

Addressing the Viewer

12th- and 13th-Century Byzantine Wall Paintings

Abstract

This chapter discusses aspects of addressing the viewer in 12th- and early 13th-century wall paintings decorating sacred spaces in Byzantium. We look at reception processes as well as questions of production, appreciating planning, and execution of the paintings as constitutive elements for their reception history. This also concerns the specific architectural conditions, which include spatial separations. Regarding the practice of image design, written and visual sources, such as pattern books, are revealing for studying the relationship between design process and reception history. “Corrections” (*pentimenti*) during the execution of the wall paintings support the argument that the paintings were designed specifically for each space and adapted to its peculiarities. This attests to space-related concepts which take into account the viewers’ subsequent reception of the images.

Image formats and the resulting proximity to or distance from the viewer are also taken into account. The pictures are not subject to a static understanding but are individualized within a certain framework. Ultimately, they are to be understood as products of a complex process of invention. The conditions of reception inherent in the respective image medium clearly gain relevance in the work process. Attention is also paid to the concrete conditions of the perception process, addressing aspects such as carefully planned light choreography. The sophisticated use of lamps, lanterns, and other lighting devices with oil and candles is specifically negotiated in the Typika. Last but not least, liturgical performance and an understanding of time conditioned by the liturgical year are among the phenomena that intensify visual reception. Generally, this chapter aims to look at the concrete and sensory conception of the images and their rhetoric as oriented towards the viewer.

1. Prelude: The Church of St. Panteleimon in Nerezi

The central concern of the following chapter is how 12th- and 13th-century wall paintings in Byzantine churches address the viewer. Processes of planning and execution of the physical environment of the paintings, i.e., their specific architectural circumstances, will play as great a role as the question of an image’s format and the choice of its proximity to or distance from the viewer. Factors constituting the perceptive process, such as the choreography of light and a temporal understanding conditioned by liturgical

* Translated by David B. Dollenmayer. Quotations for which no other translation is cited have also been translated by Dollenmayer.

performance and the liturgical year, are as much a part of the experience as the specific conception of the images and their rhetoric.¹

As the Collaborative Research Center 1391 suggests, we see the autological and the heterological dimensions of artifacts as closely tied together and develop our interpretation from that fact. Above all, we suggest a more thorough integration of the viewer's perspective in the praxeological model, which understands the connection as a dynamic exchange. What follows will hopefully make plausible this conceptual expansion.

As a prerequisite, two at least partially interdependent phenomena must be mentioned:² on the one hand, visual modifications in the bema (chancel), separated from the laity and so invisible and inaccessible; and on the other, the tendencies to address viewers in the naos in modified form by deploying constellations of images, narrative strategies, and alternative models of the images. Such processes of spatial separation occurred gradually. For example, acoustic exclusion began toward the end of the 8th century with silent prayer. In the course of the 11th century, monasteries began to follow the practice of closing the curtains in the intercolumns of the templon during eucharistic prayer to prevent an 'impure' viewing of the Eucharist.³ To compensate for this denial of visibility, icons were also deployed. In the liturgy, during both the Little and the Great Entrance, the clergy established communication between the two spatial entities.⁴ In both rituals, the priest left the sanctuary and entered the naos. The Gifts (bread and wine) were prepared in the northern side room of the bema (prothesis).

1 Given the complexity of the topic, it will be possible to highlight only some aspects here.

2 In addition to St. Panteleimon in Nerezi from 1164, a small number of earlier and later examples are included. The intention is not to make generalized statements. Some parts of the first section on Nerezi refer to Schellewald 2005 and Schellewald 2008b. On the basic separation, cf. Gerstel 1999.

3 Taft 2006; Wybrew 1990, p. 134, quotes a letter of the monk Niketas Stethatos from the Stoudios Monastery in Constantinople (end of the 11th century); cf. Stéthatos, lettre no. VIII, pp. 280–291. The passage in Darrouzès's translation is as follows (p. 283): "[...] comment peut-il être tout à fait permis aux laïques d'approcher de l'autel lorsque les mystères divins s'accomplissent, bien plus, d'y porter un regard non sanctifié et d'avoir une telle liberté pour contempler les redoutables et divins mystères et ce qu'on y accomplit?" ([...] how can the laity be permitted to approach the altar while the divine mysteries are being accomplished, and moreover, to cast an impure gaze on them and have the freedom to contemplate the awe-inspiring, divine mysteries, and what is being performed there?) On p. 285 this question is amplified: "La place des laïques, sache-le, dans l'assemblée des fidèles, lorsque s'accomplit l'anaphore sacrée, est loin de l'autel divin. L'intérieur du sanctuaire est réservé aux prêtres, aux diacres et aux sous-diacres; [...] derrière eux et leur estrade, l'espace est aux laïques [...]." (Know that the laity's place in the congregation of believers whenever the holy anaphora is accomplished is far away from the divine altar. The interior of the sanctuary is reserved for the priests, the deacons, and the subdeacons [...] behind them and their space is the place for the laity; Greek text pp. 282 and 284). Gerstel 1994, p. 203, note 26, also cites passages from this letter.

4 Cf. on the liturgy Schulz 2000; Taft 1994 includes an outline of its development.

In the Great Entrance, the priest took the bread and wine, entered the naos, and then continued through the central door of the templon into the bema. First we will pay attention to the cross-in-square church in Nerezi, dedicated to St. Paneleimon and dated to the year 1164 (Fig. 1).⁵

The paintings in the bema show significant liturgical realism in the form of eight officiating bishops in three-quarter profile, all dressed in ceremonial vestments.⁶ The parchment scrolls they hold are inscribed with excerpts from liturgical texts (Fig. 2).⁷

As in Nerezi, there are other locations where the architecture and the paintings were not developed in a common planning process (see below, section 2.1); this seems to have made certain compromises necessary in the bema's paintings. The zone with the bishops has been made coherent with the height of the templon and the upper epistyle, thus marking the zone of the image as visually privileged with respect to the clergy. However, the side walls are characterized by setbacks so that individual bishops have different amounts of space at their disposal; at the same time, in their spatial presence they are subject to a certain gradation, especially since the second bishop from the west is situated on the part of the wall that leads to the southern parabema. In the previous tradition – e.g., in the Church of St. Sophia in Ohrid from the third quarter of the 11th century – the bishops are in front view, looking straight at the viewer. Because of their orientation toward the east in Nerezi, they are shown in three-quarter profile. Their heads are turned so that we can see their faces almost entirely, but their gaze clearly seems directed inward, or rather onto the texts they hold. They have no contact with the room, thus both reinforcing their mirroring of the officiants at the altar, but also in a direct sense through their texts, opening temporal vistas that reveal the liturgy as infinitely extended beyond its active performance at the altar. But it is above all the scroll texts themselves that make the actual performative context manifest. The painter has chosen an easily legible font size.

The nature of these textual vehicles corresponds to the scrolls actually used in the ritual.⁸ The center of the apse is occupied by the two orthodox church fathers, John Chrysostom and Basil, both authors of fundamental liturgical formulas. Basil's scroll

5 Sinkević 2000; Schellewald 2005; Schellewald 2008a.

6 On the identification of various vestments, cf. Walter 1982, pp. 9–26; Gerstel 1999, pp. 25–32; Sinkević 2000, pp. 35f.

7 It is not entirely clear when this way of presenting the bishops was introduced (see below, pp. 297f.).

8 Gerstel 1999, pp. 32–34. She addresses both the number and scope of these scrolls, points to the mechanism of the scroll in the Church of St. George in Kurbinovo, painted in 1191, and refers to the liturgical scrolls, a number of which survive. Cf. Gerstel 1994 with related literature. As important as her observations are, it must be mentioned that scrolls per se have a similar form and cannot be labeled in general as liturgical. A glance at the parekklesion of the Chrysostom Monastery in Koutsovendis and its figures of prophets with scrolls (see below, p. 338) shows this very clearly. The function of the inscribed parchment scroll is not explicitly defined.



Fig. 1. Nerezi, Panteleimon Church, 1164, view from the west into the eastern part of the naos and the bema.



Fig. 2. Nerezi, Panteleimon Church, 1164, bema, apse, St John Chrysostom and Basil as liturgists.

carries the text spoken silently by the priest during the chanting of the Cherubikon.⁹ Chrysostom's text is the prayer of the Proskomidia.¹⁰ St. Athanasius is positioned behind Basil and holds the beginning of the prayer for the Little Entrance (Fig. 3).¹¹

In the passageway to the southern annex attached to the bema (diaconicon), Athanasius is followed by Gregory of Nyssa holding the prayer of the first antiphon of Basil's liturgy.¹² The last bishop on this side is Nicholas, whose scroll carries the prayer of the second antiphon after Basil's liturgy.¹³ Chrysostom leads the row of bishops on the north side with the prayer of the Proskomedia.¹⁴ Next comes Gregory (John) the Theologian with a passage from a silent prayer the priest says after he has laid the wafers on the altar.¹⁵ Epiphanius of Salamis's scroll bears the beginning of the Trisagion.¹⁶ The last bishop on this side, Gregory Thaumaturgus, holds the words of the prayer for the catechumens before the Anaphora according to St. John.¹⁷ The bishops are oriented toward the Hetoimasia, the throne that awaits the Second Coming of Christ, painted into the axis of the altar above which hovers the dove of the Holy Spirit. The instruments of the Passion are clearly identifiable. The scroll texts are obviously not intended as a continuous sequence but rather refer to individual moments of the liturgical process and

- 9 Babić 1968, p. 375; Liturgies, p. 318,4–74: Οὐδεὶς ἄξιος τῶν συνδεδεμένων ταῖς σαρκικαῖς ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡ(δοναῖς). The inscriptions are partly abbreviated (here completed in parentheses). The hymn sung during the transport of the gifts during the Great Entrance of the liturgy is called the Cherubikon.
- 10 The Proskomedia is the first part of the liturgy, during which, i. a., the gifts are prepared. The texts of all eight bishops, identified in Babić 1968, pp. 375f., indicate that the entire liturgical rite was intended to be included, at least in excerpts. The texts seem to embody the idea of bringing the images and reality into the greatest possible coherence. Fundamentally, the bishops' texts can diverge from one church to another. Cf. Babić / Walter 1976, pp. 269–280.
- 11 Babić 1968, p. 375; Liturgies, p. 312,15–24, here 15–17: Δέσποτα Κ(ύρι)ε ὁ θ(εὸς) ἡμῶν ὁ καταστήσ(ας) ἐν οὐ(ρα)νοῖς τάγματα, καὶ στρατιάς.
- 12 Babić 1968, p. 375; Liturgies, p. 310,16–19: Κ(ύρι)ε ὁ θ(εὸς) ἡμῶν, οὗ τὸ κράτος ἀνείκαστον, καὶ ἡ δόξα ἀκατάληπτος, οὗ τὸ ἔλεος ἀμέτρητον.
- 13 Babić 1968, p. 375; Liturgies, p. 343,16–18: Κ(ύρι)ε, ὁ θ(εὸς) ἡμῶν, σῶσον τὸν λαόν σου καὶ εὐλόγησον τὴν κληρονομίαν σου.
- 14 Babić 1968, p. 375; Liturgies, p. 309,8–11: Ὁ θ(εὸς), ὁ θ(εὸς) ἡμῶν, ὁ τῶν οὐ(ρά)νιον ἄρτον τὴν τροφήν τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου τὸν Κ(ύρι)ον ἡμῶν. Here it is notable that Chrysostom's scroll bears not his own words but those of the Liturgy of St. Basil.
- 15 Babić 1968, p. 376, identifies him as Gregory the Theologian; Sinkević 2000, p. 36, note 55 and fig., corrected this to John the Baptist: Κ(ύρι)ε ὁ θ(εὸς) ὁ πα(ν)τοκράτωρ ὁ μόνο(ς) ἅγιος ὁ δεχόμενος θυσίαν αἰνέσεως (Chrysostomos-Liturgy; Babić 1968, p. 376; Liturgies, p. 319,6–8 quotation, prayer 6–17).
- 16 Liturgy of St. Basil; Babić 1968, p. 376; Liturgies, p. 313,4–5: Ὁ θ(εὸς) ὁ ἅγιος, ὁ ἐν ἅγιος ἀναπαυόμενος.
- 17 Babić 1968, p. 376; Liturgies, p. 315,12–14 (the entire prayer 12–18): Κ(ύρι)ε ὁ θ(εὸς) ἡμῶν, ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν καὶ τὰ ταπεινὰ ἐφορῶν, ὁ τὴν σ(ωτη)ρίαν.



Fig. 3. Nerezi, Panteleimon Church, 1164, bema, Bishop Athanasius.

together encompass it from its beginning with the Proskomedia to its end. Thanks to their texts, the bishops from the past are integrated into the actions of the present. The moment the liturgical scroll is picked up at the actual altar is the moment the scroll text finds its voice. Essentially, a communicative space arises between image and participants based on the text they share. While the liturgy is intended for active performance, mirrored in the images it gains a timeless presence that finds its actual goal – the end of days – visually present in the image of the Hetoimasia.¹⁸ This articulates the perpetuation of liturgical acts. Like the bishops, the priest officiating at the altar brings an offering to the Trinity. The central image is thus a meeting point and pivot in which the real and the visually simulated action intersect and all temporal levels converge. The historical bishops are, as it were, promoted to co-officiants. The relatively circumscribed dimensions of the room on the one hand and the aspirational level intended by the commissioner on the other may have produced this visual conception, since through their combined influence the liturgical ritual is emphasized.

In the sixth session of the Second Council of Nicaea in 787, in which fundamental statements concerning images were promulgated following the first phase of the iconoclastic controversy, Epiphanius declares

[...] there are times when the chanting of readings in the sacred churches falls silent, but depiction in images, with a permanent place in them, expounds and proclaims to us morning, evening and night the truth of the subjects treated.¹⁹

The pictorial conception realized here goes a step further by serving as the marker of an everlasting liturgy. At the same time, the bishops as a group present a model of motion that the actual celebrants follow during the liturgy: it corresponds to the preparation within the prothesis as well as to their movements during both Entrances. For that reason, the concept of mirroring does not entirely correspond to the productive potential of this solution for the images. At the same time, inherent in the selection is a moment of visibility toward the participants standing in the naos whenever the texts

18 This interpretation is supported by the liturgical commentary of the patriarch Germanos, who speaks of the entire sanctuary as having the function of Christ's throne, which he occupies until the Last Judgment. Cf. Gerstel 1999, pp. 38f.

19 Price: The Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea, p. 544; Mansi XIII, 361 A: Ἡ γὰρ ἀνάγνωσις ἔσθ' ὅτε καὶ ἐλλείπει ἄδεσθαι ἐν τοῖς σεπτοῖς ναοῖς. ἡ δὲ εἰκονικὴ ἀνατύπωσις ἐσπέρας καὶ πρωῒ καὶ μεσημβρίας, ὡς ἐν αὐτοῖς καθιδρυμένη, διηγεῖται ἡμῖν καὶ ἀγγέλλει τὴν τῶν πραγματευθέντων ἀλήθειαν. Lange 1969, p. 166, inferred from this passage that in light of the powers attributed to the image, this represents a transition into the realm of the individual's personal piety – a sort of transference of what is proclaimed in the liturgy into everyday piety. But such a separation cannot exist, especially since one must see the liturgization of images from various perspectives.

refer to the process of entering into or through the naos. The knowledge of the liturgy, and especially of eucharistic practice, still remains hidden.

The believers are not granted a view of the performance of the liturgy. The clergy are made manifestly aware of their privileged position, while at the same time experiencing a form of self-assurance. Thus, the question of potential forms of compensation for the naos becomes urgent.²⁰

Before we turn our attention to parts of its wall paintings, let us take a brief look at the prehistory of Nerezi. Two monuments indirectly involved in the prehistory of the Church of St. Panteleimon attest to the fact that there was an apparent consciousness of a differentiated method of addressing the viewers: the church in Veljusa, built around 1080, and the parekklesion of the monastery of St. John Chrysostomos in Koutsovendis on Cyprus, whose wall paintings probably date from around 1100.²¹ Even though they have not survived in optimal condition, we can see that besides full-figure, co-officiating bishops, there are others represented in medallions. On the western wall of the parekklesion in Koutsovendis, other bishops are painted but not dressed in liturgical vestments in accordance with their location in a room with a different function.

A brief look at later wall paintings attests to programmatic conceptions suited to their individual locations. While in Nerezi the notion of an offering to the Trinity is accentuated, a few years later in the Church of St. George in Kurbinovo (1191), sacramental realism is more clearly evident: instead of a Hetoimasia, there is the body of Christ, only dressed in a cloth and positioned on a painted altar.²² Above Christ's body,

20 The chartophylax of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, Niketas, also says that the priests in other places cannot be seen by the laity in this moment; Taft 2006, p. 46.

21 In Veljusa, there are only two bishops portrayed in this way, followed by front-facing figures. Babić 1968, p. 382, wondered whether the paintings were not made later than the date in the inscription, so that the conception would be closer in time to the theological discussions of the mystery of the Eucharist. However, the earlier dating is now accepted. But it is also clear that discussions and the conception of the images cannot always be clearly aligned. The paintings in Koutsovendis confirm this assessment: Mango 1990, esp. Fig. 1a, 1b and p. 77; Papacostas/Mango/Grünbart 2007; Parani 2018. Mango 1990, p. 75, also reconstructs at least eight bishops. But there cannot have been a conception identical to the one in Nerezi, since the apse conch is dominated by three larger windows. One cannot identify the goal toward which the bishops move. A reconstruction is also difficult since Mango suggests that the first bishop is Basil, and this identification is also made by Stylianou 1985, p. 458. As an alternative, Mango suggests Gregory of Nyssa. If one accepts the first suggestion, one could conjecture that there were originally not eight bishops present, since Basil is usually placed in the center of the procession. Recent scholarship also accepts the dating of the paintings to c. 1100.

22 Cf. Gerstel 1999, pp. 37f. and 40–44. While the body of Christ in Kurbinovo bears no stigmata, the image of Christ painted around 1300 in the Church of St. John Chrysostom in Geraki bears all the signs of the Passion as well as a stream of blood and water pouring into a chalice from the wound in his side. This painting has clear analogies to the image of Christ that appears in the West in the Mass of St. Gregory.

liturgical devices are arranged: a paten overlaid with an *asteriskos*.²³ The sacramental bread is shown in the middle of the paten. A liturgical cloth is laid over the middle of Christ's body. Thus the gap between the bread of the Eucharist and the body of Christ is visually closed.

If the clergy could continually see fundamental themes reflected in the images of the liturgical space, on the other side of the barrier of the templon, similar content was conveyed by rhetorical means with a different emphasis. In Nerezi, a distinct, complex yet impressive narrative concept is developed, in which liturgical texts are again essential.²⁴

The initial view of the naos is dominated by two images facing each other, one on the south wall of the southern crossarm and the other on the north wall of the northern crossarm: the Presentation of Jesus in the Temple and the Lamentation of Christ (Figs. 4–6). The largest stretches of wall, circa four meters wide, are reserved for these pictures.²⁵ Their format and choice of subject are striking. The Presentation in the Temple is one of the so-called bipolar scenes that, for example, can be placed on either side of a window to save space. In almost no other program can we verify analogous attention paid to such an event. And: This is the first time the Lamentation was so prominently featured in a monumental program.²⁶

The first picture appears to follow an iconography developed much earlier.²⁷ Two details that depart from it are distinctive. The prophetess Anna initiates the scene with an inviting gesture as well as with a scroll whose text communicates what she is saying: "This infant consolidated heaven and earth."²⁸ With this visually rhetorical, prominent positioning of Anna, Joseph as her pictorial counterpart enters behind Symeon at the right side of the ciborium. It is also intentional that the Christ Child is characterized with a stola (remnants of which were discovered by Sinkević), indicating his priestly function.²⁹ Significant is a gesture that unites mother and child. While the child seeks

23 This is a bracket with two metal buckles diagonal to each other. A cloth is laid over it, and it prevents the cloth from touching the sacrament.

24 Cf. Schellewald 2005 and Schellewald 2008a. References to individual texts are summarized there and will not be repeated here.

25 For this purpose, windows of the outer walls had to be walled up. On the entire program of images, cf. the diagrams in Sinkević 2000, plates 8a und 8b.

26 Only in the cemetery chapel (!) dedicated to Christ in Koutsoventis on Cyprus, which belongs to the nearby Monastery of St. John Chrysostom, does one find an analogous representation, which can possibly date from the beginning of the 12th century. Cf. Stylianou 1985, pp. 463–467. The program is specific to the building's function, or at the least this is suggested by the surviving fragments of a Crucifixion, a Deposition, and an Anastasis.

27 An overview of the iconographic development is offered by Shorr 1946 and Maguire 1980/1981.

28 Sinkević 2000, p. 49, note 138.

29 Sinkević 2000, p. 49, note 139. She considers this element as the decisive modification. However, it seems to me that the original intention of the picture is only revealed in the sum of the variations.



Fig. 4. Nerezi, Panteleimon Church, 1164, naos, south arm of the cross, south wall, Presentation in the Temple.



Fig. 5. Nerezi, Panteleimon Church, 1164, naos, north arm of the cross, north wall, Lamentation of Christ.



Fig. 6. Nerezi, Panteleimon Church, 1164, naos, north arm of the cross, north wall, Lamentation of Christ, detail.

support from his mother, she has an anxious expression. Anna's declaration suggests how the picture is to be read. She gestures toward the child while identifying him through her speech as the ruler of the world. At the Hypapante – the liturgical feast celebrating the Presentation – Christ is also spoken of as the creator of heaven and earth.³⁰ There is as well a more important reference to a contemporary theological dispute on the question of the extent to which Christ as an offering can at the same time be the one to whom – in the trinitarian context – the offering is made in the act of the Eucharist.³¹ In the named councils a sermon on this historical event, attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem, was read. It stressed that the child offering himself is at the same time the priest conducting the offering, and beyond that, also the one who accepts the offerings of all in heaven.³² Thus the visual modifications are owed mostly to the current controversy. The doves held by Joseph, although part of the Old Testament rite, can clearly be read in a broad sense as offerings (but of course, not the eucharistic offering). In the internal pictorial constellation of figures, the addressee is Christ himself. The event is narratively dramatized by its confrontation with the Lamentation. The aforementioned pictorial details are principally aimed at drawing attention to the connection between the Presentation and its announcement of the Passion.

As scholarship has long since shown, the images are related antithetically in the sense of ancient rhetoric (*anamnesis* / *prolepsis*).³³ Their elaborate visual language refers to corresponding texts (i. a., sermons and hymns). The translation into another medium succeeds primarily by strategically implemented visual details, above all the intimate physical relation of the Virgin to her son. Here the focus is on the body of Christ: At the Presentation in the Temple, the child clings to his mother, anticipating his later sacrifice; in the Lamentation on the opposite wall (Figs. 5 and 6), it is the mourners who present his dead, martyred body to the viewers. Implicit in the turning of Christ's body is the invitation to the viewers to join in the protagonists' lament. The attention paid to the body is especially evident in comparison to previous depictions, e.g., that in Vat. gr. 1156, fol. 194^v.³⁴ Not only is the latter's smaller format responsible for its more cursory indication of bodily detail; in general Christ's physical presence seems much less decisive. Significant in the Nerezi wall painting is the lower edge of the image, where the Virgin's knee almost touches two instruments of the Passion, the lance and the hyssop branch. In the image from the Vatican, by contrast, a broad stretch of ground extends to the edge of the image. The presence of the dead body of Christ can be read

30 Mercenier 1953, p. 320.

31 On the councils of 1156, 1157, and 1166, at which the donor of Nerezi was present at least once, cf. Babić 1968; Sinkević 2000, pp. 38–40; Schellewald 2005, pp. 956f. and Schellewald 2008a, pp. 50f.

32 Babić 1968, p. 384; cf. PG 140, 165D–168A.

33 Maguire 1981, pp. 9–21 and 101–108; Belting 2000, pp. 150–160.

34 On the miniature: digitalized manuscript in the Vaticana (DIGIVATLIB).

as a form of visualization that functions as compensation for the denial of the eucharistic act.³⁵ On the one hand, the instruments of the Passion recall what transpired at the Crucifixion itself (lance, hyssop branch, nails, the sign from the cross in a basket), on the other, they refer to the preceding Deposition from the Cross (e.g., the tongs), which is depicted to the left, on the west wall of the northern crossarm. The vessel of ointment completes this circle. The disposition of the scenes in this small space motivates the viewers to move. While turning away from and toward the scenes in their own rhythm, viewers are able to combine the temporal difference inherent in the scenes into a momentary simultaneity. With regard to the construction of gazes, the body of Christ, thrust into the foreground at the edge of the painting, is especially striking when compared to the miniature in the lectionary (Vat. gr. 1156), which has much more space between the body and the edge of the picture frame.³⁶

With the basket at its lower edge, one's attention is drawn to the Deposition (Fig. 7). Again, one is confronted by Christ's body. The proximity of the two scenes is underscored by the element of the Virgin's tender affection for her son (Figs. 6 and 7). A further gesture reinforces the impression that the two paintings merge: In the Lamentation, John takes the dead Christ's hand between his own, while in the Deposition, he lays Christ's hand on his cheek. Based on their format and the viewer's intimate proximity to the depicted events, one can hardly escape the images' characteristic emotional charge. Their visual rhetoric provokes an empathetic reaction in the viewer.³⁷

2. Visualization and Visibility in the Naos: Addressing (Integrating) the Viewer

2.1. Planning Processes

The task of the painters' workshop was definitely not simply to transfer a traditional repertoire onto a wall. Instead, depending on spatial constraints and the specified subject matter, it was to configure and accentuate images so that their individually selected arrangements were optimized for the recipients. The concrete challenge was to compensate for the total conception of gradations of visibility as well as for the conscious exclusion of some images from being seen, as briefly described above. Painters

35 The integration of the instruments of the Passion may confirm this reading.

36 In other pictures as well – e.g., of the Deposition – one can discern an analogous conception aimed at a structured gaze. Thus in the Transfiguration, John looks toward the Lamentation. The overall narrative structure in Nerezi aims at an internal interconnectedness as well as an interaction of the viewers.

37 In section 6 below there is further discussion of the aesthetics of Michael Psellos and so-called "living painting" that is frequently associated with Nerezi.



Fig. 7. Nerezi, Panteleimon Church, 1164, naos, north arm of the cross, west side, Deposition of Christ.

presented specific solutions for such compensation, and I would like to explore some examples in churches other than Nerezi.

Unlike mosaics in a sacred space, wall paintings per se are not fundamentally dependent on the architectural form of the picture field. While the materiality of mosaics is optimally deployed on vaults, corbels, spandrels, etc., the latitude for wall paintings is somewhat larger. At the same time, the challenge lies in creating connections between individual images, as in Nerezi. Thus, it seems appropriate to begin with some thoughts on the planning process, in which the medium of (preliminary) drawing plays a role. Our knowledge about this stage is still quite limited, in the first place because of the deficiency of surviving pattern or model books. As a rule, such materials for the work of painters have not been preserved. Restle has assembled the surviving material and argues correctly for a distinction between manuals and model or pattern books.³⁸ While the former – like the best-known example, the painter's manual from Mount Athos – contain painting techniques, formulas, and ideas for sacred images and also for the decoration of monumental buildings,³⁹ pattern books or individual sheets – at least to the extent that they refer directly or indirectly to the Byzantine area – offer designs for individual figures, scenic compositions, or groups of figures that also depict dynamic moments.⁴⁰ Milne has accurately described the scholarly situation as follows:

38 Restle 1995; Restle 2001; Restle 2005.

39 The Hermeneia of Athos is a very late product. The evidence to be found in various editions reaches back into the 16th century. The painters' manual of Dionysios of Fourni probably reflects medieval practices, but its various sources and the uncertain time of its creation do not allow a precise dating. The surviving version is a compilation from the 18th century. Restle 2001, p. 284 writes: "At least for now, there are no further clues as to its real age." On the painters' manual of Athos, cf. also Restle 1995, cols. 1222–1237. The first historically verifiable date is between 1701 and 1733. Restle rightly points out that such painters' manuals saw intense usage and for this reason alone hardly survived more than two hundred years. Moreover, information about colors and color combinations would deviate according to available materials. Beginning in the 16th century, we can verify *podlinniki* specifying entire picture cycles.

40 Hutter 1999 published a manuscript containing the second volume of St. John Chrysostom's commentary on Genesis from Magdalen College in Oxford (Ms no. 3). The margins of individual pages were used for drawings. 129 drawings have survived. Hutter reconstructs 145 of them. In contrast to an earlier publication by Velmans 1972, she identifies this codex as a pattern book. The drawings of three painters reflect both wall paintings and icons; based on their lateral reversal, Hutter assumes that some had an intermediary stage in the form of "cartoons" or tracings. The coloring is probably by a later hand. The drawings display a close connection to paintings on Cyprus and were probably made in the late 12th or early 13th century. The few clues Hutter was able to find call urgently for further research. Cf. also both sides of a sheet in the Cod. Garrett 7, Princeton, University Library, whose original function can also be interpreted as a pattern sheet; Restle 1995, cols. 775f.

For the visual pattern the artist had to go elsewhere, either to actual examples in churches and illuminated manuscripts, or more likely to a private and portable notebook of stock designs. Such sketchbooks existed, we know, in the medieval West. [...] They were not show-books, and no doubt received hard usage.⁴¹

The painter's manual of Dionysios of Fourni probably reflects medieval practices, but since it draws on a large variety of sources, the question of when it originated cannot be answered with certainty.

For her examination of the "pattern book" in Oxford, Hutter at first had the impression that the drawings were partly the result of a survey in a Byzantine church. However, there is no complete annotation of individual scenes or the entire contexts of images, but rather it contains almost entirely excerpts.⁴² Further observations lead to the conclusion that in most cases, icons were the model rather than wall paintings.⁴³ It was iconographic, but also aesthetic, solutions that interested the painters. Winfield quotes a letter of 1413, according to which the painters were very closely oriented to the models: "Their eyes running hither and thither, they do not so much paint with colors as strive to gaze constantly upon a model."⁴⁴

Documents of this sort may have been written partially as a sort of note- or sketch-book. Evidence for such transfer mechanisms can be directly observed on the paintings themselves, but we still lack a comprehensive study.⁴⁵

Examples such as the well-known Wolfenbüttel *Musterbuch* (Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, Cod. Guelf. 61.2 Aug. 8 °), which contains pen-and-ink drawings from the 1230s,⁴⁶ could attest to practices that bear neither "western" nor "eastern"

41 Milne 1935–1936, pp. 65f.

42 Hutter 1999, p. 121: "[...] one gets the impression of walking around in a Byzantine church looking high up to dome and apse, then to scenes of the Life of Christ, to temple icons, and along the hierarchy of saints. Yet none of these subjects is complete and some seem to be excerpts taken from a larger context."

43 Hutter 1999, pp. 123f. Individual figures probably come from icon frames. Icons with comprehensive programs of images, like the ones surviving in St. Catherine's Monastery in Sinai, may also have functioned as models. Thanks to their mobility, they are much better suited for this task than wall paintings.

44 Winfield 1968, p. 83.

45 One example would be Byzantine cycles with the Life of the Virgin in the late 13th and early 14th centuries. Based on analogous concepts of the image and occurring over a wide geographic area (Constantinople, Thessalonica, and the paintings originating under the Serbian King Stefan Uroš II Milutin), they document well-proven modifications adapted to the individual location and context. To be sure, in these cases the concept of "model" must be applied flexibly and kept open, so that one does not resort to 19th-century ideas.

46 The literature on the Wolfenbüttel *Musterbuch* is extensive; Restle 2005, cols. 805f. In addition, cf. the essay by Geymonat 2013, who takes earlier studies into account.

connotations. Geymont suggests that it could be identified as a sort of visual traveler's diary.⁴⁷

A sheet preserved in the Augustinermuseum in Freiburg (inv. no. G23/001c) also originally came from a sketchbook.⁴⁸ Scholars have conjectured that the artist was from the upper Rhine region and was especially studying the pictures produced by crusaders in the Holy Land. As with the example in Wolfenbüttel, one can tell from this page alone the direction his study was taking. There have been various suggestions for identifying the two horsemen in the lower half of the sheet.⁴⁹ Their model may have been an icon, as often encountered in the crusader milieu. Restle, however, emphasizes that it will hardly be possible to precisely identify the original template for such a sheet.⁵⁰ A series of further examples for drawing as an observational and preliminary medium have been variously discussed in the literature.⁵¹

In addition, we can learn about preliminary drawing because it sometimes becomes visible on parts of paintings due to their poor state of preservation. Based on the work of Winfield⁵² we can conclude that preliminary drawings may have been occasionally done directly onto a bare wall, but it was more common to have a first layer of plaster as a base. Usually, with the help of the drawings, the outlines of figures and their context were established. For example, they were used to determine proportional relationships. If one takes this phase of the wall painters' work as a starting point, one must concede that during the addition of color there were naturally reworkings and deviations, for example, in the Panagia tou Arakos in Lagoudera, Cyprus.⁵³ Specific aspects of a figure could also be highlighted with gold (chrysography in vestments, nimboes, etc.) or silver, as is the case with the Theotokos on the south wall of the Panagia tou Arakos.⁵⁴ In this context, Winfield speaks of the special presence of such figures.

47 Geymonat 2013; on p. 284 he writes: "[...] a sketch-book in which to figure out designs and keep track of inventive solutions."

48 Restle 2005, cols. 780–786; Warland 2005 with an extensive bibliography on the Freiburg sheet.

49 They were long thought to be Saints Theodore and George. However, Restle 2005, col. 785, suggested identifying them as Theodore Tiron and Theodore Stratelates.

50 Restle 2005, col. 785.

51 The first comprehensive publication is by Scheller 1995. The Guthlac Roll (London, British Library Harley Roll Y b, c. 1175/1215) has drawings in medallions that are probably preliminary designs for stained-glass windows or a wooden roof. Brown 2008 has researched a series of manuscripts with pictures that could be drafts. They give the interesting impression of being prepared to yield an intended "end product" in a different medium.

52 Winfield 1968 was the first comprehensive study of this topic.

53 Winfield 2003, e.g., pp. 111f.

54 Winfield 2003, pp. 244–249. The reworking makes the original presence of the figure hard to imagine. Winfield had the privilege of being able to observe the small traces in his examination. Christ figures without the opulent application of gold seem to emphasize the Incarnation.

In addition to these remarks about the working practices of the painters, we will briefly reflect on the inventive aspect of their art.⁵⁵ Neither manuals nor pattern books were a reason to produce slavish copies of what already existed; they served the painters only as a starting point. As Barber emphasizes, the Byzantine artist was not the victim of a static, unoriginal, or repetitive tradition.⁵⁶ Following the iconoclastic controversy, there was a first phase that insisted above all that the artist or painter was divinely inspired. But at the latest in a sermon of Emperor Leo VI (886–912), we encounter the concept that the artist's capacities are enhanced by invention. The rhetor insists that his audience concentrate on precisely that richness of invention. Although Barber's conclusions are based on his analysis of this sermon, they apply equally to our context:

He has not gathered his inventions from existing models, but has brought these forth from within himself. This attention to the artist's role is important and it places him at the center of the invention of his work and at the origin of the work of art.⁵⁷

These few short passages will hopefully make clear that, from the autological point of view, workshops in the churches on the one hand had access to their repertoire, while on the other they developed individual solutions in their engagement with the site-specific architecture, the image carrier. From the heterological point of view, however, requirements for the programmatic content were influenced by the wishes of the donors and a complex context that might expand those wishes, as well as by contemporary theological discussions. In the end, however, the central challenge – integrating both points of view – was provided by the concrete situation. In the course of the 12th century, it was to all appearances considered necessary to strengthen a visual conception that would sharpen the attention of the viewers. A few examples must suffice to illustrate this fact. The paintings of the bema and naos were calculated to be seen by their respective audiences. Contents that refer to the invisible eucharistic act in the naos, or that touch on the theme of the Passion, thereby emerge as essential factors.⁵⁸

2.2. Alternative Image Concepts

In our first example, there is a sort of scenic abbreviation: either individual figures are separated from their narrative context or an event is concentrated by using fewer actors. Here too we must pay attention to how the sacred space is integrated. Figures are

55 The following discussion is indebted above all to the essay by Barber 2017.

56 Barber 2017, p. 156.

57 Barber 2017, pp. 166–170 on invention, quote p. 170.

58 The emphasis is on the fact that, in the end, several factors characterize the program of wall paintings. My focus here is thus an excerpt of the entire phenomenon.

so positioned that the space becomes an integral element of their action or communication. In occupying this space, viewers are drawn into the action as if they were on stage. This is the sense in which Lidov structured his model of an *ierotopiia*, in which the icon is to be thought of spatial with regard to the viewer as well as in general to its location.⁵⁹

In the monastery church in Mileševo, a simple domed building with an attached narthex, the Presentation in the Temple is painted on the surfaces of the south- and northwestern pillars of the dome (Figs. 8a and 8b).⁶⁰

Standing beneath the dome, one sees on the left Joseph with his offerings and the Virgin with the Christ Child, and on the right the high priest Symeon stretching out his veiled hands toward the left and accompanied by the prophetess Anna, who holds out to us a scroll with the prophecy of the child as ruler of the world. Between these two groups is the actual space – more precisely, a location on whose axis toward the east stands the altar of the eucharistic offerings behind the templon. The historical event gains additional actualization in the Christ Child, who is not being offered to Symeon – as is conventional – but to the viewers. At the same time, this gesture of direct address constitutes a temporal hinge between past and present.⁶¹ What in this instance is a spatial constellation into which viewers are integrated can at the same time be read as the transformation of an image concept that had been used in a different medium and will indirectly lead us back to Nerezi. In a tetraevangelion with marginal illustrations (Vienna, Nationalbibliothek, theol. gr. 154, fol. 143^r) we find the protagonists distributed on the left and right margins of a text column with Luke 2:28f. The Virgin is in mourning, her head drooping and a hand on her cheek. Symeon bends far forward, his covered hands holding the child over the altar as a metaphorical offering. Christ turns

59 Lidov 2017 with bibliographical information. In his incisive formula (p. 426): “[...] it emerges out of flatness into the sphere of communion with the observing person present in the church as a matter of principle.” He appropriately adapts the concept of the *chora* as it is used for an inscription on the icons of Christ and the Theotokos in the Chora Church in Constantinople (pp. 428–432). In reference to Plato, i.e., he defines it as the “space of the icon.” By being inextricably connected to its prototype, the icon oscillates between “material concreteness and divine ideality” (p. 431).

60 Cf. the sketch of the program in Radojčić 1963, pp. 9 and 11. The sketch is somewhat confusing since it places different spatial levels next to each other. The figures of the representation are each in a pair, alone on a pier. On the program of images, cf. also Hamann-MacLean/Hallensleben 1963, Pl. 12–13; Koshi 1974.

61 In this architecture, the program is governed by a unique but obviously very intentional logic that we cannot further pursue at this point. One comment must suffice: beneath the dome, scenes unfold on four picture fields. The Communion of the Apostles – which would have been appropriate in the apse – here appears on the west side. The scene is staged in such a way that it functions as a mirror to what is taking place behind the templon. Koshi 1974, p. 130, found this placement puzzling. In view of the constellation of the Presentation in the Temple discussed here, this solution gains plausibility, i.e., images in the naos also have the function of referring to the liturgical actions.



Figs. 8a and 8b. Mileševa, Monastery church, 2nd half of the 13th century, naos, Presentation in the Temple.



toward him.⁶² The appearance of Symeon follows directly from the text; not so that of the Virgin, whose image captures various aspects: the empty space in her arms for the child, mourning the loss and anticipatory mourning for the final farewell. The text that bridges the distance functions as a constituent spatial element. The visual focus is on the Virgin's mourning, which we have also seen in Nerezi.

It is hardly an accident that we can verify a similar constellation – with additional content regarding the biblical event – in the church of the Panagia tou Arakos in Lagoudera on Cyprus, completed in 1192.⁶³ In the center of the domed architecture, the north and south walls offered surfaces to be painted.⁶⁴ On the north side, Symeon with Christ on his arm and John the Baptist appear (Fig. 9).⁶⁵ The latter stands at right angles to the iconostasis. Symeon's head is gently bent toward the child, who looks at the viewer. The scroll text held by John the Baptist (John 1:29) is the key to understanding the entire constellation of figures: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."⁶⁶ The figures have their place in the lower zone of the saints, so that they directly confront the beholder. If Symeon were interpreted as functionally the realization of a saint, then the Christ Child would be his attribute. Instead, the concentration on their two persons replaces the narration of the Presentation in the Temple.⁶⁷ In Symeon's arms, Christ is the anticipation of a eucharistic offering, i.e., the one that with John the Baptist is addressed as a lamb. The reference to the Passion in such close proximity to the templon obviously reveals a programmatic intention to visually transport in its historical rootedness the eucharistic event taking place behind the screen. Christ as sacrifice (sacramental lamb) directly confronts the viewer, who is able to connect the constellation of figures to the biblical event. Winfield emphasizes that traces of candles at these locations pay tribute to their special veneration.⁶⁸

The space was a vital component of the integration of the viewers when their gaze moved to the opposite wall. Savage stresses the complexity of this constellation of

62 Maguire 1977, pp. 146f. Maguire identifies the image of the Virgin as a direct text illustration. That is without a doubt so, but this textual passage occurs only on fol. 143^v. Maguire 1980/1981, p. 269, states: "[...] to visualize the more sentimental portrayals of the Presentation which they created in the second half of the twelfth century."

63 On the Panagia tou Arakos Nikolaïdes 1996; Winfield 2003; Schellewald 2008a, pp. 59–63. Here too, the bishops with their scrolls appear in the bema.

64 Here too, notice the breadth of the available surface. The area available to the figures guarantees the attention of the viewers. The Theotokos alone occupies a field with a breadth of 152 cm.

65 Maguire 1980/1981, p. 263, emphasizes that in characterizing the figures, the accent on their differences in age is notable. He also remarks on the connection to homilies (p. 264).

66 Schellewald 2008a, p. 61.

67 In view of the position of the figure, the actual space serves as a metaphorical temple, as in Mileševa.

68 Winfield 2003, p. 192: "Suplicants stuck lighted candles onto the images of their patrons [...]."



Fig. 9. Lagoudera, Panagia tou Arakos, 1192, naos, north side.

images and also comments on the involvement of the viewer.⁶⁹ The *Theotokos Arakiotissa* (in which the Theotokos is standing before the throne and carrying the child with both her arms in front of her body) is placed again at right angles to the templon (Fig. 10).

In two columns to the left and right of the Virgin and the throne, a long donor's inscription appears in which Leon Authentou expresses his requests in making the donation.⁷⁰ The theme of the Passion inscribed in the image is manifest on various levels: in the mourning implicit in the tilt of the Virgin's head as well as in her expression. Also significant is the position of her hands, which form a liturgical spoon (*labis*)⁷¹ on which rests – according to Pseudo-Methodius⁷² – the sacrificial lamb. Christ appears in the pose of the Emmanuel Anapeson⁷³ who both sleeps and wakes, anticipating the rest of the grave. The eucharistic component is also expressed by the “stola” in which Christ is wrapped.⁷⁴ As in other locations, these indications presumably refer to Christ's priesthood. His crossed bare legs also anticipate the Passion. The view of the child's bare flesh makes his vulnerability palpable. Although this representation is not completely new,⁷⁵ its many additional modifications underline its focus on the Passion. The image is completed by attending angels with the instruments of the Passion. The eyes of the Theotokos gaze at the tools of Christ's suffering to come. The archangel Michael beside the Theotokos underscores the reference to the Passion, since his staff is inscribed with the triple Hagios.⁷⁶ In the lower zone of the domed space, the viewer is prepared for the

69 Savage 2008, p. 101, where he states: “[...] making him [the viewer, B.S.] actively participate in an extended theological message contained within a larger spatial context.”

70 Winfield 2003, pp. 244–249. Kecharitomene, the title of the picture of the Theotokos, may refer to the titular icon of the Kecharitomene Convent in Constantinople, endowed by the Empress Irene Doukaina Komnene from the years 1110–1116. On the convent in Constantinople cf. the Typikon in: Thomas/Hero 2000, pp. 649–724.

71 The connection of the images is again explicit via liturgical texts. Cf. Schellewald 2008a, p. 62.

72 PG 18, 364B.

73 On the image of the Anapeson with its complex implications and incisive connections to liturgical texts: Todić 1994, pp. 158–160; Studer-Karlen 2022.

74 This “stola” is not identical with any known liturgical vestment. There is an analogy in the apse picture in the Church of St. Sophia in Ohrid, where the Christ child is dressed in the same way. Cf. Walter 1982, p. 194, note 144, with references to other scholarship.

75 An early representation is the Circumcision in the Menologion of Basil II (Vat. gr. 1613) from circa 1000. Beginning in the 11th century, examples proliferate that clearly emphasize the eucharistic aspect. Aside from the narration, one should mention the fresco icon on the bema antae in the Church of St. Sophia in Ohrid as an early example, in which the child's legs are crossed in an allusion to the Crucifixion. Milković-Peppek 1958, plate LVI; on the iconography: Weyl Carr 2002; Corrie 1996, where one reads on p. 53: “It seems clear that the bare-legged child both in the East and in Tuscany was identified with the child of the Presentation in the Temple and called the crucifixion to mind through a visual evocation of the Lamentation.”

76 Winfield 2003, pp. 250–253.



Fig. 10. Lagoudera, Panagia tou Arakos, 1192, Panagia Arakiotissa.

theme of sacrifice by an unusual conjunction of figures. On the other hand, the fact that a cross with the instruments of the passion appears in the niches of the two parabemata (prothesis and diakonikon) defines this space reserved for the officiants with regard to the reenactment of the Passion in the eucharist. The complex content aims especially at transferring the significance of the historical narration into the liturgic ritual. The child in Symeon's arms is declared to be the future sacrifice; in the arms of the Theotokos it becomes the eucharistic offering. The interlocking content of the figures opens the horizon of a specific temporal understanding in which vastly different time levels collapse into a single time.⁷⁷ Another monument on Cyprus with a naos that focuses, as in Nerezi, on two scenes, here those of the Crucifixion and Anastasis can be adduced, if only because of its size.⁷⁸ The parekklesion of the Monastery of St. John Chrysostom in Koutsovendis, donated by Eumathios Philokales for his *memoria*. Its wall paintings date from c. 1100.⁷⁹

In this small chapel, the workshop painted figures of prophets on the north, south, and east sides of both western piers in the domed space that skillfully capture the gaze of the viewer by their bearing, gestures, and scrolls and lead it, prophet by prophet, toward the two central paintings.⁸⁰ They function as mediators. The content of the texts on their scrolls relates directly to the Crucifixion and Anastasis.⁸¹ The prophet Ezekiel is oriented toward the right, but turns his head in the opposite direction. His eyes drift to the left and encounter the gaze of the viewer. The figure's movement and especially his scroll, running dynamically from upper left to lower right, reinforce the impulse to follow him in the same direction and focus on the Anastasis. The use of costly lapis

77 The complete text of the donor's epigram is in Nikolaïdes 1996, p. 5. Directly comparable to this image concept is a miniature in the Four Gospels of Karahissar (Petropolitanus 105, fol. 114^r). On the dating to the 1180s and the localization in Cyprus, cf. Cutler/Carr 1976, pp. 304–321.

78 Here too, the life-size bishops in the bema are facing toward the middle. The dimensions of both picture surfaces are by far the largest used for scenic pictures in this location. Mango 1990 recorded all the dimensions in his study and reconstructed some in fragmentary condition. On the Crucifixion and Anastasis, pp. 80–84, Fig. 6a.

79 Mango 1990; Papacostas/Mango/Grünbart 2007; Parani 2018. The endowment seems not to be connected to an intention to establish a burial place here (Parani 2018, pp. 7–12). The best color reproductions of all scenes and individual figures discussed here are in Mango.

80 The piers are organized in three picture zones. Above imitation marble stands the front-facing figure of a monk and in each upper zone a prophet facing sideways and striding dynamically.

81 Mango 1990, pp. 85f.; Parani 2018, pp. 24 and 43f. The specific formulation of these figures captures the eye as the other saints are presented front-on. The northwest pier shows Moses with the Septuagint text Deuteronomy 28:66. On the southwest pier, Ezekiel – a mirror image of Moses – holds the text of 37:12–13 (with a small variation) toward the viewer. On the north side of this pier, one sees Isaiah with the text of 26:19. Both texts refer to the raising of the dead.

lazuli pigment lends his figure added presence. In other contexts as well, lapis lazuli is deployed to attract special attention.⁸²

In principle, the casting of prophets in the sacred space with direct reference to one of the scenes from the New Testament is not innovative. The 10th-century wall paintings in the New Tokalı in Cappadocia evince an analogous constellation.⁸³ The prophets Ezekiel and Jeremiah point toward the painting of the Crucifixion centrally placed in the apse. In contrast to the solution in Koutsovendis, however, except for his finger pointing toward the Crucifixion, the figure of Ezekiel remains immobile and facing forward. Thus, although the figure has a similar contextual function, it neither addresses nor communicates with the viewer in any comparably direct way.

The intentional differentiation in addressing the viewer is obvious. Unlike in the bema, communication in the naos does not take place by way of identification. The attention of the beholders is consciously guided as they become involved in the rhetoric of the images. They are not officiants, but they become part of the process. The success of these strategies rests on the conception of two differing spatial units. Another significant factor for the viewer is the choreography of light.

3. The Choreography of Light in Sacred Spaces

How we perceive images is partially determined by how they are illuminated. Natural interior light is modified by the number, location, and size of the windows.⁸⁴ A recent study by Potamianos analyzes the form of light shafts in the interior of Byzantine churches, but its particular effect on monumental decoration is not discussed.⁸⁵ Architectural zones of light and shadow naturally play a role in how images are perceived. The images we have been discussing are primarily located in spaces that are well illuminated in the daytime. But one must pay special attention to artificial lighting. According to our sources, the choreography of light depends on several factors. Estimation of its relevance in particular situations can be found, among other places, by studying the Typika, which in the period under discussion often prescribe precisely how light is to

82 The lavish use of this blue pigment prompted Hawkins to remark that it “[...] suggests that no expense was spared”; Mango 1990, p. 94. One can see extravagant use of lapis lazuli in other surviving paintings, for instance, in the dome.

83 Teteriatnikov 2011, pp. 52–55, on the prophets at the Crucifixion.

84 In her authoritative article, Theis 2001, pp. 54–56, points to the developmental tendencies of window size. For instance, in Nerezi, the exterior windows of the crossarms were walled up to benefit the wall painting, thus increasing the relevance of artificial light.

85 Potamianos 2021. He emphasizes that church construction definitely took lighting into account. He had already pursued this idea in several earlier studies and also discusses the transcendental qualities attributed to light.

be managed for various church feasts. Donors were apparently particularly interested in light within sacred spaces.⁸⁶ Of fundamental importance for artificial lighting are the multifarious forms of lamps, as well as what illuminant was used (usually olive oil and candles, which differ in size and weight). Ecclesiarchis and ecclesiarchissa were responsible for how the regulations were followed, but their implementation was conducted by certain lamplighters, as the Typika also prescribe.⁸⁷ Their number was determined by the size of the monastery and its associated churches. For example, the imperial Monastery of the Pantokrator in Constantinople, with its three sacred buildings, is said to have required eight orphans to carry out this function.⁸⁸ Bouras has collected from the sources the various terms for lighting and coordinated them as far as possible with surviving objects.⁸⁹ The fuel was beeswax or, preferably, olive oil.⁹⁰

Fundamentally, we know that the size could vary from just one lamp or candle⁹¹ to the so-called *choroi*, large octagonal or round crown-like chandeliers that dominated the domed space and carried several levels of oil lamps or candle holders (Fig. 11). These magnificent objects were often paid for by donations.⁹²

The mountings for the various sizes of oil lamps were made of bronze or occasionally of silver or gilded silver. The number of glass inserts varied with the occasion. Traces of light fixtures have also survived.⁹³ The Typika contain extensive information about how the lighting of a sacred space for everyday liturgical practice differed from that on high church feasts. In general, the tendency was to be guided by the calendar of feast days, the choice of patronage, and what the donors' wishes were with regard to lighting. Specific places to be lighted are clearly defined: bema, apse and sanctuary, the

86 Thomas/Hero 2000 has provided English translations of the Typika, and our references to the original texts are to that publication. In what follows, we discuss primarily Typika of the 12th and 13th centuries. For the endowments, cf. Klenner 2012; on the light sources (lamps, etc.): Bouras 1982 and Bouras/Parani 2008. On Late Antiquity and especially the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople: Bouras/Parani 2008, pp. 31–36, with bibliographical information. In the Hagia Sophia, traces of the original suspension devices survive.

87 Bouras 1982, p. 482; cf. the passage in the Typikon of the Kecharitomene Monastery in section 20: Thomas/Hero 2000, p. 681; Pantokrator Monastery: Thomas/Hero 2000, section 30, p. 754, cf. also Olcay 2001.

88 Thomas/Hero 2000, p. 754.

89 Bouras 1982, p. 491, with a table of the terms; Theis 2001, pp. 57–63; Klenner 2012, pp. 16–20.

90 Extensive information with details on the production of the lamps and also on the use and proportion of olive oil for this purpose compared to other uses: Klenner 2012, pp. 20–33.

91 For candles, it is not unusual to find notations on their number and weight and the cost of wax. Some monasteries made their own candles; Bouras 1982, p. 482; Klenner 2012, p. 27.

92 In Theis 2001 there is an illustration of a lampstand from the 13th or 14th century in the Archäologische Staatssammlung, Munich. Other objects, e.g., in the monasteries of Markov Manastir and Dečani (see Fig. 11 in this chapter), are partially preserved.

93 Theis 2001, p. 58.



Fig. 11. Dečani, Monastery church, choreography of light.

templon with the icons, the domed space, and above all the icons that refer to the liturgical feast as well as those that are especially venerated. There were individual lamps as well as candelabra equipped with several candle holders. For these, there are other names in the sources.⁹⁴ *Polycandela* refer to a disc- or cross-shaped base with depressions to hold the glass containers for the oil; moreover, there are also surviving hybrid forms with candle holders.⁹⁵

At this point, let us take a selective look at the liturgical instructions in the *Typika*.⁹⁶ The instructions for illuminating the three sacred buildings of the Monastery of the Pankrator have received significant scholarly attention.⁹⁷ They refer to individual feast days⁹⁸ which have been prioritized, as well as everyday lighting of the space during the liturgy. Precise instructions specify not only what is to be accentuated and how to differentiate between spatial compartments (e.g., the conche of the apse, the space around the altar, the templon, the dome), but also the emphasis on particular icons. For the so-called *heroon* (the church in the middle with the tomb), candlelight before immobile icons (i.e., wall mosaics) is specifically mentioned. Tesserae as well as obvious relics discovered on site testify to these material decorations.⁹⁹ The dynamic between the three buildings on feast days is also reflected in their clearly differentiated lighting. A look at the *Typikon* of the Kosmosoteira Monastery, founded by Isaak Komnenos in 1152, confirms how intensely they reflected on the lighting arrangements. One passage states that the lighting serves to make the images seem alive to the viewers. It continues by remarking on the possibility of a lovely tone issuing from the mouth of the figures.¹⁰⁰

94 Bouras 1982, p. 479: *candelai* (synonym: *photagogoi*), *kaniskia* (basket-shaped), *thryallides* and *crateres*.

95 Bouras 1982, p. 480. To learn how richly a monastery could be supplied with illumination of the most varied kind, cf. the list of the monastery of Gregory Pakourianos, Bouras 1982, p. 481.

96 Klenner 2012, pp. 44–57 and p. 64 with a list of the *Typika*, containing instructions for illumination.

97 On the text of the *Typikon*: Thomas/Hero 2000, pp. 737–774; on the illumination of the main church in section 7, pp. 741f.; on Eleousa in section 29, pp. 753f.; on the church dedicated to the Archangel Michael in section 34, p. 756. Bouras 1982, p. 482; Congdon 1996, pp. 169–184; Theis 2001, pp. 61f.; Kotzabassi 2013.

98 For the main church, the Feast of the Transfiguration is most important, followed by Christ's birth, Epiphany, and Exaltation of the Cross. The illumination on feast days such as Pentecost, Palm Sunday, etc., is only half as bright. At the same time, the choreography in the Pantokrator Monastery is distributed among the individual buildings.

99 Thomas/Hero 2000, in section 29, p. 754; on the decoration: Ousterhout 2001; Ousterhout 2010; Spieser 2015 with a reconstruction of the program of pictures.

100 Thomas/Hero 2000, *Typikon* text pp. 798–849, here in section 9, p. 802. Then follows: "For it is a marvel to behold these likenesses in painting, that is, alive and yet unmoving in space, and hence to praise the artist whom the First Creator and Lord endowed with the knowledge of how to paint in a novel fashion. For who would not congratulate him, after having traced the form of these likenesses on to his eye and his heart as though it were living."

The Typikon of Irene Doukaina Komnene for the Monastery of Kecharitomene in Constantinople also reveals how much the choreography of light mattered to the donor.¹⁰¹ Not all Typika have such detailed and precise instructions. However, the general tendency is to pay tribute to the light even only in brief passages. For the monuments discussed here, for which no Typika have survived, one can conclude – specifically in Nerezi, where the donor belonged to the Komnenian Dynasty – that, especially since the beginning of the 12th century, the management of light was as a rule elaborate and differentiated. For Nerezi, there is a detail of the painting that we can use as evidence: on both outer sides of the leading edges of the conche of the apse, two large candleholders with lighted candles are painted one above the other (Fig. 2). To be sure, we cannot reconstruct exactly how well individual rooms were supplied with artificial light. In view of the dimensions of the sacred spaces, the effect was probably not insignificant for the perception of the wall paintings.¹⁰² Light not only guides perception; it can also initiate it. The symbolic dimension of light is repeatedly addressed in the scholarship.¹⁰³ In this chapter, we are constrained to forego further discussion of it. Nevertheless, we may mention Symeon of Thessalonica's assertion in the 14th century that through divine lamps, the sight of saints and their beauty makes our glance clear and holy and we shine with an inner light.¹⁰⁴ It could be relevant for our earlier era as well.

Wall painting does not always play a defined role in regulating the choreography of light. In the Pankrator Monastery, however, special illumination is prescribed for the mosaic wall icons, as mentioned above. Even though this was apparently not the rule, the passage makes clear that monumental paintings were not fundamentally excluded from this practice. Moreover, the interplay between the featured feast-day icons and

101 Thomas/Hero 2000, typikon text pp. 664–717; e.g., on illumination for the Feast of Koimesis in section 59, pp. 696f.; for the Birth of the Mother of God in section 60, p. 697; for daily illumination in section 66, p. 698, it states that after the celebration of the liturgy the lights are extinguished. This seems to apply above all the middle of the sacred space and the templon, for candles burn day and night in the bema and before the icon of the Theotokos Kecharitomene (in section 68, p. 698). It is also a question of niceties when it says that burned-down candles must be removed on high feast days and replaced with new ones. Used candles are reserved for everyday use.

102 Although the illumination of the Hagia Sophia was enormously lavish, as one can see at the latest from the reconstruction of the lamps (cf. Bouras/Parani, Fig. 36), the authors do not think that the huge space was bright (p. 36): “Despite their great numbers, and the brilliance of their precious materials, the lights of Hagia Sophia would not have been able to drive away the darkness of night from that huge, cavernous church.” There is room for doubt about this conclusion.

103 Isar has repeatedly engaged with the concept of chora (most recently in 2021, with bibliographical information), which includes movement as well as light in the sacred space. This topic is without question complex, and a corresponding discussion of this position cannot be undertaken in the context of this chapter.

104 PG 155, 344 quoted in an English translation in Galavaris 1978, p. 72.

the parallel images on the wall must have been considerable.¹⁰⁵ While the small format of the icons enabled proximity to the viewer, because of its format, the proffered scenario remained distanced from the bodies of the believers. On the other hand, the size (see above) of the analogous images on the wall allowed physical proximity in the sense of an identification with or integration of the viewer. Thus the heightened attention promoted by the illuminated feast-day icons influenced the perception of the images in the room. At the same time, however, the modified choreography of light in the sacred space, with the flickering light sources, must have engendered an intensive play of light and shadow. Images in the less illuminated zones remained partly obscured, while others gained presence. Just as the artificial light was not static, the bodily movement of the viewers resulted in a feedback loop with the light sources. The resulting dynamic must have influenced and helped shape the perceptive process. If, for example, one considers the Presentation in the Temple in Mileševa, situated directly beneath the dome, it must still have been quite visible even in evening twilight, since the central area beneath the dome, following the instructions of the Typika, was quite well lit. Even if the effect of light choreography on the wall paintings is clearly less than on the mosaics, there remains the sacred space whose atmosphere changes in the course of the year, and the gaze of the viewer is guided – sometimes more and sometimes less – by the play of light and shadow.¹⁰⁶

4. Communicated Reception or Pure Rhetoric?

Recent scholarship on ekphrasis convincingly argues that in the case of visual images, the rhetorical device can also have the function of enlivening pictures, putting their inherent immobility into a motion that takes the figures in the image as its starting point.¹⁰⁷ According to the orthodox conception of the icon, through contact with its prototype, it is quasi-freed of spatial boundaries, so that the perception of the image can push toward other dimensions.¹⁰⁸ One example will demonstrate the potential of this process: In his ekphrasis of the pictorial decoration of the Church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople, written c. 1200, Nicholas Mesarites carried this fictional movement

105 So-called feast icons are, on the one hand, an integral part of the monumental program, but they can also appear as icons on the epistyle of the templon. Moreover, on the appropriate high feasts, they are set up and accentuated by their own lighting.

106 I have already addressed the mosaics and also the use of lapis lazuli; e.g., Schellewald 2012 and Schellewald 2018. For the wall paintings, future tests with digital tools will be needed.

107 I. a., Brubaker 1989; James / Webb 1991; Nelson 2000.

108 On the aspect of transcending the sensual, cf. the contribution by Annette Gerok-Reiter and Volker Leppin in this volume, pp. 177–226, esp. pp. 212 f.

intensely forward. While he provides an extraordinarily clear and precise description of the pictures, as the scholarship repeatedly stresses, his text also offers “an experience that stimulates the senses and makes a profound impression on the audience [...]”¹⁰⁹ He repeatedly addresses his reader directly as a viewer and imagines him as a companion. In section XXV, the rhetor is both emotionally moved and directly involved in the drama.¹¹⁰ This scene of overwhelming emotion is designed to entirely cancel the boundaries between the image, its action, and the viewer. Stylus and quill become veritable partners in crossing the Jordan. They serve as oars in the inkwell of the Black Sea: “[...] and we should steer the ship of our mind into the waves.”¹¹¹ Mesarites does not leave us guessing about the fictionality of his language or idea, when with the appropriate distance he informs us in Section XXX that what we are seeing is not the actual event but something imagined and painted.¹¹²

Meanwhile, Daskas has put forward an interpretation of a particular passage in which Mesarites speaks of a painter,¹¹³ who is described as standing next to Christ’s tomb as a “sleepless keeper.” From a marginal note, Heisenberg identified him as Eulalios.¹¹⁴ Daskas sees this figure of the painter as a sort of hidden self-portrait of Mesarites himself, who served as “keeper” of the imperial treasury. Eulalios is not an actual contemporary painter. He is introduced as a metaphor for the artistic ego and thus for the rhetor himself. If one accepts this interpretation, the rhetor (= viewer) would be imagined in the picture itself. The proximity – or rather, interchangeability – of painter and writer is provided by the concept of γραφή (*graphie*), which encompasses both activities.¹¹⁵ We can add to this context a formula often used in epigrams of a longing that animates the artist. In the end, however, it had already been formulated in the *horos*

109 Zarras 2015, p. 267. There are two English translations of the text: Downey 1957 with the Greek text and Angold 2017 (only the translation).

110 On this passage, cf. the two translations, which definitely diverge from each other: Downey 1957, p. 878, Greek text p. 906; Angold 2015, p. 105; cf. also Baseu-Barabas 1992 on the relation between text and image.

111 Angold 2017, p. 106 quotation.

112 Angold 2017, p. 115; Downey 1957, pp. 884f., Greek. p. 911. “[...] understand clearly, through the agency of the artist’s hand, how there can be waters in the air, in the upper parts of the building”; Downey 1957, p. 879, Greek. p. 907; Angold 2017, p. 106.

113 This passage from Chapter XXVIII, verse 23, has been repeatedly discussed by art historians; Downey 1957, p. 884, Greek p. 910; Angold 2017, p. 114.

114 The artist name Eulalios is mentioned, among other places, in an epigram from the 12th century; Daskas 2016, p. 157.

115 Drpić 2013. Relevant here is also the quotation from an ekphrastic oration by Mesarites for Alexios III Angelos (1195–1203), from which Daskas 2016, p. 163, quotes: “With the hand of a painter, I undertook with greatest zeal to set out as much as possible in an image [...]” Angold 2017, pp. 81f., calls Daskas’s thesis too speculative.

(declaration of faith) of the Second Council of Nicea in 787.¹¹⁶ Desire suggests its proximity to transcendence.¹¹⁷

5. Time – The Presence of the Image

In his recent discussion of the spatial conception of the icon, briefly mentioned above, Lidov also emphasizes its characteristic understanding of time.¹¹⁸ Based on various authors, including Pavel Florenskij, Antonova makes a similar argument.¹¹⁹ For the situation of the image in the sacred space, however, one must first stress its dependence on the liturgical performance that goes hand-in-hand with a definitive concept of time. Two components must be taken into account: the liturgical ritual – in which the entire biography of Christ, including the Passion, is again and again evoked through reenactment – as well as the calendar of feasts in the liturgical year.¹²⁰ More so than in the Latin liturgy, the birth of Christ already constitutes the prelude to the preparation for the Eucharist. The understanding that is the foundation of the liturgy is above all manifest in various commentaries on the liturgy. An example is the widely disseminated *Historia Ecclesiastica* by the patriarch Germanus I, who was involved in the iconoclastic controversy.¹²¹ More relevant is the *Protheoria*, written probably toward the end of the 11th century.¹²² The commemorative aspect of the liturgy as actualization is also reflected in the marginal pictures of liturgical scrolls. Transported into the present of the sacred space through the medium of the image, the process of salvation is emphatically communicated, even beyond the performance. The past is understood as present in both the liturgical ritual and the images. This perception of time depends on ritual repetition that can be concluded only by the Second Coming of Christ, i.e., the end of days, but at the same time it also depends on the concept that the Holy Liturgy is in direct accordance with the Heavenly Liturgy. Based on this presence, the connection between image / icon and viewer is accomplished. If Kemp says that fundamentally, the time to perceive the images “would involve prescribed dimensions, as when an image is used within an orchestrated ritual, as in church liturgy, and a voluntary component,

116 Price: The Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea, p. 565 “For it is to the extent that they are constantly seen through depiction in images that those who behold them [the images] are spurred to remember and yearn for their prototypes.”

117 Cf., e.g., Rhoby 2010, IK4, pp. 50–53; IK6, pp. 54f.; Me96, pp. 279–281; Me97, pp. 281f.; Me102, pp. 287–290; in Rhoby there are many more examples associated with this topic.

118 Lidov 2017, p. 425.

119 Antonova 2010.

120 In a previous essay, I have tried to examine the relation between liturgical ceremonial and image: Schellewald 2008b.

121 Bornert 1966, pp. 125–180; Schulz 2000, pp. 155–165; a critical edition of the text Meyendorff 1984.

122 Schellewald 2008b, p. 150; fundamentally Bornert 1966, pp. 181–206.

when viewing is commenced and terminated, according to the viewer's choice [...],"¹²³ then it would be essential in the Byzantine context to emphasize the liturgization of the icon, e.g., the image's feedback loop with the liturgy. The liturgy conditions the viewer to perceive the images. Antonova formulates the understanding of the icon as follows:

The main idea, as I see it, is to propose a conception of the time at the borderline between the two worlds which realizes the transformations from the profane to the sacred, from the visible to the invisible.¹²⁴

Fundamentally, the concept of an event happening at this moment (for example, the Lamentation of Christ in Nerezi) plays a central role in this move into transcendence. The concept of time in our context corresponds closely to that which Kalokyris describes in a quotation from Evangelos D. Theodoron:

Normally in worship, time ceases to exist in the form of the past, present and future, and is changed into a mystical life-experience in which, while eternity is lived in the present, things of the past and of the future and even the eschatological things – that is prehistory and the main stages of the redemptive work of Christ, as well as the salutary gifts extending to the last days which flowed from him – are condensed and experienced mystically as something living and present before our eyes.¹²⁵

A brief look back at the constellation of episcopal figures and the celebrants at the altar in Nerezi again underscores the phenomenon of converging temporal levels. The intensity with which the images address the viewer plays a part in visually conveying this temporal understanding. In the brief conclusion that follows, we will examine the extent to which specific aesthetic principles prevail in the images from the centuries we have chosen.

6. The Aesthetics of Michael Psellos and the Limits of Painting

The writings of Michael Psellos (1018–1078) are repeatedly referred to in discussions of the paintings in Nerezi. The primary focus is on his ekphrasis on the Crucifixion as well as his text on the famous icon of the Theotokos in the Blachernai Church.¹²⁶ His

123 A quotation of Martin Kemp's oral remark in Antonova 2010, p. 10.

124 Antonova 2010, p. 23. She connects this statement to the discussion of reversed perspective in Florenskij and other authors.

125 Antonova 2010, p. 135, quotes this from Kalokyris 1967, p. 359.

126 Belting 1994, pp. 261–296. In the meantime, these texts have been translated into English: Barber / Papaioannou 2017, pp. 290–299 and pp. 300–306.

texts show familiarity with ancient rhetoric and were read by an influential (intellectual) elite. Belting directly connects Psellos's concept of a "living painting" (ἡ ἔμψυχος γραφή / *empsychos graphē*) to the stylistic appearance of contemporary painting (as well as painting of the 12th century) with its obvious focus on the emotionality of the protagonists. Thus the tender gestures of the figures were interpreted in this way.

However, both Cormack and especially Barber portray these direct references as problematic.¹²⁷ Barber's position is based on a critical probe that considers a much larger text corpus.¹²⁸ According to Barber, Psellos is not referring to recently painted icons since he defines art's potential as limited and

[...] the term expresses a particular desire on the part of Psellos for what might be called an authentic presence that is mediated by the painting but that is not the product of the work of art.¹²⁹

Psellos clearly expresses his position:

While this living painting exists as a result of component parts combined most felicitously, the entire living form seems to be beyond this, so that life exists in the image from two sources, from art, which makes a likeness, and from grace, which does not liken to anything else.¹³⁰

The so-called "living painting" is not a principle that, as it were, can be perceived as a stylistic phenomenon: "A 'living painting' thus presents the natural and the supernatural together, linking the human and the divine in the work of art."¹³¹

It requires the direct intervention of an "overseeing mind" that sounds the prototype in the painting. For Psellos, despite all the efforts of the painter, as viewers we remain uncertain that art, based on its own skill, will be able to transcend the limits between visual and intelligible beauty: "The icon may allow us to see an accurately rendered subject, but it will also permit us to know that we cannot grasp the whole in the work of art itself."¹³²

Everything offered on the level of visibility is only the shadow of what we long to see. To be sure, Barber also stresses that the icon of the Virgin in the Blachernai Church, Psellos's example for the relation between the visible form (ἡ μορφή / *morphe*) and the

127 Barber 2006; Barber/Papaianou 2017; the following texts are central to Barber's introduction (pp. 247–265): On perception and perceptibles (pp. 266–269); On beauty and on intelligible beauty (pp. 270–278); selected letters (pp. 348–353).

128 Barber/Papaionnaou 2017.

129 Barber 2006, p. 118.

130 Crucifixion Ekphrasis, Barber/Papaioannou 2017, p. 299.

131 Barber 2006, p. 124.

132 Barber in Barber/Papaioannou 2017, p. 256.

actual form (τὸ εἶδος / *eidōs*), is a special case since it is a miracle-working icon in which the divine itself is manifest.

In the light of this substantial critique, we cannot use Psellos as evidence of a new painting that differs on the visible level. However, the passages in which he discusses the visible clearly reveal parallels to contemporary painting. From my perspective, these parallels are the mimetic elements of painting that produce a proximity between image and viewer, as well as the principles documented above all in Psellos's texts, in which he names emotionality as an integral element of painting.¹³³ Even where a primarily linguistic or textual question is at stake, individual passages show that his rhetoric also derives from images.¹³⁴

Psellos is convinced that earthly beauty is able to ignite the longing for the intelligible beauty in our souls.¹³⁵ Thus, although art is not living in the previously accepted sense, it can serve as a bridge or canal to transcendence. With Psellos, we gain a position that, on the one hand, assumes great potential in the visual, but on the other also determines the limits of the visible and of visibility itself.

Psellos is not very far from contemporary painting, when, for example, he exhausts the levels of the sensuous. As I have said above, there are specific spatial, formal (the format), rhetorical, and temporal structures by means of which the senses are affected. Light choreography has a special role with its lively play of illumination by offering a sort of channel that, in a symbolic way, pushes into a space beyond materiality.

As much as the effect is created by the interplay of autological and heterological aspects, in the examples cited, in its experiential dimension it is also calculated to transcend earthly connection. The goal of the aesthetic experience is thus not to suffice in and of itself but to point beyond itself. Therein lies its special claim.

133 His thoughts on literary conception are to a great extent based on Dionysius of Halicarnassus. But even if his own contribution seems quite insubstantial, his claim to give expression to individual emotions ought to be acknowledged. Thus, in one of these passages he says: "As for us, we do not use the same type of composition when we are disturbed by different emotions. The careful orator must fit what is appropriate to each state of the soul, and neither create a difference in his words for the same emotion nor produce the same order and composition for different 'emotions'." Barber/Papaioannou 2017, p. 73 from the text *Περὶ συνθήκης τῶν τοῦ λόγου μερῶν*.

134 Barber/Papaioannou 2017, p. 217.

135 In light of the Crucifixion ekphrasis, Barber/Papaioannou 2017, p. 291, make clear that by looking at the icon, the viewer is urged to contemplate what it, in fact, is unable to show.

Bibliography

Primary Literature

- Liturgies = Brightman, Frank Edward: *Liturgies, Eastern and Western. Being the Texts Original or Translated of the Principal Liturgies of the Church*, ed. with introd. and appendices by F.E. Brightman on the basis of the former work by C.E. Hammond, vol. 1: *Eastern Liturgies*, Oxford 1896.
- Mansi XIII = Mansi, Giovanni Domenico: *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. 13: *Anni 787–814*, Graz 1960 (unaltered reprint of the 1902 edition published by Hubert Walter in Paris).
- PG = *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, ed. by Jacques-Paul Migne, 161 vols., Paris 1857–1866.
- Price: *The Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea* = Price, Richard (ed.): *The Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea (787)*, vol. 2, Liverpool 2018 (Translated Text for Historians 68).
- Stéthatos = Darrouzès, Jean: *Nicétas Stéthatos, Opusculs et lettres. Introduction, texte critique, traduction notes par Jean Darrouzès*, Paris 1961 (Sources chrétiennes 81).

Secondary Literature

- Angold 2017 = Angold, Michael: *Nicholas Mesarites. His Life and Works (in Translation)*. Translated with Notes and Commentary, Liverpool 2017 (Translated Texts for Byzantinists 4).
- Antonova 2010 = Antonova, Clemena: *Space, Time and Presence in the Icon. Seeing the World with the Eyes of God*, Farnham 2010.
- Babić 1968 = Babić, Gordana: *Les discussions christologiques et le décor des églises byzantines au 12^e siècle. Les évêques officiant devant l'Hétimasie et devant l'Amnos*, in: *Frühmittelalterliche Studien* 2 (1968), pp. 368–386.
- Babić/Walter 1976 = Babić, Gordana/Walter, Christopher: *The Inscriptions upon Liturgical Rolls in Byzantine Apse Decoration*, in: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 34 (1976), pp. 269–280.
- Barber 2006 = Barber, Charles: *Living Painting, or the Limits of Pointing? Glancing at Icons with Michael Psellos*, in: Charles Barber/David Jenkins (eds.): *Reading Michael Psellos*, Leiden/Boston 2006 (The Medieval Mediterranean. Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1500, 61), pp. 117–130.
- Barber/Jenkins 2006 = Barber Charles/Jenkins David (eds.): *Reading Michael Psellos*, Leiden/Boston 2006 (The Medieval Mediterranean. Peoples, Economies and Cultures, 400–1500, 61).
- Barber 2017 = Barber, Charles: *On the Origin of the Work of Art: Tradition, Inspiration and Invention in the Post-Iconoclastic Era*, in: Kristina Mitalaitė/Anca Vasiliu (eds.): *L'icône dans la pensée et dans l'art. Constitutions, contestations, réinventions de la notion d'image divine en contexte chrétien*, Turnhout 2017 (Byzantioç. Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization 10), pp. 153–175.
- Barber/Papaioannou 2017 = Barber, Charles/Papaioannou, Stratis (eds.): *Michael Psellos on Literature and Art. A Byzantine Perspective on Aesthetics*, University of Notre Dame, Indiana 2017.
- Baseu-Barabas 1992 = Baseu-Barabas, Theonie: *Zwischen Wort und Bild. Nikolaos Mesarites und seine Beschreibung des Mosaikschmucks der Apostelkirche in Konstantinopel (Ende 12. Jh.)*, Vienna 1992.
- Belting 1994 = Belting, Hans: *Likeness and Presence. A History of the Image Before the Era of Art*, trans. by Edmund Jephcott, Chicago/London 1994.
- Belting 2000 = Belting, Hans: *Das Bild und sein Publikum im Mittelalter. Form und Funktion früher Bildtafeln der Passion*, 3rd ed., Berlin 2000.
- Bouras 1982 = Bouras, Laskarina: *Byzantine Lighting Devices*, in: *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 32.3 (1982), pp. 479–491.
- Bouras/Parani 2008 = Bouras, Laskarina/Parani, Maria G.: *Lighting in Early Byzantium*, Washington 2008 (Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Collection Publications 11).

- Brown 2008 = Brown, Michelle P.: When Illuminated Manuscripts Are Not What They Seem: the Cases of the Holkham Bible Picture Book and a Newly Discovered Croatian Altarpiece, in: *Ikon* 1 (2008), pp. 103–122.
- Brubaker 1989 = Brubaker, Leslie: Perception and Conception: Art, Theory and Culture in Ninth-Century Byzantium, in: *Word & Image* 5 (1989), pp. 19–32.
- Congdon 1996 = Congdon, Eleanor A.: Imperial Commemoration and Ritual in the *typikon* of the Monastery of Christ Pantokrator, in: *Revue des études byzantines* 54 (1996), pp. 169–199.
- Cormack 2003 = Cormack, Robin: Living painting, in: Elizabeth Jeffreys (ed.): *Rhetoric in Byzantium*, Ashgate 2003 (Papers from the 35th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Exeter College, University of Oxford, March 2001), pp. 235–253.
- Corrie 1996 = Corrie Rebecca W.: Coppo di Marcovaldo's Madonna del Bardone and the Meaning of the Bare-Legged Christ Child in Siena and the East, in: *Gesta* 35.1 (1996), pp. 43–65.
- Cutler/Carr 1976 = Cutler, Anthony/Carr, Annemarie Weyl: The Psalter Benaki 34.3. An Unpublished Illuminated Manuscript from the Family 2400, in: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 34 (1976), pp. 281–323.
- Cutler/Browning 1992 = Cutler, Anthony/Browning, Robert: In the Margins of Byzantium? Some Icons in Michael Psellos, in: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 16 (1992), pp. 21–32.
- Daskas 2016 = Daskas, Beatrice: A Literary Self-Portrait of Nikolaos Mesarites, in: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 40 (2016), pp. 151–169.
- Downey 1957 = Downey, Glanville: Nikolaos Mesarites: Description of the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople, in: *Transaction of the American Philosophical Society* 47.6 (1957), pp. 855–924.
- Drpić 2013 = Drpić Ivan: Painter as Scribe: Artistic Identity and the Arts of Graphē in Late Byzantium, in: *Word & Image* 29.3 (2013), pp. 334–353.
- Galavaris 1978 = Galavaris, George: Some Aspects of Symbolic Use of Lights in the Eastern Church. Candles, Lamps and Ostrich Eggs, in: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 4 (1978), pp. 69–78.
- Gerstel 1994 = Gerstel, Sharon E.J.: Liturgical Scrolls in the Byzantine Sanctuary, in: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 35 (1994), pp. 195–204.
- Gerstel 1999 = Gerstel, Sharon E.J.: *Beholding the Sacred Mysteries. Programs of the Byzantine Sanctuary*, Seattle/London 1999 (Monograph on the Fine Arts 56).
- Geymonat 2013 = Geymonat, Ludovico V.: Drawing, Memory and Imagination in the Wolfenbüttel *Musterbuch*, in: Heather E. Grossman/Alicia Walker (eds.): *Mechanisms of Exchange: Transmission in Medieval Art and Architecture of the Mediterranean, ca. 1000–1500*, Leiden 2013 (*Medieval Encounters* 18), pp. 220–285.
- Hamann-MacLean/Hallensleben 1963 = Hamann-MacLean, Richard/Hallensleben, Horst: *Die Monumentalmalerei in Serbien und Makedonien vom 11. bis zum frühen 14. Jahrhundert*, Gießen 1963 (*Marburger Abhandlungen zur Geschichte und Kultur Osteuropas* 2,3).
- Hörandner/Rhoby 2008 = Hörandner, Wolfram/Rhoby, Andreas (eds.): *Die kulturhistorische Bedeutung byzantinischer Epigramme. Akten des internationalen Workshops (Vienna, December 1–2, 2006)*, Vienna 2008 (*Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung* 14).
- Hutter 1999 = Hutter, Irmgard: The Magdalen College “Musterbuch”: A Painter’s Guide from Cyprus at Oxford, in: Nancy Patterson Ševčenko/Christopher Moss (eds.): *Medieval Cyprus. Studies in Art, Architecture, and History in Memory of Doula Mouriki*, Princeton 1999, pp. 117–146.
- Isar 2021 = Isar, Nicoletta: Dazzling Radiance, a Paradigma and a Quiz in Byzantine Chorography and Hierotopy, in: Jelena Bogdanović (ed.): *Icons of Space: Advances in Hierotopy*, London/New York 2021, pp. 46–67.
- James/Webb 1991 = James, Liz/Webb, Ruth: “To understand ultimate things and enter secret places.” Ekphrasis and Art in Byzantium, in: *Art History* 14 (1991), pp. 1–17.

- Klenner 2012 = Klenner, Marietta: Lichtspende in Byzanz, Masterthesis, Vienna 2012 (othes.univie.ac.at).
- Koshi 1974 = Koshi, Koichi: Über das Bildprogramm in der Klosterkirche von Mileševa, in: *Orient* 10 (1974), pp. 115–140.
- Kotzabassi 2013 = Kotzabassi, Sofia: Feasts at the Monastery of Pantokrator, in: Sofia Kotzabassi (ed.): *The Pantokrator Monastery in Constantinople*, Berlin/Boston 2013, pp. 153–190.
- Lange 1969 = Lange, Günter: Bild und Wort. Die katechetischen Funktionen des Bildes in der griechischen Theologie des sechsten bis neunten Jahrhunderts, Würzburg 1969 (Schriften zur Religionspädagogik und Kerygmantik 6).
- Lidov 2017 = Lidov, Alexei: Icon as *chora*: Spatial Aspects of Iconicity in Byzantium and Russia, in: Kristina Mitalaitė/Anca Vasiliu (eds.): *L'icône dans la pensée et dans l'art. Constitutions, contestations, réinventions de la notion d'image divine en contexte chrétien*, Turnhout 2017 (Byzantioç. Studies in Byzantine History and Civilization 10), pp. 423–447.
- Mango 1990 = Mango, Cyril: The Monastery of St. Chrysostomos at Koutsovendis (Cyprus) and its Wall Paintings. Part 1: Description with the Collaboration of Ernest J. W. Hawkins and Susan Boyd, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 44 (1990), pp. 63–94.
- Mango 1997 = Mango, Cyril: *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312–1453. Sources and Documents*, 2nd ed., Toronto/Buffalo/London 1997.
- Maguire 1977 = Maguire, Henry P.: The Depiction of Sorrow in Middle Byzantine Art, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 31 (1977), pp. 123–174.
- Maguire 1980/1981 = Maguire, Henry P.: The Iconography of Symeon with the Christ Child in Byzantine Art, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 34/35 (1980/1981), pp. 261–269.
- Maguire 1981 = Maguire, Henry: *Art and Eloquence in Byzantium*, Princeton 1981.
- Mercenier 1953 = Mercenier, Feuillen: *La prière des églises de rite byzantin*, vol. 2.1: Les fêtes. Grandes fêtes fixes, Chevetogne 1953.
- Meyendorff 1984 = Meyendorff, Paul: *St. Germanus of Constantinople. On the Divine Liturgy. The Greek Text with Translation, Introduction, and Commentary*, Crestwood/New York 1984 (Historia Ecclesiastica).
- Milković-Pepok 1958 = Milković-Pepok, Petar: Umilitelne motivi vo vizantijskata umetnost na Balkanot i problemot na Bogorodica Pelagonitisa, in: *Zbornik izdanija na Arheološkiot Musej Skopje* 2 (1958), pp. 1–30.
- Milne 1935–1936 = Milne, Herbert John: An Iconographic Sketchbook, in: *British Museum Quarterly* 10 (1935–1936), pp. 65–66.
- Nelson 2000 = Nelson, Robert S.: To Say and to See: Ekphrasis and Vision in Byzantium, in: Robert S. Nelson (ed.): *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance*, Cambridge 2000 (Cambridge Studies in New Art History and Criticism), pp. 143–168.
- Nikolaïdes 1996 = Nikolaïdes, Andréas: L'église de la Panagia Arakiotissa à Lagoudéra, Chypre. Etude iconographique des fresques de 1192, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 50 (1996), pp. 1–137.
- Olçay 2001 = Olçay Yelda B.: Lighting Methods in the Byzantine Period and Findings of Glass Lamps in Anatolia, in: *Journal of Glass Studies* 43 (2001), pp. 77–87.
- Ousterhout 2001 = Ousterhout, Robert: Architecture, Art and Komnenian Ideology at the Pantokrator Monastery, in: Nevra Necipoğlu (ed.): *Byzantine Constantinople. Monuments, Topography and Everyday Life*, Leiden/Boston/Köln 2001 (The Medieval Mediterranean 33), pp. 133–152.
- Ousterhout 2010 = Ousterhout, Robert: The Decoration of the Pantokrator (Zeyrek Camii): Evicence Old and New, in: Ayla Ödekan/Engin Akyürek/Nevra Necipoğlu (eds.): *Change in the Byzantine World in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries. Proceedings of the First International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposium*, Istanbul 2010 (Istanbul Archaeological Museum, June 25–28, 2007), pp. 432–439.

- Papacostas / Mango / Grünbart 2007 = Papacostas, Tassos / Mango, Cyril / Grünbart, Michael: History and Architecture of Saint John Chrysostomos at Koutsovendis, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 61 (2007), pp. 25–156.
- Parani 2018 = Parani, Maria: A Monument of his Own? An Iconographic Study of the Wall Paintings of the Holy Trinity Parekklesion at the Monastery of St. John Chrysostom, Koutsovendis (Cyprus) in: *Studies in Iconography* 39 (2018), pp. 1–85.
- Potamianos 2021 = Potamianos, Iakovos: The Concept of Temenos and the Section of Light, in: Jelena Bogdanović (ed.): *Icons of Space: Advances in Hierotopy*, London / New York 2021, pp. 68–91.
- Radojčić 1963 = Radojčić, Svetozar: Mileševa, Belgrad 1963 (*Umetnički spomenici Jugoslavije*).
- Restle 1995 = Restle, Marcell: *Malerbücher*, in: *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst*, vol. 5, Stuttgart 1995, cols. 1221–1237.
- Restle 2001 = Restle, Marcell: Amphibola – Patroni in der byzantinischen und postbyzantinischen Malerei?, in: *Deltion tēs Christianikēs Archaialogikēs Hetaireias* Ser. 4,22 (2001), pp. 281–286.
- Restle 2005 = Restle, Marcell: *Musterbücher*, in: *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst*, vol. 6, Stuttgart 2005, cols. 770–806.
- Rhoby 2008 = Rhoby, Andreas: Byzantinische Epigramme auf Ikonen und Objekten der Kleinkunst, nebst Addenda zu Bd. 1: Byzantinische Epigramme auf Fresken und Mosaiken, Vienna 2010 (Wolfram Hörandner / Andreas Rhoby / Anneliese Paul [eds.]: *Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung*, vol. 2) (*Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung* 15).
- Savage 2008 = Savage, Matthew: The Interrelationship of Text, Imagery and Architectural Space in Byzantium. The Example of the Entrance Vestibule of Žiža Monastery (Serbia), in: Wolfram Hörandner / Andreas Rhoby (eds.): *Die kulturhistorische Bedeutung byzantinischer Epigramme. Akten des internationalen Workshops* (Vienna, December 1–2, 2006), Vienna 2008 (*Veröffentlichungen zur Byzanzforschung* 14), pp. 101–112.
- Scheller 1995 = Scheller, Robert W.: *Exemplum: Model-book Drawings and the Practice of Artistic Transmission in the Middle Ages* (ca. 900–ca. 1470), Amsterdam 1995.
- Schellewald 2005 = Schellewald, Barbara: Nerezi, in: *Reallexikon zur byzantinischen Kunst*, vol. 6, Stuttgart 2005, cols. 946–966.
- Schellewald 2008a = Schellewald, Barbara: Und es ward Bild ... Zum Verhältnis von Bild und Text in byzantinischen Sakralräumen, in: Susanne Ehrich / Julia Ricker (eds.): *Mittelalterliche Weltdeutung in Text und Bild*, Weimar 2008, pp. 47–76.
- Schellewald 2008b = Schellewald, Barbara: Vom Unsichtbaren zum Sichtbaren: Liturgisches Zeremoniell und Bild in Byzanz im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert, in: Edgar Bierende / Sven Bretfeld / Klaus Oschema (eds.): *Riten, Gesten, Zeremonien. Gesellschaftliche Symbolik in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*, Berlin / New York 2008 (*Trends in Medieval Philology* 14), pp. 141–166.
- Schellewald 2012 = Schellewald, Barbara: Eintauchen in das Licht. Medialität und Bildtheorie, in: *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 42.167 (2012), pp. 16–37.
- Schellewald 2018 = Schellewald, Barbara: *Out of the Blue* – die Erscheinung des Göttlichen. Der Einsatz von Lapislazuli im Mittelalter, in: Natascha Adamowsky / Nicola Gess / Mireille Schnyder / Hugues Marchal / Johannes Bartuschat (eds.): *Archäologie der Spezialeffekte*, Paderborn 2018 (*Poetik und Ästhetik des Staunens* 4), pp. 217–238.
- Schulz 2000 = Schulz, Hans-Joachim: Die byzantinische Liturgie. Glaubenszeugnis und Symbolgestalt, 3rd, completely rev. and updated ed., Trier 2000 (*Sophia* 5).
- Shorr 1946 = Shorr, Dorothy C.: The Iconographic Development of the “Presentation in the Temple”, in: *The Art Bulletin* 28 (1946), pp. 17–32.
- Sinkević 2000 = Sinkević, Ida: The Church of St. Panteleimon at Nerezi. Architecture, Programme, Patronage, Wiesbaden 2000 (*Spätantike, frühes Christentum, Byzanz. Series B: Studien und Perspektiven* 6).

- Spieser 2015 = Spieser, Jean-Michel: Le monastère du Pantocrator à Constantinople. Le typikon et le monument, in: *Convivium* 2.1 (2015), pp. 202–217.
- Studer-Karlen 2022 = Studer-Karlen, Manuela: *Christus Anapeson. Bild und Liturgie*, Basel / Berlin 2022.
- Stylianou 1985 = Stylianou, Andreas u. Judith A.: *The Painted Churches of Cyprus. Treasures of Byzantine Art*, London 1985.
- Taft 1994 = Taft, Robert F.: The Synaxarion of Evergetis in the History of Byzantine Liturgy, in: Margaret Mullett / Anthony Kirby (eds.): *The Theotokos Evergetis and Eleventh-Century Monasticism*, Belfast 1994 (Belfast Byzantine Texts and Translations 6.1), pp. 274–293.
- Taft 2006 = Taft, Robert F.: The Decline of Communion in Byzantium and the Distancing of the Congregation from the Liturgical Action: Cause, Effect, or Neither?, in: Sharon E.J. Gerstel (ed.): *Thresholds of the Sacred: Architectural, Art Historical, Liturgical, and Theological Perspectives on Religious Screens, East and West*, Washington 2006, pp. 27–50.
- Teteriatnikov 2011 = Teteriatnikov, Natalia: The New Role of Prophets in Byzantine Church Decoration after Iconoclasm. The Case of the New Tokalı Kilise, Cappadocia, in: *Deltion tēs Christianikēs Archailogikēs Hetaireias* 32 (2011), pp. 51–64.
- Theis 2001 = Theis, Lioba: Lampen, Leuchten, Licht, in: Christoph Stiegemann (ed.): *Byzanz. Das Licht aus dem Osten. Kult und Alltag im Byzantinischen Reich vom 4. bis 15. Jahrhundert*. Catalogue of the Exhibition at the Erzbischöfliche Diözesanmuseum Paderborn, Mainz 2002, pp. 53–63.
- Thomas / Hero 2000 = Thomas, John Philip / Hero, Angela Constantinides (eds.): *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*, Washington D.C. 2000 (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 35.2).
- Todić 1994 = Todić, Branislav: Anapeson. Iconographie et signification du thème, in: *Byzantion* 64 (1994), pp. 134–165.
- Velmans 1972 = Velmans, Tania: Le dessin à Byzance, in: *Monuments et Mémoires de la Fondation Eugène Piot* 58 (1972), pp. 137–170.
- Walter 1982 = Walter, Christopher: *Art and Ritual of the Byzantine Church*, London 1982 (Birmingham Byzantine Series 1: Variorum publication 3).
- Warland 2005 = Warland, Rainer: Die Reiter des Freiburger Musterblattes und die Bildgeschichte der byzantinischen Zweireiterikone, in: Lars M. Hoffmann / Anuscha Monchizadeh (eds.): *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie: Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*, Wiesbaden 2005 (Mainzer Veröffentlichungen zur Byzantinistik 7), pp. 883–893.
- Weyl Carr 2002 = Weyl Carr, Annemarie: The “Virgin Veiled by God.” The Presentation of an Icon on Cyprus, in: Elizabeth Sears / Thelma K. Thomas (eds.): *Reading Medieval Images. The Art Historian and the Object*, Ann Arbor, Michigan 2002, pp. 215–227.
- Winfield 1968 = Winfield, David C.: Middle and Later Byzantine Wall Painting Methods. A Comparative Study, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 22 (1968), pp. 61–139.
- Winfield 2003 = Winfield, David C. and June: *The Church of the Panaghia tou Arakos at Lagoudhera, Cyprus: The Paintings and their Painterly Significance*, Washington 2003 (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 37).
- Wybrew 1990 = Wybrew, Hugh: *The Orthodox Liturgy. The Development of the Eucharistic Liturgy in the Byzantine Rite*, New York 1990.
- Zarras 2015 = Zarras, Nektarios: A Gem of Artistic *Ekphrasis*: Nicholas Mesarites' Description of the Mosaics in the Church of the Holy Apostles at Constantinople, in: Alicia Simpson (ed.): *Byzantium 1180–1204: 'The Sad Quarter of a Century'?*, Athen 2015 (National Hellenic Research Foundation. Institute of Historical Research. Section of Byzantine Research. International Symposium 22), pp. 261–282.