

Review Essay

The Status of the Visual in Byzantine Culture: On Some Recent Developments in Byzantine Art History

Glenn Peers

The impression given by art history surveys and civilisation courses can often be that Byzantine art is 'flat, flat figures on gold, gold ground.' Take, for instance, the ninth-century mosaic over the imperial door in the narthex of that quintessential Byzantine monument, Hagia Sophia, in Istanbul: Christ is seated on a lyre-backed throne, blessing with his right hand and holding a book open with his left. To either side are roundels containing bust portraits of two members of his celestial court, the Virgin Mary (or the Theotokos, or the Bearer of God, to use proper Orthodox designation) and an angel (Gabriel? Michael?); while the angel gazes sternly out at the viewer, the Virgin turns to the figure of Christ with hands outstretched in a gesture of supplication. Set off in their roundels, these two figures belong to a different field of activity from the fourth participant in this image, the figure of an emperor (identifiable through dress and headgear) kneeling abjectly to Christ's right and below the figure of the Theotokos.

This image possesses all the signature aspects of Byzantine art according to common perception. The figures are denaturalised forms acting out sacred drama on an abstract ground of gold. Furthermore, the scene does play to all the preconceived notions of the Byzantine state, an autocratic regime bolstered by symbolic representations of the emperor's might which served to keep the masses in superstitious thrall. Admittedly such views enact straw men (although Gibbon's disparaging of the medieval state centred on the Bosphoros still resonates with some), and no such view will be found supported in recent literature on Byzantine art. Indeed, scholarship in this decade has opened up some striking vistas across this landscape, once seen as

stark, repetitive and unworldly. In fact, Byzantine art history has begun to make a concerted and undeniable case for its indispensability within the field of Byzantine studies more broadly; in no other pre-modern culture, it might be argued, is the visual so crucial to understanding a civilisation. One need only look at the programs of the Byzantine Studies conferences, held annually in the United States (and once in Toronto), to comprehend the hold art has within this discipline. Granted, some of this predominance has to do with the difficulties of the field (the languages are often off-putting, and the resources are challenging in their inconvenience), but the art is also strangely familiar to a post-modern mind in a way that the literature, as rich and fascinating as it is, is not. Recent scholarship has, if nothing else, shown the visual to be the key to the Byzantine puzzle.

Using some of Robin Cormack's insights from his *Painting the Soul: Icons, Death Masks and Shrouds* (London, 1997), let us return to the Hagia Sophia mosaic. The identities of the figures are, as pointed out, left without marker, the inscriptions over Christ's shoulders being added a century later. Christ, of course, is unmistakable, but what of the other figures and their actions? The doorway itself determines, it would seem, part of the mosaic's meaning. This door led directly into the nave of the sixth-century church, and only the emperor could have used it. Position, then, surely suggests function. However, the ambiguity of the action and the identity of the emperor within the lunette over the door present further difficulties. On stylistic grounds the emperor is either Basil I (867-86), the founder of the Macedonian dynasty, the longest-lasting of the Byzantine period, or his son, Leo VI (886-912). Why, then, this mosaic over this particular door depicting one of these emperors? Did the emperor commission the mosaic, or was the commissioner the patriarch who had, after all, titular dominion over this church? Inscriptions or texts help us not at all with these questions. The image can mean several things depending on the argument one is following: it reveals the emperor abject and penitent, in a pose reminiscent of David before Nathan (a symbolic resonance that would not have been lost either on contemporaries of Basil, who would have known that he murdered his co-emperor after having married his colleague's mistress, or on contemporaries of his son, whose tetragamy scandal also incensed the patriarch); or it reveals the emperor in a proper pose of humility before his ruler, perhaps echoing the pose dictated by the Book of Ceremonies for the emperor entering the high church. Multivalence of meaning is, in any event, a way of looking which is generally habitual to the Middle Ages, and the ambiguity is, at some level, intentional. (Gilbert Dagron, *Empereur et prêtre*, Paris, 1996, is very good on the multiple meanings within this mosaic.)

The ambiguity which enriches the mosaic also allows us to see the centrality of the visual in this culture: it asserts in a public monument, perhaps the most high profile monument in Christendom at that time, that images are the preeminent vehicle for expressing doctrine and politics. The stylistic characteristics also indicate the sophistication of this visual proclamation. The emperor is shown as a relatively two-dimensional figure; the patterning of his garments is shifted to show shapes of the body underneath, so his dress is not simply a carapace. At the same time his body has little volume, and depth is indicated schematically by the feet and the two hands, which in any case do not cohere into a dimensionalised representation of a figure in space. Christ, by contrast, is depicted in a manner which suggests the gravity of a real body settled believably on a throne. His face is also modeled and shaded to give a sense of realism to the figure. Compared with the almost caricature-like quality of the emperor's face (which also results in his relative anonymity), Christ is depicted as fully present, impinging on the viewer's space as his right foot, too, threatens to break the picture plane. Such conventions of realism for divinity versus abstraction for the human participant are not unprecedented (compare Masaccio's "Trinity" in Sta Maria Novella, Florence), but this manipulation of stylistic modes was an important vehicle for communicating devotional meaning in the Byzantine era. (Ernst Kitzinger, *Byzantine Art in the Making*, Cambridge, 1977, remains the best study on style and its meanings.) The apparent 'real presence' is particularly intriguing, given the Byzantine approach to icons.

A long debate over the place of the icon in Byzantine society began in the 720's, was provisionally decided at the last Ecumenical Council at Nicaea in 787, reasserted itself in 815, and was decided once and for all in 843 with the reintroduction of image worship and its liturgical celebration, the Restoration of Orthodoxy. The title of that feast ought to indicate the centrality of the icon in Orthodox belief. The icon became the undeniable means for sanctioned and seemly worship of God, and that belief was never again challenged. Our understanding of this sense of presence and communication has been expanded in magisterial fashion by the work of Hans Belting. His study, *Bild und Kult* (Munich, 1990), since published in an English translation as *Likeness and Presence* (Chicago, 1994), addresses the development of the cult of icons not only from the Late Antique and Byzantine point of view, but also goes far beyond this field to trace this cult in the west in the Middle Ages and into the pre-modern era. Its scope extends well beyond that of every other comparable study, and its ideas must be contended with by everyone interested in the 'power of images.'

Icons, of course, were not entirely a Byzantine invention. Painted panels were used in a variety of contexts in the Ancient and Late Antique world, from representations of the emperor and his family that were distributed around the empire, to depictions of the gods found in public and private settings, to the well-known mummy portraits, generally called Fayyum portraits after their principal findspot in Egypt. Belting explains all of these origins in lucid detail while also bringing out the Christian alterations made to these representations, which were already commonplace in Late Antique society. Christian attitudes to these images have long been debated in this area of art history. The traditional view has held that Christians generally eschewed material supports such as icons in worship and kept a pure, aniconic piety typical of the very earliest church. This view has been seriously undermined, if not entirely dismantled, by the thorough study of Paul Corby Finney, *The Invisible God* (Oxford, 1994). Finney has demonstrated that Christians manifestly participated in the material culture of their society, all the while adapting it to their own needs and beliefs. The theologians have generally been given an adversarial position in the growth of the cult of icons in Late Antiquity, as guardians of that mythical pure tradition (see Ernst Kitzinger in *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 1954), but Finney shows them to be colluding in that adaptation of pagan and Jewish material culture. For Belting, the theologians are nearly beside the point; the subtitle of his introduction is “The Power of Images and the Limitations of Theologians.” For him, these icons became a potent link between this world and divinity that was largely private in its original stages, and then was gradually co-opted by authority figures in the church and in government. The instances of miraculous images in Late Antiquity show that icons were seen as unique repositories of presence. By the seventh century, icons were paraded around the walls of Constantinople as palladia in times of crisis. Clearly, the imperial image had long since ceded its place of dominance in the world of images.

This sense of loss of power likely informed the onslaught of imperial iconoclasm in the eighth century at a fundamental level. Other causes were certainly present (see Averil Cameron’s very fine study in *Church and the Arts*, 1992), but the sense of presence communicated by such icons as the tremendous Christ from the sixth/seventh century, miraculously preserved at Sinai—who is depicted as a Zeus-type—evidently threatened authority at the highest level of government. In the 720’s, then, Leo III moved against images, although the sources are unclear as to the extent and degree of iconoclastic policy at this early stage. Clear, however, is the personal response of Leo to circumvent the power of images and reverse the stream of disasters afflicting the empire. From a political point of view, this policy worked: the reigns of Leo and of

his son, Constantine V, were enormously successful and long. Success of this kind proved irresistible to the ninth-century emperors, who also espoused anti-image policies.

These policies had a dramatic effect on the debates about the role of the visual in Byzantium, and we are lucky to possess many documents related to these theological *cum* political arguments. Several of the debates have been translated in recent years, one very useful publication being a collection of hagiographics titled *Byzantine Defenders of Images*, edited by Alice-Mary Talbot (Washington, 1998); this collection makes many of these writings readily available for those without Greek. Analysis has increased consequently amongst art historians about the theoretical background established in this period for images. The defences rested essentially on the incarnation of Christ, especially as the most important case made by iconoclasts was against representing God. Orthodox views of salvation are markedly different from western ideas, and they devolve primarily to the concept of ‘theosis’ or divinisation. The Athanasian Creed is often quoted in this regard: “He became man that we might be made divine.” (Eric Perle in Linda Safran’s *Heaven on Earth*, published in 1998, is perhaps the best essay on Orthodox theology as it connects with images that I have read; the collection altogether is to be recommended.) This sense of divinity regenerating the relationship with humanity is fundamental to Orthodox thinking, and it also informed ideas about icons. Iconophiles, such as Theodore of Stoudios and Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople at the time of the second outbreak of Iconoclasm in 815, pointed therefore to the incarnation as the primary defence. Christ made himself man, and for that reason he must be depicted. To refuse to do so, they claimed, was to deny the reality of the incarnation and enter into heterodox territory occupied by Arians, Monophysites and worse.

All categories of representation were not covered by this stricture. For instance, angels are bodiless and immaterial, and yet were depicted—and even depicted as men with wings. The logic of this convention escaped iconoclasts, and iconophiles were forced to defend these images on different grounds from the realism demanded of Christ’s images. Angels were defined as symbolic representations, referring allusively to momentary flashes of angelic epiphany; only the inscription controlled this artificial sign. Interestingly, these dissembling images encouraged contemplation in a way different from Christ’s images because, as epigrams tell us, they led the viewer to look at the image in a non-literal way and therefore to vault contemplation to a higher plane. (See for a fuller version of this argument my book on representing

angels entitled *Subtle Bodies*, to be published in 2000.) The intellectual muscle applied to these problems is very compelling, especially as it points out the central issue dividing this culture in the eighth and ninth centuries. The visual became the defining element in religious, political and intellectual life at this time, and it remained at the centre of Byzantine thought thereafter.

This wealth has not escaped art historians. The recent collection on the relic-image Mandylyon, *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation* (Bologna, 1998), elucidates in all its essays the crucial role such an object can have in understanding a society's relationship to its God. Moreover, it shows the signal importance of images over texts in this society. The Mandylyon became part of the Abgar tradition in which that king of Edessa (present-day Urfa in Turkey) wrote to Christ for healing. Christ wrote a letter which took on talismanic powers for that city, and eventually for Constantinople itself. The image itself came to play a role as the cult of icons grew in the centuries before Iconoclasm. Originally a painted panel, it became a touch relic, a towel Christ used to wipe his wet face which retained an impression of his features in it. By the tenth century, when it was paraded into the capital after being ransomed from the Arabs occupying Edessa, it was produced by blood and sweat—and then the line between image and relic became indistinct. The basis for the Veronica legend and even for sindonologists' claims about the veracity of the Shroud of Turin, in Byzantium this image was proof both of the need for representation and of the presence of Christ in the material world.

Herbert Kessler's essay in the Mandylyon collection is masterful in its discussion of the visual strategies at play in depicting the Mandylyon and the circumvention of the possibility of idolatry. Perhaps more than any other medievalist of the past decade, he has uncovered the framework surrounding Byzantine ideas of their images, especially as expressed through the images themselves. Argumentation through images was a peculiarly medieval trait, but one often neglected by those historians who have for so long privileged text over image; views of this kind have certainly coloured art historians' attitudes to their own discipline, and it seems that only recently have critics begun to look at the intellectual moves made by images independent of text or word. (See, for example, some of the essays in Kessler's *Studies in Pictorial Narrative*, London, 1995 and *Spiritual Seeing*, Philadelphia, 2000.) The Mandylyon provides a good example again. In some representations, a direct link is made between the Mandylyon and the tablets of law that Moses brought down from Sinai. These representations belong to a long tradition of typological interpretation

of images, but the argument is made in these cases visually. The Old Testament is the shadow, the New the colour that fills in that incomplete form, fulfilling and revealing its truth. This essentially visual metaphor, found in Cyril of Alexandria and cited at Nicaea II, is expressed in sophisticated ways in Byzantium through images, especially after the wrenching debates of Iconoclasm.

The effects of Iconoclasm on images have often been debated. The precise ways in which these ideas articulated during Iconoclasm came to influence art production is only now becoming clear, especially through two excellent studies of ninth-century manuscripts (sadly, the majority of monuments from the post-Iconoclastic age are lost, as are the vast majority of the traces of Byzantium in Istanbul). Kathleen Corrigan in *Visual Polemics in Ninth Century Psalters* (Cambridge, 1992) examines a precious cache of illustrated Psalters from the period immediately after Iconoclasm. Some doubt about their date remains, but they appear to date to the patriarchate of Methodius (843-7) and so provide evidence for ideas about images by those who defended them in the midst of controversy. They reveal the hard feelings of those who struggled as partisans. Iconoclasts are depicted as bedeviled, whitewashing the icons of Christ while Christ is crucified above. The idea of the 'Second Passion' was a current one for iconophiles, and in accusing iconoclasts of re-enacting the Passion they nicely conflated historical and contemporary time, and the body of Christ with His images. The stakes were therefore high, in Christian terms, and iconophiles revealed a very unforgiving approach in the treatment of their defeated co-religionists. Iconoclasts were absorbed into a set of conventions for depicting Jews, and therefore their caricatured visages were intended to reveal their spiritual impurity and betrayal. The strength of Corrigan's book lies in fitting these caricatures into a long tradition of anti-Jewish and -Muslim literature, and this context accounts for the visual handling of contemporary iconoclastic debates. The manuscripts were, of course, Psalters, and as such were meant to be read in a variety of ways: as devotional treatises, liturgical aids, and also—it seems—polemical texts that revealed their pro-image affiliations through their interpretative illustrations.

Any public declaration of art's victory was strangely slow in coming, and not until 867 was the apse mosaic at Hagia Sophia, depicting the Theotokos and Christ flanked by archangels, inaugurated. The sermon by the patriarch Photius thankfully survives, and its ekphrastic content has been interestingly analysed by Ruth Webb and Liz James (*Art History* 1991; and see now R. Nelson, *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance* Cambridge, 2000). The figure of Photius is important for under-

standing post-Iconoclastic art production, in that he is perhaps the ultimate 'byzantine'. A mandarin, he was privy to the highest levels of Byzantine society and exercised his sizable ambition and intelligence in ways that give 'byzantine' its semantic usage in English; he was also perhaps the greatest intellectual of the entire era, and his writings reveal an expansive and active mind. His role in commissioning the Hagia Sophia apse mosaic is evident, his role in the narthex mosaic is highly possible (though unprovable), but his real fame as patron will rest with the extraordinarily sumptuous and complex manuscript of the sermons of the church father Gregory of Nazianzus, now in Paris (Bibliothèque Nationale, MS gr. 510).

Leslie Brubaker has written a monograph on this manuscript, *Vision and Meaning in Ninth-Century Byzantium* (Cambridge, 1999), a book which will surely be established as a classic of its kind. Her treatment entails a thorough contextualisation of this monument, from a very useful introduction to the iconoclastic background of the second half of the ninth century, to an exhaustive iconographic treatment of the miniatures. The manuscript was extensively illustrated; besides its rightfully-famous forty-three full-page illuminations, it also possesses many decorated headpieces and initials. Its very sumptuousness calls attention to itself, and unsurprisingly the manuscript was a gift to the emperor Basil I. Few manuscripts in the Byzantine period can claim such a pedigree, let alone this specificity of production and donation (it can be dated between 879 and 883). Until now, the manuscript has been the subject of only one truly impressive analysis; it has been referred to many times, but scarcely explained. Brubaker's book does this. And, importantly, she isolates a mode of representation that is strikingly independent from the text and complex in its system of argumentation. For instance, fol. 355r shows the Council of 381. The council is not mentioned in the sermon which is about sailors who brought grain to the orthodox church overseen by Gregory; indeed, Gregory was not even at the Council of 381. The Council dealt with the Holy Spirit and the condemnation of the heretic Macedonius. These aspects are generally appropriate to the themes of Gregory's sermon, if not directly illustrative. The illustration does respond to a number of Photius's own concerns, including the *filioque* question, Arianism and its connection to iconoclasm, the theology of the Holy Spirit, and the councils Photius himself convened in 867 and 879/80. In other words, the illustration is appropriate in a general way to the text it accompanies, but it does much more than simply refer to that text or its ideas. The illustration has been harnessed to ninth-century concerns, particularly those of Photius himself, and so possesses that same ambivalence or multivalency as the narthex mosaic in Hagia Sophia.

Church decoration in the period following Iconoclasm is regrettably scant, although some sources give a sense of the layout of painting and/or mosaic. The impact of Iconoclasm is difficult to determine, but certain developments are clear with respect to church decoration before and after the iconoclastic rupture. In any event, the changes in decoration are connected to other changes in architecture and liturgy. The shift to smaller, more centralised, buildings is apparent in nascent form before the eighth century, but the typical shape of the Byzantine church only became conventional in the ninth and tenth centuries. A typical space consists of a domed cross-in-square, that is, a domed central space with vaults opening up from that space and with auxiliary chambers in the corners. (Robert Ousterhout's essay in *Heaven on Earth* is very informative.) This plan is a response to liturgical practices that focused more on the sanctuary area and less on processional axes. It also reflected economic and social changes. The medieval empire of the ninth century was much smaller in population than its Late Antique predecessor, and the emperor was no longer in a position to fund all aspects of public building. Most of the building of this middle Byzantine period was done by individuals, and the size reflects the more modest uses to which these buildings were of necessity put. (Anthony Cutler and Jean-Michel Spieser in *Byzance médiévale* provide a very good analysis of these causes in the middle Byzantine period. Indeed, the book is admirable in many ways, except its cost.)

If the churches were humble by comparison to Justinian's great commission, the Hagia Sophia, their goals were not. One of the classic works of Byzantine art history is Otto Demus' *Byzantine Mosaic Decoration* of 1949, and his insights into the meaning of the decorative program of these churches remain a touchstone. Unlike Renaissance painting, he pointed out, Byzantine art does not set up a window through which one looks into another, perfectly rational, world. The Byzantine image is created without any such barrier. For example, in mosaic decoration, a perfect conjunction of architecture and mosaic creates an integration of viewer and image (see Ousterhout in *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 1997). The use of conches, the concave area of vaults, to create three-dimensional fields is a perfect way for the representational plan to be broken and the viewer's space entered: the Annunciation at the eleventh-century church at Daphne in Greece takes place on the curved surface so that the two figures of the Theotokos and the Archangel Gabriel confront one another across real space, the space of the viewer. This kind of interaction is not only notional, but also real; thus, for example, the traditional washing of the feet on Maundy Thursday takes place before representations such as this one in the narthex (see William Tronzo in *Res*, 1994).

That sense of integration had devotional meaning also, for the viewer was not simply passive and disinterested. The whole function of the church ensemble—of architecture, decoration, liturgy—was the absorption of the body of the worshipper into Christ's. This insight is a refinement of Demus' explanations found in Thomas Mathews' work (see, for example, *Byzantium. From Antiquity to the Renaissance*, pp. 97-135). The church is, in his words, a 'temple of transformation,' as the viewer seeks to enact the potential Christ set before humanity, the possibility of becoming divine through that sacred body. The eucharist and the liturgy more generally pursue the union of God and humanity, and all the decoration and its framework also require that union. The typical apex of a Byzantine church interior is Christ Pantocrator, staring down from His lofty situation. The goal is union with that body, and all the levels between the viewer and the Pantocrator are means to, and reminders of, that end. The lowest level normally comprises the heavenly community (saints, hermits, martyrs, those closest to humanity in accomplishment and nature). Above is the narrative zone in which Christ's life is played in selected episodes, all recalling the incarnational reality so central to Orthodox thought. In the zone of the apse and upper reaches of the nave or naos of the church are the angels, prophets, apostles, the Theotokos—all those closest to the truth revealed in Christ. The church is, then, a kind of model of the cosmos, the heavens opening up in the highest part of the building, so that the architecture seems to melt away and heaven is on earth, as the patriarch Germanus said in his important treatise on the liturgy (translated by John Meyendorff in 1984 as *On the Divine Liturgy*, Crestwood, New York).

This consideration of the importance of the visual in Byzantine culture has been brief and highly selective (Leslie Brubaker has written a series of review articles in *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* which include other issues in Byzantine art history). The field itself is in a period of growth and reevaluation. While it seems to have escaped many of the tortured self-examinations of other areas of art history, the field is not a stranger to critical theory, and even apparently conventional Byzantine art history has not remained immune from these considerations. Unfortunately, Byzantine art history is taught at fewer and fewer universities in Canada, almost never as a distinct entity. This loss is the more disturbing in that this material has a lot to offer students accustomed to modern art. The combination of different stylistic modes, the theoretical defences, and the absorption-and-theatricality aspects of this art are fully consistent with modernist thinking and art. Taking a class trip to the Menil Collection in Houston, Texas, and going to both the thirteenth-century Cypriot fresco cycle and the Rothko Chapel is not nearly as jarring as might be expected; in fact,

they are very complementary, and students find time, rather strangely, collapsing. The collections of the Royal Ontario Museum and the University of Toronto are not as breathtaking as these monuments, but they are together one of the best concentrations of Byzantium on this continent. If we take advantage of these resources, Byzantium can come alive—through looking, a very Byzantine activity.

University of Texas at Austin

Works Discussed

- Belting, Hans. *Bild und Kult: Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 1990); trans. Edmund Hephcott, *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1994).
- Brubaker, Leslie. *Vision and Meaning in Ninth-Century Byzantium: Image as Exegesis in the Homilies of Gregory of Nazianzus* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999).
- Cameron, Averil. "The Language of Images: The Rise of Icons and Christian Representation" in *The Church and the Arts* ed. D. Wood. *Studies in Church History* 25 (London, 1992), pp. 1-42.
- Cormack, Robin. *Painting the Soul. Icons, Death Masks and Shrouds* (London: Reaktion Books, 1997).
- Corrigan, Kathleen. *Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992).
- Cutler, Anthony and Jean-Michel Spieser. *Byzance médiévale: 700-1204* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996).
- Dagron, Gilbert. *Empereur et prêtre: étude sur le "césaropapisme" byzantin* (Paris: Gallimard, 1996).
- Demus, Otto. *Byzantine Mosaic Decoration: Aspects of Monumental Art in Byzantium* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1948).
- Finney, Paul Corby. *The Invisible God: The Earliest Christians on Art* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1994).
- Kessler, Herbert & Gerhard Wolf, eds. *The Holy Face and the Paradox of Representation* (Bologna: Nuova Alfa, 1998).

- . *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art* (Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2000).
- . *Studies in Pictorial Narrative* (London: Pindar, 1994).
- Kitzinger, Ernst. *Byzantine Art in the Making* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1977).
- . "The Cult of Images Before the Age of Iconoclasm," *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 8 (1954): 83-150.
- Mathews, Thomas. *Byzantium. From Antiquity to the Renaissance* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1998).
- Meyendorff, John, trans. *On the Divine Liturgy of St Germanus of Constantinople* (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984).
- Nelson, Robert S., ed. *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance: Seeing as Others Saw* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000).
- Ousterhout, Robert, "Collaboration and Innovation in the Arts of Byzantine Constantinople," *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 21 (1997): 93-112.
- Peers, Glenn. *Subtle Bodies: Representing Angels in Byzantium* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
- Safran, Linda, ed. *Heaven on Earth: Art and the Church in Byzantium* (University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State UP, 1998).
- Talbot, Alice-Mary, ed. *Byzantine Defenders of Images: Eight Saints' Lives in English Translation* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1998).
- Tronzo, William. "Mimesis in Byzantium. Notes Toward a History of the Function of the Image" *Res: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 25 (1994): 61-76.
- Webb, Ruth and Elizabeth James, "To Understand Ultimate Things and Enter Secret Places': Ekphrasis and Art in Byzantium" *Art History* 14 (1991): 1-17.