Lessons from 'The Glory of Byzantium'

ROBIN CORMACK

The major exhibition of Byzantine art at the Metropolitan Museum, New York from March to July 1997 not only brought together in one place many of the masterpieces of Byzantine art, but highlighted a number of the historical questions which face this field. 'The Glory of Byzantium' covered the normative production of art during the 'Middle Byzantine' period and the art of Byzantium's neighbours.[1] This framework directly challenges us to revisit the discussion of 'centre and periphery' in Byzantine art, although anyone who attended the Twenty-Sixth International Congress on the History of Art in Washington DC in 1985 or has read its publication will know that one session was taken at the time to be the official moment of burial of the discourse of 'centre and periphery' in any period of world art.[2] This does not mean that the discourse has gone away; the issue is whether it can be replaced with a more effective cognitive analysis. A new framework is indeed signalled by the use of the term for the exhibition 'Byzantium and its Neighbours' by its chief curators, both specialists in related areas (William Wixon in western medieval art and Helen Evans in Armenian art).

'The Glory of Byzantium' turned out to be a major blockbusting exhibition of the century, one that put together many striking objects and was distinguished by a massive catalogue, itself fashioned as a Middle Byzantine manuscript in enamelled book covers.[3] This catalogue is therefore a symbol of some of the issues raised by the presentation of the exhibition, for the dust jacket represents item 41 in the exhibition: these enamels date around 1000 and are now in the Marciana Library. They are Byzantine objects re-used in the fourteenth century in Venice to cover a western lectionary; originally they presumably formed the covers of a Byzantine book and were 'appropriated' by the Venetians as part of the booty of 1204. We will need to come back to the concept of appropriation later on, mentioning here only the point made by another visitor that Venice in the fourteenth century offered the best display of Byzantine art before the twentieth.[4]

The exhibition covered the art of Byzantium between the years 843 and 1261

DIALOGOS | Hellenic Studies Review | Number 5 (1998)
Robin Cormack | Lessons from 'The Glory of Byzantium' | pp. 27-39

(from the end of Iconoclasm up to the recapture of Constantinople from the Latin Kingdom of 1204 to 1261). It was in a sense conceived as a successor to the Age of Spirituality (held in the Metropolitan in 1977-8), a highly didactic exhibition, and in terms of numbers of visitors far less successful.[5] The organization of the exhibits was to show the centre, Byzantine art itself, in the first five galleries, and then to pass on to neighbours and rivals from north, south, east and west. It therefore highlighted the long-running debate on centre and periphery: how far is Byzantine art the art of Constantinople, and why do its forms and aesthetic extend beyond the regions of Greece and Asia Minor? How far is this a discussion to be conceived in geographical, political or cultural terms?

The exhibition and its messages can best be put into context if we take a harder look at the historiography of centre and periphery in Byzantine art history. This dichotomy has almost invariably been treated as a problem in style, or at least to be recognized through style; but it is really a cover for a number of quite diverse issues, which I would identify under three headings. The first concerns the nature of Byzantine art as an entity. The nineteenth-century problem was how to explain the difference between Greco-Roman art and the Byzantine art which succeeded it. The culture was handled synchronically, and as a whole. Medieval Christian art was seen, if not as ancient art in decline, certainly as one with a different aesthetic (though oddly compromised from time to time with moments of Renaissance, so that such objects as the Joshua Roll and Paris Psalter were not seen as individual products, but as signs of a shift in culture). The question was seen like this: was Byzantine art some kind of perverse development of tendencies from within Late Antique art? or was the impetus from outside – from the periphery of the Greco-Roman? The latter argument was pressed by J. Strzygowski, whose obsessions dominated the field for the first half of the twentieth century.[6] A significant publication in the dissolving of the simple opposition of east and west came in 1947 with a major paper by J.B. Ward-Perkins.[7] Strzygowski wrote: 'Ever since 1902 I have repeatedly called attention to the fact that Hellas died early in the embrace of the East.'[8] Mango in 1961 described the aim of Stryzygowski as an attempt to move the sources of Byzantine art further and further east until he found the origin of the dome of St Sophia in the round tents of outer Mongolia.[9] Ward-Perkins instead argued for an internal evolution to St Sophia within Roman architecture, and shifted the focus of Byzantine art history to developments within the diversity of Greco-Roman art.

Even so, the will to find remote models for Byzantium can surface at any time

– the abiding tendency, still found in the exhibition catalogue, is to represent the phoenixes on the eleventh-century ivory casket from Troyes as 'an incontrovertible example of Chinese influence' (cat. 141). Actually the same birds are on the back of a slightly earlier ivory triptych in the Vatican (cat. 79), though they are not illustrated in the catalogue but instead described as no more than 'exotic birds'. In other words, this aspect of centre and periphery has resurfaced in the exhibition within a notion of acculturation; we read in the exhibition handout that 'the empire viewed itself as the centre of the world, connecting with all the surrounding cultures' – although a distinction is made between neighbours and rivals. Perhaps inevitably a Byzantine exhibition will have a Byzantinocentric point of view, with Constantinople seen as the centre of the world, despite the multiple perspectives of the period itself. While there is much Byzantine writing which describes Constantinople as the 'Queen of Cities' and implies the superiority of life in the city, yet the Christian communities at the time might have challenged the perspective: this is the period of the Crusades and of maps with Jerusalem placed at the centre of the world.

One can characterize this approach as the 'global' view of centre and periphery – and it depends as much on 'our' view as theirs. It involves a conception of influence and stylistic change in Byzantine art, with Byzantium treated as centre and new ideas coming from outside.

The discussion of centre and periphery (to turn now to the second heading) emerges in a different form as part of a pursuit to reconstruct the art of Constantinople. The reasoning encountered is that Byzantium was an empire with a capital which was its centre of production. Unfortunately, the art of Constantinople, and particularly its monumental decoration, was in great part lost (through age, natural disaster, Iconoclasm, the Frankish conquest of 1204, and finally the Ottomans), and so the art historian's task was to find some method to reconstruct it. It was supposed from the late nineteenth century onwards that the art of the centre could be visualized through the art of the provinces, the periphery, for they must be related to the centre, like the ripples of water in a pond.

In the catalogue for the 1964 Athens exhibition, strategically entitled *Byzantine Art. An European Art,* Otto Demus wrote that 'sometimes one almost has the impression that everything we possess is but a reflection of lost originals of superb quality. That cannot of course be true: the mosaics now existing in Hagia Sophia, for example, must have been among the best of which the Empire's capital was capable. And yet these also, for all their excellence, give the impression that there

must have existed yet others of almost unimaginable grandeur.'[10] And as an explanation for this supposed fact, Demus pessimistically saw Byzantine art as producing a minority of 'original works' and a majority of cruder versions.

Demus sees the capital as the source of all invention and the centre of excellence. He teases us as viewers to recognize its pre-eminence through the veil of works of art which survive from other regions or from objects produced in Constantinople, but not of pre-eminent quality: such luxury manuscripts as the tenth-century Bible of Leo Sakellarios or the eleventh-century Menologion of Basil II have long been described as falling short in metropolitan quality. In this approach the centre is seen as the prime producer of Byzantine art, and the periphery within the empire as the secondary producer. The fragility of the analysis must be clear in all sorts of ways; but the most obvious criticism is the reductionist view that the artists of the capital must often be the very same artists who moved to and worked in the periphery, both inside and outside the empire, and worked there at the same level of craftsmanship. Equally, we might postulate the existence of artists spending their careers outside Constantinople; yet artefacts apparently produced far from Constantinople are not necessarily inferior in style or quality, witness the objects in the monastery of St Catherine on Sinai, from where thirteen icons came to the exhibition, including the Climacus icon and others for which there is a strong case for production in the monastery.[11] The quest to reconstruct the lost art of the capital from works in the periphery which supposedly reflect or distort it is perilous, and only engenders scepticism about the value and reality of the dichotomy.

The third heading is a view of centre and periphery implicit in Demus' reasoning and often developed in Byzantine art-history writing, whereby all works of art are divided according to some dichotomy: 'models and copies', 'the progressive and the traditional', 'metropolitan and provincial', or of course 'centre and periphery' – all of which are ways of pointing to the same distinctions seen in the art, in either its style or quality or both. These issues were confronted by Wharton in 1988: she tried to resolve the extreme dichotomy of centre and periphery by finding positive elements in the art of the periphery.[12] Her examples may reduce the sharpness of the dichotomy, but they inevitably maintain the framework. Wharton aimed to take the stigma out of provincial art as a critical category, without deconstructing the dichotomy as a geographical fact of life. She chose four regions to study, assuming that the Byzantine empire was so centralized and monolithic that all peripheral art was in some way related to the capital – it

was, she says, 'provincial', meaning that the art of the periphery was *dependent* on the capital, not 'regional' and *independent* (something that was possible only, she proposed, in the less centralized Roman empire), although any weakness in the power of the centre might mean less control over the peripheral art of the empire.

The discussion of centre and periphery has been one of the perennial components of the study of Byzantine art, and in all its variations it involves one constant assumption. This is that change in artistic style is decided by physical factors, geographical and environmental: the place of birth or training of the artist-producers (and perhaps the sponsors) determined their methods of expression. One of the commonest beliefs in Byzantine art history, espoused most articulately by Gabriel Millet, has been that 'regional schools' determined the pattern of the formation of Byzantine art: that art from Alexandria was illusionist in type, art from Antioch was abstract, and the new city Constantinople arose out of their combination. Our problem is not that this geographical determinism is empirically falsifiable (or at least not in its subtler forms), but that it is an incomplete account of art history, which exaggerates external considerations over internal processes. It shuts off debate, especially when all explanation is relentlessly referred back to ultimate sources of style and iconographic detail.

Several papers given at the Washington World Art History conference of 1985 represented a critical response to the discourse of centre and periphery. Castelnuovo saw the debate as an indication of colonial values.[13] He quoted Bernard Berenson: 'Despite Professor Strzygowski, the imposing publications of himself and his numberless admirers, I cannot shake off my convictions that fashions in top hat and cravats do, as a rule, go from Bond Street to the Congolese heart of darkness and not the other way round.' Castelnuovo questioned whether the argument which assumes 'one way only' was reasonable, and whether one can be certain when two places are in contact, which is the centre and which the periphery. Bialostocki used the example of Mexico to support the case for the rehabilitation of the periphery over the centre, referring to the ring road around Mexico city as the place of dynamic movement and noting that it was called 'El Periferico'.[14] His conclusion was that both centres and peripheries are creative, but in different degrees and respects; as these are defined, the idea of a dichotomy is dissolved. Brilliant's paper was a further criticism of the conception of centre as superior to periphery, seen again as a construct arising from attitudes of colonialism and élitism. He analysed the encounter between different cultures in terms of

confrontation, reception and adaptation. Brilliant took Greco-Roman art as a whole and questioned the view that it was superior to the periphery – to Palmyran art, Gandharan art, or German art.[15] What has been described as centre and periphery may be better seen as the contrast between classical and non-classical modes of expression. In reference to Stryzygowski, Brilliant saw early Byzantine art as a process of rediscovery of its eastern elements, occurring within the culture; the oriental element already in Greco-Roman art resurfaced in response to a movement towards iconic imagery. Changes in Byzantine art were thus seen as symptomatic of a reworking of Greco-Roman traditions, and not as a response to new influences from the periphery.

Much of the importance of these papers is that they set the discourse of centre and periphery in art history in historiographic contexts. Other cultural historians too have wanted to explain why scholars like Stryzygowski espoused so sharp a division between east and west – it is no surprise that the possibility of outright racialist reasons has been espoused.[16] The problem for Byzantine studies is how to distinguish the reasons for the popularity of the centre/periphery model, and its possible oversimplifications, from the empirical facts of viewing. We want to explain the emergence and development of Byzantine art out of the Greco-Roman world and to account for its differences at different times and places. The presentation of the Metropolitan exhibition and the studies in the catalogue set these issues again at the centre of debate.

The display of objects selected for the 'Glory of Byzantium' did superficially suggest a progression from centre to periphery. The introductory catalogue article by Vryonis, accompanied by illustrations from the Madrid Skylitzes, documents the self-perception of Byzantium as the great empire of its time.[17] Paradoxically, recent research has attributed the Madrid version of the Skylitzes chronicle to Sicily in the twelfth century, which suggests that its illustrations offer an outsider's view of the empire from a kingdom which is distinctive for its emulation of the perceived practices of power in Byzantium, Islam and the West.[18] Just as Wharton described Byzantium as a 'model bureaucratic empire', so Vryonis describes the functioning of empire, without questioning the concept. The exhibition and its catalogue sets out the material to test the notion of superior empire and receptive periphery, and immediately encourages uncomfortable perceptions. If this idea of a dominant empire at the centre of the world is correct, why is the related art of aligned and rival neighbouring societies seen often to be of equal quality and equally innovative? Do the similarities of the art conceal the

political relationships and differences of these other societies? How damaging to Byzantium was the Battle of Manzikert in 1071, when much of Asia Minor slipped from its orbit, and the sack of Constantinople in 1204 by the armies of the Fourth Crusade and the loss for ever of such territories as Crete?

Vryonis speaks about the Byzantine empire as the late Roman empire and a state with a vast bureaucracy. He refers to the *Kleterologion* of Philotheos of 899, an etiquette book listing the most important military and civil officials invited to the imperial banquet table, and works out that it lists fifty-nine higher and some five hundred subordinate officials who attended formal palace receptions.[19] He goes on to deduce that the bureaucracy 'in all its provincial extent' must have numbered thousands. At the upper levels, he describes these men as the most highly educated people in society: 'this intimate connection between bureaucracy, education and cultivation of letters and sciences was common to Chinese and Islamic civilization as well and gave rise to the mandarin phenomenon in each of these cultures.' But can we be sure that these figures are a true estimate and not an exaggeration? An alternative perception is that the actual aggregate of military commanders and administrators was small in relation to the population of the Byzantine lands; nor was the bureaucracy a unified and harmonious group, especially during the rivalries and power struggles of the Middle Byzantine period. Similarly there is a question mark over the estimates of the populations of both Constantinople and the provinces, though everyone seems to agree that, even if we cannot work out the population of Constantinople, yet it was smaller in the Middle Byzantine period than under Justinian (perhaps then half a million), and declined further after 1261. With all these figures being so much a matter of impression, those deduced by Vryonis need careful treatment. Instead of a vast bureaucracy, one might see the familiar picture of a state with insufficient manpower to control its regions or to work efficiently. This picture is given some support for Byzantium from the study of letters of St Theodore the Studite written during his exile from Constantinople during Iconoclasm.[20] Theodore's network of correspondents include administrators of whom some were related to him, or sympathetic to his plight for other reasons, and others simply incompetent. He skilfully evaded many of the restrictions imposed by the emperor. Ševčenko has used this material to signal the weaknesses of Byzantine administration and indeed to compare Byzantium with the Soviet Union. In Moscow a few days before the coup against Gorbachev in 1991, he was asked by vice-president Gennadi Yanaev: 'Was there totalitarianism in Byzantium?'. Ševčenko's answer

('like all centralized states with a single ideology, Byzantium tended towards totalitarianism, but, given the imperfections of the time, did not possess the technical means to achieve it') was, as he saw in hindsight, equally applicable to the coup itself.

All empires have a problem of personnel and communication. But to have those problems does not make a society an empire. Was Byzantium more than a self-styled empire after Iconoclasm? Have we too easily accepted the self-identity of the Byzantines as at the centre of the world? It is a commonplace that in the century before Iconoclasm Byzantium went through deep social and political changes – indeed Iconoclasm is widely seen as a response to changing circumstances inside the state and also a consequence of the rise of Islam.[21] Is it a modern myth to apply the term empire to Byzantium after the end of antiquity? Whittow has posed the problem of comparing Byzantium before and after Iconoclasm, but has decided that if the term of empire was applicable to China over centuries of change, then Byzantium too, despite radical changes, is equally entitled to the description after Iconoclasm.[22] Obolensky experimented with the alternative term 'Commonwealth' to describe the situation between Byzantium and the Balkans and Russian lands; Fowden adopted this description for the situation in Late Antiquity in the east.[23] The term may, nevertheless, be evasive rather than helpful.

The question of the nature of empire is at the centre of the exhibition and is fruitfully treated by contributors to the catalogue (notably I. Kalavrezou and H. Maguire). A significant review by Peter Brown of both catalogue and exhibition goes directly to the heart of the question.[24] He objects to 'the writing of the history of Byzantine art in terms of the outreach of a superior power, capable of holding in check and even of "acculturating" its more primitive "barbarian" neighbours'. Once again the paradigm of centre and periphery is under criticism, even if the vocabulary has changed. Brown explores the features of Byzantium that would be sensed and emulated by its neighbours, and he identifies them as *paideia* and *taxis*. What everyone would recognize in Byzantium and attribute to its success was its self-conscious *order*. From the Byzantines' point of view, their society may have been powerful and of imperial status; but that does not mean, as Liutprand of Cremona (coming as an ambassador from the west) wittily saw in the tenth century, that they necessarily had power and status rather than its trappings. Brown has pointed to the implications, noting that 'Byzantium should not be treated as an out and out superpower, but rather as the adroit *primus inter pares*

of a constellation of new societies, each in its own way in need of *taxis*. Middle Byzantium was a deeply changed society, and it now lived ringed by emergent and competing societies, usually socially stratified and monarchical in type.' For these societies, it was the organization of Byzantium that was the attraction, and since Byzantine art with great clarity supported and conveyed the order of Byzantine society, the reasons for 'appropriating' Byzantine art are compelling. Byzantine art encapsulated and promoted good order; other societies which used the forms and styles of Byzantine art could themselves expect to benefit from the values and standards which this visual expression would teach and promote. In this respect, the Greco-Roman legacy – Hellas as Strzygowski described it – continued in Byzantium and was passed on to other cultures in the east and west, north and south.

The term appropriation, then, may better describe the diffusion of Byzantine art both inside and outside its Orthodox Christian orbit, for it implies an active and motivated adoption, a considered act like the dust jacket of the exhibition catalogue itself.[25] It moves us away from the dichotomy of centre and periphery or the overworked art-historical notion of influence.[26] But can we actually begin to replace the long-established discourse of centre and periphery in Byzantine art, or at least begin to limit it to clearer situations? Since we have seen that a particular motivation for appropriating Byzantine imagery was the hope of transplanting its sense of order, the area to examine further is the recognition of the ways in which power was presented in Byzantium. One major manuscript in the exhibition was the eleventh-century Homilies of John Chrysostom with four introductory miniatures which include some of the most famous imperial images from Constantinople (cat. 143).[27] Close examination has shown a complicated history for the miniatures. For example, one page has an impressive composition of Christ bestowing crowns on the heads of an emperor and an empress.[28] The inscription tells us that the emperor is Nikephoros III Botaneiates (1078-81) and the empress Maria. But the miniature is re-used and has been cut down and remounted in parchment. The indications are that the original picture has been altered and that the figures were Michael VIII Dukas (1071-78) and his wife Maria of Alania. The name and face of Nikephoros are a repaint carried out after Michael's abdication (the beard is enlarged and the face retouched). Nikephoros succeeded Michael as emperor and married his wife (and so no changes were needed in the portrayal of Maria). A new miniature was painted on the back of this folio, which had previously been blank; it showed the monk Sabas reading in front of the 'real'

Nikephoros.[29] One point to make about these images is that they are a case of appropriation actually occurring at the centre of the imperial court. The status and power of Nikephoros is established by the direct reworking and supplementing of an imperial model. But this case is particularly significant, because it was this sort of model which was equally appropriated by neighbouring cultures. The imagery of the Gospels of the Bulgarian king Ivan Alexander (1331-71) in the British Library, where he is shown with his wife and family, depends for its presentational effect on exactly this kind of Byzantine composition. Such grand and impressive imperial representations supplied the neighbours and rivals of Byzantium with a repertory of triumphalist imagery, and they enthusiastically appropriated it, expecting to gain the same prestige.

The process of the circulation of imagery between these societies in the Byzantine period has obvious modern parallels. It is a commonplace that American presentation skills have recently been appropriated in British politics. But visual borrowings between cultures are never simple; the appropriated imagery has still to be effective for its new viewing public, and this may mean the selective emulation of expressions and styles. It no longer matters whether the movement of ideas is from centre to periphery (if that could be decided), but which models were selected and what they meant to those who received them.

The exhibition shows in many examples the complexities of appropriation. One might want to say that Byzantinizing objects in Kievan Rus' may be bigger and better than in the emulated culture: the Cyrillic Ostromir lectionary of 1056 (cat. 198) was a truly massive book. Equally huge in scale was the set of two large and heavy silver kraters (chalices) made in Novgorod and recording their artists and donors (cat. 197). Both are equally impressive, and they show, as do the series of large crosses which opened the exhibition, the power of visual repetition to affirm doctrine and belief. The fact that throughout the Byzantine period we find forms and motives continually repeated demonstrates one of the Byzantine devices for constructing and establishing continuity of belief and communal values. The comment of Demus that the culture had too few models and too many copies is a misunderstanding of the power of this affirmation.

Another complex example of appropriation is the twelfth-century chalice of Abbot Suger of St Denis (cat. 296).[30] The mount is western, copying Byzantine schemes and forms, and the sardonyx cup probably Ptolemaic from Alexandria. The chalice in this form is mentioned in the writings of Suger himself. His *De Administratione* supplies a striking description:

> We also procured for the services at the altar of Saint-Denis a precious chalice out of one solid sardonyx, which word derives from sardius and onyx in which the sard's red hue, by varying its property, so keenly vies with the blackness of the onyx that one property seems to be bent on trespassing upon the other.

This passage shows how closely the patron of such a work had observed it and could describe it. Elsewhere, he also indicates his critical eye for such works:

> I used to converse with travellers from Jerusalem and, to my great delight, to learn from those to whom the treasures of Constantinople and the ornaments of Hagia Sophia had been accessible whether the things here could claim some value in comparison with those there.[31]

This is one of the best objects in the exhibition for the documentation of the desires, taste and connoisseurship of a patron involved in appropriation. Suger in twelfth-century France is self-consciously emulating the Byzantine visual environment. The situation changed in the next century, after the sack of Constantinople in 1204, when we see the construction of the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris as an architectural reliquary of Byzantine looted objects.[32]

The Metropolitan exhibition is notable not just for its amazing collection of objects, including those major icons from Sinai and the materials from Athos, but also for its scholarly underpinning, which has aired many questions about this period of Byzantine history and art. My viewing of the exhibition prompted scepticism about traditional views of the nature of the middle Byzantine empire, and a realization of the need to work further on the processes of interaction between competing societies. In a sense the exhibition may be responsible for extending the debate recently reopened by Tom Mathews about what he calls 'the emperor mystique' as a factor in the interpretation of early Christian and Byzantine art – it is perhaps no coincidence that he was Byzantine consultant to the Metropolitan for the exhibition.[33] Mathews might be criticized for the shallowness of his historiography: he fails to see the influence of nineteenth-century attitudes and the role of Stryzygowski and others in forming positions on the interpretation of early Christian art; and again, he attributes far too much importance to the 'nostalgia for lost empire' which he believes dominated European art history in the middle of the twentieth century. But Mathews has

made the salutary observation that art historians have become too ready to derive the artistic representations of Christ solely from Roman imperial models and to view Christian scenes in imperial terms; he suggests rightly (if sometimes in an over-speculative way) that the visual construction of Christ developed in early Byzantine art was far more complex, with many sources and evocations. The New York exhibition moves the debate further on in time, into the period of the transformed Byzantine 'empire' after Iconoclasm. From the perspective of the USA after the fall of the Soviet Union and the rise of a global culture, it may be easier to see the limitations and biases of certain European models for understanding past cultures. It was a feature of the work of the late Alexander Kazhdan, particularly after his move from Moscow to Washington DC, that he deconstructed Byzantium's own myths and self-presentation. But an American perspective may also have its particular scenarios. Mathews' re-viewing of the image of Christ is a multifaceted one, but one role that he perceives for Christ as a teacher is as 'president of a circle of philosopher-disciples'.[34] Greek democracy too is a candidate for American appropriation; the catalogue of the 1992 exhibition, 'The Greek Miracle', in Washington offers another lesson in this respect.[35] As art history becomes world art history, the pursuit of centres and peripheries seems ever more hazardous. [36]

NOTES

1 The gallery brochure showed how the exhibition had a careful emphasis on the exhibits as the products of a multiethnic and multicultural society.

2 I.Lavin (ed.), *World Art. Themes of Unity in Diversity* (University Park 1986), I, *Center and Periphery: Dissemination and Assimilation of Style.*

3 H.C. Evans and W.D. Wixon (eds.), *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843-1261* (New York 1997). An appreciation of the visuality of the catalogue is made by K.Wilkin, '"The Glory of Byzantium" at the Met', *The New Criterion* (May 1997) 46-50. My thanks to David Ricks for this reference.

4 This observation was made by Dr P.F. Brown at a seminar about the exhibition held at Princeton in April 1997. The situation is also documented by M.Jacoff, *The Horses of San Marco and the Quadriga of the Lord* (Princeton 1993).

5 K. Weitzmann (ed.), *Age of Spirituality. Late Antique and Early Christian Art, Third to Seventh Century* (New York 1979).

6 Notably in J.Strzygowski, *Rom oder Orient?* (Leipzig 1901) and *Kleinasien, ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte* (Leipzig 1903).

7 J.B. Ward-Perkins, 'The Italian element in late Roman and early medieval architecture', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 33 (1947) 163-94.

8 J. Strzygowski, *Origin of Christian Church Art* (Oxford 1923) 5.

9 See C. Mango's preface to D.V. Ainalov, *The Hellenistic Origins of Byzantine Art* (New

Brunswick 1961).
10 O. Demus, 'The Role of Byzantine Art in Europe', *Byzantine Art. An European Art* (Athens 1964), 89-110, at 109.
11 D. Mouriki isolated a number of artists working in the monastery in the 13th century: 'A pair of of early thirteenth-century Moses icons at Sinai with the scenes of the burning bush and the receiving of the Law', *Deltion tis Christianikis Archaiologiakis Etaireias* 16 (1991-2) 171-84.
12 A.J. Wharton, *Art of Empire. Painting and Architecture of the Byzantine Periphery* (University Park 1988).
13 E.Castelnuovo, in Lavin (ed.), *World Art*, 43-8.
14 J. Bialostocki, 'Some Values of Artistic Periphery', in Lavin (ed.), *World Art*, 49-54.
15 R. Brilliant, 'Resistance and Receptivity to Greco-Roman art', in I. Lavin (ed.), *World Art*, 59-65.
16 See M. Bernal, *Black Athena: the Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilisation.* I, *The Fabrication of Ancient Greece 1785-1985* (London 1991); and W.Burkert, *The Orientalizing Revolution. Near Eastern Influence on Greek Culture in the Early Archaic Age* (London 1992).
17 S.P. Vryonis, 'Byzantine society and civilization', in Evans and Wixon, *Glory of Byzantium*, 5-19.
18 The Madrid version (Biblioteca Nacional, Vitr. 26-2) was not in the event lent to the exhibition (cat. 338).
19 See N.Oikonomidès, *Les listes de préséance byzantines des IXe et Xe siécles* (Paris 1972).
20 See I. Ševčenko, 'Was there totalitarianism in Byzantium?', in C. Mango and G. Dagron (eds.), *Constantinople and its Hinterland* (Aldershot 1995) 91-105.
21 J.Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century. The Transformation of a Culture* (Cambridge 1990).
22 M.Whittow, *The Making of Orthodox Byzantium 600-1025* (London 1996), esp. ch. 5.
23 D. Obolensky, *The Byzantine Commonwealth* (London 1971); G.Fowden, *Empire to Commonwealth. Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Princeton 1993).
24 P. Brown, 'A More Glorious House', *New York Review of Books*, 29 May 1997, 44.19-24.
25 R.S. Nelson, 'Appropriation' in R.S.Nelson and R. Shiff (eds.), *Critical Terms for Art History* (Chicago 1996) 116-28.
26 See G. Hermerén, *Influence in Art and Literature* (Princeton 1975).
27 Paris B.N. Cod. Coislin 79.
28 Folio 1 (2 bis) verso.
29 Folio 1 (2 bis) recto.
30 Now in the National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, it has a surprising later history too, spending some years in the collection of Charles Townley in London.
31 Abbot Suger, *On the Abbey Church of St.- Denis and its Art Treasures*, tr. and ed. E. Panofsky (2nd edn., Princeton 1979) 64.
32 R. Cormack, 'The French construction of Byzantium: reflections on the Louvre exhibition of Byzantine art', *Dialogos* 1 (1994) 28-41.
33 T.F. Mathews, *The Clash of the Gods. A Reinterpretation of Early Christian Art* (Princeton 1993).
34 Mathews, *The Clash of the Gods*, 180.
35 D. Buiron-Oliver (ed.), *The Greek Miracle: Classical Sculpture from the Dawn of Democracy* (Washington, DC, 1992).
36 R.S. Nelson, 'The Map of Art History', *Art Bulletin* 79 (1997) 28-40.