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The analysis of Byzantine iconography, of which Dou­la Mouriki was so excellent a connoisseur, offers many delights and not a few pitfalls. The pleasure stems from the decoding of a message, often very complex, yet usually expressed by very simple means. The dangers are due to the ambiguity of the pictorial language. One can seldom state with assurance that a given schema (say the Deêsis or the Hetoimasia) or the juxtaposition of certain subjects means exactly this or that, for it may also mean something else; and in looking for that 'something else', no matter how versed one is in Byzantine exegesis, it is all too easy to slip into interpretations that were possibly never intended, however plausible they appear to us. The following enquiry may serve to illustrate the truth of this warning.

The church of St. Mary of the Coppermarket (των Χαλ­κοπρατείων), whose three-sided apse may still be seen a short distance to the west of St. Sophia, was one of the most important shrines of Constantinople. Although it probably was not the earliest Marian church of the capital, it appears to have been the first that was built within the walls by imperial initiative, for that of the Blachernae was originally suburban. Its founder was the empress Verina, not Pulcheria, as affirmed by tradition. True it was not very big (about 30 by 20 m.) compared to its near-contemporary, S. Maria Maggiore in Rome. Soon incorporated into the complex of the cathedral, by whose clergy it was served, it became, however, in litur­gical terms, one of the most active churches of the capi­tal and remained so until the Latin conquest.

The text opens with a historical excursus. Formerly a Jewish synagogue, the church, we are told, was built by the emperor Zeno (474-491)2, who roofed it with beams of pine and cypress wood and provided it with galleries, now used to store liturgical plate3. He adorned the walls4 with a mosaic cycle, which started with the Nativity of the Virgin Mary and included the Birth of Christ. At a later date Justin II (565-578) added further adornment, namely a gilded coffered ceiling, a new set of doors made of silver, electrum and gold, and two mural compositions — one (location unspecified) representing the Adoration of the Magi, the other in the apse (κατά τον μύακα) depicting, as we shall see, the Annunciation. This second image was obliterated by Constantine V, who replaced it by a cross. After the Council of 787 the patriarch Tarasios restored the apsidal image exactly as it had been before, as affirmed by persons who were knowledgeable about those things (τους γινώσκοντας). So much by way of introduction.

The two images (surely mosaics) set up by Justin II are described rather briefly. In the Adoration the Virgin Mary was seated on a throne and held the Child in her lap. The same μόρφωσις (presumably an enthroned fig­ure) was repeated in the apse, except that here the Virgin held in her arms the “pre-eternal Lord” (τόν προαιώ­

2. This does not contradict the ascription of the church to Verina (Justinian, Nov. 3.1, a. 535) seeing that the empress remained in a position of authority at Constantinople until late 478.
3. The wording is not very clear: κατηχούμενα, έν οίς απόκειται των ιερών σκευών ἀπαλλαγή. The editor (p. 850, n. 4) understands ἀπαλλαγή in the unattested sense of ‘Ablage, Depot’. I would rather take it as equivalent to ἀπαλλαγή, ‘spare set’. Cf. Theophanes, de Boor, 450.4: ἀπαλλάξας τήν ένδυτήν [altar cloth], ὡς ἔθεσε δοτι τοῖς βασιλείσσιν. However that may be, it is interesting to note that the galleries had become redundant and were put to a use that was not originally intended.
4. Once again, the wording is unclear to me: έν δὲ τοῖς καμαράσσεις τοῖχοις.
On her right an angel, holding an imperial sceptre, was “as it were” crying out in a loud voice, “Hail thou that art full of grace, the Lord is with thee.”

The miracle occurred soon after the apse image had been restored by Tarasios. To cut a long story short, a schoolboy, coming from the narthex, entered the south aisle, walking in an easterly direction. He was so captivated by the sight of the image that he neglected to look down and fell into a well that happened to be uncovered. The splash was heard by the custodian, who hastened to the scene and the boy was extracted from the well safe and dry. As he described what had happened to him, the boy pointed to the image and said, “I had her there [i.e. in the well] holding me in her arms as she is holding that child [Christ] in her other arm. She flashed a bright light over me and said, ‘Don't be afraid, child. Sit aloft next to your schoolmate’” (“Ταύτην εϊχον έκείνον την άληθείαν κυριον). On her right an angel, holding an imperial sceptre, was “as it were” crying out in a loud voice, “Hail thou that art full of grace, the Lord is with thee.”

On which see esp. M. Sacapoulo, La Théotokos à la mandorle de Lythrankomi, Paris 1975, p. 29ff.

The presence of the Child in the scene of the Annunciation is extremely uncommon. Only two other examples are known to me, both of the second half of the 12th century. The first is a Novgorod icon now in the Tretjakov Gallery (Fig. 1). The Virgin, standing on the right, is in the act of spinning. Over her breast is a tiny Christ child, without mandorla, seated frontally, blessing with his right hand. A ray of light, now almost obliterated, issues from an arc of heaven containing the Ancient of Days. Grabar ascribed this iconography to western influence5, whereas Lazarev6, with some justification as it turns out, thought it went back to a very early model and cited as a possible precedent the apse mosaic of the Koimesis church in Nicaea (Fig. 2), to which we shall return presently. The second example is the ‘baroque’ Annunciation icon on Mount Sinai, first made known by K. Weitzmann7, and often illustrated in subsequent publications. Here the Virgin is seated on a throne, while the Holy Spirit is seen descending on her in the form of a dove. Barely visible over her breast is a mandorla containing a frontally seated Christ rendered in grisaille. The mandorla is not centered in relation to the Virgin’s body, but placed close to her right arm, perhaps to avoid an overlap with her raised left hand that holds the skin of purple wool.

Elias, of course, was acquainted with the Chalkoprateia Annunciation only as the allegedly exact copy of ca AD 800, and we do not know on what evidence he ascribed the original to the reign of Justin II. Such a date does, however, make good sense, for it was precisely under that emperor that the image of the Virgin, which may with some reason be described as a ‘Blachernitissa’, begins to take the place of the earlier Victory on imperial lead seals8. Here we touch on an oft-discussed and controversial topic, which, I believe, has been needlessly complicated by modern commentators9. All I can do in this space is to briefly state my opinion, namely that the medallion, whether it is circular or oval, whether it contains a Christ in bust or a seated Christ, whether it is held by the Virgin or not actually held by her (i.e. when her arms are raised in an orant position), had originally the same basic meaning, which was to mark off the divine Logos from the human Mother, even if later that meaning may have been misunderstood or forgotten. In other words, the medallion is an aureole or mandorla, the traditional device for indicating the presence of the divine10, and has nothing to do with the *imago clipeata*.

8. See W. Seibt, Die byzantinischen Bleisiegel in Österreich, Vienna 1978, p. 63. Cf. idem, Der Bildtypus der Theotokos Nikopolis, Beča-vrtiški 13/1 (1985), p. 557 f. (hereafter: Der Bildtypus). On the pre-Iconoclastic imperial seals, most of which are not very distinct, the medallion sometimes appears to be co-extensive with the nimbus of the Child.
Fig. 1. Moscow, Tretjakov Gallery. Icon of Annunciation.
of Roman antiquity. I further believe it is legitimate to apply the label of Blachernitissa to this type of figuration because the pre-Iconoclastic painting discovered in the presbytery of the Blachernae church in 1031 is specifically described as being of the same kind: εὐφρέθη ἐλκών ὀλγογραφική, σανίδον [variants σανίδι, ἐπὶ σανί­

 doctrines] ἑπιστήθιον κρατούσης τῆς Ἑθεότοκος τόν κύριον ἡμάν, ἀμόλυντος διαμείνεσα ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμέρων τοῦ Ἐορανόμου, etc. The context of this passage implies that the rediscovered image was a wall painting (not an icon on a panel), since it was found behind an area of damaged plaster (χρίσμα). For the term ὀλγογραφική one may compare Theophanes, de Boor, 443: Νικήτας, ὁ κυνεύδαμος πατρίαρχης, τάς ἐν τῷ πατριαρχείῳ εἰκόνας τοῦ μικρὸν σκεφτέον διὰ μουσείου οὐδας ἕξεσεν, καὶ τοῦ μεγάλου σκεφτέον τῆς τροπικῆς ἐς ὀλγογραφίας οὗτας κατη­

 νέγκεν. The images in the vault of the Big Sekreton, which were knocked down, were clearly in ‘fresco’. As to the Blachernae painting, it was in the area of the presbytery, probably in the lower register, and certainly not in the semidome of the apse. The text makes it clear that the Virgin was holding the medallion with her hands, exactly as she does on the gold coins of Romanus III. We cannot, of course, determine the date of the image, but may remember that the sanctuary end of the basilica of the Blachernae was rebuilt by Justin II, so there is a reasonable chance that the image had been put up in that connection. That would have made it contemporary with the Chalkoprateia Annunciation and the introduction of a type very close to the Blachernitissa on imperial lead seals, the last being clearly an act of deliberate policy. What we have here, in other words, is not merely a symptom of the growing prominence of icons or of reliance on the protective power of the Theo­

tokes, but rather the promotion of a particular iconography, which may, indeed, have been created at that time. Why, we may ask, did Justin II favour this type? One motive may be suggested with due caution: Justin, as readers of John of Ephesus will remember, adopted a strongly anti-Monophysite line. Whatever the Monophysites (or some of them) actually professed, they were accused by their opponents of ‘confusing’ the two na­

 tures of Christ. An anti-Monophysite iconography would, therefore, lay stress on the distinctness of the natures, on the notion of the δύσιγνον, which, I be­

 lieve, is precisely the message of the images we have been considering.

It remains to say a few words concerning the destroyed sanctuary mosaics of the Koimesis church at Nicaea, which offer an obvious parallel to the Chalkoprateia décor in that they, too, went through three phases (pre-

Iconoclastic, Iconoclastic and post-Iconoclastic), as demonstrated by P.A. Underwood. We do not know the exact date of Phase I (which I would now be inclined to place towards the end of the 7th century) nor that of Phase III (post-787 or post-843), but we are able to trace on the photographs published by Schmit the precise area of the successive alterations. On this basis we can state that the iconographic scheme of Phase I was grosso modo re-established in Phase III in the sense that Phase I also had a standing Virgin in the semidome of the apse (the area of repair being too narrow to accommodate, say, an enthroned Virgin) and four angelic figures holding banners in the bema arch. We are not, however, entitled to assume that the iconography of Phase I was in all respects identical to that of Phase III.

The meaning of the original Nicaea programme can be explicated thanks to the inscriptions, which, it must be remembered, dated from Phase I and were not disturbed in the course of the later alterations. Here, too, I shall be brief because a full discussion of the matter would require a good deal of space. The inscriptions to be considered are three in number: 1. The one placed centrally, above the standing Virgin and below the hand of God: ΕΓΓΑΣΤΡΟΣ ΠΡΟ ΔΕΙΣΔΙΟΝ ΘΕΟΤΟΚΟΥ ΤΟΝ ΚΥΡΙΟΝ ΕΓΕΝΝΗΣΑ. This is a quotation of Ps. 2.7 (κύριος εἶπεν προς μέν αμόλυντος διαμείνασα ἀπὸ τῶν ήμερων τοῦ Κοπρονόμου, etc. 12. On this point I would agree with T. F. Mathews, The Early Armenian Iconographic Program of the Ejmiacin Gospel, in: East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period, Washington, DC 1982, p. 208f., with some reservations about his alleged Buddhist models.

Fig. 2. Nicaea, Koimesis church. Apse mosaic.
εἴ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε). One may wonder whether the substitution of the aorist by the perfect was deliberate or due to a lapse of memory.

2. The names of the angelic beings (not archangels) in the bema arch, namely Ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις, κυριότητες, ἐξουσίαι (also mis-spelt). These point directly to Eph. 1.21, the only scriptural passage that mentions these mysterius entities.

3. The inscription underneath the angelic beings, repeated on each side of the arch: Και προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι (sic Θ[εοῦ]). This is taken from Hebr. 1.6, quoting with a few changes Deut. 32.43 (καὶ προσκυνήσατο αὐτῷ πάντες λαός Θεοῦ) and Ps. 96.7 (προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ, πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ). The nexus of these famous quotations, all of which had been the subject of extensive exegesis, ought to unravel the meaning of the sanctuary programme. In other words, we are not reduced to inferences drawn from iconography. Now, the central and most important text (No. 1) had given rise down to the 4th century to conflicting interpretations: spoken as it is by God, does it refer to the Incarnation or to the generation of the Only-Begotten before all time? Eventually, the second interpretation prevailed. It is represented notably by Chrysostom, who explains that πρὸ εωσφόρου refers to the creation, not the rising of the morning star on a particular day (i.e. that of the Nativity) and alleges that Christ himself (Mt 22.42-45) understood this psalm as referring εἰς τὴν κατὰ πνεύμα γέννησιν. As to εκ γαστρός, it was to be taken metaphorically. Likewise Theodoret, whose Commentary on the Psalms formed the basis of Byzantine catenae, explains that πρὸ ἐκσφόρου denoted τὸ πρὸ χρόνων αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸ αἰῶνων εἶναι, while ἐκ γαστρός stood for the identity of nature, i.e. the con-substantiality of the Father and the Son. Among later commentators, only Germanos, as far as I am aware, reverted to the ambiguity of the 4th century: for him Ps. 109 combined with Ps. 2.7 proved both the eternal divinity of the Only-Begotten and his Incarnation “in the last times.”

The two other texts, namely Eph. 1.21 (which speaks explicitly of the Ascension) and Hebr. 1.1, were, however, understood to refer to the human Christ: the angels, who always adore God, are here bidden to adore Him also as a man. Hence, the basic meaning of the Nicaea programme may be understood as the identity of the pre-eternal Logos and the human Christ. Seeing, however, that the quotation placed above the figure of the Virgin referred to the generation before all time, it would have been more appropriate to express that notion by means of a Christ figure in an aureole rather than a normal infant Christ as in Phase III. The archaeological evidence does not preclude such a possibility, which, of course, can neither be proved nor disproved beyond pointing out its greater conformity to the accepted exegesis of the biblical text, assuming the Nicaea mosaics reflected a strictly orthodox position. But what if they (or their model) reflected a Monothelite position? Here is the formulation of the ‘heretical’ Ecstasy of Heraklios: ἕνα ἰδέαν ἰδών τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν... τὸν αὐτὸν προαιώνιον τε καὶ ἐπ’ ἐσχάτων, ἀπαθῆ καὶ παθητὸν, ὀρατὸν καὶ ἀόρατον. We may remember that Germanos, whose exceptional explanation of Ps. 109 we have quoted, subscribed to the reinstatement of Monothelitism.

It is always risky to read a precise doctrinal meaning into a set of rather simple pictures. Iconography is not well equipped to express the subtle distinctions of theologians, especially in the matter of Christology, and it may be thought that in attempting such an explanation I have fallen into the very trap I mentioned at the beginning of this article.

18. PG 55, col. 264ff., esp. 275.
19. PG 80, col. 1772A.
20. Rerum eccles. contempl., PG 98, col. 436D f.; In Dormit, hom. I, ibid., col. 341. The blurring is particularly evident in the latter text, where Ps. 109 is interpreted as proving both την προαιώνιον της θεότητος εν τω μονογενεί... μετά τοϋ Πατρός συναΐδιον ούσιαν, και την ενσαρκον αυτοῦ περί τα έσχατα των καιρών... ένανθρώπησιν. In the same vein (col. 344) γαστήρ is made to refer to the Virgin’s womb and προεωσφόρος to the night of the Nativity, contrary to accepted exegesis.
21. Theodoret, PG 82, cols. 516f. (on Ephesians), 685B (on Hebrews).
22. Mansi, X, p. 993D-E.
23. Theophanes, de Boor, p. 362, 382.