

were veritable gods.¹ The veneration of Hermon persisted down to a very late date—even in the time of Eusebius² it had not lost its hold upon the inhabitants of the district—and it is possible that one of the modern names of the mountain, Jebel esh-Sheikh, has preserved a last trace of the ancient Canaanite or Amorite Baal incarnated therein.

(*To be continued.*)

GOLGOTHA AND THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

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

(*Continued from p. 65.*)

The Identification of the Traditional Sites, with Golgotha and the Tomb in the Reign of Constantine.

THE only contemporary account of the discovery of Golgotha and the Tomb, and of the erection of churches in their honour, is that given by Eusebius in his *Life of Constantine* (iii, 25–40). The “Life” has, somewhat unjustly, been called a travesty of history. Its literary style, so different from the simple prose of the *Ecclesiastical History*, its exaggerated praise of the Emperor, and its frequent attribution of Divine inspiration to his actions, create a not unnatural prejudice in the mind of the reader. But its author was no deliberate falsifier. His object seems to have been to write a panegyric rather than a sober history. After years of suffering he had seen his religion triumphant, and he wrote with poetic

¹ For Lebanon, cf. Baal Lebanon on the ancient Phœnician inscription (*C.I.S.*, I, No. 5), the existence of which I was the first to recognise. For Carmel, cf. the famous passage in Tacitus (II, 78): “Ita vocant montem deumque.” Cf. also the passage in Sanchoniathon (ed. Orelli, p. 16), where the Anti-libanus figures among the mountain gods of the race of giants, by the side of Casius, Lebanon, and the mysterious Brathu. Perhaps our Baal-Hermon himself is to be recognised in the Ζεὺς μέγιστος of a dedication copied by M. Fossey (*Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, t. XXI, p. 63, No. 72) at Kal’at Jendel on the eastern declivity of Hermon. Zeus is the usual equivalent of Baal. On line 3 I propose to restore Μάγνου for the corrupt patronymic YAYNOY. The restoration of Ἱαμοῦ, which M. Fossey suggests, is quite inadmissible.

² *Onomast.*, s.v., Ἀερμών . . . ὡς ἱερὸν τιμᾶσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν ἰδνῶν. Jerome: “In vertice ejus insigne templum quod ab ethnicis cultui habetur e regione Paneadis et Libani.”

enthusiasm of the sovereign who had wrought such a marvellous change. Can anyone regard his exuberant language as a crime? Is he the only court prelate who has written fulsome praise of a monarch whose conduct was not above reproach? Constantine was not a perfect Christian, but neither was he a Caligula, a Nero, or a Commodus, and he was infinitely superior to many of his successors who reigned centuries after Christianity had become the religion of the State.

Eusebius, from his relations with the Imperial Court, and as Metropolitan of the Jerusalem See, was in a position to obtain accurate information, and, making allowance for his extravagant language, what he says with regard to the orders of the Emperor, and to the steps taken to carry them out, is deserving of the closest attention. His meaning is sometimes obscure, but his honesty and sincerity are apparent, whilst the skill with which he avoids all direct reference to the Cross and its discovery, and the general freedom of his writings from the fables and prodigies that disfigure later church histories are remarkable. The statements which he makes with regard to the "holy places," and to the churches erected in their honour, are not always clear, but some of the difficulties disappear when it is remembered that the *Life of Constantine* was written after the Cross had been found,¹ and that the Emperor built two distinct churches—the Anastasis and the Martyrion, or Basilica. There is no account of the finding of the Cross by an eye-witness, but its discovery when, or soon after, Golgotha and the Tomb were laid bare by excavation is attested by the letter of Cyril of Jerusalem, written in May, 351, to the Emperor Constantius,² and by the allusions which Eusebius apparently makes to the Cross.³ The two churches are referred to by Eusebius,

¹ The *Theophania* and the *De Laude Constantini* were also written after the discovery.

² "In the reign of your father Constantine, the beloved of Heaven, of happy memory, the salutary wood of the Cross was discovered at Jerusalem, the Divine One having permitted him, who duly sought after righteousness, to discover the Holy Places, which had heretofore been hidden away" (*Ad Const.* § 3; Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xxxiii, cols. 1168, 1169).

³ The expressions "the token of the most holy Passion," the "assurance of the Saviour's Passion" (*V.C.* iii, 30); the "trophy of the Saviour's victory over death" (*V.C.* iii, 33, *De Laud. Const.* ix, xi; cf. Cyril, *Ad Const.* iii; *Cat.* xiii, 40); and the "Church sacred to the salutary sign" (*De Laud. Const.* ix) are opposed to the view that the finding of the Cross is a "legend which grew up after the church was built" (Guthe, *Grab, das heilige*, in Hauck's "Realencyclopädie," third edition). See Appendix 1.

and are distinctly mentioned by St. Silvia and others.¹ They stood not far from each other on a paved platform: one, the Anastasis, or Church of the Resurrection, contained within its walls the reputed Tomb of Christ; the other the Basilica, or Church of the Cross, stood above the spot where the crosses were found. In the open air, between the two churches, but a little to the south of their common axis, the rock upon which it was believed that the Cross had stood, rose some 15 feet above the level of the platform.

It must also be remembered that the history of the "holy places," as told by Eusebius, although it is happily free from the fabulous legends which disfigured the accounts of later years, is incomplete. There is no indication of the motive, other than Divine inspiration, which led Constantine to institute a search for Golgotha and the Tomb; the discovery of the Cross is not mentioned; the letter of Constantine to Macarius is apparently a reply to a communication which has not been preserved; and one expression in it, "the present wonder," seems to imply a previous "wonder," the nature of which is left to the imagination. Whether information on these points was given by Eusebius in his "Oration on the Sepulchre of the Saviour," or in his treatise on "The Structure of the Church of our Saviour, and the Form of His Sacred Cave,"² is unknown, for the two works are unfortunately lost. If it was given he may have considered the repetition of the details unnecessary in his *Life of Constantine*. On the other hand, the omission of all reference to the discovery of the Cross may have been intentional.³ The author could make no adverse comments on an incident in which the

¹ Eusebius, *De Laud. Const.* ix, *Com. in Ps.* 87, Appendix 2, 3. In her *Pilgrimage to the Holy Places* (Pal. Pilgrims' Text Society series), St. Silvia calls the basilica "the great church built by Constantine which is in Golgotha behind the Cross," and "the holy church which is in Golgotha, which they call the Martyrium" (see also Eucherius, *De Loc. Sanct.*; *Brev. de Hierosol.*; Theodosius, *De Sit. T.S.*). St. Silvia also alludes (*l.c.* pp. 61-64) to open-air services that were held before and behind the Cross which stood on the "rock of Golgotha" (*Quarterly Statement*, 1902, p. 148). The rock-hewn bases of the columns of the Anastasis, which were visible before the fire of 1808 (Mariti, *Istoria del stato pres. del città di Gerusalemme*), indicate the extent to which the rock was cut away to obtain a level platform, and isolate the tomb and the rock of Golgotha.

² Referred to in *V.C.* iv, 33, 46.

³ It may be remarked that Jerome, although he mentions the Cross, makes no allusion to its discovery.

Emperor and his mother were so deeply interested, and he may have decided to remain silent. Or he may have desired to say nothing that would divert attention from the fact that the Resurrection, to which the empty Tomb bare witness, and not the material Cross, was the basis of Christian belief.

Eusebius relates¹ that, after the Council of Nicæa, Constantine, being inspired thereto by the Saviour, decided to make the place of the Resurrection "conspicuous and an object of veneration to all," and that he forthwith gave orders for the erection of a house of prayer. The Emperor, "inspired by the Divine spirit," directed that the spot should be purified, for impious men, hoping to conceal the truth, had covered up "the sacred cave," and built above it a shrine dedicated to Aphrodite. When the shrine and its sub-structures were cleared away, and the natural surface of the ground was exposed, "immediately, and contrary to all expectation, the venerable and hallowed monument of our Saviour's Resurrection became visible." The Emperor then ordered a house of prayer to be erected round "the sacred cave," on a scale of Imperial magnificence.

After describing the discovery of the Tomb, Eusebius gives a letter from Constantine to Macarius, which was apparently written with full knowledge that the Cross had been found. The Emperor writes that "No power of language seems adequate to describe the present wonder. For that the token of that most holy Passion,² long ago buried underground, should have remained unknown for so many years . . . truly transcends all marvel . . . I desire then that you should especially be convinced . . . that of all things it is most my care how we may adorn with splendour of buildings that sacred spot which, under Divine direction, I relieved, as it were, of the heavy weight of foul idol worship—a place holy indeed from the beginning, but which has been made to appear still more holy since it brought to light the assurance of the Saviour's Passion."³ Instructions are then given for the construction of a

¹ *Life of Constantine*, iii, 25-40; English translation in *Churches of Constantine at Jerusalem* (Pal. Pilgrims Text Society series).

² The token of the Passion is the Cross, not the Tomb, and the "present wonder" may be its discovery after it had lain buried for nearly 300 years,—the implied previous "wonder" being the finding of the Tomb in perfect preservation.

³ The meaning seems to be that, in his opinion, the Tomb, holy as it was in itself, had been made still more holy by the discovery in its immediate vicinity of the Cross—the token, or assurance, of the Saviour's Passion.

basilica, "For it is just that the place which is more wonderful than the whole world should be worthily decorated."¹

After stating that the instructions of Constantine were carried out, Eusebius writes: "So on the monument of salvation itself was the New Jerusalem built, over against the one so famous of old Opposite this the Emperor reared, with rich and lavish expenditure, the trophy of the Saviour's victory over death² and first of all he adorned the sacred cave, which was, as it were, the chief part of the whole work." Eastward of the cave "the basilica was erected, an extraordinary work" of great height and extent. In the last chapter (40) the two churches, with their adjuncts, are, apparently, called a "temple," raised as a "conspicuous monument of the Saviour's Resurrection."

Eusebius, it will be observed, writes as if it were well known to everyone that the Tomb lay beneath the temple of Aphrodite. He expresses no doubt as to its authenticity, and makes no allusion to an enquiry by Macarius, or by any government official, with regard to the scene of the Crucifixion and Resurrection. Constantine, according to him, is inspired by Christ to make the Tomb a "holy place," and at once issues orders for the removal of the temple and its substructures. The historian certainly says that, when the clearance was made, the Tomb was exposed to view "contrary to all expectation"; but this may only mean that there was a tradition that the "sacred cave" had been destroyed, or injured, when the temple was built, and that those who superintended the excavation were astonished to find it perfectly preserved.

Is this an accurate account of what occurred, or is it a compromise between the necessary avoidance of anything likely to

¹ It seems clear from the previous order to build a church round the Tomb, and from the similarity of the decorative details of this church to those of the basilica that was actually built (*cf. V.C.* iii, 31, 32, 36), that the Emperor intended to build, in addition to the church round the Tomb, a large church above the spot where the Cross was found, a place "more wonderful than the whole world." If, however, the letter refers to one church only, the explanation may be that the Emperor originally intended to include all the "holy places" in one great church, and that he afterwards approved of a plan for erecting two churches submitted to him by his architect after a study of the ground.

² This expression is apparently applied by Eusebius (*De Laud. Const.* ix, xi) and Cyril (*Ad Const.* iii) to the Cross (*see* Appendix I). "New Jerusalem" may be compared with "New Rome," the name of the new capital on the Bosphorus, afterwards known as Constantinople.

give offence to the Imperial family, and a strong desire on the part of the historian to dissociate himself from the steps that were taken to find and identify the Cross? There is some reason for thinking that the latter may have been the case.

Constantine was a man of imperious temper, who brooked no resistance to his will. He was successful in all his undertakings, and believed that his success was due to intercourse with the Deity,¹ through the medium of dreams and visions, which were to him what "the voices" were to the Maid of Orleans. His belief in a Divine vocation seems to have been very real, and it was encouraged rather than discouraged by his Christian advisers. He had seen the sign of the Cross in the sky,² had placed it upon the standards of his army and upon the shields of his soldiers, and through it had gotten a great victory and the empire of the world. His training, his methods of thought were those of the West, and until he came to the East he was under the guidance of Western bishops, and was acquainted with Western Christianity alone.³ He had all the materialistic tendency of the Latin, and more especially of the Roman mind; and this tendency would, almost naturally, lead him to order a search to be made for the Cross.⁴ The view, suggested by Eusebius, that the prime motive of the Divine inspiration was the discovery and decoration of the Tomb, must be accepted with reserve. It was the Cross and not the Tomb which influenced the decision of the Emperor at critical moments, and in the salutary power of which he firmly believed.⁵ Can it be supposed that in consequence of a Divine inspiration, immediately after the Council

¹ The inscription on the triumphal arch, erected by Constantine to commemorate his victory of the Milvian bridge, dedicated 315 A.D., has the words *Instinctu Divinitatis*. Writers allude to him as being *divino monitus instinctu*; and he himself, in his letter to Macarius, writes that his action was due to "Divine direction" (see p. 143).

² The importance attached to this vision is indicated by the legend *ταύτην στίκα*, so frequently found on ancient crosses.

³ It was only after he became sole Emperor, 323 A.D., that he was brought into close contact with the Christianity of the East.

⁴ The search may have been partly due to political motives. The Emperor may have thought that as the sign of the Cross had given him victory in the field, so the Cross itself, if found, would be a rallying point for Christians, and heal the dissensions in the Church.

⁵ On a statue of himself, holding a spear which terminated in a cross, erected by the Emperor at Rome, an inscription proclaimed to all that by the salutary sign he had saved the city, and restored the senate and the Roman people to their ancient dignity and splendour (*H.E.* ix, 9; *V.C.* i; 40).

of Nicæa, the Tomb took the first place in his thoughts and the Cross the second?¹

The view that Constantine wished to find the Cross is indirectly supported by the rapid development of the cult of the Cross. Less than 25 years after the Emperor's death Cyril could write that the wood of the Cross had been "distributed piecemeal to all the world" (*Cat.* xiii, 4); Julian was able to taunt the Christians with reverencing the Cross as a divinity; and the heathen had come to regard it as a Christian idol no less materialistic than their own.

The later Greek traditions are far more concerned with the discovery of the three crosses, and the identification of the true Cross than they are with the recovery of the Tomb, and in these traditions the principal figure is not the Emperor but his mother, the Empress Helena. Thus in the fourth and fifth centuries Socrates (*H.E.* i, 17) attributes the recovery of the Tomb and the Cross to Helena, assisted by Macarius. Sozomen says (*H.E.* ii, 1) that her zeal for Christianity made her anxious when at Jerusalem to find the wood of the Cross; and Theodoretus states (*H.E.* i, 17) that she was the bearer of Constantine's letter to Macarius, and that she discovered the Cross. In the sixth century Alexander Monachus writes (*De Invent. Crucis*²) that Constantine ordered Macarius to find the Cross, the Tomb, and sacred relics, and that he sent his mother, at her own request, to Jerusalem that she and the bishop might search together for the Cross.

The Latin tradition of the fourth and fifth centuries is, that Helena on her arrival at Jerusalem made inquiry with regard to the place of the Crucifixion, and that when its situation was pointed out to her she had the superincumbent buildings and earth removed and found the three crosses. The Cross of Christ was then identified with the aid of Macarius³ (Rufinus, *H.E.* x, 7; Sulp. Severus, *H.S.* ii, 34).

¹ For the Cross and Constantine, see Clos, *Kreuz und Grab Jesu*; Wace and Schaff, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. i; *Dicty. of Christian Biography*, art. "Constantinus."

² Migne, *Pat. Gr.* lxxxvii, para. 3, col. 4062.

³ The account of the identification of the true Cross given by Severus is possibly that authorised by Macarius. It states that the body of a dead man, on its way to the grave, was carried to the spot where the crosses were found, and that when removed from the bier and placed in contact with the Cross of Christ, it stood upright. The story that the three crosses were carried to the room of a sick lady seems to be an exaggeration of the official account.

Assuming that the object of Constantine was to find the Cross, and that the Bishop of Jerusalem was instructed to search for it, the first step would obviously be to recover Golgotha and the Tomb. In no other locality could there have been any chance of success.¹ Was the situation of the two places known to Macarius? A consideration of the history of Jerusalem and of the early Church has suggested (p. 63) that the survival of any tradition with regard to them to the time of Constantine is improbable, but not impossible. Eusebius does not mention a tradition, but he says nothing that is inconsistent with a previous knowledge of the place, and his narrative, taken by itself, may perhaps be held to support the view that the position of the Tomb was known. On the other hand, the impression produced by the works of later writers is that, although there may have been some recollection of Golgotha amongst the inhabitants of Jerusalem, there was no certain knowledge of its exact situation. It is true that these later writers were not eye-witnesses, and that they only related what had become known to them through tradition, but they had access to the archives of the Church, and their statements, especially those which are common to all, must have had some foundation in fact.

Amongst Greek writers, Socrates says (*H.E.* i, 17²) that Helena recovered the Tomb "after much difficulty." Sozomen states that "it was no easy matter" to discover the Cross and the Tomb, and that according to some their situation was pointed out to the Empress by an Oriental Jew, who derived his knowledge from family documents, but that the more probable view was that God revealed it "by means of signs and dreams." Alexander Monachus writes (*De Invent. S. Crucis*) that Helena, upon her arrival at Jerusalem, charged Macarius and his suffragans to search for the Cross, and that being at a loss what to do, they offered prayers to God, and were answered by a miraculous revelation of the place to the bishop. In the letter of the Emperor Leo to Omar,³ the site is said to have been disclosed by Jews under torture. According to Rufinus (*H.E.* x, 7) the place of the Crucifixion was pointed out

¹ The custom of the Jews was to bury the cross upon which anyone was hanged with the body (*Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. et Tal.*, in Acts viii, 1).

² These extracts will be published in full when the papers appear in a separate volume.

³ Migne, *Pat. Gr.* cvii.

to Helena "by signs from heaven"; and according to Severus (*H.S.* ii, 34) the Empress, having first obtained the requisite information, had the spot cleared. Gregory of Tours says (*Hist. Franc.* i, 34) that the Cross was pointed out to Helena by a Jew named Juda.

It will be convenient at this point to sum up the evidence for and against the existence of a definite tradition. In support of the view that the "holy places" were well known to the Christian community at Jerusalem, it may be urged that during the three centuries which followed their recovery the authenticity of the sites was never questioned by Jews or heathen, and that the Christians would not have acquiesced in identifications which they knew to be false. Even Julian, and those who taunted the Christians with worshipping the Cross as an idol, so far as is known, accepted their recovery as genuine; and no accusation was brought against Macarius of perpetrating a "pious fraud"¹ during the period when a deliberate fraud, if there were one, would hardly have escaped detection. Eusebius writes as if the position of the Tomb were well known, or, at any rate, as if there were no difficulty in finding it. The Greek and Latin writers of the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries mention no miracle in connection with its recovery, such as that which attended the identification of the true Cross. If the site of the Tomb had been lost, or if there had been any doubt on the subject, Constantine, it has been argued, would have ordered a preliminary inquiry and search, but of this there is no trace in the writings of Eusebius, the only eye-witness. The selection of an inconvenient site on the slope of a rocky hill, where extensive quarrying would be necessary for the erection of a large church, must have been due to the existence of a tradition.² If Macarius and his suffragans had acted upon mere caprice, if they had believed that Golgotha was a rounded hill-top, or if the Emperor

¹ Taylor (*Ancient Christianity* ii, 277) imputes deliberate fraud to Macarius, but it is impossible to believe that the bishop could have had a cave hewn out of the rock beneath a pagan shrine, and that the heathen would have assented to the fraud.

² Finlay's argument (*Hist. of Greece* i, Ap. iii) that the minute registration of landed property in the Roman Empire and the provinces, and the maps connected with it, would have enabled Macarius to identify the garden of Joseph, must not be pressed too far. The condition of Jerusalem before the siege by Titus was not such as to facilitate the execution of a cadastral survey by the Romans, and all the city archives were destroyed during the war. A later survey would be of little value for purposes of identification.

had instructed them simply to erect churches in remembrance of the Passion and the Resurrection, they would have chosen a conspicuous spot, such as a knoll with a conveniently situated Jewish sepulchre, and not a tomb in an ancient cemetery within the walls of Hadrian's city. In all probability, also, they would have preserved the tomb intact, and made an effort to preserve the appearance of reality instead of cutting away the rock so as to have that portion of the tomb only upon which the body of the Lord had rested.

The supporters of the opposite view maintain that there is no positive proof of a definite tradition, and that the story of the recovery of the "holy places" has not sufficient guarantees to justify its acceptance. For three centuries after the time of Constantine no writers refer to a tradition, or advance any argument in favour of the sites, and most of them consider it necessary to ascribe their recovery to an inspiration or to Divine guidance. Nor, excepting the allusion by Eusebius, in his *Theophania*,¹ to "one cavern," is mention made of any mark or sign by which the tomb that was uncovered was known to be that of Christ. The silence of Eusebius with regard to a tradition is no more a proof that there was one than his omission to mention the discovery of the Cross, and the part played by Helena in the transactions at Jerusalem is evidence that the Cross was not found when the "holy places" were recovered, and that the Empress was not present during the operations which led to their recovery. It may plausibly be suggested that the historian disapproved of the proceedings, and that his silence with regard to many details is due to his honesty, and to a feeling that, in view of the official recognition of Christianity as the religion of the State, he was obliged to accept the broad outlines of the situation created by the Imperial order to find the Cross. The writers later than Constantine convey the impression that nothing was certainly known with regard to the position of Golgotha, and that an inquiry of some kind preceded its recovery. The fact that Macarius sought for and found a cave beneath the temple of Aphrodite is no proof that the cave² was the Sepulchre of Christ, or that there was a tradition with regard to it. The existence of a Jewish cemetery at the spot must have been a matter of common knowledge, and it would have been a very natural inference from

¹ Appendix 4.

² It is remarkable that Eusebius generally uses the word *κρυπτον*, *cave*, for the sepulchre, and not the usual *τάφος* (see App. 1).

the well-known characteristics of such cemeteries (*Quarterly Statement*, 1902, 284, 292) that there was a tomb beneath the temple.¹ Macarius very possibly formed a theory with regard to the site of Golgotha after more careful consideration than has been given to the subject by some modern theorists, and it is most unlikely that anyone in the fourth century would question an identification accepted by a bishop and his suffragans. There is every reason to believe that Macarius acted in good faith, and an attempt will be made later to discover the reasons which led him to fix upon the traditional sites; but the fact that the scene of the Transfiguration,² and the sites of the battle in which David slew Goliath,³ and of Rephidim,⁴ were wrongly identified in the early part of the fourth century, suggests the possibility that the bishop may have been mistaken.⁵ It may be added that the cutting away of the rock round the traditional tomb, if it did not arise from the architect's wish to produce a certain effect, may have been due to a desire to obliterate all traces of the original features of the ground.

The only possible conclusion, from a discussion of the literary evidence, seems to be that there is no decisive reason for placing Golgotha and the Tomb at the places which were accepted as genuine in the fourth century, and that there is no distinct proof that they were not so situated. Fortunately the question is purely archæological, and its solution, one way or the other, does not affect any Christian dogma or article of faith. My own view is that the tradition is so precarious, and the evidence of its credibility is so unsatisfactory, as to raise grave doubts respecting its accuracy.

(*To be continued.*)

¹ The statement of Eusebius that impious men "set themselves to consign [the Tomb] to darkness and oblivion" (*F.C.* iii, 26; *Quarterly Statement*, p. 64, App. 4) hardly means, as Robinson contends (*B.R.* i, 414) that the site was forgotten.

² *Itin. Hierosol.*

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *St. Silvin, l.c.*

⁵ Robinson lays much stress (*B.R.* i, 415, 416) upon the identification by Eusebius of the summit of the Mount Olives as the scene of the Ascension which he places at Bethany. But Eusebius connects the Ascension with the spot where Christ taught his disciples (*Quarterly Statement*, p. 64, App. 5), and the words "he led them out until they were over against Bethany" (Luke xxiv, 50), compared with Acts i, 12, "then returned they . . . from the mount called Olivet," are not opposed to the view that Christ ascended from some spot on the Mount of Olives.

APPENDIX.

(1) The question whether Eusebius alludes to the Cross in his writings cannot certainly be answered. It has been argued that his words are quite as applicable to the Holy Sepulchre as, or even more so than, to the Cross. If, however, the statement of Cyril that the Cross was found in the reign of Constantine be correct, the absence of any allusion to it by Eusebius is almost inexplicable. Eusebius certainly mentions a church at Jerusalem "sacred to the salutary sign," *i.e.*, the Cross; and it may not unreasonably be inferred that when Cyril calls the Cross "the trophy of the victory over death," and "the salutary trophy of Jesus," he uses expressions which had the same meaning and application in the time of Eusebius. An attempt is made below to make a distinction between the expressions which refer to the Cross and those which are applied to the Tomb.

References to the Cross by EUSEBIUS and CYRIL :—

- H.E.* ix, 9.—*τοῦ σωτηρίου τρόπαιον πάθους*, a *trophy* of the Saviour's Passion.
V.C. i, 40.—*μέγα τρόπαιον τουτί*, this great *trophy*.
De Laud. Const. ix.—*τῷ μεγάλῳ Σωτήρος τὰ κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου τρόπαια*, the *trophies* of the Saviour's victory over the power of death.
De Laud. Const. xi.—*τρόπαια τε τῆς κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου νίκης*, the *trophies* of the victory over death.
Cyril, *Ad Const.* iii.—*τὸ τῆς κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου νίκης τρόπαιον*, the *trophy* of the victory over death.
Cyril, *Cat.* xiii, 40.—*τὸ τρόπαιον Ἰησοῦ τὸ σωτήριον, ὁ σταυρός*, the salutary *trophy* of Jesus—the Cross.
V.C. iii, 30.—*τὸ γνώρισμα τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἐκείνου πάθους*, the *token* of that most holy Passion.
V.C. iii, 33.—*τὴν κατὰ τοῦ θανάτου σωτήριον νίκην*, the trophy of the Saviour's victory over death.
V.C. iii, 30.—*τὴν τοῦ σωτηρίου πάθους πίστιν*, the *assurance* of the Lord's Passion.
H.E. ix, 9.—*τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ σταυροῦ σημεῖον*, the *salutary sign* of the Cross.
H.E. ix, 9.—*τὸ σωτήριον σημεῖον*, the *salutary sign* (also in *V.C.* i, 40).
De Laud. Const. ix.—*νεῶν τε ἅγιον τῷ σωτηρίῳ σημεῖω*, a church sacred to the *salutary sign*.

References to the Tomb :—

- V.C.* iii, 26.—*τῆς ἀθανασίας μνήμα*, a *monument* of immortality.
V.C. iii, 33.—*μνήμα ἐκεῖνο θεσπέσιον*, that divine *monument*, *cf.* that everlasting *monument* in *De Laud. Const.* ix.
V.C. iv, 33.—*ἄμφι τοῦ σωτηρίου μνήματος λόγος*, oration on the *monument* of the Saviour.

V.C. iii, 26.—τὸ σωτήριον ἄντρον, the salutary *cave*; also in iii, 29, iv, 46—
τὸ θεῖον ἄντρον, the divine *cave*.

V.C. iii, 28.—τὸ τε ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων ἄντρον, the most holy *cave*.

V.C. iii, 33.—τὸ ἱερὸν ἄντρον, the sacred *cave*.

V.C. iii, 36.—τὸ ἄντρον, the *cave*, also in *De Laud. Const.*, ix.

V.C. iii, 28.—τὸ τῆς σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως μαρτύριον, the *testimony*
(or monument) of the Saviour's resurrection; τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος
ἀνάστασιν μαρτυρούμενον, a *testimony* to the resurrection of the
Saviour.

V.C. iii, 33.—τὸ σωτήριον μαρτύριον, the salutary *testimony*, also in
De Laud. Const. ix.

V.C. iii, 25.—τὸν τῆς σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως μακαριστότατον τόπον, the
most blessed *place* of the Saviour's resurrection.

V.C. iii, 30.—τὸν ἱερὸν ἐκεῖνον τόπον, that sacred *place* (or spot).

Cyril uses the words τὸ μνήμα, τὸ μαρτύριον, ὁ τόπος, and ὁ τάφος.

(2) EUSEBIUS (*De Laud. Const.* ix).—Again, in the province of Palestine, in that city which was once the seat of Hebrew sovereignty, on the very site of the Lord's Sepulchre (τὸ σωτήριον μαρτύριον), he (Constantine) has raised a church of noble dimensions, and adorned a temple sacred to the salutary cross (ὡς τὸ ἅγιον τῷ σωτηρίῳ σημεῖον) with rich and lavish magnificence, honouring that everlasting monument (μνήμα), and the trophies of the Saviour's victory over the power of death, with a splendour which no language can describe. In the same country he discovered three places venerable as the localities of three sacred caves; and these also he adorned with costly structures, paying a fitting tribute of reverence to the scene of the first manifestation of the Saviour's presence, while at the second cavern he hallowed the remembrance of His final ascension from the mountain top, and celebrated His mighty conflict and the victory which crowned it at the third. All these places our Emperor thus adorned in the hope of proclaiming the symbol of redemption to all mankind—that Cross which has indeed repaid his pious zeal. (From Wace and Schaff, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, i, 594; Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xx, col. 1369.)

(3) EUSEBIUS (*Com. in Ps.* lxxxvii).—Anyone who considers what wondrous things have been done in our own time at the Sepulchre and the place of the Martyrdom (ἀμφὶ τὸ μνήμα καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον) of the Saviour will understand how these prophecies have indeed been fulfilled. (Migne, *Pat. Gr.* xxiii, col. 1064.)

(4) EUSEBIUS (*Theophania*).—The grave itself was a cave which had recently been hewn out; a grave that had now been cut out in a rock, and which had experienced the reception of no other body. For it was necessary that it, which was itself a wonder, should have the care of that corpse only. For it is astonishing to see even this rock standing

out erect and alone in a level land, and having only one cavern within it, lest, had there been many, the miracle of Him who overcame Death should have been obscured. The Corpse was therefore laid there, the Vessel of the living WORD; and a great stone held (the entrance of) the cave. (Lee's translation, p. 199.)

N.B.—The Theophania is only extant in the Syriac version, and the meaning would be much clearer if the original Greek were in existence. The work was written after the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was built, or whilst it was in building, and the passage apparently alludes to the excavations by which the tomb was isolated, and to its appearance after isolation. Whether the meaning is that there was only one chamber or only one loculus or grave is uncertain—the former is most probable.

NOTES FROM JERUSALEM.

By Dr. SELAH MERRILL, U.S. Consul.

1. *An Immense Charnel House.*—In the autumn of 1898, during the visit of the German Emperor to Jerusalem, a considerable piece of land adjoining the west side of Neby Daūd, on Mount Zion, passed into the hands of the German Catholics. The entire plot of ground, of which this is a part, forms an imperfect square, bounded by a field on the south, a lane on the west, a narrow street on the north, and Neby Daūd, with the short lane leading to it, on the east. In the north-west corner a rectangular bit became, 70 years ago, the property of the American Board of Foreign Missions; the south-east corner of the square is pushed in, so that the outline of the German Catholic ground is very irregular. Beyond the lane, on the west, is the Greek cemetery, and beyond the narrow street, on the north, is the cemetery of the Armenians, and the north-east portion of this ground is very near what is known as the House of Caiaphas. These details are mentioned in order to define precisely the location of the ground in question.

In digging graves in the ground of the American Mission, we came, in three or more instances, upon what appeared to be a large flat stone, so that the holes had to be refilled and the graves dug elsewhere. At one time men were employed to dig at this point to ascertain what the obstruction below the surface was. There was uncovered a finely-constructed basement of a pier. It was 6 feet square and 2 feet high. About it, so far as the digging