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The juxtaposition of historical and architectural evidence supports the possibility of seclusion practice in the church proper. This hypothesis is valid for both the Byzantine Empire and Old Rus’. Seclusion in a church led to a higher authority and religious status of an ascetic. The structural pair of a cell and a chapel above it was introduced into a number of Middle Byzantine, mediaeval Serbian and Old Russian monuments. Idiosyncratic features of this module suggest its development for the specific needs of recluse imitating the life of a styliste.
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The Byzantine church is a highly flexible structure, architectural components of which may vary significantly from one monument to another. The overall typology invented by scholars to facilitate analysis and juxtaposition of the buildings does not preclude crucial internal modifications, differentiating the churches within a common type. However, the role of these variables, i.e. peripheral bays, enveloping the liturgical core of a church, is still underestimated and needs a thorough complex study. Several important reviews and fundamental works concerning chapels, upper-story chambers and ambulatories have already been published.1 Some studies, such as that of V. Marinis of the Middle and Late Byzantine churches of Constantinople, endeavored to define the liturgical and non-liturgical use of the enveloping structures.2 However, this major and promising theme of the history of Byzantine architecture still has its lacunae. One of them concerns the chambers integrated into the body of a church, which display idiosyncratic features, distinguishing them from other functional parts of the church complex, such as chapel, baptistery, library, metatorion, skueophylakion, prothesis and diaconicon.

This lacuna has begun to be filled in by S. Ćurčić for Byzantine and Serbian monuments and V. Sarabianov for the churches in Old Rus’.3 They put forward the hypothesis that certain outstanding monks of a special status in the ecclesiastical hierarchy may have entered the seclusion in a church proper, so a special chamber-cell needed to be assigned for their habitation and prayer. Unfortunately, neither of the scholars was able to finish his research. In this article and in my previous papers I would like to continue their work on exploring the possibility for a monk to be secluded in a ‘solitary monastic cell’ or ‘hiesichasterion’

* This research has been completed thanks to the funding from the Russian Foundation of Basic Research, project #19-012-00311 “St. Sophia cathedral in Polotsk. The building, its history and architecture.”
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2 V. Marinis, Architecture and ritual in the churches of Constantinople: ninth to fifteenth centuries, New York 2014. The emphasis on the functions of the peripheral bays was made also in the following major works: Babić, Les chapelles annexes (on the chapels); Schellewald, Zur Typologie (on the upper-story chambers); Chatzichristou, Το περίπτωση στην υστεροβυζαντινή εκκλησιαστική αρχιτεκτονική (on the ambulatories). (on prothesis and diaconicon).

3 S. Ćurčić, Monastic cells in Medieval Serbian church towers: survival of an early Byzantine monastic concept and its meaning, in: Sophia. Škornik stolat po iskusstvu Vizantii i Drevne Rusi v chest’ A. I. Komecha, ed. A. I. Batalov et al., Moskva 2006, 491–512; idem, ‘Living icons’ in Byzantine churches: image and practice in Eastern Christianity, in: Prostranstvennye ikony: performativnoe v Vizantii i Drevnei Rusi, ed. A. Lidov, Moskva 2011, 192–212; idem, Dukonikon kao isposnica: pitanje posebних namena u monaškoj crkvenoj arhitekturi Srbije i Vizantije, in: ΣΥΜΜΕΙΚΤΑ: Collection of papers dedicated to the 40th anniversary of the Institute for Art History, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, ed. I. Stevović, Belgrade 2012, 191–209; V. D. Sarab’yanov, K voprosu o funkciional’nom naznachenii palatok na khorakh Spaso–Preobrazhenskago pomeshchenii Sankt-Peterburg, 1911, 177–194; idem, Pomeshcheniia vetrogo etazha v drevnerusskikh i grkovskikh khvilkh, ikh funkciyi i skopei, in: V svezvedii L’va sbornik svet stolat po drevnerusskomu iskusstvu v chest’ L’va Isaakovicha Lifshita, ed. M. A. Orlova, Moskva 2014, 436–439.
within the church proper. To make the next steps in investigating this issue I propose to examine several monuments and written sources, which I believe could clarify the basic features of this monastic practice and reconstruct its local characteristics in Byzantium and Old Rus’ from the ninth to the thirteenth century. Moreover, such a study of the architectural setting and historical context of this phenomenon is necessary for interpreting and verifying several written testimonies on eminent ascetics, inferring their dwelling within a church. This evidence gains even more importance since it informs us on the lives of prominent historical figures and monuments playing a key role in the history of Eastern Christian architecture, such as St. Symeon Nemanja and his cell near the church of Annunciation of the Vatopedi monastery on Mt. Athos and St. Euphrosyne of Polotsk, who initially lived in the main cathedral of her land, St. Sophia of Polotsk, and then moved to the cell in the church of the Saviour at her own monastery.

The extant examples of monastic solitary cells or hesychasterions in monuments with preserved fresco paintings reveal their direct juxtaposition with images of the stylites. This is true for the church of the Theotokos Peribleptos in Mystras from the third quarter of the fourteenth century and the church of the Saviour – Transfiguration in the monastery of Euphrosyne of Polotsk from the second quarter – middle of the twelfth century, to name just a few. This cross-reference of a stylite image and a church chamber made it possible to associate the integration of a special bay into the structure of the church building with the intention of its ktor or a monk favored by the former to emulate the life of the ancient stylites. That is why to fully appreciate the middle Byzantine phenomenon of seclusion in a church one should study its origins in the Late Antique / Early Christian stylite tradition.

In the fifth century the first stylites appeared in the Syrian lands. They were the ones who chose the space between the heavens and the earth as a place of their faith. To accomplish it they mounted a pillar. The symbolic component of living on a pillar became the defining moment for the tradition under consideration. The pillar, as attested by the Vita of stylite saints, was a symbol of renunciation of all mundane affiliations, ascending of a faith. To accomplish it they mounted a pillar. The symeon of seclusion in a church one should study its origins from case to case.

L. Schachner has emphasized the ambiguity of the term ‘stylite’ in contemporaneous and later texts in Copitic, Syriac, Greek and Slavonic. In Syriac the term ‘pillar’ (esṭunā) may designate both column and tower. The stylites were called esṭunāyē or esṭunātē, and the resemblance of pillar and tower, as argued by the scholar, may explain their semantic interchangeability in Syriac texts. Therefore, from the very beginnings of this tradition the ascetics who chose to live in a tower were also perceived as stylites due to their elevated position. Though, of course, mounting a column was far more striking and inevitably a more venerable act. Hence the stylite tradition may be considered in close connection with the seclusion practice. Indeed, the majority of written sources mentioning the design of a pillar testify that there was a small cabin at the top of a column, where the ascetic lived. The presence of a roof, however, was not necessary. In some cases a window is mentioned, which a stylite could open or not according to his own wishes.

There are a lot of extant stylite towers in varying degrees of preservation. Within the frontiers of late antique Syria scholars have counted approximately one hundred freestanding monastic towers built for seclusion purposes. As a rule, such towers were multi-storied. The cell of the recluse and a chapel was situated on the upper floors, the lower floor functioned either as a future burial place, or as a cell for the stylite’s disciples. The towers were accompanied by stylite columns. L. Schachner offers a captivating picture of the Syrian landscape: the three-dimensional model of the former made on the basis of the archaeological data on the pillars shows that “a traveler on the Roman road from Antioch to Dānā and Chalcis / Beroea would have found himself, whether willing or not, within the visual range of a holy man for over 10 km or 2 to 3 hours travel and never more than 2.4 km distant from the next pillar ascetic.”

This evidence leaves no doubts about the popularity of the stylite vocation. The institutionalization of the monastic movement began in the very first century of its existence. Besides the communities of admirers later transformed into fixed monastic establishments, settled near the pillar of the most prominent stylites, such as St. Daniel and St. Symeon the Younger, some monasteries introduced this practice, seeing the necessity of having their own ‘holy man’. John of Ephesus in his ‘Lives of Eastern Saints’ tells the legend of the brothers Abraham and
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4 A. Freze, Monastyrskaiï arhitektura i traditsiïi stil'nistchestva v Vizantiï i drevneï Rusi v IX – nachale XIII veka, in: Aktual'nye problemy teori i istorii iskusstva: sbornik nauchnykh statey, ed. A. V. Zakharova, S. V. Mal'Geva, Sankt-Peterburg 2014, 90–98; eadem, Practicing the solitary life in Constantinople and provinces in the 9th – early 13th centuries: on the possibility of seclusion in a church of a monastery, in: The city and the cities, from Constantinople to the frontier. Proceedings of the Oxford University Byzantine Society’s XVI International Graduate Conference 2014, Oxford 2014, 42. I became aware of the theses of N. Stanković, Dwelling within the holy: accommodation of a monastic cell in the katechoumena at the Great Lavra (Mount Athos) and other middle Byzantine monasteries, in: Proceedings of the 23rd International Congress of Byzantine Studies: thematic sessions of free communications, Belgrade 2016, 760–761 only when revising this article for publication. As per the theses the researcher addresses the same issues, though illustrating them with a number of different examples.

5 S. Ashbrook Harvey, The sense of a stylite: perspectives on Symeon the Elder, Vigiliae Christianae 42/4 (1988) 376–394.

6 S. Ashbrook Harvey, The sense of a stylite: perspectives on Symeon the Elder, Vigiliae Christianae 42/4 (1988) 376–394.

7 L. A. Schachner, The archaeology of the stylite, in: Religious diversity in Late Antiquity, ed. D. Gwynn, S. Bangert, Leiden–Boston 2010, 329–397.

8 V. Menze, The transformation of a saintly paradigm: Symeon the Elder and the legacy of stylitism, in: Religious identities in the Levant from Alexander to Muhammad: continuity and change, ed. M. Blömer, A. Lichtenberger, R. Raja, Turnhout 2015, 213–226.

9 H. Delehaye, Les saints stylites, Bruxelles 1923, CLII–CLX.

10 Ćurčić, Monastic cells, 507.

11 S. Popović, ‘The Byzantine monastery: its spatial iconography and the question of sacredness’, in: Ieropotipoi: sozidanje sakral'nikh prostranstv v Vizantiï i drevneï Rusi, ed. A. Lidow, Moskva 2006, 167–168.

12 Schachner, The archaeology of the stylite, 379.

13 Menze, The transformation of a saintly paradigm, 220–224.
Maro. In the vicinity of their monastery there was a high column, which was mounted by monks in defined succession in order to become stylites. Abraham earned the right to ascend the column after ten years of hard labour. This tale shows that monasteries which managed a pillar existed already in the sixth century, and stylitism was not only a vocation, but also a special status to be earned by the preceding deeds.14

Already in the early Byzantine period the pillar / tower could be not only an isolated construction, but also a part of the monastic complex, even incorporated into the structure of a church. H. Butler suggested that upper-story chambers in some Syrian church towers, either flanking the altar of a church or forming its western façade, may have been used by hermits.15 However, this suggestion was criticized by B. Schellewald, due to the absence of the equipment in such chambers necessary for dwelling of a secluded monk. She emphasized that only the Theotokos church of Schêch Sleimân of the fifth century was equipped with a 'latrine', located in the northeastern upper-story chamber, and therefore, the practice of seclusion in towers of a church was not widespread in Syrian lands.16 Nevertheless, one should not underestimate the level of self-mortification of the early ascetics, one of the extreme forms of which is demonstrated by the contemporaneous Coptic tradition of walling up hermits to lead a life of complete isolation. Such elevated cells without a door had only a small hole for communication.17

R. Morris points to the rare references to the stylites in the hagiographic literature of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Only two full Viteae of the stylites from the Middle Byzantine period are extant, that of St. Luke of Chalcedon and of Lazaros of Mt. Galesion. The scholar explains the reduction in the number by the fact that the lives of recluses more often adapted to the so-called 'hybrid' form of monasticism. The traditional eremia of a styline was being replaced by their active involvement in the everyday affairs of a nearby monastery, and the stylites became a symbol of spiritual leadership, earned by the most outstanding among the monastic brethren.18 However, these arguments need to be modified. Today ten Viteae of stylites survive. Three of them, those of Timothy of Kâkhushâtâ (d. ca. 830), Luke of Chalcedon (d. 979) and Lazarus of Mt. Galesion (d. 1054), belong to the period from the ninth to the eleventh century, and the rest to earlier times.19 Taking into account the Byzantine Empire's loss of extensive territories in Syria and Egypt and evidence on stylites from other written sources, such as descriptions of pilgrims' travels to the Holy Land, we should not claim a dramatic decrease in popularity of this monastic vocation. It may be that, just as the Byzantine society became so closely acquainted with the stylites, this phenomenon lost its striking effect on the pious Byzantines, albeit retaining its highly venerable status for both laymen and monks. Niketas Choniates' account of the rebellion against Isaac II in 1187 testifies to this. According to the Byzantine historian the emperor took all possible steps in order to remain on the throne. He even invited to the palace 'the monks, who walk barefoot, who sleep on earth and who elevate themselves closer to the sun on the columns'.20 This testimony supports the continuation of the styline tradition in Constantinople at the end of the twelfth century.

In the Middle Byzantine period the tradition of a hegoumenos-styline, begun by St. Daniel and St. Symeon the Younger, was further developed. One of such hegoumoi, St. Luke of Chalcedon, was born in 879 and lived for one hundred years, according to his Vita. He spent the last forty years of his life living on a column on the sea shore near Constantinople. St. Luke began his vocation in one of the major monastic centers – Mount Olympos. Already in Chalcedon Patriarch Theophylact, who was healed by the styline, visited him frequently. The Vita speaks of how St. Luke, on the patriarch's request, undertook the revival of the monastery of St. Bassianos, which had been founded in the fifth century in the Deuteron quarter of the capital and almost immediately attracted 300 monks.21 However, by the tenth century the monastery had declined. The work of the styline was successful, and he was named its second ktetor, considered worthy of burial in the katholikon.22 The Vita does not give the details of the monastery's renewal, although it is obvious that the intervention of the saint involved more than mere financing.

Evidence from the tenth century testifies that to be called a 'styline' one was no longer required to mount a column, or even arrange a cell in a tower – climbing a steep rock would have been enough. This was the case of St. Paul the Young, the founder of the monastery of the Theotokos of Stylos on Mount Latros, one of the so-called 'holy mountains'. Scholars have dated its foundation to the 920–930s. The area of the monastic establishment was divided into two parts separated by a brick wall. In the western, larger part, the majority of brethren lived according to communal rules and in the eastern part the cave of St. Paul the Young was located, surrounded underneath by the cells of his closest disciples – hermits.23

The last Vita of a styline describes the life and feats of Lazaros of Mount Galesian, born in 966 near Ephesus and died on Mt. Galesion in 1054. He was the founder and hegoumenos of three monasteries on the mountain, which was located in the vicinity of Ephesus. His Vita offers several crucial, but still ambiguous details for the reconstruction of a hesihasterion in the body of a church. Therefore, his life is worthy of a closer examination. His Vita states that Lazaros wished to be a monk since he was twelve years old. His innermost dream was to visit

14 D. T. M. Frankfurter, Stylites and phalloibates: pillar religions in Late Antique Syria, Vigiliae Christianae 44/2 (1990) 185.
15 H. C. Butler, Early churches in Syria, forth to seventh centuries, Princeton 1929, 211.
16 Schellewald, Zur Typologie, 208–209.
17 Popović, The Byzantine monastery, 163–164.
18 R. Morris, Monks and laymen in Byzantium, 843–1118, New York 1995, 60–61.
19 Schachner, The archaeology of the styline, 330–332.
20 P. Magdalino, The Byzantine holy man in the twelfth century, in: The Byzantine saint, ed. S. Hackel, Crestwood – New York 2001, 60; Delehaye, Les saints stylites, CXLI.
21 P. Hatlie, The monks and monasteries of Constantinople, ca. 350–850, Cambridge 2011, 154–159.
22 Delehaye, Les saints stylites, LXXXVI–CV.
23 A. Kirby, Z. Mercangia, The monasteries of Mt Latros and their architectural development, in: Work and worship at the Theotokos Evergetis, 1050–1200, ed. M. Mullet, A. Kirby, Belfast 1997, 67–69.
the Holy Land. To accomplish this he repeatedly tried to run away from home. Finally, at the age of eighteen he reached Jerusalem (991 at the earliest), became a monk in the monastery of St. Sabas and then moved on to the monastery of St. Euthymios. The events of 1009, when the church of the Holy Sepulchre was destroyed on the orders of the Fatimid caliph al-Hakim, may have been the main reason for Lazaros’ return to his homeland. On his route back he visited the ‘Wondrous Mountain’ in Antioch to see the place where St. Symeon the Younger had lived as a styliste in the sixth century. On his return from the Holy Land circa 1010, Lazaros found a small hermitage near Ephesus dedicated to St. Marina, in which two hermits lived. With their help he built a pillar, on which he lived for seven years, and during this time his fame spread all over the land. However, the location of the hermitage near the main road to the city of Ephesus and his growing popularity forced Lazaros to leave the place and search for a calmer dwelling on the wild mountain Galesion. On this mountain the three monasteries of Lazaros were founded one after the other. The monastery of the Saviour was the first. It grew around the cave where Lazaros lived. However, soon his disciples constructed a pillar for him; there he stayed for twelve years. The monastery of the Theotokos was the second one, situated higher on the mountain. The third, still higher, monastery was dedicated to the Resurrection, and there Lazaros spent the rest of his life, also as a styliste. According to the Vita of Lazaros all three monasteries were communal ones, though there certain members could become recluses, including a styliste, by occupying one of the vacant pillars left after Lazaros had gone to the next monastery. The author of the Vita specifically mentioned that it was possible to become a recluse only after receiving permission from Lazaros, and many could not obtain it.

The Vita of Lazaros contains a lot of direct and indirect evidence on the construction of his pillars. Unfortunately, no traces of Lazaros’ monasteries have been found on the mountain. That is why only hypothetical reconstructions are possible, which is not to say that they are not necessary, since there are few data on the architectural aspect of the stylites’ abodes in the middle Byzantine period. Lazaros lived in a cell at the top of his pillars, neither of which had a roof, so the styliste was always exposed to all kinds of weather. The walls of his cell were not high, and when Lazaros stood, he was visible for those being in front of the pillar. Apparently, the latter was not tall, since Lazaros could communicate with monks or laymen standing below. A wooden ladder led to a platform constructed before his cell. There the majority of conversations between the styliste and his visitors took place. From the platform they could not see the styliste, unless he opened a little window overlooking the platform. This window was big enough for one to lean in or out of the cell. There are no clear data on the size of the cell, but chapter 235 of the Vita tells that its width was approximately two feet wide (‘three spans’). Lazaros slept on a specially constructed chair, and also there was a certain place to accommodate bodily functions, since the styliste did not descend from his pillar, except when he proceeded to the next one.

A small hermitage partially preserved among a great number of caves on mount Latros may be useful for a reconstruction of Lazaros’s pillars, if any of them was a freestanding building. Mount Latros is located not far from Galesion to the south from Ephesus. This hermitage, known as Sobran Kalesi, has not been accurately dated, but A. Kirby and Z. Mercangöz have proposed that it could be placed in the Middle Byzantine period. It consisted of a tower, a church, a building of unknown function and a cave. The single-aisled church has preserved only its eastern part. The tower is preserved better. Since the entrance to the tower is at the first storey, the only way its barrel-vaulted chamber could be reached was by a ladder. The tower may have offered refuge for monks in time of danger, but according to the researchers it is more likely to have served as the cell for one of the monks of the hermitage.

The Vita describes lots of everyday activities of Lazaros, but most importantly it allows the suggestion that the pillar may have been a part of the church. In several chapters (157, 207, 225) the action takes place in the church, which is hard to explain without presuming that the pillar was incorporated into the building. Chapter 249 mentions another small window which looked towards or into the church. This fact, along with several other pieces of evidence, was used by H. Delehaye and R. Greenfield to suppose that this window looked into the naos of the church, so Lazaros could see everything that was happening inside and even participate in the liturgy. Such a construction would not have precluded the necessity of a ladder and platform for daily communication with the hegumenoi.

One of the first anchorite-hegumenoi secluded within the confines of the monastic establishment may have been a certain Anthimos – the abbot of the Constantinopolitan monastery Dalmatou in the middle of the sixth century. The following anchorite-hegumenoi are also mentioned in the sources: Platon the Stoudite, Stephen the Younger, Peter of Atroa, Athanasios and Paul from Latros, Lazaros from Galesion and others. It is worth noting here that in the middle of the eleventh century the same problem of combining the seemingly incompatible monastic callings of a hegumenos and a recluse were in the process of being solved in Constantinople. One of the solutions implied the presence of two hegumenoi in charge of a monastery – the senior would become a recluse, and the junior was responsible for organizing the daily life of the community. This model was introduced in the monastery of John and Philotheos at Anaplous, founded in the second quarter of the eleventh century on the European shore of Constantinople, the very place of the feat of St. Daniel the Stylite. John and Philotheos both became the hegumenoi of the monastery; however, the latter chose to live in seclusion. This arrangement of governance by two hegumenoi was still alive in the middle of the eleventh century.
dle of the twelfth century. Timothy, the second ktetor of the famous Evergetis monastery and the author of its rule, was a recluse himself. His first intention was to provide for two hegoumenoi for the monastery: one a recluse, another responsible for everyday life. After the death of the senior hegoumenos, the junior one was to become a recluse himself, and a monk from the brethren was to be elected as the second hegoumenos. However, Timothy later decided to remove this stipulation and made provision for a single hegoumenos, who may or may not become a recluse, depending on his inclination only.31

Speaking about Constantinople and possible architectural structures to accommodate recluses, two monuments should be mentioned, which, to my knowledge, have not been examined from this standpoint yet. The first one is Kalender(i)hane Camii, the extant building of which is dated to the turn of the twelfth century (fig. 1). Already in 1932 N. Brunov argued that at least the northern corner sections of the building had three levels. It was impossible to investigate the southern corner sections, as both had been significantly altered. The upper space of the north-western section is clearly divided into areas: the walls of the lower area form a square; the upper area was made as a quatrefoil and may have functioned as a chapel. 32

L. Theis agreed with these suggestions. She was able to find a projection of masonry between the two mentioned areas, which allowed her to presume the presence of a wooden floor separating them. The scholar also notes the presence of a flat dome covering the upper quatrefoil area, an additional indication of its special liturgical status.33 This hypothesis should also be verified in relation to its possible connection with the stylite tradition. This architectural arrangement may have been intended for a prominent recluse, whose cell was located on the lower floor and his private chapel on the upper. The quatrefoil plan of the upper corner bay and its dome undoubtedly emphasizes its functional specifics, such an articulation would not have been implemented for a mere structural element. The two-storeyed ambulatories flanking the church and stair towers may have provided access to this elevated area.34 In addition, S. Ćurčić identified another architectural arrangement within the highly complicated structure of the complex of Kalenderhane Camii, which may have been intended for seclusion purposes. The scholar suggested that the so-called ‘icons chapel’, abutted upon the south side of the ‘Melismos chapel’, was built as the hesichasterion of a high-status monk, or even a pair of relatives, which after his/her death was to be trans-
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30 M. Angold, ‘Monastic satire and the Evergetine monastic tradition in the twelfth century’, in: The Theotokos Evergetis and eleventh-century monasticism, ed. M. Mullet, A. Kirby, Belfast 1994, 89–91.
31 Byzantine monastic foundation documents: a complete translation of the surviving founders’ typika and testaments, ed. J. Thomas, A. Constantinides Hero, Washington 2000, 454–506.
32 N. Brunov, Zur Erforschung der byzantinischen Baudenkmäler von Konstantinopel, BZ 32/1 (1932) 55–57.
33 Theis, Flankenräume im mittelbyzantinischen Kirchenbau, 145–146.
34 Ibid., 145–146; N. Brunov, Arkhitektura Konstantinopola IX–XII vv., VV 2 (1949) 159–160.
formed into a funeral chamber (fig. 2). The extant fresco painting which includes images of the monastic hierarchs: St Anthony, St. Onuphrius, St. John Damascene and St. Cosmas the Melodist, St. John Climacus, and partially preserved compositions of the Assumption and Resurrection, is used by the scholar to prove his hypothesis. This insertion of the ‘icons chapel’ into the south-eastern area of the church and its decoration have been tentatively dated by S. Striker and Y. Kuban to the second half of the thirteenth century.

The functional purpose of the spaces located in the eastern piers of Gül Camii, a monument with several Byzantine construction stages from the eleventh till the fourteenth centuries (fig. 3), still remains unclear. Both chambers were placed between the upper and lower storeys of the church, and small winding stairs built into the piers led to these spaces. B. Schellewald believed they were used as a concealed treasury to store relics. However, I propose to examine them as a possible place for seclusion. L. Theis argued that these small spaces appeared as the result of the rebuilding undertaken in the Palaiologan period. The layout of the initial building stage, which is dated to the eleventh century, implied a cross-in-square church with flanking ambulatories. In the second stage

the church was significantly reshaped. Gül Camii became two-storied through the whole perimeter by introducing galleries with chapels at their eastern ends. To support the galleries several openings of the corner sections of the eastern and western walls were mured to form four massive piers. Into the eastern pair of the piers the chambers in question were integrated. It is important to note that these bays each had a small window looking into the altar space, and a round opening towards the chapels at the eastern ends of the galleries. Thus, this arrangement may be associated with the model of a cell with a chapel above.

A church located at Küçükyali near Istanbul, tentatively associated by A. Ricci with the monastery of Satyros founded by Patriarch Ignatios in the second half of the ninth century had a similar layout of the eastern part. (fig. 4). As in Gül Camii the central apse was flanked by two bays on both sides, but the inner ones were designed as rectangular chambers, and the outer ones as chapels with apses. S. Ćurčić argued that at least the southern rectangular bay could have served as the abode of a recluse. The bay was separated by a thin wall (ca. 0.25 m) from the southern chapel which probably contained an arcosolium niche in its southern wall. Access to the bay was provided only from the altar space through a wooden door. It was
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35 Ćurčić, Dukomikon kao isposnica, 205–208.
36 Kalenderhane in Istanbul: the buildings, their history, architecture and decoration, ed. C. L. Striker, Y. Doğan Kuban, Mainz am Rhein 1997, 87, 149.
37 Schellewald, Zur Typologie, 216.
38 Ibid., 204–205.
39 A. Ricci, The road from Baghdad to Byzantium and the case of the Bryas palace in Istanbul, in: Byzantium in the ninth century: dead or alive?, ed. L. Brubaker, Aldershot 1998, 148.
likely that the southern wall of the rectangular chamber had a small window towards the southern chapel.\footnote{Ćurčić, Đakonikon kao isposnica, 204–205.}

The reviewed examples of special architectural arrangements, introduced into the mentioned Byzantine monuments alongside the usual features of the Byzantine architectural model of a church, reveal two distinct spatial characteristics of such chambers. They should either occupy an elevated position within the gallery level, or abut upon the altar space. However, the eastern cells of Gül Camii managed to combine both features. To illustrate this phenomenon I will turn to the monuments of medieval Serbia, which provide the scholar studying the architectural implications of stylitism with a firmer ground.

The Serbian tradition has been thoroughly explored by S. Ćurčić. First of all, the scholar examined a group of church towers of mediaeval Serbian monuments, which formed a part of their western façade, including the church of the Ascension in the Žiča monastery (exonarthex and tower – between 1219 and 1233–1234), the church of the Holy Trinity in the Sopoćani monastery (exonarthex and tower – after the second half of the thirteenth century), the church of Bogorodica Ljeviška in Prizren (completed in 1309–1310), the church of Theotokos at Peć (narthex and tower – ca. 1324–1330) and the church of St. Stephen (Lazarica) in Krusevac (1377/1378–1380). All towers had a similar multi-storey arrangement. The first level was executed as a monumental entrance to the church; the chamber on the second level may have been used as a hesichasterion; the third level accommodated a chapel, while the bells were set in the top section of a tower.\footnote{Idem, Monastic cells, 491–502.}

The Žiča tower was the monument to inspire the construction of the towers which followed (fig. 5). The hesichasterion of the first Serbian archbishop Sava I (St. Sava) was at the second level of the tower, and there he withdrew when he decided to step down from the archbishop’s throne. This chamber was never decorated; it had a wooden ceiling, which functioned also as the floor of the chapel above. The two bays were connected to each other by a wooden ladder. The partially preserved fresco painting shows an elaborate program, including representations of St. Sabas of Jerusalem and St. Theodore the Studite. The life and experience of these Byzantine saints were the reference points for St. Sava in establishing the Serbian Orthodox church, and he was named Sava (Sabas) after the former. Thus, S. Ćurčić assumed that this architectural arrangement of the Žiča tower represents the private chapel and hesichasterion of St. Sava, where ‘elevated, in an exalted position, yet in the humblest of existential circumstances, the holy man would have been emulating the lifestyle of the great monastic fathers – St. Antony walled up in a tower tomb, St. Symeon the Elder standing on top of a column, or St. Sabas of Jerusalem sequestered in a monastic tower’\footnote{Ibid., 494. Here it should be mentioned that St. Sabas of Jerusalem was not a permanent recluse within the walls of his tower.}.
The second phenomenon, that of the south-eastern corner bays, which were accessed only though the sanctuary area, is far more complex and still needs some additional arguments. The scholar proposed that a number of mediaeval Serbian and Byzantine monuments with limited access to their south-eastern corner bays should be examined as probable monastic solitary cells of high-status monks of the corresponding monasteries, as an alternative to common diaconicon functions. The following monuments were considered: the church of the Ascension in the Žiča monastery (1206–1217), the church of the Apostles at Peć (early thirteenth century), the church of the Assumption of the Morača monastery (1251–2), the church of Christ Pantokrator at Dečani (1327–1335). Others, such as the churches of the monasteries of Pridvorica, Sopoćani, Arilje, Staro Nagoričino, Banja and the churches of the Theotokos at Peć and in Kučevište, were mentioned as revealing similar characteristics.

However, his Vita reveals a significant detail, mentioning that the saint found a secret path from the cave church to his tower located on a high cliff, and thus a direct connection between a holy place and his abode was established, creating a similar church-and-cell pair. V. Palestinski SSERTI KÌA paterik I. Zhitie prepodobnogo ottsa nashego Savvy Osviãščennogo, ed. I. V. Pomiãlovsêkiî, Sankt-Peterburg 1885, 24.

Once again S. Ćurčić traced this tradition to the very origins of Serbian history as a Christian state. He referred to the Vitae of St. Symeon – Stefan Nemanja and St. Sava by Domentijan, which gave information on the cell of St. Symeon in the monastery of Vatopedi, where he retired after leaving the throne of the Serbian župan in 1196. The corresponding paragraph informs us that on the orders of Stefan Nemanja a cell was constructed with a window so he could watch ‘those who are in prayer in the holy church’. This description, indeed, may be considered as a possible indication of the seclusion of St. Symeon in this hesichasterion, which may have abutted upon the south wall of the church of the Annunciation. The most substantial arguments in favor of the ‘hesichasterion’ hypothesis are found in the church of the Assumption of the Morača monastery (fig. 6). The church was built on the orders of Stefan, the grandson of Stefan Nemanja. The south-eastern chamber of this building, accessed through a door from the altar area, has preserved its fresco decoration, which includes the cycle illustrating the life of Prophet Elijah, and the image of the Theotokos with Christ-Emmanuel in a medallion (Theotokos ’Chora tou Achorretou’ or Bogorodica Znamenie). The choice

Fig. 4. Küçükyali, general plan (after: Ricci, Bizans’ta Kar Sevgisi)
of scenes and their placement were interpreted as pointing to a specific monastic status of the compartment in question, and its architectural arrangement as alluding to the cell of St. Symeon at the Vatopedi monastery. The architectural design of the eastern zone of the church of Christ Pantokrator at Dečani also yields some important material for consideration. Its south-eastern two-storeyed bay, accessible from the sanctuary only, lacks any fresco decoration, which makes its function even more difficult to define. However, it was suggested that the rocky landscape depicted in the background of the fresco of Theotokos Eleousa, placed in the lunette above the door leading from the sanctuary to this chamber, may point to the ascetic character of the cell.

Thus, the first group of towers, forming western façades of the corresponding monuments, may be associated with the needs of the ecclesiastic hierarchy of the Serbian state: St. Sava, the first Serbian archbishop ordered the first tower, implementing the cell-and-chapel arrangement in the Žiča monastery; he was then followed by Archbishop Sava III in the church of Bogorodica Ljeviška in Prizren; and Archbishop Danilo II in the church of Theotokos at Peć. It would be tempting to connect the second group of monuments with the ruling Nemanjić dynasty, as the most conspicuous examples of this arrangement were introduced in the churches built under the auspices of the Serbian rulers, who wished to emulate the saintly founder of their family. However, this hypothesis is premature, since the question of the exact function of these south-eastern blocked-out chambers is still pending and must be ruled out before making any conclusions on whether there was a separate royal tradition.

As in mediaeval Serbia, Russian monasticism received its original impetus and inspiration from Byzantium, but its subsequent development evolved almost independently due to local historical, social and even geographical idiosyncrasies. Nevertheless, the stylite and seclusion traditions were able to find its Russian followers. V. Sarabianov has suggested that the cells on the galleries of Russian pre-Mongolian churches were constructed for persons of high spiritual authority and could even be considered as a prerogative of founders and hegoumenoi. The scholar proposed that the cells in the towers of the cathedral of Anthony’s and St. George monasteries in Novgorod and on the galleries of the cathe-
dral of the Mirozh monastery in Pskov and Euphrosyne’s monastery in Polotsk were designed specifically for seclusion and ‘individual prayerful needs’.\textsuperscript{47} All of the mentioned monasteries were among the largest and most revered monastic establishments. Their founders were either members of princes’ families e.g. monastery of St. George in Novgorod (1119) – the princes Mstislav Vladimirovich and Vsevolod Mstislavich; monastery of St. Euphrosyne (middle of the twelfth century – Euphrosyne-Preobslava, daughter of Prince Svyatoslav Vseslavich), or prominent representatives of the clergy, like the monastery of St. Anthony in Novgorod (1117–1122) – St. Anthony of Rome; Mirozh monastery (ca. 1140) – Niphont, Archbishop of Novgorod. In a later paper V. Sarabianov added to this list the church of St. Cyril in Kiev (middle of the twelfth century) built under the patronage of Prince Vsevolod Ol’govich and his wife, arguing that the southern chamber on its galleries functioned as a chapel and at the same time as a place for the solitary prayer of an eminent person, probably of princely descent.\textsuperscript{48}

The tower of the cathedral dedicated to the Nativity of Theotokos in the monastery of St. Anthony, founded in 1117, leads to the galleries and then to a domed chapel dedicated to the venerable hermits Onuphrius and Peter of Athos. A small niche was placed at the joint of the western wall of the church and the circumference of the tower (fig. 7). The fresco image of a stylite, depicted near the niche, leaves no doubt about its function. Thus, it was a seclusion cell, where, as legend has it, St. Anthony of Rome, the founder of the monastery, lived his last years.\textsuperscript{49}

The floor of the cell is significantly lower than the steps of the staircase, and its upper part had been partly walled up earlier, so only a small opening was left. The niche has a small window looking outside.\textsuperscript{50}

The tower of St. George’s cathedral, founded in 1119, of the monastery of St. George has four niches, located along the ascent of the staircase. Each was designed with a different configuration. The first one, built into the tower’s base, was planned for genuflection. The second and third niches admit a standing person, however, enclosing him to the waist, so that he could not sit down. The last niche is situated near the entrance to the chapel, located in the tower’s dome. The niche is fully opened. According to V. Sarabianov, it is highly likely that the niches of St. George’s cathedral accompanied the monks, who ascended to the chapel, and were a sort of marking, indicating the stages of repentance and prayerful ascent on the spiritual ladder (fig. 8).\textsuperscript{50}

The experience of St. Euphrosyne of Polotsk is crucial for a reconstruction of the considered monastic practice and its architectural implementation. Its overall importance is explained by the fact that it allows a scholar to work with all sources necessary for its interpretation:

\textsuperscript{47} Sarab’ianov, K voprosu o funktsional’nom naznachenii palatk, 177–194.
\textsuperscript{48} Idem, Pomeshchenii vtorogo etazha, 429–433.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid., 407–413.
\textsuperscript{50} L. I. Lifshits, V. D. Sarab’ianov, T. I. Tšarevskaiä, Monumental’naïïa zhivopis’ Velikogo Novgoroda: konec XI – pervaya chetvert’ XII veka, Sankt-Peterburg 2004, 537.
Fig. 8. Novgorod, St. George Cathedral, founded in 1119. St. George Monastery, frescoes and niches of the tower (after: Istorii russkogo iskusstva II/1)
the church of the Saviour – Transfiguration is remarkably well-preserved together with its fresco decoration and the Vita of St. Euphrosyne provides useful details. According to her Vita, St. Euphrosyne was born in 1101/1102 as a princess of Polotsk to Prince Svyatoslav (George) Vseslavich. She became a nun while still in her teen years and for some time lived in a stone ‘golbets’ of the cathedral of St. Sophia in Polotsk with the blessing of Elijah, the bishop of Polotsk. There she fasted and copied books. Later on she founded the monastery of St. Saviour – Transfiguration, where in the middle of the twelfth century the church of the Holy Saviour was erected. Upon establishing and settling the life in her monastery and founding a second one nearby with the church of Theotokos, she decided to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, also visiting Constantinople on her way. She died in Jerusalem sometime after 1167 and was initially buried in the monastery of St. Theodosius in Jerusalem.51 Obviously, St. Euphrosyne was well-acquainted with the Constantinopolitan culture and monastic traditions. This awareness was caused by special historical circumstances which her family had found itself in. The princes of Polotsk were struggling against the Kievan rulers. In 1129 they and their families were captured and sent into exile to Constantinople due to their disobedience. Presumably, the father of St. Euphrosyne, George, was one of the exiled princes, who returned to his homeland in 1139/1140.52 According to her Vita St. Euphrosyne herself did not hesitate to maintain relations with the Byzantine emperor and the patriarch. She sent her servant to Constantinople, asking them to provide her with the famous icon of Theotokos, one of the three created by St. Luke. Her request was granted and the emperor sent her a copy of the image of Theotokos of Ephesus. On route to the Holy Land, she met with Emperor Manuel I in person, who greeted her with honors and directed her to Constantinople.53

The sources mention that St. Euphrosyne spent her time within the confines of the church of the Transfiguration.54 Her previous experience in St. Sophia’s cathedral and the architectural design of the interior church spaces provide grounds to presume that her abode was set on the church galleries. The main cathedral of the land of Polotsk was rebuilt repeatedly during its long lifetime, but the foundations and some sections of walls from the middle of the eleventh century have survived. The most extensive archaeological investigations were carried out in the 1970–1980s, though the question of where the ‘golbets’ of St. Euphrosyne may have been located is still unresolved.55 This issue makes the study of the church, commissioned by St. Euphrosyne herself, even more significant.

Recent archeological works of the architectural expedition of the State Hermitage Museum in and around the church of the Saviour have shed new light on its overall composition, construction stages and inner arrangements. New finds and observations allowed P. Zykov and E. Torshin to reconstruct the spatial system of St. Euphrosyne’s presumed dwelling on the galleries.56 The gallery area of the Saviour church consists of a rectangular bay, the central part of which overlooks the naos. This

51 E. Maleto, Antologiia khlozhenii russkih puteshestvennikov XII–XV vekov: isledovanie, teksty, kommentarii, Moskva 2005, 209–220.
52 Polnoe sobranie russkikh letopisei II. Ipat’evskii letopis’, ed. I. I. Berednikov, Sankt-Peterburg 1843, 12, 15.
53 Maleto, Antologiia khlozhenii russkih puteshestvennikov, 209–220.
54 Arkhiepiskop Antonii (Me’anikov), Prepodobnaii Efrosiniia Polotkoskaia, Bogoslovskie trudy 9 (Moskva 1972) 10; Sarabjamon, Pomezheshchii vtorogo etacha, 419.
55 V. A. Bolkin, Sofiitski sobor v Polotkhe (K voprosu o zapadnykh apsidakh), in: Drevnerusskoe iskustvo: khudozhestvennaia kultura X – pervoi poloviny XIII vv., ed. A. Komech, O. Podobedova, Moskva 1988, 59–63.
56 P. L. Zykov, E. N. Torshin, Issledovaniia severnogo pomezheshchii na khorakh Spasskoi teaerkvii Efrosin’evna monastyr’ia v Polotkhe, in: Gistoryiia i arhitekturiia Polatkiia i Polatkiiai zaimst. materiialyi VII mitnarnadnal navukovai kauferentziu, ed. T. U. I‘vich, Polatsk 2019, 93–108.
oblong space connects the two cruciform chambers constructed above the south-western and north-western corner bays of the naos (fig. 9). The southern chamber was designed as a chapel covered by a dome. It has a prothesis niche and three windows in the eastern, southern and northern walls. The chapel has preserved its fresco decoration, which has been dated to the beginning of the thirteenth century. V. Sarabianov believed that both cruciform bays of the galleries functioned as chapels and cells at the same time. The southern one belonged to St. Euphrosyne, the northern one – to her sister Eudokia. He also pointed to a very important feature of both chambers: that a beholder looking through their eastern windows sees right in front of him/her the two colossal figures of St. Symeon the Elder and St. Daniel the Stylite, depicted at the center of the apses of the prothesis and diaconicon respectively (fig. 10). These images may have served as ‘prayer icons’ for St. Euphrosyne and her sister, Eudokia, who emulated their feats on the pillars in the chapel-cells of the church. The scholar has suggested that St. Euphrosyne may have taken her repose on a stone bench at the southern wall of the galleries, or on a platform right under the vault above this bench.\footnote{V. D. Sarab'yanov, \textit{Spasskii tserkov' Evfrosinievskogo monastyr'i} v Polotske, Polotsk 2016, 433–434.}
However, despite having the same layout, the northern chamber differs extensively by its spatial articulation from the southern one. Archaeological investigations of the interior of this bay have revealed traces of the wooden constructions and platforms used throughout this small area. The reconstruction shows the two-storeyed arrangement of the northern chamber. The two levels were divided by a wooden floor. Several wooden constructions were introduced into the first level, which were interpreted as shutters for the window and the niche in the northern wall; others were used as bookshelves and a desk for copying books (fig. 11). Scholars have proposed that this part of the northern chamber was used as a scriptorium and a library.58 This suggestion is strengthened further by the image of an angel writing on a desk with a quill.59 It is much harder to assign a function to the second level of this bay. It is covered by a barrel vault, measuring 2.20 meters in height from the wooden floor to its summit. The lower parts of the chamber are enlarged by three rectangular niches in each wall except the northern one. The eastern niche, moreover, was covered by a barrel vault. This chamber was lit by three cruciform windows; two of them were cut in the eastern and southern niches, while the last one was placed in the northern wall (fig. 12). The key to interpreting how this space may have been used are the traces of fresco painting, which are contemporaneous with the decoration of the rest of the church, i.e. dated to the middle of the twelfth century. According to researchers, this fact precludes a mere storage function of this space, suggesting its more exalted status as a room for ‘solitary prayer’. Scholars have proved that all described arrangements were the initial requirements of St. Euphrosyne, introduced at the time of construction of the church of the Saviour.60

The hypothesis of P. Zykov and E. Torshin is viable, taking into account all the monuments examined above and the awareness of St. Euphrosyne of Byzantine monastic traditions. Comparative analysis even allows the suggestion that St. Euphrosyne and her master builders implemented the chapel-and-cell model, similar to the arrangements of St. Sava for the Žiča tower and the north-western gallery bay in Kalender(i)hane Camii. The lower level of this area was never decorated with frescoes, except for the image of the writing angel, just like the undorned cell of St. Sava. The eastern and southern niches of the upper-level chamber of the Saviour church had a barrel vault, while the western one has a flat ceiling. It is not easy to answer the question whether the low location of the niches, probably caused by the necessity of leaving the masonry construction of the main vaults undisturbed, impeded their liturgical use. Summing up, the church of the Saviour in Euphrosyne’s monastery in Polotsk, as demonstrated by the recent discoveries, represents a whole complex of spaces constructed on the church galleries to meet the special requirements of St. Euphrosyne,
with separate rooms for her work and prayers, and even a place for rest. Though there are no arguments in favor of her seclusion at this complex, it would have certainly been a suitable dwelling place for her.

To complete the review of pre-Mongolian Russian monuments, which may be connected to the stylite tradition, I should mention a freestanding tower in Stolpe from the second half of the twelfth century – beginning of the thirteenth century with unique inner design which has no analogues in Russian architecture. The tower has five levels; the top level was executed as an octagonal chapel. Therefore the tower has all necessary prerequisites to be interpreted as a stylite pillar.

To conclude, I should put a question of the socio-political status of the persons emulating the life of the stylites, which may explain a significant number of its adepts. S. Ćurčić introduced the concept of a ‘living icon’, when a living man, though a ‘future saint’, presents himself within architectural frames, which worked to emphasize his special exalted status; the most instructive example being the Enkleistra of St. Neophitos of Cyprus at the end of the twelfth century. However, this was more than a question of self-representation. Since St. Daniel the Stylite, who acted as an advisor and trouble-shouter of the emperors Leo I (457–474) and Zeno (474–475; 476–491), stylites were involved in state affairs and found themselves at the heart of Constantinopolitan politics. Codex Skylitzes Matritensis preserved a miniature which depicts the voyage of Leo V’s emissaries to a hermit of the monastery of Philomelio in Pisidia to seek advice for the emperor. It should be stressed that the monk is represented in the window of a monastic tower (fig. 13). Both St. Luke of Chalcedon and Lazaros of Mt. Galesion had connections in the higher echelons of the Byzantine society. Hagiographic sources and historical chronicles yield significant data on the relations of emperors and the aristocracy with anchorites. Based on written testimonies historians were able to formulate the concept of the ‘politisation’ of a Byzantine saint. According to it the prominent members of the monastic movement could exert their influence on politics both on the local level and empire-wide. It is very likely that the status of these monks was emphasized symbolically, above all, by architectural means. The hegoumenos of an eminent monastery, educated and famed for his ascetic deeds, was a suitable figure to assume the role of the emperor’s advisor. Meanwhile, seclusion on the galleries or tower of a monastic church marked the authority of such an anchorite. Thus, their seclusion should not be understood as permanent, since by assuming an active social position the ascetics agreed that their peace and solitude would be disturbed. However, the transformation of this phenomenon in mediaeval Serbia and Old Rus’ was unavoidable within the different historical context. Russian and Serbian monks, following the lives of the stylites in churches built under their auspices, already had a high status, obtained either by birth in a princely family, or by holding a high position in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, or both.

Thus, the juxtaposition of historical and architectural evidence supports the possibility of seclusion practice in the church proper. This hypothesis is valid for both the Byzantine Empire and Old Rus’. Of particular interest is the case when a secluded hegoumenos was at the same time the kтетor of the building, so he or she was directly involved in the creation of the architectural program of a future church. Maintaining the practice of seclusion led

---

61 The literary work of St. Euphrosyne and her experience in following the path of the Byzantine stylites may be compared with the ones of St. Cyril, bishop of Turov, an outstanding author and junior contemporary of St. Euphrosyne, who secluded himself in a tower (stolp), where ‘he fasted, prayed and worked hard writing the Divine scriptures’. Cf. O. V. Loseva, Zhitiia russkikh svitelykh v sostave drevnerusskih protogov XII – pervoi treti XV vekov, Moskva 2009, 350–354.
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65 P. Brown, The rise and function of the holy man in Late Antiquity, The Journal of Roman Studies 61 (1971) 80–101; The Byzantine saint, ed. S. Hackel, Crestwood – New York 2001.
to a higher authority and religious status of a hegumenos, which received its architectural embodiment in the introduction of a cell for a recluse into the church proper. The accumulation of written sources and archaeological data will provide the necessary evidence for further studying the given phenomenon and defining the specific traits that characterized the cells of the recluses. In turn, these definitions could help scholars to obtain a fuller picture of the functionality of the galleries, towers and ambulatories that characterized the cells of the recluses. Nos, which received its architectural embodiment in the introduction of a cell for a recluse into the church proper.
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Византијска црква као пребивалиште

Праксе монашког осамљивања у Византији и старој Русији у периоду од IX до XIII века
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Византијска црква је сложен систем испреплетених простора, који функционишу како на светском нивоу, тако и на нивоу личних потреба монаха. Један од најважнијих аспекта који се узима у обзир при истраживању цркава је функционалност. Црква као пребивалиште монаха, оно што је резултат уживало у близини њихових стубова, било је неко слично стубу приликом формирања мисана у каснијим времима, што је резултирало у близини их стубова. Овај пракса трансформисана је у каснијим времима, што је резултирало у близини њихових стубова. Ова пракса трансформисана је у каснијим времима, што је резултирало у близини њихових стубова. Ова пракса трансформисана је у каснијим времима, што је резултирало у близини њихових стубова. Ова пракса трансформисана је у каснијим времима, што је резултирало у близини њихових стубова.
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Из овога се види да су византијска, српска и староруска архитектура изнедриле различите видове увођења ћелије за затворника у сам храм. Изгледа, при томе, да је структурни модул ћелије повезан са капелом нанит ње представљао решење којем је давана предност.