

characters from its fellows. They are orthognathous, but the wide jaw-arches are set with large, regular teeth. The noses are well arched, and must have been fairly long and prominent; they vary somewhat in width, but are for the most part leptorhine. The orbits are mostly low browed. The lower jaws are long, but only two have pointed chins. On the whole they seem to be good representative specimens of a race not unlike the present-day Arab.

The body of the girl had been cut through at the eighth thoracic vertebra, and as the front ends of the ribs had been divided at this level it is plain that the section had been made while as yet the bones were supported by the soft parts. The most careful search of the whole cave failed to discover a fragment of the body below this level. She was about 16 years of age, and probably about five feet two inches in height, with a fairly broad skull (the frontal suture being still open) and megaseme orbits. There was not any characteristic sufficiently distinctive whereby it could be ascertained whether she belonged to the same race as the men or no. My general impression, however, is that she did.

## GOLGOTHA AND THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

By Major-General Sir C. W. WILSON, K.C.B., F.R.S., R.E., &c.

(Continued from p. 384, October, 1902.)

4. HADRIAN, on the suppression of the rebellion, was able to carry out his project of rebuilding Jerusalem; and in A.D. 136, the year in which he celebrated his *vicennalia*,<sup>1</sup> the new city was dedicated to Jupiter Capitōlinus, and made a Roman colony under the title *Colonia Ælia Capitolina*.<sup>2</sup> The size of the city is unknown, but it was probably surrounded by a wall<sup>3</sup> which excluded the southern portion of the western spur, and included the traditional sites of Golgotha and the Tomb. Hadrian adorned the new colony

<sup>1</sup> The twentieth year of his reign. On these festivals, which previously had only been celebrated by Augustus and Trajan, it was customary to build or dedicate new cities, or to rename old ones.

<sup>2</sup> Ælia, from Ælius Hadrianus, and Capitolina, in honour of the god to whom the city was dedicated.

<sup>3</sup> The present city wall is generally supposed to follow, approximately, the line of that of Hadrian.

with magnificent buildings, for which much of the material was obtained from the ruins of the Temple, palaces, &c.<sup>1</sup>

On the site once occupied by the Temple of Jehovah the Emperor erected a Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (Dio. Cass. LXIX, 12), and within it placed statues of himself<sup>2</sup> and of Jupiter, who was regarded as the guardian deity of the city. Amongst other buildings attributed to Hadrian are two public baths, a theatre, two market places, a Trikameron, and others called Tetranympion, Kodra, and Dodekapylon (*Chron. Pasch.*).<sup>3</sup> On the gate which led to Bethlehem was sculptured a boar, the fifth in rank of the *signa militaria* of the Roman army, and probably connected with the Tenth Legion.<sup>4</sup>

The constitution of *Ælia* was that of a Roman colony; and the city was divided into seven quarters, each having its head-man. Jews were excluded by stringent laws. They were forbidden to enter under pain of death. Guards were stationed to prevent their entrance, and they were not allowed even to gaze upon the city from a distant height.<sup>5</sup> Pagans and Christians alone were allowed to reside in the city, and the magnificence of the colony was of an essentially pagan character. The chief religious worship was that of Jupiter Capitolinus, but on the coins,<sup>6</sup> Bacchus, Serapis, Venus or Astarte, and the Dioscuri, are represented as deities of the city. When or by whom the later temples were erected it is impossible to say. On the ground now occupied by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre stood a temple with regard to which there appear to have been two distinct traditions—one Greek, the other Latin. The first is that unknown persons erected a temple of Aphrodite above the Tomb of Christ; the second that Hadrian

<sup>1</sup> Eusebius, *Dem. Ev.*, viii, 3 (see Appendix 1).

<sup>2</sup> The Bordeaux Pilgrim (*Itin. Hierosol.*) mentions two statues of Hadrian; Jerome, *in Es.*, ii, 8, a statue of Jupiter and one of Hadrian; and *in Mat.* xxiv, 15, an equestrian statue of the Emperor. Possibly there was a statue in the temple, and an equestrian statue in the precincts. An inscription in the south wall of the Harâm esh-Sherif probably belonged to one of them.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>4</sup> See Clermont-Ganneau, *Trois Inscriptions de la X<sup>e</sup>me Légion Fretensis; Horus et St. Georges; Études d'Arch. Or.*, i, 90, for the boar of the 10th Legion.

<sup>5</sup> Sulp. Sev., *H.S.* ii, 31 (see Appendix 3). The prohibition was still in force early in the third century, and does not appear to have been relaxed until the reign of Constantine.

<sup>6</sup> The coins range from A.D. 136 to the reign of Hostilian, A.D. 251-252.

set up (whether in a temple or not is not directly stated) a statue of Venus on the spot where Christ suffered, and a statue of Jupiter above the Tomb.

The *Greek tradition* is in general agreement with the statement of Eusebius (A.D. 260–339)—the only writer on the subject who could have seen the temple before it was demolished to make room for Constantine's churches. In his *Life of Constantine* (iii, 26), Eusebius says<sup>1</sup> that certain ungodly and impious persons covered up the Tomb and built, on a paved floor above it, "a gloomy shrine" to Aphrodite, thinking that they would thereby conceal the truth. Sozomen (375–450) states (*H.E.* ii, 1) that the Tomb and Golgotha were covered up by pagans who had formerly persecuted the Church, and that the whole place was enclosed by a wall and paved. The pagans erected a "temple" to Aphrodite, and set up "a little image," so that those who went to worship Christ would appear to bow the knee to Aphrodite. Socrates (*b.* 379) relates (*H.E.* i, 17) that those who hated Christianity covered the Tomb with earth on which they built a temple of Aphrodite with her image. In the later tradition of Alexander Monachus (*De Invent. Sanct. Crucis*), who wrote in the sixth century, the holy places are covered up by the Jews, and the temple and statue of Aphrodite are the work of idolaters of later date.

The *Latin tradition* rests upon the authority of writers who, although some of them may have conversed with old men who had seen the temple when young, had no personal knowledge of the "holy places" before their isolation from the surrounding rock by Constantine's architect. So far, then, as they contradict Eusebius one cannot give them the preference. Rufinus (345–410), who does not mention a temple, says (*H.E.* x, 7) that an image of Venus had been set up by the ancient persecutors on the spot where Christ had hung upon the cross, so that if any Christian came to worship Christ, he might appear to be worshipping Venus. Jerome (346–420) writes, *circ.* 395 (*Ep. ad Paulinum*), that from the time of Hadrian to the reign of Constantine, there stood a statue of Jupiter in the place of the Resurrection, and one of Venus, in marble, on the rock of the Cross, which was worshipped by the people. "The instigators of the persecution thought that they would take away our faith in the resurrection and the cross if they defiled the holy places with idols."

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 4; the references in other authors will be given later.

Paulinus of Nola (353-431), writing to Severus, says (*Ep.* xxxi) that Hadrian, "imagining that he could kill the Christian faith by defacing the place, consecrated an image of Jupiter on the site of the Passion." Sulpitius Severus (363-420) states that images of demons were set up both "in the temple and in the place where the Lord suffered." Ambrose (*b. circ.* 340) says, in a doubtful passage (*in Ps.* xlvii), that Christ suffered in the Venerarium (*i.e.*, the place where the statue of Venus was set up).

The conflicting statements of the Greek and Latin writers may, perhaps, be reconciled by supposing that during the early part of Constantine's reign the traditional sites of Golgotha and the Tomb were covered and hidden from view by an artificial platform, upon which, immediately above the Tomb, stood a temple of Venus (Aphrodite)<sup>1</sup> containing statues of the goddess and of Jupiter (Zeus). That in the latter part of the reign, Constantine's architect, who cut away the rock to obtain a level platform for the two great churches, left the two "holy places" standing up from the floor as separate masses of limestone. And that in after years, when the size and internal arrangement of the temple were forgotten, this isolation gave rise to the idea that each holy place had been intentionally defiled by the erection upon it of a statue of a heathen deity.<sup>2</sup> It may perhaps be inferred, from the discrepancy between Jerome and Paulinus with regard to the statue on the rock of the Cross, that there was no very definite tradition when they wrote.

The statements respecting the origin of the temple cannot be reconciled. The expressions "gloomy shrine"<sup>3</sup> and "impious persons," used by Eusebius, convey the impression that he intended to describe a small temple, and not a building erected by Imperial command. When Eusebius wrote no one would have presumed to call one of the emperors an impious person. On the other

<sup>1</sup> I see no reason to doubt the accuracy of the Greek and Latin writers with regard to the deity. In a Roman colony a temple of Venus would be more natural than one dedicated to Astarte, and Eusebius would probably have mentioned the Syrian goddess if the building had been erected in her honour. The coins bearing a supposed representation of a temple of Astarte are no proof that that particular temple stood above the Tomb.

<sup>2</sup> The original form of the ground, and the distance apart of Golgotha and the Tomb, seem to exclude the theory that they were included in one temple, and that each had its special statue.

<sup>3</sup> *σκότειος μυχός*; Socrates and Sozomen use the usual word *ναός*.

hand, the statement that the material for the substructures was obtained from some place outside the city (*ἐξωθέρ*), and that the shrine stood on a paved platform, scarcely supports the view that the building was insignificant. Hadrian, whose name is mentioned in connection with the "holy places" by no Greek writer, is first introduced by Jerome and Paulinus, who wrote 60-70 years after the temple had been demolished. There is no proof that he built the temple of Venus; that he erected any temple at a place known in his time as Golgotha; or that he intended to build one above the tomb of Christ. It is very unlikely that Hadrian, who had confirmed and extended Trajan's policy of leniency towards the Christians, and who must have known how they had been persecuted by the Jews for not taking part in the revolt, would have intentionally insulted them by building a temple above the Tomb, or by setting up statues above the Tomb and the site of the Passion. On the other hand, it would be not unlike the ironical spirit of the Emperor to extend contemptuous toleration to those he considered wretched fanatics, and at the same time to cover up their holy places as a sort of sarcastic jest. It must also be remembered that Hadrian zealously patronised the Græco-Roman religious rites; and that, in erecting temples in the Oriental provinces of the empire his purpose was that they should act as constant reminders of the cult of Rome, and of the connexion between the provinces and the metropolis. The Emperor built the great temple of Venus and Rome at the capital, and temples of Venus at other places; and it is not unreasonable to suppose that he built one at Jerusalem in addition to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (*see* p. 52). If he did build a temple of Venus, the probability seems to be that the selection of the Tomb as its site was not intentional. The argument that because a temple of Jupiter was built on the site of the Temple, and a temple of Venus stood above the Tomb, the latter site was regarded by the Christians as a sacred place is unsound.

All authorities concur in the opinion that the defilement of the "holy places" was intentional; and admitting, for the sake of argument, that the positions of Golgotha and the Tomb were known<sup>1</sup> to Christians, Jews, and Pagans, it is quite conceivable that an attempt was made to cover them up and defile them during some period of persecution. If this was the case, the defilement was

<sup>1</sup> For the discussion of this question, *see* p. 57, *et seq.*

probably a spontaneous act on the part of the local authorities at a later period than the reign of Hadrian, and not due to an Imperial rescript.

5. Little is known of the history of *Ælia*<sup>1</sup> during the period A.D. 136–326. With the foundation of the new city the Jerusalem Church lost its distinctive Judæo-Christian character. Henceforward, under a succession of Gentile bishops, it was to fall more and more under the influence of Greek thought and sentiment. Not only did the Christians become more sharply separated from the Jews, but the Church eventually branded as heretics those Judæo-Christians, such as the Nazarenes or Ebionites, who held to the law, and rejected Paul as an exponent of Christianity. Even the place upon which the Temple of Jehovah had stood was, in course of time, regarded as profane.

The Christians no doubt suffered during the several persecutions, but they do not appear to have been specially molested. The long tenure of the Jerusalem bishopric by Narcissus (A.D. 190–222 ?); the foundation by his successor, Alexander (A.D. 213–251), of a library which was extant in the time of Eusebius (*H.E.*, vi, 20)<sup>2</sup>; the collection of books and manuscripts formed by Origen at Cæsarea (A.D. 231–253); and the pilgrimage of a lady mentioned by Cyprian,<sup>3</sup> indicate that the Church grew and prospered in spite of persecution. Nothing occurred that would have led Christians, who knew the positions of Golgotha and the Tomb, to forget them.

In Jewish tradition, however, there may have been a break. Except, possibly, during the later years of the reign of Septimius Severus (A.D. 193–211), the order forbidding Jews to approach the city was strictly enforced, and there was no relaxation until the reign of Constantine. During this long period of 190 years the Jews may well have forgotten the exact positions of places that were of no special interest to them, although, possibly, a general idea of the direction in which they lay may have survived.

<sup>1</sup> The name *Ælia* so completely supplanted Jerusalem, that a Governor of Palestine, in the reign of Diocletian, is said to have asked what city the latter was (Eusebius, *De Mart. Pal.*, xi). Eusebius in his *History* calls the city *Ælia*, and in his *Life of Constantine* Jerusalem. For some years after Constantine's reign the two names were used together.

<sup>2</sup> Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xx, col. 572. Alexander was bishop coadjutor until the death of Narcissus.

<sup>3</sup> *Ep.* 75. Migne, *Pat. Lat.*, iii. col. 1,164.

6. The brief epitome of the history of Jerusalem, which has been given above, strongly suggests the conclusion that if Golgotha and the Tomb were regarded by the early Christians as "holy places," or as of any special importance, the Church would have experienced no difficulty in preserving a knowledge of their positions until they were officially recovered by order of Constantine. Whether the attitude of the early Christians towards those places was such as to encourage the belief that the knowledge was preserved is another question. It is also apparent that, until the foundation of Ælia in A.D. 136, nothing occurred to break the continuity of any Jewish tradition connected with Golgotha.

*The Attitude of the Early Christians towards Golgotha and the Tomb.*

The discussion of this point is beset with difficulties. There is not in the works of any writer prior to the age of Constantine, so far as I am aware, the faintest shadow of a hint that the early Christians held the places of the Crucifixion and Burial in any special honour, that they offered prayers to God at them, or that they even knew where they were situated. This silence, which has thrown open a wild field for speculation, is suggestive, but not conclusive. At one extreme is the view of Chateaubriand,<sup>1</sup> that the Holy Sepulchre was honoured, under the name *Martyrion*, from the very birth of Christianity as a witness or testimony of the Resurrection; and at the other, the opinion of those who believe that to the early Christians the risen Lord was everything and the Tomb nothing. Between the two extremes lies the suggestion<sup>2</sup> that, although there was no special cult of the Holy Sepulchre in the first centuries of Christianity, it may well have happened that the small Christian community of Jerusalem, which was at enmity with and hated by the whole world, preserved the memory of places round which all their hopes of the fulfilment of prophecy were gathered. In which direction does probability lie? The first Christians were Jews, and this question must be considered

<sup>1</sup> *Itin. de Paris à Jérusalem*, "Introduction."

<sup>2</sup> Unger, *Die Bauten Constantin's des Grossen am heiligen Grabe zu Jerusalem*, pp. 20, 21. See also Guthe, Art. "Grab, das heilige," in Hauck's *Real. Encyk. für Prot. Theol.*, 3rd edition. Even if the first Christians, as spiritual followers of Christ, attached no importance to the scene of the Resurrection, it would have been contrary to human nature and custom to have forgotten it.

from the Judæo-Christian rather than from the Hellenic or Latin point of view.

Little is known of the rites and customs of the Jews connected with the burial of the dead ; but it is at least certain that every Jew attached great importance to burial in the family tomb ;<sup>1</sup> and this suggests the belief that the disciples and friends of Jesus did not intend the sepulchre of Joseph to be His permanent resting-place. The body was placed in it<sup>2</sup> because they were pressed for time,—the Sabbath was nigh, and the tomb was close at hand. According to John (xix, 39, 40) the body when taken down from the Cross was bound “in linen clothes with the spices, as the custom of the Jews is to bury” ; and the preparation for burial, though hurried, was apparently complete.<sup>3</sup> Matthew, Mark, and Luke state that the body was wrapped by Joseph in a linen sheet, but mention no spices. All four Evangelists describe the visit of the women to the Sepulchre on the first Sunday morning : Mark says that “when the Sabbath was past” the women “bought spices that they might come and anoint him” ; Luke states that, after the entombment they “returned and prepared spices and ointments,” and that on the first day “they came unto the tomb, bringing the spices which they had prepared.” Matthew and John do not allude to the spices.<sup>4</sup> The body was apparently laid on the rock-hewn bench which surrounded the ante-chamber ;<sup>5</sup> it was certainly not placed in a loculus.

<sup>1</sup> There was a common belief that if a Jew wished to be reunited with his family in *Sheol*, he must be buried in the family sepulchre. Even the bones of an executed criminal were removed from the common tomb to the family vault when the decomposition of the body was complete (*Quarterly Statement*, 1902, p. 142, note 1).

<sup>2</sup> Possibly Joseph, in begging the body from Pilate and placing it in his own grave, intended to save it from the indignity of burial in the common tomb, and to mark his profound feeling of respect for Jesus (*cf.* Gen. xxiii, 6 ; 2 Ch. xxiv, 16).

<sup>3</sup> For what is known of Jewish burial customs, and their application to the question of Christ's burial, *see* articles by Bender in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vols. 6 and 7 ; articles on Anointment, Burial, Tombs, Dead, Mourning Customs, &c., in Smith's *D.B.* ; Hastings' *D.B.* ; and *Encyc. Bib.* ; and *Revue Biblique*, 1902, pp. 567, 568.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. xxvii, 59 ; xxviii, 1 ; Mark xv, 46 ; xvi, 1 ; Luke xxiii, 53 ; xxiv, 1 ; John xix, 39, 40 ; xx, 1.

<sup>5</sup> Such ante-chambers are common in the rock-hewn tombs of Palestine, and according to Cyril (*Cat.* xiv., 9 ; Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xxiii, col. 833), the traditional Holy Sepulchre had one, which was cut away when the church was built.



The usual explanations of the visit of the women are, that they intended to complete the burial by anointing the body and clothing it in the usual grave-clothes, or that they simply desired to spread spices over the body to counteract the effect of decomposition before the body was placed in a *loculus*. The anointment of a lacerated body which had lain in the tomb 36 hours—a period sufficient for incipient decomposition (*cf.* John xi, 39), is most unlikely, and is opposed to the little that is known of Jewish sentiment and custom. The other explanation is less open to objection; but it seems at least as probable that the motive of the women was the preparation of the body for removal in a bier (*σφοδός*, Luke vii, 14) to a family tomb, either at Bethany, Bethlehem, or on the slopes of the Mount of Olives.

The first Christians “had all things in common,” and “as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the Apostles’ feet” (Acts ii, 44, 45; iv, 34, 35; *cf.* v, 1–11). Joseph of Arimathea was a secret disciple of Christ (John xix, 38), and, according to tradition, he was one of those who went out as a missionary to the Gentiles. There is no reason to suppose that he acted differently to other Christians, and it is probable, if not certain, that, like Joseph, surnamed Barnabas,<sup>1</sup> he sold his property, including the garden and tomb, for the benefit of the common purse.

Visits to family tombs were not uncommon amongst the Jews. They were a tribute to the memory of those members of the family buried in the sepulchre, and were not unconnected with current beliefs respecting the dead. But a visit by a Jew, or by a Judæo-Christian, to an empty tomb for the purpose of prayer, is almost inconceivable in the early days of Christianity. Apart from this, it was the general belief amongst the first Christians that Jesus was alive, that He had been raised by God, and had become a heavenly being (“He is risen,” “He is ascended into heaven”); and many eagerly expected His immediate return to reign on earth, and so complete the death and resurrection. The early Christians needed no prayers at an empty tomb to remind them of their risen Lord, and it is not probable that they paid visits to places which, to those who had known Jesus in human form, must have been full of painful memories.

<sup>1</sup> The special mention of Barnabas is, perhaps, due to the fact that he was afterwards a companion of Paul.

Any cult of the Tomb during the early years of Christianity seems impossible,<sup>1</sup> but a change may perhaps have occurred after the return from Pella. The Jewish believers at Jerusalem maintained that a strict observance of the Mosaic law in its literal sense was essential to Christianity; their chief place of worship was the Temple (Acts ii, 46, xxi, 20-26); and, in greater or less measure, they adhered to the national and political forms of Judaism. After the destruction of the Temple, the law and tradition became everything to the Jew. What was the effect of the national disaster upon the Jewish believers? The Jerusalem Church lost its supremacy, but its members continued to regard compliance with the ceremonial law as essential, and efforts to impose the yoke of the law upon Gentile Christians did not cease until the third century.<sup>2</sup> The cessation of the Temple services probably led to a development of meetings for prayer in private houses (Acts i, 14; xii, 12), and in the synagogues or churches. No one can suppose that the rulers of the reconstructed church at Jerusalem sanctioned prayers at the Tomb, or anything in the form of a cult of "holy places." At that early period the spirituality of Christianity had not so completely expended its force as to render such an act probable or even possible.

It cannot be denied, however, that the return from Pella was an occasion which might reasonably give rise to visits to those places which were connected with the last days of Christ's life at Jerusalem. Such visits, due at first, perhaps, to curiosity, to a desire to see whether the operations of the great siege had altered the appearance of the localities, may in later years have been supplemented by prayers, and these simple acts may have gradually developed into a cult of Golgotha and the Tomb. There is, however, no evidence that any development, such as that suggested, took place; and there is nothing in the scanty records of pilgrimages before the Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325) to suggest its probability.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Especially if, as has been suggested above, Joseph's tomb was never intended to be the permanent resting place of Christ's Body, and had, shortly after the Ascension, passed into other (non-Christian) hands.

<sup>2</sup> For the Judæo-Christians and "Jewish Christianity," see Harnack, *History of Dogma*, Eng. ed., i, 289-301; Ersch and Gruber, *All. Encyk. der Wissenschaften u. Künste*, Art. "Juden-Christen"; Williams' *Holy City*, i, 217-224.

<sup>3</sup> As those who had known Christ in human form died, and His divinity more and more filled the thoughts of men, a cult of the Tomb seems less and less possible.

A more reasonable supposition is that the Christians resorted to the Mount of Olives, where Christ taught his disciples, and whence He ascended into heaven; and there are some grounds for believing that this was the case. Eusebius, in a passage of great interest,<sup>1</sup> written before A.D. 325, says that people came from all parts of the earth to the Holy City, "to hear the story of Jerusalem," and to "worship on the Mount of Olives, over against Jerusalem, whither the glory of the Lord removed itself, leaving the earlier city." It is true that the historian describes what occurred in his own time; but worship on Olivet was evidently of earlier origin,<sup>2</sup> and may have grown out of the visits which were almost certainly paid to the mount by the Christians who returned from Pella. There is no feature near Jerusalem to which a resident would more naturally resort to note the changes that had taken place during his temporary absence, or to point out to a friend the sites connected with the historic Jesus. The city, exposed to view in all its details, lies at the feet of the spectator. Is it not also a fair inference, from the absence of any allusion to the Tomb by Eusebius, that the place of Christ's burial was not known when he wrote, or, at any rate, that it was not a "holy place"?

It is most improbable that visits to, or any cult of, the Tomb originated with the early Gentile Christians. The whole spirit of Paul's teaching is opposed to the view that they attached any importance to material objects connected with the life of Christ. It is of the Risen Lord that Paul speaks, rather than of the historic Jesus. The Christ of the Epistles is "not an earthly but a heavenly figure." To the early Christians it was not of pressing importance "to be acquainted with the life of Jesus on the earth." Their thoughts "were fixed on the heavenly Christ, in whose career the earthly appearance of Christ was a mere transitory, though an important, episode."<sup>3</sup> Their minds were set "on things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth."<sup>4</sup> Even the

<sup>1</sup> *Dem. Ev.*, vi, 18, see Appendix (5).

<sup>2</sup> According to Eusebius, see Appendix (5), "God established it, in the place of the earthly Jerusalem and of the services which used to be held there, after the destruction of Jerusalem."

<sup>3</sup> Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, pp. 6-9, where the attitude of the early Christians is well put. See also Harnack, *l.c.*, pp. 82-87.

<sup>4</sup> Boret takes a different view:—"It is true that such was the point of view of St. Paul, and doubtless of the other Apostles. But one would deceive oneself if one attributed the same spirituality to the masses which, from

earthly Jerusalem had given place to that of which it is written, "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all."

No record of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, during the first three centuries, by any Christian from the West has survived; but Eusebius states<sup>1</sup> that Alexander, a Cappadocian bishop, who succeeded Narcissus as Bishop of Jerusalem, visited the Holy City, *circ.* A.D. 212, "in consequence of a vow, and for the sake of information in regard to its places" (τῶν τόπων ἱστορίας). Origen went to Jerusalem, the Jordan Valley, and Sidon (A.D. 226-253), partly, at least, to investigate the footsteps of Jesus and of his disciples and of the prophets;<sup>2</sup> and in the time of Eusebius pilgrims visited Jerusalem to hear the story of the city, and to worship on the Mount of Olives (*see* p. 61). The *Cave of the Nativity* at Bethlehem is referred to by Origen,<sup>3</sup> and Eusebius alludes<sup>4</sup> to the cave on Olivet near which Christ taught his disciples. The site of the house at which the Apostles met after the Ascension appears also to have been known, and to have been occupied by a church which, according to a fourth-century tradition, existed in the reign of Hadrian.<sup>5</sup> No other sacred localities are mentioned. The absence of any allusion to Golgotha or the Tomb, in passages such as the above, which might naturally be expected to contain some reference to them, is most marked, and suggests that their exact positions were unknown to the writers, or that they attached no importance to them.

The attitude of Christians during the first three centuries to Golgotha and the Tomb is, in truth, a matter upon which no one can speak with any certainty. I can only express my personal belief that sacred localities, as we deem them, had little attraction to the early Christians; that the Jerusalem Church attached no

Pentecost onwards, composed the Christian Church. . . . One might with much more reason suppose that the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem already attached a particular interest, perhaps even an exaggerated importance, to the sacred places in their midst" (*Voyage en Terre Sainte*, 3rd edition, pp. 193, 194).

<sup>1</sup> *H.E.*, vi, 11, § 2.

<sup>2</sup> Origen, *in Joan* vi, 24; Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xiv, col. 269; *Hom. in Josh.* xvi, 2.

<sup>3</sup> *Contra Celsum* i, 51; Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xi, col. 756.

<sup>4</sup> *Dem. Ev.* vi, 18, *see* Appendix (5).

<sup>5</sup> Epiphanius, *De Mens. et Pond.* xv, Migne; *Pat. Gr.* xliiii, col. 261. This may well have been the case if the house was on the western spur outside the limits of the Roman Camp (*Quarterly Statement*, 1902, p. 380).

importance to them; that no steps were taken to preserve a knowledge of the position of those connected with the Crucifixion and Resurrection; that the Church would have discouraged anything in the nature of reverence to the Tomb; and that, even amongst the less spiritual-minded members of the community, the survival of a tradition relating to Golgotha and the Tomb is improbable, although not, perhaps, impossible. The Christians of the first century, at least, could hardly fail to remember the great principle of their Master's teaching: "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. . . . God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth" (John iv, 21-24).

---

#### APPENDIX.

(1) EUSEBIUS (*Dem. Ev.* viii, 3).—"Therefore shall Zion for your sake be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps" (Micah iii, 12), which prophecy was never truly fulfilled at any time except after they dared to do violence to our Saviour. From that time to this present day these places have lain utterly desolate, and the Mount Sion, which once was the most famous of them all—instead of the ancient meditations and practice of the prophetic and divine oracles which aforesaid were set forth in that place with great zeal by Hebrews, men who walked with God, prophets, priests, and rulers of the whole nation—now differs in nothing from the country round about it, and is ploughed and tilled by Romans, and we ourselves have seen the labour of the oxen and the crops . . . . For Jerusalem, being inhabited by strangers, even at this day furnishes stones to those who gather them, seeing that all those who in our own time dwell therein collect stones from her ruins, both from private and from public buildings, and we may see with our eyes the saddest of all sights—stones being taken from the Temple itself, and from what once was the Holy of Holies itself (τοὺς ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἁδύτων καὶ ἁγίων λίθους), to build shrines for idols and places for shows, where all the people may assemble. These things being beheld by all men, clearly prove that the New Law and the New Testament instituted by our Saviour Jesus Christ has departed from thence (*Pat. Gr.* xxii, col. 636).

(2) *Chronicon Paschale*, A.D. 119.—In the time of these consuls the Jews revolted, and Adrian went to Jerusalem. He took the Jews captive, went to the place called the Terebinth, and held an assembly (πανάγειρος). He sold them for slaves at the price of a horse per man. Those who were left he took to Gaza, and there held an assembly and sold them. That assembly is to this day called Adrian's assembly. He

pulled down the temple (*ναός*) of the Jews at Jerusalem and built the two public halls (or market places), the theatre, the Trikameron, the Tetranymphton, and the Dodekapyllon, formerly called the "Steps," and the Kodra, and he divided the city into seven quarters, and appointed a head-man for each quarter, and each quarter is called by the name of its head-man to this day. He also gave his own name to the city, and called it *Ælia*, seeing that he was named *Ælius Adrianus*. (Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xcii, cols. 613, 616.)

(3) *SULPITIUS SEVERUS* (*Hist. Sac.* ii, 31).—At this time Adrian, thinking that he would destroy the Christian faith by inflicting an injury upon the place, set up the images of daemons, both in the temple and in the place where the Lord suffered. And because the Christians were thought principally to consist of Jews (for the Church at Jerusalem did not then have a priest except of the circumcision), he ordered a cohort of soldiers to keep constant guard, in order to prevent all Jews from approaching to Jerusalem. . . . Mark from among the Gentiles was then, first of all, bishop at Jerusalem. (From Wace and Schaff, *Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. xi; Migne, *Pat. Lat.* xx, cols. 146, 147. See also Just. Mart., *Apol.* i, 47; Tertullian, *Adv. Jud.* xv; Eusebius, *Theophania*, p. 249.)

(4) *EUSEBIUS* (*Vit. Const.* iii, 26).—For impious men (or, rather, the whole race of evil spirits by their means) set themselves to consign to darkness and oblivion that Divine monument of immortality . . . . This cave of salvation did certain ungodly and impious persons determine to hide from the eyes of men, foolishly imagining that they would in some such way as this conceal the truth. Having expended much labour in bringing in earth from outside (*ἐξωθέν*), they cover up the whole place; and then, having raised this to a moderate height, and having paved it with stone, they entirely conceal the Divine cave beneath a massive mound. Next . . . they prepare above-ground a dreadful thing, a veritable sepulchre of souls, building to the impure demon, called Aphrodite, a gloomy shrine of lifeless idols, and offering their foul oblations on profane and accursed altars. For in this way only . . . did they suppose that they would accomplish their purpose, even by concealing the cave of salvation by means of those detestable abominations. (From *Churches of Constantine in Jerusalem*, Pal. Pilgrims' Text Society series; Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xx, col. 1085.)

(5) *EUSEBIUS* (*Dem. Ev.* vi, 18).—This Mount of Olives is said to stand over against Jerusalem, that is, answering to it, because God established it in the place of the earthly Jerusalem and of the services which used to be held there, after the destruction of Jerusalem. . . . This we may see, from another point of view, fulfilled to the letter even to this day, when all believers in Christ flock together from all quarters of the earth, not as of old to behold the beauty of Jerusalem, or that they may worship in the former temple which stood in Jerusalem, but that they

may abide there, and both hear the story of Jerusalem and also worship in the Mount of Olives over against Jerusalem, whither the glory of the Lord removed itself, leaving the earlier city. There also, according to the published record, the feet of our Lord and Saviour, who was Himself the Word, and through it took upon Himself human form, stood upon the Mount of Olives, near the cave which is now pointed out there. There He prayed, and on the top of the Mount of Olives communicated the mysteries of the Christian covenant, and from thence also He ascended into heaven, as we are taught by Luke in the Acts of the Apostles. (Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xxii, col. 457, 458).

---

## THE IMMOVABLE EAST.

By PHILIP G. BALDENSPERGER, Esq.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

WITH but few exceptions, Palestine has remained what it was since the days when first we hear of its existence: "The land that I will shew thee" (Gen. xii, 1). In the following description great pains have been taken to describe the manners, customs, everyday objects, clothes, and so forth of the people of the Holy Land, "Maḳâdsy," as they are styled by Arabic-speaking people out of the country, and to compare them with those of the former inhabitants—the Jews (Jehûd), not excluding the earlier dwellers in the land.

The most striking feature in the East, especially to the traveller, is the difference in the clothing of the various classes, which almost make them seem like separate nations, from the serene Effandi,<sup>1</sup> in his fur overcoat and spotless white turban, to the spare and almost naked Bedawy, in his short shirt and almost colourless and dirty *Keffiyeh* or headcloth. The Franjy appears here and there in the towns, and is at once recognised, not merely by his European clothing, which has been generally adopted, but more especially by his hat, the hated *burneifah*. Franjy, a corruption of Frank, was the official name of Roman Catholics or Western Christians. Protestants were unknown to the masses up to the time of the

<sup>1</sup>[Or rather, Effendi, as the word is more commonly known. It is the Greek *ἀδελφός* in Turkish garb.]