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This paper examines the rhetorical capacity of architecture, and in particular, “the rhetoric of architecture” rather than the usually examined “rhetoric about architecture.” In this work, the rhetoric of architecture is understood as codified visual and architectural conventions as a series of transpositions that frame specific meanings other than and beyond visible and spatial. Here the proposed “rhetoric of architecture” is also more about its capacity as a “mnemonic tool” and about the “craft of composition” rather than about persuading others or about representation based on exact likeness. This concept is particularly significant in the creation of the sacred. By focusing on the architecture of the critical building of the Holy Sepulchre that enclosed the Tomb Shrine in Jerusalem as described by Patriarch Photios in the ninth and Abbot Daniel in the early twelfth centuries, this paper argues for the recognition of the mnemonic links that the Byzantines may have used not only for remembering the Tomb of Christ, but also for their several reconstructions of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem as well as for embedding the meaning of Jerusalem and New Jerusalem in their churches built elsewhere.
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---

Rhetoric, “the formulaic art of persuasive public speaking,” was central in Byzantine culture. Descriptive passages – ekphrāseis – about architecture are closely related to visual expressions and intimately embedded in the reception and memory of architectural works. The rhetorical texts about Byzantine art and architecture have been studied from multiple perspectives. Some studies about “visual rhetoric” examine the relations between text and art, often focusing on epigrams and on the actual inscriptions on art works, including inscriptions on Byzantine architecture as studied by Amy Papalexandrou and Liz James. Leslie Brubaker and Helen Saradi focus on the

---


2 For example, E. Jeffreys, Introduction, in: Rhetoric in Byzantium, 1–5. Of the three traditional genres of rhetoric, closely related to three distinctive oratorical occasions and types of audience – the judicial of the law court, the deliberative of popular politics, and the demonstrative (panegyric or epideictic in Greek) of ceremonial occasions – the epideictic, closely related to the ekphrasis as a poetic genre prevailed in Byzantine culture. V. also Cicero on the Genres of Rhetoric, translation by J. F. Tinkler, 1995 http://rhetoric.eserver.org/categories/history/classical-genres-of-rhetoric.html accessed April 1, 2014.


4 V. for example, A. Papalexandrou, Text in context: eloquent monuments and the Byzantine beholder, Word and Image 17/3 (2001)
subject matter or *topoi* in *ekphrastic* texts and their relations to historical realities.5 Henry Maguire and Brubaker also examine *schema* (form or shape) and format as rhetorical tools used in Byzantine accomplishments.6 Robin Cormack highlights rhetorical tropes and Byzantine images that convey meanings other than the subject matter depicted within them.7

By utilizing architecture as an epistemological means, it is also possible to examine "the rhetoric of architecture" instead of the "rhetoric about architecture." In recognizing the frustrating limitations of established methods of inquiry, such as iconography, iconology, or semiotics in under-theorized studies of the meaning of medieval architecture, such a rhetoric of Byzantine architecture has been already proposed by architectural historians. By expanding upon the seminal work by Richard Krautheimer on the iconography of architecture and the meaning of "copies" in medieval architecture.8 Robert Ousterhout uses the expression "rhetoric of architecture" by connecting it to the manifold "language" of architecture and the meaning of the architectural form of a Byzantine church. In particular, he focuses on the examples of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem and Constantinopolitan Hagia Sophia and Hagios Polyeuktos to suggest how these very buildings are the *loci* of memory and how they facilitated the overarching meaning of a Byzantine church as an "image" of the Temple.9 Ousterhout further distinguishes between word-driven or metaphorical and image-driven or symbolic meanings of architecture; the former he associates with the form of a text and the latter with architectural form as the carriers of meaning. Significantly, he also allows for the possibility of overlap between the two rhetorical systems because the Byzantines did not distinguish "verbal" from "visual" memory. Architectural historians have so often likened architecture to language and the process of reading or to images and the process of making two-dimensional arts, thus limiting the ways in which architecture as a distinct discipline can be understood.10 Therefore, William White has already proposed that studies of meaning of architecture should rather be understood as a series of transpositions "with meaning in each transposition shaped by the logic of the genre or medium in which it is located," and that the multiple transpositions related to the manifold elements that make the work of architecture itself can uncover the many meanings of architecture.11 In this paper, the rhetoric of architecture is understood as codified visual and architectural conventions that allow one to understand the meaning of architecture as a series of transpositions that often frame specific meanings other than and beyond merely the visible and the spatial.12 Here the proposed "rhetoric of architecture" is also more about its capacity as a "mnemonic tool" and about the "craft of composition" rather than about the persuading of others or about a representation based on exact likeness, as Mary Carruthers convincingly explained in her book *The Craft of Thought* by focusing on the intertwined relations between literature craft and the techniques of monastic meditation in medieval Western Europe.13

Several critical aspects of architecture as a discipline complicate any discussion about the "rhetoric of architecture," which this paper does not claim to be able to or even aim to overcome.14 First, though architecture and architectural form may lend themselves to stories and are often studied via textual and language analogies, architecture is not necessarily narrative in its essence. Second, though we often understand architecture through images, architecture is not only about representation and images. Third, despite some evidence about education in literature and philosophy, we do not have documented evidence about architectural training in Byzantium.15 Such

---


12 I essentially transpose Brubaker’s definition of rhetoric of art to architecture as a distinct creative mode. In her text *Text and picture in manuscripts, 255–272*, on 257, she defines rhetoric of art as a “series of conventions that encapsulated a particular set of meanings and ultimately made any other visual pattern difficult to imagine.”


knowledge about architectural training would ultimately shed light not only on conventions used in architectural design but also on their potential role as rhetorical tools. Simultaneously, such knowledge would potentially clarify more precisely who the practitioners of the here proposed “rhetoric of architecture” may have been. That is why this paper examines the possibility of the “rhetoric of architecture” from the perspectives of those who wrote about architecture.

The Greek-speaking Byzantines inherited and practiced ancient rhetorical techniques throughout the middle ages.16 Rhetorical pedagogy, including the 

progyn-

nasmata teaching texts and their constitutive exercise on the description – ekphrasis, were crucial for recollecting, remembering, and visualizing works of architecture, both real and imagined. Jeffrey demonstrates how among critical rhetorical texts stemming from the seminal work by Aristotle, the Byzantines extensively used the text On Forms or On Ideas (Peri epidei

ktikon, Peri ἐπιδεικτικῶν), which was originally written by the Greek rhetorician Me-
nander of Laodicea-on-Lycos in the late third century and which, among other topics, dealt with the proper forms of praise for countries and cities.17 Ancient orators also utilized architecture as a mnemonic device.18 In the medieval construct of memory, which we know today as the method of loci, or the mnemonic system based on places, the main concept is that people virtually always have site-related recollections.19 In this system, physical locations and architectural frameworks contain images and signs that also incorporate related knowledge or experience. To remember, the practitioner would approach the building and walk through it several times, each time in the same order. Real physical locations, but not exclusively visited places, are commonly used in this method; therefore, formulaic and conceptual Byzantine architectural solutions, especially in religious architecture, built across vast spatial horizons in the territories of the medieval Roman Empire spanning more than a millennium (ca. 300–1500), offer themselves for posing important questions about the “rhetoric of architecture” and its practice. Above all, sacred architecture in Byzantium, which is deeply intertwined with object– and body-related practices and ac-
tions, is highly performative, a key feature of rhetoric as public presentation.

To propose and examine the existence of the “rhe-

toric of architecture,” which was critical for the creation of sacred space in Byzantine culture, this paper focuses on a seminal building – the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem that in medieval times often interchangeably stood for the aedicu-

la Shrine of the Tomb of Christ and the Rotunda Church of the Resurrection which architecturally framed the Tomb as the place of burial and resurrection of Christ. The analysis is heavily based on the Holy Sepulchre in Byzantine memory because archaeological records about Byzantine architectural campaigns and changes to the Holy Sepulchre are non-existent, and thus its historiography and textual and visual descriptions remain major sources for understanding the “Byzantine” Holy Sepulchre. A particular question is whether mnemonic images of the Holy Sepulchre and memory practices may have influenced actual Byzantine re-buildings of the Holy Sepulchre. In order to examine this delicate question, a very brief architectural history of the Holy Sepulchre will be presented first and then juxtaposed with accounts recorded by Photos, the Patriarch of Constantinople (858–867, 877–886) in the ninth century20 and the pilgrimage account by Russian Abbot Daniel in the early twelfth century.21

The Holy Sepulchre in Byzantine Memory

Three major historical segments in architectural history of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem frame the memory of this holy site (Fig. 1).22 The first period includes the fourth-century building of the Golgotha-Anastasis complex, on the traditional sites of the Crucifixion and Christ’s burial and resurrection. The second period lasts

18 F. A. YATES, The Art of Memory, Chicago 1966, 27–49, shows how the ancient Greeks credited poet Simonides of Ceos (ca. 556–468 B.C.) for the invention of archa memoriae which was later practiced by Aristotle and Cicero and how a fifth century B.C. poet fragment known as the Dialektes highlighted reasoning and repetition as critical for memory and outlined its importance “for learning and for life.” (citation on 29). Yates analysis of the art of memory in the middle ages, however, focuses exclusively on the western European realm.

from the seventh to the eleventh centuries, when Byzantines rebuilt the site on several occasions (Fig. 2). During this second period, the Golgotha-Anastasis complex suffered from Persian attacks in the seventh century, from earthquakes in the tenth century, and from devastating destruction under the Fatimid Caliph al-Hākim bi-Amr Allah (996–1012) in 1009, when he set the Tomb of Christ on fire.23 The third period, which overlaps with the reign of the Komnenian emperors, began during the interventions by Crusaders in 1099, when the entire complex was partially rebuilt during several building campaigns. In other words, the still standing church of the Holy Sepulchre – despite being closely interwoven in its Byzantine texture – is essentially a Crusader building; in fact, the Tomb Shrine installation, which is crowned by a canopy on its top, is dated to the latest, nineteenth-century restoration (Fig. 3).24

Major Byzantine sources often remain silent about the architecture of the Holy Sepulchre, despite pilgrims' continual visits to the Tomb and the recurring interest of the Byzantines in the holy places. For example, writing after 1148 when the territory of the Holy Land had been long lost to the Byzantines, Byzantine princess Anna Komnene recorded the efforts of simple people, both men and women, who desired to venerate the Holy Sepulchre and visit the holy places.25 Yet, by the twelfth century, the memory of Jerusalem and the Holy Tomb had seemingly diminished in Constantinople, as if the physical reality of the Holy Sepulchre were detached from the Byzantine imperial and historical realm. For the Byzantine court, as Anna Komnene records, Jerusalem in the mid-twelfth century was “a great city ... built long ago called Jerusalem, now in ruins through the passage of time.”26

The only known contemporary official Byzantine source that mentions the demolition of the Holy Sepulchre by al-Hakim in 1009 is the Skylitzes' eleventh-century Synopsis Historiarum for the years 811–1057. This source was critical for the changes in the architecture of the complex and, therefore, captured the attention of architectural historians; yet thirteenth-century illustrated version of the Skylitzes' manuscript omits the episode.27 The memory of

---


24 After the fire of 1808, the Tomb was significantly rebuilt for the last time in recent history; M. Biddle, The Tomb of Christ, Gloucestershire 1999, 76 sq, with references.
the event from 1009 vanished quickly in Constantinople and the Byzantine world. Thus, in the eleventh century Michael Psellus, the famous polymath and theologian made no mention of the event in his short chronicle The Chronographia, which was written in Constantinople and describes the years 976–1078.28 The silence of the Byzantine sources about the destruction of the Tomb of Christ may be explained variously, including the result of official censorship related to the unsuccessful Byzantine attempts to re-conquer Jerusalem and the diminished Byzantine imperial presence in the area29 or perhaps the result of authors following the rhetorical training put forth in Menander's text on the ekphrasis of cities, which proscribed avoiding detailed descriptions of ill-fated cities or concealing the causes for bad changes within them such as “earthquakes, or sacks, plagues, and the like”.30 However, it is another event that seems to have profoundly shaped the collective memory of the Holy Sepulchre in the Byzantine world. Already, in the late ninth century, the miracle of the Holy Fire (Ἁγιόν Φῶς) – the miraculous event preceding the Orthodox Easter when light emanates in the Cave of the Holy Sepulchre and forms a column of fire which is used to light the church candles – was attested to in both Arabic and Christian sources.31 This singular event associated with both the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Tomb of Christ prevails among Orthodox believers until present.

Very little is known about actual Byzantine architectural interventions in the Holy Sepulchre. It is undeniable that the architecture of the whole complex changed significantly after al-Hākim's destruction, and never regained its previous size or form. By the 1040s the Holy Sepulchre complex was rebuilt in at least two major reconstruction campaigns.32 The first phase was local in inspiration and technical achievement, probably initiated by al-Hākim's mother Maria and perhaps supported by the Byzantines during the period 1012–1023. The second phase was more directly Byzantine and imperial in scope and architecture, starting in ca. 1037/1038 and finished either by the time of Michael IV the Paphlagonian (1034–1041) before 1041 or of Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042–1059) in 1048.33 The Byzantines definitely reconceived the Holy Sepulchre and the Tomb of Christ within the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, nineteenth century with twentieth century steel shoring (from: Biddle, The Tomb of Christ, fig. 8)
structed the Rotunda. From the point of view of construction, the rebuilding of both the Tomb and the Rotunda run simultaneously, at least in the initial phases. This may potentially account for the occasional intermingling of their centrally planned architecture in descriptive accounts. Constantin’s basilica, however, was never restored. The entire complex became much smaller, with the main entrance to the complex relocated to the south of the courtyard. Again, it seems as if for the Byzantine world, the miracle of the Holy Fire was closely associated with the architectural changes in the complex because, if it had not during previous restorations, the Rotunda, originally a memorial, already functioned as a church in the ninth century (Fig. 2). Presumably, during each reconstruction of the complex, the Byzantines first restored the major locus sanctus, the Holy Sepulchre. Yet, how did the Byzantines accomplish these reconstructions? Because the Byzantines had already lost their imperial presence in the city of Jerusalem in the seventh century and because they most likely didn’t keep records on the architectural design of the Holy Sepulchre – as there is no evidence of architectural schools and advanced architectural training – the Byzantine reconstructions were not based on a definite pictorial scheme, but rather on the orderly combination of particular motifs, which the Byzantines built upon their belief system and related memorable imagery. In other words, it can be hypothesized that the mnemonic endurance, which reveals what the Byzantines and we today can and cannot recall about the Holy Sepulchre, was related to the rhetorical endurance of surviving descriptions of the Holy Sepulchre. The building itself functioned as a rhetorical device. At the same time, it is possible to reveal the similar patterns of design between the few surviving textual descriptions and the architectural remains of the Holy Sepulchre.

and early documents of the Latin Kingdom, ultimately rooted in the twelfth-century account (after 1165) of William of Tyre, more than a century after the event; L. J. Hoppe, The Synagogues and Churches of Ancient Palestine, Collegville 1994, 108–109; Ousterhout, Rebuilding the Temple, 66–78. The Synopsis written by Skylitzes records that Emperor Romanos III Argyros’ (1028–1034) rebuilt the Holy Sepulchre. According to the same source, Emperor Michael IV the Paphlagonian (1034–1041) may have eventually finished the reconstruction; Ioannis Skylitzes, 14 (B. 501–503). Skylitzes’ account is consistent with independent accounts by a Christian Arab observer, Yahya ibn Seid of Anthoych and by the Persian traveler Nasir-i-Khusrau, who “was well versed in the Scriptures.”

Therefore, though concerned with the architecture and place of the Tomb, these two descriptions also borrow images from the contemporary theological, exegetical, and liturgical practices. In contrast to the exuberant rhetorical texts written by contemporary Byzantine authors such as Psellus, Choniates, or Photios himself when he writes about the church of H. Sophia in Constantinople, these texts by Photios and Daniel about the Tomb of Christ are strikingly short and simple. Yet, brevity (symptoma) and clarity (saphenia) are stylistic features probably chosen with purpose. I would suggest that Photios and

Patriarch Photios and Abbot Daniel on the Holy Sepulchre: rhetoric and ars memoriae

Among the rare preserved texts about the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem that come from Byzantine world, the two surviving texts by Patriarch Photios and Abbot Daniel are of the greatest importance. Due to their extremely detailed accounts, they can be compared and additionally contrasted with some visual and architectural evidence. These two authors – Patriarch Photios in the ninth century and the Russian abbot Daniel more than two centuries later – each wrote about the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, both including distinct discussions about its Shrine of the Tomb of Christ. Photios wrote his epistolary account About the Tomb of Our Lord Jesus Christ according to the description of an eye witness and right in the aftermath of the Iconoclastic controversy. His text is not a first-hand account of the Holy Sepulchre and, in addition, is also related to a larger extended theological discussion on the role of testimony of Christ’s Incarnation in Flesh, which was a major theological issue of the Iconoclastic controversy. In this context, the Tomb of Christ is the place of the death and the resurrection of Christ and, therefore, invested with complex ontological and corporeal meanings for the Orthodox Christian believers. Daniel, however, visited the Holy Sepulchre not once but several times during his sixteen months as a pilgrim in the Holy Land around 1106, most likely from 1105 to 1107, just before major changes by the Crusaders to the church of the Holy Sepulchre in the mid-twelfth century. Daniel also records that he had a local guide, an elderly monk from St. Sabbas monastery near Jerusalem, who “was well versed in the Scriptures.”

Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades (henceforth Jerusalem Pilgrims), ed. J. Wilkinson, Warminster 2002, 258–259. The Crusaders’ emphasis solely on the recovery of a relic of the True Cross in 1099 and elaborate descriptions of the processions in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre underscore that both the Rotunda and the Tomb-shrine of Christ were largely in use by the end of the eleventh century; J. Folda, The Art of the Crusaders in the Holy Land, 1098–1187, Cambridge–New York 1995, 34 sqq. Biddle, The Tomb of Christ, 76f, with references to the primary sources. On the hypothesis that such dynamic concordance of two different types of verbal and spatial ordering of architecture can be detected already in Vitruvius’ studies of architecture, v. G. E. Meyers, Vitruvius and the Origins of Roman Spatial Rhetoric, Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 50 (2005) 67–86. For similar discussion Ch. Roueche, The Rhetoric of Kekausmenos, in: Rhetoric in Byzantium, 23–37, esp. 32–33. 34 The external wall of the Rotunda was largely intact, surviving at some points up to 11 m in height, which enabled its reconstruction on the Constantinian walls; Patriarch Photios and Iconoclasm, DOP 7 (1953) 67–98. 35 About the Tomb of Our Lord Jesus Christ 113–140. 36 On the role of Photios during the Iconoclastic controversy v. F. Dvornik, The Patriarch Photios and Iconoclasm, DOP 7 (1953) 67–98. 37 On the hypothesis that such dynamic concordance of two different types of verbal and spatial ordering of architecture can be
Daniel use these and other recognizable figures of speech and topoi as rhetorical devices, but at the same time adapt their descriptions of the Holy Sepulchre to a Christian mode of discourse understandable to the majority of medieval people. Hence, their story-telling is both common and specific.43

The emotional and psychological charge of these descriptions is critical. The narrators practice self-control by using the modesty topos (modestia), through which, as Cicero explained early on, “shame provides the care and stable authority.”44 Daniel defines himself as: “unworthy,” “the least among the monks,” “impatient,” and “wicked.”45 Daniel’s modesty is powerful because he describes holy places associated with Christ, the One who died to redeem the sins of humankind. Daniel’s and Photos’ testimonies are further strengthened by the reliability of worthy witnesses: “We have learned from those who have taken the trouble to reside in that blessed place,”46 says Photos; and “I have described it according to the testimony of the oldest inhabitants who thoroughly knew the holy places,”47 confirms Daniel. Again, the statements are Christological in mode because Christ’s ministry and passion are always attested to by witnesses. Continuing to utilize the modesty topos, Daniel further explains how his account of the Holy Land is “in simple words, without literary skill.”48 Ultimately, the seemingly simple language reflects the informed simplicity of the authors, who in their accounts use simple language that is deeply embedded with spatial and rhetorical mnemonic devices.49

Photos and Daniel also structure their descriptions of the Tomb of Christ in a strikingly similar way. Each first describes the location of the Holy Sepulchre, then its form, and finally its decorative features. Simultaneously, their descriptions are both “architectural-structural” and rhetorical as they also allow for the exchange of the architecture’s representational and experiential aspects with rhetorical mnemonic devices.50

Photos and Daniel agree about the major architectural form of the Holy Sepulchre, which emphasizes Christ’s humanity and human form.51 Daniel further specifies its place in relation to other locations in the city and the Church of the Resurrection: “...upon entering the city the Holy of Holies and site-positioned within the city of Jerusalem. Photos records that the Tomb is “one bowshot away from the ancient Jerusalem.”52 Daniel further specifies its place in relation to other locations in the city and the Church of the Resurrection: “…upon entering the city the Holy of Holies [the Dome of the Rock] is to the right and the Holy Resurrection containing the Holy Sepulchre to the left.”53 In locating the Tomb and extending its importance beyond its physical confines, Photos and Daniel rhetorically use three traditional modes of persuasion: ethos – as a mode of proof; pathos – which is emotionally and emphatically charged; and logos – traditionally reserved for the discussion of order in the cosmos.54 Photos maps the Tomb with the use of ethos as proof, citing a historical authority to persuade the audience to believe. Thus he writes that “blessed Helena ... enclosed the lifegiving Tomb within the enlarged circuit ... so arranged that it enclosed the lifegiving Tomb as a separate feature in the middle of the Church.”55 Emotionally charged as an example of pathos, the mapping is emphasized by the use of recognizable rhetorical figures of the pairs (synkrisis) and opposites (antithesis). Photos juxtaposes “the lifegiving tomb” to “the piles of rubbish and filth,”56 while Daniel speaks of “an immense joy ... and tears shed” in the holy city of Jerusalem.57

The architecture of the Holy Sepulchre provides the site par excellence and the tectonic framework for the placement of images that convey and reiterate the expressive potential and meaning of Holy Sepulchre both within and beyond its physical confines. Thus, Daniel pairs locations, assigns meanings to the specific themes represented in mosaics within the church, and relates them to the centrality of the Tomb of Christ within the round church of the Holy Sepulchre. To emphasize the spatial and temporal centrality of the Tomb as the place testifying to Christ’s death and resurrection, Daniel juxtaposes the images of Old Testament prophets, represented high above the galleries “as if alive” with the figure of Christ, the central focus and fulfillment of their prophetic visions.58 Daniel also connects Old and New Testaments imagery of eternal life – the Exaltation of Adam and Ascension of Christ – represented high above on the church walls and contrasts them with the Annunciation which emphasizes Christ’s humanity and human form.59 Once again, the complex idea of the resurrection is framed by the eponymous church spatially and visually, but also intellectually and emotionally. Similarly, Photos focuses on the Tomb with the central logos, the fundamental order of cosmos, here understood in a Christian mode via Incarnational argument: “In fact this Tomb, the source of our immortality, though it is natural rock, has been formed into a tomb by masons.”60 In other words, the rock-cut tomb, similar to Christ himself, is the source and place of salvation.

Photos and Daniel agree about the major architectural form as well as about the conceptual and the spatial (even if not necessarily strictly geometrical)61 centrality of

42 On the relations between common places and “individualness” within these common places, often literally presented by a site, as well as on the importance of these relations to what we today know as “collective memory” v. Carruthers, The Craft of Thought, 36–40.
44 Abbot Daniel, 1–3.
45 Photos, 146. V. also Appendix 1.
46 Abbot Daniel, 13.
47 Abbot Daniel, 73.
48 supra note 19.
50 Photos, 146. V. also Appendix 1.
the Tomb in the Rotunda (Figs. 1, 2). The Tomb is separated from the other parts of the Rotunda by an enclosure with gates. The cave-like Tomb chamber made of stone is simple, tiny and intimate, with a burial bench cut in rock. The interior is inclusive, individualized; when visiting the pilgrim physically occupies it. Hence, the interior is measured in minute precision and compared only with the human body. Photios thus uses the rhetorical device of personification and describes the entrance to the tomb as a mouth, repeating the expression used by the Evangelists and often reiterated by the pilgrims. For example, Abbot Adamnan of the Monastery of Iona, records the seventh-century account by Arculf, a pilgrim from Gaul, and notes that “we must refer to the difference of names of the Tomb and the Sepulchre; for that round cabin and notes that “we must refer to the difference of names of the Tomb and the Sepulchre; for that round cabin between the Tomb and the Sepulchre; for that round cabin and notes that “we must refer to the difference of names of the Tomb and the Sepulchre; for that round cabin

Rotunda. The reconstruction drawing of the Anastasis Rotunda also confirms this geometric off-centeredness of the Tomb.

The rough and haptic interior of the rock-cut Tomb chamber is then juxtaposed with its opulent and polished marble exterior in both accounts by Photios and Daniel. The columns and roof are crucial architectural elements for visualizing the Tomb shrine, which was often described as a “small house” and in the accounts by Photios and Daniel liturgically associated with the ambo (Figs. 2, 4, Table 1). Both Photios and Daniel are very insistent on columns that define the Tomb shrine and its relation to the Anastasis Rotunda. Photios explains that there are eleven columns all together, five to the north, five to the south, and between these corresponding alignments one centrally placed to the west, and one left at the opening to the Tomb. Daniel, also highlights the centrally planned “circular” form of the Church of Resurrection, which uses “twelve monolithic columns and six pillars” to envelope the Tomb shrine that had embedded on itself another concentric set of twelve marble columns. Even if Photios’ description is more likely to be more accurate than Daniel’s, it is impossible to determine the exact number of columns that surrounded the Tomb of Christ in the Byzantine period. What matters is that they certainly defined the rounded shape of the shrine and its focal point—the Tomb. Here the most pervasive architectural element, the column, explicitly stands for its ornamental value or in Photios’ words “for piety” (φιλοθεμία, φιλοτιμία), thereby losing its strictly architectural-structural role. Jukka Jokilehto in his extremely sophisticated study has already connected the practice of setting up a monument, a column (emphasis – author), or a temple to mark the importance of the place and its sanctity for future generations, to biblical reference in Genesis 28:18, “… Jacob … took the stone he put at his head, set it up as a pillar, and poured the moment of death through the mouth, thus making another appropriate associative link to the Tomb of Christ as the place of His resurrection. Namely, applying this idea to the architectural appearance of the Tomb, its “entrance,” can be seen as a kind of mouth, from which the soul departs in the same way that the resurrected Christ emerges from the Tomb. Obviously Photios did not call the opening of the tomb an “entrance,” when he understood it as the exit, the pathway to salvation.

Both Photios and Daniel emphasize the humanistic values of Orthodoxy because the Tomb is defined via its temporal human occupants – both Christ and its visitors – and their bodily, performative actions within the Tomb such as lying, bowing, kissing the bench, standing alone or in a group. These actions inevitably recall pilgrimage rituals and Byzantine church services. Furthermore, both Photios and Daniel topologically and liturgically compare the Tomb with the ambo, which was a piece of liturgical furnishing in the Byzantine church that usually occupied the central position just below the dome and from which public announcements were made. Thus within this intricate network of its corporeality, the architecture of the Tomb becomes an ontological rhetorical device.

The rough and haptic interior of the rock-cut Tomb chamber is then juxtaposed with its opulent and polished marble exterior in both accounts by Photios and Daniel. The columns and roof are crucial architectural elements for visualizing the Tomb shrine, which was often described as a “small house” and in the accounts by Photios and Daniel liturgically associated with the ambo (Figs. 2, 4, Table 1). Both Photios and Daniel are very insistent on columns that define the Tomb shrine and its relation to the Anastasis Rotunda. Photios explains that there are eleven columns all together, five to the north, five to the south, and between these corresponding alignments one centrally placed to the west, and one left at the opening to the Tomb. Daniel, also highlights the centrally planned “circular” form of the Church of Resurrection, which uses “twelve monolithic columns and six pillars” to envelop the Tomb shrine that had embedded on itself another concentric set of twelve marble columns. Even if Photios’ description is more likely to be more accurate than Daniel’s, it is impossible to determine the exact number of columns that surrounded the Tomb of Christ in the Byzantine period. What matters is that they certainly defined the rounded shape of the shrine and its focal point—the Tomb. Here the most pervasive architectural element, the column, explicitly stands for its ornamental value or in Photios’ words “for piety” (φιλοθεμία, φιλοτιμία), thereby losing its strictly architectural-structural role. Jukka Jokilehto in his extremely sophisticated study has already connected the practice of setting up a monument, a column (emphasis – author), or a temple to mark the importance of the place and its sanctity for future generations, to biblical reference in Genesis 28:18, “… Jacob … took the stone he put at his head, set it up as a pillar, and poured

61 Egeria also described the Cave of Anastasis and recorded that the Holy Tomb was in the center of the sanctuary cut in the form of chapel. The “chapel” had the porch surrounded with stone railings symbolizing the division between heaven and earth; Egeria, Travels, 173–175.


oil on top of it,” and Genesis 28:22, “And this stone I set as a pillar shall be God’s house to me...”66 Among the Orthodox Christians, the stone set as column from this story of Jacob’s Ladder is Christ, the foundation stone of the Church (cf. Mt 21:42–44; Mk 12:10; Lk 20:17–18; Acts 4:11; Rom 9:32–33; 1 Cor 3:10–11; 1 Pt 2:4–8), and the oil signifies the human nature of Christ anointed by the Holy Spirit (ca. Mt 1:18; 3:16; Heb 1:19).67 These biblical references are architecturally incorporated within the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. The human-size columns set on bases enclosing the Tomb shrine were potent mnemonic links, as Photios further explains. They were connected at the top by a cornice on which rested a pointed wooden roof. The chimney-like structure on the roof mentioned by Photios, and possibly related to the miracle of the Holy Fire as witnessed by Daniel in 1106,68 might have taken the form of an open canopied structure, a “turret (teremets) resting on pillars, and terminating in a cupola” as Abbot Daniel narrates. The word teremets that Daniel originally used to describe the turret is the Old Slavonic word, which often denoted a pavilion-like, canopied structure, usually any shelter on columns.69 Visual representations of the Tomb, dating from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries, like the fourteenth-century drawing of the Holy Sepulchre from the Vatican library, may actually refer to the Holy Sepulchre with a canopied aedicule, which was known in Byzantine times as well (Fig. 5).70 Most depictions show the Tomb as a two-storied building with a domed canopy over the burial chamber. An open canopy set on columns or possibly on paired columns supposedly replaced and replicated the previous roof of the Tomb chamber. An open canopy served in part as a covering for the burial chamber because the Rotunda during the Byzantine reconstruction probably did not have a fully enclosed dome and also would have been able to accommodate the miracle of the Holy Fire.71

When Daniel visited the Tomb, the shrine may already have been altered by the Crusaders.72 In contrast to other elements related to the Byzantine cultural realm and with which he is obviously familiar, Daniel attributes the sculpture of Christ at the top of the Tomb to the

---

67 The Orthodox Study Bible (henceforth Orthodox Bible), Nashville 2008, 38. V. also, M. Evangelatou, Ο κίονας ως σύμβολο του Χριστού σε έργα βυζαντινής τέχνης, Αρχαιολογία και Τέχνες 88 (2003) 52–58, who further examines the theme of the column as a symbol of Christ in Byzantine artworks.
68 Abbot Daniel, 74–78.
70 The Tomb of Christ would remain essentially unchanged until it was significantly rebuilt again in 1555 as post-eleventh-century models of the Holy Sepulchre like the one in the church of St. Anna, Augsburg. 1507–8 suggests. Biddle, The Tomb of Christ, 100 sqq and fig.31 on 31. On the canopy of the aedicule in the eleventh and early twelfth centuries v. also, Markovic, Prvo putovanje, 192–193; V. A. Fokolou, Απεικονίσεις του Παναγίου Τάφου και οι συμβολικές προκατάσεις τους κατά την ύστερη βυζαντινή περίοδο, ΔΚΑΕ 25 (2004) 225–236.
71 Ousterhout, Rebuilding the Temple, 66–78; Abbot Daniel, 11–12.
72 Abbot Daniel, 12–13, notes new marble slabs covering the burial bench and a sculpture of Christ. Limited archaeological evi-
Crusaders. In addition to Daniel’s account, the only image of the figure of Christ topping a shrine and associated with Byzantine artistic production known to me is the icon proskinetarion from the bilingual, Greek and Latin Hamilton Psalter, the private prayer book of Queen Charlotte of Jerusalem, Cyprus and Armenia, granddaughter of Theodore Palaeologue, despot of Mystra.73 This image shows a canopy-like structure covered by a trellis or net-like fabric and topped with a half-length sculpture of Christ (Fig. 6). This early fourteenth-century image confirms the framing of sacred space which, to judge from Daniel’s description of the Holy Sepulchre, seems to have evolved from at least the twelfth century.

A comparative analysis of the physical appearance of the Tomb from the fourth to the eleventh centuries, based on both visual and textual evidence (Fig. 7, Table 1), also suggests the rhetorical and topological endurance of architecture of the Holy Tomb across time. The earliest representations of the Tomb of Christ reveal a chamber centrally placed within the Rotunda. The repetitive motifs are railings, scalloped shell niches, (spiral) columns, curtains. Columns, lamps, the enclosure and the stone rolled from the entrance are recorded consistently. Therefore, the Tomb is specified topologically through specific, but essentially generic, decorative architectural elements such as columns, cornices, lattice work, or lanterns and high-quality materials including marble, silver, and copper, which also defined the Tomb as a recognizable and memorable free-standing and self-contained object.

The temporal aesthetic and emotional responses to the Tomb, which Photios and Daniel capture in their texts and we can assume capture the responses of other pilgrims and believers, are again guided by the rhetorical devices of the *topos* of beauty (*kallós*) and the *topos* of the opposite emotions such as joy and weeping, emphasizing the close relation between the literary *topos* and the material reality as well as site-related, performative participation in the real, physical and transcendental, metaphysical space of the Tomb. Ultimately, Daniel recognizes that seeing is believing, but adds, “thrice are happy those who visited the places without leaving their homes.”75 It is not surprising then that Photios says that the decoration of the Tomb is for piety and connects the ornaments in architecture with contemplation and memory, because the ultimate goal for the preservation of the Holy Sepulchre and its physical reality is the testimony it carries to the ultimate, spiritual truth.76

The Tomb and its truth were defined via physical architectural elements, measured by the human body, and charged with aesthetic and emotional responses. This art of memory, which creates links between the visible and the invisible, emphasizes the experiential power of architecture, which is both physical (site-related) and cerebral (intellectual-emotional). The ultimate subject matter for the Byzantines is not the Tomb itself but the human condition, here understood through the Incarnational argument. Daniel’s account ends with a *paradox* and a reference to the “Navel of the earth,” which is located just outside the memorable Church of the Holy Sepulchre (Fig. 2). The reference to the “Navel of the earth” (*νυνъ земний, ομφαλός*) comes from the prophetic text of Is 11:11–1277 and the promise of the salvation that will come in the sign of the cross from the four corners for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.


---

Fig. 6. Icon Canopy, Hamilton Psalter, 78.A.9, fol. 39v; ca. 1300, made in Constantinople, belonged to Queen Charlotte of Jerusalem, Cyprus and Armenia, granddaughter of Theodore Palaeologue, despot of Mystra (from: Byzantium: Faith and Power, ed. H. C. Evans, New York – New Haven 2004, cat. no. 77)
of the earth, presumably merging in Jerusalem, hence the power of the location of the Anastasis-Resurrection complex to attract pilgrims and believers from all corners of the earth. The Navel is, Daniel further records, "covered by a small building on (the vault of) which Christ is represented in mosaic, with this inscription: 'The sole of My foot serves as the measure for the heaven and [My hand] for the earth.'" 87 The inscription derives from Is 66:1: "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: where is the house that ye build unto me? and where is the place of my rest?" and its typological New Testament reference in Jn 4:20–24, 88 when Jesus refused to answer the question about the place of worship. Instead, this small building and its inscription recall for the question of God Himself - "immaterial and uncircumscribed, [that] has no place," 82 as explained by John of Damascus in his Exposition of the Orthodox Faith in the seventh century. It is critical that John of Damascus, whose writings were crucial for the believers during the middle ages, also emphasized the importance of "mental place where mind is active and mental and incorporeal nature exists." 83 Indeed, for Orthodox Christians, this spatial paradox is partially resolved already in this life by being united with Christ while also awaiting the second coming of Christ, which will be combined with the creation of new heavens and a new earth and Jerusalem filled with joy where "[t]he former things will not be remembered, nor will they come to mind." 84

Instead of a Conclusion: The Building in the Memory and Building from Memory

The mnemonic devices expressed in the Holy Sepulchre as a work of architecture and by its architecture imply deep cultural engagement with revealed truths. Photios himself never visited the place; Daniel was there several times, but their written memories of the Holy Sepulchre are strikingly similar, suggesting not only the pervasive endurance of the memory of the Holy Sepulchre in the Byzantine cultural landscape but also the very possibility that Phiotos and Daniel practiced the ancient technique of arts memoriae. Patriarch Photios by the virtue of his training in rhetoric was most likely familiar with this technique. 85 The composition of his narrative about the Tomb of Christ, which starts with the position of the Tomb in relation to Jerusalem and its association with Empress Helena, then focuses on the specifics of the shrine itself closely intertwined with human references, and ends with the discussion of the elements of the Tomb made "for piety," I would suggest, subtly derives from the Menander's rhetorical treatise on the praises of cities and highlights in this order: the "position" of the city, by its relation to topography or climate; then its architectural specifics, such as the citadels, and further the city's "origins, actions, and accomplishments," including those made "for piety towards the gods." 86 Upon closer examination, it is evident that Abbot Daniel similarly selected a set of "headings" for his narrative, essentially following Menander's outline. In addition, Amy Papalexandrou has demonstrated how Phiotos discussed narrative and visual rhetorics as mnemonic devices when discussing the saints and the representation of their associated narratives in the Constantinopolitan church of Hagia Sophia: "These stories are conveyed both by stories and by pictures ... For surely, having somehow through the outpouring and influence of the optical rays touched and encompassed the object, it too sends the essence of the thing seen on to the mind, letting it be conveyed from there to the memory for the concentration of unfailing knowledge. Has the mind seen? Has it grasped? Has it visualized? Then it has ef-

87 Cf. Jn 12:32; And if I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all peoples to Myself (Orthodox Bible, 1068).
88 Abbot Daniel, 14.
89 In 4:20: Our fathers worshiped on this mountain, and ye Jews say that in Jerusalem is the place where one ought to worship. 21: Jesus said to her, “Woman, believe Me, the hour is coming when you will neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, worship the Father. 22: You worship what you do not know; we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews. 23: But the hour is coming, and now is, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth; for the Father is seeking such to worship Him. 24: God is Spirit, and those who worship Him must worship in spirit and truth.” 25: The woman said to Him, “I know that Messiah is coming” (who is called Christ). “When He comes, He will tell us all things.” 26: Jesus said to her, “I who speak to you am He.”
80 John of Damascus. De fide Orthodoxa I.XIII in the chapter Concerning the place of God; and that the Deity alone is uncircumscribed stated that “God, then, being immaterial and uncircumscribed, has no place. For He is His own place, filling all things” and later “[T] hat which is comprehended in place or time or apprehension is circumscribed: while that which is contained by none of these is uncircumscribed. Therefore the Deity alone is uncircumscribed, being without beginning and without end, and containing all things, and in no wise apprehended.” Citations from John of Damascus. Exposition of the Orthodox Faith, in: Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, 9: History of Poitiers, John of Damascus, ed. P. Schaff, H. Wace, Oxford–New York 1994, 15–16.
82 Cf. Is 65:17–25; quotation from Is 65:17. V. also explanation of and references to this new creation in 2 Cor 5:17 and Rv 21:1–4; Orthodox Bible, 1109.
fortressly transmitted the forms to the memory. Abbot Daniel’s account is in regard to his acquaintance with *ars memoriae* further self-revealing because he actually visited the site. Abbot Daniel visited the Holy Sepulchre several times, and each time he visited the same places, thus tracing the very practice of *ars memoriae*, which prescribed that practitioners approach the building and walk through it several times, each time in the same order. His extremely accurate description of the Tomb of Christ, with its painstaking and accurate recording of its measurements, creates the most precise among the surviving medieval reports on the Holy Sepulchre and further confirms the power of *ars memoriae* for memorizing. I would suggest that the obvious combination of this ancient practice of *ars memoriae* with the biblical and medieval liturgical references reinforced each other and highlighted the rhetorical potency of architecture. I would even propose that the craft of rhetoric and the rhetoric of architecture in Byzantine culture reveals that the buildings as remembered in the text and the actual place also helped their perpetual re-creation in both collective and cultural memory and their actual architectural re-construction(s).

The rhetoric of architecture and the memory of the Holy Sepulchre are critical for understanding the rhetorical capacities of architecture because this architectural complex of the Holy Sepulchre, which was of greatest historical capacities of architecture because this architectural reconstruction in both collective and cultural memory and the text and the actual place also helped their perpetual re-creation in both collective and cultural memory and their actual architectural re-construction(s).

The rhetoric of architecture and the memory of the Holy Sepulchre are critical for understanding the rhetorical capacities of architecture because this architectural complex of the Holy Sepulchre, which was of greatest importance for believers, prevailed over all its diachronic and physical transformations and simultaneously set the standards for understanding the architectural concept of sacred space in the Byzantine realm. Hence, even if practitioners of *ars memoriae* – such as the highly intellectual churchmen Patriarch Photios and Abbot Daniel examined here – did not carry out the rhetoric of architecture in its technical capacity nor possess the body of knowledge necessary for actual architectural design and building, their role in spreading mnemonic links that the Byzantines may have used for their architectural accomplishments should not be underestimated. The Byzantines may have used these strong mnemonic links for their actual reconstructions of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Despite an observation that “the [Tomb] of modern times is in a far closer continuity with the earliest Cave than has usually been imagined,” (cf. Figs. 1, 3, 4, 5) the actual physical appearance of the Tomb from the Byzantine times remains controversial and any reconstruction hypothetical, but ultimately not critical. Mnemonic images could shape each Byzantine rebuilding of the Holy Sepulchre, but we are reminded that it was never an exact replica of the previous building. Under the Byzantines, the Holy Sepulchre, originally built as a commemorative martyrion functioned as a church, while its Tomb chamber acquired a canopy-like roof to resonate the miracle of the Holy Fire. However, these new architectural elements marked a historical discontinuity in the physical reality of the Holy Sepulchre, while the cognitive value of their novelty that framed the holy place of the Resurrection and localized the holy event of the Holy Fire, which was crucial for the Byzantine collective memory of the Holy Sepulchre, “for – as Carruthers wittingly remarked – we remember best what is unusual.”

The generic, pattern-like quality of the architectural form of the Tomb aedicule and its tectonics invested the space with its expressive potentials; therefore, its expressive potentials, rather than its exact physical and visual likeness across time, accounted for its pervasive potency for the “collective” memory of the Holy Sepulchre and its meaning as the promise of salvation and the New Jerusa-

---


88 Daniel describes what he sees and what he knows, yet he certainly visited the Tomb several times himself. Vivid descriptions as how one day he enters the Holy Sepulchre alone without a guide and bribes the guard to lift the marble cover over the Tomb of Christ, so as to chip a piece of stone and take it as a relic to Russia, as well as references to the historical figures he mentions, corroborates the validity of Daniel’s first-hand experience of the Holy Sepulchre; Abbot Daniel, 80–82.


90 I thank I. Drpić for discussing with me the importance of this distinctiveness of the architecture of the Holy Sepulchre in relation to other examples of Byzantine architecture.

91 On this critical philosophical question whether rhetoric is art in its technical capacity, which the ancient philosophers posed early on with an ambiguous answer and thus highlighting the capacity of rhetoric as a powerful tool to potentially coordinate distinct and discordant disciplines v. also: D. Roochnik, *Is Rhetoric an Art?*, Rhetorica 12/2 (1994) 127–154.

92 Egeria, *Travels*, 252.

93 Carruthers also claims that rhetoric as composition and invention may account for the actual building of architectural structures, *Craft of Thought*, 255. V. also R. Bork, *The Geometry of Creation*, *Architectural Drawing and the Dynamics of Gothic Design*, Farnham 2011, 422 who highlights the methodological continuity of geometric patterns relevant for the development of medieval architectural drawing and Gothic design but is of the opinion that they were independent of elucidating texts and theoretical thinking.

94 M. Marković, (Prvo Putovanje, 279–282) effectively shows how even when Russian Patriarch Nikon (1652–1658) obtained exact plan and measurements of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, its replica, built in the New Jerusalem monastery near Moscow, was not an exact copy. Rather, the focus of the design of the New Jerusalem monastery katholikon was on the floor plan and spatial concept of the church of the Holy Sepulchre.

95 Carruthers, *Craft of Thought*, 131.
lem. The dome drums of numerous Byzantine churches include engaged colonnettes, executed of marble or high-quality stone, or, in a later tradition, painted columns at angles, all of which gave the dome the appearance of a canopy reminiscent of the Tomb of Christ and the Holy Sepulchre. While it can be said that, by extension, every Byzantine church materializes the idea of the Heavenly Jerusalem, unique and memorable elements of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem may account for the more specific manifestation of this meaning of selected Byzantine churches. The case in point is the peculiar use of engaged double-colonnettes between arches of the dome drums in several Byzantine churches, which, in my opinion, because of their non-typicality, more directly refer to the memorable image of the Holy Sepulchre. Hence, the dome drum of the tenth-century Church of the Virgin in the monastery of Hosios Loukas monastery features engaged two-tiered marble colonnettes, suggestive of a canopy, as well as, between them, representations of the cross of Golgotha raised on a three-stepped base (Fig. 8), thus invoking the Holy Sepulchre complex. Emperor Constantine IX Monomachos, who may have been responsible for the reconstruction of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, also built the church of Nea Moni on the island of Chios, where the extensive and unusual use of non-structural columns and paired columns has been already noted by Charalambos Bouras. In this case the unique feature of the paired, “classicizing” columns supporting the dome as sometimes depicted in reference to the Tomb of Christ is comparable to the two-tiered and paired, freestanding marble colonnettes of the dome in Nea Moni (Fig. 9). The two later churches on Chios – Panagia Krina and Haghioi Apostoloi at Pyrgi – built as small-scale replicas of Nea Moni essentially preserved this feature of paired colonnettes (Figs. 10, 11). Although the use of twin-

Fig. 9. Nea Moni, Chios, ca. 1050s, dome (from: Bouras, Nea Moni, fig. 89)

Fig. 10. Panagia Krina, Chios, ca. 1200, dome as shown in the fresco in the church narthex (from: Bouras, Nea Moni, fig. 94)

Fig. 11. Haghioi Apostoloi, Pyrgi, Chios, thirteenth century, dome, historical photography and drawing of the section and plan of the dome (from: Bouras, Nea Moni, figs. 91-92)
colonnettes is not archaeologically attested to in the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, this feature of Roman and Early Christian imperial architecture is also seen in the depiction of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem in the fifth-century Munich ivory and the fourteenth-century drawing of the Holy Sepulchre Shrine from the Vatican library (Figs. 5, 12); therefore, this feature within the Byzantine cultural context points to the architecture and meaning of the Holy Sepulchre. The unusual and anachronistic motive of the engaged paired columns has already been noticed in the context of the Crusaders’ architectural interventions in the Holy Sepulchre. Engaged paired columns were repeated in the choir, which was not a common solution for French cathedrals of the period and Jürgen Krüger has suggested that the columns served as markers between the Constantinian and Byzantine buildings. Such a suggestion remains unverifiable, but the intentional use of engaged paired columns as potent symbolic features known from the Hellenistic and Old Testament past, firmly rooted in Jerusalem, are worth mentioning. Moreover, the two columns, or double-knotted columns at the entrance to the sanctuary have been related to the Temple of Solomon in Byzantine art and texts since the late tenth century. Furthermore, by focusing on ornaments as carriers of meaning, or made “for piety” as Photios emphasized, it can be suggested that the Byzantine insistence on the colonnettes surrounding the centrally planned Tomb aedicula in Jerusalem may account to the memorable use of engaged colonnettes for the domes of Byzantine churches. In turn, these churches can be associated with the iconic, three-dimensional image of the Holy Sepulchre with the overarching meaning of the Heavenly Jerusalem as the heavenly realm and the “locus” of the Resurrection and salvation. Hence, the role of ornament as an integral component of Byzantine architecture seems to mirror the role of ornament in rhetorical composition for contemplation and remembrance, gathering literally and symbolically site-related associations into a “place.” In that context, ornament as both literary and architectural device is simultaneously an ontological and corporeal tool deeply embodied in the compositional craft of rhetoric, including the rhetoric— the craft— of architecture.

In this complex network of rhetorics, it is crucial that architecture links topography, being, time, and memory. The concept of topology—which focuses both on a literary and a mnemonic understanding and a transcendental thinking of place (topos) within larger networks, that include topography and cultural landscapes, and questions how the changes in a given place that occur over


104 While the current uses of topology either in mathematics that deals with mathematical understanding of shapes and space and their transformations or in philosophy such as Heidegger’s topology are rather post-medieval, in each case, topology partakes of the ancient notion of place—either Greek topos or Latin locus. V. for example, J. Malpas, Heidegger’s Topology. Being, Place, World, Cambridge, Mass. 2006, 27–37.


Fig. 12. The Tomb of Christ and the Ascension of Christ, Munich ivory, ca. fifth century (Inv. Nr. MA 157, Bayerisches Nationalmuseum, Munich)
mental mosaics or frescoes of religious figurative and narrative images in its interior. In addition, the repetitive formulae of rhetorical texts about architecture and the ancient rhetorical, site-related techniques of *ars memoriae* appear crucial for remembering specific works of Byzantine architecture, both real and imagined. In the case of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and its Shrine of the Tomb of Christ, the vivid collective image of their often interchangeably referenced architecture was reduced to the spatial image of a domed structure with columns that stood equally for the structures of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Shrine of the Tomb of Christ itself, and the domes of numerous Byzantine churches, thus revealing the non-imitative potency of Byzantine architecture based on exact likeness. The *long durée* of the complex of the Holy Sepulchre, which already in the seventh century was in the non-Byzantine territories, prevailed over its numerous changes, including the destruction of the site in 1099 and subsequent reconstructions. Yet, it is the participatory event of pilgrimages and above all the annual event of the miracle of the Holy Fire that re-charged the performative dynamics of our otherwise modern static understanding of the architecture of the Holy Sepulchre. Hence, in the end, it was not critical when and what the Byzantines saw or really knew about architecture in Jerusalem, but rather how this architecture became a powerful albeit diachronical rhetorical and design tool, deeply embedded in their cultural construction, perception and reception of the sacred space.

---


---

Appendix 1

Photios, Question 107 to Amphilochius. About the Tomb of Our Lord Jesus Christ

The saving Tomb of the Lord of all is one bowshot away from the ancient Jerusalem. Indeed blessed Helena, when she visited Jerusalem and cleared that holy place of the piles of rubbish and filth there extended the buildings and the city wall. She started at a point on the ancient wall overlooking the saving Tomb, extended the perimeter, and enclosed the lifegiving Tomb within the enlarged circuit.

She also laid there the foundations of a holy sanctuary, so arranged that it enclosed the lifegiving Tomb as a separate feature in the middle of the Church. It took the place of an ambo, even though it was not used as one. Those intending to enter it have to pass through the sanctuary, and no one can enter the Tomb without going through the gates of the sanctuary.

In fact this Tomb, the source of our immortality, though it is natural rock, has been formed into a tomb by masons. The rock has been hollowed out from east to west, forming a narrow chamber. The space thus cut away is high enough to take man standing upright, wide enough only for one man to pass along, but long enough to take three or four in a row. Inside the rock chamber an additional amount of rock has been removed to create a rectangular recess long enough to take a man lying at full length, and on this the faithful Joseph is said to have laid the sinless body of the Lord. The entry for the Tomb, if that is the name to call it, or the mouth of the tomb, where the workman began to cut in, has its opening facing east, and it so happens that any one who approaches make their bow to the west.

The stone which originally rolled across the mouth of the tomb and closed it was long ago, it is said, broken in two. Part of it has been bound with copper, and stands next to the tomb, and the other part is placed on the west part of the gallery. This too receives its due veneration, lying there for all to revere. Once a year the stone bound with copper is anointed with holy balsam by the patriarch, and particularly after the Saviour’s Passion it serves as a Holy Table. So much for the Tomb itself.

Now about the additions made for decoration—or rather, for piety. The tomb has columns the height of a man which are set on bases. On the left and on the right there is an equal number, five on the north matching those on the south, with not the least difference in their shape or size. Between these corresponding rows at the western end there a column stands at the centre, but at the east end there is nothing, so as to leave an opening in front of the mouth of the Tomb. On top of these eleven columns rests a rectangular arrangement of cornices, joining the columns, and on top of these cornices (those on the east and west as well as those on the north and south) rest the elements forming the roof of the tomb. But the maker avoided round vaulting, and made a circular feature instead of an ordinary roof, joining the beams to form a kind of chimney. It was a tall roof, so that the upper end of the roof elements were more like the apex of a cone than a symmetrical roof. What we are now describing we learned from those who have made that blessed place a point of precise attention. [who have taken the trouble to reside in that blessed place].
Appendix 2

Russian Abbot Daniel in the Holy Land\textsuperscript{108}

Jerusalem

The holy city of Jerusalem lies in arid valleys, in the midst of high rocky mountains. It is only on approaching the city that one sees, first, the Tower [house] of David; then advancing a little, the Mount of Olives, the Holy of Holies [Dome of the Rock – explanation added by the author], the Church of the Resurrection, in which is the Holy Sepulchre; and finally, the whole city.

... Every Christian is filled with an immense joy at sight of the holy city of Jerusalem; and tears are shed by the faithful. None can choose but weep when they see the places so ardently longed for, where Christ our God endured the Passion for the remission of our sins; and thus, full of this deep joy, the journey to Jerusalem is continued on foot.

... On entering the city there is a road traversing it, which to the right leads to the Holy of Holies, and to the left to the Holy Resurrection containing the Holy Sepulchre.

The Church of the Resurrection of the Lord

The Church of the Resurrection is of circular form; it contains twelve monolithic columns and six pillars, and is paved with very beautiful marble slabs. There are six entrances, and galleries with sixteen columns. Under the ceiling, above the galleries, the holy prophets are represented in mosaic as if they are alive; the altar is surmounted by a figure of Christ in mosaic. At the high altar there is an "Exaltation of Adam" in mosaic; and the mosaic of the arch above represents the Ascension of our Lord. There is an "Annunciation" in mosaic on the pillars; and the mosaic on the vault of which Christ is represented in mosaic, with this inscription: 'The sole of My foot serves as the measure for the heaven and [My head] for the earth.'

Here is the description of the Holy Sepulchre: it is a small cave hewn in the rock, having an entrance so low that a man can scarcely get through by going on bended knees; its height is inconsiderable, and its dimensions, equal in length and breadth, do not amount to more than 4 cubits. When one has entered the grotto by the little entrance, one sees on the right hand a sort of bench, cut in the rock of the altar, outside the wall, is the 'Navel of the earth,' which is covered by a small building on [the vault of] which Christ is represented in mosaic, with this inscription: 'The sole of My foot serves as the measure for the heaven and [My hand] for the earth.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Architectural features of Christ's tomb in Jerusalem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>architectural features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twisted columns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lattice / trellis work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sea-shell hood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lamps-number varies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curtains/hangings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>canopy-like top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stone rolled from the entrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marble casing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metal plating of any part of the Shrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpture of Christ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The term used to describe the Shrine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The architectural features of the Tomb Aedicula as perceived by the Byzantines and those in their wider cultural circle over time may be summarized in the following table (Table 1). It attempts to describe each feature as it is known to have existed in each of the major historical periods relevant to the architecture of the Shrine: in the initial phase of development, from Constantine to the first destruction in 614; a seventh-century phase based on the description of the Frankish pilgrim Arculf (Byzantine and other surviving accounts, such as those by the Armenian pilgrim Hovsep, mention location but do not record features of the shrine); in the period of the eighth and ninth centuries as recorded by Patriarch Photios; and following the destruction in 1009 by Caliph al-Hākim as recorded by Russian pilgrim Abbot Daniel.
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Реторика архитектуре у византијском контексту: пример цркве Светог гроба

Јелена Богдановић

Реторички описи текстови о архитектури говоре о значају визуелног изражавања и саставни су део рецензије појединих архитектонских објеката и сења на њих у византијској култури. Коришћењем архитектуре за епистемолошко разумевање византијске культуры могуће је испитати реторику архитектуре, исто као и о архетипском архитектонском интервенцијама, неко је неоспорно да се архитектура целог комплекса значајно променила након Ал Хакимовог разарања 1009. године, када је Христов гроб запаљен. До пете деценије XI века комплекс цркве Светог гроба је обновљен. Византинци су обновили ротонду, али то никад није учинено са Константиновом базиликом из IV века. Цео комплекс значио је смањен. Ротонда је већ у IX веку функционисала као црква (сл. 2), а могуће је да је тако било и раније. Крајем IX века арапски и хришћански извori говоре о цркви Светог гроба као (сл. 2), а могуће је да је тако било и раније. Крајем IX века арапски и хришћански извori говоре о цркви Светог гроба као (сл. 2), а могуће је да је тако било и раније.

Професор Богдановић испитује оваквом примеру. Извршио је анализу реторике архитектуре у византијском контексту, а тачније, у разматраној наметнутој области, за анализу „византијског“ архитектонског комплекса Светог гроба. У тим најважнијим византијским изворима често се не помиње архитектура Светог гроба. Веома се мало зна и о византијским архитектонским интервенцијама, иако је неоспорно да се архитектура целог комплекса значајно променила након Ал Хакимовог разарања 1009. године, када је Христов гроб запаљен. До пете деценије XI века комплекс цркве Светог гроба је обновљен. Византинци су обновили ротонду, али то никад није учинено са Константиновом базиликом из IV века. Цео комплекс значио је смањен. Ротонда је већ у IX веку функционисала као црква (сл. 2), а могуће је да је тако било и раније. Крајем IX века арапски и хришћански извori говоре о цркви Светог гроба као (сл. 2), а могуће је да је тако било и раније. Крајем IX века арапски и хришћански извori говоре о цркви Светог гроба као (сл. 2), а могуће је да је тако било и раније.

Одреднички архитектонски материјал. Патријарх цариградски Фотије (858–867, 877–886) у IX веку описао је Светог гроба. Епистоларни запис патријарха Фотија није у оквиру расправе о улози светог места (locus sanctus) који се појављује на богослужењу у овим православном Ускра у цркви Светог гроба (сл. 5). По свој прилици, током сваке реконструкције комплекса Византинци су прво обављали овај свето место (locus sanctus) – цркву Светог гроба. О томе како су Византинци прошло тако реконструкције није могуће говорити буђући да су они изгубили власт над Јерусалимом већ у VII веку и након него су имали документацију о архитектонском проекту цркве Светог гроба. Сва је прилика да реконструкције нису биле засноване на одређеним цртежима, већ на изузетним комбинацијама појединачних мотива које су Византинци развили на основу својих веровања и сродних након у којем се главно свето место (locus sanctus) преносило ово место. Епистоларни запис патријарха Фотија није у оквиру расправе о улози светог места (locus sanctus) који се појављује на богослужењу у овим православном Ускра у цркви Светог гроба (сл. 5). По свој прилици, током сваке реконструкције комплекса Византинци су прво обављали овај свето место (locus sanctus) – цркву Светог гроба. О томе како су Византинци прошло тако реконструкције није могуће говорити буђући да су они изгубили власт над Јерусалимом већ у VII веку и након него су имали документацију о архитектонском проекту цркве Светог гроба. Сва је прилика да реконструкције нису биле засноване на одређеним цртежима, већ на изузетним комбинацијама појединачних мотива које су Византинци развили на основу својих веровања и сродних након у којем се главно свето место (locus sanctus) преносило ово место. Епистоларни запис патријарха Фотија није у оквиру расправе о улози светог места (locus sanctus) који се појављује на богослужењу у овим православном Ускра у цркви Светог гроба (сл. 5). По свој прилици, током сваке реконструкције комплекса Византинци су прво обављали овај свето место (locus sanctus) – цркву Светог гроба. О томе како су Византинци прошло тако реконструкције није могуће говорити буђући да су они изгубили власт над Јерусалимом већ у VII веку и након него су имали документацију о архитектонском проекту цркве Светог гроба. Сва је прилика да реконструкције нису биле засноване на одређеним цртежима, већ на изузетним комбинацијама појединачних мотива које су Византинци развили на основу својих веровања и сродних након у којем се главно свето место (locus sanctus) преносило ово место.
ман Данило је, међутим, посетио цркву Светог гроба неколико пута током свог ходочашћа у Свету земљу од 1106. до 1108. године, пре великих архитектонских промена које су извели крашчи средином XII века. Иако се у ова два записа помињу архитектура и место Светог гроба, у њима се појављују и слике позањене из теолошке, езегетске и литургиске прaksе. Композиције дају записи упадљиво сличне. Обојица аутора прво описују место Светог гроба, затем његову архитектуру и, на крају, његову орнаментику. Они се истовремено су архитектонско-структурални и реторички, јер омогућују размену репрезентативних и искусвених аспеката архитектуре с меморијским местима. Гроб је прво мапиран и позициониран унутар града Јерусалима. У постручку локацију Гроба његов се значај проширио изван његових физичких граница тако што Фотије и Данило реторички користе три традиционалне методе: епизо (коју називали, байдес и голош (који је емотиван и емпатичан) и печат (који је традиционално резервисан за преправку о уређењу света). 

У раду је такође показано како архитектура цркве Светог гроба пружа тектонски оквир за постањивање буквалних и менталних слика, оних које преносе и понављају експресивне потенција и значаје Светог гроба у оквиру његових физичких граница и изван њих. Записи које су оставили Фотије и Данило сагласни су у томе да је главна архитектонска форма цркве изведена као врста ротонде, а у вези с концептualном и просторном (иако не поседују геометријски значај) самом светињу Светог гроба у оквиру ротонде (сл. 1, 2). У оба записа наглашавају се и хуманистичке вредности у значају Гроба, који се одређују и помоћу људских димензија и телесног присуства – разних радњи које ходочасници сами или у групи изводе у простору Гроба (клањање, поштовање и целивање места на којем је тело Христово лежало у Гробу). Те радње неминовно су везане за ходочасничке ритуале и византијске црквене службе. Фотије и Данило такође тополошки и литургиски упоређују Гроб са амвоном, литургијским намештајем који обиљежава места са четири стране света, док ће му средиште бити пророчког текста о спасењу које ће доћи у знаку краста са четри стране света, док ће сте унутар света. Омфалос је, каже Данило даље, уоквирен мањом кућом и својим значајем према ротонди. Стуб – један од основних грана тако што Фотије и Данило реторички користе, јер се у суштини самог Бога, нематеријалног и свеприсутног. Записи које су оставили Фотије и Данило сагласни су у томе да је главна архитектонска форма цркве Светог гроба као ротонда уоквирена посебним или светиљкама, укључујући и мање материјале, укључујући мермер, злато и бакар, који такође дефинишу Гроб као препознатљив и незабораван самостални објекат. 

Упредна анализа изгледа Гроба од IV до XI века, заснована на визуелном и текстуалном материјалу (сл. 7, табела 1), указује на реторичку и тектонску тренутност архитектуре Светог гроба. Најважније представе Христовог гроба откривају централно смештену просторију унутар ротонде. Мотиви који се понастављају јесу ограда, нише у облику морских шкољки, и завесе на улазу у гробницу. Елементи који се не помињу после VII века јесу нише у облику морских шкољки и завесе. Стубови, лампе, ограда и овдвајени камен на улазу у Гроб укључују јесу ограда, нише у облику морских шкољки и завесе. Стубови,
ру помогле њиховом непрекидном „стварању” у колективном и културном памћењу, као и при њиховој практичној, архитектонској реконструкцији. Реторика архитектура је спомен Светог гроба, који је од највећег значаја за вернике, превладали су над свим дијахроним и физичким преоређењима Светог гроба и истовремено су поставили стандарде за разумевање архитектонског концепта светог простора у византијском свету. Иако они који су се служили техником архитектонске форме Светог гроба и његову тектонику, блиско повезане са нерички, општи образац архитектонске форме Свештеница користили за своја архитектонска достигнућа чини се важном. Гемеморијских веза које су Византинци користили за пројектовање и изградњу, њихова улога у ширењу капацитету и корпусу знања битних за архитектонску меморију.

Иако они који су се служили техником обраде Светог гроба као на орнаменте и носиоце значења, византијској култури. У средсређући се на стубове почетних модела у топографском и културном пејзажу из V века (сада у Минхену; сл. 12) или на цртежу из цркви Светог гроба, може се видети на слоновачи реторике архитектуре. Како је и Фотије истакао, можемо претпоставити да је Светог гроба као на орнаменте и носиоце значења, истовремено су и онтолошки и телесни, те дубоко оличени у композицији како реторичког зана та тако и – реторике архитектуре.

У овом сложеном систему реторике архитектура повезује топографију, биће, време и памћење. Иако је византијске цркве релативно лако препознати као византијске, свака је јединствена, па се пре може говорити о значају образаца и модела него о тачно одређењу византијских формама важним и за грађење и за разумевање византијске архитектуре. Концепт топологии – у којем је битно и књижевно и немногично разумевање и трансцендентално размишљање о месту (топосу) у оквиру већих културних система, оних што укључују топографију и културе пејзаже, као и питања о томе како су промене током времена у определеном месту утицај на историју локалитета – такође постаје присутан за разумевање историјског и просторног значаја реторике византијске архитектуре.

То се рећи да је самоиницирано тополошко понављање препознатљивих типова архитектонских облика из општим архитектонским формама важним и за грађење и разумевање византијске архитектуре. Изолиранстве и разумевање „на једно место” у том контексту, и књижевни орнамент (украс) и онај архитектонски истовремено су и онтолошки и телесни, те дубоко оличени у композицији како реторичког зана та тако и – реторике архитектуре.