*

Cyril of Jerusalem: Bishop and City

*

JAN WILLEM DRIJVERS

Cyril of Jerusalem: Bishop and City

By

Jan Willem Drijvers

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

Plans

PREFACE

In the second half of the 1980s I was working on a study of Helena Augusta when my interest was taken by Cyril of Jerusalem. It struck me that historians generally gave only little attention to the bishop who had been so influential in promoting the growing status of Jerusalem as a holy city in the Christianizing Roman Empire. I was able to devote myself seriously to Cyril only at the end of the 1990s. A fellowship at the National Humanities Center in North Carolina during the academic year 2000–2001 enabled me to finish my research within a reasonable period of time. The National Humanities Center is a wonderful environment in which to get serious work done and I would like to thank the Center's staff, in particular the librarians and Karen Carroll, for giving me every imaginable assistance and support. I also thank Liz Clark for the warm welcome she and her graduate students gave me at Duke University. I fondly remember the evening sessions of the Reading Group "Late Ancient Studies" and the parties at Lancaster Street. Apart from the scholarly aspect, living for a year in Chapel Hill was a wonderful family experience because my wife Maaike and two daughters, Anne and Maartje, were able to join me.

Acknowledgments and thanks are due to colleagues and friends. Some of them read sections of this study and readily gave their comments; others contributed to it through their advice and support. I would like to thank Sebastian Brock, Averil Cameron, David Hunt, Andrew Jacobs, Theresa Urbainczyk, and Annabel Wharton. Parts of this work were presented as lectures at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, the annual meeting of the North American Patristic Society in Chicago, the Oxford Patristic Conference, and the Universities of Jena, Mannheim and Kiel; I am grateful for the comments and questions of the respective audiences. I am also indebted to my colleagues in the History Department of my own university for their support.

Sadly, my father Han J.W. Drijvers, did not live to see the completion of this book because of his death in 2002. He did, however, read several draft chapters and I profited immensely from his astute

criticisms. It is a great loss to me that I can no longer converse with him about subjects of such great interest to us both.

JWD   Groningen, February 2004

ABBREVIATIONS

Anal. Boll.	*Analecta Bollandiana*
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*
BA	*The Biblical Archaeologist*
BSOAS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
BZ	*Byzantinische Zeitschrift*
CC	Corpus Christianorum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
CSHB	Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae
DOP	*Dumbarton Oaks Papers*
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
JbAC	*Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*
JECS	*Journal of Early Christian Studies*
JEH	*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*
JQR	*The Jewish Quarterly Review*
JRA	*Journal of Roman Archaeology*
JRS	*The Journal of Roman Studies*
JTS	*The Journal of Theological Studies*
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*
PG	Patrologia Graeca
PL	Patrologia Latina
PO	Patrologia Orientalis
R. Bibl.	*Revue Biblique*
RHE	*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*
ROC	*Revue de l'Orient Chrétien*
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
St. Patr.	*Studia Patristica*
TRE	*Theologische Realenzyklopädie*
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

ΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΑΓΙΟΙΣ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ

ΚΥΡΙΛΛΟΥ

ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΩΝ ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ

ΚΑΤΗΧΗΣΕΙΣ.

S. P. N. CYRILLI

HIEROSOLYMITANI ARCHIEPISCOPI

CATECHESES.

ΠΡΟΚΑΤΗΧΗΣΙΣ,	*PROCATECHESIS,*
ἤτοι πρόλογος τῶ Κατηχήσεων, τᾶ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Κυείλλα Ἀρχιεπισκόπ8 Ἱεροσολύμων.	*seu prævius Catechesibus sermo, sancti Patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Hierosolymorum.*

α. ΔΗ μακαριότητος ὀσμὴ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Α ὦ ΦΩΤΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΙ, ἤδη τὰ νοητὰ ἄνθη συλλέγετε, πρὸς πλοκὴν ἐπουργανίων στεφάνων.

OS jam adflat beatitudinis odor, ô ILLUMINANDI. Jam flores sublimioris naturæ colligitis, ad plectendas cœlestes coronas.

[marginal note right: Novi Illuminandorum status felicitas. Cat. II. 1. 2. 13.]

[left column footnotes]
1 O *Illuminandi*, Gr. ὦ Φωτιζόμενοι.] Cur mutaverimus vocem *Illuminatorum*, quæ in prioribus editionibus ab interpretibus posita est, rationem reddimus in Dissertatione II. de scriptis Cyrilli. 2 *Jam flores sublimioris naturæ*, νοητὰ ἄνθη.] Ad sitteram, *quæ sola mente intelliguntur*, vel, *intelligibiles*, quâ voce Ambrosius aliique Latini Patres τὰ νοητὰ Græcorum reddere solent: quorum exemplo etiam aliquando utemur, in vocabulo cui usus ecclesiasticus sensum novum affixit. Grodecius vertit, *flores spirituales*, nec male, cùm νοητὰ & πνευματικὰ Græcis, *intelligibilia & spiritalia* Latinis promiscue usurpentur, ad designandam rei alicujus sub sensus subjectæ sublimiorem quamdam intelligentiam, quæ ad rem sensibus superiorem, & sola mente adspectabilem, ex quadam similitudine transfertur. eoque sensu Cyrillus ipse vocem πνευματικὰ, adhibet Cat. 22. n. 8. Verùm cùm idem alibi, idque constanter, *spiritalis* vocabulo id quod Spiritus sancti proprium est significare soleat, distinctionis causâ νοητὰ alia voce reddendum censuimus. Hic

autem allegoria continetur ex dissimilibus conflata metaphoris, cujus argumentum sumsit author ex libro Canticorum sibi plurimùm familiari. Spiritalium florum nomine intelligere potest apertam jam Illuminandis scripturarum sacrarum doctrinam, quas eos ad utilitatem exhortare jubet, Cat. 9. n. 13. Spiritumverò sancti fragrantiam appellat vel proximum ejus adventum, quem suavissimo plenum odore dicit Cat. 16. n. 16. vel etiam primum ejusdem per insufflationes exorcismorum inspirati, & in auditorum cordibus inhabitantis donum. Vide infra num. 6. & 9.

2 πλοκὴν. Codex Regius 1814. habet ἀνθέμγουσα, colliguntur; ex vitiosa Græcorum diphthongum οι quemadmodum ε pronunciandi ratione, quod hic adnotamus, ut similium variationum, quæ in hujus Operis decursu animadvertet lector, & quarum bene multas prætermisimus, rationem intelligat. Cæterum codd. D.Roe. & Casaubonianus, de quibus in codicum Notitia diximus, ferunt συλλέγεσθε colligi sunt.

A

Cyril instructing his baptismal candidates. Engraving from A.A. Touttée, P. Maran, *S. Cyrilli archiepiscopi Hierosolymitani operae quae exstant omnia, et ejus nomine circumferuntur* (Paris 1720).

INTRODUCTION

Cyril of Jerusalem has hardly attracted the attention of historians. "Cyril's biography has still to be written," as a modern scholar recently remarked.[1] This study, however, is not a biography, and it is even questionable whether a biography of the fourth-century bishop of Jerusalem could be written considering the fact that the events of his life are poorly documented. This is a book about Cyril and the city of Jerusalem.

Jerusalem and its church went through significant changes in the fourth century. These began with the extraordinary interest in the holy sites in Palestine and Jerusalem displayed by Constantine the Great. In Jerusalem, Constantine had the magnificent Church of the Holy Sepulchre built to commemorate Christ's Crucifixion and Resurrection and, within a few decades, Jerusalem was raised from a city of minor importance to one of the foremost cities of the Christian world. Without discrediting Cyril's immediate predecessors Macarius and Maximus, the period of Cyril's episcopate (350–387) in particular was a time of important developments. It has been argued that Cyril was the true founder of the "new" church of Jerusalem and that his local patriotism brought Jerusalem its spiritual reputation and prominence within the world of Christendom.[2]

Whereas historians have hardly been interested in Cyril, theologians and liturgical scholars have. Cyril's main work, the *Catechetical Lectures*, is the only complete set of prebaptismal instructions that we have from the period of the early church. They are of invaluable importance for reconstructing what was learned by candidates for baptism and their preparation for the liturgical rite of baptism. But they are also of significance for Cyril's theological and christological views, and his scriptural exegesis. However, these topics have for the most part received ample attention from students working in the various scholarly disciplines of religion, and will therefore hardly be touched upon in this study, although Cyril's stance towards Arianism

---

[1] Irshai, 1999, 218 n. 37.
[2] Ibidem, 210 and 215 n. 6.

cannot be avoided. This study rather approaches Cyril, his work, and his episcopacy from a historical perspective. It attempts to sketch Cyril as a bishop vis-à-vis the Jerusalem Christian community, the events and changes taking place in Jerusalem during his episcopate, as well as his continuous endeavors to promote his bishop's see and city.

In the past, various monographs on Cyril were published but, although they offer a sketch of his life, they focus mainly on his theology, his doctrinal position, his work as a catechist, or the authorship of works attributed to him, and hardly on social-historical issues. The oldest study (in Latin) on Cyril is by Anton Augustin Touttée, published in 1720 in conjunction with a new text edition of Cyril's works.[3] This edition was reprinted in the *Patrologia Graeca* (vol. 33) in 1857 together with Touttée's *Dissertationes Cyrillianae*. The *dissertatio* on the life of Cyril was also included by W.K. Reischl and J. Rupp in their edition – still the standard one – of Cyril's works.[4] In 1891, the Swiss theologian Johann Mader published his *Der heilige Cyrillus, Bischof von Jerusalem, in seinem Leben und seinen Schriften* (Einsiedeln). This work, which is hard to come by nowadays – most libraries do not have it – focuses mainly on theological, dogmatical, sacramental and liturgical issues. So does Antoine Paulin's *Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem catéchète* which appeared in Paris in 1959 in the series "Lex orandi. Collection du Centre de Pastorale liturgique." Worth mentioning are also the general introductions by E.H. Gifford in volume seven of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (second series) of 1894 and by William Telfer to his translation of a selection of Cyril's works from 1955; both introductions offer a useful survey of Cyril and his times.[5] The same holds true for the introduction by Anthony A. Stephenson to Leo P. McCauley's translation of Cyril's complete works in the series "The Fathers of the Church."[6] Various other

---

[3] A.A. Touttée, P. Maran, *S. Cyrilli archiepiscopi Hierosolymitani opera quae exstant omnia, et ejus nomine circumferuntur* (Paris 1720). Touttée's study consists of three *dissertationes*: 1. *De vita et rebus gestis S. Cyrilli Hierosolymitani*; 2. *De scriptis S. Cyrilli, ac potissimum Catechesibus*; 3. *De variis Cyrillianae doctrinae capitibus*.

[4] W.K. Reischl, J. Rupp, *Cyrilli Hierosolymorum archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia*, 2 vols. (Munich 1848–60), vol. 1, xiii–cxxi.

[5] E.H. Gifford, "Introduction", *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* 7 (second series) (New York 1894), i–lviii; William Telfer, *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa*, The Library of Christian Classics 4 (London 1955), 19–63.

[6] Leo P. McCauley and Anthony A. Stephenson, *The Works of Saint Cyril of*

translations of Cyril's works have introductions but they are not as profound as those by Gifford, Telfer and Stephenson.[7] A major contribution to Cyrilline studies is Peter Walker's study *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century* (Oxford 1990) in which Cyril's attitude towards Jerusalem and the holy sites is analyzed and opposed to that of Eusebius of Caesarea. Most recently Alexis Doval published a study on the much debated issue of Cyril's authorship of the *Mystagogic Catecheses*.[8]

Cyril's life is not well-documented and there are periods of his life about which nothing is known. Apart from Cyril's own works, his contemporaries Jerome (*On Illustrious Men* and the *Chronicle*) and Epiphanius (*Panarion*) provide some, albeit limited, information. More important are the works written not long after Cyril's death: the *Church Histories* of Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret. Information is also provided by Alexander Monachos in his *De Inventione S. Crucis* (*c.* 600), and by Theophanes' *Chronography*.[9] The later, mostly Byzantine sources, hardly add anything to what is reported in the writings dating from the fourth and fifth centuries. There is, furthermore, a *Vita Cyrilli* in Armenian, the date of which is uncertain; it is a composite life primarily based on Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret and has no additional information to offer apart from some fantastic, anachronistic, and other historically unreliable remarks.[10] Since the sources are not abundant, it is only possible to get some glimpses of Cyril's life. In spite of these limitations,

---

Jerusalem, 2 vols., The Fathers of the Church 61 and 64 (Washington 1969–70), vol. 1, 1–65. English translations of Cyril's works in this study are by McCauley and Stephenson unless otherwise indicated.

[7] Cyril's works have been widely translated at least into English, French, German and Italian. I have not made it a task to trace all available translations.

[8] Alexis J. Doval, *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue. The Authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses*, Patristic Monograph Series 17 (Washington 2001). Several Israeli scholars have recently published on Cyril; their publications are mostly in Hebrew and therefore not accessible to me.

[9] Jer., *De Vir. Ill.* 112; *Chron.* a. 348; Epiph., *Pan.* 73.23.7, 27.8; Ruf., *HE* 10.24, 38; 11.21; Socr., *HE* 2.38, 40, 42, 45; 3.20; 4.1; 5.3, 8, 15; Soz., *HE* 3.14; 4.5, 20, 25; 7.7, 14; Thdt., *HE* 2.26–27; 3.14; 5.8–9; Alexander Monachos, *De Inventione S. Crucis* 71 (PG 87/3, 4069); Theoph., *Chronography* AM 5847, 5858, 5876 (Mango/Scott, 69–70, 86, 104). All *testimonia veterum* about Cyril have already been conveniently listed in the 1720 edition of Cyril's works and are reprinted in the PG edition, as well as in the edition by Reischl and Rupp.

[10] The *vita* was published by Bihain, 1963. It is part of the Armenian Codex 224

the sources make clear that Cyril was a prominent and controversial figure in his time. Moreover, he was bishop of one of the most important cities in the history of Christianity, the status and prestige of which had rapidly grown in the fourth century, thanks to the patronage of Constantine the Great. In addition, Cyril was the only fourth-century bishop of Jerusalem who earned a reputation as an ecclesiastical writer.

Cyril does not belong to the major league of late-antique Church Fathers. In comparison to his contemporaries Ambrose, Jerome, John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus, Basil of Caeasarea and other fourth-century bishops and theologians, Cyril was a less important figure. He was not a great theologian and some scholars have maintained that he did not quite understand the theological and christological debates of his time. No theological or exegetical works by him are known and it is questionable whether he ever wrote any. Only one of Cyril's sermons ('On the Paralytic') has been handed down. No letters are attested except for one important epistle to the emperor Constantius II. Nevertheless, Cyril was definitely not a minor figure. As a bishop, he cared for his community and his community appreciated him. He must have been a great teacher, judging by his *Catechetical Lectures* – the instructions for candidates for baptism. Furthermore, he shaped the Church of Jerusalem liturgically, organizationally, and otherwise. But, apart from that, Cyril was an ambitious politician who wanted to establish the primacy of his see in Palestine and who desired that Jerusalem be recognized as an apostolic see and become the most holy city in the Christian world.

The chapters of this book concentrate on important aspects and events of Cyril's episcopacy. The first chapter presents a sketch of the history of Jerusalem since the Bar Kokhba revolt and the refoundation of the city by the emperor Hadrian in 135 C.E. It attempts to present an impression of what kind of city Jerusalem was – its physical appearance, the people living there, the impact of Christianization – at the time Cyril was bishop there. Chapter two presents

in the "Mecharistenbibliothek" in Vienna. The MS dates from 1428 and is incomplete. The *vita* can be divided into three parts: 1. Cyril's life; 2. the appearance of the celestial cross in the sky above Jerusalem on 7 May 351; 3. liturgical reforms ascribed to Cyril and his literary activities. Although the *vita* makes for interesting reading, Bihain's judgement about it is strict: "En bref, la Vie arménienne n'apporte aucun élément nouveau à la biographie de Cyrille de Jérusalem" (p. 341).

a biography of Cyril, or at least the history of his life as far as it can be reconstructed from the sources. Ample attention is devoted to the conflict between Jerusalem and Caesarea over influence in the ecclesiastical province of Palestine, a conflict by which Cyril's life and episcopacy was dominated. The second part of this chapter deals with Cyril's works, both those genuinely written by him as well as those incorrectly attributed to him. Chapter three discusses Cyril's day-to-day work as a bishop, his responsibilities as a pastoral worker, and, in particular, his liturgical obligations. It seems that his role as a celebrant of liturgical services was among his more important, and definitely his most time-consuming obligations. Chapter four sketches the religious landscape of Palestine and Jerusalem in Cyril's time based on Cyril's remarks in his *Catechetical Lectures* on Jews, heretics, Gnostics, Manichaeans, and pagans. It appears that Cyril's world was far from being exclusively Christian but was still very much a religiously diversified world; late antique Palestine and Jerusalem were still characterized by religious plurality. The failed attempt to rebuild the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem in 363 is the subject of chapter five. Cyril was a direct witness to this event but does not seem to have commented on it unless the Syriac letter attributed to Cyril, and published for the first time in 1977, can be considered as his reaction. It is argued in this chapter that part of the contents of this letter goes back to Jerusalem traditions concerning the restoration of the Temple. Cyril's attempts to promote Jerusalem as one of the patriarchal sees are discussed in the last chapter. It is my contention that holy sites and holy objects, particularly the symbol and relic of the Cross, were important devices in Cyril's public relations campaign for Jerusalem. Also, the origin of the legend of the discovery of the Cross should be seen in the context of Cyril's efforts to gain prominence for Jerusalem and his own bishop's see, both in the church-province of Palestine and in the Christian world in general. Three appendices conclude this study. The first appendix deals with Cyril's attitude towards Arianism and it concludes that, for reasons having to do with his own ambitions, Cyril did always keep to the orthodox point of view he expressed in his *Catechetical Lectures*. The second appendix presents an overview of the daily, weekly, and annual liturgical obligations of the bishop of Jerusalem at the time Cyril was bishop, and the third appendix contains the English translation by S.P. Brock of the Syriac letter, alleged to have been written by Cyril, on the rebuilding of the Temple.

JERUSALEM IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

Jerusalem went through great transformations in the fourth century. From an insignificant provincial town it became a prominent Christian city with a correspondent architectural splendour – churches and monasteries. Its centrality as a Christian place, thanks to its biblical past and the presence of an increasing number of holy sites, brought Jerusalem to the center stage of the Christian world; it attracted many pilgrims as well as those who followed in their steps, and the city aired a cosmopolitan grandeur. The Jerusalem see – together with Rome, Antioch and Alexandria and, from 381 on, Constantinople – became the most eminent within Christendom and the Jerusalem bishop a person of authority at church councils.

In the first centuries of our era, the religious character of Jerusalem changed several times. From being the foremost Jewish city, the center of the world to Judaism, it became after 135 a Hellenic city with pagan sanctuaries and cults such as could also be found in many other cities and towns in the Roman East. In the fourth century Jerusalem changed again, now from a pagan into a Christian city and gradually churches replaced pagan shrines. While we are relatively well-informed about Jerusalem in the Second Temple period, there is not much to go on, in terms of sources, about the period after 70 C.E. The years between the First Jewish Revolt (66–73) and the Bar Kokhba Revolt (132–135) are poorly documented, and the same is true for post-Hadrianic Jerusalem or Aelia Capitolina as it was called after 135. Information only increases in the fourth century, but even about Jerusalem in this era of transformation our sources are anything but abundant.

In the 130s, the emperor Hadrian refounded Jerusalem and named it *Colonia Aelia Capitolina* in honor of himself and Jupiter Capitolinus.[1] The new Roman colony of Aelia Capitolina was built on the debris

---

[1] Opinions differ as to whether the refoundation was a consequence of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, or whether Hadrian's plan to refound Jerusalem as a Roman colony

of the Jewish Jerusalem, and was a predominantly pagan city.[2] Jerusalem had now definitively lost the central sacred function in the world that it had as a Jewish city and would only regain as a Christian city in Late Antiquity. The Jews who had survived the Bar Kokhba Revolt were expelled – many probably went to Galilee – and were replaced by a gentile population, many of them veterans coming from Syria and other nearby regions.[3] The presence of the *Legio X Fretensis* made Aelia very much a garrison town. Many of the veterans of the legion seem to have remained in Aelia after their discharge from army service.[4]

The name Jerusalem almost became extinct; Aelia became the common name for Jerusalem, a name that was still used in medieval Arabic sources as Iliya.[5] The Roman ignorance of Jerusalem is illustrated by the famous story of the interrogation by the Roman governor Firmilian of a group of Christian prisoners in 310 during the persecutions. When they were asked by the governor the name of their city one of them answered "Jerusalem," meaning of course the heavenly Jerusalem. Firmilian, however, had never heard of this place and thought that the Christians had somewhere founded a city hostile to the Roman authorities.[6] In spite of the presence of the tenth legion, Aelia Capitolina was a rather insignificant provincial town that did not differ in architectural appearance or religious and administrative character from other towns and cities in the Roman Near

---

caused the revolt, as Cassius Dio (69.12.1–2) reports. For a discussion of the causes of the revolt, see Smallwood, 1981, 428–38. For the foundation and town plan of Aelia see e.g. Lifshitz, 1977, 483–85; Smallwood, 1981, 459 ff.; Avigad, 1983, 205–207; Millar, 1990, 28–30; Tsafrir, 1999, 133–34; Sternberger, 2000, 51–55; Boatwright, 2000, 196–203.

[2] Several cults are attested in Aelia: Tychè, Serapis, Jupiter, Dionysus, Dea Roma, the Dioscuri and Victory, and Mars; see Lifshitz, 1977, 486–87 and Belayche, 2001, 108–71.

[3] Eus., *HE* 4.6.4; Cassius Dio 59.12; *Chron. Pasch.* 1, p. 474 (ed. Dindorff). Jones, 1971, 277; Avi-Yonah, 1976, 15–16; Smallwood, 1981, 460; Belayche, 2001, 129–31.

[4] Isaac, 1992, 323–25. Only sixteen inscriptions dating from the pre-Constantine period have been found in Aelia, but all of them are in Latin. This is an indication, according to Isaac, that Aelia was a veteran colony, the citizens of which spoke Latin and rather identified themselves with Rome than with the Hellenized East.

[5] Said ibn Batriq/Eutychius, *Annales* 168 (CSCO 471 [Scriptores Arabici 44], 58; 472, [Scriptores Arabici 45], 49).

[6] Eus., *Mart. Palest.* 11.8 ff. (GCS, Eusebius Werke 2.2, 936 ff.). Hunt, 1982, 4–5; Wilken, 1992, 83.

East. The administration of the province of Syria-Palaestina was coordinated from Caesarea, the provincial capital. Administratively, Aelia seems to have been organised as a normal Roman colony with a municipal council, duumvirs, aedils and decurions.[7]

The Hadrianic foundation was considerably smaller than former Jerusalem, only some 2/5 of the Jewish city.[8] Archaeological finds, which unfortunately are scanty, allow us to gain only a general idea of Aelia's town plan.[9] The sixth-century Madaba mosaic map is also helpful for acquiring some idea about the topography of Aelia.[10] Only the northern part of the present old city was inhabited and there may have been open spaces in the city without any specific use. The refoundation not only renamed the city but also recentered it. If the Temple had been the urban and religious center of Jewish Jerusalem, now the center was shifted westward. It is generally held that Aelia was built like a Roman city and that it had a regular street pattern; its city plan was therefore not much different from other eastern cities in the Roman Empire. The gate that is now known as the Damascus Gate was Aelia's main entrance. It opened on a square in the center of which stood a freestanding column. The main arteries of Aelia were the *cardo maximus* which ran from north to south, and the *cardo decumanus* which went from east to west. Another wide street ran parallel to the *cardo maximus* closer to the Temple Mount. As the Madaba map shows, this latter thoroughfare as well as the *cardo maximus* had colonnades on either side. The colonnaded street, also known from many other eastern cities, was a decisive component of Jerusalem's architecture.[11] At the intersection of the *cardo maximus* and *cardo decumanus* a tetrapylon should be imagined. Here also was Aelia's forum, to the south of the site where in the fourth century the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was built. At this forum the Capitoline temple should be envisaged as well as, at its northern end, a temple or shrine for Aphrodite.[12] Hadrian may

---

[7] Lifshitz, 1977, 484; Millar, 1990, 30.

[8] Belayche, 2001, 131–32.

[9] Maps of Aelia, based on archaeological material, are of course helpful, but not always trustworthy. For the many maps of ancient Jerusalem, see the references in Patrich, 2002.

[10] Donner, 1995.

[11] On colonnaded streets, see Segal, 1997, 5–53.

[12] For the Aphrodite sanctuary, see Eus., *VC* 3.26 f. Jer., *Epist.* 58.3: *Ab Hadriani temporibus ad imperium Constantini, per annos circiter centum octoginta, in loco Resurrectionis*

have planned to have the Capitol at the deserted Temple Mount, but if so, the plan never materialized.[13] The Temple remained in ruins and only an (equestrian) statue of Hadrian was set up on the Temple Mount and possibly an idol of Jupiter.[14] Other features of Aelia that have been archaeologically attested are the remains of the Porta Neapolitana (Damascus Gate), a *quadraporticus* at the Siloam pool, the arch of the Ecce Homo on the Via Dolorosa, and an arch that may have been the monumental entrance to the forum. The seventh-century *Chronicon Paschale* lists several other buildings in Aelia: two public baths, a theater, a *trikamaron*, a monumental gate of twelve entrances (*dodekapylon*), and a quadrangular esplanade.[15] However, none of these monuments have been archaeologically traced thus far. Hadrian may also have restored Aelia's city walls.[16]

The boundary of the residential area seems to have been the *cardo decumanus*, represented today by the modern David Street and the Street of the Chain. The area south of this line, still inhabited in Herodean times, only became part of the city and an area for habitation again at the end of the fifth or the sixth century. The *cardo maximus* in the southern part of the Old City is clearly an extension and dates from the sixth century; it was most likely constructed dur-

---

simulacrum Iovis, in Crucis rupe statua ex marmore Veneris a gentibus posita colebatur. Gibson and Taylor, 1994, 68–69.

[13] Cassius Dio 69.12.1. Some scholars think that Aelia had a second forum close to the Temple Mount; on this forum they locate Hadrian's Capitoline temple; see Gibson and Taylor, 1994, 70. Belayche (2001, 142–49) argues convincingly that Aelia's Capitol should be located at the main forum where in the fourth century the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was built.

[14] The Bordeaux pilgrim speaks of two statues of Hadrian; the other may have been of Antoninus Pius; *It. Burd.* 591; Wilkinson, 1999, 30 n. 4. Jerome refers to a statue of Hadrian, probably on horseback, and the Jupiter idol; *In Essaiam* 1.2.9 (CC 73.33): *Ubi quondam erat templum et religio Dei, ibi Adriani statua et Iovis idolum collocatum est.* See further Belayche, 2001, 136–42.

[15] *Chron. Pasch.* 1, 474 (ed. Dindorf): καὶ καθελὼν τὸν ναὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ἔκτισε τὰ δύο δημόσια καὶ τὸ θέατρον, καὶ τὸ Τρικάμαρον καὶ τὸ Τετράνυμφον, καὶ τὸ Δωδεκάπυλον, τὸ πρὶν ὀνομαζόμενον Ἀναβαθμοί, καὶ τὴν Κόδραν. A *trikamaron*, a structure with three vaulted or arched rooms, may refer to the Capitolium – the temple for Jupiter, Juno and Minerva. The *dodekapylon* is interpreted by some as a reference to the circus of Aelia; Patrich, 2002. Hunt (1982, 148–49) suggests that the *dèmosia* may not have been public baths but pools and watering places or cisterns having to do with the water supply of Aelia. The *tetranymphon* is possibly the pool of Siloam which, according to the Bordeaux pilgrim had four porticoes; *It. Burd.* 592.1: *habet quadriporticum.*

[16] Orosius, *Adv. Pag.* 7.13.5: *quam ipse in optimum statum murorum exstructione reparavit.*

ing the reign of Justinian when the Nea Church was built.[17] In the second and third centuries the area south of the *cardo decumanus* was one of the military camps of the *Legio X Fretensis*, which was stationed there since 70 C.E. It is generally agreed upon that the legion had its main quarters in the south-western part of the Old City, which is now the Armenian Quarter, hence outside the city boundaries of Aelia.[18] The legion, the presence of which must have influenced life in Aelia in many respects, remained until the end of the third century when it was transferred, probably by Diocletian, to Aila (Elath) by the Red Sea.[19] The transfer of the legion must have been a serious drain for Aelia in terms of population and economic wealth. It is not unlikely, although evidence is not available, that, when the legion left, Aelia lost a considerable part of its population and the Jerusalem economy may have suffered from a slow-down.[20]

---

[17] Avigad, 1983, 208–29.

[18] According to Bar (1998), the camp was located within the city boundaries and formed an integral part of the city. He suggests that the legion had its quarters in the south-western corner of Aelia, i.e. the area where most scholars believe the Hadrianic forum was located.

[19] Smallwood, 1981, 534.

[20] For the socio-economic influence of the Roman army in Judaea, see Safrai, 1994, 339–49. It is hard to say anything reliable about the number of inhabitants of Jerusalem. During the first Jewish revolt, some 100,000 people seemed to have lived in Jerusalem, according to Beloch (1886, 247–48; cf. Broshi [1975], who mentions a number of 82,500), but this was an extreme situation and many of these 100,000 may not have been regular inhabitants of Jerusalem but were there for shelter from the Romans. It is known that the population grew considerably in the first century C.E.; Broshi (1975, 13) estimates that at the beginning of the century Jerusalem had some 38,500 inhabitants. So, Jerusalem at the end of the Second Temple period was a very large city, thanks probably to its economic wealth which was predominantly generated by the Temple and Temple-related occupations; Safrai, 1994, 377–79, 425–26. The destruction of the Temple deprived many inhabitants of Jerusalem of their jobs and earnings which probably caused a serious decline in population, apart from those who were killed during the siege and conquest of the city by the Romans. When after the Bar Kokhba revolt the Jews were expelled from the city, the population decreased even more. New settlers came in, but their numbers seem not to have made up for the Jewish emigrants. Hadrianic Aelia was definitely a much smaller city than Jerusalem at the end of the Second Temple period and was sparsely populated. It seems reasonable to suppose that Aelia had some 15,000 inhabitants, and perhaps even less; Belayche, 2001, 110. However, that number may have dwindled at the end of the third century as a consequence of the transferral of the legion. The population gradually increased again in the fourth century when pilgrims, monks and others, attracted by the business as a result of pilgrimage and the christianization of the city, settled in Jerusalem. The growth continued in the centuries thereafter and Broshi (1975, 13) thinks that in the reign of Justinian (527–565) the city had 53,250 inhabitants.

The Jerusalem Christian community is one of the first Christian communities ever, and the Jerusalem Church is considered to be the mother of all churches.[21] Nevertheless, little is known about the history of the Jerusalem Christian community in the first three centuries C.E.[22] Most of the available information is provided by Eusebius' *Church History*. In this work, Eusebius presented lists of the bishops of Jerusalem, in the same way as he did for Rome, Antioch and Alexandria. The bishop to whom he devotes the most attention is James, Jerusalem's first bishop. James, called the "Righteous," is said to have been a brother of Jesus and to have received the episcopate from Him and his Apostles. He died a martyr's death in 62 C.E. after having been persecuted by the Jews.[23] He was succeeded by Symeon, son of Clopas, who was also martyred under the reign of Trajan.[24] Up to Hadrian's war against the Jews in 132–135, Eusebius reports that the Jerusalem Church consisted of Hebrews and that all fifteen bishops were of Jewish descent; after the Bar Kokhba Revolt all bishops are said to have been Gentiles.[25] Of those Gentile bishops Eusebius mentions more elaborately Narcissus, the fifteenth bishop after the reign of Hadrian; Alexander who was persecuted during the reign of Decius; his successor Mazabanes; and Hymenaeus, who fought against the heterodoxy of Paul of Samosata.[26] The presentation of the lists of Jerusalem bishops by Eusebius – his source for the lists was undoubtedly of Jerusalem origin – is not considered to be very reliable.[27] The chronology leaves much to be desired, and it seems hardly credible that Jerusalem had had fifteen bishops until 135, the second of which only died under Trajan, as Eusebius alleges.

---

[21] Thdt., *HE* 5.9.17.

[22] Murphy-O'Connor (1995) presents a survey of the Christian community of pre-Constantinian times.

[23] Eus., *HE* 1.12.5; 2.1.2–5; 3.5.2; 3.7.3; 7.19.1.

[24] Eus., *HE* 3.11.1; 3.32.1.

[25] Eus., *HE* 5.12.

[26] Eus., *HE* 5.12; 6.8.7–11.3; 6.39.2–3; 7.28.1. In particular Narcissus seems to have been a charismatic leader, who was able to (re)assert Jerusalem as an Apostolic see when, at the end of the second century, Victor, bishop of Rome, wished to create an empire-wide church hierarchy with Rome as the foremost Apostolic Church. Another threat for Jerusalem in this time was the Montanist's establishment of a new Jerusalem at Pepuza (Phrygia) as the scene for future eschatological happenings; see Irshai, 1993.

[27] For an elaborate discussion of the Jerusalem episcopal list, its origin and purpose, see Turner, 1900 and Manns, 1993; the latter only deals with the list of bishops until 135.

Fourteen bishops are compressed into the years between 135 and 195 C.E. It would seem therefore that the Jerusalem episcopal list was somewhat of a forgery and was only composed perhaps around the year 300 C.E. when the Christians in Aelia may have become more self-assured and conscious of the fact that they were living in a town with a great Christian past, and wanted to advocate that past. The purpose of the episcopal catalogue then was to demonstrate and to enhance the continuity of that Christian tradition. Another intention of the catalogue was to rival with the great churches of Rome, Antioch and Alexandria which also possessed these lists of bishops.

It is alleged that following the martyrdom of Stephen the Jerusalem Church was persecuted by the Jews, that the Christians left for Pella before the start of the siege of Jerusalem in the First Jewish War, and that, as already mentioned, until 135 the Jerusalem Church was composed of Christians of Jewish origin but thereafter of Gentile Christians.[28] It is generally held that the early Christians met at Mount Sion and that this hill southwest of Jerusalem, outside the boundaries of Aelia Capitolina, was the center of the Jerusalem Christian community until it shifted to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in the 330s. However, there is no reliable evidence that Mount Sion was the central locality of the Christian community of Jerusalem in the first three centuries of our era.[29] It is not at all unlikely that the centrality of Mount Sion as a Christian site as it developed in the fourth and fifth centuries C.E. was projected back to the first centuries C.E.[30] Possibly therefore the Christian community

---

[28] Eus., *HE* 2.1.8; 3.5.2–3; 4.5. This information coincides with the makeup of the Jerusalem population which consisted mainly of Jews before 135 and of pagans thereafter.

[29] Eusebius in his *Demonstratio Evangelica* (cf. 6.13; GCS, Eusebius Werke 6, 262 ff.), for instance, refers regularly to Mount Sion without mentioning that it was the meeting place for the Jerusalem Christians; the same goes for his *Onomastikon*. Eusebius' *Church History* (7.19) refers to the throne of James, also used by later bishops, without any reference to its locality. Epiphanius, writing at the end of the fourth century, is the only one who refers to Mount Sion as the meeting place for the Jerusalem Christian community; after the Bar Kokhba Revolt there remained on Mount Sion the little house of God where the disciples went up to the upper room after Christ's Ascension; Epiph., *De Mens. et Pond.* 14 (PG 43, 261). However, this may have been a later tradition connected with the church built on Sion *c.* 350. See Taylor, 1993, 209–12.

[30] For the christianization of Mount Sion in the fourth and fifth centuries, see Taylor, 1993, chap. 10.

did not have one particular meeting place but several: it could have been a private house or the house of the bishop, as was very common in other cities and towns. If that was the case, the early Christian congregation may have had the character of a household community or a number of household communities.

The Jerusalem Christians were not an isolated group. Presumably there were the normal, daily contacts with non-Christians in the city, but there were definitely relations with neighboring churches, whose leaders may have had some influence on the selection of bishops of the Jerusalem community.[31] It seems that the Church of Aelia became more self-assured in the third century, and began to function as a leading central Christian community in the region, for instance in matters relating to the heresies of Beryllus of Bostra and Paul of Samosata.[32] Christians from elsewhere came to visit Jerusalem; how many cannot be established, but there is no reason to presume that Melito of Sardis, Origen and Alexander – later to become bishop of Jerusalem – were the only ones.[33]

It is hard to say anything meaningful about the number of Christians living in Jerusalem in the second and third centuries. Presumably, this number was small considering that Aelia was a small city in terms of numbers of inhabitants and surface area, and that the major part of Jerusalem's population was pagan. However, as in the rest of the Roman world, the number of Christians in Aelia probably increased in the third century.[34] At the same time, the community may have become better organized and a hierarchical ecclesiastical organization may have developed. The Jerusalem Christians survived the persecutions of the early fourth century; only a deacon by the name of Valens died a martyr's death.[35]

Hadrian's refoundation of Jerusalem as a Roman colony had serious consequences for its Jewish population. Hadrian promulgated an edict that forbade Jews to live in Jerusalem and its municipal territory. Since this territory seems to have been rather vast, although its exact boundaries are not known,[36] no Jews were allowed to set-

---

[31] Eus., *HE* 6.10–11.
[32] Irshai, 1999, 208.
[33] Hunt, 1982, 4.
[34] For models of growth, see Stark, 1996, chap. 1, and Hopkins, 1998.
[35] Eus., *Mart. Palest.* 11.4 (GCS, Eusebius Werke 2.2, 935).
[36] For a reconstruction of Aelia's territory, see Belayche, 2001, map on p. 19.

tle in a wide circle around Aelia.[37] A late source (tenth century) mentions that Hadrian's law was renewed by Constantine around 330. However, if this information is reliable, Constantine modified the law considerably by allowing the Jews to live in the vicinity of Jerusalem and only prohibiting Jews from settling in the city. Moreover, once a year, on the day of the destruction of the Temple (9th of Ab), the Jews were allowed to enter Jerusalem to mourn at the ruins of their Temple, as the Bordeaux pilgrim, who visited Jerusalem in 333, reports.[38] Remarkably enough, the same pilgrim mentions in his report of his visit to Mount Sion, located outside the city the southwest boundary of the city of Aelia, that there had once stood seven synagogues on this hill of which only one was left – the rest having been "ploughed and sown" (cf. Isa. 1:8).[39] Some sixty years later Epiphanius mentions that seven synagogues had stood on Mount Sion, one of which had remained until the time of bishop Maximus and the emperor Constantine.[40] These references have occasioned discussion about the presence of Jews in or near Aelia. Most scholars consider it improbable that Jews had places of worship so close to Aelia and think it unlikely, basing their opinions on Hadrian's edict, and its alleged reiteration by Constantine, that Jews could actually be living in or very close to Jerusalem. However, issuing a law is one thing, enforcing that law for a period of some two centuries another. Moreover, it is not known how rigorously the law was executed and how completely the expulsions were carried out.[41] In addition to that it is hard to establish whether Constantine's repetition of Hadrian's law is to be considered a historical fact since, as previously mentioned, there is only one late source that refers to the prohibition by Constantine.[42] It seems therefore not improbable that after Hadrian had expelled the Jews from Jerusalem and its surrounding area, the observance of the law slackened over time and Jews, though not in great numbers, again settled in and near Jerusalem. Particularly in the Severan period Hadrian's ban seems to have been

---

[37] On possible boundaries, see Lifshitz, 1977, 484 and Millar, 1993, 349.
[38] It. Burd. 591. For the access to Jerusalem by Jews, see Stemberger, 2000, 40–43.
[39] It. Burd. 592.
[40] Epiph., De Mens. et Pond. 14 (PG 43, 261).
[41] Millar, 1993, 349.
[42] Irshai (1995) argues that if there was a new prohibition for Jews to enter Jerusalem in Constantine's time, this was local and not imperial, and probably emanated from episcopal influence on the secular authorities.

relaxed as a consequence of which Jews visited Aelia more openly and freely. Talmudic references even indicate that a group of Jews had come to live again in Jerusalem at the end of the second century.[43] Also in the fourth century there may still having been Jews living in Jerusalem, or at least in its immediate vicinity. Cyril warns his baptismal candidates to keep away from Jewish customs and ideas, and Jerome, who *c.* 400 lived in Bethlehem, which belonged to the Jerusalem territory and bishopric, associated with Jews.[44] As to the synagogue on Mount Sion mentioned by the Bordeaux pilgrim, this may have functioned until *c.* 350; by that time it was probably replaced by "the upper church of the Apostles" to which Cyril refers.[45] It had definitely disappeared by 370.[46] It seems therefore that access to Jerusalem for Jews was not as restricted as is often thought. Possibly Jews were even allowed to be present at the church services in Jerusalem; there was a general rule that pagans, heretics and Jews were permitted to attend the service up to the moment of the "missa catechumenorum".[47] One area, however, seems to have been off limits for Jews, namely that of the ruined Temple Mount; only once a year was this area accessible for Jews to lament their fate at the pierced stone.[48]

The desolate Temple Mount was an eye-catching feature in the urban landscape of Aelia. At least 20 percent – some 39 acres – of the residential area of Aelia was occupied by this empty site. The Herodean Temple, which had dominated Jerusalem's topography

---

[43] Safrai, 1972; Lifshitz, 1977, 487; Smallwood, 1981, 499–500.

[44] *Catech.* 4.37; Jer., *Epist.* 84.3. Kelly, 1975, 134.

[45] *Catech.* 16.4. Taylor, 1993, 210–11; Tsafrir, 1999, 139.

[46] Opt. Mil., *Schism. Don.* 3.2 (CSEL 26, 71).

[47] *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua* 89 (CC, Ser. Lat. 148, 169): *Ut episcopus nullum prohibeat ingredi ecclesiam et audire verbum Dei, sive gentilem, sive haeriticum, sive iudaeum, usque ad missam catechumenorum.* The Synod of Jerusalem (399) complains in a letter to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, about Jewish snakes, the incredible stupidity of the Samaritans, and the open impiety of the Gentiles that surround the Christians like wolves and stop their ears against the truth of the (Christian) preaching. No little effort is required to guard the sheep of the Lord and to prevent them from being torn apart. *Atque utinam . . . non nos inquietarent Judaici serpentes et Samaritanorum incredibilis stultitia atque gentilium apertissimae impietates, quorum turba quamplurima et ad veritatem praedicationis omnino auribus obturantes in similitudinem luporum gregem Christi circumientes, non parvas nobis excubias, et laborem incutiunt dum volumus oves Domini custodire, ne ab his dilacerentur;* Mansi, 1759, vol. 3, 989.

[48] *It. Burd.* 591. Stemberger (2000, 42) notices accurately that the lamenting of the Jews at their Temple site "could attest for Christians the fulfilment of the prophecies." See also Avi-Yonah, 1976, 164.

and had once been one of the largest and most magnificent sacred sites in the eastern regions of the Roman Empire, was destroyed by the Romans in 70 C.E.[49] The demolition of the Temple deprived the Jews of the center of their religious life and the symbol of their ethnos. The erasure of this sacred site and its remaining desolation was a manifestation of Roman military and political power and its emptiness a permanent sign of Jewish defeat.[50] The same is true for Hadrian's refoundation of Jerusalem which erased Jewry from Jerusalem even more completely. Over time the ideological significance of the empty Temple Mount shifted from symbolizing political and military defeat to representing religious defeat. Especially in the fourth century when Jerusalem christianized rapidly, the destruction of the Temple signified for Christians that God had left the Jews and was now on their side. The conspicuous empty space of the Temple Mount was an ever-present reminder of that. Christians had never considered appropriating the Temple Mount by, for instance, building a church or shrine there, in spite of the fact that several events of Jesus' life had occurred there. Christians realized that maintaining the emptiness of the Temple Mount was the most powerful statement conceivable of Jewish religious defeat in favor of Christianity.[51] For centuries the Temple Mount remained desolate, reminding the Jews of their subjugation and the Christians of their hegemony. Only in the seventh century, when they had conquered Jerusalem, did the Muslim Arabs appropriate the site by building there the Al Aqsa mosque and the Dome of the Rock.

In 324 Constantine defeated his opponent Licinius in the battle of Chrysopolis which made him sole ruler over the Roman Empire. Now the eastern provinces also made their acquaintance with Constantine's desire to christianize his empire. The emperor presented himself as the servant of God and in a letter to the eastern provincials he declared that "the human race, taught by my obedient service, might restore the religion of the most dread Law, while

---

[49] The destruction of the Temple cannot have been as thorough as described by Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* 6.271 ff.). Parts of it were probably still standing in the fourth century (cf. Cyril, *Catech.* 15.15) and were only destroyed by the attempt at rebuilding the Temple in 363, and by the Persian conquest of Jerusalem in 614. See Sternberger, 2000, 51.

[50] Wharton, 2000, 196–98.

[51] Wharton, 1995, 98–100.

at the same time the most blessed faith might grow under the guidance of the Supreme."[52] Christians who had suffered from Licinius' oppression were liberated and church property was restored.[53] It would not take long before the emperor directed his attention to Palestine and developed a policy of turning this region into the Christian Holy Land. The center of the Holy Land was to become Jerusalem and Constantine's policy of christianization focused particularly on this city.[54] In Jerusalem, but also in Bethlehem, which was within the authority of the Jerusalem bishopric, Constantine ordered churches to be built: the Church of the Nativity at the site where Jesus was thought to have been born, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem at the site of His Crucifixion and burial, which would become the new sacred center of the New – Christian – Jerusalem, and a church on the Mount of Olives.

From the report of the anonymous Bordeaux pilgrim, who visited Jerusalem in 333, it becomes clear that the visual environment of Jerusalem had changed considerably in a few years' time due to Constantine's building program. On Golgotha, a basilica of great beauty had been built and several holy sites were now apparently openly venerated: Sion, where the house of Caiaphas once stood and the column at which Jesus was scourged; the Praetorium where Jesus' case was heard;[55] the rock in the vineyards of the valley of Jehoshaphat where Judas betrayed Christ; the palm tree from which branches had been taken for Jesus' entry into Jerusalem; the tomb of Lazarus in Bethany. Apart from referring to the New Testament sites, the Bordeaux pilgrim also shows an interest in places mentioned in the Old Testament, in particular those connected with Solomon and to a lesser degree sites related to the Jewish kings Hezekiah and David.[56] It is hard to tell whether the sites reported

---

[52] Eus., *VC* 2.28.2. English translations of Eusebius' *Vita Constantini* are by Cameron and Hall (1999).

[53] Eus., *VC* 2.29.3–40.

[54] In Late Antiquity the name Aelia Capitolina remained persistent as the official designation of the city; Hunt, 1982, 149. Cyril, however, always spoke of Jerusalem and never of Aelia because he considered the history of Jerusalem as a continuum; in his understanding Jewish Jerusalem was in essence not different from Christian Jerusalem; Walker, 1990, 318–19. For Jerusalem in Late Antiquity, see e.g. Walker, 1995; Tsafrir, 1999. For Constantine and Jerusalem, see Hunt, 1997.

[55] The site of the house of Caiaphas and the Praetorium, were well known in Jerusalem, as is also testified by Cyril (*Catech.* 13.38–39).

[56] *It. Burd.* 589–92.

by the Bordeaux pilgrim were already venerated at the time he/she visited Jerusalem. It is tempting to say that they were – otherwise the pilgrim would not have mentioned them – but we cannot be certain. Many of the sites were already known for a longer period, as is known from Eusebius' *Onomastikon*, but that in itself is no evidence that they were also venerated. It seems that many places only received the epithet "sacred" or "holy" during the fourth century, and were only then given due veneration as is known from the pilgrim's report of Egeria, who visited Jerusalem in 382.

Golgotha was Jerusalem's most sacred site. From late antique Christian sources the impression is gained that Golgotha had since the first century been a sacred site for the Jerusalem Christians and that Hadrian had his temple for Venus built at the site to prevent Christians from venerating it.[57] A sanctuary for Venus was indeed standing on the site of Golgotha at the time Jerusalem came under the sovereignty of Constantine. Golgotha, an area of some 200 m. by 150 m., had until the first century B.C.E. been a quarry for building materials. In the early Roman period the area came under cultivation, which explains why John 19:41 mentions a garden at the site of the Crucifixion and burial.[58] The area was also used by the Romans as a general execution place, hence probably its name; Golgotha means "skull-place."[59] Golgotha was, of course, particularly known as the site of Christ's Crucifixion, and as such it is mentioned by all four Evangelists.[60] At the time that Jesus was crucified, the area of Golgotha lay outside the city walls. With the construction of new city walls by Herod Agrippa in 41–44 C.E. – so, therefore, after Christ's crucifixion – Golgotha came to be located within the city walls. Melito of Sardis, who visited Aelia around the middle of the second century mentions that the place of crucifixion was in the middle of Jerusalem (ἐν μέσῳ Ἰερουσαλήμ). This remark of Melito is, together with those in the Gospels, one of the few references to Golgotha in the sources of the first three centuries C.E. Another one

---

[57] Eus., *VC* 3.26.

[58] Gibson and Taylor, 1994, 61. Cyril (*Catech.* 14.5) refers to the remains of a garden adjacent to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

[59] According to a popular fourth-century Christian tradition, the site was called Golgotha because Adam had been buried at the place of Christ's Crucifixion; Gibson and Taylor, 1994, 59.

[60] Mark 15:22; Matt. 27:33; Luke 23:33; John 19:17–18.

is that in Eusebius' *Onomastikon*, probably composed in the 290s, in which it is reported that Golgotha, where Christ was crucified, is shown in Aelia, north of Mount Sion.[61]

Tradition has it that the Rock of Calvary, the outcrop of rock incorporated into the Constantinian church complex on Golgotha, was the spot where Christ's Cross should have been fixed and that this rock was identical with Golgotha.[62] This, however, is unlikely since, for one thing, the piece of rock is too small for that purpose. But, more important, not only the Evangelists, but also Cyril and the pilgrim Egeria some threehundred years later, refer to Golgotha as a place or area, instead of a particular piece of rock.[63] John 19:41 mentions that close to where Christ was crucified there was a garden with a new burial cave in which Christ's body was laid. It seems therefore that the area of Golgotha was not only used as an execution place, but that, as already mentioned, the area was under cultivation and contained agricultural and possibly ornamental gardens. Scattered among these agricultural plots of land were burial caves and one of them may have been Christ's Tomb. It is, however, impossible to say whether the tomb, incorporated into the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, is the same tomb as the Gospels refer to and thus whether it is indeed Christ's burial cave.[64]

Eusebius and in his wake, later Christian authors report that, during the reign of Hadrian, the site of Golgotha had been covered with a large amount of earth and had been paved over.[65] Over the "sacred cave", that is, Christ's Tomb, a temple for Venus had been erected. It is assumed that the area of Golgotha was the site where Aelia's forum was constructed when Hadrian remodelled the city. The Venus sanctuary was laid out at the northern end of this forum. Jerome reports *c.* 395 that this situation lasted some 180 years, meaning from Hadrian's reign until the time that Constantine demolished the sanctuary. He adds that a statue of Jupiter had stood on the place of the Resurrection and a marble image of Venus on the rock

---

[61] *Peri Pascha* 72, 94 (ed. S.G. Hall); *Onomastikon* 74.19–21. On these sources, see Biddle, 1999, 58–64.

[62] For the rock, see Gibson and Taylor, 1994, 80–81.

[63] Cyril, *Catech.* 1.1; 4.10, 14; 5.11; 10.19; 12.39; 13.4, 22, 28, 39; 16.4. *It. Eger.* 25.1–6, 8–10; 27.3; 30.1; 37.1; 41.1.

[64] See Biddle, 1999. According to Biddle (p. 70) there is raised "no serious obstacle to acceptance of the authenticity of the site."

[65] Eus., *VC* 3.26.

of the Cross.[66] It seems not unlikely that the Venus temple should be envisaged as a precinct that was made up of several shrines containing images of deities pertaining to the cult of Venus.[67]

This site of the Venus sanctuary was appropriated by Constantine to build a large Christian basilica. Why this site? As mentioned earlier, late antique Christian sources consider this site to be that of Christ's Crucifixion and burial, which was, however, deliberately obscured by Hadrian, to prevent Christians from venerating it, by constructing the Venus temple over it. Basing themselves on these sources, modern historians like to presume a local tradition of acquaintance and identification by the Jerusalem Christian community with this site as that of Christ's execution and burial. According to this presumption bishop Macarius informed Constantine, possibly at the Council of Nicaea, about the existence of this site. Subsequently, the emperor should have ordered a church to be built there in due honor of the site.[68] It cannot be ruled out that the Jerusalem Christian community had preserved the memory of these sites and that there existed a tradition of honoring the places of Jesus' Crucifixion, burial, and Ascension. However, sources do not allow us to be certain about the existence of such a tradition, or if there had been one, how far back in time it went. It may therefore be that only shortly before Constantine had decided to build churches on these sites, the place had attracted the attention of the Jerusalem Christians, possibly as a consequence of their becoming conscious of Jerusalem's rich biblical past and the promotion of that past. It may even be that these sites only became sacred because Constantine had churches built there.

Recently, it has been suggested that Constantine had selected the northern part of Hadrian's forum for a church complex that, analogous

---

[66] *Epist.* 58.3. See also n. 12 above.
[67] Gibson and Taylor, 1994, 70–71.
[68] E.g. Hunt, 1982, 7; Wilken, 1992, 88; Hunt, 1997, 411–12; Biddle, 1999, 65; Drake, 2000, 274–75. According to *VC* 3.30.4 an order from God had induced Constantine to relieve the site of its pagan sanctuary. It has recently been put forward that the exact spot of the Crucifixion and burial need not be identical, as late antique and medieval sources suggest. Both spots should be located in the area of Golgotha but the site of the Crucifixion should be envisaged some 200 meters south of that of the Tomb, underneath the later constructed *cardo decumanus*; Taylor, 1998. According to Taylor (p. 196) it was possibly the miraculous story of the discovery of the True Cross under the substructural areas of the Venus temple "which justified moving the localisation of the crucifixion to that region."

to the Lateran basilica in Rome, from its inception had to serve as
Jerusalem's cathedral. This ecclesiastical complex had to function as
the congregational and administrative center of the Jerusalem Christian
community. By choosing this site Constantine reasserted the Roman
constitution of Aelia while at the same time inscribing his own iden-
tity by replacing a pagan sanctuary with a Christian shrine. Only
during the construction process, which entailed digging activities, was
a tomb found that was identified as that of Christ.[69]

Whatever the emperor's motivation may have been − remodeling
Hadrian's Aelia by building a cathedral church over one of its fore-
most pagan shrines, or honoring a local tradition that considered
this site as that of Christ's Crucifixion, burial, and Resurrection −
Constantine had a church built in the center of Roman Aelia that
became the new sacred focus of Christian Jerusalem, served as its
cathedral, and was one of the most magnificent churches of its day.
Its visibility on the Hadrianic forum in the center of Jerusalem and
the prominent entrance at Jerusalem's main street, the *cardo maximus*,
testified to the prominent presence of the Christian community in
the former Jewish and pagan city and to the imperial support
Christianity enjoyed.

The main literary source for the construction and the appearance
of this basilica, generally known nowadays as the Church of the Holy
Sepulchre, is Eusebius' *Life of Constantine*, written *c.* 339. Apart from
that, the archaeological research provides valuable information about
this Constantinian church complex.[70] The building of the church was
started in 325/6 by the demolition of the Venus temple. Not only
was the pagan sanctuary demolished but the site on which it stood
was "excavated to a great depth and the pavement . . . carried away
with the rubble a long distance outside, because it was stained with
demonic blood."[71] When layer after layer was excavated, the testi-
mony of the Saviour's Resurrection, that is Christ's Tomb, was against
all expectation revealed, and "the cave, the holy of holies, took on
the appearance of a representation of the Saviour's return to life."[72]
Subsequently, Constantine instructed the authorities in the eastern
provinces to furnish lavish and generous grants to build a magnificent

---

[69] Wharton, 1995, 88–91. Cf. Biddle, 1999, 70.
[70] E.g. Coüasnon, 1974; Corbo, 1981–82; Gibson and Taylor, 1994.
[71] *VC* 3.27.
[72] *VC* 3.28.

and rich church on that site which had to be superior to those in all other places. To Macarius the emperor wrote that Dracillianus and the provincial governor were to supervise the construction work on his behalf, and that the bishop had to indicate to them how many laborers and craftsmen he needed. The bishop should also consider the marble he wanted to use for the columns, and whether he wanted the roof of the church to be decorated with gold, because "the world's most miraculous place should be worthily embellished."[73] The orientation of the complex was from east to west. The main entrance was at Jerusalem's main street, the *cardo maximus*. This was a *propylaea* access that is likely to have been part of the colonnaded *cardo maximus*. Steps led up to three porticoes that gave admittance to an arcaded courtyard that was in front of the basilica, the so-called Martyrium.[74] Another three doorways gave access to the basilica, which measured 58.50 m. by 40.50 m. and had double aisles with upper galleries on each side. This basilica was richly decorated with gold and precious marble.[75] The apse of the church had a dome that was higher than the saddleback roof of the rest of the basilica.[76] It was surrounded by twelve columns – a reference to the twelve Apostles – the tops of which were decorated by silver bowls that were donated by Constantine himself. Then followed a nice, open, colonnaded courtyard by which the basilica was connected with the site of Christ's Tomb. In the southeast corner of this courtyard was the Rock of Calvary. The site of the Tomb and the Tomb itself were decorated with columns and a variety of artwork, which was described by Eusebius as "like a head of the whole."[77] The structure, or *aediculum*, built over the Tomb stood initially in the open air.[78] The Anastasis, which in its turn covered the *aediculum*, seems not to have been part of the original Constantinian complex – it is not mentioned by Eusebius and the Bordeaux pilgrim – and was

---

[73] *VC* 3.30–32.

[74] These steps are clearly depicted on the Madaba mosaic, which presents a nice, although not accurate impression of the church; Donner, 1995, 90–91.

[75] *VC* 3.36–38. Egeria (*It. Eger.* 25.8–9) also mentions the rich way in which the church was decorated.

[76] It was probably this dome that is depicted on the Madaba map and not the Anastasis, as is often supposed; Gibson and Taylor, 1994, 74.

[77] *VC* 3.34.

[78] For a reconstruction of the form and appearance of the *aediculum*, see Wilkinson 1999, 174; Biddle, 1999, 68–69.

probably only constructed in the latter part of the reign of Constantius II, so in the 350s when Cyril was already bishop.[79] The oldest, but most succinct, description of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre by an eyewitness is given by the Bordeaux pilgrim. He/she mentions the tomb that was only a stone's throw away from the hillock of Golgotha and the basilica that was built there by the order of Constantine; the basilica was of wonderful beauty and had a cistern and a bath, in which children were washed.[80] This bath most probably refers to the baptistery that was part of the church complex and was situated at its south side. From Cyril's *Mystagogical Catecheses* it may be inferred that the baptistery had several adjoining rooms for the use of catechumens to undress, to be anointed and − after their baptism − to be clothed in white garments.[81] The administrative quarters including the bishop's residence, the Patriarchion, were attached to the north of the Anastasis.[82]

The dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre took place in 335. This was very much a state affair directed by Constantine himself, although from a distance since he was not actually present. Like the church complex itself, the consecration was clearly meant as a political message, making evident that Christianity had the full support of the emperor and Jerusalem was a centerpiece of his policy of Christianization.[83] Eusebius reports that by a letter of the emperor the bishops, assembled at the time at the council of Tyre, were urged to go to Jerusalem for the dedication ceremony.[84] Constantine's representative Marianus, members of the imperial staff, and palace officials were in charge of the festivities.[85] Marianus lavished hospitality on the bishops by organizing grand banquets and parties for them. The poor and needy, however, were also not for-

---

[79] Gibson and Taylor, 1994, 77.

[80] *It. Burd.* 594: *ibidem modo iussu Constantini imperatoris basilica facta est, id est dominicum, mirae pulchritudinis habens ad latus exceptoria, unde aqua levatur, et balneum a tergo, ubi infantes lavantur.*

[81] See Chapter 3, 92–94.

[82] See e.g. Wharton, 1992.

[83] Hunt, 1997, 419 ff. Hunt draws attention to the fact that the date of dedication − 13 September − coincides with that of the Roman festival for Jupiter Optimus Maximus, the main deity of pagan Aelia. Notably, the dedication ceremony was at the same time as the celebration of Constantine's *tricennalia*.

[84] *VC* 4.43–47; see also Socr., *HE* 1.33.1; Soz., *HE* 2.26.1–2.

[85] On Marianus, see Cameron and Hall (1999, 331). Cf. Woods (2002, 206 ff.) who doubts whether Marianus was in charge of the dedication ceremonies.

gotten; they profited from the distribution of money and clothes by Marianus. The new church was enriched with imperial gifts, and the assembled bishops presented orations and sermons in which Constantine's piety and the new church were praised, and the fulfillment of what was written was explained. Bloodless sacrifices and mystic ceremonies were held, and prayers for the well-being of the emperor and his sons were offered. Also, Eusebius himself presented an elaborate speech, and he seems to have had a leading role in the various ceremonies. He was, of course, the metropolitan of Palestine and it is therefore only natural that he should have had a prominent part in the dedication festivities, but it also seems that Eusebius had gained in prestige in comparison with ten years before when he was superseded by the bishop of Jerusalem at the Council of Nicaea.[86] A great victory for Eusebius, who harbored Arian sympathies, was undoubtedly the readmittance of Arius and his adherents into communion by the synod of bishops at Jerusalem – called by Eusebius the largest after Nicaea – on the request of Constantine.[87] Notably, we read nothing about the role of Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem at the time, in the consecration ceremonies of "his" church. Nevertheless, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and its imperial, glorious dedication in the presence of bishops from every province of the empire emphasized Jerusalem's prominent position in the Christian world and must have added greatly to the prestige of its bishop.[88]

In his description of the construction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre Eusebius does not refer to either the Rock of Calvary or the Wood of the Cross, both of which were prominent holy objects to be seen in the Constantinian church complex. Eusebius focuses on the Tomb and the Resurrection, for which he may well have had theological reasons. However, it could also be that he did not speak about Golgotha and the Cross clearly, because both added too much to Jerusalem's prestige. Reasons having to do with church

---

[86] At the Council of Nicaea the delegation of bishops from Palestine was headed by Macarius. At the same council Jerusalem was recognized as one of the four foremost sees in the Christian world and its bishops were given a place of honor at general church councils; Tanner, 1990, 9; Hefele, 1894, 404–409.

[87] VC 4.47; Socr., HE 1.33.1.

[88] VC 4.43.3–4 mentions bishops from Macedonia, Pannonia, Mysia, Persia, Bithynia, Thrace, Cilicia, Cappadocia, Syria, Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, Arabia, Palestine, Egypt and Libya.

politics may thus have caused Eusebius to avoid mentioning Golgotha
and the finding of the Cross.[89] However, in his letter to Macarius
about the building of the church, Constantine speaks of τὸ γνώρισμα
τοῦ ἁγιωτάτου ἐκείνου πάθους, "the token of that holiest passion,"
which had long been hidden under the ground and had now been
found.[90] These words are, according to several scholars, a reference
to the Cross; it would have been the discovery of the *lignum crucis*
that roused Constantine's great enthusiasm for Jerusalem and its holy
sites, and which wondrous occurrence was occasion for Constantine
to write to Macarius telling the bishop to spare no expenditure on
the construction and decoration of the church.[91] It is, of course, very
well possible that pieces of wood were found during the construc-
tion work, which initially involved digging activities, and that sub-
sequently these chunks of wood were quickly considered to be that
of the Cross. That would at least explain Cyril's remark in his *Letter
to Constantius* that the Cross was found in Constantine's time.[92] A
plausible sequence of events is that the construction of the basilica
started because the Tomb of Christ was thought to have been cov-
ered by the temple of Venus. During the excavation work of uncov-
ering the Tomb, the Cross was found, or at least a chunk of wood
held to be Cross.[93] Eusebius focuses for theological reasons on the
Tomb and Resurrection, and only in obscure terms does he refer
to the revelation of the Cross. However, it is evident that Constantine's
basilica "was as much the church of the Cross as it was of the Holy
Sepulchre."[94]

   Tradition, and in particular the legend of the discovery of the
Cross, holds Helena, Constantine's mother, responsible for the ini-
tiative to build the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. Although she was
present in Jerusalem *c.* 326 when the construction had just started,

---

[89] For this view see in particular Rubin, 1982.
[90] *VC* 3.30.1.
[91] Rubin, 1982; Drake, 1985. For a fuller survey of the scholarly discussion on
this, see e.g. Drijvers 1992, 83–87 and Hunt, 1997, 413–16.
[92] *Epist. ad Const.* 3. Remarkably, the Bordeaux pilgrim does not mention the
Cross, which is for Hunt (1997, 415) reason to remark that we "must at least
acknowledge the possibility that Eusebius . . . did not mention the relic because it
was not yet there to mention."
[93] Interesting in this respect is Socrates' remark (*HE* 1.17.3) that three crosses,
including that of Christ, were found (by Helena) in Christ's Tomb. Soz. (*HE* 2.1.5)
reports that at no great distance from the Tomb the three crosses were found.
[94] Hunt, 1997, 413.

it is highly unlikely that Helena had anything to do with it, apart from perhaps supervising the building process.[95] The initiative was Constantine's, as Eusebius clearly states in his *Life* of the emperor.[96] It was different for other churches that were built in the bishopric of Jerusalem in Constantine's time: the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem and the Eleona Church on the Mount of Olives. According to Eusebius, these shrines were consecrated by Helena.[97] It is, however, improbable that Helena was allowed to do that without the consent of her son, and it is more likely that she just carried out Constantine's policy and plans for church building in Palestine.[98]

The Constantinian basilica symbolized the New Jerusalem and was meant to confront and compete with polytheistic Jerusalem, but even probably more so with Old – Jewish – Jerusalem.[99] Illustrative in this respect is, for instance, the taking over of Temple traditions by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, such as the annual commemoration of the dedication ceremony. The latter was much like the consecration ceremony of the Temple in the time of Solomon, the Encaenia.[100] Meanwhile the Temple Mount remained a desolate area, serving to emphasize the defeat of Judaism. Moreover, anti-Judaism increased in fourth-century Jerusalem. Cyril, who was an ardent promoter of a Christian Jerusalem, definitely had his share in the creation of an anti-Jewish climate. His *Catechetical Lectures* clearly betray his anti-Jewish feelings.[101] It is therefore not surprising that, according to a later tradition, the remains of James, first bishop of the Jerusalem Church and a victim of Jewish persecution – James had been stoned to death by the Sadducees and Pharisees in 62 C.E. –,

---

[95] In the early 380s Egeria mentions that the church was built by Constantine *sub praesentia matris suae*; *It. Eger.* 25.9. Hunt (1997, 417) thinks it "hardly credible" that Helena should have nothing to do with this imperial project. For Helena, Jerusalem, and the Legend of the Cross, see Chapter 6, 167–75.

[96] *VC* 3.25, 29.1.

[97] *VC* 3.43.

[98] Drijvers, 1992, 63–64. His mother-in-law Eutropia was also an agent of Constantine's policy. She visited Mamre, near Hebron, and informed Constantine about pagan practices taking place on this holy site, where Abraham had entertained angels (Gen. 18:1–33). Subsequently the emperor gave orders for constructing a church on the spot; *VC* 3.51–53.

[99] *VC* 3.33.1–2. Hunt (1997, 422–23) rightly points out that there is no evidence that Constantine himself had intended the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as "a blow against the Jews."

[100] Busse and Kretschmar, 1987, 99–100; Wilken, 1992, 97.

[101] See Chapter 4, 100–102.

were found during Cyril's episcopate.[102] Considering his attitude
towards Jews and Judaism, the attempt in 363 by the emperor Julian
to rebuild the Temple must have come as a great shock to Cyril.
Fortunately for the bishop and the Christians of Jerusalem the attempt
failed utterly. Thanks to the interference of God, if we are to believe
the Christian sources, Constantine's New Jerusalem was saved.

After Constantine had taken the initiative, church building con-
tinued in the fourth century and Jerusalem's urban space saw an
increase in Christian architecture. In particular the Mount of Olives
was a popular building site. Churches arose at Gethsemane and the
Bethany Cave or Lazarium, where Lazarus had risen from the dead.
At the site recognized as that of the Ascension the noble lady Poemenia
had a basilica built. On Mount Sion to the southwest of the city
and possibly a center of Christian life in the pre-Constantinian period,
a church was constructed around the middle of the century; it is
referred to by Cyril as "the upper church of the Apostles".[103]

Not only churches but also monasteries became a feature of
Christian Jerusalem and its surrounding area. The special position
of Jerusalem attracted monks and nuns who desired to live in the
monasteries that were being set up at the holy sites in Jerusalem
and its vicinity. The Judaean desert became crowded with monas-
tic settlements most of which were not more than a day's journey
away from Jerusalem. The monastic movement was a major factor
in establishing a Christian topography in the Holy Land and definitely
a major force in christianizing Palestine, and especially Judaea.[104]
The heyday of Palestinian monasticism was the period from the
beginning of the fifth to the end of the sixth century. However, the
first monastic settlements in Palestine date from the fourth century.
If we are to believe Jerome, it was Hilarion who, after the example
of Antony in Egypt whose pupil Hilarion had been, initiated Palestinian
monasticism by leading an anchorite life in the desert of Gaza and
establishing a community of hermits there in the first half of the
fourth century.[105] The first monastic settlements in the desert of

---

[102] Eus., *HE* 2.23.17. Abel, 1919. The (Latin) text of the discovery of his remains
was published in *Anal. Boll.* 8 (1889) 123–24.
[103] *Catech.* 16.4. For these churches, see Taylor, 1993, 180 ff.
[104] For Palestinian monasticism see e.g. Chitty, 1966; Hirschfeld, 1992; Binns,
1994; Perrone, 1995.
[105] Jer., *V. Hilar.* (PL 23, 29–54).

Judaea are ascribed to Chariton, a native from Anatolia. He founded the communities of Pharan, Duca, and Suca, according to the sixth-century *Life of Chariton*.[106] However, the form of monasticism that is best known is that which developed adjacent to the holy sites and which is closely connected with pilgrimage. There is an evident inter-action between the monastic movement in Judaea and the arrival of pilgrims. It was pilgrims who founded monasteries at holy sites or joined monastic groups. Monasteries offered hospitality to pilgrims and pilgrimage was no doubt a source of income for monastic set-tlements. The beginning and the subsequent development of monas-ticism in Jerusalem and surrounding Judaea took place during Cyril's episcopate. It is known that there were monks and nuns among Cyril's baptismal candidates and Egeria also refers regularly to the presence of *monazontes* and *parthenae* at liturgical celebrations in Jeru-salem.[107] Presumably at least a number of these ascetics lived in monastic groups in or near Jerusalem. Most of these monastics and their settlements remain anonymous, but some of them are well-known. It seems that the earliest known monastic settlement was that on the Mount of Olives founded by Innocent the Italian, possibly in the 360s. The settlement was centered on a shrine for relics of John the Baptist. The priest-monk Palladius joined Innocent *c.* 385 and probably others did so as well.[108] Another well-known monastic settlement on the Mount of Olives was that of Melania the Elder. Melania, who belonged to the Roman senatorial aristocracy, had chosen a spiritual life and, after a tour through the Egyptian desert to visit the holy men living there, she came to Jerusalem in 373–374, where, with her ancestral wealth, she set up a double monastery together with Rufinus. This monastery served as a place for spiritual retreat, but also as a center for learning and a hospice for pilgrims.[109] Evagrius Ponticus, deacon of the Church of Constantinople, spent some time at the monastery in flight to recover from spiritual distress caused by a love affair with a prominent lady in Constantinople.[110]

---

[106] *V. Charitonis*, ed. G. Garitte, *Bulletin de l'Institut historique belge de Rome* (1941), 5–50.

[107] *Catech.* 4.24; 12.33. *It. Eger.* e.g. 24.1, 24.12, 25.2.

[108] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 44; Ruf., *HE* 11.28. Rufinus refers to a monastery of a certain Philip in Jerusalem in connection with the remains of John the Baptist; see Hunt, 1982, 167.

[109] For the hospitality offered by monasteries, see Hirschfeld, 1992, 196–200.

[110] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 38.

Melania had a good relationship with Cyril's successor John, who presented her with a relic of the Cross.[111] Unfortunately, nothing is known about contacts between Cyril and Melania and Rufinus, but it is hard to imagine that they did not know each other. Melania as well as Rufinus must have been regular participants in the processions to the holy sites and the liturgical celebrations taking place in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It is imaginable that Cyril visited their monastery occasionally. Another double monastery was founded in Bethlehem close to the Church of the Nativity by the Roman aristocratic lady Paula together with her daughter Eustochium and Jerome at the end of the 380s. This monastic settlement in Bethlehem also served as a center for learning and offered hospitality to pilgrims. Both monasteries, though of Latin origin, probably also had members from the eastern parts of the Roman Empire. The monasteries in Jerusalem and its vicinity – including the one in Bethlehem which belonged to the Jerusalem bishopric – as well as the monks and nuns living there, fell under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop of Jerusalem.

With the fame of Jerusalem as a holy city rising, pilgrims started coming in growing numbers in the fourth century.[112] They longed to walk in the footsteps of Jesus and to worship at the holy sites where Christ's Passion, Resurrection, and Ascension were believed to have taken place.[113] Not only the holy sites from the New Testament were visited and venerated by pilgrims, but also a growing number of places mentioned in the Old Testament.[114] At these sites pilgrims prayed and read the relevant passages from the Bible in order to visualize the biblical past and deepen their faith. Many pilgrims came during Easter time but presumably pilgrims visited Jerusalem the whole year round. Their presence gave Jerusalem a cosmopolitan character, since most of them came from other parts of the Roman Empire: mainly from the eastern provinces, but many also came

---

[111] Paulinus of Nola, *Epist.* 31.1.

[112] Hunt (1982) and Maraval (1985) are the standard works on pilgrimage to the Holy Land in Late Antiquity. Maraval (1985, 251 ff.) offers a survey of the holy sites in Jerusalem and its vicinity.

[113] Hunt (1982, 20–21) suggests that the churches built by Constantine on the holy sites in Jerusalem and Bethlehem were deliberately designed with large courtyards to accommodate the many pilgrims.

[114] On these Jewish sites and Christian pilgrimage, see Wilkinson, 1990.

from the Latin West. Services in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre were held not only in Greek but also in Aramaic and Latin.[115] When the Bordeaux pilgrim visited Jerusalem in 333, the city's space was christianized to a considerable extent. Many features from the Old and New Testaments present in the city and its immediate vicinity are mentioned reverently by the pilgrim from Bordeaux. Prominent of course was Golgotha with the newly built basilica, but east of the city there were the rock where Judas betrayed Christ, the palm tree from which the children broke branches to strew on Christ's path when He entered Jerusalem, the sites where He taught and prayed on the Mount of Olives and the Lazarium. In the Temple area, the landmarks were the pinnacle of the Temple from which the Lord addressed the Tempter (Matt. 4:5–7), the great cornerstone of the Temple (Ps. 118:22; Matt. 21:42), but also the pools of Bethsaida, the remains of Solomon's palace, a piece of marble with the blood of Zechariah (2 Chron. 24:20–22; Matt. 23:35), and the house of Hezekiah, king of Judah. On Sion one could see the column on which Christ was scourged, but also the sites where the house of Caiaphas and the palace of David once stood. There were further-more the pool of Siloam and the walls of the Praetorium where Pilate had heard Jesus' case.[116] From the list of the Bordeaux pilgrim one cannot but get the impression that by the 330s the Jerusalem topography was already christianized to some extent and that these places were visited and venerated by pilgrims.

The number of pilgrims that came to the Holy City is impossi-ble to establish, but the Bordeaux pilgrim and Egeria, who stayed in Jerusalem some fifty years later, can only have been the tip of the iceberg: pilgrimage became a mass phenomenon. Jerusalem attracted pilgrims from different social backgrounds. Among them must have been many common people who remain anonymous to us, but also aristocratic and even imperial pilgrims came to Jerusalem. Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, is assumed to have set the example for other distinguished women to come to the Holy Land. Aristocratic ladies such as Melania the Elder, Paula, Eustochium, Melania the Younger, and Poemenia came to the holy sites in the fourth century; the empress Eudocia departed for the Holy Land in

---

[115] *It. Eger.* 47.3–5.
[116] *It. Burd.* 589–96.

438. The wealthy pilgrims spent lavishly: they built churches and monasteries, and donated large amounts of money to the church. But pilgrims with a common background also spent money on ordinary things such as food, drink, and shelter. Economic activity in Jerusalem increased, thanks to pilgrimage, and this, in its turn, must have attracted people looking for work such as construction workers, tradesmen, shopkeepers, and prostitutes. Some of the pilgrims stayed, adopted an ascetic life, and joined one of the monastic groups that were being established in Jerusalem and its vicinity in the fourth century. Others returned with memorabilia from the Holy Land and brought Jerusalem home with them: a sample of holy soil, a flask containing oil with which Christ's Tomb was being illuminated, or, if they were lucky, a relic of the Holy Cross.[117]

The Cross became by far the most important Christian symbol in the fourth century, and one with which Jerusalem eagerly identified. The climax of every pilgrimage and a moving experience for every pilgrim was to see and touch the Cross, which was kept in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It was on display twice a year: on Good Friday and on 13 September at the commemoration of the dedication of the Constantinian church on Golgotha. The Cross was alleged to have been discovered by Helena, the mother of Constantine, when she visited the Holy Land in 326 or 327, but the historicity of this discovery by the empress is more than questionable.[118] Relics of the Cross had already been distributed over the Roman Empire by the middle of the century.[119] A splinter of the Cross was a highly desirable object; deacons guarded the Cross heavily when on display to prevent believers from taking pieces of it away, as had happened at least once.[120] Apparently the many pilgrims coming to Jerusalem confronted the church authorities with the problem of maintaining security and controlling the crowd.[121] For Cyril the Cross was the symbol par excellence and he emphasized the presence of this direct tangible connection with Christ's Passion in every possible way. Most probably during his episcopate the legend about the discovery of the Cross arose as a means to promote Jerusalem.

---

[117] On the distribution of relics, see Hunt, 1981, and 1982, 128 ff.
[118] See Chapter 6, 167–75.
[119] Cyril, *Catech.* 4.10, 10.19, 13.4.
[120] *It. Eger.* 37.2.
[121] Hunt, 1982, 128.

The growing centrality of Jerusalem in the Christian world resulted in strained relations with Caesarea, the metropolitan city of the church-province of Palestine. Although it is not unlikely that Jerusalem had already held a special position in Palestine and that in practice it was to some extent independent from Caesarea,[122] the seventh Canon of the Council of Nicaea states explicitly that the bishop of Jerusalem was subordinate to the jurisdiction of the bishop of Caesarea, whereas he held a position of honor at general church councils together with Alexandria, Antioch, and Rome. This paradoxical situation naturally created tensions between the two sees and, in addition, relations were furthermore complicated by the fact that the bishops of Caesarea were adherents of Arianism, whereas the bishops of Jerusalem were not. Bishop Macarius may have had a hand in the condemning of Eusebius by the Council of Antioch (in early 325) for his sympathetic views towards the ideas of Arius; he definitely had the upper hand over Eusebius at the Council of Nicaea and managed to gain the favor of the emperor Constantine. Tensions over doctrine and primacy in Palestine between the two sees continued during the rest of Macarius' episcopate and that of his successor Maximus. However, tensions increased and came to a climax when Cyril was bishop of Jerusalem and the see of Caesarea was occupied by Acacius.[123] Also Eusebius' spiritual theology with regard to the holy places, in contrast to the emphasis on the material presence of these sites by Cyril and his predecessors, added to the strained relations between the two sees.[124]

In the course of the fourth century Christianity became visibly present in Jerusalem and its immediate surroundings. Gradually Christianity achieved spatial control in Jerusalem: churches and monasteries became part of the urban landscape, the topography of the city was christianized through a growing number of holy sites and the presence of pilgrims, monks and clergy became a normal feature of the street scene, as did Christian processions. Through its christianiza-

---

[122] McCauley and Stephenson (1969–70, vol. 1, 13 ff.) argue that, at least until 270, Jerusalem was "a second, smaller metropolitan church in the south of Palestine" (15).

[123] See Chapter 2, 35–41.

[124] On the different theological perspectives with regard to the holy sites, see Walker, 1990.

tion Jerusalem developed from a provincial backwater town into a
cosmopolitan city full of hustle and bustle; Cyril himself speaks of
multitudes of strangers from all parts of the world that thronged the
streets of Jerusalem.[125] The Jerusalem Church ascended in a short
period from a rather insignificant community at the beginning of the
fourth century to one of the patriarchates of the Christian world by
451. Jerusalem rapidly turned into the spiritual center of the Christian
empire founded by Constantine, as is evident, for instance, from the
itineraries of the Bordeaux pilgrim and Egeria.[126] However, the dom-
inance of the Christian sources and their Christian centered view of
a Christian Jerusalem should not delude us. Most probably, fourth-
century Jerusalem was still very similar to Hadrianic Aelia Capitolina.
The layout and urban environment did not change considerably and
Jerusalem continued to have its colonnaded main streets and build-
ings such as the bathhouses, theater, circus, plazas, walls and gates.
Christian buildings, like the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, were
fitted into the Hadrianic city plan. Even though it had not been a
garrison city anymore since the end of the third century, there was
still a cavalry division – the *Mauri Illyriciani* – stationed in Jerusalem.[127]
Although, due to the nature of the sources, there is hardly any infor-
mation about the city's administration, it was probably no different
than it had been in the second and third centuries; a *curia*, referred
to by Jerome in a letter to Paulinus of Nola from 395, seems still
to have managed the city's secular affairs.[128] Unfortunately, the sources
provide no information about the relationship between Jerusalem's
secular and ecclesiastical authorities. In the same letter Jerome sketches
the liveliness of Jerusalem, although he himself most certainly did
not like that aspect of the city. Apart from referring to its council
and garrison, he calls Jerusalem a crowded city with its prostitutes,
actors, jesters and everything that is usually found in other cities;

---

[125] *Catech.* 17.16. Nevertheless, Ammianus Marcellinus, who wrote in the second
half of the fourth century, does not mention Jerusalem as one of the foremost cities
of Palestine; the cities that he does mention are Caesarea, Eleutheropolis, Neapolis,
Ascalon, and Gaza; Amm. Marc. 14.8.11.

[126] Elsner (2000, 194–95) considers the itinerary of the Bordeaux pilgrim as the
first Roman Christian text that presents Jerusalem as the center of the Christian
world as envisaged and (partly) created by Constantine.

[127] *Not. Dign. Or.* 34.21 (ed. Seeck, 73): *Equites Mauri Illyriciani, Adiae*. This divi-
sion was under the command of the *dux Palaestinae*.

[128] Jer., *Epist.* 58.4.

every race of the world was gathered there and there were so many people from both sexes that one had to endure in Jerusalem what one sought to escape elsewhere. Gregory of Nyssa, who visited Jerusalem in the early 380s, presents a similar picture: Jerusalem was a city full of sin and evildoing, which included fornication, prostitution, incest, murder, theft, poisoning and idolatry.[129] The reality of urban life in Jerusalem may also be surmised from one of Cyril's *Mystagogical Catecheses* in which references are made to theater performances by actors and dancers, chariot races in the hippodrome, and wild-beast and gladiatorial shows. The preacher, addressing the neophytes, calls these, as is only to be expected, the works of Satan from which a true Christian should turn away.[130] The people that Jerome, Gregory and Cyril are referring to were probably attracted by Jerusalem's growing wealth and the growing economic activity in the city. Due to the christianization, there was a great influx of capital into Palestine.[131] The building of churches, monasteries and hospices thanks to imperial munificence and the liberality of private persons stimulated the economy considerably. Employment increased and artisans, craftsmen, and laborers from elsewhere came to Jerusalem. The pilgrims who stayed in Jerusalem spent money on food, shelter, and guides and hence were another source for economic prosperity. The growing business of relics and other souvenirs from the Holy City was also a source of income. This economic prosperity undoubtedly invited a considerable number of people of various occupations who desired to have a share in that prosperity.

Presumably, Jerusalem remained a religiously diverse city during the fourth century. We hear nothing about destruction of pagan sanctuaries on a grand scale and it is likely that Jerusalem did not differ much from other cities in the Roman Empire in this period in that a considerable part of its population still adhered to the various polytheistic cults.[132] From the *Mystagogical Catechesis* mentioned above one cannot but conclude that polytheism was still very much

---

[129] Greg. Nys., *Epist.* 2.10. In another letter Gregory presents a different picture: in Jerusalem he had met good, philanthropical people who carried in their souls the spirit of the Lord's kindness (*Epist.* 3.1).

[130] *Catech. Myst.* 1.6. Patrich, 2002, 182. It should be noted that this passage can also be considered as a general renunciation of pagan practices and therefore need not necessarily reflect the reality of urban life in Jerusalem.

[131] Avi-Yonah, 1958.

[132] Hunt, 1982, 147 ff.; Walker, 1990, 315; Walker, 1995, 29.

alive in the second half of the fourth century. Jerusalem's bishop warns his audience not to eat sacrificial food or participate in festivals, to have nothing to do with temples where lifeless images are venerated, and not to light lamps or burn incense by springs or streams. The observation of birds, practicing divination, interpreting omens, wearing amulets, and participating in magic should also be shunned.[133] Jews might still have lived in Jerusalem in the fourth century, although their number was probably small.[134] The Christian community of Jerusalem definitely increased in numbers through conversion and immigration, but one may wonder whether they were already a majority by the end of the fourth century. Moreover, one may wonder to what extent the community was unified, particularly with regard to doctrine.[135] The apparently smooth succession by Arian bishops during the three periods in which Cyril was deposed and expelled from the city, does suggest that there were divisions within the community.

This Jerusalem was the city where Cyril lived, preached, instructed and baptized catechumens, and led liturgical processions through the streets; the city that he considered to be the center of the Christian world because of its visibly present biblical past; the city that he promoted in every possible way and that he served as a deacon and priest in the 330s and 340s, and subsequently as bishop until his death in 387.

---

[133] *Catech. Myst.* 1.7–8.
[134] See p. 10 above. The Jews living in or near Jerusalem are not known to have participated in the so-called Revolt against Caesar Gallus in 351. This "revolt", about which much remains in the dark, was concentrated in the northern part of Palestine, and Jerusalem seems not to have been affected by it. For this insurrection, see Stemberger, 2000, 161–84.
[135] Greg. Nys., *Epist.* 2.12 and 3.24.

LIFE AND WORKS

The data for reconstructing the life of Cyril of Jerusalem are restricted.[1] It is generally accepted that Cyril was born *c.* 315. This date is an educated guess based on Jerome's remark that Cyril held his *Catechetical Lectures* when still an *adolescens*.[2] Hence, he must have been some thirty-five years of age. Since these lectures were most likely given *c.* 350 − opinions differ about the exact date of their deliverance − he was born *c.* 315. Also his place of birth is not known. Although a Caesarean origin has been suggested, most authors accept Jerusalem as his town of origin, or its immediate vicinity.[3] This conjecture is founded on his alleged knowledge of the topography of the Golgotha area before the building of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as well as by his politics as a bishop in defending the interests of Jerusalem against those of Caesarea.[4] We know nothing about his background, other than the fact that he had at least one sister.[5] It is probable that his parents belonged to the upper layer of the provincial society in Palestine, and that Cyril, like so many other bishops of his time, was of curial descent. His rhetorical skills make it more than likely that he received a thorough education in the classical curriculum, which was the normal education for men belonging to the urban elite. Sozomen praises Cyril's eloquence and learning.[6] His appreciation for solitary and ascetic life as it is shown in his

---

[1] For Cyril's life and works, see e.g. Mader, 1891, 7 ff.; Telfer, 1955, 19 ff.; Paulin, 1959, 19 ff.; McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 1, 21 ff.; Yarnold, 1981; Young, 1983, 124–33; Quasten, 1984, 362–77; *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd ed., 1997, 442–43; Röwekamp, 1998; Yarnold, 2000, 3 ff.

[2] Jer., *De Vir. Ill.* 112: *Extant eius κατηχήσεις, quas in adolescentia sua composuit.*

[3] Telfer (1955, 19–20) suggests that Caesarea was Cyril's place of origin. However, the arguments for this supposition are not convincing; see Walker, 1990, 32–33.

[4] *Catech.* 14.5, 9. Mader, 1891, 12; Walker, 1990, 33; Yarnold, 2000, 3.

[5] Epiphanius (*Pan.* 73.37.5) mentions that Gelasius, bishop of Caesarea, was the son of Cyril's sister.

[6] Soz., *HE* 3.14.41–42. According to the Armenian *Vita Cyrilli* I 2 (Bihain, 1963, 341) Cyril was not only well-educated in the Old and New Testaments, but was also very knowledgeable about Greek philosophy.

Catechetical Lectures may suggest that he led such a life before he became a priest of the church in Jerusalem.[7] He was probably made a deacon in the first half of the 330s by Macarius, who was the bishop of Jerusalem at that time, and ordained a priest some thirteen years later (*c.* 343) by Macarius' successor, Maximus.[8] As a priest Cyril read the Scriptures, recited the Psalms, said prayers, and preached.[9]

Episcopal elections were often matters of profound controversy, and Cyril's election as bishop of Jerusalem does not seem to have been an exception. His ordination in *c.* 350 was surrounded by confusion and intrigue. Whereas most sources report that Cyril became Maximus' successor after the latter's death, Socrates and Sozomen inform us that Acacius, bishop of Caesarea (341–365) and metropolitan of the church-province of Palestine, managed, together with Patrophilus, bishop of Scythopolis, to eject Maximus and have Cyril installed in the Jerusalem see.[10] Both Acacius and Patrophilus were known for their Arian views, whereas Maximus adhered to the creed of Nicaea. At the Council of Serdica (343), Maximus had joined the party that supported Athanasius and restored the opponent of Arius to communion, and by this act accepted Athanasius again in the body of the faithful when he passed through Jerusalem.[11] From what Socrates and Sozomen report one could surmise that Cyril leaned toward the Arian position. The same impression is gained from Jerome's *Chronicle.* Jerome reports that after Maximus died, the Arians seized the church, even though the dying Maximus had ordained

---

[7] *Catech.* 4.24; 12.1, 33, 34. Mader, 1891, 12; Paulin, 1959, 25; Doval, 2001, 13.

[8] This is based on Jerome (*Chron.* a. 348), who reports that Cyril served as a deacon and was ordained in the priesthood by Maximus. Maximus was Jerusalem's last bishop who suffered from the persecutions in which he lost an eye; Alexander Monachos, *De Inventione S. Crucis* 61 (PG 87/3, 4061).

[9] For the duties of the priests of the Church of Jerusalem, see *It. Eger.* 24.1, 24.9.

[10] Socr., *HE* 2.38.2. Soz., *HE* 4.20.1. On the Socrates passage, see Bihain (1962), who argues that Socrates' information goes back to a Palestinian source (Gelasius of Caesarea?). For Acacius, see Leroux, 1966.

[11] Socr., *HE* 2.24.1–2. In order to restore Athanasius to communion a synod was convened by Maximus (*Apol. c. Ar.* 57, PG 25, 352–53). It seems that Maximus had no right to call a synod since he was under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan bishop of Caesarea; this may have added to the conflict between Maximus and Acacius. See also Hefele, 1896, 183–84. On the Council of Serdica, see Barnes, 1993, 71–81.

the priest Heraclius in his place.[12] In response to this, Acacius and other Arian bishops offered the see to Cyril. In order to become bishop, Cyril had to renounce his ordination as priest by Maximus. For a bribe he was willing to do so, even though renouncement of his ordination was considered to be an impiety against the priesthood. Having become bishop, he demoted Heraclius to the priesthood. Jerome clearly considers Cyril an Arian and explicitly mentions him as one of the Arian bishops of Jerusalem.[13] It is often remarked that Jerome's negative opinion of Cyril was biased and influenced by his hostility towards Cyril's successor, John, for being a follower of Origen and an adherent of the latter's views.[14] This argument is not very convincing and there is no reason for disbelieving Jerome, especially since he lived for a great part of his life in Bethlehem and must have been well-informed about the situation in Jerusalem. Furthermore, Jerome's opinion seems to be confirmed by other sources. According to Rufinus, Cyril received the Jerusalem bishopric in an irregular ordination, adding that Cyril wavered sometimes in doctrine and allegiance.[15] Rufinus' words should be taken seriously since he had been living in Jerusalem from 381 until 397 and must have been well acquainted with the history of the Jerusalem bishopric as well as with Cyril himself.

Socrates and Sozomen clearly indicate that Cyril had the support of the Arians and that he may have leaned towards Arianism, or at

---

[12] Jer., *Chron.* a. 348: *Maximus post Macarium Hierosolymarum episcopus moritur. Post quem ecclesiam Arriani invadunt, id est Cyrillus, Eutychius, rursum Cyrillus, [h]Irenaeus, tertio Cyrillus, Hilarius, quarto Cyrillus. Quarum Cyrillus, cum a Maximo fuisset presbyter ordinatus et post mortem eius ita ei ab Acacio episcopo Caesariensi et ceteris Arrianis episcopatus promitteretur, si ordinationem Maximi repudiasset, diaconus in ecclesia ministravit. Ob quam impietatem sacerdotii mercede pensatus Heraclium, quem moriens Maximus in suum locum substituerat, varia fraude sollicitans de episcopo in presbyterum regradavit.* "Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem and successor to Macarius, died. After him the Arians seized the church; that is, these Arians were its bishops: Cyril, Eutychius, Cyril again, Irenaeus, Cyril for a third time, Hilarius, and Cyril for the fourth time. Of these men Cyril served as a deacon in the Church. Although he had been ordained a priest by Maximus, after the latter's death the see was offered to him by Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, and other Arians if he would reject Maximus' ordination. For this impiety concerning the priesthood he was compensated with a bribe. The dying Maximus had substituted Heraclius in his own place. Worrying this man with a variety of deceits, Cyril demoted him from bishop to priest." Rev. trans. Donalson.

[13] For a more elaborate discussion of Cyril's doctrinal views and the contradictions the sources contain on this point, see Appendix I.

[14] For Jerome's falling out with John, see Kelly, 1975, 195–209.

[15] Ruf., *HE* 10.24.

least non-orthodox views, at the time of his ordination. However, from his extant writings no Arian leanings can be deduced. Did Cyril present himself as a proponent of Arianism, or at least as sympathetic towards this doctrine, in order to gain Acacius' support and that of the other Arian bishops? He certainly had to have the backing of Acacius since he, being the metropolitan bishop, was responsible for the appointment and ordination of the bishops in his church-province.[16] But he probably also needed his support, as well as that of other bishops, because Maximus seems not to have wanted Cyril to be his successor. For election and ordination a bishop generally needed the support of the metropolitan bishop and at least the majority of the other bishops in his church-province, as well as that of the clergy and people of his bishopric.[17] Maximus favored Heraclius probably because he knew that his protégé was pro-Nicene, whereas he was not certain about Cyril's views on delicate matters of doctrine.[18]

There has been much discussion about the date of Cyril's ordination. Often the year 348 or 349 is mentioned.[19] This is based on the date of death of Maximus as reported in Jerome's *Chronicle*.[20] However, this need not necessarily be the date of Cyril's nomination as bishop. Unfortunately, other sources do not provide more precise information.[21] Taking into account the fact that Cyril's *Letter to Constantius* dates from May 351 and is presented by Cyril to the emperor as "first fruits," it is far more likely that Cyril became bishop in 350 or perhaps even in the first months of 351.[22] This date would

---

[16] According to the fourth canon of the Council of Nicaea, the bishop of the provincial metropolis was given power of veto over episcopal elections in his province; Tanner, 1990, 7; Hefele, 1894, 381.

[17] See e.g. Noethlichs, 1973, 32; Hunt, 1998, 267. For a view which gives Jerusalem more privileges and independence in this respect, see McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 1, 13–21. Lane Fox (1986, 505 ff.) describes the many complexities and intricacies involving the election of a bishop. Although Lane Fox focuses on the pre-Constantinian period, much of what he describes probably also applies to the post-Constantinian age.

[18] For a view on the intricacies surrounding his ordination which is more sympathetic towards Cyril, see Doval, 2001, 13–21.

[19] E.g. Mader, 1891, 11–12; Quasten, 1984, 348; McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 1, 21; Röwekamp, 1998, 152. Telfer (1955, 23–24) does not name a date, nor does Yarnold (1981).

[20] Jer., *Chron.* a. 348.

[21] Theophanes (*Chron.* AM 5834 ff.) is evidently wrong in stating that Cyril became bishop in 339/40.

[22] Already suggested by Gifford, 1894, iii; see also Paulin, 1959, 25.

also coincide well with that of the deliverance of the *Catechetical Lectures*, Cyril's first major series of addresses as a bishop to baptismal candidates. These lectures, in all likelihood, are to be dated to the year 351, although the year 350 cannot be completely excluded.[23] Possibly Cyril did not immediately succeed his predecessor, Maximus. As mentioned, from Jerome's passage in the *Chronicle* it may be surmised that Maximus' protégé, Heraclius, occupied the see of Jerusalem for a while after Maximus' death, probably without being formally consecrated, but that through the combined efforts of Acacius and other Arian bishops, Heraclius was forced to abdicate and make way for Cyril.

Although he evidently had Acacius' support when he was nominated to the Jerusalem see, the initial good relations between Cyril and his metropolitan bishop soon became strained. Cyril's episcopacy was dominated and characterized by his difficult relations with Caesarea and its bishop. The problems between the two most important sees in Palestine centered around two main issues. One was about doctrine and the other, and from Cyril's perspective more important one, about authority in the church-province.[24] According to the seventh canon of the Council of Nicaea, the bishop of Jerusalem was considered to be the most prominent one in the Christian world right after the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch: "Since there prevails a custom and ancient tradition to the effect that the bishop of Aelia is to be honoured, let him be granted everything consequent upon this honour, saving the dignity proper to the metropolitan."[25] This decision of the Nicene Council created the paradoxical situation that the bishop of Jerusalem was considered almost

---

[23] See below pp. 56–58.

[24] Theodoret (*HE* 2.26.7) reports that the conflict between Cyril and Acacius was "περὶ πρωτείων". Church provinces coincided in general with the Roman administrative province. The bishop of the provincial metropolis preferred in honor and authority over the other bishops in the province. The Verona list, dating from the beginning of the fourth century, names one province Palaestina, but by the middle of the fourth century there were at least two province s of that name (Libanius, *Epist.* 335; ed. Foerster). The *Notitia Dignitatum Or.* II (ed. Seeck 5–6), dated to *c.* 400, mentions three provinces: Palaestina, Palaestina secunda, Palaestina salutaris. Metropolitan authority in the fourth century probably extended to those provinces named Palestine. When Jerusalem acquired the metropolitan rights in Palestine under bishop Juvenal by a decision of the Council of Chalcedon (451), it is known that these rights applied to all three provinces carrying the name Palestine; see Honigmann, 1950.

[25] Tanner, 1990, vol. 1, 9: Ἐπειδὴ συνήθεια κεκράτηκε καὶ παράδοσις ἀρχαία,

equal to the bishops of the most important patriarchal sees of that time in the Roman Empire, whereas he remained subordinate to the metropolitan bishop of Caeserea in Palestine. It is therefore hardly surprising that this gave rise to tense relations between Caesarea and Jerusalem, beginning immediately after the Council of Nicaea when Macarius was bishop of Jerusalem and Eusebius occupied the see of Caesarea.[26] The seventh canon of Nicaea and the interest the emperor Constantine had shown in Jerusalem were certainly not to Eusebius' liking. There are clear indications in Eusebius' works, especially his *Vita Constantini* and *Laus Constantini*, that he played down the growing status of Jerusalem and its bishop. An example is the fact that Eusebius does not refer to the discovery of the True Cross, which seems to have taken place during Constantine's reign and added so much to Jerusalem's prestige as well as that of its bishop.[27] Macarius, on the other hand, attempted to enhance the status of Jerusalem. Some think that it was through his influence at the Council of Nicaea that the seventh canon was promulgated. The presence of Christ's tomb and other biblical sites may have been underscored by Macarius to obtain a special position for Jerusalem.[28] Constantine's interest in Jerusalem and Macarius' apparently good relations with the emperor were undoubtedly helpful in the bishop's attempts to gain a prominent position for Jerusalem in Palestine.[29] Macarius seems even to have arrogated metropolitan rights for himself by trying to ordain his priest Maximus over the church of Diospolis (Lydda). However, the people of Jerusalem protested since they wanted Maximus to be Macarius' successor. Macarius agreed to this, realizing that Maximus, like himself, was of orthodox adherence and making him his suc-

---

ὥστε τὸν ἐν Αἰλίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον τιμᾶσθαι, ἐχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς, τῇ μετροπόλει σῳζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος. Also Hefele, 1894, 404–409. Edwards (2003, xxxv) makes the erroneous observation that the Nicene council "imposed a Christian patriarch on Judaea in opposition to the Jewish one"; this decree did not make the bishop of Jerusalem patriarch of Judaea nor is there any indication that anti-Jewish sentiments played a role in the position of honor the bishop of Jerusalem was awarded by the Nicene council.

[26] On the conflict, see Lebon, 1924; McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 1, 13–21; Rubin, 1982, 1996 and 1999.

[27] Rubin, 1982; Drake, 1985; Drijvers, 1992, 83 ff.; Hunt, 1997, 413–16. For a summary of the scholarly opinions about the reasons Eusebius may have been silent about this, see Rubin, 1999, 152.

[28] Rubin, 1999, 152–53.

[29] Eus., *VC* 3.25 ff.

cessor would prevent Eusebius from nominating an Arian to the Jerusalem see.[30] Conflicts continued after Maximus became bishop of Jerusalem and Acacius had succeeded Eusebius. In 346 Athanasius was allowed to return to Alexandria. On his way home, he passed through Jerusalem where Maximus, on his own initiative, called a synod of bishops from Syria and Palestine in order to restore Athanasius to communion.[31] Not only was the calling of synods the prerogative of the metropolitan bishop, but Acacius must have felt all the more offended since he was of Arian doctrine and therefore a fierce opponent of Athanasius. Moreover, Athanasius was given a letter by the bishops present at the synod in Jerusalem to congratulate the Alexandrians on the return of their bishop; Maximus heads the list of sixteen bishops who signed it. However, the strained relations between both sees came to a climax during Cyril's episcopacy.

Cyril was an ambitious man who had his own political agenda. He not only wanted Jerusalem to be the most important city in the Christian world because of its biblical history, but he also wanted his own bishop's see to be the most authoritative in Palestine. Sozomen and Theodoret both relate that Cyril aspired to first place in Palestine on the grounds that his bishopric was an apostolic see.[32] The status and prestige of Jerusalem and its bishop were central to Cyril's attitude and actions. The consequences of this were soon to be felt by Cyril and a reaction by Acacius was bound to come. Acacius was no common character; he was not only gifted with great powers of intellect and eloquence, but he also exhibited no want of skill in accomplishing his schemes.[33] He definitely could not accept a challenge to his authority as metropolitan bishop. Acacius thus became inimically disposed to Cyril and, with the support of bishops in Palestine of the same sentiment, managed to depose him. The pretext seems fantastic but may carry some degree of truth (it definitely

---

[30] Soz., *HE* 2.20.
[31] Hefele, 1896, 184; see also Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar.* 57 (PG 25, 352–53) and *Hist. Arian.* 25 (PG 25, 721). At the Synod of Tyre in 335 Maximus was still an opponent of Athanasius; however, a doctrinal issue was formally not involved since Athanasius was tried for violence and sacrilege and not for heresy; Barnes, 1993, 22–25. It is tempting to suppose that Cyril, who was a presbyter of the Jerusalem church in 346, met with Athanasius during the latter's stay in Jerusalem; unfortunately, the sources make no mention of this.
[32] Soz., *HE* 4.25.2; Thdt., *HE* 2.26.6.
[33] Soz., *HE* 4.23.1–2.

makes a good story). In 354 or 355 Jerusalem and the neighboring country suffered from famine as a consequence of which the poor appealed to Cyril for food. Since he had no money to purchase the necessary provisions, he sold a valuable robe – given by Constantine to Macarius to be worn when he performed the rite of sacred baptism – and other sacred ornaments of the church. A man recognized the robe when it was worn by an actress or stage dancer, and inquired from whence it had been procured.[34] He found out that Cyril had sold it to a merchant who, in turn, had sold it to the actress. It was this pretext of misappropriation of church possessions for the benefit of the poor, as well as allegations that he supported deposed bishops by restoring communion to them, that Acacius employed to depose Cyril.[35]

But it was not only the conflict over primacy in Palestine that caused enmity between Acacius and Cyril. As under Macarius and Maximus, it was also a matter of doctrine that drove a wedge between the bishops of Jerusalem and Caesarea. The Arian Acacius probably had every reason to believe that Cyril was on the same side on the matter of christology when he ordained him. Although Cyril's position is not quite clear, there are various indications that in his early years as bishop he was not a strict adherent of orthodoxy.[36] This changed, however, and Cyril seems to have become more and more opposed to Arianism, which was another pretext for Acacius to depose Cyril.[37]

---

[34] Soz., *HE* 4.25.1–4; Thdt., *HE* 2.27.1–2. According to Bihain (1962a) the passages of Sozomen and Theodoret go back to a common source: a passage in the *Contra Eunomium* of Theodore of Mopsuestia. 'Embellishment' of this report, in particular concerning the details about the robe, by those hostile to Cyril is not impossible.

[35] Sozomen (*HE* 4.25.1) reports that Cyril was removed from office because he had admitted the deposed bishops, Basil of Ancyra and George of Laodicea, as well as Eustathius of Sebaste and Elpidius of Satala, to communion. The latter two opposed the decrees enacted by the Arian dominated synod of Melitene. As maintained by Sozomen, Cyril himself had been present at Melitene; it is not known, however, exactly when this synod was held.

[36] See Appendix I.

[37] As appears from the proceedings of the Synod of Seleucia of 359 – for which see below –, Acacius supported Arianism in its *homoian* form, meaning that he believed that Christ was "like unto the Father". Cyril was or became a supporter of the more orthodox *homoiousianism* according to which Christ was like the Father according to his nature. Mader (1891, 18–19) thinks Cyril was charged with being an adherent of Sabellianism: "Der Vorwurf des Akacius gegen Cyrill kann nur auf

For about two years, out of fear according to Socrates, Cyril refused the repeated summons by Acacius to appear before a synod of Palestinian bishops to account for his selling of church property.[38] In 357 he was finally deposed by the synod *in absentia* and the Jerusalem see was taken over by Eutychius of Eleutheropolis.[39] Thus began Cyril's first exile.

Theodoret reports that Cyril first went to Antioch and then to Tarsus, where he was received with open arms by bishop Silvanus.[40] Apparently the two men got along very well. Silvanus allowed Cyril to teach and to take part in the ministrations of the church, much to his guest's delight as well as that of the Christians in Tarsus who greatly enjoyed the teaching of the exiled Jerusalem bishop. When Acacius became aware of Cyril's activities in Tarsus he wrote to Silvanus requesting that he prohibit Cyril from teaching, but Silvanus was not willing to do so.[41]

Upon his deposition Cyril had appealed to the emperor Constantius II to have his case brought before a greater synod since he held that he had not been dismissed by all bishops but only by Acacius and his followers.[42] This was an extraordinary act since no clergyman ever before had gone to a secular judge in order to appeal a decision made by an ecclesiastical court (the synod). The emperor

---

Sabellianismus gelautet haben, wie ja in den Augen der Arianer jeder Orthodoxe ein Sabellianer war."

[38] Socr., *HE* 2.40.38–40.

[39] Jer., *Chron.* a. 348. Epiphanius (*Pan.* 73.23.7) says of Eutychius that he had learned the orthodox creed from Maximus Confessor and that he was orthodox for a while but joined the Acacian party out of fear that he would lose his see. Cyril and Eutychius may have known each other when they both were priests in Jerusalem under Maximus. There was hatred between the two at least at the time of the Synod of Seleucia (359); Epiph., *Pan.* 73.27.8. McCauley and Stephenson (1969–70, vol. 1, 28) suggest that the enmity between Eutychius and Cyril may have been due to Cyril's possible interference in Eutychius' diocese which he may have considered to belong in his sphere of influence.

[40] Thdt., *HE* 2.26.7. Theodoret mentions that Cyril found Antioch without a pastor; possibly Cyril also did some pastoral work in Antioch, as he did in Tarsus.

[41] Thdt., *HE* 2.26.7–8. The Armenian *Vita Cyrilli* I 7–9 (Bihain, 1963, 343) reports that Cyril was able to convert Arians and Manichaeans to the orthodox faith while in Tarsus. It furthermore mentions that Acacius personally went to Tarsus instead of writing a letter to prevent Cyril from teaching there.

[42] According to Socrates (*HE* 2.40.40–41), Cyril was the first and only clergyman who appealed to the emperor, a secular judge, and did therefore not keep to ecclesiastical customs.

gave his sanction to Cyril's appeal. In 359 he ordered the bishops
of the Eastern Church to assemble in "Rugged" Seleucia, a town in
Isauria, to debate contested points of the faith, "and then to turn
their attention to the complaints of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, and
of other bishops who had remonstrated against the injustice of the
decrees of deposition and banishment which had been issued against
them, and to examine the legality of various sentences which had
been enacted against other bishops."[43] Some 160 bishops assembled
in Seleucia at the end of September 359. In spite of the fact that
the synod was supervised by Leonas, a representative of Constantius,
and Lauricius, commander-in-chief of the troops in Isauria, the delib-
erations proceeded in a chaotic way. Polemics centered around two
issues, namely doctrine and the presence of the deposed bishops, like
Cyril, at these deliberations. The confusion was augmented by the
fact that Constantius' letters were ambiguous as to which topic should
be treated first. This is not the place to go into detail about the
meeting of the Seleucia synod. Important in this respect is that, from
the sources, it appears that the controversy between Acacius and
Cyril seems to have had a great impact on the deliberations.[44] Acacius
headed the Arian party, which did not want matters of doctrine to
be discussed in the presence of deposed bishops, whereas Cyril had
associated himself with the party led by Silvanus of Tarsus, Basil of
Ancyra, Eustathius and George of Laodicea. This party took a more
favorable stance towards the Nicene Creed, although their views were
not strictly *homoousion* but rather *homoiousian*. The impression gained
from Cyril's relationship with Silvanus of Tarsus and the support he
received from other *homoiousian* bishops is that Cyril was part of a
network of like-minded bishops outside Palestine. Acacius' party con-
stituted a minority, numbering only some thirty-six bishops. After
long disputations about a formula of faith – Acacius and his friends
even presented a new creed – on which no agreement could be
reached, the Acacian party left the synod and refused to deliberate,

---

[43] Soz., *HE* 4.17.1. For the Synod of Seleucia, see also ibid., 4.22; Socr., *HE*
2.39–40; Thdt., *HE* 2.26. Cf. also Epiph., *Pan.* 73.23.2 ff. On the details of the
christological debates at Seleucia and its western counterpart, the synod of Rimini,
Athanasius has written elaborately in his *De Synodis*. On the synod of Seleucia, see
further e.g. Hefele, 1896, 261–71, and Barnes, 1993, 145–48.

[44] Cf. McCauley and Stephenson (1969–70, vol. 1, 27) who think that Theodoret,
especially, places too much emphasis on the Acacius-Cyril controversy, which makes
it seem as if it had been the dominant theme of the synod.

even though they were repeatedly solicited to do so, on the second main issue of the synod, that is the cases of the deposed bishops. As a consequence, Cyril and several others were reinstalled in their sees without opposition, and Acacius as well as many of his associates were deposed and excommunicated. This was of course unacceptable to Acacius, who, having traveled from Seleucia to Constantinople, succeeded in convincing Constantius, who leaned closely toward the point of view of the Arians, to depose Cyril again. On this occasion, Acacius seems to have told Constantius about the robe, given by Constantine to the Jerusalem church, that Cyril had sold and that had fallen into the hands of an actress. The emperor seems to have been furious about it and gave orders that Cyril should be sent into exile again.[45]

In the autumn of 359, after the meeting of the Synod of Seleucia, Cyril went back to Jerusalem to take over the bishopric again from Eutychius. He seems to have taken advantage of the deposal and absence of Acacius by intervening in the affairs of Caesarea and by consecrating a certain Philumen to replace Acacius.[46] With Acacius away in Constantinople and undoubtedly strengthened by the support of the bishops present at the Synod of Seleucia, it seems that Cyril saw his opportunity to appropriate primacy in Palestine and metropolitan jurisdiction. However, Cyril's moment of glory was of short duration. Due to the machinations of Acacius at the imperial court in Constantinople, Cyril was deposed again by the Council of Constantinople in 360.[47] Unfortunately, the sources leave us uninformed about where exactly he spent his second period of exile.[48] The see of Jerusalem was taken over by Irenaeus, a member of the Acacian party.[49]

---

[45] Thdt., *HE* 2.27.1–2; cf. Soz., *HE* 4.25.3–4.

[46] Epiph., *Pan.* 73.37.5. Telfer, 1955, 26–27.

[47] Socr., *HE* 2.42.6.; Soz., *HE* 4.25.1.

[48] Telfer (1955, 27) suggests that Cyril's place of exile lay north of Antioch, based on a story told by Theodoret (*HE* 3.14.10). According to Theodoret, Meletius, bishop of Antioch, had handed over to Cyril a young Christian boy in order to take him to Palestine, where he would be safe from his father who was a pagan priest. Theodoret situates this story during the festival at Daphne in which Julian the Apostate also participated. Although this story may be true, it is not likely that it happened when Cyril came through Antioch on his return from his second exile, since Julian only arrived in Antioch in June or July of 362 (Kienast, 1996, 323). Then eight or nine months would have elapsed since Julian became emperor and before Cyril went back to Jerusalem; this is unlikely.

[49] See n. 12 above.

Cyril's occupancy of the Jerusalem see has always been closely connected with the doctrinal stance of the reigning emperor. Luckily for Cyril, Constantius died on 3 November 361 and his successor Julian the Apostate (361–363) tried to revive the ancestral cults and was not interested in the various doctrinal views and disputations in the Eastern Church. He proclaimed universal religious toleration, canceled all banishments, and allowed bishops exiled by the Council of Constantinople to take up their sees again. Apparently, Cyril was popular with the people of Jerusalem since Irenaeus seems to have given over his see to Cyril without the slightest resistance.[50] During this third period of his episcopacy Cyril, for the first time in his life, was faced with the policies of a non-Christian emperor. The impact of Julian's program for dechristianization of the Roman Empire was felt also, and perhaps particularly, in Jerusalem. In 363 Cyril was confronted with an event that must have made a deep impression on him: the attempt to restore the Jewish Temple. Many sources relate this event, but Cyril seems to have kept silent. This undertaking, which eventually failed, must have been felt as a real threat to the Christianity of Jerusalem both by Cyril and Jerusalem's Christian community. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that no traces are to be found in Cyril's writings about the rebuilding of the Temple, unless a fairly recently discovered letter, in Syriac, ascribed to Cyril, about the event is taken into account. Cyril's alleged silence and this Syriac letter need to and will be scrutinized more closely than they have been thus far.[51]

Apart from the major event of the attempted rebuilding of the Temple, Cyril's episcopacy and see were not threatened. Julian died after an eighteen-month reign and was succeeded by Jovian (363–364), who, considered to be an adherent of Nicene orthodoxy (*homoousianism*), left Cyril in peace.[52] During the first years of the reign of Valens, emperor of the eastern provinces of the Empire (364–378) while his brother Valentinian I ruled the western provinces (364–375), the sit-

---

[50] His good relations with the common people of Jerusalem (see below Chapter 3, 68–69) seem to have provided Cyril with a sound powerbase in his bishopric.

[51] See Chapter 5.

[52] It is interesting that during Jovian's reign Acacius operated no less mundane than Cyril supposedly had done in order to become bishop of Jerusalem. Wanting to remain in power as metropolitan bishop Acacius switched camps and, together with many other bishops, signed a declaration in favor of the *homoousian* creed; Socr., *HE* 3.25.18; see also Rubin, 1999, 153.

uation remained the same for Cyril. Valens was in the first two years
of his reign rather indifferent on matters of heresy.[53] As a conse-
quence of that, Cyril, when his rival Acacius died in 365, seems to
have been able to exert some sort of metropolitan rights. In the
conflicts that ensued, after Acacius' death, on the matter of his suc-
cession, Cyril was able to consecrate Philumen again. When he was
deposed by the Acacians, now headed by Eutychius, and replaced
by the elderly Cyril, Cyril managed to nominate his sister's son,
Gelasius, to the see of Caesarea. Gelasius, however, was also deposed
and replaced by a certain Euzoïus,[54] but he managed to regain his
see when Theodosius I became emperor in 379.[55] Soon, however,
Cyril was confronted with the religious policy of Valens which favored
the Arians. In 366 Valens was baptized by Eudoxius, the Arian
(*homoian*) bishop of Constantinople. Eudoxius was behind Valens'
religious policy and it was soon after his baptism that the eastern
emperor began openly to favour the Arians.[56] As a consequence non-
Arian bishops were deposed. Sozomen relates that the orthodox were
ejected from their churches, maltreated, or in some other way
harassed.[57] It is generally held that Cyril was a victim of Valens'
religious policy. According to Socrates and Sozomen, as well as
Jerome's *On Illustrious Men*, Cyril was deposed and replaced succes-
sively by Erennius, Heraclius, and Hilarius until the reign of Theodosius
when he was restored again to his see. This information is corrob-
orated by that given in Jerome's *Chronicle*, where is mentioned that
Cyril was deposed three times.[58] However, Cyril was not banished
for the whole period of Valens' reign. This may be surmised
from various scattered remarks by Socrates and Sozomen.[59] At the

---

[53] For Valens' religious policy, see Lenski, 2002, 242–63.

[54] Euzoïus was excommunicated in the reign of Theodosius I. He was a man of
some literary renown and endeavored to preserve the famous library of Caesarea
which had greatly deteriorated; Jer., *De Vir. Ill.* 113.

[55] Epiph., *Pan.* 73.37.5.

[56] For Eudoxius' influence on Valens, see Lenksi, 2002, 243–46.

[57] Soz., *HE* 6.9–10, 12, 14, 18.

[58] Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.* 112) reports that Cyril was excommunicated many times,
but finally reinstated under the emperor Theodosius; Socr., *HE* 2.45.17–18; Soz.,
HE 4.30.3. See also Armenian *Vita Cyrilli* I 13–14 (Bihain, 1963, 344–45). One
wonders whether the mentioned Heraclius is the same one Maximus appointed as
his successor as mentioned by Jerome in *Chron.* a. 348; see n. 12 above.

[59] Remarkably enough, Theodoret, our other important source on religious impe-
rial policy, mentions nothing about a banishment of Cyril during Valens' reign.

beginning of his description of Valens' reign Socrates mentions that Cyril "was again constituted over the church at Jerusalem", while adding that the Arians or Homoians Euzoïus and Eudoxius were bishops at respectively Antioch and Constantinople, and that the Homoousians were divided and minorities in these cities.[60] Although Socrates is unclear with regard to chronology, it is most likely that he refers to the period of 364–366 when Cyril was allowed by Valens to retain his see. When Theodosius became emperor in 379 Socrates observed that Cyril was still in possession of his see.[61] From this remark it may be concluded that Cyril returned as bishop of Jerusalem when Valens was still emperor. The same may be concluded from Sozomen who states that when Theodosius became emperor "all the churches of the East, with the exception of that of Jerusalem, were in the hand of Arians".[62] It seems therefore that Cyril, after having been left alone by Valens in the period 364–366, was exiled at the end of 366 or early 367 as a consequence of the emperor's policy against non-Arians or non-Homoians. He was replaced by the three successive bishops mentioned by Socrates and Sozomen, but, as may be inferred from the remarks made by the same church historians, he returned to Jerusalem while Valens still reigned. This, then, must have happened after *c.* 376 since Hilarius at that time still occupied the Jerusalem see, as appears from Epiphanius' *Panarion*.[63] In 377 Valens abandoned his policy against non-Arians and seems to have issued a law that allowed exiled bishops and priests to be recalled from exile.[64] Probably Cyril profited from this new policy, returned to Jerusalem and was able to regain his see. As to where Cyril spent his third period of exile, the longest of the three, the sources leave us in the dark.

Details about the last seven or eight years of Cyril's episcopacy are not known. A major event during this period, however, was the Council of Constantinople of 381.[65] When Gratian appointed

---

[60] Socr., *HE* 4.1.15–16.

[61] Socr., *HE* 5.3.1.

[62] Soz., *HE* 7.2.2.

[63] *Pan.* 66.20.3: "And there have been eight bishops from that time [i.e. from the time of Mani] until the present: Bazas, Hermo, Macarius, Maximus, Cyril, Herennis, Cyril once more, and Hilarion, the present occupant of the see, who is accused of consorting with the Arians."

[64] Jer., *Chron.* a. 378; Ruf., *HE* 11.13; Lenski, 2002, 261.

[65] On this council, see Socr., *HE* 5.8; Soz., *HE* 7.7, 9; Thdt., *HE* 5.8–9; Theoph., *Chron.* AM 5876; Marcellinus, *Chron.* a. 381. Hefele, 1896, 340–74.

Theodosius emperor over the eastern part of the Roman Empire, the new emperor made it one of his primary duties to end the religious disunity among the Christians in the East. Political reasons – discussions over the right faith were not a stimulus for political stability – may have been the most important motivation, but Theodosius may also have had religious reasons. He himself was an adherent of the Nicene orthodoxy and he wanted the faith, as established in Nicaea in 325, reconfirmed. In order to accomplish his goal and to put an end to Arianism, he assembled a council at Constantinople in May 381. This council became known in history as the Second Ecumenical Council – the first one being of course that of Nicaea – even though only Oriental bishops were present. Some 150 bishops, who considered themselves orthodox, and thirty-six Arians attended the council. Of the orthodox bishops the most prominent were Meletius of Antioch; Gregory of Nazianzus, bishop of Constantinople; Timothy of Alexandria; and Cyril of Jerusalem. Cyril is mentioned by both Socrates and Sozomen, as well as by Theodoret, as one of the foremost bishops present at this council. Cyril of course ranked below the bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, and Constantinople – one of the decisions of the council was that the bishop of Constantinople was next in the order of precedence to that of Rome – but the bishop of Jerusalem was considered to be one of the top four bishops of the East.[66] Of particular interest is that Socrates and Sozomen do not mention Gelasius, bishop of Caesarea and metropolitan of Palestine; Theodoret refers to him only after having mentioned Cyril. Of course this reflects the hierarchy of general councils as determined in the seventh canon of the Council of Nicaea, but it may very well also reflect the actual circumstances in the church-province of Palestine. Gelasius was not only Cyril's junior and nephew, but he also owed his nomination to Cyril.[67] Apparently, when returned to his see, Cyril was able to reinstate his relative in the see of Caesarea. In theory, Gelasius may have been the metropolitan but, in practice, Cyril, in all likelihood, had full authority in Palestine.

---

[66] McCauley and Stephenson (1969–70, vol. 1, 32) suggest that Cyril's influence may have been great, especially at the later sessions of the council, since Meletius had died shortly after the beginning of the council, Gregory had abdicated from his Constantinopolitan see, and Timothy had been discredited because of his support of the charlatan, Maximus, as a candidate to succeed Gregory.

[67] See above p. 43.

The council made a number of decisions, such as that bishops were not allowed to perform ordinations that they were not entitled to consecrate, that each bishop should remain in his own ecclesiastical diocese and not accept a nomination elsewhere, and that the affairs of each church should be subjected to the authority of the provincial council. The main decision, however, was the re-establishment of the Nicene Creed and the condemnation of all heresies.[68] Cyril's influence on the enactment of the so-called Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (NC) was substantial as it appears from the remarkable resemblance between the Jerusalem Creed (J) and the one established in Constantinople. Unfortunately, we do not have a text of J, nor do we know that there ever was one, but the creed as preached in Jerusalem can be very well reconstructed from Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*.[69] The resemblance is so striking – of the 174 words of NC, 100 occur in J – that it is not far-fetched to infer that J was the basic model for the creed formulated in Constantinople and that Cyril was one of the driving forces behind it.[70] His promi-

---

[68] Soz., *HE* 7.9. On July 30, 381 Theodosius issued a law that established the Nicene faith as normative; *Cod. Theod.* 16.1.3.

[69] The Jerusalem Creed, as reconstructed from Cyril's *Catecheses* by Stephenson (1961) and McCauley and Stephenson (1969–70, vol. 1, 60–65), and followed by Kelly (1972, 183–84), reads as follows:

    I. We believe in One God the Father almighty maker of heaven and earth of all things visible and invisible

    II. And in one Lord Jesus Christ the Only-begotten Son of God begotten true God of the Father before all ages through whom all things are made

    III. who came in the flesh (?) (and) was made man . . . (?)

    IV. and was crucified (?) and was buried (?)

    V. who rose on the third day

    VI. and ascended into Heaven and sat down on the right of the Father

    VII. and is to come in glory to judge living and dead of whose reign there will be no end

    VIII. And in one Holy Spirit and Paraclete who spoke in the prophets

    IX. and in one baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins

    X. and holy Catholic Church

    XI. the resurrection of the flesh

    XII. and life everlasting.

In the nineteenth century the Jerusalem Creed had already been pieced together by Mader, 1891, 54–55.

[70] McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 1, 62; Staats, 1996, 81–83, 162–65. Hort (1876) had already argued that the creed, as formulated at the Council of Constantinople, was based on the Jerusalem Creed. Kelly (1972, 310 ff.) is more careful: since the Jerusalem Creed was "a largely artificial construction based on St Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*" (p. 314) a direct connection between the Constantinopolitan Creed and that of Jerusalem cannot be established.

nence and influence at the council must have been experienced by
Cyril as a triumph after all the years of conflict and exile. Cyril and
his bishop's see at last received the attention he felt they deserved
and for which he had fought so hard.

Nevertheless, Cyril's orthodoxy was not yet above suspicion, par-
ticularly not in the view of theologians, otherwise the synodical let-
ter that the council sent to bishop Damasus of Rome and other
western bishops can hardly be explained: "We wish to inform you
that the most venerable and God-beloved Cyril is bishop of the
church of Jerusalem, the mother of all the churches. He was canon-
ically ordained some time ago by those of the province and at var-
ious times he has valiantly combatted the Arians."[71] It is remarkable,
to say the least, that it was thought necessary by the assembled bish-
ops in Constantinople, including Cyril himself, to reaffirm in this let-
ter the validity of Cyril's ordination as bishop and to underscore the
orthodoxy of the bishop of Jerusalem. There clearly existed doubts
about his faith and it makes one wonder whether Cyril had been
in the orthodox camp all his life. This question becomes all the
more relevant because, in their accounts of the Council of Constan-
tinople, Socrates reports that "Cyril of Jerusalem . . . at that time rec-
ognized the doctrine of *homoousion*," and Sozomen mentions that Cyril
"had renounced the tenets of the Macedonians which he previously
held."[72]

Cyril's return to his see at the end of the 370s can only have
been possible when he still had considerable support from the Jerusalem
community and at least part of the clergy. Still, Cyril's reinstatement
may not have been acceptable to all the clergy in Jerusalem. Gregory
of Nyssa reports in one of his letters that he visited Jerusalem, where
his skills as arbitrator were needed by the principal persons of the
Jerusalem church, because there was disorder.[73] Although Gregory
is far from clear, it may well be that the problems within the Jerusalem
church had to do with doctrinal issues. Cyril, now firmly in the
orthodox camp, may have gotten into conflict with his clergy who,
during Cyril's third exile, had served under Arian bishops and may
have been consecrated by them. Gregory's stay in Jerusalem may

---

[71] Tanner, 1990, 30. The letter is also preserved by Theodoret (*HE* 5.9.1–18).
[72] Socr., *HE* 5.8.3; Soz., *HE* 7.7.4. See Appendix I for Cyril's position on Arianism.

have taken place at the end of 381 or in 382 when he was travel-ing to Arabia to handle problems within the church there.[74]

Cyril was probably not present at the Council of Constantinople which was held in 382. Of his last years as bishop of Jerusalem nothing was reported.[75] He died in 387[76] and was succeeded by John.[77] In the fifth century he was canonized by the Eastern Church. In 1882 Pope Leo XIII made him a *doctor ecclesiae* of the Catholic Church.[78] His feast day is 18 March.[79]

Cyril's episcopal career had its ups and downs. Decrees of Arian or Arianizing emperors and his conflict with Caesarea forced him to give up his see three times for a period of alltogether some thir-teen or fourteen years. The last years of his episcopacy were the most victorious: there was no opposition anymore from Caesarea and, as can be concluded from the proceedings of the Council of Constantinople, he had become an authoritative bishop in the east-ern church. Whether he made any progress in his thinking about

---

[73] Greg. Nys., *Epist.* 2.12; cf. also *Epist.* 3.24.

[74] Gregory was assigned by the Council of Constantinople of 381 to seek a solu-tion for the problems of the church in Arabia; see Introduction (pp. 33–38) of *Grégoire de Nysse. Lettres* (ed. P. Maraval); also Teske, 1997, 381. For a long time this mission was thought to have taken place at the end of the 370s, after the Council of Antioch (378). Earlier authors on Cyril have therefore connected Gregory's let-ter with the situation in Jerusalem shortly before Cyril's return. They have argued that at the end of the 370s the Christian community in Jerusalem was in great tur-moil, thereby implying that Cyril brought back peace and order; e.g. Telfer, 1955, 28–29. For a discussion of earlier opinions on the date of Gregory's visit to Jerusalem and his letter 3, as well as the christological differences within the Jerusalem com-munity he encountered, see Maraval, 1987.

[75] In these years, although no evidence is available, he is likely to have had con-tacts with Rufinus and Melania the Elder who resided in a monastery on the Mount of Olives which was founded with Melania's money in the 370s. Cyril may also have been in touch with Jerome and Paula, who arrived in Jerusalem in 385 and settled in Bethlehem; Kelly, 1975, 120–21.

[76] Jer., *De Vir. Ill.* 112: *ad extremum sub Theodosio principe octo annis inconcussum epis-copatum tenuit.* I agree with Nautin's interpretation (1961) of Jerome's calculation of Theodosius' regnal years, based on the *Fastes Consulares*, which means that year 1 of his reign officially began on 1 January 380. When Jerome reports that Cyril died in the eighth year of Theodosius' reign, he implies that he died in 387.

[77] Ruf., *HE* 11.21; Soz., *HE* 7.14.4; Thdt., *HE* 5.40.7.

[78] Mader, 1891, 46.

[79] It seems that shortly after his death Cyril's commemoration day was included in the Jerusalem liturgy since the *Armenian Lectionary*, dating from the first decades of the fifth century and based on a Greek original from Jerusalem, mentions 18 March as the saint's day of Cyril; *Arm. Lect.* No. XV (PO 36, 93). The Georgian calendar also commemorates Cyril; Garitte, 1958, 179.

theology and other matters relating to the church and faith, is impossible to say. His thinking can only be ascertained form his works, and these are limited and all dating from the beginning of his career. It seems, however, that Cyril was more of a politician than a theologian. He was predominently concerned with the status of Jerusalem and his see and theological matters were subservient to this.

A variety of works by Cyril in several languages – Greek, Syriac, Armenian, Coptic – has been passed down through the ages, although the authenticity of some of them is disputed.[80] Undisputed is his authorship of the *Catechetical Lectures*, also called Lenten lectures, and the *Letter to Constantius*; both are mentioned in Alexander Monachos' *De Inventione S. Crucis*, dating from before the year 614, a work that is one of the earliest sources to mention Cyril's works.[81] There is some discussion as to his authorship of the *Sermon on the Paralytic* and the *Mystagogical Catecheses*. Furthermore, there are four additional fragments of homilies that are, however, of minor importance.[82]

The *Sermon on the Paralytic* is the only sermon left by Cyril. It is only known from two manuscripts.[83] Although Alexander Monachos does not mention this sermon, and also the Armenian tradition does not refer to it, there is no reason to suppose that the sermon is not authentic by Cyril. The sermon seems not to have had a particular interest for the Church of Armenia and may therefore not have been known there. Comparison to the *Catechetical Lectures* suggests that Cyril

---

[80] See Quasten, 1984, 363–69. About lost and unauthentic works by Cyril, see also Mader, 1891, 60–62. PG 33, 1183 ff. includes several writings which are attributed to Cyril but which are definitely not by him. Wilkinson (1999, 51–52) suggests that a prayer over the palms before the procession on the Day of Branches in the twelfth-century *Typikon*, based on a passage in Cyril's *Catech.* 15.1, was possibly composed by Cyril. Wilkinson presents an English translation of the prayer.

[81] *De Inventione S. Crucis* 71 (PG 87/3, 4069): Κύριλλος δὲ ἦν τότε ὁ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπίσκοπος, τὸν ὁμολογητὴν Μαξιμωνᾶν διαδεξάμενος. Τούτου σώζονται κατηχήσεις δεκαοκτώ, εὐδοκίμως συγγεγραμμέναι, ἐν αἷς τὸ ἅγιον Σύμβολον ἑρμηνεύσας μνήμην τῆς τοῦ ὁμοουσίου λέξεως οὐκ ἐποιήσατο... Οὗτος ἔγραψε τῷ βασιλεῖ Κωνσταντίῳ περὶ τοῦ γενομένου σημείου (about apparition of the Cross which was mentioned immediately before this quotation). Alexander then proceeds by giving a summary of Cyril's *Letter to Constantius*.

[82] For the fragments (PG 33, 1182–83) see Quasten, 1984, 368–69 and literature cited there. An English translation of them is published by McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 2, 239–40. A homily on the feast of Hypapante attributed to Cyril is spurious.

[83] Bodleian Roe. 25, *xi s.* and Paris, B.N. graec. 1447 [Regius 2030; c. 1100]. See McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 2, 207–208.

must have been the author.[84] The sermon, based on John 5:2–15, is about the Jewish paralytic who for thirty-eight years had been lying by a pool near the sheep market in Jerusalem along with many other disabled. He was hoping to be cured by stepping into the water after an angel had troubled the pool; however, only the first one who stepped into the pool was cured. Since he had nobody to help him, he remained an invalid after all those years. Then Jesus, the healer of body and soul and the bringer of knowledge (gnosis),[85] after having asked the paralytic if he wanted to be cured, said to him "Rise, take up thy bed, and walk." The paralytic was instantly cured, not only in body but also in spirit, meaning that he became a follower of Jesus and renounced Judaism. The main message and practical lesson of this sermon is to encourage non-Christians, possibly Jews in particular, to "give ear to Jesus and 'sin no more.' "[86] Although we know that Cyril had preached elsewhere, notably in Tarsus and possibly in Antioch, the Jerusalem setting of the sermon makes it likely that this sermon was given there.[87] It is not known when the sermon was delivered. The general opinion is that it is an early work. However, this depends on the reading of the last paragraph (20). One reading goes as follows: "But our argument has led us to protract our discourse, and maybe we are standing in the way of our Father's teaching (*patrikēs didaskalias*)"; the other one reads: "But my sermon has betrayed me into wordiness, and I am standing in the way of its practical lesson (*praktrikēs didaskalias*)." If the first reading is correct, then the sermon was given when Cyril was still a priest, since the Father's teaching refers to a sermon due to be given by the bishop. If the second reading is the right one, then it could have been preached either when Cyril was still a priest or after he became bishop.[88]

Cyril's authorship of the *Letter to Constantius*, which should be dated to May 351, is undisputed.[89] Sozomen, Alexander Monachos, and

---

[84] *Catech.* 10.13 and 13.30–31, especially, show resemblance to the sermon; these passages summarize several of the themes mentioned in the sermon. Stephenson, 1957, 147–48.

[85] On Cyril's concept of Christian gnosis, i.e. the saving knowledge of Christ's divinity, and its analogy to Alexandrian conceptions of Christian gnosis, see Stephenson, 1957.

[86] Par. 19. About the anti-Jewish polemic in Cyril's writings, see Chapter 4, 100–102.

[87] Cf. par. 2 of the sermon.

[88] McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 2, 221–22.

[89] The date of the letter has been under discussion but 351 is by far the most

the Armenian *Vita Cyrilli* name Cyril as the letter's author,[90] and the event it describes is a recurrent theme in many ecclesiastical writings.[91] The letter was known not only in Greek, but also translated into Syriac, Armenian, and Georgian.[92] Since it was composed in 351, Cyril had not been bishop for long and it was apparently the first time that he had sought to get in touch with the emperor. As Cyril mentions in his letter: "This, the first offering of a letter which I have sent from Jerusalem to your Majesty, favoured by God, is as honourable for you to receive as it is for me to send."[93] The letter was written on the occasion of an extraordinary occurrence in Jerusalem on 7 May 351.[94] In the sky above Golgotha there had appeared a luminous cross that extended as far as the Mount of Olives. The shining light filled the sky over Jerusalem for several hours and everyone present observed the phenomenon.[95] As a consequence, young and old, men and women, local folk and strangers, pagans and Christians rushed to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre to praise and acknowledge the one true God.[96] In the letter Cyril argues that

---

likely. For an overview of the various suggested dates (ranging from 350 to 357), see Chantraine, 1993/4.

[90] Soz., *HE* 4.5.4; Alexander Monachos, *De Inventione S. Crucis* 71 (PG 87/3, 4069); Armenian *Vita Cyrilli* II 1–5 (Bihain, 1963, 345–46).

[91] Soz., *HE* 4.5; Philost., *HE* 3.26; *Chron. Pasch.* a. 351; Theoph., *Chron.* AM 5847, who adds that the luminous cross was seen by Constantius on the same day; *Cons. Const.* a. 352: *et apparuit in Oriente signum Salvatoris die III kal. Feb. luna XXVIII n. Mai* = *Chron. Min.* ed. Mommsen, MGH I, 238; Burgess, 1993, 237.

[92] The standard Greek text is that by Bihain (1973). English translations are by Telfer (1955, 193–99), McCauley and Stephenson (1969–70, vol. 2, 231–35), and Yarnold (2000, 68–70). For a Syriac version, see Coakley (1984); Armenian: Inglizean, 1964–1965; Georgian: Garitte, 1958, 218.

[93] *Epist. ad Const.* 1 (Bihain, 1973, 286); trans. Yarnold.

[94] The *Armenian Lectionary* LIV (PO 36, 195) mentions 7 May as a special feast day because of the apparition of the Cross. On this day Cyril's *Letter to Constantius* was read as part of the liturgical celebrations.

[95] We may wonder exactly what kind of celestial sign this was, but it seems likely that it was a solar halo not unlike the one Constantine must have seen before the battle against Maxentius in 312; Eus., *VC* 1.28–32 and commentary by Cameron and Hall, 1999, 204 ff.; see, in particular, the article by Weiss (2003). A similar phenomenon seems to have occurred in 419. Marcellinus Comes (*Chron.* a. 419) mentions the appearance of a cross of light above the Mount of Olives in the course of an earthquake. The clothes of those who were subsequently baptized were stamped with shining crosses; cf. *Consularia Const.* a. 419 = *Chron. Min.*, ed. Mommsen, MGH I, 246; Burgess, 1993, 244; Hydatius, *Chron.* XXIII = Burgess, 1993, 86.

[96] Soz. (*HE* 4.5.5) also reports about Jews who converted after having seen this miraculous heavenly sign, as does the Armenian *Vita Cyrilli* II 3 (Bihain, 1963, 346) which adds that the incredible number of 100,000 people was converted in one day.

the manifestation of the celestial cross was conclusive proof of divine support for Constantius' reign and for his campaigns against his enemies. Even the favors that God had endowed on Constantius' father, Constantine, were surpassed. Constantine had been given a mere earthly sign – a reference to the discovery of the relics of the True Cross in Constantine's reign[97] – whereas Constantius was shown a sign from heaven. By this, the prophecy in the Gospel of Matthew (24:30) was fulfilled, announcing that a sign would appear in the heavens heralding the Second Coming of Christ.[98] The celestial cross thus announces the final return of God at the end of time and the establishment of His reign. Constantius' reign is compared here with the divine kingdom. The letter is meant not only to report an unusual phenomenon and to praise Constantius' rule, but also to let Constantius know that this celestial cross was a clear sign from God that He was on Constantius' side in his campaign against the usurper, Magnentius.[99]

The *Letter to Constantius* is an interesting document for more than one reason. As said, it praises Constantius' reign and connects the appearance of the celestial cross in the sky over Jerusalem to the positive outcome of Constantius' war against Magnentius. But there

---

[97] See Drijvers, 1992; Drijvers and Drijvers, 1997.

[98] For Cyril's announcement of the Second Coming in Jerusalem, see also *Catech.* 13.41, 15.1 and 22, and Chapter 6, 161–62.

[99] Magnentius, who served as general under Constantius' brother, Constans, had been proclaimed emperor at Autun on 18 January 350. Constans was killed and Magnentius was soon in command of a large part of the western provinces. At first Magnentius attempted to gain Constantius' recognition as emperor of the West, but his efforts were in vain. Even though Magnentius was a pagan, he soon presented himself as a Christian of the Nicene conviction, clearly in opposition to the Arianizing Constantius. He even made overtures to Athanasius who seems to have thought favorably of Magnentius. Constantius, who was in the East fighting against the Persians when Magnentius committed his coup d'état, was only able to draw his full attention to the menace posed by the usurper by the end of the year 350. He went to Sirmium to prepare for a campaign against Magnentius. On 1 March 351 he appointed his nephew Gallus as Caesar to take care of affairs in the East. Several confrontations between Constantius' forces and those of Magnentius took place during the spring and summer of 351. A clear victory by Constantius' generals was won at the battle of Mursa on 28 September 351. Magnentius, however, was not yet defeated and still controlled large areas of the West. But gradually Constantius was able to gain control over the western part of the Empire. In 352 Italy went over to Constantius' side and in 353 a battle at Mons Seleucus was fought which meant the end of the usurpation. Magnentius fled to Lyon where he committed suicide on 10 August 353. Constantius was now sole ruler over the Roman Empire. See e.g. Barnes, 1993, chap. 12.

is more. The central place that Jerusalem has in the letter and the importance of the symbol of the cross are aspects that deserve closer examination. The purpose of the letter is clearly a complex one and will be more fully discussed in Chapter 6. There is another interesting aspect to the letter, that is Cyril's alignment with and support of an Arianizing emperor. This raises again the question of Cyril's stand with respect to Arianism and Arianizing views.[100]

Cyril's most important and best known works are his *Catechetical Lectures*, consisting of one *Procatechesis* and eighteen *Catecheses*.[101] These lectures were not sermons or homilies, as they are sometimes called, but prebaptismal instructions on the fundamentals of the Christian faith and creed for baptismal candidates, the *competentes* or *photizomenoi* ("those to be enlightened" or "those being enlightened"). As it appears from a note in the manuscripts, the *Catecheses* were taken down in shorthand as they were delivered.[102] Even though the instructions betray careful preparation Cyril seems to have delivered them without a fully copied out text but ex tempore making use of notes.[103] It is not quite certain whether the lectures, as we have them now, represent those delivered in one year or several years, but they appear to date from one and the same year. However, since it is very likely that the same lectures were delivered every year, it is possible that over the years they were modified and updated until they finally were "published." It might be that transcriptions of the lectures first circulated privately and were only published in the last decades of the fourth century.[104] Although it has been argued by some that the *Lectures* were not complete, the general opinion now is that we have the comprehensive syllabus and that no lectures are missing.[105]

The *Catechetical Lectures* were given during the Lenten period. Although catechumens had received these sorts of instructions before,

---

[100] See Appendix I.

[101] In the following, all sorts of liturgical aspects concerned with the *Catecheses* will be omitted from the discussion; they will be dealt with in Chapter 3.

[102] This note was already included in the earliest manuscript – *Monacensis gr.* 394, fols. 198v–199r – of the *Catecheses*; for the text, see Piédagnel, 1966, 14 n. 3; English trans. in Yarnold, 2000, 24. The same information is also included in later manuscripts.

[103] Yarnold, 2000, 14; Doval, 2001, 49–50.

[104] Jerome (*De Vir. Ill.* 112, composed in 393) knows about Cyril's *Catecheses*; the lectures were probably published at that time.

[105] Stephenson, 1954.

Cyril's lectures are the first catechetical texts known. It is not unlikely
that they were a new genre emerging in the fourth century due
to the growing number of Christians. The growth and spread of
Christianity in this era required a better and more universally orga-
nized liturgical calendar, and possibly also a more standardized
instruction of baptismal candidates at a fixed time in the liturgical
year (Lent). In the first centuries of Christianity converts were in all
likelihood instructed on a more irregular basis during a two- to three-
year period of catechumenate.[106] Lent was probably only introduced
at the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth century, but
was already recognized by the Council of Nicaea as an official period
of the Christian year.[107] The Lenten period in Jerusalem consisted
of eight weeks before Easter, at least in the 380s, as the pilgrim
Egeria reports. At the time that Cyril gave his instructions in 351,
the period was likely to have been shorter.[108] Cyril mentions that he
delivered as many lectures on the creed as possible during Lent,[109]
but it is not clear how the lectures were divided over the period. It
seems, however, that there would have been instructions nearly every
day. Lectures 6–8 and 10–12 were given on successive days, *Catechesis*
14 was given on a Monday, and there was an interval of one day
between *Catecheses* 3 and 4.[110] The lectures vary in length and some
topics receive considerably more attention than others. Lecture 18
may be a double lecture which would mean that, including the
Procatechesis, there were a total of twenty lectures.[111]

---

[106] Canon 42 of the Council of Elvira (*c.* 306) mentions a catechumenate of two
years; Mansi, 1759, vol. 2, 12–13; Hefele, 1894, 155. Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*
17 (Dix, 1968, 28) mentions a catechumenate of three years. The same text (par.
20) tells us that those who were chosen for baptism only during the vigil of the
night before their baptism are read to and instructed. For a survey of catechume-
nate and baptism in the second and third centuries, see Dujarier, 1979, 29–76.

[107] See Canon 5 of the Nicene Council; Tanner, 1990, 8; Hefele, 1894, 386–88.

[108] See pp. 57–58 below.

[109] *Catech.* 18.32.

[110] *Catech.* 7.1; 8.1; 11.1; 12.4; 14.24; 4.32.

[111] Telfer (1955, 34–36) presents the hypothesis that the lectures were evenly
divided over the eight weeks of Lent, i.e. forty days when Saturdays and Sundays
are excluded. He suggests that Cyril gave a lecture every day – twenty lectures in
Greek for the Greek-speaking members of his community and twenty in Palestinian
Aramaic for those who spoke Aramaic. Although it is an attractive hypothesis,
Telfer's theory cannot be substantiated and is actually not very probable. It is likely
that the period of Lent was shorter at the time Cyril delivered his *Catecheses* than
at the end of the century when it was eight weeks. We do not know whether Cyril
spoke Aramaic, although that is not unlikely (*It. Eger.* 47.3); his community most

The *Catechetical Lectures* are, as mentioned above, an exposition of the faith and the creed to the as-yet-unbaptized catechumens. The creed as taught by Cyril is not quoted but it can be reconstructed on the basis of the *Catecheses*, and is known as the so-called Jerusalem Creed.[112] The introductory *Procatechesis* explains what the candidates can expect and what is expected of them. They have, for example, to be sincere, to be present at every lecture, to study what they are told to study, and, because of the *disciplina arcani*, they are not to tell outsiders what they have heard – all this in order to accomplish the death of sin and a new spiritual birth through baptism. The first *Catechesis* is also introductory, and Cyril urges the baptismal candidates, among other things, to be earnest, to be constant in attending the catecheses, to banish human concerns from their minds, to be ascetic, and to be zealous in their church attendance. The second *Catechesis* is on "Repentance, the remission of Sin and the Adversary," the third on "Baptism," the fourth on "The Ten Dogmas," and the fifth on "Faith." In some of the manuscripts of the fifth *Catechesis*, the lecture ends with a recitation of the (Nicene) creed which the candidates are expected to memorize, but this may be a later addition. The following thirteen lectures expound the credal formulae clause by clause. The sixth *Catechesis* is on the "Unity of God," the seventh on "God the Father," the eighth on the "Omnipotence of God," and the ninth on "God the Creator." Then there follow instructions on "One Lord, Jesus Christ" (10), on the "Only-begotten Son of God" (11), on the "Incarnation" (12), on the "Crucifixion and Burial of Christ" (13), on the "Resurrection of Christ, His Ascension into Heaven and His sitting at the right hand of the Father" (14), on the words "And He is to come with Glory to judge the living and the dead, of Whose Kingdom there shall be no end" (15), and on the "Holy Spirit" (16 and 17). The final lecture is on the words "And in one holy Catholic Church: and in the Resurrection of the flesh, and in life everlasting."

Cyril's teaching was solidly founded in the Holy Scriptures and the Bible texts were for him the measure of all things. Each *Catechesis* opens with a relevant Bible quotation and Cyril often refers to

---

probably also included Aramaic-speaking Christians. Furthermore, Telfer's theory does not take into account several lectures (6–8, 10–12) that were given on consecutive days.

[112] See n. 69 above.

passages from the Old and New Testaments to sustain or clarify his argument and instruction.[113] Miracles and prophecy are important to Cyril and these are recurrent themes in his lectures. Prophecy, especially, deserves considerable attention from Cyril because it can be directed against the Jews. Polemics against the Jews and Judaism are an important aspect of the *Catecheses*. But this is not the only group the candidates should keep away from. They are also warned against heretics and false teachings such as those of the Gnostics and Manichaeans, and of course the pagans. Surprisingly, Cyril does not name the Arians.[114]

The question when Cyril delivered his *Catechetical Lectures* as we have them, has been the subject of scholarly debate.[115] There are several indications in the sources that help us to establish a probable date. Firstly, there is Jerome's remark that Cyril composed the lectures when he was an *adolescens*, i.e. when he was about thirty-five years of age.[116] There is internal evidence in the lectures that is also helpful. Cyril refers in *Catechesis* 6.20 to the heresy of Mani, saying that it began seventy years ago under the reign of Probus. The latter was emperor from the summer of 276 until September or October of 282,[117] which means that Cyril may have given his lectures between 347 and 352. In *Catechesis* 14.10 Cyril mentions that the month of Xanthicus has just arrived – it begins on March 24th – and that a few days before had been the equinox. In the same *Catechesis* (14.24) Cyril says that the previous day was a Sunday, which implies that the lecture was given on a Monday. This must have been a Monday towards the end of Lent – either the Monday of Holy Week or the Monday of the week before Holy Week since

---

[113] See Jackson (1991) and Saxer (1996) for Cyril's use of scriptural material.

[114] *Catech.* 4.37 gives a nice summary of the groups with which Cyril's candidates should not get involved. They should keep away from Jews, not observe their Sabbath, not attend the divinations of the Greeks, abhor the assemblies of the heretics, and not get involved with sorcery and necromancy. Cyril also urges them not to read the apocryphal books but to keep to the canon; *Catech.* 4.33 ff. Manichaeism, especially, receives a lot of attention; most of *Catechesis* 6 (20–36) is dedicated to it. See further Chapter 4.

[115] See Doval, 1997.

[116] *De Vir. Ill.* 112: *Extant eius* κατηχήσεις, *quas in adolescentia sua composuit.*

[117] Kienast, 1996, 253–54. Mani had already died in 271/2. It may be that Cyril refers to the arrival and spread of Manichaeism in Palestine. According to Epiphanius (*Pan.* 66.1.1–2) Manichaeism came to Palestine when Aurelian was emperor (270–275). See also Lieu, 1994, 53–54.

there were only four lectures to go. It is known that in the years after 347, Easter was celebrated on the following dates: 12 April 347; 3 April 348; 23 April 349; 8 April 350; 31 March 351; 19 April 352. The years 347, 349, and 352 can be ruled out. In those years Easter was too late to coincide with the information provided in *Catechesis* 14 that the Monday concerned was near the end of Lent, at the beginning of the month of Xanthicus, and a few days after the equinox. Thus only the years 348, 350, and 351 are left. The year 348 is often mentioned as the year that the lectures were delivered, but it is uncertain whether Cyril was ordained bishop at that time. It has been suggested therefore that Cyril gave these lectures while still a priest,[118] but this is unlikely. There is nothing in the lectures indicating that Cyril spoke as a priest entrusted by his bishop with the task of instructing baptismal candidates. Partly for these reasons, the year 350 has also been proposed, and has been accepted by several authors.[119]

The year 351 has never seriously been taken into consideration until a few years ago.[120] It seems, however, that this date meets the criteria better than any other year, if one assigns the Monday to the Monday of Holy Week in 351. This would then be 25 March, which is the second day of Xanthicus and three days after the equinox. In order to acknowledge this new date, one has to be prepared to accept that the instructions were not spread over the whole eight-week period of Lent and that they continued through Holy Week, concluding just before Easter. This is contradictory to the information Egeria presents, that no instructions took place during Holy Week. In Egeria's time, that is the mid-380s, there was plenty of time to conclude the *Catecheses* before Holy Week began, since at that time Lent lasted eight weeks.[121] It is very likely, however, that in the mid-fourth century Lent lasted a shorter time, probably three or four weeks. Recent studies have made clear that at the end of the third century Lent was probably a period of three weeks which gradually expanded, due to the developing liturgical program, to an eight-week

---

[118] E.g. Young, 1983, 126; Röwekamp, 1998, 152; McCauley and Stephenson (1969–70, vol. 1, 1) prefer 349.

[119] Telfer, 1955, 36–38; Janeras, 1986, 315–18.

[120] See the excellent short article by Doval (1997). What follows is based on his arguments.

[121] *It. Eger.* 27.1; 46.4.

period at the end of the fourth century. Probably the Lenten period in Jerusalem in the mid-fourth century lasted some forty days.[122] Furthermore, Holy Week might not yet have been as elaborate and overloaded with festivities around 350 as it was some thirty years later when Egeria visited Jerusalem, so there would have been time to instruct the candidates for baptism. The year 351 is therefore not only a possible but also a very probable date for the delivery of the *Catechetical Lectures*. Including Holy Week, Cyril would have needed some three to four weeks of nearly daily teaching, except for Sundays, to get through the complete syllabus. Since *Catechesis* 14 was given on the Monday of Holy Week, the last lecture (*Catech.* 18) would have been delivered on Good Friday, the day before the candidates would actually be baptized. Of course, when the period of Lent became longer and the Jerusalem liturgy developed, this pattern may have been left and the *Catecheses* may have been delivered scattered over a period of six or eight weeks.[123] So when Cyril gave first his *Catecheses* he had been bishop for only a short while. It must have been a major challenge for the newly consecrated bishop to compose and deliver these lectures.

Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures* were a model to subsequent authors who wrote on the creed. Among them were Gelasius of Caesarea, Niceta, bishop of Remesiana, Ambrose and Augustine.[124] But the greatest was the influence of Cyril's lectures on Rufinus' *Expositio Symboli Apostolorum*, written in the first years of the fifth century. The main body of this work is characterized as "a rather free, drastically abbreviated presentation in Latin of St. Cyril's teaching in the *Catechetical Lectures*."[125]

---

[122] See Chapter 3, 74.

[123] The *Armenian Lectionary*, an important source for our knowledge about the Jerusalem liturgy of the second half of the fourth century, provides a Lent of six weeks; *Arm. Lect.* Nos. XVII–XXXIII (PO 36, 95–119). Egeria, as mentioned above, reports that Lent lasted eight weeks; *It. Eger.* 27.1. Baldovin (1987, 90–93) has the interesting suggestion that the *Catecheses* were given on days that did not have stational services.

[124] Gelasius wrote an "Interpretation of the Creed", which was part of a general work on Christian doctrine, and for which he borrowed from his uncle Cyril's *Catecheses*. Niceta's *De Symbolo*, the fifth *libellus* of the *Competentibus ad baptismum instructionis libelli VI*, also took Cyril as an example. The same is true for the *Explanatio symboli ad initiandos* (PL 17, 1155–60), probably by Ambrose, and Augustine's *De fide et symbolo* and his addresses to baptismal candidates in his sermons 212–215 (PL 38, 1058–76). See Kelly, 1955, 10.

[125] Kelly, 1955, 11. PL 21, 335–86 has the Latin text of Rufinus' *Expositio*; an English translation and a commentary are provided by Kelly (1955).

In *Catechesis* 18.33 Cyril announces another set of lectures for the explication of the rites of initation (baptism, chrismation, Eucharist). These so-called *Mystagogical Catecheses* were to be given immediately after Easter when the candidates had received baptism. There exists indeed a series of five *Mystagogiae*: the first three dealing with baptism (including chrismation), the fourth with Eucharistic doctrine, and the fifth with Eucharistic liturgy.[126] However, Cyril's authorship of these lectures has been seriously disputed since the sixteenth century. Many scholars have attributed the lectures to John II, Cyril's successor as bishop of Jerusalem (387–417).[127] It is not easy to make out whether Cyril composed the *Mystagogical Catecheses*, especially since the arguments against his authorship seem strong.[128] The manuscript evidence does not favor Cyril. The oldest manuscript (*codex Monacensis gr.* 394, tenth century) mentions John as the author and there are manuscripts that mention both John and Cyril as authors. There is, however, no manuscript of the *Mystagogical Catecheses* that names Cyril as its sole author.[129] Apart from the manuscript tradition, there is additional evidence that does not favor Cyril. The attribution of the authorship of the *Mystagogiae* to Cyril is relatively late. Jerome, who mentions Cyril as the author of the *Catechetical Lectures*, does not refer to the *Mystagogical Lectures*, nor do the ecclesiastical authors of the fifth century. Only in the second half of the sixth century does Eustratius of Constantinople (d. 582) refer to them, for the first time ascribing them to Cyril, but significantly Alexander Monachos, who wrote at about the same time, is silent about them.[130] Moreover,

---

[126] The standard text of the *Mystagogiae* is by Piédagnel (1966).

[127] See Swaans (1942, 3–10), Piédagnel (1966, 18–21) and Doval (2001, 2–7) for an overview of the controversy through the centuries regarding the authorship.

[128] For the discussion of Cyril's authorship, see Swaans, 1942, 10–42; Piédagnel, 1966, 18–40; McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 2, 143–51; Young, 1983, 128–30; Quasten, 1984, 364–66; Röwekamp, 1992, 8–15; Yarnold, 2000, 24–32; Doval, 2001.

[129] For the manuscripts, see Piédagnel, 1966, 50–59 and 1967; McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 2, 144–45; Röwekamp, 1992, 86–87 and Doval, 2001, 58–79 and Appendix. All manuscripts contain both the *Catechetical Lectures* and the *Mystagogical Catecheses*. In some of them both sets of lectures contain separate titles, naming Cyril as author of the *Catechetical Lectures* and either John, or Cyril and John, as the author(s) of the *Mystagogical Catecheses*; Piédagnel, 1967, 144. In other manuscripts Cyril is mentioned in the title of the *Catecheses* and the *Mystagogiae* bears no separate title, implying possibly that the latter is also by Cyril.

[130] Piédagnel, 1967, 24–25; Röwekamp, 1992, 9–10. Renoux (1972) draws attention to an Armenian anthology containing seven manuscripts of a fragment of the

Cyril (*Catech.* 18.33) announces six or seven *Mystagogical Catecheses*, whereas only five of them are known.[131] In addition to that there have also been observed inconsistencies in style between the *Mystagogical Catecheses* and the prebaptismal lectures, the style of the first being more terse and less direct. There are also theological differences between the two series of lectures and the liturgical practices described in the *Mystagogiae* seem to belong to the end of the fourth century rather than the mid-fourth century. Because of this external and internal evidence many scholars think that Cyril cannot have composed the *Mystagogiae* and consider his successor, John, to be the author, even more so because the lectures are said to betray Origenist leanings and John is known to have been an Origenist.[132] There are also those who do not prefer either Cyril or John but have chosen to leave the question of authorship unanswered.[133] However, there are also scholars who think Cyril was indeed the author of the *Mystagogiae*. They argue that the text as we have it does not date from the mid-fourth century – hence they are not the *Mystagogiae* that Cyril announces in his *Catechetical Lectures* – but that it dates from the end of Cyril's life, somewhere between 383 and 386.[134] Recently, E.J. Yarnold, who agrees with this late date for the *Mystagogiae*, has made a case for Cyril's authorship.[135] He argues that the stylistic differences between the *Catechetical Lectures* and the *Mystagogical Catecheses* must be explained by the fact that the first lectures were taken down as they were given, whereas the latter were from the preacher's notes. Cyril expanded on these notes as he went along. Contrary to others, Yarnold is inclined to underscore the similarities between the two sets of lectures with regard to theology, spir-

---

fifth *Mystagogical Lecture* attributed to Cyril. This very passage is also quoted by Eustratius and therefore may have influenced the attribution to Cyril.

[131] This is concluded from the number of subjects Cyril intends to deal with in the *Mystagogiae* and it is presupposed that every subject is dealt with in a single lecture. This, however, need not be the case. According to Egeria (*It. Eger.* 47.1–2) the lectures were given during the eight days from Easter day to the eighth day, apparently implying that there was a lecture every day.

[132] *Contra Ioannem Hieros.* 7 (PL 23, 360). E.g. Swaans (1943, 42–43), Telfer (1955, 39–40), Bihain (1963, 340 n. 73), and Röwekamp (1992, 14–15) argue that the *Mystagogiae* have Origenist features; cf., however, McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 2, 147 and Yarnold, 2000, 27.

[133] Quasten, 1984, 366; Cross (1995, xxxvi–xxxix) wants to believe that Cyril was the author; Piédagnel (1966, 40) inclines toward John as the author.

[134] Beukers, 1961.

[135] Yarnold, 1978.

ituality, and style rather than focus on the differences. Those differences that remained can be explained by the evolution of mind Cyril went through in the period between his prebaptismal lectures and the *Mystagogical Lectures*. The manuscript tradition is not decisive, according to Yarnold, since the original manuscript may not have had an author's name.[136] Yarnold assumes, as several other scholars do, that John used Cyril's notes for his own lectures. The most plausible hypothesis then is that the *Mystagogics* are the notes of instructions Cyril gave towards the end of his episcopate and these notes were used by John for his own lectures, which may explain why John is considered the original author.[137]

Building upon the work of Yarnold, Alexis Doval has most recently presented a strong case in favor of Cyrilline authorship of the *Mystagogical Catecheses*. In a detailed study in which he compares both internal and external evidence Doval concludes that "the *Mystagogic Catecheses* ought rightfully to be included among the works of Cyril of Jerusalem".[138] Study of the external evidence shows that a. there are no objections to dating the *Mystagogical Catecheses* to the end of Cyril's episcopate; b. the manuscript tradition does not allow for an undisputable claim that John is the author of the lectures and c. the literary tradition favors Cyrilline authorship. According to Doval the internal evidence likewise favors Cyril. A comparative analysis of the prebaptismal instructions (including the *Procatechesis*) and the *Mystagogical Catecheses* with respect to rites of initiation, theology and spirituality and literary style, a comparison of the *Mystagogical Catecheses* and the few extant works of John, and a stylometric analysis disclose a correlation between the *Mystagogical Catecheses* and the *Catechetical Lectures*. Doval's research has made it improbable that John was the author of the *Mystagogical Catecheses*. Also dual authorship is unlikely, and hence it becomes probable that Cyril was their author. Indisputable proof of this authorship, however, is still not furnished, and it is doubtful whether that will be possible.

---

[136] The notes would probably not bear an author's name since they were not intended for publication because of the *disciplina arcani*.

[137] Yarnold, 2000, 32. An additional argument for Yarnold to attribute the *Mystagogical Lectures* to Cyril is their resemblance with Ambrose's *De Sacramentis*. The bishop of Milan delivered these sermons *c.* 391 and he thinks it is therefore more likely that the text Ambrose used was written by Cyril, who had died some four years before, rather than by John; Yarnold, 1975; cf. Röwekamp, 1992, 14.

[138] Doval, 2001, 243.

In the recent past various works have been discovered and pub-
lished, and attributed to Cyril. Cyril's authorship of these writings
is very much debatable and most of these works are almost certainly
spurious. An unedited *sermo acephalus* (in Greek) that is part of the
codex Stavronikita, dating from the beginning of the eleventh century,
has been ascribed to Cyril. With respect to the polemic against the
heretic Marcellus of Ancyra it resembles Cyril's *Catechetical Lecture*
15.27 ff.; this, however, cannot be sufficient reason to ascribe the
sermon to Cyril.[139] There is a fragment on christology ascribed to
Cyril, but also that is unauthentic.[140] Also a letter (in Latin) from
Cyril to Augustine about the miracles of Jerome is clearly fictitious.[141]

Much of Cyril's other work was also known in languages current
in Late Antiquity other than Greek. There existed a lively Coptic
tradition of Cyrillic writings. There are fragments of his *Catechetical
Lectures* in Coptic,[142] but most of the Coptic works ascribed to Cyril
were apocryphal. Among them were homilies on the Passion, a dis-
course on the finding of the Cross, a treatise on Mary Theotokos,
as well as an encomium on Mary Magdalene.[143]

Cyril's works are strongly represented in the Armenian tradition.
Not only his *Mystagogical Catecheses* but also his *Catechetical Lectures* were
known in Armenian.[144] The latter belong to the first Greek texts
translated into Armenian (fifth century). Cyril furthermore appears
in Armenian legends. He was obviously considered to be an impor-
tant saint by the Armenians, given the fact that the only *vita* of him
was composed in Armenian.[145] The interest of the Armenian Church
in Cyril most probably has to do with Cyril's liturgical reforms and
innovations. By the first half of the fifth century the Armenians

---

[139] Aubineau, 1987.

[140] Diekamp, 1938, 10–12.

[141] *Cyrilli Episcopi Jerosolymitani de miraculis Hieronymi ad Sanctum Augustinum Episc.
Hipponensem* (PL 22, 289–326). This letter was also preceded by a fictitious letter
from Augustine to Cyril: *De magnificentiis beati Hieronymi* (PL 281–89).

[142] For the Coptic fragments of the *Catecheses*, see Orlandi, 1974.

[143] Budge, 1915, 49–71, 183–230 (Coptic texts of the discourses on Mary Theotokos
and *inventio crucis*), 626–51, 761–808 (English trans.); Campagnano, 1980; Coquin
and Godron, 1990. Recently Lucchesi (1999) ascribed to Cyril an anonymous Coptic
homily on the twenty-four Elders of the Apocalypse (Rev. 4:4). A homily in Ethiopian
about the ascension of Mary is also ascribed to Cyril; Arras, 1974, I: 1–25 (Latin
trans.), II: 1–33 (Ethiopian text).

[144] Garitte, 1963.

[145] Bihain, 1963.

adopted Jerusalem liturgical practices as is apparent from the old *Armenian Lectionary*.[146]

In Late Antiquity there was also much translation activity from Greek into Syriac and vice versa.[147] It is therefore not surprising that Cyril's works were also available in Aramaic and Syriac. His *Catechetical Lectures* have been fragmentarily preserved in Christian Palestinian Aramaic.[148] References in Syriac manuscripts clearly indicate that at least some of Cyril's prebaptismal lectures were known in Syriac, and possibly some unknown hymns for Good Friday.[149] There is a complete Syriac version of the *Letter to Constantius*.[150] Moreover, there is a most interesting letter in Syriac, discovered in the 1970s, on the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple.[151] Although this letter is generally considered unauthentic, the kernel of it might go back to a Jerusalem milieu and possibly to Cyril.[152]

---

[146] This *Armenian Lectionary*, which was based on a Greek original, honored Cyril. He is considered by the Armenians to be the one who completed the lectionary that was first started by Jerusalem's first bishop, James; Renoux, 1969–71, 175 (PO 35) and, for other references, Wilkinson, 1999, 175–76; see also Adontz, 1927–28. The standard edition of the *Armenian Lectionary* is that by Renoux, 1969–71 (PO 36). Cyril's personal Armenian connections, if there were any, are unclear. He knew Meletius of Antioch (Thdt., *HE* 3.20), bishop of Sebaste in Armenia before he *c.* 360 assumed episcopal authority in Antioch (Socr., *HE* 2.44; Soz., *HE* 4.25.6, 28). Perhaps Cyril spent one of his exiles in Armenia.

[147] See in general Brock, 1994.

[148] For the remaining fragments of Cyril's work in Christian Palestinian Aramaic, see Desreumaux 1997, 21–22, 129–71; Müller-Kessler and Sokoloff, 1999.

[149] There are several quotations from Cyril's *Catecheses* in catenae in Syriac manuscripts in the British Library: Add. 7190, f. 200v from *Catech.* 15.3; Add. 17191, f. 55r from *Catech.* 15.3; Add. 12155, f. 65v (*Catech.* not mentioned in Wright, 1870–72); Add. 14532, f. 42v, from *Catech.* 14.30b; Add. 14532, f. 216v, from *Catech.* 4.31; Add. 12154, f. 15r, from *Catech.* 13.6 (end); Add. 14538, f. 31v, from *Catech.* 15.3. Wright (1870–72, nos. 342.27 and 358.12) mentions some fragments of hymns for Good Friday attributed to Cyril. Baumstark (1928) published the Good Friday hymns from the Syriac mss. Brit. Mus. Add. 14.697 and 17.252 (resp. twelfth and thirteenth century). Both these mss., which are of Edessene origin, ascribe the hymns to Cyril. The authorship, however, is uncertain and under discussion; see Janeras, 1988, 235–77. There are perhaps also some anaphorae in Syriac by Cyril, but they could also have been written by Cyril of Alexandria; see Raes, 1944, 325–63. I am most grateful to Dr. Sebastian Brock for these references.

[150] Coakley, 1984.

[151] See Brock, 1976 and 1977; cf. Wainwright, 1986.

[152] See Chapter 5.

CHAPTER THREE

BISHOP, CITY AND LITURGY

Cyril had been bishop for only a few years when in the mid-350s Jerusalem and its surrounding area were struck by a serious shortage of food. The church historians Sozomen and Theodoret report that the poor appealed in great numbers to the bishop for help. In order to purchase the necessary provisions to save the people from starvation, Cyril secretly sold sacred ornaments of the church and a valuable holy robe, fashioned with golden threads that the emperor Constantine had once donated for the bishop to wear when he performed the rite of baptism. However, someone recognized the robe when it was worn by an actress or stage-dancer, and discovered that Cyril had sold it.[1] Not only the robe but also the ornaments were imperial gifts.[2] This event, which for Acacius and the other Arian bishops in Palestine was the pretext for deposing Cyril,[3] signifies the considerable material wealth that the church of Jerusalem must have already possessed by the middle of the fourth century. Imperial donations but probably also gifts by pilgrims, the pilgrimage business in general, as well as testamentary endowments must have been the sources for this wealth. And it seems that the church's assets only accumulated over the years. Egeria, who visited Jerusalem in the early 380s, hence in the last years of Cyril's episcopacy, notes that on special feasts like Epiphany, Easter, and the Encaenia, the decorations in the Constantinian basilica on Golgotha and also in the Anastasis and the shrine At the Cross were "too marvellous for words." There was gold, jewels, and silk to be seen everywhere. The hangings and curtains were of silk with gold stripes. The sacred vessels and other objects used in the services were made of gold and jewels, and the sheer weight and number of candles and lamps was

---

[1] Soz., *HE* 4.25.1–4; Thdt., *HE* 2.27.1–2.
[2] Sozomen (*HE* 2.26.3) reports that Constantine donated numerous costly ornaments and gifts to the church in Jerusalem.
[3] See Chapter 2, 37–38.

beyond imagination.[4] The richness of the Jerusalem church was too strong a temptation for Cyril's successor John. He acquired a reputation for worldliness and dined off silver tableware.[5]

The selling of church property reveals Cyril's pastoral care for the poor living in the territory under his authority. Taking care of the less fortunate within his community through almsgiving, supplying food, clothing and money, belonged of old to a bishop's tasks, and although, unfortunately, this is the only instance we have of Cyril actually looking after the destitute, it appears from this story that Cyril took this obligation very seriously, and we may presume that he did so on other occasions.

This chapter deals with Cyril's duties concerning pastoral care: his daily tasks and liturgical obligations. Pastoral care concerned a wide variety of duties. A late-antique bishop was in general responsible for the administration of justice by means of his episcopal court, for the ransom of captives, for teaching and preaching, for charity and the social welfare of his flock, for the maintenance of the (orthodox) faith, for the conversion of non-believers, for spiritual guidance and direction, for the ministry of prayer, and for the care of the liturgical duties.[6] Regrettably, the lack of sources prevents us from getting a clear idea about how Cyril operated as a pastor and patron of his flock. Nevertheless, we may assume that Cyril's episcopal duties in general did not deviate from those of other bishops in Late Antiquity. Therefore, the first part of this chapter presents a short overview of the characteristic duties and obligations of a bishop as leader and caretaker of his community, including, when possible, references to the situation in Jerusalem. The second part of the chapter focuses especially on Jerusalem and deals with the role of the Jerusalem bishop as a celebrant of the liturgical services, clearly one of a bishop's most important tasks. Thanks especially to the *Itinerary*

---

[4] *It. Eger.* 25.8, 39.1, 49.3.

[5] Hunt, 1982, 153–54. See also Amm. Marc. 27.3.14 for the luxury with which bishops of Rome liked to surround themselves. For the wealth of the church in general, see Hunt, 1998, 257–62.

[6] See for this the article by Allen and Mayer (2000) which presents the *status quaestionis* of the results of scholarship with regard to pastoral care as well as two case studies on the subject concerning John Chrysostom and Severus of Antioch. Allen and Mayer distinguish seven distinct, but interrelated, aspects of pastoral care: administration, education, direction for daily life, social welfare, mission, intercession and ritualised forms of care (p. 393).

of Egeria and the *Armenian Lectionary*, we are, relatively speaking, extremely well-informed about the Jerusalem liturgy and the bishop's role in the various rites taking place in Jerusalem during Cyril's episcopate. Egeria made her pilgrimage in the years 381–384. She probably was in Jerusalem in the year 384, when Cyril was still bishop, though she never mentions his name.[7] The second part of her account deals extensively with liturgical practices in Jerusalem, though her text has not been preserved in its entirety. It is by far the most informative source for the liturgical practices current in the church of Jerusalem in the fourth century, as well as for the church of this period in general. The *Armenian Lectionary* dates from the first decades of the fifth century and is based on a Greek original used in Jerusalem itself.[8] It is an early form of the later *typikon*, a book of instructions for liturgical ceremonies.[9] The third part of this chapter deals with an important aspect of the liturgy, namely the rite of baptism; it focuses especially on Cyril's role as instructor of baptismal candidates. The pilgrim's account of Egeria and the *Armenian Lectionary* complement Cyril's own *Catechetical Lectures* – in fact the only 'direct' source we have for Cyril's relationship with his community –, as well as the *Mystagogical Catecheses*.

General responsibilities

A bishop was responsible for all matters concerning his community, clergy, and church. Further, the christianization of the Roman Empire, combined with the decreasing interest in Late Antiquity by members of the local elite for undertaking their traditional curial duties, the bishop, apart from being the community's spiritual leader, gradually

---

[7] For the date, see Devos, 1967; Maraval, 1982, 27–39. Recently Hunt (2001) has brought the date of 381–384 up for discussion again; he considers a date in the early 390s not out of account. One of the peculiarities of Egeria's account is that she does not refer to living persons by their names, but only by their functions.

[8] Conybeare (1905, 507–27) published an English translation of the lectionary based on the manuscript *Paris B.N. arm. 44*. A more complete manuscript (*Jerusalem Armenian 121*) was published by Renoux (1969–71). See also Baldovin, 1987, 64–72; Wilkinson, 1999, 175 ff.

[9] For the role of the bishop in these ceremonies the *Armenian Lectionary* is of less interest than Egeria's report and Cyril's *Catecheses*; it does, however, present detailed information about the Bible readings.

became a local patron of his city.[10] Or, as one author has aptly for-
mulated it: "He [the bishop] became the most important figure in
the community, not simply as God's minister on earth, but as its
natural leader in secular business."[11] The privileges given by Constantine
and his successors to the bishops have greatly enhanced the expan-
sion of the episcopal influence in urban affairs, and gradually made
them the equals of the powerful elite in their cities.[12] The bishop
was a new type of leader; he was not rich (or not supposed to be),
and he operated outside the traditional civic power structure. Most
importantly, unlike secular officials, he exercised his power for life.
Moreover, the sanctity of his office added greatly to his authority
and influence. The leadership of the bishop was, consequently, a sta-
ble factor amid the complexities of political life within late antique
urban communities, and added considerably to his share in the exer-
cise of authority in the city. As an urban leader, the bishop's duties
were manifold and varied. Cyril's care of the poor in a time of food
shortage is a typical act of civic patronage and one that was expected
from local leaders.[13] The fact that Cyril could serve as a patron is
indicative of the bishop's rise in status within the Jerusalem urban
community. Unfortunately, we do not know anything about the rul-
ing class of Jerusalem and the attitude of this local elite toward its
traditional duties of euergetism, but it is likely that by the mid-fourth
century the bishop of Jerusalem had become one of the city's fore-
most patrons. After all, the rise of Jerusalem in the fourth century
was due to its Christianity and special place in biblical history.
However, this does not necessarily mean that the bishop overtook
the secular administration of Jerusalem. As in other cities in the
Roman East in the fourth century the administrative role of the

---

[10] For the bishop in Late Antiquity, see e.g. Gaudemet, 1958, esp. chap. 4;
Noethlichs, 1973; Chadwick, 1980 (including the important comments by Peter
Brown); Brown, 1992, esp. chap. 3; Hunt, 1998, esp. 269 ff.; Liebeschuetz, 2001,
chap. 4.

[11] Mitchell, 1993, vol. 2, 81.

[12] For fiscal privileges a bishop enjoyed vis-à-vis his ascendancy in the city, see
Lizzi Testa, 2001.

[13] See for a survey of euergetism in Late Antiquity, including that of the Church,
the chapter "Daily Bread" in Garnsey and Humfress, 2001. On episcopal patron-
age: Lepelley, 1998. Cyril was no exception among church leaders in helping the
poor in situations of food shortage; some fifteen years later Basil of Caesarea did
the same when Cappadocia was struck by famine; Brown, 2002, 36–42.

curiales was still strong; it seems that only in the fifth and sixth centuries the position of the urban elite gradually diminished.[14]

Caring for the poor and the less fortunate – widows and orphans – was the Christian virtue par excellence, and has always been one of a bishop's most important tasks. The bishop was a "lover of the poor."[15] Christian protection of the destitute was undoubtedly one of the main attractions of the church that induced the poor to convert. The bishop's support of the poor led to the poor's support of the bishop and made the bishop a leader of a great part of the urban population. The common people added considerably to his political influence within the urban community. Taking care of the socially less fortunate was, therefore, for late antique bishops not only an act of Christian love but also an act motivated by the desire for prestige and authority.[16] The lower and the middling classes constituted the bishop's power base within the urban community. Cyril must have realized the political importance of having a good relationship with these classes of the Jerusalem community, which is why he came to their aid as in the case of the food shortage. He in turn was appreciated by the common people, who supported him. The fact that Cyril was able to return to Jerusalem to take up his see again after each of his three exiles, may be an indication for that support.

While their importance as urban magnates and patrons increased, bishops increasingly interceded with the imperial authorities at the local and provincial levels and even at the imperial court itself on behalf of individuals or communities. No sources prove that Cyril used his authority with government officials. It is, however, possible to assume that he did so in parallel to documented cases invoking other bishops.[17]

---

[14] Liebeschuetz, 2001, 139 ff.

[15] Brown, 1992, 89; idem, 2002, chap. 1. For instances of a bishop being the spokesman of the people, see Hunt, 1998, 269–70.

[16] The relationship between episcopal care for the poor and the bishop's leadership in the city is the subject of Brown, 2002. The poor are not necessarily only the socially destitute, but also the middling persons in the cities, for whom poverty was always just around the corner; also this latter group could count on the bishop's support and charity; idem, 49 ff.

[17] There are, for instance, a number of letters by Basil of Caesarea, Cyril's contemporary, in which he asks for a variety of privileges such as remission from taxation and exemption from curial duties; see Mitchell, 1993, vol. 2, 80–81. A good example of a bishop's intercession is that of Flavianus, bishop of Antioch, who after

In addition to the care of his community, a bishop was responsi-
ble for the *peregrini*, Christians from elsewhere who visited the town
of the bishop. It was the bishop's task to receive the travelers and
take care of them by providing shelter. For that purpose, several
towns had set up *xenodochia*, hostels where travelers could stay.[18] With
the increase of the number of Christians and pilgrims coming to the
Holy Land, providing hospitality became a more demanding duty
for local bishops of towns located on pilgrims' routes, as well as, of
course, for the bishops in Palestine, in particular that of Jerusalem.[19]
We do not know whether the Jerusalem church had *xenodochia* by
the time Cyril was bishop but it must at least have had some lodg-
ing facilities for pilgrims and other visitors. The monastery on the
Mount of Olives, founded by Melania the Elder sometime during
the 370s, welcomed and housed visitors, and the monastic settlement
in Bethlehem set up by the Roman aristocratic lady Paula, together
with Jerome, also had facilities for lodging travelers.[20] By the sixth
century many Jerusalem holy sites seem to have had *xenodochia*.[21] It
is likely that during Cyril's episcopate the growing number of pil-
grims to the holy sites required intensified attention from the bishop
and his clergy. Especially during Easter and the Encaenia, when the
number of pilgrims was at its peak and a great crowd assembled in
Jerusalem, providing hospitality must have been a major and time-
consuming responsibility.[22]

Managing the church property as well as the people was the task
of the bishop and his clergy. With the expansion of the church's
wealth, managing finances increasingly called upon a bishop's time
and attention.[23] Wealth came to the church from various sources;
one of the most important ones was bequests to the church, which

---

the Riot of the Statues (387) went to Constantinople to plead for clemency from
the emperor in his punishment of the city; see Downey, 1961, 426–33; cf. Liebeschuetz
(2001, 143) who argues that in the fourth century the dealings of bishops with the
imperial court concerning secular affairs were limited.

[18] On *xenodochia*, see Brown, 2002, 33–35.

[19] For this, see Hunt, 1982, 63 ff.; Maraval, 1985, 167–69.

[20] Palladius, *Hist. Laus.* 46.6; Jer., *Epist.* 108.14.

[21] Anton. Placent., *Itin.* 23 (CC, Ser. Lat. 175, 141); Cyr. Scyth., *V. Sabae* 31 (ed.
Schwartz).

[22] Egeria (*It. Eger.* 49.1–2) reports that crowds came from every region and
province to Jerusalem to celebrate the Encaenia. For the Encaenia see p. 84 below.

[23] Gaudemet, 1958, 306–11. On church finances in Late Antiquity, see in gen-
eral Jones, 1964, 894–904.

only became legally possible since the reign of Constantine. In the case of Jerusalem, imperial endowments, generous offerings by wealthy aristocratic pilgrims, modest gifts by common pilgrims, and offerings by the Jerusalem laity added greatly to the wealth of the church.[24] The Jerusalem church likely also profited from the economic boost pilgrimage generated. It is not known what the property of the church of Jerusalem consisted of, apart from the church buildings on Golgotha including their richly decorated interiors, and the other churches in the city. However, a comparison with the property that Constantine donated to the Lateran church and St. Peter in Rome, for instance, makes it likely that the assets of the Jerusalem church consisted of land, small enterprises, farms, and valuable vessels.[25] Although much of the actual management was done by members of the clergy and, in particular, the deacons, the bishop was in the end responsible for the financial affairs of his church and overseeing them must have been one of his major responsibilities.[26]

Traditionally, bishops were arbitrators in disputes between members of their congregations. This practice became officially instituted by two Constantinian laws issued respectively in 318 and 333.[27] These laws gave the bishop the authority to preside over civil cases on the request of either party; his verdict was final and no appeal was possible. The *episcopalis audientia* attracted increasingly more cases in the course of the fourth century and the bishop's role of arbitrator and judge became more important and time-consuming.[28] As a judge, the bishop took over functions that, until the decrees by Constantine, had been the preserve of secular authorities. This undoubtedly provided the bishop with more authority within the urban community

---

[24] See e.g. Binns, 1994, 85–91.

[25] For the property donated by Constantine to the Lateran basilica, St. Peter's and other churches in Rome, see *Liber Pontificalis* 34 (ed. Duchesne, vol. 1, 170–87).

[26] John Chrysostom observes that bishops were more occupied with managing estates and overseeing financial affairs than with guarding men's souls and protecting the poor; *Hom. in Matt.* 85.3–4 (PG 58, 761–62). See also Hunt, 1998, 262–63. Not much is known about the bishop's personnel and the episcopal administration; one of the few publications on this topic, but dealing mainly with the west, is by Sotinel (1998).

[27] *Cod. Theod.* 1.27.1; *Const. Sirm.* 1.

[28] For the *episcopalis audientia*, see Gaudemet, 1958, 229–52; Harries, 1999, 191–211. For the bishop as *iudex* see also Garnsey and Humfress, 2001, 74–80. Augustine complains about the amount of time his judicial work required; *De opere monach.* 29.37 (PL 40, 576); Possidius, *Vita Aug.* 19 (PL 32, 49–50). For Augustine's letters as a source for knowledge about the *episcopalis audientia*, see Lenski, 2001.

but could also present him with awkward situations, especially in cases between rich and poor.[29] Like all politicians the bishop sought after having good relations with both the community's lower classes and the urban elite. Part of the church's revenues probably came from offerings by the urban laity.[30] Like any other bishop, Cyril undoubtedly must have arbitrated in lawsuits between members of the Jerusalem community. Unfortunately, however, our sources leave us in the dark about this important part of Cyril's responsibilities.

In addition to these functions and obligations, the bishop was also accountable for the moral conduct and behavior of his clergy, the monks and nuns living in the area under his authority, and the public morality of his flock. Furthermore, he appointed new clergy and was supposed to attend the provincial synods, generally taking place twice a year,[31] as well as general councils. In Late Antiquity bishops saw their administrative duties and responsibilities being enlarged. Executing and supervising these duties undoubtedly required more and more time from bishops and called upon their managerial skills. Notwithstanding their increasing administrative responsibilies, a bishop's primary duty remained the taking care of the divine cult. However, this side of the episcopal responsibilities had its political aspects as well, as the case of liturgical processions in Jerusalem clearly demonstrates.[32] Thanks to some outstanding sources relating to liturgical practices in fourth-century Jerusalem, we are considerably better informed about Cyril's role as a spiritual leader of his community, and the tasks it entailed, than about Cyril's more secular role as an administrator and urban patron.

Liturgical duties

As mentioned above, Cyril's own works (including the *Mystagogical Catecheses*), Egeria's account of the liturgical practices in Jerusalem, and the *Armenian Lectionary*, provide important data about the liturgical role and function of the bishop. In the past this rich documentation has often led to the opinion that Jerusalem had a large

---

[29] Ambrose, *De Off.* 2.125 (PL 16, 136).
[30] Lane Fox, 1986, 505.
[31] It was decided at the Council of Nicaea (fifth canon) that provincial bishops should convene twice a year; Tanner, 1990, 8.
[32] See pp. 75–77 below.

and innovative role in the development of the liturgy in the early church, that Cyril was largely responsible for the evolution of the rites and the expansion of the liturgy as they took place in the fourth century, and that Jerusalem was an exporter of its liturgical practices to the rest of the Christian world.[33] It is certain, given the differences in the descriptions of the practices with regard to the instruction of the baptismal candidates, between Cyril on the one hand and Egeria on the other, that during Cyril's episcopate the Jerusalem liturgy was in a state of development. By the 380s, when Egeria was present in Jerusalem, the liturgy had become much more complex and advanced than it was when Cyril, as a newly appointed bishop, delivered his *Catecheses* in 351. However, it is difficult to establish whether Cyril was mainly responsible for that. Given the fact that he spent long periods in exile, some credit for the liturgical changes and evolutions may perhaps also be given to those bishops who replaced Cyril. It is now also recognized that the liturgical developments of Jerusalem were, in part, imported from elsewhere and that not all liturgical innovations were of Jerusalem origin. Most likely pilgrims introduced their own liturgical customs into Jerusalem.[34] However, given the prominence of the holy sites in the Jerusalem liturgy and the role Cyril played in the topographical development of these sacred places for Christian worship, his influence on the liturgical developments should be acknowledged to some extent.[35]

This expansion of liturgical practice in Jerusalem during Cyril's episcopate most likely accounts for the differences between Egeria's description of an eight-week Lent with seven weeks of daily catechetical instructions on Scripture and the Creed, and that of Cyril's

---

[33] Dix (1945, chap. 7) is largely responsible for this opinion. Cyril is in effect credited with the creation of the liturgical year by Dix: "The organisation of the divine office must be one of the personal achievements of S. Cyril" (329); see also Deddens, 1975, 56–57, 144 ff. Cf., however, e.g. Talley, 1991, 38–39, 172.

[34] Talley (1991, 176–89, 203–14) was the first to make with this important observation. In particular, several celebrations of the Holy Week were imported from elsewhere. See also Bradshaw, 1999, 254–56. The opinion that Jerusalem liturgical practices were quickly and indiscriminately copied elsewhere can no longer be held. The adoption of these practices was selective and often took a long time; Bradshaw, 1999, 257–58.

[35] There was of course already some sort of liturgy in Jerusalem connected with the Constantinian basilica before Cyril but he seems to have exploited and developed what was already there and incorporated other places like the Anastasis, Sion, and the Imbomon into the Jerusalem liturgy; Yarnold, 2000, 55; Baldovin, 1987, 83.

Procatechesis and eighteen *Catechetical Lectures* that mainly concentrate
on the Creed alone and for which no Lenten period of eight weeks
was necessary.[36] Presumably Cyril's *Lectures* were not only a complete
cycle of prebaptismal instructions, which concentrated mainly on the
Creed, but were also given in a period when in Jerusalem Lent lasted
less than eight weeks. It seems that initially the period of Lent in
Jerusalem lasted some three weeks,[37] and that it, because the litur-
gical practice was still in the process of development, extended to
an eight-week period, allowing for seven weeks of daily instruction
not only in the Creed but also on the Scripture, as described by
Egeria; the eighth week became the so-called Great Week. By the
time Cyril delivered his *Catechetical Lectures* (351), the period of Lent,
or at least that of baptismal preparation, possibly lasted forty days
according to Cyril's own words addressed to his baptismal candidates:
"forty days are yours for repentance",[38] and may be even shorter.

Jerusalem's liturgy was well developed by the time of Cyril's death
(387), but when did this development start? We do not know any-
thing for certain about Jerusalem's liturgical practices in the first
three centuries although some sort of liturgical rites undoubtedly took
place. However, the construction of the church complex on Golgotha
by Constantine marked a new phase in the liturgy of Jerusalem.
These buildings became the center of ecclesiastical life in Jerusalem,
and, according to Cyril, the Golgotha complex was even the center
of the world.[39] The Constantinian complex became the central church

---

[36] This difference has been, and still is, the subject of lively discussions among
liturgical scholars, and various explanations have been brought forward. This is,
however, not the place to reiterate the diverse points of view of these scholars in
their attempts to reconcile Cyril's and Egeria's information.

[37] A parallel is provided by the liturgical year in Rome where Lent lasted some
three weeks; Talley, 1991, 165–67.

[38] *Procatech.* 4. Doval (2001, 35 ff.) argues that the initial three-week program of
baptismal preparation current in Jerusalem predates Cyril. Cf., however, Johnson
(1988, 29) who thinks that in 351 there still may have been a three-week period
of baptismal preparation: "although at the time of Egeria's visit to Jerusalem there
appears to have been a seven-week process of prebaptismal instruction, in the con-
text of an eight-week Lent, including more than just the Creed, it is at least plau-
sible that the earlier (third-century?) Jerusalem tradition was a three-week cycle of
catechumenal preparation, focusing primarily on the Creed itself. This three-week
credal syllabus seems to underlie Cyril's eighteen *BCs* and to recur as the final
phase of preparation in Egeria". Johnson presents a survey of the arguments brought
forward by Cabrol (1895, 143–59), Stephenson (1954), Telfer (1955, 34–35), and
Baldovin (1987, 90–93) in their attempts to reconcile Cyril and Egeria.

[39] *Catech.* 13.28.

of Jerusalem – until then a simple church on Sion had in all probability fulfilled that function. The new cathedral church occasioned a new liturgy that made full use of the buildings on Golgotha, therefore many of the newly developed liturgical celebrations took place there. But the pro-Christian policy of Constantine and his successors also called for a more public kind of worship that corresponded with the new public status of Christianity. Christianity had basically been more private and inwardly directed than most other religions and cults in Antiquity, but the imperial support required that the new religion become visible and that Christian communities should no longer meet or hold their services within the confined walls of one particular church. Hence, more churches were built that brought Christianity into full view and worship was transformed into a public act. Also in and around Jerusalem large and magnificent churches were constructed, particularly on holy sites, and these churches became connected through a mobile system of worship, or stational liturgy.[40]

By the time Egeria visited Jerusalem the setting of the liturgy was already well established.[41] Much of that liturgy developed and centred on the city's sacred topography. Apart from the Constantinian buildings on Golgotha, there were several other churches and shrines that were incorporated into Jerusalem's stational liturgy, and all of them are historical in the sense that they were built at sites that relate to the life and passion of Christ as known from the Gospels. There was Sion, southwest of the city outside the walls, which was probably the center of Christian life in Jerusalem before the complex on Golgotha was constructed. In the fourth century a great basilica was built there, presumably before Cyril became bishop. Cyril calls it the upper church – it was located in a higher part of the city – where the Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles.[42] The Mount of Olives, also outside the city walls, had a prominent place in the Jerusalem liturgy. The first basilica built there was the Eleona

---

[40] On Jerusalem's stational liturgy, see in particular Baldovin, 1987, 45–104. Characteristic for the stational liturgy of this period is that it takes place under the leadership of the bishop, that it is mobile, that it was celebrated in designated shrines, churches or public spaces in or near the city/town the choice of which depended on the feast celebrated, and that it was the urban liturgical celebration of the day. Ibidem, 36–37.

[41] Baldovin, 1987, 46–53; Baldovin, 1989, 7–9; Talley, 1991, 40–42.

[42] *Catech.* 16.4. For Sion, see Taylor, 1993, 207–20.

church, named after the Greek name for the Mount of Olives. It was built by Constantine or Helena over the cave where, according to tradition, Jesus gave his eschatological teaching (Matt. 24:1–26:2), but it is also identified as the spot where He ascended into heaven. However, Egeria called the latter the Imbomon;[43] it seems, therefore, to have been a different site than the Eleona church.[44] On the site of the Imbomon, a church was built at the end of the century by the noble lady Poemenia, so after Cyril's time.[45] Another station that served in the Jerusalem liturgy was Bethany, a village on the slopes of the Mount of Olives where the house of Lazarus, Mary, and Martha once stood; there was also the so-called Lazarium or Cave of Bethany where Christ had raised Lazarus from the dead. By Egeria's time, a church had been erected at the site.[46] Gethsemane was also incorporated in Jerusalem's stational liturgy. At this site, near the foot of the Mount of Olives, a small church had been built to commemorate the betrayal of Christ.[47] Finally, there is the Nativity Church in Bethlehem built in the time of Constantine, supposedly on the site where Christ was born. The Christian community of Jerusalem went to Bethlehem, which belonged to the Jerusalem bishopric, a few times a year as part of the liturgical celebrations.[48] By way of liturgical processions these holy sites became interconnected and formed part of Jerusalem's liturgy.

The processional patterns of the Jerusalem liturgy are also wonderfully exemplified within Jerusalem's cathedral church, the Constantinian complex on Golgotha. The main parts of the complex were the Martyrium or basilica, the Anastasis or Rotunda covering Christ's tomb, the shrine At the Cross atop the rock of Calvary, and the baptistery. They were all used in some way or another in the various liturgical services or annual feasts, and there was a great deal of movement between the various buildings on Golgotha.[49]

---

[43] *It. Eger.* 31.1, 36.1.

[44] For the complicated traditions connected with the Mount of Olives, see Taylor, 1993, 143–56; cf. Kretschmar, 1971, 183 ff.

[45] Maraval, 1985, 265–66. For Poemenia's visit to Jerusalem, see Hunt, 1982, 160–63.

[46] *It. Eger.* 29.4–5; Taylor, 1993, 180–92.

[47] For the Christian traditions associated with Gethsemane, see Taylor, 1993, 192–201.

[48] *It. Eger.* 25.6, 12; 42.

[49] Baldovin, 1987, 59.

The liturgy, as it developed in Jerusalem in the fourth century shows that biblical story, ritual and place could be one: at the sacred sites the relevant biblical passages were read and the appropriate rites performed.[50] Moreover, Jerusalem's mobile liturgy was an interaction between the city and the church: it was public ritual and a civic mode of worship of parade and procession. Processions going through the streets of Jerusalem and moving from one sacred site to another were an essential part of the presence and visibility of Christianity. By way of these processions Christians appropriated and usurped the urban landscape. Jerusalem's urban space became ritualized in this way, and the new faith quickly transformed into one of Jerusalem's important civic powers. Although the Constantinian buildings, the urban setting, and the sacred topography were central to the Jerusalem liturgy, the person of the bishop as well was essential and vital as a focal point of this urban liturgy.[51] The role of the bishop as a celebrant and an official in the services and other meetings of the Christian community as they existed in fourth-century Jerusalem is essential to understanding the material culture of the city as well as its sacred life. In the second part of this chapter the central role of the bishop within the sacred topography is exemplified by presenting an impression of the liturgical celebrations taking place in the Great or Holy Week, by following the bishop's daily movements during this week. This will also give some insight into a bishop's liturgical obligations.

The Great Week was the week before Easter and the last week of Lent. The liturgy of this week was designed to reenact Jesus' last days, with Gospel readings appropriate for the day and place, and with the bishop at times acting the person of Jesus. Particularly in this week, there was a lot of liturgical mobility, with many processions to and from the places where Jesus had spent the last days before His Crucifixion. For the bishop this was a period full of liturgical celebrations from the early morning till often late in the evening.

---

[50] *It. Eger.* 47.5: "And what I admire and value most is that all the hymns and antiphons and reading they have, and all the prayers the bishop says, are always relevant to the day which is being observed and to the place in which they are used. They never fail to be appropriate." Smith, 1987, 74–95 presents a clear analysis of the setting and historical context of Jerusalem's stational liturgy.

[51] Baldovin, 1987, e.g. 83, 100; Wharton, 1992, 320–21.

The week started at one o'clock P.M. on Saturday, eight days before Easter Sunday. At the first service of the Saturday the archdeacon had announced for everyone to assemble at one o'clock at the Lazarium in the village of Bethany.[52] From the Church of the Holy Sepulchre the bishop and his clergy, preceded by some of the people, probably went into procession to the Lazarium. The procession went through the streets of Jerusalem, passing the Temple Mount on its north side, and left the city through to eastern gate (Jericho gate), and then had another two to three km to go before it reached the Lazarium. On its way it passed the Mount Olives with the Imbomon and the Eleona church, and the place where Lazarus' sister Mary met the Lord. At this latter site the procession stopped, and at the church that was there the bishop conducted a short service.[53] Then the people, clergy, and bishop went on to the Lazarium where such a great crowd had already assembled that not everybody could fit into the church. After singing hymns and antiphons, Easter was announced by a presbyter.[54] Everybody then processed to Jerusalem by the same route to assemble in the Anastasis where the daily *Lucernare* was celebrated, after which the congregation was dismissed and the bishop went to his quarters that were connected to the Anastasis.

The next day, Palm Sunday, began early for the bishop. At the first cockcrow, i.e. before daybreak, the bishop arrived at the Anastasis from his quarters and entered the *aediculum*, which covered Christ's tomb.[55] The people, who had already assembled in the inner courtyard between Anastasis and Martyrium, enter the Anastasis which is lighted with lamps. Three psalms are said in responsorial fashion by a presbyter, a deacon, and another member of the clergy, respectively. In between the psalms, prayers are said. After a Commemoration

---

[52] *It. Eger.* 29.3. See also *It. Burd.* 596.

[53] The church was possibly part of a monastery, since Egeria (*It. Eger.* 29.4) reports that the monks meet the bishop there. A small service is held at this church in which a hymn and an antiphon are sung, and a Gospel passage about Mary meeting the Lord is read.

[54] The presbyter read from John 11:15–12:11 which has the passage "Six days before the Passover Jesus came to Bethany"; *It. Eger.* 29.5; *Arm. Lect.* No. XXXIII (PO 36, 117).

[55] The *aediculum* had a porch with a stone railing. Apparently the bishop stood or was seated in this porch. See Wilkinson (1999, 173–75) and Biddle (1999, Figs. 64 and 66) for a reconstruction of the fourth-century *aediculum*, which stood in the center of the Anastasis.

for All and perfuming the Anastasis with the smell of incense, the bishop takes the Gospel book and goes to the door of the Anastasis where he reads the account of the Resurrection of the Lord. When the reading is finished, the bishop is ushered to the shrine At the Cross by the singing congregation.[56] Another psalm is sung and a prayer said. The bishop blesses the people who are then dismissed. When the bishop leaves to retire to his residence, everyone comes to him to have his hand laid on them. At daybreak everyone assembles in the Martyrium for the main mass. Of course the bishop gives a sermon, but also any presbyter is allowed to preach. Because of the preaching, the Sunday morning service could take until ten or eleven o'clock. After the dismissal, the faithful (not the catechumens) go into the Anastasis while the monks (*monazontes*) accompany the bishop to the Anastasis. When the bishop has entered, he takes his place on the porch of the *aediculum*. A thanksgiving and the Prayer for All is said; the bishop blesses the congregation. Then he steps down from the *aediculum* and everyone comes up to him to kiss his hand. The dismissal takes places at eleven or twelve o'clock, depending on the length of the morning service in the Martyrium. Apparently, the service in the Anastasis lasts about an hour. In the afternoon the bishop and the people assemble at one o'clock at the Eleona church on the Mount of Olives, approximately one km outside the city, for a service that lasted till three o'clock, after which the congregation, while chanting hymns, went to the Imbomon, where Christ had ascended to heaven. At five o'clock, after a reading about the children who met the Lord with palm branches (Matt. 21:9), the bishop and all the people began their descent from the Mount of Olives on foot, carrying palm and olive branches. This is clearly a re-enactment of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem with the bishop playing the role of Jesus, as is evident from Egeria: "the people accompany the bishop in the very way the people did once when they went down the hill with the Lord."[57] Unfortunately, Egeria does not

---

[56] In the southeast corner of the courtyard, between Martyrium and Anastasis, was the Rock of Calvary, which Egeria calls the Cross since a cross was erected on it; cf. Jer., *Epist.* 108.9. Egeria's "Before the Cross" (*ante Crucem*) is probably a designation for the courtyard in general. "Behind the Cross" (*post Crucem*) may be Egeria's reference to the little chapel behind the rock of Golgotha; Maraval, 1982, 63–64. Gibson and Taylor (1994, 78–79) consider *ante crucem* the designation for the courtyard and *post crucem* that for the Martyrium.

[57] *It. Eger.* 31.3 (*et sic deducetur episcopus in eo typo, quo tunc Dominus deductus est*).

mention whether the bishop, like Jesus, was riding a donkey, but her wording does make that likely. The procession went through the city to the Anastasis, where it arrived when it was already late in the day. Nevertheless, *Lucernare* was still held, after which everyone was dismissed.

On Monday the bishop conducted the morning services according to the patterns of Lent: Morning Prayer at the Anastasis at cockcrow, and two other services at the Anastasis at 9 A.M. and at midday. At three o'clock in the afternoon the bishop conducted a long service with reading, singing, and praying in the Martyrium. The service took till seven o'clock, after which *Lucernare* was held, this time also at the Martyrium.[58] After the dismissal, the people accompanied the bishop to the Anastasis, from which he apparently went to his residence. On Tuesday the services were the same as on Monday, with one addition. At night, after the *Lucernare*, the people processed to the Eleona church where the bishop entered the cave where Christ used to teach the disciples, and there he read the passage from Matthew where Christ says "See that no man lead you astray."[59] On Wednesday the services were the same, apart from the fact that after *Lucernare* everyone assembled in the Anastasis and the bishop went up to the porch of the *aediculum*. A presbyter read the passage from the Gospel about Judas Iskarioth's betrayal.[60] After a prayer, first the catechumens and then the faithful were blessed by the bishop, after which followed the dismissal. The morning services on Thursday were the same as on other days, but in the afternoon the congregation was already assembled at two o'clock at the Martyrium. The Eucharistic service that was celebrated there – the catechumens and the candidates preparing for baptism had, of course, to leave the church before the Eucharist – took until about four o'clock, after which the people were dismissed with the announcement to assemble again at seven o'clock that evening in the Eleona church (apparently there was no procession from the Martyrium to the Eleona church). However, before that, the bishop conducted another Eucharistic service in the chapel "Behind the Cross" and in the

---

[58] This can be concluded from Egeria's wording: *Lucernarium etiam agitur ibi, cum ceperit hora esse: sic est ergo, ut nocte iam fiat missa ad Martyrium* (*It. Eger.* 32.2).

[59] *It. Eger.* 33.2. The *Arm. Lect.* No. XXXVI (PO 36, 125) refers to Matt. 24:1–26:2.

[60] *It. Eger.* 34. According to *Arm. Lect.* No. XXXVII (PO 36, 127) the reading was Matt. 26:3–16.

Anastasis. From seven till eleven o'clock in the evening, hymns and antiphons were sung, alternated by readings and prayers at the Eleona church. Around midnight the whole congregation went to the Imbomon where they held a vigil with singing alternated by the bishop saying the prayers suitable to the day. On Friday morning at cockcrow, everyone left the Imbomon and went down the Mount of Olives in procession to the site where the Lord had prayed,[61] and where a church had been built; there another service was held.[62] From there, the whole community conducted the bishop to Gethsemane where the Gospel passage about Jesus' arrest was read. This procession was illuminated by hundreds of candles, according to Egeria, and must have been an impressive sight in the early morning darkness. From Gethsemane the procession proceeded to the city where it arrived at the break of day, and then through the streets of Jerusalem to the Golgotha buildings where everyone assembled "Before the Cross". There the passage about the meeting between Jesus and Pontius Pilate was read.[63] After a word of encouragement by the bishop, which the people certainly needed after an exhausting night without sleep, and a long day still ahead, he invited them to return a few hours later, at eight o'clock A.M., for one of the most interesting ceremonies of the Great Week: the presentation of the Wood of the Cross. After the dismissal, still before sunset, some went home, but some also went to Sion to pray at the site where Jesus was scourged.[64] At eight o'clock, everyone gathered on Golgotha "Behind the Cross";[65] the bishop's chair was placed there and he took his seat at a table covered with a cloth; the deacons were standing around it. Then a gold and silver box containing the Holy Wood was brought. The Wood of the Cross and the *titulus* were taken out

---

[61] Luke 22:41; cf. *Arm. Lect.* No. XL (PO 36, 137).

[62] *It. Eger.* 36:1–2; reading from Matt. 26:31–56, according to *Arm. Lect.* No. XL (PO 36, 139). For an elaborate reconstruction of the liturgical celebrations on Good Friday in Jerusalem, see Janeras, 1988.

[63] *Arm. Lect.* No. XLII (PO 36, 143); John 18:28–19:16.

[64] The Bordeaux pilgrim mentions that the column at which Jesus was scourged was still there (*It. Burd.* 592); so does Jer., *Epist.* 108.9.

[65] This refers to the chapel built in the inner courtyard of the Constantinian complex at the site where the rock of Golgotha was thought to be (see also n. 56 above). The ceremony definitely took place indoors since Egeria (*It. Eger.* 37.3) mentions that the people went in by one door and left through another: *usque ad horam sextam omnis populus transit, per unum ostium intrans, per alterum perexiens.*

of the box and placed on the table. The following ceremony then
took place:

> As long as the holy wood is on the table, the bishop sits with his
> hands resting on either end of it and holds it down, and the deacons
> round him keep watch over it. They guard it like this because what
> happens now is that all the people, catechumens as well as faithful,
> come up one by one to the table. They stoop down over it, kiss the
> Wood, and move on.[66]

This ritual kissing of the Cross, very suitable for Good Friday because
it made the believers visualize and experience Christ's Passion, took
until midday.[67] Cyril, who attached great importance to the Cross,
may have himself introduced this ceremony into the Jerusalem liturgy.[68]
Between midday and three o'clock everyone went to the shrine
"Before the Cross." The bishop's chair was placed "Before the Cross"
and the passages about Christ's suffering were read and hymns sung.
At three o'clock P.M. the passage from the Gospel of John about
Jesus giving up the ghost was read,[69] followed by a prayer and the
dismissal. Immediately after that the service in the Martyrium was
held, as on other days of the Great Week, followed by another one
in the Anastasis where the passage about Joseph of Arimathea ask-
ing Pontius Pilate for the Lord's body was read.[70] After a prayer
and the blessing of the catechumens and faithful, everyone was dis-
missed. The young members of the clergy and those of the people
who were not too tired after two days and one night of arduous

---

[66] *It. Eger.* 37.2: *Cum ergo positum fuerit in mensa, episcopus sedens de manibus suis sum-
mitates de ligno sancto premet, diacones autem, qui in giro stant, custodent. Hoc autem propterea
sic custoditur, quia consuetudo est ut unus et unus omnis populus veniens, tam fideles quam cathe-
cumini, acclinantes se ad mensam, osculentur sanctum lignum et pertranseant.* Egeria adds that
the Cross is guarded by the deacons because once someone had bit off a piece of
the Wood and stolen it. The believers not only kissed the Cross but also the Ring
of Solomon and the Horn with which the kings were anointed (*It. Eger.* 37.3).

[67] See also *Arm. Lect.* No. XLIII (PO 36, 143). There are many late antique
examples of these visualising experiences. The ascetic Paula had visions when she
visited holy sites or touched sacred objects; she saw the Lord hanging on the Cross
when touching the relic of the Holy Wood, or visualized Him when entering His
tomb; see Jer., *Epist.* 46.5, 13; 108.9. For these phenomena of visualizing and expe-
riencing the divine, see now, in general, Frank (2000, esp. 104 ff., 174 ff.) in the
cases of relics and holy places.

[68] On Cyril and the Cross, see Chapter 6.

[69] John 19:16–37; *Arm. Lect.* No. XLIII (PO 36, 155).

[70] *It. Eger.* 37.8. The passage is taken from Matt. 27:57–61, according to *Arm.
Lect.* No. XLIII (PO 36, 157).

ceremonies, kept the night vigil in the Anastasis while singing hymns and antiphons. It seems that with these celebrations the Great Week was concluded. Presumably, the bishop did not participate in this vigil; not only must the past days have been very strenuous for him, but Saturday was again a busy day, followed by the pre-dawn ceremony of baptism on Easter Sunday. On Saturday the normal services at nine o'clock and midday were held in the presence of the bishop. At three o'clock P.M. the paschal vigil started, of which the baptism is a part, and where the bishop again had to be present. The vigil started at the Martyrium and was continued with a ceremony in the Anastasis; there the passage about the Resurrection was read[71] and the Eucharist celebrated. Then the preparation for the baptismal rites began.

This overview of the celebrations of the Great Week makes clear how visible Christianity became by way of the many processions, but also how close the connection was between the bishop, the liturgy and the sacred topography of Jerusalem. The bishop was very much in the center of the liturgical celebrations, and the liturgy as it developed in Jerusalem in the fourth century used the urban space in a optimal way. The city and the holy sites just outside the walls were the scene on which the liturgical play of Jesus' last days was enacted. The sacred sites both inside and outside the city walls were incorporated as stations into the Jerusalem liturgy and became interconnected through processions. This is not only true for the Great Week but also applies to other annual celebrations. During the octave of Epiphany services were held in the Martyrium on the first three days, on the fourth in the Eleona church on the Mount of Olives, on the fifth at the Lazarium, on the sixth on Sion, on the seventh at the Anastasis, and on the eighth day "At the Cross".[72] It seems that Epiphany liturgically officially started in Bethlehem where the bishop and his clergy went for the nightly celebrations before the first day of the octave.[73] Undoubtedly the bishop and his community went in procession to these various holy sites. Furthermore there

---

[71] See *Arm. Lect.* No. XLIV (PO 36, 157 f.).

[72] *It. Eger.* 25.6–12.

[73] Egeria begins her account of Epiphany by saying that "they" arrived in Jerusalem almost at daybreak and that the bishop then went immediately to the Anastasis (*It. Eger.* 25.7–8). The bishop was probably included in "they"; cf. also *It. Eger.* 25.12: *Nam et illa hora, qua omnes nocte in Ierusolima revertuntur cum episcopo.*

were Lent, during which the number of services was intensified,[74] the octave of Easter,[75] Pentecost with processions and continuous services from early morning until midnight,[76] and the Encaenia.[77] The latter was celebrated in dramatic manner in September and commemorated the consecration of the Constantinian basilica on Golgotha as well as the discovery of the Cross. Celebrations lasted for eight days[78] and attracted great crowds, including many monks and nuns, not only from nearby provinces (Syria, Mesopotamia, Egypt, and the Thebaid) but from everywhere. Many bishops – Egeria mentions no less than forty or fifty[79] – and many of their clergy also came to Jerusalem to participate in the festivities. Our main source for the Encaenia, Egeria's account, is unfortunately incomplete, but the festival must have been at least as strenuous for the bishop as were Easter and Epiphany, since, as during these latter celebrations, services took place in the churches at the various holy sites in Jerusalem and a lot of moving around and processions must therefore have taken place.[80] Apart from his sacerdotal duties, the responsibilities he had as caretaker and host for all the strangers and his fellow bishops who had come to partake in the festival, must have been extremely time-consuming and demanding.[81]

When there were no special feasts to celebrate the bishop participated in the four daily services during six days of the week,[82] and another four services on Sunday, the main one of which included a sermon by the bishop.[83]

---

[74] *It. Eger.* 27.1–29.2. There was added an extra daily service in the Anastasis at 9 A.M. and vigil on Friday night.

[75] *It. Eger.* 39.1–40.2.

[76] *It. Eger.* 43.1–9. Egeria (*It. Eger.* 43.9) mentions that this is a very hard day for all participants: *Ac sic ergo maximus labor in ea die suffertur, quoniam de pullo primo vigilatum est ad Anastase et inde per tota die nunquam cessatum est....*

[77] *It. Eger.* 48.1–49.3.

[78] The *Armenian Lectionary* Nos. LXVII and LXVIII (PO 36, 223–25) only speaks of two days (13–14 Sept.). On the second day the relics of the Cross were shown.

[79] *It. Eger.* 49.2.

[80] *It. Eger.* 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.*

[81] For an overview of the daily and annual liturgical celebrations in which the bishop participated, see Appendix 2.

[82] *It. Eger.* 24.1–7.

[83] *It. Eger.* 26.8–25.6.

The bishop, it would seem, was supposed to be present at all of the services that took place in Jerusalem. He not only participated in all of the celebrations of the major annual festivals, such as Epiphany, Lent, Easter, Pentecost, and the Encaenia, but he was also supposed to be present at the daily offices. These liturgical duties must have been extremely strenuous and time-consuming, all the more so when preaching was involved. However, there was yet another episcopal obligation: the instruction of baptismal candidates.

Instruction of baptismal candidates and the rite of initiation

Formal initiation through the rite of baptism into the community of Christians potently marked the boundary between Christians and those who were not – in Cyril's time the latter was still a very large group. For those who went through this rite, old traditional patterns were overturned, another lifestyle was adopted and old friends were replaced by new ones. Baptism was a new birth,[84] a start of a new life within a new community. Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures* are unique because they are the only complete set of instructions for baptismal candidates from the early church that have survived.[85] The *Catecheses*, or oral instructions, were delivered by Cyril himself. They were meant to teach those preparing for baptism the moral conduct expected of them, as well as giving them an understanding of the Bible and Christian doctrine. An important concept of these instructions was the unity of the Old and New Testaments and – clearly exemplified in Cyril's *Catecheses* – that the coming of Jesus fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies and that He was the Messiah. Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*, apart from the *Procatechesis* and the first lecture, do not provide much information about practical matters such as enrollment, the investigation of candidates, the duration of the lectures, etc., but other – earlier, contemporary, and later – sources do. By combining and comparing the various relevant sources on this subject – Egeria, Ambrose, John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia[86] –

---

[84] Theod. Mops., *Hom.* 13.14; 14.2–9; Yarnold, 1994, 176, 181–87.

[85] The (post)baptismal sermons by John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia are not complete; see e.g. Yarnold (1994, 150 ff.) for the instructions of these Antiochene priests.

[86] For the texts of the baptismal instructions of the latter three and the way in which the rite of baptism was performed in Milan and Antioch, see Yarnold, 1994.

we are able to reconstruct how the process of selecting, instructing, and preparing candidates for baptism in Jerusalem worked. The same is true for the actual ceremony of baptism at Easter, as well as the explanation of the rites of initiation in the Easter week, although here the *Mystagogical Catecheses*, the original authorship of which probably goes back to Cyril, is the most important source of information.

Much has already been written about the late antique instruction of baptismal candidates and the subsequent rite of baptism,[87] and it is not my intention to repeat that here. In this section, as in the preceding one, I will pay particular attention to the role of the bishop since such an approach can give us an impression of Cyril's annually recurring episcopal tasks and responsibilities with regard to the instruction of baptismal candidates.

Although the date could vary, depending on the local tradition, in Jerusalem enrollment of baptismal candidates, also known as *nomen dare*, took place before Lent, possibly between Epiphany and the Lenten period.[88] Egeria gives an account of the procedure:

> I feel I should add something about the way they instruct those who are baptized at Easter. Names must be given in before the first day of Lent, which means that a presbyter takes down all the names before the start of the eight weeks for which Lent lasts here [Jerusalem]. . . .[89]

We know from several fourth-century sources relating to other places that bishops urged catechumens to enroll as candidates and prepare for baptism,[90] and this was probably also the practice in Jerusalem. In these same sources, bishops such as Ambrose, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, and others complain that sometimes none or only a small number of the catechumens gave their names for baptism. Apparently many fourth-century Christians preferred the status of catechumen to that of baptized Christian, and therefore postponed

---

[87] Bludau, 1924; Kretschmar, 1970; Dujarier, 1979; Baldovin, 1989; Yarnold, 1994; Finn, 1997, 196–206; Wilkinson, 1999, 57–59; Yarnold, 2000, 34–40.

[88] Bludau, 1924, 227.

[89] *It. Eger.* 45.1: *Et illud etiam scribere debui, quemadmodum docentur hi qui baptidiantur per pascha. Nam qui dat nomen suum, ante diem quadragesimarum dat et omnium nomina annotat presbyter, hoc est ante illas octo septimanas, quibus dixi hic attendi quadragesimas.*

[90] Ambrose, *Exp. in Luc.* 4.76 (PL 15, 1719); Basil of Caesarea, *Hom.* 13 *Exhort. ad Sanct. Bapt.* (PG 31, 425–444); Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 40, *In Sanct. Bapt.* 11 (PG 36, 372); Greg. Nys., *Orat. adv. eos, qui differunt baptismum* (PG 46, 417); Augustine, *Serm.* 132.1, *De verb. evang. Jo 1* (PL 38, 734–735); *De Cur. Pro Mort.* 15 (PL 40, 603).

initiation as long as possible. One of the reasons for postponing baptism undoubtedly was the strict moral conduct required of baptized Christians.[91] Considering the experience of Ambrose and other bishops, one wonders how many candidates Cyril delivered his lectures to each year. We probably should not imagine a large crowd. Apart from being few in number, the candidates were probably all adults since infant baptism was uncommon in the fourth century. About the provenance of the baptismal candidates, not much can be said with certainty, but presumably we have to consider former pagans, adherents of gnostic movements, Jews and Samaritans.[92]

The bishop controlled the admission of the candidates and performed the official investigation of the candidates in the Martyrium on the second day of Lent, which is on a Monday.

> Once the presbyter has all the names, on the second day of Lent at the start of the eight weeks, the bishop's chair is placed in the middle of the Great Church, the Martyrium, the presbyters sit in chairs on either side of him, and the entire clergy stand. Then one by one the ones who are seeking baptism are brought up, men coming with their fathers and women with their mothers.[93] As they come in one by one, the bishop asks their neighbours questions about them: "Is this person leading a good life? Does he respect his parents? Is he a drunkard or a boaster?" He asks about all the serious human vices. And if his inquiries show him that someone has not committed any of these misdeeds, he himself [the bishop] puts down his name; but if someone is guilty he is told to go away, and the bishop tells him that he is to amend his ways before he may come to the font. He asks the men and the women the same questions. But it is not too easy for a visitor to come to baptism if he has not witnesses who are acquainted with him.[94]

---

[91] For insufficient motivation for baptism, see Dujarier, 1979, 79–84.

[92] See Chapter 4.

[93] Egeria refers here to the godparents which every baptismal candidate had to have. Godparents seem to have accompanied their godchildren at exorcisms, baptismal instructions and the recitation of the Creed; *It. Eger.* 46.1, 5. John Chrysostom (Yarnold, 1994, 157–58) tells that the godparents are guarantors of the candidates' virtue in matters of the spirit, and that they are to advise, counsel and correct the candidate placed under their care.

[94] *It. Eger.* 45.2–4: *Cum autem annotaverit omnium nomina presbyter, postmodum alia die de quadragesimis, id est qua inchoantur octo ebdomadae, ponitur episcopo cathedra media ecclesia maiore, id est ad Martyrium, sedent hinc et inde presbyteri in cathedris et stant clerici omnes. Et sic adducuntur unus et unus conpetens; si viri sunt, cum patribus suis veniunt, si autem feminae, cum matribus suis. Et sic singulariter interrogat episcopus vicinos eius, qui intravit, dicens: "Si bonae vitae est hic, si parentibus deferet, si ebriacus non est aut vanus?" Et singula vitia, quae*

Cyril refers to the process of enlisting in his *Procatechesis* and a similar procedure is described for Antioch in the same period.[95] From Egeria's account it appears that enlisting as a baptismal candidate was a serious affair, considering its location – Jerusalem's cathedral church –, the presence of the church's clergy, the presence of witnesses, and of course the presence of the bishop. *Peregrini* or pilgrims may have been among the candidates, provided that they could present witnesses. This seems not to have been easy and it might well be, therefore, that the majority of the baptismal candidates came from Cyril's own ecclesiastical diocese or from areas in the vicinity of Jerusalem. As soon as their names were inscribed, the catechumens became *photizomenoi* (also *baptizomenoi, competentes, electi,* or *electi baptizandi*), a transitional phase or a second phase of the catechumenate in the rite of passage to becoming baptized believers (*pistoi, fideles*).[96]

By officially enlisting themselves, the baptismal candidates started a period of *katharsis* – a transition to a life of enlightenment. Cyril mentions that the candidates had to die first, meaning that they had to leave their former lives completely behind them, to be born again. By referring to Matt. 22:8 ff. he alludes in a metaphorical sense to

---

sunt tamen graviora in homine, requiret. Et si probaverit sine reprehensione esse de his omnibus, quibus requisivit presentibus testibus, annotat ipse manu sua nomen illius. Si autem in aliquo accusatur, iubet illum foras exire dicens: "Emendet se et, cum emendaverit se, tunc accedet ad lavacrum." Sic de viris, sic de mulieribus requirens dicit. Si quis autem peregrinus est, nisi testimonia habuerit, qui eum noverint, non tam facile accedet ad baptismum. Egeria's account refers of course to the practices current in the 380s; it is therefore not certain whether the same proceedings had already been introduced in the early years of Cyril's episcopate when he delivered the *Catecheses* as we predominantly have them now. However, this seems probable since we also know from earlier sources – not from Jerusalem but from Rome – that an investigation of the candidates' lifes was apparently standard procedure. Our main source for this is Hippolytus' *Apostolic Tradition* 20 (first decades of the third century, Rome); Dix, 1968, 30. However, it seems that initially the main investigation took place when people enrolled as catechumens rather than as baptismal candidates; during their period of catechumen, which took some three years, people were instructed and then received baptism; Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition* 16–17; Dix, 1968, 23–28. By the fourth century the practice of investigation seems to have shifted to the moment catechumens gave their names for baptism; only thereafter did they receive the basic instruction, which earlier they had received during the catechumenate. See e.g. Kretschmar, 1970, 75 f., 152 f.; Dujarier, 1979, 48–54, 92 ff.

[95] *Procatech.* 1; Theod. Mops., *Hom.* 12.14.

[96] Bludau, 1924, 226; Kretschmar, 1970, 66–69, 152–53. See also Cyril, *Procatech.* 12: "You are standing now between two frontiers"; trans. Yarnold.

this new life as putting on new garments.[97] The first lecture the candidates were given by Cyril was not an explanation of the faith, but an exhortation to be earnest, sincere, and devoted.[98] In this *Procatechesis* Cyril repeatedly tells his listeners that they should not attend his lectures without sincerity: "Let no one come here saying: 'Come on, let's see what the Faithful do. Let me go in and watch, so as to learn what goes on.'" Or: "Let there be no Simon [Magus] among you, no hypocrisy, no idle curiosity about what is going on."[99] Some may have enrolled for baptism to win the approval of a girlfriend, or to please a master or a friend; they are allowed to stay, since they can be saved, even though they have come for the wrong reason. Candidates should be diligent in their attendance at the instructions, since they are given in sequence and none should be missed.[100] Social control and a communal sense among the candidates were encouraged; if any of the candidates was missing, others should go looking for him or her. They should learn what they are taught and retain that learning forever. Candidates should not think that if they fail they can receive baptism a second or a third time. God requests their good intention and Cyril himself shall observe each candidate's earnestness and devotion. Candidates should not spend their time and energy on trivialities like the happenings in the city, or the doings of the emperor or the bishop. Instead they should fix their thoughts on higher things through prayer, Bible reading, and fasting. Furthermore, candidates are not allowed to reveal anything about the instructions to outsiders, including catechumens, and should keep to the so-called *disciplina arcani*.[101] They should also be earnest in

---

[97] *Procatech.* 3.

[98] According to William P. McDonald, in his dissertation (*Paideia and Gnosis: Foundations of the Catechumenate in Five Church Fathers*, Vanderbilt University, 1998, chap. 3), Cyril's *Catecheses* reveal a close connection between sincerity/devotion and the right (orthodox) faith. A candidate who believes rightly will interpret the Scriptures correctly and act rightly, and hence not be led astray by heretical ideas. Furthermore, when a candidate believes rightly and is sincere, he/she will be able to renounce Satan.

[99] *Procatech.* 2, 5; trans. Yarnold.

[100] The *Catecheses* 6–18 are indeed a sequential exposition of the Creed.

[101] The candidates were not supposed to reveal anything about the liturgical mysteries (*Catech.* 18.33), or the Creed (*Catech.* 5.12, 6.29), or even the contents of the instructions (*Procatech.* 12, 17). The *disciplina arcani* may have been a fiction since the Creed and the liturgical mysteries as well were probably already public knowledge by the fourth century; see Kretschmar, 1970, 154–63 and Yarnold, 1994, 55–59 for the *disciplina arcani*.

submitting to exorcisms in order to purify their souls and prepare themselves for salvation. If the candidates adhere to all this and repent of their sins, they will be able to leave their old lives behind and become reborn men and women after baptism.

The first *Catechesis* deals with the same topics as the *Procatechesis*, urging the candidates to be earnest and sincere, leave their sins behind, attend the catecheses, stay forever mindful of the instructions, and be zealous in attending the regular services (even after baptism). Cyril's emphasis on sincerity suggests that self-interest was all-too-common a motivation for baptism. After all, this was a period when it became advantageous to join the church for personal or political reasons – e.g., marrying a Christian woman, pleasing a superior in order to gain a public position.

The preparation for baptism consisted of two parts: verbal instructions and exorcism. Exorcism was an integral part of the ceremonies preparatory to baptism and was meant to expel the evil spirits from the candidates' bodies by exhalation (*exsufflatio*), and to introduce the Holy Spirit through inhalation (*insufflatio*). Through this apotropaic rites the souls of the candidates were purified. Candidates were also expected to confess their sins, although it is not quite clear whether this was part of the exorcism.[102] By exorcism, confession of sins, and fasting, people were purified in preparation of baptism. Exorcisms took place every day early in the morning, immediately after the Morning Prayer in the Anastasis.[103] The bishop was not directly involved with exorcism, which was performed by special exorcists who were members of the lower clergy. During the exorcism, the eyes of the candidates were veiled. Women and men were separated in order to avoid the incitement of passions. Apparently the exorcism took place in turns and while they waited the candidates were advised to read, pray, or sing, although women were to do this silently since they were not allowed to speak in church.[104] After the exorcism, the bishop began his instruction from his bishop's chair in the Martyrium while the candidates sat around him. Those already baptized could also attend the lectures, and the candidates' sponsors or witnesses (*patres et matres*) were allowed to be present, too. Egeria

---

[102] For confession of sins, see *Catech.* 1.5; 2.19–20.
[103] *It. Eger.* 46.1.
[104] *Procatech.* 9, 14; cf. 1 Cor. 14:34; 1 Tim. 2:12.

mentions that the instructions started at six in the morning and ended at nine o'clock, so that they took some three hours.[105] Notwithstanding Egeria's information, considering their length, Cyril's *Catecheses* did not take three hours unless we presume that they were preceded by the explanation of the Bible to which Egeria also refers.[106] Bible expositions were apparently only added to the catechesis later, when the catechumenate had lost its function as a period of instruction, and when the period of Lent had been extended from three to eight weeks. When Cyril delivered his *Catecheses* in 351, the instruction was presumably much shorter in terms of daily hours. However, extra time was probably needed for the translation into Syriac for those candidates who did not know Greek.[107] All the instructions took place in the Martyrium, as frequent references to Golgotha in Cyril's lectures confirm,[108] save perhaps *Catechesis* 14 which may have taken place in the Anastasis. This lecture is on the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ, and refers to the Church of the Resurrection, the Anastasis.[109]

An important aspect of the catechesis was of course the declaratory statement of faith, or the Creed, and Cyril's lectures are predominantly concerned with the exposition of the Creed. It seems that in Jerusalem the *traditio symboli*, the delivering of the Creed to the candidates, was done early during the instructions.[110] Cyril presented the Creed already in his fifth lecture, which then was explained

---

[105] *It. Eger.* 46.3–4.

[106] Yarnold, 2000, 38. Egeria reports that the bishop went through the whole Bible beginning with Genesis; *It. Eger.* 46.2.

[107] *It. Eger.* 47.3: *Et quoniam in ea provincia pars populi et grece et siriste novit, pars etiam alia per se grece, aliqua etiam pars tantum siriste, itaque quoniam episcopus, licet siriste noverit, tamen semper grece loquitur et numquam siriste: itaque ergo stat semper presbyter, qui episcopo grece dicente, siriste interpretatur, ut omnes audiant, quae exponuntur.* "In this province there are some people who know both Greek and Syriac, but others know only one or the other. The bishop may know Syriac, but he never uses it. He always speaks in Greek, and has a presbyter beside him who translates the Greek into Syriac, so that everyone can understand what he means." For the translation of the lectures from Greek into Syriac, see Bludau, 1924, 239–42.

[108] *Catech.* 4.10, 14; 10.19; 13.4; 16.4.

[109] *Catech.* 14.14: "the emperors of our time have built this holy Church of the Resurrection of God our Savior in which we now are"; (οἱ δὲ νῦν βασιλεῖς . . . τὴν ἁγίαν ἐκκλησίαν ταύτην, ἐν ᾗ πάρεσμεν, τῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος θεοῦ, ἀναστασεως ἐξειργάσαντο).

[110] According to Egeria (*It. Eger.* 46.3), however, the candidates received the Creed only after five weeks of instruction. Baldovin (1989, 12–13) thinks that Egeria confused the contents of the Jerusalem lectures with that of another church, or had the timing wrong. For the content of the Jerusalem Creed, see Chapter 2, 46.

article by article in the following lectures.[111] Egeria reports that after their instruction and before baptism, every candidate had to go up to the bishop, who was seated in his chair in the apse of the Martyrium behind the altar, to repeat the Creed to him (*redditio symboli*). Although we cannot be sure that this recitation of the Creed also took place in the 350s, Cyril emphasizes that the candidates should commit the Creed to memory, word for word, and repeat it among themselves.[112] After having done that successfully, the candidates were ready for baptism.

Baptism took place during the Easter vigil, at dawn on Easter Sunday, in commemoration of Jesus' passage from death to a new life.[113] By way of baptism the candidates left their old lives behind them, which according to Cyril resembled death, and "resurrected" into a new life.[114] The five *Mystagogical Catecheses*, or Μυσταγωγικαὶ ("concerning the initiation into the mysteries") are the main source for the reconstruction of the ritual.[115] The first three are on the mystery of baptism – the other two on the Eucharist. The candidates, who may not have known what to expect, since the rite of baptism

---

[111] *It. Eger.* 46.3.

[112] *Catech.* 5.12. Cyril also emphasizes that the Creed should not be written down or shared with a catechumen (*disciplina arcani*). Egeria (*It. Eger.* 46.5) situates the *redditio symboli* before the beginning of the Great Week, presumably on the Saturday morning before Palm Sunday: *Cum autem iam transierint septem septimanae, superat illa una septimana paschalis, quam hic appellant septimana maior, iam tunc venit episcopus mane in ecclesia maiore ad Martyrium. Retro in absida post altarium ponitur cathedra episcopo, et ibi unus et unus vadet, vir cum patre suo aut mulier cum matre sua, et reddet simbolum episcopo.* "When seven weeks have gone by, and only the week of Easter remains, the one which people here call the Great Week, the bishop comes early into the Great Church, the Martyrium. His chair is placed at the back of the apse, behind the altar, and one by one the candidates go up to the bishop, a man with his father and a woman with her mother, and repeat the Creed to him"; trans. Wilkinson (revised). In the 350s, when the period of Lent was shorter and the Great Week probably was not yet included in the Jerusalem liturgy, this ceremony may have taken place, if it took place, shortly before the actual baptism. For the *redditio symboli*, see also Ruf., *Expos. Symb.* 3 (PL 21, 339).

[113] Possibly people were also baptized at Epiphany, Pentecost, and the Encaenia; see Bludau, 1924, 237–38. For a comprehensive description of the initiation rites, see Baldovin, 1989, 15–20; Yarnold, 1994, 17–33.

[114] For baptism as a rite of passage, see Bell, 1997, 212–16.

[115] Cyril's are not the only fourth-century *Mystagogical Catecheses* known. There are also lectures on the mysteries by Ambrose, John Chrysostom, and Theodore of Mopsuestia; they have been conveniently assembled and translated by Yarnold (1994, 67–250), and compared and interpreted by Riley (1974). The rite of baptism is also elaborately described by Hippolytus in the third-century *Apostolic Tradition* (20–21); Dix, 1968, 30–38.

was a mystery, first enter the antechamber of the baptistery.[115] There, facing towards the west, they are instructed by a voice coming out of the darkness to stretch out their hands and renounce Satan as if he stood before them. Then a formula of renunciation is spoken by the candidates: "I renounce you, Satan; and all your works, and all [your] pomp, and cult."[117] The candidates then turn to the east, the region of light, and profess their allegiance to God and the Trinity: "I believe in the Father and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit and in one baptism of repentance."[118] Following this rite of renunciation and profession the candidates enter another room where they take off all their clothes and are subsequently anointed with exorcized olive oil from the top of their heads to the lowest part of their bodies.[119] Men and women were separated; the men were anointed by priests whereas only the forehead of women was anointed by the priest and the rest of their body by deaconesses.[120] After the anointing, they are led to the baptistery and the holy pool of baptism (ἁγίαν κολυμβήθραν; *Myst. Catech.* 2.4). They are immersed three times by the bishop as they profess their belief in the Father, the Son, and

---

[116] The location of the fourth-century baptistery within the Constantinian complex on Golgotha is hard to determine because of lack of archeological and other indications, but considering the importance of the rite of baptism as well as the architectural prominence fourth-century baptisteries had as part of cathedrals dating from this period – viz., e.g. the baptistry of John of Lateran in Rome – it is very unlikely that it was part of the administrative quarters north of the Anastasis, as has been suggested; e.g. Doval, 1993. It is more likely, as Wharton (1992) argues that the baptistery has to be located south of the Anastasis where it would have stood out architecturally. See also Gibson and Taylor, 1994, 77–78.

[117] *Myst. Catech.* 1.2, 4–8.

[118] *Myst. Catech.* 1.9; trans. Yarnold. The turning symbolizes the turning away from evil and darkness, with which the west is identified, to the Paradise of God which was in the east; *Myst. Catech.* 1.4 and 9; Riley, 1974, 59–63.

[119] The disrobing symbolizes the denunciation of the old life; the white garments that the newly baptized receive are the symbols of a new, pure life. In his *Procatechesis* 3–4, Cyril had already referred to the proper clothing as symbolizing the right disposition, by relating the story in Matt. 22:1–4 of the improperly dressed guest coming to a wedding feast. Their nakedness associates the candidates with Christ, who hung naked on the Cross, and symbolizes triumph, the return to innocence, and the entering of a new dimension of existence. The anointing has an exorcistic-healing function – it seems to be the culmination of the exorcist rites the candidates underwent during their period of instruction –, protects the candidate against evil, and unites the candidate with Christ; *Myst. Catech.* 2.3. See Riley, 1974, 162–65, 173–78, 181, 189–98 and esp. Winkler, 1978.

[120] According to Epiphanius (*Pan.* 79.3.6) a deaconess' main task is to minister women at baptism. See further Wharton, 1995, 81–84.

the Holy Spirit respectively.[121] Whereas the baptizands were in the nude, the bishop probably wore a special baptismal robe.[122] The neophytes then left the baptistery to a room where they were clothed in white garments and anointed with an aromatic oil called *myron* or chrism.[123] The *myron* is applied to the foreheads, ears, nostrils, and chests of the newly baptized. By the anointing with *myron* the neophytes receive the Holy Spirit (*Myst. Catech.* 3.3) and become, according to Cyril (*Myst. Catech.* 3.1–2), figures (εἰκόνες), partakers (κοινωνοί), and companions (μέτοχοι) of Christ. Only after the receiving of the chrism, can they call themselves real Christians (*Myst. Catech.* 3.5).[124] By then the neophytes have completed their rite of passage and finally entered their new life. According to Egeria, the newly baptized then go from the baptistery into the Anastasis where they sing a hymn and the bishop says a prayer for them. Subsequently they go to the Martyrium where they participate for the first time in the Eucharist, together with the other *fideles*,[125] a ritual that indicates their acceptance into the inner circle of the Christian community.

After having been ritually initiated into the official body of the church, instruction was over neither for the neophytes nor the bishop. At the end of his last *Catechesis*, Cyril had announced another set of lectures starting on the Monday after Easter Sunday.[126] These lec-

---

[121] Theod. Mops., *Hom.* 14.20. Although, of course, baptism symbolizes rebirth, new life, and the remission of sins, in this passage as in *Myst. Catech.* 2.6, Cyril also associates baptism with the burial and Resurrection of Christ; see also John Chrysostom (Yarnold, 1994, 155–56). Apart from symbolizing the Trinity, the triple immersion can also represent the three-day's burial of Christ – the baptismal pool becoming the symbol of the tomb – and the emersion stands for the Resurrection. For an elaborate exposition on this, see Riley, 1974, 228–42.

[122] Cf. Thdt., *HE* 2.27.2.

[123] *Myst. Catech.* 3.4. The third *Mystagogical Catechesis* is entirely dedicated to the postbaptismal anointing. Cyril actually does not refer to the putting on of the white garments, but they are mentioned by Chrysostom, Theodore, and Ambrose in their mystagogical writings; see also Riley (1974, 349–50) and Baldovin (1989, 19) for other omissions such as the consecration of the baptismal font (cf. *Catech.* 3.3) and the postbaptismal imposition of the bishop's hand (cf. *Catech.* 16.26). The white robes symbolize union with the risen Christ, forgiveness of sins, and purity of life; ibid., 416–21. Gregory of Nazianzus complained that catechumens postponed baptism because they could not afford the white garment; *Or.* 40.25, *In sanctum Baptisma* (PG 36, 394).

[124] For the symbolic complexities of the post-baptismal anointing, see Riley, 1974, 363–80. Theodore of Mopsuestia gives an elaborate description of the anointing with chrism; Yarnold, 1994, 177–79.

[125] *It. Eger.* 38.

[126] *Catech.* 18.33.

tures, the *Mystagogical Catecheses*, were an exposition of the Mysteries, possibly given every day during the Easter octave, although only five lectures attributed to Cyril have been handed down.[127] The first three deal with baptism and chrismation and only then were the neophytes given an explanation of the deeper symbolical and mystical meaning of the rituals they had gone through when they were baptized. The other two *Mystagogiae* discuss the mystery of the Eucharist. These lectures were given in the Anastasis after the morning service in the Martyrium (or one of the other Jerusalem churches), so that the lectures probably began around eleven o'clock in the morning.[128] Not only the newly baptized were present, but also any of the faithful who wished to attend. The doors of the Anastasis were kept closed so that none of the catechumens could come in and the mysteries would not become known outside the circle of *fideles*. Further, every afternoon of the Easter octave the neophytes (and others) accompanied the bishop in procession to and from the Eleona church. This ritual served as a presentation of the newly baptized to the Jerusalem community.[129]

In the fourth century the bishop became a central figure both in the civic and the religious community of Jerusalem. The changing religious mentality, which demanded a greater visibility of Christianity, made the bishop into a public figure whose presence became in particular obvious in the many processions that were introduced to reenact the biblical past and to emphasize Jerusalem's sacred topography. Through these processions the church appropriated the urban space. The rite of baptism and the instructions that preceded it display the central place and authority of the bishop.

The centrality of the bishop resulted in more arduous and demanding duties. Particularly around Eastertime, his liturgical obligations, combined with his responsibilities as an instructor of baptismal candidates,

---

[127] For Cyril's authorship and the discrepancy between the number of days and lectures, see Chapter 2, 59–61.

[128] Egeria's account, upon which this information is based, is not altogether clear. During Easter Week some of the morning services took place in the Martyrium but others at the Eleona church, the Anastasis, on Sion, and at the shrine Before the Cross; *It. Eger.* 39.2, 47.1–2.

[129] *It. Eger.* 39.3–4. Wharton, 1992, 320–21. In this respect, it would be interesting to know whether the neophytes still wore their white garments during the processions in the Easter Week.

must have been physically and perhaps also mentally, exhausting. The same applies to the other annual celebrations. With such changes as the development and expansion of the Jerusalem liturgy, the extension of the period of Lent, the addition of the Great Week, and the explanation of the Bible becoming part of the prebaptismal preparation, Cyril saw his episcopal tasks considerably expanded during his lifetime.

CHAPTER FOUR

PAGANS, HERETICS, JEWS, GNOSTICS AND MANICHAEANS

Cyril's *Catecheses* have been studied mainly by theologians. Their interest has been focused on subjects like Cyril's stance towards the heresies of his time, especially Arianism, on the so-called Jerusalem Creed, as well as on his use of the Scriptures. Since these topics have been elaborately dealt with, they are of no concern here. In this chapter, the focus on the *Catecheses* is not from a theological but from a social-historical and a social-religious perspective. Can we learn anything from these lectures about the religious landscape of Palestine and bordering regions in Cyril's time? Can we learn anything about Cyril's audience? What kind of people were his baptismal candidates? But before going into that a survey of non-Christian religious movements as treated by Cyril will be given.

Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures* were in the first place pedagogical texts and their main purpose was to instruct catechumens about basic aspects of the Christian faith. Cyril's purpose was clearly to make proper Christians out of his baptismal candidates, to teach them the "universal" Christian knowledge and to make them aware that they belonged to the universal, catholic, church.[1] Since the *Catecheses* were primarily meant for instruction and not designed to supply information on questions such as those raised above, the information they provide on these topics is scant. Nevertheless, we can get some idea of Cyril's world, and that of the candidates for whom the lectures were meant and delivered, especially by looking at those passages in

---

[1] The idea of universality was important to Cyril as appears from *Catech.* 18.23: "The Church is called Catholic because it is spread throughout the world, from end to end of the earth; also because it teaches universally and completely all the doctrines which man should know concerning things visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly; and because it subjects to right worship all mankind, rulers and ruled, lettered and unlettered; further because it treats and heals universally every sort of sin committed by soul and body, and it possesses in itself every conceivable virtue, whether in deeds, words or in spiritual gifts of every kind." For the word καθολική in Cyril's eighteenth lecture, see Moroziuk, 1989.

the *Catechetical Lectures* that deal with paganism, heresies, gnosticism, and Judaism. It appears then that the lectures were not only an instruction in the faith, but that they also served to warn the baptismal candidates of pagan practices, the numerous heresies, Judaism, and gnostic movements, as well as to instruct them on how to deal with the deviant currents within Christianity and the non-Christian religions and cults. Christians ought to be able to distinguish a wolf in sheep's clothing, or the devil disguised as an angel.[2] Using metaphors of war and battle, Cyril mentions explicitly that his instructions are also meant to provide ammunition and doctrinal armor against the enemies of Christianity:

> Persevere with the catechetical classes. If we have a lot to say, don't relax your attention. You are being given weapons to use against the powers ranged against you, weapons against heresies, against Jews and Samaritans and pagans. You have many enemies; take a good supply of weapons, for you have to shoot against many adversaries. You must learn how to shoot down the Greek, how to fight against the heretic, the Jew and the Samaritan. Your arms are ready, above all the sword of the Spirit. You must stretch out your right hand for the good cause to fight the Lord's fight, to conquer the powers ranged against you, and to become invincible to any heretical force.[3]

The impression gained from Cyril's words is that apparently these groups – pagans, heretics, Samaritans, and Jews – were felt to constitute a danger for Christians. With regard to this, it should not be forgotten that Christianity was still establishing itself in this period and that the church still had many competitors. The latter were very much a part of the social environment of fourth-century Palestine and without doubt attracted the curiosity and attention of Christians.[4]

---

[2] *Catech.* 4.1.

[3] *Procatech.* 10; trans. Yarnold. Cf. also *Catech.* 8.1. McCauley and Stephenson (1969–70, vol. 1, 83 n. 40) call attention to the fact that the weapons and equipment referred to here and in par. 16 of the same lecture "echo the theme of the Christian warfare visualized in Eph. 6:10–20 as a conflict against evil angelic powers." Cf. *Myst.* 3.4 for similar metaphors: "the breastplate of righteousness" and "the armour of the Holy Spirit"; also *Procatech.* 1 ("Now you have enlisted; you have been called to the Colors"); *Procatech.* 17 ("battle orders"); *Catech.* 1.3 ("For just as those who set out about levying an army examine the ages and constitutions of those who enlist, so the Lord, when He raises His levy of souls, examines their motives"); *Catech.* 1.4 ("spiritual armour").

[4] For the presence and distribution of religious groups in Palestine in the two centuries before 324, see Taylor, 1993, chap. 3. For pagan cults in Palestine in these centuries, see Belayche, 2001.

Relatively speaking, there are only a few references to the pagans and their cults, which may imply that they were not seen as a great risk. He ridicules pagan practices of idolatry by saying that even onions were worshiped among some pagans.[5] Nevertheless, Cyril warns his listeners that "the Greeks by their smooth tongue lead men [Christians] astray."[6] Christians should also not eat sacrificial food offered to pagan idols, drink potions, or attend pagan divinations. They should not participate in sorcery, incantation, and necromancy, venture among the assemblies of heathen spectacles, or use amulets in times of sickness.[7] To counteract the pagan danger, Christians should become well-informed. Since the pagans do not believe, for instance, in the resurrection of the dead and think that a dead man is gone forever,[8] they should be combated with their own arguments and stories,[9] which clearly prove the resurrection of the dead. As an example, Cyril refers to the story of the Phoenix: "If resurrection from the dead has been granted to this irrational creature which does not know its Maker, will not a resurrection be granted to us, who praise God and keep to His commandments?"[10] Cyril struggles with the question of why paganism and polytheistic error were in existence for so long while God is of all time and all things were made through Him. He does not really give an explanation but refers to God's goodness and majesty. Man was blind to God's majesty and had descended to the baseness of venerating stones, trees, and animals – Cyril refers to cats, dogs, wolves, dragons, and snakes – and the worship of gods like Dionysus, Demeter, and the adulterous Zeus. To correct these errors, God had sent His

---

[5] *Catech.* 6.10; cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* 15.9.

[6] *Catech.* 4.2.

[7] *Catech.* 4.28, 37.

[8] *Catech.* 18.1–2, 10.

[9] Cf. *Catech.* 18.10: "Make use of these arguments, therefore, against the Greeks; for with those who do not accept the Scriptures you must contend, not with arms taken from Scripture, but with rational demonstrations only; for they do not know who Moses is, or Isaia, or the Gospels, or Paul."

[10] *Catech.* 18.8. Cyril also refers to the cycle of nature as proof of the Resurrection: e.g. trees that are "dead" in winter are green again in spring, and the moon eclipses but becomes luminous again; *Catech.* 18.6–7, 9–10. Cyril's argument is not very impressive and one wonders whether his listeners, especially the more educated, would have been convinced by his reasoning. The story about the Phoenix is also mentioned by other Church Fathers; see McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 2, 124 n. 4.

Son: "The wound had to be healed; stones were being given the
worship due to God: could man's sickness go further?"[11]

In comparison to Cyril's remarks about the pagans, the references
to the Jews and their religion are manifold and particularly hostile.
Apparently, Cyril considered Judaism to be a malady threatening to
his own believers, and the Jews a people "ever ready to object and
slow to believe," without a desire to be cured.[12] Cyril's anti-Jewish
arguments are basically the same as can be found in the works of
other Church Fathers of this time. The Jews are unbelievers, who
put no faith in what was written and prophesied by their own pro-
phets – the coming of Christ – and they interpret the Scriptures
incorrectly.[13] Christian thought is on a higher plane than that of the
Jews since the latter deny Christ and do not believe that Christ's is
God's Only-begotten Son; consequently they also do not believe in
His virgin birth, His Resurrection, and Ascension.[14] By repudiating
Christ as the Messiah, the Jews have rejected salvation.[15] Referring
to Acts 7:51, Cyril calls the Jews "stiffnecked and uncircumcised in
heart and ear."[16] The Jews have committed wicked deeds, the worst
of which was that they plotted Christ's death, and are therefore
crucifiers and murderers.[17] For their plots against the Savior, the
Jews were cast down from God's grace.[18] However, even though cru-
cifying Christ is considered by Cyril to be the greatest sin – worse
than adultery, fornication, or any other licentiousness – even this sin
can be forgiven by God through repentance and baptism.[19] Through

---

[11] *Catech.* 6.10–11.

[12] *Catech.* 13.7; *Hom. in Paraliticum* 13.

[13] *Catech.* 4.2; 7.3; 10.12, 15; 12.2, 13, 16 (about the Jews not believing that God
became man), 21–22; 14.15.

[14] *Catech.* 4.12; 7.2; 8.1; 10.15–16; 12.2, 21–22, 27; 14.15, 22, 24. In *Catech.* 4.12
Cyril makes a comparison between Christ's Resurrection and Jonah's coming forth
from the whale after three days; he does not understand why the Jews believe in
the latter while rejecting Christ's coming back to life. According to Cyril (*Catech.*
12.17) the misdeeds of the Jews were epitomized in their patriarch.

[15] *Catech.* 12.8.

[16] *Catech.* 17.24.

[17] *Catech.* 13.7, 11, 15, 20; 14.1.

[18] *Catech.* 18.25.

[19] *Catech.* 3.15: "What sin is greater than crucifying Christ? But baptism can even
expiate this, as Peter told the thousand who had crucified Christ when they came
to him and asked him, saying: 'Brethren, what shall we do?' [Acts 2:37] For great
is our wound. You advised us of our fall, O Peter, when you said: 'The author of
life you killed.' [Acts 3:15] What salve is there for such a great wound? What

baptism, which marks the end of the Old Testament and the begin-
ning of the New,[20] even the crucifying Jews can be saved. It is an
attractive, but inconclusive, supposition that Cyril's words concern-
ing repentance through baptism for the sin of crucifixion were directed
at converted Jews among his baptismal candidates.

Apart from scorning the Jews and Judaism, Cyril cautions the bap-
tismal candidates to keep away from and not to mingle with the
Jews: "Don't desert to the Jews, for Jesus Christ has redeemed you
for ever. Avoid all Sabbath observance or describing harmless food
as common or unclean."[21] Christians should also not be led astray
by the guileful Jews who claim that there is one God alone and that
there is no Only-begotten Son.[22] Instead, they should wrestle with
the Jews and overcome their arguments by parallel examples.[23]

Cyril's *Catecheses* abound in anti-Jewish polemics. Evidently, there
was the danger of judaizing by Christians by, for instance, their par-
ticipating in Jewish festivities and observing the Sabbath. Through
their contacts with Jews, Christians might even be overcome by
Jewish arguments against Christianity and apostatize. This was not
unique for Jerusalem; in cities like Antioch and Edessa and many
others, Judaism had a great attraction for Christians.[24] Recent schol-
arship has made evident that Jews and Jewish communities did not
live in isolation as more traditional and theologically-oriented schol-
ars have long believed. Jews and Christians coexisted, churches and
synagogues could be found in the same towns and cities, sometimes
in close proximity of each other. In Late Antiquity there was no
such phenomenon as a spatial isolation of Jews comparable to the
ghettos of later periods. In Palestine, especially, where Judaism was
so prominent and the Jews were strong in numbers,[25] the judaizing

---

purification for such foulness? What salvation for such perdition? 'Repent,' he says,
'and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness
of your sins; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.' [Acts 2:38] O the
ineffable loving-kindness of God! They despair of salvation and yet are deemed
worthy of the Holy Spirit."

[20] *Catech.* 3.6.
[21] *Catech.* 4.37; trans. Yarnold.
[22] *Catech.* 10.2.
[23] *Catech.* 14.2.
[24] E.g. Wilken, 1983 (Antioch); H.J.W. Drijvers, 1992 (Edessa). On judaizing
Christians in general, see Simon, 1986, chap. 11; Wharton, 2000, 201 ff., with
many references to other relevant publications on this topic.
[25]

of Christians must have felt as a real threat by Cyril. In addition it may be remarked that Cyril's anti-Judaism could have been stimulated by the Jewish-Christian past of the Jerusalem church and Cyril's wish for emancipation from that past. Or, in the words of a modern author: "The Jewish element determined and shaped the self-perception of the Jerusalem community, whose entire history may be seen in terms of a long and enduring confrontation with its Jewish past."[26] Also Cyril's *Letter to Constantius*, in particular the passage about the Second Coming, can be interpreted as anti-Jewish.[27] The Encaenia, the annually commemorated dedication ceremony of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, carries anti-Jewish symbolism, as do other traditions originally connected to the Jewish Temple but transferred to the Constantinian church complex. Events laden with anti-Jewish symbolism are the alleged discovery in 351 of the bones of James, Jerusalem's first bishop who was stoned to death by the Jews, as well as the finding of the True Cross.

Greater than the dangers the pagans and the Jews posed for Christians in the eastern part of the Empire, were the heretics. This is not only apparent from Cyril's *Catecheses*, but also, for instance, from the publication of Epiphanius' *Panarion* or Ephrem Syrus' *Hyms against Heresies* and *Prose Refutations* in the same period that Cyril was bishop of Jerusalem. Cyril speaks at length about the various heresies that could endanger the Christianity of his audience, and takes an uncompromising stance toward these errors of faith. He does not clearly distinguish between heresies and gnosticism. By the fourth century, a heresy had come to mean a theological opinion or doctrine in opposition to the accepted, or orthodox, doctrine. Arianism is a good example of such a divergent opinion or fundamental error not in accordance with orthodoxy, and is therefore heresy. Cyril, however, calls all views not in accordance with the right faith heresies, even those that we would nowadays characterize as gnostic. In this, he does not deviate from other Church Fathers who considered gnosticism as an erratic development of Christian teaching. Cyril does not therefore clearly distinguish (and even if he had done so one wonders whether his audience would have understood the distinctions) between Valentinianism, Marcionism, Manichaeism, Sabellianism, Arianism, and Docetism – some of the deviant religious

---

[26] Irshai, 1999, 206.
[27] See Chapter 6, 161–62.

movements Cyril mentions in his *Catecheses*. Quite regularly, Cyril does not refer to heresies or gnostic sects by name but refers to them implicitly by stating their ideas. The term Arianism or Arian, for instance, does not occur in the *Catecheses*.[28] Nevertheless, Cyril warns his listeners against Arian ideas when he remarks that Father and Son are one but that there are those who believe that the Father is at one time Father and at another Son;[29] or that Christ did not gain the rank of Lord by advancement (προκοπή) but possessed it by nature;[30] or that the Holy Trinity should not be divided as "some" do. The "some" is a reference to the Arians, who held that the Son is a creature and that the Holy Spirit is inferior to the Son. In the same way, he admonishes the baptismal candidates against the ideas of Docetism according to which the Cross was a fantasy and Christ's crucifixion an illusion. According to Cyril, the Passion was real; otherwise Redemption and Salvation would have been pretenses.[31] Another heresy to which Cyril implicitly refers is that of Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra in Galatia (d. *c.* 374), who maintained that Christ would no longer reign after the end of the world. Marcellus believed that Son and Holy Spirit emanated only for the purpose of Creation and Redemption; after that they would be assimilated into the Divine Unity. The idea of Christ's kingdom coming to an end is blasphemy to Cyril and he goes on at length referring to and quoting many a Bible passage, showing that Marcellus interpreted the Scriptures incorrectly.[32]

Although Cyril mentions several heresies and gnostic movements throughout his *Catechetical Lectures*, he discusses the subject thoroughly in the sixth lecture "On the Unity of God" (pars. 12–32).[33] He begins

---

[28] The reason Cyril does not explicitly mention Arianism is not clear; it may be that he did not want to get into conflict with the Arian Acacius so soon after the latter had consecrated Cyril as bishop of Jerusalem.

[29] *Catech.* 11.18; this remark is also directed against the adherents to Sabellianism who hold the same belief. See Appendix I for Cyril's stance towards Arianism.

[30] *Catech.* 10.5. It was held by the Arians and others that Jesus was an ordinary man but that he advanced to divine status. This is a view to which Cyril is opposed; for him there was, according to his views expressed in the *Catecheses*, "one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all ages, Very God, through whom all things were made" (*Catech.* 11.21). See Gregg, 1985, 89 ff. Cyril's *Catecheses* 10 and 11 deal with christology in particular.

[31] *Catech.* 13.4, 37.

[32] *Catech.* 15.27–31.

[33] Unfortunately these paragraphs are left out of the translations by Telfer (1955) and Yarnold (2000).

by saying that "the accursed, irreligious brood of heretics" are haters
of Christ and speak of two godheads, one good and one evil. He is
apparently speaking here of the Manichaeans, since he continues,
saying that the good God is the Father of Christ, whom the heretics
identify with the sun. Cyril goes on to say that speaking about these
things is a sort of defilement, but that he must speak about it in
order to save his listeners from falling victim to these ideas out of
ignorance. After this introduction, Cyril presents an overview of sev-
eral heresies in which he mainly concentrates on the various gnos-
tic groups, whose "name signifies knowledge, though their ignorance
is profound."[34]

Following Irenaeus, Cyril calls Simon Magus the inventor of all
heresies.[35] He refers to Simon as "the first dragon of wickedness";
when his "head had been cut off, the stem of wickedness proved to
be many-headed."[36] Cyril tells the story of how Simon came to
Rome, where he consorted with the harlot Helena,[37] and presented
himself as the one who had appeared as the Father on Mount Sinai,
as Jesus Christ among the Jews, and after this as the Holy Spirit,
whom Christ had promised to send as the Advocate.[38] Simon was
so successful that the emperor Claudius set up a statue in his honor
bearing the inscription "*Simoni, deo sancto*" on its pedestal.[39] Through
the efforts of Peter and Paul and the united prayers of the Christians,
Simon Magus was annihilated. When the latter announced that he
would display his powers by being carried up into the heavens, the
supposed god Simon was struck down to earth and from thence
brought down "to the realms beneath the earth." For baptismal can-
didates, Simon was an especially wicked example because he thought
he could buy the gift of the Holy Spirit with money, whereas this

---

[34] *Catech.* 16.7.

[35] *Catech.* 6.13; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.23.2.

[36] *Catech.* 6.14–15; cf. also 15.5; 16.6, 10. The information about Simon in the
Catecheses is mostly based on Acts 8:9 ff.

[37] Simon had picked up Helena in Tyre in Phoenicia. He considered this woman
to be the first conception of his mind, the mother of all, by whom in the begin-
ning he conceived in his mind the creation of angels and archangels; Irenaeus, *Adv.
Haer.* 1.23.2. See also Rudolph, 1983, 294–98.

[38] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.23.1.

[39] This story is apparently derived from Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.* 26, cf. 56. He,
however, confused Simon with Semo Sancus, a Sabine god. See also Irenaeus, *Adv.
Haer.* 1.23.1; Tertullian, *Apol.* 13.9 (PL 1, 347–48); Eus., *HE* 2.13.3. For a depic-
tion of the inscription, see Rudolph, 1983, 295.

is a gift beyond price. Cyril regularly refers to Simon, whose belief did not come from the heart, thereby making of him an example of the hypocrite who was not enlightened by the Spirit upon his baptism.[40] By doing this, Cyril admonished his baptismal candidates to be sincere of heart and not to pretend belief when approaching the baptismal font.

After this episode concerning Simon Magus, and after having mentioned the names of Cerinthus, Menander, Carpocrates, and the Ebionites, without, however, explaining their particular importance for the development of gnostic and heretical doctrines, Cyril briefly discusses Marcion and his ideas.[41] Cyril calls him a "mouthpiece of impiety" and a "deviser of fresh mischief," since he preaches three gods: a good one – the father of Christ; a bad one – the devil; and a third one in between – the creator of the world and the God of the Jews. Since Marcion considered the father of Christ to be the only good god, the Jewish god was subservient to Him. Therefore, Marcion did not recognize the Old Testament and its testimonies. He also rejected parts of the New Testament that showed approval of the Old Testament. Marcion's canon of Scriptures only accepted the Gospel of Luke, in an adapted form, and ten Epistles of Paul (the *Apostolicon*).[42] Having the correct contents of the Bible was an important issue for Cyril. In his fourth *Catechetical Lecture*, Cyril had emphasized that the Old and New Testaments are complementary and that the Old Testament had foretold the coming of Christ as

---

[40] *Procatech.* 2; *Catech.* 3.8; 16.10; 17.25, 35.

[41] *Catech.* 6.16. Cerinthus (fl. *c.* 100) was a gnostic heretic who, as far as is known, believed that the world was not created by God but by either a demiurge or angels, that Jesus began his life as a mere man, and that only after his baptism "the Christ," a higher divine power, descended upon him and left him again at his Crucifixion; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.26.1; Eus., *HE* 3.28; Epiph., *Pan.* 28. Menander was a Samaritan and a disciple of Simon Magus, who practiced magical arts and was said to be inspired by devils. His adherents believed that they would never die. He believed that the world was created by angels; e.g. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.23.5; Epiph., *Pan.* 22. Carpocrates was a gnostic teacher in Alexandria of the second century. He taught, for example, that the world was created by angels; e.g. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.25.1; Epiph., *Pan.* 27. His followers, the Carpocratians, survived till the fourth century and preached, for example, that Jesus was born naturally. For all three, see also Rudolph, 1983, 298–99. The Ebionites were a sect of Jewish Christians who probably believed that Jesus was the natural son of Joseph and Mary and that the Holy Spirit came to him at the time of his baptism. They seem to have used only one Gospel and rejected the Pauline Epistles; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.26; Epiph., *Pan.* 30; Dauphin, 1998, vol. 1, 240 ff.

[42] *Catech.* 6.16; 7.6; 16.4, 7. See also Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 1.27; Epiph., *Pan.* 42.9.

ΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΑΓΙΟΙΣ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ

Κ Υ Ρ Ι Λ Λ Ο Υ

ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΩΝ ΑΡΧΙΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΥ

Κ Α Τ Η Χ Η Σ Ε Ι Σ.

S. P. N. CYRILLI

HIEROSOLYMITANI ARCHIEPISCOPI

C A T E C H E S E S.

| ΠΡΟΚΑΤΗΧΗΣΙΣ, ἤτοι πρόλογος τῶ Κατηχήσεων, τῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Κυρίλλε Ἀρχιεπισκόπε Ἱεροσολύμων. | PROCATECHESIS, seu prævius Catechesibus sermo, sancti Patris nostri Cyrilli Archiepiscopi Hierosolymorum. |

α. ΗΔΗ μακαριότητος ὀσμὴ πρὸς ὑμᾶς, Α ὦ ΦΩΤΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΙ, ἤδη τὰ νοητὰ ἄνθη συλλέγετε, πρὸς πλοκὴν ἐπουρανίων στεφάνων.

VOS jam adflat beatitudinis odor, ô ILLUMINANDI. Jam flores sublimioris naturæ colligitis, ad plectendas cœlestes coronas.

autem allegoria continetur ex dissimilibus conflata metaphoris, cujus argumentum sumsit author ex libro Canticorum sibi plurimum familiari. Spiritualium florum nomine intelligere potest apertam jam Illuminandis scripturarum sacrarum doctrinam, quas eos ad utilitatem dechorare jubet, Cat. 9. n. 13. Spiritusve sancti fragrantiam appellat vel proximum ejus adventum, quem suavissimo plenum odore dicit Cat. 16. n. 16. vel etiam primum ejusdem per insufflationes exorcistorum inspirati, & in auditorum verdibus inhabitantis donum. Vide infra num. 6. & 9.

1 O *Illuminandi*, Gr. ὦ Φωτιζόμενοι.] Cur mutaverimus vocem *Illuminatorum*, quæ in prioribus editionibus ab interpretibus posita est , rationem reddimus in Dissertatione II. de scriptis Cyrilli. **2** *Jam flores sublimioris naturæ*, νοητὰ ἄνθη.] Ad litteram, *quæ sola mente intelliguntur*, vel , *intelligibiles*; quâ voce Ambrosius aliique Latini Patres τὰ νοητὰ Græcorum reddere solent: quorum exemplo etiam aliquando utemur, in vocabulo cui usus ecclesiasticus sensum novum affixit. Grodecius vertit, *flores spirituales*, nec male; cùm νοητὰ & πνευματικὰ Græcis, *intelligibilia* & *spiritalia* Latinis promiscue usurpentur , ad designandam rei alicujus sub sensus subjectæ sublimiorem quamdam intelligentiam, quæ ad rem sensibus superiorem, & sola mente adspectabilem, ex quadam similitudine transfertur. eoque sensu Cyrillus ipse vocem πνευματικὰ , adhibet Cat. 11. n. 8. Verùm cùm idem alibi , idque constanter , *spiritalis* vocabulo id quod Spiritus sancti proprium est significare soleat , distinctionis causâ *νοητὰ* alia voce reddendum censuimus. Hic

ν *νοητὰ*, Codex Regius 1814. habet ἀν ἔχετε, *colligimus* ; ex vitiosa Græcorum diphtongum αι quemadmodum ε pronunciandi ratione, quod hic adnotamus, ut similium variationum, quas in hujus Operis decursu animadvertet lector , & quarum bene multas prætermisimus, rationem intelligat. Cæterum codd. D.Roe. & Casauboniaus , de cuibus in codicum Notitia diximus, ferunt *συλλέγομεν colligis sunt.*

A

Cyril instructing his baptismal candidates. Engraving from A.A. Touttée, P. Maran, *S. Cyrilli archiepiscopi Hierosolymitani operae quae exstant omnia, et ejus nomine circumferuntur* (Paris 1720).

mingle with people who hold these ideas and "not to be over curious nor wish to enter into conversation with them."[49]

Although Christians should abhor all these heretics, the worst of all is Manichaeism. Cyril calls it the "garbage bin of all heresies"[50] and he plays with the name Mani which in Greek has a close association with μανία (madness).[51] Mani combined what was bad in every heresy and in this way created a novel error.[52] Compared to the expositions on the other movements, the one on Manichaeism in *Catechesis* 6 (20–31) is much longer but hardly goes into doctrinal matters, as Cyril had done, even though in a cursory way, in the cases of Marcionism and Valentinianism. Cyril's digression on Mani and Manichaeism is so long because, as he says himself, he wants to avoid giving the impression of groundless accusations and because he wants to teach the baptismal candidates how loathsome Mani's teachings are; however, the attraction Manichaeism exerted on many undoubtedly must have been one of the reasons why Cyril elaborated on this movement. For his information on Manichaeism, Cyril drew almost exclusively on the *Acta Archelai*. The *Acta* was a Christian propagandistic text, completed probably in the 330s or 340s, that presented a biography of Mani as well as describing some of his ideas in a most unfavorable, antihagiographical way. The original (probably) Greek text has not survived but a Latin translation ascribed to a certain Hegemonius is preserved in its entirety. The text seems to have been popular in the fourth century and Cyril is the first to have used it as a source of information to purposefully demonize the Manichees. The *Acta* was also much utilized by Cyril's contemporary Epiphanius for his *Panarion*.[53]

Like the *Acta*, Cyril presents Mani as the inheritor of the doctrines of several pseudoprophets. The first of them was Scythianus, a very wealthy Saracen merchant who settled in Alexandria. This Scythianus who, according to Cyril, emulated the life of Aristotle,[54] composed four books: the *Book of the Mysteries*, the *Kephalaia*, the *Gospel*, and the

---

[49] *Catech.* 6.19.
[50] *Catech.* 6.20; 16.9.
[51] *Catech.* 6.20. Eusebius (*HE* 7.31) does the same.
[52] *Catech.* 16.9.
[53] Epiph., *Pan.* 66.1.4–12.3. The text was also translated in Syriac and probably also into Coptic and Armenian; see Lieu, 1992, 128 ff., and Lieu, 1994. 132–52.
[54] Cyril must be mistaken here since Hegemonius (*Acta Archelai* 62.3) mentions that Scythianus derived his ideas from Pythagoras; e.g. Epiph., *Pan.* 66.2.9.

Treasures. After Scythianus' death, his pupil Terebinthus inherited his wealth, books, and ideas and came to Palestine; after being discovered as an impostor, he traveled on to Persia where he changed his name to Buddas. He was put under a lot of pressure during debates by the priests of Mithras and eventually sought refuge with a widow[55] to escape from his inquisitors. When he went up to the roof of her house to work magic and call upon the demons of the air, he was struck by God and dropped dead.[56] The widow came into possession of Terebinthus' money and the books he had inherited from Scythianus. Since she was alone in the world, she purchased a boy by the name of Cubricus and instructed him in the doctrine of the Persians.[57] Since he was an excellent debater, he changed his name from Cubricus into Mani, meaning "discourse" in Persian. Mani presented himself as the Paraclete/Advocate and pretended to have superhuman powers.[58] When the son of the Persian king became sick, Mani promised to cure him through prayer. When his prayers failed and the prince died, Mani was chained and cast into prison. He managed to escape, however; "the self-styled 'Advocate' . . . was no successor of Jesus who went eagerly to the cross, but the very opposite, a runaway," says Cyril.[59] Mani fled to Mesopotamia where he ran into bishop Archelaus, a man of great religious zeal. The bishop, not trusting Mani, organized a disputation in which pagans also participated. When Archelaus asked Mani what he preached, the latter answered that the God of the Old Testament was the inventor of evils and a God who causes blindness. Archelaus refuted Mani's doctrines by referring to and quoting many texts from the Bible. Eventually, Mani is defeated and takes to flight again.[60]

---

[55] This detail is probably influenced by the account of Simon Magus, who consorted with the woman Helena.

[56] Hegemonius (*Acta Archelai* 63.4–6) mentions that Terebinthus was pulled down by an angel; Epiph., *Pan.* 66.3.12.

[57] It is not clear what Cyril means here. Epiphanius (*Pan.* 66.4.1) speaks of Mani's teaching, implying the doctrine he had learned about from the four books by Scythianus.

[58] See also *Catech.* 16.9; cf. John 16:5–15.

[59] *Catech.* 6.26.

[60] Hegemonius (*Acta Archelai*) mentions many other matters of doctrine being discussed by Mani and Archelaus, but since this particular lecture is on the Unity of God, Cyril only refers to the distinction made by Manichaeans between the God of the Old and New Testaments; see also Epiph., *Pan.* 66.8.2–10.4. Cyril also omits the story about Marcellus through whom Archelaus came into contact with Mani;

Archelaus, however, pursued him, causing Mani to flee again. Persian guards seized him and delivered him to the king. The Persian monarch ordered Mani to be flayed and have his skin put on display. The rest of his body was given over as food for wild beasts. Mani left three disciples, Baddas, Hermas, and Thomas, the latter of whom, Cyril believes, had written the Gospel according to Thomas.[61] Cyril concludes his exposition by referring to some Manichaean doctrines − such as fasting and avoidance of meat, and the idea that one changes into the plant, herb, or vegetable that one picks, or into the animal one eats − making them sound ridiculous. Furthermore, he relates that when a Manichaean is presented with a loaf of bread he says that he did not make the bread − he did not sow the wheat, reap it with a sickle, and bake it −, curses the Most High God for making the bread, and then eats it. Cyril is referring here to the strict rules to which the Elect, the highest class within the Manichaean church, had to adhere. The Elect were not permitted to plant, to harvest, or to prepare their own meals since that would mean the killing of plants. Plants contained light particles, that is the divine Suffering Jesus, and harvesting them could prevent the liberation of these particles and their return to the Kingdom of Light. However, Auditors, the second class in the Manichaean hierarchy, were pardoned for the unavoidable killing of plants, and they were the ones who harvested and prepared the meals for the Elect.[62]

Not treated in the sixth *Catechetical Lecture* is the movement of the Cataphrygians or Montanism, but Cyril refers briefly to this sect in

---

Acta Archelai 1 ff. Mani fled to a small village named Diodorus where he, according to the *Acta Archelai* (43.4 ff.) and Epiphanius (*Pan.* 66.11.1−8), planned to debate with Trypho, the village priest.

[61] Although later texts also mention a Thomas as a disciple of Mani, it is uncertain whether there was a Manichaean disciple by that name. There existed, however, a Manichaean missionary named Thomas, who operated in Egypt; Lieu, 1994, 228, 264. Even if Mani had a disciple named Thomas, it is highly unlikely that he was responsible for the apocryphal *Gospel of Thomas*. This text, known in Coptic, probably originated in the Syriac-speaking regions. There, a Judas Thomas was known as the twin brother of Jesus, and he was thought to have composed not only the *Gospel of Thomas*, but also the *Acts of Thomas*. Thomas' connection with Manichaeism probably originated from the fact that the Manichaeans honored the Scriptures ascribed to Thomas; see Blatz, 1990; H.J.W. Drijvers, 1989. Cyril execrates the Gospel according to Thomas and nobody should read it; *Catech.* 4.36; 6.31.

[62] Cyril does not elaborate on the Manichaean doctrines. Occasionally, he refers to Manichaean doctrines, for instance in *Catech.* 15.3 where he mentions the Manichaean belief that the sun is Christ; see also *Catech.* 6.13; 11.21.

his sixteenth *Catechesis*.[63] He calls Montanus, who presented himself as the Holy Spirit, a madman and miserable creature. He accuses him of lasciviousness, apparently referring to Montanus' association with the prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla. Montanus believed that Jerusalem would descend on the Phrygian village of Pepuza, where, according to Cyril, he carried out mysteries, including the cutting of the throats of little children and chopping them into pieces for unholy meals.[64]

Since in his *Procatechesis* Cyril mentions the Samaritans as one of the religious movements, together with pagans, Jews, and heretics, against which the baptismal candidates are taking up arms, one would expect an exposition on them. However, Cyril hardly devotes a word to the Samaritans. This is all the more surprising since in Cyril's time Samaritan communities were located not far from Jerusalem.[65] The only time that he speaks about them in more detail is in his last lecture in which he condemns the Samaritans for not believing in the resurrection of the dead. By referring to the Law – the Samaritans only accepted the Pentateuch – Cyril tried to make clear to his audience how silly and senseless the Samaritan ideas were: When the world was created by God out of nothing, would it then be impossible to raise the dead again? Cyril furthermore considers the Samaritans to be unbelievers for not accepting the Prophets.[66]

Scattered throughout Cyril's *Catecheses* are references to heretical and gnostic movements and their ideas. More often than not, he does not specify which doctrines were held by the several movements. This would probably be too detailed information for his listeners, who were already overwhelmed with instructions and advice. We might even wonder whether Cyril himself had detailed knowledge of the generally complicated learnings of the various gnostic and

---

[63] *Catech.* 16.8.

[64] Epiphanius (*Pan.* 48.14.5, 15.6) has a story about little children being pierced with needles to get their blood for sacrifice and drinking. Eusebius, in his passages on Montanus and the Montanists (*HE* 5.16 ff.), does not mention it; cf. Jer., *Epist.* 41.4.1, who speaks of suckling children subjected to a triumphant martyrdom.

[65] Information about the Samaritans is meager. However, several Samaritan synagogues and inscriptions have been attested for the fourth century; see Stemberger, 2000, chap. 8 and also Tsafrir, Di Segni, and Green, 1994, map 4: "Synagogues in Eretz Israel in the Roman and Byzantine Period."

[66] References to Samaritans: *Procatech.* 10; *Catech.* 4.37; 6.33; 18.1–2, 11–13.

heretical sects. So Cyril mentions in general that heretics believe that Christ was begotten of a man and a woman, that Christ is man made God, that they do not believe in the virgin birth of Christ, and that there are those who deny the humanity of Christ. Or that they believe that there was a time when Christ was not or that the Son is different from the Father. Or that they do not believe in one almighty God, but in several gods: good and evil gods, gods of light and darkness, sun and moon. Or that they distinguish between God, Jesus, and Christ and hold that the world was not created by God but by angels, a demiurge, or the devil. Or that they do not accept the resurrection of the dead. Cyril's condemnation of heretical and gnostic ideas of poverty is also interesting. According to him, there is nothing wrong with being wealthy as long as one uses his money well – by giving it to the poor, for instance; in that case, money can even be the door to the heavenly kingdom.[67]

Cyril's description of the heretical and gnostic sects is very incomplete, far from objective, and extremely negative and derogatory. However, Cyril did not aspire to completeness and objectivity; his goal was to depict Christianity's competitors and opponents as negatively as possible. By emphasizing some of the extraordinary ideas of these sects, as well as the licentiousness and almost criminal behavior of their founders, Cyril attempted to convince his audience how wrong and loathsome these movements were. Repeatedly, Cyril warns the baptismal candidates to stay away from these heretics and gnostics and shun their assemblies, since they could deceive their minds. Cyril even speaks of the church (*ekklesia*) of the malignant, that is, the meetings of the heretics, Marcionists, Manichaeans, and others. His listeners should keep to the holy Catholic Church, and if they ever stay in cities, they should not simply ask where the Lord's house is, but where the Catholic Church is. Cyril clearly implies by this that they otherwise risked the chance of entering a meeting place of a heretical or gnostic sect.[68] These are interesting remarks that raise the question of why Cyril focused so much in his lectures on heresies and gnostic movements. What does this say about Cyril's audience, and can we conclude anything from it about the religious

---

[67] *Catech.* 6.13; 7.9; 8.1, 3, 6–7; 9.4; 10.4; 11.14, 16–17, 21; 12.3, 31; 15.3; 16.4; 18.1.
[68] *Catech.* 4.37; 18.26.

landscape of Cyril's world and that of those for whom the *Catecheses* were delivered?

The *Catecheses* are monologues and the baptismal candidates were supposed to listen but not respond verbally to Cyril's instructions. Nevertheless, in the *Catecheses* there is a sense of the presence of the audience and of interaction between Cyril and his listeners. Cyril's audience supposedly reacted in some way to what he told them. We can imagine gestures and sounds of agreement and enthusiasm, chatting, and perhaps laughter, as we know, for instance, from John Chrysostom's sermons as well as from Cyril's own preaching,[69] but also reactions of weariness and restlessness. It must not always have been easy, especially for the uneducated among his audience, to remain fully attentive to Cyril's expositions. His endless references to Bible passages, both from the Old and New Testaments, may have at times seemed tiresome, were bound to have an effect on his audience's behavior, and might well have slackened their attention. Cyril himself was aware of this as it appears from remarks such as "I realize I am speaking at length and that my hearers are wearied," "May the length of my discourse, dear brethren, not prove tedious to you," and "We have discoursed at length today and perhaps your ears are weary"; he wants "to avoid exhausting the attention of my hearers" by going on too long, as well as "show regard for moderation in our discourse."[70]

Very little is known about the background and social makeup of Cyril's audience and not much can be surmised from the *Catecheses* or from other sources. Most of them, if not all, were adults, since infant baptism had become uncommon, and it is likely that their provenance intellectually, geographically, as well as religiously, varied considerably. Cyril admonishes his listeners from time to time to read the Scriptures, implying that some of them were educated, or at least could read.[71] However, uneducated people were also among

---

[69] For Chrysostom, see Mayer, 1998, esp. 131–33. Egeria mentions, e.g. the assembly's groaning and lamenting in reaction to Cyril's Gospel reading of the Lord's Resurrection; *It. Eger.* 24.10; see also 34, 36.3 and 37.7.

[70] *Catech.* 12.22; 16.25; 17.20; 13.22; 16.32. Egeria mentions that the faithful, i.e. those already baptized, who attended the *Catecheses* uttered exclamations. Egeria also reports that the newly baptized applauded loudly during the bishop's deliverance of the *Mystagogical Catecheses; It. Eger.* 46.4; 47.2.

[71] For instance, *Catech.* 4.33; 9.13; 17.34.

the candidates for baptism, as Cyril reports: "not everyone has both the education and the leisure required to read and know the Scriptures."[72] Presumably, the candidates came not only from Jerusalem and its immediate vicinity but from all over the Roman world, and perhaps even beyond, although it is likely that most of them came from the eastern provinces of the empire.[73] Jerusalem had always attracted "multitudes of strangers from all parts."[74] In the fourth century, the Christian Jerusalem began to attract many pilgrims and other visitors, turning the city into a truly cosmopolitan place where many tongues were spoken. The multinational character of Jerusalem's population was also reflected in the various languages – Greek, Aramaic, and Latin – in which services were delivered and/or translated in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.[75] The fourth-century Bordeaux pilgrim and Egeria are just the tip of the iceberg known to posterity of the great masses of pilgrims who went to the Holy Land. Probably some of those who traveled to the Holy Land did so not only to visit the increasing number of holy sites,[76] but also to seek baptism in the town so notable for its biblical history. Although he does not refer to them, Cyril may have had pilgrims among his audience, even though it was difficult for *peregrini* to obtain admission to the prebaptismal instructions since they often did not have witnesses.[77] Presumably, there were also monks and virgins (*monazontes* and *parthenoi*) who listened to Cyril's instructions. When talking about the body, he addresses those who follow a chaste life and tells them that they in particular should heed their chastity.[78] Moreover, he warns them not to consider themselves better human beings then those who live in the humbler state of matrimony.[79] Although it may seem surprising that there were monks and nuns among Cyril's candidates of baptism, monastic life may for some have begun before

---

[72] *Catech.* 5.12.

[73] Hunt, 1982, 151–53.

[74] *Catech.* 17.16. Cf. also Jer. (*Epist.* 46.10 and 108.3) who claims that every nation was represented at the holy places.

[75] *It. Eger.* 47.3–4. According to Egeria, the bishop of Jerusalem spoke Aramaic.

[76] In the fourth century, Christians were rapidly taking over pagan, Jewish, and Samaritan sacred sites; Taylor, 1993, 318–32.

[77] *It. Eger.* 45.4.

[78] *Catech.* 4.24: Καὶ τὸν περὶ σωφροσύνης λόγον, προηγουμένως μὲν ἀκουέτω τῶν μοναζόντων καὶ τῶν παρθένων τάγμα . . .; see also *Catech.* 12.33.

[79] *Catech.* 4.25.

baptism. Especially those who came as pilgrims to the Holy Land and decided to stay to adopt an ascetic life and join a monastic settlement at one of the holy sites, may not have been officially initiated and may still had to go through the rite of baptism.

Cyril's listeners also included former pagans; he addresses the candidates as "you, coming from paganism."[80] Moreover, there may also have been former Jews among his listeners who felt an attraction to Christianity. This may be surmised from Cyril's remark that even the crucifiers could be forgiven: "What sin is greater than crucifying Christ? But baptism can even expiate this."[81] Certainly there were former Manichaeans among Cyril's audience. When speaking of the Day of Judgment and the establishment of the Eternal Kingdom, Cyril refers to Matthew 24:29, where it is written that on that day the sun shall be darkened, the moon will not give light, and the stars will fall from heaven, and to Joel 3:4, where it is mentioned that the sun will be turned to darkness and the moon to blood. Addressing those who once were adherents to Manichaeism, Cyril adds: "Let the converts from the Manichaeans be instructed and no longer make these luminaries their gods, nor impiously think that this sun which is darkened is Christ."[82]

The picture that emerges from a close reading of the *Catecheses* is that Cyril addressed an audience of mixed background – intellectually, geographically, and religiously – and that, as an instructor in the faith, he had to take that into account.

A way of explaining why Cyril talks so much about pagans, Jews, heretics, and gnostics is that he defined orthodox Christianity by defining what it was not. By using the rhetorical device of describing the deviant and negative "other," he could probably bring home

---

[80] *Catech.* 2.10. Paulin (1959, 54–56) assumes that most of Cyril's audience consisted of converted pagans.

[81] *Catech.* 3.15. Jews (and pagans and heretics) may have attended regular church services in Jerusalem, which they were allowed to do up to the moment of the *missa catechumenorum*; *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua* 89 (CC, Ser. Lat. 148, 169): *Ut episcopus nullum prohibeat ingredi ecclesiam et audire verbum Dei, sive gentilem, sive haereticum, sive iudaeum, usque ad missam catechumenorum*; Parkes, 1974, 173. Epiphanius' *Panarion* contains the account of doubtful veracity of Joseph of Tiberias' conversion (30.9.1–10.1, 30.10.3–7) and that of the deathbed baptism of the Patriarch Ellel (30.4.5–7, 30.6.1–6). Epiphanius also refers in general to Jews converted to Christianity; *Pan.* 30.3.9.

[82] *Catech.* 15.3.

in a more understandable way to his listeners, especially to those
with a limited education, what Christianity was about, rather than
just presenting and explaining Christian doctrine, which was not
always easy to comprehend. Moreover, polemical rhetoric has always
been used by church leaders for fixing the boundaries of the Church
and self-defining Christianity. Cyril tried to make it clear that an
orthodox Christian is someone who is in direct opposition to pagans,
Jews, heretics, and gnostics, and their ideas, which are anathemas
to the true believer. A true Christian belonged to the Catholic
Church.[83] It is, however, also of importance to Cyril that his can-
didates should "know" these others in order to be able to control
them and have power over them.[84] Hence, Cyril's references to gen-
tiles, Jews, heretics, and gnostics did not serve only the purpose of
defining Christianity and should not be seen only within the frame-
work of a rhetorical discourse with Christianity's opponents; Cyril's
remarks also reflect a historical situation and are testimony to the
religious pluralism in the Roman Empire, especially in its eastern
provinces, around the middle of the fourth century. People living in
this period could still select from a wide variety of beliefs and, even
though the Roman Empire had gradually become more christian-
ized since the reign of Constantine the Great, and the Christian faith
had the support of the emperors, Christianity seems not always to
have been the obvious choice. Although statistical evidence is miss-
ing, it is probable that in Cyril's time Christians were still a minority,
although a fast growing one. Even if people had chosen Christianity –
the grounds for which may have varied greatly from person to per-
son – they may have had problems with the strict Christian rule of
monotheism. To most fourth-century people, monotheism was a novel
phenomenon and a complete break with the past that required a
new form of social behavior. Whereas before they were used to vis-
iting a variety of houses of worship, venerating a number of gods,
and participating in various religious (civic) festivities – all in order
to satisfy specific needs, wants, and anxieties – after their conver-
sion and baptism there was only one house of worship, one god,
and only the Christian feasts in which to participate. Conversion to

---

[83] *Catech.* 18.23.
[84] See Jacobs (2004) for this approach of cognitive control in the case of Jews in
the late antique Holy Land. Jacobs fruitfully applies postcolonial theory to his sub-
ject of study.

monotheistic Christianity not only had religious implications, but it also meant a different social life and thus a complete change of lifestyle. "Christianity is not a chance thing," as one fifth-century author put it.[85] However, many of the newly converted may not have found it easy to adjust to their new lifestyle and may have slid back from time to time, or even permanently, to old habits by, for instance, participating in non-Christian festivities and attending non-Christian houses of worship and meetings. It may even be that some new converts considered Christianity to be one of a number of cults into which one could be initiated, and did not see baptism as an irreversible rite of passage.

Cyril's *Catecheses* betray a deep concern about the seductiveness that pagan cults, Judaism, heresies, and gnostic movements held for Christians. Many of his baptismal candidates had been adherents of these cults, heresies and beliefs, and some of them may still have felt attracted to these movements. Baptism seems not to have been a warranty for the adherence to strict monotheism, against falling back into old habits, or perhaps exploring new religious ventures. Judging from the number of words dedicated to beliefs other than the orthodox Christian faith, it seems that Cyril considered paganism to be the least threatening, and Judaism to be a serious menace, but the greatest threat was posed by heretical and gnostic movements.

Recent studies have made it clear that the Hellenic cults, or paganism, persisted strongly in the fourth century, and remained attractive to Christians.[86] A few examples should suffice. The letters of Cyril's contemporary Basil of Caesarea, for instance, indicate that pagans and Christians associated freely, and provide evidence that Christians still worshiped idols, hired dream interpreters, consulted seers, and practiced pagan rituals for warding off demons, and Christian deaconesses are even said to have fornicated with pagans.[87] From what Basil describes, it is clear that there were Christians who still followed pagan customs or slid back to these habits in the event

---

[85] Callinicus of Rufinianae, *De Vita S. Hypatii Liber*, ed. Seminarii Philologorum Bonnensis Sodales, Leipzig, 1895, 99: οὐκ ἔστι τὸ τυχὸν χριστιανισμός.

[86] E.g. Bowersock, 1990; Chuvin, 1990; Trombley, 1993–94; Fowden, 1998.

[87] Basil. Caes., *Epist.* 188, 199, 210, 211, 217. Trombley, 1993–94, vol. 1, 176.

that Christianity did not fulfill their desires. We know of Christians who held civic priesthoods.[88] Until at least the reign of Theodosius I, polytheism remained common, and, in spite of the bans on public sacrifice issued by Constantine and Constantius II, many temples remained open and religious feasts continued to be celebrated. Theodoret, for instance, reports that under the reign of Valens, people sacrificed to idols, celebrated public feasts in the forum, and those initiated in the cult of Dionysus ran about in goatskins in a Bacchic frenzy.[89] The temples, and the cultic practices taking place there, were felt to be a continuous threat by the Christian Church as the raids and destruction of these sacred buildings by Christian fanatics, often organized by bishops, make clear.[90] Things seem to have changed, but only gradually, after 392 when Theodosius issued the edict that officially put an end to the freedom to practice paganism.[91] Nevertheless, the enforcement of this edict was not easily feasible as a result of which paganism did not die out but continued, albeit on a smaller scale, especially in the countryside. Regional differences, however, existed. There were rural areas that had already become thoroughly christianized by the fourth century, such as the regions between Apamea and Beroea as well as the area northeast of Antioch with its many hermits and saints, whereas regions like Lydia, Caria, and Phrygia seem to have remained largely pagan even as late as the sixth century.[92]

Polytheism persisted in Palestine also in spite of the land rapidly evolving into the Christian *terra sancta*, and in the fourth century paganism was for Christians a force to be reckoned with. Pagan vitality is, for instance, indicated by anti-Christian rioting during Julian's reign and a letter by the Synod of Jerusalem, from around 400, mentioning numerous crowds of pagans still quite openly performing their godless deeds.[93] We can assume that pagan cults continued in the Palestinian countryside, but definitely also in the cities.

---

[88] *Cod. Theod.* 12.1.112.
[89] Thdt., *HE* 5.21.3–4. Cf. Lenski, 2002, 215–18.
[90] See e.g. Fowden, 1978.
[91] *Cod. Theod.* 16.10.12.
[92] John of Ephesus, *HE* 3.3.36 (CSCO 106, Script. Syr. 55, 169); Van Ginkel, 1995, 129–38. See esp. Mitchell, 1993, vol. 2, chaps. 16 and 17 for the variegated religious landscape of Asia Minor in the fourth century.
[93] Ambr., *Epist.* 40.15; Jer., *Epist.* 93.

Pagan cults were probably still existent in Caesarea in the fourth century. In this city Lemmatius, the pagan high priest of Palestine whom Julian had appointed as part of his policy to revive the old cults, probably resided.[94] By the sixth century, Caesarea seems still to have had pagan (and Manichaean) inhabitants,[95] and there must have been other towns, including possibly Jerusalem itself,[96] where pagans were living about which the sources provide us no information. Mamre, just north of Hebron, had been from time immemorial a pagan shrine; in spite of the fact that Constantine built a church there, it seems that pagans continued to visit the place.[97] We know of at least two towns in Palestine that were still thoroughly pagan at the end of the fourth century: Raphia and Gaza.[98] We only have detailed information about Gaza, thanks to Mark the Deacon's *Life of Porphyry*. Porphyry was bishop of Gaza between 395 and 420. Upon his arrival in the city, Porphyry found a populace that was almost entirely pagan and very hostile toward him. In their efforts to hang on to their traditional Graeco-Semitic cults, they employed every means possible to oppose him. The city had eight temples and shrines – those of Helios, Aphrodite, Apollo, Kore, Hekate, Tyche, as well as a Heroeion and a Marneion, the latter being the temple for Marnes-Zeus, the local and most important god.[99] Only gradually and with imperial backing was Porphyry able to partially suppress paganism and to christianize the city. The use of force was no exception in this process: in 402 the shrine of Aphrodite and the Marneion were destroyed, and possibly the other temples as well, with the help of military forces. On the site of the Marneion a church was dedicated. The countryside around Gaza

---

[94] See Stemberger (2000, 186–98) for Lemmatius and other evidence for the persistence of pagan practices in fourth-century Palestine; also Dauphin, 1998, vol. 1, 190 ff., and Belayche, 2001, 296–309.

[95] Procopius, *Hist. Arc.* 11.26.

[96] In his *Epist. ad Const.* 4 Cyril speaks of pagans visiting Jerusalem but unfortunately he does not refer to pagans who actually lived there. However, considering Jerusalem's pagan past in the second and third centuries it seems unlikely that pagan cults and their adherents had entirely disappeared from Jerusalem by the fourth century.

[97] Soz., *HE* 2.4; Taylor, 1993, 86–95; Belayche, 2001, 298–99.

[98] Soz., *HE* 7.15.11. In the same passage, Sozomen also mentions Petre and Areopolis in Arabia, Heliopolis in Phoenicia, and Apamea in Syria as pagan strongholds, the population of which defended their temples zealously.

[99] *V. Porph.* 64.

also seems to have been predominantly pagan. When Porphyry died in 420, he had managed to convert part of Gaza's population; it seems, however, that the majority of the inhabitants continued to practice their polytheistic beliefs.[100]

During the fourth century, paganism also seems to have remained strong in Scythopolis. This major town had at least five Graeco-Roman pagan temples. All of them seem to have been abandoned by approximately the end of the fourth century due to the laws of Theodosius I prohibiting pagan cults and sacrifices.[101] However, the loss of these cult places does not imply that paganism became extinct. Pagan rites in some form continued to exist, although the general impression is that, due to the christianization of Palestine, paganism was in decline in the fourth century, and that at the end of that century in particular the traditional cults suffered a severe blow. Another town that maintained a lively pagan cult practice was Elusa in southern Palestine. There a shrine of Venus was still regularly visited by worshipers.[102]

It has long been thought that the fourth century was a period of decline for Palestinian Jewry. The number of Palestinian Jews should have diminished due to a deteriorating economy, political upheaval (the Gallus revolt of *c.* 352), natural disaster (the earthquake of 363), and the christianization of Palestine. However, over the past few decades or so this view has been radically revised.[103] Rather than a region in decline, there is now emerging a picture of Late Roman Palestine as a land of relative wealth and stability, and of cultural and religious diversity and vigor. At the town and village level, Palestine went through a period of resuscitation and material prosperity in the fourth and fifth centuries.[104] The increasing number of Christians benefited from this – but the expansion of Christianity in Palestine also contributed considerably to economic growth through, for instance, the building of churches and the pilgrimage tourism. However, it was not only the Christians who benefited; the Palestinian

---

[100] For a detailed investigation into the religious situation in Gaza during Porphyry's episcopate, see Trombley, 1993–94, vol. 1, 188–245; also Belayche, 2001, 303–308.

[101] *Cod. Theod.* 9.16.1–12. For Scythopolis, see Tsafrir, 1998, 208–18.

[102] Jer., *V. Hilar.* 25 (PL 23, 42).

[103] E.g. Groh, 1977; Nathanson, 1986; Groh, 1988 (p. 89: "Judaism in Late Roman Palestine was marvelously rich and diverse"); Wilken, 1992, 194 ff.

[104] Liebeschuetz, 2001, 57–59, 300–303.

Jews also profited. Judaism was not in decline in Cyril's time but was instead flourishing and experiencing a revitalization.

The vitality and prosperity of Judaism and the spread of Jewish communities throughout Palestine can probably best be measured by the number of synagogues still to be found in Palestine in the fourth century. Extensive archaeological research has shown that synagogues were commonplace in the landscape of many towns and villages in later Roman Palestine and several towns are known to have had more than one synagogue; Tiberias is said to have had thirteen and Sepphoris eighteen.[105] The fourth century apparently witnessed a boom in the construction of synagogues. There are, however, regional differences. The Jewish communities were predominantly concentrated in Upper and Lower Galilee and the Golan;[106] there existed a large Jewish community in Caesarea and several can also be located in southern Palestine.[107] Hardly any synagogues and Jewish communities can be attested for Judaea in this period; Judaea, which includes Jerusalem, was the most christianized region of Palestine. Outside Judaea Judaism was thus clearly visible and present in late antique Palestine and Cyril's remark "if the Jews ever trouble you"[108] might well have been a reality in the sense that the presence of Jews was unavoidable for Christians in Palestine. In towns with a diverse population, like, for example, Capernaum, where a church was located opposite a synagogue,[109] Jews and Christians ran in to each other, and probably discussed town affairs and other matters of importance and mutual interest.

There is lack of clarity concerning the presence of Jews in Jerusalem, but it is possible that there were still, or again, Jews living in Jerusalem when Cyril delivered his *Catechetical Lectures*.[110] Even though after the

---

[105] An overview of the synagogues attested for the Later Roman period is presented by Stemberger, 2000, chap. 5. See also Myers, 1988; Tsafrir, Di Segni, and Green, 1994, map 4, "Synagogues in Eretz Israel in the Roman and Byzantine Period," and map 5, "Churches in Byzantine Palestine." On the synagogue, see Levine, 1981 and 1987.

[106] Epiphanius (*Pan.* 30.11.9−10) mentions that there lived no Greeks, Samaritans, nor Christians in the towns of the Galilee.

[107] For Jews in Caesarea and its countryside, see Holum and Hohlfelder, 1988, 196−99; Holum, 1998, 163−69. Samaritans also constituted a considerable part of Caesarea's population.

[108] *Catech.* 4.12.

[109] Myers, 1988, 76; Taylor, 1993, 268−74; Jacobs, 1999.

[110] Stroumsa (1988, esp. 130−31) argues that there existed a Jewish-Christian com-

Bar Kokhba revolt in 135, the Jews were expelled from Jerusalem and from entering Jerusalem by Hadrian's edict, and this edict was reinforced, according to a late source, by Constantine,[111] it is not known how strictly these measures were enforced. The Bordeaux pilgrim, who visited Jerusalem in 333, records that Jews were allowed to visit Jerusalem once a year to lament the destruction of the Temple: "Two statues of Hadrian stand there [i.e. on Temple Mount], and, not far from them, a pierced stone which the Jews come and anoint each year. They mourn and rend their garments, and then depart."[112] This information, however, does not allow for the conclusion that no Jews were present or living in Jerusalem; it may be that they were only allowed to visit the Temple Mount once a year. The same pilgrim, as it happens, also reports that there was still a synagogue standing on Mount Sion: "Inside Sion, within the wall, you can see where David had his palace. Seven synagogues were there, but only one is left."[113] Epiphanius, who wrote at the end of the fourth century, also mentions a synagogue still standing in Jerusalem when Maximus was bishop and Constantine was emperor.[114] However, according to Eusebius, Sion was a ruined area; he also states that synagogues were established everywhere except in Jerusalem and Sion.[115] If the pilgrim from Bordeaux and Epiphanius are right, the synagogue was no longer standing by 370, as we know from Optatus of Milevis; it had probably been razed to make space for the erection of the Church of Holy Sion, to which Cyril refers to as "the upper church of the Apostles".[116]

Cyril's *Catecheses* demonstrate that Judaism had a potentially powerful attraction for his baptismal candidates. This applies not only to the Palestinian Christians among his audience, who must have

---

munity in Jerusalem and that Cyril's polemizing against Judaism was actually directed against the Jewish-Christians.

[111] Eus., *HE* 4.6.3; Eutychius, *Annales* 1.446 (PG 3, 1012). On the matter of Jews and Jerusalem, see Avi-Yonah, 1976, 163–64; Stemberger, 2000, 40–43; Wilken, 1992, 106–107. See also Chapter 1, 8–9.

[112] *It. Burd.* 591; trans. Wilkinson, 1999, 30; see also Greg. Nys., *Orat.* 6.18 (PG 35, 745); Joh. Chrys., *Adv. Iud.* 4.6 (PG 48, 880–81).

[113] *It. Burd.* 592; trans. Wilkinson, 1999, 30–31.

[114] Epiph., *De Mens. et Pond.* 14 (PG 43, 261).

[115] Eus., *Dem. Evang.* 6.13, 15–17; 8.3.1–15 (GCS, Eusebius Werke 6, 262 ff., 269 ff., 391 ff.).

[116] *Catech.* 16.4; Opt. Mil., *Schism. Don.* 3.2 (CSEL 26, 71). Taylor, 1993, 210–12; Tsafrir, 1999, 139.

had almost daily contact with Jews, but also to those who came from outside Palestine; in addition, Jewish communities were still flourishing in cities such as Antioch and Edessa[117] as well as others, constituting a potential danger to Christians in the eyes of church leaders. Not only Cyril but the church in general was concerned about the interaction between Christians and Jews and the possible consequences. Several fourth-century church councils tried to prevent this interaction by prohibiting marriages with Jews, adultery with Jewish women, attendance at Jewish feasts, honoring of the Sabbath and Jewish Passover, blessing of fields by Jews, and the entering of synagogues.[118] It is regrettable that only one of Cyril's sermons has been preserved because one wonders whether he would have delivered any homilies against the Jews, as John Chrysostom did in Antioch. Chrysostom's sermons were a response to Antiochene Christians partaking in Jewish feasts, going to synagogue, and visiting Jewish doctors, and his desire to end these practices.[119] A similar situation might well have occurred in towns in Palestine where Jews and Christians lived together.

Like Judaism, gnosticism was still very much alive in the later Roman Empire, including Palestine.[120] Even though we do not have detailed information about gnostic groups in this period, we can at least get an impression of their ubiquity. Epiphanius, for instance, informs us that Marcionite communities were widespread throughout the Roman Empire in the fourth century, and were even to be found at the doorstep of, and perhaps within, Cyril's own bishopric: "The sect is still to be found even now, in Rome and Italy, Egypt and Palestine, Arabia and Syria, Cyprus and Thebaid – Persia too, moreover and other places."[121] Although it seems that by the beginning of the fourth century the Marcionites had almost vanished from the western part

---

[117] Wilken, 1983; Millar, 1992; H.J.W. Drijvers, 1992.

[118] Nathanson, 1986, 30; Parkes, 1974, 174–77. Fourth-century Roman law, although still protecting Jews, also aspired to limit contact between Jews and Christians, thereby gradually marginalizing Judaism; Parkes, 1974, 177–82; Linder, 1987.

[119] Meeks and Wilken, 1978; Wilken, 1983.

[120] Stroumsa, 1989, 274: "it is reasonable to assume a continued presence of heretical gnostic groups in Palestine up to the fourth century."

[121] Epiph., *Pan.* 42.1.2. Apparently Constantine's law against e.g. Marcionites and Valentinians referred to by Sozomen (*HE* 2.32.1–6) did not have the desired effect.

of the Empire, they remained strong in the east. Seemingly, the Marcionite church even increased in significance in Cyprus, Palestine, and the Syriac-speaking part of Syria and northern Mesopotamia, even though it had receded from the major cities to the smaller villages.[122] The Marcionite services were open to everyone and their church buildings must still have been a visible mark on the landscape of towns and villages in Cyril's time. Since in worship and organization there was no essential difference between the Marcionite communities and the Catholic Church, the newly converted could easily be mistaken and enter a Marcionite house of worship. It is therefore most likely that Cyril's exhortation to ask for the Catholic church instead of just for the Lord's house (*Catech.* 4.37, 18.26) when members of his audience found themselves in an unfamiliar city, was made especially to prevent them from entering Marcionite churches.

Montanism also seems to have remained strong in Late Antiquity, although it is not certain whether there were any Montanist communities in Palestine. According to Epiphanius, Montanists could still be found in Phrygia, Cappadocia, Galatia, Cilicia, and Constantinople. This information is confirmed by Sozomen who reports that there were still Montanists in Phrygia and neighboring regions.[123] About the Manichaeans we have more information. Like the Marcionites, they were still a strong movement within the boundaries of the Roman Empire in Cyril's time in spite of the law Diocletian had issued against them in 302. Manichaeans were traditionally strong in the Roman east (Mesopotamia, Syria), but Manichaeism also had many adherents in Egypt and North Africa, as well as, for instance, in the city of Rome.[124] The Manichaeans were also well-represented in Cyril's own homeland Palestine.[125] A letter by Libanius from around 364, addressed to Priscianus, governor of Palestine, pleads

---

[122] Harnack, 1990, 99–103; H.J.W. Drijvers, 1987–88. In particular, in eastern Syria Marcionism remained strong as may be surmised from Ephrem Syrus' *Hymns against Heresies* and *Prose Refutations* which were directed against Marcion (and Bardaisan and Mani).

[123] Epiph., *Pan.* 48.14.2; Soz., *HE* 7.19.2.

[124] See in general Lieu, 1992.

[125] For Manichaeism in Palestine in the fourth century, see Lieu, 1992, 193–94, and 1994, 53–61. Lieu suggests that the "fact that Manichaeism was especially condemned in these lectures [i.e. the *Catecheses*] rather than any other heresy seems to suggest that Manichaeism had made a stronger impact on his [i.e. Cyril's] diocese than any other heresy" (1994, 55); see also Stroumsa, 1989, 274–76.

for religious tolerance towards the Palestinian Manichaeans. They
were apparently harassed and felt threatened, possibly as a result of
anti-Manichaean propaganda such as that of Cyril.

> The bearers are of that sect which worships the sun without blood
> offerings and, as members of the second category, honour it as a god:
> they restrain their bellies and regard the day of their death as a bless-
> ing. They exist in many quarters of the world, but everywhere their
> numbers are small. They do no harm to anyone, but they are perse-
> cuted by some people. I would like those of them who live in Palestine
> to have your excellence as their refuge and to enjoy security, and
> would-be aggressors not to be permitted to do them violence.[126]

Although the Manichaeans are not mentioned by name in this letter,
it is evident that they are the sect for which Libanius asks protection.

It seems that Manichaeans also sought converts especially among
Christian neophytes. There is a story in the *Life of Porphyry* about a
Manichaean woman from Antioch by the name of Julia, who at the
end of the fourth century came to Gaza, where Porphyry was bishop,
in order to find new followers. Julia infiltrated among the newly con-
verted Christians, corrupted them with the Manichaean doctrines,
and attempted to make them adherents of Manichaeism by bribing
them. Some Christians apparently allowed themselves to be per-
suaded by Julia and became Manichaeans. Of course, Porphyry inter-
fered and challenged Julia to a public debate, which was so heated
that Julia suffered a stroke and died. Her companions were forced
by Porphyry to renounce Manichaeism and were received back into
the church.[127]

In the beginning of the fifth century, Euthymius, a Palestinian
holy man, monk, and later abbot in Jerusalem, was able to convert
a group of Manichaeans to Christianity. Cyril of Scythopolis tells
the story that Euthymius was used to taking long walks in the desert.
On one of these walks in the desert region west of the Dead Sea
he healed the son of the headman of the village of Aristoboulias at
Ziph. Out of gratitude for his miraculous recovery the inhabitants
of Aristoboulias built a monastery for Euthymius and his companions.
Several of the Ziphean Manichaeans came under the influence of

---

[126] *Epist.* 1253 (ed. Foerster); trans. Norman (Loeb).
[127] Marc. Diac., *V. Porph.* 85–91. Lieu, 1994, 56–59; Trombley, 1993–94, vol. 1,
229–33.

Euthymius and his teachings, and were so impressed that they rejected Manichaeism, anathemized Mani, and converted to Christianity.[128]

In Cyril's *Catecheses* we catch glimpses of a world of social diversity and of religious pluralism in Late Roman Palestine. This was a world in which Christianity was still establishing itself and where other cults and religious movements were still very much extant and flourishing. Interactions between members of these assorted religious groups were unavoidable and perhaps even a social necessity, in particular in urban communities. Palestine was no exception in this respect in comparison to other regions of the Roman Empire. By the time Cyril delivered his *Catechetical Lectures*, religious pluralism and social interaction between adherents of various religious groups was a reality, a reality that a church leader like Cyril definitely could not appreciate, and the dangers against which he warned his audience. One wonders how effective Cyril's instructions in this respect were, and how many kept to the faith Cyril had taught them for the rest of their lives without occasionally eating sacrificial meat, visiting a synagogue, talking to a Manichaean, or perhaps even leaving Christianity again.

---

[128] Cyr. Scyth., *V. Euthym.* 12 (ed. Schwartz).

REBUILDING OF THE TEMPLE

Cyril had always lived under Christian emperors and, unlike his older colleagues, had not experienced persecution nor did he know what it was like to live in a world ruled by a non-Christian monarch. This would radically change in 361 when Julian – called the Apostate by Christians – became emperor. Julian wanted to turn back the clock and initiated a policy of dechristianization and repaganization.[1] Cyril was directly confronted with the emperor's policy. In contrast to what one would expect, Julian did not revitalize the pagan cults in Jerusalem as far as we know, as he did in other parts of the empire, but he focused his attention on the desolate Temple Mount, which carried such symbolism for both Jews and Christians. He allowed the Jews, whom he considered as his natural allies in his efforts to dechristianize the empire, to rebuild their Temple. This posed for Cyril the threatening prospect that Old Jerusalem would take over again from the New Jerusalem, as founded by Constantine.

Julian had been appointed Caesar by Constantius II in November 355 to take care of affairs in Gaul, where things still had not calmed down after the defeat and death of the usurper Magnentius (353), and to put an end to the frequent barbarian invasions. During his years in Gaul he managed to end the Germanic military incursions and revealed himself as an able military commander who was popular with his troops. But Julian was not just a military man. Before becoming Caesar he had dedicated himself to his studies; he was a very literate person, well-versed in rhetoric and philosophy. In the course of his study of the pagan classics and philosophy, he became more and more interested in, and convinced of, the importance of the pagan cults, and began to doubt the Christian faith. It was

---

[1] On Julian, see e.g. Bidez, 1930; Bowersock, 1978; Hunt, 1998a. The monographs by Athanassiadi (1992) and Smith (1995) pay special attention to Julian's philosophy and religiosity.

through the influence of the philosopher and theurgist Maximus, whose disciple Julian became, that he cast off his Christian beliefs probably as early as the beginning of the 350s and became an adherent of the pagan cults.[2] So when Julian became Caesar he most likely had already left Christianity and returned in secret to the pagan practices. Wisely enough, he concealed his adherence to the old cults and kept pretending that he was a Christian.[3] However, shortly after Julian heard the news of Constantius' death, probably at the end of November 361, he took off his Christian mask and openly declared himself an adherent of Hellenism. To express his thanks for Constantius' death, Julian worshiped the gods openly and sacrificed in public.[4] Julian's paganism was close to Neoplatonism and theurgical practices were essential to his worship of the gods. It was the Neoplatonist Iamblichus who had first emphasized magic and ritual in reverence for the gods, and Julian felt clearly attracted to the ideas of Iamblichan Neoplatonism. Ritual and sacrifices were central to Julian's pagan religiosity and frequent sacrificing was an especially important means for him to get into contact with, and win the favor of, the gods. If we may believe the sources, Julian's offerings were extravagant.[5]

Soon after Julian had arrived in Constantinople on 11 December, and had buried Constantius with great solemnity, he started his reforms. To get rid of several of his predecessor's partisans he organized the Chalcedon trials,[6] reorganized the imperial court,[7] reformed and attempted to strengthen the senate of Constantinople,[8] strengthened the councils of the Greek cities by reducing the possibilities for exemption and by enlarging the number of those who qualified for

---

[2] For Julian's "conversion," see e.g. Smith, 1995, 180–89.

[3] Amm. Marc. 21.2.4–5.

[4] Julian, *Epist.* 26, 415C. Cf. Ammianus Marcellinus (22.5.2) who reports that Julian came out with his paganism when in Constantinople.

[5] Libanius (*Orat.* 24.35) reports that Julian sacrificed more in ten years than all the rest of the Greeks combined; cf. Amm. Marc. 22.12.6. He is also called a "bull-burner" (Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 4.77) and a "slaughterer" (Amm. Marc. 22.14.3). Ammianus Marcellinus (25.4.17) also remarks that had Julian victoriously returned from the Persian expedition, he would have sacrificed so zealously that there would have been a serious shortage of cattle.

[6] Amm. Marc. 22.3.2; Lib., *Orat.* 18.153.

[7] Amm. Marc. 22.4; Lib., *Orat.* 18.130.

[8] *Cod. Theod.* 9.2.1; 11.23.2. *Cod. Theod.* 12.1.50 was especially aimed at the Christian priests who were exempted from curial duties, but who had now lost that privilege.

membership of the *boulè*,[9] abolished the obligatory character of the *aurum coronarium*,[10] issued an edict to alleviate the tax burden for cities,[11] and introduced stringent regulations for the use of the *cursus publicus*.[12] Many of his reforms were aimed at invigorating the economy and administration of local communities.[13]

However, Julian's religious reforms have received far more attention than his administrative and tax reforms, and understandably so. Julian's policy was aimed at dechristianizing the empire and reintroducing the cults of the pagan gods. Very early in his reign he proclaimed the reintroduction of official sacrifices as a vital part of pagan worship, and announced the reopening of the temples.[14] Julian's pro-pagan policy i.a. also becomes clear from a letter to Atarbius in which he states that he preferred adherents of the old cults over Christians for official positions.[15] A measure that raised much protest, even from pagans, was his famous edict on teachers issued on 17 June 362. It ruled that schoolteachers and professors had to be distinguished both by character and eloquence. The implication of this edict, as Julian himself explained in a letter, was that Christians teaching the classical curriculum ought not to teach the pagan classics since they did not take seriously what they taught.[16] In spite of these measures Julian also proclaimed religious toleration and for that reason orthodox Christians, who had been exiled during the reign of Constantius, were allowed to return home.[17] This measure was not taken out of sympathy with the orthodox Christians but in order to weaken the Arians, who owed their position to Constantius, and to scatter dissension among Christians.[18] Cyril was one of those who were allowed to return home. He was able to take up his see again, but it seems that restoration to episcopal sees was not part of Julian's amnesty, as the case of Athanasius makes clear who was

---

[9] Julian, *Misop.* 367D; Lib., *Orat.* 18.148, *Epist.* 696 (ed. Foerster).

[10] *Cod. Theod.* 12.13.1.

[11] *Cod. Theod.* 11.16.10; Julian, *Epist.* 73, 428C–D.

[12] *Cod. Theod.* 13.5.12; Lib., *Orat.* 18.145.

[13] E.g. Pack, 1986.

[14] Amm. Marc. 22.5.2; Lib., *Orat.* 18.126; Soz., *HE* 5.5. For Julian's anti-Christian policies, see e.g. Smith, 1995, 207–18.

[15] Julian, *Epist.* 83, 376C–D.

[16] *Cod. Theod.* 13.3.5; Amm. Marc. 22.10.7, 25.4.20; Julian, *Epist.* 61, 423A.

[17] Julian, *Epist.* 46, 414B; Soz., *HE* 5.5.9.

[18] Cf. Amm. Marc. 22.5.4.

initially prevented by the Alexandrians to take up his see again.[19]
Restoration to episcopal sees seems to have depended on the author-
ity and popularity of the exiled bishop within his community.

Around mid-June 362 Julian left Constantinople to go to Antioch
in order to prepare a great military expedition against the Sassanid
Empire. On his journey he tried to revive the cults by opening tem-
ples and appointing priests. In Antioch he worshiped at the altars
of many pagan gods such as Zeus, Hermes, Tyche, Demeter, and
others.[20] His excessive worshiping and sacrificing, however, did not
gain him much popularity with the population of Antioch, which
consisted of a great many Christians.[21] His popularity declined even
more when he reopened the temple and oracle of Apollo at Daphne
and had the remains of the Antiochene martyr St. Babylas which
were buried there – and allegedly the cause of the silence of the
oracle – removed. Under curious circumstances the temple of Apollo
burned and Julian, thinking that the Christians were behind this,
ordered the closing of the main church of Antioch. For this reason
and others, tension grew between Julian and the Antiochenes. Satires
were directed against the emperor; they mocked his appearance,
especially his beard, and his ascetic lifestyle. Julian reacted with the
Misopogon, or "Beard-Hater," in which he, in an ironic style, tried
to defend himself and scorned the Antiochenes.

At the time Julian composed the *Misopogon*, preparations had already
begun for the rebuilding of the Jewish temple in Jerusalem. This
restoration project is one of the most amazing endeavors of Julian's
short reign and one with a great impact. It elicited fierce reactions
from Christian authors and had a great influence on the opinion
formed of Julian's reign by his Christian contemporaries as well as
later generations. The source material on the event is relatively vast
and the first references in the sources are found within a year of
Julian's death on 26/27 June 363. The first to mention it were
Ephrem Syrus and Gregory of Nazianzus. Ephrem was a victim of
Julian's unsuccessful Persian campaign; he had to flee his hometown

---

[19] Julian, *Epist.* 110, 398D.
[20] Julian, *Misop.* 346B–D; Lib., *Orat.* 1.121–122, *Orat.* 15.79.
[21] For the Antiochene Christian community, see Downey, 1961, 272–316;
Liebeschuetz, 1972, 224 ff. In Julian's time the Christian community of Antioch
was divided in at least three groups: Arians, Eustathians, and Meletians; Downey,
1961, 396–97.

Nisibis, which was ceded to the Persians, to go to Edessa. Perhaps when still in Nisibis or shortly after his arrival in Edessa, he wrote four hymns directed against Julian. The fourth of these has a passage on the rebuilding of the Temple.[22] Ephrem recounts how the Jews, supported by Julian, started to restore their Temple in order to be able to make sacrifices again. However, the enterprise had to be abandoned because the Christians in Jerusalem appealed to God, who then sent storms, thunderbolts, and earthquakes. From doors that opened themselves, fire burst out and burned the Jews. Ephrem refers to Daniel 9:26–27 where it is said that the place, meaning the site of the Temple, will remain desolate forever. At about the same time that Ephrem composed his hymns against Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus wrote two invectives against Julian, his *Orations* 4 and 5. The last one gives a pretty detailed account of the restoration of the Temple.[23] Gregory reports that the Jews, who were full of hatred for Christianity, were incited by Julian against the Christians by giving them permission to return to Jerusalem and to restore the Temple in order to reestablish the customs, i.e. the sacrificial rituals, of their forefathers. The Jews immediately took up the restoration of their Temple. Even the women helped; they assisted with the actual building work and parted with their jewellery, either in order to help finance the project or to make special silver tools.[24] While the work was in full swing, storms suddenly blew up and the earth began to tremble. The Jews tried to seek protection in the houses of God but, as if driven by an invisible force, their doors remained shut. Then a fire broke out from the foundations of the Temple, which caused many Jews to be burned. Subsequently, there appeared a cross of light in the sky above Jerusalem – possibly a literary adaptation of the apparition of the luminous cross in 351 about which Cyril reported in his *Letter to Constantius* – and the sign of the cross appeared on the clothes and bodies of all those present.

The accounts by Ephrem and Gregory are full of hatred for Julian and his favoring of the Jews. Their reports have set the trend, though

---

[22] *HcJul.* 4.18–23. For an English translation of the hymns, see e.g. Lieu, 1989. Brock (1977) has an English translation of the stanzas of the fourth hymn that pertain to the rebuilding of the Temple.

[23] Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 5.3–4. According to Bernardi (1978, 91), the two invectives against Julian were written in the winter of 363–364.

[24] According to Deut. 27:5 and 1 Kings 6:7, the use of iron in the construction of the altar was legally forbidden.

they were not necessarily the sources, for the other late antique descriptions of the restoration project that can be found in various Christian writings. The story is reported or referred to, though with less rage and more matter of factly, by John Chysostom, Ambrose, and of course by the fifth-century church historians – Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Philostorgius.[25] Even though the various reports differ in points of detail, they all mention for the most part the same items mentioned earlier by Ephrem and Gregory: the great enthusiasm of the Jews for Julian's plan; Julian's intention to offer the Jews the opportunity to sacrifice again; the references to Daniel 9:26–27 as well as Jesus' prophecy in Matthew 24:1–2 that not one stone of the Temple would be left upon another;[26] the provision by Julian of financial aid and an imperial official to supervise the project; the support given by Jewish women to the restoration; the failure and abandonment of the project caused by storms, earthquakes, and fire resulting in the death of many Jews; the imprint of the cross on the clothes of the Jews; and the ultimate recognition of the Jews of the Christian god.

The contemporary and near-contemporary sources on the restoration of the Temple are almost exclusively Christian. There are only two pagan authors who refer to the event: Julian himself, who made some references to the project in his letters,[27] and Ammianus Marcellinus.[28] The latter does not place the rebuilding in a religious context and he therefore leaves out most of the features that are so

---

[25] Joh. Chrys., *Adv. Iud.* 5.11 (PG 48, 900–901); *Iud. et Gent.* 16 (PG 48, 834–35); *De S. Babyla* 22 (PG 50, 567–68); *Exp. in Ps.* 110.5 (PG 55, 285); *De Laud. Pauli* 4 (PG 50, 489); *Hom.* 4.1 in Matt. 1:17 (PG 57, 41); *Hom.* 41.3 in Acts 19:8 (PG 60, 291–92); for Chrysostom and the rebuilding of the Temple, see Wilken, 1983, 128 ff.; Ambrose, *Epist.* 40.12 (PL 16, 1105); Ruf., *HE* 10.38–40; Socr., *HE* 3.20; Soz., *HE* 5.22; Thdt., *HE* 3.20; Philost., *HE* 7.9. The best treatise on the available sources is by Levenson in his unpublished Harvard thesis of 1979; an abridged version of it is presented by Levenson (1990).

[26] Cf. also Luke 19:44, 21:6; Mark 13:2.

[27] *Epist.* 204, "To the Community of the Jews"; *Epist.* 134 "To the Jews"; *Epist.* 89b "To a Priest." It is very likely that the letter "To the Community of the Jews", in which Julian promises to rebuild Jerusalem, is not genuine; most recently it has been suggested that the letter was composed between 429 and 450 and exemplified the anti-Jewish attitude of the reign of Theodosius II; Van Nuffelen, 2001, 132–36. Of *Epist.* 134 only one sentence is left: "I am rebuilding with all zeal the Temple of the Most High God." The fragmentarily preserved *Epist.* 89b expresses Julian's intention to rebuild the Temple.

[28] Amm. Marc. 23.1.2–3. See Drijvers, 1992a; cf. Penella, 1999. See also Den Boeft, Drijvers, Den Hengst, and Teitler, 1998, 4–7.

important in the Christian works. Ammianus does not mention the appearance of the cross on the clothes of the Jews. He does not even refer to the involvement of the Jews; nor does he mention the prophecies in Daniel 9:26–27 and Matthew 24:1–2.

As for Julian's motivations to have the Temple rebuilt, several can be put forward, some of which are mentioned by the Christian sources. It is likely that Julian, who had a profound knowledge of the Scriptures, wanted to rebuild the Temple in order to prove wrong the prophecies in Daniel 9:26–27 and Matthew 24:1–2. The disproving of these prophecies would be a severe blow to the credibility of Christianity and a denial of the claim of the Christians that they were God's chosen people. A second motive was that of sacrifice. The ritual of animal sacrifice was central to Julian's reverence for the gods. He was aware of the fact that the Jews, according to their laws, were only allowed to sacrifice in the Temple in Jerusalem. Other reasons for the emperor's plan to restore the Temple may have been his wish to gain the support of the Jews living under Sassanian rule for his Persian expedition, as well as his wish to counter Constantine's policy of the christianization of Jerusalem by rejudaizing the city. Another, most interesting, motive has been adduced by M. Avi-Yonah. According to him, the Jews in Palestine formed a balancing group between Christians and pagans. In various places in Palestine paganism was still strong and, except for Jerusalem, the Christians nowhere constituted a majority. By supporting the Jews Julian could create a compact anti-Christian majority, which could seriously harm the Christian cause.[29]

It is evident that Julian considered the Jews an ally in his efforts to revive the old cults and to dechristianize the empire. This is not to say that he was a great philo-Semite. His opinion about Jews and Judaism, as it can be derived from his writings, balances between admiration and disdain.[30] Especially in his *Contra Galilaeos*, Julian expresses a negative opinion about Jews and Judaism. He considers the god of the Jews to be inferior to the pagan gods and Judaism to be inferior to the Hellenic cults. In spite of the fact that the Jews are God's chosen people, He has not brought them material advantages as the pagan gods have given to the Greeks and Romans.

---

[29] Avi-Yonah, 1976, 189–90.
[30] E.g. Aziza, 1978; Lewy, 1983, 78–83; Stemberger, 2000, 198–201.

Julian finds it impossible to consider the Jewish god as the god of
the whole universe, but regards him as a national god whose influence
is regionally limited, and thus as one of the many gods. According
to the emperor, Jewish law is harsh and rigid, and the Jews are a
stubborn people. Julian, who was well-acquainted with the Bible,
thinks the Old Testament story about the Creation, as well as the
story about the tower of Babel, is absurd.[31] Notably in his letters,
Julian expresses some admiration for the Jews and their god. He has
a high regard for the Jewish god and considers him to be a pow-
erful deity. Furthermore, he has great respect for the strict religious
attitude of the Jews, and of course the Jewish ritual offering of
sacrifices has a strong appeal for him.[32]

The chronology of the restoration of the Temple is hard to estab-
lish, and it is therefore difficult to say exactly when Julian decided
upon the undertaking. But it is probable that the decision to rebuild
the Temple was made in the autumn of 362 in Antioch, since
Ammianus Marcellinus dates the charge of Alypius – he was to super-
vise the project on behalf of the emperor – to the beginning of 363.
This does not mean that actual rebuilding started immediately, but
preparations were certainly begun.[33] Earthquakes, from which not
only Jerusalem but the whole of Palestine suffered, were probably
responsible for the failure of the project.[34]

The initiative for the project lay with Julian,[35] but one wonders
if and to what extent the emperor discussed his plan with the Jews.
There are some indications in the sources that while in Antioch
Julian had conferred on the project with a delegation of Jews.[36] If
we can believe the reports, Julian wanted them to resume sacrificing

---

[31] Julian, *c. Gal.* 75A–86A, 93E, 99E ff., 100C, 134D ff., 141C, 148C, 155C ff., 176A–C ff., 201E, 221E.
[32] *Epist.* 89a, 453D, 454A; 89b, 295D.
[33] For suggested dates, see Bowersock, 1978, Appendix I. According to Bowersock, Ammianus dates the whole project, including its failure, to the time that Julian was still in Antioch, i.e. before 5 March 363 when the emperor left the city for his Persian expedition. This is, however, a misunderstanding of Ammianus' text; see Barnes, 1992, 4.
[34] A severe earthquake in Jerusalem and the surrounding area has been attested for 363. See Amiran, Arieh, and Turcotte, 1994; Amiran, 1996.
[35] It is unlikely that the Jews took the first step, as described in the Syriac Julian romance; see below, pp. 150–51.
[36] Joh. Chrys., *Adv. Iud.* 5.11 (PG 48, 900); *De S. Babyla* 22 (PG 50, 568); Ruf., *HE* 10.38; Soz., *HE* 5.22.1–4.

again, but when the Jews made clear to him that according to the law they were only allowed to make offerings in the Temple, Julian should have made the decision to reerect the Temple. None of the sources explicitly mention the involvement of the Jewish patriarch in Tiberias and he may not have been overtly enthusiastic. A restored Temple would mean the reinstitution of the high priesthood, and since the patriarch coming from the house of Hillel did not qualify for that, he would lose his preeminent position and be superseded by the high priest.[37] Apart from the patriarch, rabbis and other Jewish leaders might not have been too enthusiastic about the project since it was taught that only with the coming of the messiah would the Temple be rebuilt. If we can believe the Christian sources, the common diaspora Jews were filled with enthusiasm and many of them flocked to Jerusalem to participate in the project. We should not forget, however, that the Christians had an axe to grind. It is not without importance in this respect to notice that the Jewish sources are silent on the whole scheme; the first reliable reference to the event in a Jewish text dates only from the sixteenth century and is based on Christian writings.[38]

The Christian sources display an extraordinary sensitivity to the site of the Temple Mount and especially to the attempted rebuilding of the Temple. Although extreme, the concern of the Christians is understandable. Had the project succeeded, Christ's prediction in Matthew 24:2 and the premonition in the book of Daniel (9:26–27) would have been proven wrong and the authority of Christianity severely damaged. In an age when Judaism was strong, particularly in Palestine,[39] and there existed a strong Christian antagonism against the Jews and their religion, this would have been a severe blow. In Jerusalem the Christian triumph was expressed explicitly by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on the one hand, but also, and perhaps even more so, on the other hand by the empty space of the Temple Mount. The razing of the Temple in 70 C.E. and the remaining emptiness of this sacred space was a clear statement and conspicuous proof of Judaism's defeat and ruination, as well as God's

---

[37] Avi-Yonah, 1976, 191–92; Bowersock, 1978, 89–90; Stemberger, 2000, 208.
[38] Adler, 1893, 642–47. Possibly there are some indications of support for Julian's project in fourth-century rabbinic literature, but opinions on this are not univocal; Avi-Yonah, 1976, 197–98; Stemberger, 2000, 207–208.
[39] See Chapter 4, 119–21.

disavowal of the Jews.[40] A rebuilt Temple would change all that.
The failure of the project must therefore have been a tremendous
relief for Christians since it constituted a clear sign that they, not
the Jews, had God on their side and were His chosen people. The
failed reconstruction was greatly exploited by Christian authors, even
to the extent that their reports come closer to legend than history
and are too fantastic to believe.[41] Another factor that might explain
the Christians' attention to the thwarted restoration is fear. Between
the lines of the various Christian reports the anxiety that once again
a non-Christian emperor might occupy the throne and deprive
Christianity of its privileges, can be detected.[42] So the restoration of
the Temple was considered a real threat: the gradual christianiza-
tion of the Roman Empire under the patronage of Julian's prede-
cessors Constantine and Constantius II could have come to an end.

From the relative silence of the non-Christian sources one could
infer that the whole restoration project was an event of minor impor-
tance, or perhaps did not even take place but was an invention given
tremendous weight by Christians for propaganda purposes. The pro-
pagandistic aspect is certainly true. Michael Adler even argued, in
what is still an important article from the end of the nineteenth cen-
tury, that it is very unlikely that the rebuilding ever started. However,
the *communis opinio* nowadays is that the Jews indeed began the restora-
tion of their Temple, in the first months of 363, but that the pro-
ject was interrupted, probably by storms, earthquakes, and subsequent
fires, and was never taken up again due to the death of Julian shortly
afterwards (26/27 June 363). One of Adler's arguments for assum-
ing that the actual rebuilding never started was the silence of Cyril:
"had so noteworthy an event happened in his own see, surely he
would have been the first to record it."[43] The fact that nowhere in
Cyril's extant writings is there a clear reference to the restoration of

---

[40] For the idea of erasure of sacred space, see Wharton, 2000.

[41] Wharton (2000, 200) makes the interesting observation that the "fictionalized
records produced in the later 4th and in the 5th c. describing the frustrated attempt
to rebuild the Temple are the literary counterparts of the all-too-real violence that
was contemporaneously directed against synagogues."

[42] Orosius' remark (*Adv. Pag.* 7.30.5) that Julian had ordered an amphitheatre to
be constructed at Jerusalem where after the emperor's Persian campaign bishops,
monks and saints should be offered to ferocious beasts, is one of the many expres-
sions of this fear, as well as, of course, of the Christian anti-Julianic propaganda.

[43] Adler, 1893, 649.

the Temple is indeed remarkable, in particular because the restoration project was an attempt to rejudaize and hence to dechristianize Jerusalem, and must therefore have been immensely threatening to the Christian community of Jerusalem and Cyril's own position. But was there indeed no reaction from Cyril?

It so happens that in the 1970s a letter on the subject, attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, and purported to be an eyewitness account of the failed restoration project, was discovered in the Syriac manuscript Harvard Syriac 99. It bears the title "On how many miracles took place when the Jews received the order to rebuild the Temple, and the signs which occurred in the region of Asia." The manuscript is of recent date (1899) but the text of the letter can be dated back as early as the sixth century. Paragraphs 2–6 are also to be found in manuscript Add. 14609 in the British Library, and are almost identical to those in Harvard Syriac 99. The London manuscript is securely dated to the sixth century.[44] In this manuscript the text is simply called "Letter of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem." There is no trace of or reference to Cyril's Syriac letter in other sources. The discoverer of the letter in Harvard Syriac 99, Sebastian Brock, published it together with an introduction, English translation, and commentary in 1977. He concluded that the Syriac letter is not a translation of an authentic letter (in Greek) by Cyril but should be considered a forgery made in the early years of the fifth century. Brock's opinion seems to have been widely accepted. To my knowledge, only Philip Wainwright has contested the views of Brock in an article published in 1986. This article has attracted little attention. Wainwright's view is diametrically opposed to that of Brock. He sees no reason why the text should be a falsification and concludes that the letter is "both a genuine addition to the Cyrilline corpus, and an important source that sheds new light on this strange episode."[45]

On the whole, Cyril's alleged Syriac letter has received little consideration in scholarly discussions and deserves some closer scrutiny. In what follows I will argue that, although it is not very likely that

---

[44] Brock, 1977, 268. Apart from these two manuscripts, the letter also occurs in a third manuscript belonging to Fr. John Khoumy of Paramus, New Jersey; this manuscript is of medieval date; Brock 1981, 321; Coakley 1984, 71–72.

[45] Wainwright, 1986, 292–93.

the letter as we have it goes back to an original by Cyril, parts of it may well have a Jerusalem origin and bring us close to Cyril.[46] Before embarking on these matters a summary of the contents of the letter, as well as an overview of the arguments of Brock and Wainwright that led them to their respective opinions, would probably be helpful.[47]

The letter, addressed by Cyril to "brethren, bishops, priests and deacons of the Church of Christ in every district," is meant to inform them of the events that occurred in Jerusalem when the Jews wanted to rebuild their Temple and about how the land was shaken, prodigies took place, and fire consumed a great number of Jews as well as many Christians. On the Sunday prior to the earthquake, when the Jews planned to lay the foundations of the Temple, there were strong winds and storms. During the night a great earthquake occurred and Cyril and his Christian congregation, who were assembled in the Church of the Confessors, left Jerusalem and went to the Mount of Olives. On the way they besought the Lord that "His truth might be seen by His worshippers in the face of the audacity of the Jews who had crucified Him." The Jews went to their synagogue but found its doors closed. Suddenly, however, the doors opened of their own accord and out of the synagogue came forth fire which burned many of them. Then the doors closed again and the whole populace, Jews and Christians alike, cried out "There is but one God, one Christ, who is victorious." The entire population tore down the idols and altars while glorifying and praising Christ, and confessing that He was the Son of the Living God. The whole city, Jews and many pagans, received the sign of baptism, so that there was no one in the city who had not received the sign of the living cross in heaven. Because of what had happened, the people thought that the coming of the day of resurrection had arrived. The sign of Christ's crucifixion was received by all, and "whosoever did not believe in his mind found his clothes openly reproved him, having the mark of the cross stained on them." Cyril felt compelled to write about these matters so that "everything that is written about Jerusalem

---

[46] The rest of this chapter is a revised version of my "Cyril of Jerusalem and the Rebuilding of the Temple (A.D. 363)" (2000).

[47] For the complete English translation of the text, see Appendix III.

should be established in truth, that 'no stone shall be left in it that will not be upturned' " (Matt. 24:2). The letter then continues with an enumeration of the towns that had suffered from the earthquake and subsequently ends with the remark that this event took place on Monday "19 Iyyar of the year 674 of the kingdom of Alexander the Greek," i.e. 19 May 363 c.e., and the statement that Julian, who had incited the Jews to rebuild the Temple, died in that year.

Brock puts forward the following arguments against the authenticity of the letter:

a. The letter is presented as an eyewitness account written immediately after the disastrous events, yet we find at the end of the letter a reference to the death of Julian on the night of 26/27 June 363, i.e. more than a month later.
b. If the letter were genuine it is hardly conceivable that it should have been ignored by the various authors from the fourth and fifth centuries who related the failed attempt of the restoration of the Temple.
c. The letter contains several topographical errors, such as a reference to a Church of the Confessors, the tomb of Jeremiah – passed by the Christian community on its way to the Mount of Olives – and the statue of Herod – thrown down by the Jews but set up again after the earthquake and other disasters were over.[48]

Although Brock considers the letter a forgery, he also thinks that it is of an early date – the beginning of the fifth century – and that the text has a "Sitz im Leben," meaning that it related somehow to Jerusalem and Cyril. As for the early date, he argues that the text of the letter resembles the reports of Gregory of Nazianzus and Ephrem Syrus, the earliest extant reports on the failed restoration project, and differs from the later accounts of the church historians (Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret) which the author does not yet know about. As for the relation to Jerusalem and Cyril, Brock thinks that the motive for the forgery would have been the wish to fit Cyril into the picture of the failure of the rebuilding of the Temple, since in his fifteenth *Catechetical Lecture* he had predicted, with reference to Matthew 24:2 that the Temple would never be rebuilt. The text is worth quoting here in full since Wainwright also refers to it.

---

[48] Cf. n. 56 below.

> For if he [the Antichrist] is to come as Christ to the Jews, and wants
> their worship, with a view to deceiving them further, he will manifest
> the greatest zeal for the temple; he will create the impression that he
> is the descendent of David who is to restore the temple of Solomon.
> Antichrist will come when in the temple of the Jews not a stone upon
> a stone will be left, as our Savior foretold . . . the Antichrist will appear
> amid all signs and lying wonders, lifting himself up against all idols;
> in the beginning he will pretend to be kindly, but afterwards he will
> display a cruel spirit against the saints of God.[49]

The church historians Rufinus and Socrates also mention Cyril in
connection with this prophecy and relate it to the restoration of the
Temple. In their texts the impression is clearly given that Cyril spoke
about this prophecy shortly before the rebuilding started:

> The foundations, then, having been cleared, and quicklime and stone
> procured, nothing more was needed before new foundations could be
> laid the next day once the old ones had been dislodged. The bishop,
> however, having carefully weighed what was contained in Daniel's
> prophecy about the times on the one hand, and what the Lord had
> foretold in the gospels on the other, insisted that the Jews would never
> be able to put a stone upon a stone there. Thus the suspense grew.[50]

Brock therefore suggests that "the same motivation that led Rufinus
and Socrates to introduce Cyril and his reference to Matthew xxiv,
2 into their account, also led someone else, who had a fair amount
of local knowledge, to compose our letter in Cyril's name, at much
the same sort of time, in the early years of the fifth century."

Wainwright is of the opinion that Brock's arguments offered against
the authenticity of the letter present more problems than they solve
and he attempts to offer a critique of Brock's position.

a. He considers the reference to Julian's death in the last paragraph
   of the letter (par. 12) to be a later addition,[51] as is probably also

---

[49] *Catech.* 15.15.

[50] Ruf., *HE* 10.38; trans. Amidon. Socr., *HE* 3.20: "On this occasion Cyril bishop
of Jerusalem, called to mind the prophecy of Daniel, which Christ also in the holy
gospels has confirmed, and predicted in the presence of many persons, that the
time indeed had come 'in which one stone should not be left upon another in that
temple,' but that the Saviour's prophetic declaration should have its full accom-
plishment. Such were the bishop's words: and on the night following, a mighty
earthquake tore up the stones of the old foundations of the temple and dispersed
them all together with the adjacent edifices"; trans. NPNF 2, 89.

[51] Wainwright (1986, 288) suggests that the reference to Julian's death in par. 12
"reads very much like a chronicle entry."

paragraph 11, where the enumeration of towns that suffered from the earthquake is given.[52] The original letter ended, according to Wainwright, in paragraph 10: "nowhere in the text is there an ending to the letter, but paragraph 10, which begins 'Thus we felt compelled to write to you the truth of these matters,' has the tone of a concluding sentence."[53]

b. That the letter is ignored and not referred to in other sources may be explained by the fact that Cyril was deposed as bishop of Jerusalem shortly after the restoration attempt and was succeeded by a bishop with Arian sympathies. His correspondence, including that on the rebuilding of the Temple, might have been suppressed. For that reason, while several of the sources on the rebuilding of the Temple – such as Rufinus, Socrates, and Sozomen – refer to Cyril, they do not mention his letter about the event.

c. The topographical mistakes can be easily explained. The "Church of the Confessors" is a possible Syriac translation of the Greek *Martyrion*, the Constantinian basilica and main church in Jerusalem, and part of the complex of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The mention of the tomb of Jeremiah is possibly a textual corruption – easy to occur in the Syriac script – of Zechariah; the latter's tomb was often visited by pilgrims in conjunction with that of Isaiah. Also the reference to the statue of Herod is in all likelihood a corruption of the text, and is meant to be the statue of the emperor Hadrian. This statue stood on the original site of the Temple and had to be removed for the rebuilding.

Wainwright's arguments make some sense except for the second one. Cyril stayed on as bishop of Jerusalem for some three years after the restoration attempt and others of his works did survive and were not suppressed by his Arian successors. It would therefore have been strange that this letter in particular would have been suppressed.

Apart from his refutation of Brock's views, Wainwright mentions several points that argue in favor of the genuineness of the letter.

---

[52] Wainwright, 1986, 287–88. Par. 11 may be based on the Syriac *Chronicon anonymum ad annum 724* (ed. E.W. Brooks, *Chronica Minora* II, CSCO, Script. Syri 3, 133). Cf. Brock (1977, 281 and 284), who argues the other way around and thinks that the information in the anonymous chronicle is based on the letter.

[53] Wainwright, 1986, 287.

According to him, the letter leaves out standard features to be found in other accounts of the event and includes details not found elsewhere, such as the actions of the Christians of Jerusalem. Apart from paragraph 12, which is probably a later addition, the letter contains no reference to the emperor Julian. The omission of the emperor's name is understandable, according to Wainwright, when Julian was still alive. Another argument that speaks against forgery is that "the reference to the Matt. 24:2 prophecy is pitched in too low a key for a forger's purpose." The motivation Brock assigned to the forger of the letter – i.e. to introduce Cyril and his reference to Matthew 24:2 – "would have been equally compelling to Cyril himself." An important argument for the authenticity of the letter is the resemblance between the passage in Cyril's fifteenth *Catechetical Lecture* – where it is said that the Antichrist will come to rebuild the Temple and when this restored Temple is demolished Christ will come "amid all signs and lying wonders, lifting himself up against all idols"[54] – and paragraph 8 of the letter: "the entire population thought that, after these signs which our Saviour gave us in his gospel, the fearful (second) coming of the day of resurrection had arrived."

How to evaluate Brock's and Wainwright's views? Both authors emphasize the resemblance between the above-quoted passage in Cyril's *Catechesis* 15 and the letter and consider this passage crucial for either a "Sitz im Leben" or Cyrilline authorship of the letter. This argument, however, is questionable. I have argued in Chapter 2 that the *Catechetical Lectures*, even though they date back to 351, may have undergone changes and additions over the years. This passage may be such an addition or adaptation, and might have been added after the failed reconstruction of the Temple.[55] Paragraphs 11 and 12 are indeed a bit curious considering the main contents of the letter, and might well be later additions, as Wainwright contends. The topographical errors should not be taken too seriously; they can be due to translation errors, as Brock himself has already noted.[56] Although most of Wainwright's arguments are not particu-

---

[54] *Catech.* 15.15.

[55] This has also been argued by Irshai (1996, 95; 1999, 213–24). Irshai presents the interesting suggestion that Cyril's Antichrist in *Catech.* 15.15 is the emperor Julian.

[56] These explanations had already been given by Brock (1976, 277–79) in his commentary on the text. That the "Herod" is a corruption of "Hadrian" is shown

larly convincing, the merit of his paper is that it draws attention to features in the letter that are not found in other accounts and seem to be specific for the Jerusalem situation, such as the topographical indications and the actions undertaken by the Christians.

It is unlikely that the letter ascribed to Cyril, as we have it in the Syriac version, is a translation of a letter in Greek written by the bishop of Jerusalem, if there ever existed such a text.[57] Presupposing the existence of a Greek original of the letter, we would have to assume the original has been tampered with during the process of translation. As just mentioned, the last two paragraphs, at least the passages referring to the towns that suffered from the earthquake, and to Julian's death, are best considered as later additions. The rest of the letter may also have undergone alterations since it gives an impression of unevenness and contains some repetition. Does this also imply that the Syriac letter does not go back to a Greek original of some sort? This is probably too rash a conclusion. It is possible that Cyril wrote about the events of 363 or in some other way reported what had happened in Jerusalem at that time. Even though we do not have his original text, the kernel of that report may have been preserved in the Syriac letter.

In Late Antiquity much translation activity was going on from Greek into Syriac and vice versa.[58] Also Cyril's writings were translated into Aramaic and Syriac.[59] The *Catecheses* have been fragmentarily preserved in Christian Palestinian Aramaic and references in Syriac manuscripts clearly indicate that at least some of these lectures were also known of in Syriac. The famous *Letter to Constantius* is known to exist in a complete Syriac version.[60] A letter by Cyril in Syriac is therefore in itself not something unique. Even though we do not have a comparable letter or other sort of text in Greek,

---

to be correct by two other (medieval) manuscripts from Tur ʿAbdin containing the letter. Both read "the statue of Hadrian"; Brock, 1981, 321. The Bordeaux pilgrim, who visited Jerusalem in 333, mentions two statues of Hadrian on the site of the Jewish Temple; *It. Burd.* 591.

[57] According to Brock (1977, 282) there is no evidence in the letter for assuming that it is a translation from Greek, in spite of the fact that it contains Greek loan words and some of the towns in par. 11 appear in their Greek form (others appear in their Semitic form). On the other hand, he does not rule out a Greek original: "On this aspect we must simply admit a *non liquet.*"

[58] See in general Brock, 1994.

[59] See Chapter 2, 63.

[60] Coakley, 1984.

it is conceivable in light of other extant translations of his works that
Cyril's alleged Syriac letter on the rebuilding of the Temple goes
back to a Greek text.

As far as I know, the question about the source for the reports
of Gregory of Nazianzus and Ephrem Syrus, the earliest extant texts
about the restoration project, has never really been addressed. How
did Gregory and Ephrem, who wrote their invectives against Julian
so shortly after the emperor's death, come to know about what had
happened in Jerusalem?[61] Did they learn about it from oral reports,
for instance from pilgrims, or did a written source circulate? It is
impossible to answer that, but the event is so closely connected with
Jerusalem that it seems likely that the account of the ill-fated rebuild-
ing of the Temple must be of Jerusalem origin.

This argument may be sustained by the resemblance Wainwright
has observed between the Syriac letter and Rufinus' report of the
restoration project.[62] Rufinus' account has the impression of deriv-
ing from a local source as does the letter. The most significant resem-
blance between the letter attributed to Cyril and Rufinus' account
is perhaps the cross-on-clothes story. Gregory of Nazianzus refers to
a luminous cross that appeared in the sky above Jerusalem and
reported that all those who had witnessed this miracle had the sign
of the cross burnt into their clothes which began to fluoresce when
they spoke about this wonder.[63] Most other Christian sources refer
to luminous impressions of the cross imprinted on the garments of
the Jews and others that could not be rubbed or washed out. However,
the letter and Rufinus' report are more matter-of-fact and leave out
all the embellishments when describing the miracles. Rufinus, after
having reported that the Jews were unwillingly forced to admit that
Jesus Christ is the one and true God, mentions that "on the fol-
lowing night the sign of the cross appeared on everyone's clothing
so clearly that even those who in their unbelief wanted to wash it
off could find no way to get rid of it."[64] The letter tells us that

---

[61] The source for the accounts of Ammianus Marcellinus and John Chrysostom
is probably dependent on Antiochene traditions. Ammianus' account might derive
from Alypius who was put in charge of the rebuilding project by Julian and who
came from Antioch. See Levenson, 1990, 266.

[62] Brock's argument (1977, 281–82) that the closest parallels to the letter are to
be found in Ephrem's and Gregory's accounts is not convincing.

[63] Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 5.4.

[64] Ruf., *HE* 10.40; trans. Amidon, 1997.

"whosoever did not believe in his mind found his clothes openly
reproved him, having the mark of the cross stained on them." Rufinus'
report most probably goes back to the now lost *Church History* of
Gelasius of Caesarea.[65] Gelasius was Cyril's nephew and he wrote
his *Church History* at the behest of his uncle.[66] If indeed Gelasius
included the story about the restoration of the Temple in his work,
it is not unlikely that this account, and hence that of Rufinus, goes
back to a Jerusalem source – written or oral. Gelasius may even
have heard of it from his uncle, Cyril. But even if Rufinus' account
does not go back to Gelasius, his source may still be of Jerusalem
origin. Between 381 and 397 Rufinus had lived in Jerusalem and
he must have been acquainted with Cyril and been familiar with all
the local stories, especially those about important events like the
restoration of the Temple.

There are several other indications of a Jerusalem origin of the
letter. The author is well-informed about the topography of Jerusalem –
as mentioned above, the errors are most probably corruptions due
to translation – and he presents unique information about the actions
of the Jerusalem Christian community. The Christians retreated from
the church where they were praying, to the Mount of Olives, where
they apparently considered themselves safer from the storms and
earthquake than in the city itself. When the danger had subsided
they returned to the city and drove out Jews, forcing the rest of the
Jews and pagans to comply with the Christian faith. The statue of
Hadrian which the Jews had thrown down was set up again. Further-
more, the letter mentions that not only Jews, but also a great many
Christians died as a consequence of the disaster, information that is
not to be found in other sources. Exact dates for these events, i.e.
Sunday 18 and Monday 19 Iyyar (18 and 19 May), are not given
in other sources and might also indicate a historical acquaintance
with the events. Of interest, too, is the remark, unique to this let-
ter, that the Jews tried to seek shelter in their synagogue. It is also
noteworthy that the anonymous Bordeaux pilgrim who visited Jerusalem
in 333 mentions a synagogue.[67] Does this reflect the actual situation,
and was there still a synagogue in Jerusalem at the time?[68] That

---

[65] For Gelasius' *Church History*, see Winkelmann, 1966 and 1966a.
[66] See Chapter 6, 169–70.
[67] *It. Burd.* 592.
[68] If so, it was demolished by 370; Opt. Mil., *Schism. Don.* 3.2 (CSEL 26, 71).
See also Chapter 4, 121.

these references were not included in the other accounts of the
rebuilding of the Temple probably has to do with the fact that these
allusions were too detailed and too narrowly concerned with the
Jerusalem situation.

The main indicator, however, of a Jerusalem origin is the occur-
rence of the symbol of the cross.[69] Most sources mention that the
sign of the cross appeared on the clothing and the bodies of those
present.[70] As I stated earlier, Gregory of Nazianzus even mentions
the appearance of a luminous cross in the sky above Jerusalem, but
he most probably embellished his narrative by borrowing this ele-
ment from Cyril's *Letter to Constantius*. In the fourth century there
developed a close connection between Jerusalem and the symbol of
the cross. During the reign of Constantine (306–337) the wood of
the Cross was allegedly discovered by the emperor's mother Helena.
Relics of the Cross were kept in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre
and already by the end of the 340s were also distributed over the
whole world by people who had taken pieces from it, as we know
from Cyril's *Catechetical Lectures*.[71] From the *Itinerary of Egeria*, which
dates from the end of the fourth century, it is known that the sym-
bol of the cross also had a prominent place in the Jerusalem liturgy.
On Good Friday the bishop of Jerusalem showed the wood of the
Cross to the believers, who were allowed to touch the relic with
their forehead and eyes, as well as to kiss it.[72] In this period the
Cross was also shown during the Encaenia, i.e. the commemoration
of the consecration of the church on Golgotha, which coincides with
the date of the discovery of the Cross on 14 September.

As I will argue in Chapter 6, the symbol of the cross was espe-
cially important to Cyril in his conflicts with Caesarea and in his
endeavors to promote the see of Jerusalem. In his *Catechetical Lectures*
Cyril gives Jerusalem a central role and its biblical association is
especially emphasized. The symbol of the cross, which plays a promi-
nent role in his theological system, was an important tool for Cyril
in his efforts to gain a prominent position for Jerusalem. For him,
the symbol of the cross was a symbol of glory, a source of life, the

---

[69] For apparitions of crosses in Jerusalem, see Vogt, 1949.
[70] An exception is Ephrem's *Hymnus contra Julianum* (4.18–23) which has no ref-
erence to the Cross.
[71] *Catech.* 4.10, 10.19, 13.4.
[72] *It. Eger.* 37.1–3. See Chapter 4, 81–82.

ground of salvation, the foundation of the faith, a source of illumination and redemption, the end of sin, and the sign of the Second Coming of Christ. With respect to this Second Coming, it is of significance that the letter also refers to this eschatological event and connects it with the appearance of the sign of the cross:

> And the entire people thought that, after these signs which our Saviour gave us in His Gospel, the fearful (second) coming of the day of resurrection had arrived. With trembling of great joy we received something of the sign of Christ's crucifixion, and whosoever did not believe in his mind found his clothes openly reprove him, having the mark of the cross stained on them. (par. 8)

As it appears from his fifteenth *Catechetical Lecture*, Cyril connects the sign of the cross with the *adventus* of Christ and the defeat of Judaism in the same way as the author of the Syriac letter does.

> But what is the sign of His coming – to prevent a hostile power from daring to imitate it? "And then will appear," He says, "the sign of the Son of Man in heaven" [Matt. 24:30]. The true sign, Christ's own, is the Cross. A sign of a luminous cross precedes the King, showing Him who was formerly crucified; and so the Jews, who before had pierced Him and plotted against Him, on seeing it, will mourn tribe by tribe, saying: "This is He who was struck with blows, this is He whose face they spat upon, this is He whom they fastened with bonds; this is He whom of old they crucified and held in derision. Where," they will say, "shall we flee from the face of Your wrath?" Surrounded by the angelic hosts, they can never escape. The sign of the Cross will terrify His foes but will give joy to His faithful friends, who have heralded Him or suffered for Him.[73]

The similarity between the passage in the Syriac letter and Cyril's *Catechesis* enhances the idea that the letter is basically of Jerusalem origin. But there is more. In a recent interpretation of Cyril's *Letter to Constantius* it has been argued that the apparition of the cross in the sky above Jerusalem described in this letter, should be considered as the announcement of the Second Coming and hence the fulfillment of the eschatological scheme.[74] This fulfillment resulted of course in the defeat of Judaism. There is therefore not only a connection between the Syriac letter and *Catechesis* 15, but also a resemblance with Cyril's *Letter to Constantius*.

---

[73] *Catech.* 15.15. Cf. also *Catech.* 13.41.
[74] Irshai, 1996, esp. 97–104.

In his attempts to gain a preeminent position for the bishop's see of Jerusalem, Cyril greatly promoted the cult of the cross. He was in all likelihood responsible for the veneration of the Cross as part of the Jerusalem liturgical cycle. There are also good arguments for supposing that Cyril was responsible for the origin and development of the legend of the discovery of the Cross, in which Jerusalem, its bishop, and Constantine's mother Helena play such prominent roles.[75] Considering the importance Cyril attached to the symbol of the cross, it is possible that the bishop of Jerusalem himself is to be credited with the story about the appearance of crosses on the garments of those who witnessed the events of 363 in Jerusalem. In this context, the cross, apart from the fact that it was imprinted on their garments as a sign of protection, evidently also symbolizes redemption and glory. The rebuilding of the Temple which, if successful, would have been a severe blow to Christianity in general and to the Christian community in Jerusalem in particular, luckily for Cyril and the Jerusalem Christians, failed. Its failure may have been turned by Cyril into a victorious event, the ultimate glory of Christianity over its Jewish opponents. The most appropriate symbol for Cyril to mark this victory was of course that of the cross, a symbol so important to him and so closely associated with Jerusalem. Therefore the cross-on-clothes story in the Syriac letter, and in the other sources from Gregory onwards that report the failed rebuilding of the Temple, has in all probability a Jerusalem origin for which Cyril is possibly responsible.

All things considered, the Syriac letter attributed to Cyril contains several elements that are likely to be of Jerusalem origin. The symbol of the cross, the information on the Jerusalem topography, the actions undertaken by the Christians, the resemblance between the letter and Rufinus' account, and perhaps the dates given in the letter may well indicate a Jerusalem milieu. Considering the fact that writings of Cyril were translated into Syriac, it is tempting to suppose that there once existed a Greek text of some sort on which the Syriac letter was based and that Cyril was responsible for it. Unfortunately, there is no proof to sustain this supposition. It is, however, hard to imagine that Cyril, especially in view of the connection he developed between Jerusalem and the cross, as well as

---

[75] See Chapter 6, 172–73.

the threatening effect a restored Temple would have had on the Jerusalem Christian community and his own episcopal see, was not somehow influential to the authorship of the text. This does not make the Syriac letter a "genuine addition to the Cyrilline corpus," as Wainwright argues, but neither is it a forgery spun out of thin air. The letter may therefore provide us with additional information and shed new light on an event that had a great impact on Christians of Late Antiquity.

A matter I have not yet touched upon is the question of why a letter attributed to Cyril on the restoration of the Temple seems to have been of particular importance in the Syriac-speaking world. Or, in other words, what is the historical context of this letter? As I mentioned before, Brock thinks that the letter is to be dated to the early fifth century, but he does not adduce arguments for this supposition. Levenson, in his unpublished doctoral thesis, has argued that the letter is to be placed in the context of Syriac popular traditions about Julian and that the work in which this tradition is best reflected is the so-called *Syriac Julian Romance*.[76] It makes good sense to seek the provenance of the letter within this tradition. The *Julian Romance*, a work of historical fiction, is a very interesting but understudied work. The long Syriac text is preserved in a sixth-century manuscript in the British Library (BL Add. MS 14641) and was first published in 1880.[77] For a long time the accepted date of composition of the *Romance* has been the first decades of the sixth century, but recently a date not long after the death of the Persian king, Shapur II (379), i.e. the end of the fourth century or the beginning of the fifth century, has been suggested on fair grounds.[78] The text originated in Edessa, probably in the School of the Persians where a "typological view of history and the rôle of the Christian emperor" was developed by Ephrem Syrus and others.[79] The work is clearly

---

[76] The suggestion was made by Levenson, 1979, 95. However, Levenson dates this tradition to the fifth and sixth centuries whereas this tradition had a much earlier origin.

[77] Hoffmann, 1880. An English translation by Gollancz, considered by experts to be inaccurate and full of mistakes, was published in 1928.

[78] Nöldeke (1874, 282–83) suggested a date between 502 and 523 C.E. H.J.W. Drijvers (1994) suggests the earlier date; he considers the *Romance* as a text that had to provide a justification for the loss of Nisibis in 363 after Julian's fatal campaign.

[79] H.J.W. Drijvers, 1994, 213.

"anti-Julian" and stands therefore in the Edessene anti-Julian tradition of which Ephrem Syrus' *Hymns against Julian* are the main representatives. The author of the text is not known but he must have been a Christian.

The *Julian Romance* may be divided into three main parts. The first and introductory part is about the reigns of Constantine and his sons, and the Christian persecution initiated by Julian. The second part is situated in Rome. Julian with the help of the Jews tries with every possible means to win over Eusebius, bishop of Rome, to the old cults.[80] Of course Julian fails and desillusioned and angry he leaves Rome to campaign against the Persians. The third, and longest, part of the narrative tells about Julian's journey from Rome to Persia and Julian's many anti-Christian measures. The other central figure in this part of the *Romance* is Jovian, who became Julian's successor after the latter was killed in battle by an arrow sent by God (Julian's death had already been prophesied by Eusebius as an act of God's justice). Jovian, who concluded a peace treaty with the Persians which included the cessation of Nisibis, is presented in the narrative as a New Constantine. Jovian turns the nightmare of Julian's reign into the reality of the Christian dream. From now on Christianity is favored by the emperor, the pagan cults are put to an end and the Jews are punished for supporting Julian. The city of Edessa has a central role in the *Romance*. In spite of Julian's threats to level the city and kill its inhabitants, Edessa alone among the cities in the East remains resolute in its faith. As a reward for this Jovian visits the city and performs a healing miracle there.

The *Romance* does not recount the failed attempt to restore the Temple on the grounds that, as the text says, this subject has already been treated by another author.[81] It does, however, contain two longer passages on two encounters between Julian and a delegation of Jews in which the Temple is the main topic and it describes how the Jews obtained Julian's permission to restore the Temple.[82] The

[80] The name of the bishop of Rome possibly refers to the historical Eusebius of Nicomedia who in 340 became bishop of Constantinople, the New Rome.
[81] "I should be doing something superfluous if I inserted into our narrative what has been outlined by another writer, who has described these events [the rebuilding of the temple] fittingly, as they actually took place"; trans. Brock, 1977, 286. Brock (1977, 286 n. 71) thinks that by this anonymous author one of the fifth-century church historians is meant.
[82] On these passages, see Drijvers, 1999a.

first passage relates a meeting in Tarsus between a delegation of Jewish high priests and Julian.[83] The Jews show their subservience by offering the emperor a golden crown. Julian expects the Jews to conform to his pagan worship, which they are most willing to do on account of their zeal to rebuild the Temple. Julian invites the Jews to a feast where they eat non-kosher food; after that he asks them to sacrifice in public to the pagan gods. The Jews consent to do this, their excuse being that Jacob, head of the tribes of Israel, sacrificed under the terebinth tree to strange gods, and Solomon sacrificed and put incense on the altars of the gods of his wives.[84] The Jews pledge unconditional allegiance to Julian and call him the king of Jacob and the leader of Israel. Having performed the emperor's will, the Jews petition Julian to set his eyes upon Jerusalem where the Temple lies in ruins. Julian promises to protect the Jews and gives them permission to lay bare the foundations of their Temple. The second passage relates a meeting not far from Edessa between Julian and the Edessene Jews.[85] The latter had been given a hard time by the Christians of Edessa not only because they were Jews but also because they supported Julian's reign. They had been verbally and physically maltreated and their synagogues were seized, their homes plundered, and their possessions taken. They explain to Julian that they are willing to serve his gods, if only they are given the opportunity, since their ancestors likewise had served a multitude of gods. The Edessene Jews request that the emperor remember Jerusalem and the Temple. Julian replies that when he returns victoriously from his Persian expedition, he will rebuild Jerusalem and restore the Temple to even greater glory than it possessed in Solomon's days.

It needs no explanation that these passages are clearly anti-Jewish and constitute Christian propaganda against Judaism and the Jews. The latter are portrayed as wicked creatures without any principles who are prepared to recognize Julian as their leader and messiah in order to get authorization from him to rebuild their Temple.

In Late Antiquity and especially after the reign of Julian, the anti-Jewish climate increased all over the Roman Empire, as can be shown from texts of the Church Fathers, imperial laws, and violence

---

[83] Gollancz, 1928, 117–26.
[84] Cf. Gen. 35:2–4; 1 Kings 11.
[85] Gollancz, 1928, 143–46.

taking place against synagogues.[86] The passages in the *Julian Romance* just referred to are only two of the many expressions of general anti-Jewish sentiment to be found in Christian texts. More particularly, they are a reflection of the situation in the city of Edessa where the text most probably was composed. The central role Edessa plays in the third part of the *Romance* is reason to believe that the text is of Edessene origin. The city is presented as "the mother of believers"[87] that, irrespective of Julian's threats to devastate the city and kill its inhabitants, stood firm in its faith. In reward the city is visited by Julian's successor, Jovian, who is received by the inhabitants of Edessa with great joy. It seems that especially around the year 400 anti-Judaism increased in Edessa and its surroundings. This period saw a significant increase of anti-Jewish texts in Syriac Christian literature. We may deduce this, for instance, from the translation into Syriac of the Judas Kyriakos legend, one of the three versions of the legend of the discovery of the True Cross. The originally Greek Kyriakos legend is of Jerusalem origin and known for its strong anti-Jewish features.[88] Another version of the same legend, the so-called Protonike story, began to circulate in the Syriac-speaking parts of the empire; the Protonike story which became part of the *Doctrina Addai*, the official but fictional story about the foundation of the Edessene church, also features a strong anti-Jewish sentiment.[89]

The contents of the Syriac letter attributed to Cyril tallies very well with what we know about Edessene (anti-Jewish) text traditions from around the year 400. Furthermore, the letter is a perfect complement to the information missing in the *Julian Romance* and both texts may well have a common provenance.[90] It is of course tempting to consider Cyril's letter as the text referred to in the passage in the *Romance* where it is mentioned that the restoration of the Temple had already been dealt with by another author.[91] Unfortunately, there is no evidence for this. It may, however, well be that *c.* 400 someone in Edessa familiar with the local literary lores as well the Jerusalem traditions with regard to the rebuilding of the Temple composed the Syriac letter attributed to Cyril.

---

[86] The literature on this is vast; e.g. Simon, 1986; Parkes, 1974; Linder, 1987; Millar, 1992; Noethlichs, 1996.
[87] Gollancz, 1928, 138.
[88] Drijvers and Drijvers, 1997.
[89] Drijvers, 1997.
[90] Levenson, 1979, 85 n. 211.
[91] See above n. 81.

PROMOTING JERUSALEM

Cyril was an ambitious man whose political agenda was dominated by his desire to make Jerusalem the most important city in the Christian world and to turn his own bishop's see into the most authoritative one in Palestine. The status and prestige of Jerusalem and its bishop were central to Cyril's attitude and actions. In this chapter the focus is on Cyril's strategies to obtain influence and power for himself and for Jerusalem by using Jerusalem's biblical past, holy sites and, especially, the symbol of the Cross.[1]

Throughout his writings Cyril emphasizes the importance of Jerusalem as the holiest city of the Christian world. It had been here that the apostolic power was first established. Referring to the Gospel of Luke and Acts, Cyril emphasizes that Jerusalem was the seat of apostolic authority. According to the spiritual grace of the Apostles operating in Jerusalem the number of Christians had increased. In Jerusalem the Apostles had issued a letter freeing "the whole world" from the Jewish practices and the customs once established by Moses.[2] Jerusalem was also the place from which the Word of the Lord had gone forth,[3] from which Paul had preached the Gospel to Illyrium and Rome and extended the zeal of his preaching even to Spain.[4] Moreover, Jerusalem was considered by Cyril to be the first bishopric and his predecessor James, Jesus' brother, the "prototype" of all other bishops. Twice Cyril singles out James in his *Catecheses*, obviously in order to stress the authority of Jerusalem as an apostolic see.[5]

---

[1] This chapter is based on my "Promoting of Jerusalem: Cyril and the True Cross" (1999).

[2] *Catech.* 16.9, 17.22, 29. See also Walker, 1990, 337–38.

[3] *Catech.* 18.34.

[4] *Catech.* 17.26; cf. Rom. 15:19.

[5] *Catech.* 4.28, 14.21. Admittedly, because of textual uncertainty over the word πρωτότυπος (see Reischl and Rupp, vol. 2, 136 n. 11) it is not quite certain whether Cyril refers to James as the first bishop ever, or that he is just emphasizing James' fame.

In addition to these scriptural arguments, Jerusalem possessed
inherently sacred sites. For Cyril Jerusalem's sacred topography was
of extreme importance from a theological perspective. According to
his theology, Jerusalem was foremost a holy city because of the many
places associated with the Gospel.[6] These were the places where Jesus
himself had been and they hence had an inherent quality of holi-
ness. Cyril calls these places "holy", "all-holy" (πανάγιος) or "blessed"
(μακάριος).[7] They were the witnesses to the truth of the Gospel sto-
ries and were an inspiration to the faith for the pilgrims who vis-
ited them. The physical presence of these sites was for Cyril the
tangible proof of the spiritual, whereas for a theologian like Eusebius,
for instance, Christianity was a spiritual religion, in which space was
neutral and the physical of no importance.[8] For the latter and other
adherents of the spiritually-centered logos theology of the Alexandrian
brand, heavenly Jerusalem was nonmaterial and hence everywhere;
but for Cyril heavenly Jerusalem was material and represented by
the city of Jerusalem itself and its many holy sites.[9] In his baptismal
instructions Cyril emphasizes unremittingly that the events of the
Gospel had taken place in Jerusalem, thereby pressing home the cen-

---

[6] *Catech.* 14.16, 17.22, 31. The following owes much to Peter Walker's study *Holy
City Holy Places?* (1990), particularly pp. 36–38 and chap. 10.

[7] *Catech.* 5.10, 10.19, 13.38–39 ("holy"); 1.1, 13.22 ("all-holy"); 4.10, 10.19
("blessed").

[8] This is not to say that Eusebius did not have any interest in the Gospel sites
as such; he clearly did as his *Onomastikon* reveals. However, he had a historical inter-
est in these sites but did not ascribe any spiritual significance to them. Also for the-
ologians like Gregory of Nyssa and Jerome, the holy sites seem to be less important
than they were for Cyril. At the end of the fourth century both men dissuade
Christians of the need to visit the holy places in Palestine; a visit to Jerusalem and
the holy sites was not essential for salvation. The important thing was not "to have
been to Jerusalem, but in Jerusalem to have lived a good life" (*non Hierosolymis fuisse,
sed Hierosolymis bene vixisse*). See Jer., *Epist.* 58.3 and Greg. Nys., *Epist.* 2.15–16; 3.11.

[9] No less than sixty-seven times does Cyril in his *Catecheses* refer to the holy places
in and around Jerusalem; Baldovin, 1987, 15. The focus on the holy sites and the
sacralization of the topography was something quite new that started in the 320s
and 330s. Constantine's building activities on biblical sites in Palestine definitely
were a great stimulus to the veneration of holy places. However, in conjunction
with the religious freedom that Christians acquired at the beginning of the fourth
century and the gradual christianization of the empire, there developed a more
place-bound piety. This new form of piety which commemorated the biblical events
at the sites where they were supposed to have taken place, replaced the Christian
religiosity of the first three centuries which was eschatological, ahistorical and not
tied to a certain place. For this change, see the important article by Markus (1994),
who sees this development beginning with the martyr cults which were locative and
historical. See also Smith, 1987, 74–96; MacCormack, 1990; Markus, 1990, 139–55.

trality and importance of Jerusalem in Christian history. In visual language Cyril reminded his audience time and again that the biblical past, the truth of Christianity and the divinity of Jesus were manifestly present.[10] The holy sites as well as the holy objects – e.g. the wood of the Cross, the palm tree in the valley, Gethsamene, Golgotha, the tomb and the stone that closes it, the Mount of Olives – bore witness to Christ and his presence in Jerusalem, as Cyril elaborately mentions in his *Catechesis* 10.19. According to Cyril "the most honored privileges are ours".[11] The holy sites were "an appropriate medium for faith, places where the divine had touched the human and the physical, places where through the physical means of touch, of sight and liturgical action human beings could now in return come close to the divine."[12] Through its holy sites Jerusalem could offer the faithful the experience of proximity to Christ and hence an opportunity to deepen their faith. In the Jerusalem liturgy, the pinnacles of which are attested to by the pilgrim Egeria and which is generally considered to have been – at least partly – developed and organized by Cyril, these holy sites were prominently emphasized and became connected by way of liturgical processions. Moreover, these sites in Jerusalem were the places which God had chosen for the occurrence of major events of the salvation history, giving Jerusalem a divine status, according to Cyril. Because of its biblical past and its specialness to God, Christian Jerusalem was holy and preeminent. Cyril considered Jerusalem as the "mother-church" for the Church in general of which the Lord's brother James had been the first bishop and which had been the place of origin of the apostolic movement.[13] In addition to that, Cyril argued that the Second Coming would take place in Jerusalem; he did so explicitly in his prebaptismal instructions and in his *Letter to Constantius*.[14] On all of these grounds Jerusalem was unique and could, in the view of Cyril, claim

---

[10] In referring to the Gospel events he regularly uses terms like παρ' ἡμῖν and ἐνταῦθα; Walker, 1990, 332–33.

[11] *Catech.* 16.4. In *Catech.* 3.7 Cyril says that Jerusalem "holds precedence in all good things" when referring that the whole of Jerusalem went out to enjoy the beginnings of baptism by John the Baptist.

[12] Walker, 1990, 37–38.

[13] Interesting in this respect is that in the letter the bishops present at the Council of Constantinople (381), at which Cyril played such a prominent role, sent to the bishop of Rome, the church at Jerusalem is called "mother of all the churches"; Tanner, 1990, 30; Thdt., *HE* 5.9.17.

[14] *Catech.* 15.15; *Epist. ad Const.* 6.

a position of preference within the Church, both in Palestine and in the Roman world in general.

Of all the holy sites in or near Jerusalem Golgotha was considered by Cyril to be particularly eminent. The place of the crucifixion, the Rock of Calvary, which was incorporated into the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, was for Cyril the "center of the world".[15] The physical presence of the site within the Constantinian church complex undoubtedly made it all the more important to Cyril.[16] No less than thirteen times does he refer to Golgotha in his baptismal instructions.[17] The privileged position of Golgotha in Cyril's theological thinking has, of course, everything to do with the Cross. Even more important than the many holy sites, including Golgotha, was the *lignum crucis* and the presence of its relics in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. These tangible relics were for Cyril a prime witness to Christ and represented "the sense of an unbroken and unmediated contact with Christ".[18] The Cross has been justly called the apex of Cyril's theological system,[19] and for Cyril it was undoubtedly the most powerful, prominent and glorious Christian symbol. He mentions the Cross regularly, in particular in his *Catechesis* 13, "On the Crucifixion and Burial of Christ". For Cyril the Cross is real and no illusion. It is the glory of the catholic Church, a source of illumination and redemption, the end of sin, the source of life, a crown of glory instead of dishonor, the ground of salvation, the indestructible foundation of the faith, the sign of the Second Coming of Christ, and the symbol that brings the faithful together. It wards off those who object against the Christian faith and, for those who deny

---

[15] *Catech.* 13.28. For the Jewish and Christian concept of Jerusalem as the center or the navel of the world, see Alexander, 1999.

[16] *Catech.* 13.22: "one should never grow weary of hearing about our crowned Lord, especially on this holy Golgotha. For others merely hear, but we see and touch."

[17] *Catech.* 1.1; 4.10, 15; 5.10; 10.19; 13.4, 22, 23, 26, 28, 39; 14.6; 16.4. Taylor (1993, 121) and Taylor and Gibson (1994, 59, 79–80) believe that Cyril rather referred to Golgotha as the whole area on which the Martyrium stood and as the general execution place of first-century Jerusalem, than to the Rock of Calvary present and visible in the courtyard between Martyrium and Anastasis. Since Cyril emphasized the physical presence in Jerusalem of holy sites and objects and attached great importance to them, it seems to me that Cyril when referring to Golgotha meant the Rock of Calvary.

[18] Walker, 1990, 246; *Catech.* 10.19, 13.39.

[19] Walker, 1990, 256.

it, the eternal fire awaits.[20] But the Cross was not only a symbol, it was also real and present. Around the middle of the fourth century, relics of it had already been distributed throughout the world, as Cyril tells his baptismal candidates.

> He was truly crucified for our sins. And should you wish to deny this, the visible itself, this blessed Golgotha, refutes you, where, in the name of Him who was here crucified, we are gathered together. Besides, the whole world has now been filled with pieces of the wood of the Cross. (*Catech.* 4.10)

> His witness is the holy wood of the Cross, seen among us even to this day, and by those who have taken portions thereof, from hence filling almost the whole world. (*Catech.* 10.19)

> He was crucified and we do not deny it, but rather do I glory in speaking of it. For if I should now deny it, Golgotha here, close to which we are now gathered, refutes me; the wood of the Cross, now distributed piecemeal from Jerusalem over the entire world, refutes me. (*Catech.* 13.4)

The distribution of relics of the Cross, and its mention by Cyril no less than three times, is of great significance. It seems that for Cyril the relic had a political usefulness for communicating the centrality and preeminence of Jerusalem to the rest of the world in order to promote his bishop's see and to make Jerusalem an influential bishopric in the ecclesiastical networks of power. As mentioned earlier, Cyril claimed the primacy in Palestine for Jerusalem instead of Caesarea by arguing that his bishopric was an apostolic see.[21] His struggle for power and the promotion of Jerusalem was complicated by the fact that for the greater part of his episcopacy the empire was ruled by the Arian emperors Constantius and Valens, who evidently were on the side of the Arian metropolitan in Caesarea. Jerusalem's position and that of its bishop were furthermore complicated by the fact that after the death of Constantine, the interest of the emperors in Jerusalem waned,[22] only increasing again in the

---

[20] *Catech.* 13.1, 4, 6, 19, 20, 22, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41; 15.22. Walker, 1990, 256–57, 328; Doval, 2001, 181–83.

[21] Soz., *HE.* 4.25.2; Thdt., *HE* 2.26.6.

[22] The only evidence we have for imperial interest in Jerusalem is Cyril's remark (*Catech.* 14.14) that "the emperors of our times" (οἱ δὲ νῦν βασιλεῖς) were to thank for the gold, silver and precious stones that adorned the Church of the Holy

time of the Theodosian dynasty. Cyril had to employ, therefore, every means available to reach his goal. And the most important medium at hand was the symbol of the Cross.

In recent studies, which owe much to modern anthropological approaches and perceptions, it has been demonstrated that there is a connection between religion and political influence and that religion helps structure society and the networks of power. The imperial cult in the cities of Asia Minor, for example, was of extreme importance both for these cities and their local elites in establishing relationships with the imperial house and advancing their own status and influence in competition with other cities and their elites.[23] Furthermore, the imperial cult also enhanced the dominance of the elites over the local populace. A relationship with the imperial house could bring all sorts of advantages to a city and its elites, such as easier access to the emperor and the granting of privileges and benefactions. The imperial cult was therefore "a major part of the web of power that formed the fabric of society".[24] Cults in general were of importance for local elites of becoming part of various power relationships in the Roman Empire.[25] To negotiate these relationships important factors were the tradition of the cult, its promotion and spread, and the communication with the divine might through power brokers (generally priests belonging to the local elite). In addition to the cult itself, religious symbols associated with it also supplied powerful images for communicating and acquiring or maintaining power and/or prestige.

While these studies and others have enabled us to better understand the role of power relationships, particular in the context of pagan cults of the first centuries c.e., it might also be fruitful when applied to Christianity in the world of Late Antiquity. Bishops increasingly took over the role of patron of local elites and became figures of authority in their local communities.[26] These bishops often shared the same social background and the same *paideia* as the secular elites,

---

Sepulchre. This may be a reference to the sons of Constantine, but may also include Constantine himself.

[23] Price, 1984.

[24] Price, 1984, 248.

[25] See Edwards (1996), who, like Price (1984), deals with cities in Asia Minor in the first two centuries of our era.

[26] Chapter 3, 67–69.

and it therefore comes as no surprise that politically they operated to a great extent in the same way as these elites. In their endeavors to anchor their city and their see in a power network, or to consolidate or enlarge their influence within power relationships, bishops resorted to cults and religious symbols. One might think here, for instance, of the various martyr cults that could lend great prestige and authority, if cleverly exploited, to a city and its bishop.[27]

Cyril clearly aimed at enlarging the prestige and authority of his episcopal see. He sought to make Jerusalem more important than it was in the church-province of Palestine, and in the network of power relationships within the Roman Empire. It is not difficult to imagine what Cyril's goals were: the recognition of Jerusalem's pre-eminence as an apostolic see at least in the church-province of Palestine but also in the Christian world on the whole, the obtaining of metropolitan rights, as well as the creation of a profoundly Christian Jerusalem. To achieve his goals, religious symbols were employed: Jerusalem itself, of course, with its many holy sites, and, foremost, the symbol of the Cross, which until the reign of Constantine had had relatively little appeal for Christians,[28] but now became a significant means to increase the glory of Jerusalem. Cyril's tactics were not new. His predecessor Macarius seems already to have fostered holy sites in Jerusalem, in particular that of the tomb of Christ, in order to promote Jerusalem.[29]

As mentioned earlier, Cyril emphasizes in his *Catechetical Lectures* the presence of relics of the Cross in Jerusalem and he regularly refers to the Cross as the Christian symbol *par excellence*.[30] However, there is another extremely important text by Cyril that demonstrates the close connection between the Cross and Jerusalem, namely his *Letter to Constantius*. The immediate cause for sending this letter was the remarkable appearance of a luminous cross above Golgotha extending to the Mount of Olives on 7 May 351.[31] The apparition

---

[27] Brown, 1981. See, for instance, the political impact of the "discovery" of the remains of the martyrs Gervasius and Protasius by Ambrose in his conflict with the imperially supported Arian party in Milan; McLynn, 1994, 209–19.

[28] See e.g. Sulzberger, 1925; Stockmeier, 1966.

[29] Rubin, 1999, 152–53.

[30] For a discussion of Cyril's references to the presence of the relics of the Cross, see also Borgehammar, 1991, 85–92.

[31] See also Chapter 2, 50–53. The 7th of May became a day of annual commemoration for the Jerusalem Christians as appears from the local calendar; *Arm. Lect.* No. LIV (PO 36, 195).

lasted several hours and was observed by all the inhabitants of
Jerusalem. It induced young and old, men and women, natives and
foreigners, and pagans and Christians to praise the Lord and to pray
at length at the holy places for Constantius' reign. Cyril presumably
had sent the letter shortly after the phenomenon occurred, that is,
in May 351.[32] The language of the letter is quite different from that
of the *Catechetical Lectures*. It is written in an ornate style and is highly
rhetorical whereas Cyril's language in the *Catecheses* is more ordinary.
The style of the letter has been compared to that of the letter by
the emperor Constantine to bishop Macarius of Jerusalem about the
construction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, a letter which
Cyril must have been familiar with.[33] The letter was sent by Cyril
as a "first offering", implying that this was the first contact between
the bishop and the emperor, and received by Constantius at a cru-
cial point in his reign. Constantius, who at the time he got the let-
ter resided in Sirmium,[34] was confronted with serious political problems.
Constantius' brother and co-emperor Constans had been murdered
and on 18 January 350 the usurper Magnentius adopted the purple
in the west. Another usurper Vetranio was proclaimed Illyrian emperor
on 1 March 350. At the time Constantius was at war with the
Sassanians, who posed a constant threat at the eastern borders of
the empire. After the battle of Nisibis (350), Constantius returned to
the west in order to settle matters there. In December 350 Vetranio
surrendered to Constantius without a fight. In March 351 Constantius
appointed his nephew Gallus to the position of Caesar in which
capacity the latter had to take care of imperial affairs in the east.
Consequently Constantius directed his attention to Magnentius whom
he was able to defeat at the battle of Mursa on 28 September 351.
The apparition of the luminous cross in Jerusalem seems thus to
have come at a convenient moment and can be seen as a favorable
premonition of victory for Constantius over Magnentius.

The letter focuses on two issues: Constantius and Jerusalem.
Constantius is referred to explicitly several times. The emperor is

---

[32] This date is now generally acknowledged. However, in the past other dates
have been suggested; Chantraine, 1993–94, 434–39.

[33] For the comparison see McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 2, 225–26.
Constantine's letter was included by Eusebius in his *Vita Constantini* (3.30–32).

[34] Barnes, 1993, 221.

called pious and benevolent towards the Church, and the letter is almost panegyrical in its praise of Constantius. He enjoys the favor of God, even more so than his father Constantine whose piety was rewarded with the discovery of the saving wood of the Cross in Jerusalem, but in Constantius' time miracles did not appear from the ground but in the heavens. By sending the trophy of the victory, that is the Cross,[35] God had sent the emperor, according to Cyril, an obvious sign of his approval of Constantius' reign and the emperor could consider God as his ally in his forthcoming confrontation with Magnentius.

The other focal point is Jerusalem. It also appears from the letter how central Jerusalem and its holy places were to Cyril. Jerusalem is mentioned no less than seven times in the not very long text,[36] but above all Jerusalem is the place where an apparition of the luminous Cross appeared. As in the *Catechetical Lectures*, Cyril connects Jerusalem and Cross and refers to the past and the biblical events that have taken place in Jerusalem:

> These words of mine, Emperor most favoured by God, are the first offering which I send you; they are my first address from Jerusalem to you, our most noble and pious fellow-worshipper of Christ, the Only-begotten Son of our God and Saviour, of Christ who accomplished the salvation of the world in Jerusalem according to the sacred Scriptures, who in this place trod death underfoot and wiped away the sins of mankind with his own precious blood, who bestowed life, immortality and spiritual grace from heaven on all who believe in him.[37]

However, it is not only the biblical past but also the eschatological future that makes Jerusalem central. The sign of the Cross that appeared in the sky above Jerusalem announces the Second Coming, which is soon to take place in Jerusalem as prophecied:

> In accordance, Emperor most favoured by God, with the testimony of the prophets and the words of Christ contained in the holy gospels, this miracle has been accomplished now and will be accomplished again more fully. For in St. Matthew's Gospel the Saviour granted his blessed apostles knowledge of future events and through them foretold

---

[35] *Epist. ad Const.* 3: νικῆς τρόπαιον, ὁ μακάριος . . . σταυρός.

[36] In Bihain's edition the letter comprises only six pages including the critical apparatus. In e.g. Yarnold's English translation it encompasses only three pages (2000, 68–70).

[37] *Epist. ad Const.* 7; trans. Yarnold.

to their successors in the clearest of statements: 'And then the sign of the Son of Man will appear in the sky' (Matt. 24:30).[38]

The centrality that he assigns to Jerusalem with regard to the biblical past and the eschatological future, may also explain why Cyril does not refer to Constantine's famous vision of 312. A luminous Cross appeared to Constantine and his troops in 312 shortly before the battle at the Milvian Bridge. Cyril most probably knew about this apparition but kept deliberately reticent about it since it took place near Rome and would therefore distract the attention from Jerusalem and make it less unique. Moreover, this vision was elaborately described by Eusebius of Caesarea in his *Life of Constantine*; Cyril may not have wanted to allude to an event related by the former metropolitan of Palestine.[39]

What objective was Cyril attempting to achieve by sending this letter? The letter is an expression of loyalty to and praise of the emperor by the newly appointed Cyril. But there is more to it than just that. To a great extent the letter is also self-serving: Cyril wanted to get the attention and gain the favor of the emperor. In order to achieve these aims "a manifestation of divine approval in Jerusalem might favorably dispose the emperor toward the city and its bishop."[40] Cyril must have realized that he needed the support of the emperor in the conflict with his metropolitan Acacius and in order to promote Jerusalem. This was all the more important because Acacius seems to have had great influence at the court in Constantinople. The church historian Sozomen reports that Acacius had secured the favor of Constantius II through court officials.[41] Acacius was no common character and was extremely resourceful in getting his way. He gained the loyalty of courtiers through bribes but he also managed

---

[38] *Epist. ad Const.* 6; trans. Yarnold. See for the Coming of the Son of Man also *Catech.* 13.41, 15.1 and 22. In a most interesting article and one of the best studies on Cyril's letter, Irshai (1996) interprets the apparition of the luminous Cross as a sign announcing the *adventus* of Christ. The Second Coming will deter and destroy Christianity's foes, by whom, according to Irshai, the Jews are meant; also Irshai, 1999, 211–12. Unfortunately, I was unable to consult Irshai's dissertation (in Hebrew) which also deals with this subject: Oded Irshai, *Historical Aspects of the Christian-Jewish Polemic concerning the Church of Jerusalem in the Fourth Century (In the light of the Patristic and Rabbinic Literature)*, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1993.

[39] Chantraine (1993–94, 440–41) thinks that Cyril may not have been familiar with Constantine's vision.

[40] Barnes, 1993, 107.

[41] Soz., *HE* 4.23.1–2.

to persuade them by the subtlety of his arguments and to impress them with his dignity. Acacius had a great reputation as a pupil and successor of Eusebius but also because of his intellect and eloquence as well as his many publications. According to Sozomen Acacius succeeded with ease in whatever he undertook.

It was already observed half a century ago that the letter was one of the tactics Cyril employed in his conflict with Acacius of Caesarea.[42] The letter clearly expresses the desire for a relationship between Jerusalem and the emperor. No evidence is available that Constantius, vis-à-vis his father, was particularly interested in Jerusalem. This letter had to change that. In practice the emperor was head of the Church; it was therefore important for Cyril to have close connections with the emperor as they had existed in the days of Constantine and bishop Macarius. Cyril presented himself as the messenger of good tidings for the emperor and as the emissary of God to communicate and interpret a divine sign. It is not without significance that this sign was a Cross, a symbol so central to Cyril's theology, and that it appeared in Jerusalem. The letter had to emphasize that Jerusalem was in God's view a preeminent and holy city, a view that the emperor also should hold. Cyril's purpose in sending the letter therefore was evidently to negotiate a power relationship between Jerusalem and the emperor in order to obtain benefits and privileges, such as a favorable position for Jerusalem and its episcopal see in the conflict with Caesarea. Unfortunately for Cyril, however, Constantius was unmoved and remained indifferent to the claims of Jerusalem and its bishop, and in the ensuing conflict between Jerusalem and Caesarea he took sides with the metropolitan Acacius.

Another event that took place in this same year is the discovery of the remains of James, Jerusalem's first bishop and brother of Jesus, if at least we are to believe a text preserved in a tenth-century manuscript.[43] James had been martyred by the Scribes and Pharisees in 62 c.e., as we know from Eusebius (quoting Hegesippus), and was

---

[42] Vogt, 1949, 601: "Das besondere Anliegen des Briefschreibers besteht aber deutlich darin, dass er Jerusalem, die Kirche und den Bisschofsstuhl dieser Stadt dem Kaiser nahebringen will." See also Chantraine, 1993–94, 440.

[43] The manuscript is preserved in the library of Chartres (Cod. sign. n. 125) and was first published in *Analecta Bollandiana* 8 (1889) 123–24: *Apparitio sanctorum Jacobi apostoli et primi archiepiscoporum, atque sacerdotum Symonis et Zachariae.* Abel (1919) has a French translation. Although the text is in Latin it supposedly goes back to a Greek original.

buried close to the Jewish temple.[44] According to the hagiographi-
cal text in the year of the consuls Sergius and Nigrianus – the year
351 –, James had appeared in a nocturnal vision to the anchorite
Epiphanius who dwelled in a cave between the Mount of Olives and
the Temple Mount. James revealed to Epiphanius that this very cave
was the site of his burial. While Epiphanius initially doubted whether
this vision was genuine, a second appearance of James convinced
him. When Epiphanius went to Cyril, the latter did not believe him
and sent him away. Only through the intervention of a certain Paul,
a prominent notable from Eleutheropolis, were the remains of James
excavated together with those of the priests Simeon and Zacharias
who were buried with James. Only when the bones were exhumed,
did Cyril become enthusiastic and he had the remains of James
translated to Mount Sion. This took place on 1 December of the
year 351.

Cyril based his authority and that of the Jerusalem see also on
the fact that it was the first bishopric ever and that its first bishop
was Jesus' brother. As mentioned above, James had been singled out
by Cyril in his prebaptismal instructions, and presumably Jerusalem's
first bishop must have been dear to Cyril if only for political rea-
sons. The discovery of the remains of the founder of the Jerusalem
church and the establishing of a martyr cult for James would undoubt-
edly have been politically most convenient for Cyril. Such events
would definitely have enhanced the status and prestige of Jerusalem
and would have underscored Cyril's claim for Jerusalem's pre-emi-
nence considerably. However, contemporary sources are silent about
this episode as well as about a martyr cult for the "prototype" of
all bishops. Hence it is questionable whether the story has some his-
torical foundation and whether it was one of the devices employed
by Cyril to promote Jerusalem. Moreover, there is a striking resem-
blance between this story and the discovery of the remains of the
protomartyr Stephen in Caphar Gamala in 415; the former story
may have been modeled on the latter.[45]

---

[44] Eus., *HE* 2.23. Cf. Fl. Jos., *Ant.* 20.9.1.
[45] Cf. Rubin (1999, 155) who considers it "reasonable to assume that two different
bishops [Cyril and John] resorted to similar methods to highlight the unrivaled holi-
ness of their church."

In the beginning of the 360s Cyril was confronted with a completely different situation. For the first time in his life the Roman Empire was ruled by a pagan emperor. Although Julian the Apostate reigned only for some eighteen months (361–363), Jerusalem was directly faced with the new religious policy of the emperor. Julian, who considered the Jews as his natural allies in his efforts to dechristianize the Roman Empire, decided to rebuild the Jewish Temple. Although the project, which started somewhere in the first months of 363, was a complete failure, the Christian reaction to it was vehement. Gregory of Nazianzus, Ephrem Syrus, the ecclesiastical historians and others in their descriptions of the rebuilding of the Temple are utterly reproachful of Julian and the Jews and ascribe the failure of the event to God's intervention.[46] Worth emphasizing is that the failure of the restoration project is marked, according to some sources, by the apparition of a luminous cross in the sky above Jerusalem. Those who witnessed this miracle had the sign of the cross burnt into their clothes and when afterwards they spoke about this miracle, the crosses on their bodies became fluorescent. These stories demonstrate again the special relationship between Jerusalem and the symbol of the cross. It might well be that Cyril is responsible for this miraculous story about the celestial, victorious cross.[47] He might have invented the story to demonstrate God's special regard for Jerusalem and to emphasize and propagate Jerusalem's pre-eminent position as a Christian city. By doing this Cyril seems to have cleverly made use of the dramatic events of 363 to promote his own episcopal see by turning an event that could have had disastrous consequences for Christian Jerusalem into a victory for the benefit of Jerusalem and his own position.

During Cyril's episcopate the Jerusalem liturgy developed and expanded rapidly.[48] Whether Cyril is exclusively responsible for these developments, as has long been supposed, is a now matter of debate. It is, however, evident that in the fourth century the holy sites in and around Jerusalem, some of which were only recently "discovered",[49]

---

[46] Greg. Naz., *Orat.* 5.3–4; Ephrem Syrus, *HcJul.* 4.18–23; Ruf., *HE* 10.38–40; Socr., *HE* 3.20.7 ff.; Soz., *HE* 5.22.7 ff.; Philost., *HE* 7.9; Thdt., *HE* 3.20.4 ff.
[47] See Chapter 5, 148.
[48] See Chapter 3.
[49] See e.g. Maraval, 1985, 251 ff.; Taylor, 1993.

were incorporated into the new liturgy and the various processions
that were part of that liturgy. The fourth-century liturgical celebra-
tions, as we know it from the itinerary of Egeria and the *Armenian
Lectionary*, clearly emphasize the close connection between Jerusalem
and the holy sites from the biblical past, as the celebrations during
the Great or Holy Week make abundantly clear. All the sites where
Jesus was known to have been present in the last days of his life
were incorporated into the Jerusalem liturgy and were connected
with each other through the processions that the faithful enacted in
this week. Jesus' Life and Passion were in this way made "real" for
the believers and his presence must have been felt by many of them.
Apart from the holy sites, the Cross also fulfilled a role in the mobile
liturgy of Jerusalem. Relics of that Cross were present in the Church
of the Holy Sepulchre and were preserved in a gold and silver box
probably in what may have been a chapel at the rock of Golgotha.[50]
On the morning of Good Friday these relics of the Holy Wood,
including the *titulus*, were shown to the believers in the presence of
the bishop and his clergy. The faithful were allowed to touch the
Wood with their forehead and their eyes, and then to kiss it; undoubt-
edly touching the Cross in this way made Christ's Passion an even
more real event for the believers.[51] Possibly the relics of the Cross
were also shown during the Encaenia, one of the major annual fes-
tivities in Jerusalem. The Encaenia was originally the feast of con-
secration of the Jewish Temple by Solomon, which afterwards seems
to have been annually celebrated by the Jews.[52] This tradition was
taken over by the Jerusalem Christian community to celebrate the
consecration of the Constantinian Church on Golgotha.[53] At the
same time the discovery of the Cross was commemorated.[54] Celeb-

---

[50] See Chapter 3, n. 56.

[51] *It Eger.* 37.2. Celebrations like these fit of course perfectly in Cyril's theology
according to which Jesus' Life, Passion, and Resurrection were real events.

[52] 2 Chron. 6:12; 7:5, 9; John 10:22 (ἐνκαίνια).

[53] Busse and Kretschmar, 1987, 99–100.

[54] *It. Eger.* 48.1–2: *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. Harum
ergo ecclesiarum sanctarum encenia cum summo honore celebrantur, quoniam crux Domini inventa
est ipsa die. Et ideo propter hoc ita ordinatum est, ut quando primum sanctae ecclesiae suprascrip-
tae consecrabantur, ea dies esset qua crux Domini fuerat inventa, ut simul omni laetitia eadem
die celebrarentur.*

rations took place in September and lasted for eight days.[55] On 14 September relics of the Cross were shown to the believers.[56]

The Cross fulfilled an important role in two of the major liturgical festivities that were celebrated in Jerusalem: Good Friday and the Encaenia. Like Cyril's *Letter to Constantius*, the Jerusalem liturgy shows that there is a close connection between Jerusalem and the Cross.[57] It is tempting to consider Cyril to be responsible for including the demonstration of the Cross in the liturgical celebrations.

We know from the *Catechetical Lectures* and the Jerusalem liturgy that the Holy Wood was already present in Jerusalem *c.* 350, and that relics of it had been distributed all over the world. In his *Letter to Constantius* Cyril even mentions that the Cross was found in Jerusalem in the days of Constantine, but details about the discovery are not mentioned.[58] However, by the end of the fourth century there existed a fully developed and widely known story or legend about the discovery of the Cross in Jerusalem.[59] The first testimony for that is Ambrose of Milan's funeral oration for the emperor Theodosius I of 395 in which the story is included. It recounts how Helena, the mother of Constantine, searched in Jerusalem for the Cross and eventually found three crosses, that of Christ and those of the two robbers. Expecting the middle Cross to be the one of Christ but also fearing that the crosses might somehow have gotten intermingled, Helena was eventually able to recognize the True Cross by way of the *titulus*.[60] A similar story, although without any mention of Helena, is presented by John Chrysostom in a homily at about the same time as Ambrose delivered his funeral oration in honor of Theodosius.[61] However, such a story apparently did not yet exist by

---

[55] *It. Eger.* 49.1: *Hi ergo dies enceniarum cum venerint, octo diebus attenduntur.*

[56] *Arm. Lect.* No. LXVIII (PO 36, 225).

[57] The particular importance of the Cross for Jerusalem is also manifested by the appointment of a *staurophylax*, a custodian of the Cross. The first *staurophylax* known is Porphyry of Gaza who was appointed in 392 by Cyril's successor John; Marc. Diac., *V. Porph.* 10; Stemberger, 2000, 59. However, it could be that the post was created earlier.

[58] *Epist.* 3: Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου καὶ τῆς μακαρίας μνήμης Κωνσταντίου τοῦ σοῦ πατρός, τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ σταυροῦ ξύλον ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ηὕρηται. . . .

[59] On the legend of *inventio crucis*, see e.g. Heid, 1989; Borgehammar, 1991; Drijvers, 1992; Heinen, 1995; Drijvers and Drijvers, 1997; Witakowski, 2001.

[60] Ambr., *De Ob. Theod.* 40–49.

[61] Joh. Chrys., *In Iohannem Hom.* 85 (PG 59, 461). See also Drijvers, 1992, 95.

the time Cyril wrote his *Letter to Constantius* and delivered his *Catechetical Lectures*, otherwise it is hardly imaginable that he would not have referred to it. It is therefore most probable that the story about the discovery of the Cross only arose in the second half of the fourth century. Recent research has made clear that Ambrose's narrative about the *inventio crucis* was most probably a variant of an originally, now lost, Greek story.[62] The text that comes closest to that Greek original was included by Rufinus in his *Church History*, which appeared in 402 or 403.[63] Rufinus tells of how the pious Helena was admonished by divinely-sent visions to go to Jerusalem, where she was to enquire the inhabitants about the site where Christ was crucified. The exact spot was hard to find because the persecutors of the Christians had built a sanctuary of Venus over it, but the site was pointed out to the empress by a heavenly sign. Helena tore down the pagan sanctuary and found deep beneath the rubble three crosses lying in disorder. Even though the *titulus* was also there, Helena was unable to identify which crosses belonged to the robbers and which one to Christ. Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, noticed the doubts of the empress and asked her to bring the crosses to him. It so happened that in Jerusalem a prominent lady lay mortally ill. Macarius prayed to God to send a sign in order to determine which cross belonged to whom. After his prayer Macarius first touched the sick woman with one of the crosses, but nothing happened. The touch of the second cross also had no effect, but when he touched her with the third cross the woman immediately regained her strength and began to glorify the Lord. After the True Cross was identified in this way, Helena built a church on the spot where she had found the Cross. Part of the Cross she sent to her son Constantine and part was left in Jerusalem where it was preserved in silver reliquaries and commemorated by regular veneration.[64] The nails too, with which Christ was fastened to the Cross, Helena sent to Constantine. The latter incorporated them into his helmet and the bridle of his

---

[62] Ambrose's version of the legend differs considerably from the others because he uses the legend in the context of the central theme of the funeral oration: the *hereditas fidei*. In order to fit the legend into this theme, Ambrose had to adapt it; Steidle, 1978; Drijvers, 1992, 109–13.

[63] Ruf., *HE* 10.7–8.

[64] Egeria mentions that the Cross was preserved in a gold and silver casket; *It. Eger.* 37.1: *loculus argenteus deauratus*.

war horse. As proof of her piety and humility Helena invited virgins consecrated to God to a banquet and served them herself.

This story, commonly referred to as the Helena legend, spread rapidly. It was included in the fifth-century *Church Histories* of Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret and also knew other Latin renderings, besides that of Rufinus.[65] Soon two other versions of the legend of the *inventio crucis* arose: the so-called Protonike legend and the Judas Kyriakos legend. The first was only known in Syriac (and later in Armenian); the story is pushed back to the first century C.E. and Helena is replaced as protagonist by the fictitious Protonike, wife of the emperor Claudius.[66] In the Judas Kyriakos version, which is characterized by severe anti-judaism, the Jew Judas finds the Cross and nails for Helena, converts to Christianity and eventually becomes bishop of Jerusalem.[67] Like Protonike, Judas is also a fictional character created for the sake of the legend. In Late Antiquity, the Byzantine period and the western Middle Ages the story of the legend of the discovery, in particular the Judas Kyriakos version, became very popular, and was known in many variants and in many – also vernacular – languages. It also became a favorite subject in the visual arts.

The origin of the legend of the *inventio crucis* has long been a matter of debate. For a long time it has been thought that Ambrose's version was archetypal, but this opinion can no longer be held. Over the past few decades various scholars have – for a number of reasons – come to the conclusion that the legend must have originated in Palestine and most probably in Jerusalem in the second half of the fourth century.[68] It is likely that the Helena legend was first put in writing *c.* 390 by Gelasius, bishop of Caesarea and metropolitan of the church-province of Palestine, who wrote a continuation of Eusebius' *Church History*.

Not much is known about Gelasius. Thanks to the political machinations of Cyril, who was his maternal uncle, he became the suc-

---

[65] Socr., *HE* 1.17; Soz., *HE* 2.1–2; Thdt., *HE* 1.18. Apart from Ambrose's version Paulinus of Nola (*Epist.*, 31.4–5) and Sulpicius Severus (*Chron.* 2.22–34) refer to the legend. For a comparison of these texts, see Drijvers, 1992, 100–117 and Borgehammar, 1991, chap. 3.

[66] Apart from circulating independently, the Protonike legend was included in the *Doctrina Addai*, the official, but fictional, foundation text of the church in the Syrian city of Edessa. See Drijvers, 1992, 147–63; Drijvers, 1997.

[67] Drijvers, 1992, 165–80; Drijvers and Drijvers, 1997.

[68] Drijvers, 1992, 138 ff.; Pohlsander, 1995, 107.

cessor of Acacius (d. 365) as bishop of Caesarea and metropolitan of Palestine. He was, however, prevented by the Arian party to take up his see until after the death of the emperor Valens in 378. He was present at the ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 381 and again in 394. It seems that his death occurred by the year 400. Of Gelasius' works only fragments remain. Jerome mentions that Gelasius wrote in an accurate and precise style, but that he barely exposed his work to publicity.[69] He wrote several treatises about dogmatic issues of which only a title or fragments are preserved.[70] Gelasius' main work was his *Church History*, a continuation of Eusebius' *Church History*. Although the work is now lost, we know of it thanks to a remark in Photius' *Bibliotheca*.[71] Gelasius wrote the *Church History* on the request of his uncle Cyril, who expressed this wish on his deathbed in 387. The work is therefore dated to *c.* 390. Attempts have been made to reconstruct Gelasius' *Church History*. Parts of it are thought to survive in Byzantine *vitae* (esp. BHG 1279 and BHG 185), the *Church Histories* of Rufinus and Socrates, and in the *Syntagma* of Gelasius of Cyzicus (end of the fifth century). Although a verbatim reconstruction of Gelasius' work is impossible, an outline of his text and the subjects discussed may be established. Thanks to the work of F. Winkelmann, who retrieved forty-one fragments that had once belonged to Gelasius' *Church History*, we now have an impression of what this work might have been like.[72] According to Winkelmann, Gelasius started his work with the persecutions under Diocletian's reign in 303 and continued until the death of Valens (378). The main theme of the work seems to have been the theological conflict within the Church, in particular the controversy about Arianism and the ensuing power struggle between the conflicting parties. Gelasius shows himself to be a staunch adherent of the Nicene doctrine and an antagonist of the Arian party. His orthodoxy may also explain the great admiration he had for Constantine, whom he considered to be the most perfect Christian sovereign.

Of the fragments that Winkelmann reconstructed of Gelasius' *Church History*, fragment 20 is of particular importance in the context of this chapter because it concerns the discovery of the Cross in Jerusalem

---

[69] Jer., *De Vir. Ill.* 130.
[70] See Diekamp (1938, 37–49) for these fragments.
[71] Photius, *Bibl. cod.* 89 (ed. R. Henry, Paris 1960, vol. 2, 15).
[72] Winkelmann, 1966 and 1966a (pp. 348–56 for the fragments).

by Helena.[73] The fragment deals with the following events: Helena and Macarius identify the True Cross by way of a healing miracle; the construction of a church on the site of the discovery of the Cross; the finding of the nails and their incorporation into Constantine's helmet and the bridle of his war horse; Helena's serving of the virgins at a banquet; Helena's death. This reconstruction shows great resemblances to Rufinus' text, and Winkelmann is of the opinion that Rufinus derived the story about the discovery of the Cross from Gelasius. Continuing the work of Winkelmann, Stephan Borgehammar made an attempt at reconstructing Gelasius' text more fully.[74] It seems then that Rufinus' text of Helena's discovery of the Cross comes closest to that of Gelasius according to Winkelmann's and Borgehammar's reconstructions. However, it must be admitted that their regenerating of Gelasius' text is not undisputed.[75] Be that as it may, but even if Winkelmann and Borgehammar are wrong and Rufinus did not follow Gelasius' text, Rufinus must have been familiar with an elaborate story about Helena's discovery of the Cross in Jerusalem, which he thought was important enough to include in his *Church History*. Rufinus, who mentions that for the Books 10 and 11 of his *Church History* – the continuation of that of Eusebius – in which he treats the period between the Council of Nicaea (325) and the death of Theodosius I (395), he made use of written sources and his own memory,[76] may very well have become acquainted with the legend of *inventio crucis*, either in written or oral form, while he was living in Jerusalem between 381 and 397. The story undoubtedly

---

[73] Winkelmann, 1966a, 351.

[74] Borgehammar, 1991, chap. 2 "Reconstructing Gelasius of Caesarea". Rufinus' text – together with those of Socrates, Theodoret and Gelasius of Cyzicus – was also for Borgehammar central to his endeavor. However, also Borgehammar did not succeed in rendering a word for word text, although he managed to present a more elaborate paraphrase of Gelasius' account than Winkelmann had.

[75] Schamp (1987) who scrutinized Cod. 88 and 89 of Photius' *Bibliotheca*, i.e. those about Gelasius, concluded among other things that Gelasius' *Church History* ended with the death of Arius still during the reign of Constantine. This, of course, considerably reduces the possible extent of Rufinus' dependence on Gelasius; for the legend of the *inventio crucis* Schamp's observation need not make a difference since Helena's discovery of the Cross is chronologically placed before Arius' death. According to Thelamon (1981, 18–21) Books 10 and 11 of Rufinus' *Church History*, which are thought to be derived from Gelasius to a certain extent, should be treated as an original work; she considers it fundamentally wrong to compare an extant text with one that is lost. For a convenient summary of the various points of view on the reconstruction of Gelasius' *Church History*, see Amidon, 1997, xiii–xvii.

[76] Ruf., *HE, praefatio Liber X* (GCS, Eusebius Werke 2.2, 957).

was popular there and may have had a connection with the vener-
ation of the Cross during the liturgical celebrations, in particular the
Encaenia, in Jerusalem. Since the legend has a clear Jerusalem set-
ting − the Cross was found there, the connection with the con-
struction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the role of bishop
Macarius − it is very likely that the legend had its origin there. So
Rufinus definitely drew on a Jerusalemitic source if he did not make
use if Gelasius' text. Since Cyril's *Letter to Constantius* does not men-
tion how the Cross was found, the *terminus post quem* for the legend
must be 351. A precise *terminus ante quem* is harder to establish but
the year 390 is very likely. This means that the legend had its ori-
gin during the episcopate of Cyril.

Opinions differ about how the legend of the *inventio crucis* arose.
However, the legend is not just a wonderful story, but a story that
served a purpose. Its origin should be seen in that context. Apart
from offering an explanation for the presence of relics of the Cross −
possibly in response to questions asked by pilgrims and others[77] −
and giving support to their authenticity, the legend especially served
a political purpose in Cyril's endeavors to gain pre-eminence for
Jerusalem.

In the legend of the discovery of the Cross, Helena, of course,
figures prominently: she travels to Jerusalem to search for the Cross.
But the other protagonist of the legend is Macarius, Jerusalem's
bishop at the time the Cross was allegedly found (the mid 320s).
Macarius is the one who by way of a miraculous healing identified
the True Cross from the three crosses that Helena had found on
Golgotha. Macarius' role was an important one: without his support
the empress would not have known which of the crosses the one of
Christ was. Discovery and identification of the Cross are therefore
an undertaking of the empress and the bishop of Jerusalem together.
And even though one purpose of Macarius' identification of the True
Cross is probably to sustain the authenticity of the Cross present in
Jerusalem, the primary aim of the legend was to establish a relation-
ship between Jerusalem, its bishop and the imperial rule of Rome.
The legend clearly gives expression to the wish for this three-cor-
nered relationship between the imperial house, represented by Helena,
Jerusalem and its episcopal see, represented by Macarius, and the

---

[77] Heid, 1989; Drijvers, 1992, 139; Borgehammar, 1991, 79–80.

Cross as the symbol that served to cement this relationship. Helena's partition of the Cross – part was left in Jerusalem and another part was sent to Constantine – by which the alliance between Jerusalem and the imperial house was confirmed, is a clear expression of this. In that respect, the purpose of the legend is remarkably consistent and comparable with that of Cyril's *Letter to Constantius*. Although testimony is not available, it seems therefore not improbable that Cyril was responsible for the origin and composition of the story of Helena's *inventio crucis*.[78]

The Cross, as symbol and tangible relic so dear to Cyril, is in the legend politically exploited to its fullest, by using it to connect Jerusalem to the imperial house. That makes the legend the perfect myth with which to promote the cause of Jerusalem. If Gelasius of Caesarea indeed included the narrative about the discovery of the Cross in his *Church History*, Cyril attempts to make Jerusalem the pre-eminent bishopric in Palestine had succeeded. It is hardly imaginable that the metropolitan of Palestine would have included a legend in which empress and bishop cooperate so closely and in which Jerusalem is so central, without realizing that it was an implicit recognition of the primacy of Jerusalem over Caesarea.

The discovery of the Cross brought Helena great fame and is the accomplishment for which she is remembered by posterity and earned her sainthood. However, it is good to realize that the legend of Helena's *inventio crucis* is a construct and not a historical source for the events it describes, let alone a reliable source. Hence, Helena acquired her fame for an act for which she was not responsible.[79] It is not known exactly how and when the Cross, or pieces of wood alleged to be the Cross, was found in Jerusalem, but Helena had nothing to do with it, as most modern authors ascertain.[80] But how

---

[78] Barnes (1981, 382 n. 130) had already observed that the story "was presumably invented by Gelasius, or by his uncle, Cyril of Jerusalem."

[79] For Helena's biographical data, see Drijvers, 1992, 9–76 and Pohlsander, 1995, 3–47, 73–100, 139–66.

[80] Cf., however, Borgehammar (1991, chap. 7), who, presenting a new chronology of Helena's journey through the eastern provinces – to have taken place, in his opinion, in 324–325 – believes that Helena did find the Cross. For a convenient overview of the modern views on Helena's alleged finding of the Cross, see Pohlsander, 1995, 111–15; to the literature mentioned there may be added Hunt, 1997, 417–19. *The Quest for the True Cross* by C.P. Thiedemann and M. d'Ancona (London 2000), written for the general audience, argues that the Cross was an important symbol in Palestine already before Constantine, and that the opinion that

then could she have become the protagonist of the legend? Eusebius
of Caesarea devotes various chapters to Helena in his *Life of Constantine*.[81]
These chapters are, among other things, concerned with Helena's
tour of inspection through the eastern provinces of the empire. This
tour, which was clearly a mission of a political nature – rather an
iter principis than a *peregrinatio religiosa* –, took place *c.* 327 when Helena
was already well into old age.[82] However, Eusebius focuses almost
exclusively on Helena's stay in Palestine and presents her journey as
a pilgrimage.[83] In addition, his presentation of the empress is one of
a very pious woman who continually visited churches, paid rever-
ence to God at the shrines in even the smallest towns and who prac-
tised charity on a wide scale. Eusebius connects her with the
consecration and dedication of two churches in Palestine: the Nativity
Church in Bethlehem and the church on the Mount of Olives on
the supposed site of the Ascension.[84] Remarkably, he does not con-
nect her whatsoever with the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, in glar-
ing contrast to the legend of the discovery of the Cross. Constantine
alone is held responsible for the foundation of Jerusalem's cathedral
church. Even if the supposed Cross was found during the construc-
tion of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, Helena was not con-
nected with it, either by Eusebius or by other authors. Judging from
these sources the conclusion is justified that the connection between
Helena, the Cross and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre evidently
was a later construct.[85] It is, however understandable that the author
made this connection and chose her as the protagonist for the story

---

Helena had no role in the *inventio crucis* is wrong. However, the evidence these
authors present is, at its best, circumstantial and their line of reasoning suggestive.

[81] *VC* 3.42–46.

[82] Holum, 1990, esp. 75–76; Drijvers, 1992, 55–72.

[83] *VC* 3.41.2: "As she accorded suitable adoration to the footsteps of the Saviour,
following the prophetic word which says, 'Let us adore in the place where his feet
have stood' (Ps. 132/131:7), she forthwith bequeathed to her successors also the
fruit of her personal piety."

[84] *VC* 3.43.1–3. Eusebius is unclear about whether Helena actually founded these
churches. Most probably she did not, since the building of churches in Palestine
was part of an overall "Holy Land plan" developed by Constantine. In *VC* 3.41
Eusebius mentions that the churches in Bethlehem and on the Mount of Olives
were founded by Constantine but "artistically honoured, perpetuating the memory
of his own mother."

[85] Also Egeria, who knew the Jerusalem situation from her own experience, cred-
its Constantine for constructing and adorning the basilica on Golgotha, although
she adds that it was built "under the supervision of his mother" (*It. Eger.* 25.9: *sub
praesentia matris suae*).

about the finding of the Cross. She was the only member of the Constantinian imperial house to have made a visit to Jerusalem at the time the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was built;[86] that made Helena the obvious candidate for someone who was looking for a prominent person with the intention of establishing a link between the discovery of the Cross and the imperial court.

During a long period of his episcopate Cyril lived in conflict with his superior in Caesarea. This conflict had a theological/christological aspect concerning Arianism but was also, and probably mainly, about power and influence in the church-province of Palestine. In the same period connections with the imperial power were strained; the Arian leanings of Constantius and his successors were certainly not advantageous to Jerusalem. But it also seems that Constantine's successors did not have the same interest in Jerusalem as the first Christian emperor had. In these circumstances it was necessary to preserve and, preferably, extend the prestige and power of Jerusalem as a holy place and as an apostolic see. Cyril used his spiritual authority to act as *patronus* of the local community. His behavior was the same as that of secular local elites. In order to advance the status of his city and himself, Cyril exploited the biblical past and the holy sites of Jerusalem. In particular, he used the main cult of Jerusalem, that is, the cult of the Cross – which he himself probably helped to develop – to link himself and his episcopate to power relationships. The connection with the imperial house was of special importance. In a world of an imperialized Christianity – a world in which the authority of the emperor in matters concerning the Church and the faith was recognized – good relations with the emperor were extremely profitable. In negotiating his access to power networks Cyril used miracles (the celestial crosses), texts (his *Letter to Constantius* and the legend of *inventio crucis*), and the Cross itself (the relics) as his authentication.

Cyril's policy was successful. His conflict with Caesarea was resolved by the nomination of his own nephew Gelasius as metropolitan. Even though theoretically Cyril was subordinate to Gelasius, Cyril actually was the bishop with the greater authority; the list of participants

---

[86] Constantine's mother-in-law Eutropia visited Palestine (Mamre) around the same time, but she is not reported to have visited Jerusalem; *VC* 3.51–53.

at the Council of Constantinople of 381, where Cyril's name is at the top of the list of bishops of Palestine and Gelasius is mentioned second, is proof of this.[87] At this council the Jerusalem church was given the title of "mother of all churches".[88] Gelasius' acceptance of the primacy of Jerusalem over Caesarea is also indicated by the inclusion of the narrative about the discovery of the Cross in his *Church History*. Jerusalem's relationship with the imperial house greatly improved during the last years of Cyril's episcopate and thereafter. The Theodosian dynasty showed increasing interest in the Holy Land and Jerusalem. Female members of the imperial family, like Eudocia, visited Palestine. They took Helena as their example and took pride in being presented as new Helenas.[89] Cyril had evidently succeeded in his efforts to promote Jerusalem. By cleverly using the holy sites and in particular the symbol of the Cross, Cyril had made Jerusalem, with its bishop, into an important participant in the power networks of the late antique Roman Empire. However, not long after Cyril's death in 387 Jerusalem's position waned once more and the bishop of Caesarea became the more powerful again. Even though the bishops of Jerusalem tried to regain supremacy, it would take until the episcopate of Juvenal (422–458) before the bishopric of Jerusalem achieved official and permanent metropolitan status and was granted patriarchal authority – alongside Antioch, Alexandria, Rome and Constantinople – by the Council of Chalcedon (451).[90]

---

[87] See Chapter 2, 45; Rubin, 1999, 155.
[88] Tanner, 1990, 30: μητῆρ τῶν ἁπασῶν ἐκκλησιῶν; Thdt., *HE* 5.9.17.
[89] Hunt, 1982, 155 ff., 221 ff.; Holum, 1982, 184 ff., 216, 217 ff.; Drijvers, 1993; Brubaker, 1997.
[90] Honigmann, 1950. See Rubin (1999, 155–57) for the attempts by the bishops of Jerusalem after Cyril to gain the upper hand again.

EPILOGUE

Cyril was an ambitious man who strived for prominence in the Christian world for his city Jerusalem and his own bishop's see. His congregation seems to have appreciated him as the returns after his exiles indicate. The community had his full concern and, as far as we can tell, he took care of it to the best of his abilities. Moreover, he was a great teacher of faith, judging from his *Catechetical Lectures*. During Cyril's episcopacy, the 'new' church of Jerusalem was shaped. In its outward appearance Jerusalem became a Christian city with a growing number of churches, newly founded monasteries, and Christian pilgrims flocking into the city and visiting its holy sites. The number of Christians in Jerusalem increased by way of conversion and immigration. However, part of the Jerusalem population probably remained non-Christian, and Cyril's city was still religiously diversified. There also remained the threat that Christianity would be marginalized again, as the attempted restoration of the Temple makes clear. It seems that in Cyril's time the organization of the Church of Jerusalem became more complex and required more managerial tasks for its bishop. The Jerusalem liturgy was reshaped, although the reorganization of the liturgical festivities seems not have been solely the work of Cyril. The increasing number of holy places was incorporated into a unique set of mobile liturgical celebrations and processions became a distinct feature of the urban landscape. The bishop was central to the liturgical celebrations in which he fulfilled a prominent and time-consuming role. In particular, Jerusalem's holiness represented by the physical presence of sites and objects – the Cross especially –, was important to Cyril. Jerusalem's direct and tangible connection with the early history of Christianity made the city the center of the Christian world. This prominence of Jerusalem should, according to Cyril, have been acknowledged by making his bishop's see into an apostolic see, as well as granting permanent primacy over Caesarea in the church-province of Palestine. Doctrinal purity was apparently subordinate to the aim of establishing the primacy of Jerusalem. In order to achieve his ambitions, Cyril seems not always to have remained true to the orthodox doctrine of faith that he taught his baptismal

candidates. To get and keep his see or to regain it, and to achieve for Jerusalem the status he had in mind, Cyril apparently had no problem with deviating from the orthodox doctrine, giving at least the impression that he was sympathetic towards Arianism or Arianizing forms of Christianity.[1] At the end of his life Cyril was successful: at general church councils he was an influential figure, more influential than his metropolitan bishop in Caesarea, whom he also seems to have superseded in Palestine itself.

When he died in 387, Cyril was succeeded by John, who remained bishop until his death in 417. During the thirty years that John occupied the Jerusalem see, he was not able to uphold the status and prestige that Cyril had acquired for Jerusalem.[2] Early in his episcopate John became involved in the Origenist controversy (393–397) in which Epiphanius and Jerome were his main adversaries.[3] Rufinus, who at the time lived in Jerusalem, sided with John. Jerome wrote his *Contra Ioannem Hierosolymitanum* to harm John and to defend Epiphanius' and his own position with regard to Origen's doctrines. John, who defended Origen's theological standing, insisted on his authority as bishop of an apostolic see to pass judgment on doctrinal matters,[4] but apparently this made no impression on his adversaries. Later on he also became involved in the Pelagian controversy. Furthermore, John, who had been a monk before he became bishop, is said to have acquired a reputation for having an interest in material wealth.[5] John's Origenist and Pelagian errors, as well as his worldliness, did the position of Jerusalem no good and the bishop of Caesarea seems to have reclaimed his authority in the church-province.[6] At a council in Constantinople in 394, Gelasius represented the bishops of Palestine while John was not present.[7] At a synod in Jerusalem in 401, Eulogius, bishop of Caesarea, was mentioned before John in the list of participants.[8] Eulogius also precedes John in the list of participants at the Council of Lydda in 415. The demotion of Jerusalem was a fact and the bishop of Caesarea was

---

[1] Rubin, 1996, 561.
[2] See Rubin (1999, 155–58) for Jerusalem's striving for primacy after Cyril.
[3] For the controversy see Kelly, 1975, chap. 18; Clark, 1992.
[4] Jer., *Epist.* 82.10.
[5] Hunt, 1982, 153.
[6] Honigmann, 1950, 216.
[7] Mansi, 1759, vol. 3, 851–52.
[8] Jer., *Epist.* 91 and 92.

in first place again. In his efforts to regain the first position in Palestine, John, like Cyril before him, took to the policy of propagating the holiness of Jerusalem. In 415, while the Council of Lydda was in session, John was informed about the site where the remains of the protomartyr Stephen were buried. He immediately left the council and supervised the excavation of the relics at Caphar Gamala.[9]

The propagation of Jerusalem's holiness was carried on by John's successors and now with considerably more success. Under bishop Praylius, an appearance of a luminous celestial cross is reported,[10] undoubtedly in imitation of that of 351, described by Cyril in his *Letter to Constantius*. Like Cyril who nominated Gelasius, Praylius was able to make a certain Domninus bishop of Caesarea.[11] Thanks to its holiness as well as to the presence of prominent pilgrims such as the empress Eudocia, Jerusalem was able to take supremacy again over Caesarea. Under Juvenal, who probably became bishop in 422, it even strived for a rank higher than that of Antioch.[12] In imitation of Cyril, Juvenal's chief goal was to elevate his see from its position of subordination to the metropolitan bishop of Caesarea. Eventually the propagation of Jerusalem's holiness met with lasting success.[13] At the Council of Chalcedon in 451 the apostolic status of Jerusalem was acknowledged.

---

[9] Hunt, 1932, 214–15.
[10] Marcellinus, *Chron.* a. 419.
[11] Thdt., *Epist.* 110 (PG 83, 1305); cf. Honigmann, 1950, 217.
[12] Honigmann, 1950, 214–15.
[13] Honigmann (1950) elaborately describes Juvenal's period as bishop of Jerusalem.

CYRIL AND ARIANISM

In his *Chronography* Theophanes explains at great length why the reference to the Arian Constantius as "most pious" in Cyril's letter to the emperor about the appearance of the celestial cross in Jerusalem in 351, does not mean that Cyril had Arian sympathies. Theophanes also explains why those who accuse Cyril of not using the word "consubstantial" in his *Catechetical Lectures* are wrong in supposing that he omitted the word because he was an Arian. He argues that it was essential "not to utter the word 'consubstantial' which was as yet confusing many persons and, because of the opposition of its enemies, discouraging those who sought baptism, but instead to make clear the meaning of the consubstantial through equivalent words." According to Theophanes, Cyril preached that "the Son was truly God from a truly divine Father."[1] A similar view is presented by Theodoret who says that Cyril was "an earnest champion of the apostolic decrees."[2]

The fact that both Theodoret and Theophanes elaborate on and emphasize Cyril's orthodoxy is revealing and seems to be an obvious indication that there existed doubts about Cyril's position on matters of doctrine and that it therefore was important to show that Cyril was a true adherent of the orthodox faith. Also, in modern scholarly works, the question of Cyril's doctrinal stance has not escaped discussion.[3] Even though Cyril does not refer to Arius and the Arians in the lists of heretics included in his *Catechetical Lectures*, there is general agreement that these lectures contain no indication that he might be an Arian sympathizer. That he does not use the

---

[1] Theoph., *Chron.* AM 5847; trans. Mango and Scott. Theophanes' notice probably goes back to a fourth-century Arian historiographer; see Philost., *HE*, Anhang VII 24–25 (GCS 21, 221). For Arians and Arianism, see Williams, 1987.

[2] Thdt., *HE* 2.26.6 (Κύριλλος . . . τῶν ἀποστολικῶν δογμάτων προθύμως ὑπερμαχῶν). Theodoret's opinion may have been influenced by the Council of Constantinople (381) at which Cyril was formally acknowledged as a *homoousian*. The Armenian *Vita Cyrilli* I 4–5 (Bihain, 1963, 342) also presents Cyril as firm in his orthodoxy.

[3] E.g. Lebon, 1924; Stephenson, 1972; Gregg, 1985; Hanson, 1988, 398–413; Doval, 2001, 13–21.

word *homoousios* in his explications of the relationship between Father
and Son may be explained by the fact that the term did not occur
in one of the ancient doctrinal formularies of the East.[4] It may also
be that he was just opposed to the term *homoousion* because it was
a nonscriptural and philosophical technical word that was easy to
misinterpret and gave rise to confusion.[5] Furthermore, it is held that
opposition to Nicaea, in Cyril's time, of itself was not an indication
of Arianism.[6] Throughout his career Cyril is considered to have
adhered closely to the Nicene doctrine.[7] However, even though his
Catechetical Lectures evidently do not indicate Arian leanings, several
other sources seem to raise doubts about Cyril's doctrinal loyalties.
Some of them, like Theodoret and Theophanes, by emphasizing too
obviously the fact that Cyril was faithful to the orthodox faith the
whole time he occupied the see of Jerusalem, actually cast doubt on
the veracity of their statements. Others – like Jerome, Rufinus,
Socrates, and Sozomen – clearly do not consider Cyril's orthodoxy
to be above suspicion.[8] It may therefore be worthwhile to have a
closer look at the sources to get a better insight into Cyril's stance
with respect to christological doctrine. It may also be valuable for a
better understanding of his position to distinguish between Cyril the
bishop-theologian and Cyril the bishop-politician.[9] As a priest who
had to instruct his flock, Cyril evidently kept to the Nicene doctrine.
However, Cyril was not a naïve man and he knew that sometimes
it would be politically convenient for his own position, as well as
that of Jerusalem, not to be too open about his doctrinal views or
even to give the impression that he sympathized with the Arians and
Arianism. A passage at the end of the fifth *Catechetical Lecture* in which
the doctrine of the faith is summed up – but not put into writing

---

[4] Walker, 1990, 32.

[5] Stephenson, 1972, 239–40.

[6] Gregg, 1985, 87.

[7] E.g. Telfer, 1955, 29; Stephenson, 1972; Gregg, 1985; Saxer, 1996, 350–52.

[8] Jerome (*Chron.* a. 348) calls Cyril an outright Arian: *Maximus post Macarium Hierosolymarum episcopus moritur. Post quem ecclesiam Arriani invadunt, id est, Cyrillus, Eutychius, rursum Cyrillus, Irenaeus, tertio Cyrillus, Hilarius, quarto Cyrillus.*

[9] I am aware of the fact that this is an artificial distinction. Theology is of course a form of politics and policy-making, and the theological idiom is close, if not similar, to the political idiom. Therefore, being a bishop inherently implied being a politician. Nevertheless, distinguishing Cyril the bishop-theologian from Cyril the bishop-politician can serve toward getting a better understanding of Cyril's positions toward Arianism.

in the text of the *Lecture* – is illuminating in this respect. Cyril urges the baptismal candidates to commit to memory the doctrine of faith – the Jerusalem Creed – word for word, to retain this doctrine for the rest of their lives, and never to receive any other doctrine than this one "even if we ourselves change our minds and contradict what we are now teaching."[10] This interesting remark apparently gave Cyril the freedom to deviate from the orthodox faith that he taught his baptismal candidates, and it seems that he did so although probably not for theological but for political reasons.

Rufinus, who was well-informed about the situation in Jerusalem, having lived there for some sixteen years at the end of the fourth century (381–397), reports that Cyril sometimes wavered in doctrine and often in allegiance.[11] Especially at crucial points in Cyril's career there seems to have been confusion and lack of clarity about his doctrinal position. This had already begun with his appointment as bishop of Jerusalem. His ordination seems to have been irregular: either the already ordained Heraclius was removed or bishop Maximus was ejected in favor of Cyril. Cyril's appointment as bishop of Jerusalem was heartily supported by Acacius, the Arian metropolitan bishop of Palestine, and other Arian bishops.[12] One wonders why Acacius would support Cyril if the latter, like Heraclius (and Maximus), was of the orthodox view? In that case, there would be nothing to gain for Acacius. It could well be that Acacius was misled and may have been under the impression that Cyril was in the Arian camp. Might Cyril himself have been responsible for this impression in order to become bishop? If this conjecture is true, it seems that Cyril was not averse to political opportunism in order to reach his goals.[13]

---

[10] *Catech.* 5.12 (μήτε ἂν ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ μεταθέμενοι, τοῖς νῦν διδασκομένοις ἐναντι-ολογῶμεν); trans. Yarnold. In his lectures Cyril does not conceal the conflicts within the church: "If you should hear about bishops in conflict with bishops, clergy against clergy, and flock against flock even unto blood, do not be troubled"; *Catech.* 15.7.

[11] Ruf., *HE* 10.24: *Hierosolymis vero Cyrillus post Maximum sacerdotio confusa iam ordinatione suscepto aliquando in fide, saepius in communione variabat.*

[12] Ruf., *HE* 10.24; Jer., *Chron.* a. 348; Socrates (*HE* 2.38.2) and Sozomen (*HE* 4.20.1) report that bishop Maximus was ejected by Acacius. See also Chapter 2, 32.

[13] Lebon (1924, 194) is of the opinion that Cyril belonged to the Arian party at the time he was nominated bishop. Lebon (p. 198) sees a gradual development in Cyril's career from being anti-Nicene to Nicene: "Les événements historiques … montrent l'évêque de Jérusalem soumis à une évolution qui, lentement et progressivement, le détache des anti-nicéens et l'amène dans les ranges du parti nicéen."

The same attitude may be detected in the already mentioned *Letter to Constantius*. In the letter, Cyril repeatedly calls the emperor "most pious," "most dear to God," "God-beloved," and "most religious," all the while knowing that Constantius sympathized with Arianism. This clever, rhetorically composed, and panegyrical letter was written by Cyril the politician rather than Cyril the theologian and was intended to bring Jerusalem and its bishop's see to the attention of the emperor and to favorably dispose Constantius toward the city and its bishop. The letter would certainly not have achieved its end if Cyril had presented himself as a supporter of Nicaea or if he had given the impression that he was critical about the Arian sympathies of the emperor.[14]

In the 350s Cyril seems to have adopted a more open position towards Nicene orthodoxy. It was one of the reasons why he got into conflict with Acacius and why he was deposed and exiled. At the Synod of Seleucia (359) he belonged to the party that opposed Acacius *cum suis*. This party concurred with the decisions taken at the Council of Nicaea but was critical about the term *homoousios*.[15] Clearly Cyril and others felt more inclined toward what is called the Macedonian heresy, named after Macedonius, the deposed bishop of Constantinople, which advocated the term *homoiousios*.[16] In spite of the fact that Cyril favored the semi-Arian, *homoiousian*, christology that the Son is not of the same substance as the Father, but that He is like Him in every particular, he was not allowed to keep his see under Constantius and later under the reign of Valens. However, he returned to his see, when Valens abandoned his pro-Arian policy.

That Cyril had definitely not adhered to the Nicene orthodoxy throughout his life, becomes most clear from the reports of the Council of Constantinople (381) by Socrates and Sozomen. Socrates reports that "Cyril of Jerusalem . . . at that time recognized the doctrine of homoousion," clearly implying that earlier he had not rec-

---

Rubin (1996, 561) formulates it less circumstantially: "In order to obtain the see of Jerusalem, he joined the camp of Acacius of Caesarea."

[14] The reference in the last paragraph of the letter to the "holy and consubstantial Trinity" is undoubtedly an addition by a scribe with the intention of vindicating Cyril's orthodoxy; Telfer, 1955, 199 n. 25; McCauley and Stephenson, 1969–70, vol. 2, 225 and 235 n. 12; Quasten, 1984, 368.

[15] Socr., *HE* 2.39.18; Soz., *HE* 4.22.5 ff.

[16] Socr., *HE* 2.45.1–2; Thdt., *HE* 2.6. From Sozomen (*HE* 7.7.3) it is obvious that Cyril adhered to the ideas of the Macedonian heresy.

ognized this doctrine. And Sozomen mentions that at that time Cyril "had renounced the tenets of the Macedonians which he previously held." In 378 the orthodox Theodosius became emperor and wanted to reconfirm the Nicene Creed in all its aspects, including the *homoousion*. It became politically convenient for Cyril to present himself as a convinced adherent of the Nicene faith and to renounce the doctrinal tenets he had earlier held. Nevertheless, Cyril's opinion in matters of doctrine seems not to have been above all suspicion. Why else should a letter by the Council of Constantinople to the bishops in the Latin west explicitly refer to Cyril's correct ordination by the bishops of the church-province of Palestine – that is Acacius and others – and the fact that Cyril had "in several places fought a good fight against the Arians"?[17] Apparently, the validity of Cyril's ordination, which according to some authors was not unquestionable, had to be vindicated and his orthodoxy emphasized.[18]

It is evident that although his *Catechetical Lectures* do not give reason to assume that Cyril held any unorthodox views, other sources indicate otherwise. The *Lectures* were composed and meant for the baptismal candidates and the Christian community of Jerusalem and they presumably express Cyril's sincere theological and christological viewpoint. However, Cyril was not only a preacher and theologian who had to concern himself exclusively with his own flock, but he also was an ambitious politician. As such, he had to take into consideration the outside world – the metropolitan in Caesarea, the Roman emperor, fellow bishops – and consequently had to involve himself with the politics of power. Cyril wavered in doctrine, as Rufinus mentions, but he probably did so for political reasons. Early in his career he was sympathetic towards Arianism in order to obtain the support of Acacius and other Arian bishops in Palestine for becoming bishop of Jerusalem. When tensions between Caesarea and Jerusalem heightened in the 350s and Cyril was deposed, he sought and gained the support of the semi-Arians, or *homoiousians*, at the the Synod of Seleucia. When Theodosius I became emperor Cyril

---

[17] Tanner, 1990, 30; Thdt., *HE* 5.9.17.

[18] The remark about Cyril's ordination may have some connection with Jerome's report (*Chron.* a. 348) that in order to become bishop, Cyril had to reject his ordination to the priesthood by Maximus, an act which he was willing to perform for a bribe.

advocated himself as a strong supporter of the orthodox, Nicene faith and as a fighter against Arianism; he was accepted as such as the synodical letter of the Council of Constantinople makes clear.[19]

---

[19] See also Socrates (*HE* 5.8.3) and Sozomen (*HE* 7.7.3) who seem to discern a development in Cyril's doctrinal ideas: from being not unsympathetic towards Arianism, Cyril had become firmly orthodox by the time of the Council of Constantinople (381).

SERVICES CELEBRATED
BY THE BISHOP OF JERUSALEM

The following overview of liturgical celebrations at which the bishop of Jerusalem was present, is based on information provided by Egeria's description of the Jerusalem liturgy and the *Armenian Lectionary*.[20]

Weekday offices:

Cockcrow	Morning Prayer at Anastasis
Midday	Service at Anastasis
3 P.M.	Service at Anastasis
4 P.M. − dusk	*Lucernare* at Anastasis and At the Cross

Sunday offices:

Cockcrow	Morning Prayer at Anastasis
Daybreak − 10/11 A.M.	Service at Martyrium; preaching
10/11 A.M. − 11 A.M./12 noon	Service at Anastasis
4 P.M. − dusk	*Lucernare* at Anastasis and At the Cross

Epiphany:

Cockcrow	Morning Prayer at Anastasis
7 A.M.	Depending on the day of the week, services at Martyrium, Eleona, Lazarium, Sion, Anastasis, and At the Cross; preaching
Midday	Service at Anastasis
3 P.M.	Service at Anastasis
4 P.M. − dusk	*Lucernare* at Anastasis and At the Cross

---

[20] *It. Eger.* 24.1–49.3; Renoux, 1969–71.

Lent:

Cockcrow	Morning Prayer at Anastasis
Before 9 A.M.	Instruction of baptismal candidates
9 A.M.	Service at Anastasis
Midday	Service at Anastasis
3 P.M.	Service at Anastasis, but on Wednesdays and Fridays on Sion; preaching
4 P.M. – dusk	*Lucernare* at Anastasis and At the Cross

Great Week:

Services as during Lent and Sundays, apart from the following additions and changes:

Saturday

1 P.M.	Service at Lazarium

Palm Sunday

1–3 P.M.	Service in Eleona church
3–5 P.M.	Service at Imbomon
5 P.M.	Procession from Mount of Olives into Jerusalem
7 P.M. (?)	*Lucernare*

Monday

3–7 P.M.	Service in Martyrium
7 P.M.	*Lucernare* in Martyrium

Tuesday

3–7 P.M.	Service in Martyrium
7 P.M.	*Lucernare* in Martyrium
after *Lucernare*	Service in Eleona church

Wednesday

3–7 P.M.	Service in Martyrium
7 P.M.	*Lucernare* in Martyrium
after *Lucernare*	Service in Anastasis

Thursday

2–4 P.M.	Service in Martyrium
between 4 P.M. and 7 P.M.	Services in Anastasis and Behind the Cross

7–11 P.M.	Service in Eleona church
Good Friday	
c. 12 midnight – cockcrow	Service/vigil at Imbomon
cockcrow – ?	Procession Imbomon-Gethsemane-Before the Cross
8 A.M. – 12 noon	Presentation of the Cross, Behind the Cross
12 noon – 3 P.M.	Service Before the Cross
3 P.M. – ?	Services in Martyrium and Anastasis

Easter Week:	
Cockcrow	Morning Prayer at Anastasis
Before 9 A.M. (?)	Instruction of neophytes in the mysteries of baptism and Eucharist
9–11 A.M. (?)	Service in Martyrium on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday; Eleona church on Wednesday; Anastasis on Thursday; Before the Cross on Saturday
After midday meal (1 P.M.?)	Services at Eleona church and Imbomon
4 P.M. – dusk	*Lucernare* at Anastasis and At the Cross

Pentecost:	
Cockcrow	Morning Prayer at Anastasis
Daybreak	Service in Martyrium; preaching
9 A.M.	Service on Sion
immediately after midday	Services in Eleona church and Imbomon
4 P.M.	*Lucernare* at Eleona church
8 P.M.	Services in Martyrium, Anastasis, and At the Cross
? – midnight	Service on Sion

There were furthermore the minor celebrations of the fortieth day after Epiphany (Hypapante) and the fortieth day after Easter. On

the first, a special service was held in the Anastasis with preaching by the presbyters and the bishop, and the interpretation of the passage about Joseph and Mary taking Jesus to the Temple; *It. Eger.* 26. *Arm. Lect.* No. XIII (PO 36, fasc. 2, 91) mentions the reading of Luke 2:22–40. The day before the fortieth day after Easter, everyone went to Bethlehem where a vigil was held on the spot where Christ was born, that is, in the cave in the Church of the Nativity. On the fortieth day after Easter presbyters and bishops preached sermons appropriate to the place and day, after which everyone returned to Jerusalem in the evening; *It. Eger.* 42. It is puzzling what exactly was commemorated on this fortieth day after Easter.[21] In addition, there were an increasing number of Saints' days and one-day feasts, including, to name just a few, the apparition of the Cross (7 May), the Holy Innocents (9 or 18 May), the Virgin Mary (15 August), John the Baptist (29 August), and feasts for Old Testament figures, emperors (Constantine and Theodosius), and martyrs. Egeria does not mention any of these days but the *Armenian Lectionary* already includes twenty-six special days.[22]

---

[21] Devos, 1968; Baldovin, 1989, 41–42; Wilkinson, 1999, 78–79.
[22] Baldovin, 1989, 42–44.

LETTER ATTRIBUTED TO CYRIL
ON THE REBUILDING OF THE TEMPLE

Translation of ms. Harvard Syriac 99, in: S.P. Brock, "A letter attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem on the rebuilding of the Temple", *BSOAS* 40 (Cambridge University Press, 1977), 267–86; repr. in idem, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (London 1984).

On how many miracles took place when the Jews received the order to rebuild the Temple, and the signs which occurred in the region of Asia.

1. The letter, which was sent from the holy Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, concerning the Jews, when they wanted to rebuild the Temple, and (on how) the land was shaken, and mighty prodigies took place, and fire consumed great numbers of them, and many Christians (too) perished.

2. To my beloved brethren, bishops, priests, and deacons of the Church of Christ in every district: greetings, my brethren. The punishment of our Lord is sure, and His sentence that He gave concerning the city of the crucifiers is faithful, and with our own eyes we have received a fearful sight; for truly did the Apostle say that `there is nothing greater than the love of God'. Now, while the earth was shaking and the entire people suffering, I have not neglected to write to you about everything that has taken place here.

3. At the digging of the foundations of Jerusalem, which had been ruined because of the killing of its Lord, the land shook considerably, and there were great tremors in the towns round about.

4. Now even though the person bringing the letter is slow, nevertheless I shall still write and inform you that we are all well, by the grace of God and the aid of prayer. Now I think that you are concerned for us, (and) our minds were tearing us – not only our own, but all our brethren's as well, who are with us, that I should tell you too about what happened amongst us.

5. We have not written to you at length, beyond the earthquake that took place at God's (behest). For many Christians too living in

these regions, as well as the majority of the Jews, perished at that scourge – and not just in the earthquake, but also as a result of fire and in the heavy rain they had.

6. At the outset, when they wanted to lay the foundations of the Temple on the Sunday previous to the earthquake, there were strong winds and storms, with the result that they were unable to lay the Temple's foundations that day. It was on that very night that the great earthquake occurred, and we were all in the church of the Confessors, engaged in prayer. After this we left to go to the Mount of Olives, which is situated to the east of Jerusalem, where our Lord was raised to His glorious Father. We went out into the middle of the city, reciting a psalm, and we passed the graves of the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, and we besought the Lord of the prophets that, through the prayers of His prophets and apostles, His truth might be seen by His worshippers in the face of the audicity of the Jews who had crucified Him.

7. Now they (sc. the Jews), wanting to imitate us, were running to the place where their synagogue usually gathered, and they found the synagogue doors closed. They were greatly amazed at what had happened and stood around in silence and fear when suddenly the synagogue doors opened of their own accord, and out of the building there came forth fire, which licked up the majority of them, and most of them collapsed and perished in front of the building. The doors then closed of their own accord, while the whole city looked on at what was happening, and the entire populace, Jew and Christian alike, cried out with one voice, saying 'There is but one God, one Christ, who is victorious'; and the entire people rushed off and tore down the idols and (pagan) altars that were in the city, glorifying and praising Christ, and confessing that He is the Son of the Living God. And they drove out the demons of the city, and the Jews, and the whole city received the sign of baptism, Jews as well as many pagans, all together, so that we thought that there was not a single person left in the city who had not received the sign or mark of the living Cross in heaven. And it instilled great fear in all.

8. And the entire people thought that, after these signs which our Saviour gave us in His Gospel, the fearful (second) coming of the day of resurrection had arrived. With trembling of great joy we received something of the sign of Christ's crucifixion, and whosoever did not believe in his mind found his clothes openly reprove him, having the mark of the cross stained on them.

9. As for the statue of Herod which stood in Jerusalem, which the Jews had thrown down in (an act of) supplication, the city ran and set it up where it had been standing.

10. Thus we felt compelled to write to you the truth of these matters, that everything that is written about Jerusalem should be established in truth, that 'no stone shall be left in it that will not be upturned'.

11. Now we should like to write down for you the names of the towns which were overthrown: Beit Gubrin – more than half of it; part of Baishan, the whole of Sebastia and its territory, the whole of Nikopolis and its territory; more than half of Lydda and its territory; about half of Ashqalon, the whole of Antipatris and its territory; part of Caesarea, more than half Samaria; part of NSL', a third of Paneas, half of Azotus, part of Gophna, more than half Petra (RQM); Hada, a suburb of the city (Jerusalem) – more than half; more than half Jerusalem. And fire came forth and consumed the teachers of the Jews. Part of Tiberias too, and its territory, more than half 'RDQLY', the whole of Sepphoris (SWPRYN) and its territory, 'Aina d-Gadar; Haifa (?; HLP) flowed with blood for three days; the whole of Japho (YWPY) perished, (and) part of 'D'NWS.

12. This event took place on Monday at the third hour, and partly at the ninth hour of the night. There was great loss of life here. (It was) on 19 Iyyar of the year 674 of the kingdom of Alexander the Greek. This year the pagan Julian died, and it was he who especially incited the Jews to rebuild the Temple, since he favoured them because they had crucified Christ. Justice overtook this rebel at his death in enemy territory, and in this the sign of the power of the cross was revealed, because he had denied Him who had been hung upon it for the salvation and life of all.

All this that has been briefly written to you took place in actual fact in this way.

PRINCIPAL ANCIENT SOURCES

Ambrose, *De Obitu Theodosii*, ed. O. Faller, CSEL 73 (Vienna 1955).

Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae*, ed. W. Seyfarth, Teubner (Leipzig 1978).

Armenian Lectionary, ed. A. Renoux, *Le codex arménien Jérusalem 121*, PO 35–36, 2 vols. (Turnhout 1969–71).

Basilius of Caesarea, *Epistulae*, ed. Y. Courtonne, Budé, 2 vols. (Paris 1957–66).

Chronicon Paschale, CSHB 16, ed. L. Dindorf (Bonn 1832); *Chronicon Paschale, 284–628 A.D.*, trans. Michael Whitby & Mary Whitby (Liverpool 1989).

Codex Theodosianus. Theodosiani libri XVI cum constitutionibus Sirmondianis, ed. T. Mommsen (Berlin 1905); *The Theodosian Code and Novels and the Sirmondian Constitutions*, trans. C. Pharr (Princeton 1952).

Cyrilli Hierosolymorum archiepiscopi opera quae supersunt omnia, ed. W.K. Reischl, J. Rupp, 2 vols. (Munich 1848–60); *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem*, trans. Leo P. McCauley, Anthony A. Stephenson, The Fathers of the Church 61, 64, 2 vols., (Washington 1969–70).

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catéchèses Mystagogiques*, ed. A. Piédagnel, SC 126 (Paris 1966).
———, *Epistula ad Constantium*, ed. E. Bihain, "Épître de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la Vision de la Croix (BHG3 413)", *Byzantion* 43 (1973) 264–296.

Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, vol. 1, Nicaea I to Lateran V, ed. Giuseppe Alberigo, trans. Norman P. Tanner ((London/Washington 1990).

Ephrem Syrus, *Hymni contra Julianum*, ed. E. Beck, CSCO 175, 176 (Louvain 1957); *The Emperor Julian. Panegyric and Polemic*, ed. Samuel N.C. Lieu (Liverpool 1989).

Epiphanius, *Panarion Omnium Haeresium*, ed. C. Holl, J. Dummer, GCS, 3 vols. (Berlin 1915–85); *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis*, trans. F. Williams, 2 vols. (Leiden 1987–94).

Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. E. Schwartz, GCS, 3 vols. (Berlin 1908).
———, *Vita Constantini*, ed. F. Winkelmann, GCS (Berlin 1975); *Eusebius. Life of Constantine. Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Averil Cameron, Stuart G. Hall (Oxford 1999).

Gregory of Nazianzus, *Orationes* 4–5, ed. J. Bernardi, SC 309 (Paris 1983).

Gregory of Nyssa, *Epistulae*, ed. P. Maraval, SC 363 (Paris 1990).

Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai*, ed. Ch. H. Beeson, GCS (Leipzig 1906); *Acta Archelai (The Acts of Archelaus)*, trans. Mark Vermes with an Introduction and Commentary by Samuel N.C. Lieu, Manichaean Studies 4 (Turnhout 2001).

Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, ed. A. Rousseau, L. Doutreleau, SC 100, 152–153, 210–211, 263–264, 293–294 (Paris, 1965–82).

Itinerarium Burdigalense, ed. P. Geyer, O. Cuntz, *Itineraria et Alia Geographica*, CC, Ser. Lat. 175 (Turnhout 1965) 1–26.

Itinerarium Egeriae, ed. P. Maraval, SC 296 (Paris 1982); *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land*, trans. John Wilkinson (Jerusalem/Warminster; 3rd edition).

Jerome, *Chronicon: Eusebius Werke* 7, ed. R. Helm, U. Treu, GCS, 2nd ed. (Berlin 1984); *A Translation of Jerome's Chronicon with Historical Commentary*; trans. M.D. Donalson (Lewiston 1996).

Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, ed. W. Herding, Teubner (Leipzig 1879); *On Illustrious Men*, trans. Thomas P. Halton, The Fathers of the Church 100 (Washington 1999).
———, *Epistulae*, ed. J. Labourt, Budé, 8 vols. (Paris 1949–63).

Julian, *Epistulae*, ed. J. Bidez, Budé (Paris 1960).

————, *The Works of the Emperor Julian*, trans. W.C. Wright, Loeb, 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass./London 1913–23).

Libanius, *Selected Works, Autobiography and Selected Letters*, trans. A.F. Norman, Loeb, 4 vols. (Cambridge, Mass./London 1969–92).

Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon*, ed. T. Mommsen, MGH Auct. Ant. 11, 39–108 (Berlin 1894); *The Chronicle of Marcellinus*, trans. Brian Croke (Sydney 1995).

Marcus Diaconus, *Vita Porphyrii (Vie de Porphyre, évêque de Gaza)*, ed. H. Grégoire and M.A. Kugener (Paris 1930).

Orosius, *Historiarum adversus paganos libri VII*, ed. K.F.W. Zangemeister, CSEL 5 (Vienna 1882).

Palladius, *Historia Lausiaca*, ed. E.C. Butler, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1898–1904).

Paulinus of Nola, *Epistulae*, ed. G. de Hartel, CSEL 29 (Vienna 1894).

Philostorgius, *Historia Ecclesiastica. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez, F. Winkelmann, GCS, 2nd ed. (Berlin 1972).

Rufinus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, in: *Eusebii historia ecclesiastica translata et continuata*, pp. 957–1040, ed. T. Mommsen, GCS (Berlin 1908); *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia*, trans. P. Amidon (Oxford 1997).

Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G.C. Hansen, GCS (Berlin 1995).

Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. J. Bidez, G.C. Hansen, GCS, 2nd ed. (Berlin 1995).

Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicon*, ed. C. Halm, CSEL 1 (Vienna 1866).

Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiastica. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. L. Parmentier, G.C. Hansen, GCS, 3rd ed. (Berlin 1998).

Theodor of Mopsuestia, *Homiliae Catecheticae. Katechetische Homilien*, Fontes christiani 17, 2 vols., trans. Peter Bruns (Freiburg 1994–95).

Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor (Leipzig 1883–85); *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*, trans. Cyril Mango, Roger Scott (Oxford 1997).

Vita Cyrilii (Armenian), ed. E. Bihain, "Une vie arménienne de Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem", *Le Muséon* 76 (1963) 319–348.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abel, Fr. M., 1919, "La sépulture de Saint Jacques le Mineur", *R. Bibl.* 16, 480–499.

Adler, M., 1893, "The Emperor Julian and the Jews", *JQR* 5, 591–651.

Adontz, A., 1927, "Les fêtes et les saints de l'Église arménienne", *ROC* 26, 74–104, 225–278.

Alexander, Philip S., 1999, "Jerusalem as the Omphalos of the World: On the History of a Geographical Concept", in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York), 104–119

Allen, P. and W. Mayer, 2000, "Through a Bishop's Eyes: Towards a Definition of Pastoral Care in Late Antiquity", *Augustinianum* 40, 345–397.

Amidon, Philip R., 1997, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia. Books 10 and 11* (Oxford).

Amiran, D.H.K., 1996, "Location Index for Earthquakes in Israel since 100 B.C.E.", *IEJ* 46, 120–130.

Amiran, D.H.K., E. Arieh and T. Turcotte, 1994, "Earthquakes in Israel and Adjacent Areas: Macroseismic Observations since 100 B.C.E.", *IEJ* 44, 260–305.

Arras, Victor, 1974, *De Transitu Mariae, Apocrypha Aethiopice,* I (Ethiopian text) and II (Latin transl.), CSCO, Scriptores Aethiopici 68 and 69 (Louvain).

Athanassiadi, P., 1992, *Julian. An Intellectual Biography* (London/New York).

Aubineau, Michel, 1987, "Un sermo acephalus ineditus – CPG 4272: Sévérien de Gabala? – restitué à Cyrille de Jérusalem", *VC* 41, 285–289.

Avi-Yonah, M., 1958, "The Economics of Byzantine Palestine", *IEJ* 8, 39–51.

—— 1976, *The Jews of Palestine. A Political History from the Bar Kokhba War to the Arab Conquest* (Oxford).

Avigad, Nahman, 1983, *Discovering Jerusalem* (Nashville).

Aziza, C., 1978, "Julien et le Judaïsme", in: J. Richer, R. Braun (eds.), *L'empereur Julien. De l'histoire à la légende (331–1715)* (Paris), 141–158.

Baldovin, John F., 1987, *The Urban Character of Christian Worship. The Origins, Development, and Meaning of Stational Liturgy* (Rome).

—— 1989, *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem* (Bramcote).

Bar, Doron, 1998, "Aelia Capitolina and the Location of the Camp of the Tenth Legion", *PEQ* 130, 8–19.

Barnes, T.D., 1981, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass./London).

—— 1992, "New Year 363 in Ammianus Marcellinus. Annalistic Technique and Historical Apologetics", in: J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst and H.C. Teitler (eds.), *Cognitio Gestorum. The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Amsterdam), 1–8.

—— 1993, *Athanasius and Constantius. Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass./London).

Baumstark, A., 1928, "Die Idiomela der byzantinischen Karfreitagshoren in syrischer Überlieferung", *Oriens Christianus* 3rd series, vols. 3 and 4, 232–247.

Belayche, Nicole, 2001, *Iudaea-Palaestina. The Pagan Cults in Roman Palestine (Second to Fourth Century)*, Religion der Römischen Provinzen 1 (Tübingen).

Bell, Catherine, 1997, *Ritual. Perspective and Dimensions* (Oxford).

Beloch, J., 1886, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt* (Leipzig).

Bernardi, J., 1978, "Un réquisitoire: les invectives contre Julien de Grégoire de Nazianze", in: R. Braun, J. Richer (eds.), *L'empereur Julien. De l'histoire à la légende (331–1715)* (Paris), 89–98.

Beukers, Cl., 1961, "'For our Emperors, Soldiers and Allies'. An Attempt at Dating the twenty-third Catechesis by Cyrillus of Jerusalem", *VC* 15, 177–184.

Biddle, Martin, 1999, *The Tomb of Christ* (Stroud).

Bidez, J., 1930, *La vie de l'empereur Julien* (Paris).

Bihain, E., 1962, "La source d'un texte de Socrate (H.E. II, 38, 2) relatif à Cyrille de Jérusalem", *Byzantion* 32, 81–91.

—— 1962a, "Le 'Contre Eunome' de Théodore de Mopsueste. Source d'un passage de Sozomène et d'un passage de Théodoret concernant Cyrille de Jérusalem", *Le Muséon* 75, 331–355.

—— 1963, "Une vie arménienne de Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem", *Le Muséon* 76, 319–348.

—— 1973, "Épitre de Cyrille de Jérusalem à Constance sur la Vision de la Croix (BHG3 413)", *Byzantion* 43, 264–296.

Binns, John, 1994, *Ascetics and Ambassadors of Christ. The Monasteries of Palestine, 314–631* (Oxford).

Blatz, Beate, 1990, "Das koptische Thomasevangelium", in: W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. I. Band: *Evangelien* (Tübingen; 6th ed.), 93–113.

Bludau, Augustinus, 1924, "Der Katechumenat in Jerusalem im 4. Jahrhundert", *Theologie und Glaube* 16, 225–242.

Boatwright, Mary T., 2000, *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire* (Princeton).

Borgehammar, Stephan, 1991, *How the Holy Cross was Found. From Event to Medieval Legend* (Stockholm).

Bowersock, G.W., 1990, *Hellenism in Late Antiquity* (Ann Arbor).

—— 1978, *Julian the Apostate* (London).

Bradshaw, Paul F., 1999, "The Influence of Jerusalem on Christian Liturgy", in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York), 251–259.

Brock, S.P., 1976, "The Rebuilding of the Temple under Julian. A New Source", *PEQ* 108, 103–107.

—— 1977, "A Letter Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem on the Rebuilding of the Temple", *BSOAS* 40, 267–286; repr. in idem, 1984, *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity* (London).

—— 1981, Review of M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, *Syriac Manuscripts in the Harvard College Library: A Catalogue* (Missoula 1979), *Journal of Semitic Studies* 26, 317–321.

—— 1994, "Greek and Syriac in Late Antique Syria", in: Alan K. Bowman, Greg Woolf (eds.), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge), 149–160.

Broshi, M., 1975, "La population de l'ancienne Jérusalem", *R. Bibl.* 82, 5–14.

Brown, Peter, 1981, *The Cult of the Saints. Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago).

—— 1992, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity. Towards a Christian Empire* (Madison).

—— 2002, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire* (Hanover/London).

Brubaker, Leslie, 1997, "Memories of Helena: Patterns in Imperial Female Matronage in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries", in: Liz James (ed.), *Women, Men and Eunuchs. Gender in Byzantium* (London/New York), 52–75.

Budge, E.A.W., 1915, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*. Vol. 5: part 1: *Coptic texts;* part 2: *English translations* (London).

Burgess, R.W., 1993, *The Chronicle of Hydatius and the Consularia Constantinopolitana. Two Contemporary Accounts of the Final Years of the Roman Empire* (Oxford).

Busse, H. and G. Kretschmar, 1987, *Jerusalemer Heiligtumstraditionen in altkirchlicher und frühislamischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden).

Cabrol, F., 1895, *Les églises de Jérusalem: La discipline et la liturgie au IVe siècle* (Paris).

Cameron, Averil and Stuart G. Hall, 1999, *Eusebius. Life of Constantine. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford).

Campagnano, Antonella, 1980, *Ps. Cirillo di Gerusalemme, Omelie Copte sulla Passione, sulla Croce e sulla Vergine*, Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell' Antichità 65 (Milan).

Chadwick, H., 1980, "The Role of the Christian Bishop in Ancient Society", in: W. Wuellner, E.C. Hobbs (eds.), *Protocols of the 35th Colloquy, The Center for Hermeneutical Studies* (Berkeley); repr. in H. Chadwick, 1991, *Heresy and Orthodoxy in the Early Church* (Aldershot).

Chantraine, H., 1993–94, "Die Kreuzesvision von 351 – Fakten und Probleme", *BZ* 86/7, 430–441.

Chitty, Derwas J., 1966, *The Desert a City. An Introduction to the Study of Egyptian and Palestinian Monasticism under the Christian Empire* (Oxford).

Chuvin, Pierre, 1990, *A Chronicle of the Last Pagans* (Cambridge, Mass./London).

Clark, Elizabeth A., 1992, *The Origenist Controversy. The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton).

Coakley, J.F., 1984, "A Syriac Version of the Letter of Cyril of Jerusalem on the Vision of the Cross", *Anal. Boll.* 102, 71–84.

Conybeare, F.C., 1905, *Rituale Armenorum* (Oxford).

Coquin, R.-G. and G. Godron, 1990, "Un encomion copte sur Marie-Madeleine attribué à Cyrille de Jérusalem", *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 90, 169–212.

Corbo, V.C., 1981–82, *Il Santo Sepolcro di Gerusalemme. Aspetti archaeologici dalle origini al periodo crociato*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem).

Coüasnon, C., 1974, *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem* (London).

Cross, F.L., 1995, *St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments* (Crestwood; 3rd ed.).

Dauphin, Claudine, 1998, *La Palestine byzantine. Peuplement et populations*, BAR International Series 726, 3 vols. (Oxford).

Deddens, K., 1975, *Annus Liturgicus? Een onderzoek naar de betekenis van Cyrillus van Jeruzalem voor de ontwikkeling van het 'kerkelijk jaar'* (Goes).

Den Boeft, J., D. den Hengst, J.W. Drijvers and H.C. Teitler, 1998, *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXIII* (Groningen).

Desreumaux, A., 1997, *Codex sinaiticus Zosimi rescriptus. Description codicologique des feuillets araméens melkites des manuscrits Schoyen 35, 36 et 37 (Londres – Oslo) comprenant l'édition de nouveaux passages des Évangiles et des Catéchèses de Cyrille* (Lausanne).

Devos, P., 1967, "La date du voyage d'Égérie", *Anal. Boll.* 85, 165–194.

—— 1968, "Égérie à Bethléem. Le 40e jour après Paques à Jérusalem, en 383", *Anal. Boll.* 86, 87–108.

Diekamp, F., 1938, *Analecta Patristica. Texte und Abhandlungen zur griechischen Patristik* (Rome).

Dix, Gregory, 1945, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London).

—— 1968, *The Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus* (London).

Donner, Herbert, 1995, *The Mosaic Map of Madaba* (Kampen; 2nd ed.).

Doval, Alexis J., 1993, "The Location and Structure of the Baptistery in the *Mystagogic Catecheses* of Cyril of Jerusalem", *St. Patr.* 26 (Louvain), 1–13.

—— 1997, "The Date of Cyril of Jerusalem's Catecheses", *JTS* 48, 129–132.

—— 2001, *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue. The Autorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses* (Washington).

Downey, G., 1961, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton).

Drake, H.A., 1985, "Eusebius on the True Cross", *JEH* 36, 1–22.

—— 2000, *Constantine and the Bishops. The Politics of Intolerance* (Baltimore/London).

Drijvers, H.J.W., 1987–88, "Marcionism in Syria: Principles, Problem, Polemics", *The Second Century* 6, 153–172.

—— 1989, "Thomasakten", in: W. Schneemelcher (ed.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, II. Band: *Apostolisches Apokolypsen und Verwandtes* (Tübingen; 6th ed.), 289–367.

—— 1992, "Syrian Christianity and Judaism", in: Judith Lieu, John North and

Tessa Rajak (eds.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* (London/New York), 124–146.

—— 1994, "The Syriac Romance of Julian. Its Function, Place of Origin and Original Language", in: R. Lavenant (ed.), *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992* (Rome), 201–214.

Drijvers, H.J.W. and Jan Willem Drijvers, 1997, *The Finding of the True Cross. The Judas Kyriakos Legend in Syriac. Introduction, text and translation*, CSCO 565, Subs. 93 (Louvain).

Drijvers, Jan Willem, 1992, *Helena Augusta. The Mother of Constantine the Great and the Legend of Her Finding of the True Cross* (Leiden).

—— 1992a, "Ammianus Marcellinus 23.1.2–3: The Rebuilding of the Temple in Jerusalem", in: J. den Boeft, D. den Hengst and H.C. Teitler (eds.), *Cognitio Gestorum. The Historiographic Art of Ammianus Marcellinus* (Amsterdam), 19–26.

—— 1993, "Helena Augusta: Exemplary Christian Empress", *St. Patr.* 24 (Louvain), 85–90.

—— 1997, "The Protonike Legend, the *Doctrina Addai* and Bishop Rabbula of Edessa", *VC* 51, 298–315.

—— 1999, "Promoting Jerusalem: Cyril and the True Cross", in: Jan Willem Drijvers, John W. Watt (eds.), *Portraits of Spiritual Authority. Religious Power in Early Christianity, Byzantium and the Christian Orient*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 137 (Leiden), 79–95.

—— 1999a, "The Syriac Julian Romance. Aspects of the Jewish-Christian Controversy in Late Antiquity", in: H.L.J. Vanstiphout et al. (eds.), *All Those Nations . . . Cultural Encounters with and within the Near East* (Groningen), 31–42.

—— 2000, "Cyril of Jerusalem and the Rebuilding of the Jewish Temple (A.D. 363)", in: Caroline Kroon, Daan den Hengst (eds.), *Ultima Aetas. Time, Tense and Transience in the Ancient World. Studies in Honour of Jan den Boeft* (Amsterdam), 123–135.

Dujarier, Michel, 1979, *A History of the Catechumenate. The First Six Centuries* (New York/Chicago/Los Angeles).

Edwards, Douglas R., 1996, *Religion and Power. Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greek East* (New York/Oxford).

Edwards, Mark, 2003, *Constantine and Christendom. The Oration to the Saints, The Greek and Latin Accounts of the Discovery of the Cross, The Edict of Constantine to Silvester*, Translated Texts for Historians 39 (Liverpool).

Elsner, Jas, 2000, "The *Itinerarium Burdigalense*: Politics and Salvation in the Geography of Constantine's Empire", *JRS* 90, 181–195.

Finn, Thomas M., 1997, *From Death to Rebirth. Ritual and Conversion in Late Antiquity* (New York).

Fowden, Garth, 1978, "Bishops and Temples in the eastern Roman Empire A.D. 320–435", *JTS* 29, 53–78.

—— 1998, "Polytheist Religion and Philosophy", in: Averil Cameron, Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History XIII. The Late Empire A.D. 337–425* (Cambridge), 538–560.

Frank, Georgia, 2000, *The Memory of the Eyes. Pilgrims to the Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London).

Garitte, G., 1958, *Le calendrier palestino-géorgien du Sinaiticus 34 (Xᵉ siècle)*, Subsidia Hagiographica 30 (Brussels).

—— 1963, "Les Catéchèses de S. Cyrille de Jérusalem en arménien. Fragments d'un manuscrit du IXᵉ siècle", *Le Muséon* 76, 95–108.

Garnsey, Peter and Caroline Humfress, 2001, *The Evolution of the Late Antique World* (Cambridge).

Gaudemet, Jean, 1958, *L'Église dans l'Empire romain (IVᵉ–Vᵉ siècles)* (Paris).

Gibson, Shimon and Joan E. Taylor, 1994, *Beneath the Church of the Holy Sepulchre Jerusalem. The Archaeology and Early History of Traditional Golgotha* (London).

Gifford, E.W., 1894, "Introduction", in: *S. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. Gregory Nazianzen*, NPNF 7 (second series) (New York), i–lviii.

Gollancz, H., 1928, *Julian the Apostate. Now Translated for the First Time from the Syriac Original* (Oxford).

Gregg, Robert C., 1985, "Cyril of Jerusalem and the Arians", in: Robert C. Gregg (ed.), *Arianism. Historical and Theological Reassessments. Papers from the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Sept. 5–10, 1983, Oxford* (Philadelphia), 85–109.

Groh, Dennis E., 1977, "Galilee and the Eastern Roman Empire in Late Antiquity", *Explor* 3, 78–93.

—— 1988, "Jews and Christians in Late Roman Palestine", *BA* 51, 80–96.

Hanson, R.P.C., 1988, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God. The Arian Controversy 318–381* (Edinburgh).

Harnack von, A., 1990, *Marcion. The Gospel of the Alien God* (Durham, NC); trans. of *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott* (Leipzig 1924).

Harries, Jill, 1999, *Law and Empire in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge).

Hefele von, K.J., 1894, *A History of the Christian Councils from the Original Documents*. Vol. 1: *To the Close of the Council of Nicaea A.D. 325* (Edinburgh).

—— 1896, *A History of the Christian Councils from the Original Documents*. Vol. 2: *A.D. 326–A.D. 429* (Edinburgh).

Heid, S., 1989, "Der Ursprung der Helenalegende im Pilgerbetrieb Jerusalems", *JbAC* 32, 41–71.

Heinen, H., 1995, "Helena, Konstantin und die Überlieferung der Kreuzesauffindung im 4. Jahrhundert", in: E. Aretz et al. (eds.), *Der heilige Rock zu Trier* (Trier), 83–117.

Henry, P. (ed.), 1984, *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition* (Philadelphia).

Hirschfeld, Yizhar, 1992, *The Judaean Desert Monasteries in the Byzantine Period* (New Haven/London).

Hoffmann, J.G.E., 1880, *Iulianos der Abtrünnige. Syrische Erzählungen* (Leiden).

Holum, Kenneth G., 1982, *Theodosian Empresses. Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London).

—— 1990, "Hadrian and St. Helena: Imperial Travel and the Origins of Christian Holy Land Pilgrimage", in: Robert Ousterhout (ed.), *The Blessings of Pilgrimage* (Urbana/Chicago), 66–81.

—— 1998, "Identity and the Late Antique City. The Case of Caesarea", in: Hayim Lapin (ed.), *Religious and Ethnic Communities in Later Roman Palestine* (Bethesda), 157–177.

Holum, Kenneth G. and Robert L. Hohlfelder, 1988, *King Herod's Dream. Caesarea on the Sea* (New York/London).

Honigmann, E., 1950, "Juvenal of Jerusalem", *DOP* 5, 209–279.

Hopkins, Keith, 1998, "Christian Number and Its Implications", *JECS* 6, 185–226.

Hort, F.J.A., 1876, *Two Dissertations* (Cambridge/London).

Hunt, E.D., 1981, "The Traffic in Relics: Some Late Roman Evidence", in: Sergei Hackel (ed.), *The Byzantine Saint. Studies supplementary to Sobornost* 5 (London), 171–180.

—— 1982, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire A.D. 312–460* (Oxford).

—— 1982a, "St. Stephen in Minorca. An Episode in Jewish-Christian Relations in the Early Fifth Century A.D.", *JTS* 33, 106–123.

—— 1997, "Constantine and Jerusalem", *JEH* 48, 405–424.

—— 1998, "The Church as a Public Institution", in: Averil Cameron, Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History XIII. The Late Empire A.D. 337–425* (Cambridge), 238–276.

—— 1998a, "Julian", in: Averil Cameron, Peter Garnsey (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History XIII. The Late Empire A.D. 337–425* (Cambridge), 44–77.

—— 2001, "The Date of the *Itinerarium Egeriae*", *St. Patr.* 38, 410–416.

Inglizean, V., 1964–65, "The Letter of Cyril of Jerusalem to the Emperor Constantius:

Study and Text", *Handes Amsorya* 78, 289–300, 449–58; *Handes Amsorya* 79, 1–16 (in Armenian).

Irshai, Oded, 1993, "Narcissus of Jerusalem and his Role in the Enhancement of the Apostolic Image of the Church of Jerusalem. The Church of Aelia between Marcus and Narcissus (ca. 135–190 c.e.)", in: Moshe David Herr, François Blanchetière (eds.), *Aux origines juives du Christianisme* (Jerusalem), 111–131.

—— 1995, "Constantine and the Jews: The Prohibition against entering Jerusalem – History and Hagiography", *Zion* 60, 129–178 (in Hebrew, with English summary).

—— 1996, "Cyril of Jerusalem: The Apparition of the Cross and the Jews", in: Ora Limor, Guy G. Stroumsa (eds.), *Contra Iudaeos. Ancient and Medieval Polemics between Christians and Jews* (Tübingen), 85–104.

—— 1999, "The Jerusalem Bishopric and the Jews in the Fourth Century: History and Eschatology", in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York), 204–220.

Isaac, Benjamin, 1992, *The Limits of Empire. The Roman Army in the East* (Oxford; rev. ed.).

Jackson, Pamela, 1991, "Cyril of Jerusalem's Use of Scripture in Catechesis", *Theological Studies* 52, 431–450.

Jacobs, Andrew S., 1999, "Visible Ghosts and Invisible Demons. The Place of Jews in Early Christian Terra Sancta", in: Eric M. Myers (ed.), *Galilee through the Centuries. Confluence of Cultures* (Winona Lake), 359–375.

—— 2004, *Remains of the Jews. The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity* (Stanford).

Janeras, S., 1986, "A propos de la catéchèse XIVe de Cyrille de Jérusalem", *Ecclesia Orans* 3, 307–318.

—— 1988, *Le Vendredi Saint dans la tradition liturgique byzantine*, Studia Anselmiana 99 (Rome).

Johnson, Maxwell E., 1988, "Reconciling Cyril and Egeria on the Catechetical Process in Fourth-Century Jerusalem", in: Paul F. Bradshaw (ed.), *Essays in Early Eastern Initiation* (Bramcote), 18–30.

—— 1990, "From Three Weeks to Forty Days: Baptismal Preparation and the Origins of Lent", *Studia Liturgica* 20, 185–200.

Jones, A.H.M., 1964, *The Later Roman Empire 284–602. A Social Economic and Administrative Survey*, 3 vols. (Oxford).

—— 1971, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford).

Kelly, J.N.D., 1955, *Rufinus. A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed* (London).

—— 1972, *Early Christian Creeds* (Harlow/New York; 3rd ed.).

—— 1975, *Jerome. His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London).

Kienast, D., 1996, *Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie* (Darmstadt; 2nd ed.)

Kretschmar, G., 1956, "Die frühe Geschichte der Jerusalemer Liturgie", *Jahrbuch für Liturgik und Hymnologie* 2, 22–46.

—— 1970, "Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der Alten Kirche", in: Walter Blankenburg, Karl Ferdinand Müller (eds.), *Leiturgia. Handbuch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes.* Band V: *Der Taufgottesdienst* (Kassel), 1–348.

—— 1971, "Festkalender und Memorialstätten Jerusalem in altkirchlicher Zeit", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästinavereins* 87, 167–205.

Lane Fox, Robin, 1986, *Pagans and Christians* (Harmondsworth).

Lebon, J., 1924, "La position de Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem dans les luttes provoquées par l'arianisme", *RHE* 20, 181–210, 357–386.

Lenski, Noel E., 2001, "Evidence for the *Audientia episcopalis* in the New Letters of Augustine", in: Ralph W. Mathisen (ed.), *Law, Society, and Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford), 83–97.

—— 2002, *Failure of Empire. Valens and the Roman State in the Fourth Century A.D.* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London).

Lepelley, Claude, 1998, "Le patronat épiscopal au IVe et Ve siècles: continuités et ruptures avec le patronat classique", in: Éric Rebillard, Claire Sotinel (eds.), *L'évêque dans la cité du IVe au Ve siècle. Image et autorité* (Rome), 17–33.

Leroux, J.-M., 1966, "Acace, évêque de Césarée de Palestine (341–365)", *St. Patr.* 8 (2), 82–85.

Levenson, David B., 1979, *A Source and Tradition Critical Study of the Stories of Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Temple* (unpublished PhD thesis, Harvard).

—— 1990, "Julian's Attempt to rebuild the Temple: An Inventory of Ancient and Medieval Sources", in: Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins and Thomas H. Tobin (eds.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls. Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins* (Lanham), 261–279.

Levine, Lee I. (ed.), 1981, *Ancient Synagogues Revealed* (Jerusalem).

—— 1987, *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity* (Philadelphia).

Lewy, Y., 1983, "Julian the Apostate and the Building of the Temple", *Jerusalem Cathedra* 3, 70–96.

Liebeschuetz, J.H.W.G., 1972, *Antioch. City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford).

—— 2001, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman City* (Oxford).

Lieu, Samuel N.C., 1989, *The Emperor Julian. Panegyric and Polemic* (Liverpool; 2nd ed.).

—— 1992, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (Tübingen).

—— 1994, *Manichaeism in Mesopotamia and the Roman East*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 118 (Leiden).

Lifshitz, B., 1977, "Jérusalem sous la domination romaine. Histoire de la ville depuis la conquête de Pompée jusqu'à Constantin (63 a.C.–326 p.C.)", *ANRW* II.8, 444–489.

Linder, A., 1987, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Detroit/Jerusalem).

Lizzi Testa, Rita, 2001, "The Bishop, *Vir Venerabilis*: Fiscal Privileges and *Status* Definition in Late Antiquity", *St. Patr.* 34, 125–144.

Lucchesi, E., 1999, "L'homélie copte acéphale en l'honneur des XXIV vieillards", *Anal. Boll.* 117, 289–290.

MacCormack, Sabine, 1990, "'Loca Sancta': The Organization of Sacred Topography in Late Antiquity", in: Robert Ousterhout (ed.), *The Blessings of Pilgrimage* (Urbana/Chicago), 7–40.

Mader, J., 1891, *Der heilige Cyrillus, Bischof von Jerusalem, in seinem Leben und Schriften nach den Quellen dargestellt* (Einsiedeln).

Manns, F., 1993, "La liste de premiers évêques de Jérusalem", in: François Blanchetière, Moshe David Herr (eds.), *Aux origines juives du christianisme* (Jerusalem), 133–158.

Mansi, J.D., 1759, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vols. 2 and 3 (Florence).

Maraval, P., 1982, *Égérie. Journal de Voyage*, SC 296 (Paris).

—— 1985, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient. Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe* (Paris).

—— 1987, "La lettre 3 de Grégoire de Nysse dans le débat christologique", *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 61, 74–89.

Markus, Robert A., 1990, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (Cambridge).

—— 1994, "How on Earth could Places become Holy? Origins of the Christian Idea of Holy Places", *JECS* 2, 257–271.

Mayer, Wendy, 1998, "John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience", in: Pauline Allen, Mary B. Cunningham (eds.), *Preacher and Audience. Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden), 105–137.

McCauley, Leo P. and Anthony A. Stephenson, 1969–70, *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem*, 2 vols., The Fathers of the Church 61 and 64 (Washington).

McLynn, Neil B., 1994, *Ambrose of Milan. Church and Court in a Christian Capital* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London).

Meeks, W.A. and R.L. Wilken, 1978, *Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era*, Sources for Biblical Study 13 (Ann Arbor).

Millar, Fergus B., 1990, "The Roman *Coloniae* of the Near East: a Study of Cultural Relations", in: Mika Kajava, Keikki Solin (eds.), *Roman Eastern Policy and Other Studies in Roman History* (Helsinki), 7–58.

—— 1992, "The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora between Paganism and Christianity", in: Judith Lieu, John North and Tessa Rajak (eds.), *The Jews between Pagans and Christians* (London/New York), 97–123.

—— 1993, *The Roman Near East 31 B.C.–A.D. 337* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Mitchell, Stephen, 1993, *Anatolia. Land, Men and Gods in Asia Minor*, 2 vols. Vol. 1: *The Celts in Anatolia and the Impact of Roman Rule*; Vol. 2: *The Rise of the Church* (Oxford).

Moroziuk, R.P., 1989, "Some Thoughts on the Meaning of ΚΑΘΟΛΙΚΗ in the Eighteenth Catechetical Lecture of Cyril of Jerusalem", *St. Patr.* 18 (1), 169–178.

Müller-Kessler, Christa and Michael Sokoloff, 1999, *A Corpus of Christian Palestinian Aramaic*, vol. 5: *The Catechism of Cyril of Jerusalem in the Christian Palestinian Aramaic Version* (Groningen).

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome, 1995, "Pre-Constantinian Christian Jerusalem", in: Anthony O'Mahony, Göran Gunner and Kevork Hintlian (eds.), *The Christian Heritage in the Holy Land* (London), 13–21.

Myers, Eric M., 1988, "Early Judaism and Christianity in the Light of Archaeology", *BA* 51, 69–79.

Nathanson, Barbara G., 1986, "Jews, Christians, and the Gallus Revolt in Fourth-Century Palestine", *BA* 49, 26–36.

Nautin, P., 1961, "La date du *de viris illustribus* de Jérôme de la mort de Cyrille de Jérusalem et de celle de Grégoire de Nazianze", *RHE* 56, 33–35.

Noethlichs, K.L., 1973, "Materialien zum Bischofsbild aus dem spätantiken Rechtsquellen", *JbAC* 16, 28–59.

—— 1996, *Das Judentum und der römische Staat. Minderheitenpolitik im antiken Rom* (Darmstadt).

Nöldeke, Th., 1874, "Über den syrischen Roman von Kaiser Julian", *ZDMG* 28, 263–292.

Orlandi, T., 1974, *Papiri copti di contenuto teologico*, Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, IX Folge (Vienna).

Pack, Edgar, 1986, *Städte und Steuern in der Politik Julians. Untersuchungen zu den Quellen eines Kaiserbildes*, Collection Latomus 194 (Brussels).

Parkes, James, 1974, *The Conflict between the Church and the Synagogue. A Study in the Origins of Antisemitism* (New York; 1st ed. London 1934).

Patrich, Joseph, 2002, "On the Lost Circus of Aelia Capitolina", *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21, 173–188.

Paulin, A., 1959, *Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem Catéchète* (Paris).

Penella, Robert J., 1999, "Emperor Julian, the Temple of Jerusalem and the God of the Jews", *Koinonia* 23, 16–31.

Perrone, L., 1995, "Monasticism in the Holy Land: From the Beginnings to the Crusaders", *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 45, 31–63.

Piédagnel, A., 1966, *Cyrille de Jérusalem. Catéchèses Mystagogiques*, SC 126 (Paris).

—— 1970, "Les Catéchèses Mystagogiques de Saint Cyrille de Jérusalem. Inventaire de la tradition manuscrite grecque", *St. Patr.* 10, 141–145.

Pohlsander, Hans A., 1995, *Helena: Empress and Saint* (Chicago).

Price, S.R.F., 1984, *Rituals and Power. The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor* (Cambridge).

Quasten, Johannes, 1984, *Patrology*. Vol. 3: *The Golden Age of Greek Patristic Literature from the Council of Nicaea to the Council of Chalcedon* (Westminster; 2nd ed.).

Raes, A., 1944, *Anaphora Syriaca Cyrilli Hierosolymitani vel Alexandrini*, in: *Anaphorae Syriacae quotquot in codicibus adhuc repertae sunt* (Rome).

Renoux, A., 1969–71, *Le Codex arménien Jérusalem 121*, PO 35–36, 2 vols. (Turnhout).
—— 1972, "Une version arménienne des catéchèses mystagogiques de Cyrille de Jérusalem?", *Le Muséon* 85, 147–153.

Riley, Hugh M., 1974, *Christian Initiation. A Comparative Study of the Interpretation of the Baptismal Liturgy in the Mystagogical Writings of Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Ambrose of Milan* (Washington).

Röwekamp, G., 1992, *Cyrill von Jerusalem. Mystagogicae Catecheses/Mystagogische Katechesen*, Fontes Christiani 7 (Freiburg).
—— 1998, "Cyrill von Jerusalem", *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur* (Freiburg/Basel/Wien), 152–153.

Rubin, Ze'ev, 1982, "The Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Conflict between the Sees of Caesarea and Jerusalem", in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *The Jerusalem Cathedra* 2 (Jerusalem/Detroit), 79–105.
—— 1996, "The See of Caesarea in Conflict with Jerusalem from Nicaea (325) to Chalcedon (451)", in: Kenneth G. Holum, Avner Raban (eds.), *Caesarea Maritima. A Retrospective after Two Millennia* (Leiden), 559–574.
—— 1999, "The Cult of the Holy Places and Christian Politics in Byzantine Jerusalem", in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York), 151–162.

Rudolph, Kurt, 1983, *Gnosis. The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (New York); trans. of *Die Gnosis. Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion* (Leipzig 1980).

Safrai, Shmuel, 1972, "The Holy Congregation in Jerusalem", *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 23, 62–78.

Safrai, Ze'ev, 1994, *The Economy of Palestine* (London/New York).

Saxer, Victor, 1996, "Cyrill von Jerusalem und die Heilige Schrift. Was er von ihr lehrt und wie er sie gebraucht", in: Georg Schöllgen, Clemens Scholten (eds.), *Stimuli. Exegese und ihre Hermeneutik in Antike und Christentum. Festschrift für Ernst Dassmann*, *JbAC* Ergänzungsband 23 (Münster), 344–356.

Schamp, J., 1987, "Gélase ou Rufin: un fait nouveau. Sur des fragments oubliés de Gélase de Césarée", *Byzantion* 57, 360–381.

Segal, Arthur, 1997, *From Function to Monument. Urban Landscapes of Roman Palestine, Syria and Provincia Arabia* (Oxford).

Simon, M., 1986, *Verus Israel. A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire (A.D. 135–425)* (Oxford); trans. of *Verus Israel. Étude sur les relations entre chrétiens er juifs dans l'empire romain (135–425)* (Paris 1964; 2nd ed.).

Smallwood, E.M., 1981, *The Jews under Roman Rule from Pompey to Diocletian. A Study in Political Relations* (Leiden; 2nd ed.).

Smith, Jonathan Z., 1987, *To Take Place. Toward Theory in Ritual* (Chicago).

Smith, Rowland, 1995, *Julian's Gods. Religion and Philosophy in the Thought and Action of Julian the Apostate* (London/New York).

Sotinel, Claire, 1998, "Le personnel épiscopal. Enquête sur la puissance de l'évêque dans la cité", in: Éric Rebillard, Claire Sotinel (eds.), *L'évêque dans la cité du IVe au Ve siècle. Image et autorité* (Rome), 105–126.

Staats, Reinhart, 1996, *Das Glaubensbekenntnis von Nizäa-Konstantinopel. Historische und theologische Grundlagen* (Darmstadt).

Stark, Rodney, 1996, *The Rise of Christianity. A Sociologist Reconsiders History* (Princeton).

Steidle, W., 1978, "Die Leichenrede des Ambrosius für Kaiser Theodosius und die Helena-Legende", *VC* 32, 94–112.

Stemberger, Günther, 2000, *Jews and Christians in the Holy Land. Palestine in the Fourth Century* (Edinburgh); rev. trans. of *Juden und Christen im Heiligen Land. Palästina unter Konstantin und Theodosius* (München 1987).

Stephenson, A.A., 1954, "The Lenten Catechetical Syllabus in Fourth-Century Jerusalem", *Theological Studies* 15, 103–116.

—— 1957, "St. Cyril of Jerusalem and the Alexandrian Christian Gnosis", *St. Patr.* 1, 142–156.

—— 1961, "The Text of the Jerusalem Creed", *St. Patr.* 3, 303–313.

—— 1972, "S. Cyril of Jerusalem's Trinitarian Theology", *St. Patr.* 11, 234–241.

Stockmeier, P., 1966, *Theologie und Kult des Kreuzes bei Johannes Chrysostomos. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Kreuzes im 4. Jahrhundert*, Trierer Theologische Studien 18 (Trier).

Stroumsa, G.G., 1988, "Vetus Israel. Les juifs dans la littérature hiérosolymitaine d'époque byzantine", *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 205, 115–131.

—— 1989, "Gnostics and Manichaeans in Byzantine Palestine", *St. Patr.* 18 (1), 273–278.

Sulzberger, M., 1925, "Le symbole de la croix et les monogrammes de Jésus chez les premiers chrétiens", *Byzantion* 2, 337–448.

Swaans, W.J., 1942, "À propos des 'catéchèses mystagogiques' attribuées à S. Cyrille de Jérusalem", *Le Muséon* 55, 1–43.

Talley, Thomas J., 1991, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year* (Collegeville).

Tanner, Norman P., 1990, *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, vol. 1, Nicaea I to Lateran V (London/Washington).

Taylor, Joan E., 1993, *Christians and the Holy Places. The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins* (Oxford).

—— 1998, "Golgotha: A Reconsideration of the Evidence for the Sites of Jesus' Crucifixion and Burial", *New Testament Studies* 44, 180–203.

Telfer, W., 1955, *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa*, The Library of Christian Classics 4 (London).

Teske, D., 1997, *Gregor von Nyssa. Briefe*, Bibliothek der griechischen Literatur 43 (Stuttgart).

Thelamon, F., 1981, *Païens et chrétiens au IVe siècle. L'apport de l'histoire ecclésiastique de Rufin d'Aquilée* (Paris).

Thiede, Carsten Peter and Matthew d'Ancona, 2000, *The Quest for the True Cross* (London)

Trombley, Frank R., 1993–94, *Hellenic Religion and Christianization c. 370–529*, 2 vols., Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 115 (Leiden).

Tsafrir, Yoram, 1998, "The Fate of Pagan Cult Places in Palestine: The Archaeological Evidence with Emphasis on Bet Shean", in: Hayim Lapin (ed.), *Religious and Ethnic Communities in Later Roman Palestine* (Bethesda), 197–218.

—— 1999, "Byzantine Jerusalem: The Configuration of a Christian City", in: Lee I. Levine (ed.), *Jerusalem. Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (New York), 133–150.

Tsafrir, Yoram, Leah de Segni and Judith Green, 1994, *Tabula Imperii Romani. Iudaea-Palaestina. Eretz Israel in the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Periods. Maps and Gazetteer* (Jerusalem).

Turner, C.H., 1900, "The Early Episcopal Lists II. The Jerusalem List", *JTS* 1, 529–553.

—— 1914, "Canons Attributed to the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381. Together with the Names of the Bishops, from two Patmos MSS", *JTS* 15, 161–178.

Van Ginkel, Jan J., 1995, *John of Ephesus. A Monophysite Historian in Sixth-Century Byzantium* (Diss. Groningen).

Van Nuffelen, Peter, 2001, "Deux fausses lettres de Julien l'Apostat", *VC* 56, 131–150.

Vogt, J., 1949, "Berichte über Kreuzeserscheinungen aus dem 4. Jahrhundert n. Chr.", *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 9 (= Mélanges Henri Grégoire I), 593–606.

Wainwright, Ph., 1986, "The Authenticity of the Recently Discovered Letter Attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem", *VC* 40, 286–293.

Walker, P.W.L., 1990, *Holy City, Holy Places? Christian Attitudes to Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the Fourth Century* (Oxford).

—— 1995, "Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the 4th Century", in: Anthony O'Mahony, Göran Gunner and Kevork Hintlian (eds.), *The Christian Heritage in the Holy Land* (London), 22–34.

Weiss, P., 2003, "The Vision of Constantine", *JRA* 16, 237–259; rev. trans. of "Die Vision Constantins", in: J. Bleicken (ed.), *Colloquium aus Anlass des 80. Geburtstages von Alfred Heuss* (Frankfurt 1993), 145–169.

Wharton, Annabel J., 1992, "The Baptistery of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem and the Politics of the Sacred Landscape", *DOP* 46, 313–325.

—— 1995, *Refiguring the Post Classical City. Dura Europos, Jerash, Jerusalem and Ravenna* (Cambridge).

—— 2000, "Erasure: Eliminating the Space of Late Ancient Judaism", *JRA* 13, 195–214.

Wilken, Robert L., 1983, *John Chrysostom and the Jews. Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London).

—— 1992, *The Land Called Holy. Palestine in Christian History and Thought* (New Haven/London).

Wilkinson, John, 1990, "Jewish Holy Places and the Origins of Christian Pilgrimage" in: Robert Ousterhout (ed.), *The Blessings of Pilgrimage* (Urbana/Chicago), 41–53.

—— 1999, *Egeria's Travels to the Holy Land* (Jerusalem/Warminster; 3rd edition).

Williams, Rowan, 1987, *Arius. Heresy and Tradition* (London).

Winkelmann, F., 1966, *Untersuchungen zur Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisereia*, Sitzungsberichte der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Jahrgang 65, Nr. 3 (Berlin).

—— 1966a, "Charakter und Bedeutung der Kirchengeschichte des Gelasios von Kaisereia", *Byzantinische Forschungen* 1, 346–385.

Winkler, Gabriele, 1978, "The Original Meaning of the Prebaptismal Anointing and its Implications", *Worship* 52, 24–45; repr. in idem, *Studies in Early Christian Liturgy and Its Context* (Aldershot 1997).

Witakowski, Witold, 2001, "Ethiopic and Hebrew Versions of the legend of *The Finding of the Holy Cross*", *St. Patr.* 35, 527–535.

Woods, David, 2002, "Eusebius on Some Constantinian Officials", *Irish Theological Quarterly* 67, 195–223.

Wright, W., 1870–72, *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum acquired since 1838*, 3 vols. (London).

Yarnold, E.J., 1975, "Did St Ambrose know the Mystagogic Catecheses of St Cyril of Jerusalem?", *St. Patr.* 12, 184–189.

—— 1978, "The Authorship of the Mystagogical Catecheses attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem", *Heythrop Journal* 19, 143–161.

—— 1981, "Cyrillos von Jerusalem", *TRE* 8, 261–266.

—— 1994, *The Awe-Inspiring Rites of Initiation. The Origins of the R.C.I.A.* (Collegeville).

—— 2000, *Cyril of Jerusalem* (London/New York).

Young, Frances M., 1983, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon. A Guide to the Literature and its Background* (London).

INDEX

JERUSALEM IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

F.D.2004

Bethesda

Damascus Gate

Gethsemane

cardo maximus

Temple Mount

Church of the
Holy Sepulchre

Statue of Hadrian

Forum

cardo   decumanus

Mount of Olives

Site of Camp
Legio X
Fretensis

House of Caiaphas

Sion

Siloam Pool

0   100   200 m

CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE

N

Anastasis

Martyrium

At the Cross

Baptistery

0   10   20 m