that the sites are not probable either for Calvary or the tomb. The hill in question, though not far outside the present north wall of the city, is at too great a distance from the probable line of the second wall, which was the outside line of fortification at the time of the crucifixion. The quarry, known as Jeremiah’s Grotto, is likely to be of later date than the third wall, which was built some years after the crucifixion, and the tomb identified as that of Christ has with good reason been attributed to the Christian rather than to the Jewish period. On the whole, therefore, the balance of argument is against the identification proposed by Thenius.

An entirely different theory regarding the site of the tomb of Christ was proposed by James Fergusson, the architect, who, in 1847, in his *Essay on the Ancient Topography of Jerusalem,* made the starth\*ng proposal that the Dome of the Rock, generally believed to have been erected by Abdalmalik (Abd el Melek) in A.D. 691, was the church built by the emperor Constantine over the Holy Sepulchre. He further elaborated his views in the interesting work entitled *The Temples of the Jews and other buildings in the Haram area at Jerusalem* (1878). Fergusson’s proposal, which found a considerable number of supporters, was based on architectural evidence, and he maintained that the building must have been designed in the time of Constantine and could not have been constructed by the Mahommedans at the end of the 7th century. Fergusson’s views were strongly supported by F. W. Unger in *Die Bauten Constantins des Grossen am Heiligen Grab zu Jerusalem,* published at Göttingen in 1863, but the objections to them on historical and topographical grounds are so considerable that they can hardly now be maintained. The theory involves placing the Temple of the Jews at the S. W. part of the Haram enclosure, and the explorations made by General Sir C. Warren showed conclusively that if the Temple had been in this position, it would have stood over the deepest part of the Tyropoeon Valley, and the foundations must have been of a most unnecessarily gigantic character. Sir C. Warren, in *The Temple and the Tomb,* 1880, replied *seriatim* to Fergusson’s proposals. The historical evidence also is entirely against the latter, and the discovery of the Madeba mosaic, which, as has been already explained, shows the church of the Holy Sepulchre in the same position as at present, is another proof that the latter was not placed by Constantine on Mount Moriah.

The final conclusion that may be arrived at with regard to the authenticity of the traditional site of the Holy Sepulchre is as follows. It may be taken as certain that the present site is that which was adopted by Macarius as the correct one early in the 4th century, but there is not sufficient evidence to prove that this tomb was the one in which the body of Christ was laid, or that remembrance of the latter bad been preserved during the three centuries that had elapsed between the time of the crucifixion and the conversion of Constantine. No other suggested site, however, has more claim to be the true one than that over which the church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands.

Literature.—By far the most important of the many works which have been published on the subject is *Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre,* by Sir C. W. Wilson (Palestine Exploration Fund, London, 1906). Sir C. Wilson was employed upon the Ordnance Survey of Jerusalem in 1864-1865, and made careful plans of the church of the Holy Sepulchre; ne had an extensive knowledge of the question, and his work forms a valuable index to the topographical and historical considerations which are involved. Among ancient writers, see Eusebius, *The Life of Constantine, The Praise of Constantine, Theo- phania;* Rufinus (a.d. 345-410), *Ecclesiastical History* ; Sulpicius Severus (a.d. 363-420), *Sacred History;* Sozomen (a.d. 375-450), *Ecclesiastical History;* Socrates *(circa* **A.D.** .379), *Ecclesiastical History.* The Publications of the Palestine Pilgrims’ Text Society contain a collection of translations of the records of pilgrims, who visited the Holy Places after the erection of Constantine’s churches; among these are included (the dates are approximate) : The Bordeaux Pilgrim, **A.D.** 333; St Sylvia, **A.D.** 385; Eucherius, **A.D.** 440; Theodosius, **A.D.** 530; Antoninus Martyr, a.D. 530; Arculfus, **A.D.** 630; Willibald, **A.D.** 754; Bernard the Wise, a.p. 870; Saewulf, a.d. 1102; Burchard of Mount Sion, **A.D.** 1283; Ludolph von Suchern, **A.D.** 1350; Felix Fabri, **A.D.** 1483. Among the writers of the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries, see J. Gretzer, *Omnia opera* (Ingoldstadt, 1598) ; F. Quaresmius, *Historica*, *theologica et moralis Terrae Sanctae*

*elucidatio* (Antwerp, 1639); T. Fuller, *A Pisgah Sight of Palestine* (London, 1650); B. de Monconys, *Journal des voyages* (Paris, 1665); A. Bynœus, *De morte Jesu Christi* (Amsterdam, 1698); J. Korte, *Reise nach dem weiland Gelobten Lande* (2nd ed., Altona, 1743) ; J. F. Plessing, *Über Golgotha und Christi Grab* (Halle, 1789). Of the numerous writers of the 19th century some of the more important are: E. D. Clarke, *Travels in the Holy Land* (Cambridge, 1823); F. R. de Chateaubriand, *Itinéraire de Paris à Jerusalem* (Paris, 1837) ; E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine* (London, 1841 and 1856); O. Thenius, “Golgatha et Sanctum Sepulchrum ” in *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie* (1842); J. Fergusson, *The Ancient Topography of Jerusalem* (London, 1847), *The Holy Sepul­chre and the Temple* (1865), *The Temples of the Jews* (1878); G. Williams, *The Holy City* (2nd ed., London, 1849); Hayter Lewis, *The Holy Places of Jerusalem* (London, 1888) ; J. T. Barclay, *The City of the Great King* (1857); F. Bovet, *Voyage en Terre Sainte* (Paris, 1862); F. W. Unger, *Die Bauten Constantins des Grossen am Heiligen Grabe zu Jerusalem* (Göttingen, 1863); General Sir C. Warren, G.C.M.G., *The Recovery of Jerusalem* (London, 1871), *The Temple and the Tomb* (1880); Colonel C. R. Conder, R.E., *Handbook to the Bible* (London, 1887); General C. G. Gordon, C.B., *Reflections in Palestine* (London, 1884); C. Clermont Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine* (London, 1899); C. Mommert, *Golgatha und das Heilige Grab zu Jerusalem* (Leipzig, 1900). See also articles in *The Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund;* Hasting’s *Dictionary of the Bible\*,* Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible\*, Recueil d'archéologie orientale; Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.* A large scale plan of the church of the Holy Sepulchre forms part of the *Survey of Jerusalem,* published by the Ordnance Survey, Southampton. (C. M. W.)

SEQUANI, in ancient geography, a Celtic people who occupied the upper basin of the Arar (Saône), their territory corresponding to Franche-Comté and part of Burgundy. Before the arrival of Caesar in Gaul, the Sequani had taken the part of the Arverni against their rivals the Aedui and hired the Germans under Ariovistus to cross the Rhine and help them (71 b.c.). But although his assistance enabled them to defeat the Aedui, the Sequani were worse off than before, for Ariovistus deprived them of a third of their territory and threatened to take another third. The Sequani then appealed to Caesar, who drove back the Germans (58), but at the same time obliged the Sequani to surrender all that they had gained from the Aedui. This so exasperated the Sequani that they joined in the revolt of Vercingetorix (52) and shared in the defeat at Alesia. Under Augustus, the district known as Sequania formed part of Belgica.∙ After the death of Vitellius, the inhabitants refused to join the Gallic revolt against Rome instigated by Julius Civilis and Julius Sabinus, and drove back Sabinus, who had invaded their territory. A triumphal arch at Vesontio (Besançon), which in return for this service was made a colony, possibly commemorates this victory. Diocletian added Helvetia, and part of Germania Superior to Sequania, which was now called Provincia maxima Sequanorum, Vesontio receiving the title of Metropolis civitas Vesontiensium. Fifty years later Gaul was overrun by the barbarians, and Vesontio sacked (355). Under Julian it recovered some of its importance as a fortified town, and was able to withstand the attacks of the Vandals. Later, when Rome was no longer able to afford protection to the inhabitants of Gaul, the Sequani became merged in the newly formed kingdom of Burgundy.

See T. R. Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (1899), p. 483; A. Holder, *Altceltischer Sprachschatz,* ii. (1904); Mommsen, *Hist. of Rome* (Eng. trans.), bk. v. ch. vii.; Dunod de Charnage, *Hist. des Séquanois* (1735); J. D. Schöpflin, *Alsatia illustrata,* i. (1751; French trans. by L. W. Ravenèz, 1849).

SEQUEIRA, DOMINGO ANTONIO DE (1768-1837), Portuguese painter, was born at Lisbon in 1768, and studied art first at the academy of Lisbon, and subsequently under A. Cavallucci in Rome. By the age of thirteen he had evinced such marked talent that F. de Setubal employed him as assistant in his work for the Joao Ferreiras Palace. Sequeira sojourned in Rome from 1788 to 1794, when he was made honorary member of the Academy of St Luke. After another two years’ travel and study in Italy, he returned to his native country preceded by so great a reputa­tion that important commissions for churches and palaces were immediately entrusted to him—scriptural subjects, large historical compositions and cabinet pictures. In 1802 he was appointed first court painter, in which capacity he executed many works