

**BYZANTINE STUCCO DECORATION (ca. 850-1453).
CULTURAL AND ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS
ACROSS THE MEDITERRANEAN**

**by
FLAVIA VANNI**

**VOLUME I:
TEXT**

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman, and Modern Greek Studies
School of History and Cultures
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
December 2020

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

Abstract

This thesis offers the first synthetic evaluation of Byzantine stucco between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries. It brings together the results of disparate studies, with new material and textual evidence, to write, for the first time, a coherent narrative of the history of Byzantine stucco during the Middle and the Late Byzantine periods. This thesis demonstrates the uninterrupted use of stucco in Byzantine architecture from the Late Antique period onwards. It sheds light on the techniques used by Byzantine artisans to work stucco and examines their social and legal status in Byzantine society, providing a nuanced vision of both the skills and incomes of people in this period. A wide range of Byzantine patrons chose to decorate their buildings with stucco: from emperors to local officers and ordinary people. They used stucco to convey statements of authority or to underline their participation in networks of power. After having analysed stucco in Byzantine society, the thesis turns to wider Mediterranean stucco production, and examines differences and commonalities between Byzantine stucco and that produced in Medieval Italy and the different regions under Islamic reigns.

This thesis is an initial framework. This framework is threefold: the single building, the broader context of Byzantine art, and the stucco production in the Mediterranean. The case-by-case approach used revealed how the study of stucco, in combination with the rest of the materials used in architecture, is crucial to understand the history of buildings and the communities behind them. It is the interaction between micro and macro contexts that provides the core for understanding stucco in Byzantine architecture. This interaction is also what makes stucco a diagnostic material, which provides us with a new insight into Byzantine architecture.

Acknowledgments

A thesis, as every piece of research, is not only the product of the individual researcher, but the result of interactions, exchanges of ideas, and collaborations.

I would like to thank Prof. Sharon Gerstel and Prof. Sophia Kalopissi-Verti for their invaluable comments, suggestions, and support during the examination process of this thesis.

This thesis would not have been possible without the generous support of several institutions. The Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC), which funded three years of my PhD (2016-2019), all my research trips in Greece and Turkey, training programmes, and the summer school ‘Rome: changing physical and ideological landscapes of the eternal city (25 June-1 July 2018)’ organised by the Midlands 3 Cities and the British School at Rome. A special thanks is for Dumbarton Oaks for granting me a Junior Fellowship (2019-2020), which allowed me to focus on the study of Byzantine stucco for an extra year in the ideal academic environment and in the best library in the world for Byzantine Studies. A deep thank is to Mary Jaharis Center for Byzantine Art and Culture for allowing me to visit Greece and the archives in Athens with a dissertation grant. I would also like to thank the International Center of Medieval Art (ICMA), for allowing me to attend the summer school ‘Cappadocia in Context (9-23 June 2019)’, organised by Koç University, which deeply impacted on my methodology.

The study of the stucco decorations included in this thesis would not have been possible without the collaboration and the authorisation of several institutions: the Ephorate of Antiquities of Arta and Dr Varvara Papadopoulou; the Ephorate of Antiquities of Euboea and Dr Alexandra Kostarelli and Dr Aleksandra Charamé; the Ephorate of Antiquities of Ioannina and Dr Konstantinos Soueref; the Ephorate of Antiquities of Lakonia and Dr Evaggelia Pantou; the Ephorate of Antiquities of West Attica and Dr Christina Merkouri and Dr Kallipe Florou; and the archimandrites of the monasteries of Vatopedi and Iviron. I would like to thank the

British School at Athens for letting me consult the Schultz and Barnsley archive and in particular Amalia Kakissis for her invaluable help.

Almost every piece of stucco decoration that I studied has a backstory which involves the people who helped me to reach places and accompanied me with both their academic help but also their friendship. I want to thank Prof. Robert Ousterhout and Prof. Tolga Uyar for pointing me to the stucco in the Timios Stavros monastery in Cappadocia and for loaning me a ladder so I could access it; Elisa Galardi, Görkem Gunay, Timuçin Alp Aslan, and Yavuz Selim Güler for accompanying me back to the monastery and getting lost on the roads of Cappadocia looking for the çeşme.

I would like to thank Prof. Stavros Mamaloukos for his kindness and unconditional help in the study of several stuccoes, in particular those from the katholikon of Vatopedi and Iviron on Mount Athos, and for allowing my father to come with him to take updated pictures of the stuccoes.

The correspondence with Professor Theocharis Pazaras was another constructive conversation for the study of the stuccoes of Vatopedi and Iviron, and I want to thank him for it.

I would like to thank Prof. Helio Hobdari for providing me with updated information about the discovery of the stuccoes of the church of the Virgin at Peshkëpi e Sipërme.

I am also extremely grateful to Prof. Andrea Babuin and Dr Athanasios Koumanthos for their help and their advice on Late Byzantine Epiros and Byzantine architecture, and Dr Dora Konstantellou for information on Late Byzantine Naxos.

The study of Italian stuccoes benefitted greatly from exchanges and conversations with Prof. Adriano Peroni, Prof. Francesca Dell'Acqua, Prof. Vincenzo Gheroldi, Prof. John Mitchell, and Dr Bea Leal.

I am also thankful to Prof Eunice Maguire, Prof. Betsy Bolman, Dr Warren Woodfin, Prof Alice-Mary Talbot, and Dr Silvia Pedone for their invaluable feedback on different topics from iconography to saint's lives.

I wish to thank the 2019-2020 cohort of fellows at Dumbarton Oaks for a remarkable year, and in particular Dr Arianna Gullo, Dr Stephanie Caruso, and Kelsey Eldridge.

I wish to thank my colleagues and friends from the Università di Roma La Sapienza, whose bibliographic help, advice and friendship was constant in all these years: Dr Alessandra Avagliano, Giulia A. B. Bordi, Vittoria Brunetti, Dr Claudia Di Bello, and Dr Lorenzo Riccardi.

These years at Birmingham would not be the same without the community of students at the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies (CBOMGS) of the University of Birmingham, to them goes my warmest thank. I would like in particular thank those who read my thesis and helped me revise it: Rachael Banes, Laura Clark, Dr Anna Kelley, Stephanie Novasio, and Dr Lauren Wainwright. Anastasia Tantarouda Papaspyrou for teaching me Modern Greek; Andrew Blacker for sharing his time with me visiting a dozen of churches in Euboea in two days. Jessica Varsallona and Dr Francisco Lopez-Santos Kornberger for sharing with me this path and for their friendship of which I am honoured.

I will always be grateful to Prof. Carolina Marchitelli and Prof. Fulvia Spesso for lighting in me the love for Art History and the Greek language back at the Liceo Augusto. Professor Alessandra Guiglia for the love for Byzantine art, for following my first steps into the unexplored world of Byzantine stucco during my Master at the Università di Roma La Sapienza, and for her continuous support until today.

It is difficult to describe the gratitude and thank to my supervisors, who followed my work for the entire time or part of it: Prof. Leslie Brubaker, Dr Ruth J. Macrides, and Dr Daniel K. Reynolds. I thank them for all their academic and personal support, for being my point of

reference as scholars and as persons, and for showing me by their examples how to build a strong community made of students and members of staff at CBOMGS.

Last but not least, I want to thank my family for everything: Massimo Vanni, Fulvia De Fabritiis, and Domitilla Vanni. In particular my father for going in Vatopedi and Iviron to take pictures of the stuccoes for me.

Finally, I want to thank Alessandro Carabia for sharing his life with me and for his love which is impossible to put into words.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.STUCCO IN MIDDLE AND LATE BYZANTINE BUILDINGS.....	13
1.1 Introduction.....	13
1.2 Stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings (9th-15th c.). Evaluation of a census.....	14
1.3 Backstory: stucco from Imperial Rome to the so-called Transitional period.	18
From the Imperial period (1 st BCE-1 st CE) to Justinian (527-565).....	20
Post-Justinianic architecture.....	24
1.4 Stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings (9 th -15 th c.).	25
1.5 Typologies of architectural decoration and their ornament in Middle and Late Byzantine stucco.	27
1.6 Cornices, friezes, and corbels.....	28
1.7 Arches.....	31
1.8 Cornices, friezes, corbels, and arches: analysis of the ornamental patterns.	33
Vegetal patterns.....	34
Geometrical patterns	40
1.9 Arched slabs.	45
Analysis of the decorative patterns	46
1.10 Colonnettes and posts	48
Analysis of the decorative patterns	49
1.11 Panels	56
1.12 Capitals	60
1.13 Epistyles	64
1.14 Proskynetaria frames.....	67
Types of stucco proskynetaria frames.....	69
Stucco proskynetaria Type A.	69
Stucco proskynetaria type A: analysis of the decorative patterns.....	70
Stucco proskynetaria Type B.	72
Some considerations on Type A and B proskynetaria	81
1.15 A possible canopy	83
1.16 Conclusions	85
2.WORKING STUCCO: PEOPLE, MATERIALS, AND TECHNIQUES.....	94
2.1 Introduction.....	94
2.2 Stages of production and techniques.....	96
2.3 Stucco mixture and why it matters (or not).....	101
2.4 Stucco workers in written sources.....	106
2.5 Stucco workers on site: specialised artisans?	111
2.6 Stucco workers in society	115
2.7 Workshop(s) at work: Middle Byzantine Mount Athos.....	119

2.8 Conclusions	129
3.COMMISSIONING STUCCO: PATRONS IN THE MIDDLE AND LATE BYZANTINE PERIOD.....	133
3.1 Introduction	133
3.2 Patronage in the Middle and the Late Byzantine period	134
3.3 Middle Byzantine period (from the mid-ninth to the beginning of the thirteenth century)	137
Constantinople	137
Cappadocia	141
Thrace	145
Macedonia	147
The Athos peninsula.....	149
Central Greece and Peloponnese.....	160
3.4 Late Byzantine period (13 th -15 th centuries).....	166
Epiros	167
Mystras and the surrounding region.....	182
Islands (Naxos, Samos, Euboea).....	192
3.5 Some observations on patrons and techniques.....	191
3.6 Conclusion	193
4.SOCIAL PERCEPTION AND THE ACTUAL COST OF STUCCO	195
4.1 Introduction	195
4.2 Absence and presence: when geology matters.....	197
4.3 Marble and stucco: economic and cultural implications.....	202
4.4 Late Byzantine perception of Middle Byzantine stucco elements. Two case studies.....	213
4.5 Conclusion	219
5.STUCCO PRODUCTION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN (ca 850- ca1450):.....	222
AN OVERVIEW AND A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS	222
5.1 Introduction	222
5.2 Middle Byzantine stuccoes and their comparators (the ninth and tenth centuries).....	227
Byzantium	227
Italy	229
Raqqa, Samarra and the 'Bevelled style' in Egypt and Northern Africa.	236
Al-Andalus	242
5.3 Middle Byzantine stuccoes and its comparators (eleventh and twelfth centuries).	246
Byzantium	246
Italy	247
Egypt	260
Al-Andalus	263
Syria and Anatolia.....	265
5.4 Late Byzantine stuccoes and its comparators (thirteenth-fifteenth centuries).	267
Byzantium	267
Italy	268
Anatolia	271
5.5 Conclusions	273

<i>CONCLUSIONS</i>	277
<i>TABLES</i>	286
<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i>	292

List of figures

Chapter 1

- 1.1. Rome, Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Altemps, fresco with stucco images (after Cenci et alii 2013).
- 1.2. Rome, Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Altemps, stucco cornices (after Cenci et alii 2013).
- 1.3. Rome, Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Altemps, stucco cornices (after Cenci et alii 2013).
- 1.4. Rome, Palazzo Massimo- Museo Nazionale Romano, stuccoes from the so-called Villa Farnesina (ph. Viggiani).
- 1.5. Rome, Porta Maggiore, Underground Basilica, stucco decoration and detail (1st c. CE) (© SSABAP)
- 1.6. Rome, Porta Maggiore, Underground Basilica, stucco decoration and detail (1st c. CE) (© SSABAP)
- 1.7. Rome, Appia Antica, tomb of the Pancratii, stucco decoration (© SAR)
- 1.8. Rome, Appia Antica, tomb of the Valerii, stucco decoration (© SAR)
- 1.9. Temple of Venus and Rome, Roman Forum, Rome. (© SSBAR)
- 1.10. Ravenna, Baptistry of the Orthodox (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.11. Cyprus, Salamis-Konstantia, so-called ‘huillerie’, fragments of stucco decoration (5th c.) (after Argaud *et al.* 1980).
- 1.12. Ravenna, San Vitale, exonarthex, stucco decoration of the vault (6th c.) (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.13. Ravenna, San Vitale, main apse, stucco stucco cornice above the opus sectile (ph. Guiglia).
- 1.14. Poreč, Euphrasian basilica, interior, stucco revetment in the soffit of the arches (6th c.) (ph. Guiglia).
- 1.15. Detail of one of the soffits (ph. Guiglia).

- 1.16. Istanbul, Hagia Sophia, south-west vestibule, stucco cornice (ph. Carabia 2019).
1. 17. Istanbul, Hagia Sophia, south-west vestibule, stucco cornice, detail (ph. Guiglia).
- 1.18. Istanbul, Hagia Sophia, inner narthex, Imperial door, stucco cornice (ph. Carabia 2019).
- 1.19. Istanbul, Hagia Sophia, inner narthex, Imperial door, stucco cornice, detail (after Guiglia, Barsanti 2012).
- 1.20. Istanbul, Hagia Sophia, galleries, stucco cornice re-made in the 19th century on sixth-century prototypes (after Guiglia, Barsanti 2012).
- 1.21. Istanbul, Hagia Sophia, galleries, western wall, stucco cornice re-made in the 19th century on sixth-century prototypes (ph Carabia 2019).
- 1.22. Thessaloniki, St. Demetrios church, transept, South harm, hearth-shape pillar, stucco capital (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.23. Cyprus, Kalavassos-Syrma, rural basilica (late 6th -7th c.) (after Panayides 2018).
- 1.24. Sinai, Monastery of St. Catherine, Icon with the Virgin Hodegetria from Cyprus (last quarter of the 13th c.) after *Byzantium Faith and Power* 2004).
- 1.25. Politika, monastery of the Panagia Peribleptos, wall painting in the dome, Pantokrator, detail of the halo worked at *pastille* (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 1.26. Enez, Fatih Camii, detail of the dome cornice, marble (after Ousterhout 1999).
- 1.27. Istanbul, Pantokrator monastery (Zeyrek Camii), stringcourse cornice, marble (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 1.28. Mystras, church of the Hodegetria, apse, marble cornice (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.29. Vatopedi, katholikon, southern choro, stucco cornice covered with fourteenth-century paintings (?) (after Tsigaridas 1998).
- 1.30. Resava, church of the Holy Trinity, naos, stucco cornices on pillars (Simić, Todorović, Brmbolić, Zarić 2011).

- 1.31. Naxos, Archatos, Panagia church, apse, plaster covering of the masonry cornice (ph. Vanni 2016).
- 1.32. Cappadocia, Timios Stavros Monastery, third chapel, stucco decoration of the arch (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.33. Cappadocia, Ihlara valley, Sümbüllü kilise (Jacinth church), northern chapel (after 1006, 1021) (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.34. Cappadocia, Soganli valley, Melekli kilise, (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.35. Cappadocia, Ortahisar, Nino kilizesi, apsidal arch, detail (11th c.) (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.36. Hosios Loukas monastery, katholikon, naos, stucco cornice at the base of the dome. (ph. Carabia 2018).
- 1.37. Hosios Loukas, katholikon, entrance of the narthex, marble cornice (first half of the 11th c.) (ph. Vanni 2014).
- 1.38. Athens, Byzantine and Christian museum, fragment of an architrave, marble (5th c.) (after Sklavou-Mavroidi 1999).
- 1.39. Hosios Loukas, church of the Virgin, entrance, marble cornice (ph. Vanni 2014).
- 1.40. Hosios Loukas, katholikon, templon, marble (first half of the 11th c.) (ph. Vanni 2014).
- 1.41. Washington D.C., Dumbarton Oaks Museum, silver lamp from the Sion Treasure (6th c.) (after Boyd 1992).
- 1.42. Vatopedi, katholikon, stucco cornice (ph. Mamaloukos).
- 1.43. Drawing of the ‘S-curve palmette’ ornament from the Cod. Paris. Suppl. gr. 27 (after Franz 1933).
- 1.44. Thebes, St. Gregory church, fragmentary cornice or epistyle (871-872) (after Grabar 1976).

- 1.45. Orchomenos (Skripou), Koimesis church, marble cornice of the dome (after Grabar 1976).
- 1.46. Cividale del Friuli, Tempietto Longobardo, architrave, marble (ph. Vanni 2017).
- 1.47. Daphni monastery, deposits, fragmentary cornice from the narthex of the katholikon, stucco (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 1.48. Amorium, Lower basilica, fragmentary cornice or epistyle, marble (11th c.) (after Ivison 2008).
- 1.49. Bursa, capital, marble (after Grabar 1976).
- 1.50. Lips monastery, south church, corbel, marble (after Grabar 1976).
- 1.51. Arta, Blachernae monastery, katholikon, sarcophagus slab (after Papadopoulou *et al.* 2015).
- 1.52. Iznik, Archaeological museum, unknown provenance (after Flaminio 2008).
- 1.53. Vatopedi, katholikon, stucco arch, detail (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 1.54. Nerezi, church of St. Panteleimon, stucco proskynetarion, detail of the epistyle and of the capitals (after Sinkević 2000).
- 1.55. Venice, Dan Marco, capitals *en champlevé* (after Barsanti 2000).
- 1.56. Athens, Byzantine and Christian museum, slab T 161 (after Sklavou-Mavroidi 1999).
- 1.57. Santorini, Panagia Episkopi church, *en champlevé* pillar of the templon (after Pedone 2000).
- 1.58. Mount Sinai, monastery of St. Catherine, cod. 155, fol. 5r, Canon table (early 11th c.) (after Weitzmann and Galavaris 1990).
- 1.59. Vatopedi, katholikon, *liti*, ground floor, detail of the friezes (ph. Mamaloukos 2019)
- 1.60. Baltimore, Walters Art Museum, fragmentary architectural ceramic from Istanbul (after Gerstel, Lauffenburger (ed.) 2001).

- 1.61. Vatopedi, katholikon, stucco cornice (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 1.62. Iviron monastery, katholikon, narthex, main door, stucco arches on colonnettes, detail of the central arch (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 1.63. Mount Sinai, monastery of St. Catherine, cod. 417, fol. 13r (mid-tenth century) (after Weitzmann and Galavaris 1999).
- 1.64. Messina, Biblioteca Regionale, Messan. Fondo Vecchio 8, fol. 2v (after Iacobini 1998).
- 1.65. Orchomenos (Skripou), Koimesis church, entablature (9th c.) (Ph. Vanni 2014).
- 1.66. Istanbul, Lips monastery (Fenar Isa camii), North Church (Theotokos), (907) (after Megaw, Hawkins 1964).
- 1.67. Trilye, Fatih Camii, cornice (after Di Bello 2018).
- 1.68. Çanakkale museum, templon epistyle, marble (Turker 2018).
- 1.69. Istanbul, Arkeoloji Müzeleri, ceramic frieze from the room in the Boukoleon palace area excavated in 1983. (after Gerstel, Lauffenburger (ed.) 2001).
- 1.70. Iviron monastery, katholikon, narthex, arcosolium, stucco (ph. Pazaras).
- 1.71. Madrid, Real Academia de la Historia, Missorium of Theodosius I (388-393).
(Wikipedia).
- 1.72. Cividale del Friuli, Tempietto Longobardo, arch, stucco (8th c.) (ph. Vanni 2017).
- 1.73. Monemvasia, Hagia Sophia, interior, trilobed window, plaster transennae (ph. Koumantis).
- 1.74. Small Lake of Prespa, Basilica of H. Achilleos, reconstruction of an arch revetments made of plaster (after Moutsopoulos 1989).
- 1.75. Small Lake of Prespa, Basilica of H. Achilleos, fragments of arch revetments made of plaster (after Moutsopoulos 1989).

- 1.76. Sofia, National Archaeological Museum, slab from Stara Zagora (first half of the 11th c.) (after Milanova 2008).
- 1.77. Canopy from the Basilica St. Martha, Bijaće, Dalmatia, Croatia, (after Bogdanović 2017).
- 1.78. Cividale del Friuli, Museo diocesano, Baptistry of Callistus (730-756) (after http://www.monasterodisantamariainvalle.it/_uk/unesco)
- 1.79. Classe, S. Apollinare in Classe, ciborium of S. Eleucado (© Europeana).
- 1.80. Thessaloniki, Rotunda, mosaics (ph. Internet).
- 1.81. Iviron monastery, katholikon, narthex, main entrance, detail of stucco decoration (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 1.82. Istanbul, AyaSofya Müzesi, architectural ceramics, columns (after Mundell-Mango 2001).
- 1.83. New York, Metropolitan Museum, ivory with the Crucifixion (mid-10th c.) (<https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/464428>).
- 1.84. Stucco figure in a niche from Khirbat al-Mafjar (Harvard archive).
- 1.85. Venice, San Marco, Treasury, censer (after Kalavrezou 1997).
- 1.86. Marble proskynetarion frame from the Panagia church, Hosios Loukas monastery (12-13th c.) (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.87. Trikkala, Porta Panagia church (1285), marble proskynetarion frame, (after Kalopissi-Verti 2006).
- 1.88. Athens, Byzantine Museum, pieces of erratic templa (11th c.) (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.89. Istanbul, Zeyrek Camii, minbar with reused Byzantine sculpture, marble (ph. Vanni 2018).

- 1.90 Thessaloniki, Museum of Byzantine culture, colonnette from an erratic templon, marble (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.91. Sinai, monastery of St. Catherine, Cod. Gr. 339 (12th c.), fol. 4v. (after Anderson 1997).
- 1.92. Athens, Little Metropolis, façade, detail of one of the sculptures, marble (ph. Vanni 2014).
- 1.93. Ioannina, Byzantine Museum, colonnette from the Koimesis of Petrobitsa, stucco (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.94. Arta, Archaeological collection of the Paregoritissa, colonnette from the Kokkini Ekklesia (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.95. Ano Volos, Panagia Episkopi, knotted colonnettes re-used (after Bouras, Boura 2002).
- 1.96. Arta, Paregoritissa church, colonnettes at the base of the squinches (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.97. Arta, sculptural collection of the Paregoritissa, templon post from the Kokkini Ekklesia of Boulgareli, stucco (ph. Vanni 2019). In red the rope colonnette.
- 1.98. Arta, Blachernae monastery, katholikon, re-used post of the templon, marble (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.99. Arta, Paregoritissa, so-called 'loggia', window mullion, capital, marble (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.100. Mystras, Peribleptos church, apse, cornice, limestone (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.101. Ljubostinja monastery, katholikon, eastern apse (after Preradović 2016).
- 1.102. Peshkëpi e Sipërme, Church of the Virgin, stucco post (ph. Mamaloukos 2020).
- 1.103. Venosa, Ss. Trinita, transept portal (eleventh century) (after Garton 1984).
- 1.104. Barletta, cathedral, western façade, window, marble and stone (© Comune di Barletta).
- 1.105. Ioannina, Byzantine Museum, post from the Koimesis of Petrobitsa, stucco (ph. Vanni 2019)

- 1.106. Lyggos Koimesis church, southern façade, two fragmentary posts (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.107. Makrinitza, Panagia church, slab, marble (after Grabar 1976).
- 1.108. Ohrid, St. Sophia, slab from the episcopal chair, marble (after Grabar 1976).
- 1.109. Maroneia (Komotini), basilica of Hagios Charalambos, fragmentary slab (9-10th c.), stucco (after Aliprantis 1975).
- 1.110. Istanbul, Mangana area, fragment of a panel (after Yalçın 2004).
- 1.111. Ioannina Museum, deposits, fragments of a slab from the Taxiarches church of Kostaniani, stucco (© Ephorate of Ioannina).
- 1.112 Thessaloniki, Vlatadon monastery, sarcophagus of George Kapandrites, lid, marble (after Pazaras 1988).
- 1.113a-b. Dečani monastery, coffin of king Stefan III Uroš Dečanski, wood (after *Byzantium Faith and Power* 2004).
- 1.114a-b. Copenhagen, The David collection, coffin from the shrine of Mahmud Khayrani (ca 1340) in Aksehir (© David collection).
- 1.115. Iviron monastery, katholikon, narthex, arcosolium, left capital, stucco (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 1.116. Iviron monastery, katholikon, narthex, arcosolium, left capital and detail of the arch, stucco (ph. Pazaras).
- 1.117. Lower Kingswood (London), impost capital (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 1.118. Izmir, Archaeological Museum, capital (after Andic 2012).
- 1.119. Istanbul, Archaeological Museum, impost capital (after Dennert 1997).
- 1.120. Ioannina, Byzantine Museum, capital on colonnette-post from Petrobitsa, stucco (ph. Vanni 2019).

- 1.121. Arta, Blachernae church, northern entrance, re-used pieces from the templon (after Vanderheyde 2005).
- 1.122. Iviron, katholikon, narthex, entrance to the naos, drawing (after Pazaras 2007).
- 1.123. Feres, Panagia Kosmosoteira, exterior, western façade (ph. Vanni 2014).
- 1.124. Feres, Kosmosoteira church, naos, capital with stucco revetment (ph. Vanni 2014).
- 1.125. Feres (Alexandroupoli), Kosmosoteira church, naos, detail of the frieze, stucco (ph. Vanni 2014).
- 1.126. Istanbul, St. Andrew in Krisei, capital, marble (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 1.127. Edirne, Archaeological Museum, capital (Dennert 1997)
- 1.128. Ioannina, Byzantine Museum, epistyle from Petrobitsa, stucco (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.129. Ioannina, Byzantine Museum, post-colonnette from Petrobitsa, stucco, in red the surviving traces of wall paintings (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.130. Glyki, H. Donatos (11th c.), epistyle (after Vanderheyde 2005)
- 1.131. Naupaktos, deposits of the kastron, epistyle (12th c.) (after Vanderheyde 2005).
- 1.132. Naupaktos, kastron, exterior, epistyle (12th c.) (after Vanderheyde 2005).
- 1.133. Ioannina, Byzantine museum, epistyle from Petrobitsa, stucco (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.134. Arta, Blachernae monastery, epistyle of the templon re-used in the northern façade (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 1.135. Crete, Anisaraki (Kandanos), H. Anna, masonry templon (1457) (after Gerstel 2006).
- 1.136. Staro Nagoričino, St. George, templon (1313-1318) (after Gerstel 2006).
- 1.137. Geraki, H. Nikolaos, templon (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.138. Nerezi, St. Panteleimon church, proskynetarion frame, stucco (1164) (after Sinkević 2000).
- 1.139. Nerezi, St. Panteleimon church, templon, marble (1164) (after Barsanti 1999).

- 1.140. Mystras, Peribleptos church, proskynetarion frame, stucco (before 14th c.) (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.141. Samari (Messenia), Zoodochos Pege church, proskynetarion frame, marble (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.142. Mystras, Metropolis (H. Demetrios), proskynetarion frame, marble (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.143. Mystras, Pantanassa, atrium, capital, marble (1428) (after Dennert 1997).
- 1.144. Peloponnese, Karyta, Panagia *tou Katrou* capitals, marble (middle or late byzantine) (after Dennert 1997).
- 1.145. Mystras, Peribleptos, 'galleries', cornice in porous limestone (14th c.) (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.146. Mystras, Peribleptos, central apse, sculptures in porous limestone (ph. Vanni 2015)
- 1.147. Ligourio (Peloponnese), H. Ioannes Eleemon, narthex, eastern wall (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 1.148a-b. Naxos, Archatos, Panagia church, proskynetarion frame (1285) (after Konstantellou 2019).
- 1.149. Naxos, Archatos, Panagia church, proskynetarion frame, detail, lionhead (1285) (ph. Vanni 2017).
- 1.150. Geraki, Zoodochos Pege church, facade, edicula, limestone (14th c.) (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.151. Geraki, St. Paraskeve church, north wall, edicula, limestone (14th c.) (ph. Vanni 2015).
- 1.152. Kokkini Ekklesia, reconstruction and drawing of the window transennae (after Orlandos 1927).
- 1.153. Ljubostina monastery, Dormition of the Virgin church, narthex, eastern wall, Deesis, proskynetarion frame, palster, details (1402-1405). (after Duric 1985).
- 1.154. Longanikos, Koimesis, northern wall, proskynetarion frame, detail of the capital (ph. Mattiello).

- 1.155. Kastoria, H. *Georgios tou Bounou*, southern wall, proskynetarion frame, detail of the capital (after Triphonova 2011).
- 1.156. Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS Vit. 26–2, fol. 145r, arrival of Nikephoros Phokas in Constantinople.
- 1.157. Samos, Kallithea, Virgin Makrini church, northern proskynetarion frame, plaster (after Mitsani 1998).
- 1.158. Samos, Kallithea, Virgin Makrini church, southern proskynetarion frame, plaster (after Mitsani 1998).
- 1.159. Samos, Kallithea, Virgin Makrini church, southern proskynetarion frame, plaster (after Mitsani 1998).
- 1.160. Hosios Loukas monastery, museum, fragmentary arched slab (12th) (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 1.161. Ljubostina monastery, Dormition of the Virgin church, narthex, eastern wall, Deesis, proskynetarion frame, plaster (1402-1405) (after Duric 1985).
- 1.162. Euboea, Spelies, Hodegetria church, interior, north wall, Deesis, plaster proskynetarion frame (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 1.163. Kastoria, Agios Athanasios of Mouzaki (1383-1384), Deesis (ph. Riccardi).
- 1.164. Borje (Albania), Christos Zoodothos, Deesis (1380/90) (after Triphonova 2010).
- 1.165. Red Monastery, view towards the East (after Bolman 2016).
- 1.166. Mount Sinai, St. Catherine monastery, apsidal arch (© Center for Archaeological Conservation, CCA).
- 1.167. Cefalù, cathedral, apse (© UNESCO).
- 1.168. Sopoćani monastery, Holy Trinity church, north-west pillar, stucco cornice (1263-1268) (© Blago Fund).

Chapter 2

2.1. Roman stucco workers at work using a) movable mouldings, b) moulds, and c) stick (after Adam 2018).

2.2. Formwork used for Merovingian sarcophagi (after Périn 1991).

2.3. Trylie, Kemerli kilise, view towards west. Detail with protruding bricks (ph. Varsallona 2013).

2.4. Mystras, Hodeghetria church, apse, detail of the preparation for the ‘opus sectile’ (ph. Vanni 2015).

2.5. Hosios Loukas monastery, katholikon, naos, preparation for the corbels (ph. Vanni 2015).

2.6. Hosios Loukas monastery, museum, fragmentary cornice from the base of the dome of the katholikon, details of the layers of plaster (ph. Vanni 2015).

2.7. Hosios Loukas monastery, museum, fragmentary cornice from the base of the dome of the katholikon, on the base signs of the tile used for attaching it to the wall (ph. Vanni 2018).

2.8. Kostaniane, Taxiarches church, northern entrance, lunette, detail of the stamped decoration of the window transenna (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.9. Daphni monastery, deposit, back of a stucco cornice with traces of a cloth; the plaster clump visible is probably modern (ph. Vanni 2018).

2.10a-b. Ioannina, Byzantine museum, epistyle from the Koimesis in Petrobitsa, section with reeds (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.11. Arta, Archaeological collection of the Paregoritissa, fragmentary slab from the Kokkini Ekklesia of Boulgareli (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.12. Arta, Archaeological collection of the Paregoritissa, fragmentary slab from the Kokkini Ekklesia of Boulgareli, section with signs of canes and wood (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.13. Ioannina, Byzantine Museum, arch from the Taxiarches of Kostaniane, section with signs of canes (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.14. Arta, Archaeological collection of the Paregoritissa church, post from the Kokkini Ekklesia of Boulgareli, section with wooden lintel (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.15. Arta, Archaeological collection of the Paregoritissa church, post from the Kokkini Ekklesia of Boulgareli, (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.16. Cividale del Friuli, monastery of S. Maria in Valle, reconstruction of the technique of the stuccoes used in the Tempietto Longobardo (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.17. Cividale del Friuli, monastero di S. Maria in Valle, fragmentary human figure, signs of reeds (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.18. Brescia, S. Salvatore, stucco, detail of the bunches of reeds attached with nails (ph. Vanni 2019).

2.19 a-b. Ligourio, St. John Eleimon, narthex, proskynetarion frame, pieces of straw visible in both the plaster of the wall painting (a) and in the flute of the frame (b) (ph. Vanni 2018).

2.20. Spelies, Odeghetria church, southern wall, proskynetarion frame, plaster composition (ph. Vanni 2018).

2.21. Spelies, Hodegetria church, southern wall, relation between the proskynetarion frame and the frescoes of the eastern side (ph. Vanni 2018).

2.22. Spelies, Hodegetria church, northern wall, relation between the proskynetarion frame and the frescoes of the eastern side (ph. Vanni 2018).

2.23. Spelies, Hodeghetria church, northern wall, relation between the proskynetarion frame and the frescoes of the western side (ph. Vanni 2018).

2.24 Mystras, Peribleptos church, proskynetarion frame, relation between the paintings and the frame (ph. Vanni 2015).

- 2.25. Mustafapaşa, Timios Stavros monastery, southern church, stucco decoration (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 2.26. Mustafapaşa, Timios Stavros monastery, southern church, scheme with the continuity of the layer of stucco and paintings (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 2.27. Vatopedi monastery, katholikon, southern choro (after Tsigaradas 1998). The stucco elements shown in yellow.
- 2.28 a-e. Lower stucco cornice. d-e are a post-Byzantine restoration. (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.29. Southern *choros*, post-Byzantine restoration (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.30. Corner with the connection between the motif in fig. 2.28b and 2.28d (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.31. Corner with the connection between the motif in fig. 2.28d and 2.28e (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.32. Drawing of the elevation of the *choroi* with the stucco arches and colonnettes (after Mamaloukos 2001).
- 2.33. Northern *choros*, second level window, stucco arch, detail (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.34. Southern *choros*, bilobe windows, stucco arch, detail (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.35. Northern *choros*, bilobed windows, stucco arch, detail (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.36a-b. Northern *choros*, bilobed windows, stucco colonnettes (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.37. Plan of the katholikon of Vatopedi, in yellow the *liti* (after Mamaloukos 2001).
- 2.38. Vatopedi, katholikon, *liti*, *pentabelon* with stucco friezes (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.39. Vatopedi, katholikon, *liti*, *pentabelon* stucco friezes, detail (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.40. Vatopedi, katholikon, *liti*, *pentabelon* stucco frieze, detail (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.41. Iviron, katholikon, narthex, main door to the naos (after Pazaras 2007).

- 2.42. Iviron, katholikon, narthex, main door to the naos, stucco arches and colonnettes (ph. Pazaras).
- 2.43. Iviron, katholikon, narthex, main door to the naos, detail of the colonnette (ph. Pazaras).
- 2.44. Iviron, katholikon, narthex, main door to the naos, detail of the base fo the colonnette (ph. M. Vanni).
- 2.45. Drawing of the arcosolium, narthex of the katholikon of Iviron (after Pazaras 2007)
- 2.46. Iviron, katholikon, narthex, arcosolium, detail of arch (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.47. Iviron, katholikon, narthex, arcosolium, detail of the signs left by the mouldings (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.48. Iviron, katholikon, Door from the narthex to the naos, stucco quarter-of archarch, detail (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.49. Iviron, katholikon, Door from the narthex to the naos, stucco quarter-of an arch, detail (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.50. Iviron, katholikon, narthex, tomb of the hegoumenoi George II and George the Hagiorite, arcosolium, detail of the arch, stucco (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.51. Vatopedi monastery, *trapeza*, fragment of the templon, marble (after Pazaras 2001).
- 2.52. Vatopedi monastery, *choroi*, stucco cornice (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.53. Vatopedi monastery, *choroi*, stucco cornice (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.54. Vatopedi monastery, *choroi*, stucco cornice (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.55. Vatopedi monastery, *liti*, stucco cornice (ph. Mamaloukos 2019).
- 2.56. Vatopedi chapel of St. Nicholas, templon, post, marble (after Pazaras 2001).
- 2.57. Iviron monastery, narthex, main door to the naos, arch, stucco (ph. M. Vanni 2019).
- 2.58. Iviron monastery, narthex, southern bay, arcosolium, marble (ph. M. Vanni 2019).

Chapter 3

- 3.1. Istanbul, Archaeological Museum, fragments of architectural ceramic still mounted on stucco from the monastery of Constantine Lips (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 3.2. Akhisar museum, stucco fragments from the Çanlı kilise ph. courtesy Ousterhout).
- 3.3. Sculptural fragment from the Odalar camii (after Westphalen 1998).
- 3.4. Iviron, katholikon, architectural plan, ground floor (after Pazaras 2006). In blue the tomb of Euthymios John the Iberian, Arsenios, and John Grdzelisdze. In yellow the tomb of George I and III, in green the frame of the entrance.
- 3.5. The tomb of Euthymios, John the Iberian, Arsenios, and John Grdzelisdze (after Pazaras 2006). The arcosolium is made of marble.
- 3.6. The tomb of George I and George III the Hagiorite (ph. Pazaras). The arcosolium is made of stucco.
- 3.7. Stucco frame of the main entrance and painting of the Virgin and Child (ph. © Pazaras, M. Vanni).
- 3.8. Drawing of the stucco frame and of the marble entablature of the main door (after Pazaras 2007).
- 3.9. Hosios Loukas, katholikon, narthex, inscription mentioning Gregorios (ph. Vanni 2018) (after Chatzidakis 2013).
- 3.10. Hosios Loukas, katholikon, naos, western wall, first part of the inscription mentioning Gregorios (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 3.11. Hosios Loukas, katholikon, naos, western wall, second part of the inscription mentioning Gregorios (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 3.12. Hosios Loukas, katholikon, naos, squinches, view from the gallery (ph. Vanni 2018). In red marked the 'intermediate area' between the stucco cornice and the mosaics.

3.13. Hosios Loukas, katholikon, bema, central apse, view from the gallery (ph. Vanni 2018).

In red the 'intermediate area' between the stucco cornice and the mosaics.

3.14. Hosios Loukas, katholikon, base of the squinches, central apse, view from the ground floor (ph. Vanni 2014). The 'intermediate area' is not visible from the ground floor, except for few details.

3.15. Arta, Kato Panagia, south façade, inscription and monogram. Transcription and interpretation of the monogram after Kalopissi-Verti 1992.

3.16. Boulgareli, Kokkini Ekklesia, naos, western wall, dedicatory inscription.

3.17. Transcription of the dedicatory inscription of the Kokkini Ekklesia (after Orlandos 1927).

3.18. Boulgareli, Kokkini Ekklesia, narthex, donor portraits.

3.19. Map of the foundations with stucco decorations.

3.20. Mystras, Peribleptos monastery, katholikon, interior, south-eastern pier, proskynetarion frame made of plaster (ph. Vanni 2015).

3.21. Proskynetarion frame at the end of the nineteenth century (Millet 1910, photos ca 1895).

In red the wooden beam.

3.22. Mystras, Peribleptos monastery, katholikon, interior, diakonikon, marble epistyle on southern wall (ph. Riccardi 2015).

3.23. Mystras, H. Demetrios, southern pier, proskynetarion (ph. Vanni 2015).

3.24. Longanikos, Koimesis, panel with the donors (ph. Mattiello).

3.25. Euboea, Spelies, Hodegetria, exterior, northern façade (ph. Vanni 2018).

3.26. Euboea, Spelies, Hodegetria, interior, apsidal arch, dedicatory inscription (ph. Vanni 2018). In blue the name of 'Pachomeres'.

Chapter 4

4.1. Cyprus, Kalavassos-Syrma, rural basilica, fragment of a frieze (late 6th -7th c.) (after Nikolaou 2020).

4.2. Cyprus, Kalavassos-Syrma, rural basilica, fragment of a frieze (late 6th -7th c.) (after Nikolaou 2020).

4.3. Cyprus, Kalavassos-Syrma, rural basilica, fragment with the Virgin and Child and capital made of stucco (late 6th -7th c.) (after Panayides 2018).

4.4. Map of marble and stone quarries in the Roman period (Oxford Roman Economy Project: www.romaneconomy.ox.ac.uk)

4.5. Naxos, Archatos, Panagia church, apse, plaster covering of the masonry cornice (ph. Vanni 2016).

4.6. Hosios Loukas, katholikon, interior, *naos*, in orange the stucco decorations (ph. Vanni 2014).

4.7. Istanbul, Hagia Sophia, interior, southern aisle, in orange the stucco decorations casted on the sixth-century ones (after Guiglia 2011).

4.8. Ravenna, Archbishop chapel (494-518), interior, in orange the stucco decoration (Wikipedia).

4.9. Ravenna, Orthodox Baptistry (second half of the 5th c), stucco decoration (after Gierlichs 1999).

4.10. Mount Athos, Karyes, Protaton church, interior view towards East (after Tablakis 2003).

4.11. Drawing of the Late Byzantine paintings and the stucco frames on the eastern piers, Protaton church (after Durić 1991).

4.12. Mount Athos, Vatopedi monastery, katholikon, *choros*, stucco colonnettes and arches. The colonnette on the right was removed for providing space to the wall paintings (after Pazaras 2002).

4.13. Mount Athos, Vatopedi monastery, katholikon, *choros*, Last supper. On the right, the stucco arch and the missing colonnette (in red) (ph. M. Vanni 2019).

4.14. Lyggos, Koimesis church, Late Byzantine stucco post re-used in the post-Byzantine façade (ph. Vanni 2019).

4.15. Lyggos, Koimesis church, Late Byzantine stucco post re-used in the post-Byzantine façade (ph. Vanni 2019).

Chapter 5

5.1. Brescia, S. Salvatore, stucco decoration in the soffits and on the front of the arches (ph. Vanni 2016).

5.2. Cividale, Tempietto Longobardo, stucco (ph. Vanni 2017).

5.3. Jerusalem, Rockefeller museum, stuccoworks from Khirbat la-Mafjar (724-743) (Wikipedia).

5.4. Window transenna from Khirbat la-Mafjar (724-743), stucco (after Hamilton 1959).

5.5. Malles, San Benedetto abbey, church, stucco decoration (ph.

https://www.suedtirol.info/en/experience/san-benedetto-church_activity_75216

5.6. Malles, San Benedetto abbey, church, detail of the stucco decoration (ph. Architecture.com).

5.7. Malles, San Benedetto abbey, church, detail of a capital (stucco) (after *Le stuc* 2005).

5.8. Brescia, Museo di Santa Giulia, Theotokos from the abbey in Leno, stucco (8th -9th c.) (ph. Wikipedia).

5.9. Brescia, Museo di Santa Giulia, Virgin and Child from the abbey in Leno, stucco (8th - 9th c.) (ph. Wikipedia).

5.10. Rome, Santa Prassede, crypt, ceiling stucco decoration (after Pasquini 2002).

5.11. Rome, San Marco, crypt, stucco decoration (after Pasquini 2002).

5.12. Palombara Sabina, San Giovanni in Argentella, ciborium, stucco and marble (ph. Vanni 2016).

5.13. Palombara Sabina, San Giovanni in Argentella, ciborium, stucco and marble, detail of the stucco (after Acconci 1993).

5.14. Palombara Sabina, San Giovanni in Argentella, ciborium, stucco and marble, detail of the back arch stucco (ph. Vanni 2016).

5.15. Palombara Sabina, San Giovanni in Argentella, ciborium, capital (stucco) (ph. Vanni 2016).

5.16. Palombara Sabina, San Giovanni in Argentella, ciborium, detail of the unfinished stucco (ph. Vanni 2016).

5.17. Formia, S. Erasmo, crypt, arch rim (stucco) (after Miele 1998).

5.18. Formia, S. Erasmo, crypt, fragments (stucco) (after Miele 1998).

5.19. Formia, S. Erasmo a Formia, crypt, fragmentary slab (?) (stucco) (after Miele 1998).

5.20. Formia, S. Erasmo a Formia, crypt, fragmentary of a convex slab/ covering/ structure (stucco) (after Miele 1998).

5.21. Formia, S. Erasmo a Formia, crypt, fragmentary slab (?) (stucco) (after Miele 1998).

Fig. 5.22-5.23. Olevano sul Tusciano, chapel B, stucco arches and colonnettes (ph. Mattiello 2018).

5.24. Olevano sul Tusciano, chapel B, detail of the capital with inscription (stucco) (ph. Mattiello 2018).

- 5.25. Canne della Battaglia, Antiquarium, deposit, fragments of stucco decoration (after Bertelli 2002).
- 5.26. Canne della Battaglia, Antiquarium, fragment of stucco decoration (after Bertelli 2002).
- 5.27. Canne della Battaglia, Antiquarium, fragment of stucco decoration (after Bertelli 2002).
- 5.28. Bari, Santa Scolastica, fragment of the stucco decoration (after Bertelli 2002).
- 5.29. Milan, S. Ambrose, ciborium (10th c.) (Wikipedia).
- 5.30. Milan, S. Ambrose, ciborium (10th c.), (Wikipedia).
- 5.31. Milan, S. Ambrose, ciborium (10th c.), detail (after Corgnati 2010).
- 5.32. Milan, S. Ambrose, stucco decoration from the apse (after Corgnati 2010).
- 5.33. Milan, S. Ambrose, tondo with S. Ambrose, stucco (polychromy not original) (10th c.?) (after Foletti 2018).
- 5.34. Samarra, style A (after Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001).
- 5.35. Samarra, style B (after Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001).
- 5.36. Samarra, style C (after Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001).
- 5.37. New York, Metropolitan museum, wooden door decorated with the 'Bevelled Syle' from Takri (Iraq) (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 5.38. Cairo, Museum of Islamic art, woden doors from the mosque al-Azhar commissioned by al-Hakim (1010) (after Bloom 2007).
- 5.39. Cairo, Ibn Tulun mosque, qibla wall, stucco decoration after restoration (© Archnet).
- 5.40. Cairo, Ibn Tulun mosque, qibla wall, detail of the stucco decoration after restoration (© V&A Creswell online archive).
- 5.41. Cairo, Ibn Tulun mosque, stucco decoration after restoration of 2005 (© Wikiwand).
- 5.42. Cairo, Ibn Tulun mosque, detail of the stucco decoration in the soffits (© V&A Creswell online archive).

- 5.43. church of al-‘Adra (Dayr al-Suriani, Wadi al-Natrun) in Egypt, stucco decoration (after Ettinghausen et al. 2001).
- 5.44. Cairo, Al-Azhar mosque, central aisle, stucco decoration (969-73) (after Bloom 2007).
- 5.45. Cairo, Al-Azhar mosque, central aisle, stucco decoration between sanctuary and sahn (969-73) in 1920s (© Archnet Creswell online archive).
- 5.46. Cairo, Qarafa mosque, detail of the stucco decoration (end of the tenth century) (after Bloom 2007).
- 5.47. Cairo, al-Hakim mosque, detail of the stucco decoration in the soffits (end of the tenth-beginning of the eleventh century) (after Bloom 2007).
- 5.48. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, fragments of the stucco decoration, vegetal motif (after Barrucand, Rammah 2009).
- 5.49. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, fragments of the stucco decoration, vegetal and geometrical motifs (after Barrucand, Rammah 2009).
- 5.50. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, fragments of the stucco decoration, flutes with palmettes (after Barrucand, Rammah 2009).
- 5.51. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, fragments of the stucco decoration, head with golden leave and glass inlay (after Barrucand, Rammah 2009).
- 5.52. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, fragments of the stucco decoration, horseman (after Barrucand, Rammah 2009).
- 5.53. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, fragments of the stucco decoration, eagle (after Barrucand, Rammah 2009).
- 5.54. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, stucco eagle (after Barrucand, Rammah 2009).
- 5.55. Sabra al-Mansuriyya, fragmentary stucco eagle (after Barrucand, Rammah 2009).

- 5.56. Istanbul, Archaeological museum, fragmentary eagles from the Northern church of the monastery of Constantine Lips, marble (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 5.57. Fragmentary eagles from the Northern church of the monastery of Constantine Lips, marble (after Macridy 1964).
- 5.58. Cordoba, mezquita, screen of the maqsura, stucco on marble columns (962-976) (after *Al Andalus* 1992).
- 5.59. Cordoba, mezquita, Puerta de San Esteban (Bāb al-Wuzarā) (855) (after *Al Andalus* 1992).
- 5.60. Cordoba, mezquita, mirhab, stucco and mosaics (962-976) (©Archnet).
- 5.61. Madinat al-Zahra, Salon Rico, stucco decoration (after *Al-Andalus* 1992).
- 5.62. Madinat al-Zahra, Salon Rico, stucco decoration from the palace of Abd al-Rahman (after Talbot Rice 1965).
- 5.63. Lomello, Santa Maria Maggiore, male figure stucco, (MiBACT)
- 5.64. Aulla, San Caprasio, stucco slab, abbot (after Pasquini 2002).
- 5.65. Vigolo Marchese, stucco figures re-used in the altar (Comune di Vigolo Marchese).
- 5.66. Camogli, San Fruttuoso, cornice, stucco (after Frondoni 2008).
- 5.67. Camogli, San Fruttuoso, panel, drawing (after Frondoni 2008).
- 5.68. Camogli, San Fruttuoso, panel (after Frondoni 2008).
- 5.69. Civate, San Pietro al Monte, ciborium, stucco (11th c.) (ph. Vanni 2016).
- 5.70. Civate, San Pietro al Monte, slab stucco (11th c.) (ph. Vanni 2016).
- 5.71. Civate, San Pietro al Monte, western facade, stucco and wall paintings (11th c.) (ph. Vanni 2016).
- 5.72. Civate, San Pietro al Monte, crypt (11th c.) (ph. Vanni 2016).

- 5.73. Aulla, S. Caprasio, sarcophagus-reliquary (first quarter of the 11th c.) (after Arslan *et al.* 2006).
- 5.74-81. Gerace, church of S. Maria del Mastro, fragments of the stucco decoration (after Lebole 2020)
- 5.82. Gerace, church of Annunziatella- S. Teodoro, arch, stucco (after Lebole 2020)
- 5.83. Gerace, church of Annunziatella- S. Teodoro, small capital, stucco (after Lebole 2020)
- 5.84. Rossano, Panagia, stucco decorations (after Lipinsky 1963).
- 5.85. Reggio Calabria, Museo Archeologico, stucco slab from Santa Maria in Terreti (after Caskey 2011).
- 5.86. Fragmentary slab from Santa Maria in Terreti (after Orsi 1922).
- 5.87. Fragmentary colonnette from Santa Maria in Terreti (after Orsi 1922).
- 5.88. Fragment of a ciborium/canopy from Santa Maria in Terreti (after Orsi 1922).
- 5.89. Stucco slab from San Giuliano at Caltagirone (after Caskey 2011).
- 5.92. Itàla, SS Pietro e Paolo, fragments of the stucco decoration (funerary monument?), capital, (after Caskey 2011).
- 5.91. Itàla, SS Pietro e Paolo, fragments of the stucco decoration (funerary monument?), capital, drawing of a fragment of an arch (after Caskey 2011).
- 5.92. Itàla, SS Pietro e Paolo, fragments of the stucco decoration (funerary monument?), capital, drawing of a fragment of an arch (after Caskey 2011).
- 5.93. Rosciolo dei Marsi, Santa Maria in Valle Porclaneta, ciborium, stucco on stone core (ph. Vanni 2014).
- 5.94. Rosciolo dei Marsi, Santa Maria in Valle Porclaneta, ciborium, stucco on stone core (ph. Vanni 2014).
- 5.95. Rosciolo dei Marsi, Santa Maria in Valle Porclaneta, pulpit, stucco on stone core.

- 5.96. Moscufo, Santa Maria del Lago, ambo, stucco on stone core.
- 5.97. Cugnoli, S. Stefano, ambo (twelfth-century) (Wikipedia).
- 5.98. Guardia al Vomano, S. Clemente, ciborium (after Nenci 2006).
- 5.99. Pietramontecorvino, stucco, fragment (after Bertelli 2018).
- 5.100. Pietramontecorvino, stucco, fragment (after Bertelli 2018).
- 5.101. San Dalmazzo Abbey, fragment of a pillar, stucco (after *Le stuc*).
- 5.102. San Dalmazzo Abbey, pavement, stucco (after *Le stuc*).
- 5.103. Müstair, Ulrich kapelle, statue of Charlemagne (1160-70), stucco (after Corgnati 2010).
- 5.104. Cairo, Museum of Islamic art, *muqarnas* from the bath of Abu'l-Su'ud in Fustat, stucco (© Qantara).
- 5.105. Egypt, al-Juyūshī mosque (1085), mihrab, stucco (after Creswell 1978).
- 5.106. Egypt, al-Juyūshī mosque (1085), minaret, stucco *muqarnas* (V&A online Creswell's archive)
- 5.107. Cairo, Ibn-Tulun mosque, qibla, mihrab of al-Afdal (1094), stucco (after Bloom 2007).
- 5.108. Cairo, Mashad of Umm Kulthum (1122), mihrab, stucco (after Bloom 2007).
- 5.109. Cairo, mausoleum of Sayyida Ruqayya (1133), main mihrab, stucco (after Bloom 2007).
- 5.110. Cairo, al-Azhar mosque, maqsura of al-Hafiz (1149-1154), stucco (after Bloom 2007).
- 5.111. Malaga, Alcazaba, stucco (after *Al Andalus* 1992).
- 5.112. Malaga, Alcazaba, stucco (after *Al Andalus* 1992).
- 5.113. Zaragoza, Aliaferia, courtyard, arches, stucco (after *Al Andalus* 1992).
- 5.114. Zaragoza, mezqita, mihrab, detail of the stucco decoration (after *Al Andalus* 1992).
- 5.115. Zaragoza, stucco decoration from Aljiaferia (after *Al Andalus* 1992).

- 5.116. Cataluña, Balaguer, Alcazaba (1070-1080), stucco decoration of the arches (after Cabañero Subiza 2011).
- 5.117. Cataluña, Balaguer, Alcazaba (1070-1080), fragment of a stucco decoration (after Cabañero Subiza 2011).
- 5.118. Cataluña, Balaguer, Alcazaba (1070-1080), stucco decoration with a harpy (after Cabañero Subiza 2011).
- 5.119. Cataluña, Balaguer, Alcazaba (1070-1080), fragments of a panel, stucco (after Cabañero Subiza 2011).
- 5.120. Seville, Alcazaba, Patio del Yeso (Wikipedia).
- 5.121. Seville, Giralda, detail of the stucco decoration (after *Al-Andalus* 1992).
- 5.122. Damascus, Maristan of Nur al-Din (1154), muqarnas, stucco (after Raby 2004).
- 5.123. Scala, cathedral, funerary monument of Marinella Rufolo Coppola (1332), stucco (after Caskey 2018).
- 5.124. Teggiano, San Pietron, funerary monument of Bartolomeo Franconi (after Caskey 2008).
- 5.125. Casertavecchia, Duomo, transept, funerary monument of the bishop Martonio (1350-70), stucco canopy (ph. Vanni 2019).
- 5.126 Ravello, church of S. Giovanni del Toro, St. Catherine of Alexandria, stucco (mid 14th c.) (after Caskey 2004).
- 5.127. Ravello, Villa Rufolo, loggia, stucco ribs (1280s-1290s) (after Caskey 2004).
- 5.128. Oxyolithos, church of the Theotokos (ph. Vanni 2018).
- 5.129. Granada, Alhambra, Sala de Los Hermana, ceiling (after *Al Andalus* 1992).
- 5.130. Granada, Alhambra, Sala de Los Hermana, wall revetment (after *Al Andalus* 1992).
- 5.131. Egypt, mausoleum of the Abbasid caliphs (before 1242) stucco (after Creswell 1978).

5.132. Cairo, madrasa of al-Nasir Muhammad ibn Qalawun (1296-1304), mihrab, stucco (after Isaak Backhoum 2016).

5.133. New York, Metropolitan museum, princely figures probably from Western Iran (ph. Vanni 2019).

5.134. Konya, stucco frieze from the Kubadabad Palace near the Lake Beyşehir (ca 1236).

5.135. Istanbul, Museum of the Islamic art, stucco cornice from the Aladdin palace in Konya (ph. Vanni 2018).

5.136. Iraq, Beth Kdeda (Mosul), Mar Benham monastery, stucco relief with the image of St. Benham (13th c. with later interventions) (Gertrude Bell online archive).

5.137. stucco relief with the image of St. Benham after 2015 (ph. Father Baho)

5.138. Iraq, Beth Kdeda (Mosul), Mar Benham monastery, stucco relief with the image of St. Sarah (13th c.) (after Snelders & Jeudy 2006).

List of tables

Table 1. Information about plaster composition of stucco decorations of buildings contained in Appendix A.

Table 2. Buildings with proskynetaria frames Type A.

Table 3. Buildings with proskynetaria frames Type B.

Table 4. Estimation of the amount of marble and stucco used in the buildings contained in Appendix A.

Abbreviations

PG: Patrologia Graeca.

PL: Patrologia Latina.

PLP: Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit.

SAR: Soprintendenza speciale per i beni Archeologici di Roma.

SSBAP: Soprintendenza Speciale Belle Arti e Paesaggio.

SSBAR: Soprintendenza Speciale per i Beni Archeologici di Roma.

A note on names and place names

The geographical areas discussed in this thesis go from Italy to Syria and North Africa.

Finding a unique way to quote names and place names is always problematic since several possibilities exist. I preferred to use for personal names the standard anglicised form where they exist and are common in English language (e.g. George, Constantine, Michael). Name place and names of churches are in transliteration (e.g. H. Georgios, Kato Panagia) and the abbreviation for ‘saint’ follows the rule of the language in which they are better known (e.g. H. Georgios for Greek, S. Giorgio for Italian). This choice is to respect the toponyms as much as possible and help the reader to locate them easily on contemporary maps.

INTRODUCTION

*“The style, proportion, colour or texture has in each case the disturbing quality of pastiche not in harmony with adjacent early features and have [sic] caused confusion in the minds of observers”.*¹

With these words, Ernest J. Hawkins opened his discussion of the stucco cornices in the southwestern vestibule of Hagia Sophia. ‘Disturbing qualities’, ‘pastiche’ and ‘confusion’ summarise several descriptions by scholars of stucco in Byzantine buildings. This does not mean that every scholar had the same impression, but it is important to bear in mind that stucco generates *confusion* because of its ambiguity: it can be easily destroyed and substituted, and it was often repainted and restored. Therefore, it is difficult to authenticate. Stucco and plaster reliefs are generally associated with the art of the Romans from the first century CE to the Late Antique and Early Byzantine period. Later, stucco was widely used in Baroque and Rococo styles both in the West and in Ottoman architecture. Finally, stucco is often associated with plaster casts and plaster cast galleries, therefore copies of originals in other media (often marble). When we apply these filters to Hawkins’ and our knowledge of art history, it is possible to understand why stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings generated and still may generate ‘confusion in the minds of observers’: it is simply not expected to be there.

This thesis provides the first synthetic evaluation of stucco (plasterwork) architectural decoration in Byzantine buildings dated between ca 850 and 1453. It brings together material evidence scattered from Constantinople, Anatolia and the Balkan peninsula, and analyses it in

¹ Hawkins 1964, 131.

a systematic manner. The goal is to provide Byzantine stucco with a methodology which benefits from *in situ* observations, as well as analysis of the primary sources and secondary literature. This allows us to use stucco as a diagnostic material which instead of *confusing* helps in establishing, clarifying, and understanding the history of single buildings and more broadly Byzantine culture and society.

A brief state of scholarship

The majority of handbooks on Byzantine art and architecture do not mention stucco decorations. The recent volume of Ousterhout briefly referred to the use of stucco in fourth- to sixth-century architecture,² while Bouras referred to the use of plasterworks and stucco window transennae in Middle Byzantine buildings.³ The examples from the Early Byzantine period are well-known and published: for instance, the sixth-century cornices of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople,⁴ the fifth- and sixth-century stuccoes from the Baptistry of the Orthodox and in the church of S. Vitale both in Ravenna,⁵ and the Euphrasian basilica in Poreč (543-554).⁶ They were analysed in broader works on the use of stucco in Italy and in the West between the Late Antique and the Early Middle Ages.⁷

Regarding stucco in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods, the evidence seems to be scattered. However, its use has been known since the end of the nineteenth century through the

² Ousterhout 2019, 44, 114, 224.

³ Bouras 2006, 102-103.

⁴ Hawkins 1964; Fobelli 2005, 65; Guiglia, Barsanti 2012, 191-201; Pedone 2013, 939-962; Barsanti, Guiglia 2014, 271-284; Niewöhner, Teteriatnikov 2015.

⁵ Pinza 1970, 151-167; Pavan 1980; Pasquini 2002, 69-71.

⁶ Šonje 1967, 51-68; Russo 1991; Peroni 1994, 101-115. See Pasquini 2002 for an evaluation of Late Antique and Early Medieval stucco in Italy.

⁷ Pasquini 2002; Sapin, Simon-Hernard ed. 2004; Sapin, Allag (ed.) 2006; Corgnati 2010.

works of Millet,⁸ Schultz and Barnsley,⁹ and Lampakis.¹⁰ Monographs, and archaeological and conservation reports concerned with single sites are the most common sources of information. They usually provide basic data on the chronology of the pieces and brief descriptions; although they are sometimes very vague.¹¹ The works of Orlandos,¹² Moutsopoulos,¹³ Louvi,¹⁴ Sinkević,¹⁵ Pazaras,¹⁶ and Ousterhout¹⁷ also evaluated the stucco elements of selected structures in light of sculptures found in the same buildings. Grabar in his study of Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture occasionally mentioned stucco elements and evaluated them together with marble and stone sculpture.¹⁸

Between the end of the 1990s and the beginning of the 2000s there was an increased interest in Early Medieval stucco (ca 400-ca 1000 CE), specifically the production in the Italian peninsula, the Alps, France, Northern Spain, and Germany. The apex can be considered the exhibition *Le Stuc: visage oublié de l'art medieval* held at Poitiers from September 2004 to January 2005, and the conference that opened it.¹⁹ The proceedings of the conference and the catalogue of the exhibition finally brought together studies carried out by art historians, archaeologists, and conservators and attempted to synthesise the different uses of stucco developed after the fall of the Western Roman Empire. However, the representation of Byzantium in these volumes is limited to Poreč and Ravenna (fourth to sixth centuries), not

⁸ Millet, Benouville 1899.

⁹ Schultz, Barnsley 1901. A drawings of the window transennae of the Zoodokos Pege at Samarina is also in the notebook SCH 16 at the British School at Athens.

¹⁰ Lampakis 1899.

¹¹ Some examples are Petsas 1952, 12-13; Orlandos 1953; Dirimtekin 1962, 175; Vokotopoulos 1969; Dakaris 1965; Aliprantis 1975-76; Asgarı 1984, 45; Westphalen 1998, 149-150.

¹² Orlandos 1927; Orlandos 1933; Orlandos 1953.

¹³ Moutsopoulos 1989.

¹⁴ Louvi 1980.

¹⁵ Sinkević 2000.

¹⁶ Pazaras 2001a; Pazaras 2006; Pazaras 2007.

¹⁷ Ousterhout 2006.

¹⁸ Grabar 1976, 54, 106, 148. He also mentioned the proskynetarion of the Protaton but he does not specified that it is made of stucco instead of marble, again he does mention the sculpture from H. Achilleios in Prespa but not the stucco arched slab.

¹⁹ Sapin, Simon-Hernard (ed.) 2004; Sapin, Allag (ed.) 2006.

even Hagia Sophia of Constantinople was included in this debate. The evidence from the seventh to the eleventh centuries in Byzantium is missing too, while is covered for the rest of Europe.

Roughly during the same years, the studies of Laskarina and Charalambos Bouras on the architecture and sculpture of Byzantine monuments in Greece included stucco elements next to the other materials used for architectural ornamentation.²⁰ This allowed for a more realistic understanding of Byzantine architecture and its original decoration. The study of Kalopissi-Verti on proskynetaria includes plasterworks next to marble sculpture showing how flexible artisans and patrons were about materials.²¹ The stucco liturgical furnishings produced by one workshop in thirteenth-century Epiros benefitted from a significant attention by scholars, starting with Orlandos,²² they were later included by Vanderheyde in the volume on the sculpture of the *theme* of Nikopolis,²³ further explored by Papadopoulou,²⁴ and included by Melvani within his evaluation of Late Byzantine sculpture.²⁵ It is important to mention that only the study conducted by the Ephorate of Arta under the direction of Papadopoulou benefitted from chemical (petrographical) analysis of the plaster used, a type of analysis that has been definitively more widespread for stuccoes in the Medieval West.²⁶ Finally, briefly before the submission of this thesis, the book of Vanderheyde on Byzantine sculpture (tenth-fifteenth century) was published. Her publication has the merit of listing some stucco decorations alongside marble, stone and wood to discuss the variety of materials and techniques used in Byzantine sculpture. However, the list of stuccoes is not exhaustive, as the aim of the volume

²⁰ Boura 1980; Bouras, Boura 2002; Bouras 2006.

²¹ Kalopissi-Verti 2006.

²² Orlandos 1927.

²³ Vanderheyde 2005, 83-87, 105-106, 147.

²⁴ Papadopoulou 2006.

²⁵ Melvani 2013, 27, 30, 137, 143, 199, 207.

²⁶ See, for example, the studies of Casadio *et al.* 1996; Palazzo-Bertholon 2004; Palazzo-Bertholon 2006; Palazzo-Bertholon 2009; Palazzo-Bertholon 2010.

is generally sculpture, and the use of stucco is mainly explained as an economical solution to the lack of marble.²⁷ This approach is problematic, as we will see in chapter 1 and 4, as it encloses the inquiry on stucco into the category of ‘poor’ versus ‘rich’ materials preventing any investigation on Byzantine perception of stucco and on the variety of patrons’ and artisans’ reasons for choosing it.

From this brief overview on the state of previous studies, it appears evident that even when experts knew about the existence of stucco decorations in Middle and Late Byzantine architecture, their knowledge did not have an impact to more general publications, nor it did reach Western Medievalists. Indeed, Middle and Late Byzantine stuccoes are absent from any debate on stucco production in the Medieval West, even though scholars generically referred to ‘Eastern’ and Byzantine influences to explain unique phenomena in regional contexts, especially in Italy, such as high percentages of gypsum in stucco mixtures.²⁸ This lack of communication between Byzantinists and Medievalists also reveals a gap in the knowledge of stucco production for the Byzantine territories. Indeed, there has been no attempt to evaluate stucco production as a whole and its changes from the Early into the Middle and Late Byzantine period, nor to evaluate aspects of production: from the identification of the artisans involved to the techniques used for carving and the recipes of the stucco mixtures. The only exception is the stuccoes of Epiros.

By not analysing stucco production from both a specific and from a bird’s-eye perspective Byzantinists are not fully taking advantage of a diagnostic material which a) provide access to a more realistic image of Byzantine architecture which was covered, decorated and filled with both durable and non-durable materials; b) allows us to inquire into

²⁷ Vanderheyde 2020, 59-61, 122-124, 161, 284.

²⁸ See, for example, Frondoni 2008b; Mannoni, Ricci 2008.

the evolution of a technique and the people who worked with it; c) provides further glimpses into local and regional histories and local networks of power which linked patrons and their audiences.

This thesis begins to fill this methodological gap.

What is stucco?

A *confusing* material and an ambiguous word: stucco. The meaning of stucco differs from language to language and from one discipline to another. In this thesis stucco is used with its generical meaning in English and it refers to every architectural decorative element made of a malleable material (usually white, pink or cream in colour) which can be moulded and/or modelled and carved, and which differs from pure clay and mud mixtures.²⁹ The term stucco is used here as a synonym of plasterwork.³⁰ In conservation practices, plaster usually refers to gypsum-based mixtures, while stucco to lime-based one.³¹ For this research it was almost impossible to draw this distinction because most of the case studies were not scientifically tested and it was not possible for me to do so.³² This means that the range of potential materials to which this thesis deals is very wide. From naked eye observation, it can only be deduced that stucco architectural decorations in the Byzantine territories were not made of clay or mud, as can be the case in Islamic art.³³ This is even more plausible due to the current state of knowledge of Western Medieval plasters and mortars which demonstrated the use of lime and gypsum as

²⁹ Therefore, I will not follow the definition of stucco made by Bloom and Blair which includes mixtures of mud and clay, Bloom, Blair (eds) 2009.

³⁰ See definition of 'stucco and plasterwork' in Hourihane (ed.) 2013. On the ambiguous meaning of stucco and the differences between English and Italian, see Gapper 1999.

³¹ On a discussion on the use of stucco, plaster and stuccoes in conservation studies, see Gapper, Orton 2011. However, their argument does not appear very convincing for Medieval and Byzantine Studies when stucco was used by different professionals who used different recipes.

³² I am going to carry out them in the near future thanks to the generous support of Mary Jaharis Center and in collaboration with Ormylia Art Diagnosis center (Ormylia-Thessaloniki).

³³ The use of clay and mud reliefs appears to be more widespread in Islamic art, Bloom, Blair (eds) 2009.

main binders.³⁴ Therefore, this research analyses the use of stucco, or plaster reliefs, that include every attempt to create low, high reliefs, and three-dimensional elements out of plaster. However, the inclusion of all these kinds of decorations and sculptures potentially creates issues regarding the identity and the education of the artisans who worked them.

Methodology

Since there are not, yet, synthetic studies on the use of stucco between ca 850 and 1453, it was crucial to approach the subject in a systematic manner, to collect information in as standardised way as possible. Therefore, each piece of decoration was studied and approached from the smallest detail to the full composition. Whenever it was possible and the stuccoes were still *in situ*, I analysed them in their stratigraphic relationship with the other elements of the wall decorations (wall paintings, marble revetments, mosaics). That allowed me to establish the moment of the sequence in which the stuccoes were made (e.g. before, after, at the same time of the wall paintings). This information was then used to interpret the sequence into a chronological hypothesis. The stuccoes were also ‘put in context’ at two levels: a) the buildings to which they belonged, meaning the stylistic and iconographic relationship with the painted and carved elements; b) the regional and macro-regional context of Byzantine sculpture and painting. In all these phases, the study of primary and secondary sources was crucial to understand the history of the buildings and to correctly frame the stuccoes.

One main issue in approaching stucco is the risk of placing each piece into the category of the ‘exceptional’. It is true that the number of surviving pieces is definitively smaller than marble and stone sculpture; however, this only tells us that there is a possibility that in some buildings the use of stucco is a unique creation, but in many others, we are simply missing the

³⁴ See chapter 2 for a discussion on Medieval and Byzantine plasters.

context. As we will see later, the context can be sketched through the analysis of the paintings and the sculpture contemporary to the plaster reliefs, and will be, hopefully, perfected by the discovery of new pieces.

Before going into the description of the content of each chapter, there is another methodological premise that I need to cover. This thesis aims at providing Byzantine stucco with an updated methodological approach and at promoting the need for a more detailed study. However, it does not aim to dissociate stucco from the architectural environment for which it was created. The impression that stucco in this thesis is isolated from the rest of the building decoration is purely functional, a way to extract from it as much information as possible regarding Byzantine art and society. I am not aiming at creating a new sub-discipline (e.g. ceramology). Indeed, the impossibility of clearly separating the different expressions of stucco from sculpture and painting it is evident from the first chapters onward. It is this bond which makes stucco an excellent element for analysing artisans' skills and labour organisation in the progression of the decoration in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings.

Structure of the thesis

This thesis is organised into five chapters and three appendices.

The first chapter shows that stucco continued to be used without interruption from the Early to the Middle Byzantine period even though substantial changes in iconography and types of decorations occurred, and how it further evolved in the last centuries of the Byzantine empire. The formal analysis of both the typologies of the decorative elements and the ornament demonstrates that generally stucco decorations looked to marble sculpture as a model by reproducing the same ornamentations. However, in other cases artisans created unique decorative solutions which were characterised by the abundance and richness of the patterns

(eg. at the Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres) and a multimedia inspiration for the shapes and ornaments (e.g. the katholika of Iviron and Vatopedi). This chapter also argues that the imitative aspect of stucco to reproduce other materials was used by artisans and requested by patrons to create amazement and awe in the aesthetic experience of the viewer, which falls under the more general experience of variety.

The following chapter establishes the ground for comparative analysis of Byzantine stucco production in the rest of the Mediterranean by laying out principles and techniques used in Byzantine stuccoes between the ninth and the fourteenth century. This is achieved by describing the techniques used for producing and working stucco and problematizing the issue of mixture recipes. The study of the manufacturing of stucco raises questions regarding who was working this material. The latter is the focus on the second part of this chapter which explores the figures of 'stucco workers', their professional role and, to the extent possible, their social condition. Neither Byzantine texts nor material evidence allow us to clearly distinguish the plasterers from the stucco-workers, nor even sometimes between them and the painters or the sculptors. In few cases, the identification of workshops can demonstrate a specialised production. Therefore, I argue that who worked stucco should be determined on a case by case basis; it could be either a specialised artisan (in charge of modelling only plaster) or a more casual worker (e.g. a painter or a sculptor who occasionally worked stucco).

The third chapter moves from production to consumption and explores patterns of patronage. It shows that in the Middle Byzantine period stucco was used in buildings commissioned by the emperor, rulers and the aristocracy, while in the Late Byzantine period the imperial patronage almost disappears, and local aristocrats and common people make their appearance next to rulers. In some areas where stucco was used in more than a building it is clear that there is a link between the different patrons. Plasterworks were used by two of the

oldest coenobitic monasteries on Mount Athos to establish their authority. In thirteenth-century Epiros stucco templa and liturgical furnishings are the *file rouge* connecting local aristocrats and officers located in the mountains with the Despot in Arta. The case of Mystras and its surroundings also shows how the Despot of Morea was able to access well-trained artisans for stucco while the aristocrats in the nearby towns only managed masonry imitations of stucco reliefs.

The use of plaster reliefs mainly in foundations made by more than a single individual (communal) and by local aristocrats brings up the issue of the actual cost of plaster reliefs and their social perception. These issues are the subject of chapter four. Stucco in general has been considered as a ‘cheap’ material, an economic substitute for marble. In this chapter I address and challenge this idea by analysing cases where the local geology encouraged the use of stucco, and cases where stucco is used next to other more expensive materials. Finally, I discuss two cases of Late Byzantine restyling of buildings which consciously preserved Middle Byzantine stucco decorations. It is clear then that a tangle of economic and cultural values lay behind the use of stucco.

The last chapter zooms out to put Byzantine stucco into the wider context of the Mediterranean. The stuccoes analysed so far are compared with contemporary examples in Italy and in the Islamic territories. The distinctive feature of Byzantine stucco is the role which stucco had in architecture, which was almost the same as sculpture and differed from Italian and Islamic architecture. Indeed, there is no surviving evidence in Byzantine buildings which can be compared to the walls covered in plaster reliefs such as the eleventh-century crypt of S. Pietro al Monte at Civate (Italy), the church of al-‘Adra (Dayr al-Suriani, Wadi al-Natrun) in Egypt (tenth century) or mosques and palaces ranging from Egypt to Islamic Spain.³⁵ However,

³⁵ See chapter 5.

one aspect which can be recorded across the Mediterranean is the general ability of stucco-artisans to move across different media (painting, sculpture, wooden and ivory carving) which suggests they were trained in multi-media workshops.

Appendix A contains the catalogue of all the case studies on which this thesis is built. Each entry corresponds to the stuccoes from a building and contains the basic information about the history of both the stuccoes and, when necessary, about the architecture. The catalogue is a tool for understanding the chronology of the pieces and my opinion on the debate, when there are several discordant points of view. It can be consulted at any time to easily follow my argument in the chapters. Appendix B lists the major monuments of medieval Serbia where there were stuccoes; it is a reference point for the reader, but the list does not claim to be exhaustive.³⁶ Appendix C contains a list of Byzantine buildings where window transennae made of stucco were found. Window transennae are one of the most widespread stucco artefacts in Byzantine architecture, however, their production was connected with glass making and they therefore require a separate investigation, which I plan to carry out in the near future.³⁷

In conclusion, this thesis aims at giving new space to stucco reliefs in the study of Middle and Late Byzantine architecture. Stucco is a material previously overlooked which nevertheless provides us with the opportunity for unique insights into Byzantine society spanning from artisans' education to networks of powers to aesthetics. It is an 'ambiguous' element which links painting and sculpture together, liquid and solid, rich and poor. It ideally provides art historians, archaeologists, and historians with a sense of the complexity of Medieval society in the Eastern Mediterranean. Finally, it provides material for a fairer debate

³⁶ Further discussion on the material included into the list in Appendix B is in chapter 1.2.

³⁷ Further discussion is in chapter 1.2.

on Medieval plaster reliefs where technical practices other than those familiar in Medieval Europe can be defined with more tidy profiles than as 'Eastern'.

1. STUCCO IN MIDDLE AND LATE BYZANTINE BUILDINGS

1.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to analyse and describe the use of stucco between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries in its various manifestations. How was stucco used? What typologies of architectural decorations were made with stucco? Are these the same as recorded for the Late Antique period or are there new typologies? How did the use of stucco change from the ninth to the fifteenth centuries? Did stucco architectural decorations and their ornamentation differ from those in marble sculpture, and mural paintings in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods?

This chapter answers such questions by first describing changes and continuities in the use of plaster reliefs in interior decoration from Imperial Rome (first century BCE-first century CE) to the Early Byzantine and the so-called Transitional period (fourth to seventh centuries) (paragraph 1.3). The second and more robust section (paragraphs 1.4-1.15) sorts and analyses stucco production dated to the Middle and Late Byzantine periods according to typologies of architectural decorations (e.g. cornices, capitals, arches, arched slabs, etc.) and their associated ornamentation. This analysis could not be summarised in a few pages, because currently there is no synthetic evaluation of Byzantine stucco production for the period between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries.

Therefore, it is crucial to begin this analysis with a ‘cataloguing’ job, because it provides stucco with methodological consistency and helps comparative analysis with marble sculpture and other media. This consists of the identification and placement of stucco decorations under the correct category of architectural decoration, allowing the exploration of changes and continuities in shapes and iconographic choices which can encompass media and time. At the same time, it helps to avoid overinterpretation. For example, when we label a piece as an arched

slab, we are leaving open the possibilities that the piece may belong, for example, to a ciborium, an arcosolium, a canopy in general or a proskynetarion frame. If we then identify the piece with one of them, for example, a proskynetarion frame we put it within the box of a very specific category of objects: the carved frame of a wall-painting icon.³⁸ Through this label we are also providing information about how the frame was experienced by the Byzantines: it signalled to the faithful the most important holy figures of the church for intercession, and directed her/him towards it. The labelling and interpretation of an architectural decoration is the first step to connect an object with a class of other materials. Indeed, proskynetaria frames were not just made of stucco but also marble and stone, and sometimes they were two-dimensional mural paintings.³⁹ It is with this class of material in mind that the artisan created the plaster relief. Did stucco proskynetaria frames differ in shape and iconography from the marble, stone, and painted examples? Is there continuity or change? Are there exchanges between these media? This discourse is valid also for the rest of the categories of stucco decorations identified.

1.2 Stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings (9th-15th c.). Evaluation of a census.

Some words on the data collected and the intrinsic limits of this analysis. The issue in dealing with stucco in the Middle and Late Byzantine period is the absence of a synthetic analysis. Therefore, I carried out a census of published and unpublished stuccoes which provides the basis for the evaluation of these decorations between the mid-ninth and the mid-fifteenth centuries.

The census resulted in the identification of thirty-four buildings with stuccoes dated between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries mainly located in modern Turkey (five), Greece

³⁸ For a definition of proskynetarion see Kalopissi-Verti 2006.

³⁹ See Kalopissi-Verti 2006 for proskynetaria in general and bibliography on the topic.

(twenty). A smaller percentage of the buildings (six) are on islands (Naxos, Samos and Cyprus). The amount of data collected seems, at first glance, exiguous when compared to the amount of marble sculpture recorded in Byzantine buildings. Nonetheless, it is significant for several reasons:

- a) The high perishability of stucco and plaster reliefs. Stuccoes and plaster reliefs are made of an easily removable material which, in most of the cases, does not leave traces when it is removed. Most of the surviving Byzantine buildings are churches which continued to be used during these centuries, while others simply fell into ruin. The first group were often refurbished, and their original aspect was altered; in this process, the decorative parts which are the easiest to modify or replace are plaster reliefs.
- b) The chronology of the findings covers, almost without interruptions, the period between the mid-ninth century and the fifteenth century. This demonstrates that stucco and plaster reliefs continued to be used during the central centuries of the Middle Ages in Byzantine architecture.
- c) The geographical location of the findings corresponds to most of the territories under direct Byzantine control and those where Byzantine art continued to be the main artistic expression, even under other rulers (e.g. Venetian Naxos). This shows that stucco and plaster reliefs were considered to be part of the decorative apparatus of Byzantine buildings.

Therefore, I believe that there is room to consider the data collected as a suitable first core of information, which allows us to start drawing some general observations about how stucco and plaster reliefs were used in Byzantine architecture from the mid-ninth to the fifteenth century.

It is also important to highlight the limits of this census. One is the underrepresentation of Cyprus and Crete in the catalogue. This is an unfortunate consequence of the current circumstances caused by the pandemic, which did not allow me to survey in-depth the two islands. Moreover, the area of the Balkans is represented only by the most well-known cases located in modern Albania and North Macedonia. Serbia is another absence. As it will become clear in the following pages, stucco appears to be intimately connected to both architectural and sculptural trends. The amount of architectural sculpture in Serbian monumental buildings is not comparable to those used in territories under direct Byzantine control; it was definitively higher (with the exception of Constantinople). The implications of the inclusion of Serbian buildings in this work would also have compromised the evaluation of stucco in comparisons to marble sculpture and its economic value (see chapter 4). Therefore, Serbian examples will be used only as comparisons to the case-studies included in the catalogue (Appendix A), and a selection of those from the most important Serbian buildings is included in Appendix B. The majority of the data discussed thus comes from Constantinople, Anatolia and Greece.

Finally, it is crucial to underline that all of the material evidence discussed in the following pages comes from religious buildings. The lack of examples in secular architecture is due to the scarcity of information about the decoration of private houses and non-religious public buildings that affects the knowledge of Byzantine sculpture and architecture for the period examined in this thesis.

Another important note concerns a category of architectural elements made of plaster which are almost omnipresent in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings: window transennae. Plaster window transennae were a widespread element in both Middle and Late Byzantine architecture and continued to be used in the Ottoman period. They were a widespread element in the Medieval West and in Islamic architecture too, even though artisans modelled them in

different shapes.⁴⁰ They were probably worked by artisans involved in glass production, since the act of casting and modelling the transennae was contemporary to the insertion of glass panes.⁴¹ Therefore, it seems plausible that transennae were produced in the same workshops as glass panes were made. It is true that the design of the transennae and the light they filtered definitively shaped the experience of the Byzantine visitor into a building and, therefore, belonged to the decorative apparatus which also included stucco reliefs, marble sculpture, mosaics, and wall paintings.⁴² Nevertheless, the evaluation of window transennae requires a different approach than wall stucco, due to the technical differences noted above, and to their widespread presence in Byzantine architecture from the Middle Byzantine period onwards. I have therefore omitted transennae from this thesis, but the reader can find a snapshot of their diffusion in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings and their most common shapes in Appendix C. Despite their omission from the catalogue and more general discussion in this thesis, it is worth emphasising that transennae provide a compelling demonstration that stucco continued to be widely produced and used across the Middle and Late Byzantine periods, though, as just noted, they were not normally made by the artisans responsible for the bulk of Byzantine interior decoration.

What emerges from the analysis of the census of Middle and Late Byzantine stucco decorations (Appendix A) can be summarised into three main points:

- a) The relationship with sculpture. Stucco decorations were modelled in accordance with the same typologies of architectural decorations as those made of marble and stone,

⁴⁰ On stucco window transennae between the fifth and twelfth centuries in the Mediterranean and Europe (material evidence and written sources), see Dell'Acqua 2003a, 13, 22, 25, 44, 45, 50, 52, 53, 54, 69, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 120, 121, 136, 137, 138, 165, 167, 168. For the use of stucco window transennae in Rome and Lazio (ninth -eleventh centuries), see Pasquini 2001, 80-83.

⁴¹ On the production of plaster window transennae in Byzantium, see Papadopoulou 2006, 345-348; Dell'Acqua 2016, 341-342, 344.

⁴² On the role of glass and window transennae both in the West and in Byzantium see Ousterhout 1999, 151-156; Dell'Acqua 2003a; Dell'Acqua 2003b; Dell'Acqua 2004; Dell'Acqua 2005; Dell'Acqua 2016; Nesbitt 2012; Nesbitt 2013.

although there were a few exceptions, which do not find any comparators in marble sculpture.

- b) The experimental quality of stucco. The main feature of stucco decorations was their rich ornamentation and the experimentalism in creating new combinations of decorative patterns (e.g. the stuccoes on Mount Athos, and in the Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres). Stucco appeared to be the best material for trying new solutions, since it can be worked more quickly and easily than marble;⁴³ moreover, it is lighter than the latter and allows for richer compositions to be placed higher in the buildings.
- c) The aesthetic value of stucco. The decorative apparatus of Middle and Late Byzantine buildings was composed of diverse materials (media) which were used to answer aesthetic, not only economic and functional needs. Stucco was among them, and its use appears to be congenial to the building of the aesthetic experience of wonder (*thauma*) in the viewer generated by the richness and variety of the interior decoration. The imitative aspect of stucco allowed the creation of reliefs which could resemble marble, and sometimes jewels (when covered in gold leaf), but also its malleability allowed artisans to create exceptional decorations which captured the eye of the visitor.⁴⁴

1.3 Backstory: stucco from Imperial Rome to the so-called Transitional period.

To understand the use of stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings, it is crucial to know that this material was used in Mediterranean cultures since the second millennium BCE in Knossos; in Pharaonic Egypt stucco was used for finishing sculptures (e.g. the bust of Nephertiti), monuments and for figural reliefs.⁴⁵ While not favoured by the ancient Greeks, the

⁴³ On the interaction between materials and makers, see Peers 2020, in part. 33-37.

⁴⁴ This topic will be covered more in-depth at the end of the chapter, after having illustrated the variety of decorations made of stucco.

⁴⁵ Lucas 1989, 76-79; Cabiale 2011a.

Etruscans and Romans made abundant use of stucco.⁴⁶ It is especially after the reign of the emperor Augustus that stucco hit its apex. Stucco was used in combination with paintings in figural scenes; at the same time, it was used for marking architectural members in interior decoration, for simulating marble ones, and for covering both flat and arched ceilings (figs. 1.1-1.4).⁴⁷ Both material and textual evidence show the widespread use of stucco. Vitruvius in book V and VII of *De Architectura* (On Architecture) (35-25 BCE) suggested that in public buildings, the cornices at the mid-height of walls should be made with stucco and should be thin and not too thick, otherwise, if they fell, they would be dangerous for the population. He advised the use of stucco for coffered ceilings for the same reason; indeed, the alternative material for them was wood, another 'light' material.⁴⁸ In another passage, Vitruvius returned to the necessity of using stucco or wooden cornices in public buildings in order to facilitate the acoustics, because it was thought that the cornice would have prevented the dispersion of sounds in vast and high ceilings.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ Cabiale 2011a, 320; Cenci et al. 2013.

⁴⁷ Giuliani 2010, 63-64; Cenci et al. 2013.

⁴⁸ «[...] Cum camarae politae fuerint, sub eas coronae sunt subiciendae, quam maxime tenues et subtiles oportere fieri videbitur; cum enim grandes sunt, pondere deducuntur nec possunt se sustinere. in hisque minime gypsum debet admisceri, sed excreto marmore uno tenore perducere, uti ne praecipiendo non patiaturo uno tenore opus inarescere. Etiamque cavendae sunt in camaris priscorum dispositiones, quod earum planitiae coronarum gravi pondere inpendentes sunt periculosae.» Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, VII, III. 3 (p. 369-370). «After the vaultings have been polished, set the impost mouldings directly beneath them. These obviously ought to be made extremely slender and delicate, for when they are large, their weight carries them down, and they cannot support themselves. Gypsum should by no means be used in their composition, but powdered marble should be laid on uniformly, lest gypsum, by setting too quickly should keep the work from drying uniformly. We must also beware of the ancients' scheme for vaultings; for in their mouldings the soffits overhang very heavily and are dangerous» English translation in Morgan 1914. For a discussion about the chronology of the *De Architectura*, see Maggi 2002, 15-17.

⁴⁹ «Praetera precigendi sunt parietes medii coronis ex intestino opere aut albario ad dimidiam partem altitudinis, quae si non erunt, vox ibi disputantium elata in altitudinem intellectu non poterit esse audientibus. Cum autem coronis praecincti partietes erunt, vox ab imis morata, priusquam in aere elata dissipatur, auribus erit intellecta.» Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, V, II. 2. «Further, the inside walls should be girdled, at a point halfway up their height, with coronae made of woodwork or of stucco. Without these, the voice of men engaged in discussion there will be carried up to the height above, and so be unintelligible to their listeners. But when the walls are girdled with coronae, the voice from below, being detained before rising and becoming lost in the air, will be intelligible to the ear.» English translation in Morgan 1914.

This acoustic value of the stucco and wooden cornices has not been confirmed by current audiometric experiments in Late Antique and Early Byzantine buildings, but does not exclude *a priori* the possibility that this was the reason behind the use of stucco and wooden string-course cornices.⁵⁰

From the Imperial period (1st BCE-1st CE) to Justinian (527-565)

Stucco was used in private and funerary architecture to create refined low reliefs with narrative scenes framed by panels, as can be seen, for example, in the stuccoes from the so-called Villa Farnesina (first century BCE) now at the museum of Palazzo Massimo in Rome (fig. 1.4),⁵¹ in the Underground Basilica near Porta Maggiore in Rome (first century CE) (figs. 1.5-1.6),⁵² and in the tombs on the via Latina (e.g. Tomb of the Valerii, and of the Pancratii) (figs. 1.7-1.8).⁵³ In all these cases, we can see a close interaction between the wall paintings and the stuccoes.⁵⁴

The interior elevation of public buildings from the Imperial to the Tetrarchic periods showed a richer architectural decoration than what we have seen before: the elevation was packed with columns, semi-columns, architraves, niches, and corbels which were made of both marble and stucco (e.g. the mausoleum of Diocletian in Split).⁵⁵ The use of stucco was congenial to the taste for walls animated with reliefs and recesses combined with *opus sectile* and marble sculptures. This taste lasted until the beginning of the fourth century and saw the frequent use of stucco for coffered ceilings. Some examples are the coffered ceilings covered in stucco (in the lateral apses and the main apse), probably gilded, made for the restoration of

⁵⁰ I thank Gianluca Foschi (Newcastle University) for the communication about the current experiments carried out in the churches of Ravenna for the ‘The Role of Musical Proportions in Early Christian Buildings’ project.

⁵¹ Sanzi Di Mino 1998.

⁵² Carcopino 1943; Aurigemma 1961, 19-27; North 2012; Seri 2016.

⁵³ Interdonato 2018.

⁵⁴ Cagnana 2000, 145-149;

⁵⁵ Guidobaldi, Pedone 2011, 40-103.

the temple of Venus and Rome in the Roman Forum by Maxentius (306-312) (fig. 1.9),⁵⁶ and the ceiling in the so-called Villa di Massenzio on the via Appia (beginning of the fourth century).⁵⁷

As several scholars have already noted, the architectural choices of Constantine the Great often reflected the desire to mark his presence.⁵⁸ These architectural choices also influenced the use of stucco. Indeed, buildings erected from his reign to the second-half of the fourth century show a tendency towards new solutions which resulted in the elimination of the rich architectural wall decoration, with the exception of niches, in favour of continuous surfaces covered in mosaic and *opus sectile* (e.g. the mausoleum of Constantina in Rome and the monumental aula of the so-called Temple of Minerva Medica).⁵⁹ Niches, architraves and cornices left space for the extensive use of *incrustationes* (incrustations), mosaics, and paintings. The alternation of solids and voids which created chiaroscuro effects were generally limited to coffered ceilings, as probably in the imperial palace of Daphne in Constantinople.⁶⁰ The lack of interest recorded for the architectural decoration in the interiors in the Constantinian period corresponded to a decrease in the number of stucco architectural decorations too, especially in Rome, where these trends would continue until the first half of the fifth century⁶¹. Nevertheless, in the fifth century, Ravenna already showed a renewed interest in architectural

⁵⁶ Ranaldi 1991; Carè 2005; Guidobaldi, Pedone 2011, 106.

⁵⁷ Guidobaldi, Pedone 2011, 70, 106, fig. 31.

⁵⁸ This concept was argued by Krautheimer: Krautheimer 1980, 3-57; and it is considered still valid by recent works: Andaloro 2006, 37-52; Guidobaldi, Pedone 2011, 35-162; Guidobaldi 2016.

⁵⁹ Guidobaldi, Pedone 2011, in part. 105-109. On the interior decoration of the so-called 'Temple of Minerva Medica', see Barrano 2019.

⁶⁰ « [...] Indeed, so large a measure of Divine love possessed the emperor's soul, that in the principal apartment of the imperial palace itself, on a vast tablet displayed in the centre of its gold-covered panelled ceiling, he caused the symbol of our Saviour's Passion to be fixed, composed of a variety of precious stones richly inwrought with gold. [...] » English translation Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, Book III, ch. 49. On the interpretation of the passage of Eusebius, see Cantino Wataghin, 2006; Guidobaldi suggested that the polyvalence of the language used by Eusebius might suggest that such coffered ceilings were of gilded stucco and not only of wood Guidobaldi, Pedone 2011, 98.

⁶¹ Guidobaldi, Pedone 2011, 115-116.

decoration in relief, as can be appreciated in the Baptistry of the Orthodox, where at the level of the windows a series of colonnettes, arches, and *ediculae* framing prophets made of stucco (fig. 1.10) emerged from the flat elevation covered by marble plaques and mosaic. In the Eastern Roman empire, already under the emperor Theodosios II (408-450), the use of architectural sculpture returned, as can be noted in the second phase of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.⁶² This is probably connected to the continuous production of marble sculpture in Constantinople, while Rome had already started the process of re-use of previous sculptures.⁶³ The mid-fifth century has been defined as period in which both the trends initiated under Constantine and the more traditional articulation of the elevations by means of architectural sculpture co-existed.⁶⁴

Cyprus between the fifth and sixth centuries showed a widespread use of stucco both in private and in religious buildings. Some well-known examples are those from the so-called *huillerie* at Salamis-Konstantia (late fifth century) (figs. 1.11, 4.1), the basilica on the acropolis of Amathounta (fifth century), and the church of the Panagia Angeloktistos at Kiti (sixth century).⁶⁵ In most of the cases, gypsum-based stucco was used for marking the interior elevation with arches, cornices, and capitals. In the Early Byzantine period, the widespread use of stucco narrative friezes and inhabited capitals, even for religious buildings, is confirmed by a letter of Nilos of Ankyra (+ 430), who instructed the prefect Olympiodorus not to decorate his church with beasts and birds made of stucco, but with crosses instead.⁶⁶

⁶² Schneider 1941; Deichmann 1956, 63-68; Mathews 1971; Russo 2009; Russo 2010, 19-34; Taddei 2017, 161-228.

⁶³ Barsanti 1990; Brandenburg 2003, 254-255.

⁶⁴ Guidobaldi, Pedone 2011, 138-139.

⁶⁵ For the so-called 'huillerie' at Salamis, see: Argoud *at al.* 1980. For the basilica on the acropolis of Amathounta see Panayides 2018, 223, fig. 45. For the mention of the mouldings and of a capital in the Panagia Angeloktistos in Kiti see: Karageorghis 1962, 295-297; for an updated bibliography on the copious Late Antique stuccowork in Cyprus, see Rautman 2003, 46-47.

⁶⁶ «[...] καὶ θήρας ζώων (5) παντοίας τοὺς τοίχους πληῖσαι, τοὺς τε ἐκ δεξιῶν, τοὺς τε ἐξ ἐναντύμων, ὥστε βλέπεσθαι κατὰ μὲν τὴν χέρσον ἐκτεινόμενα λίνα, καὶ λαγωοὺς, καὶ δορκάδας, καὶ τὰς ἐξῆς φεύγοντα ζῶα, τοὺς δὲ θηρᾶσαι σπεύδοντας, σὺν τοῖς κυνιδίοις ἐκθύμως διώκοντας· κατὰ δοντας, σὺν τοῖς κυνιδίοις ἐκθύμως διώκοντας· κατὰ δὲ τὴν θάλατταν χαλῶμενα δίκτυα, καὶ πᾶν γένος ἰχθύων ἀλιευόμενα, καὶ εἰς τὴν ξηρὰν ἐξαγόμενα χερσὶν ἀλιευτικαῖς· καὶ προσέτι γυψοπλασίας πᾶν εἶδος ἐκφᾶναι δεικνύμενον, πρὸς ἡδονὴν ὀφθαλμῶν

From the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century, the interior wall recovered its sculptural and architectural quality and stucco returned to its former importance, although often flanked by surfaces covered in mosaics or *opus sectile*.⁶⁷ Architecture under the reign of the emperor Justinian returned to a taste for *chiaroscuro* effects in the elevation by means of entablatures, cornices and columns showing experimentalism in new typologies of architectural decorations and iconographies. Buildings in Constantinople, Ravenna, and Istria show this renewed interest in elaborated sculpture for the articulation of the walls through cornices, arches, and architraves. In Constantinople this articulation of the interior elevation can be recorded, for example, in the churches of H. Ioannes of Studion (ca 450), H. Polyeuktos (ca 524-527), H. Sergios and Bakchos (527-536), and Hagia Sophia (532-537). In the latter building, stucco cornices marked the passage between the *opus sectile* and the mosaics on the walls (figs. 1.17-1.21).⁶⁸ Outside the capital, stucco appeared at the Euphrasian basilica in Poreč (ca 550) (figs. 1.14-1.15)⁶⁹ and S. Vitale in Ravenna (532-536) (figs. 1.12-1.13).⁷⁰ Sometimes the use of stucco betrayed Sasanian influence.⁷¹ A good example is the vault of the exonarthex of the church of S. Vitale in Ravenna (fig. 1.12): the vegetal scroll and the squares with plane

ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ κοινῷ οἴκῳ χιλίους σταυροὺς πῆξασθαι, καὶ ἱστορίας πτηνῶν καὶ κτηνῶν, καὶ ἐρπετῶν, καὶ βλαστημάτων παντοδαπῶν. » *PG*, vol. 79, 577-580.

«[...] to fill the walls, those on the right and those on the left, with all kinds of animals hunt so that one might see snares being stretched on the ground, fleeing animals, such as hares, gazelles and others, while the hunters, eager to capture them, pursue them with their dogs; and also nets being lowered into the sea, and every kind of fish being caught and carried on shore by the hands of the fishermen; and, furthermore, to exhibit a variety of stucco work so as to delight the eye in God's house; and lastly, to set up in the nave a thousand crosses and the pictures of different birds and beasts, reptiles and plants. In answer to your inquiry may I say that it would be childish and infantile to distract the eyes of the faithful with the aforementioned [trivialities].» English translation Mango 1972, 32-33.

⁶⁷ Guidobaldi, Pedone 2011, 110-153.

⁶⁸ For the stuccoes in the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (original and restorations), see Hawkins 1964; Guiglia, Barsanti 2012; Pedone 2013; Barsanti, Guiglia 2014; Niewöhner, Teteriatnikov 2015.

⁶⁹ On the stuccoes of Poreč, see Pasquini 2002, 54-62 and bibliography quoted there.

⁷⁰ On the stuccoes of S. Vitale, see Pasquini 2002, 40-50, figs 53, 54, 58, 61, 65, 67-72, 76, 78-79, 89-91, 93-95, 106-110, in part. 40 n. 153 for further bibliography.

⁷¹ Pasquini 2002, 40-49. On Sassanian stucco, see Kröger 1982. Exchange between Byzantine and Sassanian art is a complex phenomenon which does not involve only stucco decoration. For word limit I quote only the bibliography concerned with stucco.

leaves invade the entire barrel vault of the exonarthex transfiguring the wall through the rhythmic repetition of the motifs. In this period, in fact, the Sasanian contribution started to become more visible in Byzantine art in different media (e.g. the church of H. Polyeuktos in Constantinople). The visual culture of the Byzantine empire, which at this stage was still a Late Antique culture, absorbed such influences within the Late Antique ‘grammar of ornament’, with some exceptions, such as the exonarthex of S. Vitale where the ornament modelled in stucco invades the vault in a way more similar to Sassanian stucco rather than Late Roman ones.⁷²

Post-Justinianic architecture.

Stucco elements are more difficult to find in post-Justinian architecture than in the previous periods, and in general in the seventh and eighth centuries. This is due to a lack of material evidence for both architecture and sculpture.⁷³ Among the few examples of stucco production, there are the capitals of the heart-shaped pillars in the basilica of H. Demetrios in Thessaloniki recently dated by Bauer to the seventh century (fig. 1.22).⁷⁴ The rural basilica at Kalavassos-Syrma (Cyprus) had stucco reliefs which included a figural low relief with the enthroned Virgin and the blessing Child on her lap (late sixth-beginning of the seventh century) (fig. 1.23).⁷⁵ Cyprus seems an exception when compared with the rest of the Byzantine

⁷² Traditionally, scholars considered the Sassanian use of stucco as a mean to hide the architectural surface and transfigure it, see Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001; recently Wolf 2016. See also chapter 5 in this thesis.

⁷³ While architecture provided some buildings dated to the seventh century, the sculpture of this period has never been systematically investigated. A recent study of the evolution of the entablature from the fourth to the seventh century is in Niewöhner 2017; however, for an evaluation of the architectural sculpture in the seventh century see the unpublished thesis of Di Bello 2015.

⁷⁴ Bauer 2013, 106, n. 97, fig. 66. On the basilica of H. Demetrios, see also Sotiriou and Sotiriou 1952; Farioli 1964.

⁷⁵ Panayides 2018, 224, fig. 47.

heartland. Here, gypsum and stucco reliefs were widespread since the Hellenistic period probably due to local absence of marble.⁷⁶

1.4 Stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings (9th-15th c.).

The data emerging from the census shows that, after a gap roughly corresponding to the seventh and eighth centuries, it is possible to start to record stucco elements from the ninth century onwards. The first are a frieze found in the area of the Boukoleon palace area in Constantinople (cat. No. 1), and, possibly, a fragmentary panel from the Middle Byzantine basilica in Hagios Charalambos (Maroneia, Thrace) (cat. No. 6). From the tenth century onwards, it is possible to appreciate an increase in the number of stucco elements, with a peak in the twelfth century. The thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are remarkable for the variety of shapes of stucco decorations and techniques which go from free-standing liturgical furnishings to mortar-based friezes.

The Middle and Late Byzantine periods differ from the Late Antique period in the almost exclusive use of stucco for architectural decorative elements. Human figures and narrative scenes also seem to disappear, in contrast with the Imperial and the Early Byzantine periods where, as we have seen, low and high relief figures animated the walls of the Farnesina in Rome, the Orthodox Baptistry in Ravenna and the Basilica in Kalavassos-Syrmia in Cyprus. The Roman examples show a symbiosis between painting and stucco through the creation of wall-paintings with low reliefs figures (figs. 1.1-1.8). This symbiosis cannot be recorded in Byzantium after the seventh century until the Late Byzantine period, when decorations of the

⁷⁶ This aspect will be further analysed in chapter 4.

haloes ‘a pastiglia’ started to be used. These consisted in making the halo and its internal ornament in relief (figs. 1.24-1.25).⁷⁷

However, written sources testify to the continuous use of human images made of stucco in aristocratic domestic context. Theodore Balsamon, in the comment on canon 100 of the council of Trullo, written in the 1170s, complained about the rich who decorated their houses with painted scenes of erotes and human figures made of stucco.⁷⁸ Balsamon does not explain whether such images were a relief component of mural paintings, whether they formed scenes in low relief, or if they were free-standing statues. The first two possibilities are the more plausible, since he referred to painting just before mentioning the stucco images.⁷⁹ Indeed, three-dimensional statues fell out of use after the seventh or eighth century.⁸⁰ Though there is no other known textual or material evidence, the testimony of Balsamon makes it plausible that human figures continued to be used, at least in private houses, showing a pattern of continuity with the Late Antique tradition. Another use of stucco in Imperial and Late Antique interior decoration was for the construction of coffered ceilings, but these seem to disappear from the material and textual evidence of the Middle and Late Byzantine periods.⁸¹

⁷⁷ Decoration ‘a pastiglia’ was set also for cornices and details of the garments. It is described by Cennino Cennini for Italian paintings: Cennino Cennini, *Il Libro dell’Arte*, ch. 19. On the use of the ‘a pastiglia’ technique on icons in Cyprus see the recent contribution of Meyer-Fernandez 2018. For Naxos see Kostarelli 2017.

⁷⁸ «[...] Σημείωσαι τοῦτο· παρά γάρ οἱκοις πλουσίων τινῶν, οὐ μόνον γραφαί τοιαῦται, καί ταῦτα χρυσόπαστοι, μετὰ πάσης σχημοσύνης ἐξεικονίζονται, ἀλλὰ καί διὰ γυψίνων κατασκευασμάτων στηλογραφοῦνται ἀνθρωπόμορφα εἰκονίσματα», *PG*, 138: 862. «[...] Note this also: in the houses of some rich, not only are such paintings (even gilded ones) indecorously represented, but human forms made of stucco are also set up» English translation from Mango 1972, 234. The word ‘indecorous’ is also problematic. It can be used for both erotic scenes but also pagan scenes. In fact, indecorous images adorned the walls of the house of Alexios Axouch, *protostator*, which represented the military campaign of the Seljuk sultan Kilidj Arslān II, instead of those of Manuel II, his emperor, see Hunt 1984, 138; Magdalino 1984, 92-111. Thus, the category ‘indecorous’ is an umbrella which embraced several concepts.

⁷⁹ Mango 1972, 234.

⁸⁰ This is particularly evident in honorary monuments. After the seventh century there are no marble statues used for honorary monuments. Di Bello recently suggested that the capitals with monograms gradually substituted the statue of the emperors, as in the monument of Fokas in Afyon, see Asutay 2002; Di Bello 2020.

⁸¹ Generally, written sources do not describe ceilings covered in stucco. An ambiguous passage is the one of Nicholas Mesarites about the palace of Mouchroutas, which will be analysed in chapter 5.

1.5 Typologies of architectural decoration and their ornament in Middle and Late Byzantine stucco.

As we have just seen, in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods stucco and plaster reliefs were mainly deputed to architectural ornamentation. The most common element recorded is proskynetaria frames (in fifteenth buildings) followed by cornices, friezes and corbels (recorded in twelfth buildings). Stucco was also used for framing entrances, windows and tombs. As in Late Antique buildings, stucco was used for underlining the architectural structure of the interior by mean of cornices and friezes. Nevertheless, from the Middle Byzantine period, stucco begun to be used for different architectural elements resulting from new liturgical and community needs. Single elements of the liturgical barrier (from now onwards called a ‘templon’) such as free-standing epistyles, posts, colonnettes, panels, and frames of the proskynetaria icons could be made of stucco.⁸² Free-standing structures found particular fortune in thirteenth and fourteenth-century Epiros, even though there are some antecedents in Cyprus in the eleventh century and possibly even in the seventh century.⁸³

To sum up, the architectural decorations which will be analysed in the following sections are: cornices, friezes and corbels, arched slabs, arches, colonnettes and posts, capitals, epistyles, proskynetaria frames, and a canopy. The typologies are varied, and they testify the diverse use of stucco.

Each architectural decoration has an introduction with a brief explanation of the types of objects, followed by the ornamentation recorded on them. However, friezes, corbels, and

⁸² On parts of templa made of stucco, see Kalopissi-Verti 2006; Papadopoulou 2006; Vanderheyde 2005, 83-84, 105-106. For a more detailed bibliography, see later paragraphs 1.10-1.14.

⁸³ A more detailed analysis is in chapter 4. For the seventh-century examples, see Maguire 2012, 179; for the eleventh century in the church of St. Nicholas of the Roof, see Stylianou, Stylianou 1997, 65; Rautman 2003, 46-47; Megaw 1974 80 n. 95.

arches made of stucco shared the same ornamental repertoire, and for this reason they will be discussed together after the sections on these types of decorations and not individually.

1.6 Cornices, friezes, and corbels

The first types of stucco ornaments to analyse are cornices, friezes, and corbels. Cornices made of marble and stone were used in Byzantine architecture for dividing the exterior and the interior elevation into horizontal and vertical sections by marking the mid-height of the walls, the springing of the vaults and the domes, and by framing windows. A cornice could have a load-bearing function and be composed by a conch or by several blocks joined together by iron clamps which were partially inserted into the masonry and had a protruding part visible to the observer (fig. 1.26).⁸⁴ This visible part was decorated (painted, carved in relief, or *enchamplevé*) (fig. 1.27). Alternatively, a cornice could have only an aesthetic value that worked as a visual device by dividing the elevation of the building into horizontal sections, which were decorated with paintings, mosaics, or opus sectile. In this case, the cornice was made of plaques attached to the wall with nails (fig. 1.28), architectural ceramics, or stucco.⁸⁵

Thus, a stucco cornice was not inserted into the masonry, but was a revetment. The plaster could cover a load-bearing cornice which in some cases was roughly carved or had a standard shape (e.g. a bevelled fillet cornice),⁸⁶ while in other cases, the plaster cornice was attached directly to the masonry through various devices such as tiles (for technique aspects see chapter 2).

Stucco cornices could have carved or moulded ornamentation (fig. 1.36) or be made of mortar shaped as standard cornices (e.g. cavetto, bevelled fillet profile). In both cases they were

⁸⁴ For a discussion about the role of cornices in Byzantine architecture see Müller-Wiener 1977, 188-89; Butler 1992; Ousterhout 1999, 212-214.

⁸⁵ For tiles used as cornices, see Mundell-Mango 2001, 33-40.

⁸⁶ The latter case was suggested for the Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres (cat. No. 7.2).

polychrome. However, the latter differ from the first option because they do not have their ornamentation in relief; these are widespread in Late Byzantine architecture and especially in buildings with predominant wall painting decoration and few sculpted elements. Some examples are in the katholikon of the Vatopedi monastery (the cornice at the base of the windows of the ground floor, the cornice at the springing of the vaults and at the base of the dome) (fig. 1.29), the semi-circular cornices on the pillars of the church of Resava (fig. 1.30), and the church of the Panagia at Archathos in Naxos (fig. 1.31). I will not include these examples in the evaluation of stucco cornices, because their iconography is difficult to authenticate. In most cases they have been repainted several times, and the layer of paint visible today does not belong to the Middle or Late Byzantine phase, making the analysis of the decorative patterns impossible.⁸⁷

However, with this observation, I do not intend to exclude this category from the study of Byzantine art. They demand to be evaluated within the broader context of the development of Byzantine architecture in the Late Byzantine period and the gradual reduction of sculpture (and artisans involved in the decoration of a building), especially in rural contexts, which is too broad for the scope of this thesis.⁸⁸ Nevertheless, a methodological approach for the study of such cornices may benefit from the observations made on the proskynetaria frames later in this chapter (paragraph 1.13).⁸⁹

The buildings where stucco cornices have been recorded are: the katholikon of the Vatopedi monastery on Mount Athos (cat. No. 10.1), the church of the Virgin and the katholikon of the monastery of Hosios Loukas (cat. Nos. 19.1-19.2, 20.1-20.4), the katholikon

⁸⁷ This is the case, for example, of three of the cornices in the katholikon of Vatopedi, Pazaras 2001a, 58-63.

⁸⁸ Some insights into the development of a Late Byzantine painters and their ability in working stucco are in chapter 4.4.

⁸⁹ These cornices have not been discussed in publications concerned with Byzantine sculpture, nor in analyses of ornament.

of the monastery of Daphni (cat. No. 21), the church of the Virgin in Peshkëpi e Sipërme in Albania (cat. No. 27.8.), the church of the Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres (cat. No. 7.2), and in the church of the Kato Panagia in Arta (cat. No. 14.5). Among them, there are some elements which are catalogued as frieze, which means that it is not possible to attribute them with certainty to cornices, but they share the same ornamental patterns. They come from: the room excavated in 1983 in the area of the Boukoleon Palace in Istanbul (cat No. 1), the Odalar Camii in Istanbul (cat. No. 2), the ornamental bands flanking the windows of the *liti* in the katholikon of Vatopedi (cat. No. 10.4), and some fragments from the church of the Virgin at Peshkëpi e Sipërme in Albania (cat. Nos. 27.1, 27.6).

The second typology of stucco decorations is corbels. Corbels are trapezoidal blocks made of marble or stone which are located at the springing of the arches; they have a load-bearing function, being inserted into the masonry, but they also have a visible part which can be carved, painted, or covered by plaster reliefs. As for the cornices, when a corbel is ‘made of stucco’ this means that the stucco is the revetment which was applied and modelled on the rough surface of the stone corbel, as in the katholikon of Hosios Loukas (cat. No. 20.5). In this case, the presence of the same decoration in corbels and cornices provides consistency to the building interior.

Both corbels and cornices made of stucco usually mark the transition from vertical to curved surfaces, usually being at the springing of arches, squinches and at the base of domes. In the katholikon of Hosios Loukas, they are also the transitional elements between the marble wall revetment and the mosaics. This use finds a direct comparison in Early Byzantine buildings such as the sixth-century Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and the Archbishop chapel in Ravenna (494-518). This is particularly relevant because it testifies to the continuation of aesthetic practices from Antiquity to the Middle Byzantine period. Since the time of Vitruvius,

as we have seen, stucco cornices were located at the mid-height of the walls and at vaults. The Early Byzantine examples from Ravenna and Constantinople seem to further canonise this use of stucco as a ‘transitional material’, congenial to the change of media on wall revetment, in particular from opus sectile to mosaic. This use of stucco can also be explained by the degree of improvisation that the medium provides to the artisan. Indeed, with stucco it is possible to cover anomalies of the surface, and irregular edges of the marble and mosaic revetments more easily than with a marble cornice, due to the tools employed and the lower level of preparatory planning involved.⁹⁰

1.7 Arches

Arches made of stucco have been recorded for the katholika of the monasteries of Vatopedi (after the beginning of eleventh century) (cat. Nos. 10.2-10.3) and Iviron, on Mount Athos (1022-1066) (cat. Nos. 11.1-11.2), in the church of the Taxiarches in Kostaniane (mid-thirteenth century) (cat. Nos. 13.2-13.3) and the church of the Koimesis of Petrobitsa (end of the thirteenth century) (cat. No. 16.3), both in Epiros.⁹¹ The church of the so-called Timios Stavros monastery near Mustafapaşa (Cappadocia) (cat. No. 5) will be discussed separately, because its fragmentary condition does not allow for a secure identification of the original type of decoration.

Arches made of stucco were decorative and did not have any load-bearing function. They were mainly used as framing devices in different parts of the churches: they framed bilobed and arched windows (Vatopedi), a tomb (Iviron), and they marked the entrance from

⁹⁰ See chapter 2 on stucco production.

⁹¹ Papadopoulou suggested that the pieces labelled from the church of the Koimesis in Petrobitsa may also come from the nearby church of St. John the Baptist which is located near Petrobitsa and had a Byzantine phase. This hypothesis should not be discarded since the arrival of the pieces to the Byzantine museum of Ioannina is not well-documented. However, Papadopoulou only mentioned this possibility without exploring it in-depth. Papadopoulou 2006, 348-350 n. 70; Papadopoulou 1988.

the narthex to the naos (Ivion). The arches of Vatopedi and Ivion rest on colonnettes while those from Kostaniane and Petrobitsa are fragmentary and it is impossible to know whether they had capitals at the extremities.

The decoration of the stucco arches recorded follows the conventions of the cornices and corbels, and for this reason I will analyse their ornamentation in the next section. However, there is one exception. Unlike cornices, friezes, and corbels, the arches analysed here are never decorated with acanthus leaves. There is a preference for scrolls (palmettes and half-palmettes), interlocking circles with rosettes, heart-shaped palmettes with interlocking extremities, and braid interlace. The arches in Vatopedi and Ivion are composed of two bands where the upper one is thinner but more protruding than the lower, while one of the arches from Kostaniane (cat. No. 13.2) is differentiated into several parts: the front was decorated with a braid motif which marked the profile of the arch and the rest seems now unfinished but it was perhaps painted; the soffit of the arch is carved with heart-shaped palmettes. The organisation of the ornament on the arches resembles sculpted examples. Indeed, the arches in the templa in Mani are round arches composed of one band or two, but they do not show any carvings in the soffit. The decoration on the soffits of decorative arches is in general rare, it does not appear on proskynetaria soffits either.⁹² The presence of decoration on the soffit of the arch of Kostaniane may suggest that the arch marked a threshold, either the entrance to the bema, a chapel, or a door. The other arch from the same church is simply decorated on the front with a stylised half-palmette scroll, a motif common on both cornices and arches. The specific type of half-palmette scroll employed here can be found in the other fragments of

⁹² The original function of the piece as proskynetaria can, I believe, be excluded, because of the dimension of the arch (see cat. No. 13.2, fig. 5). Moreover, there are not any sign of pins or nails on the walls of the church, nor any space left for such a big cornice in the mural paintings. However, the restoration campaign of the wall paintings of the church ended this year, so I am waiting for their results to verify if there is any sign on the wall paintings of the arches.

stucco from thirteenth-century Epiros, but it cannot be found in marble sculpture of the same region. The consistency in style and types of decorative patterns on stucco templa in Epiros during the thirteenth century was connected to the use of the same stamps by the artisans.⁹³

The last piece is the fragmentary stuccowork on the front of the big arch in third aisle of the so-called Timios Stavros monastery (fig. 1.32), possibly an arch or an arched slab, currently unpublished, which I suggest dates to the Middle Byzantine period, around the tenth century.⁹⁴ In terms of style and ornamentation of the stucco, there is possibly a Middle Byzantine chronology for the stucco. The use of vegetal motifs, in this case, a scroll, is known for arches and arched slabs in sculpture, paintings, and stucco (see Vatopedi and Iviron). In Cappadocia, painted scrolls were used both to mark arches and to fill triangular areas (figs. 1.33-35). Whether the ornament was part of an arch or an arched slab, it is impossible to say. On the one hand the lacuna in the plaster above means we cannot guess its original shape, and on the other hand the ornamental repertoire of Cappadocian paintings shows the use of scrolls for both arches and arched slabs.

1.8 Cornices, friezes, corbels, and arches: analysis of the ornamental patterns.

The ornamental repertoire of the stucco cornices, friezes, corbels, and arches is very similar, and also shares a hierarchy of decorative motifs. Occasionally, proskynetaria frames and arched slabs will be mentioned as comparative examples since they have similar iconographies on the front of the arch or on the upper cornice.

These types of stucco decorations usually had a central band decorated with vegetal motifs and were often framed, in the upper and lower parts, by smaller fillets with geometric

⁹³ Vanderheyde 2005, 85; Papadopoulou 2006, 345-348.

⁹⁴ Further discussion on the chronology of the piece is in chapter 2 and chapter 3.

motifs such as interlaces, cubes, bead-and-reel, and rope-like ornaments. These motifs could be combined in the same cornice or arch; however, most of the geometrical ornaments, with the exception of basket-like motifs, were used for the smaller bands and not for the central one. I will analyse first the vegetal motifs and then the geometric ones in order to detect the source of inspiration for such iconographies and cross-media connections; this list of decorative motif shows, on the one hand, that stucco elements were often carved and modelled following sculptural models; on the other hand, it shows the freedom of stucco artisans to pick motifs from several media and put them side-by-side, creating very rich effects.

Vegetal patterns

Acanthus leaves and vegetal stems

The main decoration of the corbels, string-course cornice and cornice of the dome of the katholikon (and possibly of the church of the Virgin, see cat. No. 20) of Hosios Loukas is an alternation of acanthus leaves and vegetal stems (fig. 1.36).⁹⁵ This pattern is consistent with the marble door architraves of the katholikon and of the Panagia church and reminds us of classicizing patterns still in use in the Early Byzantine period. Some examples of broad acanthus leaves alternating with lotus leaves or stems appear on fragmentary architraves and imposts dated to the fifth century and preserved in the Byzantine and Christian Museum of Athens (fig. 1.38).⁹⁶ In Hosios Loukas the acanthus leaves became more schematic and flat; the points of the leaves create a sort of eyelet which in the katholikon's stucco and marble cornices are marked by a double incision (fig. 1.37), while in the Panagia by only one incision (as in fifth-century examples) (fig. 1.39).⁹⁷ The stucco cornices and corbels were modelled using patterns

⁹⁵ For the stucco decoration of the church of the Virgin in Hosios Loukas see cat. Nos. 19.1-19.2.

⁹⁶ Sklavou-Mavroidi 1999, 46 no. 42, 58 no. 65, 61 no. 71.

⁹⁷ On the cornices of the Panagia in comparisons with those in marble and stucco from the katholikon, see Boura 1980, 69-70, 95, 109, figs 180-181.

with roots in Classical and Late Antique sculpture too, as the thin band of bead-and-reel and the cube ornament show.⁹⁸ However, in the stucco cornice of the dome of the katholikon of Hosios Loukas, this ‘classical’ design is renewed with Middle Byzantine innovations. The first can be appreciated in the band with an alternation of cubes and ovuli, which is a solution not encountered in Late Antique examples where cubes and ovuli were not mixed together, but usually formed two different bands. The combination of these two motifs appears to me an eleventh-century creation. The second is the protruding openwork bosses, which create a game of low and high relief, which is generally defined as ‘two-level’ sculpture, a trend which appeared in the Middle Byzantine period, and it was used in the templon in the same katholikon of Hosios Loukas (fig. 1.40).⁹⁹ However, the stucco bosses differed from those of the templon of the katholikon, and they find the closest parallels in the lamps from the so-called Sion Treasure (sixth century) now in the Dumbarton Oaks museum (fig. 1.41).¹⁰⁰ Therefore, the ornament of the stucco cornice of the dome of the katholikon of Hosios Loukas is particularly interesting, because it displays features of Middle Byzantine sculpture, but at the same time shows a closer connection with the Early Byzantine past than the rest of the eleventh-century marble sculpture in the same building. This probably suggests a deep knowledge of the Early Byzantine and classical past by the artisans who worked the stucco cornices, but also the ability to refresh and re-invent the tradition by adding new elements (the bosses and the combination of cubes and ovuli which will be discussed later under the section ‘dentils’). Such solutions cannot be appreciated in marble sculpture.

Heart-shaped palmettes and hanging and standing heart-shaped palmettes

⁹⁸ Sklavou-Mavroidi 1999, 46 no. 42, 58 no. 65, 61 no. 71.

⁹⁹ On the definition of two-level sculpture, see Grabar 1976, 24-26; Vanderheyde 2005, 104-105.

¹⁰⁰ Boyd 1992.

These kinds of palmettes were widespread in all media in Byzantium, and stucco was no exception. It can be appreciated in the soffit of the thirteenth-century arch from the church of the Taxiarches in Kostaniane in Epiros, where heart-shaped palmettes with five and six-leaves are carved. In the soffit, the palmettes are within circles created by two interlaced ribbons, in a fashion that can be easily found in Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture, but which finds also close comparisons in the region of Epiros, for example the templon epistyle of the church of the Blachernae monastery near Arta now immured in the narthex's northern façade.¹⁰¹

The use of a plain heart-shaped palmette has just one occurrence in the cornices in this catalogue: that in the katholikon of the Vatopedi monastery, where standing and hanging palmettes connected by horizontal stripes are the main motif (fig. 1.42). This motif can be identified with the 'S-curve' motif recorded by Franz for illuminated manuscripts (fig. 1.43).¹⁰² The palmettes of Vatopedi are extremely rigid, making the identification of the motif very difficult at first glance; they can even be confused with 'S' motifs such as those carved in marble in a different context: the Tempietto Longobardo of Cividale (second half of the eighth century) (fig. 1.46). The closest examples in Byzantine sculpture can be found in the fragmentary epistyle from the church of H. Gregorios at Thebes (871-872) (fig. 1.44),¹⁰³ and in the church of the Koimesis at Skripou (today Orchomenos) (873-874) (fig. 1.45).¹⁰⁴ Therefore, they show that stucco was decorated with the same ornamental repertoire as marble sculpture that can be found in manuscripts, which draws from more generically aniconic decoration common to different media (from marble to textiles to metalworks to architectural ceramics and illuminated manuscripts).

¹⁰¹ Recently on the templon epistyle, Papadopoulou 2015c, 83-96; Melvani 2013, 197 no. 29, fig. 49; Vanderheyde 2005, 79-83.

¹⁰² Franz 1934, 61-63, pl. XIV, XVII n. 20. The motif was also used in architectural ceramics, even though with a more elaborate palmette, see Gerstel, Lauffenburger (ed.) 2001, 290 cat. No. C4.

¹⁰³ Grabar 1963, 95-99, pl. XLIII 1.

¹⁰⁴ Grabar 1963, 90-95, pl. XXXIX-XLII, in part. Pl. XLII 2. More recently, Barsanti 2007, 5-24; Bevilacqua 2011.

Heart-shaped palmettes and stems.

Heart-shaped palmettes and stems can be found in the fragmentary cornices from the narthex of the katholikon of Daphni (fig. 1.47). This motif is widespread in Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture from Anatolia to Greece, as can be appreciated in the lower band of an eleventh-century capital from Bursa (fig. 1.49),¹⁰⁵ in a fragmentary stone epistyle from Amorion (eleventh century) (fig. 1.48),¹⁰⁶ in the lower band framing the panels of the tribunes of S. Marco in Venice (eleventh century),¹⁰⁷ and in Late Byzantine examples such as a corbel from the southern church of Constantine Lips (1290-1300) (fig. 1.50),¹⁰⁸ in the arcosolium of the tomb A in the parekklesion of the Chora church (1316-1321),¹⁰⁹ and finally in the sarcophagus plaque in the church of the Blachernae in Arta (second quarter of the thirteenth century) (fig. 1.51).¹¹⁰ Finally, the motif was also used on the collars of two ceramic colonnettes from Nikomedia (early tenth- mid-eleventh century).¹¹¹ In stucco examples, heart-shaped palmettes and stems are recorded in the upper cornice of the proskynetarion of Nerezi (fig. 1.138). In none of these cases, however, are the palmettes paired with a dentillated moulding. The combination of palmettes with dentils can be found in a marble arch from the monastery of Daphni itself,¹¹² in an epistyle of unknown provenance now in the archaeological museum of Iznik (fig. 1.52),¹¹³ and in a fragmentary arch (proskynetarion?) from Hierapolis (ninth-tenth century).¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁵ Grabar 1976, 43-44 no. 15, pl. X c.

¹⁰⁶ Ivison 2008.

¹⁰⁷ Grabar 1976, 75-76 n. 74, pl. XLIX.

¹⁰⁸ Grabar 1976, 127-129, pl. CI n. 128b; Melvani 2013, 190-191.

¹⁰⁹ Melvani 2013, 191-192 no. 9.

¹¹⁰ Grabar 1976, 145, CXXIV n. 152c; Melvani 2013, 197 no 29, fig. 50; Papadopoulou 2015b, 113-114.

¹¹¹ Gerstel 2008, 20 cat. No. 24.

¹¹² Sklabou Mavroeide 1999, 143 n. 198.

¹¹³ The epistyle is not dated but finds close comparisons with the sculptures of the church of Christ Pantepoptes (now Eski Imaret Camii) in Constantinople and in general with pieces of the eleventh century, see Flaminio 2008, 43 n. 23, fig. 10.

¹¹⁴ Pedone in De Giorgi, Pedone 2019, 385-386, fig. 11a.

Therefore, the motif of the heart-shaped palmettes and stems combined with a dentil band is another sign of the shared ornamental repertoire of stucco and marble sculpture.

Another variation of the heart-shaped palmette and stem is found on the arches of the katholikon of Vatopedi, where the palmettes are connected by a horizontal strip (fig. 1.53). This motif does not find many comparisons in Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture, where it is more common to find the motif of a palmette within circles created by two interlaced ribbons. However, some comparisons with Vatopedi exist and these are the small impost on the capitals of the stucco proskynetarion and the marble epistyle, both from the church of St. Panteleimon in Nerezi (figs. 1.54, 1.139). The stucco and marble sculptures from Nerezi were probably worked by the same people and is revealed by the repetition of motifs. Therefore, even if the version of the pattern in Vatopedi is more schematic than that in Nerezi (the palmettes seems to be enclosed into circles), here we can see again that stucco and marble were decorated according to the same ornamental conventions.

Palmette/half palmette scroll

The palmette and half-palmette scroll is an ornament which was used for decorating bands; in sculpture it can be found on cornices, friezes and arches, but also on epistyles and proskynetaria. Stucco follows these conventions.¹¹⁵ On the basis of the material analysed in this thesis, the palmette scroll on stucco is of two types: the type recorded in Vatopedi (fig. 2.54) and Iviron (fig. 2.57), and a more complicated format such as in the fragment of the epistyle from the Koimesis of Petrobitsa (fig. 1.128). The use of the palmettes scroll is well attested in low relief sculpture and *en-champlevé* (figs. 1.55-1.57), but also in metalwork, in architectural ceramics

¹¹⁵ It is important to note that palmette and half-palmette scrolls were also used to mark the borders of textiles.

(fig. 1.82)¹¹⁶ and illuminated manuscripts of the Middle and Late Byzantine periods.¹¹⁷ The type of scroll from Petrobitsa finds its closest comparisons in the stucco production of the thirteenth and fourteenth-century Epiros and in Middle and Late Byzantine illuminated manuscripts where the scroll starts to become more intricate and includes both palmettes and half-palmettes.¹¹⁸

Half-palmette scrolls are very common in Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture for framing panels and for cornices. Some stucco examples of this motif, even if rendered in different styles, are a cornice from Peshkëpi e Sipërme (cat. No. 27.1, 27.13), and an arch from the church of the Taxiarches in Kostaniani (cat. No. 13.2); the same type of ornaments frieze can be found on the lateral bands of the stucco proskynetarion from Mystras (fig. 1.140) and in the arched slabs from Prespa (cat. No. 8).

The use of palmette and half-palmette scroll in stucco decorations follows the same norms as in other media, that is to place these motifs on horizontal and framing bands.

Rosettes and circles

The rosette-and-circle motif is another pattern recorded in the stucco artefacts analysed. It is composed of a series of circles made by two interlaced ribbons (figs. 1.59, 2.44). In each circle there is a rosette and the space between each circle has some elongated leaves. This motif is not an exclusive of stucco, but finds comparisons in sculpture, paintings, architectural ceramics, and illuminated manuscripts. Some examples are the canon table painted on fol. 5r of codex 155 on Mount Sinai (early eleventh century) (fig. 1.58),¹¹⁹ some fragmentary architectural ceramics from the Topkapı Sarayı Basilica in Istanbul (beginning of the tenth- mid-eleventh

¹¹⁶ Gerstel, Lauffenburger (ed.) 2001, 181 cat. No. II. 18.

¹¹⁷ Franz 1934, 60-63, pl. XIII,

¹¹⁸ For a repertoire of palmette and half-palmette scroll see Franz 1934.

¹¹⁹ Weitzmann, Galavaris 1990, 51, cat. No. 22, pl. LVIII, 119-122, in part. 119.

century) and those now at the Walters Art Museum at Baltimore (beginning of the tenth- mid-eleventh century) (fig. 1. 60).¹²⁰ Again, stucco cornices and friezes were decorated using an aniconic ornamental repertoire which was shared with different media.

Standing and hanging calyx scrolls

This pattern is found in only two buildings: the katholikon of the Vatopedi monastery and the katholikon of the Iviron monastery, both decorated with stucco reliefs between the beginning of the eleventh century and 1066 (figs 1.61-1.62).¹²¹ The calyxes do not find any comparisons in sculpture but only in tenth-century illuminated manuscripts: the Messan. Fondo Vecchio 8, fol. 2v in the Biblioteca Regionale di Messina (beginning of the tenth century) (fig. 1.64),¹²² and the fol. 13r of the codex 417 in the monastery of St. Catherine in Mount Sinai (mid-tenth century) (fig. 1.63).¹²³ This suggests that the artisans who worked stucco in Iviron and Vatopedi enriched their decorative repertoire by studying the patterns found in illuminated manuscripts, of which there were numerous examples on site. The stucco production in these two monasteries is characterised by the variety of sources for their ornamentation and for the types of architectural decorations which span from illuminated manuscripts to architectural ceramic and ivory. The artisans who worked these stuccoes were able to create new solutions by taking inspiration outside of the repertoire of sculpture.

Geometrical patterns

Bead-and-reel

¹²⁰ Gerstel, Lauffenburger (ed.) 2001, 211 cat. No. XII.9, 270 cat. No. A 55.

¹²¹ For a discussion about the chronology of the stuccoes from Vatopedi and Iviron see cat. Nos. 10-11 and chapter 2.7.

¹²² The manuscript was written and decorated between the end of the ninth and the first half of the tenth century probably in Constantinople, see Iacobini, Perria 1998.

¹²³ Weitzmann, Galavaris 1990, 28-31, fig. 32.

This is a very common motif which is continuously used from the Classical period through the Middle Ages. There are several variations where the proportions of the elements change, as in Early Byzantine sculpture, bead-and-reel ornaments continued to be used as a complement of other main motifs. They decorate fillets framing the central band in cornices and arches. The bead-and-reel pattern is recorded in all the stucco cornices and corbels of the katholikon of Hosios Loukas (figs 1.36, cat. No. 20.1, 20.3, 20.5), while it is absent from the marble cornices with the acanthus and stems motif in the same monastery; this is another element which shows that in stucco cornices there was a more classicising language than in marble ones, perhaps because the models for decorating stucco cornices were still anchored to Classical and Early Byzantine examples. A tiny and schematic bead-and-reel band frames the main decoration of the stucco arch of the arcosolium in Ivron (fig. 1.70), as well as the arches of the stucco proskynetaria in the Protaton church on Mount Athos (cat. No. 9.1-9.2), and in the stucco proskynetarion in the Peribleptos church of Mystras (fig. 1.140). A more classicising version can be appreciated in the stucco proskynetarion of the St. Panteleimon church of Nerezi (fig. 1.138), and later in the cornices of the church of the Holy Trinity in the monastery of Sopoćani (1263-1268) (fig. 1.168).¹²⁴ In short, bead-and-reel is a very common motif used in Middle and Late Byzantine stucco, marble sculptures and in any other media as a complement to the main motif which usually occupies a major portion of space.

Dentils

The use of dentils in stucco follows the conventions of marble sculpture, where they mark the tiny bands below or above the main decoration of cornices or arches. In some cases, dentils became an uninterrupted series of cubes, as we can see in the stucco cornice of the katholikon

¹²⁴ See Appendix B for bibliography.

of Daphni (fig. 1.47), in the proskynetaria of the Protaton church (cat. No. 9.1-9.2), and in the arcosolium of the northern tomb in the narthex of the katholikon of Iviron (fig. 1.70).

Dentils can also be re-interpreted, as is the case of the cornice of the dome of the katholikon of Hosios Loukas, where the lower band has a series of dentils alternated with ovuli (fig. 1.36). We have already noted before how artisans in this cornice mixed Classical and Middle Byzantine elements, creating a *unicum*. The fillet with dentils provides us with another example. Indeed, while dentils are very common in entablature of the Early Byzantine period, and there are some examples in the Middle Byzantine sculpture, such as the Koimesis of Skripou (873-874) (fig. 1.65),¹²⁵ the church of the Virgin in the Lips monastery (907) (fig. 1.66),¹²⁶ and a fragmentary arch from the sculptural collection of the monastery of Daphni (eleventh century),¹²⁷ it is very rare if not impossible to find comparisons for fillets where dentils and ovuli were combined together in the same fillet.¹²⁸ Usually, they are on two different fillets. Therefore, it seems to me that in the stucco cornice of Hosios Loukas there is a sort of fusion of dentils and the egg-and-dart motif, which is the product of the stucco artisans playing with the Classical repertoire.

Flutes

This motif is recorded only in the fragment of a frieze from a room excavated in the area of the Boukoleon palace, possibly a small church (cat. No. 1). Mundell-Mango suggested that the cornice might have been decorated with a tongue-and-dart motif or with flutes. I believe that the flutes are a more likely solution because the number of vertical fillets is too large for a

¹²⁵ Papalexandrou 2000; Barsanti 2007, 5-23.

¹²⁶ Grabar 1963, 100-124, pl. XLVII-LVII, in part. pl. XLIX, 3; Macridy 1964, 259; Mango, Hawkins 1964, 306, figs 9-10; Barsanti 2007, 24-30, fig. 18.

¹²⁷ Sklavou-Mavroidi 1999, 145 no. 198.

¹²⁸ For the fragmentary arch from the Daphni monastery see Sklavou-Mavroidi 1999, 145 n. 198.

tongue-and-dart motif. The flutes can have more fillets, as visible on a marble templon epistyle at the Çanakkale museum (fig. 1.68).¹²⁹ Some of the architectural ceramics from the same Boukoleon room catalogued as showing ‘tongue-and-dart’ motif display a closer adherence to this fluting than to ‘tongue-and-dart’ (fig. 1.69) and should be re-categorised. The flutes can be found in marble entablatures and capitals from the fifth to the seventh centuries, while they almost disappear in the Middle and Late Byzantine repertoire.¹³⁰ However, there are a few dated cases which are close to the stucco frieze: the marble cornice in the Fatih Camii (H. Stephanos) at Trilye dated to the ninth century (fig. 1.67) and the cornices and the impost of the capital from the lost church of St. Clement in Ankara.¹³¹ Therefore, the frieze from the Boukoleon can be placed among these examples which are among the last appearances of carved flutes together with the architectural ceramics which decorated the same chapel.¹³²

Interlace

Interlace can be divided into two groups: interlace with eyelets and basket-like motifs.

The first appears on the tiny fillet crowning the main band of the cornices and arches of the katholikon of Vatopedi, and on the arches of Iviron (cat. No. 10.1-10.3, 11.1-11.2). The basket-like motif was used as main decorative motif for the window jambs of the *liti* (inner narthex) of the Vatopedi monastery (cat. No. 10.4), on the outer arches of the door frame of the katholikon of Iviron (cat. No. 11.2), on the arched slabs from Prespa, and on an arch from the Taxiarches church in Kostaniane. The use of basket-like ornament on the front of the arch is a common trait in stucco, marble/stone sculpture, and painted imitation of sculptural artefacts

¹²⁹Türker 2018, 487, fig. 164.

¹³⁰Niewöhner 2017.

¹³¹ To these we should also add those re-used in the presbytery of the Kalenderhane Camii at Istanbul, and the Koimesis church at Nikaia both dated around the end of the seventh century, see Di Bello 2018, in part. 13.

¹³² For the architectural ceramics, see Gerstel, Lauffenburger (ed.) 2001, 172-175, in part. I.B. I, I.B.3.

(e.g. figs. 1.77, 1.79, 1.141). Interlaces of both kinds are very common decorative patterns in every media, so it is not surprising to find them in stucco.

Peltae

The arch of the tomb in the narthex of the katholikon of Iviron has an unusual crowning composed by semi-circular elements with a central ‘stem’ which does not find close comparisons with contemporary Byzantine sculpture (fig. 1.70). I suggest identifying them as *peltae*, because of the close similarities with the elements crowning the architecture in the so-called missorium of Theodosius I (fig. 1.71), and, on a monumental scale, the so-called Tempietto Longobardo in Cividale del Friuli, dated to the middle of the eighth century (fig. 1.72), where they were defined as a variant of the *pelta*.¹³³ The *pelta* is a motif which was present on Late Antique floors and walls decorated with *opus sectile* and mosaics. However, there are no known cases of the survival of the *peltae* from the Middle Ages in Byzantine territories. This is the reason for the Tempietto Longobardo being the only comparator even if it is a monument distant in time and space to Iviron. The *peltae* in the tomb of Iviron are another element which may demonstrate the perpetuation by stucco workers of the Late Antique decorative repertory of ornament.

Rope-like ornament

Rope-like ornaments are used in thin bands complementary to the main motif. This is the case of the cornices from the deposits of the monastery of Daphni (cat. No. 21) (fig. 1.49), where

¹³³ On the *peltae* in the stucco arch of the Tempietto see L’Orange, Torp 1979, 63-64. Pazaras suggested that the *peltae* crowning the arch are similar to the leaves used as crowning of proskynetaria and ciboria in tenth- and the eleventh-century ivories, Pazaras 2006, 132 n. 40-45. I agree that the ivory are a good comparator for crowning of arches in general and can be taken as a general indicator of the artistic taste. However, they do not represent a close comparison for the arch of Iviron, because they do not show any *pelta* but stylised acanthus leaves and *fleur-de-lis*. The choice of the *peltae* on stucco appears to be peculiar.

the rope motif is under the frieze with palmettes and stems, and it also marks the collars and the bases of the small columns in the arches of Iviron framing the main motif (fig. 1.115). The role of rope ornament in stucco decorations is analogous with its use in Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture, once again demonstrating that the ornament on stucco was applied following the same norms as marble sculpture.

Triangles

Triangles can be found in the inner band of the arches crowing the main door of the katholikon of Iviron (cat. No. 11.2). From the picture it is very difficult to visualise them, but they perform the same function as dentils and cubes: they are in a smaller band framing the central band and they are used for providing the arch with chiaroscuro effects. Triangles are also found on the capitals of the arcosolium in the same narthex of Iviron (fig. 1.115). The use of triangles in capitals is not very common in Byzantine sculpture, but it finds comparisons in stuccoes from different periods and in different geographical areas, such as the capital from the church of Kalavassos Syrma (seventh century) (fig. 1.23),¹³⁴ the ninth century frieze in the crypt of the church of S. Marco in Rome (fig. 5.11),¹³⁵ and the window frame of the Hagia Sophia of Monemvasia (fig. 1.73).

1.9 Arched slabs.

Arched slabs made of stucco decorated the Basilica of H. Achilleios on the Small Lake of Prespa (cat. No. 8), while the fragmentary decoration in the church of the so-called Timios

¹³⁴ Panayides 2018, 224, fig. 47.

¹³⁵ Pasquini 2002, 79-80, figs. 152-155.

Stavros monastery (Cappadocia) (tenth century or later) (cat. No. 5), already discussed in paragraph 1.7 may have had the shape of an arched slab.

The arched slabs from H. Achilleios were found during the excavation of the Basilica and are probably today lost, since at the time of their recovery, the archaeologists noted that they were very fragile, and that they started breaking in horizontal sections. Moutsopoulos suggested that they belonged to a ciborium; this function is suggested by the location of the discovery of the stucco pieces, in the middle of the central nave of the Basilica. Since there is no additional information available about them, this hypothesis cannot be confirmed neither it can be excluded. For this reason, the pieces are listed here under the generic label ‘arched slabs’, while I explore the possibility of a ciborium based on their iconography in the following section.¹³⁶

Analysis of the decorative patterns

The ornamentation of these slabs is composed of a frame and a major image in the middle. The frame has in some cases a basket-like motif composed of the intersection of four ribbons (in some cases the ribbons have an incision in the middle while in other cases they do not) (fig. 1.74);¹³⁷ an interlace could also decorate the frame instead of a half-palmette scroll. The pendentives of the arch show two peacocks flanking a central flower or a vase now lost. The iconography of two birds flanking a central element is widespread on slabs, panels, and on proskynetaria frames. Some examples are the stucco proskynetarion from St. Panteleimon in Nerezi (fig. 1.138), a stone example from the church of the Virgin in Koronissa (twelfth

¹³⁶ On the panels see Moutsopoulos 1989, 331-332; Vanni 2019, 1128-1131.

¹³⁷ The absence of the incision can be due to the degradation of the material and not necessary to a stylistic difference.

century),¹³⁸ an arched slab (possibly a proskynetarion) now in the museum of Hosios Loukas,¹³⁹ a stone plaque now in the Archaeological Museum of Stara Zagora (first half of the eleventh century) (fig. 1.76),¹⁴⁰ and also a panel of the sanctuary screen from the church of St. Barbara in Cairo (eleventh century), now preserved in the Archaeological Museum of the same city¹⁴¹. However, comparators with ciboria from Constantinople and Thrace are scarce. The slabs from H. Achilleios are closer in style and iconography to sculptures produced on the Adriatic coast at almost the same time; among them is one of the faces of the Early Medieval ciborium of the cathedral of Rab (Croatia),¹⁴² the canopy in the Baptistry of Callistus of Cividale del Friuli (730-756) (fig. 1.78),¹⁴³ and the ciborium of S. Eleucadio in S. Apollinare in Classe (Ravenna) (beginning of the ninth century) (fig. 1.79).¹⁴⁴ Peacocks and vegetal patterns symbolised the resurrection and alluded to Paradise, as is clearly stated in an inscription on the interior of the ninth-century ciborium/canopy of the Basilica of St. Martha in Bijaće (fig. 1.77):

«Here, the soul, like the bird from the
trap, raises the hope of eternity.... We pray to Jesus Christ, trusting in
help of holy [Martha?] ... most humbly to be surrounded by God's will
while we exist and to receive the eternal life. Amen.»¹⁴⁵

Other occurrences of peacocks associated with canopies and structure-like ciboria are frequent in illuminated manuscripts and in mosaics, such as the Rabbula Gospel fol. 1b,¹⁴⁶ in the architectural backgrounds of the images in the Rotunda of St. George in Thessaloniki (fig.

¹³⁸ Vanderheyde 2005, 55 n. 76.

¹³⁹ Grabar 1976, 58-60, pl. XXVI.

¹⁴⁰ An analysis on the piece and the group of sculptures it belongs, see Milanova 2008, in part. fig. 6.

¹⁴¹ Auber de Lapierre, Jeudy 2018, 60-69, in part. fig. b. p. 62

¹⁴² Vežić 1997, in part. Figs. 9-10.

¹⁴³ Chinellato 2011, in part. 61.

¹⁴⁴ Angiolini Martinelli 1968, 36-37, pl. fig. 34.

¹⁴⁵ English translation from Bogdanovič 2017, 124.

¹⁴⁶ Bernabò 2008; Bernabò 2014.

1.80), and in the Carolingian Sacramentary of Godescalc, fol. 3v (781–783);¹⁴⁷ therefore, the stuccoes from Prespa are not an exception, but are decorated following iconographic conventions connected to canopies.

While the stuccoes from Prespa are decorated according to iconographic conventions common in the Early Middle Ages, it seems to me that the most satisfying connections are with Adriatic marble canopies. These connections are strengthened by the tight stylistic comparisons, such as the crude rendering of the birds, the interlaced motifs, and the organisation of the ornaments into flat framing bands and animal figures in the pendentives.¹⁴⁸ Connection with the Adriatic *milieu* is also strengthened by the types of window transennae made of stucco for the same church which belong to typologies common in Italy and dated between the seventh and the tenth centuries.

1.10 Colonnets and posts

Colonnets and posts made of stucco were used for several decorative purposes; this is reflected by the use of different shapes and their decoration, but mainly their dimensions (from ca. 0.65 m to 1.20 m). The colonnettes that will be analysed below are those recorded in the *katholika* of the Vatopedi and Iviron monasteries on Mount Athos (cat. Nos. 10.2-10.3, 11.1-11.2) used for framing windows, a tomb, and the main door to the naos (the shape of this framing setup is very unusual). In Late Byzantine Epiros there was a specific production of free-standing liturgical barriers with simple posts and posts surmounted by colonnettes, which were found in the Kokkini Ekklesia in Boulgareli (1295/96) (cat. Nos. 15.7-15.13), Kato Panagia church (Arta) (mid-thirteenth century) (cat. No. 14.1), Koimesis church in Petrobitsa

¹⁴⁷ On the manuscript, see Underwood 1950; Reudenbach 1998; Crivello 2007; Laffitte, Denoël (eds.) (2007), 93-94 n. 8; Crivello *et al.* 2011.

¹⁴⁸ For other examples, see the Early-Medieval ciboria from Knin, Bijaće, Zadar. Bogdanović 2017, 105-108,

(end of the thirteenth century) (cat. No. 16.2), the Koimesis church in Lyggos (end of the thirteenth century) (cat. Nos. 17.1-17.3), and the thirteenth-century phase of church of the Virgin at Peshkëpi e Sipërme (cat. No. 27.9) currently unpublished. Colonnets made of stucco were also used in proskynetaria; the surviving ones are from the Protaton church on Mount Athos (end of the tenth century) (cat. Nos. 9.1-9.2), H. Ioannes Eleemon in Ligourio (Peloponnese) (twelfth century) (cat. No. 23), and the church of St. Panteleimon in Nerezi (Northern Macedonia) (1164) (cat. No. 28). Among all the cases listed here, only the cases in Epiros are self-supporting elements, while the others are always attached to the wall (for the different technical aspects see chapter 2).

Analysis of the decorative patterns

Of the examples which appear in the catalogue, only the colonnettes framing the windows in the *naos* of the katholikon of Vatopedi and the tomb in the narthex of the katholikon of Iviron have a plain shaft. Plain shaft colonnettes are widespread for both window-posts, arcosolia, and framing setups in both the Middle and the Late Byzantine periods.

Among the stucco examples, the ornament of the colonnettes above the main door of the katholikon of Iviron (fig. 1.81) are an exceptional case for their ornament. The shafts show a peacock-feather pattern which does not find many comparators within marble or stone sculpture of the Middle and Late Byzantine periods with the exception of a post from the templon of the Panagia of Skripou (873-874).¹⁴⁹ They seem to reproduce with stucco the openwork effects reached in ivory carvings and metalwork, such as the plaque with the Crucifixion at the Metropolitan Museum (second half of the tenth century) (fig. 1.83) and the

¹⁴⁹ Megaw 1966; Barsanti 2007, 5-23; Bevilacqua 2013, 138-145, fig. 53b. On the church see Sotiriou 1931; Pallas 1976-77; Papalexandrou 2000; Papalexandrou 2001; Bevilacqua 2011; Bevilacqua 2013, 133-154.

censer in S. Marco (twelfth century) (fig. 1.85).¹⁵⁰ However, scale-ornaments resembling peacock plumes appears to be a feature of ceramic colonnettes produced between the ninth and the eleventh century (fig. 1.82),¹⁵¹ but they appear also in the stuccoworks from the Umayyad palace of Khirbat al-Mafjar (arches of the niches with standing figures) (724-743) (fig. 1.84).¹⁵² Moreover, the bases of the colonnettes are also decorated with circles with rosettes made in openwork technique. The combination of these two motifs is a *unicum* in sculpture which shows how stucco was worked, here, with incredible freedom by artisans who gleaned motifs from different media.

Another type of colonnette made of stucco is the knotted colonnettes, which can be found in the proskynetaria of the Protaton church on Mount Athos, and in the colonnettes surmounting the posts of the Kokkini Ekklesia in Boulgareli and the Koimesis of Petrobitsa ; to these examples we should add the now-lost example of the Taxiarches of Kostaniane which was signalled by Dakaris.¹⁵³ The Epirote cases differ from the Protaton because they have six knotted shafts instead of four.

The use of knotted colonnettes became widespread in Byzantine sculpture from the twelfth century onwards, though it is attested in other media since at least the tenth century. Two steatite icons dated to the tenth century are among the oldest surviving examples, as demonstrated by Kalavrezou.¹⁵⁴ Therefore, the stucco colonnettes of the proskynetaria of the Protaton are significant for tracing of the knotted columns on monumental scale, because they are probably the oldest known examples, which even pre-date the marble ones. From the Middle Byzantine period knotted colonnettes were consistently used in liturgical furnishings and in

¹⁵⁰ Weitzmann 1972, 65-69, fig. 27; Kalavrezou 1997, 250-251.

¹⁵¹ Gerstel, Lauffenburger (ed.) 2001, 221 cat. No. XII.35, 232 cat. No. XV.6, 233 cat. No. XV.9, 234 cat. No. XV.11, 260 cat. No. A.50, 287 cat. No. B.15; Gerstel 2008, 22 cat. No. 29.

¹⁵² On Peacock-feathers see Anderson 2001, esp. 120-122.

¹⁵³ Dakaris 1961.

¹⁵⁴ Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1985, 97. More recently on knotted columns see Ćirić 2018.

threshold areas, as can be appreciated in the *proskynetaria* from the church of the Virgin in the monastery of Hosios Loukas (end of the eleventh-beginning of the twelfth century) (fig. 1.86),¹⁵⁵ and those made of marble from the church of Porta Panagia in Pylai (Trikala) (1285) (fig. 1.87).¹⁵⁶ Knotted colonnettes were mainly used in *templa*, as is the case of the colonnettes now in the Byzantine Museum of Athens (tenth to eleventh century) (fig. 1.88), those of the Museum of Byzantine Culture of Thessaloniki (eleventh century) (fig. 1.90), and the two colonnettes reused in the Ottoman minbar of the Zeyrek Camii (Pantokrator church) in Istanbul (ca. 1118 and 1136) (fig. 1.89).¹⁵⁷ Finally, knotted colonnettes are also used in window jambs and in low relief arches framing the image of the cross in Middle Byzantine marble carvings (fig. 1.92). Illuminated manuscripts confirm the use of knotted colonnettes in representations of liturgical furnishings and architecture from the eleventh century onwards (fig. 1.91).¹⁵⁸ The Herculean knot had carried apotropaic and redeeming meaning since Antiquity, and continued to be used in the Middle Byzantine period when it was associated with the description of the Temple of Solomon.¹⁵⁹ The complicated version of the knotted columns encountered in Epiros (six shafts, two knots) (figs 1.93-1.94) does not find many comparisons among the surviving Byzantine sculpture. However, a close comparator is the twelfth-century re-used colonnette at the entrance of the Episkopi church in Ano Volos (perhaps second half of the thirteenth century), which has six shafts bound by a double-knot exactly as in the examples from Boulgareli (fig. 1.95).¹⁶⁰ However, here the capital is different from the Epirote one. The case from Anos Volos testifies to the use of the six-shafts and knotted colonnettes at least from the

¹⁵⁵ Boura 1980, 131.

¹⁵⁶ Grabar 1976, 149, pl. CXXXI.

¹⁵⁷ Megaw 1963, 340-43; Kalavrezou 1985, 97; Ousterhout 2010, 435-436; Barsanti *et al.* 2010, 147; Ousterhout 2018, 229.

¹⁵⁸ Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1985, 96-97. See, for examples those in Weitzmann, Galavaris 1990, 139, 141, 180-182, pl. CXLII fig. 144, CXLII fig. 472, CLXXXVII fig. 670.

¹⁵⁹ Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1985.

¹⁶⁰ Bouras, Boura 2002, 76-77, fig. 530.

twelfth century. The use of knotted columns can be found in Epiros too, in the church of the Paregoritissa of Arta both in the templon post (1250s) now at the Byzantine Museum of Ioannina, and in the colonnettes located at the base of the squinches of the dome (1294-1296).¹⁶¹ The latter are composed of four shafts but two knots (fig. 1.96).

Moving to the types of posts made of stucco, it is important to say that all the known examples are from thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Epiros, and in most of the cases it is clear that they continued in colonnettes above (fig. 1. 95);¹⁶² the same cannot be assumed for the two pieces now walled into the southern wall of the church of Lyggos (fig. 1.106), because it is not possible to check whether they were cut or not. The posts ornamentation is composed by two panels: the first is a square containing a Solomonic knot or, alternatively, vegetal interlace recalling the shape of a Solomonic knot but with four lateral points; the second is a rectangular panel decorated by a vegetal scroll. Solomonic knots are not tremendously widespread in Middle Byzantine sculpture but they appear to have been used in another monument of Epiros, the Paregoritissa in Arta (1250s) on the colonnettes of the templon where it becomes a basket-like motif.¹⁶³ The motif of the vegetal interlace with four points also finds some comparisons in the carved panel from the episcopal chair of St. Sophia in Ohrid (1317), now re-assembled in the Ottoman minbar (fig. 1.108), and in a carved panel from the church of the Panagia in Makrinitza (Thessaly) (fig. 1.107).¹⁶⁴ Finally, the same motifs, but enriched with more leaves and made in a different technique, can be seen in the portal of the cathedral of Bisceglie (Apulia) (second-half/end of the thirteenth century).¹⁶⁵ The use of the same pattern in Ohrid and

¹⁶¹ Melvani 2013, 198 no. 32, fig. 41.

¹⁶² The church of St. Nicholas of the Roof in Cyprus had a templon made of stucco, probably dated around the eleventh century; we should imagine posts made of stucco too. See Megaw 1953; Megaw 1974 80 n. 95; Stylianos, Stylianos 1997, 65; Rautman 2003, 46-47.

¹⁶³ Melvani 2013, 198 n. 32; Orlandos 1963, 104.

¹⁶⁴ The panel from Makrinitza has a more complex ornament which is composed by a combination of foliate square knot (or Herculean knot).

¹⁶⁵ Schäfer-Schuchardt 1987, I, 150 n.6; II, pl. 297b; Belli D'Elia 2003, 269-270.

Makrinitza shows that the artisans who made the stucco templa in Epiros used decorative repertoires shared by artisans in both the regions of Macedonia and the Balkans; indeed, such cultural exchanges happened also on a bigger scale and are visible in the architectural plan of the Kokkini Ekklesia of Boulgareli (consecrated in 1295/96) which shares a similar architectural type and exterior decoration with the church of the Peribleptos of Ohrid (now Sv. Kliment) (1294/95).¹⁶⁶ Moreover, the use of a similar (but not identical) pattern in the portal of Bisceglie testifies of the circulation of this peculiar pattern which connects Epiros also with the other side of the southern Adriatic Sea. The vegetal scrolls used for the rectangular panel of the stucco posts are usually the heart-shaped palmette scroll with half-palmettes on either side (1.105), which finds comparison with one in the Blachernae church (Arta) (fig. 1.98).¹⁶⁷ However, the scheme of two posts from Lyggos (fig. 1.106) and Peshpëpi e Sipërme (fig. 1.102) is peculiar because the half-palmettes branches interlace in a very specific way which does not appear to be symmetrical. This peculiar motif finds again comparisons in some eleventh-century sculptures in the transept portals of the new church of SS. Trinita in Venosa (Basilicata) (fig. 1.103).¹⁶⁸ However, in the Venosa example the scroll comes out from a lion's mouth; again, the comparison with Epiros should be taken with a bit of caution and simply as a reflection of a common visual culture, because the animal is absent in the stuccoes and because the Venosa sculpture dates two centuries earlier than the Epirote stuccoes.

Finally, among the fragments of templa from Epirote churches there is an occurrence of spiral colonnettes which, at least in one case, flanked a post (fig. 1.97). Spiral colonnettes are not very common in Byzantine architecture of Greece and Turkey from the Middle Byzantine period onwards. However, it seems possible that they were in use at that time since they appear

¹⁶⁶ See chapter 3 for the relationship between the Kokkini Ekklesia and the Sv. Kliment in Ohrid.

¹⁶⁷ See Papadopoulou 2015c, 86, fig. 60 and bibliography quoted there.

¹⁶⁸ Garton 1984, 185, pl. XLVIIb, fig. 208.

in illuminated manuscripts, such as Vat. Gr. 1162 (late 1140s) illustrated in the scriptorium of the Kokkinobaphos monastery;¹⁶⁹ in this manuscript spiral columns are mainly associated with canopies, especially ciboria.¹⁷⁰ Unfortunately, monumental comparisons are scarce. The type recorded in Epiros more closely resembles a cordon column. Cordon, or rope-like, ornaments can be found as framing bands in Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture. They appear both on stucco and marble friezes (see section on rope-like ornament above). In Epiros thick cordons appear on the panel from H. Merkourios in Arta (twelfth century),¹⁷¹ the epistyle from the church of H. Donatos at Glyki (eleventh century),¹⁷² the epistyle from H. Dimitrios tou Katsouri (twelfth century),¹⁷³ the arched slab from Koronissa (twelfth century),¹⁷⁴ an epistyle and a door lintel from Naupaktos' fortress (twelfth century),¹⁷⁵ and in the lower band of one of the capitals of the 'loggia' of the Paregoritissa in Arta (1294-1296) (fig. 1.99).¹⁷⁶ Other occurrences of the cordon ornament appear in the Peloponnese, in particular in the Late Byzantine sculpture in porous limestone produced for Mystras (fig. 1.100),¹⁷⁷ and the kastron of Geraki.¹⁷⁸ Cordon ornaments are also common in Apulia, and similar cordons to Epirote ones can be appreciated in one of the capitals originally in the cathedral of Bari, today in the Museo diocesano, dated to the thirteenth-century,¹⁷⁹ and in the splay of the windows of the cathedral of Barletta (end of

¹⁶⁹ On the manuscript, see Linardou 2004, 229-247; Linardou 2017 and further bibliography.

¹⁷⁰ See fol. 52r, 90r, 100r, 119v, 190r.

¹⁷¹ On the sculpture of H. Merkourios, see Vanderheyde 2005, 41-45.

¹⁷² Vanderheyde 2005, 21-24, 28-29 n. 22-24, figs. 22-24.

¹⁷³ Vanderheyde 2005, 45-46, 48 n. 60, fig. 53.

¹⁷⁴ Vanderheyde 2005, 55, 56 n. 75, fig. 66.

¹⁷⁵ Vanderheyde 2005, 66-67 n. 92-93, figs 82a, 83a

¹⁷⁶ Melvani 2013, 198 n. 32.

¹⁷⁷ See, for example, those from the church of the Peribleptos (1365-1374), Louvi 1980, 138-168; Melvani 2013, 204 n. 50.

¹⁷⁸ For a synthesis on the sculpture of porous limestone of Geraki, see Melvani 2013, 205-206 nos. 54-57.

¹⁷⁹ These capitals have been previously connected to the lateral ciboria attributed to the sculptor Anseramo da Trani and commissioned by the archbishop Romualdo Grisone (1280-1309), Schäfer-Schuchardt 1987, I, 30; II, pl. 79a. However, Gioia Bertelli noted that these capitals do not fit with the rest of the sculptures signed by Anseramo, suggesting a chronology of some decades before. She also framed these capitals within a broader artistic landscape, which includes the capitals of the ciborium of Bitonto (Apulia), and those in the cathedrals of Split and Trogir, Bertelli 2015, 41-47.

the twelfth-beginning of the thirteenth century) (fig. 1.104).¹⁸⁰ Cordon colonnettes also became widespread on facades of later Serbian foundations; indeed, they were used at the church of the Dormition of the Ljubostinja monastery (fig. 1.101),¹⁸¹ on the northern façade of the church at Ravanića, and the southern façade of the church at Kruševak.¹⁸² In the case of Epiros, it seems that the cordon colonnettes are modelled following an ornamental motif widespread in local Middle Byzantine sculpture, but they are also one of the few examples of surviving spiral colonnettes from the Middle and Late Byzantine periods. This demonstrates the importance of local taste, which was probably enriched by the interactions with the Adriatic, Serbia, and Morea.¹⁸³ It is impossible to go further into details on the nature of such interactions (e.g. itinerant workshop, movable object etc.) for stucco, because the surviving fragments are decorated with motifs widespread in all these territories. Moreover, Epirote stuccoes combine a maximum of two patterns on each piece, while Apulian and Dalmatian ones tended to be richer combining several patterns on the same architectural decoration. Therefore, while Epirote stucco workers used motifs used elsewhere in the Balkans and in the Adriatic, their ‘selection’ seems to have been their peculiarity, and possibly their local imprint.¹⁸⁴ This is a point to which we shall return later in this thesis.

¹⁸⁰ Schäfer-Schuchardt 1987, I, 109, 110-111; II, pl. 222a, 233a; Belli D’Elia 2003, 267-268.

¹⁸¹ Đurić 1985, 51-62, French summary 131-132.

¹⁸² Millet 1919 figs. 184-85, 194-95, 204. For a synthesis on Serbian sculpture in the fourteenth century, see Preradović 2016, in part. cordon colonnettes are figs 357, 359, 362.

¹⁸³ Contacts between these regions were already frequent for economic transactions, as can be seen in the documents preserved in the archives of Dubrovnik, Krekić 1961. Unfortunately, the published documents do not preserve any evidence of movement of stucco artisans. However, there is evidence of ‘greek’ (icon) painters and goldsmiths living in Dubrovnik, but we do not know if they worked stucco too, Krekić 1961, 207n. 263-264, 266, 268, 270, p. 215 n. 315. On economic transactions between Epiros, Morea, Venice, Dalmatia and Apulia, see also the numismatic evidence compared to social structures of Arta and Ioannina in Shea 2011,

¹⁸⁴ The case of the tiles immured in the facades of H. Basilios at Arta shows a similar but more precise attitude of Epirote artisans towards non-local techniques. Recent archaeometrical analysis showed that artisans produced these tiles knowing the technique of Italian Archaic maiolica but using local materials. Moreover, some of the tiles show a considerable degree of experimentalism from the Italian Archaic maiolica, suggesting that the tiles were produced locally by artisans trained in Italian Archaic maiolica or fully aware of the technique. The case of the tiles of H. Basilios and the stuccoes suggests, in my opinion, that in Epiros, there were local artisans fully aware of artistic production outside Epiros (e.g. technique and decorative patterns). However, they did not simply reproduce techniques and decorative motifs, but they englobed them into the local artistic language. On the one

1.11 Panels

Fragments of panels made of stucco have been recorded in Maroneia (Thrace) (cat. No. 6), and in five churches of Epiros: the Taxiarches in Kostaniane (mid-thirteenth century) (cat. No. 13.3), the Kato Panagia in Arta (after the middle of the thirteenth century) (cat. Nos. 14.2-14-3), the Kokkini Ekklesia in Boulgareli (1295/96) (cat. Nos. 15.1-1.5), the Koimesis of Kleidonia (end of thirteenth - beginning of fourteenth century) (cat. No. 18.2), and in the church of the Virgin in Peshkëpi e Sipërme (near Argirocastro, Albania) (cat. Nos. 27.2, 27.7-27.8) (second half of the thirteenth century).

The fragment from a panel from the area of the Middle Byzantine church of H. Charalambos in Maroneia has in the centre a Latin cross with branches that end in small triangles (fig. 1.109). To the left, a quadrilobed shape was made with a double ribbon. Inside the shape, a leaf remains. The panel with the cross and the quadrilobed shape is framed on the upper side by two-stripes forming an interlaced band. The original design of the panel should have included another quadrilobed element on the right of the cross. The presence of the quadrilobed element and the general design recall Early Byzantine panels; indeed, the quadrilobed element finds comparisons with a fragment from the Mangana area in Istanbul (fig. 1.110), a fragmentary panel found in Traianoupolis in Thrace, and in the panel of the soffit of the architraves of the Hagia Sophia in Istanbul, all dated to the Early Byzantine period.¹⁸⁵ However, panels dated between the fifth and the sixth centuries usually have flat mouldings, while the stucco piece from Maroneia has an interlaced ribbon which is more common in the following centuries, such as on the fragments of an ambo from the so-called 'Three churches'

hand, this testifies the deep connections of Epiros with the Adriatic, the Balkans and Morea; on the other hand, it shows the originality of Epirote artistic production. On the tiles of H. Basilios, see Mastrotheodoros *et al.* 2018 and bibliography quoted there.

¹⁸⁵ Yalcin 2004, 239, 286, figs 160-162.

of Paros (eighth- eleventh centuries).¹⁸⁶ There is not any information on the original function of the panel. Aliprantis, who discovered it in 1979, did not provide any information about the context and the precise location of the panel. It seems possible that it came from the church underneath the Middle Byzantine basilica.¹⁸⁷ This subterranean church had the apse painted with a foliate cross and the inscription Ι(ησοῦς) Χ(ριστός) ΝΙΚΑ.¹⁸⁸ Without any further information about the context of the stucco panel, I need to turn only to iconography and style for providing a date. On the basis of the already mentioned comparisons, I believe that the panel fits well between the seventh and the tenth century.

The other panels made of stucco are dated almost four centuries later and are located in Epirote churches. The unpublished pieces from Peshkëpi e Sipërme (cat. Nos. 27.7-27.8, 27.13) which were discovered during the restoration of the church in the summer 2020, seem to belong to the same group of stucco furnishings recorded in the Epirote churches. This is visible from the use of the same decorative motifs as well the same techniques (formworks, mouldings and incision). The fragments of panels show identical motifs (in terms of style and iconography) as the panels from the Kokkini Ekklesia (cat. Nos. 15.3, 15.5) and the posts from Lyggos (cat. No. 17.2). It is important to note that the hearth-shape palmette with a lower pediment recorded in the panels on these latter churches does not find many comparisons, with the exception of a thirteenth-century capital in the cloister of the church of S. Benedetto in Bari;¹⁸⁹ again, another (even) small connection with the Adriatic.

Papadopoulou considered all the fragmentary panels to be part of *templa*, with the exception of those from Peshkëpi e Sipërme which were at the time still immured into the altars of the church. This identification is correct for most of the cases; however, the panel from the

¹⁸⁶ Pallas 1977, 202-205; Jakobs 1987, 295 pl. 22.

¹⁸⁷ Aliprantis 1975-76, 226, fig. 2.

¹⁸⁸ Aliprantis 1975-76, 226-229, figs 7-9; Aliprantis 1994, 74-94, figs 55-57.

¹⁸⁹ Schäfer-Schuchardt 1987, I, 34; II, pl. 84d; Belli D'Elia 1987, 194.

Taxiarches of Kostaniane (second half of the thirteenth century) requires further evaluation (fig. 1.111), because the shape of the panel is unusual for a templon.¹⁹⁰ Indeed, it is not rectangular, but its upper end is pointed. There are no comparisons in surviving Middle and Late Byzantine templa for panels of this shape. The pointed profile of the Epirote slab is reminiscent of a chair or episcopal throne, even though its dimensions (around 72cm in height and 55cm in width) would be small for a chair.¹⁹¹ However, there is no trace in the church of a structure such as a chair; moreover, if this was an episcopal chair, the church of the Taxiarches should be a bishopric seat, which it was not. It is possible that this is the remains of a chair made for a local aristocrat (maybe the lord in charge of the settlement), for their use during the service, but there are not any comparisons for stucco chairs in either Byzantium or in the Medieval West.¹⁹²

Another possible explanation for the shape of the panel is that it imitated a sarcophagus. Middle and Late Byzantine sarcophagi were usually made of marble rectangular panels and covered by a 'pediment' lid (triangle shape);¹⁹³ therefore, there were no 'pointed' panels, since the pediment belongs to the lid and the panel. Nevertheless, 'pointed' panels are a common trait of wooden coffins for Seljuk shrines, such as that of Mahmud Khayrani in Aksehir (ca 1340) (fig. 1.114a).¹⁹⁴ When we look at the decoration of the stucco panel, we note that the rectangular section shows a series of squares framing an eight-pointed star containing an interlaced based on the Solomonic knot. The pediment displays a simple vegetal motif composed of two half-palmette with stems interlocked. The decoration of the pediment with a vegetal motif finds

¹⁹⁰ Georgiadou already noted that the triangular ending of the panel is odd for a templon, Georgiadou 2015, 176 n. 586.

¹⁹¹ The panel is today fragmentary, lacking part of its left portion. Information about dimensions and the state of the piece is in cat. No. 13.1.

¹⁹² For an analysis on the patronage of the Taxiarches of Kostantiane, see chapter 3.

¹⁹³ This is not the only type of monumental tomb for the Middle and Late Byzantine period. For a classification of Middle and Late Byzantine sarcophagi and tombs see Pazaras 1988; English summary in pp. 168-176.

¹⁹⁴ Sarre 1909, 35, pl. XIV; 33 *masterpieces of Islamic art*, 4; von Folsach 1985, 60-61; *Art from the World of Islam* 1987, cat.no. 166; von Folsach 1990, cat.no. 293; von Folsach *et al.* 1996, cat.no. 380; von Folsach 2001, cat.no. 433.

comparisons in sarcophagi and wooden coffins, as can be seen in the lid of the sarcophagus of George Kapandrites now in the monastery of Vlatadon in Thessaloniki (end of the thirteenth-beginning of the fourteenth century) (fig. 1.112), and on the already mentioned wooden coffin of the shrine of Mahmud Khayrani in Aksehir (ca 1340), where the vegetal motif is on the pediment of the lateral panel (fig. 1.114). However, the closest comparison for the ornamentation of the stucco panel of Kostaniane is the wooden coffin in the shrine of the Serbian king Stefan III Uroš Dečanski (ca 1343) (fig. 1.113),¹⁹⁵ where an intricate vegetal motif fills the pediment of the lid, and a six-pointed star the lateral panel. However, this coffin is made in the fashion of Byzantine sarcophagi with a pedimental lid and five plaques. The evidence from sarcophagi of the Middle and Late Byzantine period is more conspicuous for marble than wooden examples and does not show ‘pointed’ slabs for the lateral sides.¹⁹⁶ Wooden examples have not survived with the exception of that in the shrine of Stefan III Uroš.¹⁹⁷ In the absence of other comparisons for the ‘pointed’ shape of the stucco panel from Kostaniane, other than the fourteenth-century Seljuk coffins, I have turned to the iconography. Here, the closest connections are with the coffin of the shrine of Stefan III Uroš which post-dates the stucco slab, but may show the diffusion of a typology of wooden coffins which may already have been in use by the thirteenth-century, since the ‘pedimental’ lid was used in marble sarcophagi since the Middle Byzantine period.¹⁹⁸ It is impossible to verify whether wooden coffins of the type recorded in the fourteenth-century Seljuk shrines were widespread in the Byzantine world, because we do not have any surviving material evidence, and even the evidence from wall paintings and illuminated manuscripts (e.g. scenes from the Anastasis or

¹⁹⁵ Brooks 2004, 114-115 and bibliography quoted there.

¹⁹⁶ For marble sarcophagi see Pazaras 1988

¹⁹⁷ Brooks 2004, 114-115.

¹⁹⁸ For sarcophagi with ‘pedimental’ lid, see Pazaras 1988, 87-88, 170, pl. 1-2, 25.

funerals of saints in psalters) generally shows marble sarcophagi with ‘pedimental’ lids.¹⁹⁹

In sum, on the basis of the iconographic comparisons with the shrine of Stefan III, it cannot be excluded that the stucco panel imitated the lateral panel of a wooden coffin or a sarcophagus. It may have been part of the contents of a shrine, a reliquary, or a memory of a tomb which, perhaps, was originally preserved into the church of Kostaniane.²⁰⁰

1.12 Capitals

Capitals made of stucco are recorded in the proskynetaria of the church of the Protaton on Mount Athos (ca. tenth century) (cat. Nos. 9.1-9.2), in the framing of the windows of the *choroi* in the katholikon of the monastery of Vatopedi on Athos (after the beginning of the eleventh century) (cat. Nos. 10.2-10.3), in the northern tomb in the narthex and the entrance to the naos of the katholikon of the Iviron monastery, also on Athos (1029-1066) (cat. Nos. 11.1-11.2), in the proskynetarion of the church of St. Panteleimon in Nerezi (1164) (cat. Nos. 28) (these will be analysed in the section on proskynetaria), and in the posts-colonnettes from at least two churches in Epiros: the Koimesis in Petrobitsa (end of the thirteenth century) (cat. No. 16.2), and the Kokkini Ekklesia in Boulgareli (1295/96) (cat. No. 15.8). Finally, there are two cases of stucco used on already-existing capitals. The first one is an act of restoration, probably dated to the Byzantine period: the restoration with stucco of some broken volutes of a second-century capital, which was re-used in the narthex of the Panagia church in the monastery of Hosios Loukas (cat. No. 20.3). The second one is a total remaking in stucco of some Byzantine marble capitals in the church of the Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres Thrace, (1152) (cat. No. 7.1).

¹⁹⁹ Some, among many, examples are the scene of the Anastasis in the narthex of the katholikon of Hosios Loukas, the katholikon of Daphni, the parekklesion of the katholikon of the Chora monastery, and the Menologion of Basil II (Vat. Gr. 1613), fol. 33, 104, 167, 204, 294, 298, 347, 355, 391, 406.

²⁰⁰ The location of the shrine may have been the diaconicon (right side) of the church, which is the only area not covered by paintings, possibly the sign of a ‘sculptural’ decoration for this area. The restorations of the paintings of the church which ended in the Summer 2020 may shed light on the original location of the stucco elements too.

The capitals in the katholikon of Vatopedi are in the shape of a truncated pyramid with no carved or modelled decoration.

The capitals of the tomb of George the Hagiorite in the katholikon of the monastery of Iviron (1029-1066) (fig. 1.115) belong to the typology defined by Dennert as ‘mit einem großen Blatt auf den Kanten’ (with a large leaf at the edges), usually found on templa up to the eleventh century.²⁰¹ Some comparisons are a capital in the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul (fig. 1.119),²⁰² one from the Archaeological Museum of Izmir (fig. 1.118),²⁰³ one from Constantinople but today in the church of Lower Kingswood (London) (fig. 1.117),²⁰⁴ and another in the museum of Çanakkale.²⁰⁵ All these examples are generically dated to the Middle Byzantine period. The Iviron example is characterised by a cordon on the lower band and triangles on the upper band. One side is also decorated with a form of rosettes (fig. 1.116), which are rarely on impost capitals but rather on epistyles such as the two pieces from the museum of Izmir.²⁰⁶ A more elaborate version of these ‘rosettes’ can be seen, again, in architectural ceramics, where petals are formed by the intersection of two circles,²⁰⁷ while in Iviron the petals appear to be come squared, probably due to the narrow space of the capital. Thus, the stucco capital from the tomb of Iviron seems to be a richer version of the ‘standard’ templon capital ‘mit einem großen Blatt auf den Kanten’.²⁰⁸

In the narthex of the same church, the stucco capitals of the entrance to the naos are of a different typology (fig. 1. 79). They are a derivation of a Corinthian capital where the volutes are still visible, but the acanthus leaves are almost unrecognisable; in their place there is a

²⁰¹ Dennert 1997, 118-122.

²⁰² Dennert 1997, 121, 209, cat. no.262.

²⁰³ Andiç 2012, 123-124, cat. no.109, inv. n. 413, fig. 109.

²⁰⁴ This capital is today unpublished, but may come from the Pantokrator monastery in Constantinople.

²⁰⁵ Türker 2018, 92-95, cat. no.93, fig. 142.

²⁰⁶ Andiç 2012, 95-96 cat. no.82, 147-147 cat. no.114b.

²⁰⁷ Gerstel, Lauffenburger (ed.) 2001, 213 cat. No. XII.13, 277 cat. No. A.70, 286 cat. No. B.13.

²⁰⁸ For the definition of the typology of the capital see Dennert 1997, 118-122, in part. 121.

combination of diagonal lines. The two capitals are slightly different from one another even though they belong to the same typology. The one on the right has a double ribbon which creates circles marked in the middle by a drill on the lower part, while the other lacks this detail. The left capital also has less-stylised acanthus leaves. Pazaras, who first published them, rightly observed that they do not find any comparisons in Middle Byzantine sculpture. This is another peculiar aspect of the stuccoes from Iviron, which do not seem to conform with contemporary Middle Byzantine sculptural production, testifying to the extreme freedom and invention of the artisans who made them. To the already mentioned aspects (the capitals and the colonnettes), it is important to add that the entire composition (a central arch flanked by quarter-arches) above the entrance to the katholikon is a *unicum*. The only comparisons are in tenth- and eleventh-centuries ivories,²⁰⁹ and, on a monumental scale, in the shape of the windows of Middle Byzantine architecture, an example being the windows of the Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres (1152) (figs. 1.122-1.123). Thus, stucco in Iviron appears to be the medium which synthesises iconographies and decorative schemes from different media and objects of diverse scale to give life to an original monumental solution.

The capitals on the knotted colonnettes from the Epirote churches are cubic and carved with two rows of scales (fig. 1.120). The use of cubic capitals on knotted colonnettes is not exclusive to stucco production nor to Epiros but seems to be widespread in local regional contexts. They can be recorded on the marble colonnettes re-used on the façade of the katholikon of the monastery of the Blachernae in Arta, which have been variously dated between the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth centuries (fig. 1.121).²¹⁰ Other examples are from Mani, where the knotted colonnettes and cubic capitals are matched with

²⁰⁹ Pazaras 2007, 50-55.

²¹⁰ Vanderheyde 2005, 79-81, fig. 105; Melvani 2013, 197, cat. no.29; Papadopoulou 2015c.

posts surmounted by knotted colonnettes, as in the Epirote cases, and they date from the second half of the eleventh to the beginning of the thirteenth century.²¹¹

The capitals in Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres present a different case from the others already discussed. Here stucco was used for making capitals, but it was applied on already carved marble ones. The new capitals made of stucco are a real re-making and update of the ornament of the already existing capitals, which were made during the construction of the church (consecrated in 1152).²¹² The impost-capitals are decorated with a medallion framed by an interlaced ribbon which is flanked by two leafy branches (1.124). A frieze of heart-shaped palmettes with pierced edges provides the lower part of the capital. Above the medallion, there is an impost composed of two cornices (fig. 1.125) The upper one is decorated with a basket-like motif, while the second, which is bigger, has a vine-leaves scroll with cornucopias. The vine leaves are almost detached from the background, and it is possible to see the veins that have been delicately carved. Dennert described it as a frieze with a vine scroll and cupids, and, in the angles, lion heads.²¹³ Due to the current condition of the capital it is only possible to see some figures, possibly birds pecking grapes, among the leaves and branches. The peculiar shape of the capital is due to its dimensions and to the necessity of englobing the marble capitals and the dossierets. Therefore, comparisons are almost impossible and probably unnecessary. For the iconography (not for the style), some comparisons are the capitals in the church of H. Andreas in Krisei (nowadays Koça Mustafa Paşa Camii) (fig. 1.126) in Istanbul,²¹⁴ a capital now in the Archaeological Museum of Edirne (Adrianopolis) (11th c.) (fig. 1.127),²¹⁵ a capital in the

²¹¹ Drandakis 2002, 123-132 (H. Dimitrios at Dua Pigadia, Platsas), 159-160 (H. Basilios, Kaphionas), 177-185 (H. Petros, Kastaneas), 224-230 (H. Nikolaos, Kampinari Platsas), 265-275 (Episkopi), 306-313 (Koimesis, Kastania in Messianiaki Mani) figs. 199, 204, 273, 341, 407-408, 456-457, 459

²¹² Sinos noted that the mural paintings overlap the stucco capitals, Sinos 1985, 98-101; Dennert 1997, 83; Ousterhout & Bakirtzis 2007, 74-75; Vanni 2019, 1134-1137; see also cat. No. 7 for a discussion on the chronology of the capitals.

²¹³ Dennert 1997, 83.

²¹⁴ Dennert 1997, 105-107, pl. 39, n. 5.

²¹⁵ Dennert 1997, 108-109, n. 225.

Museum of Uşak (western Anatolia),²¹⁶ and a capital with a monogram now at the Museum of Bodrum.²¹⁷

In general, the majority of the capitals made of stucco are of ‘templon’ dimension, with the exception of those from the Kosmosoteira in Feres which are monumental. All the capitals, however, have a rich iconography in common and demonstrate experimentalism resulting in new solutions. Stucco made this possible.

1.13 Epistyles

The two pieces identified as epistyles come from churches in Epiros dated between the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries. They are the epistyle from the church of the Koimesis in Petrobitsa, now on display at the Byzantine Museum in Ioannina (cat. No. 16.1), and a fragment, possibly of an epistyle, from the church of the Metamorphosis in Kleidonia, currently preserved in the deposits of the same museum in Ioannina (cat. No. 18.1). This latter piece is a small fragment broken on each side which makes impossible any reconstruction; it is decorated with a half-palmette scroll.

In contrast, the surviving pieces from the epistyle of Petrobitsa allow an almost entire reconstruction of the original shape. The epistyle was not a simple architrave but had at least two arched openings (fig. 1.128). The arches probably rested on the colonnette-posts which are displayed in the same section of the museum (fig. 1.129). If my reconstruction is correct, then the epistyle in Petrobitsa was composed of arches and an architrave. Temples with arched openings can be found in masonry examples dated between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries, such as the one in the church of H. Anna in Anisaraki (Kandanos) in Crete (1457)

²¹⁶ Parman 2002, 195 cat no. U49, pl. 127 fig. 172.

²¹⁷ Dennert 1997, 119-120, pl. 46, n. 254.

(fig. 1.135).²¹⁸ The epistyle of Petrobitsa differs from masonry examples in its close relation to sculpture. The low-relief vegetal scroll in combination with high-relief birds can be traced to Middle Byzantine solutions: the epistyle from the church of H. Donatos in Glyki (eleventh century) (fig. 1.130),²¹⁹ the door frames now in the deposits of the castle of Naupaktos (twelfth century) (fig. 1.131),²²⁰ and the architrave immured in the fortress of Naupaktos (twelfth century) (fig. 1.132).²²¹ These marble and stone examples also share with the stucco from Petrobitsa the way of making the feathers of the bird by oblique lines creating a sort of herringbone; the same procedure can be spotted on the feather of the angel and the peacocks of the templon of the katholikon of the Blachernae monastery in Arta (fig. 1.134)²²² and in the stucco epistyle of Petrobitsa (1.133). The low-relief scroll matched with the high-relief bird is consistent with marble and stone sculpture of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in Epiros characterised by the perpetuation of iconographies from the Middle Byzantine period.²²³ On the one hand, the stucco epistyle shows an ornamentation in continuity with the eleventh and twelfth centuries; on the other hand, the presence of arches seems to me a peculiar aspect probably connected to a regional evolution of the templon. Indeed, comparisons to this shape exist but come from different areas where the artistic production is characterised by a strong regional identity. An arched templon without fixed icons was carved in the Chapel 25 in the Göreme valley (Cappadocia);²²⁴ and in Georgia, polylobed arches constituted the opening of the templon in Goni (eleventh century) and in Satkhe (thirteenth century).²²⁵ It is crucial to also

²¹⁸ Gerstel 2006a, 136, cat. No. 57, fig. 1; Spatharakis 2001, 207, 209; Lassithiotakis 1970, figs. 251-253.

²¹⁹ Vanderheyde 2005, 30 no. 28, fig. 27 a.

²²⁰ Vanderheyde 2005, 67 no. 93, figs. 83a-c.

²²¹ Vanderheyde 2005, 67-68 no. 95, fig. 85.

²²² Papadopoulou 2015c, 91-95.

²²³ The reference to the Middle Byzantine past is a trend which is parallel to the innovations recorded in Epirote sculpture of this period normally connected to the interaction with Western sculpture, see Vanderheyde 2005, 77-87; Melvani 2013, 102-106.

²²⁴ Epstein 1981, 16-17 fig. 4.

²²⁵ Dadiani *et al.* 2017, 238, fig. 567; Iamanidzé 2010, 113-116, 238-241.

add that one of the colonnette-posts from the same church of Petrobitsa preserves on one side some traces of painted plaster with a band of red and blue (fig. 1.129).²²⁶ This side of the colonnette-post does not show any kind of decoration and looks ‘unfinished’: the post is flat and the colonnettes are not even modelled. It seems possible that the reason for that was that this side was intended to be left without decoration from the beginning in order to accommodate a plaster painted icon.²²⁷ If this is correct, then we should imagine the templon of Petrobitsa opaque and with painted icons, similar in a way to the opaque templa from the church of H. Georgios in the kastron of Geraki (fourteenth century),²²⁸ H. Nikolaos in Geraki in Peloponnese (fig. 1.137), and in St. George in Staro Nagoričino (1313-1318) in North Macedonia (fig. 1.136).²²⁹ Therefore, the stucco epistyle and the colonnette-post from the templon of Petrobitsa are probably another piece of the puzzle in the study of the gradual development of the templon into an opaque screen. The chronology to the end of the thirteenth century is consistent with the diffusion of masonry opaque screens in the Byzantium,²³⁰ providing us with extra evidence for northern Greece, which is underrepresented for the thirteenth century. As Gerstel noted, masonry opaque screens were of two kinds: those which combined stone elements and masonry (e.g. the one in St. George in Staro Nagoričino), and those made only of masonry (e.g. H. Nikolaos in Geraki).²³¹ The stucco templon of Petrobitsa appears to be something in-between these two types because it was made of plaster,²³² but it was modelled in imitation of sculpture.

²²⁶ This is a standard frame for both painted icons and narrative scenes. However, the location of the fragments allows us to exclude the narrative scene.

²²⁷ Another explanation for the absence of the decoration on one side of the colonnette-post is that the piece originally leaned against on the eastern piers. I believe that we can exclude this possibility because the post shows decorative motifs in low relief on the side opposite to the unfinished one. This would have prevented the insertion of a templon panel.

²²⁸ Gerstel 2006a, 159 no. 25, fig. 3.

²²⁹ Gerstel 2006a, 152, fig. 21.

²³⁰ Gerstel 2006a, 136.

²³¹ Gerstel 2006a, 136-138.

²³² See chapter 2 for technical aspects.

Therefore, we presented with, perhaps, a ‘transitional’ typology of liturgical screen, in-between templon and opaque screen, and in-between marble sculpture and masonry.

1.14 Proskynetaria frames

As we have seen in sections 1.9, 1.10 and 1.11, stucco was used in Epiros for creating the elements which were assembled into liturgical furnishings (panels, colonnettes, posts, epistyles). The latter seems to have been a localised episode; in contrast, the employment of plaster for modelling other parts visually connected to the templon, the frames of the proskynetaria icons, was widespread from the Peloponnese to Macedonia and testifies to another instance of stucco used for the taste of *poikilia* (variety) rather than for necessity, as will be discussed in the last section of this chapter. Proskynetaria images were made for veneration, generally, of Christ, the Mother of God, or the patron saint, and are mainly located on the eastern pillars and/or in the narthex.²³³ These images are usually painted on the wall or in mosaic, even though they could have been also carved in marble.²³⁴ They stand out from the rest of the figural decoration because they are usually larger than the other images and they are often framed by an arch or an arched slab supported by a couple of colonnettes which can be made of marble, stucco, or being just be painted.²³⁵

²³³ With the Modern Greek term *proskynetaria*, scholars usually refer to images of particular devotion. The word probably derives from proskynesis (προσκύνησις), a term that expresses a way to show devotion and that included a simple bow, or full prostration, and in case of sacred images, also a kiss (Brubaker, Haldon 2015, 59-61; Brubaker, Haldon 2001, 252-53). Scholars now agree that the plural form of the term, proskynesis (προσκυνήσεις) can identify icons of special veneration. This is particularly true in typika, inventories of churches, and Saints’ lives where it emerges that such images were located next to the templon and they were often illuminated by candles and lamps. Typika also tell us that such images represented Christ (the Saviour) and the Virgin, the patron saint or a saint venerated on specific days by the community of the church. The typikon of the monastery of the Virgin Kosmosoteira in Feres, is a good example «[...]two candelabra with eight candleholders should stand by the two icons set out for veneration, that is, in the two parts of the church where my Supremely-good Christ, and the Mother of God and Kosmosoteira, are respectively represented with great skill, so [...]» soon after, the founder of the typikon mentioned the bema that is the epistyle of the templon. *Typikon of the Sebastokrator*, 802 (ch. 9).

²³⁴ On images of the Virgin carved in marble and their liturgical function, see Paribeni, 2008; on Late Byzantine templa carved with sacred images and narrative scenes, see Melvani 2013, 72-81.

²³⁵ Marble and stucco reliefs were certainly painted too. On stucco proskynetaria it is still possible to see traces of paint.

Due to their location, such images and their frames were seen by both the laity during the whole celebration and by the priests during the procession to the altar. Thus, they were probably addressed during the liturgy by both communal and individual prayers.²³⁶ The specific iconographies of Christ and the Virgin in the eastern pillars of the naos emphasise the intercession of the Virgin Mary for Humanity and the benevolent response of Christ Pantokrator.²³⁷ The relationship of the proskynetaria images to the ‘conversation’ happening in the liminal space of the templon was made visually clear to the faithful thanks to the big frames which surrounded the sacred figures. The frame was a device for establishing a hierarchy of the images present in the sacred building. At the same time, it also visually connected such images to the sacred barrier, the templon, creating a continuous fence from the central apse to the lateral spaces (traditionally called prothesis and diakonikon). The use of similar decorative motifs in both the templon and the proskynetaria frames supports this idea.²³⁸

When proskynetaria images were located on the eastern wall of the narthex, they created a sort of ‘preparatory’ screen which mirrored the one inside the naos, and introduced the faithful into the church; this ‘screen’ was made visible to the faithful through wall-painted frames, or carved relief or flat frames made of marble, stone or stucco.²³⁹ These types of frames are the same as recorded for proskynetaria images in the naos and on the eastern pillars of the church.

There is no demonstrable correlation between the material of the templon and the choice of marble or stucco for the proskynetaria, as we will discuss later in this section. These materials

²³⁶ Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 107.

²³⁷ The templon was already charged with intercessional meanings, as can be seen in cases with figural decoration on the epistyle such as the one from Selçikler (1019-1025). Both material and textual evidence clearly states that the epistyle, and in general the barrier which separated the laity from the priests carried the images of the Deesis or the Trisagion (abbreviated Deesis). On the evolution and meaning of the templon there is a wide bibliography, I signal here Epstein 1981; the volume *Thresholds of the sacred* (Gerstel ed. 2016); Vanderheyde 2007; Melvani 2014. On the templon of Selçikler, Barsanti 2007, in part. 36-43.

²³⁸ Bréhier 1940; Grabar 1961; Chatzidakis 1979; Epstein 1981; Kalopissi-Verti 2006; Vanderheyde 2007.

²³⁹ The repetition of the Deesis on the eastern wall of the narthex does not appear to be connected to any specific church plan but it might be connected to devotional practices and to the office of the *lite*, for monastic churches Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 130-131.

were not exclusive to a specific category of artisans, as will be demonstrated in the following chapter, but could be worked by sculptors, painters and plasterers. Thus, a continuous comparison with marble and painted proskynetaria frames is required. For a discussion of technique and artisans' identity, see chapter 2.

Types of stucco proskynetaria frames

The proskynetaria made of stucco can be divided into two categories: those which have the decorative patterns in relief (Type A) and those with only the outline of the frame in relief but with the decorative pattern simply painted (Type B).

It is important to make this distinction, because the two types required the artisans to use different techniques, and the selection of type A or B also impacted ornamental choices which differed between the two formats. Such choices show a closer relation of the proskynetaria type A to sculpture and type B to painting.

Stucco proskynetaria Type A.

The stucco proskynetaria frames belonging to this category are those preserved in the Protaton church on Mount Athos (tenth century) (cat. Nos. 9.1-9.2),²⁴⁰ in the church of St. Panteleimon in Nerezi (1164) (cat. No. 28),²⁴¹ and in the Peribleptos church of Mystras (before the fourteenth century) (cat. No. 24).²⁴² The use of Type A proskynetaria frames continued in the Late Byzantine period also in Serbia, as can be seen for those made during the second phase

²⁴⁰ Orlandos 1953.

²⁴¹ Okunev 1929; Sinkevič 2000.

²⁴² Louvi 1980, 120-125; Marinou 2002, 86.

of the church of the Saviour in the Zića monastery (fourteenth century) and in the Holy Trinity church in the Sopoćani monastery (second half of the thirteenth century).²⁴³

In terms of shape, all the examples belong to the typologies of proskynetaria frames attested also in marble and stone. Indeed, the round arch-shape of the proskynetarion of the Protaton church finds comparison with the tenth-century marble example from the monastery of Hosios Loukas.²⁴⁴ These two are the oldest known examples of proskynetaria frames.²⁴⁵ Therefore, it has been suggested that the use of a simple arch is a sign of the early date, since from the twelfth century onward, carved proskynetaria frames are always composed of an arched panel.²⁴⁶ Type A proskynetaria indeed, seem to have been a stucco version of marble ones. This 'imitative' aspect is clear in the shapes of the frames and the iconographies chosen to decorate them, which find close comparators with marble examples; indeed, the other cases (Nerezi, Mystras, Sopoćani, and Zića) dated between the twelfth to the fourteenth century are arched slabs proskynetaria and confirm the trend of using this format of marble proskynetaria from the twelfth century onwards.²⁴⁷

Among the Type A proskynetaria, only those in the Protaton and in St. Panteleimon at Nerezi still preserve the colonnettes. These have been analysed above.

Stucco proskynetaria type A: analysis of the decorative patterns.

In terms of overall decoration, the frame of the Protaton, apart from the colonnettes, is the simplest. In fact, the arch is composed by a huge band of heart-shaped palmettes and by two

²⁴³ Kandić, Milošević 1985, 15; Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 16, n. 27; Gugolj, Tešić-Radovanović 2016, 311. Unfortunately, these frames of Sopoćani were destroyed but the signs left on the ruined surface suggest that they were decorated with carved motifs similar to the cornice of the portal lunette of the narthex, see Korać 1974.

²⁴⁴ Boura 1980, 105- 109, σχ. 3-4, fig. 168.

²⁴⁵ Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 108-110.

²⁴⁶ Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 108-110.

²⁴⁷ Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 110.

tiny bands with a bead-and-reel motif and pointed cubes. I have already discussed the use of heart-shaped palmettes and of bead-and-reel motifs in architectural sculpture and in paintings earlier in this chapter.

Mystras provides another example of two-level sculpture in stucco technique (fig. 1.140).²⁴⁸ The use of two-level sculpture was widespread for marble and stone during the twelfth century and became less common in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.²⁴⁹ It is clear that the frame is more comparable with marble and stone examples than with painted ones. The closest comparators are the twelfth-thirteenth century frames from the Metropolis of Mystras (fig. 1.142) and from the church of the Zoodochos Pege in Samari (Messenia) (fig. 1.141), which both have openwork bosses on the spandrels and openwork decoration on the arch.²⁵⁰ The colour element which characterises the Metropolis of Mystras and Samari examples (with painting, mastic and opus sectile) was probably also present in the proskynetaria of the Peribleptos but in paint, since some traces of blue still survive in the openwork of the arch (cat. No. 24, fig. 24.3c). However, the frame also shares some similarities with Late Byzantine sculptures in Mystras; for example, the leaves in the background are of a similar shape to those that would later be carved in 1428 for the Pantanassa (fig. 1.143). The cabochons with a Solomonic knot (widespread in both Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture) find close a comparison with the fourteenth-century limestone cornice in the ‘loggia’ of the Peribleptos, which displays a similar taste for high relief and rough surface (fig. 1.145). The jutting-out masses of the rosettes and cabochons on the stucco proskynetarion are similar to the rosettes and fleur-de-lis in the apse’s external façade (fig. 1.146). These comparisons suggest that the

²⁴⁸ Another example in stucco is the dome cornice in the katholikon of Hosios Loukas, which was analysed earlier.

²⁴⁹ Grabar 1976, 24-26; Outside from Mystras, stucco examples with two-level sculpture are the cornice of the dome in the katholikon of Hosios Loukas (cat. Nos. 20.1-20.2), the epistyle of the templon from Petrobitsa (cat. No. 16.1).

²⁵⁰ Bouras 1979; Marinou 2002, 85-87; Bouras, Boura 2002, 250-251, figs. 284-285.

frame from the Peribleptos was worked by looking at marble and porous limestone examples produced in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods.²⁵¹

Another proskynetarion frame is located in the church of St. Panteleimon in Nerezi (1164) (fig. 1.138), which is in line with the example from Mystras and highlights the close relation between stucco and marble. Indeed, the frame has a richer decoration and more delicate carving than the marble templon made for the same church. The proskynetarion is composed of a trilobed arch surmounted by an architrave and two small columns; the trilobed arch rests on two couples of double colonnettes by a high impost and small capitals. In terms of decorative repertoire, the frame does not differ from the one carved on the marble templon (fig. 1.139).²⁵² However, the soft rendering of the pheasants, the abundance of details, and the complex architectural structure make it stand out from the rest of the sculptural (marble) decoration, which is simpler and characterised by a coarser execution.²⁵³ The soft surface of stucco allowed the artisans to reach a more refined rendering of the decorative motifs which required more time for marble.

Type A proskynetaria cannot be visually distinguished from marble and stone ones, because they shared formats and decorative motifs with them, therefore they were a good alternative to marble proskynetaria frames.

Stucco proskynetaria Type B.

Proskynetaria frames Type B can be both modelled in the shape of an arch or be formed of an arched slab on colonnettes with painted decorative ornamentation; the mixture of the plaster appears to be less homogenous and rougher than that used for Proskynetaria Type A.

²⁵¹ For a discussion about the chronology of the proskynetarion frame, see chapter 3.4.

²⁵² The proskynetaria frames are considered to be made by the same workshop that did the templon, by Grabar 1976, 105-106; Petrov 1986, 361-362; Sinkevič 2000, 88; Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 113.

²⁵³ Grabar 1976, 106.

Indeed, Proskynetaria Type B are basically made of mortar or masonry rubble, which was quickly modelled and painted to resemble sculpture, but whose relationship with the latter is less close than that of Type A.

Before drawing some general considerations on Type B proskynetaria, it is important to note that the ornamentation and the stratigraphic relationship with the paintings of most examples have not been sufficiently discussed by previous scholars. This latter aspect is crucial in their evaluation because it reveals the close technical connections with mural paintings which often informed the iconographic choices of the artisans. Therefore, I will proceed in this section by discussing each case in chronological order.

The proskynetarion frame from the church of H. Ioannes Eleemon in Ligourio (cat. No. 23) is located on the eastern wall of the narthex.²⁵⁴ The frame can be dated to the second half of the twelfth century, since it was made during the same campaign as the mural paintings (the frame and the painting layers do not significantly overlap), as I verified in March 2018. It framed an image, nowadays unrecognisable, which was flanked by two female saints (fig. 1.147). All three saints belong to the same panel which is delimited in the upper part by a horizontal red band which follows the stone string-course cornice, and laterally by two vertical bands: one marks the right corner and follows the profile of the stone cornice, while the other marks the shape of the proskynetarion frame. The string-course cornice has now lost the layer of paintings which covered it originally; however, it is possible that it visually functioned as an epistyle of a tempon. The proskynetarion frame signalled the hierarchy of the sacred images of this 'barrier'. The proskynetarion is composed of a round arch which rests on capitals which

²⁵⁴ On the church of H. Ioannes Eleemon and its construction phases, Bon 1951, 149; Bouras 1974; Dimitrokallis 1990, 112, 114; Hadji-Minaglou 1994, 172-173, 179, 183.

are connected to the arch and to the pilasters by two pairs of fillets. The pilaster has a flute in the middle. Some traces of red, blue, and yellow paint are still visible on the frame. From what it is possible to see with naked eye, there is a thick red band which covers the interior part of the arch. The exterior is covered with both yellow and blue paint. The two pairs of transitional bands have three vertical red bands flanked by two yellow ones. The capital appears to be painted mainly in blue; however, it is not easy to distinguish whether the blue is the actual painting or if it is a degradation of the layer. Finally, the same bluish paint alternated with red is visible inside the flutes and covers the pilaster (fig. 2.19b).²⁵⁵ The example from Ligourio appears today as a flat arch on fluted pillars. It is impossible to reconstruct the original polychromy on the arch front. However, what appears clear is that there was no decoration in relief, except for the flutes of the pillars. Therefore, it was probably made by someone who belonged to the workshop of the painters.²⁵⁶

The same can be said for the next example, which is the proskynetarion frame of the image of the Virgin and the Child in the church of the Panagia in Archatos, Naxos (cat. No. 30) (fig. 1.148).²⁵⁷ The frame was made during the second decorative campaign of the church, dated to 1285 by the inscription of the priest Michael, one of the donors and a painter himself, and located next to the image of St. John the Forerunner.²⁵⁸ The frame is shaped to resemble an arched slab on two colonnette-posts. The lower part of the right colonnette seems to have continued into the presbytery forming the lower part of the templon.²⁵⁹ This part has been almost destroyed to make room for the movable icons of the post-Byzantine wooden liturgical

²⁵⁵ It is difficult to say with certainty whether the polychromy described belongs to the Byzantine phase of the building. Further research on the pigments compared to those of the mural paintings may help to resolve the issue.

²⁵⁶ See chapter 2 for information about the production of Proskynetaria Type B.

²⁵⁷ On the church and its painted programme: Dimitrokallis 1981; Kalopissi-Verti 1994: 145-146, fig. 5; Mitsani 2000, 96, 98; Aslanidis 2017, 336-343.

²⁵⁸ Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 87-88 (A 35).

²⁵⁹ However, this requires further investigations. I hope to conduct a survey as soon as possible to verify the relationship between the slab and the paintings.

barrier. If the proskynetarion frame was connected to the templon, it would have been part of a masonry templon, and it would be an exceptional case of a masonry templon paired with a plaster proskynetarion frame. Indeed, masonry templa usually do not have proskynetarion frames in relief but are simply painted.²⁶⁰

Another aspect worthy of note is the elliptic (or flat horseshoe) shape of the arch and the peculiar form of the colonnettes which do not find any comparison in marble and stone examples. However, it may have been a local practice, since a proskynetarion with an almost identical shape is found in the church of H. Sozon in ‘Giallous’ on the same island (1315-16) (cat. No. 31), in the church of H. Georgios in Kato Potamia (ca 1300-1310) (cat. No. 32), and in the church of H. Ioannes Theologos in Kamino Philotio (στην Κάμινο Φιλωτίου) (cat. No. 33).²⁶¹ The shape and decoration of the elongated colonnettes in the proskynetarion of the Panagia of Archatos find as a close comparator those of the proskynetaria frames of the church of the Virgin Makrini in Kallithea, Samos (ca. 1300) (cat. No. 29).

The proskynetarion of Archatos also shares similar iconographic choices with the examples of Samos and H. Sozon in ‘Giallous’: all of them are painted with birds, felines and wild animals alternating with interlace and rosettes on a white background. Indeed, the frame of Archatos has birds and six-leaf rosettes on the pendentives, while the upper part of the frame has two birds (partridges or peacocks) pecking and turned toward a central vegetal motif. The capitals are painted with the head of a lion (or lioness) showing its fangs and tongue (fig. 1.149). Above the capitals two acronym or initials, ΩΡ ΧΤ, are painted.²⁶² A band with an interlace ribbon is above and below the lion. The presence of birds pecking or drinking from a central

²⁶⁰ Results of a survey on Late Byzantine opaque masonry screens is in Gerstel 2006a. Even though Gerstel’s chapter is focused on opaque screens (which then include proskynetaria icons within the barrier), the evidence from other masonry barriers confirms this tendency. However, the church of the Taxiarches of Kostaniane could have had a proskynetarion frame made of stucco alongside the already attested stucco templon.

²⁶¹ Kostarelli 2017, 276, fig. 10; Konstantellou 2019, 189.

²⁶² The acronyms were noted by Konstantellou 2019, 188.

element (a fountain or a vegetal motif) is common in marble and stone slabs, as well as on proskynetaria frames, and it carries meanings alluding to eternal life.²⁶³ Some examples are the slab now in the museum of the monastery of Hosios Loukas,²⁶⁴ and the proskynetarion frame from the church of the Virgin of Koronissa (twelfth century).²⁶⁵ Moreover, peacocks and small birds are also carved and painted on the stucco arched slabs from H. Achilleios in Prespa (fig. 1.74), on the stucco frame of Nerezi (Type A) (fig. 1.138), on the plaster frame of the Virgin Makrini in Kallithea, Samos (Type B) (figs. 1.157-1.159), and the plater frame from H. Sozon in 'Giallous' (cat. No. 31). Another aspect which shows how the painters looked at carved examples for their iconographic choices is in the posts. They are quickly modelled in a polygonal shape, to imitate carved posts, and the painters then covered them with vegetal stems in a way similar to those carved on the posts and epistyles of marble templa, such as those of the Koimesis of Charia²⁶⁶ and the Asomatos in Kolouni both on the peninsula of Mani and dated to the twelfth century.²⁶⁷

What is probably the most striking feature of the proskynetarion frame of the Panagia of Archatos is the lionhead capital. The presence of lionheads in Late Byzantine painted architectures continued the Ancient tradition of placing them on buildings as architectural decorations, as well as architectural structures, furnishings such as thrones, and in combination with marble, especially on sarcophagi. Mouriki noted that from the second half of the thirteenth century, lionheads and masks became widespread in Late Byzantine paintings which she interpreted as a revival and, at the same, a result of closer interaction with the West, occasioned by the Latin occupation of Byzantine territories.²⁶⁸ However, lionheads and masks were used

²⁶³ On the meaning of peacocks in Byzantine art, see Roux 1991; Weyl Carr 1991.

²⁶⁴ Grabar 1976, 58-59, pl. XXVI.

²⁶⁵ Vanderheyde 2005, 55 no. 76 fig. 66.

²⁶⁶ Drandakis 2002, 238, fig. 359.

²⁶⁷ Drandakis 2002, 294-295, fig. 432-433.

²⁶⁸ Mouriki 1980-1981.

also before this; in particular, in illuminated manuscripts dated to the tenth and the eleventh centuries, but also in some initials of twelfth century.²⁶⁹ During the Middle Byzantine period there were few appearances of feline heads in sculpture: the capitals of the New Metropolis of Berroia,²⁷⁰ and the waterspouts on the drum of the church of the Virgin in Hosios Loukas.²⁷¹ From the second half of the thirteenth century, feline heads and lionheads became more widespread in sculpture and stucco reliefs. Some examples are the capitals of double colonnettes now at the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul, where lionheads are flanked by birds,²⁷² the proskynetarion frame in H. Paraskeve in the kastron of Geraki (fourteenth century) (fig. 1.151),²⁷³ the aedicula of the image of the Virgin above the entrance of the Zoodokos Pege church in kastron of Geraki (fourteenth century) (fig. 1.150), and the feline heads on plaster window transennae from the Kokkini Ekklesia of Boulgareli (1295/96) (fig. 1.152). Lionhead capitals were used in other Type B proskynetaria: in the church of the Dormition in Longanikos, Peloponnese (fig. 1.154), in H. Georgios *tou Bounou* in Kastoria (second half of the fourteenth century) (fig. 1.155),²⁷⁴ and in the narthex of the Ljubostina monastery church (ca 1406–1408) (fig. 1.153).²⁷⁵ In Ljubostinja and Kastoria, the lionheads were painted *en grisaille* following a more classicising style, while in Archatos the combination of the yellow of the fur, the red of the tongue and the strong facial traits underlined by a black line, makes the lion much more vivid and grotesque than the others. A similar taste for the grotesque is seen in the proskynetarion frame of the Dormition of Longanikos, where the cat shows pointed fangs, being almost demoniac and recalling of Romanesque sculpture, but also iconographic solutions

²⁶⁹ Mouriki 1980-1981, 318, 320-321, 328.

²⁷⁰ Panayotidi 1970-72, 88-89, pl. 28γ.

²⁷¹ On the sculpture from the church of the Virgin of the monastery of Hosios Loukas, see Boura 1980, 22, 36-48, figs. 20, 36-48, 59-85 (other waterspouts with lionheads from Middle Byzantine buildings).

²⁷² Yalcın 1999, 363, n. 53, fig. 18.

²⁷³ Wace 1904, 142; Bouras 2001, 251; on the paintings, see Dimitrokallis 2001, 39.

²⁷⁴ Triphonova 2010, 173-174, fig 223, 225-226.

²⁷⁵ Đurić, 1985, figs. 112-128; Djordjević, Marković, 2000-2001, 30-32; Todić 2007; Drpić, 2013, 335.

recorded in the Madrid Skylitzes usually associated with a Western hand (fig. 1.156).²⁷⁶ It is not impossible that the painters of Naxos and Longanikos included in their repertoire Western elements such as grotesque faces, since both the island and the Morea experienced Latin occupation.²⁷⁷ Another source of inspiration may have been liturgical garments produced in the Palaiologan period and after, where lionhead capitals were used to frame holy figures.²⁷⁸ These examples show the various range of media from which the painters of Archatos could have accessed this iconographic motif.

It is almost impossible to provide lionheads with a specific symbolism aside from the generical ‘antiquarianism’ and ‘apotropaic’ meaning that had characterised them since Antiquity. However, the grotesque aspect of the lions in Archatos together with the original function of the church may explain the choice of lionhead capitals as prophylactic and not only an antiquarian choice. The recent study of the painted programme of the church by Konstantellou sheds light on the presence of healing saints in the northern chapel of the church through unusual iconographic choices.²⁷⁹ The healing saints are concentrated in the northern chapel, which is located next to the proskynetarion Type B.²⁸⁰ Konstantellou argued that the chapel functioned as a veneration chapel for healing purposes. The position of the

²⁷⁶ For a recent study on the artists involved in the illumination, see Tsamakda 2002, 373-379.

²⁷⁷ However, it is more difficult to verify how the lion was understood in Late Byzantine society. On the symbolism of the lion in Western Medieval art, see the synthesis of Pastoureau 2004, 49-63.

²⁷⁸ See the *epitrachelion* of Dositheos the Hieromonk at the Byzantine and Christian Museum of Athens (first half of the fourteenth century, Woodfin 2012, 255-256, cat. nr. 30 and further bibliography; the *epimanikia* with Sts. John Chrysostom and Basil (end of the fifteenth-beginning of the sixteenth century), Woodfin 2012, 278, no. 8 and further bibliography; and the now-lost *epitrachelion* of the Vatican Sacristy which survives in the drawing-cast of Seroux D’Angicourt (fourteenth-sixteenth centuries), which shows in the lower part a series of felines very similar to those painted in the church of Archatos. Unfortunately, the chronology of this piece is very wide, see Moretti 2018, 431-452, in particular fig. 1 and 6.

²⁷⁹ Konstantellou 2019, 192-212.

²⁸⁰ The series of healing saints starts with the image of St. John the Forerunner the *Rigotioktis* (Πργοδιωκτης, he who repels the shivers) depicted in the apse of the northern chapel. It is surrounded by a painted proskynetarion frame with crosses, six-petal rosettes and a feline (a panther?) showing its tongue framed in a medallion against a red background. On the northern wall, there are the images of two saints identified by Konstantellou as St. George *Diasoritis* and St. Kyriakos bishop of Jerusalem, both healing saints. Konstantellou 2019, 143-219, in part. 192-206.

proskynetarion frame Type B leads me to wonder whether the image of the Virgin which it surrounds had any specific healing feature and if the lionheads on the frame signalled it. A possible answer might have come from the two acronyms above the capitals which are, unfortunately impossible to decipher due to the condition of the painting.²⁸¹

Therefore, in the absence of more solid data it is only possible to note that the iconography of the lionhead in Archatos acquired a specific apotropaic meaning due to its location into a place of particular veneration, but nothing more.²⁸² This iconography also tells us that proskynetaria Type B in general is that they participated in the revival of lionheads and masks, recorded especially in Late Byzantine paintings from the second half of the thirteenth century.

Additional proskynetaria Type B are those in the church of the Virgin Makrini in Kallithea (Samos), dated to ca. 1300 (figs. 1.157- 1.159),²⁸³ which are in shape and ornamental choices very close to the example from Naxos. They are decorated with mainly vegetal and animal motifs. The frame of the Virgin (fig. 1.190) is characterised by the extensive vegetal decoration and two medallions with birds, while the frame of the Pantokrator (fig. 1.159) has images of felines (maybe leopards?), birds and a deer in medallions against a vegetal background. The shaft of the colonnette of the frame of the Pantokrator has an interlaced motif and a Solomonic knot framed by triangles which resembles the band with interlaced motifs on the colonnettes of the proskynetarion of Naxos. Solomonic knots are often found engraved on columns. The overall decoration of the two proskynetaria imitates marble and stone examples

²⁸¹ Konstantellou 2019, 188-189; Konstantellou 2020.

²⁸² The presence of the lionhead capitals on Late Byzantine proskynetaria should be explored in the future, in light of the use of Herculean symbols to guard entrances of templa, such as the knotted columns and the hand holding a sceptre or a clave in some Middle Byzantine templa. For knotted columns see Kalavrezou-Maxeiner 1985. On the iconographic motif of the hand in Middle Byzantine templa, see the different opinion of Vanderheyde 1999, and Barsanti 2019.

²⁸³ On the mural painting and the proskynetaria frames see: Mitsani 1998, 96-109.

in use since the Middle Byzantine period; for example, the arched slab, now in the Hosios Loukas monastery museum, which shows a deer attacked by a griffin (fig. 1.160). The iconography is very similar to that already seen in the Panagia in Archatos on Naxos (with the exception of the lionheads), therefore I refer to the previous section for them.

The last example of proskynetaria Type B frame is not one image, but a Deesis. The first one is located on the northern wall of the church of the Hodegetria in Spelies, Euboea (1311) (fig. 1.162).²⁸⁴ The frame is composed of three moulded arches crowned by an epistyle; in the spandrels there are tear-drop bosses. Compared to the other Type B examples, this frame is more accurate. This is not only true in terms of modelling, but also in the proportions and measurements of the frame which are extremely regular: the width of the two lateral arches is slightly smaller than the central one (48.5 cm for the lateral arches and 58.5 cm for the central one) as is the same for their heights; the different mouldings of the frame maintain the same length, being symmetrical. The shape of the frame is peculiar because the arches do not rest on colonnettes; the frame looks like three suspended arches whose supports are missing. We do not find comparators in Late Byzantine sculpture. Emmanuel, the first scholar to study the wall-paintings of the Hodegetria of Spelies and its frame in detail, suggested prototypes for the frame of the Deesis should be seen in gothic-western art, because the sequence of three ‘suspended’ arcades can be found on altars, triptychs and tombs.²⁸⁵ This may be possible, however, the wall paintings of some slightly later churches, testify to the use of ‘suspended’ arches framing images of the Deesis. These are two churches in Kastoria, H. Athanasios tou Mouzaki (1384/1385) (fig. 1.163),²⁸⁶ and H. Georgios *tou Bounou* (second half of the fourteenth

²⁸⁴ On the iconographic programme of the church see: Foustieris 2006, 80, 194-196; Emmanuel 1990; Ioannou 1959, XI, 59-77; Zographos 1927, 1, 6.

²⁸⁵ Emmanuel 1990, 460-461.

²⁸⁶ Pelekanidis 1953, pl. 142-154, in part. Pl. 150β; Chatzidakis in Pelekanides, Chatzidakis 1985, 106-119 in part. fig. 14.

century),²⁸⁷ as well as the church of Christos Zoodothos in Borje (Albania) (1389/90) (fig. 1.164).²⁸⁸ The three churches share with the Hodegetria of Spelies its small dimensions and the location of the Deesis on the northern wall next to the step leading to the bema.²⁸⁹ The only comparison from plaster proskynetaria frames is that of the Deesis of the church of Ljubostjnia monastery (ca 1406–1408) (fig. 1.161).²⁹⁰ Spelies and Euboia were under Venetian domination during the fourteenth century, so it is possible that the patron and the artisans of Spelies knew of portable icons or altars produced in Italy or Europe which had with such frames.²⁹¹ What appears clearer is that the ‘suspended’ arches continued to be used by Macedonian painters, demonstrating the fortune of this scheme which finds its first appearance on the plaster frame of Spelies.

Some considerations on Type A and B proskynetaria

We can draw the following observations from the material presented above for both proskynetaria frames Type A and B:

- a) Type A and B proskynetaria frames show a decorative repertoire that is also found in marble and stone examples, as well as in painting. This demonstrates that stucco proskynetaria frames do not differ from those in other media in their iconographic sources.

²⁸⁷ On the church see, Triphonova 2010, in part. 38-39, fig. 62.

²⁸⁸ Lozanova 2004.

²⁸⁹ They also show the pairing of this frame with a specific iconography of the Deesis which includes Christ dressed as king and sitting on a throne with tall seatback. Moreover, for the H. Athanasios *tou Mouzaki* and the Zoodothos of Borje it has been suggested that they were painted by the same workshop, Chatzidakis in Pelekanides and Chatzidakis 1985, 107.

²⁹⁰ Drpić, 2013, 335; Todić 2007; Djordjević, Marković, 2000-2001, 30-32; Đurić, 1985, figs. 112-128.

²⁹¹ See examples quoted by Emmanuel, Emmanuel 1990, 461, n. 66. Probably a closer comparison is the altarpiece made by Vigoroso da Siena in 1291 for the church of S. Giuliana in Perugia, now at the Galleria Nazionale dell'Umbria, inv. no. 32.

b) However, there are some sharp differences between Type A and Type B. Type A clearly imitates marble examples; the structure of the frame is articulated in colonnettes, imposts, capitals, and epistyles, which find numerous comparisons in sculpture. The artisans responsible for Type B looked at marble examples as prototypes too, but the manufacture and technique resulted in the creation of different shapes. For example, the colonnettes of the frame in the Panagia church in Archatos continued on to a polygonal pillar, which we need to see as an attempt at imitating the colonnette-pillar used in carved templa. However, the pointed shape of the shaft of the column suggests a sort of misinterpretation or a conscious experimentation, moving away from the prototype. Another sign of the non-carving mindset of these artisans is, I believe, the unusual shape of the arch: on the left side, the arch has two levels of ‘splay’ which gradually disappear on the right side. This may be the result of either the lack of a preparatory drawing of the frame, or a conscious attempt to provide depth to the frame, creating a sort of niche which could be better appreciated from the nave. Another aspect to note is that the ‘splay’ is painted with an interlace motif. In Type A and marble proskynetaria frames, when the interlace marks the arch, the latter always protrudes from the arched slab, but in Archatos it is the opposite. The painter then followed ornamental conventions of sculpture, while whoever modelled the plaster misinterpreted the carved prototype or had another model of proskynetarion frame in mind. Another difference between proskynetaria frames Type A and B is that the latter do not conform to the format conventions of sculpted proskynetaria frames. Indeed, while the use of the simple ‘round arch’ basically disappeared from the marble and Type A frames after the twelfth

century, it continued to be used in Type B and in painted proskynetaria frames.²⁹² Of fifteen proskynetaria frames made of stucco, four have a simple round arch: those in the Protaton (cat. Nos. 9.1-9.2), the church of H. Ioannes Eleemon in Ligourio (second half of the twelfth century) (cat. No. 23), the church of H. Athanasios in Leontari (1370-90) (cat. No. 25), the church of H. Ioannes Theologos in Kamino Philotio (cat. No. 33), and the church of H. Georgios *tou Bounou* in Kastoria (second half of the fourteenth century) (cat. No. 12). With the exception of the proskynetarion of the Protaton, all the other examples belong to 'Type B'. This is a further element which associate proskynetaria frames Type B with wall paintings.

- c) Colour. The proskynetaria frames of both types were painted. The pigments mostly remained on Type B examples, while most of the Type A proskynetaria frames have lost their original colours. Their current condition does not allow for a reconstruction of their original polychromy, which requires specialist investigations.

1.15 A possible canopy

The last category of architectural elements made of stucco is a canopy, today lost but appreciated and drawn by Barnsley when he, with Schultz, visited the monastery of Hosios Loukas in Beotia in 1889-1890 (cat. No. 20.6). They paid specific attention to the materials employed. At the time of their visit, the shrine of Saint Luke in the katholikon still preserved a pyramidal canopy. The pyramidal cover rested on marble colonnettes (which are today still in place), however, Schultz and Barnsley recorded that the cover was made of stucco (today lost). At the time of the restorations of the monastery under the direction of Stikas (1938-1964), the

²⁹² With this statement I do not mean that marble and Type A proskynetaria frames were not originally painted. I refer to the wall paintings where the frame is not in relief.

pyramidal cover was lost. Stikas only recorded remnants of ‘old’ plaster.²⁹³ He noted that the colonnettes and architraves broke into the marble revetment of the wall, showing that the shrine was added after the marble revetment was made; he also pointed out that the presence of the shrine was not harmonious with the rest of the architecture of the katholikon.²⁹⁴ In contrast, recently Bogdanović noted how the painted image of Loukas of Stiris should have appeared exactly on top of the canopy when seen from the northern arm of the cross of the church.²⁹⁵ On the basis of the description of the pilgrimage experience at the monastery of Hosios Loukas she suggested that the pilgrims should have looked at the shrine from the area marked by the *opus sectile* ‘omphalos’ in the pavement. Unfortunately, this hypothesis clashes with the objective fact that the insertion of the colonnettes and architraves broke into the marble revetment. A possible explanation is a change in project while the decoration of the katholikon was still in progress. Stikas suggested that the shrine was added somewhere between the end of the eleventh century and the twelfth century.²⁹⁶ Chatzidakis, in contrast, considered the shrine to be the product of a restoration that occurred around 1792, which is testified by an inscription; however, as Stikas noted, the inscription referred to the ‘tomb’ of the saint and not to a shrine – and the tomb of St. Luke was located in the crypt of the katholikon by that time. In the absence of the original pyramidal cover, it is very difficult to propose a specific chronology. The marble architectural elements of the shrine are not part of the same set and were probably in secondary use. The pyramidal shape of the stucco cover finds comparison in both sculpted canopies, and

²⁹³ Stikas 1970, 133; Stikas 1974-75, 54-74 in part. 55.

²⁹⁴ Stikas 1974-75, 54-76, 136-137.

²⁹⁵ Bogdanović 2017, 195-206.

²⁹⁶ Stikas dated the construction of the katholikon at the time of the emperor Constantine IX Monomakos (1042-1055) Stikas 1970-1972, 9-33; Stikas 1974-75.

in those depicted in the architectural background of mosaics and paintings of the Middle and Late Byzantine periods.²⁹⁷

Some examples are the canopies represented in the ivory of St. Menas now in Milan (seventh century),²⁹⁸ the fragmentary marble plaque representing the Holy Sepulchre now in the Dumbarton Oaks museum (sixth-seventh century),²⁹⁹ the canopy covering the icon of Mary depicted in the Hamilton psalter (ca. 1300), fol. 39v,³⁰⁰ and finally pointy covers are on the shrine/proskynetarion in the church of the Taxiarches in Kalyvia-Kouvara, Attica (thirteenth-fourteenth century?).³⁰¹ These examples suggest that shrines with pyramidal covers were widespread in the Byzantine period; canopies in Orthodox churches of the post-Byzantine period tended to have a dome instead.³⁰² Therefore, while the shape of the cover and the mural painting of St. Luke just above the shrine makes a Byzantine chronology possible and worthy of consideration, it cannot be verified further, nor its potential date be restricted to either the Middle or the Late Byzantine period.

1.16 Conclusions

The present chapter demonstrated that stucco continued to be used from the Late Antique to the Late Byzantine periods without interruption. The evidence presented and discussed here, showed patterns of continuity and change. Finally, a detailed formal and iconographical analysis of Middle and Late Byzantine examples was presented, illustrating the relationship

²⁹⁷ See, for example the reliquary of St. Demetrios (eleventh century), the ciborium painted in the mosaics of the apse of St. Sophia in Kiev (eleventh century), the canopy on the ambo and the ciborium in the church of the Dormition at Kalambaka (after tenth century), and the ciborium in the scene of the Presentation of the Virgin at the Peribleptos church in Ohrid (fourteenth century).

²⁹⁸ Tasso 2016.

²⁹⁹ Vikan 1995, 82-86, no. 34.

³⁰⁰ Belting 1970, 72-75; Spatharakis 1974; Spatharakis 1976, 45-48; Havice 1984; Ševčenko cat. No. 54 in Vassilaki (ed.) 2000.

³⁰¹ Orlandos 1923, 165-168; Ćurčić 2000a.

³⁰² The pyramidal cover continued to be used in Muslim minbars.

between stucco, marble sculpture, wall painting, and architectural ceramics, and demonstrating that, while stucco generally participated in the trends recorded in sculpture, it also differed from it in a richer ornamental and formal repertoire which occasionally allowed artisans and patrons to create new solutions.

To sum up the elements of continuity with the Late Antique period, one evident example is the perpetuation of the use of string-course cornices made of stucco (e.g. katholikon of Hosios Loukas, Kosmosoteira in Feres), which finds a parallel in Roman written sources, in particular in the passage of Vitruvius in *De architectura*.³⁰³ Moreover, the way in which stucco string-course cornices appear in Middle Byzantine buildings (e.g. the katholikon of Hosios Loukas) mirrors sixth-century churches, such as Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and S. Vitale in Ravenna where they mark the change in wall revetment from marble to mosaic.³⁰⁴ Stucco continued to be used to mark these intermediate zones.

Another element which seems a reminiscence of the Late Antique interior wall is the framing of the windows by means of stucco arches and colonnettes in the interior of the *choroi* of the katholikon of Vatopedi, which create an interplay of solids and voids. The wall of the *choroi* recalls solutions like the *ediculae* with prophets in the area between the windows in the Baptistry of the Orthodox in Ravenna, or the *ediculae* carved in limestone in the bema of the church of St. Anthony of the Red Monastery (fig. 1.165). The window above the apsidal arch of the church of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai (fig. 1.166), provides us with another case of plaster colonnettes this time covered in mosaic resembling a jewelled colonnette, but still dated to the sixth century. It is difficult to say if this was a conscious reference, even though we cannot exclude this possibility.

³⁰³ Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, V, II, 2 and VII, III. 3.

³⁰⁴ See above, paragraphs 1. 3.

There were, as we have seen, substantial changes to the ornamental vocabulary and forms of architectural decoration in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods. The first, more evident change is the gradual disappearance of narrative scenes and human figures from the fifth century onwards, the causes of which are still not clear and cannot be answered by this thesis. After those in the Baptistry of the Orthodox in Ravenna (ca mid-fifth century), stucco ornamentations usually displayed vegetal and geometric motifs. An exception is Cyprus where the use of stucco was firmly rooted from the Hellenistic period onward due to the lack of local marble,³⁰⁵ and where narrative scenes and human figures are recorded until the late-sixth and the beginning of the seventh century. Outside Cyprus, however, the shift away from human figures in stucco decorations is not paralleled in sculptural production where human figures continued to be carved, even though they were used sparingly.³⁰⁶ This may simply be due to the accidental destruction of evidence. Indeed, as we have seen, the passage on the canon of Trullo by Theodore Balsamon probably referred to scenes made of stucco representing human figures, providing us with a precious snapshot of stucco in lay buildings, since the material collected in this thesis comes only from religious contexts.³⁰⁷ In churches, generally, human figures are carved in marble and stone in low and high relief on templon epistyles, on capitals, and on panels (being low-relief icons); occasionally they appear on tomb slabs (eg. Maria Palaiologina in the Lips monastery).³⁰⁸ In thirteenth-century sculpture there was a renewed interest in narrative scenes and in the representation of sacred figures which was particularly widespread in Palaiologan Constantinople, even though other examples can be registered in

³⁰⁵ See chapter 4 for a discussion on the subject.

³⁰⁶ Human figures can be mainly found in Middle and Late Byzantine templa (e.g. Serçikler) and in general in slabs.

³⁰⁷ *PG*, 138, 862; English translation from Mango 1972, 234. It is impossible to say if they were three-dimensional sculptures, though there is scarce evidence for three-dimensional sculpture in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods, with the exception of the image of the acrobat at the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul, Grabar 1976, 140-141, pl. CXVIII n. 146; Firatlı 1990, 18 cat. No. 33-34, pl. 15 33a-b, 34.

³⁰⁸ Melvani 2013, 63-84.

Athens, Thessaly, and Epiros.³⁰⁹ This trend does not find comparators in stucco examples. The reason for this is not clear. Perhaps, the lack of stucco examples is due to the accidental destruction of the evidence or to the growing importance of marble.

During the Middle and the Late Byzantine periods, it seems that stucco was mainly used for making and simulating sculptures, since stucco architectural decorations find close parallels in marble, with some few exceptions (e.g. the doorframe of the katholikon of Iviron, the capitals in the Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres). This connection with sculpture seems to have been stronger than in the Late Antique period, when stucco was also used as a complement for wall paintings. If we exclude haloes worked in *pastille*, there is no evidence in Byzantine buildings of mixing techniques of wall paintings and stucco as in Roman paintings, or even in eighth- and ninth-century stuccoes from Northern Italy, Switzerland and France, where stucco was real a complement of the wall painting and vice-versa. Surely, stucco was painted, but it was not used to create big narrative compositions on walls, as for example in the crypt of the church of S. Pietro al Monte at Civate (Italy) (fig. 5.72). Byzantine stuccoes more closely resembled their contemporary sculptures, which were painted, but they were rarely used for big narrative scenes.

Therefore, it seems that we should understand stucco in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods within the realm of ‘sculpture’ and that we should consider stucco decorations within the broader frame of Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture. The reference to sculpture in some cases is closer than others, and it can be summarised as follows:

- a) Cornices and friezes made of stucco followed the conventions of sculpture, without innovating dramatically the iconographic repertoire.

³⁰⁹ Melvani 2013, 63-84; Grabar 1976, 23-24.

- b) The same can be said about the arched slab probably part of a ciborium, from H. Achilleios on the Small Lake of Prespa.
- c) Even though, in general, colonnettes, posts, and capitals follow the ornamental conventions of marble sculpture, they appear to be innovative in the number of decorative patterns used, as well as, in the case of Iviron (both the tomb and the door frame) references to ivory carvings, architectural ceramics (the peacock-plumes shafts of the colonnettes) and new motifs (*peltae*).
- d) The free-standing templa from Epiros appear to be conservative in iconographic choices (they follow Middle Byzantine conventions) compared to contemporary marble sculpture, but they are a precious testimony to the development of the templon into an opaque barrier, as the epistyle from Petrobitsa suggests. In this regard, their study could contribute to the understanding of the form of liturgical barriers in the Late Byzantine period. Moreover, if the plaque from the Taxiarches of Kostaniane was part of a reliquary or a shrine, this will testify to a unique use of stucco.
- e) Proskynetaria frames show the variety in which stucco can be worked and lead us to wonder how such reliefs were perceived by the Byzantines themselves. Indeed, while Type A proskynetaria could be confused with marble examples, in Type B the ‘imitative’ nature is more evident. This means that Type B proskynetaria were easily recognisable as made of a malleable material used to create a sculpture; a sculpture which had very little relief and which was really a hybrid in between painting and sculpture, more an illusion of a sculpture.³¹⁰ The view of a Type B proskynetaria can be compared to the relative surprise which is raised by the view of the more refined colonnettes in relief but covered in mosaic from the cathedral of Cefalù, Sicily (mosaics

³¹⁰ The same consideration can be made for masonry cornices. See earlier in this chapter for a discussion on this.

after 1145) (fig. 1.167). Here the colonnettes are clearly not made of marble, but of mosaic on protruding plaster, and the mosaicists played with their medium in suggesting and imitating a column. In this regards, Type B proskynetaria are similar, because they are a protruding part of the wall paintings (they are made of the same medium, plaster), but they are painted and modelled by looking at sculptural prototypes. The more widespread diffusion of proskynetaria Type B in the Late Byzantine period, suggests, in my opinion, that they were appreciated by Byzantine audiences and patrons for this imitative feature.³¹¹ This leads us towards the evaluation of the last important aspect, which is the architectural context where stucco decorations were experienced and understood.

Stucco decorations were inserted into buildings made and adorned with different materials. Stucco is a highly imitative material: it can resemble marble and can be reminiscent of it. So, what led to the actual choice of stucco by the patrons and the artisans? This question is central also to chapter 4, therefore, the observation which will be made in the following lines will not involve the economic aspect of the use of stucco, but instead its value in the planning and making of the ornament and how it contributed to the aesthetics of the building. There is not a unique answer to this question, but several observations follow. The first is that since stucco is a malleable material which can be easily modelled, cast, and carved, there are some cases where I believe that the use of stucco was connected with specific needs. This is the case of the stucco cornice on the central apse of the katholikon of the Daphni monastery. The cornice is the continuation of the *en-champlevé* one which runs in the perimeter of the naos. Why was stucco used in the apse, at the feet of the Virgin Mary, the most sacred space, while the other part the

³¹¹ This aesthetic value was probably connected to a change in skills of the artisans during the Late Byzantine period. See chapter 4 for a discussion about this.

cornice was made of marble, a material highly appreciated by Byzantines? A possible explanation is that the apse profile is very narrow and cutting a marble cornice for that curvature would have been difficult. At the same it is important to signal that a similar choice was made in the Koimesis church of Nikaia in the Middle Byzantine period where a cornice made of another ‘ephemeral’, but malleable, material (tiles) was made for the apse in the period between 843 and 1067.³¹² Another case is the katholikon of Hosios Loukas where all the string-course cornices, apse included, are made of stucco. Here, as in Daphni, the chord of the apse is very deep and narrow and the stucco in the apse may have solved the issue of providing the church with a cornice that was difficult to prepare.

The use of stucco can also be seen as a continuation of previous traditions, as we have seen, and a perpetuation of aesthetic conventions.

The final observation involves the aesthetic perception of the interior decoration. Apart from those cases where stucco is poorly modelled and is in buildings, or in areas of the building with no sculpture,³¹³ the remainder of the cases raise the question of whether the use of stucco answered aesthetic needs, and what these needs were. One possibility is that stucco allowed the ornamentation of the church to be as rich and varied as possible. This does not only involve the investment in the most expensive materials, such as gold, silver, and precious marbles, but it also involved any means necessary to generate amazement to the visitor.

Late Antique and Byzantine authors often described the experience of amazement and wonder, *thauma* (θαῦμα), in beautiful buildings as the impossibility to fix the gaze on anything in particular, because of the incredible artisans’ craftsmanship and the variety of materials. Some examples are the description of the Justinian Hagia Sophia by Paul the Silentiary,³¹⁴ of H.

³¹²For the tiles and their datation, see Hirschibichler 2001; figure in Tronzo 2001, fig. 18.

³¹³ A discussion on the economic relationship between marble and stucco is in chapter 4.

³¹⁴ Mango 1972, 80-91. Further bibliography in chapter 4.4.

Sergios at Gaza by sixth-century rhetorician Chorikios of Gaza,³¹⁵ and the church of the Virgin of the Pharos in the Great Palace of Constantinople by the patriarch Photios (858-867, 877-886).³¹⁶ The ability of artisans to work stucco by creating marvellous shapes and, in some cases, covering it with gold indeed concurred to make the visitor lost and amazed. Another element in the experience of *thauma* was the amazement generated by the ability of artisans to work material to resemble something else, as suggested, for example in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus of Panopolis³¹⁷ and in the epic-romance *Digenes Akritas*.³¹⁸ In these two passages, the visitor is amazed by the ability of artisans in working wood as it was ivory and onyx pavement as it was ice. Stucco is a highly imitative material, as we have seen, and can be easily mistaken for marble or can resemble a jewel when covered in gold.³¹⁹

It seems to me that one of the reasons for the use of stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings is to promote the experience of *thauma* being part of the devices, which came together to make the visitor feel lost and at the same time amazed at the continuous cross-reference of different materials in a building. For example, if a Byzantine person entered in the room of the Boukoleon palace (cat. No. 1) s/he would be immersed in a multi-material room where architectural ceramics imitated enamels, and stucco imitated marble and communicated with the limestone inlaid arches, which in turn looked like monumental enamels.³²⁰ This exchange and dialogue between different media and the game of mirrors created by these cross-references

³¹⁵ Chorikios of Gaza, *Opera*, I, 2.17-76. English translation in Mango 1972, 60-68.

³¹⁶ Photios, *Homiliae*, X, 100 v.31-103 v.5. English translation in Mango 1972, 185-186.

³¹⁷ The episode is the visit of Bakchos (the protagonist) to the palace of king Staphylos in Assyria, *Dionysiaca*, XVIII, in part. vv. 67-86, p. 69.

³¹⁸ This is the description of the palace that Digenis himself build on the Euphrates, where 'he paved the floor with onyx so smoothly polished that those who saw it mistook it for water congelated to ice.' Mango 1972, 216. For the date of *Digenes Akritas* and its manuscript tradition, see Jeffreys 1998, xiii-xli.

³¹⁹ See Chapter 4 for further discussion on this topic.

³²⁰ To these materials we should add that the pavement was covered in *opus sectile* and that the centre had a marble table (probably an altar). Guiglia 2011, 429-430; Asgarı 1984.

is well known, for example, for textiles hung on walls representing architectural elements or patterns used in mosaic floors.³²¹

The amazement and confusion generated by a multi-material space where various media used similar patterns is based on the assumption that the viewer could, in some ways, perceive the different materials as such. The main question is: could a Byzantine person distinguish whether a capital or a cornice was made of stucco or marble? The artisans and patrons probably yes, because one used the medium and the other paid for it. Other people, who judged by eye, maybe not, especially if they were looking at a proskynetarion Type A, at the capitals of the Kosmosoteira, or the arcosolium and door frames of Ivron. For these people, stucco was perceived as part of the whole alongside the rest of the incredibly rich decoration, which was intended to amaze them with its shining colours and extravagant shapes. This latter aspect can be particularly appreciated in the rich ornamental solutions recorded on stucco artefacts.

In sum, stucco was and continued to be a considerable part of Byzantine interior decoration during the Middle and the Late Byzantine periods. Its use represents the development of a Late Antique tradition, which was perpetuated because it continued to answer both the aesthetic and functional needs of the time.

³²¹ Bühl 2019; Dospěl Williams 2019; DeMoor, Fluck 2009. This exchange could also go from the humble material to the rich one, as recently demonstrated by Eunice Maguire for the composite-basket capitals which faithfully reproduced Late Antique baskets, Maguire 2019.

2.WORKING STUCCO: PEOPLE, MATERIALS, AND TECHNIQUES³²²

2.1 Introduction

Exploring how Byzantines worked stucco between 850 and 1453 is a hard job. The first obstacle is the near absence of any specialist investigation concerned with stucco mixtures and tools used for carving and modelling. This lack mirrors a disinterest in stucco to the benefit of wall paintings, architecture, and marble sculpture. The numerous cases of wall paintings whose plaster was analysed do not involve any investigation of the stucco elements which lie alongside them.³²³ This creates problems and gaps in our knowledge of Byzantine artisanal practices. In some cases, the stuccoes were clearly contemporary with the wall paintings and they were probably made of the same material; however, sometimes the stuccoes and the wall paintings are not contemporary at all. In these cases, the chemical analysis of the plaster of the mural paintings is useless to our understanding of the stucco elements.³²⁴ The only case of archaeometrical analysis of stucco artefacts dated between the tenth and the fifteenth centuries was carried out on some Late Byzantine pieces in Epiros. The study published by Papadopoulou in 2001 is probably one of the first concerned with ingredients used in stucco mixtures and with the technique of modelling and casting Late Byzantine stucco.³²⁵ Studies of this kind should be routine.

The knowledge that Byzantinists have of stucco production is largely theoretical and based on naked eye observation. It is true that most of the stucco decorations known are still *in situ*, and that taking samples is an invasive procedure. However, infrared and UV light analysis,

³²² Parts of an earlier version of this chapter will appear in L. Brubaker, A. J. Kelley, F. Vanni, *Skint: Peasants and Poverty in Byzantium*, forthcoming.

³²³ Daniilia *et al.*, 2000.

³²⁴ This is the case for the Protaton church, the katholikon of Vatopedi monastery and the katholikon of the Iviron monastery all on Mount Athos.

³²⁵ Papadopoulou 2006.

which do not involve the withdrawal of any sample, would help us compare the composition of the stucco mixture with the plaster of the wall paintings. Basically, there is still need of a specialist archaeometrical bibliography which, I hope, will appear soon.³²⁶

One way to remedy this lack is to use the data from the analysis of wall painting plasters, but this requires a critical approach. In fact, as will be demonstrated in this chapter, even when contemporary, the ingredients chosen for the stucco mixture might not be the same as those used for the base of the wall paintings because we cannot assume that painters and stucco workers always worked side by side. The observation of the different phases (not necessarily chronology) of the wall paintings and stuccoes is nonetheless a very useful tool.

Byzantine written sources do not really help in filling gaps concerning stucco ingredients and tools used for modelling or in identifying how moulds were used or made. Treatises of painters such as the *Book of the Art* of Cennino Cennini are absent from Byzantine literature.³²⁷ For the Early Middle Ages, we might consider the work of the monk Theophilus, *De diversis artibus*, but this is not unanimously recognised as a treatise which reflects the Byzantine tradition, and was probably German.³²⁸ The treatise of Dionysios of Fournà is another controversial work, but in any event it is a handbook for painters and does not mention anything related to stuccoworks.³²⁹

The aim of this chapter is to establish the ground for comparative analysis of Byzantine stucco production in the rest of the Mediterranean by laying out principles and techniques used in Byzantine stuccoes between the ninth and the fourteenth century. This will be pursued by

³²⁶ I am in touch with Ormylia Art and Diagnosis for conducting non-invasive analysis (XRF, m-Raman, FTIR analysis) to identify the binder used in the stucco mixtures of 6 buildings in Greece and analyse the pigments. These analyses are funded by the Mary Jaharis Center for Byzantine art.

³²⁷ Cennino Cennini, *The Book of the Art*.

³²⁸ For a summary on the scholars supporting the German, Benedictine identity of Theophilus, see Tosatti 2000. This position has been recently re-confirmed by the study of Gearhart 2017, 1-15. Theophilus, *De diversis artibus*.

³²⁹ Dionysios of Fournà, *Ερμηνεία*. For an English translation see Hetherington 1974; for a recent publication on the figure of Dionysios and the manuscripts preserving the *Hermeneia* see Kakavas 2008.

describing the techniques used for producing and working stucco; problematizing the issue of stucco mixtures; focussing on stucco workers, their professional role and, to the extent possible, their social conditions. The evidence from both Byzantine texts and the stucco decorations dated between the ninth and the fifteenth century does not allow us to clearly distinguish the figure of the plasterer from the stucco-worker. Therefore, here stucco-worker stands for the artisan who works stucco either as a specialised artisan (in charge of modelling shapes out of plaster) or as occasional experience (e.g. a painter or a sculptor who occasionally works stucco). Finally, the last section is dedicated to the presentation of a case study and the discussion of the possibility of the identification of a workshop. This will highlight the problems raised by stucco decorations and provides a test-case for the analytical tools developed in this chapter.

2.2 Stages of production and techniques

The cases evaluated show a variety of techniques, sometimes used at the same time.

Stucco architectural decorations were worked in several stages, which could be done *in situ* or not. When worked in *situ*, the artisan applied several layers of plaster to the wall in decreasing thickness (fig. 2.6) and outlined their geometrical shape (e.g. arch or cornice) with a trowel or using movable mouldings (fig. 2.1a, c). The use of movable mouldings is already recorded in the stucco production of both the Roman and Sassanid periods, as well as in the Islamic territories, such as the panels and cornices found in churches of the area of the Gulf (Iraq) dated to the Early Islamic period.³³⁰

The wall was previously chiselled or provided with tiles to grant enough grip to the layers of plaster (figs. 2.5, 2.7). It is possible to imagine that nails and reeds were also used for

³³⁰ For technique in the Roman period see Bettini 2001; Adam 2018, 245-247; for Umayyad examples see Hamilton 1959, 156-293, in part. 273-281, pl. LXI-II; for the Gulf area Lic 2017, section 2.3, 3.2.3, 4.4.

the same purpose, as can be noted in Western examples such as at San Salvatore in Brescia,³³¹ however, this remains an hypothesis for Middle and Late Byzantine examples since I could not verify their use in any of the pieces I was able to examine. Features of the masonry could provide a perfect grip for stucco elements too. The now ruined Kemerli kilise in Trylie shows a level of protruding bricks at the level of the stringcourse cornice in the apse and in the interior faces of the springing of the arches (fig. 2.3): this line today provides the grip for the rococo stucco decoration, and it could have worked in the Byzantine period as grip for a moulded plaster cornice (either flat or with decorative motifs in relief) or for a cornice made of marble plaques, as in the Hodeghetria church in Mystras (fig. 2.4).³³² Indeed, the sixth-century stucco cornice in the south-western vestibule of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, was attached upon a ‘hollow, boxlike, construction of bricks arranged parallel to the wall face but inclined outwards towards the top which was covered by a row laid horizontally and inclining slightly upwards to where they are embedded in the wall’.³³³ An arrangement of tiles was recorded for the stucco cornice at the base of the dome in the katholikon of Hosios Loukas, too (eleventh century).³³⁴ After the architectural decoration was outlined, the decorative patterns were sketched either with coloured pigment or with incisions on the last layer of plaster while still wet (either with spatulae/sticks or pointed tools or with the help of a ruler).³³⁵ I have not found any preparatory drawing in the Byzantine stucco pieces examined since most of the stuccoes are still in situ; however, they were found both in Western and Eastern examples (e.g. San Salvatore in Brescia, San Giovanni in Argentella, Khirbat al-Mafjar).³³⁶ In these latter cases, the preparatory drawing

³³¹ For Western examples see the volumes edited by Sapin, Simon-Hiernard 2004; Sapin, Allag (ed.) 2006. More specific studies are those of Palazzo-Bertholon 2009; Palazzo-Bertholon 2010; Gheroldi 2014.

³³² For a recent analysis of the architecture of the Hodegetria church see Koufopoulos, Myriantheos 2018.

³³³ Hawkins 1964, 134.

³³⁴ Schultz, Barnsley 1901, 29.

³³⁵ Signs of ruler, scoring tool, blunt point, dividers, and taut strings were signalled by Hamilton first and by Arce later on some unfinished panels from Khirbat al-Mafjar, see Hamilton 1959, 273; Arce 2007, 525-531.

³³⁶ Gheroldi 2014; Acconci 1993; Hamilton 1959.

is visible because either the last layer of plaster fell off or the artefact has some unfinished parts (e.g. San Giovanni in Argentella).³³⁷ It is reasonable to assume that when Middle and Late Byzantine stuccoes were worked without moulds (e.g. Hosios Loukas and Daphni) artisans made a sketch of some sort (either carved or painted) as a guide during the carving process.

The decorative patterns were then carved on the moist surface with a spatula, a knife or a stick following a process of ‘cutting away’ the material (fig. 2.1c). Free-hand modelling was also practiced, as testified by the proskynetarion frame of Nerezi where fingerprints were detected already by Bošković.³³⁸ As an alternative, the decorative pattern could have been stamped on the wet plaster using a mould (figs. 2.1, 2.8, 2.47). In two cases, the arcosolium of Iviron and the architrave from the church of Petrobitsa (Epiros), there were some details (the peltae and the birds, respectively) were made in moulds and, once dried, attached to the architectural decoration with liquid plaster (figs. 1.128, 2.46).³³⁹ The stucco templa from Epiros show also some details carved into the dry surface.

An architectural decoration could also be modelled away from the wall. The fragments of a cornice now in the deposit of the Daphni monastery show traces of a cloth on the back and the lateral sides (fig. 2.9). This means that the cornice was made by pouring the plaster into a wooden box lined with a cloth. When the plaster dried, the cornice was removed with the help of the cloth. The same cornice shows signs of carving of the wet stucco with a spatula or a knife after having outlined the band with a ruler.

³³⁷ On the ciborium made of stucco in S. Giovanni in Argentella (Palombara Sabina), see Betti 2005, 165-179; Acconci 1993.

³³⁸ Bošković 1993, 157.

³³⁹ Papadopoulou 2006, 346-347.

The production of free-standing elements required a more complex procedure.³⁴⁰ The plaster was poured in a formwork from which at least three sides could be removed. The process of pouring the plaster inside the formwork happened in several phases so as not to create bubbles which would have threatened the density and the stability of the final object. During these phases, the artisans inserted some elements such as wooden pieces and reeds (whole or cut in half) (figs. 2.10-2.14) used for reinforcing the structure but also for providing resilience to the mixture.³⁴¹ Papadopoulou suggested that the formworks used for the liturgical furnishings of Epiros had the decorations carved in negative in order to cast the architectural element with the ornamentation; other details were later carved once the element was already dry. She also suggested that such formworks, or rather casts, were made of gypsum and that the interior was covered in oil or another material which allowed for easy detachment of the final piece.³⁴² We know that such casts could also be made of other materials such as clay and wood.³⁴³ We should then imagine a similar use of formworks as in the Merovingian plaster sarcophagi (fig. 2.2).³⁴⁴

The cases from thirteenth-century Epiros provide us also with some information on how a templon made of plaster was mounted. The vertical architectural elements, post-colonnettes had wooden beams inside which exited the upper part of the capital. The beam was probably used to provide stability, and possibly to join the colonnette and the capital to the epistyle, though the surviving pieces do not show that the beam exited the capital. A wooden horizontal stylobate secured the templon to the pavement, as Orlandos noted in the Kokkini Ekklesia in

³⁴⁰ For the production of free-standing elements in Byzantine territories see Vanderheyde 2005, 105-106; Papadopoulou 2006, 345-348. However, comparable processes were used for the production of plaster sarcophagi in Merovingian Gaul, see Périn 1991.

³⁴¹ Reeds arranged in vertical and horizontal lines are also attested in the panels from the church of Santa Maria de' Terreti, now in the deposit of the Museum Archeologico Nazionale of Reggio Calabria. These panels and the rest of the stucco decoration from the same church are both considered the product of Arab artisans from Sicily or of local Byzantine workshop, Caskey 2008; Orsi 1922.

³⁴² Papadopoulou 2006, 346 and n. 47-48.

³⁴³ Cabiale 2011b, 339-340; Périn 1991, 299-301; Ragona 1968; Ragona 1960.

³⁴⁴ Périn 1991; *Archéologie des nécropoles* 2013, 34-35.

Boulgareli.³⁴⁵ It is not clear whether the post-colonnettes were secured to the foundation through their inner wooden beam or whether the closure slabs had any inner structure which joined to the foundation, since no intact pieces survived. There are three fragments of ends of post-colonnettes which clearly show that the wooden beam did not stick out (fig. 2.15); these fragments do not show any carved ornamentation; therefore, it is possible that they were the lower part of the post-colonnettes. If this is the case, then the post-colonnettes were secured to the foundation through another layer of plaster. What seems clear is that the inner structures were strategically used for each element. Wooden beams can be found mainly in vertical elements, while reeds and canes were used for the horizontal ones. The only exception is the lower 'step' in a panel from the Kokkini Ekklesia which shows a wooden piece; in this case, the wooden beam served to balance the weight of the panel in order to prevent collapse (fig. 2.12). Indeed, the plaster mixture used in Epirote templa is very heavy. Panels and epistyles, instead, have reeds and canes inside which were probably used to lighten the structure; in some cases, they were used to create a grid made of vertical and horizontal canes. However, the use of the canes is not so systematic as it is in cases in the West, for example, the stuccoes in Cividale, Brescia, and Malles where bunches of reeds form the core of the stucco figures (figs. 2.16-2.18). In these cases, the considerable number of reeds served both to provide an adequate grip of the figures to the wall and to lighten the structure.³⁴⁶ In the Epirote cases the reeds are not in bunches, but single reeds are located at some distance one another (figs. 2.10-2.13), which both strengthened and lightened the plaster but not as efficiently as in the Western examples.

³⁴⁵ Orlandos 1927, 163.

³⁴⁶ Gheroldi 2014; Peroni 2002; Northdurfter 2002, 67-74.

2.3 Stucco mixture and why it matters (or not)

The definition of stucco has been at the centre of several studies.³⁴⁷ The introduction of this thesis already discussed the terminology chosen and the impossibility of drawing a sharp line between the so-called ‘and stucco based on lime or gypsum. The reason is that artisans of the Middle Ages experimented with a great variety of mixtures which cannot easily be categorised, and, as we will see in this chapter, there is no knowledge of the composition of Byzantine stucco mixtures dated between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries. Therefore, the word stucco here is used as a synonym of plaster relief.

In the Middle Ages, stucco mixtures are mainly of two kinds: those based on lime and those based on gypsum. In both cases lime and/or gypsum act as the binders and are present in high percentages (around 30-40%) and they are mixed with water; other materials, such as sand, powdered marble, straw, and broken tiles can be added to strengthen the mixture, to make it waterproof, or to just slow down the drying process leaving the artisan extra time for modelling. Vitruvius in his treatise *De Architectura* (35-25 BCE) prescribed the use of lime instead of gypsum, and in fact lime-based stucco is attested in Italy and France from the Augustan period.³⁴⁸ Moving East, Parthian and Sassanian stuccoes are mainly based on gypsum, though they can contain lime as well; this tradition of mixed stucco was later adopted by the artisans working for the Umayyad caliphs (661-750) who even used different mixtures for different kinds of stucco reliefs in the same building.³⁴⁹ The consistent use of gypsum-based stucco

³⁴⁷ Some of them are in Gapper, Orton 2011; Biscontin, Driussi 2001; Segagni-Malacart 2000; Kühn 1996; *Stucchi e mosaici alto medievali* 1962.

³⁴⁸ Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, VII, 1-4; Palazzo-Bertholon 2004.

³⁴⁹ Arce stated that Umayyad stuccoes were composed by a layer of lime plaster on which a thin layer of gypsum-based plaster was applied and carved. The mixed technique is suggested by the frequent detachment of the carved surface which did not have enough grip. Arce 2007, 529, n. 67. On stuccoes in southern Iraq, see Simpson *et al.* 2012, 212.

seems to have become widespread in the Islamic territories after the construction and decoration of the new capital of the Abbasid dynasty, Samarra founded in 836.³⁵⁰

The survey published by Palazzo-Bertholon on stuccoes in France, Switzerland, and Northern Italy showed a general shift in technology from lime to gypsum which became consistent from the ninth century onwards, due to the influence of Islamic technique through Umayyad Spain.³⁵¹ It should be noted that the presence of gypsum can be a result of a chemical transformation of calcium carbonate (lime) into calcium sulphate (the main component of gypsum) across the centuries because of the changed condition of the building.³⁵² However, it is unlikely that consistent use of gypsum recorded for the ninth century onwards can be explained entirely by this natural transformation, and it probably does reflect a change in local technique.³⁵³

The use of gypsum (calcium sulphate $\text{Ca} \cdot \text{So}_4 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$) instead of lime (calcium carbonate $\text{Ca} \cdot \text{Co}_3$) has some consequences. In general, a gypsum-based plaster is more compact than a lime-based one and allows the creation of high reliefs easily; however, the mixture shows a very low resistance to water, therefore it is not suitable for exteriors.

Before being mixed with water and inert materials, the gypsum or the calcium carbonate needs to be prepared. This can be done by cooking the limestone and the gypsum rocks. Lime and gypsum rocks were fired in different kilns.³⁵⁴ The φούρνος τῆς ασβέστου (kiln for unslaked

³⁵⁰ Stuccoes in the Middle East dated between the eight and the ninth centuries were not scientifically analysed (with the exception of Samarra which registered the use of almost pure gypsum, López Borges 2014. However, on the basis of the drastic change in composition of the stuccoes from Southern Mesopotamia and Persian Gulf region after Samarra (836), which differs from Parthian stuccoes (mixed technique) and Roman stuccoes (lime-based), Lic hypothesized that Samarra represented a turning point, Lic 2017, section 2.3.

³⁵¹ For the connection between France, Catalona and Islamic Spain, see Palazzo-Bertholon 2009, 288-290, 298. See also Palazzo-Bertholon 2004; Palazzo-Bertholon 2010.

³⁵² Gheroldi 2014, 109; Wisseman *et al.* 2011, 226; Jenssen, Majewski 1974, 333.

³⁵³ The correspondence between the different composition of plasters and phases can also be recorded in wall paintings, see Wisseman *et al.* 2012, 226-227.

³⁵⁴ The use of both lime and gypsum in the same mixture led Wolff to suggest that gypsum and lime could have been fired in the same kiln. Wolff 1966, 126.

lime) was the structure for firing lime which required a minimum of 800°C; γυψάρια (kilns for gypsum) were kilns whose temperature could be set to two ranges: 120-130°C or 800-1000°C. Gypsum rocks undergo reversible transformation at low temperatures of 120-130°C, but, if gypsum is fired in very high temperature, such as 800-1000°C or even 1300°C, the mixture created with it can be easily moulded because it will dry slowly (between ten hours and two days) and once dry it will reach the consistency of alabaster becoming incredibly hard and a very resistant to water; usually this latter technique is used for pavements, even though some eleventh-century stuccoes in the West used it too.³⁵⁵ Therefore, the use of gypsum instead of lime may be due to several factors: the need for a cheap material (gypsum rocks are very common in Mediterranean areas and the amount of timber required for the firing process is not as abundant as for the production of lime), or the need for strong plaster for high reliefs. If in the medieval west and in the Islamic East the ninth century is a sort of threshold for the use of gypsum-based stuccoes, is it possible to say this for Byzantine stuccoes too?

Recipes and mixtures of Byzantine stuccoes are largely unknown. Some fifth- and sixth-century stuccoes from Hagia Sophia in Constantinople and Dion (Greece) are known to be lime-based, and this is in accordance with the general trend of the Mediterranean;³⁵⁶ in contrast, those from the so-called ‘huillerie’ in Salamis of Cyprus (fifth-century) are gypsum-based.³⁵⁷ For the Middle Byzantine period nothing has been analysed, to my knowledge; but the mid-late-thirteenth-century stuccoes from Epiros have been analysed and are gypsum-based.³⁵⁸ Table 1

³⁵⁵ Cabiale 2011a, 325; Exner 2003, 657-659.

³⁵⁶ Hawkins stated that the cornice in the south-west vestibule in Hagia Sophia, Istanbul, was lime-based, though he does not provide any evidence for chemical analysis, see Hawkins 1964. Tested lime-based stuccoes are those from the Basilica A of Dion. I thank Ormylia Art Diagnosis Centre for the sharing the results of their unpublished analysis. A preliminary report is available at: http://www.artdiagnosis.gr/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Ormylia_site_stucco.pdf.

For an overview of the evidence from France and Italy, see Palazzo-Bertholon 2004; Palazzo-Bertholon 2006.

³⁵⁷ The use of gypsum-based stuccoes and wall painting plasters is peculiar to the island of Cyprus which is particularly rich in gypsum see Argoud *et al.* 1980, 27-28; Rautman 2003, 46-47.

³⁵⁸ Papadopoulou 2006, 344-345.

presents our current knowledge of the mixtures of the Middle and Late Byzantine stucco analysed in the catalogue (Appendix A), which is unfortunately based only on naked eye observation; I hope to carry out chemical analysis shortly as a separate project.

Though it is not possible to state yet whether Byzantine artisans used gypsum or lime more frequently in their stuccoes, we can say something about the aggregate materials used and their relationship to mural paintings.

Twelve cases out of thirty-five are probably made with the same plaster as that used for the wall paintings. All of them (except Timios Stavros) are proskynetaria frames; all of them (except Timios Stavros) do not have any decorative motifs in relief. These features suggest that such decorations were worked by the painter or that painter and stucco-worker worked simultaneously, side by side, using the same materials.³⁵⁹ In Ligourio the same ‘arriccio’ (undercoat) and ‘intonachino’ (topcoat) was used for both the stucco and the wall paintings above, which consists of straw pieces (and possibly wood shavings) and small rocks (fig. 2.19). In Spelies, the situation is apparently less homogenous: the stucco frame was made at the same time of the wall paintings (see paragraph 2.5) but has ceramic fragments in the mixture which are not recorded in the plaster of the wall paintings (figs. 2.20-2.22). The use of ceramic fragments confers stability to the plaster and allows the creation of the relief without the use of reeds as armature.

The case of the monastery of the Holy Cross in Timios Stavros (Cappadocia) is more problematic since the plaster relief is difficult to access and both the mural paintings and the relief are covered by a later whitewash which does not facilitate the reading of the surface.³⁶⁰

³⁵⁹ This is in accordance with what has already been noted for stuccoes in France, Italy and Spain, see Peroni 2006; Sapin 2004, 21-22. A detailed analysis of the progression of the construction site was made for the San Salvatore in Brescia: Gheroldi 2014.

³⁶⁰ The whitewash has a graffiti with the date 1870 on it but it can be reasonably related to the restoration undertook in the nineteenth century, on the church see Ousterhout 2017, 122-123.

What is clear is that there is no fracture between the plaster relief and the plaster of the wall paintings, therefore they were probably made of the same material (figs. 2.25-2.26).

Stucco mixtures were made for reliefs to decorate the interior. Therefore, it is not surprising to note the absence of pinkish mixtures which often is the sign of the use of ground tiles to make the stucco waterproof.³⁶¹ The use of ground tiles was recorded in the window transennae of the church of the Virgin Kosmosoteira in Feres,³⁶² while their pinkish colour suggests ground tiles were also a constituent part of the stucco from the katholikon of Hosios Loukas and a Sophia in Monemvasia.³⁶³

Understanding the ingredients used in Middle and Late Byzantine stuccoes matters. Knowing the binder (gypsum or lime) and the aggregates chosen each time will allow Byzantinists to take part to the debate about the transition between Late Antiquity and Middle Ages in the arts, and especially on stucco, where technical aspects play a crucial role.³⁶⁴ Verifying whether Byzantines preferred lime or gypsum will also allow Byzantinists to contextualise and compare Byzantine stucco production in its Mediterranean context, providing, probably, the missing link in the chain between stucco production in Europe (Italy, France, Germany, Spain) and the Middle-East (Syria, Jordan, Iraq).

³⁶¹ Ground tiles were also used in hydraulic mortars, Cagnana 2000, 137-141; Adam 2018, 76-79.

³⁶² Bakirtzis 1997, 507.

³⁶³ Most of the window transennae of the katholikon of Hosios Loukas were destroyed during the second World War, but some of the original are now on display in the museum of the monastery, while some still in situ (e.g. the one between the *prothesis* and the bema. In Hagia Sophia of Monemvasia, survives a fragment of the window transennae on the wooden beams of two openings of one *trifora*. These fragments are visible from the interior. I thank Athanasios Koumantos for signalling them to me.

³⁶⁴ On Medieval stucco mixtures, see Exner 2003; Palazzo-Bertholon 2004; Palazzo-Bertholon 2006; Palazzo-Bertholon 2009; Palazzon-Bertholon 2020. On Roman and post-Augustan stucco mixtures see Jewell 2011, 18-27.

2.4 Stucco workers in written sources

In the Roman period, Latin authors such as Pliny and Vitruvius used several terms to identify stucco workers. The most common were: *tectores*, *albarii*, and *gypsarii*. This is not the occasion for going into this matter in-depth; it is enough to say that in this period stucco was used for a broad range of objects, such as architectural decorations, but also copies of marble statues and funerary masks.³⁶⁵ The existence of three different terms to identify stucco-workers was related to the kind of objects which the artisans could make with stucco; however, scholars believe that the term *tector* and *albarius*, and their combination (*albarium tector*) is the closest to our concept of stucco-worker.³⁶⁶

In the Late Antique period there was a gradual slight shift in terminology, where the word *gypsarius* and the pairing of gypsum and stucco became more common.³⁶⁷ A precise definition is in the Edict on Maximum Prices issued by the emperor Diocletian in 294 and again in 301, where there is a distinction between *plastae gypsarii* and *plastae imaginarii*. They were two different kinds of workers, both were paid per day, but the *plastae imaginarii* had a higher salary. This is because, according to Blanc, the *plastae imaginarii* would probably be those who made figurative reliefs, while the *plastae gypsarii* were artisans who moulded cornices, architectural decorations, and copies of marble statues made of gypsum.³⁶⁸ In the sixth century, Cassiodorus referred to *gypsoplastes* active in the decoration of the interior of buildings.³⁶⁹ They were employed next to other qualified workers directed by the owner of the house.

³⁶⁵ Bettini 2001, 8; Blanc 1983, 872.

³⁶⁶ On the ambivalence of the Latin terms see Bettini 2001, 75-81; Blanc 1983, 861-870.

³⁶⁷ Bettini 2001, 81-82; Blanc 1983, 870-876.

³⁶⁸ Blanc 1983, 870-876.

³⁶⁹ «[...]Quidquid enim aut instructor parietum, aut sculptor marmorum, aut aeris fusor, aut camerarum rotator, aut gypsoplastes, aut musivarius ignorat, te prudenter interrogat; et tam magnus ille fabrilis exercitus ad tuum recurrit iudicium, ne possit aliquid habere confusum. [...] » Cassiodorus, *Variarum*, PL, VII, 5, 711. 'The mason, the marble-cutter, the brass-maker, the builder of vaults, the plasterer, and the mosaicist all will ask you about anything they are unsure of, and so, an army of artisans will come to you for orders, so as to avoid any kind of mistake', English translation from Zanini 2007, 385.

The definition of 'moulding' (*de plastis*) by Isidore of Seville (ca. 600-625) is useful for understanding the connection (and the equivalence) between the Latin and Greek vocabulary. He says that 'moulding for walls is representing images and figures out of gesso and tinting them with colours'; and he continues '*plastice*' is the Greek name for what in Latin is 'forming likeness from earth or gesso'. Thus, making a shape by pressing into clay is '*plastice*'.³⁷⁰

Both Cassiodorus and Isidore refer to stuccoworks using a combination of the word gypsum and *plasso* (to mould). However, recent analysis on the stucco fragments from basilica A at Dion (Greece) demonstrated that the association stucco-gypsum appreciated in language did not always mirror an increasing use of gypsum as main binder in stucco mixture.³⁷¹

The *Codex Iustinianii*, in a quotation of a constitution of Constantine I from 337, called the stucco workers '*deauratores albi* (*quos graeci koniatas appellant*)'.³⁷² Indeed, κονίατας (*koniatas*), from κονίαμα (*koniama*) meaning stucco or plaster, was used to identify an artisan who dealt with plaster next to *χρείσαντες* (*chreisantes*) and *λευκοτῆς* (*leukotēs*), but they were mainly attested in the second and the third century CE for indicating whitewashers and artisans in charge of the moulded cornices.³⁷³ However, these terms were not subsequently used in Byzantine texts concerning professions, and the association of the word γύψος (*gyposos*) and the verb πλάσσω (*plassō*) was preferred instead.³⁷⁴

To find mention of people involved with stucco in later Byzantine texts, we need to reach the Middle Byzantine period: here γυσοπλάσται (*gysoplastai*) appears in the *Book of the Eparch* (tenth century) in a passage which lists artisans involved in building sites.³⁷⁵

³⁷⁰ Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*, 19, 15.

³⁷¹ See footnote no.337.

³⁷² Eng. Transl: *deauratores albi* who the Greeks call *koniatas*.

³⁷³ The difficulty in translating these words can be mirrored in the different translation offered by scholars, see Marsili 2019, 213; Borgia 2012, 63; Ruffing 2008, 402, 600-601, 618; Robert, Robert 1954, 281-283, n. 162.

³⁷⁴ However, in the Life of St. Sabas (seventh-eight centuries) the word *christes* (χρίστης) is used to mean a plasterer by trade, called Mamas from Bethlem, who was in charge of the construction of a cistern and a σκεπτούριον and worked with an apprentice. Magoulas 1976, 16.

³⁷⁵ *The Book of the Eparch*: chapter 22.

The same passage is quoted in the later fourteenth-century *Hexabiblos*, and a similar word, γυσεμπλάσται (*gypseplastai*), is used in the thirteenth-century *Lexikon* of the so-called Pseudo-Zonaras for indicating those who work gypsum.³⁷⁶ Koukoules suggested that γυσοπλάσται (*gypsoplastai*) needs to be distinguished from those who fired gypsum in structure called γυψάρια (*gypsaria*) (workshop with kiln) whose construction and location within cities was regulated by law.³⁷⁷ Indeed, in the *Book of the Eparch* γυσοπλάσται (*gypsoplastai*) is mentioned next to other artisans active on a building site where the lime-makers (those who produced unslaked lime) are absent. A similar attitude can be recorded in the *Edict of Maximum*, where the lime-makers (*calcis coctori*) are clearly distinguished from the stucco workers (*platae gypsarii* and *plastes imaginarii*).³⁷⁸

A less-clear definition was used by the eleventh-century author of the *Life of Saint Lazaros* in Mount Galesion who mentioned a man who 'was skilled in the art of moulding gypsum'.³⁷⁹ The man was in charge of building a kiln for firing the gypsum to be used for the construction of the tower for the stylite monk. If the task assigned to the man was somehow connected to his previous skills, it seems difficult to identify him as a stucco-worker; he was rather someone who fired gypsum. Unfortunately, this remains a matter of pure speculation since the text does not specify the man's tasks. Two documents preserved in the archive of Dubrovnik and dated to June 1383 mention a *gypsarius* regarding his salary. However, they do not provide more details regarding the *gypsarius*' tasks.³⁸⁰

³⁷⁶ Harmenopoulos, *Hexabiblos*, book. 3, title VIII, 40, p. 446; Pseudo-Zonaras, *Lexicon*, 1651, l.5.

³⁷⁷ Harmenopoulos, *Hexabiblos*, book 2, title IV, 14, p. 246. The same term, but in Latin characters, is used in the Langobard Southern Italy to indicate the property of the Langobard duke Arechis II, who owned a *gypsaria* see *Chronicon Sanctae Sophiae*, 320. Again, on the distinction between *gypsoplastai* and *gypsopoi* see Koukoules 1948, 184.

³⁷⁸ Diocletianus, *Edicum de pretiis*, VII, 6.

³⁷⁹ «ἡ τοῦ γύψου πλάσις [...] ἥν ἐπιστήμη», *Life of St. Lazaros in Mount Galesion*, ch. 93. For a hypothetical identification of this man with another monk 'skilled in construction' see Rigo 1995, 23-29.

³⁸⁰ *Odluke veća Dubrovačke republike*, 331-332, 378.

At first glance, these written sources seem to suggest the existence of specialised artisans. However, a deeper investigation into one of these texts reveals a more complicated situation. The *Book of the Eparch* is a collection of regulations of the activities of guilds, which came under the supervision of the Eparch of Constantinople, a sort of supreme judge in Constantinople and its vicinity.³⁸¹ It has been dated between the ninth and the tenth century.³⁸² The Book is organized into twenty-two chapters, each one related to the activity and formation of a specific group of professionals.³⁸³

Chapter 22 mentions the γυσοπλάσται (*gypsoplastai*) alongside other professions involved in building-sites: carpenters (λεπτουργοί) (*leptourgoi*), marble masons (μαρμαράριοι) (*marmararoi*), locksmiths (σκοθυραρίοι) (*skothyraroi*), painters (ζωγράφοι) (*zōgraphoi*), and others (λοιποί) (*loipoi*). The mention of γυσοπλάσται (*gypsoplastai*) among other artisans involved in building sites can be interpreted as a mirror of a composite presence of specialised artisans active in Constantinople.

Unlike the others, chapter 22 deals only with the obligations of contractors to resolve any issues between the employer and the employee, for example, the nature of the contract (verbal or written), the condition for breaking the contract, and situations in which the contract could be modified. Moreover, the chapter is concerned with the safeguarding of the employer rather than the maintenance of equal rights among the parties involved. Indeed, two of the four paragraphs refer to the 'malice' of the artisans, revealing a specific and different agenda for this chapter. For this reason, I suggest that chapter 22 was intended as a guide to help employers to resolve any possible disputes that might have arisen during the construction and the decoration of buildings in Constantinople. Hence, it needed to be as inclusive as possible by listing all the

³⁸¹ On the debate about the existence and the reality of guilds in Constantinople see Maniatis 2001; on the debate about the evidence of the involvement of building artisans into guilds, Bouras 2002, 541-543.

³⁸² Duřichev 1970, IX.

³⁸³ There are, however, several gaps.

roles artisans would have performed on a hypothetical construction site. A construction site might have been as big and well-articulated as that for sixth-century Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (71x 77 m), or the eleventh-century katholikon of Hosios Loukas (16 x 28 m) in Greece where several specialised artisans were required to work at the same time; but it could also be smaller, as is the case for the church of St. Panteleimon at Nerezi (15.90 x 9.60 m) where there is a clear distinction between painters and sculptors but the latter were also responsible for the stuccoes. In other more modest churches, the plasterer or the painter may have been involved in the creation of plaster reliefs as is probably the case of the Panagia in Archatos, Naxos (6.95 x 3.45) (1285), and the Hodegetria church in Spelies, Euboea (5.33 x 2.90 m) (1311). These last two churches, despite their small dimensions, were covered with high-quality wall paintings made by a local workshop composed of a few painters.³⁸⁴ The absence of any surviving piece of stone or marble sculpture and the nature of the stucco proskynetaria (typology B), suggests that the painters or the plasterers were likely the authors of both proskynetaria. Therefore, the passage from chapter 22 of the *Book of the Eparch* represents an exceptional source because it mentions people involved with plaster; however, it is very unlikely that so many specialists were working at the same time in every Middle Byzantine construction site.³⁸⁵ These roles, and in particular those of the γυψοπλάσται (*gypsoplastai*), were probably tasks which many artisans could perform. Therefore, it is not surprising that there is so little information about stucco-workers in Byzantium: the task was frequently performed by plasterers, sculptors, and painters.

³⁸⁴ In the Hodegetria of Spelies Emmanuel identified two hands, Emmanuel 1990, 464-467, while Chatzidakis simply identified a local workshop, Chatzidakis 1974, 162-168, of a different opinion is Velmans 1968, 214-224. Konstantellou recently suggested that the paintings in the Panagia of Archatos were the product of a local workshop active in Naxos in the last twenty years of the thirteenth century, Konstantellou 2019, 143-219, 292-353.

³⁸⁵ There is also a lot of debate about the actual application of the *Book of the Eparch* outside Constantinople. Several scholars have suggested that it did not have force outside the capital: Bouras 2002, 540; Dagron 2002, 407; Ousterhout 1991, 79; Mango 1976, 26.

2.5 Stucco workers on site: specialised artisans?

The evaluation of the presence of artisans specifically deputed to make decorations of stucco needs to take into account the narrative provided by the monuments too. A careful observation of the stratigraphy between wall paintings and stucco decoration provides information in apparent contradiction with the textual sources. It is not always possible to verify this since in several cases the original relationship has been compromised (e.g. at Protaton, Vatopedi, Iviron). Nevertheless, the cases which allow it, provide us with useful information.

One source of information is the proskynetaria frames. As already noted in chapter 2 (stucco in buildings), they are visually connected to both the fresco icon and to the liturgical barrier, or templon, since they often carry the same decorative motifs or use a decorative repertoire connected to sculpture. As we saw, Type B is more related to painting than Type A both in ornamental choices and the shapes of the frames themselves. This link with painting can also be detected in the process of moulding.

One case is the frame from the Hodegetria church in Spelies (Euboeia) (1311). The analysis of the stratigraphy of the church shows that the stucco frame and the wall paintings were made at the same time: there is no fracture between the painted figures and the frame, the surface of the frame continues into the wall paintings seamlessly. The artisans started painting the church from the apse and then they moved towards the west by painting the ‘transept’, where the stucco frames are located, and then the western barrel vault.³⁸⁶ Indeed, both the eastern edges of the stucco frames cover the wall paintings of the triumphal arch (figs. 2.21-2.22) while the lower western edges are partially covered by the wall paintings of the western barrel vault (fig. 2.23). Therefore, the making of the stucco frame belongs to the same time as

³⁸⁶ This is a standard procedure in the decoration of churches.

the normal process of frescoing the interior of the church which happens during a campaign, not earlier or later.

The same observations can be made for all the proskynetaria frames Type B.

Proskynetaria Type A are more difficult to evaluate. The relations between the frames and the painted icons in Protaton is compromised (the icon and the frame are not contemporary); the frame in the Peribleptos church in Mystras seems to be clearly detached from the wall paintings (a crack runs along the entire inner perimeter (fig. 2.24): this is a sign either of the production of the frame through use of a formwork or a moulding, or that it was detached from the wall and reattached at a certain point.³⁸⁷ The proskynetarion frame of the image of St. Panteleimon in the homonymous church in Nerezi (fig. 1.138) belongs to the same phase of the wall paintings and of the marble templon.³⁸⁸ However, it is difficult to evaluate the relationship between the frame and the paintings above because the church was restored several times and the plaster of the internal edge of the stucco frame looks new.

A very good case study is the unpublished fragment of stucco decoration in the middle aisle of the Timios Stavros monastery (cat. No. 5).³⁸⁹ Here the upper edge of the stucco decoration sits on top of the wall painting plaster while the lower one is contiguous with the plaster of the wall paintings of the arch and of the intrados (figs. 2.25-26). This demonstrates that here the stucco decoration was worked at the same time as the paintings (and with the same material): it is even impossible to distinguish between the painter and the stucco-worker.

The close interaction between painter and stucco-worker (when they were not, in fact, the same person, which they often were) has already been noted for Roman and Late Antique stucco production, and has been verified for the Early Medieval cases such as San Salvatore in

³⁸⁷ I do not think that the frame is a spolia, as suggested by Louvi. The removal of the frame from another building and the mounting on the new wall would have ruined the piece. For the thesis of Louvi see Louvi 1980, 122.

³⁸⁸ Sinkević 2000, 86-88, 90-91.

³⁸⁹ On the complex see Ousterhout 2017, 122-125.

Brescia, the Tempietto of Cividale del Friuli, the stuccoes in Germigny-des-Prés, the San Benedetto church in Malles, and the eleventh-century stuccoes from San Pietro a Monte (near Civate)³⁹⁰ and Santa Maria Maggiore in Lomello.³⁹¹ The study of the stratigraphic sequence of wall painting and stuccoes made by Gheroldi demonstrated that artisans in charge of the paintings and of the stuccoes worked side by side and shared the same tools and materials.³⁹²

For stucco artefacts made in formworks or mouldings the production process is different and involves the creation of mouldings either in wood, in clay, or in stucco. The skills required in this case are really for working in three-dimensions, therefore they may belong to a sculptor, a carpenter or a specialist in stucco production. The amount of work (in terms of planning and realisation) and specialisation required for producing stucco liturgical furnishing (e.g. those produced in Epiros) suggests that the artisan who produced them specialised in this technique. The production of free-standing elements made of stucco by a specialised artisan or team is not an exclusive feature of Byzantium since it is attested also in the twelfth century in Abruzzo and possibly at the end of the eleventh century in Calabria.³⁹³

Can we talk about the consistent presence of stucco-workers as specialised figures who are assigned to only the decoration in stucco (an equivalent of the contemporary plasterer)? No. The narrative provided by the monuments has shown that it is essential to evaluate case by case and that every generalisations risk excluding the variety and complexity of approaches which the Byzantines had towards stucco. Technique, and not only formal and iconographical aspects, needs to be taken into account. The cases shown above demonstrate that in most cases it is impossible to distinguish between a painter and a specialist in stuccowork. These cases are

³⁹⁰ Peroni 2006.

³⁹¹ Lomartire 2006.

³⁹² Gheroldi 2014.

³⁹³ For the workshop of Ruggero, Roberto and Nicodemo in Abruzzo some recent contributions are Nenci 2006; Taraborrelli 2004; Gandolfo 2002. For the production in Calabria see Caskey 2011; Di Gangi 1998; Di Gangi 1995; Orsi 1922.

usually proskynetaria Type B and simple moulded cornices with decorative motifs in paint (and not in relief), and cases where the layer of the plaster of the painting and the stucco is the same show that it was made during the same 'pontata'. The identification of specific stucco production in certain areas (Epiros and Mount Athos, which will be discussed below) is, however, the sign of a specialist in stucco production who, in these cases, worked extensively with formworks and mouldings. But it is often unclear whether string-course cornices, proskynetaria, and other decorations should be assigned to stucco-workers or to other artisans who could, on occasion, work in stucco.

The evidence from the written sources in combination with the material evidence provides us with a complicated picture of the Byzantine artisanal world. On the one hand, written sources show a specific terminology for stucco artisans that survived from the Roman and Late Antique period. On the other hand, material evidence shows a blurred situation where is not possible to find any consistent pattern. The only generalisation that we can make is that artisans in charge only of the stucco decoration would have worked in big buildings with a rich and varied decoration, while in smaller buildings an artisan would have performed several roles.

The scarcity of sculpture in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings, and the frequent use of spolia, made the sculptors of this period flexible, as Melvani suggested, and able to move from one material to another with ease.³⁹⁴ Moreover, proskynetaria made of flat, painted stucco (Type B) and the case from the Timios Stavros monastery provide a good witness to the ability of painters to work in three dimensions, thus resolving any problems caused by the absence of specialised carvers.

Our contemporary difficulty in identifying the hand of a painter from the hand of the carver on a stucco artefact is the consequence of the deep interaction between them which is

³⁹⁴ Melvani 2013, 43-61, in part. 48-50, 60.

rooted in their interdisciplinary training. The training of a Middle Byzantine builder took place on the construction site, not in a separate workshop, and this was probably valid also for the other artisans active in building decoration.³⁹⁵ The collaborative nature of a construction site influenced the formation of the artisan who was multitasking and not reducible to a maker of just one of our contemporary categories of the arts.

2.6 Stucco workers in society

As we learn from the *Book of the Eparch*, people who modelled stucco worked on construction sites, therefore their working conditions were roughly the same as carpenters, stonemasons, sculptors and painters.³⁹⁶ They worked with a contract which established guarantees for the employer and the employee, even though it seems to favour the former. Contractors could not leave one commitment for another one, and they would have paid a high fine if the job was left unfinished.³⁹⁷ The concern to assure the completion of work is not an innovation of the *Book of the Eparch*; already the Sardis inscription (459) regulated any potential bad conduct of building-site artisans by obliging them to not abandon any work before completion.³⁹⁸

Artisans involved in building construction and decoration worked with a contract in the West too. Three titles of the Edict of the Longobard king Rothari (643) were concerned with the injuries that could befall artisans, patrons, and third parties and apportioned responsibilities and provided the contractors with a list of duties and some rights (e.g. if during the construction of a house, stone or wood fell and killed or injured someone, the responsibility fell on the master

³⁹⁵ Ousterhout 1999, 44; on the composition of workshops which were temporary aggregations of artisans see *Ibidem*, 50-57.

³⁹⁶ Unfortunately, written sources do not help in describing the hierarchy of the construction site; the workforce was divided into *τεχνήτεες* (specialised workers) and *εργολάβοι* (unspecialised workers); the only figure which may emerge is that of the architect, mason and master mason who was an artisan with a leading role, Ousterhout 1999, 44.

³⁹⁷ *The Book of the Eparch*, ch. 22.

³⁹⁸ Di Branco 2000, in part. 190-191, 198-200.

builder and his crew, not on the patron).³⁹⁹ The *Edict of Liutprand* (713) also lists the prices for such artisans, called *magistri commacinorum*, which shows that they were in charge of the construction and decoration of buildings including stucco decoration (*opus tectoriis*).⁴⁰⁰

Middle and Late Byzantine legal sources do not touch on the topic of injuries during worktime or even establish the responsibilities of people on the building site. The *Basilika* (886), the *Tipoukeitos* (twelfth century) and the *Hexabiblos* (fourteenth century) just repeat the legislation from the *Codex Iustinianii* and Chapter 22 of the *Book of the Eparch*.⁴⁰¹ Some indirect information can be derived, with the proper precaution, from the inscription at Sardis (459) which establishes the number of days that an *oikodomos* (*oikodomos*) could claim for illness but does not mention sculptors, marble workers, painters or stucco workers.⁴⁰² We can assume that for these latter categories of artisans the conditions were similar but there is no direct proof.⁴⁰³ Isaurian stonemasons λατομοί (*latomoi*) working at the walls of Antioch could leave the site for illness but they did not receive any salary in this period: the stonemason whose eye was injured was miraculously healed by St. Symeon Stylite the Younger and refunded his savings, 12 gold coins, which he had evidently had to spend on living expenses when he was out of work.⁴⁰⁴

³⁹⁹ *Edict of Rothari*, art. 144, 145, 152. On *magistri commacini* and artisans in Longobard laws, see Azzara 2009.

⁴⁰⁰ *De mercedibus magistrum comacinorum*, II, CLVIII, pp. 244-246.

⁴⁰¹ Carile 2009, 697-700.

⁴⁰² On the translation of the term *oikodomos* and its actual role on the building site in the middle and late Byzantine period, see Bouras 2010, cat. no.1, 4, 12, 18, 39, 45; Ousterhout 1999, 4, 42, 44, 47, 51-55, 57, 267 n. 21. For the Early Byzantine period, see the recent synthesis in Borgia 2012, 56, 61.

⁴⁰³ Di Branco 2000.

⁴⁰⁴ *Life of St. Symeon*, vol. 1, 159 (180); vol. 2, 185 (180); *Vita S. Symeonis*, 378 (F), 379 (198). There are differences in the terminology and in the information provided in the Van den Ven edition and in the *Acta Sanctorum*. In the first, the man is described as a ‘Ἀνθρώπος τις τῶν ἐν ταῖς οἰκοδομαῖς λιθοξοοῦντων’ while in the second uses ‘λατομοῦντων’ instead. Moreover, only the first version mentions that the compensation for the man’s work was twelve gold coins.

The evidence from several buildings in the countryside with stucco decoration (e.g. Leontari, Archatos) suggests that artisans who dealt with this material were present locally.⁴⁰⁵ Artisans in rural areas apparently alternated between artisanal activity and work in the fields.⁴⁰⁶ This is clear from the documents in the archives of Mount Athos. From the eleventh century onwards, the documents show the presence of artisans among the peasants. Among the listings of the *paroikoi* and the *zeugataroi*, the *praktika* mention also artisans such as shoemakers, smiths and potters but also sculptors, and carpenters – stucco workers are not specifically mentioned, but we can easily imagine that among the professionals listed there was someone who would have made stucco decorations. Artisanal occupation follows the names in the *praktika*.⁴⁰⁷ Therefore, these people were both peasants and artisans suggesting that artisanal activity was not a self-sustainable occupation.⁴⁰⁸

In the countryside, where villages were the most common settlement, the buildings were not on the same scale as cities. The implications of such differences were explored by Panayotidi who demonstrated that local painters' workshops active in the area of Kastoria and in the Mani between the tenth and the thirteenth century were probably composed by people whose primary activity was not painting.⁴⁰⁹ In fact, she was able to calculate how many days a 'workshop' employed to paint buildings of small and medium dimensions, and to demonstrate that they were not enough to sustain a person for an entire year. The amount of sculpture

⁴⁰⁵ For the Panagia in. Archatos, Naxoso, the painters have been identified with a local workshop, while in Leontari it has been observed that the painters were into the cultural orbit of Mystras, but they were not the same artisans. Konstantellou 2019, 295-349, in part. 336-349; Albani 1989, 259–294.

⁴⁰⁶ Kaplan 2009, 197-198.

⁴⁰⁷ It is difficult at this stage to say whether this connotation may be interpreted as a surname or whether it was a sort of nickname, because it usually does not survive to second generation, Laiou 1977, 119-128.

⁴⁰⁸ Individuals with artisans' appellatives recorded by Lefort for the 13th -14th century Macedonia were about 8-10% of the population, Lefort 2002, 308-310. The appearance of artisanal appellative among the rural population was also interpreted as a sign of the effects of demographic growth (from the eleventh-twelfth century to the end of the fourteenth century) which has a consequence on the impoverishment of the population and the necessity to find extra activities to sustain their life; at the same time it also testifies to the increase in standards of living. Kaplan 2009, 157-158.

⁴⁰⁹ Panayotidi 2005.

produced by the workshop of Niketas *marmaras* active in Mani between the tenth and the eleventh century was probably not enough to sustain those individuals either.⁴¹⁰ This is debatable because only five of the pieces are ‘signed’; however, if we take into account all the other pieces attributed to him by Drandakis, the number rises to fourteen. In any case, there are not any other comparable examples to Niketas, and this leads me to think that artisans in the countryside needed another job. This brings up the issues of training of the artisans, their professionalism and whether or not they were different from amateurs. This issue has not found any satisfactory answer yet due to the absence of data such as the majority of the contracts. However, if stucco was worked alternatively by painters and sculptors, the time for working it would have been minimal: some small ‘extra work’ for them which may have taken them an extra day or two to complete the job. It is important to bear in mind that painters and sculptors did also other jobs which, even slightly, may have increased their final pay.

That sculptors, carpenters, and painters were part of the rural community is also suggested by several dedicatory inscriptions and signatures (e.g. in the Panagia church, Archatos, Naxos) and from the presence in the painted programme of some churches of the Saints Floros and Lauros, who occasionally hold trowels and are patrons of sculptors and masons.⁴¹¹

In short, the identification of stucco workers as specific figures in Byzantine society is an impossible task. The evidence presented here demonstrate that, if a specialist stucco-worker

⁴¹⁰ It is debatable whether the workshop of Niketas was a self-sustainable occupation. There are five templa bearing the ‘signature’ of Niketas while there are fourteenth attributed to him and his workshop by Drandakis; if all nineteenth should be connected to him, the amount of work required to carve all these templa constituted a consistent part of the year for the sculptors. For the inscriptions and the templa see Pallis 2013; Drandakis 2002, 3-18, 37-62; Drandakis 1975-76; Drandakis 1972.

⁴¹¹ On the close relationship between a painted iconographic programme and the rural population see Gerstel 2016, 102-127. The representation of Saint Floros and Lauros holding a trowel is in the church of Saint Peter and Paul in Kalyvia, Attika (1232); they are usually represented holding a cross, as martyrs, as in the parekklesion of the monastery of Chora in Constantinople, or as anargyroi, as in the Bahattin Samanlıđı church, Cappadocia, where they hold a physician box, or even as military saints in the church of the Anargyroi in Kastoria, see Jolivet-Levy 2009, 93-95.

existed, this was not recognised as such by society, or at least there was no specific terminology consistently employed. Again, this mirrors the difficulty in identifying the ‘hand’ of the specialist on stucco artefacts and suggests that stucco-people normally belonged to the general category of artisans, more specifically of painters, sculptors and possibly carpenters, rather than occupying a specialist niche of their own.

2.7 Workshop(s) at work: Middle Byzantine Mount Athos.

The identification of workshops active in the Byzantine empire has mainly been applied to Late Byzantine paintings (e.g. Panselinos). However, when dealing with sculpture the matter becomes more complicated because there is not any evidence in written sources, and artisans’ signatures are rare. The sixth century has provided us with several examples of workshops active in the trade of marble and marble sculpture, for example those on the island of Prokonnesios and in the area of Amorion; however, when we turn to the Middle Byzantine period, we are able to identify few workshops active in more than a building, for example Niketas *marmaras* in eleventh-century Mani.⁴¹²

Stucco is no exception. Evidence of stucco decorations is even less numerous than marble and stone sculpture (because the material is very fragile); only one workshop is known, and it operated in thirteenth-century Epiros.⁴¹³ The *modus operandi* of this workshop has already been discussed in this chapter (see paragraph 2.2), therefore I will not focus again on it here.

⁴¹² For the exportation of marble and the identification of workshops in the sixth century see Karagiorgiou 2015; Castagnino, Paribeni 2015; for the eleventh-century workshop active in Mani see Pallis 2013; Drandakis 1975-76; Drandakis 1972. A summary on workshops active in the Middle and Late Byzantine period is in Vanderheyde 2020, 108-116.

⁴¹³ The workshop can be securely identified in the Kokkini Ekklesia (Boulgareli), the Koimesis of Petrobitsa, and the church of the Taxiarches of Kostaniane, Papadopoulou 2006.

The stucco decorations in the katholika of Vatopedi and Iviron, on Mount Athos, provide an additional case study which requires further discussion.⁴¹⁴ In order to do so, I will analyse the decoration made of stucco in both buildings with attention to ornamentation, technique and chronology.

The katholika of Vatopedi and Iviron share the dates of their first phases, which are established between the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century.⁴¹⁵ Their architectural plan is usually considered to be part of the first stage of the elaboration of the so-called Athonite type. The sculptural decoration, however, does not show secure signs of a connection between the two monuments. The stucco decoration, on the other hand, provides us with a link.⁴¹⁶

There are no surviving documents attesting to the establishment of the Vatopedi monastery; however, by 985 it must have been founded as its hegoumenos Nikolaos signed the act of the protos Thomas.⁴¹⁷ Mamaloukos in his study of the architecture of the katholikon, dated the naos with the lateral apses (or *choroi*) and the inner narthex (*mesonyktikon*) to the end of the tenth century, the outer narthex (*liti*) to the beginning of the eleventh century and the

⁴¹⁴ The stuccoes of Vatopedi and Iviron were first published by Pazaras who did not develop further the several features of homogeneity shared by the plaster reliefs of both buildings Pazaras 2007; Pazaras 2006; Pazaras 2001a, Pazaras 2001b.

⁴¹⁵ It is now common opinion that the current building of the katholikon of Vatopedi was built in several phases: first the naos and the *mesonyktikon* (between 972 and 985), then by the beginning of the eleventh century, the *liti*, finally, by the mid-eleventh century, the chapels of H. Nikolaos and H. Demetrios were built and decorated; the only remnants of the Middle Byzantine mosaics were dated around the middle of the eleventh century. For the architectural phases see Mamaloukos 2001, 119-131, 381-382; for the chronology of the sculptural decoration see Pazaras 2001a; for the mosaic see Tsigaridas 1998, 222-224. Mylonas reconstructed the phases of the construction of the katholikon of Iviron: the core (consisting of a cross-in-square naos and a three-bayed two-storied narthex) was built between 980 and 983; between 1005 and 1028 the northern chapel was built, followed by the addition of side conches before 1029, and the construction of the south chapel during the eleventh century. A second outer narthex was added towards the end of the first half of the eleventh century; finally, the stone pavements of the naos, south chapel, and in the centre of the outer narthex were executed in the mid-eleventh century. See Mylonas 1985, 66-68, and Stanković 2017, 61-64 for an updated bibliography.

⁴¹⁶ I want to express my sincere thanks to Professor Pazaras, Professor Mamaloukos and the monasteries of Vatopedi and Iviron for providing me with updated pictures and for allowing my father to do a photographic survey under my guidance since women cannot access the Athos peninsula.

⁴¹⁷ *Actes d'Iviron*, I, n. 7, l. 5, 63. *Actes de Vatopédi*, 9.

chapel of H. Demetrios to the first half of the eleventh century, the chapel of H. Nikolaos slightly after.⁴¹⁸ The interior wall surfaces are articulated by stringcourse cornices and by arches and colonnettes made of stucco. Plaster reliefs also decorate the area of the windows of the *liti*. The stucco elements were first published by Pazaras, who dated them to the beginning of the eleventh century, while dating the rest of the sculpture of the katholikon between the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century.⁴¹⁹ Indeed, stucco shows ornaments used in sculpture, ivory and jewellery dated between the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century, but since some stuccoes are in the *liti*, the entire set of stucco must – if Mamaloukos' dating on the phases of the monument is correct – belong to the beginning of the eleventh century. Pazaras also suggested that the stucco ornamentation in the *naos* was probably made at the same time as the mosaic of the Annunciation, on the eastern arch at the base of the dome, dated by Tsigaradis around the mid of the eleventh century, but he did not expand on the context of this second intervention.⁴²⁰ This is the goal of the following paragraphs. Before doing so, it is essential to describe how the stucco elements interact with the walls, the ornamentation used, and the technique employed by the artisans.

The stucco elements belong to the architectural decoration which divides the interior of the walls into horizontal sections through three stringcourse cornices, arches and colonnettes. However, only the lower stringcourse cornice has decorative motifs in relief (figs. 2.27-2.28). The cornice is composed of a thin upper band with an interlaced ribbon and of a lower one which shows different decorative patterns which correspond to the different sections of the building: hanging and standing calyxes, hanging and standing heart-shape palmettes connected

⁴¹⁸ Mamaloukos 2001, 119-131, 381-382; Mamaloukos 1998, 172-174; Mamaloukos 1996, 116.

⁴¹⁹ Pazaras 2001a, 58-61, 77-78, 101-102.

⁴²⁰ Pazaras briefly commented that this intervention probably involved the arches at the springing of the dome, Pazaras 2001a, 58. Tsigaradis noted that the closest stylistic comparison for the Annunciation of Vatopedi is the mosaics of the Nea Moni in Chios (1042-1055), Tsigaradis 1998, 224.

by a horizontal stripe, palmette scrolls and an alternation of rosettes and reeds bounded by a horizontal stripe. Pazaras identified a small section with a post-Byzantine restoration of this cornice (fig. 2.28e); indeed, this section shows a different rendering of the leaves and a flat background which is absent in the rest of the others.⁴²¹ Thanks to the pictures taken in May 2019 (which I commissioned), it was possible for me to also note that the section of the cornice with rosettes and reeds (figs. 2.28d, 2.29) shares a similar treatment with the background and the dimensions of the moulding. This section also does not fit perfectly with the others (fig. 2.30), since it is bigger than they are, but it shares the same dimensions with the post-Byzantine cornice with calyxes (fig. 2.31). For these reasons, I believe we can consider the rosette section a post-Byzantine restoration too.

Moving to the upper part of the walls of the *choroi*, the windows are framed by arches on colonnettes (figs. 2.32-2.46). As with the stringcourse cornice, the arches have an upper band with an interlaced ribbon and a lower band with the main motif (a palmette scroll, an alternation of circles and palmettes, and interlocking circles with a five-leaf rosette or flower inside) (figs. 2.33-2.35).

Finally, the last stuccoes to be examined are those flanking the *pentabelon* of the *liti*. The space between the columns and the modern wooden window frames is filled with a thick layer of plaster; the decoration has been partially mutilated by the new wooden frames, possibly in substitution for the old plaster transennae with oculi (figs. 2.38-2.40).

The entire stucco decoration of Vatopedi, except for the two post-Byzantine sections, shows consistency. Both the stuccoes in the *choroi* and the *liti* show the use of the same decorative motifs, such as the five-leaf palmette scroll. However, in terms of style, the carving in the *liti* appears sharper than that in the *choroi*. This is probably due to the different techniques

⁴²¹ Pazaras 2001a, 59, 117, fig. 75β.

used by the artisans. In fact, the sharper profile and the irregularities in the carvings of the *liti* point towards the free-hand modelling of the stucco (probably with knives and sticks). Instead, the arches in the *choroi* were apparently outlined *in situ* by means of movable mouldings, then the decorative motifs were either modelled free-hand following a preparatory drawing or with stamps, since the surface is considerably more regular than in the *liti*. The semi-colonnettes and the semi-columns were worked *in situ* too.⁴²²

The monastery of Iviron is about 20 km from Vatopedi. Here the stucco decorations are located in the narthex: they frame the entrance of the main door, and the arcosolium of the northern tomb.

The framing of the main entrance of the katholikon is composed of a structure entirely made of stucco which formed a central arch on colonnettes and of two quarters arches which lean on the central one (figs. 2.41-2.42). These arches are composed of an upper, protruding band decorated with an interlaced ribbon and a basket-like motif, and a lower band with vegetal motifs whose repertoire is shared with Vatopedi, although the style is different. The colonnettes have capitals with stylised vegetal and geometric motifs. The shafts have an upper and lower collar with a rope-like motif and a sort of peacock-plume carved in relief on the shaft which recalls the pattern used in architectural ceramics (fig. 2.43). The base of each colonnette is decorated with interlacing circles and with a four-petal rosette, as in the arches of the upper windows in the *choroi* of Vatopedi (figs. 2.44, 2.33).

⁴²² Since it is not known how these decorations were attached to the wall, the only way to understand the technique used by the artisans is to look carefully at them. The irregularities showed by the friezes in the *tribelon* as well as the sharp profiles of the carving suggest, in my opinion, that this area was worked *in situ* by modelling the stucco with knives and sticks. In the *choroi*, the stucco elements seem to have been planned more carefully than in the *liti*. For example, the distance between the centres of each rinceaux is more or less the same on the entire cornice. Moreover, the carving profile is smoother. These elements suggest the use of at least preparatory drawings or even moulds. It is unlikely that these cornices were first worked in wooden moulds and then attached to the wall, because the junctions at the corners are very well done. The arches in the *choroi* are located at a considerable height; it is more reasonable to think that they were modelled *in situ* using movable mouldings for outlining the upper and lower band. The columns, which are actually semi-columns, were worked *in situ* too because they are all different in size.

The arcosolium in the northern tomb shows a very rich decoration too (figs. 2.45, 1.70). The arch is composed, again, of an upper, protruding band with an interlaced ribbon and a tiny strip of reels which frame the central motif: palmettes in circles. Finally, the lower band is formed of a series of dentils. The arch is surmounted by a series of *peltae* which do not find any direct comparisons with any piece of sculpture or ivory dated to the Middle Byzantine period that I know. As noted in the previous chapter, a possible comparison might be the fourth-century *missorium* of Theodosius I or the mid-eight-century stuccoes from Cividale del Friuli in Italy, but the similarities are presumably coincidental.⁴²³ At the end of the arch, the *peltae* are substituted by a sort of capital with luxurious leaves and four-petal rosettes on the sides. The colonnettes are simpler than those on the main door. The shaft is smooth but, as in the other example, a collar with a rope-like motif marks the transition with the capital and the base. The capital belongs to the typology defined by Dennert as ‘with big leaves at the edges’, usually found in templa up to the 11th century.⁴²⁴

Artisans in Ivron worked stucco using several techniques at the same time:

- The symmetry and precision of the door frame and the arcosolium suggests that the shapes of the arches and colonnettes were made in moulds, then mounted on the wall. At the same time, we cannot exclude the possibility that movable moulds were used for outlining the two bands of the arches as well as the column shafts of the door frame.
- The *peltae* were certainly made in moulds and, once dry, applied to the back of the arch, as can be noted in photos (fig. 2.46).⁴²⁵
- I believe we can also hypothesise stamps for the palmettes in circles of the arcosolium: here the lower leaves at the base of the palmette show the same imperfection in most of

⁴²³ Pazaras did not find any comparisons either. Pazaras 2006, 129-133.

⁴²⁴ Dennert 1997, 118-122.

⁴²⁵ This observation was confirmed by Pazaras in private conversation.

the frieze: a sort of bleeding of the stucco from one leaf into another. This could be a sign of the use of a moulding on the wet stucco or a sort of 'mistake' made by the artisan while modelling the mixture (fig. 2.47).

- The quarter arches in the main door, on the other hand, show imperfections and inconsistencies, such as the presence of six-and-five-leaf palmettes randomly, which is a sign of a free-hand carving (figs. 2.48-2.49).

Chronology: Pazaras dated both the arcosolium and the door frame between 1029 and 1066. This chronology is anchored in stylistic and iconographic analysis, which points towards the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century.⁴²⁶ Moreover, he was able to identify the tomb in the arcosolium with the hegoumenos George I (+ 1029) and George the Hagiorite (1065, *translatio* 1066).⁴²⁷ The life of George the Hagiorite, indeed, records that the saint decided to move the relics of the first founders (John and Euthymios the Iberians) to the narthex and to build a tomb for them on the southern side, and soon after he decided also to make a tomb for his predecessor, the *hegoumenos* George I, for whom he made a tomb on the north side.⁴²⁸ The life continues by saying that after the death of the Hagiorite, his remains were put together with those of George I in 1066.⁴²⁹ The identification of this tomb with the arcosolium made of stucco proposed by Pazaras allows us to have a specific chronology for it. The very close resemblances between the stucco arcosolium and the door framing also led Pazaras to link the latter to the chronology 1029-1066.⁴³⁰

⁴²⁶ Pazaras 2007, 55; Pazaras 2006, 129-133.

⁴²⁷ Pazaras 2006, 133-136.

⁴²⁸ «[...] Car, lorsque le bienheureux eut prit le bâton de l'higouménat, il travailla avant tout à préparer le vénérable sépulcre | comme un trésor destiné à recevoir les reliques de notre saint père théophore Euthyme, plus resplendissantes que le soleil et plus pures qu'une perle, d'où jaillissent en abondance la source de guérisons et la grâce de miracles.[...]» *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, §27,55.

⁴²⁹ «[...] Mais nous ne choisîmes pas l'endroit où conserver les reliques du bienheureux avant d'avoir interrogé le bienheureux Pierre déjà mentionné. <Le bienheureux> resta donc trois jours devant le saint père Euthyme ; puis nous l'emportâmes dans l'église de Tous les saints et nous y déposâmes le cercueil du bienheureux [...]» *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, §97, 112.

⁴³⁰ Pazaras 2007, 53-55.

When comparing the stucco decorations in Vatopedi and Iviron, the similarities are striking.

- 1) The arches are organised in the same way: a protruding band with an interlaced pattern and a flat one with a vegetal one. The real element of diversity is the colonnettes in terms of decoration, scale and technology. The half colonnettes vary between 0.5 to 1.5 metre in height; the free-standing colonnettes are ca 1 metre.
- 2) The stucco elements show the same decorative patterns, such as the palmette scroll, the four-petal flowers in interlocking circles, the interlaced ribbons etc.
- 3) Style: in both churches, the veins of the palmettes leaves are made in the same way: the central vein leaves the leaf 'open' (fig. 2.50). In this way, the main design is created by two parallel lines. In the same way, two parallel lines draw together the different patterns of the cornice of the *choroi* of Vatopedi (figs. 2.52-2.53). The same method of drawing vegetal motifs can be noted in the epistyle of the marble tempon of the katholikon of Vatopedi (fig. 2.51).

At the same time, when we look at how the calyx of the palmette scroll is made in both monuments, we can distinguish three manners of carving which are probably the sign of different hands rather than different workshops. The first hand was responsible for the stucco cornice in the *choroi* and the stucco window frame in the *liti* of Vatopedi: here the calyx is usually marked by two dots, and it is consistent with the treatment of the calyxes in the palmette scroll, and in the marble posts of the chapel of H. Nikolaos in Vatopedi (figs. 2.54-2.56). The calyxes in Iviron are slightly different and from them two leaves exit as opposed to only one in the Vatopedi examples (fig. 2.57). If we compare the palmette scroll of the door frame of Iviron with the scroll on the arch of the arcosolium of the southern tomb (fig. 2.58), made of marble, but commissioned by George the Hagiorite, there are apparent differences in the rendering of the palmette and

the calyxes. That is to say that the calyxes in the stucco arch above the door of Iviron have several features in common with the stuccoes and the marble sculpture produced for Vatopedi at the beginning of the eleventh century (the chapel of H. Nikolaos and the date of the *liti* are the *terminus post-quem*), while they do not find close comparisons in the sculpture made of stucco and marble made for the same narthex of Iviron. This detail (the calyxes of the scroll), is another element which links inevitably the stuccoes of Iviron and Vatopedi.

These elements demonstrate that we have in front of us a very consistent group of decorations which connects the two monuments.⁴³¹ The critical link between the two monuments is the stuccoes carved in the *liti* of Vatopedi. According to Mamaloukos, the *liti* was added at the beginning of the eleventh century to the original core (the katholikon and the narthex).⁴³² The stylistic connections between the friezes in the *liti*, those in the *choroi* and those in the narthex of Iviron, allows us to establish the beginning of the eleventh century as a *terminus post-quem* for the creation of the stuccoes of Vatopedi. If we accept the chronology proposed by Pazaras for the stuccoes of Vatopedi (mid-eleventh century), the plaster reliefs were made in a span of fifteenth to twenty years. Therefore, the chronology and the close similarities in the stucco elements of Vatopedi and Iviron allow us to consider them as the product of the same workshop or a very homogenous production on Mount Athos which continued for roughly two generations. The artisans seem to have specialised in architectural decorations made of stucco, and were highly aware of the techniques available, with possible

⁴³¹ The two churches already shared similarities in architecture which led Mamaloukos to hypothesise the use of the same drawings for their construction, Mamaloukos 2003, 119-128. However, similarities in the sculptural decoration were not underlined.

⁴³² Mamaloukos 2001, 205-206; Mamaloukos 1996, 115.

connections with the sculptors active at the same time in the two buildings.⁴³³ Whether such artisans were monks or lay people is problematic. For this specific case there is no evidence which can help us. There is evidence for carver and mason monks on Mount Athos but unfortunately none of them can be linked to the sculptures and stuccoes produced for Vatopedi and Iviron in the eleventh century.⁴³⁴

Understanding how a workshop worked and how it interacted with the rest of the artisans on a building site provides us with information about social organisation and level of artisanal specialisation. A workshop can provide us with a pattern which connects several buildings and a network of patrons, as demonstrated for thirteenth-century Epiros.⁴³⁵

The patronage of Vatopedi and Iviron during the eleventh century was monastic: the hegoumenoi Nicholas (+ 1012-1018) and Athanasios (ca 1020-1046/48) for Vatopedi, and the hegoumenoi George I and George the Hagiorite for Iviron. Vatopedi in this period was concerned with establishing its authority on Athos: in 985 it occupied the last place among the monasteries of the peninsula, while by 1045 (typikon of Constantine Monomachos) it had risen to the second place, and indeed the number of monks increased and its importance grew around the middle of the eleventh century.⁴³⁶ In the twelfth century, however, it trailed Iviron until its promotion to ‘royal monastery’ in the thirteenth century, which allowed it to be from 1312 onwards the second monastery in the Athonite hierarchy, followed by Iviron.⁴³⁷

At Iviron, during the eleventh century, the hegoumenate of George the Hagiorite was a crucial moment for the Georgian and Greek communities of the monastery; as shown by

⁴³³ It is more difficult to verify whether the mosaicists were in charge of the stucco elements since it is impossible to evaluate the entity of the mid-eleventh century intervention in the building. Tsigaridas 1998.

⁴³⁴ They are Δανιήλ ὁ οἰκοδόμος at the Lavra, ὁ Γρηγόριον μαῖιστορα at the Lavra, Μεθόδιος μονάχος και μαστόρο at Vatopedi (inscription), Σεραπίως μονάχος τέκτων (at Pantokrator monastery in the Meteora), for the references see Bouras 2002, 544-545.

⁴³⁵ For plaster reliefs, see Papadopoulou 2006; for painters, see Babuin 2013, 407-408, fig. 4.

⁴³⁶ *Actes de Vatopédi*, I, 11-12.

⁴³⁷ *Actes de Vatopédi*, I, 3-36.

Bernadette Martin-Hisard, during his hegoumenate George was devoted to reinforcing and re-establishing Georgian authority in the monastery over the Greeks who were claiming the first foundation of the katholikon.⁴³⁸ This attempt can be seen in the hagiographical activity of the hegoumenos, but also in the re-decoration of the katholikon which involved the translation of the relics of the first Georgian founders into the new tomb in the narthex of the katholikon (with a marble arcosolium) and the construction and decoration of another tomb, on the other side, for his Georgian predecessor (with a stucco arcosolium).⁴³⁹ This is not accidental but answers specific needs of legitimisation.

The narrative provided by the stucco decorations of Vatopedi and Iviron opens windows to the actual relations between the two monasteries. The use of a similar language is used for legitimising their authority, and it suggests a dynamic of competition in the Athos hierarchy - which will be explored in the next chapter.

2.8 Conclusions

This chapter focused on establishing a detailed inventory of the techniques utilised, the people involved in, and the material used in the production of Middle and Late Byzantine stucco. The techniques recorded (free-hand, knives and sticks, movable mouldings, moulds, formworks) are in line with those used in the Medieval West and the Islamic East at the same time. However, further useful results may come from statistical analysis of the frequency of ingredients used in Byzantine stuccoes (e.g. lime, gypsum), as well as on methods used to attach stuccoes on walls. For the study of this latter aspect, the use of XR analysis will provide some non-invasive possibilities, which will enable us to identify the system of armatures in Byzantine stucco which

⁴³⁸ Martin-Hisard 2006, 132-148.

⁴³⁹ For the policy of George the Hagiorite in relation to Georgian legitimisation, see Martin-Hisard 2006, 138-148.

are mostly still *in situ*.⁴⁴⁰ Such results will help in situating Byzantine stuccoes in a Mediterranean context and show the transference of skills and techniques across different cultures.⁴⁴¹

The discussion of the stucco mixtures has provided the first raw material on binders and ingredients and suggested possible ways to get information in lieu of chemical analysis, for example by looking at the composition of wall painting plasters. Nevertheless, much still remains to be done for us to understand Byzantine stucco and to reach a decent level of knowledge which will allow the dialogue between Byzantinists, Medievalists and scholars of the Islamic East.⁴⁴² Interest in stucco technology, production processes, and carving has been raised in studies of Medieval art and the social history of Europe. Petrographic analysis of stucco mixtures, identification of the tools used in moulding and modelling stucco have been identified, and this has allowed the accumulation of a considerable amount of data from stuccoes from the Early Middle Ages to the fourteenth century, in an area which goes from Spain and Italy to Germany and France.⁴⁴³ Published research into stucco production and carving methods are less frequent for stucco decorations of Syria and Iraq made under the Umayyads and the Abbasids. Only recently, the stuccoes from Samarra have benefitted from chemical analysis which confirmed the preponderance of gypsum in the mixture.⁴⁴⁴ A recent study on the stuccoes of churches in the Gulf area filled a gap in the knowledge of Eastern

⁴⁴⁰ A recent presentation of this technique was made by Felici during the Summer school *Stucchi e stuccatori ticinesi a Roma: Dalla riscoperta cinquecentesca alla grande tradizione barocca*, Istituto Svizzero di Roma (28 luglio – 3 agosto 2019), Felici 2019.

⁴⁴¹ Methods of attaching stuccoes on the wall are a useful tool for identifying itinerant workshops or transferring of techniques, see Vanni *forthcoming a*.

⁴⁴² The disparity in knowledge between Medieval West and Islamic East has already been pointed out by Lic 2017, 2.3.

⁴⁴³ The volume Sapin, Allag (ed.) 2006, provides a good cross-section of the state of archaeometrical knowledge of stucco in Medieval Europe, to this should be added Palalazzo-Bertholon 2010; some other publications are Exner 1996; Frizot 1977; Emmenegger 1997; Hoernes 2002; Palazzo-Bertolon, Sapin 2014.

⁴⁴⁴ López Borges 2014.

stuccoes,⁴⁴⁵ though the amount of data accumulated is not even comparable to that available for Western ones.

What this chapter has emphasised is that the figure of the stucco artisan was multivalent. To the professional figure (or role) mentioned in the *Book of the Eparch*, the material evidence adds variety, by demonstrating that stucco was worked both by specialists and by other artisans such as painters and probably sculptors. This depended on the scale of the building, the amount of stucco decoration present in it, and the technique used. In any case, the sharp distinction between painting and sculpture that we perceive today was distinctly more blurred in the Middle Ages. One aspect to consider is also that most of the stuccoes examined still preserve traces of colours which made the reliefs a sort of plastic painting, and colours covered sculptures too.⁴⁴⁶

We have also examined the social condition of the people who worked stucco (specialists, painters, or sculptors). These people belonged to the category of building-site artisans and they worked with a contract. They were possibly organised in workshops which could be also itinerant (Epiros, possibly Mount Athos,). In rural areas, it is clear that most of them were also peasants, performing artisanal activity as a second job.

Finally, section 2.7 proposed the identification of a workshop active in the monasteries of Vatopedi and Iviron during the eleventh century. Taking into account that evidence from stucco decoration is scarcer than that for marble sculpture and wall paintings, the identification of this second workshop is remarkable and illuminates the still unlocked potential of the study of this material. The identification of the workshops in Epiros and on Athos was possible, I believe, because of the concentration of stucco decorations in a specific microregion; all the other examples listed are isolated buildings in diverse regional contexts.⁴⁴⁷ It seems, therefore,

⁴⁴⁵ Lic 2017.

⁴⁴⁶ On colours on Byzantine sculpture, see Pedone 2019.

⁴⁴⁷ The distances covered by the two workshops are very different: a sort of 20 km for the workshop on Mount Athos and 120 km as maximum distance for the workshop in Epiros.

possible that these latter buildings have simply lost their original larger regional context, or that it has yet to be fully investigated.

The study of techniques and the identification of workshops and homogenous groups of decorations are useful tools for spotting the connections between buildings and their patrons and for revealing patterns of investments and political ideology. But this is material for the next chapter.

3.COMMISSIONING STUCCO: PATRONS IN THE MIDDLE AND LATE BYZANTINE PERIOD

3.1 Introduction

After having seen how stucco was used in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings and how it was worked, it is important to understand how stucco worked in society from the point of view of the patrons, the audience and the economy. Patronage will be discussed in this chapter, while cost and audience are the subject of chapter 4.

Past scholarship on Middle and Late Byzantine stucco almost never engaged in attributing stuccoes to specific individuals; one reason is that stucco was often difficult to authenticate, and the focus of such scholars was rarely on stucco but the whole building or, for example, its wall paintings.⁴⁴⁸ It is also true that, so far, no plaster reliefs are signed or show signs of specific personalities, though as we saw in the last chapter, some workshops have identifiable ‘signatures’. This may be the result of the fragmentary state of preservation of stucco artefacts and the loss of the original polychromy of the pieces. Since our medium is often silent about its patrons, most of the information for this chapter was collected through the evaluation of the stucco pieces within their buildings and their stratigraphic relationship with other media, and through epigraphic material and data from texts associated with the history of the relevant buildings.

Thus, this chapter discusses the data available for patronage of the most significant case-studies. The buildings are presented chronologically and following the geographical

⁴⁴⁸ See Introduction for a survey of past scholarship.

distribution and order of the Catalogue (see Appendix A for a discussion on the criteria used for this order).

The analysis presented in this chapter demonstrates that for most of the cases it is possible to anchor stuccoes to specific chronologies and, occasionally, to specific individuals. This does not mean that stucco was chosen as ‘the’ preferred medium to express the ideology of patrons, as sometimes happens with sculpture and wall paintings, for example, but that it was part of the media used to express their ideology visually. To give an example, we do not have – yet – stucco funerary monuments or inscriptions which celebrate a specific personality explicitly.⁴⁴⁹ However, in at least one case (the *katholikon* of Iviron) it is possible that stucco was used to express the agenda of the *hegoumenos* George III the Hagiorite, or that stucco was part of the refurbishments of buildings included within a larger plan to establish the authorities of monasteries (Vatopedi, Hosios Loukas). In other cases, it was possible to identify networks of patrons connected by the use of the same stucco artefacts (Epiros) or, where the different economic means of the ruler and of the local aristocracy were visible (area of Mystras). Finally, this chapter also demonstrates that stucco was used by high-level patrons in the Middle Byzantine period and that the range of patrons in the Late Byzantine period included also groups of common people who could afford to pay for plaster reliefs which were less elaborate.

3.2 Patronage in the Middle and the Late Byzantine period

The range of donors who commissioned churches with stuccoes changed from the Middle to the Late Byzantine period. This change mirrors patterns already noted for mural paintings through dedicatory inscriptions which suggests that from the ninth to the eleventh century,

⁴⁴⁹ An exception may be the stucco decoration from the church of Kostaniane in Epiros, where the panel ending in a tympanum suggests that it was part of a coffin or a funerary memory/reliquary (cat. No. 13.1). Further investigations of the complex and the stucco pieces may help in exploring this hypothesis.

patrons who left their name in dedicatory inscriptions from Anatolia to Epiros were mainly state officials and ecclesiastics, that is representatives of the central authorities.⁴⁵⁰ Inscriptions and donor portraits also tells us that towards the end of the twelfth century there was shift towards regional aristocrats.⁴⁵¹ In the Late Byzantine period there is again an increased presence of local ecclesiastics, administrative and military officers which was probably related to the concern of the Palaiologoi to retain the control of the re-conquered land through the dissemination of the imperial policy.⁴⁵² However, another important change in the Late Byzantine period is the recording of a considerable amount of groups of local people in dedicatory inscriptions.⁴⁵³ This testifies to the practice of ‘collective’ foundations, which is the collaboration of several people or a group of people to fund the construction and the decoration of a building.⁴⁵⁴ Such foundations can be identified thanks to inscriptions which list several people, families or even entire villages, while in other cases the different donors names are recorded in single inscriptions located in several areas of the church (e.g. in the apse, next to the image of a saint, on the apsidal arch etc.).⁴⁵⁵

When we move towards the evidence provided by stucco, we can see that in the Middle Byzantine period, stucco decorations appear in buildings probably associated with the emperor (the room in the area of the Boukoleon Palace in Constantinople), those funded by members of the imperial family (the Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres), members associated with the imperial family but locally rooted (St. Panteleimon in Nerezi), rulers directly antagonising Byzantium (H. Achilleios on the Small lake of Prespa), and notable religious people, probably the

⁴⁵⁰ Kalopissi-Verti 2015, 136-138.

⁴⁵¹ This had been noted on by Kalopissi 2015, 137. On the state of the study on Byzantine dedicatory inscriptions, see the recent volumes edited by Spiesier, Yota ed. 2012; Rhoby ed. 2015.

⁴⁵² This is particularly visible in Peloponnese, Kalopissi-Verti 2015, 139.

⁴⁵³ Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 45-46.

⁴⁵⁴ On collective foundations see Kalopissi-Verti 2012, 125-140; Kalopissi-Verti 2007, 333-340.

⁴⁵⁵ This is the case of the Panagia church in Archatos, see cat. No. 30.

hegoumenoi, for the cases on Mount Athos (Protaton, Vatopedi, Iviron). However, the above-mentioned foundations are only half of the number of the Middle Byzantine churches listed in the Catalogue. The other half no longer have any extant inscriptions and their patronage is debated, but it includes two important religious centres (the monastery of Hosios Loukas in Boeotia, and the katholikon of the Daphni monastery in Attika). For the remaining buildings (the Timios Stavros monastery and the Çanlı kilise in Cappadocia, the basilica in Maroneia, the church of H. Ioannes Eleimon in Ligourio and the church of the Virgin in Peshkëki e Sipërme) it is only possible to collect information about the community who used them.

Patrons who commissioned stuccoes in the Late Byzantine period (from the second half of the thirteenth century onwards) are more varied. This mirrors the general pattern of patronage recorded in dedicatory inscriptions.⁴⁵⁶ Moreover, the widespread use of such inscriptions allows the identification of regional patterns in the use of stucco from the second half of the thirteenth to the beginning of the fifteenth century which shows networks of patrons and their hierarchy, which is mirrored by the technique used for producing stucco elements. The areas are: Epiros under the Komnenoi-Doukai, Mystras and its surroundings between the Kantakouzeonoi and the Palaiologoi, and the islands (Euboea, Naxos, Samos).

In the following paragraphs, I will go over the most significant churches contained in the Catalogue (see Appendix A), discussing the evidence available for their patronage and for the communities who used these buildings.

⁴⁵⁶ Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 45-46; Kalopissi-Verti 2015, 135-156.

3.3 Middle Byzantine period (from the mid-ninth to the beginning of the thirteenth century)

Constantinople

In Constantinople, few stucco decorations dated to the Middle Byzantine period survive, but they are enough to grasp the level of patronage involved. These decorations come from buildings for which no inscriptions survive, but some information can be acquired from the written sources.

The first example is a room from the Boukoleon palace which had a stucco frieze (cat. No. 1). The Boukoleon palace was the area of the Great Palace connected to the Boukoleon harbour, the entrance by sea to the imperial palace through the southern maritime walls of the city.⁴⁵⁷ It was extensively restored by the emperor Theophilos (829-842) and defensive walls were built by Nikephoros II Phokas (963-969) who was eventually assassinated there.⁴⁵⁸ During the reign of Alexios I Komnenos (1081-1118) the emperor moved to the palace of the Blachernai, but under the Komnenoi some areas of the Great Palace continued to be used and new parts were added (e.g. the *Manuelites* and/or *Mochroutas*).⁴⁵⁹ It is not clear, however, whether the Boukoleon Palace and the room where the stucco frieze was found continued to be used. This is what emerged from the excavation conducted in 1983 by the Istanbul Archaeological Museum Directorate, during the construction of the railway, which unearthed the room with the stucco frieze, located behind the so-called 'House of Justinian', slightly north of the railway.⁴⁶⁰ The room had a decorative apparatus which included, at least in its last phase, a

⁴⁵⁷ On the palace of the Boukoleon see Mango 1995b, 645–649; Mango 1997, 41–50; Bardill 2006 especially 24–28, 37–40; Barsanti 2011, 45–58; Kislinger and Heher 2015. On the Boukoleon harbour, see Heher 2016.

⁴⁵⁸ On the fortifications of Nikephoros Phokas, see Mango 1997; Bardill 2006, 36–39. On the assassination of Nikephoros II Phokas, *Leonis diaconi Historiae*, Book IV, 7, English translation in Talbot, Sullivan 2005, 113 n. 51, 136–139;

⁴⁵⁹ On the Manouelites, see Magdalino 1978; On the Mochroutas see the Ebersolt 1910, 49–150; Janin 1964, 122; Guiland 1969, 159; Magdalino 1978; Hunt 1984, 141–142; Brand 1989, 19–20; Redford 1993, 219; Asutay-Effenberger 2004; Walker 2010; Redford 2013,

⁴⁶⁰ Asgarı 1984, 45–46, figs. 12–19.

marble altar or a table, an *opus sectile* pavement, inlaid panels made of marble, limestone arches with glass inlaid, architectural ceramics, and a stucco frieze.⁴⁶¹ The room was dated by Mundell Mango between the mid and the late ninth century on the basis of the architectural ceramics found there.⁴⁶² Other scholars, on the basis of the design and in the technique used for the marble *opus sectile* suggested a later date around mid-tenth century probably to be connected to the intervention of Nikephoros Phokas (968-969).⁴⁶³ It is possible that the stucco frieze was part of the same decorative campaign as the architectural ceramics since these two media often interacted. This can be appreciated in other two Constantinopolitan buildings, the *katholikon* of the monastery of Constantine Lips where architectural ceramics were attached to the wall by a thick, modelled piece of plaster (fig. 3.1), and also in the Sampson hospital where architectural ceramics were probably flanked by stucco *proskynetaria*.⁴⁶⁴ Since the room with stucco frieze is located in the area of the Boukoleon palace, it is possible that it was connected to an imperial patron.⁴⁶⁵ The decorative apparatus chosen for this room plays on the concept of variety and imitation of materials through different media, a taste often recorded in other buildings with architectural ceramics.⁴⁶⁶

Another Constantinopolitan building decorated with stucco was the Odalar Camii, a monument which is now almost destroyed (cat. No. 2). The studies carried out before its destruction, in the 1950s, and the comprehensive study of Westphalen, later, showed that the

⁴⁶¹ Asgari 1984, 46.

⁴⁶² Mundell Mango 2001, pp. 22-24; Gerstel, Lauffenburger (eds.) 2001, 172-175; in Kongaz 2011 the stucco frieze is wrongly labelled as 'terracotta' and the image is upside-down.

⁴⁶³ Sodini 1994, 182; Guiglia 1999, 325 n. 29; Bolognesi *et al.* 2008, 121-123; Barsanti, Guiglia, Paribeni 2010, 140, fig. 3; Guiglia 2011, 429-430.

⁴⁶⁴ For architectural ceramics mounted on stucco mouldings, see Gerstel, Lauffenburger (eds.) 2001, 189-195 in part. fig. VI.3.

⁴⁶⁵ Bolognesi suggested to identify the room with the chapel dedicated to the Archangel Michael in the palace of Kamilas built by the emperor Theophilos. This suggestion was not developed further, and it seems to not have had any impact on further scholarship. Bolognesi in Bolognesi *et al.* 2008, 122-123.

⁴⁶⁶ On the aesthetic value of architectural ceramics, see Anderson 2001; Tronzo 2001.

church had several phases which date from the seventh to the Late Byzantine period.⁴⁶⁷ In particular, part of the masonry was dated to the eleventh century, with an extensive restoration in the twelfth century which included mural paintings, among them, the image of St. Merkourios now at the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul;⁴⁶⁸ the Late Byzantine phase is testified by the fragmentary bust of an apostle, also at the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul, which finds comparisons with those made for the Palaiologan phase of the southern church in the monastery of Lips.⁴⁶⁹ It is possible that the church was part of a privately endowed monastery, even though there are no written sources to confirm this. Of the several identifications proposed, recently Asutay-Effenberger convincingly argued that the Odalar Camii was the katholikon of the monastery of H. Ioannes Prodromos in Petra one of the most important centres in Constantinople.⁴⁷⁰

Regarding the friezes described by Westphalen on the basis of the account of Schatzmann, it is impossible to advance any suggestion regarding the original patronage since even the other fragmentary cornices recorded there are currently impossible to date or see.⁴⁷¹ The only information provided by Westphalen is a broad chronology from the Middle to the Late Byzantine period, and that the Odalar Camii was the katholikon of a very important and rich monastery in Constantinople.

The last example of stucco decorations in Constantinople is the proskynetaria frames recovered during the excavations of Ramazonoğlu and later published by Dirimtekin in the area between Hagia Sophia and Hagia Eirene, identified with the Hospital of Sampson (cat. No. 3). The proskynetaria were recovered in a room converted into a chapel (called *martyrium* in

⁴⁶⁷ Alpatov 1926; Brunov 1926; Schatzmann 1935; Schatzmann 1940; Westphalen 1998; Barsanti 2013, 484-490.

⁴⁶⁸ Westphalen 1998, 85-140.

⁴⁶⁹ Firatlı 1990, 81-82; Yalcın 1999, 361; Melvani 2013, 198, fig. 14c.

⁴⁷⁰ Asutay-Effenberger 2008, 299-325. The identification was already suggested by Ousterhout 1985, 117 n.5, and by Mango 1995a, 18.

⁴⁷¹ Westphalen 1998, 149-150.

Dirimtekin's article and room 5 in Peschlow's publication),⁴⁷² and they were dated between the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century.⁴⁷³ Dirimtekin justified this chronology on the basis of the close resemblance of the stucco proskynetaria with some at the Archaeological Museum of Istanbul; the inventory number provided by Dirimtekin does not find any correspondence with the published catalogues of sculptures of the museum, and the current location of the stucco proskynetaria is unknown; thus, I could not verify this chronology.⁴⁷⁴ In the absence of first-hand data, we can extract some information from the study of Peschlow, who dated the construction of the niches with the stucco frames to the eleventh or the twelfth century on the basis of the masonry, therefore providing us with a *terminus post quem* for the stucco frames, if not a confirmation of the chronology proposed by Dirimtekin.⁴⁷⁵

There are no inscriptions or direct information about the patronage of the 'chapel', and there is no mention of the hospital in the written sources of the eleventh and the twelfth centuries, even though it was certainly in use at that time, because it was later occupied by the Latins between 1204 and 1261 and continued to function as hospital.⁴⁷⁶ The continuous support of the emperors to *xenodochoi* recorded in the tenth and the twelfth centuries suggests there was continued support for the Hospital of Sampson too.⁴⁷⁷ The Hospital of Sampson was not linked to any monasteries for the Early and the Middle Byzantine period, since it appeared to be an institution administered by a *xenodochos* and *chartoulari*, and it had possessions in Asia Minor.⁴⁷⁸ This situation changed after the Fourth Crusade, but this does not seem to concern the chronology of the room where the proskynetaria were found.⁴⁷⁹ What is clear from one of

⁴⁷² Peschlow 1977, 146-149, 168-171, 187-188, 190-205, Pl. 1, n. 5.

⁴⁷³ Dirimtekin 1962, 175.

⁴⁷⁴ The inventory numbers provided by Dirimtekin are inv. no. 6156-6181.

⁴⁷⁵ Peschlow 1977, 149 n. 266, 170 n. 307.

⁴⁷⁶ Miller 1990, 127. For the period under the Latin occupation see Stathakopoulos 2005, 255-273.

⁴⁷⁷ Miller 1990, 127-128.

⁴⁷⁸ Miller 1990, 126-127.

⁴⁷⁹ Miller 1990, 128-135; Stathakopoulos 2005.

the written sources concerned with the hospital, the *Miracle Tales of St. Sampson*, is that it was a place frequented not only by poor but also the aristocracy.⁴⁸⁰ It is impossible to say whether the wall paintings and their stucco frames in the ‘chapel’ were donated by a private donor.⁴⁸¹ The only statement possible is that the stucco was used to decorate a chapel located in one of the most powerful charitable institution where both aristocrats and others sought healing.⁴⁸²

Cappadocia

Cappadocia is a region where it seems that stucco was not widespread. The only two examples (one unpublished) are partially connected with masonry architecture. This is particularly interesting because it tells us that rock-cut architecture probably did not need to use stucco since sculptures could be easily obtained by carving the volcanic rock and by employing the same artisans. The presence of stucco reliefs in masonry buildings then may suggest that this material was associated with different techniques, *modus operandi*, and aesthetic criteria than those associated with rock-cut churches.

The first case is the southern church of the so-called Timios Stavros monastery. This is a complex of three churches (cat. No. 5) which were made in different periods. The oldest two are rock-cut single-nave churches.⁴⁸³ The third church is composed of three aisles: while the northern aisle and part of the apse are rock-cut, the pillars, the south-western wall and a small

⁴⁸⁰ Among the aristocrats who took advantage of the hospital there are the *droungarios* Leo, the prothospatharios Eustathios, Bardas strategos of Macedonia and brother of a patrikios, see Ebersolt 1921, 76; Janin 1969, 561-62; Mathews 1971, 79; Miller 1990, 121; Jacoby 2001, 288.

⁴⁸¹ Mango suggested that the room was converted into chapel when the *droungarios* Leo was in charge of the hospital through the *charistichion* (970s), and that the architectural ceramics found there should be attributed to his intervention. However, he does not provide any element to verify this assumption, Mango 2001, 9.

⁴⁸² In the account of the celebration of Palm Sunday, the *Book of Cerimonies* mentions that the *xenodochos* of the hospital of Sampson was the first of the hospitals directors to enter the Chrysotriklinos for the formal reception. *De Cerimoniis*, I, 32, B (p. 173), Engl. Transl. *The Book of Cerimonies*, I, ch. 32, 173.

⁴⁸³ Ousterhout 2017, 122-123; Jolivet-Lévy 1991, 187; de Jerphanion 1936, 100-104. Of a different opinion is Lemaigre Demesnil 2010, 114-118, in part. 117-118.

section of the apse were built with reused stone masonry; the rest is an Ottoman restoration.⁴⁸⁴ The stucco, so far unpublished, appears to have been decorating the arch of the northern aisle which connects the second and third pillars to the west. The northern aisle was likely converted to a sort of *parekklesion*, as the tomb at the base of the second pillar suggests.⁴⁸⁵ As noted in chapter 2, the analysis of the stratigraphic relationship between the mural paintings and the stucco that I carried out during a visit to the church during the summer of 2019, revealed that they probably belong to the same phase, dated to the Middle Byzantine period (figs. 2.25-2.26), and not to the nineteenth century as previously stated by Lemaigre Demesnil.⁴⁸⁶ The wall paintings of the arch with the stucco, and the stucco itself, are still covered by the thin layer of whitewash, which in some areas has fallen, showing the underlying layer of paintings. This underlying layer shows an intense red which can be seen also on the soffit of the north-eastern arch of the same church (cat. No. 5, figs. 5.5-5.6). The soffit of the arch with the stucco also seems to display a series of busts, as in the soffit of the north-eastern arch. The paintings of the church did not benefit from in-depth studies due to their covering with the layer of white paint. Jolivet-Levy identified at least two phases of paintings in the complex and she dated the oldest one, in the apse, to the tenth century.⁴⁸⁷ It seems to me that the soffit of the arch with the stucco may belong to a subsequent phase, which is the one also connected to the north-western arch (cat. No. 5, fig. 5.6). The paintings on the soffits of the north-western arch find comparisons with those made between the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries for the Direkli kilise. Therefore, if the paintings on the soffit of the arch with stucco belong to the same of those on the north-western arch, then we may propose a date to the end of the tenth and

⁴⁸⁴ Ousterhout 2017, 122.

⁴⁸⁵ Ousterhout 2017, 122.

⁴⁸⁶ For the dating of the piece to the nineteenth century, see Lemaigre Demesnil 2010, 115-118, in part. 115 and 117.

⁴⁸⁷ Jolivet-Levy 1991, 187.

the beginning of the eleventh century for the stucco too. However, since the understanding of the soffit of the arch with the stucco is still very difficult, this chronology remains speculative. Therefore, we should generally indicate as Middle Byzantine date for the stucco which starts from the tenth century.⁴⁸⁸ It is not possible to state who commissioned the stucco decoration of this aisle of the church or if it was connected to the burial next to it, because the tomb is not dated and the complex continued to be in use until the twentieth century.⁴⁸⁹ Ousterhout suggested that Timios Stavros developed into the complex with the three-aisled church after originating as a centre focused on the veneration of a holy person.⁴⁹⁰ Unfortunately, this is the only information available and we are lacking any knowledge of holy individual active there.

The second masonry church from Cappadocia with stucco decoration is the well-known Çanlı kilise (or Bell-Church) which was a prominent church of the settlement next to the Akhisar fortress.⁴⁹¹ Ousterhout has argued that this settlement functioned as an administrative centre and residence for the families of the high-ranking officials related to the fortress since there are no signs of any smaller dwellings in the area.⁴⁹² They were recorded, instead, on the other side of the cliff where there are also utilitarian buildings, and houses with courtyards, absent in the Çanlı kilise settlement.⁴⁹³ The stucco pieces found and recorded in Çanlı kilise (cat. No. 4.3) (fig. 3.2) were out of context at the time of their discovery in the northern narthex

⁴⁸⁸ The close location of the soffits dated to the tenth century, and the use of the same red, may suggest that also the paintings on the arch and on the stucco belong to the tenth-century phase, and in turn the stucco too. This comparison is valid only if the polychromy on the stucco visible today is the original one. Moreover, while the stucco shows characteristics which point towards the Middle Byzantine period, these are not resolute for establishing its absolute chronology. This is a task which can be assessed only by the removal of the whitewash from all the painted surface which include also the stucco. Therefore, the chronology that I suggest here does not pretend to be conclusive, but only hypothetical.

⁴⁸⁹ It seems to be a Byzantine burial since there is still trace of the lid which would have sealed the rock-cut coffin, as it happens for other Byzantine burials in the region.

⁴⁹⁰ Ousterhout 2017, 123.

⁴⁹¹ Ousterhout 2017, 335; Ousterhout 2005, 135-148, in part. 147-148.

⁴⁹² Ousterhout 2017, 325-335; Ousterhout 2011, 212-215.

⁴⁹³ This variety speaks for a social stratification of the society of this settlement, which is absent in the Çanlı kilise where were found only houses with courtyard, normally associated with the aristocracy. Therefore, the Çanlı kilise settlement has been interpreted as the place where the officials working at the Akhisar fortress and their family were living. See Ousterhout 2017, 325-335; Ousterhout 2011, 212-215.

and are, therefore, impossible to date.⁴⁹⁴ The shape of the fragments is also hard to interpret: they could be part of a frame of some sort - Ousterhout suggested a tomb -⁴⁹⁵ or the cover of wooden beams of the windows, as found in Hagia Sophia in Monemvasia (fig. 1.73). A very close comparison can be made with a fragment of a frieze found in the Odalar Camii but it is not clear whether it was made of marble or stucco (fig. 3.3).⁴⁹⁶

What seems to emerge from these two cases and from the regional context of Cappadocia is that stucco decoration appears in the two churches which makes use of masonry but it seems to be absent from the rock-cut ones.⁴⁹⁷ In fact, even if the aisle of the church with stucco was rock-cut, it belonged to a building two-thirds of which was made of masonry (the central apse and the two aisles). It is impossible today to link these churches to a patron, since no inscriptions survive and there is no record in the written sources. Therefore, it is only possible to say that for the Timios Stavros church the configuration of the sacred building above a room, probably a monastic cell, suggest a monastic environment or a place of local veneration due to the expansion and refurbishments of the complex over the time.⁴⁹⁸ For Çanlı kilise, its original function is not clear since no monastic complex was attached to it; however, it appears to have been within a settlement of probably military officers, and the use of very expensive materials (e.g. the bricks in the façade and the lazurite and ultramarine blue in the mural paintings) suggests that this was a lavish foundation for an aristocratic audience.⁴⁹⁹

⁴⁹⁴ Ousterhout 2005, 189 n. 29, 206, figs. 254, 269; Ousterhout 2006, 79.

⁴⁹⁵ Ousterhout 2005, pp. 189 n. 29, 206, figs 254, 269.

⁴⁹⁶ Westphalen 1998, 141 n. 3, pl.38,4.

⁴⁹⁷ Among the rock-cut churches there is no record of stucco elements, since all the sculptural elements are carved from the Volcanic tufa.

⁴⁹⁸ Ousterhout 2017, 123.

⁴⁹⁹ For the analysis of the pigments used in the mural paintings see Wisseman et al. 2011, 223-227.

Thrace

Thrace has two known monuments with stucco elements: a church found in the area of Byzantine Maroneia, and the katholikon of the monastery of the Virgin Kosmosoteira in Feres. The first excavations of Byzantine Maroneia in the area of Palaiochora were carried out by Aliprantis and briefly published in an article of 1975 where he mentioned the discovery of the panel made of stucco (cat. No. 6) in a church with an apse painted with a foliate cross.⁵⁰⁰ The panel was dated between the seventh and the ninth century on the basis of its decoration considered to be Iconoclast.⁵⁰¹ However, this position can no longer be accepted since it has been demonstrated that aniconic decorations can be dated from the sixth to the tenth century.⁵⁰² The panel and its church do not appear in the publication of the site which focussed on the Early Byzantine basilica.⁵⁰³ However, some hints regarding the chronology of the stucco plaque can be found in its design which finds comparisons in marble plaques from the seventh to the tenth century.⁵⁰⁴ In the absence of crucial information which can help us in narrowing down the chronology of the stucco and its church and to identify its patrons, it is only possible to say that the plaque was made between the seventh and the tenth centuries.

However, the church of the Virgin Kosmosoteira in Feres is a well-known monument. It was the katholikon of the monastery founded in 1152 by Isaak Komnenos *sebastokrator* who was the sixth son of the emperor Alexios I Komnenos and Eirene Doukaina; the patronage of his family is well-known and it involved the convent of the Mother of God Kecharitomene by Eirene Doukaina and the Pantokrator monastery by his brother and emperor John II and his

⁵⁰⁰ Aliprantis 1975-76, 223-229. In the subsequent publication on Byzantine Maroneia (Aliprantis 1994) there is no mention of the plaster panel.

⁵⁰¹ See chapter 1.9.

⁵⁰² See the volume edited by Campagnolo *et al.* 2014 for a summary on the question and different positions. In particular, on the crucial cases of Naxos and Cappadocia, see Crow, Turner 2014; Jolivet-Levy 2014 and further bibliography. Recently on Cappadocia, see the summary of Ousterhout 2017, 198-204, 208-209.

⁵⁰³ Doukata-Demertzi 2008.

⁵⁰⁴ See chapter 1.11.

wife Eirene Piroska, both in Constantinople.⁵⁰⁵ Isaak *sebastokrator* was also the founder of the monastery of Chora (in its Komnenian phase), again in the capital, established first as his burial site.⁵⁰⁶ After being exiled from Constantinople, he moved his tomb to Thrace, to the church of the Kosmosoteira.⁵⁰⁷ Part of the re-made capitals in stucco are still preserved within the church (cat. No. 7.1) which belong to this phase. These stucco capitals played an essential visual role within the church decoration due to their size and to the fact that they were probably the only pieces of sculpture of the church, except for the *templon*, the bronze railings to mark the area of the tomb of Isaak and the tomb slab.⁵⁰⁸ These capitals may have both a load-bearing and a decorative role. Indeed, the innovative plan of the church, with two pairs of narrow columns on the western side, still exhibits severe load-bearing problems, because they are too slim to support the big dome.⁵⁰⁹ The use of stucco does not seem to have helped in consolidating the structure; it wraps around the capitals and the imposts, but it does not re-direction the loads from the thin columns. The decorative impact of the capitals is unprecedented. In the Kosmosoteira, stucco allowed the creation of a rich decoration which mirrors the experimentalism recorded in the architecture.⁵¹⁰ The result shows that Isaak employed artisans who were able to create new solutions both in architecture and in sculpture.

⁵⁰⁵ *Typikon of the Sebastokrator*, 782.

⁵⁰⁶ *Typikon of the Sebastokrator*, §89, 838. Isaak *sebastokrator* is also known for his active patronage in the arts such as the Octateuch now in the library of the Seraglio in Istanbul, see Uspensky 1907; Anderson 1982, 84- 86, 91; Ševčenko 2000, 782. Against this attribution is Pelletier 1962, 11. Moreover, when Isaak went to the Holy Land, he also paid for the construction of an aqueduct for the monastery of St. John the Forerunner near the Jordan river, Kurtz 1907, 102. On Isaak see also Underwood 1966, I, 8-13. Varzos 1984, I, 238-254.

⁵⁰⁷ *Typikon of the Sebastokrator*, §89, 838-839.

⁵⁰⁸ *Ibidem*; Ousterhout 2002, 13-15; Ousterhout, Bakirtzis 2007, 77-88. Recently on the cycle of wall paintings of the church, Ševčenko 2012.

⁵⁰⁹ Iron tie rods were inserted in the mortar between the capitals and the masonry in order to connect the capitals to the perimeter walls to pass on the weight of the dome. Moreover, a flat iron bar was located in an intermediate zone between the capitals and the abacus. Both the iron bars and the beams are dated to the Middle Byzantine period since they are within the mortar. Sinos 1985, 86-88; Dennert 1997, 82; Ousterhout 1999, 214-216; Ousterhout, Bakirtzis 2007, 56.

⁵¹⁰ On the architectural plan of the Virgin Kosmosoteira see Mango 1976, 134; Sinos 1985, 75-176 in part 157-176; Ousterhout 1999, 122-125, 149.

Macedonia

Stucco was not exclusive to Byzantine patrons. Stucco reliefs adorned the basilica of H. Achilleios on the small lake of Prespa (cat. No. 8), a church usually connected to the patronage of the ruler Samuel I of Bulgaria.⁵¹¹ Though no dedicatory inscription survives intact, scholars agreed to identify it with the basilica mentioned by the historian John Skylitzes.⁵¹² After Samuel I took the Byzantine city of Larissa in 985, he removed the relics of H. Achilleios from the cathedral and brought them in the city of Prespa, one of the most important centres of the Bulgarian kingdom together with Ohrid.⁵¹³ The church is monumental (22x44 m), one of the biggest in the Balkans, and it was the result of an ambitious project to create an appropriate seat for the Bulgarian patriarch - the Bulgarian Church became autocephalous in this period. The basilica had stucco arched slabs, possibly part of a ciborium, which were worked in the same style and with the same decorative motifs of the stone sculpture of the building.⁵¹⁴ While the architecture shows clear connections to the Byzantine territories (masonry, proportions),⁵¹⁵ the iconography and the carving of the stone and stucco sculptures find comparisons with the contemporary sculpture on the Adriatic coast, and in the Balkans and less in Constantinople.⁵¹⁶ It is possible that Samuel employed local artisans for the stone and stucco sculptures. I believe that the use of stucco for the arched slab may be connected to the desire to use a variety of materials in his foundation, in line with the contemporaneous taste in Byzantine buildings.⁵¹⁷

⁵¹¹ On Samuel and the church of H. Achilleios, see Grabar 1976, 8; Moutsopoulos 1989, I, 83-85; Moutsopoulos 1999, 7-18, in part. 17-18. On the stucco reliefs, see Moutsopoulos 1989, I, 189-190, 331-332, figs. 27-28 pl. 31, 1-2, 32, 1; Moutsopoulos 1999, 248-249, figs. 211-212.

⁵¹² Grabar 1964, 163-168; Ćurčić 2010, 311-12.

⁵¹³ Skylitzes, *Synopsis*, 312-313. The construction of the basilica by Samuel is mentioned only in the manuscripts A, C, E, U.

⁵¹⁴ Moutsopoulos 1989, I, 331-332.

⁵¹⁵ The choice of a basilica seems a bit out of date for the end of the tenth century, however, this choice was interpreted by scholars as a conscious revival testifying the ambitions of Samuel, or congregational needs, see Ćurčić 2010, 312; Ousterhout 2019, 536-538.

⁵¹⁶ See chapter 1.9 for comparisons.

⁵¹⁷ This aspect will be discussed further in the conclusions of this chapter.

The other example from the historical region of Macedonia is the church of St. Panteleimon in Nerezi, near Skopje (ca 1164) (cat. No. 28) which brings us into the century following the defeat of Samuel I by the Byzantine armies.⁵¹⁸ This church was located in Byzantine territory, founded by Alexios Angelos Komnenos, as the inscription on the lintel of the main door testifies, and it was the place where he was probably buried.⁵¹⁹ Alexios was one of the sons of Theodora Komnene and Constantine Angelos.⁵²⁰ Theodora and Constantine started the Angelos-Komnenos family, a branch of the extended imperial family, which generated four subsequent emperors. Alexios Angelos states clearly in the inscription that he is the son of the *porphyrogennete* Theodora, sister of the emperor Alexios I Komnenos.⁵²¹ Alexios Angelos Komnenos is partially known from the written sources; they tell us that he was an intellectual figure very close to his cousin, the emperor Manuel I Komnenos, and he played a considerable role in the synod of 1166.⁵²² Some iconographic choices in the painted programme of the church of St. Panteleimon recall the emperor's position on theological matters discussed in the synods of 1156, 1157, 1166 as Sinkević demonstrated.⁵²³ The settlement of Nerezi was probably a property of Alexios Angelos, and it has to be understood within the context of the Komnenoi and their activities, in particular of Manuel I who granted several estates and lands to his family in the Balkans. Nerezi was close to Skopje, and a strategic point since it was in

⁵¹⁸ On the church see, Sinkević 2000; Ćurčić 2010, 410; Ousterhout 2019, 373, 410.

⁵¹⁹ Sinkević 1996, 39; Ousterhout 2002, 7; Ousterhout 2019, 373.

⁵²⁰ On the figure of Alexios Angelos Komnenos, see Sinkević 1996; Sinkević 2000, 4-5.

⁵²¹ Sinkević 2000, 4-5.

⁵²² *Niketas Choniates*, col. 253.

⁵²³ The church of St. Panteleimon is one of the four churches with the Kiss of the Apostles painted within the scene of the Communion of the Apostles. Sinkević argued that this signified the Ecumenical unity, and reflected Manuel I's policy based on tolerance, in particular regarding disputes on the different Eucharistic rituals. Moreover, the inclusion in the scene of Peter and Paul kissing, and also Andrew and Luke, who were very popular saints in Macedonia, was seen as an attempt to promote the unitarian policies of Alexios Angelos (thus supporting the emperor Manuel I) to those within the area. Another aspect which shows the involvement of Alexios in dogmatic matters of his time, is the representation of the *Hetoimasia* in the bema of the church which symbolize the Holy Trinity in this case; under Manuel I, there were three Constantinopolitan Councils (1156, 1157, 1166) which discussed the dual nature of Christ and his status as member of the Holy Trinity. Sinkević 2000, 8, 33-34, 35-39. In a previous contribution, Sinkević noted also some disagreements between Alexios Angelos and Manuel I, Sinkević 1996, 36-37.

the *theme* of Macedonia, which, since 1004, encompassed the territories taken away from the Bulgarians in the time of Samuel. In this area, a foundation such as St. Panteleimon, full of references to Constantinople, aims at reinforcing the imperial rule in a peripheral area.⁵²⁴ Such references have been identified in the architectural plan of the church, in some iconographic choices of the mural paintings and in their style; the sculpture is also in line with the current trends recorded in Thessaloniki and Constantinople.⁵²⁵ All this information allows us to contextualise the stucco proskynetaria of this church as part of the decorative apparatus of a member of the imperial family who was a close collaborator of the emperor Manuel I.

The Athos peninsula

Three out of four of the most important and ancient foundations on Mount Athos had stucco decoration: the Protaton church and the katholika of the monasteries of Vatopedi and Iviron. For the Great Lavra, the first monastery in the hierarchy of the Athonite republic, it is unknown whether the katholikon or any of the subsidiary chapels had any stucco decoration.⁵²⁶ In all three cases stucco was produced for decorating the churches used by monastic communities and in at least two cases (Vatopedi and Iviron), it is possible to talk about monastic patronage.

The Protaton church preserves two stucco proskynetaria dated around the middle of the tenth century. The building is located in Karyes, which in the tenth and the eleventh centuries was the administrative centre of Athos, seat of the *protos* (the judicial and administrative

⁵²⁴ Sinkević 2000, 5-10. On the similarities with Constantinopolitan architecture, see Ousterhout 2019, 357, 359 fig. 15.9C, 411-412, 550.

⁵²⁵ Architecture and paintings also show some regional elements in typologies and iconographies; however, it seems clear that there was a conscious attempt to connect this foundation to Constantinople. Sinkević 2000, 21-28, 29-84 in part. 80-82; Ćurčić 2010, 410.

⁵²⁶ The possibility that the katholikon of the Great Lavra had stucco should not be disregarded because this building and those of Vatopedi and Iviron have all a similar architectural plan, the so-called 'Athonite type' (tryconch), which was elaborated in a close amount of time in all three buildings. According to the most recent studies, the katholikon of Vatopedi is probably the oldest building with a triconch-shape, followed by the Lavra and Iviron, Mamaloukos 2011, 39-50.

authority of the monastic peninsula).⁵²⁷ The church was remodelled and redecorated several times; Mylonas identified the first building phase within the beginning of the tenth century, the second phase with the intervention of the *hegoumenos* Athanasios who added the transept at the time of the emperor Nikephoros Phokas (963-969), and the third with an intervention in the time of the emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos (1282-1328), when the external walls were reinforced and a new cycle of mural paintings was made.⁵²⁸ The stucco proskynetaria (cat. Nos. 9.1-9.2) were first published and dated by Orlandos to the tenth century together with the marble templon;⁵²⁹ Grabar dated them to the eleventh century on the basis of their inhomogeneity with the marble templon, based on observations about style, which were not very convincing;⁵³⁰ Mylonas, however, provided a wider timeframe for the stucco proskynetaria, dating them between the intervention of Athanasios (ca. 960/65) and Andronikos II Palaiologos (1282-1328).⁵³¹ Finally, the subsequent mentions of the stucco proskynetaria by Kalopissi-Verti, Vanderheyde, and Papadopoulou dated them generically to the tenth century without anchoring them to Athanasios.⁵³² As already discussed in chapter 1, a date to the tenth century is possible for the shape of the frame and the decorative patterns used. The patronage of Athanasios is possible but it is not verifiable, because the evidence connected to his intervention does not allow us to connect the proskynetaria to him for sure.⁵³³ Another possibility is that the stucco proskynetaria were made during another later intervention, possibly connected to the *hegoumenos* of the monastery of Xenophon who donated 36 pounds of gold to renew the church

⁵²⁷ Papachryssanthou 1975, 114-129.

⁵²⁸ Mylonas 1979, 143-160; Mango 1976, 116. On the wall paintings see, Vasilakeris 2013; Daniila *et al.* 2007, 1971-1984; Tsigaridas 2003, 17-65; Daniilia *et al.* 2000, 91-110; Acheimastou-Potamianou 1994, 26, 236; Xyngopoulos 1964, 419-430.

⁵²⁹ Orlandos 1953.

⁵³⁰ Grabar 1976, 68.

⁵³¹ Mylonas 1979, 146.

⁵³² Vanderheyde 2005, 84; Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 110; Papadopoulou 2006, 344.

⁵³³ Pazaras already suggested that the templon was connected to him, Pazaras 1997, 236-237.

in 1083;⁵³⁴ however, this chronology does not explain the shape of ‘simple arch’ instead of arched slab for the proskynetaria. As we have seen in chapter 1, stucco proskynetaria are modelled as ‘simple’ arches even later, such as in the twelfth-century church of H. Ioannes Eleemon in Ligourio (cat. No. 23), and in the Ljubostinja church (ca 1406–1408) (fig. 1.161). Nevertheless, these two cases belong to ‘Type B’ proskynetaria which does not show consistent patterns as ‘Type A’ due to the different kind of artisans who were modelling them (probably painters). Therefore, it is only possible to say that the stuccoes were made for the church of the main centre of Athos and that they were probably commissioned by religious leaders (possibly Athanasios).

The patronage of the stuccoes in the katholika of Vatopedi and Iviron is clearer, and allows us to contextualise them within the agendas of the monasteries. As demonstrated in chapter 2, the stucco elements were probably produced by the same workshop, or were, at least, produced in the same timeframe.⁵³⁵ The narrative provided by the stucco decorations of these two buildings opens a windows into the use of stucco as part of the monasteries’ strategies of affirming their power on Athos. As we have noted earlier, between the end of the tenth and the eleventh century both monasteries were expanding, renovating their katholika and developing into the most influential institutions after the Great Lavra, and at the expenses of the *protos* in Karyes.⁵³⁶

The building activities which enlarged the katholikon of Vatopedi were undertaken from the beginning of the eleventh century, and they continued until around the middle of the century; the known hegoumenoi of this period are Nicholas (+ 1012-1018) and Athanasios (ca

⁵³⁴ *Actes Xénophon*, n. 1, ll. 179-180.

⁵³⁵ See chapter 2.9 for the buildings, the chronology and the artisans.

⁵³⁶ Papachryssantou 1975, 99-107, 117-118.

1020-1048).⁵³⁷ This is the period when the architectural plan of the katholikon of Vatopedi was taken as a model by the other two important monasteries: the Great Lavra and Iviron.⁵³⁸ Under the hegoumenate of Athanasios (ca 1020-1048), Vatopedi experienced a period of expansion both in monastic population and in properties through the purchase of new ones both on Athos and in Macedonia.⁵³⁹ This expansion was recognised by the *typikon* of the emperor Constantine Monomachos (1045) where Vatopedi was recognised as second in the Athonite hierarchy, and benefitted from special concessions which, on the one hand, enabled it to compete with the Great Lavra and, on the other, pushed it to the same level of Iviron.⁵⁴⁰ Oikonomides noted that the active hegoumenate of Athanasios laid the path for the recognitions of 1045.⁵⁴¹ Indeed, at the beginning of his hegoumenate he signed lower down in the list.⁵⁴² However, it appears to me that before Athanasios, the status of Vatopedi is not entirely clear; in 985 it is the last in the list,⁵⁴³ in 998 it is third (while Iviron is eighth),⁵⁴⁴ in 1020 it is second (after the Great Lavra)⁵⁴⁵ before going down in the list between 1030 and 1040. These data shows that Vatopedi sporadically jumped to the top of the hierarchy, but only after 1045 did the situation become stable for a while.

⁵³⁷ The dates provided for the hegoumenoi on Athos do not always correspond to the actual time they spent in their office but rather they are connected to their appearance in the documents. See the list of the hegoumenoi in *Actes Vatopedi*, 51-52; *Actes d'Iviron*, I, 93-94.

⁵³⁸ For a synthesis on the studies on the so-called 'Athonite type' see Mamaloukos 2011, 39-45.

⁵³⁹ *Actes de Vatopédi*, 10-12.

⁵⁴⁰ This is clear from the servants each hegoumenos could bring with them during the general assemblies. In the *typikon* of Tzimiskes (972) the *protos* was accompanied by six servants and the other hegoumenoi without; the *typikon* of Monomachos (1045) established that the hegoumenos of the Lavra was accompanied by six servants, the hegoumenoi of Vatopedi and Iviron by four servants each, the *Protos* by three servants, and all the other hegoumenoi by one each. These regulations show the balance of power on Athos in the tenth and eleventh centuries and underline the superiority of the three big coenobitic monasteries (Lavra, Vatopedi and Iviron), *Actes du Prôtaton*, 104-105, n. 7 202-215, n. 8 215-23.

⁵⁴¹ Oikonomides also connected the monastery to the aristocracy of Adrianople, see Oikonomides 1998, 44-53.

⁵⁴² This can be seen in a document of 1035 *Actes de Lavra*, I, n. 29, while already in a document of 1044 Vatopedi was going up, *Actes de Esphigmenou* 1973, n.3 l. 36.

⁵⁴³ *Actes Iviron* I, n. 7, ll. 5, 63.

⁵⁴⁴ *Actes Vatopedi*, I, n. 2, l. 29.

⁵⁴⁵ *Actes Iviron*, I, n. 24, l. 24.

Is the expansion of Vatopedi visible in the architecture of the katholikon and, in particular, in the use of stucco? Around the middle of the eleventh-century, the katholikon was decorated with mosaics in the naos (today only the Annunciation survives), and later the mosaic of the *deesis* was commissioned in the narthex by the hegoumenos Ioannikios (end eleventh/beginning twelfth century).⁵⁴⁶ As noted in chapter 2, the stucco decorations of Vatopedi should be dated to the time of the construction of the *liti* (beginning of the eleventh century) because those made for the naos and those for the *liti* are homogenous. This observation allows us a date to the hegoumenate of Nicholas (+ 1012-1018) or Athanasios (ca 1020-1048). We know nothing about Nicholas' activities, while for Athanasios it is clear from the surviving documents the community was consistently enlarged: he requested an extra pair of oxen to knead bread;⁵⁴⁷ new properties were acquired, and also the chapels of H. Demetrios and H. Nikolaos were added to the katholikon under him.⁵⁴⁸ Stavros Mamaloukos attributed the construction of the *liti* to him too.⁵⁴⁹ This means that after a period of growth (mid tenth -1020), in the second quarter of the eleventh century the katholikon of Vatopedi was reshaped with the addition of new spaces and the stucco decoration. These changes and investments in the katholikon corresponded to its period in the lower place in the Athonite hierarchy but, ultimately, they elevated Vatopedi to the rank as second monastery in 1045. Why did Vatopedi fall in the hierarchy while it was investing in its main church? Did it have financial problems, or this fall was connected to the fortunes of Iviron, the other powerful monastery? Probably the

⁵⁴⁶ The Annunciation has been dated around the half of the eleventh century, and the Deesis between the end of the eleventh century and the beginning of the twelfth, see Tsigaridas 1998, 222-230; Walters 1968, 314.

⁵⁴⁷ *Actes du Prôtaton*, n.8 ll. 93-99, p. 219, 228.

⁵⁴⁸ The chapel of H. Demetrios has been dated to the first half of the eleventh century and the chapel of H. Nikolaos slightly after. On the architecture see Mamaloukos 1998, 173-174; Mamaloukos 2001, 82-102, 125-128, 160-168, 206-208, 225. On sculpture, see Pazaras 2001a, 81-100.

⁵⁴⁹ Mamaloukos 2001, 205-206; Mamaloukos 1996, 115.

latter. And it is significant for this study to note that the rise of Iviron to the second place in hierarchy corresponded to some renovations in the katholikon involving the use of stucco.

As noted in chapter 2, the stuccoes in the inner narthex of the katholikon of Iviron can be dated between 1029 (death of the hegoumenos George I) and 1066 (death of the hegoumenos George III the Hagiorite) (cat. Nos. 11.1-11.2).⁵⁵⁰ These years are crucial for the history of the monastery's community and the recognition of the Georgian leadership by both its monks and by the rest of the Athos peninsula. I would argue that the stuccoes are part of the George's Hagiorite's discourse of legitimising the presence of the Georgians on Athos, as several elements suggest.

The known building works in the katholikon of Iviron are those under the hegoumenos George I who improved the church, and added the chapel on the southern side; such works are confirmed by a document dated to 1020 where Iviron was allowed to have a second pair of oxen for the works in the katholikon.⁵⁵¹ Some years after his death, probably under the hegoumenos Gregorios, George I was buried in the narthex of the katholikon.⁵⁵² However, the narthex acquired a special importance only under the hegoumenos George III the Hagiorite who promoted substantial aesthetic and ideological changes, through the *translatio* of the relics of the most important individuals in the history of Iviron, St. Euthymios and John the Iberian (the founders of the monastery), Arsenios and John Grdzelisdze, who were placed into marble pseudo-sarcophagi at the southern end of the narthex. (figs. 3.5-3.6).⁵⁵³ The creation of this

⁵⁵⁰ The hegoumenoi of this period are George II (1029-ca 1035), Gregorios (ca 1035-1041), Symeon (1041-1042), Stephanos (1042-1044), George III the Hagiorite (ca 1044-1056), Arsenios (1056-1059), Theodoros (1061), and George IV Oltisari (1065-1077/78). *Actes d'Iviron* I, 94; *Actes d'Iviron* II, 61.

⁵⁵¹ *Actes d'Iviron* I, n. 24, pp. 228-233. The figure of the hegoumenos George I was controversial. He was deposed from his hagoumenate because was accused of being part of a cup against the *doux* of Thessaloniki, Constantinos Diogenes, and for this reason he was condemned to the exile, see *Actes d'Iviron* I, 41-45. His first rehabilitation happened under Gregory, but it is under the hegoumenate of George III the Hagiorite that George I was recognized as founder and builder of the katholikon, Martin-Hisard 2006, 146-148; Martin-Hisard 2005, in part. 90-95.

⁵⁵² Rehabilitation of George I under him and not under George II *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite* §98

⁵⁵³ *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, §97-99.

tomb aimed at promoting the cult of the Georgian founders (Euthymios and John the Iberian) and, at the same time, at justifying the presence of the Georgians in the church and the performing of the liturgy in the Georgian language.⁵⁵⁴ Indeed, the intervention of George III, which included the stucco elements, must be seen in the light of the contemporary events which occurred in the community of Iviron: the clashes between the Georgians and Greeks. In the eleventh century, the community of Iviron was made up of both Georgian and Greek monks. Since the time of the hegoumenate of Euthymios, Greeks were welcomed into the community; under George I, the Greeks and the Georgians started to be treated differently, such as using different liturgies in their own languages, but the situation exploded between 1029 and 1041.⁵⁵⁵ The main disagreement was that the Greeks claimed the church of the Virgin (the *katholikon*) as their own, and therefore they claimed the lead of the monastery.⁵⁵⁶ In fact, at the beginning of the 1030s, the Georgians were using the church of the Virgin, while the more numerous Greeks used the one dedicated to the Prodomos, which was smaller and less prestigious. The situation reversed under George II (1029- ca 1035) as he supported the Greeks, but it changed back to the *status quo* in ca. 1035, which was later confirmed in 1041 by the emperor Michael IV.⁵⁵⁷ It has been noted that while the Georgian community at Iviron always had the support of the emperors and of the Georgian nobility, the Greek community outnumbered the Georgians and had the support of the other Athonite monasteries.⁵⁵⁸ After the interventions of the emperors, the Georgians took over, and George III the Hagiorite became hegoumenos.⁵⁵⁹ Even before he became head of Iviron, George III had a clear agenda, seen through his work on the

⁵⁵⁴ Martin-Hisard 2006, 141-148; Martin-Hisard 2005, 79–100; *Actes d'Iviron* I, 54-55.

⁵⁵⁵ *Actes d'Iviron* I, 45-59. Martin-Hisard shortened this period to 1033-1041. Martin-Hisard 2006, 132-136.

⁵⁵⁶ Martin-Hisard 2006, 139-148; *Actes Iviron* I, 33-50.

⁵⁵⁷ *Actes Iviron*, I, 46.

⁵⁵⁸ Lefort suggested that the accusation (and condemnation) of George I was part of a coup against the *doux* of Thessaloniki was planned by the other Athonite monasteries. *Actes d'Iviron*, I, 42.

⁵⁵⁹ *Actes d'Iviron*, I, 42-53; Martin-Hisard 2006, 130-141.

translation of liturgical texts from Greek into Georgian, continuing the legacy of the Georgian founders.⁵⁶⁰ Moreover, he wrote the *Life of John and Euthymios* which underlined the will of the Mother of God to have them on Athos and her desire that Georgian language was used in the monastery and in the liturgy.⁵⁶¹ This concept was also visually expressed in the narthex of the katholikon, where the Hagiorite built the already mentioned tomb for the bodies of Euthymios, John the Iberian, Arsenios, and John Grdzelisdze, and promoted the cult of Euthymios by sending his relics to Constantinople and Jerusalem.⁵⁶² At the same time he also established commemorations and rituals to be performed in front of the tomb of Euthymios.⁵⁶³ It appears clear that George aimed at consolidating the presence of the Iberians on Athos by promoting the cult of one of its founders.⁵⁶⁴

The stucco elements in the narthex decorate the tomb of George I (figs. 3.4, 3.6) in front of the tomb of Euthymios, and they frame the entrance to the naos (fig. 3.7). This latter frame leaves an empty space (a sort of lunette) profiled by an arch on colonnettes, a space which was probably originally filled with an image. Today it contains a post-Byzantine fresco of the Virgin, but we cannot exclude that it originally framed another, older, image of the Mother of God, since the *Life of John and Euthymios*, written by the Hagiorite himself, mentions that the katholikon had the image of the Virgin at the entrance.⁵⁶⁵ In this regard, the peculiar stucco frame underlined the importance of the image of the Virgin Mary, fitting perfectly with the agenda of George III the Hagiorite who stressed the connection between the Virgin and the

⁵⁶⁰ *Actes d'Iviron*, I, 50-53; Martin-Hisard 2006, 141-148.

⁵⁶¹ These aspects were already noted by Lefort, however Martin-Hisard reconstructed the hegoumenate with extreme precision by convincingly exploring the complicate agenda of George the Hagiorite both as a monk and as hegoumenos. *Actes d'Iviron*, I, 53-55; Martin Hisard 2005; Martin-Hisard 2006, 139-148;.

⁵⁶² *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, § 27-29; *Actes d'Iviron*, I, 54. On their tomb, see Pazaras 2006, 125–152; Pazaras 2007, 47–64. For the identification of this tomb with the one of Euthymios, John the Iberian, Arsenios, and John Grdzelisdze, see Pazaras 2006.

⁵⁶³ *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, § 26-29.

⁵⁶⁴ Martin-Hisard 2006, 146-148.

⁵⁶⁵ *La Vie de Jean et Euthyme*, §37, n. 168; *Actes d'Iviron*, I, 63, n. 5-6.

Georgian founders. The other stucco element is the frame of the arcosolium of the tomb of George I which is very similar in style, dimensions, and ornamentation to the doorframe. These analogies suggest that they were made during the same campaign.⁵⁶⁶ Unfortunately, the *Life of George the Hagiorite* does not fully describe the aspect of the tomb of George I, and simply states that the tomb had a sarcophagus made of marble, with no mention of the arcosolium.⁵⁶⁷ This silence, even if is probably explained by the interest of the hagiographer in the tomb and not in its decoration, leaves us open two possible dates. The first one is the hegoumenate of Gregorios (ca 1035-1041), when the body of George I was moved into the narthex; the other possibility is that the stucco elements belonged to the period of George III the Hagiorite when the narthex acquired considerable importance. The choice of stucco by the Hagiorite may be related to this being an intervention made in a short amount of time soon after the construction and decoration of the tomb of Euthymios in marble;⁵⁶⁸ another possibility is that the use of stucco signalled a hierarchy between the two tombs, where the marble tomb of Euthymios was the focus of the narthex; however, the stucco arcosolium of George I's tomb has a richer decoration than the marble one.⁵⁶⁹ Finally, another possibility is that the stuccoes were made when the body of George III the Hagiorite was deposited with George I (1066), the other 'constructor and decorator'.⁵⁷⁰ If we want to date the stuccoes to this latter intervention, the

⁵⁶⁶ Pazaras 2007, 54-55.

⁵⁶⁷ *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, § 97. The description of the tomb of Euthymios contains information about the sarcophagus only. *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, § 27 In these passages, the interest of the hagiographer is merely on the remains of these people, while the ornamentation of the tombs can be simply implied by the appellation of George the Hagiorite as 'decorator' of the church *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, § 98.

⁵⁶⁸ Stucco is a quick alternative to marble: it can be easily modelled and worked faster than marble/stone and once dry it resemble marble.

⁵⁶⁹ It is possible that the stucco arcosolium was covered with golden leaf since from the pictures it seems to see remnants of the preparation of the gilding (bolo) (but this hypothesis should be tested by proper analysis). If this is true, it would be difficult to imagine that stucco was perceived in this case as a cheaper material than marble. I am also not considering the possibility of a lack of marble for the arcosolium because Ivion between the end of the tenth and the eleventh century was able to import marble from outside Athos and to employ artisans educated in Constantinople, Pazaras 2001b. Moreover, the other works undertaken by George III the Hagiorite involved marble since he remade the *opus sectile* pavement of the entire church and narthex. Liakos 2008; Martin-Hisard 2006, 142-146; *Actes d'Ivion*, I, 62-63.

⁵⁷⁰ *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, § 99.

hegoumenos was George IV Oltisari, who is not known for any interventions into the katholikon.⁵⁷¹ Therefore, it seems more reasonable to place the stuccoes into one of the interventions of the Hagiorite which aimed at reinforcing the presence of the Georgian community by strengthening the ties between the founders, the Virgin Mary, and the Georgian language. Additionally, the decision to decorate the tomb of George I can be seen as a way to remember the predecessor most involved in building activities, and it was indeed there that the Hagiorite was buried after his death in Constantinople.⁵⁷² The motivation behind using stucco could be connected to a possible later intervention soon after the construction and decoration of the tomb of Euthymios. This intervention required the Hagiorite to fund a quick decoration with the greatest effect, both framing the image of the Virgin on the door and re-habilitating the figure of George I through his tomb.⁵⁷³

What does the stucco tell us about the agenda of the hegoumenoi of Vatopedi and Iviron? The answer is in the organization of the Athonite peninsula and the balance of power from the end of the tenth century to the eleventh. This period saw the promulgation of two *typika* for the Mount Athos by the emperor John Tzimiskes (972) and by Constantine Monomachos (1045); the following one was much later, in 1406 by Manuel II Palaiologos.⁵⁷⁴ As observed by Denise Papachryssantou, the *typikon* of 1045 does not cancel the one of 972 but, rather, it defines some grey areas.⁵⁷⁵ What emerges from the *typikon* of 1045 is the concern to consolidate the authority of the great monasteries (Great Lavra, Vatopedi, Iviron) at the expenses of the *protos*, but also to regulate and contain their economic expansion on Athos.⁵⁷⁶

⁵⁷¹ *Actes d'Iviron*, II, 18-19.

⁵⁷² The account of his death in Constantinople on 24 May 1065 and the *translatio* of his body into the katholikon of Iviron is in the *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, §93-100.

⁵⁷³ The hierarchy between Euthymios and George I was respected because the latter tomb is bigger in size and more imposing than the George I's one.

⁵⁷⁴ *Actes du Prôtaton*, n. 13.

⁵⁷⁵ Papachryssanthou 1975, 104. In the *typikon* of Tzimiskes there is no mention of Vatopedi, which appears in the documents for the first time in 985.

⁵⁷⁶ Papachryssanthou 1975, 104-107.

This aspect is clear from the change in the hierarchical composition of the main attendees at the assemblies held in the Protaton church, the seat of the *protos*, the central authority on Athos. The *typikon* of 972 mentions first the *protos* accompanied by six servants, followed by the hegoumenos of the Great Lavra with two servants, the monk Paul with one servant and then the hegoumenoi of the other monasteries without servants (among them Iviron, Vatopedi is not mentioned in this *typikon*).⁵⁷⁷ In the following *typikon* (1045), the order changes: first the hegoumenos of the Great Lavra with six servants, then the hegoumenoi of Vatopedi and Iviron with four servants each, and after them the *protos* with three servants, followed by all the other hegoumenoi with one servant each.⁵⁷⁸ Papachryssantou noted that this list mirrored the balance of power in the eleventh century which was probably very unstable, especially for Vatopedi and Iviron.⁵⁷⁹ The importance of the ‘great’ monasteries is emphasized in the changes made to the chairs of the assembly which reunited all the hegoumenoi for the discussion of important matters.⁵⁸⁰ Before 1045 the assembly was simply chaired by the *protos*, while the *typikon* of Monomachos stated that it should be chaired by the *protos* assisted by the hegoumenos of the Great Lavra and by the other ‘notables’ which Papachryssantou identifies as the hegoumenoi of the *dunatotera monasēria* (Vatopedi and Iviron).⁵⁸¹

The stucco elements which were part of the renovation works undertaken in the katholika of Vatopedi and Iviron should be framed within this context of competition and internal development of the communities of these monasteries. The lower position of Vatopedi

⁵⁷⁷ *Actes du Prôtaton*, n. 7, ll. 27-29.

⁵⁷⁸ *Actes du Prôtaton*, n. 8, ll. 140-154.

⁵⁷⁹ The absence of frequently signed documents in this period was justified by her as a consequence of the competition between monasteries in this period. She basically suggested that the absence of signed documents by lists of hegoumenoi was due to the reluctance of writing down these tensions. The competition between Vatopedi and Iviron is also demonstrated by the fact that the copy of the *typikon* of Tzimiskēs (1045) made by the copyist of Iviron shows the signature of the hegoumenos of his monastery before the one of Vatopedi. Papachryssanthou 1975, 114-123.

⁵⁸⁰ Papachryssanthou 1975, 114-119.

⁵⁸¹ Papachryssanthou 1975, 117.

within the hierarchy while its own katholikon was renovated can be explained by the temporary expansion of Iviron before the crisis and as a final step towards the establishment of Vatopedi among the most important Athonite monasteries. The disputes between the Georgian and the Greek communities in Iviron led to the weakening of the power and authority of the monastery which, in turn, led to the monastery receiving the third place in the *typikon* of 1045; this power was re-established thanks to the policy of George III the Hagiorite which consolidated the community and provided the monastery with a veneration site (the tomb of Euthymios in the narthex), the effects of which will be seen at the end of the eleventh century and in the twelfth when Iviron became second again.⁵⁸²

Central Greece and Peloponnese

In the Middle Byzantine period, the churches of two other significant religious centres had stucco decorations: the katholikon of Hosios Loukas in Boeotia (first half of the eleventh century) (cat. No. 19), and the katholikon of the Daphni monastery (eleventh-twelfth century) near Athens (cat. no. 21). In the Argolid, there is also the church of H. Ioannes Eleemon which has been considered as a katholikon of a monastery in the settlement of Ligourio (cat. No. 23).⁵⁸³ The stuccoes of all three churches cannot easily be connected to the intervention of specific personalities, as we will see in the following section; however, whoever commissioned them, invested much of their wealth into very lavish foundations (Hosios Loukas and Daphni) and into a locally important religious centre (H. Ioannes Eleemon in Ligourio). Therefore, stucco was chosen to decorate significant local and interregional foundations. There is not

⁵⁸² Despite the incredible job of George III the Hagiorite, by the end of his hegoumenate, the authority of Vatopedi was very difficult to challenge since it received higher rents by the emperors than Iviron, it expanded its properties, until in 1287 was defined imperial monastery, Oikonomides 1998, 46-47.

⁵⁸³ No monastery structures were excavated, yet. Moreover, it is almost impossible to distinguish at this time between a parish church and a monastery since this distinction is only attested in the later Ottoman cadastre.

information about who commissioned the church of H. Ioannes Eleemon in Ligourio; therefore, I will not go much into detail for it in this paragraph. Regarding the katholikon of Daphni, it is important to quote the recent study of Panayotides-Kesisoglou. She suggested that a possible candidate for the construction and decoration of the current katholikon of Daphni (naos and inner narthex) is Gregory Kamateros, praitor (πραιτωρ) of the theme of Greece and Peloponnese in between the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century, which corresponds to the chronology of the mosaics.⁵⁸⁴ The figure of Gregory is known thanks to his lead seals, which survive at the Numismatic Museum of Athens and at the Dumbarton Oaks Museum, and Niketas Choniates mentioned him.⁵⁸⁵ The arguments in favour of his identification are the presence of two saints called Gregory (who may call for the patron's name) and the highly sophisticated iconographic programme, which may match Gregory's high level of literacy.⁵⁸⁶ The absence of monks and women among the saints represented in the mosaics may also point towards a lay patron. However, no inscription survives to confirm this hypothesis. The stucco frieze and the stucco window transenna from the narthex should belong to the phase of the decoration of the narthex (end of the eleventh -beginning of the twelfth century) and possibly to the patronage of Gregorios Kamateros.

The church for which we have more information, though it is very problematic, is the katholikon of Hosios Loukas built in the first half of the eleventh century. The monastery was founded in the tenth century by St. Luke in a strategic position at a crossroad of networks which connected central Greece with the Peloponnese, and on the pilgrimage route between Rome and Jerusalem.⁵⁸⁷ At the beginning of the eleventh century, the monastery of Hosios Loukas developed from being a simple station on the road to Athens (and Jerusalem), to a pilgrimage

⁵⁸⁴ Panayotides 2019.

⁵⁸⁵ Kazhdan 1991.

⁵⁸⁶ Panayotides 2019.

⁵⁸⁷ Oikonomides 1992, 253-254.

site of the tomb of St. Luke with ascribed healing properties.⁵⁸⁸ This is the period when the *katholikon* was built and covered with marble, mosaics, mural paintings, and stuccoes. The majority of scholars believe that the *katholikon* was built by the third of May 1011 or 1022, when the relics of Luke were moved into the finished church, as the *Anakomidi* (the account of the *traslatio* of the relics) suggests.⁵⁸⁹ Another possibility is offered by the account of Cyriacus of Ancona who visited the monastery in 1436 and learned that the *katholikon* was founded by the emperor Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-1055).⁵⁹⁰ The recent 14C analysis of two wooden beams still in the putlog holes of the *katholikon* seems to confirm the chronology of 1011-1022 because they provides a range of dates which goes from 991 to 1040 with the internal highest probability of 1015-1033 (68.3%). What seems convincing for a circumscribed chronology is the evidence from the *Life of St. Luke* and the *Anakomidi* which point towards 1011 or 1022, because they were written soon after the Saint's death and within a century of it, while by the time of Cyriacus of Ancona's visit in 1436 the information about the foundation had ample opportunity for revision.

Who commissioned the stuccoes (cat. No. 20)? The first candidate is the hegoumenos Philotheos who is represented in the paintings of the *katholikon* offering the church.⁵⁹¹ Another possibility is Gregorios, the monk recorded in two inscriptions carved on four plaques flanking the main door of the *naos*.⁵⁹² Gregorios is recorded as monk and as who decorated the church

⁵⁸⁸ Oikonomides 1992, 254-255.

⁵⁸⁹ This was first suggested by Chatzidakis, Chatzidakis 1969, 127-150.

⁵⁹⁰ This possibility has been defended by Stikas even though it was not followed by many scholars. Stikas 1974-75.

⁵⁹¹ The identification of the painting is in Chatzidakis 1969.

⁵⁹² The inscription on the two plaques flanking the main door visible from the narthex is an epigram written in capital letters with diacritics and breathings, and reads as follows «+Λουκᾶ τρισμάκαρ, τὸ/ φιλόθεον ἔργον/ γλυφὲν δέχοι/ ο ἐκ χειρῶν Γρηγο//ρίου ὅπερ τέτευχε/ πρεσβείαις σου θαρ/ρήσας, διδοὺς εἰς πέ/ρας καὶ λύσ<ι>ν ὀφλημά/των +» Greek text from Rhoby 2014, 355 with my addition of inscription's lines. 'Three times blessed Luke, may you accept the godly work, that has been engraved, from the hands of Gregorios, which he created trusting your intercessions, by granting (him) final redemption from sins'.

The inscription on the two plaques flanking the main door visible from the naos is written in capital letters with diacritics and breathings, and reads as follows «+ Χριστέ, μοι δίδου / ὀφλημάτων τὴν λύσιν / Γρηγορίῳ μοναχῷ //

with sculptures (*ergon glyphen*) and marble (*marmarosen*) (figs. 3.9-3.10).⁵⁹³ Most scholars agree that Gregorios held the position of hegoumenos;⁵⁹⁴ this is the most plausible option even though the inscription is not straightforward, because Gregorios is neither qualified as ‘hegoumenos’ nor as ‘pater’ (a word which is used for the identification of the hegoumenoi in the wall paintings of the crypt), but simply as monk.⁵⁹⁵ However, the location of the inscription is crucial because it was seen by anyone who entered the church from the narthex and by those who were leaving the church. Gregorios’ *ergon glyphen* (sculptures), were probably the marble revetment of the walls where the inscriptions are embedded. He may also be the patron of the stuccoes,⁵⁹⁶ because the marble revetment and the stucco elements seem to have been made by artisans who collaborated and followed the same scheme. This can be observed through the relationship between marble, stucco and mosaics. The presence of stucco was planned from the beginning to be part of the design of the interior decoration, because, between the wall-*opus sectile* and the mosaics, the artisans responsible for these media left an empty space. This space was filled with the stucco cornice but not entirely as one would expect. If we look at the cornice from the galleries, we can note that the empty space between the marble and the mosaics was not totally filled with stucco: the ornamental border of the mosaic scenes in the squinches is

τῷ σῶ οικέτι / τῷ κοσμίσαντι τὴν / μαρμάρωσιν ταύτην» Greek text from Rhoby 2014, 355 with my addition of inscription’s lines. ‘Christ, grant me redemption from sins, (me) the monk Gregorios, your servant, who adorned this marble.’. For a detailed analysis of the inscriptions and their metric, see Rhoby 2014, 354-357.

⁵⁹³ On a discussion on the meaning of ἔργον γλυφέν and τὴν μαρμάρωσιν, see Rhoby 2014, 355-357, figs. XLV-XLVI.

⁵⁹⁴ Among them, Chatzidakis 1969, 141; Oikonomides 1992, 251; Chatzidakis 2013, 258.

⁵⁹⁵ Bouras suggested that the inscription may refer to a mason, instead. The expression ‘from his hands’ is unusual for dedicatory inscription, Bouras 2010, 12 n. 9. Recently on the identification of Gregorios with a sculptor, see Vanderheyde 2016. Despite the peculiarity of the inscription, I believe it is more possible that it refers to a donor rather than an artisan because of the context of the building. The inscription is not on a capital or on an architectural member (the most common place for names of artisans), but on four plaques on a highly visible place, flanking the entrance of the naos. Moreover, in the katholikon of Hosios Loukas there is not any reference to any personalities, with the exception of the hegoumenoi. In the middle Byzantine period, buildings resulting from a considerable investment of money, particularly, do not preserve mentions of artisans but rather donors. The situation changed during the thirteenth and fourteenth century when artisans and non-aristocratic people started being frequently recorded by dedicatory inscriptions.

⁵⁹⁶ Or better, the stuccoes may have been part of the decoration sponsored by Gregorios.

slightly irregular and it ends ca 10-15 cm before the stucco (fig. 3.12).⁵⁹⁷ This is also visible in the apse (fig. 3.13). The tesserae draw an irregular border while the stucco cornice is extremely regular (as the marble revetment). How can this be interpreted? The likeliest explanation is that the stucco cornice was made slightly before the mosaics were finished, but soon after the marble revetment was mounted on the walls. Why did the mosaicists did not fill the space with tesserae? Perhaps economic reasons: this ‘empty’ band cannot be seen by anyone at the ground floor but only from the galleries – the ground floor was the ‘hotspot’ where the relics of St. Luke were exposed. Therefore, the mosaicists by not adding extra rows of tesserae could save money and time.⁵⁹⁸ Another possibility is that the lower border of the scenes in the squinches and in the apse is irregular due to the optical adjustment necessary to adapt the scenes and the image of Mary onto concave surfaces. Moreover, the gap is almost invisible from the ground floor showing that the artisans were fully aware of the optic trick (fig. 3.14). In any case, it seems to me that if the mosaicists were in charge of the stucco decoration, they would have covered this ‘empty’ band with moulded plaster to create a smooth transition between the mosaics and the marble revetment.⁵⁹⁹ The stucco cornice, then, appears to be worked with movable mouldings which granted it regular dimensions. The lack of ‘coordination’ between the work of the mosaicists and the stucco cornice suggests that the latter was worked by the *équipe* in charge with the marble revetment rather than the mosaicists, and, for this reason, there is a chance that Gregorios paid for the stucco elements too.⁶⁰⁰

⁵⁹⁷ These measurements are approximative since it is not possible to verify them without scaffoldings.

⁵⁹⁸ 10-15 cm are not many for a small building, but they make the difference in a construction like the katholikon of Hosios Loukas. A similar ‘intermediary zone’ can be noted in a later monument: the church of St, Saviour in the Chora monastery in Constantinople.

⁵⁹⁹ This empty band may also correspond to the line of the scaffoldings which separated the mosaics from the wall revetment. If this is the case, the artisans worked the stucco cornice after the mounting of the marble plaques on the wall, and before the removal of the scaffoldings.

⁶⁰⁰ An argument can be raised against this hypothesis by noting that this ‘empty’ space is absent in the corbels at the ground floor. This can be explained by the fact that at this height a visitor could see the lack of mosaic. The stucco cornice at the base of the dome deserves further consideration because the area should not have had any marble revetment but only mosaics. The cornice may be the key to understanding the progression of the works in

The evidence provided by the analysis of the patronage of Middle Byzantine buildings shows that stucco was used by members of the extended imperial family, the aristocracy, and eminent monastic foundations both in Constantinople and in the provinces. Several foundations which looked to the capital (e.g. Çanlı kilise in Cappadocia) or were founded by members of the imperial family (Kosmosoteira in Feres and St. Panteleimon in Nerezi) contain high-quality stucco elements. The katholika of Vatopedi and Iviron were commissioned by personalities acquainted with Constantinople who were educated or spent considerable time there.⁶⁰¹ Therefore, it is likely that stucco was used in Constantinople too, but it did not survive in the majority of cases because it is a perishable material. It is not possible to quantify how widespread stucco was in Constantinopolitan buildings because there are very few traces of it today. However, the examples recorded in the provinces are probably a reflection of what was happening in the capital and in the rest of the empire. Moreover, the use of stucco by members of the aristocracy, members of the imperial family, influential monasteries, and monasteries which were pilgrimage centres renowned in the Byzantine Empire demonstrates that stucco was part of the decorative apparatus of high-status buildings.⁶⁰² Stucco was not perceived as a cheap material, but it was perfectly thinkable as a legitimate material to be used in an important foundation in the Middle Byzantine period.

Hosios Loukas: the mosaicists started working from the top of the dome and the stucco-worker did the cornice at the base of the dome, then the mosaicists continued applying tesserae by proceeding downwards. At the same time the artisans responsible for the wall *opus sectile* started covering the wall from the highest point (the base of the squinches going downwards); this allowed the stucco artisan to apply the cornice on the 'intermediary' zone just before the mosaicists finished the squinches.

⁶⁰¹ The founders of Vatopedi were probably members of the aristocracy of Adrianople, Oikonomides 1998, 44–53; while George the Hagiorite spent a considerable amount of time in Constantinople, where he also died, Martin-Hisard 2006.

⁶⁰² For Hosios Loukas see Schultz and Barnsley 1901; Chatzidakis 1969; Stikas 1974–75; Oikonomides 1992; Chatzidakis 2013. For Daphni, the founder is not known but during the first half of the eleventh century it was a male monastery and its hegoumenos had a seal, see Millet, Benouville 1899; Lampakis 1899; Bouras 1998; Arletti 2013; Loukopoulou, Mouropoulou 2013.

3.4 Late Byzantine period (13th-15th centuries)

There is more information about the names and origins of the patrons who commissioned churches with stucco decorations after the Fourth Crusade and the capture of Constantinople by the Latins (1204), than in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Another difference from the Middle Byzantine period concerns geography: stucco decorations appear in churches mainly located in mainland Greece and the islands, while they are not recorded at all in Constantinople or Anatolia.⁶⁰³ A considerable change also concerns the origin of the patrons who used stucco: they are not emperors, nor any member of the imperial family but there is an increasing presence of rulers, local officials, and common people. This ‘composite’ patronage of stucco mirrors the changes in patronage recorded from the thirteenth and fourteenth century Greece through inscriptions.⁶⁰⁴ The Late Byzantine period also sees an increasing use of plasterwork in a less-refined techniques which involve mortar and masonry (e.g. proskynetaria Type B); this is telling of the artisans available to those patrons and their economic means. The implications of this situation will be discussed in the following paragraphs which deal with foundations grouped into geographical areas, also corresponding to the division in chronology. The technical and economic repercussions of the proskynetaria Type B will be discussed in paragraph 3.5.

⁶⁰³ This statement is not valid for window transennae, which continued to be used in Constantinople. Some examples are those from the parekklesion of the katholikon of Chora, Ousterhout 1987, 56-57, figs. 85-86; Megaw 1963, 349 n. 49, 365-366; those from an underground funerary chamber in the exonarthex of the church of the Pammakaristos, Ousterhout 1999, 153, fig. 114; Hallensleben 1963, 180-181, fig. 11. Among those used outside Constantinople, see those from the parekklesion of the Çanlı Kilise, see cat. No. 4.2 and Ousterhout 2005, 189 n. 29, 206, figs. 254, 269.

⁶⁰⁴ Kalopissi-Verti 2015, 136-138; Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 45-46.

Epiros

The first group of patrons commissioning stucco is from the Despotate of Epiros. Their commissions were liturgical barriers and in one case possibly a sarcophagus or a memorial/reliquary. The production of free-standing stucco elements is not known for other areas of the Byzantine Empire with the exception of eleventh-century Cyprus.⁶⁰⁵ In Epiros, stucco templa have been found in six churches: the Kato Panagia just outside Arta (second half of the thirteenth century), the Kokkini Ekklesia or Panagia Bellas in Boulgareli (1295/96), the church of the Taxiarches in Kostaniane (from 1240 to the beginning of the fourteenth century), the Koimesis church in Lyggos (end of the thirteenth century), the Koimesis church in Petrobitsa (end of the thirteenth century), and the church of the Metamorphosis in Kleidonia (after the end of the fourteenth to the beginning of the fifteenth century). To them, we should add also the church of the Virgin near the village of Peshkëpi e Sipërme (Albania), also known as Episkopi,⁶⁰⁶ which belonged to the territories of the state of Epiros. These pieces were not dated nor connected to the Epirote workshop until now.⁶⁰⁷ The building phases of the church and its geographical location make possible to frame it within the network of people and patrons of the rest of Epiros, as will be discussed later.

The analysis of the patrons of these churches shows an active patronage of the local aristocracy which was connected at different levels with the despots. This connection was expressed through the offices and titles of the patrons and through the exchange of materials between aristocrats and between them and the despots. Stucco was one of these materials and the people who worked with it were connected with both the despots and the aristocrats.

⁶⁰⁵ In Cyprus the use of stucco for decorating the interior of buildings is uninterrupted from Late Antiquity to the contemporary period due to the high percentages of gypsum in the terrain. See chapter 2 paragraph 2.2, and chapter 4 paragraph 4.2 on this topic.

⁶⁰⁶ Soustal, Koder 1981, 230-231.

⁶⁰⁷ Some of them were published more than ten years ago, but at that time there were found only few pieces of plaques and friezes re-used into the altars, see Hobdari 2009.

Before demonstrating this, it is important to outline the available data regarding both the chronology of the stuccoes from these seven different locations, and the information on the patrons.

The only buildings for which we have information about the patrons are the Kokkini Ekklesia, the Taxiarches in Kostaniane, and possibly the Kato Panagia. Among them, only the Kokkini Ekklesia has an inscription with a date: 1295/96.⁶⁰⁸ It is essential to state that it is not entirely sure that the stuccoes were made when the buildings were finished, or that they can be linked to the patrons recorded in the inscriptions of those churches.⁶⁰⁹ However, stylistic features and the fact that the chemical composition of the plaster is identical in all the examples, make them a homogenous group of artefacts which were produced in a relatively short period and by the same people.⁶¹⁰ The only securely dated stuccoes are those from the Kokkini Ekklesia of Boulgareli (1295/96): Orlandos found the wooden stylobate of the templon *in situ* and no other templon was found in that church.⁶¹¹ This suggests that the stucco templon was made at the same time as the construction of the church and its decoration with wall paintings, or in a period close to them. The stylistic and iconographic analysis confirms this date. Therefore, the Kokkini Ekklesia acts as a chronological indicator for the other churches too.⁶¹²

Before analysing the Kokkini Ekklesia and the other foundations in depth, it is important to underline that among all the churches with stucco liturgical furnishings, only one can be

⁶⁰⁸ Orlandos 1927, 153–169; Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 54–55.

⁶⁰⁹ For the pieces labelled as from the Koimesis of Petrobitsa there is no report about their discovery, nor documentation about their arrival at the Byzantine Museum of Ioannina, Papadopoulou 2006, 350 n. 70. See cat. No. 16 for bibliography.

⁶¹⁰ Papadopoulou 2006, 341–348.

⁶¹¹ The stucco templon was later substituted by a wooden iconostasis which laid on top of the previous wooden stylobate: Orlandos 1927, 163–164. For how a stucco templon was mounted see chapter 2.2.

⁶¹² Papadopoulou 2006, 341–342. This chronology is not unproblematic. As we have seen in chapter 1, the stucco templa from the Epirote foundations displays several features which do not conform to the ‘standard’ Byzantine templon, but rather there are innovative elements (e.g. the panel from Kostaniane, cat. No. 13.1) which may point towards a later date. For these reasons, it would be very useful to analyse the wooden beams still inside the panels and posts with a dendrochronological analysis or, eventually, 14C.

connected to the patronage of the despots: the church of the monastery of the Kato Panagia (cat. No. 14), just outside Arta, the capital of the State of Epiros. The building is usually connected to the Despot Michael II Komnenos Doukas thanks to the monogram in bricks on the southern wall, interpreted as Μ(ι)χ(αήλ) Δ(ού)κ(ας) (Michael Doukas) (fig. 3.15),⁶¹³ which suggests that Michael was part of the Komnenoi Doukai, the despotate family. There are two possible candidates for the monogram: Michael I (+ 1214) or Michael II (1231-67/68). Scholars usually identified it with Michael II on the basis on the interpretation of another inscription from the same church engraved in porous stone:

+ Πύλας ημιν ανοιξον ω θε(ο)υ Μ(ητ)ερ
της μετανοίας του φωτός ου-
σα πύλη

+ Open [for] us, oh Mother of God, the
gates to of the repentance you (who are) the
gate of light.

The dedication of the church to the Virgin and the use of the word μετανοία (*metanoia*), meaning ‘repentance’, was seen as an allusion to the Michael II (1231-67/68), who built two churches dedicated to the Virgin (one was the Pantanassa in Philippiada) as an act of repentance for his bad conduct toward his wife, Theodora.⁶¹⁴ If so, the chronology of the church narrows to around the middle of the thirteenth century.⁶¹⁵ The inscription has also another monogram, which was interpreted as Δ(εσπότη) Μ(ιχαήλ) π(αράσχου) ρ(ύσιν ἀμαρτημάτων),⁶¹⁶ and as Δ(εσπότη) Μ(ιχαήλ) Π(ροσπάτης) Ρ(ωμαίων).⁶¹⁷ In both cases, the monogram refers to Michael

⁶¹³ Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 31, 51-52.

⁶¹⁴ Kalopissi-Verti 1992 31, 51-52. Nicol 1957, 200–201; Orlandos 1937, 70-71. The account of this event is in the Life of St. Theodora. *Life of St. Theodora of Arta*, 332.

⁶¹⁵ According to the *Life*, Theodora was pregnant when she was exiled, and the exile lasted almost five years. The date of birth of her first son, the future despot Nikephoros, is 1240, *Life of St. Theodora of Arta*, 330-331 for a chronology of the life of Theodora see *ibidem*, 323-325.

⁶¹⁶ Orlandos 1936a, 86-87, fig. 19; Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 31, 51-52.

⁶¹⁷ Tsiligiannis 2007, 47, 78.

II Komnenos-Doukas, thus reinforcing the identification with the despot. However, Rhoby suggested another possible reading, alongside the others, as Δ(η)μ(ή)τρ(ιος) μ(η)τρ(ο)π(ολι)τ(ης),⁶¹⁸ while recently Velenis read Δ(η)μ(ή)τρ(ιος), which he identified with the archbishop of Ohrid Demetrios Chomatenos (+ ca 1236), challenging previous attributions and re-discussing the date of foundation.⁶¹⁹ Demetrios Chomatenos had a close relationship with key personalities of the Epirote state: he crowned Theodore Komnenos-Doukas emperor in Thessaloniki and was a close friend of the metropolite of Naupaktos, John Apokaukos. Velenis suggested that the Kato Panagia was a foundation of both Michael II and Demetrios Chomatenos, at the time when Chomatenos was in Epiros and retired in a monastery (ca 1235), and when the church of Epiros began to restore the ecclesiastical relations with the church of Nikaia after the schism (1228–33). Velenis also pointed out the strategic location of the Kato Panagia, which was on the same road that passed by the monastery of the Panagia tou Brioni (distant ca 5 km), connected to the patronage of the patriarch of Nikaia, Germanos II and dated around 1238.⁶²⁰

Regarding the chronology of the stucco pieces, there are some issues if we accept the foundation of the Kato Panagia to 1230s. The main problem is that the mixture of the stuccoes is identical to the rest of the stucco liturgical furnishings produced in Epiros, which are anchored to the date of the Kokkini Ekklesia of Boulgareli (1295/96). If the pieces of the Kato Panagia are attributed to the 1230s, they anticipated the others by almost sixty years, making the workshop active for almost three generations. There are no occurrences of workshops recorded for more than two generations in Byzantium and few in the Middle Ages elsewhere, which at least suggests that the stucco pieces of the Kato Panagia should be dated at least to the

⁶¹⁸ Rhoby 2014, 153.

⁶¹⁹ Velenis 2018 72-73.

⁶²⁰ Velenis 2018, 74-75.

middle of the thirteenth century.⁶²¹ What calls for a contemporaneity of the pieces with the construction of the church, is the surviving plaster window transenna in the southern side of the church, which belongs to the same group of stucco pieces produced for the other Epirote churches.⁶²² This reinforces the hypothesis that the church was founded at least around the middle of the thirteenth century by the figure of Michael II.⁶²³ The original function of the stucco pieces is unclear, because the fragments are too few to sustain any hypothesis.⁶²⁴

The Kato Panagia is the only church with stucco liturgical furnishing in Arta and its vicinity: all of the other examples come from peripheral areas, mainly mountainous territories associated with the control of the passages between valleys (fig. 3.19). Moreover, two of them still preserve the dedicatory inscriptions which testify that the founders were collaborators of the Despot at different levels.

The first inscription is in the Kokkini Ekklesia in Boulgareli which was the *katholikon* of a monastery founded by the *protostrator* Theodore Tzimiskés, his wife the *protostratorissa* Maria, his brother, John, and his wife Anna.⁶²⁵ They are all portrayed in the eastern side of the narthex with Theodore bearing the model of the church (fig. 3.18). The church is a cross-in-square plan with a central dome supported by piers on the east, and columns piers on the west. A narthex with a central dome closed the entrance of the church on the western side.⁶²⁶ Finally,

⁶²¹ The workshop of sculptors around the figure of Niketas marmaras is usually considered to be active around 1075 but it is difficult to quantify how many years since only one piece is dated, see Drandakis 1975; Drandakis 2002. Generally, workshops of Byzantine painter cannot be traced for more than a generation. Another famous case is the workshop of Roger, Robertus and Nicodemus, which specialised in stucco ambos and ciboria and was active in Abruzzo between 1140s and 1160s, see Nenci 2006, 274, n. 12. We have to reach a more conspicuous sculptural and architectonical production under the label of the ‘cosmatesque’ to see a workshop active for more than two generations, that is the Vassalletto family, see Bassan 2000 for a summary of their activities.

⁶²² On the transenna see, Appendix C no. 11.

⁶²³ However, I agree with Rhoby that the inscription on porous limestone does not clearly refer to the act of repentance of Michael, and that it was probably a formula widespread in monasteries.

⁶²⁴ Papadopoulou excluded that they belonged to a *templon*, Papadopoulou 2006, 357-358, n. 102.

⁶²⁵ Parts of the structures of the former monastery were excavated by the Ephorate of Arta, see Papadopoulou 2001; for a more comprehensive study see Papadopoulou 2008.

⁶²⁶ The dome was recently found during the last restoration and study campaign of the church, Papadopoulou 2008.

there was an open porch where many burials were recently found.⁶²⁷ On the western wall of the *naos*, just above the door, there is an inscription in twelve lines and twenty-seven dodecasyllabes, which has lacunae but the general meaning is clear (fig. 3.16-17); it mentions the donors, the dedication of the church to the Theotokos, and the date: the ninth indiction under the reign of the despot Nikephoros and his wife Anna. This indicates either the year 1281 or 1295/96;⁶²⁸ however, the close resemblance between this church and the church of the Peribleptos in Ohrid (1294/95), has led scholars to prefer the date 1295/96 for the Kokkini Ekklesia.⁶²⁹ As noted earlier, when he visited the church, Orlandos found the wooden stylobate of the stucco templon *in situ* which allowed him to consider the liturgical furnishing as part of Theodore's phase of the church.⁶³⁰

Theodore is identified in the mural paintings as *protostrator* in the inscription of the narthex and probably in the inscription of the naos too, though it is fragmentary.⁶³¹ The title of *protostrator* was an office, not a dignity, which was one of the highest ranks after the *sebastokrator* and the chief in command of the army and the fleet.⁶³² In Pseudo-Kodinos the title belonged to the emperor's household, but it also had important military tasks, and the titleholder was involved in local administration.⁶³³ Kyritses, in his doctoral thesis on the aristocracy of the thirteenth and early fourteenth century, pointed out that Theodore was the *protostrator* of the despot (and not of the emperor), which means that he was one of the closest collaborators of Nikephoros I.⁶³⁴ So, the patron of the Kokkini Ekklesia was a member of the local aristocracy

⁶²⁷ Again, this was discovered on the same occasion Papadopoulou 2008.

⁶²⁸ Orlandos originally suggested the year 1281 as the ninth indiction falls only in 1281 and 1295/96 of Nikephoro's reign because he thought that he died in 1290. The subsequent studies of Nicol and Hallensleben demonstrated that Nikephoros died between 1295 and 1296. Nicol 1981; Hallensleben 1967-74, 310-312.

⁶²⁹ Hallensleben 1967-74; Kalopissi-Verti 1992, p. 55; Papadopoulou 2002, 125.

⁶³⁰ Orlandos 1927, 163.

⁶³¹ Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 54-55.

⁶³² Macrides *et al.* 2013, 73-83; Kyritses 1997, 134.

⁶³³ Macrides *et al.* 2013, 304.

⁶³⁴ Kyritses 1997, 134.

who had strong ties with the despot of Epiros, and he commissioned a church decorated with a templon made of stucco (cat. No. 15).

The next building with stucco elements and information about the patron is the church dedicated to the Taxiarches in the village of Kostaniane (cat. No. 13). The first five lines of the painted inscription above the north door provides us with the name of the donor: the *pansebastos* Isaak Theodore.⁶³⁵

Ἀνηγέρθη ἐκ βά[θ]ρων καὶ ἀ[ν]ιστορήθη	It was built from foundation and painted
[...] καὶ π[ά]νεστος] ναὸς τοῦ π[...]	[...] and venerable temple of [...]
Ταξ[ι]άρχου Μιχα[ήλ] [...] ὀνο[μα]ζομένου	Archangel Michael ... called
δαπά(?)νη π[ο]λὴ τοῦ παν[σε]βάστου [...] κυροῦ Ἰσαακίου	with great expense from the <i>pansebastos</i> [...] <i>kyr</i> Isaac
Θε[ο]δόρου καὶ τη[ς] [...] Χυρ[α]μ[...]. ⁶³⁶	Theodoros and of the [...].
[...]	[...]

The title of *pansebastos* (or *pansebastos sebastos*) was a dignity of not very high status in the Late Byzantine period. In the Palaiologan period, the emperor regularly granted it to local aristocrats of middle and low level, probably a socially diverse group composed of local functionaries and local grandees; such people ‘despite their humble origins’ and despite the fact that they did not reside in Constantinople, had to attend ceremonies in the capital.⁶³⁷ Riccardi recently suggested that Isaak Theodore might have had also an office, based on the interpretation of the inscription.⁶³⁸ The inscription mentions the title *pansebastos* followed by a lacuna, the appellative *kyr*, and then the first name (Isaak). In documents of the Palaiologan period it is common to mention people by referring first to the dignity, followed by the office,

⁶³⁵ The inscription was originally composed of eleventh lines, of which only six survive today.

⁶³⁶ The text of the inscription is the version of Babuin 2013, 406; the entire inscription is in Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 52, fig. 6.

⁶³⁷ Macrides *et al.* 2013, 299; Kyritses 1997, 22-28, 409-413.

⁶³⁸ Riccardi 2015, 359.

then *kyr*, and finally the name;⁶³⁹ therefore, it is possible that the lacuna following *pansebastos* may have originally incorporated the office.⁶⁴⁰ Thus, the founder of the church, and possibly the patron of the stucco reliefs, was a local aristocrat of a middle or low level who had a title (*pansebastos*) and possibly an office too.

Isaak's inscription does not provide us with a date. The architecture of the church has been dated by Tsouris between 1240 and 1270 based on the ceramoplastic decoration of the masonry;⁶⁴¹ Babuin has systematically studied the wall paintings of the church and identified two workshops which might have worked at two different times.⁶⁴² The first began to work soon after the construction of the church (1240-70), while the second one worked on the church around the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁶⁴³ Riccardi has refined this chronology to the end of the thirteenth century and attributed all the wall paintings to Isaak Theodore, since he sees this church as a product of the policy of the despot Nikephoros I (ca 1240 – ca 1297), as will be discussed shortly.⁶⁴⁴ The stucco pieces which decorated the church can be generally dated to the second half of the thirteenth century for the reasons discussed earlier. More problematic is to link the stuccoes with Isaak with certainty, because there is no information at all about the location of the piece at the time of their discovery.⁶⁴⁵ The stratigraphy or any other method which might help in reading the material relationship of the stuccoes with the wall paintings or the masonry commissioned by Isaak is now lost. For this reason, it is only possible to say that the stucco elements belonged to a foundation connected to a local officer, which

⁶³⁹ Some examples of such order are in Macrides *et al.* 2013, p. 298 n. 92. However, this pattern is not always followed.

⁶⁴⁰ Riccardi 2015, 359.

⁶⁴¹ Tsouris 1988, 185, 202-204; this chronology has been widely accepted by scholars such as Küpper 1990, II, 151; Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 52. Previously on the building Euaggelidis 1931, in particular 267-268, figs 7-8.

⁶⁴² For the study of the wall paintings, their chronology and an updated bibliography see Babuin 2013. During my last visit in May 2019, I noted some cleaning surveys on the surface of the incredibly dark paintings. In Spring 2020, restorations were carried out; they will probably provide extra data on the chronology of the wall paintings.

⁶⁴³ Babuin 2013, 407-408.

⁶⁴⁴ Riccardi 2015, 361-366.

⁶⁴⁵ Euaggelides 1931, 266-268; Dakaris 1961, 198 n. 47.

served a local community, and, possibly, the policy of the despot Nikephoros I (ca 1240 – ca 1297).

There is not any secure information about the dates of foundation or the patrons who commissioned plaster templata for the churches of the Koimesis in Lyggos (cat. No. 17), Koimesis in Petrobitsa (cat. No. 16), and the Metamorphosis in Kleidonia (cat. No. 18). What is clear is that they were located outside the main urban centres (Arta and Ioannina), and were in mountainous areas which may seem at, first glance, remote places.⁶⁴⁶ However, while these areas were peripheral to urban centres, they were on strategic locations for the territory of the despotate. A closer glance at their geographical location provides useful information on the settlements of the churches and their strategic position.

Boulgareli and the Kokkini Ekklesia were half-way along the route between Arta and Trikkala (Thessaly). The road which today connects the two centres and passes via Boulgareli. It is assumed that it traces a medieval one, because there are not any other possible passages towards Thessaly from Arta.⁶⁴⁷ At the time of the dedication of the Kokkini Ekklesia, Thessaly was under the rule of Constantine and Theodore Doukas, children of John I Doukas, the illegitimate son of Michael II Komenos-Doukas and half-brother of Nikephoros. The relationships between Thessaly and Epiros were fluctuating. However, scholars noted that the policy of Constantine and Theodore was aggressive against both the Angevins and Epiros and that in the years around 1295/96 (dedication of the Kokkini Ekklesia), Thessalian troops invaded several territories in the southern Epiros and also arrived in the region outside Arta.⁶⁴⁸ Therefore, the Komnenoi-Doukai had every interest in controlling and marking the border with Thessaly. This border was also charged with ideological meaning. On the Thessalian side of

⁶⁴⁶ Today, they can be reached only via car, and the passages between one village to the other are very narrow roads which are often dirt roads (e.g. from Kostaniane to Lyggos)

⁶⁴⁷ Soustal, Koder 1981, 89, 131; Nicol 1984, 241; Riccardi 2015, 364; Georgiadou 2015, 162-163.

⁶⁴⁸ Asonitis 2005, 79-80; Osswald 2012, 124-125.

the road passing to the Kokkini Ekklesia, there was the church of the Porta Panagia at Pyle, a foundation of the half-brother of Nikephoros, John I Doukas.⁶⁴⁹ Then, it is possible to see the Kokkini Ekklesia and its monastery in Boulgareli founded by the *protostrator* Theodore Tzimiskes and decorated with various materials, among them a stucco templon, as part of a broader strategy of controlling the borders by Nikephoros through his men.⁶⁵⁰

Regarding the locations of the other churches with stucco liturgical furnishings (fig. 3.19), as noted by several scholars, Kostaniane, Lyggos, and Petrobitsa are located in elevated areas controlling mountains passages and overlooking plains.⁶⁵¹ To that may be added the geographical proximity of Kleidonia to the so-called fortress of Kastraki Agios Menas, still in use during the Late Byzantine period.⁶⁵² Moreover, the settlement of Petrobitsa was close to the *kastron* of Hagios Donatos (Paramythia) which was also in the proximity of the river Kalamas, navigable in the Venetian period, at least;⁶⁵³ to the south of the castle of Hagios Donatos there was also the church of H. Dimitrios in Kypsele, a possible foundation of the *protostrator* Michael Zorianos who held this office under the despot Thomas (1296-1318), successor of Nikephoros.⁶⁵⁴ Lyggos and Kostaniane were also close to Ioannina and to a major trade route which connected the hinterland to the coastal area, and to the road of Paramithya;⁶⁵⁵ in fact,

⁶⁴⁹ On the church see, Orlandos 1935b; Bouras, Boura 2002, 273-274. Recently on the *proskynetaria*, Vassilaki 2013.

⁶⁵⁰ The importance in controlling the borders with Thessaly and the Angevins has already been suggested by Riccardi 2015, 361-367. On the strategic location of the Kokkini Ekklesia, see also Georgiadou 2015, 162-167, 198-201.

⁶⁵¹ Kostaniane was on the road to Paramithya, see Babuin 2013, 395.

⁶⁵² Synkellou 2008, 443.

⁶⁵³ Soustal and Koder 1981, 236-237. South to Hagios Donatos there was the monastery of H. Demetrios in Kypsele, probably a foundation of Michael Zorianos, *protostrator* of the despot Thomas.

⁶⁵⁴ Michael Zorianos is a key figure for Epiros in the period between the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century. His patronage activity and his intellectual interests are well known and includes a ring now at the Metropolitan Museum of New York, a manuscript (Codice Barocci), but also buildings such as the church of the monastery of St. Demetrios in Kypsele, the church of H. Nikolaos and the Taxiarches in Mokista. This is an exceptional case which, nonetheless, shows the various patronage activities of the high aristocracy of Epiros in this period. On Zorianos and his patronage Zorianos, see Riccardi 2015, 367-384; Vokotopoulos 2012; Konstantinides 2001, 243-244; Vokotopoulos 1988, 164-167; Nicol 1984, 221.

⁶⁵⁵ Soustal, Koder 1981, 92.

nearby there was another important settlement, Bella (today near Kalpaki), which flourished in the thirteenth century.⁶⁵⁶

When observing how such foundations interacted with the landscape of Late Byzantine Epiros, it appears that during the reign of Nikephoros and Anna (ca 1266/8–ca 1296/8) and later under Thomas (1296–1318), the foundations of the despotes and their family were concentrated in Arta and its surroundings, while other members of the aristocracy, especially those who held offices, were located in peripheral but strategical areas. In addition to the churches with stucco templa, some of the patrons who commissioned these buildings, all of which are churches, are known thanks to inscriptions:⁶⁵⁷ the *pansebastos* Basilios Tzikos and the *oikonomos* George were founders of the church dedicated to the Virgin Kyriotissa and the H. Theodoroi in Prebetza (Akarnania),⁶⁵⁸ the *protostrator* Michael Zorianos, active under the despot Thomas (1296–1318), founded the churches of Mokista and maybe Kypsele,⁶⁵⁹ the priest and *oikonomos* of the metropolis of Ioannina Michael Philantropenos renovated the church of H. Nikolaos Spanos (or ton Philantropenon) in 1291/92;⁶⁶⁰ and finally the family of the Strategopouloi associated with the church of H. Nikolaos *tou Ntilou*.⁶⁶¹

Except for the *oikonomoi* Michael Philantropenos and George, all the patrons were lay people with military command (*protostratores*) or had a dignity of *sebastos/pansebastos* which

⁶⁵⁶ Soustal, Koder 1981, 123–124. For the analysis of the importance of Bella/Bela in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, see Osswald 2011, 114, 214, 356, 360, 385–389, 401, 405, 413, 419, 423, 438, 448, 464, 532, 724, 770, 785, 799,

⁶⁵⁷ For the second half of the thirteenth century there is a lack of written sources (abundant for the beginning of the century), therefore, the only information available about Epirote aristocracy is through inscriptions. Riccardi 2015, 351.

⁶⁵⁸ On the inscription: Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 56–57, fig. 16; Vokotopoulos 1986, 264–266; Veikou 1998, 123–125.

⁶⁵⁹ The inscription of Mokista which mentions Michael Zorianos was published several times, I signal here the last edition in Rhoby 2014, 369–73.

⁶⁶⁰ The monastery of H. Nikolaos is now lost but the name of the *oikonomos* and the date of foundation was recorded on an inscription dated to 1541/2 which copies the thirteenth-century one. Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 42, n. 143; Nicol 1984, 241–242, 247–248; 248; Osswald 2011, 737–738; Fundić 2013, 30.

⁶⁶¹ Acheimastou-Potamianou 1969; Soustal and Koder 1981, 205–206.

was frequently conferred to local functionaries of military ranks and civil officers.⁶⁶² Their patronage in these peripheral territories led me to think that they were rooted in these territories where they founded the churches. Why? The political situation under the reign of Nikephoros and Anna (ca1266/8–ca1296/8) and, later, under Thomas (1296/8–1318) might provide a clue for this increase in building activity recorded in the last decades of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth. Georgiadou suggested that the foundations with inscriptions were related to the control of the borders by Nikephoros against the Angevins, and with his brother-in-law, John, in Thessaly.⁶⁶³ This suggestion is valid for the foundations of southern Epiros, but it does not include the churches with stucco liturgical furnishings with the exception of the monastery in Boulgareli, which, as we saw before, was on the route between Arta and Trikkala, therefore close to the border with the Doukas of Thessaly.

Finally, regarding the patronage of the stuccoes from the church of the Virgin at of Peshkëpi e Sipërme (Episkopi) there is not much information. The church was built either at the beginning of the eleventh century or around the end of the eleventh and the beginning of the twelfth century,⁶⁶⁴ it was provided with a very rich sculptural decoration composed by an ambo, altar, templon, and cornices all dated to the Middle Byzantine period.⁶⁶⁵ In the thirteenth century a one nave was added to the southern side of the church.⁶⁶⁶ This addition shows a

⁶⁶² On the people holding the title of *sebastos* and *pansebastos*, see Kyritses 1997, 22-26.

⁶⁶³ Georgiadou 2015, 196-201. Riccardi suggested that the foundations of Zorianos and other aristocrats in Aetolocarniana, should be interpreted as a result of the policy of Thomas after the battle of 1306, when the Despotate took Naupaktos, Bonitsa, and Butrint to the Angevins, see Riccardi 2015, 361-366. Therefore, the foundation of the Kokkini Ekklesia in Boulgareli as well as the other foundations with stucco liturgical furnishings were not part of the policy of Thomas. Boulgareli should be seen as a response (or mirroring of increasing tensions) to the incursion into Epiros of Constantine and Theodore of Thessaly in 1295. For the incursion see Nicol 1984, 48-49.

⁶⁶⁴ This is the opinion of Holland 1819, 481; Versakis 1916, 117; Meksi 1975; Hobdari 2009. For a chronology on the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century, see Vokotopoulos 1975, 188-189; Vanderheyde 2005, 13-14.

⁶⁶⁵ Vokotopoulos 1975, 74-80, in part.80; Vanderheyde 2005, 13-14; Hobdari 2009.

⁶⁶⁶ Meksi suggested that it functioned as a narthex, Meksi 1975. For a summary on the phases of the church, see also Soustal, Koder 1981, 230-231.

similar masonry as the narthex of the H. Theodora of Arta (after the mid-thirteenth century),⁶⁶⁷ and for this reason it has been dated between the second half of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁶⁶⁸ This chronology matches the stucco pieces and therefore we can imagine that they were made to decorate this building or that they were made slightly later its construction. The patron for this Late Byzantine phase is not known. However, the location of the church is consistent with the borders of the state of Epiros from the second half of the thirteenth century, which arrived till nowadays Himarë (Albania).⁶⁶⁹ The church of the Virgin is located near the mountains which connect today Albania to Greece, the same mountains where Kleidonia is. Moreover, Peshkëpi e Sipërme (Episkopi) is only 30 km away from the monastery of H. Nikolaos at Mesopotam, one of the most important *scriptoria* of the time for Epiros,⁶⁷⁰ and it probably belonged to the dioceses of Drynopolis.⁶⁷¹ Therefore, it is clear that the area was very much alive and important for the state of Epiros during the second half of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁶⁷²

Whether all the churches with stucco liturgical furnishings were part of this capillary control of the territory against the Angevins or not, they show a network of people who

⁶⁶⁷ Meksi 1975. On the H. Theodora, see Orlandos 1935a; Papadopoulou 2007, 45-55.

⁶⁶⁸ Meksi 1975.

⁶⁶⁹ Asonitis 2005, 87-90.

⁶⁷⁰ On H. Nikolaos at Mesopotam, see Meksi 1972; Giakoumis, Karaïskaj 2004; Triggiani 2009; Macchiarella 2011; Ćurčić 2015, 130; Riccardi 2015; Triggiani 2015.

⁶⁷¹ Vanderheyde 2005, 13. The frontiers in this area were however, fluid around the middle of the thirteenth century, see Osswald 2011, 103-140. On the administrative and ecclesiastical organisation of the territory, see Osswald 2011, 347-417.

⁶⁷² Perhaps, the area will become more challenging to control during the first half of the fourteenth century. In 1315, the monks of the monastery of H. Nikolaos at Mesopotam asked, and received, from the Patriarch of Constantinople a decree confirming the status of the monastery as *stravropegiake mone* and its properties. This request was caused by the intervention of the bishop of Chimara, who imposed his authority on the monastery and took its possession, Nicol 1984, 76. This incident suggests that the political authority was not strong in this area. It may have been the consequence of the political situation, which saw, the Angevins on the coast in Butrint and the territories previously belonging to the state of Epiros formally re-united to the Byzantine territories in today Albania, Nicol 1984, 76-78. However, the Byzantine presence was probably stronger around Berat and closer to the via Egnatia, Christidou 2010, 256-265. Nevertheless, the relevance of the area of Mesopotam and the status of the church of Peshkëpi e Sipërme should be further investigated.

collaborated at different levels with the despot. This collaboration is visible in the exchange of artisans and materials between the despots and the aristocracy.

Indeed, it has been noted that the bricks of the Kokkini Ekklesia are the same of the Parigoritissa in Arta, founded by the despot in ca. 1290.⁶⁷³ The same Kokkini Ekklesia shares architectural similarities with the Parigoritissa but also with another contemporary foundation located in a different territory: the Peribleptos in Ohrid (today Sv. Kliment) (1294/5) founded by the aristocrat Progon Sgouros.⁶⁷⁴ As demonstrated by Babuin, the Kokkini Ekklesia shared an *équipe* of painters with the church of Kostaniane, founded by the *pansebastos* Isaak Theodoros.⁶⁷⁵ Finally, the connection between Boulgareli, Kostaniane and the despot is stucco, because it was used also in the Kato Panagia founded probably by the despot Michael II Komnenos-Doukas.

It is important to say that usually foundations of the despot have marble sculpture,⁶⁷⁶ and that the Kato Panagia is an exception. Epiros is a region which in the Late Byzantine period was lacking marble. The ancient quarries were closed, so new sculptures were made by reusing ancient marbles from the cities of Ambrakia (ancient Arta) and Nikopolis or by re-using Middle Byzantine sculptures.⁶⁷⁷

One could argue that the transportation of marbles to the mountainous areas would have been especially difficult due to the elevation of these locations, their distance from Arta and even more from Nikopolis (almost a 100 kilometres), and this would have raised the cost of the material. While stucco was easily transportable, the gypsum used in the mixture was quarried locally and it is still abundant in Epiros, where several quarries remain active today (fig.

⁶⁷³ Riccardi 2015, 363 n. 101.

⁶⁷⁴ Čurčić 2010, 571-572; Hallensleben 1967-74.

⁶⁷⁵ Babuin 2013, 407-408, fig. 4. He showed that same cartoons for figures were used in both churches.

⁶⁷⁶ The opposite cannot be said because the foundations connected to Michael Zorianos have marble.

⁶⁷⁷ Vanderheyde 2005, 91-98; Melvani 2013, 136-137.

3.19).⁶⁷⁸ Two of them are very close to three of the churches with stucco liturgical furnishings (Kostaniane, Petrobitsa and Lyggos).

We know, however, that it was not impossible to bring heavy cargo up to Boulgareli because at the time of Theodore Tzimiskes two columns were transported there, though this probably required a considerable effort.⁶⁷⁹

In this intricate network of despots and local aristocrats, stucco was a relatively affordable material, but was also indigenous to the mountainous areas of northern Epiros, so I would not exclude the idea that this material was used to express the local identity of the patrons. However, stucco was also used just outside Arta (Kato Panagia), becoming involved in a discourse of exchange between centre and periphery. The directions of this exchange, unfortunately, are difficult to trace. In terms of relative chronology, the first foundation should be the Kato Panagia (around mid-thirteenth century) followed by the Taxiarches in Kostaniane (between 1240 and the end of the thirteenth century), and the Kokkini Ekklesia in Boulgareli (1295/96).⁶⁸⁰ Thus, it seems that the direction of the diffusion of this material is centre-periphery. However, we cannot also exclude the possibility that this technique was developed and rooted in the mountainous areas where the quarries stand, and that we are seeing a phenomenon which goes from periphery to centre. But this remains only a hypothesis since more precise data about the other foundations in Petrobitsa, Lyggos, Kleidonia, and Peshkëpi e Sipërme is lacking.⁶⁸¹

⁶⁷⁸ The analysis performed by the Ephorate of Arta showed that the gypsum was quarried in the region. For some contemporary gypsum quarries, see Papadopoulou 2006, 347.

⁶⁷⁹ There are no quarries or places where to take Ancient or Middle-Byzantine sculptures in the vicinity.

⁶⁸⁰ For the original chronology of the churches of Petrobitsa, Lyggos and Kleidonia there is almost no information. Indeed, the provenance of the plaster reliefs from these areas is only attested through the labels attached to the pieces in the Byzantine Museum of Ioannina.

⁶⁸¹ The ongoing restorations to the wall paintings in the Taxiarches of Kostaniane may provide extra data for the establishment of a more precise chronology for the paintings and provide a terminus *post quem* for the stucco elements.

Mystras and the surrounding region

The second group of patrons commissioned stucco in the area of Mystras and its surroundings. It includes the despots of Morea and local aristocrats who, in turn, founded the church (and the monastery) of the Peribleptos in Mystras, of H. Athanasios in Leontari, and of the Dormition in Longanikos. The settlements involved in commissioning stucco were part of the same cultural and political environment:⁶⁸² Leontari and Longanikos were politically connected to Mystras, and the painters active in these two locations looked to the paintings of the Peribleptos as their main point of reference for style and iconography.

This group of foundations is different from that in Epiros, because of the quality of stucco commissioned by the patrons. Stucco commissioned by local aristocrats was definitively of a lower quality than that commissioned by the despotes: the church of the despotes had Type A proskynetaria, while those of the aristocrats had Type B proskynetaria (made of mortar and ceramic fragments). This subaltern relationship is also visible in the quality of the paintings which adorn the churches of Leontari and Longanikos where the workshop was not the same of Mystras but was part of the so-called ‘Mystras style’.⁶⁸³ Therefore, in this area of the Peloponnese we are dealing with a group of foundations where the hierarchy is clearly expressed through the materials used for building and decorating the churches. Stucco is a crucial part in this discourse.

The church at the top of the pyramid of this hierarchy is the Peribleptos of Mystras, the centre of the Despotate of Morea. The Peribleptos was located in a peripheral area of the city, on the opposite side to the palace of the despots, and of the monastery of Zoodothes,⁶⁸⁴ another

⁶⁸² In particular, the connection between Longanikos and other centres under the dioceses of Mystras, Geraki and Kastania, were explored by Kappas 2016, in part. 177-179.

⁶⁸³ Albani suggested that the painters active in the Peribleptos worked for H. Athanasios too, while the paintings of Longanikos have the Peribleptos as a model for iconography and composition, Albani 1989, 259–294.

⁶⁸⁴ The monastery of Christ Zoodothes has been traditionally identified with the church of the Hagia Sophia in Mystras, Chatzidakis 1981, 69; Marinou 2009b. However, recent studies shed light on the architectural phases (at

foundation of the first Despot of Morea, Manuel Kantakouzenos (ca 1349 - ca 1380), son of the emperor John IV Kantakouzenos and brother of Matthew, the co-emperor. The Peribleptos was part of a monastery and it was built by exploiting part of the nearby rock, an aspect which led Ćurčić to suggest that the monastic settlement may be associated with a sacred figure in the nearby cave.⁶⁸⁵ The church is a cross-in-square church with a central dome supported by piers on the east and two columns on the west. The mural paintings still cover most of the interior surface and were probably made by a workshop with numerous painters who also worked in the south-east chapel of the Hagia Sophia in Mystras (after 1366).⁶⁸⁶

The sculptural decoration of the Peribleptos was systematically studied by Louvi in 1980, and apart from Grabar, who wrote a few years before her, other scholars have based their research on her study.⁶⁸⁷ Louvi mapped the sculpture of the Peribleptos and noted that it is composed of re-used elements mainly dated to the Middle Byzantine period, with a few Early Christian details, and a handful of elements carved in the 14th century.⁶⁸⁸ The templon is no exception: the epistyle in the diakonikon is Middle Byzantine, while the central part was carved in the fourteenth century by reworking an Early Byzantine marble cornice. This piece reproduces the ‘Anatolian’ motif of the arcades on double colonnettes and inserts new elements such as *fleur-de-lis* of the Florentine type, the monogram of Manuel Kantakouzenos, and the

least three) of the Pantanassa church and led Aspasia Louvi-Kizi to identify this latter church with the Zoodothēs monastery, Louvi-Kizi 2019, I, 151-246, in part. 189-246.

⁶⁸⁵ Ćurčić 2010, 595. Ćurčić also signalled other Late Byzantine cases where a church was located on a previously holy place in caves, see Ćurčić 2000, 86-87.

⁶⁸⁶ On the connection between patrons and painters in the chapel of the Hagia Sophia, see Emmanuel 2003, in part. 159-186. On the wall paintings of the Peribleptos, see Lafontaine-Dosogne 1964, 50, 52 n.10, 64, 65, 66, 67, 72, 73, 77, 78, 86, 87, 88, 89, 101, 104 n. 6, 110, 113, 114, 122, 125, 129, 130, 131, 133, 139, 140, 141, 142, 158, 159, 168-170, 171, 1712, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 191, 193, 200, 202, 205, 207, 210, 212, figs. 51, 65. 76-77, 92; Mouriki 1970; Chatzidakis 1996, 77-89; Papamastorakis 2001, 12-13; Louvi-Kizi 2003; Kalopissi-Verti 2013, 238; Emmanuel 2015.

⁶⁸⁷ Grabar 1976 148, pl. CXXXV c; Louvi 1981; Marinou 2002, 86; Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 116 no. 29; Marinou 2009c, 186-187.

⁶⁸⁸ Louvi 1980, 138-171 and table pp. 173-184. The recent publication of Louvi-Kizi on the architectural phases of the monasteries of the Peribleptos and the Pantanassa (Louvi-Kizi 2019) do not reconsider nor analyse in-depth the chronology of the stucco proskynetarion.

rampant lion with the four Jerusalem crosses, which was the emblem of the Lusignan family in Cyprus.⁶⁸⁹ There are also other sculptures from the Peribleptos which are now at the Archaeological Museum of Mystras, such as the Pantokrator framed by an openwork arch on colonnettes and displays a small *fleur-de-lis* on the cuff of Christ.⁶⁹⁰

The only element in stucco is the proskynetarion frame on the south-eastern pillar (fig. 3.20). It is reasonable to think that there was another one on the other pillar too. Grabar considered the frame to be part of the sculptural decoration made in the fourteenth century for the church,⁶⁹¹ but Louvi suggested that the proskynetarion was Middle Byzantine *spolia*, because its lower-right edge is broken by the marble epistyle (figs 3.20-3.21).⁶⁹²

This last observation is true, but it provides us with information about when the proskynetarion was mounted rather than when the frame was originally carved. Indeed, by looking at the relationship between marble epistyle, stucco and wall paintings it is only possible to say is that the epistyle was mounted before the marble epistyle of the diakonikon was mounted and the southern wall of the diakonikon was painted, because the epistyle breaks the stucco proskynetarion frame (figs 3.20-3.21) and the red band framing the painted scenes follows the profile of the epistyle (fig. 3.22). On the opposite edge of the epistyle, where the stucco is, there is a lacuna in the paintings which does allow us to verify if the paintings were made after the mounting of the epistyle. Nevertheless, since the epistyle breaks the stucco frame, the latter must already have been already in place. Then the wall paintings on the eastern pier were, perhaps, already finished. It seems to me an odd way of proceeding and shows some inaccuracy by the stonemasons responsible for mounting the epistyle. The break of the stucco frame could have been avoided if the epistyle was located few centimetres behind, as happened

⁶⁸⁹ Louvi 1980, 142-143, 146-147; Mattiello 2018, 88-89.

⁶⁹⁰ For a synthesis, see Melvani 2013, 204 no. 50, figs. 79-84.

⁶⁹¹ Grabar 1976, 147-148.

⁶⁹² Louvi 1980, 120-124. The observations made by Marinou are the same as Louvi, see Marinou 2009c, 186-187.

in the church of H. Demetrios, also in Mystras (fig. 3.23), where the proskynetaria frames were also re-used. The fracture on the left edge of the stucco proskynetarion was probably caused by the insertion of the wooden epistyle of the post-Byzantine iconostasis (fig. 3.21). The loss of almost the entire section of wall paintings on the pier with the stucco does not permit us to identify any other elements of the stucco proskynetarion or to determine whether they were made of stucco or marble or be just painted. Therefore, as the proskynetarion stands, there are equal possibilities that the stucco was either a re-used Middle Byzantine piece or a Late Byzantine creation.

In support of the first hypothesis is the absence of carved stucco and of proskynetaria frames Type A in Morea in this period. The other examples are Type B frames, as we will see in the following pages. Stylistically, the frame is made according to general designs of late twelfth-century examples, but the treatment of volumes and some motifs find also close comparison with the Late Byzantine sculpture made of porous limestone produced for the same church, as we saw in chapter 1. However, it seems to me unlikely that a stucco frame could survive almost intact its detachment from another church, its transportation and its re-mounting on the eastern pier of the Peribleptos, especially since the people in charge of the placing of the templon were not very careful, as we have seen.⁶⁹³

These observations do not allow us to exclude a Late Byzantine chronology. The similarities with Middle Byzantine examples can be explained within the context of the sculptural production in Mystras under the Kantakouzenoi, and later under the Palaiologoi, which shows a continuous reference to the Middle Byzantine period, with minimal space for new motifs aside from monograms and the fleur-de-lis as already observed by Grabar and

⁶⁹³ There is, however, the possibility that the proskynetarion was a spolia from a building on the presumed cell of the holy man, but there are no evidence for that.

Louvi.⁶⁹⁴ In sum, the creation of the stucco proskynetarion, should, I think, be placed within the first phase of the church of the Peribleptos which is the one connected to the ruling couple of Mystras Manuel Kantakouzenos and Isabelle de Lusignan,⁶⁹⁵ where Isabelle played a prominent role as supported by the studies of Louvi and later Mattiello.⁶⁹⁶

The presence of such elevated patronage is visible in the quality of the masonry of the building, which continued local traditions (cloisonné masonry) even with some ‘gothic’ elements and was equipped with a marble templon and with mural paintings of very high quality. The discordant element was, I believe, the lack of accuracy in the assembling of the templon epistyle in the diakonikon which broke the stucco proskynetarion, which is difficult to explain.

The use of a stucco proskynetarion by Isabelle and Manuel followed well known trends of matching marble templa and stucco proskynetaria frames, which continued into the Late Byzantine period.⁶⁹⁷ It is noteworthy that in this period in Morea this is the only case of Type A proskynetarion frame and that it is linked to a despotal foundation, while the more widespread Type B frames can be found in foundations of local aristocrats, and it testifies of the greater cost of proskynetaria frames Type A, as we will see later.

⁶⁹⁴ Grabar 1976, 148.

⁶⁹⁵ Louvi-Kizi’s identification of at least two phases to be dated to the Byzantine period is crucial. The first is associated with Isabelle de Lusignan and Manuel Kantakouzenos (1365-1374), the second with Leo Mavropappas and his wife and dated to the Palaiologan rule of Mystras, Louvi-Kizi 2003. This position has been accepted by most scholars, Ousterhout 2019, 643; Kalopissi-Verti 2013, 234-235; Marinou 2009c. This interpretation has been recently challenged by Mattiello who suggested that the first phase should be dated to the period between 1280 and 1283 and to be attributed mainly to Isabelle de Lusignan, while the second phase should be connected to the personality of Bartholomea Acciaiuoli, daughter of the Duke of Athens, Nero I Acciaiuoli, and wife of Theodore I Palaiologos despot of Mystras, on the basis of the presence of Florentine *fleur-de lis* on the templon epistyle, Mattiello 2018, 74-96.

⁶⁹⁶ While the two scholars have different opinions on the relative chronology of the building and on the patronage of the second phase, they arrived at the conclusions that Isabelle de Lusignan played a prominent role in the foundation of the Peribleptos, Louvi-Kizi 2003; Mattiello 2018 74-89, 95-96,

⁶⁹⁷ Another case is the church of the Saviour in Sopoćani, see Korać 1974, 30, figs. 2, 6, 8.

The second case of stucco proskynetarion in Morea is located almost 50 km from Mystras, in the settlement of Leontari. Today it is a village; however, it was a settlement of some importance during the Middle and especially the Late Byzantine period. Indeed, it had a *kastron*, possibly dated to the eleventh century,⁶⁹⁸ and it was the temporary seat of the metropolite of Chrysoupolis in the Middle Byzantine period.⁶⁹⁹ *Leontarion* is mentioned in several sources, among them, Cyriacus of Ancona who visited it in 1436 when Thomas Palaiologos sheltered there from the Turks.⁷⁰⁰ It is possible that members of the Leontaris family were originally from here. Among them, Demetrios Leontarios was the general of the fleet under the despot of Morea Theodore II Palaiologos (1382-1407) and a well-known person in that time: when he died, John Eugenikos dedicated two funerary epigrams to his memory.⁷⁰¹ Other members of the Leontaris family are recorded later: John Laskaris Leontarios and his son Demetrios Laskaris Leontarios; the latter was in touch with Bessarion and copied several manuscripts.⁷⁰² Finally, a Maria Laskarina Leontarina was buried under the belfry of the monastery of the Prodromos of Petra in the fifteenth century.⁷⁰³ Taking all these elements into account, it is clear that Leontari had significant importance during the Palaiologan rule of the Despotate of Morea.

The church which preserves the stucco proskynetarion is H. Athanasios, a cross-vaulted single nave building. Unfortunately, there is no explicit information about the patrons. Based on the choices made in the iconographic programme, Albani suggested a military, aristocratic

⁶⁹⁸ Athanasoulis, Mamaloukos 2020.

⁶⁹⁹ On the settlement of Leontari, see Albani 1992; Zakythinos 1953, 101, 144-145, 215, 217, 260, 287-88, 318-19, 331-32; Zakythinos 1932, 155, 157, 196, 201, 226, 236, 266-67, 269, 284.

⁷⁰⁰ Sabbadini 1910, 203; Zakythinos, 1953, 91; Albani 1992, 175 n. 103. For the Latin text and English translation see the *Cyriac of Ancona, Later Travels*, 298-299.

⁷⁰¹ Zakythinos 1932, 201; Zakythinos 1953, 144-145, 331-332.

⁷⁰² On the importance of Leontari, and its close association with the Leontarios family, I refer to Albani 1992, 175, 179-180 n. 98-99, 101-102.

⁷⁰³ Schreiner 1975-79, vol. 1 98B-3 (January 16th, 1450), 647; vol. 2, 477; vol. 3, 132; Varsallona 2016, 183. On the tower see de Clavijo, *Embassy to Tamerlane*, 136.

patronage for this building.⁷⁰⁴ The plinth of the nave is painted with a series of saints, which is not unusual; however, on the northern wall, soon after Athanasios, three military saints occupy an entire half of the nave. In front of them, on the north wall, there is the unusual presence of three saints named John: John the Baptist, John Chrysostom, and John the Evangelist. This stress on the name of John and the manifest presence of military saints led Albani to hypothesize aristocratic patronage for this church, possibly connected to someone called John. The quality of the paintings also suggests that the patron hired a workshop which knew the paintings in the Peribleptos church in Mystras very well since they used similar iconographies and have a similar style.⁷⁰⁵ These painters also collaborated with the plasterer in the creation of the proskynetarion frame. This element is distinct from the Peribleptos in Mystras: the proskynetarion in H. Athanasios belongs to the Type B proskynetaria, the creation of which was cheaper and did not required an artisan skilled in the art of moulding or carving, but only someone skilled with a spatula. The proskynetarion frame could have been modelled either by the plasterer and then covered with colours by the painter, or just made by the painter himself.⁷⁰⁶

A proskynetarion Type B can be found in another aristocratic foundation which shows ties with Mystras and with the Peribleptos in the painted programme: the church of the Dormition at Longanikos (40 km from Mystras and ca 17.5 km from Leontari) (cat. No. 26). The church is a single nave building and the painted programme covers the entire surface of the church except the western wall where the only painted area is the niche with the representation of the donors. This is a peculiar aspect which was explained by Chassoura as a deliberate choice

⁷⁰⁴ Albani 1989.

⁷⁰⁵ Albani 1989, in part. 280, 283-86, 288. Albani also suggested that the paintings of H. Athanasios need to be connected to those in the dome of the western gallery of the H Apostoloi in the same Leontari as possibly the product of the same workshop, Albani 1989; Albani 1992. This connection between the Saints Apostles and H. Athanasios has been challenged by Louvi-Kizi who noted that the masonry of the dome of the H. Apostoloi cannot be dated to the fourteenth century but rather to the fifteenth century, Louvi-Kizi 2007.

⁷⁰⁶ See chapter 1.12 for proskynetaria Type B.

due to the economic restrictions of the patron. In fact, the iconographic programme is not incomplete but just 'compressed' to cover a smaller surface.⁷⁰⁷ The reading of this compressed iconographic programme suggests a funerary character for the church due to the selection of the narrative scenes and their placement in the building. The deceased was represented in the niche of the western wall which is emphasised by a stucco frame (fig. 3.24). Before turning to the stucco frame, let us focus on the representation of the patrons. The niche has at the centre the Virgin Mary and two figures: a man and a child. The inscription which once identified the people is now illegible. Orlandos first, and Chassoura, more recently, suggested that the donors were a layman who recently took monastic vows, and his son, represented in prayer in front of the Virgin with the Child. The man has a long beard and wears a dark-red mantle and a blue *analabos*, on his head a white cloth drapes down to his shoulders. This cloth has been interpreted by Orlandos as an iconographic detail which signalled that the man was deceased,⁷⁰⁸ while Chassoura thought that the white cloth referred to the outfit of a monk.⁷⁰⁹ The young boy painted next to the man wears a richly embroidered long tunic and a belt which suggests the high status of the child.⁷¹⁰ Therefore, we are looking at an act of patronage of a rich man, based in Longanikos, who took monastic vows probably after having lost his child, a practice common among the Byzantine aristocracy of this period.⁷¹¹

The material chosen to provide visibility to the image of the donor is a frame made of plaster. The frame belongs to the Type B proskynetarion and it was created either by the collaboration of a painter and a plasterer or only by the painter. A frame made using the same

⁷⁰⁷ Chassoura 2002, 61.

⁷⁰⁸ Orlandos 1938, 482-485.

⁷⁰⁹ Chassoura does not think that the white cloth should refer to the deceased condition of the man, but his current rank in the monastery. See Chassoura 2002, 220-222.

⁷¹⁰ Chassoura 2002, 220-22; Orlandos 1938, 483. Orlandos also noted the remnants of the dress of a female figure, Orlandos 1938, 482. The current state of the wall painting does not show any sign of a third donor, indeed, Chassoura mentioned only the man and the child in front of the Virgin.

⁷¹¹ Chassoura 2002, 222. On post-humous representation of patrons, see Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 27, n. 33.

technique is the one recorded in the already-mentioned H. Athanasios in Leontari, another aristocratic foundation. This technical detail also links the chronology of the frame to the paintings. A *terminus post quem* is provided by the comparison of the paintings with those in the church of H. Georgios (1374/75) in Longanikos itself, and dated by the donors' inscription.⁷¹² The iconography in some of the narrative scenes in the church of the Dormition provide with another element of connection with the H. Athanasios in Leontari (ca 1370-90) and the Peribleptos in Mystras, but also to the later churches of the *kastron* of Geraki. Chassoura defined the style of the paintings of Longanikos as an intermediate step in the transmission of the style of Mystras in the Peloponnese and especially to the regional version encountered in Geraki.⁷¹³ Another connection to Geraki is the use of feline heads for the capitals of the plaster frame, which recall those carved in limestone in the church of H. Paraskeve in the *kastron* of Geraki itself. As we saw in chapter 1, lionheads were also recorded in the stucco Type B frames of the Panagia in Archatos in Naxos (1285) (fig. 1.149) and in the narthex of the church of Ljubostinja (ca 1406–1408) (fig. 1.161). This shows that the painters of Longanikos used both similar iconographic conventions as those found at the nearby Leontari and Geraki, but they also participated of trends which encompassed Peloponnese.

The plaster frame in the Dormition of Longanikos, then, was commissioned by aristocrats who employed painters trained in the so-called style of the Peribleptos of Mystras who were also active in the H. Athanasios of Leontari almost contemporaneously. If they were not the same workshop, they certainly belonged to the same cultural *milieu*. The use of proskynetaria Type B frames in both churches is probably the sign of a peripheral workshop

⁷¹² On the inscription see Orlandos 1938, 479-481; Chassoura 2002, 19, 418, fig. 24; Feissel, Philippidis-Braat 1985, 339–40, pl. XXV; Gerstel and Talbot 2006, 484-85.

⁷¹³ Chassoura 2002, 311-313.

and the limited resources of the patrons who could not afford to pay artisans at the same level as those active in the Peribleptos of Mystras.

The analysis of the cases from the area of Mystras shows an intersection of patrons and workshops and the stuccoes they could access. The first preliminary conclusion is that here, again, the technique used for stucco marked the difference between various levels of patronage (Type A proskynetaria for the despots and Type B for the aristocracy). Moreover, the despot and his wife had access to marble and could hire sculptors for the re-working of several pieces, while the aristocratic patrons of H. Athanasios and the Dormition church did not. They could rely only on the masons who build their churches and the painters who decorated the interior walls and supplied for the elements in relief through the quick modelling of the plaster into proskynetaria frames. The preference recorded by such patrons for plaster proskynetaria cannot be interpreted as a direct derivation from Mystras, because stucco was not consistently used in other foundations where painters of the so-called Mystras style were active.⁷¹⁴ Stucco was even an exception in Mystras, where the proskynetaria frames were often made of marble or stone. The cases of Longanikos and Leontari show that these settlements located in the Taygetos mountains were vibrant communities where the local aristocracy engaged in patronage activities and, when possible, wanted to have elements ‘in relief’ for which the collaboration of painters and plasterers would suffice to provide them prestige.⁷¹⁵

⁷¹⁴ On the so-called school of Mystras and the churches of Longanikos and Leontari, see Mouriki 1996 (reprint of 1978), in part. 20; more recently, see Gerstel 2013a, 364, n. 115-118.

⁷¹⁵ On the appreciation of (marble) sculpture in Late Byzantine society see Melvani 2013, 13-25, 154-161.

Islands (Naxos, Samos, Euboea)

The islands of Naxos, Samos and Euboea provide further cases of patronage of plaster reliefs. They show a composite society which continued to flourish under the Byzantine and Latin rule where aristocrats were not the only patrons.

For the last thirty years of the fourteenth century, Naxos was ruled by Duke Marco Sanudo II (1262-1303) and was part of the Duchy of the Archipelago; Euboea was Byzantine but with several settlements of Venetians; while Samos remained under Byzantine control until 1304 when it was surrendered to the Genoese.⁷¹⁶ The examples which will be analysed below show that stucco was chosen not only by aristocrats but also by monks, priests, and common people.⁷¹⁷ Again, what makes the difference is not only the material itself but the level of craftsmanship employed. Moreover, it seems to me that both ordinary people and aristocrats used stucco in the same way they used sculpture: to channel the sight and draw the attention of the visitor on relevant areas of the church, and to provide the building with prestige.

The first case is the church of the Panagia in Archatos, located in the south-east hinterland of the island of Naxos, approximately 10 kilometres from the modern village of Ano Sagri (cat. No. 30). The building has a cruciform plan and the interior walls are entirely covered by paintings.⁷¹⁸ While the mural paintings are of very good quality, the masonry is now covered by several layers of restorations which makes it impossible to evaluate it in its entirety.⁷¹⁹ The plaster relief is the proskynetarion which belongs to the second layer of paintings dated to 1285 by the painted inscription of the priest Michael, donor and painter, next to the image of St. John

⁷¹⁶ It was briefly recaptured by the Byzantines between 1329 and 1346, but then it was under Genoese control until 1475, Gregory 1991.

⁷¹⁷ Interesting enough is the appearance of the spouse and the family members of such donors, as happened in Late Antique pavement mosaics in Greece and Palestine. The family members re-appear at the same time in the documents concerning the lands and properties of the monasteries on Mount Athos.

⁷¹⁸ The most recent studies on the church are Aslanidis 2017, and the unpublished PhD thesis of Kostantellou 2019.

⁷¹⁹ Aslanidis 2017, 336-343.

the Forerunner.⁷²⁰ The church of the Panagia was not just the foundation of the Michael but of a series of individuals. A supplication mentions Eugenios, probably a common person, since his name is not preceded by any title, office nor by *kyr*. Other painted supplications (but without names) are located in the apse, in the north chapel, in the spandrel of the dome and in the western wall.⁷²¹ These inscriptions, and the identification of the other saints as mainly healing saints by Konstantellou, shed light on the beliefs of the local community which gravitated around the church.⁷²² The evidence from the church of the Panagia in Archatos tells us that proskynetaria frames made by modelling plaster were used in communal foundations of a certain importance; indeed, the church was sponsored by several individuals (among them the priest and painter Michael and Eugenios) who managed to hire a local workshop of painters of good quality to ensure the decoration of the local pilgrimage centre.⁷²³

The second case of patronage of stucco is another proskynetarion frame in Naxos, in the church of H. Sozon in ‘Giallous’, which is located south-east to Hagiassos (cat. No. 31). The church is single nave with a central apse, and it was once covered by a barrel vault. The building is now in ruins since the roof collapsed and the northern wall is at risk of falling; both the northern wall and the apse are now secured by scaffoldings. The remnants of the walls are covered with wall paintings. There is very little information about its foundation; the only sure thing is the date in the fragmentary inscription which survive from the apse: 1314. The stucco proskynetarion had an inscription too which is very fragmentary as well; Kostarelli reconstructed it as a dedicatory inscription.⁷²⁴ Therefore, in H. Sozon there were at least two inscriptions: one in the apse and another one next to the saint framed by the plaster

⁷²⁰ On the inscription see Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 85 n. 35, figs 58-59. On the painted programme Dimitrokallis 1981; Kalopissi-Verti 1994, 145-146, fig. 5; Mitsani 2000, 96, 98; Konstantellou 2019, 413-219.

⁷²¹ Konstantellou 2019, 150-151.

⁷²² On healing saints in pictorial programmes or rural churches in general, see Gerstel 2015, 157-165.

⁷²³ On the workshop, see Konstantellou 2019, 295-349, in part. 336-349.

⁷²⁴ On the inscription, see Mastoropoulos 1983, 126; Kostarelli 2013, 64.

proskynetarion; it is thus likely that the decoration of the church was sponsored by at least two individuals.⁷²⁵ If we look at other foundations in Naxos between the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century with a similar painted decoration, they are mainly ‘collective foundations’, which means that their construction was funded by several individuals or families.⁷²⁶ Therefore, H. Sozon may be framed within the context of collective foundations.

Moving to the island of Samos, the next foundation with plaster reliefs is the so-called Virgin Makrini in a grotto just uphill from Kallithea (cat. No. 29). The church was built and decorated in several phases; the last is the one which concerns us since it is contemporary to the proskynetaria frames made of plaster. The location of the church, the depiction of the Virgin Spelaiotissa (literally ‘of the grotto’) and the painted invocation of a monk called George next to her lead us to think that this was a church connected to monks possibly living as hermits in the surrounding area.⁷²⁷ The paintings were first published by Mitsani who established their chronology around 1300, and provided information about the historical context. She also suggested that the building be identified with the Panagia *Thaumastē*, one of the chapels owned by the Sinaitic *metochion* of H. Georgios Kastanias, in Samos.⁷²⁸ The church of the Virgin Makrini and its Type B proskynetaria should then be framed within a monastic environment, probably composed of hermits.

The last foundation with a stucco element to be examined is the Hodegetria church in Spelies, Euboea (cat. No. 22). The church has a cross-vaulted plan with a semi-circular apse which is polygonal in the exterior. The foundation stands out from the other Late Byzantine

⁷²⁵ However, this is clearly not a decisive proof, because the fragmentary condition of the inscriptions does not allow to verify whether the name in the apsidal arch was the same of the proskynetarion.

⁷²⁶ Some of them are the above mentioned Panagia in Archatos and the Panagia της Γιαλλούς (1288/89). See Kalopissi-Verti 1992, 35-37, 45-46, 88-91 for other collective foundations also in Naxos. On collective foundations, see Kalopissi-Verti 2012, 125-140.

⁷²⁷ Mitsani 1998, 108-109.

⁷²⁸ This information comes from a *sigillion* of the patriarch dated to 1816 which copies an older of 1776. Mitsani 1998, 96-97.

churches of central Euboea both for architectural features and for its wall paintings. The masonry is composed by regular stone blocks with bricks in the vertical and horizontal joints, and it is more carefully constructed than the contemporary churches of central Euboea. The northern façade has a trilobe window which was subsequently blocked up to provide extra space for the painted decoration. The trilobe window is on the side of the current road (north) but opposite the lateral entrance (south); it is possible that there was another entrance on the western façade, but if so it is now lost.⁷²⁹ The trilobe window does not appear in any other foundation in central Euboea between the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century. It required a moderate amount of bricks and masons for carving the big arch of the niche and the smaller ones to match the colonnettes (fig. 3.25); for this reason, the patron invested his resources on only the side which was seen by people using a road on the northern side of the church, as today. This suggests that the patron was unable to commission architectural

⁷²⁹ The later construction of the narthex destroyed the western façade, Emmanuel 1990, 451.

decorations on each façade, due to the absence of specialised artisans in central Euboea, or the relatively limited economic means of the patron.⁷³⁰

The interior of the church is completely covered with paintings. The dedicatory inscription of its founder runs on the triumphal arch (fig. 3.26):

ΑΝΗΓΕΡΤΘΗ	Ο	ΘΕΙΟΣ	ΚΑΙ	‘The divine and most venerable church of
ΠΑΝΣΕΠΤΟΣ		ΝΑΟΣ	ΤΗΣ	the Hodegetria was raised through the
ΟΔΗΓΗΤΡΙΑΣ	ΔΙΑ	ΣΥΝΔΡΟΜΗΣ	ΚΑΙ	contribution and at the expense of the
ΕΞΟΔΟΥ	ΤΟΥ	ΔΟΥΛΟΥ	ΤΟΥ	servant of God Gregorios Pachomeres in the
ΓΡΗΓΟΡΙΟΥ	ΤΟΥ	ΠΑΧΩΜΕΡΗ	το 6819	year 6819 from the birth of the world’.
				ἀπὸ το κτίσεως κόσμου’ ⁷³¹

Gregorios of Pachomeri is an unknown figure who appears only in the inscription of the Hodegetria.⁷³² The use of the word *kyr* suggests that he was an aristocrat, possibly an official or a functionary.⁷³³ The choice of the narrative scenes and their location within the building led Emmanuel to hypothesize a funerary function for the church, where Gregorios was probably buried.⁷³⁴

⁷³⁰ We should not exclude the possibility of an architectural decoration on the western façade, now lost. If this ever existed, it reinforced the idea that the decoration of the exterior of the church was planned according to the local network of roads. Similar choices were made for the Çanlı kilise in Cappadocia, Ousterhout 2019, 443; Ousterhout 2017, 89-93; Ousterhout 2011, 27-36; Ousterhout 1999, 27-28.

⁷³¹ Transcription from Liapes 1971, 129. The inscription is today only partially legible due to the bad condition of the wall paintings at the top of the triumphal arch.

⁷³² *PLP*, 22205.

⁷³³ Kyritses 1997, 12-16.

⁷³⁴ Emmanuel 1990, 467. The hypothesis is unfortunately not substantiated by archaeological excavations.

The plaster proskynetarion frame belongs to Type B, and this is consistent with what we observed for the churches connected to aristocratic patronage in the Late Byzantine period: they had access to multi-tasking painters who probably worked in collaboration with the plasterers. Aristocrats and the local population seemed unable to hire artisans who could make Type A proskynetaria or to stucco decorations with decorative patterns in relief. This was probably connected to the different economic value of stucco decorations with patterns in relief and also to changes in skills of artisans in the Late Byzantine period, as we will see.

3.5 Some observations on patrons and techniques

As we have seen in the previous paragraphs, in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods patrons of different social background commissioned plaster reliefs: members of the imperial family, rulers, aristocrats, local officers, hegoumenoi, and common people. However, there is a discernible pattern which is particularly visible for proskynetaria frames (Table 2).

Proskynetaria Type A frames are in churches mainly dated to the Middle Byzantine period and all are in churches founded by members of the highest strata of the society.

In contrast, Type B frames have a more varied patronage which includes local aristocrats and the local population, and they mainly date to the Late Byzantine period (Table 3).⁷³⁵

Moreover, Type A proskynetaria were commissioned by patrons who had access to marble supply and were able to hire sculptors for the templon, while Type B frames were in churches where we can verify only the presence of a crew of painters; sculptors seem to not be there. This may suggest that patrons of churches with Type B frames, for some reasons, could not hire

⁷³⁵ In Serbia, in the narthex of the church of the Dormition of Ljubostinja, there is another Type B proskynetarion frame which is connected to the patronage of princess Milića. On the chronology of the paintings – and therefore the proskynetarion frame – see Todić 2007.

sculptors for the liturgical barriers and *proskynetaria*, so they hired multi-tasking painters who created architectural decorations in addition to painting.

The use of *proskynetaria* Type A and B frames is generally indicative of the status of the patron, or, at least, the building. Stucco elements with decorations carved and modelled in relief were in buildings with lavish architectural decoration composed by a variety of materials (e.g. marble, mosaics, wall paintings). They could be used next to other plaster reliefs, such as cornices, with decorative motifs only painted.⁷³⁶ However, stucco elements with decorative patterns in relief did not appear in churches decorated only by wall paintings and with *templa* made of masonry or wood. Stucco elements without decorations carved and modelled in relief (but only painted) tend to be located in churches or in areas of churches where wall paintings are the only medium, but this is not a firm rule.

What this evidence suggests is that stucco elements with decorations in relief were probably more expensive than those without, because they required artisans skilled in modelling plaster, and such artisans were not part of the workshop of the painters who decorated these churches. Moreover, in one case, the tomb in the narthex of the *katholikon* of Iviron, it seems that there are still traces of the preparation for gilding; if this is correct, then the arch (and possibly the colonnettes) were covered in golden leaf, and the stucco would have been expensive. There is no trace of gilding in any Type B *proskynetaria* nor in cornices without patterns in relief.⁷³⁷

⁷³⁶ The use of painting cavetto cornices with decorative motifs can be recorded on both marble and stucco. For example, the marble stringcourse cornice of the *parekklesion* of the *katholikon* of the Chora monastery in Constantinople, Ousterhout 1987, 54, fig. 91; some stucco examples are in the chapel of H. Euthymios in H. Demetrios in Thessaloniki (1302-1303), see Bauer 2013, 426-432; in the church of H. Nikolaos Orphanos in Thessaloniki, Bakirtzis (ed.) 2003; in the *katholikon* of Vatopedi on Mount Athos, Pazaras 2001a, 58-59 and in many other churches; medieval Serbia had also a high concentration of such reliefs. See for examples, those in the church of the Holy Trinity of the Resava monastery, Simić *et al.* 2011, 54, 82, 88, figs. 40-42.

⁷³⁷ An exception is the plaster cordons attached to the pillars in the church of the Holy Trinity in the Resava monastery, which are painted and show some patterns in golden leaf, see Simić *et al.* 2011, 82, 88, figs. 40-42.

3.6 Conclusion

In conclusion, patronage of plaster reliefs changed from the Middle to the Late Byzantine period. While from the mid-ninth to the twelfth century the aristocracy, the emperor and rulers commissioned stucco, from the thirteenth century the local aristocracy and common people started to do so as well, as we know thanks to inscriptions. Surely, non-aristocratic commissions were made also in the previous period, but there is no direct evidence for this with stucco, since any sign of individuals were probably applied through painting, and the original polychromy of the stuccoes is impossible to reconstruct for the majority of the cases.

In the Middle Byzantine period, stucco was mainly used in buildings decorated with a great variety of materials (marble, mosaics, wall paintings). From the Late Byzantine period, a simplified version of stucco relief (e.g. Type B proskynetaria) started to become common in foundations of both local aristocrats and local people; this type of relief seems to have been more affordable for patrons who did not employ any marble in their foundations, though there are few exceptions. The fact that the majority of the Type B proskynetaria are dated to the Late Byzantine period does not mean that they were not used before, as the example of H. Ioannes Eleemon (twelfth century) (cat. No. 23) demonstrates it. The lack of evidence from the Middle Byzantine period may be the consequence of the casual survival of the material.

Moving from the snapshots and isolated case studies to our three micro-regional contexts adds further precision. The first is Mount Athos in the eleventh century, and in particular the monasteries of Vatopedi and Iviron which used stucco for establishing their authority on the Sacred Mountain and to address internal struggles within the monastery community (Iviron). These cases have also shown that stucco is a good indicator of later interventions. The second is Epiros where both the despot and the local aristocracy had access to the same sculptures made of stucco. The absence of a differentiation in terms of quality of

the carving of these liturgical furnishings, together with the close political ties which linked the despot and the local aristocrats, leaves space for looking at the interaction between them by means of exchange of artisans and materials. Further studies on the chronology of the pieces and of the buildings may help in clarifying the direction of this exchange (centre-periphery or the opposite), while it may be possible that stucco liturgical furnishings in Epiros begun to represent Epirote identity, as discussed in paragraph 3.4.

Stucco tells us of a different story about the relationship between centre and periphery in Morea, where the different ways of making proskynetaria frames mirrored the hierarchy between the despot (Type A frame) and the local aristocrats (Leontari, Longanikos), and their economic means expressed in their access (or not) to marble supply. The case of Morea, once again, demonstrates that technical aspects mattered. A proskynetarion Type A frame required more work and more skills (therefore costed more) than a proskynetarion Type B frame.

The analysis on the patrons associated with stucco decorations demonstrated that stucco was not a cheap choice, and that in micro-regional contexts it can provides us with a glimpse into the relationship of a network of individuals.

4.SOCIAL PERCEPTION AND THE ACTUAL COST OF STUCCO

4.1 Introduction

After having discussed in the previous chapter the kind of patrons who commissioned stucco and connections between the techniques used to work plaster reliefs and the status of the patrons, this chapter evaluates the economic and cultural value of stucco. These two aspects cannot be discussed separately, because they represent two sides of the same coin, as will be demonstrated on these pages.

The use of certain materials in architecture can be connected to local availability, but material is also a means to display the wealth and identity of the patron and her/his community, which is the result of cultural values. One good example is Çanlı kilise in Cappadocia which, during its first phase, was built with ashlar masonry made of local stone (hard volcanic tuff) and bricks. Bricks were not common in Cappadocia,⁷³⁸ and indeed, in the Çanlı kilise they were used strategically: only on the exterior.⁷³⁹ This suggests that bricks were not abundant at this specific construction site and that they were not produced locally but they were instead imported.⁷⁴⁰ Why import bricks to a region (Cappadocia) which is rich in stone?⁷⁴¹ The answer is probably because bricks were used in Constantinople, and the patron or the community who used the church wanted to underline ties with the capital.⁷⁴² Can we say that bricks were an expensive material in the Byzantine empire? Not generally, but clearly there were some

⁷³⁸ In Anatolia ashlar masonry was predominant since the Early Byzantine period, Ousterhout 2019, 88; Ousterhout 2017, 321-322; Ousterhout 2011, 81-88.

⁷³⁹ Ousterhout 2019, 443; Ousterhout 2017, 89-93; Ousterhout 2011, 27-36; Ousterhout 1999, 27-28.

⁷⁴⁰ No kiln has been found yet in the settlement. The other masonry church there does not have any bricks. A case where bricks appear to have been imported was supported by chemical analysis, Morganstern 1983, 92; however, there is at least a clay deposit in Anatolia along the Kızılırmak river, which is used today, Ousterhout 2011, 82.

⁷⁴¹ The blocks were even quarried less than a kilometre from the church, Ousterhout 2019, 395; Ousterhout 2011, 131, 136, fig. 189.

⁷⁴² Ousterhout 2011, 89-90.

difficulties involved in bringing them to the plateau where Çanlı kilise was built. Can we say, then, that the patron did not have enough money to buy bricks for the entire church? It is possible, but this does not automatically mean that s/he was a common person with limited economic means. Indeed, s/he hired painters who decorated the interior using iconographies, style, and pigments which were used in Constantinople in the same period.⁷⁴³ Çanlı kilise was also located in an aristocratic (possibly military) settlement, and it was built and decorated by extremely skilful artisans: it is not an average church. Bricks were not an expensive material *per se* but in some areas, such as Cappadocia, they probably were. Therefore, their parsimonious use in Çanlı kilise does not tell us that the patron was ‘poor’ (s/he could not even buy enough bricks!), but that bricks represented Constantinopolitan architecture, and this is the reason for transporting them to this area of Cappadocia. The display of wealth and identity of the patron through bricks is recognised in the scarcity of the material in Cappadocia, which led to its strategic use on the façade.⁷⁴⁴ That is to say that cultural and economic values go hand-in-hand in architecture.⁷⁴⁵

It is with these two parameters in mind that we need to approach the use of stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine architecture. Indeed, in some cases it is clear that a tradition of working stucco was born out of necessity (Cyprus, Epiros) and responded to an absence of marble, but in other cases it seems that stucco was considered to be part of the range of materials which continued to be used from the Late Antique period (e.g. Hosios Loukas). It is very difficult to say whether in this second case, patrons and artisans were always conscious of the economic impact, but we cannot ignore the possibility.

⁷⁴³ Wisseman et al. 2011.

⁷⁴⁴ The settlement was probably connected to the nearby fortress of Akhisar. The structure and the dwellings found in the Çanlı kilise settlement lead us to think that it was inhabited by the families of the military officers in service at the fortress, Ousterhout 2017, 325-335; Ousterhout 2011, 212-215.

⁷⁴⁵ Similar observations were drawn by Cutler regarding building decoration in mosaic or wall paintings, see Cutler 2002 in part. 555-565.

This chapter argues that there is not one singular reason for the use of stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine architecture. Both economic and cultural reasons were at play.

In order to understand this, we will follow three paths:

- The local availability of gypsum
- Economic return of the use of stucco instead of marble
- Cultural criteria used for the appreciation of stucco and some examples of conscious preservations of Middle Byzantine stuccoes by Late Byzantine audiences.

4.2 Absence and presence: when geology matters.

As shown in chapter 2, stucco mixtures are mainly of two types: those with gypsum and those with lime as a main binder. In general, gypsum-based stuccoes are stronger than lime ones, and they allow the creation of high reliefs; however, they suffer water damage, and for this reason, they were not used for the decoration of the exteriors.

There are only two regions where the local availability of gypsum appears to be connected to the widespread use of stucco: Cyprus and Epiros.

The use of stucco in Cyprus is mainly known for the Roman and Late Antique periods.⁷⁴⁶ Both private houses and public buildings had walls decorated with plaster reliefs and paintings. A fifth-century dwelling in Salamis-Konstantia shows an entire room with walls divided by stucco partitions in the shape of figurative friezes, arches, and half-columns (fig. 1.11).⁷⁴⁷ This is not exceptional *per se*, since paintings and stucco were also used together in the rest of the Roman world. However, in Cyprus there is a high concentration of stucco

⁷⁴⁶ Rautman 2003, 46-47; Megaw 1953, 137; Christou 1994, 689-91; Hadjisavvas 2000, 692-93; Papageorgiou 1963; Flourentzos 1996, 15 n. 56, pl. XXV; Karageorghis 1962, 412-13, fig. 106a-c; Michaelides 1998, 192 fig. 8; Megaw 1976, 358 fig. 28; de Gagniers, Tram Tarn Tinh 1985, 94 nos 57-60, 111 n.109; Megaw 2000; Karageorghis 1960, 295-97; Argoud *et al.* 1980, 27-28, 31-36, pl. IVa, XXIII 7-8, XXIV-VIII.

⁷⁴⁷ Argoud *et al.* 1980, 27-28, pl. XXIV-VIII.

alongside marble until the collapse of quarrying activity and the marble trade from the seventh century onwards. Cypriot Late Antique churches and basilicas show a consolidated tradition of working stucco which included friezes with animals, geometric motifs, and spiral columns and they corresponds to the description of the church decoration made by St. Nilos of Ankyra in one his letters to the prefect Olympiodorus.⁷⁴⁸ These decorations were also used side by side to marble panels and gypsum-stone posts in the bema enclosure and in the *solea* of the church A at Katalymmata ton Plakoton (36 x 14 m).⁷⁴⁹ In the basilica of Kalavastos-Syrma, the surviving remains of the stucco decorations suggest the presence of a larger composition, which was made by skilled artisans between the end of the sixth and early seventh century.⁷⁵⁰ Indeed, the fragmentary Virgin with the blessing Child (fig. 4.3) may be part of a larger narrative scene (the Adoration of the Magi?), and it is difficult to imagine the capital as an isolated element; it probably formed part of the partition of the wall from which survive several friezes (figs. 4.1-4.2).⁷⁵¹

In the sixth and seventh centuries, panels with narrative scenes made of stucco were located in buildings where the rest of the sculptural decoration was made of re-used marble and local carved stone, suggesting that the use of stucco (and local stone) was a response to the absence of marble.⁷⁵² Indeed, the known antique quarries on the island only produced limestone

⁷⁴⁸ In a letter which St. Nilos of Ankyra (or of Sinai) sent to the prefect Olympiodorus, he refers to the contemporary use of decorating houses with hunt scenes and stuccoes, which should be avoided in the house of God. He suggested the use of scenes from the Old and New Testaments on walls and crosses, instead, *PG* 79, 577-80, English translation in Mango 1972, 32-33. Friezes with images of animals were found in the basilica of Amathus, Karageorghis 1962, 412-13, Michaelides 1998, 192 fig. 8; an acanthus capital was part of one of the phases preceding the seventh century mosaic of the church of the Angeloktistos in Kiti Karageorghis 1960, 295-97; a half-colonnade with twisted fluting and a capital of a half-column was found in the basilica of Marathovouno Papageorgiou 1963. The use of stucco has been interpreted by Megaw as a local feature of Cyprus, Megaw 1974, 69 n. 46, 74.

⁷⁴⁹ Maguire 2012, 178-179; Nikolaou *forthcoming*.

⁷⁵⁰ For the area see Panayides 2018, 224-226, fig. 47.

⁷⁵¹ Panayides 2018, fig. 47.

⁷⁵² Megaw 1974, 69, 80; Stylianou 1997, 65; Rautman 2003, 46-47, 51-52, fig. 3.54.

and were located in Xylophagou (south-east Cyprus),⁷⁵³ and Paphos (south-west Cyprus).⁷⁵⁴ However, Cyprus is rich in gypsum which is still quarried and exported today.⁷⁵⁵

The incredible amount of stucco for church and domestic decoration in Late Antique Cyprus does not find many comparisons, and it seems to have continued into, at least, the Middle Byzantine period.⁷⁵⁶ The main innovation seems the appearance of stucco-made templa, as the one re-used as filling for a twelfth-century wall in the church of St. Nicholas of the Roof near Kakopetria.⁷⁵⁷ It has been suggested that this piece may be a survival of a wider production now lost.⁷⁵⁸ Unfortunately, stucco production in Cyprus during the Middle and Late Byzantine periods has not yet been studied,⁷⁵⁹ and finding information on this topic requires specific surveys on Cyprus, which I could not conduct for this thesis due to the current pandemic. Rautman suggested that the stucco tradition survived or was revived in the production of the Cypriot traditional decorated shelves, known as *souvantza*.⁷⁶⁰

A comparative case study can be found in Epiros two centuries later. Here seven churches dated between the second half of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century had stucco liturgical furnishings (mainly templa).⁷⁶¹ The use of the same decorative patterns, the shapes of the architectural members, and the use of the same techniques (formworks, moulding, stamping, incision), including identical ingredients in the stucco

⁷⁵³ Karageorghis 1969, 494.

⁷⁵⁴ Maier, Karageorghis 1984, 249-277.

⁷⁵⁵ An estimate of the quarry activities is provided by the website of the Republic of Cyprus http://www.moa.gov.cy/moa/mines/minesSrv.nsf/dmlquarries_en/dmlquarries_en?opendocument

⁷⁵⁶ On the continuity in the use of stucco in Cyprus from the Late Antique to the Middle Byzantine periods and its connection to the absence of marble and the use of gypsum (for both moulded plaster and masonry), see Papageorgiou 1963, 100-101; Megaw 1974, 69, 74, 80; Rautman 2003, 46-47.

⁷⁵⁷ The wall is the one where the image of St. Nicholas is painted, see Stylianou, Stylianou 1997, 65; Rautman 2003, 46-47; Megaw 1974 80 n. 95.

⁷⁵⁸ Megaw 1974, 80 n. 95.

⁷⁵⁹ Rautman 2003, 47.

⁷⁶⁰ Rautman 2003, 47.

⁷⁶¹ The patronage of the churches was analysed in chapter 3.4. The churches are cat. Nos. 13-18, 27.

mixture, showed that these liturgical furnishings were made by the same workshop.⁷⁶² Moreover, the stucco is mainly composed of gypsum, which was quarried locally.⁷⁶³ Still today, Epiros, like Cyprus, is a region rich in gypsum.⁷⁶⁴ Some of the contemporary quarries were probably also used in the Middle Ages and, as noted earlier, two are very close to three of the churches with stucco templa.

The use of stucco barriers in medieval Epiros is only attested in the north, in particular between Arta, Ioannina, Higoumenitsa (Greece), and Episkopi (Albania).⁷⁶⁵ As we saw in the previous chapter, all the churches with these templa are also located in mountainous areas, with the exception of the Kato Panagia on the plain of Arta. Three of the contemporary quarries are located in an area surrounding three of the churches (the Koimesis of Petrobitsa, the Koimesis of Lyggos, the Taxiarches of Kostaniane) (fig. 3.19). Moreover, marble is almost entirely absent in the churches with stucco elements. The only exception is the Kokkini Ekklesia in Boulgareli which has two re-used columns.⁷⁶⁶

Marble appears to be absent in Epiros (fig. 4.4). A local limestone called ‘marble of Ioannina’ was sometimes used for sculpture, although it did not allow the creation of smooth reliefs.⁷⁶⁷ In the Roman and Early Byzantine period, marble was imported from Eastern Greece, the Aegean, and Asia Minor, probably by sea and through the use of navigable rivers such as the Arachthos and the Acheron.⁷⁶⁸ In the Middle and Late Byzantine periods, the importation of marble dramatically decreased, and the re-use of previous sculpture became widespread.⁷⁶⁹ The

⁷⁶² Papadopoulou 2006.

⁷⁶³ This is indicated by the petrographical analysis, see Papadopoulou 2006, 347, n. 54-55.

⁷⁶⁴ Papadopoulou 2006 347, n. 54-55.

⁷⁶⁵ However, we cannot exclude that the actual distribution of stucco templa is due to chance.

⁷⁶⁶ Papadopoulou 2001-2004; Orlandos 1927.

⁷⁶⁷ Kokkorou-Aleura *et al.* 2014, 74; Vanderheyde 2005, 91-92.

⁷⁶⁸ Veikou 2012, 19-39 in part. 28, 31, 33, 402; Vanderheyde 2005, 91-92.

⁷⁶⁹ On Middle Byzantine Epiros see Vanderheyde 2005, 91. This is a general trend in Byzantium and in the Eastern Mediterranean. For a good summary on the subject see Sodini 2002; a more optimistic view is in Greenhalgh 2009 even though he does not analyse Byzantium in-depth.

local abundance of gypsum combined with the absence of marble is probably the basis of the use of stucco for three-dimensional sculptures in the second half of the thirteenth century.

It is difficult to imagine that this process, which involves several stages and the use of different tools, was developed in the thirteenth century out of the blue.⁷⁷⁰ The production of free-standing elements, such as templa, requires different skills from the modelling of simple reliefs: artisans must have been acquainted with formworks and able to secure the stability of each piece (see chapter 2.1), and they needed to use a considerable amount of gypsum powder and water.⁷⁷¹ The process required highly specialised artisans, whose presence is most plausibly explained as the result of a continuous tradition for which we have lost previous (Early and Middle Byzantine) manifestations. Alternatively, the artisans responsible may have moved to Epiros from elsewhere, but even this possibility cannot be verified because we lack contemporary productions in the nearby regions (the Balkans, and in general the regions on the Adriatic Sea) with which to compare Epiros. The existence of stucco templa in Cyprus in the eleventh century allows us to hypothesise that such artefacts were probably used in several areas of the Byzantine empire from the Middle Byzantine period onwards. Templa made of stucco are also recorded in Calabria and Sicily in churches built between the end of the Islamic rule and the beginning of the Norman domination (end of the eleventh-beginning of the twelfth century).⁷⁷² The artisans responsible for these templa used stamps and decorative motifs which

⁷⁷⁰ On issues of the transmission of techniques in productions processes and in art see Mannoni, Giannichedda 2003, 1-22.

⁷⁷¹ An idea of the amount of gypsum and water required for a templon may come from the studies of experimental archaeology made for the Merovingian sarcophagi of France (fifth century). They have a similar chemical composition to the Epirote liturgical furnishings because they are made of gypsum (plaster of Paris) and water, and they are three-dimensional too. To make a sarcophagus two metres long (lid excluded) they needed between 400 and 500 kg of gypsum and between 200 and 500 litres of water. This technique does not involve the use of wooden beams, as in Epiros, which lowers the amount of gypsum required. For the technique and procedures of production of Merovingian sarcophagi, see *Archéologie des nécropoles* 2013, in part. 34-35.

⁷⁷² Templa and pieces from liturgical furnishing are known for the churches of S. Maria de' Terreti, S. Maria del Mastro, the church of S. Teodoro (also called 'Annunziatella') in Gerace, the church of the Panagia of Rossano (possibly a ciborium), the Baptistery in Santa Severina Orsi 1922; Lipinsky 1963; Di Gangi 1995; Di Gangi 1998; Di Gangi 2003; Lopetrone 2017. In Sicily, the church of the monastery of S. Giuliano at Caltagirone, and the

are mainly Islamic; nevertheless, the presence of this material for the liturgical barriers in churches suggests a Mediterranean ‘know-how’ of stucco free-standing structures that connected Cyprus, Calabria and Epiros. Calabria is another mountainous region which in the eleventh and twelfth centuries mainly re-used ancient marble.⁷⁷³

It would be tempting to argue that Cyprus, Epiros, and Calabria are connected, but the data is scarce. The presence of stucco templa in these buildings may be a sign that stucco was used as a substitute for marble on occasions, and that it was possible for a Byzantine person to imagine a tempon of a material other than marble.⁷⁷⁴ It is, however, impossible to quantify the diffusion of stucco templa in other Byzantine territories aside from Epiros, since the evidence either does not survive or it is unknown.

4.3 Marble and stucco: economic and cultural implications.

The abundance of gypsum in the terrain can explain the development of a strong and specialised stucco tradition, as at Cyprus and Epiros. However, geology is not always responsible for reliance on stucco. Economy also plays a role. Economy must be understood as a method of

church of Santi Pietro e Paolo at Itàla, see Bottari 1931; Ragona 1960; Ragona 1968; Mento 2003; Caskey 2011. Caskey seems to imply that the known examples in Sicily are made of lime-based plaster, Caskey 2011, 86. For Calabria, scholars usually refer to them as ‘gessi’ which means gypsum-based plaster; however, it is not clear whether any of these elements have been tested.

⁷⁷³ On the re-use of marble in Calabria during the Middle Ages, see Morrone Nymo 2011. The Archaeological Museum of Reggio Calabria is currently analysing the fragments of liturgical furnishings made of stucco (late eleventh- beginning of the twelfth century); the preliminary results seem to suggest that the binder was lime and not gypsum. The results were presented in a communication of Antonino Tranchina, ‘L’allestimento dello spazio sacro per i monaci greci dello Stretto: i materiali in stucco da S. Maria di Terreti (Reggio)’, at *Liturgical installations and their sculpture (4th -15th c.)*, 27th Annual International Scientific Symposium of the International Research Center for Late Antiquity and Middle Ages, University of Zagreb, online event 1 -4 October 2020.

⁷⁷⁴ Regarding the stuccoes from Calabria and Sicily, Barsanti suggested that the choice of stucco was not dictated by the absence of marble but by aesthetic and cultural affinities with Islamic art which exploited the plastic qualities of stucco to create interlaced patterns and complicated decorative motifs, Barsanti 1989, 351-352. This observation works for the cultural *milieu* of Calabria and Sicily which were commercially and culturally connected to Maghreb and in general the Islamic world. However, we should not forget that in the Byzantine territories, most of the templa were made of marble, or occasionally wood, and that there was probably a hierarchy of materials familiar to the inhabitants of the territories under direct Byzantine rule, where marble was the preferred material for templa.

saving both cost and time. Stucco is a good visual (but not load-bearing) substitute for marble and can successfully take any shape that marble can.

It is a very difficult task to evaluate of the costs of materials, because there are not enough written sources about prices, nor is there relevant information covering all the different regions where churches with stuccoes are located. Moreover, the political situation in most of these areas changed and sometimes influenced (directly and indirectly) the supply of some materials. Therefore, I will address this issue by roughly evaluating the amount of stucco and marble/stone sculpture used in a building. This estimation does not provide a completely realistic picture of all the expenses of a patron because – among other things – it suffers from losses of material evidence.

First, we need to say a few words about marble supply in the Middle and the Late Byzantine periods and how this had changed from the Late Antique period. For the period between the fourth and the sixth centuries it is possible to reconstruct the almost industrial-scale activity of the quarries and of some workshops which exported architectural elements and liturgical furnishings to the entire Mediterranean.⁷⁷⁵ Most of the quarries active in the Roman period continued to be used until the sixth century. Evidence of the continuous use of the quarries for the Middle and Late Byzantine period is less consistent. From the seventh to the fifteenth century, the amount of marble quarried *ex novo* decreased dramatically.⁷⁷⁶ This was connected to the lowered demand for marble architectural elements due to the decrease in construction activities in the seventh and eighth centuries, but also to the gradual change in the

⁷⁷⁵ This ‘intensive’ production of buildings required a considerable number of specialised artisans, which is mirrored by two decrees of the *Codex Theodosii* and the *Codex Iustinianii* which made exempt thirty-five categories of artisans from *munera publica* in order to encourage their profession and secure the transmission of their skills to new generations of artisans (in this case, their children), see Mango 1972, 14-15; Sodini 1979, 107; Zanini 2007, 382-385. For recent analysis on the organisation of the marble production in the Eastern Mediterranean between the fourth and the sixth centuries, see Marsili 2019; Castagnino, Paribeni 2015; Karagiorgiou 2015; Paribeni 2013; Barsanti *et al.* 2010.

⁷⁷⁶ A lot has been published about the use of marble and the evolution of quarry activity, here I signal the useful synthesis of Marsili 2019, 45-51, 66-78; Sodini 2002 and bibliography quoted there; Greenhalgh 2009, 90-138.

architectural shapes of the buildings from basilica to cross-in square plans, which required fewer sculptural elements.⁷⁷⁷ Indeed, the number of columns and entablatures which characterised the interior of Late Antique buildings, decreased dramatically. Columns did not disappear but the new centrally-planned churches required a smaller number than before; architectural sculpture was mainly relegated to string-course and dome cornices, capitals, the templon and other liturgical furnishings (ambo and ciborium), the altar, and sarcophagi.⁷⁷⁸

Therefore, when we consider the sources of marble in the Middle and Late Byzantine periods, we need to include cities and towns with an Ancient Roman and Early Byzantine monuments from which to source architectural material, especially marble.⁷⁷⁹ It is almost impossible to say whether re-used marble was more expensive or cheaper than quarried marble, because this would have depended on the control of the areas of marble supply, as well as the demand and cost of transportation (transportation by land was far more expensive than by sea).⁷⁸⁰ What seems clear is that stone and marble sculpture continued to be perceived as a valuable material which was employed by patrons who wanted to show their prestige, and was appreciated by society until and through the Late Byzantine period.⁷⁸¹

This phenomenon is particularly visible in Constantinople thanks to both the material evidence and the written sources. Some Middle Byzantine examples of re-use are the

⁷⁷⁷ On the changes in Byzantine architecture between the so-called 'Transitional Period' to the Middle Byzantine period, see Ousterhout 2019, 245-265, 306-309; Ćurčić 2010, 251-262, 271-343; Sodini 2002; Mango 1976, 87-137.

⁷⁷⁸ Grabar 1976, 26-31; Melvani 2013, 43-61.

⁷⁷⁹ On stockpiling and markets of marble in the Mediterranean see Greenlagh 2009, 116-124; Sodini 2002, 140.

⁷⁸⁰ Greenhalgh 2009, 133.

⁷⁸¹ Written sources do not always deal with the description of sculpture. However, when they do it, they underline the magnificence of the shapes that the artisan was able to create, and they can also specify the material (marble or stone). A Middle Byzantine example is the life of George the Hagiorite where only the marble sarcophagi are described, but not the marble and stucco arcosolia, See *La Vie de Georges l'Hagiorite*, § 27, 97. For a synthesis on written and epigraphic sources and sculpture in Late Byzantine period see Melvani 2013, 13-25.

sarcophagus of the emperor Constantine V by Michael III for a chancel screen,⁷⁸² the use of marbles from the mausoleum of Justinian for the Nea Ekklesia, and the church of the Virgin in the Forum by Basil I.⁷⁸³ In the Palaiologan period, the church of the Saviour in the monastery of Chora re-founded by Theodore Metochites, re-used Early Byzantine capitals and a marble door, at the very least.⁷⁸⁴ In general, it has been noted that the use of Early Byzantine sculpture by the Palaiologoi in Constantinople also acquired an ideological aspect.⁷⁸⁵ Outside of the capital, we can see a similar phenomenon in cities with an ancient past and surroundings (e.g. Thessaloniki, Athens, Sparta, Nikopolis, Epidauros). Less clear is the case of rural areas. It is known that some churches had their masonry made of local stone extracted from quarries nearby the church itself.⁷⁸⁶ In the peninsula of Mani, the high-volume production of sculptures between the eleventh and twelfth centuries should be connected to the use of quarries, such as those of Proasteio in Messenian Mani.⁷⁸⁷ Moreover, in some cases, architectural sculpture was also composed of re-used sculptures.⁷⁸⁸ It has been argued that the marbles used to cover the walls and the pavements of the two churches of Hosios Loukas in Beotia were re-used.⁷⁸⁹ At the same time, the capitals and the templa produced for the church of the Virgin and the katholikon were probably made by quarrying or re-using a considerable quantity of marbles, since the same elements were sent to the *metochia* of the monastery (H. Nikolaos *sta kambia* near Skripou, the Panagia in Politika and Hosios Loukas in Euboea).⁷⁹⁰

⁷⁸² Sodini 2002, 138.

⁷⁸³ See Müller-Wiener 1983 on the general attitude to re-use ancient sculptures in Constantinople.

⁷⁸⁴ Melvani 2018a.

⁷⁸⁵ Melvani 2018a.

⁷⁸⁶ Some examples are in Mani and Attika. On quarrying activities and their being part of the village life, see Gerstel 2015, 41, figs 28-29. The masonry of the first construction phase of the church of H. Nikolaos *sta kambia* was composed of a considerable part of new quarried masonry, Bouras, Boura 2002, 171-174.

⁷⁸⁷ Gerstel 2015, 41. On sculptural production in Mani, see Drandakis 2002.

⁷⁸⁸ One case is H. Theodoroi in Ano Poula (Mani), see Drandakis 1974, 125-128; Gerstel 2015, 41, 139-142, fig. 102. Recently on the church, see Katsafados 2015; Gerstel 2020, in part. p. 23.

⁷⁸⁹ Lambraki 1992, 31-32; Lambraki 1993, 25-26.

⁷⁹⁰ On the workshops that made the sculptures in H. Nikolaos *sta kambia*, the Panagia in Politika and the templon in the church of Hosios Loukas in Euboea, see Orlandos 1952; Boura 1980, 113, 120, figs 171-173, 187-190;

It is impossible for this thesis to evaluate case-by-case the amount of newly quarried, newly carved sculptures and re-used elements for each foundation with stucco decoration.⁷⁹¹ However, we can analyse some case studies which allow us to estimate the amount of marble required for covering the surface occupied by stucco elements in the relevant churches, and use this evidence (with all due caution) to consider the economic impact of the use of stucco in a Middle and Late Byzantine buildings. Economic impact will be evaluated in terms of ‘saving marble’. This calculation is often problematic since we do not always know how much marble was originally used in a given church. For example, for the church of Peribleptos in Mystras and the katholikon of Vatopedi on Mount Athos, studies have identified re-used material and whether it was re-carved in the Late and Middle Byzantine periods.⁷⁹² In other cases, such as the Protaton on Mount Athos, the original templon was restored in the twentieth century, and in others material has simply been lost without any indication of the original extent of marble decoration (e.g. the church of the Timios Stavros monastery in Cappadocia, the Odeghetria in Spelies in Euboea). Of 34 churches catalogued in this thesis, 14 provided sufficient information to calculate how much ‘marble saving’ stucco allowed.

Table 4 lists these buildings and indicates stucco decorations, as well as sculptures made of marble and stone. Several observations about the economic implications of the use of stucco may be drawn from this data.

- 1) In some buildings the use of stucco helped to reduce the amount of marble required.

This is visible in the use of stucco proskynetaria Type A (church of the Protaton, St.

Bouras 1988-89; Dennert 1997, 17-19. Sodini pin-pointed a series of cases where sculptures were made from newly quarried material and re-used sculpture, Sodini 2002, in part. 140-145.

⁷⁹¹ Such an estimation would help to better understand the capacity of patrons to have fresh-quarried marble, the state of quarrying activity in the Middle and Late Byzantine period, and therefore the amount of money invested by a patron for sculptures.

⁷⁹² For the Peribleptos of Mystras, see Louvi 1980, 103-172, in particular see the inventory table 173-184. For the katholikon of Vatopedi, see Pazaras 2001a, 19-78.

Panteleimon in Nerezi, Peribletos of Mystras) which reduced the amount of marble necessary for the templon by approximately 50%. The case of the arched slabs, probably part of a ciborium, in the basilica of H. Achilleios on the Small Lake of Prespa (cat. No. 8) helped considerably to reduce the amount of stone necessary for the church: here only two of the sarcophagi survive, and probably the fragments of the liturgical barrier made of stone.⁷⁹³ At H. Athanasios in Leontari (cat. No. 25) the only element in 'relief' is the frame of the proskynetarion (Type B) which, as we saw, was not carved and was made of mortar covered with plaster and then painted; thus, it cannot be really considered as a 'sculpture'. The templon is today made of wood and is post-Byzantine. There is no information about the original sculptural decoration of the church; however, the size and the plan of the building suggests that there was only the templon. So, yes, the proskynetarion frame helped to avoid the procurement of the material for an arch and two colonnettes. The proskynetarion frame made of out of plaster in the Panagia in Archatos in Naxos (cat. No. 30) did reduce the amount of marble required, since marble and stone sculptures were simply not used there: the string-course cornices are made by covering the masonry with thick plaster and then painting it (fig. 4.5). This is the same procedure used for the proskynetarion frame.⁷⁹⁴ So, in the church of the Panagia, marble and stone sculpture were replaced by plaster and masonry reliefs.⁷⁹⁵ This may not be an isolated case. Indeed, the church of H. Sozon in 'Giallous' (cat. No. 31) could be another one.

⁷⁹³ The sculptures found alongside the sarcophagi and the stuccoes are a panel, the fragments of two posts and a capital which may belong to a templon, see Moutsopoulos 1989 vol. 2, 246-259.

⁷⁹⁴ The frame was simply made with more plaster which was roughly modelled with a *spatula*.

⁷⁹⁵ The templon belongs to the category of the masonry templa. However, its contemporaneity with the proskynetarion and the second phase of the wall paintings still requires further investigations.

- 2) There are some cases where the amount of stucco is insignificant compared to the amount of marble and stone sculpture (katholikon of Hosios Loukas, Panagia Kosmosoteira in Feres). This is particularly visible in corbels, string-course cornices, and dome cornices. Here the use of stucco did not solve issues such as the difficulties in procuring a large piece of marble, but does provide small details, which may have helped save marble for use in large areas. The transition between the straight and the curved surface is always marked by a cornice, and usually in the Middle Byzantine period this cornice is carved in relief (and painted) or *enchamplevé*.⁷⁹⁶ Stucco carved cornices can be worked faster than marble, because they do not need to be modelled to the exact size of the wall where they will be inserted or attached, the decorative patterns can be ready in few hours, and the material allows the quick correction of mistakes. The economy of time and money may explain the stucco revetment of both the cornices and the capitals in the Kosmosoteira of Feres (cat. No. 7).⁷⁹⁷ Economy of both time and money can also be spotted in the katholikon of Hosios Loukas. Here, the string-course cornice covers a perimeter of circa 46.7 metres in the naos; if we add this perimeter to the cornice of the central dome and the narthex, the total amount of metres covered by stucco is roughly 99.5 metres. This would have had an impact on the total cost of the marble revetment and sculpture. Economy of time and cost is also implied by the stucco

⁷⁹⁶ From the Late Byzantine period, it became more common to just paint a marble or stone flat cornice (e.g. the narthex of the church of the Saviour in Chora in Constantinople).

⁷⁹⁷ In the church of the Panagia Kosmosoteira, the stucco capitals cover marble capitals. This is a real re-modelling of the capitals with new decorative patterns. Scholars have suggested that stucco was used to make harmonious the transition between the thin columns and the massive wall above (the marble capitals were too small), see Sinos 1985, 97; Dennert 1997, 97-101. However, the final result does not seem to me to be very harmonious. Moreover, the marble capitals, even though decorated with the same patterns, differ from each-others in the quality of their carving: some are very accurate, while others look like they were carved quickly. The use of stucco may be a way to unify the capitals and to make a very luxurious decoration which was definitively more appropriate for a patron such as Isaak Sebastokrator. Vanni 2019, 1137.

string-course cornice and the arches in the katholikon of Vatopedi. If we accept that they were made when the *liti* was built (that is after the construction of the naos), then the use of stucco compensated for the absence of a string-course cornice of masonry and created a rich decoration in a relatively small amount of time.

- 3) In areas where there was shortage of marble (Epiros), and where the transportation of marble was difficult due to the topography, stucco was the best alternative because it could be worked on site, and the transportation of the ingredients of the plaster was relatively feasible since the materials could be divided into infinite light cargoes. A marble column, colonnette or panel could not be transported so easily especially in mountainous areas such as those around Arta and Ioannina.⁷⁹⁸ This does not mean that it was impossible, but that the cost involved in transportation was definitively higher than in other places; indeed, the *protostrator* Theodore Tzimiskés and his family managed to deliver two big columns (and probably the mullions) to Boulgareli, which must have taken considerable effort.⁷⁹⁹

To evaluate the cost of stucco we should also take into account the cost involved in crafting the material, which is the wage of the artisans. As we have seen in chapter 2, in most cases stucco was worked not by a specialist but by someone who belonged to the crew of either the sculptors or the painters. It is not possible to say whether the crafting of stucco by a painter or a sculptor was cheaper since there is almost no information about the wages of the painters

⁷⁹⁸ For transportation of columns see Adam 2018, 29-31.

⁷⁹⁹ On the columns see Orlandos 1927, 168-169; Papadopoulou 2008, 329. If the columns were transported from Arta to Boulgareli (probably re-used from an ancient building), the workforce managed to move them through a considerable difference of altitude: Arta is 30m elevation while Boulgareli is 511m. However, if they were using fluvial routes, the Kalentines (a tributary of the Korphito and then Arachtos river) would have landed them at the foot of Boulgareli.

active in decorating buildings.⁸⁰⁰ What seems possible to me is that the working of stucco by someone who was already doing other parts of the decoration may help in cutting the cost, because artisans were usually paid per day, and the salary sometimes included meals.⁸⁰¹ In fact, since the number of elements made of stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine churches is often small, the time which an artisan would devote to them would not have required too many extra days of work; artisans could just fit the working of the stuccoes into their daily work and be paid only some days extra. For example, if we consider a proskynetarion frame, the plasterers in charge of the lower layers of the wall paintings could have laid out the preparation of the proskynetarion too. Then, the upper layers of the stucco were carved by one of the sculptors, while the other members of the carving workshop were mounting the templon. The plasterer and the sculptor would have been on site anyway, maybe a day less if they had not had to work the stucco piece. On the contrary, if the person responsible for the stucco was a specialist s/he would have needed one day for laying out the preparatory layer and, at least one day to carve/model it, and another one to paint it. This is a rough approximative count, but it gives us a glimpse into the possible savings made by using already present artisans instead of calling in a specialist to prepare the stucco relief.

This is particularly true for small buildings where the amount of stucco produced would not have involved too many days of work for an artisan, and therefore a painter, plasterer or a sculptor could have made them during one of their days of work.

⁸⁰⁰ Cutler 2002, 556, 562-564.

⁸⁰¹ Cutler suggested that painters active in buildings were paid per day, Cutler 2002, 564. On the salary of stucco workers see, Diocletian, *Edicum de pretiis*, VII, 30-31; on sculptors' and masons' contracts which shows that they were paid per day, see the Epigraph of Sardis (401) in Di Branco 2000. The Life of St Symeon Stylite the Younger (521-592) mentions some stonemasons who could not work (and be paid) because they were injured, *Life of St. Symeon*, vol. 1, 159 (180); vol. 2, 185 (180); *Vita S. Symeonis*, 378 (F), 379 (198); a summary of working conditions of masons and sculptors is in Bouras 2002, for daily wages in part. 541. A list of wages including those of stone cutters, sculptors, and carpenters is in Morrisson, Cheynet 2002, 864-867. Finally, the mention of the *gyrsarius* in the archives of Dubrovnik (1383) includes an annual salary which includes both payment in coins and in *modis*; this way of managing salaries is similar to Venetian documents and it is difficult to say if Byzantium used a similar system at this period, *Odluke veća Dubrovačke republike*, 331-332, 378.

The use of stucco has some economic implications; however, this was not the only reason it was used. Indeed, other cultural and practical reasons are basic aspects of the use of stucco and the shapes that it takes.

The use of stucco decorations is a legacy of Roman and Late Antique architecture. This is particularly evident in cornices used to mark the transition between the straight and curved surfaces of the wall.⁸⁰² The use of stucco corbels, string-course, and dome cornices in the katholikon of Hosios Loukas (fig. 4.6), not only answers the need to save square metres of marble, but also reproduces aesthetic choices which find parallels with Late Antique buildings, such as the Archbishop chapel in Ravenna (494-518) (fig. 4.8) and Hagia Sophia in Constantinople (fig. 4.7).⁸⁰³ It also conforms to the indications for the decoration of public buildings provided by Vitruvius in *De Architectura* (35-25 BCE), where he suggested making the cornices out of stucco or wood and not too thick, otherwise, if they fell, they would have been dangerous for the population.⁸⁰⁴ The use of arches and architectural partitions to decorate the upper part of windows of the katholikon of Vatopedi maybe testify to a look back to earlier solutions, maybe something similar to the Baptistry of the Orthodox in Ravenna (fig. 4.9).

The continuation of Imperial and Late Antique tradition may also explain the use of stucco in the Middle Byzantine period for decorating the interior of private houses with ‘human forms’ possibly next to painted images of cupids which are condemned by Balsamon as they ‘satisfy carnal desires’.⁸⁰⁵ This condemnation appears to be against the ‘pagan’ theme of such decorations, a kind of decoration which reminds us of the fourth-century stuccoes in the so-

⁸⁰² See chapter 1. This also always marks also the passage from the dado covered with marble revetment and mosaics on the arches, spandrels and domes.

⁸⁰³ On the Archbishop chapel’s stucco, see Pasquini 2002, 38-39.

⁸⁰⁴ Maggi 2002, 15-17. Vitruvius also recommended putting stucco or wooden cornices at the mid-height of the interior walls of public buildings in order to facilitate the acoustics, because it was thought that the cornice would have prevented the dispersion of sounds in vast and high ceilings. However, it is yet to be confirmed whether Middle and Late Byzantine people still used cornices for these purposes. Vitruvius, *De Architectura*, V, 2.2. English translation in Morgan 1914.

⁸⁰⁵ See chapter 1.4 for a discussion about this passage.

called huillerie at Salamis-Konstantia in Cyprus (fig. 1.11), and those from Kalavassos-Sirmata (fig. 4.2).

The use of stucco may have been consciously chosen to contribute to the visitor's amazement at the continuous cross-reference of different materials in a building, as we noted in chapter 1. The use of one material to refer to another is also well known in sculpture. Sodini underlined the close ties between liturgical furnishings that were encrusted marble (e.g. *opus sectile* and incrustation with mastic) and the enamels, by suggesting that in the Middle Byzantine period, in particular under the dynasty of the Macedonians, there was a desire to make liturgical furnishings appear as if they were made of gold and precious stones. The technique of the 'marbre enstartz' (encrustation) allowed artisans to reach almost identical results with a more affordable material.⁸⁰⁶ I believe that the Byzantine people experienced this ambiguous space and sometimes even appreciated the different materialities.⁸⁰⁷ Recently, Eunice Maguire pointed to the imitative aspects of composite-basket capitals, which replicated the shape of baskets produced in Late Antiquity.⁸⁰⁸ So, there was not only an imitation of rich materials through the use of poorer materials, but also the opposite happened. This is the ambiguous, playful aspect of the interior decoration of Byzantine buildings where stucco found one of its cultural values.

Finally, the use of stucco can also begin as a necessity, but then become charged with further values. This is, I believe, a possibility, even if impossible to demonstrate, for the use of stucco in Late Byzantine Epiros, and especially in the Kato Panagia just outside Arta. As shown in chapter 3, all the churches with stucco templa are located in peripheral locations and are

⁸⁰⁶ Sodini 1995 and later Barsanti 2007.

⁸⁰⁷ The same can be said for architectural ceramics, and for the liturgical barriers made out of ceramics such as the one from Preslav and now at the Archaeological Museum of Sofia, and the fragments now between the Walters Arts Museum of Baltimore museum and the Louvre in Paris, see Totev 1999, 86-89; Gerstel, Lauffenburger 2001, 243-287.

⁸⁰⁸ E. D. Maguire, 2019.

foundations of aristocrats and local officers, with the exception of the Kato Panagia which was founded by the despot. No marble templon has been found for these churches, and generally their sculptural furnishing is limited to mullions, with the exception of the Kokkini Ekklesia where there are two columns. It seems difficult to imagine that the despot Michael II was running out of marble, since all the other foundations connected with the despots were equipped with marble sculptures. I believe that the use of stucco was more intentional. One reason for this is that it was a trend which had started around the middle of the thirteenth century and that it may well be that Michael II chose it because it was a novelty. During the reign of Nikephoros, the despot may have donated templa and other liturgical furnishings to peripheral foundations and employed the stucco workshop because the locations were not easily accessible. Another possibility is that liturgical furnishings made of stucco started to be produced in the peripheral areas and became a sign of the identity of these mountainous areas. Their adoption by Michael in the Kato Panagia may take advantage of this local tradition to cement his relationship with the mountainous areas, crucial for controlling of the borders of the state of Epiros.

4.4 Late Byzantine perception of Middle Byzantine stucco elements. Two case studies.

In order to understand stucco within Byzantine society, it is crucial to explore how the Byzantine people evaluated it. While marble was appreciated as such for its qualities, such as durability and shining colours, stucco almost never appear explicitly in Byzantine descriptions as 'stucco'. Indeed, in the *ekphrasis* of Hagia Sophia of Paul the Silentiary, the stucco cornices are described by their shape and their colour (gold).⁸⁰⁹ A similar, but not identical, mindset is

⁸⁰⁹ «[...] The twining vine with shoots like golden ringlets winds its curving path and weaves a spiral chain of clusters. It projects gently forward so as to overshadow somewhat with its twisting wreaths the stone that is next to it. Such ornaments surround the beautiful church. [...]», English translation in Mango 1972, 86; Fobelli 2005, vv. 652-657. Hawkins suggested to match Paul's description with the stucco cornice that runs along the whole ground floor of the Church and which is above the marble revetment, Hawkins 1964, 131. This indication was

Agnellus Ravennatis (ninth century), who describes the stuccoes from the Late Antique churches of Ravenna as *gypsea metalla*; Agnellus mentions in this case both the material (gypsum) and the colour (gold).⁸¹⁰ The word ‘gypsum’ was also used by Greek authors of the Middle and the Late Byzantine periods. A passage in the Acts of the monastery of Iviron mentions a ‘gypsum column’ marking the boundaries of a property.⁸¹¹ It is possible that the document referred to either a column made of gypsum stone or of stucco; I believe that the latter is possible, because in the following descriptions of the same border, the column disappears, and the other markers (a big rock and a tree) remain.⁸¹² This was probably the sign of the perishability of the material. If this interpretation is correct, it testifies that sometimes people perceived stucco decorations as different from stone ones and that their re-used also encompassed utilitarian aspects.⁸¹³

Apart from these few mentions, the general silence on stucco in Byzantine descriptions of buildings may show the criteria for which a material was appreciated: the shape, the colour and its ability to reflect the light. These features can be proper of both marble and stucco, since studies have demonstrated that gold leaves as well as pigments were applied on marble sculptures from the Early to the Late Byzantine periods.⁸¹⁴ Stucco was gilded and covered with

examined in more detail by recent studies on Hagia Sophia that have convincingly argued that the Justinian church had stucco decoration, see Fobelli 2005; Guiglia, Barsanti 2012, 191-201; Barsanti, Guiglia 2014, 271-284.

⁸¹⁰ Agnellus Ravennatis, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis*, 200, ll. 406-407.

⁸¹¹ The property is the *proasteion* of Bolbos which in 979-80 became property of the monastery of Iviron. The testament of the *protospatharios* Demetrios Pteleotes (written before 959) mentions the boundaries of the property, among them there is a ‘gypsum column’ « [...] (καὶ) διαχωρίζει ὁ ῥάχων μέχρι τοῦ Ρουσαίου ἐν ᾧ ἵσταται γύψι[ν]ον κίονιν » which can be translated as ‘[...] (and) the ridge separates until the (proasteion) of Rousiou, here stands a gypsum column’, *Actes Iviron* I: 171-172, ll. 48-59, esp. l. 49.

⁸¹² The column does not appear in subsequent documents concerned with the boundaries of the same property (Act of the censor Andronikos of 1047, chrysobull of Nikephoros III Botaneiates of 1079, *praktikon* signed by Gregory Xeros of 1090-1094, *praktikon* of John Komnenos of 1104); moreover, in the following two centuries, this part of the border did not change considerably, because the *proasteion* of Bolbos expanded to the South-West, see Lefort 1982, 39-41; Smyrlis 2006, 47-48, 130-131. Therefore, it is possible that the column was destroyed or removed. On the gypsum column see Vanni 2016, 34-38.

⁸¹³ These few passages do not mirror the material evidence, and therefore they are not the most suitable tool with which to spot unknown stucco artefacts.

⁸¹⁴ Pedone 2018; Pedone 2016; Barsanti 2016.

pigments too.⁸¹⁵ However, while for marble and stone authors often attach the label λιθιν-ος,η,ο, εκ λίθου/ (of stone) μαρμαριν-ος,η,ο (of marble), they did not do the same for stucco, aside from the few exceptions already discussed.⁸¹⁶ It is known that marble was a preferred material for architecture, as its widespread use testifies. The reason why stucco artefacts were not described by underlying their materiality may be due to the fact that stucco lacks a quality which marble has: durability. Indeed, marble and stone are the media for inscriptions and tombs; through marble and stone, the individual marked her/his presence and passed on to posterity. The absence then of descriptions of decorations and sculptures labelled as made of stucco is not the sign of the absence of stucco from Byzantine architecture, since the material evidence says the contrary, but instead shows that stucco was appreciated for the artisan's skills. The already mentioned *ekphrasis* of Hagia Sophia of Paul the Silentiary, the only case in which a stucco decoration was matched with a literary description, is therefore instructive. In his work, Paul is very specific about the provenance of all the marbles, but he describes the stucco cornice for its beautiful shape and because it is gilded.⁸¹⁷

The appreciation of objects because they were made by skilled artisans may explain the preservation of stucco elements during Late Byzantine decorative campaigns of Middle-Byzantine buildings on Mount Athos. The renovations of the Protaton church in Karyes and the katholikon of the Vatopedi monastery between the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth centuries demonstrate that stucco was a material worthy of being preserved. Both buildings were Middle Byzantine foundations which received a new pictorial programme during the reign of the emperor Andronikos II Palaiologos (1282-1328).

⁸¹⁵ This has already been discussed in chapter 1 and 2.

⁸¹⁶ The adjective recorded are: γυψιν-ος,η,ο (of gypsum), κονιαματ-ος,η,ο (of stucco/plaster/mortar), γυψινοκονιάματ-ος, η, ο (of gypsum-plaster/stucco).

⁸¹⁷ Paulus Silentiarius, *Descriptio Sanctae Sophiae*, 652-657, English translation in Mango 1972, 86.

The Protaton church was heavily restored at the end of the thirteenth century. Tradition says that it was set on fire by the Unionists of the emperor of Michael VIII Palaiologos and then it was entirely rebuilt by the *phylomonachos* Andronikos II Palaiologos who re-established Orthodoxy there.⁸¹⁸ However, the building still preserves the previous phases of the tenth century, while only some minor changes have been dated to the end of the thirteenth century. Mylonas suggested that these repairs happened after the Catalan period on Mount Athos (1307-1309).⁸¹⁹ In any case, the wall paintings of most of the interior surface of the church, including the proskynetaria images on the eastern pillars (figs. 4.10-4.11), were updated. This new painted decoration covers the upper interior surface with narrative scenes, and the lower part with standing figures. The painters and the person responsible for the organization of the new decoration decided to spare the frames of the proskynetaria made of stucco.⁸²⁰ The sacred image changed but the frame remained. The chronology of the frames (ca tenth century) (cat. No. 9) has already been discussed in chapter 1; it is clear by looking at the Late Byzantine paintings that the painters adapted them to the pre-existent frame (fig. 4.11). Why did they keep the stucco frames rather than re-make them? An explanation, which cannot be demonstrated, is that the monks wanted to keep them in place, since they belonged to the older phases. Another answer is that the painters were not able to substitute the stucco frames with new ones, because nobody in the workshop was able to mould and model stucco. The painters are the only people who could have substituted them since no new sculptures were made during this decorative campaign. So, who made the Late Byzantine wall paintings in the Protaton church? The Russian traveller Barskij attributed them to the legendary painter Manuel Panselinos, already considered a point of reference for painters by Dyonisus of Fourni in his eighteenth-century painter's

⁸¹⁸ Mylonas 1979, 152.

⁸¹⁹ Mylonas 1979, 152.

⁸²⁰ Pazaras 2001a, 59-61.

manual.⁸²¹ The actual existence of this painter is still debated,⁸²² but the paintings both in fresco and *a secco* techniques on a lime-based plaster, are dated between the end of the thirteenth century and the beginning of the fourteenth.⁸²³ Acheimastou-Potamianou dated the paintings to one of the patriarchates of Athanasios I (1289-93, 1305-10), due to the close stylistic similarities with the paintings in Sv. Kliment in Ohrid (1295) and the chapel of H. Euthymios in H. Demetrios in Thessaloniki (1302-1303), which allows us to frame them in this period.⁸²⁴ The workshop active in the Protaton belonged to the cultural *milieu* of Thessaloniki, which was not in any way peripheral. Indeed, the crossing of patrons and paintings with stylistic and iconographic similarities showed a network of personalities who were also active in Constantinople and the Serbian lands of king Milutin I; Milutin chose ‘Thessaloniki painters’ for his foundations.⁸²⁵

The second case of the preservation of stucco elements in the Late Byzantine period is located in the katholikon of the monastery of Vatopedi (ca 15km away from Karyes). Here, as we have seen earlier, there are stucco decorations dated to the eleventh century (cat. No. 10) which today lie side-by-side with paintings dated between the end of the thirteenth and the beginning of the fourteenth century.⁸²⁶ A similar situation is evidenced at the Protaton church. The relationship between the Late Byzantine paintings and the plaster reliefs is mainly visible in the area of the *choroi*. Here, some of the stucco colonnettes were removed to provide extra space for the narrative scenes (figs. 4.12-4.13). The Late Byzantine painters struggled to adapt

⁸²¹ Barskij 1887, 171.

⁸²² On the wall paintings and debate about the historical reality of Manuel Panselinos there are a lot of publications, I signal here Xyngopoulos 1964; Acheimastou-Potamianou 1994, p. 26, 236; the volume *Manuel Panselinos and his age* 1999; Tsigaridas 2003, esp. 24; Milliner 2012; the volume of Tsolakis 2015.

⁸²³ For the analysis of the technique and the pigments used see Daniila *et al.* 2000; Daniila *et al.* 2007.

⁸²⁴ Acheimastou-Potamianou 1994, p. 26, 236. It has recently argued an imperial patronage by Vasilakeris 2013.

⁸²⁵ Xyngopoulos 1956, 55-57; Milović-Peppek 1967, 54-59; Todić 1987; Vepheiades 2019.

⁸²⁶ On the paintings see Ioustinos 1983; Tsigaridas 1998, 234-279; Vepheiades 2019. The katholikon also has other paintings dated to the twelfth century, but they are not located in areas with stucco decoration, see Tsigaridas 1998, 220-234.

the scenes to the surface outlined by the Middle Byzantine plaster frames. This was not an ideal surface for the display of the narrative scenes which, by the Late Byzantine period, become crowded and set against elaborate architectural backgrounds and natural landscapes, and required a continuous and regular surface. This was not a peculiarity of the workshop active in Vatopedi. *Équipes* of artisans using similar pictorial conventions to those in Vatopedi, such as the one active in the Peribleptos (now Sv. Kliment) in Ohrid (1294-95),⁸²⁷ and the chapel of H. Euthymios in H. Demetrios in Thessaloniki (1302-1303),⁸²⁸ divided the interior surface into rectangular panels. They did not have to deal with walls crossed by stucco arches or vertical sculptural elements, with the exception of horizontal string-course cornices which do not clash with the painted grid of vertical and horizontal red lines of the panels of the narrative scenes. This may show that the painters of Vatopedi were not used to working on a wall already divided into irregular sections.⁸²⁹ This observation also shows that such workshops did not have anyone able to make stucco cornices or that they did not interact with anyone who was making stucco elements at the time of the decoration of these buildings.

The reason for the maintenance of the stucco frames in the Protaton and in the katholikon of Vatopedi may be the presence of the plaster reliefs since the eleventh century, a feature in common with the katholikon of Ivron. In Ivron, the image of the Virgin which is today framed by the stucco above the main entrance is dated to the eighteenth century, and it is possible to imagine that this spot was filled with another image in the eleventh century too, as discussed in chapter 3.⁸³⁰ Again, the sacred image changes, the stucco stays.

⁸²⁷ On the paintings of the church see Marković 2011; Djurić 1976, 22-25.

⁸²⁸ On the paintings of the parekklesion of H. Euthymios see Gouma-Peterson 1976, 168-183; Gouma-Peterson 1991, 111-159; Kourkoutidou-Nikolaou, Tourta 1997, 170-172; Bakirtzis 1998, 71-77; Tsigaridas 2008; Bauer 2013, 426-432.

⁸²⁹ Or that, at least, they did not have any model to adapt to the architectural shapes of the *choroi* of Vatopedi.

⁸³⁰ Martin-Hisard 2006, 138 n. 1445.

The reason behind the choice of keeping the stuccoes, even in a decoration which could have better functioned without them, is perhaps the desire to preserve a traditional aspect, which connected three of the four most ancient Athonite foundations. If this is the case, the simple act of preserving the stucco frames and adjusting the painted decoration around them is comparable to the attitude towards something ‘permanent’ and not easily movable, such as sculpture. Buildings could have their wall paintings re-made in different times, but usually the templon, the proskynetaria frames, and the mullions were not replaced so easily, due to the cost which involved their removal and the making of new ones. Stucco is actually easily removable and not too expensive to work. I believe that one possible reason for its preservation on Athos was the appreciation of the stucco frames connected to the history of the buildings, and the absence of artisans able to make better ones in the Late Byzantine period. A similar, but later example is the re-use of two Late Byzantine posts made of stucco into the post-Byzantine masonry of the church of the Dormition of Lyggos, in Epiros (figs. 4.14-4.15). Usually, this happens with marble and stone pieces. The plaster of the posts is hard, but it is not as strong as marble, and still the posts were re-used in the masonry as *spolia*. Their re-use can probably be explained by the prestige of this Medieval piece which was perceived worthy to be displayed on the main façade of the church.

4.5 Conclusion

A tangle of economic and cultural values lay behind the use of stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine buildings. The actual cost of the material was not the only reason for its use. If we look at the price of the raw material and its transportation costs, a block of marble was definitively more expensive than gypsum powder (already fired and ready to use). In two cases (Cyprus and Epiros), the local absence of marble and the abundance of gypsum encouraged the

development of three-dimensional stucco reliefs. However, these examples cannot provide a model for the use of stucco in the entire Byzantine world. Indeed, the rest of the known stucco reliefs for the other regions is bidimensional and in some cases they were used following Late Antique aesthetic conventions. For these latter cases, it is more difficult to say whether stucco was used for cultural or economic reasons; attempting to do so would be like trying to solve the old riddle “which came first, the chicken or the egg”?

As we have also seen in the previous chapter, the patrons who chose plaster reliefs are often members of, at least, the high aristocracy. Is there a contradiction with the economic value of stucco? No. Stucco could be used for expressing a local identity, for continuing (consciously and unconsciously) previous traditions, for creating a multisensorial experience, or simply for its plastic values which allowed for great and rich decoration in a small amount of time.

Economic reasons behind the use of stucco also should be contextualised. ‘Saving’ is an action common to both poor and rich people, sometimes even in opposition with the values of society. This can be understood with an example from a later chronological period: Lorenzo Ottoni (1648-1736), one of the most famous sculptors of Late-Baroque Rome who obtained commissions from both popes and the aristocracy for sculptures made of marble but also stucco. The payments which Ottoni received for stucco sculptures were always circa one-third of the price reserved for marble ones – this cost did not involve the cost of the material but only the work of the artist.⁸³¹ The difference in price can be connected to the amount of days necessary to make the sculptures, but also to the ambivalent reputation which stucco had even in the Late-Baroque period.

⁸³¹ An example is the payments made for the chapel of S. Cecilia in S. Carlo ai Catinari in Rome, see Ferraris 1991, 216-224. I thank Vittoria Brunetti, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, for showing me the unpublished contracts of Lorenzo Ottoni; a discussion on them is in the forthcoming PhD thesis of Vittoria Brunetti, *Lorenzo Ottoni and the roman sculpture between XVII and XVIII century*, Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa.

In Byzantium, we do not know whether stucco was considered a 'cheap' material or not. What is clear is that its malleability granted it the appreciation of the public for the shapes that the artisan could give it, and sometimes was preserved because artisans were perhaps not able to make them anymore. Its use also had some economic implications in helping saving marble which, in some areas, was not so easily available as in the Late Antique past or was too expensive.

5. STUCCO PRODUCTION IN THE MEDITERRANEAN (ca 850- ca1450):

AN OVERVIEW AND A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

5.1 Introduction

Previous chapters of this thesis focussed on understanding and defining what Byzantine stucco was, through identification of the types of architectural decorations and decorative patterns, technique aspects (ingredients used in stucco mixtures, working techniques), the makers, the patrons, and by exploring the economic implications in using stucco (wages, extraction, geology). This chapter grounds on these analyses and expands the horizon on the Mediterranean stucco production. How did Byzantine stucco relate to its use made by contemporary societies? What were the main differences, what the common traits? Since stucco is widespread in Islamic art, it is tempting to look for contacts between Byzantium and its Muslim neighbours in stucco production; but how much can stucco tell us about these contacts?

To answer these questions, comparators were selected on the basis of geographical proximity to Byzantium, their contacts through commercial routes, and cultural exchanges visible also in other media. Stucco production from Italy was chosen as representative for the use of plaster reliefs in the west of Byzantium. The Italian peninsula and Sicily appear a very fertile grounds for comparisons because their stucco production differs from region to region showing connections with France, Germany and the Alps, as well as with North Africa and the Adriatic coast.⁸³² At the same time, Calabria and Apulia were until the eleventh century, even formally, under Byzantine rule, and followed Byzantine conventions in architecture and

⁸³² For general surveys on the use of stucco in Italy and its heterogenous production, see Gierlichs 1991; Pasquini 2002; Exner 2003; Nenci 2006; Corgnati 2010.

paintings, though in most cases it appears that such conventions were expressed in a local artistic language.⁸³³ The different dominions of the Italian peninsula entertained with Byzantium commercial relations, and the Adriatic Sea, in particular, was a real bridge between Byzantium and Western Mediterranean where ideas and people easily travelled.⁸³⁴

For the eastern and southern Mediterranean, it is impossible to choose only one comparator. This is mainly due to the state of studies of Islamic art on stucco which for Syria, Iraq, Palestine, Egypt, Tunisia, Libya, Algeria, and Morocco did not benefit from regional and micro-regional studies.⁸³⁵ Most of the studies generally seem to aim at framing the use of stucco in the ‘evolution’ of Islamic art, and at identifying transfers of ideas and techniques from Mesopotamia and Iran to the rest of the territories under Islamic rules.⁸³⁶ The role of Iran and Mesopotamia into Islamic art is evident and it is not my intention here to challenge this argument. However, this continuous ‘looking East’ for innovations and solutions makes it difficult to identify local and historical characters of every manifestation of stucco carving in different Islamic territories, as well as the identification of signs of contacts between the Islamic territories and Byzantium via stucco.⁸³⁷ Therefore, at this stage of knowledge, it is impossible

⁸³³ On the architecture of Calabria and Sicily, see the surveys of Tabanelli 2019; Venditti 1967.

⁸³⁴ The bibliography on this topic is potentially infinite. I signal here some contributions for the exchanges between Byzantium and Italy. One is the exportation of bronze doors from Constantinople to Venice, Rome, Montecassino, Salerno, Monte S. Angelo (Apulia) in the eleventh century, see Iacobini (ed.) 2009; For pilgrimage routes see recently Campobasso 2020; some territories today between Italy and Croatia were under the same dioceses in the Early Middle Ages, and the movement of people is also reflected in the artistic production. In particular on sculptural production see Tagliaferri 1981. On Salento, see Safran 2014. On political, economic and cultural connections, see the recent volume edited by Skoblar 2021.

⁸³⁵ For Iran it is different since there are studies on stucco due to the uninterrupted tradition in the use of stucco still today. However, most of them mainly analyse stucco in terms of local and foreign ‘influences’ and follow an evolutionary approach.

⁸³⁶ This is the case of the most famous handbook of Islamic art and architecture: Talbot Rice 1965, 33-35, 50-51, 80; Scerrato 1972, in part. 31-38; Creswell 1978; Creswell 1979; Ettinghausen *et alii* 2001, 56-61, 102-105, 137, 178, 186, 212, 286-288; Bloom 2007 where mentions to stucco is continuous throughout the text.

⁸³⁷ This is also the result of a lack of dialogue between scholars of Islamic art, Byzantinists and Medievalists. One example is the case study of the stuccoes from a palace of Sabra al-Masuriyya (tenth century) where the authors did not find any comparators in Islamic art for the display of carved eagles nor in Byzantium, while it is known that the northern church of Constantine Lips had a full display of marble eagles, Barrucand, Rammah. 2009. See paragraph 5.2 for a discussion on the topic.

to choose one historical region among the Islamic territories on the Mediterranean which can work for us just as one comparator. Therefore, I chose different comparators depending on the chronological period trying to match them with geographical proximity. The comparators are Abbasid Syria and Iraq (Samarra), Seljuk and Ilkhanid Anatolia whose powers had constant relationship with Byzantium, Egypt and the historical region of Ifriqiya (Eastern Algeria, Tunisia, Western Lybia)⁸³⁸ for the Fatimid and the Ayyubid period (969-1250 ca), which was partially connected to the production in Syria and also of Sicily and possibly Byzantium (see later on the discussion about the *Mochroutas* palace), and finally Islamic Spain.

The most striking element which emerges from the comparison of Byzantine stucco with the rest of the Mediterranean is that outside Byzantium human figures and narrative scenes continued to be carved in stucco:⁸³⁹ they were part of the sculptural repertoire of the Middle Ages in Italy as well as in the rest of Europe, but also in visual culture of Fatimid Egypt, Zirid Tunisia, Seljuk Anatolia and Iran, where stucco was highly figurative since Antiquity. As far as we know, in Byzantium narrative scenes disappeared from stucco after the seventh century, at least in church contexts, though they were probably still used in private houses.⁸⁴⁰ The absence of findings from secular contexts definitively skews our current impression of Byzantine stucco. Human figures continued to be carved in stone and marble,⁸⁴¹ but they were not as ubiquitous as in architectural sculpture of Medieval Italy between the eleventh and the fifteenth centuries.⁸⁴²

⁸³⁸ For a definition of this historical region, see Dominique 2019.

⁸³⁹ It is important to bear in mind that the stuccoes from these areas come from secular contexts, while the others are all from religious context (mosques, madrasas) where Islamic art tended to be aniconic.

⁸⁴⁰ This is what tells us the surviving material evidence. As we noted in chapter 1.4, it is unfortunately a matter of speculation whether in Byzantium human figures continued to be carved for private purposes until, at least, the twelfth century, or whether the images which Balsamon referred to were similar to Seljuk reliefs but there is nothing which can confirm it.

⁸⁴¹ In the Middle and Late Byzantine periods, human figures appear more frequently on marble and stone plaques, epistyles, sometimes on arches and capitals, and rarely as small statues. For a recent discussion on the topic, see Vanderheyde 2020, 210-282.

⁸⁴² Grabar 1976, 13-31; Melvani 2013, 63-84.

Another difference between Byzantine, Western, and Islamic stuccoes is that in Byzantium stucco was used for architectural elements, while in the rest of the Mediterranean it could also cover entire walls (e.g. Civate, the mosque of Córdoba).⁸⁴³ The production of free-standing elements with stucco can be recorded both in Italy and in Byzantium.⁸⁴⁴ More ambiguous is the fabrication of the liturgical furnishings in Calabria which was attributed to Muslim artisans.⁸⁴⁵ The production processes are somehow similar to those recorded in the rest of Italy and later in Epiros. However, I do not know of any other (published) comparators in Islamic art with the exception of window frames, and of the balustrades with incorporated posts between marble columns on the first floor of the Umayyad complex of Khirbat al-Mafjar.⁸⁴⁶

It has been noted that in Italy stucco production anticipated trends which became common in sculpture in the following decades; the plasticity of the material, which gave more freedom to artisans, explains such experimentalism. This has been noted by Peroni for both the stuccoes of Civate (eleventh century) which forerun trends later developed in Romanesque sculpture,⁸⁴⁷ and by Caskey for the late-eleventh-century stuccoes from Itàla in Sicily, which are among the first experiments in the creation of a new artistic language by the Normans soon after their conquest.⁸⁴⁸ The use of stucco for experimenting new solutions continued later, in the funerary monuments on the Amalfi coast made between the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth century, which were among the first examples of gothic funerary monuments in Southern Italy.⁸⁴⁹ Instead, the analysis of Fatimid art in Egypt by Bloom often considered the medium as an expression of local tradition and connected stucco to pre-Fatimid trends which

⁸⁴³ The case of Timios Stavros Monastery, even though is fragmentary, might provide for innovative use of the material compared to the other case studies.

⁸⁴⁴ Cabiale 2011b; Papadopoulou 2006; Di Gangi 1998; Di Gangi 1995.

⁸⁴⁵ See footnote no. 935 for bibliography on the question.

⁸⁴⁶ Hamilton 1959, in part. 241-figs 222-281.

⁸⁴⁷ Peroni 2006.

⁸⁴⁸ Caskey 2011.

⁸⁴⁹ Caskey 2008; on the patronage of stucco pulpits on the Amalfi coast also Marchionibus 2009.

continued, with few changes, until the twelfth century.⁸⁵⁰ However, his framework does not appear to explain satisfactorily the stuccoes in Sabra al-Masuriyya dated to the Zirid period (end of the tenth beginning of the eleventh century) (published after Bloom's book) which show a great variety of figurative stuccoes, eagles and animals.⁸⁵¹ Stucco was generically interpreted by the majority of scholars of Islamic art as a material 'typical' of Persia, and that from there the new trends generally arrived to the rest of the Islamic world. Therefore, it seems that stucco was a material which both expressed local craftsmanship, but it was also open to the experimentations coming from Persia.⁸⁵²

This chapter will proceed in sections organised chronologically. Each section contains a quick summary of the evidence for Byzantine stucco followed by a more detailed survey of the evidence from the Mediterranean comparators. These surveys heavily rely on the scholarship available on the topic and do not generally aim at challenging previous assumptions. The aim is to display the stucco production in the Mediterranean in order to situate Byzantium in the Mediterranean context.

Technique and production processes will not be fully investigated here. This is because the level of knowledge of stucco production in Byzantium, Italy and Islamic territories is deeply unbalanced due to trends in scholarship, as already discussed in chapter 2. Moreover, it would be impossible to make a comparative analysis without the main term, which is Byzantine stucco, for which the knowledge about the mixtures is only based on one study.⁸⁵³ Therefore, I

⁸⁵⁰ Bloom 2007.

⁸⁵¹ Barrucand, Rammah 2009.

⁸⁵² However, due to the widespread use of stucco in the entire Mediterranean, and in Byzantine art, as this thesis demonstrated, it would be useful in the future, if scholars of Islamic art would expand their range of comparisons to the Western Mediterranean and Byzantium in order to verify possible cross-cultural connections.

⁸⁵³ The study is the already mentioned Papadopoulou 2006.

will occasionally and inconsistently refer to technique processes, especially regarding the use of mouldings or ‘free-hand’ production, when the material allows it.

A warning to the reader about this chapter. Since most of the buildings cited here are very well-known by scholarship and benefitted from a wide range of publications, this chapter does not attempt at providing with a complete list of publications for each building mentioned. Some geographic areas go beyond my expertise and my training as art historian; therefore, on several occasions I simply quoted the most relevant publications or the most recent from which the reader can have an idea on the bibliography and state of studies on the subject.

5.2 Middle Byzantine stuccoes and their comparators (the ninth and tenth centuries).

Byzantium

As we saw in the first chapter, in the ninth and the tenth centuries stucco was used for a variety of architectural decorations: proskynetaria frames, a ciborium, friezes, panels, and possibly an arch.⁸⁵⁴ At least in Cyprus, the use of stucco for free-standing elements continued from Late Antiquity to at least at the end of the tenth- beginning of the eleventh century.⁸⁵⁵

The stuccoes produced between the ninth and the tenth centuries, or at least the few remains that we have, attest to the use of both traditional architectural typologies and decorative patterns and at the same time new ones. This is clear in the frieze from the room found in the area of the Boukoleon palace (cat. No. 1) which seems to have been planned reproducing ornaments *en pendant* with the architectural ceramics.⁸⁵⁶ The scheme of the decoration of the plaque of the Byzantine Maroneia also is pretty archaic (cat. No. 6).⁸⁵⁷ On the other hand, in the tenth century, there are cases which seem to be isolated and that may suggest for the

⁸⁵⁴ See chapter 1.

⁸⁵⁵ Stylianou, Stylianou 1997, 65; Rautman 2003, 46-47; Megaw 1974 80 no. 95.

⁸⁵⁶ See chapter 1. 8.

⁸⁵⁷ See chapter 1. 11.

developments that artisans were doing with stucco. The first is the ciborium from the church of H. Achilleios on the Small Lake of Prespa (cat. No. 8) which finds comparisons with iconography with stone ciboria produced on the Adriatic coast;⁸⁵⁸ at the same time, it differs from them because it is made of stucco. Another exception is the proskynetaria from the church of the Protaton on Mount Athos (cat. No. 9) which are the oldest surviving examples of proskynetaria together with those from the church of the Virgin of the monastery of Hosios Loukas.⁸⁵⁹ Finally, the relief from the Timios Stavros monastery in Cappadocia (cat. No. 5) is a difficult case due to its fragmentary condition and the poor state of the wall paintings to which it probably belongs; however, it should be framed into the Middle Byzantine period and around the tenth and the eleventh centuries.⁸⁶⁰

In the previous chapters we noted that all these cases show that the artisans who worked stucco looked at contemporary sculpture for their creation, but at the same time they may have set the foot forward for innovation. The difficult chronology of both sculpture and stucco for this period does not allow us to establish with certainty whether stucco or marble came first, for example, for proskynetaria frames. However, it is remarkable that the knotted columns of the proskynetarion of the Protaton are among the oldest knotted colonnettes in three-dimensions and not on illuminated manuscripts, to have survived. Therefore, for this first period, we may say that stucco and sculpture were in dialogue and that they had a two-way exchange. We cannot say that stucco was simply imitating sculpture.

⁸⁵⁸ See chapter 1. 9.

⁸⁵⁹ Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 107-109.

⁸⁶⁰ See chapters 1. 7, 3. 3.

Italy

Stuccoes made in the Italian peninsula between the ninth and the tenth centuries are more varied than Byzantine ones. There are architectural decorations such as ciboria, panels, colonnettes, arches and colonnettes, but also figurative reliefs.⁸⁶¹ The most striking difference with Byzantium is the continuous use of stucco for human figures which appeared both as isolated (e.g. tondos), and in architectural elements (e.g. ciboria, capitals).

Even though they are outside our chronological framework, it is important to refer to the stuccoes produced under the reign of the last Longobard king in Northern Italy, Desiderius: those from the church of S. Salvatore in Brescia (ca 750)⁸⁶² (fig. 5.1) and the so-called Tempietto Longobardo in Cividale del Friuli (ca 750) (fig. 5.2).⁸⁶³ Even though they stand out from the contemporary artistic production in Italy, they are crucial because they provide us with the background in the use of stucco in the Italian peninsula, a production whose language was deeply rooted in Late Antique visual culture connecting the Eastern and Western Mediterranean.⁸⁶⁴ This is clear from the close similarities between Cividale's and Brescia's stuccoes with those produced for the Umayyad palace of Khirbat al-Mafjar in Syria (705-715) (figs. 5.3-5.4).⁸⁶⁵ Scholars are still divided about the identity of the artisans. Some see a direct presence of Umayyad artisans in the two Langobard monuments, whilst others have noted that both Langobard and Umayyad experience born out of a common visual language which was

⁸⁶¹ It is also true that in Italy the material evidence survived is more abundant than in Byzantium. For a first census on stucco in Italy (even if with some inaccuracies), see Nenci 2006 and the map provided there. A survey on stucco in Italy in the Late Antique and Early Medieval period is Pasquini 2002.

⁸⁶² Recently on the chronology of the S. Salvatore at Brescia and the tempietto Longobardo at Cividale, see for Brescia Brogiolo, Antonelli 2014, 17-33, 44-87, in part. 77-78 for the 14C analysis of the reeds inside the stuccoes. The bibliography on the stuccoes of Brescia is wide. A first study on the stuccoes of Brescia is Peroni 1962. Later studies which narrowed the chronology of the stuccoes Peroni 2002; Gheroldi 2014. On glass bulbs in stuccoes, Dell'Acqua 2003b. On the chemical composition of the stuccoes of Brescia and Cividale, Casadio *et al.* 1996.

⁸⁶³ Torp 2006, 8-9; L'Orange 1979, 129; Torp 1977, 133-139; on the hypothesis of two phases in the Tempietto: Lusuardi-Siena 2002, 205-250.

⁸⁶⁴ Recently on the subject, Leal 2014; Vanni *forthcoming a*.

⁸⁶⁵ A common element is also the use of glass bulbs in stuccoes from Brescia, Cividale, Qasr al-Hayr West and Olevano sul Tusciano, see Dell'Acqua 2003b; Leal 2014, 239.

still alive in the newly conquered territories of Syria to the Eastern Roman Empire (Byzantium) by the Umayyad caliphs and Italy.⁸⁶⁶ This last one seems to me the most reasonable option.⁸⁶⁷ Indeed, Cividale is not too far from Ravenna, where in the eight centuries, several fifth and sixth-century buildings with stucco were visible, among them the Orthodox Baptistry.⁸⁶⁸

Moving to the ninth century we see that the newly conquered Carolingian northern Italy showed an incredible variety of stucco production in terms of decoration and iconographies used. The importance of stucco in Early Medieval art was well explained by the definition of ‘moulding’ given by Hrabanus Maurus (ca 780–856) in his work *De universo*, which was based on the Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*, and it is particularly important because it connected plasterworks with paintings: “moulding (on walls) is to create images out of gypsum and to tint them with colours”.⁸⁶⁹ Indeed, the stuccoes made between the eight and the tenth centuries always showed this deep interaction and dependence between stucco and wall paintings.⁸⁷⁰

This is particularly visible in the stuccoes produced in the Alps in the ninth century. The importance acquired by the Alpine arc as a link between the Carolingian central territories, Italy, and Eastern Europe stimulated the foundation and decoration of several churches which used stucco as their main material for decorations. The first phase of the church of the abbey of S. Benedetto at Malles (Bolzano) was decorated by a system of wall paintings and stucco elements: colonnettes, panels, cornices (figs. 5.5-5.7).⁸⁷¹ The stucco elements were worked by

⁸⁶⁶ On the hypothesis for a presence of Umayyad artisans in Cividale and Umayyad influences, see Strzygowski 1908; Åberg 1945, pp. 17-36, in part. 20-21, 36; Gioseffi 1974; Gaberscek 1977; Tavano 1990, 60-70; Vaj 2002. On the idea of a mediation through Byzantium and on a common visual language at this stage at the Early Middle Ages, Mor 1965; L’Orange 1974; Torp, L’Orange 1974; Mor 1986; Torp 1999; Torp 2006, pp. 16-20; Kiilerich 2010, p. 95.

⁸⁶⁷ This is what I also argued in Vanni, *forthcoming*.

⁸⁶⁸ For the use of stucco in the Early Byzantine period, see chapter 1.3.

⁸⁶⁹ Exner 2003, 655-657.

⁸⁷⁰ Exner 2003. On the interaction between paintings and stucco in the Carolingian period, Peroni 1986; Peroni 1994; Gierlichs 1991; Peroni 2002. In the last decade, studies on the stuccoes of Cividale and Brescia managed to reconstruct their original polychromy, see Kiilerich 2010; Chinellato 2014; Kiilerich 2020.

⁸⁷¹ Rasmø 1962; Peroni 1986; Peroni 2002; Northdurfter 2002.

the same people who did the paintings or by artisans working side by side them: this has been demonstrated by the discovery of the preparatory drawings in the plaster for both the stucco elements and for the paintings.⁸⁷² It is impossible to reconstruct the original relationship between the wall paintings and the two stucco busts of the Theotokos made for the abbey of Leno (near Brescia), now in the museum of S. Giulia in Brescia, (figs. 5.8-5.9). However, here the human figures were not part of an architectural element (as with the capitals in Malles), but they were the main subject, being icons made of stucco.⁸⁷³ The style of the figures in Malles and Leno is entirely different. While in Malles the human figure emerges from the capitals in rough proportions and finds comparison in the painting and sculpture of Northern Italy, France and Germany, in Leno the elongated figures and the big haloes recall the elegant figures painted in Castelseprio (near Varese),⁸⁷⁴ in the crypt of Benevento,⁸⁷⁵ and, partially, in the apse of the church of S. Ambrogio in Montecorvino Rovella (SA) (in the Southern Longobard territories).⁸⁷⁶ However, the stucco figures from Leno appear to be more slim and schematic.

A different kind of stucco production is recorded in Rome, under pope Paschal I (817-824) and Gregory IV (827-844), as can be appreciated in the crypts of the churches of S. Prassede and S. Marco (figs. 5.10-5.11).⁸⁷⁷ In both cases, stucco covers the flat stones of the roof with geometrical motifs made by using moulds. The motifs employed (triangles, flowers

⁸⁷² Rasmø 1962; Verzone 1941-42, 121-128, figs 1, 3; Verzone 1942, 119-121; Rasmø 1966, 189-202; Lorenzoni 1974, 63-65; Pasquini 2002, pp. 102-104. Spiral columns and system of cornices very similar to S. Benedetto at Malles were also found in the church of S. Pietro a Merano, in the same region, Corgnati 2010, 66-67.

⁸⁷³ The 14C analysis on the reeds used to attach the stucco to the wall allowed to date it between half eighth and the mid-ninth century; Pasquini narrowed this chronology to half ninth. Pasquini 2002, p. 100; on the results of the analysis see Tagliapietra 2006, pp. 197-202.

⁸⁷⁴ The bibliography on Castelseprio is wide. I signal here the latest volume on the monument which also re-examined the building and pictural phases of the church, Brogiolo *et al.* 2014;

⁸⁷⁵ On the wall paintings Parente 1993.

⁸⁷⁶ Peduto, Mauro 1990; Suatoni 2001; Dell'Acqua *et al.* 2017; Dell'Acqua *et al.* 2018; Mitchell *forthcoming*; Vanni *forthcoming* b.

⁸⁷⁷ On the stuccoes of S. Prassede, see Muñoz 1918; Baldracco 1941; Pani Ermini 1974, 132-133, pl. XXXIV; Pasquini 2002, 77-79. On the stuccoes of S. Marco, Hermanin 1932; Verzone 1941-42, 121-123, pl. XLIII figs 8-9; Krautheimer *et al.* 1962, II, 240-241, figs. 194-196; Cini 1976; Pasquini 2002 79-80.

etc.) find direct comparisons in those used in Malles, but in Rome no human figures were recorded.⁸⁷⁸ This may be due to the simple lack of survival of material evidence; however, in Rome and Byzantium we can record similar aesthetic choices which saw the selection of durable materials such as mosaics and marble sculptures as the preferred media to communicate theological positions and to mark the presence of individuals.⁸⁷⁹

The area around Rome shows interesting artefacts whose chronology has been established between the end of the eight and the end of the ninth centuries. They are the ciborium in the church of S. Giovanni in Agentella (Palombara Sabina) and the fragments found in the church of S. Erasmo in Formia (Latina).⁸⁸⁰ The ciborium's arches and pinnacle are made of stucco on a core (armature) made of reeds,⁸⁸¹ the capitals are made of stucco, while resting on marble columns (figs. 5.12, 5.15). An interlace pattern covers the entire surface of the ciborium and it changes slightly on each side (figs. 5.13-5.14); it was not made with moulds, but with pointed tools and spatulae, as the unfinished part shows (fig. 5.16). Acconci's study of the ciborium is the first which included the capitals in the evaluation of the ciborium, showing that the treatment of the leaves finds comparisons with Islamic art, but at the same time the interlace of the canopy recalls western examples such as the fragments from S. Erasmo at Formia, S. Benedetto at Malles, and insular manuscripts.⁸⁸² The fragments from S. Erasmo at Formia (Latina) were in part found during the excavations of the 1970s, and in part are still in

⁸⁷⁸ To the ninth century were also dated the restorations of some fifth-century stucco edicolae in the clerestory of the church of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome, see Pani Ermini 1974, 110, n. 52-53, pl. XXI; of a different opinion is Bonelli in Gandolfo 1976, 301-318.

⁸⁷⁹ One case among many is the mosaics commissioned by Paschal I. On this topic see Goodson 2010, in part. 81-103; Foletti, Giesser 2016; Dell'Acqua 2020, in part. 268-277.

⁸⁸⁰ The chronology proposed by scholars for the ciborium in Argentella goes from the seventh to the twelfth centuries. On the basis of the detailed analysis and on the striking comparison with S. Erasmo at Formia, I believe there is room to agree with Acconci for a chronology around the ninth century Acconci 1993. However, the church still awaits a stratigraphic study for the painting and physical and chemical analysis for the stucco. A recent analysis of Betti dates it to the second half of the eleventh century on the basis of the similarities of the capitals with those of the *tour-porche* of the abbey of Saint-Benoit-sur-Loire, Betti 2005, 165-179.

⁸⁸¹ This is what I could see during a visit in 2016.

⁸⁸² Acconci 1993.

situ. On the basis of the comparisons with other pieces of Early Medieval sculpture, Miele suggested a chronology between the end of the eighth and the ninth centuries (figs. 5.17-5.21).⁸⁸³ The technique employed for the relief is similar to the ciborium in Argentella: the surface, still wet, was carved with pointed tools and spatulae.⁸⁸⁴ To this group of stuccoes dated between the end of the eighth and the end of the ninth centuries there are also the two niches framed by stucco arches on colonnettes in the chapel B of the cave sanctuary of S. Olevano sul Tusciano (near Salerno) (figs. 5.22-5.24), in the territory controlled by the Longobards of Southern Italy (*Langobardia minor*).⁸⁸⁵ The sanctuary was a crucial religious and political spot on the way of the pilgrimage routes to the Holy Land and on the axis connecting centres dedicated to the cult of the Archangel Michael, among them, the famous Mount S. Angelo on the Gargano mountain (Apulia).⁸⁸⁶ The interlace motifs and the cross at the centre of one of the arches find comparisons with Langobard sculpture from Pavia (Northern Italy) dated to the mid eighth century, but also, I also pinpoint that the highly stylised flat leaves of the capitals were present in the stuccoes from S. Erasmo in Formia.⁸⁸⁷ Another aspect in common with the Langobard territories in Northern Italy (*Langobardia maior*) is the insertion of glass bulbs for decorative purposes in the stuccoes of Olevano, a feature not recorded anywhere else with the exception of Brescia, Cividale, and probably the Umayyad stuccoes from Qasr al-Hayr West (ca. 727).⁸⁸⁸

⁸⁸³ Miele 1998.

⁸⁸⁴ Miele 1998, 214-15.

⁸⁸⁵ Di Muro 2011a; Di Muro 2011b; Di Muro *et al.* 2003.

⁸⁸⁶ Di Muro 2011b, 32-40.

⁸⁸⁷ One of the capitals still has traces of an inscription which Di Muro interpreted as referring to a Longobard prince (fig. 5.24). This inscription, the presence of the archangel Michael on the coinage of the Longobards of Salerno, and increasing trade activities in Salerno between the mid-eighth and the beginning of the ninth century, led him to date the wall paintings and the stuccoes to this period, Di Muro 2011, pp. 32-44. While the historical background sounds fascinating and coherent, no serious stratigraphical analysis was carried out on the stucco elements, which I hope to do in the near future.

⁸⁸⁸ For glass bulbs in Brescia and at Qasr al-Hayr West, see Leal 2014, 239. For glass bulbs in chapel B of S. Olevano sul Tusciano, see Di Muro 2001, 112-116; Di Muro *et al.* 2003, 398.

The use of stucco in the ninth and the tenth centuries was not exclusive to Northern and Central Italy. Apulia also shows some few but precious remains, which testify to the continuous tradition in using stucco since Late Antiquity. The cases are the fragmentary friezes found during the excavation of the castle of Canne delle Battaglie (northern Apulia) (figs. 5.25-5.27),⁸⁸⁹ and those from the archaeological area of the church of S. Scolastica in Bari (fig. 5.28) dated before the tenth century by Bertelli due to the archaeological context in which they were found.⁸⁹⁰ They are decorated with motifs common to the Late Antique repertoire such as acanthus leaves, while using also interlaces which are a distinctive mark of Early Medieval sculpture in Italy.

The use of stucco in strategic areas of Italy is not an isolated phenomenon of eighth- and ninth-century Europe. In particular, Carolingian territories used stucco as one of their main material in crucial monuments, such as the oratory of Germigny-des-Prés founded by the abbot Theodulf (806) which incorporated Late Antique and Sassanian motifs,⁸⁹¹ and the church of St. Laurent in Grenoble which shares with Germigny-des-Prés the use of stucco to cover huge interior surfaces, which finds elements similar to both Sassanian examples but also the Alps.⁸⁹²

The mid-tenth century saw the renovation of the presbyterial area of the church of S. Ambrogio in Milan. On this occasion, the apsidal arch was covered with stucco vegetal motifs, with the symbols of the Evangelists, and probably the tondo with the bust of St Ambrose, later described by the poet Petrarch (figs. 5.32-5.33).⁸⁹³ The representation of a saint as a bust framed by a roundel made of stucco is not a novelty for ninth-century stucco production, since we can

⁸⁸⁹ Bertelli 2002, 229-231, pl. XXIII n. 223, 225-232.

⁸⁹⁰ Bertelli 2018, p. 499-500; Bertelli 2002, 162-163, pl. XLIV-XLV.

⁸⁹¹ For a summary on the bibliography of the stuccoes of Germigny-des-Prés, see Heber-Suffrin, Sapin 2004, 170-175.

⁸⁹² The stuccoes are now lost but they are known through nineteenth-century drawings, see Peroni 1962, 292-294; Hubert 1953, 327-334. The stuccoes were first dated to the sixth century Deschamps 1925, 6-98.

⁸⁹³ Pasquini 2002, 106-110.

find a parallel in the one representing St. Sola in the church of Solnhofen an der Altmühl where the homonymous saint was buried in 834 or 838.⁸⁹⁴ The use of making portraits with stucco had also an illustrious antecedent: the image of Charlemagne in his tomb in Aachen.⁸⁹⁵ But the most famous piece in S. Ambrogio is the stucco ciborium on porphyry columns with the representations of two male rulers and their wives, identified by most of the scholars as the emperor Otto I and Adelaide, and Otto II and Theophano (figs. 5.29-5.30).⁸⁹⁶ The ciborium does not find iconographic and typological comparisons with other known stucco ciboria, such as the one made for the church of H. Achilleios on the Small Lake of Prespa (cat. No. 8) by Samuel of Bulgaria nor with the one in S. Giovanni in Argentella near Rome. In the ciborium of S. Ambrogio, the figures are the main focus and are the centre of the political and ecclesiastical message that the entire renovation of the apse conveys. However, what the church of S. Ambrogio and H. Achilleios have in common is the choice of stucco by rulers for ciboria associated with relics. In the first case, the re-invention of the relics of St. Ambrose, the local saint, and, in the second, the appropriation of the relics of an important holy man, St. Achilleios.⁸⁹⁷ Both ciboria demonstrate that stucco was a material considered to be worthy to decorate crucial churches; it is more difficult to say whether the association of stucco with relics was casual or it had a specific connotation.⁸⁹⁸

Another possible aesthetic connection for the crowning of the pinnacle of the ciborium in S. Ambrogio is in the *peltae* crowning the later arcosolium in the katholikon of Iviron through the use of (eleventh century) (cat. No. 11.1).

⁸⁹⁴ De Francovich dated it between 819 (year of the foundation of the church) and 834-838, De Francovich 1955, 388.

⁸⁹⁵ Corgnati 2010, 71-72.

⁸⁹⁶ On the ciborium see Foletti 2016, 81-84; Peroni 1996, 25-36; D'Achille 1993, 718-735; Elbern 1990, 395-409; Little 1988, 82-101; Bertelli 1981; Peroni 1974, 59-119.

⁸⁹⁷ Recently on the re-invention of the relics of St. Ambrose, see Foletti 2018, in part. 181-222.

⁸⁹⁸ For example, if it was symbolically connected to stucco used in funerary commemorative monuments in the Late Antique period, in particular in the catacombs of Rome.

Finally, it is important to look at one detail of the ciborium which shows some iconographic and technical aspects common also to Northern Africa and Byzantium: the three-dimensional eagle grasping a fish which crowns one of the capitals (fig. 5.31). The conventions followed in the rendering of the eagle (in particular the wing with scales on the upper part interrupted by a middle edge with pearls and then long parallel plumes) is the same used for the marble eagles in the cornices of the North church of the monastery of Constantine Lips in Constantinople (907) (figs. 5.56-5.57)⁸⁹⁹ and in the ninth-tenth century stuccoes from Sabra al-Masuriyya (Tunisia) dated to the Zirid period (figs. 5.53-5.55).⁹⁰⁰ It is possible that all these three very geographically distant monuments used common prototypes, probably textiles (e.g. the textile from the reliquary of St. Simiárd and the one now at the National Museum of Denmark), since Fatimid sculpture produced in the tenth century shows a different way of rendering the plumes of wings and the chest.⁹⁰¹

Raqqa, Samarra and the 'Bevelled style' in Egypt and Northern Africa.

After 750, the Umayyad ruling family was overturned by the family of the Abbasids who took power and moved away from the older capital, Damascus, to Raqqa (Syria), then Baghdad, and in 836 to the newly constructed Samarra (Iraq).⁹⁰² Samarra is well-known for the extensive use of stucco for both caliphal, and aristocratic dwellings as well as in public buildings.⁹⁰³ The construction of Samarra started in 836 under the caliph al-Mu'tasim. It was built from scratch over a very extended area. It had to provide the caliph with a palace, spaces for the

⁸⁹⁹ Grabar 1963, 100-124, pl. XLVII-LVII; Macridy 1964, 254-258; Mango, Hawkins 1964, 300-301, fig. 1.

⁹⁰⁰ Barrucand, Rammah 2009.

⁹⁰¹ *The Glory of Byzantium* 1997, cat. no. 150, p. 226-227, fig. 149; Hedeager Krag 2010, 17-26. On Fatimid eagles, see Bloom 2007, 89-116.

⁹⁰² The caliph al-Mu'tadid (892-902) eventually came back to Baghdad.

⁹⁰³ The stuccoes of Samarra benefitted from significant scholarship which I do not aim to summarise here. I signal the pivotal publications on the topic. Herzfeld 1923; Creswell 1979, 277-288. On a re-evaluation of Herzfeld and Creswell scholarship, see Northedge 1991, 74-93. More recently Haase 2007; Gonnella 2013, 79-101.

administration of the state but also houses for the people and a considerable number of dwellings for the state administrative class in a very short amount of time. The interior wall decoration of these houses has as its principal element moulded stucco, which is usually divided by scholars into three styles (A, B, C or 3, 2, 1) (figs. 5.34-5.36).⁹⁰⁴ Among them, the third, also called ‘bevelled style’, was produced in an almost ‘industrial’ scale in panels made in formworks, mouldings and stamps combined together. Samarra also used marble extensively for the caliphal buildings, which shows the use of the bevelled style too.

Samarra is usually considered as a fixed point for the changes in stucco production through the three styles (in particular the ‘bevelled style’) and technique, which quickly spread from Iraq to Iran and Ifriqiya.⁹⁰⁵ The stuccoes from Samarra are crucial for their iconographic choices and their chemical composition which differ from the previous Umayyad examples.⁹⁰⁶ The first difference is that the human figure does not appear anymore (at least on stucco, not on paintings), while they were preponderant in Umayyad foundations; the second difference involves the ingredients used in the stucco mixtures: in Samarra the plaster is composed of almost pure gypsum, while Umayyad examples made use of both lime and gypsum.⁹⁰⁷ As noted by Lic, after Samarra there was a tendency of making stucco out of pure gypsum which was adopted also by Christian communities living under Islamic rule.⁹⁰⁸

⁹⁰⁴ Herzfeld 1923; Creswell 1979, 277-288. On the perception of the entire decorative apparatus of the stuccoes and the other sculptures from the caliphal palace of Samarra, see Saba 2015.

⁹⁰⁵ Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 57-59, 65-66, 78-79; on the use of Samarras style stuccoes in the church of Deir al-Surian at Wadi Natrun (Egypt) as a result of the presence of Iraqi monks, see Immerzeel 2008; other scholars are more cautious about it, Bloom, Blair 2009. However, we should use Samarra as a general indicator for the ninth century, since recent studies are demonstrating that some changes were already happening in Raqqa between 786 and 809 under the caliph Hārūn al-Rashīd, Daiber, Becker 2004; Corsi 2017.

⁹⁰⁶ This differentiation should not be seen as a drastic change in stucco technique. Indeed, Style A (or 3) stucco is still linked to aniconic Umayyad solutions both in iconography and in carving techniques. Herzfeld 1923; Creswell 1979, 277-288; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 57-59; Corsi 2017.

⁹⁰⁷ Burgio *et al.* 2007; Lòpez Borges 2014.

⁹⁰⁸ This has been verified for the area of the Gulf, Lic 2017. In general, the use of stucco by Christian communities seem to follow contemporary Islamic iconographies and styles, and not Byzantine ones. Some examples are the church of Deir al-Surian at Wadi Natrun in Egypt decorated with ‘Samarra style’ stuccoes marked only by crosses, see Immerzeel 2008. This freedom registered in stucco mirrors a similar attitude recorded also in other media, such as textiles and woodcarving, by Christian communities living under Islamic rule, as discussed by Thomas 1997.

This is particularly visible in Egypt in the Abbasid period under the Tulunids, in particular in the mosque of Ibn Tulun (Fustat, Cairo) (878/879) which displays an extensive stucco decoration on the arches and soffits, and colonnettes with carved capitals (figs. 5.39-42), which show close similarities with the decoration found in the Great Mosque of Samarra, some of whose architectural features (e.g. the minaret) can be observed in the Egyptian mosque too.⁹⁰⁹ The circulation of ‘Samarra models’ involved also the production of woodworks, as can be seen in the wooden doors with the motifs of the ‘bevelled style’ now in the museum of Islamic art in Istanbul and at the Metropolitan Museum in New York (fig. 5.37). The circulation of such models in Egypt generated local versions of the Abbasid language which was used also in Christian monuments, such as the church of al-‘Adra in Dayr al-Suriani (Wadi al-Natrun) in Egypt (913-14). In the church, the plasterwork shows traits common to contemporary Egyptian mosques and it only differs from them in the presence of crosses (fig. 5.43).⁹¹⁰ There is no Middle Byzantine comparator for the covering of half the wall with stucco. Such vast surfaces were usually covered with mosaics, wall paintings or marble revetments in Byzantium.

During the last three decades of the tenth century, the Fatimids founded several mosques in Cairo, their new capital. The mosque of al-Azhar (969-73) still preserves several fronts of the arches, squinches completely covered by a continuous palmette scroll, and bands of Kufic inscriptions with selected verses of the Quran (figs. 5.44-5.45).⁹¹¹ The appropriation and perpetuation of carving styles which originated from the Samarra prototypes is, again, echoed in the woodcarving of the doors of the mosque commissioned by al-Hakim in 1010 (fig. 5.38).⁹¹² Another mosque which probably had a very rich stucco decoration similar to al-Azhar is the mosque of the Qarafa (976) where the stucco carvings in the mihrab and the window

⁹⁰⁹ Creswell 1979, 223-227; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 92-94.

⁹¹⁰ Immerzeel 2008, 59-74.

⁹¹¹ Bloom 2007, 59-65; Rabbat 1996.

⁹¹² David-Weill 1931, 16-18; Lamm 1935, 68-69; Yeomans 2006, 78; Bloom 2007, 63-65.

grills of the original qibla wall survive (fig. 5.46).⁹¹³ From the written sources, we also know that these stuccoes were flanked by wall paintings representing illusionistic muqarnas made by a painter from Bosra.⁹¹⁴ Finally, between the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century, the stuccoes from the al-Hakim mosque in Cairo were made.⁹¹⁵ Here the vegetal scrolls which covered the walls of al-Azhar and al-Qarafa disappeared and left place only to the floriated Kufic inscriptions which mark the pointed arches (fig. 5.47).

Apart from Samarra, some extra evidence on the use of stucco in secular contexts comes from the excavations of Sabra al-Mansuriyya, a city founded by the Fatimid caliph al-Mansur (946-53) near Kairwan (Tunisia).⁹¹⁶ The city, however, spent most of its short life (it was abandoned by the eleventh century) under the Zirid dynasty, which was ruling on behalf of the Fatimids but was almost independent. Most of the stuccoes were found near the south-western palace and were dated to the Zirid period.⁹¹⁷ There are three different styles of stucco decorations, which belonged to two phases dated between the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh century. The first phase stuccoes have aniconic decorations composed of a series of palmette scrolls on a blue-painted background.⁹¹⁸ The second phase consists of different interventions: a re-making of the first phase stuccoes by englobing the stems and leaves of the vegetal scroll in bulgy and protruding new scrolls; the creation of new vegetal decorations which finds comparisons with late-tenth century ivories produced in al-Andalus (fig. 5.48), and other patterns based on interlaced geometrical patterns (figs. 5.49-5.50);⁹¹⁹ the last group is probably the most interesting because it is composed of human figures with traces of golden

⁹¹³ Bloom 1987.

⁹¹⁴ Bloom 1987, 7; Bloom 2007, 62-63.

⁹¹⁵ Creswell 1978, 65-106, in part. 83-84; Bloom 1983; Bloom 2007, 72-81.

⁹¹⁶ Talbi 2012.

⁹¹⁷ Barrucand, Rammah 2009; Cressier, Rammah 2015; Cressier, Vallejo Triano 2015.

⁹¹⁸ Barrucand, Rammah 2009, 350-351.

⁹¹⁹ Barrucand, Rammah 2009, 351.

leaf, and animals such as hares, ibexes, quadrupeds, lions, a griffon, and twenty-one eagles, some with spread wings others with wings next to their bodies (figs. 5.51-5.55).⁹²⁰ Most of the images of human and animals were probably part of a composition representing pleasure scenes, such as hunting and playing music which was a popular theme in contemporary Fatimid ivories, woodworks, and ceramics.⁹²¹ The twenty-one eagles decorated a gallery which probably functioned as a representative room. Barrucand and Rammah noted that eagles were a theme present also in contemporary ceramic production;⁹²² however, the display of so many eagles in one place recalls those in the Nero Domus Aurea and in the Domus Tiberiana in Rome (both painted and made of stucco) which may suggest that whoever commissioned them in Sabra al-Mansuriyya knew such solutions probably through the mediation of Byzantium.⁹²³ The authors continued by saying that they did not encounter a similar display of eagles in Byzantium, yet.⁹²⁴ To this latter point I do not agree, because the church of the Theotokos by Constantine Lips in Constantinople displays a wide range of (marble) eagles (figs. 5.56-5.57).⁹²⁵

When we compare the use of stucco of the ninth and tenth centuries of Syria, Iraq, Egypt and Tunisia with Byzantium, we note that there are some differences and some common traits.

The first, most evident difference is the extensive use of stucco in Islamic buildings. Scholars explained the use of stucco with the widespread mud-brick building technique and rubble masonry.⁹²⁶ This technique allowed the construction of buildings and their rich interior decoration in a relatively short amount of time. Indeed, most of the cities built *ex-novo* by the

⁹²⁰ Barrucand, Rammah 2009, 351-352.

⁹²¹ Bloom 2007, 65-70, 89-115.

⁹²² Barrucand, Rammah 2009, 352.

⁹²³ Barrucand, Rammah 2009, 352.

⁹²⁴ Barrucand, Rammah 2009, 352.

⁹²⁵ On the sculpture in the church of Constantine Lips, see Grabar 1963, 100-124, pl. XLVII-LVII; Macridy 1964.

⁹²⁶ Clévenot, Degeorge 2000, 83-84; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 5, 54; Bloom, Blair 2009.

caliphs were mainly built in mud-bricks (e.g. Samarra, Sabra al-Masuriyya).⁹²⁷ The matching of stucco with brick architecture has also been interpreted as an inheritance from Persian-Sassanian architecture, which then passed into Islamic architecture.⁹²⁸ While in several cases, the use of stucco can be explained to the necessity to cover interior and exterior surfaces built in mud-brick, it is more difficult to justify the widespread use of stucco only as a Persian influence. Places such as Egypt, by the tenth century, had a local tradition of mud-brick and stucco; after all, mud-brick architecture was practiced there long before the advent of Islam.⁹²⁹ A good example is the church of Meryem Nazret in Addi Awona, Tigray (Ethiopia).⁹³⁰ This is probably the only church with stuccoes known in Ethiopia for the Medieval period.⁹³¹ The church was founded by Egyptians who moved there. The area of Tigray had a strong regional building technique in ashlar masonry, the Egyptians did not. So, they cut local stones in small and irregular pieces, to make the material familiar to their building practices: rubble masonry and mud-bricks.⁹³² The inside of the church was covered by a thick layer of plaster with mouldings, which differed from contemporary Ethiopian architecture where rock-cut and ashlar masonry churches had their interior decorated with carved geometric sculptures, which were not in stucco.⁹³³

⁹²⁷ Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 51-59. There is an exception which is Madinat al Zahra in Islamic Spain where bricks and stones were used in association with stucco decorations both in the interior and the exterior of buildings, see Cressier, Vallejo Triano 2015 for a comparative analysis between Sabra al-Masuriyya (Fatimid) and Madinat al-Zahra (Umayyad Spain).

⁹²⁸ Scerrato 1972, in part. 31-38; a more cautious position is in Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 7-8, 43-45, 51, 52, 54, 59, 60, 87, 156.

⁹²⁹ Lucas 1989, 48-50; Bloom 2007, 34, 37-40, 59-65, 72-81.

⁹³⁰ Muehlbauer 2020, 106-108; Derat *et al.* 2020.

⁹³¹ The excavation on the Islamic settlement of Harlaa (Ethiopia) also may point towards the importation of plaster reliefs from probably Egypt or Yemen, as noted in Insoll *et al.* 2021, 488-494, fig. 3D.

⁹³² Muehlbauer 2020; Derat *et al.* 2020.

⁹³³ On Ethiopian architecture and its relation to Byzantium see Ousterhout 2019, pp. 295-300; Muehlbauer 2020.

It also can be noted that wherever there was a strong ashlar-masonry building tradition, the use of stucco by the locals appeared to be occasional. This is the case of Anatolia where stucco is almost absent from the Byzantine period until the arrival of the Seljuks.⁹³⁴ However, even if the relationship between mud-brick architecture and stucco works for the cases already mentioned, it cannot be taken as a universal rule, since in Islamic Spain stucco was widespread as well as building techniques in ashlar-masonry and bricks.⁹³⁵

Al-Andalus

Since 751, much of the Iberian Peninsula was under Umayyad rule. The most famous buildings of this period with stucco are the Great Mosque of Córdoba and those in the caliphal city of Madina al-Zahra, just outside Córdoba.⁹³⁶ Here stucco was mainly used for the upper zones in buildings where the rest of the interior was covered with marble and mosaics, in a similar way as in Byzantium. Indeed, here marble continued to be used for pavements and dado, while mosaics and stucco appear on the upper portions of the walls. However, the major difference is the amount of space reserved to stucco and mosaics. While in Byzantium mosaics cover most of the available surface, in Umayyad Spain it is often the opposite. The use of the same materials in Umayyad Spain is probably due to its inheritance of the Late Antique building tradition, which was rooted both in Syria, origin of the Umayyad dynasty, and in Spain.⁹³⁷

The Great Mosque of Córdoba is a key building of the Islamic rule in al-Andalus. While scholars argued whether or not it sat above a pre-Islamic building, the current fabric tells us

⁹³⁴ Öney 1980, 173-174; Crane 1994; Ölçer 2005, 110; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 256-257.

⁹³⁵ Dodds (ed.) 1992 for an overview, and above footnote nos. 894, 905, 906.

⁹³⁶ These are not the only example of Umayyad architecture in Islamic Spain. For a survey on architecture in Islamic Spain, see the volume Robinson ed. 1992; a more update vision is Anderson, Rosser-Owen eds. 2007, 3-114.

⁹³⁷ On a summary on Umayyad architecture in Syria and Palestine and use of mosaics, see Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 15-29. On the ideological value of Umayyad Syria in Umayyad Spain, see Calvo Capilla 2010. On the use of mosaic in the architecture of Umayyad Spain, Calvo Capilla 2014, 88-96; Dodds 1992, 22.

about several phases which started with Abd al-Rahman (785/86-786/7) and continued until the fifteenth century when it was converted into a Christian cathedral.⁹³⁸ During the ninth and the tenth centuries, the rulers enlarged the building considerably and decorated it with an incredible variety of materials, which included carved stucco. Some aspects to bear in mind are the way in which stucco was used, in particular in regard to how the same technique was used in Byzantium. The first aspect is the use of stucco to cover the horse-shoe arches with alternating flat-red panels and carved ones simulating voussoirs. This is visible in the Puerta de San Esteban (Bāb al-Wuzarā) of the Great Mosque of Córdoba (fig. 5.59), built by Abd al-Rahman II in 855, and in the architecture of Madinat al-Zahra, especially in the so-called Salon Rico, built between 953/4-956/7 by the caliph Abd al-Rahman III.⁹³⁹ Coming back to the Mosque of Córdoba, it is important to note the development in the use of stucco in the following enlargement made by al-Hakam II (962-967) which involved the construction of a *maqsura*, of a second *mihrab*, and the extension of the *qibla* (fig. 5.58). In the *qibla*, stucco was used to frame the mosaic inscriptions, and to create polylobed arches on colonnettes just above the inscriptions; polylobed arches covered in stucco are replicated in monumental scale in the screen of the *maqsura* (fig. 5.60). Here, stucco is used for the bands of the arches, to fill the irregular spaces between the arches, the colonnettes and the epistyles, but also to cover the upper part of the wall. The stucco decoration of the *maqsura*, and in general of ninth and tenth century Andalusia, differed from the examples from Egypt, Syria, and Iraq because of the deep carving, sometimes for the decorative patterns, but also for the consistent use of flat bands to divide and organise the decoration.⁹⁴⁰ Such frames and bands were present also in Syria, Iraq

⁹³⁸ For a summary on the building and decorative phases of the Great Mosque of Córdoba, see Dodds 1992; Koury 1996; Calvo Capilla 2014, 51-58, 85-88, 569-571.

⁹³⁹ Vallejo Triano 1992; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 137-140, 170. On the relationship between stone and stucco carvings in Madinat al-Zahra, see Vallejo Triano 2007.

⁹⁴⁰ Dodds 1992, 16 fig. 6, 18-24 figs. 9-11; Vallejo Triano 1992, 33-39, figs. 4-6; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 90-91.

and Egypt but they were often carved (figs. 5.41-5.42, 5.45, 5.105, 5.107). In the Great Mosque of Córdoba, while stucco is used extensively, it is contained into the shape of frames and arches, a feature common also to Byzantine practices.

The city of Madinat al-Zahra provides us with the use of stucco in secular buildings, such as the caliphal palace but also with evidence from aristocratic dwellings.⁹⁴¹ One of the most iconic and well-preserved ambient of the caliphal palace is the so-called Salon Rico, built between 953/4 and 956/7 by Abd al-Rahman III.⁹⁴² Here, stucco was used for the middle and the upper zone: it continued to be contained within frames and arches but these elements are not multiplied to create a continuous surface which rises to the flat wooden ceiling (fig. 5.61).⁹⁴³ Marble was used too in the finely carved the dado, the columns and their capitals. Both marble and stucco were carved with vegetal motifs modelled on the theme of the tree-of-life. Each is indistinguishable from the other. The use of stucco for the upper part can be connected to both the lightness of the material (more suitable for upper zones) and also the possibility of a quick decoration. Indeed, while the caliph Abd al-Rahman had an ambitious project and considerable economic means, we need to bear in mind that stucco provided with a quick and beautiful decoration, which was particularly suitable for covering large surfaces.

Some other carvings of stucco arches show less rich and intricate decorations when compared with the caliphal palace (fig. 5.62).⁹⁴⁴ In one case it is possible to see the decoration of an arch with a palmette and half-palmette scroll which is framed by a thin flat band. If we look at the end of the pendentives, the style of the carving, as well as the half-palmettes and the flat band, recall the arch decoration in the church of the Timios Stavros monastery in

⁹⁴¹ Vallejo Triano 1992; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 137-140, 170.

⁹⁴² Vallejo Triano 2007.

⁹⁴³ Vallejo Triano 1992; Vallejo Triano 2007.

⁹⁴⁴ Talbot Rice 1965, 79-80.

Cappadocia (cat. No. 5).⁹⁴⁵ While it is impossible for me to argue for a direct contact between Cappadocia and Andalusia, it is possible to think of a common model.

The comparisons between the use of stucco in Islamic territories, in particular, Syria, Iraq, Egypt and Islamic Spain and Byzantium between the ninth and the tenth centuries allows us to make some observations which help in framing Byzantine stucco. The ninth century and the construction of Samarra (836) represented a turning point in stucco production in Islamic art. From this moment, the so-called Samarra styles spread from Iraq to Egypt together with changes in techniques which resulted in an increased use of pure gypsum. These changes affected also Christian communities living under Muslim rule, such as those in the Gulf area and in Egypt, which were formally connected to the patriarch of Jerusalem and in turn to Constantinople. While these people kept using Christian iconographies in their wall paintings, in stucco they created new solutions following stylistic trends and architectural conventions of Islamic art.⁹⁴⁶ The case of the church of Wadi al-Natrun is exemplary.⁹⁴⁷ This tells us that stucco was not perceived as the main medium to express Christians' visual connection with the Orthodox world, not even, perhaps, as representative of 'Byzantine' architecture, but it was a local medium, therefore subject to local trends.

In Constantinople, we do not know whether stucco worked in any of the 'Samarra' styles was used, though it may perhaps have appeared in the palace of Bryas built by the emperor Theophilos on the example of the caliphal palace in Baghdad.⁹⁴⁸ Whether or not this was the case, 'Samarra' styles had no lasting impact on Byzantine stucco practice.

⁹⁴⁵ Talbot Rice 1965, fig. 76.

⁹⁴⁶ Thomas 1997; Bolman, Lyster 2002.

⁹⁴⁷ See footnote 872. On the use of stucco by Christian communities of the area of the Gulf, see footnote 875.

⁹⁴⁸ This aspect will be developed in the conclusion of this chapter.

Despite the differences between Byzantine and Islamic stucco, it is possible to identify a common ground still in the tenth century. This is the use of decorating interiors of public buildings with a system of marble plaques (pavement and dado), stucco (frames and arches), and mosaic (conch of apses and upper zones), where stucco usually is the intermediary between marble and mosaics. This system belongs to Late Antique architecture, as we saw in chapter 1. Some of its traces can be spotted in the Great Mosque of Córdoba, before disappearing consistently in the Almohad period when stucco invaded the dado.⁹⁴⁹

5.3 Middle Byzantine stuccoes and its comparators (eleventh and twelfth centuries).

Byzantium

Stucco produced in Byzantium between the eleventh and the twelfth centuries is definitively more experimental than that in the previous and the following centuries. Typologies of architectural decorations include proskynetaria, tomb framing, doorframes, capitals, cornices, friezes, and probably panels.

What distinguish stuccoes from stone and marble sculpture is the accuracy of the carving and, in several cases, the will to experiment with richer compositions (the capitals in Feres, cat. No. 7, the arcosolium and the door frame in the katholikon in Iviron, cat. No. 11.2, and the proskynetarion in Nerezi cat. No. 28). When they are not directly innovative, stucco elements are clearly updated in iconography and style with the rest of the sculptural decoration (e.g. Hosios Loukas cat. No. 19).

⁹⁴⁹ The use of stucco in the dado was already recorded in the so-called Salon Rico of the palace of Madinat al-Zahra and in the architecture during the Taifa period. However, it is from the thirteenth century during the Almoravid and Almoad domination that stucco panels started to be used consistently in the dados in substitution of marble, see Ewert 1992; Dickie 1992.

Italy

The eleventh and the twelfth centuries were an experimental moment for stucco in Italy which in parts mirrored and anticipated trends in marble and stone sculpture.

In this period, several liturgical furnishings made of stucco (ciboria, ambos, barriers) were produced in different areas: Liguria, Southern Italy, and Abruzzo. In some cases, they were self-supporting structures, while in others the stucco was applied to a stone core. Human figures continued to be part of stucco sculptures both as isolated figures and in narrative scenes. Stucco in this period continued to be used by artisans for creating new solutions ahead of stone sculpture. Both the stuccoes from S. Pietro al Monte at Civate (Lombardy) and those from S. Pietro at Itàla (Sicily) anticipate trends which characterised, on the one hand, Romanesque sculpture of the following decades,⁹⁵⁰ and on the other hand, Norman visual culture in Southern Italy.⁹⁵¹

In Northern Italy in the eleventh century there was a strong, renewed interest in human figures which appeared often isolated and framed by simple friezes and colonnettes, but they were also inserted in architectural elements such as capitals. Some examples of isolated figures are the surviving fragments from the church of S. Maria Maggiore at Lomello (fig. 5.63), which suggest that the military figures in high relief were framed by vertical and horizontal bands of geometric and vegetal motifs.⁹⁵² The same is true for the panel, now lost, from S. Caprasio at Aulla where the image of the abbot was flanked by vertical bands (fig. 5.64),⁹⁵³ and of the images today re-used in the altar of the church of Vigolo Marchese (fig. 5.65).⁹⁵⁴

⁹⁵⁰ Peroni 2006.

⁹⁵¹ Caskey 2011.

⁹⁵² Pasquini 2002, 112; Lomartire 2006; Palazzo 2014.

⁹⁵³ Arslan *et al.* 2006, 192-196.

⁹⁵⁴ Arslan *et al.* 2006, 193.

The most famous example in eleventh century northern Italy is the basilica of S. Pietro al Monte above Civate whose chronology is usually fixed around 1097, the year of the burial of the archbishop of Milan Arnolfus II.⁹⁵⁵ The peculiar architecture with an apse in façade and the semi-circular atrium, displays on the inside a triumph of stucco.⁹⁵⁶ The first noteworthy aspect is the ciborium (fig. 5.69) which has as a model the ciborium in S. Ambrogio in Milan (fig. 5.29), but in Civate the figures acquires features which will be characteristic of Romanesque sculpture in the following decades, such as the increased volume of the figures and their dramatic expression.⁹⁵⁷ In S. Pietro al Monte, stucco also marks the three arches of the internal façade with fleshy acanthus leaves, which, like an embroidery, frame the wall paintings with the scene of the Apocalypse (fig. 5.71). In this area, the only figurative element in stucco is the Lamb which completes the iconography of the wall paintings and demonstrates that the two media were not only part of the same decorative campaign, but there was a deep symbolic interaction between the two. The use of stucco in the church continues with self-supporting panels dividing the nave from the access to the crypt. They are decorated with gryphons and other animals on intricate vegetal background (fig. 5.70). The lower crypt is completely covered with stucco: all the capitals (on a stone core), the scenes of the Passion of Christ, the Crucifixion and the Dormition of the Virgin in the apse (fig. 5.72). Artisans showed excellent mastery in both aniconic motifs and human figures; indeed, Peroni defined Civate as the ‘apex in the relationship between painting and stucco’.⁹⁵⁸ This close relationship is undoubtedly true, but we need also to note that in the same building, artisans were able to work stucco in a more ‘sculptural’ way by making self-supporting panels.

⁹⁵⁵ Guiglia Guidobaldi 1994

⁹⁵⁶ Peroni 2006; Bertelli 1979; Marcora 1974.

⁹⁵⁷ Peroni 2006.

⁹⁵⁸ Peroni 2006.

The existence of a shared visual culture in north-western Italy is also testified by the use of similar schemes for the transennae of Civate in the abbey of S. Fruttuoso in Camogli. Here, a number of plaques were part of a wall decoration which included also cornices and decorative bands with a perspective meander (figs. 5.66-5.68).⁹⁵⁹ With the exception of the perspective meander, the scheme of the plaques of Camogli recalled solutions from Byzantine silks,⁹⁶⁰ but also the transennae from Civate. Moreover, after the discovery that the stuccoes in Camogli are made of almost pure gypsum, some scholars believed that this is the sign of an ‘Eastern’ provenance of the artisans, since pure gypsum is not attested in the region of Liguria before the sixteenth century.⁹⁶¹ Certainly, the case of Camogli is an exception in its region from the technical point of view. The statement of Frondoni and other scholars, however, lacks precision. What do they mean with ‘Eastern artisan’? Do they mean Islamic production? In that case, as we have seen in the previous paragraph, gypsum-based mixtures became widespread from the ninth century from Iraq to Ifriqiya, even though we are not sure about the consistent use of gypsum in the tenth and eleventh centuries.⁹⁶² Moreover, we do not know whether and how such tradition reached Liguria.⁹⁶³ Matching ‘gypsum’ with ‘Eastern’ is problematic because the state of study of Islamic stucco composition is not fully developed yet, with the exception of Islamic Spain. However, it is important to note that some decades later, in Calabria and Sicily were produced free-standing liturgical barriers and ciboria made probably by Muslim artisans.

⁹⁵⁹ Frondoni 2008b; Belli D’Elia 2008.

⁹⁶⁰ Frondoni 2008b, in part. 46.

⁹⁶¹ Mannoni, Ricci 2008; Panizzoli 2008.

⁹⁶² The amount of Islamic stuccoes tested is not high at all. It is known that Samarra stuccoes were almost pure gypsum, see López Borges 2014; Burgio *et al.* 2007. From the ninth century, at least the stuccoes from the Gulf, started being composed with high quantities of gypsum, Lic 2017, 2.3. However, Palazzo-Bertholon in her study on the composition of stuccoes located between Southern France and Northern Spain, noted an increase in the use of stucco around the eleventh century which she connected to a transferring of knowledge and techniques from Islamic Spain, Palazzo Bertholon 2009; Palazzo Bertholon 2004.

⁹⁶³ A possibility is the transfer of pure-gypsum mixtures via France which already had a tradition of pure-gypsum mixtures (Merovingian sarcophagi in fifth centuries), and it was probably absorbing gypsum-based stuccoes from Catalonia, Palazzo Bertholon 2009.

Some of them (Itàla, Sicily and Terreti, Calabria) were made of lime,⁹⁶⁴ while those from Gerace (Calabria) are of three different mixtures with both lime and gypsum in variable percentages.⁹⁶⁵ Regarding Byzantine stucco, there is no information about mixtures of the tenth to the twelfth centuries. An aspect to bear in mind is the flexibility of artisans and their knowledge of materials which helped them to find the best solution each time. Indeed, the use of pure gypsum may be explained to create a very strong mixture suitable for high reliefs and for self-supporting elements. Before the case of Camogli, pure gypsum was used for sarcophagi in the Merovingian period, the saints in Cividale (around the middle of the eighth century), and later for the twelfth-century ambos and ciboria of Abruzzo, and the templa from Epiros (thirteenth century): all these classes of objects and decorations required a strong material.⁹⁶⁶

Sarcophagi made of stucco are not widespread in Italy, with the exception of the one of S. Caprasio at Aulla (ca 90 km distant from Camogli), which contained the relics of the patron saint (fig. 5.73)⁹⁶⁷: the object recalls the examples in pure gypsum plaster of the Merovingian sarcophagi in France (fifth century), and does not find comparisons in Italy but in Germany, where sarcophagi and funerary slabs made of stucco were used since the tenth century.⁹⁶⁸

Moving to Southern Italy, during the last three decades of the eleventh century in Calabria and Sicily stucco liturgical furnishings were worked for Christian patrons probably by Muslim artisans.⁹⁶⁹ One of the most striking aspects of these pieces is not only their iconography but also the technique used to make them. The decorative patterns were stamped

⁹⁶⁴ I thank Antonino Tranchina (Bibliotheca Hertziana) for sharing this information with me in spoken communication.

⁹⁶⁵ Caskey 2011, 86. Di Gangi 1995, in part. 85 n. 12; Di Gangi *et al* 1991.

⁹⁶⁶ A discussion on the benefit of the use of gypsum is in Cabiale 2011b.

⁹⁶⁷ Arslan *et al.* 2006, 193-195, fig. 17.

⁹⁶⁸ See for example, the sarcophagus of Lotarius II Walbeck in Walbeck (Sassonia Anhalt) (last quarter of the tenth century) made of stucco on a stone core, Adamiak, Prillep 1980; Corgnati 2010, 135-136; the slabs of the abbesses in the crypt of Qedlinburgh (1045, 1061, 1095), Panofsky 1924, 87-89; Niehr 1992, 334-336; Corgnati 2010, 135-139; the slab of the tomb of Windukind of Saxony (1100-1130), Panofsky 1924, 83-84; Corgnati 2010, 135.

⁹⁶⁹ On the identity of the artisans, see Ragona 1960; Ragona 1968; Di Gangi 1995, in part. 97; Caskey 2011, 114-119.

by pressing the mould on the wet surface.⁹⁷⁰ Therefore, the ornamentation is not always in relief but it is shallow. Sometimes the application of moulds appears to be cursive: in several pieces it is easily possible to spot the signs of the juxtaposition of the moulds (figs. 80-81). In other cases, the transition was smoother than in others, and the signs of the moulds did not remain. These details show a *modus operandi* of an almost 'industrial' production, which do not find direct comparisons in Italy or in Byzantium, but the workshops in Samarra and Ifriqiya, instead.⁹⁷¹ A later use of moulds is in the ciboria and ambos produced in Abruzzo, but there the artisans used different iconographic sources and were technically more accurate than the Calabrian and Sicilian ones.⁹⁷²

All the pieces recorded are from churches, and they have been connected to the patronage of the Count Roger and the beginning of the Norman domination.⁹⁷³ After the conquest of Sicily, written sources testify that the booty of Normans was also composed of people and resulted in the dislocation of part of the Muslim population from Sicily to Calabria as slaves.⁹⁷⁴ The possible presence of artisans among these relocated people might explain the heterogeneous experiences in the stuccoes in Calabria and in Sicily for churches.⁹⁷⁵ The mix of Byzantine and Islamic decorative motifs can be appreciated in the stuccoes from the churches of S. Maria del Mastro (ca 1083-1084) (figs. 5.74-5.81) and the Annunziatella-S. Teodoro from Gerace (fig. 5.82), which belonged to a small ciborium and chancel slabs, probably part of a liturgical barrier; all the pieces were worked with moulds except the small capital from the Annunziatella-S. Teodoro which was worked with spatulae (fig. 5.83).⁹⁷⁶ As Di Gangi

⁹⁷⁰ Di Gangi 1995; Caskey 2011.

⁹⁷¹ Di Gangi 1995.

⁹⁷² Gandolfo 2002; Nenci 2006.

⁹⁷³ Di Gangi 1995; Tabanelli 2015, 98-142; Tabanelli 2019; Lebole 2020, 58-114.

⁹⁷⁴ Caskey 2011, 116-117.

⁹⁷⁵ Caskey 2011, 116-117.

⁹⁷⁶ Di Gangi 1995.

demonstrated, the iconography of the decorative motifs, as well as the thin vegetal stems against a deep-carved background, show multiple connections to the art of al-Andalus and Maghreb rather than to eleventh and twelfth-century western sculpture.⁹⁷⁷ Some pieces which testify, I believe, the use of the same moulds of Gerace were re-used as filling in the altar of the Baptistry of Santa Severina (near Crotone), now at the Museo Diocesano.⁹⁷⁸ Other pieces of liturgical furnishings (maybe a ciborium) with similar decorative patterns worked with the same techniques, decorated the Panagia of Rossano (fig. 5.84).⁹⁷⁹ Northern of Rossano, there are some stuccoes similar to those from Gerace in the abbey of S. Angelo in Chirico Raparo.⁹⁸⁰

Finally, other examples from this production under the first Norman rule, are the panels from S. Maria in Terreti (end of the eleventh century) (figs. 5.85-5.88) which are decorated with birds and animals arranged symmetrically to a central stem (fig. 5.85) framed by pseudo-Kufic inscriptions and recessed stars.⁹⁸¹

While the recessed stars can be found generally in Islamic art, and also in a window transenna from the baptistry of Santa Severina (Calabria), the organisation of the plaque with symmetric animals into roundels framed by a band with pseudo-script attest to the cross-cultural exchanges between Byzantine, Islamic and Western cultures. As noted by scholars, the best comparisons for the panels can be found in silk textiles produced by the Normans, whose workshops were composed of Byzantine artisans taken from Thebes in 1147 during a raid.⁹⁸² At the same time, roundels with animals disposed symmetrically against a stem is a design

⁹⁷⁷ Di Gangi 1995.

⁹⁷⁸ Lopetrone 2017, 81, 115, 180, 186, figs 161. In the Baptistry of Santa Severina a fragmentary window transenna was found with a similar star as the panels of S. Maria in Terreti, Lopetrone 2017, 81, 115, fig. 160. On the window transenna see also Orsi 1922; Loiacono 1934, 176 -179, fig. 7.

⁹⁷⁹ Lipinsky 1963.

⁹⁸⁰ Giuliani 1994; Bertelli 2018; Bertelli does not publish any pictures. I plan to visit the abbey soon to verify whether the state of the pieces.

⁹⁸¹ Orsi 1922; Lipinsky 1963; Scerrato 1979, 354-355; Barsanti 1989; Zinzi 2003; Caskey 2011.

⁹⁸² Monneret de Vuillard 1946; Barsanti 1989. Recently on silk industry in Palermo, Vernon 2019.

widespread in Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture, as well as the use of pseudo-Kufic scripts to frame panels and decorate liminal spaces.⁹⁸³

The use of pseudo-Kufic scripts in Calabria is not the only case in Italy. They were used since the tenth century in wall paintings of Apulia, and they reappear in the twelfth-century sculpture in Abruzzo, and from that moment they would be used in Western art until the fifteenth century (e.g. in the David of Donatello).⁹⁸⁴ Even though the ornamentation used for the stuccoes of Terreti and Gerace shows a mixture of Byzantine and Islamic elements, the technique of using moulds extensively instead of free-hand carving is more common in Islamic stuccoes, while is almost absent in Byzantine ones.⁹⁸⁵ This is the reason why most scholars attribute the stuccoes from Calabria and Sicily to Muslim artisans.⁹⁸⁶ The use of pseudo-Kufic has been defined by Pedone and Cantone as an ‘object of transition’ and a ‘cross-cultural formal language’ in relation to the widespread use in Byzantium during the tenth and the eleventh centuries in every media, which confirms the close interactions with the Islamic civilisation during the Macedonian dynasty.⁹⁸⁷ The use of pseudo-Kufic on the panels of Terreti is emblematic of these continuous cross-cultural exchanges which in Calabria and Sicily were particularly encouraged by the political situation and the multicultural society composed of Greek-speaking and Arabic-speaking population which was joined by Normans since the end of the eleventh century. Scholars identified in these characteristics of the stucco production in Calabria the rising Norman visual culture and ideology which will find its most well-known apex in Palermo in the twelfth century.⁹⁸⁸

⁹⁸³ Recently on the topic of the pseud-Kufic in Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture see Pedone, Cantone 2013; Melvani 2018b.

⁹⁸⁴ Fontana 1999.

⁹⁸⁵ Analysis on the similarities and differences of the panels of Terreti with Byzantine and Islamic practices were explored by Barsanti 1989; Di Gangi 1995; Di Gangi 2003; Caskey 2011. On the use of pseudo-Kufic in Byzantium, see the recent studies of Pedone, Cantone 2013; Melvani 2018b.

⁹⁸⁶ Ragona 1960; Ragona 1968; Di Gangi 1995; Caskey 2011.

⁹⁸⁷ Pedone, Cantone 2013, 132.

⁹⁸⁸ Di Gangi 2003; Caskey 2011; Tabanelli 2019.

A design similar to Islamic textile patterns and to Middle Byzantine sculptures made with mouldings can be found in the panel in the church of S. Giuliano at Caltagirone in Sicily (1071) (fig. 5.89).⁹⁸⁹ Finally, an outstanding example is the stuccoes from the church of Santi Pietro e Paolo in Itàla, near Messina, a church founded for a Greek monastery by Count Roger in 1092. The documentation of the church prior to the restorations of the 1950s and the surviving fragments help in reconstructing the original decoration. The capitals of the nave were all made of stucco with battle scenes, and there was also a structure made of stucco from which there survive only a small capital and an architrave (figs. 5.90-5.92).⁹⁹⁰ This structure may have been a tempon or a funerary monument. The latter hypothesis seems appropriate for the battle scenes stamped through moulds on the surface. The rough figures display a narration which has been compared for its vivacity to the Bayeux tapestry, another Norman product, even though the rendering of the human figure in the stuccoes is clumsy.⁹⁹¹ Caskey suggested that this can be explained by the use of Muslim artisans who were not used to carve human figures.⁹⁹² The stucco reliefs narrate a war between westerners and Muslims; they appear to be one of the first manifestations of figural sculpture under the new Norman rule, and they show the immediate concern of the Normans to narrate the conquest.⁹⁹³ This is a tendency which will be developed roughly a century later and which finds its first manifestation in stucco before any other media.⁹⁹⁴

Stucco production in Calabria and Sicily shows some iconographic connections with Byzantium, which were, not transmitted by Byzantine stucco but by textiles (e.g. Terreti).

⁹⁸⁹ For the similarities with Middle Byzantine sculpture, see Barsanti 1989. For similarities with Islamic textiles, see Caskey 2011, 110, 113.

⁹⁹⁰ Caskey does not specify whether stucco was a revetment or not. I believe that it was since stucco cannot support a structure in stone.

⁹⁹¹ Caskey 2011, 93-118.

⁹⁹² Caskey 2011, 105-106.

⁹⁹³ This is clear from the armature of the knights as well as by the presence of arms typical of Muslim fighters, and camels. Caskey 2011, p. 104.

⁹⁹⁴ Caskey 2011, 93-118.

However, we can see a similar use of stucco for free-standing structures as in Cyprus (eleventh century) and later for Epiros (late thirteenth century).

While continuing our survey of stucco production in Italy, the most well-known stucco productions of twelfth-century Italy are the ambos and ciboria produced between the 1140s and 1160s by a family workshop composed of a father, son and uncle: Roger, Robert and Nicodemus, known thanks to their signatures and the date they carved on their works. They worked in an area that is, today, in the region of Abruzzo (centre of Italy), on the Adriatic side of the peninsula, whose arts in this period, sculpture in particular, synthesized both Romanesque and Islamic elements and attested to contacts with the rest of the centre of Italy but also with Apulia.⁹⁹⁵

The ambos and ciboria were made for the churches of S. Clemente in Guardia al Vomano, in the church of S. Maria in Valle Porclaneta in Rosciolo dei Marsi, the church of S. Maria del Lago in Moscufo and S. Clemente at Casauria and, probably, the church of S. Cristinziano in S. Martino sulla Marrucina (figs. 5.93-5.98).⁹⁹⁶ These works are micro-architectures where the artisans carefully planned every part with skilful mastery of the material. Some parts are self-supporting plaques, while in structural parts, such as the stairs of ciboria and the columns, the stucco was mounted on a stone core. This precision and complete mastery of the material may be a sign of the specialisation of the workshop in micro-architectures made of stucco.⁹⁹⁷ The workshop also used the same models which were arranged in different ways for each piece. They also used both mouldings and free-hand carving techniques.⁹⁹⁸ The sculptures of the workshop of Ruggero, Roberto and Nicodemo differ from the stucco production of Calabria and Sicily for their mastery and accuracy of the carving,

⁹⁹⁵ Gandolfo 2002; Nenci 2006.

⁹⁹⁶ Nenci 2006.

⁹⁹⁷ Nenci 2006.

⁹⁹⁸ Gandolfo 2002; Nenci 2006.

which cannot always be appreciated in the other reliefs. Indeed, in the cases from Calabria it is often possible to see the signs of the connections of the stamps on the surface. Some scholars suggested that the Abruzzese workshop was trained in different materials; this is suggested by the presence of identical decorative motifs on the wooden doors of Cugnoli (Abruzzo) and a possible identification of Roger with the homonym artisan author of the bronze doors of the mausoleum of Bohemond in Canosa, Apulia (beginning of the twelfth century).⁹⁹⁹ However, the latter hypothesis did not find any secure proof yet. There is also the possibility that the workshop was also trained in woodcarving; stucco workers in the Mediterranean used iconographies and patterns common also to other media, so it would not be surprising that the authors of the ciboria and ambos in Abruzzo were also able to carve wooden doors. One example of this dialogue between media is that both stucco and wooden production of Abruzzo saw an increasing use of pseudo-Kufic inscriptions and of vegetal motifs modulated on such inscriptions in the twelfth century, a phenomenon recorded in Apulia and in Western Southern Italy too.¹⁰⁰⁰ The use of the trefoil arch is connected to an Islamic language, but here it appears to be put next to animals snagged into vegetal stems, a motif found in Italian illuminated manuscripts and in Romanesque sculpture.¹⁰⁰¹ Therefore, the workshop of Roger, Robert and Nicodemus is a witness of the heterogenous visual culture of the mid-twelfth century which shows the use of Islamic motifs possibly mediated by Apulia next to western manuscript illumination. The closest connections with artistic production from Apulia may have been

⁹⁹⁹ Aceto 2001, 56-59. For a summary on the scholarship of the workshop of Roger, Roberto and Nicodemo, see Nenci 2006, 274-275.

¹⁰⁰⁰ Fontana 1999.

¹⁰⁰¹ Some examples are the fol. 6v of Lectionary from the Curia Arcivescovile at Chieti, Abruzzo (second half of the eleventh century) and the fol. 8v of the homiliary of the Archivio Capitolare at Atri, Abruzzo (thirteenth century?), Curzi *et al.* 2012, 63-164, 167-168, fig. p. 93, 95

favoured by the Norman conquest of Abruzzo by Roger II, which started from the southern part of the region, at the border with Apulia.¹⁰⁰²

When we look at the stucco production in Apulia the panorama is patchy and it seems that stucco production was definitively of less importance than sculpture in marble and stone, even though the few examples are of extreme interest.¹⁰⁰³ They are the fragments of a possible ciborium from the chiesa matrice of S. Maria in Pietramontecorvino which were connected by Bertelli to a cultural milieu influenced by the stucco examples of Abruzzo (figs. 5.99-5.100).¹⁰⁰⁴ However, the evidence of the Norman conquest of Abruzzo through Apulia may show, in my opinion, that the examples from Pietramontecorvino must be at least the product of the same cultural milieu, if not the predecessors of the Abruzzo examples.

Coming back to Sicily, but at the time of the established Norman rule under Roger II, we do not find liturgical furnishing made of stucco, but decorations which followed Islamic repertoires and were worked by Muslim artisans: two famous examples are the monumental Kufic inscription in the Zisa of Palermo, and a window transenna from the church of S. Maria dell'Ammiraglio (the Martorana), the church founded by George of Antioch and covered with Byzantine (or Byzantinising) mosaics, S. Giovanni degli Eremiti and others in the Museo Abbatellis in Palermo.¹⁰⁰⁵ These examples find comparisons with contemporary stucco production from northern Africa rather than Byzantium or Medieval Europe.

Finally, after the stuccoes of Civate, northern Italy does not show a consistent use of this material in the twelfth century; it is very sporadic. One example is the fragments of pillars decorated with basket-like patterns and interlaces from the abbey of S. Dalmazzo in Pedona,

¹⁰⁰² Bologna 1986.

¹⁰⁰³ The evidence for stucco production is exiguous; however, it is also true that its study has been conducted so far only by Gioia Bertelli, a summary on her studies on Apulian stucco is in Bertelli 2018.

¹⁰⁰⁴ Bertelli 2018, 499; Bertelli, Di Spirito 2000.

¹⁰⁰⁵ Dell'Acqua 2003a, 75, 76 n. 520, 95, 145, pl. 41. A summary on the stucco production in Palermo under the Normans is in Romano 2018.

now in the parish church of Borgo San Dalmazzo (fig. 5.101).¹⁰⁰⁶ In this abbey, stucco was used for the pavement in a technique which mixed plaster and mastic for creating lively effects (fig. 5.102).¹⁰⁰⁷ While in twelfth-century Northern Italy it is not possible to appreciate a continuous use of stucco for human figures and narrative scenes, this is not the case of the regions today in Germany and Switzerland. Here stucco was used for a three-dimensional statue of Charlemagne (1160-70) in the Ulrich kapelle in Müstair, and for monumental tombs and choirs where the images of Mary, Christ and the Apostles dominated (fig. 5.103).¹⁰⁰⁸ However, such examples do not find any comparator in Byzantine stucco.

When we compare the stucco production in the Italian peninsula and in Sicily with the one in Byzantium between the eleventh and twelfth centuries, the first, more evident aspect is, again, the absence of human figures in Byzantine stuccoes, while they proliferated in Italy. As noted above, the absence of human figures in Byzantine stuccoes does not mirror a contemporary trend in Byzantine sculpture, where panels with sacred figures and emperors continued to be carved. This brings us to the issue highlighted in several parts of this thesis which concerns the representativity of the surviving evidence for general consideration about stucco in Byzantium. I believe that it is possible that human figures continued to be carved in stucco; they just did not survive or are not known yet.

An element which connects Italian and Byzantine production is the use of stucco to experiment new shapes. In Byzantium, this experimentation can be appreciated through rich

¹⁰⁰⁶ Micheletto, Uggè 2004, 222-225.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Micheletto, Uggè 2004, 225.

¹⁰⁰⁸ See the two apostles re-used in the altar of S. Remigo at Corzonesco Ticino (end of the eleventh -beginning of the twelfth century); the apostle in the sacristy of St. George in Castro Ticino; the monumental tomb in S. Cyriacus in Genrode, the three-dimensional Virgin with Child in the lunette under the *Maiestas Domini* in the cathedral of Erfurt (Turingen); the virgins in the cathedral of Hildesheim (1150-1186); the choir in the same cathedral of Hildesheim (end of the twelfth-beginning of the thirteenth century); the choir in Halberstadt. For a summary on stucco production in Germany, see Corgnati 2010, 133-181; For a recent contribution on these funerary monuments, see Fozi 2016.

compositions and through the use of an ornamental repertoire which is not exclusive of monumental sculpture but also involves ivory carving and metalworks. In Italy this experimentation seems to benefit from the relationship between painting and sculpture (Civate) or cross-cultural connections (Calabria and Sicily) which guided the directions of future developments in Romanesque sculpture in the first case, and the new cultural ideology under the Normans in the second.

It is interesting to note also that the trefoil arch of the proskynetarion of Nerezi does not find comparisons with contemporary Byzantine sculpture. The choice of trefoil arch and some details of the carving of the peacock in the proskynetarion of Nerezi were interpreted by Grabar as Islamic elements.¹⁰⁰⁹ However, while trilobe arches were widespread in Islamic architecture (e.g. the mosque of Córdoba), they also appeared in eleventh- and twelfth-century wall paintings of Macedonia, and manuscript illumination.¹⁰¹⁰ On the other side of the Adriatic Sea, trefoil arches were used by the workshop of Ruggero, Roberto and Nicodemo for their stucco ambos and ciboria. While there is no evidence of a direct contact between the Abruzzese workshop and the artisans in Nerezi, the use of trefoil arches on the Adriatic side of Italy complicates the issue of the contacts between Islam and Byzantium which may have happened independently or mediated by the Italian peninsula.

Finally, a common element between stuccoes in Italy and Byzantium is technical: the majority of the pieces are all carved without the use of stamps. There is an exception which is the production in Calabria and Sicily, which has been connected for this reason to Muslim

¹⁰⁰⁹ Grabar 1976, 106.

¹⁰¹⁰ Sinkevic already signalled the window of the White Tower at Skopje and the painted cross at the church of H. Nikolaos *tou Kasnitzi* a Kastoria (twelfth century), Sinkević 2000, 90. Other examples are the painter proskynetarion frame in the church of the H. Anargyroi in Kastoria (ca 1180) where the trefoil arch frame three figures, Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 113; the proskynetaria again in wall painting from the church of St. George at Kurbinovo (1190), Kalopissi-Verti 2006, 112-113, figs 8-9; and also the use of trefoil arches can be seen in the manuscript Gr. 33 on Mount Sinai, produced by a Constantinopolitan workshop, in the image of St Gregory of Nazianzos probably inside the *Nea Ekklesia* (twelfth century.), Weitzmann, Galavaris 1990, 140-153.

artisans; and the stuccoes from Abruzzo, where there is a skilful use of moulds and stamps which does not really find comparisons in twelfth century stucco production in the Mediterranean.

Egypt

The eleventh-century stucco production in Egypt does not bear the same tendency towards the figurative as recorded in Northern Italy and central Europe. However, in this period Egypt saw several innovations in stucco decoration which were both the product of deeper interaction with Syria and Anatolia, but also new solutions made by local artisans.¹⁰¹¹

The first element which scholars usually consider as an introduction from Persia (with the possible mediation of Syria) is *muqarnas*. The first known muqarnas in Egypt are made of stone and stucco and are all dated around the second half of the eleventh century.¹⁰¹² Among those made of stucco we can see those found in the bath of Abu'l-Su'ud in Fustat (Cairo) which were painted with images of musicians, dancers and people drinking (fig. 5.104).¹⁰¹³ Another example of stucco muqarnas is in the mosque of al-Juyushi (1085) (fig. 5.106), built in the cemetery of Cairo; they are used as a cornice in the tower, so not for domes or niches.¹⁰¹⁴ In the interior of the same mosque, stucco is also used for cornices bearing Kufic inscriptions and for the mihrab (fig. 5.105). The mihrab is in the shape of a niche, as usual in Egyptian architecture, with vegetal motifs in the spandrels. However, here the vegetal scrolls appear to be more geometric than previous examples (e.g. the al-Hakim mosque) and it is filled with geometric

¹⁰¹¹ Bloom 2007, 51-87, in part. 85-87.

¹⁰¹² Bloom 1988. On the origin of muqarnas see also Creswell 1978, 252-253; Tabbaa 1985; Koliji 2012.

¹⁰¹³ Bloom 1988; Abbas 2006.

¹⁰¹⁴ Bloom 1988. The use of muqarnas in Egypt, and in particular in al-Juyushi mosque display the work of artisans who were able to mastery this technique very well and were conscious of its use. He does not think they were experimenting by giving a try. He connects the introduction of stucco muqarnas to the advancement which were already happening in Syria (congregational mosque of Aleppo) and the mosque in Ani in Turkey.

motifs.¹⁰¹⁵ It seems an evolution of the palmettes and fruits in style B and C of Samarra but made in a crisp carving. Egyptians artisans explored new solutions in stucco in the mihrab commissioned by the vizier al-Afdal in the mosque of Ibn-Tulun (Cairo) and dated to 1094 (fig. 5.107).¹⁰¹⁶ The general structure of the mihrab is similar to the one in al-Juyushi: a pointed arch on colonnettes and spandrels. However, in Ibn Tulun the mihrab is not a real niche, but only an illusion, since the stucco is applied on the flat surface of a pier; Bloom noted that flat mihrab were not common in Egypt in eleventh and twelfth centuries, while they were in Iran.¹⁰¹⁷ Another aspect which connects this mihrab with Iran is the use of the Y-fret motif to decorate the spandrels, which cannot be found in Egypt before this date. These elements and some aspect of the inscription led Bloom to identify here an attempt to introduce some new elements from Iran, probably mediated by Syria.¹⁰¹⁸ I believe that there is possibly another element which makes this mihrab noteworthy. The arch of the mihrab is marked by a protruding openwork basket-like motif. The use of protruding openwork interlaced ribbons is widespread in Byzantine proskynetaria (both made of marble and stucco) from the eleventh to the thirteenth centuries.¹⁰¹⁹ Moreover, if we look at the Umayyad stuccoes from Syria, we will find the use of openwork protruding patterns to mark arches (fig. 5.4). In Egypt, and in particular in stucco decoration, this element does not seem to me very common. It may be hypothesized then, that this similar use of the pattern to underline arches can be the result of interaction through Syria or a direct contact with Byzantium.¹⁰²⁰

¹⁰¹⁵ Bloom 2007, 131-134.

¹⁰¹⁶ Creswell 1952, 220-222; pl. 116; Bloom 2007, 136-139.

¹⁰¹⁷ Bloom 2007, 136-139. Previously on the mihrab Creswell 1978, 221-222.

¹⁰¹⁸ Bloom 2007, 134.

¹⁰¹⁹ For example, the proskynetaria now in the Church of the Virgin in the monastery of Hosios Loukas (twelfth century), the proskynetaria in the Zoodochos Pege at Samarina (twelfth century and those in the Mitropolis of Mystras (twelfth century) and the stucco proskynetarion in the Peribleptos of Mystras (second half of the fourteenth century).

¹⁰²⁰ The use of openwork bosses can also be found in thirteenth century architectural sculpture of Seljuk Anatolia, such as in the Karatay madrasa in Konya (1252), while an arch marked by an interlaced motifs moduled on the Sjuk dragon is on a gate of the citadel of Aleppo (thirteenth century), Ettinghause *et al.* 2001, fig. 375, 387.

In the twelfth century, stucco, as well as stone carving, saw the widespread use of muqarnas but also the creation of ‘ribbed’ niches. These are niches which resemble shells but with alternated semi-circular and triangular flutes. One of the first occurrences in stucco is the mihrabs in the Mashad of Umm Kulthum (1122) (fig. 5.108).¹⁰²¹ The lower conch of the niche is covered with a continuous pattern of interlaced ribbons forming stars. Both the lower edge of the conch and the arch of the niche are marked by a band with a half-palmette scroll. The upper part of the wall is marked by a series of pointed arches which are followed by a continuous display of interlaced bands filled by geometrical and vegetal motifs. The structure of this mihrab (fluted niche, pointed arch and continuous patterns on both the conch and the upper part) will be used also in thirteenth-century stuccoes.¹⁰²²

A similar but more complicated and sophisticated example is the main mihrab in the mausoleum of Sayyida Ruqayya (1133) (fig. 5.109): here, the arch is marked by a series of pointed-arched niches which recall muqarnas; the upper part is now worked following the convention of Egyptian stucco which consist of an epigraphic band and by spandrels with vegetal motifs.¹⁰²³ The carving is sharp as in al-Juyushi and previous examples. The renovation works undertaken by caliph al-Hafiz (1149-1154) in the mosque of al-Azhar (Cairo) included a considerable amount of stucco decoration.¹⁰²⁴ The upper zone of the maqsura is completely covered with carved plaster (fig. 5.110). In particular, the stucco in the dome is compressed into a pattern of polylobed arches carved with vegetal and geometric motifs. The area of the spandrels is decorated with inscriptions, but the spandrels now show some vegetal scrolls

¹⁰²¹ Creswell 1978, 239-241; Williams 1983, 41; Bloom 2007, 139, fig. 104.

¹⁰²² See mausoleum of Abbasid caliphs in next paragraph.

¹⁰²³ Creswell 1952, 247-253, pl.87b, 119-120; Williams 1983, 44-50; Bloom 2007, 146-149.

¹⁰²⁴ Creswell 1952, 254-257, pl. 90-91; Bloom 2007, 149-152.

composed of concentric circles surrounding palmettes and pinecones. Finally, in the maqsura there is the first occurrence in Egyptian art of stucco window transennae with coloured glass.¹⁰²⁵

Al-Andalus

During the eleventh and the twelfth centuries there were several political changes in al-Andalus. The eleventh century is the century which saw the civil war of 1010-1013 and the formation of regional kingdoms usually called *Taifa* kingdoms.¹⁰²⁶ The Córdoba-centred art which dominated the Umayyad period encountered a re-interpretation under the new kingdoms and it was nurtured by the interaction with the Fatimids of Egypt and the rest of the Mediterranean.¹⁰²⁷ Stucco decoration appears to follow this path of both re-interpretation of Córdoba art and innovation. One case is the palace of the Alcazaba in Malaga. Here, stucco continued to be used to decorate arches, as in Córdoba and Madinat al-Zahra, but the style of the carving became more geometric and the vegetal patterns became more stylised (fig. 5.111). The design of the interlaced polylobed arches continued to be used until the Almohad period, where it was reduced to the essential, sometimes through the elimination of the carvings (fig. 5.112).

The use of stucco in Zaragoza, in particular in the palace of Aljafería and its mosque, is more spectacular (figs. 5.113-5.115).¹⁰²⁸ The intersecting polylobed arches of the courtyard are not directly filled with vegetal motifs but with architectural ones: small columns sustain fantastic arabesques. The small zones created by the intersecting arches and arabesques is then filled with vegetal motifs (fig. 5.114). The mosque shows a similar way in dividing the stucco decoration by means of thick bands of intersecting ‘arches’ which were filled with vegetal

¹⁰²⁵ Creswell 1952, 256; Bloom 2007, 149-150.

¹⁰²⁶ Viguera Molins 2011, 21-39.

¹⁰²⁷ Robinson identified two tendencies of Taifa art: one to dialogue between kingdoms and another to diplomatic with outside the Iberian Peninsula, Robinson 1992.

¹⁰²⁸ Ewert 1978, 166; Ewert 1980, 242; Robinson 1992, 56-61.

motifs. It is possible also that the stuccoes from the palace of Zaragoza had figurative panels. This is suggested by a relatively close palace in Balaguer, the so-called Alcazaba, built between 1070 and 1080.¹⁰²⁹ Here, several figurative stuccoes were found, among them a harpy (figs. 5.116-5.119).¹⁰³⁰ The way in which the style and technique of the carving for decoration is carried out suggests that the artisans active in the two palaces belonged to the same cultural milieu.¹⁰³¹

During the twelfth century until the third decade of the thirteenth century, the art of Islamic Spain strengthened its ties with Morocco and the Maghreb. This already ongoing process was consolidated by the Almoravid and later by the Almohad rule which had its political centre in Marrakesh. Regarding stucco, there is not much which survived until today. It is possible that the mosque built at Seville, the new centre of Almohad rule in Spain, had stucco decoration but it did not survive. What remains from the twelfth century is the so-called Patio del Yeso in the Alcazar of Seville. (fig. 5.120). Here the motif of the intersected arches creates a monumental openwork. A similar design made of plaster can also be found on the minaret of the mosque of Seville (so-called Giralda) (fig. 5.121).

Such spectacular use of stucco would not find its way into Byzantine art. While we cannot exclude the possibility that aristocrats may have had their houses decorated in an Islamic style, the material evidence seems to suggest that Islamic stucco did not have an impact in Byzantine stucco and marble production.¹⁰³²

¹⁰²⁹ Giralt Balagueró 1985; Robinson 1992, 59-60; Cabañero Subiza 2011.

¹⁰³⁰ Cabañero Subiza 2011, 551 fig. 16.

¹⁰³¹ This is also suggested by the family relationship between the rulers of Zaragoza and the one in Balaguer, see Robinson 1992, 59-60; Cabañero Subiza 2011.

¹⁰³² The question of Islamic-style buildings in Constantinople and in the Byzantine empire will be addressed in the conclusions of this chapter.

Syria and Anatolia

From around the mid eleventh century, both Syria and Anatolia gradually fell under the rule of the Seljuks and were politically connected again to Central Asia. One use of stucco was surely the creation of domes and semi-domes with muqarnas, as in the Maristan founded by Nur al-Din (1154), a local governor on behalf of the Seljuks. Here, the muqarnas are used next to a re-used classical pediment (fig. 5.122).¹⁰³³ The re-use of Late Antique and ancient sculpture is a well-known phenomenon which can explain the small presence of stucco for this period in both Syria and Anatolia. In relation to the local availability of sculpture, it is also important to stress the strong stone carving tradition in these regions which scholars saw as the cause for the scarce use of stucco.¹⁰³⁴ Motifs coming from the stucco tradition of Iran and Iraq were carved in stone and reinterpreted in the light of monumental stone carving.¹⁰³⁵ However, it is possible that the first phase of the Kiosk at Konya built by the sultan Kılıç Arslan II (1156-1192) had stucco decorations, at least muqarnas. This is suggested by the use of stucco muqarnas in Damascus roughly at the same time, and maybe by the Byzantine writer, Nicholas Mesarites, who mentioned a pavilion called *Mochroutas* in the Great Palace of Constantinople ‘made by a Persian hand’.¹⁰³⁶ Scholars have suggested several possible reconstructions of this pavilion, but all agree that the ceiling described must have been covered by muqarnas. The majority believes that the *Mochroutas* was a Seljuk-style pavilion similar to the one in Konya, since the description of the ‘cruciform’ tiles of the monumental staircase to access the space points in this direction.¹⁰³⁷ Recently, Johns suggested that the muqarnas ceiling was probably a wooden

¹⁰³³ Raby 2004, 299-301; Allen 1986.

¹⁰³⁴ Crane 1994; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 241-243.

¹⁰³⁵ Korobeinikov 2014, 81-110.

¹⁰³⁶ Angold 2017, § 27, 69; Mango 1972, 228-229.

¹⁰³⁷ On the *Mochroutas*, see Ebersolt 1910, 49-150; Janin 1964, 122; Guiland 1969, 159; Magdalino 1978; Hunt 1984, 141-142; Brand 1989, 19-20; Redford 1993, 219; Asutay-Effenberger 2004; Walker 2010; Redford 2012; Redford 2013.

one, very similar to the one in the Cappella Palatina in Palermo.¹⁰³⁸ While arguments in favour of either a Seljuk or a Sicilian aspect of the muqarnas ceiling seem to me based on valid arguments, the text of Mesarites does not help in understanding the original material of the ceiling.

The evidence for the use of stucco in Fatimid Egypt, Islamic Spain, Syria and Anatolia shows that in these territories stucco was widespread in architecture and it covered large surfaces. Secular art, mainly represented by the examples in al-Andalus, shows that figurative stucco was common and that it was worked following the same stylistic trends as ivory and woodcarving.¹⁰³⁹ From the eleventh century *muqarnas* became widespread generally in Islamic art and they were made in stucco as well as in wood or stone. How does this incredibly rich production relate to Byzantium? It is very difficult to see common patterns through stucco. We know that ivories and portable objects were used as diplomatic gifts between the Abbasid, the Umayyads of al-Andalus, the Fatimids of Egypt and the Byzantine emperors;¹⁰⁴⁰ however, stucco did not seem to be a receptive material for such interactions. As we just saw, we know from written sources that the emperor Theophilos and later Manuel I had two palaces made following Abbasid and possibly Seljuk styles. In the twelfth century the historian John Kinnamos (before 1143-after 1185) described the suburban house of Alexios Axouch, *protostator* under Manuel I, in 1167 as decorated with scenes from the military campaign of the Seljuqs sultan Kilidj Arslān II.¹⁰⁴¹ Later in the thirteenth century the metropolitan of Naupaktos, John Apokaukos, described the ‘Persian’ *soufa* built by Constantine Komnenos

¹⁰³⁸ Johns 2016.

¹⁰³⁹ Holod 1992; Cabañero Subiza 2011, in part. 545-547, 550-551.

¹⁰⁴⁰ Grabar 1997; Hoffmann 2001. On the circulation of people see also Necipoğlu 2013.

¹⁰⁴¹ Magdalino 1978; Hunt 1984.

Doukas Angelos of Epiros.¹⁰⁴² While the authors of these descriptions used the connotation ‘Persian’ as pejorative to denigrate the people who were using them (Alexios Axouch, John the Fat, Constantine Komnenos Doukas Angelos),¹⁰⁴³ it has been demonstrated that this does not mean that there were not any Islamic-style buildings in Byzantium.¹⁰⁴⁴ From these descriptions we do not know whether stucco was used in such palaces, but surely Islamic art was probably experienced by the upper strata of Byzantine society through not only movable objects.¹⁰⁴⁵ Due to ubiquitous presence of stucco in the architecture of different Islamic regions, it is possible that it may have been reproduced in Byzantium too, though today we have lost its traces.

5.4 Late Byzantine stuccoes and its comparators (thirteenth-fifteenth centuries).

Byzantium

Stucco continued to be used in Byzantium and in territories artistically linked to it (Serbia), during the Late Byzantine period. However, as we have seen in chapters 1 and 3, between the thirteenth and the fifteenth centuries the use of mortar-based proskynetaria frames (Type B) became widespread, while we saw also the production of free-standing liturgical furnishings in Epiros, and possibly a Type A proskynetarion frame in Mystras.¹⁰⁴⁶ This varied production required also workshops differently-trained. In terms of decoration, as we saw, stuccoes showed schemes and designs which looked towards marble and stone sculpture.

¹⁰⁴² Magdalino 1978, 106; Lambropoulos 1988; Riccardi 2015, 253-256.

¹⁰⁴³ On the meaning of ‘Persian’ in Nikolas Mesarites, Magdalino 1978, 106; Walker 2010, 96 n. 9; Shukurov 2012, 277, 290; Shukurov 2016, 11-64; in the writings of John Apokaukos, see Riccardi 2015, 108-109.

¹⁰⁴⁴ Though the reasons behind the construction of Islamic-style architectures by Byzantine emperors was also dictated by a rhetoric of power and diplomatic relationship, see Keshani 2004; Walker 2010; Walker 2011; Redford 2013.

¹⁰⁴⁵ On the transmissions of ideas about architecture through movable objects, Redford 2012.

¹⁰⁴⁶ There is potentially another case to add to Mystras: the proskynetaria frames of the church of the Holy Trinity at Sopoćani (Serbia). The frames are today lost but some drawings survive, see Korać 1974, in part. Fig. 6, see also Appendix B in this thesis.

For the period corresponding to the Late Byzantine period (thirteenth to fifteenth centuries), any comparison of Byzantine stucco with the rest of the Mediterranean is almost impossible. This is caused by the different range of decorations made with this material. For this reason, the survey on the comparators will not be carried out as in the previous pages, but only the major features useful to the comparison will be pinpointed together with the most striking differences.

Italy

From the thirteenth century onwards, the use of stucco in Italy dropped dramatically. The census made by Nenci shows only few examples,¹⁰⁴⁷ though they are meaningful for both their monumental scale and for their innovative aspects. The surviving material evidence is mainly composed of high reliefs with images of saints, funerary monuments and lunettes with half-busts of saints or narrative scenes.

The production in southern Italy, in the region of Amalfi, while formally different from the Byzantine production, offers several insights into workshop practices, patrons and the aesthetic perception of stucco, which can be fruitfully compared with Byzantine works. The Amalfi-area stuccoes were studied in depth recently by Caskey, who noted that they are the first witnesses to the Gothic style in Southern Italy, since the artisans who worked them were informed about recent developments in marble sculpture and painting both in Italy (Tino di Camaino, Giotto and Pietro Cavallini) and France through the Angevin court in Naples (figs. 5.123-5.126).¹⁰⁴⁸ Particularly remarkable are the funerary monuments of a series of aristocrats

¹⁰⁴⁷ The use of stucco in Italy after the end of the twelfth century has not been fully investigated. The only attempt to make a survey is the one of Nenci which was not developed further, Nenci 2006, 269-271.

¹⁰⁴⁸ This is visible in the lunette of the sacristy of S. Filippo Neri in Pontone (mid-fourteenth century), and in the image of Saint Catherine of Alexandria in the sacristy of S. Giovanni del Toro, Ravello (mid-fourteenth century), see Caskey 2004, 190-242; Caskey 2008, 117-118, fig. 5.

dated between the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth centuries. They are the funerary monuments of Bartolomeo Franconi (1401) in S. Pietro in Teggiano (fig. 5.124), and of Marinella Rufolo Coppola (1332) in the cathedral of Scala (fig. 5.123).¹⁰⁴⁹ Here stucco was modelled in Gothic shapes creating an incredible synthesis of painting, sculpture and architecture.¹⁰⁵⁰ The elaborate canopy tomb of Marinella Rufolo is also the first attested example of a Gothic canopy for a funerary monument for the Amalfi area: stucco was, again, the material for introducing new trends.¹⁰⁵¹ For Amalfitan society, stucco was not selected simply because it was inexpensive: the same families could and did afford mosaic and marble pulpits. The Spina family commissioned the pulpit made of marble and mosaic for the SS Annunziata in Minuto (ca 1330). The D’Afflitto family sponsored a pulpit in stucco in the church of S. Stefania in Pontone and in S. Maria della Lama, as well as the pulpit in S. Eustachio at Pontone made of marble and mosaics.¹⁰⁵²

Finally, stucco in the Amalfi and Salerno areas was also used for decorative vault ribs, which did not have any load-bearing or structural purpose, being a revetment which divided the compartments of the vault’s surface.¹⁰⁵³ There were two types of decorative ribs (squared and round), which in the house of Rufolo in Ravello were used to distinguish different rooms, a use

¹⁰⁴⁹ Other stuccoes can be found in the cathedral of S. Maria Maggiore in Pavia, now at the Musei Civici in Castello Sforzesco, Peroni 1975, 37-38; in the abbey of the Agostinians at Vasto (Tuscany) where stucco was used for corbels Calò Mariani 1995, 534-535; in the monumental relief with Christ and two saints which decorated the tower of the ‘Colombaione’ at Badia at Settimo (Tuscany) (fig. 137-138), before being destroyed in 1944, Cervini 1999.

¹⁰⁵⁰ Other funerary monuments made of stucco in the area but which require further analysis are the tomb of Giacomo Capograsso in the duomo of Salerno (1340), the tomb of the bishop Martonio (1350-70) in the cathedral of Casertavecchia (fig. 5.125), see Chinappi 2018; the tomb of Bartolomeo Franconi (1401) in the church of S. Pietro at Teggiano; the funerary monument of Antonio Sirraca bishop of Acerno (1436) in the atrium of the duomo of Salerno, *Campania*, 2012, 509.

¹⁰⁵¹ Caskey 2008, 113-114, 120-122.

¹⁰⁵² The use of stucco by these merchant families is even more remarkable if we think that they put their emblems on both stucco and marble pulpits, Caskey 2004, pp. 190-242; Caskey 2008; Marchionibus 2009.

¹⁰⁵³ Caskey 2008, 114-117.

that anticipates trends of the heyday of French Gothic under the Angevins in Naples (fig. 5.127).¹⁰⁵⁴

It is difficult to compare the use of stucco in Italy and Byzantium in this period, because artisans followed iconographic and stylistic conventions which were very different. While Late Byzantine sculpture in territories under Latin rule showed the assimilation of Romanesque and Gothic elements (e.g. Euboea, Athens, Peloponnese),¹⁰⁵⁵ these trends were not visible in stucco production. The proskynetarion frame from Mystras did not incorporate any Latin element, whilst it reproduced Middle Byzantine designs; the liturgical furnishings from Epiros possibly showed more connections with Serbia than with Italy directly, as we saw in chapter 1. The creation of decorative ribs in Southern Italy does not find direct comparison with Byzantine examples; indeed, when vault ribs appear, they have a structural function, such as those in the church of the Theotokos in Oxyolithos (Euboea) where the cross-vault has real ribs in porous limestone which were covered and decorated by means of wall paintings (fig. 5.128). Maybe, a similar attitude to the Italian decorative ribs can be seen in the cordons made of stucco at the corner of the piers in Serbian buildings, such as those in the monastery of Resava.¹⁰⁵⁶

Finally, the stucco production from Amalfi shows a range of patrons which belonged to the local aristocracy, which was active enough to hire artisans familiar with the latest artistic trends; however, the ruling family, the Angevins of Naples, never used stucco. In Epiros and in Morea, where we have groups of local aristocrats too, we find that stucco was not only used by them but also by rulers.¹⁰⁵⁷ In both cases, we see that stucco was highly valued by these Medieval societies, even though marble was generically considered to be more appropriate for

¹⁰⁵⁴ Caskey 2008, 116-117.

¹⁰⁵⁵ Grabar 1976, 21-23; Melvani 2013, 112-113, 117-122. The question of the sculptures of the Paregotirissa of Arta is still open, and for this reason I will not include it here. On the topic of cultural memory and the transmission and assimilation of architectural forms, see Grossman 2012. On

¹⁰⁵⁶ Simić *et al.* 2011, 54, 82, figs. 40-42.

¹⁰⁵⁷ See chapter 3.4.

the representation of rulers. While in Byzantium this statement fits perfectly with Palaiologan patronage in Constantinople, Mystras and Arta provides us with some exceptions (Peribleptos church and Kato Panagia), which show a more dynamic and varied aesthetic.

Anatolia

When we compare the stucco production of thirteenth, fourteenth, and the fifteenth centuries from Anatolia, Egypt and Islamic Spain with that from Greece and the Dodecanese islands we do not find too many elements in common. Stucco was used to cover whole interior surfaces (figs. 5.129-5.130), and it followed design which do not find comparison with Byzantine stucco (figs. 5.131-5.132).

However, it is important to see how stucco was used in Seljuk palaces in Anatolia to compare it with Byzantine ones, because, as we have seen, there were occasionally buildings made in 'Persian' (that is probably Seljuk) style built for rulers and for the aristocracy since the Middle Byzantine period.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, Anatolia was under the rule of the Seljuks of Rum and gradually came under the Mongols (Ilkhanids).¹⁰⁵⁸ In general, it seems that stone was preferred to stucco, following traditions of stone-carving rooted in these territories since the Roman period. Stucco appeared to be more widespread in the areas under Seljuk control which today are between the states of Iran, Afghanistan and Turkmenistan,¹⁰⁵⁹ where stucco was used to create monumental figures, such as those of princes, which are now in museums, among them, the Metropolitan Museum of New York and the Staatliche Museum of Berlin, which have

¹⁰⁵⁸ On the architecture of the last Seljuk period and the Mongol domination, see Blessing 2014.

¹⁰⁵⁹ Öney 1980, pp. 173-174; Crane 1994; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 215-243; Ölçer 2005, 110. These scholars interpreted the use to decorate facades with monumental sculpture as a result of the interaction between the local tradition in stone carving and decorative patterns in stuccoworks from Iran and Afghanistan.

been recently attributed to Western Iran (fig. 5.133).¹⁰⁶⁰ There are not any comparable examples from Anatolia. What remains of the use of stucco in Anatolia are some mihrabs in mosques, such as the fragmentary mihrabs from the Ulu Cami in old Matalaya (1247) and the Eşhrefoğlu Suleyman Bey Hamam in Beyşehir (end of the thirteenth century);¹⁰⁶¹ the intact stucco mihrab friezes in the Sahib-ata Khanigah Madrasa at Konya (1279-80);¹⁰⁶² and finally the stucco friezes framing the faience mosaic mihrab in the Arslanhane mosque (1289) in Ankara.¹⁰⁶³

Finally, the most interesting evidence comes from secular architecture: the stuccoes dated to the renovation of the pavilion of the Alaeddin Palace in Konya by Kay Qubad I (second quarter of the thirteenth century) (fig. 5.135),¹⁰⁶⁴ and the Kubadabad Palace near Lake Beyşehir (ca 1236) (fig. 5.134). The stuccoes from these palaces are moulded cornices and arches which were used for decorating walls next to tiles, opus sectile pavements, marble and stone sculptures.¹⁰⁶⁵ The cornices show images of animals, fantastic animals and in one case two horsemen killing a lion and a dragon in a typical Seljuk formula.¹⁰⁶⁶ This shows the continuous use of figural sculpture in Seljuk secular buildings of Anatolia, which, however differed from a widespread general trend in Seljuk and Ilkhanid territories, where we saw an increase use of stucco for creating human figures in high reliefs which will eventually arrive at its highest peak in the fourteenth century.¹⁰⁶⁷ This trend was also adopted by Christian communities, especially

¹⁰⁶⁰ Heidemann *et al.* 2014; Rugiadi 2016, 40-47, cat. no. 1a-j.

¹⁰⁶¹ Öney 1980, 173.

¹⁰⁶² Öney 1980, 174.

¹⁰⁶³ Otto-Dorn 1956; Öney 1980, 174.

¹⁰⁶⁴ Otto-Dorn 1969, 475-479; Öney 1980, 173; Redford 1993, 221, 223, n. 19; Ettinghausen *et al.* 2001, 256-257; Roxburgh (ed.) 2005, 392, no. 58; Canby *et al.* 2016, 81-87; Blessing 2014, 29.

¹⁰⁶⁵ Otto-Dorn 1969, 477-79; Redford 1993; Roxburgh (ed.) 2005, 392, no. 58.

¹⁰⁶⁶ This iconography shows the intersection and the mixing of cultures of Anatolia in this period, since the horseman slaughtering the dragon can be a reference to St. George but also the dragon symbolises the moon and the lion the sun for Seljuk culture, Ölçer 2005, 112-113. The same of 'Seljuk' dragon can be found in wall paintings of Cappadocia of the thirteenth century, see Jolivet-Levy 2008; on the artistic relationship between Christian Orthodox of Cappadocia and Seljuk, see Uyar 2015.

¹⁰⁶⁷ Rugiadi 2016, 40-47.

in the area of Mosul, where churches record the use of large figurative panels made of stucco worked in a style similar to the Iranian examples (figs. 5.136-5.138).¹⁰⁶⁸

The absence of large human figures from the palaces of Konya and the restricted use of stucco to only cornices and friezes, as happened in Byzantine buildings, makes Konya as a sort of middle point between Byzantium and Iran. Stuccoes from Konya were worked using moulds and stamps,¹⁰⁶⁹ a technique not common in Byzantine stuccoes, with the exception of Epiros. When we compare the ornamental patterns and the style of carvings of the latter, it seems there are not comparisons with Seljuk and Ilkhanid stuccoes. In this period, Byzantine stucco did not mirror the increasing political and economic contacts with the Seljuks of Anatolia, which were nonetheless visible in other aspects of Byzantine life.¹⁰⁷⁰

5.5 Conclusions

Looking at Middle and Late Byzantine stucco in comparison with the rest of the Mediterranean may leave us a bit disappointed. Stucco does not appear to be the preferred medium to testify the continuous exchanges Byzantium had with the different cultures overlooking the Mediterranean. This statement is generical and does not pretend to include every manifestation of stucco produced in the Middle Ages in Byzantium. Indeed, the Late Byzantine stuccoes produced in Epiros probably suggest connections and exchanges with the Balkans and Serbia in particular.¹⁰⁷¹

¹⁰⁶⁸ This is the case of the Syriac monastery church of Mar Benham near Qaraqosh (Iraq) (half of the thirteenth century) where, on one panel, there is the representation of a seated figure and, in another, there is a rider on a horse and an angel. The images made in stucco are those of Saint Benham and his sister Sarah, see Snelders, Jeudy 2006 in part. 130-135, pl. 18-19. The images were highly damaged in 2015 by ISIS occupants who also blown up the funerary monument of Saint Behnam, Lafleur 2017.

¹⁰⁶⁹ Roxburgh (ed.) 2005, 392, no. 58.

¹⁰⁷⁰ On the political, economic, and cultural contacts between Seljuks and Byzantium, see in particular Brand 1989; Necipoğlu 2009; Redford 2012; Necipoğlu 2013; Korobeinikov 2014; Uyar 2015; Shukurov 2016.

¹⁰⁷¹ See in particular chapter 1.11, 1.13.

In Byzantine architecture, there is no evidence for extended surfaces covered with stucco, whilst this is clearly the case for Italy and Islam. The role of stucco in Byzantium seems to be restricted to frames, free-standing liturgical furnishings and cornices. In a way, it perpetuates, even if with some innovations (*templa*, *proskynetaria*), the conventions of Roman architecture. This is probably the main difference with stuccoes produced in the rest of the Mediterranean, and its main feature.

Regarding iconography, in stucco production it is also more difficult to detect patterns directly imported from other cultures which go beyond the general trends recorded in marble sculpture. That is to say that stucco does not seem to be a privileged material for exploring the interaction of Byzantium with the different cultures of the Mediterranean.¹⁰⁷² One would expect the high mobility of stucco-artisans in the Mediterranean due to the relatively easy transport of the material, as happened, for example, in fourteenth- and fifteenth-century Spain with the so-called Mudejar style,¹⁰⁷³ but unfortunately this cannot be demonstrated for Byzantium. These are, however, considerations which resulted from an unfair comparison. Indeed, all the Byzantine stuccoes analysed come from religious contexts, therefore they are not representative of the entire stucco production in Byzantium. In the realm of secular architecture, we already mentioned known cases of importation of foreign artisans to make buildings in a ‘foreign’ style.¹⁰⁷⁴ The first is the palace of Bryas built by the emperor Theophilos in the manner of Abbasid palaces of Baghdad.¹⁰⁷⁵ Here it is not the place to discuss the political meaning of this palace, because the main focus of this chapter is to evaluate to what extent Byzantine stucco interacted with the rest of the Mediterranean. We cannot exclude, but neither prove it that in

¹⁰⁷² Textiles, ivory and metal working are a more fertile ground to see these exchanges.

¹⁰⁷³ On Mudejar style, see Robinson 2011.

¹⁰⁷⁴ See above. For a discussion of the inclusion of ‘foreign’ elements in the representation of the Byzantine emperor, see the volume of Walker 2011.

¹⁰⁷⁵ The palace is mentioned by the Continuator of Theophanes, Mango 1972, 120. On the palace of Bryas, see Grabar 1957, 169-172; Ricci 1998; Keshani 2004; Brubaker, Haldon 2015, 421-422.

the Bryas palace stucco was used next to marble, as in the Abbasid palace of Samarra (usually taken as a point of reference for the lost palace of Baghdad). Even though we do not know whether the Bryas palace had stucco inside, it is important not to exclude a priori that there it was missing. Indeed, as we saw in the first chapter of this thesis, Byzantines appreciated stucco for the elaborate shapes artisans were able to create with it and for its brilliant colours. Its materiality was not their concern, and they were rarely explicit to say that something was made of stucco.¹⁰⁷⁶ In any case, there is no surviving evidence for the spread of Abbasid style stucco in Byzantium in the subsequent period. The same can be said for the impact of the so-called *Mochroutas* palace which has been identified by some scholars with the *Manuelites*, the palace built by the emperor Manuel I Komnenos (1143-1180).¹⁰⁷⁷ Whether we need to imagine the muqarnas ceiling as made of wood or stucco, what is clear is that there are not any other known mentions nor material evidence for muqarnas in Byzantium. This is not to say that Byzantium was impermeable to any other culture, because it is well known that it was indeed permeable. However, when we deal with stucco these intersections cannot be easily identified. Indeed, all the known examples do not show an extensive use of stamps, which were generously used by Seljuk, Andalusian and Northern African artisans.¹⁰⁷⁸ Regarding stucco production in Greece and islands under Latin rule, we may expect to see some Western influence in the sculpture in plaster, as, for example, happens in Peloponnese with sculpture in porous limestone, but this seems only to involve some painted iconographic motifs, such as the grotesque lionheads transposing the motif in painting.¹⁰⁷⁹

¹⁰⁷⁶ See chapter 1. 16 and 4.4.

¹⁰⁷⁷ See footnotes 1003-1004 on this topic.

¹⁰⁷⁸ This can be seen, for example, in the stuccoes from Calabria and Sicily (figs. 5.74-5.92), in the stuccoes from Konya figs. 5.134-5.135), and in the Alhambra (fig. 5.130).

¹⁰⁷⁹ An exception may be the use of 'grotesque' lionhead for capitals in proskynetaria Type B in Longanikos, Naxos and Ljubostinja.

Nevertheless, the similar layout in the decoration of Fatimid mihrab and Middle and Late Byzantine proskynetaria should be explored more in depth in the future to see whether such solutions are resulting from the use of the same source or whether they are the fruit of the interactions between Byzantium and Egypt.

One aspect which can be recorded across the Mediterranean is the general ability of stucco-artisans to move across different media: painting, sculpture, wooden and ivory carving. Their rich decorative repertoire and close similarities between the quality of the carvings of stucco, ivory and wood suggests that stucco artisans were trained in multi-media workshops in Islam, Italy and Byzantium.

Finally, the aim of this chapter was to identify the specific aspects of Byzantine stucco in relation to the range of stucco production in the regions and political entities geographical, politically and economically connected with Byzantine territories. I believe that this aim was met and that it is clear that Byzantines used stucco according to architectural conventions which gave stucco the same space as marble and stone, which in the rest of the Mediterranean varied. In Byzantine architecture, it seems that there was never the will to use stucco to cover entire walls or ceilings as in Islamic and Romanesque buildings; this role was simply reserved for paintings and mosaics.

CONCLUSIONS

This thesis demonstrated that stucco continued to be used as architectural decoration in Byzantine buildings much later than the seventh century. It brought together the results of disparate studies, together with new material and textual evidence in order to begin writing a more coherent and systematic narrative for the history of Byzantine stucco between the middle of the ninth and the fifteenth century. This narrative is not always homogenous and does not provide absolute generalisations for the study of this material. This is caused by the availability of the surviving archaeological evidence on isolated monuments and few groups of buildings connected by geographical location and chronology. Unfortunately, chance survival of both structures and their original decorative schemes, and the absence of widespread detailed knowledge about stucco in the general scholarship continue to be a hinderance. Therefore, this study is the product of a series of snapshots where micro-regional contexts which were analysed in their specificity first, providing micro-histories which then allowed for the observation of general trends. Thus, the future discovery of further archaeological evidence and the consequent enlargement of this corpus, may change some of the general observations made here.

However, what this thesis stressed from the beginning is the need for a rigorous methodology in studying stucco which starts with the systematic cataloguing activity undertaken here. This activity is, nevertheless, interpretative, but essential in order to establish a dialogue between stucco decorations and the other materials used for decorating Byzantine architecture. This process is to provide stucco with a contextual framework. The components of that framework are threefold: the single building, the broader context of Byzantine art, and the stucco production in the Mediterranean. It is the interaction between micro and macro contexts which is the core for understanding stucco in Byzantine architecture.

Before this study, the knowledge about Byzantine stucco between the ninth and the fifteenth centuries consisted of isolated works concerned with specific studies.¹⁰⁸⁰ Basically, there was not an overview of long-term phenomena and intra-regional patterns. In terms of long-term phenomena, it was not clear how much the use of stucco in the Middle and Late Byzantine period was indebted with the Early Byzantine and Late Antique period.¹⁰⁸¹ This research provided material for understanding patterns of continuity which can be identified with the types of architectural decorations employed (cornices, friezes, arches, semi-colonnettes, three dimensional liturgical furnishings) and with the decorative motifs used (e.g. acanthus leaves in Hosios Loukas, astragals, dentils and dices, and ovuli). In particular, the use of arches and colonnettes to mark the windows of the *choroi* in the katholikon of Vatopedi (beginning of the eleventh century) reminds of previous uses such those in the Baptistry of the Orthodox in Ravenna (ca. mid-fifth century). This testifies of architectural conventions which passed from Late Antiquity to the Middle Byzantine period and the formal changes that they experienced too: in Vatopedi there are not the aediculae with saints flanking the windows but only arches and colonnettes marking the window's level.¹⁰⁸²

Some ways of using of stucco which did not survive to the Middle and Late Byzantine periods include the revetment entire vaults and soffits of the arches (e.g. S. Vitale in Ravenna, the Euphrasian Basilica in Poreč), but also the employment of stucco to complement mural paintings as happened in the Imperial period (e.g. the stuccoes from the Farnesina). In general, the amount of stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine religious buildings dramatically decreased and its place was taken by mosaics and mural paintings. The parts which continued to be made with stucco are those which more resembled sculpture. A major change from Late Antiquity is

¹⁰⁸⁰ See the Introduction for a discussion on the state of scholarship.

¹⁰⁸¹ See chapter 1.

¹⁰⁸² See chapter 1.

also the apparent absence of human figures in the stuccoes analysed. However, this statement should be contextualised before being passively accepted. Indeed, the typologies of stucco decorations which survive today are those which statistically contain fewer images in Middle and Late Byzantine sculpture (cornices, arches, corbels, proskynetaria frames, capitals). With few exceptions,¹⁰⁸³ among architectural decorations, the panels and epistyles are usually the elements where human figures are carved. The only panels made of stucco that we know are either aniconic (Maroneia) or they are so fragmentary that we cannot reconstruct the original design (Epiros). The epistyles analysed (Epiros) do not have any human figures. Therefore, we need to be cautious regarding human figures and stucco, also because it may not mirror the evidence in secular contexts.¹⁰⁸⁴ I believe that with the eventual discovery of new pieces this aspect will be clarified in the future.

The decrease in the use of stucco in Middle and Late Byzantine architecture compared to the Early Byzantine period observed in this thesis has consequently raised questions on whether the artisans in charge of stucco decorations were stucco-workers by profession or people belonging to the crew of painters and sculptors who occasionally were in charge of stucco elements in addition to other tasks. As we have seen in chapter 2, the legislation present in the Book of the Eparch seems to perpetuate the reality described in previous codes (the Diocletian's edict on maximum prices, a constitution of Constantine I from 337, and the *Codex Iustinianii*) by listing professionals in charge only of stucco elements (*gyssoplastes*) next to painters, sculptors, masons etc.¹⁰⁸⁵ Yet, the comparative analysis of the archaeological evidence makes difficult to imagine stucco-workers as independent professionals, especially when we look at the small amount of stucco used in most of the middle and late Byzantine buildings,

¹⁰⁸³ The sculptural production of Late Byzantine Constantinople, and the arches in the Parigoritissa of Arta in Epiros.

¹⁰⁸⁴ For a discussion on this topic, see chapters 1.4, 1.16.

¹⁰⁸⁵ See chapter 2.4.

with the exclusions of the exceptional case of thirteenth-century Epiros, and possibly tenth and eleventh-century Athos.¹⁰⁸⁶ They would not have enough work to do. Moreover, the almost complete absence of mentions of stucco-workers in narrative, historical, and hagiographical texts makes it impossible to take the passage of the Book of the Eparch as representative of the ‘standard’ artisanal composition of the Middle and Late Byzantine period when locales very different from Constantinople, such as smaller cities and rural contexts, existed. Therefore, the comparative analysis of textual and material evidence, does not allow for arguing that in all the case-studies evaluated here, there were people who worked stucco for living. What it seems more plausible is that in big-scale building projects stucco decorations were entrusted to an individual or a group of individuals (e.g. the katholikon of Hosios Loukas), while in smaller buildings stucco elements were worked by people who belonged to the group of the sculptors (e.g. St. Panteleimon at Nerezi) or the painters (e.g. Panagia of Archatos in Naxos).¹⁰⁸⁷ The complexity and the difficulty in finding explicit mentions of stucco-workers in written sources is mirrored by some case studies, especially proskynetaria Type B and in the case of the Timios Stavros monastery in Cappadocia, where it is not possible to draw a line between the painter and the stucco-worker through the progression of the work, suggesting that the stucco elements were made by the painter or by someone who was working side-by-side with him, on the same scaffoldings.¹⁰⁸⁸ This ‘hybrid’ situation is not automatically synonym of low quality. The ability to model and carve stucco depended on the skills of the artisan and of their training.

Generally, Byzantine artisans used a great variety of techniques and approaches on stucco which avoided standardisation. Stucco reliefs were shaped through the use of spatulae, knives, pointed tools, and free hand but also by means of movable mouldings and stamps.¹⁰⁸⁹

¹⁰⁸⁶ See chapter 2.5.

¹⁰⁸⁷ See chapter 2.5, 2.8.

¹⁰⁸⁸ See chapter 2.5 and cat. No. 5 on this matter.

¹⁰⁸⁹ See chapter 2.2

The relief was then covered by paint and sometimes the details were carved on the dry surface. Other times, especially in works of lower quality (Proskynetaria Type B), the shape was outlined with a spatula or a trowel and the decorative motifs were painted to imitate carved ones.¹⁰⁹⁰ What still remains to be seriously investigated is the chemical composition of stucco mixtures, a fact which cripple our knowledge of Byzantine artisans' procedures and does not allow for a serious comparative analysis with the rest of the Mediterranean.¹⁰⁹¹

However, the analysis of the technical, stylistic and iconographical aspects of stucco decorations carried out in this thesis have already provided with new insights on the history of some buildings. In particular, for the *katholika* of Vatopedi and Iviron monasteries it helped in expanding the historical setting behind the creation of their stuccoes (Vatopedi, Iviron) and nuancing their chronology (Vatopedi).¹⁰⁹² The will of the monastery of Vatopedi to establish its authority as a coenobitic monastery on Athos was projected through the enlargement of its *katholikon* and new decorations made of stucco in the *liti* and in the *choroi*.¹⁰⁹³ On the basis of the technical, iconographic and stylistic analysis and the comparison with the rest of the sculpture in the *katholikon*, I argued that the stucco arches in the *choroi* should be contemporary and not earlier to those in the *liti* and therefore should be dated to the beginning of the eleventh-century, during the new works in the church. The monastery of Iviron and the personality of the *hegoumenos* George the Hagiorite should be connected to the stuccoes in the narthex of the *katholikon*.¹⁰⁹⁴ They were part of a series of interventions aiming to reinforce the Georgian leadership of the monastery at the eyes of the Greek community of Iviron, of the other Athonite monasteries, and of the rest of the Orthodox world. This strategy was based on the promotion

¹⁰⁹⁰ See chapter 2.2.

¹⁰⁹¹ For a problematisation and a state of the knowledge about Byzantine stucco mixtures, see chapter 2.3.

¹⁰⁹² See chapter 2.7.

¹⁰⁹³ See chapter 2.7 for the analysis of the technical aspects and chronology, and chapter 3.3 for the historical framework.

¹⁰⁹⁴ See chapter 3.3.

of the cult as saint of one of its Georgian founders, Euthymios, on his connection with the Mother of God and the rehabilitation of the previous hegoumenos George I. All these elements were concentrated in the narthex of the katholikon (tomb of Euthymios, tomb of George I, image of the Virgin). Two of them (tomb of George I and the potential image of the Virgin) were framed by rich stucco elements which were probably gilded.¹⁰⁹⁵

The case of Iviron also shows us the relevance of stucco in patrons' strategies through architecture. In the Middle and Late Byzantine periods, patrons used stucco together with the other materials used for decorating their buildings where they aimed at perpetuating their memory. The analysis of the patronage of churches with stucco elements demonstrated that, in the Middle Byzantine period, stucco was mainly used by members of the imperial family, by aristocrats, and by rich monasteries; the only exception is the church of H. Ioannes Eleemon in Ligourio whose patron(s) is unknown. From the thirteenth century onwards, the range of patrons became more diverse including also communal foundations and members of the local aristocracy, mirroring a more general trend in Late Byzantine architecture already recorded through dedicatory inscriptions and donor portraits.¹⁰⁹⁶ Regarding the significance of stucco into the discourse of individual patrons, the best results were obtained in areas where there was a concentration of buildings with stucco: Mount Athos (tenth-eleventh centuries), Epiros (thirteenth century), Mystras and its surroundings (fourteenth century). The evidence from Athos was summarised in the previous paragraph. Regarding Epiros,¹⁰⁹⁷ this thesis helped to further frame the patrons of the churches using stucco liturgical furnishings (thirteenth century), by noting that this material connects a series of foundations of local aristocrats who collaborated with the Despots at different levels. The unpublished pieces from the church of Peshkëki e

¹⁰⁹⁵ See chapter 3.3.

¹⁰⁹⁶ See chapter 3, in particular 3.2.

¹⁰⁹⁷ See chapter 3.4.

Sipërme complicate this picture and may testify of the extension of this network in today Southern Albania, an area contended between the despotate of Epiros, the Palaiologoi of Constantinople, and the Angevins between the second half of the thirteenth century and the fourteenth century.¹⁰⁹⁸ All of them are located in peripheral mountainous areas with the exception of the Kato Panagia, on the plain of Arta, the capital of the State of Epiros. The Kato Panagia founded, probably by the despot Michael II Komnenos-Doukas around the middle of the thirteenth century represents one of the first occurrences of stucco and it raises the question of whether the use of this material started in the mountainous areas or rather it started in Arta and only later became typical of foundations of officers on the mountains due to easy transportation of gypsum in these remote areas.

The last group of patrons who used stucco were in the Despotate of Morea,¹⁰⁹⁹ in particular Mystras and in the settlements of Leontari and Longanikos. The results from this region differ from Epiros because here it is possible to see that the despot Manuel Kantakouzenos and his wife Isabelle de Lusignan could hire artisans who made a proskynetarion type A, while the unknown patrons of the churches in Longanikos and Leontari were able to hire multitasking-painters who were able to produce only mortar-based proskynetaria (Type B). In this case, then, stucco is an indicator of the means at disposal of the patrons and it is not surprising that at the top there is Isabelle de Lusignan and his husband, the despot of Morea.

The choice of stucco by artisans and patrons was also problematised in terms of economic implications (money and time) and cultural values. While this research demonstrated that the use of stucco *per se* helped in saving marble, and that in specific areas and chronologies

¹⁰⁹⁸ Nicol 1984, 50-83; Schreiner 2009; Osswald 2011, 103-140.

¹⁰⁹⁹ See chapter 3.4.

(Early Byzantine Cyprus and Late Byzantine Epiros) stucco was used out of necessity, it also showed that its use was imbued with aesthetic and ideological values.¹¹⁰⁰ The malleability of stucco allowed artisans to create extremely rich carvings which were widely appreciated by Byzantine authors and were considered worthy to be preserved by the Byzantine themselves (see the Late Byzantine redecoration of the churches of Protaton and Vatopedi which spared the stucco elements).¹¹⁰¹

Finally, this thesis outlined a broad comparison between Byzantine stucco production and the rest of the Mediterranean.¹¹⁰² What emerged from this analysis is that Byzantine stucco follows some conventions which made it different from the rest of the Mediterranean. These conventions are the result of the different organisation of the decoration in Byzantine architecture, especially from Italian and Islamic buildings. These differences tend to be typological and less related to the ornament. Indeed, while single decorative patterns such as palmette and half-palmette scrolls can be found in the Mediterranean in different variations, stucco is tied to the shapes and convention of Byzantine architecture and its interior decoration. This makes it almost impossible to record entire walls or vaults covered in stucco in Byzantium, while this happens in Islamic architecture in different territories and in occasionally in Italy. In Byzantium stucco is connected to transitional elements: cornices, corbels, proskynetaria frames and templa. It seems that there were nor any dadoes covered in stucco reliefs, as for example in ninth-century Samarra (Iraq), Islamic Spain, or the abbey of S. Fruttuoso in Camogli (Italy). Again, this aspect is connected with the use of sculpture in Byzantine architecture, at least religious ones, where dadoes are either covered with marble panels, possibly with their veneers disposed symmetrically, or by paintings, usually reproducing marble panels and/or with images

¹¹⁰⁰ See chapter 4.

¹¹⁰¹ See chapters 1.16, 4.4, 4.5.

¹¹⁰² See chapter 5.

of standing saints and Church fathers. This way of decorating churches became consistent in the Middle Byzantine period, after the end of the Iconoclasm, and in connections with the current developments in architecture seen elsewhere.

This does not mean that in Byzantine stucco there is no trace at all of the continuous visual exchanges taking place with the rest of the Mediterranean; these should have happened through other movable media such as woodworks, metalworks, jewellery, ivories and textiles. The absence of a specific 'repertoire' of shapes and patterns in stucco which goes beyond the realm of the aniconic motif may also be the result of the relatively scarcity of professional stucco artisans who could have looked at other uses of stucco, as well as other typologies of architectural decorations. Future directions for the study of the permeability of stucco to cross-cultural exchanges should focus on different media and should aim at exploring more in-depth aspects concerned with production processes, in particular the chemical composition of stucco mixtures. So far, only Medieval European stuccoes have benefitted from systematic testing campaigns; here features not labelled as 'local' are generally considered as 'Eastern introductions'. However, a more nuanced definition of 'Eastern' on the basis of actual technical processes is still to come.

In conclusions, this thesis provides with the first methodological overview of the use of Byzantine stucco between ca 850 and 1453. This work has begun answering some questions regarding the continuity in its use, its perception by Byzantine society, the evolution of its techniques and its contextualisation into the Mediterranean production, and in providing a systematic framework for the study of stucco, has detailed the course for possible future study. In the end, the history of a material is the history of the people who worked it, those who commissioned it and the society in which they lived.

TABLES

Table 1. Information about plaster composition of stucco decorations of buildings contained in Appendix A. They are listed following the order of the catalogue.

<i>Plaster composition</i> Building	Gypsum	Lime	Same as wall paintings	Unknown	Other materials
Boukoleon				X	?
Odalar Camii				X	?
Sampson hospital				X	?
Çanlı kilise	?			X	?
Timios Stavros			X		?
Maroneia				X	Straw?
Feres, Kosmosoteira					
Prespa, H. Achilleos				X	Linen rags
Protaton church				X	?
Vatopedi, katholikon				X	
Iviron, katholikon				X	
Kastoria, H. Georgios tou Bounou			X		
Kostaniane, Taxiarches	X				Reeds, (wood?)
Arta, Kato Panagia	X				Reeds
Boulgareli, Kokkini Ekklesia	X				Reeds, wooden lintel
Lyngos, Koimesis	X				Reeds, wooden lintel
Petrobitsa, Koimesis	X				Reeds
Kleidonia, Metamorphosis	X				Reeds, wooden lintels (?)
Hosios Loukas, katholikon				X	
Daphni	?				
Spelies, Hodegetria			X		ceramic fragments, small

					rocks/wooden fragments (?)
Ligouriou, H. Ioannes Eleemon			X		Wood shavings, small rocks
Mystras, Peribleptos				X	
Leontari, H. Athanasios			X		?
Longanikos, Koimesis			X		
Peshkëpi e Sipërme, church of the Virgin				X	?
Nerezi, St. Panteleimon				X	?
Samos, Virgin Makrini			X		
Naxos, Archatos, Panagia			X		
Naxos, H. Sozontous Giallous			X		
Naxos, Kato Potamia, H. Georgios			X		
Naxos, Kamino Philotio, H. Ioannes Theologos			X		
Cyprus, Kakopetria, St. Nicholas of the roof				X	?

Table 2. Buildings with proskynetaria frames Type A.

Cat. No.	Location	Church	Chronology	Patron	Audience	Bibliography
3	Constantinople	Sampson Hospital, chapel	Middle Byzantine (12 th c. ?)		Aristocratic	Dirimtekin 1962
9	Mount Athos, Karyes	Protaton	10 th c.	Athanasios (?)	Monastic	Mylonas 1979; Kalopissi-Verti 2006
28	Nerezi	St. Panteleimon	1164	Alexios Angelos Komnenos		Okunev 1929; Bošković 1933; Sinkević 2000; Kalopissi-Verti 2006
24	Mystras	Peribleptos	1365-1374	Isabelle de Lusignan and Manuel Kantakouzenos		Louvi 1980

Table 3. Buildings with proskynetaria frames Type B.

Cat. No.	Location	Church	Chronology	Patron	Audience	Bibliography
23	Peloponnese, Ligourio	St. John Eleemon	Second half of the 12 th c.			Bouras 1974.
30	Naxos, Archatos	Panagia	1285	Collective foundation		Konstantellou 2019
29	Samos, Kallithea	Virgin Makrini	Ca 1300	Monastic (?)		Mitsani 1989
22	Euboea, Spelies	Hodegetria	1311	<i>Kyr</i> Gregorios Pachomeres		Emmanuel 1990
31	Naxos, Hagiassos area	Hagios Sozon της Γαλλούς	1314	Collective foundation (?)		Kostarelli 2013
26	Peloponnese, Longanikos	Koimesis	Post 1374/75	Male aristocrat		Chassoura 2002
25	Peloponnese, Leontari	St. Athanasios	Ca 1370-90	Male aristocrat		Albani 1989

Table 4. Estimation of the amount of marble and stucco used in the buildings contained in Appendix A. The buildings are listed following the order of the catalogue.

Cat. No.	Church	Marble	Stone	Stucco/plaster	Sculptures not in situ/lost
7	Feres, Kosmosoteira	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •4 capitals •4 columns •3 mullions (min.) •Templon: 3 epistyles, 8 colonnettes, 4 slabs, 4 half slabs) •2 doorframes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •115 m (ca 22.24 m2) stringcourse and dome cornices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •115 m (ca 22.24 m2) stringcourse and dome cornices •4 capitals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Altar •Tomb of Isaak Sebastokrator
8	Small Lake of Prespa, basilica of St. Achilleos		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •2 sarcophagi (8 slabs) •2 columns 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •4 arched slabs (ciborium?) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Templon •4 columns (ciborium) (?)
9	Athos, Karyes, Protaton church	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •templon (8 colonnettes, 2 slabs, 2 half slabs, 3 epistyles) •door frames •mullions 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •2 proskynetaria frames (2 arched slabs, 4 pairs of knotted colonnettes) 	
10	Athos, Vatopedi, katholikon (naos, mesonyktikon and liti) 1103	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •templon (8 colonnettes, 4 slabs, 3 epistyles) •13 columns with capitals, •14 slabs •1 stringcourse cornice (external) •5 doorframes •1 pseudo-sarcophagus (2 slabs) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •23.7 m (ca 4.26 m2) carved stringcourse cornice 1104 •6 arches •10 half-colonnettes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Altar

1103 Pazaras 2001a.

1104 There are other two stringcourse cornice made of plaster which do not have carved decoration. If these plaster cornices were there from the beginning, then the total perimeter covered with plaster instead of marble was 71 m.

11	Athos, Iviron, narthex of the katholikon ¹¹⁰⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • tomb (1 arch, 2 colonnettes) • 2 pseudo-sarcophagi (5 slabs) • opus sectile pavement 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 tomb: 1 arch, 2 colonnettes), door frame (2 half-colonnettes, 1 arch two quarter of arch) 	
13	Epiros, Kostantiane, church of the Taxiarches			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 slab • 2 arches 	• Templon?
15	Epiros, Boulgareli, Kokkini Ekklesia	• 6 mullions	• 2 columns	• templon (ca 4 colonnettes, 2 slabs, 1 epistyle)	
20	Beotia, Hosios Loukas, katholikon ¹¹⁰⁶	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Templon (6 colonnettes, 2 slabs, 3 epistyles) • Opus sectile wall • Champlevé cornice • Opus sectile pavement • 24 columns • Mullions • Window slabs (interior and exterior) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dome cornice (24.52 m, 6.13 m²) • Stringcourse cornice in the naos (46.7 m, 8.40 m²) • Stringcourse cornice in the narthex (28.37 m, 5.1 m²) • ca 20 corbels 	
22	Euboea, Spelies, church of the Hodegetria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Colonnade • Capital 	• 3 mullions	• Proskynetarion frame	
23	Peloponnese, Ligourio, St. John Eleemon, narthex	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several Ancient marble slabs re-used in the masonry • 2 columns 		• Proskynetarion frame	

¹¹⁰⁵ Pazaras 2006; Pazaras 2007.

¹¹⁰⁶ Bouras 2015, 60-85.

24	Peloponnese, Mystras, church of the Peribleptos ¹¹⁰⁷	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Templon: 3 epistyles, 2 slabs, possibly 6 colonnettes •7 imposts •2 columns •2 mullions •2 fragmentary cornices •1 slab 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •2 cornices in porous limestone •3 slabs •3 plaques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Proskynetarion (1 slab, possibly 2 colonnettes) 	
25	Peloponnese, Leontari, church of St. Athanasios		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •2 mullions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Proskynetarion frame (arch, 2 colonnettes) 	
28	Nerezi, church of St. Panteleimon ¹¹⁰⁸	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Templon (2 slabs, 2 half-slabs, 4 colonnettes, 1 architrave) •11 mullions 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •2 proskynetaria frames (2 arched slabs, 4 colonnettes) 	Altar?
30	Naxos, Archatos, church of the Panagia			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Proskynetarion frame (arched slab, 2 colonnettes)¹¹⁰⁹ 	

¹¹⁰⁷ Louvi 1980. In the table are mentioned only the pieces which were used in the Kantakouzenos-Lousignan phases.

¹¹⁰⁸ Sinkević 2000.

¹¹⁰⁹ The church has also a flat stringcourse cornice made of plaster, and a masonry templon whose chronology of the latter needs to be verified.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Actes de Esphigmenou : Lefort, J. (1973) *Actes de Esphigmenou*. Archives de l'Athos 6. Paris.

Actes d'Iviron I: Lefort, J. (1985) *Actes d'Iviron I. Des origines au milieu du XIe siècle. Texte*. Archives de l'Athos. Paris.

Actes de Lavra, I : Lemerle, P., Guillou, A. and Svoronos, N. (1970) *Actes de Lavra. Des origines à 1204. Texte*. Archives de l'Athos V. 5 vols. Paris.

Actes du Prôtaton : Papachryssanthou, D. (1975) *Actes du Prôtaton*. Archives de l'Athos 7. Paris.

Actes de Vatopédi, I: Bompaire, J., Lefort, J., Kravari, V., et al. (eds.) (2001) *Actes de Vatopédi. Des origines à 1329. Texte*. Archives de l'Athos XXI. Paris.

Actes de Xénophon: Papachryssanthou, D. (1986) *Actes de Xénophon*. Archives de l'Athos 15. Paris.

Agnellus Ravennatis, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis* : Agnellus Ravennatis, *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis*, XLI, ed. D. Mauskopf de-Liyanis, Turnhout, 2006

Cassiodorus, *Variarum*: Cassiodorus (1848) *Variarum, Libri Duodecim*. Patrologia latina. Migne, P. (ed.). Paris.

Cennino Cennini, *The Book of the Art*: Frezzato, F. (ed.) (2006), *Cennino Cennini. Il libro dell'arte*. I colibrì. Vicenza.

Chorikios of Gaza, *Opera*: Foerster, R. and Richtsteig, E. (eds.) (1929) *Choricii Gazaei opera*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Chronicon Cassinensis: Hoffmann, H. (ed.) (1980) *Leo of Ostia, Chronica Monasterii Casinensis*. MGH Scriptores. Hannover.

Chronicon Sanctae Sophiae: Martin, J.M. (ed.) (2000) *Chronicon Sanctae Sophiae (cod. Vat. Lat. 4939)*. Fonti per la storia d'Italia, Rerum Italicarum Scriptores. Roma.

Clavijo, *Embassy to Tamerlane*: de Clavijo, R. G. (1999). *Embajada a Tamorlán*, ed. Francisco López Estrada (F. López Estrada, Trans.). Editorial Castalia.

Cyriac of Ancona, Later Travels: *Cyriac of Ancona, Later Travels*. The I Tatti Renaissance Library. Bodnar, E.W. and Foss, C. (eds.). Cambridge, Massachusetts- London.

De Cerimoniis: Reiske, J.J. (ed.) (1829) *Constantini Porphyrogeniti Imperatoris De cerimoniis aulae Byzantinae libri duo: Graece et Latine*. Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae. Bonn.

De diversis artibus: Theophilus (2000) *De diversis artibus*. Salerno.

De mercedibus magistrum comacinarum: Caroli Baudi a Vesme (ed.) (1855) “De mercedibus magistrum comacinarum. Appendix XI, Edicti Liutprandi regis.” In *Edicta Regum Langobardorum*. Historiae patriae Monumenta. Torino. pp. 241–254.

Diocletianus, *Edicum de pretiis*: Lauffer, S. (ed.) (1971) *Diokletians preisedikt*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Available at: http://www.hs-augsburg.de/~harsch/Chronologia/Lspost04/Diocletianus/dio_ep_i.html (Downloaded: 20 February 2017).

Dionysiaca: Nonnus of Panopolis (1962) *Dionysiaca*. The Loeb Classical Library. III vols. Lind, D.R. (ed.). London: Heinemann.

Dionysios of Fourni, *Ερμηνεία*: Dionysios of Fourni (1885) *Ερμηνεία των Ζωγράφων ως προς την Εκκλησιαστικήν Ζωγραφίαν*. Konstantinides, A.P. (ed.). Athina.

Dionysios of Fourni (1974) *The “Painter’s manual” of Dionysius of Fourni : an English translation [from the Greek] with commentary of cod. gr. 708 in the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library, Leningrad*. London.

Edict of Rothari: Bluhme, F. (ed.) (1868) “Edictum Rothari.” In *Monumenta Germaniae historica inde ab anno Christi quingentesimo usque ad annum millesimum et quingentesimum*. Hannover: Impensis bibliopolii aulici ahniani. pp. 3–90.

Available at: https://www.dmgh.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb00000878_00003.html?sortIndex=020%3A010%3A0004%3A010%3A00%3A00&sort=score&order=desc&context=ROTHARI&divisionTitle_str=&hl=false&fulltext=ROTHARI (Downloaded: 24 September 2018).

Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*: Eusebius (1979) *De vita Constantini*. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers II. Schaff, P. (ed.). Eerdmans.

Available at: <https://www.ccel.org/ccel/s/schaff/npnf201/cache/npnf201.pdf>.

Ερμηνεία των Ζωγράφων ως προς την Εκκλησιαστικήν Ζωγραφίαν: Dionysios of Fourni (1885) *Ερμηνεία των Ζωγράφων ως προς την Εκκλησιαστικήν Ζωγραφίαν*. Konstantinides, A.P. (ed.). Athina.

Harmonopoulos, *Hexabiblos*: Constantinos, H. (1851) *Manuale legum sive Hexabiblos cum appendicibus et legibus agrariis*. Leipzig: T.O. Weigel.

Available at: <https://archive.org/details/constharmonopol00heimgoog/page/n7/mode/2up> (Downloaded: 17 February 2020).

Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*: Isidore of Seville (1911) *Etymologies*. Oxford.

La Vie de Georges l’Hagiorite: Martin-Hisard, B. (2006) *La Vie de Georges l’Hagiorite (1009/1010-29 juin 1065)*. Introduction, traduction du texte géorgien, notes et éclaircissements. *Revue des études byzantines*, 1 (64–65): 29–119.

La Vie de Jean et Euthyme : Martin-Hisard, B. (1991) *La Vie de Jean et Euthyme et le statut du monastère des Ibères sur l'Athos. Revue des études byzantines*, (49): 67–142.

Leonis diaconi Historiae: Hase, C.B. ed. (1828) *Leonis diaconi Caloensis Historiae libri decern*. Bonn.

Life of St. Lazaros in Mount Galesion: Greenfield Richard P. H. (2000) *The life of Lazaros of Mt. Galesion: an eleventh-century pillar saint*. Byzantine saints' lives in translation 3. Washington D. C.

Life of St. Symeon: La vie ancienne de S. Syméon Stylite le Jeune (521-592), ed. P. Van den Ven, *Subsidia hagiographica* 32. Bruxelles 1962, vol 1-2.

Life of St. Theodora of Arta: Talbot, A.-M. (ed.) (1996) "10. Life of Saint Theodora of Arta." In *Holy women of Byzantium : ten saints' lives in English translation*. Byzantine saints' lives in translation. Washington, D.C. pp. 322–333.

Niketas Choniates: Migne, P. (ed.) (1877) *Nicetae Choniatae Opera omnia*. Patrologia graeca cursus completus. Parisii.

Odluke veća Dubrovačke republike: Dinić, M.J. (1951) *Odluke veća Dubrovačke republike*. Beograd: Srpska Akademija Nauka.

Paulus Silentarius, *Descriptio Sanctae Sophiae*: De Stefani, C. (ed.). (2011) *Descriptio Sanctae Sophiae. Descriptio ambonis*. Berlin.

Photios, *Homiliae*: Laourdas, B. (ed.) (1966) "ΦΩΤΙΟΥ ΟΜΙΛΙΑΙ." In *Ἑλληνικά 12 Παράρτημα*,. Thessaloniki. pp. 1–186.

Pseudo-Zonaras (1808) *Iohannis Zonarae lexicon ex tribus codicibus manuscriptis*. 2 vols. repr. Amsterdam 1967. Leipzig.

Skylitzes, Synopsis: Iohannes, Wortly (ed.). (2010) *A synopsis of Byzantine History, 811-1057*, Cambridge.

The Book of Cerimonies: The book of ceremonies: with the Greek edition of the Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae (2012). Byzantina Australiensia. Canberra.

The Book of the Eparch: Koder, J. (1991) *Das Eparchenbuch Leons des Weisen*. Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

English translation: *Tò Επαρχικὸν βιβλίον. The book of the eparch. Le livre du préfet / by Leo VI, Emperor of the East; with an introduction by Ivan Dujcev* (1970). London.

Typikon of the Sebastokrator: Ševčenko, N. P. (2000) "Kosmosoteira: Typikon of the Sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos for the Monastery of the Mother of God Kosmosoteira near Bera." In *Byzantine monastic foundations documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies XXXV. 5 vols. Washington D. C. pp. 782–858.

Vita S. Symeonis: Vita S. Symeonis Junioris Stylitae, XXIV Maji (1866). In *Maii tomus quintus. Acta Sanctorum*. Editio novissima. Parisii et Romae. pp. 310–398.

Vitruvius, *De Architectura*: Vitruvius. *Architettura (Dai Libri I-VII)*. Translated by Silvio Ferri. Classici Greci e Latini. Milano, 2002.

English translation: Morgan, M. H. (1914). *Vitruvius. Ten Books on architecture*. London.

Available at: https://www.gutenberg.org/files/20239/20239-h/20239-h.htm#Page_131

Secondary sources

33 masterpieces of Islamic art from Ahuan Islamic Art 1974-1984 (1984). London.

Abbas, M. (2006) “The Fatimids.” In O’Kane, B. (ed.) *The treasures of Islamic art in the Museums of Cairo*. Cairo-New York. pp. 46–91.

Åberg, N. (1945) *The Occident and the Orient in the art of the seventh century. II, Lombard Italy*. Stockholm.

Acconci, A. (1993) S. Giovanni in Argentella presso Palombara Sabina: le testimonianze altomedievali; il ciborio e l’affresco dell’Adorazione della Croce. *Arte medievale*, VII. I: 15–41.

Aceto, F. (2001) “L’ Abruzzo e il Molise.” In D’Onofrio, M. (ed.) *La scultura d’età normanna tra Inghilterra e Terrasanta*. Roma. pp. 49–70.

Aceto, F. and Lucherini, V. (eds.) (2001) Leone Marsicano, Cronaca di Montecassino (1126-33). Biblioteca di cultura medievale. Milano.

Acheimastou-Potamianou, M. (1969) Νέα στοιχεῖα περί τῆς Μονῆς τοῦ Αγίου Νικολάου τοῦ Ντίλιου εἰς τὴν ὠῆσον τῶν Ἰωαννίνων. *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον*, A (24): 152–175.

Acheimastou-Potamianou, M. (1994) *Greek Art. Byzantine wall paintings*. Ekdotike Athenon. Athens.

Adam, J.-P. (2018) *L’arte di costruire presso i romani*. Biblioteca di archeologia. XII. Milano.

Adamiak, J. and Prillep, R. (1980) *Kunstland DDR: Ein Reiseführer*. München.

Albani, J. (1989) Die Wandmalereien der Kirche Hagios Athanasios zu Leondari. *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 39: 259–294.

(1992) The painted decoration of the cupola of the western gallery of the church of the Holy Apostles of Leontari. *Cahiers Archéologiques fin de l’Antiquité et Moyen Age*, (40): 161–180.

Allen, T. (1986) *A classical revival in Islamic architecture*. Wiesbaden.

Aliprantis, Th.Ch. (1975-1976) Ανασκαφή εις Άγιον Χαράλαμπον Μαρωνείας Κομοτηνής. *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, MB: 223–229.

Aliprantis, Th.Ch. (1994) *Βυζαντινή Μαρωνεία. Ανασκαφή στον Άγιον Χαράλαμπο*. Thessaloniki.

Alpatov, M. (1926) Die Fresken der Odalar-Djami in Konstantinopel. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, (26): 373–379.

Andaloro, M. (2006) “Dalla statua all’immagine dipinta.” In Andaloro, M. and Romano, S. (eds.) *La pittura medievale a Roma, 312-1431*. Milano. pp. 37–52.

Anderson, G.E. and Rosser-Owen, M. (eds.) (2007) *Revisiting Al-Andalus: Perspectives on the Material Culture of Islamic Iberia and Beyond*. Boston.

Anderson, J.C. (1982) The Seraglio Octateuch and the Kokkinobaphos Master. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (36): 83–114.

(2001) “Tiles, books, and the “Church like a bride adorned with pearls and gold.”” In Gerstel, S.E.J. and Lauffenburger, J.A. (eds.) *A lost art rediscovered: the architectural ceramics of Istanbul*. Baltimore. pp. 119–142.

Andiç, A. (2012) *İzmir Arkeoloji Müzesi’ndeki Bizans Dönemi Taş Eserleri*. Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Üniversitesi.

Angiolini Martinelli, P. (1968) “*Corpus*” della scultura paleocristiana bizantina ed altomedievale di Ravenna, I. Altari, amboni, cibori, cornici, plutei con figure di animali e con intrecci, transenne e frammenti vari. Roma.

Angold, M. (2017) *Nicholas Mesarites. His Life and works (in translation)*. Translated Texts for Byzantinists. Liverpool.

Antonaras, A.C. (2019) *Έργα από τη συλλογή του Μουσείου Βυζαντινού Πολιτισμού. The Art of Glass. Works from the collection of the Museum of Byzantine Culture*. Thessaloniki: Μουσείο Βυζαντινού Πολιτισμού.

Arce, I. (2007) “Umayyad building techniques and the merging of Roman-Byzantine and Partho-Sassanian traditions: continuity and change.” In *Technology in transition A.D. 300-650*. Late antique archaeology. Leiden. pp. 491–537.

Archéologie des nécropoles mérovingiennes en Île-de-France (2013). Programme collectif de recherche.

Argoud, G., Callot, O. and Helly, B. (1980) *Salamine de Chypre. XI, Une résidence byzantine, “L’huilerie.”* Paris.

Arletti, R. (2013) “A study of glass tesserae from the monasteries of Daphni and Hosios Loukas.” In Entiwigle, C. and James, L. (eds.) *New light on old glass: recent research on Byzantine mosaics and glass*. London. pp. 70–75.

Arslan, E.A., Bartoli, F., Boggi, R., et al. (2006) Indagini archeologiche nella chiesa dell'abbazia altomedievale di San Caprasio ad Aulla (MS). *Archeologia Medievale*, 36: 167–221.

Asgarı, N. (1984) Istanbul temel kazılarında haberler – 1983. *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı*, 2: 43–62.

Aslanidis, K. (2017) *Βυζαντινή ναοδομία στη Νάξο. Η μετεξέλιξη από την παλαιοχριστιανική στη μεσοβυζαντινή αρχιτεκτονική*. Thessaloniki.

Asonitis, S. (2005) *Το Νότιο Ιόνιο κατά τον Όψιμο Μεσαίωνα*. Athina.

Asutay, N. (2002) Uno sconosciuto monumento onorario dell'imperatore Foca da Synada presso Akronion (Afyon). *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, (95): 1–6.

Asutay-Effenberger, N. (2004) 'Muchrutas': Der seldschukische Schaupavillon im Grossen Palast von Konstantinopel. *Byzantion*, 2 (74): 313–329.

(2008) Das Kloster des Ioannes Prodromos της Πέτρας in Konstantinopel und seine Beziehung zur Odalar und Kasım Ağa Camii. *Millennium*, (5): 299–325.

Athanasoulis, D. and Mamaloukos, S. (2020) “Το κάστρο.” In S. Mamaloukos (ed.), *Λεοντάρι Αρκαδίας. Ιστορία, Αρχιτεκτονική & Προστασί*. Thessaloniki. pp. 26–37.

Auber de la Pierre, J. and Jeudy, A. (2018) *Catalogue général du Musée copte du Caire: objets en bois*. Bibliothèque d'études coptes. Le Caire.

Aurigemma, S. (1961) *La basilica sotterranea neopitagorica di Porta maggiore in Roma*. Roma.

Azzara, C. (2009) “Magistri commacini, maestranze e artigiani nella legislazione longobarda.” In *Magistri commacini. Mito e realtà del medioevo lombardo. Atti del XIX Congresso internazionale di studio sull'alto medioevo. Varese-Como 23-25 ottobre 2008*. Spoleto. pp. 19–33.

Babuin, A. (2013) “La decorazione ad affresco della chiesa degli Arcangeli a Kostaniani, in Epiro.” In *Vie per Bisanzio. Atti del VII Congresso dell'Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini (Venezia, 25-28 novembre 2009)*. Due Punti. Bari. pp. 395–414.

Bakirtzis, C. (1997) Φερραι, Κοσμοσώτεια. *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον*, 47 (B, 2): 506–507.

(1998) *The basilica of St. Demetrius*. Archaeological Guides I. M. X. A. Thessaloniki.

(ed.) (2003) *Άγιος Νικόλαος Ορφανός: οι τοιχογραφίες*. Athina: Ακρίτας.

Baldracco, G. (1941) La cripta del secolo IX nella chiesa di S. Prassede a Roma. *Rivista di archeologia cristiana*, (XVIII): 277–296.

Bardill, J. (2006) “Visualising the Great Palace of the Byzantine emperors at Constantinople. Archaeology, text, and topography.” In *Visualisierungen von Herrschaft: frühmittelalterliche*

Residenzen: Gestalt und Zeremoniell: internationales Kolloquium 3./4. Juni 2004 in Istanbul. Byzas. Istanbul. pp. 5–46.

Barrano, S. (2019) “La decorazione dell’aula: nuovi dati per un aggiornamento dell’ipotesi ricostruttiva del rivestimento interno.” In Barbera, M.R. and Magnani Cianetti, M. (eds.) *Minerva Medica: ricerche, scavi e restauri*. Milano. pp. 200–228.

Barrucand, M. and Rammah, M. (2009) Sabra al-Mansuriyya and her neighbors during the first half of the eleventh century: Investigations into stucco decoration. *Muqarnas*, 26: 349–376.

Barsanti, C. (1989) “Appunti per una ricerca sugli stucchi di ambito siciliano e calabrese in epoca normanna.” In *Atti del Congresso Internazionale, Rossano 28 settembre - 1 ottobre 1986*. Grottaferrata. pp. 351–364.

(1990) L’esportazione di marmi dal proconnesio nelle regioni pontiche durante il IV–VI secolo. *Rivista dell’Istituto Nazionale d’Archeologia e Storia dell’Arte*, 12. (1989): 91–220.

(2007) “La scultura bizantina fra tradizione e innovazione.” In Conca, F. and Fiacadori, G. (eds.) *Bisanzio nell’età dei Macedoni, forme della produzione letteraria e artistica, VII Giornata di Studi Bizantini (Milano, 15-16 marzo 2005)*. Quaderni di ACME 87. Milano. pp. 5–49.

(2011) “Un inedito disegno delle rovine del complesso costantinopolitano del Boukoleon.” In *Forme e storia. Scritti in arte medievale e moderna per Francesco Gandolfo*. Roma. pp. 45–58.

(2013) “Una ricerca sulle sculture in opera nelle cisterne bizantine di Istanbul: la Ipek Bodrum Sarnıcı (la cisterna n. 10).” In Rigo, A., Babuin, A. and Trizio, M. (eds.) *Vie per Bisanzio. VII Congresso Nazionale dell’Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini, Venezia 25-28 novembre 2009*. Bari. pp. 477–498.

(2016) “Scultura dipinta a Bisanzio.” In Andreuccetti, P.A. and Bindani, D. (eds.) *Il colore nel Medioevo: arte, simbolo e tecnica. Tra materiali costitutivi e colori aggiunti: mosaici, intarsi e plastica lapidea. Atti delle giornate di studi, Lucca, 24-25-26 ottobre 2013*. Collana di studi sul colore 5. Lucca. pp. 61–86.

(2019) “A margine delle colonne-clava dell’arco del Foro di Teodosio I a Costantinopoli.” In Cosentino, S., Pomero, E.M. and Vespignani, G. (eds.) *Dialoghi con Bisanzio. Atti dell’VIII Congresso Nazionale dell’Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini, Ravenna 25-27 settembre 2015*. Spoleto. pp. 45–62.

Barsanti, C. and Guiglia, A. (2014) “Alcune riflessioni sulle travi lignee scolpite della Santa Sofia a Costantinopoli e sui restauri dei fratelli Fossati.” In *L’officina dello sguardo. Scritti in onore di Maria Andaloro*. Roma. pp. 271–284.

Barsanti, C., Guiglia, A. and Paribeni, A. (2010) “Le officine dell’imperatore: marmora byzantina.” In *Medioevo: le officine. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi Parma, 22-27 settembre 2009*. Milano. pp. 118–151.

Barskij, V.G. (1887) *Vtoroje posescenie svjatoj Athonskoj gori*. St. Petersburg.

Bassan, E. (2000) Vassalletto. *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Medievale*. Available at: https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/vassalletto_%28Enciclopedia-dell'-Arte-Medievale%29/.

Bauer, F.A. (2013) *Eine Stadt und Ihr Patron. Thessaloniki und der Heilige Demetrios*. Berlin.

Belli d'Elia, P. (1987) *Alle sorgenti del Romanico: Puglia XI secolo*. Bari: Edizioni Dedalo.

(2003) *Puglia romanica*. Patrimonio artistico italiano. Milano: Jaca Book.

(2008) "Interventi." In *Gli stucchi di San Fruttuoso di Capodimonte*. Genova: De Ferrari. pp. 104–109.

Belting, H. (1970) *Das illuminierte Buch in der spätbyzantinischen Gesellschaft*. Heidelberg.

Bernabò, M. (2008) *Il Tetravangelo di Rabbula, Firenze, Biblioteca medicea laurenziana, Plut. 1.56: L'illustrazione del Nuovo Testamento nella Siria del VI secolo*. Roma.

Bernabò, M. (2014) The Miniatures in the Rabbula Gospels: Postscripta to a Recent Book. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (68): 343–358.

Bertelli, C. (1981) *Il ciborio della basilica di Sant'Ambrogio in Milano*. Milano.

Bertelli, G. (1979) Note sugli stucchi della cripta di San Pietro al Monte a Civate. *Bollettino d'Arte*, VI (64): 69–78.

(ed.) (2002) *Le Diocesi della Puglia Centro-Settentrionale: Aecae, Bari, Bovino, Canosa, Egnathia, Herdonia, Lucera, Siponto, Trani, Vieste*. Corpus della scultura altomedievale 15. Spoleto.

(2018) "Scultura in stucco in età medievale in Puglia (secoli V-XII). Un ritorno al passato." In *"Di Bisanzio dirai ciò che è passato, che passa e che sarà" scritti in onore di Alessandra Guiglia*. 2 vols. Roma. pp. 483–505.

Bertelli, G. and Di Spirito, G. (2000) Nouveaux fragments sculptés en stuc provenant de Pietramontecorvino près de Lucera (Pouilles). *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 43e année (n°169) (Janvier-mars 2000): 91–99.

Betti, F. (2005) *La diocesi di Sabina*. Corpus della scultura altomedievale. Spoleto.

Bettini, S. (2001) "Opus tectorium, opus albarium, gypsum. Note sullo stucco romano tratte dalle fonti antiche." In *L'arte dello stucco in Friuli nei secoli XVII-XVIII: storia, tecnica, restauro, interconnessioni: atti del Convegno internazionale (Passariano - Udine, 24-26 febbraio 2000)*. A cura di Giuseppe Bergamini, Paolo Goi. Udine. pp. 75–86.

Bevilacqua, L. (2011) "Committenza aristocratica a Bisanzio in età macedone: Leone protospataro e la Panagia di Skripou." In Quintavalle, A.C. (ed.) *Medioevo: i committenti: atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Parma, 21- 26 settembre 2010*. I convegni di Parma. Milano. pp. 411–420.

(2013) *Arte e aristocrazia a Bisanzio nell'età dei Macedoni*. Milion. Roma.

- Biscontin, G. and Driussi, G. (eds.) (2001) *Lo stucco: cultura, tecnologia, conoscenza: atti del convegno di studi, Bressanone 10-13 luglio 2001*. Marghera-Venezia.
- Blanc, N. (1983) Les stucateurs romains: témoignages littéraires épigraphiques et juridiques. *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Antiquité.*, 95 (2): 859–907.
- Blessing, P. (2014) *Rebuilding Anatolia after the Mongol conquest. Islamic architecture in the Lands of Rûm, 1240-1330*.
- Bloom, J.M. (1983) The Mosque of al-Hākīm in Cairo. *Muqarnas*, (1): 15–36.
- (1987) The Mosque of the Qarafa in Cairo. *Muqarnas*, (4): 7–20.
- (1988) The Introduction of the Muqarnas into Egypt. *Muqarnas*, (5): 21–28.
- (2007) *Arts of the City Victorious: Islamic art and architecture in Fatimid North Africa and Egypt*. New Haven.
- Bloom, J.M. and Blair, S.S. (eds.) (2009) Stucco and plasterwork. *The Grove Encyclopedia of Islamic Art and Architecture*. 3 pp. 235–238.
- Bodnar, E.W. and Foss, C. (eds.) (2003) *Cyriac of Ancona, Later Travels*. The I Tatti Renaissance Library. Cambridge, Massachussets- London.
- Bogdanović, J. (2017) *The Framing of Sacred Space: The Canopy and the Byzantine Church*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bolman, E.S. (ed.) (2016) *The Red monastery church: beauty and asceticism in upper Egypt*. New Haven and London.
- Bolman, E.S. and Lyster, W. (2002) “The khorus vault: an Eastern Mediterranean synthesis.” In Bolman, E.S. (ed.) *Monastic visions. Wall paintings in the Monastery of St. Antony at the Red Sea*. New Haven. pp. 127–154.
- Bologna, F. (1986) “San Clemente al Vomano: il ciborio di Ruggiero e Roberto.” In Aceto, F. (ed.) *La Valle del medio e basso Vomano*. Roma. pp. 299–339.
- Bolognesi, E.M., Berucci, G. and Garnerone, D. (2008) The Bukoleon monumental itinerary and the two connected western and eastern itineraries. *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı*, (25): 117–128.
- Bon, A. (1951) *Le Péloponnèse byzantin jusqu'en 1204*. Paris.
- Borgia, E. (2012) “Attestazioni epigrafiche di mestieri legati alla costruzione nell'asia minore romana e protobizantina: specializzazioni e ruolo sociale.” In *Arqueología de la construcción III. Los procesos constructivos en el mundo romano: la economía de las obras*. Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología. Madrid. pp. 53–68.
- Bošković, G. (1933) La restauration récente de l'iconostase à l'église de Nerezi. *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, (VI): 157–159.

Bottari, S. (1931) Frammenti figurati in gesso di arte arabo-normanna rinvenuti in Itàla. *Archivio storico per la Sicilia orientale*, (28): 54–65.

Bouras, L. (1979) Architectural Sculptures of the Twelfth and the Early Thirteenth Centuries in Greece (pl. 21-32). *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, 4 (Στη μνήμη της Μαρίας Γεωργίου Σωτηρίου): 63–75.

L. (1980) *Ο γλυπτός διάκοσμος του Ναού της Παναγίας στο μοναστήρι του Οσίου Λουκά*. Βιβλιοθήκη της εν αθήναις αρχαιολογικής εταιρείας. Athina.

Bouras, Ch. (1974) Ο Άγιος Ιωάννης ο Ελεήμων Λιγουριού Αργολίδος. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής αρχαιολογικής εταιρείας*, 7: 1–30.

(1988-1989) Παρατηρήσεις στο καθολικό τής μονής τής Θεοτόκου Περιβλέπτου στά Πολιτικά Ευβοίας. *Αρχεόν Ευβοϊκών Μελετών*, (28): 53–62.

(1998) “The Daphni monastic complex reconsidered.” In Ševčenko, I. and Hutter, I. (eds.) *Aetos: Studies in Honour of Cyril Mango Presented to Him on April 14, 1998*. Stuttgart. pp. 1–4.

(2001) “The impact of Frankish architecture on thirteenth-century Byzantine architecture.” In Laiou, A. and Mottahedeh, R.P. (eds.) *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*. Washington D. C. pp. 247–262.

(2002) “Master craftsmen, craftsmen and building activities in Byzantium.” In *The Economic history of Byzantium*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 39. Washington D. C. pp. 539–554.

(2006) *Byzantine and post-Byzantine architecture in Greece*. Athens.

(2010) Μνείες οικοδόμων, μαστόρων και κατασκευαστών στο μέσο και το ύστερο Βυζάντιο. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, ΛΑ’: 11–16.

(2015) *Η αρχιτεκτονική της μονής του Οσίου Λουκά*. Athina.

Bouras, Ch. and Boura, L. (2002) *Η ελληνική ναοδομία κατά τον 12ο αιώνα*. Athina.

Boyd, S. (1992) “A “Metropolitan” treasure from a church in the provinces: an introduction to the study of the Sion treasure.” In *Ecclesiastical Silver Plate in Sixth-Century Byzantium*. Washington D. C. pp. 5–38.

Brand, C.M. (1989) The Turkish Element in Byzantium, Eleventh–Twelfth Centuries. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (23): 1–25.

Brandenburg, H. (2003) *Le prime chiese di Roma IV-VII secolo*. Milano.

Bréhier, L. (1940) “Clôtures de choeur dans les monastères de l’Athos.” In *Atti del V Congresso internazionale di Studi Bizantini*. Roma. pp. 45–56.

Brogiolo, G.P. and Antonelli, F. (eds.) (2014) *Dalla corte regia al monastero di San Salvatore - Santa Giulia di Brescia*. Mantova.

Brogiolo, G.P., Gheroldi, V., De Rubeis, F., et al. (2014) Nuove ricerche su sequenza, cronologia e contesto degli affreschi di Santa Maria *foris Portas* di Castelseprio. *Hortus Artium Medievalium*, 2 (20): 720–737.

Brooks, S. (2004) “Sculpture and the Late Byzantine tomb.” In Evans, H.C. (ed.) *Byzantium. Faith and Power (1261-1557)*. New Haven and London. pp. 95–116.

Brubaker, L. and Haldon, J. (2001) *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca 680–850): The Sources: An Annotated Survey*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

(2015) *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era, c. 680-850: a history*. Cambridge.

Brunov, N. (1926) Die Odalar-Djami von Konstantinopel. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, (26): 352–372.

Bühl, G. (2019) “Textiles, Architecture, Space.” In *Woven interiors: furnishing Early medieval Egypt*. Washington, D.C. pp. 15–34.

Burgio, L., Clark, R.J.H. and Rosser-Owen, M. (2007) Raman analysis of ninth-century Iraqi stuccoes from Samarra. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, (34): 756–762.

Butler, L.E. (1992) “Hagia Sophia’s nave cornices as elements of its design and structure.” In *Hagia Sophia from the age of Justinian to the Present*. Cambridge. pp. 57–77.

Cabañero Subiza, B. (2011) Pautas que rigen las composiciones decorativas del palacio taifal de la alcazaba de Balaguer (Lleida). *Artigrama*, (26): 535–556.

Cabiale, V. (2011a) “L’utilizzo del gesso nel mondo antico: alcuni esempi e osservazioni.” In *I solai di gesso. Giochi artistici d’ombre dal Monferrato*. Roma. pp. 319–336.

(2011b) “Manufatti autoportanti in gesso: alcuni esempi medievali.” In *I solai in gesso. Giochi artistici d’ombre dal Monferrato*. Roma. pp. 337–342.

Cagnana, A. (2000) *Archeologia dei materiali da costruzione*. Manuali per l’archeologia. Mantova.

Calò Mariani, M.S. (ed.) (1995) *Federico II: immagine e potere*. Bari.

Calvo Capilla, S. (2010) “Analogies entre les grandes mosquées de Damas et Cordoue: mythe ou réalité ?” In Borrut, A. and Cobb, P., M. (eds.) *Umayyad Legacies. Medieval Memories from Syria to Spain*. Islamic History and Civilization. Leiden, Boston: Brill. pp. 281–311.

(2014) *Las mezqitas de al-Andalus*. Estusio Andalusies. Almeria.

Campagnolo, M., Magdalino, P., Martiniani-Reber, M., et al. (eds.) (2014) *L’aniconisme dans l’art religieux byzantin. Actes du colloque de Genève (1-3 octobre 2009)*. Geneva.

Campania (2012). Touring Club italiano.

Campobasso, G. (2020) “Per una topografia sacra dell’Adriatico fra Medioevo ed Età Moderna: navigazione, pellegrinaggio, esperienze liminali e costruzione di luoghi santi sulle rotte per la Terrasanta. Dalle fonti all’immaginario.” In *Gli Amalfitani nella Puglia medievale. Insediamenti, fondaci, vie e rotte commerciali, relazioni artistiche e culturali. Atti del Convegno Amalfi, 15-16 dicembre 2017*. Amalfi. pp. 263–306.

Čanak-Medić, M. (1995) “Spasova crkva u Žiči.” In Čanak-Medić, M. and Kandić, O. (eds.) *Arhitektura prve polovine XIII veka*. Beograd. pp. 57–61.

Canav-Özgümüş, Ü. and Kanyak, S. (2015) “Recent glass finds from Pantocrator church in Istanbul.” In Lazar, I. (ed.) *Annales du 19e Congrès de l’association internationale pour l’histoire du verre. Piran 2012*. Koper. pp. 350–356.

Canby, S., Beyazid, S., Rugiadi, M., et al. (2016) *Court and Cosmos. The Great age of the Seljuqs*. New York.

Cantino Wataghin, G. (2006) “Lo stucco nei sistemi decorativi della Tarda antichità.” In *Stucs et décors de la fin de l’antiquité au Moyen Âge (Ve - XIIe siècle). Actes du Colloque international tenu à Poitiers du 16 au 9 septembre 2004*. Turnhout. pp. 115–124.

Carcopino, J. (1943) *La basilique pythagoricienne de la Porte Majeure*. Paris.

Carè, A. (2005) *L’ornato architettonico della Basilica di Massenzio*. Studia Archaeologica. Roma.

Carile A. (2009) “Artigiani e architetti nella legislazione esarcale e romano-orientale.” In *Magistri commacini. Mito e realtà del medioevo lombardo. Atti del XIX Congresso internazionale di studio sull’alto medioevo. Varese-Como 23-25 ottobre 2008*. Spoleto. pp. 691–712.

Casadio, P., Perusini, T. and Spadea, P. (1996) “Zur Stuckdekoration des “Tempietto Longobardo” in Cividale: Technische und naturwissenschaftliche Untersuchungsergebnisse.” In *Stuck des frühen und hohen Mittelalters. Geschichte, Technologie, Konservierung*. München. pp. 37–51.

Caskey, J. (2004) *Art and patronage in the medieval Mediterranean: merchant culture in the region of Amalfi*. New York.

(2008) Liquid Gothic: uses of stucco in southern Italy. *Reading Gothic architecture*, pp. 111–122.

(2011) Stuccoes from the early Norman Period in Sicily: figuration, fabrication and integration. *Medieval Encounters*, (17): 80–119.

Castagnino Berlingheri, F. and Paribeni, A. (2015) “Marble production and marble trade along the Mediterranean coast in the Early Byzantine period (5th-6th centuries AD): the data from quarries, shipwrecks and monument.” In Militiello, P.M. (ed.) *SOMA 2011. Proceedings of the 15th Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology, held at the University of Catania 3-5- March 2011*. BAR International Series 2695 (II). 2 vols. Oxford. pp. 1033–1041.

Cenci, C., Lauria, M. and Violante, S. (2013) “Decorazioni architettoniche e figurate in stucco.” In *Museo Nazionale Romano. Evan Gorga: la collezione di archeologia*. Milano. pp. 122–150.

Cervini, F. (1999) Prima di Nicola. Un rilievo classico che era a Badia a Settimo. *L'artista. Critica dell'arte in Toscana*, pp. 76–97.

Chassoura, O. (2002) *Les peintures murale byzantines des églises de Longanikos, Laconie*. Athènes.

Chatzidakis, M. (1969) A propos de la date et du fondateur de Saint-Luc. *Cahiers Archéologiques fin de l'Antiquité et Moyen Age*, (19): 127–150.

(1974) “Classicisme et tendances populaires au XIV^e siècle. Les recherches sur l'évolution du style”, In *Actes du XIV Congrès international d'Etudes byzantines (Bucharest 1971)*. 1 vols. Bucharest. pp. 153–188.

(1979) “L'évolution de l'icône aux 11^e–13^e siècles et la transformation du templon.” In *XV Congrès d'Etudes Byzantines. Athens Sept. 1976*. Athens. pp. 331–66.

Chatzidakis, N. (2013) “The Abbot Philotheos, Founder of the Katholikon of Hosios Loukas: Old and New Observations.” In Entiawistle, C. and James, L. (eds.) *New light on old glass: recent research on Byzantine mosaics and glass*. London. pp. 254–259.

Chinappi, E. (2018) “I monumenti funebri di Francesco della Rath e di Giacomo Martono nella cattedrale di Caserta Vecchia.” In Gianandrea, M., Gangemi, F. and Costantini, C. (eds.) *Il potere dell'arte nel Medioevo. Studi in onore di Mario D'Onofrio*. Roma. pp. 207–218.

Chinellato, L. (2011) Il battistero di Callisto, l'altare di Ratchis e i marmi del Museo Cristiano: spunti per una rilettura. *Forum Iulii*, (35.2011): 59–84.

(2014) “Il colore nella plastica del sec. VIII tra trattatistica e riscontri materiali: i casi di Cividale, Brescia e Disentis.” In *Un Medioevo in lungo e in largo da Bisanzio all'Occidente (VI-XVI secolo)*. Studi per Valentino Pace. Ospedaletto, Pisa. pp. 21–32.

Christidou, A. (2010) *Unknown Byzantine art in the Balkan area: art, power and patronage in twelfth to fourteenth-centuries churches in Albania*. PhD thesis, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of London.

Christou, D. (1994) Chronique des fouilles et decouvertes archeologiques a Chypre en 1993. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, (118): 647–93.

Cini, S. (1976) “S. Marco, rilevamento delle decorazioni in stucco altomedievali in stucco altomedievali di Roma.” In *Roma e l'età Carolingia. Atti delle giornate di studio, 3 - 8 maggio 1976*. Roma. pp. 310–312.

Ćirić, J.S. (2018) “Tying the Knot: the Knotted Column in the Architecture of King Milutin.” In *Minima medievalia, Atti Accademia roveretana degli Agiati, CCLXVIII*. Classe di Scienze umane Classe di Lettere ed Arti Accademia Roveretana degli Agiati IX. Rovereto. pp. 133–145.

Clévenot, D. and Degeorge, G. (2000) *Splendors of Islam. Architecture, decorations, design*. New York.

Corgnati, M. (2010) *L'arte dello stucco in Europa dalla Tarda antichità all'età gotica*. Perugia.

Corsi, A.L. (2017) A brief note on early Abbasid stucco decoration. mMadinat al-Far and the first Friday mosque of Iṣfahān. *Vicino Oriente*, (XXI): 83–95.

Crane, H. (1994) “Anatolian Saljuq architecture and its links to Saljuq Iran.” In *The Art of the Saljūqs in Iran and Anatolia: proceedings of a symposium held in Edinburgh in 1982*. Islamic art and architecture. Costa Mesa, California. pp. 257–268.

Cressier, P. and Vallejo Triano, A. (2015) Madīnat al-Zahrā' et Ṣabra al-Mansūriyya: deux versions d'un même scénario. *Journal of Islamic Archaeology*, 2 (2): 139–169.

Cressier, P. and Rammah, M. (2015) “Retour sur les stucs de Sabra al-Mansūriyya.” In *Montagne et plaine dans le bassin méditerranéen : actes du quatrième colloque international, Kairouan 5, 6 et 7 décembre 2011*. Tunis. pp. 303–317.

Creswell, K.A.C. (1952) *The Muslim architecture of Egypt. Vol 1 Ikshids and Fātimids A.D. 939-1171*. Oxford.

(1953) *The Muslim architecture of Egypt. Vol 2, Ayyūbids and early Bahrite Mamlūks, A.D. 1171-1326*. Oxford.

(1978) *The Muslim architecture of Egypt. Vol 1 Ikshids and Fātimids A.D. 939-1171*. New York.

(1979) *The Muslim architecture of Egypt. Vol 2, Ayyūbids and early Bahrite Mamlūks, A.D. 1171-1326*. New York.

Crivello, F. (2007) “Les Evangiles de Saint-Denis et l'influence de l'École de la cour de Charlemagne sur les scriptoria de Francie occidentale.” In Crivello, F. and Laffitte, M.P. (eds.) *Les Manuscrits carolingiens*. Bibliologia. Turnhout. pp. 45–88.

Crivello, F., Denoël, C. and Orth, P. (2011) *Das Godescalc-Evangelistar: eine Prachthandschrift für Karl den Grossen*. Darmstadt: Wiss. Buchges.

Crow, J. and Turner, S. (2014) “L'archéologie des églises aniconiques de Naxos.” In Campagnolo, M., Magdalino, P., Martiniani-Reber, M., et al. (eds.) *L'aniconisme dans l'art religieux byzantin. Actes du colloque de Genève (1-3 octobre 2009)*. Geneva. pp. 193–204, 313–316.

Ćurčić, S. (1979) *Gračanica: King Milutin's church and its place in late Byzantine architecture*. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Ćurčić, S. (2000) “Smisao i funkcija katihumena u poznovizantijskoj i srpskoj arhitekturi.” In Drašković, D. and Djordjević, S. (eds.) *Manastir Ziča: Zbornik radova*. Kraljevo. pp. 83–93.

(2000a) “Proskynetaria icons, saints, tombs, and the development of the Iconostasis’.” In Lidov, A. (ed.) *The iconostasis: origins-evolution-symbolism*. Moskow. pp. 134–142.

(2010) *Architecture in the Balkans from Diocletian to Süleyman the Magnificent*. New Haven.

(2015) “The Epirote input in the architecture of Byzantine Macedonia and of Serbia around 1300.” In Katsaros, V. and Tourta, A. (eds.) *Αφιέρωμα στο Ακαδημαϊκό Παναγιώτη Α. Βοκοτόπουλο*. Athina. pp. 127–140.

Curzi, G., Manzari, F., Tentarelli, F., et al. (2012) *Illuminare l’Abruzzo. Codici miniati tra Medioevo e Rinascimento*. Pescara.

Cutler, A. (2002) “The Industries of Art.” In *The Economic History of Byzantium. From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library Collection. Washington, D.C. pp. 555–587.

D’Achille, A.M. (1993) v. Ciborio. *Enciclopedia dell’Arte Medievale*. IV pp. 718–735.

Dadiani, T., Khundadze, T. and Kvachatadze, E. (2017) *Medieval Georgian sculpture*. Tblisi.

Dagron, G. (2002) “The Urban economy, seventh–twelfth centuries.” In *The Economic history of Byzantium*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 39. Washington D. C. pp. 393–461.

Daiber, V. and Becker, A. (eds.) (2004) *Raqqa III: Baudenkmäler und Paläste, I*. Mainz.

Dakaris, S. (1961) Αρχαιότητες και μνημεία Ηπείρου: Νομός Πρεβέζης (Μιχαλίτσι, Παλαιορόφορος, Μεσοπόταμον Φαναριού). Νομός Θεσπρωτίας (Νεολιθικόν σπήλαιον Σίδερης-Φιλιατών, Ρίζιανη, Ντόλλιανη). Νομός Ιωαννίνων (Δωδώνη, Λοιπαί εργασίαι). *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον*, 17: 187–199, pl. 221–226.

Dakaris, S. (1965) *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον, Χρονικά*, 2 (20): 355.

Daniilia, S., Sotiropoulou, S., Bikiarisa, D., et al. (2000) Panselinos’ Byzantine wall paintings in the Protaton Church, Mount Athos, Greece: a technical examination. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 1: 91–110.

Daniilia, S., Tsakalof, A., Bairachtari, K., et al. (2007) The Byzantine wall paintings from the Protaton Church on Mount Athos, Greece: tradition and science. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, (34): 1971–1984.

David-Weill, M.J. (1931) *Catalogue général du Musée arabe du Caire. Les bois à épigraphes jusqu’à l’époque mamlouke*. Cairo.

De Francovich, G. (1955) “Problemi della pittura e della scultura preromanica.” In *I problemi comuni dell’Europa post-carolingia*. Settimane di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull’Alto Medioevo. Spoleto. pp. 355–519.

De Giorgi, M. and Pedone, S. (2019) “La scultura nella chiesa di San Filippo a Hierapolis. Nuovi dati e il progetto Marmora Phrygiae.” In *Dialoghi con Bisanzio. Spazi di discussione*,

percorsi di ricerca. Atti dell'VIII Congresso dell'Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini (Ravenna, 22-25 settembre 2015). 2 vols. Spoleto. pp. 367–387.

Deichmann, F.W. (1956) *Studien zur Architektur Konstantinopels im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert nach Christus*. Baden-Baden.

Dell'Acqua, F. (2003a) *Illuminando colorat: la vetrata tra l'età tardo imperiale e l'alto medioevo. Le fonti, l'archeologia*. Studi e ricerche di archeologia e storia dell'arte 4. Spoleto.

(2003b) "Mundus habet noctem detinet aula diem". Il vetro nelle architetture di Brescia, Cividale, Salerno, San Vincenzo al Volturno, Farfa, nuovi dati scientifici." In *I Longobardi dei ducati di Spoleto e Benevento, atti del XVI Congresso internazionale di studi (Spoleto Benevento, 20-27 ottobre 2002)*. Spoleto. pp. 1351–1371.

(2004) "The Stained-Glass Windows from the Chora and the Pantocrator: a 'Byzantine' Mystery?" In *Restoring Byzantium. The Kariye Camii in Istanbul and the Byzantine Institute restoration*. New York. pp. 68–77.

(2005) Enhancing Luxury through Stained Glass, from Asia Minor to Italy. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 59: 193–211.

(2016) "Plaster Transennae and the shaping of light in Byzantium." In *La mémoire des pierres. Mélanges d'archéologie, d'art et d'histoire en l'honneur de Christian Sapin*. Bibliothèque de l'Antiquité Tardive 29. Turnhout. pp. 325–334.

Dell'Acqua, F., Foletti, I., Gheroldi, V., et al. (2017) Echoes of Milan in Ninth-Century Langobardia Minor? Preliminary Findings on the Painted Programme of S. Ambrogio alla Rienna, Montecorvino Rovella (Salerno). *Convivium*, IV (2): 202–209.

Dell'Acqua, F., Gheroldi, V., Marazzani, S., et al. (2018) La chiesa altomedievale di Sant'Ambrogio a Montecorvino Rovella (SA). Prima campagna di studi archeologici e storico-artistici. *Hortus Artium Medievalium*, (24): 417–442.

DeMoor, A. and Fluck, C. (2009) *Clothing the house: furnishing textiles of the 1st Millenium AD from Egypt and neighbouring countries*. Tiel.

Dennert, M. (1997) *Mittelbyzantinische Kapitelle. Studien zu Typologie und Chronologie*. Asia Minor Studien. Bonn.

Derat, M.-L., Fritsch, E., Bosc-Tiessé, C., et al. (2020) Maryam Nazret (Ethiopia): The Twelfth-Century Transformations of an Aksumite Site in Connection with an Egyptian Christian Community. *Cahiers d'Études africaines*, LX (3) (239): 473–507.

des Gagniers, J. and Tran Tarn Tinh (1985) *Soloi. Dix campagnes de fouilles, 1964-1974*. Ste. Foy, Quebec.

Deschamps, P. (1925) Etude sur la renaissance de la sculpture en France à l'époque romane. *Bulletin Monumental*, pp. 6–98.

Di Bello, C. (2015) *La scultura tra la fine del regno di Giustiniano e le prime formulazioni dell'età mediobizantina a Costantinopoli, in Asia Minore e in territorio ellenico: un percorso da delineare*. PhD thesis, Università di Roma "La Sapienza."

(2018) "Le sculture della Fatih Camii a Trilye: una tappa significativa nel processo di transizione verso la plastica mediobizantina." In Di Bello, C., Gandolfi, R. and Latella, M. (eds.) *In corso d'opera 2. Ricerche dei dottorandi in Storia dell'Arte della Sapienza*. Roma: Campisano editore. pp. 11–18.

(2020) "I capitelli imposta del tipo cosiddetto a pannelli nell'ambito della produzione scultorea postgiustiniana." In Moreau, D., Snively, C.S., Guiglia, A., et al. (eds.) *Archaeology of a World of Changes. Late Roman and Early Byzantine Architecture, Sculpture and Landscapes: Selected Papers from the 23rd International Congress of Byzantine Studies (Belgrade, 22–27 August 2016) – In memoriam Claudia Barsanti*. BAR International Series 2020. p. 267–276.

Di Branco, M. (2000) Lavoro e conflittualità sociale in una città tardoantica. Una rilettura dell'epigrafe di Sardi CIG 3467 (= Le Bas-Waddington 628 = Sardis VII, 1, n. 18). *Antiquité Tardive*, 8: 181–208.

Di Gangi, G. (1995) Alcuni frammenti in stucco di età normanna provenienti dagli scavi medievali di Gerace. *Arte Medievale*, (9): 85–103.

(1998) "Interventi archeologici a S. Maria del Mastro e nei pressi di loc. Parrere (Gerace): Nuovi dati su scavi e materiali." In *Calabria bizantina. Civiltà bizantina nei territori di Gerace e Stilo*. Soveria Mannelli. pp. 573–599.

(2003) "L'architettura religiosa di età normanna in Calabria." In Cuteri, F.A. (ed.) *Normanni in finibus Calabriae*. Soveria Mannelli. pp. 65–75.

Di Gangi, G., Lebole, C.M. and Sabbione, C. (1991) Scavi medievali in Calabria, Gerace 1. Rapporto preliminare. *Archeologia medievale*, (18): 587–642.

Di Muro, A. (2001) *Le terre tra Salerno e il Sele in età longobarda. Insediamenti economia e istituzioni dal VII all'XI secolo*. Salerno.

(2011a) "Il santuario del Mons aureus tra storia e archeologia (secoli VII-XI)." In *La Grotta di San Michele ad Olevano sul Tusciano. Storia, archeologia e arte di un santuario altomedievale*. Medievalia. Olevano sul Tusciano. pp. 7–68.

(2011b) *La Grotta di San Michele ad Olevano sul Tusciano. Storia, archeologia e arte di un santuario altomedievale*. Medievalia. Olevano sul Tusciano.

Di Muro, A., La Manna, F., Mastrangelo, M., et al. (2003) "Luce dalla grotta: primi risultati delle indagini archeologiche presso il santuario di san Michele ad Olevano sul Tusciano." In *Atti del III Congresso nazionale di archeologia medievale, (Castello di Salerno, Complesso di Santa Sofia, Salerno, 2-5 ottobre 2003)*. Firenze. pp. 393–410.

Dickie, J. (Zaki, Y). (1992) "The palaces of the Alhambra." In Dodds, J.D. (ed.) *Al-Andalus: the art of Islamic Spain*. New York. pp. 135–151.

Dimitrokallis, G. (1981) “Ο ναός της Παναγίας Ἀρχατοῦ Νάξου.” In *Α Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινὰς καὶ Μεταβυζαντινὰς Αρχαιολογίας καὶ Τέχνης. Abstracts*. 1981. pp. 15–16.

(1990) *Οι Ἀγνόσιοι βυζαντινοὶ ναοὶ τῆς Μεσσηνίας*. Athina.

(2001) *Γεράκι. Οἱ τοιχογραφίες τῶν ναῶν τοῦ Κάστρου*,. Athina.

Dirimtekin (1962) Les fouilles faites en 1946 - 1947 et en 1958 - 1960 entre Sainte-Sophie et Sainte-Irène à Istanbul. *Cahiers Archéologiques fin de l'Antiquité et Moyen Age*, 13: 161–185.

Djordjević, I.M. and Marković, M. (2000-2001) On the Dialogue Relationship between the Virgin and Christ in East Christian Art. *Zograph*, (28): 13–48.

Djurić, V. (1976) *Byzantinische Fresken in Jugoslawien*. Munich.

Dodds, J.D. (1992) “The Great Mosque of Córdoba.” In Dodds, J.D. (ed.) *Al-Andalus: the art of Islamic Spain*. New York. pp. 11–26.

Dominique, V. (2019) Ifriqiya. *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

Dospěl Williams, E. (2019) “Private spectacle.” In *Woven interiors: furnishing Early medieval Egypt*. Washington, D.C. pp. 35–62.

Doukata-Demertzi, S. (2008) *Παληόχωρα Μαρώνειας. Η ανασκαφή τῆς παλαιοχριστιανικῆς βασιλικῆς καὶ τοῦ μεσοβυζαντινοῦ οικισμοῦ*. Kavala.

Drandakis, N. (1972) Νικήτας Μαρμαράς. *Δωδώνη*, 1: 21–44.

(1974) Ἐρευναι εἰς τὴν Μάνην. Πρακτικά τῆς ἐν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικῆς Εταιρείας, (129): 110–138.

(1975-1976) Ἀγνωστα γλυπτά τῆς Μάνης ἀποδιδόμενα στο μαρμαρά Νικήτα ἢ στο ἐργαστήρι τοῦ. *Δελτίον τῆς Χριστιανικῆς Αρχαιολογικῆς Εταιρείας*, 8: 19–28.

(2002) *Βυζαντινά γλυπτά τῆς Μάνης*. Athina.

Drpić, I. (2013) Painter as scribe: artistic identity and the arts of graphē in late Byzantium. *Word & Image*, 3 (29): 334–353.

Dučev, I. (1970) “Introduction.” In *Τὸ Ἐπαρχικὸν βιβλίον. The book of the eparch. Le livre du préfet / by Leo VI, Emperor of the East; with an introduction by Ivan Dujcev*. London. pp. VII–XIII.

Đurić, S. (1985) *Ljubostinja church of the Assumption of the Virgin* [In Serbian with French summary]. Skopje.

Ebersolt, J. (1910) *Le grand palais de Constantinople et le livre des cérémonies*. Paris.

(1921) *Sanctuaires de Byzance. Recherches sur les anciens trésors des églises de Constantinople*. Paris.

Elbern, V.H. (1990) “Riflessi della dignità imperiale di Milano nell’arte altomedievale.” In *Felix Temporis Reparatio. Atti del convegno archeologico internazionale, Milano 8-11 marzo 1990*. Milano. pp. 395–410.

Emmanuel, M. (1990) Die Fresken der Muttergottes-Hodegetria-Kirche in Spelies auf der Insel Euboia (1311). Bemerkungen zur Ikonographie und Stil. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 83: 451–67.

(2003) “Η Αγία Σοφία του Μυστρά. Παρατηρήσεις στις τοιχογραφίες και στο εικονογραφικό πρόγραμμα.” In Paliouras, A. and Stavropoulou, A. (eds.) *Μίλτος Γαρίδης, 1926-1996: αφιέρωμα*. Ioannina: Πανεπιστήμιο Ιωαννίνων. pp. 153–198.

(2015) “Το εικονογραφικό πρόγραμμα του καθολικού της Μονής Περιβλέπτου στον Μυστρά και το ζήτημα του κτήτορα.” In Katsaros, V. and Tourta, A. (eds.) *Αφιέρωμα στον Ακαδημαϊκό Παναγιώτη Α. Βοκοτόπουλο*. Athina: ΚΑΠΟΝ. pp. 407–416.

Emmenegger, O. (1997) Gipsstuck und Kalkstuck. Geschichte, Technik und Restaurierung. *Kunst und Architektur in der Schweiz*, XLVIII (4): 6–12.

Epstein, A.W. (1981) The Middle Byzantine Sanctuary Barrier: Templon or Iconostasis? *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 134 (1): 1–28.

Ettinghausen, R., Grabar, O. and Jenkins-Madina, M. (2001) *Islamic art and architecture (650-1250)*. Pelican History of Art. Hong Kong, Singapore.

Euaggelidis, D. (1931) Βυζαντινά μνημεία της Ηπείρου. *Ηπειροτικά Χρονικά*, (6): 257–274.

Ewert, C. (1978) *Spanisch-islamische systeme sich kreuzender Bögen, III. Die Aljaferia in Zaragoza. Part 1*. Madrider Forschungen. Berlin.

(1980) *Spanisch-islamische systeme sich kreuzender Bögen, III. Die Aljaferia in Zaragoza. Part 2*. Madrider Forschungen. Berlin.

(1992) “The architectural heritage of Islamic Spain in North Africa.” In Dodds, J.D. (ed.) *Al-Andalus: the art of Islamic Spain*. New York. pp. 85–96.

Exner, M. (ed.) (1996) *Stuck des frühen und hohen Mittelalters. Geschichte, Technologie, Konservierung*. München.

(2003) “Stucchi.” In *Arti e storia nel Medioevo. Vol. II, Del costruire: tecniche, artisti, artigiani, committenti*. Torino. pp. 655–672.

Farioli, R. (1964) “I capitelli paleocristiani e paleobizantini di Salonicco.” In *Corsi di cultura sull’arte ravennate e bizantina. Ravenna 8-12 marzo 1964*. Ravenna.

Feissel, D. and Philippidis-Braat, A. (1985) Inventaires en vue d’un recueil des inscriptions historiques de Byzance, III, Inscriptions du Péloponnèse (à l’ exception de Mistra). *Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherche d’histoire et civilisation de Byzance*, (8): 267–395.

Feld, O. (1969-1970) Zu den Kapitellen des Tekfur Saray in Istanbul. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, 19–20: 359–367.

Felici, A. 2019. ‘Analisi RX per l’osservazione delle armature interne’. Lecture at the summer school *Stucchi e stuccatori ticinesi a Roma: Dalla riscoperta cinquecentesca alla grande tradizione barocca*, Istituto Svizzero di Roma (28 luglio – 3 agosto 2019).

Ferraris, P. (1991) Antonio Gherardi e la cappella di Santa Cecilia in San Carlo ai Catinari a Roma. *Studi di storia dell’arte*, (2): 213–241.

Firatlı, N. (1990) *La sculpture Byzantine figurée au Musée Archéologique d’Istanbul*. Paris.

Flaminio, R. (2008) “La decorazione scultorea della chiesa di Cristo Pantepoptes.” In Pennas, C. and Vanderheyde, C. (eds.) *La sculpture byzantine : VIIe - XIIe siècles. Actes du colloque international organisé par la 2e Éphorie des Antiquités byzantines et l’École française d’Athènes (6-8 septembre 2000)*. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Supplement. Athènes: École française d’Athènes. pp. 39–54.

Flourentzos, P. (1996) *Excavations in the Kouris valley, II. The basilica of Alassa*. Nicosia.

Fobelli, M.L. (2005) *Un tempio per Giustiniano: Santa Sofia de Costantinopoli e la Descrizione di Paolo Silenziario*. Roma.

Foletti, I. (2016) “Il ciborio di Sant’Ambrogio tra passato (e futuro). Un monumento perno nella ricezione e nella costruzione dell’identità figurativa milanese.” In Foletti, I., Quadri, I. and Rossi, M. (eds.) *Milano allo specchio: da Costantino al Barbarossal’autopercezione di una capitale*. Milano. 81-84.

(2018) *Oggetti, reliquie, migranti: La basilica ambrosiana e il culto dei suoi santi (386–972)*. La storia dell’arte. Temi. Milano: Viella.

Foletti, I. and Giesser, V. (2016) “Il IX secolo: da Pasquale I (817–824) a Stefano V (885–891).” In D’Onofrio, M. (ed.) *La committenza artistica dei Papi a Roma nel Medioevo*. Roma. pp. 219–38.

Fontana, M.V. (1999) Un itinerario italiano sulle tracce dello pseudo-cufico. *Grafica*, pp. 67–84.

Fousteris, G.P. (2006) *Εικονογραφικά προγράμματα σε βυζαντινούς σταυρεπιστέγους ναούς*. PhD thesis.

Fozi, S. (2016) “From the “pictorial” to the “statueque”: two Romanesque effigies and the problem of plastic form.” In Adams, A. and Barker, J. (eds.) *Revisiting The Monument: Fifty Years since Panofsky’s Tomb Sculpture*. London. pp. 30–48.

Franz, A.M. (1934) Byzantine Illuminated Ornament: A study in Chronology. *The Art Bulletin*, 16 (1): 42–101.

Frizot, M. (1977) *Stucs de gaule et des provinces romaines. Motifs et techniques*. Dijon.

Frondoni, A. (ed.) (2008a) *Gli stucchi di San Fruttuoso di Capodimonte*. Genova.

(2008b) “Per un primo inquadramento degli stucchi di San Fruttuoso.” In *Gli stucchi di San Fruttuoso di Capodimonte*. Genova. pp. 43–70.

Fundić, L. (2013) *Η Μνημειακή τέχνη του Δεσποτάτου της Ηπείρου την περίοδο της δυναστείας των Κομνηνών Αγγέλων (1204-1318)*. PhD thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Gaberscek, C. (1977) Riflessi sasanidi sull’arte di età longobarda in Friuli. *Antichità Altoadriatiche*, (XII): 491–509.

Gandolfo, F. (1976) “Rilevamento delle decorazioni in stucco altomedievali di Roma.” In *Roma e l’età carolingia. Atti delle giornate di studio*. Roma. pp. 301–318.

(2002) “L’uso di modelli in una bottega di stuccatori abruzzesi alla metà del XII secolo.” In *Medioevo. I modelli. Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Parma 27 settembre - 1 ottobre 1999*. Milano. pp. 319–329.

Gapper, C. (1999) What Is “Stucco”? English Interpretations of an Italian Term. *Architectural History*, (42): 333–343.

Gapper, C. and Orton, J. (2011) Plaster, Stucco and Stuccoes. *Journal of Architectural Conservation*, 17 (3): 7–22.

Garton, T. (1984) *Early Romanesque sculpture in Apulia*. PhD thesis, University of London.

Gearhart, H.C. (2017) *Theophilus and the theory and practice of medieval art*. University Park, Pennsylvania.

Georgiadou, S. (2015) *Architecture and statehood in Late Byzantium: a comparative study of Epiros and Trebizond*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Gerstel, S.E.J. (2006a) “An alternative view of the Late Byzantine sanctuary screen.” In *Thresholds of the sacred. Architectural, art historical, liturgical, and theological perspectives on religious screens, East and West*. Washington D. C. pp. 135–162.

(2006b) *Thresholds of the sacred. Architectural, Art Historical, Liturgical, and Theological perspectives on Religious screens, East and West*. Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Studies. Washington D. C.

(2008) The Nikomedia Workshop: New Evidence on Byzantine Tiles. *The Journal of the Walters Art Museum*, 1 (66/67): 5–53.

(2013a) “Mapping boundaries of church and village.” In *Viewing the Morea: land and people in the late medieval Peloponnese*. Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine symposia and colloquia. Washington D. C. pp. 335–368.

(ed.) (2013b) *Viewing the Morea: land and people in the late medieval Peloponnese*. Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine symposia and colloquia. Washington D. C.

(2015) *Rural lives and landscapes in late Byzantium: art, archaeology and ethnography*. Cambridge.

- (2020) Recording Village History: The Church of Hagioi Theodoroi, Vamvaka, Mani. *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 1 (38): 21–41.
- Gerstel, S.E.J. and Lauffenburger, J.A. (eds.) (2001) *A lost art rediscovered: the architectural ceramics of Byzantium*. Baltimore.
- Gerstel, S.E.J. and Talbot, A.-M. (2006) Nuns in the Byzantine Countryside. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (27): 481–490.
- Gierlichs, J. (1991) Stucco. *Enciclopedia dell'Arte medievale*. IX pp. 1–24.
- Gheroldi, V. (2014) “Evidenze tecniche e rapporti stratigrafici per la cronologia del Sistema decorative della basilica di San Salvatore II.” In *Dalla corte regia al monastero di San Salvatore - Santa Giulia di Brescia*. Mantova. pp. 97–119.
- Giakoumis, K. and Karaiskaj, G. (2004) New architectural and epigraphic data on the site and catholicon of the monastery of St. Nikolaos at Mesopotam (Southern Albania). *Monumentet*, pp. 86–95.
- Gioseffi, D. (1974) Le component islamiche dell'arte altomedievale in Occidente. *Antichità Altoadriatiche*, (IV): 121–136.
- Giuliani, C.F. (2010) *L'edilizia nell'antichità*. 4th ed. Roma.
- Giuliani, R. (1994) “Elementi decorativi in stucco dall'abbazia di Sant'Angelo al monte Raparo.” In Carletti, C. (ed.) *Culto e insediamenti micaelici nell'Italia meridionale fra tarda antichità e medioevo. Atti del convegno internazionale Monte Sant'Angelo 18 - 21 novembre 1992*. Bari.
- Gligorijević Maksimović, M. (2009) Classical elements in the endowments of Serbian XIII century donors. *Recueil des travaux de l'Institut d'études byzantines*, 46: 255–264.
- Gonnella, J. (2013) “Three stucco panels from Samarra.” In Blair, S. and Bloom, J.M. (eds.) *God is beautiful and loves beauty: the object in Islamic art and culture*. Yale. pp. 79–101.
- Goodson, C. (2010) *The Rome of Pope Paschal I: Papal Power, Urban Renovation, Church Rebuilding and Relic Translation, 817–824*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought. Cambridge.
- Gouma-Peterson, T. (1976) The parekklesion of St. Euthymios in Thessalonica: art and monastic policy under Andronicus II. *Art Bulletin*, (59): 168–183.
- (1991) “The frescoes of the parekklesion of St. Euthymios in Thessaloniki: patrons, workshops and style.” In Ćurčić, S. and Mouriki, D. (eds.) *The Twilight of Byzantium. Aspects of cultural and religious history in the Late Byzantine empire*. Princeton, New Jersey. pp. 111–159.
- Grabar, A. (1957) *L'iconoclasme byzantin. Dossier archéologique*. Paris.

(1961) Deux notes sur l'histoire de l'iconostase d'après des monuments de Yougoslavie. *Zbornik Radova Vizantinoloskog Instituta*, (7): 13–22.

(1963) *Sculptures byzantines de Constantinople (IVe - Xe siècle)*. Paris.

(1964) Deux témoignages archéologiques sur l'autocéphalie d'une église: Prespa et Ochrid. *Zbornik Radova Vizantinoloskog Instituta*, 2 (8): 163–168.

(1976) *Sculptures byzantines du Moyen Âge. II (XI-XIV siècle)*. Bibliothèque des cahiers archéologiques. Paris.

Grabar, O. (1997) "The Shared Culture of Objects." In Maguire, H. (ed.) *Byzantine Court Culture from 829 to 1204*. Washington D. C. pp. 115–30.

Greenfield, R. P. H. (2000) *The life of Lazaros of Mt. Galesion: an eleventh-century pillar saint*. Byzantine saints' lives in translation 3. Washington D. C.

Greenhalgh, M. (2009) *Marble past, monumental present: building with antiquities in the mediaeval Mediterranean*. Leiden.

Gregory, T.E. (1991) Samos. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Online version.

Grossman, H.E. (2012) On Memory, Transmission and the Practice of Building in the Crusader Mediterranean. *Medieval Encounters*, 18 (4–5): 481–517.

Gugolj, B. and Tešić-Radovanović, D. (2016) The Žiča Altar Screen Icons'. *IKON*, (9): 311–322.

Guidobaldi, F. (2016) "La formulazione progettuale della basilica cristiana come ulteriore espressione dell'innovazione costantiniana nel campo dell'architettura." In *Costantino e i costantinidi - l'innovazione costantiniana, le sue radici e i suoi sviluppi. XVI Congressus Internationalis Archaeologiae Christianae, Romae (22-28.9.2013)*. Città del Vaticano. pp. 461–491.

Guidobaldi, F. and Pedone, S. (2011) Il viraggio delle scelte decorative nei rivestimenti pavimentali e parietali in età costantiniana: dagli antefatti agli esiti. *Musiva & Sectilia*, VIII: 35–162.

Guiglia Guidobaldi, A. (1994) Civate. *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Medievale*. Available at: http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/civate_%28Enciclopedia-dell%27-Arte-Medievale%29/ (Accessed: 14 August 2020).

Guiglia, A. (1999) "La decorazione pavimentale bizantina in età paleologa." In Iacobini, A. and Della Valle, M. (eds.) *L'arte di Bisanzio al tempo dei Paleologi 1261-1453*. Milion. Roma. pp. 321–358.

(2011) "The marble floor decoration in Constantinople: prolegomena to a corpus." In Şahin, M. (ed.) *XI. Uluslararası Antik Mozaik Sempozyumu 16 – 20 Ekim 2009 Bursa, Türkiye. Türkiye Mozaikleri ve Antik Donemden Ortacag Dunyasina Diger Mozaiklerle Paralel Gelisimi: Mozaiklerin Baslangicindan Gec Bizans Cagina Kadar Ikonografi, Stil ve Teknik /*

11th International Colloquium On Ancient Mosaics October 16th – 20th, 2009, Bursa Turkey. Mosaics of Turkey and Parallel Developments in the Rest of the Ancient and Medieval World: Questions of Iconography, Style and Technique From The Beginnings of Mosaic Until The Late Byzantine Era. Istanbul. pp. 413–436.

Guiglia, A. and Barsanti, C. (2012) Aspetti meno noti della decorazione della Santa Sofia di Costantinopoli. *Arkeoloji ve Sanat*, (139): 191–201.

Guilland, R. (1969) *Études de topographie de Constantinople byzantine*. Berlin.

Gullo, A. (2018) Shield / bouclier Guez, J.-P. (ed.). *Dictionnaire des images du poétique*. Paris.

Haase, C.P. (2007) “The development of stucco decoration in Northern Syria of the 8th and 9th centuries and the bevelled style of Samarra.” In Hagedorn, A. and Shalem, A. (eds.) *Facts and artefacts: art in the Islamic world; Festschrift for Jens Kröger on his 65th birthday*. Leiden. pp. 439–460.

Hadji-Minaglou, G. (1994) Le grand appareil dans les églises des IXe-XIIe siècles de la Grèce du Sud. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, (118): 161–197.

Hadjisavvas, S. (2000) Chronique des fouilles et decouvertes archeologiques a Chypre en 1999. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, (124): 665–99.

Hallensleben, H. (1963) Untersuchungen zur Baugeschichte der Pammakaristoskirche, der heutigen Fethiye camii, in Istanbul. *Istanbul Mitteilungen*, 13–13: 128–193.

(1967-74) Die architekturgeschichtliche Stellung der Kirche Sv. Bogorodica Peribleptos (Sv. Kliment) in Ohrid. *Zbornik na Arheoloskiot Muzejna Makedonija*, (6–7): 297–316.

Hamilton, R.W. (1959) *Khirbat al Maffar: an Arabian mansion in the Jordan Valley*. Oxford.

Harrison, R. (1992) Amorium excavations 1991: the fourth preliminary report. *Anatolian Studies*, 42: 207–222.

Harrison, R. and Christie, N. (1993) Excavations at Amorium: 1992 Interim Report. *Anatolian Studies*, 43: 147–162.

Havice, C. (1984) The marginal miniatures in the Hamilton Psalter (Kupferstich-kabinett 78.A.9). *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen*, (26): 79–142.

Hawkins, E.J. (1964) “Plaster and Stucco cornices in Hagia Sophia.” In *Actes du XIIe congrès international des études byzantines 3 (Belgrade)*. Beograd. pp. 131–135.

Hedeager Krag, A. (2010) *The Eagle Silk and other silks in the shrine of St. Canute in Odense Cathedral*. Herning.

Heher, D. (2016) “Der Palasthafen des Bukoleon.” In Daim, F. (ed.) *Die byzantinischen Häfen Konstantinopels*. Mainz. pp. 67–88.

- Heidemann, S., De Lapérouse, J.-F. and Parry, V. (2014) The large audience: life-sized stucco figures of royal princes from the Seljuq period. *Muqarnas*, 31: 35–71.
- Hermanin, F. (1932) *S. Marco. Le Chiese di Roma illustrate*. Roma.
- Herzfeld, E. (1923) *Der Wandschmuck von Samarra und seine Ornamentik*. Die Ausgrabungen von Samarra I, Forschungen zur Islamischen Kunst II. Berlin: Reimer.
- Hetherington, P.B. (1974) *The "Painter's manual" of Dionysius of Fournas: an English translation [from the Greek] with commentary of cod. gr. 708 in the Saltykov-Shchedrin State Public Library, Leningrad*. London.
- Hirschbichler, M. (2001) "Koimesis church (Hyakinthos monastery), Nicaea." In Gerstel, S.E.J. and Lauffenburger, J.A. (eds.) *A lost art rediscovered: the architectural ceramics of Istanbul*. Baltimore. pp. 236–237.
- Hobdari, E. (2009) Skulptura dhe instalimet liturgjike në kishën e shën mërisë në Peshkëpi të Sipërme (Gjirokastër). *Iliria*, 34: 331–352.
- Hoffmann, E.R. (2001) Pathways of Portability: Islamic and Christian interchange from the tenth to the twelfth century. *Art History*, 1 (24): 17–50.
- Hoernes, M. (ed.) (2002) *Hoch- und spätmittelalterlicher Stuck. Material - Technik - Stil - Restaurierung*. Regensburg.
- Holland, H. (1819) *Travels in the Ionian isles, Albania, Thessaly, Macedonia during the years 1812 et 1813*. Cambridge.
- Holod, R., C. (1992) "Luxury arts of the caliphal period." In Dodds, J.D. (ed.) *Al-Andalus: the art of Islamic Spain*. New York. pp. 41–47.
- Hourihane, C. (ed.) (2013) *The Grove Encyclopedia of Medieval Art and Architecture*. Oxford.
- Hubert, J. (1953) "La "crypte" de Saint-Lauren de Grenoble et l'art du sud-est de la Gaule au début de l'époque carolingienne." In *Arte del Primo Millennio. Atti del II Convegno per lo studio dell'arte dell'Alto medioevo tenuto presso l'Università nel settembre 1950*. Torino. pp. 327–334.
- Hunt, L.A. (1984) "Comnenian Aristocratic Palace Decoration: Descriptions and Islamic Connections." In Angold, M. (ed.) *The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII Centuries*. Oxford. pp. 138–147
- Iacobini, A. and Perria, L. (1998) *Il vangelo di Dionisio*. Milion 4. Roma.
- Iacobini, A. (ed.) (2009) *Le porte del paradiso: arte e tecnologia bizantina tra Italia e Mediterraneo (XI - XII secolo); convegno internazionale di studi Istituto Svizzero di Roma, 6 - 7 dicembre 2006*. Roma.
- Iamanidzé, N. (2010) *Les installations liturgiques sculptées des églises de Géorgie*. Bibliothèque de l'Antiquité Tardive. Turnhout.

- Immerzeel, M. (2008) Playing with Light and Shadow: The Stuccoes of Deir al-Surian and Their Historical Context. *Eastern Christian Art*, (5): 59–74.
- Insoll, T., Khalaf, N., MacLean, R., et al. (2021) Material cosmopolitanism: the entrepot of Harlaa as an Islamic gateway to eastern Ethiopia. *Antiquity*, 95 (380): 487–505.
- Interdonato, E. (2018) La cd. tomba dei Valerii nel parco delle tombe della via Latina. Studio architettonico e iconografico. *Archeologia Classica*, (N.S.II,8), (69).
- Ioannou, A. (1959) *Βυζαντινές τοιχογραφίες της Εύβοιας*. Athina.
- Ioustinos Simopetritis (1983) *Παραστάσεις τεσσάρων αρχιεπισκόπων Θεσσαλονίκης σε τοιχογραφίες του καθολικού τής Μονής Βατοπεδίου*. Πρωτάτο 5.
- Iverson, E.A. (2008) “Middle Byzantine Sculptors at Work: Evidence from the Lower city Church of Amorium.” In Pennas, C. and Vanderheyde, C. (eds.) *La sculpture byzantine : VIIe - XIIIe siècles. Actes du colloque international organisé par la 2e Éphorie des Antiquités byzantines et l'École française d'Athènes (6-8 septembre 2000)*. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Supplement. Athènes: École française d'Athènes. pp. 487–514.
- Jacoby, D. (2001) “The urban evolution of Latin Constantinople (1204-1261).” In *Byzantine Constantinople*. Leiden. pp. 277–297.
- Janin, R. (1964) *Constantinople byzantine*. Paris.
- (1969) *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin : Première partie, Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat œcuménique*. Publications de l'Institut français d'études byzantines. Paris.
- Jeffery, G. (1918) *A description of the historic monuments of Cyprus. Studies in the archaeology and architecture of the island*. Nicosia.
- Jeffreys, E. (1998) *Digenis Akritis. The Grottaferrata and Escorial versions*. Cambridge Medieval Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenssen, V. and Majewski, L. (1974) The Church of the Panagia Amasgou, Monagri, Cyprus, and Its Wallpaintings. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (28): 329–345.
- de Jerphanion, G. (1936) *Une nouvelle province de l'art byzantin: les églises rupestres de Cappadoce*. Paris.
- Jewell, K.M. (2011) *Power in plaster: the installation of stuccowork during the late antique and early Byzantine periods*. University of Louisville.
- Johns, J. (2016) “A tale of two ceilings. The Cappella Palatina in Palermo and the Mouchroutas in Constantinople.” In Ohta, A., Rogers, M. and Wade Haddon, R. (eds.) *Art, Trade and Culture in the Near East and India: from the Fatimids to the Mughals*. pp. 1–16.
- Jolivet-Levy, C. (1991) *Les églises byzantines de Cappadoce : le programme iconographique de l'abside et de ses abords*. Paris.

- (2008) Saint Théodore et le dragon: nouvelles données. *Puer Apuliae*, (1): 357–371.
- (2009) “The Bahattin Samanlıđı Kilisesi at Belisırma (Cappadocia) Revisited.” In Hourihane, C. (ed.) *Byzantine art: recent studies. Essays in honor of Lois Drewer*. Tempe, Arizona. pp. 81–110.
- (2014) “De l’aniconisme en Cappadoce: quelques réflexions à la lumière de découvertes récentes.” In Campagnolo, M., Magdalino, P., Martiniani-Reber, M., et al. (eds.) *L’aniconisme dans l’art religieux byzantin. Actes du colloque de Genève (1-3 octobre 2009)*. Geneva. pp. 127–140, 271–284.
- Kakavas, G. (2008) *Dionysios of Fourni (c. 1670 - c. 1745): artistic creation and literary description*. Leiden.
- Kalavrezou-Maxeiner, I. (1985) “The Byzantine knotted column.” In *Byzantine studies in honor of Milton V. Anastos*. Byzantine kai Metabyzantina. Malibu. pp. 95–103.
- Kalavrezou, I. (1997) “Luxury objects.” In Evans, H.C. and Wixom, W.D. (eds.) *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843–1261*. New York. pp. 218–252.
- Kalopissi-Verti, S. (1992) *Dedicatory inscriptions and donor portraits in thirteenth-century churches of Greece*. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für die Tabula Imperii Byzantini. Wien.
- (1994) Painters in Late Byzantine society. *Cahiers Archéologiques fin de l’Antiquité et Moyen Age*, (42): 139–158.
- (2006) “The Proskynetaria of the Templon and Narthex: Form, Imagery, Spatial Connections, and Receptions.” In *Thresholds of the sacred. Architectural, Art Historical, Liturgical, and Theological perspectives on Religious screens, East and West*. Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Studies. Washington D. C. 107–134.
- (2007) Church Foundations by Entire Villages (13th–16th c.). A short note. *Zbornik Radova Vizantinoloskog Instituta*, In honor of Goiko Subotić (44): 333–340.
- (2012) “Collective Patterns of Patronage in the Late Byzantine Village: The Evidence of Church Inscriptions.” In Spieser, J.M. and Yota, E. (eds.) *Donation et donateurs dans le monde byzantin*. Paris. pp. 125–140.
- (2013) “Mistra. A fortified Late Byzantine settlement.” In *Heaven and Earth. Cities and countryside in Byzantine Greece*. Athens. pp. 224–239.
- (2015) “Byzantine Dedicatory Inscriptions and Donor Portraits (7th–15th c.). A Project in Progress at the University of Athens.” In Rhoby, A. (ed.) *Inscriptions in Byzantium and Beyond: Methods – Projects – Case Studies*. Wien. pp. 135–156.
- Kandić, O. and Milošević, D. (1985) *Le monastere de Sopoćani*. Belgrad.

Kaplan, M. (2009) "The producing population." In *The Social History of Byzantium*. New York. pp. 143–167.

Kappas, M. (2016) "Approaching Monemvasia and Mysras from the outside: the view from Kastania." In *Viewing Greece: cultural and political agency in the Medieval and Early Modern Mediterranean*. Turnhout. pp. 147–181.

Karageorghis, V. (1960) Chronique des fouilles et decouvertes archeologiques a Chypre en 1959. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, (84): 242–99.

(1962) Chronique des fouilles et découvertes archéologiques à Chypre en 1961. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, 68 (1): 327–414.

(1969) Chronique des fouilles à Chypre en 1968. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, (93): 431–569.

Karagiorgiou, O. (2015) "An early Byzantine stonemason and his workshop: new evidence from Amorium." In Petridis, Pl. and Foskolou, V. (eds.) *ΔΑΣΚΑΛΙΑ: Papers in honour of Prof. Maria Panagiotidi-Kesisoglou*. Athens. pp. 177–199.

Katsafados, P.S. (2015) Νέα στοιχεία για τις αφιερωτικές επιγραφές (13ος αιώνας) του ναού των Αγίων Θεοδώρων ΑνωΠούλας, Μέσα Μάνης. New evidence on the dedicatory inscriptions (13th century) in the church of the Hagioi Theodoroi, Ano Poula, Inner Mani. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (36): 275–288.

Kazhdan, A. (1991) Kamateros. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*.

Keshani, H. (2004) The Abbasid palace of Theophilus: Byzantine taste for the arts of Islam. *Al-Masaq*, 1 (16): 75–91.

Kiilerich, B. (2010) "The rhetoric of materials in the Tempietto Longobardo at Cividale." In *L'VIII secolo: un secolo inquieto. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Cividale del Friuli, 4 - 7 dicembre 2008*. Udine. pp. 93–103.

(2020) Texture, Colour and Surface Appearance of the Cividale Stuccoes. *CLARA, Special issue: Perceiving Matter. Visual, Material and Sensual Communication from Antiquity to the Middle Ages and Beyond*, (5): 1–12.

Kislinger, E. and Heher, D. (2015) Der Boukoleonhafen und die angrenzenden Palaststrukturen. *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik*, 64.

Kokkorou-Aleura, G., Poupaki, E., Eustathopoulos, A., et al. (2014) *Corpus Αρχαίων Λατομείων. Λατομεία του ελλαδικού χώρου από τους προϊστορικούς έως τους μεσαιωνικούς χρόνους*. Athina.

Koliji, H. (2012) Revisiting the Squinch: From Squaring the Circle to Circling the Square. *Nexus Network Journal*, 2 (14): 291–305.

Kongaz, G. (2011) "Boukoleon Sarayı/Boukoleon Palace." In *Istanbul'daki Bizans Sarayları/ Byzantine palaces in Istanbul*. Istanbul. pp. 71–84.

Konstantellou, T. (2019) *Ένα «εργαστήριο» ζωγραφικής στην ύπαιθρο της Νάξου (τέλη 13ου-αρχές 14ου αιώνος): κοινωνικός χώρος και εικαστική δημιουργία*. University of Athens.

Konstantellou, T. (2020) Saint John the Baptist Rigodioktes. A holy healer of fevers in the church of the Panaghia at Archatos, Naxos (1285). *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (41): 173–196.

Korać, V. (1974) Oltraska pregrada un Sopoćanima. *Zograph*, 5: 22–30.

Korobeinikov, D.A. (2014) “The Sultanate of Rūm: Preliminary Remarks.” In *Byzantium and the Turks in the Thirteenth Century*. Oxford studies in Byzantium. Oxford. pp. 81–110.

Konstantinides, K. (2001) “Από την πνευματική ζωή του κράτους της Ηπείρου (1204-ca. 1340).” In *Μεσαιωνική Ήπειρος. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου, Ιωάννινα 17-19 Σεπτεμβρίου 1999*. Ioannina. pp. 231–256.

Kostarelli, A. (2013) *Η μνημειακή ζωγραφική το 14ο αιώνα στη Νάξο*. PhD thesis, University of Ioannina.

(2017) “Παρουσία του επωνύμου αγίου στην μνημειακή ζωγραφική της Νάξου.” In Sergis, M.G. and Fragkoulopoulos, B.I. (eds.) *Νάξος δια μέσου των αιώνων. Πρακτικά του Πανελλήνιου επιστημονικού συνεδρίου. Απεράθου Νάξου, 31 Αυγούστου - 2 Σεπτεμβρίου 2013*. Athina-Naxos. pp. 265–279.

Koufopoulos, P. and Myriantheos, M., P. (2018) “Παρατηρήσεις στην αρχιτεκτονική του ναού της Θεοτοκού Οδηγητρίας στη μονή Βροντοχίου Μυστρα (Αφεντικό).” In *Ήρως κτίστης: μνήμη Χαράλαμπου Μπούρα*. Athina. pp. 653–656.

Koukoules, P. (1948) *Vie et civilisation byzantines. Βυζαντινών βίος και πολιτισμός*. Collection de l’Institut Français d’Athènes. Athènes.

Koukourtidou-Nikolaidou, E. and Tourta, A. (1997) *Wandering in Byzantine Thessaloniki*. Athens.

Koury, N.N.N. (1996) The Meaning of the Great Mosque of Cordoba in the Tenth Century. *Muqarnas*, (13): 80–98.

Krautheimer (1980) *Rome, profile of a city, 312-1308*. Princeton N.J.

Krautheimer, R., Frankl, W. and Corbett, S. (1962) *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae*. Città del Vaticano.

Kröger, J. (1982) *Sasanidischer Stuckdekor: ein Beitrag zum Reliefdekor aus Stuck in sasanidischer und frühislamischer Zeit nach den Ausgrabungen von 1928/9 und 1931/2 in der sasanidischen Metropole Ktesiphon (Iraq) und unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Stuckfunde vom Taht-i Sulaimān (Iran), aus Nizāmābād (Iran) sowie zahlreicher anderer Fundorte*. Mainz.

Kühn, H. (1996) “Was ist Stuck? Arten-Zusammensetzung -Geschichtliches.” In *Stuck des frühen und hohen Mittelalters. Geschichte, Technologie, Konservierung*. Munich. pp. 17–24.

- Küpper, H. (1990) *Der Bautypus der griechischen Dachtranseptkirche*. 2 vols. Amsterdam.
- Kurtz, E. (1907) Unedierte Texte aus der Zeit des Kaisers Johannes Komnenos. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, (16): 69–119.
- Kyritses, D.S. (1997) *The Byzantine aristocracy in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries*. PhD thesis, Harvard University.
- Laiou, A. (1977) *Peasant society in the Late Byzantine empire. A social and demographic study*. Princeton N.J.
- Laffitte, M.P. and Denoël, C. (eds.) (2007) *Trésors carolingiens. Livres manuscrits de Charlemagne à Charles le Chauve. Catalogue de l'exposition (Paris, 20 mars-24 juin 2007)*. Paris.
- Lafleur, B. (2017) “Deir Mar Behnam: the Destruction of Iraq’s Christian Heritage.” In *Nineveh, the Great City. Symbol of Beauty and Power*. Papers on Archaeology of the Leiden Museum of Antiquities. Leiden. pp. 270–274.
- Lafontaine-Dosogne, J. (1964) *Iconographie de l'enfance de la Vierge dans l'Empire byzantin et en Occident*. Mémoires de la Classe des beaux-arts 2. Vol. I, Bruxelles.
- Lambraki, A. (1992) “Αναγνώριση τών μαρμάρων στά δάπεδα τού συγκοτήματος Οσίου Λουκά Φωκίδος, 1.” In *12ο Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινής καί Μεταβυζαντινής Αρχαιολογίας καί Τέχνης*. Athina. pp. 31–32.
- (1993) “Αναγνώριση 2.” In *13ο Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινής καί Μεταβυζαντινής Αρχαιολογίας καί Τέχνης*. Athina. pp. 25–26.
- Lamm, C.J. (1935) Fatimid woodwork, its style and chronology. *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Egypte*, (18): 59–91.
- Lampakis, G. (1899) *Χριστιανική ἀρχαιολογία τῆς Μονῆς Δαφνίου*. Athina.
- Lassithiotakis, K. (1970) Εκκλησίες τῆς Δυτικῆς Κρήτης, Δ, Επαρχία Σελίνου. *Κρητικά Χρονικά*, (22): 133–210.
- Leal, B. (2014) “The stuccoes of San Salvatore, Brescia, in their Mediterranean context.” In *Dalla corte regia al monastero di San Salvatore - Santa Giulia di Brescia*. Mantova. pp. 221–245.
- Lebole, C.M. (2020) *Metamorfosi di un territorio Scavi archeologici tra Locri e Gerace: dal tardoantico al post medioevo*. Torino.
- Lefort, J. (1982) *Villages de Macédoine. I. La Chalcidique occidentale*. Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance. Monographies. Paris.
- (2002) “The Rural Economy, Seventh–Twelfth Centuries.” In *The Economic history of Byzantium. From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies 39. 3 vols. Washington D. C. pp. 231–310.

- Lemaigre Demesnil, N. (2010) *Architecture rupestre et décor sculpté en Cappadoce (Ve-IXe siècle)*. BAR International Series. Oxford.
- Liakos, D. (2008) The Byzantine Opus Sectile Floor in the Katholikon of Iveron Monastery on Mount Athos. *Zograph*, (32): 37–44.
- Liapes, H. (1971) *Μεσαιωνικά μνημεῖα Εὐβοίας*. Athina: 1971.
- Lic, A. (2017) *Christian Stucco Decorations in Southern Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf Region, 6th-9th centuries*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford.
- Lightfoot, C.S. and Ivison, E.A. (1997) The Amorium Project: The 1995 Excavation Season. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 51: 291–300.
- Linardou, K. (2004) *Reading two Byzantine illustrated books. The Kokkinobaphos manuscripts (Vaticanus Graecus 1162 and Parisinus Graecus 1208) and their illustration*. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham.
- Linardou, K. (2017) “The homilies of Iakovos of the Kokkinobaphou monastery.” In Tsamakda, V. (ed.) *A Companion to Byzantine illustrated manuscripts*. Leiden, Boston. pp. 382–394.
- Lipinsky, A. (1963) Stucchi medievali di Calabria. *Almanacco calabrese*, (13): 76–90.
- Little, C.T. (1988) “Avori milanesi del X secolo.” In Bertelli, C. (ed.) *Il millennio ambrosiano. La città del vescovo dai Carolingi al Barbarossa*. Milano. pp. 82–101.
- Loiacono, P. (1934) Il restauro compiuto al Battistero di S. Severina. *Bollettino d'arte*, pp. 174–185.
- Lomartire, S. (2006) “Le stuc et le décor architectural: les stucs de Lomello et quelques autres fragments lombards du haut Moyen Age au XIIe siècle.” In *Stucs et décors de la fin de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge (Ve-XIIe siècle): actes du colloque international tenu à Poitiers du 16 au 19 septembre 2004*. Turnhout. pp. 307–324.
- Lopetrone, P. (2017) Il Battistero bizantino di Santa Severina. Studi e restauri 1994-2009. *Quaderni Sibernensi. – Rivista di cultura, storia e tradizioni*, (XV–2013): 1–222.
- López Borges, V.H. (2014) Report on the conservation of a fragment of gypsum plasterwork from Samarra. *Samarra finds from the Herzfeld Excavation in the Victoria and Albert Museum*. Available at: <http://samarrafindsproject.blogspot.com/2014/03/report-on-conservation-of-fragment-of.html> (Accessed: 8 June 2019).
- Lorenzoni, G. (1974) *Monumenti di età carolingia. Aquileia, Cividale, Malles, Münster*. Padova.
- L'Orange, H.P. (1974) “Il Tempietto di Cividale e l'arte longobarda alla metà dell'VIII secolo.” In *La civiltà dei Longobardi in Europa, Atti del Convegno internazionale, Roma-Cividale del Friuli 1971*. Roma. pp. 433–460.

L'Orange, H.P. and Torp, H. (1979) *Il Tempietto Longobardo di Cividale. Parte 3: La scultura in stucco e in pietra del Tempietto*. Roma: Giorgio Bretschneider.

Loukopoulou, P. and Mouropoulou, A. (2013) "Notes on the morphology of gold glass tesserae in the monastery of Daphni." In Entiwestle, C. and James, L. (eds.) *New light on old glass: recent research on Byzantine mosaics and glass*. London. pp. 75–81.

Louvi, A. (1980) *L'architecture et la sculpture de la Perivleptos de Mistra*. Universite de Paris La Sorbonne. Available at: <https://www.didaktorika.gr/eadd/handle/10442/3900> (Accessed: 9 May 2018).

Louvi-Kizi, A. (2003) Οι κτήτορες της Περιβλέπτου του Μυστρά. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (24): 101–118.

(2007) Ο ναός των Αγίων Αποστόλων στο Λεοντάρι Αρκαδίας. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (28): 99–114.

(2019) *Η Φραγκική πρόκληση στον Βυζαντινό Μυστρά: Περίβλεπτος και Παντάνασσα*. 2 vols. Athina: Γραφείον Δημοσιευμάτων της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών.

Lozanova, R. (2004) "The Church of Christ Zoodotes in Emborion (Albania)." In *Obraz i slovo – Εικόνα και λόγος. Recueil à l'occasion du 60e anniversaire du Prof. Axinia Džurova*,. Sofia. pp. 151–165.

Lucas, A. (1989) *Ancient Egyptian Materials and Industries*. fourth edition. London.

Lusuardi Siena, S. (ed.) (2002) *Cividale longobarda: materiali per una rilettura archeologica*. Milano.

Macchiarella, G. (2011) "Un caso a sé: San Nicola di Mesopotam (Albania)." In Derosa, L. and Gelao, C. (eds.) *Tempi e forme dell'arte. Miscellanea di studi offerti a Pina Belli D'Elia*. Foggia. pp. 123–135.

Macrides, R., Munitiz, J.A. and Angelov, D. (2013) *Pseudo-Kodinos and the Constantinopolitan court: offices and ceremonies*. Birmingham Byzantine and Ottoman Studies. Farnham, Surrey, UK; Burlington, VT, USA.

Macridy, T. (1964) The Monastery of Lips and the Burials of the Palaeologi. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (18): 253–277.

Magdalino, P. (1978) Manuel Komnenos and the Great Palace. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, (4): 101–105.

(1984) "The Byzantine aristocratic oikos." In *The Byzantine Aristocracy IX to XIII century*. BAR International series. pp. 92–111.

Maggi, S. (2002) "Vitruvio: la vita e l'opera." In *Vitruvio, Architettura (dai libri I-VII)*. Classici greci e latini. Milano. pp. 9–38.

Magoulias, H.J. (1976) Trades and crafts in the sixth and seventh centuries as viewed in the lives of the saints. *Byzantinoslavica. Revue internationale des études byzantines*, (37): 11–35.

Maguire, E.D. (2019) “Unpacking the Basket and Knowing the Ropes: Patterns in Humble Materials as Design Prototypes.” Presented at the panel *Byzantine Materialities, I: Textiles, Exchange, and Daily Life*. International Medieval Congress of Leeds, 2019.

Maguire, R. (2012) *Late Antique Basilicas on Cyprus: sources, contexts, histories*. PhD thesis, East Anglia.

Maier, F.G. and Karageorghis, V. (1984) *Paphos: History and Archaeology*. Nicosia.

Mamaloukos, S. (1996) “The buildings of Vatopedi and their patrons.” In Bryer, A. and Cunningham, M. (eds.) *Mount Athos and Byzantine monasticism: papers from the Twenty-eighth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Birmingham, March 1994*. Publications / Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies. Aldershot. pp. 113–125.

(1998) “The architecture of the katholikon.” In *The Holy and great monastery of Vatopaidi. Tradition, history, art*. II vols. Mount Athos. pp. 166–179.

(2001) *Το καθολικό της μονής Βατοπέδιου. Ιστορία και αρχιτεκτονική*. National Technical University of Athens.

(2011) A contribution to the study of the “Athonite” church type of Byzantine architecture. *Zograph*, (35): 39–50.

Mango, C. (1972) *The Art of the Byzantine empire (312-1453). Sources and documents*. Englewood cliffs, New Jersey.

(1976) *Byzantine architecture*. New York.

(1995a) “The Water Supply of Constantinople.” In Mango, C. and Dagron, G. (eds.) *Constantinople and Its Hinterland. Papers from the Twenty-seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993*. Society for the Promotion of Byzantine Studies 3. Aldershot. pp. 9–18.

(1995b) “Ancient Spolia in the Great Palace of Constantinople.” In *Byzantine East, Latin West. Art-historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann*. Princeton N.J. pp. 645–649.

(1997) The Palace of the Boukoleon. *Cahiers Archéologiques fin de l’Antiquité et Moyen Age*, 45: 41–50.

(2001) “Ninth- to eleventh-century Constantinople: the cultural context.” In Gerstel, S.E.J. and Lauffenburger, J.A. (eds.) *A lost art rediscovered: the architectural ceramics of Byzantium*. Baltimore. pp. 5–12.

Mango, C. and Hawkins, E.J. (1964) Additional Notes. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (18): 299–315.

Mango, C., Hawkins, E.J. and Boyd, S. (1990) The Monastery of St. Chrysostomos at Koutsovendis (Cyprus) and Its Wall Paintings. Part I: Description. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 44: 63–94.

Maniatis, G.C. (2001) The domain of private guilds in the Byzantine economy, tenth to fifteenth centuries. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 55: 340–369.

Mannoni, T. and Giannichedda, E. (2003) *Archeologia della produzione*. Torino.

Mannoni, T. and Ricci, R. (2008) “Ricerche e analisi sulla composizione degli stucchi di San Fruttuoso.” In *Gli stucchi di San Fruttuoso di Capodimonte*. Genova. pp. 75–78.

Manuel Panselinos and his age (1999). Athens.

Marchionibus, M.R. (2009) “Pulpiti di stucco in Costiera.” In *Scritti in onore di Francesco Abbate*. 2. Kronos. Martina Franca (Ta). pp. 139–144.

Marcora, C. (1974) *Gli stucchi di S. Pietro al Monte sopra Civate*. Lecco.

Marinou, G. (1990) *Άγιος Δημήτριος η Μητρόπολη του Μυστρά*. PhD thesis, Εθνικό Μετσόβιο Πολυτεχνείο (ΕΜΠ). Available at: <http://thesis.ekt.gr/thesisBookReader/id/2262#page/2/mode/2up> (Accessed: 23 July 2018).

(2002) *Άγιος Δημήτριος η Μητρόπολη του Μυστρά*. Υπουργείο πολιτισμού δημοσιεύματα του αρχαιολογικού δελτίου. Athina.

(2009a) “Οι εκκλησίες του Μυστρά.” In Sinos, S. (ed.) *Τα μνημεία του Μυστρά. Το έργο της Επιτροπής της Αναστήλωσης μνημείων Μυστρά/The monuments of Mystras: the work of the Committee for the Restoration of the Monuments of Mystras*. Athens. pp. 113–114.

(2009b) “Αγία Σοφία.” In Sinos, S. (ed.) *Τα μνημεία του Μυστρά. Το έργο της Επιτροπής της Αναστήλωσης μνημείων Μυστρά/The monuments of Mystras: the work of the Committee for the Restoration of the Monuments of Mystras*. Athens. pp. 155–174.

(2009c) “Μονή Περιβλέπτου.” In Sinos, S. (ed.) *Τα μνημεία του Μυστρά. Το έργο της Επιτροπής της Αναστήλωσης μνημείων Μυστρά/The monuments of Mystras: the work of the Committee for the Restoration of the Monuments of Mystras*. Athens. pp. 175–188.

Marsili, G. (2019) *Archeologia del cantiere protobizantino. Cave, maestranze e committenti attraverso i marchi dei marmorari*. Bologna.

Martin-Hisard, B. (2005) “Monaci georgiani sull’Athos nell’XI secolo.” In Calà, S. and Cremaschi, L. (eds.) *Atanasio e il monachesimo al Monte Athos. Atti del XII Convegno ecumenico internazionale di spiritualità ortodossa, sezione bizantina: Bose, 12-14 settembre 2004*. Magnano. pp. 79–100.

(2006) *La Vie de Georges l’Hagiorite (1009/1010-29 juin 1065). Introduction, traduction du texte géorgien, notes et éclaircissements. Revue des études byzantines*, 1 (64–65): 5–204.

- Mastoropoulos, G. (1983) Άγνωστες χρονολογημένες βυζαντινές επιγραφές 13ου και 14ου αιώνα από τη Νάξο και τη Σίκινο. *Αρχαιολογικά Ανάλεκτα εξ Αθηνών*, (13): 121–31.
- Mastrotheodoros, G.P., Beltsios, K.G., Bassiakos, Y., et al. (2018) Two unique Byzantine immured lead-glazed relief ceramic icons and related tiles from the church of St Basil in Arta, Greece: investigation and interpretation of materials and techniques. *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences*, pp. 2059–2074.
- Mathews, T.F. (1971) *The early churches of Constantinople. Architecture and liturgy*. London.
- Mattiello, A. (2018) *Latin basilissai in Palaiologan Mystras: art and agency*. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham.
- Megaw, A.H. (1953) Archaeology in Cyprus, 1952. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, (73): 133–37.
- (1963) Notes on Recent Work of the Byzantine Institute in Istanbul. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 17: 333–371.
- (1966) The Skripou screen. *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, (61): 1–32.
- (1974) Byzantine Architecture and Decoration in Cyprus: Metropolitan or Provincial? *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 28: 57–88.
- (1976) Excavations at the episcopal basilica of Kourion in Cyprus in 1974 and 1975: a preliminary report. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (30): 345–71.
- (2000) “The Soloi basilicas reconsidered.” In *Πρακτικά του τρίτου διεθνούς Κυπριολογικού συνεδρίου, Λευκοσία, 1996*. Nicosia. pp. 171–80.
- Meksi, A. (1972) Arkitektura e kishës së Mesopotamit. *Monumentet*, (3): 47–95.
- (1975) Dy kisha bizantine nërreth të Gjirokastrës [Deux églises byzantines du district de Gjirokastra. *Monumentet*, (9): 77–105.
- Melvani, N. (2013) *Late byzantine sculpture*. Studies in the visual cultures of the Middle Ages. Turnhout.
- (2014) *The middle Byzantine sanctuary barriers of Mount Athos: templon and iconostasis*. In Athina: Πανεπιστήμιο Αθηνών: Σαριπόλειο Ίδρυμα. pp. 305–336.
- (2018a) “Late, Middle and Early Byzantine sculpture in Palaiologan Constantinople.” In *Spolia reincarnated: afterlife of objects, materials, and spaces in Anatolia from Antiquity to the Ottoman era*. Istanbul. pp. 149–172.
- (2018b) “Apotropeia and Ornament: Late Byzantine Sculpture and the Migration of Pseudo-Arabic Writing.” In Coden, F. (ed.) *Minima medievalia. Atti Accademia roveretana degli Agiati*. IX. Rovereto. pp. 159–169.
- Mento, G. (2003) “Itàla. La Chiesa di SS. Pietro e Paolo.” In Bacci, G.M. and Mastelloni, M.A. (eds.) *I Normanni nel Sud. Nuovi segmenti di storia europea*. Messina. pp. 50–52.

Meyer-Fernandez, G. (2018) Donner du relief à l'icône: les décors en stuc des icônes de Chypre au XIIIe siècle. *Cahiers Archéologiques fin de l'Antiquité et Moyen Age*, 57: 75–92.

Michaelides, D. (1998) Archeologia paleocristiana a Cipro. *CCARB*, (44): 179–239.

Micheletto, E. and Uggé, S. (2004) “Borgo San Dalmazzo (Cuneo). Abbaye San Dalmazzo di Pedona.” In *Le stuc, visage oublié de l'art médiéval. Expositions, Poitiers, Musée Sainte-Croix, 16 sept. 2004-16 janv. 2005*. Paris. pp. 222–225.

Miele, A. (1998) *La scultura altomedievale nella diocesi di Gaeta (VIII-IX secolo): decorazioni marmoree e stucchi ad intreccio di nastro vimineo della chiesa di Sant'Erasmus a Formia*. Marina di Minturno (LT).

Milanova, A. (2008) “La production d'un atelier de sculpture en Bulgarie byzantine à la fin du Xe ou au début du XIe siècle.” In *La sculpture byzantine: VIIe - XIIe siècles. Actes du colloque international organisé par la 2e Éphorie des Antiquités byzantines et l'École française d'Athènes (6-8 septembre 2000)*. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Supplement. Athènes. pp. 163–181.

Miljković-Peppek, P. (1967) *Deloto na zografite Mihailo i Eutihij*. Skopje.

Miller, T.S. (1990) The Sampson Hospital of Constantinople. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, (XV): 101–135.

Millet, G. (1919) *L'art ancien serbe: les églises*. Paris.

Millet, G. and Benouville, P.L.A. (1899) *Le monastère de Daphni. Histoire, architecture, mosaïques*. Monuments de l'art byzantin. Paris: E. Leroux.

Milliner, M.J. (2012) “Man or Metaphor? Manuel Panselinos and the Protaton Frescoes.” In *Approaches to Byzantine Architecture and its Decoration. Studies in Honor of Slobodan Curčić*. Farnham. pp. 221–235.

Mitchell, J. (forthcoming) “Ornament as Index: Dado as Agent in the Early Middle Ages.” In Marazzi, F. and Cuomo, M. (eds.) *La pittura parietale aniconica e decorativa fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo. Tradizioni, temi e tendenze*, 7-8/09/2019, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli. Napoli.

Mitsani, A. (1998) “Βυζαντινές τοιχογραφίες στη Σάμο· Άγιος Γεώργιος Δρακαίων και Παναγία Μακρινή Καλιθέας.” In *Η Σάμος από τα βυζαντινά χρόνια μέχρι σήμερα: πρακτικά συνεδρίου*. Athina. pp. 85–142.

(2000) Η Μνημειακή ζωγραφική στις Κυκλάδες κατά το 13ο αιώνα. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (KA): 93–122.

(2002) Η χορηγία στις Κυκλάδες από τον 6ο μέχρι τον 14ο αι. Η μαρτυρία των επιγραφών. *Επιστημονική Έπετηρίς Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδῶν*, (42): 391–430.

Monneret de Vuillard, U. (1946) “La tessitura palermitana presso i normanni e i suoi rapporti con l'arte bizantina.” In *Miscellanea G. Mercati*. Studi e testi. Città del Vaticano. pp. 464–486.

Mor, C.G. (1965) L'autore della decorazione dell'oratorio di S. Maria in Valle a Cividale e le possibili epoche in cui potè operare. *Memorie Forogiuliesi*, (XLVI): 19–36.

(1986) Cronologia e monumento d'età longobarda a Cividale. *Quaderni cividalesi*, (13): 7–18.

Moretti, S. (2018) “Su un'antichissima “stola greca della Sagristia Vaticana.”” In Pedone, S. and Paribeni, A. (eds.) “*Di Bisanzio dirai ciò che è passato, che passa e che sarà*” scritti in onore di Alessandra Guiglia. Roma. pp. 431–452.

Morganstern, J. (1983) *The Byzantine Church at Dereagzi and Its Decoration*. Tübingen.

Morrisson, C. and Cheynet, J.-C. (2002) “Prices and wages in the Byzantine World.” In Laiou, A. (ed.) *The Economic History of Byzantium*. Washington D. C. pp. 815–878.

Morrone Naimo, M. and Grillo, E. (2011) “Marmi romani nel territorio di Locri, dopo Locri.” In *Sculture da Locri romana. πόλεις / urbes città antiche del meridione*. Locri. pp. 95–104.

Mouriki, D. (1970) Αι βιβλικά προεικονίσεις της Παναγίας εις τον τρούλλον της Περιβλέπτου του Μυστρά. *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον, Μελέται*, (25): 217–51.

(1980) Stylistic Trends in Monumental Painting of Greece during the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (34–35): 76–124.

(1980-1981) The mask motif in the wall paintings of Mistra. Cultural implications of a classical feature in Late Byzantine Painting. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (10): 307–338, pl. 83–94.

(1996) “Stylistic Trends in Monumental Painting of Greece at the Beginning of the Fourteenth Century.” In *Studies in late Byzantine painting*. London. pp. 1–81.

Moutsopoulos, N.K. (1972) *Καστοριά. Λεύκωμα*. Thessaloniki.

(1989) *Η Βασιλική του Αγίου Αχιλλείου στην Πρέσπα. Συμβολή στη μελέτη των βυζαντινών μνημείων της περιοχής*. 3 vols. Thessaloniki.

(1999) *Η Βασιλική του Αγίου Αχιλλείου στην Πρέσπα. Ένα μνημείο κιβωτός της τοπικής ιστορίας*. Thessaloniki.

Muehlbauer, M. (2020) *Bastions of the Cross: Medieval Rock Cut Cruciform Churches of Tigray, Ethiopia*. PhD thesis, University of Columbia.

Müller-Wiener, W. (1977) *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls: Byzantion, Konstantinupolis, Istanbul bis zum Beginn d. 17. Jh.* Tübingen.

Müller-Wiener, W. (1983) “Spoliennutzung in Istanbul.” In Boehmer, R.M. and Hauptmann, M. (eds.) *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasien: Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*. Mainz. pp. 369–82.

Mundell-Mango, M. (2001) "Polychrome tiles found at Istanbul: typology, chronology and function." In *A lost art rediscovered: the architectural ceramics of Istanbul*. Baltimore. pp. 13–42.

Muñoz, A. (1918) Studii sulle basiliche romane di S. Sabina e S. Prassede. *Dissertazioni della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia*, (XIII): 119–128.

Mylonas, P.M. (1979) Les étapes successives de construction du Protaton au Mont Athos. *Cahier Archéologiques*, XXVIII: 143–160.

(1985) "Notice sur le katholikon d'Iviron." In Lefort, J., Oikonomides, N., Papachryssanthou, D., et al. (eds.) *Actes d'Iviron I. Des origines au milieu du XIe siècle. Texte*. Archives de l'Athos. Paris. pp. 64–68.

Necipoğlu, N. (2009) *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins. Politics and Society in the Late Empire*. Cambridge, Massachussets- London.

(2012) *Byzantium between the Ottomans and the Latins: politics and society in the late empire*. Cambridge.

(2013) "Circulation of People between the Byzantine and Ottoman Courts." In Ödekan, A., Necipoğlu, N. and Akyürek, E. (eds.) *The Byzantine Court: Source of Power and Culture. Papers from the Second International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposium, Istanbul, 21–23 June 2010*. Istanbul. pp. 105–108.

Nenci, C. (2006) "Gli stucchi italiani. Nuove ricerche su alcune opere in stucco dell'Abruzzo." In *Stucs et décors de la fin de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge (Ve-XIIe siècle): actes du colloque international tenu à Poitiers du 16 au 19 septembre 2004*. Turnhout. pp. 269–284.

Nesbitt, C. (2012) Shaping the sacred: light and the experience of worship in middle Byzantine churches. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, 2 (36): 139–160.

(2013) "Experiencing the Light Byzantine Church Window Glass and the Aesthetics of Worship." In Entiwistle, C. and James, L. (eds.) *New Light on Old Glass: Recent Research on Byzantine Mosaics and Glass*. London. pp. 207–216.

Nešković, J. and Nikolić, R. (1987) *L'église Saint-Pierre pres de Novi Pazar*. Belgrad.

Nicol, D.M. (1957) *The despotate of Epiros*. Oxford.

(1981) The Date of the Death of Nikephoros I of Epiros. *Rivista di Studi Bizantini e Slavi*, 1 (1): 251–257.

(1984) *The despotate of Epiros, 1267-1479: a contribution to the history of Greece in the Middle Ages*. Cambridge.

(1996) *The reluctant emperor: a biography of John Cantacuzene, Byzantine emperor and monk, c. 1295-1383*. Cambridge.

Niehr, K. (1992) *Die Mitteldeutsche Skulptur der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts*. Weinheim.

Niewöhner, P. (2017) The decline and afterlife of the Roman entablature. The collection of the archaeological museum Istanbul and other Byzantine epistyle and cornices from Constantinople. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen*, (67): 237–328.

Niewöhner, P. and Teteriatnikov, N. (2015) The South Vestibule of Hagia Sophia at Istanbul. The Ornamental Mosaics and the Private Door of the Patriarchate. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (68): 117–156.

Nikolaides, A. (1996) L'église de la Panagia Arakiotissa à Lagoudéra, Chypre: Etude iconographique des fresques de 1192. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 50: 1–137.

Nikolaou, D. (forthcoming) “Παλαιοχριστιανικές Βασιλικές της κυπριακής υπαίθρου: Καλαβασός, Μαρώνι, Χοιροκοιτία, Κοφίνου.” In *Πρακτικά Α΄ Επιστημονικού Συνεδρίου «Ιερά Μητρόπολις Τριμυθοῦντος: Ἐκκλησιαστική Ἱστορία καὶ Παράδοσις»*, Μοσφιλωτή, 19-20 Ἀπριλίου 2017. Nicosia.

North, J.A. (2012) “Sappho Underground.” In Dignas, B. and Smith, R.R.R. (eds.) *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*. Oxford, New York. pp. 37–68.

Northedge, A. (1991) Creswell, Herzfeld, and Samarra. *Muqarnas*, (8): 74–93.

Northdurfter, H. (2002) *St. Benedikt in Mals*. Lana.

Oikonomides, N. (1992) The First Century of the Monastery of Hosios Loukas. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 46 (Homo Byzantinus: Papers in Honor of Alexander Kazhdan): 245–255.

(1998) “Byzantine Vatopaidi: a monastery of the great aristocracy.” In *The Holy and great monastery of Vatopaidi. Tradition, history, art*. Mount Athos. pp. 44–53.

Ölçer, N. (2005) “The Anatolian Seljuks.” In Roxburgh, D.J. (ed.) *Turks: a journey of a thousands years, 600-1600. Catalogue of the exhibition held at the Royal Academy of Arts 22 January-12 April 2005*. London. pp. 104–113.

Okunev, N. (1927) La découverte des anciennes fresques du monastère de Nerezi. *Slavia*, 6: 603–609.

(1929) L'iconostase du XIIe siècle à Nerezi. *Seminarium Kondakovianum*, 3: 5–23.

Öney, G. (1980) “Architectural decoration and the Minor Arts.” In *The Art and architecture of Turkey*. New York. pp. 137–169.

Orlandos, A.K. (1923) *Παλαιοχριστιανικοί καὶ βυζαντινοὶ ναοὶ τῶν Καλυβίων Κουβαρά*. Athina.

(1927) Μνημεία του Δεσποτάτου της Ηπείρου. Η Κόκκινη Εκκλησιά (Παναγία Βελλάας). *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, 2: 153–169.

- (1933) Τα Βυζαντινά μνημεία της Βήρας. *Θρακικά*, 4: 3–34.
- (1935a) Οι σταυρεπίστεγοι ναοί τής Ελλάδος. *Αρχαίον τών Μνημείων τής Ελλάδος*, A (1): 41–52.
- (1935b) Η Πόρτα-Παναγιά της Θεσσαλίας. *Αρχαίον τών Μνημείων τής Ελλάδος*, (1): 5–40.
- (1936a) Η Μονή της Κάτω Παναγιάς. *Αρχαίον τών Μνημείων τής Ελλάδος*, (2): 70–87.
- (1936b) Η Αγία Θεωδόρα της Άρτας. *Αρχαίον τών Μνημείων τής Ελλάδος*, (2): 88/104.
- (1937) *Βυζαντινά μνημεία τής Άρτης*. Αρχαίων των Βυζαντινών Μνημείων της Ελλάδας.
- (1938) Βυζαντινά μνημεία των κλιτύων του Ταιγέτου. *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, 14: 461–485.
- (1952) Το παρά το Αλιβέρι μετόχιον τού Οσ. Λουκά Φωκίδος. *Αρχαίον τών Μνημείων τής Ελλάδος*, (7): 131–145.
- (1953) Το μαρμάρινο τέμπλο του Πρωτάτου των Καρυών. *Επετηρίς Εταιρείας Βυζαντινών Σπουδών*, 23 (ΚΓ): 83–91.
- (1963) *Η Παρηγορήτισσα της Άρτης*. Athina.
- Orsi, P. (1922) Placche in gesso decorate di arte arabo-normanna da S. Maria di Terreti presso Reggio Calabria. *Bollettino d'Arte*, (12): 546–562.
- Osswald, B. (2011) *L'Épire du treizième au quinzième siècle: autonomie et hétérogénéité d'une région balkanique*. PhD thesis, University of Toulouse.
- Otto-Dorn, K. (1956) Der Mihrab der Arslahne-Moschee in Ankara. *Anatolia*, (1): 21–30.
- Otto-Dorn, K. (1969) Bericht über die Grabung in Kobadabad 1966. *Archäologischer Anzeig*, 4 (84): 438–506.
- Ousterhout, R. (1985) A Sixteenth Century Visitor to the Chora. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (39): 117–124.
- (1987) *The architecture of the Kariye camii in Istanbul*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies. Washington D. C.
- (1991) “Constantinople, Bithynia and Regional Developments in Later Palaeologan Architecture.” In *The Twilight of Byzantium: aspects of cultural and religious history in the late Byzantine Empire: papers from the colloquium held at Princeton University, 8-9 May 1989*. Princeton, New Jersey. pp. 75–91.
- (1999) *Master builders of Byzantium*. Princeton N.J.

- (2002) "Byzantine Funerary Architecture of the Twelfth Century." In *Drevnerusskoe iskustvo. Rusi i stranii byzantinskogo mira XII vek.* St. Petersburg. pp. 9–17.
- (2005) *A Byzantine settlement in Cappadocia.* Dumbarton Oaks Studies. Washington D. C.
- (2006) "Archaeological materials from the Çanlı kilise in the Aksaray museum." In *23 Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı.* Ankara. pp. 71–78.
- (2010) "The Architectural Decoration of the Pantokrator Monastery: Evidence Old and New." In *Papers of the First Sevgi Gönül Memorial Symposium 2007.* Istanbul. pp. 432–439.
- (2011) *A Byzantine settlement in Cappadocia. Revised, paper edition.* Dumbarton Oaks Studies. Washington D. C.
- (2017) *Visualizing community: art, material culture, and settlement in Byzantine Cappadocia.* Dumbarton Oaks Studies. Washington D. C.
- (2018) "Piroska and the Pantokrator: Reassessing the Architectural Evidence." In Ousterhout, R. and Sághy, M. (eds.) *Piroska and the Pantokrator: Dynastic Memory, Healing and Salvation in Komnenian Constantinople.* Budapest. pp. 225–260.
- (2019) *Eastern medieval architecture: the building traditions of Byzantium and neighboring lands.* Onassis series in Hellenic culture. New York.
- Ousterhout, R., Ahunbay, Z., Ahunbay, M., et al. (2000) Study and Restoration of the Zeyrek Camii in Istanbul: First Report, 1997-98. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 54: 265–270.
- Ousterhout, R., Ahunbay, Z. and Ahunbay, M. (2009) Study and Restoration of the Zeyrek Camii in Istanbul: Second Report, 2001-2005. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 63: 235–256.
- Ousterhout, R. and Bakirtzis, C. (2007) *The Byzantine Monuments of the Evros/Meriç River Valley.* Thessaloniki.
- Palazzo, B. (1951) *Deux anciennes églises dominicaines à Stamboul: Odalar Djami et Kefeli Medjidi.* Istanbul.
- Palazzo, M. (2014) "I frammenti di decorazione a stucco della basilica di Santa Maria Maggiore a Lomello. Note sulla tecnica e sui materiali." In *L'alto medioevo artigiani e organizzazione manifatturiera.* Bologna. pp. 27–34.
- Palazzo-Bertholon, B. (2004) "Le stuc: une technique et une tradition." In *Le stuc, visage oublié de l'art médiéval.* Paris. pp. 27–35.
- (2006) "La nature des stucs entre le Ve et le XIIe siècle dans l'Europe médiévale: confrontation de la caractérisation physico-chimique des matériaux aux contextes géologiques, techniques et artistiques de la production." In *Stucs et décors de la fin de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge (Ve-XIIe siècle): actes du colloque international tenu à Poitiers du 16 au 19 septembre 2004.* Turnhout. pp. 13–48.

(2009) Le décor de stuc autour de l'an Mil: aspects techniques d'une production artistique disparue. *Les Cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa*, (XL): 285–298.

(2010) “Confronti tecnici e decorativi sugli stucchi intorno all’VIII secolo.” In *L’VIII secolo: un secolo inquieto. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Cividale del Friuli, 4 - 7 dicembre 2008*. Udine. pp. 285–296.

Palazzo-Bertholon, B. and Sapin, C. (2014) “Les stucs médiévaux de la cathédrale de Chartres.” In Timbert, A. (ed.) *La cathédrale de Chartres: matériaux et construction*. Art et Société. Paris. pp. 203–214.

Pallas, D. (1976) Ἡ Παναγία τῆς Σκριποῦς. *EESM*, (6): 1–80.

(1977) *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Grèce découverts de 1958 à 1973*. Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane. Roma.

Pallis, G. (2013) Inscriptions on Middle Byzantine Marble Templon Screens. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 2 (106): 761–810.

Panayides, P. (2018) “Βυζαντινή Κύπρος I: Ὑστερη Αρχαιότητα και Πρώιμη Βυζαντινή περίοδος (284-649 μ.Χ.).” In *Ιστορία της Κύπρου (11000 π.Χ.- 649 μ.Χ.)*. Athina. pp. 178–243.

Panayotidi, M. (1970-1972) Βυζαντινά κιονόκρανα με ανάγλυφα ζώα. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (6): 82–129.

(2005) “Village painting and the question of local “workshops.”” In *Les villages dans l’empire byzantin (IVe - XVe siècle)*. Réalités byzantines. Paris. pp. 193–212.

(2019) Αναζητώντας τον ιδρυτή της μονής Δαφνίου. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (40): 193–222.

Pani Ermini, L. (1974) *La diocesi di Roma I*. Corpus della scultura altomedievale, VII. Spoleto.

Panizzoli, L. (2008) “Gli stucchi di San Fruttuoso: note di restauro.” In *Gli stucchi di San Fruttuoso di Capodimonte*. Genova. pp. 71–74.

Panofsky, E. (1924) *Die deutsche Plastik des 11. bis 13. Jahrhundert*. München.

Papachryssanthou, D. (1975) *Actes du Prôtaton*. Archives de l’Athos 7. Paris.

(1986) *Actes de Xénophon*. Archives de l’Athos 15. Paris.

Papadopoulou, B. (1988) Πετροβίτσα, Ναός Γενεσίου Προδρόμου. *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον, Χρονικά*, (43): 323–324.

(1996) “Ἡ Κόνιτσα και η ευρύτερη περιοχή της κατα τη Βυζαντινή Περίοδο.” In *Η επαρχία Κόνιτσας στο Χώρο και το Χρόνο. Εισηγήσεις στο Α’ Επιστημονικό Συμπόσιο. Δήμος Κόνιτσας*. pp. 75–99.

(2001-2004) Βουλγαρέλι, Κόκκινη Εκκλησιά. *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον. Χρονικά*, Β' 5 (56-59): 168-169.

(2006) Γύψινα υστεροβυζαντινά ανάγλυφα από την Ήπειρο. *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον*, 56 (2001): 341-364.

(2007) *Byzantine Arta and its monuments*. Athina.

(2008) Η Κόκκινη εκκλησιά στο Βουλγαρέλι της Άρτας. Στοιχεία απο τη νεότερη ερεύνα. *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, (42): 323-345.

(ed.) (2015a) *Η Βλαχέρνα της Άρτας*. Arta.

(2015b) “Οι σαρκοφάγοι.” In Papadopoulou, B. (ed.) *Η Βλαχέρνα της Άρτας*. Arta. pp. 107-117.

(2015c) “Το βυζαντινό μαρμάρινο τέμπλο.” In Papadopoulou, B. (ed.) *Η Βλαχέρνα της Άρτας*. Arta. pp. 83-96.

Papageorgiou, A. (1963) Η βαϊλική Μαραθοβούνου. *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*, pp. 84-101.

(2012) “The architecture of the church of the Panagia Phorbiotissa.” In Weyl Carr, A. and Nikolaides, A. (eds.) *Asinou across time. Studies in the architecture and murals of the Panagia Phorbiotissa, Cyprus*. Dumbarton Oaks Research Library Collection. Washington D. C. pp. 39-68.

Papakostas, T. (2015) *Inventory of Byzantine Churches on Cyprus*. London. Available at: <http://ibcc.dighum.kcl.ac.uk/> (Downloaded: 23 July 2018).

Papalexandrou, A. (2000) *The Church of the Virgin of Skripou: Architecture, Sculpture and Inscriptions in Ninth-Century Byzantium*. PhD thesis, Princeton University.

(2001) Text in Context: Eloquent Monuments and the Byzantine Beholder. *Word&Image*, (17): 259-283.

Papamastorakis, T. (2001) *Ο διάκοσμος του τρούλλου των ναών της Παλαιολόγειας περιόδου (1261-1453) στην Βαλκανική χερσόνησο και την Κύπρο*. Βιβλιοθήκη της εν'Αθήναιος' Αρχαιολογικής εταιρείας'. Athina.

Parente, G. (1993) Gli affreschi della cripta del duomo di Benevento: analisi e restauri. *Archeologia e arte in Campania*. Napoli. pp. 59-63.

Paribeni, A. (2008) “I rilievi in marmo rappresentanti la Vergine e altri personaggi religiosi: considerazioni sulla cronologia e sul loro ruolo nella liturgia.” In Pennas, C. and Vanderheyde, C. (eds.) *La sculpture byzantine : VIIe - XIIe siècles. Actes du colloque international organisé par la 2e Éphorie des Antiquités byzantines et l'École française d'Athènes (6-8 septembre 2000)*. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Supplement. Athènes. pp. 561-575.

(2013) “Modalità e prassi operative delle maestranze del proconnesio nei cantieri bizantini tra V e VI secolo.” In *Acta XV Congressus Internationalis Archaeologia Christianae. Episcopus, Civitas, Territorium. Toleti (8-12/09/2012)*. Studi di Antichità cristiana. Città del Vaticano. pp. 1471–1480.

Parman, E. (2002) *Ortaçağ'da Bizans Döneminde Frigya ve Bölge Müzelerindeki Bizans Taş Eserleri*. Eskişehir.

Pastoureau, M. (2004) *Une histoire symbolique du Moyen âge occidental*. La librairie du XXI^e siècle. Paris.

Pasquini, L. (2002) *La decorazione a stucco in Italia fra Tardo antico e Alto Medioevo*. Ravenna.

Pazaras, Th. (1988) *Ανάγλυφες σαρκοφάγοι και επιτάφιας πλάκες της μέσης και ύστερης βυζαντινής περιόδου στην Ελλάδα*. Athina.

(1995) Το μαρμάρινο τέμπλο του καθολικού της Μονής Βατοπεδίου. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (18): 15–31.

(1997) “Η Βυζαντινή γλυπτική το Άγιον Όρος.” In *Θησαυροί τοῦ Ἁγίου Ὄρους. Catalogue of the exhibition Thessaloniki – Mousio Vyzantinou Politismou (21 giugno 1997-30 aprile 1998)*. Thessaloniki. pp. 231–246.

(2001a) *Τα βυζαντινά γλυπτά του καθολικού της Μονής Βατοπεδίου*. Thessaloniki.

(2001b) “Το μαρμάρινο τέμπλο του καθολικού της Μονής Ιβήρων.” In *Άγιον Όρος, Φύση-Λατρεία-Τέχνη*. 2 vols. Thessaloniki. pp. 165–77.

(2006) Οι κτητορικοί τάφοι στο καθολικό της μονής Ιβήρων. *Βυζαντινά*, 26: 125–152.

(2007) Γύψινες ανάγλυφες διακοσμήσεις της μεσοβυζαντινής εποχής στο καθολικό της Μονής Ιβήρων. *Μακεδονικά*, 36: 47–64.

Pedone, S. (2013) “«Souvenirs d’une grandeur qui ne s’efface pas» La Santa Sofia di Giustiniano in alcuni disegni di Charles Textier.” In Rigo, A., Babuin, A. and Trizio, M. (eds.) *Vie per Bisanzio. VII Congresso Nazionale dell’Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini. Venezia 25-28 novembre 2009*. 2 vols. Bari: 939-962.

(2016) “Bisanzio (ri)colorata: tecniche, effetti e problemi aperti.” In Andreuccetti, P.A. and Bindani, D. (eds.) *Il colore nel Medioevo: arte, simbolo e tecnica. Tra materiali costitutivi e colori aggiunti: mosaici, intarsi e plastica lapidea. Atti delle giornate di studi, Lucca, 24-25-26 ottobre 2013*. Collana di studi sul colore 5. Lucca. pp. 87–102.

(2018) *Bisanzio a colori. La policromia nella scultura bizantina*. Università di Roma “La Sapienza.”

Pedone, S. and Cantone, V. (2013) The pseudo-Kufic Ornament and the Problem of Cross-cultural Relationships between Byzantium and Islam. *Opusculae Historiae Artium. Supplementum*, (62): 120–136.

Peduto, P. and Mauro, D. (1990) Il S. Ambrogio di Montecorvino Rovella. *Rassegna Storica Salernitana*, 7 (13): 7–48.

Peers, G. (2020) “Late Antique Making and Wonder.” In Cosentino, S. (ed.) *Ravenna and the Traditions of Late Antique and Early Byzantine Craftsmanship. Labour, Culture, and the Economy*. Millennium Studies in the culture and history of the first millennium C.E. Berlin/Boston. pp. 33–58.

Pelekanidis, S. (1953) *Καστοριά Ι. Βυζαντιναί τοιχογραφίαι*. Thessaloniki.

Pelekanidis, S. and Chatzidakis, M. (1985) *Kastoria*. Athenes.

Pelletier, A. (1962) *Lettre d’Aristée à Philocrate. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes*. Sources chrétiennes. Paris.

Pennas, C. (2009) “Βυζαντινή παράδοση και τοπική κοινωνία στην έδρα του Δουκάτου της Νάξου. Η μαρτυρία των μνημείων.” In Moschonas, N. and Stylianoudes, A. (eds.) *Το Δουκάτο του Αιγαίου, Πρακτικά Επιστημονικής Συνάντησης Νάξος-Αθήνα 2007*. Athina. pp. 149–185.

Périn, P. (1991) “Sarcophages de plâtre.” In *Naissance des arts chrétiens. Atlas des monuments paléochrétiens de la France*. Atlas archéologique de la France. Paris. pp. 299–305.

Peristianes, I.K. (1922) *Μονογραφία τῆς ἀρχαίας πόλεως καὶ ἐκκλησίας τῆς Ἀσίνης (νῦν Ἀσίνους)*. Nicosia.

Peroni, A. (1962) “La ricomposizione degli stucchi preromanici in San Salvatore a Brescia.” In *La chiesa di San Salvatore in Brescia. Atti dell’VIII Congresso di studi sull’arte dell’alto medioevo (Verona - Vicenza - Brescia, 1959)*. Milano. pp. 229–315.

(1974) “La plastica in stucco nel S. Ambrogio di Milano. Arte ottoniana e romanica in Lombardia.” In *Kolloquium über spätantike und frühmittelalterliche Skulptur, Heidelberg 1972*. Mainz am Rhein. pp. 59–119.

(1975) *Pavia. Musei civici del Castello Visconteo*. Bologna.

(1986) “Stucco e pittura nel S. Benedetto di Malles.” In Spada Pintarelli, S. (ed.) *Festschrift Nicolò Rasmo: scritti in onore*. Bozen/Bolzano. pp. 77–90.

(1994) “Riflessioni sul rapporto tra architettura e stucco nella basilica eufrasiana di Parenzo e nel San Salvatore di Brescia.” In *Scritti in onore di Gaetano Panazza*. Brescia. pp. 101–115.

(1996) “Frühmittelalterlicher Stuck in Oberitalien. Offene fragen.” In Exner, M. (ed.) *Stuck des frühen und hohen Mittelalters. Geschichte, Technologie, Konservierung*. München. pp. 25–36.

(2002) “Stucco, pittura e sinopie in S. Salvatore di Brescia e in S. Benedetto di Malles.” In Poeschke, J. (ed.) *Sinopien und Stuck im Westwerk der Karolingischen Klosterkirche von Corvey*. Münster. pp. 59–69.

(2006) “San Pietro al Monte di Civate o l’apogeo del rapporto tra pittura e stucco.” In *Stucs et décors de la fin de l’Antiquité au Moyen Âge (Ve-XIIe siècle): actes du colloque international tenu à Poitiers du 16 au 19 septembre 2004*. Turnhout. pp. 285–306.

Peschlow, U. (1977) *Die Irenenkirche in Istanbul. Untersuchungen zur Architektur*. Istanbuler Mitteilungen/Beiheft 18. Tübingen.

Petrov, K. (1986) “La plastica di decorazione in Macedonia dal X al XIV secolo.” In *XXXIII Corso di cultura sull’arte ravennate e bizantina, Ravenna 15-22 marzo 1986*. Ravenna. pp. 357–365.

Petsas, P. (1952) *AE, Χρονικά*, pp. 12–13.

Pinza, M.T. (1970) Decorazioni in stucco degli edifici di culto paleocristiani di Ravenna: gli stucchi di S. Vitale. *Felix Ravenna*, (IV): 151–167.

Pitarakis, B. (2001) “Note sur le kathokikon, architecture et décor.” In *Actes de Vatopédi. Des Origines à 1329. Texte*. Archives de l’Athos XXI. Paris. pp. 39–50.

Preradović, D. (2016) “Architectural Sculpture and the System of Decoration of Moravan Churches.” In Vojvodić, D. and Popović, D. (eds.) *Sacral art of the Serbian lands in the Middle Ages*. Belgrade. pp. 435–445.

Prieto-Domínguez, O. (2013) On the Founder of the Skripou Church: Literary Trends in the Milieu of Photius. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 1 (53): 166–191.

Prolović, J. (2017) *Resava (Manasija). Geschichte, Architektur und Malerei einer Stiftung des serbischen Despoten Stefan Lazarević*. Wien: Verlag der österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Rabbat, N. (1996) Al-Azhar Mosque: An Architectural Chronicle of Cairo’s History. *Muqarnas*, (13): 45–67.

Raby, J. (2004) Nur Al-Din, the Qastal al-Shu‘aybiyya, and the “Classical Revival.” *Muqarnas*, 21: 289–310.

Ragona, A. (1960) Stampi per la ceramica e per gli stucchi nell’arte siculo-musulmana. *La Ceramica*, (12): 30–33.

(1968) Gli stucchi arabonormanni della chiesa di San Giuliano in Caltagirone. *Palladio*, pp. 25–30.

Ranaldi, A. (1991) La decorazione architettonica interna delle celle del Tempio di Venere e Roma: una ipotesi di restituzione. *Quaderni dell’Istituto di Storia dell’Architettura*, 14 (1989): 3–16.

Rasmo, N. (1962) “Note preliminari su S. Benedetto di Malles.” In *Stucchi e mosaici alto medievali*. Milano. pp. 86–110.

(1966) “Gli affreschi carolingi di Malles.” In *Arte in Europa, scritti di storia dell’arte in onore di E. Arslan*. Milano. pp. 189–202.

Rautman, M. (2003) *A Cypriot village of late antiquity: Kalavassos-Kopetra in the Vasilikos Valley*. Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series 52. Portsmouth.

Redford, S. (1993) Thirteenth-century Rum Seljuq palaces and palace imagery. *Ars Orientalis*, (23): 219–236.

(2012) Portable Palaces: On the Circulation of Objects and Ideas about Architecture in Medieval Anatolia and Mesopotamia. *Medieval Encounters*, (18): 395–402.

(2013) “Constantinople, Konya, Conical Kiosks, Cultural Confluence.” In Ödelam, A., Necipoğlu, N. and Akyürek, E. (eds.) *The Byzantine Court: Source of Power and Culture. Papers from the Second International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposium, Istanbul 21–23 June 2010*. Istanbul. pp. 41–47.

Restle, M. (1969) *Byzantine wall painting in Asia minor*. Shannon: Irish University Press.

Reudenbach, B. (1998) *Das Godescalc-Evangelistar ein Buch für die Reformpolitik Karls des Großen*. Frankfurt am Main.

Rhoby, A. (2014) *Byzantinische Epigramme auf Stein*. Byzantinische Epigramme in inschriftlicher Überlieferung. Wien.

(ed.) (2015) *Inscriptions in Byzantium and Beyond: Methods – Projects – Case Studies*. Wien.

(2017) “Das Licht Christi leuchtet Allen. Form und Funktion von Kreuzen mit Tetragrammen in byzantinischen und postbyzantinischen Handschriften.” In Moutafov, E. and Toth, I. (eds.) *Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art: Crossing Borders*. Sophia. pp. 71–89.

Riccardi, L. (2015) *L’Epiro tra Bisanzio e l’Occidente: ideologia e committenza artistica nel primo secolo del Despotato (1204-1318)*. PhD thesis, Università di Roma “La Sapienza.”

Ricci, A. (1998) “The road from Baghdad to Byzantium and the case of the Bryas Palace in Istanbul.” In Brubaker, L. (ed.) *Byzantium in the ninth century: dead or alive? : papers from the thirtieth Spring Symposium of Byzantine studies, Birmingham, March 1996*. Aldershot. pp. 131–150.

Rigo, A. (1995) Il monte Galesion (Alaman Dağ) e i suoi monasteri: da S. Lazzaro (m. 1053) alla conquista turca (ottobre 1304). *Cristianesimo nella storia*, 16: 11–43.

Robert, L. and Robert, J. (1954) *La Carie: historie et géographie historique avec le recueil des inscriptions antique*. Paris.

Robinson, C. (1992) “The Art of the Taifa kingdoms.” In Dodds, J.D. (ed.) *Al-Andalus: the art of Islamic Spain*. New York. pp. 49–61.

- Robinson, C. (2011) Towers, Birds and Divine Light: The Contested Territory of Nasrid and “Mudéjar” Ornament. *Medieval Encounters*, (17): 27–79.
- Rosser, J. (1985) Excavations at Saranda Kolones, Paphos, Cyprus, 1981–1983. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 39: 81–97.
- Roux, J.P. (1991) Animali. *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Medievale*. Available at: https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/animali_%28Enciclopedia-dell%27-Arte-Medievale%29/.
- Roxburgh, D.J. (ed.) (2005) *Turks: a journey of a thousands years, 600-1600. Catalogue of the exhibition held at the Royal Academy of Arts 22 January-12 April 2005*. London.
- Ruffing, K. (2008) *Die berufliche Spezialisierung in Handel und Handwerk : Untersuchungen zu ihrer Entwicklung und zu ihren Bedingungen in der römischen Kaiserzeit im östlichen Mittelmeerraum auf der Grundlage griechischer Inschriften und Papyri*. Pharos; Studien zur griechisch-römischen Antike. Leidorf.
- Rugiadi, M. (2016) “Sultans of the East and the West.” In *Court and Cosmos. The Great age of the Seljuqs*. New York. pp. 38–47.
- Russo, E. (1991) *Sculture del complesso eufrasiano di Parenzo*. Napoli.
- (2009) The sculptural decoration of the Theodosian church of St. Sophia. *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı*, 1 (26): 155–166.
- (2010) “Evidence from the Theodosian Saint Sophia.” In Barsanti, C. and Guiglia, A. (eds.) *The sculptures of Ayasofya Müzesi in Istanbul. A short guide*. Istanbul. pp. 19–34.
- Saba, M.D. (2015) A restricted gaze: the ornament of the main caliphal palace of Samarra. *Muqarnas*, (32): 155–195.
- Sabbadini, R. (1910) “Ciriaco d’Ancona e la sua descrizione autografa del Peloponneso trasmessa da Leonardo Botta.” In *Miscellanea Ceriani Raccolta di scritti originali per onorare la memoria di M.r Antonio Maria Ceriani, prefetto della Biblioteca Ambrosiana*. Milano. pp. 183–247.
- Safran, L. (2014) *The Medieval Salento: Art and Identity in Southern Italy*. Philadelphia.
- Sanzi Di Mino, M.R. (ed.) (1998) *La villa della Farnesina in palazzo Massimo alle Terme Museo Nazionale Romano*. Milano.
- Sapin, C. (2004) “Introduction. Le stuc, visage oublié de l’art médiéval.” In *Le stuc, visage oublié de l’art médiéval. Expositions, Poitiers, Musée Sainte-Croix, 16 sept. 2004-16 janv. 2005*. Paris. pp. 17–25.
- Sapin, C. and Allag, C. (eds.) (2006) *Stucs et décors de la fin de l’antiquité au Moyen Âge (Ve - XIIIe siècle). Actes du Colloque international tenu à Poitiers du 16 au 9 septembre 2004*. Turnhout.

Sapin, C. and Simon-Hiernard, D. (eds.) (2004) *Le stuc, visage oublié de l'art médiéval. Expositions, Poitiers, Musée Sainte-Croix, 16 sept. 2004-16 janv. 2005*. Paris.

Sarre, F. (1909) *Erzeugnisse islamischer Kunst. Teil 2, Seldschukische Kleinkunst*. Berlin.

Scerrato, U. (1972) *Islam*. Milano.

(1979) "Arte islamica in Italia." In Gabrieli, F. and Scerrato, U. (eds.) *Gli Arabi in Italia*. Milano. pp. 245–471.

Schäfer-Schuchardt, H. (1987) *Die figürliche Steinplastik des 11. - 13. Jahrhunderts in Apulien*. 2 vols. Bari: Casa Editrice Adriatica.

Schazmann, P. (1935) Die Grabung an der Odalar Camii in Konstantinopel. *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts*, (50): 511–519.

Schneider, A.M. (1941) *Die Grabung im Westhof der Sophienkirche zu Istanbul*. Istanbul. Mitteilungen. Berlin.

Schreiner, P. (1975-1979) *Die byzantinischen Kleinchroniken*. 3 vols. Wien.

(2009) "Hekabe in Epiros oder: die Ermordung des Despoten Thomas Angelos (1318)." In Kotzabassi, S. and Mavromatis, I. (eds.) *Realia Byzantina*. Herausgegeben von Sofia Kotzabassi und Giannis Mavromatis. Berlin. pp. 253–266.

Schultz, R.W. and Barnsley, S.H. (1901) *The Monastery of Saint Luke of Stiris in Phocis, and the dependent Monastery of Saint Nicolas in the Fields, near Skripou, in Boeotia*. London.

Segagni Malacart, A. (2000) Stucco. *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Medievale*. 11.

Seri, G. (2016) *L'ipogeo di Porta Maggiore a Roma: dramma sacro e antiche religiosità negli stucchi decorativi della basilica sotterranea*. Acireale.

Ševčenko, N. P. (2000) "Kosmosoteira: Typikon of the Sebastokrator Isaac Komnenos for the Monastery of the Mother of God Kosmosoteira near Bera." In *Byzantine monastic foundations documents. A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typika and Testaments*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies XXXV. 5 vols. Washington D. C. pp. 782–858.

(2012) "Revisiting the frescoes of the church of the Kosmosoteira at Pherrai (1152)." In *Symmeikta. Zbornik radova povodom cetrdeset godina Instituta*. pp. 85–91.

Shea, J. (2010) *The Late Byzantine city: social, economic and institutional profile*. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham.

Shukurov, R. (2012) "The byzantine classification of the turks: Archaization or academic traditionalism?" In Asutay-Effenberger, N. and Daim, F. (eds.) *Φιλοπάτιον: Spaziergang im kaiserlichen Garten. Beiträge zu Byzanz und seinen Nachbarn: Festschrift für Arne Effenberger zum 70. Geburtstag*. Mainz. pp. 273–296.

(2016) *The Byzantine Turks, 1204-1461*. Medieval Mediterranean. Leiden, Boston.

- Simić, G., Todorović, D., Brmbolić, M., et al. (2011) *Monastery Resava*. Belgrad.
- Simpson, S.J., Ambers, J., Verri, G., et al. (n.d.) “Painted Parthian Stuccoes from Southern Iraq.” In pp. 209–220.
- Sinkević, I. (1996) Alexios Angelos Komnenos, a Patron without History? *GESTA*, 1 (35): 34–42.
- (2000) *The Church of St. Panteleimon at Nerezi. Architecture, Programme, Patronage*. Spätantike, frühes Christentum, Byzanz., Reihe B, Studien und Perspektiven. Wiesbaden.
- Sinos, S. (1985) *Die Klosterkirche der Kosmosoteira in Bera (Vira)*. Byzantinisches Archiv. München.
- Sklavou-Mavroidi, M. (1999) *Γλυπτά του Βυζαντινού Μουσείου Αθηνών: κατάλογος*. Athina.
- Skoblar, M. (ed.) (2021) *Byzantium, Venice and the medieval Adriatic : spheres of maritime power and influence, c. 700-1453*. British School at Athens studies in Greek antiquity. Cambridge.
- Skouras, Y. (1967) *Ιστορία των Ευβοϊκών μόνων (από αρχαιοτατων χρόνων μέχρι σήμερα)*. Athina.
- Smyrlis, K. (2006) *La fortune des grands monastères byzantins, fin du Xe-milieu du XIVe siècle*. Centre de Recherche d’Histoire et Civilisation de Byzance-Collège de France, Monographies. Paris.
- Snelders, B. and Jeudy, A. (2006) Guarding the Entrances: Equestrian Saints in Egypt and North Mesopotamia. *Eastern Christian art*, (3): 105–142.
- Sodini, J.-P. (1979) L’artisanat urbain à l’époque paléochrétienne. *Ktèma*, (4): 71–119.
- (1994) Le goût du marbre à Byzance : sa signification pour les Byzantins et les non-Byzantins. *Etudes balkaniques*, (I): 177–201.
- (1995) “La sculpture médio-byzantine: le marbre en ersatz et telqu’en lui-même.” In Mango, C. and Dagron, G. (eds.) *Constantinople and its hinterland. Papers from the twenty-seventh Spring Symposium of byzantine studies, Oxford, April 1993*. Aldershot: Rutledge. pp. 151–166.
- (2002) “Marble and Stoneworking in Byzantium, Seventh–Fifteenth Centuries.” In *The Economic History of Byzantium. From the Seventh through the Fifteenth Century*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies XXXIX. Washington, D.C. pp. 129–146.
- Šonje, A. (1967) Gli stucchi della basilica eufrasiana di Parenzo. *Felix Ravenna*, (44): 51–68.
- Sotiriou, G.A. (1928) *Die Byzantinische Malerei des XIV. Jahrhunderts in Griechenland (Bemerkungen zum Stilproblem der Monumentalmalerei des XIV. Jahrh.) Vortrag gehalten auf dem II. internationalen Kongress für Byzantinistik in Belgrad 1927*. Athens.

- Sotiriou, G.A. and Sotiriou, M. (1952) *Η Βασιλική του Αγίου Δημητρίου Θεσσαλονίκης*. Athina.
- Sotiriou, M. (1931) Ο ναός της Σκριπούς της Βοιωτίας. *Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς*, pp. 119–157.
- Soustal, P. and Koder, J. (1981) *Nikopolis und Kephallenia*. Tabula Imperii Byzantini. Vienna.
- Spatharakis, I. (1974) The Proskynesis in Byzantine Art. *Bulletin Antieke Beschaving*, (49): 190–205.
- (1976) *The portrait in Byzantine illuminated manuscripts*. Leiden.
- (2001) *Dated Byzantine wall paintings of Crete*. Leiden.
- Spieser, J.M. and Yota, E. (eds.) (2012) *Collective Patterns of Patronage in the Late Byzantine Village: The Evidence of Church Inscriptions*. Paris.
- Stanković, N. (2017) *At the Threshold of the Heavens: The Narthex and Adjacent Spaces in Middle Byzantine Churches of Mount Athos (10th–11th Centuries) - Architecture, Function, and Meaning*. Princeton University.
- Stathakopoulos, D. (2005) Discovering a Military Order of the Crusades: The Hospital of St. Sampson of Constantinople. *Viator*, (37): 255–273.
- Stavridou-Zafraka, A. (1988) “Συμβολή στο ζήτημα της Αναγόρευσης του Θεόδωρου Δούκα.” In *Αφιέρωμα στον Εμμανουήλ Κριαρά. Πρακτικά Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου, 3 Απριλίου 1987*. Thessaloniki. pp. 39–62.
- Stefec, R. (2014) Beiträge zur Urkundentätigkeit epirotischer Herrscher in den Jahren 1205–1318. *Nea Rhome*, (11): 249–370.
- Stikas, E. (1970) *Τό οικοδομικόν χρονικόν τῆς Μονῆς Οσίου Λουκᾶ Φοκίδος*. Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρείας. Athina.
- Stikas, E. (1974–1975) Ο Κτίτωρ το καθολικο τῆς μονῆς Οσίου Λουκάς. *Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθῆναις Ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρείας*, (80).
- Strzygowski, J. (1908) Das orientalische Italien. *Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft*, (1): 16–34.
- Stucchi e mosaici alto medievali. Atti dell’ottavo Congresso di studi sull’arte dell’Alto Medioevo* (1962). Milano: Ceschina.
- Stucco, Islam (2018). *The Oxford dictionary of late Antiquity*. 3 p. 1421.
- Stylianou, A. and Stylianou, J.A. (1997) *The painted churches of Cyprus*. Nicosia.
- Suatoni, S. (2001) Pittura monumentale della Campania longobarda: gli esempi di Occiano e Pernosano. *Apollo. Bollettino dei Musei Provinciali del Salernitano*, XVII: 10–45.
- Synkellou, E. (2008) *Ο πόλεμος στον δυτικό Ελλαδικό χώρο κατά των ύστερο μασαίων (13ος–15ος αι.)*. Εθνικό Ίδρυμα Ερευνών, Ινστιτούτο Βυζαντινών Ερευνών. Μονογραφίες 8. Athina.

Tabanelli, M. (2015) *Architettura sacra in Calabria e in Sicilia nell'età della Contea. Gli interventi dei conquistatori normanni tra occidentalizzazione e persistenze italogreche*. PhD thesis, Università di Roma "La Sapienza."

(2019) *Architettura sacra in Calabria e Sicilia nell'età della Contea normanna*. Roma.

Tabbaa, Y. (1985) The Muqarnas Dome: Its Origin and Meaning. *Muqarnas*, 1 (3): 61–74.

Taddei, A. (2017) *Hagia Sophia before Hagia Sophia: a study of the Great Church of Constantinople from its origins to the Nika revolt of 532*. Saggi di Storia dell'arte. Roma.

Tagliaferri, A. (1981) *Le Diocesi di Aquileia e Grado*. Corpus della scultura altomedievale. Spoleto.

Tagliapietra, M. (2006) "La madonna in stucco conservata presso il museo della città in Santa Giulia a Brescia." In *Stucs et décors de la fin de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge (Ve-XII siècles)*. Bibliothèque de l'Antiquité Tardive 10. Paris.

Talbi, M. (2012) Şabra or al-Manşūriyya Bearman, P., Bianquis, T., Bosworth, C.E., et al. (eds.). *Encyclopaedia of Islam*.

Talbot, A.-M. and Sullivan, D.F. (2005) *The History of Leo the Deacon. Byzantine Military Expansion in the Tenth Century*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies. Washington, D.C.

Talbot Rice, D. (1965) *Islamic art*. London.

Talgam, R. (2004) *The stylistic origins of Umayyad sculpture and architectural decoration*. Wiesbaden.

Taraborrelli, L. (2004) *Maestro Nicodemo*. Guardiagrele.

Tasso, F. (2016) "The Grado chair: a review of the historical and documentary sources." In *The Salerno ivories: objects, histories, contexts*. Berlin.

Tavano, S. (1990) *Il Tempietto longobardo di Cividale*. Udine.

Thomas, T. (1997) "Christians in the Islamic East." In Evans, H.C. and Wixom, W.D. (eds.) *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843–1261*. New York. pp. 244–257.

Todić, B. (1987) "Protaton et la peinture Serbe des premières décennies du XIVe siècle." In Samardžić, R. and Davidov, D. (eds.) *L'art de Thessalonique et des pays balkaniques et les courants spirituels au XIVe siècle*. Beograd. pp. 21–31.

Todić, B. (2007) Vreme podizanja i živopisanja Ljubostinje. The dating of the building and paintings of Ljubostinja. *Saopštenja: Republički zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture*, (XXXIX): 101–116. English summary 115–116.

Torp, H. (1999) “Una Vergine Hodighitria del periodo iconoclastico nel ‘Tempietto Longobardo’ di Cividale.” In *Arte d’Occidente. Temi e metodi. Studi in onore di Angiola Maria Romanini*. Roma. pp. 583–599.

(2006) *Il Tempietto Longobardo. La cappella palatina di Cividale*. Udine.

Tosatti, S.B. (2000) Teofilo. *Enciclopedia dell’Arte Medievale*. Available at: https://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/teofilo_%28Enciclopedia-dell%27-Arte-Medievale%29/ (Accessed: 29 October 2020).

Totev, T. (1999) *The Ceramic Icon in Medieval Bulgaria*. Sofia.

Trapp, E. and Gastgeber, C. (eds.) (2001) *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*. Wien.

Triantaphyllopoulos, D., D. (1975) Εκκλησιαστικά μνημεία στην Κλειδωνιά Κονίτσης. *Ηπειρωτικά Χρονικά*, pp. 7–59.

Triggiani, M. (2009) “San Nicola a Mesopotam. Stratigrafie e analisi delle tipologie murarie.” In Boriani, M. and Macchiarella, G. (eds.) *Albania e Adriatico meridionale. Studi per la conservazione del patrimonio culturale (2006-2008)*. Firenze. pp. 58–61.

(2015) “Mesopotam 2007: frammenti di conoscenza. Lo studio e la conservazione dei reperti scultorei erratici.” In Borlani, M. and Gianbruno, M. (eds.) *Studi per la conservazione del patrimonio culturale albanese. Ricerche e progetti in ricordo di Giancarlo Macchiarella*. Firenze. pp. 117–128.

Triphonova, A.P. (2010) *Οι τοιχογραφίες του Αγίου Γεωργίου του Βουνού στην Καστοριά: συμβολή στη μελέτη της ζωγραφικής του δεύτερου μισού του 14ου αιώνα στην ευρύτερη περιοχή της Μακεδονίας*. PhD thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

Tronzo, W. (2001) “The vagaries of a motif and other observations on ornament.” In *A lost art rediscovered: the architectural ceramics of Byzantium*. Baltimore. pp. 143–158.

Tsamakda, V. (2002) *The Illustrated Chronicle of Ioannes Skylitzes in Madrid*. Leiden.

Tsigaridas, E. (1998) “The mosaics and the byzantine wall-paintings.” In *The Holy and great monastery of Vatopaidi. Tradition, history, art*. II vols. Mount Athos. pp. 220–284.

(2003) “Μανουήλ Πανσέληνος: ό κορυφαίος ζωγράφος της εποχής τών Παλαιολόγων.” In *Μανούηλ Πανσέληνος εκ του ιερού ναού του Πρωτάτου*. Thessaloniki. pp. 17–65.

(2008) *Οι τοιχογραφίες του παρεκκλησίου του Αγίου Ευθυμίου (1302/3) στον ναό του Αγίου Δημητρίου: έργο του Μανουήλ Πανσελήνου στην Θεσσαλονίκη*. Thessaloniki.

Tsiligiannis, K.A. (2007) *Η ιστορία τού μοναστηρίου του Κάτω Παναγιάς Αρτας*. Arta.

Tsolakis, V. (2015) *The Protaton church, village of Karyes, Mount Athos: The frescoes of Manuel Panselinos - Pictures, texts, sketches*. Thessaloniki.

Tsouris, K. (1988) *Ο κεραμοπλαστικός διάκοσμος των υστεροβυζαντινών μνημείων της βορειοδυτικής Ελλάδος*. PhD thesis, University of Kavala.

Türker, A.Ç. (2018) *Byzantine architectural sculpture in Çanakkale*. Research in the early Christian and Byzantine periods on the valleys that reached the Hellespont 1. Ankara.

Underwood, P.A. (1950) The Fountain of Life in Manuscripts of the Gospels. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, (5): 43–138.

(1966) *The Kariye Djami*. 4 vols. London/New York.

Uspensky, T. (1907) Konstantinopolskii seralskii kodeks vosmikhnizhiya. *IRAIK*, (12): 18–32.

Uyar, T. (2015) “Thirteenth-Century ‘Byzantine’ Art in Cappadocia and the Question of Greek Painters at the Seljuq Court.” In Peacock, A.C.S., De Nicola, B. and Nur Yıldız, S. (eds.) *Islam and Christianity in Medieval Anatolia*. Farnham, Surrey, UK; Burlington, VT, USA.

Vaj, I. (2002) “Il tempietto di Cividale e gli stucchi Omayyadi.” In *Cividale Longobarda. Materiali per una rilettura archeologica*. Milano. pp. 175–204.

Vallejo Triano, A. (1992) “Madinat al-Zahra: the triumph of the Islamic state.” In Dodds, J.D. (ed.) *Al-Andalus: the art of Islamic Spain*. New York. pp. 27–40.

(2007) “Consideraciones generales sobre los programas decorativos de Madinat al-Zahra.” In Caballero Zoreda, L. and Cruz, P.M. (eds.) *Escultura decorativa tardorromana y altomedieval en la Península Ibérica*. Madrid. pp. 391–414.

Vanderheyde, C. (1999) Un motif sculpté insolite sur les piliers de templa. *Byzantion*, LXIX (1): 165–177.

(2005) *La sculpture architecturale byzantine dans le thème de Nikopolis du Xe au début du XIIIe siècle (Epire, Etoile-Acarmanie et Sud de l’Albanie)*. Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique. Supplement. Athènes.

(2007) The Carved Decoration of the Middle and Late Byzantine Templa. *Mitteilungen zur Spätantiken Archäologie und Byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte*, (5): 77–111.

(2016) “Les inscriptions du moine Grégoire et le décor en marbre du katholikon du monastère d’Hosios Loukas.” In Brodbeck, S., Nikolaidis, A., Pagès, P., et al. (eds.) *Mélanges Catherine Jolivet-Levy*. Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherche d’histoire et civilisation de Byzance. Paris. pp. 647–665.

(2020) *La sculpture byzantine du IXe au XVe siècle. Contexte - Mise en oeuvre - Décors*. Paris.

Vanni, F. (2016) *Stucco decorations in the middle-byzantine period: evidence from the written source*. MRes, University of Birmingham.

(2019) “Aspetti meno noti della scultura medio bizantina: la decorazione a stucco.” In Cosentino, S., Pomero, E.M. and Vespignani, G. (eds.) *Dialoghi con Bisanzio. Atti dell’VIII*

Congresso Nazionale dell'Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini, Ravenna 25-27 settembre 2015. Spoleto. pp. 1119–11140.

(forthcoming a) “Transferring skills and techniques across the Mediterranean: some preliminary remarks on stucco in Italy and Byzantium.” In Brubaker, L. and Darley, R. (eds.) *Global Byzantium. Proceedings of the 50th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies. Birmingham 25th - 27th March 2017.*

(forthcoming b) “La ‘finta’ porta in Sant’Ambrogio a Montecorvino Rovella (SA): alcune riflessioni su un unicum altomedievale.” In Marazzi, F. and Cuomo, M. (eds.) *La pittura parietale aniconica e decorativa fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo. Tradizioni, temi e tendenze*, 7-8/09/2019, Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Napoli. Napoli.

Varsallona, J. (2016) ““The very horizon shook with the noise”. Bells and belfries from the West to Palaiologan Constantinople.” In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium “DAYS OF JUSTINIAN I”, Skopje 30 – 31 October, 2015. Skopje. pp. 177–183.*

Varzos, K. (1984) *Η Γενεαλογία των Κομνηνών. Βυζαντινά κείμενα και Μελίται 20α-20β. 2 vols. Thessaloniki.*

Vasilakeris, A. (2013) Οι τοιχογραφίες του Πρωτάτου και το πρόσωπο του αυτοκράτορα. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας, (ΛΔ): 117–128.*

Vassilaki, M. (ed.) (2000) *Mother of God. Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art. Milano.*

(2013) “The Absence of Glass. Talking about the Mosaics at Porta Panagia in Thessaly, Greece.” In James, L. (ed.) *New Light on Old Glass: Recent Research on Byzantine Mosaics and Glass. London: British Museum. pp. 229–233.*

Veikou, M. (1998) *Late Roman and Byzantine inscriptions from Epiros (an inventory, commentary and comparative study).* MPhil Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham.

(2012) *Byzantine Epirus: A Topography of Transformation. Settlements of the Seventh-Twelfth Centuries in Southern Epirus and Aetoloacarnania, Greece. Leiden.*

Velenis, G. (1994) “Σχόλια και παρατηρήσεις σε πολύστιχες πλίνθινες επιγραφές.” In Katsaros, V. (ed.) *Αντίφωνον: Αφιέρωμα στον Καθηγητή Ν. Β. Δρανδάκη. Thessaloniki. pp. 266–281.*

(2015) “Οι ταφικές επιγραφές του ναού της Βλαχέρνας.” In *Η Βλαχέρνα της Άρτας. Arta. pp. 119–138.*

(2018) “Προσθήκες και διορθώσεις σε επιγραφές τριών σταυρεπίστεγων ναών του 13ου αιώνα.” In *Ηρώς κτίστης. Μνήμη Χαραλάμπου Μπούρα. Athens. pp. 69–76.*

Velmans, T. (1968) Deux églises byzantines du debut du XIVe siècle en Eubée. *Cahier Archéologiques, (18): 191–225.*

Venditti, A. (1967) *Architettura bizantina nell'Italia meridionale. Campania, Calabria, Lucania. Napoli.*

- Vepheiades, K. (2019) The wall-paintings of the Protaton Church revisited. *Zograph*, (43): 113–128.
- Vernon, C. (2019) Dressing for Succession in Norman Italy: The Mantle of King Roger II. *Al-Masaq*, 1 (31): 95–110.
- Versakis, P. (1916) Βυζαντινακοί ναοί βορείου Ηπείρου. *Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς*, pp. 108–117.
- Verzone, P. (1941–42) Note sui rilievi in stucco dell'Altomedioevo nell'Italia settentrionale. *Le Arti*, (IV): 121–128.
- (1942) *L'architettura religiosa dell'alto Medioevo nell'Italia settentrionale*. Milano.
- Vežić, P. (1997) I cibori a pianta esagonale risalenti all'alto medioevo in Istria e in Dalmazia. *Hortus Artium Medievalium*, (3): 101–116.
- Viguera Molins, M.J. (2011) “Al Andalus and the Maghrib (from the fifth/eleventh century to the fall of the Almoravids).” In Fierro, M. (ed.) *The Western Islamic World Eleventh to Eighteenth Centuries*. New Cambridge History of Islam. Cambridge. pp. 21–48.
- Vikan, G. (1995) *Catalogue of the sculpture in the Dumbarton Oaks collection from the Ptolemaic period to the Renaissance*. Dumbarton Oaks catalogues. Washington D. C.
- Vita S. Symeonis Junioris Stylitae, XXIV Maji (1866). In *Maii tomus quintus*. Acta Sanctorum. Editio novissima. Parisii et Romae. pp. 310–398.
- Vokotopoulos, P. (1968) Χρονικά. *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον*. Χρωνικά, (24): 300–302.
- (1969) Χρονικά. *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον*. Χρωνικά, (24): 256.
- (1975) *Η εκκλησιαστική αρχιτεκτονική εις δυτικήν Στερέαν Ελλάδα και την Ηπείρον απο το τέλος του 7ου μέχρι του τέλους 10ου αιώνας*. Βυζαντινά μνημεία. Thessaloniki.
- (1986) “Ο ναός της Παναγίας στην Πρεβέντζα της Ακαρνανίας.” In *Byzantium: Tribute to Andreas N. Stratos*. 1 vols. Athens. pp. 251–275.
- (1988) Η πλίνθινη επιγραφή της Μονής του Αγίου Δημητρίου στο Φανάρι της Ηπείρου. *Ελληνικά*, (39): 164–167.
- (2012) *The monastery of Saint Demetrios at Phanari: A Contribution to the Study of the Architecture of the Despotate of Epiros*. Athens.
- von Folsach, K. (1985) *Davids Samling gennem 24 år, 1962-1985 = The David Collection: a 24-year period: 1962-1985*. København.
- von Folsach, K. (1990) *Islamic art: the David Collection*. Copenhagen.
- (2001) *Art from the World of Islam in The David Collection*. Copenhagen.

- von Folsach, K., Lundbæk, T. and Mortensen, P. (eds.) (1996) *Sultan, Shah, and Great Mughal: the history and culture of the Islamic world [exhibition, the National Museum, Copenhagen, 1996]*. Copenhagen.
- Wace, A.J.B. (1904) Laconia. Frankish Sculptures at Parori and Geraki. *Annual of the British School at Athens*, (11): 139–145.
- Walters, C. (1968) Two notes on the Deesis. *Revue des études byzantines*, (26): 311–336.
- Walker, A. (2010) Middle Byzantine aesthetics and the incomparability of Islamic Art: the architectural Ekphraseis of Nikolaos Mesarites. *Muqarnas*, (27): 79–101.
- (2011) *The emperor and the world: exotic elements and the imagining of Byzantine imperial power, ninth to thirteenth century C.E.* Cambridge, Massachusetts- London.
- Weitzmann, K. (1972) *Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Medieval antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks collection. Ivories and steatites.* 3 vols. Washington D. C.
- Weitzmann, K. and Galavaris, G. (1990) *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai: the illuminated manuscripts. Volume one: from the ninth to the twelfth century.* Princeton N.J.
- Weyl Carr, A. (1991) Peacocks. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*.
- Westphalen, S. (1998) *Die Odalar Camii in Istanbul: Architektur und Malerei einer mittelbyzantinischen Kirche.* Istanbul Mitteilungen. Tübingen.
- Williams, C. (1983) The cult of 'Alid saints in the Fatimid monuments of Cairo. Part I: the mosque of al-Aqmar. *Muqarnas*, (1): 37–52.
- Wisseman, S., Sarin, P., Ousterhout, R., et al. (2011) "Appendix 3: Pigment analysis." In *A Byzantine settlement in Cappadocia revised, paper edition.* Dumbarton Oaks Byzantine Studies. Washington D. C. pp. 223–227.
- Wolf, G. (2016) "Vasting walls, displaying structure, crossing cultures: transmedial and transmaterial dynamics of ornament." In *Histories of ornament from global to local.* Princeton and Oxford. pp. 96–105.
- Wolff, H.E.V. (1966) *The traditional crafts of Persia: their development, technology, and influence on Eastern and Western civilizations.* M.I.T. Press.
- Woodfin, W. (2012) *The Embodied Icon: Liturgical Vestments and Sacramental Power in Byzantium.* Oxford.
- Xyngopoulos, A. (1956) *Μανουήλ Πανσέληνος.* Athens.
- (1964) "La peinture monumentale au Mont-Athos. Mosaïques et fresques,." In *Corsi di cultura sull'arte ravennate e bizantina.* 11. Ravenna. pp. 419–430.

Yalcın, A.B. (1999) “Materiali di età paleologa nel Museo Archeologico di Istanbul.” In Iacobini, A. and Della Valle, M. (eds.) *L’arte di bisanzio e l’Italia al tempo dei Paleologi 1261-1453*. Milion. Roma. pp. 359–382.

(2004) “I soffitti non decorati degli architravi delle finestre della galleria occidentale.” In Guiglia, A. and Barsanti, C. (eds.) *Santa Sofi a di Costantinopoli. L’arredo marmoreo della Grande Chiesa giustiniana*. Studi di Antichità cristiana LX. Città del Vaticano. pp. 229–289.

Yeomans, R. (2006) *The art and architecture of Islamic Cairo*. Reading, UK.

Zakynthinos, D.A. (1932) *Le Despotat grecque de Morée. Histoire politique*. Paris.

(1953) *Le Despotat grecque de Morée. Vie et institutions*. Athènes.

Zanini, E. (2007) “Technology and ideas: architects and master-builders in the Early Byzantine world.” In *Technology in transition A.D. 300-650*. Late antique archaeology. Leiden. pp. 379–405.

Zarras, N. (2016) Artistic production in centres and periphery of the Byzantine Peloponnese. Aspects of monumental paintings in the Late Palaiologan period. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (37): 41–68.

Zinzi, E. (2003) “Tradizione bizantina nell’architettura sacra d’età normanna in Calabria. Uno sguardo d’insieme e tre rilevanti testimonianze: S. Giovanni Theriste, S. Maria de Tridetti, S. Maria di Terreti.” In Cuteri, F.A. (ed.) *I Normanni in finibus Calabriae*. Soveria Mannelli (Catanzaro). pp. 43–64.

Zographos, P. (1927) Χριστιανική Εύβοια. *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*, (4): 3–13.