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Abstract

This paper examines the ideological relationship of the Holy Sepulchre and the Temple of Jerusalem, as manifest in writings, ceremonies, and architecture. A possible relationship between the form of the Tomb aedicula at the Holy Sepulchre and early representations of the Ark of the Covenant is explored. Related to this, the origin and significance of the term martyrion in reference to the site of the Holy Sepulchre is discussed. The term was apparently derived from the prophetic language of the Septuagint, and thus meant something different from simply a martyr’s shrine. Finally, some comments are presented on the interpretation of the symbolic language of architecture.

With the construction of the church of the Holy Sepulchre, begun by Constantine the Great in A.D. 326, the city of Jerusalem once again possessed a major religious shrine. The Temple of Jerusalem had been destroyed in A.D. 70 during the Roman sack of the city, and it was never rebuilt. In describing Constantine’s building program, the emperor’s biographer, Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, invited a comparison of the two: the Holy Sepulchre is the “New Jerusalem, facing the far-famed Jerusalem of old time...” and the Tomb of Christ is called the “Holy of Holies,” contrasting the new architectural creation on the western hill of the city with the ruins of the Jewish Temple to the east of the Tyropoeon Valley, where the Dome of the Rock now stands (Fig. 1).† In effect, the Holy Sepulchre became the New Temple.

Such an ideological transformation, symbolizing the change from the Old Covenant to the New Covenant, found several forms of expression in the Early Christian centuries. I am not implying that the Holy Sepulchre was constructed as a “copy” of the Temple, and the comparison of the two buildings can be taken only so far. But for the Christian visitor to Jerusalem, the symbolic content was enriched by the strength of the association. Moreover, because of resonance and richness of allusion at the Holy Sepulchre, the complex provides us with an instructive example for the study of the iconography of architecture. That is, if architectural form is to be the bearer of meaning, how is a specific or general interpretation attached to a given form? Krautheimer introduced the examination of such questions more than forty years ago in a study that focused on the architectural copies of the Holy Sepulchre.‡

However, in an architectural copy there is a repetition of elements that provides something of a formal “hook” to hang our meaning on. The association between these two great Urbilder, the Holy Sepulchre and the Temple, is more complex and more elusive.

To be sure, the two buildings were lacking in most formal similarities. The Temple had been rectangular in plan, preceded by a broad porch. It faced east onto a court, where its altar was located. The interior was divided...
between the sanctuary and the Holy of Holies, which once contained the Ark of the Covenant (Fig. 2). In contrast, the Holy Sepulchre was a complex of buildings with an atrium, a five-aisled basilica, an inner court with the chapel of Calvary in the southeast corner, and the Anastasis Rotunda to the west, containing the aedicula of the Tomb of Christ (Fig. 3).

Nevertheless, there are a few similarities. For example, the orientation of the two buildings was the same, that is, with the entrance to the east, and, according to the late fourth-century pilgrim Egeria, the dedications were also related. She wrote:

The date when the church on Golgotha (called Martyrium) was consecrated to God is called Encaenia, and on the same day the holy church of the Anastasis was also consecrated . . . the day of Encaenia was when the House of God was consecrated, and Solomon stood in prayer before God's altar, as we read in the Books of Chronicles.

An association seems to have been made primarily on the basis of function, and the timing and organization of individual celebrations, as well as the ordering of the liturgical calendar, reflected Jewish worship. Wilkinson has suggested that parts of the early liturgical celebration at the Holy Sepulchre were structured following the model of the ceremonies at the Temple. The synagogue service may have provided a liturgical intermediary, but many elements would seem to relate directly to the Temple. For example, the timing of the Morning Whole-Offering at the Temple is paralleled in the Weekday Morning Hymns at the Holy Sepulchre. Both began at cockcrow with the opening of the doors; morning prayers or hymns were begun at daylight. Subsequently, in the Temple service, the High Priest and other priests entered the Temple and prostrated themselves; whereas at the Holy Sepulchre, the Bishop and clergy entered the Tomb Aedicula for prayers and blessings. Then, in both ceremonies, the officiants emerged from the entrance of the Temple or Tomb to bless the people.

In other celebrations described by Egeria, if the comparison with Temple service holds, the Tomb of Christ takes the place of the Temple or, perhaps more specifically, the Holy of Holies. The ever-burning lamp in the Tomb may be likened to the menorah in the Temple (or perhaps

to similar lamps in synagogues); and the Rock of the Crucifixion assumes the role of the altar of sacrifice on Mount Moriah. In addition, the “Stone of the Angel” in front of the Tomb of Christ—the stone rolled from the original rock-cut tomb—is described not as round, but as a “cube,” which would liken it to the Altar of Incense at the Temple.

Such a liturgical reflection of the Temple would accord with the exegetical emphasis of fourth-century Christian writers; that is, it mirrors the desire of writers like Eusebius to ground the recently accepted faith on the signs and prophecies of the Old Testament. In fact, the symbolic association of the Temple and the Sepulchre may have been initiated by Eusebius himself. In his sermon on the dedication of the church at Tyre of 317, for example, Eusebius modeled his description of that church on Ezekiel’s vision of the Temple, and Josephus’s description of the Temple as rebuilt by Herod. His purpose was to demonstrate the continuity from Temple to church, and to show the fulfillment of Haggai’s prophecy about the Jewish Temple that “the latter glory of this House shall be greater than the former” (Hag. 2:9).

Moreover, the language used by Eusebius to describe the discovery of the site of the Tomb of Christ and the subsequent Constantinian building project at the Holy Sepulchre follows the same pattern. From the beginning, he refers to the site as the martyrion of the Savior’s Resurrection. By the end of the fourth century—and in modern scholarship—the term martyrion is used in a somewhat different sense, but Eusebius must have intended it in the same way St. Cyril explains a few decades later, namely, in reference to the prophecy of Zephaniah: “Therefore, says the Lord, wait for me at the martyrion on the day of my resurrection.”

Eusebius also preached at the dedication of the basilica at the Holy Sepulchre in 336. The sermon has not survived, although he noted in the Life of Constantine that he “endeavored to gather from the prophetic visions apt illustrations of the symbols it displayed.” In consideration of this and his references elsewhere, Wilkinson is probably correct in suggesting that Eusebius interpreted the the martyrion of the Savior” as the New Temple of Jerusalem in the dedicatory sermon.

The connection of the Holy Sepulchre with the Temple, then, seems to have existed from its inception, and it is seen most clearly in the shaping of the liturgy and in the language of Eusebius. Neither seems to have had a clear, architectural manifestation. Nevertheless, the association was developed in the folklore of the Early Christian period. One result was a blatant literalism: “holy sites” and relics previously associated with the Temple were gradually incorporated into the Holy Sepulchre complex. For example, in the fourth century the Pilgrim of Bordeaux saw on the Temple Mount “an altar which has on it the blood of Zacharias—you would think it had only been shed today,” as well as the footprints of the soldiers that killed him. By the sixth century, the site had migrated, and the author of the Breviarium saw the “altar where holy Zacharias was killed, and his blood dried there,” in front of the Tomb of Christ. Sometime before the seventh century, the Church of the Aedicula was dedicated in the northeast corner of the church, the spot in which tradition placed the tomb of Christ. This was a move which has been interpreted both as a gesture of reverence and as an attempt to adapt to the growing interest in the macabre.
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century, the *omphalos* or navel of the world was also relocated at the Christian center.¹⁵

Events from the life of Christ associated with the Temple were transferred as well. For example, pilgrims in the sixth century were told that the inner courtyard of the Holy Sepulchre was the Temple court “where Jesus found them that sold the doves and cast them out.”¹⁶ In addition, Christian pilgrims saw the Horn of the Anointing used by the Jewish kings, the ring of Solomon, and the altar of Abraham.

The Horn of the Anointing is an evocative relic, however untestified in the Jewish sources. It is first mentioned by Egeria in the late fourth century, and was venerated along with the Wood of the Cross and the ring of Solomon on Good Friday.¹⁷ The ring of Solomon is perhaps more intriguing. It was apparently a seal-ring, decorated with a pentagram. According to a Jewish legend, well known in the Early Christian centuries, it was claimed to have been used by King Solomon to seal the demons and thereby gain power over them. While under his control, the power of the demons was channeled to aid in the construction of the first Temple.¹⁸ Elsewhere in the Basilica of Constantine, pilgrims saw the vessels in which Solomon had sealed the demons.¹⁹

The altar of Abraham marked the site where he had offered his son Isaac as a sacrifice on Mount Moriah, and this was commonly identified with the altar of the Temple. The event figured prominently in Christian thought, juxtaposing the sacrifice of Abraham with that of Christ. According to the *Breviarius*, the sacrifice of Abraham occurred “in the very place where the Lord was crucified.”²⁰ Thus, Golgotha became Mount Moriah, and was also regarded as the place where Adam was created and where he was buried. The altar is also mentioned by the Piacenza Pilgrim and by Adomnan, and it is represented in the Holy Sepulchre plans that accompany the texts of Adomnan.²¹

After the Arab capture of Jerusalem, the Dome of the Rock was constructed on the Temple mount, presumably on the former site of the Temple, left barren under the Christian rule. Under Muslim rule the site again became associated with the shared theme of the Sacrifice of Abraham. Likewise in Muslim thought, the two sites were juxtaposed. As Muqadassi related:

Abd al-Malik, seeing the greatness of the *qubba* of the Holy Sepulchre and its magnificence, was moved lest it should dazzle the minds of the Muslims and hence erected the Dome of the Rock.²²

Another manifestation of the association between the Temple and the Holy Sepulchre may be seen in the representations of the two buildings. Although there was very little similarity between the two, they are portrayed in a like manner on coins, pilgrims’ souvenirs, and works of art. Both are commonly represented with architectures of two different scales: larger columns support an architrave, pediment, or dome above a smaller structure that can be identified either as the Ark of the Covenant in the Holy of Holies or as the Tomb aedicula.

The earliest representations of the Temple may be those from coins associated with the Bar Kochba revolt of A.D. 132–35 (Fig. 4). Four columns support the architrave of a large building, within which stands an object with an arched top. Several scholars have viewed this image as a Torah shrine, but considering the Messianic hope of the revolt for the restoration of the Temple, as well as the conventions of Roman coinage, this should be interpreted as the facade of the Temple with the Ark of the Covenant inside.²³ Incidentally, many of these coins were pierced to be worn on a necklace, possibly with amuletic properties. It is noteworthy that the coin images date from more than a half-century after the final destruction of the Temple, and long after the Ark had disappeared. Nevertheless, a tradition of visual representation seems to have been established.

The image above the Torah shrine in the Synagogue at Dura-Europos (A.D. 244–45) is virtually identical, and the narrative scene of the Sacrifice of Abraham surely indicates that this is the Temple (Fig. 5).²⁴ And as Rosenau points out, it would be redundant to represent the Torah shrine above the Torah shrine.²⁵ At Dura, the Ark is shown with a shell motif in its arched pediment, a detail repeated in the actual Torah shrine below. Because the shrine—the Ark of the Law—replaced the Ark of the Covenant in Jewish thought, as synagogue worship replaced Temple worship, it follows that the shrine should be modeled after the Ark. This has led to numerous confusions in the interpretation of Jewish imagery. In the iconographic transfer from Temple to Sepulchre, as we...
shall see, the synagogue may have served as an intermediary, just as it did in the development of the Christian worship service. Similar images are seen in the mosaic floors of several early synagogues, as at Khirbet-Susiya (fourth-fifth century) and Beth She’an (fifth century). Both include a pediment and the distinctive shell niche above the Ark.

Representations of the Holy Sepulchre in pilgrims’ souvenirs are remarkably similar to the representations of the Temple. On several pilgrims’ ampullae, dated ca. 600, from the collections at Monza and Bobbio, the aedicula of the Tomb of Christ is shown below a schematic representation of the Anastasis Rotunda, normally with the roof supported by four columns; a similar example is in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection (Fig. 6). The Tomb aedicula is topped by a pediment containing a shell motif. Differentiated by the form of the roof, the crosses, and the grilles at the entrance to the tomb, the images nevertheless call to mind the Ark within the Holy of Holies at the Temple.

The specific imagery of the Ark or Tomb aedicula merits further investigation. In the rock-cut tombs at Sheikh-Ibreiq, the scallop shell is combined with an arched lintel, both recognized as symbols stressing the divinity or “superiority” of the deceased, or possibly the immortality of his soul, as Goodenough suggests. The imagery would emphasize the burial “in the law,” reflecting either synagogue or Temple architecture.

Similar symbolic shrines appear as windows on the south facade of the synagogue at Capharnaum, facing toward Jerusalem (Fig. 7). The shell niche is clearly represented, topped by a pediment or arculated lintel supported by two pairs of columns. The columns have spiral fluting, a detail that appears in several other Temple images, and on most of the Christian pilgrims’ flasks. On the latter, the spiral columns may be a part of either the aedicula or the Rotunda, but they seem to have been potent and necessary symbols in the schematic representations. One may recall the spiral columns at the shrine of St. Peter in Rome, which according to legend were taken from the Temple of Jerusalem. In addition, similar forms appear on the sixth-century altar base from the cathedral of Ravenna, which was dedicated to the Anastasis, suggestive of a connection with Jerusalem.

Perhaps closest to the original Tomb aedicula is the fragmentary stone model found in Narbonne (Fig. 8).
From this, the facade of the aedicula can be reconstructed as a pedimented arch opening to a shall niche; the colonnaded porch below was enclosed by grilles. The remaining surfaces were decorated with columns (perhaps spiral columns?). The reconstructed form of the Tomb of Christ is better seen in Wilkinson’s model (Fig. 9).

The reconstructed Tomb aedicula compares nicely with another image from Capharnaum, which I think should be identified as the Ark of the Covenant in a cart, perhaps a reference to its return to Israel from the land of the Philistines (Fig. 10). This unique image is normally interpreted as a moveable Torah shrine or Ark of the Law, but I Kings 6 and II Kings 6 both describe the use of a cart for the eventual return of the Ark to Jerusalem. Interpreted as such, it would have been a potent symbol in the post-Temple period. It is perhaps the only nonaxial representation of the Ark from this period, revealing colonnettes along its flank, as well as the shell motif in the pediment. Both features are also found on the Tomb aedicula.

The above discussion suggests that not only were the Christian representations of the Tomb of Christ influenced by the Temple imagery of the period, but that the original form of the Tomb aedicula may also have borrowed from the evocative formal language of contemporaneous Jewish art. And perhaps here we should return to Eusebius, who seems to have been on hand from the beginning of official interest in the site. In his writings and presumably in his dedicatory sermon, Eusebius played a critical role in defining the meaning of the Holy Sepulchre in relationship to the Temple. Could he also have influenced the selection of suitable architectural forms? As the architectural setting acted as a physical manifestation of the significance of the site and the events it commemorated, it may well be that Eusebius also helped to establish the architectural imagery of the Tomb aedicula.

However, I am not going to push this point. It is a mistake to view these images in isolation. Pedimented arches, shell niches, and aediculae were all common elements in the late Roman architectural vocabulary, particularly in the Near East, and these elements appear in various combinations in numerous other works of architecture—as for example, the Temple of Venus at Baalbek—and even works of the minor arts, and slightly later in early Muslim mihrab niches. In many—if not most—instances, these forms would seem to be part of an architectural language of power or glorification. In any event, the suggestion of specificity of reference in the selection of architectural forms at the Holy Sepulchre must be tempered with a broader view of the architectural vocabulary of the period.

Whereas the architectural metaphor may not have been explicit, it was strengthened by Eusebius’s more specific literary metaphor. In addition, it further accorded with the aim of fourth-century scriptural exegesis: to
validate the newly accepted religion with the prophecy of the Old Testament. The “martyrion of the Savior’s Resurrection” could be confirmed both by the writings of Zechariah and by the existence of the Tomb. Architecture could help to demonstrate that “the latter glory of this house shall be greater than the former.” According to his view, both the shrines of martyrs and the holy sites of Palestine could be called martyria: the term was thus generic from the beginning, and this is how it is used in modern scholarship. For example, Krautheimer, following Grabar’s lead, defined martyrion as “a site which bears witness to the Christian faith either by referring to an event in Christ’s life or Passion, or by sheltering the grave of a martyr, a witness by virtue of having shed his blood; the structure erected over such a site.”

However, Grabar’s interpretation is a bit at odds with the few early Christian writers who explained the term. Diechmann points out that the word was foreign and uncommon in Latin, and possibly out of date by the time of Walafrid Strabo (ca. 808–49), who gave the following definition: “martyria vocabantur ecclesiae quae in honore aliquorum martyrum fiebant.” Isidore of Seville (ca. 560–636) followed the same pattern: “martyrium, locus martyrum, graecia derivatione, eo quod in memoriam martyris sit constructum, vel quod sepulcrum ibi sint martyrum.” Both Strabo and Isidore limit their definition to the shrines of martyrs.

But what about the early fourth-century sanctuaries marking the Holy Sites of Palestine so important to Grabar’s definition and subsequent discussion? A look at the texts indicates that the only Palestinian holy site called a martyrion during the fourth century was the Holy Sepulchre. This also was apparently the first site designated as such, and the term had special connotations related to the site.
The term *martyrion* appears about 250 times in the Septuagint, normally in a legal sense, meaning the proof of something, the evidence. When applied to a specific time or place, the term is usually expanded to *he skene tou martyrion*. God himself could be the *martyrion*, in an accusing sense and in executing judgment. Although the idea of martyrdom—that is, suffering and death for the faith—was prevalent in later Jewish thought, the martyrs of the Old Testament, strictly speaking, were those who bore witness with a message for others. This usage was adopted in the New Testament, in which the Apostles were witnesses in a legal sense, and the term *martyrion* usually referred to witness against false belief rather than the evangelistic witness of missionary preaching.

In accordance with its objective connotations, *martyrion* later became used to refer to a martyr’s tomb. Again, the development of this usage is problematic. As far as I have been able to determine, the first recorded use of the word *martyrion* to refer to a venerated Christian site seems to have been by Eusebius in the *Life of Constantine*, written around A.D. 337, in his description of the discovery of the Tomb of Christ, which he called “the venerable and most holy *martyrion* of the Savior’s resurrection.” As noted above, his terminology clearly came from Zephaniah 3:8: “Therefore says the Lord, wait for me at the *martyrion* on the day of my resurrection. In Greek, the verse ends, “... eis hēmeran anastaseōs mou eis martyrion.” This might also be translated as, “... until the day of my resurrection for a *testimony*”; or “... against the day when I arise as an *accuser*.” Both appear in modern usage, the first in the English version of the Septuagint, and the second in the St. Joseph’s Catholic Bible. In the Septuagint version the words *martyrion* and *anastasis* were used, and both were to become toponyms at the Holy Sepulchre. About 350, St. Cyril refers to the same passage in his *Catecheses*:

> Now for what reason is this place of Golgotha and of the Resurrection called not a church like the rest of the churches, but a *martyrion*? It was perhaps because of the prophet who said: “in the day of my resurrection at the *martyrion*."

What may appear to us as a rather obscure reference concurs with the aim of contemporaneous scriptural exegeses: to validate the newly accepted religion with the prophecy of the Old Testament. But in both Eusebius and Cyril, the meaning of Zephaniah has been altered. In Zephaniah, the Lord will execute judgment. And the place of judgment will be His holy mountain, where the Temple is located. In Eusebius, there may be a hint of the New Testament meaning of witness against false belief, because the term *martyrion* is first introduced immediately following an account of the destruction of the shrine of Aphrodite on the site, “defiled as it was by devil-worship.” The Tomb of Christ thus became a testimony both for the Resurrection and against false gods. Eusebius did not mean simply “tomb of the martyr,” although Cyril’s explanation may be headed in that direction: he clearly interprets the term as a special name for a building. Thus, in the writings of both Eusebius and Cyril, *martyrion* had a specific meaning in relationship to the site.

By the end of the fourth century, Eusebius’s complex meaning had been lost. The pilgrim Egeria (ca. 385) associated the term *martyrium* with the Constantinian basilica, explaining that it was known as such “because it is on Golgotha behind the Cross, where the Lord was put to death.” Notably it was the basilica, not the rotunda with its signative shape, that was to be called the *martyrium*.

By the second half of the fourth century, it seems, the term was in use to refer to martyrs’ shrines and places of martyrdom. Egeria’s misunderstanding removed any specificity from the term *martyrion* as it applied to the holiest site in Christendom, and the rich associations of the term were subsequently forgotten. With the meaning introduced by Eusebius, as a part of an extended metaphor, the Holy Sepulchre could be regarded as a *martyrion* in a very special sense: it could become the New Temple of Jerusalem by supplanting the “place of judgment” of Old Testament prophecy. And even though Eusebius’s literary metaphor was forgotten, the association of the two sites persisted in Early Christian thought.

* * *

Buildings to commemorate the saints and buildings to honor the events in Christ’s life may have borrowed from the same architectural language of glorification, but it would seem that they were viewed differently. The term *martyrium* did not originally refer to a specific building type—nor for that matter did the term *basilica*. In the twentieth century, such typological associations, as well as the belief that form must reflect function, have imposed a false sense of order on the study of Early Christian architecture. Frequently form *could* act as a signifier of general symbolic meanings, but our interpretations must be tempered with a careful reading of the available textual evidence.

This, I should note, is the warning given by Krautheimer in his “Introduction to an ‘Iconography of Medieval Architecture.’” But does the architectural image necessarily carry the same level of meaning as the literary metaphor? In his paper, Krautheimer considered why the majority of Early Christian baptisteries were centrally planned and normally were octagonal. Looking at the ceremony of baptism, as well as numerous Early Christian writers’ interpretations of the ceremony, he stressed that the rite of Christian initiation ceremonially reenacted the burial and resurrection of Christ. Going one step further, he suggested that the same meaning was manifest in the architecture, that is, that the baptistery as a building type
was modeled after the form of the Anastasis Rotunda at the Holy Sepulchre.

But whereas the meaning of the ceremony is made explicit through its language, no surviving text states that an Early Christian baptistery was a copy of a specific building. Moreover, there is nothing explicit in the architectural form of any of these buildings to establish a link with the Holy Sepulchre. On the other hand, there would seem to have been a general, typological association of the octagonal baptistery with a common form of late Roman imperial mausoleum, and this would have emphasized the association between baptism and death. The relationship with the death of Christ is established in only the most general terms through the architecture, whereas the symbolism of the baptismal ceremony is much more specific.

Thus, architecture may comment on or interact with the rituals it houses, but I think it is a mistake to expect a direct symbolic correspondence. In the architectural setting, there was perhaps by necessity only a general association of form and meaning. It was the function—the liturgy—that added texture, nuance, and specificity.

On the basis of the above discussion, I think we can see a similar relationship between form and function emerging at the Holy Sepulchre. The associations with the Temple were developed only in a general way with respect to the architecture, but they became more specific in the liturgy, as well as in the writings of Eusebius and St. Cyril. Whereas a comparison seems invited, nowhere are we told that the Holy Sepulchre was a “copy” of the Temple. Such a blatant equation would have proved limiting and would not have resonated with the other, equally important, messages of the building, such as the victory of the church, the active involvement of the imperial family, and the order and harmony of the Christian cosmos. The architectural setting had to provide a symbolic framework in which many associations could be evoked and could exist simultaneously. Clearly, the understanding of the liturgical service and of the literary metaphor can aid in the interpretation of architectural form, but in the final analysis, words and images, ceremonies and settings, communicate in different ways.

NOTES

* The following study owes much to John Wilkinson, whom I gratefully acknowledge for his continued friendship and encouragement. Earlier versions were presented at the 1988 Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians in Chicago and at the University of Chicago Colloquium on Art, Liturgy, and Music in 1989.
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