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ABSTRACT

Russian Orthodoxy considered the church building to be an icon of heaven that portrayed Heaven-on-Earth and provided a glimpse of the Heavenly Jerusalem. Symbolism was used in church architecture to express these themes. This thesis explores the representation of Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem in the Uspensky Sобор (Cathedral of the Assumption), in the Moscow Kremlin and the Pokrovsky Sобор (Cathedral of the Intercession) in Red Square in Moscow.

Fifteenth and sixteenth Muscovite church symbolism is best interpreted through a theological lens to provide insight into the mindset of those times. It is more accurate than a purely political, historical, or cultural approach. Biblical imagery relating to the themes of Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem will be the starting point. The meaning of the Old Testament tabernacle and the temple is significant because symbolism from these structures was later transferred into church structures.

The Russian inheritance of Christianity from the Byzantine church is addressed. The Mongol occupation and the subsequent defeat of their descendants, the Tatars, affected Russian theological symbolism and interpretation. The outcome was that Russian Church architecture took a different course to that of its Byzantine predecessor. The highlight of the Heavenly Jerusalem theme was reached in the sixteenth century with Moscow’s image as a “chosen city,” which was an extension of the “chosen people” concept of Kievan Rus a few centuries earlier.

The background context of the theological, historical and political situation of Russia is used as a framework to examine the art and architecture of the two cathedrals. The rise of Moscow was related to the relocation of the centre of Orthodoxy from the city of Vladimir to Moscow. The symbolism relating to the theme of Heaven-on-Earth is examined in the Uspensky’s exterior and interior architecture along with a comparative study of its prototype church in Vladimir.
The Heavenly Jerusalem theme was understated in the Uspensky Sobor, although an appraisal of its relics and icons suggests that there was considerable thought about it emerging in the middle of the sixteenth century.

The Heavenly Jerusalem concept was most exemplified in the Pokrovsky Sobor. The antecedents (zions, votive churches and kokoshniki) that pre-dated the Heavenly Jerusalem theme shed light on the development of the theme itself. Similarly, the role reversal between the theological proclamation in the exteriors and interiors of Russian churches is significant because it reflected the shift from the Heaven-on-Earth theme towards the Heavenly Jerusalem theme which dominated the sixteenth century.

Consideration is given to the numerical symbolism and the church domes of this period because they are often regarded as a cipher to sixteenth century Russian churches. While the background influences on the construction of the Pokrovsky are examined, the overall conclusion is that its construction was for theological reasons. The second major finding was that there was a shift in Moscow’s theological role from asking for intercession towards a self-assurance that Moscow was divinely protected. Three of the Pokrovsky Churches are discussed in more detail than the others because their architecture more fully anticipated the Heavenly Jerusalem.
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INTRODUCTION

Russian orthodoxy considered churches to be icons of heaven. Church architecture symbolized the kingdom of heaven. There were two aspects to this. The first is that heaven met earth in the church building. This concept was affirmed in the real presence in the Eucharist in the Russian mass. The second was that the church building provided a glimpse of the transfigured world, that is, the “Heavenly Jerusalem” to come after the apocalypse. This was the Heavenly Jerusalem of the book of Revelation (Rev 21:18-21). Traditionally medieval Russian churches had represented Heaven-on-Earth in their architecture but this intensified in the fifteenth century. In the sixteenth century, the focus was on the Heavenly Jerusalem.

This thesis explores the representation of Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem in monumental fifteenth and sixteenth century Muscovite church architecture in the Uspensky Sobor (Cathedral of the Assumption) in the Kremlin and the Pokrovsky Sobor (Cathedral of the Intercession) in Red Square, Moscow. These themes dominated religious thought in this time period. My thesis is limited to evidence from these two cathedrals in order to carry out an in-depth study.

Ivan III, who reigned from 1462-1505, commissioned the Uspensky Sobor which was completed in 1479 as the restoration of the collapsed church of the same name. The architect Fioravanti, who was from Venice rebuilt the church using the Uspensky Sobor of the city of Vladimir as an example. He used architecture to represent theological symbolism with a harmony that had not been seen before in Russia. The Uspensky pointed the way to the second theme of this thesis, the Heavenly Jerusalem. It is significant to this study because it was the first major state church that became the model for a national school of religious architecture in the construction of other churches.

The Pokrovsky Sobor was commissioned in 1555 by Tsar Ivan IV, who reigned from 1547 to 1584. Barma and Postnik Yakovlev were the builder-designers of the cathedral. Although the cathedral broke with architectural tradition, it used traditional theological
symbolism to proclaim that Moscow was both the icon of, and the preparation for the Heavenly Jerusalem. The Pokrovsky was chosen for this study, firstly because of its unique place in Russian history as the representation of the Heavenly Jerusalem and secondly, because of the layers of meaning associated with this representation. It introduced many new architectural features that had not been combined before. The design of the Pokrovsky was strongly symbolic in its theology and in its use of numbers.

In addition to the above reasons for my selection of these two particular churches as a comparative study, the development of the Heaven-on-Earth theme into the Heavenly Jerusalem theme merits study in its own right. Uspensky Sobor contained both concepts although its Heavenly Jerusalem theme was less obvious. This was generally the case in fifteenth century Russian architecture. In the Pokrovsky Sobor the Heavenly Jerusalem theme was overtly proclaimed in the exterior architecture while its interior was relatively modest. I will determine the reasons for the role reversal between the exterior and interior of churches that occurred in the sixteenth century.

Consideration will be given to both the exteriors and the interiors of the two buildings. Externally the domes, roofs, apses, walls, and overall form served to portray the themes, while the choice of building materials and architectural techniques reflected theological principles. The courtyard and portals were likewise full of religious symbolism and will be taken into consideration in my exploration of the buildings. Supporting evidence from the symbolism of the interior features such as the royal doors, inner domes, frescoes and iconostasis will be evaluated.

My focus is on interpreting theological symbolism through the architecture and art of the two cathedrals in this study. Architecture has tended to play a secondary role to art and art history in the academic literature. There are few interdisciplinary studies that consider interpreting the theological principles in Russian architecture. There is considerable research on the history of the Russian Orthodox Church itself in its socio-political context, but studies of the symbolism of the architecture have tended to be purely technical or otherwise mystical and philosophical without peer reviews and examples from specific churches being given to support the arguments that are made. For this
reason, I will not be able to use the ideas of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century Russian theological philosophers. There is a need for study of the theological principles behind the architecture of Russian churches that uses evidence from the architecture itself.

Literature of the twenty years of so has recognised that it is not possible to conduct Russian research in isolated disciplines and that Russian church history was affected by a range of theological, historical, social, cultural, ethnic and political factors. The theology behind the Heavenly Jerusalem theme in particular needs to be understood in the historical context of the sixteenth century where the Muscovite defeat of the Tatars was interpreted apocalyptically. I will read the historical aspects of church architecture in the light of the principles of the Orthodox Church that the church building must show Heaven-on-Earth. The traditional symbolism of church architecture is very important in understanding the changes that occurred in the theology of the mid-sixteenth century when architecture focussed more on the Heavenly Jerusalem than on the Heaven-on-Earth theme.

While I have spent many hours in the two churches, this will essentially be a literature based project. The project will proceed by examining the literature relating to the architecture and the theology of the Russian Orthodox Church. My approach will be both historical and theological. My primary sources are the artworks themselves and the Russian Chronicles. The Chronicles provide insight into the theology of the two cathedrals and how they were perceived in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Michael Flier and Daniel Rowland are the leading researchers in the field who take into account the theological context of the fifteenth and sixteenth century when considering the meaning of symbolism of a religious nature. William Brumfield’s encyclopaedic research on Russian religious architecture has provided valuable historical detail of a more factual nature. I will draw on the works of the major historians and theologians who have studied fifteenth and sixteenth century Russian architecture and culture. The initial plan was to reconcile the conflicting theories in the literature as to the origins and meaning of specific architectural features. In many cases this is impossible and instead I
seek to determine exactly what the symbolism of the given feature is saying with respect to my chosen themes. My aim is to show how the Heavenly Jerusalem and Heaven-on-Earth are depicted in the architecture of the churches. My study will add to the interpretation of the body of knowledge about Russian church architecture with respect to theology.

The Uspensky and the Pokrovsky Sobor have been altered and restored, although many of the structural features and artworks are in their original form. Where this is not the case, artworks and frescoes have also been restored where possible to their original versions over the last hundred years or so. I will make some prior assumptions in this thesis in relying on descriptions of artworks and floor plans of the cathedrals as they looked in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Many of the details in these descriptions have been confirmed in the light of twentieth century excavations and restoration at the sites of the churches.

**Definition of Terms/ Further context**

A further major problem that limits research in Russian theological history is the terminology that is used. The original Pokrovsky was known as the Trinity Church. Consecrated in 1561, it became a sobor or cathedral. A sobor is similar to an ecclesiastical basilica but it is translated incorrectly into English as cathedral. While this is not technically correct, it is the official translation of this word which will be used in this thesis. I will use “sobor” in the singular and “sobori” as the plural which is a phonetic translation from the Cyrillic.

The central church of Pokrovsky Sobor was dedicated to Mary's intercession and Trinity Church more specifically referred to the Eastern sanctuary. Since the Intercession Church was the name for the whole church of all nine buildings, it was known both as Trinity and Intercession. It was not until the end of the sixteenth century that it became consistently known as the Jerusalem. In the seventeenth century, all nine churches together were referred to collectively as St Basil’s. This popular name took hold and even today the church is still known by this name. It is frequently incorrectly referred to as St Basil’s Cathedral in academic literature. St Basil’s is one of the nine churches and that church
alone does not have cathedral status. It is the whole complex of all nine churches together that is the cathedral. In Russia it is called “Church of the Intercession on the Moat,” and “Church of the Intercession of the Most Holy Theotokos on the Moat.” A less formal popular name is “Temple of Vasili the Blessed.” Technically this is correct.

I will use the term “Russia” to refer to the geographical Russian lands united by the Tsar. The Muscovite state is the state that emerged after Tsar Ivan IV united these lands. This covered a bigger area than the city of Moscow today. For the sake of clarity, I have referred to the pre-unification and post-unification city as Moscow. Today Moscow is known as Moskva by Russian speaking people. The designation, Kievan Rus will be used to refer to the Slavic lands in Ukraine and Russia as far as Novgorod that were under the control of the Kievan Princes from 882AD.¹

Instead of Anglicising the names of people, I have used the Russian versions where possible. This means that both the saint and the Tsar are referred to as "Vasili" instead of "Basil." Similarly, the Archangel Michael becomes Archangel Mikhail. Metropolitans Makarii and Pyotr replace the popularly Anglicised form of Macarius and Peter. This is truer to the names that they were known by during their lifetimes.

The following list explains some technical terms that are used in this thesis:
Machiolation: The edge of the platform at the top of a wall. It had holes to facilitate the launch of missiles from it. It was used in fortress architecture and later for decorative purposes in military-style architecture.
Kokoshnik: (plural kokoshniki). A blind gable.
Blind arcade: An arcade is a line of arches with supports in the form of pillars or columns. It is blind when the detail of the wall does not involve it being pierced.
Ciborium: A canopy that is supported by columns.
Acheiropoietos: An image of Christ that has appeared miraculously and which is not made with human hands.

**Shape of Dissertation:**

Chapter One gives the theological background context to the relation between heaven and earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem in Russian Orthodox theology up to and including the building of the two sobori. It traces the themes from biblical times through to the Byzantine and the Russian churches. The historical context that gave rise to Moscow’s self-image as a “chosen city” provides a framework for understanding the art and architecture of the two churches in the wake of the Tatar occupation that was interpreted apocalyptically.

Chapter Two focusses on the Heaven-on-Earth theme in the Uspensky Sobor. It draws on the political, and historical influences behind the building of this sobor. The importance of the site of the Uspensky underpins this chapter and supports my argument that the relics and icons of the Uspensky pointed to the Heavenly Jerusalem. Exterior and interior architectural symbolism is discussed with respect to the Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem themes.

Chapter Three starts with the prototypes that gave rise to the Heavenly Jerusalem theme in the Pokrovsky Sobor. The construction of this sobor is considered in the context of the capture of the city of Kazan. Other influences on its architecture are examined too. I appraise the symbolism of the exterior and interior of the sobor and the significance of the Palm Sunday ritual held outside it. Finally, I put forward a hermeneutic argument to understand the Pokrovsky group of churches as one unit through a theological lens that considers the Orthodox mind-set of the times within the Messianic Mission framework.

In Chapter Four, I draw together the themes to make an overall statement about the portrayal of the Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem themes in the architecture and art of the Uspensky and the Pokrovsky Sobori. I will also give some recommendations for future research.
Chapter 1

HEAVEN-ON-EARTH AND THE HEAVENLY JERUSALEM IN RUSSIAN ORTHODOX THEOLOGY

Symbolic imagery was used to express the themes of Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem in Russian church architecture from the tenth century up until the end of the sixteenth century. The representation of these themes was systematic and highly visual. The focus of this chapter is to examine the background context that shaped the themes of Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem in Russia. Starting with the biblical conception of the themes, this chapter will then address the Russian development of the Byzantine religion, the context of Orthodoxy and the medieval belief that earthly things were visible representations of invisible heavenly ones.

1.0 HEAVEN-ON-EARTH AND THE HEAVENLY JERUSALEM IN THE BIBLE

In this sub-chapter, I will focus on the following themes: Heaven-on-Earth imagery in the Old Testament, the tabernacle and the temple as microcosms of heaven and earth, the meaning of the rebuilding of the temple including the renewal of creation and its associated eschatological implications, Ezekiel's temple vision and the start of apocalyptic writing, the Second Temple Period, and the Heavenly Jerusalem in the New Testament’s Book of Revelation.

The New Testament understanding of the Heavenly Jerusalem was grounded in Old Testament imagery and symbolism of a city that lived by God's Word. Over time in the Old Testament, the expectation of the New Jerusalem became associated with a concurrent restoration of Israel's relationship with God. The Heavenly Jerusalem is only referred to in a few places in the New Testament (Gal 4:26; Heb 11:10; 12:22; 13:14; Rev 21:2; 21:10). The Old Testament tended to refer to the "New Jerusalem," or the "New Temple." The non-canonical book of 2 Baruch is an exception in that it specifically refers to the "Heavenly Jerusalem." After the destruction of the first temple, the rebuilding of the new temple became associated with the New Jerusalem.
The book of Revelation is the key text regarding the Heavenly Jerusalem in the New Testament. While the Heavenly Jerusalem imagery of Revelation refers to a holy city, it contains imagery of the Garden of Eden with the Tree of Life there (Rev 22:2; Gen 3:22). Paradise evokes images of heaven but the word for paradise is only used three times in the Old Testament (Neh 2:8; Eccl 2:5; Song 4:13). The Septuagint uses the term “paradeisos” to refer to the Garden of Eden. Paradeisos is thought to have been derived from the Persian word “pardes” for an enclosed garden. In addition to the above references to paradise as a kind of Heaven-on-Earth, the word came to be used in a religious sense. Thus, in the New Testament, for example, Christ told the good thief who was crucified beside him that he would be with him in paradise (Luke 23:43). Paradise seems to be associated here with salvation and with the presence of God.

a) Heaven-on-Earth Imagery in the Old Testament

In the Bible, the cosmos is understood to be made up of heaven and earth (Gen 1.1; 2:1; Exod 31:17; Ps 102:25; Isa 48:13; 51:13). The concept of Heaven-on-Earth is another way of describing God’s presence on earth. According to the creation story in Genesis, the Garden of Eden is one such place. The very structure of the Bible indicates the importance of the Heaven-on-Earth theme. The Garden of Eden in the second chapter of the first book of the Bible was mirrored structurally by the key passage relating to the Heavenly Jerusalem in the penultimate chapter of Revelation, the last book of the Bible where the cosmos is said to be transformed into a new heaven and a new earth: “And I saw the holy city, the New Jerusalem coming down out of heaven...” (Gen 2:8; Rev 21:2). The Old Testament framework is important to understanding the Heavenly Jerusalem in Revelation but as Jan Du Rand points out, the meaning of the Heavenly Jerusalem cannot be grasped just by using this framework.3

In the account of the creation of heaven and earth given in Genesis 1, it is repeatedly affirmed that the creation, including all material reality, is good. The material world includes the precious stones, gold and metals that are described in the Old Testament (Gen

---

2:11-12; Ezek 1:26). The book of Revelation describes them too in connection with Heaven-on-Earth and later with the city that descends from heaven, that is, the Heavenly Jerusalem (Rev 21:18-21).

The imagery of Heaven-on-Earth in the Garden of Eden is particularly appropriate because the storyteller claims that God walked in the Garden of Eden (Gen 3:8). After the expulsion of Adam and Eve from the garden, the biblical witness tells us that an angel guards its border (Gen 3:23-4). This indicates that the Garden of Eden is regarded as heavenly. However, Jacob's dream of the ladder to heaven, suggests that the guarding of the border does not preclude access to heaven by humankind (Gen 28:12). The ladder touches both heaven and earth which means that humankind does have hope of accessing heaven.4

This boundary between heaven and earth was explored in both Old and New Testaments, particularly through theophanies. The coming together of heaven and earth is apparent in biblical stories of theophany such as Moses' encounter with God on Mt. Sinai (Exod 19:11). Again, after Moses had erected a tabernacle to house the ark of the covenant, it is said that a “cloud” covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle” (Exod 40:34). Likewise, in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, the boundaries between heaven and earth were removed at the transfiguration of Christ (Matt 17:2; Mark 9:3). A further expression of the removal of the boundary between heaven and earth occurs at the crucifixion of Jesus when it is said that the curtain of the temple was torn in two (Matt 27:51; Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45). This is interpreted by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews as symbolising an opening of the way between earth and heaven. Christ is considered to be the one through whom the way is opened (Heb 10:19-20).5

---

b) The Tabernacle and the Temple: A Microcosm of Heaven and Earth

The architectural imagery of the tabernacle and the Jerusalem temple connected them to the Garden of Eden and to the Heavenly Temple. The tabernacle (and later the temple) were built as dwelling places for God (Exod 25:8; 2 Sam 7:5; 1 Kgs 5:5; 6:13) and as an attempt to reconcile Israel to God. According to the biblical witness, the tabernacle was divinely inspired in that God gave Moses the dimensions for it which were based on those of the heavenly temple (Exod 25:9; 25:40; Num 8:4). Similarly, the temple plans were believed to be divinely inspired (1 Chr 28:11-19).

Elizabeth Bloch-Smith connects the two pillars of the temple to the Garden of Eden because they contained symbols of the tree of life and of the tree of knowledge. The menorah in the sanctuary of the temple may also have been a symbol of the tree of life. The cherubim that featured in the holy of holies on each side of the ark of the covenant in the tabernacle had a similar role to the cherubim that were said to guard the Garden of Eden after the expulsion of Adam and Eve (Gen 3:24). The temple too, had carved cherubim and palm trees in the holy place and depicted on the walls and doors (1 Kgs 8:6-7; 6:29; 6:32-35).

Garden of Eden imagery is explored by the Old Testament scholar, Walter Brueggemann in his book The Law: Place as Gift, Power and Challenge in Biblical Faith. He examines the importance of the physical land for Israel’s faith in terms of the two paradigms of paradise lost (Gen. 1-11) and promised land (Gen. 12-50). There are theodic connections with the concept of exile (from Eden, and subsequently from Israel) being related to mankind’s sin and of a future promised land where God’s word prevails.

---

10 Ibid., 69.
The significance of Brueggemann’s work in this area is that it highlights the physicality of heaven on this earth and the relationship of faith to land or place. While Brueggemann is concerned with the importance of land as it related to faith, Gregory Beale addresses the importance of symbols within structures that were dedicated to God as his dwelling place on earth. The structure of the tabernacle, for example, represented the tripartite cosmos as it was understood at the time, (invisible heaven, visible heaven and earth). This symbolism was later transferred to the temple structure. Ezekiel’s vision of the future temple likewise envisages a tripartite structure to the temple (Ezek 41:1-4).

The Jerusalem temple featured a courtyard at its centre with an altar for sacrifices while the sanctuary at its eastern end and its inner part contained the holy of holies which had a candelabra, an altar, and the holy breads.\(^{11}\) In the temple structure, the outer court of the temple represents the visible earth: the holy place represents the visible sky or heaven, while the holy of holies represents the invisible heavens, the dwelling place of God.\(^{12}\) The curtains of the tabernacle and the outer veil of the holy place in the temple represent the boundary between the “visible and the invisible creation,” that is earth and heaven, and the past, the present and the future.\(^{13}\) God was believed to have a real presence in the holy of holies, which represents the heavens or the invisible cosmos (Ps 132:7-8). The temple structure has implications beyond itself in pointing the way to a future temple of cosmological proportions.

Only the high priest was allowed to enter the holy of holies once a year. He had to surround himself with incense because the presence of God was too holy to be witnessed (Lev 16:13).\(^{14}\) The ark of the covenant was understood to be the footstool of God’s throne (1 Chr 28:2; Ps 99:5) and its placement in the inner sanctuary suggests a belief in the real presence of God (Exodus 25:22). Isaiah 6:3 refers to the real presence of God in the temple.\(^{15}\)

---


\(^{13}\) Lidov, "Spatial Icons," 88.

\(^{14}\) Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 35.

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 49.
c) The Temple Rebuild

The meaning of the temple is a major theme of the Old Testament. After the destruction of the first temple in 586BC by the Babylonians, the Old Testament prophets considered what a rebuild would mean and anticipated it in terms of the restoration of their relationship with God and the establishment of a New Jerusalem. The first temple had been a representation of the heavenly temple, and so its rebuilding was considered to have eschatological implications. The rebuild was interpreted to include a renewal of creation which would include the Garden of Eden at the same time as the New Jerusalem emerged. The New Temple was the fulfilment of God’s plans for Eden. Overall the restoration via the New Temple would be transformative to the point of being a new creation. Both Ezekiel and Isaiah describe a Heaven-on-Earth or a paradise that will exist within the context of a New Jerusalem (Ezek 36:11; 47:12; Isa 51:3).

The nature of Ezekiel’s vision reflects the perceived relationship between heaven and earth in that the wheel of the heavenly vehicle is touching earth (Ezek 1:15). The wheels bear the glory of God which means that the spheres of heaven and earth do connect. There is a promise to re-establish the sanctuary in the land (Ezek 26:28). In Ezekiel’s vision, the glory of God comes to dwell in the temple; God is believed to dwell in the earthly structure that is dedicated to him and by virtue of his presence makes the structure sacred (Ezek 43:5). Further imagery in the "holy mountain of God" in Zion (Ezek 20:40) is another way of portraying God’s presence on earth, Heaven-on-Earth.

Ezekiel lived towards the end of the Babylonian exile and his account reflects the concern of the times with rebuilding the temple (Ezek 40-48). The New Jerusalem had not appeared in biblical prophecy before Ezekiel’s account. Scholars have struggled with questions arising from the book of Ezekiel. They question if Ezekiel envisaged an earthly or a heavenly temple and if it was thought to be part of the Messianic reign on earth or part of the heavenly kingdom that would last forever. This leads to the question as to

whether the events in the vision were imminent or in the future at the end of time. Finally, the significance of the sacrifices has puzzled researchers. The sacrifices were part of the atonement ritual in the Old Testament, but not in the New Testament. This does not necessarily mean that the sacrificial vision could only refer to worship in the not too distant future.

The most important question in interpreting Ezekiel in terms of relevance to the New Jerusalem concept is whether Ezekiel was envisaging a physical temple or an eschatological one? The literature is divided on this issue. Eric Baker has restated the issues as such: Was the temple to be built by God or by people? Or were the people to build one temple and God build the next one? 

Christopher Wright, Daniel Block, Moshe Greenberg, and Andrea Spatafora hold that Ezekiel’s temple vision was more than a physical restoration of the temple structure. They believe it is a complete restoration of the relationship between Israel and God.

Under this view the specific temple imagery used by Ezekiel explains spiritual truths. The evidence in support of this claim is that while at first appearance, Ezekiel seems to be commanding the rebuild of the temple, the temple instructions and details were not offered as a specific building plan for a temple to be built by people in the future. Block states that “nowhere is anyone commanded to build it.” Walther Eichrodt disregards the reference to the angel measuring out the temple because he does not accept this as an indication that it was a specific plan for a temple to be built by people.
These researchers see Ezekiel’s temple vision in terms of the ideal eschatological temple. At first appearance, this argument does not take into account the precise nature of the measurements that are given by Ezekiel. The measurements seem to suggest that the temple could not be referring to an eschatological temple.

Bruce Waltke extends the above eschatological argument with his “canon of progressive revelation” theory that referred to a spiritual temple. Here, the focus is on symbolic aspects of visions that culminated in the New Testament with Christ and church as the spiritual temple. An argument in favour of a non-literal view of the temple vision is that Ezekiel does not mention the ark of the covenant, although this argument is not conclusive, because Jeremiah tells us that the ark would not be “remembered, missed or remade” (Jer 3:16-17).

Gregory Beale has researched the connection between the layout of the tabernacle and temple and the eschatological “reality of God dwelling with humanity.” He thinks that God would not confine himself to residing in one structure like a temple but that he would dwell in the entire cosmos in the eschaton. However, a closer reading of the Old Testament shows that God was never confined to the temple or the tabernacle before it. The prophets were always aware of his heavenly home at the same time as believing that God was truly present in the tabernacle and subsequently in the temple. The argument for an eschatological temple is strengthened by what is known of the local area surrounding the first and second Jerusalem temples. The environmental descriptions given in Ezekiel do not resemble these locations. In particular the river flowing from under the temple does not seem to be an earthly one (Ezek 47:1-12).

In appraising the above theories, a strong argument in favour of a physical temple is that Ezekiel provided a lot of detail about the construction of the temple (Ezek 40-42; 43). If it was purely spiritual, there would have been no need to provide the precise
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measurements that Ezekiel gave, although it is possible that the construction details are
given to express the order and beauty of the temple. This would still make them valid
even if the temple that Ezekiel saw was an eschatological one. Furthermore, no temple
like the one that Ezekiel saw had been built in the past, and neither was one built in the
post-exilic period after Ezekiel’s lifetime. The temple built under Nehemiah’s watch did
not look like the one in Ezekiel’s vision. To this day, no such temple has ever been built.
Clearly it refers to a future temple. There was a promise in Ezekiel’s vision to make the
temple the dwelling place of God forever, yet the temple envisaged looked different from
the Heavenly Jerusalem described in Revelation. The theory that would best fit what is
known is that of a temple which is both literal and eschatological. This draws on both
symbolic and literal aspects of Ezekiel.

Ezekiel implies the Heavenly Jerusalem in his description of the contrast between the
earthly and the heavenly mountain and the connection of God with sanctuaries in heaven
(Ezek 28:14; 16-17). Isaiah has similar mountain imagery to Ezekiel in his vision. The
reference to “my holy mountain, Jerusalem,” is an expression of the faith that God was
permanently present in the holy place on earth (Isa 66:20-22; 65:25). Isaiah’s vision of
the Heavenly Jerusalem involves the Messianic reign on Mt. Zion and Jerusalem. The
earthly temple is described as God’s “footstool,” which suggests that the temple is seen as
an extension of God’s heavenly throne (Isa 66:1). There is support for this in Psalm 150:1
too with the parallel structure of this verse connecting the temple with God’s throne in
heaven. Psalms is notable for its use of parallel linguistic structures to connect terms of
equivalent meaning.

Isaiah had already established that Jerusalem is connected with creation, but now it is
linked to a new creation: “For I am about to create new heavens and a new earth... for I am
about to create Jerusalem as a joy (Isa 65:17-18). A few verses earlier it was prophesised
that the present earth and heaven would be destroyed (Isa 34:4). But Isaiah proclaims
the hope of a transformed cosmos and a New Jerusalem thereby overcoming the
destruction brought upon the temple and upon the city of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar
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in 586/587BC (Isa 65:17). It is unclear if Isaiah sees a heavenly temple or the earthly one in Jerusalem. Spatafora thinks that this could be a deliberate ambiguity due to the prophet wanting to show the temple as the boundary between heaven and earth.\(^{29}\)

The book of Isaiah is composed of three parts written at different times. The third part, usually known as Trito-Isaiah is concerned with the temple and eschatological restoration and was probably concurrent with the period just before or immediately after the Babylonian exile. The rebuilding of the temple envisioned in Trito-Isaiah is seen as a key part of Israel’s restoration and the rebuilding of its relationship with God. After the exile of around seventy years which followed the destruction of the first temple, the Jews returned to Jerusalem in three lots. The book of Ezra gives an account of the restoration of worship in Jerusalem and the foundations being laid for the rebuilding of the temple (Ezra 3). The rebuilding of the temple was halted however, due to conflicts about it (Ezra 4:24). It was started again at the behest of prophets Haggai and Zechariah (Ezra 5:1) and was finished in 515BC. Haggai and Zechariah had urged the rebuild because they thought that it would bring about the conditions that would herald in the new eschatological age (Hag 2:9; Zech 8:9).

During construction of the second temple, consideration had already given to the implications of a temple that may have been inferior in terms of appearance and size (Hag 2:3-4; Ezr 3:12). The post-exilic temple was much less grand than the first Jerusalem temple. The first temple had been believed to be God’s dwelling place that could not be destroyed, but it was demolished. In the light of this, the prophets formulated the concept of a heavenly temple that would be a grand temple that could not be ruined (see for example Hag 2:3).

Zechariah describes a temple associated with Israel’s ruling over all nations which does suggest that it could be an eschatological temple because this sort of leadership was not something that could have been envisaged as a realistic possibility for Israel in the near future at the time of writing (Zech 8:22-23).\(^{30}\) The reference to angels is suggestive of a
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heavenly temple and Zechariah does go on to associate the rebuilding of the temple with a Messianic figure (Zech 3:6-7; 6).\textsuperscript{31} The above points raise the possibility that he is talking about an eschatological temple at the end of time.

d) Second Temple Period

While Ezekiel discusses the rebuilding of the temple as being necessary for God to return to it, Zechariah seems to suggest that God would return to the people first in order that the temple be rebuilt (Ezek 40-48; Zech 1:16). In the Second Temple Period, Jewish apocalyptic writing became prominent. A particular feature of Second Temple Judaism is that it interprets the Old Testament prophecies on restoration apocalyptically.\textsuperscript{32} Apocalypticism was a genre that focussed on the battle between good and evil. This genre tends to feature the following elements: a new order being established to restore goodness, and God visiting earth in judgement to re-establish order.\textsuperscript{33} It uses symbolic colours and numbers in its visions to reveal something.

There is a shift from prophecy towards an apocalyptic perspective in the later books of the Old Testament and in 1 Enoch. Enoch which was probably written between 166-163BC, proclaims that the New Jerusalem Temple will be the greatest one (1 En 90:29). The Second Temple was still in existence as Enoch was writing but the Jews remained under persecution. Enoch anticipates that the New Temple or the New Jerusalem would be set in the new creation (1 En 10:23; 24:26). He describes a throne in the mountain garden of Eden and a corresponding heavenly temple (1 En 14:8-14; 24:4-5). He uses the same Garden of Eden imagery as Ezekiel and Isaiah but he focusses on the eschatological vision of the heavenly temple. If the temple is to be in heaven rather than on earth, then this would provide an explanation as to why the existence of the earthly temple had not helped the plight of the Jews. The concept of a heavenly temple would have provided hope
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Caution is needed when making parallels between books that use similar imagery because by their very nature, the images in the genre of apocalypse have meaning related to the context in which they were written. The apocalyptic books of Tobit, Sirach and 2 Maccabees were contemporaneous with Enoch. These books were written in the light of the Maccabean victory that had not brought about the reconciliation with God that had been expected. This perhaps informed their theme that the new age would be inaugurated when the temple was pure enough (Tob 14:6; Sir 36:18-19; 2 Macc 2:18). Tobit has a restored Jerusalem/Heavenly Jerusalem in view that is dependent on right worship (Tob 13:9-18; 14:6). 3 Baruch of the Eastern Orthodox Canon represents an alternative view that there is no point in perfecting or restoring an earthly temple because the real temple is in heaven. There is dispute as to the date that this book was written and it is not possible to determine whether the Second Temple was still in existence in the lifetime of the writer.

The destruction of the Second Temple by the Romans around 70AD would have affected the context of the apocalyptic books of 2 Esdras (4 Ezra) and 2 Baruch which were written in the late first to early second century, and the New Testament book of Revelation which was written around 96AD. 2 Baruch is a narrative that looks back to the time of the Babylonian exile but it was actually written in the light of the destruction of the second Jerusalem Temple. It is non-canonical although it does hold weight in that it is thought that the same author wrote 3 Baruch which is part of the Eastern Orthodox Bible. In the context of persecution, there is an emphasis on the Heavenly Jerusalem that would transform the earthly one (2 Esdr 7:26; 10:25-28; 2 Bar 32:1-4). 34 2 Baruch indicates that the Heavenly Jerusalem is pre-existent from the time of creation and refers directly to the Heavenly Jerusalem and to the physical structure of a temple (2 Bar 4:3; 4:2-7).

Ezekiel’s description of the temple and Enoch’s throne vision are used as a source by the later prophets. 35 Ezekiel declares that the new temple is to be the permanent dwelling place of God (Ezek. 43:7). It is eschatologically important. Both Ezekiel and Isaiah connect
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the rebuilding of the temple to the New Jerusalem (Ezek 40-41, Isa 6:1-3). By the time that Revelation, 2 Baruch, and 2 Esdras were written, the focus had moved towards establishing the New Jerusalem by right worship which was regarded as a prerequisite for the New Jerusalem. Like Ezekiel and Isaiah, Baruch and Esdras hold that the New Jerusalem will be set in the new creation that will descend from heaven to earth to make a New Jerusalem that is the heavenly temple (2 Esdr 7:26, 10:42-44; 13:35-36; 2 Bar 4:1-7; 4:26-27). The context of the Heavenly Jerusalem in 2 Esdras and 2 Baruch is important. The Second Temple had been destroyed by this time with no likelihood of a third earthly temple, therefore the next temple had to be an eschatological one in a transformed earth or a Heavenly Jerusalem.

I have discussed the changing nature of the New Jerusalem concept over the course of various Old Testament and non-canonical sources. Some features of the concept are constant while others are affected by the historical context in which the prophets are writing and by the current status/absence of the earthly temple. Over this time period, the Psalms supported the Old Testament interpretation of the temple as the permanent dwelling place of God through God’s presence in Zion which was associated with the Holy Mount (Ps 2:6; 48; 65:9; 65:1; 9:11; 99:2; 76:2; 132:13) and His city, Jerusalem (Ps 46:5; 122:2; 132:14). Jerusalem is associated with God due to the location of His sanctuary there. Some Psalms have a heavenly temple in view while others refer to the earthly Jerusalem Temple (Ps 96:6; 68:35). The Psalms are representative of the Old Testament belief that saw the Jerusalem Temple as the earthly representation of the heavenly one (Ps 78:69; 99:5; 2:4-5). References to the temple are not expressly eschatological, although the temple is connected with future rewards.

Psalms were sung in worship and were sometimes used as prayers for the restoration of the temple and of Jerusalem which would occur through God’s presence in Zion (Ps 85:1; 57:5; 69:3; 53:6). The Psalms are a witness to the Old Testament concept of heaven and earth perishing in the context of a new heaven and earth (Ps 93:1; 102:26) and they are reflections by the Jewish people on their temple and the restoration that they expect.

e) Revelation

The book of Revelation draws on the common thread running through the Old Testament and Jewish apocalyptic literature that gives an account of Israel’s history, a Messianic battle, and a New Jerusalem. It uses Old Testament imagery of a new heaven and a new earth after the first heaven and earth are transformed/renewed (Rev 21:10). The new creation is set in the Heavenly Jerusalem, the holy city that descends from heaven (Rev 21:2; Heb 11:10; 13:14). The Old Testament motifs of holy waters, Garden of Eden imagery, and gold and precious jewels are transferred into Revelation’s account of the Heavenly Jerusalem (Gen 2:8-17; Ezek 28:13; 1 En 4:8-14; Rev 21:18-21).

While Revelation follows the Old Testament fairly consistently in its Heavenly Jerusalem imagery, the same cannot be said about its temple imagery. In the Old Testament, the temple itself is often regarded as part of the New Jerusalem or as playing a major role in inaugurating it, although Isaiah hints at the Messiah being the new temple when he says that there will be no need for the temple because God is the everlasting light (Isa 60:19). In the New Testament, Christ himself is described as the temple or the Heavenly Jerusalem (John 2:21).

Paul’s understanding of the temple is that the church in Christ is the holy temple (Gal 2:21-22; 1 Cor 3:16). This needs to be understood in the context of first century Jerusalem where the temple had become corrupted with money-lenders by the time of Jesus (Luke 19:46). After Herod the Great’s restoration of the temple, there was a focus on its grandness rather than on God. In Acts, Paul seems to be moving away from the physical structure of the temple as having meaning when he declares that God does not literally dwell in temples made with human hands, although he is saying this to Pagans who had built altars to unknown Gods (Acts 17:24).

There is some clarification of the New Testament understanding of the temple in Hebrews, where the witness confesses that while the Jerusalem temple may be considered as an image of the heavenly one, it is not the heavenly temple itself (Heb 9:24; 10:1). This appears to rule out the possibility that a physical temple on earth could fulfil the role of the heavenly temple. However, we are also told that the tabernacle is based on the
heavenly one and that each physical object on earth was a shadow of the same spiritual physical object in heaven (Heb 9:23). Revelation describes the New Jerusalem as both a physical temple and a spiritual one (Rev 21:12-21:22).

**f) Summary**

In considering the extent to which the temple and the earthly Jerusalem were considered to be an anticipation or foretaste of the heavenly temple and the New Jerusalem, there is no single understanding of the temple concept in the Bible although it can be said that earthly temples and cities are understood to be symbolic anticipations of God’s fulfilment of the created order. Similarly, heaven and earth are represented symbolically in the tabernacle and thereafter in the temple. The earlier books of the Old Testament reflect on the centrality of the temple at Jerusalem to God’s people as the place of God’s presence.

It is understood in the Old Testament that the tabernacle is to be patterned on the heavenly one (Exod 25:9; 1 Chr 28:19). The tabernacle and the temple are regarded as divinely inspired by God. In this respect God is believed to have guided the representation of Heaven-on-Earth which has a restorative function in reconciling humankind to God. It is difficult to determine the extent to which God is believed to dwell in the temple. In Deuteronomy, the temple is spoken of as the place where God’s name prevails. The building of the cherubim around the ark of the covenant however, and the temple protocols do suggest a belief in the real presence of God. It seems clear that God is believed to live in heaven but that his presence was simultaneously in the Jerusalem Temple.

This belief is confirmed in Ezekiel’s temple vision where the presence of God leaves the temple (Ezek 9:3). Although there is dispute between scholars as to the exact nature of the temple that Ezekiel envisaged, there are strong eschatological overtones to his vision. Over time, an eschatological temple built by God is anticipated by the later prophets too. After the exiles returned from Babylon, the outlook becomes more eschatological and focussed not on the actual temple of Jerusalem, but on an eschatological temple. This is also the case after the destruction of the second temple by the Romans in 70AD.
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References to the New Jerusalem itself are implied rather than overtly proclaimed in the Old Testament and the imagery is often in the form of a new temple that includes Garden of Eden imagery and which looks different to the historical Jerusalem city and temple. The Heavenly Jerusalem imagery is in part informed by Heaven-on-Earth imagery. The tradition views the heavenly city symbolically in fairly consistent terms although the concept of the Heavenly Jerusalem is affected by the particular context in which the prophets who visualised it found themselves.

In the Old Testament, the temple itself is the place where people go to meet God. By contrast, in the New Testament, the people could meet God in the person of God himself.\textsuperscript{38} The New Testament description of the heavenly city, that is, the Heavenly Jerusalem, has a lot of imagery from the Old Testament, but it is more clearly in view as a city as opposed to a temple. Its temple references are both spiritual and physical and relate to the body of Christ and to the church.

1.1 THE RUSSIAN DEVELOPMENT OF THE BYZANTINE RELIGIOUS MODEL

In order to understand why the Russian religious model developed in the way that it did, a comparative study of its Byzantine antecedents will be the focus of this section. There were three concepts that the Russians inherited from the Byzantines. These are that the boundaries between heaven and earth were blurred, that the church was an icon of the heavenly church and that icons had an important role in purification and revelation. Both the inheritance of the Byzantine religion and the Russian development of Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem will be examined here.

\textit{a) Inheritance of Byzantine Religion}

When Prince Vladimir of Kiev converted to Christianity in 988AD, he adopted the Byzantine religion which came complete with a distinctive style of art, architecture, culture, liturgy and beliefs. The “Povest Vremennykh Let” (“The Primary Chronicle” also known as the “Tale of Bygone Years”) is a history of Kievan Rus from around the mid-ninth century to the early twelfth century that was written around 1113AD. It is the leading
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document on the historical, political and religious context of that period. The Primary Chronicle (entry for 987AD) tells us that Prince Vladimir of Kiev sent a delegation to the Hagia Sophia Cathedral in Constantinople to report back to him on the Byzantine Church and its liturgy. The imagery used by the delegation is evidence that the Kievan Rus understood the Byzantine symbolism of the church as paradise on earth with no sharp separation between heavenly and earthly realms. “We did not know whether we were in heaven or on earth because there is no such sight and no such beauty on earth...we only know that God dwells there among men.” The above phrase is often assumed to be a reference to the heavenly, but a closer examination of the quote reveals that the boundary was blurred for “we did not know if we were in heaven or on earth.” The above example is illustrative of the overall conviction in both the Byzantine and subsequently in the Russian church that the boundaries of heaven and earth overlap.

b) The Church as Icon of the Heavenly Church

The Church Fathers set the scene for the Byzantine interpretation of Heaven-on-Earth which was developed over hundreds of years and was adopted by the Russian Church. The Greek and Byzantine Church Fathers were respected in the Russian Church as they had been in the Byzantine Church. Indeed, alongside the Psalms and the apocrypha, writings of the Church Fathers and detailed lives of saints were available in Slavonic in Kievan Rus. The idea of Heaven-on-Earth tended to be associated with an earthly paradise. An early representation of the church as a paradise can be found in the work of Irenaeus, (130-202AD) Bishop of Lyons, who said that the church was a “paradise planted in this world.” Eusebius (260/265-339/340AD) developed the theme with his description of church as “the earthly likeness of heaven.” The Byzantine hymns of the next century provided clues as to Heaven-on-Earth. St. Ephrem (b.306AD) the Syrian,
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Bishop of the Church of Edessa, declared in his sixth “Hymn on Paradise” that the “church is similar to paradise.” By the eighth century, St. Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople from 715AD to 730AD, went beyond these comparisons. His hymn confessed that the church is heaven on earth, and that the church is an image of the Heavenly Jerusalem to come. In this way he connected both themes. His basis was scriptural (2 Cor 6:16; Lev 26:12). Maximus the Confessor, (580-662AD), had argued the same point from a Christological basis: “Christ binds about himself paradise and the inhabited world, heaven on earth.”

c) Icons and Heaven-on-Earth
Within the overall icon of the earthly church as a representation of the heavenly church, icons had several roles. In addition to scripture and tradition, the Byzantine conception of Heaven-on-Earth was informed by Graeco-Roman values. These values of truth, beauty and clear visual images of deity were assimilated into Byzantine Christian art, enabling recognition of the saints in the icons. The Russian use of icons was inherited from the Byzantine tradition that had started in the fourth and fifth centuries with the east Roman army who used icons to pray to the saints for intercession in wars.

Icons were regarded as windows to heaven, and as such they were credited with having a role in purifying and transforming the cosmos. The purpose of icons was to restore the image of God that was destroyed by sin. Icons were considered to be the first fruits of
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the glorification of matter. This had implications for their role in the transfigured cosmos, that is, the Heavenly Jerusalem. John of Damascus (675-749AD) who was one of the main proponents of the pro-icon movement during the first iconoclasm (when icons were destroyed from 730-787AD), argued that because Jesus was material in human form, matter could be glorified by God: “The word made flesh has deified the flesh.” If flesh was a vehicle of the spirit, icons were too. His theory was also informed by the concept put forward by St. Basil the Great, (330-379AD) who had argued that icons contain the prototype of the person whom they portray: “The honour paid to the image passes to the prototype.”

The general Christian concept of church as “provisional paradise” was transformed into Heaven-on-Earth in the Orthodox Church with symbolic imagery. The art of the times kept pace with the changes that started in the eighth century in a shift away from the mystagogical ideas of Maximus Confessor (that the liturgy was a foretaste of the heavenly liturgy) to a more symbolic representation. The Byzantine masters taught the monks at the Kiev Catacomb Cave Monastery how to paint icons.

**d) The Russian development of Heaven-on-Earth**

Kievan Rus frescoes and mosaics from the eleventh up until the thirteenth centuries were based on the middle period Byzantine (867-1056AD) model with long lines, slim figures and large-scale forms. This style had more fluidity in the movement of the
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figures, than the period that preceded it from the fourth to the seventh centuries before the first iconoclasm. There was a greater emphasis on the Heaven-on-Earth theme rather than the “other-worldly effect” suggested by the constrained spiritual rendition of human features, with small mouths, long noses and elongated limbs of the earlier period. The point here is that instead of showing only heavenly attributes, the later icons showed earthly features as well which is more in keeping with the Heaven-on-Earth theme. The Russian Church continued to have close contact and leadership from the Byzantine Church until the thirteenth century.

The Russian understanding of Heaven-on-Earth started as a Byzantine concept but later developed its own unique characteristics. The Slavic word “rai” denoted both heaven and paradise. “Rai” had its origins in the Greek word for enclosed garden or park. The Russians understood paradise as Heaven-on-Earth, a physical reality. Brouwer has identified that the form that this took tended to be a church, monastery complex, or a known place. The concept of land as paradise was important. When Prince Vladimir became Christian, he was said to have proclaimed: “the Russian land is baptized.”

Bishop Illarion took up the theme of Heaven-on-Earth in the church/city in his eleventh century Sermon on Law and Grace: “See also your city beaming in its grandeur. See your blossoming churches...See the city gleaming in its adornment of saintly images and fragrant with thyme and re-echoing with hymns and divine sacred songs.” His words captured the physicality of the church which continued to be an important concept for several centuries to follow. In 1347, Vasily Kalika, Archbishop of Novgorod (1330-1352), wrote to Fyodor Dobry, Bishop of Tver, (1342-1360), in response to a dispute over the relative spirituality or physicality of the church as paradise. This reveals that the Archbishop was at pains to prove that paradise was physical and not just spiritual.
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The fourteenth and fifteenth century icons commonly depicted Heaven-on-Earth rather than just images of saints. When the Uspensky Sobor was built, the most valuable of these icons were brought to the Uspensky, thus helping to set the scene of Moscow (and not just the church) as Heaven-on-Earth. Dionisi’s “In Thee Rejoice” painting of the 1480s was in the Uspensky’s iconostasis. This painting in particular offered an image of Heaven-on-Earth.\footnote{67} It depicted a hymn being sung by earthly and heavenly choirs to the Virgin Mary.

\textbf{e) Byzantine Portrayal of the Heavenly Jerusalem}

The portrayal of the future Heavenly Jerusalem in the early Byzantine church was focussed especially on the image of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre was built at the site where the crucifixion was believed to have been carried out. This church was interpreted in early Byzantine times as a visual image of the Heavenly Jerusalem. From post-iconoclastic times, the image of a tiered tower and a basilica was how the Heavenly Jerusalem was represented in Byzantine art.\footnote{68}

The Byzantines did not claim that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was the site of the future heavenly Jerusalem\footnote{69} but rather that it was a symbol. This became standardized in the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries when images (such as gates, cities, temples, gardens) were commonly used to represent the Heavenly Jerusalem.\footnote{70} From the twelfth century onwards, the Heavenly Jerusalem was shown in murals, icons and other artworks and in liturgical manuscript illustrations with the gates of heaven behind the Virgin Mary’s throne and a city wall.\footnote{71} The Heavenly Jerusalem was represented visually in clusters of symbolic images that provided meaning when read together. More specifically, images of the city, temple, tower, heavenly gates, garden of paradise and the Virgin Mary were used in varying combinations to portray the Heavenly Jerusalem.\footnote{72}
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Constantinople, the capital of the Byzantine church had special status as a divinely protected Kingdom of God. The relocation of relics from Jerusalem to Constantinople when the Muslims overtook Jerusalem in 638AD reinforced its role. It was known as the Heavenly Jerusalem. The Heaven-on-Earth and Heavenly Jerusalem themes were expressed for example, through the use of light and in the grandness of the Hagia Sophia Cathedral (built 532-537AD). The theology behind this was drawn from the Christian Neo-Platonism of Gregory of Nyssa (335-396), whose theory on transcendence and divine immanence required that the earthly and the heavenly were portrayed symbolically rather than realistically.

f) The Heavenly Jerusalem within the Russian Religious Model.

Research by Daniel Rowland and Susana Pietro showed that Moscow’s self-image related more to the Old Testament than to the Third Rome because it saw itself as the new Israel in a succession of chosen peoples. It is my contention that this same evidence indicated that Moscow was thought of as the Heavenly Jerusalem. There are two schools of thought on the “chosen people” theme in the interpretation of the Russian Heavenly Jerusalem. The first which is held by Rowland and Michael Flier is that the earlier medieval interpretations and reflections of Illarion and the Primary Chronicle set the scene of the Rus as chosen. The second view which is held by Brumfield is that the historical events of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries contributed to Moscow’s self-image in its Messianic Mission.

Both of these views are valid. There is support for the early medieval school of thought in that the abovementioned primary sources indicate that the Kievan Rus regarded themselves as chosen. A few centuries later, Moscow as a city was thought of as chosen. This is tied in with its Messianic Mission that took hold during the reign of Ivan IV in the
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sixteenth century. It was during the Messianic Mission that the Heavenly Jerusalem became important in Moscow ideology. While Kiev did not have a Messianic Mission, Moscow used the Kievan Rus precedent to form its own theology of being chosen in the sixteenth century. It is simplistic however to say that this was the only influence on Moscow’s self-image. Moscow’s concept of the Heavenly Jerusalem was influenced by a complex set of circumstances that will be discussed in more detail throughout Chapters Two and Three.

One of the earliest references to the “chosen people” is found in the Primary Chronicle in a section that summarises the Bible and is said to have been taught to Prince Vladimir by a Greek missionary. Here Apostle Andrew went to the Dnieper River and said: “See ye these hills? So shall the favour of God shine upon them that on this spot a great city shall arise and God shall erect many churches therein.” Illarion’s eleventh century “Sermon on Law and Grace,” made the point that Kiev related to the Heavenly Jerusalem through its self-image as a chosen people. He said “Many prophesied of the Israelites’ rejection by God and to such prophets God gave his commandments to foretell the calling of other nations in their stead.” He referred to Kiev as the “New Jerusalem.” From the start of Kievan Christianity in the ninth century, the Primary Chronicle emphasised the Kievan Rus as the chosen people over the Israelites. Marie Gasper-Hulvat proposes a third view that Moscow’s transformation into the Heavenly Jerusalem to which Christ would return, was gradual over several centuries and it evolved alongside the transferral of holy relics over time from Constantinople to Moscow.

Another aspect to the Heavenly Jerusalem theme was the relationship between light and the transfiguration of Christ. Light was considered to carry important meaning related to the transfiguration of Christ. As one of the twelve great feasts of the Orthodox Church,
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Christ’s transfiguration was connected to the transfiguration that will happen at the end of time. Russian art took up the Byzantine theme of divine light. As early as the thirteenth century the transfiguration had been shown symbolically in Russian art. This was effected through intense attention to light, in particular gold highlights. The thirteenth century “Our Lord of the Golden Hair” icon (brought to the Uspensky probably from Vladimir), showed Christ with golden hair and skin tones.

There was a gradual shift towards understanding Moscow as the Heavenly Jerusalem. Moscow was hardly mentioned in the Chronicles until the fourteenth century. It rose to prominence, however, after Metropolitan Pyotr relocated the capital of Orthodoxy to Moscow in 1326. The development of the Heavenly Jerusalem concept was heavily affected by late fourteenth century apocalypticism in Russia. Apocalypticism typically uses symbolism in depiction of its ideas. There was a second major break with orthodox tradition in the fourteenth century in the form of a new art movement. This saw paintings of the apocalypse being displayed on the western walls of Orthodox churches. In a tradition dating back to the eighth century, the Last Judgement paintings had been featured on the western walls. The Last Judgement paintings showed rewards and damnation being meted out at the end of time whereas the Apocalypse focussed on the Battle of Armageddon that would lead to the end of the world. The change signalled that a new religious symbolic language was being inaugurated.

This change in theology and art heralded the introduction of the Heavenly Jerusalem idea in Moscow. In the late fourteenth century, Theophanes’ “Apocalypse” was hung over the iconostasis in the Uspensky Sobor. It showed the battle that would lead to the Heavenly Jerusalem. Given its subject matter, it is remarkable in that it is a joyous painting. Nikolai Voronin describes it as adopting not the “sombre mysticism but triumphant justice” and having “light graceful forms.” The medieval Russians had expected the apocalypse in
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1492AD and as a result, Moscow had not ordered any new paschal canons or church calendars from Constantinople. When the apocalypse did not eventuate, Zosima Metropolitan of Moscow wrote his own canons as the “defender of Christianity.” He called Moscow the “New Jerusalem” in three of the four early copies of his new orthodox calendar.

Several paintings related to the apocalypse. The white horse in the St. George icons in the Uspensky was associated with the apocalyptic “Lord of Hosts” in Rev 19:11 and St. George with martyrdom. The symbolism of the colours of the dull-coloured dragon under the gleaming white hooves of George’s horse emphasised the battle between good and evil. These icons did not show Heaven-on-Earth. Several St. George icons including the Novgorodian twelfth century one were brought to the Uspensky. The number of St. George icons indicates how important the theme was. This theme would be further developed in the “Church Militant” painting.

The twelfth century “Virgin of Vladimir” icon was repainted by Andrei Rublev in the fifteenth century. It showed a shift in thinking that developed the theology of the earlier painting. The original was brought from Constantinople to Kiev in the twelfth century before being moved to Vladimir after Kiev fell. Grand Prince Vasili III’s (1479-1533) army had asked Metropolitan Kiprian to bring the Virgin of Vladimir to protect against Timur’s invasion of Moscow, with the result that Timur fled after seeing a ghost. The original painting was located behind the iconostasis while the new one was in front of it near
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where the Eucharist was received. The new one opened access to the one in the heavenly area. It revealed the deeper mysteries. It was a proclamation of Moscow’s quest to be the Heavenly Jerusalem. That it was placed near the body of Christ in the form of the Eucharist was symbolic of the Moscow Heavenly Jerusalem being understood as God’s will.

The original painting was sorrowful but the second one was gracious and heavenly. This suggested that Mary was moving towards her role in the Heavenly Jerusalem with her son as triumphant and neither of them suffering. My interpretation of the two paintings is that the second painting revealed a change in role of the icon from an intercessory one to proclamation of the Heavenly Jerusalem. By this I mean that previously people had prayed to Mary to intercede to God for victory in battles and for relief in times of hardship and sorrow. Icons were used as windows to prayer and communion with the saints. The first Virgin of Vladimir icon captured the understanding that Mary had for the suffering of others because she had been through suffering herself. By the time the second icon was painted, Moscow was more secure in its belief that Mary was the protector of the city and in the painting, Mary herself is protected by saints.

The placement of the 1514 Virgin of Vladimir in the Uspensky highlighted the part/whole relationship because icons of saints were placed around her. In the fifteenth century, Dionisi’s icons showed a more definite shift from intercession towards the Messianic Mission of the Tsar. Icons of this time assumed that divine protection was granted rather than asked for. They were schematic, showing many separate ensemble elements working together to make up a whole. This was achieved through the depiction of lots of figures, detailed architecture and landscapes in the background. Dionisi was of the new order. His work of the late fifteenth century was quite different from that of the traditional master, Rublev. Rublev’s work featured saintly figures in traditional symbolic poses whereas Dionisi experimented with movement in the figures. His figures have a sense of mystery and detachment due to the impressionistic strokes and washes of soft colour. His work lacks the fervent spirituality and bright colours of Rublev. This shift in iconographic
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scheme was typical of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The sadness of the figures in art of the previous centuries gave way to art that used warmth of expression and the idea of individual parts making up a whole that had meaning when all its components are viewed together.

The “Church Militant” icon showed the theological ideas associated with Moscow at the height of its self-image as the Heavenly Jerusalem in the sixteenth century (fig.2, p111). It was so important that it was painted in several forms for both the Uspensky and the Arkhangelsky Sobori. Commissioned in 1552 after the battle of Kazan, it was hung over the Tsar’s throne. It showed Tsar Ivan IV on a white horse crossing between heaven and earth, following Archangel Mikhail with Saints behind him leading the Muscovite Christian army into Moscow which was shown as the New Jerusalem. While the apocalypse had been depicted before, the implication here was that a reigning ruler was uniting the earthly world and the saintly heavenly realm while Kazan (representative of the city of Sodom) burned on account of its sins.

Ethnic battles in sixteenth century Russia were painted as cosmic battles between good and evil. The Tatars in Russian art were portrayed as dragons, which meant that they were thought of as satanically evil. The "Church Militant" painting related to Dan 12:1; Rev 12:7; 19:11-21. In the top left of the painting Mary and the baby Jesus are shown as giving out martyrs’ crowns to angels to bring to the soldiers who died in battle. Again this was an expression of the Great Menology belief that there was heavenly confirmation that the Russians were doing God’s holy work. The painting placed the expected Heavenly Jerusalem in a continuum of time, which was not too far after the battle of Kazan. It could be said that Kazan was the start of it.

Alongside the move towards the Heavenly Jerusalem in art, the Heaven-on-Earth motif continued to be deliberately invoked up until the sixteenth century when Vasili III on viewing the completed murals of the Uspensky Sobor in 1515 said that he “felt as if he were in heaven.” This is in contrast with Prince Vladimir’s delegation to the Hagia Sophia
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in the tenth century who said that they did not know if they were in heaven or on earth. My interpretation of Vasili’s words is that they implied a development of the heaven meeting earth theme. Up until then, the Russian church emphasised Heaven-on-Earth rather than heaven alone and the transformed earth was less prominent. This is in keeping with the emphasis on the Heavenly Jerusalem in the sixteenth century. Vasili III was connecting heaven with Moscow’s Uspensky Sobor.

Sixteenth century sources such as the “Tale of the Princes of Vladimir,” set the scene of Moscow as the Heavenly Jerusalem. They made it clear that the representation of the Heavenly Jerusalem was transferred to Moscow when the imperial regalia was brought from Kiev to Moscow.98 It was the second time that the spiritual rights had been symbolically handed over. The first time was in the twelfth century when the Greek Emperor Constantine Monomakh sent the famous imperial crown known as the cap of Monomakh of Kiev.99 The gift was regarded as the passing of succession from father to son by the Princes of Kiev and thereafter to the Princes of Vladimir and Moscow.100 Ivan IV who was the first consecrated Tsar wore it at his consecration.101

Metropolitan Makarii’s “Velikie Chetii Minei” (Great Menology) reflected the official ideology during Ivan IV’s reign and showed continuity with Illarion’s “chosen people” theme.102 Illarion’s “Sermon on Grace and Law,” was known in sixteenth century Moscow.103 At Ivan IV’s coronation in 1547, Makarii addressed the Tsar as the heir to David.104 Metropolitan Makarii referred to the Muscovites as “God’s chosen people.”105
This shows the importance of the Old Testament to Russian ideology. Apart from the Menology, there were several other sources of material on the “chosen people” theme in Moscow. While, there was no complete Bible translation till the end of the fifteenth century, the Old Testament and the Apocrypha were available, as well as the Paleya.

The latter was an interpretation based on the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kings, and Chronicles. Scripture was not widely used during the fifteenth century even though it was available. The reason for this was that the world had been expected to end and that there was a shortage of biblical literature. At any rate the biblical texts would have had an influence only on those who were able to read them. Literacy rates even among the elite boyars at court were still very low, which is why Russian theology was mostly expressed visually in icons and in architecture. The Old Testament, the Paleya, and the Russian Chronicles were shown in art rather than in text.

g) The Decline of the Heavenly Jerusalem in Art and Architecture

The depiction of the Heavenly Jerusalem declined in art and architecture in Moscow after the 1560s. Church architecture became decorative rather than symbolic. The changed political situation was a factor in the decline of the Heavenly Jerusalem theme. This was because religion was closely connected to the state. People lost faith in the state after conflicts between church and state rulers, a civil war in 1598, an interregnum and false pretenders to the throne. The idea of Moscow as the Heavenly Jerusalem was briefly refuelled with the appointment of its first patriarch in 1598, and when Boris Godunov became Tsar he planned a grand “New Jerusalem” cathedral to be modelled on the Temple of Solomon, and the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but it was never built. Similarly, Patriarch Nikon built a monastery near Moscow in the 1650s along the lines of a New Jerusalem. It included the Church of the Resurrection which had a tent roof (intended to
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imitate the Church of the Holy Sepulchre), and a church that was set in the ground in imitation of the cave where St Helena was said to have found Christ's cross. When Nikon was exiled during the construction stage, and his monastic riches were confiscated, there was not enough money to finish the construction. It was eventually finished in 1685, but its foundations started sinking within decades, the roof collapsed in 1723 and there was a fire three years later. After the seventeenth century, the use of Orthodox domes in church architecture declined.

With the rise of the Stroganov school of iconography in the late sixteenth century, the spiritual aspects of icon painting gave way to an ornamented style. The wealthy Stroganov family formed a painting workshop that gave rise to an art movement. They were the patrons of this new art movement as well as the proponents of it. The Stroganov school used a lot of detail in the form of many figures and complicated backgrounds, often of architecture and landscape. The intense detail in the paintings made the religious themes harder to find. This was quite different from the direct thematic representation of biblical and historical themes that had been seen in the Muscovite period just before this.

With the growing awareness of naturalism in Western paintings of this period, Russian painters focussed on artistic techniques and the rules of perspective at the expense of religious symbolism. This led to criticisms that the Stroganov style was worldly or secular. Notwithstanding this, Byzantine forms continued to be used and the Heavenly Jerusalem was still depicted in art, often as a fortified city. In the seventeenth century, the Russian Church ended up divided with the Old Believers continuing to paint icons in the traditional way while the new method initiated by Patriarch Nikon’s reforms was to portray figures realistically.
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1.2 THE CONTEXT OF ORTHODOXY

After the decline of the monasteries at the end of the fifteenth century due to internal disputes, the Metropolitans and the bishops became more powerful than the monks who had formerly been at the centre of Orthodox religious expression.\textsuperscript{114} The monasteries had been the centres of icon painting and writing the Russian Chronicles.\textsuperscript{115} The Metropolitans aligned themselves with the emerging state, the Grand Princes and the Tsars. At the end of the fifteenth century, many of the Russian principalities were still independent, although Ivan III had unified Russia to a large extent. With this rise in state religious power, religious expression and worship at local shrines, parish churches and monasteries became subordinate to leadership from the big cathedrals that were being built. The nature of miracles became public with the victory over the Tatars being seen as God’s will.\textsuperscript{116} In this respect, the post-Tatar church was different from its predecessor.

Worship itself was similar in all levels of Russian society and religion was at the forefront of daily consciousness.\textsuperscript{117} This is known from the Birchbark documents of Novgorod, which were records of the religious experience across all social classes. They were indicative of a common Christian identity.\textsuperscript{118} The nature of worship itself was communal even at the highest levels of society. In the second Uspensky Sobor, the Tsar stood during services in a gallery over the nave.\textsuperscript{119} This was quite different from the Byzantine Church where the Emperor sat on a throne.\textsuperscript{120} After the third Uspensky was built in 1479, the Tsar worshipped together with the elite warrior class known as the Boyars, and he stood by the South door.\textsuperscript{121}
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An important characteristic of Russian Orthodoxy that was tied in with its communal nature was that its churches were highly visible. The Uspensky was built to be easily seen by the whole city of Moscow. It was built to such a massive scale and on high ground because its physical and visually commanding presence was required to provide stability and hope in an unstable world where life was fraught with difficulty, having been subject to Mongol occupation, famines and very harsh laws.122 There were several factors in the harsh historical context of Moscow that influenced its development as a representation of the Heavenly Jerusalem. The church building itself represented Heaven-on-Earth, but the Heavenly Jerusalem concept was related to the whole city of Moscow. While the literature is divided as to their influence and extent, these are the main ideas that have been considered: the Mongol occupation, the Muscovite defeat of the Tatars at Kulikovo and Kazan, the fall of Constantinople, the Third Rome and the Messianic Mission. There were also subsidiary factors in Russia’s perceived cosmic role in the wake of the Council of Florence.

**a) The Mongol Occupation**

The Mongols took control of Kiev (the Rus centre of Christianity), after ruining it in three series of attacks between 1237 and 1241.123 The Novgorod Chronicle of 1224 details this conquest in a theodic way regarding it as punishment for sins: “The same year for our sins, unknown tribes came whom no one exactly knows, who they are, nor whence they came, nor what their faith is: but they call them Tatars…”124 By the same reasoning, any victory over the Mongols was interpreted as God’s favour. This informed the concept of Moscow as Heavenly Jerusalem after its victory over the Tatars who were the descendants of the Mongols. Bishop Vassian Rylo’s letter to Ivan III on the Ugra in 1480 described the Muscovite victory over the Tatars as “God’s liberation of Exodus.”125 He spoke of the Tatars as evil and the Tsar as being in a battle against the Hagarenes.126 While the concept of the

---

126 PSRL, Voskresenskaya Letopisei, or the Resurrection Chronicle, vol. 8 (St. Petersburg, 1859), 207-213, cited in Donald Ostrowski, *Muscovy and the Mongols: Cross Cultural Influences on the Steppe Frontier 1304-
Heavenly Jerusalem was forward looking, these words drew on the past in two ways, by referring to the Old Testament and because Illarion’s Sermon was possibly a source for Rylo’s letter.

**b) The Muscovite Defeat of the Tatars**

At the same time that the Muscovites were gathering strength to overpower Tatar domination, the first iconostasis was created in 1405. It was a Russian development; the Byzantine church did not have it. This was typical of the differences between Russian and Byzantine religion. Before discussing the victory over the Tatars, the religious differences between Russian and Byzantine orthodoxy need to be addressed. Zernov has put forward a model of the “Three Romes,” to illustrate the differences between the Byzantine and the Russian Church where each “Rome” had a different person of the Trinity at its centre. Under this model, the first Rome, (Rome itself), brought the rule of law and thus it related to God, the Father.\(^{127}\)

The second Rome, Constantinople, brought apologetic Christianity that justified its authority with creeds to fight heresy.\(^{128}\) This Rome was Christocentric with the Emperor as the earthly representation of Christ.\(^{129}\) The third Rome, Moscow, sought the transformation of people back to the prototype that God intended through the agency of the Holy Spirit.\(^{130}\) The Russians saw the saints and the Virgin Mary as being guided by the Holy Spirit and as protectors of the community. Due to the historical context of the Russian Church in the wake of the Mongol occupation, it focussed more on intercession and protection than the Byzantine Church did. The communion of saints became linked to Moscow and the quest to break free from the Tatars.\(^{131}\) Icons invoked divine protection through the intercession of the figures portrayed.
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The first victory over the Tatars at Kulikovo in 1380 by the Muscovite Christian soldiers did not affect the outcome of the war in general, although it was an important turning point that provided the psychological victory that was needed.132 With each battle more land was claimed back from the Tatars.133 By 1480 the occupation of Moscow was over although the Tatars remained in control of other areas.134 Then, in 1552, Ivan IV’s capture of Kazan, (the Tatar capital city) was interpreted apocalyptically with Moscow being regarded as the Heavenly Jerusalem.135

Apocalyptic struggles were thought to occur many times over.136 Ivan’s self-image as stated in his letter to Prince Kurbsky in 1564, was that of leader who together with Christ, Archangel Mikhail and the Virgin Mary was leading the army towards the New Jerusalem.137 Priscilla Hunt has analysed his correspondence to reach the conclusion that he thought that he needed to save his subjects and the cosmos, to make them “chosen” in order to fulfill their destiny in the Messianic Mission.138 This understanding was supported by the church. Makarii had blessed Ivan IV’s attack on Kazan.139 Under Ivan IV’s rule, the Russians believed that they would be the last post of Christianity prior to Christ’s second coming.140 Hunt, Berdyaev and Gasp-Hulvat follow this view that the Messianic Mission was the basis of Ivan’s power as Tsar to lead Moscow in its transformation into a holy state.141
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c) The Council of Florence

The Council of Florence was a meeting of representatives from both the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches. Each side had their own agenda: the Catholics sought unity and consensus with the Orthodox Churches on theological issues while the Orthodox sought military support against the Turks. Unity was fleeting and the Russian representative who had signed up for reunion was in trouble with both the Tsar and the people on his return.\textsuperscript{142} The fall of Constantinople was seen by Christians as punishment for the Byzantine Church agreeing to the Florentine Council. The aftermath of the Council of Florence had coloured the Russian interpretation of the fall of Constantinople. Prince Vasili II of Moscow officially rejected the Council at his synod of 1448 and claimed independence for the Russian Church at the same time.\textsuperscript{143}

d) The Fall of Constantinople

The fall of Constantinople to the Ottomans in 1453 contributed to the rise of Moscow as its successor. The fall is often considered to have played a major role in the Heavenly Jerusalem development although Russia had been independent from Constantinople since the mid fifteenth century. The conversion of the Hagia Sophia Cathedral into a mosque was a symbolic and real confirmation of the loss of identity of the capital city of orthodoxy.\textsuperscript{144} Susana Prieto found that the Muscovites probably validated their role as successor only in hindsight; she saw the need to claim Old Testament grounds for Moscow, and the Council of Florence of 1438-1439 as contributing more to the theme.\textsuperscript{145} In addition to these factors, Flier adds that Ivan III believed that the Russian church needed to be unified to prepare for its cosmic role.\textsuperscript{146}

Primary sources from Moscow suggested that the Russians interpreted Constantinople’s fall theodically. The “Svod 1508,” and the second redaction of the “Tale of the Capture of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453 support this.”\textsuperscript{147} The fall appears to fulfil theodical
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predictions of it by Pseudo Methodius (c650-late seventh/early eighth century) in his “Apocalypse”\textsuperscript{148} and Leo the Wise (886-912AD) who predicted that a fair race would defeat the Ishmaelites and inherit the “seven hills” (a reference to the successor of Rome which had seven hills).\textsuperscript{149} The Russian Church often compared its enemies to Old Testament races.

e) The Third Rome and the Messianic Mission

Decades earlier, around 1510AD, monk Filofei of Eleazor Monastery in Pskov wrote an Epistle to Tsar Vasili III, in which he prophesised that Moscow would be the “Third Rome.”\textsuperscript{150} He wrote that “two Romes have fallen, the third stands and there shall be no fourth.”\textsuperscript{151} Filofei thought that the first Rome fell due to heresy, and the second Rome fell due to the infidel Turks.\textsuperscript{152} The first two Romes did not protect the faith. In declaring Moscow to be the Third Rome, Filofei was claiming for Moscow the responsibility for protecting orthodoxy. The Epistle had been used in the early sixteenth century to argue that the Tsar had a duty to protect orthodoxy. In the late sixteenth century, Filofei’s Epistle was re-interpreted to promote Moscow’s Messianic Mission.

Stella Rock and Daniel Rowland however, found the Messianic Mission to be an anachronistic reading of Filofei’s epistle because the Third Rome was not officially recognised until 1589 with the document of the New Moscow Patriarchate.\textsuperscript{153} Ellen Hurst is of the view that Moscow had already established itself as the successor of Constantinople decades before the Third Rome concept became official.\textsuperscript{154} However Makarii did refer to Filofei’s Epistle in his Menology in 1547.\textsuperscript{155} Either way, the implications for the Tsar remained the same. If he let the “last Rome” collapse, then that
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would inaugurate the apocalypse, which would hasten along the Heavenly Jerusalem. This argument is strengthened by the apostolic and imperial genealogies that were written. These showed that the Tsar’s past ancestors prepared him and Moscow for their role as the Third Rome. Metropolitan Makarii commissioned a new family history going back to Caesar Augustus. “The Little Chronicle of the Beginning of the Reign of the Tsar and Grand Prince Ivan Vasil’evich” and the “Book of Degrees of the Imperial Genealogy” as well as the “Illuminated Chronicle” were such histories that glorified the Kazan pro-Muscovite battle and the divine protection of the Virgin Mary.

1.3 THE CONTEXT OF THE VISIBLE AND THE INVISIBLE

In medieval and Muscovite Russia, life was interpreted with respect to the invisible. Earthly things reflected heavenly ones and were explained in relation to the heavenly. The earthly world used art and architecture to proclaim the invisible. The church building as an image of the whole cosmos was the link between the invisible and the visible, and within it icons were the bridge between the two spheres. Rowland’s extensive studies on Muscovite orthodoxy emphasize just how much this interpretation dominated religion: “Almost all products of orthodox culture had the task of linking these two worlds.”

The symbolism associated with the visible and the invisible was particularly apparent in the mid-Byzantine period in the royal court of the Emperor, which, as discussed earlier, is the period that also had the most influence on the emerging Russian Church that had its origins in Kievan Rus. The invisible was proclaimed physically by having two thrones in the Imperial Throne room in the court, one for the invisible presence of God and one for the Emperor.
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The Byzantine Church and thereafter the Russian Church lived by the Nicene Creed: “God made Heaven and Earth and all things visible and invisible.” The heavens were part of the “invisible” unchanging realm while the earthly realm was considered to be “visible” and in a changing state. The “invisible” and the “visible” were connected with the Orthodox understanding of the energies and essence of God. The Russian Church followed the Byzantines in believing that the energies refer to God’s creativity in the visible world. St. Vasili, (329-379AD) used the energies of God to infer the essence of God: “no one has seen the essence of God, but we believe in it because we experience his energies.”\(^{163}\) Maximus the Confessor used this theology in his concept of the boundary between the visible and the invisible in the seventh century.\(^{164}\) Later on, St. Symeon of Thessalonica (949-1022AD) confirmed that the decision to divide the church interior into the nave and the sanctuary was taken in order to represent the visible and the invisible.\(^{165}\) However, the essence of God was unknowable. The energies and essence theory continued to be developed into medieval times. In 1347, Gregory Palamas (1296-1359) used it to inform a Hesychastic argument that the divine light from the transfiguration illuminates the soul.\(^{166}\)

Russian icons used theological symbols rather than realistic portrayals and because of this they are important guides to the Russian understanding of the themes of this thesis. The Russian contribution to the visible and the invisible was centred around the art of Andrei Rublev (1360s-1427/1428), a monk from Spaso-Andronikov Monastery in Moscow. His iconographic work in relation to the visible and the invisible, created a harmony between the visual depiction of heaven and earth that was previously unknown. This was achieved through showing the spiritual and the abstract in a physical, material way.\(^{167}\) Hughes describes Rublev’s work as having “spirituality” (beauty of spirit) and aesthetics (beauty of form).\(^{168}\) The Heaven-on-Earth theme was given a new spiritual depth with Rublev’s
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1411 painting “Old Testament Trinity” that personifies the Trinity in a human way, yet expresses such a harmony of form between the figures and skilful use of colour to indicate the heavenly aspects of the Trinity (fig.3, p112). The icon refers to Genesis 18:1-6 where Abraham collectively addresses his heavenly visitors as “Lord.”

Behind the Trinity in this icon is the physical church that represents the Heavenly Jerusalem. Both the Heaven-on-Earth paradise in the form of the tree of life from the Garden of Eden and the Heavenly Jerusalem in the church are represented in the icon. In doing so, Rublev affirms Ephesians 1:22-23 that in the church all things heavenly and earthly should be united in Christ. Rublev is credited with having created the first iconostasis in 1405. This is significant because it became symbolically meaningful with respect to the Heavenly Jerusalem. The iconostasis reveals the heavenly realm behind it when its doors are opened. To those on earth, it shows the hierarchy of heaven with the most holy figures at the top.

In summary, the theological and historical context of Russia provides a framework through which to interpret the architecture of the two cathedrals. The Byzantine religion informed the development of the Russian concept of Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem. The Russian model took a different route as a result of several overlapping factors that affected the context of its religion. The Mongol occupation with its theodic implications, the Kulikovo and the Kazan battles, the fall of Constantinople, and the outcome of the Council of Florence contributed to the rise of the self-image of Moscow as the Heavenly Jerusalem. While there is vigorous scholarly dispute concerning the extent to which the above-mentioned factors affected each other and the rise of Moscow, there is no dispute that in the sixteenth century, Moscow saw itself as the Heavenly Jerusalem. Chapter Two will interpret the Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem themes in the Uspensky Sobor.
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Chapter 2

HEAVEN-ON-EARTH IN THE USPENSKY SOBOR

2.0 Introduction

In Chapter One, theological, cultural and historical contexts were given to provide a framework with which to examine the architecture of the Uspensky and the Pokrovsky Sobori. Part One of Chapter Two addresses four areas: the background to the Heaven-on-Earth theme starting with the Byzantine influence on Russian churches, the integrated nature of politics and religion in fifteenth century Russia, the rise of Moscow, and the increased proclamation of Heaven-on-Earth through architecture and art. Part Two gives an account of all three Uspensky Sobori as well as the prototype at Vladimir with particular emphasis on the third Uspensky. A review of the literature is given because there are diverse opinions on the influences that affected the construction of the Uspensky and this has implications for the twin themes of this thesis. The rest of the chapter interprets the symbolism of the Heaven-on-Earth theme and the signs that pointed to the Heavenly Jerusalem theme in the Uspensky.

2.1 The Background

a) Early Kievan-Rus Churches

Chapter One gave an account of the Byzantine origins of Russian churches in Kievan Rus. The Byzantine influence on the religious architecture of Kievan Rus was profound and spanned several centuries. The first stone church in Kievan Rus territory was the Bogoridsky (Church of our Lady) in Kiev built in 990AD by a Byzantine builder.\[172\] The oldest extant church however, is Spaso-Preobrazhenskii (Church of the Transfiguration) in Chernigov which was built before 1036.\[173\] Existing religious architecture (including those churches which are in ruins), indicates that while Kievan Rus churches followed Byzantine form from the end of the ninth century,\[174\] differences appeared as early as the
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eleventh century with the Kievan Rus development of the multi-domes that led to symbolism in churches being mostly concentrated in the roof.\textsuperscript{175} The multi-domes created an effect of harmony. The early Kievan churches, of which the St. Sofia Sobor of 1036AD is the most prominent example had a high degree of commonality in the artworks, notably the mosaics in the apse, inner dome and the frescoes, whereas the Byzantine cathedrals at Constantinople did not exhibit a unified relationship between the artworks and the whole church. Domes had formerly been used in Roman buildings and were adopted by the Christian church in the fourth century for martyria and baptisteries. In the fifth century, however, the dome became symbolic of heaven.\textsuperscript{176}

Byzantine churches combined the basilica and the rotunda form of the early Christian churches and this church form was particularly suitable for displaying artworks on the walls. The high point of iconography was in the Russian development of the first iconostasis in the fifteenth century. Overall the architecture of the domed churches of the Orthodox tradition expressed the idea of harmony between heaven and earth. Heaven-on-Earth was expressed in the churches with architectural structures, religious objects and art all having symbolic meaning.

\textbf{b) Politics and Religion}

Uspensky Sobor is often regarded as a state church that was manipulated by the Tsar for political reasons. Given that religious thought dominated life in fifteenth century Russia, politics and religion were interconnected. Like the Byzantines before them whose emperor was “equal to the Apostles,”\textsuperscript{177} the Russian Tsar had authority as God’s representative on earth. For this reason, it is impossible to separate politics from religion in researching this time period. The throne of Monomakh expressed the Muscovite tradition of politico-religious succession. The throne, which was crafted in 1551, showed scenes of the Byzantine Emperor Constantine Monomakh gifting the shapka (which is royal head-dress in the form of a sable cap encrusted with precious jewels) to Prince

\textsuperscript{175} Oswald Spengler, \textit{The Decline of the West} (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 113.
\textsuperscript{177} Zernov, \textit{Eastern Christendom}, 39.
Vladimir Monomakh of Kiev in the twelfth century. This gift passed on spiritual authority by way of succession as it was handed down through successive generations from the Princes of Kiev to the Princes of Vladimir and Moscow. Ivan IV was the first consecrated Tsar to wear the shapka. In Chapter One, I discussed how the Muscovite royal leaders mostly stood in church services and how they were more humble in worship than the Byzantine Emperors had been.

The Throne of Monomakh looked more like a church pew than a throne. It was made from walnut wood and it had four lions as pillars that held up a canopy. It was originally painted gold and it had a kokoshnik at the top. It was crafted some three hundred years after the shapka and it portrayed Prince Vladimir of Kiev as looking like Ivan IV to make the latter’s claim to spiritual succession even stronger. In doing so, the symbolism in the shapka was re-evaluated to make the Russian claim to be the head of Orthodoxy stronger. In addition to the Throne of Monomakh adding weight to the authority of the shapka, the legend was spread that Caesar had originally owned the shapka and that Ivan IV was descended from both the Emperor Constantine Monomakh and Roman Emperor Augustus Caesar. Having built up the legend as much as possible, the shapka was brought before the masses in the sixteenth century so that they could take oaths of allegiance in front of it. Constantinople was the historical capital of Orthodoxy but its position weakened after it fell to the Turks in 1453. The gifting of the shapka in the twelfth century added weight to the claims five hundred years later that Moscow was to be the new capital of Orthodoxy.

The Throne of Monomakh was important for ceremonial as well as practical purposes. The Uspensky Sobor itself had a combination of religious, political and ceremonial functions. In it, Tsars were crowned and married, Metropolitans were ordained, victory
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Commemorations were held and it was the starting point for the Easter procession. Blessings before military battles took place under the icon of the Virgin of Vladimir in the Uspensky. More sobering rituals such as declaring anathema against apostates took place here too. Biblical stories were re-enacted on a grand scale, in particular, the ritual foot washing and an adaptation of the story of Daniel where three young Babylonian men were put in the furnace. In tandem with the political and ceremonial functions, the hallowed ground of the Uspensky had a spiritual role as a burial site for Metropolitans since the middle of the fourteenth century.

Usually the royal leader had a gallery that connected the palace to a church so that he or she could visit it easily, but the Uspensky was so sacred and grand that it was never intended to be used as a domestic church or for private worship. The Uspensky's significance extended beyond its own time and locality in that it set the standard for national churches to follow. The Uspensky was a model for five other five-domed cathedrals that were built after it in the second half of the sixteenth century in Vologda, Rostov Veliky, the Moscow Novodevichy Monastery, Danilov Monastery of Pereslavl-Zaleski, and the Trinity-Macarius Monastery in Kalyazin.

c) Art and Architecture and the Restored Kremlin

Art and architecture had been instrumental in rebuilding and renewing Christianity in the wake of the Tatar domination. William Brumfield has found that in general terms, the attention to the physicality of the church was carried over from the Mongol occupation where the church was a physical symbol of unity. He ties this in with national consciousness, arguing that architecture became a means of renewing Christianity to the point that Christianity could overpower the Tatars in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The post-Tatar church offered protection on a national level through prayers of intercession for the whole emerging state.
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The Kremlin provided protection as well as spiritual guidance. It was built on a previously fortified wooden settlement of churches and associated buildings and was used as a fortress in the siege of Moscow before Donskoï’s early victory over the Tatars at Kulikovo in 1380. This military function ran alongside the religious role of the Kremlin and indeed the roles intersected because the seat of Orthodoxy had to be protected and defended. Donskoï added structural features such as iron gates and battlements to the Kremlin to fortify it. He also enlarged the Kremlin walls and had a moat dug around it.

Tsar Ivan III who reigned from 1462-1505, set in place a large-scale programme to restore collapsed Kremlin churches. He was key to the start of the unification of Russia having annexed Rostov, Yaroslavl and Novgorod, and by defying the Tatars by not paying them the monetary tribute. His quest for unification can be seen in his 1480 signature “Tsar and Autocrat of all Russia.” There are conflicting interpretations of Ivan’s rebuilding programme. Brumfield thinks that Ivan sought religious and cultural continuity with the rebuilding programme, while Hurst thinks that the Tsar “just happened” to be ruling in the wake of the liberation from the Tatars.

The question as to whether the rebuilding programme was related to politics or religion is hypothetical because politics and religion were intertwined. The golden age of architecture in Moscow began during Ivan III’s reign and has often been associated with a show of political power. However, there is one architectural feature that suggests otherwise: the gold roofs were built during a time of religious consolidation and they predated true political power. Gold was used in Orthodoxy for the roofs during Ivan III’s reign. In the Orthodox hierarchy of colours it related to heaven and purity rather than as a show of political grandness. This would suggest a theological basis for the architecture.

191 Ibid.
192 Ibid.
194 Hurst, “Italians and the New Byzantium,” 35.
Researchers had been caught up in trying to interpret the actual situation of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and the balance between state and Church. This led to intense debate as to whether the Church was controlled by the Tsar and the extent to which the Church helped the Tsar to create a theocracy. A second line of research has been to try to work out the religiosity of the Tsar using primary documents of the time and his own correspondence. This has created difficulties because whole histories of Russia were written in the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries to glorify Moscow and the Tsar. The nature of these Chronicles was propagandic and even polemical. In addressing the problems mentioned above in understanding the relationship between the political and religious factors in the Muscovite time period, Michael Flier’s research has been a watershed in that he freed research from the purely historical and political.

Flier’s methodology has been to examine not only the historical context of Moscow but also the theological. His work is valuable to this thesis because he focuses on symbolism. His method is to select a particular artwork, architectural feature, religious ritual, document or monument and to work out what the symbols associated with it were trying to say within the above parameters. In doing so, he has drawn on earlier representations of the given item to identify, track and explain changes.

Ellen Hurst is of the view that Moscow needed the physical symbolism of new architecture to go with its image as the new Byzantine capital.¹⁹⁶ She looks back to the Byzantine architecture of Kievan Rus as an influence on Moscow’s architecture in later periods.¹⁹⁷ She considers the architecture of Ivan III to have been a kind of Renaissance of the earlier Byzantine period.¹⁹⁸ Her other argument to support this is that Metropolitan Iona who was the first independent Metropolitan of the autocephalous Russian Church after Russian Orthodoxy separated from Byzantine Orthodoxy in 1448, praised the Greek Orthodox Church in his speech.¹⁹⁹ However, my argument is that the Russian Church would not have separated at all had it fully wanted to follow the Byzantine Church.
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Hurst states that on the one hand Ivan III did not have a plan in mind in rebuilding the Kremlin, but she also claims that he had a very “deliberate rebranding” plan of the city through architecture and that he deliberately sought Byzantine architects in Italy after they were no longer available in Constantinople. She goes on to state that Ivan III wanted to publicly show the connection to Byzantium by building the Byzantine buildings and that “there is no reason to believe that there had been a move away from Byzantium.”

Dmitry Shvidovsky favoured Italian and Byzantine influences on the Uspensky's architecture as did Brumfield and Hurst. He refers to the words of the Chronicler “This church is wondrous for its magnitude, its height, its abundance of light and space, its sonority such as have never been before witnessed in Rus...” to support his argument that these same marvellous features “can be traced to the great Italian cathedrals of the late middle ages.” He considered that Moscow was where the "last renaissance of Byzantium took place, the last rally of those true to the ideal of the taken empire." He does not seem to have taken into account that Moscow was seeking to become a Muscovite capital rather than a Byzantine one, and to distance itself from the Byzantine world after the Council of Florence. Similarly, Hurst who relied on Shvidovsky's theory to some extent, claims that Moscow "sought to recreate the Byzantine Empire" when it laid claim to being the new capital of Orthodoxy. By this time, the Russian Church had developed a mistrust of Catholic culture and the Byzantine Church whom they considered to have sold out to the Catholic Church after the Council of Florence.
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The above arguments that looked back to the historicity of the Byzantine architecture with respect to influencing the sixteenth century architecture do not take into account the events of the fifteenth century such as the Council of Florence and the Russian Church seeking independence. There is another discrepancy in that Shvidovsky finds a strong Renaissance factor in the design of the Uspensky while at the same time finding that it was built to unify the Russian Church in the wake of the Council of Florence which had divided Orthodoxy.\(^{209}\) Conceivably, both could be true, but if the reason for building the Uspensky was to hold the Russian Church together after recent opposition, then it would not seek to quote the architecture of the rival church in question.

My second argument looks to the architecture itself which points to the Uspensky as unique in breaking with Byzantine tradition. This is important because my thesis is that the Uspensky Sobor was designed to symbolise Heaven-on-Earth, (notwithstanding that the sanctuary itself was literally regarded as Heaven-on-Earth due to the real presence of Christ). The Uspensky was not just a church that was incidentally built by Ivan III. At any rate, the new nationalism did require new architecture in the 1360s-1420s.\(^{210}\) At the start of the sixteenth century, Vasili III centralised power further (and gave further religious sanction for building churches).\(^{211}\)

A recent development has been to consider customs that fostered religious values. Alexei Lidov calls it "hierotopy," which is the "ongoing creation of sacred space."\(^{212}\) This theory holds that rulers continued traditions and rituals at the same time as adding in new elements. David Miller, in discussing Eric Hobsbawm’s work on the subject, believes that such practices used ritual to establish and legitimize power in the relationship between church and state.\(^{213}\) Although my intention is to focus on symbology rather than the true motivation of the Church and Tsar and the morality of it, this sort of research does provide
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many concrete examples of physical works of art, literature and architecture that contain the Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem themes. For example, The Book of Degrees and the Illuminated Chronicle commissioned by Makarri and Ivan IV set out the basis of Russia as the New Israel.\textsuperscript{214}

\textbf{d) The Rise of Moscow}

In Chapter One, I discussed the growing importance of Moscow in the wake of Metropolitan Pyotr’s relocation from Vladimir to Moscow. Brumfield saw the relocation of Metropolitan Pyotr as having had a direct causal link to the architecture of the Moscow cathedrals.\textsuperscript{215} Indeed Pyotr laid the cornerstone of the first Uspensky which was itself the first stone church to be built in Moscow.\textsuperscript{216} The records of the times referred to the first Uspensky being built in limestone in 1326 on the site of an earlier cathedral.\textsuperscript{217} Excavations in 1968 revealed a cemetery and pieces of a thirteenth century church which supports the theory that an earlier wooden church existed there. When Pyotr died about a year after the construction of the first Uspensky, he was interred within it and was canonized in 1339.

Dionisi’s icon of “Metropolitan Pyotr and his Life” (late fifteenth to early sixteenth century) included a series of images from the Metropolitan’s life that showed the basis for his saintliness. One of these scenes shows him laying the cornerstone of the Uspensky Sobor. This suggests that the site was already sacred or that it became holy after Pyotr laid the cornerstone there. One only has to look to the cassock of Metropolitan Pyotr to realise that Moscow was rising to prominence.\textsuperscript{218} The cassock was mentioned in the Chronicles. The cassock was of blue cloth sourced from Constantinople and it had over one thousand silver crosses sewn on to it and gold medallions around the collar.\textsuperscript{219}
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The transferral of the seat of Orthodoxy with Pyotr’s relocation to Moscow meant that Vladimir became part of the Moscow principality. Nikolay Solovyev and M. Ilyin interpret this to mean that Muscovite architects took on Vladimirian ideas architecturally, although Ilyin takes this further in his view that the emerging stone architecture was about showing power. Stone was permanent, expensive and stone-masons were few. Dmitri Obolensky found a Vladimirian influence, not just for the Uspensky but for limestone churches in general in Moscow, although he concedes that the early churches that would provide the most secure evidence for this theory are lost. There is not much surviving stone architecture so it is difficult to know how prevalent it was.

Moscow’s rise does appear to be related to the relocation of Orthodoxy. Stone was used in the rise of the Moscow state with monumental works of stone appearing in the fourteenth century. The use of stone was related to the new ideas about portraying Heaven-on-Earth in monumental architectural works. The Chronicles were important in what they did not say. Moscow was not often mentioned in the Chronicles prior to the fourteenth century although the Chronicle of Tver of 1156 reported that Iurii Dolgorukii carried out some Kremlin fortifications. In the second half of the fifteenth century, the Chronicles gave details on the use of stone in Moscow. The Chronicle references to the appearance of stone architecture in Moscow indicate that it was a new feature that was connected with the politico-spiritual rise of Moscow rather than a re-working of earlier Vladimirian architecture. The stone architecture of Moscow was different to that of Vladimir. The use of stone in Moscow coincided with increased proclamation of Heaven-on-Earth.

There is a theory that the first state churches were attempts to transfer medieval wooden architectural models into stone. This is controversial because it relates to an interpretation of the Chronicle that says that the columns of the Uspensky Sobor were as though they were “carved in stone.” Kathleen Berton supports the wooden influence,
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Shvidovsky acknowledges its possible influence, while Brumfield dismisses it for lack of evidence. This will be discussed further in Chapter Three because the same arguments persist as to whether the Pokrovsky Sobor too was influenced by wooden architecture. The issue concerns the possible influences on the design of these churches and also whether the Chronicle should be taken literally or figuratively when talking about other architectural issues.

George Hamilton has stated that all that can be definitely said is that Moscow’s buildings were almost all wooden up until the time of the rebuild of the Kremlin. This is not quite the case because the first Uspensky Sobor built in 1326 was a stone church. Furthermore, stone had been used in Vladimir, albeit with some loss of architectural technique under Tatar rule, and Moscow did commission stone work, again with limited success as the collapse of the first two Uspensky buildings show. The number and quality of stonework buildings declined during the Mongol domination. The question as to whether stone was a new feature or a revival of an earlier one became bound up with whether it could be connected to the rise of Moscow and the associated theology of Heaven-on-Earth.

If the emergence of stone architecture was a new idea connected with the political and spiritual rise of Moscow, then it is indeed connected with the Heaven-on-Earth theme in architecture but if it was simply a re-working of earlier Vladimirian architecture, then it is harder to secure this point. My view leans towards the new idea theory because the reports in the Chronicle mentioned above support this and because the stone architecture of Moscow was different to that of Vladimir. Furthermore, it is important to consider the religious context of the relocation of Orthodoxy to Moscow rather than to just examine the architectural evidence connected with the relocation.
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e) Increased Proclamation of Heaven-on-Earth.

It is my contention that the Uspensky Sobor represented the pinnacle of the Heaven-on-Earth theme and that the proclamation of this theme intensified with the construction of this cathedral. The reasons for my claim are that the site of the Uspensky had long been considered to be holy ground and that this belief became stronger after the victory over the Tatars. In Chapter One, I discussed how an icon of the Virgin Mary was believed to have halted the advance of Timur into Moscow. Similarly, churches that were dedicated to the Virgin Mary were believed to have miracles associated with them. The construction of the Uspensky allowed it to accord itself of her grace. The Uspensky was dedicated to Mary’s dormition (or falling asleep in Christ) and to her assumption. Apocryphal details tell us that when she fell asleep, her soul went to heaven and that three days later, her body was assumed into heaven. The symbolism of the Uspensky Sobor emphasised the heavenly and the earthly. Furthermore, the association with miracles in the Virgin Mary’s name was a sign of Heaven-on-Earth.

In order to understand the Heaven-on-Earth theme, the predecessors of the Uspensky need to be discussed. The first Uspensky was built in stone in 1326 by Ivan Kalita with one dome, three apses and six pillars and it featured semicircle motifs. Prince Dmitri Donskoi added four stone churches around it in 1367 and fortified its walls. It was rebuilt because it was a modest church that did not fit Moscow’s image in terms of political and religious authority. It was not grand enough nor big enough for ceremonial processions after the rise of Moscow. Its narrow windows suggested a defensive structure. There was a pattern that when churches were restored after being ruined by the Tatars, they were rebuilt with narrow windows. As a sanctuary from further invasions, the first Uspensky had no windows at the lower levels and the upper windows were so narrow that only birds could fit through the bars. This defensive type of architecture would not have fitted the Heaven-on-Earth theme that was coming to the fore.
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There was another urgent reason for the rebuild; the Uspensky had been near collapse since Ivan III became Tsar in 1462. If the cathedral stood for religious and political power, then a collapsed building would be a very bad sign. The architects, Kristov and Myshkin were hired for the rebuild that would show the Kremlin's new ideology. In 1471 they were sent to the similarly titled Uspensky in Vladimir to study its architecture. However their construction of the second Uspensky collapsed soon after it was finished on May 20 or 21st 1474. Brumfield cites poor materials and technique and the placement of the staircase over an already weak structure as causative factors.

Returning now to the concept of holy ground, the three Uspensky churches had been rebuilt on the same site over what had previously been a cemetery and a small wooden church. The graves of the holiest men in Russian history were brought here and churches were built over them. Metropolitan Pyotr had designed his own tomb in the first Uspensky. The grave of Pyotr was associated with miracles and prophecies. He had correctly predicted the eventual victory over the Mongols and that Moscow would rise to become the most important city in Russia. His very presence in the Uspensky, particularly after his canonisation, was important with his tomb being placed near the altar. On three occasions, after his remains were disturbed (due to Mongol attack, building collapse and during the construction of the Uspensky), it was claimed that his body was found to be incorrupt. The importance of Metropolitan Pyotr was emphasised by the ritual of consecrating archbishops at his grave. Other important ceremonies were held there too with state documents and agreements being ratified beside his grave and with the Moscow Grand Princes and Tsars kissing the cross on his tomb.

The above factors were influential in the decision of Tsar Ivan III to organise a grand replacement cathedral. Ivan took over from the Metropolitan in organising the new sobor. The reasons for this are contended. Brumfield thinks that Ivan's credibility was at stake, while Hurst downplays the contribution of the Tsar as she queries whether he had a building plan for the Kremlin. Hurst thought that Ivan III's key priority was that the
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Uspensky should proclaim the Russian Orthodox Church as the new defender of Orthodoxy\textsuperscript{233} after the Council of Florence.\textsuperscript{234} She does concede that irrespective of whether Ivan had a unified plan, he did have the above specific proclamation in mind in the Uspensky Sobor.\textsuperscript{235} His architecture shed light on the political and religious atmosphere of Moscow which became very important in the proclamation of Heaven-on-Earth in the third Uspensky Sobor.

\textbf{2:2 The Moscow Uspensky.}

After the collapse of the second Uspensky, Ivan III commissioned builders from Pskov, but without success.\textsuperscript{236} We know from the second Sofia Chronicle how important it was to Ivan that the sobor be rebuilt. The Chronicle gives details of Ivan sending a boyar\textsuperscript{237} called Semeon Tolbuzin to Italy to seek a builder.\textsuperscript{238} Architect Ridolfo Fioravanti, (popularly known as Aristotle on account of his engineering abilities)\textsuperscript{239} from Bologna was chosen. Fioravanti found the Uspensky to be unfixable, but he was given considerable freedom to build a new one. The Sofia Chronicle captured the awe with which his work was regarded by contemporaries as it described the demolition of the Uspensky: “It was extraordinary to see that which was made in three years come undone in less than a week.”\textsuperscript{240} The Chronicles give details of each stage of his work with similar praise. This does suggest that Fioravanti’s work was really out of the ordinary.

\textbf{a) The Vladimir Uspensky Prototype}

The literature is fairly agreed as to Vladimirian influence on the Uspensky's five-domes, six pillars and austere exterior.\textsuperscript{241} Faensen, Brumfield, Sisov and Obolensky hold this view. Brumfield infers that Vladimirian architecture influenced that of Moscow. Given that Moscow’s earliest churches are no longer extant, he traces Zvenigorod architecture
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(which he thinks influenced Muscovite architecture), back to Vladimirian roots. He does think that the Muscovite architects did develop the style further to make it more distinctive.242

George Hamilton is one of a few researchers who think that the town of Novgorod which was known for its massive monumental architecture had a major influence on the construction of the Uspensky.243 Within this Novgorodian school of thought, there are minor variations. Berton found Novgorod to be a major influence, although she also placed more emphasis on the similarities rather than the differences between the architecture of the Vladimir Uspensky and the Moscow one.244 My research into the architectural changes between the construction of the Vladimir Uspensky and the Moscow Uspensky found that while Moscow retained the spiritual symbolism of Vladimir in its architecture, it otherwise superseded it rather than revised or continued it for the following reasons.

At first appearance, the Moscow Uspensky was similar in its dome structure and severe monumental exterior, but it departed from the cross-in-square form of the Vladimir Uspensky. Secondly, its ornamentation reflected religious symbolism and did not rather acknowledge pagan heritage like the Vladimir Uspensky had done. While Novgorod did have large churches, and it was one of the cities that Fioravanti visited, Fioravanti's construction methods, use of architectural features such as blind arcades, cross-vaults in the nave, bricks in the vaults and iron tie rods were unique and without precedent.

There were precedents in the decades prior to the Uspensky's construction for churches that had one or two features of the Moscow Uspensky such as light and spaciousness, but no prototype harmonised them the way that Fioravanti did. His work was controversial to the point that at first it was considered to be heretical. While Ivan III permitted the new construction methods and form of the Uspensky, the Metropolitan initially thought that

243 Hamilton, The Art and Architecture of Russia, 122, 125.
the plans for the Uspensky were a “Latin heresy.” Fioravanti was permitted to go ahead and he laid the foundations in 1475. The church took around four years to build and was consecrated on 15 August 1479.

In spite of the earlier setback with the Metropolitan, religious considerations do seem to have been at the forefront of Fioravanti’s construction of the new Uspensky, in that he was compelled by Ivan III and the Metropolitan to spend months studying the symbolism and design of the Vladimir Uspensky before starting work on the Moscow one, as well as touring the sobori of Vladimir, Rostov, Iaroslavl, and Novgorod. Fioravanti was skilled to the extent that he did not need architectural lessons so that cannot have been the reason that he was studying the sobori. Moreover, he was specifically told to use the Vladimir Uspensky Sobor as a model.

The Vladimir Uspensky Sobor was so important that it became the model for the construction of the Moscow Uspensky. After Kiev was sacked by the Mongols and left with only around two hundred survivors, Prince Andrei Bogoliubskii sought to establish Vladimir as the centre of Orthodoxy. The Vladimir Uspensky was built in 1158-60, and modified from 1185-1189 after a fire. Andrei’s son, Vsevolod III, enlarged and further remodelled it after which he claimed authority for building the largest church known at the time. The Vladimir Uspensky was sacked in 1238, rebuilt at the end of that century and in 1408, Prince Vasili of Moscow commissioned iconographers Danil Chorny and Andrei Rublev to paint frescoes and icons for it. In Chapter One, I discussed how Rublev’s "Old Testament Trinity" pointed to the Heavenly Jerusalem. His works became extremely important theologically for the Moscow Uspensky, because they connected the theme of Heaven-on-Earth to the Heavenly Jerusalem in Moscow.
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The twelfth century Uspensky Sobor was the prototype for the Moscow Uspensky. Today part of a blind arcade, a wall, a window, frescoes from the north aisle, and relief carvings of the Vladimir Uspensky are extant. Heaven meeting earth was a major theme in the description in the Laurentian Chronicle of the Vladimir Uspensky Sobor:

And in that year (1160) the Church of the Holy Mother of God was completed in Vladimir by the devout and beloved of God Prince Andrei; and he decorated it with wondrously many icons, and precious stones without number, and holy vessels, and covered it with gold, for by his faith and devotion to the Holy Mother, God brought him masters from all levels.\(^{254}\)

This theme of Heaven-on-Earth was common to all Russian churches. The significance of the Vladimir Uspensky perhaps lay in it being the centre of Russian Orthodoxy that set the standard for other churches to follow.

There were differences between the Vladimir and the Moscow Uspensky which is understandable because they were built in different eras. Vladimir’s Uspensky was of the twelfth century mid-Byzantine period. It was originally built with one large drum and cupola although four smaller domes were added in 1180. It had three apses and six pillars. In this respect it carried on the tradition of the Kiev Cave Monastery. Kievan Rus had developed the uniquely Russian feature of multi-domed churches with the biggest dome representing Christ and the smaller domes representing the evangelists or the archangels.

The Vladimirian prototype of a cubic church with five domes became the hallmark of Vladimir and later of Muscovite architecture. Multi-domes disappeared for a while under Tatar rule, but the Moscow Uspensky revived their use. This is significant because it looked backwards to previous traditions while heralding in a new age of architecture. Metropolitan Filipp’s instruction to Fioravanti: “We desire to see a church of the same dimensions” as the Vladimir one\(^ {255}\) was important because the scene was already being set to showcase the new Uspensky as sacred in quite a different way to the Vladimir one. The placement of the tombs of the Metropolitans and saints at the Moscow site had
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already distinguished it as more holy than the Vladimir one.\textsuperscript{256} The site of the Moscow Uspensky was considered to be very holy and was the burial ground for saints and Metropolitans whereas in the earlier centuries, localised churches were more like shrines for local saints, not a collection of the most revered saints and relics. The theology of St. Serafim held that because they are the first fruits of the Heavenly Jerusalem, the remains of the saints are sanctified or partly transfigured.\textsuperscript{257}

Returning now to compare the exteriors of the Vladimir and the Moscow Uspensky Sobori in more detail, it is possible to track the changes in the theme of Heaven-on-Earth. Both churches were grand structures built on high ground with gilt cupolas. The theological statement of this was that the church was meant to be visible to all people. There was some resemblance between the two sobori, but the Moscow Uspensky’s size set it apart. Furthermore, it did not have the gargoyles and detailed exterior ornamentation of its predecessor. Vladimir Uspensky’s exterior had figures of animals and pagan motifs.\textsuperscript{258} As an early church, the Vladimir Uspensky still acknowledged pagan aspects of culture. Indeed, Christianity had co-existed for a few hundred years in Russia with paganism.

In the Moscow Uspensky, the attention was on the size and harmony of the exterior rather than on details. The Patriarkhaya Chronicle reported that the Uspensky was “marvellous for its size, height and spaciousness.”\textsuperscript{259} Fioravanti further enhanced this with careful window placement so as not to break the visual line.\textsuperscript{260} He used rectilinear pilasters and blind arcading without ornamentation.\textsuperscript{261} The size of the building and lack of decoration was striking to the point that the Patriarkhaya Chronicle stated that it “looked as though it were carved from a solid rock”\textsuperscript{262} (see for example fig.4, p113). While the exterior of the Moscow Uspensky was austere, this created a harmony of form and line that Vladimir did not have. Fioravanti overcame some awkwardness that the design of the Vladimir
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Uspensky had presented. At Vladimir, the columns of the sobor divided the bays awkwardly. By making the bays in the Moscow sobor all the same size this problem was no longer an issue.

Hurst makes an important point that previously Russian architects considered the symbolic elements of architectural theology separately but that Fioravanti was able to unify all the elements in a holistic way which contributed to the overall harmony of his work. The Sofia Chronicle described the contrast between the Uspensky Sobor and the rest of Moscow which was almost all wooden, which would have added to the experience of Heaven-on-Earth. The Laurentian, Patriarskaya, and the Tipograpfskaya Chronicles were similar in their awe of the Uspensky.

**b) The Exterior of the Moscow Uspensky**

**i) Portals**

When considering the Heaven-on-Earth theme, the pritvor or portals provided a wealth of evidence. As a microcosm of both the church and heaven, these white stone portals were arched entrances. Their importance was such that even though the Uspensky was breaking new ground in its architectural portrayal of the theme of Heaven-on-Earth, the portals had to remain traditional in their iconography. Important ceremonies were performed in front of the south side of the Uspensky. Over the south portal was a fresco of the Virgin of Vladimir with Archangels Mikhail and Gabriel on either side of the doorway standing guard (fig. 5, p114).

Moscow was believed to be under the Virgin’s protection along with the archangels as defenders. Below this was a monumental blind arcade with portrayals of various saints and two angels who were writing down the names of people entering the cathedral. Above the portal arches was the "Miraculous image of the Saviour" and Christ, Mary and John the Baptist were featured on the door. The northern wall faced the Patriarchal apartments and accordingly it followed the themes of saints. Above it was a big painting of Christ, the
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Apostles, the Virgin Mary and the disciples. The eastern side contained the apses (whose interior housed the altars). It was an intensely holy area. The western facade was at the front of the church as per tradition and originally the Uspensky had scenes here of the assumption and the apocalypse although these were destroyed by fire in 1547.

While much of the imagery described here was used in all sorts of artistic and cultural contexts in Christian churches, the Russian Orthodox Church was a lot more symbolic in its interpretation of various church features. Each work of art and each architectural feature was a stand-in for a theological concept or a biblical feature. Up until the sixteenth century, church exteriors were austere but their interiors were magnificent. However, because the recessed part of the portal also represented the interior of the church symbolically, it had to maintain detail. The door of the portal represented the interior of the sanctuary with the altar and therefore it depicted Christ. The portal itself represented the dome which was symbolic of heaven. With the dome as heaven, and the recess as the inside of the church and Christ at the door, the symbolism was that Christ is needed to reach Heaven-on-Earth and the door was the boundary between the two. The symbolism of Christ as the door echoes John 10:9 in which Jesus says “I am the door (or gate). Whoever enters by me will be saved.”

**ii) The Atrium**

The atrium was the area immediately outside the church. It used to be a closed courtyard in early Christian times. The atrium is a physical and a spiritual transition from the outside world to the church. It was the first part of the spiritual purification that was needed to take the Eucharist, because from the atrium, the church was visible and accessible. The overall statement that the atrium made was that rather than closing itself off from the outside world, the church sought to meet it and to transfigure it.

I have not found any mention of the atrium of the Uspensky in scholarly literature, but there is an area called Soborni Ploschard (Cathedral Square) which is in the middle of the

---
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cathedrals of the Kremlin that functions as an atrium in the way described above. It serves as a transition from the outside world into a holy place. The Soborni Ploschard serves as a model, I suggest for how the atrium to the Uspensky Sobor may be understood. The Palm Sunday procession at Easter that was symbolic of Christ’s entry into Jerusalem, and other important processions such as the coronation of the Tsars began outside the Uspensky Sobor in Soborni Ploschard before making their way into the Uspensky. The gathering in the square prior to these processions did suggest a purificatory process as a time of preparation for the religious ceremonies to follow.

### iii) The Exterior Domes and the Crosses

The original domes were plates of iron but after the 1547 fire they were rebuilt with gilded copper sheets. This is consistent with the shift in perception in Orthodoxy as the Heaven-on-Earth theme of the fifteenth century moved towards the Heavenly Jerusalem theme of the sixteenth century. The Heavenly Jerusalem of Revelation was a golden city. Exterior domes of Russian churches were topped with a cross at the top of each dome. Like all Russian crosses, there was a foot-bar that sloped upwards to the right to represent the good thief who was crucified alongside Christ. Russian crosses have three crossbars altogether. The top one represents the plaque with the phrase relating to Christ as the King of the Jews. The middle bar is symbolic of where Christ’s wrists were nailed and the bottom bar is the foot-bar. These crosses represented the gate or the boundary between heaven and earth as mediated through Christ. The Heaven-on-Earth theme was most clearly and simply expressed in the cross.

The Heaven-on-Earth theme was most clearly and simply expressed in the cross. The Uspensky crosses featured a remarkable new architectural feature that was laden with symbolism. They had a crescent moon at the foot of the cross which symbolised victory over the Tatars. In Matthew 24, the call for Christians to prepare for Christ’s advent...
included reference to the “sign,” the cross itself (Matt 24:30). The salvific symbolic associations of the cross thus connected the Heaven-on-Earth theme with the Heavenly Jerusalem theme that followed it. In the symbology of the ancient world, the cross represented the unity of the sky, the earth, space and time. In other words, the cross provided symbolic representation of the various aspects of creation being brought together. Within Christian theology, creation is thought to have been reconciled through the cross of Christ. There is some overlap here between pre-Christain and Christian symbology with respect to the order of the cosmos.

iv) Shapes, Form and Materials of the Nave

Shapes were very important in church building. The depiction of the earth as a square and the cosmos as a circle prefigured Christian times and these shapes were universally understood. In Christian times, the square and the arch came to represent man and God, while the cube represented the earth and the dome represented heaven.\textsuperscript{273} The Uspensky had three cubic naves to represent earth and the dome over it to represent heaven which touched earth at the boundaries. In this way the very structure of the church proclaimed the presence of Heaven-on-Earth.

Architecture and art work together create meaning to create a rich sensory experience and to convey a powerful symbolic vision. The Russian architects knew this and their theories have been borne out by Alexander Barabanov’s research on the relationship between the expressive qualities of shapes that create emotional harmony within architecture. Barabanov found that ideas about the universe were represented in architecture and that plans for buildings were regulated by the belief systems of the prevailing culture. In particular, Barabanov discusses how the emerging Muscovite state added symbolism that was mediated through the social, religious, political and cultural context of the times to the image of the church as the Heavenly Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{274}
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Fioravanti divided a rectangle into twelve squares with three pairs of pillars to create three naves. The nave was structurally and symbolically a very important part of the church that represented the redeemed world in the upper levels, the earthly world at the lower levels and the relationship between the two as mediated by Christ. Fioravanti’s innovations in the nave included cross vaults rather than barrel vaults, extending the main drum over the central body rather than within it, using brick rather than stone in the vaulting, and iron tie rods in the drums, the masonry, and the vaulting. Zakomary (gables) were used in the transition from the façade to the roof with delineated bands to mirror the interior division of bays. The main south facade was divided vertically into equal sections by lopatkas or massive pilaster strips carrying semicircular zokomary and side projections. Fioravanti’s skilful use of materials and new techniques resulted in the creation of a church that was unlike any other of its time. This meant that Heaven-on-Earth was able to be shown in a way that was new, unusual and grand at the same time.

v) Innovative Materials

The materials that Fioravanti used in the construction of the Uspensky allowed him full expression of Heaven-on-Earth. His bricks enabled him to make innovations in the design of the vaults of the cathedral which affected the illumination of the building. In turn, the illumination contributed considerably to enhancing the Heaven-on-Earth theme. Fioravanti’s bricks were lighter and stronger than the usual bricks of this time and that meant that in the Uspensky, he was able to build high open spaces with slim supports in the vaults (this is illustrated in fig.6, p115). In the Chronicle, his limestone mixture was described as strong and his use of iron ties (which were more durable than the traditional wooden ones) in the vaulting was noted, as well the use of oak tree stumps in the foundations. The Russian Chronicle stated that “the depth was of two sathens and in one place even more” which seemed to be calling attention to a new way of making deeper foundations.
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A sazhen is either 1.76m or 2.48m depending on whether it is “swung” or “skewed.” The swung sazhen is based on the span of outstretched arms while the skewed sazhen is a measurement between an upstretched arm and the opposite foot. Due to the changes in the way the vaults were made, the interior of the Uspensky was light and spacious.\textsuperscript{282} By contrast, other churches of this time were darker and narrower with low ceilings, although there had been a few early prototypes with limited use of high-arched walls and stepped vaults since the time of the building of the Uspensky Sobor of Kolomna in 1380 that was built to commemorate the victory at Kulikovo.\textsuperscript{283}

\textit{vi) Departure from Cross in Square Form}

An argument against the proclamation of Heaven-on-Earth in the Uspensky’s architectural symbolism is that it was not built using the traditional Byzantine form of a basilica with a cross-in-square type plan (fig.7, p116). The cross in square form was considered to be a perfect form because it looked like the cross of the crucifixion. It did have practical advantages as well in terms of liturgy and ritual. To depart from it was a major break with tradition. Brumfield has posited a reason for Fioravanti not using this form. His argument is that as the biggest building in Moscow, the Uspensky would not have been able to support its own weight if it had a cross-in-square plan.\textsuperscript{284} Fioravanti would have been anxious not to repeat the collapse of the previous Uspensky. This may be why he did not build a choir gallery either, because this too would also have weakened the overall structure. There was one precedent in the Andronikov Monastery Cathedral for both the departure from the cross in square form and the absence of a choir gallery.\textsuperscript{285}

The effect of not having a choir gallery was to create an aura of spaciousness and the impression of illumination by natural light.\textsuperscript{286} In the light of these breaks with tradition, and the accompanying loss of religious symbolism of not having the cross shown in the floor plan, nor an upper gallery to sing God’s praises, it is my view that Fioravanti would have had to make sure that his sobor completely exceeded all expectations in every other
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respect to proclaim Heaven-on-Earth. The Patriarskaya Chronicle suggested that this was the case when it described the Uspensky as being: "... very marvellous for its size, height, brightness, acoustics and its extent, such as had not been seen before in Rus, except for the Vladimir church, and having stepped back a little, anyone would see it as if (it were of) one stone." 287

The Moscow Chronicle of 1479 echoed this: "And that church was exceedingly wondrous in its majesty and height, illumination and resonance and spaciousness such as never seen before in Russia with the exception of the church of Vladimir and the Master was Aristotle. 288 Aristotle was the nickname for Fioravanti. The Russian Chronicle commented on the exactness of his architecture, saying that "everything was made according to the rule of compass." 289 Irina Rodimseva connects Fioravanti's symmetrical plans with heights and widths derived from the golden section. 290 This was a way of representing God's glory using number and mathematics.

c) The Interior

i) Concealed Apses and the Sanctuary

There is significant evidence in the large assumption painting on the semi-circular wall of the middle apse of the Uspensky, which as per tradition was dedicated to the Virgin Mary. It had been specifically painted for the consecration of the sobor. The second painting of the great entry into Jerusalem related to the Old Testament where the Messiah was predicted to ride into Jerusalem “triumphant and victorious is he, humble and riding on a donkey, on a colt, the foal of a donkey,” (Zech 9:9) and similarly to the descriptions in the Gospels of Christ's entry into Jerusalem (Matt 21:4; Mark 11:9; Luke 20:38; John 12:13-15). The two paintings symbolised two of the most important concepts of Russian theology, the importance of the Virgin Mary, and Christ's entry into Jerusalem, which, to sixteenth century eyes was a prefiguration of the second coming. Orthodoxy had always had an awareness of the impending apocalypse which would finish with the Heavenly Jerusalem.
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The apse itself housed the sanctuary (which symbolised heaven) and the middle apse of the Uspensky represented the incarnation. The altar at the baseline of the apse symbolised the tomb and the throne of Christ. The apse was womblike in structure in order to portray the Virgin Mary who gave birth to Christ. Mary, born on earth, and Christ, both heavenly and earthly were the two holiest figures in the Orthodox Church and therefore it is fitting that the supreme example of architectural harmony between heaven and earth should be in the apse. Indeed, Fioravanti created the impression of perfect form by the use of concealed apses in the eastern wall of the Uspensky to give the illusion of a perfect cube. The blind walls built along the sides of the apses kept the cube shape, unlike other churches where the apse stuck out (fig. 8, p117). This was a major architectural innovation that contributed significantly to the aesthetic impression of perfect harmony.

The iconography of the sanctuary revealed scenes from Christ's life that emphasised his humanity and his divinity. The lower axis of the sanctuary featured the Last Supper. While the central apse had scenes related to the Virgin Mary and Christ, the area above it featured the Trinity. An icon of the church festival in honour of the Virgin Mary entitled “Praise of the Mother of God Festival,” was hung to the left of the apse while “Divine Sophia” was on the right. Interestingly these more abstract concepts of Trinity and Divine Sophia or wisdom were personified as people in images that the viewers could understand.

**ii) The Inner Domes**

The dome was the most important part of the church. The Uspensky's domes were supported on a drum which had windows in it thus making the cathedral very light. The dome appeared to reach high towards the heavens but it was still far from it. The meaning of this was that the Uspensky was striving for heaven but instead of reaching up towards it, Christ descended to the earth to make heaven meet earth. The light from the window drums separated Christ from the world yet enabled him to be part of it. The hierarchy of heaven was shown in the dome with Christ the Pantokrator at the top. He was only shown in transfigured glory when he was painted in the dome, never in pain nor on the
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cross suffering. In this respect the dome and the high vaulted ceiling did represent heaven. This is a victorious Christ and a reference to the future. Christ was shown in all five of the Uspensky's inner domes, the central dome showed him as Pantokrator, and in the other four he was portrayed as Emmanuel, God of Sabaoth, the Archeiropoietos, and the holy child on his mother's lap. The dome contributed to the magnificent sound projection in the Uspensky too, creating further aesthetic impressions of Heaven-on-Earth.

The Pantokrator had four Archangels painted around him above the four crossing pillars and this deliberately evoked images of Revelation 7:1 where four angels were “standing on the four corners of the earth.” Biblical figures from both the Old and the New Testament including the prophets, and the apostles were painted between the drum windows. This showed continuity between the Old and the New Testaments. In the pendatives (where the dome of the church touches the nave), the evangelists were painted. Gould states that this was because they "recorded the meeting between man and God" with their gospels that "united heaven and earth." The ceiling and the upper walls had the life of Christ, festivals, annunciation and assumption.

**iii) The Pillars**

The Uspensky’s high vaulted ceiling was held on six pillars, two square ones on the sides of the altar and four circular ones in the main part of the sobor (fig.9, p118). The pillars represented the hierarchy of heaven in their structure with frescoes painted of Christ at the top, followed by the evangelists and the church fathers. If the ceiling was heaven, then the pillars which were painted with images of one hundred and thirty-five martyrs were the physical and spiritual supports of the church. In the churches that were built prior to the Uspensky, even with the use of pillars, the inner dome was usually dark because the windows behind the iconostasis were unable to light up the inner space although lamps and candles mitigated this to some extent. This also meant that the iconostasis and the “Last Judgement” paintings on the western wall were usually obscured.
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The significance of seeing the Last Judgement icons clearly in the Uspensky was important to its proclamation of both the Heaven on Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem themes. In being so illuminated with light, Fioravanti’s sobor created the impression that the light was generated from within the church as though God was present. The interior of the Uspensky used gold, lamps, polished metals, and jewels that reflected light. Heaven-on-Earth was proclaimed in the precious stones in the icon covers too which featured saints who were painted with their haloed heads visible through the cut-outs in the gold and silver icon covers.296

d) Interior Parts of the Uspensky that Pointed to the Heavenly Jerusalem

i) Relics

The relics and the iconostasis traditionally portrayed Heaven-on-Earth but they also took this theme further by pointing ahead to the Heavenly Jerusalem. In this way, they prepared the way for the Pokrovsky Sobor which, related more overtly to the Heavenly Jerusalem. In the Uspensky there was said to be a piece of the robe of Christ. Whether or not one believed that this relic was real, together with the reliquary of the canonized Patriarch it was the proclamation that heaven met earth that was important here. The tombs on the mosaic floor beneath the Uspensky held the graves of canonized fourteenth century Metropolitans, Pyotr and Kiprian, and of the fifteenth century Metropolitan Fothium. These relics were considered to be a meeting point of heaven and earth because the earthly remains were in the church while the souls of the saints were in heaven. I have already discussed the theology behind the saints’ bodies as the first fruits of the Heavenly Jerusalem.

ii) The Architecture of the Iconostasis

Each architectural feature of the church had symbolism associated with it that related to the overall theme of Heaven-on-Earth and sometimes implied the Heavenly Jerusalem as well. The iconostasis as a fixed interior structure assumed these themes.297 It had three doors at its east end that both revealed and concealed the sanctuary which housed the
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altar behind. The icons revealed and illuminated theology but also concealed the sanctuary. In keeping with this, the middle doors (known as the Royal Doors) had icons of the Annunciation and the evangelists who revealed God’s message visually. Saint Germanus of Constantinople had established that the altar was the border between heaven and earth, as well as the tomb of Christ. Therefore the doors to the altar revealed heaven when they were opened during the Eucharist.

The deacons’ doors to the right of the royal doors had life sized icons of Archangels Mikhail and Gabriel who guarded heaven. Their guarding role meant that access to the sanctuary (and by implication to heaven) could not be taken for granted. Archangel Mikhail was in life-sized form in an icon over the Royal doors in the Uspensky. This was important because he was portrayed as a heavenly soldier and the attributes that he was predicted to use in the cosmic battle at Armageddon did become assimilated into Russian theology and the art associated with them. The portrayal of Mikhail pointed ahead to the Heavenly Jerusalem. While Mikhail was the symbol of freedom from the Tatars, he also prefigured the apocalypse. Mikhail was very highly placed physically and situated close to both the Virgin Mary and Christ.

The Chronicle of 1481 reported that Dionisis and two priests started painting the iconostasis in 1481. While the Uspensky was dedicated in 1479. The frescoes were not completed until 1515. Restoration of the Uspensky removed coatings of lime and cement that revealed that the iconostasis had works by Theophanes, Rublev and Dionisi. It is difficult to analyse the original iconostasis because the top rows were replaced in the seventeenth century, and others decayed. A fire in 1642 or 1643 necessitated the repainting of many paintings although fragments of the frescoes in the apses and three tiers of the iconostasis are extant.
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In sixteenth century style, all interior surfaces of the Uspensky were covered with brightly coloured paintings, and the frescoes and icons drew attention to the important parts of the cathedral structure. The Uspensky was traditional in its iconography. Selected scenes and episodes from the Old Testament were portrayed in the narthex which fitted its preparatory theme. The narthex was the first room on entering the church and was traditionally a long dark narrow space where people gathered their thoughts and prepared their souls for the deeper mysteries of Heaven-on-Earth. As such, it represented the fallen world. In local churches it was where the catechumens stood, and where exorcisms were performed. While the Uspensky was used for more grand ceremonial functions than this, the narthex was still a call to repent.

The Old Testament scenes were shown in icons in the narthex. The narthex was considered to be a place of spiritual preparation or purification and the Old Testament was considered in Russian Orthodoxy to be a preparation for the “spiritual fulfilment” of the New Testament. Accordingly the New Testament scenes were shown in icons in the nave to represent illumination. Paintings of martyrs and ascetics were included as examples of the various stages on the road to glory. The images from the assumption represented the highest level in spiritual progression. The western wall of the nave and narthex had the “Last Judgment” scene, the passion, the assumption, and scenes from Mary's life. These images would be viewed on leaving the church and encouraged the viewer to consider his or her own spiritual progression and ultimate judgement. On entering the church, the Eastern wall had paintings of seraphim, which evoked contemplation in the viewer of heaven.
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In addition to the symbolism of the architecture of the Uspensky, there were three axes in Russian churches along which paintings were arranged. The first from west to east relates to God’s grace and the stages in spirituality already described above. The second axis was vertical, showing the hierarchy of heaven in the arrangements of icons in the church and in the iconostasis. Christ the Pantokrator was at the top in the dome and the vaults and beneath him were the angels, evangelists and martyrs. The upper parts of the walls featured the gospels, church festivals, parables and miracles. This followed the liturgical calendar. The next two rows featured the life of Mary, and illustrations of chants to her because Russia saw itself as protected by her. In the third axis, icons circled the nave. They were said to be interactive in their poses towards each other and because they were in the part of the nave that represented the world and its history.

The New Testament was shown in the nave whose architecture corresponded to the redeemed world. The north and south walls of the nave showed the ecumenical councils from the fourth to the eighth centuries at the lower levels that helped to shape orthodoxy and its beliefs. The transfiguration featured in the southern apse and the incarnation in the northern apse. The above descriptions show that not only did the church walls reflect the biblical world and Russian history, there was also a systematic organisation of material. The aesthetic presentation of the artwork would also have enhanced the worshipper’s experience.

iii) Movement towards the Heavenly Jerusalem.

The Throne of Monomakh and the Church Militant painting hung near it strongly evoked the Heavenly Jerusalem theme in the Uspensky, but they date from a later period to the architecture and the earlier artworks discussed. They were roughly concurrent with the end of the war against the Tatars. The throne and the painting predated the construction of the Pokrovsky Sobor (built 1555-1560) which became the epitome of the Heavenly Jerusalem theme by about five years. They point to the full emergence of the theme.
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The Tsar’s stall which housed the Throne of Monomakh provided a further indication of the Heavenly Jerusalem theme. The octagonal canopy over the throne strongly resembled the “kokoshniki”\textsuperscript{315} that had started to appear more frequently in exterior Russian church architecture (fig. 10, p119). The resemblance was so striking that it did appear to be a quotation of kokoshniki. Kokoshniki are arched gables that came to be full of meaning and symbolism. They were associated with Archangel Mikhail, the spiritual defender of Moscow who would defeat Satan in the battle of Armageddon in the end days that would precede the Heavenly Jerusalem. Kokoshniki will be further explored in Chapter Three.

In Chapter One, I discussed the “Church Militant” icon that was painted in the 1550s as a visual portrayal of the Heavenly Jerusalem theme that specifically showed Moscow as the Heavenly Jerusalem. This painting was the second aspect of the Uspensky Sobor in the 1550s that set the scene in terms of theology for the Pokrovsky Sobor.

In appraising the Uspensky Sobor overall, I have argued that it was designed to be the pinnacle of the expression of Heaven-on-Earth. Its exterior followed medieval symbolism in its severity yet its structure and design introduced a new grandness that had not been seen before. At this stage it was limited to its monolithic size yet it set the scene for further development in exteriors that would express the Heavenly Jerusalem in the sixteenth century. The interior of the Uspensky was magnificent in terms of its finery of jewels, artworks and the use of gold. This was in deliberate contrast to the exterior. As Chapter Three will demonstrate, the relationship between exterior and interior architecture was about to change substantially with a role reversal by mid-sixteenth century.
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Chapter 3

POKROVSKY SOBOR: THE HEAVENLY JERUSALEM

One of the central themes of church architecture in the fifteenth century was the portrayal of church buildings as the meeting point between heaven and earth. Alongside this understanding of church architecture, a second theme emerged, that of the church as an anticipation of the Heavenly Jerusalem. This found particular expression in the altar and the sanctuary of the church. While always less prominent than the Heaven-on-Earth theme, the Heavenly Jerusalem became important in Muscovite ideology during Ivan IV's reign and was overtly proclaimed in the sixteenth century.

In Chapter One, the identification of the Heavenly Jerusalem with the Kievan Rus was explored. In Chapter Three, the concept is viewed through sixteenth century eyes after the liberation of the Russians from the Tatars. Under Ivan IV's rule, the Heavenly Jerusalem related to Moscow as a city rather than to a people as in Kiev. It was part of Moscow's Messianic Mission. This chapter tracks the change from an implied Heavenly Jerusalem towards a bold declaration of it. The development of the concept is examined starting with its antecedents in zions, kokoshniki and three earlier prototype sobori. The symbolism of the number eight and its relationship to architecture is important here.

After this, the background context of the construction of the Pokrovsky is given. The influences on the Pokrovsky domes and building itself are discussed because they shed light on the theme of the Heavenly Jerusalem. This is followed by an account of the symbolism of the three Pokrovsky churches that are dedicated to the Trinity. I then explain the reasons for the plain interior of the Pokrovsky. The decline of the Heavenly Jerusalem theme closes the chapter along with a summary of the Muscovite understanding of the theme.
3.0 Antecedents

a) Zions (Jerusalems)

An important focus question for this chapter is: Were there any architectural antecedents to the Pokrovsky Sobor being the expression of the Heavenly Jerusalem? Or was its architecture unique? To understand the origins of the Heavenly Jerusalem concept in the Pokrovsky Sobor more fully, one needs first to turn to clues in the religious objects of churches around this time. Religious objects are important to this thesis because they expressed the architecture of the Heavenly Jerusalem before the full portrayal of this concept in actual architecture itself.

According to David Duncan, zions (also known as Jerusalems) were silvercastings of single-domed churches that portrayed Jerusalem symbolically. In 1486, Tsar Ivan III donated two such zions to the Uspensky Sobor to represent the Heavenly Jerusalem in ceremonies (fig. 11, p120). The rebuilding of the Uspensky Sobor was clearly connected in Ivan III's mind with the proclamation of Heaven-on-Earth. The commissioning of the zions and their particular functions as symbolic representations of the Heavenly Jerusalem show that Ivan III also had the Heavenly Jerusalem in mind as well. He commissioned a zion for the coffin of Metropolitan Pyotr that showed the church building with Jesus, the Virgin Mary, John the Baptist, the evangelists, the disciples Peter, Andrew and Simon and angels. This zion is perhaps the most obvious symbolism of this time period that the church building itself was bound up with both the Heavenly Jerusalem and the company of heaven in fifteenth century theology.

b) Kokoshniki

There were clues in individual church architectural features that pointed to the Heavenly Jerusalem prior to the construction of the Pokrovsky Sobor itself. In Chapter Two, the strong resemblance of the canopy over the Tsar's stall to architectural kokoshniki was discussed as a pointer to the Heavenly Jerusalem theme. Kokoshniki, or arched gables had been seen as early as the fifteenth century but they acquired new meaning in churches of

---

316 Duncan, Great Treasures of the Kremlin, 176.
317 Flier, "The Apocalypse in Russian Historical Experience before 1500," 156.
the sixteenth century. At first, they were decorative, but later they had symbolism associated with them. The exact number configuration of tiers, shapes and number of kokoshniki related to different saints, or angels. The tiers represented the Church Triumphant, the Christians in heaven. The cupola represented God, and the Church Militant, (the Christians on earth who were still struggling in the fight against evil and sin), was represented in the main cubic part of the church.

Kokoshniki were associated with defensive architecture because they looked like tiers of chain mail in armour. Their military symbolism had a practical use too in that they tended to have look-out towers at the top. The portrayal of the New Jerusalem in the book of Revelation was of a city with many gate-towers. The sixteenth century Russian churches appeared to quote this (Rev 21:12) and the towered heavenly city of Isaiah (Isa 54:12). Another symbolic meaning of kokoshniki was that they represented the flames of the heavenly fire of Pentecost. This meaning was retained in the sixteenth century. In addition to this, kokoshniki came to be associated with the heavenly host of military angels led by Archangel Mikhail, the warrior archangel (Rev 12:7-9). The Pokrovsky Sobor itself featured highly decorated kokoshniki while maintaining militaristic looking machiolations.

c) Votive Churches:
i) Symbolism of the Number Eight

The Uspensky Sobor had inspired monumental architecture in the sixteenth century in churches built under the guidance of the Metropolitans with the result that their architecture was more severe and associated with the emerging state. A second sort of church called “votive” became significant in the sixteenth century. Votive churches were built to thank God (often for victories in battle or for the birth of a male heir), but there was little room for prayer inside them. They were built by the rich or by royalty.
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Accordingly, their style was fantasy-like in their free form. Votive churches had certain characteristics: central plans, cornices, blind gables, kokoshniki, shatior (tent roofs), and the use of the number eight which was of religious significance, in octagonal structures. Before discussing these churches further, the significance of the number eight and how it related to the plans, form and symbolism of Russian religious architecture needs to be understood.

The tent-roofs that appeared in the votive churches were eight-sided and with the cupola they added up to nine. The viewer would have seen three sides of three triangles which represented the trinity. When the octagons were layered on top of each other, they created the effect of reaching upwards towards heaven. The number eight was prominent in the Pokrovsky Sobor and its prototypes. The above structural layout placed heavy emphasis on the number eight which was traditionally associated with new beginnings, the resurrection and the second coming of Christ. The new beginnings related to Pentecost being on the fiftieth day or the eighth day of the seventh week. Jesus’ resurrection was on Nisan 14 (three days and three nights after he was buried) which was at the end of the sabbath on Nisan 17. This was the eighth day, counting his crucifixion. There were eight post-resurrection appearances of Jesus.

There were two votive churches that have been widely identified as prototypes for the Pokrovsky Sobor. These are the Vosnesenskaya Sobor (the Ascension Church) at Kolomenskoe), which was probably built in 1530-32 by Tsar Vasili III to thank God for granting him a future heir who would become Ivan IV, and the Ioanna Krectitelia (the John the Baptist Church) of Dyakovo. The Vosnesenskaya Church had an eight-sided tent roof with an octagonal tower on it, while the Ioanna Krectitelia had four octagonal towers and four chapels around a main tower. Like the Pokrovsky it featured the number eight in its
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plans and architecture. The Pokrovsky itself had an octagonal base as a result of two squares being superimposed on each other\textsuperscript{329} (fig. 12, p121). These squares made an eight pointed star. In Russia, octagons were associated with stars and the resurrection and thus their meaning was connected with eternal life.\textsuperscript{330} Stars, especially the eight pointed one, were symbolic of the Virgin Mary. In icons, Mary's robes were painted with stars. This same star pattern featured in the octagonal tent-roof in the Pokrovsky’s biggest church, the Church of the Intercession, which was dedicated to Mary. The iconostasis of this church had the eight pointed star in its centre. In Chapter Two, I discussed the changing nature of the relationship between Mary and Moscow with respect to her being regarded as protector of Moscow rather than one to be asked for intercession. By the time of the Pokrovsky's construction, Moscow was regarded as divinely protected.

The Pokrovsky had an octagonal central church with a tent roof and a gilt cupola on top of this. In the larger square were four large octagonal churches with towers on the compass points. The four pillar chapels around the central one represented the corners of the world. In the smaller square at the diagonal points were four smaller cuboid churches with cupola and raised drums on three levels of kokoshniki.\textsuperscript{331} The symbolism associated with octagonal pyramid church types such as the Pokrovsky, was of the union between earth and heaven and the ascension.\textsuperscript{332} The eight cupolas were different in design which Faensen interprets as a way of showing both unity and variety and of singling out each individual church within an overall whole complex\textsuperscript{333} (fig.13, p122). The unity was in the general shapes and use of machioliation in the exterior and in the cornices in the interior. The variety was in the size, ornamental coverings and the interlacing designs.\textsuperscript{334}
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ii) The Vosnesenskaya Sobor

The Vosnesenskaya was significant as an antecedent to the Pokrovsky on a number of grounds. It was one of the earliest, perhaps the earliest tent-roofed churches in Moscow.335 Clearly, its architects were not using traditional form in this church which was a sudden departure from the domed cruciform church (although one school of thought of which Vernadsky is a proponent, is that the Vosnesenskaya simply transferred ideas from wooden churches into stone or brick). Vernadsky considers this to be the first pyramidal type church to be built from stone and not wood,336 while Ilyin finds no precedent for it. The Primary Chronicle referred to the Vosnesenskaya as being "in the manner of wood."337 This complicated the issue because it was unclear whether this phrase was figurative or literal.

This leads back to the question asked in Chapter Two as to whether there were any new developments with the building of these sixteenth century churches or simply a revival of former architectural features and materials. Hamilton, Solovyev, and Brumfield cannot find any examples of the tent roof and steeple prior to the Vosnesenskaya.338 Brumfield does not ascribe to the wooden origin theory due to a lack of evidence. He points out that the Primary Chronicle also referred to the “unprecedented nature” of the conical tower of the Vosnesenskaya,339 which implied that this sort of tower had not been built before. Instead of a cupola, the Vosnesenskaya had a long brick tent roof with limestone details over a cube-shaped plan with a tower on it. Its tiers of kokoshniki showcased its verticality.

While the kokoshniki in the exterior proclaimed the heavenly host which was associated with the Heavenly Jerusalem, the interior of the Vosnesenskaya was very plain. In spite of the church being relatively well lit in comparison to other churches (on account of its careful window placement), it did not illuminate religious mysteries in the way that the
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Uspensky had done where the ceiling was covered with paintings of Christ and the hierarchy of heaven. The interior had no murals and used architectural surfaces for interest. Its symbolism was in its architecture. Shvidovsky provides an answer as to why this church that represented the Heavenly Jerusalem had a small interior: “When a strong impact of monumentality and a limited capacity” [meaning it can house a small congregation only] are combined in a church, it is a sign that the architecture proclaims a concept that serves a specific function.\textsuperscript{340} In this instance, it was the exterior that had the message about the Heavenly Jerusalem.

The Vosnesenskaya had four narthexes and no altar apse. In Chapter Two, I discussed the tradition of Russian architectural symbolism where the narthex represented purification and the spiritual transition from the sinful world to the redeemed world of the nave, while the apse represented the incarnation and the protection of Christ and the Virgin Mary. The combined symbolic meaning of having many narthexes in the absence of an apse was that interior purification was still needed to reach the Heavenly Jerusalem and that Moscow was not yet considered to be fully protected.

The interior of the Vosnesenskaya resembled that of the subsequent Ioanna Kreactitelia Church and it had some similarities to that of the Pokrovsky Sobor. In the light of the above details about the Vosnesenskaya, it is my contention that the change from interior to exterior emphasis related to a growing consciousness of the Heavenly Jerusalem theme. This theme was apparent in the Vosnesenskaya but it was not fully developed until the construction of Pokrovsky Sobor. Once the Vosnesenskaya set the precedent, it influenced future votive churches. Its tower is believed to have influenced the construction of the Pokrovsky which featured a similar pattern in its Intercession tower.\textsuperscript{341} As such the Vosnesenskaya was a prototype. Significantly, the church authorities would have had to agree to its plans,\textsuperscript{342} and this indicates that that there was a change in theological symbolism in architecture.
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**iii) Ioanna Krectitelia**

Ioanna Krectitelia is short for the Russian translation of Tserkov Yseknozenia Glavi Ioanna Predtechi v Dyakove, the Church of the Decapitation of John the Baptist at Dyakovo. The Ioanna Krectitelia was previously thought to be built before the Vosnesenskaya. However the Ioanna Krectitelia chapels had the names of Ivan IV’s family displayed along with their patron saints. This would place its construction after 1547 when Ivan IV became Tsar. Solovyev gives a 1547 date for the cathedral, interpreting it as a coronation commemoration, while Vernadsky places it as a transitional link between earlier wooden churches and pyramidal churches like the Vosnesenskaya and the Pokovskiy. Under this view, it is a precursor to the Pokrovsky. M.A. Ilyin, P.N. Maximov, and V.K. Kostochkin believe that the Ioanna Krectitelia was a memorial for Ivan IV’s dead son Dmitry and give a date of 1553-1554. The Ioanna Krectitelia had five separate domed churches that were connected by passageways. Like the Pokrovsky, it was a striking group of pyramidal churches that was showcased by being built on high ground. The significance of the Ioanna Krectitelia is that it anticipated the Pokrovsky with tiers of kokoshniki around a central tower.

Voyce and Brumfield focus on the Ioanna Krectitelia domes as influences on the minor towers of the Pokrovsky. In turn, Brumfield identifies a theory that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was an inspiration for the Pokrovsky domes that were rebuilt after the 1583 fire and that this was an expression of the Jerusalem theme, although his position on whether this theory is valid is unclear. Voyce acknowledges the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as a possible origin of onion domes too. In addition to the domes of the Ioanna Krectitelia, Voyce regards the architects’ use of kokoshniki in tiers instead of columns and pendatives as influential on the construction of the Pokrovsky where it was
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further developed into a new style.\textsuperscript{354} Like the Vosnesenskaya and later the Pokrovsky, the interior of the Ioanna Krectitelia emphasised structural architectural features\textsuperscript{355} such as cornices and vertical niches in the walls instead of art, but the interiors of these three churches remained dark. The Heavenly Jerusalem theme was still not well illuminated.

### 3.1 Background and Form

Barma and Postnik Yakovlev from Pskov\textsuperscript{356} are traditionally held to be the architects of the Pokrovsky. This was confirmed by manuscripts discovered in the nineteenth century, although some evidence from different sources suggests that Barma and Postnik were the same person.\textsuperscript{357} The Pokrovsky was built in Krasni Ploschard (Red Square) which was a commercial centre known in the fifteenth century as Trinity Square. There was ease of access to it. It was not within the walls of the Kremlin though it was built from the same red bricks used in the new Kremlin walls of 1485.\textsuperscript{358} The Pokrovsky had a foundation of white stone (which was a nod to traditional medieval Muscovite religious architecture) while the Pokrovsky churches themselves used the modern red brick. The use of red bricks in a new location suggests that this was a continuity of the Kremlin yet the moat that was built to separate it from the Kremlin showed that it was also distinct from the Kremlin. The unique architecture signalled a new theology at play.

There is much debate as to why Ivan IV built the Pokrovsky in the square and not within the Kremlin walls. Berton is not alone in thinking that Ivan built it in such a location because he hated the boyars (military elite) in the Kremlin.\textsuperscript{359} Ivan had a mistrust of the boyars due to various intrigues at court with disloyal boyars when he was growing up. Flier considers the Pokrovsky to be an “extension of royal space.”\textsuperscript{360} Brumfield takes a more votive approach in thinking that Ivan sought to proclaim the national significance of the Kazan victory.\textsuperscript{361} All streets in Moscow led to the Pokrovsky. The interior of the
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Pokrovsky churches were not suitable for worship on a large scale and in fact services were held outside it. This is in keeping with the theological symbolism being in the exterior rather than in the interior of the churches of the sixteenth century.

The exact order and dates of the construction of the Pokrovsky Sobor are sketchy and are at best approximate because there are conflicting dates and details given in the Chronicles and other literature. Ivan IV led the Muscovite Christian soldiers to victory at Kazan. A wooden church was probably built in 1552 in honour of the win. This first building was called "Trinity Church" and it was thought to be followed by a stone "Trinity Cathedral" in 1553 on the same site to proclaim not just the victory over Kazan, but the triumph of Orthodoxy. Seen through the Tsar's eyes, these victories inaugurated Moscow's destiny beyond being an icon of the heavenly city. It was so all-encompassing that it proclaimed the Messianic Mission of Moscow.

The Nikonovskaya Chronicle for 1554 reports that in the autumn, Ivan IV ordered the construction of the Intercession Church on the same site as the Trinity before building wooden churches next to the Trinity after each victory over the Tatars. It is known that the stone Church of the Intercession and the other churches were built around the Trinity in 1555-60 and that in 1559, the Trinity was enlarged to become the Intercession Sobor. It was dedicated on the feast of Peter and Paul on 29 June 1561 (12 July 1561 under the old calendar) by Ivan IV and Metropolitan Makarii. This is known because a Chronicle about the construction of the Pokrovsky was found in the Intercession Church during restorations made in the 1950s-1960s.
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Furthermore, the Nikonovskaya Chronicle Supplement reported that in 1561, the Stone Intercession Church, the Trinity, and other churches were completed. All the churches together were called the Trinity Church (Troitsky Tserkov) and later they were known collectively as the Church of the Intercession on the Moat (Sobor Pokrova na rvu). An additional church was dedicated to St. Vasili (Basil), the Holy Fool who died in the year of the Kazan battle. The St. Vasili Church was added to the East of the original Trinity Church. In 1588, it was replaced with a brick chapel connected to the North East corner of the church and another church was built next to it in the seventeenth century. The whole church complex became known as St. Vasili the Blessed (Vasili Blazhennyy).

The central church of Pokrovsky Sobor was set to the west to compensate for its larger apse on its eastern side. This made the whole complex asymmetrical although when viewed from the west (the side facing the Kremlin), it looked symmetrical. This side was fortress-like with its machiolations and looked monolithic. In this way, it took on some of the characteristics of the Kremlin which was a fortress. From the north and the south, the Pokrovsky was multiaxial. With the symmetry, the architecture seemed to be saying that it was traditional in its protector role (fortress) and it was aware of its history (traditional symmetry). However, when viewed from another angle, its asymmetry showed it to be grand, paradoxical, and other worldly, much like the Heavenly Jerusalem.

The Intercession Church had eight churches around it (fig.14, p123). This juxtaposed recent Russian history with the biblical past. The churches were dedicated to saints whose feasts were celebrated on days around the Kazan storm. The Intercession of the Virgin Festival was on October 1st, the day that Ivan IV began the Kazan battle, and so this festival came to be associated with his victory. While each Pokrovsky church represented battles in the attempts to win Kazan, the deeper meaning was intended from the start because Ivan had wanted eight churches at first, but his advisors insisted on nine, with the ninth dedicated to the Virgin Mary. Clearly, there was meaning beyond Kazan.
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The Pokrovsky was subject to fires and looting associated with war and for this reason its interiors today are different from the original. The interiors were first rebuilt after a fire in 1583. What is now the Lower Church in the basement however, had thick walls and offered good fire retardance. This is why it was used to hide the Tsar’s treasure in dangerous times. As such it was not open to the public due to access being via a very constricted stairway and having no windows, it was not suitable for worship purposes. The Lower Church today is eerie looking and resembles a dungeon. Of the nine churches, only a handful were restored in the 1920s-1930s to their sixteenth century look while others currently have iconostases, art and murals that date from later periods. The St. Varlaam, Alexander Svirsky and Trinity Churches have been restored to look like the sixteenth century versions of their original brickwork.

**3.2 Domes**
The true intent of the architects is open to contention. A lot of the debate centres on what influenced the construction of the Pokrovsky. In this respect one has to look backwards first. Many researchers consider the domes of the Pokrovsky to hold the key to understanding the themes while others take into account the meaning of the architecture of the complex as a whole. Both ideas will be addressed here. There are conflicting views as to the origin of the gilded onion shaped domes that replaced the original sheet-metal covered helmet shaped ones in 1586 after the fire three years prior.\(^{375}\) Lidov relates them to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem and Rowland considers that the domes may have had their origins in zions whose upper sections represented the cupola of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.\(^{376}\) Significantly the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was viewed by Christians as the New Jerusalem, the “physical image of the heavenly kingdom.”\(^{377}\) Therefore the introduction onion domes would have fostered thoughts of the church in Moscow as the ideal image of the Heavenly Jerusalem.
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Pavel Miliukov in his 1903 “Outlines of the Russian Culture” saw the domes as being influenced by local conditions. Their structure, in his opinion, was designed to accommodate local climatic conditions to prevent snow build-up and to cope with heavy rain. He thinks that the domes were influenced further by the availability of materials. Voyce also follows this theory to some extent. Rowland’s view on the other hand takes into account the prevailing belief of the sixteenth century Muscovites that the Pokrovsky itself (as opposed to just the domes), was modelled on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. He supports this theory by pointing out that the square next to the Pokrovsky was called “lobnoe mesto,” which he took to translate as “place of the skull,” or “Golgotha.”

The significance for the Heavenly Jerusalem theme of the domes being modelled on the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and their location next to a square that is associated with the site of the crucifixion is that the site is being symbolically connected to the crucifixion and the resurrection with their implications for eternal life. The crucifixion and the resurrection were seen by the Russian Church as a prefigurement for Christ’s second coming. I would add that “lob” means forehead and “lobnoe” means “of the forehead.” This shifts the precise meaning of "lobnoe mesto" to "place of the forehead." This particular spot in the square was where executions took place under Ivan IV’s rule where the prisoner had to place their forehead on a big stone before execution. In my view, for this reason, the title indicates a historical rather than a religious association with the square.

### 3.3 Influences on the Construction of the Pokrovsky

There are several variations on an Italianate source of inspiration for the Pokrovsky. Shvidovskiy saw a Byzantine-Italian influence on the sobor’s construction, and this view acknowledged the Russian inheritance of architecture from the Byzantines as well as
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foreign Italian influence in the sixteenth century. Voyce favoured an Italian Renaissance influence. In answer to the above, a full import of ideas from Italy is contentious because this followed after the fallout of the Council of Florence and a general mistrust of Catholic or "Latin" influences. Russia did not have a Renaissance of architecture and art like Western Europe did at this particular time.

A rival theory is that the origins of the Pokrovsky were completely internal and that it was a natural extension or revival of earlier traditions in architecture that expressed theological ideas. Barma and Postnik hailed from Pskov. Voyce suggests that at least the kokoshniki of the Pokrovsky were a Pskovian architectural feature that was further developed into a new style. Voyce's theory is that kokoshniki originated in the wooden architecture of the Northern lands but that they became more decorated under oriental influence and less Byzantine over time. Rather than seeing the kokoshniki as Pskovian, Brumfield relates the idea of the collection of the Pokrovsky churches as coming from the Pskov builders influencing the sixteenth century Muscovite builders. His reason for this is that they were skilled in part/whole structures where there were individual churches that also were part of a “unified ensemble.” The building of a cluster of chapels around a central church was not new, although Brumfield cited the Ioanna Krecitelia as being unique in that its chapels were part of an “integrated design.” If the Ioanna Krecitelia at Dyakovo was perhaps the first church to feature the unified design, then that would go against Brumfield's own argument of the Pskovian churches predating this.

While Voyce sought to trace kokoshniki back to wooden architecture, Hamilton, Berton, Zabelen, and Kudryavtsev find that wooden architecture in general inspired the Pokrovsky. In addition to this, Berton identifies octagonal churches in thirteenth
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century icons, but not in any extant architecture. I do not accept this as an architectural influence because I have already shown how ideas in art often appeared a long time ahead of their representation in architecture. Ideas that were shown in art were not always concurrent with the architecture at the time of the painting. The fact that an octagonal image appears in a thirteenth century icon does not mean that octagonal churches had been built by then. The most that can be said is that art may have influenced architecture. If the Pokrovsky was a brick interpretation of earlier wooden architecture, it begs the question as to why it departed from the wooden norm at all. Wood was certainly more convenient and cheaper than brick although it was a fire risk. On the other hand, stone and brick were more conducive to creating impressive permanent monumental architecture. Faensen considers a wooden influence that intensified. Stone was gradually replaced by brick after the construction of the third Uspensky.

A modern argument is that the Pokrovsky was based on an Asian mosque called Kul Sharif in Kazan that was destroyed. Hamilton does not believe in an Eastern origin (as in Tatar) origins because no surviving Mongol architecture resembles the Pokrovsky although along with Berton he does find that the colours, surface patterns and cupola mouldings of the Pokrovsky resembled Tatar carpets. The Asian theory had taken hold in the late nineteenth century with Viollet de Duc becoming an authority on Russian architecture on the strength of drawings sent to him from Russia. De Duc thought that the Pokrovsky was derived from Scythian, Byzantine and Mongol culture. Brumfield who has carried out the most extensive architectural research in the field and who studied the history associated with it, thinks that Moscow architecture has been “mistakenly interpreted as being a mixture of Mongol, Byzantine, Asian, Western influences.” At the same time, he does not think that the Pokrovsky was intended to “accept an entire architectural system from the west” either.
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In my view, the literature referred to above has not taken sufficient account of the theology of the Heavenly Jerusalem although Brumfield’s research reveals an appreciation of the historical context of war and the recent liberation from the Tatars against the backdrop of theological symbolism related to architecture. The newer theories lean towards interpreting the meaning of the Pokrovsky as a whole collection of churches and examining the theology behind this. Recent research suggests that the Pokrovsky must be viewed as an integrated group of churches. Rowland finds that the Pokrovsky looked like the historical Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{398} The Pokrovsky Sobor looked like the Heavenly Jerusalem of the book of Revelation that featured squares with many gates and precious stones.\textsuperscript{399} The original colour scheme of the Pokrovsky followed the depiction of the Heavenly Jerusalem in Revelation more accurately than the present-day colours which were a 1680s addition (Rev 4:3-4:4).\textsuperscript{400} The exterior was originally white, red, gold with green and blue ceramic inserts to imitate the precious stones: “And the one seated there looks like jasper and carnelian, and around the throne is a rainbow that looks like an emerald” (Rev 4:3).

The above arguments as to the influences on the Pokrovsky are important because they affect the interpretation of the Heavenly Jerusalem theme. If the Pokrovsky had the abovementioned oriental aspects, then it was more likely to have been built as a purely votive church as thanks for victory over the Tatars. If it was based on Jerusalem however, it would lean more towards the Heavenly Jerusalem concept. As a whole, the group of churches in the Pokrovsky Sobor pointed to the Heavenly Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{401} I beg to differ slightly from Rowland’s point of view that the Pokrovsky was meant to look like the historical Jerusalem. The historical Jerusalem was a high-walled city. In my view, Moscow was not attempting to quote the actual Jerusalem because the Pokrovsky which represented the Heavenly Jerusalem was visible to all. Being outside the Kremlin walls, it was more accessible to the local populace. For these reasons it relates more to the New Jerusalem than to the historic Jerusalem.
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Hurst regards the Pokrovsky as having religious symbolism that went beyond being merely votive. She goes so far as to say that Moscow’s status was that of defender of Orthodoxy and "defender and defended." In his piece on biblical military imagery, Rowland found that Moscow’s rulers believed Moscow to be under divine protection and to have a role that was sanctioned by God in world history. It follows that while there was a subsidiary votive meaning to the Pokrovsky (which did follow votive architectural patterns), the whole of the Pokrovsky architecture was intended to portray the divine protection of Moscow and was a proclamation of its cosmic destiny. Both Grabar and Rowland were concerned with the part-whole relationship of the Pokrovsky. Grabar sums it up neatly in saying that normally a part stands for a whole, but in the Pokrovsky the whole city of Jerusalem is represented in this church. To him this shows that the Heavenly Jerusalem is not confined to a particular place or location. This argument overcomes objections that the Heavenly Jerusalem should only be in the earthly Jerusalem in Israel.

Flier’s research is refreshing in that he takes us beyond the purely historical and the political. Previous analysis of the Pokrovsky had tried to interpret the actual situation of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and the balance between state and church. This led to intense debate to which I alluded in Chapters One and Two as to whether the church was a vehicle of the Tsar and the extent to which the church helped the Tsar to create a theocracy. A second line of research has been to try to work out the religiosity of the Tsar using primary documents of the time and his own correspondence. This has created difficulties because whole histories of Russia were written in the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries to glorify Moscow and the Tsar. The nature of these Chronicles was propagandic and even polemical. Flier’s methodology however involves an examination not only of the historical context of Moscow, but also of the theological convictions expressed in architecture. His work is valuable to this thesis because he is focussed on symbolism.
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When working out the symbolism associated with particular religious objects or processes, Flier is well respected in the field of Russian history and theology for being able to interpret objects and symbols by tracking the way that symbolic reference changes over time.\(^\text{407}\)

Flier examined the symbolic meaning of the Pokrovsky as an ensemble. He thinks that the whole complex was carefully planned to relate to deeper truths of the Heavenly Jerusalem or the kingdom to come rather than to the historical victories.\(^\text{408}\) As such the Pokrovsky was both ideological and eschatological (especially in the three cathedrals relating to the Trinity) while the votive military battles were represented in the northern cathedrals and national interests in the southern cathedrals.\(^\text{409}\) In this way the Heavenly Jerusalem was set within a cultural and national context. This was a skilful way of making the theology of the Heavenly Jerusalem tangible and real as opposed to an abstract concept.

### 3.4 The Trinity of Churches

It is my contention that the Trinity Church, the Entry of Christ into Jerusalem Church, and the Intercession Church were the three most important churches of the Pokrovsky and that they did function as an anticipation for the second coming of Christ that would be the start of the inauguration of the Heavenly Jerusalem. The evidence is in the symbolism of these three churches and in the Palm Sunday ritual. These churches were dedicated individually and as a trio to the trinity and they also had lesser votive functions. The Trinity Church was in the Eastern position where it acted as a sanctuary to the whole group of churches.\(^\text{410}\) Since early Christian times, holy things had been associated with an eastward direction. The east symbolised the Resurrection which was connected with dawn. The glory of God came from the East (Ezek 43:2). In Brumfield’s trinity theory, the Trinity Church corresponded to the apse which housed the sanctuary that represented heaven.

\(^{408}\) Flier, "The Apocalypse in Russian Historical Experience before 1500," 137.  
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The Intercession Church, the central church, was named after the pokrov (veil of Mary) and dedicated to her festival which took place on the battle of Kazan. As such, it represented the intercession and divine protection. Read against the Trinity Church, it suggested that Moscow would be under divine protection during the second coming. The seventeenth century traveller, Olearius, reported that the Intercession Church was known in Moscow as “Jerusalem.”\(^{411}\) The Intercession Church commemorated victory over the Anti-Christ Tatars but reminded the faithful that all victories were God’s. After Kazan was taken, Christianity was imposed on the locals there.\(^{412}\) In Ivan IV’s mind he would consider that he was protecting Kazan by extending Mary’s protection to them. The tent roof of this church looked like a ciborium, symbolic of God’s protection of church and Tsar.\(^{413}\)

The main entrance to the whole Pokrovsky Sobor was through the Entry of Christ into Jerusalem Church which was dedicated to Christ’s entry into Jerusalem as the name makes clear. According to Brumfield however, it is intended to allude to Ivan’s entry into Kazan.\(^{414}\) (Today, however, entry to Pokrovsky is only through St. Vasili’s Church). The Entry of Christ into Jerusalem Church is important to the whole theme of this thesis because it presents Moscow as both the new or Heavenly Jerusalem and as the church to come.\(^{415}\) It referred to Christ’s entry into Jerusalem which the Russians believed was also a prefiguration of the second coming. The narthex on the western side represents purification for the life to come.\(^{416}\) The dark labyrinthine corridors of the churches served the same purpose.

The Entry of Christ into Jerusalem Church was integral to the Palm Sunday ritual and to Moscow’s conception of itself as the New Jerusalem.\(^{417}\) The ritual is a re-enactment of the biblical witness of the arrival of the Messiah into Jerusalem as predicted by Zechariah and as witnessed by the description in the gospels (Zech 9:9; Matt 21:4; Mark 11:9; Luke 20:38; John 12:13-15). The procession started at the Uspensky Sobor, (whose altar was
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dedicated to Christ’s entry into Jerusalem), and finished at the Entry of Christ into Jerusalem Church. In the ritual, the Tsar, the Metropolitan and a horse/donkey re-enacted Christ’s entry into Jerusalem. The association with Ivan IV’s entry into Kazan was an obvious additional feature of the ritual that was made clear from Easter 1557 onwards. The Tsar led a horse on which sat the Metropolitan in the role of Christ. The Tsar held the reins and acted as shepherd.

From 1559 onwards, the start of the Palm Sunday procession was at the Trinity Church which was being enlarged to become the Intercession Church. In a complex argument, Flier argues that the Pokrovsky was gradually unified once the ninth cathedral, the Intercession Cathedral was finished in 1561. He connects this with a shift in focus from the Trinity (the former name of the Pokrovsky group of churches) to the Intercession. This would mean a shift in ideology from Heaven-on-Earth which had dominated Russian religion, to divine protection. Flier’s argument supports my overall claim that the architecture showed a shift in ideology too from the Heaven-on-Earth to the Heavenly Jerusalem theme. The Heaven-on-Earth theme was still embedded in the Trinity Cathedral but the whole Pokrovsky ensemble of churches came to refer to a transfigured world where the exterior of the church proclaimed the message to all. The Pokrovsky symbolically represented the Heavenly Jerusalem.

The Palm Sunday ritual which took place outside the Pokrovsky a week before Easter is to be understood as a prefigurement of Christ’s second coming. It looks back to Christ entering the historic city of Jerusalem and forwards to the Heavenly Jerusalem. Flier’s assessment of the Palm Sunday ritual is that it symbolized hope for Orthodoxy in the apocalypse to come. To sixteenth century eyes, the physical aspects of the Pokrovsky and
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the ritual brought the historical Jerusalem and the future Heavenly Jerusalem into the context of sixteenth century Moscow. The Palm Sunday ritual cast a biblical image onto Moscow.\textsuperscript{426}

The "Book of Degrees," a sixteenth century history of Moscow, gave insight into the religious aspects of the Pokrovsky. It reported that Metropolitan Makarii sanctified the Pokrovsky that was "built clearly and wonderfully with various churches on a single foundation," and that the church proclaimed God's miracles in the battles and ultimate capture of Kazan and Astrakhan.\textsuperscript{427} This primary evidence goes some way to counter some of the earlier theories that the Pokrovsky was merely a symbol of victory in battle. Rather Makarii was saying that all victories were God's.

\textbf{3.5 The Interior}

The interior of Pokrovsky Sobor is described by Berton as "almost suffocating."\textsuperscript{428} On my first visit there I thought that it felt like a prison or a dungeon. However, after passing through the low-roofed galleries, the visitor discovers that the churches themselves are more spacious with higher ceilings. The Pokrovsky of the sixteenth century had whitewashed interior walls which connected the inner galleries.\textsuperscript{429} Like its two predecessors, it had architectural features such as cornices, pilasters, niches, and brickwork patterns in place of decoration\textsuperscript{430} (see for example the restored Alexander of Svirsk Church, fig.15, p124). This indicates that the walls were not meant to be covered with murals. The inner space is so small that only three to four worshippers at a time could be accommodated in the individual churches.

An exception to the dark interiors is found in the Church of the Intercession which has a lighter interior with more windows making it possible to see all the way to the apex of the tent. This church has several entrances with portals on the side of its inner gallery (fig.16,
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This size of this church (it is the largest in the Pokrovsky), and its central position indicates that it was the most important. Its external tent roof is forty-six metres in height but the church still only has a floor space of eighty square metres. Even this church was not built with the function of holding church services in mind. The tall apex made heating difficult and so it was only able to be used in summer. Restorations have revealed that this church’s interior was painted to look like imitation brick. Brumfield has identified similarities in the interiors of the Vosnesenskaya and the Ioanna Krectitelia. This is in keeping with the interior being subordinate to the exterior in sixteenth century churches of this type.

While Hurst identifies a Renaissance influence in the frescoes of flowers in the portal to the gallery of the Church of the Intercession and this forms part of her argument in favour of a strong Italian influence, the earliest known reference to these frescoes was after the restorations of 1682. Solovyev also discusses the paintings of the walls, vaults, stairways and passages here in this context, but again they were outside of the Muscovite time period. Furthermore, Hurst concedes that the Italian builders had left Moscow by 1539 and that no Italians were directly involved in the construction of the Pokrovsky.

3.6 Decline of the Heavenly Jerusalem Theme
Stone architecture continued to be used in churches and monasteries after the sixteenth century, but in the immediate wake of the Pokrovsky’s construction, few buildings were built. Ivan IV’s leadership turned evil and became hostile to Christianity. His Oprichniki or secret police committed such heinous acts that the image or icon of the Heavenly Jerusalem in Moscow was damaged. The tortuous years under the persecution of the Oprichniki and the ensuing economic crisis affected stone architecture. Brick had replaced white stone and was comparatively cheap but even the use of stone and brick in
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construction nearly stopped altogether under these conditions. As people feared for their lives under the new regime, confidence in the idea of Moscow as an anticipation of the Heavenly Jerusalem was rapidly eroded. Harsh economic conditions, political intrigues and wars also meant that it was unsustainable. The Messianic Mission came to a halt when the quest to be Tsar was fraught with rival contenders and conflict between church and state.

Once stability returned in the seventeenth century, there was renewed interest in the Heavenly Jerusalem, although the deep symbolism of architecture and materials was lost to practical concerns. The Pokrovsky Sobor remained unsurpassed in terms of central location, beauty, elaborate structure and layers of symbolic meaning. There was not another church built in Moscow that came close to it in this respect. To his credit, Ivan IV had tried to form specific guidelines to maintain and standardise rules for iconographic symbolism with his Stoglav Council. In spite of this, iconography suffered in the seventeenth century as Russian artists experimented with Western art forms. This resulted in a loss of symbolism at the expense of realism in art. Portrait type art and miniature paintings became popular. In the sixteenth century, the Pokrovsky proclaimed its message physically through its architecture. In the seventeenth century, while the image of the Heavenly Jerusalem was preserved in the architecture, its golden age was over.

The Heavenly Jerusalem was a religiously meaningful concept that went back to eleventh century Kievan Rus where the people saw themselves as God’s chosen ones. Over time, the concept became associated with Moscow as a city. There were a number of historical and religious forces that contributed to this including a growing awareness of the impending apocalypse or the end of the world. In the sixteenth century, Moscow saw itself as an "image" of the Heavenly Jerusalem, or as an anticipation of the heavenly city. During the reign of Tsar Ivan IV, this understanding became more than just an image because under the Tsar’s guidance, Moscow was considered to have a key role in the Messianic
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Mission. By the middle of the sixteenth century, with the Tsar at its helm, the Muscovite Christian soldiers were fighting "Anti-Christ" in battles that were regarded as practices for the apocalypse to come in the future.

The Pokrovsky Sobor was built as more than an image of the Heavenly Jerusalem. It was a *proclamation* of the Heavenly Jerusalem that would follow. An image reflects the heavenly equivalent whereas a proclamation overtly announces it. Instead of the interior relationship with God that the architecture and art of the Uspensky Sobor had symbolised, all attention in the Pokrovsky was on the exterior architecture and outdoor proclamation to the masses. The Pokrovsky's architecture had symbolism that related to the Holy Trinity, the Heavenly Jerusalem to come and to historical events in Russia's recent past. When read together, they announced that Moscow had a key role in cosmic destiny as the city waited for the Heavenly Jerusalem.
Chapter 4

CONCLUSION

4.0 Heaven-on-Earth in the Uspensky Sobor

The idea that the physical church building should show Heaven-on-Earth was a significant theme in Russian architecture that was expressed right from the beginning of Christianity in Kievan Rus in the tenth century. My finding was that while the Russian Church outgrew its Byzantine origins, it still maintained the Byzantine understanding of realised eschatology which saw the church as an icon of its heavenly counterpart. This interpretation was reflected in church architecture and art work. Every structure and item of the church was bound up with intense theological symbolism that reached a high point in the last quarter of the fifteenth century in the Uspensky Sobor. The Uspensky was an excellent study for this thesis in that it expressed the theme of Heaven-on-Earth in a grand way in its architecture. This overt expression enabled me to make definite conclusions. The Uspensky helped to lock in Moscow as the Heaven-on-Earth that would set the standard for other churches to follow rather than each individual church being a representation of Heaven-on-Earth.

Although the theological meaning of religious artistic and architectural symbols remained consistent for centuries, new elements were added in. Medieval Russia had interpreted earthly things by way of reference to heavenly ones. The church building proclaimed Heaven-on-Earth and in doing so it connected heaven and earth. Rather than interpreting heaven and earth as two separate spheres, there was a lot of overlap. As the sixteenth century approached, earthly representations of heaven became more intense and grand. This was especially so in the Uspensky where the severe monolithic exterior struck awe into the viewer, yet still created a visual impression of perfect harmony. By contrast, its interior was aesthetically beautiful with frescoes on almost every surface and extensive use of gold and precious stones.
My research found many layers of symbolism within the Uspensky; there were symbols within symbols. This was most apparent in the exterior portals which paradoxically represent interior parts of the church which themselves have theological meaning. Each architectural feature of the church was a stand-in for a part of theology relating to Heaven-on-Earth. Fioravanti’s major innovation in creating a concealed apse created perfect harmony architecturally which showed the importance of the incarnation where heaven met earth in the form of Jesus.

The clearest example of the overlap between and earth was in the pillars of the Uspensky. The pillars were a visual depiction of Russia’s saints and martyrs who represented Russia’s sacred place in history. The evangelists were also shown in the frescoes here. This meant that there was a connection between the gospels and their message and Russian history. These figures touched heaven and earth in the form of the dome and the nave respectively. Physically the role of the pillars is to support the dome and spiritually the martyrs and evangelists stand up for heaven.

I had to address concerns in the literature about whether the Uspensky simply transferred ideas from wood into stone and whether it was a revival of earlier architecture. My conclusion was that earlier architecture was used as a starting point, but that the Uspensky went beyond earlier representations of Heaven-on-Earth and every aspect of this cathedral superceded anything that had gone before it. Its physical characteristics, the context of its construction, and that it was built to be a permanent massive structure, (while its predecessors had been torn down) made this clear. Most significantly, it was built on holy land. The Kremlin builders had repeatedly used this particular site in the Kremlin environs for its most sacred church rather than rebuilding next to it. It was as though the very land itself proclaimed Heaven-on-Earth.

The evidence outlined in Chapter Two led me to conclude that the Uspensky was deliberately planned to portray Heaven-on-Earth. This was not accidental nor a natural consequence of the restoration of the Kremlin. The Uspensky became the epitome of Heaven-on-Earth. Much of this was due to the genius of its architect, Fioravanti, who integrated the symbolic elements of Russian theology into a unified statement in
architecture. Evidence from the primary sources of the times such as the Chronicles captured the Heaven-on-Earth aspects in their descriptions of the Uspensky and its construction.

4.1 Heaven-on-Earth in the Pokrovsky Sobor
By contrast, the second cathedral built three quarters of a century later, Pokrovsky Sobor, had little of the Heaven-on-Earth theme in its interior. It was not set up to hold a congregation. In keeping with the Orthodox emphasis on inner beauty, the Uspensky’s plain exterior contrasted with its beautiful interior. This was reversed with the Heavenly Jerusalem concept of the sixteenth century when churches had magnificent exteriors and subdued interiors. These churches were highly visible and did not emphasise the quiet contemplation of religious mysteries in the way that fifteenth century churches had.

The message was in the exterior of the sixteenth century churches rather than at the foot of the iconostasis. Pokrovsky Sobor was an ensemble of churches, each of which could not fit more than a few people around its altars. The constricted space was not conducive to proclaiming Heaven-on-Earth. Its architecture, both exterior and interior, suggested that this church was meant to be viewed from the outside. Accordingly, its message was in its exterior. The Pokrovsky did not make a statement of Heaven-on-Earth, rather its focus was on the Heavenly Jerusalem.

4.2 The Heavenly Jerusalem in the Uspensky Sobor
My research found a change in the nature of the Heavenly Jerusalem concept over time. The primary evidence from the Chronicles as well as sermons by Bishops Illarion and Rylo indicated that the Heavenly Jerusalem concept in early medieval Kievan Rus was bound up with the idea that the people of Kievan Rus themselves were God’s "chosen people." In architecture, the concept was implied in the sanctuary and the altars of the churches. The iconostasis both revealed and concealed the sanctuary beyond it and so the construction of the first iconostasis in 1405 encouraged more thought about the Heavenly Jerusalem and access to it.
The location of the repainted Virgin of Vladimir opened spiritual access to the Heavenly Jerusalem in the sanctuary where the original was located. It proclaimed the Heavenly Jerusalem just beyond. The second painting mirrors the shift in thinking from Mary's role as intercessor to Mary, the defender of Moscow. The Heavenly Jerusalem became prominent in icons and religious objects in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In the sixteenth century, the Heavenly Jerusalem related to Moscow as a city that was chosen by God. Kievan Rus’ understanding of the Heavenly Jerusalem had related to the Old Testament idea of a succession of chosen people. Moscow's concept was grounded in the book of Revelation of the New Testament and in particular to the description of the holy city, that is the Heavenly Jerusalem (Rev 21:2).

Turning now to the art that was concurrent with the rise of Moscow, a new theological movement became apparent here. There was a shift in emphasis from the last judgement to depictions of the apocalypse. The Uspensky, like its predecessors, did have a Heavenly Jerusalem theme expressed in the sanctuary and in its apocalypse paintings. The difference was that this cathedral used light to enhance its art and architecture and the sanctuary, paintings and inner domes were very well illuminated. In this respect, it showcased the Heavenly Jerusalem theme that was already there. There was no darkness as the church looked forward to the Heavenly Jerusalem. The Heavenly Jerusalem had already been prefigured in Rublev’s "Old Testament Trinity" icon. This painting linked Heaven-on-Earth with the Heavenly Jerusalem which was shown as a church building.

I identified that the Uspensky had six new markers that pointed to the future Heavenly Jerusalem in a way that the earlier churches did not. The first was in the gold domes that suggested the golden Heavenly Jerusalem of Revelation. Secondly the crosses on the domes looked forward to the Heavenly Jerusalem because since early Christian times, crosses were a call to prepare for the second coming of Christ. Thirdly, the Heavenly Jerusalem of the future was made more imminent by portraying the recently defeated Tatars as Anti-Christ. The victory over these “Anti-Christ” had led to Moscow becoming the representation of the Heavenly Jerusalem in a Messianic Mission led by Tsar Ivan IV as Russia inched forwards to the impending apocalypse. The fourth marker was in the Church Militant icon that portrayed Moscow as the Heavenly Jerusalem. Fifthly, the defeat
of the Tatars was proclaimed symbolically in architecture in the crescent moons near the crosses on the domes of the Uspensky. The sixth marker was in the exterior portals and interior iconostasis where Archangel Mikhail featured in massive form. Archangel Mikhail was prophesied to defeat Satan in the last battle of Armageddon that would lead to the inauguration of the Heavenly Jerusalem. That he features so strongly in important parts of the Uspensky is indicative of the rise of the Heavenly Jerusalem concept. The Uspensky structure departed from the traditional cross form. Christ in the Heavenly Jerusalem had no cross. This was already suggested in the inner domes of the victorious Christ who was never portrayed here as suffering but rather in transfigured form as he would be in the Heavenly Jerusalem. Thus the Heavenly Jerusalem of the future was shown in the domes.

There were three other prefigurements of the Heavenly Jerusalem in the Uspensky Sobor. The first was in the canopy over the Tsar’s stall which strongly resembled the kokoshniki that would become an architectural representation of Archangel Mikhail of the Heavenly Jerusalem in sixteenth century churches. Secondly, the relics of the saints and Metropolitans were strongly associated with the Heavenly Jerusalem. The sanctified bodies in some cases were incorruptible or partly transfigured. In Russian theology this meant that they were the first fruits of the restoration of matter in the transfigured cosmos of the Heavenly Jerusalem. The relics along with the icons were very important in showing what Rus believed of the Heavenly Jerusalem. They proclaimed that matter would be transfigured to a perfect state, that people would be reunited with their incorruptible bodies in the Heavenly Jerusalem and that they would be in the heavenly company of God, the Virgin Mary, Archangels and Saints. Because the relics and the saints’ bodies in their graves were only partly transfigured, this meant that the full transfiguration associated with the Heavenly Jerusalem was to happen at a later point.

Finally, in 1515, when Tsar Vasili III viewed the paintings in the Uspensky, he deliberately rephrased an earlier Prince’s words to recast them in the light of the Heavenly Jerusalem rather than the Heaven-on-Earth theme. He said that he felt that he was in heaven whereas Prince Vladimir of Kiev had quoted his delegation as saying that they did not know if they were in heaven or on earth when they viewed the Hagia Sofia, which was the Byzantine prototype church for Russian Christianity. These words encapsulate the development
that was taking place in Russian theology as the emphasis shifted from Heaven-on-Earth to the Heavenly Jerusalem. Overall, the architecture of the Uspensky Sobor implied the Heavenly Jerusalem. Some seventy-six years later, its artwork and religious objects were more specific about the Heavenly Jerusalem. Significantly, some of these paintings and objects were concurrent with the construction of the Pokrovsky Sobor which explains their focus on the Heavenly Jerusalem.

4.3 The Heavenly Jerusalem in the Pokrovsky Sobor.

The Heavenly Jerusalem concept in sixteenth century Moscow was translated into architecture. The factors that I found to have been the most influential on the Moscow understanding of the Heavenly Jerusalem were: The Mongol occupation (and their subsequent defeat), the fall of Constantinople, the Third Rome concept and the Messianic Mission. Subsidiary factors such as Russia’s role in the wake of the Council of Florence were also considered because they gave insight into the context of Orthodoxy.

There was a shift in emphasis from grand interiors and austere exteriors of churches to grand exteriors and plain interiors in the sixteenth century when art became subordinate to architecture. I agree with Rowland, Flier and Brumfield that in order to uncover the meaning of the Pokrovsky’s symbolism, the churches need to thought of as a unit rather than individual churches. This is because the idea of an ensemble of churches to portray the Heavenly Jerusalem shows that the Heavenly Jerusalem itself was thought to be a group of churches which implies also that it would be a holy city of numerous buildings. When regarded as individual churches, the Pokrovsky appears to defy analysis in its varied structures and free form, but when examined as a whole, it makes sense.

In appraising the evidence for and against the domes being part of the Heavenly Jerusalem concept, I was not able to make a definitive statement because there are compelling arguments for both sides. In tracing the antecedents of the Pokrovsky Sobor, my findings were that its architecture and symbolism was prefigured in the Church Militant icon and zions. Theological architecture had begun to shift with the advent of votive churches in the sixteenth century. I agree with the prevailing view that the Vosnesenskaya and the Krectitelia Ioanna Sobori did influence the construction of the Pokrovsky. As prototypes,
these churches were a kind of a trial run for the Heavenly Jerusalem portrayal which reached its pinnacle in the Pokrovsky Sobor. The proclamation of the Pokrovsky as the Heavenly Jerusalem was so clearly established that it was easy to confirm it by looking at the primary sources of the sixteenth century, and the architecture of the church read against the description of the Heavenly Jerusalem in Revelation 21:22. In the Pokrovsky, careful attention was given to the visual description of the Heavenly Jerusalem in Revelation right down to the colour scheme, shape and gates.

Brumfield’s theory that the Trinity, Entry of Christ into Jerusalem and the Intercession churches held additional meaning relating to the Trinity has compelling evidence to support it in terms of the directional orientation, function, name and symbolic meaning of the three churches. These three churches showcased the central one, that is, the Intercession Church, whose illumination and architecture marked it as the most important at the time of construction. The theory of a theological shift from a focus on intercession towards Moscow being blessed or divinely protected, is backed up by the Palm Sunday ritual analysis by Flier. Overall my finding was that the votive interpretation of the churches was subsidiary to their overall religious meaning. The votive meaning supported the Heavenly Jerusalem concept by making it real and tangible to the people. Rituals such as the Palm Sunday procession were re-enacted to show it as the image of the Heavenly Jerusalem while still acknowledging the historical Jerusalem.

The Pokrovsky had many layers of symbolic meaning. Its architects and artists under the command of the Metropolitan and the Tsar deliberately planned these multi-levelled meanings that set the scene for the Messianic Mission. This would take place to lead in to the Heavenly Jerusalem with Moscow at the forefront of activity. The Heavenly Jerusalem in the architecture of the Pokrovsky had a parallel theme of victory or thanksgiving for defeating the Tatars. Strictly speaking, these themes were not really parallel because the victory over the Tatars was perceived as a religious one. The Church Militant icon recast the Tatars and the Muscovites as the Anti-Christ and the heavenly army of the apocalypse respectively. In this painting, Moscow was portrayed as the Heavenly Jerusalem.
While the Pokrovsky was the proclamation of the Heavenly Jerusalem, my finding in Chapter Three was that the reality was quite different with the evil deeds of Tsar Ivan IV. Ironically the demise of the Heavenly Jerusalem was attributable to the very Tsar who commissioned the cathedral that would proclaim it. The harsh reality of Russian life in the latter part of the sixteenth century and early seventeenth century did make the Heavenly Jerusalem concept unsustainable. Together with the new art movements of the seventeenth century that undid centuries of theological symbolism in icons, the physical representation of the Heavenly Jerusalem had lost its power.

This thesis has demonstrated that the Russian church stood in both ages; that of the paradisical Heaven-on-Earth while looking forwards to the Heavenly Jerusalem. These two churches revealed the whole Russian understanding of Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem. Furthermore, it was proclaimed visually. The study of theological symbolism in Russian architecture is relatively new. There are many further avenues for research in this area. A more thorough classification system for icons over the centuries would help considerably. Future research could include the extent to which other cathedrals in the Kremlin and the Moscow area expressed the themes of Heaven-on-Earth and the Heavenly Jerusalem. The other Kremlin churches were built at different times and it would be interesting to investigate whether this made a difference to the representation of the themes.
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Source: Alex Zelenko [GFDL (http://www.gnu.org/copyleft/fdl.html) or CC BY-SA 4.0-3.0-2.5-2.0-1.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0-3.0-2.5-2.0-1.0)], via Wikimedia Commons (28 April 2016).
Source: Shakko [CC BY-SA 3.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0)]Or GFDL (http://www.gnu.org/copyleft/fdl.html)], via Wikimedia Commons, (28 February 2016).

**Figure 11**
Reconstructed by Nikolai Brunov, *Floor Plan of Pokrovsky Sobor, east at the top, west at the bottom*, 1930.
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https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%3ATrinity_Cathedral_Moscow_-_first_floor_plan.jpg


Attribution: By NVO [Public domain], via Wikimedia Commons.
Source: m-guffler [CC BY-SA 3.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0)], via Wikimedia Commons, (28 February 2016).
The churches in the Pokrovsky are each known by several different names and two of the churches were rededicated to different saints which again resulted in new names. For these reasons, I have referred to the church names in English below and given their direction within the site.

1 Central church: Intercession of the Most Holy Theotokos
2 Western church: Entry of Christ into Jerusalem
3 Eastern church: Holy Trinity
4 North-western church: St. Gregory the Illuminator of Armenia
5 Northern church: Sts. Kiprian and Ustinia (renamed later)
6 North-eastern church: Three Patriarchs of Alexandria (renamed later)
7 South-eastern church: St. Alexander of Svir
8 Southern church: Icon of St. Nicholas of Velikaya
9. South-western church: St. Varlaam of Khutyn
(10 St Vasili [Basil the Blessed] added in 1588)
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Source: by shakko [CC BY-SA 3.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0)], via Wikimedia Commons, (28 February 2016).

File: St. Basil's Cathedral Interior by shakko 19.jpg
https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File%3ASaint_Basil's_Cathedral_interior_by_shakko_19.jpg

Source: shakko [CC BY-SA 3.0 (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0)], via Wikimedia Commons, (28 February 2016).


Basil of Caesarea: the following works by are taken from: Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Series II. Vol. 8:


*Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei (PSRL, or The Russian Chronicle).* The following references are taken from: *Polnoe Sobranie Russkikh Letopisei (PSRL),* 41 Vols. St. Petersburg/Petrograd/ Leningrad/and Moscow: Nauka, 1841-2002:


________. “Layout.”

________. “Structure.”


