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Introduction – Recollection in Patches

Jerusalem is a city, a place, a mental construction, a biblical-mythical memory. Once Jerusalem has been all this at the same time, then Jerusalem can be all this time and again by active remembrance within the context and problematic nature of the present. Through the centuries Jerusalem has been visited, sought after, used, reused, appropriated, and it has acted as a point of reference on many levels. The city has become part of different cultural figurations in different periods and places. However politically explosive, a reference to this city is ultimately pointing back to the Jerusalem of the Bible. The city, or even only its name, can be an experience of divine presence, as much as it can be a source of conflict deriving from the same claim that it is the Holy City – a claim that is forever contested and reasserted. From Early Christian times on, a great variety of legitimizations have been constructed by emphasizing myriad aspects of this source, by way of more or less orchestrated memory processes.

The contributions in this book refer, explicitly or implicitly, to dimensions of cultural memory, the way in which the past is remembered, appropriated and represented. Memory takes a vital part in the dynamics of culture. It recaptures, recycles, reshuffles and re-mediates cultural practices. It uses language, texts, images and buildings in order to develop, preserve and continue cultural identities. Cultural memory is thus a mediated memory. Its media are not so much vessels of memory in which memory passively resides but objects or manifestations through which memories are produced, shared, and given meaning.\(^1\) They select and organize representations of the past in such a way that they can be meaningful in the (historical) present, though such redirections may lead to conflicts among groups with different or antagonistic experiences.\(^2\) Cultural memories are thus negotiated, present-oriented and relative, and they depend upon processes of exchange and transfer. In this book, readers can find various examples of these processes throughout a range of historical periods and artistic media.

This collection of studies on Jerusalem in art and architecture is the result of a joint project by researchers of the Department of Art History at Radboud University Nijmegen. In May 2011 and September 2012 two symposia served as mid-term reviews at which the preliminary results were presented. Specialists in various fields such as the history of painting, sculpture, architecture, book illumination, and applied arts, from Early Christian times to the present, ar-

---

1 Sturken 1997, p. 9.
2 Rigney 2005.
articulated a variety of cultural, religious, philosophical and political implications of the visualization of Jerusalem. Works of art were the points of departure and main focus of those meetings, where the aim was to discern constants and variables in attitudes towards the real and imagined Jerusalem.

Jerusalem in art has been a subject of study more frequently in recent years. This interest can be said to have been initiated by Bianca Kühnel of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who had already dedicated a publication to Early Christian and medieval representations of the Holy City in 1987. A decade later she edited a much broader collection of essays on the same theme, this time covering a span of two millennia and the three faiths Judaism, Christianity and Islam. In 2007 the Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florence organised the conference ‘Jerusalem as Narrative Space’, which concentrated again on medieval and Early Modern representations. Here the textual and visual narratives were the leitmotif, with the works of art primarily understood as the bearers of meaning. In 2009 followed a conference ‘Imagining Jerusalem in the Medieval West’ at University College, Oxford. Almost parallel to our project, the Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität in Frankfurt am Main organised the congress ‘Räume der Passion’, once again dealing with the Middle Ages and the Early Modern period, this time confined to visualizations of the Passion.

The volume at hand proves once more that Jerusalem is an object of perennial interest. As a source of religious, political, cultural and consequently artistic focal points, the theme shows no signs of running dry. On the contrary, because of the ongoing turmoil, the city as a point of reference seems to gain new importance all the time. This observation was precisely the starting point for the present research project. Every period constructs its own Jerusalems determined by the aspirations, desires and issues of its own time, while at the same time referring back to an unchallenged origin. How did art respond to all this? With regard to Jerusalem, art has been created at the intersection of two axes: that of the uncertain contemporary situation and that of the continuous chain of meanings that history puts on the city. From this observation three notions emerge: context – contrast – conflict. These concepts can be related to the geographical Jerusalem that can be visited; to memories and objects that can be brought back; and to interpretations that can be attached to the city

---

3 For example see: Montefiore 2011.
5 Kühnel 1998.
6 Jerusalem as Narrative Space 2012.
7 Imagining Jerusalem 2012.
8 Räume der Passion [foreseen 2014].
from a (mental) distance – or to the complex interplay of these different manifestations.

Without aiming to survey the subject of Jerusalem in art in its entirety, our goal was to encompass a period of almost twenty centuries, from Early Christian times onwards. The choice was made to focus on Western objects and treat them as works of art, with attention to their materiality and tangibility. Our aim was not to arrive at general conclusions beyond those already made in other studies, but rather to add new insights to the totality of mechanisms that play a role in representation and memory processes concerning Jerusalem by means of a selection of specialized topics. The goal was to discuss in depth a series of artworks and artefacts which question the representation of Jerusalem and complement each other or put other cases in perspective. Inevitably all cases deal to a certain extent with religious or political notions and the effects they produce on the representation of Jerusalem and on cultural debate in general. As a whole and in connection to each other, the individual case studies thus do exceed their own scope. The contributions differ in their approach. They range from a cultural historical perspective to an art theoretical or a more essay-like discussion, as such also covering different ways of writing art history.

The contributions of this volume are grouped under two main themes. The first part of the book, Competing Memories and Contrasting Meanings is dedicated to cases in which the concept of Jerusalem creates contrasts through the way it is remembered and through the specific meanings contained in this memory. These case studies demonstrate how the context generates conflicting interpretations of aspects of the city. The conflicts have had wide consequences both in many cultural environments and also in art.

The second part of the book, Imitation and Translocation, concentrates on how Jerusalem was brought to the Western World – both physically and metaphorically. What links these case studies is the aspect of motion. The change of context confronts old with new concepts, here and now with there and then. Travelling to Jerusalem and back again, people gathered spiritual memories as well as material objects. Back home they materialized the city in another place. Through translocation the Holy City was recreated elsewhere in thought, in works of art and in buildings. These recreations were considered to be more than a mere substitute, acting as instruments of memory.

To stress the permanent topicality of Jerusalem, the first part begins in the twenty-first century. The successive texts trace the way back to the fourth century. Most contributions in some way pursue the original source, the Jerusalem of the Bible. The second part of the volume then departs from the period in which Jerusalem became a topic in Western art and proceeds forwards again to
the present and the future. The present time thus functions as a frame that surrounds and contextualizes the cases, highlighting how the time in which we live determines our perspective on the subject.

Although this book examines continuity in the artistic questioning of Jerusalem, this does not mean that it ignores major shifts in the history of this subject. The most prominent dividing line is without doubt the Holocaust and the subsequent foundation of the state of Israel in the twentieth century. After these events, artists tended to put terror and collision in the foreground. Although conflict was by no means absent in earlier times, it was of a different nature. Rather than irresolvable conflicts within works of art, there were instead juxtapositions of alternative interpretations and representations of Jerusalem. The aim of artworks in earlier times had been first and foremost to propagate a univocal, often doctrinal, vision in reaction to deviating opinions.

In the contribution by Anneke Schulenberg the work Present Tense by the British-Palestinian artist Mona Hatoum is described as the search for a homeland that, as the result of political and religious conflicts, consists only of dispersed territories. The impact of the determining power of mapping as the outcome of enforced treaties with the aim of control means imprisonment in everyday life. The sculpture of this map of the fragmented Palestinian territories determined in 1993, symbolically made of aromatic Nablus soap, not only reflects upon the limits of boundaries, but at the same time tries to point at the stability these should and can provide. In a way the sculpture embodies hope for the future.

With this opening article the stage is set: Jerusalem and Israel as places of conflict, caused by history, problematic and contested in the present, and a possible hopeful answer for the future.

In her contribution on The Green Line by the Belgian artist Francis Alýs, Mette Gieskes also tackles the contested boundaries of Jerusalem and Israel as a whole. Here, the focus is on the impact of the politically sensitive armistice demarcation line of 1948, which Alýs traced in 2004 with a dripping can of green paint. This temporary intervention in public space invites reflection on the seminal yet relatively non-intrusive armistice line as an historical source of separation between Israelis and Palestinians and the conflict between them, as well as a potential source of future peace. The absurdity of the action, which also explores the political potential of art, stimulates awareness of the arbitrariness of two-dimensional borders that are enforced onto a continuous, three-dimensional world, dividing the indivisible.

Wouter Weijers presents a profound analysis of two homonymous paintings entitled Jerusalem by Anselm Kiefer and Gerhard Richter. The contrast between the works turns out to be as fundamental as the internal conflict that the separate paintings evoke. The works of the two artists mark the extremes of
the way in which the problematic implications of Jerusalem could be dealt with in Germany after 1945. The mythic and material memory of Jerusalem is challenged on various levels in relation to Germany’s role in the Second World War and the after-war period in Israel. Both works try in a very particular way to cope with the burden of recent history, especially that of the Holocaust. What was forcefully forgotten is recalled, what is remembered is questioned, what is unimaginable is represented. Eventually all this points back at the Holy City.

The striving for a humanistic solution to deviating opinions about the city of Jerusalem and its monuments has led to highly detailed reconstructions of the past. A seventeenth-century manifestation of this phenomenon is discussed by Jeroen Goudeau, in a text on the Temple of Jerusalem in the Dutch Republic. The Old Testament Temple is probably one of the most emblematic buildings in history. On the interface between theology and architecture, scholars of all time have tried to integrate this biblical structure into the religious, political and aesthetic paradigms of their own milieu. Lost as a material source and only fragmentarily described in various texts, the divine Jewish Temple, the holiest of places for the People of the Book, made one of the authoritative focal points of the real and imagined city. The article evaluates an Early Modern protestant reconstruction of the Temple as a visual component of the humanist enterprise of biblical criticism.

Although in quite another sense, reconstructing and remoulding the past architecturally is also the subject of the contribution by Mariëtte Verhoeven. She concentrates on the stone remnants of Crusader architecture in contemporary Jerusalem. Instead of reconstructing their original form, seven key monuments, starting with the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, are considered as multilayered objects that have been subject to constant change. Verhoeven shows the different mechanisms by which buildings can acquire new meanings or can undergo radical changes that involve specific values. In each subsequent intervention a new layer to the city and its history has been added while the older layers remain visible. As visible witnesses of the past these buildings pass down the narrative of the turbulent history of Jerusalem.

Sible de Blaauw examines how a variety of media, including relics, images, locations, buildings and liturgical ceremonies, were employed to represent and incorporate Jerusalem in (Early) Christian Rome. His diachronic survey shows that the link between the two cities had been established as early as Constantinian times and was (re)activated through the ages. However, the references seem to be more or less independent phenomena. De Blaauw demonstrates convincingly that the strong and concrete potentials of meaning transfer did not result in a comprehensive, consistent, or even lasting concept
of Jerusalem in Rome. Apparently the city of Peter and Paul did not need to become a Second Jerusalem.

De Blauw’s contribution is the closest this book gets to the starting point of Jerusalem as source for artistic representation in Western art. However, at the same time it seems that the source in the ages before Christianization draws back, dissolves, and grows impalpable. The concept of Jerusalem that seems so clear and meaningful in later periods of Western art, becomes more and more diffuse, with every step further back in time. After the destruction of the Temple and the expulsion of the Jewish inhabitants, Jerusalem became a relatively insignificant Roman city with an indeterminate identity. Yet, its sacred character did not fall into oblivion, but was rather increasingly open for interpretations and appropriations from new religious and cultural perspectives. This multiplication of engagements with Jerusalem as a sacred city, by Christians, Muslims and Jews alike, made the history of the city into one of continuously changing configurations, from tolerant coexistence and cultural exchange to aggression and segregation.

It was the Crusaders who re-established Jerusalem as a Christian city. Katja Boertjes describes the cult of pilgrims’ ampullae that bear images of the new, reconquered Jerusalem. They functioned as souvenirs for the pilgrims and Crusaders themselves, but perhaps even more as devotional objects for those who had not visited the Holy Land. The ampullae travelled back with the passengers and thus captured the memory of Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre in narrative, as well as materially transferring a tangible ‘memento’ of the Holy City.

Besides the active pilgrimage and material souvenirs there was the pilgrimage in the mind, as Hanneke van Asperen expounds on the basis of two late-medieval manuscripts from the collection of the Radboud University Library. By way of these texts, which describe devotional exercises, the mental pilgrim could travel instantaneously to the holy places. This spiritual way of travelling not only bridged a geographical distance, but also distance in time, as the worshipper felt actually present at the biblical events themselves, especially at Christ’s Passion. In order to enhance the experience, the texts contain detailed measurements of distances between sites, and topographical information such as the number of steps to be climbed. In a way, this pilgrimage was more real than an actual presence in Jerusalem. In the texts the likeness with the contemporary city was no longer important. The biblical city prevailed. The biblical scenes even gained relic-like importance.

Measurements and other specific physical features were also important in copies after the holy sites as they developed in Europe during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. With their translocation to other regions, monuments
marking biblical episodes were transformed into simulacra, enabling pilgrims to pursue their devotions to the holy places without having to travel to the Holy Land. Apart from a few sometimes rather randomly chosen characteristics, as a rule, exactitude in these reproductions was not an issue. Bram de Klerck’s contribution deals with this rich phenomenon in late-medieval and Renaissance Italy, focussing on the pilgrims’ sanctuary known as ‘Sacro Monte’ near Varallo in Piedmont. In chapels and their interior decorations, scenes of the Life and Passion of Christ were visualized in such a way that the visitor must have felt himself present at the episodes depicted. De Klerck confronts both style and function of the life-like, expressive decoration of the chapel of the Holy Sepulchre at Varallo, with Leon Battista Alberti’s renaissance-humanist ‘copy’ of Christ’s tomb, located in the Cappella Rucellai in the Church of San Pancrazio in Florence.

The counterpart of the city of the Old Testament and the historical Jerusalem is the New Jerusalem, envisioned in St John’s Apocalypse. This heavenly city is not real yet but is expected to become so at the end of time. Curator Daan Van Speybroeck examines two stained glass window representations of this apocalyptic city by the contemporary French artists Gérard Garrouste and Jean-Michel Alberola. Glass windows, being one of the most immaterial of forms in visual art, seem very apt to represent a heavenly situation. In the light of recent history, however, the connection between Jerusalem and heaven has become problematic. That is why Garrouste challenged the traditional configuration of Old and New Testament by placing Genesis on the dark north side of the church building and the Apocalypse on the sunlit south. In Alberola’s windows the conflict is stressed through the representation of the irreconcilability of the heavenly Jerusalem and biblical Babylon.

In the closing contribution Rudie van Leeuwen also deals with the New Jerusalem, this time to be established on earth. Two enterprises in performance and music are presented within a specific Jewish context. With his Medinat Weimar project the artist Ronen Eidelman plays with implicit sensitivities around Zionism and the fear of Jewish world dominion, when he propagates the ideal New Jerusalem in the historically ‘brown’ German state of Thuringia. He dislocates the public by this provocative proposition, of which it is not clear at first sight to what extent this is a serious enterprise. The Yiddish songs by for instance Daniel Kahn and the context of their performance, as well as references to Socialism, alienate the audience just like the work of Eidelman. Nowadays it is perhaps by these confusing projects, in which irony meets social criticism and an excruciating but still ongoing history meets a sense of humour, that we can reflect on our own attitude towards Jerusalem.
After all, it is in the nature of art to express complex concepts, to mediate between the ordinary and the unsaid, to oscillate between reality and imagination – always providing a provisional and single way out.

The Editors

Literature


*Jerusalem as Narrative Space/ Erzählraum Jerusalem*, ed. by Anette Hoffmann and Gerhard Wolf, Visualising the Middle Ages 6, Leiden 2012.


PART 1

Competing Memories and Contrasting Meanings
Introduction – Recollection

In Patches
CHAPTER I

Sites and Senses
Mapping Palestinian Territories in Mona Hatoum’s Sculpture Present Tense

Anneke Schulenberg

In April 1996, Mona Hatoum, a British artist of Palestinian origin, installed a work entitled Present Tense at the Anadiel Gallery in East Jerusalem, an area annexed by Israel in 1967 (Figs 1.1–1.2). On the floor of the gallery, Hatoum laid 2400 pieces of soap in a rectangular shape. The soap was Nablus soap, a traditional Palestinian product made of olive oil. Hatoum pressed tiny red glass beads in curved lines into the soap (Fig. 1.2). At first sight, the lines seem to make up abstract forms, but in fact they depict part of the occupied Palestinian territories that, as determined by the 1993 Oslo Accords, Israel should have handed back to the Palestinian authorities. Hatoum came across a map of these territories on the first day of her visit to Jerusalem. In Present Tense, she omitted the outlines of the map of Israel, only drawing the Palestinian territories: fragmented parcels of land, scattered across Israel, resembling an archipelago.

Present Tense was originally a site-specific sculpture as the work was made specifically for that exhibition in Jerusalem and was an immediate response to the site. By inscribing the map of the Oslo Accords on a local traditional product, Hatoum investigated the political, social and cultural dynamics at play within the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Drawing only the Palestinian territories in Israel on the soap, Hatoum focused on the Palestinian situation within the conflict. The context of the city of Jerusalem affected the meaning of the artwork, enhancing the political dimension. Jerusalem was and remains the core issue in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as it is claimed by both parties to be the capital of their states. Yet since the exhibition in Jerusalem, Present Tense has been displayed in several solo and group exhibitions, and was even acquired by
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1 The Anadiel Gallery is now called the Al-Ma’ham Foundation, and its aim is ‘to promote, instigate, disseminate and make art in Palestine’; “Al-Ma’hal Historical Background,” Al-Ma’hal Foundation for Contemporary Art, http://www.almamalfoundation.org/aboutus.php (accessed on 28 June 2012).
Figure 1.1  Mona Hatoum, Present Tense, 1996, soap and glass beads, 4.5 × 241 × 299 cm, installation at Anadiel Gallery, Jerusalem. Courtesy White Cube and Anadiel Gallery, Jerusalem.

Figure 1.2  Mona Hatoum, Present Tense (detail), 1996, soap and glass beads, 4.5 × 241 × 299 cm, installation at Anadiel Gallery, Jerusalem. Courtesy White Cube and Anadiel Gallery, Jerusalem.
Tate in 2013. The important relation between the work and its original site is now broken, which affects the meaning of the work.

With Present Tense, Hatoum not only explored the implications of the map for the Palestinians, but also set up a relationship between the work and the viewer. She constructs this relationship by adopting the aesthetic language of Minimal Art, more specifically its strategies to establish a relationship between the viewer and the artwork, in her case by activating the viewer’s olfactory organ through the smell of soap. Through this relationship, an interplay takes place between the political content of the work, the site and the viewer. Although the exhibition at the Anadiel Gallery included several of Hatoum’s works, this contribution focuses on how Hatoum, in her site-specific sculpture Present Tense – as installed in Jerusalem – sets up a physical encounter between artwork and viewer by stimulating the senses, in order to examine the socio-political implications for the Palestinians of the map of the Oslo Accords. I will end with a discussion of the consequences for the meaning of the work of reinstalling it in other places.

Mapping Palestinian Territories

When Hatoum, the daughter of Palestinian refugees, went to Jerusalem for her solo exhibition at the Anadiel Gallery, it was her first visit to the former homeland of her parents. In an interview with Michael Archer, Hatoum revealed how she felt about working in Jerusalem: ‘Going to Jerusalem was a very significant journey for me, because I had never been there. [...] Jack Persekian, who has this little gallery in East Jerusalem, and I had been discussing the possibility of doing the exhibition there for over two years. I kept postponing it because emotionally it’s a very heavy thing ...’

The visit to Jerusalem was of personal importance for Hatoum. She was born in 1952 in Beirut, Lebanon, but her family is originally from Haifa. When the Jewish militants bombed Haifa in 1948, the family fled to Beirut. While Hatoum was visiting London in 1975, the Lebanese civil war broke out. Expecting the conflict to last for a few days, maybe weeks, she planned to return to Beirut. As the problems lasted longer than she expected and the Beirut airport was closed for nine months, she was forced to stay in London. Hatoum decided to attend art school, first the Byam Shaw School of Art (1975–79), followed by the Slade School of Art (1979–81). After she finished art school, Hatoum

---

remained in London, where she currently still lives and works, although she has also had a studio in Berlin for several years.

When Hatoum finally decided to exhibit in Jerusalem, it seemed almost inevitable that the context of the city would play a role in the exhibition, not only because of her Palestinian background, but also because she often creates artworks in response to the context of the location of an exhibition. Before going to Jerusalem, Hatoum already had ideas for the gallery show, but never executed them when she arrived in the city: ‘The ideas I had proposed beforehand seemed to be about turning the gallery into a hostile environment, but the environment outside was already so hostile that people hardly needed reminding’. As mentioned earlier, on her first day in Jerusalem, Hatoum stumbled upon a map of the Oslo agreement. After some consideration she decided to make a sculpture based on it: ‘When I first came across [the map], I had no intention of using it, but a week later I decided I would like to do something with this local soap made from pure olive oil, and the work came together’. The hostility of the environment of Jerusalem also seems to have affected Hatoum’s choice of the red beads: ‘Originally I was going to draw the outline of the map by pushing nails into the soap, but it looked quite aggressive and sad. I ended up using little glass beads which I pressed into the soap’.

From ancient times onward, map-making has been tied to conquest. Maps are often used to affirm territorial claims, as is the case with the map from the Oslo Accords. In 1993, an attempt was made to resolve the ongoing conflict between Palestinians and Israelis. The government of Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) signed, after years of negotiations, the Oslo Accords, also called Oslo I, or, officially, the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements. In this agreement, the two parties decided that the Israeli army would withdraw from some parts of the West Bank and
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4 Hatoum interviewed by: Archer 1997, p. 26. According to Gannit Ankori, Hatoum’s visit to her homeland, or her going back ‘home’, as well as the ‘cosy’ atmosphere of the gallery, eventually inspired Hatoum to turn the space into ‘a symbolic home’. He claims that her use of the traditional soap alludes to the bathroom, arguing that other works in the exhibition can also be related to specific home spaces. In the sculptures No Way and No Way II, Hatoum placed bolts in the holes of two kitchen utensils – a colander and a strainer – turning them into strange objects normally kept in kitchens. On the second floor, Hatoum displayed a metal bed without a mattress called Lili (Stay) Put, as a reference to a bedroom. The bed was standing in the middle of the room, tied to the floor with transparent nylon threads, evoking, according to Ankori, ‘the conflict between displacement and rootedness’. See: Ankori 2006, pp. 141–43.


6 Hatoum interviewed by: Archer 1997, p. 27.

the Gaza Strip. Furthermore, a provisional Palestinian self-governance would be established, and Israel and Palestine would publicly recognize each other. A new series of negotiations, however, would have to be set up on issues such as the exact borders between Israeli and Palestinian territories, return of Palestinian refugees, Jewish settlements in the Occupied Territories, and the biggest problem of all, the future of Jerusalem.8

Present Tense not only examines a political map, but was also created especially for the exhibition in Jerusalem, and the context of the city frames the meaning of the work. Jerusalem has a long and complex history, but for the sake of this contribution, only the relevant events after 1948 will be expounded upon. The Anadiel Gallery, in which Present Tense was exhibited, was located in East Jerusalem. In 1948, East Jerusalem was occupied by Jordan, while Israel had captured West Jerusalem. One year before, however, in 1947, the General Assembly of the United Nations had agreed to make an international zone, including Jerusalem, that would be governed by a U.N. trusteeship council. Before this plan could be made operable, Jerusalem had already been divided between Israel and Jordan. Israel then claimed Jerusalem as its capital in 1950, going on to conquer East Jerusalem in 1967. According to the international community, Jerusalem’s situation remains undecided and, as such, it does not recognize Israel’s claim of Jerusalem as its capital. The capture of East Jerusalem in 1967 is also seen by the international community as illegal, and it treats East Jerusalem as Palestinian territory under military occupation by Israel. The Palestinians claim East Jerusalem as the capital of their future Palestinian state.9 Present Tense was thus created in a highly contested area in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Moreover, Present Tense was created in April 1996, only months after Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin was murdered. A few months before this murder, on 24 September 1995, the second part of the Oslo Accords, Oslo II, had been signed by Israel and the PLO. This second agreement gave the Palestinians self-governance in Bethlehem, Hebron, Jenin, Nablus, Qalqilya, Ramallah, Tulkarm, as well as in approximately 450 villages. On 28 September, Oslo II was ratified by Rabin and PLO chairman Yasser Arafat. Just over five weeks later, on 4 November 1995, Rabin was murdered by an Israeli opponent of the Oslo Accords. After this incident, the peace process began to fall apart and violent attacks by Islamic fundamentalists of Hamas led to a halt to negotiations with the Palestinians.10 Although Present Tense does not refer to these political events, they

---

8 Fischback 2000[a], p. 284.
10 Montefiore 2011, p. 507.
are likely to have framed the viewer’s experience of the work in the East Jerusalem gallery at that time.

The map which was drawn as a result of the 1993 Oslo Accords to indicate the future Palestinian territories in Israel, was the point of departure for Hatoum’s work. This map is a reflection of political ideas and serves military goals of controlling the territorial divisions, something Hatoum is well aware of: ‘[...] it was a map about dividing and controlling the area. At the first sign of trouble, Israel practises the policy of ‘closure’: they close all the passages between the areas so that the Arabs are completely isolated and paralyzed’. The division of the territories by the Oslo Accords has served as a form of surveillance of the Palestinians, the map representing power relations.

The topic of surveillance and control of human beings has been of interest to Hatoum ever since as a student she read the book *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison* by the French philosopher Michel Foucault. In this book Foucault argues that the disciplinary techniques used in prisons starting in the middle of the eighteenth century are a means of controlling people. One of the techniques Foucault describes is hierarchical observation. People can be made to behave in certain ways by merely observing them. Several architectural structures, such as watchtowers, are designed for observation and command over people, but Foucault was especially interested in Jeremy Bentham’s panopticon. The panopticon is a cylindrical construction with a small tower in the middle of a huge cupula. All the cells of the inmates are located around this tower against the wall of the cylinder. From the central tower, a guard can monitor each cell. The key to disciplining the prisoners is to make them believe they are under constant observation, even if they are not. Thus, inmates are controlled through surveillance, not only as a result of physical constraints. Foucault argued that through this threat of observation of the bodies that need to be controlled, institutions like prisons have moulded bodies into the correct form, creating so-called ‘docile bodies’. Docile bodies were ideal in a modern industrial society as they would also function in other disciplinary institutions, such as factories, military regiments, and schools.

Hatoum has made a number of artworks that deal with issues of control and surveillance, mainly in relation to institutional and architectural structures, for example *Light Sentence* (1992) (Fig. 1.3). For this work, Hatoum piled up wire mesh lockers and placed them in the middle of a dark room. Some of the locker doors are open. The vertical piles of lockers are connected to each other to
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11 Hatoum interviewed by: Archer 1997, p. 27.
12 Pieters 1997, s.p.
form a U-shape. In the middle of the U-shape a light bulb hangs from the ceiling. This light bulb slowly moves from the ceiling to the floor, touches the floor, and after slightly toppling over, slowly rises again. The light from the bulb falls on the lockers, casting shadows on the walls of the room. When the light bulb reaches the floor, the shadows begin to tremble. Visitors who enter the installation see their own shadows projected onto the wall, making them part of the installation, and are burdened with feelings of unease, or as Hatoum described it:

[...] [T]he movement of the light bulb causes the shadows of the wire mesh lockers to be in perpetual motion, which creates a very unsettling feeling. When you enter the space you have the impression that the whole room is swaying and you have the disturbing feeling that the ground is shifting under your feet. This is an environment in constant flux – no
single point of view, no solid frame of reference. There is a sense of instability and restlessness in the work.14

With the title Light Sentence, Hatoum steers the viewer’s interpretation towards ideas of confinement or imprisonment. The lockers, however, are perhaps also an allusion to other institutional structures, like schools or factories, where people can put their personal belongings in lockers before going to class or to work. As Foucault indicated, these institutions also discipline people, since they set norms – either through examination of students or job descriptions that determine their behaviour – which people have to adjust to. For Hatoum, Light Sentence refers to all instances where the built environment is designed to restrict personal freedom:

[...] I have now spent half of my life living in the West, so when I speak of works like Light Sentence, [...] as making a reference to some kind of institutional violence, I am speaking of encountering architectural and institutional structures in Western urban environments that are about the regimentation of individuals, fixing them in space and putting them under surveillance.15

Although Present Tense does not directly refer to structures of control, the divisions of territories in the Oslo Accords also fixed people to spaces in order to put them under surveillance. The map of the Oslo Accords shows how Palestinians were to be confined in small areas. Hatoum also refers to these restrictions: ‘[...] [T]he saddest thing in Jerusalem was the policy of ‘closure’ that restricted movement for the Arabs’.16 Also, the Palestinian Authority took over the task of policing the Palestinian population inside the territories, and quickly set up police and security forces. Israel, however, maintained control over the borders, airspace, labor, water and natural resources of the occupied territories. Israel also controlled the registration of the population, possessing the
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15 Hatoum interviewed by: Antoni 2002, pp. 117–19. Although Hatoum specifically relates institutional violence to Western urban environments, institutionalization is not a typical Western phenomenon. Hatoum perhaps relates institutionalization to Western environments, because – she has stated – it was in London that she for the first time became aware of such an institution: ‘The Slade [School of Fine Art] was my first encounter with a large institution, and the impersonal, bureaucratic machinery that constitutes the ‘institution’ was totally foreign to me. I was so much at odds with that environment that I started to examine the reasons why’. Hatoum interviewed by: Archer 1997, p. 10.
power to grant Palestinians residency, to change their residency status (for instance from Gaza to the West Bank), and to issue identity cards.\textsuperscript{17} Palestinians were also confronted with checkpoints, curfews, and road blocks that were used by the Israelis to restrict the movement of the Palestinians. Thus, Palestinians were not only confined to small areas, but ‘the institutionalized system of checkpoints, curfews, and closures introduced by Oslo led to ever-greater immobilization and paralysis ...’\textsuperscript{18}

In \textit{Present Tense}, Hatoum not only explores the confinement of people to restricted areas using military presence, but also utters a hope that the situation will change. The title \textit{Present Tense} is based on the grammatical term for the inflection of verbs to locate a situation in the present time, but it can also refer to a tense situation in the present. Hatoum has explained the title as follows: ‘The piece is called \textit{Present Tense}; it’s about the situation as it was then.’\textsuperscript{19} Hatoum’s reference in this quote to a specific situation at a specific time already hints at the fact that the territorial divisions are subject to change due to political conflicts. Hatoum has stated about \textit{Present Tense}, in reference to the transient nature of soap, that ‘it holds the promise [the soap] will dissolve one day and with it all these ridiculous borders.’\textsuperscript{20} Thus, the fragility and instability of the borders as well as Hatoum’s hope that the borders will dissolve is reflected in the nature of the material.

\textit{Present Tense} was the first of Hatoum’s works to deal with the issue of mapping and change. Many followed afterwards. According to Hatoum, maps ‘give [...] the allusion of a stable, measurable space. [My] works are more about mappings of precarious space with unstable boundaries and a shaky geography.’\textsuperscript{21} Three years after \textit{Present Tense}, Hatoum created another floor piece, called \textit{Map} (1999) (Fig. 1.4). On the floor of a museum, Hatoum laid out the continents of the world with glass marbles. In contrast to \textit{Present Tense}, in \textit{Map} no political borders of the nations on the continents are visible; only the outlines of the continents can be seen. The map is, however, fragile, because when viewers enter the room, their steps make the floor vibrate and the glass marbles roll out of place. Viewers can slip over the dispersed glass balls, expe-

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{makdisi2008} Makdisi 2008, pp. 84–85.
\bibitem{makdisi2008p} Makdisi 2008, p. 85.
\bibitem{hatoumi} Hatoum interviewed by: Archer 1997, p. 27. This statement by Hatoum is not completely correct. The 1993 Oslo Accords have never been fully executed as not all of the occupied territories were returned to the Palestinian Authority by Israel.
\end{thebibliography}
riencing the ground they walk on as unstable. Since in this work the borders are geographical rather than political, Hatoum destabilizes the surface which viewers walk upon to ‘expand the idea of a shaky ground to the entire earth’.22 Showing only geographical borders, Map is less politically charged than Present Tense.

**Symbolic Soap of the Homeland**

For Present Tense, Hatoum used a local material that is emotionally charged for Palestinians, traditional Palestinian Nablus soap. This soap is made in Nablus, a city north of Jerusalem, out of virgin olive oil, water and a sodium compound. The centuries-old production method takes several weeks. It is said that Palestinian women were already making the soap for household purposes more than one thousand years ago. The major soap industry in the city came into existence in the tenth century, and the soap was exported across the Arab world and Europe. The industry was at its height at the end of the nineteenth century with nearly 40 factories in existence. In the twentieth century, many

factories were destroyed through several natural disasters, such as the earthquake in 1927, and again after Israeli military invasions which began in 2000 at the start of the Second Intifada. Currently, only two factories remain active. The factory that produced ‘Al-Jamal’ soap, the brand Hatoum used, was destroyed by Israeli forces in 2002.

Nablus soap is thus inextricably connected to Palestinian cultural history and identity. Using this material for a sculpture in Jerusalem has political, cultural and emotional implications. For Hatoum, the soap functioned as a ‘symbol of resistance’. This symbolism might be interpreted as a resistance against oppression of Palestinians in general, but in relation to the map of the Oslo Accords imprinted on the soap, it is more a symbol of resistance against the absurdity of the borders determined by the agreement.

The soap not only functions as a symbolic sign with political connotations, but it has an additional, perhaps even more powerful, effect as the smell of the soap triggers recollection. In his book Swann’s Way, Remembrance of Things Past (1913), Marcel Proust described how penetrating smells can be, as did Patrick Süskind in his novel Perfume: The Story of a Murderer (1985). Although in Süskind’s novel, the main character Grenouille has extraordinary power to discern odours, which is of no importance in relation to Hatoum’s work, the fragment given below does show how a smell can produce a bodily response and how it can be relived at a later time:

Grenouille sat on the logs, his legs outstretched and his back leaned against the wall of the shed. He had closed his eyes and did not stir. He saw nothing, he heard nothing, he felt nothing. He only smelled the aroma of the wood rising up around him to be captured under the bonnet of the eaves. He drank in the aroma, he drowned in it, impregnating himself through his innermost pores, until he became wood himself; he lay on the cord of wood like a wooden puppet, like Pinocchio, as if dead, until after a long while, perhaps a half hour or more, he gagged up the word “wood.” He vomited the word up, as if he were filled with wood to his ears, as if buried in wood to his neck, as if his stomach, his gorge, his
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nose were spilling over with wood. And that brought him to himself, rescued him only moments before the overpowering presence of the wood, its aroma, was about to suffocate him. He shook himself, slid down off the logs, and tottered away as if on wooden legs. Days later he was still completely fuddled by the intense olfactory experience, and whenever the memory of it rose up too powerfully within him he would mutter imploringly, over and over, “wood, wood.”

The smell of the soap in *Present Tense* can similarly produce an embodied response in the viewer. *Present Tense* is Hatoum’s only olfactory artwork, and Hatoum has never explicitly said anything about the effect of smells on viewers. However, in an interview in 1997, after the installation of *Present Tense*, Hatoum explained the importance of experiencing her artworks through the senses:

> For me, the embodiment of an artwork is within the physical realm; the body is the axis of our perception, so how can art afford not [to] take that as a starting point? We relate to the world through our senses. You first experience an artwork physically. I like the work to operate on both sensual and intellectual levels. Meanings, connotations and associations come after the initial physical experience as your imagination, intellect, psyche are fired off by what you’ve seen.

For Hatoum, a bodily experience of her work through the senses is essential as, again in her own words, this experience ‘activate[s] a psychological and emotional response.’ Although most artworks primarily address the viewer’s sight in a direct way, the other senses – touch, hearing, smell and taste – can also play a role in engaging with artworks. Hatoum has also used sound in a couple of artworks to elicit emotional responses from the viewer, for instance in *Home* (1999) and *Current Disturbance* (1996).

In *Present Tense*, the smell of the Nablus soap pulls a viewer towards the work. As the material is a traditional Palestinian product, the smell can also evoke emotional responses to the work in Palestinians. Laura U. Marks has argued that smells activate emotions, and that individuals retain olfactory
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26 Süsskind 1985, p. 17.
29 For more information on the role of the non-visual senses in artworks, see: Art, History, and the Senses 2010.
memories longer than visual or auditory memories. They can evoke personal and nostalgic memories of, for instance, grandmother’s pie or mother’s perfume.\textsuperscript{30} Hatoum has indicated that Palestinian visitors of the exhibition immediately recognized the material and the smell.\textsuperscript{31} It is, however, difficult to determine which thoughts, memories, emotions or ideas the smell actually triggered in the viewers. Perhaps the smell recalled childhood experiences, or possibly – as a symbol of the Palestinian identity – functioned as a reminder of the Nakba\textsuperscript{32}, connecting it to the current Palestinian situation. Marks also points out that, for exiles, senses such as smell, taste and touch can be a reminder of the homeland, and especially a reminder of their separation from it.\textsuperscript{33} For the viewer’s of \textit{Present Tense} in 1996, the spread of the smell of the soap throughout the gallery in occupied East Jerusalem – for Palestinians an emotionally charged place – may not only have activated memories, but may also have intensified a longing for the homeland that was taken from them. This longing may have been accompanied by a feeling of sadness, because the homeland, as they knew it, no longer existed. The integration of the map of the Oslo Accords must have only enhanced that feeling, as it shows fragmented Palestinian territories. Hatoum activated the senses of Palestinian viewers with the scent of this work, which, along with the map of the Oslo Accords, may have caused a reliving of personal and cultural memories of Palestinian history and the loss of homeland.

The meaning of the smell of Nablus soap is, however, partially culturally determined.\textsuperscript{34} The smell of olive oil soap will only evoke memories in Palestinians, and only in those Palestinians who grew up with the smell. Viewers without a Palestinian background are likely not to be familiar with the specific scent. For these viewers, the smell of the soap perhaps only carries connotations of cleaning, and will conjure completely different thoughts, memories or emotions. The use of soap as a medium can also evoke a completely different reaction. An Israeli artist, for instance, asked Hatoum, after a lecture at the al-Wasiti Art Centre in East Jerusalem, if she was not aware that soap was connected with the Holocaust. During World War II, soap in the concentration

\begin{footnotesize}
\item[31] Hatoum interviewed by: Archer 1997, p. 27.
\item[32] Nakba is an Arabic term for catastrophe and refers to the events that took place in Palestine during and after 1948. Almost 80 percent of the Palestinians became refugees when, during the war, the state of Israel was established. For the Palestinians, this war was a ‘catastrophe’ as people were dispersed and their communal life was ended with violence, see: Abu-Lughod and Sa’di 2007, p. 3.
\item[33] Marks 2000, pp. 231–32.
\item[34] Classen 1993, pp. 1–11.
\end{footnotesize}
camps was manufactured from the human fat of the camp’s victims.\textsuperscript{35} Hatoum said about this reaction: ‘This couldn’t have been further from my thoughts.’\textsuperscript{36} Thus, viewers’ reactions to the smell of the soap, or to the soap itself, can be very diverse, and the intensity of the reaction may also differ from viewer to viewer. But whatever responses viewers might have, the smell of the soap will provoke a physical sensation and set up an interplay between the viewer and the sculpture.

\textbf{Minimalism and Material}

Although the smell of the soap causes a physical reaction in the viewer, Hatoum also aimed to provoke a bodily experience of the work in the viewer through the use of the artistic language of Minimal Art. The majority of Minimalists wanted to create a physical relationship between the artwork and the viewer. Hatoum’s placement of the blocks of soap in a grid on the floor is, however, especially reminiscent of the floor pieces by Minimal artist Carl Andre. For \textit{Magnesium Square} (1969), for example, Andre placed 144 plates of magnesium in a square flat on the floor (Fig. 1.5). The magnesium plates are unprocessed in part because Andre, like other Minimalists, aimed to make works that were not the expression of the artist’s emotions. To achieve this, Andre used prefabricated industrial materials, which he did not carve or model. Andre left the materials intact, and in \textit{Magnesium Square} simply placed the plates next to each other to create a square. As none of the magnesium plates has been given more importance than another within the serial structure, there is no internal hierarchy in the work. \textit{Magnesium Square} does not refer to anything outside the work, but only to its own structure and the materials. For Andre the material was essential. He aimed for a direct and sensual engagement of the viewer with the work’s physical and tactile qualities, such as the material’s solidity, weight, and color, which a viewer could experience literally by touching the material or by walking on the work.\textsuperscript{37}

The sculpture \textit{Present Tense} is not a work of Minimal art, but Hatoum employs the minimalist language to set up a relation between artwork and viewer. Before discussing Hatoum’s use of the minimalist language in \textit{Present Tense}, this contribution expands on her ideas on a physical interaction between viewers and her artworks in general, as it provides a better understanding of how

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{35} Persekian 2013, s.p.
\textsuperscript{36} Hatoum interviewed by: Archer 1997, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{37} Gieskes 2006, p. 18.
\end{footnotes}
important this relationship has been for her since the late 1980s. Hatoum’s early work in the 1980s consisted of performances and video art, in which she often explicitly referred to events in the Middle East. After a few years, Hatoum felt that these works were too didactic, and she switched to installation art and sculptures. This switch in mediums also entailed a switch in her approach to the viewer, as she has explained: ‘What changed is that instead of me delivering a message to the audience through my actions as a performer, I decided to set up situations where viewers could experience for themselves feelings of danger, threat, instability and uncertainty through the physical interaction with the work’.

The first of Hatoum’s works to establish a physical relationship between the viewer and the work was the installation The Light at the End (1989) (Fig. 1.6). Originally made for the Showroom, a gallery in East London, Hatoum placed six vertical electric heating elements in a steel frame in the corner of a room. The walls of the gallery were painted the color of dried blood and the room was
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completely dark.\footnote{According to Brett, the room was even darker than it appears on the photographs, see: Brett 1997, p. 60.} Standing at a distance, the viewer was attracted by the beauty of the six red lines, but when approaching the work, the heat – another bodily sensation – became uncomfortable and at a certain point even threatening. As Hatoum states: ‘The associations with imprisonment, torture and pain were suggested by the physical aspect of the work and the phenomenology of the materials used’.\footnote{Hatoum interviewed by: Archer 1997, p. 17.} Hatoum established a physical relationship between the viewer and the work, so that through her work the viewer might experience feelings of threat, danger and fear.

*The Light at the End* and *Present Tense* both make use of a sensory experience to pull the viewer towards the work and arouse strong associative emotional responses. For both works, Hatoum used the minimalist aesthetic language. Hatoum started to use the minimalist language in 1989, when the physical interaction between viewer and artwork became important to her.
She has stated: ‘I liked the minimal aesthetic because of the economy of form and the emphasis on the material reality of the work. At the time, it felt important to use the language of minimalism but also to fill it with signs that refer to the world outside, as opposed to keeping it non-referential.’

Although in this comment, Hatoum does not specifically refer to minimalists’ preoccupation with the viewer’s physical encounter with an artwork, Hatoum’s appropriation of the minimalist aesthetic language in Present Tense contributes to a phenomenological experience and understanding of the work. As it is beyond the reach of this contribution to delve into the minimalists’ theories on the viewer’s bodily engagement, the following will be restricted to Andre’s floor pieces, such as 144 Magnesium Square, which is similar to Present Tense on several levels. In his book The Sculptural Imagination. Figurative, Modernist, Minimalist, Alex Potts describes how a viewer’s engagement with Andre’s floor pieces differs from an interaction with a traditional sculpture. Andre’s 144 Magnesium Square has no frontal view from which the sculpture is to be seen, so there is no fixed viewpoint. According to Potts, this lack of a singular viewpoint ‘forces one to engage with the work at a kinaesthetic as well as purely visual level’. The work can be viewed from all sides, even from above. The viewer is invited to walk around, and even on, the work to experience the sculpture and its material.

As previously stated, for Andre, a direct engagement of the viewer with the physical and tactile qualities of his work is essential. He has written: ‘[...] [T]he tendency of my work is to engage the participant in a more physical, tactile experience’. Although the viewer can have a tactile experience of the material used by Andre by walking on the work and touching the plates, they cannot experience the weight of the material, as they are not allowed to pick up the plates. According to Potts, this tactile experience of the work can only be experienced by the viewer through ‘imaginative identification’. The viewer has to imagine how the artist laid down the plates and feels the substance and mass

42 Potts 2000, p. 313.
43 Potts also states that a complex dynamic arises between the encounter of the verticality of the viewer’s body and the horizontality of the work, as it creates a tension between the two. The effect of this tension is an increased awareness of one’s verticality and the horizontality of the floor piece, see: Potts 2000, p. 320.
44 Andre quoted in: Gieskes 2006, p. 76.
45 Potts 2000, p. 321. According to Potts, viewers are never allowed to touch the plates of Andre’s work. Potts seems to rest his statement on a leaflet that was handed out at an exhibition on Andre’s sculptures in 1996 at the Museum of Art in Oxford, which stated that viewers should not touch the works. This seems inconsistent with Andre’s ideas on
of the material. Potts states that Andre was also fascinated by this internalized tactile experience before realizing the actual piece, when the artist laid down the work in his mind. As Andre claimed:

I do not visualize works and I do not draw works and the only sense I have running through my mind of the work is almost a physical lifting of it. I can almost feel the weight of it and something running through my mind either has the right weight or it doesn’t.46

According to Potts, the viewer can share the artist’s internalized tactile experience. Walking around and on the work, the viewer can imagine how the artist had a tactile experience with the material, just as a viewer can imagine how a sculptor carved a figure out of wood or marble, or molded clay.47

A viewer engaging with Hatoum’s work Present Tense might have a similar tactile and bodily experience as a viewer of Andre’s work. Similarly to a viewer’s engagement with Andre’s floor sculpture, the viewer can walk around Hatoum’s sculpture Present Tense to experience the work from different perspectives. Although the viewer cannot walk on the work, nor touch its material, the viewer can also have an internalized tactile experience with the soap. The viewer can imagine touching the material and feeling its substance, or can imagine how Hatoum pressed the beads into the soap. Together with the smell of the soap, this internalized touching of the material enhances the engagement of the viewer with the work, and perhaps also the emotional response of Palestinian viewers. By drawing a political map on the soap, Hatoum relates the soap to a political reality, and establishes a sensual as well as political engagement with the work for the viewer. This is different from Carl Andre’s work, which does not explicitly refer to politics, even if the artist’s political convictions in part determined the structure, materials, and form of his work.48

Within the politically charged context of Jerusalem, Hatoum uses the minimalist aesthetic language to emphasize the material and to set up a relationship between the viewer and the artwork, to make the viewer aware of their own body in relation to the site and to engage the viewer on a physical level with the political content of the work.

---

47 Potts 2000, p. 321.
Reinstallations of *Present Tense*

As *Present Tense* was shown at, and made explicitly for, an exhibition in Jerusalem, the context of the city affects the work. Hatoum, however, reinstalled the work several times, for instance for her solo exhibition *Present Tense: Mona Hatoum* at the Parasol Unit, Foundation for Contemporary Art in London in 2008; at the group exhibition *Disorientation II: The Rise and Fall of Arab Cities* at Abu Dhabi Art in 2009–2010; and at a solo exhibition at Arter in Istanbul in 2012. In 2013, as already mentioned, the original work from 1996 was acquired by the Tate, and is now part of their permanent collection.\(^49\) When a site-specific work is moved to another place, the replacement affects the meaning and interpretation of the work.\(^50\) The site at which the work is made informs it, and is therefore part of the interpretation. With a relocation, the relationship between work and site is broken, and as a result the meaning of the work shifts.

*Present Tense* is no longer exhibited in the highly charged political context of Jerusalem, but the work never entirely loses its political content. That is partly due to Hatoum’s use of the political map of the Oslo Accords, but also because visitors to the later exhibitions are given information about the background of the sculpture. The meaning of *Present Tense* now differs from exhibition to exhibition. In the context of the exhibition in Istanbul, the meaning of *Present Tense* was framed in relation to other works in Hatoum’s oeuvre, with their recurring themes of war, conflict and borders. Within the group exhibition *Disorientation II: The Rise and Fall of Arab Cities*, Hatoum’s sculpture obtained its meaning through the context of the subject of the exhibition. This exhibition showed the work of Arab artists who examined issues of conflicts, war and displacement in their work after the utopian vision of the pan-Arab unity failed in the 1970s.\(^51\)

The question may arise, however, whether the reinstallation and conservation of *Present Tense* is desirable, as the sculpture loses a major part of its

---

\(^{49}\) As *Present Tense* has not been on display yet at the Tate, it is unknown in what context it will be exhibited and what it will mean for the notion of ‘site-specificity’.

\(^{50}\) Kaye 2000, pp. 1–2.

social, cultural and political implications in these new and different contexts. For instance, the present author saw the sculpture at Hatoum’s solo exhibition in Istanbul in 2012, along with 29 other artworks by Hatoum from the 1990s until the present years. Although, as said before, Present Tense does not lose its political content entirely in new contexts, the work does lose its ‘sharp edges’. This is probably enhanced by the fact that the soap was already 16 years old: the smell was gone! In a video from 2011 that is made available on YouTube, Hatoum says that she is also remaking the work, because of the brown stains on the soap: ‘At the time [of the making of Present Tense], we didn’t think about conservation very much, so it is all drying out, shrinking, and going brown. So now what we are doing with the fresh soap is that we are covering it with liquitex to seal the moisture in, so that hopefully it will stay like this’.52 Because of the liquitex, the material will stay intact, but the work will no longer have its characteristic smell.

Apparently, the shift in the meaning of Present Tense due to a recontextualization and the loss of smell are not problems for Hatoum. What is also striking is that these reinstallations, the conservation, and remaking of the sculpture disregard an important dimension of the original work: the implications of the transient nature of soap, which in its dissolving process also dissolved the borders within the work. The reinstallations as well as the new version of the work thus show that the recontextualization and conservation of Present Tense has consequences for the meaning of the work, which was originally linked to a particular site, to Jerusalem.
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CHAPTER 2

The Green Line
Potency, Absurdity, and Disruption of Dichotomy in Francis Alÿs’s Intervention in Jerusalem

Mette Gieskes

Jerusalem is one of the places where the personal concerns of artist Francis Alÿs (Antwerp, 1959) have coincided with local circumstances. Like many other artists in today’s age of globalization and biennial culture, Alÿs travels the world like a nomad, creating his artworks – or ‘interventions’, as he calls them – in response to the places he visits, often situations of societal and economic crisis or political impasse. Not infrequently, his interventions, in the artist’s own words, ‘hit a nerve’ in the local community and beyond, usually when his own preoccupations ‘meet’ the situation he encounters with a fruitful ‘clash’.  
The confrontation between Alÿs’s narrative and Jerusalem, which took place on the fourth and fifth of June 2004, received the title The Green Line: Sometimes doing something poetic can become political, and sometimes doing something political can become poetic. For this piece, which has also been referred to as Walk through Jerusalem, Alÿs walked through what he has identified as the archetypal city of conflict with a pierced can of green paint in his hand, creating a line that traced his journey (Fig. 2.1). The artist’s route roughly followed the section within Jerusalem of the armistice demarcation line that has separated the Israeli and Palestinian communities since the end of Israel’s War of Independence in 1948: a contested border that was internationally ratified under UN supervision in 1949, and has therefore been dubbed ‘the 1949 armistice line’, but lost official boundary status in 1967 (Fig. 2.2).

Both concept and structure of The Green Line are markedly simple, yet the work evokes a complex network of associations, regarding the history, present, and future of Jerusalem as well as themes prevalent in much contemporary art, including Alÿs’s own work. The work first and foremost inspires reflection on the contemporary status of the 1949 armistice line Alÿs partially traced 56 years after its institution in 1948. The line has been viewed both as an undesirable, arbitrary source of conflict and division and – contrarily – as a relatively

1 From: Francis Alÿs, A Story of Deception 2010, p. 35.
flexible and unimposing, yet, according to some, much needed boundary between Palestinians and Israelis; one that is much preferable to the relentless, mammoth separation walls built under the aegis of Ariel Sharon some 55 years later; one that may contain the only promise of future peace. Besides rekindling the memory of what can be seen as the source of the separation of Israelis and Palestinians and triggering consideration of the contested past and prospects of Jerusalem, *The Green Line* also relates to the artist’s own oeuvre, which he conceives of as a narrative that is constructed by the episodes that are his works.3

Many of the chapters of Alÿs’s fiction, like the episode of *The Green Line*, are set in a particular site which the artist, so to speak, has imported into his fiction, and zoom in on the specific circumstances of that site.4 Yet, in spite of the site-specificity and uniqueness of each of the episodes, several themes can be detected that since the 1990s have recurred in the multiple episodes that make
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FIGURE 2.2  Francis Alÿs, The Green Line, Jerusalem 2004, Ephemera. COURTESY DAVID ZWIRNER, NEW YORK/LONDON.
up the weaving of Alýs’s personal narrative, including the episode set in Jerusalem. Among these themes are the relation between art and politics, social practices and structures that acquire sculptural shape, Western modern hegemonic structures of control as well as informal practices that exist in spite of the predominance of such structures (e.g. bartering, drug trafficking, and artist’s strolls), and, more specifically, the repercussions of border regulations. Other themes recurring in Alýs’s narrative, not so much manifest in The Green Line, are the deceptive myth of progress that defines the capitalist project, the overvaluation of efficiency, and informal labor. From the beginning, Alýs’s narrative has moreover given a central place to the Greek notion of the polis as a place of conflicts ‘whence the materials to create fictions, art and urban myths are extracted’. It seems that Alýs’s journey through sites that offer new material and dimensions to his narrative – often sites that show the pitfalls of modern systems of control – was bound to lead him to Jerusalem, the city Israeli and Palestinians both see as the political and administrative center of their respective territories. It had previously taken him to places like Mexico City, Tijuana, and Lima, and would later lead him to Havana and Kabul.

This paper will consider how The Green Line fits into the narrative of Alýs’s oeuvre and through which mechanisms it was able to hit a nerve locally as well as globally. Did the work, which seems to call attention to the artificiality and absurdity of borders, emerge from a hope that art can provide a way out of impasse, that art is capable of affecting politics, as the subtitle suggests? Given that in Alýs’s works, structure and shape tend to be analogues for social situations and practices, what can be made of the simple shape of the line? Having its origins in a can of paint, held by an artist, the line Alýs left behind during his walk through Jerusalem seems to refer to one of the most basic elements of art – the artist’s mark – yet here this essential feature of art appears in a public site of political conflict. Like its location, the line’s horizontality and temporality have implications as well. In all its simplicity and specificity, this line seems to be pregnant with meaning. This paper will discuss the green line in Alýs’s Walk through Jerusalem as the locus where various kinds of dialectics meet and are dissolved, incarnating both simplicity and complexity, separation and linkage, inflexibility and fluidity, arbitrariness and purpose, irony and seriousness, and art and politics. At the end, discussions of the various types of dialectics embodied in Alýs’s protean line will bring out the paradox in Alýs’s use of a line, the most concrete manifestation of the idea of borders, to defy and contest boundaries, including also those between the local and the global, representation and abstraction, life and art, and conflict and solution.

---
The Green Line: Source of Conflict and Conciliation

Alýs’s action in Jerusalem was recorded on video by filmmaker Julien Devaux, while the artist walked and traced a line of about 24 kilometers through various neighborhoods, roads, and uninhabited lots of land, walking past several barriers and security control posts that restrict the movement of the city’s inhabitants, primarily Palestinians. At various intervals, the artist stopped to refill the can in order to ensure that the line was continuous, using a total of 58 liters of green vinyl paint. The ensuing video is engineered in such a way that the refilling is not shown. What is remarkable about the footage on the video is that few bystanders react to the artist’s activity, including the guards at the security check points, possibly because the presence of the camera set Alýs’s action off as an extraordinary, singular event with a destination beyond the immediate surroundings, paradoxically neutralizing its immediate effects.

Although the video survived as a document of Alýs’s walk, it should also be seen as an integral part of the work, which was first put on view at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem in 2005, and in 2007 at the David Zwirner Gallery in New York. In both Jerusalem and New York, it was shown as part of an exhibition that carried the name of the subtitle of the work: Sometimes doing something poetic can become political, and sometimes doing something political can become poetic, a qualified yet still hopeful statement that can be seen as the leading maxim of many of Alýs’s works. In the David Zwirner gallery, not only a projection of the film was shown, but also archival material about the Green Line, paraphernalia, sculptures by the name of camguns – hybrids between camera’s and machine guns – and paintings of various places in and around Jerusalem, such as Jerusalem E., Baqe, Bazra and Untitled (2004), which the artist created while he was working on The Green Line (Fig. 2.3). Eleven interviews the artist conducted in October 2004 with various distinguished people – mostly Israeli and Palestinians – while they watched an excerpt of the recorded walk were also made available in the exhibition space, on computers with headphones. These interviews, some of which can now be accessed through the artist’s website, gave visitors to the gallery a sense of the variety of
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7 Alýs 2007, s.p.
views on the situation in the Middle East, particularly with regard to the status of the 1949 armistice line, and on the power and limits of art in such situations of conflict, though most of the interviewees seem to have been partial to the Palestinians.9

What gave Alyś’s walk through Jerusalem an extra charge and provoked much commentary was of course the fact that his route was determined by the Green Line that Lt Colonel Moshe Dayan, military commander of the Israeli forces in the region of Jerusalem towards the end of Israel’s 1948–49 War of Independence, had drawn with green wax pencil on a map by the scale of 1:25,000 on the 30th of November, 1948, the year of the end of the British/United Nations Mandate of Palestine and the proclamation of the State of Israel.10

---


10 Most sources on Alys mention a scale of 1:20,000, probably based on Meron Benvenisti, whose book Alyś himself cites in the video. See: Benvenisti 1996, p. 57. Newman, however,
The line was approximately 310 kilometers in length, starting at the northern section of the Jordan Valley and ending in the Dead Sea at the median line between Israel and Jordan, officially separating Israel from the West Bank, from 1948 until 1967. Dayan had plotted the line on the basis of the position of the Israeli and Arab armies at the time of the armistice that marked the end of the Arab-Israeli war, to mark the land that was to be controlled by Israel. Lt Colonel Abdullah al-Tal, the Jordanian commander representing the Arab forces in the Jerusalem region, marked the boundaries of the areas under Jordan control with red pencil. The two lines converged in most places, but failed to do so at some sites, areas that were to become demilitarized buffer zones, widely known as ‘no-man’s land’. The line was hence, as is not uncommon with borders, a product of both conflict and attempts at resolution and reconciliation.

The line settled upon in 1948 was, with some adjustments, internationally recognized in 1949 as the provisional eastern border of Israel in the Rhodes Armistice Agreements, also signed by the neighboring countries Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan, and Syria. David Newman gives an overview of the changes made in the 1949 agreements, which slightly altered the course of the demarcation line of 1948. Many of the changes were determined by Israel’s desire to maintain control over main roads and railways and, less, by the needs of the local population. The 1949 armistice line was, as a result, more curved in some places than the line drawn by Dayan in 1948. Within Jerusalem, the most southern point of the line is near Ramat Rachel and its most northern point is in the proximity of Givat HaMivtar. According to Meron Benvenisti, whose 1996 book City of Stone: The Hidden History of Jerusalem Alÿs excerpted in his
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11 Newman 1995, pp. 3–8. From 1950 until 1988, residents of the West Bank were Jordanian citizens. Hanson Bourke, p. 18. Jordan did not give up its rights to the West Bank when Israel conquered it in 1967. In 1988, however, Jordan recognized the state of Palestine when Palestinians declared independence.

12 Eg. the area between the villages Katana and Budrus, just north of Jerusalem. Newman 1995, p. 8.


video, the width of the actual, coarse pencil marks, approximately three to four millimeters on the map, in reality covered an area of 60 to 80 meters. Benvenisti writes: ‘These vast buffer zones quickly became empty “no man’s lands” prohibited to both sides, scarring the heart of Jerusalem’. Newman has also remarked that the area along the boundary line, which was situated in the city core, remained undeveloped, especially the no man’s land that between 1948 and 1967 was the only border crossing along the 310-kilometer Green Line, with a width that at places reached hundreds of meters. After 1980, when Israel officially declared Jerusalem as physically united, parks and residential areas were established in previous frontier zones, but much land is still undeveloped. Alÿs’s video documents this uncultivated land: a viewer unaware of the location of the artist’s walk may well suspect at times that Alÿs was walking through the countryside rather than through a legendary city.

As the armistice line was not officially marked on the actual land, partly because it was not meant to be a permanent border but rather a temporary boundary separating two communities into ethnically homogeneous territories, it did not have as obvious an effect as it might have had under other circumstances, but the experience of division, both physically and mentally, has been real since 1948. Newman has observed that the line remained ‘strongly imprinted on the mental images of Israelis, Palestinians, and the International Community as constituting the territorial demarcator between two people and their respective territories’. As the years went by, both Israelis and Jordanians built wire fences and patrol roads, and mined border areas along and near the Green Line to mark the line and to enhance security. In 1953, Border Guards were established. People living along the line on both sides have lived in fear of aggression. Even if the Green Line has no longer had any real political bearing since 1967, when Israel expanded its territory during the Six-Day War and has since then blurred and shifted the line through building activities and expansion drift, the division of 1948 is still manifested in Jerusalem’s layout and
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its inhabitants’ daily lives, continuing to separate the East from the West.\textsuperscript{21} It still marks an internal boundary, between the land administered by Israel and the surrounding territories that Israel occupied following the Six-Day War of 1967: the West Bank and the Gaza strip.\textsuperscript{22} The \textit{de facto} preservation of an officially revoked boundary has been deliberately secured by Israel in various ways. As Newman has pointed out, Israel has, for instance, minimized economic contact between the West Bank and land west of the former Green Line, protecting the Israeli economy by preventing cheap products from crossing the line. He describes this Israeli strategy as a symptom of the paradox that Israel opened the boundary yet at the same time inhibited movement of goods and people across the line, therewith in effect perpetuating the line and closing the boundary that was officially open.\textsuperscript{23}

Although the Green Line that Dayan had drawn was contested since its inception, after 1967 the question arose if Israel should not again recede to the 1948 line, which may have been all but ideal for Palestinians, but was much more favorable for them than the situation that arose in 1967, when Israel started to disregard borders, confiscating land that according to the 1949 negotiations did not belong to it, and – after 1967 – founding settlements in the West Bank and constructing various types of infrastructure.\textsuperscript{24} After the 1967 War, Israel actually instituted a law annexing East Jerusalem to its own territory. Since then, highly segregated Jewish residential neighborhoods have been founded in the eastern part of the city, located in such a way that a potential future repartitioning of Jerusalem into a Jewish West and a Palestinian East has become close to impossible, unless the settlers are evacuated.\textsuperscript{25} Eyal Weizman, who has written about the ‘spatial politics’ of Jerusalem, has pointed out that the line is shown on most Palestinian and international maps, but on few official Israeli ones, suggesting that Israel would happily erase the memory of the once official status of the line.\textsuperscript{26} Some argue that the Green Line should again


\textsuperscript{22} Hanson Bourke, pp. 17–20. The Golan Heights is also internationally considered occupied territory, but in 1981 the Knesset extended Israeli administration, jurisdiction, and legislation to the area.


\textsuperscript{25} Newman 1995, pp. 40–41.

\textsuperscript{26} Weizman in Francis Aly, A Story of Deception 2010, p. 175. Weizman is not alone in pointing out that Israel benefits from covering up the history of the green line. Peace Now, an activist non-governmental organization that advocates a two-state solution to the conflict between Israel and Palestinians, has argued that the so-called ‘infitada bypass’ roads.
serve as a starting point of negotiations, as it was in the early 1990s. Fatah, for instance, sees the line as a potential future border of a Palestinian state, but most members of Hamas are not open to this. The paradoxical situation has arisen that a line that once propelled and in memory still embodies conflict, may at the same time offer a solution that would not be perfect, but that would at least end the current impasse.

Porous Lines, Intrusive Walls

The question arises whether Alýs’s action, by reinserting the Green Line in Jerusalem, a city of division that in 1980 was, however, declared by the Knesset the ‘complete and united’ capital of Israel, advocated a return to the situation before 1967. The appealing unobtrusiveness, relative fluidity and even horizontality of Alýs’s line could indeed be interpreted as expressing a positive nod to what are often called the ‘pre-1967 borders’, which were much more flexible, immaterial, and abstract, than the literally and physically segregating, concrete and dominantly vertical security barriers that Israel has constructed in various cities since 2002, following attacks of Arabic suicide terrorists during the second Intifada. These separation barriers, often dubbed ‘apartheid walls’ by Palestinians, are to reach a length of more than 420 miles long, consisting of concrete walls as tall as 26 feet within areas of Jerusalem. Its locations are controversial, to say the least: as estimated in 2011, after completion of the barrier, which departs in many places from the route of the Green Line, 9.5% of the West Bank is estimated to be situated on the western side, 85% of the barrier being located in the West Bank. Such massive separation walls appear on

Israel has built to connect the settlements to the main Israeli land, all in the name of increase of security for Israel, were meant ‘to create for their users the illusion that the Green Line has disappeared and that there is no Arab population in the area’. See: http://www.fmep.org/reports/archive/vol.-5/no.-3/new-roads-create-an-asphalt-revolution (accessed October 2010). Cf. Newman 1995, p. 14. Hanson Bourke argues that most Palestinian maps do not show the Green Line either. Hanson Bourke, p. 47.


28 Hanson Bourke, pp. 46, 64.

some of the paintings Alÿs made in Jerusalem while working on The Green Line and are also the subject of a series of paintings of Marlene Dumas, which were shown at the David Zwirner Gallery in 2010 in the exhibition Against the Wall (Fig. 2.4).

When comparing the uncompromising, almost threatening walls that appear in these paintings to Alÿs’s green line, the latter appears especially non-intrusive, emphasizing the merits of the status the Green Line had had prior to 1967: comparatively few gates or walls were erected on the actual land to mark the provisional armistice line, as a result of which the boundary was relatively easily passed and adjusted, even if the 1949 line did lead to economic and settlement dislocation, cut off people – mainly Palestinians – from fertile fields, houses, and places of employment, and severed eighty villages from parts of their land.30 Alÿs’s paintings Bagh and Bazra (2004), and – more emphatically so – Dumas’s Figure in a Landscape (2010) and The Wall (2009), on the other hand present the depicted walls as vertical, imposing structures that obstruct both view and movement.31 Like Alÿs’s individual works, which often respond to a particular socio-political situation yet are intrinsically woven into the fabric of the artist’s narrative, Dumas’s paintings from the Against the Wall series
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31 See: Against the Wall. Marlene Dumas 2010.
correspond to the personal narrative of the South African-Dutch artist, whose work is rooted in the experience of Apartheid. Many of Dumas’s paintings concern segregation, oppression, and humanity’s failure to coexist. Her paintings from the above-named series are the first in her oeuvre that provide a criticism of this failure by means of a representation of architecture: oppressive constructions that determine and restrict people’s lives in a very literal way. The Wall, based on a newspaper photograph, depicts a group of Orthodox Jewish men in front of a wall that could be interpreted as the Wailing Wall in Jerusalem but which is actually an Israeli security fence near Bethlehem. Viewers of Wall Wailing and Wall Weeping, two other paintings from the Against the Wall series, are also likely to interpret the depicted walls as the Wailing Wall, but the people pressed against the wall actually depict Palestinians who in 1967 were searched by Israelis in a raid in Jerusalem.

In considering the disjunction between the transience, horizontality, and fragility of the Green Line on the one hand and the permanence, verticality, and massiveness of the security wall on the other, it is useful to refer to a small publication of the Henry Moore Institute in Leeds of 2008 that accompanied the exhibition The Object Quality of the Problem (On the Space of Palestine/Israel), which reflects on the Palestine/Israel conflict in spatial terms. In this catalogue, which also includes a short entry on Alÿs’s The Green Line, writer Adania Shibli explains that she is unwilling to view Palestine as a ‘territory’, a term that to her ‘suggests borders’. While ‘the occupier/colonizer’ has turned the land into territory by ‘cutting’ space that was once unmarked and ‘continuous’, Palestinians still attempt to experience the space as a porous ‘space of flows’. In another contribution to the same catalogue, Eyal Weizman’s ‘Politics of Verticality’ – a section from Hollow Land – Israel’s Architecture of Occupation (2007) – this space of flows is characterized as ‘indivisible territory’. Weizman argues, following Ron Pandak, one of the main masterminds of the

32 See: ”Against the Wall” by Marlene Dumas opens at Serralves Museum’ 2010.
33 ”Against the Wall” by Marlene Dumas opens at Serralves Museum’ 2010.
34 The project The Object Quality of the Problem (On the Space of Palestine/Israel) started by asking the question of whether sculptural thinking can help ‘understand another place, and other spatial experiences, as lived elsewhere, in our own time’. The Object Quality of the Problem 2008, p. 8.
35 The Object Quality of the Problem 2008, p. 10. Since the First Intifada (1987–1991/1993), regulations for Palestinians from the Occupied Territories like the West Bank traveling to Israel for (temporary) employment have been much stricter than before: workers are issued identity cards that have to be shown at check posts and road blocks established along what used to be the Green Line. Newman 1995, p. 14.
Oslo Process of 1993, that the only feasible way to divide this single, indivisible territory is a three-dimensional matrix of roads and tunnels. Weizman mentions that President Bill Clinton's 2000 plan for the partitioning of Jerusalem proposed that all sections of Jerusalem occupied by Jews were to become Israeli, while all sections inhabited by Palestinians were to constitute the Palestinian State. Sixty-four kilometers of walls ‘would have fragmented the city into two archipelago systems along national lines. Forty bridges and tunnels would have accordingly woven together these isolated neighborhood-enclaves’.37 Various buildings in the Old City would have been split along vertical lines between Israelis and Palestinians, with the lower floors occupied by Jews and the upper floors inhabited by Muslims. Although this three-dimensional plan may seem doomed for failure, it reflected a real ‘political space’, desperately struggling to ‘separate the inseparable’.38 It moreover was in fact not much more than an extension of the actual situation: Weizman points out that Palestinian militants have been circumventing Israeli barriers in three dimensions, digging tunnels and launching rockets through the air, while the existing Israeli infrastructure, with its elevated bypass roads, viaducts, and tunnels, has also already taken three-dimensional form.

**Artificial Borders and Absurdity**

Although considerations of ‘technologies of domination’39 like solid walls may make an interpretation of Alÿs’s appealingly non-intrusive and modest line as an attempt to point out the benefits of the 1949 armistice line plausible, various other qualities of the work speak against it: the line’s emphatic ephemerality could also be interpreted as an expression of partiality to disappearance, and concomitantly a preference for unification over the segregation that would persist with an official reinstatement of the Green Line. Moreover, Alÿs’s line, which – as noted above – cuts through neighborhoods, not taking the slightest notice of the daily routines of inhabitants of Jerusalem, seems to be a parody of the callous way in which Dayan had cut a line on the surface of the map, that abstracted representation, not considering the way the actual space was used by either Israelis or Palestinians. Even if, as noted earlier, the 1949 lines were somewhat adjusted to the reality of the lives of the land’s inhabitants, the armistice agreements of 1949, Brawer and Newman have observed, still discounted the ‘physical and human geographical features’ along the full length of the
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37 The Object Quality of the Problem 2008, pp. 41–42.
38 Weizman in: The Object Quality of the Problem 2008, p. 43.
39 Weizman in: The Object Quality of the Problem 2008, p. 44.
boundary, also ignoring land usage like the centuries-old pastures of the Bedouin population. The parodic nature of Alýs’s *The Green Line*, which accentuates the fact that this highly influential boundary is in fact relatively unrecognizable on the actual ground, gives viewers the sense that the work first and foremost demonstrates the artificiality and absurdity of the Green Line, and perhaps even of borders in general. Indeed, one of the themes that returns in various episodes of Alýs’s narrative is the idea that all order and divisions, for instance in the form of borders, are enforced onto a changeable and continuous world.

The absurdity and artificiality of border politics is perhaps most saliently revealed in *The Loop* (1997), in which Alýs took one month and five days to travel from Tijuana, Mexico, to San Diego, crossing through Central and South America, the Pacific Rim, China, Russia, Canada, and the United States. Avoiding the border between Mexico and the United States, the artist not only reversed the modern ideal of minimum effort, maximum result (for Alýs an earmark of economic logic), but also mockingly contrasted the obstacles migrant workers face when attempting to cross borders to the unreflective ease and naturalness with which artists and other art world denizens nowadays travel the world from one biennial or triennial to another. With regard to a later work, *Don’t Cross the Bridge Before You Get to the River* (*working title*) (2008), Alýs has said that the ‘contradiction of our times’ is: ‘how can we live in a global economy and be refused free global flow?’ For this work, Alýs instructed one line of children with toy boats in the Strait of Gibraltar to leave Spain in the direction of Morocco and another one to wade towards Spain from Morocco, with the imaginary intention of meeting at the horizon. Both of these works resist the stagnation of flow and continuity, caused by the economic system, political control, and fear of ‘other’ people, like the illegal immigrants who risk their lives in attempts to cross the US-Mexican border and the Strait of Gibraltar. In all cases the stagnation is the result of the enforcement of unnatural, restricting boundaries onto a changeable, flowing world.

In a different yet comparable way, *The Green Line*, as mentioned earlier, brings to mind the blatant fact that, when Dayan drew the Green Line on the map (an abstracted representation removed from reality), he did not reckon with the neighborhoods and the free movement of the communities through which the line would cut, indifferent to the social and geographical reality of 1948. It could be argued that this move was concomitant with the way the new
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state of Israel had been formed in the late 1940s and 1950s: a ‘fictitious undertaking’, as Zvi Efrat has argued, of politicians, planners, and architects ignoring existing buildings, infrastructure and people while configuring the land as if it had been vacant and ‘amorphous’ before. This abstract, two-dimensional ‘cardboard proto-state’ of the master planners – really an act of power – was constructed, one could state, with disregard of the three-dimensional lived reality, highlighting its artificiality. As Weizman points out in a text on Alÿs’s *The Green Line*, maps manage, regulate, and order the world ‘as much as they represent it’.43 He has observed that ‘[t]o drip paint over the surface of the city along [the green] line is to transform, for the duration of this walk, the territory into a map, a one-to-one map’.44 This mapping of a paper map on the surface of the real city, with its ‘changes in materiality, patterns of light and shadow […], textures of the ground’, as well as its social reality, drives home the distance between the conceptual space in which political decisions are made and the experiential space onto which these decisions are imposed.45

Weizman argues that the power of Alÿs’s retracing of the Green Line is that it provides a provocative ‘challenge to the existing dominant and expansionist logic of the city’, but claims that *The Green Line* fails to question ‘the very logic of separation’. Weizman himself believes that the seed of a peaceful future does not lie in yet ‘another borderline’, but in ‘the possible emergence of a shared surface’.46 *The Green Line* may, however, as well be read as a questioning of the logic of partition. If the humorous dimension and seeming purposelessness of Alÿs’s action are acknowledged, *The Green Line* can be seen as an attempt to make people aware of the absurdity and impact of the Green Line and of borders in general, an awareness that may have more potential to lead to change than the more commonsense and less extraordinary attempts of politicians. In 2005 and 2007, the following text by Alÿs was written on a wall at the entrance of the aforementioned exhibitions at the Israel Museum and David Zwirner:

Can an artistic intervention truly bring about an unforeseen way of thinking, or is it more a matter of creating a sensation of ‘meaninglessness’ that shows the absurdity of the situation? Can an absurd act provoke a transgression that makes you abandon the standard assumptions on the sources of conflict? Can those kinds of artistic acts bring about the

44 Francis Alÿs, A Story of Deception 2010, p. 175.
45 Francis Alÿs, A Story of Deception 2010, p. 175.
46 Francis Alÿs, A Story of Deception 2010, p. 177.
possibility of change? In any case, how can art remain politically significant without assuming a doctrinal standpoint or aspiring to become social activism? For the moment, I am exploring the following axiom: Sometimes doing something poetic can become political and sometimes doing something political can become poetic.47

Perhaps an artwork that would have staged more ideal circumstances, a vision of a future of peaceful coexistence, would have been more to Weizman’s satisfaction, as it would have gone beyond what could be seen as not much more than the rearticulation of a boundary. In various other works, Alÿs does present a vision of a less partitioned, superior world, if in a highly imaginary, unpractical way. In his work in the Strait of Gibraltar, the two lines of Moroccans and Spaniards evoke the image of a meeting at the horizon, envisaging a more desirable situation with fewer restrictions and obstructions. This 2008 work clearly revisits an earlier work, Bridge/Puente (2006), for which Alÿs requested fishermen in both Havana and Key West to position their boats in lines pointing toward the city on the opposite side of the Straits of Florida, generating the fabular mental image of a collective effort creating a ‘floating bridge’ between the United States and Cuba, two nations in conflict.48 But whereas such works use the strategy of imagination, The Green Line refers to the actual past, relating it to the actual present.

It seems precisely the sense of purposelessness and the manifestation of the absurdity of past events and the current, very real situation, along with the absence of a proposal that suggests a way out of deadlock, that prevents The Green Line from becoming one-dimensionally doctrinal and activist, or naively optimistic. Given the close to unsurpassable complexity of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Alÿs was not really in the position to envisage a mythical, unified, non-partitioned space for Jerusalem in the vein of Bridge/Puente, one that might have embodied the hope Alÿs has frequently expressed that rumors set off by his works could lead to a transformation of fiction into reality.49 The potential of rumors triggered by The Green Line to bring about change are more likely to reside in the work’s invitation to viewers to see the actual situation as absurd. The ludicrous transgression of most of Alÿs’s actions, including The Green Line but also When Faith Moves Mountains (2002), for which 500 volunteers moved an enormous sand dune near Lima, Peru, ten centimeters from its

47 Francis Alÿs 2007, s.p.
original place, makes the works memorable and especially suitable subjects of rumors. The use of humor not only allows artists to confront people with sensitive situations, affronting them with painful issues from a humorous distance: unexpected absurdities are also more likely to stick to people's memories and become material for discussion, especially if the event to be remembered can be condensed into a concise image or anecdote, as is usually the case with Alÿs's projects, which often translate socio-political tensions into a simple visual-spatial form, like a line. Mark Godfrey has elaborately discussed Alÿs's strategy of devising performances that can easily be distilled into a single, succinct image, phrase, or aphorism, one that can crystalize the entire work. This condensation facilitates the subsequent dissemination of the work to a vast public, beyond the art community, through postcards, DVD's, magazines, websites, and — most importantly — rumors. It is in this democratic post-stage of his works, in which rumors are spread by mouth, published texts, or mediums such as the internet, that Alÿs situates the power of the work to bring about the promise of change, to 'affect the social imaginary', to cause people to 'revise' their own 'discourse'. The absurdity of a work, in addition to the work's capacity to cause a 'clash' between the artist's concerns and the local situation into which the work intervenes, is likely to increase the power of art to provoke change, as it offers a 'moment of suspension of meaning, a brief sensation of senselessness that reveals the absurdity of the situation and, through this act of transgression', which makes people 'step back or step out', it can 'open up — even if just for a few seconds — a new, other, perspective on the situation'. It is through this strategy of absurdity that 'sometimes doing something poetic can become political'.

50 For remarks of Alÿs's on the critical power of humor, which 'often allows you to bypass situations that would not otherwise have been allowed to happen if I had, for instance, a militant attitude', see: 'Walking the Line' 2009, p. 4 and Russell Ferguson, 'Interview', in Francis Alÿs 2007, p. 25.
54 Alÿs and Medina 2005, p. 90. It is partly because of the emphasis Alÿs places on the power of dissemination that materials like letters, notes, and sketches are exhibited along with documentation of the artist's performances: these materials all add more dimensions to the discourse and rumors prompted by the artwork.
Resolving Dialectical Structures: A Practice of Disruption

As suggested earlier in this essay, Alÿs's works often combine seemingly opposite concepts, practices, and terms, dissolving the dichotomy in the process. The works may incorporate both simplicity and complexity, inflexibility and transience, conflict and resolution, humor and seriousness, the local and the global, art and life, and poetry and politics. This dialectical structure already appeared in some of Alÿs's earliest works. The Collector (1990–92), for instance, featured the artist walking through Mexico City with a tiny magnetic dog on wheels that collected the metallic waste it encountered in the streets. Hinting at street dogs and people surviving on the garbage found on the streets, realities that Alÿs credited with the power to resist the regulated, hygienic modern ideal of urban planning, The Collector not only prefigured the later works' criticism of the modern Western ideal of control and regulation, but also the dialectical play that characterizes much of the later work. The Collector's dialectics moved between the positive and negative magnetic poles, art and non-art (the daily life of garbage), and serious social commentary on the one hand and humorous, childlike play on the other.\(^56\)

Another early work, Bridge (Snails) (1992), features combinations of opposites that are even more clearly related to The Green Line (Fig. 2.5). In an exhibition space in Brussels, Alÿs released 1300 snails on the walls and ceiling. The snails tended to stay within a linear perimeter of green soap with a width of 8 centimeters and a length of 112 meters, consuming the drawings hanging on the wall within the green line, which they were unable to cross. Alÿs has commented that the 'line of soap turns into the hygienic filter separating and protecting the artwork from the public and vice-versa, while a play of territories takes place in between the floor occupied by the visitors and the walls and ceiling invaded by the snails'.\(^57\) While the green line segregated the animals from the humans, protecting the visitors from the snails, there was one passage in the otherwise impervious boundary line: a soapless column in the middle of the gallery connecting the territory of the snails, which included the ceiling, to that of the visitors, who stood on the floor. Alÿs and art critic Cuauhtémoc Medina have written that, although the 'segregation and communication between both spaces suggested the fantasy of their unification,' 'even that utopian possibility was disturbing': 'Not far away was the memory of the disruption of civilized order by an invasion of animals'.\(^58\) Bridge (Snails) is clearly related
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\(^{56}\) Francis Alÿs, A Story of Deception 2010, pp. 50–51.


to the artist’s exploration during his architectural training of the transformation in the late Middle Ages to a new, modern model of city planning, in which animals no longer co-existed with people near the old city center, but were evicted to land outside of the city walls, a transformation the artist obviously laments.59 The utopian possibility Alýs and Medina recognized in Bridge (Snails) consisted in the promise of disruption of this modern, civilized organization of urban space.

The question arises of whether Alýs with The Green Line, which seems to refer in various ways to the earlier Bridge (Snails), also hoped to give a glimpse of the utopian possibility of unification and co-existence, though The Green Line did not feature a bridge for Palestinians or Israeli that could have served a function comparable to that of the column in Bridge (Snails). It is not irrelevant to note in this context that in some of Alýs’s works, lines do not separate but connect, as is very literally depicted in the painting Snakes and Ladders (2008), undoubtedly related to his work in the Strait of Gibraltar of the same year (Fig. 2.6). In this small painting, the green snake and ladder, instead of

connecting board squares as in the homonymous game, link mountains that are separated by water. But where lines in the guise of bridges – as well as in the form of corridors of cooperating people (Don’t Cross the Bridge Before You Get to the River, Bridge/Puente, and When Faith Moves Mountains) – can bring together, when given the function of boundary, they tend to separate. If Alÿs’s line in The Green Line has a utopian possibility, besides its potential to revise people’s perspectives through absurdity, it may instead lie, as suggested before, in the fact that it is less transient than the walls that were being built around 2004. The transience of the line might suggest that segregating lines are acceptable to Alÿs as long as they are flexible and provisional.

If Bridge (Snails) simultaneously brings to light and questions the validity of lines of demarcation between animals and humans, the uncivilized and the civilized, revulsion and attraction, public and private, life and art, and division and unification, it is not only the last pair that 12 years later again took on a
primary role in *The Green Line*, but certainly also the second to last pair: the life-art dichotomy. Where *Bridge (Snails)* brings elements of life, or nature, to an art context, *The Green Line* most obviously brings art to life, revisiting Alýs’s less politically-charged action *The Leak* (1995), in which the artist left a gallery with a perforated can of paint, walked through the neighborhood and returned to the gallery after having found his way back to the gallery with the aid of the paint trail.\(^6\) *The Leak* obviously alludes to Jackson Pollock’s action painting and dripping technique, although Alýs replaced the arena of the canvas by that of the urban surface, taking art beyond the confining white architectonic cube of the gallery.

Alýs has disclosed that with *The Leak*, he hoped to ‘create a narrative produced by a material expenditure or dissipation’, generating a story by *using up* material paint, perhaps in reference to the dematerialization of art since the 1960s, but more pertinently relating to his decision as an artist and former-architect not to make buildings, sculpture or other objects, all of which have a certain ‘consistency’.\(^6\) Through the practice of walking, an ‘exercise with a temporality akin to that of narrative’, as opposed to the stability of objects, Alýs rather wanted to challenge the ‘permanence’ of art.\(^6\) The temporality of everyday life, walking, and narrative as such offers Alýs a mode of resistance within the field of art. With his ambulatory explorations of the poetic potential of unplanned events and situations in the urban fabric, he moreover attempted to resist the prevailing concept of architecture and urbanism as ‘a predeter-
minded field of trajectories and transactions’.\(^6\) As walking is marked by temporality and movement, and cannot be controlled and predetermined, it can challenge the modern systems of control and regulation that have come to dominate our lives, including those that have enforced artificial political borders.\(^6\) During walks, our direct contact with our concrete environment leads us to experience the unexpected, undetermined, and inconsistent, which provides us with a mode to escape from the structures that attempt to order, divide, and control everything.

Alýs has compared *The Leak*’s ‘material expenditure’ to that of his performance *Fairy Tales* of the same year, a walk through Mexico City (re-enacted in Stockholm in 1998) during which he left behind a trail by unraveling his own sweater, as if unweaving the ‘thread’ of a narrative that had previously been
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60 Alýs performed *The Leak* both in São Paulo and in Ghent in 1995.
woven.\textsuperscript{65} Like \textit{The Leak} and \textit{The Green Line, Fairy Tales} is an act of ‘productive unmaking akin to the unravelling of tales and stories.’\textsuperscript{66} The references to the fairy tale of Hansel and Gretel, the myth of Ariadne, Theseus, and the Minotaur’s labyrinth, as well as the story of Penelope’s nightly undoing of the shroud she weaves during the day are most explicit in \textit{Fairy Tales}, but can also be related to \textit{The Leak} and \textit{The Green Line}.\textsuperscript{67} Also applicable to \textit{The Green Line} is Alyş’s comment on the fabular dimension of \textit{Fairy Tales}: ‘Whereas the highly rational societies of the Renaissance felt the need to create utopias, we in our times must create fables’.\textsuperscript{68} Unweaving within the everyday reality of Jerusalem a thread of paint that originated both in the story of art and in the history of that holy yet conflicted city can be seen as parallel also to another work that Alyş has associated with fables: \textit{When Faith Moves Mountains}. Like this earlier work, which took place in a transitional, post-dictatorial period during which Peru was struggling to institute a democracy, \textit{The Green Line} attempted to ‘translate social tensions into narratives’ and ‘visual-spatial form’, with the intent to ‘infiltrate the local history and mythology’ of Jerusalem, ‘to insert another rumor into its narrative’ in the hope that the action would become a story, a fable, that will ‘survive the event itself’, intervening in the ‘imaginial landscape’ of the city, and thereby ‘actualizing’ the work.\textsuperscript{69}

Of all his numerous performances, \textit{The Leak} must have seemed to Alyş to offer most unexplored possibilities, as it is the only work to which he returned several times. A year before his walk through Jerusalem, Alyş had walked with a pierced can of blue paint from the Musée d’Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris to a former convent in the Latin Quarter to which the museum located temporarily while its permanent building was being renovated. Alyş and Medina have written that the artist reenacted \textit{The Leak} multiple times because it is a ‘paradigm’ of the artist’s ‘desire to leave a permanent trace in the fabric of the city and the collective imagination of its inhabitants through the act of walking’, suggesting that it on the one hand mocked artists’ narcissistic eagerness to leave a permanent trace of themselves in the world while on the other hand expressing the more altruistic ambition of affecting the world in a positive manner through this trace.\textsuperscript{70} Alyş and Medina have indicated that with such

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{65} Francis Alyş, \textit{A Story of Deception} 2010, p. 90.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Francis Alyş, \textit{A Story of Deception} 2010, pp. 66–67.
\item \textsuperscript{67} Francis Alyş, \textit{A Story of Deception} 2010, p. 90.
\item \textsuperscript{68} Francis Alyş, \textit{A Story of Deception} 2010, p. 90.
\item \textsuperscript{69} These words of Alyş’s describe \textit{When Faith Moves Mountains}. Alyş and Anton 2002, p. 147; Francis Alyş, \textit{A Story of Deception} 2010, pp. 15, 36, 126–29.
\item \textsuperscript{70} Francis Alyş, \textit{A Story of Deception} 2010, pp. 66–67.
\end{itemize}
actions involving dispelling and the leaving of a trace, the artist reversed the principle of earlier works like *The Collector*, which was a gathering (of non-art into the realm of art) rather than a marking (of a non-artistic site through an artistic act). In these works, one might say, Alÿs explicitly acted out his insight that ‘[…] any art document is, by nature, a self-conscious intervention in the complex texture of reality – at least in terms of provoking a hiatus in the customary order of things.’ Alÿs’s axiom ‘sometimes doing something poetic can become political,’ part of the subtitle of *The Green Line*, takes this statement into the realm of the political.

The dictum ‘sometimes doing something poetic can become political’, which expresses Alÿs’s desire that art can affect life on a political level, is in turn related to the artist’s much-quoted proposition ‘Sometimes doing nothing leads to something’, a principle that reverses the proposition ‘Sometimes doing something leads to nothing’, which is also the subtitle of the five-minute video *Paradox of Praxis 1* (1997). This video documents Alÿs pushing a big block of ice through the streets of Mexico City until it is no more than a puddle of water. Another instance of productive unmaking, *Paradox of Praxis 1* is a parody of the ‘unproductive hardship involved in the daily survival tactics’ of many laboring people in Latin America, playing out the disproportionate relation between maximum effort and minimum outcome. It is one of a number of artworks in which Alÿs comments on the battle of Latin American countries to ‘adjust to the social and economic expectations of their northern neighbors’ in an ‘epic of effort’.

Besides a commentary on the local, or in this case regional, situation, *Paradox of Praxis 1* also explores the question of whether art can lead to true change or whether art really is without purpose, a question also broached in *When Faith Moves Mountains*, which carried the motto ‘maximum effort, minimum result’, inverting ‘the principle of efficiency that lies at the heart of modern economic thought’ but also provoking reflection on the purposes of art. It is not a coincidence that the axiom ‘Sometimes doing something leads to nothing, and sometimes doing nothing leads to something’ has a structure analogous to ‘Sometimes doing something poetic can become political, and sometimes doing something political can become poetic’. Where the poetic and art tend to be associated with the ‘nothing’ and the purposelessness, the political is more likely to be connected to the ‘something’ and the
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'purposeful'. In his action Turista of 1994, in which Alís stood in line with unemployed Mexican laborers offering his 'services' as a tourist, he seemed to ridicule the purposelessness of artist's work. Standing behind a sign identifying him as 'Turista', the artist empathized with the laborers' struggle to survive in a capitalist economy but also self-mockingly identified the role of the artist as 'professional observer'.

Alís has stated that for more than 10 years after his exploration of the adage 'sometimes doing something leads to nothing', he attempted to devise a sequel with actions that were to 'illustrate the contrary principle: 'sometimes doing nothing leads to something' These attempts, he has argued, have failed, but the failure has inspired 'a number of other works based on the questioning of efficiency'. The Green Line seems to simultaneously question the capacity of art to lead to true political change and cautiously express the belief that art, possibly through its absurdity, can be qualified to 'provoke a hiatus in the customary order of things' and lead to different perspectives, more, at least, than the extremely time-consuming, expensive political negotiations and military efforts that have offered no way out of the conflict up until now. Even if it may not explore concepts like 'faith', bridge, and change' in as courageously and 'naively utopian' a way as When Faith Moves Mountains, The Green Line is still relatively optimistic and resistant in that it is unwilling to conform to the 'climate of skepticism' that doubts all ambitious attempts at provoking political change. Even if The Green Line does not offer as tangible a utopian possibility as Bridge (Snails), which invites viewers to imagine a unification between animals and humans, like that earlier work it incites a disruption by, on the one hand, revealing the tendency of human beings to bring about segregation through lines of demarcation and, on the other hand, concurrently incorporating ingredients than can counter separating forces, such as the point of potential passage in Bridge (Snails), but also the transience and non-intrusiveness of the painted line in The Green Line. It contains the hope that art can make a difference, leading people to think differently through the strategy of the absurdity.

Alís has explained that he does not want to 'add to the city', but 'to absorb what was already there, to work with the residues, or with the negative spaces, the holes, the spaces in-between'. It is the negative spaces in the

75 Francis Alís, A Story of Deception 2010, p. 61
76 Francis Alís, A Story of Deception 2010, p. 82
77 Francis Alís, A Story of Deception 2010, p. 76
79 Alís in: Seven Walks 2005, p. 44.
modern hegemonic structures, including perhaps semi-forgotten yet fully present borders, that have the power to disrupt and resist these structures. The structure of Alÿs’s narrative, like the structure of its particular episodes like The Green Line, seems to oscillate between opposites: a negation of opposites through an exploration of liminal, interstitial spaces, spaces in-between, a structure that seems to resonate in the artist’s exploration of both the futility and potency of art as well as in his desire to invite people to reflect on solutions to conflicts while simultaneously drawing inspiration from them, seemingly conceiving of conflicts as instigators of change.\(^{80}\) It is in the places inbetween, where dichotomies come together, that the order of things can be resisted.

**Bibliography**
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CHAPTER 3

Jerusalem as Trauerarbeit
On Two Paintings by Anselm Kiefer and Gerhard Richter

Wouter Weijers

In 1986, Anselm Kiefer produced a painting he entitled Jerusalem (Fig. 3.1). It is a large and heavy work measuring approximately thirteen by eighteen feet. When viewed up close, the surface is reminiscent of abstract Matter Painting. Liquid lead was applied, left to solidify and then scraped off again in places, ripping the work’s skin. When the work is viewed from a distance, a high horizon with a golden glow shining over its centre appears, which, partly due to the title, could be interpreted as a reference to a heavenly Jerusalem. Two metal skis are attached to the surface, which, as Fremdkörper, do not enter into any kind of structural or visual relationship with the painting.

Eleven years later, Gerhard Richter painted a much smaller work that, although it was also given the title Jerusalem, was of a very different order (Fig. 3.2). The painting shows us a view of a sun-lit city. But again Jerusalem is hardly recognizable because Richter has let the city dissolve in a hazy atmosphere, which is, in effect, the result of a painting technique using a fine, dry brush in paint that has not yet completely dried. It is the title that identifies the city. Insiders might be able to recognize the western wall of the old city in the lit-up strip just below the horizon, but otherwise all of the buildings have disappeared in the haze. A longer viewing of the painting, however, reveals a car park with lamp posts in the zone at the bottom.

Apart from their identical names, these artworks are poles apart – in size, materiality and texture, depiction and religious reference, in the conception of art behind each work, in the ways they relate to history and memory, and in how they were received. These paintings are different in so many ways that they barely tolerate each other. But whichever way you look at it, in both works the name Jerusalem refers to the city marked by history, where ancient religious and political conflicts are still present today and are continuously fed by memory. Even in these relatively recent paintings, Jerusalem is inevitably a place of memory.

Memories do not simply emerge from a readily available past but are constructed and reconstructed in the present. Recollection is a social and cultural
practice in which a continuous selection, rearrangement and transformation of memory takes place. However, that selection is always perspectival and influenced by socio-cultural and political motives. The same applies to these two works.

The artists are close to being contemporaries. Richter, born in Dresden in 1932, was thirteen years old when the Second World War ended, and then grew up in the GDR until he took refuge in West Germany in 1961. Kiefer was born in Donaueschingen (Baden-Württemberg) in 1945, a war child. Both artists have had a connection to the burden of totalitarian regimes and one thing they do have in common is that they have not avoided that history in their work. Their two Jerusalems are part of this history. After the extermination of millions of European Jews during the Shoah, every German artist who decides to call a painting Jerusalem knows that this work will carry the burden of that past. Richter and Kiefer grew up in its shadow, and memories of it have had a profound influence on the oeuvre of both artists. However, where one artist seems to want to remember, the other one seems to want to forget, to such an extent that one could speak of ‘divided memories’, to borrow Benjamin Buchloh’s concept, albeit in a slightly different context.1
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1 Buchloh 1996.
Buchloh is the critic who has provided what is possibly the sharpest, and ideological, formulation of the difference between Kiefer’s and Richter’s art. He positioned both artists in relation to the artistic culture of post-war Germany and to the (self-)reflective and socio-critical attitude of the historical avant-garde. According to Buchloh, the biggest problem was how to represent history in post-fascist Germany. The recent German past had, with the loss of Germany’s cultural identity, also problematized memory to an exceptional degree. A new meaning could only emerge from the creation of new modes of memory, which did have to remain inextricably linked to the reality of the past, however. In that respect, Buchloh considered Kiefer to be a ‘regressive’ artist whose work suggested that history could be transcended. In his opinion, Kiefer does not provide historical insight into processes of cultural memory but

2 Buchloh 1996, p. 64 and pp. 69–70.
rather mythologizes the past. Richter’s art, on the other hand, is explicitly aimed at the time span that was still accessible to individual memory. Buchloh sees Kiefer and Richter as artistic and political antagonists. However, whether the artists, with all their major differences, should be opposed so diametrically when it comes to their reworking of German history is debatable.

In his study on the Holocaust, Michael Rothberg has asked several weighty questions about what happens when two parties dealing with the past compete for precedence in collective memory processes where one past will always be at the expense of the other. He uses a concept of recollection that is not based on constant rivalry, but starts from the complex interweaving of various practices of memory, which are constantly formed and reformed in varying relation between collective memory and (group) identity. Applied to Kiefer and Richter’s work, such an approach is not an attempt to mediate between their highly divergent conceptions of art and practices, but an occasion to examine their relationship with post-war German cultural memory. Rothberg sees memory as fundamentally ‘multidirectional’, subjected to constant exchange, cross-pollination and mutual borrowing. This interaction between various memories in a state of continuous reconstruction leads to what he, as opposed to rigid competitive memory, calls the productive dynamics of ‘multidirectional memory’. The question is how these two very different paintings relate to this dynamics. In order to answer that question, the two Jerusalem paintings in this essay are the departure point for a series of considerations that view these artworks in relation to each other, but also, explicitly, to other works from both oeuvres.

Kiefer’s Iconoclastic Controversy

In the winter of 1986, Kiefer’s Jerusalem was on display in the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam at the exhibition Anselm Kiefer. Bilder 1986 – 1980. The striking reversal of dates in the title suggests a return to the past. The exhibition started (or ended) with a work from 1980: Bilder-Streit, which depicts a black-and-white photo of the floor and brick wall in Kiefer’s studio at the time
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4 Rothberg 2009, pp. 1–21. Rothberg’s book is not about art but about the competition between the positions of the Holocaust and slavery in cultural memory.
5 Rothberg 2009, pp. 2–3.
Glued to the floor are strips of paper on which a well-discernible wood grain pattern of planks is printed. The outlines of a painter’s palette have been drawn over these with black paint. The palette is a motif that recurs time and again in Kiefer’s paintings, especially during the seventies, but also later. In the photo are displayed three miniature German tanks which have set the wood, or the palette, alight. The title Bilder-Streit refers to the conflict between iconoclasts and iconodules during the eighth and ninth century in Byzantium as a result of the decree issued by Emperor Leo III in 726, prohibiting the use of images, out of fear of idolatry. In earlier versions of Bilder-Streit, Kiefer had painted the tanks as well as the names of the Byzantine combatants from both sides. Kiefer links the Byzantine iconoclasm to the destruction and banning of entartete Kunst during the Nazi regime here.

But there is another important issue that severely burdened post-war art. The essay ‘Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft’, written by Theodor Adorno in 1948 and published in 1951, contains the now famous line ‘Nach Auschwitz ein Gedicht zu schreiben, ist barbarisch’, which has been quoted often, in any con-
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7 Anselm Kiefer 1984, pp. 88–89.
ceivable context, and is actually part of a sentence from a longer quotation.\textsuperscript{8} In her book \textit{Anselm Kiefer and Art after Auschwitz}, Lisa Saltzman explores Adorno’s thesis in relation to Kiefer’s \textit{Bilder-Streit} and the Second Commandment, which forbids the making of ‘graven images’.\textsuperscript{9} What that commandment implies is not that God should not be depicted but that he cannot be depicted because he is unknowable. Adorno applies the commandment to the unspeakable horrors of the Holocaust, which leave no other possibility than ‘an aesthetic ethics of visual absence and poetic silence’.\textsuperscript{10} However, this silence is not total and can be articulated, as in Paul Celan’s poetry and in some forms of abstract art and atonal music which give a wide berth to sensual experiences, pleasures and desires. With his rejection of ‘libidinous engagement’, Adorno shifts the responsibility from the object to the spectator: Moses destroyed Aaron’s golden calf because the Jews did not direct their worship at God but at the statue.\textsuperscript{11} The image is not forbidden but it requires an ethical spectator who has internalized the old testamentary law. Only then can testimony be given, as required in Leviticus 5:1.

In \textit{Bilder-Streit}, Keifer also thematizes the tension between images and their prohibition by stacking various layers of meaning in his combination of studio photo and painter’s palette with tanks, fire and smoke: layers that refer to the mythical time of the Bible, to the historical time of the Byzantine iconoclastic controversy and to the lived-through time of the Second World War that is still near. Moreover, he views this stratification in relation to his contemporary artistic calling.

In his book \textit{Das kulturelle Gedächtnis}, Egyptologist and cultural scientist Jan Assmann distinguishes two modes of remembering, which permeate each other often.\textsuperscript{12} ‘Communicative memory’ is his term for the ‘biographical’ memory, which goes back three generations and refers to memories we share with contemporaries. This communicative memory disappears with its bearers and can then only be conveyed through media. Next to this, Assmann places the ‘cultural memory’, which in his theory refers to what he calls ‘origins’. It is aimed at a (distant) past that has disappeared but is constantly commemorated through symbolic figures such as myths. In Assmann’s notion of cultural

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{8} ‘Kulturkritik findet sich der letzten Stufe der Dialektik von Kultur und Barbarei gegenüber: nach Auschwitz ein Gedicht zu schreiben, ist barbarisch, und das frisst auch die Erkenntnis an, die ausspricht, warum es unmöglich ward, heute Gedichte zu schreiben’. Adorno 1977, p. 30.
\item \textsuperscript{9} Saltzman 1999, pp. 17–27.
\item \textsuperscript{10} Saltzman 1999, p. 19, and Exodus 20: 4–6.
\item \textsuperscript{11} Saltzman 1999, p. 21.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Assmann 1992, pp. 48–59.
\end{itemize}
memory, factual history is transformed into remembered history and thereby into *mythos*. Cultural memory contains something sacred then, in which memory often takes the shape of a ceremonial celebration that serves to bring the past into the present. This process involves the constant application of what Assmann has called the *Rekonstruktivität* of cultural memory, which is the way this memory adapts itself to ever-changing, contemporary memory needs.

If Kiefer’s *Bilder-Streit* also shows a form of transference from a primeval age to his own time, the question is what memory needs it is based on. This question is directly linked to that of how Kiefer manages, in his visual art and in his own time ‘after Auschwitz’, to deal with the historical event whose extraordinary horrors prevent their expression, yet at the same time demand to be remembered.

Kiefer’s artworks from the period 1970–1986 problematize the possibility and impossibility of the representation of history, specifically that of Germany, from the perspective of the post-war generation which has to position itself in relation to the burdened heritage of the previous generation. However, in the eyes of some critics, his reclaiming of German preoccupations and myths that had been deeply tainted by Nazism, led to an art that was at the very least ambivalent, but to some plainly reactionary and mostly disturbing. Criticism increased when Kiefer showed a series of landscapes, woodcuts and artist’s books, including the painting *Nero malt* (1974) in the German pavilion at the Venice Biennale in 1980 (Fig. 3.4). By far the largest part of the painting is taken up by the blackish-brown, scorched-looking, ploughed arable land in which traces of blood are also still visible. Over this, Kiefer painted, in red and orange strokes, a transparent palette with paintbrushes that change into candles. High on the horizon they set a village alight with their flames. The ambiguous image, in which fire can be interpreted as both destructive and cleansing, seemed to contain a barely concealed allusion to the ‘Blut und Boden’ ideology with its atavistic dream of a pure race, in which even the notion of extermination resounded.

In her review of the exhibition in *Die Zeit*, Petra Kipphoff voiced her fear that Kiefer did not refer to the German horror and aggression to denounce them but to maintain them in a subdued form in his megalomaniac work. With this comment she subscribed to a more generally supported conviction that Kiefer did not so much come to grips with the shameful chapters of
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13 Fuchs 1980, p. 57. *Malen = Verbrennen* is the title of another painting by Kiefer from 1974, which was also shown in Venice, besides *Nero malt*.

14 Saltzman 1999, p. 109–10 and p. 163 n. 36.

Germany’s history but reaffirmed them. The often-quoted headline ‘Überdosis am Teutschen’ above Werner Spies’s review of the exhibition in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung of 2 June 1980 speaks volumes.

Benjamin Buchloh’s criticism in his essay ‘Figures of Authority, Ciphers of Regression: Notes on the Return of Representation in European Painting’, which was published in the spring of 1981, was even sharper. Even though Kiefer is mentioned just once and only in a derivative way in a note, Buchloh classes him with contemporary German artists like Penck, Baselitz and Lüpertz, who with their return to forms of representation embodied the negative, if not reactionary, antithesis of the historical avant-garde. Buchloh regards the return to representation as the most important symptom of this regression. He believes that although this ‘neo-expressionism’ pretends to be subversive, its radicalism is apolitical in the end, and he sees the ‘postmodern’ demolition of the avant-garde idiom as a cynical attempt to reaffirm (conservative) power structures. Eight years later, in 1989, Buchloh repeated his criticism, but this time much more explicitly aimed at Kiefer. According to Buchloh, the attraction of Kiefer’s work partly stems from ‘its reconstitution of traditional identity

16 Buchloh 1981.
for the generation of West Germans who wish to abandon the long and difficult process of reflection upon a post-traditional identity’. However, whether it was Kiefer’s aim to fulfil *that* wish is highly doubtful.

**Mourning**

At the heart of Kiefer’s works referring to German history is the question of how this heritage is to be represented by the post-war generation ‘whose memory is without “recollections”’ because the personal remembrances of the Nazi years are absent. What Kiefer does is not so much a work “of” memory, but a work “on” memory, writes Daniel Arasse. Because personal ‘recollections’ are absent for his generation, Kiefer claims the memory through other’s objects, texts and images. Furthermore, according to Andreas Huyssen, Kiefer’s thematizing is not expressed in a stereotyping of ‘the German’ but in the ambiguity of Kiefer’s work in the context of German society after Auschwitz. Kiefer does not explore, and exploit, the power of mythical images without (self-)reflection on the ambivalent nature of such mystifications at a time when West German culture was haunted by the past – a culture ‘haunted by images which in turn produce haunting images’.

By detecting an ambivalence between fascination and horror that partly goes back to the theory of the Sublime, Huyssen shifts the attention from the work itself to the ambiguous experiences of the spectator, for instance with respect to the painting *Sulamith*, a painting about mourning in a culture that is unable to mourn. In *Sulamith* (1983), Kiefer has transformed a fascist architectural space for the Nazi death cult into its opposite (Fig. 3.5). By using the name Sulamith – the girl from Shulem (Song of Solomon 7:1), Solomon’s great love and bride – Kiefer takes a big step in his work towards a confrontation with the Holocaust instead of with his own German history. The painting harks back to a photo of a model of the vaulted crypt under the *Soldatenhalle*, which was designed by Wilhelm Kreis but never built, and was meant to be a Pantheon for ‘deutsche Kriegshelden’. Kiefer subjects the fascist death cult to a rigorous metamorphosis. The crypt’s windows are shut and the brick vaults now show black scorch marks. Seven fires burn in the background, immediately bringing to mind the Menorah, the golden candlestick with seven arms, which is one of
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17 Buchloh 1989, p. 100 n. 5.
18 Arasse 2001, p. 77.
19 Arasse 2001, p. 74.
the oldest symbols for Judaism and which burned permanently in the Second Temple in Jerusalem, thereby raising the suggestion that this is a sacred place. At the same time, the tunnel-shaped, dark hole at the end is reminiscent of the incinerators in which the gassed Jews were cremated. Kiefer has transformed the place where glorious German heroes were supposed to be honoured for a thousand years into a place of mourning for the victims of the Shoah.  

In order to understand the impact of the painting in 1983, it is important to realize that there were no memorials for the victims of the Holocaust anywhere in West Germany at the time, apart from the remains of the concentration camps.

In this painting commemorating Sulamith, she is absent. Yet her name and her metonymical representation are there in the grey, ash-like layer that has spread from the fire over the top half of the painting, in keeping with the ban on images, which prohibits the depiction of that which cannot be depicted. At the same time, Sulamith is an image that bears witness to the unspeakable.

---

A major problem related to the representation of the Holocaust that Kiefer and others encountered during the eighties, is what Primo Levi (who was a prisoner in Auschwitz himself) has called ‘the memory of the offence’, the memory of the extreme experience that binds victim and perpetrator together forever.\textsuperscript{23} The painting Sulamith visualizes this unavoidable interweaving by situating Sulamith’s monument in a Nazi building that itself was meant as a place of commemoration. This conflicting coordination of the German and the Jewish leads to what Matthew Biro has called ‘hermeneutic undecidability’: ‘the ability of a cultural representation to generate not just ambiguity, but a conflict of interpretations: radically contradictory readings of the same set of signifiers’.\textsuperscript{24} The way Kiefer places various times and ways of representation next to each other in his work defies the spectator to compare and contrast the different levels of time and space. This also happens in Jerusalem.

\textit{Jerusalem (1)}

Kiefer’s Jerusalem also refers to the Holocaust and German history, even though this cannot immediately be deduced from the painting. It does not show us the historical or the contemporary, earthly Jerusalem, and despite the allusion in a golden glow that lights up at the top of the image, the painting does not show the promised heavenly place from the Revelation of St John either (21: 1–4).

Jerusalem started as a painted landscape and Kiefer himself identified the earthly part as a stubble field.\textsuperscript{25} This would indicate that he started with the same landscape he has used time and again (compare Fig. 3.4) but that it then became hidden from view by many additions and scrapings-off. Over this layered surface float the two metal skis, parallel to the canvas, one with its tip pointing up and the other with its tip pointing down. Both directions are emphasised even more by two arrows that have been drawn on the skis with white chalk. With their vertical position, the skis point from earthly to heavenly regions and back again.

The painting can be seen as both a flat, almost impenetrable surface and as a landscape that runs into the background to the horizon, perspectively. The skis are attached frontally and oriented along a vertical axis, a strange position for skis, which we would sooner want to let glide into the landscape. According to Kiefer, they represent ‘the cosmic clambering that is supposed to lead us to

\textsuperscript{23} Levi 1989, p. 12; Biro 2003, pp. 114.
\textsuperscript{24} Biro 2003, p. 117.
the Heavenly Jerusalem but that road goes up and down, down and up [...]’

As far as I know, it is the only time Kiefer used skis as a, rather strange, metaphor for this motion between up and down. He used the more apt image of ascending and descending a ladder much more often.

In (late) medieval art, the ladder is depicted countless times as a symbol for the link between earth and heaven, with the chosen ones having to walk up many steps to reach the Divine light, and the damned making the opposite movement down to hell. An illustration from a fourteenth-century Catalonian manuscript shows a ladder that leads to ‘the house of wisdom’ where God’s hand lets down ‘the rope of mercy’ from above. From this rope hang the intellect, the memory and willpower, followed by the seven virtues. Further down, the seven sins, only mentioned by name, burn in the fires of hell.

Kiefer’s Jerusalem, with its upward and downward motion, can also be interpreted along the vertical axis. However, evil is dragged into Kiefer’s own time – and for him, in the 1980s, it is the pure evil of the Holocaust. This is highlighted by a comparison with another painting by Kiefer. Eisen-Steig (1986) also shows a landscape with a high horizon and was initially entitled Heavenly Jerusalem (Fig. 3.6). The skis in Jerusalem have bindings, the clips that clamp the feet to the (metal) slats and therefore presume a potential human presence. In Eisen-Steig, we also see bindings attached to metal – in this case a reference to the iron mechanics use to climb up and down telephone poles. However, Kiefer transforms the motion along the vertical axis into a horizontal one here, as if the ladder is laid down on the ground and now forms the iron path that does not lead to heaven but to destruction.

Eisen-Steig, writes Matthew Biro, shows the Holocaust as an anonymous trip to death. Just like Jerusalem, its surface possesses an intruding materiality, but this wall, with its heavy impasto is, much more than in Jerusalem, broken by a coercive perspective that converges to a point at the centre of the horizon. This lay-out also pulls us spectators through the wall into the background.

Nevertheless, Eisen-Steig is an ambiguous painting, one that confronts us with our own ‘hermeneutic undecidability’. The train tracks bend away from
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27 A variation on this can be found on panel number 7 of Kiefer’s 14-part cycle The Secret Life of Plants for Robert Fludd (Grothe Collection, Duisburg), where the left and right half of a pair of slippers, splashed with white paint, point up and down in opposite directions.
28 Ramón Lull, Thomas de Myésier, Electorarium Parvum seu Breviculum, Badische Landesbibliothek, Codex St. Peter perg. 92. See also: Roob 2006, p. 250.
29 Anselm Kiefer 1987, p. 143.
31 Biro 2003, p. 133.
each other to the left and the right in the distance and Kiefer, again as in Jerusalem, makes the sky light up just above the horizon using gold leaf. What’s more, olive branches protrude from the bindings. The olive branch has been a symbol of life and continuance ever since a dove released by Noah returned to the arc with an olive branch as the first sign of life on earth after the Flood (Genesis, 6–9). Seen as a horizontal axis disappearing in the distance, we are standing at the beginning of a railway that pulls our eyes to the horrific end in the distance. Seen as a vertical axis, we are at the bottom of the ladder which may lead up to salvation, but only if we climb it one rung at a time. Even in that case, we, spectators, are closer to the fires of hell than to the light of heaven.

The paradox of the representation of the Holocaust in Germany is the duty to remember it and the impossibility of depicting it. Eisen-Steig and Jerusalem give rise to conflicting interpretations. The constant reversal of motion along the vertical and the horizontal axes shows the dichotomy of heaven and earth and good and evil in Kiefer’s work from that period most clearly, but with a pessimistic undertone that shows the irreparable tear in the fabric of the world. However, it is during these very years that Kiefer bends his work away from scenes that reflect the burdened German history and towards artworks that focus on various aspects of Jewish mysticism and mythology. In this respect Jerusalem also forms a pivotal point.
Richter’s ‘Inability To Represent’

In 1995, Gerhard Richter was in Jerusalem on the occasion of his exhibition *Gerhard Richter – Paintings* in the Israel Museum (19 September – 30 December 1995). The day after the opening, he took a photo of the town from the King David Hotel, facing the northeast, looking out over the Yemin Moshe district towards the Christian part of the old city, the western walls of which are visible.32 On the photo itself the date of the shot is displayed: ‘95 9 20. That same year, Richter decided to use the photo from 1995 as the basis of two virtually identical paintings of slightly different sizes that were both given the title *Jerusalem*. I will limit myself to the larger work here, which is part of the Frieder-Burda collection in Baden-Baden. On the back, the name and date are displayed: ‘Richter XI.1995’.

Compared to the photo, Richter's painting is more schematic and the colour, however refined, has a more artificial feel to it. In the painting, the city is almost erased, both literally and figuratively (Fig. 3.2).33 Jerusalem is nothing but an unspectacular shade, one that does not show any of its complicated history. Richter’s *Jerusalem* does not go back to a mythical primeval source, but to a banal, everyday photo of a place that seems just as banal and everyday. Yet, just like Anselm Kiefer's *Jerusalem*, Richter's painting cannot be separated from a long series of historical connections, a context in which it becomes meaningful. The fact that Richter does not feel the need to mythologize Jerusalem again does not mean that to him the city falls outside the shadow of history, and specifically that of the Shoah. Even in this earthly form, Richter's Jerusalem is a place burdened with memories.

A year earlier, in Jerusalem, Richter had been awarded the 1994/5 Wolf Prize in arts (painting).34 ‘Calling on history and art history, [...] Gerhard Richter introduces the problem of representation and the representable, of history and politics, in the specific context of post-Auschwitz Germany, of Germany beyond the wall’, according to the judges’ report. In this report, Richter’s work is
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33 Gerhard Richter Bilder 2008, pp. 142, 167. See also: http://www.gerhard richter.com/search/?search=jerusalem%201995 (accessed on 28 July 2014). The smaller painting *Jerusalem* (CR 825–1) made international news when it failed to sell at the guide price of five to seven million pounds sterling at a Sotheby’s auction in London on 20 October 2008 and was withdrawn from the auction. It was sold for 6.6 million dollars by Sotheby’s on 26 June 2012, however.
34 AP, ‘German painter Gerhard Richter gets the Wolf Prize’, *The Jerusalem Post*, 30 November 1994, p. 3. Richter was awarded the prize on 29 November 1994 and was the second German artist to win it, after Anselm Kiefer, who had received it in 1990.
called ‘continuously ambivalent’ and its strength is that it ‘renders obsolete the constant references to the “end of painting”, its inability to represent’. The question is how this ambivalence and the ‘inability to represent’ relate to a banal and everyday view of Jerusalem painted from a snapshot taken from a hotel room.

**Landscapes (‘Für uns ist Alles leer’)***

Richter’s oeuvre is layered and varied. Over the years it has moved in different directions which can exist alongside one another or can cross each other. The artworks are related to various traditions, including that of abstraction, which are reused and undermined in equal measure, but also to a diverse repertoire of second-hand images that can come from anywhere – from mass media, art history and photos he took himself.

The category in which Jerusalem is sometimes placed in Richter’s seemingly very heterogeneous oeuvre is that of landscape art. That is the case in both Richter’s classification of his own work and in Gerhard Richter Landscapes from 1998, which was compiled by Dietmar Elger. Yet within Richter’s complete oeuvre the landscape has a modest place, especially when compared to the large number of abstract works.

During the years 1968–69, Richter thematized the motif of the landscape in an interrelated series of works based on photos of, amongst other things, the flat landscape surrounding his town of residence, Düsseldorf, as in Landschaft bei Hubbelrath (1969, Fig. 3.7). These paintings met with surprise at the time. Richter was accused of an escapist return to the fine arts, which could hardly be taken seriously, especially in those years of socio-cultural and political turmoil. However, these negative qualifications were reversed by others. It is true that Richter himself, in a somewhat obstinate statement, explained the origin of these paintings from a need for something beautiful to paint and later said that the landscapes showed his desire, yet at the same time they
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38 Godfrey 2011, p. 79.


also exhibited a subversive ironic quality that could refute the accusation of the nostalgic escape from the present. Moreover, Richter himself called his landscapes ‘first and foremost “untruthful”’. This untruthfulness does not only lie in the projection of human emotions onto a nature that is itself completely soulless, but specifically in the nostalgic longings that led him to make these paintings in the late sixties. The anachronism of these paintings is also their undermining quality, yet at the same time, dreams and longings are acceptable to Richter, providing their untruthfulness vis-à-vis real life is recognized.

Not only landscape painting but the entire art of painting as a credible artistic medium was under great pressure in avant-garde circles during those years. This led to a paradoxical iconoclasm amongst ambitious artists, in which painting only seemed possible if it simultaneously showed it was no longer possible, or at the very least showed awareness of its own impossibility. So
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41 Bätschmann 2011, p. 64.
43 Bätschmann 2011, p. 66.
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Richter's fundamental problem was painting while it could no longer be done, showing this ‘impossibility’ in a painting, and doing so while aware that it was not going to get him anywhere. This kind of attitude can only lead to a, perhaps more repressed than directly visible, critical and reflective art, even if it seems to draw on the traditional genre of the landscape.

Oskar Bätschman has pointed out that Richter's interest in the landscape more or less coincided with a renewed orientation on the Sublime and on northern European art in the art and art historiography of those years (an interest that comes to light in a different way in Kiefer's work). Accordingly, Richter was sometimes called a ‘belated Caspar David Friedrich’ in art criticism.

But even though Richter adopted a lay-out developed by Friedrich (an open-ended landscape without repoussoirs, with a low horizon, a high, empty sky above it and a foreground without a special focus), his apparent imitation of Friedrich is mediated by a photo. According to Richter, this method, which is fundamental to him, is what makes the painting more objective and ‘corrects’ his own view. Apart from that, the technique of blurring disturbs the painting's connection to the landscape that is represented. The painted landscape is hard to fix and oscillates between appearing and disappearing.

Richter's alleged connection to the work of Caspar David Friedrich is ambiguous at the very least. In 1973, Richter said ‘dass wir die Romantik nicht hinter uns gelassen haben. [...] Die Romantik ist bei weitem nicht erledigt. So wenig wie der Faschismus’. But straight after, when asked about the difference between his work and romanticism, he added: ‘Was mir fehlt, ist die geistige Grundlage auf der die romantische Malerei beruhte. Wir empfinden nicht mehr die “Allgegenwärtigkeit Gottes in der Natur”. Für uns ist alles leer’.

Richter's Landschaft bei Hubbelrath shows a contemporary, banal landscape in which a rain-drenched asphalt road, a road sign and bollards have domesticated nature. The fact that the painting is based on an amateur snapshot turns it into a fragment in time that seems to negate any claim to eternity. Nevertheless, Richter's landscapes, however unspectacular, can be seen as mediators of moods and desires in their allusion to romantic notions, even though continuity and discontinuity go hand in hand here and associations with romanticism are immediately undermined. Richter's painting Abendstimmung (1969), for

45 Bätschmann 2011, p. 64. See also: Rosenblum 1961 and Rosenblum 1975.
46 Werner Krüger quoted in: Godfrey 2011, p. 79.
example, recaptures, amongst other things, the romance of everyday desires as they are played out in any travel brochure. In that sense it is a reproduction of a reproduction of a clichéd mood, whether or not burdened with extra layers of meaning as it pervades our commodity culture in an endless circulation of unreflected images. The use of travel brochures or amateur snapshots also freed Richter’s landscapes of the artistic need for personal experience and aspects of the art of painting like style, composition, or (self-)expression. After all, the photo had already done that for him. In that sense, Richter’s Abendstimmung is just as banal as his painting of a toilet roll (Klorolle, 1965). But there is more.

Just as Kiefer’s retaking of earlier phases of painting during the sixties was seen as an anachronism, even as regressive, apropos the compelling course of art history, so were Richter’s landscapes. The taboo was reinforced by the idea that these kinds of paintings had perhaps had their legitimate historical moment during the romantic period but later, especially during the time of National Socialism, had become tainted. Moreover, Richter’s supposed relation to Friedrich was coloured by the particular way Friedrich had been received in the Third Reich, when some Nazis had seen him as a precursor of National Socialist art.50

However, in Richter’s emptiness it is the gulf that separates German romanticism from the post-Holocaust history of Richter and Germany that is shown.51 Richter’s landscapes are dominated by the need for a visual reflection on his own historical situation and the possibilities that are left for painting in this period. His art destabilizes traditional forms of representation and the inherited meanings attached to them. The subversive and contemporary quality of Richter’s landscapes, and this also applies to his Jerusalem, entails our insecurity about what we actually see in front of us.

We think we discern Friedrich’s art in Landschaft bei Hubbelrath because we bend the landscape to an art historical tradition, which then pervaded every nook and cranny of our media culture. It is an image conveyed by media that Richter displays in his paintings, and his landscapes, rather than claiming inner experiences of a religious nature, show the casual, incidental and banal-contemporary. Yet simultaneously, cultural and political layers of meaning that enriched, or indeed burdened, the landscape earlier also sound through in Richter’s paintings. What’s more, in his representation of the landscape he also

50 Godfrey 2011, p. 79 and p. 89 n. 38.
51 Godfrey 2011, p. 80.
touched upon nostalgic feelings of longing for what was lost. This makes Richter’s landscapes a form of ‘Trauerarbeit’.

Memory Images

The relationship between the painting as an art-immanent aesthetical attempt directed at the medium and the artistic debate on one hand, and the narrative spun around it, through which the painting positions itself in relation to the world at large on the other, is often complicated in Richter’s work. One example is the way Richter uses his family album for a layered and multifaceted memory art.

When Richter left East Germany with his wife Marianne (Ema) Eufinger in 1961, he also left his family behind. He would never see his parents again. Apparently he did take photos from the family album, because in the mid-sixties he used several of those as the basis of a number of paintings. Much has been written about these paintings, especially because over the course of the years, and therefore in hindsight, a connection between these works, which had initially gone unnoticed, was spotted. The story that pulls these works together leads us back to extremely nasty aspects of life in Germany under Nazi rule during the Second World War, but it is important to realise that to the uninitiated spectator – meaning virtually everyone around 1965 – these paintings seemed to have been derived from neutral, everyday private snaps.

From the group of five or six paintings, I select two here: Onkel Rudi (1965, Fig. 3.8) and Tante Marianne (1965, Fig. 3.9). The narrative one could spin around these photos can be summarized as follows. Onkel Rudi is based on a photo of the brother of Richter’s mother, Rudolf Schönfelder. It was an ordinary photograph at the time but it was made special by the course of history. It shows a proudly smiling young man in his Wehrmacht officer’s uniform, shortly before he was killed in 1944. Tante Marianne is the pendant painting to Onkel Rudi. In the painting she, 14 years old, is depicted with a baby: her nephew Gerhard Richter. When she was about nineteen, a mental illness that was diagnosed as schizophrenia manifested itself, and in 1938 she was admitted to a
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psychiatric clinic where she underwent forced sterilisation that same year, as a result of a decision by the court in Dresden. In February 1945, she was murdered as part of the Nazi’s euthanasia programme for the mentally ill. Her life story and the unique historical circumstances of her death cannot be deduced from the painting Richter made of her, however. Those circumstances only appear when we see the painting in relation to Onkel Rudi and one or two other works that are considered part of this group, and the underlying story that connects these paintings.  

These family paintings are often seen in the light of the collective silence of the German people about the war and the mass destruction of people in concentration camps and psychiatric institutions. This self-imposed forgetting
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55 Familie (1964) and Herr Heyde (1965) belong to these other works. Familie am Meer (1965) was not included until later.
plays an important role in divergent and sometimes conflicting interpretations of Richter’s work. One of the questions is to what extent Richter’s paintings helped break the post-war silence, all the more because the intrinsic connection of the works was not known to a larger audience at the time. With these paintings, Richter seems to simultaneously thematize the Nazi era and keep it at a distance. During the same years, Adolf Eichmann (in 1961 in Jerusalem) and guards of the concentration camps in Auschwitz (in 1963–1965 in Frankfurt) went on trial, and the German press wrote detailed reports about the mass destruction of the Jews for the first time.

Richter’s ‘realistic’ paintings are based on a specific type of given, everyday reality: amateur photos from the family album or photos from papers and magazines. By using them he plays out the dialectic between a desired aesthetic act on one hand and a static, objective world on the other. What is of special importance in this connection between painting and photography is the relation to memory. A photo shows us a reality that is elsewhere in time and place and thus replaces the current observation of reality. Living reality becomes history in the photo, but at the same time amateur photos are used as ‘memory aids’ in the battle against the destruction of time. In the words of Roland Barthes: ‘in-
stantaneous in space and past in time, in photography an illogical link between the now and the then is forged [...] the “has been” encroaches on the “is now”.56

Richter transforms the dematerialized, commonplace light image, handed down through time, into a material and handcrafted object, and by doing so returns the actual time and the actual space to the painting. The dialectic between the plastic-pictorial presence of the painting and an iconic-photographic absence, and the moving back and forth between present and past, presence and absence in one and the same image, leads to the essence of Richter’s work.

Although emptiness and absence form the core of Richter’s art, that which the image refers to still resonates in the painting, even though its accessibility is affected, as if a veil is lowered that precludes a sharp focus. The past is simultaneously brought closer and blurred in the painting. The fact that these artworks are paintings is crucial, because with their special technique they do exactly what a photo cannot do: present and pull back at the same time. With this technique, Richter shows processes of remembering and forgetting, and this is what makes his paintings into memory images.

Impossible Paintings

Germany’s deepest wound, which has never healed, is the Holocaust. Richter considered defining that almost unfathomable mass murder artistically in his paintings at least twice in his life as an artist, but both attempts failed due to the impossibility of the task. Both attempts can be traced in Richter’s Atlas.57

The first, from 1967, is a group of photos depicting the persecution of the Jews (arrests, public humiliation, executions and images from concentration camps) copied from books, some of which have been blurred or coloured in (Fig. 3.10).58 In Atlas, these are immediately followed by a number of panels

---


57 Richter’s Atlas is the ever-expanding collection of photos, newspaper and magazine cuttings and design sketches, brought together on panels, which served as part of the source material for Richter’s artworks and which has also been published as a book. Although the images in Richter’s Atlas more or less follow his development over the years, the order and arrangement of the panels/pages is more thematic than strictly chronological.

58 The photo at the top left (Fig. 10, panel 19), which is repeated twice more, depicts Jewish forced labourers, including Elie Wiesel, in concentration camp Buchenwald and was taken five days after the liberation by the Americans.
with photos from pornographic magazines. The second attempt is a larger group of photos, again of the persecution of the Jews, which he included in *Atlas* under the title ‘Holocaust’ in 1997 (panels 635–646). I believe that the problem with these attempts, and the reason they failed, is that Richter’s dialectic relation between appearing and disappearing cannot work here. Any artistic transformation of the photos is doomed to fail because these images will not be erased so easily. What the photos from the concentration camps have in common with the pornographic images is that the eye is caught in and by the obscene, which keeps forcing itself on the spectator through all artistic interventions. Apparently, Richter did not find a way to transform the need to look to a different level. His strategy of ‘unpainting’, that is to say, emphasizing the physical reality of the painting by pushing back the image, did not work here. All that was left was repetition and with it the impossibility of aesthetic reflection.

*Jerusalem (2)*

Richter’s soft-toned and sunny *Jerusalem* takes us in with ease – or at least it seems to. On closer examination it turns out that the city cannot be reached by

---


60 The concept of ‘unpainting’ comes from Storr 2000, p. 111.
our gaze. And even though the painting is based on an ordinary photo, dated to the exact day, that captured the factual existence of the city on 20 September 1995, the painting does not escape the ‘imagined reality’, the web of associations, desires, and memories that have been spun around the actual Jerusalem through the centuries.\textsuperscript{61} Three religions have developed a ‘sacred geography’ there that has everything to do with the ancient phenomenon of recognizing a place as the location where one makes contact with a supernatural, spiritual domain. Jerusalem cannot be separated from the mysterious, heavenly bliss it represents. Even though several religions dismiss each other’s founding stories as ‘mere’ myths, the city’s holiness is pre-eminently based on these mythologies. These myths are what make the various religious claims on Jerusalem so irrational and explosive and they are the source of deep conflicts that still continue in our time.

Unlike Kiefer’s painting, in which the heavenly and mythical Jerusalem is played out and separated from the geographical place in modern-day Israel, Richter’s earthly, personally viewed Jerusalem seems to be stripped of all that is holy and symbolic. However, this does not mean that Jerusalem can be construed as a commentary on paintings that are overburdened with meaning, like Kiefer’s. Even if Richter’s Jerusalem truly is stripped of all things transcendental and spiritual, that does not mean that the discordant history of the place can be banished from our memory and that Richter has not taken it into account. Just as his banal, pseudo-romantic, ‘untruthful’ Landschaft bei Hübbrath can only exist artistically by letting several cultural and historical meanings that shaped the landscape in art in the past sound through in the painting, Jerusalem cannot make us forget everything the city stands for just like that. Jerusalem is also part of a historical and narrative context that exists outside the painting.

In the post-war era, Jews regard Jerusalem as the city with ‘healing power’: ‘they see Jewish Jerusalem rising phoenix-like from the ashes of Auschwitz’.\textsuperscript{62} Richter is a special outsider here, however – not a perpetrator, but a German and raised in the GDR, a state that did not consider the Nazi era part of its own history and therefore excused itself from the moral duty of recognizing the state of Israel. Aside from that, his Jerusalem places itself in an artistic context that is partly formed by Richter’s art preceding this painting. The painting links itself to other works, including Onkel Rudi and Tante Marianne, which show us in an ambivalent way that we are unable to prevent the tragedies that ensue

\textsuperscript{61} The concept of ‘imagined reality’, specifically related to Jerusalem, is borrowed from Armstrong 2005, p. xi.

\textsuperscript{62} Armstrong 2005, p. x.
from convictions, ideas and religion. They draw on actual events in the world, even though the act of painting brings them into the realm of art, where they play their own game.

If Kiefer’s Jerusalem sets off into a mythical Ursprungszeit, Richter’s Jerusalem shows the dialectic of the then and now, the now of December 1995, when he painted the town. On the evening of 4 November 1995, prime minister Yitzhak Rabin was murdered in Tel Aviv by Yigal Amir, an ultra-right, Jewish student who violently opposed the so-called Oslo Accords that Rabin had reached earlier with the Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat in 1993 and 1995. Based on the politics of ‘land for peace’, these agreements regulated the right of self-government of the Palestinians in the Palestine territories. Another part of the agreement was that Arafat’s PLO was to recognise the state of Israel’s right to exist and renounce its destruction. However, orthodox Jews, ultranationalists, and supporters of the Likud Party saw the Palestinian territories as indissolubly linked to the God-given Jewish land. The magazine Nekuda, published by settlers, wrote that Rabin’s government was a ‘government of blood’ and the leader and founder of the secular right-wing party Tsomet, Rafal Eitan, called the council of ministers ‘a bunch of judenrat quislings’. On 5 October 1995, a month before Rabin’s murder, a demonstration was held against ‘Oslo II’, at which Likud politicians Benjamin Netanyahu and Ariel Sharon spoke, amongst others. Rabin was represented as a Nazi collaborator and demonstrators carried posters on which he was depicted wearing a Nazi uniform. In this political turmoil, mythical history, recent past and current events fell on top of each other.

Before the end of that year, Gerhard Richter painted Jerusalem – a fading image of longing, absence, incompleteness and frustration that is as equally incapable of holding on to the past as it is of focussing on the future.

---

64 The posters can be seen in a YouTube clip about the Likud demonstration. (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9MTx8O_hzU, accessed on 28 August 2013). At 2:31 signs are shown on which Arafat is compared to Hitler and Rabin to Pétain (the French Field Marshal who collaborated with the Germans during World War II and led a puppet regime in Vichy France). Between 4:10 and 4:25 the posters depicting Rabin in a Nazi uniform are shown. These posters were based on a photo of Heinrich Himmler.
65 Richter took his photo of Jerusalem on 20 September 1995. In Gerhard Richter 2005, all paintings are mentioned and shown in chronological order. Both paintings with the title Jerusalem (numbers 835–1 and 835–2) are part of the last six of a total of 61 paintings Richter made that year. After that followed four smaller abstract works.
**Jerusalem & Jerusalem: diverging and converging practices of memory**

Both Anselm Kiefer and Gerhard Richter's practices of memory consist of a continuous selection, rearrangement and transformation of images. This is why a constant transference of meaning takes place in the work of both artists, making it impossible to fix that work in its meaning. Yet the way the various works within both oeuvres refer to each other follows a course that prevents arbitrariness and provides a consistency behind which a coherent conception of art is hidden, developing in different directions over time. It is clear that the conceptions of both artists vary greatly. Kiefer's *Jerusalem* consists of an almost overwhelming accumulation of materials and objects, in part metaphorically used; Richter's much smaller work shows nothing more than a thin skin of oil paint, in which his distinctive artistic processes (from photo to painting) lie. Kiefer's painting seems overburdened with potential meanings of a great and mystical weight, while in Richter's work such a notion of 'deep' meaning appears to have been dissolved so far that it seems empty to us – although inability is also thematized in his work.

Nonetheless, both artists play out the dualism between the banal and the sublime. Although Kiefer's imagination may possess ahistorical and mythical-theological dimensions, the impulse behind it is the German history and identity, which he and his contemporaries experienced as highly problematic. Moreover, his work is at least as concerned with the earthly and human, even in its horrific forms, as it is with a promise of salvation.

Richter may seem much more focussed on the here and now and reflect on current events in his art, but while doing so he also often refers, directly or indirectly, to a long tradition of cultural and religious practices. And at least part of his work deals with the same problematic German history and identity that was also at the root of Kiefer's work up until and well into the eighties. Both artists show that they are ambivalent about the world and how it can be represented by art, and that ambivalence returns in artworks filled with hermeneutic undecidability. Both apply, albeit in very different ways, a self-conscious, anachronistic practice of 'postmodern' history painting that is capable of keeping history present in the consciousness in a critical and historically-specific way.

In their art, both Kiefer and Richter work with a concept of ‘multidirectional memory’, which is based on the complicated interweaving of various practices of memory in a state of constant reconstruction and in varying relations
between collective memory and identity, as advocated by Michael Rothberg. Memory and identity are never pure and authentic, neither are they connected by a straight line. Their relationship is subject to continuous reconstruction, whereby one's own memories and identities interfere with those of others: 'Memories are not owned by groups, nor are groups "owned" by memories', according to Rothberg. Add to this the ahistorical quality of memory – bringing together then and now, there and here – and the memory practices and identity constructions attached to them seem unstable and subject to constant enrichment or even reversal. Kiefer and Richter both take part in these kinds of multiple memory processes. Even though their artistic ideas and the execution of those ideas are very different, they both reflect each other’s practices. It is in that reflection that they take part in the dynamic transfer as it occurs in memory between various places and times. To both artists, remembering is ‘making present’, bringing a layered and traumatic past into a heterogeneous and changing present.

Both Kiefer’s Jerusalem and Richter’s Jerusalem are about coping with bereavement in a productive way rather than about passive melancholy. Both paintings are part of chains of references within oeuvres that deal with the way Germany copes with the Second World War, especially the Holocaust, and the inability to visualize it directly. In Kiefer’s case, Jerusalem takes a new position within a group of works that make the transition from an art that is focussed on German history to one that takes Jewish history and culture as its subject. Richter’s Jerusalem places the impossibility of remembering opposite this. Of course he remembers, but he does not really know what and how and what to do with it, except to turn that inability into an artwork, and by doing so, visualize the problem of contemporary painting without a ‘deeper meaning’.

Both Jerusalems are the result of the conflict between remembering and forgetting and the ‘re-remembering’ of a ruined past in an indirect way. In the paintings, the unimaginable is partly presented by using the banal, trivial and cliché, but in such a way that the result remains filled with doubt. Like all memories, these paintings are layered and subject to constant rearranging, because they do not only refer to other media themselves, from tourists’ photos to historical images, but also because they in turn are media that activate memory and carry its burden.

---

67 Rothberg 2009, p. 5.
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CHAPTER 4

Ezekiel for Solomon
The Temple of Jerusalem in Seventeenth-century Leiden and the Case of Cocceius

Jeroen Goudeau

The Temple of Jerusalem, one of the most important building sites for Jews, Christians, and Muslims, has been a permanent topic of theological, historical, and political discourse. The Temple is also one of the most archetypical buildings in the history of architecture. It was not just one building but referred to various successive building complexes, one of which was seen only in a vision by the prophet Ezekiel. Speaking of the Temple in general is problematic. After a necessarily lapidary overview of some historical data, in this contribution the context of the discussion will be limited to the work of a geographically delineated group of scholars who offered an interpretation of the Temple at one particular period in time. In order to grasp some of the peculiarities of the multifaceted phenomenon, this paper will concentrate on the situation in Leiden in the second half of the seventeenth century, from an architectural-historical point of view. A special focus will be on Johannes Cocceius (1603–69) and his interpretation of the Temple as described in Ezekiel’s prophecy. It took this verbose Leiden theologian only a few words to explain the Temple vision of Ezekiel: ‘It is clear that this sight was shown for the solace of the Israelites, so that those who have not had, nor had seen the Temple, while beholding this Temple, would contemplate on the meaning of this sight.’ Along with his philological, emblematic study of the Temple, Cocceius presented an actual reconstruction of the Temple as contemporary architecture. His attempt can be understood as biblical criticism by visual means, in which text and image are closely intertwined. The engravings of the Temple that accompanied his

1 Much has been written on (aspects of) the Temple. A recent general introduction: Goldhill 2004; on the site of the Temple with references to the actual situation: Schanks 2007. As this contribution concentrates on architecture, see especially: Hermann 1967; Busink 1970–80; Rosenau 1979; Vogelsang 1981; Van Pelt 1984; Ramírez 1991; Von Naredi-Rainer 1994.

2 “t is klaar, dat dit gesichte vertoond geweest is tot vertroostinge van den Israeliten, opdat die, die geen tempel hadden nog sagen, door het beschouwen van desen tempel ondertusschen sig souden besig houden en overdenken, wat dit gesigte zoude kunnen betekenen.’ Cocceius 1691, p. 641.
text can be understood as part of an architectural debate, parallel to theology and biblical chronology, conducted on another level and with other means, but within the same context of criticism.

**Biblical Architecture**

The question of the Temple can be regarded as closely connected to the history of the People of the Book as a whole – to Jerusalem as well as to the Exile and Diaspora. In the course of the unsettled times, the appearance of the Temple, or, to be more precise, of the successive Temples, evolved fundamentally, as did the meaning. In order to contextualize the seventeenth-century perspective, a few data that played a role in the debates of that era need to be discussed.

The original Temple of Jerusalem on Mount Moria would have been built (according to modern knowledge around 961 BCE) by King Solomon as per God’s own instructions to King David. The so-called first Second Temple was erected on the same spot, on the foundations of this earliest construction. The rebuilding was executed (between 536–515 BCE) after the Jewish people had returned from their Exile in Babylon. The first building had been destroyed (in 586 BCE) when King Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem. The rebuilding of the Temple took place under Judah’s governor Zerubbabel, during Darius reign, and is also referred to as Temple of Zerubbabel. This second construction was once again partly replaced and was expanded to twice its size under Roman rule by King Herod (started in 20 BCE and only completed after his death). The latter complex, also referred to as the Second Temple, was finally destroyed by the Roman commander and future emperor Titus in 70 CE. These structures received a virtual counterpart: the future Temple in the vision of the prophet Ezekiel. Chronologically Ezekiel’s was the second documented Temple, envisioned during the Captivity (around 593–568 BCE). On the one hand, Ezekiel’s version was a prophecy of a Temple yet to come but, on the other hand, the description clearly recalled Solomon’s divine and archetypical example in Jerusalem.

All these Temples and their supposed historical existence were known from texts. In the late sixteenth and seventeenth century the Temple aroused new interest, as did other biblical physical structures and locations, such as the

---

3 See e.g.: Edelman 2005.
4 The interpretation of Ezekiel’s visionary Temple is an ongoing debate. This is also the case with the biblical Temple descriptions. See for instance: McCormick 2002.
Tower of Babel, Noah’s Ark, and the Garden of Eden. Prelates, princes, biblical scholars and architects began to study anew the Temple of Jerusalem in the Old Testament, and in addition to that in the Jewish rabbinical commentaries. The most studied passages were in the historical Bible books I Kings 6 and 7, II Chronicles 3, and the Mishnah passages Middoth II and IV. Biblical scholars also consulted the account of the Temple by the Romano-Jewish historian Flavius Josephus in Antiquities of the Jews (ca. 94 CE) and the chronicle of the final destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple in 70 CE in The Jewish War (ca. 75 CE). Ezekiel’s Temple vision was described in chapters 40–48 of his prophecy. The main reference to the original Tabernacle, the heart of the Temple, was found in Exodus 25–31 and 35–40. Josephus’s report was about the Temple building he had actually seen, whereas Ezekiel saw something that might come in the future. Then there was also another view – that of the end of time, beyond Ezekiel and beyond the Temple. The New Testament ends with pages of John’s Apocalypse in which the New Jerusalem is imagined in chapter 21. This was again a symbolic view but with mention of exact formal characteristics that in some respects were considered to resemble those of Solomon’s Temple.

These texts contain a mix of references to characteristics and fairly exact measurements of the Temple complex. Today, scholars emphasize the differences in character, age, and aim of the accounts, while early modern biblical critics and theologians were mainly concerned with the fact that multiple data in the texts vary. Scholarly debate was devoted to the reconciliation of all the apparently incompatible indications, as well as to the question of how to fit the inconsistencies into one theological narrative. In their meticulous discussion of the exact physical qualities of the various Temple descriptions and the spatial relationships between the buildings and their surroundings, the early modern scholars differed essentially from their medieval predecessors.

One way of arranging all the directions into a meaningful whole was to reconstruct the verbal Temple visually – in scaled drawings or by way of a well-proportioned model. Here artists, architects and architectural theorists became involved. They not only translated words into images but in addition transferred certain characteristics of the Temple to new buildings, and – in part unintentionally – transferred characteristics of contemporary architecture to the Temple. For the first time visualization was more than schematic, allegorical or typological interpretation – it entered the domain of the architect.

---

6 Flavius Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, esp. vIII 61–129, xI 8–17, 57–83, xv 380–424; idem, The Jewish War, esp. v 136–247, vI 249–356. Neither Josephus’s apparent ideological point of view, nor the dependability of his account were questioned at the time.
7 See e.g.: Delano-Smith 2012, pp. 42–44.
Protestant Tendencies

Having been destroyed in Jerusalem and projected as a future state, the Temple could just be detached symbolically from its original context and be transferred to other times and other places. Moreover, with regard to the Temple, in early modern Europe the travel reports from the Holy City were considered far less reliable than the accounts in the Bible, because after Josephus they could only describe what was no longer there, and even then in fragmentary detail. In the sixteenth, but mainly in the seventeenth century, in the wake of the new biblical criticism, the theme of reconstructing the Temple gained importance. Despite the irreconcilable differences between the Roman Catholic Church and Protestantism and the vehement controversies between the two, the Temple received a great deal of scholarly attention from both sides. The Catholic countries kept their focus primarily on Catholic sources. Two very influential reconstructions of the Temple were conceived at the Spanish court of King Philip II (1527–98). The first was the result of the rational approach of the librarian of the Escorial Benito Arias Montanus (1527–98), who studied the historically successive Temple constructions. In sharp contrast to this, the Jesuit Juan Battista Villalpando (1552–08) developed a comprehensive and very detailed classicist reconstruction in collaboration with his colleague Jerónimo Prado (1547–95). This reconstruction was primarily based on the prophetic Temple of Ezekiel. Published only after the death of Philip II and Prado, in three volumes between 1596 and 1605, it was Villalpando’s impressively visualized architecture that would definitely combine the reconstruction according to Ezekiel’s vision with the notion of Solomon’s first Temple.

While the weight of Villalpando’s intimidating scholarly reconstruction had almost settled the discussion in Catholic circles in the South, with France in a somewhat indefinite middle position, his work challenged the studies in the North. Unlike Italy and Spain, the religiously fragmented territories of Northern Europe took many different available Temple reconstructions and interpretations into consideration. Yet even there the monumental work by Prado and Villalpando would become the benchmark of Temple literature, especially in the Protestant states of Germany and in the Dutch Republic. It did not matter that the Northern Netherlands had freed themselves from the Spanish

---

8. On the translocation of holy sites such as the Holy Sepulchre, see for example the contribution by Bram de Klerck in this volume.


crown only shortly before. What is striking is that in the countries of the Reformation the scholarly debate on the Temple was both broad and intense.

In the Dutch Republic, the Temple appears to be etched in the memory of theologians, poets, playwrights, painters and architects alike. The painter-architect Salomon de Bray (1597–1664) sought the origin of architecture in God’s instructions to Solomon, just as Villalpando had done previously.\footnote{De Bray 1631, p. 2.} The Jewish scholar and rabbi, Jacob Jehuda Leon (1602–75) from Middelburg made an almost obsessive study of Solomon’s architecture, earning himself the nickname ‘Templo’. He constructed a large wooden scale model with which he travelled round as far as London and published a series of engravings and descriptions of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem based on Villalpando and Jewish sources such as Middoth.\footnote{Between 1642 and 1675 nine different editions appeared in seven languages. See: Offenberg 1976; Offenberg 1993; Offenberg 2004.} The circle around the Stadtholder’s secretary and erudite diplomat Constantijn Huygens (1596–1687) took a keen interest in the subject as well, especially in relation to architecture. In his discussions with the architect Jacob van Campen (1596–1657) on the characteristics and importance of the new classicist architecture, Huygens included the Temple reconstructions by Villalpando and the Frenchman François Vatable (d 1547). In 1637, Huygens obtained a fine copy of Villalpando’s Ezekiel commentary himself (Fig. 4.1).\footnote{On Huygens and Villalpando, see: Ottenheym 1999, pp. 94–95; Vlaardingerbroek 2011, pp. 71–72. Huygens’s own copy can be identified in the library of Radboud University Nijmegen, sign. OD a 30. The three frontispieces contain his autograph: ‘Constanter’.} Van Campen must have become greatly fascinated by the Temple, as he integrated aspects of the Temple in his own architecture. He made explicit formal references to the Temple with, for instance, the imposing outward curving buttresses (derived from Villalpando’s engravings), ornaments such as the pomegranate (common emblems of the Resurrection and the community of the faithful) and, less obvious, the Temple dimensions that were derived from the scattered Bible passages. A fine example is the Nieuwe Kerk in Haarlem (1645–47), which contains all these elements, both on the exterior and the interior.\footnote{Ozinga 1929, pp. 59–66; Van der Linden 1990.} The magistral Portuguese Synagogue of Amsterdam of 1671–74 designed by Elias Bouman (1635–86) is another attempt to integrate the Temple into Dutch Classicist architecture.\footnote{Portugese Synagoge 2012, pp. 55–72.} Van Campen went further than applying the Temple to his church architecture. He even used the less common Palace of Solomon as a model for the prestigious Amsterdam Town Hall.\footnote{Vlaardingerbroek 2011, pp. 68–76.} Both the architectural
and intellectual references to biblical architecture in which Van Campen mixed Solomon’s and Ezekiel’s Temple – as did many others – had a strong influence on the most important architects of Dutch Classicism around him, such as Pieter Post, Daniël Stalpaert, Adriaan Dortsman and, not least, Arent
van 's-Gravesande (ca. 1610–62). After his training with Van Campen, Van 's-Gravesande was to become city architect of Leiden.17

The Rapenburg Constellation

For some time the heartland of Temple study in the Dutch Republic must have been Leiden. The Dutch Calvinist tradition of Hebrew and rabbinical studies rooted in and around the new state’s first university, which was founded in this second largest city of the Republic. Like the interest in more or less modern classical philology in general, the interest in Hebrew also started there with Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609).18 It was further established by the Hebraist Johannes Drusius Sen., who soon left Leiden in 1584 for a position in Franeker. This brand new university then would become the second centre of Hebrew studies. In Leiden the jurist and antiquarian Petrus Cunaeus (1586–1638) set a standard with his De Republica Hebræorum, a three-volume study on Jewish polity in the Old Testament, which appeared in 1617 and ran through fourteen reprints as well as translations in Dutch, French, and English.19 The highly detailed treatment of the old legislation and of the many Jewish customs, as well as those of ancient gentiles, was illustrated by evocative prints.

With regard to architecture, Cunaeus’s ground plan of Jerusalem, for which he had looked closely at Villalpando’s example, is of interest (Fig. 4.2). The irregular city consists of more or less square housing blocks that have been adapted to the hilly terrain. The public, religious and state buildings are placed on squares and, what is essential, they all have elementary geometric volumes. David’s Palace is situated in the centre of the circular fortress of his city, whereas the building itself is built on a square plan. The square or rectangular ground form with cubic corner pavilions is the basic type for nearly all the other large structures, like the Fortress of Antiochus, the Palace of Annas and the House of Pilatus. The special shape of the Palace of Solomon is remarkable, with its double inner courts that would become the example for Van Campen’s Amsterdam Town Hall.20 Semicircular and elliptical theatres are also present, referring to the Roman period. The city is dominated however, by the cubic Temple mountain and the square Temple complex on top of it, consisting of three concentric courts with the inner court again divided in nine inner squares. Cunaeus was

17 Steenmeijer 2005.
18 Katchen 1984, esp. part I.
19 I have consulted the Dutch edition by Willem Goeree: Cunaeus 1682–83.
20 First observed by Guido Steenmeijer. See: Vlaardingerbroek 2011, p. 254 n. 190.
far from original with this plan of Jerusalem. Indeed this representation, established by Villalpando, can be said to be the iconic image of the Holy City during the seventeenth century. What is perhaps most interesting in this context is that the plan can be taken as a sample sheet for (Dutch) classicist architectural types and town planning. In a complex reciprocity, this image on the one hand was the product of a contemporary classicist ideal, while on the other hand this architecture, once projected on the buildings of the Holy City, provided authoritative type examples for the architecture of its time. Though frequently occurring in architectural history, the force of this visual rhetorical mechanism in the spread of the classical ideal in the Dutch Republic must not be underestimated.

The Temple and the appeal of biblical architecture found its expression in the design of real buildings. The Leiden city architect Arent van 's-Gravesande drew inspiration from the Temple for the measurements of the Marekerk (1639–48): 100 by 100 (by 100) feet, a proportion Jacob Jehuda Leon had given
before.\textsuperscript{21} In the façade of the almshouses of the Hofje van Brouchoven (1639–41), Van 's-Gravesande made reference to the frontispiece of Villalpando's second volume of Ezekiel's Temple vision.\textsuperscript{22} In this case the source was not a particular reconstructed ancient building, but the classicist imaginary architecture of a title page – a purely intellectual citation.

Cunaeus and his generation had only started a discussion that also spread to Franeker and Amsterdam. Nevertheless, the Calvinist scholarly discussion culminated in Leiden with the two most influential Christian Hebraists of the time, Constantijn L'Empereur and Johannes Cocceius. Constantijn L'Empereur van Oppyck (1591–1648) became professor of Hebrew studies in 1627. He met Van 's-Gravesande when they both became involved in the project of the Bibliotheca Thysiana (1654–57) at Leyden's most prominent canal the Rapenburg.\textsuperscript{23} In 1630, L'Empereur published the first Latin translation of the Mishnah treatise Middoth.\textsuperscript{24} The choice for this text is not clear and even raises some questions. Moreover, it cannot be explained by L'Empereur's official university commitment to refute rabbinical exegesis (\textit{adversus judæos}).\textsuperscript{25} The text deals mainly with the proportions of the Temple – Middoth means 'measurements' – and therefore is at some distance from theological key problems of the time or of rabbinic studies in general. However, the book did complement or correct known information about the dimensions of the Temple given in the Old Testament. L'Empereur mentions in his preface to the book that his close friends Daniel Heinsius and Gerard Johannes Vossius in Leiden had encouraged him to carry out this enterprise. The book was dedicated to the States of Holland, which suggests that it filled a certain need, or at least that there was an intellectual audience for it. Maybe the audience was indeed the Stadholder's court or the Huygens circle.\textsuperscript{26} More important is the phenomenon that on many occasions and in art, politics and theology the new Dutch state was advertised as the New Israel – the concept of \textit{Neerlands Israel}.\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{21} Steenmeijer 2005, pp. 182–87, esp. p. 183.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Steenmeijer 2005, pp. 217–21. Prado had died in 1595 so Villalpando delivered the last two volumes of the study alone.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Steenmeijer 2005, pp. 255–56.
\item \textsuperscript{24} L'Empereur 1630; Van Rooden 1985, pp. 137–40.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Van Rooden 1985, p. 174.
\item \textsuperscript{26} L'Empereur knew Huygens from a distance and once wrote to him, reminding him that they had common family ties. See: Van Rooden 1985, pp. 231–32.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Bisschop 1993; Van Campen 2006, \textit{passim}. Dunkelgrün 2009 provides an erudite overview of interpretations of this 'abundance of Hebraic imagery, Old Testament themes, biblical analogies, and other expressions of Israelite self-perception in Dutch Golden Age culture'.
\end{itemize}
In Leiden, the Temple theme proved to be far more than an incidental whim or private matter of isolated theorists. The people involved came from different directions and operated more or less independently on their own projects, but geographically they were concentrated around a small spot in Leiden, the Rapenburg. The university was located around this canal, as were several publishing houses like Elsevier’s. Nearly all the professors of importance lived on or near this centre of learning. At the same time as the rise of the intellectual and social status around the canal, the townscape of this quarter developed at a brisk pace. Its medieval character acquired a new décor, an architecture according to the latest classicist standards with the ‘learned’ ionic pilaster façades. Mathematician and private lecturer Nicolaus Goldmann (1611–65) taught architecture and fortification in a block of houses at the Rapenburg.28 By now it will come as no surprise that the comprehensive and highly systematic architectural theory he developed was ultimately founded on the Temple. His main source was Ezekiel’s vision, and his main example Villalpando. On this canal, also, lived the second renowned Hebraist of the era, Johannes Cocceius.29

**Under the Spell of Ezekiel**

Like L’Empereur, the theologian Johannes Cocceius (Koch or Cock; 1603–69) was born in Bremen.30 He was trained as a philologist in Latin and Greek, as well as in Hebrew and Arabic. In Hamburg he was taught by a rabbi. In 1626 he moved to Franeker where he came under the influence of the Hebraist Sixtinus Amama, who by that time had succeeded Drusius. There Cocceius skillfully translated Sanhedrin and Makkot, two treatises from the Mishnah, into Latin, an achievement that won the admiration of Hugo Grotius, Heinsius and L’Empereur.31 Eventually, in 1650, his fame brought him to Leiden, where he became professor of theology. There he further developed his federal theology, claiming a covenant of grace to all true Christians.32 Although a famous theologian, it was for his Hebrew Lexicon that he became renowned after his

---

28 Goudeau 2005. Goldmann lived in the Hof van Zessen, i.e. Rapenburg 28F, now the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden.
29 ‘Coccejus, professor, weduwe en erven, Noord-Rapenburg’. *Leidse Lasten 1674*.
30 On Cocceius: Van Asselt 1997; Van Asselt 2001[a] and [b]. In Dutch his name is written as Coccejus, in Latin as Cocceius or Coccejus.
31 Cocceius 1629.
32 Developed in his main publication: *Summa Doctrinæ de Fœdere & Testamento Dei explicata*, Amsterdam 1648.
death.33 The Countess Palatine Maria Eleonore of Brandenburg (1642–88) at Kaiserslautern urged him to this immense project; he was able to finish it only shortly before his death in 1669. His strong philological inclination and his almost exclusive focus on the Bible, combined with his more or less prophetic exegesis, brought him at the end of his life to delve into the vision of Ezekiel.34

The book Prophetia Ezechielis, Cum Commentario appeared in Amsterdam in 1669. It consists of three parts: forty-eight richly annotated chapters of the Bible book (‘Ezechiel Propheta’, 372 pp.); an elaborate commentary on the chapters 40–48 that deal with the description of the Temple (‘Significatio Templi Ezechielis’, 42 pp.); and in between, nineteen full-page engravings that visualize Cocceius’s interpretation of Ezekiel’s Temple, accompanied by a short description (‘Typus Sanctuarii’; 4 pp.). The treatise was reprinted in Cocceius’s Opera Omnia of 1673–75 by his son Johannes Henricus Cocceius, who also published a Dutch translation in 1691: De Prophetie Van Ezechiel, Met de Uitleggingen Van Johannes Cocceius.35 For this edition the illustrations were engraved anew, differing only in minor details.

Cocceius argued that Ezekiel’s vision was about the Third Temple and could not be the one built by Zerubbabel. He maintained that this Second Temple, which looked very different from Ezekiel’s version, had been corrupted in the past and had subsequently been destroyed. Moreover, Christ had come to the Second Temple, and according to the prophecy of Daniel 9:24, the Holy City and its Sanctuary had been ruined. Jerusalem was no longer the place where God could be found.36 Finally, Ezekiel saw a Temple in the south, outside a city, whereas the measurements were far too large to fit on the plateau anyway.

The Third Temple would be immaterial, stated Cocceius, because God could not dwell in a House made by man. To understand the significance of this imagined building was to search for its hidden meaning. The vision prophesied the Kingdom of God, a spiritual reality with a spiritual significance.37 Cocceius’s whole commentary, in fact, is an argument to prove these points. It is strange that to this end Cocceius undertook a meticulous reconstruction of the Temple vision, both in words and in architecture (Figs 4.3–4.6). Although in

36 Cocceius 1691, p. 642.
37 Cocceius 1691, p. 642.
this he was anything but an exception, his rather hands-on approach to the architectural design seems at first sight incompatible with his emphasis on the intangibility of the structure. He took his project seriously and involved two specialists in it. The first of these was Samuel Kechelius, or Samuel Carl Kechel ab Hollensteyn (1611–68). Kechelius was a mathematician and astronomer from Prague and worked as a private lecturer in Leiden. He became known for first observing the comet (‘staert-ster’) of 1664, which he described both to Christiaan Huygens and in a short tract. Cocceius asked Kechelius because of his knowledge of mathematical problems and of architecture. He could help with the conversion and interpretation of the biblical textual indications to a three-dimensional architecture. It is unknown if the two were already acquainted, but both where connected to the university. 

Curiously, the Czech Kechelius was the direct Rapenburg neighbour of the Silesian mathematician and architectural private lecturer Nicolaus Goldmann, who had presented his reconstruction of the Temple in 1659 or even earlier, so they must have exchanged ideas on this and other architectural topics. Cocceius had begun his Ezekiel commentary before 1665, the year Goldmann died. It is possible that Kechelius, as his neighbour and colleague, then became the nearest specialist at hand. Kechelius, in his turn, died in 1668. Possibly the work was not wholly finished at that time. Meanwhile, a second specialist was added to the team. Cocceius’s Amsterdam publisher, Johannes van Someren, 

---

38 Cocceius writes: ‘Wij hebben dan ook, na dat wy de woorden des Propheten, soo nauw als mogelik ondersocht hadden, alles aangewend, op dat volgens de Prophetische maten, alle de plaatsen en deelen des Heyligdoms, door den Edelen en Vermaarden Wis-Konstenaar Samuel Karel Kechel goeder gedachtenisse, souden afgeschetst werden, op dat zelfs de oogen mochten sien en oordeelen van de seer gevoegsme bestellinge en bouw-orden’. Cocceius 1691, p. 628.


40 In a letter to Constantijn Huygens the Leiden mathematician Franciscus van Schooten Jun characterized him as very renowned for his knowledge in arithmetic, geometry, fortification and perspective, and as loved by all his colleagues: ‘so heeft de voorsz. persoon groote renommee in de konst [...] ende hy verders van ijder seer bemint sy’. Briefwisseling Huygens 1911–17, vol. 4 (1915), 1644–49, Gs 24, p. 317, letter 4369, 4 June 1646.

41 On 8 February 1666 Kechelius received an annual salary of 200 guilders by the senate of the university for 32 years of service in the study of mathematics. In 1667 he was not appointed as the successor of Golius but instead obtained permission for astronomical demonstrations at the university observatory. See: Molhuysen 1913–24, vol. 3, pp. 204 and 212.


43 Cocceius makes no mention of Goldmann, nor explains his choice for Kechelius.
recommended a skilled architect of the Roman Catholic confession. Although he is not mentioned by name, it is almost certain that Philips Vingboons (1607–78) was the architect in question.44 Vingboons was in great demand by the elite on the new canals in Amsterdam, for whom he also designed a fine series of country estates.45 The preparation for the book and the illustrations were sent by mail and each stage of the visualization was discussed.46 Initially there had even been plans to build a wooden model of the Temple as well, as Jacob Jehuda Leon and others had done. After 1665, this expensive and labour-intensive plan must have been abandoned.47

According to Cocceius

On the whole, Cocceius interpreted the Bible historically. He developed a precise doctrine of seven successive stages of the liberation of the Church as described in the Revelation of St John and prophesied in Deuteronomy. These

44 Later, Cocceius’s son Johannes Henricus did not come up with a name either, but spoke of ‘one of the most eminent architects of Amsterdam’. Cocceius Jun 1692, p. 30. I thank Robert Jan van Pelt for this additional information. His explanation for this anonymity is that there arose a conflict between Cocceius and Vingboons. Van Pelt 1991, p. 105.


46 Cocceius wrote about the progress in some letters to his friend Johannes van Dalen, the Calvinist minister of the Palatine court at Kaiserslautern. While the typesetting progressed to chapter 38, Cocceius received the drawing of the Temple façade from the Amsterdam artist, he reported at 3 September 1667: ‘Ezechiel ad cap. 38. processit. Amsterodami Templum inciduntur æri. Artificem nacti sumus Pontificium, qui orthographiam ejus exhibeat’, Cocceius 1673–75, vol. 6 (1673), p. 67, Epistola cxliv; ‘Sex tabulæ sunt caulatae […] Pleraque hæc jam sunt formata ab Architecto Amstelodamensi, homine Pontificio, sed industrio, cælatura restat. Editor meus non parcit sumtibus’. Cocceius 1673–75, vol. 6 (1673), p. 74, Epistola clxi: On 22/12 May 1668 the architects’ drawings were ready. Apart from the first six illustrations, all the engraving had still to be done, for which the publisher reached into his pockets willingly.

47 This is mentioned in a letter again to Van Dalen in 1665, but Cocceius is not very convinced about the chance of success: ‘Cæterum idem artifex [i.e. Kechelius/ Vingboons?] cogitaverat structuram hanc erigere è ligno. Sed, quia è manu laborat, & non habet, qui eum adjuvet, ab ipso nihil spero. Et nonnullius sumtus id foret’. Cocceius 1673–75, vol. 6 (1673), p. 57, Epistola cxviii.
stages were taken as seven successive and actual historical periods (*curriculum regni*). The first stage spanned the period from Christ’s Ascension to the destruction of Jerusalem. The fifth period was marked by the Reformation, while the Thirty Years’ War (1618–48) made the sixth. God’s Realm was eventually to be fulfilled in the seventh stage. According to Cocceius’s multi-staged, dynamic and eschatological expectation, the end of time would take place around 1667. His belief in the restoration of Israel in the countries of the Reformation, with far-reaching theological consequences, puts Cocceius’s simultaneous involvement with Ezekiel’s Temple vision in an imperative context. As the end of time, the present day acquired pregnant biblical dimensions. Therefore, for Cocceius the spiritual Temple must have been of highly topical interest. He must have felt strongly about his reconstruction project.

While becoming real in these very years, the Temple could not be visualized other than by the apex of contemporary architecture. This becomes evident in the nineteen engravings that accompany the text. They show the ground plans of the terrain, the complex and individual buildings, the façades, the cross-sections, and some special architectural elements such as the Solomonic columns, cherub decoration and the altar for burnt offering (*holocaustum*) (Figs 4.3–4.6). Besides the Temple building in the centre of the complex, Cocceius devoted a great deal of space to the annexes, such as the entrance gates and the houses of the priests. All buildings, with their specific position, measurements and decoration come together in a persuasive bird’s-eye view of the complex with the Temple in the middle of a symmetrical lay-out (Fig. 4.3). The accuracy of the reconstruction is represented by the dominating grid. Moreover, the effect of the one-point perspective is intensified by axonometric projection, in this case the absence of a perspectival shortening. This drawing method also stresses the important role of the exactitude of the measurements. All in all, this perspective is more than an attractive addition to the traditional set of drawings required in architectural design: plan, elevation, and section. It is the recapitulation of an interpretation, emphasizing that all the parts and all the biblical instructions fit together.

One of the standing points of criticism in most reconstructions of the Temple was the determination of the unit of measure, that is, the interpretation of the biblical terms ‘cubit’ and ‘palm’ and the exact length of the measuring rod, as in Ezekiel 40:5. Villalpando and many others had opted for a rod of six cubits plus one palm. Cocceius read instead that every sacred Cubit measured an ordinary cubit plus a palm. The consequences for the overall dimensions were

---

49 Cocceius 1691, p. 646.
enormous, as Cocceius’s later critics would adduce. In fact, almost the whole project of the Temple is about measurements. The problem now is about how to bring these measurements together for the purposes of architecture, or, perhaps more accurately, how to fill in the parts that were not specified. The way Cocceius speaks about architectural detail shows his keen interest in the matter and reveals his contact with architectural specialists. He writes with ease about the detailing of mouldings or the arrangement of rooms. A large part of his philological enterprise concerns the interpretation of the text in architectural terms. However, at every turn Cocceius uses his architectural enunciations for a theological, emblematic interpretation.\(^5\) So for example, the seven steps of the entrance gates to the courts symbolize the seven biblical periods. The Temple gate refers to Christ; the three thresholds represent the three witnesses. The incidence of light was telling – the windows representing the enlightenment of the eyes of intellect, as were all sorts of symbolic numbers (for instance 3, 7, 8, 12, 30, 60) and measures of rooms. The elementary proportions 1:1 and 1:2 dominated, just as the round biblical dimensions (for instance 500, 100, 50 and 25 rods; the square with sides of 500 rods = 3,000 Cubits → a

circumference of 12,000 Cubits). The wind directions were also significant: the Antichrist came from the south; the Temple was situated in the west of the complex. Three steps reminded of the Trinity. Between the gates of the courts was a straight line as an allegory of the path to perfection. The outer court was one hundred by one hundred rods, ‘meaning a large number’. The Holy of Holies represented the heavenly state on earth by way of the Church of the New Testament, and so on.\textsuperscript{51} Especially telling is the asymmetrical location of the house of the priests on the north side of the Temple. For Cocceius this proves that the (Church of the) North was predestined to lead the South – the Protestant Church would eventually lead to Salvation.\textsuperscript{52}

The reconstruction contains some striking architectural features. It involves a square plan (following Villalpando), but here divided in two concentric courts and the Temple connected against the inner quadrant (Fig. 4.3). The asymmetrical setting of the gates in the ring-walls is noteworthy. Cocceius’s Temple building lacks the common higher front part, a characteristic of Ezekiel’s vision. Furthermore, Cocceius does not follow the T-shaped ground plan with a broader front part, as in Josephus. Other reconstructions of Ezekiel’s Temple, including Villalpando’s, preferred Solomon’s type with the tall entrance hall. The typical curved buttresses are applied to the walls around the courts and they also support the Temple nave. The flat roofs of the Temple and the gates are exceptional. This is also the case with the ressaults of the Temple side walls and the unusual application of the lowest, Tuscan order at the entrances. Most peculiar, however, are the asymmetrically positioned and setback priests’ housing blocks which are provided with large buttresses. The lay-out of the fronts strongly resemble the contemporary Dutch house building practice, especially the northern façade in the austere style, which would become the ideal in the later seventeenth century (Fig. 4.4). With respect to the decoration, the palm leaves on the outer walls of the Temple building, the palm trees on the gates and the crowning pomegranates are characteristic.

Although much more can be said about the architecture, in this context two remarks are especially relevant. First, that text and illustration do not always correspond exactly. This is salient in the case of the two Solomonic columns, Jachin and Boaz, which are made much smaller than in Cocceius’s description. Another striking detail concerns the positioning of the buttresses of the Temple building in relation to the pilasters (Figs 4.3 and 4.5). In comparing the elevation drawings, the only way to solve this question is to assume that the pilasters are at the same time buttresses – a very odd architectural solution.

\textsuperscript{51} Cocceius 1691, p. 664.
\textsuperscript{52} Cocceius 1691, p. 670.
The clever projection in which the Temple side walls are not visible conceals the inconsistency almost perfectly, only betrayed by the curved shadows of the pilasters on the side walls (Fig. 4.5). On this point the theologian and the architect must have disagreed strongly.

This incongruence leads to the fundamental difference between the textual and visual reconstruction of the Temple. The key problem is that in philology one can omit or avoid certain gaps that a drawing cannot. Architectural reconstructions demand that every detail is considered meticulously and aligns with all the other instructions. The architect or artist has to remedy the deficiencies and for that he has to make many choices. In the end, the interpretation could be determined by features on which the textual sources were silent. One of

\[\text{FIGURE 4.4} \quad \text{Johannes Cocceius, Opera Omnia [...] Amster-\d tan 1673-75, vol. 3, Tabs XIV and XV, elevations of the House of the Priests, southern and northern façades, engraving. TILBURG UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.}\]
these things can be the choice of a specific architectural style. Not infrequently critics of certain Temple reconstructions stressed the aspects that were the consequence of filling in these lacunas. As such, apart from a theological stand, the reconstructions also became part of an architectural debate.

Images of Biblical Criticism

As one of the most influential theologians of his time, Johannes Cocceius became involved in various debates. Apart from the controversy with the theologian Gisbertus Voetius, he was, unwillingly, and to a certain extent, undeservedly classified as a Cartesian. His theology thus was perceived as having philosophical and even scientific dimensions. This had its effect on the position of the so-called Cocceians, many of whom in some way engaged in Ezekiel’s vision. With his Temple reconstruction Cocceius also entered the

---

54 For example Jacobus van Ostade, David Flud van Giffen, Fredericus Van Leenhof, Friedrich Adolf Lampe and Salomon van Til. See: Van Campen 2006, passim.
domain of architecture. In his architectural translation of Ezekiel, the future was not only a projection of religious desire, but also a place where one actually could and would want to live. The architecture was both ideally distant and familiar, referring to the best examples of the new classicist architecture in the Dutch Republic. Cocceius’s commitment had two dimensions that mutually interacted. On the theological level, the architecture functioned as a medium, by which the immaterial was visualized and by means of which the spiritual meaning could more easily be grasped. This theological and learned reconstruction was at the same time a manifestation of thinking about the foundations of true architecture.

It is not surprising that dissenting opinions came from both sides. Cocceius’s opponent Campegius Vitringa (1659–1722) interpreted Ezekiel’s Temple as a material building and rejected Cocceius’s chiliastic inclination. The antiquarian, bookseller and architectural theorist Willem Goeree (1635–1711) criticized the reconstruction in architectural terms; the basic rod, for instance, was misunderstood.55 These combined attacks were countered in 1692 by Johannes Henricus Cocceius (1642–1712), son of Johannes, in the comprehensive defence Naeder Ondersoek Van het Rechte Verstand Van den Tempel.56 This publication in its turn provoked a second argument by Vitringa in the form of a ‘letter’ of a few hundred pages.57 In architectural publications, Johannes’s original reconstruction was noted several times, for instance in a treatise on the Temple by the German architect and theologian Leonhard Christoph Sturm (1669–1719), whose father, the Cartesian mathematician Johann Christoph Sturm (1609–70) once had studied in Leiden. Sturm was also in the possession of the manuscripts of the Leiden theorist Nicolaus Goldmann, including his Temple reconstruction. In 1696, Sturm was to publish the latter’s architectural theory in which he included the unabridged text of Ezekiel 40–46.58

Cocceius’s Temple engravings were biblical criticism by visual means. Generally the term biblical criticism is reserved for textual operations, in which the Bible counts as the universal, and only reliable and incontestable source – the adage sola scriptura. As a consequence, the Bible had to be taken literally and the true meaning of God’s word could only be revealed through the correct source. Apart from the text of the Bible containing obscure tracts and conflict-

56 Cocceius Jun 1692.
57 Vitringa 1693. The discussion between Cocceius Jun, Vitringa and Goeree in relation to the interpretation of Cocceius Sen is outside the scope of this paper.
ing information, there was also the question of which counted as the basic authoritative text. Therefore people such as Hugo Grotius started to compare the most important Bible sources, those being the Septuagint, the Vulgate and the Masoretic Tanakh, in their most reliable versions. To do so, one had to master the three languages of Antiquity: Greek, Latin and Hebrew – the ideal of the eruditio trias lingualis. Cocceius was one of those scholars in the heyday of biblical criticism. In scholarly circles, the problematic character of corrupted transcripts, translations and editions caused a vehement discussion on the right interpretation of the Bible. Perhaps less obvious, but certainly less studied in the context of this debate, is the impact of the image.

The theme of the Temple can serve as a good example. The visualizations of the reconstruction are more than a supplementary illustration to a source text. As stated, the engravings also caused a debate, theologically as well as historically, albeit conducted on another level and with other means, but within the same context of criticism. The examples of the pair Prado-Villapando and the alliance Cocceius-Kechelius-Vingboons show that text and image are strongly intertwined. In his written commentary on Ezekiel, Cocceius took the classic course – from the reproduction of the source text, through an extensive philological commentary on grammar and semantics, to a specific theological interpretation. To that he added the visual translation of the text by way of a reconstruction that he thought of as accurate. Actually, with the illustrations he went in the opposite direction: he used the insights gained by his criticism, via an architectonic translation to a visual representation of what he thought of as the original Temple – from the interpretation back to the source.

Vanishing Points – Jerusalem and the Temple

Cocceius was convinced that if all the biblical information on the Temple was correct then Ezekiel could not have seen the Temple of Jerusalem, although it shared some features with Salomon’s First Temple. Villalpando, among others, had striven to combine the two (Ezekiel ≠ Salomon). Other authors, such as Vatable, considered them entirely different structures (Ezekiel ≠ Salomon). For Cocceius, at the end time Ezekiel’s Temple would replace the once perfect Sol-

---

59 The three languages were gradually extended to four, with Arabic. In the course of the seventeenth century Hebrew became more and more subsumed under theology and in the eighteenth century the Hebraists would be eventually replaced by the broader-based Orientalists. See: Katchen 1984, p. 18.
monic Temple (Ezekiel ← Salomon). Most of the seventeenth-century authors saw Ezekiel’s vision in one way or another as a point of reference.

When evaluating the different Temple reconstructions, one has to be aware of the connection between the two real Temples and the envisioned third one. In the case of Cocceius, the Temple was a purely spiritual one that nevertheless would be realized in a short space of time – as a state of being in which the visualized building acted as the emblem. Cocceius was convinced that the end of time was at hand around 1667. Hence, the Dutch Republic was only the last – and best – phase of world history. Although Cocceius cannot be regarded as a chiliast pur sang, it is remarkable that in some respects his expectations coincide with other chiliastic prophesies, such as the turmoil around the self-proclaimed messiah Sabbatai Zevi (1626–76) around 1666, which affected especially the Sephardic community in Amsterdam. Cocceius’s strong conviction that Ezekiel’s vision was topical is revealing with respect to the choice for a Temple reconstruction by one of the leading contemporary architects. Cocceius related the architecture of Ezekiel’s Temple to the contemporary situation in the Republic. The Dutch classicist architecture was the décor of the young self-confident Republic that showed its newly gained prosperity through it. The foundation of contemporary design principles on true biblical architecture connected the Republic, not only in a metaphorical way but also in a physical sense, to the land of the Bible. This theoretical connection had practical architectural applications. Explicit references to the Temple were made in emblematic ornamentation such as the curved buttresses, palm leaves, pomegranates and cherubs mentioned (Fig. 4.6). Less obvious were design schemes following the measurements or proportions of the Temple, indirectly readable but directly related to God’s own architecture. What is remarkable is that in the built examples, eclecticism was more common than the restriction to one interpretation. Apart from the better-known references that could be understood by anyone, a more scholarly interpretation was reserved for a small audience. With references to the Temple, the patrons, scholars and architects debated by means of stone; they showed their knowledge and status to the educated beholder. Similar to Cocceius’s goals on a theological level, in this architecture the immaterial became tangible. In real buildings, the Temple reconstruction as an historical and philological operation, acquired a meaning.

60 Van Asselt 1996, p. 211. Moreover, for Cocceius the broad interest by scholars in the study of Hebrew sources was an indication that the restoration of Israel would be imminent. See: Van Campen 2006, p. 290.
for the society of that time, with an implicit view to a future end state – the *eschaton*, the new heaven and new earth.

And Jerusalem? In the Dutch Republic, the distance to the Jerusalem of the Second Temple was great – geographically, in time, but above all ideologically. The destruction of the Temple was irreversible. The two successive buildings had been lost, as had the Old Covenant. The New Testament would eventually lead to the fulfilment of the Scripture, including the Temple, the visionary meaning of which prevailed. The Temple was lost in Jerusalem but was projected onto the Republic in a civil society steeped with Calvinism, and in different ways now regarded as the New Jerusalem.62 With Ezekiel, the exclusive bond with Jerusalem had been removed, as Cocceius stressed with reference to the last verse of the vision.63 To search for the physical remnants of the Temple in Jerusalem was no longer relevant. The certainty of the twofold destruction surpassed the knowledge of remains still to be seen in the Holy City. The Temple belonged to a closed period of history. Thus the building became a double vanishing point in memory – back to Solomon, ahead with Ezekiel. For Cocceius the Temple of Jerusalem had become a place of the absence of God, a

---

62 Cocceius 1691, Voor-reden; Dunkelgrün 2009.
63 Cocceius 1691, p. 711.
divine dwelling but now an empty one. Ezekiel’s Temple took its place – both immaterial and material, spiritual and even eschatological, a revaluated Christian concept of a quintessentially Jewish promise.
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CHAPTER 5

Jerusalem as Palimpsest
The Architectural Footprint of the Crusaders in the Contemporary City

Mariëtte Verhoeven

Latin Crusaders captured Jerusalem on 15 July 1099, after Pope Urban’s call at the end of 1095 for the First Crusade. Latin domination of Jerusalem lasted until 1187 when Sultan Saladin captured the city. Although Latin rule was re-established for short periods between 1229 and 1239, and between 1241 and 1244, it was in the twelfth century that the Crusaders executed an extensive building campaign that aimed at the redefinition of the city’s Christian topography.

Crusader architecture is mostly viewed as an isolated phenomenon with distinguishing stylistic and formal characteristics. In the first studies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Crusader architecture was typified by French scholars as French Romanesque but, later, Byzantine and local Eastern influences were also acknowledged. As is often the case in architectural history, research into the Crusader period focuses on the reconstruction of the original shape of buildings and not on their afterlife and continuous transformation. In descriptions of the buildings, later additions and transformations are omitted while the captions of photographs of buildings in their current form mention only the original building dates. In his study on Crusader Jerusalem, Adrian Boas remarks that ‘in appearance, the Old City of Jerusalem is still essentially a medieval city [...] with the exception of the Jewish Quarter, which has been largely rebuilt since 1967, the city is very much as it appeared nine hundred years ago and a visitor from the twelfth century would probably not

---

1 The generic term ‘Crusaders’ refers to a heterogeneous group of Christians from all over Latin Western Europe and from every level of society who participated in the Crusades. Because knights and soldiers came in greater number from France and Germany than from any other country the contemporary term ‘Franks’ was used by both Europeans and Muslims for the settlers in the Holy Land.

have too much trouble in finding his way about. Although Boas refers more to the lay-out of the city than to the shape and function of the buildings from the Crusader period, he suggests at least that the latter survived more or less intact.

Buildings, however, although built on specific and fixed locations, change continuously, as does the culture around them. Especially in a city such as Jerusalem, where many buildings are the markers of holy, often contested, places, religious buildings have undergone significant (physical) transformations during dramatic religious turnarounds, including changes of function or patronage, rebuilding and restoration, and neglect or demolition. In the following, therefore, instead of framing Crusader buildings in the time of their conception, the constitution of their architectural layers will be discussed in order to do justice to and acknowledge the processuality of architecture. I will do so by considering the buildings as architectural palimpsests. The metaphor of the palimpsest refers both to the multi-layeredness of buildings as well as to the observation that older architectural layers mix with new layers, as old text shines through the new text of a reused piece of parchment. In the case of buildings this effect can be the result of decay or repair and therefore unintentional, or deliberate as in the case of restoration or rebuilding with the purpose of erasing or re-establishing the old.

The starting point of what follows is the appearance, the upper layer of the palimpsest, of a set of Crusader buildings that are considered to be the best preserved examples of Crusader architecture in contemporary Jerusalem. The selection includes buildings that were newly built by the crusaders (Churches of St Anne; Church of the Ascension and of St James) as well as older buildings that were substantially rebuilt in the Crusader period (Church of the Holy Sepulchre, St Mary of Mount Zion and St Mary in the Valley of Jehoshaphat). In addition I will discuss the Templum Domini, the Islamic Dome of the Rock, which was appropriated by the Crusaders and played an important role in the reestablishment of a Christian Jerusalem in the Crusader period.

3 Boas 2001, p. 3.
4 The descriptions of the buildings are based on my own observations during my stay in Jerusalem in November 2011. Details on the history of the buildings are based on the studies of Vincent and Abel 1914–26 and Pringle 2007, unless otherwise mentioned. In his corpus of the churches of Jerusalem, Denys Pringle mainly compiles the results of earlier studies (see note 1). In particular, the archeological and historical research of the Dominican Fathers Vincent and Abel is still fundamental for our knowledge of Crusader architecture in Jerusalem. The specific pages in the work of Vincent and Abel and Pringle which relate to the buildings discussed in this article are referred to in each paragraph.
Blended Architecture: Church of the Holy Sepulchre

The ‘liberation’ of the Holy Sepulchre (which turned out to be not only from the Muslims but from the Eastern Christians as well), and visiting the place of Christ’s resurrection, the most holy place of Christendom, were the main goals for the Crusaders who joined the First Crusade. The rebuilding of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which dated back to the time of the emperor Constantine and his mother Helena, was the most important building campaign after the Crusaders had captured the city in 1099. Today it is still the most important Christian pilgrimage site in the world.

The church is located in the Christian Quarter of the Old City, near the Muristan. The south façade is the only part of the church that is not hemmed in by other buildings and that is visible from street level. The façade consists of two stories with a double portal in the first and a double window on the second storey. The most striking characteristic of the façade is the rich ornamental sculpture of the capitals and the voussoirs of the arches surrounding the portals and windows, and of the friezes framing both levels of the building.

Through the left portal in the south façade one enters the south bay of the transept of the church. The enclosure of the nave, which functions as the Katholikon of the Greek Orthodox, blocks the view on the Rotunda to the west of it. In fact, as a result of the division of the church among the different denominations with the Greek Orthodox, Armenian Apostolics and Roman Catholics as the primary custodians, and the Coptic, Ethiopian and Syrian Orthodox as the secondary ones, all views through the building are blocked.

The inconvenient arrangement of space in the current building can only be understood within the context of its history. The building campaign of the Crusaders, which lasted from 1099 until 1170, united different holy sites under one roof: the Rotunda, a centrally-planned martyrion with the Tomb of Christ, the rock of Calvary and the cave of the Finding of the Cross. The courtyard to the east of the Rotunda which also dates back to Constantinian times, was replaced by a church with a nave and four aisles, galleries, and cross-vaults. The church had a transept with a dome at the intersection of the transept with the nave, and a choir with an ambulatory and chapels on the east side. Behind these chapels, stairs led down to the Chapel of Helena. The chapel was built on the foundations of Constantine’s basilica and contained capitals that were spolia, like other pieces of reused architectural sculpture in the church, possibly coming from one of the Islamic monuments on the Temple Mount.6 From

6 Wilkinson 1987, pp. 27–28. Krüger 2000, p. 90, states that the spolia in the Chapel of Helena derive from the Al Aqsa Mosque. Ousterhout 2003, p. 18, questions whether it is likely that all
the chapel another flight of stairs led down to the cave of the Finding of the Cross.

On the exterior, the south façade with the double portal was added by the Crusaders, and on the right of the façade a porch constituted an external access to the Chapel of Calvary. Other additions were a bell-tower and a cloister for Augustinian Canons. The first was built over and around the existing chapel of St John the Evangelist on the south side of the Rotunda, while the latter extended over the Chapel of Helena and the cave of the Finding of the Cross.

After the Crusader period the church once again underwent several changes. It is not clear whether the Aedicule with the Tomb of Christ had been stripped of its silver ornaments by the Muslims or by the Christians after Jerusalem fell to Saladin in 1187 and the church came under Muslim control. In 1211–12 the Western pilgrim Wilbrand of Oldenburg saw the church with its marble and mosaic decoration intact. Later in the thirteenth century the cloister of the Augustinian Canons was destroyed. The few remains of it, among which traces of an arch (Fig. 5.1), are incorporated in the Coptic patriarchate and the Ethiopian monastery, which are now located on the roof of the church. In 1555 the Aedicule was completely rebuilt by the Franciscans. In 1719 the timber roof of the Rotunda was renewed and the height of the bell tower, which had been without bells since 1187 and the spire of which had fallen in 1549, was reduced by two stories. After a fire in 1808 the interior of the church was almost completely restored, including the rebuilding of the apse in a baroque style with a new iconostasis in stone. The open conical roof of the Rotunda was replaced by a timber dome and again between 1866 and 1868 by a dome with a steel construction. In the middle of the nineteenth century the porch that gave access to Calvary was renewed, walled up and furnished as what is called the Chapel of the Franks. After an earthquake in 1927 the dome over the crossing of the Crusader transept had to be pulled down and rebuilt, and the Rotunda was also almost completely renewed.

Today, it is difficult to establish to what extent the Crusader church had been a unity. The building brought all the holy places under one roof, and for that purpose both existing and new structures were joined together; but whereas in the Crusader period the interior could be perceived in its entirety

of the reused capitals in the Crusader church came from the same place. He states that ‘if the crusader masons were scouring the city for suitable building materials, they could certainly have found better pieces than, for example, the mismatched columns and cut-down capitals in the chapel of Helena’.

7 Pringle 2007, p. 31, with references.
from any vantage point\(^9\), that effect has been obliterated by later alterations and partitions of the interior space. The extensive mosaic decoration programme of the Crusader period must have contributed to the unity, but of that layout only the mosaic of the Ascension of Christ in the Chapel of the Crucifixion on Calvary remains.

This means that although the ground plan of the current church is still that of the twelfth century, only a few parts of the building have been left untouched since the Crusader period. Even the apparently undamaged façade did not survive intact. The decorated marble plaques that were applied to the lintels of the double portal were removed to the Rockefeller Museum in 1927. The mosaics of the tympana above the doors, representing the Virgin and Child on the

\(^9\) Kühnel 1994, p. 22.
left tympanum and on the right Christ appearing to Mary Magdalene, did not survive.

Inside Out: Church of the Ascension

In the village of at-Tur, on the highest point of the Mount of Olives, a small chapel lies hidden behind the walls of a courtyard. The chapel is built on the location from which Christ supposedly ascended to heaven.

The Chapel of the Ascension is an octagonal building constructed in yellow ashlar masonry (Fig. 5.2). The first zone, terminated by a cornice, consists of a blind arcade with arches springing from the corner pilasters. Except for the

---

pair framing the entrance on the western face, each of the eight pilasters is flanked by a pair of columns with finely carved capitals. The abaci on the western face indicate that on the location of the masonry pilasters underneath them there once stood columns with capitals that have been lost. The *voussoirs* of the arches and the abaci, capitals, columns and bases are of blue-white marble.

The second zone of the building, where the masonry is more irregular than that of the lower zone, consists of an octagonal drum supporting a dome. The drum has small windows on four sides.

On the west a low rectangular door gives entrance to the interior of the chapel with its rounded wall surface. It has a *mihrab*, an Islamic prayer niche in the south wall. To the right, on the floor, is a slab of stone with the alleged footprint of Christ.

We know that the Crusaders built a Church of the Ascension in the first half of the twelfth century.11 John of Würzburg (c. 1165) describes ‘a large church, in whose centre, uncovered by a large aperture, is shown the place of the Lord’s Ascension’.12 The pilgrim Theodoric (1172) gives a fuller description of the building: ‘One ascends into the church by twenty great steps; in the midst of the church there stands a round structure, magnificently decorated with Parian marble and blue marble, with a lofty apex, in the midst whereof a holy altar is placed, beneath which altar is to be seen the stone on which the Lord is said to have stood when He ascended to heaven’.13 These descriptions make clear that the building that is now called the Chapel of the Ascension was in fact an aedicule in the central bay of a larger church. The archeological evidence shows that the walls of the courtyard surrounding the aedicule or chapel partly follow the traces of the octagonal external wall of the Crusader church of which only a few remains survive.

What we know of the Crusader building is that it was an octagonal church with an aedicule of the same form in the central bay. Nothing is known about the vaulting of the inner space of the church, including the original vaulting of the central bay. Denys Pringle proposes a rather unlikely reconstruction with a division in nine bays covered by groin-vaults with cross ribs supported by wall

11 On the basis of the accounts of the pilgrim Saewulf (1102) and the Russian Abbot Daniel (1106–08), Kühnel 1994, p. 33, dates the Crusader church of the Ascension between 1102 and 1106–07; Kühnel 1994, p. 33. Pringle 2007, p. 73, concludes, on the basis of the same accounts and other early twelfth-century texts, that the church was not yet rebuilt in the beginning of the twelfth century. According to Pringle the earliest references indicating that the church had been rebuilt date from around the middle of the twelfth century.


pilasters, four central piers and pendentives supporting a drum capped by a dome over the central square bay.\textsuperscript{14} According to descriptions by pilgrims, the interior of the church was defined by a free-standing colonnade.\textsuperscript{15} Bianca Kühnel assumes a circular form for the inner row of columns, this in relation to the supposition that the Crusader Church of the Ascension was a replica, both in form and size, of the inner octagon of the Dome of the Rock, or the \textit{Templum Domini} as it was called in the Crusader period (see below).\textsuperscript{16}

The history of the church goes back to the end of the fourth century when sources already mention a church in that location.\textsuperscript{17} The walls of the twelfth-century Crusader church overlay and partly enclosed the foundations of a Byzantine church that was built on a rounded platform. Towards the end of the seventh century the pilgrim Arculf, a bishop from Gaul, described the church.\textsuperscript{18}

After 1187 the church came into Muslim possession when Saladin established the building as a foundation in favour of two sheikhs. In 1211–12 the monastery that adjoined the church was destroyed and a mosque was established in it. The church was in ruins from the fifteenth century on, but the aedicule in the central bay remained intact.

The aedicule transformed into its current form of an independent building in 1620 when a drum supporting a dome was added to the chapel while the east door was blocked and a \textit{mihrab} was inserted into its south wall. One of the alleged footprints of Christ was removed to the Dome of the Rock. The internal rounded wall surface also dates from this period. The dome collapsed during an earthquake in 1834 and was subsequently rebuilt.

The building that is now called the Chapel of the Ascension is in fact no more than a fragment of the twelfth-century Crusader church. Only the walls, including the architectural sculpture of the first zone of an aedicule in the central bay of the larger church, survived. The walls of the surrounding courtyard give an impression of the size of that church. The Chapel is still in Muslim possession and is a holy place for both Muslims – who believe in the ascension of the prophet Jesus but not in his crucifixion – and Christians.

\textsuperscript{14} Pringle 2007, p. 79, p. 81 and Plan 9.
\textsuperscript{15} Kühnel 1994, p. 31, with references.
\textsuperscript{16} Kühnel 1994, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{17} Kühnel 1994, p. 30; Pringle 2007, p. 72.
**Restoration or Reconstruction: Church of St Anne**

The Church of St Anne is considered to be the best preserved and most representative example of Crusader church architecture in Jerusalem. The church is located to the north of the Temple Mount, near the Lion’s Gate and 50 m north of Jehoshaphat Street (Via Dolorosa). Ruins here were identified with the Baths of Bethesda or the Sheep Pool, the location to which both the Miracle of the Healing of the Paralytic and the Birth of Mary in the House of Joachim and Anne are linked. From the sixth to the twelfth century both events were commemorated in one church, St Mary near the Sheep Pool.

After the conquest of Jerusalem the Crusaders dedicated the Byzantine Church of St Mary near the Sheep Pool to St Anne, the mother of the Virgin. However, between 1102 and 1165, the Crusaders built a new Church of St Anne at a short distance to the south east of the Byzantine church. On the foundations of the Byzantine building they erected a small church or monastery dedicated to the Miracle of the Healing of the Paralytic, which is now in ruins. Excavations in the 1960s showed no evidence for the presumption that the Crusader church was built upon the remains of a Byzantine predecessor although structures associated with the Byzantine Church of the Sheep Pool would have extended into the area of the twelfth-century building.

The Church of St Anne lies in a courtyard in the Muslim quarter, behind the walls of the hidden complex administered by the White Fathers. It is one of few free-standing churches in the ‘Old City’ of present-day Jerusalem (Fig. 5.3). The building, constructed in lime stone ashlar, is a basilica of irregular measurements with a nave and two aisles, four bays in length, and a dome over the crossing in the first bay. On the east the church terminates in three semi-circular apses, which are polygonal on the exterior. The church is groin-vaulted with barrel vaults over the first bay. The pointed arches rest upon compound piers.

The crypt is entered via a flight of stairs in the central bay of the south aisle. It consists of a complex of several subterranean spaces including a pair of rock-cut caves below the apse that is supposedly the house of Joachim and Anne and the birth place of the Virgin Mary.

---

20 Mayer 1977, p. 248. Pringle 2007, pp. 142–43, supposes that the first St Anne was a smaller predecessor of the Crusader church on the same location.
21 Mayer 1977, p. 248; Pringle 2007, pp. 142–43. According to Vincent and Abel 1914–26, p. 733, the church was built in the first half of the twelfth century. It has also been considered to be a foundation of Queen Melisende in the 1140s; Kühnel 1994, p. 19 and Folda 2008, p. 36.
The building as a whole gives the impression of having survived more or less intact, but actually how well preserved is this basilica? In 1192 Saladin founded a madrasa, a religious school, including a mosque, in the church. The building was in Christian hands again between 1229 and 1244. After 1244 Christians had limited access to the building, but they were allowed to enter the crypt. By the early eighteenth century the building was unoccupied, although the Franciscans, together with local Christians, celebrated mass in the crypt. In 1841–42 the mosque was repaired by the Ottoman governor of Jerusalem, Tayar Pasha. A new mihrab was installed and the construction of a cylindrical minaret was started, but was never completed. The base for the minaret was the stair-turret of the bell tower, which stood over the western bay of the south aisle and had been damaged during the earthquake in 1834. In 1856 the building was granted to Napoleon III as an expression of gratitude for French help to the Ottomans in the Crimean War.

The current state of the church, which has been in hands of the Catholic White Fathers since 1878, is the result of the complete restoration of the building between 1862 and 1877. The renewal included the suppression of the mihrab, the excavation and reconstruction of the crypt, the reconstruction of a
diminutive bell-tower and the replacement of much of the sculptural orna-
tment. After this nineteenth-century restoration, the church was damaged by
an Israeli mortar shell in 1967 after which the dome was partially rebuilt.

The result of the radical nineteenth-century restoration was a reconstruc-
tion to the alleged original state of the building. It included the erasure of later
layers, more especially the Islamic ones. The only present relic of the building’s
Islamic history is Saladin’s inscription of 1192, recording the establishment of
the madrasa, set in the tympanum above the entrance door in the western fa-
çade.

Commemoration and Context: Cenacle (St Mary of Mount Zion)\textsuperscript{24}

The Cenacle or Last Supper Room is not easy to find in present-day Jerusalem.
It is located on Mount Zion on the second floor of a building in the courtyard
of a yeshiva, a Jewish educational institution for Torah and Talmud studies. The
Cenacle consists of a room, measuring 15.3 by 9.4 m, divided in six bays covered
by groin vaults carried by free-standing columns and pilasters. A staircase in
the southwest corner that leads down to the first floor is surmounted by a bal-
dachin. Stairs in the south-east and north-east corners lead up to doors, the
north-eastern one of which gives entrance to a minaret. Other Islamic features
are a mihrab in the south wall of the room and stained-glass windows and
plaques with Arabic inscriptions. Neither from the location nor from the deco-
ration can it be deduced that this was once a space with a Christian religious
function.

The Crusaders restored a Byzantine basilica that had been associated with
the Flagellation, the Last Supper, the descent of the Holy Spirit and with Mary’s
Death.\textsuperscript{25} They incorporated the apse and flanking chapels of this building into
a new, vaulted church that was 11 metres longer than its predecessor. It had a
nave of twelve bays and double aisles. Within the four eastern bays of the two
southern aisles there was a gallery, which commemorated the upper room of
the Last Supper (the so-called Cenacle) and the Chapel of the Holy Spirit. To-
wards the west end of the northern aisle a square aedicule surmounted by a
rounded baldachin represented the place of the Virgin’s Dormition. The Cena-
acle was remodeled in an early Gothic style in a second building phase, proba-
bly in the 1170s or 80s. By the 1180s the lower room in the south western corner
was identified as the location of the Tomb of David.

\textsuperscript{24} Vincent and Abel 1914–26, pp. 441–81; Pringle 2007, pp. 261–87.
The church came into Muslim possession after 1187 and was probably in ruins around 1219 when al-Mu'azzam 'Isâ destroyed the fortifications of Jerusalem. Pilgrim accounts from the thirteenth century describe the church as being in a ruinous state, apart from the part of the building that enclosed the Cenacle. Between 1332 and 1336 the Franciscans purchased the Cenacle and the ruined Chapel of the Holy Spirit from the Mamluk sultan. Nicolas of Poggibonsi (1346–50) describes the stations in the ruined church: the place where St John the Evangelist said mass to St Mary; the place where St Mary died; the place where St Matthias was made Apostle; the stone that the angel carried from Mount Sinai to the Holy Sepulchre; the chamber in which the Virgin Mary remained for seven years; the stone where St James the Less was made bishop of Jerusalem; the stone where St Stephen was buried in Mount Zion; the Tomb of David and of Solomon in Mount Zion; the place where the Holy Spirit came to the Apostles; the place where Christ washed the feet on Maundy Thursday; the place where Christ appeared to his disciples in Mount Zion, and the place where Christ had Supper with his Apostles. The last is described as a church held by the Friars Minor containing three altars. In 1523 the Ottoman Sultan Süleyman ordered the expulsion of the friars from Mount Zion and a year later the Cenacle was converted into a mosque. The Franciscans retained some rooms in the convent that they had established and one in the Cenacle for use as a chapel. After the city walls were rebuilt between 1536 and 1541 Mount Zion lay outside the city. In 1551 all the buildings of the complex came into Ottoman hands. In the seventeenth century a small mosque, covered by a dome, was built in the place of the chapel of the Holy Spirit, directly above the Tomb of David.

From 1831, the Franciscans were allowed to celebrate mass in the Cenacle on Maundy Thursday and Whit Sunday, and it was only in 1948 that the Muslims were definitely excluded. The Cenacle came under the control of the Israeli Ministry of Religious Affairs, and the present yeshiva was established in the former convent buildings.

Of all the events that were once commemorated in the Church of St Mary of Mount Zion only the commemoration of the Last Supper has survived. The Cenacle retains the memory of the Last Supper but from its original context, the Crusader Church of Mount Zion, only written evidence has survived. Confusingly, the Cenacle is located near the Church of the Dormition, built by the German Emperor William II in 1900. This church was laid out around the remains of a supposedly Byzantine building, identified with the Byzantine Church of St Mary of Mount Zion. The only part that remained of the latter,

however, is located under the Cenacle. Here, in an exedra of a chapel of the Byzantine church, stands the so-called Tomb of David, now in Jewish possession.

Baroque Treasury: Church of St James (Armenian Cathedral)\textsuperscript{27}

The Church of St James or Armenian Cathedral is located in the Armenian quarter, near the southern wall of the Old City. The church is hidden behind the walls surrounding the terrain of the Armenian Patriarchate and, apart from its western façade, is enclosed by other buildings (Fig. 5.4).

The Armenian Cathedral is a basilica of three bays, with a dome over the central bay, a walled-in narthex along its south side containing the Etchmiadzin chapel and another narthex and gallery along its west side. Four piers, with a projecting pilaster or shaft on each side covered with paintings and tiles, carry the vaults. The church terminates in the east in a central apse and two side apses. On the north side stands the Chapel of St Menas, presumably dating back to the fifth century, with, on its upper level, a chapel dedicated to the Holy Apostles. The chapel of St Stephen, which functions as the sacristy, is built in the angle between the east wall of the Chapel of St Menas and the north side of the church. The building is open to the public for a short period once a day but entrance to the chapels of the church is allowed only to the Armenian community.

The Church of St James was built by the Armenians between 1142 and 1165. According to the pilgrim John of Würzburg (1165) the head of St James the Great, who had been decapitated by Herod, was venerated in the church.\textsuperscript{28} From the fourteenth century onwards, the patron of the church was identified by pilgrims as St James, brother of Jesus and the first bishop of Jerusalem, who is in Latin Western tradition identified with James the Less.\textsuperscript{29} In today’s church the head of St James the Great is kept in a small chapel in the north wall to the right of the entrance to the St Menas chapel. The throne of St James the Less is attached to the north-eastern pier of the church, and his grave, marked by a low rounded grille, is located in front of it. The throne dates from the seventeenth century, the period in which other works were also executed in the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{27} Vincent and Abel 1914–26, pp. 516–61; Armenian Art 1980, pp. 121–29; Pringle 2007, pp. 168–82.
\item \textsuperscript{28} John of Würzburg, CCCM, vol. CXXXIX, p. 133; PPTS, vol. V, p. 45.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Lexikon Theologie und Kirche, vol. V, p. 270; Pringle 2007, p. 170, with references to pilgrims accounts.
\end{itemize}
church, including the walling up of the narthex and the decoration of the choir with a mosaic floor.

The main part of the decoration, however, dates from the first half of the eighteenth century. In that period the Crusader fabric was covered with plaster, tiles from Kütahya in present-day Turkey, wooden panels and gilded ornaments. The entrances to the chapels of the church were decorated with doors with inlaid work, a new main altar and iconostasis were placed in the apse and the Etchmiadzin chapel was erected in the eastern end of the former narthex. In 1821 the dome was repaired and after the earthquake of 1834 a new narthex and a gallery to the west front were built.

The baroque decoration obscures the view of the architectural form and space which goes back to the time of the Crusaders. From the decoration of the twelfth-century building only a few of the capitals of the piers remain as well as the frame of the portal from the narthex to the church, consisting of a pointed arch of two orders resting on colonnettes.
Crusader Staircase to a Byzantine Crypt: St Mary in the Valley of Jehoshaphat\textsuperscript{30}

At the base of the Mount of Olives steps from the road descend into a square courtyard containing a façade with a portal. The portal is enclosed by a pointed arch of three orders, supported on six colonnettes with Corinthian capitals. A broader arch, supported by a pair of colonnettes, surrounds the recessed portal. Behind the portal a staircase of 47 steps (Fig. 5.5) leads to a crypt with the tomb of the Virgin Mary. The walls and vaults of the crypt are blackened with the smoke from candles and oil lamps. The interior is decorated with altars, icons, and a forest of hanging lamps. The complex is known as St Mary in the Valley of Jehoshaphat.

The Crusaders rebuilt a church dedicated to St Mary that already existed in 451 and was described by the pilgrim Arculf (c. 685): ‘It is a church built at two levels, and the lower part, which is beneath a stone vault, has a remarkable round shape. At the east end there is an altar, on the right of which is the empty rock tomb in which for a time Mary remained entombed. [...] The upper Church of St Mary is also round, and one can see four altars there’.\textsuperscript{31} From the ninth century onward different sources describe the upper church as being in ruins.

The Crusaders rebuilt the upper Byzantine church as a three-aisled basilica with an eastern apse and twin towers at the west end. They also extended the lower church, or crypt, which was built in the shape of a cross. The eastern arm, containing the rock-cut tomb aedicule of Mary, was extended by ca 14 metres and ended, like the western arm, in a semi-circular apse. The tomb aedicule was regularized by a masonry coating, covered in marble and surrounded by an arcade. The southern arm was extended with a monumental staircase which gave access to the crypt.

The staircase is spanned by a transverse arch which must have carried the south wall of the upper Crusader church. The arch touches the Byzantine masonry of the crypt. In 1161, Queen Melisende was buried in an arched chapel (more a niche) to the right of the monumental staircase. In the later Middle Ages she was identified as the founder of the church. Since the fifteenth century the chapel of Melisende has been identified as that of Joachim and Anne. Opposite, a little further down the stairs was another niche, probably the burial place of Queen Morphia, wife of Baldwin II and Melisende’s mother, who

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{30}{Vincent and Abel 1914–26, pp. 805–31; Pringle 2007, pp. 287–306.}
\end{footnotes}
was buried in the church in c. 1129. Since the sixteenth century this chapel has been dedicated to St Joseph.

Saladin destroyed the upper church in 1192, when he began to rebuild the city walls. The tomb of Mary, mother of the prophet Isa (Jesus), now became an Islamic sacred place but Christians were not excluded from it. In the sixteenth century, the Ottomans removed the marble covering of the tomb aedicule and plastered over it. In the seventeenth century the altar to the south of the tomb of the Virgin was replaced by a mihrab. Another prayer niche was added inside the tomb aedicule. The columns of the arcade that surrounded the tomb, and the ciborium above it (described by the pilgrim Theodoric), were removed but the capitals and bases remained in situ. In 1757 the crypt was taken over by the Greeks and Armenians while the Franciscans, who had been
allowed to say mass at the tomb since the fourteenth century, were excluded from it.

The façade of the upper church and the extensions to the Byzantine crypt, including the monumental staircase, is what has remained from the Crusader complex. It is one of two locations in Jerusalem commemorating Mary’s Death, the other one being on Mount Zion (see above).

Creating a Christian Jerusalem: The Templum Domini

In Early Christian times no attempt had been made to rebuild the Jewish Temple that had been destroyed by Titus in AD 70. After the capture of the city by the Muslims in 638, the Umayyad caliph built the shrine of the Dome of the Rock on what is called Temple Mount. According to tradition it was built on the location of Mohammed’s ascension after he made his ‘night journey’ from Mecca to ‘the farthest mosque’. This was supposed to be the Temple in Jerusalem, although Jerusalem is not mentioned in the Qur’an.

In 1099 the Crusaders identified the Dome of the Rock as the Templum Domini although they must have been well aware that it was not the Temple of the Old Testament. According to the pilgrim Saewulf, the footprints in the rock that was exposed inside the building were those of Christ. In the 1120s Fulcher of Chartres noted that an altar had been placed over the rock and a choir had been installed for the clergy. When the church came to be served by Augustinian Canons is not clear, but a prior of the Templum Domini is first mentioned in 1112. The pilgrim John of Würzburg (c. 1165) gives a description of the building: ‘Now this same Temple of the Lord, which has been adorned by someone both within and without with a wondrous casing of marble, has the form of a beautiful rotunda, or rather of a circular octagon, that is, having eight angles disposed in a circle, with a wall decorated on the outside from the middle upwards with the finest mosaic work, for the remainder is of marble. This same lower wall is continuous, save that it is pierced by four doors, having one door towards the east, which adjoins a chapel dedicated to St James, for on that side he was thrown down from the roof of the Temple and killed with a fuller’s club, having been the first high priest under the new law of grace in Jerusalem.

---

35 Pringle 2007, p. 401, with references.
John goes on to quote the inscriptions to be seen on the building and describes the sites in and around it, including a stone marked by the Lord’s foot when he threw the buyers and sellers out of the Temple. This was joined to a stone marking the spot where Christ was presented. According to the pilgrim Theodore (1172) this place was enclosed by an iron screen with doors. He is the only one who states that the Temple and its altar were dedicated to the Virgin Mary. John of Würzburg mentions that the sign of the Holy Cross, which the Christians had placed on the dome was ‘very offensive to the Saracens, and many of them would be willing to expend much gold to have it taken away; for although they do not believe in Christ’s Passion, nevertheless they respect this Temple, because they adore their creator therein, which nevertheless must be regarded as idolatry on the authority of Saint Augustine, who declares that everything is idolatry which is done without faith in Christ’.  

With the appropriation of the Dome of the Rock, the most prominent building of the city (Fig. 5.6), the Crusaders established an axis running from the Church of the Ascension via the Templum Domini to the Holy Sepulchre. While the Islamic Dome of the Rock, now Templum Domini, had been built after the example of the Early Christian Rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre, the Church of the Ascension in its turn imitated the form of the Dome of the Rock (see above). Because of this conscious misconception the octagon became the archetypical model for the Temple in (Northern) Europe during the Middle Ages.

The other Islamic buildings on the Temple Mount that were appropriated by the Crusaders included the Qubbat-as-Silsila or Dome of the Chain, which became the Chapel of St James the Less, and the al-Aqsa Mosque that became the Palatium Salomonis.

With the transformation and dedication of the monuments on the Temple Mount, the Crusaders denied the Islamic origin of the buildings. The names of the buildings now referred to an origin in the Early Christian past, the period in which the Temple Mount had not been occupied by the Christians. After the fall of Jerusalem to Saladin the buildings on the Temple Mount were returned to Muslim use and the traces of Christian possession were erased. With that, the conceptual axis of the Church of the Ascension – Templum Domini – Holy

---

39 This argument was proposed by Bianca Kühnel in the paper she presented at the expert meeting ‘Monuments and Memory’, organized at the Radboud University Nijmegen on 8–9 December 2011.
40 I thank Jeroen Goudeau for pointing this out to me.
Sepulchre was also disturbed. The cross that stood over the dome of the *Templum Domini* was pulled down and dragged through the streets where it was smashed to pieces. Saladin’s purification of the building included the replacement of the Latin inscriptions and decoration. The wrought-iron Crusader grille surrounding the rock remained in place until the 1950s. For a short period in the year 1244 the *Templum Domini* was re-occupied by the Latins, who again raised a cross over the dome, but this came to an end with the capture of Jerusalem by the Khwarizmian Turks.

Today the monuments on the Temple Mount are not accessible to non-Muslims. However, anyone can visit the vast platform, where only a few pieces of architectural sculpture serve as a reminder of the Crusader occupation of the area, although they will hardly be recognized as such by most of the visitors.

**Conclusion**

During the relatively short period of about a hundred years in which the Crusaders occupied Jerusalem, they managed to execute an extensive building
program. It included the re-adaptation or rebuilding of monuments that dated back to Early Christian or Byzantine times, the appropriation of Islamic edifices, and the construction of new buildings. With that they realized their goal of the re-establishment of Jerusalem as a Christian city.

After the fall to Saladin in 1187, Jerusalem became a predominantly Islamic city. To use the metaphor of the palimpsest: a new layer was added to the city, older layers were erased or mixed with the new layer. Especially during the Ottoman period (sixteenth – nineteenth centuries) Islamic features, for example mihrabs and minarets, were added to converted buildings such as the churches of the Ascension, St Anne, St Mary of Mount Zion and St Mary in the Valley of Jehoshaphat. In the case of the Church of St Anne these additions have been erased, as happened with the Christian features of the appropriated monuments on the Temple Mount that were returned to Muslim possession. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Church of St James the Great never came into Muslim use but they had their own history of transformation.

If one compares the current appearance of the Crusader buildings with their original form, one can conclude that only fragments – a staircase, a crypt, a façade, columns or foundations – have survived. Even the apparent authenticity of the Church of St Anne is the result of extensive restorations in the nineteenth century. The buildings can be designated as 'Crusader buildings' only when they are framed in the time of their conception.

At the same time, despite – or thanks to – Jerusalem’s history of religious conversions, many of the Crusader buildings stayed in use and are the city’s visible witnesses to this turbulent past. Their different forms and meanings in various contexts were the result of different types of transformation: blending, piling up, erasure, reconstructive interpretation, demolition, isolation, covering up and appropriation. And in the surviving buildings, however much transformed, the continuity of at least a part of Jerusalem’s Christian topography, re-established in the twelfth century, has been preserved.
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CHAPTER 6

Translations of the Sacred City between Jerusalem and Rome

Sible de Blaauw

Several cities and individual churches in the Middle Ages were associated with the idea of representing or incorporating Jerusalem in one manner or another. This widely attested phenomenon occurred in a large range of variants, depending on the ‘type’ of Jerusalem represented and the way in which the representation was made concrete.¹ In this contribution, I aim to discuss one of the earliest, and perhaps one of the most notable cases of ‘being’ Jerusalem outside Jerusalem. The church leaders of Rome may have had very specific reasons for appropriating the significance of the historical Jerusalem as the ancient capital of the Roman Empire. Moreover, they may have utilized very specific instruments in order for this claim to materialize. It was rooted in the idea that Christian Rome had been founded directly from Jerusalem by the mission of the apostles Peter and Paul. Rome was, in the words of Jennifer O’Reilly: ‘the western extremity of their evangelizing mission from the biblical centre of the earth at Jerusalem and became the new centre from which their papal successors continued the apostolic mission to the ends of the earth.’²

The existence of the apostles’ tombs, reinforced by the recollections of numerous Christian martyrs, was the fundamental factor in making Rome into the new spiritual capital of the Christian world. This claim urged Christian Rome to establish new terms for its relationship with what qualified, perhaps, as ‘the ideological centre of the Christian empire’ in Jerusalem.³ It has been argued that the Roman Church did so by a literal transfer of the significance of earthly Jerusalem to Rome, and hence by making Jerusalem superfluous. Hartmann Grisar’s 1899 essay ‘Antiche basiliche di Roma imitanti i santuarii di Gerusalemme e Betlemme’ contained stimulating ideas and observations, which have largely been reproduced by later scholarship, often, however, without critical evaluation of the evidence.⁴

³ Elsner 2000, p. 194.
⁴ Grisar 1899.
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In the following pages, the visual and material means employed to link Jerusalem or ideas of Jerusalem to the physical city of Rome in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages will be examined. Buildings, topography, iconography and liturgy in Christian Rome comprised various images and reflections of Jerusalem. The investigation will concentrate on the most conspicuous and consistent examples of references to the earthly Jerusalem, which represent a variety of ‘media’, including relics, visual representations, locations and ceremonies. These quotations or allusions may also refer to the Heavenly Jerusalem, but this level of interpretation needs no inclusion in the present argument. The discussion starts in Constantinian times and ends in the period of the overwhelming increase of ideas about, and memories of, Jerusalem produced all over Western Europe as a result of the Crusades. For obvious reasons, the Roman Church which is itself called ‘Jerusalem’, Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, will claim a central role in the ensuing discussion.

The Earliest Relic from the Holy Land?

The building programme of the emperor Constantine, ruling over the city of Rome from 312 until his death in 337, included the first all-embracing project of architectural and urbanistic Christianization of the ancient capital.\(^5\) The new, public buildings for Christian worship were destined for different functional categories: the urban cathedral of the Lateran, the memorial basilica of St Peter’s on the Vatican hill and funerary basilicas on the Christian cemeteries outside the walls. One of Constantine’s foundations, however, was exceptional in all respects. It was a church (\textit{basilica}) installed in an existing building, the Sessorian palace, and it was allocated to the veneration of a relic brought from afar, a fragment of the wooden cross on which Jesus of Nazareth had been crucified (Fig. 6.1).\(^6\) Both the reuse of an older building and the cultic focus on a translated relic are unique in Constantine’s building activities in favour of the Christian Church, including his projects in the Holy Land and the new capital of Constantinople. The Roman editor of the early sixth century, who made use of original archival documents concerning Constantine’s church foundations to compile the \textit{Liber Pontificalis}, the book with the biographies of the Roman

\(^5\) Recent overview: Brandenburg 2004.

\(^6\) LP 34 c. 22: ‘Eodem tempore fecit Constantinus Augustus basilicam in palatio Sessoriano, ubi etiam de ligno sanctae Crucis domini nostri Iesu Christi in auro et gemmis conclusit, ubi et nomen ecclesiae dedicavit, quae cognominatur usque in hodiernum diem Hierusalem […]’
bishops, did not fail to add that the church in question was entitled Hierusalem 'until the present day'.

The intricate layers of traditions regarding the Finding of the True Cross, the role of the empress Helena, Constantine's mother, and the diffusion of Cross relics and their cult over the empire in the course of the fourth century have obscured the significance of the facts regarding Rome. The early installation of a memoria of the Holy Cross in an imperial palace complex in Rome is extremely plausible, in view of sound written and archaeological evidence.7 ‘Early’ means before the 350s, the period in which the legendary tradition of the Cross Finding and the pilgrimage of Helena (died 329/330) to the Holy

---

7 For brevity sake I refer to the arguments discussed in De Blaauw 1997.
Land was constructed.\(^8\) The cult in Rome appears to belong to the protohistory of this famous legend: a moment when the value of the Holy Cross as a relic had been recognized and the proliferation of particles was about to start, but without an underpinning narrative. The foundation documents of the Roman *memoria* do not speak about Helena, even if the empress-dowager may have lived in the Sessorian palace. The church, basically a large rectangular hall with diaphragm colonnades and an apse at its eastern end, must have been founded during Constantine’s reign, but may have been accomplished only under Constantine’s sons, one or two decades after their father’s death in 337.\(^9\)

The remaining hard evidence is remarkable enough. The creation of a *memoria* of the Holy Cross in Rome is the first outside Jerusalem that is historically corroborated. From its arrival in Rome, the Cross relic was sealed in a casing of gold and jewels – mentioned by the *Liber Pontificalis*. Its most probable place of conservation was a chapel directly behind the apse of the church, decorated with mosaics on behalf of the reigning emperors in the period 425–44. This later became the chapel of St Helena. Accidentally or not, its disposition corresponded to the location of Golgotha in relation to the Constantinian basilica of the Holy Sepulchre complex in Jerusalem.\(^10\) The aspect of topographical identification is reflected in the epithet *Hierusalem*, current at least from the fifth century onwards and henceforth expressed in the usual designation of the Church as the Holy Cross in Jerusalem (today: Santa Croce in Gerusalemme).\(^11\)

---

8 Scholarly consensus confirms the construction of the Helena legend in Jerusalem around the middle of the fourth century or slightly later: Drijvers and Drijvers 1997, p. 13.

9 Brandenburg 2004, pp. 103–08.

10 Already noticed by Grisar 1899, pp. 557–58. The difference is the location of the Cross sanctuary: to the left of the apse in Jerusalem and to the right in Rome. Although the dispositions of the sanctuaries are opposite, both are situated on the south side. Cf. a possible parallel in Santa Croce, Ravenna, in the years of Galla Placidia (c. 430–50), who is also known as the patron of a decoration of the Roman chapel: Smith 1990, pp. 193–95. In Ravenna the possible location of a cult of the Cross is situated to the left, i.e. the north of the apse. Smith is wrong in supposing that the Roman chapel is situated to the left of the apse as well.

Jerusalem as the Christian Sacred City

The Roman relic belongs to the first stage of the perception of Jerusalem and the Holy Land as the memorial place of the Salvation on earth, for which the physical evidence of Christ’s Cross was increasingly a vital notion.\textsuperscript{12} Constantine’s patronage of building in the Holy Land after 325 AD, early pilgrimage movements and the first diffusion of Cross relics confirm the growing consciousness of the sacred topography of Jerusalem in the 330s and 340s.\textsuperscript{13} In a wider context, this development may be seen as an episode in the redefinition of Christian identity in the Roman Empire, where Christian communities had been minorities suffering under suppression only recently, and now became part of an imperial project to make them participants in the legitimization of the emperor’s authority.\textsuperscript{14} Although Constantine never visited Jerusalem as an emperor, and can hardly have nourished direct political interests for the inconsiderable provincial city, his cultural or religious commitment to local Christian sites is well documented.\textsuperscript{15} His position may have converged well with tendencies in the city’s Christian community to establish a Christian dominated Jerusalem, which would erase Jewish and pagan recollections.\textsuperscript{16}

Only in a second phase, reasonably linked with the policy and catechetical activity of Bishop Cyril from 350, was Christian cultural memory in Jerusalem redefined and assembled into the story of the Finding of the True Cross by Helena. Without doubt, use was made of the historical notions of the previous generation to which may belong the identification of the Cross of Christ under Constantine, as well as a journey of Helena to the Holy Land in 326. Helena’s expedition was remarkable enough for an empress and a pioneering act of pilgrimage. The combination of these elements in one narrative, however, has many features of an invention of tradition.\textsuperscript{17} It spread continually over the empire, inspiring several variants in the East. Ultimately, in the 390s, the Helena legend was known in Italy.\textsuperscript{18} The idea that Helena found the True Cross of Christ in the direct vicinity of the very spot of the Crucifixion, and started the

\textsuperscript{12} Heid 2001[a], pp. 119–25.
\textsuperscript{13} Elsner 2000.
\textsuperscript{14} On the role of the Holy Land in this process: Jacobs 2004.
\textsuperscript{15} I am, however, rather sceptical towards the central role of the Holy Land in the ‘construction of Christian imperial ideology’ stressed e.g. by Elsner 2000 and Jacobs 2004.
\textsuperscript{16} Jacobs 2004, pp. 139–43.
\textsuperscript{17} Drijvers 1991, pp. 79–180, esp. pp. 138–45. The most recent evaluation of the sources and relevant scholarship: Heid 2001[b].
distribution of its relics, would become the dominant story all over the Christian world in the Middle Ages.

Constantine had been willing to mark the urban area of Jerusalem and nearby Bethlehem with three conspicuous Christian buildings on the sites of Christ’s birth, of his Teaching and of his Death and Resurrection. In the course of the century, these Constantinian *memoriae* became the nuclei of a landscape of *loca sancta*, holy sites, which made Jerusalem into a Holy City (Fig. 6.2). Its memorial geography of the history of Salvation attracted Christians from the whole empire and beyond. They visited places where biblical events themselves had taken place, spots where crucial moments in the history of Salvation could be experienced with the human senses in the most direct way. The accounts of early pilgrimages from the West to Jerusalem testify to the unique value of the Holy Land. An anonymous pilgrim from Bordeaux had already travelled during Constantine’s reign, leaving the first written pilgrimage account (333 AD). Another pilgrim, Egeria, visited the Holy Land in the later years of Cyril’s pontificate, and left a detailed diary (381–84 AD). The development of the cult of the Cross in half a century seems to be reflected in the way both authors refer to it. The first account only mentions Golgotha in passing, as the place of the Crucifixion close to the Holy Sepulchre, whereas Egeria describes the ceremonies of veneration of the Holy Cross extensively.

The incomparable spiritual significance of the sacred topography of Jerusalem and the Holy Land was recognized in Rome during the fourth century, above all in ascetical circles. Jerome, the learned theologian, and aristocratic women like Paula and Melanija the elder and the younger all left the busy capital and travelled to Palestine, to find a spiritual refuge in the direct vicinity of the holy places. Rome may have been blessed with the tombs of the apostles; a metropolis could not offer the ideal place for ascetic ‘imitation’ as the holy places in Palestine. In his letter to Marcella, Jerome stressed the particular sanctity of Jerusalem and did not hesitate to conclude that the city was even superior to Rome.

---

19 For this development I was able to consult the recent, still unpublished Habilitationschrift by Ute Verstegen, University of Erlangen 2013: ‘Heiliger Ort – sakraler Raum. Kontinuität und Wandel in der Inszenierung der Herrenorte in Jerusalem’.
20 Itinerarium Burdigalense and Egeria 37 / 48 in: Itineraria 1965 CC 175, pp. 13–20, 80–81, 89.
22 Hieronymus, Epist. 46.8.11 (392/93 AD), CSEL 54, pp. 338–41.
In this light, the decision to bring a particle of the ‘sacred wood’ to Rome and to make it the focus of an imperial foundation must have been a meaningful and ostentatious choice in the early phase indicated above. It is not known who took the initiative, but the idea can only have arisen in the context of the empire-wide imperial patronage for the Christian Church. The creation of a memoria of the Holy Cross, probably the first outside Jerusalem, must have aimed at adding a spiritual quality to the already existing eminence of Rome as the city of the apostles Peter and Paul and of numerous martyrs. Through it,
the Roman Church was able to appropriate a key aspect of Jerusalem’s rising identity as the unique Christian Sacred City. As noted above, the nomenclature *Hierusalem* of the Roman *memoria*, and maybe the arrangement of the Cross relic in a separate room behind the main apse, refer directly to the topographical dimension of the relationship with Jerusalem.

With this notion of the appropriation of Jerusalem that could be traced back to the emperor Constantine, the second founder of Christian Rome after the apostles, the Church of Rome might cherish the potential of demonstrating itself as a successor and substitute for the earthly Jerusalem. Hierotopy, the creation of sacred places, was an important instrument used by church leaders such as Pope Damasus (bishop of Rome 366–84) to establish Rome as the Christian Sacred City *par excellence*, at the same time that his colleague Cyril was working with similar intentions in Jerusalem.\(^{24}\) However, the presence of an early Cross relic in Santa Croce and the concomitant topographical notion of holiness associated with this church were not capitalized on systematically to the greatest extent during the following decades and centuries, as far as the scanty sources report it. Damasus set the tone in concentrating entirely on the Roman martyrs, without any reference to the Cross relic.

The story of the Finding by Helena was not linked to the Constantinian relic in Rome before the late Middle Ages. This is notwithstanding the popularity of the Finding legend on one hand, and on the other the high probability of some connection between Helena and the Sessorian palace complex, in which the *Hierusalem memoria* was created (Fig. 6.3).\(^{25}\) Epigraphical evidence suggests that the empress made use of the palace during her stays in Rome, the city where she died and was buried in 329 / 330 AD. About 500 AD the ‘Sessorian’ church was spontaneously mentioned as *Basilica Heleniana*.\(^{26}\) The editor of the *Liber Pontificalis* in the early sixth century refers to Helena as ‘beata’, implying her sainthood.\(^{27}\) He also gives evidence of knowing the so called Judas Cyriacus version of the Cross Finding legend.\(^{28}\) Nevertheless, the same editor refrains from including Helena’s name in the passage on the foundation of the Basilica Hierusalem and the donation of a Cross relic by her son Constantine. Obviously, he saw no reason to give the widely known legend of the Finding of the Cross a specific Roman twist.

---

24 For the term hierotopy see: Lidov 2006.
26 Gesta Xysti in *LP* (Duchesne 1886 i, p. 196 n. 75).
27 *LP* 34 c. 26.
28 *LP* 32 c. 2.
Meanwhile, the expansion of the cult of the Cross in the Christian world from the last quarter of the fourth century onwards had produced a number of places where Cross relics were kept and venerated. The earliest testimony after that of the Roman relic comes from Northern Africa, where in Tixter (Kherbet Oum el-Ahdam, modern Algeria) an inscription mentions relics kept in a Christian sacred building.\(^{29}\) ‘Holy memorial. Part of the earth of promise where Christ was born, [...] of the apostles Peter and Paul [...] of African martyrs] and part of the wood of the Cross’. It is clearly dated 359.\(^{30}\) Apart from the local saints, the items mentioned are striking. Rome was firm in not allowing the distribution of relics of its martyrs for many centuries. The items regarding Peter and Paul must have been secondary or contact relics, but even for this category, the mention is very early. Just as remarkable are the relics from the Holy Land, referring to the Nativity and the Crucifixion of Christ. Both Cross relics and earth or stone from holy places would become very common relics

---


\(^{30}\) The line regarding the Cross may have been added, but only slightly afterwards and in the same lettering: Duval 1982 vol. 1, pp. 331–37.
in the future, but their existence at this date, in a rural place in the province of Mauretania is noteworthy. The inscription demonstrates that the growing awareness of the holiness of the sites of the Salvation was a widespread phenomenon in the Roman world of the third quarter of the fourth century.

The new capital of Constantinople was credited as having the most important Cross relics after the remnants preserved on Golgotha itself. The earliest version of the Helena Legend mentions the relic of Constantinople, sent by Helena to her son, but keeps silent on that of Rome.31 This silence on the other versions of the legend may be explained by the Eastern perspective of the legends, but, in the long run, this account will certainly have had its effect given the background of the rivalry between the two capitals. The sources from Constantinople, however, fail to provide an unequivocal view of the presence of significant Cross relics in the city.32 Obviously, no explicit cult of the Cross had developed in the Eastern capital since the alleged translation from Jerusalem.33 Only in the late sixth century, after the translation of another celebrated Cross relic from Apamea, did a popular tradition of veneration of the Cross begin to turn up in Constantinople.34 Meanwhile, the significance of Constantinople itself as a Sacred City had been emphasized by those Christian authors who criticized the obsession with pilgrimage to the Holy Land. The author of the Life of Daniel the Stylite around 500 AD, for example, encourages his readers with the words of the Byzantine saint himself to refrain from the journey to Jerusalem, but rather to go on local pilgrimage to the capital: with its tombs of martyrs and honour inspiring places ‘you will see the Second Jerusalem there’.35 This qualification was certainly exaggerated, since it was exactly the lack of important martyr’s tombs that was a tangible weakness of the New Rome compared to the Old. A systematic development of Constantinople as a centre of pilgrimage and a site of loca sancta seems only to have occurred in the Komnenian period (1081–1185).36

The diffusion of the wood of the Cross made the possession of Cross relics less exclusive and the claim to embody Jerusalem less imaginative. In Rome itself during the later fifth century, popes provided the baptisteries of the main basilicas, the Lateran and St Peter’s, with special chapels containing Cross

31 Rufinus Aquileiensis, Historia Ecclesiastica 10.7 in: Eusebius Werke 2.2, 1908, p. 970.
32 For the improbability of a relic collection in Constantinople already under Constantine see: Wortley 2004.
relics mounted in gold and precious stones. Yet, the earliest relic in Rome could have been exploited just because of its early date and celebrated donor. Its fame, however, does not seem to have spread about outside Rome. Whereas the city became a principal destination for pilgrimage from the entire Christian world during the fourth century, the focus was exclusively on the tombs of the Apostles. The Cross relic is never mentioned by any external source. But there is also a virtual absence of local witnesses. Leo the Great (444–61), the first noteworthy theologian among the Roman bishops, highlights the significance of the Cross as the symbol of Christ’s triumph and recognizes the value of Cross relics as testimonies of the Incarnation that may help to strengthen the faith, without ever referring to the prominent existence of such a relic in Rome itself. His later successor Gregory the Great (590–604) has a definite interest in the martyrs’ tombs in Rome and in the phenomenon of relics. At the same time, he shares the critique of earlier authors on distant pilgrimages to the Holy Land, diverging openly from Jerome and his Roman followers. All the same, this opinion did not keep him from supporting institutions for pilgrims in Jerusalem and the Holy Land with money and goods. Ultimately, Gregory nourished a predominantly spiritual view of Jerusalem: as the place of God it can be in the soul of each individual in search for peace, wherever he or she is.

Even if the interest in Rome for its connection with the Holy Land and its sacred topography may not have been consistent and enduringly intense, it appeared to be a lasting feature of the papal city and it survived Late Antiquity. Rome’s second urban patriarchal church, Santa Maria Maggiore, bore the epithet ad praesepe from the seventh century onwards. The name implies the existence of a relic of Christ’s manger from Bethlehem. Indeed, these relics are documented in Santa Maria Maggiore in later centuries, as well as a special chapel at the northern flank of the nave to shelter them. The first record of the name ad praesepe may not accidentally occur in the pontificate of Pope Theodore (642–49), himself born in Jerusalem. Its promotion occurred in a dramatically new political configuration. The Holy Land had been captured by the Arabs in 637, so that the safety of the important testimonies of the

37 LP 46 c. 3; LP 53 c. 7; De Blaauw 1997, pp. 68–69.
38 Bardy 1949.
42 Gregorius Magnus, Hom Ez. 1. 10.24, ed. CCL 142, p. 156; Maraval 1991, pp. 72–75.
44 LP 75 c. 2.
Incarnation had become an urgent issue.\textsuperscript{45} Theodore interfered directly in aid of the continuation of the Christian presence in Jerusalem. During the next decades, the papacy showed its lasting interest in the Holy City and was even able to fill part of the power vacuum in Christian Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{46} In the inner Roman perspective, the parallels of the Roman Bethlehem with the Jerusalem of Santa Croce cannot be missed. Albeit chronologically distant in their origins, the creation of ‘Bethlehem’ may have strengthened and updated the older ‘Jerusalem’ and the other way around maybe the Cross\textit{ memoria} has helped to enhance the credibility of that of the Crib. The reception of this Holy Land topography in Rome is testified in an eleventh century\textit{ ordo} for the coronation of the Holy Roman emperors in Rome, in which the newly crowned emperor makes a miniature pilgrimage from the ‘Bethlehem church’ to the ‘Jerusalem church’.\textsuperscript{47}

\textbf{Iconographical Evocations of Jerusalem}

The representation of the Holy Land plays a remarkable role in the monumental iconographic programmes of Late Antique Roman churches. In one of the earliest preserved apse mosaics, of Santa Pudenziana (shortly after 400 AD), a representation of Jerusalem even constitutes one of the main iconographic components (Fig. 6.4). Behind the enthroned Christ in the midst of the college of apostles, a tall jewelled cross on a hilltop emerges against the backdrop of a panoramic cityscape with representative buildings.

The diverging interpretations of the Santa Pudenziana mosaic actually contribute to the perception of a multilayered meaning with levels of representation that largely do not exclude each other.\textsuperscript{48} Christ appears at the same time as King, Teacher, Judge and God. The composition of the mosaic with the central throne clearly refers to the actual liturgical situation in the apse during the Eucharist, where – on stational days – the Roman bishop would sit on the central cathedra and the higher clergy (the later cardinals) on the wall benches at both sides of the pope. The teaching function of Christ is directly mirrored in that of the pope underneath. This is also a representation of the Church,

\textsuperscript{45} Ó Carragáin 2005, p. 239.
\textsuperscript{46} Van Dijk 2001, pp. 324–27.
\textsuperscript{47} ‘[...] coronatus vadit de ecclesia Bethlehem ad ecclesiam Jerusalem’, Ordo\textit{ Coronationis Imperatoris} 13.7, \textit{MGH Fontes iuris Germanici antiqui in usum scholarum} 9, 1960, p. 35. This ritual is not referred to again in the later\textit{ ordines}.
\textsuperscript{48} Dassmann 1970 (still fundamental); Kühnel 1987, pp. 63–72.
emphasized by the two women, who may symbolize the Jews and the Gentiles as the distinct groups constituting the Church. Christ is without doubt depicted in his divine being, harking back to iconographical features of the pagan gods. But every visitor to the church would also immediately recognize the imperial characteristics used to express the complex idea of a majestic God-Man. The women holding crowns actually take part in an imperial throning ceremonial. Simultaneously, the mosaic clearly has an eschatological perspective, in the Four Living Creatures from the Book of Revelation. The reflection of a terrestrial reality and the heavenly vision that are both present in the mosaic are connected by the cross and the city. The cross — preciously decorated with gems — rises on a hill cut back to bare stone, which is clearly a representation of Golgotha in Palestine. At the same time, the cross does not represent the moment of the Crucifixion but is in its glorified appearance a symbol of the Triumph of Christ. These terrestrial and heavenly layers of meaning must therefore also be present in the city panorama. The buildings behind the continuous porticus are rendered in such a particular way that they are most likely reproductions of actual monuments in earthly Jerusalem. They may include the Christian buildings Anastasis and Martyrium to the left, and the Imbomon

49 Mathews 1993, pp. 98–114.
and Eleona basilicas on the Mount of Olives to the right.\textsuperscript{51} This portrayal of the earthly, Christianized Jerusalem was the best formula for representing the heavenly city of New Jerusalem that was the focus of the eschatological message of the liturgy as well as of sacred iconography.\textsuperscript{52} The gemmed cross would return as the central motif of several Roman mosaics during the next centuries, for example in the added small apse in Santo Stefano Rotondo. The mosaic was installed by Pope Theodore (642–49) in a chapel that he created as the burial place for his father, originating from Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{53} Though the Jerusalem association of this cross may have been very concrete, since it may have represented the gemmed cross standing on Golgotha after the ‘liberation’ of Jerusalem from the Persians by the emperor Heraclius in 629, there is no topographical context, not even a hilltop.\textsuperscript{54}

A more specific representation of Holy Land sites is again to be found in the fifth century, on the former apse arch of Santa Maria Maggiore (432–40 AD). The cycle dedicated to the Childhood and Second Coming of Christ includes the emblematic images of two cities as each other’s counterparts in the lower zone of the arch. They are inscribed as \textit{Hierusalem} (left) and \textit{Bethleem} (right). Even though the compact formula and the jewelled walls might indicate otherwise, they are primarily the symbolic representations of the real cities in Palestine, with some of their characteristic buildings.\textsuperscript{55} The gems on the walls are clearly derived from the apocalyptic Jerusalem, but obviously transmitted to the earthly cities. (Bethlehem has no eschatological character.) The sheep coming from the cities stress their symbolic meaning for the Church for Jews and Gentiles respectively.

Due to the fragmentary survival of Early Christian monumental iconography and an almost complete vacuum of examples in the East, it is not possible to evaluate the surviving works in Rome in a comparative way.\textsuperscript{56} Yet, a pronounced topographical spotlight on the earthly Jerusalem is visible mainly in two works of the first half of the fifth century. The heavenly Jerusalem may

\textsuperscript{51} Pullan 1998 (with some debatable points regarding details); Heid 2001[a], 176–88; critical: Deckers 1988, pp. 326–30.

\textsuperscript{52} Matthiae 1967, p. 61; Ó Carragáin 2005, pp. 232–33.

\textsuperscript{53} I.P 75 c.1/ c. 4 (and note 1 by Duchesne 1886 i, p. 333); for Theodore's father's burial: Syll. Lareshamensis 1, Duchesne 1886 i, p. 334 n. 9.

\textsuperscript{54} Ó Carragáin 2005, p. 234.


\textsuperscript{56} I leave in abeyance Osborne 2008 on the seven candlesticks in the ss. Cosma e Damiano mosaic as possible allusion to the lost Temple treasure.
have been less a focus than has often been suggested. Moreover, even in an eschatological context, the representation of Jerusalem may have exhibited recognizable features of the real city. The imagery of the triumphal Cross, on the other hand, was directly associated with the gemmed relic crosses in which the wood of the Holy Cross was preserved and venerated in real liturgy.

Liturgical Evocations of Earthly Jerusalem

In the Roman liturgical year three days were more or less focussed on the cult of the Cross. Good Friday belonged to the most ancient core of the liturgical year over the entire Christian world. The feast of the Finding of the Cross on May 3rd may have originated in Rome, whereas the feast of the Exaltation of the Cross was introduced in Rome from the East, most probably soon after the triumph of Heraclius over the Persians and the recovery of the Holy Cross at Golgotha. Cross relics played a role in the ceremonial on Good Friday and on the Exaltation. In the late seventh century, when these rituals were first described in Rome, relics of the True Cross had become relatively numerous, also in Rome itself, so that they do not necessarily represent an explicit relationship to Jerusalem. However, such a direct relationship does exist in some aspects of the feast as celebrated in Rome.

The *Inventio Crucis* on 3 May is a direct result of the Judas Cyriacus version of the Cross Finding legend, which mentions the discovery by Helena on the third day of May. The probable creation of this feast in Rome, outside the papal liturgy and at a relative early date – it was observed in the sixth century – is a remarkable testimony of a rare Western initiative in this context. One wonders whether this purposeful reception of the Eastern legend was a venture of the clergy of the Sessorian basilica, in an attempt to call attention to the relic and to the story that gave her its name, *Hierusalem*.

The introduction of the *Exaltatio sanctae Crucis* feast was stimulated by topical events in Jerusalem in 629–31. The day of 14 September was the traditional Dedication feast of the Holy Sepulchre church in Jerusalem, which became a celebration of Christian triumph after the defeat of the Persians and the restoration of the Cross memorial on Golgotha. In Rome, its commemoration was combined with the veneration of a ‘lifegiving’ relic of the Holy

58 De Blaauw 1997, pp. 70–72 (with further literature).
Cross.\textsuperscript{59} This is testified for St Peter’s, but probably was also in use in other churches that had a precious Cross relic in their possession.\textsuperscript{60} Ultimately, under the Syrian Pope Sergius I (687–701) the feast was part of the papal liturgical system. The author of Sergius’ life in the Liber Pontificalis gives it a special profile by means of a semi-miraculous story of the ‘discovery’ of a forgotten but very precious relic cross in a ‘dark corner’ of St Peter’s.\textsuperscript{61} On opening a silver casket and removing a silk cushion that was in it, the Pope found a metal cross decorated with precious stones. After removing the four plates in which the jewels were embedded he discovered a ‘large and indescribable portion of the saving wood of the Lord’s Cross’. This relic was obviously judged to have an extraordinary value, since it was transferred to the papal residence of the Lateran and exposed in the Lateran basilica each year on 14 September, to be kissed and worshipped by the people. It is the oldest known Cross relic in Rome that can be traced physically, with a fair amount of probability, until modern times. The gemmed cross containing the sacred wood with a balm-filled cavity in its centre was discovered in the altar of the Lateran palace chapel in the early twentieth century in a cruciform silver container from the Carolingian period.\textsuperscript{62} The central role given to this relic in the papal liturgy of the \\textit{Exaltatio} from the late seventh century onwards proves that it was considered the major Cross relic in Rome and the most direct representative of the relics that were kept on Golgotha itself, meanwhile under Muslim rule.

The liturgy of Good Friday certainly was the oldest Jerusalem-related rite in Rome. The earliest lists of papal stations, rooting in the later fifth century, mention the basilica \\textit{Hierusalem} as the place for the celebration on the day of Christ’s death.\textsuperscript{63} The role of the basilica’s Cross relic, however, is unclear. Only after 700 does the earliest preserved description of the rite mentions a solemn veneration of the Cross by pope and people at the altar of Santa Croce, but this was astonishingly not the Constantinian relic. The object of veneration was brought in a penitential procession from the Lateran, and was in all probability identical with the relic cross discovered in St Peter’s and since then secured in the palace chapel of the Lateran. The description of the Cross in the \\textit{ordo} for


\textsuperscript{61} L.P. 86 c. 10.

\textsuperscript{62} Thunø 2002, pp. 21–22. The gemmed cross itself is now lost, but photographs and descriptions exist.

\textsuperscript{63} De Blaauw 1997, pp. 71–72; De Blaauw 1994, 188–89. The suggestion of Grisar 1925, pp. 4–6, that the Roman stational organization was based on that of Jerusalem has proven to be untenable in the light of later research.
the ritual corresponds perfectly to the other information: it was carried in a
gold casing with gems, the wood of the Cross itself was covered with gold and
gems and had a cavity with odoriferous balm.64

Accordingly, about 700 AD the gemmed cross from St Peter’s/ the Lateran
palace had been able to surpass other well known Cross relics in Rome, par-
ticularly those of the Vatican and Lateran baptisteries and that of Santa Croce.
The reason for this remarkable turn, even in the primeval rite of Good Friday,
is unknown, but it definitely was an infringement of the prestige of the relic
tradition of Santa Croce. The most plausible explanation is, that the Constan-
tinian relic in its precious casing had not survived the sackings of Rome in the
fifth century. Notwithstanding the loss of an object, the identification of the
Constantinian memoria with Jerusalem was rooted deeply enough in Roman
soil to warrant that the station of papal liturgy on the days of the liturgical year
which had the strongest associations with Jerusalem be held in Santa Croce: Good Friday and the Sunday of Lent when the psalm ‘Laetare Hierusalem’ was
sung as the Introit. Meanwhile, the role of the palace as a treasury for the most
precious relics has a parallel in the imperial palace of Constantinople, from
where a Cross relic was carried forth in processions.65

Perhaps the ritual significance of Cross relics had not been essential in
Rome in the preceding centuries. The unmistakable boost in the cult of the
Cross during the seventh century may have been energized by developments
in the East, above all by the vicissitudes of Jerusalem, that saw the extinction
of Byzantine Christian rule in favour of Persian and finally of Arab power. The
development of Roman rituals in this period shows at any rate a special sus-
ceptibility for the traditions of Jerusalem, a phenomenon likewise visible in
Constantinople.66 The Good Friday procession from the Lateran to Santa
Croce had clearly mimetic features in relation to the procession of bishop and
pilgrims in Jerusalem to venerate the Cross at Golgotha, including its associa-
tions with the Passover of Exodus and its eschatological perspective of jour-
neying towards the heavenly Jerusalem.67 The fact that not the pope, but the
Cross relic was the protagonist of the procession, and the barefoot walking of
all participants as a penitential gesture, made this procession to S. Croce into a

---

65 Klein 2004, pp. 36–37; Flusin 2004, pp. 69–70 (11th century); Bacci 2003; Lidov 2012; Bozóky
2007, pp. 106–18 (views the imperial relic collection in Constantinople as the model for
several imitations in the West. This is debatable in the light of the Lateran tradition).
66 Klein 2004, pp. 41–43.
symbolic pilgrimage to Golgotha. Even if Santa Croce no longer contributed a relic, its topographical association with the city of the Salvation could obviously still work in an effective way. The rite of veneration itself consisted of the opening of the reliquary casing on an altar and the exposition of the relic cross contained in it so that it could be kissed by the clergy and faithful. This was a century old tradition, practised in Jerusalem already in the late fourth century. The interaction of cult traditions between Jerusalem, Rome and Constantinople is obvious, but hardly traceable in its exact patterns of causes and effects, particularly before the seventh century. This is precisely why it is important to underline the bare facts of the Jerusalem association in Rome in the fourth century and the development of the cult of the Cross in the fifth century under the aegis of the popes.

Diachronic Perspectives

The attention to the historical sites of the Salvation in Early Christian Rome had no counterpart in a direct interest for the Jewish history of the Holy Land. On the other hand, neither is there any indication of a conscious strategy to deny or outdo the Jewish discourse on the Land of Israel. Any local interest in the sacred vessels of the Herodian Temple, installed by Vespasian in Rome as trophies, is lacking before the eleventh century. A general Christian attention to the biblical temple and its cult was slowly developing and resulted in a more consistent corpus of exegetical reflection and symbolic interpretation only after the treatises on the Tabernacle and the Temple by the Venerable Bede in distant Britain in the decades around 700. Notwithstanding the strong metaphorical concept of these works, they enhanced and stimulated knowledge of the historical temples of Jerusalem.

Direct reflections of the Jerusalem Temple are found in Rome from the eleventh century onwards. Then, the papal chapel of St Lawrence in the Lateran palace started to be entitled Sancta Sanctorum. The expression sancta sanctorum was already known for the relic collection in a church altar since the early

---

fifth century. Nonetheless, its application for a spatial entity may indicate a strengthening of its original reference to the Holy of Holies in the Temple of Jerusalem. The collection of relics from the Holy Land and the Life of Christ in the altars of this chapel originates in the seventh or eighth centuries. Apart from the eminent Cross relic, the collection also contained geographical memories from the Holy Land in the form of stones and soil from the sacred sites, a genre going back likewise to the fourth century, witness the inscription from Tixter. In a recent study, Galland counts six written labels for relics from various biblical places, and several tens for relics from geographically indicated places related to the Life of Christ, almost all of them paleographically dated in the seventh or eighth century. This bears witness to a (first) inventory of the relic collection, which may itself have existed earlier. A twelfth century author brings to mind that the famous icon of the Saviour in the palace chapel, considered as not having been painted by human hands, had been brought to Rome by Titus and Vespasian.

The association of the Lateran basilica with the Temple of Jerusalem in the High Middle Ages has been studied intensely during the last decades. From the tenth century onwards, the Temple allusion was obviously one of the means to distinguish the papal cathedral vis-à-vis the Vatican basilica with the tomb of Peter. Soon, the pretention of being the successor of the biblical Temple took on material features, with the claim that the basilica housed the sacred vessels of the Temple as relics in its high altar. This tradition has always been controversial in Rome itself, not in the least due to obvious historical improbabilities. The first author of the Description of the Lateran Church, a treatise originating in the later 11th century, attributes all the relics from the Temple purportedly kept in the basilica not to Titus and Vespasian, but to Helena, who would have brought them with her from Jerusalem to Rome, on behalf of her son Constantine. The successive versions of the Description during the twelfth century show how the process of uncovering the history of the Lateran basilica was verified using historical and legendary material, the main ingredients of which were Constantine, Helena and the Jerusalem Temple.

---

74 Nussbaum 1959, pp. 242–43.
75 Galland 2004, pp. 87–89.
76 Galland 2004, catalogue, pp. 93–144.
77 Nicolaus Maniacutius, quoted by Longo 2012, p. 133.
78 Herklottz 2000 (new edition of earlier studies), here esp. pp. 170–80; De Blaauw 1990; some more recent studies are referred to in the following notes.
Another tradition claimed the singular bronze columns from imperial times, standing in front of the Lateran high altar, as coming from Jerusalem as well (Fig. 6.5). A solemn late thirteenth century inscription refers to the bronze columns as ‘brought from Jerusalem to Rome by Titus and Vespasian’.81 More than a century earlier, the Jewish author Benjamin of Tudela had identified them as ‘the handiwork of King Solomon’ from the First Temple.82 From the sweat said to run down from the columns each year on the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple by the Romans, it is clear that the local Roman-Jewish community truly believed that these were relics of the authentic Temple, present in Rome.

Notoriously, pro-Lateran authors in the Reform period of the Church developed the concept of the real Jerusalem in Rome: Jerusalem, with the pope as its high priest, was now in Rome, and had taken over the relevance of the old Je-

81 Nilgen 1977, pp. 21–24 (‘de Herusolima ad Urbem’).
82 Champagne and Boustan 2011, pp. 477–81.
rusalem in an eschatological perspective.\textsuperscript{83} Just as clear, however, is that this concept was nourished only in a limited circle and for a limited time: it was not decisive to the ideology of papal authority and had obviously already lost its vital force in the course of the twelfth century. In the polemics between the Lateran and Vatican canons, those of the Vatican took care to accuse their Lateran brothers of being ‘iudeaeos et moysisetas’ serving a ‘synagogue’, deliberately avoiding the identification of the Lateran basilica with the Temple of Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{84} Notwithstanding some propagandistic turns, the medieval Lateran complex cannot plainly be read as a \textit{lieu de mémoire} of the Temple and the Holy Land. Ingo Herklotz has demonstrated that the combination of reminiscences, in which Roman antiquity as well as the first Christian emperor, Constantine, play a prominent role, was ultimately focussed on Christ and above all on the pope as Christ's representative on earth, as high priest and as imperial ruler.\textsuperscript{85}

Since the beginning of the Crusades, material memorabilia from the Holy Land and the earthly Jerusalem spread all over Western Europe in a never equalled density. After the Fall of Constantinople in 1204, the dispersal of the Holy Land treasures collected over centuries in the Eastern Christian capital augmented the Western relic resources with a last quantitative and qualitative inundation.\textsuperscript{86} Since then, at the latest, the material mementoes of Jerusalem in Rome lost their relative exclusivity. Certainly, the acquisition of the famous Column of the Flagellation from the imperial palace in Constantinople by the Roman cardinal Giovanni Colonna in 1223, was a major catch.\textsuperscript{87} Nevertheless, the relic, placed in the Zeno-chapel of the cardinal’s titular church of S. Prassede, never attained the prestige and popularity of Christ’s Crown of Thorns, brought from Constantinople to Paris via Venice in 1238–1239 as a trophy by King Louis IX. Other relics came directly from the Holy Land to Rome, in order to rescue them for the possible threat of the Arab re-conquerors. A significant case was the ‘re-burial’ of St Jerome, whose remains were translated from his tomb in the Nativity church in Bethlehem to Santa Maria Maggiore.\textsuperscript{88} An altar with his relics was set up in front of the entrance to the Praesepe-chapel in the course of the thirteenth century, so that the direct connection of the church father to the site of the Nativity of Christ was suggested as continuing. Thus,

\textsuperscript{83} Cf. Longo 2012, pp. 134–36.
\textsuperscript{84} Longo 2012, p. 126.
\textsuperscript{85} Herklotz 2000, pp. 10–14.
\textsuperscript{86} Byzance et les reliques 2004, pp. 91–105, 183–90, 238–48.
\textsuperscript{87} Vannutelli 1896.
Rome not only confirmed its association with Bethlehem, but also fetched back one of the most important teachers of the faith who had once left the city in favour of the Holy Land. The retrospective consideration that no remains of the saint have ever been discovered in the Roman basilica only corroborates the frequent experience of scholars that the spiritual intention of the story is more important than the purported facts. 

After the definite loss of the Latin territories in the Holy Land, the interest in the real city seems to have given way to a more spiritual concept of Jerusalem. The Jubilee Years promulgated by the popes from 1300 onwards made Rome into a full successor of Jerusalem for the pilgrims, substituting for it even in being the ‘navel of the world’. The links with old Jerusalem tended to become more symbolic, as part of a general process of universalization and mediation in late medieval piety.

Meanwhile, ancient associations with Jerusalem in the Roman sacred landscape were retained and sometimes were revitalized. In the Lateran palace, new testimonies of the Holy sites popped up, notably the mensura Christi and the Holy Stairs. In the thirteenth century, the regular entrance steps of the medieval Lateran palace were said to be the steps that had led up to the praetorium of Pontius Pilate in Jerusalem. It is an interesting example of a long existing functional object that was provided gradually with a supplementary layer of significance as a relic, in this case of Christ’s Passion. The same is true for three beautiful marble portals in the Lateran Aula of the Councils, said to be from Pilate’s palace. The mensura Christi, four columns in the same large palace aula were believed in the fifteenth century to establish the corporal height of the Lord (Fig. 6.6). The stone tablet on which the soldiers played dice for the robe of Christ at his crucifixion was shown here as well. Authors report the persistent, but unpleasing tradition that these relics from Jerusalem were brought to Rome in the booty of Titus. Only later in the sixteenth century, was their presence in Rome connected to the pilgrimage of the pious empress Helena. By then, comparable relics had also appeared in secondary churches. For example, the stone on which Abraham intended to sacrifice Isaac and

89 On the archaeological search after St Jerome’s relics in S. Maria Maggiore see: De Blaauw 1994, pp. 378–79.
92 Horsch 2003.
95 Ginzburg 1982, pp. 68–70.
96 D’Onofrio 1974, pp. 107–08.
the altar on which Jesus was presented in the Temple of Jerusalem forty days after his birth, were preserved in an obscure church between the Tiber and St Peter’s (now in the Church of the Frisians, ss. Michele e Magno).97

Certainly not by chance did the Vatican basilica appropriate an older tradition from the Lateran basilica by identifying the twisted vine-scroll columns in front of the high altar as spoils from the Temple of Solomon. The association of these exceptional spoils donated by Constantine with the Jerusalem Temple would find a successful reception in the Temple iconography from the fifteenth century onwards.98 At the same time, the Lateran had lost its Temple obsession, and had turned to the more solid Roman tradition of the veneration of the apostles Peter and Paul, whose alleged head relics were installed in the monumental ciborium of the high altar in 1370 circa.99

---

To return at last to the starting point of Jerusalem in Rome: during the Middle Ages the Church of S. Croce in Gerusalemme did not project a strong profile as the oldest Christological site related to Jerusalem in Rome. The *titulus*, the panel with inscription which was hung on Christ’s Cross according to the Gospels, seems to have been the most prominent relic and was enclosed high in a wall niche of the new triumphal arch in the twelfth century. Peter Cornelius Claussen suggests convincingly that the singular marble decoration of the twelfth century bell tower, consisting of a double cross inserted in the front wall, is a medieval reference to the cult of the Holy Cross in this church. However, it is only in the course of the fifteenth century, that a more overt focus on the basilica’s particular identity becomes discernable. The first Roman source linking Helena explicitly with the founding of S. Croce is Flavio Biondo about 1445. After the ‘rediscovery’ of the *titulus* relic in 1492, not accidentally in the same year as the final defeat of Muslim rule in Spain, the Spanish cardinal priests of the basilica launched a grand scale revival of the cult of the Cross, including the veneration of Helena as founder of the basilica. The vault of the apse and the chapel of St Helena received new decorations celebrating the Holy Cross, its invention and exaltation. A long inscription combined several legendary traditions regarding the church, its relics and founders. Pilgrims now visited the chapel hearing that is was Helena’s bedroom and that its pavement was laid on earth from Golgotha, brought along by the empress to her Roman palace.

**Concluding Remarks**

There has never been a comprehensive and lasting concept of Jerusalem in Rome, neither on a devotional and liturgical level, nor as a coherent ideology. There are no traces of the creation of a ‘sacred landscape’ according to a ‘topographical blueprint of the Holy Land’ that would transform Rome into a ‘New Jerusalem’. Yet, the materials for a direct line of meaning-transfer from

---

100 Claussen 2002, pp. 431–32.
102 De Blaauw 1997, p. 66.
103 Gill 1995.
104 Gerusalemme a Roma 2012, *passim*.
105 Sahnner, p. 103. The problem of Sahnner article is, apart from the errors in the use of sources and archaeological evidence, the underlying presupposition that Jerusalem was generally accepted as a model that had to be imitated or even to be reproduced as a ‘blueprint’. There is hardly any evidence for this premise.
Jerusalem to Rome were provided at a remarkably early date. ‘Potentials’ is the best term for them, used in a similar manner by Ousterhout when speaking on medieval Italian cities. He observes a ‘wide range of potentials’ with added associations ‘that could transcend physical forms’.106 In the case of Rome, these possible capacities may have been stronger and more concrete than in other Italian cities, not at least due to the early origins of the relic traditions and their topographical associations. From Constantine onwards, this Jerusalem subtext could be activated and was activated at relevant moments in relevant places. The early cult of the Cross in the fourth and fifth centuries, as well as the Temple associations in the eleventh and twelfth centuries are the most specific Roman phenomena. It may seem astonishing that they were not exploited in a more intense and consistent way. The reason is, however, self-evident enough. The city of Peter and Paul did not need Jerusalem. In his 1868 treatise on the holy sites of the Jerusalem Temple and the Grotto of the Nativity, Domenico Bartolini, canon of the Lateran basilica and later a cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, deals extensively with the history of the locations in Palestine, but does not hit upon the idea of any allusion to the topographical traditions of the holy sites and the primeval Christological relics in Rome.107 Even with his genuine interest in Jerusalem, the nineteenth-century prelate cannot veil the long tradition of Roman superiority toward the Holy Land. Even Jerome came back to Rome.
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PART 2

Imitation and Translocation
CHAPTER 7

The Reconquered Jerusalem Represented
Tradition and Renewal on Pilgrimage Ampullae
from the Crusader Period

Katja Boertjes

Several pewter pilgrimage ampullae whose iconography refers to Jerusalem have been preserved from the second half of the twelfth century. These ampullae enabled crusaders, pilgrims and other visitors of the Holy City to take an ‘image of Jerusalem’ to other places. These images included depictions of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre as the Crusaders had rebuilt it in the middle of the twelfth century, but also of events that had taken place in Jerusalem. The custom of decorating objects with images referring to a site of pilgrimage and offering them to pilgrims, who then spread the souvenirs to other regions, was not a new one. Even in the Early Christian period, pilgrims’ ampullae and other souvenirs bearing references to the Holy Sepulchre, or events that had taken place in the Holy Land, were already available there. However, the ampullae from the Crusader period are decidedly different from the earlier ones originating from the Holy City. Tradition alternates with renewal. After a general discussion of the custom of taking souvenirs from Jerusalem from the time of the first pilgrimages, the focus will be on pilgrimage ampullae from the Crusader period. What influence did the presence of the Crusaders in Jerusalem have on the iconography of the ampullae and their distribution to the West?

Relics and Eulogiae

From the time of Constantine the Great onwards, pilgrimage to the Holy Land developed rapidly. Worshippers visited the places where events from the Old and New Testament had taken place. They also wanted to be able to see, worship and even touch the many relics that had been found over the centuries. In Jerusalem, worship was concentrated in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, where believers could visit the relic of the True Cross and Christ’s Holy Sepulchre. As more pilgrims came to Jerusalem during the fourth century, the holy places and relics had to be better protected, because fragments of revered objects were popular souvenirs. In some places it was even necessary to place
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guards to prevent the theft of relics. Splinters of the wood of the Cross and pieces of rock from Christ’s Tomb were particularly in demand. Egeria records in her late fourth-century pilgrim’s account that the Cross in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was protected by guards after a pilgrim had bitten a piece of it off when kissing it. 1 At the beginning of the fifth century, almost every region of the Roman Empire possessed fragments of the Cross relic. 2

Tangible memories of the holy places could also be obtained by collecting eulogiae or tertiary relics. 3 The eulogiae include naturalia, ‘natural signs’, such as a pebble picked up near the Holy Sepulchre, a piece of wood found on the Mount of Olives, water from the river Jordan or natural materials like the rose of Jericho, palm branches or thorns that were picked from the hedges on the Mount of Olives. The eulogiae also include other materials found close to sacred places, like dust that had covered Christ’s Tomb, wax from the candles in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre or oil from lamps that burned near Christ’s Tomb. 4 Augustine (354–430) reported that a friend of the former official Hesperus, from the vicinity of Hippo, had taken some sand from the Holy Land for his comrade. Hesperus, who had hung the container with the sand in his bedroom, used it to ward off misfortune. 5 Antoninus of Piacenza records in his late sixth-century pilgrimage account that visitors to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre could collect two kinds of eulogiae: soil from the Holy Sepulchre and oil from the lamp that burned permanently near the Tomb. 6 A good example of a collection of eulogiae is the wooden relic box from the treasure chamber of the Capella Sancta Sanctorum of the Lateran, which was painted with five scenes from the Life of Christ in the late sixth century or early seventh century. 7

---

3 Eulogia (derived from the Greek word “εὐλογία”) is used in the sense of ‘blessed souvenir’ here. The concept of ‘eulogia’ has more meanings (in a different context). See: Stuiber 1966 for a detailed description. A eulogia’s value was based on the belief that the sanctity and sacred power of places, people and objects could be transferred by touch. See e.g.: Vikan 1984. In a more general sense, eulogiae also served as amulets, attracting prosperity and warding off misfortune. The word “εὐλογία” appears on Early Christian pilgrimage ampullae from Jerusalem as well as in written sources.
4 For a detailed study of the eulogiae pilgrims took from the Holy Land, see Bagatti 1949.
5 Hunt 1982, p. 130 and note 9, with a reference to Augustine, De Civitate dei, 22, 8.
6 Passage 18, 2–3. See: Milani 1977, p. 142. Antoninus of Piacenza uses the word ‘benedictio’ in the sense of a souvenir that was taken by a pilgrim as a relic here. See: Vermeer 1965, p. 79.
7 Now in the Museo Sacro in Vatican City, inv. no. 1883 A-B.
original contents of the box consisted of pieces of cloth, soil, stones and wood from sacred places, accompanied by strips of text that show that the various eulogiae came from different places in the Holy Land.\footnote{See: Morey 1926; Vikan 1982, pp. 18–20, Figs 13a-b; Ornamenta Ecclesiae 1985, vol. 3, pp. 80–81, no. H8; Kitzinger 1988, p. 60 and p. 61, Fig. 7; Krüger 2000, p. 69, Fig. 69 and p. 70.}

**Mass Production**

When the onrush of pilgrims kept increasing during the fifth and sixth century, another solution for obtaining a souvenir, which did not involve taking original relics from the place of pilgrimage, arose alongside the phenomenon of tertiary relics: man-made pilgrimage souvenirs. These objects were produced on a large scale. They were usually made by means of moulds, which made it possible to produce many identical copies relatively quickly. The quantity and diversity of man-made souvenirs from Jerusalem is unprecedented. Examples are medallions, censers, jugs, small bottles, jewellery and scale models of famous landmarks.\footnote{For a more general article on the meaning, appearance and materials of the Jerusalem souvenirs from the Early Christian period to the present day, see Gockerell 1983. The pilgrimage ampullae from the crusader period are not mentioned in this article.} The pewter pilgrimage ampullae form a special group within this category because they combine a mass-produced object with a eulogia. Apart from the ampullae’s precious contents, the images depicted on them also played an important role. After all, by transporting ampullae to other places one did not just take a tangible piece of the sacred place elsewhere (both the ampulla itself and its contents) but also an ‘image of Jerusalem’. Literally, because the ampullae were decorated with depictions of monuments seen in the Holy City, or of events that had taken place there. The ampulla repeated what the visitors of the Holy City had seen themselves, thus keeping the memory alive.

The ampullae were not only important as visual mementoes of the place the pilgrim or Crusader had visited, they also played an important role in the way visitors to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre experienced their devotion. The images on the ampulla could increase its value as a eulogia. The ampulla might even have been brought into contact with relics or holy places the pilgrim had visited. That is why the iconography of the ampullae did not just emphasize the sacred contents, but also the unique experience the pilgrim or Crusader had had in that place. The ampullae were not complete until the pilgrims supplemented them with their own experiences, especially if the souvenirs
had been filled, blessed and sealed in the presence of the visitors.\textsuperscript{10} Images could strengthen the memory of this experience: the combination of the image on and the materials in the ampulla made it easier for the wearer of the souvenir to recall and perhaps even relive the sanctity of the place they had visited, both while travelling and once they had returned home.

A relatively large group of about thirty preserved Early Christian ampullae and approximately twenty-five ampulla sides, made from an alloy of tin and lead,\textsuperscript{11} refer to Jerusalem and other places in the Holy Land in their iconography. There is a strong resemblance between the ampullae with regard to decoration motifs and shape. The best-known are those in the Museo del Duomo in Monza and the Museo di San Colombano in Bobbio. These two collections can be dated fairly accurately in the period from the middle of the sixth century to the early seventh century on historical grounds. This is why it is generally assumed that similar ampullae were made in the same period.\textsuperscript{12} They all have round bellies with detailed images in bas-relief that refer to the New Testament (Fig. 7.1).\textsuperscript{13} The discovery of a casting mould in the village of Siloam, close to Jerusalem, in 1992, revealed that manufacturers also made ampullae with depictions of scenes from the Old Testament.\textsuperscript{14} Some bear inscriptions in Greek writing. A suspension is missing. Perhaps a strap was attached to the ampulla’s neck, with or without ears to run a string through.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{10} Hahn 1990, p. 91.

\textsuperscript{11} Grabar 1958, p. 11, thinks they are made of lead. This misconception has occasionally been adopted in later literature. Material analysis of a number of ampullae has shown that the tin content of the alloy is quite high. See Engemann 1973, p. 7 and note 16 and 17; Engemann 2002, pp. 154–55, note 11.

\textsuperscript{12} See e.g.: Grabar 1958, p. 14. This dating has been adopted in later literature without discussion.

\textsuperscript{13} Much has been written about the question of whether or not these images on the pilgrimage ampullae reflect (decorations of) monumental sanctuaries of the loca sancta in Jerusalem or the Holy Land. See Smirnov 1897, pp. 90–91; Grabar 1958, pp. 45–50; Ainalov 1961, pp. 225–48, specifically pp. 233–36; Engemann 1973, pp. 22–25; Grigg 1974; Weitzmann 1974, pp. 48–49; Kötzsche-Breitenbruch 1984, p. 232; and Vikan 1995 (with a summary of the discussion on pp. 377–78).

\textsuperscript{14} The mould, dated in the second half of the sixth century or early seventh century, was used to produce ampullae of the same type as the specimens discussed here. On one side, the Sacrifice of Isaac is depicted, the other side shows Daniel in the Lion’s Den. See: Piccirillo 1994.

\textsuperscript{15} The straps and chains that are now attached to the ampullae in Monza are not authentic. The leather carrying straps around the necks of a number of other ampullae do seem to be authentic, however. See Württembergische Landesmuseum in Stuttgart, inv. nos 1980–205a and 1980–205b; Cleveland Museum of Art, inv. no. 1999.46; private collection
In the existing literature, this group of pilgrimage ampullae is often referred to as ‘Palestinian ampullae’, indicating that they originate from the Holy Land without ascribing the objects to a specific place of pilgrimage. It seems likely that they were distributed at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, because all images refer to Christ, whose tomb and relics of the True Cross were worshipped with such intensity there. Pilgrims’ souvenirs often display scenes from the lives of the saint who is worshipped in the area where they were acquired, even though in many cases those events did not occur in that particular place of pilgrimage. They refer to images that pilgrims would see in church or to stories that the visitors would hear on the spot. Not all images on the ampullae from the Holy Land refer directly to the Holy City, but scenes from Christ’s Life in Jerusalem (particularly his death and resurrection) are well presented. That is why Jerusalem is the most likely place of production.

**Ampullae from the Crusader Period**

There is no record of ampullae originating from the Holy Land between the late seventh and the middle of the twelfth century. During the second half of

---

Christian Schmidt in Munich, inv. nos 1550 and 1723; Diözesanmuseum in Cologne, inv. no. 1996/436; Menil Collection in Houston, inv. no. 83-024 DJ. See: Kötzsche-Breitenbruch 1984, p. 239 (on the leather straps around the ampullae in Stuttgart) and Engemann 2002, p. 169.
the twelfth century, the production of pewter pilgrimage ampullae in Jerusalem revived – a dating that is mainly based on the way the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is depicted on the souvenirs. The ampullae production in Jerusalem during the Crusader period coincides with the mass production of badges and related materials in various other places of pilgrimage, particularly in Western Europe. However, Jerusalem seems to have been the only place of pilgrimage where pewter pilgrimage ampullae were made in both the Early Christian period and the High Middle Ages. No ampullae have been preserved from both periods from any other place of pilgrimage. The preserved Early Christian specimens that refer to a specific place of pilgrimage all originate from the eastern Mediterranean. After the revival of the tradition in Jerusalem in the middle of the twelfth century, the emphasis of the ampulla production shifts to Western Europe. In the Western places of pilgrimage, the ampullae are less popular than the badges. Nevertheless, they remain a constant factor in the supply of devotional objects in many places of pilgrimage up until, and including, the late Middle Ages. The Crusaders who came to Jerusalem from Western Europe and returned home afterwards undoubtedly contributed to the widespread familiarity with, and the distribution of, the souvenirs in the West.

The twelfth-century ampullae from Jerusalem are not the only ones that can be associated with the Crusaders in the Holy Land, however. It is worth mentioning a unique archaeological find in the Crusader state Acre, which, after the fall of Jerusalem in 1187, became the main pilgrimage centre of the region. Here, pilgrims arrived from Europe and then travelled on to the various sacred places in Syria, Galilee and Jerusalem. In this seaport town, a thirteenth-century workshop was dug up, where pewter pilgrimage ampullae with decorative patterns had been cast. The find included six casting moulds, scraps of lead and other unwrought material, and one ampulla that had already been cast but not finished.

---

16 Early Christian places of pilgrimage from which ampullae whose iconography and/or inscriptions refer to their place of origin have been preserved, are (besides Jerusalem) Karm Abu Mena, Nazareth, Mons Admirabilis, Sergiopolis and Constantinople.

17 In the late twelfth century, Canterbury and Thessaloniki follow. In the thirteenth century Vendôme, Evesham, Burton-upon-Trent, Westminster, Bromholm, Worcester, York, Waltham, Walsingham and Boulogne-sur-Mer; in the fourteenth century, Noyon and Maastricht. The revival of ampulla production in the second half of the twelfth century and the popularity of ampullae in the thirteenth and fourteenth century coincide with the period in which many Christian pilgrimages were undertaken.

18 Syon 1999. According to him, the (moulds for) ampullae do not show a characteristic iconography because they did not serve as pilgrims’ souvenirs from one particular place, but because they were meant to be taken from Acre to other sanctuaries in the region.
Five ampullae that were preserved from the Crusader period can be ascribed to Jerusalem on the basis of their iconography. Two of those reside in the Skulpturensammlung und Museum für Byzantinische Kunst in Berlin (Figs 7.2 and 7.5),\(^1\) one in the British Museum in London (Fig. 7.3)\(^2\) one in the Malcove Collection in Toronto,\(^3\) and one in the Cleveland Museum of Art (Fig. 7.4)\(^4\) They are all decorated on both sides. To avoid confusion in the descriptions, the terms 'front' and 'reverse' of the ampullae will be used below. Both sides are of equal importance, however. Images, inscriptions or shape do not indicate that one particular side was considered more important than the other.

**Iconography**

It is only logical that the Holy Sepulchre was an ubiquitous image on the ampullae from both the Early Christian period and the High Middle Ages, but its specific iconography is different in both periods. Three ampullae from the twelfth century show the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in virtually the same way (Figs 7.2–7.4).\(^5\) The building is rendered schematically but is recognizable. Both the interior and exterior are combined in one image. The structure consists of three parts, each with an arch in their interior. Under the central, largest arch lies Christ’s body, wrapped in cloths, on a tomb. He has a nimbus around his head. Above the tomb, a saddle roof or conical dome is depicted. The arch on the left is crowned with a small domed roof with a cross. Above the arch on the right, a three-story tower with a pointed roof rises up. A lamp is suspended from each arch. All this clearly refers to the new Church of the Holy Sepulchre as the Crusaders had rebuilt it in the middle of the twelfth century: with a tall tower (on the right of the ampulla) and a domed roof (on the left of the ampulla). On the ampulla in Berlin, a number of faded, Greek letters can be


\(^2\) Inv. no. M&LA 1876, 12–14, 18. Smith 1861, pp. 247–248, pl. xxxix, Fig. 1; Dalton 1901, no. 997; Byzantium 1994, p. 187, no. 202.

\(^3\) Inv. no. M82.210. The Malcove Collection 1985, p. 79, no. 103 (erroneously dated in the sixth century).

\(^4\) Inv. no. 1999.234. Unpublished.

\(^5\) One ampulla in the Skulpturensammlung und Museum für Byzantinische Kunst in Berlin, inv. no. 25/73, one in the British Museum in London, inv. no. M&LA 1876, 12–14, 18, and one in the Cleveland Museum of Art, inv. no. 1999.234.
seen. They may have spelled Ο Α[ΓΙΟC] ΤΑ[ΦΟC], the Holy Sepulchre. The ampullae in London and Cleveland do not bear inscriptions (anymore). The necks of the three ampullae are decorated on both sides with symbolic and decorative patterns including a cross, a patriarchal cross, a zigzag and vines. These motifs vary per ampulla. The combination of vines and a patriarchal cross on both necks of the ampulla in Berlin leads Folda to the observation that this is a reference to the cross as the Tree of Life in the Byzantine tradition. The image might refer to the Golgotha chapel in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

For iconographical and historical reasons, Kötzsche dates the souvenirs in Berlin in the period between the consecration of the Crusader church in 1149 and the conquest of Jerusalem in 1189. Folda believes that the ampulla in Berlin bearing the image of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was made after circa 1154, when the bell tower was completed. This dating can perhaps be specified even further because of the three lamps depicted under the arches.

24 Kötzsche 1988, p. 17.
27 Folda 1995, p. 294. Moreover, for stylistic reasons he thinks the ampullae were made before 1160. Folda 1995, pp. 296–97.
Arnold of Lübeck mentions in his *Chronica Slavorum* that Henry the Lion donated three eternal lamps to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on his pilgrimage to the Holy Land: one for the Holy Sepulchre, one for Golgotha, and one for the Cross relic.\(^{28}\) If the three lamps under the depicted arches refer to these lanterns, the souvenirs must date from after 1175, when the duke undertook his journey. Another possibility is that the lamps refer to the ‘holy fire’, a ceremony that has taken place on the Saturday before Easter ever since the fourth century. A flame from heaven supposedly comes down and miraculously lights the lanterns above the Holy Sepulchre.

The reverse sides of the three ampullae each show a different scene. One shows the Three Women at the Tomb (Fig. 7.2),\(^{29}\) a theme that was also often depicted on Early Christian ampullae (Fig. 7.1). On the left side of the ampulla, the three women are depicted. According to the Gospels they came to the Tomb early in the morning with spices and aromatic oils to anoint Christ’s body, when they noticed that the stone that sealed the Tomb had been moved and the body had disappeared. They are dressed in long garments and have nimbuses around their heads. Behind them, we see buildings that indicate the city of Jerusalem. The woman in front, probably Mary Magdalene, wears a small jug or ampulla. To the right sits an angel, also with a nimbus. He holds a sceptre with a knob in the shape of a fleur-de-lis in his left hand. With his other hand, he points to show the women the empty Tomb on the far right of the ampulla. It has an arched entrance. The angel extends his right wing over the women, who are rendered on a slightly smaller scale. The guards are not depicted. The Greek letters on the ampullae are yet again hard to read. According to Kötzsche, they might form the words Η ΜΗΡΟ ΦΩ[ΘI], the carriers of ointment.\(^{30}\) The subject is thematically connected to the front of the ampulla. The image of the building (the Church of the Holy Sepulchre) is linked to an important event that had taken place there. The women were the first to visit Jesus’s Tomb and pilgrims visiting the Church of the Holy Sepulchre could identify with them.

On the other side of the second ampulla, two warrior saints are depicted (Fig. 7.3).\(^{31}\) Both have a nimbus and are dressed in chain mail. The saints both carry spears in their left hand, and rest their right hand on a shield that stands on the ground. It is possible to deduce from the partly weathered Greek letters next to the soldiers that one of them is Saint George. The other person cannot

---

29 Skulpturensammlung und Museum für Byzantinische Kunst, Berlin, inv. no. 25/73.
be identified with certainty anymore, but it is probably saint Demetrius. The two warrior saints should undoubtedly be seen in the context of the Crusaders. George is regarded as the patron saint of knights, particularly the Crusaders. Demetrius was also a warrior saint the Crusaders could identify with. Once again we see a connection between the figures depicted on one side of the ampulla and the building on the other. The warrior saints helped the Crusaders see themselves as the protectors of Jerusalem in general and the Holy Sepulchre in particular.

---

32 Byzantium 1994, p. 187, no. 202. Dalton 1901, p. 176, no. 997, identifies the warrior saints as George and Aetius. From the late twelfth century, ampullae depicting saint Demetrius were in use in Thessaloniki, often combined with an image of another saint. Nevertheless, the ampulla discussed here certainly does not originate from Thessaloniki, but from Jerusalem. The ampullae from the Greek place of pilgrimage are designed differently. They do have a circular belly but the image is surrounded by a decorative band, which the ampulla discussed above lacks. Moreover, the saints on the ampullae from Thessaloniki are invariably only depicted down to the middle of their torsos, while his entire body is shown here. Lastly, the image of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on the front of the ampulla discussed here evidently refers to Jerusalem.
The reverse of the ampulla in Cleveland shows the Descent into Hell, also called the Descent into Limbo or the Anastasis (Greek for ‘resurrection’) (Fig. 7.4). Christ descends into limbo after his death, the region between heaven and hell, to free the souls of the Old Testamentary saints. They had died in the period in which there were no Christian sacraments, after all, and where therefore banished to this place, neither heaven nor hell, until Christ would come to free them. With a long garment and a cruciform nimbus, Christ occupies the ampulla’s central position. He holds a patriarchal cross in his left hand, while pulling Adam towards him with his right hand. Behind them, Eve holds up her hands in supplication. On the right sit King David and King Solomon, who can be recognized by their crowns. Underneath this image, the underworld is indicated with a few lines. The cross-shaped beams Christ stands on symbolize the gates to the realm of the dead, which he has knocked open. Next to the cruciform nimbus are the Greek letters IC XC, Jesus Christ. A virtually identical depiction of the theme is displayed on the reverse of an ampulla in Berlin (Fig. 7.5).<sup>33</sup> It refers to the deliverance by Christ and mainly occurs in Byzantine

---

33 Skulpturensammlung und Museum für Byzantinische Kunst, Berlin, inv. no. 24/73.
painting. There is an easy explanation for the fact that the Descent into Hell is depicted on pilgrimage ampullae from Jerusalem and that the theme is linked to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. The original martyrium that Empress Helena had built over Christ’s Tomb around 326 was called the Anastasis Rotunda because Christ had risen from the dead there. The building, which was later incorporated in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, appears frequently on the Early Christian ampullae (Fig. 7.1). The two ampullae from the Crusader period, however, do not show the building but the story of the Anastasis. This theme, illustrated with Adam and Eve as well as the kings David and Solomon, was not depicted until the ninth century. The scene is thematically linked to the Anastasis and thus to the Anastasis Rotunda, which still formed an important part of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre during the Crusader period.34

The ampulla in Berlin that bears a depiction of the Descent into Hell, shows an image of the Crucifixion on its front (Fig. 7.5). Christ hangs from a cross with broad beams. He is dressed in a long, sleeveless robe that is characteristic of Byzantine art. His head is slightly bent and has a cruciform nimbus around it. Above the horizontal beam are the letters IC XC, Jesus Christ. At the bottom of the cross an arch is seen, with a head-sized object underneath it. It is probably a skull, referring to both Golgotha (place of the skull) and the skull of Adam.

34 Kartsonis 1986, p. 123.
Adam was supposedly buried on the place where Christ was crucified, after all. Mary and John the Evangelist flank the cross. Both have a nimbus and wear long garments. Mary, on Christ’s right, has bent her head slightly and lifts – as a sign of grief – her left hand to her cheek, supporting the elbow with the other hand. Between the cross and Mary stands a stick with a sponge, as a reference to the Roman soldier Stephaton, who offered Christ something to drink. Behind Mary, on the far left of the ampulla, we see a building that functions as a schematic representation of the city, Jerusalem. To the left of the crucified Christ stands John. Between them, the lance of the soldier Longinus is depicted. Behind John, a glimpse of the city of Jerusalem can be seen again. Early Christian ampullae also frequently feature depictions of the Crucifixion, but with a different iconography (Fig. 7.1). The combination of the Crucifixion and the Descent into Hell on one ampulla is not surprising. Both themes are closely related to the Passion of Christ as well as to the location of important places in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, namely the Golgotha chapel and the Anastasis Rotunda.

The ampulla in Toronto, lastly, is too weathered to describe in detail. Both sides display a simple cross. Any conceivable inscriptions or details are no longer visible, but it would appear that this ampulla also refers to the Crucifixion.

It is clear that the iconography of all ampullae from the Crusader period has to do with the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, the Crusaders, or the events that took place on or near this site. Just like the images on the Early Christian ampullae, the scenes on the medieval ones might refer to images that were shown in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre or to stories that were told there. Kötzsche formulated the plausible theory that the mosaics in the Crusader church may have served as examples for the iconography on the ampullae. Written sources confirm that depictions of the Crucifixion, the Anastasis and the Women at the Tomb were part of the mosaic decoration of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

After the Crusades

In Tärnborg (Denmark), a pewter pilgrimage ampulla that refers to two places in the Holy Land was dug up in 1986 (Fig. 7.6). On one side, the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem is depicted. The other side shows the birth of Christ and thus refers to the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem. The souvenir, currently in the

Nationalmuseet in Copenhagen, is dated in the fourteenth century. Both ears have broken off, but their joins are still visible. The front shows an angel at Christ’s empty Tomb. The angel, on the left side of the ampulla, wears a long robe and has a nimbus around his head. Opposite him, on the right side of the ampulla, the Holy Sepulchre is shown as a domed monument. The building has a square entrance at the front. In the foreground lie a number of unidentifiable objects. The reverse undoubtedly shows a depiction of the Nativity, which took place in Bethlehem. On the left side of the ampulla Mary is shown, while on the right baby Jesus lies in the manger, wrapped in cloths. Behind the manger, a stylized ox and donkey are seen. A divine light seems to shine in the background. Thus the beginning (the Nativity) and the end (the Resurrection) of Christ’s Life on earth are displayed on one ampulla, as well as two important locations in the Holy Land.

37 No inv. no. Liebgott 1988, p. 218, no. 11, p. 219, Fig. 21, p. 220, Fig. 22. The sites where the other medieval ampullae were found are unknown.
38 Liebgott 1988, p. 218, suggests that it is an Annunciation scene: the angel would then be Gabriel greeting Mary. The Virgin is absent from the scene, but Liebgott claims she is in the building.
Several written sources also confirm that the custom of bringing back ampullae from the Holy Land still existed after the Crusader period. In an account of his travels, the French nobleman Nompar 11 describes the souvenirs he bought during his stay in Jerusalem in 1418 to give as presents to his wife and the liege lords and ladies of his estate. Near the end of his summary he mentions an ampulla decorated with palm branches ‘filled with water from the river Jordan’.39 Such fifteenth-century ampullae decorated with palm branches have not been found as yet. Friar Felix Fabri from Ulm also brought home a bottle of water from the river Jordan from the Holy Land in the fifteenth century.40 What it looked like is not mentioned in his account.

Contents of the Ampullae

It is not only the iconography that makes the ampullae special, but also their contents. As mentioned above, the pilgrimage ampullae form a special group that has its own (extra) practical value within the category of man-made souvenirs. The ampulla was not just a tangible memento of Jerusalem, the souvenir also contained a memory of the Holy City. That is why the pilgrimage ampullae offer just a bit more than the other souvenirs, like medallions or badges: apart from the fact that they bore images referring to Jerusalem and had perhaps been brought into physical contact with the sacred places, a tangible memory of the place of pilgrimage could be taken along in the ampulla.

Some images on the Early Christian ampullae have Greek circumscriptions that reveal what the original contents were, for instance ΕΛΑΙΟΝ ΕΥΑΟΥ ΖΩΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΓΙΩΝ ΤΟΙΩΝ, oil from the tree of life of the loca sancta – which indubitably refers to the wood of the Cross. This type of oil is also mentioned in several written sources. Cyril of Scythopolis (circa 524–558), for one, wrote about oil that had been blessed through contact with the Holy Cross in his Vita S. Sabæ. Saint Sabas of Jerusalem used the oil to chase demons from the hill of Castellion, heal a severely ill man, and exorcize the devil from a girl who had been possessed.41 In 598, Pope Gregory the Great thanked the former consul Leontios for ‘oleum [...] sanctæ crucis’ he had received from him.42 The pilgrim Antoninus of Piacenza was the first to report the use of ampullae in combination with this holy oil. In his description of the worship of the Holy

39  Seigneur de Caumont 1975, p. 139.
40  Prescott 1954, p. 216.
41  Cyril of Scythopolis, Vita S. Sabæ, 27, 45, 63. See Festugière 1962, pp. 37, 62, 93.
Cross in the atrium of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, he reports how ampullae, which were half-filled with oil, were blessed in the presence of the wood of the Cross. When the Cross touched the rim of the ampulla, the oil started to foam. If the bottles had not been closed quickly, the oil would have flowed right out again, according to Antoninus.43

What the contents of the pewter pilgrimage ampullae from the Crusader period discussed here were has not been recorded in written sources or inscriptions on ampullae. Moreover, they were all empty when found. We know from various other places of pilgrimage that the contents of the ampullae usually consisted of holy water or oil. There were several sacred springs in the Holy Land, like the one at Emmaus, in which Christ supposedly washed his feet, or the spring in Bethlehem from which Mary drank when fleeing to Egypt.44 The river Jordan was also an important part of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, because the river is mentioned several times in the Bible. The river water itself was considered to have healing powers. As mentioned above, friar Felix Fabri brought home a bottle of water from the river Jordan. Another passage from his pilgrim’s account reveals that he was not the only one. He saw many people filling small jugs, flasks and glass bottles with water from the river to take with them as a souvenir.45 It is unclear whether the pewter pilgrimage ampullae with a reference to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre discussed here were used for taking along this holy water. None of them refer to the river Jordan or any of the springs with healing properties in the Holy Land. The fourteenth-century ampulla in Tärnborg, which refers to Jerusalem and Bethlehem, may be linked to the curative spring in Bethlehem, but this cannot be said with certainty.

When it comes to the contents of the ampullae from the Crusader period, it seems more logical to look in the direct vicinity of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, because of their iconography. It is probable that not only the exterior but also the contents followed the Early Christian tradition. During the Crusader period there is no more mention of oil flowing from the Wood of the Cross, however. Close examination of the ampullae that are decorated with a depiction of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre reveals that oil lamps hang above and next to the Tomb (Figs 7.2–7.4). The three lanterns that Henry the Lion donated to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in 1172 and the ceremony of the holy fire have already been mentioned above. It is unclear whether the suspended lamps on the ampullae refer specifically to those or if they represent the oil lamps above the Tomb in a more general sense. The fact that these

44 Kötting 1980, p. 408 mentions several springs.
lights are shown so prominently on the small pilgrims’ souvenirs does indicate that they played a big role in the devotional experience of the pilgrims during the second half of the twelfth century.\textsuperscript{46} It is possible that the visitors of the church took a small amount of sacred oil from one of the lamps that burned near Christ’s Tomb to carry with them as a eulogia. The pilgrims’ ampullae were perfect containers for a few drops of this liquid. Perhaps the original contents of the ampullae from the Crusader period should be sought in this direction.

The Depiction of Jerusalem on Pilgrimage Ampullae

It is clear that the pilgrims’ souvenirs from the Holy City have a long tradition: from relics and eulogiae to mass production. Pilgrimage ampullae originating from Jerusalem from both the Early Christian period and the Middle Ages have been preserved. On the ampullae from the Crusader period, the continuity of the Early Christian tradition is (partly) visible in the choice of the themes that are depicted in bas-relief, the use of Greek letters for the inscriptions, the round shape of the ampullae and the choice of material (an alloy of tin and lead). But it is not surprising that, after several centuries of Persian and Arabic rule, the Early Christian ampulla tradition in Jerusalem did not continue unchanged. The production revived in the second half of the twelfth century, but the designs were different. The ampullae from the Crusader period have broader necks and have – as opposed to the specimens from the Early Christian period – two ears to hang them from. Moreover, the images on the medieval ampullae are fairly schematic and linear, while those on the early specimens are very detailed. The images on the ampullae from the Crusader period are a mix of traditional and innovative iconography. The front and reverse connect elements that can be linked to the location: building (Church of the Holy Sepulchre), event (the Three Women at the Tomb, Christ on the Cross, the Descent into Hell) or people (warrior saints). The narrative scene of the descent into hell (the Anastasis) had not yet occurred in Early Christian times. However, the Anastasis was indicated as a building in that period (the Anastasis Rotunda,

\textsuperscript{46} These lamps are not only depicted on the ampullae from Jerusalem but also on a number of devotional objects from other places of pilgrimage. For instance on an ampulla from Canterbury (1171–1250) with an image of Thomas à Becket’s body lying in state. Three oil lamps are suspended above the bier. Spencer 1998, pp. 63–65, no. 19. A fourteenth-century badge from Saint-Antoine-l’Abbaye shows two oil lamps. They hang above two cripples worshipping St Anthony. Van Beuningen, Koldeweij and Kicken 2001, p. 247, no. 1049.
which Empress Helena had built around 326). Narrative themes like the crucifixion of Christ and the Women at the Empty Tomb are depicted in both periods, but in different ways. The tradition of depicting the Church of the Holy Sepulchre on pilgrimage ampullae also continues, but in the Crusader period only a section of the original building with Christ’s Tomb was preserved. On later ampullae we see the church as it was rebuilt just before the middle of the twelfth century, on the initiative of the Crusaders, as a powerful symbol of the reconquered Jerusalem. The fact that ampulla manufacturers chose the image of two warrior saints with whom the Crusaders could identify and through whom they could see themselves as protectors of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, is also no doubt connected to (the presence of) the Crusaders in the Holy City.

The influence the Crusaders have had on the appearance of the ampullae from Jerusalem should not be underestimated. The ampullae had become simple yet effective propaganda material as a result of the combination of traditional and innovative elements. They were an adequate means of spreading an ‘image’ of a new, Christian Jerusalem on a wide scale, a Jerusalem that owed its existence to the conquests of the Crusades. These Crusaders have undoubtedly had their share in the iconography as well as the distribution of (and therefore familiarity with) the pilgrimage ampullae in Western Europe. They had conquered Jerusalem and wanted people in Western Europe to know about the power shift in the Holy Land. The ampullae, decorated with images of the rebuilt Church of the Holy Sepulchre, were an ideal medium for this. The souvenirs were mass-produced quickly and cheaply and their compactness made them easy to take along. The ampullae depicting the new Church of the Holy Sepulchre became the way to spread the image of the Western Jerusalem over a large area.
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CHAPTER 8

‘As if they had physically visited the holy places’
Two Sixteenth-century Manuscripts Guide a Mental Journey through Jerusalem (Radboud University Library, Mss 205 and 233)

Hanneke van Asperen

In the special collections of Radboud University Library are two sixteenth-century manuscripts that contain internal, or mental, pilgrimages through the city of Jerusalem. The texts allow the reader to visit the biblical sites in Jerusalem without leaving the confines of the home. One element sets them apart from the popular devotion known as the Stations of the Cross: both texts mention the exact distances between the sites. This makes it theoretically possible for the readers to duplicate the journey of Christ to Mount Calvary while trying to imagine his suffering. The mental pilgrims could earn remissions of temporal punishment ‘as if they had physically visited the holy places’.1

Jerusalem was vividly present in collective thought at the time the texts were written and used, although access to some of the Christian sites of worship had become difficult because the city was under Muslim control. Some churches had fallen into disrepair or were (partly) destroyed. The incalculable significance of the far-away city that had become less and less accessible gave rise to a large body of literature dedicated to pilgrimages to the Holy Land. One of the genres was the religious exercise of mental pilgrimage. The spiritual journey through the city of Jerusalem has been the subject of well-wrought research.2 However, a few elements in the pilgrimage exercises merit further attention. First, the exercises were not limited to sites in Jerusalem, but focused on relics in Rome as well. Apparently, the mental pilgrimage gave the devotee freedom to ‘move’ beyond geographical and temporal boundaries. Additionally, the exercises combine traditional meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ

1 Ms 233, fol. 1r: ‘die moghen verdienen al die oflaten des heijlighe stats iherusalem alleene of sij alle die heijlighe plaetsen lichamelick visitierden.’

2 I would like to thank Kathryn Rudy, because this article relies for a major part on her extensive work on the subject. She made several valuable suggestions for improvement after reading it pre-publication.
with (elements of) popular fifteenth-century devotions such as the Sorrows of the Virgin and the rosary. Finally, measurements linked to Christ’s road to Calvary, such as the distances between the different stations, gave the pilgrim the possibility of replicating the physical journey, but they also turn the book into a veritable relic of the Passion.

**Augustinian Canonesses and Franciscans**

Mental pilgrimage has a long tradition. It was popularized during the late fourteenth and fifteenth centuries by different religious orders, not least by the protagonists of the *Devotio Moderna* or Modern-Day Devout, a spiritual reform movement under the guidance of the theologian and preacher Geert Grote (1340–84). Geert Grote and the Modern-Day Devout focused on the necessity for every individual to imitate Christ. Devotional literature with a strong focus on the Passion would help to accomplish their goal. Pilgrimage on the other hand, including the journey to the Holy Land, was regarded with suspicion since it more often lead to physical corruption than mental salvation. Mental pilgrimage provided the devout with a way to imitate Christ and profit from the advantages of pilgrimage, while avoiding the dangers and temptations that were inextricably bound up with a physical journey. Furthermore, mental pilgrimage was a welcome alternative for those people who could not leave their homes, for example those who had taken the vow of *clausura*. Religious women, especially, seem to have had a preference for pilgrimage exercises.

Two manuscripts in Radboud University Library illustrate, however, that mental pilgrimage was an exercise that did not limit itself to circles of the Modern-Day Devout but was picked up and elaborated upon in different religious orders. The first (Ms 205; Fig. 8.1) was compiled and used at the convent

---


7 Rudy 2011, pp. 23–35.
of St Agnes in Maaseik, originally a community of the Sisters of the Common Life. It moved to the grounds ‘op de Weide’ in 1405 where the sisters took up the Rule of Saint Augustine in 1415–16. In 1455, the convent of Mariaweide became the seat of the newly founded Chapter of Venlo in line with the wish for a lifestyle after the example of the Congregation of Windesheim, the monastic branch of the Modern-Day Devout. The mental pilgrimage is in line with

---


those practices of the Modern-Day Devouts that the sisters of Mariaweide so deeply admired. The pilgrimage exercise entitled The Indulgence of the Holy Sites of Jerusalem (‘Den Aflaet der Heilighe Steden van Jherusalem’) had a considerable popularity among the sisters of Maaseik; they wrote out several copies that have been carefully investigated and described in much detail, most recently by Kathryn Rudy. The other book of mental pilgrimage in Radboud University Library (Ms 233) stems from a Franciscan context (Fig. 8.2).

---

10 Rudy 2011 and Rudy 2000[a].

11 Literature on Ms 233: Huisman 1997, pp. 209–21. See: Rudy 2000[b], p. 466, for a manuscript with a guide for mental pilgrimage that was probably for a Franciscan monk.
'aubergine style' pen work points to the province of South Holland. The texts must have been written in 1503 at the earliest because Pope Julius II (1503–13) is mentioned twice (fols 42r and 43r). The book was probably produced in the first half of the sixteenth century and this is corroborated by the watermarks which have been dated between 1477 and 1553.

From Pilgrimage to Passion Devotion

There is an impressive body of scholarship that has already addressed mental, or virtual, pilgrimage. The desire for mental exercises arose from the idea that travelling to a sacred site in itself did not constitute a proper pilgrimage. The spiritual effort of pilgrimage was considered more important than the physical strain. With the words of the Franciscan Friar Matfre Hermengaud in his Breviari d'Amor, which he started to write in 1288: 'Without true love of God the attempts to reach the sanctuaries of St Menas or the Holy Virgin, of St James or of Rome are futile, because the pilgrim will not find God if God is not in himself.' The ultimate goal of Ermengaud's encyclopaedic work is to teach the laity about natural, divinely sanctioned love. He continuously stresses that religious acts such as pilgrimage are meaningless without piety.

From the growing importance attached to spiritual exertion it was a small step to eliminate the physical aspect from pilgrimage altogether and focus entirely on the spiritual elements, thus creating a pilgrimage of the mind. The exercise elaborates on the concept of life as a peregrinatio – in the classical sense of living or travelling abroad – which was developed by Augustine in the fifth century. From this, pilgrimage came to be regarded as a metaphor of life: a return of the soul to his fatherland which is the city of God, i.e. the Heavenly

---

15 Ms 205, fol. 240r: 'Dijt is den aflaeft der heiliger steede van iherusalem ende des berchs van caluarien welc een yegelic mens verdienen mach die desen ganc des crucen ihesu ende sijns bitteren lijdens betracht met ynicheit'.
Jerusalem. In the words of the Delft-born priest Christiaan van Adrichem who wrote several works on the Holy Land, Jerusalem could be regarded as ‘a figure of every faithfull mans soule’. Piously travelling through Jerusalem, the mental pilgrims could model their lives after Christ’s example. This way, Jerusalem was imprinted in their hearts.

To transform a Jerusalem pilgrimage account into an exercise of devotion to the Passion, the sequence of the sites in the mental exercise could (and should) be shifted. Most Holy Land pilgrims visited Bethlehem and Nazareth after they had seen the sites in Jerusalem. In A Devout Exercise of the Passion of Our Saviour, the topographical sequence of the sites has been abandoned in favour of the chronology of the events. After the stations of Nazareth where the Virgin was visited by Gabriel, and Bethlehem where Christ was born, circumcized and visited by the Three Magi, the mental pilgrim continues with the sites from the Passion ending with the station of Pentecost. A Devout Exercise seems the next logical step in the modification of the Jerusalem pilgrimage account into a spiritual exercise. The new sequence corresponds with traditional meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ, such as St Aelred of Rievaulx describes in a letter from 1160.

In making up an exercise of Passion devotion locations could be skipped entirely. Stations were carefully chosen, depending on the events to be commemorated. The misreading or misunderstanding of the words in a source text could even lead to the invention of a new station. The arch of Ecce Homo is called swych boeg in many mental pilgrimage texts. Occasionally, the last word boeg or boeg (arch) is changed into boom or boem. In A Devout Exercise, this station is transformed into the station of the vighe boem (fig tree). The text

---

19 It is generally assumed, and with good reason, that the mental pilgrimages were based on actual pilgrimage accounts. See: Rudy 2011, pp. 255–56; Beebe 2008, pp. 39–70; Rudy 2000[b], pp. 514–15; Miedema 1998, p. 92; Wasser 1991, pp. 29–32. After the exercises of mental pilgrimage were firmly established they probably started to influence actual pilgrimage accounts. This may have been what happened in A briefe description of Hierusalem. See: Van Adrichem 1595, pp. 57–59.
20 Aelred of Rievaulx 1971; Aelred of Rievaulx 1957, pp. 32–49.
21 For example Van Haver 1963, p. 49 (on Heer Bethléem). Both ‘swich boege’ and ‘swych boem’ are used in Ms 205 (fols 244r and 245r).
22 Ms 233, fol. 15v: ‘Ende als ghij o lieue heer ihesu xpe mitten cruce weder waert op ghrechett soe sijt ghij in grote banicheit [sic] voert ghegaen ende sijt alsoe bijder stede des vighe-boems ghecomen’.
on this station is very short; no event is associated with this location, whereas the other stations are described in great detail and are always coupled with specific events and emotions. No known tradition of the via crucis involves a fig tree. Most likely, this fig tree or vyghe boom is a corruption of the word for the station of the spandrel arch. Significantly, the scribe added the correct number of ells between the station of the fall and the invented site of the fig tree without any corrections, making it likely that he or she had a corrupt model that was copied faithfully.23

Another step in the transformation was the amalgamation of different devotional exercises. The Maaseik exercise was probably developed from a text that focused on the ascent of Mount Calvary. The source text does not contain the last three stations where the focus shifts from Christ to the Virgin: her swoon at the base of the cross, the mourning over the dead Christ and the entombment.24 These final three stations were possibly added later. Additional, although indecisive, arguments for this hypothesis are provided by the rubric of the source text: ‘This is the indulgence of the holy site of Calvary’ instead of ‘This is the indulgence of the holy sites of Jerusalem and of Mount Calvary’ as in the later copies. Further on the rubric reads ‘If you then start the mountain...’ which is not repeated in later versions.25

Regardless of their origin, the last three stations focusing on the suffering of the Virgin clearly indicate the influence of the popular devotion of the Sorrows of the Virgin. The Sorrows were a vehicle for Passion devotion which made them complementary to mental pilgrimages.26 The Maaseik pilgrimage makes it possible for the reader to follow Christ’s example using the Virgin as a model for emotional response. Consequently, Christ’s mother is elevated to a status where she became worthy of imitation herself.

The rosary was another popular tool for Passion devotion in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. In the mental pilgrimage called A Devout Exercise of the Passion of Our Saviour (‘Een Devote Oefeninghe vander Passij Ons Salich-makers’) in the Observant book, every meditation is followed by common prayers, namely the Pater Noster and the Ave Maria. This coupling of meditations and prayers is reminiscent of the increasingly popular rosary devotion.27

23 Ms 233, fol. 16r: ‘Van die stede des vals tot die stede des vigheboems, dat sijn xxxij ellen’.
24 Kathryn Rudy thinks it is possible that the last stations are missing from the source text which she identifies as a manuscript in Brussels (Royal Library of Belgium, ms Iv 428), but also suggests that the text ended with the crucifixion. Rudy 2000[a], p. 222.
The rosary sprouted from different devotions such as the repetitive citation of common prayers and the Psalter which was originally a recitation of the 150 Psalms. Although different forms of the rosary circulated during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, there are some recurring elements: chronologically-ordered meditations on the Life of Christ and his mother in combination with repetitive citations of Aves and Pater Nosters; features that characterize the pilgrimage exercise in the Observant manuscript.

Jerusalem and Rome

Rome was the usual destination for mental travellers in addition to Jerusalem. Jerusalem and Rome were obvious choices for different reasons. The two cities could claim seniority; they were the oldest pilgrimage sites of Christianity, one in the East, the other in the West. Secondly, Jerusalem and Rome had more than one site to visit, offering the mental pilgrim the possibility of a sequential exercise, whether chronological or not. Thirdly, the areas in and around Jerusalem and Rome offered mnemotechnical advantages that helped memorize and structure the corresponding contemplations. In a way, all Christians were familiar with Jerusalem and Rome because the cities formed an essential part of their discourse. Fourthly, the pilgrimage attractions in Jerusalem and Rome concentrated on the events described in the New Testament, especially Christ’s Passion. The holy places in Jerusalem were physically and conceptually tied up with the incidents from the Life of Christ, and Rome had numerous relics of the Passion. The sites in Jerusalem that were saturated with Christ’s blood, sweat and tears during the Passion were important – if not the most important – relics of Christ on earth. Rome and Jerusalem were complementary in many respects. Holy Land pilgrims visited Bethlehem to see where Christ was

---

28 As-Vijvers 2007, pp. 46–47.
31 When describing Mount Calvary, one of the pilgrimage texts actually states that the mountain is ‘saturated with the precious blood of Jesus and drenched with the tears of sweet maid Mary’. (Ms 205, fol. 253v). On the relic-like importance of earth and stones, see: Rudy 2011, pp. 107–118 and Beebe 2006, pp. 106–07. Lucy Donkin is currently completing a monograph on medieval attitudes to holy ground which might shed interesting light on earthen relics.
born, but they could visit his manger in Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome. The house of the Last Supper was located in Jerusalem; the table where Christ sat with his disciples was in St John Lateran. The Holy Sepulchre and Mount Calvary were the main attractions of Jerusalem; the nails of the cross and the titulus were kept in Santa Croce in Rome in a chapel that was suggestively and symbolically called Gerusalemme.\(^{32}\)

Mental pilgrimage through the city of Rome served the same purpose as an imagined stay in Jerusalem. The mental pilgrim could visit the Seven Churches of Rome ‘as if one were in the Holy Land’.\(^{33}\) Not surprisingly, pilgrimages through Rome and Jerusalem sometimes appear in the same manuscripts.\(^{34}\) The two traditions could even be intertwined. In the two Nijmegen booklets, the relics of Rome are woven into the fabric of a Jerusalem pilgrimage. When the pilgrim reaches the site where Christ fell on the stairs while carrying the Cross, the text mentions that the scala santa is in St John Lateran in Rome.\(^{35}\) When Christ reaches Veronica’s house near Jerusalem’s judicial gate and leaves his imprint on the cloth that Veronica gave him to dry his face, there is mention of the relic of the veil which is kept in St Peter’s in Rome.\(^{36}\) The incorporation of the Roman churches in the pilgrimage text indicates the importance attributed to these relics. The veil and the scala santa had become so important and inextricably bound up with their respective churches that both these objects and their sanctuary had to be incorporated in a description of Christ’s way to

---


33 Cited from a rubric in a manuscript with a compilation of mental pilgrimages, written in Brigitte convent for a female audience, texts in Latin and Dutch, late fifteenth century, kept in The British Library, Ms 31001, fols 68v-69r: ‘als of men waer inder stat van Roemen’ as transcribed by Rudy 2011, p. 401. Compare to Radboud University Library, Ms 233, fol. 1r. On Rome as an alternative to Jerusalem, see: Rudy 2011, p. 197.

34 Bethlehem 1992, pp. 327–29. See: Rudy 2011, pp. 235–238; Rudy 2000[b], p. 513, and Miedema 1998, pp. 87–88, for the example of the abbess of a convent in Villingen (Germany) who had the stations of Rome and Jerusalem carved on marble slabs allowing the nuns to walk from one place to another.

35 Ms 233, fol. 15v: ‘Ist saeck dat ijemant dese trappen op cruijpt op sijn bloete knijen ende op elcke trappe deuotelick spreeckt een pr nr ende een aue maria. Dese trap heeft xxiij graden ende is noch huijden te daghe tot sinte ians te lateranen te romen in sijn kercke’.

36 Ms 233, fol. 18r: ‘Ende doe sijt ghij o lieue heer toe ghegaen ende hebt v ghebenedijde aensicht volcomelick in den doeck ghedruckt ende hese veronica weder om in een teijjen des liefs voer een testament gheheuen ende noch ter tijt soe wort dat te romen in sinte peters kerck bewaert voer heijlichdom’.
Calvary. Although the devotee places himself in Christ’s footsteps and transposes himself to the biblical times when the relics were supposedly still in Jerusalem, nevertheless it is considered important to mention their current presence in Rome. The sanctuaries of Rome derived their significance from the presence of these important Passion relics so that, in turn, the churches become a part of biblical Jerusalem. Although the text deals with events and objects supposedly from biblical times, not with the contemporary cities, temporal boundaries dissolve and the churches of Rome are superimposed upon the map of Jerusalem.

Despite the similarities between Rome and Jerusalem, logical but significant differences in the descriptions of two cities characterize the mental journeys. Jerusalem’s churches are not incorporated in the pilgrimage text. Even the Church of the Holy Sepulchre which was the climax of every pilgrim’s visit to Jerusalem is not mentioned. This does not mean that the site was of less importance to the mental pilgrim. On the contrary, its significance is amply expressed in the plenary indulgence that both the physical and the mental pilgrim could gain. These plenary indulgences were reserved for a few sites of major importance. In contrast to the indulgences to be gained from visiting Rome, the Jerusalem indulgences are connected with the sites and the events rather than the sanctuary and its objects.

Churches are not mentioned but some of Jerusalem’s monuments are, namely the elevated place where Pilate sat when he judged Christ (called lithostrotos), and the ‘high’ spandrel arch (or swych boeg) which was believed to have been the location of Pilate’s ecce homo speech. According to the text, Constantine’s mother, Helena, had two stones of marble installed that were originally situated in front of Pilate’s palace. Christ had stood on one of them during Pilate’s speech, Pilate on the other. These elements were probably integrated in the pilgrimage because they were supposedly present at the time the crucifixion took place. They are extant relics of the Passion, unlike the churches that were built afterwards to commemorate an event.

---

37 Sites with plenary indulgences are marked with a cross; these are the stations of the receiving of the Cross (3), Ecce Homo (4), where Christ meets the Virgin (5), Mount Calvary (9), the Lamentation (11) and the Entombment (12 and last). Besides indicating plenary indulgences, the crosses mark the sites of special importance on the road to Calvary since plenary indulgences are always coupled with sites of salvific significance.

The events themselves could be regarded as relics. Several forms of late-medieval piety focused on the Passion through its excerpts; these could be narrative scenes, Christ’s body and the instruments of the Passion or his wounds. David Areford has convincingly argued that this kind of devotion was closely linked with the veneration of relics.39 Because of the fragmentation of the Passion the events gained relic-like importance. A fifteenth-century print visualizes the relic-like status of the Sorrows of the Virgin. Two male figures, a monk and a nobleman, kneel in adoration of the scenes of the Sorrows (Fig. 8.3).40

Behind the monk and the nobleman stand a man and a woman, apparently of simple birth. The scenes of the Sorrows are stored in a reliquary-shaped frame reminiscent of a monstrance containing hosts which were often venerated as if they were relics and thought to instigate miracles. Related prints explicitly refer to the pilgrimage site of Delft (Holland) where ‘many miracles happened after the invocation of the Passion of Christ and Sorrows of the Virgin’.41 The Delft cult of Our Lady of Seven Sorrows can be traced back to a document of 1506, but might be somewhat older.42 Because of the way the Delft cult is described, and the way it is visualized in the pilgrimage prints, it seems that the events coupled with the Sorrows of the Virgin were venerated in a way that was analogous to the veneration of the Delft statue of Our Lady of Sorrows, as miracle-working images.

When contemplating the seven Sorrows of the Virgin, the devotee ‘also has to contemplate in the Passion of Our Lord’, wrote Father Dierick Adamszoon who actively propagated the cult of Our Lady of Sorrows in the city of Delft.43 Notably, the monk to the side of the print is involved in repetitive prayer using a string of prayer beads. The most common repetitive prayer exercise was the rosary which, as mentioned earlier, was often used to contemplate the Passion. Again, the rosary, the Sorrows of the Virgin and the Passion are inextricably connected.

---

42 Verhoeven 1992, pp. 228–46.
43 Verhoeven 1992, p. 228.
Measuring the Passion

The pilgrimage exercises hold an apparent paradox. The texts contain many adjectives and adverbs like *sunderlinge groete pijn* (‘exceptionally large pain’), *ontellicx lasters* (‘uncountable slanders’), *grondeloese bermherticheit* (‘unfathomable mercy’).⁴⁴ The message is clear: the sufferings of Christ and his mother and the pity they express are immeasurable and indescribable. On the other hand, the text is filled with quantities and numbers: the exact number of steps

---

⁴⁴ Ms 205, fols 240v, 245v and 250r.
or ells between different sites, the sizes of the wounds, the number of steps on every stair and the number of people present.

The measurements are given in order to lend credibility to the descriptions. Furthermore, the desire for the measurable and countable seems to counterbalance the growing emphasis on extreme emotion. When describing the emotions of the Virgin at the time of the crucifixion, the text of A Devout Exercise reads: 'And no one can imagine how great her sorrow and pain has been'.45 It is hard to imagine the unimaginable; the measurements seem to meet the growing desire to follow in Christ’s footsteps although the sufferings of Christ and the Virgin are inconceivable. A Devout Exercise is a chronometric relic to boot. The different stages of the mental journey are linked to the days of the week. The rubric states that the devotee can perform the mental pilgrimage in one day, but it is also possible to visit specific sites on specific weekdays. The days are not random; the station of Mount Calvary is visited on a Friday, the day that Christ was crucified. The Resurrection takes place on a Sunday. The entire pilgrimage is completed in a week.46 Only when the mind has become one with Christ does it no longer need precise measurements to help it imitate Christ.47

One consequence of this desire for the measurable was the metric relic.48 Because the English noblewoman Richeldis was told the exact measurements of the house of Nazareth she could have the building replicated in Walsingham; it would attract pilgrims from all over the United Kingdom and the Continent.49 Many Jerusalem Chapels were built according to the measurements of the prototype in the Holy Sepulchre.50 Even though they hark back to one and the same model, these chapels are very different in appearance and some-

---

45 Ms 233, fols 20v–21r: ‘Ende nijemant en mach daer wt dencken hoe groet dat haer smart ende pijn ende droeffenis is gheweest’.
46 As Rudy has noted, the division of a text into segments to be completed over the course of a week was quite common for devotional texts. Rudy 2011, p. 199 n. 42. For examples of meditations coupled with the days of the week, see also Van Dijk 2000, pp. 52–53 and Kock 1999, pp. 198–201. For a mental pilgrimage coupled with the days of the year, see: Wasser 1991, p. 30.
49 Spencer 1998, pp. 135–47.
50 Bram de Klerck in this volume; Kroesen 2000; Pieper 1995; Adornes en Jeruzalem 1983, pp. 19–21 and 70–73.
times do not even look like their prototype; their meaning is inherent in their dimensions.

The measurements that were somehow connected to Christ and his Passion could be used to create metric relics. Pilgrims cut off cords that had the exact height of the cross or the length of the Sepulchre, even the sizes of the wounds or the nails that were used during the crucifixion. Sometimes the cords became relics by touching holy relics or sites, but just the association would suffice. Replicas could possess miraculous powers in the same way as other relics. Different devotional manuscripts contain the exact measurements of Christ’s body or of the cross.51 Both The Indulgence and A Devout Exercise mention in detail the deep wound on Christ’s shoulder that was inflicted by carrying of the cross.52 The conversation between Saint Bernard and Christ on the excruciating pains of his shoulder wound ‘which was three fingers deep’ is demonstrable in texts from the early sixteenth century.53 Another manuscript in Radboud University Library (Ms 85) contains a replica of the shoulder wound on a piece of parchment (Fig. 8.4).54 The figure of the wound was ‘cut out of an iron plaque with an instrument’, according to the cryptic text that is written on the same parchment leaf. The text suggests that the image was an exact replica of a metric relic, thus twice removed from the actual wound. A person could obtain an indulgence simply by looking at the image and saying a prayer. Because measurements conveyed meaning, even power, the picture became a metric relic itself. The image was glued to the first page of the manuscript so that the owners could see it every time they opened the book. One of the subsequent proprietors of the book, Geertgen Jans van Woercken, wrote her name above the image, possibly in order to give some direction to the miraculous powers that could work through the image.55

52 Ms 205, fol. 249r: ‘O lieue here ic danc dij oec der groter pijnen welc du haddes van der dieper wonden die op dijn heilige gebnende scholder stont die drie vinger diepe was weelc dij meer wee dede dadie ander wonden’; Ms 233, fols 16v-17r: ‘ende ghij sijt opter aerden gheuallen ende dat sware hout des heijlighe cruijs viel op v rechter schouder ende heeft daer inghedruckt een wont van drie vinghere diep ghelijkerwijs alsmen leest datet sinte bernerdus is gheopenbaert’.
53 Rudy 2011, pp. 105–06; Meertens 1931, pp. 24–26
54 Ms 85, fol. 1r: ‘ Dit is die manier van die grootheijt des wonde, die onse lieue heere, in sijn gebenedijde schouder hadde, daer hij sijn cruijs op moste draegen. Dat, welcke is wt een ijseren plaet gesteecken mit een instrument, daer dit wt gemeeten is. Soe wiese aensiet mit deoutie, ende leest een Pater noster, die sal vertroost worden, in wat lijden dat hij ijs’.
55 Ms 85, fol. 1r, above the image: ‘Dit boeck hoort toe Geertgen Jans van Woercken’.
The manuscript is written on paper; the image was painted on parchment. Parchment was associated with skin (parchment = animal skin), and consequently with the skin of Christ. A full-size image of a nail that was used to crucify Christ was drawn on a page alongside a prayer to the Nail (Fig. 8.5).56 The illuminator has painted the Nail as if it had slit the page causing two horizontal cuts, disappearing through one of them and coming out through the other. The nail piercing the page brings the association of the parchment with the skin of Christ poignantly to the fore. In the preface to Christiaan van Adrichem’s description of Jerusalem, the Crucifixion is likewise compared with a book ‘written with the quill of the speare, of the nails of the thornes, and

56 Rotterdam, gemeentebibliotheek, Ms 96 E 12, fol. 28v. See Rudy 2011, pp. 104–06, Pl. I. The caption reads: ‘Dit is figuer nae die naghel ons heeren’.
of the whippes, in the most pure parchment of the Immaculate lambe, and with the purple bloude of the same [...] 57

A single-sheet image in the Metropolitan Museum of Art clearly shows the association of parchment with skin (Fig. 8.6). An angel pulls up a piece of cloth revealing the side wound of Christ (John 19:34) in a visual format harking back to images of the sudarium with the imprint of Christ’s face. The Passion relic of the Vera Icon was kept in St Peter’s in Rome from the twelfth century onwards and shown to pilgrims on a regular basis. In parallel to the sudarium the side wound is depicted as a Passion relic. The block print of the side wound is more than an image; it is a vision. The three-dimensionally depicted heart floats in

57 Van Adrichem 1595, preface.
front of the cloth instead of being imprinted upon it. The angel does not (just) show a piece of cloth he unveils the wound to the devotee, thereby increasing a sense of physical presence. Most interesting is the slit in the page. A diagonal cut through the parchment manifests the side wound that was made with the spear before taking Christ down from the cross.\textsuperscript{58} The parchment substituting Christ’s skin is literally wounded. From the unveiling of the heart to the slit representing the side wound, this print provides several levels of revelation for

\textsuperscript{58} On the side wound, see: Smith 2012, p. 61; Lewis 1996, pp. 204–29.
the devotee to experience and pass through in his desire for union with Christ. To further enhance the effect of the folio as wounded skin, red paint indicates the blood dripping from the wound into the chalice below.59

Guide, Devotional Tool and Relic

Pilgrimage accounts were suitable reading material for devotees who had not been to Jerusalem themselves, because it allowed them to learn about the Gospels and led to a greater understanding of Christian mysteries of salvation. Christiaan van Adrichem added a subtitle to *A briefe description of Hierusalem* saying that the book is ‘Verie profitable for Christians to read, for the understanding of the Sacred Scriptures’.60 The description of sites in Jerusalem – and Rome for that matter – took the reader back in time to the events that are described in the Bible. The exercise of mental pilgrimage takes the pilgrimage account one step further and turns it into a devotional exercise on the Passion.

The two versions of a mental pilgrimage in Radboud University Library are several steps removed from the pilgrims’ guides that describe a physical journey to topographical sites in the Holy Land. First, the sites are arranged chronologically as Christ and the Virgin would have visited them. Secondly, the texts evoke biblical passages and emotions, not so much the contemporary city of Jerusalem. Because mental pilgrimage did not deal with contemporary Jerusalem, but with events from biblical times, Rome and Jerusalem, which both had different things to offer the mental pilgrim, could be integrated into one exercise. To become suitable for Passion devotion the exercises of mental pilgrimage merged with different popular devotions in an interesting way. Because the events are arranged chronologically, other devotions and meditations such as meditations on the Life and Passion of Christ, the Stations of the Cross, the Seven Sorrows of the Virgin and the rosary could easily be incorporated into the fabric of the devotional exercise.

Images of the wounds make different parts of the Passion physically present using parchment as a substitute for skin; measurements make it possible for the devotees to use their own body to add corporeity to the devotional exercise. Some of the mental pilgrimages with measurements were converted to

---

59 Besides the association of parchment with skin (or even flesh) text was associated with textile, as I have argued before. Van Asperen 2007, pp. 94–96. From these associations grew an interesting interplay of the innately related phrases parchment-text and flesh-cloth.

60 Van Adrichem 1595.
replicate Christ’s journey physically.\textsuperscript{61} This does not mean that readers of mental pilgrimage always turned the exercise into a physical replication, even if the texts mentions the exact number of footsteps or ells. The reader of \textit{The Indulgence of the Holy Sites of Jerusalem} from Maaseik is advised to retreat to a secluded place to perform the exercise.\textsuperscript{62} Knowledge of the footsteps and ells between stations makes it possible to replicate Christ’s journey physically and mentally, but the measurements are more vital to the text: they turn the book into a relic of the Passion. The metaphor of text as a relic was reinforced by the metaphor of the Crucifixion as a book written in Christ’s blood using the Arma Christi (the Nails, the Spear, etc.) as styles. The written pilgrimage texts had an intrinsic value as relics that fitted books of Passion devotion and could provide the same rewards as other (metric) relics.

The mental pilgrimage provides the devotee with a guide through Jerusalem and a matching relic of the Passion, because the mental exercises offer a ‘measurable’ connection with the Passion of Christ. Using recognizable units of space and time, the biblical events become attached to the reader’s domain. Geographical boundaries dissolve; earthly and biblical times fuse. Because of their multilayered connection with the Passion, the texts could be used in a variety of ways: to duplicate Christ’s journey physically by copying the exact distances, to meditate on the Passion and move in the mind only and/or to safeguard the book owner as would any of the Passion relics that pilgrims so loved to carry with them.
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CHAPTER 9

Jerusalem in Renaissance Italy
The Holy Sepulchre on the Sacro Monte of Varallo

Bram de Klerck

The iconography of St Charles Borromeo (1538–84) contains some interesting instances of the kneeling saint in the immediate vicinity of the recumbent figure of the deceased Christ. The Saviour’s largely nude body, head sometimes still crowned with thorns, is placed on a catafalque or marble slab. An example is a painting executed after 1615 for the Church of Santi Carlo e Giustina in Pavia, by the Milanese artist Giulio Cesare Procaccini (1574–1625), now in Milan, Pinacoteca di Brera (Fig. 9.1). The work represents St Charles, dressed as a cardinal, kneeling and looking up to an angel who is pointing at the body of Christ.1 What is especially striking in this painting and images like it is that they suggest the real presence of the sixteenth-century Milanese archbishop at Christ’s bier. By uniting the figures of Christ and St Charles in one and the same space, realistically proportioned to each other, the painters emphasize that, to the saint, the body of the dead Christ is almost tangible. It is as if, long after the biblical events of Christ’s crucifixion and burial, Borromeo found a miraculous way to go back in time some one-and-a-half millennia to find the Saviour’s body inside the hermetically closed tomb.

However improbable the scene may appear, these paintings reflect a specific religious experience and practice, as they are documented in the earliest written accounts of Charles Borromeo’s life. In 1610, Giovanni Pietro Giussano became the first hagiographer of Borromeo, who was canonized in that same year. On several occasions, the author stresses the fact that the cardinal cherished a special devotion to Christ’s Passion. According to Giussano’s account and other biographical sources, in October 1584 Borromeo travelled to a pilgrim’s sanctuary known as Sacro Monte (‘Holy Mountain’) near the town of Varallo Sesia in Piedmont, some one hundred kilometres northwest of the archiepiscopal see in Milan. In Varallo, St Charles visited the chapels where paintings and sculptures depicted episodes from Christ’s Life and Passion, to which the chapels were dedicated. Borromeo turns out to have given special

1 For the iconography of Charles Borromeo, see e.g.: Carlo Borromeo 1997 (for the theme St Charles at the bier of Christ: pp. 248–50); Carlo e Federico 2005.
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attention to the theme represented in the chapel of the Holy Sepulchre. In the legend of the Saint, this devotional exercise became closely linked with his own death, which occurred days later, on 4 November 1584, when he was back in Milan. Indeed, St Charles prayed in this chapel on the Sacro Monte ‘as if he
saw his own end nigh, and contemplated the death of the Saviour, whose likeness was — and still is — present in a life-sized, veristically painted figure carved in wood by an anonymous sculptor of around 1490 (Fig. 9.2).

Charles Borromeo must have been well aware of the representative power of this kind of recreation of the sacred sites. It was he who famously praised Varallo’s sanctuary as La nuova Gerusalemme (‘the New Jerusalem’), an epitheton which can still be read in the Latin inscription over the arch on the magnificent entrance gate to the site. The present contribution is concerned with references to the sacred sites of Jerusalem, as they became manifest in Western Europe and more specifically in Italy during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Recreations of sites in the Holy Land, in the form of Calvaries, Holy

---

2 ‘[...] come se vedesse vicino il suo fine’: Giussano 1610, p. 483; for an art-historical interpretation of this episode, see: De Klerck 1999, pp. 120–21; De Klerck 2009, pp. 203–04.

3 The inscription reads: ‘haec nova hyerusalem vitam svmmo [...] labores atq. redemptionis omnia gesta refert’. To be sure, the characterization ‘new Jerusalem’ or just ‘Jerusalem’ for places reminiscent of the sacred sites in the Holy Land, is hardly original and can be found in countless other instances.
Mountains, and suchlike sanctuaries, have been a subject of scholarly debate in the last few decades. Recent publications tend to treat them as isolated monuments or as belonging to regionally and chronologically limited groups. In a recent contribution, Bianca Kühnel even argues that one reason for the traditionally rather fragmented approach to these ‘Holy Landscapes’ is that – ‘serving popular devotional practices and heavy with naturalistic detail’ – they have long been considered by art historians to belong to the realm of ‘low art’.4 However, it could also be argued that some of the monuments in question are clearly the products of artistic conceptions connected to the Renaissance humanistic tradition. The present contribution focuses primarily on the devotional function of a few fifteenth- and sixteenth-century ‘copies’ of the Holy Sepulchre, by juxtaposing, and at the same time relating, the coarse expressiveness of the chapel on the Sacro Monte to a highly refined Early Renaissance monument like the shrine designed by the famous Renaissance architect Leon Battista Alberti for the Cappella Rucellai in Florence.

Varallo

Founded in the last decades of the fifteenth century, the Sacro Monte of Varallo is the first sanctuary of its kind. In the course of the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, many other ‘Holy Mountains’ were constructed, both in Italy and abroad.5 Each consists of a series of individual chapels, of which the interiors are decorated with frescoes and sculptures. In the case of Varallo they depict episodes like the Nativity, the Adoration of the Shepherds, the Arrival of the Magi in Bethlehem (Fig. 9.3), Ecce Homo, and the Crucifixion.6 The last chapel in the sequence of the narrative— which was in fact one of the first to be constructed on the Sacro Monte— is the one dedicated to the Sepulchre.

Over time, the decorations in the chapels of Varallo were executed by anonymous craftsmen and by documented local artists such as the painter and sculptor Gaudenzio Ferrari (1475/80–1546) from nearby Valduggia, and the painter Tanzio da Varallo (1575/80–1632/33). Foreign artists also worked on the

4 Kühnel 2012, p. 244.
5 For the intriguing phenomenon of sacri monti, in Italy, elsewhere in Europe as well as in the Americas, see: e.g. Kubler 1990; Barbero 2001; Zanzi and Zanzi 2002; De Klerck 2009. For a more personal discussion of the nine sanctuaries in Lombardy and Piedmont that, as a group, have been introduced to UNESCO’s World Heritage List in 2003, see: Nieuwenhuis 2006.
6 The chapels in other sacri monti sometimes depict different themes: for instance, in Varese (Lombardy) it is the life of the Virgin; in Orta (Piedmont) the life of St Francis.
Sacro Monte, for example sculptor Jean de Wespin, called ‘Il Tabacchetti’ (ca. 1567–1615) from Dinant in far-away Wallonia. The decorations consist of frescoes on the walls and vaults of the chapels, combined with life-sized sculptures of human figures carved in wood or modelled in terracotta or stucco, painted in vivid colours or sometimes even sporting real clothes, hats and other attributes, and with real hair on skulls and cheeks. These fascinating ensembles convey the impression of show-boxes or tableaux vivants inviting the devout beholder to join and participate. The Sacro Monte offered the possibility of completing a pilgrimage without having to set out on the long and hazardous journey to the Holy Land. This is exactly what must have been the intention of the founder of the sanctuary, Bernardino Caimi, a later beatified Franciscan of the rigorous Observant branch of the Order, who himself had been in Palestine and visited the sacred sites. After he died in, or shortly after, 1499, Observant Franciscans were to remain administrators of the sanctuary.

7 In publications on the Sacro Monte, Caimi is often defined as an administrator of the sacred sites, or guardian of the Holy Sepulchre. In reality he was more of a diplomat and trouble shooter who was often sent by his Order and religious authorities to solve prob-
Initially, the general layout and the location of the chapels on the Holy Mountain of Varallo, loosely and on a much smaller scale, followed the topographical disposition of Jerusalem. A comparable design characterizes a second Sacro Monte, constructed slightly later than Varallo, this time not in the Alpine regions of Piedmont and Lombardy where all subsequent Holy Mountains on the Apennine peninsula are to be found, but in Tuscany. Shortly after 1500 the Sacro Monte of San Vivaldo was founded near the town of Montaione in Valdelsa. The arrangement of the chapels, and to some extent even the shape of the mountain itself, as well as the hills and valleys surrounding it, call to mind the map of the city of Jerusalem. The plan of the Tuscan sanctuary more or less reflects the location of, for example, the Valley of Jehoshaphat and the Mount of Olives, the places where Calvary and the Sepulchre were believed to have been in Jerusalem, as well as the geographical features in and around that city. The suggestion of commensurable topographical characteristics and (proportioned) distances has always been important in these and similar sanctuaries. Even after the original topological layout of the chapels on the Sacro Monte of Varallo had been changed into one with a more chronologically ordered sequence in the 1560s, a local seventeenth-century cleric not only defined the site, rather commonplace for that matter, ‘our own Jerusalem,’ but also stressed that in his view the nearby rivers Mastallone and Sesia, as well as Lake Orta, mirrored the waters in the Holy Land:

the neighbourhood is the exact counterpart of that which is in the Holy Land, having the Mastallone on the one side for the brook Kedron, and the Sesia for the Jordan, and the lake of Orta for that of Caesarea.

The earliest chapels in Varallo were built according to local traditions of vernacular architecture. Later in the sixteenth century, from 1565 to 1568, a drastic renovation and reorganization of the site and the chapels was carried out after

---

Vannini 1989; Siew 2008, especially pp. 40–44.

8 In the words of the nineteenth-century English novelist, Samuel Butler (1835–1902), quoting one canon Torrotto in 1686; Butler 1888, p. 26. Apparently, the canon was not very aware of the topography of the Holy Land. Caesarea is a town on the Mediterranean in the north of Israel, i.e. more than a hundred kilometres northwest of Jerusalem, whereas Lake Orta is situated some twenty kilometres east of Varallo.
designs by the architect Galeazzo Alessi (1512–72). Many chapels were redesigned or newly constructed in Alessi’s elegant and varied late Renaissance classicist style. As a result, the exteriors of neither the early nor the later chapels contain direct references to the forms of the sites in the Holy Land – even insofar as they were known at the time. However, architectural elements and parts of the interiors of several chapels evidently do aim at imitating aspects of the (real or imagined) original edifices. The chapel of the Holy Sepulchre, which was constructed in 1491 and provided with the wooden statue of the deceased Christ mentioned earlier, is a case in point.

**Relics and Recreations**

Apparently, as becomes clear from Charles Borromeo’s demeanour during his pilgrimage to the Sacro Monte, but also from the great popularity the sanctuary enjoyed, attracting devout by the hundreds, even thousands, from as far away as Switzerland, the chapels in Varallo served as satisfying substitutes for the places in the Holy Land. This, to be sure, was nothing new. In medieval and early modern Europe, biblical sites have been recreated time and again, and in a great variety of forms and a multitude of appearances. One especially intriguing instance is the house where the Virgin Mary lived. Popular belief has it that the so-called ‘Holy House’, towards the end of the thirteenth century, had been transported in clouds from Nazareth to Dalmatia. A few years later, angels were to once again carry it airborne to Loreto, a town located some thirty kilometres south of Ancona on the Adriatic coast of Italy where the house is still venerated in a shrine. The Basilica della Santa Casa was erected around it during the sixteenth century. In reality, remains of a house at the time believed to have been the Virgin’s dwelling place were shipped to Italy by crusaders in the thirteenth century. Many similar chapels, more or less following the shape and/ or measurements of the Holy House of Loreto have followed, everywhere in Europe.

Loreto’s *sancta casa* is a special case, if only because of its size. In a way, however, it is just one of the many secondary relics of the Virgin Mary. These

---

10 Alessi’s drawings have been published in Brizio and Stefani Perrone 1974.
11 Samuel Butler quotes the already mentioned canon Torrotti who, in 1686 had written about visitors from Piedmont and Milan, adding that ‘From elsewhereith processions arrive daily, even from Switzerland, and there are sometimes as many as ten thousand visitors extraordinary come here in a single day …’. Butler 1888, pp. 25–26.
12 For the Holy House of Loreto, see e.g.: Sacello Santa Casa 1991.
types of objects, big and small, are scattered all over the Christian world, often provided with certificates or inscriptions to testify to their authenticity. Pieces of rock and other material scraped or cut from sacred sites were brought back home by pilgrims, but also less direct remains like oil from the lamps above the Holy Sepulchre. To return to Varallo, an interesting example can be found right next to the entrance of the chapel of the Holy Sepulchre. Here, a piece of stone only a few inches high has been walled up in a niche closed by a wrought iron lattice (Fig. 9.4). A Latin epitaph underneath explains that the object is part of the ‘stone of the Holy Sepulchre of our Lord Jesus Christ which is in Jerusalem’.13

Apart from this relic, apparently taken from the Sepulchre, it is clear that sanctuaries like the one at Varallo are not particularly concerned with actual, physical remains of the sites in the Holy Land. Rather, they present the visitor with imitations that not only refer to the originals but must even have taken their place in the imagination and religious experience of the visitors to the sanctuary. For instance, just a few steps away from the small reliquary just mentioned, far more eye-catching is a slab of stone of a man's height, exposed in a niche (Fig. 9.5). It is provided with a marble epitaph with an inscription in Italian revealing that ‘this stone in every respect resembles [my italics] the one with which the sepulchre of our lord Jesus Christ was covered in Jerusalem’. There turns out to be something miraculous to the object as well, because the text goes on to explain that the stone has not been man made, but rather ‘found when digging the first foundations of this sacred place’,14 suggesting that the site was in a way predestined.

Of a more deliberate nature are the efforts to refer to the holy places in certain details or in the architectural design of parts of several chapels on the Sacro Monte. The chapel of the Nativity, for instance, has a concave space made out of rough stonework which reflects the form of the niche above the altar in the Grotto in Bethlehem were Christ was believed to have been born. Beneath the altar in Varallo there is also a copy after the fourteen-point silver star which in Bethlehem marks the exact spot of the Nativity. And the entrance to the chapel in Varallo has its portal and half-circular steps copied after those which in Bethlehem lead from the Church of the Nativity to the subterranean cave (Fig. 9.6). The burial chamber which is part of the Sepulchre chapel in Varallo


14 ‘QUESTA PIETRA È IN TUTTO SIMILE A QUELLA CON LA quale FU COPERTO IL SEPOLCRO DEL NOSTRO SIGNOR GESÙ CHRISTO IN GERUSALEMME TROVATA NELLO SCAVARE I PRIMI FONDAMENTI DI QUESTO SACRO LUOGO’.
Figure 9.4 Varallo, Sacro Monte, reliquary with a piece of rock from the Holy Sepulchre, ca. 1490. Photo: Bram de Klerck.

Figure 9.5 Varallo, Sacro Monte, replica of the stone covering Christ’s tomb, ca. 1490. Photo: Bram de Klerck.
has been designed to resemble the Tomb of Christ in Jerusalem. To emphasize this, an inscription over its entrance reads: SIMILE E IL S[AN]TO SEPVLCRO DE Y[ESV] XR[IST]O (‘Similar [to this] is the Holy Sepulchre of Jesus Christ’; Fig. 9.7).

‘Reproductions’ of the Holy Sepulchre

Buildings referring in one way or another to the Sepulchre in Jerusalem and the so-called ‘Anastasis Rotunda’ (literally ‘Rotunda of the Resurrection’) in which it is enclosed, were constructed in Western Europe from at least as early as the fifth century onward. In the Middle Ages a great variety of edifices were considered imitations or variants of the Holy Grave. Quite a few churches, free-standing chapels, or chapels within churches were dedicated to and/or named...
after the Holy Sepulchre. Sometimes written sources attest to the intention to construct those edifices as copies of the church in Jerusalem. As a rule however, in outward appearance such buildings are not even close to faithful ‘copies’ as we would nowadays understand the concept. Often they are characterized only by a selection of rather vague or merely symbolical references to the original. Elements in a surprising variety of degrees of obviousness and probability, turn out to have been chosen as distinguishing for the Rotunda and the Holy Sepulchre.

15 A pioneering study on the practice of ‘copying’ buildings in the Middle Ages is Krautheimer 1942, especially section 1, ‘Copies in Mediaeval Architecture’, pp. 2–20 (see also the German translation in Krautheimer 1988, Ch. vi, with updating postscripts by the author, pp. 190–97). In later years, Krautheimer’s views have met with criticism, especially concerning the use of the concept of ‘copy’, and the lack of documentary evidence to ascertain the intentions of architects and patrons (see Schenkluhn 1999, Carver McCurrah 2011). Krautheimer’s analysis of the relations in form and meaning between different medieval religious buildings, however, remains a useful point of departure for the aspects of architectural imitation which concern us here.

16 For the reception in Western Europe of the Rotunda in Jerusalem: Krautheimer 1942, and more recently e.g. Krüger 2000, pp. 188–93. For the many variants of the Holy Sepulchre in Europe: e.g. Rüdiger 2003; Morris 2005.
What this last edifice looked like at any given date, is very hard to reconstruct. To begin with, very little has remained of the rock-cut tomb that some three hundred years after Christ’s death on the cross was identified as the one where he was buried. The so-called ‘Aedicule’, which now stands in the monumental Rotunda on the spot of that tomb, is a much later construction built in 1809–1810 after its predecessor had been destroyed by fire. By then, moreover, it had already lived through centuries of destruction and rebuilding. In 325–326 a tomb believed to be Christ’s burial place was discovered, and after that the Roman Emperor Constantine was responsible for the construction of a huge church as well as the first Aedicule on the spot of Christ’s entombment and resurrection. After most of the complex had been destroyed in 1009 by orders of the Egyptian Caliph al-Hakim, it was reconstructed later in the eleventh century. Yet another reconstruction of the Aedicule was carried out in 1555 by the Franciscan Boniface of Ragusa, custos of the Holy Land. It was this edifice that was to perish in the 1808 fire. The various appearances of the Aedicule have in common a ground plan divided into two spaces: the so-called ‘Chapel of the Angel’, leading to the burial chamber itself.

In the Christian world many chapels and other edifices, sometimes containing relics taken from Jerusalem, were considered imitations of the Aedicule from at least the ninth century on. Often they played a part in Easter ceremonies celebrating Christ’s Death and Resurrection. In Italy, a few interesting instances exist. In 1003, for the presbytery of the Benedictine abbey church of Fruttuaria, some twenty kilometres northwest of Turin, the monk-architect Guilielmo da Volpiano (known in English as St William of Dijon) designed an edifice documented as the ‘Sepulchre’. Excavations have revealed that this was a freestanding chapel on a circular ground plan. Something similar can be found in the old town of Aquileia in the Northern Italian region of Friuli, where, in the years around the middle of the eleventh century, a ‘Holy Sepulchre’ was built. This edifice also has a circular plan, and a tapered roof reminiscent of what the earliest Constantinian Aedicule in Jerusalem might have looked like; but it also has twelve columns which probably refer to those of the Rotunda surrounding it. A comparable combination of elements charac-

---

17 For the building stages of the Holy Sepulchre and the church surrounding it, see: Krüger 2000, pp. 34–167; for an overview of the history and various forms of the Aedicule, see: Briddle 1999.

18 Kroesen 2000; Morris 2005 (with previous bibliography). Towards the end of the Middle Ages, these chapels lose their independent architectural form and become incorporated in churches as lateral chapels or parts of towers. Kroesen 2000, p. 45, traces this development in Late Gothic Northern France; Schmidunser 2008, pp. 21–22, mentions even earlier examples of Holy Sepulchre chapels under church towers, in eleventh-century Spain.
terizes the Aedicule which is part of Santo Stefano in Bologna: a complex of no less than seven churches and chapels, known as ‘Jerusalem’ at least since 887. One of these edifices is the centralized, octagonal church of San Sepolcro which was doubtlessly intended to refer to the Rotunda in Jerusalem. Inside this building an imaginative construction built after 1141, perhaps based on an even earlier one, shows a remarkable combination of an edifice reminiscent of the Aedicule and, with a cross on top, elements of Calvary.¹⁹ In Germany, and of a somewhat later date, there is the copy of the Aedicule in Eichstätt in Bavaria, built originally around 1560, and rebuilt in the seventeenth century in its present location in the Capuchin convent of the town. The centralized structure with slightly projecting, blind arches on the exterior evokes aspects of the Aedicule in Jerusalem.²⁰

A change occurred during the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, when patrons in Germany and Italy seem to have asked for more visual and archaeological accuracy. The Aedicule in a lateral chapel of the Church of St Anne in Augsburg, built in 1507–08, is a more or less half-size reconstruction of the Sepulchre in Jerusalem. Probably due to the limited space in the chapel of St Anne, the interior of this variant lacks the Chapel of the Angel. In Italy, the already mentioned Sacro Monte of San Vivaldo in Tuscany boasts a freestanding imitation of the Aedicule (dated to before 1516, perhaps as early as 1509), complete with a Chapel of the Angel. Here, the burial chamber itself is placed within a centralized structure with blind arches on half-columns at the exterior. Inside, in a rectangular space covered with a bohemian vault, a terracotta statue of Christ lies in a sarcophagus.²¹

Already four or five decades earlier and in an entirely different, Renaissance-humanist context a highly interesting Aedicule had been built in the so-called Cappella Rucellai in Florence. Today, this chapel remains the only consecrated part of the former church of San Pancrazio, originally a medieval structure which is now a museum dedicated to the twentieth-century Tuscan sculptor Marino Marini. Together with the completion of the façade of the nearby church of Santa Maria Novella (completed in 1470), the renovation of Palazzo Rucellai (ca. 1460), and the construction of the Loggia Rucellai (ca. 1466), the chapel is the result of the collaboration of the architect, Leon Battista Alberti

---


²⁰ Briddle 1999, p. 31.

²¹ Briddle 1999, p. 31 (Augsburg), pp. 31–34 (San Vivaldo). For San Vivaldo, see e.g.: Jerusalemlemme San Vivaldo 2006.
(1404–72) and his patron, Giovanni di Paolo Rucellai (1403–81). This wealthy Florentine merchant commissioned it to be his own burial place.

The design of the chapel has been universally attributed to Alberti ever since Vasari in the 1550 edition of his Vite connected the learned architect’s name with the project (Fig. 9.8). The interior of the barrel-vaulted space, which was originally open toward the church, is a wonderful example of Alberti’s refined architectural design. The so-called Tempietto del Santo Sepolcro is centrally placed, a construction on a rectangular ground plan with a semi-circular apse. The elegant ‘small temple’ is adorned with fluted Corinthian pi-
lasters supporting an entablature with an inscribed frieze, above which a band of ornamental merlons in the shape of stylized lilies is placed. The walls are covered with slabs of white marble, decorated with small circular incrustations and framework in green. The only opening to the interior of the edifice is the low entrance at the front. A Latin inscription above it gives the date of 1467 in Roman numerals, and identifies the patron Giovanni Rucellai, who is explicitly said to have wanted the chapel to be like the tomb in Jerusalem (... ad instar Iherosolimitani sepulchri).²³

Alberti’s tempietto, which on the inside lacks a Chapel of the Angel, has often been called a rather free variant of the shrine in Jerusalem as it looked at the time. Giovanni Rucellai is known to have sent an agent to Jerusalem to study and take measurements of the Sepulchre. In a letter to his mother the merchant writes that he had sent ‘a technician and assistants’ to the Holy Land, to bring him ‘the right design and measurements of the Holy Sepulchre’, because it was his intention to ‘have built one similar to it [a quella simiglianza] here in our chapel which at the moment I am having constructed in the Church of San Pancrazio’.²⁴ We know of at least one other instance in which a patron sent an agent to the Holy Land to gather information on works of architecture. To be able to erect a church ad similitudinem s. Jerosolimitane ecclesie (‘similar to the church in Jerusalem’), the eleventh-century Bishop Meinwerk of Paderborn sent Abbot Wino of Helmershausen to Jerusalem to study the Rotunda and bring back mensuras eiusdem ecclesie et s. sepulgrī (‘the measurements of that church and of the Holy Sepulchre’).²⁵ Still, the church built in Paderborn – supposedly on the basis of Abbot Wino’s information – and consecrated in

²³ ‘Iohannes Rucellarius Pavli f. Vindesalvtem svam precaretvr vnde omnvm cvm Christo facta ext resvrectio sacellvm hoc ad [I]nstar Iherosolimitani sepVlchri facivndvm cvraVit Mcccclxvii’. For more on this and the other inscriptions, see: Sperling 1989.

²⁴ ‘[...] vi do avviso come ieri finii di fare la spedizione in Terra santa, avendo colà inviati due legni a tutte mie spese con ingegnere et uomini, acciò mi piglino il giusto disegno e misura del Santo Sepolcro di Nostro Signore Giesù Cristo, e che colla maggior celerità gli sarà possibile in qua ritornino e me le portino, perchè io possa adempire al mio desiderio con farne edificare uno a quella simiglianza qui nella nostra cappella, che nuovamente fo fabbricare nella chiesa di S. Pancrazio nostra cura, quale come voi sapete è a buon porto, non mancandovi altro per renderla perfetta che il modello di così ricco e prezioso tesoro. Vene ho voluto dare questo avviso, sapendo quanta sia in voi, come pure regna in me, la devozione versò quei santi luoghi’. The undated letter (kept in Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale) has come down to us in an eighteenth-century copy only, see Giovanni Rucellai 1960–61, vol. 1, p. 136, 181 n. 1.

²⁵ Krautheimer 1942, p. 4.
1036, is one of those examples of reproductions in medieval architecture in which accuracy remains limited to a selection of essential features – in this particular case merely a centralized ground plan referring to the Rotunda.26

More than four centuries later, Giovanni Rucellai had something else in mind. As for the degree of accuracy of the information his delegates gathered in the Holy Land, we grope in the dark, and it has been suggested that in fact Alberti, rather than looking to Jerusalem, looked to Early Christian buildings in Florence and Rome for inspiration.27 But still, the tempietto in San Pancrazio shows unmistakable allusions to characteristics of the Jerusalem Aedicule. For instance, the basic form has the rectangular ground plan and apsidal niche of the original, and the articulation of the exterior of the prototype, with blind arches on half columns is reflected in Alberti’s pilasters supporting an entablature on the side walls. The low entrance echoes the one of the burial chamber in Jerusalem, just as the circular lantern-like aedicule on top is similar to the structure on the roof of the fifteenth-century ‘original’. Although the monument in Florence is much smaller, its proportions follow those of the shrine in Jerusalem. Thus, Alberti’s design turns out to be a stylized, harmoniously classical adaptation of the original. In his 1961 study of the monument, Ludwig Heydenreich suggests that this way of treating architectural essentials and proportions should not so much be considered a Renaissance variant of the medieval practice of the imitation of architecture. Rather it seems that Alberti did not in the first place set out to present a faithful rendering of the edifice as it looked like around the middle of the fifteenth century. His is an ‘ideal’, Renaissance image of the original as it was imagined to have been in Early Christian, i.e. Late Antique, times.28 It is no coincidence that he chooses the green and white marble incrustation referring to a Tuscan tradition in architecture, of which some instances, like the Florentine Baptistery, were believed to be of Antique origin.

26 The original church was located in what is now the Busdorf convent in Paderborn. Excavations have made clear that it was an octagonal structure on a circular base, provided with four protruding rectangular chapels. It lacked supports to divide the interior: Krautheimer 1942, p. 4, Fig. 1b.

27 Borsi 1977, p. 106, mentions a few churches which themselves have been based on aspects of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, such as Santa Costanza and Santo Stefano Rotondo in Rome. The green and white marble incrustation refers to ‘proto-Renaissance’ architecture in Tuscany like San Miniato al Monte and the Baptistery of Florence.

‘Realism’ on the Sacro Monte

The Chapel of the Holy Sepulchre on the Sacro Monte of Varallo is fully integrated in a larger architectural complex. It does not have an articulate, separate exterior, let alone one that refers to the Jerusalem Aedicule. The chapel’s interior, however, reflects the Aedicule’s two rooms: the ‘Chapel of the Angel’ on a semicircular ground plan, and a barrel-vaulted burial chamber on a rectangular one. However much Alberti’s idealizing, humanist convictions differ from the high-pitched emotionalism expressed by the Sacro Monte decorations, the basic idea in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries was, in a way, comparable. For both monuments aim at bringing the sacred closer to the individual devout by means of a ‘realistic’ reproduction. Obviously, there is the formal difference, connected to an original function and the original public, between realism in the Renaissance sense of a rather detached, idealizing reconstruction on the one hand, and a less sophisticated but at the same time much more tangible reproduction on the other. Apparently, however, both Alberti in Florence and the Franciscans in Varallo valued a recreation of Christ’s tomb as it was believed to have looked in the early days of Christianity – be it in an idealized archaeological sense in San Pancrazio, or be it on the Sacro Monte, by including the protagonist, or protagonists, of the biblical event. For here, not only is the figure of Christ present in the form of a very lifelike sculpture, but there is also a statue of Mary Magdalene kneeling in a niche in the Chapel of the Angel.

The presence of the Magdalene brings to mind Easter plays in which many a re-creation of the Holy Sepulchre played a part during the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period.29 Frequently, the emptiness of the tomb received specific attention in these plays, as it indicated Christ’s triumph over mortality. This aspect is emphasized also in Giovanni Rucellai’s chapel: the prominent inscription on the frieze literally quotes St Mark from the Vulgate: YHESVM QVERITIS NAZARENEM CRVCFIXVM SURREXIT NON EST HIC ECCE LOCVS VBI POSVERVNT EVM (‘ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him’: Mark 16: 6). According to the Evangelist, it was with these words that an angel greeted the Three Marys who had come to the grave to anoint Christ’s body which was not there anymore.

Indeed, like in many reproductions of the Holy Sepulchre, the catafalque inside Rucellai’s Aedicule is empty. At Varallo, however, Christ’s body has been

---

29 Interestingly, at Varallo, the Magdalene is depicted as she came to Christ’s grave on Easter Morning, as yet unaware of the resurrection of the Saviour. For this play with dramatic irony, see: Hood 1979, esp. p. 301.
made present: he is not only visible but also physically tangible, inviting the pilgrim to contemplate the death of the Saviour.³⁰ Life-sized sculptures of the deceased Christ had become increasingly popular in Europe since, amongst others, thirteenth-century Franciscans in Italy and the Modern Devotion Movement in Northern Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries began to make a point of a more emotional, personalized religious experience.³¹ In fifteenth-century Italy, Emilian artists such as Guido Mazzoni from Modena (1450–1518), and the Bolognese Niccolò dell’Arca (ca. 1435–94) made highly expressive terracotta groups of the Lamentation. Fifteenth-century Piedmont also saw an increase in production of life size wooden statues of the deceased Christ.³²

The presence of such an image in the chapel of the Holy Sepulchre in Varallo, confronts the devout beholder in a direct and emphatic way with the essence of the human suffering of the Saviour. It was exactly this aspect that was central to the pilgrimage to the Sacro Monte of Varallo, as we know from two sixteenth-century guide books to the sanctuary. They reflect a type of devotion in which imagination, emotional participation and identification are essential factors. One of those guides is a 22 page booklet entitled Questi sono li Misteri che sono sopra el Monte de Varalle, published in Milan by Gottardo da Ponte in 1514.³³ In rhyming verse, it offers a description of the chapels of the Sacro Monte and the episodes depicted in them. The verses narrating Christ’s sepulchre are exemplary for the way in which the text directs the pilgrim in what he should see, think and feel, emphasizing the similarity of the chapel to the Holy Sepulchre:

Quivi contempla o anima devota
El to signor qua morto riposato
Quivi di pianto ognun si se percota
Sol ammirar il loco asomigliato

³⁰ The glass case, in which the wooden sculpture is placed, is a later addition.
³¹ See e.g.: Schmiddunser 2008, esp. pp. 37–70.
³² For this kind of sculpture in Emilia, see e.g.: Verdon 1978; Emozioni in terracotta 2009. For Piemont and Lombardy, see e.g.: Tra Gotico e Rinascimento 2001, pp. 86–87, 112–13; Legni sacri e proziosi 2005, pp. 92–93. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, images of the deceased Christ became especially popular in France and Spain; see: Martin 1997; Schmiddunser 2008, which is concerned mostly with Spanish yacentes and the sculptor Gregorio Fernández (1575–1636).
El luoco scuro tali si pernota
Simil sepulcro marmore intagliato
Dalata a christo doi Angeli stano
Lun la corona e laltro i giodi in mano.\textsuperscript{34}

[There, o devout soul, you contemplate
your Lord who has been deposed here,
there each chastises himself with grief
upon merely seeing the place which resembles
the place where He passed the night,
like the sepulchre cut in marble.
At Christ's side there are two angels,
one holding the crown, the other the nails.]

This way of immersing the devout, both mentally and physically, in sacred stories and places is typical of devotional practices as they emerged during the first decades of the sixteenth century in Northern Italy in the context of the Catholic Reformation. Later in the century, Charles Borromeo was an exponent \textit{par excellence} of this movement which in the meantime had evolved into the Counter-Reformation. This devotional background was exactly the reason that St Charles appreciated Varallo's Sacro Monte so highly, and why, in later paintings, he came to be depicted as being present in Christ's tomb, mourning for his deceased Redeemer. As if he himself were there, inside the Holy Sepulchre, in Jerusalem.
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CHAPTER 10

The Overdetermination of the Heavenly Jerusalem
Contemporary Windows by Gérard Garouste and
Jean-Michel Alberola

*Daan Van Speybroeck*

At the beginning of 1990s, the Dutch stained-glass artisan Eugène Laudy (1921–1995) realized a window representing the Heavenly Jerusalem for the Dominicus Church in Nijmegen. The window is part of a cycle of ten windows in the church’s nave: five scenes from the Old Testament on the north side, and five windows on the south side with scenes from the New Testament, all made by Laudy. His assignment was described very carefully by the church.1 The biblical scenes that were to be depicted in the windows on one side had to correspond with those in the opposing windows. So, for example, the window opposite the Heavenly Jerusalem shows Moses when he is shown the Promised Land.

Laudy clearly accentuated the Heavenly Jerusalem in this window: the city descends from heaven with its twelve gates guarded by twelve angels, and is a colourful ensemble that contrasts sharply with the mainly greyish background – the world into which this city descends. In short, it is as described in the Apocalypse or the Book of Revelation. At the end of that book, the Heavenly Jerusalem is mentioned (Rev. 21.2): ‘And I, John, saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven.’

Then follows a description of the city, where the city’s brilliance is compared to the glitter of precious jewels, with twelve gates in its high wall, each with an angel and bearing the name of one of the twelve tribes of Israel. In the centre of the Heavenly Jerusalem stands the throne of God and the Lamb, radiating light.

As a stained-glass artisan Laudy complies with his commission, and designs an image of the Heavenly Jerusalem that will function within the local church community. However, the artists Gérard Garouste and Jean-Michel Alberola translate the commission into the language of their own oeuvres. In so doing, they do not merely illustrate, but realize true contemporary works of art with all the characteristic features thereof. This essay, which explores representations of the Heavenly Jerusalem in various windows, starts with Laudy’s

---

example in order to contrast his rather conventional approach with the totally different artistic considerations of the French artists Gérard Garouste in Talant and Jean-Michel Aberola in Nevers, whose windows will be described more comprehensively in the following.

Concerns with Regard to the Heavenly Jerusalem

In his window Laudy showed the city as it has descended on earth with its gates, angels and flowing spring, but, unlike the city in Revelation, it has the shape of a cross. This refers to the Heavenly Jerusalem as the embodiment of the church of Christ, as professed by the ecclesiastical authority.2 Laudy complied with the iconographic and theological tradition, without questioning or problematizing the fact that effectively the church prematurely appropriates the ‘paradise at the end of times’ with this image.

When we examine this somewhat randomly chosen example more closely, we see that the Heavenly Jerusalem comes to us with a series of problems.

The problem that immediately presents itself is why opposing windows in a church should have to correspond? The reason is that the Old and New Testament can be contrasted with each other that way, thereby establishing an inequality, a hierarchy. In the positioning of the windows, in which light plays an important role, the old testamentary scenes are located on the dark north side. Their content is only explained, made clear, through the confrontation with the new testamentary windows opposite them, which are flooded by sunlight. This kind of reading is called ‘typology’3 and contains a frequently occurring, yet disguised and latent, form of discrimination against the Jewish scriptures. This is essentially what happens in Laudy’s windows.

A second problem is the church’s aforementioned urge to appropriate. By appointing itself as the embodiment of the Heavenly Jerusalem, it bestows on itself an absolute dimension, proclaiming itself the one true church by wanting its Jerusalem to reign supreme.

Yet another concern relates to the problem of commissioned art, more specifically artwork commissioned for a church. Nowadays, it is a fact that contemporary windows with themes such as the Heavenly Jerusalem are meant for churches, while the church is often no longer the institution that commis-

sions them; it is usually the state or a cultural or tourist agency that pays... and the maxim ‘he who pays the piper calls the tune’ applies here, too.

Have the church and art not drifted too far apart these days for the former to formulate an adequate assignment for the latter? Or, from the other perspective, is the artist not too self-willed, following his own logic and patterns? Is he able, and does he want to bow to an ‘external’ client who has his own agenda and who is usually a stranger to the artist?

In this context, Markus Lüpertz’s design for the windows of the cathedral of Nevers in France comes to mind.4 When asked to depict Genesis, the German artist showed man as he knew him, scarred by the recent war history of his country (whatever side people had been on, one is tempted to add). His face is as contorted as it is tormented and he seems to know neither peace nor faith. This did not go down well with bishop Michel Moutier of Nevers. He had asked for man before the Fall and that was what he wanted the windows to present to his faithful.

Yet a further concern is the word ‘Jerusalem’ itself. This name cannot be separated from historical events, for example the persecution of the Jews by the Nazis not all that long ago; nor from the foundation of the Jewish state, as recently as 1948, and even more recently, for instance, in 1967, the Six-Day War. By giving a window the name ‘Jerusalem’, one does not only refer to the biblical Jerusalem: the city’s present complex issues are also immediately evoked, issues we are all aware of, that we hear of daily, and that are, as yet, far from resolved. This raises the question whether contemporary artists are still able to connect the word ‘Heavenly’ with ‘Jerusalem’. The socio-political situation in Jerusalem has become so corrupted and hopeless that the said elements, ‘Heavenly’ and ‘Jerusalem’, can no longer be linked. At the same time, more generally speaking, we live in a secularized world in which ‘heavenly’ is inconceivable in itself; so it probably does not matter anymore if it is linked to Jerusalem or not.

The Heavenly Jerusalem in Stained Glass

Although stained glass windows in churches are determined by various things – their fixed position, involvement of a church that is no longer the client, and the tradition of opposing the Old and New Testament – it is specifically in the case of the Heavenly Jerusalem that an overdetermination takes place. The

---

term ‘overdetermination’ is derived from psychoanalysis and here represents the fact that an artwork is determined by many factors that are not necessarily consciously experienced by either the artist or the audience. So while producing a window is a complex process in itself, at the same time it is directed by a multitude of divergent forces that have a part in its realization. As a result, the final work is determined by a mix of alliances – conscious and unconscious – each influencing a component part of the work. Although the Heavenly Jerusalem is seldom mentioned, expected or demanded explicitly in a commission to depict the Apocalypse in a stained glass window, there is usually one window depicting that specific theme. The Heavenly Jerusalem is a subject that the artist may choose to include in his interpretation of the Apocalypse. If he does choose it, this new testamentary theme in most cases leads to the conventional confrontation with the Old Testament. One could ask if it is appropriate in our time to ignore Jerusalem’s current situation, even if nothing in the assignment refers to it explicitly. Jerusalem joined with ‘Heavenly’ intensifies both the old testamentary and the contemporary: even though the people there will not stop fighting each other, this city bears the name of peace and cannot continue to do so without consequences when it is being represented in art.

This kind of overdetermination, and all its contradictions, brings us to the core of visual art – to depict the ‘unimaginable’. Do we not touch upon the essence of visual art with this problematic situation? Is the entire (western) visual art not based on capturing the contradictory in one single image: on creating a ‘both – and’ situation, thereby transcending the logical order. Just think of the depiction of the mother-virgin and the ‘son of god’, or being God and man. Was such a contradictory perspective not the drive behind Lüpertz’s windows for the cathedral of Nevers: depicting man as a repulsive war criminal and simultaneously as defenceless victim, scarred by those war crimes? And this, placed in religious context, shows contemporary, post-war mankind and incorporates man from before the Fall – the image bishop Moutier expected? In short, one and the other.

Heavenly Jerusalem windows are inevitably confronted with such overdetermination, which is fascinating from an artistic point of view, and very interesting and inspiring for contemporary artists. In other words, stained glass windows, which have come to be seen as craft rather than art, and therefore

---

5 The concept of ‘overdetermination’ has various cognate meanings. Here I use the term as defined by Laplanche and Pontalis 1981, pp. 467–69.
6 Pontévia 1984, p. 36 ff.
7 Blanchet 2003, pp. 31–34.
slightly stuffy and musty, could, if they succeed in shaping and depicting the unimaginable, return to the artistic stage.

After this general, rather theoretical and abstract formulation of the problem, in order to fulfil the promise in the subtitle, two windows in which artists choose the Heavenly Jerusalem as their subject will be discussed.

It must be stressed that the term ‘artist’ is emphasized deliberately here in contrast to ‘artisan’. Stained glass ‘artisans’ are more rigid, more docile and usually have a fixed iconographical arsenal on which they fall back easily, and all too soon, in order to realize the theme that has been commissioned. Principally, they make use of their knowledge as artisans and rely on the imagery that is available, or a certain abstraction of it. That is not to say that in their case it is a matter of ‘your wish is our command’: indeed, there is a form of professional pride and dignity in every craft. Yet, in Nijmegen Laudy did not get beyond illustrating a rather conventional typological and iconographical scheme that had little to do with the unimaginable and undepictable. Artists, on the other hand, reformulate their assignment – or at any rate we expect them to – in order to execute it in line with their oeuvre and their time. That is what we saw in Lüpertz’s windows in Nevers, after all. When choosing an artist for a stained glass commission it is therefore important to know the artist’s oeuvre and judge whether it fits the assignment.

Gerard Garouste in Talant

In 1995, Gérard Garouste (b. 1946) was assigned the task of designing all the windows, forty-six in total, of the early Gothic church of Talant, a fashionable suburb of Dijon in France; a project that was finished in 1997. He is a renowned French artist, with no specific knowledge of, or experience with, stained glass. His designs – once accepted – were realized by Atelier Pierre-Alain Parot, in close cooperation with the artist himself.

Because the church was dedicated to the Nativity of Mary, the assignment stipulated that this was the theme to be expressed in the choir. In the church's

---

8 Lagier 2000, pp. 6–9; Loire 2011, pp. 181–92; implicitly about the contemporary battle over windows between stained glass glaziers and artists, see: Geron and Moxhet 2001.

9 This is demonstrated in a series of artistic stained glass projects, described in: Lumière contemporaines 2005, including the windows of Carole Benzaken in Varennes Jarcy, Gérard Garouste in Talant, Martial Raysse in Paris, Sarkis in Azay-sur-Cher and Carmelo Zagari in Faymoreau.


nave (in the clerestory and in the aisles) themes from the Old and New Testament were to be depicted. Elaborating on the figure of Mary, the artist mirrored women from the Old Testament and the New Testament in the aisles, while mainly showing scenes from Genesis in the high nave on the north side and scenes from Revelation on the south side.

From the start, the artist was averse to the traditional division of themes between the sunny side and the dark side that was imposed upon him. The window’s commissioners would not go back on this decision, however, because they subscribed expressly to the tradition of the typological reading prevalent in stained glass windows in churches. Garouste saw the typological requirement as a form of explicit discrimination against the Jewish heritage, a discrimination that he regarded as one of the factors leading to the persecution of the Jews, with which he wanted no association: nor did he want to contribute to its return. He was particularly sensitive to this because he was married to a Jewish woman and had two sons with her who were therefore Jewish. Against this background, he learned Hebrew and preferred to speak of the Tanakh (as the collection of the Torah, the Prophets and a number of Writings). Moreover, a recently published autobiography shows that Garouste’s resistance to the division that was forced upon him had – if one can put it this way – deeper and very personal roots. During the war, his father had systematically sold goods that had been seized from Jews. On the other hand, the artist cooperated closely with Père Louis Ladey, a very amiable village priest and member of the diocesan commission that formulated the assignment. Both men got along extremely well, which resulted in great loyalty on both sides.

So despite his disagreement with the typological requirements, the artist continued with the assignment, expecting, even trusting, that he could negate the inherent coercion and the discriminatory dimension by virtue of the content of his windows and their positioning in relation to each other. He tried to do this by allowing women from the Bible to confront each other in opposing windows, making sure that those from the New Testament were not seen as explaining those from the Old, nor appear in any way to be stronger. In this coupled confrontation, the presence of each was equally powerful.

His ‘strategy’ – discussed too briefly here – is most clearly visible in the confrontation between the windows of the sacrificial altars, which interrupt the sequence of women in the aisles. Here we see that the sacrifices of the Old

---

13 Garouste and Perrignon 2009.
Testament are animals, while in the New Testament human sacrifices – even though they are martyrs – are depicted. With this interruption, the artist obliged the visitor to reflect for a moment, thus forcefully raising the question of who is 'prefigured'.

This strategy indicates a wider context envisioned by Garouste: he wanted his windows to urge the faithful to think. To him, his assignment took place against a background – even though he did not depict it directly, because that would be merely illustrating – of the obedience that is enforced among children from their first Holy Communion, through catechesis and through listening to the priest. He contrasted this tradition with the bar mitzvah of Jewish boys: on their own, in the rabbi's place, facing all present, they have to read out a text and explain it. With his windows – in their figuration, their composition, and their interrelationships – he invited Catholics to think for themselves and to interpret independently the biblical scenes that were represented. Thus his windows in Talant, in part through the addition of texts in Hebrew, Latin and French, stimulate the spectator to do more than view the windows, but also to look up the texts and so return to the source with an open mind.

This is the context within which Garouste's Jerusalem window is situated in the church of Talant (Fig. 10.1). It is – from the choir – the first window in the northern aisle. We see the twelve sons of Jacob, who form the twelve gates of the city of Jerusalem, as it were. This is a reference to both the Old and the New Testament: Ezekiel (48.31) and Revelation. In the foreground one of the figures is fully visible – Judah – because he gave his name to the Jewish people. Depicting him this way also makes it look as if he wears the Jewish tribes as his crown, thus showing Jesus to be a descendant from these tribes and making him, from the perspective of Jewish history, somewhat less overpowering. Garouste depicts Judah as the gate to the tetragrammaton here – the four letters used to refer to God in Hebrew.

However, the link to Jerusalem – here with no reference whatsoever to the Heavenly – is weak. Is it not rather the Catholic commissioner who wants to see the heavenly city in the window and who projects his interpretation onto it? However, the window is mirrored by a different, opposing window, depicting another city: Capernaum – as is inscribed on the window (Fig. 10.2). Again, one notices that all is not right on the side of the New Testament: the city is engulfed in flames – cursed by Jesus, who lived there but could not get anyone to listen to his words. Consequently, the city is seized by a fire that may or may not be cleansing. But with Capernaum we do not find ourselves only in the
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14 Garouste and Perrignon 2009, p. 100.
New Testament, because the city is already also mentioned in the Tanakh. Thus, Garouste invites the visitors to the church to think for themselves, rather than confirming their beliefs. He does so by mixing up the New and the Old Testament, as it were, making it impossible to go back to one of the two books and placing them on this or that side of the church: we are confronted with a complexity of references and connections.

In order to enhance our interpretation of Garouste’s windows, we should look at two windows that are in the same bay in the clerestory as ‘Jerusalem’ and ‘Capernaum’: ‘The Burning Bush’ on one side, and ‘The Throne of Light’ on the other. God is the focus of both windows; his name appears in the flames of the bush (as depicted in the window) and there is a reference to him on the
back of his throne. This Throne of Light brings us back to Revelation, albeit to the beginning rather than the end (Rev. 4.2). Garouste shows us the empty throne with only one inscription: ‘God is one’. In the ‘checkerboard’ in the lower part of the window, we can see a reference to the floor of the temple in Jerusalem. Both the throne and the temple are empty – we can project various meanings onto them. Here, Garouste speaks of an absence ‘to experience the presence of what immateriality absence possesses’. Without becoming very concrete, we could (with a bit of goodwill) think of contrasts when considering the checkerboard: of all the black-white situations in Jerusalem – ranging from good and evil, and war and peace, or about day and night and old and new, the earthly and the heavenly, the latter emphasized by the throne depicted above it.

However, all this does not bring Jerusalem itself, today’s city, to the forefront. Is the concreteness of present-day, troublesome Jerusalem not ‘missed’ here, perhaps even avoided? On the other hand, the artist might have been somewhat reluctant because depicting a Heavenly Jerusalem could be too much of an invitation to see the window as ‘the church’, surrounded by its light and glory. Thus we could say that Garouste, reading Revelation, did not reach the passage about the Heavenly Jerusalem, and therefore lets his visual reading end earlier – although he does let the theme shine through in the window with The Throne of Light.

Even though in Garouste’s windows in Talant (the Heavenly) Jerusalem is not the main theme, the message of the windows is powerful. And perhaps it is precisely this ‘absence’ making room for a much more essential immaterial ‘presence’ that the artist was after. In any case, visiting the church of Talant and being caught in the light falling through the windows, breaks our world open to the heavenly. Feasting our eyes, we are encouraged to read, to think, and to interpret. In this church, Garouste takes us to the source of the words, to ‘the word as a creative agent’ if not in order to accomplish, at least to evoke a birth, or as it were, a rebirth.

Jean-Michel Alberola in Nevers

It is a strange fact that one of the windows of the northern transept arm of the cathedral of Nevers in France, designed by the French-Algerian artist Jean-Mi-
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16 Garouste à Talant 2006, p. 72.
Michel Alberola (b. 1953), is called ‘Heavenly Jerusalem’, although no one seems to remember where the name came from (Fig. 10.3).

More generally speaking, there are other strange aspects to this art assignment.18 Initially, in 1989, Alberola was commissioned to design a series of seven windows depicting Revelation19 in the southern transept arm of the aforementioned cathedral. After he had finished this project – which does not show a Heavenly Jerusalem but does, in a sense, include the Throne of Light – he was given a second assignment of realizing the same theme in six windows in the northern arm of the transept. The fact that he was allowed to take Revelation again and depict it a second time in the same church, and this so close to the

---

19 Van Speybroeck 1998, pp. 60–91; Bansept 1999. The windows were commissioned by the Délégations aux Arts Plastiques (DAP), the programme was written by the Association Regards sur la Cathédrale de Nevers with help from the Commission diocésaine d’art sacré.
other, existent windows, is curious. What is even more curious was that these windows were to be placed on the north side.

In the meantime, stained glass artisan Pierre Denfert, with whom Alberola had been working, had died and the artist went in search of a new studio. He chose Atelier Duchemin\(^{20}\), a renowned stained glass studio in Paris, passed down from father to daughter, that specialized in working with artists and was very open to what many artisans saw as the strange expectations and demands of artists who were usually not familiar with stained glass. Consequently, owing both to the experience the artist had gained with stained glass and the new collaboration, this second series of windows has a different character. Where Alberola used quotations from a classic medieval window – the *Tree of Jesse* from the Kunibertus Church in Cologne\(^ {21}\) – for his windows in the southern arm, he mainly quotes from medieval illuminations of various Apocalypses in the northern arm. The Heavenly Jerusalem window mentioned above should be placed in this context (Fig. 10.3).

The position of this window in the entire wall surface may also cause surprise. The Heavenly Jerusalem window is the lowest window of the four, while, with its heavenliness, we would sooner expect it at the top (Fig. 10.4). That is not necessarily so strange, however, considering that the Heavenly Jerusalem descends on earth, therefore to the lowest level.

Besides ‘Heavenly Jerusalem,’ this window is strangely enough sometimes called the ‘Babylon’ window, referring to the exact opposite – the doomed city of impure souls that is to be destroyed. Again we are faced with the question of where the name came from. From the church? From the diocesan commission that got to formulate the assignment but to which the artist did not always listen faithfully and attentively? From the ministerial institutions that followed and guided the work closely (and paid for it)? Or is it the result of the visual quotations that were detected through art historical and theological interpretations of the window? In any case, it seems to evoke the two incompatibles – the heavenly and the demonic – simultaneously.

The artist himself does not seem to aim for a single name. His approach results in a synthetic image that can be – however contradictory – one and the other. Which brings us to the heart of art again. After all, such a synthetic approach means that the windows in the wall form a whole, and that the various themes from Revelation do not follow each other consecutively in the wall. Garouste’s work already showed certain leaps in the story, with breaks and interruptions. With Alberola, the approach is even more radical: various subjects

\(^{20}\) Blanchet 2010, idem, pp. 135–38; Ateliers Duchemin 2009.

\(^{21}\) For descriptions of the window, see: Grodecki 1977, pp. 222–24.
from Revelation can come together in one window by flowing into one another and mixing. It enables the Heavenly Jerusalem and Babylon to present themselves and take place at the same time in one window – as if Alberola, while designing the window, eats the book to make it his and lets everything come together inside himself. In this respect, he referred in a lecture to a passage in Revelation (Rev. 10.9–10): ‘So I went to the angel and asked him to give me the little scroll. He said to me, “Take it and eat it. It will turn your stomach sour, but in your mouth it will be as sweet as honey”. I took the little scroll from the angel’s hand and ate it. It tasted as sweet as honey in my mouth, but when I had eaten it, my stomach turned sour’. In short, in the work of this artist, the

Heavenly Jerusalem is no longer a theme that stands on its own but, now that the chronology and dichotomy has been broken, is present in the whole of the Revelation window in manifold and diversified ways.

When we return to the window discussed here, we see that it is composed of a series of elements. Formally speaking, there is a window in the window, although not in the usual way, where an ornamented border frames the heart of the window with the actual theme. Here, what seems to be the heart of the window has been tilted and shifted to the right, and thus has disappeared from the centre. This is clearly shown by the way this section is bordered off in the whole of the window. We are more or less familiar with the figurative parts of the window. Maybe ‘familiar’ is too bold a word: they mainly call up in the mind of anyone with some knowledge of art history strong associations with illuminations from medieval texts, namely Apocalypses. At the top of the window the hand of God comes down from heaven. This hand seems to throw a building towards earth. The movement is accompanied by an angel who, upside down, in the end places the building on earth. Although it is an ‘act of God’ – described in the Bible as ‘coming down from God out of heaven’ (Rev. 21.2 and 10) – it is not a city that is thrown, but a building. During its fall and before the building is put straight again, it passes another building with several towers. While the angel is in effect shown in a nose dive, he moves on the edge between the so-called inner window and the so-called border, while the proportion between both parts is far from centred, as mentioned before. The inner window is more peaceful or, rather, harmonic in its composition and refers to Cistercian windows – with little colour and taut, stylized geometric or vegetative patterns. In the inner window, the buildings are standing upright, straight.

We see a sequence of quoted images here. Both the Hand of God mentioned above and the city that is passed on the way down are derived from the Apocalypse of Oxford. The building that is thrown and put upright comes from the Apocalypse of Valenciennes and is the synagogue/church of Smyrna, while the ‘accompanying’ angel – hardly recognizable due to the omissions in the window, because only the feet and hands are explicitly left – comes from the Apocalypse of Trier.

If we look closer, we notice that the Apocalypse of Oxford and of Trier show details from the depiction of the Fall of Babylon. And we can ask ourselves if there was ever a Heavenly Jerusalem here, or if there ever will be. Seen within the synthetic approach of Alberola's Apocalypse there is something to be said for the idea, however. After all, Smyrna is one of the cities, mentioned at the beginning of Revelation, that is judged favourably because of its poverty, which is actually its wealth. The central place of the feet in the window could be a reference to Isaiah 52.7, where, after ‘the feet of him that bringeth good tidings'
have been applauded, there is mention of the ‘ruins of Jerusalem’ – pillaged by
the Babylonians – but ‘redeemed’ now. So a Heavenly Jerusalem on earth after
all!

Again, the contemporary Jerusalem with its complex problems is far away.
There is no trace of it unless perhaps, and yet again with goodwill, in the quoted
reference to the ‘ruins of Jerusalem’.

Overdetermination

It is precisely in its overdetermination, that Jerusalem possesses a large poten-
tial for art. The unimaginable and the undepictable come together there – and
when an artist nevertheless finds a way to display the incompatible, it forms an
opening to, even an appeal from, a different world from the everyday one and
its prevailing reality. Both Garouste and Alberola have understood this well
and use Jerusalem as a suitable handle or force – which they let go just as eas-
ily. Sticking to the actual Jerusalem would mean going with the current trend
of what we hear and see about it in the media, would eventually become ideo-
logical and possibly even end up in ‘political correctness’. Both artists are not
so much interested in Jerusalem. For them it is matter to art, it offers perspec-
tive to let something be born, to hold it up to the world. They are after the
potential that is hidden in Jerusalem – a potential that goes further than
‘stretching’. A transformation takes place here (the temptation is to say ‘tran-
substantiation’23, because of the ecclesiastical context in which the windows
manifest themselves), leading us elsewhere, possibly taking us to another way
of living and existing.

The overdetermination of Jerusalem and the perspectives hidden in it, are
reinforced even further, intensified, by adding ‘Heavenly’ to it on one hand,
and on the other hand by bringing the overdefinition into a church in the form
of windows. Thus the windows of these artists touch upon a social area that
(due to advancing secularization) gradually lets more land lie fallow, namely
religion and more specifically the presentia realis that the Catholic Church
hardly refers to in our time. The presentia realis is, however, secularized here. It
is, in the words of Garouste, ‘the presence of what immateriality absence pos-
sesses’24. And just as the windows fill this empty spiritual place, they also fill
an empty artistic place, presenting stained glass art, a genre in which the
artistic investment had previously become minimal. After becoming outdated

and stuffy as a craft, stained glass art is reappearing on the artistic stage thanks to artists like Garouste and Alberola.25 With their so-called (Heavenly) Jerusalem windows, Garouste and Alberola open up new ground for art and develop it, or perhaps rather perpetuate it in a way one rarely sees in museums these days. Through this – or through this getting out of hand as a kind of divine ‘being thrown’ – much more is offered. It leads to that which we can actually expect of art: a moving presence and a partaking of another dimension of existence in bringing together incompatibles. This is probably an old-fashioned, outdated demand on, and expectation of, art. Perhaps Garouste’s and Alberola’s art only finds a suitable home in churches these days as a last alternative accommodation – so in that sense we can speak of a conventicle or ‘hiding church’. But the attraction of so many cultural tourists probably makes it difficult to experience what is offered there.

Perhaps these artists bring us the name Jerusalem as the bearer of peace. Does Garouste not let something immaterial like that be born in Talant? Does Alberola not turn out to be right when he says that with a successful artwork we find ourselves in something that transcends us, allowing us to join him in speaking of ‘regained peace’26, ultimately that of the Heavenly Jerusalem?
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CHAPTER 11

‘You want to take us to Jerusalem ...’
Medinat Weimar: A Second Jerusalem in Contemporary Visual Arts and Klezmer Songs

Rudie van Leeuwen

On 22 June 2008 a rally and a conference were organized in the German city of Weimar celebrating the establishment of a new movement: Medinat Weimar. According to an information sheet, which was handed out on-site and had been posted earlier on the internet, the purpose of the rally was to introduce the movement to the general public, while the conference was meant ‘to broaden the collective element to the movement’. The rally took place on the Theaterplatz from 11 AM till 1 PM, and the audience was encouraged to actively participate in the meeting and to bring homemade signs and banners. It was stated that ‘Empty placards and markers will also be available so anyone can add their own slogans’. To the untrained eye it seemed yet another anti-fascist demonstration. Standard maxims were displayed, such as ‘Rettet uns vor den Nazis’, though more cryptic expressions and demands were also presented, such as ‘Auch die Diaspora braucht ein Zuhause’ and ‘Koschere Bratwurst Jetzt!’ (Fig. 11.1).

Since the average gentile would not be familiar with the Hebrew word for ‘state’, Medinat (מְדִינַת), the ultimate goal of the gathering remained probably unclear to most of the general public and the guileless passers-by. Nevertheless both the movement’s logo, a map of the German federal state of Thuringia (Thüringen) emblazoned with a Menorah, the Jewish seven-branched lamp stand, and its adage ‘I ⧫ Thuringia’, clearly hinted at its ultimate objective: the foundation of Jewish State in this Bundesland, with Weimar as its capital. It seems rather unheymish, though perhaps not inapposite, to found a New Jerusalem in Weimar, the birthplace of the first constitutional German Republic, which made way for Nazism and, one could argue, ultimately led to the Holocaust.
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Weimar as a New Jerusalem

Prior to the public meeting a website (medinatweimar.org) was launched by the artist Ronen Eidelman on which thirteen principles were posted, the first being: ‘Medinat Weimar wishes to establish a Jewish state in Thuringia, Germany, with the city of Weimar as its capital’. The second principal states that ‘Medinat Weimar is a solution to overcome the present crises and heal Jewish trauma, German guilt, East Mediterranean conflicts, East German troubles and many other problems in the world’. While the beginning of the third principle places these aims in an artistic perspective, stating that ‘Medinat Weimar will utilize the autonomy of art and its institutions’, thus fixing its nationalist aspirations within the realm of the idealistic, the second part propagates using ‘the tools of political campaigning and activism to convince the citizens of Ger-

---

2 http://medinatweimar.org/ (accessed on 1 May 2012).
many, the European Union, the world[’]s Jewish communities and the international community to support the founding of the state.

Can we take both these mission statements equally serious? The political relativism of these maxims is further enhanced by point four which explicitly states that one is ‘Jewish not through blood or ancestry but through similarity in mind, culture, common history and unity of fate’. It also becomes clear that ‘Jews from non-European origin, Palestinians[,] Arabs (Muslim and Christian alike) and all other parties affected by the activities of the state of Israel are considered to share a common fate’; and that, according then to the fifth proclamation, even ‘people from any background and nationality’ are welcome to become active supporters of the cause.

Then in a flurry of terminology, unbridled ambition takes the upper hand and it is boldly claimed that ‘Medinat Weimar can play an important role in healing anti-Semitism, Schuldabwehrantisemitismus (guilt-defensiveness anti-Semitism), problematic expressions of Philosemitismus, both German and Jewish self hatred and the ongoing conflict between the Jewish, Arab and Muslim communities. The term Schuldabwehrantisemitismus was introduced by Theodor Adorno (1903–1969) for a new kind of secondary anti-Semitism, consisting of prejudices that are directed against Jews, often disguised as a comparison of the Israeli policy to that of Nazi Germany, which functioned as a psychological defence mechanism for repressing feelings of guilt.

This enumeration of final solutions is followed by an important proviso declaring that though Medinat Weimar does not want to replace the ‘current state of Israel’ [!] it addresses the failure of the Zionist state and wants to create a (proper) safe haven. More universal beliefs are put forward in the eighth and ninth principles that insist on the right of ‘self-redetermination’ and ‘self-redefinition’, and the traversing of all ideological, cultural and religious trenches within the Israeli and German discourse. The tenth statement focuses on the reasons for the choice of Thuringia as the place for the foundation of this Jewish state, such as: ‘its important place in German culture, history of anti-Semitism and German nationalism, legacy of Jewish life and culture as well as its shrinking population and a weak economy’.

---


4 ‘Medinat Weimar is not a replacement of the current state of Israel but a different Jewish state’.
The eleventh principle formulates in a roundabout way the political scope of Medinat Weimar, as being ‘a sober and anti-fascist solution to many problems that the state of Thuringia is facing as a former East German province’. This fallacy ends with a catchphrase: ‘A Jewish state is not a punishment but a prize’, which is followed with the almost religious promise of redemption ‘through Thuringia’ for all German people, as well as the prospect of the liberation from the ghosts of the past. Elucidating this unexpected spiritual notion, the purpose of Medinat Weimar is pinpointed within the contemporary discourse. According to its twelfth principle it sets itself ‘to question and explore the rise of nationalism versus the reality of globalization and migration and the re-emergence of religion as a cultural identifier versus the secular globalization of capital’.

The thirteenth principle, finally, offers some kind of solace for the restless reader, reducing the severity of earlier assertions, by emphasizing that ‘Medinat Weimar is not a realistic movement, but rather one that seeks to agitate and provoke by taking anti-Semitic, neo-liberal, nationalistic, Zionist arguments to their unreasonable conclusions illustrating their inner logic and absurdity’. Thus, by purposefully undermining its very foundations, Medinat Weimar attempts to refute at first hand any fundamentalist adherence. The preamble of this last key point additionally whittles down the legitimacy of the underlying arguments, though its stratagem reaffirms the belief in the political objectives of the movement and its commitment to provocation as a means to an end.

Provocative intentions also become clear from Eidelman’s other art projects, such as Coming out in Lublin, Poland, which was made as part of the 2010 Open City Festival – a festival of art in public spaces, curated by Krzysztof Zwirblis. In and around the old city centre of Lublin in Poland, Eidelman posted life-size reproductions of old black and white photographs portraying all kinds of Jewish people – ‘Young, old, modern, religious, political activist ...’ – who had lived in those streets and houses from the late nineteenth century until World War II. In what he called ‘a modest gesture’, Eidelman wanted to return the people in the photos to the place from which they had been taken. Near the photos appeared different questions in Polish which were clearly intended to shock the reader, even if on a subliminal level, questions such as

---

'Does your family hide a great mystery/secret?', 'Does your grandmother mumble in her sleep in a foreign tongue?', and 'What kind of Jew are you?' More shock and awe has been avowedly engendered in an earlier artistic venture, called *Magav in Weimar*, that Eidelman clandestinely undertook in 2008 in Thuringia's cultural capital, and which is directly related to the *Medi-nat Weimar project*. The artist intended to bring an armoured jeep of the Israeli border police into the streets of Weimar, but could not do so for obvious reasons, and therefore built a two-dimensional life size cut out instead, like the fake police cars that deter drivers from speeding. This mock-up jeep was subsequently mounted on the side of shopping cart and Eidelman went out on patrol, or rather, was escorted by this out-of-place vehicle.

The jeep was pushed from behind by an assistant of whom only the lower legs are visible in three short YouTube video clips that were uploaded in 2008: *Magav in front of Goethe House, Magav escorting me on the streets of Weimar, Magav in front of Bauhaus-Universität, Weimar.* When Eidelman parked the jeep near to the Gauforum, a building complex built for the national-socialist party administration, he was asked by a female official to kindly move it. Her rationale was not so much that the artist had no permission, but more importantly since 'the Gauforum has such an ugly history that they need to watch out about what messages are being sent'. Reflecting on what she said, Eidelman noted the irony by remarking that: 'Almost anywhere in Germany where I would park the jeep I would be parking on ugly history'.

In an interview by Nat Muller for the sixth issue of *Visual Foreign Correspondents*, in de Balie Amsterdam, on the 15th April 2008, Eidelman elucidated some aspects of his *Magav in Weimar* project.

*Magav* (the Israeli border police) have a well-deserved reputation for violent treatment of minorities and underprivileged people, both in Israel and the Palestinian territories. In addition to the daily harassments on the streets, during demonstrations and direct actions, while exercising

---

6 Czy w twojej rodzinie jest wielka tajemnica; Czy twoja babcia mamrocze w obcym języku przez sen?; Jakim Żydem jesteś?

7 We may safely assume that the uploader (amhaaretz) is Eidelman himself. The term *Am ha'aretz* יָרָץ הָאָרֶץ means 'the people of the Land'. *Magav in front of Bauhaus-Universität, Weimar*; *Magav escorting me on the streets of Weimar*, *Magav in front of Goethe House*, video clips uploaded on January 29, 31 and February 1, 2008, last accessed 1 May, 2012, YouTube, [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l45bWw81nLs](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l45bWw81nLs); [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_w4pDqw117M](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_w4pDqw117M); [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8xnT3ieL6Zw](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8xnT3ieL6Zw).

8 Muller 2008, s.p.
their democratic rights, demonstrators get beaten, tear-gassed, shot at with live and rubber bullets, and arrested by these forces, whose mission should be to protect citizens not to attack them. I myself experienced all these “treatments” over the years of being active in anti-occupation and anti-capitalist direct actions groups. So when I see them patrolling the streets I don’t feel safe for myself, or my neighbours. Still, I decided to bring the Israeli border police to Weimar due to the unusual situation which is comprised of the unique relationship between Israel and Germany, the catastrophic past and because of the place Israel’s security forces take up within the discourse about security and militarism.

Eidelman acknowledges that even though not everyone would have been aware of the significance of the jeep – or for that matter be familiar with the situation in Israel/Palestine – all should have recognized that it is a militarized jeep.

And while a fake jeep does more or less the same job and provokes discussion just as much as would a real one, the mock-up vehicle has, moreover, a specific connotation since ‘the two-dimensional façade barley [barely] standing on its wooden frame, is very much like the fake façades of Weimar’s historic building’. On his site Eidelman wrote that his aim was to examine what this action would bring about and how the presence of a militarized police force from Israel in a small quiet East German town would be perceived: ‘Would it produce fear, antagonism, discomfort or maybe understanding and sympathy? The site of the Star of David is never neutral on the streets of Germany, all the more so when it is painted on an armored jeep’.

Despite the fact that Medinat Weimar is not a real political movement, it had several offices in Europe, in the form of impermanent installations which were part of smaller and larger exhibitions. A ‘temporary Swedish headquarters’ was established at Tegen2 gallery in Stockholm in October 2009, thus constituting the showpiece for a solo exhibition (Fig. 11.2). According to Eidelman the Kingdom of Sweden – the then president of the European Union – could play ‘a role in forwarding the vision of the movement and can help persuade

9 ‘[…] The façades, historical manipulations, and the cultural cloning wish to suggest authenticity, but they do have to be really convincing to fulfill their purpose and to create in Weimar the romantic Disneyland of the east. In the same way, security can work as a façade. It does not really have to be convincing, you don’t need expensive systems, trained personnel, intelligence, and expertise. What is needed is a pretence of security, feeling of security, the knowing of its being and the statement that it is present’.

the European community as well as their German neighbors in [sic] the vitality of the idea.\footnote{http://www.flickr.com/photos/maarav/4995479917/ (accessed on 1 May 2012)}

Earlier that year, in June, a \textit{Ma'achaz} (outpost; handhold, foothold; stronghold) was erected at the 53rd Venice Biennale; in reality a cardboard cut-out or “two-dimensional scale model” of a building. On Eidemans personal website we can read that due to insufficient financial resources ‘Medinat Weimar decided in the spirit of Zionism to defer reality and settle with a symbolic Pavilion at Giardini\footnote{http://roneneidelman.com/?p=304, posted 24 June 2009: ‘Rather than adopt to the reality that the Jewish state in Thuringia does not exist and the movement for the state has no financial ability to rent a space and hold a decent exhibition (like the Palestinian and gypsy participations)...’}.\footnote{http://roneneidelman.com/?p=304, posted 24 June 2009: ‘Rather than adopt to the reality that the Jewish state in Thuringia does not exist and the movement for the state has no financial ability to rent a space and hold a decent exhibition (like the Palestinian and gypsy participations)...’} That the Medinat Weimar project is still ongoing proves Eidelman’s contribution to the recent \textit{Heimatkunde} exhibition, which was held at the Jewish Museum in Berlin from September 16th 2011 till January 29th 2012. In this exhibition, given the subtitle \textit{30 Künstler blicken auf Deutschland}, works
had been gathered that all address key aspects of their perceptions of “Germany” and “in Germany”.

Eidelman’s Berlin installation consisted, as had been the case in Stockholm, of a table with paperwork and a map on the wall (Fig. 11.3). Only now the table has acquired more the character of a desk, of a proper office space, instead of an exhibition stand. The two white table flags have been replaced by one big white flag hanging from the wall. The accessories have been extended to include writing utensils, a cylindrical money-box, and a metal bowl filled with *button* badges bearing slogans like ‘It’s safe now / You can come back’ and ‘I 🇩🇪 Thuringia’. Most importantly, the installation was made more interactive, by means of a TV screen mounted above the desk, showing a propaganda film.

There is only one component that actually returns from the previous installation: a picture of the comedian Mel Brooks. It is no longer hanging between

---


14 Pictures of the office in the Jewish Museum in Berlin were posted on the Medinat Weimar website on 19 September 2011.
other famous (more long-faced) Jews on the wall, as in Stockholm, but stands on a desk in a frame as if to show a portrait of a loved one. In this way, the seriousness of the entourage seems dismissed with a wink. What is remarkable in comparison to this comic relief and earlier verbalizations of the project is the more serious and unswerving political tone of a statement that was published in the exhibition catalogue, and as well on the website:

The Medinat Weimar movement not only supports the efforts of young Jewish Israelis to obtain a second passport from a European country or even to take on German nationality. It also offers a vision of a social utopia that aims to stop the decline of Thuringia’s population and combat the popularity of radical right-wing ideology. Medinat Weimar draws on various ideas discussed in connection with the Zionist movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.\(^\text{15}\)

It is well known that thousands of Israelis are reclaiming their EU citizenship as Israel’s security concerns escalate; German passports are especially popular.\(^\text{16}\)

It seems that – at least within the context of this exhibition – Medinat Weimar intended to generate a more serious political discussion. This also becomes clear from the audio recording of a panel discussion with ‘activists of the committee Medinat Weimar’, that took place on 14 January 2012 at the Jewish Museum in Berlin, and which was moderated by Cilly Kugelmann, curator of the exhibition.\(^\text{17}\) More tellingly this Podiumsgespräch was given the title ‘Weimar, das künftige Jerusalem?’. Participants in the discourse were Sami Khatib, a cultural scientist and activist in the movement, who is a son of a Palestinian father and German mother, and other representatives of the academic world, Professor Liz Bachhuber of the Bauhaus-Universität Weimar, and Professor Dr Hanne Seitz of the Fachhochschule Potsdam. Central to the discussion was the distinction between exhibition and public space, between art and political action campaign.

\(^{15}\) See for the German text: Berlin 2011, p. 54; http://www.jmberlin.de/heimatkunde/kuenstler/eidelman.php (accessed on 1 May 2012).

\(^{16}\) Gideon Levy, ‘Fear is driving Israelis to obtain foreign passports’, Haaretz (2 June 2011); Tzvika Brot, ‘German passport popular in Israel, Israel News (31 May 2011).

As an introduction to the talk Cilly Kugelmann compares *Medinat Weimar* with a similar art project, the *Jewish Renaissance Movement in Poland* (JRMiP), by the Israeli-Dutch artist Yael Bartana. The fictitious Jewish Renaissance Movement, which promotes the return of 3.3 million Jews to Poland, is simulated through videos, stories, and conferences. Bartana’s cinematographic trilogy, *Mary Koszmary (Nightmare)* (2007), *Mur i wieża (Wall and Tower)* (2009), and *Zamach (Assassination)* (2011), was part of the official Polish contribution to the 54th International Art Exhibition in Venice of 2011, called *and Europe will be stunned*. According the official website ‘Bartana tests reactions to the unexpected return of the ‘long unseen neighbour’ and recalls the forgotten motif of alternative locations for the state of Israel that were once considered by Zionists, such as Uganda’. The First International Congress of the JRMiP was held 11th-13th May 2012 in Berlin.

A quote by Bartana, which Kugelmann cites in the talk, is very similar to a statement that Bartana made for a German radio station: ‘Wir wollen zurück. Nicht nach Uganda, Argentinien, Syrien oder Madagaskar. Auch nicht nach Palästina, sondern nach Europa, in den Kontinent unserer Väter und Vorfahren. Ganz besonders Polen liegt uns am Herzen, das immer noch in unseren Gedanken und Träumen existiert.’

The idea of an alternative settlement of the Jewish state seems to have a revival in popular culture, and the folly of it is brilliantly depicted in a 2008 episode of the CBS sitcom *The Big Bang Theory*, in which one of the main characters, Sheldon Cooper, plans to win the Nobel Peace Prize by building an exact replica of Jerusalem in the Mexican desert, even with a wailing wall ‘exactly like the one in Jerusalem, but close to taco stands and cheap prescription drugs’.

From the perspective of historical justice (*Historische Gerechtigkeit*), Kugelmann refers to Hannah Arendt’s opinion that Germany is to blame for the conflict in the Middle East, and therefore – as the latter once whimsically added in a polemic – should put a piece of land at Israel’s disposal. When asked which

---

18 Perutz 2012. According to Eidelberg ‘There are a lot of Polish people upset because they feel that they deserve the Jews more than the Germans’, in: *Podiumsgespräch*, Berlin, 14 January 2012. (See above).
21 Richter 2010, s.p.
22 *The Big Bang Theory*, Season 1, episode 12, "The Jerusalem Duality", written by Chuck Lorre and Bill Prady, directed by Mark Cendrowski, storyline by Jennifer Glickman & Stephen Engel, and teleplay by Dave Goetsch & Steven Molaro, aired 14 April 2008, program code 3T66.
23 Arendt’s remark could not be traced by me.
were the motivations for moving Herzl’s Jewish State to Thuringia, Eidelman brings up the need for nationalism, his personal experience as a minority (‘the other’) in Weimar, and the present danger for the first Jewish state in Israel, which is, according to him, not so much threatened from outside (by Iran) as from within. And though Eidelman does not oppose the State of Israel, and is even willing to fight for it, he fully acknowledges the need for a Plan B, which in time took the form of Medinat Weimar.

As a supporter of the movement Sami Khatib repudiates the interpretation of its inherent nationalism in a literal sense by describing Medinat Weimar as a ‘Statenloser Staat’, ‘Anti-Staat’ and ‘Paradoxie eines Staates’, while emphasizing its Messianic notions of a promised land, where all people could live together peacefully.24 The question is whether such a state is still Jewish, and to what extent it should be. Medinat Weimar is therefore characterized by Khatib as a ‘Staat der Statenlosen’ (State of Stateless), ‘Staat der Wurzellosen’ (State of the rootless or uprooted), an obvious paradox, since these notions are stereotypes which have been ascribed to Judaism in classical anti-Semitism, and in addition enable us to consider Medinat Weimar as a Jewish experience, though they could easily fit other peoples. This phenomenon is called “universal singularity” in modern philosophy.25 Khatib refers also to Gershom Scholem (1897–1982) who said: ‘Wir Juden sind kein Staatsvolk. Die anderen Völker übrigens auch nicht’.26

On the other hand and for his part, Eidelman claims, as he did in the fourth principle of Medinat Weimar in a somewhat platitudinous way, that its inhabitants would be bound together by fate, because all people share a common future, referring to Martin Buber’s speech for the twelfth Zionist Congress of 1921. But Buber has not only argued that a people is defined by a common fate, but also that a people is a “natural” community, which he distinguished from a “symbolic” community of a religious nature (i.e. church).27 It seems beyond dispute that Medinat Weimar is essentially symbolic by nature and has religious (Messianic) traits.

Time and again, the speakers of the Podiumgespräch draw attention to the differentiation between the virtual and the real world of Medinat Weimar, often demarcated by the border between art and politics. Liz Bachhuber rightly

24 Khatib, Podiumsgespräch, Berlin, 14 January 2012. Khatib is writing a Ph.D. thesis on Walter Benjamin’s messianic Marxism.
25 See for universal singularity, the figure which combines the dimension of One with the dimension of ‘for all’: Badiou 1997, p. 80.
27 Buber 1921; Baum 2001, pp. 32–33.
notes ‘Auch fiktionale Wirklichkeiten haben Auswirkung auf uns’.\textsuperscript{28} Kugelmann speaks of a \textit{Diasporic Utopia} and interprets Medinat Weimar – ‘Eine Staat ohne Territorium aber mit einem Hymne’ – foremost as an art project and not as a political project.\textsuperscript{29} This internal conflict had already risen painfully to the surface when the board of the Bauhaus University had expressed its concerns, fearing that ‘the visitors, press, the Jewish community, the State of Israel, the Palestinians and other Arab visitors and Neo-Nazis would not be able to identify it as an art project’.\textsuperscript{30}

Furthermore, the question arises of what kind of population this state would consist of and which language would be spoken in this \textit{Diasporic Utopia}. Eidelman says that the question is difficult to answer because ‘we don’t know who will arrive’. Within this context he mentions Daniel Kahn (from Detroit) and Psoy Korolenko (from Moscow), two modern \textit{klezmorim} (professional Jewish musicians) who already live in Berlin, to illustrate that Jews (and not only Jews) are already coming to Germany. Both musicians are the composers of the hymn that is used as a leader in the promotional video shown at the Berlin exhibition and on the website.\textsuperscript{31}

Nonetheless, Professor Hanne Seitz notes that, although the project began in the real world, with concrete actions (\textit{Handlungsvollzüge}) such as the public manifestation and the Jeep performance, since then ‘nothing has happened in real space’ but only in discourses. By implication, she mentions the multiannual project of the city of \textit{Słubfurt}. Launched in 1999 by Michael Kurzwelly, this project by a German – Polish association strives for the reunification of Frankfurt an der Oder and the Polish town of Słubice on the other side of the river, which used to form a single town until 1945.\textsuperscript{32} This project assumed a real dimension when the name \textit{Słubfurt} was entered into the Register of European City Names (\textsc{recn}) in 2000. Seitz wonders how \textit{Medinat Weimar} project will continue to manifest itself in real life, since actions are indispensable for the

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
creation of identity.\textsuperscript{33} She asks if the music, which has recently played a more important role within the movement, is the path to follow.\textsuperscript{34} Since this question remains unanswered in the panel discussion it seems appropriate to go into the matter here.

**Shpil zhe mir a lidle oyu f YouTube?**

First and foremost, it is important to note that the national anthem of Medinat Weimar is sung in Yiddish. This High German language of Ashkenazi Jewish origin is in often a unifying factor for Jewish identity-formation, especially for secular Jews – not exclusively those with an Eastern-European background – who do not (want to) derive their Jewishness from religious culture or Zionism. The lyrics, as written by Daniel Kahn and Psyo Korolenko are simple: ‘Eynem a tog ‘kh vel oyle zayn, in Eretz Thüringen arayn. Eretz Thüringen! Eretz Thüringen! Eretz Thüringen, vu bist du?’ , which translates as: ‘One day, I want to be a pilgrim/an immigrant, in the Land of Thuringia. The Land of Thuringia! Land of Thuringia, where are you?’\textsuperscript{35}

Two things come to our attention. To begin with, there is no mention of Medinat Weimar, the “Weimar State,” as a twist to the Weimar Republic. Instead we hear of Eretz Thüringen, “Land of Thuringia” as in Eretz Yisrael, the Land of Israel, the biblical name for the Holy Land, which as a concept has been evoked by the founders of the actual State of Israel. Secondly, the word oyle stands out, which is normally used for the Jewish immigrant to Palestine/Israel.

The second stanza goes: ‘Eynem a tog ‘kh vel zoykhe zayn, in Eretz Thüringen arayn. ay yah-yah-ay, in Eretz Thüringen arayn! (One day, I want to be worthy to enter / live to see the Land of Thuringia.) Interestingly, this second stanza is sung as an opening canto by Kahn en Korolenko in the YouTube clip The Internationale greet Medinat Weimar of 2009, though with the Eretz Thüringen re-

\textsuperscript{33} Yael Bartana tried to actively involve outsiders in the identity-building process of the JRMiP by introducing membership cards and recruiting delegates and active participants for the First International Congress.

\textsuperscript{34} Seitz, in the Podiumsgespräch: ‘Die Musik spielt jetzt, glaub ich, seit neuestem mehr ein Rolle, also da will Ich fragen, geht es vielleicht in dieser Richtung weiter, ...dass also Handlungen passiere."

frain in stead of the *ay yah-yah-ay*.\(^36\) Moreover, one hears not *vu* ("woo") *bist du*, as in the promotional video, but *vi* ("wee"), which could be interpreted as a Mideastern (Polish/Galician) or Southeastern (Ukrainian) Yiddish pronunciation of the word for ‘where’, but must be more likely understood as ‘how’, as in “Land of Thuringia, how are you?’, which seems very appropriate for a greeting.\(^37\)

In this clip, first one hears the tune of *The International*, the hymn of international Socialism, being played by Kahn on a music box mechanism. Then follows the anthem, lustily sung by Korolenko and Kahn, who afterwards greet the Congress for a New Jewish state in Thüringen. Next a little speech is held in Yiddish by the two, which they instantly translate into English, Russian, and German, the core being: ‘*Nor mit a nayer un frayer veymarer republik ken man shafni fun daytsland a taytsch-land, un fun eyrope a nay-eyrope*’, which they artistically construed in English as: ‘Only by building a new and free Weimar Republic we can truly make Germany a Jewmany and Europe a Newrope’, while in the German translation Germany is to be made ‘ein Bedeut-Land’, *a meaning-land*, a literal translation of the Yiddish word *taytsch* (meaning) + *land*.

The video session proceeds with a musical transliteration of the poem *Dos naye lid* (The New Song) by Avrom Reyzen (1876–1953), which was first published in 1918.\(^38\) It was translated by Heinz Kahlau (1931–2012) into German for a GDR folk song book.\(^39\) We hear a trilingual performance in Yiddish, German and English of the text *‘Un zol vi vayt nokh zayn di tsayt fun lieb un fun sholem dokh kumen vet, tsi fri, tsi shpet di tsayt – es iz keyn kholem!*\(^40\) The lines that

\(^{36}\) ‘Unternationale greet Medinat Weimar’, video clip (uploaded by amhaaretz on 26 June 2009), YouTube, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AmZHAXlChQ The video description speaks of: ‘Psoy Korolenko and Danik Redlick of the The Unternationale send their greeting to The Movement for a Jewish State in Thuringia, Germany’.


\(^{39}\) Jaldati, Rebling & Kahlau 1966. The German text was published on medinatweimar.org/2008/06/10/anthem-for-medinat-weimar, but has now been removed.

\(^{40}\) The literal translation being: And how long away will be the time of love and peace, but will come too early, too late, the time – it is not a dream.
Kahn sings in English are: ‘The morning breaks, the world awakes to rise and to face the hour. So one and all come hear the call to glory hope and power’.\textsuperscript{41}

In the video description on YouTube we can read that ‘Punk-Cabaret musician Daniel Kahn has recommended this song as the anthem for the movement [of Medinat Weimar]’.\textsuperscript{42} This hymn, often sung in Yiddish schools in the United States, should not be confused with a workers song (of the Jewish Labour Movement) with the same name, as Eidelman probably did when he called it ‘an old Bund freedom song’ in the clip’s description.\textsuperscript{43} As an outro to the clip Kahn wants to declaim Eretz Thüringen again, but quasi-accidentally starts to sing Eretz Yisroel, correcting his mistake promptly with an ‘Oh’, followed by the proper wording, and backed-up vocally by Korolenko.

Music, Language and Image

In the Berlin Podiumgespräch the formative principles of Jewish identity were discussed, as well as the ideological basis for Medinat Weimar, such as the defence against an experienced prosecution, but also a (Non-Zionist) national Jewish awareness, which was fed by the fact that Eastern-European Jewry had an important cultural denominator, namely its own language (Yiddish). Yiddish emerged, after all, as the lingua franca of a large Jewish community in Eastern Europe which renounced Zionism and sought Jewish cultural unity and autonomy in Europe. For this reason it seems logical to choose the mother tongue (mameloshn) of the once prosecuted as one of the official languages (besides German and English) for Medinat Weimar, as Kahn and Korolenko did in their musical tributes. And how does their CD The Internationale relate to the Medinat Weimar, and first and foremost, what is and concerns this so-called Internationale?

Language and music appertain to the foremost of five areas of Jewish experience: Jewish culture and tradition. The others are: Israel (Zionism), Shoah (Holocaust), personal history and local culture and background.\textsuperscript{44} The interest in klezmer music and especially Yiddish songs provided a bonding mechanism for Jewish identity throughout the twentieth century. From the late 1970s there was a klezmer revival in the United States and Europe. Singing in Yiddish

\begin{footnotes}
\item[41] See for another English version by Gus Tyler: Mlotek 1997.
\end{footnotes}
was propagated in the U.S. by Michael Alpert, Adrienne Cooper, and in Europe by Ben Zimet and Manfred Lemm, amongst many others. Although the old guard certainly has not disappeared from the scene, since the beginning of the twenty-first century a second klezmer revival is going on.

This revival is characterized by a multitude of styles and backgrounds among the musicians, coming from all corners from the world, but principally operating from Germany. The musical genres range from pop (Fayvish), heavy metal (Gevolt), glam rock (Yiddish Princess), disco (Jewrythmics), electro (Jewishyssee) to folk punk (The Painted Bird), while still more authentic, classical and jazz variants of klezmer prevail. The success of some of these peculiar klezmer crossovers could be explained by internet-globalism which guarantees the existence of such cultural niches.

The participation of non-Jews in the formation of Jewish identity, as intended by Eidelman, is already happening in the musical world. Sometimes this overt multiculturalism is very much cultivated. Geoff Berner for instance has released a modern Chinese version of the classic song Mayn Rue Plats (My Resting Place) by Morris Rosenfeld (1862–1923). It is no coincidence that Berner and his compatriot Benjy Fox-Rosen, are considered participants of the so-called Klezmer Bund founded by Daniel Kahn. Sometimes called “Alienation Klezmer Bund” or “Verfremdungsklezmer Bund” by Kahn, Rokhl Kafriessen recognized it as ‘an overt nod to Brecht’s theory of Verfremdungseffekt’. There is a song about this organization on the CD Lost Causes (2010) by Daniel Kahn & The Painted Bird, backed-up by a chorus of famous klezmer musicians.

Although Kahn and Eidelman share a fascination for alienation, and both are clearly antifascist, Kahn seems more actively involved in the leftist/anarchist protest movement. We have already noted that Eidelman was not against the State of Israel, but is this also the case for Kahn and Korolenko? Their CD The Internationale – a combined artistic effort with the band Oy Division – features a Russo-English translation of the song Oy, ir narishe tsienistn (“Oh, You

---

45 See for this phenomenon in Poland: Waligórska 2005.
47 http://geoffberner.com/?page_id=2.“They represent the flowering of a reborn radical Jewish culture, what Berner’s tour mate Daniel Kahn of Berlin band The Painted Bird calls the “Klezmer Bund”.
48 Kafriessen 2009, s.p. She is working on a book called The Myth of the Yiddish Atlantis.
Foolish Little Zionists”). This socialist folksong was first recorded November 26, 1930 in Kiev by the ethnomusicologist Moshe Beregovski (1892–1961), as sung by house painter Ts. Lachman Gersh of Medzhybozhe (Ukraine).

The album title, The Internationale, not only seems to allude to the socialist song The International, but is also a clear reference to the International Workingmen’s Association (1864–1876), often called the First International, since a similar wording, ‘The First Uninternational’, appears on the front page of the CD booklet. An anti-Semitic caricature is depicted on this cover, showing a hook-nosed, bearded man, wearing a golden crown with a golden calf on top, who grasps a world globe with his bony fingers which resemble a bat’s talons (Fig. 11.48).

This recycled political cartoon, Rothschild, drawn by Charles-Lucien Léandre (1862–1930, was first published in the French satirical magazine Le Rire on April 16, 1898 (Fig. 11.5). Often thought to depict the then long deceased Jakob Mayer Rothschild (1792–1868), founder of the French branch of the Rothschild family bank, this ghastly figure is more likely to represent a more general image of the “Jewish Threat”, epitomized by the Rothschild family, considering the inscription on the aureole which reads “DIEV PRO[TÈGE] ISRAEL” (May God protect Israel). According to Jean-Michel Renault ‘le banquier Rothschild représente l’archétype du juif capitaliste dont l’ambition est de s’accaparer toutes les richesses du monde’.

Arguably depicting a specific member of the prominent banking family, this iconic “predatory Jew”, who stretches his demonic hands around the globe, is often associated with the idea of a Jewish conspiracy to take over the world, and has repeated itself ever since in pictorial tradition of caricature. Fredrik Strömberg suggests a temporal connection with the propaganda book The Protocols of the Elders of Zion, an elaborate anti-Semitic hoax – though that was only first published in Russian in 1906. The book purports to document the

53 Rosenberg 1960, facing p. 135. (Often recognized as a portrait “Mayer” Rothschild – there were several with that second name – and sometimes wrongly attributed to Gustave Doré) See: Freedman 2008, p. 49.
54 Renault 2006.
‘YOU WANT TO TAKE US TO JERUSALEM ...’

Figure 11.4a, b Covers of the gatefold and booklet of the CD The Internationale. AURIS MEDIA RECORDS, AUM014, 2008.
minutes of a secret conference of Jewish leaders discussing their goal of global Jewish hegemony.56 A French edition of the book from the 1930s indeed shows a figure in a similar pose as Léandre’s Rothschild (Fig. 11.6).57

The artwork designers, Victor Levin and Chen Langer, have connected a speech balloon to Rothschild’s mouth that reads ‘Pleased to meet you’ in Yiddish, Russian and English, followed by ‘hope you guess my name ...’, referring to the first song of the CD, Rakhmones afn tayfl, a klezmer version of the Stones’ song Sympathy for the Devil.58 The front cover picture shows a modified woodcut from a seventeenth-century book, The World Turned Upside Down, showing

56 Cohn 1966; Segel 1996.
57 See: De Michielis 2004, p. 403; and in Dutch: Smelik 2010, p. 205, Fig. 15.
58 Credited in the liner notes of The Internationale as: ‘After reb Mikhl Jagger’.
a bulbous figure standing on his head (Fig. 11.4A). In the globe-like belly of this topsy-turvy personification a star of David has been inserted, thus literally putting the concept of “International Jewry” upside down. While the title of the CD seems to hint on an undisclosed leftwing assembly, another fling with Socialism (or rather Bundism) is suggested by the red colouring of the flag which had already appeared (though blank) on the original woodcut, as well as by the red banner on the backside of the gatefold.

So, is there only a blatant anti-Zionist significance to the lyrics or is there more to it? The first two original stanzas are in Yiddish, the same as in the original song. They are followed with Kahn’s very free translation: ‘Oh you foolish little Zionist/ With your utopian mentality/ You’d better go down the fac-

---

tery/ And learn the worker’s reality. // You want to take us to Jerusalem/ So we can die as a nation/ We’d rather stay in the Diaspora/ And fight (work/wait) four our liberation’. In the liner notes an asterisk is put after this last sentence which calls out a footnote stating ‘this could also be sung as “and work for assimilation” or “and wait for annihilation,” depending on one’s political intention and/or historical perspective’.

An amateur video clip of a performance on 24 March 2011 in Beit Avi Hai, Jerusalem, proves that this remark did not remain a dead letter, since it shows Kahn repeating the comment and singing both variations of the refrain, together with Korolenko.60 Kahn introduces the song: ‘And we’ll sing it in combination with another song, which is its dialectical opposite. And you can maybe make a synthesis out of it, but probably not’.61 He refers to the hymn Ikh heyb oyf mayn hand un ikh shver (“I raise my hand up and I swear”) of the Beitar Movement, a Revisionist Zionist youth organization founded in 1923 in Riga, Latvia, by Vladimir (Ze’ev) Jabotinsky (1880–1940).62 The song also appears as number 5a on the CD The Uninternationale, directly followed by song 5b Di Hofnung (“The Hope”), an English translation of Hatikvah, the national anthem of Israel.63

So we can state with certainty that The Uninternationale is definitely not anti-Zionist, nor specifically Bundist for that matter, and its political scheme is more a kind of utopian shpileray, as is the case with Medinat Weimar. Both Medinat Weimar and the Uninternationale seem deliberately to respond to the fear of Jewish world power in humoristic way, which is perhaps the binding component. It is significant that Eidelman addresses the fear among the indigenous inhabitants of Thuringia by reassuring them that the Weimar Onion Market (Zwiebelmarkt) will not be cancelled, in contrast to the Weimar Klezmer

60 ‘Psyo Korolenko and Daniel Kahn, “Oy, you foolish Zionists”, videoclip (uploaded by TheShenbuv on 1 April, 2011), YouTube, http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dEZFPNRp6Q at 0:15–0:25
63 Credited as: ‘The original Yiddish Beitar Song from the 1930s. Recorded in 2005 in Brest from Mikhail Lantshevitsky by Dmitry Slepovich and Nina Stepanskaya. Transl. into English by Daniel Kahn, into Russian by Psyo Korolenko’. For the poem HaTiq’vah by Naphtali Herz Imber (1856–1909), see the liner notes and for its English translation by Jacob Goodman: Bradford Boni 1947.
Festival, for which there will no longer be any need when the New Jerusalem has been established.64
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