First Annual

BYZANTINE STUDIES CONFERENCE

Cleveland, 24 - 25 October 1975

ABSTRACTS OF PAPERS

The Byzantine Studies Conference is planned as an annual autumn forum for the reading and discussion of papers embodying current research in all aspects of Byzantine studies. The present Abstracts are being sent to all registered participants in advance of the Conference, to facilitate discussions. We expect to follow this pattern in future years. For further information, or to obtain an additional copy of these Abstracts ($2.50 including postage), write to: Byzantine Studies Conference, c/o Prof. Walter Kaegi, Department of History, University of Chicago, 1126 East 59th Street, Chicago, Illinois 60637.

Index of Speakers

Byzantine Theology and Philosophy

Homer Iliad 9 and Gregory Nazianzen

John T. Cummings, Wilson College

Demonstrates that Gregory Nazianzen in his "Carmen de vita sua" has deliberately patterned his dramatic presentation of the Council of Constantinople in 381 on Book 9 of the Iliad, casting himself in the role of Phoenix, the bishops in that of Achilles, and the strife on the Meletian schism at Antioch as counterpart to that over Briseis. Examines form and language.

(Pseudo-) Dionysius the Areopagite: His Place in the Development of Byzantine Christian Thought

David B. Evans, St. John's University

This paper takes its departure from the manifest transformation of the forms of Byzantine religious life in and after the reign of Justinian I, and relates them to the influence of the still anonymous author who wrote under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. In spite of its increasing objectivity and thoroughness, the scholarly literature of Dionysius tends to view him as an isolated phenomenon, a major figure in the history of early Byzantine spirituality nonetheless without significant effect on the development of Byzantine Christian doctrine. This orientation is to be corrected by understanding Dionysius's work as a protest against the then contemporary modes of religious expression: it proposes to replace dogma, hitherto the bearer of Byzantine religious identity, with what Dionysius calls mystagogy, which in popular religious life takes the form of a new emphasis upon liturgy. In Dionysius, this liturgical mystagogy even replaces monastic ascetism as the bearer of the religious ideal of Byzantium.

Soon after married to the new spirituality associated with the rising see of Constantinople -- represented in the sixth century by Hagia Sophia and the works of Romanus Melodus -- the doctrine of Dionysius becomes the most authoritative literary expression of the new religious identity typical of the Byzantine Middle Ages. Meantime, classical dogma is displaced to a secondary stratum of religious consciousness; it is assigned the role of sine qua non of orthodoxy and entrusted to a special class of guardians: monastic theologian, now professors of theology, who will hereafter the tradition of the Fathers almost exclusively in the terms prescribed the now pre-eminent liturgical mystagogy. In this light, Dionysius's apparent discontinuity with the tradition before him is not the sign and token of an author on the periphery of the Byzantine religious development, but rather the distance taken from the contemporary religious establishment by a radical whose views are soon to inaugurate a new and significantly different phase of orthodoxy.

Problems of Relationships between Byzantine Florilegia

Dominic O'Meara, Catholic University of America

This paper will consider the problem of the relationships obtaining between some of the principal Byzantine Florilegia, in particular the Loci communes

attributed to Maximus the Confessor and the Melissa of "Antonius". The problem will be approached by a study, based on MS evidence, of the various ways in which certain sententiae attributed to Iamblichus appear in these Florilegia: their introduction into the Florilegia; the various truncations, transformations and misattributions they suffer in passing from one recension to another. The pattern which emerges from the history of these sententiae will then be used as a method for establishing relationships between the different versions of "Maximus" and "Antonius", which will in turn lead to some tentative conclusions concerning the development of this branch of anthological literature. Reference will also be made to Iamblichean sententiae found in other Byzantine Florilegia, in so far as they relate to the topic of the paper. It is hoped that this approach will produce some detailed results not obtained by the general structural studies which have been made, and may contribute to a fuller and more precise description of this integral part of the spiritual and intellectual life of Byzantium.

Gregory II of Cyprus and Late Thirteenth Century Byzantine Theology

Aristeides Papadakis, University of Maryland, Baltimore County

The thirteenth century is a great turning point in the history of the Byzantine Church and Byzantine theology. It was of course the moment of division in the history of united Christendom triggered by the fourth crusade and the ensuing ecclesiastical colonialism of the Roman Church. But it was also the return of the theological debate in Byzantium, recalling, mutatis mutandis, the earlier age of christology. The great controversy over the union of the Churches in the late thirteenth century, the disruptive quarrel of Arsenius, and the equally crucial crisis of hesychasm that followed were in the main fought out on the field of dogma.

In the internal life of the Byzantine Church perhaps no partiarchate in this century is of greater historical and theological significance than that of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283-1289). This paper concerns the labors of Gregory, one of the major Orthodox Byzantine theologians of the thirteenth century, to find a solution to the Filioque issue that dominated the theological world of Byzantium at the time of the Union of Lyons (1274). His predecessor John Beccus's attempts to change the Byzantines' point of view were the prelude, as Pachymeres states, of the theological debate that came in the patriarchate of Gregory II. This, however has been generally ignored. Indeed, Gregory's physiognomy, which like Photius's belongs as much to the history of scholarship as to ecclesiastical history, remains for the most part unknown. Few scholars put much premium on Gregory's theology on the procession; it is generally viewed as second-string, holding no more than a tenuous position in the history of doctrine. Is this true? Has Gregory been ignored as a result of the disproportionate scholarly attention given to his rival Beccus? This paper will attempt to answer some of these questions.

Early Christian Art

Redating the Esquiline Treasure

Kathleen J. Shelton, University of Chicago

The Esquiline silver treasure, most commonly represented by the so-called Projecta casket, is a key monument in the history of late antique/early Christian

art. The ownership of the treasure is known through monograms and inscriptions; singular objects within the treasure indicate links to wealth and power backed up by data furnished by the study of the prosopography of the empire; and several of the contemporary stylistic modes of the late antique period are represented within the sixty-one pieces of the hoard. What has made the treasure so important, however, is its extremely precise date in a field where so few objects can be dated with any security.

The date, 379-383 A.D., is unfortunately derived from evidence external to the treasure, and the arguments presented and accepted in the late eighteenth century can be shown to be specious. It is still possible, however, to discuss the treasure as a fourth century collection with internal indications of a date in the mid-century. The iconography of the tyche of Constantinople establishes a terminus post quem of 330, while a study of the contemporary female hairstyles furnishes a terminus ante quem of 370 A.D. Numerous stylistic parallels for the non-figural designs can be found in silver hoards datable to the fourth century; specific parallels to the figural styles are few.

With the redating of the treasure, it is necessary to reconsider its once canonical place within the Renaissance of the late fourth century. The fourth century has been discussed as having any number of revival movements to which the treasure might be assigned, but close observation suggests that the treasure is best placed in a different context. The figural styles can be understood within a general conception of fourth century style, seen in silver and in other media. While not necessarily challenging the theories of revivals of classical forms, the esquiline treasure and its related works speak of the survival and transformation of classical forms within a periodic style.

A Mould for Pilgrim's Art from Mamre?

Margaret English Frazer, Metropolitan Museum of Art

An unpublished Early Christian terracotta mould in a private collection in New York presents on one face a scene of the three angels at the oak of Mamre and on the other a personification of Heaven. I shall examine the iconography, the provenance, and the date of this mould. The scene of Mamre differs from known examples in several interesting ways. For example, the angels in dress, in arrangement and in gesture resemble Late Antique hieratic imperial group portraits on coinage. The personfication of Heaven similarly derives from a Late Antique prototype, probably of East Roman origin. She appears to be a purely pagan image and this juxtaposition of pagan and Christian iconography is unique among the few moulds that survive from the Early Christian period. In view of the mixture of pagan, Christian and Jewish cults at Mamre, the mould may have been made there. It probably is to be dated before the sixth century.

New Light on Byzantine Christianity in Jordan Through Recent Excavations

Bastiaan Van Elderen, Calvin Theological Seminary

In recent years numerous new Byzantine sites have been identified in Transjordan. During the past five years the author has supervised the excavations of remains of

Byzantine churches on twelve new sites. Every one of these churches contained extensive mosaic floors, often found in a good state of preservation. A wide range of colors was used to display various geometric designs and to depict animals, human figures, and birds in these pavements. Numerous Greek inscriptions were found in the floors; in some cases providing dates, in other cases, names of church officials. These new discoveries will be reviewed and their contributions to the art, architecture, liturgy, and worship of the early church considered. The integration of these new materials with previous evidence of Byzantine Christianity provides important perspectives on this period in Transjordan.

The Lady of Carthage

Margaret Alexander, University of Iowa

I propose to present a problem for which I cannot give a final answer. I can suggest certain explanations, and I hope to elicit more. My subject is a mosaic panel -- one is tempted to say "icon" -- found about twenty years ago in a "late antique" house in Carthage. Surrounded by a jeweled border, it occupied the center of the mosaic pavement in the main room of the house.

The pavement was composed of an all-over pattern of imbrications decorated with florets; the panel is filled by the bust of a woman. Her head is surrounded by a nimbus, and she is clothed in a purple chlamys fastened at the shoulder by a jeweled broach. Her right hand is raised in a gesture of address; a scepter rests against her left shoulder. Her hieratic pose and courtly garb bespeak an empress. But why would a portrait of an empress be placed on the floor? That is but one of several questions which this panel has provoked. Not only her identification but also her origin and date are still debated.

G. Picard (1954) in a brief report on the excavation, proposed that she represented an allegorical figure symbolizing power rather than a specific imperial presence. Lézine and Duval (1959) expanded on the architectural data and described the mosaics in adjoining rooms but begged the issue of identification and date of the panel. Heurgon (1958) writing on a treasure from Ténès in Algeria, compared the mosaic figure with a portrait on one of the medallions, identified by him as Galla Placidia.

In a general article on late antique painting (1962) Carandini, without explanation, called the figure an archangel; she dated it in the VI century and declared it almost certainly a Greek import. L'Orange (1969), discussing a late antique statue, favored the period ca. 440 though was reluctant (as he still is) to abandon the possibility of Justinianic date. He identified the figure as an empress but did not commit himself to a specific one.

In all these studies, with the exception of the brief notice by Picard, the Carthage panel was secondary to the main theme; whereas it is the focus of my reappraisal. Concentrating on two major aspects -- 1) the panel itself, giving new typological and stylistic evidence and 2) its architectural setting — I shall present a resumé of my conclusions regarding its identification, date and significance.

The Stylistic and Iconographic Development of Greek Mosaic Pavements, Fourth to Sixth Centuries

Marie Spiro, University of Maryland

The development of Early Christian pavements in Greece can be traced in a series of secular and religious buildings which date from the late fourth to the late sixth centuries.

Early Period: The earliest pavements are simple in design and color and contain homogeneous decorative schemes articulated by simple bands or fillets. They clothe the surface with close-knit, two-dimensional, textural patterns which are inscribed with simple geometric or geometricized floral motifs.

Fifth and Sixth Centuries: Although aniconic pavements continue to be popular in the fifth and sixth centuries, they are transformed into colorful and frequently complex carpets articulated by decorative bands, not simple, flat ones, and enclosed by borders which are very often wide. The embellishment of the geometric carpet is also marked by an increase in the size of the individual units of the designs creating, thereby, large insets for the abstract filling motifs and for organic ones which begin to appear around the middle of the fifth century. Their introduction represents a second trend in the development of Greek pavements. At first, the repertory consists only of plants, and land and sea animals which are rigidly contained within the insets. Later, toward the end of the fifth century, they also occupy large, independent panels. The popularity of these organic forms, whether in small insets or large panels, continues into the sixth century when representations of the months and the seasons, and hunters and fishermen make their appearance.

The plethora of figural pavements in sixth century buildings clearly reflects the scope of the mosaicists' imagery and, also, the progress of the stylistic development. For, by this century, the three-dimensional forms of the earliest fauna have been changed into forms which are arranged across the surface and made to respect and reflect its solidity. By the end of the century, they become attenuated patterns and silhouettes of great linearity and variety which cover the surface with intricate and delicate polychromatic networks.

Byzantine Letters and Manuscripts

Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts in the Monastery of St. John the Theologian on Patmos

Ernest Saunders, Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary

Critical notes on the twenty-nine lectionaries and thirty-nine straight text manuscripts of the New Testament in the vellum manuscript collection in the Library of the Monastery of St. John on the Greek island of Patmos. Since 1971 the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity in Clarement, California, has been involved in developing an analytic, descriptive catalog of these manuscripts as part of a larger project of the Center for Byzantine Studies of the Greek National Foundation of Scientific Research. The Greek program is preparing such a catalog

for all the 890 Byzantine and post-Byzantine manuscripts in the monastery library. The present writer has been a research worker with the Institute's Patmos Monastery Library Project during the summers of 1972 and 1973.

Greek Knowledge of Latin Literature in the Fourth Century

Elizabeth Ann Fisher, University of Minnesota

Although the Greeks of the Roman Empire are generally considered to have maintained an aloof and superior attitude towards the literature of their Roman rulers, the Fourth Century provides instances of considerable interest in Latin literature within the Greek-speaking population. This interest can be traced using a variety of evidence: translations from Latin to Greek (e.g., Eutropius' history, Dositheus' grammar, Varro's agricultural writings), literature written in Latin by Greeks (e.g., Ammianus Marcellinus, Claudian), oratorical use of Latin literary sources (Eusebius' speech of Constantine), Latin papyri with Greek notes or translations, etc. This evidence may suggest the effect which the presence of a Latin-speaking Emperor and court in the new eastern capital had on the literary horizons of Greek speakers at various levels of society and in various occupational and interest groups.

The Knowledge of Greek in Medieval Europe: Its Grammatical and Lexicographical Sources

Bernice M. Kaczynski, Yale University

The paper begins with a survey of the linguistic materials available for the study of Greek in medieval Europe, including late-classical as well as contemporary sources. These comprise Greek, or Greek-Latin, alphabets, grammars and glossaries in occidental manuscripts. After construing the body of Greek material in its broadest possible sense, the discussion passes to an examination of the practice of Greek at a single monastery.

The abbey of St. Gall, in Carolingian Swabia (present-day Switzerland) is chosen for this purpose. During the period of its greatest cultural florescence (816 - 1022), coinciding with the eras of the Carolingian and Ottonian Renaissances, St. Gall ranked among the foremost intellectual centers of Europe. It is known to modern scholars, particularly, for its pursuit of Greek learning.

A systematic investigation of the Greek production of its scriptorium, along with a consideration of bilingual manuscripts demonstrated to have been there at an early date, yields a considerable body of evidence. Reference is also made throughout to comparable manuscripts written at other monasteries. Among the questions considered: Was St. Gall, in fact, representative or typical of medieval monasteries in its conduct of Greek? What was the nature and the quality of the Greek material available to its inmates? How well did they learn the language on the basis of these resources? What, finally, were the fruits of their study?

Byzantium in the Seventh Century

Controversy and Confidence in the Seventh-Century Crisis

Walter Kaegi, University of Chicago

The insufficiency of sources has thus far impeded modern scholarly understanding of the external and internal crises which the Byzantine Empire underwent in the seventh century. A neglected and obscure subject is the impact on and opinions of Byzantine contemporaries concerning their century's momentous changes, especially the reverses and calamities of its middle and last decades. After George of Pisidia falls silent, no single source provides extensive information on official or unofficial attitudes towards the situation of the empire. The collection of occasional isolated and even parenthetical references from various patristic sources (e.g., hagiography, papal correspondence, apologetics against Jews, works of Ss. Maximus the Confessor and Anastasius the Sinaite, Acts of the Sixth Oecumenical Council and Monophysitic literature) offers some hints concerning contemporary reactions to and descriptions and interpretations of the empire's political and military experiences. Not surprisingly, extant sources fail to reveal any sophisticated attempt to understand, explain, and cope with recent historical developments. The overwhelmingly religious character of these sources probably accounts for their attempt to interpret events almost exclusively in terms of a religious frame of reference, whether Orthodox, Monothelite, Monophysite, or Jewish. Apologetical treatises against Jews provide some of the clearest, however inadequate, rationalizations of events by Christians. Invocations of divine wrath and confident reaffirmation of the convergence of the empire's religious and military fortunes repeatedly reappear in the texts. The fragmentary traces of these arguments display little originality; they resemble in part religious explanations of the empire's condition which had already become prevalent in an earlier crisis, that of the fifth century.

The Shape of the Seventh Century in Byzantine Art

David H. Wright, University of California, Berkeley

The seventh century for Byzantine art had the shape of a camel with two humps. The first hump was the reign of Heralius, the second the reign of Justinian II. Each hump stored up in its fatty tissue vast reserves of the classical tradition in art, and each hump meant a selective revival of that tradition, as well as a marked increase in high-level patronage. Each brought a corresponding improvement in both quantity and quality after a period of decline. But the two revivals developed very different styles, for under Heraclius there was a general renewal of perennial Hellenism in Byzantine guise, while Justinian II seems to have sought specifically a revival of the art of the first Justinian. His artists turned to models from the middle of the sixth century, rather than to the more easily available models from the first part of the seventh century. Thus the Heraclian period is characterized by voluminous figures which tend to move freely in an indefinite space, while the figures of Justinian II are more plastic and substantial, more clearly articulated by linear design, and some are given a consciously constructed spatial setting. At the risk of oversimplification, the Heraclian style can be characterized as painterly, that of Justinian II as linear.

All of this is hypothesis, advanced as a basis for discussion. It is an attempt to make sense of a confusing range of material, and it touches on many celebrated controversies in the dating of major monuments. Most of my basic hypothesis is already implicit in the publications of Ernst Kitzinger, but recently a number of details have been challenged, and I propose to reexamine the evidence from scratch. In this advance summary I shall try to identify all these problems in some detail, in effect giving the footnotes to my argument, though in abbreviated form. In presenting the paper I shall concentrate on the visual qualities of only a few of the major examples cited, and attempt to show the reasonableness of my hypothesis as a whole. Then the floor will be open for discussion.

Besides the controversies involving specific monuments there are two larger issues implicit in my hypothesis which some may want to question: the validity of the concept of "period style" in early Byzantine art, and the relationship of metropolitan and provincial developments. On the second issue it seems to me clear that in the period with which we are concerned Constantinople was the source of all revival movements, that indeed it was the only center of artistic production with sufficient social, economic, and political continuity--with enough of a living tradition of workshop practice--to make possible a classical revival in art. When symptoms of such a revival are found in Rome (or elsewhere) it is usually clear that they are the result of artists or models brought from Constantinople. The accidents of preservation make it necessary for our study to depend on many Roman examples, but a close analysis of such examples always reveals some degree of provincialism, and in framing our conclusions we must always try to see Roman work from the perspective of Constantinople. (For further discussion see Kitzinger's Bericht to the Int. Byz. Kongr., Munich, 1958, particularly pp. 33-39.)

The more general question of "period style" is difficult. Some eminent Byzantinologists, particularly those with little experience of other periods of the history of art, have ignored this concept altogether, and have sought to argue the dating of a controversial monument entirely on the basis of iconographic features, or the historical probabilities affecting the site. On the contrary, I believe the concept "period style" has demonstrable utility. Of course it is necessary to use it critically, particularly to consider carefully the effect of iconographic requirements (or the use of a particular model) upon the range of stylistic choice available to the artist.

It is important to analyze a "period style" in terms of basic issues such as the coordination of human anatomy and the spatial implications of a figure's actions, or the degree of three-dimensionality suggested by color gradations and linear details. There may be a Morellian trap for the unwary who seize upon a minor detail, such as the shape of the eye or the ear, for such a detail may be copied accurately from an older model (or even invented independently) while the "period style" of the copyist is revealed in more basic, but relatively subtle qualities.

The concept has been most completely tested as applied to the Italian Renaissance, and many specialists today feel that the preceeding generation attempted too rigid a definition of "period style." It is easy to point out how the development of some very great artists (Titian, for example) goes

beyond the strict definitions of the concept, or that an example of provincial art of modest quality is virtually styleless, or depends on a tradition long out of date at the time the work was made. This latter phenomenon is a commonplace in the study of Byzantine art, and easily recognizable. In theory perhaps we should also allow for the possibility of an extraordinary individual artist comparable to Titian in scope and originality. But the fact remains that on the basis of "period style" a Renaissance specialist can normally assign a work of reasonable quality to at least the correct third of a century. Subject to greater precautions, I believe the Byzantinologist can usually hope to achieve comparable accuracy.

There is one large body of dated material normally ignored by art historians which supports my hypothesis of the two humps, and also demonstrates convincingly the primacy of Constantinople. This is the gold coinage. Even a glance at the plates of the new Dumbarton Oaks or Bibliothèque Nationale catalogues confirms the general shape of the development. The revival style, characterized by naturalistic treatment of the portrait, and very plastic modeling in high relief, first appears in the gold coins of Heraclius struck in Constantinople in 613. It flourishes there for about two decades, but beginning with the issue of 629 (where Heraclius first sports a long beard and moustaches in the Persian manner) there is some reduction in the plasticity of the image and in the physical coherence of the depiction; this lower level of a revival style continues until the third issue of Constans II, in 651, but after that the decline in quality is rapid. During all this time there are only faint reflections of the revival to be seen intermittently in provincial coinage, even in cities as important as Alexandria, Ravenna, or Rome. The first symptom of a new revival comes in a few examples of the fourth series of Constantine IV (681-685), which copies a type from the early sixth century; but the revival appears fully developed on the first series of Justinian II (685-687) and reaches a climax with the famous image of Christ on his third series (692-695). Some of the revival is still apparent in the coins of Leontius (695-698) but the quality soon declines, and fails to recover even in the second reign of Justinian II.

The numismatic evidence is a convenient background for our investigation, but it should not be overestimated. The coins of Justinian I, for example, give only a remote hint of the splendors of imperial art in his reign. The coins of Heraclius are more revealing, but the major accomplishments of his reign must be sought in other media. Most of the key works have been so well discussed recently by Kitzinger and others that I shall be brief in reviewing the following examples, except in examining certain important controversies.

Dated silver: Three pieces with classical subjects are outstanding examples of the Heraclian style: the Vienna bucket, the Meleager dish, and the Maenad dish (Dodd, Byz. Silv. Stamps, 1961, nos. 56, 57, 70). In each the figures are plastically treated and relatively coherent in their ponderation. Their turning motions and gestures are remarkably spatial, and the Meleager dish even has implications of a continuous landscape setting. The modeling is softly modulated and the linear details are held to a minimum. The drapery reveals the anatomy, never establishing dominant linear patterns of its own. The David dishes from Cyprus are uneven in quality and somewhat different in style. Their technique involved more chasing from the front of the dish, with more linear details, and among the various models used there is strong influence of those

from the Theodosian period (Kitzinger, 1958 Kongr. p. 5). Therefore the David dishes cannot be cited as an example of pure Heraclian period style. But Dodd has shown that the classical pieces and the David dishes are very closely linked in the sequence of control stamps, and in fact the whole group can be dated more precisely than commonly realized. They cannot be later than 630 because of the portrait type used for Heraclius in the stamps, and since the David dishes were obviously made to commemorate Heraclius's victory over the Persians they can not be earlier than 628. The sequence of control stamps makes the Vienna bucket and the Meleager dish no more than about a year before the David dishes, and the notorious need for silver to pay the army (621-628) suggests that none of these pieces would likely have been made before 628. (These and other issues were very well explored by Elaine Kohn in an unpublished Berkeley senior hours thesis in 1966-7; Steven Wander, who took my course in this material in 1967, seems to have understood considerably less of my lectures: MetMusJ 8 [1973] 89-104.)

This renewed Hellenism was continued in the early years of Constans II in the Nereid jug and the Obolensky trulla (Dodd nos. 75, 77), where the style is remarkably plastic and the contours a little more clearly defined, and in one Christian work, the British Museum bowl with the bust of a saint (Sergius or Bacchus, Dodd no. 78), where the style is less corporeal, presumably reflecting a deliberate choice in the iconography of styles. To judge from the portrait of Constans II on the control stamps, none of these pieces can be later than 651; the Nereid jug is probably after 645 but the Obolensky trulla is probably dated 641-645. At any rate this is the last silver clearly dated by imperial control stamps, and there are no other candidates for high quality silver in the classical tradition in the rest of the seventh century. It seems that this extraordinary revival disappeared after about twenty years.

It also seems that in silver the revival developed well along in the reign of Heraclius, after a marked decline in the continuity of the classical tradition in the time of Justin II. That the diversification and decline of classical style evident in the Stuma and Riha patens, dated 577, characterized Constantinople itself was argued by Kitzinger (1958 Kongr. pp. 18-20) and confirmed by Dodd's study of the imperial stamps (BSS nos. 20, 27; DOP 22 [1968] 143-149). There is one isolated exception, the Euthenia dish also dated 577 (Dodd no. 26), which should be seen as a survival of the Justinianic classical style. The British Museum censer of c. 605-610 (Dodd no. 35) and the Vatican reliquary, probably from early in the reign of Heraclius (Dodd no. 47) effectively show the styles of the Stuma and Riha patens continuing in use at a modest level of quality.

Ivories: There is not a single certainly dated Byzantine ivory between the middle of the sixth century and the beginning of the tenth. Nor are there any candidates which correspond in style to the masterpieces of Heraclian silver. The conclusion is unmistakable: for some unknown reason, in the seventh century there was no ivory carving in Constantinople of the quality we take for granted in the sixth and tenth centuries. Two isolated candidates, the Procession of Relics in Trier and the Enthroned Saint with Disciples in the Louvre (Volbach, Elfenbeinarb. 1952, nos. 143, 144) show relatively plastic figures carved in high relief, but their dating is quite uncertain, and I am inclined to keep both within the sixth century. Recently Weitzmann has sought to place the St. Mark ivories and their relatives in Palestine around the eighth century

(DOP 26 [1972] 45-91); whatever may be the truth in this matter, and I still prefer an eleventh-twelfth century date and Graeco-Italian localization, is obvious that the style of these ivories is quite separate from the styles we are discussing in the seventh century.

Salonica, St. Demetrius: The mosaics on the piers flanking the entrance to the presbytery commemorate a restoration after a fire for which there is vague and complex documentation. Cormack's recent discussion (AnnBSA 64 [1969] 43-45) has exposed all the difficulties without helping us reach a conclusion. But I think it is reasonable to date these mosaics around 640, within a margin of about a decade. For one thing, both priests depicted wear large bushy beards of the type shown on the coins of Heraclius from 629 to 641 and on many of the coins of Constans II from 651 to 668, but not otherwise in this era, and the magistrate wears a shorter beard and has hair standing out from the sides of his head in a manner seen on the coins of Heraclius from 613 to 629, used later for his sons when they were of appropriate age, and used for Constans II from 645 to 651, but not after that. In each of the five panels (excluding the replacement mosaic of the Virgin and St. Theodore) we see a frontal standing saint, raising his hands in prayer, or placing them protectively on the shoulders of the donors. The figures are stiff and timeless, their bodies moderately voluminous but quite without substance, while their faces are modeled strongly through gradations of color. This may be taken as a close reflection of Constantinopolitan art late in the Heraclian period (see further Kitzinger, 1958 Kongr. pp. 2, 25-28). The three medallions formerly in the north aisle (destroyed 1917) were presumably by the same artists, but the recently discovered mosaic on the west wall, probably portraying the same deacon (Soteriou pls. 69, 70), is much more provincial in quality.

The mosaics done before the fire of around 630 were mostly discovered in 1907 and destroyed in 1917. The surviving fragment from the north aisle is almost useless for stylistic judgement; the panel at the west end of the south aisle (Kitzinger pl. 22) is quite provincial in quality, and while the one at the west end of the north aisle (Unesco pl. 6) is of good quality it is tantalizingly incomplete. Judging particularly from the watercolors by W. S. George (published by Cormack) it seems to me there were comparable differences of style and quality in the lost mosaics of the north aisle, but agreeing with Kitzinger (pp. 21-22) against Cormack (pp. 45-52) I believe these various ex voto mosaics were executed not very long before the fire, probably by different artists. It would be odd to find such a disparate set of private commissions part of the original decoration of the church, and it is far easier to understand such ex votos in terms of the developing cult of relics and of images early in the seventh century than late in the fifth. Two of the lost panels, the Virgin and Child with angels (spandrel C) and St. Demetrius (spandrel H), which have the same border motif, seem to me of good enough quality to stand as local reflections of the early Heraclian style, and the contrast of this St. Demetrius with the pier mosaics clarifies the stylistic and iconographic developments of the late Heraclian period: the further suppression of corporeality, the more intimate association of saint and donor, and the more prominent display of the holy image.

Mt. Sinai, Icon of the Virgin and Child with two standing Saints, probably Theodore and Demetrius. This is surely Constantinopolitan in quality, a

masterpiece of the type distantly echoed in the aisle mosaics of St. Demetrius. Each of the styles deliberately juxtaposed in the icon seems to me typical of the climax of the Heraclian revival. The two angels turning to look up at the hand of God are the painted equivalent of the classical figures on the silver dishes: well coordinated in their action and strikingly three-dimensional in rendering. The two standing saints show a higher quality, and, I believe, a slightly earlier version of the style of the pier mosaics at St. Demetrius. They are voluminous, and the highlights on the dark complexion of St. Theodore have a remarkably plastic effect. But they are substanceless and their garments are like hollow sheathes. Even though in each the left knee must be understood to be bent there is no sense of weight and support, and in each the left arm has vanished. They are a perfect visualization of the idea that the image of a saint is like a hollow receptacle for the prayers of the believer, no more than an intermediary between the believer on Earth and the saint in Heaven. The Virgin is painted in the same technique, but with even greater three-dimensionality of effect. On the other hand her eyes are deliberately averted, and the intimacy of spiritual contact between image and believer is thereby restrained. This establishes a sense of hierarchy and decorum in the spiritual program of this icon, with its climax in the Child. He is shown in almost the same classical style as the angels, as if literally depicting the incarnation, but in effect he is even more remote from the spiritual intimacy sought by the believer in front of the holy image. The Child turns and moves in a limited three-dimensional space, and avoids the direct gaze of the beholder. He is the Word made Flesh, but the believer is to approach him through the intercession of saints lower in the hierarchy.

Roman mosaics: As frequently explained (e.g. Kitzinger, 1958 Kongr., pp. 16-18), papal commissions in Rome offer a documented sequence of mosaics to help us identify developments in period style, and in this era to recognize the collapse of local Roman tradition and the arrival of fresh impulses from Constantinople. S. Lorenzo f.l.m. (579-590) shows the dead end of what may loosely be called the Justinianic style, best represented in Rome by SS. Cosma e Damiano (526-530). There the figures were very plastic in effect and relatively well coordinated; now the figures are flat and awkwardly restricted in their actions. What had been the contours of rounded surfaces are now rigid linear outlines imposing a two-dimensional pattern upon figures which now for the most part have only the slightest gradations in color. Admittedly there are difficult problems posed by the technical inconsistencies of this mosaic, for the four central heads use very small tesserae and a limited range of light tones, while the other three heads use normal-size tesserae and a much greater range of colors. No amount of study of the mosaic with good binoculars nor of the available photographs of details has led me to a satisfactory understanding of this, but I would point out that in SS. Cosma e Damiano there is a puzzling inconsistency in the style of treatment (but not of mosaic technique) in the contrast of the head of St. Theodore with those of the four other saints. At any rate, I can not agree with the elaborate hypothesis of Baldass (GBA 49 [1957] 1-18], apparently developed without benefit of scaffolding, which would assign the central figures to the early twelfth century (cf. also Nordhagen, ActaInstRomNorv 2 [1965] 154; and in opposition Mattiae, Mos.Med.Chiese Roma, 1967, pp. 149-168). If we compare, for example, the S. Lorenzo head of St. Peter with the St. Peter of a typical Roman mosaic of the mid-twelfth century, S. Maria in Trastevere or S. Francesca Romana (Matthiae pl. 92 with pl. 262 or

276) it is immediately apparent how the rigid outline, distilled as it were from the shaded contours of the Justinianic style, is characteristic of the late sixth century, and not of the twelfth. There is further confirmation for this characterization of Roman art around 600 in the miniatures of the Corpus Christi Gospels, a manuscript probably sent to St. Augustine of Canterbury by Pope Gregory the Great.

S. Agnese f.l.m. (625-638) shows not the dead end of an earlier tradition in Rome, but a tentative version of the new Heraclian style imported from Constantinople. Now the titular saint stands as an isolated devotional image in the middle of the apse. There is a subtle distinction between the bent leg and the straight leg which the artist hardly understands. Outlines are much less assertive than in S. Lorenzo and there is an extremely clumsy attempt to use coloristic modeling in the cheeks. To imagine what this pathetic Roman artist was attempting to achieve we can turn to the St. Demetrius on the Sinai icon, or we can extrapolate between the two Constantinopolitan models which must lie behind the earlier and later mosaics of St. Demetrius in Salonica. The small apse mosaic with Sts. Primus and Felicianus in S. Stefano Rotondo (642-649) reveals a slightly better understanding of this style, and helps confirm the general chronology of style I have been explaining.

S. Venanzio in the Lateran Baptistery (640-649) has mosaics of much higher quality, the climax of this Roman development. The frontal standing saints in the side panels (note that their lower legs and feet are modern restorations) exemplify a figure style close to that of the north aisle St. Demetrius (spandrel H) in Salonica, and are more voluminous than the pier mosaics at Salonica, which must be approximately contemporary. This suggests a certain time lag in the Roman adaptation of Heraclian art from the capital. The standing figures in the apse (apart from the frontal Virgin) are different from the other standing figures we have been considering in that they are not individual devotional images, but members of a group who all turn slightly in homage toward the central figure of the Virgin. Although detached from any physical setting, they are thereby involved in space, and at the same time their faces are strongly modeled by gradations of color with a minimum of restrictive outline. Thus these figures begin to approach the style of the frieze of standing classical gods on the Vienna bucket. S. Venanzio gives some hint of what a Constantinopolitan mosaic with comparable subject matter might have looked like at the height of the Heraclian revival; I would expect it to have had figures even more voluminous and spatially active, and to have been even more painterly in the effect of its coloristic gradations.

Rome, S. Maria Antiqua: Layer IIb of the palimpsest wall, originally showing four Church Fathers with quotations from their writings, can be dated precisely, for this was a kind of political poster put up to support the decisions of the Lateran Council of 649; it was probably intended as a temporary supplement to an existing scheme of decoration and certainly must have been done before its sponsor, Martin I, was captured and taken to Constantinople in June of 653. Only one of the faces survives in reasonable condition, but it shows a style corresponding to that of S. Venanzio, strong coloristic modeling with shading applied in a relatively free brushstroke, and without the systematic build up of highlights found in other seventh-century frescoes in the church.

The essential question is, how much of the other decoration can be associated with the Church Fathers of 649? Nordhagen (ActaInstRomNorv 1 [1962] 58-63, 71)

sought to attach to this date all the seventh-century work in S. Maria Antiqua except the Annunciation of layer IIa, a corresponding painting postulated at the left of the apse, and the fragmentary lowest layer in the apse; these he assigned to the architectural campaign which included enlarging the apse and replacing the original brick piers with the four columns we see in the nave today, a campaign supposed to be dated by coins of Justin II, as pointed out by Krautheimer (Corpus II, 1962, pp. 255, 264). This is hardly the occasion for a full review of the complex and difficult archaeology of these layers of plaster, but I would like to report that repeated examinations have allowed me to confirm some of Nordhagen's observations, while others seem to me doubtful. I cannot consider the archaeological evidence complete enough to associate the various scattered paintings as he does, and I believe a solution to the apparent contradictions must be sought through a combination of verifiable archaeological data, common sense, and stylistic analyais.

At this point I must turn to the history of the original excavation. Giacomo Boni (1859-1925) was an enthusiastic amateur polymath, widely acquainted in literary and artistic circles, sincerely devoted to discovering and restoring the monuments of antiquity, and a successful popularizer, but impatient with scientific archaeology. The excavations began on 8 January 1900, and the destruction of the seventeenth-century church of S. Maria Liberatrice, which turned out to be some ten meters above the pavement of S. Maria Antiqua, began on 10 February; by 21 April the site was sufficiently cleared for the King and Queen to visit it and see the newly discovered frescoes. In the meantime Boni had used as many as 350 workers and occasionally dynamite. The only known records from this period are a few photographs made mostly as the digging approached the pavement, or soon afterwards. Boni never published any systematic account of this excavation, and his assistant Artioli, working in 1917-19, lamented that he could find no one to give him detailed information on it. As early as August 1900 Boni explained to friends that the imperial building had been converted into a church early in the sixth century (by substituting columns for the original piers of the impluvium). In the next years he invariably repeated this conclusion in letters, newspaper stories, and other popular accounts. The only one I have been able to find which gives any explanation of his reasoning (a brief story in La Patria, 9 July 1901, presumably inspired or written by Boni) refers vaguely to a "studio analitico" of the masonry involved.

The only authentic record of the coins which are now supposed to date this conversion is in the outline for a projected publication which Boni drew up well after 1900, published posthumously by Tea, his literary executrix (SMAnt, 1937, p. 19). In the section that was to explain the conversion of the building into a church, including the substitution of columns for piers, he outlines "descrizione delle monete del VI secolo rinvenute sotto la base della seconda colonna di sinstra;(and in the margin) mi pare che le monete fossero tre; le ho ad ogni modo in apposito involto nel cassettino; furono esaminate dal direttore del gabinetto numismatico capitolino." The coins must have been in terrible condition. What cassettino he kept them in is not known, but I can report on the basis of careful search and the generous assistance of the staff of the Foro Romano that there is no trace or record of any such coins today. It is Tea, not Boni, who identifies these coins with Justin II (pp. 7, 41) and since she reports them as lost (p. 362) it seems she never saw them. It is not clear why she identified them with Justin II.

Even if the coins were correctly identified the report of their finding needs critical examination. Frank Brown kindly confirms my suspicion: deliberately placing coins under a column like a modern time capsule in a cornerstone was never a Roman practice; but he adds that it was normal in the Renaissance at least at Rimini, and suggests that Boni may well have known the practice in his native Venice. It seems to me reasonable to conclude that a clump of deteriorated bronze coins was found near the column base below the pavement level, and much later carelessly referred to by Boni as under the column base, that they were never properly cleaned or identified, and soon were lost. At best they could provide nothing more than a terminus post quem for the modification which presumably included cutting the new apse (though Boni thought that was later: Tea, p. 19), thereby destroying part of the Madonna Regina of layer I and requiring the new decoration of layer IIa, including "der schöne Engel." It is a pity that the flimsiness of the archeological evidence was not recognized earlier, for those who have accepted layer IIa as dated to the time of Justin II (as Bertelli in 1964 Bonn Kongr.f.Kg., p. 103) have found it difficult to fit it into any coherent art historical context. Nothing could be more different than the schöne Engel and the heads of S. Lorenzo f.l.m., and even in Constantinople only the isolated Euthenia dish could be cited as comparable in style.

To return to the problem of sorting out the various seventh-century frescoes, common sense suggests that when architectural modifications of this scope were undertaken there was also a considerable program of decoration. I would even like to suggest that this campaign marked the establishment of a deaconry under papal patronage, and that the epithet "Antiqua" by which the church was designated as early as around 640 (cf. Krautheimer, p. 249) simply characterized the building; consider the names of the nearby deaconries S. Maria in Cosmedin and S. Maria in Via Lata. Be that as it may, the stylistic connection of the schöne Engel with the pier frescoes, and above all with the masterly Maccabees, was persuasively argued by Kitzinger in 1934 (Röm.Mal., pp. 8-12) and I would extend this argument to the various other paintings Nordhagen associates with the Church Fathers of 649. There may be a way out of the difficulties in assessing the archaeology of the apse wall. At the left of the apse the Church Fathers crudely overlap a fine panel of painted marble which was obviously designed after the apse was enlarged (layer IIa). Nordhagen argues from various observations of continuity of plaster in different parts of the apse (p. 59, which I could not fully confirm) that these two layers were part of the same campaign despite the clumsy overlap, but his conclusion defies common sense. Nordhagen is correct, however, in observing that the corresponding panel of painted marble at the right of the apse, which is smaller and neatly abutts the Church Fathers, is actually carefully overlapped by the plaster of the Church Fathers. Now it is only reasonable to assume that the presence of the Church Fathers represents a change in program occasioned by the controversy surrounding the Lateran Council of 649, and since they have such a specifically political function, it is also reasonable to assume that Martin I thought of them only as a temporary decoration; that is why although of higher quality the technique of painting is much looser than in any other Roman frescoes of the period, and the lack of a built-up layer of highlights in the faces almost makes them look unfinished.

Painters frescoing a wall normally work from the top to the bottom to avoid marring their completed work. In this case we may suppose that the wall to the left had been finished when it was decided to add the Church Fathers. A gifted

painter (Greek, to judge by his lettering) was told to put up this political poster and started at the left. Then it appeared that to have enough room for the Church Fathers and their long quotations he was spoiling the marble panel below. Since this was temporary decoration nothing was done about his work already finished, but at the right of the apse the specialist who did marble panels was still at work and modified that panel to fit the new scheme, or was called back from another job to replace the marble panel before the political painter did the second pair of Church Fathers. This seems to me reasonable speculation which will account for all the observed data. Certainly layer IIb is later than layer IIa, but the difference may be a matter of days or months rather than years, and stylistic analysis requires their close association.

If, then, we assume a date for these frescoes in the 640s we can supplement the picture of Byzantine art in Rome built up on the basis of the mosaics. Kitzinger rightly emphasizes that the Maccabees is the key example, the work of an outstanding Greek master. This is, of course, a devotional image, a kind of icon on the wall, and we may recall that relics of the Maccabees were venerated at nearby S. Pietro in Vincoli, but here, curiously enough, it is the mother, Solomone, who is the center of the cult, and each of her seven sons turns gently towards her, holding out his open right hand in acknowledgement of her special distinction. Although the fresco is now considerably worn and faded, the figures are still impressively voluminous in effect, and the folds of the garments are described by gradations of color rather than rigid outlines. The contrapposto of a figure like the older son at the right may be less striking than in a nude on the Meleager dish, but it is no less classical. These voluminous turning figures are located on a receding ground plane which is defined by subtle gradations of color as well as overlapping and a few hints of cast shadows; the result is an indefinite but relatively deep and continuous space. The well-preserved parts of the face of Solomone have subtle gradations of color, light reds over tans, with carefully built up touches of highlight on top of them, achieving naturalistic representation with brilliant coloristic effect, but within the design limits of severe frontality. Allowing for its three-quarter view and for differences in preservation and between individual artists the schöne Engel is comparable in style and technique. The turning heads of the Maccabee sons are less well preserved and being less important probably were less carefully finished. They have much freer brushstrokes, with an astonishingly painterly effect; at first glance they seem to resemble in technique the Church Fathers of 649, but the Maccabee heads originally had a full system of highlights.

The Maccabees are the best surviving example of a campaign of decoration which must have been quite extensive, including, for example, the hopelessly faded cycle of the life of Christ on the right wall of the presbytery, and the "icon" of St. Anne lower down on the same wall, respectfully preserved by the painters working for John VII, who repainted the rest of this wall. Although now terribly faded the Deisis with a donor and the three saints on the bema side of the piers must have been similar to the Maccabees in style. The St. Demetrius in the southeast corner of the nave, also now terribly faded, but in good condition when discovered, appears to be the work of a less skillful Greek painter, for despite some awkward linear details and a less expressive face it is similar in general stylistic effect to the St. Demetrius of the Sinai icon.

The St. Barbara opposite him is a much less skillful adaptation of the Solomone, probably the work of an Italian painter still struggling to learn the imported style, and the Annunciation on the pier corresponding to the Maccabees is another case of an Italian painter imitating with little understanding the Constantinopolitan style: the voluminous effect and fluttering drapery are partly suppressed by linear patterns, and the free and vigorous brushstroke becomes a disruptive squiggle. It was a great struggle for Roman painters to understand this revival of perennial Hellenism.

There are two other Roman frescoes which can be associated with this period. The lowest layer of frescoes in S. Maria in Via Lata, the newly discovered Seven Sleepers of Ephesus and the Judgement of Solomon and other fragments already known, show active voluminous figures moving in a landscape. They seem at least generally comparable to the Maccabees in this regard and in the very illusionistic painting of the faces, but the garments have a more linear system of articulation. It is hard to argue a precise date because they are in poor condition, and they have been published only on a partial and preliminary basis (Bertelli in Scuola e Cultura 2 [1962] 198-204; ChieseRomIll 114 [1971] 33-34, 50-56; Paragone 291 [1974] 23-36). The Catacomb of Generosa includes a fresco with Christ flanked by four standing saints, which was damaged by the removal of relics in 683. Again the figures are quite voluminous and painted in a lively illusionistic manner which seems appropriate for the climax of the Heraclian revival in Rome in the 640s (Bertelli, Paragone 291 [1974] 27, pl. 23). Other frescoes are sometimes attributed to this period, but being generally poorly preserved and of modest quality it is impossible to make firm judgements on the basis of style alone. On the other hand, knowing the style of the best Roman painters of this period it is possible to speculate about lost manuscript illustrations reflected in later adaptations. Köhler sought the models of the Tours Evangelists in this phase of Roman art, and I believe the Maiestas page of the Codex Amiatinus is copied from a Roman work of the 640s.

Roman Icons: The icon in the Pantheon is commonly supposed to have been painted in time for the dedication on 13 May 609 (Bertelli, Boll.dA 46 [1961] 24-32). Although it is terribly damaged it shows significant resemblance in style to the Mt. Sinai icon of the Virgin, Child and Saints. The head of the Child is extraordinarily lively in effect, particularly if studied in a photograph taken after cleaning but before the excessive inpainting which gave it a stiffer effect. The Mt. Sinai Child would seem to have been very similar, though probably of higher quality, but it is now so badly rubbed it is hard to be sure. The Pantheon Virgin is a wreck, while the Mt. Sinai Virgin is in relatively good condition; it is therefore hard to be sure how much of the observed differences such as a harder outline in the eye and lips of the Pantheon Virgin mean a difference in quality, but it does not seem the Pantheon icon was ever such a masterpiece of the Heraclian revival as the Mt. Sinai icon. If we assume the Pantheon icon was ready in 609 it is hard indeed to imagine such painting done in Rome--between the mosaics of S. Lorenzo f.l.m. and S. Agnese f.l.m. Since the Pantheon was still imperial property and Boniface IV specifically obtained the authorization of Phocas for its conversion, it seems reasonable to suppose that the principal icon of the new church dedicated to the Virgin could have been sent from Constantinople. In that case symptoms such as the slightly hardened contours in the head of the Virgin would be interpreted as characterizing

an early phase of the classical revival which was to reach its climax a decade or two later. But the basic concept of "perennial Hellenism" requires that in Constantinople, even at a time when the coins suggest that the classical tradition was at low ebb, it must still be possible to produce an individual work in classical style under special circumstances; the specific iconographic tradition of classical style in the Child could produce an individual revival. Alternatively, one could suppose the icon was painted in Rome somewhat later, and then these symptoms would indicate its provincial origin.

The icon now in S. Francesca Romana, presumably from S. Maria Antiqua, is clearly a later version of the style of the Pantheon icon, and must surely be Roman work. As Kitzinger has emphasized (StudiesA.M.Friend, 1955, pp. 132-150) it is very close indeed to the schöne Engel. As in that fresco the stylistic point of departure can be seen in the Solomone, but in the icon the specifically Roman adaptation is further refined at the highest level of quality. The coloristic modeling is regularized and controlled, giving the face virtually an eggshell delicacy entirely different from the vigorous brushstrokes of pure Hellenistic tradition. The outlines of the eyes are composed as closed forms with a distinctive shape and the contours of the brows are adjusted for continuity with the ridge of the nose. Linear symptoms which in the Pantheon icon seemed a little clumsy are now supremely expressive, and the device of having one eye averted (found also in both heads of the Pantheon icon) now gains superhuman authority as it limits the spiritual intimacy sought by the believer in front of the holy image, and reminds him of the correct rôle of the icon as intermediary. The particular refinement of this process of abstraction is Roman, but it has its Greek analogue in the pier mosaics at St. Demetrius. What little survives of the Child shows the much freer illusionistic rendering we expect in the Child, particularly as a subordinate figure who looks up to his mother. In every way then, this icon belongs in the 640s and we can imagine it, twice life size, as the principal icon of the newly decorated deaconry of S. Maria Antiqua.

We have found that the major undated works can reasonably be fitted into the pattern of the first hump of the seventh century, a pattern established by the documented works, including particularly the coins. The revival began in Constantinople around 610, reached a climax there around 630, and was gradually transformed into an increasingly abstract manner around 640. The revival was introduced into Rome by around 630, and flourished there in the 640s with various degrees of understanding. But there is not a single work of Byzantine art of major quality specifically dated between about 650 and about 685. This is not too surprising in view of the condition of the empire, the growth of Arab power, the slavic incursions, etc. We can at least examine two Italian examples from this period to confirm the impression of decline and disintegration of the classical tradition in art suggested by the coins. The Privilegio mosaic in S. Apollinare in Classe (673-679) is in hopeless condition but whatever in it may still be original and whatever of the facing Sacrifice mosaic can be dated with it (Demus, JbÖstByz 18 [1969] 229-238) shows no trace of the Heraclian revival, rather an enfeebled repetition of motifs from the Justinianic tradition in Ravenna. In Rome the mosaic of St. Sebastian in S. Pietro in Vincoli is probably an isolated devotional image made to establish a special cult in connection with the plague of 680. It is basically a poor imitation of the style of the side panels at S. Venanzio and suggests that what little might have been done in Rome in that

period was poor in quality and merely repeated at a low level the Constantinopolitan models which had produced a flourishing revival in the 640s. Meanwhile we have nothing at all to show for Constantinople.

Yet the very first gold coins of Justinian II, issued in 685, are among the most impressive works of the second hump. They are struck in very high relief, giving a convincingly plastic and well coordinated frontal image of the young emperor. As relief carving they easily equal in quality the best of the Heraclian coins, and they are distinctly more plastic in style, with more consistently rounded forms. But they are not entirely unanticipated, for the last gold series of Constantine IV (681-685) revived an early sixth-century type, last used by Justinian I around 538, where the emperor's head is turned slightly to the right, and the best examples of these coins give some hint of a classical revival in style. The choice of iconographic type is interesting in the light of the later works of Justinian II, but this turning pose was not used again in coins. The second series of Justinian II, where a beard is added to his portrait (687-692), is less consistent in quality, but the third series (692-695) with the famous image of Christ is one of the chief glories of the Justinianic revival, one of the most convincing classical adaptations in the whole of Byzantine art (Breckenridge, NumNotesMon 144, 1959). After the deposition of Justinian II the revival style continued in coin portraits for most of the reign of Leontius (695-698) but then the quality declined and never fully recovered, even in the second reign of Justinian II (705-711). In other media, however, it seems likely that there was more continuity in Constantinople throughout this period. The trouble is that none of the apparently Constantinopolitan works of the period is indisputably dated. Therefore we must begin our analysis with Rome, making the usual allowances for the irregular occurence of provincial qualities, and later we must turn to Ummayad painting, distinguishing carefully between its classical and oriental sources.

Rome, S. Maria Antiqua: The extensive repainting commissioned by John VII (705-707) has been thoroughly described by Nordhagen (ActaInstRomNorv 3, 1968) and I am inclined to agree with all his attributions to this period. Obviously there were a number of painters involved, who showed varying degrees of skill and provincialism, but behind these variations we can perceive a common basis of style, which must have been imported from Constantinople. The major heads are strikingly plastic in effect, whether slightly turned, as in the medallions of Apostles, or frontal, as in the Church Father of layer III of the palimpsest wall. They are strongly modeled by gradations of shadows and highlights which are always applied systematically, but may appear as more vigorous brushstrokes in the work of some individual painters. The contours are clearly defined but that definition may be either a firmly drawn outline or a shadow modulated into a black edge. The linear details may be freely drawn for naturalistic effect, as in St. Andrew, or they may be organized into coherent patterns, as in St. Paul, in a manner recalling the specifically Roman quality of the S. Maria Antiqua icon. In either case these heads, with their direct gaze, are enormously impressive. The heads in the narrative compositions are smaller in absolute size and tend to be painted in a freer manner; the contours and highlights may be broken up to enhance the lively effect, but even in so astonishingly Hellenistic a head as the seraph at the top of the apse wall there is a more definite contour than in the schöne Engel and its relatives.

The figures in the narrative scenes are very plastic but may seem almost arbitrarily activated: in the Adoration the first magus kneels urgently with

his feet spread apart while the second turns sharply in contrapposto. Simon of Cyrene is hunched forward as he carries the cross with urgent step; this action is clarified by a system of linear articulation in the drapery, a pattern of lines organized both to emphasize the articulation of the anatomy and in its abstract rhythm to supplement the action of the figure. This kind of linear pattern is completely different from the rigidifying patterns we expect particularly in provincial work, and it has its precedent in the Mt. Sinai mosaic, a work of the highest quality from the end of the reign of Justinian I: compare Simon carrying the cross with Moses unbinding his sandal. Similarly the heads in medallions at Mt. Sinai are generally comparable to those in S. Maria Antiqua in their plasticity and in their accented contours, while some of the heads of active figures in the narrative scenes are comparable in their freer use of illusionistic color modeling. The obvious difference in medium prevents our pursuing this comparison much further but here is good evidence for the Justinianic revival suspected by Kitzinger as early as 1934 (RömMal, p. 16; 1958 Kongr., p. 32); Nordhagen's objections (Acta 3, 1968, p.111) are based on comparisons with provincial examples at Ravenna.

Rome, Oratory of John VII in Old St. Peters: The surviving fragments of these mosaics (also described by Nordhagen, ActaInstRomNorv 2 [1965] 121-166) are less useful for our purpose largely because of their poor condition, which reduces the apparent range of coloristic modeling and its plastic effect, but the use of contours is comparable to what we have seen in the frescoes, and the classical component of the figure style is evident in many details, such as the Washing of the Child. Furthermore, the Grimaldi drawings made before the destruction of the Oratory, although not reliable in every detail, do suggest landscape settings of a fairly organized type, particularly in the Nativity and Entry into Jerusalem. These can give some notion of the relatively elaborate spatial compositions developed by the painters of John VII, particularly if we return to the surviving fragments of such compositions in his frescoes in S. Maria Antiqua. One of these is worth mentioning: the mountains behind the figures of David and Goliath are not essential to the iconography and contrast notably with the vague and open spatial recession in the Maccabees, but this is a common Justinianic formula for a mountain, to be seen, for example, in the apse mosaic of S. Vitale.

Mt. Sinai, Icon of St. Peter: This is obviously Constantinopolitan work, and as Kitzinger has shown (StudiesA.M.Friend, 1955, p. 138), comparison with the medallions of S. Maria Antiqua date it to the period around 700. The head has the same plasticity but the details are rendered with more naturalistic subtlety: the lines of the hair are organized in patterns, but less rigidly than in some of the Roman heads, and the contours are less emphatically defined. The body has an extraordinary effect of bulky plasticity, and the articulation of the drapery is organized to create patterns of sweeping lines which supplement this effect. The dramatic sense of corporeality in this figure is complemented by the specific spatial setting of the exedra behind him. These qualities, combined with the direct gaze of the saint, establish a relationship between believer and holy image entirely different from the control and decorum which characterize the Heraclian icon of the Virgin and Child with Sts. Theodore and Demetrius. Now it seems the prayers of the believer might be too much directed to the substance of the image rather than to the spiritual reality which lies

behind it, and the temptation to idolatry seems much closer.

Rome, S. Maria in Trastevere, Icon of the Virgin and Child with donor and angels. Bertelli demonstrated (MadSMT, 1961) on many grounds, particularly the content and lettering of the inscription, that this icon must have been commissioned by John VII, and that it is he who is kneeling at the feet of the Virgin. He also demonstrated that stylistic analysis confirms the specifically Roman nature of the painting particularly evident in comparing the head of the angel at the left with the medallion of St. Paul in S. Maria Antiqua. The heads of the other angel and the Child, however, are much closer to Constantinopolitan work. Where they are well enough preserved the bodies show the bulky quality and something of the system of linear articulation in the garments which we expect in the work of John VII, but without the extraordinary suggestion of corporeal presence we find in the Mt. Sinai St. Peter. The head of the Virgin is very plastic but almost metallic in its rigidity, apparently a further development of the Roman tradition of the treatment of the principal figure of a holy image as we observed it in the S. Maria Antiqua icon. Because of this, and through compositional devices such as the stretched torso of the Virgin, the believer is enormously impressed by the solemnity of an image like this, and is prevented from achieving excessive spiritual intimacy with it. The coming split between East and West over the cult of images seems predicted in these two versions of a common period style.

Jerusalem, Dome of the Rock: The mosaic inscription implies the completion of this enormous scheme of decoration, originally both inside and out, in 691/2; the building cannot have been begun before 685, when Abd el-Malik became Caliph, and so we must imagine that there was a vast crew of mosaicists at work, and we can understand the uneven quality of the result. Here and in the Great Mosque of Damascus it is necessary to rely on old photographs and to distinguish carefully the original parts from various restorations, for in both cases it seems the latest restorations have been catastrophic. In the Dome of the Rock much of the ornament reflects the oriental tradition, particularly the Sassanian motifs, but there are also many variations on the classical motifs of acanthus foliage and scroll, and there are naturalistically rendered trees and garlands on the soffits of many arches. While some of the acanthus details are strongly schematic most of the cup-shaped clumps of acanthus and the better examples of acanthus scroll are very three-dimensional in effect and emphasize the natural growth of the leaf, with its irregular jagged edge turning in space.

Damascus, Great Mosque: built by the Caliph al-Walid (705-715) with an enormous international crew of workmen, including, we know from good historical sources (cf. Gibb, DOP 12 [1958] 221-233), mosaicists sent from Constantinople by Justinian II. The scattered fragments of the minor decoration, both inside and out, include acanthus motifs and naturalistic trees comparable to those of the Dome of the Rock, and a lower proportion of oriental motifs. But the most important feature is the large landscape mosaic in the courtyard discovered in 1929. This is a sacro-idyllic landscape in the Roman tradition. There is some precedent closer in time in mosaic pavements such as the one with trees, animals, and water in St. Demetrius at Nikopolis, from early in the reign of Justinian I. But in Damascus, although neither animals nor humans are shown, in the authentic Roman tradition there are clusters of buildings of various types rendered in classical style and filling out the background of the landscape. There could be no more dramatic demonstration of "perennial Hellenism" than this

link between Pompeii and the Macedonian Renaissance, and despite its location at Damascus it must be seen essentially as part of the Constantinopolitan art of Justinian II.

Qusayr Amra: This remote palace of an Ummayad prince was certainly decorated after 711, probably not very long after. Of the vast scheme of painted decoration known from the descriptions and drawings published by Musil only a fraction survived to be photographed, but this fraction includes both human figures and animals which can be claimed to depend in style on the revival of Justinian II. The nude women are not only corpulent according to Arab concepts of female beauty, they are rendered with coloristic modeling and coherent contours to give maximum plastic effect. The other figures and the animals are equally plastic in rendering and some have complex postures turning in space.

Constantinople, Great Palace Mosaic: In reviewing the Second Report of the excavations Mango demonstrated that the mosaic cannot be earlier than the second half of the sixth century (ArtB 42 [1960] 67-70); considering the literary evidence he suggested that it might be part of the building campaign of Tiberius II (578-582). Reviewing once more the archaeological evidence, and emphasizing the well known fact that Justinian II built two important buildings in this general part of the palace (in 694 according to Ebersolt, GrPalais, 1910, p. 95), Nordhagen claimed the mosaic for Justinian II (BZ 56 [1963] 53-68), an attribution which I find entirely convincing. (The evidence for such a date was also considered by Elizabeth Allen Defouloy in an unpublished Berkeley M.A. thesis, 1966.) If anything the archaeology of the site favors a date later than the sixth century: under the mosaic were unfinished capitals of sixth-century type, and brickstamps with cruciform monograms, a type which began only in the reign of Justinian I. The adjoining apsidal hall, of which only foundations remained, was presumably contemporary with the mosaic in the peristyle, but it was phase V in a complex sequence of changes and additions in which phase I shows characteristic Justinianic masonry. This seems to make Tiberius II unlikely, but not impossible, Furthermore, what little we know of Constantinopolitan art around 580 (coins and silver) suggests that this was a time of grave decline in the classical tradition, a time when so extraordinary a monument as this mosaic would be entirely isolated.

Certainly the style of the mosaic fits easily into the period of Justinian II. The natural growth of leafage in the acanthus scroll of the border is similar to that at the Dome of the Rock, but, as might be expected in Constantinople, a little more naturalistic in detail and finer in quality of work. The human masks in the border are closely comparable to the major John VII heads in S. Maria Antiqua, or to the Mr. Sinai icon of St. Peter. The trees in the bucolic scenes are similar to the most naturalistic trees in the mosaics at Jerusalem and Damascus, and the little bits of architecture in these scenes are simpler versions of those in Damascus. Above all the figure style of the Great Palace mosaic can be seen as the Constantinopolitan source studied by the painters of John VII and those of Qusayr Amra. The figures are very plastic in effect, strongly modeled by gradations of color and given a definite contour; they are vigorous in their actions, many turning sharply in space, and we find both the hunched-over formula and the wide-spread stance familiar from S. Maria Antiqua. Furthermore, the major lines of the garments are organized into patterns which articulate the anatomy and supplement the action of the figure.

The idea of a Justinianic revival is obvious here in the general repertory of the floor mosaic and in many specific motifs. A direct comparison, as with the Goatherd dish (Dodd no. 9) raises the problem of distinguishing the style of the revival from that of the original. I think the difference can be recognized in aspects such as occasional awkwardness in anatomy: a head displaced with respect to the shoulders, an active stance which is stretched beyond reason. The Painters of Justinian II lacked final confidence in handling the basis of the classical style they sought to revive.

Constantinople, Hagia Sophia, mosaic in the room over the southwest ramp: Cormack (in an article to be expected in DOP) identifies this room as the Sekreton built by the Patriarch John II Scholasticus (565-574), and assigns the mosaics to that date. But the acanthus scroll on the vault is very similar to that at the Dome of the Rock (cf. Kitzinger, 1958 Kongr. p. 11). The large medallions on the walls originally had busts of saints; in the Justinianic period (as at Mt. Sinai) such medallions were placed on the soffit of an arch or in a similar way integrated into the scheme of architectural decoration, but here they are separated and made a prominent feature of the wall at a lower height, more like the medallions in S. Maria Antiqua. This seems to me symptomatic of the increasing cult of images to be expected in the time of Justinian II, but not in the time of Justin II.

British Museum, Add. Ms. 5111: These two fragmentary folios of an extraordinarily luxurious set of Canon Tables have acanthus foliage and various oriental motifs which are very similar to those of the Dome of the Rock. Furthermore, although very small, the medallion busts of Apostles show the vigorous plasticity and the defined contours we expect in the time of Justinian II.

Salonica, St. Demetrius, fresco of an imperial adventus: This probably refers to the triumphal entry of Justinian II into Salonica in 688/9, but the identification is not certain (Breckenridge, BZ 48 [1955] 116-122). The beard on this emperor corresponds to that on the portrait of Justinian II in his second series of gold coins (687-692). The fresco was considerably damaged even when first discovered after the fire of 1917, and it is rather provincial in quality, but the style certainly fits this date, for the heads are strongly modeled and have defined contours. The principal figures are very plastic in effect, and one turns sharply in contrapposto; the linear scheme of articulation of drapery supplements the actions and clarifies the anatomical articulation.

Kiti, apse mosaic: Although somewhat provincial in execution, the style clearly fits the period of Justinian II. The figures are very plastic in effect, strongly modeled, with defined contours; the lines of the drapery, particularly in the angel at the right, articulate the basic anatomy and emphasize the stepping action. There are close parallels for the decorative motifs of the borders in the Dome of the Rock (but not for the animal heads, which are Christian symbols). There is no specific documentation for the building, but the mosaic is an addition carried out after a fire; it is tempting to connect the fire with the Arab raids in the middle of the century, and the new mosaic with the neutralized and peaceful status of Cyprus following the treaty of 688 (cf. Jenkins in StudiesD.M.Robinson, 1953, II, pp. 1006-1014). Megaw formerly agreed with this date (1958 Kongr. Akten, pp. 350-351) but is now inclined to assign the mosaic to the late sixth century (DOP 28 [1974] 74-76).

Rome, Catacomb of Commodilla, fresco of St. Luke with painted inscription "Sub tempora Constantin[o] Aug[u]sto n[ostro] factum est." It is easier to say what this curious inscription does not mean (it is not an imperial commission) than to understand what it really does mean. It seems a very strange notion for a painter to record the date of his work so prominently and in such vague terms, and one wonders whether some other reference is not intended, perhaps an earlier establishment of a cult or translation of relics. The fresco is one of several isolated additions to the decoration of a chapel first established in the catacomb late in the fourth century for the cult of the relics of Sts. Felix and Adauctus. It is on a wall cut as part of an enlargement not earlier than the sixth century, and is next to an apse apparently used for the altar. There is no apparent reason for adding a devotional image of St. Luke. If we accept the received assumption that a seventh-century date is intended in the inscription both Constans II (641-668) and Constantine IV (668-685) are eligible. The former was never popular in Rome (recall his imprisoning Martin I and his robbing the Pantheon of its bronze tiles) but the latter was highly regarded for his sponsoring of Council of 680/1, and therefore Wilpert (RömMosMal, 1916, p. 946) considered the early 680s the most likely date.

The painting is provincial in quality, but the figure is strongly modeled and has bold linear contours; the face has vigorous brushstrokes for highlights and shadows and is very plastic in effect. The lines of the drapery form a pattern articulating the anatomy, though quite awkwardly at the right knee. In short, this seems inescapably a reflection of the style of Justinian II. If Wilpert's date is correct the fresco is contemporary with the first symptoms of that revival, the last issue of the gold coins of Constantine IV, but it is hard indeed to understand how such a style could have reached Rome, where it contrasts in every way with that of the apparently contemporary mosaic of St. Sebastian in S. Pietro in Vincoli. Alternatively, one could attempt to explain this style as a uniquely linear and vigorous interpretation of the style of the Church Fathers of 649, and place this fresco in the time of Constans II, but I do not find that convincing. If I could date it on the grounds of style alone I would place it just after John VII, seeing features such as the awkward stance, the strong linearity and the schematic shadow for spatial recession as the first step in the direction of the frescoes of S. Saba, etc. The style of the lettering, with its careful shading and distinctive serifs, also connects the fresco with John VII. I think the meaning of the inscription needs thoughtful study.

Castelseprio, S. Maria foris Portas: It would be inappropriate here to attempt to summarize the literature of this enduring controversy. It is obvious that these frescoes are the work of a Greek painter of extraordinary gifts, an artist who must have been trained in Constantinople but somehow found employment in the foothills of the Alps. In a sense he appears as the Byzantine Titian, a great artist whose brilliant personal style developed far beyond the norms of his time, but I believe it is nevertheless possible to define his point of departure. The medallion bust of Christ is terribly worn and faded, but it is clear at least that the anatomy was coherent and the head very plastic in effect, painted with controlled shading and highlights and a defined contour. The heads in the narrative scenes are inevitably very different, being much smaller in absolute size and mostly shown in active three-quarter view, but the very lively effect obtained by breaking up some of the contours and accenting the highlights is approached by the best heads in the narrative scenes of the John VII paintings

at S. Maria Antiqua. There are also important iconographic connections with the work of John VII, such as the inclusion in the Nativity of the doubting midwife, the Washing of the Child, and the Annunciation to the Shepherds (cf. Nordhagen, ActaInstRomNorv 2 [1965] 131-134). The Construction of the spatial compositions was probably similar (to judge from copies and fragments of the John VII work); the formula for a mountain in the Nativity is the same as in David and Goliath at S. Maria Antiqua, and the architectural motifs in the distance are the same as in the Great Mosque at Damascus.

But most important, the figure style at Castelseprio can be seen as an enhanced version of the period style of Justinian II, a style practiced with uneven success by the painters of John VII. A seated figure such as the Joseph in the Nativity turns gently in contrapposto, and is rendered bulky and substantial by the control of shading and highlights and by the design of the folds of his drapery. An active figure, such as the angel of Joseph's Dream or Joseph in the Journey to Bethlehem, gains his dynamic expressive quality largely through coordinating the articulation of his drapery in a pattern of lines so as to clarify the action, and to supplement by abstract rhythm the effective motion of the figure. This is the same principal we have observed before, a basic aspect of the Justinianic revival, but here it is more skillfully handled than in the paintings of John VII, and it is heightened in dramatic effect beyond either the paintings of John VII or the Great Palace mosaic. This expressive enhancement and the exaggeration of vigorous brushstrokes make Castelseprio virtually a mannerist version of the basic style of Justinian II. It would seem to come late in this revival. From the point of view of local painting in the Langobard kingdom it would be convenient to date Castelseprio around the 720s, for the sinopie of layer I at S. Salvatore in Brescia (apparently dated c. 754) are so similar to Castelseprio that one must imagine them the work of a pupil of the Castelseprio master (this point emerges with new clarity from a Berkeley Ph.D. dissertation now almost completed by Barbara Bernhard Anderson). Indeed, it seems to me possible to follow the influence of the Castelseprio master in northern Italy through the rest of the eighth century, but I would insist that his style has nothing to do with later Carolingian painting, particularly the Reims manuscripts; that should be seen as a Northern development on the basis of the unique style of the foreign (Greek?) artists who painted the Schatzkammer Gospels in a renewed version of perennial Hellenism completely different from Castelseprio.

In Constantinople the end of the second hump is lost in an era of political instability followed by iconoclasm. We can speculate that such conditions led artists like the Castelseprio master to emigrate, but we have no evidence to follow the art of the capital any further into the eighth century. There is a hint of development, however, in later Ummayad painting, for the mosaic pavement at Khirbat-al-Mafjar (a palace left unfinished in 743) shows a hardening and flattening in the rendering of foliage, and a more restrictive outline and less spatial arrangement in the animals. This seems a decline in the classical component of this style, still brilliant in its decorative effects. Then with the collapse of the Ummayad dynasty and the rise of the Abassids Islamic culture turned away from Byzantium and Islamic art became obviously Oriental.

In Rome, on the other hand, there was a considerable afterlife for the period style of Justinian II. The painters of John VII were quite active, and I suspect, for example, they painted the fragmentary Agony in the Garden in S.

Maria in Via Lata. Next came the frescoes of S. Saba, where the linear element in the style becomes more prominent but where the basic inheritance of the style of Justinian II is still obvious. By the time of the chapel of Sts. Quiricus and Julitta in S. Maria Antiqua (741-752) the linear element and the flattening effect have become dominant, and in the fresco of Hadrian I in S. Maria Antiqua (772-795) we see the dead end of this style. Cut off from Constantinople, the source of perennial Hellenism, Roman art could not sustain a classical revival indefinitely, and the next great renewal in Rome, as seen in the mosaics of Pascal I (817-824), drew its models primarily from Roman works of the early sixth century. The second hump of the seventh century had a kind of tail in Rome which dwindled away in the middle of the eighth century.

In explaining my hypothesis I have attempted to account for all the significant dated works and to show how the major undated works can be fitted into the scheme. I think the results are satisfactory, but I realize there are two issues which need repeated evaluation: the claim that the period style of Justinian II was recognizably different from that of Heraclius because of a conscious attempt to revive the style of Justinian I; and the claim that the generation before 610 and the generation from about 650 to about 685 were periods of general decline in quantity, in quality, and in the understanding of the classical inheritance. While inevitably we use words like "decline" the development of art should not be thought of as arbitrary curves on an economist's chart. Our model must be a simplification if we are to make sense of our diffuse data, but it must have an organic quality and be able to respond with a heave or a ripple to new discoveries or to changed opinions. Since in presenting this paper I shall be able to consider only a few examples I shall welcome discussion on any of the others, particularly those which are most controversial. But beware the camel who gets his nose into your tent: there is a lot more of him to come!

The Later Roman Empire

Computer Analysis of the Data in The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire

Ralph W. Mathisen, University of Wisconsin

Volume I of The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire provides us with an invaluable tool for the study of the late Roman empire. Its usefulness would be greatly enhanced by the ability to sort out quickly from this huge mass of data groups of individuals meeting specific requirements, e.g. all Spanish Christians during the reign of Theodosius. The recurrent nature of the data associated with each name, e.g. origin, rank, etc., makes the data ideally fitted for computer analysis. My paper discusses the manner in which the data in the PLRE have been condensed to make them intelligible to the computer. It also covers applications and limitations of such an analysis of prosopographical data. While thus far only a small percentage of the names have been coded, the basic FORTRAN programs are now operational and tests have been run. The specific, though preliminary, results of these tests will also be discussed.

The Conversion of Eudocia

Kenneth G. Holum, University of Maryland

Aelia Eudocia, consort of Theodosius II (402-450) and one of the typical potent women of his time, has received surprisingly little attention from critical historians. Gregorovius' dated but attractive biography and Seeck's brief account in Pauly-Wissowa remain the basic modern treatments. Neither exploits a fraction of the sources available.

Eudocia was born Athenais, the daughter of a pagan teacher of rhetoric in Athens. Orphaned at an early age, she became known to the emperor, probably through a maternal uncle who wished to exploit her charms to secure protection for admirers of paganism. Before her marriage she received baptism, and by the time of the Nestorian controversy felt enough at home in her new religion to intervene in church politics, apparently on Nestorius' behalf. A few years later she traveled to Jerusalem. There she sat at the feet of the very holy nun Melania the Younger, but also apparently intervened in communal strife in favor of Jews. Back in Constantinople, she secured the appointment of a literary man and reputed pagan, Cyrus of Panopolis, to the praetorian prefecture of the East. Shortly thereafter, she left her husband and returned to spend her remaining years in Palestine. By the end of her life (ca. 465) she had won a reputation as a supporter of monasticism and builder of churches, and as a protector of persecuted monophysites.

Obviously the distinctions we think we see in late antique/proto-Byzantine religiosity--between paganism and Christianity, the teachings of Nestorius and Eutyches, adherence to Christ and sympathy for Jews--did not appear so clear to Eudocia. I hope to make some sense of her views by a study of her actions and close examination of her poetry, a substantial body of which has been preserved. This paper grows out of my 1973 Chicago dissertation, "Aelia Pulcheria and the Eastern Roman Empire," and is part of the preliminary work necessary before the publication of the dissertation as a monograph.

The Treaty with the Huns of 443

William Bayless, Rutgers University

E.A. Thompson, A History of Attila and the Huns, pp. 77 and 217, maintains that Theodosius II never paid the annual tribute to the Huns required by the Peace of Margus (435). He argues that the 6,000 pounds of gold demanded by Attila in 443 was a round sum demanded as compensation for the tribute in arrears, and that Priscus (fr. 3) states that the war was caused by the failure of the Romans to pay the tribute.

My reasons for disbelieving this argument are as follows.

If the Romans did withhold the tribute from 435, why did the Huns not mention it in 441 when they resumed hostilities? The war began when the Huns attacked a border fort. In Priscus (fr. 2) the Huns give various reasons for this attack. There is not a word about the supposedly withheld tribute. Yet one would certainly expect it here since the Huns justified the attack by the grievances they had against the Empire.

I believe Thompson has also misunderstood fr. 3. A careful reading of the passage shows that Attila claims that Theodosius has refused to pay the tribute on the pretext that the war is under way. In other words, Theodosius withheld tribute from the outbreak of the war in 441, not from the Peace of Margus in 435. The renewal of hostilities in 441 would provide the Romans with an entirely justified reason for refusing payment. With the return of the fleet from Sicily that was originally directed against the Vandals, Theodosius might take this step with some confidence. But it would have been irresponsible folly for Theodosius to send a fleet against the Vandals in 441 with the knowledge that he was provoking the Huns by continually refusing to pay the tribute that he had promised.

Finally, Priscus (fr. 5) does not say or imply that the 6,000 pounds of gold was intended as arrears for withheld tribute. If this sum was exacted for the purpose Thompson claims, why did not Attila calculate it precisely rather than resorting to a "round sum"?

The 6,000 pounds demanded in 443 was probably a general indemnity therefore.

The Emperor Majorian and the East

Gerald Max, University of Wisconsin

Among the last emperors of the Roman West, Julius Valerius Majorianus (425?-461) was a singular anomaly: a ruler of strong will, energy, and independence. To his panegyrist and admirer Sidonius Apollinaris (430?-479?), whose name the age itself might bear, he was Scipio Africanus and Trajan reincarnate. Born, however, in the very worst of times, he was, as the historian Gibbon suggested, a hero in an age of iron who longed for a golden age past. As Emperor (457-461), he reigned under exceptional duress to achieve the object of his longing, making the maximum effort to reverse the process of decline the Empire had been undergoing for centuries.

With the death of Valentinian III in 455, the male line of the house of Theodosius the Great (379-395) expired and the inherited miseries of royalty passed to new men of whom Majorian, almost without exception, proved the ablest. But the times needed at least an able man at the helm. The dismemberment of the Empire was, at the outset of his reign, all but an accomplished fact. Federate and sovereign states, long established or nascent, of dubious loyalty or actively hostile, infested the once far-reaching and ordered dominions of the Pax Romana. In Spain, the Visigoths and Sueves warred for Hegemony over the peninsula unmindful of the imperial might with which the barbarian tribes, including the Franks, the Alans, and the Burgundians, established permanent and semi-permanent abodes. Britain had long since been abandoned to the Saxons and, more recently (in 454), Dalmatia, under Count Marcellinus, defected from the Empire. Perhaps the most important of the western provinces, Africa, from which, for over a century, Rome had drawn the greater part of her grain supply, was under the hostile control of the Vandals. To aggravate the situation, East was becoming more independently East and West more independently West. Indeed, after the death of Theodosius I, the Empire was divided between his two sons Honorius (395-423), ruling from Ravenna, and Arcadius (395-408), ruling from Constantinople. From then on the two halves of the Empire slowly drifted apart. Probably the greatest historian of his age, Priscus, significantly allowed one theme to emerge from his otherwise marvelously antiseptic narrative--how the division of the Empire, a weakness which

the Hun Attila (443-453) and the Vandal Gaiseric (428-477) brilliantly exploited, was ruining the whole.

The reign of Majorian--and his counterpart in the East Leo I (457-474), presents an interesting chapter in East-West relations. Though the date and circumstances of his elevation have long been topics of heated debate, it is generally agreed that the solution to the problem lies in the diplomatic relations between the Eastern and Western Courts. Whether Leo, the senior Augustus, ever recognized Majorian as his legitimate western colleague has not been certainly proven. Indirect evidence, however, permits the conclusion that Leo partially recognized him or the political situation in Italy. This paper then will offer the relevant material and show, too, how the position of Marcellinus of Dalmatia influenced the attitude of both the eastern and western governments towards each other.

Byzantine Architecture

Some Churches of the Early Macedonian Period and the Question of Sources

James Morganstern, Ohio State University

This paper discusses three churches of the early Macedonian period and examines their possible sources. The churches treated include that of St. Andrew at Peristerai of 870/1, the church at Dereagzi, probably of the late ninth or early tenth century, and the Church of the Theotokos built by Constantine Lips and consecrated in 907.

The churches are described and sources suggested, where possible, for the basic spaces and for the annex spaces. The sources envisioned for the basic spaces appear to date from no earlier than the seventh century and usually belong to the eighth or early ninth. The sources for the annex buildings, however, seem uniformly older and date from the time of Justinian and before.

In conclusion, one may venture a few observations. To judge from the three churches chosen, Byzantine architects of the early Macedonian period appear to have used a series of recent designs for their basic church spaces. For their appended buildings, on the other hand, they seem to have sought older models, suggesting, as in other media, a conscious revival.

Evolution of the Middle Byzantine Five-Domed Church Type

Slobodan Ćurčić, University of Illinois

Byzantine architecture knows two basic five-domed church types: 1. the Justinianic type--based on a free Greek-cross plan with the domes occurring over the crossing and over the arms of the cross, and, 2. the Middle Byzantine type--based on the cross-in-square plan with the domes basically appearing over the crossing and over the four compartments between the arms of the cross. The physical differences between the two types have long been known, but other equally significant differences have thus far received inadequate attention. We propose to show that the Middle Byzantine five-domed church evolves not from a simple design modification of the Justinianic five-domed church, but from a

complex process involving liturgical, architectural and iconographic planning.

The oldest post-Iconoclastic five-domed church--Nea Ekklesia--finished by 880 for Emperor Basil I, though no longer extant, on the basis of descriptions has been recognized as the prototype of Middle Byzantine five-domed churches. Although the sources pertaining to the Nea Ekklesia have been discussed on numerous occasions a major fact has been overlooked: the Vita Basilii states that the church had five dedications, implying the presence of five altars. Since a Byzantine church could have but one altar, we have to visualize the Nea Ekklesia as a compound of five churches, or as a major church with four subsidiary chapels. Although subsidiary chapels appear very early in Byzantine architecture, only after Iconoclasm are they fully regularized in plan and systematically integrated into the total mass of the building. The post-Iconoclastic five-domed church can thus be seen as a formal product of this evolution. The significance of the dome as the central point of the iconographic hierarchy in post-Iconoclastic church decoration has been illuminated by Demus. The implication of multiple domes in the context of the "ideal decorative system" has not been explained. In the light of our analysis, the five domes can be interpreted as the five foci of the five decorative systems, each associated with a functional and architectural entity--a church or a chapel. This notion seems corroborated by the later surviving examples, such as Nerezi (1164), where five aspects of Christ occupy the apexes of the five domes.

Archaeologically, the arrangement of a cross-in-square church with four gallery chapels is demonstrated by the tenth century church of Constantine Lips in Constantinople, although the presence of domes on drums in this case is not absolutely certain. A number of eleventh century churches display pairs of domed gallery chapels on their west sides (e.g. Panagia Chalkeon in Thessaloniki, and Koimesis at Mesa Gonia on the Island of Thera). In the course of the eleventh century, however, the five-domed church began to be treated as an architectural form substantially divorced from the quintuple functional consideration from which it evolved. Several examples scattered over a large territory from Calabria to Asia Minor, and from the Peloponesus to Russia, illustrate the emergence of a new variant of the five-domed church, one in which the subsidiary domes open directly onto the corner spaces of the cross-in-square plan. The original relationship of a single dome to the individual chapel is never entirely lost. In various forms this relationship persists to the end of the Byzantine architectural development.

The Middle Byzantine five-domed church despite certain visual similarities with its Justinianic predecessor, displays an evolutionary path indicating a substantial liturgical, architectural, and iconographic independence from the pre-Iconoclastic tradition.

Banquet Address

Byzantine Field Archeology: The Outlook

Cecil L. Striker, University of Pennsylvania

The purpose of this paper is to arouse discussion on the role of field archeology in Byzantine studies. Its present position with relation to the field, which will be briefly described, is anomolous--not unlike that which Byzantine studies, itself, enjoys with respect to other established disciplines such as classics and history. It will be stressed that up to now the concern of Byzantine field archeology has been confined almost exclusively to art, architecture,

and epigraphy.

The paper will suggest that advantages are to be drawn from the anomolous position and nascent state of archaeology within the field of Byzantine studies. On the one hand, it is not yet so strongly bound to the limited, traditional objectives of archaeology. On the other, the relative smallness of the Byzantine field lends itself well to inter-disciplinary communication, which is the necessary condition for effective archaeology.

The possible extent to which these advantages may be exploited will be considered from both a theoretical and practical standpoint. Some aspects of the so-called "new archeology" will be described; and possibilities of its application in such areas of inquiry as urbanism, every day life, agriculture, demography, diet, health, and trade will be posed.

The Imperial Centuries in Byzantium (7th-11th c.)

From Patrida to Genos: Hagiography and the Byzantine Aristocracy in the Early Middle Ages

Dorothy de F. Abrahamse, California State University, Long Beach

This paper will examine the evidence of the hagiographic texts of the sixth, seventh and ninth centuries for the evolution of the Byzantine aristocracy in the early middle ages. A comparison of pre-Iconoclastic and ninth century texts offers three kinds of evidence for change: 1) Hagiographic rhetoric from the two periods shows changes in standard formulas from attributions of "eminence and wealth in a city" to phrases for nobility of blood and descent. 2) Changes in the meaning and usage of specific terminology for nobility and landholding patterns will be examined as a reflection of social change. 3) The backgrounds of individuals mentioned in the texts--saints and their clients--suggest significant differences in the relationships between provincial aristocrats and imperial rank, in the function of family associations and city patriotism, and in the economic basis for nobility in the two periods.

The evidence demonstrates that "nobility" in pre-Iconoclastic saints' lives was applied to two separate groups--imperial officials in Constantinople and the leading men of large and small provincial cities. Ninth century texts mention no nobles with ties to provincial cities; rather, the term is used for men with imperial or provincial offices and men of good family or descent. More important, a careful study of hagiographical evidence offers insight into fundamental changes in the structure and function of the genos in the early middle ages, and can enlarge our understanding of the much debated problem of the origins of the medieval Byzantine aristocracy. Finally, although no late seventh or early eighth century saints' lives survive, a careful comparison of sixth and ninth century texts provides important clues to the nature of the changes in the Byzantine social structure in the seventh and eighth centuries, and it allows us to understand changing meanings of nobility in the late ancient and early medieval worlds.

Toward a Reinterpretation of the Second Iconoclastic Period

John Rosser, Boston College

Iconoclasm during the second period of controversy is most often considered impotent, spiritually exhausted, an imitative reaction which hardly had support beyond the confines of the capital. Paul Alexander has shown that this view is unsubstantiated for the reign of Leo V (813-820). It can now be shown that the same is true for the reign of Theophilus (829-842). Theophilus' iconoclastic decrees were effective far beyond the capital, and they bear a striking resemblance to those of Leo V. In fact, there are so many resemblances between the two emperors that perhaps we should cease calling Theophilus an imitator of the Abbasid soverign Harun al-Raschid (786-809), but rather of Leo the Armenian! Theophilus continued the overall internal policy of Leo V, a policy which aimed at revitalizing the Empire. Iconoclasm was an integral part of this policy, not some unwise aberration of otherwise exemplary monarchs. And both monarchs were indeed exemplary, effective and popular. Their reigns exhibit the vigor of the second iconoclastic period, despite the interlude of decline under Michael II (820-829).

Byzantine Imperialism in Armenia, 990-1021, Reconsidered

John H. Forsyth, University of Michigan

The Byzantine annexation of Armenia, which amounted to the annexation of the province of Tayk and its dependencies and Vaspurakan, by Basil II did not come about singly as a product of Byzantine imperialism and territorial aggression. In actuality the annexations were the result of a complex set of factors; the most important was the centuries-old distrust between Armenians and Byzantines. It is often claimed that Davith of Tayk, whom the chroniclers maintained to have been without son or heir, actually did have a son, albeit adopted; also that Basil II was behind the poisoning of Davith in 1000 A.D. To the chroniclers who maintained that the cession of Vaspurakan was the frustrated response of the ruler Senacherib to bloody Turkoman or Kurdish incursions from the east, a modern authority responded, "No one gives away what is his."

To the contrary it can be shown that Basil originally showed great favor toward Davith after he had sent Basil 12,000 troops that rendered him crucial aid in putting down the revolt of Bardas Skleros (976-979). Such was Basil's gratitude that he may have entrusted the extremely strategic city of Theodosiopolis thereafter to Davith.

Davith, however, for what may have been good reasons of his own, did not support Basil during the rebellion of Bardas Phocas (987-989), which almost succeeded in toppling the Emperor from his throne. In 988 Davith was at war against his adopted son Bagrat, king of Abkhazia, and was in no position to support Basil, whose cause in Anatolia looked hopeless in any case. Davith's aid to Bardas Phocas was relatively slight compared to what he had given Basil a decade earlier. Nevertheless, Basil grimly forced Davith's accession in 990 and sent a punitive expedition in 992 against the Kurds of Lake Van who had supported Phocas. Obviously, Davith's adoption of Bagrat could have lapsed during their recent war.

The Armenian sources do not confirm the charge that Basil poisoned Davith. In fact some Armenian sources praise Basil. Finally, the notion that the fragmented petty states of Armenia were capable of strongly resisting the Sekjuks is without evidence and should not be used as an argument against the wisdom of Basil's policy of annexation. Nor can Basil be held responsible for the blunder of later emperors who tried to force Chalcedonian orthodoxy on the Armenians.

The Tomb of the Empress Theophano and the Convent of St. Constantine in Constantinople

George P. Majeska, University of Maryland

Byzantine sources state that Theophano, the wife of Emperor Leo VI, was buried in the Church of All Saints, in an imperial mausoleum at Holy Apostles, and in a Convent of St. Constantine which was later called the Church of St. Theophano. Each is correct, but only for a specific time. The paper suggests why the body might have been moved. A comparison of Russian descriptions of Constantinople with Byzantine material locates the last of these resting places of the Empress Theophano in the rather restricted area between Holy Apostles and the Pantocrator Monastery and confirms a once posited identification of this convent with the Church of St. Constantine at the Cistern of Bonus. Anthony of Novgorod's description of the pre-1204 Byzantine capital also provides the key to why Theophano had founded a shrine of St. Constantine: it was dedicated to St. Constantine of Synada whose intervention had saved her life and that of her husband (or at least their political lives). The paper also points out that the contemporary Church of St. Constantine at Eis Pēgas, which the same source connects with the St. Constantine whose shrine Theophano founded near Holy Apostles, was rather a shrine to Theophano's step-brother-in-law Constantine, the eldest son of Emperor Basil I who founded the church.

Byzantinoslavica

The Metaphysics of Byzantine Diplomacy in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries

Frank Wozniak, Appalachian State University

The Byzantine Empire for the largest part of its history pursued a diplomacy of balancing various countervailing forces. The resulting diplomatic pattern often appears hypocritical and excessively obtuse when examined by modern historians. All too often there seem to emerge grounds for the pejorative term "byzantine diplomacy"; yet the concept of emperorship and imperium within the Empire shows other aspects of Byzantine motives and their accompanying ideology.

The problems of the development of a foreign policy and its implementation by a Christian empire troubled the Empire and its formulators of policy at frequent intervals. There was no time where this was more characteristic than during the period of the writings of Leo VI the Wise and the Patriarch Nicholas Mysticos in the forty years straddling the year 900. The purpose of this paper will be to examine the Tactica and other writings of Leo VI particularly in the

sections of foreign ethnic powers, and the letters of Nicholas Mysticos to the Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria in an attempt to define the basic premises and preconceptions which influenced the formulation of Byzantine diplomacy.

Byzantine Imperial Thought in Theory and Practice in Vladimirian-Jaroslavian Russia

Walter K. Hanak, Shepherd College

The official reception of Christianity from Byzantium exposed Kievan Russia to a period of political and cultural efflorescence. Christianity, the Russian annalists and literary apologists believed, had effaced the primitive Kievan Rus' political and pagan religious legacy. But a major difficulty explaining this transition was the relational character of the Kievan velikii kniazi (grand princes) to the autokratores (autocrats). The early Russian and their contemporary Byzantine sources do not fully define the precise nature of their relationship nor do these same sources explain the role played by the Kievan rulers within the community of Christian princes at whose head sits the Byzantine emperors. Yet, the nature of grand princely power as a result of Byzantine political and religious influences underwent some alteration, but the image of the Kievan grand princes demonstrates an early Russian textual reluctance to admit dependency upon Byzantine imperial theory and practice.

I propose in this paper to demonstrate the uneven inculcation into Kievan Russia of the Byzantine religious and political thought world. Further, I will show how the Kievans through their conversion gained an imprecise Christian notion of monarchy and of the powers of a grand prince. And the Rus', prompted by feelings of preserving their identity and independence, moved with caution into the political and religious orbit of Constantinople. On the one hand, the Rus' were willing to elevate their standing amongst the nations and took steps to assure this gain, while on the other hand they demonstrated their aloofness to the Byzantine political sphere by resorting to arms.

Illustrated Manuscripts

Narrative Time in the Quedlinburg Itala

Inabelle Levin, Case Western Reserve University

The Quedlinburg Itala, Berlin Stbl. theol. ms. lat. 485, is the oldest extant illustrated manuscript of the Bible. It was probably produced in a Roman workshop during the first third of the fifth century. Detailed instructions to the painter, which were accidently revealed under each picture, indicate that this cycle was originally invented for the Quedlinburg Itala. (Other supporting evidence is available, but it will not be presented in this paper.) The instructions agree more closely with the text than with the pictures. The repeated departures of the pictures from the instructions and the text are according to three types of pictorial traditions: stock figures and groupings from model books, the official iconography developed for imperial triumphal ceremonies, and landscape elements from earlier Roman illusionistic wall painting.

In their reliance on imperial triumphal iconography the Quedlinburg Itala artists followed the narrative tradition rather than the grand tradition. Although fourth and fifth century imperial art showed strong preference for hieratic, aulic, timeless compositions the Quedlinburg Itala artists preferred laterally developing episodic narratives. Whether using monoscenic, paratactic, compositions, continuous narration, friezes, registers, or bird's-eye panoramas the miniaturists always limited them to the essential elements. They used the same means of representing the continuous passage of time which had been developed in Roman narrative art for indicating causality and temporal sequence.

The Quedlinburg Itala belongs to a category of densely illustrated deluxe manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries. By commissioning such manuscripts as the Quedlinburg Itala, Cotton Genesis and Vienna Genesis, Christians could demonstrate that their Bible lent itself to the same rich narrative illustration as did classical pagan literature. This was a period of frequent iconographic invention in Christian narrative cycles and of experimentation in the layout for the illustrated codex. The two and four part grid framework frontispiece format used for the Quedlinburg Itala enabled the artists to group the pictures as a prefatory index to the textual units which followed in order to orient the reader. It provided a pictorial synopsis of the following story which could be understood without consulting the text because the essential episodes were assembled on one page. The grouped pictures show cause and effect relationships from the initiating event to the conclusion. They allow more flexibility in the selection of scenes than is provided by the column picture type, because the miniatures can illustrate several closely related verses eithout constantly interrupting the text. They show the narrative relationship of events that may occur on one page of text that follows as well as on the next twenty pages.

The Evolution of the Byzantine Prophet Book

Leslie Brubaker, Pennsylvania State University

Since A.M. Friend's discussion of prophet portraiture in his monumental study of Evangelist portraits, the illustrations accompanying the numerous preserved Byzantine Prophet Books have received only summary examination. This cursory attention has led to the general assumption that Eastern prophet portraiture remained essentially unchanged from the fifth to the thirteenth century. While it is true that post-Iconoclastic Prophet Books form a singularly homogeneous group, those few codices which antedate the Iconoclastic controversy exhibit significant formal and iconographical differences from their (presumed) successors. The results of a systematic study of these discrepancies are revealing not only for their contradiction of established manuscript "theory" (particularly that concerning the development of narrative illustration); on a more pragmatic level, the results of such a study offer assistance in determining the chronology of the sources used for those manuscripts--such as Psalters and Menologia--which include prophet portraits.

The Scriptural Exegesis of Leo the Patrician and his Miniaturist in Vaticanus Reginensis Graecus 1

Thomas F. Mathews, New York University

The study of the miniatures of this great Macedonian-period Bible may start with an analysis of the pictorial sources for the miniatures, but it must

not stop there. The miniatures pose a serious problem of biblical exegesis. Unlike other biblical illustrations, the miniatures of Reg. Gr. 1. do not appear in a narrative setting but as frontispieces, originally one for each book of the Bible. A unique kind of collaboration between the patron and the painter stands behind their composition. The patron, Leo the Patrician, composed a set of iambic preface verses for each book, and these provided the material for the painter. The miniatures can only be interpreted in connection with the verses, and the verses locate them in the living and evolving tradition of Byzantine scriptural exegesis. In the format of the present conference it will not be possible to present more than a few miniatures in this method, but it is hoped that this presentation will at least plot the course for a more comprehensive study.

The Order and Content of the David Miniatures in the Psalter of Basil II

Anthony Cutler, Pennsylvania State University

In celebrity and seeming familiarity, the Psalter of Basil II (Venice, Marciana cod. gr. Z. 17) is rivalled among Byzantine manuscripts only by Paris gr. 139: the bibliography through 1974 numbers more than 40 major items. Yet, despite this reputation, its famous six-part page with scenes from the Life of David has never been the subject of detailed scrutiny. Because of this cycle, the codex is often compared to--and sometimes admitted to the company of--the "Aristocratic" Psalters. Yet in many ways the Venice manuscript differs significantly from the customary comparanda. In its order of miniatures (as against that of most Psalters), it places the Anointment of David ahead of the Shepherd protecting his flock; and (as against the textual order of I Kings) David fights with the bear before his struggle with the lion. Iconographically, too, the cycle is full of anomalies: David and Goliath are shown before rather than during or after their battle; the young musician is already crowned as he plays before Saul; and David's Penitence is accompanied not by the customary Rebuke but by the figure of the King praying to an arc of Heaven. The explanation of these problems must take into account two major bodies of evidence ignored in previous discussions of the cycle. These are 1) the historical circumstances of Basil's accession to power and the events of his reign, and 2) pre-Iconoclastic David cycles which, it can be shown, have a direct bearing upon that of the Venice Psalter.

The Byzantine Cycle of the Acts as Illuminated by Chicago 2400

Annemarie Weyl Carr, Southern Methodist University

The Byzantine cycle of the Acts--its elusive character and questionable existence--has attracted considerable scholarly attention in recent years. Ernst Kitzinger has examined the cycles of Peter and Paul in Monreale, Dorothy Glass has investigated South Italian sculptured cycles containing images from the Acts, Sirarpie der Nersessian has studied the schematic, small-figure illuminations of Walters Art Gallery, MS. 533 and Mt. Sinai, MS 275, and Herbert Kessler has published the four pictures prefacing Paris, gr. 102. These studies should now be joined by an investigation of the largest surviving Byzantine cycle of illustrations

to the Acts. This is in the Rockefeller McCormick New Testament, a lavishly illustrated Greek New Testament now in Chicago, and familiarly known as Chicago 2400.

Chicago 2400 preserves thirteen of its original nineteen Acts miniatures, framed pictures inserted into the columns of the text above the passages which they illustrate. The initial six pictures are small and awkwardly composed; the remainder are larger, with confident compositions and flamboyant colorschemes. The duality of small and large miniatures echoes the similar duality in the Chicago manuscript's Gospel illustrations. The break between small and large scenes comes at an interesting point, however. The larger, more confident miniatures begin with the appearance of Saul. The initial group of little pictures can be reconstructed to include the Ascension, St. Peter with the Disciples, the Election of Matthias, the Pentecost, the Healing at the Beautiful Gate, SS. Peter and John before the Sanhedrin, and the Death of Ananias. The second group can be reconstructed to include scenes of SS. Peter and Paul only. This is, in fact, the way the cycle was reconstructed by H.R. Willoughby in his major study of the miniatures in Chicago 2400. In order to reconstruct the cycle in this manner, Willoughby had to postulate the use of two apocryphal scenes, both seen in the lives of SS. Peter and Paul at Monreale. The limping inarticulateness of the small miniatures and the abrupt shift in size and quality with the advent of St. Paul led Willoughby to postulate that the Chicago cycle is a composite, drawn whenever possible from illustrated Saints' Lives of Peter and Paul, and composed with awkward, first-hand spontaneity when the pictures had to be based on the text of the Acts, itself.

The majority of Byzantine illustrations to the Acts can be interpreted in just this light, as composites based on Saint's Lives. This has generated considerable doubt as to the existence of an Acts cycle, as such. A small number of monuments, however, contradict this view, and imply the existence of a genuine Byzantine cycle of illustrations to the Acts. The cycle which they suggest is extensive, closely bound to the text, wholly canonical, of considerable antiquity, and alive still in the twelfth century, its compositions shifting with broader shifts in Byzantine taste, style and usage. It is the intention of this paper to present the evidence for the existence of this cycle, and to demonstrate that it is this cycle—rather than a composite drawn from illustrated Saints' Lives—that has governed the imagery in the Chicago New Testament.

Aspects of Old Testament Iconography in the Last of the Byzantine Marginal Psalters, Hamilton 78.A.9

Christine Havice, University of Kentucky

The Kupferstichkabinett of the Dahlem Museum in (West) Berlin possess the last and largest of the eight surviving Byzantine marginally-illustrated Psalters, the Hamilton Psalter, 78.A.9, which contains both Greek and Latin text and is generally ascribed a thirteenth-century date. Internal evidence suggests that the manuscript was copied on Cyprus, but this has not as yet been carefully supported by stylistic analysis.

The Hamilton Psalter differs from the other members of its class in that the body of the text is preceded by a series of miniatures illustrating the one hundred fifty-first or supernumerary Psalm dealing with David's youth. The

episodes thus represented form a frontispiece series to the rest of the manuscript similar to that found in the so-called aristocratic full-page Psalters, most notably the famous Parisinus, cod. 139.

However, these images differ both stylistically and iconographically from the other David scenes found throughout the body of the Psalter. In examining the marginal illustrations of the David cycle and others drawn from the Old Testament, particularly Genesis and Exodus, one notes some iconographic variations which cannot always be readily explained by comparison with other marginal Psalters. These include a somewhat expanded version of the Joseph cycle, two series of miniatures treating the Plagues in Egypt, and the Crossing of the Red Sea, two scenes of which occupy the only full-page composition within the body of the Psalter, preceding the Odes. It is upon these scenes, largely unpublished, that this discussion will center, considering the increased influences of the aristocratic Psalter group and the somewhat prosaic attitude of the Hamilton artists to the illustration of the text.

Byzantium: The Final Phase

The Problem of Byzantine Decline: Towards a New Paradigm

John Teall, Mt. Holyoke College

Until recently, surveys of Byzantine history from the death of Basil II to the Fourth Crusade with virtual unanimity viewed these centuries in terms of decline, explaining the empire's loss of political preeminence as a function of the weakness of its society, characterizing the latter as "feudalized" or even "played out," "unhealthy," and "diseased." Included among both causes and symptoms of decline were the failure of autocratic leadership after Basil's death, debasement of the currency, venality of offices, widespread employment of mercenaries, farming of taxes, the award of privileged exemptions, and the strife of parties. Recent work, first in intellectual history and more lately in the economic sphere, accords ill with the decline paradigm. It delineates, rather, a society marked by cultural creativity coupled with agricultural and commercial development.

It is the purpose of the present paper to attempt to resolve this dilemma: first, by noting that the practices and institutions enumerated above, although not widely characteristic of the medieval west in the eleventh and twelfth centuries when they prevailed at Byzantium, may indeed be found in profusion throughout the west at the end of the middle ages and during the early modern period. Symptomatic there of the birth of the early modern state, of the transition to more effective government and to a more highly monetarized economy, they failed to produce the catastrophic results they had earlier occasioned in Byzantium.

The reason for the differing outcome may be found in external conditions, in what might be termed--anachronistically--"international relations." Each European state was locked in a struggle with rivals whose strengths and weaknesses were not unlike its own. If the resulting balance of power system withheld long-term hegemony from any one of them, it at least permitted all to survive. Byzantium, at the crossroads of the world, confronted rivals whose strengths and weaknesses were of a very different order among themselves and from the empire's own. The consequences were manifest at Manzikert in 1071 and at Constantinople in 1204.

Such a view suggests a paradigm differing from that of decline, one based upon a comparison of Byzantium's strengths and weaknesses with those of its contemporaries in, respectively, the earlier and later middle ages. Research guided by a conceptual framework of that nature may indicate that Byzantium, precocious when judged by early medieval standards, with equal precociousness encountered in the eleventh and twelfth centuries certain general problems of early modern state-building which its particular external circumstances or conditions did not permit it to solve.

Palaeologan Painting during the Early Period of the Reign of Andronicus II (1282-1311): Considerations of Style and Meaning

Thalia Gouma Peterson, The College of Wooster

The reign of Anronicus II (1282-1328), a period of economic crisis, strategic weakness, religious dissent and political instability, is extremely rich artistically, especially in the field of painting. Many of the frescoes in Yugoslavia and Greece and the mosaics of Constantinople and Thessalonica have been studied and have become better known in the last two decades. However, other material in this artistically and culturally complex period has not been investigated and a synthesis of the many diverse trends still remains to be made.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate a group of paintings of the period 1282-1311, the first period of Andronicos' reign. I shall call the art of this period the "second Palaeologan style" to distinguish it from the "first Palaeologan style" of the reign of Michael VIII (1261-1282) and from the "third," or mature, Palaeologan style of the later part of Andronicos' reign (1311-1328). Artistic development does not fall within chronological divisions. However, it does reflect cultural changes and there were such changes during the Palaeologan period which roughly correspond with the chronological divisions suggested above. These, in turn, affected the art. There are profound differences between the paintings of Sopoćani (c. 1260-1270) and those of the Kariye Djami (c. 1316-1321) and yet both are Palaeologan and are at the most sixty years apart.

It is during the decades between c. 1282 and 1311 that the most important changes were taking place and that many antithetical forces were at work both within the society and the art of the period. As a result these paintings are filled with an intensity, dynamism and explosiveness, never before encountered in Byzantine art. They express such an urgent sense of vitality that they come close in spirit to contemporary paintings in the West. However Byzantine art remained true to its transcendent meaning to the very end, and its transformation into the art of a proto-Renaissance was never complete. It is the tension between the pulse of reality and the consistently transcendental meaning of the icon which gives the painting of this period its special character.

Antonios of Larissa, the "New Theologian"

Paul Magdalino, Dumbarton Oaks

The career and writings of Antonios, Metropolitan of Larissa, are of considerable interest to historians dealing with the Byzantine provinces in the fourteenth

century. Antonios was head of the Thessalian church at a time when important political and religious developments were taking place in the region of Trikkala: he was closely in touch with these developments since he resided there and not in Larissa, his own see. He held office for a period of over thirty years (1333-post 1366) during which seven semi-independent regimes came to power in Thessaly. After the Serbian conquest (1348) he took refuge in Thessalonica, where he seems to have made some influential friends, and he finally returned to his see at the invitation of the Despot Nikephoros II Doukas about 1356. Under Nikephoros and his successor, the "Emperor of the Greeks and Serbs," Symeon Uroš, Antonios was a prominent figure at the local court, which provided much patronage for local monasticism, notably the ascetic movement taking place among the Meteora rocks.

Antonios is also known as a writer of homilies, but these are unpublished and are known mainly through the preliminary study made in 1936 (BNJ) by N.A. Bees, which contains many inaccuracies and gives no idea of the historical material afforded by these writings. Two encomia are, in fact, of particular interest to the historian. Both are addressed to local saints who went unrecognized in Constantinople: Oikoumenios, allegedly a fourth-century bishop of Trikkala, and Kyprianos, Antonios' own predecessor as Metropolitan of Larissa. They are evidence for the strength of local tradition in the local church, and for the way in which an enterprising bishop could himself help create this tradition by describing the issues which concerned him in hagiographical terms.

The Basilika and the Demosia: the Treasuries of the Late Byzantine Empire

Timothy S. Miller, Catholic University of America

In the fourth book of the History of John Cantacuzenus the emperor states that he is unable to finance a war with Serbia or Galata because both the basilika and the demosia are empty. In other passages the emperor refers to two treasuries, the demosia and the basilika or basilikon tameion. His language suggests two treasuries in the financial structure of the late Byzantine bureaucracy, but many recent Byzantine scholars have detected only one, the basilikon or basilikon bestiarion in many sources. From Franz Dölger's work on Byzantine financial institutions to the recent study of Nicaean government by Michael Angold works touching on the Palaeologan financial bureaus fail to point out that there were two state treasuries. In my paper I would like to examine some of the documents of the Palaeogan period to prove that there were surely two separate financial offices and that this distinction was rooted in bureaucratic tradition and in the method of land classification. The basilika and demosia were first visible under those names as the state treasuries in the Book of the Eparch (late ninth century). When prostagmata of the Palaeologan empire are viewed carefully, they prove that these offices were still functioning in the fourteenth century.

Imperial and Church Arts

The Ivory Sceptre of Leo VI: Its Religious and Political Significance

Kathleen Corrigan, University of California, Los Angeles

Much research has been done on ninth, tenth and eleventh century ivories in general, but generally this research has been confined to the grouping and dating of works based on stylistic analysis, the delineation of workshops and the search for iconographic and stylistic prototypes in both ivory and other media (such as manuscript illumination, metalwork and painted icons). Scholars working on ivories have not usually considered the problem of the actual significance or function (in political and religious terms) of the objects they are studying: the available historical evidence has been considered only insofar as it enhances the solution of the limited problems they have set for themselves.

The ivory sceptre of Leo VI (886-912) is more than a rare example of ninth century Byzantine ivory carving: it is the only surviving object of its kind, presenting an unusual coronation image. The ivory depicts the crowning of a Byzantine emperor by the Virgin, accompanied by the archangel Gabriel. The other side of the sceptre shows an image of Christ between the two apostles, Peter and Paul. The aim of this paper is to determine the statement made by this ivory within the particular political and religious system of the Byzantine imperial court.

The inscription on the sceptre is connected to the liturgy of the Feast of Pentecost. Thus it can be determined that the ivory commemorates the celebration of this particular religious feast. By correlating the liturgy and ceremonial for this feast, one can explain the presence and arrangement of the figures on the ivory and specify the precise architectural setting in which they appear. This, then, would facilitate an explanation of the meaning of the whole image in terms of Byzantine ideas about the nature of imperial power.

Byzantine Cameos with Arched Tops: A Question of Purpose

Ljubica D. Popovich, Vanderbilt University

Surviving examples of Byzantine glyptic art vary greatly in style, iconography, material, and shape. The most popular shape was any of several variations of an oval. Rarest of all shapes used by Byzantine masters was that of a vertical rectangle with rounded top. Some examples of this shape are now preserved in London (Victoria and Albert Museum, A-21-1932), in Paris (Louvre, MR-95), in Athens (Benaki Museum, no. 41), and in Baltimore (Walters Art Gallery, no 42.5). Besides the similarity in shape, three of these cameos are very close in size, while the Louvre example is somewhat larger.

Most recent scholarship dealing with Byzantine carvings in semi-precious stones is directed toward problems of date and style; much less attention has been paid to the original purpose of these cameos. One generally assumes that Byzantine cameos were made to serve as encolpia. It is beyond doubt that in the majority of cases circular and oval cameos served as either breast pendants or

brooches. Numerous other Byzantine jewelry objects executed in gold and enamel in similar shapes were definitely used as such ornaments. All these objects confirm a long-existing tradition of circular and oval shapes for the encolpia. Why would the Byzantine artist deviate from the established form of a disc or an oval by carving a rectangular cameo with rounded top and using it as a neck pendant? The purpose of this paper is to examine this particular shape of Byzantine glyptics and to advance a hypothesis about its possible application.

An examination of Byzantine written sources, including Constantine Porphyrogenetos, discloses frequent mention of precious stones on crowns and garments, and on secular and ecclesiastical objects. Although one can distinguish the stones thus used, there are no specific references to the shapes of these stones. However, the study of a differenct kind of evidence--that provided by the monuments themselves--reveals representations so strikingly similar in shape to the cameos under consideration that certain conclusions can be drawn. Especially close parallels in form are to be found in representations of imperial crowns from the middle Byzantine period, precisely the era in which the rectangular cameos with rounded tops are dated.

Representations of the following crowns have in their center a plaque with arched top: the mosaic of Constantine the Great (in the vestibule of Hagia Sophia, tenth century); the crown of Irene (from the Comnenian panel in the gallery of the same church, twelfth century). Furthermore, in miniature representations, all the depictions of the crown worn by Nicephorus III Botaniates (The Homilies of St. John Chrysostomos, Paris, B.N., Coisl. 97), show the same element in the center of the crown. Numismatic evidence is also very clear; on the gold coins of Leo VI, the central arched plaque is clearly distinguishable. The marble roundel depicting a Byzantine emperor, now in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection (twelfth century), shows an arched plaque secured to the crown with prongs. Finally, the Holy Crown of Hungary (Constantinople, ca. 1074-77), made of gold and enamels, uses precisely the same shape of enamelled plaques rounded at the top around the circumference of the crown.

On the basis of visual documentation found in Byzantine art, I wish to offer the following hypothesis: the Byzantine cameos with arched tops were made not as encolpia, but were used as part of the decoration of Byzantine imperial crowns during the middle Byzantine period. Until a Byzantine text is found which specifically states to the contrary, this hypothesis would seem to stand on the firm ground provided by the visual evidence.

State of Research on Some Recent Acquisitions

William D. Wixom, Cleveland Museum of Art

An informal illustrated talk dealing with selections from the Museum's acquisitions over the last few years since the purchase of the third century group of Early Christian marble sculptures (see preliminary publication, CMA Bulletin, March 1967). The objects, dating from the fourth century to the eleventh century, will include a gold glass, three bronzes, a lead medallion, an ivory pyx, a reliquary pendant with cloisonné enamel, a silver and niello processional cross, and, if time permits, three glazed earthenware plates with agraffito decoration. Comment and discussion in the Early Christian and Byzantine Gallery (Gallery Level) will be encouraged following the talk.