My recent visit to Žiča gave me the opportunity to visit the cemetery chapel/ossuary, in the immediate vicinity of the monastery but outside its precinct. The church is known to have been built on earlier structural remains which have aroused little interest in the researchers of not only Žiča but also of the medieval Serbian religious heritage in general. The remains being of particular relevance to the study of medieval monastic burial practices and monastic communities in general, we have revisited the available data in the attempt to shed some light on the former appearance and purpose of this church. An important goal of this research is to look at this form of burial in the wider context of medieval monastic burial practices.

The remains of Žiča’s ossuary chapel, situated about 500 m southwest of the monastery, on a site originally quite near, and presently about a kilometre away from the right bank of the Ibar river, were uncovered in the summer of 1938 at the instigation of Bishop Nicholas (Velimirović). Preserved barely above ground level and buried under piles of stones and demolition debris, the remains had long lain hidden in the dense shrubbery of the young oak forest and practically had gone unnoticed by earlier explorers. The excavation was carried out by unskilled labour without any expert guidance, which resulted in the loss of a variety of data obtainable during a professionally led excavation. Luckily invited to visit the site, the architect Aleksandar Deroko made...
Fig. 1. Funerary church at Žiča: a) plan above floor level; b) plan below floor level; c) longitudinal section; d) cross-section (after Deroko 1939)

Сл. 1. Гробна црква у Жичи: a) основа изnad Јоха; b) основа исход равни Јоха; c) Јошени јпресек; d) Јошени јпресек (према: Deroko 1938)
detailed technical drawings of the remains and noted down his observations, which he subsequently published.³

The church was an elongated rectangle in plan, extending into a spacious eastern apse of equal width (fig. 1). Measured externally, it was 19 m long by 7.89 m wide. The remains consisted of foundations with some remnants of the longitudinal above-ground walls preserved to a height of one to two courses of stone. The foundations, undoubtedly sunk into virgin soil with no traces of earlier construction, were exposed to a depth of 1 m, at places to 1.50 m. The foundation walls were in a good state of preservation, except for the portion of the west wall where the door is expected to be, which had apparently been pulled down during the unearthing. The thickness of the foundations was quite even, about 1 m (ca 3.5 ft). The space below the floor level was also partitioned by foundation walls. A partition separated the apse from the nave, where two longitudinal walls spaced 1.30 m apart formed ten compartments or chambers, five on the northern and five on the southern side. All chambers were built in the same way and were of the same size, 1.40 m wide and 2 m long west to east. The upper corners of every chamber wall were cut out, forming a groove about 0.10 m wide and 0.20–0.25 m high, obviously for fitting the slabs that would have served as lids covering the chambers flush with the church floor level. The depth of the chambers to the slab was about 0.75 m, or about 1 m to the floor surface. None of the slabs was found, but A. Deroko noted that the demolition debris contained fragments of white marble slabs. No traces of flooring were observed at the bottom of the chambers.⁴

All foundation walls, including the partitions, were built of large river boulders with the ample use of white lime mortar. The boulders and the inner surfaces of the chamber walls were rather roughly hewn. There is little information enabling inferences to be made about the appearance and the building method used for the upper part of the structure. The barely surviving remnants of the above-ground walls indicated crude construction. The demolition debris reportedly did not contain any fragments of brick or fresco plaster. The composition of the debris suggested that the above-ground structure had served as a source of building material, i.e. that the above-ground structure can only be a matter of conjecture. There should be no doubt that it was a chapel where memorial services were held. It probably had a wooden roof support, even though a vault over the nave or a semi-dome over the apse cannot be ruled out either.

At the time the remains of the chapel were unearthed, its original structural design, and to an extent its function,⁵ remained somewhat unclear, and so did its relationship to the monastery and, especially, its date. Deroko believed that the shape of its plan resembled “baroque-style churches in Vojvodina”, and that it might date “from the time of Bishop Janja” (Ioannikios Nešković) or the mid-nineteenth century. Such a late dating, set forth without closer analysis, has turned the attention of the subsequent researchers away from the remains, which is one reason why they are virtually unknown even today.⁷ Another reason was the fact that Bishop Nicholas had a new structure built on the unearthed massive foundation walls, thereby restoring its significance as a consecrated place. The new construction observation made by Deroko, however, is that the skeletons he saw had been laid down “head towards the east”, i.e. on a west-east axis, or in the anatomic position. This seems to suggest that the chambers were not originally intended as bone depositories, i.e. for secondary burial. Yet, since the reburial of bones was a widespread practice in monastic communities, such use of the chambers cannot be completely ruled out. At any rate, the reported description of the skeletons as well as the type and size of the chambers, which are better described as tombs, suggest that they served as primary burial places. Given their width, they were apparently intended for multiple burials. The spacious semicircular apse showed no indication of a disturbance of the soil, which suggests that it was not intended for burial.

Unlike the subterranean part of the church, which is perfectly clear from the surviving foundation walls, the above-ground structure can only be a matter of conjecture. There should be no doubt that it was a chapel where memorial services were held. It probably had a wooden roof support, even though a vault over the nave or a semi-dome over the apse cannot be ruled out either.

³ Deroko 1939, 105–108.
⁴ Deroko 1939, 105.
⁵ Ibid. The amount of disarticulated bones found in the burial chambers during a renovation of the church that was built on the uncovered remains of the earlier funerary church in 1938 was considerably smaller. For this information, we are thankful to the architect V. Vučković, who oversaw the renovation carried out sometime around 1980.
⁶ Deroko 1939, 107.
Fig. 2. Funerary chapel at Studenica of Hvosno: plan and sections
(after field records kept at the Institute for Art History, Belgrade)

Сл. 2. Гробна црква у Студеници Хвоснанској: основа и пресеци
(према теренској документацији из Института за истраживање уметности у Београду)
involved lowering the ground level down to the foot-
ing on the west side and partially in the space between
the two parallel walls in the interior. In this way a sort of
a corridor to the altar was formed, whereby the original
appearance of the building was considerably altered.

Before embarking upon an analysis of the church
in a bid to establish the date of its construction and the
length of its use, relying on the known analogies and
written sources, one particular analogy, which has also
remained virtually unknown and understudied, should
be mentioned. It was discovered within the complex of
the ruined monastery of Studenica of Hvosno (Studeni-
ca Hvostanska) about ten kilometres east of Pec in the
north of Metohija, Province of Kosovo. The monastery,
ravaged and abandoned in the late seventeenth century,
reached our times levelled to the ground. It had been
systematically dismantled by local Albanian popula-
tion using it as a source of building material. The first
excavations carried out in the early 1930s discovered
what had been left of the walls of the church of the
younger monastery, which was dated to the first half of
the thirteenth century.8 A much more extensive inves-
tigation covering most of the complex was undertaken
between 1965 and 1970.9 The walls could only parti-
tially be traced, because most of them had disappeared
in repeated demolitions. Unlike the remains of the walls,
which were thoroughly explored and recorded, archae-
ological stratigraphy was largely neglected, which now
makes it difficult to identify and date the obviously
multiple phases of construction.10

As a more detailed look at these remains goes be-
yond the scope of this paper, we shall only dwell on the
basic stratigraphic data of interest to our topic. Chro-
nologically the oldest discovery was the late antique
rampart recorded only in the northern portion of the site.
In the middle of the complex were traces of a three-
aisled basilica and its annexes, and in its immediate
vicinity, to the north, the walls of a one-aisle church.
On that side, a section of a later enclosing wall with a
gate was unearthed, traces of which were also found in
its uncovered remains. It was built in the area between
the demolished late antique rampart and the northern
section of the later enclosing wall of the monastery
complex. Judging by the remains of this later wall,
1.30–1.40 m (4.5 ft) thick, it was solidly built of rough-
ly hewn stones and bricks laid in courses.13 Parts of it
were torn down to build the refectory and the dorter of
the younger monastery.14 It was somewhat better pre-
served only in the section adjacent to the funerary
building and further to the northeast, where the gate
was located.

The solidly built and quite well-preserved under-
ground space of the funerary building was sunk into the
ground next to the outer face of the northern section of
the enclosing wall, more precisely, in the space between
the late antique rampart and this wall.15 It was laid on
a west-east axis on an elongated rectangular plan with an
oblong apse at the east end (fig. 2). The internal
dimensions were 13.35 m (ca 44 ft) in length and
4.30–4.40 m (ca 13 ft) in width. It was accessed from the
northwest by a partially vaulted 1.25 m wide pas-
sageway with a few steps. The underground room or

8 Smirnov, Bošković 1936, 47–82.
10 The excavations on the site were carried out without archae-
ologists. On a single occasion, in 1967, an archaeologist of the
National Museum in Belgrade was engaged for the excavation of
burials. The small finds, mostly potsherds, were processed as indi-
vidual finds without reference to stratigraphic contexts. The pro-
cessing was carried out by M. Bajalovic Hadži-Pešić, see: Korac
11 Korac 1976, 42, fig. 4.
12 Korac 1976, 43–56, fig. 5.
13 Korac 1976, 34.
15 The presentation of the excavation results contains the obser-
vation that the enclosing wall overlay the wall of the funerary build-
ing (Korac 1976, 35). A close examination of the field records and
photographs seems to suggest otherwise. The subterranean burial
crypt was built in an excavation which had exposed the foundations
of the existing enclosing wall so that in some places the two wall
masses touched or were bonded together. Therefore, the possibility
that they were constructed simultaneously should not be ruled out.
crypt was divided into three unequal bays by two pairs of pilasters supporting the reinforcing arches. The narrowest western bay was as wide as the passageway. The crypt with about 0.75 m (2.5 ft) thick walls was covered with a barrel vault, of which a good part survived. The oblong apse was also barrel vaulted. The lower portions of the walls were built of rough-hewn stones and mortar mixed with crushed brick, while the upper zones, the pilasters and the vault were built of bricks laid in horizontal courses with thick mortar joints. The brickwork in the vault of the central bay was different and reminiscent of a groin vault. The apex of the vault was at a height of about 2.60 m from the former floor level. The wall surfaces were smoothed and coated with a 2–3 mm thick layer of finer plaster showing no traces of frescoes. The passageway steps were also coated with plaster.

Under the entire floor of the crypt were burial chambers. They were arranged in five rows of about six tombs each, which is to say that there were about thirty in all. All were oblong in plan, orientated west to east, 1.80–2 m long, about 0.50 m wide and about 0.45 m deep. In the oblong apse, a similar chamber adjoined a larger chamber, 1.95 m by 1.70 m. The chambers were separated from one another by thin walls built of smaller stones and fragmented bricks. Their bottoms were coated with plaster mixed with crushed brick, and on some of their walls traces of a finer finish with the same type of plaster were observable. The chambers had been covered with stone slabs. None of them were found, but their imprints were observable in the remaining plaster on the side walls. The crypt was filled with debris containing a large amount of stones and fragmented bricks as well as collapsed blocks of the vault. The chambers contained disarticulated skeletal remains “heaped up in a disorderly manner”, and no goods. As they were not subjected to anthropological examination, not even an approximate estimate can be made of the number of interred bodies, and neither are there any field observations which would be helpful in drawing any reliable conclusions about the funerary building.

What may be reliably concluded from the discovered remains is that the chambers were used for primary burial, which suggests that the crypt was not intended as an ossuary. Over the long period of burial a part of it may have been used for the secondary burial of bones. The abovementioned chamber in the apse, considerably larger than the rest, may have served the same purpose. The question remains open as to how the above-ground part of the building looked like. We may assume that it was a funerary chapel whose south side abutted the outer face of the enclosing wall of the monastery. Its floor level may be quite reliably established in relation to the upper plane of the apex of the vault of the crypt and the sill of the nearby gate in the enclosing wall, which are at about the same relative elevation. It may have been a chapel with a single aisle, a semicircular eastern apse and a door at the west end.

Unlike the structural remains that offer basic information about the structural makeup and the presumed appearance of this building, which may be described as a two-level funerary chapel, its date and the complex of which it formed part pose a more complex problem. During the excavations, the remains were clearly identified and thoroughly explored of the younger monastery complex, the one created after the 1220s, when Studenica of Hvosno was an episcopal see of the Serbian Church. The poorly preserved earlier remains, obviously belonging to several building phases, were much more difficult to identify with precision. What could be reliably identified as the earliest phase was the late antique rampart, but there was no clue as to whether it had been in use at the time of the construction of the three-aisled basilica, which was roughly dated to the fifth/sixth century. The fate of the basilica prior to the second period of Byzantine rule over Metohija in the reign of Emperor Basil II (r. 976–1025) remains an open question. In the early eleventh century the area of Hvosno formed part of the Bishopric of Prizren under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Ohrid. This may be the time when the religious function of the site was restored and the monastery dedicated to the Mother of God founded, the one known to have been there at the time the area of Hvosno was incorporated into the Serbian realm in the late twelfth century. It may be assumed, although there is no material evidence to prove it, that the earlier basilica was then renovated to serve as
the *katholikon* of the new monastery. In the eleventh/twelfth century a smaller oblong church was built north of it. It had a narthex apparently connecting it with the renovated basilica.\(^{21}\) It was undoubtedly then that the enclosing wall whose traces were unearthed on the north side and in a number of trial trenches was also built.\(^{22}\) Apart from a cistern, residences belonging to the earlier monastery could not be identified among the discovered structural remains. Despite the meagre archaeological remains and the dearth of written sources, the important role of the monastery in the centuries following the restoration of Byzantine rule may be surmised indirectly. It is indicated by the events that took place between the capture of the area of Hvosno by Stefan Nemanja in the 1180s and the establishing of the autocephalous Serbian Archbishopric in 1219. The monastery of the Mother of God in Hvosno was certainly an important ecclesiastical centre referred to in connection with momentous events in Serbian history. For instance, it was there that the relics of Stefan Nemanja, who had died as monk Simeon on Mount Athos, were solemnly greeted on their way to their final resting place at the monastery of Studenica. They were brought back to the “fatherland” by Nemanja’s son, Sava/Sabas of Serbia, in his attempt to reconcile his quarrelling brothers and put an end to the civil war in Serbia.\(^{23}\) It cannot be a coincidence, then, that in the early 1220s this ancient and obviously distinguished monastery became the seat of a newly-established diocese of the autocephalous Serbian Archbishopric of Hvosno.\(^{24}\)

The monastery’s importance in the period before the founding of the bishopric and the construction of the younger church provides the context for the creation of the funerary chapel. It undoubtedly was a two-level chapel outside the monastic enclosure intended for the burial of monks. It apparently was built at the same time as or shortly after the enclosing wall, the construction of which may have been chronologically close to the founding of the monastery. A solidly-built funerary chapel must have had an important place among the religious buildings of the community in Hvosno. The tombs in its crypt were intended for single primary burials. It is not impossible that after a certain number of years the tombs were used for new interment, as masonry tombs usually were. The number of buried persons remains unknown, because no anthropological analysis was undertaken at the time of the excavation. Nor is there any indication of how long it was in use. From what the stratigraphy of the later buildings suggests, it appears that the chapel and the enclosing wall fell in disuse or were partially torn down at the time of the construction of the church and other buildings of the younger monastery complex, i.e. after the 1210s.

The virtually unknown remains of the funerary chapels at Zića and Studenica of Hvosno are examples of a monastic burial practice which has been attested in a single but well-known case in the Byzantine cultural orbit: the monastery of Bachkovo near Plovdiv, Bulgaria. This monastery, formerly known as the Holy Mother of God Petritzionitissa, was founded in 1083 by Gregory Pakourianos, a Byzantine high-ranking military official (*megas domestikos* of the West) of Georgian-Armenian descent. He primarily intended his foundation for the monks of Georgian origin. Apart from the *katholikon*, the space enclosed by strong walls contained two smaller churches dedicated to St. John the Forerunner and St. George respectively, as well as a number of other buildings. The original churches, believed to have been built in the Caucasian tradition, i.e. in the architectural tradition of Georgia and Armenia, have not survived.\(^{25}\) What survives of the original complex is the funerary chapel, “kostnitza”, about 300 m east of the monastic enclosure. It is a two-level one-aisle barrel-vaulted building 21.20 m long by 7.30 m wide (fig. 3). At its west end there is a two-level, originally open, narthex. The interior on both levels is decorated with frescoes generally associated with its funerary function.\(^{26}\) The worship area on the upper level, accessed from the south due to the configuration of the terrain, was built of dressed stones alternated with thin bricks. The lower, semi-sunken level, which served as a monastic burial crypt, was built more modestly, mostly from rough-hewn stones.\(^{27}\) Beneath its floor are fourteen oblong burial chambers arranged in three rows and orientated west to east. Their depth is about 1.60 m. They were originally covered with stone slabs. This lower level of the Bachkovo chapel has been unfailingly interpreted as the monastery’s ossuary, which no doubt was its basic function.\(^{28}\) This is suggested by the

\(^{21}\) Korać 1976, 71–85, figs. 157 and 158.
\(^{22}\) Korać 1976, 41–42, fig. 4.
\(^{23}\) Popović, D. 2006, 232–252 (with the sources).
\(^{24}\) Janković 1979, 73–83.
\(^{25}\) Bakalova 2003, 11–23.
\(^{26}\) Bakalova 2003, 59–115.
\(^{27}\) Bakalova 1997, 36.
Fig. 3. Bachkovo ossuary: plans of the church and the crypt, and longitudinal section (Čurčić 2010, 393, fig. 427)

Сл. 3. Бачковска космурница: основа цркве, основа крипте и Јондужени пресек (Čurčić 2010, 393, fig. 427)
size of the chambers, obviously intended for the deposition of the bones disinterred from the monastery’s cemetery. Their arrangement, however, resembles the tombs intended for single burials. It may be assumed that the ossuary was modelled on a funerary chapel, probably Constantinopolitan, whose crypt contained burial chambers for single, primary burials. The attempts to elucidate the architectural and functional origin of the Bachkovo chapel or ossuary which, taken as a whole, has no close analogies, have given rise to various hypotheses, but the definitive answer has not been found. Its potential source has usually been looked for in earlier Armenian architecture, but it has also been observed that it displays an archaic design closer to Early Christian two-level mausoleums. It has even been suggested that the design may have been influenced by builders acquainted with the architectural tradition of the First Bulgarian Empire. Researchers attempting to draw more reliable conclusions have at their disposal a small number of surviving examples, for the most part in Constantinople and in what was the core area of the Byzantine Empire.

Precious information for the study of the places and forms of monastic burial at the time when some of the abovementioned buildings were constructed is offered by the typika of the eleventh/twelfth century. Laying down the rules for his foundation, the monastery of the Mother of God Kosmosoteira in Bera, eastern Thrace (1152), sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos expressly forbade the interment of the monks within the monastic enclosure, and stipulated that they be buried in a cemetery outside the monastery intended for the monks only, where he also intended to have a funerary chapel built. In the closing part of the typikon, he explained his decision, which deserves to be quoted in its entirety: I did want for these godly men to be interred inside the enclosure of the monastery, out of reverence toward them, and to honor their dead in a more personal way. But since this area, that is within the circuit wall, is almost completely taken up by the church and the houses needed by the monks, and there is not fitting or agreeable place left over in it for the bodies of the dead, I changed my mind about burying them inside it. A monastic burial site outside the enclosure, with a funerary chapel, was envisaged in the typikon for the monastery of the Mother of God ton Heliou Bomon in Bithynia, not far from present-day Bursa near the Sea of Marmara. After the prayer service in the exonarthex of the church, the body of the deceased was to be carried to the burial place with the bier and let it be buried in the tombs of the monks on the right side, that is, of the church, in which the brothers alone must be buried, no one of those from the outside being buried with them.

The rules regulating monastic interment were of particular importance in urban settings, especially Constantinople. The typikon for the Pantokrator monastery provided for the burial of the monks at its dependency, the monastery of Medikariou, which had a graveyard with a chapel. A rule providing for monastic burial can also be found in the typikon for the monastery of the Mother of God Kecharitomene in Constantinople dating from the 1110s. Its founder, Empress Irene, wife of Alexis I Komnenos, states that there is no room for the burial of nuns within the monastery and provides for it at the convent called Ta Kellarias, formerly owned by the Ecumenical Patriarchate. After the prayer service, the body of the nun should be transported to the convent of the Mother of God Ta Kellarias with the bier carried either by her sister nuns or by the female servants as many of the nuns following her as the superior orders. She is to be buried in the tombs of the nuns, where only the nuns who practice the religious life in the convent of my Mother of God Kecharitomene must be buried.

These excerpts from typika of the eleventh/twelfth century clearly speak of the rule for monastic burial not to be performed within the monastery enclosure but in a specified, usually nearby place. As the typikon for the Monastery of the Mother of God Kosmosoteira quite clearly shows, the reasons behind such practice were of a practical nature. On the other hand, the design of such burial places was not uniform. For instance, Isaac Komnenos chose a walled monastic cemetery with a small chapel in the middle. In other cases, it was a funerary church, as a rule with a crypt containing burial chambers surmounted by a chapel where memorial services were held. In the case of large and distinguished monasteries, such as the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople, the funerary chapel was tended by monks especially appointed to the task. The

29 Grabar 1968, 889.
34 BMFD, vol. 2, 766.
crypt of a funerary chapel could have been used for the primary burial of monks in individual tombs, as some Constantinopolitan typika appear to indicate. An unquestionable example of such practice is offered by the already described remains of the funerary chapel of the monastery of the Mother of God of Hvosno and, in a way, by the original funerary chapel at Žiča. Yet, the best preserved representative of a frescoed two-level funerary church with a crypt for monastic burial is the “kostnitza” of Bachkovo. As we have seen, the crypt contains as many as fourteen chambers whose arrangement resembles the tombs for individual burial, but whose structure, and especially size, suggest that they were intended for secondary burial. A representative example of a two-level chapel with an ossuary is the funerary chapel of the Daphni monastery near Athens, some hundred metres east of the enclosure (fig. 4). Its lower level, whose plan shows three equal bays, contains six above-ground burial chambers 3 m by 3 m built between the pilasters.37 The chambers served for the secondary burial of the bones disinterred usually three to five years after the primary interment. The upper level served as a chapel where memorial services were held.38

This practice of monastic burial in funerary ossuary chapels has continued into our times in the monasteries of Mount Athos, where chapels with an ossuary exhibit various designs. One of the best examples is the cemetery chapel of the Annunciation at the monastery of Hilandar, which is thought to have been built in the fourteenth century at the latest. It is a two-level chapel some hundred metres north of the monastic enclosure. Its upper level functions as a chapel, and the lower, semi-sunken one, as a crypt with an ossuary. The lower room is oblong in plan and has along the longer walls four large pilasters which form five niches on each side. At the bottom of each niche is a rectangular opening providing access to a spacious burial chamber (fig. 5). In accordance with the usual practice, the body is first buried in the small graveyard around the church of the Annunciation. After a period of time, the remains are disinterred and the bones deposited in one of the subterranean chambers, while the skull is deposited in the ossuary.39

Monastic burial practices in the jurisdictional area of the autocephalous Serbian Church are still insufficiently known. Even the first attempt to compare what we know of medieval monastic burial practices, notably in the areas of the Byzantine Empire, reveals a considerable difference between the Serbian and Byzantine practices. The typikon for Studenica, which was observed by most Serbian monasteries, contains no provisions relating to a monastery burial ground. There is a section on how to chant and perform the memorial service [panahida], instructing about the rite and prayers, but without specifying the place of burial.40 The reason becomes clear if we remember that Sava of Serbia, in laying down the typika for the foundations of his father, Simeon Nemanja, largely drew on the typikon for the Constantinopolitan monastery of the Mother of God Evergetis, which does not contain such provisions.41

That the medieval Serbian monasteries had no fixed rules regulating monastic burial is also suggested by

38 For more on this issue see: Babić 1969, 40–47.
40 Sveti Sava, 41–96; see Babić 1969, 50–55.
the research done so far. The monks were usually buried around the main church. At Studenica, it was mostly the area in front of the katholikon and in the southern part of the enclosure. It appears that the area in front of the church was intended for the abbots. The graves of the first two abbots, Ignatios and Dionysios, abutted to the southern foundation wall of the church, exactly opposite the tomb of the founder, Simeon Nemanja, buried in the western bay of the church. In view of the documented burial of Abbot Simeon in the same area in 1570, this practice seems to have been observed even later. A quite distinct example is the grave of the first abbot of the monastery of Sopočani, who was buried in a tomb surmounted by a pseudo-sarcophagus in the southwest corner of the narthex.

There is no reliable evidence for medieval monastic cemeteries outside the monastic enclosures. Judging by some considerably later documentary source materials, the possibility that the large medieval monasteries had such cemeteries cannot be ruled out. An eighteenth-century copper engraving of Studenica (1733) shows a cemetery with the now gone funerary church of All Saints to the south of the monastic enclosure. An engraving of Dečani made towards the end of the first half of the eighteenth century also shows a graveyard to the southwest of the enclosure. It has been explored recently, but there is no reliable evidence for establishing its date and length of use. So far the existence of funerary chapels or ossuaries belonging to medieval Serbian monasteries has not been attested, and neither has the practice of reburying the disinterred bones in a collective ossuary.

The exploration of some monastic enclosures has shown that the burial ground around the katholikon was not exclusively reserved for monks. Fully reliable conclusions are as yet impossible to draw given that none of the monastic burial grounds has been systematically explored. The available results show that these churchyards were in use for several centuries, which makes it difficult to distinguish earlier burials from later ones, dating from periods when lay people from

---

43 Radan-Jovin, Janković, Temerinski 1988, 45–49.
44 Popović, D. 1992, 68.
45 Car 1988, 276.
46 Popović, Hadžić 2012, 81.
local communities were also buried in the monastery churchyards. Some information about the persons buried within monastic enclosures is offered by the epigraphic material from the rare surviving gravestones of the fourteenth and fifteenth century. Most of the inscriptions on the fragmented grave slabs from the monastery of Sopočani refer to the departed monks. Some of them had been members of the nobility who took monastic vows and hence their secular names and titles in the inscriptions, such as monk Thomas, born as Borislav, “protovestiarios of all the Serbian and Greek lands”. All gravestones recovered from the churchyard of the monastery of Gradac also marked the graves of monks. The only exception is the gravestone inscription of an anonymous noblewoman, the wife of “vojvoda Bratoslav Humljadin [of Hum]”. A somewhat more complex picture of the practice is offered by the churchyard of the katholikon of Studenica dedicated to the Mother of God, which has only been partially explored within a conservation works project. The surviving inscriptions suggest that the numerous grave slabs discovered so far marked monastic burials. However, among a few graves discovered during the conservation works around the church of St. Nicholas in the southeast portion of the enclosure, two were quite distinctive. They abutted to the northern wall of the narthex and contained grave goods, notably jewellery, suggesting the graves of noblewomen. Yet another female burial was discovered south of the church. Its gravestone of fine craftsmanship bore the inscription: God’s slave Anastasia. The observation that the grave had been opened by tomb raiders implies that it had been expected to contain jewellery. The widely accepted assumption that it was the grave of a nun should certainly be reconsidered. Moreover, all circumstances indicate that it was the grave of a noblewoman, which, along with other examples, raises the important question as to who else other than the monks or nuns could have been entitled to be buried within a monastic enclosure. This question will be discussed in more detail in another place, using the case study of Studenica.

The burial of lay persons in monastic churchyards was apparently a privilege granted only by exception. The already mentioned typika of the eleventh/twelfth century expressly stipulate that only the monks or nuns of the respective monastery be buried in the monastery’s graveyard. That there were exceptions to this quite strict rule may be seen from the provision of the typikon for the monastery of the Mother of God Kosmosoteira by which the ktetor bans the burial of lay persons, with one exception: I absolutely do not want a single one or more of the people – unless perhaps someone who is very rich wants to be buried outside the church and its narthex, someone who, in exchange for burial in the monastery, will bring many movable and immovable possessions to add to its revenue. The “absolute” ban obviously did not apply to the powerful members of nobility capable of offering a generous compensation, “movable and immovable possessions”, for the privilege of being buried in the monastery’s consecrated ground. In the case of royal foundations, such a privilege could also be granted by the royal founder or his successors.

Let us now revert to the question of monastic burial at Žiča, which has inspired our research in the first place. The archaeological examination carried out in 1988–92 was focused on the katholikon dedicated to the Saviour. Its interior and the area of about three metres in radius around the church were systematically explored. Nearly 200 burials were discovered around the church and in the exonarthex, but none in the church itself. Most of them have been dated to a later burial phase, i.e. to the eighteenth century and early decades of the nineteenth, when the local population also used the abandoned monastic precinct for burial. These new burials considerably disturbed the earlier monastic graves. It was also established that almost all graves in the exonarthex were of a later date, but the question has remained unanswered as to whether some of the articulated skeletons belonged to an earlier phase. The only recorded burial inside the church and the original narthex is the masonry tomb of Archbishop Eustathios I (Jevstatije), who was buried in 1286. The side chapels contain masonry tombs dated to the second half of the nineteenth century and no earlier burials.

Even though our information on the burials around the katholikon of Žiča is scanty, some observations can

---

51 Popović, D. 1988, 498–499, fig. 11 (with the earlier literature).
53 Popović, M. forthcoming.
54 BMFD, vol. 2, 837.
be deduced from the archaeological record. There was around the main church an older monastic burial ground, as was the case in other monasteries of medieval Serbia. This older horizon of burials, which were for the most part destroyed or disturbed and as a rule without grave goods, is difficult to date with any precision. Only one of them yielded coins of Prince Lazar (r. 1371–89), documenting the oldest layer of burials around the church. The find of coins of King Sigismund of Hungary (r. 1387–1437) probably also came from a disturbed grave. To this period, roughly the fourteenth century or early decades of the fifteenth, would also belong the rare fragments of thin grave slabs of white marble. One of them bears a part of the inscription referring to a buried monk. These archaeological finds are reliable evidence that monastic burials were performed around the katholikon of Žiča during the fourteenth century and undoubtedly later too. As for burial prior to this period, there is no reliable archaeological evidence.

The recorded remains of the funerary church open up the possibility for shedding more light on the earliest phase of Žiča when it comes to monastic burial. There are no surviving documents relating to the organisation of the community of the monastery that was the seat of the Archbishopric. It seems likely that Sava of Serbia, the creator of many aspects of the Žiča monastery, would have laid down the rules for monastic burial, but since the typikon for Žiča has not survived, this remains an open question. In view of Žiča’s distinctive role, the rules of that typikon would not necessarily have been identical to the typika for other royal Serbian foundations. It may be assumed therefore that, unlike the typika for Hilandar and Studenica which make no mention of monastic graveyards, the typikon for Žiča might have specified the rules for monastic burial. It is almost certain that in this early period burial within the monastery enclosure was not permitted. The reasons could have been practical because the monastic complex was relatively small due to the configuration of the terrain. Apart from the usual monastic buildings, it undoubtedly contained a sizeable archiepiscopal residence. On the other hand, Sava of Serbia was familiar with the typika for the monasteries in Mount Athos and Constantinople, where the burial of monks within the monastic enclosure was forbidden. The monks were buried in their own separate cemetery not far from their monastery, where there were chapels or funerary churches with crypts and ossuaries expressly intended for the burial of monks.

Therefore, the remains of the funerary church of the monastery of Žiča should be looked at bearing in mind all information described above. In terms of its structure and purpose, it conformed to the monastic burial practice known from the typika of the eleventh/twelfth century. It finds close analogies in the rare surviving buildings of the same purpose, but it is the only known such building in the area of the autocephalous Serbian Church. It may be assumed therefore that it formed part of the original design of Žiča, devised by and realised through the effort of Sava of Serbia. It is distinctive in that it is a single-storey funerary building which combines the functions of a funerary chapel and a crypt with burial chambers because such structures usually had the form of a two-level funerary church. It was probably built in the 1220s, but it remains to establish how long it was in use and how it fared when Žiča was ravaged by the Cumans in the second half of the thirteenth century. What also remains unknown is if it was renovated along with the monastery in the early decades of the fourteenth century. We can only conjecture that it lost its original function then, as the monastic burials within the enclosure seem to indicate.

56 Minić 2000, 236.
57 Minić 2000, 237–238, fig. 9.
Blago manastira Studenice, ed. V. Durić, Beograd 1988, 29–68.


ГРОБНА ЦРКВА МАНАСТИРА ЖИЧЕ

ка проблему средњовековних монашких сахрана у Византији и Србији
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Резиме:

Гробна црква, костурица, монашко сахрањивање, типик, Константинопол, Бачевачка костурица, Жича, Студеница Хвоставска.

Остаци жичке гробне цркве – „костурице“, открили су се у лето 1938. године на иницијативу епископа Николаја Велимировића. Њени трагови налазе се око 500 м северозападно од манастира, на положају сала удаљеном о 1 km од обале Ибра. Предузета ископавања, нажалост, вршила су без стручног надзора тако да је изгубљен читав низ података да који се могло доћи у току радова. Српина је односност што је по завршетку раскопавања познао архитекта Александар Деро, који је откривеност оставало детаљно технички снимио и забележио своја запажања, која је након тога и објављена.

Откривени остаци грађевине су изузетне правовугаоне основе по просећеном подручју апсидом на истоку, која се без рамена спаја са бојачким подхватајем зидовима (сл. 1). Њене спољне димензије су: дужина 19 m, а ширина 7,80 m. Откривени су готово искцрпиво темељни остаци, са траговима надземних делова бојачких зида у висини једног до два реда реда камена. Како се могло одмах уочити, биле су укопане у земљи, без трагова старијих слојева. Затечени зидови су били добро очувани. Широка темеља је добаљена у једнога и износи око један метар. Темељним зидовима био је изделан и унутрашњи простор, али само до равни пода. Једним посебним облуком одвојена је апсис од осталах простора грађевине, где два подлажна зида, на међусобном раствоју од 1,30 m, са одговарајућим посебним зидовима образују десет гробних комора, по четета и јужне стране. Све коморе су биле једнако грађене и истим димензијама. Имају су ширину од 1,40 m, док им је дужина по оси запад–исток износила око 2 метра. На горњем рубу зида сваке од гробних комора налази се усек („фалф“) ширине 0,10 m, а висине 0,20–0,25 m у通关у на горњу површину зида. Они усечени представљали су лежишта за плоче, које су до равни пода затварале гробну комору. Дубина гробних комора до поклониле плоче износила је око 0,75 m, односно око један метар до нивоа пода. Ни једна од ових поклониле плоче није откривена. На дну гробних комора нику примећени трагови пода.

Сви темељни зидови били су једнако грађени крупним речним облукома, са домаћег бечкеречког материја, а површинам им је гроб на досећању, што се такође односи и на изглед на унутрашњим просторима гробних комора. О изгледу и начину грађења горњег дела ове гробне цркве нема доступним података. Преостали, минимални трагови надземних делова зида указују на ток гроба зидања. Забележено је да је у штути није било улога непокретних материјала, али је на локалитету преостало само оно што није било употребљиво за ново зидање.

Гробне коморе, како је забележено, „били су пуне скелета“; наводи се и процента да их је било око 500, што је свакако претерано. Ипак изузетно је важно запажање А. Деро, да су скелети који је он видео биле „окренуте главом ка истоку“, односно оријентисане запад–исток, што значи да су били у анатомском положају. То би тако указивало на могућност да гробне коморе у жичкој гробној цркви нису биле прорубљене на�재љењем за дете, односно, за секундарну сахрањивању покопника, мада се таква њихова функција, будући уобичајена у монашких сахранама, не може потпуно искушити. Конструкција и димензије поменутих комора, или боље ређе гробница, уз поменут податак, наводе на закључак да је у њима вршена првоцима сахрана.

За разлику од подземног дела грађевине о изгледу надземног дела могу се изнети само предпоставке. У питању је, без сумње, било гробног хреста у којем су обаљавале заузапоклене службе. Опстакери део у пространој подручној апсиди био је без трагова укопа, што указује да није био предвиђен за сахрањивање. У равни пода налазиле су се, по свему судећи, масивне камене плоче којима су гробнице биле затворене. Саме гробне коморе, ако се има у виду њихова ширине, биле су намењене за сахрањивање више покопника. Услед недостатка одговарајућих података, остаје отворено питање како је изгледала горња конструкција жичког гробног храма. Највероватније је био наткривен древном кровном конструкцијом, мада ни постојање свега, као и подухлазе над апсидом није изукснутио.

Када су откривени остаци ове гробне цркве, остало је неколико нејасана њених каснијих конструктивних склопа, а деловима и функција, затим односе према манастиру и, нарочито, време настанка. Без упознања у подобром разматрању, А. Деро је закључио да потиче из новијег времена. Такво датовање, без задатка у појединици, одукуло је паузу позиција истраживаца са остатака овог здања, што је и главни разлог збор којег је до данас остало готово непознато. На то је утицајала и чињеница да су, према замислима владике Николаја, откривени остаци обимних зидова надзидани, покривени древном кровном конструкцијом и тако поново добили значаје сакралног простора.

Пре упознања у анализу жичке гробне цркве, ради утврђивања времена њеног настанка и трајања, уз разматрање познатих аналогија и података из писаних извора, показано је на још један аналогијски пример, који је остао готово непознат и недовољно објашњен. Општено је у комплексу разрушеног манастира Студеница Хвоставска, око десетак километара источно од Пећи. Остатке зида на терену, приликом истраживања која је вршено В. Корош 1965–1970, било је могуће само делимично сагледати будући да су они,
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ни остаци гробне цркве Богородичиног манастира у Студеници Хиостанској, као и некадашња гробна црква у Јички. Међутим, најбољи очувани репрезентант фрескописане двогра- жне гробне цркве са критом намењеном монашким сахра- нама, као што је познато, представља Бачковска „доминцица“. Као слични примери манастирских костурица наведени су гробни паралакс манастира Дафи код Атине (сл. 4) и гро- бљанска црква Благовешћена у Хиландару (сл. 5).

О сахрањима монаха у манастирима на подручју ауто- кафарних Српске цркве још увек се недовољно зна. Већ при посматрању се упутио напред изнета сазнања о средњовековним монашким сахрањима, превасходно у областима Ро- мејског царства, може се уочити да се српска функционална пракса те врсте у значајној мери разликује од византајске. У Студеничком типику, који је регулисан живот у већини српских манастира, нема правила о манастирском гробљу. Постоји поглавље о томе „како појавити националне и државе домове“ где се даје упутство о самој ритуалној радњи и мо- литвама, али се не помиње простор за сахрањивање. Ова по- јава постаје сасвим јасна ако се усматра, као што је познато, да је Сава Српски, састављајући типику за задужбине свога оца Симеона Немање, највећим делом користио типику па- риградског манастира Богородице Евергетисе, где такође таквих одреда нема.

На чињеницу да у српским манастирима нису постојала чиста правила о монашким сахрањима указују и резултати досадашњих истраживања. Монашке некрополе најлоћније су се налазиле око главине манастирске цркве. У Студеници, то је углавном био простор испред западне фасаде цркве и у јужном делу порте. Уз сам храм су се, изгледа, сахрањи- вали изумани. Тако су гробови првих студеничких изумана Игицита и Дионисија били укопани у темељ јужног зида са сплавној стране. Овај обичај је, изгледа, био поштован и касније. Сасвим особен пример представља гроб првог игу- мана манастира Софијани, који је био сахрањен у јутоза- падном углу приправе, у западном гробу над којим се нала- зи псевдосаркофаг.

О средњовековним монашким некрополама изван ма- настирског облика нема упознала података. Сузећи по знат- ној познатим изворима, није искућено их било постојање у великој средњовековној манастири, какав је случај са Студе- ницима и Дечанима. Уз манастире средњовековне Србије до сада није утврђено постојање гробних храмова нити костурни- ца. Такође није посебно везано ни пракса, да се после одређе- ног броја година прекопавају манашки гробови ради преноса земних остатака и њихове секундарне сахрање у језич- носрпских костурица.

Приликом истраживања неких манастирских целина, уочено је да се на монашким некрополама око главине цркве нису сахрањивали само монаси. Понекада сакривача овој појави још увек нису могућа с обзиром да ниједна мана- стирска некропола до сада није у већем обиму истражена. Досадашњи резултати су показали да је на тим просторима вршено интензивније сахрањивање током више столећа, па је готово немоћно извојити старје монашке сахрање од по- зијних уокопа – када се уз манастирске цркве сахрањивало и около становништва. Нешто потрудној податке о структу- ри сахрањених у манастирима пружа епиграфска грађа са ретких очуваних надгробних плоча из раздобља 14—15. века. Са некрополе која се налазила уз цркву манастира Софијани,
натписи са преосталих уломака надгробних плоча углавном помињу сахрањене монахе. Исти случај је Градцу и Кончу-
лићу, где изузетак представља само натпис на једној плочи која је обележавала гроб једне властелине.
На што сложенији слику сахрању у оквиру манастир-
ског комплекса указује некропола око Богородичине цркве у Südö, која је само делимично изстражена. Ако је су-
дити по сачуваним натписима, за броје, до сада откривена нагробне плоче са те некрополе може се поуздано тврдити 
да су обележавале средишњевековне монашке гробове. Међу-
тим, приликом конзерваторских радова око цркве Светог 
Николе у југоисточном делу порте, испуњено је неколико гроб-
ова, међу којима су била и два у којима су биле сахрањене властелине. Истом приликом, једно од ове цркве откривен је још један женски гроб, обележен лепо обрађеном над-
гробном плочом са натписом, који обавештава да је ту са-
хранена „раба божија Анастасија”. Устаљено мишљење је 
да је реч о гробу монахиње, сигурно због хетмења преспи-
тинаве. Штавише, све околности указују на то да је ту била 
хранилаца властелине, што уз остале сличне примере отва-
ра важно питање, које су личности, осим монаха, могле стега 
право да се сахрање у кружу манастира. На примеру Südе-
нених ове питање ће, на другом месту, бити широко размотрано.
Појава љачких гробова на манастирским некро-
полама представљала је, по свему судећи, одређену при-
винелију која се само по изузетку дodelењала. У типима 
из 11–12. века постоје изречене одређене привинелије ко-
мени сложености, из роба божија Анастасија". Устаљено мишљење је 
да је реч о гробу монахиње, сигурно због хетмења преспи-
тинаве. Штавише, све околности указују на то да је ту била 
хранилаца властелине, што уз остале сличне примере отва-
ра важно питање, које су личности, осим монаха, могле стега 
право да се сахрање у кружу манастира. На примеру Südе-
нених ове питање ће, на другом месту, бити широко размотрано.
Pojava lažkih grobova na munitsi
skim nekropolama mogu sahrajivati isključivo monashi. Međutim, postojali su i izracu odredene pravila o monaškim sahranama. Gotovo je is-
viesno da u tom ranom razdojbi nije bilo dozvoljeno sahraj-
ijavaje u okviri mantsira, odnosno na prostoru oko crke. 
Na to su mogli uticati i praktični razlozi budući da 
je kompleks mantsira, uslovnjen konfiguracijom terena, 
bi lo relativno mali. Pored uobičajenih mantsijskih zda-
nja tu se, bez sumnje, nalazila i prostrana arhiepiskopska 
"palata". Sa druge strane, Sava je veoma dobro poznavao 
ustrojstva mantsira, kako na Svetoj Gori, tako i u Kon-
stiantinonolu, gdje su bile zabrane ukopi monaha u okvri-
u mantsijskog obzija. Mantshe sahrane vrisene su na 
posebnim neproplama, nedaleko od mantsira, gde su po-
ostojale kapele ili grobni hramovi sa kriptama i kustur-
nicama, izrечно određene za sahrane monaha.
Nakon razmotreno je pitaanje mantskih sahrana u 
Jiči, koje su dele potcepti podsticaj naim razmatra-
prenasledno usmerena na istraživanja glavne mantsijske 
crke Svetog Slaša, i dela mantsijske portes oko crke u 
izvini od oko tri metra. Na tom prostoru i u eksnarkek-
smu otkriveno je gotovo dve stotine grobova Večina va pri-
pada mladim hronizoju sahrajivajegan, to jest razdojba 18. 
I prvinh dehenija 19. veka, kada se u kompleksu zapustelago 
mantsih sahrajivajeg i lokalno stavitivashch. Tmih uko-
zyma paromečeni su u velikoj meri grobni starari mantsi-
skih neproplama.
I porode čvijenice da se raspolaže oskudnim podaci-
ma, o sahrahama vršenim uz žicu Sponsku crkvu isak 
su moguća neka zapakažen, zasnovano na arheološkim nalazi-
ma. U porit ocrke postojala je starari mantska nekro-
polla, kao što je to bi bio slučaj i sa drugim srpskim mantsi-
rima. Taj starari hroniz ovdob groba, najcvo reñejherenih 
ili paromečenih, po pravilu bez grobnih prihoda, teshko 
je vremenski određen. Samo u jednom od tih groba na-
ven je novak kinesaza, koji dokumentuju najstariji nivo 
ukopavanja na prostoru oko crke. Iz jednog rasturgovog gro-
ba poticne i nalaz novih ugarskog kraja Singsimunda. Tome 
razdojba, odnosno 14. veku ili prvim dehenijama 15. veka,
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