Duchesne, L. Christian Worship: Its Origins and Evolution. Trans. M. L. McClure. 5th ed. London: SPCK, 1927.
- Duval, N. "Les origines de la basilique chrétienne." L'Information d'histoire de l'art 7 (1962): 1-.
- Dvornik, F. Early Christian and Byzantine Political Philosophy. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 9. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1966.
- Eade, John, and Michael J. Sallnow, ed. Contesting the Sacred: the anthropology of Christian pilgrimage. London & New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Elliott, T. G. "Constantine's conversion: Do we really need it?" Phoenix 41 (1987): 420-38.
- . "Constantine's early religious development." Journal of Religious History 15.3 (1989): 283-291.
- . "The Language of Constantine's Propaganda." Transactions of the American Philological Association 120 (1990): 349-353.
- . "Eusebian frauds in the Vita Constantini." Phoenix 45 (1991): 162-71.
- . "Constantine and 'the Arian reaction after Nicaea'." The Journal of Ecclesiastical History 43 (1992): 169-94.
- . "Constantine's Preparations for the Council of Nicaea." Journal of Religious History 17.2 (1992): 127-137.
- Elm, Susanna. "Perceptions of Jerusalem pilgrimage as reflected in two early sources on female pilgrimage (3rd and 4th centuries AD)." Studia Patristica 20 (1989): 219-23.
- Emonds, H, ed. Enkainia: Gesammelte Arbeiten zum 800 jährigen Weihegedächtnis der Abteikirche. Dusseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1956.
- Ernout, A. "Les mots grecs dans la Peregrinatio Aetheriae." Emerita 20 (1952): 289-307.
- Errington, R. M. "Constantine and the pagans." Greek Roman and Byzantine Studies 29.3 (1988): 309-318.
- Esbroeck, Michel van. "Une homélie sur l'église attribuée à Jean de Jérusalem." Le Muséon 86 (1973): 283-304.
- . Les plus anciens homéliaires Géorgiens: étude descriptive et historique. Louvain: Institut Orientaliste de l'Université Catholique de Louvain, 1975.

- _____. "Le manuscrit Sinaïtique géorgien 34 et les publications récentes de liturgie palestinienne." Orientalia Christiana Periodica 46 (1980): 125-141.
- _____. "Les manuscrits de Jean Zosime Sin. 34 et Tsagareli 81." Bedi Kartlisa 39 (1981): 63-75.
- _____. "Jean II de Jérusalem et les cultes de S. Étienne, de la Sainte-Sion et de la Croix." Analecta Bollandiana 102 (1984): 99-134.
- Fears, J. R. "The cult of Jupiter and Roman imperial ideology." Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II. Berlin/New York: 1981. 17.1: 3-14.
- Férotin, Marius. "Le véritable auteur de la 'Peregrinatio Silvae', la vierge espagnole Éthéria." Revue des Questions Historiques 30 (1903): 367-397.
- Ferrua, Antonio. The Unknown Catacomb: a unique discovery of early Christian art. New Lanark, Scotland: Geddes & Grosset, 1991.
- Finegan, Jack. Handbook of Biblical Chronology: principles of time reckoning in the ancient world and problems of chronology in the Bible. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964.
- Finney, Paul Corby. "Early Christian architecture: The beginnings (A review article)." Harvard Theological Review 81.3 (1988): 319-39.
- _____. The Invisible God: the earliest Christians on art. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Fowden, G. "Bishops and temples in the Eastern Roman empire AD 320-435." Journal of Theological Studies 29 (1978): 53-78.
- Fox, R. Lane. Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World from the Second Century AD to the Conversion of Constantine. London: Viking Press, 1986.
- Frantz, Alison. "From paganism to Christianity in the temples of Athens." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 19 (1965): 187-205.
- Freeman-Grenville, G. S. P. "The basilica of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem: history and future." Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland .2 (1987): 187-207.
- Frend, W. H. C. "Church and state: perspective and problems in the patristic era." Studia Patristica 17.1 (1982):
- _____. The Rise of Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

- _____. "The Church in the reign of Constantius II (337-361)." L'église et l'empire au IV^e siècle. Ed. Albrecht Dihle. Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique Entretiens 34. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1989. 73-111.
- Frolow, A. "La dédicace de Constantinople dans la tradition Byzantine." Revue de l'Histoire des Religions 127 (1944): 61-127.
- Frugoni, Chiara. A Distant City: images of urban experience in the medieval world. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.
- Gamurrini, J. F. "S. Silvae Aquitaine; Peregrinatio ad Loca Sancta." Studi e documenti di Storia e Diretto 9 (1888): 97-174.
- Geanakoplos, Deno John. "Church building and 'caesaropapism' AD 312-565." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 7 (1966): 167-186.
- Gero, Stephen. "The true image of Christ: Eusebius' letter to Constantia reconsidered." Journal of Theological Studies 32 (1981): 460-470.
- Gibson, Shimon, and Joan E. Taylor. Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Jerusalem: the archaeology and early history of traditional Golgotha. Palestine Exploration Fund Monograph, Series Maior, 1. London: Palestine Exploration Fund, 1994.
- Girardot, K. M. "Constance II, Athanase et l'édit d'Arles (353). A propos de la politique religieuse de l'empereur Constance II." Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie. Ed. C. Kannengiesser. Théologie Historique 27. Paris: Beauchesme, 1974. 63-92.
- Golan, David. "Hadrian's decision to supplant 'Jerusalem' by 'Aelia Capitolina'." Historia 35.2 (1986): 226-239.
- Goodenough, E. Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman World. 13 vols. New York: Pantheon, 1953-1968.
- Gordan, H. L. "The basilica and the stoa in Rabbinical literature." Art Bulletin 13 (1932): 353-75.
- Gordon, Richard. "The veil of power: emperors, sacrificers and benefactors." Pagan Priests: Religion and Power in the Ancient World. Ed. Mary Beard and John North. New York: Cornell University Press, 1990. 201-231.
- Goudoever, J. van. Biblical Calendars. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959.
- Gough, Michael. The Early Christians. Ancient Peoples and Places 19. London: Thames & Hudson, 1961.
- Grabar, André. L'empereur dans l'art byzantin: recherches sur l'art officiel de l'empire d'Orient. Paris: Belles Lettres, 1936.

- _____. Martyrium: Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique. 2 Vols. Paris: Collège de France, 1946.
- _____. "La basilique Chrétienne et les thèmes de l'architecture sacrale dans l'antiquité." Kuntzchronik May (1951): 98-103.
- Grant, Robert M. Augustus to Constantine: The thrust of the Christian movement into the Roman World. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- _____. "Temples, Churches and Endowments." Early Christianity and Society: seven studies. London: Collins, 1978. 148-157.
- _____. Eusebius as Church Historian. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- _____. "Eusebius and Imperial Propaganda." Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism. Ed. H. W. Attridge and G. Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992. 658-683.
- Green, Miranda, and John Ferguson. "Constantine, sun-symbols and the Labarum." Durham University Journal 80.1 (1987): 9-17.
- Grégoire, Henri, and Paul Orgels. "S. Gallicanus, consul et martyr dans la passion des SS. Jean et Paul, et sa vision «Constantinienne» du crucifié." Byzantium 24 (1954): 579-601.
- Groh, Dennis. "Galilee and the Eastern Roman Empire in late antiquity." Explor 3 (1977): 78-93.
- _____. "The Onomasticon of Eusebius and the rise of Christian Palestine." Studia Patristica 18.1 (1985): 23-31.
- Grubbs, Judith Evans. "Constantine and imperial legislation on the family." The Theodosian Code. Ed. Jill Harries and Ian Wood. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993. 120-142.
- Grünwald, Thomas. Constantinus Maximus Augustus: Herrschaftspropaganda in der zeitgenössischen Überlieferung. Historia: Einzelschriften H.64. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1990.
- Haas, Christopher. "The Alexandrian riots of 356 and George of Cappadocia." Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 32 (1991): 281-301.
- _____. "Late Roman Alexandria: Social structure and intercommunal conflict in the entrepôt of the East." Ph.D. University of Michigan, 1988.
- Hall, Stuart. Some Constantinian documents in the Vita Constantini. Paper delivered at the symposium, "Constantine and the Birth of Christian Europe", Warwick University: 1993.
- _____. "The use of earlier material in the Vita Constantini I 57-59." Studia Patristica 24 (1993): 96-101.

- Halt, J-J. "Le vision de Constantin au sanctuaire de grand at l'origine celtique du labarum." Latomus 9 (1950): 427-36.
- Hamilton, R. W. "Jerusalem in the fourth century." Palestine Exploration Quarterly (1952): 83-90.
- Hanson, R. P. C. "The fate of Eustathius of Antioch." Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte 95 (1984): 171-79.
- . "The transformation of pagan temples into churches in the early Christian centuries." Studies in Christian Antiquity. Ed. R. P. C. Hanson. Edinburgh: 1985. 347-58.
- Harnack, Adolf. The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. 2 Vols. Trans. J. Moffatt. London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.
- Harrelson, W. "The celebration of the feast of booths according to Zech 14:16-21." Religions in Antiquity: Essays in memory of E. R. Goodenough. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968. 88-96.
- Hefele, C. H. A History of the Christian Councils to the Close of the Council of Nicaea AD 325. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1871.
- . A History of the Councils of the Church AD 326-AD429. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1876.
- Heid, Stefan. "Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalems." Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum 32 (1989): 41-71.
- Heim, François. "L'influence exercée par Constantin sur Lactance: sa théologie de la victoire." Lactance et son temps. Ed. J. Fontaine and M. Perrin. Théologie Historique 48. Paris: Éditions Beauchesme, 1978. 55-74.
- Heiming, Odilo. "Review of Botte, Le lectionaire arménien (1949)." Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft 3 (1956): 409-11.
- Helgeland, John. "Time and space: Christian and Roman." Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II:23:2: 1303-1304.
- Hillyer, N. "First Peter and the feast of Tabernacles." Tyndale Bulletin 21 (1970): 67f.
- Hobbs, Alanna Emmett. "Digressions in the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret." Journal of Religious History 14.1 (1986): 1-11.
- Holdsworth, C. J., and T. P. Wiseman, ed. The Inheritance of historiography 350-900. Exeter Studies in History 12. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1986.

- Hollerich, Michael J. "The comparison of Moses and Constantine in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Life of Constantine*." *Studia Patristica* 19 (1989): 80-85.
- . "Myth and history in Eusebius' 'de Vita Constantini': Vita Constantini I,12 in its contemporary setting." *Harvard Theological Review* 82.4 (1989): 421-445.
- . "Religion and politics in the writings of Eusebius: Reassessing the 1st so-called court-theologian." *Church History* 59.3 (1990): 309-325.
- Holum, Kenneth G. "Hadrian and St. Helena: Imperial travel and the origins of Christian Holy Land pilgrimage." *The Blessings of Pilgrimage*. Ed. R. Ousterhout. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1990. 66-81.
- Hunt, E. D. *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire A.D. 312-460*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- . "Christians and Christianity in Ammianus Marcellinus." *Classical Quarterly* 35 (1985): 186-200.
- . "Christianity in Ammianus Marcellinus revisited." *Studia Patristica* 24 (1993): 108-113.
- . "Space and time transcended: the beginnings of Christian Pilgrimage." *The Sense of the Sacramental: movement and measure in art and music, place and time*. Ed. David Brown and Ann Loades. London: SPCK, 1995: 59-77.
- Irwin, Patrick. "Bishop Alexander and the Jews of Jerusalem." *Persecution and Toleration: papers read at the 22nd & 23rd meetings of the Ecclesiastical Historical Society*. Ed. W. Sheils. Oxford: Blackwell, 1984. 317-327.
- Ison, D. "The Constantinian Oration to the Saints: Authorship and Background." Ph.D. Kings College London, 1985.
- . "Pais-Theoi in the age of Constantine." *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1987): 412-419.
- Jacob, Andre. "Les euchologues du fond Barberini grec de la Bibliotheque vaticane." *Didaskalia* 4 (1974): 131-222.
- Janeras, S. "Contributo alla bibliografia Egeriana." *Atti del convegno Internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae*. Accademia Petrarca di Lettere arti e Scienze Arezzo. 1987. 355-366.
- Jeffrey, Peter. "The Sunday office of seventh-century Jerusalem in the Georgian chantbook (Iadgari): A preliminary report." *Studia Liturgica* 21 (1991): 52-75.

- _____. "The earliest Christian chant repertory recovered: the Georgian witnesses to Jerusalem chant." Journal of the American Musicological Society 47 (1994): 1-38.
- Jeremias, Joachim. Golgotha. Ἀγγελος: Archive für neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte und Kulturkunde 1. Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1926.
- Jones, A. H. M. "Notes on the genuineness of Constantinian documents in Eusebius' Life of Constantine." Journal of Ecclesiastical History 5 (1954): 196-200.
- _____. Constantine and the Conversion of Europe. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Jourel, Pierre. "Le culte de la croix dans la liturgie Romaine." La Maison Dieu 75 (1963): 68-91.
- Judge, E. A. "Christian innovation and its contemporary observers." History and Historians in Late Antiquity. Ed. B. Croke and A. M. Emmett. Sydney: Pergamon Press, 1983. 13-29.
- Jungmann, Josef A. The Early Liturgy to the Time of Gregory the Great. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1959.
- Kannengiesser, Charles. "The Athanasian decade 1974-84: a bibliographical report." Theological Studies 46 (1985): 524-41.
- _____. Arius and Athanasius: two Alexandrian theologians. Aldershot, Hamps.: Variorum, 1991.
- Kannookadan, Pauly. The East Syrian Lectionary: An Historico-Liturgical Study. Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientale, 1991.
- Kavanagh, A. "How rite develops: Some laws intrinsic to liturgical evolution." Worship 41 (1967): 334f.
- Kee, A. Constantine versus Christ: The triumph of ideology. London: SCM, 1982.
- Kennedy, George A. Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- Kent, John Philip Cozens. The family of Constantine I, A.D. 337-364. The Roman Imperial Coinage, 8. London: Spink & Son, 1981.
- Keresztes, P. "Patristic and historical evidence for Constantine's Christianity." Latomus 42.1 (1983): 84-94.
- Keresztes, P. "Constantine: called by divine providence." Studia Patristica 18.1 (1985): 47-53.

- Khoury-Sarkis, G. "L'église dans l'année liturgique Syrienne." Irenikon 28 (1955): 186-93.
- _____, and A. du Boullay. "La bénédiction de l'eau la nuit de l'Épiphanie dans le rite Syrien d'Antioche." L'Orient Syrien 4 (1959): 224-29.
- Kight, Duane Winston. "From "secret cell" to compostella: Medieval itineraries of Theosis." PhD. University of Pennsylvania, 1990.
- Kirschner, Robert. "The vocation of holiness in late antiquity." Vigilae Christianae 38 (1984):
- Klein, R. Constantius II und die christliche Kirche. Impulse der Forschung 26. Darmstadt: 1977.
- Klijn, A. F. J., and G. J. Reinink. Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Kniazeff, A. "La spiritualité de la croix dans les offices byzantins des 13 et 14 Septembre." Liturgie, Spiritualité, Cultures: Conférences Saint-Serge XXIXe Semaine d'études liturgiques. Ed. A. M. Triacca and A. Pistoin. Ephemerides liturgicae subsidia 29. Rome: 1983. 153-179.
- Kohler, C. "Note sur un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque d'Arrezzo." Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartres 45 (1884): 141-51.
- Konstantinidis, Chrysostome. "L'ordo de la dédicace des églises selon le rite byzantin vers le milieu du VIIIe siècle." Πεπραγμένα του Θ' Διεθνούς Βυζαντινολογικού συνεδρίου (Thessalonika, 12-19 April 1953). Athens: 1956. 2: 206-215.
- Krauss, S. "The Jews in the works of the Church Fathers." Jewish Quarterly Review 6 (1894): 82-99; 225-261.
- Krautheimer, Richard. Constantine's church foundations. Congressio internazionale di archeologia christiana. Trier: Pontificio istituto di archeologia cristiana, 1965: 237-255.
- _____. "The Constantinian basilica." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 21 (1967): 115-40.
- _____. Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture. The Pelican History of Art. 3rd ed. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1981.
- _____. Three Christian Capitals: topography and politics. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- _____, et al. Corpus Basilicarum Christianorum Romae: the early Christian basilicas of Rome. 5 Vols. Monumenti di Antichità cristiana. Vatican City: Pontificio istituto di archaeologia cristiana, 1977.

- Kyrtatas, Dimitris J. The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities. London: Verso, 1987.
- L'Orange, H. P. Art Forms and Civic Life in the Roman Empire. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965.
- Lambert, A. "Egeria: notes critiques sur la tradition de son nom et celle de l'Itinerarium." Revue Mabillon 26 (1936): 71-94.
- _____. "Egeria, soeur de Galla." Revue Mabillon 27 (1937): 1-42.
- _____. "L'Itinerarium Egeriae, vers 414-16." Revue Mabillon 28 (1938): 49-69.
- Lamirande, Émilien. "La pèlerine Égérie: une grande dame de l'antiquité chrétienne." Église et Théologie 15 (1984): 259-91.
- Lassus, J. "L'Empereur Constantin, Eusèbe et les lieux saints." Revue de l'Histoire des Religions 171 (1967): 135-44.
- Ledwich, W. "Baptism, sacrament of the Cross." The Sacrifice of Praise. Ed. B. Spinks. Rome: 1981. 199-211.
- Leeb, H. Die Gesänge im Gemeindegottes dienst von Jerusalem (vom 5. bis 8. Jahrhundert). Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie 28. Wien: Herder, 1970.
- Leroux, J-M. "Athanasius et la seconde phase de la crise arienne (345-373)." Politique et Théologie chez Athanase d'Alexandrie. Ed. C. Kannengiesser. Théologie Historique. Paris: Beauchesme, 1974. 145-156.
- Lethaby, W. R. "The temple, the church of the Ascension, and the finding of the Cross." Palaestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement (1897): 75-77.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. Antioch: City and imperial administration in the later Roman empire. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- _____. Continuity and Change in Roman Religion. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979.
- _____. "Ecclesiastical historians on their own times." Studia Patristica 24 (1993): 151-63.
- Lieu, Judith. "History and theology in Christian views of Judaism." The Jews Among Pagans and Christians. Ed. Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak. London & New York: Routledge, 1992. 79-96.
- Linder, A. "The Myth of Constantine the Great in the West: Sources and Hagiographic Commemoration." Studi Medievali 16 (1975): 43-95.

- _____. "Ecclesia and Synagoga in the Medieval myth of Constantine the Great." Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire 54 (1976): 1019-60.
- Louth, A. "The date of Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica*." Journal of Theological Studies 41 (1990): 111-23.
- MacCormack, Sabine. "Roma, Constantinopolis, the emperor, and his 'genius'." Classical Quarterly 25 (1975): 131-150.
- _____. "Latin prose panegyrics: tradition and discontinuity in the later Roman Empire." Revue des Études Augustiniennes 22 (1976): 29-77.
- _____. Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1981.
- _____. "Loca Sancta: The organisation of sacred topography in late antiquity." The Blessings of Pilgrimage. Ed. R. Ousterhout. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- MacMullen, Ramsey. Christianizing the Roman Empire AD 100-400. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Mango, Cyril. The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453: sources and documents. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Manns, Frédéric. "Une tradition Judéo-Chrétienne mentionnée par Egérie." Henoch 10 (1988): 283-91.
- Maraval, Pierre.. "Le temps du pèlerin (IV^e - VII^e siècles)." Le temps Chrétien de la fin de l'Antiquité au Moyen Age III^e - XIII^e Siècles. Ed. J.-M. Leroux. Colloques Internationaux du CNRS 604. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1984. 479-88.
- _____. Lieux Saints et Pèlerinages d'Orient. Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe. Paris: 1985.
- _____. "Un querelle sur les pèlerinages autour d'un texte patristique (Grégoire de Nysse, Lettre 2)." Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses 66 (1986): 131-146.
- _____. "Égérie et Grégoire de Nysse. pèlerins aux lieux saints de Palestine." Atti del convegno Internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae. Accademia Petrarca di Lettere arti e Scienze Arezzo. 1987. 315-331.
- _____. "Liturgie et Pèlerinage durant les premier siècles du Christianisme." La Maison Dieu 170 (1987): 272-93.
- _____. "Saint Jérôme et le pèlerinage en Palestine." Saint Jérôme entre l'Orient et l'Occident. Colloque de Chantilly Sept. 1986. Paris: 1988. ?
- Markus, R. A. "Holy Places and Holy People." The End of Ancient Christianity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- _____. Christianity in the Roman World. London: Thames & Hudson, 1974.
- Martin, A. "Les premiers siècles du Christianisme à Alexandrie: Essai de topographie religieuse (III-IV s.)." Revue des Études Augustiniennes 30 (1984): 211-235.
- Martin-Achard, R. Essai biblique sur les fêtes d'Israel. Geneva: Collection Labor et Fides, 1974.
- Mathews, Thomas F. The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy. The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971.
- _____. The Clash of Gods: a reinterpretation of early Christian art. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- Matthews, John F.. The Roman Empire of Ammianus. London: Duckworth, 1989.
- _____. Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court AD 364-425. Oxford: 1975.
- _____. "The origin of Ammianus." Classical Quarterly 44.1 (1994): 252-269.
- McClendon, C. B. "The History of the Site of St Peter's Basilica, Rome." Perspecta: The Yale Architectural Journal 25 (1989): 33-65.
- McVey, K. "The domed church as microcosm: likely roots of an architectural symbol." Dunbarton Oaks Papers 37 (1983): 91-121.
- Metreveli, Elene. "Les manuscrits liturgiques Géorgiens des IXe - Xe siècles et leur importance pour l'étude de l'hymnographie Byzantin." Bedi Kartlisa 36 (1978): 43-48.
- _____. "Le plus ancien tropologion Géorgien." Bedi Kartlisa 39 (1981): 54-62.
- Meyers, Eric M. "The current state of Galilean synagogue studies." The Synagogue in Late Antiquity. Ed. Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987. 127-137.
- Meyvaert, P. "Diversity within Unity, A Gregorian theme." Benedict, Gregory, Bede and Others. Ed. P. Meyvaert. London: 1977. 141-162.
- Milburn, Robert. Early Christian Art and Architecture. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Miles, Margaret R. "The evidence of our eyes': Fourth-century Roman churches." Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christian and Secular Culture. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985. 41-62.
- Millar, Fergus. The Emperor in the Roman World (31BC - AD337). London: Duckworth, 1977.

- _____. "The Jews of the Graeco-Roman diaspora between paganism and Christianity, AD 312-438." The Jews Among Pagans and Christians. Ed. Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak. London & New York: Routledge, 1992. 97-123.
- Mohrmann, Christine. "Égérie et le monachisme." Corona Gratiarum: miscellanea patristica, historica et liturgica Eligo Dekkers O.S.B. xii lustra complenti oblata. Brugge: Sint Pietersabdij, 1975. 1: 163-80.
- Momigliano, A. The Conflict between Paganism and Christianity in the Fourth Century. Oxford: 1963.
- Mondesert, Claude. Le monde grec ancien et la Bible. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984.
- Montgomery, J. A. "The dedication feast in the Old Testament." Journal of Biblical Literature 29 (1910): 29-40.
- Moore, P. G. "Cross and crucifixion in Christian iconography." Religion 4 (1974): 104-13.
- Morin, G. "Un passage énigmatique de S. Jérôme contra le pèlerine espagnole Euchéria?" Revue Bénédictine 30 (1913): 174-86.
- Morrison, Karl F. Rome and the City of God: An Essay on the Constitutional Relationship of Empire and Church in the Fourth Century. Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 54. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1964.
- Mossay, J. Les fêtes de Noël et d'Épiphanie d'après les sources littéraires cappadociennes du IV^e siècle. Louvain: Textes et Études Liturgiques 3, 1965.
- Muncey, R.W. A History of the Consecration of Churches and Churchyards. Cambridge: W. Heffer, 1930.
- Murray, Alexander. "Peter Brown and the shadow of Constantine (review article)." The Journal of Roman Studies 73 (1983): 191-203.
- Murray, Charles. "Art and the Early Church." Journal of Theological Studies 28 (1977): 303-345.
- Nautin, P. "La conversion du temple de Philae en église chrétienne." Cahiers Archéologiques 17 (1967): 1-43.
- Neusner, Jacob. Judaism and Christianity in the Age of Constantine. Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Newman, John Henry. Two Essays on Biblical and Ecclesiastical Miracles. London: Longmans, Green, & Co, 1870.

- _____. The Arians of the Fourth Century. 5th ed. London: Pickering, 1883.
- Nobbs, Alanna Emmett. "Digressions in the Ecclesiastical Histories of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret." Journal of Religious History 14.1 (1986): 1-11.
- Nordberg, Henric. Athanasius and the Emperor. Societas Scientiarum Fennica. Commutationes humanarum litterarum XXX:3. Helsinki, 1963.
- Odahl, C. "A pagan's reaction to Constantine's conversion: religious references in the Trier Panegyric of AD 313." Ancient World 21 (1990): 45-63.
- _____. "Constantine's epistle to the bishops at the Council of Arles: a defense of imperial authorship." Journal of Religious History 17.3 (1993): 174-89.
- Ousterhout, R. "Rebuilding the Temple: Constantine Monomachus and the Holy Sepulchre." Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians 48.1 (1989): 66-78.
- _____. "The Temple, the Sepulchre, and the Martyrion of the Savior (the relationship of the Holy Sepulcher and the Temple of Jerusalem manifested in writings, ceremonies and architecture)." Gesta 29.1 (1990): 44-53.
- Outtier, Bernard. "Un témoin partiel du lectionnaire Géorgien ancien (Sinai Géorgien 54)." Bedi Kartlisa 39 (1981): 76-88.
- Painter, K. S. "A fourth-century Christian treasure found at Water Newton, England, in 1975." Art, Archeology, and Architecture. Ed. Paul Corby Finney. Reprint ed. Studies in Early Christianity 18. New York: Garland Pub., 1993. 259-345.
- Palmer, A. N. "The inauguration anthem of Hagia Sophia in Edessa." Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies 12 (1988): 117-67.
- Parkes, James. "Jews and Christians in the Constantinian Empire." Studies in Church History. Oxford: Basil Blackwell & Mott, 1964. 69-79.
- Parmentier, Léon. "La lettre de l'empereur Constantin au sujet de la construction de l'église du Saint-Sépulcre, à Jérusalem." Revue Archéologique 14 (1909): 42-51.
- Pasquali. "Die Composition der Vita Constantini des Eusebius." Hermes 46 (1910): 369-86.
- Patterson, Lee. "On the margin: postmodernism, ironic history, and medieval studies." Speculum 65 (1990): 87-108.

- Payne, Randall Merle. "Christian worship in Jerusalem in the Fourth and Fifth centuries: the development of the lectionary, calendar and liturgy." Ph.D. Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1980.
- Peirce, Philip. "The Arch of Constantine: propaganda and ideology in late Roman art." Art History 12 (1989): 387-418.
- Perrone, L. "Vie religieuse et théologie en Palestine durant la première phase des controverses christologiques." Proche-Orient Chrétien 27 (1977): 212-49.
- Philips, Charles R. "Julian's rebuilding of the temple: a sociological study of religious competition." Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers. Ed. P. J. Achtemeier. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979. 167-172.
- Phillips, James Earl. "The site of the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem: its pre-Constantinian and Constantinian phases." PhD University of Texas at Austin, 1977.
- Pietri, Charles. "La politique de Constance II: Un premier 'césaropapisme' ou 'l'imatatio Constantini'?" L'église et l'empire au IV^e siècle. Ed. Albrecht Dihle. Fondation Hardt pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique Entretiens 34. Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1989. 113-172.
- Piganiol, André. L'Empire Chrétien (325-395). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1972.
- Pinney, G. F. "Constantine as Augustus." American Journal of Archaeology 88.2 (1984): 256.
- Pitt-Rivers, George. The Riddle of the 'Labarum' and the Origin of Christian Symbols. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1966.
- Price, R. M. "Pluralism and religious tolerance in the empire of the fourth century." Studia Patristica 24 (1993): 184-88.
- Price, S. R. F. Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Pullen, Wendy. "Mapping time and salvation: early Christian pilgrimage to Jerusalem." Cosmos: the yearbook of the Traditional Cosmology Society 9 (1993): 24-40.
- Purvis, James D. Jerusalem, the Holy City: a bibliography. Metuchen, N.J.: The American Theological Library Association, Scarecrow Press, 1988.
- Quasten, J. "Oriental Influences in the Gallican Liturgy." Traditio 1 (1943): 55-78.

- Rankin, O. S. The Origins of the Festival of Hanukkah. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1930.
- Reif, S. C. "Jewish liturgical research: Past present and future." Journal of Jewish Studies 34 (1983): 161-170.
- Renoux, A. "Un manuscript du lectionnaire arménien de Jérusalem." Le Muséon 74 (1961): 361-.
- . "L'Épiphanie à Jérusalem au IV^e et au V^e siècle d'après le lectionnaire arménien de Jérusalem." Revue des Études Arméniennes 2 (1965): 343-59.
- . "La croix dans le rite arménien: histoire et symbolisme." Melto 5 (1969): 123-175.
- . "Hiersolymtana." Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft 23 (1981): 1-29, 149-75.
- . "Liturgie arménienne et liturgie hiérsolymitaine." Liturgie de l'église particulière et de l'église universelle: conférences Saint-Serge XXII^e semaine d'études liturgiques. Paris, 30 juin - 3 juillet 1975. Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1976. 275-88.
- . "Les ministres du culte a Jérusalem au IV^e et au V^e siècle." L'Assemblée Liturgique et les Différents Rôles dans l'Assemblée. Ed. A. Pistoia and A. M. Triacca. Conférences Saint-Serge XXIII^e semaine d'études liturgiques. Paris, 28 Juin - 1 Juillet 1976. Rome: Edizioni Liturgiche, 1977. 253-267.
- . "Un document nouveau sur la liturgie de Jérusalem." La Maison Dieu 139 (1979): 139-164.
- Riall, Robert Archie. "Athanasius Bishop of Alexandria: the politics of spirituality." Ph.D. University of Cincinnati, 1987.
- Ridley, R. T. "Anonymity in the Vita Constantini." Byzantion 50 (1980): 241-58.
- Righetti, M. Manuale de storia liturgica. 3rd ed. 4 vols. Milan: Ancora, 1959-66.
- Risenfeld, H. Jésus Transfiguré: L'arrière-plan du récit évangélique de la transfiguration de nôtre-seigneur. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1947.
- Rivers, Joseph. "Pattern and Process in Early Christian Pilgrimage." Ph.D. Duke University, 1983.
- Rodgers, B. Saylor. "Constantine's pagan vision." Byzantion 50 (1980): 259-78.

- _____. "Divine insinuation in the Panegyrici Latini." Historia 25 (1986): 69-99.
- _____. "The metamorphosis of Constantine." The Classical Quarterly n.s. 39.1 (1989): 233-46.
- Rordorf, Willy. The Eucharist of the Early Christians. Trans. Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1978.
- Rosenau, Helen. Vision of the Temple: The image of the temple of Jerusalem in Judaism and Christianity. London: Oresko Books, 1979.
- Roueché, Charlotte. "Theodosius II, the cities, and the date of the 'Church History' of Sozomen." Harvard Theological Review 81 (1988): 130-31.
- Rousseau, Philip. "The exegete as historian: Hilary of Poitiers' Commentary on Matthew." History and Historians in Late Antiquity. Ed. B. Croke and A. M. Emmett. Sydney: Pergamon Press, 1983. 107-115.
- Rubin, Z. "The church of the Holy Sepulchre and the conflict between the sees of Caesarea and Jerusalem." The Jerusalem Cathedra Ed. Lee Levine. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi Institute, 1982: 79-105.
- Ruggieri, Vincenzo. "Consecrazione e dedicazione di chiesa, secondo il Barberinanus graecus 336." Orientalia Christiana Periodica 54 (1988): 79-118.
- Russell, Kenneth W. "The earthquake of May 19, AD 363." Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 238 (1980): 47-64.
- Salzman, M. "Superstitio and the persecution of pagans in the Codex Theodosianus." Vigiliae Christianae 41 (1987): 172-88.
- _____. On Roman Time: The codex-calendar of 354 and the rhythms of urban life in late antiquity. Berkely & Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1990.
- _____. "How the west was won: The christianization of the Roman aristocracy in the west in the years after Constantine." Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History. Ed. Carl Deroux. Collection Latomus 217. Brussels: 1992. 6:
- Sanders, Gabriel. "Égérie, saint Jérôme et la Bible. En marge de L'Itin. Eg. 18,2, 39,5 et 2,2." Corona Gratiarum: miscellanea patristica, historica et liturgica Eligo Dekkers O.S.B. xii lustra complenti oblata. Vol 1. Brugge: Sint Pietersabdij, 1975: 181-199.
- Sansterre, J. M. "Eusébe de Césarée et la naissance de la théorie 'césaropapiste'." Byzantion 42 (1972): 131-95, 532-94.

- Schmemmann, Alexander. Introduction to Liturgical Theology. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1975.
- Schneider, A. M. "The churches of Palestine and their influence on early Christian architecture." Antiquity 12 (1938): 174-.
- Schoedel, William R., and R. L. Wilken, ed. Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorem Robert M. Grant. Hew Haven: Yale University Press, 1984.
- Schwartz, Joshua. "The Encaenia of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, the temple of Solomon and the Jews." Theologische Zeitschrift 43.3 (1987): 265-81.
- . "Gallus, Julian and anti-Christian polemic in Pesikta Rabbah." Theologische Zeitschrift 46.1 (1990): 1-19.
- Scullard, H. H. Festivals and Ceremonies of the Roman Republic. London: Thames & Hudson, 1981.
- Selwyn, E. C. "The feast of Tabernacles, Epiphany and Baptism." Journal of Theological Studies (1911): 225-36.
- Seston, W. "Les murs, les portes et les tours des enceintes urbains et le problème des res sanctae en droit romain." Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à André Piganiol. Ed. Raymond Chevaltier. Vol 3. Paris: S.E.V.P.E.N, 1966: 1489-98.
- Setton, Kenneth M. Christian Attitudes towards the Emperor in the fourth century. Reprinted from Columbia University Press 1941 ed. AMS Press, 1967.
- Shepherd, M. H. "The earliest Christian basilica." Yearbook of Liturgical Studies 7 (1966): 73-86.
- . "Eusebius and the Liturgy of St James." Yearbook of Liturgical Studies 4 (1964): 109-123.
- . "Liturgical expressions of the Constantinian triumph." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 21 (1967): 59-78.
- Simon, Marcel. Verus Israel: a study of the relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (135-425). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Sivan, H. "Holy Land pilgrimage and western audiences: Some reflections on Egeria and her circle." Classical Quarterly 38.2 (1988): 528-535.
- . "Who was Egeria? Piety and pilgrimage in the age of Gratian." Harvard Theological Review 81.1 (1988): 59-72.

- . "Pilgrimage, monasticism and the emergence of Christian Palestine in the 4th century A.D." The Blessings of Pilgrimage. Ed. R. Ousterhout. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- Sjöqvist, Erik. "Kaisareon: a study in architectural iconography." Opuscula Romana 1 (1954): 86-105.
- Skeen, Judy Lynn. "A comparative study of the wandering people of Hebrews and the pilgrimage of Egeria." PhD. The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1993.
- Smith, C. "Christian rhetoric in Eusebius' panegyric at Tyre." Vigiliae Christianae 43.3 (1989): 226-247.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "Jerusalem: the city as place." Civitas: religious interpretations of the city. Ed. P. S. Hawkins. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986. 25-38.
- . To Take Place: toward theory in ritual. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Spitzer, L. "The epic style of the pilgrim Aetheria." Comparative Literature 1 (1949): 225-58.
- Stambaugh, J. E. "The functions of Roman temples." Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. New York/Berlin: 1978. II.16.1: 554-608.
- Starowieyski, M. "Bibliografia Egeriana." Augustinianum 19 (1979): 297-317.
- Stauffer, S. Anita. "Inculturation and church architecture." Studia Liturgica 20.1 (1990): 70-80.
- Stemberger, Günter. Juden und Christen im Heiligen Land: Palästina unter Konstantin und Theodosius. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1987.
- Stern, H. Le calendrier du 354: Étude sur son texte et sur les illustrations. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique. Paris: Geuthner, 1953.
- . "Les calendriers romains illustrés." Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II.12.2 (1981): 431-475.
- Sterns, Indrikis. The Greater Medieval Historians: An Interpretation and a Bibliography. Washington DC: University Press of America, 1981.
- Storch, R. "The Eusebian Constantine." Church History 40 (1971): 144-55.
- . "The Trophy and the Cross: Pagan and Christian symbolism in the fourth and fifth centuries." Byzantion 40 (1970): 105-118.

- Straub, Johannes. "Constantine as 'Koinos Episkopos': Tradition and innovation in the representation of the first Christian emperor's majesty." Dumbarton Oaks Papers 21 (1967): 39-55.
- _____. "Réflexions sur religion et politique aux temps du Bas-Empire." Transformation et Conflits au IVe Siècle Ap. J.-C.: Colloque organisé par la Fédération Internationale des Études Classiques Bordeaux 7, au 12. Septembre 1970. Antiquitas: Reihe 1, Abh. zur alten Geschichte; Bd 29. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1978. 127-131.
- Stritmatter, A. "The Barberinum S. Marci of Jacques Goar." Ephemerides Liturgicae 47 (1933): 329-97.
- Sutherland, C.H.V. Roman Coins. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1974.
- Swanson, Donald C. "A formal analysis of Egeria's (Silvia's) vocabulary." Glotta 44 (1966-67): 177-254.
- Taft, Robert. "Some notes on the Bema in the East and West Syrian tradition." Orientalia Christiana Periodica 34 (1968): 326-59.
- _____. The Great Entrance. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 200. 2nd ed. Rome: 1978. 98ff.
- _____. "Liturgy as Theology." Worship 56 (1982): 113f.
- Talley, Thomas J. "Liturgical time in the ancient Church: the state of research." Liturgical time: papers read at the 1981 congress of Societas Liturgica. Ed. W. Vos and G. Wainwright. Rotterdam: Liturgical Ecumenical Center Trust, 1982. 34-51.
- _____. "Constantine and Christmas." Studia Liturgica 17 (1987): 191-197.
- _____. The Origins of the Liturgical Year. 2nd ed. New York: Pueblo, 1991.
- Taylor, Joan E. Christians and the Holy Places: the myth of Jewish-Christian origins. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Telfer, W. "The author's purpose in the Vita Constantini." Studia Patristica 1.1 (1957): 160f.
- _____. "Constantine's Holy Land plan." Studia Partistica 1.(T+U 63) (1957): 696-700.
- Ternant, Paul. "La signification spirituelle de la basilique du Saint-Sépulchre." Proche-Orient Chrétien 2 (1952): 319-332.
- Testini, Pasquale. "Egeria e il S. Sepulcro di Gerusalemme." Atti del convegno Internazionale sulla Peregrinatio Egeriae. Accademia Petrarca di Lettere arti e Scienze Arezzo. 1987. 215-30.

- Theckeneth, J. "The Church Bride of Christ: Historical, analytical and theological study of the season of the consecration of the church in the East Syrian tradition." Ph.D. Pontifical College of St Anselm, 1987.
- Tolotti, Francesco. "Il S. Sepolcro di Gerusalemme e le coeve basiliche di Roma." Mitteilungen des Deutsche Archäologische Institut in Rom 93 (1986): 471-512.
- Treggiari, Susan. Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.
- Tryon-Montalembert, R. de. "Les fêtes d'automne et la liturgie chrétienne." Rencontre 62 (1979): 205-13.
- Tsafrir, Yoram. "The Byzantine setting and its influence on ancient synagogues." The Synagogue in Late Antiquity. Ed. Lee I. Levine. Philadelphia: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987. 147-157.
- Turner, H. W. From Temple to Meeting House: The Phenomenology and Theology of Places of Worship. Religion & Society 16. The Hague: Mouton, 1979.
- Ulfgard, H. Feast and Future: Revelation 7:9-17 and the Feast of Tabernacles. Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series 22. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1989.
- Väänänen, Veikko. Le Journal-Épître d'Égérie (Itinerarium Egeriae): Étude linguistique. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.
- Vermeer, G. F. M. Observations sur le vocabulaire du pèlerinage chez Égérie et chez Antonin de Plaisence. Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva 19. Utrecht: 1965.
- Vincent, H., and F. M. Abel. Jérusalem: Recherches de Topographie d'archéologie et d'histoire. 2 Vols. Paris: 1912, 1926.
- Voelkl, L. "Das konstantinischen Kirchenbauten nach Eusebius." Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana 29 (1953): 49-66.
- _____. Die Kirchenstiftungen des Kaisers Konstantin im Lichte des römischen Sakralrechts. Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Forschung des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 117. Köln: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1964.
- Wade, Andrew. "The oldest Iadgari: the Jerusalem topologion, V-VIII c." Orientalia Christiana Periodica 50 (1984): 451-56.
- Wainwright, G. "'Bible et Liturgie': Daniélou's work revisited." Studia Liturgica 22 (1992): 154f.

- Wainwright, P. "The authenticity of the recently discovered letter attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem." Vigiliae Christianae 40.3 (1986): 286-293.
- Walker, P. W. L. "Eusebius, Cyril and the holy places." Studia Patristica 20 (1989): 306-14.
- _____. Holy City, Holy Places? Christian attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Ward-Perkins, J. B. "Constantine and the origins of the Christian basilica." Papers of the British School at Rome 22 (1954): 69-90.
- _____. "Memoria, martyr's tomb, and martyr's church." Congressio internazionale di archeologia christiana. Trier: Pontificio istituto di archeologia cristiana, 1965. 3-24.
- _____. Roman Imperial Architecture. The Pelican History of Art. London: Penguin Books, 1981.
- Wardman, Alan. Religion and Statecraft Among the Romans. London: Granada, 1982.
- Warmington, B. "The sources of some Constantinian documents in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History and Life of Constantine." Studia Patristica 18.I (1985): 93-98.
- _____. "Virgil, Eusebius of Caesarea, and an imperial ceremony." Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History. Ed. Carl Deroux. Collection Latomus 196. Brussels: 1986.
- _____. "Did Constantine have 'religious advisors'?" Studia Patristica 19 (1989): 117-129.
- _____. "Eusebius of Caesarea's versions of Constantine's laws in the codes." Studia Patristica 24 (1993): 201-207.
- White, Lloyd Michael. Building God's House in the Roman World: Architectural Adaptation Among Pagans, Jews, and Christians. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- White, Susan. "Liturgical architecture 1960-1990: A select bibliography." Studia Liturgica 20 (1990): 219f.
- Wilken, Robert. John Chrysostom and the Jews: rhetoric and reality in the late fourth century. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- _____. "Eusebius and the Holy Land." Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism. Ed. H. Attridge and G. Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1992. 736-760.
- _____. The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian history and thought. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.

- Wilkinson, John. "Paulinus' temple at Tyre." Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 32.4 (1981): 553-61.
- . "The tomb of Christ: An outline of its structural history." Levant 4 (1972): 91-96.
- . "Jewish influences on the early Christian rite of Jerusalem." Le Muséon 92 (1979): 347-59.
- . "Jewish holy places and the origins of Christian pilgrimage." The Blessings of Pilgrimage. Ed. R. Ousterhout. Urbana: 1990.
- . "New Beginnings and church dedications." Creation and Liturgy: in honor of H. Boone Porter. Ed. Ralph N. McMichael. Washington: The Pastoral Press, 1993. 251-64.
- Williams, Daniel H. "Ambrose, emperors and Homoians in Milan: the first conflict over a basilica." Arianism after Arius: essays on the development of the fourth century trinitarian conflicts. Ed. Michel R. Barnes and Daniel H. Williams. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993. 127-146.
- Williams, G. H. "Christology and Church-State Relations in the Fourth Century." Church History 20.3 & 4 (1951): 1-33, 1-26.
- Willis, G. G. Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy. Alcuin Club Collections 50. London: SPCK, 1968.
- Wilson-Kastner, Patricia, ed. A Lost Tradition: women writers of the early church. Washington, D.C.: University Press of America, 1981.
- Wissowa, Georg. Religion und Kultus der Römer. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1971.
- Wright, D. E. "Constantine and the 'Mother of God': Oratio ad Sanctorum Coetum 11:9." Studia Patristica 24 (1993): 355-59.
- Yarnold, Edward J. "The authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem." The Heythrop Journal 19 (1978): 143-61.
- . "Who planned the churches at the Christian holy places in the Holy Land?" Studia Patristica 18.1 (1985): 105-109.
- . "The baptism of Constantine." Studia Patristica 26 (1993): 95-101.
- Ziegler, Joseph. "Die Peregrinatio Aetheriae und die hl. Schrift." Biblica 12 (1931): 162-98.

