FROM THE RESURRECTION TO THE ASCENSION:
CHRIST'S POST-RESURRECTION APPEARANCES
IN BYZANTINE ART (3rd – 12th c.)

by

POLYVIOS KONIS

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

Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies
Institute of Archaeology and Antiquity
College of Arts and Law
The University of Birmingham
November 2008

UNIVERSITYOF BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

Abstract

This thesis examines the evolution and dissemination of the iconography of the post-Resurrection appearances of Christ. Special attention is given to the association between word and image, as well as the influence exerted on art by contemporary theology, liturgy and politics. The earliest use of these apparitions in art is associated with baptism while in literature they were successfully employed against heresies. The Virgin's participation in the post-Resurrection narrative reveals the way in which homilies and hymns inspire art. Another important figure of these apparitions, which receives special attention, is the Magdalene, whose significance rivalled that of the Virgin's. While the Marys at the Tomb and the Chairete were two of the most widely accepted apparitions, it was the Incredulity of Thomas that found its way in the so-called twelve-feast cycle and revealed the impact of liturgy upon the dissemination of an iconographic theme. The emergence of the Anastasis will rival their exclusive role as visual synonyms of Christ's resurrection, but this thesis reveals that their relation was one of cooperation rather than rivalry, since the post-Resurrection scenes and the Anastasis complimented each other in terms of iconography and theology. Finally it becomes apparent that the pilgrimage in the Holy Land and the liturgy that was taking place there is responsible for many iconographic details which help us discern the dissemination of a particular iconography.

To my parents for their love and support

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Professor Leslie Brubaker, whose inspirational teaching, expertise, understanding and patience added considerably to my graduate experience. Her assistance in grant proposals, scholarship applications and of course this thesis has been immense. I would also like to thank Dr. Mary Cunningham, who voluntarily acted as my second supervisor, and who patiently read through earlier chapters of this thesis and offered numerous suggestions.

A special thanks goes out to Professor Dimitrios Triantafyllopoulos of the University of Cyprus for his care and support during my undergraduate years and to the members of the Centre for Byzantine Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies of the University of Birmingham: Bryer, Ruth, Joe, Dimiter, Vicky and many others, whose help was never short. My thanks should be extended from here to the academics and stuff of the IAA for their assistance in numerous occasions.

I would also like to thank his Most Reverend Neophytos, Metropolitan of Morphou, for his guidance and support from my teenage years up to this day, and the director of the Cultural Foundation of Archbishop Makarios III, George Christodoulou, for his care.

To the list I should add Professor Gerhard Wolf director of the Kunsthistorisches Institut for allowing me to use the extensive library and premises of the Institute and Dottoressa Manuela de Giorgi for facilitating the afore-mentioned visit and my stay in Florence but mostly for her friendship and support. I would also like to thank the directors of the Research Centre of Anatolian Civilizations (RCAC), of the Koç University, Professor Scott Redford and Dr. Alessandra Ricci, and the committee who entrusted me with a Senior Fellowship.

I would also like to mention those individuals and institutions who entrusted me with their money. The Costakis and Leto Severis foundation, and especially his chairman Demosthenes Severis and his acting secretary Phoivos Vovides for a generous

Table of Contents

List of Illustrations

Figure 1: Wall painting, Baptistery, Dura-Europos (mid. 3rd c.) after Kraeling 1967: plate XX.

Figure 2: Mosaic, Baptistery of S. Giovanni in Fonte, Naples (ca. 400) after Maier 1964: plate V: 5

Figure 3: Mosaic, Baptistery of S. Giovanni in Fonte, Naples (ca. 400) after Maier 1964: plate VII.

Figure 4: Ampulla, Monza (6th-7th c.) after Grabar 1958: plate XV.

Figure 5: Ampulla, British Museum (6th-7th c.) after Engenmann 1973: table 9: c-d.

Figure 6a: Sancta Sanctorum panel (6th c.) after Nees 2002: figure 80.

Figure 6b: Sancta Sanctorum panel (6th c.) detail after Grabar 1969: figure 260.

Figure 7: Ivory Pyxis, Syria, (6th c.) Metropolitan Museum after St. Clair 1979: figure 7.

Figure 8: Ivory Pyxis, Valeria Church, Sitten 6th c. after St. Clair 1979: figure 1.

Figure 9: Bronze Medallion (Amulet), Egypt (6th c.) after Schlumberger 1895.

Figure 10: Icon from Sinai, pre-Iconoclast (7th c.) after Weitzmann 1976: no. B27: plate LXXV.

Figure 11: Sarcophagus of Servanne, Arles (4th c.) after Wilpert 1929-36, 1: tav. XV.

Figure 12: Reproduction of the Sarcophagus di Bosi, (4th c.) after Wilpert 1929-36, 2: fig.204 and 209.

Figure 13: Sarcophagus of St. Celse, Milan (4th c.) after Wilpert 1929-36, 2: tav. CCXXXXIII, 6.

Figure 14: Mosaic floor, Piazza Armerina (5th c.) after Dorigo 1966, fig. 119.

Figure 15: Marble statue, Rome (1st – 2nd c.) AD, Metropolitan Museum of Arts, gift of John D. Rockefeller Jr., 1932 (32.11.4).

Figure 16: Silver plate, Constantinople (5th – 7th c.) after Weitzmann 1960, 48, fig. 5

Figure 17: Sarcophagus, fragment, Ravenna (4th c.) after Wilpert 1929-36, tav.243, 3.

Figure 18: Ivory plague, Rome (ca. 400), Bavarian National Museum Munich after Volbach 1961, no.93.

Abbreviations

AB: Analecta Bollandiana

AJA: American Journal of Archaeology

ArtB: Art Bulletin

BAR: British Archaeological Reports

BZ: Byzantinische Zeitschrift

CA: Cahiers archéologiques

CCSG: Corpus christianorum. Series Graeca

CSCO: Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium

CSEL: Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum

DOP: Dumbarton Oaks Papers

DOS: Dumbarton Oaks Studies

EEC: Encyclopaedia of Early Christianity

EtudByz: Etudes byzantines

GRBS: Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies

JbAC: Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum

JBL: Journal of Biblical Literature

JEChrSt: Journal of Early Christian Studies

JÖB: Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik

JThSt: Journal of Theological Studies

JWarb: Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes

LCI: Lexikon der Christlischen Iconographie

MonPiot: Monuments et mémoires de la fondation Eugène Piot

NCE: New Catholic Encyclopaedia (second edition)

NBullArcChr: Nuovo Bollettino dell'Archeologia christiana

NPNF: Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Church (second series)

NT: Novum Testamentum

OCA: Orientalia Christiana Analecta

PG: Patrologiae cursus completus, Series graeca, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1857–66)

PL: Patrologiae cursus completus, Series latina, ed. J.-P. Migne (Paris, 1844–80)

PO: Patrologia orientalis, ed. R. Graffin and F. Nau (Paris, 1903–)

RBK: Reallexikon der Byzantinischen Kunst

REB: Revue des Etudes Byzantines

RSR: Revue des sciences religieuses

SC: Sources chrétiennes

SJT: Scotish Journal of Theology

Tortulae RQ: Tortulae Römische Quartalschrift Supplementheft.

VigChrist: Vigiliae christianae

INTRODUCTION

The iconography of the post-Resurrection appearances of Christ has not received thorough attention from scholars and has habitually been studied in the shadow of the development of another theme, that of the Anastasis. This is unwarranted considering the fact that the post-Resurrection narrative materialises in art half a millennium earlier. During this period the appearances were employed as the sole reference to the Resurrection of Christ.[1] Furthermore, the scenes from the post-Resurrection narrative, which vary in the number and gender of the participants, the time and place of the events, the actions and words exchanged by the main *personae* involved, offered the artists many and diverse options.

In various studies the scholars have been eager to demonstrate that the Anastasis was created to fill an iconographic vacuum left by the 'inadequate' post-Resurrection imagery.[2] This view is presented in Anna Kartsonis' book, *Anastasis: The Making of an Image*, where the author examines the birth and rise in importance of the Anastasis scene. In her view the scene emerged to fill the void left by the scenes inspired by the post-Resurrection narrative, which did not present Christ's actual moment of resurrection. This thesis will examine the relation between the Anastasis and the post-Resurrection appearances in order to prove that the latter were not simply narrative historical substitutes of the resurrection, employed in anticipation of the emergence of the Anastasis.[3] The idea that the latter scene filled a void, presupposes that the artists and their patrons were not satisfied by the message evoked by the post-Resurrection

---

[1] Kartsonis 1986, 143.
[2] Grabar 1969, 124; Kartsonis 1986, passim.
[3] Kartsonis 1986, 21

scenes, and they were in search for a scene that will depict Christ's resurrection. However, as Kartsonis herself argues, the Anastasis does not depict Christ's exact moment of resurrection but rather his sojourn in Hades, which, like the rescue of Adam, are far from complete. In the examination that follows, I will not only present the relation between the Anastasis and the post-Resurrection scenes, but also the latter in their own historical context. This ultimately will demonstrate that the scenes were of a combined historical, theological and liturgical value, and different appearances were employed at different time, and for different reasons. The substitution of the post-Resurrection scenes for the Anastasis, takes place much later than Kartsonis believes and for other reasons.

The post-Resurrection scenes drew their subject matter from the text of the Gospels, while a completely dissimilar list is offered by Paul in his *Epistle to the Corinthians* (I Cor. 15: 3-9). A notable difference exists between the two lists: in the Gospels women play an important role while in Paul's epistle there is not a single reference to any female involvement.[4] It is the Gospel narrative though, and not the epistle that materialises in art, visible by the fact that none of the post-Resurrection appearances described in Paul's epistle are depicted in the surviving artistic examples. This could also be explained by the priority of the Gospels over the Epistles and also by the fact that the absence of any female authority from Paul would have looked conspicuous, especially when the Gospels described the women as first to visit Christ's tomb. For these reasons, Paul's epistle will not be examined in this thesis.

---

[4] Mánek 1958 argues that either Paul's Jewish background or the fact that he was not aware of the tradition of the empty tomb is responsible for this absence. Based on I Cor. 14: 34-35, it is argued by theologians that Paul was a misogynist: "Let your women keep silence in the churches for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything let them ask their husbands at home". The authenticity of this verse is disputed by Lüdemann 1996, 86-89.

The most important of these appearances, which occupy the bulk of my thesis are: the Maries at the Tomb (Matt. 28: 1-8, Mark 16: 1-8, Luke 24: 1-12; John 20: 1); the Chairete (Matt. 28: 9-10), the Incredulity of Thomas (John 20: 24-29), the Miraculous Draught of Fishes (John. 21: 1-23); and the Road and Supper at Emmaus (Mark 16: 12-13, Luke: 24: 13-15).[5] Other minor scenes, such as Peter and John at the Tomb (John 20: 2-8) and the Noli me Tangere (John 20: 11-18) make rare appearances before the twelfth century and are treated only in passing.

From the afore-mentioned appearances, only the Maries at the Tomb is described by all four Gospels, and while not an appearance per se, since the resurrected Christ is not involved, the scene was by far the most popular, especially in pre-Iconoclast art. According to the Gospels, a variable number of women, ranging from one – the Magdalene – in the Gospel of John (20:1), up to an unspecified number of more than three in Luke (24:1),[6] visited Christ's tomb on Easter morning only to find it empty. An angel or two, informed them of the Resurrection, and instructed them to tell the disciples of the news. The empty sepulchre is a key feature in the presentation of Christ's resurrection since it proved that he was not a mere man. This importance is also attested in the surviving artistic examples, none of which conceal from the viewer the emptiness of the tomb. This is not howeve true for other details, which are often omitted from pre-Iconoclast art, such as the sleeping guards and the angel, absent from the St. Celse sarcophagus (fig. 13) and the British Museum ivory panel (fig. 21) respectively.

---

[5] See below for the choice of the names of the post-Resurrection scenes.
[6] The named women described in the post-resurrection narrative are nevertheless five.

As opposed to the Maries, the Chairete (All Hail) is described solely in the Gospel of Matthew (28: 9-10). According to the Evangelist, two women, namely Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (the mother of James and Joses), after discovering the empty tomb, come across the resurrected Christ, who hails them. The Gospel of Mark (16: 9) and the Gospel of John (20: 14-18), describe a similar event, but with only one woman, Mary Magdalene. This is called the Appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene or Noli me Tangere (Touch Me Not).[7] This scene appears rarely and usually very late in Byzantine Art and never acquires the importance that the Chairete scene had, throughout the Early and Middle Byzantine period.[8]

Another of Christ's post-resurrection appearances is the Incredulity of Thomas, described solely in the Gospel of John (20:24-31). The scene was titled by the Byzantines, "The doors being shut" (John 20:26) or "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28). According to narrative, Christ entered the house where the disciples were gathered, although the doors were shut. Christ's second appearance served to dispel Thomas' disbelief who was invited by Christ to touch his wounds in order to assert that he was not a ghost but made of flesh and bones. The scene gained much popularity in the theological cycles as it proved Christ was a God and a man of flesh at the same time. Thomas' cry of: 'My Lord and my God' (20: 28) was also used in the same theological context. The scene appeared very early in Christian iconography with the first evidence stretching back to the fourth and fifth centuries, while the first fully developed example comes from Sant' Apollinare Nuovo (fig. 29). The

---

[7] *RBK*: Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen, 382, where four types of Noli Me Tangere are distinguished.

[8] 'The choice of this scene <Chairete> as the sole reference to the Resurrection is characteristic of Early Christian Cycles': Kartsonis 1986, 143. In chapter 4.2.2 I demonstrate how the Chairete remained popular after the Iconoclasm.

Incredulity along with the Chairete and the Maries, were the three most frequently

depicted scenes from the post-Resurrection cycle.

This is partly true for the Road to and Supper at Emmaus described in detail in the

Gospel of Luke (24: 13-32), while the Gospel of Mark (16: 12-13) presents us with an

abbreviated version of the same account. According to the Gospel narrative, two

disciples, one of them named Kleopas,[9] were heading towards the small village of

Emmaus not far from Jerusalem. At some point they were joined by Christ, whom

they did not recognize. Together they walked up to the village where Christ joined

them for dinner. Only during the partition of the bread by Christ did the two disciples

realize with whom they were talking. After the revelation, Kleopas and his companion

returned to Jerusalem and informed the disciples of the event.

In the Gospel narration, two events were emphasized, namely the journey to Emmaus

and the subsequent dinner.[10] As a result, these two events will take shape in art and

become part of cycles with the Road to Emmaus appearing as early as the sixth

century in Sant' Apollinare (fig. 28), while the Supper at Emmaus in the twelfth-

century cycle of Monreale.[11] Details from this Gospel story will also appear in

extensive post-Resurrection cycles.[12]

---

[9] Probably he was the husband of one of the Maries (John, 19: 25 and Luke 24: 18).
[10] Réau 1957, II: 561-67; *RBK*: 386-87; *LCI*: 622-626
[11] Demus 1949, 289, pl. 73A-B.
[12] Such as Cleopas and his companion informing the disciples; see for example the Gospels in Florence (Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23), folio 164[r] in Velmans 1971, 48, fig. 266 and the cruciform reliquary of Paschal I: Cecchelli 1926-1927, 166 and unnumbered image on page 169. The latter scene is a replica of the Women Announcing the Resurrection to the Disciples on the same reliquary. This scene appears also in Monreale, Demus 1949, 289, pl. 73a-b.

The last scene from the post-Resurrection narrative to be treated in this thesis is the Miraculous Draught of Fishes which is described in the Gospel of John (21: 1-14). According to the Gospel of John, Christ appeared on the shores of Tiberias and instructed his disciples to throw their nets in the water. After a successful catch, Peter realized that the person on the shore is Christ and dived into the water. He was joined by the rest of the disciples on the shore where Christ had prepared a meal. The scene, even though it appears as early as the fourth century in the Baptistery of San Giovanni in Naples (fig. 3), it does not share the same popularity as the other post-Resurrection scenes, described above.

The chapters follow a chronological order with the first three examining the pre-Iconoclast evidence, while the latter three, the evidence from the ninth until the twelfth centuries. The first chapter is dealing with the earliest surviving evidence, divide into three main subchapters. The first examines the presence of scenes from the post-Resurrection narrative in Baptisteries and as it will be argued, their function is not restricted to their association as synonyms for Christ's resurrection, but they were also employed because of their baptismal connotations. In the second subchapter I will discuss how the shrines of Palestine shaped the evolution and dissemination of a particular iconography, visible through the depictions of Christ's sepulchre as a free-standing building, and the inclusion of details relevant to the pilgrims' experiences. The last subchapter is concerned with two iconographic cycles, a Roman and a Palestinian one, and examines which post-Resurrection appearances were included in, or exclude from each cycle and for what possible reasons.

The second chapter examines the two most important characters of the post-Resurrection narrative, the Virgin and the Magdalene, the discussion aims to facilitate a better understanding on the dynamics of the two characters in pre-Iconoclast art and literature. During the analysis of the iconographic evidence in the first chapter, it became apparent that the Virgin was inserted in the post-Resurrection narrative, when no Gospel verification existed, while at the same time, the *Noli me Tangere* scene was conspicuously absent from pre-Iconoclast art. Antiochene theologians tried to fill this void by identifying the Virgin with the 'other Mary'. However, the theologians were unable to explain the Magdalene's primacy in the post-Resurrection narrative. This clearly worried some early Christian authors and one might suggest that they deliberately tried to diminish her role. This is evident from the inconsistency with which she was treated in the theological discourse and also by the absence of the *Noli me Tangere* scene from the artistic production. These and other considerations will be discussed in full in chapter two.

In chapter three I analyse the use of the post-Resurrection appearances as polemics against the heretics, in the Christological controversies regarding Christ's nature after the resurrection, and the influence this practise might have exerted upon their depictions in art. While not entirely art-historical, the analysis provides a deeper understanding on the theological message and dogmatic value of these scenes. This will also aid us in the iconographic analysis of the Arian decoration of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, which follows in the second subchapter. Other issues will also be examined here, which were only touched upon in the previous chapters. More specifically I will demonstrate how current liturgical practises, such as those observed during baptism and Easter, played an important role in the dissemination of specific

iconographic details, such as the censers and the candles in the Maries at the Tomb scene.

The fourth chapter opens with a discussion on Iconoclasm, and then sets to examine the relation between three scenes: the Anastasis; the Maries at the Tomb; and the Chairete in the ninth century. As it will be argued, in Italy the Maries were coupled with the Anastasis, while in the East both scenes were supplanted by the Chairete. It will be demonstrated that Iconoclasm was the driving force behind the Chairete's rise in importance. Christ's human nature was a crucial argument in favour of his depiction in art, and the Chairete offered an image of the resurrected Christ, who was was seen and touched by human witnesses. In other words, Italy untouched by Iconoclasm continued to employ the Maries coupled with the new scene of the Anastasis, while in Constantinople the Chairete was frequently employed.

The first section of chapter five is dedicated to the Virgin and the new exegetical approach introduced by George of Nicomedia after Iconoclasm. According to his argument, the Virgin was no longer to be identified with the 'other Mary' and the Myrrh-bearers, since she never left the burial site. It will be argued that George's exegesis emanated from the need to detach the Virgin from a group, whose treatment by the Church Fathers was inconsistent and problematic, and also from a group whose most important figure was the Magdalene. This change should not be seen as unrelated to the Virgin's rising cult. Furthermore, George's explanation offered the opportunity to the Magdalene to assume her role as the leading Myrrh-bearer, and it is not a coincidence that, not long after George's exegesis had appeared, her relics were transported to Constantinople by Leo VII, on the same day as Lazaros'. The latter

provided me with the incentive to examine whether the Magdalene was considered to be Martha's and Lazaros' sister, as opposed to the sinner of Luke (7: 37) promulgated by Gregory the Great. These and other traditions will be examined in the second subchapter of chapter five, and will add conclusively in how the Magdalene was perceived by the Byzantines: a sinner or a saint?

Finally, chapter six examines the post-Resurrection appearances in narrative and festal cycles. It will be suggested that the important role of the Incredulity of Thomas in the tenth and eleventh centuries comes as the result of an iconographic and festal amalgamation: iconographic, because it depicts a tangible and resurrected Christ, who is both a perfect man and God,[13] and festal, because Thomas' Sunday occupies a special place in the calendar of the church, and in the *Book of the Ceremonies*.[14] The latter, even though is restricted to the participation of the emperor and his court in the liturgy,[15] demonstrates that not all of the feasts were of equal importance. Cappadocia will also be brought into the discussion, not only for the wealth of its Middle Byzantine paintings, but also in order to demonstrate that local preferences existed, which are not necessarily 'archaic' or 'provincial', but rather relevant to a particular cycle. Areas outside Byzantium, but inside its sphere of influence, will also be employed, mostly for their comparative importance.

In terms of resources I have included the vast majority of the artistic and literary production. In the latter group, I have also included hymnography, since it constitutes a real source of theology, but also bearing in mind that in the free language of hymns, theology is not always clearly distinguished from poetry. I also considered of great

---

[13] As reflected in Thomas' words: 'My Lord and my God' (John 20: 28).
[14] Mateos 1963, I: 108-09; Constantine VII, *Book of the Ceremonies* in Vogt 1935, I: 44-45.
[15] Mathews 1971, 113.

importance the inclusion of contemporary theological and liturgical sources, keeping in mind that the scenes I am examining, was not only of a paramount theological, but also of liturgical importance. Even if, at some times, a rather straightforward relation between texts and images is assumed, in other instances issues of material, location, function and patronage are also taken into account. The same applies for the literary production; a hymn, a sermon, an epistle, an ekphrasis and an anti-heretical treatise, all perform different functions and address different audiences. In that sense, art and text are similar; both are concerned not so much with each other, but with the viewer and reader/listener.[16] Thus, when Severian (4th – 5th c.) preached that 'Thomas' finger became a pen of devoutness'[17] he did not only create a mental image in his audience minds, but also provided them with a 'reading' of the Incredulity scene.

The geographical horizon of the thesis will include areas directly under Byzantine control or under its influence. This will demonstrate whether local preferences existed and will add decisively to the reconstruction of the development of the scheme. For example Middle Byzantine art from Cappadocia differs in the choice of the post-Resurrection scenes from Constantinople and mainland Greece. In terms of chronology the research spans from the third century to the twelfth centuries.[18] The chronological survey will illustrate the ways in which these scenes were developed, multiplied and enhanced by artists, and established in contemporary cycles. The material evidence will be drawn from every surviving source, such as manuscript illuminations, ivories, icons, marble friezes, mosaics, wood carvings, jewellery, and wall paintings.

---

[16] James 2007, 9.

[17] Severian, *On the Ascension,* PG 52, col. 779.

[18] The post-Resurrection appearances in the Palaeologan era have already been considered by Zarras, 2006.

Since there are no standard versions for the names given to the post-Resurrection appearances, visible in bibliography and in appendices, were they appear under various names, it was difficult to decide what terminology to use. For example, the Maries at the Tomb, appear also as: the Women at the Sepulchre, Easter Morning, the Myrrh-bearers, the *Myrrhophoroi* (Myrrh-bearing women), and the Holy Women, in various combinations.[19] Non-English bibliography shows the same discrepancy. This array of names made the use of indices complicated. On occasion authors even used the general title Resurrection to describe a post-Resurrection appearance.[20] For the names of these appearances I have followed the most widely accepted versions in this thesis. For example the appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene (John 20: 17), is titled Noli me Tangere, while the appearance of Christ to the two Maries (Matth. 28: 9) is titled Chairete. This is done partly because these are the most widely accepted names, and partly because they reflect the popularity these scenes shared in the Latin and Greek world respectively.

In the translation of Greek proper names and places, the standard anglicized forms will be used where they exist, while in all other cases a literary transcription will be made. In some rare instances in which the Latin forms are prevalent, these will be used instead of the Greek – e.g. Celsus instead of Kelsos or Marcionites instead of Marcionistes, in order to avoid unnecessary confusion. For reasons of space and efficiency the shortened versions of the names of the post-Resurrection scenes will be used along the longest, hence Maries equals the Maries at the Tomb, and the

---

[19] The same applies for other post-Resurrection appearances like the Incredulity of Thomas, also known as the Appearance of Christ in the presence of Thomas, Doubting Thomas, *Pselaphesis* (pulpation) etc.
[20] Willoughby 1995, 61ff.

Incredulity stands for the Incredulity of Thomas, Fishes for the Miraculous Draught of Fishes etc. When talking about iconographic themes the words will be capitalized (e.g. Crucifixion, Resurrection), otherwise, they will not. In terms of primary sources, English translations will be used throughout and the latest editions will be used wherever available.

In sum, this thesis aims to examine the evolution and dissemination of the iconography of the post-Resurrection appearances of Christ up to the second half of the twelfth century. It will explore changes in the iconography, secular and theological influences as well as local traditions. The broad framework aims to facilitate a better understanding of the changes that took place in the course of this theme's development. Also, in the best of my knowledge, I have provided a comprehensive presentation of all available material.

CHAPTER 1: The Earliest Evidence

This chapter is concerned with the earliest surviving examples of the post-Resurrection appearances of Christ. It is divided into three subchapters, each dealing with a specific aspect of their developing iconography. The earliest examples correspond with the use of these appearances in Baptisteries, and in the first subchapter I will argue that their function was not only associated to their use as synonyms to Christ's resurrection but also to their baptismal connotations. In doing so I will employ literary evidence from sermons and orations, and also liturgical sources associated with baptism.

In the second subchapter I will discuss how the cult of the Holy Land shaped the evolution and dissemination of a particular iconography. It will be argued, that not only current architectural forms, but also current liturgical practises were responsible for many iconographic details. Evidence will be collected from all available sources, such as the ampullae, and other works of art produced locally, which then will be cross-referenced with pilgrims' descriptions of the actual shrines and the liturgy performed there.

Finally the last subchapter is concerned with two iconographic cycles, a Roman and a Palestinian one, and examines points of contact, while focusing on the evolution of specific, to each cycle, iconographic details. Some of them were short-lived while others flourished well into the Middle Byzantine period. This eventually will demonstrate how Italy developed a distinct taste on the choice and configuration of the post-Resurrection scenes. This will be further exploited in subsequent chapters dealing with the post-Iconoclastic evidence.

1.1: The Post-Resurrection Appearances and the Baptismal Rite.

> The baptism which lies before you is a great matter. For prisoners it means
>
> ransom; for sins forgiveness; the death of sin; new birth for the soul; a shining
>
> garment; a holy, indelible seal; a chariot to heaven; the food of paradise; the
>
> grant of royalty; the grace of adoption.[21]

These words from the *Procatechesis* of Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. 315-387) illustrate the

significance baptism had in the Early Byzantine period. Cyril is well known for his

baptismal instructions, composed of eighteen *Catecheses* and a *Procatechesis* and

habitually dated to about 350, around the time Cyril became bishop.[22] Speaking about

the mysteries and baptism in particular, Cyril explained why it was better

pedagogically for the newly-baptized to witness these mysteries before learning about

their meaning: 'I saw clearly that seeing is much more convincing than hearing'.[23] It

seems that for Cyril, an image was a much better channel to impart knowledge than

words alone and it comes as no surprised that during his catechetical lectures, he used

to present the catechumens with images in order to better explain his arguments.[24]

The depiction of scenes from the New Testament, and specifically from the post-

Resurrection cycle in a baptistery, like the two that follow in the discussion, could be

explained as didactic media for the newly baptized. However baptism and resurrection

have a much more significant theological connection. A passage from Romans 6: 3-4

associates the remission of sins from Christ's death and resurrection with baptism,

---

[21] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Procatechesis* in Yarnold 2000, 51.
[22] Yarnold 2000, 21-22: there is evidence that the text of these instructions was altered at some point to accommodate later liturgical changes.
[23] Ibid, 50.
[24] See below note 59

which is also performed for the death of sin. Gregory the Theologian, in his sermon

On Holy Baptism, explains exactly that.[25] With baptism, notes Gregory, we are buried

with Christ, in order to be resurrected with him; we descend with him in order to rise

with him.[26] Furthermore baptism and resurrection appear on more than forty

sarcophagi of the Constantinian era, where baptism is denoted by the Water Miracle

performed by Moses and the resurrection by the Raising of Lazaros.[27] The

architecture of baptisteries also points in the same direction. The majority of these

buildings were octagonal and centrally planned, such as the baptisteries of the Arians,

and the Orthodox in Ravenna, and St. Menas in Egypt.[28] The number eight has also a

mystical explanation. Justin Martyr (c.100-c.165) explained: 'these <Noah and his

family> all being eight in number, were a symbol of the day that is indeed eight in

number, in which our Christ appeared as risen from the dead'.[29] In the same way that

the eighth day is the beginning of a new world, the octagonal baptistery introduces the

baptized into the Christian realm.[30]

The strong association between resurrection and baptism is also attested by the fact

that baptism took place on Easter. Many early sermons on Easter concluded with

---

[25] Gregory the Theologian, Oration 40: *On Holy Baptism*, PG 36, cols. 359-427. See also Basil, On Holy Spirit, NPNF 8, 35.
[26] Ibid, col. 649: 'Let us then buried with Christ by Baptism, that we may also rise with him; let us descend with him, that we be exalted with him'.
[27] Weitzmann 1979, no.374. Maier 1964, 101-102, cites a number of sarcophagi from the second and third century with scenes that denote baptism.
[28] Ousterhout 1990, 51-52. Another source for the octagonal shape of baptisteries could be found in the Roman mausolea, such as Diocletian's at Split, Krautheimer 1986[4], 64 and 95.
[29] Justin Martyr, *The Dialogue with Trypho* in Williams 1930, 282-283. The same idea appears in Ambrose, *In Psalmum XLVII Enarratio*, PL 14, col.1201: 'et resurrectione sua octavam sanctificavit'; 'with his resurrection sanctifies the eighth day'.
[30] *The Epistle of Barnabas* (2nd c.), PG 2 col. 772: 'αρχην ημερας ογδοης ποιησω, ο εστιν αλλου κοσμου αρχη'; 'I will create an eighth day, which is the beginning of another world'. For a French translation see Prigent and Kraft 1971, 186-189. The author of the epistle was influenced by an apocryphal Old Testament reading, II Enoch, 33, 1: 'And I appointed the eighth day also, that the eighth day should be the first-created after my work, and that the first seven revolve in the form of the seventh thousand, and that at the beginning of the eighth thousand there should be a time of not-counting, endless, with neither years nor months nor weeks nor days nor hours'.

references on baptism.[31] Egeria, during her pilgrimage to the Holy Land (381-384),

attended and described the mystery of 'those who are to be baptised at Easter' in

detail.[32] Tertullian in his treatise on Baptism specifically mentioned that: 'The

Passover provides the day of the most solemnity for baptism, for then was

accomplished our Lord's passion, and into it we are baptized'.[33] This is also attested

by the Great Lectionary of Jerusalem, where the bishop baptized the catechumens,

while the deacon read twelve lections.[34] At the end, the newly baptized were

introduced to the church, while the *troparion* 'Christ has risen from the dead' was

chanted.[35] The same is also attested by the *Typikon* of the Hagia Sophia, preserved in

ninth- and tenth-century manuscripts.[36]

Even in the early Christian era, Easter was not the exclusive day for administering

Baptism. Tertullian (ca.160-ca.230) in his treatise *On Baptism* explained that besides

Easter, the best period for someone to be baptized was between Easter and Pentecost,

because it was during that period that Christ manifested himself to his disciples;[37] a

clear reference to the post-Resurrection appearances. Much later, Pope Leo the Great

(440-461), insisted that baptism should not be administered on the feast of Epiphany

---

[31] See for example Athanasios of Alexandria, *Sermons on Holy Easter,* PG 28, cols. 1073-1081 and 1081-1092.

[32] Egeria*, Travels* 45: 1 in Maraval 1982, 304-305: "hi qui baptidiantur per Pascha"; for the English translation see Wilkinson 1999, 161.

[33] Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 19: 1-3: 'Diem baptismo sollemniorem pascha praestat, cum et passio domini in qua tinguimer ad impleta est' in Evans 1964, 40-41.

[34] Tarchnischvili 1959, 109-110.

[35] Ibid, 113: 'Christus surrexit a mortuis'.

[36] Mateos 1963, 84-88. See also Bertonière 1972, 132-135.

[37] Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, 19: 'exinde pentecoste ordinandis lavacris laetissimum spatium est, quo et domini resurrectione inter discipulos frequentata est'; 'After that, Pentecost is a most auspicious period for arranging baptisms, for during it our Lord's resurrection was several times made known among the disciples' in Evans 1964, 40-41.

but rather on Easter and Pentecost, and rebuked those priests who introduced such an innovation.[38]

The baptistery in Dura-Europos in Syria provides us with the earliest surviving representation of a post-Resurrection appearance. The scene depicted here is the Maries at the Tomb (fig. 1). Even though this scene does not portray the resurrected Christ, during the Early Christian period, it was by far the most important of the post-Resurrection cycle. Its popularity could be possibly explained by the fact that it was the only scene described by all four Gospels, thus given validity far greater than any other scene.[39] According to the Gospels, a variable number of women visited Christ's tomb on Easter morning, only to find it empty; an angel (or two), informed them that Christ had been resurrected.[40] In Early Christian and Byzantine art this scene became the primary visual synonym of the resurrection.[41]

In character, the baptistery is simply a typical private house of Dura, modified slightly to adopt it to religious use.[42] On one of the walls of the baptistery (room 6) exists a date, which is translated as AD 232; this in addition to the destruction date of the city in AD 256, gives us a *terminus post* and *ante quem*.[43] According to the excavators the private house was built ca AD 232 and it was changed into the Christian building

---

[38] Leo the Great, *Letter XVI*: *To the bishops of Sicily* in PL 54, col. 698. For an English translation see *NPNF* 12, 27.

[39] Other scenes that were employed to denote Christ's resurrection were, amongst others, the Chairete and the Incredulity of Thomas; the former described in Matth. 28: 8-10, the latter in John 20: 24-29. These two apparitions offered something that the Maries lacked, a representation of the Resurrected Christ.

[40] Matth. 28: 1-8; Mark 16: 1-8; Luke 24: 1-12; John 20: 1-10. The different details of each Gospel, had forced many theologians to try to harmonise the Gospel narrative, by placing all the post-Resurrection appearances in one continuous narrative.

[41] Kartsonis 1986, 19.

[42] Kraeling 1967, 3.

[43] Ibid, 4: room 6 contains a massive installation consisting of two elements that identify it as a baptistery. The first is a large rectangular basin built of tiles and covered with mortar. The second element is a heavy vaulted canopy surmounting the basin, consisted of tiles and rubble and arched at the front and at the sides.

approximately half way between AD 232 and 256.[44] Beside the Maries, a number of

other wall paintings survive on the walls of the baptistery. Worth mentioning here are

two scenes directly related to water and thus to baptism: the Healing of the Paralytic

and Christ walking on the water, 'possibly part of a 'Mighty Works' cycle' that could

have numbered as many as ten scenes.[45] These two scenes appear also in the

Baptistery of San Giovanni that follows in the discussion.

The scene with the Maries at the Tomb runs from the east wall of the room to the

north, in one continuous sequence over 5m long, and consists of three different

surviving elements.[46] The first element depicts five pair of feet; the second portrays

the leaves of a panelled door, while the third shows three women holding torches and

spices, approaching a sarcophagus flanked with stars. The third element, which is the

most important of the three, shows three women wearing long sleeved robes and long

veils, marching from the right towards a sarcophagus with large stars at the corner,

each holding a torch and a bowl of unguent.[47]

The incomplete state of the surviving remains and 'the unusual iconographic

conventions and forms of the Biblical traditions' made the identification of the

composition quite difficult.[48] One suggestion is that the scene depicts not the Maries

---

[44] Ibid, 38.

[45] Ibid, 65. See also the Baptistery of San Giovanni in Naples, below.

[46] Ibid, 72: pls XLII, XLIII, XLV.

[47] Ibid, 166; Weitzmann 1979, no. 360. According to Grabar 1956, 16, the need of torches is explained by the fact that the women entered the tomb-chamber, where it was dark. It could also be said that the Maries arrived at the Tomb very early in the morning when it was still dark. The Gospels use such words as "very early in the morning" (Luke 24: 1), "when it was yet dark" (John, 20:1), "as it began to dawn" (Matth. 28: 1) and only Mark (16: 2) mentions that they arrived "at the rising of the sun".

[48] Kraeling 1967, 81. On the other hand, since this is the earliest surviving example of the Maries at the Tomb, the term "unusual conventions and forms" is not appropriate. What later became the norm of depicting Maries at the Tomb must have followed an evolution, of which the depiction at Dura could have been one of the starting points.

at the Tomb but the Parable of the Ten Virgins.[49] The number ten agrees with the

number of the five pairs of feet on the north wall, with the visible three on the east

wall and the additional two that might had not survived on the same wall.[50] The

problem with this identification is that the three women on the east wall are

approaching, beyond any doubt, a sarcophagus and not a house, something that makes

the identification of this scene with the Parable of the Ten Virgins untenable.[51]

A number of further problems arise from the identification of this scene as the Maries

at the Tomb of Christ. First is the absence of the angel(s) and the guards, so typical in

later representations. Then the number of women is neither the usual three of Western

art nor the two so typical in eastern iconography.[52] Finally there is the question of

what the other two surviving elements depict, namely, the five pairs of feet and the

half opened panelled door. To start from the latter, these elements, according to the

archaeologists, depict the moment when the five women arrived at the tomb's

entrance. Thus the artisan had somehow chosen to divide the gospel narrative into two

scenes, with the first depicting the women outside the tomb, while the other shows

them inside.[53]

It is difficult to say whether guards were depicted because of the fragmented status of

the fresco; however the lack of space between the five pairs of feet makes it almost

impossible. The absence of the angel(s) can be explained on the basis that the stars

---

[49] Millet 1956, 1-9. This article was printed post-mortem and the editors of *Cahiers Archéologiques* noted that Millet's hypotheses "n'est plus défendable aujourd'hui".
[50] Kraeling 1967, pl. XLVI.
[51] Grabar describes this sarcophagus as a massive and simple structure with no ornaments in its exterior, with a lid in triangular shape and supplied with acroteria. According to the same author these are "caractères banals de bien des sarcophages d'époque romaine" and even its massive structure in proportion with the Maries is not unusual, Grabar 1956, 14.
[52] Millet 1960, 517; according to the author the West preferred the version of Mark while the East the version of Mathew. This view is contested in a following chapter.
[53] Kraeling 1967, 87.

that appear on top of the sarcophagus symbolize the two angels of the Gospels, the latter are identified as stars in the Old Testament (Job 38:7). Grabar in contrast believes that the stars are actually part of the decoration (acroteria) and that the scene describes not the encounter of the two Maries with the angel but the visit of the women to the tomb and thus there was no need to portray any angels.[54] This could be one of the reasons that this iconographic variant, in which the tomb appears sealed, never acquired an importance in art, as it concealed from the eyes of the viewer the empty tomb and thus the reality of Christ's resurrection.[55] The emptiness of the tomb was proof of Christ's resurrection and the majority of all later variations of this scene will not fail to portray it.

The presence of five women at the tomb of Christ on Easter morning also creates certain problems with the identification of the scene as such, as none of the Gospels mentions five women at the tomb. In fact, Matthew mentions two (Matth. 28: 1); Mark mentions three, who carried spices and ointments (Mark, 16: 1); John mentions only Mary Magdalene (John 20: 1) and only Luke mentions three by name and others that came with them, bringing spices, (Luke 24: 10). It seems plausible that the artisan has drawn his inspiration from a different source: Tatian's *Diatessaron*, a harmony of the four Gospels that was circulated widely in Syria. A fragment of this book was discovered during the excavations.[56] The number of women who visited the Tomb of Christ was five; namely, Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joseph, the

---

[54] Grabar 1965, 16-20. Grabar's other examples of a *visitatio sepulchri* includes the Chludov Psalter, folio 44 and an unpublished miniature from a tenth-century manuscript in Florence: Ashburnham 17, fol.57. Milburn 1988, 12, believes that the two stars symbolize Hope and Salvation. Weitzmann 1979, no. 360: 404-405.

[55] Kraeling 1967, 18. On the other hand, it is not Christ's resurrection that probably interests the artisan but rather Christ's death, which draws its inspiration from Romans 6: 3-4. The two are of course intertwined.

[56] Ibid, 86 and 175.

mother of the sons of Zebedee, Salome and Joanna.[57] Subsequently Tatian in his effort to harmonise the four Gospels in the *Diatessaron*, included all the named women of the post-Resurrection narrative.[58] As Theodoret of Cyrus (ca.393-ca.457) and bishop Rabbula suppressed the circulation of the *Diatessaron*, it is possible that many iconographic elements disappeared with it; one of them could have been the five women.[59] If this explanation is correct, it would demonstrate a close association between theological literature and art visible in the earliest surviving evidence.

Another question that arises from the decoration lies in its connection with the architectural setting. To be more precise, it relates to the grand scale with which the scene of the Maries at the Tomb is depicted on the walls of a baptistery. The scene points to the conception that baptism is the sacrament in which the Christian dies in sin and arises in newness of life.[60] A passage from Romans does in fact provide us with an explanation: 'Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life' (Romans 6: 3-4). That Romans was used in the third century, in connection with the interpretation of baptism, is well attested in a number of Christian authors, such as Tertullian and Origen.[61]

---

[57] The Virgin is not mention by the Evangelists as being at the tomb of Christ, even though she is mentioned at the scene of the Crucifixion; this fact led Christian apologetics to identify her as one of the Maries at the Tomb.

[58] It should be noted though that even in Tatian's harmony there is no mention of five women at the tomb of Christ at one moment but rather five named women.

[59] Vööbus 1951, 5.

[60] Kraeling 1967, 178 and 192; the repetition of the five women in such prominence on the walls of the baptistery could have been influenced and inspired by liturgical processions of the Easter festivals though, according to the author, "this is by no means necessary".

[61] Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 9: 15-21 in Evans 1964, 40-41; Origen, *Commentary on John*: *Book* 1, XXVII: 181 in Trigg 1998, 133.

It was Cyril of Jerusalem who made explicit the connection between the quotation from the Romans and the sacrament of baptism in a series of catechetical lectures such as *Catechesis III* and *Mystagogic Catechesis II*, and *III*.[62] In *Mystagogic Catechesis II*, Cyril notes:

> 'After these things, ye were led to the holy pool of Divine Baptism, as Christ was carried from the Cross to the Sepulchre which is before our eyes'.[63]

Most probably the lecture took place inside the Constantinian rotunda; thus Cyril was able to point at the Holy Sepulchre while delivering his lecture. Gregory the Theologian also stresses the connection between baptism and resurrection, in his thirty-first oration *On the Holy Spirit* and in his fortieth oration *On the Holy Baptism*,[64] but it is in Augustine's *Enchiridion*, commonly dated ca. 421 that the two find their best explanation.[65] Augustine believed that Christ made his resurrection the symbol of new life by dying in the flesh, which signifies sin, and rising again clean of any sins: 'Such is the meaning of the great sacrament of baptism'.[66] The clear connection between the sacrament of baptism, and Christ's death and resurrection, explains the prominence with which the scene of the Maries is depicted in Dura.

The earliest representation of the Maries at Tomb comes from a remote Roman outpost on the Euphrates and from a formative period for Christian art, and since it stands alone as the sole example of its time, it makes any comparative study difficult. Nevertheless, even though the depiction is essentially different from any other

---

[62] For an English translation of the *catecheses* see Yarnold 2000, 89, 174 and 177 respectively. See also Doval 2001, 103, where the author states that "the water is associated more with the Christ, the one who conquers death in the tomb, than with the <Holy> Spirit".

[63] PG 33, col. 1080; for the English translation see Cross 1995, 59-63 and also Yarnold 2000, 174.

[64] PG 36, col. 165 and 569, respectively.

[65] Augustine, *Enchiridion*, Fathers of the Church, 2: 357-472.

[66] Ibid, 407.

subsequent scenes of the same subject,[67] it will become apparent from the example

that follows, that a connection between the Maries and the baptismal rite was not

unique to Dura.

The next surviving image of the Maries at the Tomb dates one and a half centuries

later and comes from the mosaic ceiling of a baptistery in Naples. There is much

debate on the date of these mosaics, with most authorities agreeing on a date between

the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century, that is, in the final years of

Severus' episcopate (362-408).[68] Bishop Severus erected a small baptistery near the

Cathedral of San Giovanni in Naples, which he decorated with mosaics.[69] Sadly the

humidity of the place and the many restorations, have had a catastrophic effect on the

mosaics, rendering many difficult to study since parts had flaked off.[70] The

similarities in the decoration between Dura and Naples baptisteries are however noted

by many authors.[71]

The compartment that contains the Maries at the Tomb is one of the least well

preserved (fig. 2). It includes a figure seated on a big stone in front of a small

building. The figure is without head, left shoulder and right leg. He is wearing a long

white tunic and a pallium with blue letters.[72] Behind him there is a small rectangular

building, of which only the lower part survives; it is, however, enough to reconstruct

---

[67] Kraeling 1967, 213; in its development the theme acquires two different forms in which the tomb plays a prominent role. In the one, the tomb is represented by the Jerusalem Anastasis and in the other it is represented by an open sarcophagus. The latter appears rarely in Byzantine art. One notable exception, which however is associated with the scene of the Entombment, appears in the fresco from the Crypt of Hosios Lukas ca. 1100, Chatzidaki 1997, fig. 84.
[68] Maier 1964, 70-74.
[69] Ibid, 16; the dome is superimposed upon an octagon which in turn rests on a square. The decoration is limited to the dome and the octagon.
[70] Ibid, 18.
[71] Kraeling 1967, 122-124; Grabar 1969, 20-23; Maier 1964, 79 ff.
[72] Ibid, 35; in fact only one letter is visible, "I".

the whole building. It is made up of blocks of tiles and flanked by polygonal pillars. Two women are visible coming from the left, one of whom is standing. The standing figure, of which only part of the head and right eye survives, wears a head-scarf.[73] The other woman's head, of which only a small part survives, is substantially lower; she was probably kneeling before the sitting figure.[74]

That this scene is again connected with Romans 6: 3-4 and thus with Christ's baptism and resurrection, is confirmed by the fact that it is located in a baptistery. Some iconographic details though suggest a slightly different analysis. The Gospels while describing the encounter of the Maries with the angels mentioned nothing about them kneeling in front of them. Only Luke 24:5 mentions that the women bowed their faces: 'As they were afraid, and bowed their faces down to the earth'. No mentioned is made of them kneeling.[75] The question that arises here is whether the artisan had allowed himself some divergence from the Gospel narrative; after all it is only natural that the two women knelt in the presence of such superior things. Another possibility is that this scene, like the one on the Milan Ivory, depicts not the Maries at the Tomb but the Chairete (Matth. 28: 8-10), where the two Maries are described as touching Christ's feet.[76]

The next compartment (fig. 3), which is divided into two registers, contains a scene identified by Maier as the Walking of Christ on Water (Matt. 14: 22-33; Mark 6: 45-

---

[73] Ibid, 36; according to the author, this is a typical Palestinian garment.

[74] This scene resembles the one on the Castello Sforzesco ivory, recently identified as a conflation between the Chairete and the Maries at the Tomb; see Weitzmann 1979, no. 453.

[75] The Greek word used is 'κλίνω' which means turn downward, thus they turned their faces downwards but they did not fell down in *proskynesis*.

[76] Further discussion will follow below.

52; John 6: 16-21).[77] Other authorities believe that two distinct scenes are depicted: Christ Walking on the Water (upper register) and the Miraculous Draught of Fishes (not the post-Resurrection event), that is, the calling of Peter and Andrew (Matt. 4: 18-20; Mark 1: 16-20; Luke 5: 1-11).[78] There is also the possibility that both compartments visualize John 21: 1-14, that is the post-Resurrection appearance of Christ at the Sea of Tiberias, commonly known as the Miraculous Draught of Fishes.[79] Peter's jump in the water, to reach Christ on the shore, could be paralleled with the submersion of the catechumen in the pool.[80] John Chrysostom in his oration *Against Ebrosios and on the Resurrection* drew an analogy between the draught of fishes from the water and the exit of the newly baptized from the baptistery's pool.[81] Also Cyril of Jerusalem, in his twelfth catecheses *On 'who became incarnate and became a human being'*, interpreted Christ's miracle of Walking on the Water as an allusion to baptism.[82]

If the scene is in fact the post-Resurrection Miraculous Draught of Fishes, then its placement after the Maries at the Tomb compartment, and before the Mission of the Apostles in the next, follows the chronological sequence of the Gospel narrative.[83] Furthermore if the Miracle at Cana is depicted in the first compartment (it is after all the first public miracle performed by Christ), and the Ascension in the last, then

---

[77] Maier 1964, 38-41.
[78] Ibid, 40-41.
[79] With this view agrees Schumacher 1959, 26: "Möglicherweise folgten drei weitere Bilder aus dem Leben Jesu bis zu den erhaltenen Szenen nach der Aufertsehung: die Frauen am Grabe, Christus am See Tiberias und Dominus legem dat" and Drewer 1981, 535.
[80] Shaw 1974, 12; the author also believes that the Miraculous Draught of Fishes could have a Eucharistic or quasi-Eucharistic content.
[81] PG 50, col. 549; the quotation is not from the post-Resurrection Miraculous Draught of Fishes but from the start of Christ's ministry, the calling of the first apostles (Matth. 4: 19).
[82] Yarnold 2000, 146.
[83] A more detailed analysis follows in chapter 3.2.2.

identification would allow compartments, five, six and seven, to depict a small post-Resurrection cycle.[84]

The absence of the net from the scene on the upper register should not deter us from identifying the scene as the Miraculous Draught of Fishes, since it is quite possible that the craftsman decided to conceal the fishing net from our eyes because, according to the Gospel narrative, it was placed on the other site of the boat (John 21: 6).[85] On the lower register the disciples are portrayed at the moment when they throw their fishing nets on the right, thus making the net visible. Thus, by concealing the net on the upper register and then depicting it on the lower, the artist emphasized the importance of following Christ's commandments. This is the second example where a post-Resurrection scene is depicted in two consecutive scenes, with the other being the Maries at the Tomb, at Dura. In fact the depiction of the Miraculous Draught of Fishes into two consecutive scenes became common after Iconoclasm.[86]

The baptisteries of Dura-Europos and Naples include in their iconography at least one scene from the post-Resurrection cycle. Apart from their association with Romans 6: 3-4 and with Baptism, these post-Resurrection appearances could have also served as

---

[84] Schumacher 1959, 26. The scenes in these compartments are respectively: the Maries at the Tomb, the Miraculous Draught of Fishes and the Mission of the Apostles. The latter scene had an importance greater than a simple post-Resurrection appearance. Maier describes the scene of the Mission of the Apostles as not being of any earthly or terrestrial value, not being a historical scene as Paul is involved, but a scene of no time or space, an allusion. It seems that this scene has a meaning of its own and does not belong to a post-Resurrection cycle, as it does not follow the Gospel narrative but rather illustrates another meaning, that of the Apostolic teaching, Maier 1964, 109.

[85] The passage reads: 'He said, "Throw your net on the right side of the boat and you will find some". When they did, they were unable to haul the net in because of the large number of fish.'

[86] These are the lost mosaic panel from the Holy Apostles, a fresco from Pskov, and in two illuminated manuscripts, a Gospels now in the Vatican (11th c.) and an *Euchologion* from Italy (late 10th and early 11th c.). For the Holy Apostles see Mesarites *Ekphrasis*, XXXVI: 1 in Downey 1954, 889 note 2 and 914; for the Pskov fresco see Maguire 1974, 124; for the Gospels see Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palat.cod.gr.5 in Millet 1960[2], 573, fig. 608 and for the *Euchologion* see Grabar 1972, 65-67. Grabar believes that the two scenes are not the Miraculous Draught of Fishes but rather Christ Walking on the Water and the Multiplication of the Loaves. A discussion of the evidence and on the manuscript, in particular, appears in a following chapter.

instructive or visual paradigms for the catechumens to contemplate. In the case of Dura, the grand scale with which the scene of the Maries at the Tomb is depicted separates it from the rest of the decoration, pointing to its comparative importance, while its proximity to the baptismal font illustrates the scene's theological meaning.

The association with baptism declined in importance as baptism itself will lose the prominence it was given at the very beginning of the history of the Church.[87] This decline in the Middle Byzantine period is observed in the reading for Easter in the *Typikon of the Great Church*: 'You should know that, if there are no baptisms, after the *Benediction*, we read the passage *As many of you as were baptised into Christ* (Gal. 3: 27) and then the prokeimenon'.[88] This marginal note indicates that at some point during the Middle Byzantine period in the Great Church, it was quite common not to have baptisms on Easter. In the chapter that follows the post-Resurrection appearances will be examined in a completely different context, the cult of the Holy Land. It will be argued that pilgrimage in the Holy Land further enhanced the historical validity of the post-Resurrection appearances, as visual synonyms of the Resurrection.

---

[87] Davies 1968, 1.
[88] Mateos 1963, 89.

1.2: The Post-Resurrection Appearances of Christ and the Arts of Palestine.

Besides Dura-Europos, all other representations of Christ's post-Resurrection appearances, including those in the Naples Baptistery, are posterior to the establishment of the cult of the Holy Land.[89] The group of examples that follows is directly connected with this cult and is related to holy shrines established and flourishing during and after the fourth century in the Syrian and Palestinian areas. These in effect are connected either with Old and New Testament descriptions or with saints who lived in the area, such as Symeon the Stylite. However it was places linked to Christ's life, miracles and passion that enjoyed the greatest popularity; and Jerusalem in particular claimed the most significant sites.[90] The Mount of Olives represented the Ascension, the Golgotha basilica and the church of the Anastasis represented Christ's Crucifixion and Resurrection. Hesychios, a fifth-century presbyter of Jerusalem, made this association explicit in a sermon on Easter: 'This trumpet that Bethlehem moulded and Sion forged, in which the Cross became the hammer and the Anastasis the anvil'.[91] The trumpet is of course Christ, whose passion and resurrection Hesychios' wordplay vividly associates with the actual shrines.

It was these places of cult that influenced the development of Palestinian iconography, visible in works of art produced not only locally but elsewhere in the Christian world too.[92] These artefacts had depictions that were related either to their

---

[89] Grabar 1972, 265-266.
[90] Vikan 1982, 6.
[91] Hesychios, *Second Homily on Easter* in Aubineau 1972, 122-23 and note 8.
[92] The ampullae of Bobbio and Monza, the marriage rings and amulets and the provincial sarcophagi to mention just some. A discussion of the afore-mentioned evidence follows below.

contents or their place of origin, thus making them very important examples of the representational arts of Palestine. As Vikan has already noted, 'the pilgrim, like the modern tourist, wanted something to take home with him' or her; these 'souvenirs' helped pilgrims to recall in memory the places they had visited and the cult venerated there.[93] The best example of Palestinian imagery keeping a material memory of the cult place is the Maries at the Tomb, where the sepulchre is always represented as the rotunda founded by Constantine and not as the rock-hewn grotto of the Gospels.[94] A number of ampullae produced locally attest to this.

Made of lead and tin, these ampullae or pilgrim-flasks were used as containers of oil from the holy places and have generally been dated in the second half of the sixth century.[95] Most of them are now located in the treasuries at Monza and Bobbio. They were mass-produced in Palestine as pilgrims' souvenirs and the nature of their iconography was intended, as already mentioned, to commemorate visits to specific holy places.[96] The Crucifixion; the Maries at the Tomb; the Ascension; and the Incredulity of Thomas, point to Jerusalem. The Annunciation; the Visitation; the Nativity; and the Adoration of Magi, point to Bethlehem.[97] The Maries at the Tomb and the Crucifixion were by far the most frequent subjects on these ampullae (fig. 4-5).[98] Sometimes the two scenes were coupled on the same side of the ampulla, for example on nos. 10-15 at Monza.[99] Their coupling could be explained either in terms of their importance as the two most vital events of Christian theology, or by the fact

---

[93] Vikan 1982, 10. The author adds that these souvenirs had a purpose and were not mere artifacts to evoke pleasant memories but rather pieces of portable sanctity: ibid, 13.
[94] Grabar 1972, 266.
[95] Weitzmann 1974, 33.
[96] Weitzmann 1979, no. 446.
[97] Dalton 1911, 624. We could even be more precise and point for example to the Golgotha basilica for the Crucifixion, to the Anastasis Rotunda for the Maries.
[98] Grabar 1958, 51; Monza nos 2-3, 5-6, 8-15; Bobbio nos 3-6, 7, 15, 18.
[99] Ibid, 26-31. The enumeration of the ampullae follows that of Grabar.

that they commemorate the two most prominent shrines of Christianity, the Golgotha basilica and the Anastasis Rotunda.[100] Since however these ampullae functioned as commemorative objects, the latter seems more plausible.

The ampullae follow the Gospel narrative in the representation of the main characters of the Maries at the Tomb scene, that is, the two women and the angel, but differ substantially in the depiction of the tomb, thus shifting the importance from the Gospel narrative to the architectural setting and the experiences the pilgrims shared there. On the ampullae, two women in long veils (*maphoria*) are depicted, which indicates the artist's preference for the Gospel of Matthew, where only two women are mentioned. What is interesting though is that the woman closer to the tomb carries not a jug of unguent but a censer. We know that in the early Church women were ordained as deaconesses and it is probable that the artist was inspired by this tradition.[101] Egeria also describes how the clergy carried censers into the tomb on Sunday morning.[102] This is one of a number of departures from the Gospel narrative in favour of a local tradition. The angel is usually depicted seating by the tomb with wings and a halo, pointing with one hand towards the empty tomb while holding a staff with the other. The inscription for the scene, which sometimes appears at the

---

[100] Ibid, 58: "Pour faire pendant au crucifiement, image de la mort glorieuse du Christ, les graveurs des ampoules figuraient la Résurrection". Even though Grabar's supposition could be correct, there is no reason why we should think that the two scenes are not of equal importance or even that it is the other way round, that is, the Crucifixion is the one that matches the glorious Resurrection of Christ.

[101] See also Egeria, *Travels* 24: 10 in Maraval 1982, 244-245 and Bertonière 1972, 95. The deaconesses still participate in liturgy in the tenth century as recorded in Constantine VII, *Book of Ceremonies* in Vogt 1935, 2: 171.

[102] Egeria, *Travels* 24: 10 in Maraval 1982, 244-245; Wilkinson 1999, 144. The translation here is by Vikan 1988, 22:

> "*After these three psalms and prayers*
> *they take censers and into the cave of the Anastasis,*
> *so that the whole Anastasis basilica is filled with the smell*".

same side as the Crucifixion, is ANECTH O ΚΥΡΙΟΣ: (Christ has risen) variously spelled.[103]

The tomb is usually depicted as a small circular building surrounded by a higher columnar structure, with a conical domed roof, usually surmounted by a cross. The representation of the tomb on the ampullae can be divided into two categories. The first has a summary form and depicts only the basic characteristics, such as the circular building, the frontal grills and the surmounting cross.[104] The other group shows much attention to detail and depicts the columns of the façade, the side grills, hanging lamps and tapestries and even candles flanking the cross.[105] It becomes obvious that the craftsmen departed from the Gospel narrative in favour of a local tradition, in this case the Constantinian rotunda. Contemporary pilgrims' accounts verify the details on the ampullae as for example the grills, described by Egeria as *cancelli*.[106] Finally, in some of the most detailed examples, an altar is visible inside the tomb, which, like the censers, has a liturgical significance and suggests the reading of the mass at the site.[107] Egeria supports this view in her itinerary, when she mentions that the bishop takes the Gospel, enters the *cancelli* and reads there the lection of Christ's resurrection.[108]

The Maries at the Tomb is not the only post-Resurrection appearance employed on these ampullae. Two ampullae, Monza no. 9 (fig. 4) and one in the British Museum

---

[103] Ibid, 624. Grabar 1972, 185, believes that the inscriptions show exactly the intentions of the artist to depict Christ's resurrection.
[104] Wilkinson 1972, 92-93.
[105] Ibid, 93.
[106] Egeria, *Travels* 24: 3 and 24: 9 in Maraval 1982, 236-237 and 244-245; Wilkinson 1999, 143-44. Vikan 1982, 21 cites many passages from contemporary descriptions made by pilgrims such as Egeria and the Piacenza pilgrim.
[107] Weitzmann 1974, 43-44.
[108] Egeria, *Travels* 24: 9 in Maraval 1982, 244-45; Wilkinson 1999, 144.

(fig. 5) have the scenes of the Maries at the Tomb on the obverse and the Incredulity of Thomas on the reverse.[109] The depiction of this scene was intended to remind the pilgrim of the Gospel account of Thomas' incredulity, and the fact that he was rebuked for his lapse of faith.[110] It is sometimes argued that this scene replicates a monumental Incredulity scene that existed in a Jerusalem church where the pilgrims commemorate this appearance.[111]

The ampulla at the British Museum depicts Christ standing in the middle of the scene, holding a book with his left hand, while his right pulls Thomas' hand onto his wound (fig. 5). The group of disciples is unevenly divided, with four disciples on Christ's right and eight on Christ's left side, making a total number of twelve. Above top of the group of four disciples, a freestanding building appears which represents the closed doors through which Christ entered. The same scene on the Monza ampulla does not depict the closed doors, thus allowing space for the disciples to be divided evenly in two groups of six. Both ampullae bear the inscription: O KC MOY KAI O ΘEOC MOY: My Lord and my God, (John 20: 28).[112] As it will be pointed out in chapter six, after Iconoclasm the inscription accompanying the scene changed into: The doors being shut (John 20:26). The only divergence from the Gospel narrative is the book that Christ holds in his left hand, a detail not recorded in John and only appears on the ampullae. This could indicate that the book, which could be the New

---

[109] For the British Museum example see Engenmann 1973, table 9: c-d and for Monza 9 see Dalton 1911, fig 39 and Grabar 1958, pl. XV. An ampulla from Bobbio also depicts the scene: ibid, pl. XLII.2.
[110] 'Doubting Thomas provides an obvious biblical parallel for the pilgrim and his own experience': Vikan 1982, 25, fig. 19.
[111] Grabar 1972, 190. Weitzmann 1974, 49, believes that there is no need to assume a direct influence of monumental art, especially when icons could have played an intermediary role.
[112] Grabar 1958, 25-26, pl. XV: Monza 9; see also 37, pl. XLII.2 Bobbio 9 where only the word ΘEOC is visible. The Incredulity of Thomas will receive further attention in the subsequent chapters concerning the post-Resurrection cycles and their use as visual polemics.

Testament or a Gospels book, holds the truth of Christ's resurrection. A quotation

from John Chrysostom provides us with a possible explanation.

In a sermon based on the question of why Christ did not show himself to everybody

after the resurrection, Chrysostom starts by saying that the truth of Christ's

resurrection lies in his appearances to his disciples, as described in the Gospels: 'The

testimony of Christ's resurrection lies on his appearances to the disciples and the

testimony of these appearances lies in this book', [113] i.e. the New Testament or the

Gospels. Then he explains why Christ did not appear to everybody. First he states that

as many did not believe in Lazaros' resurrection, why should they believe in Christ's;

secondly Thomas himself did not believe, even though he was with Christ for years

and saw his miracles and finally, why mention only Thomas, says Chrysostom, when

the rest of the disciples still had doubts which Christ resolves by asking them for

something to eat: 'Have ye here any meat?' (Luke 24: 41).[114] It seems that the New

Testament scene depicted on the ampullae served as a reminder that the event

portrayed, namely the Incredulity of Thomas, was just one of the many proofs of

Christ's resurrection.

To take this argument a step further, the New Testament/Gospels that Christ's holds

in his hand portrays a more specific liturgical connection. The lection from the Gospel

of John 20: 19-25 which describes the Incredulity of Thomas was read, according to

---

[113] PG 51, col. 105-106: "της δε αναστάσεως απόδειξις εστι τα σημεία τα αποστολικά, των δε σημείων αποστολικων διδασκαλειον εστι τουτο το βιβλίον". In English: "The testimony of Christ's resurrection lies on his appearances to the disciples and the testimony of these appearances lies in this book [New Testament]".
[114] Ibid, col. 106.

Egeria, on Easter Sunday during Matins.[115] What is unusual, however, is that the lection finishes with verse 25, which is not the end of this appearance. Verse 25 records the words of Thomas: 'Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe'. This verse leaves the audience with anticipation, as they will have to wait one week before they hear the end of the story, on Thomas' Sunday.[116] The lection of that day finishes with verse 31, from which Chrysostom, above, draws his inspiration. The verse reads: 'But these are written, that we might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing we might have life through his name'. It is quite reasonable to think that the book that Christ holds in his hands is not only a general reference to the New Testament/Gospels as a book that contains this appearance, but has a more specific connection with the lection on Thomas' Sunday. In other words, this iconographic detail was influence by contemporary liturgy in Palestine and served both as reminder of the truth of the Gospel and also the specific lection on Thomas' Sunday.

A painted panel from Rome is closely related to the ampullae, in the choice and configuration of the scenes, and also because it served as a container of blessings from the Holy Land. Formerly part of the Sancta Sanctorum treasure and now in the Museo Sacro of the Vatican, this painted wooden panel served as the cover to a small red box filled with bits of earth, wood and cloth. These were 'blessings' from the Holy Land.[117] The inside of the reliquary's cover depict five scenes. Starting from the bottom left to the top right, the scenes are: the Nativity, the Baptism, the Crucifixion,

---

[115] Egeria, *Travels* 39: 5 in Maraval 1982, 292-295; Willkinson 1999, 158: "and the Gospel reading which describes the Lord coming to this place on this day". Hence the Gospel links the pilgrim with Christ's own experience.

[116] Tarchnischvili 1959, 119-120; the lection for the Vespers is taken from John 20: 26-31.

[117] Vikan 1982, 18.

the Women at the Tomb and the Ascension (fig. 6a). It should be noted here, that while this object functioned as a commemorative piece from Palestine, its painted panel sets it apart from the mass-produced ampullae, and demonstrates that it was not a simple souvenir, but rather, a special gift commissioned by a wealthy patron, for a special recipient.

The scene of the Maries at the Tomb appears on the left on the upper register (fig. 6b). Two haloed women approach the tomb from the left, wearing distinctively different clothes.[118] The one on the right bends over the tomb, probably following the Gospel narrative: 'And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away' (Mark 16: 4). On the other side of the tomb a haloed, winged, angel is depicted sitting, pointing with his right hand to the tomb's entrance. Similar to the ampullae, the tomb occupies the centre of the composition. The latter is depicted as a 'complex architectural ensemble modelled on the tomb aedicule and the Anastasis Rotunda as they existed at the time of the painting'.[119] The dome of the rotunda appears floating over the tomb, in the shape of a polygonal structure. The aedicule inside the rotunda has conical roof supported by columns and decorated with marble revetments and a grillwork. This is reminiscent of the ampulla no. 9 at Monza (fig. 5), and the description by the Piacenza pilgrim (ca.570): 'The tomb is roofed with a cone which is silver, with added beams of gold'.[120] A similar description is found in the *Breviarius* or 'Handbook' of the early sixth century.[121] The artist of the Sancta Sanctorum panel preferred to emphasize the

---

[118] The one in the purple garment is the Virgin, securely identified from the other scenes (e.g. the Ascension) where she is wearing the same clothes. This, as we will see on the relevant chapter, contradicts the Gospel narrative where the Virgin is not mentioned at any post-Resurrection event. See also Weitzmann 1974, 42.

[119] Ibid, 19.

[120] Wilkinson 1977, 83. A closer inspection of the aedicule on the Sancta Sanctorum panel reveals a grey (silver) coloured conical roof and yellow (gold) coloured beams, which support this description.

[121] Wilkinson 1977, 60: 'Over the actual Tomb is a roof of silver and gold, and everything around it is gold'. Ibid, 5 and 59 note 1, argues that this passage, along with others, might not have been part of the

architectural structure of the sepulchre at the expense of the biblical narrative. This will not be the last instance in which this takes place.

On a sixth-century ivory pyxis from Palestine and now at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 7), the Gospel narrative is totally disregarded but the scene could possibly be identified as the Maries at the Tomb, even though the tomb had been replaced by an altar and the two Maries are holding censers, instead of spices.[122] The altar is situated in what it seems to be a ciborium. The ivory carver 'by substituting an altar for the actual tomb, illustrates the popular belief in the symbolic identification of the Holy Sepulchre with the altar, an association that grew out of the Eastern belief in the presence of the crucified Christ on the altar during the celebration of the Eucharist'.[123] This identification, albeit in reverse, is verified by the ampullae, where the Maries are approaching the sepulchre holding censers instead of unguent jars and spices, thus a parallel could be drawn between Christ's sepulchre and the altar. Female incense-bearers were attested until the late twelfth century but their access to the altar was at that time prohibited.[124]

On the altar there is a book -probably a Gospel- and above them a hanging lamp,. Two curtains hang from the side arches. The whole structure is flanked by the two women holding censers, while in the remaining space three women are depicted orant, each below an arcade. A total number of five women appear also in Dura and this was explained earlier as an influence from Tatian's *Diatessaron*. Since this type of

---

original version but that it was added later by people who had used this 'Handbook' and annotated it with observations of their own.
[122] St. Clair 1979, 129-131; Weitzmann 1979, no. 520.
[123] Weitzmann 1979, no. 520, 581; Cook 1928, 336 notes that the altar could in fact be the stone which various pilgrims describe in front of the entrance of the Holy Sepulchre.
[124] Karras 2005, 96.

literature was being suppressed by the church,[125] it is more likely that the depiction of the Maries here follows current liturgical practises.

Another ivory pyxis, from the Museum of the Valeria church in Sitten (fig. 8), depicts the Maries at the Tomb with the addition again, of non-narrative elements, such as the censers and the Apostles, Peter and Paul.[126] On the ampullae and the pyxides, the Mary closer to the Anastasis aedicule holds a censer, the angel sits beneath a canopy, and underneath his feet, six guards are depicted. All these details demonstrate how liturgy, architecture and Gospel narrative were blended together, to produce the scene of the Maries at the Tomb on the two pyxides.[127] The Loca Sancta, its shrines and liturgical practices helped to create a blend unique to Palestinian art that distinguishes it from contemporary art in Italy.

Two examples from Egypt and Sinai that follow in discussion, demonstrate how elements from pilgrimage art were adopted in the artistic production of neighbouring areas.[128] These are a bronze medallion (amulet) from Egypt that dates in the sixth century and a pre-Iconoclast icon of Sinai that dates in the seventh century. The bronze medallion derives its iconography from the ampullae (fig. 9).[129] On the upper half we see the Crucifixion. Christ, dressed in a kolobion appears, between the two thieves. On the bottom of the cross two suppliants are depicted.[130] Christ is inscribed

---

[125] Vööbus, 1951, 5. Most probably the depiction of five women came as a result of the artist's need to fill the empty space (*horror vacui*).

[126] Ibid, 129. Cook 1928, 336.

[127] The censer represents the liturgy, the Anastasis aedicule represents current architectural forms and the other details follow the Gospel narrative.

[128] Egypt had its local saints and pilgrim places, like the monastery of Saint Menas, southwest of Alexandria, probably the most popular water shrine of the Early Byzantine period: Vikan 1982, 16.

[129] Ibid, 40. Vikan must have misread "cuir" for "cuivre", thus referring to the medallion as being made of leather, instead of bronze.

[130] Schlumberger 1893, 163-170; Schlumberger says that these could not be "ni la Vierge et saint Jean ni les deux soldats", ibid, 164. Vikan identifies them as two suppliants; Vikan 1982, 40-41.

ΕΜΜΑΝΟΥΗΛ. The scene on the lower half depicts Maries at the Tomb. An inscription that reads CΤΑΥΡΕ ΒΟΗΘΙ ΑΒΑΜΟΥΝ (*Cross help Avamoun*) divides the two scenes. The tomb occupies the centre of the scene, while the two haloed Maries, inscribed here as ΜΑΡΙΑ Κ[ΑΙ] ΜΑΡΘΑ (*Mary and Martha*), occupy the left hand side.[131] They are holding censers instead of myrrh, like on the ampullae and on the ivory pyxis from Syria-Palestine mentioned above. The angel is inscribed ΑΓ[Γ]ΕΛΟC ΚΥ[ΡΙΟΥ] (*Angel of the Lord*) and occupies the right hand side; he is depicted seated, haloed and winged. The tomb is surmounted by a cross and has a two-fold door, depicted here half open. There is probably a lamp hanging from the roof. The majority of the iconographic elements on this medallion can be found in abundance on examples from Palestine.

The second example is a pre-Iconoclast icon from the Old Library of Saint Catherine's Monastery in Sinai that dates to the seventh century and depicts the Chairete (fig. 10). [132] As Weitzmann has already noted there was a connection between the cult of the *Loca Sancta* and the Sinai Monastery at least in part because of the inclusion of the latter area in the so-called Palestina Tertia, and thus under the same administration as the other pilgrimage places in the Holy Land.[133]

---

[131] The Gospels mention nothing of Martha being one of the Myrrh-bearers, rather the two names, Martha and Maria, appear twice in the Gospels, once in the Raising of Lazaros (John 11: 1-44) and once on the account of the visit of Christ to the house of Martha and Maria (Luke 10: 38-42). That Mary Magdalene was considered to be Mary the sister of Martha and thus of Lazaros is attested both in an attempt of Gregory the Great (540-604) to declare Mary Magdalene, Mary of Bethany and Mary the sister of Martha as one person, refuted by the Eastern Church and in a tradition current in the East in the eighth century: Murray 2001, 315-318. See the discussion in chapter 5.2. It is possible that the artist of the medallion included Martha as one of the Myrrh-bearers because of the belief that her sister was the Magdalene.

[132] Weitzmann 1976, 50, no. B27, pls LXXV and colour XXI.

[133] Weitzmann 1974, 33.

Part of the left side of the Chairete icon is missing, but it must have depicted the rest

of the figure of Christ who is depicted approaching from the left, dressed in a tunic.

He holds a scroll with his left hand, while his right is raised in a gesture of speech

towards the standing Mary. His face 'is framed by the dark hair and short painted

beard typical of the so-called Palestinian type'.[134] The Mary on the foreground,

kneeling to touch Christ's foot, must be Mary Magdalene, but the other Mary is not

the mother of James as described in the Gospel of Matthew (28: 9-10), but the Virgin

as indicated by the inscription that reads: Η ΑΓΙΑ ΜΑΡΙΑ (Saint Mary). The whole

composition is closely related to the Sancta Sanctorum panel in terms of the two

women's postures, and also because both have included the Virgin in the post-

Resurrection cycle.[135]

The cult of the Holy Land had undoubtedly shaped the evolution and even the

dissemination of a particular iconography connected with the shrines themselves.

Pilgrims travelling throughout the empire and even beyond, carrying locally produced

artefacts helped the spread of typical Palestinian iconographic formulae. Finally,

liturgical practises played their own part in the evolution of the theme. This is verified

by the presence of the altar, the substitution of the jars of unguents for the censers,

and also by the New Testament/Gospels that Christ holds in his hand in the

Palestinian examples of the Incredulity of Thomas. Further considerations will be

examined in chapter three, where such details as the floral decoration and the candles

that appear on the sepulchre of Christ in the Maries at the Tomb scene, will be

associated with a particular liturgy, the Easter vigil. This will be further substantiated

by quotations that connect women deaconesses holding censers during the afore-

---

[134] Weitzmann 1976, 50, no.B27.
[135] On the inclusion of the Virgin as part of the post-Resurrection cycle, see below chapter 2.

mentioned liturgy.[136] The next subchapter will focus on the choice of post-

Resurrection scenes in an iconographic cycle, by focusing on the two best preserved

and documented cycles: the Palestinian and the Roman. This will eventually

demonstrate whether the cult of Loca Sancta played any role in the choice of the post-

Resurrection scenes.

---

[136] See for example the twelfth-century typikon of Jerusalem in Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963[2], II: 179, 189 and 191.

1.3: Roman and Palestinian iconographic cycles

Two iconographic cycles were distinct in the Early Byzantine period, a Roman and a Palestinian one. Their contemporary existence does not point to a common source of inspiration, since the Palestinian cycle showed a strong dependence on the cult of the areas connected with the passion and resurrection of Christ in the Holy Land, while the Roman cycle showed a tendency on experimentation and, as in the case of the post-Resurrection appearances, to adopt only a handful of those iconographic characteristics so typical in Palestinian art. Other influences on Early Christian monuments came from the Greco-Roman tradition, apocryphal writings, theological interpretations, hymns and liturgy.[137]

One of the earliest passion and post-Resurrection cycles appears on the fragmented fourth-century Servanne sarcophagus, now in Arles (fig. 11).[138] Most of the scenes cannot be safely reconstructed, because the surviving panel is mostly damaged. Those identifiable are Pilate Washing his Hands, the Chairete, a scene described by Wilpert as 'Apparizione agli Apostoli' and finally the Ascension.[139]

The Chairete composition portrays three women instead of the two described in the Gospel of Matthew, the sole source of this event.[140] The three women are depicted in the foreground kneeling in front of a standing figure, which is partly damaged. The two guards in the background flank a rotunda-shaped tomb, making this scene one of

---

[137] Weitzmann 1979, 450.
[138] Wilpert 1929-36, 2: 331 and 1: pl. XV.
[139] Ibid 2: 331.
[140] Matthew 28: 1 says: "In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulcher". The Gospel of Mark mentions three women but it does not mention the Chairete; 16:1: "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, bought spices, so that they might go and anoint him".

the earliest to include the sleeping or terrified guards.[141] Their presence makes the identification of this scene, as the Chairete less plausible, since the guards are habitually associated with the Maries at the Tomb, a more likely candidate. The standing figure could also be an angel and not Christ, as is the case on the wooden doors of Santa Sabina, where again the angel is depicted standing and not sitting.[142] If this scene is the Maries at the Tomb, then the Servanne sarcophagus is one of the early examples, along with the Munich-Ascension ivory (fig. 18), to depict three women instead of two.[143]

The scene described by Wilpert as the 'Apparizione agli Apostoli' is very fragmented; thus the most secure comments are drawn from later reproductions.[144] From the surviving elements and the drawings, it would appear that the scene shows Christ making a gesture of blessing with his right hand whilst flanked by two disciples on each side. It is possible that this scene is an abbreviated Mission of the Apostles, a common theme on Early Christian sarcophagi.[145] The Gospels of Matthew (28:16-20) and Mark (16:14-20), combine the Appearance of Christ to the Eleven with the Mission of the Apostles. The post-Resurrection cycle concludes with the Ascension.

Another Chairete scene appears on the fourth-century sarcophagus of Cesi, which is only known from a reproduction by Bosio (fig. 12).[146] The diminutive image appears

---

[141] "Due custodi armati": Wilpert 1929-36, 2: 330.
[142] For Santa Sabina, see below.
[143] Wilpert 1929-36, 2: 331, believes that the third woman is Salome and that the sculpture here offers a conflation of the two Gospel accounts, Matthew 28: 8-10 (Chairete) and Mark 16: 1-7 (Maries at the Tomb).
[144] Wilpert 1929-36, 1: 33.
[145] Ibid, 1: 32-46 identifies most of the scenes in which Christ is flanked by the twelve Apostles as the Mission of the Apostles.
[146] Bosio 1632, 79 reproduced in Wilpert 1929-36, 2: 325, fig. 204 and detail 209. This sarcophagus according to Bosio was retrieved from a Vatican basilica and was preserved, probably until its disappearance, in the "palazzo del duca di Cesi in Borgo Vecchio": ibid, 325.

at the base of a cross flanked by six disciples on each side. Two women appear half kneeling in front of Christ, who is depicted with his right hand extended towards them in a gesture of benediction. In the background appears a rotunda-shaped building, which represents the empty tomb.[147] The Chairete scene here differs from the one on the Servanne sarcophagus in two main details: i) the absence of the soldiers and ii) the number of women. The differences between the two scenes make the identification of the scene on the Servanne sarcophagus as the Maries at the Tomb even k-more plausible. The three Maries will feature more often in Western art while the East shows its preference for two.[148] As it will be discussed in another chapter, this is not a rule and a clear distinction did not appear before the twelfth century, thus the number of women cannot be used as an iconographic detail that distinguishes a Byzantine from a non-Byzantine work of art.

The artist's decision to depict a diminutive Chairete scene in this crowded composition may depend on the surrounding imagery. The cross, surmounted with a Chi-Rho covered with a laurel and flanked by the twelve apostles, alludes to Christ's resurrection, thus the inclusion of the Chairete functions not as a substitute but rather as a complement to this imagery. By depicting the resurrected Christ and the empty sepulchre, the allusion to the resurrection offered by the cross with the laurel, it now becomes a historic fact. In other words the Chairete scene possessed Gospel verification and was more than a mere allusion to the resurrection.

---

[147] In very few occasions is the tomb associated with the Chairete. For a discussion on Christ's tomb as a free standing building see below.

[148] See for example Millet 1960[2], 517 where he states that the West will illustrate the Gospel of Mark, 16: 1-10, where three women are mentioned, while the East will depict only two following the Gospel of Matth. 28: 1-7. This is observable on some Carolingian ivories, as opposed to the Cappadocian churches, of the tenth and eleventh centuries. See also the discussion in chapter 4.2.1.

Another fourth-century sarcophagus, the front part of which is now in the church of

Saint Celse at Milan from whence it derives its name, depicts an abbreviated post-

Resurrection cycle that contains the Maries at the Tomb and the Incredulity of

Thomas (fig. 13).[149] According to Wilpert, the composition of the Maries does not

follow the Gospel in all aspects.[150] One of these departures is the angel's

representation over the tomb, instead of occupying the space directly in front or

usually beside the tomb. His position on top of the building could be explained by the

lack of space or rather by the fact that this angel is closer to the Roman winged deity

Eros who is normally depicted flying.[151] Many contemporary examples of Eroti

survive. Well known are the examples from the Villa Romana in Piazza Armerina

(fig. 14), and from the dome of Santa Costanza in Rome, ca. 350.[152] The presence of

the Eros points both to the continuation of Roman motifs in Christian art and most

likely, to a workshop that produced pagan and Christian works of art.

The linen clothing at which one of the women stares is another departure, since this is

not part of the Maries at the Tomb narrative but are discovered later by the apostles

Peter (Luke 24: 12) or John and Peter (John 20: 5-6). These are two minor events

titled as Peter, or Peter and John at the Tomb. The inclusion here of the linen clothing

at the tomb's entrance shows either the familiarity of the artist with contemporary

theological literature in which the linen clothing played a prominent role since it

---

[149] Ibid 2, 330, pl. CCXXXXIII.6. The front of the sarcophagus also represents the Nativity and Christ between two Disciples.
[150] Ibid, 330.
[151] The sculptor of this sarcophagus seems to be more familiar with pagan motifs rather than Christian. Christ's posture in the Incredulity also points to that direction.
[152] For the Eroti in Piazza Armerina see Dorigo 1966, figs. 119-121 and for the Eroti in Santa Constanza see Panselinou 2000, fig. 11.

proved that the body of Christ was not stolen, or with the Gospel narrative.[153] The only evangelist to mention the linen clothing was John (20:6), the sole source for the Incredulity of Thomas that follows the Maries on the sarcophagus. It seems plausible that it was the Gospel of John and not the exegetical works that influenced the depiction of the linen clothing on this sarcophagus. It is much easier to have access to a Gospels manuscript than to the exegetical works of John Chrysostom and Leo the Great. This is evident by the fact that other contemporary to the sarcophagus works of art, which depict the Maries unaccompanied by the Incredulity, chose to ignore the linen clothing.

The tomb on the Saint Celse sarcophagus is depicted as a circular building, a rotunda. The conical roof of the building is covered with tiles and supported by long wooden beams, similar to other contemporary and later depictions from the West.[154] The earliest examples of post-Resurrection appearances from the East – such as the censers and the ampullae – are much later and differ substantially in the depiction of the tomb. The iconographical details on those artefacts are similar to one another since they were based on the actual shrines, something verified by contemporary pilgrims' descriptions, while the representations on the sarcophagi and other media from the West depict a circular building with many variations. The Western craftsmen felt no obligation to represent the Holy Sepulchre as it was because these artefacts were never meant to be used as souvenirs; rather they chose to depict what the viewer could identify as Christ's tomb, a mausoleum. The use of this sepulchral structure was wide-spread in the Early Byzantine world and only emperors, their families and very

---

[153] For the linen clothing see John Chrysostom's *Homily LXXXV on John*, PG 59, col. 464; Leo's the Great *Oration LXXI*: *On the Lords Resurrection*, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* III, 189 and Severos of Antioch's *Oration Seventy-Seven*, PO 16, col. 816-8.

[154] The Milan ivory and the Church of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo are two such examples, of which discussion follows below.

rich individuals were entombed in such buildings. Their grandeur and association with the imperial family could explain why the artists and their patrons saw fit to portray Christ's sepulchre in such a manner. If an emperor and his family were worthy of an elaborate mausoleum then it is of no wonder that Constantine himself had chosen this sepulchral architectural form over Christ's own sepulchre. However, by depicting the tomb as a mausoleum, the artists have isolated their depictions from the Gospel narrative.[155]

According to the Gospel of Matthew, the tomb where Christ was placed belonged to an individual named Joseph and is described as 'hewn out in the rock', Matth. 27: 60. The same Gospel reports that Joseph 'rolled a great stone against the door of the tomb'. The Gospels of Mark (15: 46) and Luke (23: 53) agree with this description. The Gospel of John does not mention the structure of the sepulchre, but it does say that it was found inside a garden near where Christ was crucified, that is the Golgotha (John 19:41). The Gospels mention nothing about a free-standing structure but both the Roman and Palestinian cycle represented the sepulchre of Christ as such. This depiction of Christ's tomb as a free-standing structure went unchallenged well into the Middle Byzantine period. In some occasions, like for example in Palestine, it acquired such architectural details that help us discern local influences.

In other words, details such as the colonnade, the aedicule or the interior of the Holy Sepulchre, as depicted for example on the Sancta Sanctorum panel and on a number of ampullae, would have been puzzling to somebody who never visited Jerusalem. This is not to say that the viewers would have been unable to identify the structure as

---

[155] In the East however, since the church of the Anastasis was built on top of the historical side of Christ's resurrection, and due to the parallels drawn between the two in the liturgy, the depiction of the ampullae enhanced the Gospel narrative rather than alienated it.

Christ's tomb, since this is implied by the context of the scene, but the iconographic

details of the sepulchre on the Palestinian examples were meant to replicate

contemporary architecture and to serve as reminders to the actual shrines. This is why

the West never opted for an actual depiction of the Holy Sepulchre, but instead,

preferred the image of a mausoleum, which could have both evoked an illustrious

building fit for God, and at the same time provided a distant echo of what the

Constantinian rotunda in Jerusalem might have looked like. Western viewers had an

abundance of mausolea in their environs and those living in Rome had something

even better, an actual Constantinian rotunda; the church of Santa Costanza.[156] In both

traditions, the sepulchre of Christ was depicted as a free-standing structure, and while

it was easily identified as such from the context of the scene, the architectural details

were relevant to a specific audience.

On the Saint Celse sarcophagus, the sepulchre in the Maries at the Tomb scene serves

also as the border that divides the latter from the next scene, the Incredulity of

Thomas (fig. 13). This is one of the earliest depictions of the latter, described only in

the Gospel of John (20: 24-29). Three characters appear in this setting: Thomas,

another disciple and Christ. The latter stands on the right while the two disciples

appear on his left. Later representations depict Christ flanked by two groups of

apostles. It should be noted though that Thomas, who appears in the foreground, is

depicted from this early stage in a bowing position, common again in later

representations. An unprecedented detail, with no later examples, appears on this

sarcophagus; this is Christ's posture and especially his right hand. The hand, in the

---

[156] See below the discussion on the ivories.

way it bends behind Christ's head, is reminiscent of classical statues depicting female deities and especially statues of Wounded Amazons (fig. 15).[157]

Both Christ and the Amazon have sustained an injury by a spear, on their side; Christ on the cross by a Roman centurion (John 19: 34) and the Amazon by Achilles or Hercules. The myth of the wounded Amazon appears in Apollodoros, *Epitome* and Diodoros of Sicily, *History*.[158] The former was still in use as a source of inspiration for Middle Byzantine miniatures.[159] It is possible that the artist could have used one of the numerous statues of Wounded Amazons in existence as a source of inspiration. Christ's posture is closely related to the Wounded Amazon in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (AD 100-200). This particular posture was described as giving the impression of great suffering.[160] The wounded side and the great anguish could explain why the artist employed the classical formula of an Amazon to depict a Christian theme. The presence of these statues in and around Rome is evident by their inclusion in private collections. For example in the eighteenth century two such marble statues were acquired by Pope Clement XIV for the Vatican, from the Mattei collection.[161]

Two obstacles however arise with this identification. The first is based on gender and the second on whether the myth of the wounded Amazon was active around the time the sarcophagus was made. To start from the former, gender was not an issue since

[157] One such example is the statue of the Wounded Amazon (1st – 2nd AD), now at the Metropolitan Museum of Arts.
[158] Apollodoros, *Epitome* V: 1-2 in Frazer 1921, 210-213; Diodoros of Sicily, *History* II, 46: 3-6 in Oldfather 1935, 34-37. Both authors describe the fight between Achilles and Penthesilia and Hercules with Hippolyte.
[159] According to Weitzmann 1960, 50 and note 20, Apollodoros' *Epitome*, was one of the most popular text of its kind in mediaeval Byzantium.
[160] Von Bothmer 1957, 221 describes four variations of Wounded Amazons with the one in the Metropolitan Museum of Art showing greater suffering than in the other three types.
[161] De Campos 1975, 382 and figs. 249-250.

Mathews has convincingly argued that Christ in Early Christian art 'often showed a decidedly feminine aspect'.[162] Matthews' argument is well supported by a number of artistic and literary examples that date between the fourth and sixth centuries;[163] these correspond with the fourth-century date of the sarcophagus and also with the model employed. If artists could depict an effeminate Christ, then the borrowing of a female iconographic model, in this case, a wounded Amazon, seems even more plausible.

That the Amazon's tradition was still active around the time this sarcophagus was constructed is evident from two contemporary sources. The first is the *Historia Augusta* written around AD 400, which offers a detailed but fictitious description of Aurelian's triumph over Zenobia of Palmyra.[164] In that description, among the defeated tribes was a group of wounded Amazons. Another contemporary example comes from the Christian apologist Orosius.[165] In his *History*, written ca. 415, Orosius employs the Amazons in an argument that the sack of Rome by the Goths in 410 was no different than any other barbarian invasions in the pagan period.[166] This shows that some level of awareness existed in literature about myths relating to Amazons. But the latter were not only employed in literature but also in art. Various artistic examples representing Amazons survive from the pre-Iconoclast era. One such example is a Byzantine silver plate from the Dumbarton Oaks Collection dated between the fifth and seventh centuries, and depicts an Amazon on a horse attacking a

---

[162] Mathews 1993, 121 and fig. 98 of a sarcophagus which depicts Christ with swelling breasts and feminine haircut.

[163] Ibid, 138.

[164] Pohl 2004, 24. For the text see the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, XXXIV in Magie 1954, 260-61.

[165] *Historia*, Book I, 2: 50; 15: 3 and 21: 2; Book III, 18: 5 in Arnaud-Lindet 1990, 24, 64, 73 and 169, respectively.

[166] Pohl 2004, 27-28. Orosius, *Historia*, Book I, 16: 1-2 in Arnaud-Lindet 1990, 66 and notes 1-4. See also James 1996, 14, where she notes that the Byzantines 'compared contemporary events to Greek and Roman history'.

lion with a spear (fig. 16).[167] The Amazon was a popular figure in Early Byzantine art and literature, and a workshop that was familiar with pagan motifs, as the Eros depicted in the previous scene suggests, would have no hesitations in employing it as a model.

The re-use of Roman spolia must have helped to draw attention to deserted pagan monuments, a practice that became common in the fifth century.[168] Theodoric was known for reusing old Roman spolia in Ravenna, some of them carried from as far as Rome.[169] But not only architectural pieces were reused. Marble statues were also re-carved to suit new purposes.[170] In this era of despoliation, the sculptors of the Saint Celse sarcophagus must have been familiar with both the ongoing tradition about Amazons and most probably with some surviving examples. Since the use of classical statues does not necessarily means 'sympathy for paganism'[171] any final objections that the source of inspiration for the artist of the sarcophagus was a statue of a wounded Amazon are set aside.

To recapitulate, from the discussion above it becomes apparent that both the tradition and images of the Amazons survived and could have been known to the carver of the sarcophagus. Since many carvers were producing both pagan and Christian works it is not implausible that they were influenced by pagan models, which were employed to depict a Christian theme. Also it is reasonably easy to document the impact of 'pagan' imagery on early Christian iconography. Therefore, it is quite possible that Amazon

---

[167] Weitzmann 1960, 48, fig. 5 and 49, fig. 6 for a fourth-century mosaic floor from Antioch which depicts the same motif.
[168] Brenk 1987, 106.
[169] Ibid, 107-108: Theodoric used the spolia not for his churches but rather for his palace.
[170] Smith 1999, 161-62, 182 and *passim*.
[171] James 1996, 13.

iconography influenced the way the Incredulity was depicted. The posture of the Wounded Amazon was shorted-lived and no other examples survive. In the examples that follow Christ's hand is raised in the air in the posture of an orator.

One such example comes from a late fourth-century sarcophagus now in the Ravenna Museum (fig. 17).[172] The scene only holds the two main characters. Christ is depicted on the right with his left hand raised in a posture of an orator, while with his right he guides Thomas' hand onto his now exposed, wound.[173] Both figures wear long tunics or most probably togas,[174] and the whole scene is flanked by two cypresses. The trees are a strange addition to the scene, as the whole incident takes place inside a house. This not the only instance in which a sarcophagus from Ravenna depicts a scene flanked by two trees. The Pignatta sarcophagus, now in the Braccioforte Mausoleum, depicts on its narrow side the Visitation flanked by two cypresses.[175] In both instances the Gospel narrative is abandoned for a more symbolic representation of the event. In the Incredulity, this is also evident by the absence of the other disciples and of the 'shut doors' (John 20: 26), typical in later representations.[176] Furthermore, Thomas' body is not bent, as in later examples, but appears upright, a posture not completely unknown to this period, as the Santa Sabina doors will demonstrate below.

---

[172] Wilpert, 1929, 331, pl. cit. 3; Muratori 1911, 39-58 fig. 2; the latter remains the most detailed publication on this sarcophagus.

[173] Unfortunately the part of Christ's hand holding Thomas's does not survive but it can be securely reconstructed from the marks on Thomas' right hand, Zucchini and Bucci 1968, 26, no. 6.

[174] Thomas, whose garments are better preserved, wears an under-tunic that reaches above the ankles, while the toga is "pulled tightly across the chest from the right armpit to the left shoulder; the garment then re-appears from behind, wide of the body, forming a single broad U –best visible on Christ's garment– in front of the body, rising from the right knee to the extended left forearm over which the excess cloth hangs this was a traditional (and awkward) defining feature of the garment". The long quotation that describes our example perfectly, was taken from Smith 1999, 178 who discusses in detail the differences between the Late Antique chlamys, toga and himation; esp. 176-182. Thomas and Christ are depicted here wearing the Late Antique toga, as it appears on contemporary statues like those of the emperors Arcadius and Valentinian II, ibid 162, fig.3-4. Thus the most appropriate garments for Christ and Thomas were those worn by the imperial family.

[175] Lawrence 1970, figs. 31-34, 18 note 86.

[176] Muratori 1911, 51-52.

The two early cycles on the Saint Celse and Servanne sarcophagi reveal the popularity the Maries, the Incredulity and the Chairete shared in extensive cycles. Many characteristics that became common features in later representations, such as the bending postures in the Chairete and the linen clothing in the Maries at the Tomb, make their appearance at this early stage, while others, such as Christ's posture on the Saint Celse sarcophagus, were disregarded and replaced. Thus the sarcophagi offer a good insight in the beginnings of this iconography and demonstrate that artists, in this early stage, were ready to experiment before adopting any formulae.

The same applies for ivory carving as the following ivories demonstrate. The first example comes from an ivory leaf that represents the Maries at the Tomb, now in the Castello Sforzesco museum in Milan, dated ca. 400 (Fig. 19).[177] The tomb on this ivory is represented as a circular building, divided into two zones by an ornamental frieze. The walls of the tomb are made of tiles and the panels of the half-opened door are decorated with the Raising of Lazaros and Christ addressing Zacchaeus. It is not clear what the lower panel represents but from the gestures and postures it seems to replicate the main scene of the ivory, the Maries at the Tomb.

An ornamental lotus-and-palmette frieze divides the ivory into two zones. This frieze is identical with the one on the Symmachi and Nicomachi diptych in the Victoria and Albert museum and musée Cluny respectively, and the Rufus Probianus diptych in the Staatsbibliothek Preussicher Kulturbesitz in Berlin.[178] The pattern was favoured in the early imperial period and 'signals both the common origin and the shared art

---

[177] Weitzmann 1979, no. 453; Volbach 1961, no. 92.
[178] Kinney 1994, 463. The article is a response to a re-dating of the Symmachi ivory to the 19th c.

historical self-consciousness of these reliefs'.[179] The upper register, which is divided

by the ornamental frieze, depicts the higher part of the tomb, which has a conical roof

covered with tiles and drilled with windows. Above the tomb float the symbols of the

evangelists Matthew and Luke. Beneath these symbols two guards are depicted

prostrate with fear.[180] The presence of only two evangelist symbols suggests that this

plaque was probably part of a diptych, and, like other Early Christian diptychs, it was

used in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy.[181] The names of the living and the dead

for whom special prayers were made during the liturgy were written on the back of

these diptychs.

The lower register presents a blend between the scenes of the Maries at the Tomb and

the Chairete.[182] This interpretation is based on several iconographic details. The

posture of the two women is one such detail. The woman in the foreground is

presented kneeling while the other is depicted slightly bowed.[183] These gestures and

attitudes are common only in the Chairete scene, while in images of the Maries at the

Tomb, the women are portrayed standing and not kneeling. Their postures are

reminiscent of the seventh-century Chairete icon from Sinai which depicts the

Chairete.[184] Even though two centuries later, the icon is employed here because it

offers one of the earliest securely identified, asymmetrical examples of the Chairete.

But the postures are not the only common feature between the ivory and the icon, the

scroll that Christ holds in his left hand is another common detail, which additionally

---

[179] Ibid, 464.

[180] Weitzmann 1979, no. 453. Volbach 1961, no. 92, on the other hand believes that the two guards are sleeping,

[181] On its reverse the names of the living and dead were probably inscribed, thus making a Resurrection iconography fully appropriate to such a function, Weitzmann 1979, no. 453.

[182] This composition is a conflation of the scene of announcement with the subsequent event of the Chairete (Matt. 28: 9-10): Weitzmann 1979, no. 453

[183] Only the Gospel of Luke 24: 5 describes that the women bowed their heads out of fear.

[184] Ibid, no. 453. For a discussion on the Sinai icon see the next chapter.

appears on the Chairete miniature from the Rabbula Gospels (fig. 35). The three

Chairete scenes contain many details typical on all other later representations of the

scene.[185] A final detail that weighs the argument in favour of the Chairete is the fact

that the seated figure appears haloed. No angel is depicted haloed in the Maries at the

Tomb scene prior to the sixth-century mosaic at Sant' Apollinare. In the latter the

angel also holds a staff and not a scroll, which demonstrates that the latter was a detail

related to Christ and not the angel.

It is not clear whether the Milan ivory represents one of the earliest stages in a

developing Chairete iconography or whether the artist has consciously chosen to

combine the two scenes into one. Unfortunately, the contemporary mosaics from the

Baptistery of San Giovanni in Naples, which depict the Maries at the Tomb, can not

shed much light because of their fragmented state (fig. 2).[186] From the surviving

sections, it appears that the whole scene is similar to the ivory. A figure is depicted

seating on a rectangular block that resembles the one on the Milan ivory (fig. 19),[187]

holding a scroll in his right hand, while the postures of the women are identical to

those of the ivory. However, in the absence of the upper part of the seated figure, we

cannot be sure if the individual in the presence of whom they bow is Christ or an

angel.[188] The similarities between the two have already been noted by Meier, who

believes that both depict the Maries at the Tomb.[189] Whatever the case, the Milan

ivory demonstrates that the Gospel narrative offered more than one visual

interpretation. It should be noted that in terms of authenticity, the Milan ivory is not

---

[185] Such as the church of Santi Martiri in Cimitile, the Dresden ivory and the manuscript Jerusalem, Armenian Patriarchate, cod.1796. For these and other examples see the following discussion.
[186] Maier 1964, 35.
[187] In San Giovanni the rock is a perfect cube while on the ivory is rougher.
[188] Meier 1964, 36-37 provides a brief description of the various interpretations of the scene and of the seated figure.
[189] Ibid, 37 and note 7.

open to question, for it bears in its reverse a palimpsest of writings, one layer of which is attributed to the sixth or seventh centuries.[190]

A panel now in the Bavarian National Museum in Munich (fig. 18), dated ca. 400, is, according to some authorities, closely related to the Milan ivory.[191] Two scenes from the post-Resurrection cycle are fused in this undivided ivory panel, perhaps the centre piece of a five-part diptych. At the top right is the Ascension, while the rest of the panel portrays the Maries at the Tomb.

The scene with the Maries portrays three women approaching an angel, who sits in front of the sepulchre. Their garments are similar to the Milan ivory (fig. 19): the women wear long-sleeved chitons and have their heads covered, while the angel wears a tunic. The latter addresses them by raising his right hand. The sepulchre is represented as a two storey building flanked by two soldiers, one of them asleep. The upper part of the sepulchre is a rotunda, pierced with niches sustained by two pillars and decorated with effigies; on top of it a tree with two birds is depicted. The lower part of the sepulchre is a rectangular building made of bricks. The two-panelled entrance door is depicted closed, flanked by two statues, with only one being visible.

The differences, both iconographic and stylistic, make it improbable that this ivory is of the same group as the Milan ivory, which is ascribed to a Roman workshop.[192] The first difference is the number of women.[193] Here three are depicted making this one of

---

[190] Kinney 1994, 465.
[191] Volbach 1961, no.93; Weitzmann 1979, no. 453.
[192] Volbach 1961, no. 93, believes that is probably of North Italian origin.
[193] On the other hand if the Milan ivory depicts the Chairete, then no valid comparison can be made on the iconography, since these are two different scenes. However, since the scene is identified by scholars as the Maries at the Tomb or as a conflation between the latter and the Chairete, the

the earliest images to depict the Maries at the Tomb with three women rather than two.[194] Another difference appears in the way the upper part of the sepulchre is depicted. In no other contemporary representation does such a detailed description exist, though one might find the columns of the upper part of the Munich ivory, reminiscent of the internal colonnade of Santa Costanza (fig. 20). The coupling of two columns to support the spring of a single arch is characteristic of the period.[195] Both the Milan ivory and the British Museum plaques depict the upper part of the tomb as a rotunda with a conical roof, covered with beams and tiles and drilled by windows.[196] The Munich ivory differs also in the rendering of the lower part of the sepulchre. Here the tomb's panelled door is represented closed and not open as in the other two ivories.[197]

Stylistically, the Munich ivory differs both from the Milan ivory but also from the British Museum ivory plaque that I will discuss shortly. The differences are visible in the rendering of the individual figures, and their movements. The faces of the characters on the Milan ivory and the British Museum plaque express no feelings but rather have blunt expressions. Their postures seem unnatural that is, not relaxed, as if they were frozen while performing an ancient drama. On the Munich ivory though, the artist makes considerable effort to render each individual with a different facial expression, while their postures seems very natural.[198] The differences between the

---

iconographic comparison between the two ivories could help settle what the scene on the Milan ivory potrays.

[194] The Servanne sarcophagus also depicts the Maries at the Tomb with three women. Wilpert, 1929-36 2, 325 had identified it as the Chairete.

[195] Weitzmann 1979, nos. 246-247.

[196] For the similarities between the Milan ivory and the British Museum ivories see below. The Saint Celse sarcophagus depicts the tomb in a similar way, duplicating though only the upper part of the sepulchre on the afore-mentioned ivories.

[197] This is probably the last time in which the tomb's entrance will be represented closed.

[198] A comparison between the guards on the Milan and British Museum ivories and the Munich ivory, shows exactly this difference in the rendering of the of the postures.

Munich and the other two ivories, is not necessarily indicative of a different date, but

probably of a different workshop.[199]

The British Museum passion plaques, ca. 415, offer another example where one or

more post-Resurrection scenes appear on an ivory.[200] These four plaques are probably

components of an ivory casket and they depict scenes from the Passion and the

Resurrection of Christ. In chronological order, the first plaque depicts in an undivided

sequence, Pilate washing his hand, Christ carrying the Cross (Via Crucis) and the

Denial of Peter; the second panel depicts the Crucifixion and Judas' death; the Maries

at the Tomb (fig. 21) and the Incredulity of Thomas (fig. 22), occupy the entirety of

the third and fourth plaques, respectively. It thus becomes apparent that the artist has

shifted the importance from the Passion to the Resurrection by not compromising any

space for the scenes of the Maries and the Incredulity. This almost certainly reflects

theological considerations, since Christ's resurrection was a vital point in the

presentation of Christianity, as it proved Christ's divinity and God's plan for the

redemption of humankind.

The panel that portrays the Maries at the Tomb does so in a rare symmetrical way and

lacks one of the most important elements of the scene, the angel. The angel is absent

in favour of a symmetrical arrangement. His inclusion would have rendered the whole

---

[199] Without of course disregarding the exploitation of late antiquity by the Carolingian elite and the interest shown to late antique iconography in the eleventh and twelfth centuries in Southern Italy Cutler 1998, 1 and 6 respectively. To make things even more complicated a rock-cut crystal in the British Museum, published by Beckwith 1975, pl. 2a, reproduces in reverse the Munich ivory. The crystal is considered to be the work of a Byzantine workshop of the late sixth century Ibid, 3. Beckwith however does not explain how this exact copy was made, or why it is considered to be Byzantine; furthermore the sixth-century date is uncertain since the hord of coins with which it was found, does not provide an exact date but rather a terminus ante-quem. As I have suggested in a paper presented at the 9th Postgraduate Colloquium (Birmingham, 31st May 2008), the date of the Munich Ivory should be reconsidered, Konis 2008.
[200] Kitzinger 1960, 21.

scene asymmetrical, as the two women would have appeared on one side, as they do

in all other later examples, and the angel on the other, thus the number on each site

would have been unequal. The plaque of the Incredulity of Thomas also demonstrates

the artist's attention to the symmetric rendering of the post-Resurrection scenes. The

fact remains that this is only the second-known example (the first being at Dura) in

which no angel is depicted.[201] This seems to reveal that the symmetrical rendering of

the scene which favoured the absence of the angel was not very popular.

The tomb's structure is similar to the one on the Milan ivory, save that the entrance is

not surrounded by an ornamental frieze but flanked by two columns. Two sleeping

guards are depicted on the right and left of the entrance, in a symmetrical manner.

Exactly above them, two women are depicted staring at the tomb, with one of their

hands touching their cheeks, in a gesture of bewilderment. The panels of the door, as

on the Milan ivory, are decorated with various scenes; the Raising of Lazaros is the

only one identifiable. Another common feature between the two ivories is the hats of

the soldiers. Both soldiers on the Milan ivory and the left soldier (viewer's

perspective) on the British Museum ivory of the Maries wear exactly the same hat.

This particular type of cap appears in other fourth-century representations. One

example comes from the Lateran Sarcophagus 61, which dates ca. 315-325 and

depicts an extensive cycle from the lives of Christ and Peter.[202] In the scene where

Peter is taken prisoner, the Roman soldiers wear the distinct round caps of the British

---

[201] There is an ivory diptych from Milan, reproduced in Jerphanion 1930, 154-155, that depicts a similar scene but with no Maries, rather four guards are arranged symmetrically, two on each side, flanking a structure similar to the one on the British Museum and the Milan Castello Sforzesco ivories. This scene probably depicts the guarding of the tomb and not the Maries, who appear on the next leaf.
[202] Weitzmann 1979, no.374; see also the Christus-Petrus sarcophagus, in the Vatican City, Museo Pio Christiano, ibid, fig. 53.

Museum and Milan ivories.[203] The same type appears on the Arch of Constantine

consecrated in 315, to commemorate his victory over Maxentius at the Milvian

bridge,[204] in Piazza Armerina, and on the statue of the Tetrarchs now in Venice.[205]

The similarities between the ivories and the marble freeze could be evidence of the

same workshop and thus of a workshop that produced both Christian and pagan art.[206]

The fourth and final ivory plaque of the British Museum depicts the Incredulity of

Thomas (fig. 22). Here, Christ stands on a small podium in the middle of the scene,

with his left hand raised, while he holds his tunic with his right. He is surrounded by

two disciples on each side. The gestures are reminiscent of the Munich ivory but

again they are more theatrical than natural and the facial expressions that portray no

emotion recall the Milan ivory. Thomas is depicted half bowed with his finger

touching Christ's wound which is located on the latter's left side.[207] This is not the

first time that Christ's wound appears on the left. An earlier example is found on the

Ravenna sarcophagus discussed above; a later one appears on a mosaic panel from the

church of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo (considered below).[208] The wounded left side

corresponds with the Crucifixion scene, where the centurion is depicted piercing

Christ's left side. According to Muratori, 'the wound on the left offers, generally, a

sign of great antiquity'.[209] The two disciples on each side of Christ make this plaque

---

[203] This scene is described in the apocryphal Acts of Peter, James 1924, 333: "And while Peter thus spake, and all the brethren wept, behold four soldiers took him and led him unto Agrippa".
[204] Weitzmann 1979 no.58, fig.54; Brenk 1987, 104-105, points out that the Arch's construction from spolia that date back to the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian and Aurelius, was the result of imperial propaganda and not "of economic necessity, lack of artistic imagination or superficial haste".
[205] For the latter two see Dorigo 1966, figs. 99, 101 and 100, respectively.
[206] Weitzmann 1979, 399.
[207] In the Crucifixion scene, the centurion is also located on the left, thus it was only natural to depict the wound in the Incredulity on the same side. The location of the wound on the left might have something to do with the fact that is where the heart is located. For a discussion see Muratori 1911, 45-47.
[208] For a discussion that ranges from early Christianity to modern times, see Gurewich 1957, 358-362.
[209] Ibid 1911, 47: 'la ferita a sinistra offra, in generale, un indizio di maggiore antichita'.

the earliest symmetrical version of the Incredulity and balance the previous scene of the Maries at the Tomb, which also follows the symmetrical type. Later versions of the Maries, however, do not continue this symmetrical type.

Another point worth mentioning, since it demonstrates how short-lived was Christ's posture as a wounded Amazon, is the artist's choice to depict Christ's right hand in a posture similar to the Ravenna sarcophagus, namely with his hand raised in the air and not behind his head as on the Saint Celse sarcophagus. That the artist was familiar with both postures becomes apparent when we look the pose of the soldier with no hat on the Maries' plaque. Here the soldier has his hand over his head in a gesture identical to that of Christ on the Saint Celse sarcophagus. However the soldier's posture here, does not follow the type of the 'Wounded Amazon', as in the case of Christ on the Saint Celse sarcophagus but rather another classical tradition, where the hand placed behind the head means that the individual is sleeping or dying. It could also signify the moment when the soldiers 'became as dead men' (Matth. 28: 4). The artist of the British Museum ivory chose to depict Christ in the posture of an orator, rather in the type of the 'Wounded Amazon'. As in the case of the Saint Celse Sarcophagus, classical traditions were employed to present Christian subject matter.[210]

A final point should be made about the depiction of the Holy Sepulchre on these ivories. While the Munich ivory depicts the upper register of the tomb in a very different fashion, the British Museum and Milan ivories depict a drum pierced with windows, with an inclined roof, covered with tiles and supported by beams. As I have

---

[210] The absence of the Amazon's posture might indicate that this classical tradition was not favoured by the artist and/or patron of this ivory.

mentioned above, Santa Costanza is a possible source of inspiration.[211] It was

probably built as a mausoleum for Constantine's daughter Constantina, who died in

Bithynia, Asia Minor in 354; however a recent archaeological excavation by David

Stanley during the 1991-92 seasons, offers other possible solutions.[212] Constantine

and/or his immediate family built at least three funerary rotundas: Santa Costanza in

Rome, the mausoleum next to Hagioi Apostoloi in Constantinople and the Holy

Sepulchre in Jerusalem.[213] This of course does not imply that the three buildings were

exactly the same, but we know that they shared some similarities, probably known

and exploited by the ivory carvers who wanted to portray Christ's sepulchre as a free-

standing building, resembling the Anastasis rotunda. Kleinbauer had noticed that the

diameters of the inner spaces of the Holy Sepulchre and Santa Costanza are identical

and that: 'if Constantinas' mausoleum was not modelled directly upon the Anastasis

Rotunda, the two buildings share a common model'.[214] Both the British Museum and

Milan ivories replicate in detail the drum of Santa Costanza. The Milan ivory seems

to have copied the brick wall of the mausoleum, as well. The square base is not easy

to explain. Grabar cites a number of older mausolea, like the one of Caecilia Matella

at the Via Appia, but admits that the building had no windows.[215] Nonetheless, I

believe that Santa Costanza could have provided the prototype if the artist had looked

at it from the main entrance, where the building gives the impression of having a

square base (fig. 23).

---

[211] Volbach 1961, 29-35; Weitzmann 1979, no. 108.

[212] Stanley 1994, 260, basing this argument on a rather peculiar reading of the archaeological evidence, dismisses the idea that this building is the mid-fourth century mausoleum of Constantina. Mackie 1997, 397, based on this afore-mentioned evidence, supports the view that this mausoleum was built by Julian for his wife Helena and probably for Constantina. Brubaker 1997, 59 supports a female matronage for Santa Costanza.

[213] Grabar 1972, I: 257 note 1.

[214] Kleinbauer 1987, 290.

[215] Grabar 1972, I: 271.

Santa Costanza was not the only building in Rome with a round drum, pierced with windows, with beams supporting a tiled roof. Santo Stefano Rotondo, though half a century later than the ivories, provides another example (fig. 24).[216] The building was erected during the papacy of Simplicius (468-483) and shows strong Palestinian links, especially with the Holy Sepulchre.[217] The dimensions of the two buildings are strikingly similar: Santo Stefano has an inner colonnade radius of 12.06m, compared to the Holy Sepulchre's 12.02m; the circumference of the Santo Stefano is 75.76m, while that of the Holy Sepulchre is 75.80; and both buildings have a height of about 20m.[218] If the Roman people were so eager to copy in such detail the buildings of Palestine, then in my opinion the artists would have no hesitation in using them as 'accurate' representations for their work.

The next example of a post-Resurrection appearance comes from the wooden doors of the church of Santa Sabina in Rome, of about AD 432-440. The church was built on the Aventine hill by an Illyrian priest, some years after the sack of Rome by Alaric.[219] Eighteen of the twenty-eight original figurative panels survive on the Santa Sabina door, with Old and New Testament scenes, but their arrangement had been altered by two restorations.[220] The scenes from the Passion cycle are depicted mainly in the small panels. The cycle also includes, three scenes from the post-Resurrection

---

[216] Volbach 1961, 28. Krautheimer 1986[4], 92 and Davis-Weyer 1989, 69 and 71, argue that the Anastasis Rotunda might have influenced the architecture of the building.
[217] Davis-Weyer 1989, 67 believes that Santo Stefano Rotondo is associated with the Emperor Anthemius and thus its construction should be placed between 467-468.
[218] Mâle 1960, 69-70.
[219] Delbrueck 1934, 139: The Church of Santa Sabina on the Aventine was consecrated under Pope Sixtus III shortly after the year 432. Mâle 1960, 50, believes that the church was built by an Illyrian priest named Peter.
[220] Volbach 1961, no.103-105; Weitzmann 1979, no. 438; Delbrueck 1934, 142 believes that: "The wooden doors were hardly made for their present location; apparently they had to be cut down on size so as to fit into the marble portal".

narrative: the Maries at the Tomb, the Chairete and an abbreviated Appearance to the Eleven.

The wooden panel with the Maries depicts a scene very different from any other contemporary or later representations (fig. 25). The tomb here is neither the well defined Constantinian structure of the ivories nor the circular buildings of the sarcophagi; instead this panel depicts two roughly sketched buildings, which according to one theory, represent Jerusalem and Christ's sepulchre.[221] Another possible explanation is that the triangular-roofed building represents the Anastasis basilica, while the domed structure represents the Rotunda. This is another example where the sepulchre of Christ imitates architectural forms. Later manuscripts showed the same emphasis on two distinct roofs, whenever the architectural setting meant to depict Jerusalem.[222] The whole background is carved with tiles, probably in an attempt to imitate the tiled tomb of the ivories. In the right corner of the composition, a standing winged angel appears below an arched-doorway which signifies the tomb's entrance, though according to the Gospel narrative the angel should appear seated at the tomb's entrance or inside the tomb, but not standing.[223] He raises his hand in a gesture typical of salutation. The two women carry unguents with their left hands while with their right hands, they make a gesture of greeting.[224]

---

[221] Jeremias1980, 64, sees similarities between this panel and the *Kreuzigungs-Tafel*, on which Jerusalem is being represented. Berthier, 1892, 46, expresses the same idea.
[222] See for example the background setting on fol. 47^r, Turin University Library Cod. C.I.6 and fol. 177^r, Moscow State Historical Museum Cod.146 in Galavaris 1969, pl. VIII, 46 and pl. IV,14 respectively.
[223] Matth. 28: 2; Mark 16: 5. John 20: 12. The standing angel is a common feature in other panels of this door: Jeremias 1980, 65.
[224] Ibid, 64.

The Chairete scene offers the first example where the artist depicts the trees as part of the garden in which the event takes place (fig. 26).[225] Christ is depicted on the right in a frontal position, greeting the two women who stand on the left. He has his right hand raised in a gesture of greeting and he wears a tunic and sandals. The same clothes and gesture also appear on other Passion panels.[226] The two women wear long-sleeved chitons and their heads are covered with long veils.[227] Both have their right hand raised inside their clothing in a gesture of salutation. The scene diverts from the Gospel narrative as it depicts the two women standing and not kneeling. The same posture appears on the Cesi sarcophagus and the Milan ivory.[228]

Another wooden panel contains what has been identified by various scholars as the Appearance of Christ to the Eleven.[229] This event is described in Luke 24: 36-49 and in John 20: 19-23. The scene depicts Christ and three disciples in the foreground while the background is filled with a tiled wall. The asymmetrical composition of this scene is reminiscent of the Incredulity of Thomas on the Saint Celse sarcophagus, but the similarities end here. The number of disciples, here only three, does not prohibit identification of this scene as Christ's Appearance to the Eleven, as this is not the first time that such an abbreviated scene appears.[230] The same restriction applies to the Incredulity of Thomas: representations of this scene prior to that at Sant' Apollinare

---

[225] Ibid, 66, identifies the trees from their fruits, as two pines (left and right) and an oak (in the centre). Berthier 1892, 52, on the other hand, believes that the two trees on the extremities are palm-trees.

[226] Jeremias 1980, 66: "im gleichen Aussehen und in der gleichen Kleidung wie auf den übrigen Passionstafeln". Christ also looks very similar with the angel on the previous panel.

[227] The clothing is reminiscent of the women in the scene of Maries at the Tomb in Dura.

[228] Jeremias 1980 66, agrees with this position: "In diesem Punkt unterscheidet sich die Tafel der Sabina-Tür eindeutig von den übrigen Denkmälern, indem sie entgegen dem Evangelientext die Frauen stehend wiedergibt".

[229] Berthier 1892, 37; Delbrueck, 1934, 141; Jeremias 1980, 65. This scene was also identified as the Second Coming: Weitzmann 1979, no. 438.

[230] The Servanne sarcophagus also depicts a diminished Appearance to the Eleven.

Nuovo, which will be discussed shortly, never depicted the full number of

disciples.[231]

However another interpretation has been proposed for this panel. Instead of the

Appearance to the Eleven it is said to depict the Second Coming. The interpretation

was based on Christ's halo, which contains the monogram Chi and Rho and the letters

Alpha and Omega, which represent the Second Coming.[232] Because this type of

monogram appears very frequently in the fifth century, and predominately in North

Italy, it was used as a criterion to establish the origins of Santa Sabina's doors.[233] The

fact that Christ on the Chairete panel appears with no halo, seems to confirm that this

panel is in fact the Second Coming, as it would have been highly improbable to have

Christ depicted with a halo in one post-Resurrection scene and not in another. The

stylistic differences between the two panels might suggest the work of different

craftsmen and thus explain the discrepancy in depicting between Christ.[234] That the

two artists were not of equal skill is quite visible from the surviving panels while their

diverse iconography could be explained as the product of different models. This is

visible through the surviving examples of the Maries, produced in Rome around the

same time as the doors, none of which is similar to another. It has been suggested

though, that the two distinct carving styles were influenced by two different centres,

Constantinople for the "well-modeled" panels and Rome and the Roman sarcophagi,

for the "plain" panels.[235] This supposition is problematic since it labels the production

---

[231] The Saint Celse sarcophagus depicts two disciples, the Ravenna only one and the British Museum ivory plaque four.
[232] The scene "is without close parallel": Weitzmann 1979, no. 438. The Alpha and Omega are mentioned in the Apocalypse, 22: 13, "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last". See also Boston 2003, 38, who argues that the Alpha and Omega, was not an identifying inscription, but rather a guarantee to salvation.
[233] Jeremias 1980, 68.
[234] Weitzmann 1979, no. 438.
[235] Ibid no. 438

of Roman workshops as inferior to those of Constantinople; this ought not to be the case, as the ivories produced in Rome demonstrate.

Because a third of the scenes are missing and their order has been altered by various restorations, it is difficult to interpret the programme of this cycle. Stylistically the post-Resurrection scenes on the Santa Sabina doors are closer to the sarcophagi than the ivories, as both of them emphasise the main characters of the events and devote less attention to details. However the Crucifixion at Santa Sabina is closer to the one on the London ivory. The unusual structure on the Maries panel had no precedent, while the garden, portrayed on the Chairete panel with the help of trees, became one of the most common features of this scene. Still it is not easy to explain both the absence of the kneeling female postures on this panel and the Constantinian rotunda on the Maries panel, typical in all other previous and contemporary representations of these scenes. The fact that a number of ivories in circulation during the same period in Rome depicted those details complicates things even more. It becomes apparent that the artist(s) of the wooden panels were either not familiar with the sources of the ivory carvers and their work or that the wooden doors were not made in Rome.[236]

Another possibility also exists, that the artist(s) of the Santa Sabina doors created eclectic pastiches, selecting various details from diverse media to portray the scenes.[237] As no standard depiction existed for any of the post-Resurrection appearances, the artists may have incorporated freely details from the sarcophagi and other media. One of the panels even depicts a building identified by Mâle as a two-

---

[236] Or, as Prof. Brubaker has suggested to me, the artist had a specific iconographic point to make that we simply can no longer recover.

[237] A similar remark was made by Muratori 1911, 54 on the sculptural arts of Ravenna: 'La scultura ravennate sarebbe cosi un arte eclettica risultante da un antico fondo locale misto a elementi paleobizantini, alimentato da continui inlussi della Siria, dell' Asia Minore…'.

towered Syrian church.[238] The building truly has two towers but whether Syrian or not

is hard to say. If not in their totality then at least in their majority, the narrative value

of these scenes was not disregarded but rather enriched with details presumably

identifiable by the viewers though their precise significance is no longer clear to us.

As in the case of the ivories, the panel of the Maries at the Tomb depicts some

architectural details, which the viewer could, one assumes, identify. The Santa Sabina

wooden doors portray not the letter of the Gospel but rather the spirit.

The earliest representation of Christ's post-Resurrection appearances in monumental

art comes from the church of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna. A dedicatory

inscription helps us date the church between 493, the year Goths entered Ravenna,

and 526, the year Theodoric died.[239] The mosaic decoration is divided into three

horizontal zones: the first runs along the wall between the summit of the arches and

the base of the windows; the second covers the spaces between the windows and the

third extends from the top of the windows up to the ceiling. After expert observational

and chemical analyses by Bovini, the mosaic decoration of the latter zone has been

shown to belong to the original decoration of Theodoric.[240] The band on the left

contains a series of thirteen rectangular panels representing scenes from the life and

miracles of Christ, while the right band contains eleven panels with scenes mainly

from the Passion of Christ.[241] The style of the two registers differs substantially.[242]

---

[238] Mâle 1960, 57 believed that the first hand visible on these panels was influenced by the sarcophagi while the other "retain traces of the freedom and the feeling for the picturesque of Hellenistic art".

[239] Bovini 1961, 6.

[240] Urbano 2005, 82. Von Simson 1987, 73, argued that the mosaics might have been completed during the reign of Theodoric's daughter, Amalasuntha.

[241] Ibid, 14.

[242] Jerphanion 1930, 91, saw in the two styles "une intention théologique et l'affirmation du dogme de deux natures". Urbano 2005, 104, believed that the argument that a beard could serve as an iconographical indication of humanity as opposed to divinity, is itself problematic and unconvincing.

The left wall begins with the Miracle at Cana and finishes with the Healing of the

Paralytic, while the right wall begins with the Last Supper and finishes with the

Incredulity of Thomas. The scenes of the latter zone present a larger number of people

as the group of the Apostles is not reduced (as it is on the left wall), but rather is

depicted closely grouped.[243] The action is full of movement and Christ appears not as

a youth (as on the left wall) but as a bearded man.[244] Three post-Resurrection scenes

appear on this zone, namely: the Maries at the Tomb, the Road to Emmaus and the

Incredulity of Thomas. This is the earliest surviving depiction of the Road to

Emmaus.

The panel with the Maries depicts the Constantinian rotunda at its centre (fig. 27). The

tiled canopy is supported by four columns which rest on a pedestal. Inside the tomb,

an empty sarcophagus with the lid open is depicted. The sarcophagus, which is

depicted here for the first time, later became a common feature in Carolingian

depictions of the Maries at the Tomb.[245] The two women and the angel appear on each

side of the tomb, thus creating a symmetrical composition, reminiscent of the one on

the British Museum plaque.[246] All earlier and contemporary examples depicted the

angel as a young man, but in this composition the angel is depicted winged. The

wings and the staff the angel holds are two attributes that were depicted, over and

again, in all subsequent representations. The two Maries are wearing purple and dark

---

[243] Ibid, 90.

[244] Bovini 1961, 18; Jerphanion 1930, 91, believed that the gestures and postures are depicted in such a manner in order to stress the historical value of the scenes.

[245] Goldschmidt 1970, pls XVII, XXI, XXIII-XXIV, XLIII etc.

[246] The British Museum plaque depicted the scene in absolute symmetry with the same number of characters on each side, whereas here the number of characters on each side is different i.e. two women and one angel. The earliest surviving compositions from the East, like the ampullae and the marriage rings, depict the scene in the same way as the mosaic panel of Sant' Apollinare's church, which could denote an Eastern influence. Of course the earliest examples from the East are at least a century later, something that is not prohibitive as earliest examples could have traveled from the East in the form of ampullae, marriage rings and even illuminated manuscripts.

green tunics and robes covering their heads, and they have their right hands extended in a gesture of astonishment or questioning.

The next compartment contains the earliest surviving depiction of the Road to Emmaus (fig. 28). The town of Emmaus is presented as a walled city in the upper left part of the panel.[247] The artist has captured the moment where the disciples invite Christ to join them on their journey to Emmaus, 'as it was almost night' (Luke 24: 28-29). The two disciples depicted here flanking Christ have their right hands extended towards Emmaus, while Christ's right hand is making a gesture of blessing. There is also a clear distinction between the two disciples with the older, depicted here with beard and longer hair, leading the group towards Emmaus.

The third panel, which concludes the Passion cycle, depicts the Incredulity of Thomas (fig. 29). Christ appears in the middle of this mosaic panel, raising his left hand so Thomas could touch his wound. Eleven disciples flank the scene; six on the left and five on the right (viewer's perspective). In the group of five disciples, the one closest to the foreground is kneeling with both hands covered inside his tunic. Behind the group of six disciples there is a door firmly closed. This is according to the Gospel of John, which refers to 'the doors being shut' (24: 26) yet another instance in which the artist seems to have taken all the important Gospel details into account. The closed doors appear here for the first time, probably signifying the theological value this

---

[247] Saint Jerome in his *Letter to Eustochium* (c. 415), mentions that in the city of Nikopolis (formerly called Emmaus), Christ consecrated a church in the house of Cleophas, Wilkinson 1977, 47. Eusebius of Caesarea identifies Emmaus with the ancient town of Nikopolis (Amwas), an important and flourishing town about 80 miles from Jerusalem: Thomsen 1903, 30 and 60. For an interesting discussion on the importance of the *Onomastikon* in Byzantine topography see Wolf 1964, 66-95.

detail have gained through centuries of Christological dispute.[248] While the

Palestinian ampullae depict twelve disciples, the artist of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo

preferred an accurate rendering of the Gospel's narrative and depicts eleven, as the

number of the Apostles was reduced after Judas' suicide (Acts 1: 13). This is also the

first time that the full number of disciples appears in the Incredulity of Thomas.[249]

Nordstrom believes that the scenes with Christ were influenced by a North Italian

Lectionary.[250] While this might be applicable, other considerations seem as plausible.

For example many of the subjects illustrated in these panels, such as Peter's denial

and the Raising of Lazarus, appear both in Roman and North Italian art.[251] Thus a

lectionary is not the only place to look for possible influences. Bovini points out the

similarities between the Last Supper in the Rossano Gospels, generally considered to

be a Syro-Palestinian product, and that of Sant' Apollinare.[252] Palestinian influences

are also visible on other mosaic panels that show similarities with a number of

ampullae and marriage rings.[253] The mosaic panel with the Maries for example,

follows both the ampullae and the rings in the rendering of the main features of the

scene: the sepulchre appears in the middle, flanked by the two Maries and the

angel.[254] The postures also resemble those on the ampullae but it is the sepulchre itself

---

[248] Early Christian theologians explained Christ's dual nature by commenting on the fact that he entered through the shut doors as a God, while at the same time he allowed one of his disciples to touch him and affirm also his human nature; for a thorough discussion see chapter 3.1. For the use of John's quotation as the standard inscription of the Middle Byzantine Incredulity scene see chapter 6.1.1

[249] Lack of space could possibly explain why this was not the case in earlier examples. Both the sarcophagi and the British Museum ivory plaque lacked the space this mosaic panel had. In contrast many sarcophagi depict the full number of the disciples in a scene known as Traditio Legis, while the Dumbarton Oaks ivory (10th c.) has all eleven of them.

[250] Nordstrom 1953, 63, whose view is reproduced by Volbach 1961, nos. 150-153.

[251] See for example the British Museum ivory plaques of ca. 400, in which Peter's denial is depicted, and also the North Italian, Andrews Diptych for the Raising of Lazarus, Weitzmann 1979, no. 452 and 450 respectively.

[252] Bovini 1960, 19

[253] Even though the ampullae and marriage rings are dated between the late sixth and seventh century, earlier creations are likely to have traveled to the West.

[254] After Iconoclasm the angel will be depicted in the middle and the tomb on the right.

that would have made no sense if not for the colonnade that covers the aedicule on

Monza nos. 3, 5 and 9 to mention just a few examples. The artist of Sant' Apollinare,

decided instead of the aedicule to depict inside the colonnade, a standing sarcophagus

with the lid uncovered.[255] The representations of the sepulchre on the Roman ivories

were either unfamiliar to or ignored by the Sant' Apollinare mosaicist.

The Incredulity of Thomas also keeps the same arrangement of the main characters as

appears on Monza 9 and on Bobbio 10, but especially with that on the British

Museum ampulla where the doors are also depicted.[256] The absence of the Gospel that

Christ holds on all of the ampullae probably indicates that this Palestinian detail,

discussed in detail in the previous chapter inspired, which most likely by the reading

from the Gospel of John (20: 24-29) on Thomas Sunday, was not preferred here.[257]

The Syrian influence is also noted by Von Simson who remarks that according to

Agnellus, every bishop of Ravenna from Apollinaris to Peter Chrysologus was

Syrian.[258] It is important at this point however, to stress that no examples of the Road

to Emmaus survive in the East prior to the eleventh century,[259] and when they do, it is

usually in densely illuminated manuscripts in Florence and Paris.[260] In contrast, the

scene survives in many Italian monuments such as Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, Santa

Maria Antiqua, the cruciform reliquary of Paschal I, Sant' Angelo in Formis and

---

[255] This choice must have something to do either with the fact that the complex rendering of the aedicule on the ampullae would have made no sense for a scene that appears on the upper register of the church, making small details invisible, or with a belief that the aedicule would have confused the viewer who had never seen a depiction of the interior of the Holy Sepulchre.

[256] For Monza and Bobbio see Grabar 1958, pls. XIV and XLII.2; for the British Museum ampulla see Engenmann 1973, pls. 317-18.

[257] It should be noted however that most of the surviving examples of pilgrimage art, are posterior to Sant' Apollinare Nuovo.

[258] Von Simson 1987, 75.

[259] The church of the Holy Apostles did not include the scene, and nor does any of the Cappadocian churches. The scene is also absent from the manuscript, Mount Athos, Dionysiou 587 in Pelekanides 1980, which also omits other post-Resurrection scenes, such as the Incredulity while emphasising others such as the Maries at the Tomb which appears five times.

[260] Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23, folio 164[r] in Velmans 1971, 48, fig. 266 and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, cod.gr.74, folio162[v] in Omont 1908, 2: 6, fig. 141.

Monreale. It becomes apparent that the scene of the Road to Emmaus was favoured in the decorative scheme of Italian churches. I would like to propose that the scene's popularity should not be seen as irrelevant to the transformation of Christ and his disciples into pilgrims. The scene provides a visual parallel to the pilgrim's own experience in undertaking the journey to meet Christ.[261]

The most extensive cycle of post-Resurrection scenes in monumental art comes from Rome, notably from Santa Maria Antiqua. According to the Liber Pontificalis and a dedicatory inscription, the paintings in the Oratory of Santa Maria Antiqua must be attributed to Pope John VII (AD 705-707).[262] The surviving scenes offer a good insight into the choice and configuration of the post-Resurrection narrative and even though many of them appear today in a fragmented status, the existing details provide us with many iconographic details. From this cycle, the Incredulity of Thomas, the Road to Emmaus, the Miraculous Draught of Fishes and the Appearance to the Eleven can be safely reconstructed from the surviving elements, while a further scene is still disputed.[263]

To start from the latter, the surviving evidence reveals the feet and the lower part of two disciples.[264] According to Nordhagen the scene must depict Peter and John at the Tomb.[265] This event is described in the Gospels of John 20: 1-10 and Luke 24: 1-12 and takes place after the Maries (or in this case Mary Magdalene) had visited the tomb on Easter morning. In John's variation, Mary Magdalene visited the tomb and after finding it empty informed the disciples, of whom Peter and John rush to the

---

[261] A discussion on these and other examples and the Road to Emmaus appears in the last chapter.
[262] Nordhagen 1968, 15.
[263] Various authorities see in this scene the Noli me Tangere (John 20: 17) or the Ascension; ibid, 31.
[264] A haloed figure once visible on the left of the scene, is now lost.
[265] Nordhagen 1968, 31; pl. XXXIII: a-b.

empty tomb. In Luke's variation only Peter visited the tomb after being informed by the Maries. In iconography this scene finds its place only in dense post-Resurrection cycles and in manuscripts where almost all Gospel scenes are illustrated. Nordhagen's identification of the scene as Peter and John at the Tomb is based on the movement and clothing of the two surviving figures, of whom: 'one walks quickly and the other kneels or bows deeply'.[266]

Nordhagen's identification remains questionable. As the author himself admits, this scene is common only in later Byzantine iconography and its closest parallels come from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[267] Both the cruciform reliquary of Paschal I (817-824) and the eleventh-century Gospels from Florence, depict the scene in two iconographic variants, neither of which resembles Santa Maria Antiqua.[268] This renders Nordhagen's position that the scene in Santa Maria Antiqua retains those characteristics that were to become common in later Byzantine iconography unsustainable.[269] Despite the fragmentary status of these frescoes, Grüneisen in his early twentieth-century publication of Santa Maria Antiqua was able to see a haloed figure.[270] Grüneisen also drew a picture of the fresco in which two pairs of feet are depicted on the right, while a haloed figure appears on the left (fig. 30). However, Grüneisen's identification as the Appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene (Noli me Tangere) is not plausible, since the Gospels describe only two persons in that scene

---

[266] Ibid, 31.

[267] Ibid, 31. And well outside the scope of this thesis.

[268] For the reliquary see Lauer 1906 pl. IX which depicts all fifteen faces of the reliquary in very good quality reproduction, and Cecchelli 1926-27, image on page 157. The eleventh-century manuscript Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23 in Velmans 1971, 48, fig. 266, depicts three distinct moments of the narrative; none however resembles the scene from Santa Maria Antiqua.

[269] Nordhagen 1968, 93.

[270] "Sur la dernière peinture… on voit deux personnages en marche, l'un d'eux parait s'incliner, du côte oppose on voit une autre personne nimbée, c'est peut-être l'apparition de Jésus a Marie Magdeleine', reproduced in Nordhagen 1968, 32.

and not three, the number that appears on the fresco.[271] It is not clear whether

Grüneisen was actually referring to the Chairete, which portrays three *personae* along

with Mary Magdalene, and was a far more popular scene than the Noli me Tangere in

pre-Iconoclast iconography

Another possibility exists. The scene in Santa Maria Antiqua may represent the

Maries at the Tomb. The postures described by Nordhagen appeared frequently in the

iconography of the Maries, as for example on the Milan Castello Sforzesco ivory from

Rome, but better exemplified by the Sancta Sanctorum Panel, both of which could

have provided the source of inspiration.[272] If we admit that the figure on the left is the

angel, then the two figures on the right represent the two Maries. The posture of rapid

movement recalls the Virgin from the Sancta Sanctorum panel and while admittedly

there is not enough space between the angel and the Maries to represent the sepulchre,

this could have been depicted on the background, as on the Milan ivory.[273] The

'apostolic clothes' that Nordhagen describes could have been those of the Maries, as

no distinction appears between them and those worn by the apostles on the cruciform

reliquary of Paschal I. More than a century earlier George of Antioch (†593), in a

sermon dedicated to the Maries, put in Christ's mouth the following words: 'Peter,

who denied me, must learn that I can ordain women apostles'.[274] This line of thinking

appears also in Modestos (†634) of Jerusalem and in the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia.[275]

---

[271] Ibid, 32.

[272] The only point that speaks against such identification for this fresco is the space between the two characters, an uncommon feature for both the Maries and the Chairete. The space between the two women is visible only on the Rabbula Gospels; there one of the Maries is the Virgin.

[273] Further considerations will be examined in the post-Iconoclast chapter.

[274] *Oration on the Myrrh-bearers*, PG 88, col. 1864.

[275] Modestos of Jerusalem, *On the Myrrh-bearers*, PG 86.II, cols. 3276; Mateos 1963, I: 114-115 respectively. Both documents style the Magdalene as a female disciple of Christ.

After Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, the Road to Emmaus makes its second monumental appearance in the West at Santa Maria Antiqua (fig. 31). Here the scene is fragmented and only the lower part survives. From the surviving elements two – possibly three – figures are visible walking from the left towards the right. The figures appear against a hilly landscape, on the far right of which part of a fortified city appears with a horizontal inscription written on its walls: <CI>VITAS <EMMA>US (*City of Emmaus*).[276] The fortified city is reminiscent of the equivalent one on the mosaic panel in the church of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo.

In the Incredulity of Thomas, Christ stands frontally in the centre of the panel with his right arm raised and the palm facing the viewer (fig. 32).[277] He is flanked by two groups of apostles. The first group on the left (viewer's perspective) numbers three apostles,[278] while the other group, led by Peter includes seven.[279] On the viewer's left the inscription reads < APO> STOLI, (<APO>STLES) while on the right the full inscription appears between a cross and a heart (or an ivy leaf) APOSTOLI (APOSTLES).[280] The fresco seems totally to disregard the inscription of the ampullae: My Lord and my God' (John 20:29).[281] The closed doors in the right corner are shown as a house-like structure, in a manner similar to the same scene at Sant' Apollinare Nuovo. This is the second instance in which the architecture depicted at Santa Maria Antiqua follows closely that of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo.

---

[276] Nordhagen 1968, 38, pl. CXXIII; inscription 44.
[277] Ibid, 32-33, pl. CXXXIV, IX.
[278] Nordhagen sees traces of a fourth disciple in the left group, bowing or kneeling, whom he identifies with Thomas: ibid, 33.
[279] Ibid, 33; Peter is recognizable "by his short white hair with the characteristic band of curls above the brow".
[280] Ibid, inscription 40.
[281] Monza 9 and Bobbio 9 in Grabar 1958, 25-26, pl. XV and 37, pl. XLII.2 respectively; and British Museum ampulla, Engenmann 1973, pl. 9: c, d.

The Miraculous Draught of Fishes, also known as the Appearance of Christ at the Sea of Tiberias, appears here almost fully developed (fig. 33). One notable difference from other versions of the scene is the absence of the net, which appears both on the earlier mosaic panel of the baptistery of San Giovanni in Naples and in later manuscript illuminations.[282] The left of this panel reveals a number of apostles inside a boat.[283] In Nordhagen's reconstruction nine disciples are depicted. The Gospels of John 21:2 however speaks only of seven, six if we consider that Peter is always depicted in the water. All later examples however depict a variable number of disciples, ranging from two to six.[284] Above the group of disciples a fragmented inscription reads: ✝APOSTO<LI>. Nordhagen distinguishes John in the crowd of the apostles; the latter 'is raising his right hand forward in gesture of speech or exclamation'.[285] In the sea, which is painted blue with white curved lines marking the waves, a swimming figure appears with a damaged inscription over him reading: <P>ETRUS.[286] At the extreme right the lower part of Christ is visible exists. At his feet there is a fish which 'lies on a field of strong yellow and red'.[287] According to Nordhagen this scene contains many characteristics of the fully developed scene: John's gesture of acclamation,[288] Peter swimming and the fish on the coals.[289]

---

[282] See the following eleventh-century manuscripts: Gospels, Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana cod.VI.23, fol. 211[r] in Velmans 1971, fig. 301; Lectionary, Mount Athos, Dionysiou 587, fol. 116[r] in Pelekanides et al. 1973, 434; Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palat.cod.gr.5 in Millet 1960, 573, fig, 608. For the Naples Baptistery, see above.

[283] Nordhagen 1968, 33, pl. XXXV: b.

[284] Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23, depicts four disciples; Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palat.cod.gr.5 depicts six; the mosaic in Monreale portrays only two, Demus 1974 in Millet 1960, pl. 74a.

[285] Ibid, 34. The identification is based on the Gospel of John 21: 7, "Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, 'It is the Lord'".

[286] Ibid, 34.

[287] Ibid, 34. This describes John 21: 9, "When they got out on land, they saw a charcoal fire there, with fish lying on it, and bread".

[288] Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23, Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palat.cod.gr.5, and the mosaic in Monreale however do not portray this gesture.

[289] Ibid, 34. Nordhagen believes that there is a connection between the scene of Christ's Walking on the Water, which appears as early as the third century at Dura-Europos and the Miraculous Draught of Fishes.

However the absence of the net and the irregular number of disciples creates difficulties in arguing that this scene, like Peter and John at the Tomb, provides evidence that Santa Maria Antiqua included the fully developed forms of these scenes before Iconoclasm.[290]

The extensive cycle of appearances finishes with a scene titled by Nordhagen as: 'Appearance, with Christ adored by his apostles'.[291] This scene because of its proximity to the Incredulity of Thomas could represent the Appearance to the Eleven. The surviving wall painting though depicts the disciples in postures of *proskynesis*, something that is not described in the Gospel of John. The Mission of the Apostles is a more likely candidate, since the composite event described in Matthew (28:17), describes the disciples as worshipping him in proskynesis but because of its fragmentary condition, this scene remains open to interpretation.

It should be noted that while the scenes were presented here in chronological fashion, this does not apply to the actual decoration, which follows neither the Gospel narrative nor the liturgical calendar. For example the Road to Emmaus appears at the end of the cycle, when it should have been depicted second. The same applies to the Incredulity of Thomas which follows the Appearance to the Eleven.[292] The configuration, as it will be discussed in chapter three, might be related to the zone of Apostles that appears directly below.

The earliest iconographic cycle of post-Resurrection appearances from the East is known only from a description. Choricius is the author of an *ekphrasis* on the

---

[290] Nordhagen 1968, 93.
[291] Ibid, 35-37.
[292] Further discussion on the decoration of Santa Maria Antiqua will follow on chapter 4.1.

decoration of the church of Saint Sergius at Gaza, which describes very briefly what appears to be a Chairete scene.[293] Choricius' text reads:

> They also set guards next to His tomb, but He, making mock of their guards, regains His immortality and, after appearing to the women about His mother, is borne up to His dwelling place escorted by a heavenly choir.
>
> And so He has not belied the ancient prophets who compass about the central part of the ceiling.[294]

Byzantine *ekphrasis* cannot be relied upon to provide an 'archaeological' description of the object or scene the author describes. In part, this is because any description involves the selection of the details to be included.[295] More importantly however, we should bear in mind that the aim of an *ekphrasis* is not to describe a particular object but rather to convey the effect that the object would have upon the listener.[296] It represents 'a living response to works of art, and one which is perceptual rather than descriptive'.[297]

The details chosen by Choricius to describe the post-Resurrection sequence are evidence of not just one but two post-Resurrection appearances. These details are: the guards, the tomb, and the women. The guards and the tomb are habitually associated with the Maries at the Tomb and not the Chairete. If Choricius is describing an actual

---

[293] Mango 1972, 60 n.25. Grabar believed that the scene described by Choricius is the Maries at the Tomb: Grabar 1972, II: 269

[294] Trans. Mango 1972, 68. The Greek the text reads, "και φύλακας τω τάφω παρακαθίζουσιν, ο δέ τήν φυλακήν αυτοις εις γέλωτα περιστήσας καί τήν αθανασίαν ανακτησάμενος καί ταις αμφί την τεκουσαν φανείς πρός την οικείαν ανάγεται ληξιν ουρανίω χορω προπεμπόμενος και ου διέψευσε τούς πάλαι προφήτας τήν μέσην της οροφης περιτρέχοντας χώραν": Foerster 1929, 21.

[295] Webb 1999, 59-60.

[296] Ibid, 64.

[297] James and Webb 1991, 3.

scene, then it seems that the two scenes are either conflated into one, as in the case of

the Milan ivory, or that Choricius speaks of two distinct scenes in one continuous

narration thus describing the events as if they were unfolding in front of him, a

technique common in *ekphraseis*.[298] If this is the case, then it is possible that not only

the Chairete but also the Maries at the Tomb were depicted in the mosaic decoration

of Saint Sergius.

Dumbarton Oaks, the National Museum in Palermo, the British Museum and the

Walters Art Gallery in Baltimore each possesses one of four similar octagonal gold

rings with scenes from the life of Christ.[299] Dated to the seventh century, these rings

portray an almost identical Christological cycle, apparently inspired by Palestinian

pilgrimage art.[300] With only slight variations the rings depict the following New

Testament scenes: the Annunciation; the Visitation; the Nativity; the Presentation in

the Temple; the Adoration of the Magi; the Baptism; the Crucifixion; the Maries at

the Tomb and the Chairete. The Dumbarton Oaks ring replaces the Maries at the

Tomb with the Chairete. These rings are closely related 'in the number, choice and

configuration of their scenes' to the ampullae at Monza and Bobbio, a silver armband

in Cairo and some bronze censers of Palestinian origin.[301]

On the Baltimore ring, the tomb is surmounted by a cross and is flanked by two

women and the angel. The latter is depicted seated with his right hand raised in a

---

[298] Webb 1999, 64 notes that: "*Ekphraseis* of works of art show a tendency to ignore the static, spatial nature of the painting or mosaic, and to recount the events depicted as if they were unfolding in time".
[299] For the Dumbarton Oaks ring see Weitzmann 1979, no. 446 and Ross 1965, 2: 58-59, no. 69: pls XLIII – IV and colour pl. E. For the other rings and armbands see Engenmann 1973, 5-27: figs. 4-6.
[300] Ross 1965, 59, believed that the Dumbarton Oaks ring was made in Constantinople.
[301] Weitzmann 1979, no. 446. Beside the topographical details on some of the scenes and the restrictions of the topics on subjects related to Palestinian shrines, Engenmann also points out the absence of any Old Testament scenes and Miracles of Christ: Engemann, 1973, 25-26.

gesture of benediction while the woman closest to the tomb holds a censer. The

Palermo ring has the exact same scene, save for the angel who is depicted standing.

The London ring differs from the other two, as it depicts only the angel and the tomb;

probably lack of space prevented the artist from depicting the two women.[302] On the

seventh and last visible face of the Dumbarton Oaks ring (the eighth bears the bezel),

the Chairete appears, following the Crucifixion.[303] Christ is visible on the left, while

two kneeling figures appear on the right. The two trees shown in the background are

probably cypresses and they symbolize the garden. As we have seen the trees had

already made their appearance on the Santa Sabina doors in the fifth century.

Closely connected with the marriage rings is a silver armband of the seventh century

produced somewhere in the eastern Mediterranean. On six of its eight medallions, the

armband reproduces scenes from a Christological cycle similar to the one on the

marriage rings.[304] The scenes are: the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Baptism, the

Crucifixion, the Maries at the Tomb and the Ascension. The other two medallions

depict magical signs and apotropaic acclamations. The scene of the Maries at the

Tomb is identical with the one on the marriage rings apart from the tomb, which is not

surmounted by a cross.

Also dated to the seventh century are two similar bronze censers divided between the

British Museum (fig. 34) and the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts.[305] The censers are

suspended by chains and have a low rimmed base. They are decorated with five

---

[302] The scene of the Maries at the Tomb is the last in the cycle and as such is partly covered by the bezel.
[303] Weitzmann 1979, no. 446; Ross 1965, 58-59, no. 69: pls XLIII – IV and colour pl. E.
[304] Vikan 1982, 41.
[305] For the British Museum censer see Dalton 1911, 620-621: fig. 393-394. For the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts example see Weitzmann 1979, no. 564.

scenes in high relief: the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Baptism, the Crucifixion and

the Maries at the Tomb. The choice of the scenes is reminiscent of that on the

marriage rings and the armband. The scene with the Maries on the British Museum

censer depicts a standing, winged angel, pointing towards a tomb. The latter is made

of tiles, with a domed roof, surmounted with a cross. Two women are represented

next to the tomb; the one closer to it seems to hold a censer. The Virginia example

depicts the Maries at the Tomb, with only one Mary. The angel holds a staff and

points at the tomb's entrance, which is flanked by two columns and has a roof that

curves upwards with two acroteria, similar to the one depicted in the Rabbula

Gospels, which will be discussed shortly.[306]

According to various scholars, the place of origin of the ampullae, the marriage rings

and the amuletic armbands, is Palestine.[307] The most common scenes of the

Palestinian cycle were the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Nativity, the Adoration of

the Magi and Shepherds, the Baptism, the Crucifixion, the Maries at the Tomb and the

Ascension.[308] Some examples included, instead of the Maries, the Incredulity of

Thomas or the Chairete.

The sixth-century Rabbula Gospels portrays a small post-Resurrection cycle, which

covers the lower third of folio 13[r], while the remaining two-thirds depict the

Crucifixion (fig. 35).[309] The scenes that comprise the post-Resurrection cycle are: the

---

[306] Ibid, no. 564.

[307] Engemann 1973, 25-26; Vikan 1982, 20 and 40-43; Ross 1962, no.87, 71-72; Ross 1965, no 69, 58-59, pl. XLIII. The latter, as noted earlier, believed that the Dumbarton Oaks gold marriage ring was of Constantinopolitan origin.

[308] Grabar 1958, 68; Kartsonis 1986, 101, note 18 compares the scenes that appear in various media, such as ampullae, rings, censers and reliquaries.

[309] Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.I.56, Cecchelli 1959. For the Syrian origin of the manuscript see Mundell-Mango 1983.

Maries at the Tomb, the tomb with rays of light coming from it and the Chairete. The miniaturist drew his inspiration from the Gospel of Matthew.[310] This is apparent from the fact that only two women are depicted in the Maries scene and also by the subsequent scene of the Chairete, described only in the Gospel of Matthew 28: 8-10.

Depicted in the left corner is Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (Matth. 28: 1), identifiable by the following scene of the Chairete and from the Crucifixion, respectively. The Virgin, but not the Magdalene, is portrayed with a halo. A winged angel is depicted sitting on the tomb's entrance-stone, which he removed seconds before (Matth. 28: 2). In the middle of the scene the tomb is depicted with rays of light coming out of it. The tomb is a free standing building with its entrance flanked by two columns with capitals, while two acroteria appear on its pediment. The structure is closer to Roman-Hellenistic models than to the Constantinian rotunda. The guards are presented here as shaken by the angels' presence, whose appearance 'was like lightning and his raiment white as snow' (Matth. 28: 3-4). In the right corner the Chairete appears (Matth. 28: 9-10). Here Christ is depicted making a gesture of benediction to the two kneeling women. These are the two Maries of the previous scene, identifiable by their clothing.

Kartsonis sees in the tomb exploding with light an early attempt to fill in the iconographical vacuum left by the lack of knowledge about Christ's actual moment of resurrection.[311] However, the Gospel narrative does provide us with an explanation. The rays of light could be easily explained by the Gospel narrative as the angel's act of removing the tomb's entrance or even as part of his appearance at the scene,

---

[310] The miniatures fit logically into a systematic Christological cycle that confirms the present order of binding, thus they were an integral part of the book finished in 586: Wright 1973, 203 and 207.
[311] Kartsonis 1986, 21.

something that is enhanced by the soldiers' reactions (Matth. 28: 2-4).[312] Since the

Gospel of Matthew is the only one to describe these events and also the Chairete and

the Maries that flank the scene, it becomes apparent that what is described by

Kartsonis as the exploding tomb is in fact part of a continuous narrative inspired by

the Gospel of Matthew. Kartsonis also believes that the overcoming of the guards is

connected with the actual moment of Christ's resurrection.[313] However, various

homilies make it clear that the guards were scared by the presence of the angel and

not by Christ's resurrection, the time of which remained unknown.[314] Gregory, bishop

of Antioch (†593), in his oration titled 'On the Myrrh-bearers', provides us with an

explanation.[315] In one of many fictional dialogues based on quotations from the

Gospel narrative, Christ, who in the meantime had been resurrected, orders the angel

to inform the 'faithful and brave women' of his resurrection and also to scare off the

guards.[316] Finally according to Severos of Antioch, nobody knew the exact moment of

Christ's resurrection.[317]

The angel's presence at the tomb served to demonstrate the emptiness of the tomb to

the women; Christ needed no assistance from the angel as he had already left the

tomb. Isidoros Pelusiotes (†450), in an epistle written to a deacon named Theodosius

and titled 'On Christ's Resurrection' explained exactly that.[318] Isidoros elucidated

---

[312] "And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men", Matth. 28: 2-4.

[313] Kartsonis 1986, 22. See also Cecchelli 1959, 70.

[314] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis X: On "and in one Lord, Jesus Christ"* in Yarnold 2000, 60. See also Eusebios bishop of Emessa, *Explanatory fragments from the N. T.* in PG 86.1, col. 549;

[315] PG 88, col. 1847-1866.

[316] This shows exactly how the author elaborates on the Gospel narrative, i.e. Matth. 28: 4, "And for fear of him the keepers did shake and became as dead men" becomes in Christ's words "Appear to the keepers fearsome". Ibid, col. 1856-1857.

[317] Severos of Antioch, *Cathedral Homilies*, PO 16, col. 798.

[318] PG 78, col. 409.

some of the events that took place on Easter morning including the angel's presence at

the tomb. By the time the angel had moved the stone from the tomb, says Isodoros,

Christ had already been resurrected, and thus the angel was not there to assist Christ

but to verify the resurrection to the women.[319] Hesychios of Jerusalem, an almost

contemporary source, repeated the same idea in a homily on Easter, where he

explicitly stated that Christ was risen without the aid of the angels.[320]

The Chairete on the Rabbula Gospels occupies the lower right-hand side of the page

and its only divergence from the biblical account rests in the Virgin's appearance in

the scene.[321] The latter can be securely identified from the Crucifixion and Maries

scenes, where only she is depicted with a halo and wears the same clothes.[322] Next to

her is Mary Magdalene, which means that the artist perceived the Virgin as the 'other

Mary' of the Gospels.[323] The background of this scene is filled with trees, reminiscent

of the Santa Sabina door, and the proximity of this scene to the tomb reminds us of

the fourth-century sarcophagi discussed above. Christ appears on the left, moving

towards the two women; he is wearing a tunic with a chiton on top, and sandals, and

makes a gesture of blessing with his right hand, while with the other he holds the

---

[319] Ibid, col. 409 where he adds that angels obey only God.

[320] Hesychios, *Second Homily on Easter* SC 187, Aubineau (ed.) 1972, 124 and note 37, with further examples.

[321] The Virgin does not visit the tomb in the canonical Gospels, but we know that such a tradition was active in Syria and Palestine in the sixth century (see next chapter). Furthermore the miniaturist was influenced by John (19: 17-37) in the image of the Crucifixion, as this Evangelist is the only one to mention the Virgin under the cross. Additionally, John is the only one to mention the incident with the Roman centurion piercing Christ's side. In my opinion the impact of John's account must be seen in the light of adding the Virgin in the subsequent post-Resurrection events. The Virgin is not mentioned in the post-Resurrection cycle, but if she appears in the scene of the Crucifixion then was probably seen as 'natural' to show her participation in the subsequent events. A detailed discussion follows in chapter 2.1.

[322] For the Virgin as part of the post-Resurrection sequence see Breckenridge 1957, 9-32.

[323] Matth. 28: 1. An idea already expressed in the fourth century by John Chrysostom *On Holy Easter and on the Resurrection*, *Oratio* II PG 46: col. 633: 'Thus the other Mary, I (we) believe that she is the birth-giver of God'.

chiton. The two women are depicted kneeling at Christ's feet, with the Virgin in the foreground.

On a pre-Iconoclastic icon from Sinai that depicts the Chairete (fig. 10), the Mary in the foreground, bending to touch Christ's foot, is the Magdalene, while the Mary in the background in an upright position is the Virgin. The latter is identified by an inscription that reads 'Holy Mary', which means that the prostrating figure is the Magdalene. Depicting the Virgin standing when the Gospels make explicit that both women knelt in Christ's presence might suggest that the artist wanted to demonstrate the difference between the Mother of God and the Magdalene. This is also evident in the Rabbula Gospels, where only she, Christ and the angel are depicted haloed. After Iconoclasm, the postures of the Magdalene and the Virgin were reversed.[324]

The Chairete however was less popular in pilgrimage art than either the Incredulity or the Maries. This could be explained by the fact that while the Maries were commemorated in the Anastasis church and the Incredulity of Thomas in the house where this appearance took place,[325] there was no tangible site connected with the Chairete. The vague description in Matthew (28: 9) that this appearance took place in an unspecified point between Christ's tomb and Jerusalem never resulted in the establishment of a shrine. Later representations of the Chairete scene tend to include trees and a rough landscape, which might have been influenced by the Gospel of John, which describes the Noli me Tangere, an event similar to the Chairete. This took place in the garden where the sepulchre was located, something that is also evidenced by the fact that Mary Magdalene confused Christ with the gardener (John 20: 15).

---

[324] See the discussion in chapter 4.2.2.
[325] For Thomas' church see Grabar 1972, 190.

Nevertheless, in the architectural complex of the Anastasis church, the garden of the

Gospels had its own area. According to Cyril of Jerusalem the atrium of the Anastasis

church was the 'garden', exactly because the sepulchre was inside the church.[326]

However there is no evidence of any liturgical attributes attached to the atrium-

garden, but rather the Chairete was commemorated in a brief ceremony that took

place inside the Anastasis. This is evident from the manuscript Jerusalem Patriarchate,

Hagios Stauros (AD 1122), which, according to Bertonière, is of capital importance in

the history of the Jerusalem liturgy.[327] According to this manuscript, the patriarch

entered the sepulchre before the canon, while the myrophoroi (Myrrh-bearers) wait

outside. As he emerged he greeted the myrophoroi by saying: 'All hail. Christ is

Risen'.[328] This brief ceremony was clearly inspired by the Chairete (Matth. 28: 9).[329]

The role that the Chairete played in the liturgy of Easter compensated for the lack of a

shrine dedicated solely to this event. As noted earlier, the absence of a shrine might

explain why the scene was not popular amongst the examples of pilgrimage art. The

Chairete is depicted in the Rabbula Gospels and on the Sinai icon – both products of

Syro-Palestine – which attests to the familiarity of the scene in Holy Land, but not in

artefacts that were conceived as pilgrim's souvenirs. [330]

In this chapter it was discussed how Rome never followed the iconographic scheme

based on the Loca Sancta and its shrines, but rather developed a distinct taste for

---

[326] *Catecheses XIV*, PG 33, col. 829.
[327] Bertonière 1972, 14. The manuscript probably reflects older practices and when it was copied in 1122, 'it was no longer a document destined for real use, but rather as something to be preserved in the archives', ibid 13.
[328] Bertonière 1972, 95.
[329] Ibid, 95.
[330] The possibility also exists that this icon could have been produced elsewhere and brought to the monastery by pilgrims or traveling artists whose steady influx is visible even in the period of the Arabic conquest: Brubaker and Haldon, 2001, 60.

experimentation; not one post-Resurrection scene is identical with another, in any media, something that it cannot be said about the arts of Palestine. The limited number of examples from the Holy Land that are not connected directly with pilgrimage art – the church of Saint Sergius at Gaza, the Rabbula Gospels and the Sinai icon – show some unique characteristics such as the inclusion of the Virgin in the post-Resurrection sequence, or a tomb independent from the shrine of Constantine. This suggests that when talking about the arts of Palestine, we ought to distinguish the mass-produced pilgrimage art from the rest.

From the afore-mentioned discussion, it also became apparent that both East and West represented the post-Resurrection appearances in an amazing variety of media, from ivory carvings and marble relief to mosaics and wall paintings, and from wooden panels to icons. Many iconographic characteristics were common to different media, which might suggest a common source of inspiration, one such example was the sepulchre of Christ. The persistence with which artists both Eastern and Western depict Christ's tomb as the Constantinian edifice is not difficult to explain. We need only to take into consideration the popularity the shrine had in Late Antiquity and Middle Ages. Beside the ampullae, small replicas of the Holy Sepulchre are scattered throughout Europe, along with real life structures inspired by the shrine.[331] The continuous flux of pilgrims kept the memory alive, while their detailed descriptions and drawings could have provided the prototype for the artists.[332]

The influences on the post-Resurrection appearances, ranged from New Testament quotations, such as Romans (6:3-4) that related the scenes to baptism, to exegetical

---

[331] Biddle 1994, 73-147; Wilkinson 1972, 83-97. A more detail account on the evolution of the Holy Sepulchre and its influence over the Maries at the Tomb iconography will follow in separate chapter.
[332] Wilkinson 1977 with various pilgrims' descriptions and drawings.

works that provided an explanation to the significance of the Miraculous Draught of Fishes in a baptismal context. Pagan Roman art provided another source of inspiration especially for the surviving Italian examples. One such example is the angel in the Maries at the Tomb. The latter appears behind the tomb on the Saint Celse sarcophagus in a manner close to a Roman Eros, but gradually changes from the 'man in white' (Mark 16: 5) on the Munich ivory or the standing fearsome winged creature on the Santa Sabina doors, to the more relaxed portrayal of Sant' Apollinare and the ampullae. Also Christ's posture in the Incredulity of Thomas on the afore-mentioned sarcophagus was short-lived. His depiction in the posture of a wounded Amazon may have aroused strong objections which might explain why only one example survives.

Sant' Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna illustrated how Western artists were not simple copyists of Eastern examples but rather made an eclectic selection of those motifs that would have made sense to their audience. The exclusion of such details as the aedicule, also not depicted on the ivories, and the Gospel book that Christ's holds in his hand in the Incredulity, show that what made sense to the Palestinian viewer and to those who had visited the Holy Land was not of any particular interest to the artists in the West. These details indicate the importance of local preferences, or even the affiliation of a work of art with a geographical area and this ultimately leads to how the viewers' perception of a work of art helped shape its iconography.

This formative period demonstrates not the inadequacy of the post-Resurrection appearances to depict the resurrection but rather the chameleonic attributes that helped the scenes flourish as visual synonyms of the resurrection. In the following chapter, the impact of theological literature will be examined, regarding the Virgin's

participation in the post-Resurrection narrative. The reasons for this inclusion and the

'rivalry' between her and the most important figure of the post-Resurrection narrative,

namely Mary Magdalene, will be analyzed in two separate subchapters.

CHAPTER 2: The Virgin and the Magdalene as Myrrh-bearers.

In the previous chapter during the analysis of the Palestinian evidence, a 'discrepancy' occurred regarding the Virgin's participation in the post-Resurrection narrative. The latter is not mentioned as being one of the women visiting Christ's tomb on Easter morning; nevertheless, the Virgin was identified as the 'other Mary'. A closer reading of the Gospels demonstrates that the 'other Mary' was Mary the mother of James and Joses and not the Virgin. In the first subchapter I will discuss the reasons for the Virgin's inclusion in the post-Resurrection narrative, and its subsequent representation in the scenes of the Maries at the Tomb and the Chairete. In doing so, a relation between artistic production and current theological trends, as they appear in orations, sermons, hymns and the apocryphal literature will be examined. This will ultimately demonstrate how theology and art interacted.

The Magdalene's presence in the post-Resurrection narrative is well attested by all four Gospels, where she features by and large as the most important individual. In contrast, the Virgin's participation is diminutive as she only appears in John 19: 25, at the Crucifixion.[333] The Virgin, however, could not have been absent from Christ's resurrection, and thus from one of the most important soteriological concepts of Christianity. Whether it was the Magdalene's pre-eminence or the ascending importance of the Virgin that eventually forced the latter's insertion into the post-Resurrection narrative, will be examined in the second subchapter. Here follows an exhaustive survey of all available pre-Iconoclast theological sources combined with all the surviving artistic evidence.

---

[333] See for example Table I.

2.1: The Virgin in the post-Resurrection Appearances of Christ in the Period before the Iconoclasm.

The earliest reference to the post-Resurrection appearances of Christ comes from the first epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.[334] Peculiarly enough this catalogue excludes any female presence, thus contrasting with the canonical Gospels where the Myrrh-bearers play a prominent role.[335] Paul also mentions that Peter was the first to see Christ resurrected, while in the Gospels, Mary Magdalene and the 'other Mary' are the individuals who see Christ first.[336] The patristic literature predominately followed the Gospel narrative and only very few comparisons were made between the Gospels accounts and Paul's epistle.[337]

Both pagans and Manicheans attacked the credibility of the Gospel narrative by stressing the discrepancies between the four evangelists.[338] This forced many ecclesiastical authors to respond by trying to harmonise the Gospel narrative and especially the post-Resurrection sequence within which many details vary.[339] The

[334] I Cor. 15: 3-9. According to Weiss 1983, 36, this is probably the "oldest and only real catalogue".
[335] The absence of any female account in Paul's list could be justified by his Jewish background, where women were not legal witnesses. The possibility also exists that Paul was not aware of the tradition of the empty tomb. For both arguments see Mánek 1958. Based on I Cor. 14: 34-35, it is argued that Paul was a misogynist: "Let your women keep silence in the churches for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the law. And if they will learn anything let them ask their husbands at home". The authenticity of this verse is still disputed and as Lüdemann 1996, 86-89, has commented: "this passage could be an addition from the pen of 'orthodox' disciples of Paul who have introduced the views of later times into I Corinthians".
[336] Mathew 28: 8-10; Mark 16: 9-11 and John 20: 11-18.
[337] One such occasion in which the Gospel's account and Paul's epistle are fused comes from John Chrysostom in an oration on the Ascension, PG 52, 773-792 and especially 782-783, where he enlists eleven of Christ's post-Resurrection appearances including those from the I Cor. 15: 3-9. His example is followed by Photios in the *Amphilochia*, PG 101, 46-1172, a series of question and answers and by Josephus in his *Book of Annotations*, PG 106, 169-170 where the author enumerates just ten appearances, excluding the Appearance to the Seventy (O´).
[338] See for example *Against Celsus* a treatise written by Origen as a response to the accusations of a pagan philosopher name Celsus, Chadwick 1980.
[339] For example the number of women and the time of their visit, as well as the number of angels (or men in white) they had witnessed.

harmonisation of the four Gospels was a practice that dated from the second century

as illustrated by the *Diatessaron* of Tatian (†172).[340] Treatises were also written on

this subject and on many occasions they formed part of sermons and orations

delivered on Easter.[341]

The harmonizing process compressed all the events of the post-Resurrection narrative

into one continuous chronological narrative. This basically implied that the four

Gospels described different groups of women, visiting Christ's tomb on different

times and seeing a variable number of angels. One of the problems that arose in the

harmonizing process was the Magdalene's presence. The latter is described as being

part of every group of women that visited Christ's tomb on Easter morning and thus,

according to Gregory of Nyssa, she was the only individual who had witnessed the

empty tomb four times and seen Christ resurrected twice.[342] Other ecclesiastical

authors chose to speak of two or even three Maries of Magdala.[343] While Mary

Magdalene plays a predominant role in the events, the Virgin seems to be completely

absent. This void was filled by the ecclesiastical fathers and the apocrypha.

One such apocryphal source of Coptic origins, is the so-called *Book of the*

Resurrection of Jesus Christ, by Bartholomew the Apostle, variously dated between

---

[340] For the text see Hamlyn Hill 1894. This early harmonisation could have influenced later endeavours.

[341] For example, Severos of Antioch (6th c.) *Homily Seventy-seven* in PO 16, Kugener and Triffaux (eds.) 1922, 794-861. Other ecclesiastical authors engaged to the harmonisation endeavour were Eusebios of Caesarea (ca.260-ca.340), *A Selection of Questions and Answers to Marinos*, PG 22 col.937-976; Augustine of Hippo (354-430), *Harmony of the Gospels*, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, 6, 65-236; Ammonios, presbyter of Alexandria (5th c.), *Exposition of the Gospel of Saint John*, PG 85, col.1392-1522; Hesychios, presbyter of Jerusalem (5th c.), *Questions and Answers*, PG 93, col.1392-1448; Victor of Capua (6th c.), *Sources on Christ's Resurrection*, in Pitra 1852, 1, LIV.

[342] Severos of Antioch *Homily Seventy-seven* in PO 16, Kugener and Triffaux (eds.) 1922, 794-861, for further discussion see below and also Table II.

[343] Eusebios, Ammonios, and Victor speak of two, while Hesychios speaks of three; for references see above and also the discussion on the Magdalene that follows.

the fourth and seventh centuries.[344] According to the author, a group of women visited

Christ's tomb on Easter morning; these were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of

James, Salome, Mary and Martha, Susannah (other manuscripts mention Joanna),

Berenice and Leah.[345] While this catalogue does not mention the Virgin, the latter

appears to lead the group of women when they arrive at the tomb.[346] Upon their

arrival the Virgin engages the gardener Philogenes in a dialogue (in the canonical

Gospels the gardener is Christ); the latter replies by addressing the Virgin both as

'holy Virgin' and 'the mother of the Christ'.[347]

As soon as their dialogue finishes Christ makes his appearance among them and

addresses the Virgin as 'Mary the mother of the Son of God' to which she replies

'The Son of the Almighty, and Master, and my Son'.[348] The vocabulary that follows

and especially the epithets ascribed to the Virgin by Christ are particularly important,

as they provide us with an insight of the author's devotion to the Virgin:

> Hail, My mother. Hail, My holy ark. Hail, thou who hast sustained the life of
>
> the whole world. Hail, My holy garment, wherein I arrayed Myself. Hail, My
>
> water-pot, which is full of holy water. Hail, My mother, My house, My place
>
> of abode. Hail, My mother, My city, My place of refuge.[349]

This phraseology, even though it comes from an apocryphal source, resembles in

various instances the Orthodox position. The appellation 'mother' finds its earliest

---

[344] Wallis Budge 1913. The apocryphal gospel is dated in the fourth century, while some parts could be even earlier. James 1924, 186, dates the gospel between the fifth and seventh centuries. Schneemelcher also agrees with this chronology, Wilson 1973, 485.

[345] The catalogue contains all the canonical women and also a number of other women whose names are fictitious e.g. Berenice and Leah, whom the author of the apocryphal text relates to Christ's ministry. Leah for example is the name given to the Widow of Nain (Luke 7-11).

[346] It is difficult to explain how the Virgin appeared in the narrative and why the author did not mention her before as part of the group.

[347] Wallis Budge 1913, 188

[348] Ibid, 188.

[349] Ibid, 189-190.

visual parallel in the Roman catacombs.[350] The appellation *Theotokos* was sanctioned

by the Council of Ephesos (431), while the appellation *Mētēr Theou* (Mother of God)

became increasingly popular in the period after Iconoclasm.[351] However it should be

noted that the apocryphon does not actually address the Virgin as mother of God

(*Mētēr Theou*), but rather as the mother of the son of God.

Furthermore parallels may be drawn between the appellations of the Virgin in the

Akathistos Hymn and the apocryphon:

> a) Hail, since you bear him who bears all (Akathistos).[352]
>
> a) Hail, thou who hast sustained the life of the whole world (Apocryphon).[353]
>
> b) Hail recalling of fallen Adam (Akathistos).[354]
>
> b) Hail the ark of the sons of Adam (Apocryphon).[355]
>
> c) Hail thou who didst sustain the Life of the Universe in thy Womb
>
> (Akathistos).[356]
>
> c) Hail, womb of the divine Incarnation (Apocryphon).[357]

Beside these verses, other words such as ark, treasure and house are common in both

works, which does not necessarily imply dependence of one over the other but rather

that they are the product of the same period. The apocryphon is now dated to the fifth

---

[350] Kalavrezou 1990, 165 argues that, while one cannot be absolutely certain, it is likely that the female figure holding a child in the catacomb of Priscilla is most probably the Virgin.

[351] Kalavrezou 1990, 172.

[352] Peltomaa 2001, 4-5, strophe 1: 13.

[353] Wallis Budge 1913, 190. The idea of the Virgin as a container of the uncontainable was very popular in the fifth century and it appears in Ephrem the Syrian, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodotos of Ancyra, Basil of Seleucia and other. For further discussion and bibliography see Peltomaa 2001, 136-139.

[354] Peltomaa 2001, 4-5, strophe 1: 8.

[355] Wallis Budge 1913, 190. The apocryphon though fails to grasp the soteriological message of the Akathistos verse, which encapsulates the belief that the Virgin is the second Eve who redeems the humankind and restores it to its pre-fall condition.

[356] Peltomaa 2001, 4-5, strophe 1: 15.

[357] Wallis Budge 1913, 190. Christ followed by the Father and the Holy Ghost, bless the womb of the Virgin; ibid, 191.

and sixth centuries, and no later than the seventh,[358] while the Akathistos is dated

between the fifth and sixth centuries.[359] By using the afore-mentioned vocabulary the

author of the apocryphon is keen to praise the Virgin. He also goes a step further and

substitutes the Virgin for the Magdalene, placing the former in the post-Resurrection

narrative and the Noli me Tangere episode in particular. The disregard of the Gospel

narrative is according to James typical of other Coptic apocrypha.[360]

Another apocryphal work of Coptic origins is the *Discourse on Mary Theotokos by

Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem*.[361] At some point in the narrative the Virgin describes

how Christ appeared to her after the resurrection: 'And I went to the tomb, and He

appeared unto me, and He spake unto me, saying, 'Go and inform My brethren what

things ye have seen. Let those whom my father hath loved come to Galilee'.[362] The

inspiration is taken from the Gospel of Matthew since it is the only Gospel that

combines an appearance to the Maries (the Chairete) with the command to inform the

disciples about the meeting in Galilee.[363] However the Virgin here is not accompanied

by Mary Magdalene. The latter's absence may be an indication of a conscious

decision by the author to suppress the Magdalene's role. This will become clearer

below and also in chapter five, where the 'friction' between the Virgin and the

Magdalene, regarding the latter's pre-eminence in the post-Resurrection narrative,

---

[358] See above note 330.

[359] Peltomaa 2001, 40-48 summarises the various theories on the authorship and date of the Akathistos and 66 where she argues for a more precise date based on the salutations used in the text. This was the period of the Nestorian controversy which according to Peltomaa prompted the exaltations of Mary, expressed in encomia, exclamations and salutations. This interest is also reflected by the fact that in the apocryphon the hymns, blessings, salutations and prayers occupy a large part of the text.

[360] James 1924, 186; James also adds that the author's preoccupation with the hymns, blessings, salutations and prayers is visible by the fact that they occupy a large part of the text.

[361] Wallis Budge 1915.

[362] Breckenridge 1957, 11.

[363] Matth. 28: 10

surfaces in the writings of George of Nicomedia, Euthymios Zigadenos and in a lesser extent in Joseph the Hymnographer's hymns.

Another piece of information comes from the opening lines of this text where the Virgin says:

> My father was Joachim, which is interpreted, 'Kleopa'. My mother was Anna, who brought me forth, and who was usually called 'Mariam'. I am Mary Magdalene, because the name of the village wherein I was born was 'Magdala'. My name is 'Mary, who belongeth to Kleopa'. I am Mary who belongeth to Iakkobos (James), the son of Joseph the carpenter, into whose charge they committed me.[364]

It becomes immediately apparent that the author tries to justify the Virgin's absence from the post-Resurrection narrative of the canonical Gospels by identifying her as all the following: Mary Magdalene, Mary of Kleopas and Mary the mother of James and Joses. A similar action was taken by the author of the previous apocryphon where the Magdalene was replaced by the Virgin.[365]

Here, the identification of the Virgin creates more problems than it solves. The Virgin could not have been Mary Magdalene, Mary of Kleopas and Mary the Mother of James, as these women are specifically mentioned by the evangelists as distinct individuals. It is likely that the author of the apocryphon knew that this identification was obscure; so what reasons have prompted this explanation? Was it out of tremendous zeal, a zeal that overshadowed any logical explanation? Or was the author summing up various theories? The answer is probably a mixture of both and even

---

[364] Breckenridge 1957, note 8.

[365] Ephraim the Syrian (ca.306-373) in his writings also fails to distinguish between Mary the Virgin and Mary Magdalene, Gambero 1999, 115 note 21.

though the fusion of all the Maries into the Virgin had no later imitators, her identification as Mary the mother of James and Joses had found its way into fourth-century mainstream theology.

A good example is provided by John Chrysostom (344-407). In his *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*, the author identifies the Virgin as 'Mary the mother of James and Joses'.[366] While commenting on Matthew 27: 55-56,[367] regarding the women who witnessed the Crucifixion, the author suddenly asks: 'Who were they? His mother, whom we believe is the Mary of James and the others'.[368] Chrysostom here does not comment on the post-Resurrection appearance of Christ but on the Crucifixion. Thus his deduction could simply follow that of the Gospel of John where the Virgin is described as being under the cross (19: 25-27). It should also be noted that in the following verses that describe the burial and resurrection of Christ, no connection is made between 'Mary the mother of James and Joses' (27: 56) whom Chrysostom identified earlier as the Virgin and the 'other Mary' (Matth. 27: 61 and 28: 1). The absence is curious, especially when the connection between the two is a logical deduction from Matthew as the only 'other Mary' was 'Mary the mother of James and Joses'. In my opinion two possibilities exist: that the author believed that these were two distinct individuals; and/or that he did not intend to elaborate on the Virgin's presence in the post-Resurrection narrative.[369]

---

[366] PG 57-58, col.13-794

[367] Matth. 27: 55-56: "And many women were there beholding afar off, which followed the Jesus from Galilee, ministering unto him. Among which was Mary Magdalene and Mary mother of James and Joses, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee".

[368] PG 58, col.777.

[369] Breckenridge 1957, 13 agrees with the latter view: 'The fathers of the church first touched upon the matter from its periphery'.

Another point made by Chrysostom is that the women will be the first to see Christ

resurrected: 'And they will first see Christ <resurrected>,[370] and the gender mostly

reproached, will be the first to receive the blessings of this vision'.[371] Immediately

after this verse, follows the verse of the identification of the Virgin with the 'other

Mary'. This could be either a coincidence or an intentional effort to place the Virgin

in the post-Resurrection sequence. The latter though, seems more plausible, since the

parallelism between the Virgin and Eve had a long history in theological exegesis.

Chrysostom, as we have seen above, mentions nothing of the Virgin in the following

verses where he describes the Maries at the Tomb and the Chairete. The absence of

any further explanation could be ascribed also to the fact that the purpose of this

commentary was not solely to explain the Gospel of Matthew but also to tackle issues

of everyday life. For example, Chrysostom after describing the Maries at the Tomb

and the Chairete finds the opportunity to criticise those women who overdress and

wear excessive jewellery[372] and on the occasion of the bribing of the guards (Matth.

28: 11-15), the author attacks those who spend their time gathering wealth.[373] The

reality however remains that Chrysostom did not elaborate on his idea.

We move now from golden mouth (Chrysostom) to golden discourse (Chrysologos),

as Peter Chrysologos (ca.380-ca.450) was titled by his ninth-century biographer,

Agnellus of Ravenna. In a sermon on Christ's resurrection, Peter associated the other

---

[370] Giannelli 1953, 108 in his French translation added the word "ressuscité" after that of "Christ". Breckernridge 1957, 13 note14 believes that Giannelli had "overstepped the bound of prudence in emending Chrysostom's text". In my opinion Giannellis' addition of the word "ressuscité" is only natural for two reasons; firstly is based on the fact that Chrysostom comments on the final chapters of Mathew and is only natural to imply that the women will see Christ resurrected and secondly the same explanation in this context is given by many other contemporary and later authors.

[371] PG 58, col. 777: "Καί αυται πρωται ορωσι τόν Ιησουν και το μάλιστα γένος κατακριθέν τουτο πρωτον απολάβει της των αγαθων θεωρίας". This was a common view among the theologians; for further discussion, see below.

[372] PG 58, col. 783-788; the author spends quite some time attacking the use of gold jewels.

[373] Ibid, col. 790: "Μέχρι πότε δουλοι χρημάτων;" In English: "For how long will you be slaves of money?".

Mary with the Virgin: ''the other Mary' (Matth. 28: 1) came. The name is that of the

mother of Christ; that is, the mother came, the woman came, so that she who had

become the mother of the dying might become the mother of the living.'[374] By

identifying the Virgin as one of the Myrrh-bearers, Peter has to explain that her visit

to the tomb was not the result of lapsed faith: 'Mary and Mary came to see the tomb;

do you understand that they came to see the Lord, but to see the tomb? For they really

believed that the Lord was already risen'.[375] Clearly by including the Virgin as one of

the Myrrh-bearers the theologian had to justify the acquisition of myrrh. If the women

had truly believed in Christ's resurrection then there was no need to buy myrrh. Peter

bypasses the problem by saying that they did not come to see Christ but rather the

sepulchre.[376] Peter's reading of the visit of the two Maries at the tomb as a visit to the

sepulchre had no later imitators, as opposed to his identification of the Virgin with the

'other Mary'.

An identification similar to those of Chrysostom and Peter was made by Severos, the

sixth-century monophysite Patriarch of Antioch in his seventy-seventh homily

delivered in 515.[377] In this homily Severos dealt with the discrepancies of the Gospel

narrative regarding the post-Resurrection events. This oration is attributed in various

manuscripts to Gregory of Nyssa and to Hesychios, but a Coptic fragment had settled

the authorship on Severos.[378] After commenting on the Chairete and on why the

---

[374] Peter Chrysologos, *Sermo LXXIV*: *De Resurrectione Christi*, PL 52, col. 409; for the English translation see Gambero 1999, 299 and also *The Fathers of the Church* 110, 124.
[375] PL 52, col. 413 and in Gambero 1999, 299.
[376] 'The sight of the tree had deceived her <Eve>; the sight of the sepulchre was to restore her <womankind>', says Peter *The Fathers of the Church* 110, 125
[377] Severos of Antioch, *On the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ* in PO 16, Kugener and Triffaux 1922, 794-861; for the date see the introduction, ibid 771. For a recent study on Severos see also Allen and Hayward 2004, and 49 for the date.
[378] PO 16, 769. For the Coptic fragment see Voicu 1992, 385-6. I am indebted to Dr. Mary Cunningham and Prof. Pauline Allen for their assistance in the identification of the afore-mentioned homily.

women were the first to see Christ resurrected, Severos moves a step further to identify the 'other Mary' with the Virgin: 'The other Mary, I believe to be the Theotokos'.[379] Severos explains his identification by saying that if the Virgin was under the cross during the Crucifixion (John 19: 25) it was only natural for her to be part of the resurrection. The author added that the Virgin, who was the source of joy, should be the one who brings the joy to the disciples. Severos also drew a parallel between the 'All Hail' spoken by Christ to the two Maries (Matth. 28: 9) and the 'Hail' of the Angel in the Annunciation: 'Hail, thou that art highly favoured, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women' (Luke 1: 28). The difference between Chrysostom and Peter, on the one hand, and Severos, on the other, is that the latter's identification placed the Virgin directly in the Chairete scene. Furthermore Severos, unlike Chrysostom, elaborated further on the subject producing the interesting connection between the Annunciation and the Chairete, and also repeated his identification a few lines later, where he mentioned that the Magdalene was accompanied by the Virgin.[380]

The three authors however share a common element in their writings. Severos, like Chrysostom and Peter Chrysologos, before identifying the Virgin as the 'other Mary', drew a comparison between the women and original sin.[381] It is not a coincidence that in these patristic examples the association is followed by an identification of the Virgin as one of the Myrrh-bearers. The latter by becoming the messengers of the resurrection redeemed Eve and all women from the original sin. This connection

---

[379] Ibid, col.633; notice here the use of the term Theotokos by Severos.

[380] Ibid, col.633.

[381] Ibid, col.632. Peter Chrysologos states: 'She who had taken perfidy away from paradise hurries to take faith from the tomb; she, who had snatched death from the hands of life, hastens to snatch life from the hands of death', *Sermo LXXIV: De Resurrectione Christi*, PL 52, col. 409. For an English translation and discussion see Gambero 1999, 299.

between the Myrrh-bearers and the Fall features frequently in the patristic literature from the fourth century onwards, whilst an association between the Virgin and Eve appears as early as the second century.[382] This association may be another reason why the fathers of the Church identified the Virgin as one of the Myrrh-bearers.

One of the earliest references to an association between the Myrrh-bearers and Eve is found in the works of Athanasios of Alexandria (296-373). Athanasios' bishopric, Alexandria was the undisputed religious capital of Egypt and it bore the legacy of such great philosophers as Philo and Origen whose importance rested in the fact that they employed allegorical and philosophical methods in their interpretation of the Bible.[383] In this environment, Athanasios composed his works, including the sermon *On Holy Easter*.[384] According to the author, Christ appeared to the Maries because: 'A woman was the cause for the loss of paradise but now she brings the good tidings of the resurrection; she pulled the first Adam to the fall but now she announces the resurrection of the second Adam'.[385] Eve was the cause of humanity's fall but the Maries, by becoming the bearers of the good tidings of the resurrection, redeemed her and all women.

An echo of Athanasios' explanation is also found in a treatise of Ambrose of Milan (ca.340-397) dedicated to the Holy Spirit. Here Ambrose explains how Mary, by becoming the messenger of the resurrection to the Apostles, loosened the hereditary

---

[382] The earliest reference appears in Justin Martyr (†165) in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, PG 6, cols. 709-712 in Williams 1930, and the first elaboration comes from Irenaeus of Lyon (†202) in his treatise *Against Heretics*, Ante Nicene Library 5. For a thorough discussion see Gambero 1999, passim.
[383] Pettersen 1995, 1-18.
[384] Athanasios of Alexandria, *On Holy Easter and to the Newly-baptized on Saturday Sermon*, PG 28, cols. 1081-1094.
[385] Ibid, col.1084.

bond and 'the huge offence of womankind'.[386] The author however refers only to Mary Magdalene and the Noli me Tangere.[387] Gregory of Nazianzos (329-ca.390) also preferred Magdalene to the two Maries in his forty-fifth oration dedicated to Easter.[388] Both authors' decision to use the Noli me Tangere instead of the Chairete is likely based on the fact that is much easier to set a parallel between Eve and one woman, Mary Magdalene, than with the two Maries of the Chairete.[389]

It was the Virgin, though, who assumed the title of the second Eve and not the Magdalene. Thus Chrysostom and Severos, by placing the Virgin in the post-Resurrection narrative, apparently did so in order not only to show that the Virgin could not have been absent from Christ's most important ministry but also to enhance the argument that it was the Virgin who was the second Eve and not the Magdalene. John Chrysostom makes this explicit in the sermon *On Holy Easter*.[390] Chrysostom explains that the symbols of the Fall – 'virginity, wood and death' – had become the symbols of Christ's victory.[391] The author explained that Eve symbolizes the virgin, and the forbidden tree denotes the wood, and finally Adam symbolizes death. In this manner, Chrysostom explained that Christ's mother was a virgin and the cross where Christ was crucified was the wood and finally that Christ's sacrifice symbolizes the conquest of death. Here the two Eves share virginity as their common feature.[392]

---

[386] Ambrose of Milan, *On the Holy Spirit* in *The Fathers of the Church*, 44: 31-244
[387] Ibid, 179.
[388] Gregory of Nazianzos, *On Holy Easter*, PG 36: 656-57.
[389] The fact that these two theologians never placed the Virgin in the post-Resurrection narrative (if we accept that Gregory is not the author of *Christos Paschon*) meant that they had no reservations about associating Eve with the Magdalene; she was after all the most prominent of the Myrrh-bearers and Christ had appeared to her twice.
[390] John Chrysostom, *Oration on the Holy Easter*, PG 52, 765-772.
[391] Ibid, 768.
[392] According to Chrysostom, Eve was still a virgin before the expulsion from paradise, ibid, 768. For the title Virgin (Παρθένος) see Peltomaa 2001, 126-128.

Virginity is the subject of a treatise by Ambrose of Milan where the author briefly

mentioned that the Virgin was the first to see Christ resurrected.[393] Here the author

did not elaborate on his thought and did not explain whether he believed that the

Virgin was one of the Maries. Rather he was satisfied to draw a parallel between the

Virgin's womb and Christ's tomb, thus linking the mystery of Incarnation with the

Resurrection. In the next sentence, Ambrose continued his treatise by referring to

Mary Magdalene and the Noli me Tangere.[394]

Ambrose, like Chrysostom, did not provide any further evidence for his explanation.

All the afore-mentioned theologians though, shared a common element in their

writings: just before or after they have associated the Virgin with the post-

Resurrection narrative, they linked her with one or more of the following theological

concepts: the Incarnation; the Annunciation; or the Second Eve. In the early Christian

tradition, a parallel had been established between Genesis 2 and the Lukan account of

the Annunciation; and between the contrast of the two virgins, Eve and Mary, with the

Incarnation.[395] These conceptions were used to enhance the fathers' arguments and

probably were responsible for or guided them to the incorporation of the Virgin into

the post-Resurrection narrative.

It appears, however, that the fourth-century theologians were reluctant to elaborate on

the Virgin's association with the post-Resurrection narrative. They only made passing

references and rarely explained their choices. In contrast, the apocryphal works of the

fourth and fifth centuries were more eager to exploit all the possibilities, which is why

---

[393] *Liber de Virginitate*, PL 16, col. 283: "Vidit ergo Maria resurrectionem Domini: et prima vidit, et credidit".
[394] PL 16, col. 283: "Vidit et Maria Magdalena".
[395] Meyendorff 1974, 146.

the anonymous author of the *Discourse on Mary Theotokos* identified all the Maries

of the post-Resurrection narrative with the Virgin.[396] The artistic production of the

fourth and fifth centuries offers no examples in which the Virgin can be distinguished

in either the Maries at the Tomb or the Chairete.[397] The absence of any evidence

identifying the Virgin in these examples could possibly signify that her association

with one of the Myrrh-bearers had not yet entered the visual vocabulary of the church.

This is further supported by the fact that none of the surviving examples of the Maries

and the Chairete contain any inscriptions to identify the Virgin in the scenes,[398] and

none of the Maries appears haloed. In later examples the identification of the Virgin is

based on an inscription (Sinai icon) and on the halo (Rabbula Gospels and Sancta

Sanctorum panel).

In the fifth century the Virgin's role was revisited. At the Council of Ephesos (431),

the Virgin became the Theotokos.[399] One of the main features of the proceedings of

this Council was the reading of Cyril's letters addressed to Nestorios and the latter's

response, which proved the former to be in accordance with the Nicene Creed and

eventually convicted the latter as a heretic, and implemented the dogma of the

Theotokos.[400] Craftsmen though were more hesitant to accept this new title and well

---

[396] See above.

[397] Neither the sarcophagi nor the ivories show any evidence that the artist meant to depict the Virgin in those scenes but the absence of any inscriptions make any secure conclusion difficult. For bibliography see previous chapter.

[398] For inscriptions see Boston 2003 who argues that these were not common before Iconoclasm and Maguire 2007, 145 who argues that even directly after Iconoclasm the naming of sacred figures was not yet considered customary.

[399] Tanner 1990, 37-74.

[400] Ibid, 58-59.

into the sixth and seventh centuries the term Holy Mary appears in various artistic

examples,[401] while the term Theotokos only appears much later.[402]

In the sixth century we have an abundance of evidence, both in theological literature

and in artistic production, which placed the Virgin in the post-Resurrection narrative.

The evidence comes entirely from Syria and Palestine, which demonstrates that this

was a local tradition. The Syrian Rabbula Gospels is one such example.[403] The Maries

at the Tomb and the Chairete cover the lower register of folio 13ʳ, while the rest of the

page depicts the Crucifixion.[404] The two women in the Maries at the Tomb and the

Chairete scenes are Mary Magdalene and the Virgin; the latter can be securely

identified from the Crucifixion scene, where she is depicted haloed. As we saw in

chapter one, the possibility exists that the artists chose to portray the Crucifixion

according to the Gospel of John in order to make use of the representation of the

Virgin as a justification for her appearance in the post-Resurrection narrative of the

Gospel of Matthew.[405] Severos of Antioch, in his afore-mentioned oration on Easter,

used the same reasoning: 'that she did not fail to keep up with the Passion, but she

stood by the cross, as John had described'.[406] It is likely that Severos' supposition

(and Chrysostom's to a lesser extent) found its way into the visual vocabulary of the

Church and influenced the illumination of the Rabbula Gospels.[407]

---

[401] Examples include the mosaic from the Angeloktisti church, Cyprus and the Chairete icon from Sinai (see below), from the sixth and seventh centuries. See also Kalavrezou 1990, 168, for further examples and discussion.

[402] Kartsonis 1986, 108-109; Kalavrezou 1990, 168-170.

[403] Cecchelli 1959.

[404] See chapter 1, for a discussion on the iconography.

[405] The Gospel of John will become the customary source for the Crucifixion possibly because it included the Virgin. The latter will be used extensively by George of Nikomedia, Symeon Metaphrastes and Eythymios Zigadenos as proof that the Virgin remained at Christ's sepulchre overnight, and thus she was the first to see him resurrected. For a discussion see chapter 5.1.

[406] Severos of Antioch, in PO 16, Kugener and Triffaux 1922.

[407] This of course does not preclude the fact that this conclusion could have been reached independently following a similar line of reasoning.

Another work of Palestinian origins, the *Questions and Answers* attributed to

Anastasios of Sinai, points in that direction.[408] This work comprises one hundred and

fifty-four questions and answers of which at least eighty-eight, the so-called *Soterios*

collection, are not by Anastasios of Sinai but by a later author.[409] This collection

places more emphasis on hermeneutical problems, and 'assembles an arsenal of other

patristic questions'.[410] The question that interests us is number one hundred and fifty-

three in the *Patrologia Graeca*: 'Whether or not the four evangelists agree with each

other regarding Christ's resurrection', and is one of the inauthentic questions, of a

later author, which dates before the ninth century. [411]

This pseudo-Anastasios, while tackling the number of the Maries stated: 'We have

learned that Mary the mother of James and Joses, who is named by the other

evangelists, is the Birth-giver of God'.[412] The author's use of the past perfect tense to

say 'we have learned' (in Greek: 'μεμαθήκαμεν'), [413] could possibly serve as an

indication that the idea that the Virgin was Mary the mother of James and Joses had

only recently become widespread.[414] This is further enhanced by the fact that Pseudo-

Anastasios even though he cited Epiphanios and Eusebios as sources for his answer,

---

[408] Richard and Munitiz 2006.

[409] I thank both Rev. Dr. Munitiz and Prof Sieswerda for this information. For the date of the *Soterios* collection see Sieswerda 2009, forthcoming.

[410] Richard and Munitiz 2006, LI.

[411] PG 89, 809-814; as it was suggested to me by Professor Sieswerda this group of questions dates before the ninth century.

[412] Ibid, 809.

[413] Gregory of Nyssa uses "believe" in the infinitive that is "πιστεύειν" in Greek; Chrysostom "λέγει" while Ambrose says "I think", that is "ergo" in Latin. See above for references.

[414] Of course because of the nature of this work, that is a compilation of answers by different authors, the past perfect tense and the verb "learn" could have simply signified that this information derived from another source.

failed to cite any author as the source for his belief that the Virgin was the 'other Mary'.[415]

However, another explanation for the absence of attribution might come from the preceding question, one hundred and fifty-two, the answer to which is attributed to Severos the monophysite Patriarch of Antioch. As we have seen above, Severos in his seventy-seventh oration identifies the Virgin as the 'other Mary'. It is possible then that Pseudo-Anastasios, who obviously knew Severos' writings as he cites him in the previous question, used him as a source for this answer.[416] By identifying the Virgin as the other Mary the Syrian theologians were able not only to insert her in the post-Resurrection narrative and thus in one of the most significant moments in Christ's life but also to downplay the Magdalene's role as being the first to see Christ resurrected. It was only fitted that his mother was there if not before the Magdalene at least with her in the Chairete scene.

Besides Pseudo-Anastasios another author of Syrian origins was Romanos Melodos. From his *synaxarion* in the *Menologion* of Basil II, we learn that Romanos was a deacon in the church of the Resurrection in Beirut, which was the main church of the city.[417] From another version, we learn that he was born in the Syrian city of Emessa and from a hymn, preserved in a handful of manuscripts, we learn that Romanos was a Jew who then became a Christian and was offered great honours by the emperor.[418]

---

[415] Some marginal notes on a few manuscripts attribute the answer to Hesychios. I am indebted to Rev. Dr. Munitiz for the information.

[416] A possible explanation for why Pseudo-Anastasios did not cite Severos again, might come from the fact that Severos' answer precedes question one hundred and fifty-three thus the author felt no need to repeat the citation. For the date of the Soterios collection see Sieswerda 2008, forthcoming.

[417] Maas and Trypanis 1997, xvi; *Menologion* of Basil II, Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, cod.gr.1613.

[418] Tomadakis 1965³, 86-89.

He probably came to Constantinople during the reign of Anastasios I (491-518), and composed most of his works there.[419] Romanos is known as the most important composer of the *kontakion,* a sermon in verse accompanied by music, and while the form appears fully developed in the sixth century, the term *kontakion* appears only in the ninth.[420]

Romanos did not actually identify the Virgin with the 'other Mary' but, rather like Ambrose, stated his belief that she will be the first to see Christ resurrected. This is recorded in the *kontakion* titled 'On Mary at the Cross', which is a dialogue that takes place under the cross between the crucified Christ and his mother.[421] During that dialogue Christ promises the Virgin that she will be the first to see him after the resurrection: 'Be brave, mother, as you will be the first to see me from the tomb'.[422] Romanos' exegesis places him directly within the sixth-century Syrian tradition but it does not clarify whether the author believed that the Virgin was one of the Maries or that a special appearance was reserved for her.[423] Romanos' special emphasis on the Virgin is found also in the *kontakion* 'On the Marriage at Cana', where the Virgin's intersession as a mother is what caused Christ to perform the miracle.[424]

A final point should be made concerning Romanos' hymnography. The latter referred to the Virgin as the first to see Christ resurrected, but he did so in the poetic language of hymnography. Therefore it is not easy to distinguish whether the author of a given

---

[419] Ibid, 92-94; the author is in favour of Anastasios I (491-518) rather than Anastasios II (713-716), as some of Romanos' kontakia were used in a miracle of Saint Artemios, which according to the author of the *Vita*, took place during the reign of Herakleios (611-641). Also Romanos' *kontakion* "On Earthquakes and Fires" speaks clearly about the *Nika* revolt; Maas and Trypanis 1997, no.54: 462-471.

[420] Previously it was called by a number of other terms: ἔπος, ψαλμός, δέησις; ibid, p.xi and note 1.

[421] Ibid, no.19: 142-149.

[422] Ibid, 146, ιβ: 10: "Θάρσει, μητερ, οτι πρωτη με ορας απο του τάφου".

[423] Grosdidier de Matons, 1964-1981, 4: 177, n.2.

[424] Kalavrezou 1990, 167; for the *kontakion*, see Maas and Trypanis, 1997, no.7: 49-63.

hymn to the Virgin intended to make a 'doctrinal declaration or to elicit feelings of devotion from his audience'.[425] But even in the freedom of poetic language the theologian would not have crossed the line between Orthodoxy and heresy just to elicit feelings of devotion or to bring events dramatically to life for the congregation, thus Romanos' hymnographical cycle 'constitutes a real source of theology'.[426] His belief that the Virgin would have seen Christ resurrected is not a mere tool of dramatisation but rather an expression of what appears to have been, by the sixth century, a widespread belief. The sermons, hymns and artistic examples analysed above, all had a public audience, and thus it is not unlikely that the belief in the Virgin as a Myrrh-bearer was shared equally among the clergy (who wrote the texts) and the congregation (which heard them delivered). This distinction between popular belief and theology is important, since without the sanction of the official church, which constitutes the only source of theology, the Virgin as a Myrrh-bearer could not have been appeared on icons and Gospels manuscripts. To conclude Byzantine hymnography need not to be seen just as poetry but as a contributor to theology and thus the metaphorical language should be studied for its content as well as for its rhetorical forms.[427]

The following example of a post-Resurrection appearance comes from the genre of *ekphrasis*.[428] Chorikios' *ekphrasis* on the mosaic decoration of the church of Saint Sergios at Gaza (ca. 536) mentions very briefly what seems to be a Chairete scene.[429] Chorikios' text reads:

---

[425] Hannick 2005, 70. I thank Dr. Cunningham for bringing this point to my attention.
[426] Meyendorff 1974, 7.
[427] Peltomaa 2001, 30.
[428] Webb 1999. For a thorough discussion see previous chapter.
[429] Mango 1972, 60, note 25. For the discussion see previous chapter.

They also set guards next to His tomb, but He, making mock of their guards, regains His immortality and, after appearing to the women about His mother, is borne up to His dwelling place escorted by a heavenly choir.[430]

Mango believes that the Virgin is part of the Chairete scene.[431] However the possibility exists that the Virgin might not have been present. A closer examination of the Greek text and especially the sentence that mentions the Virgin reveals that what the text describes is not the latter, but rather the women that were with her probably in the Crucifixion scene. Chorikios' text reads: 'appeared to the women surrounding the Virgin'. It could not have been possible for the Virgin to be surrounded by two women in the mosaic, as this would have raised the number of women in the Chairete scene to three, instead of the two described in the Gospel of Matthew.[432]

Two possibilities exist: first that this scene is the Chairete and Christ appears to the women who accompanied the Virgin in the Crucifixion scene; or second that Chorikios' *ekphrasis* describes not the Chairete but a different scene. In my opinion the latter proposition sounds more plausible especially when we use an alternative reading and replace the article 'ταῖς' with 'τοῖς' – thus, instead of women the Virgin was surrounded by men.[433] If this is correct, Chorikios' description does not refer to the Chairete but rather to the Ascension, where the Apostles are depicted surrounding the Virgin, probably in the same manner as it is depicted on the Sancta Sanctorum panel.

---

[430] Ibid, 68. For the Greek text see Foerster 1929, 21.
[431] Mango 1972, 68 note 67.
[432] No known Chairete scene depicts three women instead of two. The Servanne sarcophagus that depicts three women probably represents the Maries at the Tomb.
[433] In the *apparatus criticus* in Foerster 1929, 21, note 8, the editor notes that the article "ταις" is replaced by the article "τοις" by Boissonade in the latter's edition of manuscript M. Manuscript M is used extensively by Foerster to provide alternative readings throughout.

It is highly unlikely though that the Church of Saint Sergios did not have a post-Resurrection scene in its repertoire. Chorikios' brief description should not dissuade us from believing that such a scene existed. In the absence of any such description one might turn to the two surviving and almost contemporary pieces of art from the East, the Rabbula Gospels (discussed in chapter one) and the Sancta Sanctorum panel (discussed below) to fill the gap. At Saint Sergios, the Chairete and/or the Maries at the Tomb were most probably depicted between the Crucifixion and the Ascension, on the basis that is extremely unlikely that the Resurrection of Christ would have been absent from the decoration of a church so close to the place that this event took place.

The Sancta Sanctorum panel just mentioned is habitually dated to the seventh century, and here the presence of the Virgin in the Maries scene is securely identified.[434] The panel served as the cover of a small box filled with bits of earth, wood and cloth; these were 'blessings' from the Holy Land.[435] The inside of the reliquary's cover depicts five scenes. Starting from the bottom left to the top right, the scenes are: the Nativity, Baptism, Crucifixion, Women at the Tomb and Ascension. These paintings serve as a reference guide to the shrines of the Holy Land from which these relics were collected or at least associated; two of these relics still have legible labels: 'from the Mount of Olives' and 'from Sion'. The panel itself functions as a component which enhances the historical and spiritual validity of the context of the box.

---

[434] In my opinion an earlier date should not be totally excluded on the premise that many iconographic and stylistic similarities exist between the scenes from the panel and the miniatures from the Rabbula Gospels. For example the Crucifixion resembles the one in the Rabbula Gospels in a number of details (e.g. the background with the two mountains, Christ's *kollobion*, and the two soldiers). The sixth-century date is also supported from palaeographical evidence, Elsner 1997. 119 note 17.

[435] Vikan 1982, 18. On this occasion the relics complement and enhance the visual value of the paintings on the panel.

The scene of the Maries at the Tomb appears on the left top zone. Two haloed women approach the tomb modelled on the Tomb aedicula and the Anastasis Rotunda.[436] The dome of the Rotunda is in the shape of a polygonal structure, with columns and a coned roof, decorated with marble revetments and a grillwork reminiscent again of various pilgrims' descriptions.[437] On the right of the tomb a haloed, winged, angel is depicted sitting, pointing at the tomb's entrance.

The two Maries wear distinctively different clothes; the woman in the red mantle is the Magdalene, while the woman in the dark blue mantle, decorated with white spots and looking inside the tomb, is the Virgin. The latter can be securely identified from the scenes of the Ascension, the Nativity and the Crucifixion, where she is depicted in the same clothing. A particular iconographic detail of this scene has no precedence and that is the posture of the Virgin, who bends over to see the empty tomb. In all other earlier and later examples the Mary closest to the tomb bends her head slightly and not her entire body.[438]

In order to show the difference between the two women, the artist apparently depicted the Magdalene standing upright and further from the tomb, with the more fervent Virgin bending over in a posture that shows rapid movement. The only Gospel that describes a woman leaning over to see the empty tomb is John 20: 11, where the evangelist narrated the episode of the Noli me Tangere, the main female protagonist of which was Mary Magdalene; thus this may be another occasion in which the Magdalene's attributes have been taken over by the Virgin, though in this case the

---

[436] Vikan 1982, 19.
[437] Egeria, *Travels*, in Maraval 1982, 60-66.
[438] The example closest to this posture comes from the fourth-century sarcophagus of Saint Celse, Wilpert 1929-36, 2: 330, but in this example the Mary closest to the tomb only bends slightly.

Magdalene's movement was associated with a different moment in the narrative. It is not however prudent to over-emphasize one iconographic detail when it is obvious that the Virgin is the main focus of the whole panel – she appears in four scenes out of five, as opposed to Christ's three – thus the rapid movement in the Maries scene and the overall emphasis given to the Virgin might simply be part of her rising importance as the primary figure of female devotion.

However the postures on the seventh-century pre-Iconoclastic icon from Sinai which depicts the Chairete are reversed.[439] Part of its left side is missing, but it must have depicted the rest of the figure of Christ who is represented approaching from the left dressed in a tunic. He holds a scroll with his left hand, while his right is raised in a gesture of speech towards the standing Mary. His face is framed by the dark hair and short painted beard typical of the so-called Palestinian type.[440] In the foreground, the Mary depicted kneeling to touch Christ's foot must be Mary Magdalene, while the Mary who stands upright in the background is the Virgin, identified by an inscription that reads: Η ΑΓΙΑ ΜΑΡΙΑ ('Saint/Holy Mary'). On this occasion the person showing more zeal and kneeling to touch Christ's feet is the Magdalene and not the Virgin.

The Chairete in the Rabbula Gospels depicts both women kneeling, with the Virgin represented in the foreground and the Magdalene in the background, but the Virgin's status is emphasised by the halo; only she, the angel and Christ are depicted haloed, thus the Virgin belongs on the same level of holiness as them. On the Sinai icon though, both women are depicted haloed; thus the artist's decision to depict the Virgin

---

[439] Weitzmann 1976, 50 no. B27, pl. LXXV and colour pl. XXI.
[440] Ibid, 50

standing could be interpreted as an attempt to show the special relation between

Christ and his mother, and also the different status of Mary Magdalene and the Virgin.

This is further enhanced by the fact that Christ's gaze is directed towards the Virgin

and not the Magdalene, and by the fact that they both appear on the same level.[441] The

Magdalene's posture of *proskynesis* could also serve as a reference to the viewer of

how to venerate the resurrected Christ (and the Virgin?). Finally it should be noted

that this icon is only the second surviving example of an icon depicting a post-

Resurrection appearance before the tenth century.[442]

In the afore-mentioned examples of the Chairete, the Virgin is easily distinguished by

either a halo or an inscription, while the Magdalene's presence can only be assumed

from the Gospel narrative. This could either signify their different status, or more

probably the fact, that it was the Virgin who needed to be identified, as she was the

one whose presence in the scene was not supported by the Gospel narrative. As

Boston argues, the need of identification did not apply to Christ.[443]

Other evidence from Palestine includes a number of marriage rings and armbands, all

described in the previous chapter.[444] According to Maguire, the scene of the Maries at

the Tomb on those artefacts omits the Virgin.[445] However, the sixth-century

Antiochene commentators and the artistic examples discussed above demonstrate that

---

[441] If this supposition is correct, then the possibility exists that the Mary depicted standing in the Chairete scene of the Milan ivory (c.400) is the Virgin.

[442] The other example is a diptych from Sinai dated to the tenth century, Soteriou 1956-58, 52-55 and pls 39-41.

[443] Boston 2003, 39. See also Maguire 2007, 139, who argues that the absence of names helped the images to communicate for than one message.

[444] Engemann 1973; Vikan 1991/2.

[445] Maguire 2005, 187-188, comments on a series of armbands from the sixth and seventh centuries that depict the Maries at the Tomb. While it is true that the Virgin is not identifiable on the armbands, contemporary evidence from Syria and Palestine included the Virgin both in the Chairete and in the Maries at the Tomb scene.

the Virgin could was part of the Maries at the Tomb as well as the Chairete scenes. It is not clear though whether the artist of the armbands or the marriage rings meant to depict the Virgin in these miniature scenes. What can be securely determined from the armbands though is that all the Maries appear haloed, while in all other earlier representations they were not. The addition of the halo could perhaps indicate that their status was elevated by the inclusion of the Virgin in the scene (the latter appears haloed in all sixth- and seventh-century examples from Palestine) and by changes in the liturgical calendar.[446]

To summarise, the fourth-century commentators placed the Virgin in the post-Resurrection narrative but they never elaborated on their verdict. These early examples stand alone and perhaps demonstrate that no special attention was given to the subject by early theologians who touched on the subject only superficially. Their discussion usually comprised a simple sentence or, as in the case of Ambrose involved a subject different from the resurrection: the virginity. The priority of the Maries over the Apostles in seeing Christ resurrected, was explained by the fourth-century Church Fathers in the context of the First Sin. According to their exegeses Eve was the first to sin and thus the Maries were the first to lift this sin by becoming the messengers of the resurrection. An analogy was drawn between the Magdalene and Eve in this context on more than one occasion, but it was the Virgin who assumed the title of the second Eve, a subject further exploited and entwined by the Church Fathers with the concepts of Incarnation and *oikonomia*. It is not clear however

---

[446] Further discussion will follow in a separate chapter that discusses the influence of the Jerusalem *Typikon* and of the *Typikon* of the Great Church on the celebration of the Myrrh-bearers and the dedication of the third Sunday after Easter to their memory. Beside the liturgical evidence, emphasis will be given on the homiletic and hymnographic tradition, which in the seventh century will titled them as "women apostles": Gregory bishop of Antioch, PG 88, "*Oration on the Myrrh-bearers*", col. 1847-1866.

whether John Chrysostom actually considered the 'other Mary' to be the Virgin, or whether he felt inclined to include her in the post-Resurrection narrative out of doctrinal and/or theological motivations.

In the fifth century the Virgin was proclaimed Theotokos and her status was thus elevated and canonized. The council of Ephesos proclaimed that: 'If anyone does not confess that Emmanuel is God in truth, and therefore that the holy virgin is the mother of God, let him be anathema'.[447] This was both Cyril's personal victory and a triumph of the Alexandrian school of thought over the Antiochean.[448] Because the proceedings of this council had both a disciplinary and a dogmatic undertone[449] it is difficult to ascertain whether or not the term 'Theotokos' was just another argument used in the condemnation of Nestorios. If furthermore we accept that the conciliar statements themselves assume a negative form; they condemn distortions of the Christian Truth, rather than elaborate its positive content,[450] then the emphasis is shifted to the condemnation of Nestorios rather than to the term 'Theotokos'; a term already in use (though contested) before the Council of Ephesos. This might explain why the term was not instantly adopted in the artistic examples, such as in the one that follows.

The Sinai icon, even though painted two centuries after the council of Ephesos, insists on identifying the Virgin as ΑΓΙΑ ΜΑΡΙΑ (Saint Mary) (fig. 10). The same is true for two icons from Sinai that portray the Crucifixion.[451] Both use the same monogram for

---

[447] Tanner 1990, 59.
[448] Peltomaa 2001, 52. Meyendorff 1974, 20-23, speaks of the victory of the Alexandrian allegorism against the Antiochean literal, historical meaning.
[449] De Urbina 1953, 234: "noi abbiamo non soltanto una sentenza *disciplinare* che depone e scomunica Nestorio ma anche un giudizio *dogmatico* previo che decide in maniera assoluta e perentoria in favore della maternita divina di Maria".
[450] Meyendorff 1974, 4.
[451] Soterious 1956-58, 38-40, pls 24-25.

the legend, as it appears on the Chairete icon. The two icons have been dated to the

eight and ninth century, with one even considered to be post-Iconoclast.[452] In

monumental art, a wall painting of the Virgin holding Christ from Santa Maria

Antiqua uses the same monogram, while the full inscription appears on the sixth-

century apse mosaic of Panagia Angeloktisti, in Cyprus.[453] From these examples it

becomes apparent that the term Theotokos was not instantly adopted in the visual

representations of the East or at least at Sinai and Cyprus.[454]

To recapitulate, the abundance of evidence from sixth- and seventh-century Palestine

show that at least in that area, the presence of the Virgin in the post-Resurrection

narrative was widely accepted. Whether this is related to a cult dedicated to the Virgin

is difficult to say. The popularity she acquired however in the post-Resurrection

appearances could indicate that she was now becoming 'the prime female figure of

Christian devotion'.[455]

Tsironis believes that 'a new theme first emerges in the free images of poetry; it then

moves over into the languages of religious homilies, which is also poetical but it is

closer to the liturgical style; it appears next in iconography; and only when the new

theme had been fully integrated within all those media can be adopted and assimilated

into liturgical texts'.[456] In the Virgin's inclusion in the post-Resurrection narrative,

Tsironis' proposal attains some verification. Both the hymns and the apocrypha use

---

[452] For a discussion with up-to-date bibliography see Brubaker and Haldon 2001, 60-61 and 68-69, figs. 37 and 48.
[453] For a brief discussion of the term in connection to the Chairete icon, see Weitzmann 1966, 318. For Santa Maria Antiqua see Avery 1925, 143, pl. CV: fig. 39 who argues that the wall painting has Alexandrian associations.
[454] According to Avery, the monogram 'Saint Mary' in Santa Maria Antiqua could be explained as 'Monophysite prejudice', ibid 143.
[455] Kalavrezou 2005, 104.
[456] Tsironis 2005, 92

poetic language, which finds its way into the religious homilies delivered both by the fourth-century fathers and by the sixth-century Antiochene commentators; the latter probably inspired the first examples in iconography. The idea that the Virgin was part of the post-Resurrection appearances enters liturgy through the various hymns of the *Triodion*, and the *kontakia* dedicated to her in the context of Christ's resurrection.

The identification of the Virgin as the 'other Mary' did not go unchallenged. By the fifth-century, Hesychios of Jerusalem in his *Collection of Questions and Answers* states that Mary the mother of James was not the Virgin, but the Virgin's sister, with whom she shared a name.[457] Hesychios however was more inclined towards Alexandrian allegory, rather than towards the Antiochene or literal interpretation of the scripture.[458] In the ninth century, George of Nikomedia offered a different solution to the 'problem'. The Virgin, according to George, was not mentioned by the evangelist as one of the named women, who visited the tomb on Easter morning because she, contrary to the other women, never left the tomb.[459] This new explanation found many later imitators, while the old interpretation never completely disappeared.[460]

To sum up, the Virgin's presence in the post-Resurrection narrative started with passing references from John Chrysostom and Ambrose of Milan, and progressed to the more elaborate argument by Severos of Antioch. Around that time it was

---

[457] PG 93, col.1433: "Οθεν και η αδελφη της Θεοτόκου, τω αυτω εκέκλητο ονόματι, και Μαρία Ιακώβου"; in English: "and thus the Theotokos' sister was called with the same name, Mary [mother] of James".

[458] For Hesychios' Alexandrian tendencies, see Aubineau 1972, 39-40.

[459] George of Nikomedia, *Ninth Sermon*: *To the immaculate Theotokos' presence by the tomb and thanksgiving to the brilliant resurrection*, in PG 100, cols. 1489-1504.

[460] It appears for example in the *Triodion* of Joseph the Hymnographer (9th c.), Theophylaktos of Ohrid and Theophanes Kerameus. For a discussion, see the post-Iconoclast evidence discussed in chapter 4 below.

incorporated into hymnography and art, with the majority of the evidence coming from Antioch and its environs, which might betray a local preference. However, the Virgin's inclusion in the scene did not change the fact that the Magdalene featured more prominent in the post-Resurrection narrative, in all four Gospels. It is thus particularly noteworthy that on a number of occasions, both visual and literary, we have seen the Virgin displacing the Magdalene and acquiring her attributes. This 'rivalry' and Magdalene's role in the post-Resurrection appearances will be discussed in the following chapter.

2.2 The Magdalene in the post-Resurrection Appearances in the Period before the Iconoclasm.

The Magdalene is the most prominent female figure both in the canonical Gospels and in apocryphal literature. Her role in Christ's resurrection is paramount and is attested by her special appearance described in the longer ending of the Gospel of Mark (16: 9) and in more detail in the Gospel of John (20: 14-18). This is called the Appearance of Christ to Mary Magdalene or the Noli me Tangere (Touch Me Not).[461] This scene appears rarely and usually very late in Byzantine art and never acquires the importance that the Chairete scene had, especially in the early centuries.[462] In terms of theological exegeses, the Noli me Tangere created some difficulties, as Christ's words 'Touch me not' contrast with his reactions in the Chairete episode, where Christ allowed the two women to touch him.[463] The Magdalene's path intertwines with that of the Virgin in the post-Resurrection narrative and this clearly caused some consternation amongst theologians as the Virgin's role expanded after the Council of Ephesos.

The Magdalene's role in the Gospels, both canonical and apocryphal, will be elucidated and a special attention will be given to the theological writings of the Church Fathers, as the three show distinct approaches to her role. In this study every published source, which fells inside the chronological limits of this chapter, will be examined. The artistic evidence, scarce as it is, raises certain questions about the

---

[461] *RBK*: 'Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen', 382, where four types of Noli Me Tangere are distinguished.
[462] Kartsonis 1986, 143. The Chairete retained its popularity in ninth-century Constantinople, as the scene appeared in the mosaic decoration of the Holy Apostles and at the Virgin at Pege. For a discussion see chapter 4.2 below.
[463] Bauckham 2002, 284, calls this verse from John "an interpretive crux that has been extensively discussed and debated".

reception of the Noli me Tangere image in Early Byzantine art. Finally the interaction between the Virgin and the Magdalene will receive special consideration, as the latter's role in the post-Resurrection narrative overshadowed that of the Virgin's.

In the four canonical Gospels, Mary Magdalene appears as the primary figure in the Passion and post-Resurrection narrative. From the Crucifixion to the Resurrection, whenever a named group is described, the Magdalene is present and on all but one occasion, she is given priority over the other named women (Appendix I).[464] It should be noted that while the names of the other women vary, the Magdalene's appears in every group and is sometimes followed by that of Mary the mother of James (and Joses). The authors of the Gospels, by including her in the Passion and post-Resurrection narrative, appear to have considered her testimony as extremely significant.

This is not the case with Celsus, a second-century philosopher who attacked the Magdalene's credibility as a witness of Christ's Resurrection. His words survive in Origen's treatise *Against Celsus* a polemic consisting of eight books where the author refutes Celsus' arguments.[465] The reference to Mary Magdalene comes from *Book II*, where Celsus stated that that the latter was 'a hysterical female… who either dreamt in a certain state of mind… or, which is more likely, wanted to impress the others by telling this fantastic tale'.[466] The prejudice directed specifically against the Magdalene as a witness to Christ's resurrection, gives us the notion that her testimony must have

---

[464] The only instance where the Magdalene is not described as heading the group, is in John 19: 25 (Crucifixion), were the Virgin and her sister are present. In the apocryphal *Gospel of Peter*, the Magdalene, "a woman disciple of the Lord", heads an unnamed group of women at the empty tomb, Wilson 1973, 187.

[465] PG 11, col. 651-1710.

[466] Ibid, col. 888-89; the English quotations are taken from Chadwick 1980, 112.

held great validity in the Early Church. Celsus attacked the reality of Christ's

resurrection by calling her a hysterical woman and a liar. Ultimately, Celsus goal by

characterizing Mary Magdalene crazy and thus nullifying her testimony, wanted to

prove that Christ had never been resurrected and thus Christianity was a false religion.

Women's testimony in antiquity, and especially in Jewish Palestine, was regarded as

unreliable.[467] But this does not affect the unique role the women and Mary Magdalene

shared in the resurrection as, according to the Gospels, they were the only ones to

witness the actual place of burial and thus they alone could vouch for the fact that

Christ's tomb was found empty.[468] The fact that the evangelists named the women

rather than referring to them either as an unnamed group or by the head of the group

(Mary Magdalene), signifies their importance in the early community as recognized

eyewitness authorities.[469] Origen, for example, in response to Celsus' accusations that

Christ appeared only to one woman, cites Matthew 28: 9-10, the Chairete. For Origen,

both Mary Magdalene and the 'other Mary' were credible witnesses.[470]

To return to Celsus' phraseology, the term 'hysterical' is the kind of language you

expect to be employed by a pagan philosopher attacking Christianity.[471] However the

Magdalene's behaviour, as described in the Gospels, was nothing like that. In the

narrative, the Magdalene is depicted as a zealous and fervent person, who followed

---

[467] Bauckham 2002, 257-58.

[468] Ibid, 188. The only exceptions are the Gospel of Luke (24: 12), which mentions Peter's visit to the tomb, and the Gospel of John (20: 3-10), where both Peter and John visit the empty tomb.

[469] Bauckham 2002, 189.

[470] The fact that Origen refers to two eyewitnesses could be a reflection of the Jewish tradition as recorded in the Torah, where at least two witnesses were necessary. For this argument and on women's credibility as witnesses see Bauckham 2002, 295-304.

[471] Christians also employed this kind of vocabulary when they were attacking heretics. One such example was Epiphanios, who calls Origen mentally deranged; see PG 43, 41-236.

Christ from the beginning of his ministry up to the very end, and she was rewarded

for her faith with a special appearance.

As mentioned above, Severos' second oration on Easter was also an effort to

harmonise the post-Resurrection accounts by placing them in one continuous

narrative.[472] Because the Magdalene appears in all four groups of women and in two

of Christ's appearances, this process meant that according to Severos' explanation,

she must have visited Christ's tomb four times and must have seen him resurrected

twice. Severos' account starts with Mary Magdalene and the 'other Mary', whom he

identified as the Virgin, visiting the empty tomb and seeing Christ resurrected.[473]

Then, according to the narrative, the rumours spread by the guards made Magdalene's

faith lapse and drove her back to the empty tomb.[474] Severos explained the

Magdalene's lapse of faith in the same manner as he did with the Incredulity of

Thomas: that is, she doubted to make our faith even stronger,[475] but he does not fail to

add, 'it is not unusual that woman's nature makes it easier to lapse'.[476]

Severos, while commenting on the Noli me Tangere episode, explained again that the

tears of the Magdalene were representative of female behaviour, but justified her

inability to understand Christ as the result of her tearful eyes and the heavy morning

mist.[477] By this time, the Magdalene had visited the tomb and had seen Christ

---

[472] Severos of Antioch, PO 16, Kugener and Triffaux 1922, 794-861.

[473] See the preceding section on the Virgin.

[474] This description follows the Gospel of Matthew (28: 15) were the guards were bribed to spread the rumour that Christ's body was stolen: "So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day".

[475] PO 16, 812: "And because of his [Thomas'] incredulity and touch, we have our faith secured … in the same manner, Mary Magdalene's incredulity… made the miracle of the resurrection more truthful.

[476] Ibid, 812.

[477] Ibid, 822. While the tearful Magdalene is reported in the Gospel of John, there is no evidence to support Asterios of Amasia's claim that the women were crying during the Passion and Crucifixion of Christ: *Homily V*, in Datema 1970, 45ff.

resurrected twice. The two subsequent visits are explained as accidental meetings of the Magdalene with the relevant group of women whom she leads back to the tomb in order for them to see what she had witnessed.[478]

John Chrysostom gave a different account in one of his homilies *On the Gospel of John*, where he commented on the crucifixion, burial and resurrection of Christ.[479] According to Chrysostom, Mary Magdalene failed to understand Christ's resurrection, which is why she asked where his body was placed.[480] In the next homily, the author explained in detail exactly when Mary Magdalene became conscious of Christ's resurrection.[481] Not the empty tomb, nor the two angels, in fact not even Christ himself were enough evidence for the Magdalene to comprehend Christ's resurrection and only when Christ called her by her name did Mary understand. Chrysostom's explanation is not very flattering to Mary: 'Because the intelligence of the woman was not high enough, as to understand the resurrection from the linen clothing'.[482] But not everything in Chrysostom's commentary was negative about the Magdalene. The author mentioned that she was a caring and affectionate character but only to draw a distinction between those characteristics and her intelligence.[483]

Ammonios, a presbyter from Alexandria (†458), in his *Explanation of the Gospel of John*, clarified that no discrepancies existed between the Gospels of Matthew and

---

[478] Ibid, 832. The last visit of the Magdalene is explained on the premises that Salome, who is only mentioned in the Gospel of Mark 16: 1, was totally unaware of what had happened, which is why Magdalene returned with her at the tomb for the last time.

[479] PG 59, *Homily 75*, col. 459-468

[480] Ibid, col. 465.

[481] Ibid, col. 467.

[482] Ibid, col. 467. Peter and John, who had visited Christ's tomb moments before, had grasped the reality of Christ's resurrection from the linen clothing lying inside the tomb; the Magdalene failed to do that, according to Chrysostom.

[483] Ibid, col. 469.

John, regarding the time of the women's visit at the tomb.[484] Mary Magdalene is again

treated as an oblivious woman who fails to understand Christ's resurrection in

contrast to Peter and John. Ammonios however explained that the Magdalene's lack

of understanding lay on the fact that it was still very dark, and she was unable to

discern the figure of the man standing in front of her or, added the author, because

Christ was concealing himself in a supernatural aura.[485] The dialogue that follows

between the Magdalene and Christ was necessary, said Ammonius, in order for her

not to be terrified by the sudden view of Christ, whom she thought dead. That is why

Christ showed his wounds to his disciples during his Appearance to the Ten in the

absence of Thomas, to ease their anxiety and fear.

Cyril of Alexandria (†440) in his *Commentary on John* did not fail to repeat that the

Magdalene's understanding was slow, and added that this was common female

behaviour.[486] Cyril though, like most theologians, was not completely negative and

added that darkness could have played a role in Magdalene's inability to

understand.[487] He even went further to add that the dialogue between Christ and the

Magdalene served as an antidote to the words spoken by God to Eve, when she was

told that she would give birth in pain.[488] This indirect connection between Eve and the

Magdalene occurs in other ecclesiastical writers such as Gregory the Theologian

(ca.329-ca.390) and Ambrose of Milan (ca.340-397).[489] These writers, however, never

elaborated on this concept, because the role of the second Eve was reserved for the

---

[484] Ammonios of Alexandria, *On the Gosple of John*, PG 85, col. 1391-1524; esp. col. 1516-1521
[485] Ibid, col. 1517, in translation: "A Godlike power was concealing him".
[486] PG 73-74, col. 689.
[487] Ibid, col. 689-690.
[488] Gen. 3: 16: "I will greatly increase your pangs in childbearing; in pain you shall bring forth children, yet your desire shall be for your husband, and he shall rule over you".
[489] PG 36, 657-58, *On Holy Easter*; *The Fathers of the Church*, PG 44: 31-244, *On the Holy Spirit*, respectively.

Virgin and not Mary Magdalene. In those few instances where a parallel was set or a reference was made, the Magdalene represented all womankind.

The popularity of these ideas is well attested not only in literature but in hymnography as well. In the sixth *kontakion*, *On the Resurrection*, by Romanos Melodos, we come across a blend of both the Magdalene's inability to understand and also of her important role as a redeemer of Eve's sin. This *kontakion* is considered to be one of Romanos' finest.[490] It contains two proœmia referring to the Chairete and Mary Magdalene respectively. The latter's words (John 20: 13) are attributed by Romanos to all of the Maries.[491] From this point on, the *kontakion* has a narrative structure reminiscent of Severos' of Antioch effort to harmonise the Gospel narrative.[492] Another similar point between Severos' harmonisation and Romanos' *kontakion* is the important role that Mary Magdalene plays in both.

The narrative begins with a nameless group of women ready to make their way to Christ's tomb, but at the last minute they decide to send Mary Magdalene instead and she will inform them whether Christ is resurrected.[493] The Magdalene visits the tomb, finds the stone removed and turns back to inform Christ's disciples. The first to arrive at the tomb are Peter and John; the latter, even though first at the tomb, waits for Peter

---

[490] Maas and Trypanis 1997, 223-233.
[491] De Matons 1964-1981, 4: 381, note 1.
[492] Grosdidier de Matons sees a similarity not only with Severos' effort of harmonisation but also with Eusebius'one: De Matons 1964-1981, 4, 358-359. Though quite likely to have been influenced by both writers, Eusebius complex structure and language render him a less likely candidate. Furthermore while Eusebius' effort of harmonisation is one of questions and answers, Severos' is of a continuous narrative, similar to the one adopted by Romanos. Also, in both Severos and Romanos, Magdalene plays the protagonist's role. The latter is also noted by De Matons 1964-1981, 4, 365. It should be noted however that De Matons falsely attributes the harmonisation to Gregory; recent scholarly work attributes it to Severos.
[493] This is obviously one of Romanos' inventions.

to enter first as he is the 'first' of the apostles.[494] Peter and John find the tomb empty

and think that Christ did not appear to them because they were not worth it. The

Magdalene, who listens to them, replies by saying that they have to be patient as

Christ will appear first to the women as they were first to sin.[495] Ecclesiastical authors

have already expressed this idea, but this is the first time that they put the words in

Mary Magdalene's mouth.

At this point Romanos inserts a stanza describing three events from the gospels: a) the

raising of Lazaros, b) the 'woman who was a sinner' and c) the raising of the daughter

of Jairus. It is obvious that the two 'raisings' are connected with Christ's rising that

follows this stanza. The inclusion here of the 'woman who was a sinner' could

possibly serve as a parallel with the Magdalene or could be an indirect connection

between the Magdalene and the 'woman who was a sinner'.[496] Kassiani's troparion

On the Harlot is considered to have been dedicated to Mary Magdalene.[497] This

assumption was based on the fact that Kassiani (or Kassia) clearly drew a parallel

between the sinner and the Myrrh-bearer by stating that the former 'Lord, the woman

who had fallen into many sins, perceiving your divinity, took up the role of Myrrh-

bearer, and with lamentation brings sweet myrrh to you before your burial'.[498] It was

---

[494] Romanos uses the word "κορυφαῖος", verse δ΄, 225. The author then cites a quotation from the John 21: 15-19, which is the concluding part of Christ's appearance at lake Tiberias or the Miraculous Draught of Fishes used here to enhance Peter's supremacy rather than as a post-Resurrection event.

[495] This is as we have seen above, a popular belief expressed with slight variations by Athanasios of Alexandria (PG 28, col. 1084), Ambrose of Milan (*The Fathers of the Church*, 44: 179), Gregory of Nanzianzos (PG 36, col. 657-58), Gregory of Nyssa (PG 46, col. 632) and others.

[496] De Matons, 1964-1981, 4, 395, understands the exact opposite, that the inclusion here of the "woman who was a sinner" shows that Romanos believed that Magdalene was not the sinner of Luke 7: 36.

[497] Kazhdan 1999, 318-19. A thorough discussion follows in chapter 5.2.

[498] Christ and Paranikas 1963², 104 The English translation was taken from www.anastasis.org.uk/ © Father Ephrem Lash.

in the West that the association between the Magdalene and the sinner became a rule

under Pope Gregory the Great (540-604).[499]

To return to the *kontakion* the narrative continues with Christ's appearance to the

Magdalene. The latter fails at first to understand him but then, after listening to her

master's voice, she recognizes him and tries to touch him. At that point Christ shouts,

Touch me Not (John 20: 17). Romanos finds here the opportunity to explain why

Christ refuses the Magdalene's touch: 'Don't touch me, or you conceive of me only as

a human? I am God, touch me not'.[500] After having seen Christ resurrected the

Magdalene returns to the other women and informs them of Christ's resurrection. In

the following stanza the Magdalene explains what happened to the other women, who

run to the tomb. There they see an angel seated at the entrance who advises them not

to be afraid, as his manifestation was to intimidate the guards and show them that 'he

whom they guard is the lord of angels'.[501] The final stanza is a Romanos' hymn to the

resurrection.

The Magdalene's portrayal in the *kontakion* is positive. Romanos put in the latter's

mouth an explanation already found in the theological literature of the previous

centuries. Romanos also hinted that an association between the Magdalene and the

---

[499] Murray 1996, 315-318.

[500] Verse ια´ 228. This explanation does not correspond with the one given in the previous *kontakion* on the resurrection (no. 28, verse ιε´ 216), where Christ instructs the Magdalene not to touch him: "do not touch the flesh that suffered on the cross, I have not yet raised it to heaven". This explanation is closer to the gospel narrative. Gregory of Nyssa, *Against Eunomius Book Twelve* (PG 45, col.884-885) offers a similar explanation to that of Romanos'. Gregory believes that we can touch Christ's human nature, as in the case of the Appearance to the Eleven, but we cannot touch Christ's divine nature, as in the case of Noli me Tangere.

[501] Verse ιθ´ 231; (Matth. 28: 1-10). A similar view was expressed by Cyril of Jerusalem, in *Catechesis X*: *On "and in one Lord, Jesus Christ"* where the author explains how Christ the son of God is the Lord, by using (among others) the argument the he is the Lord of Angels, as in the case of Maries at the Tomb (Matth. 28: 7) where "an angel announced the good news, and like a true servant told the women"; Yarnold 2000, 123.

sinner existed, but as it will be discussed in chapter five, this association was never sanctioned by the Orthodox Church.

A completely different view about the Magdalene comes from Anatolios. There is much speculation concerning who this hymnographer was and when he composed his work, but nothing is certain.[502] It is usually supposed that he lived in Constantinople no later than the eighth century, while others confuse him with Patriarch Anatolios (†458).[503] Based on the vocabulary of hymns this author must have been working well before the eighth century,[504] but a more precise date cannot be fixed. He is considered to be the author of the *Stichera* (Στιχηρά) *Anatolika*, a series of hymns that commemorate Christ's resurrection, which is why they are also called *Anastasima*.[505] The *Stichera Anatolika* are sung on Holy Saturday at Vespers and on Easter Sunday at Lauds.[506]

The stichera are written in all eight modes, with each mode containing eleven hymns, a total therefore of eighty-eight hymns. Tillyard divides them into the following categories: a) Praises only, b) the Descent in to Hades and the Opening of Paradise, c) the Women at the Sepulchre (Maries at the Tomb), d) the sealing and opening of the tomb, the bribing of the soldiers.[507] The group that interests us is the Maries at the

---

[502] Christ and Paranikas, 1963², XLI-XLII.
[503] Tillyard 1940, (Part I) XIII.
[504] I thank Dr. Cunningham for this information.
[505] Christ and Paranikas 1963², 113-115, have included only a number of the stichera. The whole group appears in Tillyard 1940, 3-106. Tillyars neither verifies nor challenges Anatolios' authorship of the stichera anatolica, but he is rather happy to say that these "are commonly ascribed to Anatolius the Younger", ibid, XII.
[506] Four for each service, ibid, XI.
[507] Ibid, XIII.

Tomb, reference to which appears in six hymns.[508] Most of them follow the same
pattern. The women visit the tomb where they see an angel who informs them of
Christ's resurrection. A good example is provided by a hymn in mode II (ἦχος β΄);
'The angel informed the women about you, the crucified and buried lord, and told
them, "come, see where the Lord lay; for he has been raised, as he said…"'.[509]

The only divergence from this pattern comes from the following two hymns. In the
first hymn, in mode III (ἦχος γ΄), it is not the women but Mary Magdalene who visits
the tomb, where she initially sees the two angels and then Christ himself (John 20: 11-
18). This is actually the only mention of an appearance by Christ in this stichera. The
second divergence from the pattern comes from a hymn in mode IV (ἦχος δ΄) where,
instead of the Maries, Mary Magdalene alone visits the tomb. Here the author stressed
the fact that she actually arrived there first: 'The women desired to see your
resurrection, oh Christ the God! Mary Magdalene came there first…'.[510]

Another group of just three hymns is dedicated to the Maries themselves without the
mention of an angel.[511] The first example of this group is just a short hymn of no
special interest to us here, since it contains no references to the Myrrh-bearers and the
Magdalene.[512] The second one repeats the celebrated idea that the women saw Christ

---

[508] Following Tillyard's edition the hymns are: mode I, no.6, 7-8; mode II, no.1, 13; mode III, nos.5-7, 29-33; mode IV, no.7, 46-47; mode II plagal, no.8, 77-78; mode III plagal, no.7, 89-90; mode I plagal, no.3, 58-59. The hymn in mode II, no 1 is also reproduced in Christ and Paranikas1963², 113.
[509] My translation; for the Greek text see Christ and Paranikas1963², 113. The quotations in the hymn are from Matth. 28: 5-6.
[510] My translation; for the Greek text see Tillyard, 1940, 46. The Greek verb used here in its participant is "προλαμβάνω", which means do something in time or before somebody or something. The author repeats this idea in his *Idiomelon* on Mary Magdalene (see below).
[511] The women but not the angel(s), are mentioned in the following stichera: ibid, mode II, no.5, 18-19; mode IV, no.11, 54-55; mode III, no.9, 34-35.
[512] Ibid, mode II, no.5, 18-19.

resurrected first because they were the first to sin.[513] The third one, which is the most

important, has as follows: 'After finding Peter hiding, Mary Magdalene shouted:

'Why did you leave Christ to suffer alone and you did not suffer with him as his

friends, nor did you entomb him as your teacher deserved? Not even his death moved

you. Go and see the empty tomb of him who sits in the embrace of the Father and bow

to the Giver of mercy''.[514] The words put into the Magdalene's mouth differ

substantially from those in John 20: 2, not only in terms of vocabulary but also in

sentiment: 'They have taken the Lord out of the tomb and we do not know where they

have laid him'. Here, the Magdalene was not the oblivious woman of the gospel, not

the absent-minded woman of the commentaries and orations,[515] not even the polite

Magdalene of Romanos' sixth *kontakion* 'On the Resurrection'.[516] Mary Magdalene is

depicted here as a strong individual who had perceived the reality of Christ's

resurrection and is ready to lecture the 'first' of the apostles, Peter, on his

cowardice.[517] The Magdalene of Anatolios' hymns demonstrates that no unified

approach existed in the Orthodox Church for the Magdalene.

One of Anatolios' most interesting works is his *Idiomelon* (Ιδιόμελον) to Mary

Magdalene. Written in mode II plagal, the hymn reads as follows:

> First to see the divine Resurrection of the First Cause of blessings,
>
> who in his compassion made our nature divine, you were revealed as
>
> also the first herald of the Gospel, Mary Magdalene, as you cried to
>
> the Apostles, 'Put away despair, regain good cheer, and come, look

---

[513] Ibid, mode IV, no.11, 54-55. For examples of patristic literature on this subject see previous chapter.
[514] Ibid, mode III, no.9, 34-35.
[515] To mention but some: John Chrysostom, PG, 59, *Ομιλία Πς´*, col. 467; Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on John* PG 73, col. 1082.
[516] See above the description of the sixth *kontakion* "On the Resurrection".
[517] This is certainly not the invention of a poet whose treatment "has little originality" and whose examples showed "how narrow was the poet's range" according to Tillyard 1940, XIII.

now on Christ who has risen again and grants the world his great

mercy.[518]

What is striking is the composer's belief that it was Mary Magdalene and not the

Virgin who saw first Christ resurrected. This contrasts with Romanos' *kontakion* 'On

Mary at the Cross' and with Joseph the Hymnographer's hymns of the *Triodion*.[519] It

becomes obvious that Anatolios, if he is the author of this *idiomelon*, had no

reservations in ascribing Christ's first appearance to the Magdalene. Furthermore the

words spoken by Mary are reminiscent of those in the apocryphal literature, where she

intervenes to comfort the disciples.[520]

Such an apocryphal work is the *Gospel According to Mary*, dated in the second

century, where Mary Magdalene is the main character.[521] Here she appears to comfort

the other disciples when they were in distress and also shares with them her

revelations. Her testimony however was met with disbelief from Andrew and Peter.

The latter is known for having a hostile attitude towards women and the Magdalene in

particular,[522] something attested by his reply to her in the afore-mentioned Gospel.[523]

The Magdalene's intervention in this apocryphon serves to restore courage to the

disciples.[524] It becomes apparent that Mary Magdalene's great prominence in this text

is reflected by the fact that she was imparted with special revelations, and her

---

[518] The translation was taken from the following website: www.anastasis.org.uk © Father Ephrem Lash.

[519] See previous chapter on the Virgin in the post-Resurrection Appearances of Christ.

[520] Magdalene's attitude in this hymn has parallels only in the apocryphal literature particularly the *Gospel according to Mary* also known as the *Gospel of Mary*.

[521] Wilson 1973, 344.

[522] Ibid, 343. It has even been suggested that this might represent a real conflict in the early church between disciples of Mary Magdalene and Peter; King 2003, 173.

[523] *Gospel of Mary* (17:18-22) in Tuckett 2007, 99.

[524] In the Gospel of John the Magdalene after having seen Christ resurrected returns to the disciples and informs them of her vision: "Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her" (John 20: 18). This is the only instance where the Magdalene appears to share a revelation with the other disciples, which might have served as a source of inspiration for this and other apocrypha.

presence often overshadowed that of the twelve. The surviving fragments prove that the Gospel was circulated and read in Egypt, and probably Syria, over a period of at least three centuries, from the time it was composed in the second century until the copy made in the fifth-century Berlin Codex.[525]

Mary Magdalene not only engaged in conversations with the disciples but also with Christ himself. In Gnostic literature, women disciples appear as interlocutors of Christ, and most frequent in this role was Mary Magdalene.[526] Gnosticism was a widespread religious philosophy, current in the early centuries of the Christian era, which was characterized by the doctrine that salvation is achieved through knowledge (gnōsis).[527] In the *Pistis Sophia*, a late third- or probably fourth-century Egyptian Gnostic work, which in character is a lengthy post-Resurrection conversation between Christ and his disciples, the Magdalene intervenes seventy-two times[528] and she is responsible of asking thirty-nine out of the forty-six questions put to Jesus.[529] The prominent role of Mary Magdalene was confirmed by Christ himself: 'But Mary Magdalene and John, the maiden will surpass all my disciples and all men who shall receive mysteries in the Ineffable'.[530] In Epiphanios' *Panarion* or 'medicine chest', a treatise in which the author refuted the teachings of eighty sects from the very beginnings of Christianity up to his own time, a passage survives from the Gnostic Gospel *Questions of Mary*.[531] In that passage Christ took Mary Magdalene to the mount of Galilee where he presented her with a revelation, a secret teaching imparted to a privileged listener.

---

[525] King 2003, 185; Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, Berlin, Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung.
[526] Bauckham 2002, 240.
[527] NCE 1981, 6: 523.
[528] Four interventions were made by Salome and Martha and three by the Virgin, Bauckham 2002, 241.
[529] Wilson, 1973, 257.
[530] Ibid, 256-57.
[531] Philip, 1990. Wilson, 1973, 256-57.

In Origen's treatise *Against Celsus*, the author quotes a list made by Celsus in which various Gnostic sects derived their beliefs directly from women: 'Simonians from Helen, Marcellians from Marcellina, Harpocratians from Salome, others from Mary [Mariamme], others from Martha'.[532] Mary Magdalene's exploitation by various Gnostic sects is attested by her popularity in that literature and also in Epiphanios' *Panarion*. That Origen's Mary is in fact Mary Magdalene, is supported both by the spelling Mariamme, which is how the Magdalene is spelled in both Coptic and Greek manuscripts of the *Gospel of Mary, w*here she is securely identified, and also by the fact that in various Gnostic texts she appears as the leading female authority, the head of the disciples.[533] It could be argued that her prominence in Gnostic circles might have influenced the way her personality was presented in the Orthodox writings. The Christian authors might have suppressed the women disciples of Jesus because of Gnostic appeals to their authorities. Bauckham, however, argues that there is no evidence of a deliberate polemic of this kind.[534] Nevertheless, in some apocryphal texts like the *Gospel according to Mary,* it becomes apparent that the words spoken by Mary Magdalene offer a strong basis for legitimating women's authority.[535] This could have not gone unnoticed by the Church Fathers and could explain why the differences between the two literatures are so striking. This intentional polemic becomes more apparent below.

The Magdalene's importance in the Gnostic literature is evident from Epiphanios' treatise *Against the Gnostics*, where the Noli me Tangere was put to a very peculiar

---

[532] PG 11, col. 1281. Chadwick 1980, 312.
[533] For further discussion with references see Tuckett 2007, 14-18.
[534] Bauckham 2002, 246.
[535] King 2003, 172.

use.[536] It was employed by the author to attack adultery and seduction. Christ is preventing Mary Magdalene from touching his body in order, according to Epiphanios, to demonstrate the purity (αγνείαν) and abstinence of the body.[537] Here, the choice of Mary Magdalene to attack the Gnostics was not coincidental. By implying that the Magdalene was not pure, Epiphanios indirectly attacked both the leading female figure of Gnosticism, and thus the core of their teachings, but also the Gnostics themselves, who like the Magdalene were not allowed to touch (comprehend) his divinity.

The discrepancy between the Gnostic and Canonical literatures might also be due to the fact that many Gnostic groups had women leaders. In fact the gnostic Magdalene became a figure to whom some Christians appealed in order to defend and promote, between other things, the role of women in the church.[538] This was in stark contrast to the increasing opposition to any female leadership in the official Church. Timothy, a priest who lived in Constantinople ca. 500, offered a glimpse of what the Church's standpoint on the subject was. The author, in a treatise titled *On the Treatment of Heretics*, attacked the heresy of Marcionites.[539] This heresy appeared from the very beginnings of Christianity and adopted a strong ecclesiastical organization similar to that of the official church, thus becoming one of 'the most dangerous foe Christianity has ever known'.[540] This group used to bring forth women as their teachers who subsequently became leaders of men and also priestesses, and thus, according to Timothy, disgraced Christ who is the head of the Church.[541] Timothy's accusation

---

[536] PG 41, col. 356.
[537] Ibid, col. 356.
[538] King 2003, 173.
[539] PG 86.1 *On the Treatment of Heretics*, col.11-74, col. 52.
[540] Arendzen 1910.
[541] PG 86.1, col. 52.

first appeared in Tertullian's writings who lived a generation after Marcion's death

and is a much better witness to the sects' customs. The official attitude of the Church

explains why the Magdalene never acquired the same prominence but does not

explain why her treatment was so inconsistent.

Sometimes the Magdalene was portrayed as an unintelligent individual, while on

other occasions she exceeded the first of the Apostles in bravery. These variations in

our authors' perceptions of the Magdalene should be seen in the light of the different

genres to which their texts belong, but also in the light of the authors' preferences and

whether these were influenced by current trends. The prejudice against any female

authority in the official church might be another reason for her contradictory

treatment by the authors. Mary Magdalene as the most significant character in

Christ's Passion and Resurrection drew to much attention to herself, thus potentially

rivalling the role of the Theotokos. The absence of any surviving visual examples of

the Noli me Tangere in the period before Iconoclasm could be explained by the

prominence of another post-Resurrection image, the Chairete.[542] The fact that two

Maries were present in the Chairete meant that the Magdalene's role was equalled by

that of another woman, the 'other Mary'. As soon as the 'other Mary' was identified

as the Virgin, Mary Magdalene's presence in the scene became supportive rather than

primary, and she could have been omitted if the Gospel was not talking about two

women. As noted earlier, the pair of women probably responded to Jewish law, which

required two witnesses, but whether this is relevant to the popularity of the Chairete

---

[542] The Road to Emmaus and the Noli me Tangere were "two of the most memorable events of the resurrection appearance narrative", Bauckham 2002, 283-84. This was not reflected in art.

over the Noli me Tangere it is difficult to say, especially given the anti-Jewish sentiment of the Christian Church.[543]

To sum up, a variety of reasons seem to have influenced the exclusion of the Magdalene and the Noli me Tangere from Byzantine art. The Magdalene's popularity in the apocrypha associated her with heresy, while her important role in the post-Resurrection narrative rivalled that of the Virgin's, once the latter was included. The confusion on how many Maries of Magdala existed did not help either, while the words of Christ, 'Touch me not', became an explanatory crux, especially in the light of the Chairete, where Christ's allows the two women to touch him. This tangibility played a significant role in the scene's rise in importance after Iconoclasm.

Furthermore, the efforts of harmonisation suggested that the Magdalene's presence time and again at the tomb was based on a mixture of impulsiveness, incredulity and what was described by the authors as 'a common female behaviour'. Finally the lack of a well-known shrine deprived the Magdalene of a source of relics, in the form of *eulogiai*. None of the surviving ampullae depicts the Noli me Tangere. These reasons must have played a role in the absence of the scene from the early Byzantine art.[544] The inconsistency with which the Church Fathers approach her character is relevant not only to the influence this might have exerted on her representation in the artistic production, and thus relevant to the Noli me Tangere scene, but also to her cult, with no secure shrines attributed to her before Iconoclasm.

---

[543] The Jewish law states: "A single witness shall not suffice to convict a person of any crime or wrongdoing…only on the evidence of two or three witnesses shall a charge be sustained", Deut 19: 15.
[544] Other considerations will be discussed in chapter 5, which examines the post-Iconoclast evidence. After Iconoclasm the 'rivalry' between the Virgin and the Magdalene clearly surfaced for the first time in the theological literature.

In this chapter we examined how the two most important female figures of the post-Resurrection narrative were treated in the theological literature. As far at the Virgin is concerned, the rise in her cult meant that she could not have been absent from Christ's resurrection inspire of the Gospel's silence. Thus the Virgin was labelled the 'other Mary' and as such she appeared in a number of artistic examples, which, like the theological sources, correspond both in place and time with Antioch and its environs. Thus it is safe to argue that the Virgin as the 'other Mary' was clearly an Antiochene exegetical invention.

On the other hands the Magdalene's role in the same narrative, where she featured as the most prominent figure was minimised by the Church Fathers. The Magdalene's pre-eminence eclipsed that of the Virgin and by playing down her role, usually by attacking her character, the Fathers of the Church wanted to make sure that no comparisons would have been made between the two. Also, this contradictory treatment should not be seen as unrelated to the Magdalene's role in the apocryphal literature, where she features prominent as an interlocutor of Christ, must have played its part in the fathers reluctance to see her for what she was, one of Christ's more fervent supporter. In the chapter that follows a different kind of theological literature will be examined, the one employed by the church against the various heresies.

CHAPTER 3: Anti-Heretical, Ecclesiastical and Liturgical Influences

In the previous chapter I have discussed the influenced exerted by theological exegesis on the two main *personae* of the post-Resurrection narrative, namely the Virgin and the Magdalene, and how this subsequently influenced their depictions in art. In this chapter I will examine more specific issues related to theology, liturgy and ecclesiastical policy and whether these have played any role in the evolution, dissemination and iconography of the post-Resurrection appearance.

The first chapter deals with the Christological controversies regarding Christ's nature with specific reference to the use of the post-Resurrection appearances, as visual polemics against the heretics, and the influence it might have exerted on their depictions in art. It should be noted, though, that while the analysis is not strictly art-historical, it makes a significant contribution to the understanding of the theological background of these scenes. The explanations offered by the theologians enhance our understanding of how the post-Resurrection narrative was perceived in terms of dogma.[545]

The second subchapter deals with more specific theological issues. The first section discusses the Arian decoration of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, and whether the scenes from the upper zone of that church conveyed a 'heretical' message. This will provide me with the opportunity to put the discussion of the previous subchapter, into context.

---

[545] Kartsonis 1986, 34-35, argues that "it is doubtful that contemporary art produced by Christians for Christians would remain oblivious to important christological issues". It should be noted, however, that this understanding presupposes not only a deep understanding of theology but also a very specific 'reading'.

The other sections will examine the influences exerted upon the scenes by the liturgy of Baptism, the Easter liturgy and the Canonical and Apocryphal tradition. These influences are visible in various iconographic details. Through the participation in liturgical celebrations, the faithful was able to relive and experience the theological meaning of events in the life of Christ; thus the details inserted in the iconography are not unrelated to this participation, but rather were deliberately chosen to create in the minds of the beholders an image of combined narrative and liturgical value.

3.1 The post-Resurrection Appearances of Christ as Polemics against Heresies.

> Thomas' finger became a pen of devoutness, overthrowing the heretical nets and shutting the mouths of those who dared say that Christ had assumed a body and died symbolically.[546]

The resurrection of Christ is the cornerstone of Christian theology as it proves both Christ's divinity and also God's plan for the salvation of humanity. Christian doctrine concerning the resurrection of the body and the Last Judgment were major problems for the presentation of Christianity and it is not surprising that the first works of Christian theology addressed these very issues.[547] In order to verify the corporeal resurrection of the dead, the fathers of the Church had to prove that Christ's body, and not only his spirit, left the tomb.[548] Another issue addressed by the theologians was

---

[546] Severian, *On the Ascension,* PG 52, col. 779.
[547] Price 1999, 121-122.
[548] Markellos of Ankyra, *On the Incarnation and Against the Arians*, PG 26, col. 224: "And for that we say that Christ died and buried and resurrected in flesh".

linked to whether Christ's nature after the resurrection remained the same as before.[549] In both instances, the post-Resurrection appearances became crucial to the argument as they provided the necessary evidence to refute opposing teaching expressed by various heresies.

In the first three centuries of Christianity, various heresies considered Christ to be either an entirely divine being or merely a man: the Ebionites denied Christ's divinity altogether while Docetism eliminated his humanity.[550] Ignatios of Antioch (ca.50-ca. 110), who is regarded as the most important and most successful ecclesiastical representative in the early second century anti-heretical struggle,[551] had to conduct a two-front war against the Ebionites and the Docetists. The former was a Judaising sect that denied the virginal conception and believed that Christ was conceived in the normal way.[552] In the *Epistle to the Ephesians* and the *Epistle to the Trallians*, Ignatios tackled with this issue by emphasising that Christ was truly born by Mary in accordance with the plan of God and through the presence of the Holy Spirit and was truly raised from the dead.[553] While no specific reference exists on a particular appearance, Christ's birth through the Holy Spirit and his resurrection, were employed as evidence of his divinity.

Ignatios, however, did employ the post-Resurrection appearances to tackle the heresy of Docetism. On his way to martyrdom, Ignatios passed through Smyrna where he

---

[549] Leo the Great (c.395 – 461) in his sermon *On the Lord's Resurrection,* NPNF 12: 182 says that "Christ's manifestations after the Resurrection showed that his Person was essentially the same as before". For Leo the Great see below.

[550] Kelly 1958, 138-142.

[551] Bauer 1972, 61.

[552] Goulder 1999, 27.

[553] Ignatios, *Epistle to the Ephesians*18:2; *Epistle to the Trallians*, 9; in Grant 1966, 49 and 78. For a discussion see Goulder 1999, 26-27.

came into personal contact with this heresy.[554] Docetism taught that Christ did not

have a real body during his life on earth but rather a bodily appearance, an illusion of

flesh.[555] Docetic views on Christ's incarnation are generally thought to have

developed in Gnostic circles.[556]

Ignatios, in his *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans*, immediately tackled the reality of Christ's

death and resurrection.[557] The author refers to Christ's Appearance to the Eleven and

stressed that after the resurrection Christ ate and drank with his disciples.[558] While the

Appearance to the Eleven is described in all four Gospels, the one used by Ignatios is

from Luke 24: 36-43. This was presumably done because Luke stressed Christ's

human nature by recording his words as: 'handle me and see for a spirit hath no flesh

and bones'. Furthermore, in this appearance, Christ asks his disciples for food which

'he took and did eat before them'.[559] Ignatios' primary concern was to prove Christ's

human nature after the resurrection; the Appearance to the Eleven from the Gospel of

Luke proved exactly that.

The same concern over Christ's human nature is also evident in the teachings of

Irenaeos, the second-century bishop of Lyon. Irenaeos was born before AD 142 and

became bishop after AD 178. In his treatise in five books commonly titled *Against

Heresies*, Irenaeos dealt especially with the general resurrection and the resurrection

of the flesh, which was denied by the Gnostics.[560] Quotations from the Emmaus story

---

[554] Lightfoot 1889, 285-286.
[555] Bercot 1998, 305; NCE 1981, 4: 934.
[556] NCE 1981, 4: 934. Bauer 1972, 67, believes that Ignatios himself was not free from Gnosticism.
[557] Grant 1966, 115; Richardson 1953, 112.
[558] Grant 1966, 116; Richardson 1953, 113. A longer version of the *Epistle to the Smyrnaeans* exists that contains additional post-Resurrection events; this work though is considered to be the work of a fourth- or fifth-century author, ibid, 71.
[559] Luke, verses 39 and 43 respectively.
[560] Lawson 1948, 280-281; Grillmeier 1975[2], 110.

(Luke 24: 13-35) were employed by Irenaeos in defence of the faith in *Book III*.[561] In *Book IV*, the author stressed the importance of the bodily resurrection of Christ by noting that is through Christ's flesh and blood that we were saved.[562] Irenaeos, like Ignatios before him, denounced heretical teachings by using quotations from the post-Resurrection appearances, and especially those described in the Gospel of Luke. His primary aim was to argue in favour of the reality of Christ's human nature, as this was the instrument of salvation, and as such it had to be identical with the one meant to be saved.[563]

The treatise *Against Celsus* by Origen (185-232) stands out as the culmination of the whole apologetic movement of the second and third centuries.[564] Celsus, who titled his work *True Account*, was probably the first pagan to write a whole treatise against Christianity.[565] Origen's response had been composed 'to free Christians of the embarrassing and intolerable situation of not being able to respond adequately to Celsus'.[566] To the latter's accusations that Christ never suffered on the cross and his wounds were fictitious, Origen replied by describing the Incredulity of Thomas, where Christ invites Thomas to touch his wounds.[567] Origen also described Christ's appearance to the disciples on the Road to Emmaus, where he identified the other disciple, whose name is not mentioned in the Gospels, as Peter: 'And according to the Gospel of Luke, while Peter and Kleopas were talking to each other about what had happened to them, Christ appeared among them'.[568]

---

[561] *Ante Nicene Library* 1: 5, 328.
[562] Ibid, 14, 416-418.
[563] Kelly 1958, 147-148.
[564] Chadwick 1980, ix.
[565] Frede 1999, 132 -133.
[566] Ibid, 139. The author argues that Irenaeos did not take up this endeavour without hesitation.
[567] PG 11, col. 892.
[568] Ibid, col. 893. This is probably one of the earliest identification of Peter as one of the two disciples of the Emmaus story; the other disciple's name is Kleopas and is recorded in Luke (24: 18).

Another question brought up by Celsus was why Christ did not appear to those who accused and sentenced him to death or to somebody else beside his disciples.[569] In reply Origen said that Christ after the resurrection appeared for a forty-day period to his disciples (Acts 1: 3); he then quoted Paul (I Cor. 15: 5-8), who reported that Christ had also appeared to five hundred people.[570] For Origen, not all humans have the ability to see Christ resurrected and those who saw him did not actually perceive him in the same way: 'And to all who see <him>, appears not the same'.[571] Origen repeated again the Emmaus story and gave special attention to the fact that the two disciples recognized Christ during the supper, when he broke up the bread and gave it to them.[572] However some later theologians strongly contested Origen's theology, claiming that his theories on the soul of Christ amounted to a denial of the corporeal resurrection.[573]

Epiphanios of Cyprus (ca.315-403) was one such theologian. At the request of the Pamphylian monks for whom he wrote the *Ancoratus* (Well-Anchored) in 374, Epiphanios wrote in 377 the *Panarion* or *Medicine Chest*.[574] It was compiled of three books in which he refuted the teachings of eighty sects from the very beginnings of Christianity up to his own time.[575] In *Against the Marcionites*, Epiphanios refuted a Gospel written by Marcion, one of the leading heretical teachers of the second

---

[569] PG 11, col. 896.

[570] 1 Cor. 15: 6: "After that He was seen by over five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain to the present, but some have fallen asleep".

[571] PG 11, col. 896.

[572] Ibid, col. 901. According to Kodell 1988, 111, this act is Christ signature; Christ from now on will be present in the breaking of the bread, but will no longer be visible.

[573] Kelly 1958, 474-475; Grillmeier 1975[2], 146-147; Bethune-Baker 1923[3], 152-153.

[574] Dechow 1988, 94.

[575] Ibid, 94. For an English translation of the *Panarion* focusing only on the sects' beliefs and practices, see Amidon 1990.

century, who only accepted the authority of the Gospel of Luke.[576] While Epiphanios

was refuting the corrupted passages from the post-Resurrection narrative, he stressed

the corporeal Resurrection of Christ.[577] The emphasis on the bodily resurrection

should be seen as the result of the many Gnostic elements employed by Marcion in

his teaching. In *Against the Gnostics*, however, Epiphanios did not insist on the bodily

resurrection of Christ but rather attacked the sexual practises of the various Gnostic

sects by employing the Noli me Tangere as a model. Epiphanios explained that Christ

prevented Mary Magdalene from touching his body in order to demonstrate chastity

and abstinence. [578] The choice of this appearance is not coincidental, for, as we saw in

the previous chapter, the Magdalene appeared extensively in Gnostic writings.[579]

From these examples, it becomes apparent that the post-Resurrection appearances

were employed in the first centuries to lay emphasis on Christ's human nature after

the resurrection. This was prompted by heretical teaching stressing the exact opposite:

Christ's spiritual or divine nature. The theologians employed an armament of post-

Resurrection appearances taken in their majority from the Gospel of Luke. This is

probably due to the fact that the Appearance to the Eleven in the Gospel of Luke has a

more terrestrial value if for example it is compared with the same appearance

described in the other Gospels.[580] In Luke, Christ speaks of his humanity and

---

[576] PG 41, *Against the Marcionites*, col. 695-774; Amidon 1990, 144-160. Marcion's Gospel was in fact a debased version of that of Luke. For Marcion see Bercot 1998, 419.

[577] Epiphanios refers to the Maries at the Tomb, the Emmaus story and the Appearance to the Eleven.

[578] PG 41, *Against the Gnostics*, col. 329-363; ibid, col. 356.

[579] Shoemaker 2001, 560, contests the view that the name Mary refers necessarily to Mary Magdalene and suggests that the Gnostic Mary "is in fact a composite figure, and that she has absorbed elements of both the Magdalene's and the Virgin's identities". See also the previous chapter for a discussion on the Magdalene in the Gnostic literature. The same confusion appears in the writings of Ephraim the Syrian, Gambero 1999, 115, note 21.

[580] In Mark 16: 14-18 and John 20: 19-23, the Appearance to the Eleven is fused with the Mission of the Apostles, the same applies for Matth. 28: 16-20, but the appearance takes place in Galilee and not in Jerusalem.

performs in a typically human fashion: feeling hungry and eating.[581] The same could be said of the Road to and Supper at Emmaus, described again in Luke, where Christ walked, conversed and ate with his disciples. With the sole exception of Dura-Europos, no post-Resurrection images of Christ's appearance survive this early; this makes it difficult to determine what effect this anti-heretical literature might have exerted in their depiction in art.[582]

The theology of the fourth century was dominated by the figure of Athanasios, Patriarch of Alexandria (ca.296-373), who defended the Nicene faith through skilful politics and theological acumen.[583] Athanasios is also known as the greatest adversary of Arianism, a heresy promulgated by the priest Arios, whose name it adopted. The conflict between the official church and Arios' supporters triggered the intervention of the Emperor Constantine who, in response, called the First Ecumenical Council in Nicaea (325).[584]

Arios' taught that Christ was begotten, thus different from the true God, and that as a creature, Christ was fallible and passible.[585] Some of Arios' words survived in a letter that formed part of the proceedings of the Council of Nicaea and was sent to the church of Alexandria. In this letter Arios had stated that Christ: 'is from things that are not', and 'before he was begotten he was not' and 'there once was when he was

---

[581] Luke 37-43: "They were startled and frightened, thinking they saw a ghost. He said to them, 'Why are you troubled, and why do doubts rise in your minds? Look at my hands and my feet. It is I myself! Touch me and see; a ghost does not have flesh and bones, as you see I have.' When he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet. And while they still did not believe it because of joy and amazement, he asked them, 'Do you have anything here to eat?' They gave him a piece of broiled fish, and he took it and ate it in their presence."

[582] The scene of the Maries at the Tomb in Dura was most probably inspired, at least in the number of the women, by the *Diatessaron* of Tatian. For a discussion see chapter 1.

[583] Young 1983, 57.

[584] Ostrogorsky 1963, 106-107.

[585] Young, 61. For Arios' *Thalia*, see Stead 1978.

not'.[586] The heresy of Arios was crucial for the formulation of the doctrine of the consubstantiality of Christ. The creed of Nicaea, by calling the Son 'only begotten, that is, from the substance of the Father',[587] was attacking Arios' teaching by employing the very weapon he had brought to the debate.[588] This creedal formula emphasized that Christ is fully God and not an exceptional human being.[589] It could be argued that the importance of Christ's human nature, as seen in the first Christian centuries, had now been shifted to his divine nature, and thus a different armament of quotations was needed, one that stressed his divine nature over his human.[590]

This is evident in a number of discourses against the Arians, where Athanasios used, among others, references to the post-Resurrection narrative. In *Discourse I,* the author referred to the myrrh carried by the Maries, as a fulfilment of the prophecies.[591] Even though the importance here was placed on the myrrh rather than on the post-Resurrection appearance, Athanasios was employing it to demonstrate that the prophecies were fulfilled and that Christ was God. Athanasios then added: 'but he is the same; nor did he alter when he became man'.[592] In *Discourse II*, the author employed the quotation from the Incredulity of Thomas, 'My Lord and my God' (John 20: 28) as proof of Christ's divinity.[593] The emphasis here was on Thomas' words and not on his actions, as the latter drew attention to Christ's human form. In *Discourse IV*, the author employed again the Incredulity of Thomas and the

---

[586] Tanner 1990, 16-17.
[587] Ibid, 5.
[588] Pelikan 1971, 202.
[589] Meyer 2006, 83.
[590] Grillmeier 1975[2], 310, states that Athanasios 'does not accuse them <the Arians> of having made Christ into a special type of being, but simply of having made him into an ordinary man'. The concern over Christ's dual nature will of course remain a focal point throughout the Patristic era.
[591] NPNF 4, 334. The prophecy is from Psalm XIV, 8: "And thy garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia".
[592] Ibid, 334.
[593] Ibid, 361. The same idea is also expressed in *Letter LIX to Epiktetos*, 574 and in *Letter LXI to Maximos*, 578.

Appearance to the Eleven, to demonstrate that Christ had the same substance with God.[594] The connection between Thomas and the discourse against Arios became even more explicit in a small sermon dated AD 402, where the Incredulity was used to attack Arian teaching.[595] In these examples, the weight of the argument fell on the post-Resurrection appearances, with the aid of which Athanasios pointed at Christ's divinity and consubstantiality.

Eunomios was the principal leader of the Anomoean party within the Arian sect, which derived its name from the belief that the Father and Son are unlike or dissimilar in essence, thus rejecting the Nicene dogma of *homoousios*.[596] Gregory of Nyssa (ca.330-ca.395), in his treatise *Against Eunomios*, which was written as a response to the latter's *Apologia Apologiae*,[597] employed the Noli me Tangere and the Appearance to the Eleven to refute Anomoean teaching. The Noli me Tangere was also employed by Eunomios and his party, to prove that Christ was only human, as he had brothers.[598] The argument was based on Christ's words spoken to the Magdalene: 'Go instead to my brothers and tell them' (John 20: 17).[599] Gregory, by employing the afore-mentioned appearances demonstrated that while one can touch Christ's human nature, as in his Appearance to the Eleven, his divine nature is untouchable, as demonstrated in the Noli me Tangere.[600] The epicentre of Gregory's position was that the human qualities of Christ proved not only that he was man, but that he became

---

[594] Ibid, 447. Arios, in his teaching that survives through a number of letters and long quotations from a metrical work named *Thalia*, teaches, among other things, that Christ was not consubstantial with the father but that God created him out of non-existence ("εξ ουκ όντων"), Hanson 1988, 20.

[595] Pseudo-Chrysostom, *On Saint Thomas the Apostle, and against the Arians, and to the same Arian tortured and killed in Thrace*, PG 59, 497-500. For the date see Antonopoulou 2001, 100, note 19.

[596] For Eunomios and the Anomoean heresy, see EEC 1997[2], 399 and 58-59, respectively.

[597] Meredith 1999, 28.

[598] Canévet 1983, 162.

[599] Canévet 1983, 162: "Ainsi la parole du Christ à Marie Madeleine est un cheval de bataille des Eunomiens puisque le Christ montre qu'il a des frères".

[600] PG 45, col. 884 -885; Jaeger 1960, VOL: 289-290.

one to transform humanity.[601] Like Athanasios', Gregory's teaching stressed Christ's divine nature over his human.

Another heresy that professed Christ's humanity was the Apollinarians. This group derived its name from Apollinarios of Laodicea (ca. 315 – ca. 392), who taught that Christ had a human body and soul and that the Logos took the place of his human spirit. In *Against Apollinarios*, Gregory of Nyssa employed the Appearance to the Eleven (Luke 24: 39) in order to point out that Christ became human only after the Incarnation.[602] A similar idea was expressed by Ambrose of Milan (ca. 340 – 397) in his treatise *On the Christian Faith*, where the author cited again the Appearance to the Eleven from Luke 24:38 in order to demonstrate that only Christ's human nature had a beginning and an end.[603] Ambrose also used the Chairete episode as evidence that Christ accepted worship from the two Maries as God, but at the same time he worshipped God with his human nature.[604]

The Arian teaching on Christ's humanity forced the Church to respond by stressing Christ's divinity. Once more the anti-heretical polemicists employed a variety of post-Resurrection appearances aiming primarily to prove Christ's consubstantiality with the Father. The theologians, though, were careful not to overstress their arguments on Christ's divinity, as his human nature was also fundamental for the dogma of the corporeal Resurrection. This is evident from the thirty-eighth homily *On I Corinthians* by John Chrysostom (344-407), where he explained why Paul in his epistle refers to

---

[601] Canévet 1983, 162-163.
[602] Ibid, 1152. See also Jaeger 1958, III.1: 150-151.
[603] NPNF 10, 278
[604] Ibid, 278. Ambrose points that the latter refers specifically to Christ's humanity.

the scriptures.[605] The scriptures, said Chrysostom, do not mention anything about the death of sin, but focus on the corporeal death and resurrection of Christ, which is why Paul makes a list of people to whom Christ appeared. Otherwise this list of appearances would have been unimportant.[606]

The same interest on the bodily resurrection is also evident in Epiphanios's *Ancoratus*, probably one of his most celebrated works, where the author deals in particular with the Trinity and the Dogma of the Resurrection.[607] In discussing Christ's Resurrection, Epiphanios stated that not only Christ's spirit had left the tomb, but also his body. To support his arguments the author employed quotations from Mark 16: 6 (Maries at the Tomb) and also John 20: 24 (Incredulity of Thomas); in the first occasion because the angels informed the women that Christ was no longer in the tomb, and in the second occasion because Thomas actually touched Christ's body.[608] The bodily resurrection was used by Epiphanios to attack Origen's beliefs on the same subject.[609]

Amongst post-Resurrection imagery, the surviving fourth-century artistic evidence illustrates a preference for the Maries at the Tomb, the Incredulity and the Chairete. Contemporary theology employed these appearances against heretics but their popularity was not relied solely on their anti-heretical function. In the fourth century these depictions were expressions not only of the theology but also of the reality of

---

[605] I Cor. 15: 3 "that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures"; PG 61, col. 325-326.
[606] Ibid, col. 326, here Chrysostom cites Paul, I Cor. 15: 3-8, where the latter makes a list of post-Resurrection appearances. Chrysostom bypasses the discrepancy between Paul's reference to Peter as the first to see Christ resurrected (as opposed to the Maries in the canonical Gospels), by saying that Paul refers to the first man and not woman.
[607] PG 43, col. 41-236. For a comparative study on Epiphanios and Origen see Dechow 1988, 349 ff.
[608] PG 43, col. 184.
[609] Dechow 1988, 390 believes that Epiphanios' position that Origen degraded the Resurrection of the dead was unsubstantiated.

the Resurrection, that is, they acted both as scenes of an historical episode, the resurrection, and also of dogma. This is further substantiated not only by the presence of the afore-mentioned images but also by the absence of others. Scenes like the Appearance of Christ to the Eleven (Luke 24: 36-49) and the Emmaus story Luke 24: 13-35, both associated mainly with Christ's human nature, are completely absent from this period; a period that was preoccupied with the divine and consubstantial nature of Christ.

Theodoret of Cyrus (ca.393-ca.457) summarises amply the situation up to his own time by explaining what the process of refuting heretical teaching should be:

> When therefore we are disputing with Marcion, Manes and Valentinos, the earliest inventors of impiety, we endeavour to prove from the divine scriptures that the Lord Christ is not only God but also man. When however, we are proving to the ignorant that the doctrine of Arios, Eunomios and Apollinarios about the œconomy is incomplete, we show from the divine oracles of the Spirit that the assumed nature was perfect.[610]

Theodoret here points to the difference between the early heretics who refused to accept Christ's human nature, and the later heretics who considered Christ not consubstantial to God.

After the death of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus became the leading Antiochene theologian.[611] Written in 447, his *Eranistes* consisted of three discussions in dialogue form between two *personae*: the Orthodox and the Eranistes (collector).[612]

---

[610] NPNF 3, *Letter CLI to the Monks of the Euphratensian, the Osrhoene, Syria, Phoenicia and Cilicia*, 327.
[611] Ettlinger 1975, 3.
[612] Ibid, 5 and note 2 for the name 'Eranistes'.

From that treatise comes *Dialogue III: The Impassible*, in which Theodoret tackled with the question of the bodily resurrection of Christ.[613] Theodoret cited Matthew 27: 57-60 and Luke 23: 50, who describe Joseph of Arimathaea's request for Christ's body. The author also cited the angel's words to the Maries at the Tomb as described in Matthew 28: 6 'Come see the place where the Lord lay', as these refer to the corporeal body of Christ.[614] On the Eranistes' persistence in speaking of the Resurrection of God rather than of a body made of flesh, Theodoret replied by saying: 'But who hearing of a resurrection of a God, would ever believe that the resurrection of men would be exactly like it'.[615] The same line of reasoning was used again in his *Letter to the Soldiers*, but here instead of the Maries, the author cited Mary Magdalene's visit to the tomb.[616] The Appearance to the Eleven was also used in the same letter by Theodoret to demonstrate that the body that suffered on the cross had now been resurrected.[617]

The Appearance to the Eleven was used again in *Dialogue II: The Unconfounded*, as proof of Christ's bodily Resurrection.[618] On the question of whether Christ showed his hands to the disciples (Luke 24: 39) in the same manner as he wrestled Jacob (Gen. 32: 24) Theodoret's respond was negative, as on the former occasion, said the theologian, Christ had a real body.[619] Theodoret constantly employed the Appearance to the Eleven in order to prove that Christ's human body remained unaltered after the

---

[613] NPNF 3, 226-227.
[614] Ibid, 227.
[615] Ibid, 228.
[616] Ibid, 311; SC 111, 166.
[617] NPNF 3, 231. On the same subject Theodoret quotes two earlier fathers, Hippolytos and Eustathios of Antioch; ibid, 235.
[618] Ibid, 191.
[619] Ibid, 198; Christ's nature was not obligated to human needs; he eats not because he needs to, but to prove his bodily resurrection says Theodoret.

Resurrection.[620] It thus becomes apparent that the concern with the bodily resurrection

of Christ remained a vital element for the presentation and defence of Christianity in

the fifth century and that the Appearance to the Eleven from the Gospel of Luke was

introduced as important evidence to Christ's unchanged human nature after the

Resurrection.

Theodoret however was not only preoccupied with Christ's human nature but also

with his divine one. This is evident in his *Letter to Dioskuros*, where Theodoret stated

that Thomas managed through the visible nature to discern the invisible, a clear

reference to Thomas' actions and words: 'My Lord and my God' (John 20: 28).[621]

Cyril of Alexandria (ca.370-444), a key figure of the Council of Ephesos (431), used

the same reasoning in his *Thesauros* (Treasure), a work that contains a number of

assertions tackling the subject of the consubstantiality of the Holy Spirit, directed

mainly against the Arian and Eunomian heresies.[622] In assertion thirty-two the author

gave a great number of references to demonstrate that Christ is God and one of these

is John 24: 24-31, the Incredulity of Thomas. While the Incredulity was used as

evidence of Christ's divinity, Cyril in his second letter to Nestorios feels obliged to

explain Christ's words to Mary Magdalene.[623] It is true, says Cyril, that Christ called

the Father 'God' (John 20: 17) even though he was himself God, but he also became

man and so was subject to God according to the nature of manhood.[624] It becomes

apparent that the Noli me Tangere was employed here by the heretics to prove

---

[620] Ibid, 199; 202, where the author uses a fusion between the Appearance to the Eleven and Incredulity; 205, where the author cites a quotation from Ambrose's *Exposition of the Faith*; 208, where Theodoret cites a quotation from Gregory of Nyssa's, *Against Eunomios* (see above). See also Theodoret's *Demonstration by Syllogisms*, NPNF 3, 247 and the *Letter to the Monks of the Euphratensian, the Osrhoene, Syria, Phoenicia and Cilicia*, ibid, 331.
[621] PG 83, col. 1265.
[622] PG 75, col. 9-656.
[623] Tanner 1990, 53.
[624] Ibid, 53.

Christ's humanity, as in the case of the Eunomian heresy refuted by Gregory; thus

there is a visible difference between the use of the Incredulity by the Orthodox and of

the Noli me Tangere by the heretics.

Leo the Great (ca.395-461), like Cyril before him, played a key role in an Ecumenical

council. The formula accepted in the 'Definition of the faith' at the Council of

Chalcedon (451), was in agreement with Leo's letter to Flavian.[625] This letter formed

part of the proceedings of the Council and is also known as 'The Tome'.[626] There Leo

employed the Appearance to the Eleven, the Supper at Emmaus and the Incredulity of

Thomas to attack Eutyches' heresy.[627] These appearances, said Leo, occurred 'so that

it would be recognised that the proper character of the divine and of the human nature

went on existing inseparable in him'.[628] The author employed a variety of appearances

as proof of Christ's dual nature.[629] The same idea is also expressed in a sermon on the

resurrection where Leo stated that: 'Christ's manifestations after the resurrection

showed that his person was essentially the same as before'.[630]

The fifth century saw two Ecumenical councils, in Ephesos and Chalcedon, which

professed that two perfect natures existed in Christ. Both councils incorporated

writings from leading theologians of the time, who in their turn made use of

references to the post-Resurrection appearances. Leo the Great, on one hand,

employed various appearances in order to prove that after the resurrection the two

natures in Christ remained inseparable; on the other hand, Cyril's reference to the

---

[625] Ibid, 75.
[626] Ibid, 75.
[627] Ibid, 80, NPNF 3, 42. For the heresy of Eutyches see Bercot 1998, 476-478
[628] Tanner 1990, 81.
[629] It could be that the Appearance to the Eleven and the Supper at Emmaus from the Gospel of Luke prove Christ's human nature, while the Incredulity of Thomas, both.
[630] Leo the Great, *Sermon LXXI*: *On the Lords' Resurrection*, NPNF 3, 182.

Noli me Tangere was a response to heretical teaching employing this very appearance as evidence of Christ's humanity. As has been discussed in the previous chapter, the Noli me Tangere is virtually absent from the Early and Middle Byzantine art. The fact that this appearance was employed by various heretical sects like the Gnostics, the Anomeans (Eunomians) and the Nestorians may be another reason for its absence from iconography.

In the example that follows, it is the presence and not the absence of a post-Resurrection appearance that points in the same direction. The earliest surviving depiction of the Road to Emmaus forms part of the Arian decoration of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo.[631] The choice of this appearance might be related to the fact that the Arians were firm supporters of Christ's humanity, and as we have seen above the Emmaus story had such connotations. Their choice however to depict the Incredulity of Thomas in the next compartment is puzzling. The latter was employed by the Orthodox as testimony of Christ's dual nature. However from the *Anathemas of the Three Chapters*,[632] which formed part of the proceedings of the Second Council of Constantinople (553), we learn that Theodore of Mopsuestia professed that the words spoken by Thomas: 'My Lord and my God' (John 20: 28) were 'not said about Christ, but that Thomas was in this way extolling God for raising up Christ and expressing his astonishment at the miracle of the Resurrection'.[633] Thus Thomas' words were manipulated by Theodore in such a way as to prove Christ's human nature: it was not Christ the God who was resurrected but rather it was God who had raised Christ. While difficult to associate this theology with the Arian decoration, the fact remains

---

[631] Bovini 1961, 14.
[632] That is, the teachings of Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus and Ibas of Edessa.
[633] Tanner 1990, 120.

that the earliest representation of the Road to Emmaus was depicted in an Arian church.[634]

The evidence considered in this chapter explains why some appearances were more popular than others. For example, the absence of the Noli me Tangere from pre-Iconoclast art may be based on the Magdalene's role, heretical associations, as well as apocryphal links, but also on the fact that this appearance did not offer a 'tangible' Christ and the words spoken by Christ remain up to this day, an interpretational problem. The bodily resurrection remained a key dogma of Orthodoxy and Christ's refusal to let the Magdalene touch him might partly explain its absence from art.

The popularity of the Maries at the Tomb in contrast cannot be due only to its use by the fathers of the church in their anti-heretical teaching but rather to the testimony this appearance offered of the empty tomb crucial evidence which proved that Christ's body, and not only his spirit had been resurrected. As the corporeal resurrection was denied by many heresies, the Maries might have gained some momentum in the early stages, but its role was rivalled by that of the Chairete and the Incredulity of Thomas. The Maries lacked something that the two latter had: a visual image of the resurrected Christ. This image, combined with the words spoken by the *personae* involved in these appearances, argued in favour of Christ's dual nature.

The early evidence from theology show that some sort of interaction existed between the anti-heretical literature and the post-Resurrection scenes. The latter were not simply chosen because of their function as synonyms to the resurrection, but some

---

[634] See following chapter for further considerations.

were preferred or rejected because of their dogmatic undertones. It also becomes apparent that the post-Resurrection narrative was employed by the Church Fathers in order to express dogma at a particular period of time. For example at Ephesos (431) emphasis was given to Christ's divinity, at Chalcedon (451) to his full humanity, then at Constantinople (553) back to his divinity followed by a new awareness of his human 'energy' at Constantinople in 680. It is true that each doctrinal definition at Ephesos, Chalcedon and Constantinople II, 'by solving some issues had raised new ones'.[635] This in conjunction with the fact that the Ecumenical councils issued specific definitions on the relationship between Christ's human and divine natures, created a pedantic movement that affirmed one over the other of Christ's two natures; thus the appropriate post-Resurrection appearances were used by the Fathers to prove one or the other of Christ's dual nature.

After Iconoclasm, the Chairete became more popular than the Maries in Constantinople, as a visual synonym to the resurrection, while in the West where no Iconoclasm occurred, the Maries scene retained its importance.[636] In the tenth century, the Incredulity appeared both in mosaics,[637] and on ivories,[638] as part of the so-called twelve feast cycle. Its dogmatic message of Christ's dual nature, which derived from the actions and words of the main characters and especially from Thomas' exclamation, was employed successfully against the heretics turning this post-Resurrection scene to one of major theological importance.[639]

---

[635] Meyendorff 1974, 36.
[636] See chapter 4.2.2
[637] See the discussion that follows in chapter 6.
[638] Weitzmann 1972, 46 argues that the Dumbarton Oaks ivory of the Incredulity was part of a twelve feast cycle. See also the discussion in Evans and Wixom 1997, no 94.
[639] Anastasios Sinaites, *Hodegos*, PG 89 col. 117, where the author speaks of the unity of the two natures: 'συζυγίαν των φύσεων'.

3.2 The role of Theology and Ecclesiastical policy in the evolution and dissemination of the post-Resurrection Appearances.

In the preceding section I discussed the influence that the anti-heretical literature might have exerted on the depiction of the post-Resurrection appearances in pre-Iconoclast art. While the results are not conclusive, the impression that some kind of interaction existed between the two is not implausible. This section however will focus on how other aspects of theology and ecclesiastical policy might have influenced the iconographic evolution and dissemination of the post-Resurrection appearances in the pre-Iconoclast period. The necessity of synthesis means that some aspects that were previously discussed will unavoidably be repeated here briefly, while other evidence will be introduced in further detail.

3.2.1 Ecclesiastical policy: The case of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna.

After the Byzantine re-conquest of Ravenna, the confiscated Arian churches passed through a process of liturgical consecration and rededication; and in the case of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, through a final element of change: 'the modification and purgation of the images'.[640] From the *Liber Pontificalis* we learn that bishop Agnellus 'reconciled all of the churches of the Goths that had been built at the time of the Goths and king Theoderic and which held by the perfidious Arians and by the doctrine and faith of the heretics'.[641] However the mosaic panels of the upper register of the church escaped this process and they were left intact.

---

[640] Urbano 2005, 92.

[641] The English translation was taken from Urbano 2005, 82. The Latin text reads: "Igitur iste beatissimus omnes Gothorum temporibus vel regis Theodorici constructae sunt, quae Ariana perfidia et

In the previous chapter it was argued that the choice to depict the Road to Emmaus in Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, a scene rarely depicted in Byzantine art and usually forming part of extensive post-Resurrection cycles, was the result of Arian influence. The scene, as we have seen, has a more terrestrial value and was used by the early Church Fathers as part of arguments intended to prove that Christ possessed not only a divine nature but also a human one. Whether the mosaic panel of the Road to Emmaus has a hidden theological agenda will be discussed below.

The two other scenes from the post-Resurrection cycle, namely the Maries at the Tomb and the Incredulity of Thomas, present no distinctive modifications from earlier models that one may label 'Arian'; on the contrary, these scenes share many stylistic and iconographic elements that were absent in earlier representations but became standard in the fully developed Middle Byzantine depictions of these themes.[642] However, one particular detail is somewhat suspicious: the standing sarcophagus in the Maries' panel. This is the second oldest instance, Dura being the first, that Christ's sepulchre is depicted as a sarcophagus.[643] If we consider that there was both a Roman and a Palestinian influence in Ravenna,[644] then the absence of a mausoleum or of an elaborate structure becomes conspicuous. However, the colonnade that surrounds the sarcophagus does provide a distant memory of the Constantinian rotunda and a burial

haereticorum secta doctrina et credulitate tenebantur", *Liber Pontificalis* 86: 38-41 in Deliyannis 2006, 253.

[642] For example the winged seated angel of the Maries becomes standard in later representations, which is also the case for the full number of disciples that appear in the Incredulity. The latter scene however portrays Christ raising his left hand instead of his right.

[643] Here of course the sarcophagus is surrounded by a colonnade, covered with a dome. Part of a sarcophagus is also visible on the British Museum ivory panel that depicts the Maries at the Tomb.

[644] Von Simson 1987 and Baumstark 1910 respectively. While Von Simson argues for a Roman influence on the mosaic decoration, it should be noted that the only other pre-Iconoclast example of the Road to Emmaus comes from Rome and Santa Maria Antiqua but post-dates our example, thus the possibility exists that it is the arts of Ravenna that have actually influenced the iconography of Rome.

place fit for God.[645] Most probably Christ's sepulchre on this panel shows the diversity of examples available to the artists in Ravenna, instead of a hidden theological agenda.

Both the Maries at the Tomb and the Incredulity were depicted flanking the Road to Emmaus, something that attests once more to their popularity as visual synonyms of the Resurrection. These Maries and the Incredulity 'proved' Christ's Resurrection and they were usually coupled together as on the Monza ampulla no. 9 (fig. 4),[646] and the British Museum ivory (figs. 21-22),[647] and many later examples. Thus the inclusion of the Road to Emmaus between these two images at Sant' Apollinare must have served another function. Before trying to establish what this function might have been, it should be noted that all other surviving examples of the Road to Emmaus, aside from manuscript illumination, come from the West.[648] The wall-paintings from Santa Maria Antiqua and the reliefs from the cruciform reliquary of Paschal I are two such examples.[649] Thus the depiction of the Road to Emmaus could have been a 'local', Italian tradition, of which Sant' Apollinare Nuovo was just one example. This, of course, does not fully explain the choice of this scene in the mosaic decoration.

It has been established by scholars that the Christological cycle portrayed in the two upper registers on the opposing walls of Sant' Apollinare belonged to the original

---

[645] See for example the similarities between the two sepulchres on the contemporary ivory pyxis from Palestine, Weitzmann 1979, 581, no 520 and this mosaic, Bovini 1961, fig.37.
[646] Grabar 1968, 24: the Crucifixion with the Maries appears on the one side, while the Incredulity on the other.
[647] Kitzinger 1960, 21, Weitzmann 1979, no. 452.
[648] See for example Nordhagen 1968, for the frescoes of John VII (705-707) in Santa Maria Antiqua; Cecchelli 1926-27 for the cruciform reliquary of Paschal I (817-824); and the much later mosaics of Monreale, Demus 1949.
[649] The only difference however is that these monuments contain lenghty post-Resurrection cycles.

Arian decoration.[650] Is it then possible to argue that the scenes reflect an Arian

theology? And if so, why they were kept intact? To answer the first question one

usually has to maintain that the differences in the facial characteristics of Christ in the

scenes from his miracles and life are indicative of a theological agenda. In the passion

cycle Christ appears bearded, while in the miracle cycle he is beardless. Thus the

miracle register supposedly depicts Christ's divine and the passion scenes his human

nature.[651] Urbano on one hand believes that 'the panels representing the resurrection

appearances in the 'passion' cycle do not depict a suffering Christ but rather a

(bearded) glorified Christ appearing to his followers'.[652] Von Simson on the other,

believes that the great Christological controversies of the fifth century, and especially

Nestorianism, found their way into the mosaic panels of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo.[653]

While this argument still remains unsettled among scholars, Von Simson's closing

remarks on the subject are of some importance: 'but the essence of these mosaics is

what may be called their 'ecumenical spirit': they draw their inspiration from the

earliest and deepest sources of the Christian faith'.[654] This ecumenical spirit could

explain why these scenes were left intact. They were not promoting an Arian theology

but a theology that was open to interpretation.

While Urbano argues that the idea that a beard indicates Christ's humanity, is 'itself

problematic and unconvincing' that does not necessarily imply, and the author himself

agrees, that the scenes were not theologically charged.[655] In the previous chapter, we

have seen how the same events from the New Testament were used by both Orthodox

---

[650] Bovini 1961, 6; Von Simson 1987, 71.
[651] See for example the classic study, Von Simson's 1989, 71-76.
[652] Urbano 2005, 104
[653] Ibid, 73-74.
[654] Von Simson 1987, 75.
[655] Urbano 2005, 104.

and heretics to promote their respective theologies. Theodoret explained what the process of refutation would be when the heretics use the Maries at the Tomb.[656] The same, to a lesser extent, could be said about the Incredulity of Thomas, where the words spoken by Thomas were manipulated by Theodore of Mopsuestia to show that Christ had only a human nature.[657] If a New Testament episode could be used by either side to prove their argument, then the images themselves could perform the same task. Thus when a church changes hands, the same images could be interpreted by the new owners as corresponding with their version of theology. This may explain why the mosaics on the upper tier remained unaltered; they suited both traditions and they were theologically but not dogmatically charged. To conclude, 'there is no convincing evidence that Arian Goths developed a distinctive artistic tradition of employed significantly different symbology or iconography in Italy as an expression of an Arian theology or identity'.[658]

It is plausible then that the Road to Emmaus had no 'heretical' implications. As this scene appears in no other monument outside Italy before Iconoclasm, its choice in the upper register of Sant' Apollinare could be seen as part of a local tradition that grew independently from pilgrimage iconography, but not from pilgrimage.[659] The House of Kleopas, one of the two disciples of Emmaus, is already mentioned as a pilgrimage site by Jerome in his *Letter to Eustochium* (AD 404) and also by a certain Theodosios in his *Topography of the Holy Land* (first quarter of the sixth century).[660] Jerome's

---

[656] Theodoret, *Letter CXLIV to the Soldiers*, NPNF 3: 311.
[657] Tanner 1990, 120.
[658] So Urbano 2005, 88 note 43.
[659] The scene of the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, could have served as an antitype for the road the pilgrims took for the Holy Land; it also served as a reminder that they will also 'meet' Christ in the Holy Land, the same way the two pilgrims met Christ on the road to Emmaus. See the final chapter and also below.
[660] Wilkinson 1977, 47 and 65 respectively.

influence on the understanding of the Holy Land by western Christians was immense

and this is reflected by the fact that his description of the site of the Ascension was

reproduced by Paulinus of Nola and Sulpicius Severus within ten years of the letter

being written.[661] Thus the city of Emmaus on the mosaic panel was a constant

reminder of one's journey to meet Christ, either spiritually or in reality, by visiting the

Holy Land.[662] This mosaic panel has a final detail of some interest. The second of the

two disciples on the mosaic panel, unnamed in the Gospels, preserves the facial

characteristic typical of Peter.[663] While the Gospels provide no name for Kleopas'

companion, Origen had identified him with Peter,[664] thus a loose connection between

Rome, Peter, and the Road to Emmaus in Ravenna can be established.

3.2.2 Baptismal Rite.[665]

The link between Christ's death and resurrection, and baptism is centred on a passage

from Romans 6: 3-4.[666] Various witnesses attest that in the early church, baptism took

place after the celebration of Easter, which further enhanced the connection between

the resurrection and the baptismal rite.[667] Furthermore the centrally planned octagonal

baptisteries were influenced both by the Roman funerary architecture and also from

---

[661] Ibid, 2 and note 15.

[662] In later examples of the Road to Emmaus, Christ is depicted in the guise of a pilgrim; for the discussion see the final chapter.

[663] He is not howerer similar to the disciple heading either group of Apostles on the Incredulity panel.

[664] Origen, *Against Celsus*, PG 11, col. 901.

[665] For a chronological presentation of sources relating to baptism, see Whitaker 2003.

[666] "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life".

[667] Such witnesses were Egeria (381-383), *Travels* 45: 1 in Maraval 1982, 304-305; and the Jerusalem Lectionary (5th-8th c.), Tarchnischvili 1959, 109-110. Additionally, many early Easter sermons concluded with references on baptism; see for example Pseudo-Athanasios of Alexandria, PG 28, cols. 1073-1082 and 1081-1092 and Augustine of Hippo, PL 38, cols. 1158-1179.

the use of number eight in Early Christian symbolism[668] Dura-Europos and Naples,

two of our earliest surviving baptisteries include, in their iconographic cycles scenes

from the post-Resurrection cycle. The similarities between the two baptisteries have

been noted by various authors.[669] Downing explained the similarities on the premise

that baptistery iconography was developed earliest of all, and thus, it was conceived

separately from the decoration of the rest of the church.[670] This is supported by the

fact that scenes from early baptisteries, and especially the two under discussion,

present a similar Christological cycle, one that stresses the importance of baptism and

the remission of sins.[671] This is not to say that all Christian art is identical but rather to

point out how some scenes were chosen intentionally for their baptismal connotations.

The common iconographic elements of Dura and Naples include, amongst others, the

Maries at the Tomb, a scene identified as Christ Walking on Water and the Samaritan

Woman at the Well.[672] In the first chapter it has been argued that the scene of the

Maries at the Tomb is directly associated with the passage from Romans 6: 3-4. The

scene sometimes identified as Christ Walking on the Water (Matth. 14: 22-23; Mark

6: 45-52; John 6: 16-21) at Dura could be better explained if identified, as in the case

---

[668] Krautheimer 1986[4], 95. For the significance of number eight in connection with Baptism see the following inscription from the baptistery of Saint Thecla at Milan, reproduced from Underwood 1950, 81:   The temple of eight niches rose up for holy use,
    The octagonal fountain is appropriate for that rite [i.e. baptism].
    It was fitting that the house of holy baptism rise up in this number [i.e. 8]
    By which true salvation returned for mankind
    With the light of Christ rising again, of Christ who opens the gates of death
    And raises the dead from their tombs
    And freeing confessed sinners from the stain of sin
    Cleanses them with the water of the pure-flowing font.
[669] Maier 1964, 79 ff.; Kraeling 1967, 122-124; Grabar 1969, 20-23; Downing 1998, 273.
[670] Downing 1998, 273.
[671] Ibid, 271-280; Drewer 1981, discussed the importance of marine scenes in Early Christian paintings and mosaics. Gates 1984, 180 on the other hand believes that is 'fruitless to attempt to establish *iconographical* ties between the series of paintings and early Christian art in the West. The chapel <baptistery> is… strictly Durene'.
[672] Both baptisteries depict also a starry sky and Christ the Good Shepherd. It is possible that more similarities were shared by the two buildings but unfortunately the fragmented state in which the mosaic panels of the Naples' baptistery survive cannot attest securely to such conclusion.

of the Naples baptistery, with the Miraculous Draught of Fishes (John 21: 1-14), the post-Resurrection scene.[673] In the former scene, it is Peter's lapse of faith that is emphasised, an act that almost had him drown,[674] while in the Miraculous Draught of Fishes, Peter's zeal is underlined.

Two details in particular show the strong association the Miraculous Draught of Fishes has with baptism. First is Peter's submersion in the water. This is paralleled with the immersion rite that took place during baptism. John Chrysostom describes this process in a catechetical lecture: 'After the unction he <the priest> submerges you in the holy waters'.[675] During Cyril's time the threefold immersion becomes pre-eminent,[676] and is interpreted 'not in terms of the Trinity but rather as an imitation of Christ's three-day burial'.[677] The second detail that shows the close association between this scene and baptism is the dialogue that follows on the shore, between Peter and Christ. In this dialogue Christ asks Peter the same question three times.[678] Peter's answers could be seen as an act of catharsis, for during the Passion, he had denied Christ thrice (Matth. 26: 69-75). Thus by answering Christ's three questions, Peter is forgiven for his earlier lack of faith. During the fifth-century, Ammonios, a presbyter from Alexandria, explained exactly that: '<Christ> eradicates the three declarations of denial, and with words rectifies the misdemeanour done by words'.[679]

---

[673] Schumacher 1959, 26 and Drewer 1981, 535 agree with this identification. Grabar also believes that the scene appeared on the ampullae Grabar 1968, 51 and 59, pl. XLIII: 1,2.

[674] The Walking on Water from Mathew 14: 30-31 reads: "But when he <Peter> saw the wind boisterous, he was afraid; and beginning to sink he cried, saying, Lord save me. And immediately Jesus stretched his hand and caught him, and said unto him, O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?"

[675] Chrysostom, *Second Baptismal Catecheses* in Wegner 1957, 147.

[676] Doval 2001, 120-122.

[677] Baldovin 1989, 18.

[678] John 21: 15-17: "do you love me more than these".

[679] Amonnios, *Exposition on the Gospel of S. John*, PG 85, col. 1521. See also Augustine, *On the Gospel of Saint John*, in Innes 1874, 542: "To the threefold denial there is now appended a threefold confession".

It is the following sentence however that explicitly shows the connection between this scene and baptism: 'It has become a tradition from this, that those about to be baptized to make three professions of faith'.[680] If by the fifth century this had become an active tradition, then it is possible that such a tradition existed already in the third century in Dura.

To summarise, the scene identified as Christ Walking on the Water, is in my opinion the Miraculous Draught of Fishes. The presence of this scene in the Naples Baptistery demonstrates its close association with baptism. This is also supported by theological evidence, where Peter's three denials after Christ's arrest, were eradicated during the Miraculous Draught of Fishes episode. The custom of making three professions of faith during baptism drew its context directly from this episode.

Another scene common to both baptisteries and associated with baptism but not with the post-Resurrection narrative is the Samaritan Woman at the Well (John 4: 1-42).[681] An almost contemporary sermon by Tertullian (ca.160-ca.230), illustrates how this scene and others mentioned above, were advocates for the sacred use of water:

> Wherever Christ is, there is water: he himself is baptized in water (Matth. 3: 16); when called to a marriage he inaugurates with water the first rudiments of his power (John 2: 7-11); when engaged in conversation he invites those who are athirst to come to his everlasting water (John 4: 1-42); teaching of charity he approves a cup of water offered to a little one as one of the works of affection; at

---

[680] Amonnios, *Exposition on the Gospel of S. John*, PG 85, col. 1521.
[681] Even though at a first glance this scene has no baptismal connotations, these are apparent in a homily of Tertullian, for which see below.

a well-side he recruits his strength (John 4: 1-42); he walks upon the water
(Matth. 14: 25).[682]

Tertullian here was referring to Christ's Walking on the Water and to his encounter
with the Samaritan Woman at the Well, as well as other scenes. No mention however
was made of the Miraculous Draught of Fishes or any post-Resurrection appearances.
Tertullian however explained that this list, of which I reproduce only a small part,
spoke of 'those general matters which confirm the religious significance of
baptism'.[683] The absence of the post-Resurrection appearances should not deter us
from identifying the scene in the Dura baptistery as the Miraculous Draught of Fishes.
This absence is explained by the fact that a more specific connection existed between
them and baptism, and not a general one, as in the afore-mentioned examples.

This specific connection was made obvious by Tertullian later on, when he advised
that besides Easter the best period for someone to be baptized is during Pentecost
(Easter tide): 'Pentecost is a most auspicious period for arranging baptisms, for during
it our Lord's resurrection was several times made known among the disciples, and the
grace of the Holy Spirit was first given and the hope of our Lord's coming made
evident'.[684] For Tertullian, besides Easter, the best period for baptisms was during
Easter tide, when the post-Resurrection appearances took place. In the fifth century
this tradition was attested in a letter by Leo the Great, where the author argued that
those priests who baptize during the feast of Epiphany depart from the established
tradition. 'By administering the sacrament of baptism to greater numbers on the feast
of the Epiphany than at Easter-tide, I <Leo> was surprised that you or your
predecessors could have introduced so unreasonable an innovation as to confound the

---

[682] Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 9: 15-21 in Evans 1964, 20-21.
[683] Ibid, 10: 1-2 in Evans 1964, 20-21.
[684] Ibid, 19: 6-9 in Evans 1964, 40-41.

mysteries of the two festivals and believe there was no difference between the day on which Christ was worshipped by the wise men and that on which He rose again from the dead'.[685] We see again that for Leo, the relation between Christ's resurrection and baptism was far more important from Christ's epiphany and baptism. Easter Sunday and the period leading to Pentecost were considered as the most appropriate period by the Church to perform baptism, exactly because of their association with Christ's Resurrection, and his post-Resurrection appearances.

Thus the analogy we noted above is in agreement with the surviving iconographical evidence: beyond their role as visual synonyms of the Resurrection, the post-Resurrection appearances were also used as symbols of the mystery of baptism. Their earliest function, as observed in the two baptisteries above, was in fact connected mostly with the latter. In these examples the images function in a twofold way: they serve as models for baptism and also as instructive visual aids for the baptized. The latter is supported by the fact that the catechetical lectures were read inside churches and baptisteries and thus the priests could direct their audience's attention to the mosaics and wall-paintings, in the same manner as Cyril of Jerusalem directs his audience's attention to Christ's tomb. The catechumens were able to contemplate those images while listening to the preaching. This practise is attested by Egeria[686] and is also observed in various catechetical lectures by Cyril of Jerusalem.[687]

A final point should be made about the scene of the Maries at the Tomb in Dura. The latter, besides being a reference to baptism, may have served as an example to the

---

[685] Leo, *Epistle XVI*, PL 54, col. 695 ff. See also Underwood 1950, 58 and note 72.
[686] Yarnold 2000, 37: "The result is that in these places all the Faithful follow the scriptures when they are read in church".
[687] Cross 1995, 59-63. Cyril had of course the luxury of presenting his audience with the actual shrines, while everybody else had to use other means.

catechumens. Some of the iconographic peculiarities of the scene follow current liturgical trends. For example, the paratactic form in which the five women are depicted, and their white clothing, exemplify the procession the catechumens adopted on their way to the baptismal font. That the newly-baptized were given white robes is attested by Ambrose of Milan (340-397) in his treatise *On the Mysteries*: 'After this, white robes were given to you as a sign that you were putting off the covering of sins and putting on the chaste veil of innocence'.[688] An allusion on the white robes could also be found in Cyril's fourth Mystagogical *Catechesis*,[689] and a description of the procession of the newly-baptized exists in Egeria's *Travels* (381-383).[690] Furthermore the torches carried by the Maries possibly signify the candles carried by the newly baptized during the ceremony of baptism, which is also called an illumination.[691] The torches are also described in a *kontakion* by Romanos Melodos (ca.485-ca.560) and in a sermon by John of Damascus (ca.676-ca.750).[692] In these two examples the torches are connected with the celebration of Easter rather than with the mystery of baptism but since it was during Easter that baptisms took place, there is no obstacle in connecting the two. It is plausible that the Maries in Dura were associated both with the celebration of Easter and baptism, not only theoretically but practically as the catechumens were invited to participate in the celebrations through imitation of the scene. The Maries at the Tomb in Dura could be employed as a source to reconstruct early liturgical practices, especially when not much is known about the baptismal rite

---

[688] Ambrose, *On the Mysteries*, NPNF 10, 321.

[689] Cyril, *Mystagogical Catecheses* IV: 8, in Piédagnel and Paris 1966, 142-143.

[690] Egeria, *Travels* 38: 1, in Maraval 1982, 290-291.

[691] Grabar 1956, 16, explains that the torches were employed by the women because they have entered inside the tomb. While this is plausible, another explanation is provided by the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, which notes that when the women visited the tomb "the darkness yet remained", Hamlyn-Hill 1894.

[692] Romanos Melodos, *On the Resurrection VI*, in Maas and Trypanis 1997, 228: "awake everyone from sleep, so they could light torches and meet me"; John of Damascus, *On Easter Sunday* PG 96, col. 841: "we should approach bearing torches". A similar reference appears in his Kanon on Easter, where he states: 'Let us go out bearing torches, and meet Christ as he comes from the sepulcher like a Bridegroom'; translation from www.anastasis.org © Father Ephrem Lash.

in this early stage.[693] In the following subchapter the influence of another liturgy will be examined, the Easter vigil.

3.2.3 Changes in the Liturgical Calendar.

The liturgy of Jerusalem revolved around its sacred topography, with the church of the Anastasis being its epicentre.[694] The fourth-century pilgrim Egeria offers valuable information about the early liturgy, the celebration of Vespers and of the resurrection vigil.[695] According to Egeria, during *Lychnikon* (Lucernare) the candles are lit from a fire that burns in a lamp inside the cave; this, according to Taft, symbolizes the risen Christ, the light that illumines (that is, saves).[696] The same author argues that the sanctuary apse symbolizes the cave while the altar represents the sepulchre.[697] Theodore of Mopsuestia had systematically interpreted liturgy as a dramatic re-enactment of the passion of Christ.[698] Having these interpretations in mind, it is not surprising that some of our Palestinian artistic evidence preserve not the only the memory of the actual shrines, but also a memory of the liturgy.

The Metropolitan Museum pyxis offers such an example (fig. 7). Even though the Gospel narrative is totally disregarded, as instead of spices the Maries are holding censers, and instead of the sepulchre an altar is depicted, the scene can still be

---

[693] Taft 1992, 25, noted that the term 'rite' does not apply in the pre-Constantinian period, as a plethora of local liturgical practices were followed, instead of a coherent unified corpus of liturgical usage.

[694] Taft 1980/1, 65.

[695] Ibid, 65.

[696] Egeria, *Travels*, in Wilkinson 1971, 123-24; Taft 1980/81, 66. The most thorough and detail discussion remains Bertonière 1972, 72-105.

[697] Taft 1980/81, 66. The evidence is presented below.

[698] Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Homily Fifteen* in Tonneau and Devreesse 1949, 463: "C'est pourquoi certains des diacres, qui étendent des nappes sur l'autel, présentent la similitude des linges de l'ensevelissement; et ceux qui se tiennent des deux cotes agitent tout l'air au-dessus du corps sacre". For a discussion see Taft 1980/1, 62-65. The same author argues that this was not an Antiochene invention, but rather a development of a trend present in the Eucharistic thought from the start, Taft 1980/81, 68

identified as the Maries at the Tomb.[699] Saint Clair argues that 'the substitution of

altar for tomb on the Metropolitan Museum pyxis was not topographical but rather

liturgical, that is, it intended to illustrate the identification of Christ's tomb with the

main altar of the Christian church'.[700] The inspiration however could have been drawn

not simply from an unidentified altar but from the altar of the Holy Sepulchre.[701] The

liturgical connotations were expressed by Theodore of Mopsuestia's writings (above)

but were also adopted by the Byzantine rite as observed by Patriarch Germanos

(†ca.730): 'The holy altar stands for the place where Christ was laid in the

grave…'.[702] The association probably grew from the belief that Christ was present

during the celebration of the Eucharist.[703] It is further enhanced by the fact that the

pyxis was probably used to store the bread for the Eucharist.[704]

Beside the ivory pyxis, the Monza and Bobbio ampullae offer a varied and

contemporary reflection of what the sepulchre of Christ looked like.[705] Bobbio no. 6,

however, offers an example where not only the sepulchre is depicted but also

contemporary liturgy.[706] On this ampulla, four candles are represented on the roof of

the sepulchre while three lamps are depicted in the interior.[707] Visible on Bobbio no. 6

are, according to Grabar, two acroteria.[708] However the two acroteria bear a

resemblance to floral decoration, which along with the four candles and the three

lamps could signify that a special celebration is taking place at the sepulchre. This is

---

[699] Weitzmann 1979, no. 520. The Maries are holding censers in almost all the surviving examples of the Monza and Bobbio ampullae, Grabar 1958, Monza no.2-3, 5-6, 8-15; Bobbio 3-6, 7, 15, 18.
[700] St. Clair 1979, 131
[701] St. Clair 1979, 130-31.
[702] English translation from Taft 1980/81, 73.
[703] Weitzmann 1979, 581.
[704] St. Clair 1979, 132.
[705] Barag and Wilkinson 1974, 179-187.
[706] For a description of the ampullae see Grabar 1958.
[707] Monza no. 3 depicts only one lamp but no candles, ibid 20.
[708] Ibid, 35-36.

further enhanced by the fact that the hand of the surviving Mary holds a censer, typical on other examples of this scene. The candles that were lit on top of the sepulchre and the lamps in the interior, combined with what it looks like floral decoration, points to a special vigil. Egeria describes such a vigil: 'All the people congregate once more in the Anastasis, and the lamps and candles are lit, which makes it very bright'.[709] The Maries at the Tomb scene on this ampulla does not offer simply a memory of the actual shrine but I would argue, also of a special liturgy.

The ampullae however, as a mass produced art, performed a different task. The liturgical affinities on Bobbio no. 6 should be seen as the artist's choice to depict a scene that would attract potential buyers, who in their turn were interested in purchasing an artefact that would constantly remind them not only of the Holy Land and its churches but also of the experiences they had. The liturgical connotations served to recall in the mind of the owner not the liturgy per se, but the place in which it took place and the experience they had; thus the importance of the scene on the ampullae is shifted from the liturgy to its commemorative power.

The *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia preserves some liturgical changes which are significant for the development of the Maries as an independent feast. Mateos argues that the Maries at the Tomb pushed the figure of Joseph of Arimathea, who also celebrated on the Myrrh-bearers Sunday, into second place.[710] The hymns used today on the Sunday of the Myrrh-bearers appear on the tenth-, eleventh-century manuscript Saint Cross 40

---

[709] Egeria, *Travels* in Wilkinson 1971, 123-24. While Egeria says nothing about floral decoration, this could still be observed in the Orthodox Church on Holy Friday, when Christ's sepulchre (*Epitaphios*) is covered with flowers, and also on Holy Saturday Matins, when the priest announces the Resurrection and disperses flower petals to the congregation.
[710] Mateos 1963, II: 115, note 3.

on Wednesday after Easter.[711] If we accept that the hymns follow the feast then it is possible that at some point the feast of the Maries was moved from Wednesday after Easter to the third Sunday after Easter. This change signifies both the importance that the Myrrh-bearers gained after Iconoclasm, but also their detachment from Easter. This paved the way for the Anastasis to become the visual synonym of Easter. The movement from Wednesday to the third Sunday after Easter is further attested by the fact that the feast of the Maries does not follow in chronological sequence as it precedes, in the Gospel narrative, the Incredulity of Thomas, which is celebrated on the second Sunday after Easter.[712] The manuscript preserves an older tradition in which the Maries were celebrated before the Incredulity.

Some iconographic details were inspired by current liturgical practises. Women deaconesses were attested both in the churches of Constantinople and Jerusalem, but it was in the latter that they played an important role during the celebration of Easter. The candles were also associated with the Easter vigil, and their depiction as covering the Holy Sepulchre as presented on the ampullae, served not only to recall in memory a random liturgy, but the Easter vigil. The candles, the white garments and the paratactic procession on the wall at Dura were also influenced from a liturgy; the baptismal liturgy which was taking place during Easter. Finally the changes in the liturgical calendar can be interpreted in a two-fold way. On one hand one might argue that the Maries rose in importance and acquired a special Sunday after Easter, while on the other, it could be said that the Maries scene, by being disassociated from Easter

---

[711] Ibid, note 3: 'Le tropaire des femmes myrophores qu'on chante aujourd'hui apparaît dans H seulement le mercredi du Renouveau'.

[712] The Jerusalem *typikon*, contrary to the Constantinopolitan, begins the Gospel reading on Thomas Sunday with John 20: 26, which opens with the following sentence: 'And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them', Tarchnischvili 1959, 116. The *typikon* of Constantinople begins with verse 24, Mateos 1963, II: 114. For a detailed discussion see chapter 6.

lost its primary role as a reference to Christ's resurrection and thus to Easter. This process was however gradual, and as I will be discussing in chapter four, the Anastasis was first coupled together with the Maries, before finally supplanting it and becoming the primary scene of Easter.

3.2.4 Theological Literature: The Canonical and the Apocryphal Tradition.

The canonical Gospels were probably the most important source of inspiration for Early Christian art. However artists also drew inspiration from extra-canonical sources such as the apocrypha and Gospel harmonies. A Gospel harmony, a fragment of which was discovered *in situ*, seems to have provided the inspiration for at least one wall-painting in the baptistery of Dura: the Maries at the Tomb.[713] Bypassing the argument of whether this fragment belongs to Tatian's *Diatessaron* or to an unnamed passion Harmony, we observe that the number of women in the scene of the Maries at the Tomb does not correspond with the canonical narrative.[714] In this depiction the number of women is neither the three described in the Gospel of Mark nor the two described in the Gospel of Matthew, but rather five. This number can only be verified if we taken into account the names of all the female *personae* who are described in the post-Resurrection narrative: Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, the mother of the sons of Zebedee, Salome and Joanna. Thus the scene draws its inspiration from a harmony tradition.

The lasting popularity of Tatian's *Diatessaron* is evident by the fact that well into the fifth century bishop Rabbula had to suppress its circulation and replace it with the

---

[713] Kraeling 1967, 86 and 175.
[714] Parker, Taylor and Goodacre, 1999 argue in favour of a passion Harmony, while Joosten 2003 argues for a Tatianic connection.

Peshitta, a Syrian version of the Gospels.[715] In the interval between the third and fifth centuries, a plethora of depictions of the Maries at the tomb survived, none of which depicted five women. The absence of this version from art could be attributed both to the war waged by the church against Tatian's *Diatessaron* and to the fact that the canonical Gospels offered a variety of descriptions that were further combined and exploited in the Early Christian period.[716]

Augustine of Hippo in a passage written ca. 400 attacked the authors of an apocryphal letter, purportedly written by Christ and addressed both to Peter and Paul.[717] This was, of course, historically inaccurate for many reasons, but mostly because Paul became Christ's disciple after the latter's Ascension. What is interesting, however, is that Augustine believed that the authors of the letter were influenced by the many representations of Peter and Paul in the company of Christ: 'And so Peter and Paul, occurred to them, I believe, just because in many places they chanced to see these two apostles represented in pictures as both in company with him… thus to fall most completely into error was the due desert of men who sought for Christ and his Apostles not in the holy writings but on painted walls'. [718] Augustine here offered an instance in which art influences literature and not the opposite.

The opposite, that is, the impact of literature over art, is visible from a number of examples connected with apocryphal Gospels. One such example is the so called Infancy Gospels (the Proto-evangelion of James, the Gospel of Thomas and Pseudo-

---

[715] Burkitt 1935, 255; Vööbus 1954, 93-4 believes that Rabbula was not the author of the Peshitta, based on the fact that the latter changed parties and condemned Nestorianism, something that would have made the reception of the Peshitta almost impossible.

[716] The sarcophagus of S. Celso in Milan combines the scenes of the Maries at the Tomb with Peter and John at the Tomb by inserting in the depiction the linen clothing that were discovered by the latter.

[717] Davis-Weyer 1993, 42.

[718] Select Library, VI: 83-84. For the English translation see Davis-Weyer 1993, 42.

Matthew), which provided a detailed account of the life of the Virgin, her

Presentation in the Temple, as well as detailed descriptions of the Nativity.[719] Some of

those details found their way into art, as in the case of the Sancta Sanctorum panel. In

the Nativity scene, an ox and an ass are depicted over the manger of Christ, the

inspiration for which is drawn from Pseudo-Matthew.[720] Furthermore instead of the

stable implied by the manger described in Luke 2: 7, the whole scene takes place

inside a cave, described again in Pseudo-Matthew.[721] The cave however could have

been inspired not only by the apocryphal description but also from the actual shrine.

Origen in *Against Celsus* mentions that in Bethlehem, one could see the cave where

Christ was born, while the same is repeated again by the Piacenza pilgrim (ca. 570).[722]

The Maries at the Tomb scene, which appears on the same panel, offers another

instance in which the actual shrine influenced iconography. This scene however

contains another feature that is drawn from a non-canonical source, and this is the

inclusion of the Virgin as one of the Myrrh-bearers.

We have already seen that the Virgin was not mentioned in the canonical Gospels as

part of the post-Resurrection narrative. Her absence from such a fundamental doctrine

of Christian theology became more conspicuous with her ascending importance. A

series of apocryphal works seems to have inspired her inclusion,[723] but the matter

---

[719] Murrays 1998, 28-29.

[720] Pseudo-Matthew, *Gospel* ch.14, in Wilson 1973, 410. Willoughby 1955, 63.

[721] Willoughby 1955, 63. It should be noted though that while Luke refers to a manger this does not preclude that the stable was not in fact a grotto. This type of stables can be still found in many Middle Eastern countries and Cyprus.

[722] *Against Celsus* I: 51: "If anyone wants further proof to convince him that Jesus was born in Bethlehem…, he may observe… the cave at Bethlehem is shown were he was born and the manger in the cave where he was wrapped in swaddling clothes" in Chadwick 1953, 47; for the Greek text see Marcovich 2001, 53. The Piacenza pilgrim reports in his *Travels* v178: 29: "there is the cave where the Lord was born, and, inside it, there is the manger decorated with gold and silver at which lights are burning night and day" in Wilkinson 1977, 85.

[723] One such apocryphal source is the so-called *Book of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, by Bartholomew the Apostle*, variously dated between the fourth and seventh centuries, Wallis Budge

becomes more complicated when mainstream theology, expounded by such

theologians as Ambrose of Milan in the West, and John Chrysostom, in the East,

expressed a similar view.[724] The two approaches (canonical and apocryphal) were

however completely different. The Orthodox theologians were never eager to

elaborate on the Virgin's presence in the post-Resurrection narrative, while the

apocryphal, mostly of Coptic origins, went to the other extreme by substituting the

Virgin for either Mary Magdalene or on one occasion all of the Myrrh-bearers.[725]

To make things even more complicated, almost all our artistic evidence is associated

with Syria and Palestine, while two Antiochene bishops seem to have taken the

Virgin's presence in the post-Resurrection narrative for granted. Chrysostom, who

started his career in Antioch, and Severos, Patriarch of Antioch between 512 and 519,

maintained through their writings that the Virgin was one of the Myrrh-bearers.[726]

This persistence, which is also evident in the work of another Syrian priest, Romanos

Melodos, creates the impression that this is not a coincidence.[727] Almost all our

theological evidence must have been inspired by an ongoing Syrian, and, to be more

precise, Antiochene tradition. The latter school of theology, together with the

Alexandrian, were the most influential in the development of Christian doctrine.[728]

1913; James 1924, 186; Wilson 1973, 485. Another apocryphal work of Coptic origins is the *Discourse on Mary Theotokos by Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem*, Wallis Budge 1915.

[724] The two authors never elaborated on the idea that the Virgin was part of the post-Resurrection narrative and in the case of John Chrysostom, until a corpus of his works is compiled, we cannot be sure whether his brief reference was an interpolation by a later copyist.

[725] For this see the discussion in Chapter 2.

[726] Rabbula Gospels; Severos, *Oration Seventy-Seven*, PO 16, col 810 ed. by Kugener and Triffaux 1922; Pseudo-Anastasios, *Questions and Answers*, PG 89, col.809. According to Richard and Munitiz 2006, this question is not by Anastasios of Sinai but from a later author. Prof. Sieswerda is preparing a publication on these questions in *Pseudo–Anastasius Sinaita. Quaestiones et responsiones* (Corpus Christianorum Series Græca) forthcoming.

[727] Maas and Trypanis 1997, 146; De Matons 1964-1981, 4: 176 note 2, believes that Romanos exegesis is closer to that of Severos of Antioch.

[728] Meyendorff 1974, 22-23 speaks of two schools of thought: the Alexandrian, that used allegory and the Antiochene that employ a more historical and literal approach.

If we accept that the Antiochene School of theology was responsible for bringing into being the concept of the Virgin as one of the Myrrh-bearers, then it comes as no surprise that our artistic evidence corresponds both in place and time with this tradition. Besides the Rabbula Gospels, both the Sinai icon of the Chairete and the Sancta Sanctorum panel are also of Syro-Palestinian origins.[729] It is quite plausible then, that the theological concept of the Virgin as a Myrrh-bearer influenced her depiction in art. By identifying the Virgin as one of the Myrrh-bearers, the Antiochenes included her in a theological concept of paramount importance: the Resurrection. The possibility exists that the Virgin's addition to the post-Resurrection narrative was the result of a combination between the ascending importance of both the Resurrection and the Virgin. While this clarifies the chronological and spatial limits of our artistic and theological evidence, it fails to elucidate why this tradition was never popular elsewhere.[730] One might argue that if the Virgin's role was ascending, such a notion would have been widely accepted. However, if the Antiochene theologians, who promulgated the idea of the Virgin being one of the Myrrh-bearers were discredited through their association with monophysitism, their ideas about the Virgin's role might well have been less easily assimilated. But while this is true for Severos, John Chrysostom was hardly ever considered a monophysite.[731]

At his enthronement in 512, Severos affirmed Nicaea, Constantinople and Ephesos but explicitly anathematised Chalcedon and the Tome of Leo, as well as Nestorios,

---

[729] The church of Saint Sergios in Gaza, described by Choricios, *Choricii Gazaei Opera* ed. by Foerster 1929, might contain a scene from the post-Resurrection cycle, but in my opinion the Virgin's presence might be restricted only to the Ascension.

[730] It should be noted here, that the only evidence that exists outside Antioch, is from Ambrose of Milan and Sedulius. For the discussion see previous chapter.

[731] He was however considered an origenist.

Eutyches, Diodore and Theodore of Mopsuestia.[732] However he was later condemned for both Nestorianism and Eutychianism and his writings were burned.[733] Romanos was a firm supporter of Justinian's religious policy and in several of his *kontakia* the author attacks the Apollinarians, the Eutycheans and the Arians, but when it comes to attacking the monophysites, he is not so explicit.[734] This was explained by Mitsakis partly as a reflection of Justinian's policy to bring the monophysites in line with the Chalcedonean doctrine and partly because Theodora was known for her monophysite tendencies.[735] However Romanos' hesitation might be indicative of at least some monophysite or Antiochene affinities. De Matons believes that Romanos' exegesis on the Virgin's participation in the post-Resurrection narrative resembles that of Severos.[736]

However the fact remains that Severos was a monophysite while Romanos' hesitation to explicitly attack monophysite teaching might suggest that, if not a monophysite himself, he had at least some sympathy for the latter. The Virgin's proclamation as Theotokos by the Council of Ephesos in 431 found strong resistance in the East, and especially in Nestorian circles. Nestorios employed the term 'Χριστοτόκος' (Christ-bearer) in order to reconcile the term Theotokos and Theodoret of Cyrus' term 'ανθρωποτόκος' (human-bearer).[737] Antiochene theology revolved around the notion that it is through Christ's Resurrection and the restoration of his humanity that

---

[732] Torrance 1988, 5.

[733] Ibid, 5 and ACO 3, 121: 26; in English "and let it be burned in a fire".

[734] Mitsakis 1986, 440-448.

[735] Ibid, 451.

[736] De Matons 1964-1981, 4: 177, note 2, believes that both authors accepted that a special appearance was reserved for the Virgin. However a careful reading of Severos' homily shows that the author believed that the Virgin was the 'other Mary', while Romanos believed that the Virgin was the first to see him raised. De Matons' explanation however might still be true if we accept that Romanos meant that the Virgin will see him first, exactly because she was the 'other Mary' of the Chairete.

[737] Grillmeier 1975², 1: 493. Nestorios efforts to reconcile the two views led to his condemnation, while Theodoret was condemned post-mortem by Justinian.

Christians were redeemed and restored.[738] Theodoret stated that it was not Christ the

God who was resurrected but Christ the man.[739] The presence of the Virgin in the

post-Resurrection narrative as one of the Myrrh-bearers could serve as an indication

that she was no different than the other Maries; a more compassionate mother, for a

more human Christ. This is one reason why the Sinai icon insists on labelling her

Saint Mary, instead of Theotokos.[740]

While the evidence is far from conclusive, the notion that an Antiochene tradition was

hidden behind the inclusion of the Virgin in the post-Resurrection narrative can be

securely reconstructed. Whether this innovation was associated with a monophysite

theology, is difficult to say. The association however of many eminent Antiochene

theologians such as Theodore of Mopsuestia and Severos with heresy, and the

condemnation and subsequent burning of the latter's' writings (which however

survived in Syrian and in the works of Pseudo-Anastasios), could explain why this

tradition was never very popular outside Syria. One might argue that the presence of

the Virgin in the post-Resurrection narrative and imagery was the result of a

combination of Antiochene theology, centred on Christ's Resurrection, and probably

on the ascending importance of the Virgin, and might have been influenced by

monophysite tendencies, at least regarding this scene's limitations inside an

Antiochene tradition.

To sum up, this chapter dealt with the theological and liturgical background of the

post-Resurrection scenes. Their use in anti-heretical literature rested not so much

---

[738] NCE 1064: *Monophysitism*.
[739] Theodoret, *Dialogue III*: *The Impassible* NPNF 3, 228: "But who hearing of a resurrection of a God, would ever believe that the resurrection of men would be exactly like it"
[740] See the discussion in the previous chapter.

upon their resurrectional message, but to the evidence they provided about Christ's nature after the resurrection. The latter was a key element in the discourse about Christ's two natures. While the evidence is scant and inconclusive, the notion exists that this discourse must have played its role on the evolution and dissemination, if not all, at least for some of the post-Resurrection appearances. In other words not only their theological message was of importance but also their dogmatic. The choice of scenes in Sant' Apollinare do provide some evidence to further substantiate this claim. The Road to Emmaus portrays a more human Christ, and the same applies, to some extent, to the Incredulity Thomas, but as I have suggested, it all comes down to the interpretation. The images, especially without inscriptions, offered more than one possible readings,[741] and this must have been exploited by the current occupants of Sant' Apollinare, to correspond with their own version of theology.

Finally, from the discussion it becomes apparent that liturgy, and more specifically, liturgical practises, found their way into iconography. Details such as candles, floral decoration and censers were inspired by a liturgical context. The Virgin as one of the Myrrh-bearers was a much more radical innovation which drew its inspiration, not from the canonical Gospels, but from an Antiochene theological exegesis. The latter went unchallenged during Iconoclasm and well into the ninth century. It is the latter period that will be the focus of the next chapter, where other innovations, such as the placement of the angel in the centre of the Maries scene, will be discussed.

---

[741] For this argument see Maguire 2007, 139.

CHAPTER 4: The Maries, the Anastasis and the rise of the Chairete

This chapter sets out to examine the relation between the Anastasis and two scenes from the post-Resurrection narrative, namely the Maries at the Tomb and the Chairete. It will focus on the changes that took place during Iconoclasm, in order to demonstrate the impact the latter had on the choice and configuration of the Maries at the Tomb and the Chairete. As it will be argued below, Italy untouched by Iconoclasm employed the Maries combined with the Anastasis, while in Constantinople, where the impact of Iconoclasm was greater, the Chairete rose in prominence and surpassed in importance the Maries. This consequently reflected the needs of a changing society. The Chairete offered a tangible and human Christ, and as Patriarch Nikephoros argued, Christ could be depicted in the arts because he was also human.[742] However, the scene provided not only a human Christ but also human witnesses.[743] If humans could see and worship Christ, then, according to John of Damascus, the same could be applied for the worship of images.[744]

Other, more specific issues will also be examined, such as the number of women in the Maries scene and the relocation of the sepulchre in the corner of the same scene. The former has been falsely employed to separate an Italian from a Byzantine Maries at the Tomb composition, while the latter offers an indication of how the Maries at the Tomb adapted its iconography to suit current needs. Finally, special attention will be given to the Anastasis, which in the ninth century, functions as another scene from the

---

[742] Nikephoros, *Objections*: *That Christ remained a perfect Man and a perfect God*, in Pitra 1852, 352-65
[743] Brubaker 1999, 302; Brubaker 1996, 12.
[744] John of Damascus, 'First Apology of Saint John of Damascus Against those who attack the divine images', 16 in Anderson 1997, 23

post-Resurrection narrative and does not supplant the Maries and the Chairete in importance.

4.1: Iconoclasm and its Aftermath

This short introductory section does not aim to analyse the reasons behind the rise of Iconoclasm, but rather to examine its impact on Byzantine art and especially on the iconographic evolution and dissemination of the post-Resurrection appearances. After all Iconoclasm was 'only one of a number of elements relevant to the evolution of Byzantine culture and society in the eighth and ninth centuries'.[745]

According to Brubaker, 'Kitzinger's model' on the rise in importance of sacred images from 550 onwards, was based on texts whose authenticity has since been questioned.[746] Texts like the *Miracles of Kosmas and Damian* and the *Spiritual Meadow* of John Moschos were evidently altered at a later date.[747] The rise of *acheiropoieton* icons in the sixth century, and the importance – as recorded in the seventh century *Miracles of St. Artemios* – of visions and visitations of Saints, as opposed to holy portraits, shows that the image had not yet functioned as a portal to the divine.[748] The few surviving portraits of Saints from the seventh century were most probably *ex voto* images, like for example the mosaics of Saint Demetrios in Thessalonike and an icon of Saint Peter from Mount Sinai (B. 5).[749] It was in the last two decades of the seventh century that the images became portals through which one could reach the saint depicted, but even then, images do not replace visions,

---

[745] Brubaker and Haldon, 2009 [forthcoming]. I am indebted to Professor Brubaker for giving me the opportunity to read chapters from the unpublished manuscript.
[746] Brubaker 1998, 1218.
[747] Ibid, 1219 and passim.
[748] Ibid, 1223-1234.
[749] Ibid, 1235

visitations and relics but rather become another means of accessing the holy.[750] The theology and codification of the icons' role, surfaced only during the debate between iconoclasts and iconophiles, in other words the cult of icons 'did not lead to Iconoclasm but it was generated by the discourse of the debate about Iconoclasm'.[751]

In this discourse both sides were eager to promote their Orthodoxy by demonstrating that their beliefs were in accordance with the Fathers of the Church. Since however history is written by the victors, it is necessary to approach the surviving sources with a critical eye. Some interpolations were innocent attempts, made in order to make a text comprehensible and relevant to a transformed society.[752] Others were deliberate attempts to promote the righteousness of one side against the other.

Epiphanios of Cyprus was one of those theologians whose teachings were caught in the discourse. The several attempts made by the Iconophiles to prove that he was not against icons, indicates that he was used extensively by the Iconoclasts. John of Damascus in one of his apologies wrote: 'If you say that blessed Epiphanios clearly forbade us to have images, know that these words attributed to him are spurious, and were written by someone using Epiphanios' name, as has happened often'.[753]

The same support for Epiphanios appears in a treatise on Christ's two natures written by the ninth-century Patriarch of Constantinople, Nikephoros.[754] The motivation behind this treatise was not only to prove that Christ had two perfect natures but also

---

[750] Ibid, 1251.
[751] Ibid, 1254.
[752] Ibid, 1221.
[753] John of Damascus, 'Second Apology of Saint John of Damascus Against those who attack the divine images', 16: 1 in Anderson 1997, 64.
[754] Nikephoros, *Objections*: *That Christ remained a perfect Man and a perfect God*, in Pitra 1852, 352-65

with the help of earlier Fathers to justify that Christ could be depicted in art: 'For this

<reason> he can be portrayed, because he is human'.[755] Nikephoros advanced his

arguments with the help of lengthy quotations from Epiphanios' work *Ancoratus*.[756]

In those quotations the Maries at the Tomb, the Noli me Tangere and the Incredulity

of Thomas featured prominently.[757] Nikephoros' choice to cite Epiphanios is

explained immediately after. Some Iconoclasts in order to deceive the naive and

gullible, says Nikephoros, used the name of Epiphanios, when it is obvious from his

writings that he believed that Christ's body and human nature remained unchanged

after the resurrection.[758] Christ's humanity provides the necessary justification for his

depiction in art. In this manner, Nikephoros succeeded not only in establishing

Christ's two natures, but also in using the same argument to prove Epiphanios'

Orthodoxy. It remains however unlikely that Epiphanios' argument on Christ's

humanity was part of his conviction that the latter could be depicted in art.[759] Hence,

Nikephoros' explanation should be seen in the light of an era of 'rethinking and re-

appropriating the past'.[760]

The main argument of the Iconophiles was based on Christ's humanity. Since Christ

assumed a human nature, he could be portrayed in images as such. In the words of

John of Damascus: 'But now when God is seen in the flesh conversing with men, I

make an image of the God whom I see. I do not worship matter; I worship the creator

of matter who became matter for my sake'.[761] The Iconophiles, by placing greater

---

[755] Ibid.: 'δια τουτο περιγραπτος, καθ'ο ανθρωπος'.
[756] For Epiphanios' *Ancoratus*, see PG 43, col. 41-236.
[757] Nikephoros, *Objections*, in Pitra 1852, 356-358.
[758] Ibid, 358-359.
[759] For Epiphanios' opposition to religious art see the abstracts reproduced in Mango 1972, 41-43. For a discussion on the use of *Ancoratus* in its real context see chapter 3.1.
[760] Brubaker and Haldon 2001, xxv.
[761] John of Damascus, 'First Apology of Saint John of Damascus Against those who attack the divine images', 16 in Anderson 1997, 23.

importance on Christ's humanity, unintentionally diminished the importance of one of the post-Resurrection scenes; this was none other, than the Maries at the Tomb. The scene, as we have seen, was frequently depicted in pre-Iconoclast art to convey Christ's resurrection through the empty sepulchre. The emptiness of the tomb, while it conclusively proved Christ's resurrection, offered no visible evidence of his humanity, other than what the sepulchre could offer. The Chairete conversely, not only produced an image of the resurrected God, but depicted the two women touching his feet and in some instances included the sepulchre itself. A tangible Christ proved conclusively that his nature remained unaltered after the resurrection. The iconophile arguments resemble in their character the anti-heretical treatises, in which the post-Resurrection appearances were again used as proofs of Christ's dual nature. In this occasion however emphasis is given on Christ's humanity, as a justification of his depiction in art.

In his third homily in defence of images, John of Damascus speaks of the angels: 'even if nothing physical or fleshly may be attributed to an angel, it is still possible to depict and circumscribe them according to their nature… Those who were worthy saw these images, and beheld a bodiless and intellectual sight made manifest through physical means'.[762] The line: 'those who were worthy saw these images' refers to those instances in which humans witness an angel. One such instance is the Maries at the Tomb. The emphasis given by John of Damascus on the angel might explain why in the vast majority of post-Iconoclast examples of the Maries scene, the angel was placed in the centre, relegating the sepulchre in the corner. If the Maries can discern the bodiless angel, then apparently the latter could be depicted in art.

---

[762] John of Damascus, *Third Apology* 24, in Anderson 1997, 78.

Iconoclasm also changed the attitudes of the Byzantines towards art. The viewers'

emotional response became an important part of how one perceives art.[763] The

emotional response was not new after Iconoclasm as seen for example in Gregory of

Nyssa's *Homily in Praise of Saint Theodore*,[764] but what appeared in isolated

examples before Iconoclasm, becomes a common occurrence thereafter. A

comparison between the mosaic panels of the Maries in Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, and

the fresco of the same scene in Kiliçlar Kilise shows exactly how the Byzantine's

perception of art had changed. The Maries in Sant' Apollinare (fig. 27), with their

choreographed moves and gestures expect no emotional response from the viewer; the

Maries in Kiliçlar Kilise (fig. 36) however, turn to one another in a posture of

amazement.[765]

The emotional response is not simply expected but is also a necessity for the

participant in the liturgy. This is clearly illustrated in a sermon on Easter by Gregory

the Theologian.[766] Even though it was written in the fourth century, none of the pre-

Iconoclastic examples of the Maries at the Tomb could have evoked the feelings of

piety Gregory is trying to channel through his sermon. The theologian urges us to

become Mary, Salome and Joanna (the Myrrh-bearers) in order to feel the mystery of

the Resurrection.[767] This experience by participation takes place during the liturgy,

---

[763] Brubaker 1989, 25, with special reference on ninth-century ekphrasis.

[764] PG 46, cols. 735-748. The same emotional response is again a necessity in Gregory of Nyssa's *Letter* 2 5-7, but this time in relation with actual pilgrimage sites: 'How will it be possible to pass through places full of passion without passion'. Gregory's asks for the same emotional response but this time not on art but for actual shrines.

[765] In this occasion one should take into consideration the differences in media. A better comparison can be drawn between the Incredulity in Sant' Apollinare and the same scene in Hosios Lukas and Daphni.

[766] *Homily on Easter*, PG 36, col. 623-664.

[767] PG 36, col. 658. It is not a coincidence that the Paschal canon of John of Damascus shows heavy influences from Gregory's homily on Easter and New Sunday, Louth 2002, 258-268.

and is aided by the images that surround the believer.[768] Besides the images, the

liturgy as a re-enactment of Christ's life and death provides the viewer with another

image. The Great Entrance for example was explained as the deposition of Christ in

the tomb by his disciples.[769]

After Iconoclasm 'the engagement of the beholder is essential to the Byzantine

concept of images'.[770] This interaction allows a great deal for personal emotional

involvement.[771] In the same manner that the image elicits emotions from the beholder,

the beholder sees in the image those characteristics that will trigger these emotions.

And as the beholder's status, level of literacy, theological background vary the images

themselves vary, in order to be able to 'extort' the necessary response. Thus the

choice and configuration of images should not be seen as irrelevant to the patron and

expected addressee(s), as for example is the case with the Paris Gregory, to which we

will return later.

A close comparison between East and West reveals a shift in importance amongst the

post-Resurrection appearances. In the West where no Iconoclasm occurred, the

Maries retained their popularity, while in the East, and around the ninth century,

another post-Resurrection appearance seems to have taken the lead from the Maries;

this scene is the Chairete.[772] The period after Iconoclasm saw the emergence of the

Anastasis, a scene that rivalled the exclusive role of the post-Resurrection

appearances, as synonyms of Christ's resurrection. According to Kartsonis, the

---

[768] Mathews 1995, 12: 'Not enough attention has been given to how the images functioned in worship, at what points in the ceremony they were invoked, and how they would have affected the behaviour and attitude of the participants'.
[769] Mathews 1971, 155, with references.
[770] Brubaker 1989, 27.
[771] Mathews 1995, 12.
[772] See the discussion in chapter 4.2.2.

Anastasis emerged out of the growing interest on the death of Christ that followed the defence of Orthodox doctrine against Monophysite, Theopaschite and Monothelite doctrines.[773] The post-Resurrection appearances were also employed against heretics, but their importance was not based solely on that. Rather, the emphasis given in post-Iconoclast art on Christ's humanity and tangibility could explain why ninth-century Constantinople favours the Chairete.[774] The Maries at the Tomb scene, did not disappear but found its way in the narrative Cappadocian cycles, where it appears regularly accompanying the Anastasis.

---

[773] Kartsonis 1986, 61 and 227.
[774] Brubaker 1999, 302.

4.2 The post-Resurrection appearances in the ninth century.

In the period after Iconoclasm, the post-Resurrection appearances continued to function as a visual synonym for the resurrection. One of them, the Maries at the Tomb, retained its popularity throughout the ninth century, but was now accompanied by the newly-established scene of the Anastasis. Italy in the ninth century provides us with at least two examples in which the two scenes are coupled together. However the Maries at the Tomb underwent an important transformation in the configuration of the scene. After Iconoclasm, the tomb was moved from the centre of the scene to its extremities, while its place is now occupied by the angel, hitherto depicted either in the corner or in the foreground in front of the building. The pre-Iconoclast western examples of this scene, exemplified by the Roman ivories and sarcophagi, portrayed the tomb as a free standing building. This depiction was primarily based on local architectural examples while some details could have been inspired from Constantine's building programme in Rome or directly from the Holy Sepulchre. In the East, the depiction of the tomb relied heavily on the Holy Sepulchre, but this association originated out of necessity rather than choice. Pilgrimage art's primary aim was to recall in memory the actual shrine of Jerusalem and thus the experiences shared by the pilgrims there. The East did show some diversity in its depictions of the sepulchre, observable in such examples as the Rabbula Gospels and the ivory pyxides.

It has long been argued that the East and the West depict a different number of women in the Maries at the Tomb scene. According to Millet, the East preferred two while Western artists depicted three.[775] This according to Millet and Jerphanion was based on the respective Gospel reading for Easter: the East employed Matthew (28:1-

---

[775] Millet 1960², 517.

8) who describes two women, while in the West the Gospel reading was taken from (Mark 16:1-8), who describes three women visiting Christ's sepulchre.[776] As it will discussed below this distinction does not apply to the Middle Byzantine period. A common tradition is visible in both East and West, through the relocation of the sepulchre from the centre of the scene to the corner and its transformation to a rock-hewn cave. To sum up, the purpose of this chapter is threefold: firstly, to demonstrate the never-fading importance of the Maries at the Tomb; secondly, to demonstrate that the distinction between two women for the East and three women for the West does not apply in the Middle Byzantine period; and thirdly to discuss the association between the Anastasis and the post-Resurrection appearances, focusing mainly on the Maries and the Chairete. In doing so, this chapter will also centre on the new iconographic elements and changes introduced in the post-Resurrection scenes. It will be further divided in two subchapters, each dealing with the eastern and western examples of these scenes.

4.2.1 The West in the ninth century.

As it was the case before Iconoclasm, the West provides us again with the most surviving examples from monumental art. The examples include the lower church of San Clemente (847 – 855), the church of Santi Martiri in Cimitile ca. 900, and from the thriving monastery of San Vincenzo al Volturno, in the area of the Benevento, paintings from the crypt of Saint Epiphanios (824 – 842). All the afore-mentioned examples include in their iconography the Maries at the Tomb. Osborne in his

---

[776] Ibid, 517; Jerphanion 1930, 231 and note 2, adds Pope Gregory's, *Liber Sacramentorum* PL 78 col. 242 and note 964 (erroneously written in PL as 954). However, as the *Liber Sacramentorum* mentions only two words from the respective Gospel reading: 'Maria Magdalena', it is not clear why the editor in note 964 believes that is Mark, when it could have been either Matthew or John: 'Hic mos hodie perseverat, ut primo die Paschae legatur Evangelium *secundum Marcum* (my italics)'. I believe that this explanation has been applied to the text a priori.

publication of San Clemente argues that the scene of the Maries 'does not seem to have been a popular subject in Roman painting'.[777] Osborne justifies this argument by citing the extensive cycle of the presbytery of Santa Maria Antiqua. It is thus necessary at this point, and before describing the post-Iconoclast churches from the West, briefly to establish the presence of the Maries in Santa Maria Antiqua in order to demonstrate the ongoing tradition of depicting the Maries in Rome before iconoclasm.

In Santa Maria Antiqua, the fragmentary status of one of the scenes raises the question whether or not it portrayed, the Maries at the Tomb. This fresco has been variously described as Peter and John at the Tomb, the Noli me Tangere, the Ascension and as undecipherable.[778] The fresco was part of a post-Resurrection cycle comprised of five scenes, all of which had already made their appearance in monumental art: the Incredulity of Thomas; the Road to Emmaus; the Miraculous Draught of Fishes; and the Appearance of Christ to the Eleven. According to Nordhagen, the damaged fresco depicts Peter and John at the Tomb. Thus, it is not only the absence of the Maries from such a dense post-Resurrection cycle that is surprising but also the presence of a hitherto unknown scene. The Maries were already depicted along with the Miraculous Draught of Fishes in the baptistery of San Giovanni in Naples and with the Incredulity of Thomas and the Road to Emmaus in San Apollinare Nuovo. Roman art also showed its preference for the scene, as it

---

[777] Osborne 1984, 64.

[778] Nordhagen 1968, 31, with older bibliography. See also chapter 1.3 for a detail discussion of the iconography.

appears on the wooden doors of Santa Sabina and on at least three surviving ivory panels, dated around AD 400 and ascribed to a Roman workshop.[779]

Santa Maria Antiqua is not the only iconographic programme commissioned by John VII (705-707); this Pope was responsible for the mosaic decoration of the Oratory in Old Saint Peter. This Oratory was one of the many chapels housed in the east end of Old Saint Peter's nave, which were demolished in 1605 by Pope Paul V to make way for the new church, then under construction.[780] Unlike his predecessors, Pope Paul V provided for the preservation of the material culture by employing Giacomo Grimaldi to provide a detailed documentation 'in pictura et scriptura' of the buildings about to be demolished.[781] Two of Grimaldi's drawings seem to exclude the Maries at the Tomb, which adds further justification to Osborne's view for the absence of the scene from Santa Maria Antiqua.[782] However Osborne goes on to admit that Grimaldi must have seen the Maries at the Tomb in the Oratory, as the scene appears in another drawing from a manuscript now in the Vatican Library.[783] This detailed drawing presents the scenes from the Oratory numbered with a letter of the alphabet and accompanied with an inscription (fig. 37).[784] The drawings of Grimaldi that exclude the Maries have only one accompanying inscription, which refers to the Oratory in general and not to its decoration.[785] It becomes evident that the only manuscript that was meant to describe 'in pictura et scriptura' the mosaic decoration of the Oratory, is

---

[779] These are the British Museum ivory, the Milan Castello Sforzesco ivory and the Munich Ascension ivory, all discussed in a previous chapter.

[780] Van Dijk 2001, 305.

[781] Ibid, pp. 305-306.

[782] The drawings by Grimaldi that exclude the Maries at the Tomb are those found in the Archivio S. Pietro, Album, fol. 31-32, reproduced in Waetzdolt 1964, 69, nos. 894-895, pls. 477-478.

[783] Osborne 1984, 64-65. The manuscript Vat.Barb.Lat.2733, fols 90^v-91^r is reproduced by Kartsonis 1986, fig. 15. The Maries appear also in another manuscript of the same library, Vat.Barb.Lat.2732, fols 76^v-77^r which is reproduced in Van Dijk 2001, fig. 3.

[784] The scene of the Maries is numbered with the letter Z and accompanied by the following inscription: 'et quando angelus mulieribus apparuit ad monumentum', ibid, fig. 15.

[785] For the inscriptions see Waetzdolt 1964, 69, nos. 894-895.

the one preserved in the Vatican Library which depicts, amongst other scenes, the Maries at the Tomb (fig. 38).

Just because the two cycles were commissioned by the same patron does not imply that the Maries at the Tomb were also depicted in Santa Maria Antiqua. The scene was, however, part of the mosaic decoration of the Oratory, in which our diminutive scene shared the same compartment with the Anastasis.[786] The choice of combining these two scenes is not incidental; it will become a common feature in many post-Iconoclast examples.[787] This choice is based on the fact that the two scenes present not only two distinct moments in Christ's resurrection, but also two distinct theological conceptions. The Anastasis scene on the one hand, portrays the death of Christ and thus the passibility of his human nature, but at the same time portrays him victorious over death and hence the impassibility of his divine nature.[788] The Maries scene on the other hand portrays the empty tomb, and thus illustrates the conviction that not only Christ's spirit had left the tomb but also his body and that the resurrection of the dead will not only be spiritual but also corporeal. It becomes apparent that the scene of the Maries at the Tomb, even in its diminutive form, was significant enough to be part of a mosaic cycle that included only two scenes from the post-Resurrection narrative: the Anastasis and the Maries. Its absence then from a cycle that included five post-Resurrection scenes and was commissioned by the same

---

[786] Kartsonis 1986, 78, believes that Anastasis supplants the Maries 'who are now relegated to a tiny area in the upper right-hand corner at the end of the cycle'. Van Dijk 2001, 310, believes that this arrangement follows a general pattern which depicts 'the simpler compositions with fewer scenes per panel, in the upper registers and more complicated, polyscenic compositions in the bottom register'.
[787] For a discussion see below.
[788] Kartsonis 1986, 227 and passim.

person is curious, especially when the Maries were replaced by Peter and John at the Tomb, a secondary scene.[789]

If Nordhagen is correct in his identification of the fragmented scene in Santa Maria Antiqua as Peter and John at the Tomb, then it is worth considering the reasons behind this 'irregularity'. First we need to explain why this scene was included in a post-Resurrection cycle and also why it was substituted for the Maries at the Tomb. To start with the latter, both the Maries and Peter and John at the Tomb portray the empty sepulchre and thus convey the same theological message.[790] Even though no angel appears in the Peter and John scene, Christ's resurrection is further enhanced by the linen clothing discovered by the two disciples. Such was the importance of the latter that it became a common feature in the majority of the post-Iconoclast examples of the Maries at the Tomb. The importance of the linen clothing as proof of Christ's resurrection was already expressed by John Chrysostom, Leo the Great, Ammonios of Alexandria and Severos of Antioch.[791] In later depictions of the Maries, the angel's posture changes from that of speech and acclamation to one of direction, pointing to the empty sepulchre and the linen clothing that lie within.[792] But this alone cannot, obviously justify the inclusion of Peter and John at the Tomb, for the linen clothing

---

[789] For the post-Resurrection cycle see Nordhagen 1968, 31-38 and pls XXXIII a-b – XXXVII a-b and especially, 31-32 and pl. XXXIII a-b for what the author describes as Peter and John at the Tomb.

[790] In the Gospel of John (20: 3-8), Peter and John visit the tomb after being informed by the Magdalene, while in the Gospel of Luke (24: 12) it is Peter alone, after being informed by an undisclosed number of women (three are named: Mary Magdalene, Joanna and Mary the mother of James). See the discussion on cruciform reliquary of Paschal I that follows below.

[791] John Chrysostom, *Homily LXXXV on John*, PG 59, col. 464; Leo the Great, *Oration LXXI: On the Lords Resurrection*, NPNF III, 189; Ammonios of Alexandria, *Exposition of the Gospel of John*, PG 85, col. 1516-21; Severos of Antioch, *Oration Seventy-Seven*, PO 16, col. 816-18.

[792] The Milan and Munich ivories (ca. 400), the Santa Sabina doors (432-440), and the sixth-century Rabbula Gospels depict the angel in a posture of speech, while in all later examples the angel will be depicted pointing at the tomb. The mosaic of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo and the Sancta Sanctorum panel represent an intermediate stage in which the angel points to the tomb but the linen clothing are not visible.

were also depicted in the scene of the Maries, as we have already observed on the fourth-century sarcophagus of Saint Celse (fig. 13).[793]

A possible explanation is offered by John VII's iconographic programme of the Oratory of Old Saint Peter. Besides the Christological cycle, Grimaldi's drawings depict a Peter cycle of mainly apocryphal scenes divided into three registers.[794] The iconographic similarities between the post-Resurrection cycle in Santa Maria Antiqua and the Peter cycle in the Oratory were used by Van Dijk, as evidence that the two works were commissioned by John.[795] Furthermore Van Dijk sees in the Peter cycle a deliberate attempt at self promotion.[796] By portraying scenes from Peter's life in the Oratory, John VII honoured the first of the Apostles in whose steps he followed as Pope of Rome. In the post-Resurrection cycle the substitution of Peter and John at the Tomb for the Maries could have served not only to honour Peter and thus John's Papal authority, but also John whose name the Pope carried. This could also explain the choice of over Peter and John at the Tomb, instead of Peter at the Tomb, an even rarer scene, in which only the latter apostle is depicted.[797]

The choice of the other post-Resurrection scenes might not have been incidental or based purely upon their popularity. In the Incredulity of Thomas, Nordhagen identifies the disciple closer to Christ as Peter.[798] In the Miraculous Draught of Fishes, it is Peter who dives into the waters (John 21: 7), identified by a surviving inscription

---

[793] Wilpert 1929-36, 2, 330 and pl. CCXXXXIII.6.
[794] Van Dijk 2001, 306, figs. 1-2.
[795] According to Van Dijk, 2001, 310, the preaching scenes in the Peter cycle find a parallel in the Incredulity of Thomas and the Appearance to the Eleven.
[796] Ibid, 320-321.
[797] This is an even rarer scene described only in Luke 24: 12: 'But Peter got up and ran to the tomb; stooping and looking in, he saw the linen cloths by themselves; then he went home, amazed at what had happened'.
[798] Nordhagen 1968, 32-33. This is detail common in all later examples of the Incredulity.

that reads (P)ETRUS.[799] According to Origen, on the Road to Emmaus, the unnamed

companion of Kleopas was Peter,[800] but this view was not endorsed by later authors,

and no examples survive in art.[801] Because the upper part of the two disciples is

missing, it is difficult to say whether Kleopas' companion was in fact Peter. It is

possible that Peter's presence in the scenes was the driving force behind this lengthy

post-Resurrection cycle and also for the substitution of the Maries, with Peter and

John at the Tomb.

A final remark should be made. Directly below the Christological scenes appears a

band with medallions depicting apostles. Peter's medallion appears directly below the

scene of Peter and John at the Tomb, while directly below the Incredulity of Thomas,

appears the medallion of Thomas. It seems that the band of the apostles acts as a

visual commentary for the scenes of the post-Resurrection cycles. However, as in the

other scenes of the post-Resurrection cycle – the Miraculous Draught of Fishes and

the Appearance of Christ to the Eleven – the main character is again Peter. It is not

clear whether or not this connection between the medallions and the post-Resurrection

scenes that lay above, was a coincidence.

If the scene depicted in Santa Maria Antiqua is Peter and John at the Tomb, then this

is the first time the scene appears in monumental art. The substitution of the most

popular scene of the post-Resurrection cycle, with one of that was apparently

---

[799] Ibid, 33.
[800] *Against Celsus*, PG 11, col. 901. The name of Kleopas' companion is not mentioned in the Gospels.
[801] At Sant' Apollinare Nuovo and Monreale, Kleopas' companion is different from the disciple who heads the group of Apostles in the Incredulity (Peter). In the Gospels, Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23, Velmans 1971, 48, fig. 266 the narrative of the Road to Emmaus is 'broken' in order to insert Christ's appearance to Peter. This happens because, according to the Gospels, upon the arrival of Kleopas and his companion to Jerusalem, they were informed that Christ had appeared to Peter (Luke 24:34.

unknown can only be explained as part of a deliberate attempt of self-promotion by John VII. It is also worth noticing that the only scenes absent from this lengthy post-Resurrection cycle are those in which the primary figures are women: the Maries and the Chairete. It is then possible that Pope John VII preferred scenes where male authority supplants that of women, which might further support the argument of self-promotion. In short, the absence of the Maries from this cycle should not thus be used as an argument that the scene was not popular in Roman painting. Nevertheless, in the light of the fragmented status of this scene, and based upon the evidence introduced above and the iconographic details discussed in a previous chapter, the possibility that the fresco depicted the Maries at the Tomb cannot be dismissed.[802]

The Maries continued to be a popular theme in Italy after Iconoclasm. One example survives in a very fragmented condition on the wall that divides the narthex from the main church in the lower basilica of San Clemente, and is attributed to the papacy of Leo IV (847-855).[803] From the surviving evidence it becomes apparent that the composition retains its pre-Iconoclast configuration, in which the tomb is still depicted in the centre, while the two Maries and the angel appear at each side. Since the fresco is badly damaged and no detailed photo exists, my presentation of this scene relies on Cecchelli's and Osborne's descriptions.[804]

Cecchelli in his brief description, referred to the sepulchre as an 'edicola sepolcrale', while Osborne called it a 'cave chamber'.[805] At first their accounts seem conflicting

---

[802] See also chapter 1.3 for a detailed discussion on the surviving iconographic details.
[803] Cecchelli 1957, 132.
[804] Osborne's publication contains a general view in which the Maries are barely visible due to angle in which the photo was taken thus making the details undecipherable. Cecchelli's publication does not include the scene in its photographic repertoire.
[805] Cecchelli 1957, 133; Osborne 1984, 62.

but not, however, when compared with two early Cappadocian churches. The first one

is Kiliçlar Kilise, dated shortly after 900.[806] In the Maries at the Tomb scene the

sepulchre has already being relegated in the corner (fig. 36), making it the first

monumental example in which this transition takes place. However the tomb is

neither the Holy Sepulchre nor the rock-cut cave, but is depicted as a free-standing

building with triangular roof and two slender columns at the front. Cave, who wrote

her PhD thesis on the monument, described it as 'a tall vertical tomb structure'.[807]

Even though the sepulchre is moved into the corner of the scene, it retains its pre-

Iconoclast depiction as a free-standing structure. In the Old Tokali Kilise (ca. 900),

the tomb is shared as a common feature between the Maries and the Anastasis (fig.

39).[808] The tomb here resembles a free-standing structure, but it is not the clearly

defined building of Kiliçlar. Its peculiar shape, with the addition of the two prophets

on top,[809] probably presents a transitional stage between the free standing building

and the cave. It seems then that the earliest examples from the East back Cecchelli's

description. However Osborne's description is supported by Belting, who sees

similarities between the cave-like sepulchre in Santi Martiri in Cimitile and that in

San Clemente.[810] It is true, though, that the early examples of the cave sepulchre

imitate free-standing structures, which might explain Cecchelli's description.

Besides the cave-like tomb, which still lies in the middle of the scene, another detail

makes it appearance here for the first time: the unguent jars. In all other earlier and

contemporary examples, the Maries are depicted holding censers, while in the

---

[806] Restle 1967, I: 131-134.
[807] Cave 1984, 163. The last two words could be easily translated into Italian as 'edicola sepolcrale'.
[808] Wharton-Epstein 1986, figs. 39-40.
[809] Kartsonis 1986, 166, believes that the tomb also serves as a sarcophagus for David and Solomon whose jewels match those of the decoration from the tomb's entrance.
[810] Belting 1962, 78. For Santi Martiri see below.

majority of the surviving pre-Iconoclast evidence they hold nothing at all. The only

notable exception is the Rabbula Gospels, where the Virgin holds a jar. According to

Osborne's description, in San Clemente both women are holding jars in their left

hands while the one furthest from the sepulchre holds 'either a scroll or a long-

stemmed ointment vase'.[811] No depictions survive in which the Maries hold a scroll

and no examples exist in which a Mary holds jars in both her hands. In the Rabbula

Gospels, however, Mary Magdalene – who is depicted behind the Virgin – holds a

censer instead of a jar (fig. 35). [812] It is possible then that Osborne's 'long-stemmed

vase' was nothing more than the round censer supported by chains. This combination

appears also in Armenian iconography, where again the Mary closer to the angel

carries the jar, while the one behind her holds the censer.[813] The combination of jar

and censer in the hands of one woman appears in the tenth-century Cappadocian

church of Bahattin Samnliği Kilise, where the Mary nearest to the angel holds both a

censer and an unguent jar.[814] An Ottonian manuscript of the early eleventh century,

now at the Berlin State Museum, depicts the Mary closer to the Tomb, carrying both a

censer with her right hand and a jar of unguent with her left (fig. 40),[815] thus

demonstrating that while it is possible to depict a Mary holding two objects, these

normally were a jar and a censer and not two unguent jars.

Cecchelli in his description says that 'l'Angelo avverte 'Resurrexit non est hic' (Mark

16: 6)' but does not clarify whether this was an actual inscription he witnessed or

---

[811] Osborne 1984, 62.

[812] Almost all the ampullae depict the Mary closer to the tomb holding a censer. The same applies for the ivory pyxis from the Metropolitan Museum and the Sitten pyxis (Museum of the Valeria Church), St. Clair 1979 128-130, figs. 1 and 7. It is true that a scroll appears on the Sitten pyxis, but it is not carried by the Maries but by the two apostles flanking the scene, ibid, 129, fig. 1.

[813] See for example the two twelfth-century manuscripts, Venice, Mekhitharist Library 141 and Jerusalem, Armenian Patriarchate ms. 1796, introduced in a following chapter.

[814] Thierry and Thierry 1963, 168.

[815] Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek ms.theol.lat. fol. 2, in Rothe 1968 pl. 21.

poetic licence; Osborne in contrast mentions no inscription. Accompanying

inscriptions appear already in Santa Maria Antiqua. If there was indeed an inscription,

then it is not the first time in which the scene is inspired by Matthew 28: 1-8 while the

accompanying text is taken from Mark 16: 6. This is also attested in Kiliçlar Kilise,[816]

and in Çarikli Kilise (second half of the twelfth century).[817] With minor variations the

inscriptions in both churches read: ΙΔΕ Ο ΤΑΦΟC ΟΠΟΥ ΕΘΗΚΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ.[818]

The choice of this inscription is related to the angel's gesture, which is now depicted

pointing at the tomb. The quotation from Mark 'look, there is the place' complements

the scene better than Matthew's account 'come, see the place'. Thus it is probably the

iconography of the scene that was responsible for the accompanying text.

Another detail of particular interest is the lamp that appears hanging from the tomb's

entrance.[819] While a lamp appears on various examples associated with pilgrimage

art,[820] this is the first time it appears in monumental art. Belting, who drew a

comparison between San Clemente and Santi Martiri, mentions nothing about the

lamp but sees in the interior of both tombs the linen clothing.[821] It is not clear why

Belting does not mention this otherwise important detail. The opposite applies to

Cecchelli, who mentions nothing about the linen clothing but only the lamp.[822] In

---

[816] Jerphanion 1930, 231 note 2; Cave 1984, 164; Osborne 1984, 64.

[817] Restle 1967, fig. 211.

[818] Mark 16: 6: 'Behold, the tomb where they have laid him'.

[819] Cecchelli 1957, 133: 'e in alto è una lampada'; Osborne 1984, 62 and 66.

[820] A lamp is represented hanging inside the sepulchre on the sixth-century ivory pyxis from Palestine now at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, St. Clair 1979; a bronze medallion (amulet) from Egypt, Schlumberger 1893; and on the ampullae Monza 3 and Bobbio 6, Grabar 1958. For further details see previous chapters.

[821] Belting 1962, 78: 'Im Innern des Grabes sieht man in beiden Fresken das geknotete Linnentuch'.

[822] Cecchelli 1957, 133: 'e in alto è una lampada'.

contrast, Osborne, who supports the presence of the lamp, points out that the absence of the linen clothing is surprising.[823]

The explanation for this confusion lies in the iconography of the linen clothing. There are two important things that we ought to consider. The first is the habitual depiction, by post-Iconoclast artists, of the linen clothing as two distinct garments and second, the position of one of those garments closer to the tomb's roof, following a false perspective. The depiction of Christ's linen clothing as two distinct garments was based on the Gospel of John. According to that Gospel, the first garment was used to cover Christ's head and was 'not lying with the linen cloths but rolled up in a place by itself' (John 20: 6-7); the second garment was used to cover Christ's body. The two garments are depicted in a distinct manner.[824] The one used for Christ's head follows the Gospel's description and appears rolled up in the shape of a coil,[825] or tied up in a knot.[826] There is no consistent iconography for the second linen cloth. It appears as a snake-like garment in the Old Tokali, loose in Çarikli Kilise (fig. 41), and as a cocoon, on the twelfth-century Armenian manuscript, Venice, Mekhitharist Library ms. 141 (fig. 42).[827] The arrangement of one piece of cloth over the other follows a false perspective as both were lying inside the tomb. It is possible then that the linen cloth was confused for a lamp. Its circular shape, its placement closer to the roof and the fragmented condition of the fresco might explain this misunderstanding.

---

[823] Osborne 1984, 66. Osborne's identification is based on a photo, which unfortunately is not reproduced in his book.

[824] It should be noted however that not all the post-Iconocast examples depict two distinct pieces of clothing.

[825] Çarikli Kilise (2nd half 12th c.) and Karanlik Kilise (1200/10), Restle 1967, II: figs. 211 and 239 respectively.

[826] Santi Martiri in Cimitile (shortly after 900), Belting 1962, fig. 37; Old Tokali Kilise (2nd decade of 10th c.), Wharton-Epstein 1986, fig. 39; Dovecote (963-969), Restle 1967, II: fig. 311.

[827] For the Old Tokali Kilise see Wharton-Epstein 1986, 65, where it is described as a loose bandage, fig. 39; for Çarikli Kilise see note 65 above and for the Armenian manuscript see, Der Nersessian 1993, fig. 72. Another manuscript, Jerusalem, Armenian Patriarchate ms. 1796 (12th c.), is closer to Çarikli; this was also the type favoured throughout the Middle Byzantine period.

The same confusion appears in an article published by Roe.[828] What Roe identifies as a lamp hanging from the arched door of the cave at the late eleventh-century church of Sant' Urbano alla Caffarella (fig. 43), could in fact be the linen cloth that covered Christ's head. The circular form of the garment with its two loose endings pointing upwards and its depiction closer, but not however attached to the tomb's ceiling, might again explain the confusion. Nonetheless, a lamp is clearly depicted in the contemporary eleventh-century chapel of Saint Jean of Le Liget, France, where the background of the Maries scene depicts an architectural ensemble: a triconch from which the lamp is suspended (fig. 44). It has been argued that the scene of the Maries in Le Liget relies heavily on the actual Holy Sepulchre.[829] Like on the ampullae and the pyxides from Palestine, the presence of the lamp in Le Liget was intended to commemorate the actual shrine.[830] This is not to say that all art is similar but rather to point out the incentive: to commemorate the actual shrine in Jerusalem.

In all pre-Iconoclast examples of the Maries, the lamp appears only when the tomb is portrayed as an architectural ensemble commemorating either the Holy Sepulchre (ampullae) or its altar (pyxides). In San Clemente the tomb is a cave, thus the lamp would have been out of context and not related in any way with the Gospel narrative. We should not however insist further on this point, as the state of the fresco is such that it cannot yield any secure conclusions.

---

[828] Roe 1941, 217.
[829] Munteanu 1977, 33: 'The pictorial rendering of the Holy Sepulchre in the scene of the Three Maries at the Tomb to the right of the apsidal window constitutes an equivalent of the actual shrine of the Sepulchre', fig. 5a-b.
[830] Ibid, 33.

The scene of the Maries at the Tomb in San Clemente marks, according to Belting, an intermediary stage in the development of the new iconographic type, in which the tomb will be represented as a rock-hewn cave.[831] The addition of details common in later representations, such as the linen clothing and the unguent jars, further adhere to this view. Nevertheless one particular iconographic detail; the censer and the jar in the hands of one of the Maries, never materialised in Middle Byzantine art.

The depiction of the Maries at the Tomb which survives in the crypt of the palace chapel of San Vincenzo al Volturno precedes that of San Clemente by a few decades and was painted well into the last phase of Iconoclasm in the East. The scene, along with the rest of the iconography of San Vincenzo, is considered one of the most important examples of Italian art and is dated ca. 830, during the early years of the abbacy of Epiphanios (824-842), who is portrayed in the frescoes.[832] The composition shares many similarities with that of San Clemente. The tomb at San Vincenzo is again the centre of attention but the angel does not occupy the extreme right corner as in San Clemente, but rather is portrayed in front of the sepulchre (fig. 45). Two Maries appear again, with the one closer to the tomb holding a jar with her left hand and probably a censer with her right. As we have seen above, this feature appears also in San Clemente, which probably indicates a common prototype. However, in San Clemente, the jar and the censer are carried by the Mary furthest from the tomb.

One notable difference, from other earlier and contemporary examples of the scene, is the shape of the tomb, which in San Vincenzo is depicted not as a cave but rather as a free-standing building with two slender towers on each side, each pierced with a

---

[831] Belting 1962, 79.
[832] Hodges 1997, 118-19; Mitchell 1985, 125 notes that abbot Epiphanios is depicted in the Crucifixion scene as a kneeling supplicant 'with the square halo of the living'.

window. The structure is inscribed: SEPULCRU DNI (The sepulchre of the Lord).

This unusual depiction of the sepulchre is unprecedented both in early Christian and

Byzantine art. Neither the Gospel narrative nor the actual Constantinian building were

used as a source for this unconventional structure. One might argue that the sepulchre

was modelled after a two-towered Syrian church, similar to the one depicted on a

panel from the Santa Sabina doors.[833] Whether Syrian or not, Cook states that in four

western examples 'the sepulchre is a miniature church with towers'.[834] Our example

falls directly into this category. The connection between the two-towered church and

Christ's sepulchre is further enhanced by the presence of a crowned weeping female

figure inscribed IERUSALE (Jerusalem). The figure of Jerusalem appears over the

Maries at the Tomb and the Crucifixion thus signifying the location in which the two

events took place.[835] Hence, even the unconventional – at least to the modern eyes –

sepulchre, is instantly placed in the Loca Sancta. However the weeping Jerusalem is

closely associated with the Crucifixion rather than the Maries, as it recalls the Gospel

of Luke (19: 41-47), where Christ is the one who weeps for Jerusalem for her

horrifying future, because she ignored the visitation from God.[836]

The absence of the Anastasis from the cycle in San Vincenzo is not singular in the

ninth century. In the East, both the Holy Apostles and the Virgin at Pege excluded it

from their iconography.[837] However the Maries in San Vincenzo are not the sole

---

[833] The doors are now widely considered to be the product of a Roman workshop, Weitzmann 1979, 488, no. 438. The sepulchre of Christ is closer to Gothic examples of church architecture, i.e. Notre Dame in Paris. While Ousterhout 1996, 21, is probably correct when he argues that 'we don't need the monuments of Early Christian Syria to explain the origins of the Romanesque twin-towered façade', the early ninth-century paintings from San Vincenzo could provide the link between the two.

[834] Cook 1928, 344 and note 155.

[835] In fig. X, Jerusalem is number 9; the Maries at the Tomb are numbers 13-14, while the Crucifixion is number 5.

[836] Valente 1995, abstract taken from www.italiamedievale.org-sito.acim-contributi-cripta.epifanio

[837] Detailed discussion on the written sources that describe the two monuments and their iconography follows in the next chapter.

reference to the Resurrection. Directly below Jerusalem and inside a blind niche between the Maries and the Crucifixion, appears a scene titled by Valente 'Christo Risorto'.[838] In this scene Christ appears standing between two Saints, Lawrence and Stephen; on his nimbus the letters Alpha and Omega appear, while he holds a book inscribed 'EGO SUM DS ABRAHA' (I am the God of Abraham).[839] The only detail that points towards a post-Resurrection scene is the fact that Christ is flanked by two *personae*, as in the Chairete. The position of the scene between the Crucifixion and the Maries, and below Jerusalem, helped create an illusion of a resurrected Christ. This according to Valente was enhanced by the presence of candles, lit inside the blind niche.[840] It is the scene of the Maries at the Tomb that functions here as a reference to the resurrection, which is further enhanced by the linen clothing tied up in a knot inside the sepulchre, making this the earliest monumental example in which this detail is included.[841]

The linen clothing is absent from the Maries scene on the almost contemporary cruciform reliquary of Paschal I (812-824), now in the Museo Sacro of the Vatican.[842] This silver reliquary depicts an extensive post-Resurrection cycle, which includes the Maries at the Tomb (fig. 46). Contrary to the two wall-paintings discussed above, the Maries hold nothing in their hands. The tomb, which appears as a free-standing structure, has no resemblance to San Vincenzo but rather is depicted as an elongated building with a domical roof similar to the one depicted on the fourth-century Saint Celse sarcophagus. The two women of the reliquary do not approach the tomb but instead they are moving quickly away from it. Probably here the artist depicted the

---

[838] Ibid.
[839] Exodus 3: 6
[840] Valente 1995.
[841] It appears already on the Saint Celse sarcophagus at Milan (4th-5th c.).
[842] Lauer 1906, 69-71; Cecchelli 1926-1927, 162-163.

angel's command: 'Then go quickly and tell his disciples' (Matth. 28: 7). Of course

no one expects a silver reliquary to look like a wall painting. The example was

employed here in order to demonstrate that the emphasis here was not on the visit of

the Maries at the sepulchre, but rather on the subsequent event: the angel's command

to inform the disciples. The absence of the containers from the hands of the Maries,

further enhanced by their postures, was an intentional act by the artist and/or his

patron, to illustrate a different point in the narrative.

Another notable difference is the absence of the linen clothing. Even though the angel

blocks the view of the tomb's interior, it is doubtful that the linen clothing was

depicted. This was represented inside the sepulchre, in the Peter and John at the Tomb

scene, which appears on the same face of the reliquary (fig. 46). It is plausible that

whenever Peter and John appeared in the same cycle as the Maries, the linen garments

were portrayed inside the sepulchre of the former scene, where they actually belong

according to the Gospel narrative.[843]

A final point should be made, about the depiction of the angel at the front of the

sepulchre. On the reliquary of Paschal I (fig. 46) and at San Vincenzo (fig. 45), the

angel is positioned neither at the extremities nor in the middle of the scene but rather

on the foreground in front of the tomb. This arrangement follows an unbroken Roman

tradition that goes back to the Roman ivories (ca. 400) and to a lesser extent to the

Maries panel from the Santa Sabina doors. According to Grimaldi's drawing (fig. 38),

---

[843] However as their common appearance is a rarity we should not insist further on this assumption. A similar action however is taken when the Chairete and the Maries are depicted together. The sepulchre which is the main feature of the Maries never appears in the Chairete when the two scenes are portrayed together. It is shared however on the Rabbula Gospels and on the Victoria and Albert museum ivory plaque (North Italy, Venice? 12th c.), Goldshmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: no.42 and Williamson 1986, 77; colour pl. 3.

the same positioning occurs also in the Old Saint Peter. Consequently San Clemente

shows an innovative approach not only in the depiction of the sepulchre as a rock-

cave, but also in breaking away from the afore-mentioned tradition. Depicting the

sepulchre in the centre of the scene was a popular arrangement in pilgrimage art, but

Roman art prior to San Clemente never used it, while outside Rome Sant' Apollinare

is the only exception.[844] San Clemente is influenced by a pre-Iconoclast tradition

regarding the configuration of the scene, while at the same time it introduced a new

trend of depicting the sepulchre as a rock-cut cave. Thus even if we admit that

Osborne is right when he argues that the two Maries are not evidence of direct

Byzantine influence,[845] the departure of San Clemente from a long Roman tradition,

in favour of a hitherto uncommon configuration, demonstrates either Byzantine

impact or a ninth-century western innovation.[846]

That the scene in San Clemente is closer to the pre-Iconoclast configuration, as it

appears on Byzantine pilgrimage art, is also evident from the angel who 'gestures

towards' the tomb.[847] From Osborne's description it seems that the angel makes a

gesture of benediction towards the women, while his stretched hand points at the same

time to the tomb, which lies in between. This gesture finds its closer parallel on the

Sancta Sanctorum panel (fig. 6a). It is worth noting at this point, that if the lamp seen

by both Cecchelli and Osborne (but not by Belting), was indeed depicted inside the

tomb, and if one of the Maries was holding a censer, then not only the configuration

---

[844] The sepulchre is depicted between the two Maries on the British Museum ivory panel, but there the whole scene follows a strict symmetry which results in the exclusion of the angel, who would have rendered the scene assymetrical.

[845] Osborne 1984, 65.

[846] Besides Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, the only other surviving example outside Rome comes from the baptistery of San Giovanni in Naples, where again the Roman tradition is followed rather loosely. In this example, the angel is depicted at the front of the entrance, between the sepulchre and the Maries, imitating the ivories but following a different perspective.

[847] Osborne 1984, 62: 'He has ochre wings and gestures towards the grave'.

of the scene, but also its details are closely related to pilgrimage art, examples of which had already reached Italy.[848] Aside from the rock-cave, recorded both by Osborne and Belting, the whole composition seems to rely heavily on pilgrimage art.

The same could be said about Santi Martiri in Cimitile, which dates between the end of the ninth, beginning of the tenth century. Here the scene follows the Middle Byzantine configuration, where the angel is centrally positioned and flanked by the two Maries holding jars (fig. 47) on the left and the sepulchre on the right. The latter is depicted, according to Belting, as a cave-like opening similar to the one in San Clemente.[849] Visible inside the cave of Santi Martiri is the linen clothing tied up in a knot, while next to the sepulchre two soldiers are portrayed sleeping. They wear their helmets and mail-coated armour, while their shields and spears are resting next to them. This is the earliest monumental example in which the soldiers are included, predating the earliest depiction from the East by more than a century.[850] Neither Kiliçlar, nor the Old Tokali includes the soldiers in their iconography of the scene. The soldiers however had already made their appearance in pre-Iconoclast illuminated manuscripts and ivories, but not in monumental art.[851]

---

[848] Is should be noted that the ampullae of Bobbio and Monza have been in Italy for more than a century prior to Santi Martiri; the same applies for the Sancta Sanctorum panel. Other artefacts and illuminated manuscripts could have been brought by Syrian refugees of the Monophysite persecution and Arab invasion.

[849] Belting 1962, 78.

[850] Soğanli, Karabas Kilise (10th-mid 11th c.), Restle 1967, fig. 461. The soldiers are mentioned however in the detailed *Ekphrasis* of Mesarites, on the church of the Holy Apostles, Downey 1957, 883. For a discussion see the following chapter.

[851] See for example the Rabbula Gospels and the Milan Castello Sforzesco and Munich ivories. The depiction of the soldiers in miniatures and ivories continues after Iconoclasm, observable in the marginal Psalters e.g. Mount Athos, Pantokrator 61, fols 30ᵛ, fol. 89ʳ, fol 109ʳ: Dufrenne 1966, and on an ivory diptych from Milan (10th c.), Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: 42, to which we will return later.

The scene of the Maries in Santi Martiri appears exactly below the Anastasis, while in San Clemente it is exactly above it. The deliberate positioning of these two scenes in such proximity does not follow simply a chronological sequence, but was a common ninth-century practice, in which the scenes were grouped together in order to create a visual commentary.[852] The Martvili triptych, a ninth-century portable phylactery from Tbilisi in Georgia is such an example (fig. 48). The obverse of the triptych represents a formal Deesis group in enamel, while the reverse represents four scenes in niello work.[853] These are: the Nativity and the Presentation in the Temple in the upper register, and the Resurrection and the Maries at the Tomb in the bottom register. Here the scenes of the upper register are compared with those of the lower register. Thus the mystery of redemption is explained through scenes from the Incarnation and Passion of Christ.[854] However the scenes can be explained also on a vertical axis, similar to the one from fol. 30^r of the Paris Gregory, to which we will return later. The birth of Christ in the Nativity denotes the birth of the new Adam, while in the Anastasis Christ raises the old Adam from the dead. Here Nativity and Anastasis are juxtaposed in order to present two of the most important moments in Christ's life and thus of Christian theology: the Nativity and the Resurrection.[855] These were also the two greatest feasts of the liturgical calendar.

The visual commentary of the other two scenes, the Presentation in the Temple and the Maries at the Tomb raises some difficulties as not many examples survive in

---

[852] Best exemplified by fol. 30^v in the Paris Gregory (Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale, cod.gr.510), Brubaker 1996, 11-12 and Brubaker 1997, 291-302.
[853] I thank my friend and colleague Maria Paphitis (Christie's) for providing me with a high resolution image of the phylactery. See also Kartsonis 1986, 113-114 and fig. 24g.
[854] Kartsonis 1986, 114.
[855] See for example www.anastasis.org © Father Ephrem Lash for the following *troparion* from the sixth ode of John of Damascus *Kanon on Easter*:
    Unbroken you preserved the seals, O Christ, in your rising from the tomb, nor injured the licks of the virgin womb in your birth, and have opened to us the portals of Paradise.

which these scenes are grouped together.[856] Nonetheless, the artist of this phylactery

ingeniously represented the Mary closer to the sepulchre holding an enormous jar of

unguent in such a way that it creates the illusion of presenting it to the angel.[857] The

same posture appears directly above the Mary in the Presentation scene, where the

Virgin presents Christ to Symeon. This visual commentary is better explained through

the juxtaposition not only of the gestures but also of the words and actions of the

personae involved. Symeon replies to the Virgin's presentation of Christ by saying:

'for my eyes have seen your salvation' (Luke 2: 30) while below, the Maries offer

myrrh for Christ, who according to theological interpretation was 'the myrrh poured

for our salvation'.[858] Other parallels between the two scenes involve the temple that

accepts Christ, and the sepulchre that receives his body and, while through Christ

Symeon witness the salvation of humankind (Luke 2: 30-31), the Maries witness the

same truth through the angel's words and the empty tomb. Furthermore a possible

liturgical connection could be drawn between Symeon's words: 'a light for revelation

to the Gentiles' (Luke 2: 32) with the lighting of the candles associated with Easter.

On the Martvili Triptych, the association between the Anastasis and the Maries is as

important as their juxtaposition with the scenes of the upper register. In fact, all four

scenes are employed together to present the two most prominent moments in Christ's

life: Incarnation and Resurrection. Furthermore, as it has been argued above, the

Maries and the Anastasis scenes when combined together create a self-sufficient

---

[856] On the Fieschi Morgan reliquary (Metropolitan Museum of Arts, 9th c.), the Nativity appears again over the Anastasis. The other two compartments depict the Annunciation over the Crucifixion. For the date of the Fieschi Morgan reliquary and a discussion on this and other reliquaries, including the Martvili Triptych, see Kartsonis 1986, 94-125.

[857] This posture is unique and appears only on this phylactery which further enhances its purpose as a visual commentary associated with the scene above. Also the size of the jar is so big that is comparable to Christ from the Presentation scene.

[858] John of Damascus, *Homily on Holy Easter*, PG 96, col.636; see also Athanasios of Alexandria, *First Discourse Against the Arians*, NPNF 4, 1886, 334, where he mentions that the myrrh carried by Maries fulfilled the prophecy: "And thy garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia", Psalm 16: 8.

model of Christ's resurrection. To sum up there is a deliberate emphasis on the

vertical juxtaposition of the four scenes, either as two groups which promote the

Incarnation and the Resurrection, or individually. This theological agenda, could be

explained as the product of a deep knowledge and understanding of theology by the

patron of this reliquary, but the innovative approach by which the artist depicted Mary

holding the container, remains in my opinion, the artist's own innovation.

As has already been observed by Kartsonis, the Maries in the ninth century do not

eclipse the Anastasis.[859] While this is probably true, all the ninth-century narrative

cycles from both Italy and the East, do not fail to combine the latter scene with the

Maries. Both scenes appear in San Clemente, Santi Martiri and Kiliçlar Kilise. It

seems then that in the ninth century, neither the Anastasis, nor the Maries were

individually seen as synonyms for the resurrection, but their juxtaposition was

necessary. This combination does not follow a narrative sequence, at least not a

Gospel one, but rather the two events shared the same liturgical and hymnographical

space. The celebration of the resurrection culminated with a combination of the

Gospel reading (Matthew 28:1-20) and a sermon written by Gregory the Theologian

that makes a brief, but vivid, reference to Christ's sojourn in Hades.[860] Furthermore

the hymns of the period up to Easter were full of references to the Maries and to

Christ's sojourn to Hades.[861] The combination of the two scenes is better explained in

Old Tokali Kilise where the sepulchre from the Maries scene provides also the setting

for the depiction of the two prophets from the Anastasis scene. Thus the coupling of

---

[859] Kartsonis 1986, 144.

[860] While reading the following line one instantly recalls to memory the image of the Anastasis: 'he was raised, in order to pull towards him, those who were lying dead in the sin' Gregory Nazianzenus, *Oration on Easter and on Reluctance* PG 35, col. 400.

[861] Joseph the Hymnographer, *Triodion*, PG 87, 3839-3982.

the Anastasis with the Maries must have been influenced at some level by contemporary liturgical and hymnographical trends, or vice versa.

In San Clemente the Anastasis and the Maries appear grouped together, thus being of the same height as the Crucifixion. In this way both scenes work together as one, making them comparable to the Crucifixion to which they are adjacent.[862] Kartsonis believes that the 'presentation of these three scenes as a unit continues and expands the older tradition, which presented the Crucifixion and the Myrophores as a unit'.[863] This older tradition was visible, as we have seen in San Vincenzo al Volturno. To take Kartsonis' words one step further, the older tradition now expands in order to accommodate the Anastasis. Thus to illustrate Christ's death and Resurrection, the Maries are now coupled with the Anastasis or vice versa. Kartsonis, however, in order to prove that the Anastasis is more important than the Maries, argues that in San Clemente the Maries occupy a smaller surface than the Anastasis, which is reminiscent of the mosaic in the Oratory of John VII;[864] she fails however to notice that in Santi Martiri, it is the Anastasis that is now relegated to the smaller space near the apse (fig. 47).

In the ninth-century monumental examples, the two scenes are combined together as one unit. This is observable in San Clemente, Santi Martiri in the West and Kiliçlar Kilise in the East. The reasons for this combination vary and are open to interpretation. It seems however that the Anastasis in the ninth century narrative cycles cannot function by itself as a visual synonym to the Resurrection, and only

---

[862] Tronzo 1987, 488: 'It could be said, therefore, that this wall decoration, far from being a mere gathering of narrative subjects, was a carefully contrived and differentiated entity that drew upon larger conventions in order to define within this specific church a definite, if subsidiary, liturgical place'.
[863] Kartsonis 1986, 88. See also the combination of the two scenes in San Vincenzo al Volturno, above.
[864] Kartsonis 1986, 78 and note 120.

when coupled with the Maries did the theology of the resurrection becomes clear.

Furthermore, contemporary liturgy and hymnography could have influenced their

common presentation, as the two events, were celebrated during Easter and in the

ninth-century *Triodion* of Joseph the Hymnographer, the three events were the main

source of inspiration for the hymns.[865] The dedication of the second Sunday after

Easter to the Myrrh-bearers shifted the balance in favour of the Anastasis, as it

detached the Maries from the Easter feast.[866]

The post-Resurrection cycle in Santi Martiri includes in its sequence the Chairete and

the Incredulity of Thomas, thus making it one of the earliest examples in which these

three scenes (four with the Anastasis), are combined together.[867] The contemporary

frescoes from Kiliçlar Kilise, and Cappadocia in general, exclude the Incredulity and

the Chairete, which appear rarely.[868] While the Incredulity of Thomas had already

appeared among the mosaics of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo and the frescoes of Santa

Maria Antiqua, the symmetrical example of the Chairete from Santi Martiri is the

earliest in monumental art.[869] The scene follows the type common in contemporary

and later representations in which Christ appears in the middle flanked by the two

Maries.[870] All pre-Iconoclast examples show a preference for the asymmetrical type,

in which both Maries appear on one side, with Christ on the other. Santi Martiri

---

[865] Joseph the Hymnographer, *Triodion*, PG 87, cols 3839-3982. The Old Testament was also used as a source of inspiration for these hymns.

[866] For this and related discussion see the following chapters.

[867] While the combination of the Maries with the Anastasis is quite common, the Chairete and the Incredulity do not appear in the same cycle before the Middle Byzantine period with Santi Martiri being a notable exception. The reasons behind this absence could be that two scenes evoked the same theological message, of the risen Christ being seen and touched by human witnesses.

[868] Restle 1967, III: 518, identifies the scene of the Chairete amongst the frescoes of Behatin Samanliği Kilise (Beliserama, 11th c.). Jerphanion 1925-42, II.1, 225-226, identifies a damaged scene from a church in the Mavrucan area as the Noli me Tangere, without however excluding the possibility that it could depict the Chairete. The scene appears in Açikel Ağa Kilise, which dates either in the eighth or ninth centuries, Thierry 1968, 57 fig. 18. A discussion follows in the final chapter.

[869] It does however seem to have formed part of the mosaic decoration of the Church of the Virgin at Pege, while an asymmetrical example survives in Açikel Ağa Kilise. For a discussion see next chapter.

[870] See Brubaker 1997, 299 note 83 for a list of symmetrical and asymmetrical examples.

represents the postures of the two Maries in a distinct manner, as all the other pre-Iconoclast examples do, none of which depicts the same posture. Belting believes that the Chairete fresco stands at the beginning of the evolution of the Western type.[871]

The closest parallel to our fresco comes from the postures and gestures of the Maries on the Arles sarcophagus. The similarities however end here, as the scene on the sarcophagus depicts an unconventional number of women (three instead of the two described in Matthew 28: 9-10), and follows the asymmetrical type. Belting argues quite convincingly that Christ's movement and hand posture are reminiscent of later examples of the Noli me Tangere.[872] He also finds an almost identical posture of Christ in the scene of the Road to Emmaus on the Troia Rotulus.[873] However the posture of Christ is completely different on the contemporary Carolingian ivory from Metz, which dates in the second half of the tenth century and depicts both the Road and Supper at Emmaus (fig. 49). Thus one might argue that the Troia Rotulus and Santi Martiri used a common prototype or most probably the latter influenced the former.[874]

While it is true that the scene in Santi Martiri is a combination between the Chairete and the Noli me Tangere, Belting's distinction between a 'mittelbyzantinischen Chairete-Typus' and an 'abendländischen Noli me Tangere-Typus',[875] is not entirely valid, at least not for the Middle Byzantine period. It is true that later Western art

---

[871] "Am Anfang der erhaltenen italienischen Denkmäler steht das Fresko in Cimitile" Belting 1962, 84. This it true when one compares the fresco with the mosaic in Monreale, Demus 1949, 289, pl. 72.
[872] Belting 1962, 79-84.
[873] Archivio Capitolare, Exultet 3 (second half 12th c.) ibid, 84-85, figs. 41-42.
[874] Italy has a long tradition in the arts, thus it is neither necessary nor prudent always to look for Carolingian prototypes every time something 'diverts' from Byzantine art.
[875] Ibid 85: 'Der in Cimitile auftretende Typus stellt eine Kombination des mittelbyzantinischen χαίρετε-Typus und des abendländischen Noli me Tangere-typus dar.'

showed its preference for the Noli me Tangere, but on Carolingian and Ottonian

ivories, the Noli me Tangere appears only rarely.[876] In regards to Christ's depiction, a

similar posture of rapid movement is visible on the Maries on the cruciform reliquary

of Paschal I (fig. 46).[877] As was the case with the distinction between two and three

Maries, the division between the Byzantine Chairete and the Western Noli me

Tangere has not yet emerged.

The last scene from the post-Resurrection cycle in Santi Martiri is the Incredulity of

Thomas. Unlike the Chairete, the Incredulity had already appeared in monumental art

before Iconoclasm. The scene in Santi Martiri depicts Christ in the middle flanked by

two groups of Apostles. The right group is headed by Peter, while according to

Belting, Paul leads the second group,[878] thus making this scene the first example in

which this Apostle is securely identified. As there is no Gospel verification for Paul's

presence in the scene, his depiction must have been influenced by the many

representations of these two Apostles heading the groups of disciples in such Early

Christian scenes, as Christ's among the Apostles and the *Traditio Legis*.[879] Already in

the early fifth century, Augustine of Hippo had commented on how Paul was

erroneously included in such scenes.[880] Paul is again portrayed heading the right

group of disciples, in the Incredulity miniature on the tenth-century Saint Petersburg

Lectionary.[881] The same apostle leads again the right group of Apostles in the mosaic

---

[876] See for example the catalogue of the Carolingian and Ottonian ivories (8th – 11th c.), published by Goldschmidt, where only one example of the Noli me Tangere appears: Goldschmidt 1970, 150, pl. XLII: Wurzburg Universitätsbilbiothek ivory, end of 11th c.

[877] Cecchelli 1926-1927. The sense of movement is evident in all the scenes that do not take place inside a house. Thus the Incredulity of Thomas, the Appearance of Christ to the Eleven, and the Supper at Emmaus present a more static depiction of the main characters.

[878] Belting 1962, 86 and fig. 34; the scene is quite damaged but two disciples with the characteristics of Saint Paul and Peter are seen leading the two groups of Apostles.

[879] Schumacher 1959, 1-39

[880] See the discussion in chapter 3.2.4.

[881] Petersburg, State Library cod.gr.21 (10th c.) in Morey 1929, 53 ff. and fig. 65.

panels of the Incredulity in Hosios Lukas and Daphni.[882] This scene, as we will see

below, accompanies the Homily on Thomas Sunday in the manuscripts of the

Liturgical Homilies of Gregory.[883]

Stylistically the ninth-century examples from Italy show influences from the

Byzantine tradition, while they retain some autochthonous Italian characteristics. San

Vincenzo's iconography shows many influences from Italian art, while the choice and

configuration of the post-Resurrection scenes in San Clemente and Santi Martiri helps

us to put them, by comparison, into the sphere of Byzantine influence. For example,

the coupling of the Maries with the Anastasis, typical of the Cappadocian churches,

appears also in Santi Martiri and San Clemente, while in San Vincenzo, the older

tradition is preserved, in which only the Maries are depicted. The scene remains by far

the most important of the post-Resurrection cycle and, even with the emergence of the

Anastasis, its value as a synonym for the resurrection does not seem affected.[884] In all

ninth-century examples the two scenes are depicted side by side, as if the older and

established image is introducing the 'newcomer' to the spectators.

The combination of the two scenes follows mostly liturgical considerations. This is

also evident by the absence of the previously popular Italian scenes of the Miraculous

Draught of Fishes and the Road to Emmaus. These two scenes never gained any

liturgical importance and there was no special feast day for them.[885] They appear in

---

[882] See chapter 6.1.
[883] Galavaris 1969.
[884] The Maries are absent from the Chapel of Saint Zeno in Santa Maria Prassede. The Anastasis'
presence could be explained by the funeral context of the Chapel, Kartsonis 1986, 88-93, esp. 92-93.
[885] While the Incredulity and the Maries/Chairete had their own Sunday dedicated to them.

hymns mostly associated with their use as *Eothina* Gospels,[886] that is, passages related to Christ's resurrection, read on an eleven week cycle during *Orthros* and therefore also called morning resurrection Gospels. Since this was the case with all the post-Resurrection appearances, no special attention was given to them. The Maries and the Anastasis however complement each other visually, theologically and liturgically. Visually because the Anastasis offers an image of the resurrected Christ, absent from the Maries scene, while the sadness of the Maries was changed to joy by the victorious Christ of the Anastasis. The hymns of the *Triodion* and of Easter insist on this change of emotions.[887] Theologically because Christ's sojourn in the underworld and the rescue of Adam would have seemed incomplete if not for the empty sepulchre that signified his return to life. Liturgically, because the Maries, through the Gospels, and the Anastasis through a homily of Gregory of Nazianzos, shared the same liturgical space during Easter. The Gospel and the sermon readings complement each other like the two images do.

Finally the ninth-century examples from Italy demonstrate that Jerphanion's and Millet's view has a fundamental flaw.[888] Jerphanion maintained that the Gospel of Mark had become the primary reading for Easter in the West during or even before the papacy of Gregory the Great (540-604) and thus the number of Maries should be used as a feature to distinguish between a Byzantine and an Italian or western composition of the scene. However, in the afore-mentioned discussion, no examples of the Maries at the Tomb were inspired by the Gospel of Mark 16:1. The only example that follows the Gospel of Mark with some accuracy is the Munich ivory (ca,

---

[886] See for example the eleven *Eothina Anastasima* ascribed to the Emperor Leo the Wise, and the *Eksapostilaria* of his son Constantine VII, Christ and Paranikas 1963[2], 106-112.

[887] This feeling of changing emotions appears in many hymns of the *Octaechos*, but is better exemplified by the two *Apolitikia Anastasima*, Christ and Paranikas 1963[2], 87-88.

[888] See above notes 743 and 744.

400), which dates more than a century and a half before Gregory's papacy and stands alone in a period of continuous experimentation.

The Gospel reading cannot be used as a model for distinguishing an 'Eastern' from a 'Western' example, at least not in this period. Many examples from Cappadocia depict the two Maries of Matthew but the inscription that accompanies them is taken from Mark. In the West, while the two Maries of Matthew were depicted, the scene drew other details that were not Byzantine. For example, the Maries at the Tomb scene from San Vincenzo is not a Byzantine work of art. Thus it becomes apparent that in the ninth century the number of Maries cannot become a feature that separates a Byzantine from an Italian example of the Maries at the Tomb. [889]

To conclude, it becomes apparent from the Italian examples that the scene of the Maries at the Tomb retained its popularity in the ninth century. Their combination with the Anastasis creates a new visual commentary which demonstrates on one hand the chameleonic attributes of the Maries scene, and their unfading importance. The East-West distinction between two and three Maries does not apply for the ninth century and probably for the whole Middle Byzantine period. What can be securely stated is that the Gospel reading from Mark exerted limited or no influence upon the theme in the West, well into the ninth century.

---

[889] Cook 1928, 337 first noted that between the ninth and twelfth centuries, Italy produced a wide mixture of iconographies of the Maries at the Tomb.

4.2.2. The East in the ninth century.

The ninth-century narrative cycles from the West portray the Maries and the Anastasis side by side. In the East the process of adaptation was much slower. Iconoclasm gave rise to discussion of aspects of Christ's incarnation, while his human nature was at the forefront of anti-iconoclast discourse. Since the Maries at the Tomb conceal from the viewer the resurrected Christ, the plethora of Chairete examples that appear in Constantinople during the ninth century can be explained as a response to the need to display Christ in his human form in the aftermath of Iconoclasm. Since the West never followed an Iconoclastic policy, the Maries retained their popularity, but in the East, the Chairete which promoted Christ's tangibility and visibility by humans was rising in importance. 'The holy women who brought unguents *seeing* the Saviour with their eyes and *touching* His immaculate feet', was one of many icons that adorned the churches, explained Nikephoros, Patriarch of Constantinople.[890] Seeing and touching are two actions that conclusively portray a more human Christ; seeing and touching also became part of a more personal approach between the image and the beholder.

One of the earliest post-Iconoclast monumental examples of a post-Resurrection appearance comes in the form of an epigram, attributed to Ignatios, magister of the secretaries.[891] The epigram was one of six written for the church of the Virgin at Pege. Five of the epigrams talk about the mosaic decoration, while the sixth mentions the

---

[890] The italics in the main text are mine. Nikephoros, Patriarch, *Synodical Epistle to the Oriental Patriarchates* 6, Eng. transl. in Mango 1972, 176-77. In this letter the author states his belief that icon painting was older than the Gospels.

[891] See epigram 109 in Stadtmveller 1894, 30 and also in Dübner 1864, 13. The church is also mentioned in Constantine's VII, *Book of the Ceremonies*, Vogt 1935, II: 87 as celebrating on the feast of the Ascension, which is rather appropriate for a church in which the latter was depicted on the dome.

renovation of the church by Basil I (867-86).[892] The epigram that interests us, is titled:

For the same church, for <the> Salutation (Chairete),[893] and reads:

> The Lord in saying 'hail' to the women,
>
> initiates universal salvation.[894]

According to Talbot, one must view the title of an epigram with caution since it was often added later when the epigrams were copied; she further adds that 'if the subject matter and imagery of the poem fit the title, it seems reasonable to assume that the title is correct'.[895] In this occasion the '*χαιρετισμός*' of the title, does not refer to the Annunciation but rather to the Chairete. This is corroborated both by the '*Χαῖρε*' attributed to Christ and also from the context of the epigram. It should be noted however, that the title '*χαιρετισμός*' appears in later epigrams in connection with the Annunciation.[896]

Nevertheless, the '*Χαῖρε*' in its singular form and as a reference to the Chairete, appears in a hymn from the *Triodion* of Joseph the Hymnographer (9th c.).[897] The use of the singular '*Χαῖρε*' instead of the plural '*Χαίρετε*' follows an old tradition in which the words spoken by the angel in the Annunciation are juxtaposed with the words spoken by Christ to the two Maries in the Chairete.[898] The juxtaposition between two

---

[892] Theophanes Continuatus, *Vita Basilii* V: 321, Eng. transl. in Mango 1972, 192. Kartsonis 1986, 147.

[893] Epigram 114, title: εἰς <τὸν> *χαιρετισμόν*, in Stadtmveller 1894, 30 and Dübner 1864, 13-14. The absence of the article *τον* before *χαιρετισμόν* in Dübner's edition is in my opinion a better reading, as it makes a distinction between the Chairete: *χαιρετισμόν* and the Salutation: τὸν *χαιρετισμόν*. See below note 863.

[894] Epigram 114.

[895] Talbot 1994, 139 discusses later epigrams for the same church.

[896] Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, cod.gr.524, epigram II reproduced in Hörandner 1994, 118; Mount Athos, Vatopedi cod. gr. 36 and Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, cod.gr.507, epigram 1a in Hörandner 1992, 108.

[897] Joseph the Hymnographer, *Triodion*, PG 87, col. 3920. Further discussion follows in a separate chapter, where this hymn is linked to a ninth-century trend, introduced by George of Nikomedia, in which the Virgin was the first to have seen Christ resurrected.

[898] Pseudo-Epiphanios, *Second Homily on the Illustrious Saturday*, PG 43, col. 444ff.

scenes is also visible in some of Ignatios' epigrams.[899] The scene described here is undoubtedly the Chairete.

The other epigrams mention the Ascension, the Crucifixion, the Transfiguration and the Presentation to the Temple; most of these scenes were popular before Iconoclasm. Since the church was erected by Justinian,[900] it is possible that the mosaic decoration dates from that period. Architecturally the church 'was cleverly compacted by means of only four arches',[901] which in their turn were resting either on four barrel vaults or on four pendentives, depending on what the plan of the church was.[902] The five epigrams seem to suggest that the decoration was limited to those five spaces: the four created by the arches, and the dome.[903] The sources mention that Basil's I intervention on the church was limited to the dome, as some dignitaries prohibited him from pulling down and rebuilding the whole church.[904]

Nevertheless, the Church of the Virgin at Pege shares some similarities with other ninth-century examples associated with Basil I and his court. Both in the afore-mentioned church and in the celebrated Paris Gregory, to which we will return shortly, the Chairete replaced the Maries and the Anastasis as the sole reference to the resurrection. Furthermore, it becomes obvious that the Constantinopolitan court was

---

[899] It seems that most of the epigrams are deliberately juxtaposing two scenes. Kartsonis 1986, 149, has noted that the Crucifixion epigram bears iconographic details that are best suited to the Anastasis, but the author goes a step further to suggest that the two scenes were merged into one.

[900] *De sacris aedibus Deiparae ad Fontem, ASS Nov. III:879* in Mango 1972, 103

[901] Ibid, 103.

[902] For the architectural terms and the building style in Constantinople during Justinian's reign, see Krautheimer 1986[4], 238-257.

[903] Demus 1976, 108, argues against the assumption that the Pentecost was depicted in the dome.

[904] Mango 1972, 201-202. Basil was prevented from pulling the church down and rebuilding it, but was allowed to restore the parts that have fallen down, thus it is probable that the decoration was simply renovated and not made from scratch.

not so eager to include the Anastasis in its repertoire, something which is visible in

the mosaic cycle of another Constantinopolitan church, the Holy Apostles.

The church of the Holy Apostles was built by Constantine or most probably

Constantios, in the fourth century and was replaced in 536 by Justinian's church.[905]

Holy Apostles was second in importance only to Hagia Sofia, mainly because of its

use as the burial place of the emperors until the eleventh century.[906] There is much

discussion about the date of the mosaic decoration of this church, which is variously

dated between the sixth and twelfth century. Kartsonis, on one hand, argues that some

of the mosaics belong to the twelfth century, while others date from the reign of Basil

I.[907] Wharton-Epstein on the other, believes that the church received its first figural

decoration during the reign of Justin II (565-578) while the cycle described by

Rhodios and Mesarites is of the ninth century.[908] The decoration now survives only

through various descriptions, two of which fell into the category of *ekphrasis*.

The first *ekphrasis* was written by Constantine Rhodios between 931 and 944 as the

centrepiece of a poem dealing with the seven wonders of Constantinople.[909] Because

Rhodios description breaks off, we are in no position to know whether his *ekphrasis*

described any scenes from the post-Resurrection narrative.[910] Various scholars have

---

[905] Krautheimer, 1986[4], 69; Wharton-Epstein 1986, 80, places the rededication of the church during the reign of Justinian in 550. Downey 1951, believes that the church was built by Constantine's son Constantios; with that view agrees Maguire 1974, 121. The Fetih Mosque now occupies the place where the church once stood, ibid, 121-122.
[906] Wharton-Epstein 1982, 79.
[907] Kartsonis 1986, 146. For Kartsonis' view see below.
[908] Wharton-Epstein 1982, 80 and 89. See also Maguire 1974, 122.
[909] Constantine Rhodios, *Ephrasis on the Church of the Holy Aposles*, in Legrand, 1896, 32-65. Wharton-Epstein 1982, 81.
[910] Constantine Rhodios, *Ephrasis on the Church of the Holy Aposles*, 981 in Legrand, 1896, 65.

already noted that in its present form Constantine's text is incomplete.[911] The second

ekphrasis written by Nikolaos Mesarites has been deduced from internal evidence to

have been written between 1198 and 1203.[912] This *ekphrasis*, which is one of the

longest and more elaborate of its kind,[913] offers a detailed account of the decoration,

which includes an extensive post-Resurrection cycle. This cycle is most probably of

the ninth century,[914] since that is when the only recorded renovation took place, while

some iconographic elements, such as the Bribing of the Guards, offer a ninth-century

terminus ante quem. Lengthy post-Resurrection cycles were quite common in the

ninth century.[915] Finally, the differences between Rhodios' and Mesarites' *ekphrasis*

do not necessarily indicate that an alteration took place between the two accounts, but

rather that they were addressing a different audience.[916]

After Mesarites had started to describe this cycle, he advised his audience that his

discourse will follow a slower pace. The *logos* (discourse), Mesarites says, 'will walk

with a slower foot because of the unpleasant nature of the story, and, so to speak, its

deathlike and funeral character'.[917] Webb was the first to notice that at this point in

Mesarites *ekphrasis* 'the personified logos takes on the emotions appropriate to the

---

[911] Kartsonis 1986, 146, note 70; Wharton-Epstein 1982, 81-82, who further argues that Rhodios 'dryly outlines the architectural attributes of the building'. For a more lenient approach see Webb 1999, 66 who argues that 'the way in which Constantine evokes the decoration, only to return to the architecture, is an acknowledgment both of the variety of spectacle offered by the church and of the fact that the author must impose his own order upon the material'.

[912] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XLIII: 7 in Downey 1954, 896 and 918 [the first page indicates the translation and the second page the Greek edition]. Downey 1954, 859: 'The date is indicated by the allusion to kinship between the Patriarch John X Camateros (1198-1206), to whom the work is dedicated, and his niece the Empress Euphrosyne, wife of Alexius I Angelos (1195-1203)'.

[913] Maguire 1974, 121. Rhodios' description was mostly concerned with the architecture, Downey 1954, 860.

[914] See Wharton-Epstein 1982, 89: 'the Holy Apostles retained its sixth-century architectural form as well as the figural decoration it had in the ninth century'.

[915] Cecchelli 1926-1927, 163. Other examples include the cruciform reliquary of Paschal I (817-824) and Santi Martiri in Cimitile, which include three or more post-Resurrection scenes in their cycles.[915] With the exception of the Holy Apostles, the extensive post-Resurrection cycles seems to be a western feature.

[916] Wharton-Epstein 1982, 89.

[917] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXXVIII: 1 in Downey 1954, 882 and 909.

various sights described'.[918] Mesarites' statement might also come as a warning to his audience, contemporary and modern alike, that his description will follow a slower pace, not only because of the 'funeral character' of the mosaics, but also because of the many details that he will include in the narrative. Not all the scenes described by the author were actually part of the mosaic decoration, but rather some were added in order to assist him in following a 'slower foot', appropriate according to him, for this sequence. Mesarites dresses his personified logos in black and uses such words as deathlike and funeral, in order, in my opinion, to recreate a funeral march.[919] Nevertheless this slower foot and the funeral character of the discourse, is nothing more of an excuse since after the Entombment, all the events, including the Maries at the Tomb, speak of the harmonious message of the resurrection.

The Maries at the Tomb is usually the first scene to open a lengthy post-Resurrection cycle both in the East and the West before and after Iconoclasm. However Mesarites invited his audience to look at the women 'as they are shown seated over against the tomb, which is diametrically across from us'. The scene is inspired from the Gospels and belongs to the Entombment sequence.[920] The two women sitting opposite the tomb appear also in the illuminated Psalters.[921] The closest example to Mesarites' description comes from the Theodore Psalter, where two Maries and the Virgin, are depicted standing, watching Joseph and Nikodemos carrying Christ's body in the tomb.[922] This is also shown in the Saint Petersburg lectionary, where the scene shares

---

[918] Webb 1999, 67, where the author further adds that Mesarites' *logos* 'runs away from the author, addresses the women at the tomb of its own accord, looks about curiously, and notices details by itself'.
[919] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXIX: 1 in Downey 1954, 882 and 909.
[920] Matth. 27: 61: 'Mary Magdalene and the other Mary were there, sitting opposite the tomb'. The same description appears with variations in Mark 15: 47; Luke 23: 55-56.
[921] See for example the Khloudov Psalter (Moscow, Historical Museum gr.129, fol. 44r), Shchepkina 1977, and Pantokrator Psalter (Mount Athos, Pantokrator 61, fol. 112r), Dufrenne 1966, pl. 16.
[922] Theodore Psalter (London, British Museum, Add.19.352, fol 116r), Nersessian 1970, pl. 70, fig. 192.

the same folio as the Entombment and accompanies the lesson for Good Friday.[923]

According to Morey the seated Maries watching the sepulchre are not to be found

after the tenth century.[924] The author is correct in his assertion, something that is

verified by the surviving evidence. None of the richly illuminated Gospels in Paris

and Florence depict the Maries sitting;[925] and since the latter are almost always

excluded from the scene of the Entombment in Cappadocia, in the one instance that

they are not, in Latmos, at Yediler Cave (end of 12th c.), they are depicted standing.[926]

The same applies for the scene in Monreale.[927]

Since the *ekphrasis* tries to evoke the same feelings as the work of art,[928] Mesarites'

description of the two women sitting opposite the tomb does not necessarily imply

that the scene was represented in the mosaic cycle, but rather his short description was

inspired by, and most likely served as an introduction to an actual mosaic, the Maries

at the Tomb. This is evident from the fact that the author did not invite his audience to

focus its attention upon the Maries scene, exactly because they were already 'looking'

at it. Every time that Mesarites describes a new scene, that is, another mosaic panel,

he invites his audience to look or focus their attention on a particular place inside the

church.[929] It could then be deduced that the only scenes that were actually depicted in

the church of the Holy Apostles are those for which Mesarites offers a particular

location inside the church and asks for his audience's attention. This takes place five

---

[923] Saint Petersburg, State Library, cod.gr.21 in Morey 1929, 54 and 84, fig. 100.

[924] Morey 1929, 87. If valid, then Morey's observation could offer a terminus ante quem for the mosaics or at least for the post-Resurrection cycle. The eleventh century illuminated Theodore Psalter, (see note 887), seems to support Morey's view, as the Maries are depicted standing.

[925] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, cod.gr.74, fol. 160[r] in Omont 1908, fig.139; and Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23 fol. 163[r] in Velmans 1971, fig. 265.

[926] Restle 1967, II: LXXI, fig. 548.

[927] Kitzinger 1960, fig. 47.

[928] Macrides and Magdalino 1988, 47.

[929] The same reasoning is used by Mango 1972, 205 and note 117 for the panygeric of Leo VI on the church of Stylianos Zaoutsas.

time in Mesarites' description: 'which is diametrically across from us' (XXVIII: 3);
'at the angular point of the *stoa* (XXIX: 1); 'the hand of the artist has depicted over
against the *stoa.*' (XXIX: 5); 'is over against the arch' (XXXIV: 1); 'steered by the
hand of the painter toward the shore over against the arch', (XXXVI, 1). These five
examples correspond with the scenes of the Maries; the Chairete; the Bribing of the
Guards; the Incredulity of Thomas; and the Miraculous Draught of Fishes. Only the
Bribing of the Guards has no monumental counterpart, but the scene was popular in
the ninth-century, as it appears in the Psalters that follow in discussion.

In the Maries scene, the *ekphrasis* describes various details which have already made
their appearance in monumental art, such as the unguent jars, the linen clothing and
the guards.[930] Mesarites also noted that the two Maries, who he named before as Mary
Magdalene and Mary the wife of Kleopas (John 19: 25), stand petrified by the vision
of the angel, who sits at the tomb's entrance. Two tenth-century examples preserve
the postures but not the unguent jars.[931] The monumental examples from Cappadocia
however portray no such fear. The only surviving monumental example, which seems
to retain many details from Mesarites's description, albeit the scene follows a three-
Maries composition, is the late twelfth-century mosaic from Monreale, where the
scene.[932]

According to Kartsonis, the mosaic of the Maries at the Tomb belongs to the twelfth
century as the mosaicist is depicted in the scene.[933] A marginal note allegedly

---

[930] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXVIII: 11, 19 and 20 respectively in Downey 1954, 883 and 910.
[931] These are the ivory diptych from Milan (fig. X), classified in the Romanos group, Goldschmidt and Weitzamann 1930, II: 42; and the Saint Petersburg Lectionary (fig. X), (State Library, cod.gr.21), Morey 1929, fig. 75.
[932] Demus 1949, no. 72.
[933] Kartsonis 1986, 146.

preserves the name of the artist Eulalios.[934] The text of Mesarites however is confusing, since it speaks of a sleepless watcher, thus making the identification of the artist as one of the guards in the Maries scene, extremely difficult.[935] The guards are depicted stricken by fear or sleeping and not standing sleepless by the tomb. Two examples survive between the third and the twelfth century. On the Munich-Ascension ivory (fig. 18) the guards are depicted standing, but only one appears sleepless. The other example comes from the Pantokrator Psalter, the only post-Iconoclast example in which the guards are depicted standing. Here the latter are, however, associated with the scene of the Bribing of the Guards.[936] However Mesarites' description does not speak of military gear but rather of an elaborate costume.[937] Mesarites explains that this costume was worn by the artist Eulalios when he was alive.[938] Thus what we 'see', is not the artist Eulalios, but a *persona* from the narrative, dressed in Eulalios' costume; in this manner the former is identified in the scene Mesarites' describes from his clothing. So who wore Eulalios costume? The answer, I believe, lies in manuscript illumination.

The ninth-century marginal Psalters depict a sleepless figure with an elaborate costume standing next to the tomb, watching the entrance for the impending resurrection; this is none other than Prophet David.[939] David's elaborate costume is also visible from his depictions in the Anastasis scene in the Cappadocian churches. The Khludov Psalter in particular depicts on the same folio, not only David

---

[934] Downey 1954, 910, note 17 and Maguire 1974, 122-123.

[935] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXVIII: 23 in Downey 1954, 884 and 910

[936] Dufrenne 1966, fol. 89ʳ, pl. 12.

[937] A figure standing by the tomb would have attracted too much unnecessary attention, since all other contemporary and later examples do not depict the guards as standing by the tomb, but rather stricken by fear or sleeping directly below.

[938] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXVIII: 23 in Downey 1954, 884 and 910: 'which he wore with distinction in life'.

[939] So Demus 1979, 242-243 and note 13-15 for various examples.

prophesizing the resurrection but also the Maries watching over the tomb, a scene

described by Mesarites at the beginning of his post-Resurrection narrative.[940]

Mesarites' elaborate *logos* framed the actual mosaic panel of the Maries at the Tomb,

with two scenes from the Psalters, the Maries watching the Sepulchre and the Bribing

of the Guards. This act serves Mesarites' aim to follow a slower pace but also further

enhances his audience's response to his narrative. His detailed description of the two

afore-mentioned scenes from the post-Resurrection narrative, appealed to the

listeners' imagination and to their prior experiences, making them thus, able to 'see'

and feel, as if in the presence of the scene.[941]

Demus believed that all the afore-mentioned scenes were part of the mosaic

decoration and even goes a step further and attributes both the decoration of the

Khludov Psalter and the mosaic of the Holy Apostles to a period dominated by the

figure of Photios.[942] Whilst agreeing with the author on the ninth-century date and the

possibility of an influence by Photios, the probability that the Maries watching over

the tomb, and David's inclusion in the Maries scene, were depicted in the church, is

highly unlikely. The scene of the Maries watching over the tomb features prominently

in illuminated Gospels and Psalters and since Downey has already observed that

Mesarites depended on a Psalter for his quotations, it is not unlikely that Mesarites'

descriptions of the two scenes derive from an illuminated Psalter. This is further

enhanced by the fact that no examples of the two scenes survive in monumental art.[943]

Subsequently the description did not follow the actual mosaic cycle but rather was

---

[940] Khludov Psalter, Historical Museum cod.gr.129, fol. 44 in Shchepkina 1977.
[941] Webb 1999, 64.
[942] Demus 1979, 243: "konnten in der gleichen theologischen Atmosphare entstanden sein, die sehr wesentlich von der Personlichkeit des Photios bestimmt war".
[943] I was unable to locate any such scenes in monumental art inside the time scope of this thesis.

part of Mesarites stratagem to follow a slower pace, which subsequently, aided him to elicit feelings of piety from his audience.

The post-Resurrection narrative continues with the Chairete, which Mesarites placed in a specific location inside the church.[944] One detail of particular interest is the posture of the two Maries which, according to Mesarites, were 'supporting their whole bodies on knees and elbows': they were thus in a posture of deep proskynesis.[945] This posture cannot serve as an indication of the type of Chairete used here, as both the symmetrical-monumental type and the asymmetrical-narrative type depict the two Maries in deep proskynesis.[946] Ninth-century monumental examples are not of much help, in providing us with a possible solution on the type of Chairete employed in the Holy Apostles. Santi Martiri in Cimitile follows the symmetrical type and depicts the two Maries half-kneeling, while Açikel Ağa Kilise in Cappadocia depicts an asymmetrical Chairete and portrays only one of the two Maries in deep proskynesis (fig. 50).[947] Mesarites' description may have been based on an illuminated Psalter.[948] Whichever type was used here, there is no doubt that a Chairete scene was included in the decoration.

---

[944] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXIX: 1 in Downey 1954, 884 and 910.

[945] Ibid, XXIX: 3 in Downey 1954, 884 and 910.

[946] Mount Athos, Pantokrator 61, fol. 109[r] (9th c.) in Dufrenne 1966, pl. 16 and the ivory diptych from the Dresden Museum (10th c.) in Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: 41a, are the closest parallels to the asymmetrical type. Paris Gregory, cod. gr. 510 fol. 30[r] (9th c.) in Brubaker 1999, fig. 7, and the ivory diptych from Milan (10th c.) in Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: 42, are the closest parallels to Mesarites' description, following the symmetrical type. The posture of deep proskynesis is retained throughout the Middle Byzantine period and is absent only from monuments that are loosely related to Byzantine art, such as the mosaics in Monreale, in which the postures of the Maries are closer to those of Santi Martiri in Cimitile and on an Italo-Byzantine ivory from the Victoria and Albert museum. For the ivory and Monreale see below.

[947] For Santi Martiri see previous chapter. For Açikel Ağa Kilise see Thierry 1968, 57; the author also argues for a possible date during the temporary restoration of the images, ibid, 69. Further discussion follows below, and in Chapter 5.

[948] The scene appears on folio 109[r] in the Psalter, Mount Athos, Pantokrator 61 (9th c.) in Dufrenne 1966, pl. 16 and also on folio 60[v] in the Gospels, Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23 (11th c.) in Velmans 1971, fig. 301

The *ekphrasis* continues with the Bribing of the Guards, the Women with the Disciples and the Disciples Going to Galilee.[949] These events are described in the concluding verses from the Gospel of Matthew 28: 11-20. The depiction of the Bribing of the Guards, which according to Mesarites is depicted 'over against the *stoa*'[950] appears again in the Pantokrator and Khludov Psalters.[951] References to the Bribing of the Guards appear also in the eighth-century *Stichera Anatolika*, (Στιχηρά Ανατολικά), a series of hymns that commemorate Christ's resurrection, also called *Anastasima*; these are attributed to the shadowy figure of Anatolios.[952] A number of these hymns contain references to the Bribing of the Guards, as for example the following *sticheron* in plagal mode I (ἤχος πλάγιος α΄):

> The guards were instructed by the unlawful <priests>: 'Conceal Christ's resurrection and receive money, and say that while you were asleep, the dead man was taken from the tomb'; Who has ever seen [such a thing]? Who has ever heard of someone stealing a dead body anointed and naked, leaving inside the tomb the linen clothing?[953] Do not fool yourselves Jews….[954]

The other two scenes, the Women with the Disciples and the Disciples Going to Galilee are not part of the Psalters' iconography but they do appear in illuminated Gospels, where all the scenes are illustrated.[955] The Women with the Disciples scene

---

[949] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXX-XXXII in Downey 1954, 884-886 and 910-912.

[950] Ibid, XXIX in Downey 1954, 884 and 910.

[951] Mount Athos, Pantokrator 61, fol. 89ʳ in Dufrenne 1966, pl. 12 and Moscow, Historical Museum, cod. 129, fol. 67v in Corrigan 1992, fig.41, respectively. The Bribing of the Guards is not connected with the resurrection but it is part of the Easter morning narrative described only in Mathew 28: 11-15.

[952] The edition of Christ and Paranikas 1963², 113-115 includes only a small number of the stichera. For the complete list see Tillyard 1940, 3-106.

[953] This echoes an idea already expressed by John Chrysostom in his commentary, *On the Gospel of John* PG 59, col. 465.

[954] My translation of Christ and Paranikas 1963², 115.

[955] See for example the Gospels (Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23), Velmans 1971, pl. 30, fig. 125 and pl. 41 fig.129 respectively.

appears also on the ninth-century cruciform reliquary of Paschal I.[956] However these minor scenes were apparently only part of Mesarites narrative rather than of the Church's actual decoration. This is suggested by the fact that the author after instructing his audience to turn their attention 'over against the *stoa*', continues his narrative without referring to another specific location or asking his audience to focus their attention on another panel.[957] Mesarites uses *stoa* to denote a number of places inside the church, such as the central hall and the four arms of the church,[958] but also the colonnades which ran around the arms.[959]

This seems to be corroborated by the subsequent narrative. Here Mesarites guided his audience towards Thomas: 'But let us go… to that disciple who showed his doubt'. At this point one expects to hear a description of the Incredulity of Thomas, but instead the author describes Thomas' meeting with the Apostles (John 20: 24-25), before eventually describing the Incredulity. There is no reason to believe that the meeting was depicted, but rather Mesarites' introduction serves again to heighten his audience's attention by creating the same feeling of disbelief shared by Thomas. Internal evidence also suggests that the description of Thomas' meeting with the Apostles was part of the *ekphrasis* on the Incredulity of Thomas. This is based on the fact that the author does not instruct his audience to turn their heads again, or even focus their attention on a different panel but rather mentions 'here again', thus Mesarites and his audience seem to remain on this panel.[960] Furthermore in the

---

[956] Cecchelli 1926-1927, 160.
[957] Wharton-Epstein 1982, 85, also excludes the Women with the Disciples but includes the Disciples going to Galilee.
[958] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XV: 1; XVII: 1-2; XXIX: 1; XL: 2 in Downey 1954, 870, 873, 884, 892 and 902, 903-04, 910 and 915. See also Downey 1954, 869 and note 3.
[959] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXXVII: 5-6 in Downey 1954, 890 and 914.
[960] Ibid, XXXII: 2 in Downey 1954, 886 and 912.

Typikon of Hagia Sophia, the Gospel lection of Thomas Sunday begins with John 20:

24, so Mesarites' description accords with the liturgy.[961]

The slower pace that Mesarites followed from the Maries Watching the Tomb

onwards allowed him to include minor scenes not depicted in any surviving

monumental cycles. However this slower pace is not, as the author himself wants us

to believe, the result of a discourse which he labels as deathlike and funeral,[962] as all

the events, including the Maries at the Tomb, speak of Christ's resurrection and thus

offer a harmonious message.[963] Hence the funeral procession is actually a stratagem, a

self-conscious rhetorical act from Mesarites whose narrative elaborated upon the

actual decoration to incorporate scenes common in illuminated manuscripts but totally

absent from monumental art.

In the Incredulity of Thomas, Mesarites' description offers various iconographic

details. The author mentions nothing about Christ pulling Thomas' hand towards his

wound, a detail that would have undoubtedly attracted his audience's attention. Its

absence could indicate that the mosaic showed the posture in which Thomas

approaches Christ's side unaided. This posture appears on the eleventh century

mosaics of Hosios Lukas and Daphni.[964] Mesarites mentioned that Christ 'seems

almost, so to speak, to fear the touching of the wound'.[965] The only example that

predates Mesarites and portrays Christ showing some fear or better some anxiety, is at

Daphni, where Christ's hand is neither raised in the air, nor pulling Thomas' hand, but

---

[961] But not however of the *Eothina* Gospels, since the Gospel of Luke is absent.

[962] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXIX: 1 in Downey 1954, 882 and 909.

[963] It is also possible that since the Holy Apostles was the burial place of emperors, these sarcophagi were place in proximity to the mosaic panel of the post-Resurrection narrative as an illustration of the hope for eternal life.

[964] For Daphni see Diez and Demus, 1931, fig. 104; for Hosios Lukas see Chatzidaki 1997, fig. 23.

[965] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXXIV: 2 in Downey 1954, 887 and 913.

is depicted turned towards his chest (fig. 51).[966] A similar posture appears in a
thirteenth-century fresco at Sopočani (fig. 52), and a fourteenth-century icon (fig. 53)
follows Mesarites' description closely, albeit for the lack of fear; both monuments
however antedate Mesarites.[967] It is not unlikely that Mesarites' uses here his own
imagination, without of course excluding the possibility of him having seen such a
work of art, which today is not extant. Before concluding his description of the
Incredulity, Mesarites asks Thomas to loudly proclaim the Lord and God,[968] only for
the author himself to answer that Thomas cannot speak, as it is a lifeless image which
comes to life only through his narrative.[969] Undeterred by Thomas' 'silence',
Mesarites asks him once more whether he wants to join them in their procession
towards the final miracle, the Miraculous Draught of Fishes, only for the author to add
again that Thomas has gone before us.[970]

As was the case with the Maries, the Chairete, the Bribing of the Guards and the
Incredulity, Mesarites once again instructs us to follow him for one more scene. The
Miraculous Draught of Fishes follows the Incredulity of Thomas not only in Mesarites
narrative but also in the Gospel of John (21: 1-25). The scene appears rarely in
Byzantine art and if the scene was actually included in the sequence at the Holy
Apostles, it would provide the only known monumental example from the East before
the twelfth century, though the scene appears in the densely eleventh-century Gospels

---

[966] Most of the examples fall into these two categories. Three examples dated in the tenth century,
provide us with a third type in which Christ's hand extends towards Thomas. These are the Dumbarton
Oaks ivory, the ivory diptych of the Hermitage Museum, and the Lectionary, Saint Petersburg (State
Library, cod.gr.21); for these see the discussion that follows here and in chapter 6, with references.

[967] Maguire 1974, 125-126.

[968] An allusion to John 20: 28 'My Lord and my God!'

[969] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXXIV: 8-9 in Downey 1954, 888 and 913.

[970] Ibid XXXIV: 9 in Downey 1954, 888 and 913. Thomas left them behind because he is depicted also
on the mosaic panel of the Miraculous Draught of Fishes.

in Florence, Rome and Paris.[971] Again, it is difficult to discern the iconographic

details in Mesarites' vivid account. However Maguire believes that the confused

telling of the Gospel narrative is evidence that Mesarites based his description on the

actual mosaic panel, for which he sees similarities with a fresco from the Mirož

Monastery, Pskov (1156).[972]

It is true that the fresco from Pskov (fig. 54) follows Mesarites's description on the

premise that both divide the narrative into two consecutive scenes. While impossible

to determine whether the two mosaics shared the same configuration, it is possible

that the mosaic of the Holy Apostles was also divided into two panels. This scene was

commonly depicted as such, not only in manuscript illumination, but also in

monumental art. Besides Pskov, the Miraculous Draught of Fishes appears divided

into two scenes, in the fourth-century mosaic panel in the baptistery of San Giovanni

in Naples (fig. 3), in an eleventh-century illuminated Gospels from the Vatican

Library, and in a late tenth-, early eleventh-century *Euchologion* from Italy (fig.

55).[973]

One detail is of particular interest, since it shows evidence of influence from an actual

depiction of the Miraculous Draught of Fishes; this is Mesarites' description of Peter

turning away from the disciples to return to the boat, following Christ's command to

---

[971] Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod. VI 23 (11th c.) in Velmans 1971, fig. 301; Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palat.cod.gr.5 (11th c.) in Millet 1960², fig. 608 and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, cod.gr.74, fol. 211ᵛ in Omont 1908, fig. 185.

[972] Maguire 1974, 124.

[973] For San Giovanni see the pre-Iconoclast evidence; for the Vatican manuscirpt Rome, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Palat.cod.gr.5, see Millet 1960², 573, fig. 608 and for the *Euchologion* see Grabar 1972, 65-67. Grabar believes that the two scenes are not the Miraculous Draught of Fishes but rather Christ Walking on the Water and the Multiplication of the Loaves. A discussion on this manuscript follows in another chapter.

retrieve the net.[974] As noted already by Millet and Maguire, this description resembles the one in Pskov (fig. 54).[975] In order however for Mesarites to include this event he had to alter the normal sequence of the Gospel, which up to this point was following.[976] Thus Mesarites looped back a few verses in the Gospel in order to fill the void that the premature ending brought to his narrative. With the Miraculous Draught of Fishes, Mesarites finishes his *ekphrasis* on the post-Resurrection narrative, but not before complaining that 'this is the shore, to which, I think, we have come more quickly than was necessary'.[977] He then continues with the decoration that appears 'on those portions that rise up from the pavement'.[978]

It has been suggested above that not all the events described by Mesarites formed part of the mosaic decoration of the Holy Apostles, but rather they were components of his *ekphrasis*. It has also been suggested that the only scenes that were depicted are those for which Mesarites provides a specific location inside the church and asks his audience to turn their attention. From the scenes that belong to this category, the only one unprecedented in monumental art is the Bribing of the Guards, whilst the Maries, the Chairete, the Incredulity and the Miraculous Draught of Fishes –all of which are allocated a special place inside the church – had already appeared in monumental art before Iconoclasm.

---

[974] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXXV1: 4-5 in Downey 1954, 889 and 914.

[975] Millet 1960, 574 and Maguire 1974, 124 respectively.

[976] This raises the question of how an *ekphrasis* is written. It gives the impression that the author was unable to amend the written text and thus he was force to come up with an explanation. If so, it points to the possibility that Mesarites was looking at an image while writing, and only when he reached the next image he realised that he had to amend his narrative. This on the other hand does not explain why it was necessary for him to include this detail in the first place. The only possible explanation is that his audience would have thought of this absence as a weekness of Mesarites *ekphrasis*. This remains, however, an assumption.

[977] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXXVI: 1 in Downey 1954, 889 note 2 and 914. From Mesarites words, we understand that he would like to talk more about this scene, or probably about the whole post-Resurrection cycle, as the coming to the shore signals the end of his slow-paced journey.

[978] As opposed to those 'which are raised up in the air' i.e. over the arches, Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXXVII: 1 in Downey 1954, 890 and 914.

The only post-Resurrection scenes absent from Mesarites' *ekphrasis* are those from the Gospel of Luke. This Gospel describes the Road to, and Supper at, Emmaus (Luke 24: 13-35).[979] Mesarites's post-Resurrection narrative is based, however, solely on the Gospels of Matthew and John,[980] and while the Road to Emmaus has a long history in the West,[981] in the East it is virtually absent from iconography up to the eleventh century.[982] Liturgical influences explain the popularity of the Gospels of Matthew and John.[983] Furthermore the absence of the Gospel of Luke and the Road to Emmaus may be explained as the Gospel's 'secondary' use in depicting scenes related to the post-Resurrection narrative. The most popular were based on the other three Gospels: the Chairete was inspired by the Gospel of Mathew, the Incredulity by the Gospel of John, while the Maries, even though described by all four Gospels, their description was based on either the Gospel of Mathew or Mark.

Mesarites' *ekphrasis* resembles a work of art in the sense that the author drew inspiration from a variety of media, without excluding of course his own imagination. Some details however are so similar with extant works of art that give the impression that Mesarites was not simply aware of them but he employed them is his narrative. A notable source of inspiration was, perhaps, illuminated manuscripts, which is further enhanced by the fact, that some of the scenes Mesarites described appeared solely in

---

[979] It is also alluded in the Gospel of Mark 16: 12-13.

[980] Millet 1960[2], 551, believes that in the Maries at the Tomb, a scene from Luke has been inserted.

[981] It appears in Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, Bovini 1961, fig. 38; at Santa Maria Antiqua, Nordhagen 1968, pl. CXIII; and in three consecutive episodes, on the cruciform reliquary of Paschal I, Cecchelli 1926-27, unnumbered figures on page 163.

[982] The first recorded appearance comes from the illuminated Gospels, Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, cod.gr.74, fol. 162[v] and 163[r] in Omont 1908, fig.141; and Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, cod.VI.23 fol. 164[r] in Velmans 1971, 48, fig. 266. The scenes which appear fully developed, demonstrate that they were either copied from an earlier source or that the miniaturists were very familiar with the iconography.

[983] Kartsonis 1986, 144-45.

illuminated Psalters and Gospels. One such example is the sitting Maries in the Entombment scene, which as Morey has correctly observed, they do not appear seated after the tenth century. The do however in ninth-century Pantokrator Psalter.[984] The same applies for Mesarites description of a figure with an elaborated costume standing by the tomb of Christ. This was undoubtedly influenced from an illuminated Psalter since it is there that this scene solely appears.

At this point Downey's remark to his introduction of Mesarites' *ekphrasis* is of key importance. Downey mentions that Mesarites' brother John was an authority on the Exegesis of the Psalms during Alexios' III reign (1195-1203) and that he had written a commentary; Downey concludes that this might have inspired Mesarites to quote the Psalms in his *ekphrasis*.[985] It is not implausible to assert that Mesarites, while quoting the Psalms and preparing his *ekphrasis*, had the chance to observe the marginal illuminations of the Psalters and consciously, or even unconsciously, to include details from them in his *ekphrasis*. This is not to say that Mesarites necessarily owned a copy, or that he employed one specifically in order to compose his *ekphrasis*, but he was, to a certain extent, influenced by scenes he must have seen in the Psalters.

An *ekphrasis* is 'an exhibition of eloquence',[986] a literary genre and not a guide to the monuments, and the author engages the audience in order to create the same feeling/reactions as if they were present; in other words, a participation from a distance. The author's challenge is limited by words, thus the more elaborate the

---

[984] Mount Athos, Pantokrator monastery, cod.61, fols 112ʳ in Dufrenne 1966, pl. 16.
[985] Downey 1957, 859 note 4.
[986] Photios of Constantinople, *Homily X*: *The Inauguration of a Church in the Palace*, 189 in Mango 1958, 177-190. The whole passage reads: 'For my purpose was not to make an exhibition of eloquence, but to show that the church is most excellent and beautiful and that it defeats the canons of an *ekphrasis*'.

discourse the closer it gets to the monument it describes, which is why Mesarites' description constantly elaborates on the scenes in the church.[987] Nevertheless, as Webb has pointed out, the sacred experience was not only limited to the seen and tangible object, but also to the unseen and intangible.[988] A stagnant description of the monument would serves only the former, but by including details from contemporary or earlier material and literary sources, Mesarites enhanced his *ekphrasis* and thus the sacred experience of his audience. After all the level of success and the author himself will be judged by this same audience, to which over and again Mesarites turns to, and invites to follow or gaze at a mosaic.[989] By inserting contemporary details, Mesarites enhanced his audience's participation, asking them to recall in memory existing works of art, beyond the Holy Apostles.[990] Webb believes that the written discourse derives primarily from the intellect and only secondarily from the material fabric of the church.[991] Hence, it is not necessary for us to think that the details, common to Mesarites' narrative and contemporary art prove that the decoration of the Holy Apostles was the product of that author's era or 'the late date of the mosaics'.[992]

To conclude, the extensive post-Resurrection cycle dates most probably in the ninth century. This is based both on the fact that it was during the reign of Basil I that the restoration took place, and on the fact that no other evidence exist for an alteration of the church's decoration at a later time. Furthermore, at least one of the scenes, the

---

[987] James and Webb 1991, 8.

[988] Webb 1999, 74.

[989] As the audience was comprised of high ranking officials and the educated elite it is possible that they were also familiar with illuminated manuscripts.

[990] Like illuminated manuscripts that some of his audience might have possessed, churches not extant, like that of Stylianos Zaoutsas and the Virgin at Pege, churches that today have lost their decoration, such as that of Constantine Lips or simply works of art with which the author and his audience were familiar with, but we know nothing about them, today.

[991] Webb 1999, 73.

[992] Maguire 1974, 123. Mesarites' comment on his contemporary, the artist Eulalios, whom however he does not name, should be seen in the same light, that is, as a detail that offers his audience a recognized example.

Bribing of the Guards, is associated with the ninth-century marginal Psalters, and was used as a polemic against Jews and Iconoclasts.[993] The latter again fits both the period after Iconoclasm and also the anti-Jewish agenda of the emperor Basil I, who was responsible for instituting a policy of forced baptism for the Jews.[994] Furthermore the absence of the Anastasis, of which no mention is made by either Constantine Rhodios, whose text is anyway incomplete, or Mesarites, was not only a common occurrence in ninth-century art but it features in another church associated with Basil I: the Virgin at Pege.

A third example comes from folio 30^v of the Paris Gregory (fig. 56), dated between 879 and 882. This richly illustrated manuscript was commissioned by Patriarch Photios as a personal gift to Basil I (867-886).[995] The folio depicts four scenes from Christ's passion and resurrection in three registers: the Crucifixion occupies the upper register, the Deposition and the Entombment the middle, and the Chairete the lower register.[996] The folio originally prefaced the first oration of Gregory, but at some point it was moved to preface the third oration which is dedicated to Thomas' Sunday.[997] The reading of that day is taken from John 20: 24-29 and describes the Incredulity of Thomas.[998] And it is the Incredulity that accompanies the third homily of Gregory in other surviving manuscripts.[999]

---

[993] Corrigan 1992, 29-30.

[994] Ibid, 43-44, who cites the *Vita Basilii* (ed.) Ševčenko, chapter 95.

[995] Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, cod.gr.510 in Brubaker 1999, 5-7, 412-414, fig. 7.

[996] Ibid, 291-302 and note 53, with bibliography specific for this folio.

[997] Ibid, 5 note 12, and 93. Gregory Nazianzenus, *Oration XLIV*: *On New Sunday*, PG 36, cols. 608-622. The second Sunday after Easter is also titled the New Sunday (Καινη Κυριακη) as it is the first Sunday after Christ's resurrection. Since the Gospel reading describes Thomas' incredulity, gradually the second Sunday came to be described as Thomas' Sunday. In Gregory's sermon however, no mention is being made of Thomas; the depiction of the Incredulity in these manuscripts indicates that the Gospel reading exerthed more influence than the sermon on the choice of scene to illustrate.

[998] In the Jerusalem Lectionary, Tarachnischvili 1959, 119-120, the Gospel reading for Thomas' Sunday is taken from John 20: 26-31. In the *Typikon Hagia Sophia*, Mateos 1963, II: 108-109, the reading is from John 20: 19-31, which includes five more verses; these describe the Appearance of

Since the iconography of folio 30^v does not suit the third oration of Gregory, and the second oration is accompanied by the Vision of Habakkuk, the folio must have accompanied the first oration on Easter.[1000] Scholarly consensus unanimously agrees with the association of these miniatures to the first oration.[1001] However, in the majority of the surviving manuscripts of Gregory's sermons, the first oration is prefaced with an image of the Anastasis.[1002] Since, however, these manuscripts postdate the Paris Gregory, their illuminations reflect a later tradition, in which the Anastasis had already become the visual synonym of Easter. This evidently suggests that the scenes of folio 30^v, whose association with the text is further supported by passages from the sermon introduced by enlarged initials,[1003] belong to another tradition and thus ought to be examined not only against the Anastasis, but rather in association with other ninth-century monuments. As it has been noted above, this is the third example associated with Basil I and his court in which the Chairete either supersedes the Anastasis, or the Anastasis is completely omitted.

Christ in the Absence of Thomas (or to the Eleven). An earlier stratum in the *Typikon* shows that these five verses (John 20: 19-23) belonged to the Easter Sunday reading, Mateos 1963, II: 97, note 2. These liturgical changes reflect the rising popularity of the scene. The same but with reverse effect applies for the Myrrh-bearers, who were celebrated on Easter, but then moved on the third Sunday after Easter, Mateos 1963, II: 108-109. For a discussion on the popularity of Thomas' Sunday see chapter 6.1.

[999] Galavaris 1969, 14-16.

[1000] Brubaker 1999, 93, 292 note 58.

[1001] Ibid, 291; Kartsonis 1986, 141-142; Der Nersessian 1962, 217-218. Nevertheless, it is the second oration that specifically speaks of the Crucifixion, with references to the cross and the wood; and also of the Deposition and the Entombment, with references from Matthew and Luke and more specifically of the names of Simon of Cyrene and Joseph of Arimathea; and finally of the Myrrh-bearers and the Noli me Tangere (but not the Chairete): Gregory Nazianzenus, *Oration XLV*: On Holy Easter, PG 35, cols 624-664, for the afore-mentioned references see especially cols. 652-657. The second oration however, is, as mentioned above, accompanied by the Vision of Habakkuk.

[1002] Galavaris 1969, 14-16.

[1003] Brubaker 1999, 291-292; Brubaker 1985, 4.

In terms of iconography, the images of the Crucifixion and the Chairete occupy their whole registers, thus demonstrating their comparative importance.[1004] Both scenes depict Christ in the middle in such a way that the two miniatures create a vertical visual commentary in which the crucified Christ is aligned with the resurrected Christ.[1005] Christ is depicted two more times on the verges of the middle register: once in the Deposition and once in the Entombment; thus when all representations of Christ are combined, they create an imaginary cross.

The vertical and horizontal alignments which are based on the figure of Christ can explain why the Chairete was chosen over the Maries at the Tomb. The latter does not depict Christ; thus it creates an iconographic and theological vacuum. The iconographic vacuum exists because Christ was represented in all other scenes and he is thus 'anticipated' at the Resurrection; and the theological vacuum exists because a risen and seen Christ better complements the oration on Easter than does the Maries at the Tomb in which he is absent. The choice of the Chairete over the Anastasis can be explained along the same lines, since Brubaker has noticed that in the Chairete, Christ is seen and touched by humans, while in the Anastasis, there are no terrestrial witnesses.[1006]

The presence of either the Maries or the Anastasis would have made the inclusion of the other imperative. A look at all other surviving ninth-century monuments (San

---

[1004] On the British Museum ivories (ca.400), the Crucifixion shares its space with the Hanging of Judas, while the post-Resurrection appearances are the only ones specifically allocated a single ivory panel. While the Crucifixion shares space with the relatively unknown theme of the Hanging of Judas, on the Paris Gregory it occupies the whole register, while the 'new' scene of the Deposition and the Entombment are forced to share space. What remains however unaltered and demonstrates exactly the unfading importance of the scene, is that on both the ivories and on the manuscript, the space of the Chairete is not compromised by the insertion of any other scenes.
[1005] Brubaker 1999, 301; Kartsonis 1986, 144-145. See the discussion on the Martvili triptych (9th c.).
[1006] Brubaker 1999, 302; Brubaker 1996, 12.

Clemente, Santi Martiri and the Old Tokali Kilise) reveal that the Maries and the

Anastasis appear side by side and share the same importance. Both scenes

complement each other: the Maries with the empty sepulchre and the Anastasis with

the victorious Christ. The sepulchre was a detail that the miniaturist of the Paris

Gregory did not want to compromise, thus he inserted it to the Chairete in the shape

of a rock-hewn cave, replicating the one from the Entombment which lies directly

above. In this way, the vertical axis discussed above is further enhanced and the visual

commentary is made clearer.[1007]

A similar pattern appears in the West, in the eleventh-century church of Sant' Urbano

alla Caffarella, employed here for comparative reasons, where however the Chairete

is replaced by the Maries (fig. 43), and the commentary is constructed on a horizontal

rather than on a vertical axis. The rock hewn-cave, in the Maries scene, is depicted on

the right, while in the Entombment it is on the left. Consequently a small mount is

created in the middle of the two scenes, and despite a small decorative band that

divides them, the tomb appears as one unified structure. The change in the tomb's

orientation in the Maries panel was a deliberate act.[1008] Thus Sant' Urbano and the

Paris Gregory manage to create a continuous visual commentary through the careful

location of the sepulchre.[1009]

[1007] Brubaker 1999, 301.
[1008] The viewer follows Christ's body being placed inside the tomb, only to witness at the next compartment that the tomb is empty and the linen shroud is folded inside.
[1009] The continuity on the Paris Gregory is also aided by the cross, which appears in the Crucifixion and the Deposition, while the sepulchre appears in the Entombment and the Chairete in a manner reminiscent of the popular game, Snakes and Ladders.

Since however the sepulchre appears only in the asymmetrical versions of the

Chairete,[1010] to represent it in the symmetrical version – as on folio 30^r of the Paris

Gregory – was an innovation, which further enhances the idea that the sepulchre

served a specific purpose. The sepulchre on the Paris Gregory is a well defined rock-

hewn cave, which contrasts with the more artificial representations of San Clemente

and Santi Martiri, and the free-standing buildings of the Khludov (fig. 57) and

Pantokrator Psalters (fig. 58).[1011] Photios' interest in the Holy Sepulchre could explain

both the innovation and the rock-hewn structure.[1012] In this detailed account on the

Holy Sepulchre, Photios described the tomb as a rock chamber, cut from the natural

rock.[1013] Photios also described the actual architectural enclosure, but did so almost

unwillingly, since he speaks of those details as 'additions made for the sake of

decoration – or rather piety'.[1014] For Photios the 'source of immortality' is the rock-

hewn structure, while the man-made structure was unnecessary embellishment.

Photios' description of the Holy Sepulchre speaks explicitly about the Entombment:

'Inside the rock chamber… a rectangular recess… and on this the faithful Joseph is

said to have laid the sinless body of the Lord'.[1015] The sepulchre in the Entombment is

described by Photios as a rock-hewn structure and depicted as such by the miniaturist

---

[1010] None of the surviving symmetrical compositions portrays the sepulchre, but rather the garden, which is usually denoted by the present of two trees flanking the figure of Christ.

[1011] For the two churches see previous chapter. For the Pantokrator Psalter, (Mount Athos, Pantokrator monastery, cod.61) see fols 24^v, 26^v and 30^v, in Dufrenne 1966, pl. 3-4 and for the Khludov Psalter (Moscow, Historical Museum gr.129) see fols 9^v and 78^v, in Shchepkina 1977 and Corrigan 1992, figs. 36 and 66. The two traditions are better exemplified in two monuments only a few decades apart: San Vincenzo al Volturno (ca. 830), depicts a free-standing building while San Clemente (847-855) depicts a rock-hewn tomb. A discussion on the manuscripts follows.

[1012] Photios, *Homilies XI-XII: 'On Holy Saturday'* in Mango 1958, 193-219; Brubaker 1999, 301. The same interest according to Brubaker 1999, 205-207, appears also in fol. 285^r, where Helena is portrayed holding a rock-cut structure identified by the author as the Holy Sepulchre. For further discussion see also Brubaker 1985, 10 and note 78.

[1013] Wilkinson 1977, 13 mistakenly refers to Photios' *Amphilochia* as the source; the mistake was amended by Brubaker 1985, note 80 where she identified the correct citation.

[1014] Ibid, 13.

[1015] Ibid, 13.

of the Paris Gregory. The contemporary Pantokrator and Khludov Psalters portray the sepulchre in the Entombment in a fashion similar to the Paris Gregory.[1016] In the scenes from Christ's resurrection though, the Psalters favour the free-standing building.[1017] When the two scenes were combined on folio 30^v of the Paris Gregory, the Entombment, detached from the pre-Iconoclast tradition that favoured the free standing building, portrays the sepulchre as a rock-hewn cave, thus making 'necessary' the reproduction of the sepulchre in the following scene, both for narrative and iconographic reasons.[1018]

Further to the considerations discussed above, another possibility exists. Since it is the Maries and not the Chairete that follows the Entombment, the miniaturist of the Paris Gregory inserts the tomb in order to fill the gap in the narrative and to make the transition between the two scenes more subtle. The Entombment and the Chairete do not appear next to each other and in the tenth-century narrative cycles, they drift further apart.[1019] It should be noted that when the Chairete is accompanied by the Maries at the Tomb, the sepulchre is never represented in the former scene. One twelfth-century example which follows the Rabbula Gospels closely, depicts the sepulchre in the midst of the two scenes, but even there the sepulchre is organically associated with the Maries rather than the Chairete.[1020] As the tomb's entrance has

---

[1016] For the Pantokrator Psalter see fol.122^r in Dufrenne 1966, and for the Khludov Psalter see fol.87^r in Shchepkina 1977. For the relationship between the Paris Gregory and the Psalters regarding the Entombment see Brubaker 1999, 297-299 and fig. 118.

[1017] Kartsonis 1986, 137, notes that the two scenes 'could hardly form a sequence'.

[1018] Ibid, 129: 'The sequential presentation of the Entombment and the Myrophores in an extended narrative cycle will create a logical conflict over essential features of the burial site of Christ. The cave represents the literal imagery of the Gospels, while the architectural structure is more of a *locus sanctus*'.

[1019] The Anastasis will be inserted between the Maries and the Chairete as for example on the tenth-century ivory diptych at Milan (fig. X) in Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: no. 198.

[1020] The Chairete shares the tomb with the Maries on an ivory from the Victoria and Albert museum (11th c.), Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: no. 41a. The composition is reminiscent of the Rabbula

flaked off, it is not possible to determine positively the presence or not of the linen

clothing, but the fragments suggest that the latter were depicted, something that is

further confirmed by the way that the embalmed body of Christ is exposed in the

Entombment scene.[1021]

The presence of the Chairete in Paris Gregory can thus be justified in terms of

composition, narrative, iconography and theology. The question of whether the

Anastasis was bypassed, as Kartsonis argued, is only rhetorical, as we do not know

whether there was truly an intention to represent the Anastasis, especially when all

other contemporary evidence favoured the Chairete. All the examples in which the

Anastasis appears, postdate the Paris Gregory and thus are not relevant to the

discussion. What is relevant though is that the Chairete is time and again present in

ninth-century monuments associated with Basil I and Photios. Kartsonis attributes this

'to the official conservatism of the time of Basil I', and adds that the Resurrection

appears in the works associated with the court of Leo VI.[1022] However, as it will be

discussed below, Leo VI did not favoured the Anastasis, on the contrary this emperor

is responsible for translating the relics of two of the most important *personae* of the

post-Resurrection narrative, Mary Magdalene and Thomas, while he composed a

sermon for the latter and a number on hymns dedicated to the post-Resurrection

appearance, known as morning resurrection hymns or *eothina Anastasima*.[1023]

Gospels (Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, Plut.I.56), albeit the sepulchre on the ivory is a rock-hewn structure.

[1021] Through a black and white reproduction, I was able to discern two pieces that most probably belonged to the endings of the linen clothing. In colour the two pieces are indistinguishable.

[1022] Kartsonis 1986, 151

[1023] These correspond with the eleven *Eothina Gospels*, the gospel lections that describe Christ's post-Resurrection appearances mentioned above. For a detailed discussion see below and also chapters 5 and 6.

A church associated with Leo's court, but not with Leo himself, is the one built by his father-in-law Stylianos Zaoutzas, between 886 and 893. The mosaic decoration is known through a panegyric delivered by Leo himself.[1024] From the panegyric we learn that the Anastasis had formed part of the decoration; Mango has even suggested that there were probably two versions of the scene.[1025] Like Mesarites, Leo VI provides a location inside the church for each of the scenes he describes. Thus when he says: 'and in another place He is seen trampling on corruption. And he rises elsewhere and raises Adam along with himself…'[1026] we ought to believe, as Mango does, that he speaks of two distinct mosaics. However Kartsonis argues that the church included only one version of the Anastasis.[1027] Thus two possibilities exist, first, that the words 'He is seen trampling on corruption' was part of the Anastasis' description (as Kartsonis suggests) or that a distinct mosaic panel was described (as Mango suggests) but not however a second Anastasis.

Regarding the first consideration, it is true that an image of Christ trampling over corruption (or Hades) is associated with the Anastasis. However the emphasis here is equally divided between the words 'trampling' and 'He is seen'.[1028] By using the passive 'He is seen', Leo VI makes clear that he does not speak about his contemporary viewers, as for that he uses the present tense, but rather about the people depicted in the mosaic. These could either be the two Maries of the Chairete or the prophets of the Anastasis. The Chairete seems to be a better suggestion, especially if we consider that Leo here speaks metaphorically rather than literally, that is,

---

[1024] Mango 1972, 203-205. For the Greek text see Kartsonis 1986, note 88. For a French translation see Frolow 1945, 43-91, esp. 52-53.
[1025] Mango 1972, 205 and note 117.
[1026] Mango 1972, 205.
[1027] Kartsonis 1986, 151.
[1028] The passive voice denotes that Christ is seen not by Leo's spectators, but rather by people depicted on the mosaic panel.

Christ's resurrection has resulted in the end of corruption and the two Maries are witnesses to that. This also eliminates the possibility that two mosaic panels depicted the same scene: the Anastasis; something unprecedented in mosaic decoration.

If indeed the Chairete was depicted in the church of Zaoutsas, its coupling with the Anastasis is not unique. Açikel Ağa Kilise in Cappadocia,[1029] and two identical ivories from the Dresden and Hermitage Museums, affiliated with the Romanos group, depict the two scenes. In fact the ivories portray only the two: the Chairete on the upper, and the Anastasis on the lower register. [1030] It is instantly noticeable that the ivory retains the configuration of the church of Zaoutsas, that is, the Chairete is depicted before the Anastasis; however in Açikel Ağa Kilise, on a tenth-century ivory diptych from Milan (fig. 59) and on a twelve feast icon from Sinai dated by Soteriou to the tenth century,[1031] the Chairete follows the Anastasis. This confusion as to whether the Anastasis proceeds or follows the Chairete could possibly indicate that the Anastasis was having difficulties finding its places in the narrative cycles. To return to our point of departure – the church of Zaoutsas – whatever the coupling of the Chairete with the Anastasis in these ninth- and tenth-century examples indicates, it is clear that the two scenes co-existed regularly at the time and thus the possibility that the two scenes formed part of the decoration of the Church of Zaoutzas remains plausible.

Kartsonis suggests that Leo VI promoted the Anastasis, through the church of Zaoutsas. However this emperor is connected with two of the most prominent figures of the post-Resurrection narrative: Mary Magdalene and Thomas, to whom he

---

[1029] Thierry 1968, 33-69, figs. 2, 17-18.
[1030] Evans and Wixom 1997, no.93, 147-148; Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, no. 41a.
[1031] Soteriou 1956-1958, 52-55, fig. 39 and, for a detail, fig. 41.

dedicated newly-founded churches and on whom he delivered sermons.[1032] Leo VI is

the author of the eleven *Eothina Anastasima*, hymns written on the evangelical

pericopes of the post-Resurrection narrative. From the existing evidence it becomes

apparent that contrary to Kartsonis believe, Leo was not favourably disposed towards

the Anastasis; on the contrary well into the tenth century the Anastasis follows the

same process of adaptation as in the ninth-century west, that is, it appears side by side

with the already established scenes of the Maries and the Chairete.

The Chairete is again present in one of the ninth-century illuminated Psalters,

commonly known as the marginal Psalters.[1033] These are the Khludov Psalter

(Moscow, Historical Museum gr.129),[1034] the Pantokrator Psalter (Mount Athos,

Pantokrator monastery, cod.61),[1035] and the Paris Psalter (Paris, Bibliothèque

Nationale cod.gr.20).[1036] These Psalters are 'related to one another through the

subjects illustrated and the approach to composition, as well as through their style of

painting'.[1037] Some differences in context though, might have some chronological

implications.[1038] Psalm exegeses and liturgy can only partially explain the use of these

marginal illuminations since some of them were employed as polemics against

Iconoclasts, Jews and Muslims.[1039] Amongst the illustrations are several that depict

Christ's resurrection.[1040] In the majority of these scenes, Christ appears leaving the

---

[1032] See the discussion in the following chapters.

[1033] Corrigan 1992, 2 also asserts that the illuminations were not 'overtly political' but also historical and typological.

[1034] Shchepkina 1977.

[1035] Anderson 1994 and 1998.

[1036] For the Pantokrator and Paris Psalters see Dufrenne 1966. For a more up-to-date study and the use of the three Psalters as visual polemics see Corrigan 1992.

[1037] Anderson 1994, 211.

[1038] Anderson 1998, 306, believes that the Paris Psalter is the oldest of the group.

[1039] Corrigan 1992, 5 and passim.

[1040] See for example the detailed analyses of the various themes in Kartsonis 1986, 131-140.

sepulchre in the proximity of which David stands.[1041] The dependence of these miniatures on the Psalms can partially explain why post-Resurrection scenes appear only rarely in the marginal Psalters (Appendix 2). In other words, since the miniatures are based on the text of the Psalm and not on the Gospel narrative, the artist felt no obligation to depict any scenes deriving from the latter.

The Khludov Psalter illustrates Psalm 77: 65 on folio 78[v], with Christ standing in front of the sepulchre, with David nearby.[1042] However the Pantokrator Psalter illustrates the same Psalm quite differently. On folio 109[r] Christ is again depicted in front of the sepulchre, but David is absent; two women and two soldiers appear in the tomb's proximity (fig. 58). Christ, the sepulchre and the two Maries create an asymmetrical version of the Chairete, but some details show how the miniaturist adapted current formulae to create a new scene. One such detail is the identical postures of the Maries in deep proskynesis.[1043] This feature appears only in the symmetrical version of the scene, while the asymmetrical depicts the two women usually in different postures, with one of the two in a more upright position.[1044]

Another detail that shows the level of adaptation is Christ's gaze. In all other asymmetrical examples of the Chairete, Christ is always depicted as looking, moving and gesturing towards the two women. Here however Christ totally ignores the two

---

[1041] Ibid, 66-68.

[1042] Khludov Psalter, Moscow, Historical Museum gr.129, fol. 78[v] in Shchepkina 1977, reproduced also in Corrigan 1992, fig. 66.

[1043] The two Maries are not depicted haloed but this could probably be explained by the presence of Christ. In various folia, whenever Christ is depicted, the other *personae* are not haloed. See for example, Mount Athos, Pantokrator 61, fol. 63[r], fol. 137[r], pl. 8: the Washing of the Feet and pl. 20 the Mission of the Apostles respectively; on fol. 112[r] since Christ is absent, Martha and Mary at Lazaros' tomb are depicted haloed, Dufrenne 1966, pl. 16.

[1044] While it is common to see non identical postures in the symmetrical composition, the asymmetrical always depicts the two women in different postures.

women while his gaze is focused upon the text of the Psalm.[1045] The borrowings from

the symmetrical version of the Chairete, such as the postures of the two women and

Christ's frontal stance, the latter's gaze away from the two Maries, and the inclusion

of the soldiers, a detail specifically mentioned in the Psalm,[1046] demonstrates that the

miniaturist modified the Chairete scene to better suit the text it accompanied.[1047]

While the iconographic dependence on the Chairete is quite clear, what remains

however unanswered, is why the miniaturist of the Pantokrator opted for a modified

Chairete scene instead of the simple solution that appears on the Khludov Psalter.

Having in mind that changes were made 'to suit the tastes of patrons, miniaturist or

expected viewer',[1048] and that the Psalters were most probably illuminated in

Constantinople. The possibility exists that the Pantokrator Psalter reflects the

Constantinopolitan interest on the Chairete, which was subsequently developed out of

an interest on the human, tangible and visible Christ during and after Iconoclasm,

exemplified by a number of artistic examples connected with the reign of Basil I.

Psalm 77 was used, according to Corrigan, as an anti-Jewish polemic linked again

with the court of Basil I. [1049] Verse sixty-six further explains why the Chairete was

chosen: 'He put his adversaries to rout; he put them to everlasting disgrace' (77: 66).

The word rout, is usually associated with war, thus the presence of the soldiers

---

[1045] Christ stares at the text of the Psalm in all other examples of the resurrection in the Pantokrator Psalter, fols. 24^v, 26^v, 30^v in Dufrenne 1966, pl. 3-4.

[1046] Psalm 77: 66: 'He put his adversaries to rout; he put them to everlasting disgrace'. As Walter 1986, 271 suggests: 'A simple word association was often sufficient for them <miniaturists>'.

[1047] This resurrection scene along with the one on fol. 44^v of the Kludof Psalter, contain the most details: see Appendix 2.

[1048] Brubaker 1999, 42

[1049] Corrigan 1992, 43-44, who cites the *Vita Basilii* (ed) Ševčenko, chapter 95 and other ninth century evidence such as the *Disputation Against the Jews*, PG 89, 1203-1272. According to the author Basil I instituted a policy of forced baptism on the Jews. However while the author aptly demonstrates that the Psalm miniature follows an anti-Jewish agenda, the discussion revolves around the Kludov image, rather than the Pantokrator Psalter: Corrigan 1992, 51-52. Even so, there exists again a loose association between Basil's I court and the Chairete. For the anti-Jewish agenda in the orations see Cunningham 1998, 284-86.

illustrates how Christ has defeated his enemies, while his presence as a resurrected

God, could have been employed as a visual polemic against the Jews, who refused

Christ's divinity. As Walter suggests, 'a simple word association was often sufficient

for them <miniaturists>'.[1050] The presence of the Maries might also be explained as

an anti-Iconoclast imagery which promoted Christ humanity, visible by terrestrial

witnesses. The miniaturist, who was never short of Chairete examples, adapted the

image on the Pantokrator Psalter in order to make a specific reference to the text.

Chairete was not the only scene from the post-Resurrection narrative that appears in

the illuminated Gospels. The Khludov Psalter offers two examples of the Maries at

the Tomb, both on folio 44^v, which accompany Psalm 43.[1051] The Byzantine

commentators never associated Psalm 43 with the resurrection, although a general

reference exists in the text.[1052] The first of the two scenes portrays the two Maries

sitting on the right of the tomb, behind of which appears David. The inscriptions read:

'David prophesying the Resurrection' and 'Women Myrrh-bearers'. Directly in front

of the sepulchre, two soldiers are depicted sleeping. The second Maries scene appears

directly below the seated Maries. The two women are now depicted standing next to

the tomb, but the one in the foreground looks at the soldiers. It is not clear whether

this gaze was intentional, but the whole composition has a narrative substructure. The

first scene is inspired by the Maries Watching the Sepulchre (Matth. 27: 61), while the

second portrays their arrival at the Tomb (Matth. 28: 1). The presence of the soldiers

could be explained both visually and textually. The verse that describes the soldiers

guarding the tomb is Matthew 27:66, thus the Gospel narrative seems to follow a

---

[1050] Walter 1986, 271.
[1051] Khludov Psalter, Moscow, Historical Museum gr.129, fol. 44^v in Shchepkina 1977.
[1052] Walter 1986, 278; Corrigan 1992, 68, believes it was inspired by such phrases as: 'Arise O Lord' and 'Awake O Lord'.

vertical axis from the Maries Watching the Sepulchre 27: 61, to verse 27: 66, and finally to the Maries at the Tomb 28:1. This is further substantiated by the fact that according to the *Typikon of Messina* this Psalm was read during the *Orthros* of Holy Saturday.[1053] According to the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia, during the same *Orthros*, the Gospel reading was taken from Matthew 27: 62-66, the Soldiers Guarding the Tomb.[1054]

While Kartsonis is right to assert that in the ninth-century marginal Psalters, the Chairete appears only once in an adapted iconographic variant,[1055] these manuscripts focus neither on the Anastasis nor on the Maries/Chairete, but rather, the majority of the miniatures insist upon Christ's bodily resurrection, by depicting him leaving the tomb. The influence of the Maries and the Chairete was only indirect, as the Psalms offered the opportunity to depict aspects of the incarnation 'not witnessed by any eye, dead or alive' with an 'iconographic extremism'.[1056] It is true that to portray Christ alive in the sepulchre, or his actual moment of resurrection, was unprecedented in Byzantine art and would have raised some objections. Severos of Antioch proclaimed that nobody knew the exact moment of Christ's resurrection. As we have seen in his orations on Easter, Severos explained that while Christ was resurrected on Saturday night, nobody knew the exact time of the resurrection, and that the women learned from the angel about the resurrection but not about the exact time that it took place.[1057]

[1053] Walter 1986, 278; for the *Typikon of Messina* see Arranz 1969, 242-246. The *Typikon* was written in AD 1131 and follows Studite practice closely, ibid, XI and XX.
[1054] Mateos 1963, 84
[1055] Kartsonis 1986, 134. Also Kartsonis is probably wrong when she identifies Martha and Mary at the Tomb of Lazaros as the Myrrh-bearers; for the scene from the Pantokrator Psalter see fol. 112ʳ in Dufrenne 1966, pl. 16. Also see the discussion in chapter 5.2.
[1056] Kartsonis 1986, 138, speaks of Christ being alive inside the tomb and the bodily resurrection.
[1057] Severos of Antioch, PO 16, col. 798.

However, the miniaturist, by including David the Prophet and Psalmist, in those 'extreme' examples, manages to hint that the scene depicted is not an historical event, but rather a prophecy.[1058] And it is true that most of these scenes have an accompanying inscription which reads along the lines of: 'David prophesying the Resurrection'.[1059] Both David and the inscription offer the miniaturist the necessary excuse to depict Christ's resurrection in a way unprecedented in Byzantine art, justifying them in the sense that what the viewer sees is a prophecy, a prophecy associated with the accompanying text. This is exemplified on folio 9^v of the Khludov Psalter, where David's sneak inside Christ's sepulchre makes it clear that what the viewer sees is the scene through David's eyes.[1060] In other words the association between the text and the image passes through the figure of David, whose Psalms are the incentive, and his presence the excuse, for the bold treatment of the subject. The miniatures should not be seen as radical innovations but rather, as clarifying improvements;[1061] they do not show an iconographic extremism, but rather an ingenious use of images.

The ninth century yields one Cappadocian example of the Chairete. The rock-cut church of Açikel Ağa Kilise depicts six scenes from the Christological cycle: the Annunciation; the Nativity; the Presentation in the Temple on the south wall; and the Crucifixion; the Anastasis; and the Chairete on the north wall.[1062] The juxtaposition of

---

[1058] In some examples the soldiers are also depicted, but their presence can be verified by the Gospels.

[1059] For the Greek text see Corrigan 1992, 176, notes 22-27.

[1060] This is further corroborated by the Chairete and the Maries scenes (see above for details). In the Maries at the Tomb, David appears behind the sepulchre. His presence is to affirm the resurrection, as the inscription suggests. In the Chairete however the presence of Christ renders David's depiction unnecessary, as now Christ is seen and adored by humans.

[1061] Brubaker 1999, 43.

[1062] Thierry 1968, 45-57, figs.10-13 and 17-18.

these scenes was not unique in the ninth century. The Fieschi Morgan reliquary

contains four of these scenes – the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Crucifixion and the

Anastasis – while the Martvili Triptych substitutes the Annunciation for the

Presentation in the Temple and the Crucifixion for the Maries at the Tomb.[1063] The

painter responsible for Açikel Ağa Kilise, however, chose the Chairete over the

Maries; a choice which was most probably influenced by the depiction of the

Annunciation directly on the opposite wall. As I have already mentioned, the

juxtaposition between the Chairete and the Annunciation, was employed by various

theologians. Pseudo-Epiphanios, who makes a series of analogies between Christ's

life and death, compares the Annunciation with the Chairete: 'There <Bethlehem> the

angel cried to the Virgin 'Hail', and here <Jerusalem>, Christ, the angel of the great

council, shouted to the women, 'All hail''.[1064] Epiphanios here makes an interesting

wordplay not only between the words 'Hail' and 'All hail' but also between Christ

who is the 'angel of the great council' and the angel of the Annunciation. Joseph the

Hymnographer in his *Triodion* combines the latter with Christ's resurrection,[1065] and

even changes the 'All Hail' of the Chairete from plural to the singular 'Hail'.[1066] This

change appears in many hymns dedicated to the Virgin, and by substituting the plural

for the singular, the author praised the latter.

[1063] See Kartsonis 1986, 94-125, esp. 113-114, for a detailed analysis, and 101 note 18, for a table with the scenes depicted on the reliquaries. However the table should be amended as Kartsonis has not taken into consideration the Maries scene that appears on the Martvili Triptych.

[1064] Pseudo-Epiphanios, *Second Homily on the Illustrious Saturday*, PG 43, col. 444ff. According to the *Typikon* of Messina (AD 1131), this homily was read on Holy Saturday at Vespers, Arranz 1969, 243.

[1065] See for example this sticheron anastasimon from the Myrrh-bearers Sunday:
> 'An Angel before your conception brought the greeting 'Hail' to her that was full of grace. An Angel rolled away the stone of your glorious grave at your Resurrection. The one instead of grief revealed signs of joy; the other instead of death proclaimed to us a Master, giver of life. Therefore we cry to you, 'Benefactor of all mankind, Lord, glory to you!'.

The translation was taken from Father Ephrem Lash's website: www.anastasis.org.

[1066] Joseph the Hymnographer, *Triodion*, PG 87, col. 3917 and 3920

Indeed on the Chairete fresco from Açikel Ağa Kilise, the Virgin appears as one of the Myrrh-bearers (fig. 50).[1067] The fresco is similar to the seventh-century Sinai icon of the same subject, where again the Virgin is part of the scene.[1068] The postures are almost identical but the Virgin here is not the standing figure of the Sinai icon, but rather the woman in deep *proskynesis*. In a previous chapter I have argued that on the Sinai icon, the Virgin and Christ appear on the same level, while the Magdalene appears in a posture of *proskynesis*, which reflects the rising importance of the veneration through proskynesis in the seventh century.[1069] The change in the postures, while it might be incidental, could also reflect the changing role of the Virgin. In other words by depicting the Virgin and not the Magdalene, in a posture of deep proskynesis, the artist demonstrates that a more personal approach, like the one offered by a mother to son, has now become the acceptable practice in Açikel Ağa Kilise. The majestic Saint Mary of the Sinai icon now gives way to the more emotional Mother of God of the Cappadocian church.

The Maries in the West and the Chairete in the East demonstrate that the post-Resurrection appearances were never supplanted by the Anastasis, but rather that the latter functioned as another scene in the post-Resurrection cycle. The ninth-century examples from the East reveal that Iconoclasm shifted the balance of importance from the Maries to the Chairete, as the resurrected, visible and tangible Christ became the centre of attention. The Maries appeared twice in the illuminated Psalters and once in the church of the Holy Apostles, but the majority of the surviving examples favoured the Chairete. The latter was coupled with the Anastasis in Açikel Ağa Kilise and most

---

[1067] Thierry 1968, 57, fig.18.
[1068] Weitzmann 1976, B26.
[1069] Brubaker 1998, 1234

probably in the church of Stylianos Zaoutsas, demonstrating that in Constantinople, the role of the Maries was now taken up by the Chairete.

The Chairete appeared to have been very popular during the reign of Basil I and throughout this chapter it was associated with both him and Photios. The latter was a prolific writer and in his *Amphilochia* explains, or rather justifies, why Christ allows the two women of the Chairete to touch him, but forbids the Magdalene in the Noli me Tangere from doing so.[1070] The Maries, says Photios, were allowed to touch him, as they approached him with humility and venerated him as God, but the Magdalene, not recognizing the glorified body, tried to embrace him as her master and not her God.[1071] The two Maries of the Chairete, by touching Christ's feet in humility and worshipping him in *proskynesis*, provided both the necessary justification for venerating Christ in images and the model of how one should perform this act, and with what sentiment (humility). The changing postures of the Virgin demonstrate that she has now transformed into a more humane mother, who perceives her son's divinity and worships him as God but with a sentiment typically human. As it will be discussed in the following chapter, this line of thinking was also employed by George of Nikomedia. In the latter's exegesis, the Virgin was no longer to be associated with the 'other Mary' and thus with the Myrrh-bearers, since only she believed in her son's resurrection and stayed by the tomb from the time of the deposition. This innovative approach on the Virgin's presence at the tomb, also aided the Magdalene's cult. These, and other issues, will be examined in the following chapter.

[1070] Photios, Patriarch of Constantinople, *Amphilochia*, PG 101, col. 46-1172. These were a series of questions asked by Amphilochios the Metropolitan of Kyzikos for which Photios provides the answers.
[1071] Ibid, 'Question 127', col. 985-992, esp. col. 989. The same view was shared by Hesychios of Jerusalem, *Questions*, PG 93, col. 1392-1448, esp. 1441.

CHAPTER 5: The Virgin and the Magdalene after Iconoclasm

This chapter discusses the two main characters of the post-Resurrection narrative in the artistic and literary production of the post-Iconoclast era. The first subchapter is dedicated to the Virgin and the new exegetical approach introduced by George of Nicomedia. According to his exegesis the Virgin was no longer to be identified with the 'other Mary', and subsequently with Mary of James (Matth. 27: 36), because she remained at the sepulchre of Christ, from the time of his burial until his resurrection. The need to detach the Virgin from a group, whose treatment by the Church Fathers was inconsistent, and her rising importance, are two possible reasons for this new exegetical approach, and will be fully exploited below.

By separating the Virgin from the Myrrh-bearers, the Magdalene, who featured prominently as the head of the Myrrh-bearers, was no more rivalling the Virgin's importance in the post-Resurrection narrative. The Magdalene was free to assume her role as the leading Myrrh-bearer, and it is not a coincidence that her relics were soon after transported in Constantinople, during the reign of Leo VI. While the Magdalene's cult was rising, various traditions were circulating about her identity. In the West, Pope Gregory the Great conflated Mary of Magdala with the sinner of Luke (7: 37). This was not however the case in the East, where Gregory's composite Magdalene was rejected. A different notion, though, seemed to have lingered in the minds of the Byzantines, that the Magdalene was Mary of Bethany, the sister of Martha and Lazaros. This tradition, along with others, seemed to have played an important role in the Magdalene's cult, and they will be examined in the second subchapter.

5.1: *Maria sola assidente ad ostia monumenti.*[1072]

In a previous chapter I have discussed how the Virgin, through a predominately

Antiochene exegesis, was associated with 'Mary the mother of James' (Matth. 27: 56)

and thus introduced in the post-Resurrection narrative as one of the Myrrh-bearers.

The discourse was never refined and often the commentators referred to it in passing,

never elaborating on their deliberation.[1073] Ambrose of Milan (ca.340-397) in his

treatise *On Virginity* simply refers to the Virgin as the first to see Christ resurrected:

'et prima vidit et credidit'.[1074] In two works dedicated to Easter, one written in verse

and the other in prose, Sedulius (†ca.440-450), an author about whom we know very

little,[1075] introduced this notion into the post-Resurrection narrative.[1076] In both works

Sedulius identified the Virgin as one of the Myrrh-bearers – but not explicitly with the

'other Mary'– and stated his belief that 'The Lord showed himself to her eyes

first'.[1077] It is not unlikely that the author fused together two ongoing traditions, the

one expressed already by Chrysostom, in which the Virgin was identified as one of

the Myrrh-bearers, and the other by Ambrose, where the Virgin was the first to see

Christ resurrected.[1078] Sedulius however, like his predecessors, failed to elaborate on

the reasoning behind Christ's appearance to his mother.[1079]

[1072] Symeon Metaphrastes, *Menologion* PG 115, col. 555. The text reads: 'Only Mary was siting at the tomb's entrance'.
[1073] See Chapter 3.1.
[1074] Ambrose of Milan, *Liber de Virginitate*, PL 16, col. 283.
[1075] Gambero 1999, 289-290; Breckenridge 1957, 15.
[1076] Sedulius, *Paschalis Carminis libri V* and *Paschalis Operis Libri V* in CSEL X, 16-146 and 176-303 respectively. The two works offer a good opportunity to examine how prose becomes verse. For example, the following line in the *Opera Paschalae*, 297:
    'Haec honorem Mariae praesentat et gloriam, quae, Domini cum claritate perspicua semper
    mater esse cernatur, semper tamen virgo conspicitur'
in the *Carmina Paschalae*, 141 appears as:
    'Haec est conspicuo radians in honore Mariae,
    Quae cum clarifico semper sit nomine mater,
    Semper virgo manet' etc.
[1077] Ibid, 140-41 and 297-298. The English translation is from Gambero 1999, 289.
[1078] The close connection between Sedulius and Ambrose is visible not only through the notion of 'prima vidit' but also through the association of Mary's virginity with the resurrection. This is visble from Ambrose's treatise *Liber de Virginitate* and for Sedulius see note 1027 above. Gambero 1999,

Until the mid-ninth century, the notion that the Virgin was one of the Myrrh-bearers
prevailed. George of Nikomedia (†880), a ninth century commentator and a close
friend of Patriarch Photios,[1080] disaffiliated himself from this Antiochene tradition. In
a sermon titled 'And they stood by the cross, his mother, and his mother's sister, the
wife of Kleopas and Mary Magdalene' (John 19: 25),[1081] delivered on Saturday
Matins (Friday night), he told his audience that only the Virgin remained outside
Christ's sepulchre.[1082] George ended his sermon with Joseph of Arimathea and
Nikodemos departing from the tomb, while the Virgin was left sitting at the entrance;
this was a story that George continued in another sermon delivered the next day.[1083]
The Virgin was not just sitting and lamenting, but also waiting for the Resurrection to
take place, that is, contrary to the other women who never believed in the
resurrection. George's audience was also left waiting, demonstrating the author's
great abilities as an orator.

The next day, during the morning liturgy of Holy Saturday, George, as promised,
delivered his oration titled: *On the immaculate Virgin by the tomb and a thanksgiving*

---

290 mistakenly believes that Sedulius speaks of Christ's Second Coming. However in my
understanding, Sedulius speaks of Christ's return from the underworld (not his Second Coming), and
thus juxtaposes Christ's incarnation and Mary's virginity, with the miracle of the resurrection and the
good tidings Mary brings to the world. This is more clearly stated in Sedulius' treatise, *Opera
Paschalae*, 298.

[1079] It is plausible that Sedulius did not favour a special appearance to the Virgin; the latter was the first
to see Christ resurrected as part of the Myrrh-bearing group.

[1080] Tsironis 1998, 297. White 1982, 189, note 1 mentions that among the surviving letters of Photios
eleven were addressed to George.

[1081] For a discussion on the models used by George in his homily, see Tsironis 1997; the article is
available online through www.myriobiblos.com. The author by mistake refers to the passage as taken
from John 20: 25 instead of 19: 25.

[1082] George of Nikomedia, *Sermon on 'Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his
mother's sister', and on the burial of our Lord, Jesus Christ, on the Holy and Great Friday* PG 100,
col. 1489.

[1083] Ibid, col. 1488. So Tsironis 1998, 304-305. This sermon was read on Saturday Matins (Friday
night) while the one that George promised to deliver was read on Saturday Vespers.

on the glorious resurrection.[1084] In this sermon, George tried to justify the silence of

the Gospels regarding the Virgin's participation in the post-Resurrection narrative.

The Gospels, said George, mentioned only the women who returned to the sepulchre;

the Virgin was not part of that group because she never left the burial place.[1085]

George's explanation glorified the Virgin, by stressing that only she had remained by

the tomb's entrance because only she had perfect confidence in Christ's resurrection.

This special attention to the Virgin comes as no surprise to us, since most of George

of Nikomedia's orations were dedicated to her.[1086] According to Krumbacher, George

used to greatly employ his imagination to elaborate on events from the life of the

Virgin.[1087] In this case however, George goes a step further, and uses the silence of

the Gospels as a tool to introduce a novel conception.

George of Nikomedia's familiarity with Antiochene exegesis is apparent in the way

he tried to refute the long-lasting notion that the Virgin and the 'other Mary' were the

same person. George rhetorically asked his audience why others before him had made

this identification, when in all other passages of the New Testament the Virgin is

referred to, not as the 'other Mary', but as the 'mother' of Christ.[1088] The author adds

that the women standing by the cross in the Gospel of John are denoted by their

names, but when the Virgin is mentioned, she is called mother.[1089] George's rationale

was rather cunning: by disassociating the Virgin from the Myrrh-bearers, he enabled

---

[1084] George of Nikomedia, PG 100, cols. 1489-1504. Tsironis 1998, 305 asserts that besides the two homilies, a third must have existed, now either lost or unedited, which was probably delivered on Easter Sunday.
[1085] PG 100, col. 1493.
[1086] Tsironis 1998, 297.
[1087] Krumbacher 1964, 179
[1088] PG 100, col. 1493.At this point George quotes the following verses from the New Testament: Matth. 2: 14; John 2: 1, 2: 5 and 2: 12; Luke 8: 20; John 19: 25 and Acts 1: 14.
[1089] John 19: 25: 'Near the cross of Jesus stood his mother, his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Kleopas, and Mary Magdalene' and John 19: 26: "When Jesus saw his mother there, and the disciple whom he loved standing nearby, he said to his mother, 'Dear woman, here is your son'". John 25 was the subject of George's homily delivered on Holy Friday.

himself to place her at the sepulchre before them and thus stressed her priority over the other women. More importantly, George heralds the Virgin as the only witness to Christ's actual moment of resurrection.

According to Severos of Antioch, who professed that the Virgin was the 'other Mary', the moment of Christ's resurrection was only known to God.[1090] Thus, once more, George departs from an established school of thought in favour of a new concept, unprecedented in pre-Iconoclast theology. The Virgin not only saw Christ resurrected but also she witnessed his actual moment of resurrection. In other words, while the Maries saw the angel and all subsequent events, the Virgin saw Christ leaving the tomb.[1091] George's explanation renders all others, null and void.[1092] The question however remains: what made George of Nikomedia to reassert the role of the Virgin from a Myrrh-bearer to a more humane mother?

One possible answer lies in the transformation of the Virgin's devotion after, and possibly during, Iconoclasm, when emphasis was given to her 'human and maternal sides of her personality'.[1093] George's sermons describe a more humane mother, one who laments her son and follows his every step from the passion to the resurrection. Undeterred by the Gospels' silence, George creates an *argumentum ex silentio* to prove that a mother could not have been absent from her son's passion and resurrection.

[1090] Severos of Antioch, PO 16, col. 798.
[1091] PG 100, col. 1497.
[1092] Chrysostom's and Severos' in particular, who believed that the Virgin was 'Mary the mother of James' (Matth. 27: 56).
[1093] Kalavrezou 1990, 165: 'With the demise of Iconoclasm, theologians and artists took a fresh look at the Virgin and began to develop the human and maternal sides of her personality'. Also see Cameron 1997, 18, where she argues that the title 'Mother of God' is associated with the 'softer image' that begins to appear after Iconoclasm.

By disengaging the Virgin from the Myrrh-bearers, George manages not only to show her priority over them, but also to detach her from a group whose treatment by the Church Fathers was inconsistent. Christ's earliest appearance to them after the resurrection was explained as part of Eve's First Sin and God's redemptive plan, but in a male-dominate ecclesia, a woman's priority over a man was, in fact, incomprehensible.[1094] This is probably why many ecclesiastical authors elaborated on what they considered to be common female characteristics: fear, impulsiveness, lack of judgment and lack of faith. Asterios of Amasia (ca.375-405) claims that the women were crying for the duration of Christ's Passion and Crucifixion.[1095] The Magdalene, one of the Myrrh-bearers, was constantly rebuked for her lack of understanding and impulsiveness, a comment extended by commentators to all women.[1096] Theophylaktos of Ohrid (ca.1055-after 1126) in his commentary on Mark 16: 1-8 says that the Maries were unable to acknowledged Christ's divinity, which is why they bought myrrh to apply to his dead body.[1097]

Comments like these were, however, juxtaposed with other more positive for the Maries. Josephos (ca. 380) in his *Book of Annotations* makes a list of those women who 'by benefiting their husbands, they pleased God'.[1098] This list of prominent

---

[1094] For example, Paul in his enumeration of Christ's appearances in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (15: 5-10).

[1095] Asterios of Amasia, *Homily V*, in Datema 1970, 45ff.

[1096] See the discussion in chapter 2.2.

[1097] Theophylaktos of Ohrid, *Commentary on the Gospel of Mark*, PG 123, col. 491-682.

[1098] PG 106, col. 44-45. Note however that the women here are praised through their husbands. For a discussion on the author's date see Moreau 1955-57, 241-276. According to Moreau, the appellation of the Virgin as Theotokos should not deter us from dating the *Book of Annotations* and its author before the Council of Ephesos (431), ibid, 254 and note 4.

women includes the three Maries who first witnessed Christ's resurrection.[1099] John of Damascus (ca.680-749) explains how the Maries' will and fervour was stronger than that of Christ's disciples,[1100] while Gregory of Antioch (†590) in his sermon 'On the Myrrh-bearers' states his amazement of how Peter, the first of the Apostles, was scared by the voice of a young woman (a reference to the first of Peter's denials; Matthew 26: 29), while two women, much 'weaker' and 'scared', went to honour their dead master.[1101] Gregory, however, like Theophylaktos above, did not fail to add that by buying myrrh the Maries demonstrate that they never believed in Christ's resurrection.[1102] It becomes apparent that the Virgin as a Myrrh-bearer must have been caught up in the conflicting discourse; this offered George of Nikomedia the incentive to disassociate the Virgin from the group and seek another explanation, more suited to the ever-growing cult of the Virgin.

It is not clear whether George of Nikomedia, by elaborating on a special appearance reserved for the Virgin, knew and employed the writings of Ambrose and Sedulius or whether he came up with this concept independently. It is true however that Romanos in the sixth and Joseph in the ninth century included in their hymns a similar notion. According to Tsironis, George's sermon shares many similarities with Romanos' *kontakion* on *Mary at the Cross*, in which Christ promises his mother that she will be the first to see him resurrected.[1103]

[1099] Ibid, col. 45: "Τὴν τε ἀνάστασιν τοῦ Κυρίου αἱ τρεῖς Μαρίαι πρῶται θεασάμεναι, τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀπήγγειλαν" and "Ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἰωάννα ἡ τοῦ ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρώδου γυνὴ μετὰ καὶ ἄλλων πιστοτάτων γυναικῶν ἀκολουθοῦσα τῷ Κυρίῳ" etc.
[1100] John of Damascus, *Homily on Holy Easter*, PG 96 col. 636. The same conviction, albeit only for the Magdalene, appears in a *sticheron* by Anatolios: Tillyard 1940, mode III, no.9, p.34-35.
[1101] Gregory of Antioch, *Oration on the Myrrh-bearers*, PG 88 col. 1853.
[1102] Ibid, col. 1856.
[1103] Tsironis 1997, who states: 'George knew Romanos' hymn and he uses the technique of dialogue in a similar way in order to achieve a similar end'. For the kontakion see Maas and Trypanis 1997, no.19: 142-49.

In the *Triodion* of Joseph the Hymnographer (812-886), the Virgin's inclusion in the post-Resurrection narrative passed into a different level, that of liturgical purpose.[1104] Joseph repeated the idea that a special appearance was reserved for the Virgin, while her priority over the other women was again extensively repeated.[1105] The author twice mentioned that the Virgin was there before the other women, but as in the case of Romanos, he does not make explicit whether he believed that a special appearance was reserved for the Virgin or whether the latter saw Christ as one of the two Maries of the Chairete. In one of these hymns, Joseph finished by using the word 'Hail' in the singular form instead of the 'All Hail' of Matthew, thus emphasizing that Christ hailed only one woman, the Virgin. This also points to a connection between the Annunciation and the Resurrection further exemplified in many hymns of the *Triodion*.[1106] The Virgin is both the vessel of Christ's birth, thus the beginning of his redemptive plan, and also the second Eve.[1107] As Cunningham argues, festal sermons resemble 'hymns in prose' and are 'highly dependent on the poetic and typological imagery which had developed in honour of the Theotokos since the late sixth century'.[1108] This is most certainly true for George, whose homilies seem to rely on the hymns of Romanos and Joseph.

[1104] PG 87, 3839-3982.

[1105] PG 87, cols. 3904D-3905A, 3908B, 3909D; since each column of the PG contains an average of 13 hymns, I have included here the letter of the row for a quicker cross-reference.

[1106] Ibid, col. 3929D: "Χαιρε, σοι προσφθέγγεται ως αιτία ουση της χαρας, αναστας, Παρθένε, εκ του μνήματος ο Δεσπότης, ον υπερ πάντων ικέτευε"; In English (my translation): "Hail, addresses to you the resurrected from the tomb Lord, as you are the reason of joy, Virgin, to whom mediate for us all". This juxtaposition is also visible on the Martvili Triptych, in an epigram by Ignatios for the Church of the Virgin at Pege, and in Açikel Ağa Kilise. For a discussion see the previous chapter.

[1107] This view is skilfully represented in the writings of Proklos of Constantinople where the author draws a parallel between the birth of Cain from Eve, and the birth of Christ from the Virgin; the former was a disciple of sin, while the latter the redeemer of humanity. For a discussion of Proklos as a Marian preacher and his views on redemption see Peltooma 2001, 101-113.

[1108] Cunningham 1996, 180.

George's explanation however remains unique; by including in a festal sermon a notion hitherto reserved for the poetic language of hymnography, it introduces it into mainstream theology. His high-flown style, which made him popular during his own time,[1109] offered the best setting for introducing such a novelty. An *argumentum ex silentio* was not the best way to initiate a new theological concept of paramount importance or to refute a long-lasting and revered tradition, but under the cloak of his high style and elaborate discourse, and his profound knowledge of theology, George presents his audience with an explanation unprecedented in patristic thought. This demonstrates not only George's abilities as an orator, but also the high esteem in which the Virgin's veneration was held after Iconoclasm. It appears that the audience did not challenge this novelty, and seems also to have accepted that, if the Virgin was lamenting under the Cross,[1110] she could not have been absent from the subsequent events and especially from Christ's resurrection.[1111] Romanos and Joseph the Hymnographer paved the way for the reception of George's of Nikomedia's explanation.

In the previous chapter we have seen how the Chairete fresco from Açikel Ağa Kilise (fig. 50),[1112] portrays the Virgin not as the majestic standing figure of the Sinai icon (fig. 10), but rather as the woman in *proskynesis*. This changed role, between icon and fresco, makes clear that in the ninth century the Virgin's human and maternal sides

---

[1109] Cunningham and Allen 1998, 8.

[1110] See for example the following abstract from Leo Byzantios' (7th c.?) *idiomelon sticheron* from the Matins of Holy Friday (tone 3):

> The Centurion, seeing the marvel, was afraid; while your Mother, standing by, cried out, lamenting as a mother, 'How should I not lament, and beat my breast, as I see you naked as one condemned, hanging on a tree?' Crucified, buried and risen from the dead, Lord, glory to you!

The translation was taken from www.anastasis.org © Father Ephrem Lash.

[1111] For an extremely helpful introduction on preacher and audience, see the introduction in Cunningham and Allen 1998, esp. 12-20 and passim.

[1112] Thierry 1968, 57, fig.18.

had become very important. The accompanying inscriptions amply show this transformation. Even though the two women are labelled 'Myrrh-bearers', a monogram next to the Mary in proskyneses reads 'Mother of God'. The title 'Saint Mary' of the Sinai icon gives way to the more poignant title of Mother of God. This conscious act not to identify the standing figure with the Virgin, but rather with the woman in *proskynesis*, shows exactly that the fresco in Açikel Ağa Kilise marks a transitive period, in which the Virgin is still the 'other Mary' of Matthew, since she is depicted in the Chairete scene, but her posture of veneration marks the turning point from the majestic Virgin to the more humane mother.[1113]

Accompanying Psalm 38: 12, 'All those who were close to me stand far away', on folio 45^v of the eleventh-century Theodore Psalter, is a scene inspired by John 19:25, the Women Witnessing the Crucifixion.[1114] The Betrayal is also depicted on this folio. The coupling of the two scenes is inspired by the Psalm: Judas represents those who were close to Christ, but now distant themselves, while the Maries, the Virgin and John represent those who remained loyal. Two inscriptions exist. The first, over the two Maries reads 'the women' while the other reads 'Mother of God'. As in Açikel Ağa Kilise above, the Virgin is distinguished from the other Maries by means of an inscription.[1115]

[1113] Thierry and Thierry 1963, 169, believe that the Virgin is depicted in the Chairete scene of Bahattin Samnliği Kilise: "Sa mère s'est jetée a terre devant lui et a saisi son pied gauche", but they provide none other evidence than the similarity between the postures in Bahattin and in Açikel Ağa Kilise. Nevertheles the postures are not enough evidence for this attribution, since they are a common feature of the narrative type of the Chairete.

[1114] Theodore Psalter, London, British Museum, Add.19.352, fol. 45^v, Nersessian 1970, 29, pl. 25, fig. 78. John 19: 25: 'Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene'. A few verses later John's presence is also established.

[1115] She also appears closer to John and away from the two Maries.

The same applies to the scene of the Entombment on folio 116[r].[1116] This accompanies Psalm 88:7: 'Your wrath lies heavily upon me; you have overwhelmed me with all your waves'. While the scene seems unrelated to the Psalm, the latter was read during the Vespers of Holy Friday,[1117] the same day as the Entombment was commemorated, thus 'the illuminator who added such a picture did so because he recalled the verse in the context of its use in church'.[1118] The scene of the Entombment does not however follow the Gospel narrative. This is evident from the inclusion of the Virgin in the scene, an addition justified neither by John 19: 38-40 nor by the synoptics.[1119] The miniaturist by consciously inserting a third figure in the scene seems to adhere to George of Nikomedia's explanation. It also offers evidence that in the eleventh century, the notion that the Virgin remained present throughout Christ's passion had become a *topos*.[1120]

Breckenridge notes that the Virgin continues to appear in the post-Resurrection cycle in the Middle Byzantine Period and cites various examples.[1121] However, neither in the Iviron Gospels,[1122] nor in the Saint Petersburg lectionary,[1123] any indication exists that one of the Maries is the Virgin. The Iviron Gospels depicts the Maries in mantles of various colours with no accompanying inscriptions, while the fact that there are four Maries in the Saint Petersburg Lectionary, does not necessarily imply that the fourth figure was the Virgin.

[1116] London, British Museum, Add.19.352, fol. 116[r] in Nersessian 1970, 45, pl. 70, fig. 192.

[1117] Mateos 1963, 80.

[1118] Anderson 1988, 553.

[1119] The Gospel of John was used as a source of inspiration for Joseph of Arimathea and Nikodemos, the Synoptics for the presence of the women watching the sepulchre. Matthew and Mark mention two while Luke mentions an unspecified number of women.

[1120] This could again explain the juxtaposition between the Betrayal and the scene with the Virgin on folio 45[v] that is, to demonstrate that the latter was also present during the Betrayal.

[1121] Breckenrigde 1957, 15. I was unable however to verify or not the presence of the Virgin in the Washington, Freer Gospels no.4.

[1122] Mount Athos, Iviron Gospels, no.5 in Pelekanides et al. 1973.

[1123] Saint Petersburg, State Library cod.gr.21, in Morey 1929

In the tenth- and eleventh-century theological treatises, evidence exists that George's

exegesis received a good reception. In one of Symeon Metaphrastes' (†960) sermons,

which survives only in a Latin translation,[1124] it becomes clear that George's

explanation was not lost or marginalized but was accepted and adopted by later

theologians. The same view is shared in the *Lamentation of the Most Holy Theotokos*,

which is found in the Slav but not in the Greek versions of the *Triodion*. In Canticle

eight, verse four, the Virgin proclaims: 'I shall not leave thy tomb my child….'[1125]

Symeon, like his predecessor, states his belief that the Virgin remained at the tomb's

entrance throughout Christ's death, which is why is not mentioned in the Gospels as

returning to the sepulchre. Symeon's explanation of why the Virgin is not 'Mary the

mother of James' is again similar to George's: 'others in fact, she who is called Mary

of James, they would consider to be the Theotokos, but neither rightly nor accurately

they inferred the truth; indeed everywhere in the Gospels, after the mystery of the

rising, she herself was explicitly and properly called mother and this is altogether how

she was especially called in writing'.[1126]

Euthymios Zigabenos (or Zigadenos), a Constantinopolitan monk, is best known for

his *Panoplia Dogmatike*, a refutation of heresies written under the auspices of Alexios

I (ca.1110).[1127] But he also wrote a commentary on Matthew, and, like his

predecessors, George of Nikomedia and Symeon Metaphrastes, Euthymios refutes the

---

[1124] Symeon Metaphrastes, *Oration on the Saint Mary*, PG 115, cols. 529-564.

[1125] Canticle Eight, verse three in Mary and Ware 1978, 42 and 620; for the Greek text see Pitra 1858, 495.

[1126] PG 115, col. 555: 'alli vero Mariam quae appellate est Jacobi, existimarunt esse Deiparam, non recte, neque accurate veritatem conjectantes, Ubique enim in Evangeliis ipsa post arcanum illum ortum aperte et proprie nominatur Mater et hanc omniono maxime notam habet appellationem'. Like George of Nikomedia, the author cites various passages from the Gospels to clarify his point.

[1127] Mullet 1997, 74; Euthymios was for some time wrongly identified with Euthymios of Akmonia: ODB 2227.

tradition that the Virgin was the 'other Mary'.[1128] This refutation should not be seen as an anachronism but rather as a criticism on an extant Antiochene tradition, visible in the writings of his contemporary Theophylaktos of Ohrid (ca.1055-after 1126) and later in Theophanes Kerameus (†1152) and Gregory Palamas (1296-1359).[1129]

The explanation that James and Joses were Joseph's children and thus the Virgin's, derives from an improper way of thinking, said Euthymios, and explains that if the evangelists wanted to mention the Virgin they would have done so by referring to her as the mother of Jesus. [1130] Euthymios employed here the same refutation as his predecessors, but went a step further and added that if we admit that the Virgin was the 'other Mary' and subsequently 'Mary of James and Joses', then the Magdalene, who is mentioned in the post-Resurrection narrative in all four Gospels, is proved to be more zealous than the Virgin.[1131] This consideration, while it occupied the minds of theologians since the Patristic period, had never before surfaced in the discourse; this is, as far as I know, the first clear indication of the relation between the Virgin and the Magdalene in post-Resurrection narratives.

Augustine for example, when discussing the Magdalene's role in the post-Resurrection narrative sees in her actions a passionate woman: 'Then Mary Magdalene came, who unquestionably was surpassingly more ardent in her love than these other women'.[1132] If Augustine knew and accepted the notion that the 'other Mary' was the Virgin, he would have never made this comparison. This is exactly what Euthymios feared when he proclaimed that the 'other Mary' could not have been

---

[1128] Euthymios Zigabinos, *Commentary on Matthew*, PG 129, col. 107-766; esp. 737-740.
[1129] For these authors, see below.
[1130] PG 129, col. 737.
[1131] Ibid, col. 737. For a detail discussion see chapter 3.2 on the Magdalene.
[1132] Augustine of Hippo, *The Harmony of the Gospels*, NPNF VI, 65-236; 213.

the Virgin. This rivalry is also visible in Joseph the Hymnographer's *Triodion*. In the only instance in which Joseph mentions the Magdalene he calls her not by her name, but rather with the Greek word 'κόρη', which means 'young woman' or 'daughter'. Directly follows a hymn in which Joseph states his belief that the Virgin will be the first to see Christ resurrected: 'Only she, before the other women, had seen you Christ, coming from the tomb beautifully radiant, only the holy virgin, had listened to the Hail'.[1133] The fact that this hymn immediately follows the only reference to the Magdalene, and also the use of such words as 'only' and 'Hail' in singular, demonstrates that the author wanted to shift the importance from the Magdalene to the Virgin.

Euthymios concludes his argument by explaining that the Virgin is not mentioned in the post-Resurrection narrative, because she never left the tomb, but stayed there and lamented her son, as every mother would have done.[1134] He then says that those who do not read the Gospels cautiously might have doubts on the number of visits the Maries made to Christ's tomb, on Easter morning;[1135] even John Chrysostom did not spend much time on this question.[1136] Euthymios adds that those who say that the visits were four on different times and by different women, and those who say that the visits were four by the same women, can be easily refuted, because their reasoning is unsound.[1137] The author then goes on to reconstruct the visits in a harmony. While Euthymios' profound knowledge of patristic literature is evident in his exegeses, he does not take everything for granted and, like George of Nikomedia and Symeon

---

[1133] PG 87, col. 3920.
[1134] PG 129, col. 740.
[1135] Ibid, col. 745.
[1136] Ibid, col. 745: 'οὐκ ἐπολυπραγμόνησεν'. Eutymios refers to Chrysostom's *Seventy-ninth Homily on Matthew*, PG 58, col. 783-788.
[1137] PG 129, col. 745. Probably this is an indirect reference to Severos.

Metaphrastes, did not hesitate to directly challenge old views. Finally by disassociating the Virgin from the Maries, Euthymios felt at ease to repeat the idea that by buying myrrh to apply to Christ's dead body, the Maries showed that they did not believe in the resurrection.[1138]

Theophylaktos of Ohrid, a contemporary of Euthymios repeats the afore-mentioned idea in his exposition of the Gospel of Mark, where he states that the women were again unable to acknowledge Christ's divinity.[1139] However in the exposition of the Gospel of Luke, Theophylaktos does not hesitate to identify the Virgin as 'Mary of James' and thus place her in the same group of women which he had previously rebuked.[1140] Theophylaktos' explanation, while it seems conflicting, probably echoes Euthymios' words that some people believed that the visits were four and by different women. The fact of the matter remains that Theophylaktos' comments were undoubtedly not flattering for the Maries,[1141] and that the Antiochene exegesis was still thriving.

This is also the case in the twelfth century, apparent in the writings of Theophanes Kerameus. It is not clear whether this theologian was acquainted with the view that a special appearance was reserved for the Virgin and chose to ignore it, or whether he was completely ignorant of it, but the fact remains that in his homily on the third

---

[1138] Ibid, col. 744.

[1139] Theophylaktos of Ohrid, *Exposition of the Gospel of Mark*, PG 123, col. 491-682. The author is responsible for delivering a panegyric for Alexios I in 1088: Angelov 2006, 62, note 123; for a French translation of the panegyric and an introduction to Theophylaktos, see Gautier 1980: 213-243 and 11-37 respectively. For an assessment of Theophylaktos based mostly on the author's letters see Mullet 1997 esp. 260-277.

[1140] Theophylaktos of Ohrid, *Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* , PG 123, col. 683-1126; col. 1112.

[1141] Most likely this prolific author, who occupies four volumes in the *Patrologia Graeca*, and whose writing comprises as Mullet 1997, 231 suggests of 'exegesis, polemic, hagiography, homiletic, epideictic, rhetoric and poems' relied so much on earlier authors that some of the comments were probably inserted without careful thinking. Since however no critical edition exists of his expositions on the Gospels, this remains for the time being impossible to confirm.

morning Gospel (*eothinon*), the author proclaims that the Virgin was the 'other Mary' and in turn, the Mary of James and Joses.[1142] Theophanes surely was not ignorant of the inconsistent treatment of the Maries which he admits in another homily dedicated to the fourth morning Gospel (*eothinon*).[1143] In that homily he uses a reference from Metaphrastes' *menologion*,[1144] thus demonstrating that he knew at least one work of Symeon Metaphrastes. It is possible then, that Theophanes knew the latter's notion and simply chose to ignore it.[1145]

In the fourteenth century – and thus outside the scope of this study – Gregory Palamas (ca.1296-1359) seems to have been familiar with both exegeses. Palamas repeats again that the Mary of James and Joses was the Virgin, and was called as such because these were Joseph's two sons, and also notes that she was the first to see Christ resurrected in the Chairete.[1146] Palamas tries to reconcile the two notions, Virgin's priority and her identification with the 'other Mary', but leaves untouched the problem of the Magdalene's pre-eminence in the post-Resurrection narrative. Palamas knew the objections to the Virgin's appellation and tries to refute them.[1147] The Evangelists do not mention her as mother, says Palamas, but as the 'other Mary' because her testimony as a mother would have given rise to some suspicion.[1148]

[1142] Theophanes Kerameus, *Homily on the Second Eothinon*, PG 132, cols. 618-630, esp. 621-624.
[1143] Theophanes Kerameus, *Homily on the Fourth Eothinon*, PG 132, cols. 641-648.
[1144] Ibid, col. 645; Theophanes cites here the *Menologion* of Symeon Metaphrastes PG 115, col. 821. For the *Menologion* see PG 114, cols. 305-1452; PG 115, cols. 9-1327 and PG 116, cols. 9-1399.
[1145] The high esteem in which Theophanes held Symeon Metaphrastes is evident by the epithet 'γλυκής', which can be translated as elegant, sophisticated, refined etc.
[1146] Gregorios Palamas, *On the Sunday of the Myrrh-bearers and on the Virgin being the First to See Christ Resurrected*, PG 151, cols. 240-41.
[1147] These objections were expressed by George of Nikomedia, Symeon Metaphrastes and Euthymios Zigabenos. See discussion and references above.
[1148] PG 151, col. 237.

In the period after Iconoclasm, George of Nikomedia introduced a notion previously alluded to, only in hymns, or referred to in passing in pre-Iconoclast theology. George used an *argumentum ex silentio* to prove that the Virgin remained at Christ's sepulchre from the time of his burial until the resurrection. The popularity of this exegesis is obvious in the writings of Symeon Metaphrastes and Euthymios Zigabenos. From the ninth to the twelfth century, the Antiochene notion that the Virgin was the 'other Mary' seems to have been marginalized and only resurfaces in the writings of Theophylaktos of Ohrid and Theophanes Kerameus.[1149]

It is true that the Byzantine theologian was never eager to claim originality but rather preferred to show that his teachings were in accordance to the apostolic tradition and the fathers of the church. Some, however, were not content with traditional approaches, such as George of Nikomedia and Euthymios Zigadinos, whose interpretation provided a fresh perspective. The changes in the Virgin's cult, and in Byzantine culture after Iconoclasm in general, may be responsible for the surfacing of this notion. And while the Virgin was commented for her confidence in Christ's resurrection, the Magdalene continued to be presented as a diverse figure, praised by some theologians and rebuked by others. In the chapter that follows, this treatment will be further examined in close association with her identification as the sinner of Luke and Martha's sister.

[1149] It is possible however that the two traditions co-existed throughout the Middle Byzantine period.

5.2 Mary Magdalene the Myrrh-bearer, the Sinner and the Apostle.

In his *Life of the Artists* Georgio Vasari mentions that in sixteenth-century Rome, a chapel was dedicated to the Magdalene in the Church of SS Trinita dei Monti.[1150] The decoration of the chapel was commissioned by a courtesan and comprised by four scenes from the life of Mary Magdalene.[1151] According to Whitcombe these scenes suited the decoration of a repentant courtesan.[1152]

The identification of the Magdalene as a repentant prostitute was introduced for the first time in the sixth century when Pope Gregory the Great, in a sermon delivered probably in 591, identified Luke's unnamed sinner (7: 37) with the woman from whom Christ had expelled seven demons (Mark 16: 9) and thus with the Magdalene:

> We believe that this woman [Mary Magdalene] is Luke's female sinner, the woman John calls Mary, and that Mary from whom Mark says seven demons were cast out.[1153]

Gregory's *Homilies on the Gospels*, from which this abstract is taken, were gathered during the author's lifetime into two volumes and were sent to Bishop Secundinus of Taormina.[1154]

[1150] Vasari, *Life of the Artists* in Bettarini and Barocchi 1966, V: 13; Whitcombe 2002, 273.

[1151] As noticed by Whitcombe 2002, 273, the references appear in the life of the painter Perino del Vaga and in the life of the engraver Marcantonio Raimondi: Vasari, *Life of the Artists* in Bettarini and Barocchi 1966, V: 149 and 13: 'fatter per una meretrice'. The courtesan might have been Lucrezia Scanatoria, Whitcombe 2002, 278

[1152] Ibid, 273 and 279, where he notes that the church would not have allowed a practicing courtesan to acquire and decorate a chapel.

[1153] Gregory the Great, *Homiliarum in Evangelia*, Libri II, PL 76, col. 1238-46; col. 1239: 'Hanc vero quam Lucas peccatricem mulierem, Joannes Mariam nominat, illam esse Mariam credimus de qua Marcus septem daemonia ejecta fuisse testatur'. For the translation and discussion see Whitcombe 2002, 279.

[1154] Allwin DeLeeuw 1985, 855. The author convincingly proves the popularity of Gregory's *Homilies on the Gospels* in the Carolingian period.

Their popularity is well attested in the Carolingian period, when these homilies were extensively copied and through legislation were recommended to priests, presumably as models for their own preaching.[1155] A random sampling of nineteen inventories, mainly monastic, proves that the legislation was observed: thirteen mentioned '*libri homiliarum*' and five specifically speak of Gregory's homilies.[1156] Through his homilies the notion of a composite Magdalene had spread throughout the Carolingian world, which does not imply that this notion became universally accepted, but rather that the idea was widespread in the West.

The question on how many Maries of Magdala were in the Gospels seems to have occupied the minds of other sixth-century authors. Victor of Capua, an author about whom we know very little, in his *Capitula de resurrectione Domini* deals with some of the difficult points regarding Christ's resurrection.[1157] In his effort to demonstrate that no discrepancies exist between the Gospels regarding the post-Resurrection narrative, Victor offers the simple solution of two Maries of Magdala, the one described in Mark 16: 9, from whom Christ had expelled seven demons and the other in John 20:1.[1158] Victor's solution of two Maries of Magdala never found a foothold in theological thought but proves that the number of Magdalenes occupied the thoughts of theologians, which in its turn explains why Gregory came up with the solution of the composite character.[1159]

[1155] Ibid, 859: Hincmar of Rheims, Riculf of Soissons and a collection of laws compiled for Hatto of Mainz explicitly recommended the use of Gregory's forty *Homilies on the Gospels*.

[1156] Ibid, 861: from the unnamed thirteen books, many more could have belonged to Gregory.

[1157] Victor believed that Mary Magdalene of Mark 16: 9 was the sinner and a different person from the Magdalene of John 20: 1: Pitra 1852, LIV and PL Suppl. IV, col. 1196-97.

[1158] Victor does not fail to add that even if only one Mary Magdalene existed there is still no discrepancy between the Gospels.

[1159] The same preoccupation appears in Eusebios of Caesaria, *Question on the Gospels*: *Question 2, to Marinos*, PG 22, cols. 940-948, esp. col. 948.

In the East, Modestos, Patriarch of Jerusalem (†634), in a sermon titled *On the Myrrh-bearers*, offers a somewhat different explanation.[1160] In this small sermon dedicated solely to Mary Magdalene, and not to the Myrrh-bearers as the title suggests, Modestos identifies the Magdalene as the woman from whom Christ had expelled seven demons, in accordance to the longer ending of Mark (16: 9),[1161] but adds that the Magdalene was a virgin: 'the stories teach us that the Magdalene remained a virgin throughout her life'.[1162] Modestos also compares her with Peter, and explains that in the same manner as Peter was the head of Christ's disciples, likewise, the Magdalene through her virginity and fervour became the head of the female disciples.[1163] In the next line Modestos explains that the group of female disciples followed the Virgin in the same manner as the male disciples followed Christ.[1164] This explanatory piece was inserted here in order to put the Magdalene's authority into perspective: she was the first among the female disciples, but the Virgin was the primary female figure, under whom the Magdalene was serving. Modestos also mentions that after the Virgin's dormition, the Magdalene went to Ephesos were she died as a martyr.[1165] Modestos' virgin and martyr Magdalene is a far cry from Gregory's penitent sinner, and indicates that in the East, local traditions had more influence upon the perceptions of the Magdalene's character than Gregory's explanation. It is difficult to assess how widespread Modestos' views were. On one hand his notion of a virgin Magdalene does not feature in later literature even though

---

[1160] Modestos of Jerusalem, *On the Myrrh-bearers*, PG 86.II, cols. 3273-3276.

[1161] The same view is expressed, albeit not so explicitly, in Maximos the Confessor, *On Various Difficult points* PG 91, col. 1377.

[1162] Ibid, 3273.

[1163] Ibid, 3276.

[1164] An echo of Augustine's words, NPNF VI, 213.

[1165] PG 86.II col. 3276.

Photios cites passages from his sermon *On the Myrrh-bearers*, in his *Library*.[1166] On

the other hand, Modestos' view that Magdalene was the first amongst Christ female

disciples, is echoed in a work by George of Antioch (†593), and by Euthymios

Zigabenos in his *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*.[1167]

Another positive view of the Magdalene comes from a *sticheron idiomelon* by

Anatolios, in which the Magdalene is depicted as a fervent individual who not only

perceives the reality of Christ's resurrection, but is ready to rebuke Peter for his

cowardice.[1168] In another *idiomelon*, Anatolios states his belief that the Magdalene

was the first to see Christ resurrected.[1169] The same applies to various hymns from the

Canon on Mary Magdalene by Theophanes 'Graptos' (775-845).[1170] This is an idea

briefly repeated by Anastasios Sinaites in his *Hodegos*, where he ascribes Christ's

first appearance to the 'Mary in the garden'.[1171] This is a reference to the garden

described in John (19: 41), and also in the Noli me Tangere incident, in which Christ

appears to the Magdalene in the guise of a gardener (20: 15).[1172] It could be said,

---

[1166] Photios, *Library*, cod. 275 in Henry 1977, VIII: 7872, 118. See also Daley 1998, 14 note 41, where he argues that Photios cites passages from the Modestos' sermon *On the Myrrh-bearers* that Photios considered to be important.

[1167] For these two authors see below.

[1168] Tillyard, 1940, mode III, no.9, 34-35. The earliest Western hymns dedicated to the Magdalene come from the tenth and eleventh centuries, Szövérffy 1963, 87. For a detailed discussion of 160 Western hymns dedicated to the Magdalene, see ibid, 79-146.

[1169] Tillyard, 1940, mode IV, 46. For the Greek text see Christ and Paranikas1963², 116.

[1170] Theophanes Branded, *Canon on Mary Magdalene*, *ode* 3, mode VIII: 'Joyfully you came to the tomb of the Redeemer, *being the first*, O Maiden, to look on the divine Resurrection. Therefore you were declared herald of the Gospel and cried out: Christ has been raised. Clap your hands'. The English translation was taken from www.anastasis.org.uk/ © Father Ephrem Lash.

[1171] Anastasios Sinaites, *Hodegos*, PG 89 col. 225. Sinaites' emphasis here is not on the Magdalene but on Christ's nature after the resurrection. For a thorough discussion on Sinaites' *Hodegos*, see Kartsonis 1986, 40-67.

[1172] Maximos the Confessor explains Christ's appearance to the Magdalene as a gardener in the sense that the clothing symbolized the real world, while Christ's body, which the Magdalene is not allowed to touch, symbolized the spiritual PG 91, col. 1132. The title of the treatise is *On Various Difficult Points*, PG 91 cols. 1033-1417, which demonstrates that the explanation of why Christ does not allow the Magdalene to touch him, was an exegetical crux.

however, with some reservations,[1173] that by attributing Christ's first appearance to the Magdalene, the two authors demonstrate that they were not advocates of the Virgin's association with the 'other Mary'.

In the ninth century Kassiane or Kassia the nun composed a *sticheron* which is sung at Matins on Holy Wednesday, widely known by its first verse 'Lord the woman fallen in many sins'.[1174] The subject of the hymn derives mostly from the Lukan account of the sinful woman who anointed Christ's feet with myrrh (7: 36-50), but also employs a similar, but not identical incident from Matthew (26: 6-13).[1175] As it will be argued below, Kazhdan is not correct when he states that the hymn was dedicated to Mary Magdalene.[1176] It is true though, that Kassiane clearly draws a parallel between the sinner and a Myrrh-bearer by stating that the former 'took up the role of Myrrh-bearer, and with lamentation brings sweet myrrh to you before your burial'.[1177] The association between Christ's death and the myrrh comes from Christ himself when he states that: 'For in that she poured this ointment upon my body, she did it to prepare me for burial' (Matthew 26: 12).[1178] Kassiane employs here both accounts: the Lukan, from which she takes the theme of the sinful woman, a theme

---

[1173] It is natural that in a *sticheron* dedicated to the Magdalene, the hymnographer will try to stress his object's qualities, while in an anti-heretical treatise, the emphasis is not on the characters but rather on the dogma their actions and words convene.

[1174] Tsironis 2004, 138 note 1 for an up-to-date bibliography on Kassiani. For the Greek text see Christ and Paranikas1963², 104 and for an English translation see Tillyard 1923, 30; reproduced also in Wellesz 1949, 278-79. An English translation is available online at www.anastasis.org.uk/ © Father Ephrem Lash. Tripolitis 1992, xi, notes that while there were other female hymnographers, Kassiane was the only one to find her way into the liturgy and the only one mentioned in Nicephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos' fourteenth-century catalogue of famous hymnographers.

[1175] The same story is also repeated in Mark 14: 3-9 and John 12: 1-8.

[1176] Kazhdan 1999, 318-19. Tsironis 2003-04, 143, believes that this assertion is based on thin grounds, as the name is not referred to anywhere. See also Catafygiotu-Topping, 1982, 204, note 26. Tripolitis 1992, 76-77 and Dyck 1986, 66-67 also argue for an identification of the sinner with the Magdalene; the latter ibid 66, note 9, cites the following sources: Jerome PL 22, col. 588 and Theodore of Mopsuestia PG 66, col. 784, which are however, inconclusive.

[1177] Christ and Paranikas1963², 104. The English translation was taken from www.anastasis.org.uk/ © Father Ephrem Lash.

[1178] This association appears also in John of Damascus, *Homily of Holy Saturday*, PG 96 col. 636.

absent from Matthew where the anointment is done by Martha's sister; and the

Matthean account, from which she takes the parallelism of the two anointments.[1179]

The same combination appears in Romanos' *kontakion On Doubting Thomas*.[1180]

Matthew 26: 6-16 was also the reading of Holy Wednesday Matins.[1181] Hence, the

juxtaposition between the sinner and the Myrrh-bearer does not necessarily imply that

Kassiane believed that the Magdalene was the sinner of Luke, but rather this

parallelism derives from the liturgy and essence of Holy Week and even encompasses

'the entire Lenten experience of repentance'.[1182] This experience is better described in

a sermon on Easter by Gregory Nazianzenos, who urges us to become Nikodemos,

Salome, Mary and Joanna, in order to participate in the mystery of the

resurrection.[1183] The repentant sinner of Kassiane's hymn stands for every man or

woman who must approach this mystery in repentance and humility.

In the sixth *kontakion*, *On the Resurrection*, the liturgical relationship between 'the

woman who was a sinner' and the Paschal experience, is clearly visible.[1184] Romanos

while narrating a series of events inspired by the post-Resurrection narrative, inserts a

stanza that describes the raising of Lazaros, the 'woman who was a sinner' and the

raising of the daughter of Jairus.[1185] As mentioned in a previous chapter the two

---

[1179] As Catafygiotu-Topping 1982, has noted, in Luke's account Christ's passion and death are not imminent, while in Matthew's and Mark's they precede the Betrayal. John's account which is again distant from the passion contains nevertheless, a reference to Christ's death similar to the two afore-mentioned Gospels.

[1180] Maas and Trypanis 1997, 234-241: (Luke 7:39) (Matth. 26:7) (Luke 7: 38).

[1181] Mateos 1963, 70-71.

[1182] Catafygiotu-Topping, 1982, 201-3 notes that many other hymns were dedicated to the sinful woman; for a similar view see also Tsironis 2003-04, 144.

[1183] Gregory Nazianzenos, Oration 45, *On Holy Easter*, cols. 623-664, esp. 657-58. For an English translation see NPNF 7, 432.

[1184] Maas and Trypanis 1997, 223-233. For a critical edition with introduction and commentary see De Matons 1967, 4: 355-421.

[1185] De Matons, 1967, 4: 395, believes that the inclusion here of the "woman who was a sinner" shows that Romanos believed that Magdalene was not the sinner of Luke 7: 36. Dyck 1986 argues that Cassiane's *troparion* has many points of contact with Romanos' *kontakion*.

raisings could be seen as prefigurations of Christ's resurrection.[1186] The sinful woman, on the contrary, is an example of repentance, with which Romanos invites his audience to identify.[1187] As in the case of Kassiane's *troparion*, the words used by Romanos to describe the sinner are reminiscent of a Myrrh-bearer. In the *kontakion* the sinner is described as crying, not only at Christ's feet, but also over his body and at his tomb, a clear reference to the Myrrh-bearers.[1188] Also, the stanza that follows begins with the Magdalene being in tears, a reference to the tears shed by the sinner in the previous stanza.[1189]

The association between the sinner and the Myrrh-bearer is most probably a literary convention and a word-play employed by Romanos to strengthen his narrative structure, and also to associate the three events, and especially the 'sinner', with the Paschal experience. Furthermore, the myrrh is extensively used in orations and sermons in reference to Christ's passion and resurrection. This is evident in a number of hymns ascribed to the author of the *Easter Kanon*, John of Damascus.[1190] The first reference comes from the fifth *ode*: 'Let us arise in the early dawn, and instead of myrrh, offer praises to the Master'.[1191] The association between the myrrh and Paschal experience is more apparent in the first *troparion* of the seventh *ode*: 'The holy women hastened after you with myrrh. The One whom they sought with tears as a mortal, they worshipped with joy as the living God, and they proclaimed the mystic

---

[1186] Also the Sunday before Holy Week gradually came to be called 'Lazaros' Sunday'.
[1187] Romanos dedicates to her the *kontakion*, *On the Sinful Woman*, in ibid, 73-80, in which no reference is made to the Magdalene.
[1188] Maas and Trypanis 1997, 227: η΄.
[1189] Maas and Trypanis 1997, 227: θ΄.
[1190] Also called the "Golden Kanon". There is an English translation of John of Damascus' Easter kanon at www.anastasis.org.uk © Father Ephrem Lash. The English quotations used hereafter in the text, were taken from this website, unless otherwise indicated.
[1191] Christ and Paranikas 1963[2], 219. The quotation 'early dawn' is from Luke 24: 1. See also Louth 2002, 263.

Passover, O Christ, to your disciples'.[1192] In a *Homily on Holy Easter*, John of

Damascus explains that Christ was 'the myrrh poured for our salvation'.[1193] The

association that derives between the sinner and the Maries, in the context of the myrrh

poured for Christ, is not evidence that either Romanos or Kassiane conflated the

Magdalene with the sinner of Luke; this analogy was rather drawn from a theological

context.[1194]

On folio 196[v] of the Paris Gregory, three linked episodes are portrayed: the Raising of

Lazaros; the Supper at Bethany; and the Entry into Jerusalem.[1195] What is interesting

here is the fact that the woman who anoints Christ in the house of Simon (Supper at

Bethany), is not the unnamed woman described in Matthew (26: 7) and Mark (13: 3),

nor Mary, Martha's sister, described in John (12: 3), but rather the sinner of Luke (7:

37), whom the miniaturist titles as 'the Harlot' (Η ΠΟΡΝΗ). The latter wears the

same clothes as Mary in the previous scene.[1196] The miniaturist took from Mark and

Matthew the setting: the house of Simon; from Luke: the sinner; and by depicting the

latter in the same guise as Mary of Bethany, manages to insert John's narrative and

harmonise, in a single miniature, two distinct events: the anointment by the sinner of

Luke, whose memory was celebrated on Holy Wednesday, with the Supper at

Bethany, which was commemorated on Palm Sunday. As Brubaker has noted, the

Mary in the Raising of Lazaros wears the same clothes as the harlot (Η ΠΟΡΝΗ) in

---

[1192] Christ and Paranikas 1963[2], 220. The events described here are probably those of Matth. 28: 1-10.
[1193] John of Damascus, *Homily on Holy Easter*, PG 96, col.636; see also Athanasios of Alexandria, *First Discourse Against the Arians*, NPNF 4, 1886, 334, where he mentions that the myrrh carried by the Maries fulfilled the prophecy: "And thy garments smell of myrrh, aloes, and cassia", Psalm 16: 8.
[1194] Louth 2002, 265 argues for an association with Cant. 1: 3: 'Pleasing is the fragrance of your perfumes; your name is like perfume poured out. No wonder the maidens love you!'.
[1195] Brubaker 1999, 79, fig. 24; the scholar notes that these events were commemorated on Palm Sunday.
[1196] Brubaker 1999, 82, on account of the duplicate robes, believes that these are the same person, and that person is the Magdalene. It should be noted however that the facial characteristics are somewhat different and that the latter has her hair loose.

the scene titled as the 'Supper at Simon's' (O ΔΙΠΝΟC ΤΟΥ CIMONOC).[1197] While the miniaturist alludes that the sinner of Luke could be Mary of Bethany, there is no indication that the latter was the Magdalene. However, this allusion is most probably based upon liturgical considerations, the same employed by Romanos in his sixth *kontakion*, *On the Resurrection*, where again the Raising of Lazaros and the sinner are combined.

Photios tackles the question 'How many women had applied myrrh to Christ?' in his Amphilochia.[1198] No mention is made of Mary Magdalene as she did not apply her myrrh to Christ, as the latter had already been resurrected. The women were not two or four, says Photios, nor one, as Theodore of Mopsuestia and Apollinarios claim, but three.[1199] The sinner of Luke (7: 39) is the first of the three women, and this is evident, says Photios, by the fact that this event takes place at a different time from those described in Matthew (26: 6-14) and Mark (14: 3-9), where the second woman is signified; the last of Photios' three women is Mary, Martha's and Lazaros' sister, as described in John (12: 1-8).[1200] Photios distinguishes the three women as Mary of Bethany, the sinner of Luke, and the 'harlot' of Matthew and John.[1201] As a final point it should be noted that Photios makes no connection between any of the three women and the Magdalene.

While it becomes quite apparent that Pope Gregory's composite Magdalene had not been accepted in pre-Iconoclast Byzantium, evidence exist that her burial site in

---

[1197] Ibid, 82; the author identifies Mary of Bethany with the Magdalene.
[1198] Photios, *Amphilochia*, PG 101, 'Question 48': cols. 357-68.
[1199] Ibid, cols. 357-60.
[1200] Ibid, col. 360: Photios explains that the second woman applied myrrh to Christ two days before his passion, while Mary, Martha's sister, did this six days before Easter.
[1201] Ibid, cols. 360-361; Photios uses the words 'ἀπὸ πορνείας ἄγους ἐπονομάζεται' which reflects the word 'πόρνη' as it appears in the Paris Gregory; see above note 1084.

Ephesos had become an important pilgrimage destination. This city was one the

richest pilgrimage sites, as it offered shrines associated with the cult of *personae*

closely associated with Christ.[1202] The Magdalene's tomb was not, however, the most

important pilgrimage site in Ephesos, since the city boasted the tomb and relics of

Saint John the Theologian, and also the tomb of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesos.[1203]

Other relics included the red stone on which Joseph of Arimathea had washed the

body of Christ,[1204] and a shirt that Mary Magdalene made for Saint John.[1205] The

association between the two saints is visible in the sermon by Modestos, where he

mentions that the Magdalene went to Ephesos 'because she did not want to be

separated from the virgin and evangelist John, until her death'.[1206] The same view is

also expressed by Gregory of Tours (538-594).[1207] The red stone, on which Joseph

placed Christ's body, is also indirectly associated with the Magdalene, since both

saints are celebrated on the same day.[1208] In the eight century, the pilgrim Willibald

visited Ephesos and the tomb of Mary Magdalene,[1209] and in the twelfth century the

Russian pilgrim Daniel (1106-1107) could see both her tomb and her head,[1210]

(despite the fact that her relics were transported in Constantinople by Leo VI.[1211] It

---

[1202] Foss 2002, 138.

[1203] Ibid, 130: the tombs of Saint Timothy, and Saint Hermione, daughter of the apostle Philip were also located in Ephesos.

[1204] It seems that this same stone was transported to Constantinople by Manuel I Komnenos and was placed next to his tomb in the Pantokrator Monastery, Mango 1969/70, 372-373. The information is recorded in Niketas Choniates, *Historia*: 'Beside it, placed on a pedestal a red stone, long as a human body, is exposed to veneration. This had previously been kept in the church of Ephesos, and it is said to be the one upon which, after His descent from the cross, Christ was wrapped in funeral clothes and embalmed'.

[1205] Ibid, 131.

[1206] PG 86.II col. 3276.

[1207] Gregory of Tours, *Miraculorum Libri VIII*, PL 71, 731: 'In ea urbe <Epheso> Maria Magdalenae quiescit, nullum super se tegumen habens'.

[1208] Mateos 1963, 114-115.

[1209] Anonymous, *Vita sive potius itenerarium sancti Willibaldi*, 60: 'Ubi postquam ad sepulchrum sancti Johannis Evangelistae, ebulliens inde mannam admirantes, lacrimis perfuderunt, postquam se septem dormientibus et Mariae Magdalenae ibidem requiescenti commendaverunt…' in Tobler 1874, 56-76. For a discussion see Foss 2002, 138 and Saxer 1958, 26.

[1210] Wilson 1895, 5; Khitrowo 1889, 7: 'il y a la aussi le tombeau de Marie Madeleine, ainsi la tête'.

[1211] So Foss 2002, 139. For a discussion see below.

becomes apparent that the tradition that Mary Magdalene had lived and died in Ephesos was known in the sixth century in both East and West, and that her tomb attracted many pilgrims.

The eighth-century itinerary of the pilgrim Willibald, mentioned above, survives however in two recensions, and, as noted by Saxer, the Magdalene's tomb is not mentioned in the ninth-century version, but only in the much later eleventh-century revision.[1212] The *menologion* of Basil II is the earliest document to describe the exact location of Mary Magdalene's tomb, which places it in the entrance of the Seven Sleepers' cave; this information is repeated in an eleventh-century *menologion*.[1213] Willibald's eleventh-century version of his itinerary records this information: 'postquam se septem dormientibus *et Mariae Magdalenae*'.[1214] The addition of the words '*and Mary Magdalene's*' after that of the Seven Sleepers, demonstrates that the tradition recorded in the *menologion* found its way into Willibald's eleventh-century recension. The question that arises is what made the scribe of the later version, to incorporate the Magdalene's tomb when it was clearly absent from the earlier. The answer lies in the Magdalene's cult, which was boosted in the interim period between the late ninth and tenth centuries.

This boost is recorded in the late ninth- early tenth-century *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia, were Mary Magdalene is recorded as having three feast days.[1215] The most important

---

[1212] Saxer 1958, 26 and note 70 for the two recensions. An English translation of the ninth-century version exists in Wilkinson 1977, 125-135, esp.126.

[1213] PG 117, col. 553; see also Saxer 1958, 27 and note 74.

[1214] 'After this to the seven sleeper and the Mary Magdalene', Tobler 1874, 60.

[1215] The Gospel reading for her three feasts was taken from Mark 16: 1-8, see Mateos 1963, I: 280-82, 346 and 358, respectively. The Epistle reading was taken from I Corinthians 9: 2-12. Verse 5 is quite illuminating: 'Don't we have the right to take a believing wife along with us, as do the other apostles and the Lord's brothers and Cephas?'.

was on the 22nd of July, but her memory was also celebrated on the 4th of May along with Lazaros'. On that day the *Typikon* reads: 'On the same day, memory of the translation of the holy relics of the saint and friend of Christ, Lazaros, and of the Myrrh-bearer Mary Magdalene […] The commemoration takes place in the most charitable monastery which the same emperor <Leo VI> dedicated in the memory of the saint <Lazaros>'.[1216]

The association between the two saints and the placement of their relics in a common church recalls Pope Gregory's composite Magdalene. However, Bernard the monk who visited Bethany about 870, records the following in his journal:

> From this we went on southwards to Bethany descending from the Mount of Olives for a mile. In the monastery church there is the tomb of Lazaros. And near by to the north, is the pool in which the Lord told Lazaros to wash after he had been brought to life again. *People say that afterwards he was bishop of Ephesos for forty years.*[1217]

The 'people' of Bernard mention a tradition which localizes both the Magdalene and Lazaros in the same city: Ephesos. Nevertheless, their common commemoration cannot be explained by this tradition, since Lazaros' relics were transported from Cyprus and not from Ephesos.[1218] The tradition recorded in Bernard's itinerary was either an invention intended for a Western audience familiar with Gregory's composite Magdalene, or part of the same 'stories' Modestos had employed in his sermon *On the Myrrh-bearers*.

[1216] Mateos 1963, 346-348.
[1217] Bernard the Monk, *A Journey to the Holy Places and Babylon*, 144 in Wilkinson 1977, 141-145. The italics are mine.
[1218] George the Monk (Continuator), *Lives of the Recent Emperors*, PG 109 col. 921.

As mentioned above, on the 4th of May, the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia commemorates the translation of both saints' relics to Constantinople. Two sermons of Arethas of Caesarea (860-932), delivered in Leo's presence, record the arrival of Lazaros' relics and the solemn procession that followed to his newly established church;[1219] no reference however is made to the Magdalene. Arethas mentions Lazaros' sister in the opening lines of his first oration, but only to assert that this is not the banquet in which she anointed Christ, but rather the translation of the saint's relics; a few lines later he adds that Leo sheds tears instead of myrrh.[1220] These details are however related to the Gospel story of the anointing of Christ in Bethany by Lazaros' sisters and no connection whatsoever is made to the Magdalene.[1221] In his second oration, Arethas describes in detail the arrival of Lazaros' relics: 'It was daybreak when the emperor boarded a boat and crossed over from the palace to Chrysopolis, where the relics of Lazaros had just arrived' and a few lines below he allows the emperor 'to embrace the remains of Lazaros'.[1222] Clearly, if Arethas knew about the Magdalene's relics, he would have undoubtedly mentioned them and also praised the emperor for transporting them to Constantinople.

[1219] Arethas of Caesarea, *Speech of the Welcome to the honourable relics of Lazaros which Leo the Christ-loving emperor had translated from Cyprus* and *Description by the same of the holy procession which Leo the pious emperor made for the honourable relics of Lazaros, the friend of Christ, when he first translated them in Cyprus* in Westerink 1972, 7-10 and 11-16 respectively. For an English translation see Jenkins et al. 1954, 5-11. The authors express the view that the sermons were delivered in AD 901 or 902. Since the *Typikon* mentions that their feast is on the 4th of May, is possible that the procession to Leo's newly-established church and monastery, took place on the 4th of May 902; this is corroborated by the second sermon that mentions 'a crowd equaled only by last year's', meaning the arrival of the relics in the previous year: Westerink 1972, 11 and Jenkins 1954, 8. See also Antonopoulou 1998, 329.

[1220] This is reminiscent of John of Damascus' *troparion*.

[1221] Arethas of Caesarea, *Speech of the Welcome* etc. in Westerink 1972, 7.

[1222] For the English quotations see Jenkins 1954, 6 and for the Greek text see Westerink 1972, 12-13.

Mary Magdalene's relics must have been transported in Constantinople during the

reign of Leo, but at later stage.[1223] This assumption is supported by the date of the

Typikon of the Great Church, which corresponds with the reign of Leo. Furthermore

in the *Typikon* the latter's name is mentioned in reference to the translation of the two

saints' relics. Consequently the Magdalene's relics were transported from Ephesos to

Constantinople and placed in the church of Lazaros, which evidently influenced their

common commemoration.[1224] The question that arises, though, is why the

Magdalene's relics were not placed in a church dedicated to her but placed in

Lazaros' church. Even if we admit that no churches were dedicated to the Magdalene

in Constantinople,[1225] this does not explain why her relics were placed in the

katholicon of a monastery for male eunuchs.[1226] Is it possible that this was an

intentional act, part of the conviction that the Magdalene was related to Lazaros?

None of the tenth-century chronicles mention anything about this association and the

same applies for both the *Typikon*, and the *Menologion* of Basil II.[1227] All the

evidence points to the fact, that the Magdalene did not become the composite

character of Pope Gregory. However, the celebration of the sinner during Holy Week,

her association with the Paschal experience, and more importantly the common

---

[1223] So Jenkins 1954, 10.

[1224] A lengthy sermon written by the fourteenth-century theologian Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, *On St Mary Magdalene*, mentions that the Magdalene's relics were carried by both Leo and his brother Alexander, PG 147, col. 574. This information is not however corroborated by any tenth-century chronicle; see following note for references. See also the discussion in Tougher 1997, 219-232, esp. 222, where he mentions that Alexander also took part in a procession on the feast of Mid-Pentecost.

[1225] Janin 1969, mentions no churches dedicated to the Magdalene, he mentions however that in the thirteenth century a monastery was dedicated to Martha (Κυρά Μάρθα), which however derived its name not from the Myrrh-bearer but from Michael's III Palaiologos' sister, ibid, 324. What is interesting however is that an anonymous fifteenth-century description of Constantinople, mentions that the monastery had Mary Magdalene's relics; however a Russian pilgrim, the deacon Zosimos (1419-1421) saw the relics of Mary of Kleopas; this is probably another case of mistaken identity. For the Russians pilgrims see Khitrowo 1889, 235 and 205 respectively.

[1226] This information is recorded in Theophanes Continuator, Pseudo-Symeon Magistros and George the Monk (Continuator), PG 109, cols. 381, 765 and 921 respectively.

[1227] For the chronicles see preceding note; Mateos 1963, I: 280-82, 346; Basil II, *Menologion*, PG 117, col. 553

attributes she shared with the Myrrh-bearers, and Mary Magdalene in particular, must have complicated the latter's identity.

Leo VI, besides transporting the Magdalene's relics to Constantinople, wrote many hymns in her honour. These were part of a series of eleven hymns, called the morning resurrection hymns or *eothina Anastasima*.[1228] These hymns correspond with the eleven *eothina* gospels, the gospel lections that describe Christ's post-Resurrection appearances.[1229] These hymns are sung on Sunday at *Orthros* when an *eothinon* gospel is read.[1230] The literary value of the hymns is captured in the following sentence by Tillyard: 'If at times Leo does no more than paraphrase the gospel story, yet here and there we see a flash of insight or a picture boldly drawn, which testify to a talent not great indeed but worthy of respect'.[1231]

The Magdalene features in many *eothina* and mainly in those in which the Gospel reading describes an event in which she is the primary figure: the third, the seventh and the eighth.[1232] The following is Leo's eighth *eothinon*:

> 'The burning tears of Mary fall not in vain, For, lo! she hath been found worthy of angel's teaching and of a vision of Jesus himself. But still, like a weak woman, she thinketh the thing of earth, wherefore she is warned not to touch Thee, O Christ. Howbeit she was sent as messenger to Thy disciples. To them she brought the good tidings, announcing Thy ascension to thy Father

---

[1228] Hadjisolomos 1986, 1. For the *eothina* see Tillyard 1949, 59-84; also in Christ and Paranikas 1963², 105-109.

[1229] The earliest list of eleven appearances, comes from Chrysostom, *On the Ascension*, PG 52, cols.782-783 but this differs substantially from the eleven *eothina* gospels.

[1230] Hadjisolomos 1986, 3. If for example the reading is from Matth. 28: 16-20 (Appearance in Galilee) then the *eothinon* that describes this event will be sung; in this occasion, the first eothinon and so on. When the cycle of the eleven Gospels is completed, it starts again from the beginning.

[1231] Tillyard 1949, 5: XI. A similar view appears again in Tillyard 1923, 35.

[1232] These correspond to the Noli me Tangere, as describe in Mark 16: 9-11.

abode. With her, do Thou deem us also worthy of Thy presence, O Lord our Master'.[1233]

Leo believes that the Magdalene was worthy of an angelic message and a vision of Christ and even though he calls her weak, he titles her as messenger of the good tidings of the resurrection.[1234] The Greek words used are: 'εὐαγγέλια ἐφησε'. In Greek, the word 'εὐαγγέλιον' has two meanings: 'good tidings' and 'Gospel'. The use of this word is not coincidental; clearly Mary Magdalene carries a very important message: an 'εὐαγγέλιον'.

In the late sixth century, George of Antioch (†593), in a sermon dedicated to the Maries, puts in Christ's mouth the following words: 'Peter, who denied me, must learn that I can ordain women apostles'.[1235] The same view is repeated by Euthymios Zigabenos in his *Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew*: 'The women he <Christ> had ordained Apostles to the Apostles, honouring the gender, dishonoured by the deception of the devil'.[1236] Gregory's and Euthymios words reflect the high esteem in which they held the Myrrh-bearers but since women were not allowed to preach or take any offices in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the titled *Apostle* never gained much popularity. For Timothy of Constantinople (ca. 500), women could not become teachers and subsequently leaders of men and priestesses, as this would bring disgrace to Christ who is the head of the Church.[1237] Theophanes Kerameus knew about this

---

[1233] Tillyard 1923, 35 and also in Tillyard 1930-31, 120, Eighth *Eothinon*, mode plagal IV.
[1234] In a sermon by Leo the Philosopher PG 107 cols. 96-103, the Maries are described as: 'Blessed women… carrying the office of preachers'. There is some confusion on whether this Leo is the same as the emperor.
[1235] *Oration on the Myrrh-bearers*, PG 88, col. 1864.
[1236] PG 129 col. 757.
[1237] Timothy of Constantinople, *On the Treatment of Heretics*, where the author attacks the heresy of Marcionites, PG 86.1, col.11-74, col. 52. See also Tertullian, *Prosecution Speech against the Heretics*. ANF 3, 263: 'The very women of these heretics, how wanton they are! For they are bold enough to teach, to dispute, to perform exorcisms, to undertake cures – it may be even to baptize'.

debate and in his *Homily on the Fourth Eothinon Gospel* points out that no discrepancy exists between the teachings of Paul, who declared that women should not become teachers of the faith, and the fact that the Myrrh-bearers brought the message of the resurrection to the disciples: they did not teach them says Theophanes, but they informed them.[1238]

To conclude, it is possible that Leo came to admire the Magdalene as the most important figure of the post-Resurrection narrative through the influence of hymns such as those by John of Damascus and Theophanes Graptos, which affected his writings. The transportation of the Magdalene's relics in Constantinople should be seen as the result of this admiration; their placement in Lazaros' church however, remains puzzling. This could signify that no church was dedicated to her, before or after the translation of her relics; it could also signify that the same 'ἱστορίαι' that influenced Modestos sermons, and Bernard's itinerary, could have influenced Leo, who saw some connection between Lazaros' sister and the Magdalene, and thus decided to place her relics in the saint's church. Since, however, this is not supported by any literary sources or iconography, this remains a hypothesis.

George of Nikomedia's detachment of the Virgin from the group of Myrrh-bearers must have played some role in the boost of the Magdalene's cult. Since she no longer rivalled the Virgin's role in the narrative, the Magdalene was free to assume her role as the most important Myrrh-bearer. Euthymios Zigabenos rightly asserts that if the

---

[1238] Theophanes Kerameus, *Homily on the Fourth Eothinon*, PG 132, col. 645. A completely different Magdalene is portrayed in the Coptic *synaxarion* in which no mention is made about Ephesos:

> 'This saint preached with the disciples, and brought back many women to the Faith of Christ. The apostles ordained her a deaconess, to teach the women, and to assist in their baptism. She received many insults and humiliation from the Jews, and she departed in peace while she was still ministering unto the disciples.'

For the Arabic text and a French translation see *Synaxarion*, PO 17, Basset 1907, 693-694.

Virgin was the 'other Mary', then her role in the post-Resurrection narrative is overshadowed by that of the Magdalene. By inserting the Virgin in the post-Resurrection sequence, Antiochene theology managed to solve the problem created by her absence but not that of Magdalene's primacy. George and his adherents, Symeon and Euthymios, obviously recognized this discrepancy and by adopting the view that the Virgin remained throughout Christ's Passion and only she saw the actual moment of resurrection, managed to turn to balance to the latter's favour.

While no secure evidence exists to determine whether or not Pope Gregory's composite Magdalene materialised in the East, a liturgical conflation appears in the hymns of Romanos and Kassiane. In addition, the writings of the theologians remained ambiguous, and the absence of any definite 'answers about the Magdalene' is reflected in modern scholarly work: whether the illustration of Psalm 79: 3 on the Pantocrator Psalter portrays Martha and Mary Magdalene at the Tomb of Christ,[1239] or Martha and Mary at the Tomb of Lazaros,[1240] remains anybody's guess.

[1239] So Kartsonis 1986,134
[1240] So Dufrenne 1966, 30, for the miniature from the Pantokrator Psalter on fol. 112[r], see ibid pl. 16.

CHAPTER 6: Festal or Narrative Cycles?

The following chapter examines the presence of the Maries, the Chairete and the Incredulity in iconographic cycles from the tenth until the twelfth century. In doing so, the chapter is divided into to two main subchapters, with the first divided again into two smaller sections, each examining the presence of the Incredulity and the absence of the Chairete and Maries from the so-called twelve-feast cycle, respectively. At this point I should clarify, that it is not my aim to provide a detail discussion on the much debated festal cycle, but rather to explain the possible reasons behind the inclusion of the Incredulity of Thomas in iconographic schemes often associated with this cycle. In other words, to explain how the latter scene was transformed from a reference to Christ's resurrection into a festal scene. The Maries and the Chairete, while retaining their importance as references to Christ's resurrection, they were never presented as festal icons, in either literary or artistic examples. Their absence from the festal cycle, and their presence in the narrative one, will also be examined. This will demonstrate that not all the post-Resurrection scenes were deemed as 'festal icons'.

The second subchapter is discussing the iconographic schemes of Cappadocia, while examples from other areas closely associated with Byzantium will be brought into the discussion for comparative reasons. As it will become apparent, the Incredulity and the Chairete are virtually absent from the arts of Cappadocia. The two scenes, continued to feature prominent in the arts of Constantinople but in Cappadocia the decorative schemes concentrated on the Maries and the Anastasis. This is also apparent in examples outside Cappadocia and Byzantium in general, but inside the latter's sphere of influence. As part of the more general aim of this thesis, the

relationship between the Maries and the Anastasis inside narrative cycles will also be examined, in order to demonstrate that the latter did not supplant in importance the post-Resurrection scenes – as Kartsonis proposes – either in the narrative or in the festal cycle. Other issues, touched upon in chapter four, will be further examined here, such as the three-Maries composition, and the unpopularity of the Road to and Supper at Emmaus in Byzantine monumental art.

As far as terminology is concerned, a festal scene must commemorate an important feast of the church and often be part of a cycle of related scenes. A festal scene also suppresses unnecessary details and usually employs short titles. On the other hand a narrative scene is set apart not only by the inclusion of details and titles, which often are taken unmodified from the Gospel narrative, but also by the fact that normally they do not commemorate a special feast of the liturgical calendar. It should be noted, though, that a festal scene can appear modified in a narrative cycle.[1241] Also, it should be noted, that the terms festal and liturgical are not used as synonyms. The latter term specifically signifies the practises that take place during the liturgy; thus a narrative scene can include details from the Gospels and the liturgy. For example, in the Maries at the tomb, the soldiers are influenced by the former, while the censers by the latter.

6.1: The post-Resurrection Appearances in the Twelve Feast Cycle

The surviving ninth-century evidence reveals that the Maries at the Tomb and the Chairete retained their popularity and were extensively used to denote Christ's resurrection. The West, untouched by Iconoclasm continued to employ the Maries,

---

[1241] For example, a festal Crucifixion will only depict Christ, the Virgin and Saint John, and will be title 'Crucifixion'. A narrative Crucifixion, will also depict the centurion, the good and bad thief and other details, while the title will be taken from the Gosple narrative i.e. John 19: 27.

while in the East, and especially in Constantinople where the bulk of our evidence

survives, the need for a more tangible and human Christ brought the Chairete scene to

the forefront. The Anastasis appears side by side with the afore-mentioned scenes but

apparently gains no special prominence, since the instances in which the latter

supersedes the Maries and the Chairete are fewer than those in which is supplanted.

The continuing importance of the post-Resurrection scenes is evident from their

inclusion in the so-called twelve feast cycle (*dodekaorton*).

In the discussion that follows the use of these appearances in the twelve feast cycle

will be examined, while special attention will be given to the Incredulity of Thomas

and the Chairete, which appear to be rising in importance throughout the tenth and

eleventh centuries. The Incredulity of Thomas, in particular, appears in mosaics,

frescoes and ivories often associated with Constantinopolitan or aristocratic

patronage. The Incredulity of Thomas had a long tradition in the arts and the

theological thinking, therefore its rise in prominence comes as no surprise. The

Incredulity of Thomas was celebrated as an independent feast on the first Sunday after

Easter and churches and monasteries were dedicated to the saint's memory from the

early Byzantine period.[1242] Additionally, this appearance was used extensively against

heresies that were trying to promote one of Christ's two natures.[1243]

Based on the decorations of three cross-in-square churches, namely Hosios Lukas,

Daphni and Nea Moni, Demus proposed an hierarchical system of icons, better known

---

[1242] Janin 1969, 248-252, enumerates five churches and monasteries in Constantinople, mainly of the fifth and sixth centuries. According to a letter of Severos, a monastery dedicated to Thomas existed in Seleukia in the fifth century, Allen and Hayward 2004, 17.
[1243] For the use of the Incredulity of Thomas against heretics see chapter 3.1.

as the classical system of Middle Byzantine decoration.[1244] According to his three-tiered division, the middle tier depicts scenes from the life of Christ, which make up a festival cycle based on the liturgical calendar of the church.[1245] Nevertheless, while the scenes were at some level inspired by the festal cycle, they do not follow the church's calendar but rather the life of Christ.[1246] In addition, as noted by James, no two Byzantine churches are precisely alike, which demonstrates that what was included or excluded made a difference to the interpretation of the decoration.[1247] It is in fact the inclusion of the Incredulity of Thomas, and the exclusion of two other popular post-Resurrection scenes, the Maries and the Chairete that will be examined in this chapter. This exclusion was based, in my opinion, on the fact that the latter two scenes were not conceived as 'festal icons'.

According to Kitzinger, the twelve feast cycle was established as a distinct category and appeared side by side with the more extensive narrative cycles from the eleventh century and probably even earlier.[1248] The canon of the twelve scenes normally composed of three scenes from Christ's infancy (Annunciation, Nativity, Presentation in the Temple); three from his public life (Baptism, Transfiguration, Raising of Lazaros); three from his Passion and Resurrection (Entry into Jerusalem, Crucifixion, Anastasis); and the following three (Ascension, Pentecost and the Koimesis).[1249] Other scenes, like for example the Incredulity, were also employed. This canon,

---

[1244] Demus 1948.
[1245] Ibid, 15-16.
[1246] Kitzinger 1988 and more recently James 1994.
[1247] James 1994, 163.
[1248] Kitzinger 1988, 534-536. In the *Narratio de St. Sophia*, Preger 1901, 74ff, which dates from the eight and ninth centuries and provides an account of the construction of the homonymous church, we find the following passage: 'He <Justinian> also made golden vessels, those for the twelve feasts' Mango 1972, 100. As noted by Kitzinger the notion of twelve feasts must have existed earlier than the eleventh century, Kitzinger 1988, 534 note 3. Weitzmann 1972, 46, believes that it became standardized, more or less in the tenth century and gained greater acceptance in subsequent centuries.
[1249] Kitzinger 1988, 537.

which omits the post-Resurrection appearances, besides the Anastasis, reflects a later tradition, somewhat different from what the Middle Byzantine evidence portrays.

6.1.1 The Incredulity of Thomas in the festal cycle.

One such piece of evidence is a tenth-century Constantinopolitan ivory plaque of the Incredulity of Thomas, now part of the Dumbarton Oaks collection (fig. 60).[1250] The scene, which is rendered 'in a hieratic, centralized composition, with Christ in an isolated frontal position' is set in front of a closed panelled door.[1251] The composition retains the correct number of disciples (eleven), five on the left and six on the right, which was not always the case in the Middle Byzantine period.[1252] An inscription appears divided between the left and right upper corners of the ivory: ΤΩΝ ΘΥΡΩ<Ν> ΚΕ and ΚΛΕΙΣΜΕΝΩ<Ν> ('The doors being shut', John 20:26). This is probably the first time in which this inscription accompanies the scene. In Santa Maria Antiqua, in the Presbytery of Pope John VII, the surviving inscription simply reads: APOSTOLI (apostles);[1253] while on the ampullae, the inscription reads: Ο ΚΣ ΜΟΥ ΚΑΙ Ο ΘΕΟC ΜΟΥ ('My Lord and My God': John 20:29).[1254]

The inscription on the ivory almost certainly reflects liturgical influences. This is evident from the following. In the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia the lection on Thomas' Sunday begins with John 20: 24. Verses twenty-four and twenty-five are not however

---

[1250] Weitzmann 1972, 43-48, pls. XXII, XXIII and colour pl. 4.

[1251] Weitzmann 1972, 43.

[1252] As for example in the contemporary manuscript Saint Petersburg State Library, cod.gr.21 in Morey 1929, 54, fig. 65.

[1253] Nordhagen 1968, 32-33, pl. CXXXIV, IX; for the mosaic see chapters 1.3 and 4.2.1. The Incredulity of Thomas also appears in a drawing of the Old Saint Peter by Grimaldi, in which no inscription appears, Waetzdolt 1964, nos. 933-934, figs. 485-85a.

[1254] See for example the ampullae Monza 9 and Bobbio 9 in Grabar 1958, 25-26, pl. XV and 37, pl. XLII.2 respectively. An identical description appears also on the British Museum ampulla, Engenmann 1973, pl. 9: c, d.

associated with the Incredulity of Thomas, but they are the concluding verses of Christ's Appearance to the Eleven (in the Absence of Thomas).[1255] According to Weitzmann 'there is a tendency to illustrate, if possible the very beginning of the pericope'.[1256] This is evident in the eleventh-century lectionary Dionysiou 587 of Mount Athos. In this profusely illustrated manuscript, which reveals a complexity in its stylistic expression,[1257] the accompanying miniature for Thomas's Sunday is not the Incredulity but the Appearance of Christ to the Eleven.[1258] The miniaturist, probably influenced by verse twenty-four, opted to depict the Appearance of Christ to the Eleven and not the Incredulity of Thomas, which is described in detail later on, and was associated with the feast of the day which later came to be called Thomas' Sunday.

It is possible then that the first line of the lection influences not only the iconography but also the accompanying inscription. However verse twenty-four makes no reference to the words 'the doors being shut'. These are cited on verse twenty-six which renders the hypothesis void. Nevertheless, the Jerusalem Lectionary begins the lection on Thomas' Sunday with verse twenty-six.[1259] The reason for this discrepancy between Constantinople and Jerusalem lies in liturgical practises. The Jerusalem Lectionary by beginning with verse twenty-six not only excludes those details that are not associated with the Incredulity, but also preserves the chronology of the Gospel: 'And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them; then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you'. It becomes apparent that the Jerusalem Lectionary by beginning its reading on

---

[1255] Mateos 1963, II: 96-97 and note 2.
[1256] Weitzmann 1980, VI: 96.
[1257] Mouriki 1980-81, 90.
[1258] Fol. 14ᵛ in Pelekanides et al. 1980, pl. 199. See also Walter 1991-92, 136
[1259] Tarchnischvili 1959, 116.

Thomas' Sunday with verse twenty-six, creates the allusion that the feast and the

Gospel episode unfold in real time, that is, eight days later.

Not far from Jerusalem, in the church of the Nativity (AD 1169) in Bethlehem (fig.

61), the mosaic inscription that accompanies the Incredulity of Thomas reads: 'Pax

Vobis' (John 20: 26).[1260] However, Quaresmius, a seventeenth-century traveller,

recorded in 1626 the following Latin inscription: IANUIS CLAUSIS, which

corresponds with the Greek, ΤΩΝ ΘΥΡΩΝ ΚΕΚΛΕΙΣΜΕΝΩΝ ('The doors being

shut': John 20:26).[1261] Both inscriptions, that is, 'Peace be unto you' and 'The doors

being shut', derive from verse twenty-six. The oldest, however, as recorded by

Quaresmius, is the latter, which most probably dates from the original decoration of

the church. In the treatise *On the Ceremonies*, a special acclamation was chanted

during Thomas' Sunday, by the Veneti (Blues), which also incorporates the exact

same quotation that appears on the Dumbarton Oaks ivory: 'the doors being shut'.[1262]

Evidently this inscription was by far the most appropriate to accompany the

Incredulity of Thomas.

To return to the ivory, Weitzmann argues that the Dumbarton Oaks Incredulity

belongs to the same group as three more ivories: a plaque in the State Museum in

Berlin with the Raising of Lazaros; a Koimesis in the Museum of Fine Arts in

Houston; and a Nativity and Annunciation plaque in the British Museum.[1263] The four

---

[1260] Harvey 1910, pl. 11.

[1261] The Latin passage reads: "et post dies octo iterum erant discipuli eius intus et Thomas cum eis venit Iesus *ianuis clausis* et stetit in medio et dixit pax vobis' (John 20: 26); Harvey et al. 1910, 45.

[1262] Constantine VII, *Book of the Ceremonies* in Vogt 1935, I: 44. Of course this could be a coincidence, but since neither the quotations 'My Lord and my God' so typical on the ampullae, nor 'Peace be unto you' that now accompanies the Nativity church mosaic appear, it could demonstrate that this particular quotation shared some popularity also among the Constantinopolitan populace.

[1263] Weitzmann 1972, 45. For an illustration of the four plaques together see Evans and Wixom 1997; pls 94 a-b.

ivories, along with eight more, were purportedly mounted on a wooden panel in order to create a twelve feasts icon.[1264] Although no tenth-century icon of this type survives with separately carved panels fastened to a core, the common physical qualities argue in favour of a twelve feast cycle.[1265] According to Weitzmann's reconstruction, the Incredulity takes the place of the Ascension, which according to the same scholar, is also the case at Hosios Lukas and Daphni.[1266]

Another ivory, a diptych from Saint Petersburg, dated between the late tenth and early eleventh centuries,[1267] depicts in three rows a twelve feast cycle, inspired by the Gospel of Luke.[1268] The scenes are: the Annunciation, the Visitation, the Nativity and the Presentation in the Temple in the upper register; the Baptism, the Transfiguration, the Entry into Jerusalem and the Crucifixion in the middle register; and the Anastasis, the Incredulity of Thomas, the Ascension and the Pentecost in the lower register. In the Incredulity panel the scene retains the hieratic and centralized character of the Dumbarton Oaks ivory. Christ is depicted on a podium, flanked by the correct number of disciples, headed by Peter and Paul. The latter apostle is of course an erratum since Paul became Christ's disciple long after this incident took place. The artist's deliberate choice to include Paul comes as no surprise to us. Already in the fourth century Augustine complained about the non-canonical inclusion of Paul in scenes

---

[1264] Weitzmann 1972, 46, fig. b.

[1265] Evans and Wixom 1997, 148, no. 94. Nevertheless, this could have also been a narrative cycle.

[1266] Weitzmann 1972, 46; Weitzmann 1980, VI: 96. For the churches see the following discussion.

[1267] Piatinsky et al. 2000, B48; Evans and Wixom 1997, 144, no. 91; Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1979, II: 60, no.122 date the ivory in the tenth century and as part of the 'Romanos group' (however in the introduction of the 1979 reprint, Weitzmann attributes the Romanos ivory to Romanos IV, instead of Romanos II); Bank 1966, no. 140 dates the ivory between the tenth and eleventh centuries. Cutler 1998, I: 8 supports a tenth century date for the Romanos ivory. Kalavrezou 1977, 319 and passim, dates the Romanos ivory to the third quarter of the eleventh century.

[1268] Evans and Wixom 1997, 144, no. 91; however the Incredulity of Thomas is not mentioned in the Gospel of Luke; the event described at 24: 36 is the Appearance to the Eleven combined with the Mission of the Apostles; also the Anastasis does not belong to the Gospel narrative. In addition the author of the entry believes that the Pentecost, which is depicted in the last compartment, is also called the Mission of the Apostles. The latter however is a separate event described in the Gospels, while the Pentecost is described in the Acts 2: 1-13.

where Christ is flanked by his Apostles. The presence here of Paul heading the group

of the Apostles in the Incredulity, reveals how a long iconographic tradition could

bypass the authority of the Gospels.

The inscription is again taken from John 20:26 and reads: ΤΟΝ ΘΥΡΩΝ

ΚΕΚΛΙΣΜΕΝΟΝ, in an unusual orthography, where the word ΘΥΡΩΝ (doors) is

correctly written with omega since it is plural, while the adjective ΤΟΝ (the) and the

past participle ΚΕΚΛΙΣΜΕΝΟΝ (being shut), are written with omicron.[1269] What is

however significant is the fact that no doors are depicted, which raises the question of

why the artist did not opt for an inscription that would have turned the viewer's

attention, not to the missing doors, but to Christ or Thomas instead?[1270] The answer

probably lies in the fact that in the tenth century, this had become the standard

inscription to accompany the scene.[1271] No other example of the Middle Byzantine

period conceals the doors from the viewers. Indeed the inscription appears in all other

examples in which one is still visible.[1272]

The importance of the inscription, which draws the attention to the closed doors, lies

in the message it conveys. Thomas' touch in the Incredulity, points to Christ's

humanity, and while this was an important argument during Iconoclasm, in the tenth

century, Christ's two perfect natures had to be reaffirmed. The closed doors and the

---

[1269] Also the past participle is written with iota instead of epsilon-iota.

[1270] Such as the inscription 'My Lord and my God', which accompanies all pre-Iconoclast examples, or 'Peace be Unto You'. This is also related to the literacy level of the expected viewer.

[1271] The unusual orthography of this and other scenes from the Saint Petersburg ivory, demonstrates that the artist did not use a lectionary as a source for neither the iconography, nor the orthography, as it would have been easy for him to copy the correct writing from the text of the book. It is as if the artist remembered the titles from memory or was comminucated them orally.

[1272] These include both the *katholikon* and the crypt of Hosios Lukas. Unofortunately the upper part of the mosaic in Daphni is destroyed but its close association with the scene at Hosios Lukas makes it probable that this inscription was included.

inscription conveyed that exact message: that Christ's enters through the doors being shut as a God, but at the same time lets Thomas touch him to affirm his human nature.

The absence of the Raising of Lazaros and the presence of the Visitation and the Incredulity of Thomas raise the question whether the ivory was meant to represent the major feasts.[1273] Although there is no indication that a twelve feast cycle was sanctioned this early, and keeping in mind that this is the second example in which the Incredulity seems to form part of a cycle, it seems likely that the Saint Petersburg ivory reflects an early version of a feast cycle. In fact an epigram *On the Dodekaorton* (On the Twelve Feasts) by Gregory of Corinth demonstrates that the Incredulity formed part of a twelve feast cycle as late as the early thirteenth century.[1274] Gregory's epigram describes the following scenes in this order: the Nativity, the Baptism, the Presentation in the Temple, the Annunciation, the Entry into Jerusalem, the Crucifixion, the Deposition, the Pentecost, the Anastasis, the Incredulity of Thomas, the Ascension, and the Transfiguration.[1275]

Two manuscripts preserve an identical collection of epigrams, dated ca. 1100, which once more include the Incredulity of Thomas.[1276] The title of this collection is inscribed: 'Various epigrams on the holy icons of the feasts'.[1277] The association between the Incredulity of Thomas and the feast is corroborated by the title of the epigram, which reads: *Antipascha* (After Easter). The author titled the epigram by

---

[1273] Evans and Wixom 1997, 144, no. 91.

[1274] For the epigram with a German translation and commentary see Hunger 1982, 637-651. For a comparative presentation of the scenes with other epigrams, see the Appendix in Hörandner 1994, 133. For Gregory of Corinth as a grammarian see Robins 1993, 163 ff.

[1275] The irregular chronology of the scenes appears, albeit abridged, in another epigram from a manuscript preserved in the Ecumenical Patriarchate (Istanbul, Patr.cod.3), see the Appendix in Hörandner 1994, 133.

[1276] Hörandner 1992, 107-115.

[1277] Ibid, 108; here however, not only the major episodes of Christ's life appear, but also his miracles.

using the form which appears in the *typika*, instead of using the inscription 'The doors

being shut' that appears in the surviving tenth- and eleventh-century evidence,

emphasizing the liturgical association of the epigram.

In another epigram written by John Mauropous, the eleventh century bishop of

Euchaita, and titled 'To the great icons of the feasts', the following ten scenes are

mentioned: Nativity, Baptism, Transfiguration, Raising of Lazaros, Entry into

Jerusalem, Crucifixion, Anastasis, Incredulity of Thomas, Ascension, and

Pentecost.[1278] The word feast seems to appear in the title of all epigram collections in

which the Incredulity is mentioned. Evidently, the Incredulity of Thomas, was in the

minds of Middle Byzantine authors, a feast. But no mention is made on any other

scenes from the post-Resurrection cycle except for the Anastasis. On one rare

occasion an epigram ca. 1300, is dedicated to the Miraculous Draught of Fishes.[1279]

Besides ivories and epigrams, eleventh- and twelfth-century monumental art includes

in its iconography the Incredulity of Thomas. The scene appears in the crypt and the

katholikon of Hosios Lukas, the *katholikon* of Daphni, and the church of the Nativity

in Bethlehem, all associated with metropolitan art, and in some cases with imperial

patronage.

The decoration of the crypt at Hosios Lukas with scenes from Christ's passion and

resurrection in eight lunettes around the walls is relevant to its use as a burial

---

[1278] The epigram survives in the manuscript Vaticanus Graecus 676, published by Lagarde 1882, 2-8. Hörandner 1994, 133 in his Appendix fails to realize that the *Pselapheses* (Palpation) is an alternative title used for the Incredulity of Thomas and distinguishes the two. The title *Pselapheses* appears on a marginal miniature on the twelfth-century manuscript of the *Liturgical Homilies* of Gregory Nazianzenos, Athos, Vatopedi 107, Galavaris 1969, fig. 318.

[1279] Hörandner 1994, 119-121 and 131-32 who also notes, that this is 'a subject rare in poetry'.

chapel.[1280] This is the only post-Iconoclast example in which the Incredulity of Thomas is not associated with a festal cycle. The Incredulity occupies the whole lunette (fig. 62) while the Maries at the Tomb which is also depicted in the crypt, shares its lunette with the Entombment, with the latter being a rare version combined with the Lamentation.[1281] The Entombment and the Maries in such proximity appear in other Middle Byzantine cycles especially from Cappadocia, where the two scenes often precede the Anastasis.[1282] Cappadocian cycles tend to be narrative, so is the cycle in the crypt of Hosios Lukas;[1283] also both show a preference on scenes from Christ's passion and resurrection, but whether these similarities were based on their monastic character, is difficult to say.

While the Maries and the Entombment feature in various cycles of the Middle Byzantine period, the presence of the Maries and the Incredulity as the sole references to the Resurrection appear at Hosios Lukas for only the second time, the first being the British Museum ivory plaques (ca. 400).[1284] Exactly because the existence of these two scenes outside lengthy post-Resurrection cycles is rare, their presence does not seem to follow an established tradition. Since the crypt was used as a funeral chapel and having in mind the way that the Maries scene shares the same space with the Entombment, it is likely that the Maries was chosen for its sepulchral connotations,

---

[1280] Connor 1991, 57. The fresco decoration is dated to the eleventh century, since a fresco of Saint Nikon who died in 997, appears in the decoration, Oikonomides 1992, 249 note 20.

[1281] Connor 1991, 37-39. Chatzidaki 1997, 95. The postures of fear of the two Maries in the fresco from the crypt, find their closest parallel in two tenth-century examples, the manuscript from Saint Petersburg (State Library, cod.gr.21) and the Milan ivory. The emphasis on emotions is most often visible in narrative cycles after Iconoclasm. This is further corroborated by the Incredulity of Thomas in the crypt, which differs substantially from the 'festal' examples from the katholikon above.

[1282] Such as Kilişlar Kilise, Çavusin, Tokali Kilise, Elmali Kilise in Cappadocia and Sant'Urbano alla Caffarella in Italy. Connor 1991, 39 is right to assert that the two scenes do not appear elsewhere combined into one, but the Cappadocian churches portray the two scenes in a continuous undivided band.

[1283] Epstein 1986, 17; Rodley 1983, 325.

[1284] The two scenes appear in a 'non-canonical' *dodekaorton* in the church of Saint Nicholas at Kintsvisi in Georgia (early thirteenth century), Kitzinger 1988, 542, note 35; Eastmond 1998, 141.

rather than for being a synonym for the resurrection. Chatzidaki, however, points out that we might assume that the Maries 'despite not being fully developed, replaces the Anastasis, which is missing from the crypt cycle'.[1285] It is however unlikely that the combination of the Maries, with the Lamentation-Entombment, was meant to *replace* anything. The absence of the Anastasis from the crypt remains puzzling, especially when one considers the prominence is given in the narthex above. However, this is not the only funerary church in which the Anastasis is omitted; neither Constantine Rhodios nor Mesarites mention the scene in their *ekphrases* of the Church of the Holy Apostles.

The Incredulity of Thomas remains the sole reference to Christ's resurrection in the crypt. Its eminence is also reflected by the fact that the Incredulity, unlike the Maries and the Anastasis, appears both in the crypt and in the *katholikon* above. The fresco underwent some changes visible today in Christ's gesture. The artist originally followed the version of the *katholikon* where Christ raises his hand to show Thomas his wound, but later redrew the arm in the position it appears today, that is, with Christ pulling Thomas' right hand towards his wound.[1286] Connor sees similarities between Christ's gesture in the Incredulity fresco from the crypt and the Anastasis mosaic from the *katholikon*.[1287] This raises the question whether the alteration was made at a later point when the occupants of the crypt felt that the absence of the Anastasis should be compensated for without repainting any of the already existing scenes.

[1285] Chatzidaki 1997, 75.
[1286] Ibid, 75. This detail has gone unnoticed by Connor 1991.
[1287] Connor 1991, 39-40. The same posture appears in the twelfth-century mosaic of the Incredulity from the Nativity church in Bethlehem, Harvey 1910, pl. 11.

The *katholikon* was most probably completed in 1011, when the relics of Hosios Lukas were translated there by the abbot of the monastery, Philotheos.[1288] The monastery benefited from some imperial donation during the reign of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-1054).[1289] The monastery also had links with the Theban aristocracy, which was in direct contact with the Constantinopolitan court.[1290] The mosaics decoration of the narthex, to which the Incredulity belongs, exemplifies the style of the whole church.[1291]

On the four broad squinches under the main dome of the church, the following four scenes are depicted: the Nativity, the Presentation in the Temple, the Baptism, and the Annunciation, which now survives as a seventeenth-century fresco. Chatzidaki believes that these four scenes were inspired by the 'Great Feasts', while the Anastasis, the Crucifixion, the Washing of the Feet and the Incredulity of Thomas (fig. 63), which are depicted in the narthex, are related to Christ's passion and resurrection.[1292] According to Kitzinger's model though, the Anastasis and the Crucifixion are common occurrences in the twelve feast cycle, while the presence of the Washing of the Feet and the Incredulity of Thomas in the mosaic decoration of Hosios Lukas is not incidental. Both appear in Daphni, while the Washing of the Feet is also depicted in Nea Moni and was one of the scenes, 'which most frequently were added to (or substituted for) those of the regular *Dodekaorton*'.[1293] Thus there is no reason to rule out that these eight scenes (nine with the Ascension) were inspired by

---

[1288] Chatzidaki, 12; the abbot can be recognised in portraits in the *katholikon* and in the crypt by inscriptions and the consistency with which his facial characteristics are copied.

[1289] Chatzidaki 1997, 10. This emperor is also associated with Nea Moni, Mouriki 1980-81, 88 and Maguire 1992, 213.

[1290] Chatzidaki 1997, 11-12. See also Connor 1991, 121 and passim; Oikonomides 1992.

[1291] Mouriki 1980-81, 83.

[1292] Chatzidaki 1997, 19.

[1293] Kitzinger 1988, 542, who also notes that the Washing of the Feet is a common occurrence in the narthexes of Hosios Lukas and Daphni.

the great feasts of the liturgical calendar.[1294] Furthermore, most of the mosaics

suppress the background of the scene so to emphasize 'not the narrative of the event

but its significance'.[1295]

Another mosaic decoration includes in its repertoire the Incredulity. Although the

patronage of the *katholikon* at Daphni remains enigmatic, the decoration is usually

dated to the end of the eleventh century,[1296] when Daphni was a well-furnished

monastery.[1297] According to Mouriki, the metropolitan origins of the mosaics of

Daphni cannot be disputed, while the importance of these mosaics 'as reflections of

contemporary monumental painting in Constantinople, of which so little is preserved'

is hardly necessary to stress.[1298] The mosaic decoration is again divided between the

narthex and the main church, but the cycle of Christ's life concludes not with the

Ascension or the Pentecost but with the Incredulity of Thomas (fig. 51).[1299]

To end a Christological cycle with a post-Resurrection appearance was a feature

common in pre-Iconoclast art. The marriage rings and the censers, discussed in a

previous chapter and associated with pilgrimage art, end their cycles with the Maries

and in some instances with the Chairete.[1300] In Sant' Apollinare Nuovo the cycle

concludes with the Road to Emmaus, while in the baptistery of San Giovanni the

---

[1294] The same however cannot be said for the distribution of saints in the same church. For this argument see James 1994, 165, note 9 who also notes that there is an 'increasing reluctance to see the scenes from the life of Christ as making up a festival cycle according to the liturgical calendar'.

[1295] Chatzidaki 1997, 28.

[1296] Mouriki 1980-81, 94.

[1297] Diez and Demus 1931, 109: the authors cite the *Vita of Meletios the Younger* a local saint. See also Mouriki 1980-81, 94.

[1298] Mouriki 1980-81, 98-99.

[1299] Kitzinger 545, note 46. The Dormition of the Virgin is also depicted but is unrelated to the Christological cycle.

[1300] Ibid 555. The same applies to other pre-Iconoclast cycles such as that in the Oratory of John VII, where the cycle finishes again with the Maries: Kartsonis 1986, 78. See also chapter 1.2.

cycle ends with the Miraculous Draught of Fishes.[1301] If we accept a ninth-century

date for the decoration of the Holy Apostles and Açikel Ağa Kilise, then it becomes

apparent that this feature survives in the period directly after Iconoclasm.[1302] The

Holy Apostles concludes with the Miraculous Draught of Fishes while Açikel Ağa

Kilise with the Chairete.[1303] This demonstrates that to conclude a Christological cycle

with a post-Resurrection scene was not uncommon neither in pre- nor in post-

Iconoclast cycles. The Incredulity of Thomas in Daphni by bringing Christ's cycles to

an end followed this same practise.[1304]

The cycle at Daphni was in all probability not inspired by a *dodekaorton*, and to

answer Kitzinger's question on where one draws a line, Daphni is probably one such

place.[1305] The fact that the decoration comprises an impressive number of scenes,[1306]

and the fact that the scenes from the Virgin's infancy in the narthex 'shades over from

subsidiary feast cycle to straight narrative',[1307] point in that direction. This, however,

does not exclude the possibility that some scenes might have been included because

of their festal connotations. In fact, in the main church and among the scenes on flat

surfaces, the following were accorded special importance because of their size and

refinement of execution; these are: the Entry into Jerusalem; the Crucifixion; the

Anastasis; the Incredulity of Thomas; and the Dormition of the Virgin.[1308] This

---

[1301] For references see earlier chapters.
[1302] See the discussion in Wharton-Epstein 1982 and Thierry 1968 respectively.
[1303] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXXV in Downey 1954, 889 and 913 and Thierry 1968, 69 respectively.
[1304] Prior to Daphni, the Incredulity did not bring any Christological cycle to an end. It concludes, though, a passion and resurrection cycle on the British Museum ivory plaques, if we admit that no other plaques existed. Furthermore, the presence of the Dormition of the Virgin in which Christ is again present, might indicate that the Incredulity was not the last scene but the penultimate one as at Sant' Apollinare Nuovo.
[1305] Kitzinger 1988, 543: 'The question is where to draw the line'.
[1306] Mouriki 1980-81, 96
[1307] Kitzinger 1988, 544.
[1308] Mouriki 1980-81, 96.

special arrangement demonstrates that not all the scenes were accorded the same attention. Consequently this must have been based on fact that these scenes were a common occurrence in other feast cycles, and their presence here reflects, I believe, their festal qualities, and to some extent the interest of the donors and/or occupants of the monastery.[1309]

Another mosaic decoration, however, on the island of Chios, in Nea Moni, excludes the Incredulity. The imperial patronage of Constantine IX Monomachos (1042-1054) and the proximity to the capital, make the scene's absence from the mosaic decoration more conspicuous.[1310] The scene is however present in the mosaic decoration of the Nativity church, the decoration of which is dated by an inscription to 1169,[1311] which is considered to be the work of Constantinopolitan mosaicists sent by Manuel Komnenos (1145-1180) to Jerusalem.[1312]

Four subjects from the New Testament survive in the transepts; two almost complete – the Incredulity and the Entry into Jerusalem – and two fragmentary – the Ascension and the Transfiguration.[1313] The popularity of these scenes is well attested from other earlier and contemporary cycles, while the presence of the Incredulity in particular seems to be an extension of the tenth- and eleventh-century tradition and should not be seen as unrelated to the presence of Constantinopolitan craftsmen. Hunt, who

---

[1309] It should be noted however that the monks of Cappadocia, showed no interest at all in the Incredulity of Thomas. For this discussion see chapter 6.2. Of course this is not to say that they only occupants of the Cappadocian churches were monks; for this argument see Ousterhout 2005.
[1310] Ibid, 88. Maguire 1992, 213 speaks of imperial perspective and also of the fact that some monks were closely involved with the court in Constantinople.
[1311] The Latin inscription can be seen as serving the needs of a Latin clergy, but the three Maries composition in the Melisenda Psalter is not indicative of Western influences, at least not direct ones, but copies in my opinion the mosaic from the Anastasis church, after the restoration by the Crusaders; for this point see chapter 6.2
[1312] Harvey et al. 1910, 49-50. Hunt 1991, 75 argues for autochthonous artists.
[1313] Harvey et al. 1910, 31.

challenges the presence of the latter, speaks instead of indigenous craftsmen.[1314]

Whatever the case may be, the imperial patronage of Manuel Komnenos, who is

depicted in the mosaics cannot be disputed.[1315]

The Incredulity mosaic appears in the transept of the East wall (fig. 61).[1316] Hunt

believes that the iconography diverges from Byzantine tradition because Christ pulls

Thomas' hand towards his wound.[1317] Nevertheless, this gesture appears on a

marginal miniature from the contemporary manuscript of Gregory's liturgical

homilies,[1318] on ampullae (for example Monza 9 [fig. 4], Dumbarton Oaks),[1319] in the

crypt of Hosios Lukas, discussed above, and in the tenth-century Gospels manuscript

Saint Petersburg, State Library cod.gr.21.[1320]

The presence of the few surviving scenes from the New Testament could be justified

by their importance as feast icons. Hunt has argued that the juxtaposition between

scenes from Christ's birth and passion in the Nativity church was employed in order

to promote in visual form, the two natures of Christ, and is related to the efforts made

by Manuel to reconcile the monophysite churches.[1321] It is true that Christ's dual

nature is visible in the mosaic of the Incredulity of Thomas, since the words and

actions of the two *personae* involved in the scene demonstrate that Christ after the

---

[1314] Hunt 1991, 75-76, believes that the trilingual inscriptions (Latin, Greek, Syriac) respond to the multicultural milieu of twelfth-century Jerusalem.

[1315] Ibid, 78, the presence of the emperor amongst the mosaic decorations of the Nativity church is explained as 'to sanction the emperor's rights as both imperial caretaker of one of the holiest shrines in Christendom and as the arbiter of Orthodoxy'

[1316] Harvey 1910, pl. 11; Hunt 1991, fig. 11.

[1317] Hunt 1991, 81.

[1318] Saint Catherine's Monastery, Sinait.gr.339 in Galavaris 1969, 78, fig. 380; the author cites other illustrated copies such as the one from Moscow, Historical Museum cod.146 (11th c.).

[1319] For the British Museum example see Engenmann 1973, table 9: c-d and for Monza 9 see Dalton 1911, fig 39 and Grabar 1958, pl. XV.

[1320] For Hosios Lukas see Chatzidaki 1997, fig. 84; for the manuscript see Morey 1929, fig. 65.

[1321] Hunt 1991, 78 and 82.

resurrection was both a man and a God.[1322] The monophysite argument is difficult to sustain, since, as in the case of Sant' Apollinare, the scenes could have been interpreted by the present occupants in order to correspond with their own version of theology.

But the choice of this post-Resurrection appearance should not be seen only as related to contemporary theological debates or current trends in Constantinople. Pseudo-Epiphanios (7th c.), in a sermon on Holy Saturday, drew a clear parallel between Christ's birth in Bethlehem and his re-birth in Jerusalem.[1323] The association becomes clearer in a homily by Theodotos of Ankara dedicated to the nativity of Christ.[1324] . Theodotos believes that Christ's birth through a virgin's womb finds its closest parallel with the entrance of Christ through 'the doors being shut', in the Incredulity of Thomas.[1325] This association dates back in the apocryphal *Protoevangelion of James*, in which the midwife Salome employs the exact same mannerisms and words of Thomas. Salome, unable to believe the miracle of virgin birth – like Thomas had troubles believing in the resurrection of Christ –, states: 'As the Lord my God lives, unless I put my finger and test her condition I will not believe'.[1326] The similarity to Thomas' words from John 20: 25 and 28 is instantly visible.[1327] The mosaic panel of the Incredulity of Thomas in the Nativity church reflects, between others, a theological exegesis and shows that the scene was kept in high esteem well into the twelfth century.

[1322] See chapter 3.1.

[1323] Pseudo-Epiphanios, *Homily II*: *On Holy Saturday*, PG 43, col. 444: Νυκτι Χριστος εν Βηθλεεμ γενναται, νυκτι και εν τη Σιων αναγενναται. The two events, the Nativity and Christ's appearance take place during the night.

[1324] Theodotos of Ankara, *First Homily on the Nativity of the Lord*, PG 77, cols 1349-1370.

[1325] Ibid, col. 1352.

[1326] *The Protoevangelium of James* 19.3-20.1 in Wilson 1973, 384-385.

[1327] John 20: 25: 'and place my finger in the mark… I will not believe'; 28: 'My Lord and my God'.

The inclusion of the Incredulity of Thomas in a festal cycle is justified in a variety of ways. The scene's significance lies in its long history in patristic thought, exegesis, liturgy and art. To begin from the latter, while the early versions of the scene were limited to two or three *personae,* the fully developed scene that appears in Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, demonstrates that scene gained a 'monumental quality, similar to most representations of the Mission of the Apostles'.[1328] The symmetrical arrangement and to a lesser extent, the architectural background, offer a monumental quality absent from other post-Resurrection appearances such is for example the Maries. Early efforts to create a symmetrical version, like the one on the British Museum ivory (fig. 21) or on a bronze ring from the Royal Ontario Museum,[1329] never found a foothold in Byzantine art. Another post-Resurrection scene, the Chairete, with its two versions (symmetrical and asymmetrical) was a less favourable candidate,[1330] and in fact the few surviving monumental examples of the scene prefer the asymmetrical-narrative version.[1331]

In terms of the liturgy, it is true that both the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia and Constantine's treatise *On the Ceremonies* do not describe the feast of Thomas' Sunday in much detail.[1332] In fact, the name used to signify the day in both documents is Sunday 'After Easter' (Antipascha), thus the designation Thomas's Sunday had not yet entered official ecclesiastical or administrative documents. Even in the much later *Typikon* of Messina (1131), the second Sunday after Easter, is again called Sunday

---

[1328] Weitzmann 1980, 96.
[1329] The ring is currently exhibited in the Joey and Toby Tanenbaum Gallery of Byzantine Art, at the Royal Ontario Museum.
[1330] A detailed discussion follows below.
[1331] Like in Açikel Ağa Kilise, Thierry 1968, 57, fig.18.
[1332] Mateos 1963, I: 108-09; Constantine VII, *Book of the Ceremonies* in Vogt 1935, I: 44-45.

after Easter.[1333] However, the Gospel lection and the hymns of the day were dedicated

on Thomas' incredulity, and while official ecclesiastical documents insisted upon

labelling the day Sunday after Easter, on a twelfth-century manuscript, which

preserves Romanos' *kontakion* of the day, the title Thomas' Sunday appears.[1334] The

first reference to the title 'Thomas' Sunday' comes from a thirteenth-century

manuscript, which preserves a combined Constantinopolitan and a Jerusalem

typikon.[1335] The appellation Sunday after Easter, however, which was the most

common at least in official ecclesiastical document, has a specific importance since it

links Thomas' Sunday with Easter Sunday, and thus with the most important feast of

the Christian calendar. The Gospel reading of the day, which begins with verse

twenty-four, also links the two feasts in terms of narrative.[1336] Thus the importance of

the scene should not be seen as unrelated to its connection with Easter.

While, however, the feast is associated with Easter, the hymns of the day reflect a

different interest. From the *Typikon* of Messina, we learn that on Thomas' Sunday:

'we do not chant any of the resurrection hymns of the *octaechos*, but rather *idiomela*

stichera of the feast'.[1337] The Greek word used is *eorti* which is translated into

English as 'feast'. Thomas' Sunday, in antithesis to the Myrrh-bearers' Sunday, has

its own hymns. The feast's relative importance is also stressed in the treatise *On the*

Ceremonies where a special ceremony is described as taking place every year with the

---

[1333] Arranz 1969, 256.
[1334] De Matons 1981, vol.5: 28-29. Other titles were given to *Antipascha*, such as New Sunday. This signifies, that more than one terms were in use at the same time.
[1335] Dmitrievskij 1965², 72.
[1336] See the discussion above.
[1337] Arranz 1969, 256.

participation of the emperor and the aristocracy, something that cannot be said for the

Myrrh-bearers Sunday. [1338]

As discussed in a previous chapter, Thomas' Incredulity was used in anti-heretical

literature. Athanasios of Alexandria employs the Incredulity against the Arians, as

proof of Christ's divinity,[1339] while Epiphanios employs it to prove his humanity;[1340]

Furthermore, Ambrose utilizes it to demonstrate that Christ was one Lord and one

God.[1341] The same use is recorded in Anastasios Sinaites' *Hodegos*: 'Thomas

recognizing in him the two natures united cried out saying: My Lord and my God'

(John 20: 28).[1342]

Besides its anti-heretical use, many sermons and orations turn Thomas' lack of faith

into enquiry. One such view was expressed by Athanasios of Alexandria in his

Sermon on Holy Easter: 'He did not as much dissolve Thomas disbelief but rather

fulfilled his wish.'[1343] The author very eloquently turns Thomas' disbelief into desire

and adds that Thomas touches Christ's wounds not for his own sake but for us all.[1344]

[1338] Mateos 1963, I: 108-09; Constantine VII, *Book of the Ceremonies* in Vogt 1935, I: 44-45. The title Myrrh-bearers Sunday is in used today by the church but neither the *typikon* of Hagia Sophia nor the *typikon* of Messina give any title for the day, but in the latter, the majority of the hymns and the *kanon*, were dedicated to the Myrrh-bearers.

[1339] Athanasios of Alexandria, *Against the Arians*, NPNF 14, 361 and 447; and also in a number of letters e.g. *LIX to Epictetus* and *LXI to Maximus*, 574 and 578, respectively.

[1340] Epiphanios, *Ancoratus*, PG 41, col. 184.

[1341] Ambrose of Milan, *On the Holy Spirit (To the Emperor Gratian)*, NPNF 10, 150. Also in Ambrose's work *On the Belief in the Resurrection*, 183, the author quotes Christ's words from the Incredulity of Thomas: "Blessed [are] those who have not seen and [yet] have believed" (John, 20: 29).

[1342] Anastasios Sinaites, *Hodegos*, PG 89, col. 117.

[1343] Athanasios of Alexandria, *Sermon on Holy Easter*, PG 28, col. 1084: "Μαλλον δε ου την απιστίαν έλυσεν, αλλά την επιθυμίαν ενέπλησε". See also Severos of Antioch, *Seventy-seventh Homily on Easter*, PO 16, col. 812.

[1344] Athanasios of Alexandria, *Sermon on Holy Easter*, PG 28, col. 1085. See also Ammonios of Alexandria (5th c.), *Exposition on the Gospel of John*, PG 85, col. 1520, where the author states that Thomas wanted to touch Christ not because he was incredulous but because he felt sorry for not being there in the first place. Maximos the Confessor, *On Various Difficult Points*, PG 91 col. 1381, says that Thomas nickname, 'Δίδυμος', the Twin, derives from his hesitating double nature, and concludes that Thomas is every hesitating man. The same view is expressed by Theophylaktos of Ohrid (12th c.) in his *Exposition of the Gospel of John*, PG 50 col. 300.

In Pseudo-Epiphanios, Thomas turns from incredulous to 'praiseworthily curious'.[1345] From the early Christian years, the reluctance of the Church Fathers to rebuke Thomas for his incredulity, as opposed to the ease with which they reproach the Maries for their 'common female behaviour', demonstrates the difference in exegetical approach offered by the Church Fathers, for the two afore-mentioned events: the Incredulity and the Maries.

Churches were dedicated to the saint's memory from the early Christian centuries.[1346] The importance of one of his churches in particular, Saint Thomas of Amantios, is signified by the fact that the relics of John Chrysostom were translated there on January 438, before finally being transported to the church of the Holy Apostles.[1347] The imperial connection with this church is evident from the fact that it was used as the burial place of Justin I and his wife Euphemia,[1348] and after it was burnt down, the church was magnificently restored by Leo VI.[1349] This emperor wrote at least two homilies on Thomas,[1350] with one dedicated to the translation of the saint's head, but the homily was delivered by a secretary, since the emperor was occupied.[1351] It was not however common for an emperor to compose and also deliver homilies,[1352] which points both to the piety of Leo VI and also to the special esteem in which he held Thomas, and other saints, such as Mary Magdalene as we saw earlier.

[1345] Pseudo-Epiphanios, *Homily II*: *On Holy Saturday*, PG 42, col. 449.
[1346] Janin 1969, 248-252.
[1347] This information is recorded in Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, *Ecclesiastical History*, PG 144, 1209, and if not true, at least reflects the popularity of the saint in the twelfth century, probably following the establishment of his feast as one of the most important of the church calendar.
[1348] Janin 1969, 249, notes 2-5 with references.
[1349] Antonopoulou 2001, 98, note 11.
[1350] BHG 303, nos.1843-44.
[1351] Antonopoulou 1998, 319.
[1352] De Matons 1973, 191; for the Greek text see Antonopoulou 2001, 98 note 12. BHG 303, no.1844a

The presence of the Incredulity in luxury and expensive media, such as ivories and mosaics, reflects the importance that the scene retained during the Middle Byzantine period, without of course excluding the fact that the scene never lost its importance, since it appeared on ivories and mosaics from the fifth and sixth centuries. The cycles in which the Incredulity forms part were associated with aristocratic and/or imperial patronage, and appear to reflect contemporary Constantinopolitan cycle.

Leo's translation of Thomas' relics in Constantinople in the early tenth century might explain how the scene rose further in importance. However there is another significant association between the feast of Thomas and Constantinople. In an anonymous *typikon* edited by Pitra, the following note exists: 'Wherever you find three embroideries (κεντήματα), the feasts belong to Jerusalem, wherever you find a cross, to the Studios <monastery>'.[1353] At the beginning of each feast one of the two signs was painted; in the case of Thomas' feast on the 6th of October, a cross was depicted. It is then possible, that the celebration of Thomas' feast was established first in Constantinople and then it was dispersed to the rest of the empire. It is not clear, however, why it was necessary for the scribe or its patron to distinguish between the two traditions: Constantinople (Studite) and Jerusalem (Saint Sabas). What can be securely asserted though, is that Thomas' feast was connected to the monastery of Studios and thus to a Constantinopolitan tradition.

In the surviving cycles discussed above, the Incredulity of Thomas is accompanied by no other post-Resurrection scene aside from the Anastasis. This raises the question of the relation between the two scenes. If the cycles were orientated towards the

---

[1353]*Typikon of Studios and Jerusalem*, Pitra 1858, 452-453.

narrative, then both scenes commemorate Christ's resurrection. If however the cycles were inspired by the great feasts of the church, then the Anastasis undoubtedly commemorated Easter, while the Incredulity commemorated Thomas' Sunday, since it is during that day that the Gospel lection, which described the event, was read and the hymns that emphasised it, were sung. The latter explanation seems more likely. Thus, in these cycles the Incredulity of Thomas is transformed from a simple post-Resurrection scene to a feast icon. This association is further corroborated by the various epigrams discussed above. The same could be said about the Anastasis. However, the Incredulity offers something that the former scene does not, a resurrected, tangible and human Christ, who is also a perfect God. The Chairete in the ninth century weighed the argument on Christ's humanity, but after Iconoclasm ceased to be the centre of attention, Christ's perfect natures had to be reasserted, and the Incredulity of Thomas did this perfectly.[1354] Furthermore, the incredulous Thomas, in line with the changing culture of Byzantine art, allowed a more personal involvement of the beholder,[1355] his lack of faith reminded the viewers of their own; and in the words of Theophylaktos of Ohrid (ca.1055-after 1126), Thomas becomes every man and woman.[1356]

In conclusion, while in some instances it is not easy to distinguish between a festal or a narrative cycle, the liturgical importance of Thomas' feast, which is evident from the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia, and Constantine's treatise *On the Ceremonies*, must have played a decisive role in the transformation of the Incredulity of Thomas from a simple narrative scene to a festal icon. This transformation is not unrelated to the long

---

[1354] As reflected in the words of Leo the Great who states that in the Incredulity, "Christ's divine and human nature might be acknowledged to remain still inseparable", NPNF 3: 42.
[1355] Brubaker 1989, 27; Mathews 1995, 12.
[1356] Theophylaktos of Ohrid (12th c.) in his *Exposition of the Gospel of John*, col. 300

history the scene had in anti-heretical literature, theological exegesis and art. Aristocratic and even imperial patronage must have played some role, but whether this reflects the preference of the patrons, or whether the latter were influenced by ongoing trends in Constantinople, is difficult to say. In the discussion on the Chairete that follows, the festal connotations of the Incredulity will become even clearer.

6.1.2 Narrative or festal cycle? The case of the Chairete.

As it was discussed in a previous chapter, directly after Iconoclasm and in the ninth-century in particular, the Chairete features prominent in the arts of Constantinople, where it appears as the sole reference to the resurrection in the church of the Virgin at Pege and the Paris Psalter, and accompanied by other post-Resurrection scenes in the Holy Apostles and probably the church of Zaoutsas. The Chairete provided an example in which a resurrected, human and tangible Christ appears to human witnesses. The scene appears on a tenth-century diptych icon from Sinai. When compared to the Saint Petersburg ivory diptych discussed above, the Chairete 'substitutes' for the Incredulity,[1357] while the Raising of Lazaros and the Koimesis are absent. The absence of the Koimesis from the diptych is according to the Soterious, a sign of antiquity.[1358] In terms of iconography, the Chairete is rendered in the symmetrical-monumental form, with Christ in a frontal position flanked by the two Maries in proskynesis (fig. 64). Some parts of the painting have flaked off, but part of the inscription is still discernible: XAIPE. This in fact could be the whole inscription,

---

[1357] Soteriou 1956-58, 52-55 and pls 39-41.
[1358] Ibid 53.

as this form is preferred instead of the plural XAIPETE, as also in the Paris

Gregory.[1359]

Some difficulties arise with the presence of the Chairete in this cycle. If the icon truly

represents a twelve feast cycle, then the Anastasis scene commemorates Easter and

the Chairete, which follows in the sequence, the Myrrh-bearers' Sunday. The problem

with this interpretation however lies on the fact that the Gospel reading and

subsequently the commemoration of the Chairete, takes place during the Easter vigil,

something attested by the Jerusalem Lectionary and the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia.[1360]

It was not influenced by the morning Gospel (*eothinon*) either, since according to the

Typikon of Messina, the *eothinon* reading for the Myrrh-bearers Sunday was taken

from Luke (24:1), which is unrelated to the Chairete.[1361]

The possibility, however, that the Chairete scene is associated with the Myrrh-bearers

Sunday lies in hymnography. Event though the Gospel reading mentions nothing

about the Chairete, the hymns of the day were taken from the Easter vigil,[1362] and

contained many references to the Chairete. These hymns however, contain references

not only to the Chairete but also to the Maries, and since the second Sunday after

Easter came to be called the Myrrh-bearers' Sunday, the latter scene was a much

better choice. The Maries however, lack the monumental quality offered by a

symmetrical scene, and more importantly an image of the resurrected Christ; these

two considerations, along with the Chairete's popularity in ninth-century art, could

explain the scene's choice for this cycle.

[1359] Brubaker 1999, fig. 7. The inscription appears on Christ's left, next to his head, on both examples.
[1360] Tarchnischvili 1959, 113; Mateos 1963, I: 90-91.
[1361] Arranz 1969, 261; it describes the Maries at the Tomb, instead.
[1362] Ibid, 260.

Another indication of a festal connection comes from the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia,
where on the second Sunday after Easter the memory is commemorated: 'of the
righteous, Joseph of Arimathea and Mary Magdalene and the other <female>
disciples of the Lord'.[1363] Mary Magdalene is separated from the other female
disciples by name, which reflects her comparative importance; the same could be said
about the choice of the Chairete, a scene in which the Magdalene is one of the two
women flanking Christ.

This seems to be corroborated by a marginal miniature from an eleventh-century
manuscript, where a diminutive Chairete accompanies Mark 16: 9-13 (fig. 65).[1364]
The first line of the Gospel reads: 'Now when he rose early on the first day of the
week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene….'. The miniaturist did not opt for a Noli
me Tangere scene, which is mentioned in the text. This is even stranger, since the
figures of the two women and Christ form an initial A, which would have looked far
better with the presence of only one woman and Christ. The same discrepancy
between text and image appears in another miniature from the same manuscript,
where instead of the Magdalene informing Peter and John about Christ's resurrection
(John 20: 1-10), the miniaturist depicts again two women (fig. 66).[1365]

[1363] Mateos 1963, I: 114-115. In modern *eortologia* the caption reads: 'On the same day, the third
Sunday from Pascha, we celebrate the feast of the Myrrhbearers. We also remember Joseph of
Arimatheia, who was a disciple in secret, as well as Nikodemos, the disciple by night'. As noted
already by Mateos 1963, 115, note 3, the name Sunday of the Myrrh-bearers pushed Joseph's name
into second place.
[1364] Mount Athos, Dionusiou 587 fol. 31^r, in Pelekanides 1973-79, pl. 211.
[1365] Ibid, fol. 170^v, pl. 275. The Magdalene however, is depicted alone in the following miniature that
accompanies (John 20: 11-13), which describes the Magdalene's second visit at the Tomb.

It remains however highly unlikely that the Chairete scene from the Sinai diptych meant to commemorate the Myrrh-bearers Sunday.[1366] The latter feast, which was established long after Thomas' Sunday, as the hymnographic evidence discussed elsewhere shows, has no organic association with Easter. The Incredulity, through Christ's first appearance in the absence of Thomas, was not only organically associated with Easter, but was also called *Antipascha* (After Easter). A canon of the Council of Trullo (692) stipulates that Easter celebrations are to be extended to the whole week after Easter, until *Antipascha*.[1367] The Sinai icon most probably celebrates major events from Christ's life in a narrative sequence unrelated to the liturgical calendar, while the pairing of the Anastasis and the Chairete in narrative cycles was quite common in the ninth and tenth centuries.[1368] The following examples offer the opportunity to examine the pairing of the Chairete with the Anastasis, not as two separate feasts of the liturgical calendar, but rather as two scenes of the post-Resurrection cycle, which complement each other.

Executed in the middle of the tenth century in Constantinople, two almost identical ivory plaques now in the Hermitage and Dresden Museums, attest exactly that.[1369] Only two scenes are depicted on these ivories: the Chairete in the upper and the Anastasis in the lower register. The iconography of the Chairete in both ivories

---

[1366] For an opposite view see Morey's 1929, 53, who reconstructed the fragmented lectionary Saint Petersburg, State Library cod.gr.21, where the Maries and the Chairete accompany the Lesson for the Myrrh-bearers Sunday. There is no mention of a special ceremony taking place on the Sunday of the Myrrh-bearers in Constantine's treatise *Book of the Ceremonies*, as opposed to Thomas' Sunday.
[1367] Kartsonis 1986, 63. *Ecumenical Council in Trullo*, Canon 66: 'From the holy day of the Resurrection of Christ our God until the next Lord's day, for a whole week, in the holy churches the faithful ought to be free from labour, rejoicing in Christ with Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs etc.' in NPNF 14, 565. Note here how the feast of Thomas' Sunday is called 'the next Lord's day'.
[1368] See for example Açikel Ağa Kilise in Thierry 1968, 45-57, figs.10-13 and 17-18 and the Milan ivory diptych that follows in discussion.
[1369] For the Dredsen copy see Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: 37, no. 41a and for the State Hermitage ivory see Evans and Wixom 1997, 147-48, no. 93. The almost identical ivories gave rise to suspicions that one of them (Hermitage) might be a forgery, ibid 147, no. 93.

follows the asymmetrical type; Christ appears on the right, holding a scroll with his left hand while with his right, he makes a gesture of benediction towards the two women who appear on the left in deep proskynesis. Behind the women appear two trees: a cypress and a pine.[1370]

Even if we admit that the Hermitage and Dresden ivories belonged to an epistyle, the latter was not based on a liturgical twelve-feast cycle. The presence of the Chairete and the Anastasis indicates that this was a narrative cycle, since no two scenes are employed to commemorate the same feast, in a twelve-feast cycle. Furthermore, in terms of iconography, the Chairete follows the asymmetrical, narrative style which points against a festal cycle. The narrative character of the epistyle is further substantiated by an ivory in the Kestner-Museum in Hanover, which depicts the Crucifixion and the Deposition, and has the same dimensions, style and lettering as the Chairete and Anastasis panels. While the Crucifixion is a scene common in the festal cycle, the Deposition is not.

An iconographic detail of particular interest, since it shows that even in the tenth century the Anastasis had not found its place in a narrative cycle, is the latter's placement occasionally before or after the Chairete. On the two afore-mentioned ivories from the Hermitage and Dresden, the Chairete is depicted in the upper register, thus giving the impression that it precedes the Anastasis, which chronologically does not. However, on the Sinai icon the Anastasis follows the correct chronology since, although the Anastasis is not described in the Gospels, Christ's descent into hell took place in the interim between his death and resurrection. Besides the Sinai icon, two

---

[1370] Ibid, 37. The authors believe that the pine might be an olive tree. However two pines appear also on the Santa Sabina doors.

Byzantine ivory diptychs from Milan and from the treasury of the Cathedral at

Chambéry, along with the fresco from Açikel Ağa Kilise follow the correct

chronology. Such inconsistencies were not however unique. The Milan diptych,

which follows in the discussion, has the same peculiarity on the left leaf, where the

Baptism is depicted before the Presentation in the Temple.

A tenth-century Byzantine ivory diptych, now in the Milan Cathedral (not to be

confused with the ca. 400 ivory of Castello Sforzesco), juxtaposes scenes from

Christ's Nativity and Passion on two panels. The left panel depicts the following

scenes: the Annunciation and the Visitation, undivided on the first register, followed

by the Nativity, Baptism and Presentation in the Temple in the remaining three

registers.[1371] On the right leaf, from top to bottom the following four scenes appear:

the Crucifixion, the Maries at the Tomb, the Resurrection and the Chairete.

The nine scenes are not be associated with the feast cycle since it is apparent that the

emphasis of the ivory lies in the juxtaposition between scenes from Christ's nativity

and passion/resurrection, an association quite common in the ninth century, visible in

such examples as the Martvili Triptych, where the Nativity and the Presentation in the

Temple are juxtaposed with the Anastasis and the Maries at the Tomb;[1372] and in

Açikel Ağa Kilise where the Annunciation, the Nativity and the Presentation in the

Temple are juxtaposed with the Crucifixion, the Anastasis and the Chairete.[1373] The

absence of scenes from Christ's ministry, public life, miracles, as well as the

---

[1371] This ivory diptych was dated by Weitzmann to the tenth century and classified, amongst others, in the Romanos group, however the author understands the difficulties of ascribing an ivory to a certain group: Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: 37-38, no. 42.
[1372] For the Martivili Triptych see Kartsonis 1986, 113-114.
[1373] For Açikel Ağa Kilise see Thierry 1968, 57, fig.18. For a discussion on the juxtaposition between Christ's nativity and passion/resurrection see chapter 4.2.1.

Pentecost and the Ascension demonstrates that this is not a festal cycle but rather a narrative that depends on two of the most important feasts of the Christian calendar, Christ's birth and resurrection.

In terms of iconography the scene of the Maries at the Tomb is reminiscent of its Cappadocian equivalent. The posture of the Mary closer to the angel finds its closest counterpart in Kiliçlar, where she is depicted turning her head towards the Mary in the back. On the ivory the Mary turns three quarters of her body to cling on the Mary behind her in an exaggerated posture of fear. The scene is entitled Ω ΤΑΦΟΣ (The Tomb). It should be noted here that choice of the inscription might again be the result of the first line of the Gospel lection, in this case of Holy Saturday Vespers.[1374] The interest on Christ's sepulchre as a rock-hewn cave is visible in the writings and patronage of Photios,[1375] and on this ivory.

Other later and contemporary inscriptions are divided into two groups: the descriptive and the narrative. The first group is best exemplified by Old Tokali Kilise, (ca. 900) where each group is separately inscribed: Ε ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ (Myrrh-bearers) ΑΓΓΕΛΟC (angel) ΤΟ ΜΝΙΜΑ (the tomb); while the second group by Çarikli Kilise of the eleventh or twelfth century, where the inscription reads: ΙΔΟΥ Ο ΤΑΦΟC ΟΠΟΥ ΕΘΗΚΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ (Mark 16: 6).[1376] Unlike the Incredulity of Thomas, the Maries never acquired a single inscription. The inscriptions taken from the Gospels, point to the narrative character of the cycle.

[1374] According to the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia, the reading for Easter was taken from Matth. 28: 1-20 Matteos 1963, 90-91. The word *Τάφος* appears only in the first line of Matthew, while all other Gospels prefer the word *Μνημείον* (monument/tomb) while once appears the word *Μνῆμα* (tomb).
[1375] Brubaker 1999, 301; see also the discussion of the Paris Gregory in chapter 4.2.2.
[1376] 'See the place where they laid him'. The word 'tomb' is substituted for the word 'place'.

By following the symmetrical type, the Chairete scene of the ivory retains its monumentality while losing none of its expressive character, typical of the art right after Iconoclasm. The composition shows Christ standing frontally in the middle of the scene, holding a scroll with his left hand, while making a gesture of benediction with his right. The two Maries are arranged symmetrically, each depicted holding one of Christ's feet. This detail, along with their postures of proskyneses and the fact that they stare at the ground, reminds us of Mesarites' description: 'The women bend the whole gaze of their eyes down upon the ground, unable to look back into the godlike aspect of His face, supporting their whole bodies on knees and elbows; their hands which have grasped his immaculate feet, cling to them ardently'.[1377] This demonstrates how a twelfth-century *ekphrasis* and a tenth-century ivory intended to evoke the same emotional response from their respective audiences. The whole scene is flanked by two cypresses, and is inscribed: TOXEPETE (The Chairete).[1378]

A twelfth-century ivory from the Victoria and Albert Museum is considered to be an Italo-Byzantine work (fig. 68).[1379] The ivory panel contains six scenes from the Christological cycle in three undivided registers. The first register from left to right depicts the Annunciation and the Nativity. The second register has the Transfiguration and the Raising of Lazaros. The third and final register depicts the Maries at the Tomb and the Chairete. The absence of the Anastasis is notable, while the presence of the Transfiguration and the Raising of Lazaros raises the question whether this is the surviving panel of a diptych that contained six more scenes, and thus originally provoded a cycle of twelve scenes.

[1377] Nikolaos Mesarites, *Ekphrasis*, XXVIII: 3 in Downey 1954, 884 and 910.
[1378] The inscriptions of the Chairete also show some uniformity, and often appear either in the singular or plural.
[1379] Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II. no. 198; Williamson 1986, 165.

The presence of two post-Resurrection scenes in an undivided register points to a narrative cycle and even though the commemoration of the Maries was celebrated on the second Sunday after Easter, the scene was never used as a festal icon, and no written evidence survives to support such an identification unlike, for example, the Incredulity. Furthermore, the coupling of the latter with the Chairete is unlikely to have been used to commemorate the Myrrh-bearers Sunday. Furthermore, while it is plausible that the Chairete is used as a synonym of Easter, this would have rendered the scheme out of its correct chronology, since Easter precedes the Myrrh-bearers Sunday and not vice versa. The ivory in all probability contains important scenes from the life of Christ and since this is an Italo-Byzantine example, the presence of the Maries is explained by the scene's lingering importance in the west. Furthermore, the absence of the Anastasis signifies that the latter image had not become the sole reference to the resurrection and that narrative cycles showed their preference to the post-Resurrection appearances, whose unfading popularity is attested as late as the twelfth century.[1380]

The iconographic details of the Maries, are reminiscent of the fully developed Cappadocian scenes, while its grouping with the Chairete in an undivided register, with the tomb in the centre and equally shared by both scenes, is reminiscent of manuscript illumination and especially of the sixth-century Rabbula Gospels.[1381] The presence of a palm tree and a pine on two mountains in the background of the Chairete scene is a rarity, since a palm tree, as opposed to a pine or a cypress, has no

---

[1380] It might also indicate an earlier date for the ivory.

[1381] This relation is further corroborated by the postures of the two women in the Chairete scene, which follows the narrative-asymmetrical type of the manuscript.

connotations with a cemetery and is a type of plant that appears in desert areas and not gardens.

A final ivory, a Byzantine diptych now in the Cathedral treasury of Chambèry, is dated with some hesitations to the twelfth century (fig. 69).[1382] The main body of each leaf is divided into four zones of different width depicting scenes from Christ's early life and miracles, ending with his passion and resurrection. The central and biggest zone of each leaf depicts the Virgin with Christ, and the Ascension. In a narrow zone over the latter, the following three scenes appear: the Entry into Jerusalem, the Anastasis and the Chairete, in a correct chronological order. The latter follows the symmetrical type where Christ is flanked by two women and two trees, of which only the right one survives. The scene is inscribed +XAIPETE, in a rare instance in which the plural and the correct orthography are used.[1383] The entirely accurate Greek orthography appears not only in the titles of all the scenes, but also in an inscription that runs along the borders of the ivory and identifies the donor as a high ranked official: (*Rhaiktor*).[1384] This could be a high ranking courtier even an important civil official, such as a *logothetes tou genikou*.[1385]

The last two ivories demonstrate that the coupling of the Chairete with the Anastasis and/or the Maries lingered well into the twelfth century. The cycles in which the scenes appear could not have been destined to celebrate the major feasts of the

---

[1382] Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930 II: 78-79, no. 222. The authors have marked the date with a question mark.

[1383] The two leaves have various inscriptions some of them running along the borders of each leaf. The latter are connected with the scenes of each leaf which could be roughly divided into two main categories: early life and miracles and passion and resurrection.

[1384] 'ΡΑΙΚΤΩΡ Ο ΠΙΣΤΟC ΟΙΚΕΤΗC ΠΟΛΛΩ ΠΟΘΩ'. The authors mention in passing that one of Constantine VII tutor's was a rector.

[1385] ODB 1787-88. According to the Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium, this title does not appear after the eleventh century, thus an earlier date is plausible.

liturgical calendar given that the three scenes were commemorated on the same day. The presence of the Anastasis in the narrative cycle, either coupled with the Chairete, or between the latter and the Maries, shows that while the scene gained in importance by becoming the primary festal scene for Easter, its narrative value was less significant –since it has no Gospel verification– and the pairing with the afore-mentioned scenes remained a necessity whenever a narrative cycle was depicted.

The absence of the Incredulity from the ivory cycles that include the Maries, the Anastasis and the Chairete, points in my opinion to the fact that the former scene was not employed as a narrative, but rather as a festal scene. The Incredulity by becoming a feast-icon gained in importance but isolated itself from the post-Resurrection narrative. In the various epigrams mentioned in the previous chapter, no reference is made either to the Maries or to the Chairete, while the Anastasis features prominently. Thus, the pairing of the Anastasis and the Incredulity in a cycle could be indicative of festal influences, while the presence of the Anastasis in the company of the Maries and the Chairete could be indicative of a narrative cycle. Cappadocia, which follows in discussion, seems to exclude the Incredulity from its cycle, while the Maries and the Anastasis appear side by side. The Chairete, while popular on the ivories, finds no real foothold in Cappadocia and the instances in which the scene is depicted are rare.

It becomes apparent that a narrative and a festal cycle existed side by side and the presence or absence of a post-Resurrection scene could help identify the nature of a cycle. However, by transposing later practices to earlier centuries, the scholarly discourse has admittedly cast aside the post-Resurrection scenes by minimizing their presence as 'substitutes' for the Anastasis. Their role is much more significant in the

development of Middle Byzantine iconography. The Anastasis as a festal scene appears often side by side with the Incredulity; while in the narrative cycles, it is coupled with the Maries and the Chairete, the latter is the only scene to appear in all the afore-mentioned examples.[1386]

One possible reason why the Chairete never acquired a festal prominence might be explained by the Anastasis' rising popularity. Otherwise the Chairete in its symmetrical version, with Christ in a frontal and hieratic position flanked by the two Maries, had all the necessary monumental qualities to become a festal icon. One of its deficiencies was however the presence of an entirely female audience, as compared with the presence of the prophets, Adam and Eve in the Anastasis, and the eleven Apostles in the Incredulity. The absence of the Chairete or the Maries from epigrams dedicated to the 'great icons of the feasts', testifies that the latter scenes were never considered as such.

The Macedonian dynasty showed its interest in on the post-Resurrection appearances, since during Basil's reign and Photios' patriarchate, the Chairete reigned supreme in Constantinople. Later emperors such as Leo VI and Constantine VII wrote hymns on the post-Resurrection appearances, known as *eothina* and *eksapostilaria* respectively.[1387] Leo was also responsible for transporting the relics of Mary Magdalene and Thomas, two of the most prominent *personae* of the post-Resurrection narrative. The actions of this dynasty must have influenced, at some level, the dissemination of the post-Resurrection iconography.

[1386] To these, another example should be added from the Pantokrator Monastery, in which according to the *Typikon* a Chairete scene appears along with the Crucifixion and the Anastasis, Mango 1969/70, 374 who cites Dmitrievskij 1895, 678.

[1387] Christ and Paranikas 1963[2], 106-112; Tillyard 1930-31, 115-147.

6.2: Cappadocia and beyond.

As noted by Thierry, Cappadocia has more than two thirds of the surviving painted decoration from the tenth and eleventh centuries.[1388] The area is one of those rare instances in which the development of Middle Byzantine art is completely documented.[1389] However, as Epstein also suggests, the evolution of Cappadocian painting does not necessarily mirror the progress in other provinces or Constantinople itself.[1390] This is not to say that Cappadocia was isolated from the capital, nor that its inhabitants, monks or otherwise,[1391] were ignorant of ongoing trends, but it is true that while Constantinopolitan and metropolitan art shows its preference for the Incredulity of Thomas and the Chairete, Cappadocia favours the established formula of the Maries accompanied by the Anastasis. In other words Cappadocian painting does not mirror the empire as a whole, especially in regards to the post-Resurrection appearances, but at the same time was familiar with current stylistic and iconographic trends.

The Incredulity and the Chairete appear in Cappadocia only in rare occasions. The question that arises is why the two afore-mentioned scenes are excluded from Cappadocian cycles, or better, why these cycles favour the combination of the Maries with the Anastasis.

It is notable that major surveys undertaken by Jerphanion, Lafontaine-Dosogne, Restle, Thierry and Jolivet-Lévy all mention only a handful of churches that include a

[1388] Thierry 1975, 77.
[1389] Wharton-Epstein 1975, 115.
[1390] Ibid, 115.
[1391] The presence of purely monastic communities has been contested by Ousterhout 1996, 28-32 and 1997, 301 ff. For monastic communities see especially Rodley 1985.

Chairete scene. Jerphanion identifies a damaged scene from a church in the Mavruçan

area, as the Noli me Tangere, without however excluding the possibility that it could

depict the Chairete.[1392] Lafontaine-Dosogne and Restle identify the scene amongst the

frescoes of Bahattin (or Behatin) Samanliği Kilise at Beliserama, of the end of the

tenth century.[1393] Thierry, who also records the latter,[1394] mentions additionally that a

Chairete scene appears in the ninth-century church of Açikel Ağa Kilise.[1395] Finally,

according to Jolivet-Lévy, in Açik Saray, in the church of Saint George, the scene

appears on the north wall, along with the Entry into Jerusalem and the Resurrection of

Lazaros, while the Crucifixion is coupled with Anastasis on the west wall.[1396] The

church dates to the eleventh century.[1397]

These four examples demonstrate that the Chairete did not acquire much importance

in the iconographic scheme of the Cappadocian churches. However, the surviving

examples do reveal some conformity with those outside Cappadocia. Açikel Ağa

Kilise for example juxtaposes three scenes from Christ's passion and resurrection,

with three from his infancy.[1398] The same applies for two contemporary reliquaries,

the Fieschi Morgan and the Martvili triptych, where similarly, incarnation and

salvation are stressed.[1399]

[1392] Jerphanion 1925-42, II.1, 225-226.
[1393] Lafontaine-Dosogne 1963, 147 dates the church to the end of the 10th c. Restle 1967, III: 518, dates the church to the eleventh century.
[1394] Thierry and Thierry 1963, 155-173, esp. 169.
[1395] Thierry 1968, 57 fig. 18; despite the article's title 'Un décor pre-Iconoclaste' the author concludes that the decoration dates either during the interval of Iconoclasm or right after; ibid 69. For a discussion on this church see chapter 4.2.2.
[1396] Jolivet-Lévy, 1991, 225, the name given by the author is, as she admits, hypothetical.
[1397] Ibid, 227.
[1398] Thierry 1968, 45-57.
[1399] Nevertheless this was a fundamental truth of the Christian faith, which does not necessarily implicate the three monuments in a direct association, but rather connects them as products of the same period, the ninth century.

Another connection between centre and periphery is visible in the tenth century

church of Bahattin Samnliği Kilise, where the Passion and Post-Resurrection cycle

includes the Crucifixion, the Entombment, the Maries at the Tomb, the Anastasis and

the Chairete.[1400] A similar cycle appears on the right leaf of the contemporary Milan

ivory, with the exception of the Entombment. The latter scene was a common

occurrence in other tenth-century cycles, such as Kiliçlar (ca. 900) and the Old Tokale

Kilise of the early tenth century.[1401]

Another meeting point between Cappadocia and the arts of Constantinople comes

from the church of Saint George in Açik Saray, of the eleventh century, where the

Anastasis and the Chairete are depicted unaccompanied by the Maries,[1402] which is

also the case with two identical tenth-century metropolitan ivories.[1403] Thus the

limited examples of the Chairete reveal that the area was not ignorant of ongoing

trends in Constantinople.[1404]

The Chairete scenes from the afore-mentioned churches follow the narrative

asymmetrical type, which further enhances the argument that the Chairete was never

transformed into a feast icon. The narrative character of the Chairete scenes can be

adduced, not only from their composition, which seems to follow exclusively the

asymmetrical type, but also from the inscriptions. In the case of Açik Saray, the

inscription reads in one continuous frieze: ΧΑΙΡΕΤΑΙ-ΑΙ-ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΟΙ-ΑΙ-ΔΕ-

---

[1400] Thierry and Thierry 1963, 157

[1401] For the inclusion of the Entombment in the churches of Cappadocia see below.

[1402] Jolivet-Lévy, 1991, 225.

[1403] For the Dredsen copy, see Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: 37, no. 41a, and for the State Hermitage, see Evans and Wixom 1997, 147-48, no. 93. For a discussion see the previous chapter.

[1404] See also Epstein 1986, 18 and Cormack 1967, 22-24 who speak of the close association between Cappadocia and the most progressive currents if Constantinopolitan decoration.

ΠΡΟΣΕΛΘΟΥΣΑΙ-ΕΚΡΑΤΗΣΑΝ-ΑΥΤΟΥ-ΤΟΥΣ-ΠΟΔΑΣ.[1405] Açikel Ağa Kilise

not only employs the title ΧΑΙΡΕΤΕ, but also names the other characters: Christ (IC

XC), the two women (E ΜΥΡΟΦΩΡΕ), and from the latter group, the Virgin (MP

ΘΥ).[1406]

The difference between the two Chairete inscriptions reveals their diverse character.

In Açik Saray, the quotation from the Gospel and the asymmetrical type of the scene

point to the narrative character of the composition. In Açikel Ağa Kilise, where three

scenes from Christ's passion and resurrection are juxtaposed with three from his

nativity, the Chairete acquires greater importance. This is visible from the title which

appears over the characters: ΧΑΙΡΕΤΕ. This title accompanies all other surviving

monumental-symmetrical examples of the Chairete, like on the Paris Gregory (fig.

56), the Milan ivory diptych (fig. 59) and the twelfth-century diptych from the

cathedral treasury of Chambéry (fig. 69), all of which employ the title 'All Hail'

(Χαίρετε) with minor modifications.[1407]

It becomes apparent that the symmetrical examples of the Chairete and the

'monumental' images of the Incredulity of Thomas, employ short, standard quotations

from the Gospels that function as titles, while the narrative scenes frequently employ

lengthy quotations from the Gospels and tend to name all the characters in the scene.

Cappadocian painters never employed the monumental-symmetrical configuration of

the Chairete exactly because they had no use for it in the narrative-liturgical cycles

that dominate the area's churches. In Açikel Ağa Kilise, the scene is neither purely

---

[1405] Thierry and Thierry 1963, 169. The inscription is taken from Matthew 28: 9 albeit for the
substitution of 'they' with 'Myrrh-bearers': '"All hail". The Myrrh-bearers came and clasped his feet'.
[1406] Thierry 1968, 57.
[1407] For the ivory from the cathedral treasury of Chambéry see Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II:
no 222.

narrative, nor purely monumental, since the emphasis is on the juxtaposition between Christ's nativity and death.[1408]

For the Incredulity of Thomas, the examples from Cappadocia are even rarer, and only two secure specimens can be mentioned. The first comes from the church of Saint John the Baptist in Çavusin, where the Incredulity of Thomas appears on the south wall.[1409] A second abbreviated example is depicted in the tenth-century Ballik Kilise at Soganly.[1410] In this church, the Incredulity is the only reference to the resurrection, while the composition retains only the two main *personae*, one of them securely identified as ΘΟΜΑC (Thomas) by an inscription.[1411] The use of the Incredulity as the sole synonym of the resurrection, and the use of only two characters, is evidence of some antiquity or at least of an early model. It does not reflect though the Constantinopolitan interest in the scene. The presence of a handful of examples of the Chairete and the Incredulity in Cappadocia, demonstrates that the area, while familiar with ongoing metropolitan trends, was not so eager to adopt the two scenes into its iconographic repertoire.

In the choice and configuration of the Passion and Resurrection scenes, the Cappadocian churches show a remarkable uniformity. The Maries and the Anastasis are rarely absent, while the Ascension, and often the Entombment, flank the two

---

[1408] This is also attested on the two similar ivories from the Hermitage and Dredsen Museums discussed above, where the asymmetrical scene uses the title TOXEPETE sic. (Chairete). Nevertheless the two Maries and the two trees are depicted in such a way that the narrative composition gains some monumentality, while the scene in the way is depicted, complements the asymmetrical Anastasis on the lower register; for the two ivories see Weitzmann 1930, II: 37, no. 41a and Evans and Wixom 1997, 147-48, no. 93, respectively.
[1409] Jolivet-Lévy 1991, 26.
[1410] Jerphanion 1925-42, II1: 264; Jolivet-Lévy 1991, 255.
[1411] Jerphanion 1925-42, II1: 264.

scenes.[1412] The presence of the Maries before the Anastasis, and sometimes between the latter and the Entombment, demonstrates that this was not a feast cycle, but rather a narrative one. The coupling of the Maries with the Anastasis dates from before Iconoclasm, observable in the Oratory of John VII.[1413] The pairing appears in Santi Martiri in the ninth century, while both scenes are depicted in San Clemente.[1414] So far as the configuration of the post-Resurrection narrative goes, Cappadocia follows a pre-Iconoclast tradition. Epstein has also noted this continuity in reference to the Old Tokali Kilise[1415] while Cormack in reference to two other scenes: the Nativity and the Trial by Bitter Water.[1416]

The scenes from Christ's Passion and Resurrection offer a variety of interpretations. Jerphanion on one hand speaks of the 'cycle of the sepulchre' and notes that in Kiliçlar and Tokali, it is comprised of three scenes: the Deposition, the Entombment and the Maries at the Tomb.[1417] Jolivet-Lévy notes that in the New Tokali Kilise the scenes of the Descent from the Cross and the Entombment are juxtaposed with the scenes of the Maries and the Anastasis to reveal the two natures of Christ, the human and the divine.[1418] In the Old Tokali, Kartsonis speaks of the Entombment, the Maries and the Anastasis, as a 'unique sequence in which the message is delivered by three consecutive and interactive scenes'.[1419] It becomes apparent that each scholar had placed the Maries in a different group in order to illustrate a different point:

[1412] Elmali Kilise, Tokali Kilise, Kilislar Kilise
[1413] See for example the two manuscripts Vatican Library, Barb.Lat.2733, fols 90^v-91^r and Barb.Lat.2732, fols 76^v-77^r, in Kartsonis 1986, fig. 15 and Van Dijk 2001, fig. 3, respectively.
[1414] For Santi Martiri see Belting 1962; for San Clemente see Cecchelli 1957 and Osborne 1984.
[1415] So Epstein 1986, 19, in connection to the Old Tokali kilise.
[1416] Cormack 1967, 24-26.
[1417] Jerphanion 1925-1942, I: 89: 'le cycle de la Sépulture'.
[1418] Jolivet-Lévy 1991, 98.
[1419] Kartsonis 1986, 166: The tomb's absence in the Entombment is covered up by its use in the next scene of the Maries while the same tomb is used also by the Anastasis as the sarcophagus for David and Solomon.

Jerphanion, a sepulchral cycle; Jolivet-Lévy, Christ's divine nature; and Kartsonis a three-fold narrative scene. What is important though is that the scene of the Maries at the Tomb was included in every argument.[1420] These modern interpretations of the scene may also reflect the reasons behind its extensive use in Cappadocia: it conveyed different and diverse messages, and helped to tighten the narrative, with the non-canonical scene of the Anastasis.

The painting programmes of the Cappadocian churches reveal more than style does, about local attitudes towards art.[1421] One local convention is the use of elaborate narrative cycles, unparalleled outside Cappadocia.[1422] The narrative cycle in the New Tokali Kilise, which is divided into larger and smaller scenes, led Epstein to argue that the scenes are conceived 'either as great independent icons or as strip narratives'.[1423] This is based on the fact that some scenes occupy a larger space, while others appear directly below grouped into small narrative strips. For example, the Crucifixion takes the whole tympanum of the arch, while below, the Deposition, the Entombment, the Anastasis and the Maries are grouped in pairs. The difference between the larger-monumental and the smaller-narrative scenes was explained as the result of large scenes' importance as ecclesiastical feasts.[1424] Thus the Crucifixion was chosen for its festal importance, while the Anastasis and the Maries, two scenes that signify Christ's resurrection and the feast of Easter, were relegated to a narrative strip. Since Christ's resurrection and Easter are of far greater liturgical importance than, for

---

[1420] Other considerations, such as the relation between Christ's crucifixion and resurrection are stressed by Jerphanion in Karanlik Kilise where the Anastasis and the Maries frame the Crucifixion: Jerphanion 1925-1942, I.2: 409, 414-415; pl. 103: 1.
[1421] Epstein 1979, 37-38.
[1422] Epstein 1986, 17; Rodley 1983, 325.
[1423] Epstein 1986, 26
[1424] Ibid, 26.

instance, the Annunciation, which also occupies a larger space, the answer lies elsewhere.

The hesitation to allocate a larger space to the Anastasis and thus to promote the scene as a festal equivalent of Easter is probably associated with the fact that the Anastasis had not yet become the primary icon for the feast, nor a self-sufficient scene to convey the message of the resurrection, which consequently explains the constant presence of the Maries. The same could be said about the tenth-century icon from Sinai where the Anastasis appears side by side with the Chairete.[1425] In the eleventh century though, the scene appears amongst the mosaics of Hosios Lukas, Daphni and Nea Moni, indicating that the scene was becoming widely accepted, while in the twelfth-century Transfiguration church of the Mirozhsky Monastery at Pskov, 'where a clear distinction is made between primary and secondary subjects', the Anastasis is now allocated the larger space, while the Maries and the Chairete are depicted in the narrative band below.[1426] Cappadocian artists however, preferred to employ the Anastasis for its narrative rather than festal value, evident from its pairing with the Maries and the grouping with other scenes from Christ's passion and resurrection.

The cycles in Cappadocia are not however purely narrative. As we have seen, Açikel Ağa Kilise juxtaposes scenes from Christ's nativity and resurrection, to illustrate the dogmas of incarnation and salvation. Other churches follow a combined narrative and liturgical structure. In the eleventh-century Column Churches, and especially Karanlik Kilise, Epstein sees a Cappadocian concern for the established metropolitan liturgical

---

[1425] Soteriou 1956-58, 52-55 and pls 39-41.
[1426] Kitzinger 1988, 544, figs. 2-3. Lazarev 1966, 101-103 notes that most of the smaller scenes do not follow a chronological sequence, but they were employed to fill up the empty spaces. Amongst these scenes many were from the post-Resurrection cycle: the Incredulity of Thomas, the Maries at the Tomb, the Chairete, the Appearance to the Eleven, the Miraculous Draught of Fishes.

arrangements, where the twelve scenes from the life of Christ mirror the twelve-feast cycle.[1427] Mouriki also notes many similarities between the Nea Moni and the Column Churches.[1428] Thus it is necessary to point out, that the scenes of the latter group of churches do not follow a festal cycle. This is apparent from such scenes, as the Journey to Bethlehem and the Christ's betrayal by Judas which are depicted in Karanlik but here associated with a festal cycle. Furthermore if we compare Karanlik with the other Column Churches, namely Çarikli and Elmali, we notice an interest in scenes associated with Holy Week. From the Entry into Jerusalem through the Ascension, there are seven Holy Week scenes in Karanlik and Çarikli and nine in Elmali, while the rest of the scenes from Christ's Nativity and Public Life occupy a smaller percentage: five in Karanlik, four in Elmali, and three in Çarikle. The scenes inspired by the events of Holy Week are far more numerous than those from Christ's earlier life. This, consequently, demonstrates that while a festal cycle never materialised in Cappadocia, some churches reveal an interest in Christ's passion and resurrection.[1429]

The interest in the liturgy of Holy Week is corroborated by the scenes of the Last Supper and the Betrayal, which are depicted in Elmali and Çarikli. The two events are commemorated on the same day, Holy Thursday Matins, and shared the same Gospel reading (Matth. 26: 2-20).[1430] Consequently, the two scenes do not represent two different feasts, but rather two distinct moments in liturgical-narrative time.[1431] The

---

[1427] Epstein 1979, 33. Jerphanion however enumerates thirteen scenes and not twelve Jerphanion 1925-1942, I.2: 379. Restle on the other hand enumerates fifteen.

[1428] Mouriki 1985, passim.

[1429] This is not the case with Çavusin Dovecote, where twelve scenes from the Nativity and twelve from the Passion are depicted, with an abbreviated Ministry cycle, Rodley 1983, 327-328.

[1430] Mateos 1963, II: 76-77; the two events are described in a single reading from Matth. 26: 2-20. The importance of Holy Thursday is evident by the fact that along with Holy Friday and Saturday they were called the *Triduum*, Baldovin 1989, 39.

[1431] Baldovin 1989, 39.

same applies for other scenes such as the Maries and the Anastasis, which were celebrated on Holy Saturday during Matins and Vespers. This liturgical influence is further corroborated from iconographic details, such as the use by the Maries of censers and crosses and the title with which they were denoted: Myrrh-bearers. Thus, a distinction should be made, between the scenes that were inspired by the great feasts of the church, and those inspired by liturgical prominence, such as those from the Holy Week cycle.

To begin with the latter, the title Myrrh-bearer is an epithet which derives from the descriptions in Mark and Luke, where the women prepare myrrh to apply on Christ's dead body.[1432] The term appears in the titles of two late sixth-, early seventh-century sermons, but no mention of the epithet is made in the text of the sermons, which raises the question on whether the titles are later interpolations.[1433] The term appears in various *troparia* of the *Canon for the Myrrh-bearers* of Andrew of Crete (†740), the eighth-century preacher and hymnographer.[1434] References exist in the *Typikon* of Hagia Sophia[1435] and in various hymns of the *Triodion*.[1436] It also appears in canticle seven of the *Lamentation of the Theotokos* by Symeon Metaphrastes (†960) sung on Good Friday; there the Virgin is described as crying 'along with the other Myrrh-

---

[1432] Mark 16: 1; Luke 23: 56-24: 1.

[1433] The two works are the *On the Myrrh-bearers and Joseph of Arimathea* etc, by Gregory of Antioch, PG 88 cols. 1847-1866; *On the Myrrh-bearers*, PG 86.II col. 3273-3276 by Modestos of Jerusalem. My hesitations for the titles of these sermons lie on the fact that the first oration reflects a later tradition in which the Maries had pushed the figure of Joseph of Arimathea into second place, see Mateos 1963, II: 115, note 3; while the second oration is in fact dedicated to the Magdalene and not to the Myrrh-bearers.

[1434] PG 97, cols. 805-1444 and for an English translation: www.anastasis.org. For Andrew's life see Kazhdan 1999, 38-50 and Tomadakis 1965[3], 188-208; for Andrew as a preacher see Cunningham 1998, 267 ff.

[1435] Not however in the title of the Myrrh-bearers Sunday, where the term 'female disciples' is used, but rather in the *troparion* that accompanies the feast, Mateos 1963, II: 114-115.

[1436] Joseph the Hymnographer, *Triodion*, PG 87, col. 3905B-D, 3949C etc.

bearers'.[1437] In Cappadocia the title Myrrh-bearers appears in almost all the surviving

examples in which an accompanying inscription is visible: Kiliçlar Kilise (ca.

900),[1438] Old Tokali Kilise and New Tokali Kilise,[1439] the church of the Holy Apostles

in Sinassos of the early tenth century,[1440] the Çavusin Dovecote (963 – 964),[1441] and

the Column Churches,[1442] to mention some. The inscriptions reveal that the title was

widely employed in Cappadocia; they also demonstrate the influence exerted by the

hymns of the Holy Week and the *Triodion* on the paintings.

Occasionally the inscription ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ (Myrrh-bearers) appears as the only

inscription of the Maries scene, but its proximity to the women does not help us to

understand whether it was used as a title for the whole scene or just for the women,

and thus to assert that this is how the scene was called in the Middle Byzantine

period. On the Chludov Psalter (fig. 57), the inscription reads: ΓΥΝΕΚΕC

ΜΟΙΡΟΦΟΡΟΙ: 'Myrrh-bearing women',[1443] with the word myrrh-bearing, used as an

epithet. On the eleventh-century Theodore Psalter, the epithet is now dropped and

only the title *αι γυναικες* (the women) appears over the two Maries.[1444] Two other

Constantinopolitan examples, the Martvili triptych (fig. 48) and the Milan ivory (fig.

59) both use the title: Ο ΤΑΦΟΣ (the tomb).[1445] In Cappadocia and the Old Tokali a

similar inscription appears accompanying Christ's sepulchre, and not however the

---

[1437] Canticle seven, verse three, Mary and Ware 1978, 42 and 620; for the Greek text see Pitra 1858, 492-495.

[1438] Jerphanion 1925-1942, pl. 52: ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ

[1439] Epstein 1986, 60-66: Ε ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ

[1440] Jerphanion 1925-42, II.1: 72, the title appears in the Entombment (ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ) while in the Maries the inscription reads: ΙΔΕ Ο ΤΟΠΟΣ ΟΠΟΥ [ἔθη]ΚΑΝ [αυτον].

[1441] Rodley 1983, 328: [ΜΥ]ΡΟΦΟΡΕ

[1442] Jerphanion 1925-1942, 415, Karanlik: Ε ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ; 446, Elmali: Ε ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ (in the Crucifixion); 464-465: Çarikle, Ε ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ (in the Crucifixion and the Maries at the Tomb).

[1443] Shchepkina 1977, fol. 44[r].

[1444] Theodore Psalter, London, British Museum, Add.19.352, fol. 45[v], in Der Nersessian 1970, 29, pl. 25, fig. 78.

[1445] For the inscription on the Martvili, now barely visible see Kartsonis 1986, fig. 24g. The inscription on the Milan ivory uses the omega instead of the correct omicron: Ω ΤΑΦΟΣ., for the latter see Goldschmidt and Weitzmann 1930, II: no. 42.

whole scene; the inscription reads: TO MNIMA (the sepulchre).[1446] Both words are found in the Gospels.[1447]

In Karabaş Kilise, a church dated by an inscription in the reign of Constantine Dukas (1060-1061), only the word ΛΗΘΟΝ (stone) appears over the angels head.[1448] The decoration was linked stylistically by Kostof with the contemporary mosaics of Daphni and especially with Nea Moni.[1449] According to Kostof, the similarities are visible on the thickly sketched, emphatic robes with frigid folds, and to the faces 'haunted by deepset dark ringed eyes'.[1450] Mouriki, who also notes the facial similarities, further adds the posture of the Magdalene, who raises her hands inside her *maphorion*, in the Crucifixion scenes of Nea Moni and Karabaş.[1451] Furthermore, Wharton-Epstein believes that the scenes are considered to function as monumental liturgical icons.[1452] With that in mind is worth considering the possibility that the word ΛΗΘΟΝ functions here as the title of the scene. The only obstacles for this identification come from the bad state of preservation, from the accusative ΛΗΘΟΝ and from the scene of the Anastasis. In the first instance the fragmented status of the fresco prohibits us to discern whether other inscriptions were employed and flaked off. In the second instance, the use of the accusative ΛΗΘΟΝ is not appropriate for a title; the nominative ΛΗΘΟΣ should have been used,[1453] and finally in the Anastasis scene, [Α]ΔΑΜ (Adam), the only word that survives is not appropriate for a title.

[1446] Epstein 1986, 60-66.

[1447] Matth. 28: 1 uses 'τάφον' while the other three Gospels Marc 16: 1; Luke 24: 1; John 20: 1 use 'μνημεῖον'.

[1448] Dalton 1911, 270; Jerphanion 1925-1942, pl. 199; Wharton Epstein 1975, 119; Restle 1970, 266, doubts about the inscription and dates the frescoes in the second half of the thirteenth century.

[1449] Kostof 1972, 226-227; Wharton Epstein 1975, 119 who agrees only with the Nea Moni similarities.

[1450] Kostof 1972, 227. Mouriki 1985, 221-222, also acknowledges the common facial characteristics.

[1451] Mouriki 1985, 130; see also 221-222 and 260.

[1452] Wharton-Epstein 1979, 38.

[1453] The accusative appears in inscriptions that accompany the angel, such as the one in Karanlik Kilise, Jerphanion 1925-42, pl. 103: 1-2, where it reads: 'ἄγγελος εἰς τὸν λίθον καθήμενος [my italics]. Thus

Consequently, the Cappadocian examples differ from their metropolitan counterparts in the words employed. The title Ο ΤΑΦΟΣ in the Constantinopolitan examples probably reflects the same interest on Christ's sepulchre, as that recorded on the Paris Gregory.[1454] Cappadocia shows no interest in the latter title, or in the title 'women' which appears solely in the Psalters, sometimes accompanied by the adjective 'myrrh-bearing'. Cappadocia, for the Maries, utilizes the title ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ (in various writings), which becomes the customary inscription. For the other features of the scene, that is, the angel, the sepulchre, the linen clothing and the soldiers, there is no apparent liturgical influence, and the inscriptions are often taken unmodified from the Gospels.[1455]

Besides the title 'Myrrh-bearers', the liturgical impact is visible from iconographic details such as the censers and crosses with which the Maries are often depicted. In Egri Taş Kilise, the first of three Maries holds a cross, while the other two hold unguent jars, one of them green and the other yellow, which according to the Thierrys, indicate the material of the jars; bronze and glass.[1456] The difference in colour might also indicate a difference in content. On a twelfth-century Armenian manuscript from the Kingdom of Cilicia,[1457] not far from Cappadocia, the first of the two Maries holds a small container, while the other a small jug, recalling in memory the Gospel of Luke (23: 56), where the Maries prepared myrrh but also spices.

---

the word that appears over the head of the angel, might be associated with the latter's action of removing the 'stone' from the tomb's entrance. Also the word ΛΙΘΟΣ appears in Kilişlar Kilise along with the inscription ΜΥΡΟΦΟΡΕ, Cave 1984, 163-64. See also the discussion on the Jerusalem *typikon* of 1122 that follows below.
[1454] Brubaker 1999, 205-207 and 301.
[1455] See for example the inscriptions of the scene in the Column Churches; for references see note 1382.
[1456] Thierry and Thierry 1963, 39-72, esp. 61.
[1457] Venice, Mekhitharist Library 141 (12th c.), in Der Nersessian 1993, fig. 72. For a date in the eleventh century see Janashian 1966.

In Bahattin Samnliği Kilise, the Mary nearest to the Angel holds both a censer and an unguent jar.[1458] Another Armenian manuscript from the Kingdom of Cilicia, depicts on folio 88^v the Chairete (lower register) and Maries at the Tomb (upper register) (fig. 70).[1459] In the latter scene, the Mary closer to the angel holds a censer. The two examples from Armenia employed here indicate how the two areas shared common features in their iconographic repertoire. While plausible that Armenian manuscript iconography influenced the artistic production of Cappadocia,[1460] it is not unlikely that both areas drew their inspiration independently from the same source.

The censer for example can be explained as an influence from current liturgical practises, such as those described as late as the twelfth century in a *typikon* from Jerusalem (AD 1122).[1461] According to the *typikon*, during the matins and vespers of Holy Saturday, women titled as Myrrh-bearers,[1462] use censers in front of the sepulchre, which in one occasion is called *Αγιος Λίθος* (Holy Stone).[1463] This interest on current liturgical practises must be related to the recapture of the Holy Land by the Crusaders and consequently by the fact that travel from, and to that area, became more accessible. Travelling artists, patrons and images must have been employed both in Cappadocia and in the Kingdom of Cilicia,

It should be noted at this point, that other liturgical influences are visible in the *typikon* of Jerusalem mentioned above. The latter contains references to many

---

[1458] Thierry and Thierry 1963, 168. See also the discussion on San Clemente in chapter 4.2.1

[1459] Jerusalem, Armenian Patriarchate 1796 (12th c.), in Der Nersessian 1993, fig. 64

[1460] For the Armenian influence on Cappadocian churches see Lafontaine-Dosogne 1963, 170-72; the review by Lafontaine-Dosogne 1965, 557 on Thierry and Thierry 1963; and Cormack 1967, 26.

[1461] Jerusalem, Holy Cross, cod.43 in Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963^2, II: 1-254.

[1462] See the discussion in Karras 2005.

[1463] Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963^2, 179 and 191, and 189 respectively. The word stone signifies either the stone over which Christ's body was laid, or the stone that was used to seal the entrance of the tomb.

inscriptions found in the afore-mentioned Cappadocian churches. For example, the Maries are inscribed Myrrh-bearers and depicted holding censers; the same applies for the women-deaconesses in the Jerusalem *typikon*, they are also titled Myrrh-bearers and described as holding censers. Furthermore, the word stone appears in the accusative both in relation to the sepulchre in the Maries at the Tomb scene in Karabaş Kilise and in connection with the actual sepulchre in Jerusalem.[1464]

The tradition to substitute the jar for a censer dates from before Iconoclasm and is associated with pilgrimage art. On the majority of those examples, the Mary closer to the angel holds instead of a jar, a censer suspended from chains.[1465] This detail appears at San Clemente and in an eleventh-century Ottonian manuscript (fig. 40),[1466] which point to a widespread tradition.[1467] The use of the censer in relation to the liturgy of Jerusalem is recorded, as early as the fourth century, by Egeria, while a re-enactment of the Chairete, with the participation of women deaconesses,[1468] was taking place in the church of the Holy Sepulchre.[1469] The presence of censers and processional crosses in the hands of the Maries helps to discern local preferences, which might not be unrelated to current liturgical practises.

One rare but not unparalleled motif amongst the churches of Cappadocia is the Maries at the Tomb with three, instead of two women. The churches that employ a three-Maries composition span chronologically from the tenth to the fourteenth century, and

---

[1464] Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963², 189.

[1465] See for example Grabar 1958 for the ampullae Monza no.2-3, 5-6, 8-15 and Bobbio no.3-6, 7, 15, 18; and the sixth-century ivory pyxis from Palestine, now at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (fig. 7).

[1466] Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek theol.lat fol. 2, in Rothe 1968, pl. 21.

[1467] It is worth noting though, that the shapes and types of censers differ substantially in each example.

[1468] The deaconesses still function in the tenth century as recorded in Constantine VII, *Book of Ceremonies* in Vogt 1935, 2: 171: 'Les diaconesses de Sainte-Sophie tenaient, en effet, un rang a part et éminemment respecte dans le hiérarchie ecclésiastique'.

[1469] Egeria, *Travels* 24: 10 in Maraval 1982, 244-245; for the re-enactment see Bertonière 1972, 95.

geographically to Ihlara, Sinassos and Göreme, making the creation of a pattern

almost impossible. It is not necessary though to create a pattern; we could simply

admit that the three-Maries composition co-exists with the more prevalent two-Maries

configuration and thus the distinction between two Maries for the East, and three

Maries for the West, is not applicable; at least not before the twelfth century.

The Holy Apostles in Sinassos, dated by a stylistic comparison to the tenth

century,[1470] and the Chapel of the Theotokos of the same date,[1471] are the earliest

examples from Cappadocia, and from the East,[1472] to depict three Maries at the Tomb.

In the area of Ihlara, two more churches dated by the Thierrys' to the second half of

the eleventh century depict the Maries scene with three women; these are the Eğri Taş

Kilise and the Pürenli Seki Kilise.[1473] Finally in Göreme, in the Karşi Kilise, which is

dated by an inscription to 1212, another such composition survives.[1474] While these

five churches are enough to simply argue in favour of two concurrent traditions in

Cappadocia, the three-Maries composition could be explained in another way.

After the recapture of Jerusalem, the crusaders had magnificently restored the church

of the Holy Sepulchre and decorated it with mosaics. They placed an Anastasis

mosaic in the apse of the Rotunda,[1475] while the aedicule was decorated with mosaics

depicting the Entombment and the Maries at the Tomb; in style and technique the

mosaics reveal Byzantine influences.[1476] The arrangement of the Anastasis in the

---

[1470] Jerphanion 1925-42, II: 72-73; Epstein 1986, 15.

[1471] Jerphanion 1925-42, I: 132, pl. 34.1

[1472] A rock-cut crystal in the British Museum also depicts three Maries; the crystal is considered to be Byzantine and has been dated to the sixth century and is in fact a replica in reverse of the Munich Ascension ivory (ca.400), Beckwith 1975, 3.

[1473] Thierry and Thierry 1963, 137-153; Lafontaine-Dosogne 1965, 557 argues for a later date.

[1474] Jerphanion 1925-42, II: 11, pl. 145: 2.

[1475] For a detailed analysis of the Anastasis mosaic see Borg 1981, 7-12.

[1476] Biddle 2000, 82; see also the pilgrims' descriptions reproduced in Borg 1981, 7-8.

Rotunda and the Maries in the aedicule reflect the liturgy and the ancient symbolism of the building.[1477]

The consecration of the church took place in AD 1149, by the Latin Patriarch Foucher who adopted for his seal an image of the Anastasis; the scene is believed to have been inspired by the actual mosaic of the Holy Sepulchre.[1478] The seals of the previous patriarchs depicted the Maries at the Tomb, with three Maries, an angel and an empty sarcophagus.[1479] Since their seals antedate the mosaics, it is not implausible that the earlier Latin patriarchs brought the three Maries tradition with them and the latter could have influenced the actual mosaic. Since however the mosaic has perished, this remains a supposition. Nevertheless, a contemporary depiction of the Maries at the Tomb exists, which might reflect what the actual mosaic looked like.[1480] This is the three-Maries composition on the Mellisenda Psalter, a manuscript illuminated with Byzantine miniatures.[1481] The three Maries were explained as an influence from the Latin tradition.[1482] Since however at least four Cappadocian examples seem to antedate the manuscript, it is not unlikely that the miniaturist never realized that the representation was following a 'western' tradition.

To conclude, the three-Maries mosaic at the time of its construction was not heralded as a Latin image. The Cappadocian churches had already employed it, and even if we

---

[1477] Babic 1969, 93. For the liturgy, see the re-enactment of the Chairete that took place outside the aedicule, Bertonière 1972, 95 and for the text Papadopoulos-Kerameus 1963², 191. For the ancient symbolism, the Maries at the Tomb, was a better choice for Christ's actual tomb (aedicule), while the Anastasis was better choice for the Anastasis basilica.
[1478] Borg 1981, 9-10.
[1479] Ibid, 9.
[1480] Borg 1981, 12, argues that the miniature of the Anastasis on the Melisenda manuscript (below) copies the actual mosaic.
[1481] British Museum, Egerton 1139 in Morey 1942, 151.
[1482] Ibid 151, along with the calendar illustrations and the initials.

considered them to be later than the mosaic,[1483] – and thus to have been influenced by it – both the painters in Cappadocia and the miniaturist of the Mellisenda Psalter, did not considered it as a Latin image. The three-Maries iconography in Cappadocia and on the manuscript is Byzantine.

It was probably during the last quarter of the twelfth century when the three Maries rose in prominence, and one cannot fail to associate this interest on a three-Maries composition, with their depiction inside the aedicule of the most prominent shrine of Christianity. In the same way that the ampullae aided in the dissemination of a particular Maries at the Tomb scene outside Palestine, the mosaic in Jerusalem must have turned the tide in the West. This is why the mosaicist of the Cathedral in Monreale, chose a three-Maries configuration, not so because he was following local or western antecedents, which is, however, visible on other mosaics, but mostly because the three-Maries composition through its association with the Holy Sepulchre, was becoming more popular in Italy. The Byzantine mosaicist had no hesitation in producing a three-Maries composition, while the craftsman of a thirteenth-century crucifix from Tereglio, while following the 'Byzantine' model, added a third Mary into his two-Maries composition as an afterthought.[1484]

The examples from outside Cappadocia, but well inside Byzantium's sphere of influence, namely from Georgia, the Principality of Kiev and Sicily, that follow in the

---

[1483] Since only one Cappadocian church Karsi Kilise (AD 1212) postdates the new mosaic composition, it seems that there was no impact of the mosaic in Jerusalem on the Byzantine monuments. Since however the late-eleventh century date of Eğri Taş Kilise and Pürenli Seki Kilise is based solely on stylistic considerations, a date in the mid-twelfth century should not be excluded and thus an influence of the mosaic on the three-Maries composition in those two churches.

[1484] Cook 1928, 341. However the three Maries tradition was popular in both the Carolingian and Ottonian world, as reflected from their ivories Goldschmidt 1970, but Italy shows its preference on the two.

discussion, are employed here in order to demonstrate that the scene of the Maries at the Tomb was not simply an 'archaic tradition' in a 'provincial' corner of the empire, but rather part of a wider tradition that continued to flourish. The Maries scenes continued to appear in elaborate church programmes, such as the following one, associate with the court of Georgia.

In the Church of Saint Nicholas (ca. 1207) in Kintsvisi, the most lavish and richest of the churches of Queen Tamar (1184 – 1213), the scene of the Maries is divided into three parts by two elongated windows (fig. 71).[1485] The Anastasis is grouped with the Crucifixion, while directly below the angel of the Maries scene appears Queen Tamar between Giorgi III and her son Giorgi Laša. Eastmont believes that the image was 'affirming the everlasting life for the dead'.[1486]

The Maries scene is again part of the richly decorated church of Saint Sophia at Kiev imitates the cross-domed plan of the Constantinopolitan churches.[1487] The programme of this church was executed sometime after 1046, during the reign of Jaroslav and comprised mosaics and frescoes.[1488] Amongst the sixteen surviving scenes, the following were inspired by the post-Resurrection cycle: the Anastasis, the Chairete and the Incredulity of Thomas. Since the cycle is fragmented, it is not clear whether more post-Resurrection scenes were depicted and thus whether the cycle was as rich as the one in Monreale.

[1485] Eastmond 1998, 141, colour pl. XV; Lazarev 1967, 221.
[1486] Eastmond 1998, 147; the huge angel's role is to draw attention to the royal figures below and his gold halo, matches the gold of the royal scene, ibid 150.
[1487] Krautheimer 1986[4], 295.
[1488] Lazarev 1967, 154.

In terms of extensive post-Resurrection cycles West seems to follow an unbroken tradition. This tradition is visible in the sixth-century church of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo, in the Presbytery of John VII (705-707), in the ninth-century church of Santi Martiri in Cimitile; in Sant' Angelo in Formis and Monreale of the eleventh- and late-twelfth century respectively.[1489] The latter is surpassed in the number of post-Resurrection scenes only by the reliquary of Paschal I (817-824).

Monreale shows exactly how the extensive post-Resurrection cycles continued to be popular in the arts of Italy until the twelfth century. In the mosaic decoration six scenes from the post-Resurrection cycle are depicted: the Anastasis, the Maries at the Tomb, the Chairete, the Emmaus story, the Incredulity of Thomas and the Miraculous Draught of Fishes.[1490] Even though the iconography of the New Testament scenes conforms to Byzantine conventions, there are 'scenes and details for which no satisfactory equivalent has yet been discovered in Byzantine monuments'.[1491] Worth mentioning here is the Emmaus story, which is divided into four consecutive scenes: the Road to Emmaus, the Supper at Emmaus, Christ's disappearance from the meal and finally, Kleopas and his companion informing the disciples. As noted by Demus, Christ's disappearance from the meal is a scene with no antecedents and must have been an invention of the Monreale designer.[1492]

[1489] The only comparable example from the East comes from the church of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople. For a discussion on the churches see previous chapters, while a discussion for Sant' Angelo in Formis follows below.

[1490] Demus 1949, 288-291, pls. 71b-74a.

[1491] Kitzinger 1960, 31 and for the quotation see footnote 37 in 126.

[1492] Ibid 1989, 289 'in order to fill the tier completely and create a symmetrical pattern'.

The Emmaus story is not described in Mesarites' *ekphrasis* of the church of the Holy Apostles,[1493] nor does it appear on the eleventh-century illuminated manuscript Dionysiou 587.[1494] The two richly illustrated Gospels in Florence and Paris that depict the Emmaus story do it in two and one scenes, respectively.[1495] In fact the scene of the Road to and Supper at Emmaus, do not appear in monumental art in Byzantium. The two manuscripts used above for comparison, are in fact the only known examples which are dated before the twelfth century. Thus the tradition of the four mosaics is not Byzantine, but most probably Italian.[1496] The Road to Emmaus is depicted, in all the afore-mentioned extensive post-Resurrection cycles, besides Santi Martiri, which makes this scene one of the most widely accepted post-Resurrection scene in Italian art.

Its popularity should not be seen as unrelated to the scene's later development as a reference to pilgrimage.[1497] In Sant' Angelo in Formis, Christ is depicted wearing an 'oddly draped costume that leaves his legs bare', with a pilgrim's purse depicted hanging across his left shoulder, and a pilgrim's staff in his left hand; in Sant' Angelo in Formis is further depicted with a conical hat.[1498] In Monreale a similar costume is worn by Christ but with no hat.[1499] Christ as a pilgrim becomes both an example of

---

[1493] Demus however believes that it does but cites no reference from the text; ibid 289. Mesarites refers to the disciples going to Galilee, which is described in Matthew. Neither Downey 1957, 33 nor Wharton Epstein 1982, 85 mention the scene.

[1494] Pelekanides et al. 1980; the manuscript shows a remarkable preference for the Maries scene, which appears five times in both marginal and larger miniatures.

[1495] Florence, Biblioteca Laureziana, VI.23, folio 164ʳ in Velmans 1971, 48, fig. 266 and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, cod.gr.74 folio162ᵛ in Omont 1908, 2: 6, fig. 141.

[1496] The Emmaus story appears also in four scenes on the Troia rotulus, Troia, Archivio Capitolare, Exultet 3.

[1497] For a detail discussion see D'Onofrio 1999, 63-79. Vikan 1982, 25 argues that the Incredulity of Thomas provides an obvious biblical parallel for the pilgrim and his own experience. The same could be said about the Road to Emmaus.

[1498] Ilsley Minott 1967, 162.

[1499] Demus 1949, pl. 73a.

mediaeval pilgrimage and also brings to memory the experiences of those who have already undertaken the journey.

In Cappadocia and beyond, the post-Resurrection appearances were modified, developed and enhanced and in one occasion in Monreale, a new scene was invented. The Maries retained their popularity in the narrative cycles of Cappadocia, while the Incredulity rose in importance as a feast icon. The Chairete after its boost in the ninth century remained popular and often accompanied the Anastasis and the Maries in narrative cycles. The West developed its own liking for extensive post-Resurrection cycles, from which one scene was rarely absent; the Road to Emmaus. The latter along with the Miraculous Draught of Fishes, were second in importance only to the three scenes mentioned above.

CONCLUSION

The study of the post-Resurrection appearances as a group but also individually aimed to provide not only a short chronological overview of the evidence, and thus of the iconographical evolution of the theme, but also to discuss specific aspects that were related to the scenes themselves and their presence in cycles. The scenes were not of equal importance, nor did they evoke the same messages. The changing nature of Byzantine art and culture offered some of them the chance to shine (some of them in reality as mosaics) while others saw their significance to gradually decline under the presence of new scenes, such as the Anastasis. I aimed not to study the theme in opposition to the Anastasis, but rather independently, as an important iconographic theme, that spans the entire era of Christian and subsequently Byzantine art. In doing so I tried to avoid anachronistic thinking by placing later traditions in earlier centuries. In other words, I did not employ the Anastasis' popularity in late Middle and Palaeologan periods, as evidence that the Byzantine artists were on the look for a scene that would have replaced the post-Resurrection scenes.

In the Early Christian era, the post-Resurrection appearances were associated with Baptism and the first material evidence available derived from two baptisteries. In Baptism, the Maries and the Miraculous Draught of Fishes found their earliest use. With the creation of the Loca Sancta and the establishment of shrines, the post-Resurrection appearances appeared on commemorative souvenirs. This Palestinian iconography was dispersed through pilgrimage to the corners of empire, influencing local art, with example of this influence being visible in Rome and Ravenna. Italy however showed a distinct interest on this iconography and adopted those

characteristics that made sense to its audience. The detailed depictions of the actual

shrine of the Anastasis never found a foothold in the West, which preferred to employ

local architecture as its source of Christ's sepulchre. The West also showed a special

interest in the Road to Emmaus, which appears in all the extensive iconographic

cycles. The *peregrini* of Emmaus became the pilgrims, who like Kleopas and his

companion, meet Christ and share an apocalyptic experience. In later representations,

Christ depicted in pilgrim's clothes, becomes both the antitype and the goal of a

pilgrim.

The study of this iconographic theme has yielded some new evidence, such as the

posture of Christ as the wounded Amazon, which has gone unnoticed by art-

historians, and the changing role of the Virgin as a Myrrh-bearer. This point was not

given much attention even in new and extensive scholarly work.[1500] The Virgin was

included in the post-Resurrection narrative, initially with hesitation, but as her cult

grew, so did the arguments in favour of her presence at the tomb. The role of the

Magdalene is treated in close association with that of the Virgin, given that both their

roles intermingle. On one hand the Magdalene was the most important character in the

post-Resurrection narrative, described by all four Gospels as head of the Myrrh-

bearers, while a special appearance was reserved for her. The Virgin on the other, was

identified as the 'other Mary' in order to be inserted in the narrative, but this did not

change the fact that another woman, the Magdalene, was featuring by and large as the

most important character. The fathers of the church came up with a new idea: the

Virgin was not the 'other Mary'; she is not mentioned in the post-Resurrection

---

[1500] It is worth noting that in the two volumes that accompany the exhibition the *Mother of God* at the Benaki Museum in Athens (October 20, 2000 - January 20, 2001), no reference is made to the Virgin's participation in the post-Resurrection narrative.

narrative because she never left the tomb but stayed as every mother should have done.

This was not the only time the fathers of the church occupied their minds with the post-Resurrection appearances. These appear in commentaries on the four Gospels, in orations and sermons of various subjects, such as Easter, Baptism, the Ascension, catecheses etc., but also in hymns ranging from *kontakia* to elaborate *kanons*. Hymnography offered the opportunity for a more 'lively' rendering of theology. But it was in the anti-heretical literature that these appearances found a practical use. The church from its very beginnings had to defend itself against the many heresies that rocked its foundations. Every post-Resurrection appearance disclosed a different message, some promoting a more human while others a divine Christ; some even promoted both. While a direct influence from this literature on the post-Resurrection scenes cannot be securely reconstructed due to the lack of supporting evidence, the case of Sant' Apollinare proved that at some level, the scenes were chosen for their theological rather than their dogmatic value.

A different kind of heresy, Iconoclasm, provided the Chairete with the chance to establish itself as the most important scene of the post-Resurrection narrative, in the post-Iconoclast cycles of ninth-century Constantinople. The tangible and human Christ in the Chairete provided a better alternative than the Maries scene, which concealed from the eyes of the beholder the very reason for which Christ could be depicted in art; his was human. In the following centuries, some scenes through their association with the great feasts of the church were transformed into monumental feast icons. The Incredulity of Thomas, a scene with a long history in the arts and the

theological discourse, became an important scene in the twelve feast cycle. It was through its association with the feast of Easter and thus with the most prominent of the church calendar, as the appellation *Αντίπασχα* shows, that feast rose in importance in metropolitan art but not in the arts of Cappadocia.

And while Constantinople showed its preference to the Chairete and the Incredulity, Cappadocia, one of the most important provinces in terms of quantity of artistic examples, and of Middle Byzantine art being completely documented in one particular are, showed only a minimum interest on these scenes. In the narrative cycles of the area, the Maries and the Anastasis are grouped together in a fashion that dates back to the Oratory of John VII. The two scenes were not linked together through narrative, but through liturgy. It was argued that their early grouping helped to introduce the scene in the post-Resurrection narrative, but the later examples reveal point that that it was so successful that there was no need for it to be substituted by any other scene. In Cappadocia, the two scenes share a common narrative, liturgical and iconographic space.

The relation between the post-Resurrection appearances and the Anastasis was discussed by Kartsonis; however this thesis offered a fresh perspective and a somewhat different exegesis on the relation between two. The post-Resurrection appearances remained an adequate reference to the resurrection, and their message was enhanced through their association with current trends, liturgical changes and prominent feasts. One might even argue that the instances in which the post-Resurrection scenes are supplanted are no less than those in which they supersede the

Anastasis. In the discussion, I aimed not to employ any anachronistic thinking but rather to study the scenes in their own chronological and geographical context.

The changing postures of the Virgin in the Chairete, demonstrate how the relation between icon and beholder was transformed after Iconoclasm. The distant and majestic Saint Mary of the Sinai icon changed into the more personal mother of God, whose posture of humbleness and deep *proskynesis* provided the example with which the Byzantines should identify. The Virgin in front of the living Christ and the beholder in front of an icon should approach in humility and reverence, since what they see is not a mere depiction but a portal to higher things.

From Syria to Italy and from Egypt to Georgia, and everything in between, and from wood carving to manuscript illumination, and from mosaics to marble friezes, this thesis aspired to provide an exhaustive and detailed investigation of the surviving artistic and literary evidence available. The post-Resurrection appearances were important and self-sufficient scenes that were used not only as visual synonyms of Christ's resurrection, but also in a wider context, exactly because of their combined theological, historical and liturgical value. Little study has been devoted to the post-Resurrections scenes and this thesis has changed that.

APPENDIX 1

| Named Women in the Passion and post-Resurrection Narrative ||
Gospel	Named Women
Matthew 27: 56 (Crucifixion)	Mary Magdalene Mary the mother of James and Joses The mother of the sons of Zebedee
Matthew 27: 61 (Burial)	Mary Magdalene The other Mary
Matthew 28: 1 (Empty Tomb)	Mary Magdalene The other Mary
Matthew 28: 9 (Chairete)	Mary Magdalene The other Mary
Mark 15: 40 (Crucifixion)	Mary Magdalene Mary mother of James the little and Joses Salome
Mark 15: 47 (Burial)	Mary Magdalene Mary of Joses
Mark 15: 47 (Empty Tomb)	Mary Magdalene Mary mother of James Salome
Mark 16: 9-11 (Noli me Tangere)	Mary Magdalene
Luke 24: 10 (Empty Tomb)[1501]	Mary Magdalene Joanna Mary mother of James
John 19: 25 (Crucifixion)	The Virgin Mary the wife of Clopas (the Virgin's sister) Mary Magdalene
John 20: 1 (Empty Tomb)	Mary Magdalene
John 20: 11 (Noli me Tangere)	Mary Magdalene

[1501] The same group of women was probably present in the crucifixion and burial of Christ, where they are only referred to, as the women "which came with him from Galilee". Bauckham believes that in Luke 8: 2-3 and again in 24: 10, the evangelist mentions Joanna and Mary Magdalene, in order to remind the readers that the discipleship of these two women and the others spans from the Galilean ministry to the resurrection, Bauckham 2002, 186.

APPENDIX 2

- **Iconographic details of the resurrection scenes from the ninth century marginal Psalters**.

Psalm / Verse	Manuscr. / Folio	Use in Liturgy[1502]	*Christ*	*Tomb*	*David*	*Soldiers*	*Maries*
7: 7-9	(K:6ʳ)	*Prokeimenon* (S) (Mark 16:1-8)		●	●	●	
9: 33	(K:9ᵛ, P:24:ᵛ)	*Prokeimenon* (S) (John 20:1-10)	●	●	●		
11: 6	(P:26ᵛ)		●	●	●		
30: 5-7	(K:26ᵛ, P:30ᵛ)	*Troparion* (S) on Holy Saturday	●	●		●	
43: 24	(K:44ʳ)	*Orthros* (M) of Holy Saturday		●	●	●	●
68: 28-29	(K:67ᵛ, P:89ʳ)			●		●	
77: 65	(K:78ᵛ)	Holy Saturday (S)	●	●	●		
77: 65	(P:109ʳ)	--- >> ---	●	●		●	●

K: Khludov Psalter (Moscow, Historical Museum gr.129)
P: Pantokrator Psalter (Mount Athos, Pantokrator monastery, cod.61)
S: *Typikon of Hagia Sofia* (10ᵗʰ c.)
M: *Typikon of Messina* (1131 AD)
* The Paris Psalter (Paris, B.N.gr.20) does not contain any such details.

[1502] The information derives from Walter 1986, 272-282 and refers to the *Typikon of Hagia Sofia*, Mateos 1963 and the *Typikon of Messina*, Arranz 1969. See also Cutler 1980-81, 17-30. The choice of the *typika* was based on the fact that these preserve details, such at the readings of the Psalms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allwin DeLeeuw (P.) 1985: 'Gregory the Great's Homilies on the Gospels' *Studi Medievali, Serie Terza* 26, 855-869.

Amidon (P. R.) 1990: *The Panarion of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis: Selected Passages* (New York & Oxford).

Anderson (D.) 1997: *St. John of Damascus: On the Divine Images* (New York).

Anderson (J. C.) 1988: 'On the Nature of the Theodore Psalter', *ArtB* 70:4, 550-568.

Anderson (J. C.) 1994: 'The Palimpsest Psalter, Pantokrator Cod. 61: Its Content and Relationship to the Bristol Psalter', *DOP* 48, 199-220.

Anderson (J. C.) 1998: 'Further Prolegomena to a Study of the Pantokrator Psalter: An Unpublished Miniature, Some Restored Losses, and Observations on the Relationship with the Chludov Psalter and Paris Fragment', *DOP* 52, 305-321.

Antonopoulou (T.) 1998: 'Homiletic Activity in Constantinople around 900' in Cunningham (M.) and Allen (P.) eds. (Leiden, Boston, Cologne), 317-348.

Angelov (D.) 2006: *Imperial Ideology and Political Thought in Byzantium, 1204–1330*, Cambridge.

Arendzen (J.) 1910: 'Marcionites' in *Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York) retrieved from http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09645c.htm (13/07/09).

Arnaud-Lindet (M. -P.) 1990: *Orose Histoires (Contre les Païens)* [Text, introduction and translation] 1 (Paris).

Arranz (M.) 1969: *Le typikon du monastere du Saint-Sauveur a Messine* (Roma).

Aubineau (M.) ed. 1972: *Homélies Pascales (cinq homélies inédites)*, *SC* 187 (Paris).

Avery (M.) 1925: 'The Alexandrian Style of Santa Maria Antiqua Rome', *ArtB* 7:4 (1925), 131-149.

Baldovin (J. F.) 1989: *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem* (Nottingham).

Banck (A.) 1966: *Byzantine Art in the Collections of the USSR* (Leningrad and Moscow).

Barag (D.) and Wilkinson (J.) 1974: 'The Monza-Bobbio Flasks and the Holy Sepulchre', *Levant* 6, 179-87.

Bauckham (R.) 2002: *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels*, (Grand Rapids MI).

Beckwith (J.) 1975: 'Some Early Byzantine Rock Crystals', in Robertson (G.) and Henderson (G.) eds. *Studies in Memory of David Talbot Rice* (Edinburgh), 1-5.

Belting (H.) 1962: *Die Basilica dei SS. Martiri in Cimitile und ihr frühmittelalterlicher Freskenzyklus* (Wiesbaden).

Bercot (D. W.) ed. 1998: *A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs* (Peabody MA).

Berthier (J. -J.) 1892: *La Porte de Sainte-Sabine a Rome* (Friburg).

Bertonière (G.) 1972: *The Historical Development of Easter Vigil and Related Services in the Greek Church* OCA 193 (Rome).

Bettarini (R.) and Barocchi (P.) 1966: *Giorgio Vasari, Le Vite de' piu eccellenti pittori scultori e architettori, nelle redazioni del 1550 e 1568* (Florence).

Bethune-Baker (J. –P) 1923[3]: *An introduction to the Early History of the Christian Doctrine to the time of the Council of Chalcedon* (London).

Biddle (M.) 1994: 'The Tomb of Christ: Sources, Methods and a New Approach', in K. Painter, (ed.) *Churches Built in Ancient Times. Recent Studies in Early Christian Archaeology* (London), 73-147.

Biddle (M.) 2000: *The Church of the Holy Sepulchre* (Milan).

Borg (A.) 1981: 'The Lost Apse Mosaic of the Holy Sepulchre, Jerusalem' in Borg (A.) and Martindale (A.) *The Vanishing Past: Studies of Medieval Art, Liturgy and Metrology presented to Christopher Hohler*, BAR 111, 7-12.

Bosio (A.) 1632: *Roma sotteranea nelle quale si tratta de' sacri cimiterii di Roma, del sito, forma, et uso antico di essi...* (Rome).

Boston (K.) 2003: 'The Power of Inscriptions and the Trouble with Texts' in Eastmond (A.) and James (L.) eds. *Icon and Word: The Power of Images in Byzantium Studies presented to Robin Cormack* (Aldershot), 35-57.

Bovini (G.) 1953: 'Nuovissime osservazioni sulla tecnica e sui mosaic di S. Apollinare Nuovo di Ravenna' in *Atti dell' VII Congresso Internationale di Studi Bizantini* (Rome), II: 96-99.

Bovini (G.) 1961: *Sant' Apollinare Nuovo in Ravenna* (Milan).

Breckenridge (J. –D) 1957: '"Et Prima Vidit": The Iconography of the Appearance of Christ to His Mother', *ArtB* 39:1, 9-32.

Brubaker (L.) and Haldon (J.) 2001: *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca 680-850). The Sources* (Aldershot and Burlington).

Brubaker (L.) and Haldon (J.) 2009 [forthcoming]: *Byzantium in the Iconoclast Era (ca 680-850): Volume 2* (Cambridge).

Brubaker (L.) and Smith (J. M. H.) 2004: *Gender in the Early Medieval, East and West 300-900* (Cambridge).

Brubaker (L.) 1998: 'Icons before Iconoclasm?' *Morfologie Sociali e Culturali in Europa fra Tarda Antichità e Alto Medioevo* (Spoleto, 1998), 1215-1254.

Brubaker (L.) 1997: "Memories of Helena: Patterns in Imperial female Matronage in the fourth and fifth centuries" in James (L.) ed. *Women, Men and Eunuchs. Gender in Byzantium* (London and New York), 52-75.

Brubaker (L.) 1996: 'Miniatures and Liturgy: Evidence from the Ninth-Century codex Paris.gr.510' *Byzantion* 66, 9-34.

Brubaker (L.) 1989: 'Perception and Conception: Art, theory and culture in ninth-century Byzantium' Word and Image 5:1, 19-33.

Brubaker (L.) 1985: 'Politics, Patronage and Arts in Ninth-Century Byzantium: The "Homilies" of Gregory of Nazianzus in Paris (B.N.gr.510)', *DOP* 39, 1-13.

Cameron (A.) 1994: 'Texts as Weapons: Polemic in the Byzantine Dark Ages' in Bowman (A. K.) and Woolf (G.) eds., *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge), 198-215.

Catafygiotu Topping (E.) 1982: 'The Psalmist, St. Luke and Kassia the Nun', *EtudByz* 9: 2, 199-210.

Canévet (M.) 1983: *Gregoire de Nysse et l'Hermeneutique Biblique* (Paris).

Cave (J.) 1984: *The Byzantine wall-paintings of Kiliçlar Kilise: Aspects of monumental decoration in Cappadocia*, PhD Pennsylvania State University.

Cecchelli (C.) 1926-27: "Il Tesoro del Laterano – I. Oreficerie, Argenti, Smalti" *Dedalo* VII/ 1&2 (1926-1927).

Cecchelli (C.) 1957: *San Clemente* (Rome, 1957).

Cecchelli (C.) et al. 1959: *The Rabbula Gospels* (Olten and Lausanne).

Chadwick (H.) 1980: *Origen: Contra Celsum* [translation, introduction and notes] (Cambridge, 1980).

Chatzidaki (N.) 1997: *Hosios Lukas: Byzantine Art in Greece* (Athens, 1997).

Christ (W.) and Paranikas (M) 1963[2]: *Anthologia Graeca Carminum Christianorum* (Lipsiae).

Connor (C. L.) 1991: *Art and Miracles in Byzantium: The Crypt of Hosios Loukas and its Frescoes* (Princeton).

Cormack (R.) 1967: 'Byzantine Cappadocia: The Archaic Group of Wall-Paintings' *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* ser.3 30, 19-36.

Corrigan (K.) 1992: *Visual Polemics in the Ninth-Century Byzantine Psalters* (Cambridge).

Cross (F. L.) 1995: *St. Cyril of Jerusalem's Lectures on the Christian Sacraments* (New York).

Cutler (A.) 1998: 'On First Principles and Second Thoughts" in *Late Antique and Byzantine Ivory Carving* I: 1-8 (Aldershot, 1998).

Cunningham (M.) 1996: 'The Sixth Century: A Turning-Point for Byzantine Homiletics?' in E. Jeffreys and P. Allen, *The Sixth Century: End or Beginning* (Brisbane).

Cunningham (M.) 1998: 'Andrew of Crete: A High-Style Preacher of the Eight Century' in Cunningham (M.) and Allen (P.) eds. (Leiden, Boston, Cologne), 267-293.

Cunningham (M.) and Allen (P.) eds. 1998: *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden, Boston and Cologne).

D'Onofrio (M.) 1999: 'L'Iconografia di Christo ad Emaus e l'abbigliamento del Pellegrino medievale' in Von Saucken (P. C.) ed. *Santiago, Roma, Jerusalem. Actas del III Congreso Internacional de Estudios Jacobeos* (Santiago), 63-79.

Dalton (O. M.) 1911: *Byzantine Art and Archaeology* (Oxford).

Daley (B. E.) S.J. 1998: *On the Dormition of Mary: Early Patristic Homilies* [Translation and commentary] (Crestwood, N.J.).

Davis Weyer (C.) 1993: *Early Medieval Art 300-1500: Sources and Documents* (Toronto).

Davies (J. G.) 1968: *The Architectural Setting of Baptism* (London).

Datema (C.) 1970: *Asterius of Amasia, Homilies I-XIV: Text, Introduction and Notes* (Leiden).

De Campos (D. R.) 1975: *Art Treasures of the Vatican: Architecture, Painting, Sculpture* (Amsterdam).

De Matons (J. C.) 1964-1981: *Romanos le Melode hymnes* 5 vols. (Paris).

De Matons (J. C.) 1973, 'Trois études sur Léon VI' *Travaux et Memoires* 5, 181-242.

De Urbina (O.) 1953: 'Il Dogma di Efeso', *REB* 11, 233-240.

Delbrueck (R.) 1934: 'Notes on the Wooden Doors of Santa Sabina' in *ArtB* 34: 2, 139-145.

Deliyannis (D. M.) 2006: *Agnelli Ravennatis, Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis* (Turnhout).

Demus (O.) 1949: *The Mosaics of Norman Sicily* (London).

Demus (O.) 1979: '"The Sleepless Watcher" Ein Erklärungsversuch', *JÖB* 28, 241-245.

Der Nersessian (S.) 1993: *Miniature Painting in the Armenian Kingdom of Cilicia from the twelfth to the fourteenth centuries*, 2 vols. (Washington D.C.).

Diez (E.) and Demus (O.) 1931: *Byzantine Mosaics in Greece: Daphni and Hosios Lucas* (Cambridge MA).

Dorigo (W.) 1966: *Pittura tardoromana* (Milan).

Doval (A. J.) 2001: *Cyril of Jerusalem, Mystagogue: The authorship of the Mystagogic Catecheses* (Washington, D.C.).

Downey (G.) 1951: 'The Builder of the Original Church of the Apostles at Constantinople: A Contribution to the Criticism of the Vita Contantini attributed to Eusebius' *DOP* 6, 53-80.

Downing (C. J.) 1996: 'Wall Paintings from the Baptistery at Stobi, Macedonia, and Early Depictions of Christ and the Evangelists' *DOP* 52, 259-280.

Dübner (F.) 1864: *Epigrammatum Anthologia Palatina cum Planudeis et Appendice Nova: Epigrammatum Veterum ex Libris et Marboribus* I (Paris).

Dufrenne (S.) 1966: *L'illustration des psautiers grecs du Moyen Age* I. *Pantocrator 61, Paris Grec 20, British Muséum 40731*. Bibliothèque des Cahiers Archéologiques, I (Paris).

Dyck (A. R.) 1986: 'On Cassia, Κύριε η εν πολλαις' *Byzantion* 56, 63-76.

Eastmond (A.) 1988: *Royal Imagery in Medieval Georgia* (University Park, PA).

Eastmond (A.) and James (L.) eds. 2003: *Icon and Word. The Power of Images in Byzantium. Studies presented to Robin Cormack* (Aldershot).

Elsner (J.) 1997: 'Replicating Palestine and Reversing the Reformation: Pilgrimage and collecting at Bobbio, Monza and Walsingham' *Journal of the History of Collections* 9:1, 117-130.

Engenmann (J.) 1973: 'Palästinensische Pilgerampullen im F. J. Dölger Institut in Bonn', *JbAC* 16.

Ettlinger (G. H.) ed. 1975: *Theodoret of Cyrus: Eranistes*, [Introduction, translation and notes] (Oxford).

Evans (E.) 1964: *Tertullian's Homily on Baptism* [Introduction, translation and notes] (London).

Evans (H. C.) and Wixom (W. D.) eds. 1997: *The Glory of Byzantium: Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era A.D. 843-1261* (New York).

Frazer (J. G.) 1921: *Apollodorus: The Library* [Translation], (London and New York).

Foerster (R.) 1929: *Choricii Gazaei Opera* (Leipzig).

Foss (C.) 2002: 'Pilgrimage in Medieval Asia Minor' *DOP* 56, 129-151.

Frede (M.) 1999: 'Origen's Treatise against Kelsos' in M. Edwards, M. Goodman and S. Price (eds.) *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews and Christians* (Oxford), 131-155.

Frolow (A.) 1945: 'Deux églises byzantines d'après des sermons peu connus de Léon VI le Sage' *EtudByz* 3, 43-91.

Galavaris (G.) 1959: *The Illustrations of the Liturgical Homilies of Gregory Nazianzenus* (Princeton N.Y.).

Gambero (L.) 1999: *Mary and the Fathers of the Church: The blessed Virgin Mary in patristic thought* (San Francisco).

Garsoian (N. G.) 1971: 'Byzantine Heresy: A Reinterpretation', *DOP* 25, 87-113.

Gates (H. –M.) 1984: 'Dura-Europos: A Fortress of Syro-Mesopotamian Art', *Biblical Archaeologist*, 166-181.

Gautier (P.) ed. 1980: *Theophylacte d'Achrida Discours, Traites, Poésies*, [Introduction, texte, traduction et notes] CFHB 16/1 Series Thessalonicensis, (Thessalonique); 1986: *Lettres*, CFHB 16/2 (Thessaloniki).

Giannelli (C.) 1953: 'Témoignages patristiques grecs en faveur d'une apparition du Christ ressuscité à la Vierge Marie', *REB* 11, 106-119.

Goldschmidt (A.) 1970: *Die Elfenbeinskulpturen, aus der zeit der Karolingischen und Sächsischen Kaiser, VIII – XI Jahrhundert* (Berlin).

Goldschmidt (A.) and Weitzmann (K.) 1979: *Die Byzantinischen Elfenbeinskulpturen, des X - XII. Jahrhunderts* 2: *Reliefs* (Berlin).

Goulder (M. D.) 1999: 'Ignatius Docetists' *VigChrist* 53:1, 16-30.

Grabar (A.) 1972: *Martyrium: Recherches sur le culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique.* I: *Architecture* II: *Iconographie* (London).

Grabar (A.) 1969: *Christian Iconography: A Study of its Origin* (London).

Grabar (A.) 1958: *Les Ampoules de Terre Sainte* (Paris).

Grabar (A.) 1956: 'La Fresque des Saintes Femmes au Tombeau a Dura', *CA* 8, 9-26.

Grant (R) ed. 1966: *The Apostolic Fathers: A new Translation and Commentary*, vol. 4 (London, Camden N.J., Toronto).

Grillmeier (A.) 1975[2]: *Christ in Christian Tradition*: *From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)* transl. J. Bowden (London and Oxford).

Guwerich (V.) 1957: 'Observations on the Iconography of the Wound in Christ's side, with Special Reference to Its Position' *JWarb* 20:3/4, 358-362.

Hadjisolomos (S.) 1986, *The Modal Structure of the 11 Eothina Anastassima ascribed to the Emperor Leo* (+912) (Nicosia).

Halkin, (F.) 1939: 'Le mois de janvier du "Ménologe Imperial" byzantin', *Analecta Bollandiana* LVII, 225-236.

Hamlyn Hill (J.) 1894: *The Earliest Life of Christ ever compiled by from the four Gospels being the Diatessaron of Tatian* (Edinburgh).

Hannick (C.) 2005: 'The Theotokos in Byzantine hymnography: typology and allegory', in Vassilaki (M.) ed. *Images of the Mother of God: Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium* (Aldershot), 69-76.

Hanson (R. P.) 1988: *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381* (Edinburgh).

Harvey (W.) et al. 1910: *The Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem* (London).

Hodges (R.) 1997: *Light in the Dark Ages: The Rise and Fall of San Vincenzo al Volturno* (London).

Hörandner (W.) 1992: 'Ein Zyklus von Epigrammen zu Darstellungen von Herrenfesten und Wunderszenen', *DOP* 46, 107-115.

Hörandner (W.) 1994: 'A Cycle of Epigrams on the Lord's Feasts in Cod. Marc. Gr. 524' *DOP* 48, 117-133.

Hunger (H.) 1982: 'Gregorios von Korinth; Epigramme auf die Feste des Dodekaorton' *AB* 100 (1982).

Hunt (L -A.) 1991: 'Art and Colonialism: The mosaics of the Nativity Church in Bethlehem (1169) and the problem of "Crusader" Art', *DOP* 45, 69-85.

Innes (J.) 1874: *Lectures or Tractates on the Gospel according to Saint John* (Edinburgh).

Ilsley Minott (C.) 1967: *The Iconogaraphy of the Frescoes of the Life of Christ in the Church of Sant'Angelo in Formis*, PhD Princeton University.

Jaeger (W.) 1958: *Gregorii Nysseni Opera* (Leiden).

James (M. R.) 1924: *The Apocryphal New Testament being the Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypses* (Oxford).

James (L.) and Webb (R.) 1991: 'To Understand Ultimate Things and Enter Secret Places: Ekphrasis and Art in Byzantium' *Art History* 14, 1-15

James (L.) 1994: 'Monks, monastic art, the sanctoral cycle and the middle Byzantine Church', in Mullet (M.) and Kirby (A.) eds. *The Theotokos Evergetis and eleventh-century monasticism*, Byzantine Texts and Translations 6.1 (Belfast), 162-175.

James (L.) 1996: '"Pray Not to Fall into Temptation and Be on Your Guard": Pagan Statues in Christian Constantinople', *Gesta* 35: 1, 12-20.

James (L.) 1997: *Women, Men and Eunuchs Gender in Byantium* (London and New York).

James (L.) ed. 2007: *Art and Text in Byzantine Culture* (Cambridge).

Janin (R.) 1969, *La Géographie Ecclésiastique de l'Empire Byzantin; I: Le siège de Constantinople et le Patriarcat Oecuménique III: Les eglises et les monasteres* (Paris).

Jenkins (R.) et al. 1954: 'Nine Orations of Arethas from Cod.Marc.Gr.524', with B. Laurdas and C. A. Mango, *BZ* 47, 1-40.

Jeremias (G.) 1980: *Die Holtztur der Basilika S. Sabina in Rom* (Tubingen).

Jerphanion (G. de) 1925-1942: *Une nouvelle province de l'art Byzantin: Les églises rupestres de Cappadoce* 5 vols. (Paris).

Jerphanion (G. de) 1930: *La Voix des Monuments: Notes et Etudes d'Archéologie Chrétienne* (Paris and Brussels).

Janashian, (M.): *Armenian Miniature Painting of the Monastic Library at San Lazaro: I* (Venice).

Joosten (J.) 2003: 'The Dura Parchment and the Diatessaron' *VigChrist* 57, 159-175.

Jolivet-Lévy (C.) 1991: *Les Eglises Byzantines de Cappadoce: le programme iconographique de l'abside et de ses abords* (Paris).

Kalavrezou (I.) 1990: 'Images of the Mother: When the Virgin Mary became Meter Theou', *DOP* 44, 165-172.

Kalavrezou (I.) 1977: 'Eudokia Makrembolitissa and the Romanos Ivory', *DOP* 31, 307-325.

Karras (V) 2005: 'The Liturgical Function of Consecrated Women in the Byzantine Church' *Theological Studies* 66, 96-116.

Kartsonis (A.) 1986: *Anastasis: The Making of an Image* (Princeton).

Kazhdan (A.) 1999: *A History of Byzantine Literature* (650-850) (Athens).

Kelly (J. N. D.) 1958: *Early Christian Doctrines* (London).

Khitrowo de (B.) 1889: *Itinéraires Russes en Orient* (Genève).

Kinney (D.) 1994: 'A Late Antique Ivory and Modern Response' with Cutler (A.) 'Suspicio Symmachorum: A Postscript', *AJA* 98.3, 457-480.

Kitzinger (E.) 1960: *Early Medieval Art in the British Museum* (London).

Kitzinger (E.) 2002: 'Reflections on the Feast Cycle in Byzantine Art' *Studies in Late Antique, Byzantine and Medieval Western Art* 1 (London); first published in *Cahiers Archéologiques* 36, 1988, 51-73.

Kleinbauer (W. E.) 1987: 'The Double-Shell Tetraconch Building at Perge in Pamphylia and the Origin of the Architectural Genus' *DOP* 41, 277-293.

Kodell (J.) 1988: *The Eucharist in the New Testament* (Collegeville, MI).

Konis (P.) 2008: 'The Munich-Ascension Ivory: Late Antique or Carolingian', [Paper presented at the 9th Postgraduate Colloquium, Birmingham, 31st May 2008].

Kraeling (C. H.) 1967: *Excavations at Dura Europos. Final Report VIII, Part II: The Christian Building* (New Haven).

Krautheimer (R.) 1986[4]: *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* [Revised by R. Krautheimer and S. Ćurčić], (New Haven and London).

Krumbacher (K.) 1964: *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Literatur* 1 [Greek Translation] (Athens).

Kugener and Triffaux 1922: 'Les Homiliae Cathedrales de Sévère D'Antioche, Homélie LXXVII', *PO* 16.

Lafontaine-Dosogne (J.) 1963: 'Nouvelles notes Cappadociennes', *Byzantion* 33, 121-183

Lauer (M. P.) 1906: 'Le Trésor du Sancta Sanctorum' *MonPiot* 15.

Lawrence (M.) 1970: *The Sarcophagi of Ravenna* (Rome).

Lawson (J.) 1948: *The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeos* (London).

Lazarev (V.) 1967: *Storia della Pittura Bizantina* (Torino).

Lightfoot (J. B.) 1889: *The Apostolic Fathers: Part II: S. Ignatios, S. Polycarp* (London and New York).

Louth (A.) 2002: *St John Damascene: Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology* (Oxford).

Lüdemann (G.) 1996: *Heretics: The other Side of Early Christianity*, [English Translation, John Bowden] (London).

Maas (P.) and Trypanis (C. A.) 1997: *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica: Cantica Genuina* (Oxford).

Mackie (G.) 1997: 'A New Look at the Patronage of Santa Costanza, Rome' *Byzantion* 67, 383-406.

Macrides (R.) and Magdalino (P.) 1988: 'The Architecture of Ekphrasis: Construction and Context of Paul the Silentiary's Poem on Hagia Sophia', *BMGS* 12, 47-82.

Magie (D.) 1954: *The Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, 3 vols. [Translation] (London and Cambridge Massachusetts).

Maguire (H.) 2007: 'Eufrasius and Friends: On Names and Their Absence in Byzantine Art' in James (L.) ed. *Art and Text in Byzantine Culture* (Cambridge), 139-160.

Maier (J. L.) 1964: *Le baptistère de Naples et ses mosaïques* (Freiburg).

Mâle (E.) 1960: *The Early Christian Churches of Rome* (London).

Mánek (J.) 1958: 'The Apostle Paul and the Empty Tomb', *NT* 2.

Mango (C.) 1960: 'The Legend of Leo the Wise' in *Zbornik Radova Vizantološkog Instituta* VI, 59-93.

Mango (C.) 1969-70: 'Notes on Byzantine Monuments' *DOP* 23, 369-375.

Mango (C.) 1972: *The Art of the Byzantine Empire 312-1453. Sources and Documents*: The History of Arts Series (Englewood Cliffs).

Maraval (P.) 1982: *Egérie, Journal de Voyage (Itinéraire)*, SC 296 (Paris).

Maraval (P.) 2002: 'The Earliest Phase of Christian Pilgrimage in the Near East (before the 7th c.)' in *DOP* 56, 63-74.

Mary (Mother) and Ware (C.), *The Lenten Triodion from the Original Greek by Mother Mary and Archimandrite Kallistos Ware* (London and Boston).

Marcovich (M.) ed. 2001: *Origenes Contra Celsum Libri VIII* VCS 54 (Leiden, Boston, Köln).

Mateos (J.) 1963: *Le Typicon de la Grande Eglise: Ms. Saint-Croix no 40, Xe siècle. Tome II: Les Cycle des Fêtes Mobiles*, OCA 166 (Roma).

Mathews (T. F.) 1971: *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy* (University Park and London, 1971).

Mathews (T. F.) 1993: *The Clash of Gods: A reinterpretation of Early Christian Art* (Princeton).

Mathews (T. F.) 1995: 'The Sequel to Nicaea II in Byzantine Church Decoration' XII: 11-21 in *Art and Architecture in Byzantium and Armenia* (Aldershot); first published in *Perkins Journal* 41/3 (1988), 11-21.

MacMullen (R.) 1989: 'The Preacher's Audience (AD 350-400)', *JTS* 40, 503-511.

Meyendorff (J.) 1974: *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes* (London and Oxford).

Meyer (J. R.) 2006: 'God's Trinitarian substance in Athanasian Theology', *SJT* 59:1, 81-97.

Milburn (R.) 1988: *Early Christian Art and Architecture* (Aldershot).

Millet (G.) 1960: *Recherches sur l'Iconographie de l'Evangile*, (Paris).

Millet (G.) 1956: 'Dura et El-Bagawat: Les Parabole des Vierges', *CA* 8, 1-9.

Mitsakis (K.) 1986: *Byzantine Hymnography from the New Testament until Iconoclasm* [Greek] (Athens, 1986).

Mitchell (J.) 1985: 'The Painted Decoration of the Early Medieval Monastery' in R. Hodges and J. Mitchell, *San Vincenzo al Volturno: The Archaeology, Art and Territory of an Early Medieval Monastery* BAR 252, 125-176.

Morey (C. R.) 1929: 'Notes on East Christian Miniatures' *ArtB* 11:1, 4-103.

Morey (C. R.) 1942: *Medieval Art* (New York).

Mullet (M.) 1997: *Theophylact of Ohrid: Reading the Letters of a Byzantine Archbishop* BBOM 2 (Aldershot and Brookfield).

Munteanu (V.) 1977: 'A Romanesque Copy of the Anastasis: The Chapel of Saint Jean of Le Liget' *Gesta* 16:2, 27-40.

Mundell-Mango (M.) 1983: 'Where was Beth Zagba?' *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 7, 405-429.

Muratori (S) 1911: 'La Incredulita di S. Tommaso', *NBullArcChr* XVII, 39-58.

Murray (P.) and Murray (L.) 2001: *A Dictionary of Christian Art* (Oxford).

Nees (L.) 2002: *Early Medieval Art* (Oxford).

Nordhagen (P. J.) 1968: *Institutum Romanum Norvegiae. Acta ad Archaeologia et Artium Historiam Pertinentia, Volumen III: The Frescoes of John VII (A.D. 705-707),* (Roma).

Oikonomides (N.) 1992: 'The First Century of Hosios Lukas', *DOP* 46, 245-255.

Oldfather (C. H.) 1935: *Diodorus of Sicily* (London and Cambridge Massachusetts).

Omont (H.) 1908: *Evangiles avec Peintures Byzantine du XIe siecle* 2 vols. (Paris).

Osborne (J.) 1984, *Early Medieval Wall-Paintings in the Lower Church of San Clemente, Rome* (New York and London).

Ostrogorsky (G.) 1963: *Geschichte des Byzantinischen Staates* (Munich) [Greek Translation Athens 1995].

Ousterhout (R.) 1990: 'The Temple, the Sepulchre and the Martyrion of the Savior', *Gesta* XXIX/1, 44-53.

Ousterhout (R.) 1996: 'An Apologia for Byzantine Architecture' *Gesta* 25, 21-33.

Ousterhout (R.) 1997: 'Survey of the Byzantine Settlement at Çahn Kilise in Cappadocia: Results of the 1995 and 1996 Seasons" *DOP* 51, 301-306.

Ousterhout (R.) 2005: *A Byzantine Settlement in Cappadocia* DOS 42 (Washington D.C.).

Panselinou (N.) 2000: *Byantine Painting: The Byzantine Society and Its Icons* (Athens).

Papadopoulos-Kerameus (A.) 1963^2: *Analekta Hierosolymitikes Stachyologias* vol. II [Greek] (Bruxelles).

Parker (D. C.), Taylor (D. G. K.) and Goodacre (M. S.) 1999: 'The Dura-Europos Gospel Harmony' in Taylor (D. G. K.) ed. *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts* [SBL Text-Critical Studies 1], (Birmingham) 192-228.

Pelekanides (S. M.) et al. 1980: *The Treasures of Mount Athos* (Athens).

Peltomaa (L. M.) 2001: *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathistos Hymn* (Leiden, Boston, Köln).

Pettersen (A.) 1995: *Athanasius* (London).

Philip (R. A.) 1990: *The Panarion of St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis: Selected Passages* (New York and Oxford).

Piatinsky (Y.) Baddeley (O.) Brunner (E.) and Mango (M. M.) eds. 2000: *Sinai, Byzantium and Russia: Orthodox Art from the Sixth to the Twentieth Century* (London).

Piédagnel (A.) and Paris (P.) 1966: *Cyrille de Jérusalem, Catéchèses Mystagogiques* SC 126 (Paris).

Pitra (J. B.) 1852: *Spicilegium Solesmense Complectus Sanctorum Patrum Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum*, 1 (Paris).

Pitra (J. B.) 1858: *Spicilegium Solesmense Complectus Sanctorum Patrum Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum*, 4 (Paris).

Pohl (W.) 2004: 'Gender and Ethnicity in the Early Middle Ages' in Brubaker (L.) and Smith (J. M. H.) eds. *Gender in the Early Medieval World, East and West, 300-900* (Cambridge) 23-43.

Price (S.) 1999: 'Latin Christian Apologetics: Minacius Felix, Tertullian and Cyprian' in M. Edwards, M. Goodman and S. Price (eds.) *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews and Christians* (Oxford), 103-129.

Prigent (P.) and Kraft R.A) 1971: *Épître de Barnabé* [introduction, translation, notes] SC 172 (Paris).

Richard (M.) and Munitiz (J. A.) eds. 2006: *Anastasii Sinaitae, Questiones et Responsiones* CCSG 59 (Leuven).

Richardson (C.) et al. 1953: *Early Christian Fathers*, (London, 1953).

Réau (L.) 1957: *Iconographie de l'Art Chrétien*, (Paris).

Restle (M.) 1967: *Byzantine Wall Paintings in Asia Minor* 3 vols. (Recklinghausen).

Restle (M.) 1973: 'Zum Datum der Karabaş Kilise in Soğanli Dere' *JÖB* 19, 261-266.

Robins (H. R.) 1993: *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*, Trends in Linguistics/ Studies and Monographs 70 (Berlin and New York).

Rodley (L.) 1983: 'The Pigeon House at Çavusin' *JÖB* 33, 301-339.

Rodley (L.) 1985: *Cave monasteries of Byzantine Cappadocia* (Cambridge).

Rothe (E.) 1968: *Medieval Book Illumination in Europe* (London).

Roe (A. S.) 1941: 'A Steatite plaque from the Museo Sacro of the Vatican Library', *ArtB* 23:3, 213-220.

Ross (M. C.) 1965: *Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Medieval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection* 2: *Jewelry, Enamels and Art of the Migration Period* (Washington D. C.).

Saxer (V.) 1958: 'Les Saintes Marie Madeleine et Marie de Béthanie dans la tradition liturgique et homilétique orientale' *RSR* 32, 1-37.

Schluberger (G.) 1893: 'Quelques monuments byzantins inédits' *BZ 2* 90-1; reprinted in idem, *Melanges d'Archeologie Byzantine* (Paris, 1895).

Ševčenko (I.) 1962: 'The Illuminators of the Menologium of Basil II' *DOP* 16, 243-276.

Shaw (A.) 1974: 'The Breakfast by the Shore and the Mary Magdalene Encounter as Eucharistic Narratives', *JThSt*, 12-26.

Shchepkina (M. V.) 1977: Миниатюры Хлудовской Рсалтьри (Moscow).

Smith (R. R. R.) 1999: 'Late Antique Portraits in a Public Context: Honorific Statuary at Aphrodisias in Caria, A.D. 300-600' *JRS* 89, 155-189.

Soteriou (G.) and Soteriou (M.) 1956-58: *Icons du Mont Sinai* I: Planches (Athens, 1956), II : Texte (Athens 1958) [In Greek with French synopsis].

St. Clair (A.) 1979: 'The Visit to the Tomb: Narrative and Liturgy on Three Early Christian Pyxides' *Gesta* 18: 1, [Papers Related to Objects in the Exhibition "Age of Spirituality", The Metropolitan Museum of Art (November 1977-February 1978)], 127-135.

Stadtmveller (H.) 1894: *Anthologia Graeca, Epigrammatum Palatina cum Planudea* I (Lipsiae).

Stead (G. C.) 1978: 'The Thalia of Arius and the Testimony of Athanasius', *JThSt* 29, 20-52.

Szövérffy (J.) 1963: 'Peccatrix Quondam Femina': A Survey of the Mary Magdalene Hymns', *Traditio* XIX (1963), 79-146.

Taft (R.) 1980/81: 'The Liturgy of the Great Church: An Initial Synthesis of Structure and Interpretation on the Eve of Iconoclasm', *DOP* 34/5, 45-75.

Talbot (A. –M.) 1994: 'Epigrams of Manuel Philes on the Theotokos tes Peges and Its Art' *DOP* 48, 135-165.

Tanner (N. P.) 1990: *Degrees of the Ecumenical Councils* 1: *Nicaea I to Lateran V* (London and Washington D.C., 1990).

Tarchnischvili (M.) 1959: *Le Grand Lectionnaire de l'église de Jérusalem (V^e- VIIIe siècle)*, CSCO 188 – Scriptores Iberici 9 (Louvain).

Thierry (N.) 1968: 'Un décor pré-Iconoclaste de Cappadoce: Açikel Ağa Kilisesi (église de l'Ağa, a la main ouverte') *CA* 18, 33-69.

Thierry (N.) 1975: 'L'art monumental byzantin en Asie Mineure du xie siècle au xive' *DOP* 29, 73-111.

Thierry (N.) and Thierry (M.) 1963: *Nouvelles Eglises Rupestres de Cappadoce: Région du Hasan Daği* (Paris).

Thomsen (P.) 1903: *Palaestina nach dem Onomasticon des Eusebiu*, PhD University of Tübingen.

Tillyard (H. J. W.) 1923: *Byzantine Music and Hymnography* (London).

Tillyard (H. J. W.) 1930-31: Ἐωθινά Ἀναστάσιμα: The Morning Hymns of the Emperor Leo: Part 2. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 31, 115-147.

Tillyard (H. J. W.) ed. 1940-49: *The Hymns of the Octoechus*, in C. Höeg, H. J. W. Tillyard, E. Wellesz, *Monumenta Musicae Byzantinae Transcripta* (Copenhagen).

Tobler (T) 1874: *Descriptiones Terrae Sanctae ex saeculo VIII. IX. XII. et XV.* (Leipzig).

Tomadakis (N.) 1965^3: *Η Βυζαντινή Υμνογραφία και Ποίησης* (Θεσσαλονίκη).

Tonneau (R.) and Devreesse (R.) eds. 1949: *Les Homélies Catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste. Reproduction phototypique du ms. Mingana Syr. 561 (Selly Oak Colleges' Library, Birmingham)* Studi e Testi 145 (Vatican, 1949).

Torrance (I. R.) 1988: *Christology after Chalcedon: Severos of Antioch and Sergios the Monophysite* (Norwich).

Tougher (S.) 1997: *The Reign of Leo VI (886-912): Politics and People* (Leiden, New York and Köln).

Trigg (J. W.) 1998: *Origen: The Early Church Fathers* (London & New York).

Tripolitis (A.) ed. 1992: *Kassia: The Legend, the Woman and her Work*, Garland Library of Medieval Literature 84 (New York and London).

Tronzo (W.) 1987: 'Setting and Structure in two Roman Wall-Paintings of the Early Middle Ages', *DOP* 41, 477-492.

Tsironis (N.) 1997: 'George of Nicomedia: Convention and Originality in the Homily of the Good Friday' *Studia Patristica* 30, 332-336.

Tsironis (N.) 1998: 'Historicity and Poetry in Ninth-century Homiletics: the Homilies of Patriarch Photios and George of Nicomedia' in M. Cunningham and P. Allen, *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics* (Leiden, Boston, Köln), 295-316.

Tsironis (N.) 2003-04: 'The Body and the Senses in the Work of Cassia the Hymnographer: Literary Trends in the Iconoclastic Period', *Symmeikta* 16, 139-157.

Tuckett (C.) 2007: *The Gospel of Mary* (Oxford).

Underwood (P. A.) 1950, 'The Fountain of Life in Manuscripts of the Gospels', *DOP* 5, 43-138.

Urbano (A.) 2005, 'Donation, Dedication and Damnatio Memoriae: The Catholic reconciliation of Ravenna and the Church of Sant' Apollinare Nuovo', *JEChrSt* 13:1, 71-110.

Van Dijk (A.) 2001: 'Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, and Constantinople: The Peter Cycle in the Oratory of John VII (705-707)', *DOP* 55, 305-328.

Velmans (T.) 1971: *Le Tétraévangile de la Laurentienne: Florence, Laur.VI 23*, Bibliothèque des Cahiers Archéologiques, 6 (Paris).

Vikan (G.) 1982: *Byzantine Pilgrimage Art* (Washington D.C.).

Vikan (G.) 1991/2: 'Two Byzantine Amuletic Armbands and the Group that they Belong', *The Journal of the Walter Arts Gallery* 49/50, 33-51.

Voght (A.) 1935: *Constantin VII Porphyrogenete: Le Livre des Ceremonies*, 1: Text and translation; 2: Commentary (Paris).

Volbach (W. F.) 1961: *Early Christian Art* (London).

Von Bothmer (D) 1957: *Amazons in Greek Art* (Oxford).

Von Simson (O.) 1987: *Sacred Fortress: Byzantine Art and Statecraft in Ravenna* (Princeton).

Vööbus (A.) 1951: *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac*, CSCO 128, Subsidia tom.3 (Louvain).

Waetzdolt (St.) 1964: *Die Kopien des 17 Jahrhunderts nach Mosaiken und Wandmalereien in Rom* [Römische Forschungen der Bibliotheca Hertziana 18] (Wien).

Wallis Budge (E. A.) 1913: *Coptic Apocrypha in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*, (London).

Walter (C.) 1986: 'Christological themes in the Byzantine marginal Psalters from the ninth to the eleventh century', *REB* 44, 269-287.

Walter (C.) 1991-92: 'The Date and Content of the Dionysiou Lectionary', in *ΔXAE Δ´* IΣT´, 132-152 reproduced in Walter (C.) 2000, *Pictures as Language: How the Byzantine Exploited them* (London) VI.

Webb (R.) 1999: 'The Aesthetics of Sacred Space: Narrative, Metaphor and Motion in *Ehphraseis* of Church Buildings', *DOP* 53, 59-60.

Wegner (A.) 2001: *Huit Catéchèses Baptismales Inédites* SC 50 (Paris).

Weitzmann (K.) 1960: 'The Survival of Mythological Representations in Early Christian and Byzantine Art and Their Impact on Christian Iconography', *DOP* 14, 45-68.

Weitzmann (K.) 1966: 'Eine vorikonoklastische Ikone des Sinai mit der Darstellung des Chairete', *Tortulae RQ,* Suppl. 30 (Rome), 317-325.

Weitzmann (K.) 1971: 'Diptikh slonovoi kosti iz Ermitazha otnocyashchiisya k krugu Imperatora Romana' *Византийский временник* 32, 142-155 reproduced and translated in Idem (1980), *Byzantine Book Illumination and Ivories* VIII, 3-15: 'An Ivory Diptych of the Romanos Group in the Hermitage' (London).

Weitzmann (K.) 1972: *Catalogue of the Byzantine and Early Medieval Antiquities in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection* 3: *Ivories and Steatites* (Washington D.C.).

Weitzmann (K.) 1974: '*Loca Sancta* and the Representational Arts of Palestine', *DOP* 28, 31-55.

Weitzmann, (K.) 1976: *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai; The Icons. Volume One: From the Sixth to the Tenth century* (Princeton).

Weitzmann (K.) 1979: *Age of Spirituality: A Catalogue* (New York).

Wellesz (E.) 1949: *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography* (Oxford).

Westerink (L. G.) ed. 1972: *Arethae Scripta Minora* 2 (Leipzig).

Wharton Epstein (A.) 1975: 'Rock-Cut Chapels in Göreme Valley, Cappadocia: The Yilanli Group and the Column Churches', *CA* 24, 115-135.

Wharton Epstein (A.) 1979: 'The Problem of Provincialism: Byzantine Monasteries in Cappadocia and Monks in Italy' *JWarb* 42, 28-46.

Wharton Epstein (A.) 1982: 'The Rebuilding and Redecoration of the Holy Apostles in Constantinople: A Reconsideration', *GRBS* 23, 79-92.

Wharton Epstein (A.) 1986: *Tokali Kilise: Tenth Century Metropolitan Art in Byzantine Cappadocia* DOS 22 (Washington D.C.).

Whitaker (E. C.) 2003[3]: *Documents of the Baptismal Liturgy* [revised and expanded by M. T. Johnson] (London).

Williamson (P.) 1986: *The Medieval Treasury: The art of the Middle Ages in the Victoria and Albert Museum* (London).

Wilkinson (J.) 1972: "The Tomb of Christ: an outline of its structural history", *Levant* IV, 92-93.

Wilkinson (J.) 1977: *Jerusalem Pilgrims: Before the Crusades* (Warminster).

Wilkinson (J.) 1999: *Egeria's Travels* (Warminster).

Williams (A. L.) 1930: *Justin Martyr: The Dialogue with Trypho* [Translation, introduction, notes] (London).

Willoughby (H. R.) 1955: 'The Distinctive Sources of the Palestinian Iconography' *JBL* 74, 61-68.

Wilpert (J.) 1929-36: *I Sarcophagi christiani antichi*, 3 vols. (Rome).

Wilson (C. W.) 1895: *The Pilgrimage of the Russian Abbot Daniel in the Holy Land: 1106-1107 A.D.* (London).

Wilson (R. McL.) 1973: *New Testament Apocrypha* (Wiltshire); first published as E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen* 1 (Tubingen).

Wolf (C. U.) 1964: 'Eusebius of Caesaria and the Onomasticon' *The Biblical Archaeologist* XXVII: 3.

Yarnold (S. J.) 2000: *Cyril of Jerusalem* (London & New York).

Zarras (N.) 2006: *The Iconographic Cycle of the Eothina Gospel in the Palaeologan Monumental Art of the Balkans* [Greek] PhD National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.

Zucchini (G. V.) and Bucci (M.) 1968, *I sarcophagi a figure e a carattere simbolico* (Roma) in G. Bovini, *Corpus della scultura paleocristiana bizantina ed altomediovale de Ravenna* 3 vols. (Rome).