

## Accepted Version

Gaetano Curzi

*Reflexes of Iconoclasm and Iconophilia in the Roman wall paintings and mosaics during the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries*

In

in "Ikon. Journal of Iconographic Studies", 10, 2018, pp. 9-20 (**rivista di fascia A**). (ISSN 1846-8551)

Gaetano Curzi

University of Chieti-Pescara

g.curzi@unich.it

**Abstract:** In the first decades of the 8th century, the affirmation of Iconoclasm in the Byzantine Empire opens a groove between Rome and Constantinople, that will be reconstructed only in the middle of the next century. In this long time frame we are witnessing the rebirth of the Western Empire with the coronation of Charlemagne, who also expressed doubts about the legitimacy of the veneration of images in his *Capitulare de imaginibus*, the so-called *Libri carolini*. However, the cult of icons in Rome was out of the question and, together with the cult of the martyrs and their relics, constituted one of the pillars on which the image of the Holy City was based. This paper therefore examines the role played by these disputes on monumental decorations commissioned by popes. In the great aspe mosaics of Santi Nereo e Achilleo and Santa Maria in Domnica, by Leo III and Paschal I, and also in some wall paintings (e.g. in Santa Maria Antiqua or San Clemente), we can in fact observe a distancing from the traditional iconographic schemes, arising from the early Christian age, that probably reflects these religious struggles.

**Keywords:** Rome, Mosaics, Wall painting, Icons, Popes, S. Clemente, S. Maria Antiqua, Ss. Nereo e Achilleo, S. Prassede.

«Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness»<sup>1</sup>, this is repeated several times in the Bible, apparently closing definitively the question of images, yet in the early middle ages Rome was a city full of Christian images.

The great mosaic theophanies in the apses and the icons, protagonists of liturgical processions, document a cult that transcends the instructional function of the image assumed by Gregory the Great in his celebrated letter to bishop Serenus of Marseille<sup>2</sup>, to which however we may trace the cycles from the Old and New Testaments that from the 5th century onwards graced the walls of the main basilicas.

Notwithstanding this authoritative stance, doubts about the legitimacy of images were never wholly assuaged in the Christian world, even if in the 6th and 7th centuries the most marked positions in their defence were expressed in a context of anti-Judaic polemics<sup>3</sup> where the Jewish destroyer of images reprises the stereotype of the deicide, in accordance with an assimilation between iconoclasts and slaughterers that would appear on a celebrated page of the Chludov Psalter<sup>4</sup> at the end of more than a century of Byzantine iconoclasm.

The crisis that exploded in the first half of the 8th century in Constantinople was moreover an event without precedent: involvement of the centre of power and the emperor in person in fact differentiated it considerably from the anti-image positions taken up repeatedly in geographically localized contexts<sup>5</sup>.

It is therefore inevitable to analyse the Roman reflexes of this situation, setting out from S. Maria Antiqua<sup>6</sup>, the church of the Byzantine community in Rome, linked to the Palace and the dignitaries who represented the emperor in the monumental heart of the ancient capital.

In 705 the son of one of these functionaries became pope with the name of John VII and at once provided for redecorating the entire presbytery of the building, whose fulcrum of worship however was the great icon of the *Theotokos* (fig. 1), now in S. Maria Nova, dating to the last decades of the 6th century<sup>7</sup>. Historical events and attempts at preservation have seriously altered the work and today all that remains of the first painting are the heads of the Virgin and Child, considerably larger than life size and set in a later context.

We do not know if the original icon was full figure - if so it would have been almost 3 metres -, cut at the waist<sup>8</sup> or head and shoulders as it is currently. It certainly must have been a monumental work capable of eliciting a sense of subordination in the faithful, analogous to what emerges from the relationship between the praying Virgin and the figure of John VII in the mosaics of his chapel in the Vatican basilica (fig. 2)<sup>9</sup>.

Indirect confirmation of the considerable size of the icon is also found in the *Liber pontificalis* where we learn that Gregory III coated the «*imaginem sancte Dei genetricis antiquam*» with 50

*libre* of purest silver, which is to say more than 16 kilos. Considering the specific weight of silver and the fact that to be workable silver leaf must be no thicker than 1 mm, we may calculate that the coating commissioned by the pope had to cover a minimum surface of 1600 cm<sup>2</sup>, more than 20% larger than the present one. But this extension could have been considerably greater since there was also silver leaf between 0.2 and 0.5 mm<sup>10</sup>.

In the text it is not actually specified where this icon was at the time of its precious silver-leafing, but the adjective *antiqua*, which in John VII's biography was used to identify the basilica on the slopes of the Palatine, led to the hypothesis that the painting was precisely the one worshipped in this building, whose antiquity and venerability was thus underscored in a biography, that of Gregory III, who gave considerable prominence to icons, as would be the case with subsequent pontiffs<sup>11</sup>.

So it is likely that events linked to the struggle against images and to the resolutions of the Council of Hieria<sup>12</sup> in 754 carried a certain weight in pope Paul I's decision to intervene, half a century after John VII, in the presbytery of S. Maria Antiqua, sacrificing the original apsidal composition which probably dated to the late 6th century and depicted the Virgin enthroned among angels and saints Peter and Paul<sup>13</sup>.

The centre of the new apse consists (figs. 3-4) of a gigantic Redeemer on a pedestal, flanked by two figures of angels recalling those on the summit of the arch but with the heads replaced by the Tetramorph. On the left, the Virgin, set slightly back, embraces Paul I who bears a codex, like Christ himself. With this gesture Mary seems not so much to present the commissioner of the work as to introduce him to a vision inspired by that of Isaiah: "[...] I saw also the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up [...] Above it stood the seraphim, each one had six wings [...]"<sup>14</sup>.

The reference to the vision of Isaiah might in fact be an argument for legitimising the depiction of Christ and the angels, which is to say precisely those whom the iconoclasts held to be less representable, thus supplying an explanation for the decision to reduce Mary, for whom the church is named, to a simple role of intercession and to eliminate the principles of the apostles, otherwise incomprehensible for a pope who moreover came from the Roman aristocracy.

The evident disproportion between the main figure and the patron, extraneous to the tradition of the roman apses, therefore recalled the mosaic panel of John VII and above all the great Marian icons of Rome, from the one in the same church to the Madonna della Clemenza in S. Maria in Trastevere (fig. 5) which at bottom right has a small figure that has been almost wholly lost<sup>15</sup>. And we should not forget the hypothesis that the *Hodegetria* of the *Pantheon*, in its original form, was almost 2.5 metres high<sup>16</sup>.

The lack of surviving works means that we cannot follow any evolutions of these themes in monumental painting at the time of Stephen III and Hadrian I, whereas the pontificate of Leo III

began with the apse of the basilica of S. Susanna, lost but documented by descriptions and copies<sup>17</sup>. Here the traditional seven figure scheme is altered by the insertion of the Virgin who, however, more than playing an active role as in S. Maria Antiqua would seem almost to balance the insertion of Charlemagne (fig. 6).

Abetted by the short-lived restoration of images in Constantinople<sup>18</sup>, the undertakings of Leo III in these years therefore seem to follow the thread of Roman tradition with pregnant references to the changing of the European scene brought about by the ascent of Charlemagne who also appears in the arch of the Triclinium Leoninum (fig. 7)<sup>19</sup>.

The *Liber pontificalis* however bears out that in 814 Leo built from its foundations the church of Ss. Nereo e Achilleo, decorating it magnificently. Notwithstanding various reconstructions, the general plan of the original building remains, and above all the mosaic in the apsidal arch depicting the Annunciation, the Transfiguration and the *Theotokos* adored by an angel (fig. 8).

Whereas the mosaic on the bowl-vault must have been in very poor condition at the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century. Cardinal Baronio<sup>20</sup> had it replaced with a fresco that probably reprises its essential elements: ten saints at the sides of a great jewelled cross, surmounted by the dove of the Holy Spirit (fig. 9). It stands on a hill where six lambs are drinking from the descending rivers.

That the cross was the fulcrum of apsidal composition seems to be confirmed by a painting kept in the Vatican Library (fig. 10), discovered by Giovanni Battista De Rossi<sup>21</sup> who, given its perfect correspondence to what remains in the arch, held it to be a copy of the entire mosaic decoration of the church, made prior to the loss of the apse, even though the overall dimensions of the picture<sup>22</sup> exceed the usual copies of Christian antiquities created in Rome at that period.

Modern restoration has moreover revealed<sup>23</sup> that this painting is made up of two distinct elements, which is to say a part in oils, corresponding to the depiction of the arch, which was then glued to a rectangular canvas on which the apse was depicted in tempera. This execution in two phases, which might also have been determined by damage to the lower part of the first version, has aroused doubts about the reliability of this testimony which, however, had always disconcerted scholars by the absolute originality and essentiality of the composition that it reproduces. In fact a great gilded cross stands at the centre, on a hillock, almost surrounded by a purple drape, towards which six lambs are heading.

A jewelled cross at the centre of an apse is not in itself an anomaly and is documented by the mosaics of S. Pudenziana and S. Stefano Rotondo in Rome, S. Apollinare in Classe in Ravenna<sup>24</sup>, restored by Leo III himself<sup>25</sup>, and by the lost one of the basilica *Nova* in Cimitile, described by Paulinus of Nola who commissioned it<sup>26</sup>. The cross on a throne flanked by lambs stood out on the lower fascia of the apse in the Vatican basilica<sup>27</sup> decorated by Innocent III, which however was

probably inspired by the previous mosaic, and above all on the conch of the basilica built, again by Paulinus, in Fondi<sup>28</sup>.

In all these cases however the cross is never completely isolated or free from anthropomorphic figures, so if the painting in the Vatican Library (fig. 10), is not a complete invention for the apse area – which I personally do not believe – we have to at least surmise that its creator or the primary source saw the mosaic in precarious conditions of preservation and were therefore unable to reproduce certain figures perhaps already very fragmentary or in any case not recognisable. Conspicuous in his absence in fact is Leo III as patron, especially in a building for whose construction and decoration he was wholly responsible<sup>29</sup>.

It is therefore possible that at the sides of the cross, as in the chapel of Ss. Primo e Feliciano in S. Stefano Rotondo<sup>30</sup>, there were Nereo and Achilleo, perhaps accompanied by Domitilla and other martyrs among those cited also by Baronio who, in redoing the apse, could have simplified the composition by omitting hard to recognise symbols and characters, in line with the precepts of clarity of the Church after the Council of Trent.

The fresco in the apse today and the painting in fact concord only in the number of lambs and the centrality of the jewelled cross, to which multiple references may be overlaid: from the great golden cross weighing 150 *libre*, Constantine's gift to the Vatican basilica<sup>31</sup>, to the crosses which in the iconoclastic age dominated the apses of churches in the East<sup>32</sup>.

Of course this does not mean a granting of credit to the positions of image refusal but rather an 'in context' citation. The replacement of Christ with the cross in the apse is actually less disruptive if examined jointly with the arch, where the figure of Christ of the Transfiguration in an axial position almost recomposes the bust-cross nexus which is found in the chapel of Ss. Primo e Feliciano and which probably featured also in the apse of St. John Lateran, since it was reprised in the late 13th century mosaic<sup>33</sup>. Besides, the Lateran Council of 769 had established that images should not be worshipped but venerated, precisely as the Cross and relics were<sup>34</sup>.

The choice of subjects on the arch (figs. 8, 10) seems moreover to contain an explicit declaration in favour of images, practically simultaneous with the new iconophobic phase that spread through the Byzantine empire in those years<sup>35</sup>. It has in fact been noted that in the 9th century the *Theotokos* had taken on an anti-iconoclastic value<sup>36</sup>, while the Second Council of Nicaea established that images of Christ arose from his incarnation<sup>37</sup> which is represented here by the Annunciation<sup>38</sup>. This image therefore associated with the *Theotokos* visualised the twofold nature of Christ which, according to Leo the Great<sup>39</sup>, was manifested consubstantially during the miracle of the Transfiguration. Indeed this is the only episode in Jesus' earthly life in which his divine nature was rendered visible in

human form, permeated by light, thus becoming a formidable argument in favour of the legitimacy of anthropomorphic representation of Christ<sup>40</sup>.

In the 6th century the Transfiguration was depicted in the apsidal mosaics of S. Caterina al Sinai, of S. Apollinare in Classe, where it appears in a symbolic version, and of the so-called *Stefania*, the lost cathedral of Naples, as well as on the exterior of the basilica of Porec with few traces remaining above the apse, whereas up to this point it seems extraneous to the Roman tradition. Here a few years later it would appear in the chapel of S. Zenone<sup>41</sup> (fig. 11), in a setting where indeed the symbolic role of light is emphasised, as demonstrated by the *Deesis* with the figure of Christ replaced by a window that directs the light towards the empty throne of the *Etimasia* on the opposite wall (fig. 12)<sup>42</sup>.

A great many elements underscore the continuity of buildings constructed and decorated by Paschal I with those of Leo III, almost all of them however either lost or radically transformed. I refer to the taste for the reuse of the ancient, which led to the choice of identical *spolia* for frames and corbels in Ss. Nereo e Achilleo and in S. Prassede (figs. 13-14), to the technical-executive unmistakableness of the mosaics which offer almost superimposable faces or, of course, to an explicit declaration in favour of images which emerges in the extraordinary mosaics of S. Maria in Domnica<sup>43</sup>, with even greater emphasis than in Ss. Nereo e Achilleo.

In fact it was recently recognised, in this bringing together of heterogeneous themes in the arch and apse, an attestation of the twofold nature of Christ and of his incarnation, within a decoration which in the *titulus* and the colouristic choices declares great attention to the function of light and the beauty of materials and colours<sup>44</sup>, also demonstrating accord with the thought of Ambrosius Autpertus<sup>45</sup>.

Focusing on the compositional aspects, the apse moreover includes a host of angels that recalls the arch in S. Maria Antiqua, this time however in adoration of a gigantic icon of the Virgin with Child, at whose feet Paschal kneels devotedly, facing the spectator (fig. 15). The pose recalls that of Theodotus on the entrance wall of his chapel in S. Maria Antiqua (fig. 16)<sup>46</sup>. In the mosaic however the patron is not offering candles but taking the Virgin's foot in his hands, making ready to kiss it, thus triggering a precise reference to the cult of icons and in the specific case to the "Madonna della Clemenza" in S. Maria in Trastevere (fig. 17), where old photos<sup>47</sup> bear witness to the presence of a kneeling pope on the right, partly the result of subsequent overpainting.

The mosaic decorations of the arch and apse vault of S. Prassede e S. Cecilia in Trastevere are different in that the iconographic choices follow in the wake of the Roman tradition, attested by Ss. Cosma e Damiano, the oldest surviving example of the seven figure scheme in the apse conch and apocalyptic composition in the arch<sup>48</sup>.

Another reference to S. Maria Antiqua might be seen in the last mosaic of the great Carolingian period in Rome, that of S. Marco (fig. 18)<sup>49</sup>, done no later than 844, where the disproportionate Christ erect on a pedestal would appear to cite the apse of Paul I in S. Maria Antiqua (fig. 4), in a composition where pedestals and shields isolate the figures, accentuating their iconic value.

Shortly after the definitive reaffirmation of the cult of images in Constantinople in 843<sup>50</sup>, during the pontificate of Leo IV, a presbytery named for the pope, with an operation that recalls that of John VII in St. Peter's, transformed a space adjacent to the narthex of the minor basilica of S. Clemente into a chapel decorated with a Christological cycle<sup>51</sup>. On the main wall, behind the altar, was a considerably sized Ascension (fig. 19), perhaps framed by an arch<sup>52</sup>. At the base, between the frontal figures of Leo IV and St. Vitus, the apostles are portrayed in dynamic pose, rendered with thick lines of drapery that recall the mosaics of Paschal I. At the centre of this group there was a relic inserted in an oval niche, perhaps a stone from the Mount of Olives where in the 9th century there was a Latin monastic community in contact with Rome<sup>53</sup>. Above this, Mary is in praying pose, surmounted by Christ within a mandorla borne by four angels that recalls the oval frame of the stone just below.

One is struck then by the originality of this relic which makes an image of itself in a Christological scene<sup>54</sup>, yet a niche with perhaps analogous functions was also identified at the centre of a painted scene in the oratory beneath S. Saba<sup>55</sup>. In the case of S. Clemente this cult-related device seems to anticipate the fragment of the True Cross inserted into the mosaic of the upper basilica in the first half of the 12th century<sup>56</sup>, transforming the Crucifixion in the centre of the apse vault into a gigantic encolpion, but at the same time a relic of the Passion – the *titulus crucis* - was inserted into the center of the arch in S. Croce in Gerusalemme<sup>57</sup>. However the inscriptions of the mosaics of S. Prassede and S. Cecilia, already referred to the presence of relics within those churches<sup>58</sup>.

With its iconic value, the stone set in the wall also recalls the use of icons inserted into murals, which is well documented in Naples and Campania<sup>59</sup> but finds a counterpart in Rome in the panel that probably constituted the face of Christ in the almond (fig. 20) on the counter-façade of S. Giovanni a Porta Latina, done in the second half of the 12th century<sup>60</sup>.

In reaction to the waves of iconoclasm that swept the Byzantine world the popes in those years therefore seem to have emphasised the role of images, even with triumphalist accents, but nor did the extraordinary decorative and symbolic value of the great Roman mosaics leave the Carolingian world indifferent, notwithstanding the well known perplexities with regard to the cult of images.

This is suggested by the mosaics of the dome of the Palatine chapel of Aachen. The current ones were done at the end of the 19th century by a Venetian company to replace the mediaeval decoration, borne out by an engraving by Ciampini<sup>61</sup>, where over and above certain Ravenna

influences we find, in the figures that offer crowns to the monumental enthroned Christ, references to the Roman arches and apses but also to the mosaics on the façade of St Peter's, commissioned by Leo I and redone by Gregory IX<sup>62</sup>.

An analogous inspiration from prototypes of Christian and imperial Rome was then included in the so-called arch of Eginardo, a triumphal structure in miniature, perhaps originally surmounted by a jewelled cross<sup>63</sup>.

Theodulf of Orléans, the prudent author of the *Libri Carolini*, also wanted to embellish the apse of the oratory he built at Germigny-des-Prés with a mosaic subtly allusive to Old Testament themes<sup>64</sup>, filtered by mediaeval exegesis<sup>65</sup>. Yet in observing the faces of the two cherubim flanking the Ark of the Covenant the reference to Roman models, in this case not iconographic but formal, is almost equally explicit. Besides, after decades of Byzantine iconoclasm, where but in the Rome of the popes might the intellectuals of Charlemagne's court look for their monumental decorations?

**Aknowelgedments:** I would like to thank Giulia Bordi, Manuela Gianandrea, Lucia Morganti, Simone Piazza.

**Summary (in Croatian):** In the first decades of the 8th century, the affirmation of Iconoclasm in the Byzantine Empire opens a groove between Rome and Constantinople, that will be reconstructed only in the middle of the next century. In this long time frame we are witnessing the rebirth of the Western Empire with the coronation of Charlemagne, who also expressed doubts about the legitimacy of the veneration of images in his *Capitulare de imaginibus*, the so-called *Libri carolini*. However, the cult of icons in Rome was out of the question and, together with the cult of the martyrs and their relics, constituted one of the pillars on which the image of the Holy City was based. This paper therefore examines the role played by these disputes on monumental decorations commissioned by popes. In the great apse mosaics of Santi Nereo e Achilleo and Santa Maria in Domnica, by Leo III and Paschal I, and also in some wall paintings (e.g. in Santa Maria Antiqua or San Clemente), we can in fact observe a distancing from the traditional iconographic schemes, arising from the early Christian age, that probably reflects these religious struggles.

**List of illustrations:**

- 1) Rome, S. Maria Nova, Icon (from: G. Leone, 2010)



- 2) Drawing by Giacomo Grimaldi of the lost mosaics of John VII in the Vatican basilica (from: Andaloro, 1989)
- 3) Rome, S. Maria antiqua, apse (author)
- 4) Rome, S. Maria antiqua, apse, reconstruction (from: de Grüneisen, 1911)
- 5) Rome, S. Maria in Trastevere, Icon, the so-called *Madonna della Clemenza* (from: G. Leone, 2010)
- 6) Rome, S. Susanna, apse mosaic, reconstruction (from: Davis-Weyer, 1965)
- 7) Drawing by Alfonso Ciacconio of the lost mosaics of Leo III in the First Lateran *triclinium* (from: M. Luchterhandt, 1999)
- 8) Rome, Ss. Nereo e Achilleo, inner view (author)
- 9) Rome, Ss. Nereo e Achilleo, apse (author)
- 10) Rome, Vatican Libray, painting showing the mosaics of Leo III in Ss. Nereo e Achilleo
- 11) Rome, S. Prassede, chapel of S. Zenone, *Transfiguration* (author)
- 12) Rome, S. Prassede, chapel of S. Zenone, *Etimasia* (author)
- 13) Rome, Ss. Nereo e Achilleo, apse, corbels (author)
- 14) Rome, S. Prassede, corbels (author)
- 15) Rome, S. Maria in Domnica, apse mosaic (from: *Enciclopedia dell'arte medievale*, )
- 16) Rome, S. Maria antiqua, chapel of Theodotus (author)
- 17) Rome, S. Maria in Trastevere, Icon, the so-called *Madonna della Clemenza* (from: Wilpert, 1906)
- 18) Rome, S. Marco, apse mosaic (author)
- 19) Rome, S. Clemente, *Ascension* (author)
- 20) Rome, S. Giovanni a Porta Latina, *Last Judgement* (author)

---

<sup>1</sup> Exodus 20, 4; Deuteronomy 5, 8.

<sup>2</sup> «Aliud est enim picturam adorare, aliud per pictura historiam quid sit adorandum addiscere. Nam quod legentibus scriptura, hoc idiotis praestat pictura cernentibus, quia in ipsa etiam ignorantes vident quid sequi debeant, in ipsa legunt qui litteram nesciunt. Unde et precipue gentibus pro lectione pictura est»: S. Gregorii Magni opera, Registrum epistularum: libri I – VII (Corpus christianorum. Series latina, 140A), D. NORBERG (ed.), Turnholti, Brepols, 1982, p. 874.

<sup>3</sup> H.L. KESSLER, “Iconoclastia”, in: *Enciclopedia dell'arte medievale*, VII, Roma, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1996, pp. 276-282.

<sup>4</sup> Moscow, Hist. Mus. MS. D.129, fol. 67r.

<sup>5</sup> L. BRUBAKER, *L'invenzione dell'iconoclasmo bizantino*, Roma, Viella, 2015; T.F.X. NOBLE, *Images, iconoclasm, and the Carolingians*, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009, pp. 46-109.

<sup>6</sup> *Santa Maria Antiqua tra Roma e Bisanzio*, M. ANDALORO-G. BORDI (EDS.), Milano, Electa, 2016.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., pp. 194-196; G. LEONE, *Icone di Roma e del Lazio*, Roma, L'Erma" di Bretschneider, 2010, I, p. 57.

<sup>8</sup> K. Dotzer, “Die Rekonstruktion der Marientafel aus Santa Maria Antiqua und ihre Aufstellung im Kirchenraum”, in: *Mitteilungen zur spätantiken Archäologie und byzantinischen Kunstgeschichte*, vol. 2, 2000, pp. 53-78.

<sup>9</sup> M. ANDALORO, “I mosaici dell'Oratorio di Giovanni VII”, in: *Fragmenta picta. Affreschi e mosaici staccati del Medioevo romano*, Roma, Argos, 1989, pp. 169-176; A BALLARDINI, “Il perduto Oratorio di Giovanni VII nella basilica di San Pietro in Vaticano. Architettura e scultura”, in: *Santa Maria Antiqua tra Roma e Bisanzio, op. cit.*, 2016,

- pp. 220-227; P. POGLIANI, "Il perduto Oratorio di Giovanni VII nella basilica di San Pietro in Vaticano. I mosaici", *ivi*, pp. 240-247.
- <sup>10</sup> G. CURZI, "Tra Saraceni e Lanzichenecchi. Crocifissi monumentali di età carolingia nella basilica di S. Pietro", in: *Arte medievale*, vol. 2, no. 2, 2003, pp. 15-28.
- <sup>11</sup> T.F.X. NOBLE, *op. cit.*, 2009, pp. 54-56, 116-134.
- <sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 94-99.
- <sup>13</sup> W. DE GRÜNEISEN, *Sainte-Marie-Antique*, Roma, Bretschneider 1911; G. BORDI, "Santa Maria Antiqua attraverso i suoi palinsesti pittorici", in: *Santa Maria Antiqua tra Roma e Bisanzio*, *op. cit.*, 2016, pp. 34-53; for a different hypothesis see: B. BRENK, *The apse, the image and the icon: an historical perspective of the apse as a space for images*, Wiesbaden, Reichert, 2010 p. 106.
- <sup>14</sup> *Isaiah* 6, 1-2.
- <sup>15</sup> G. LEONE, *op. cit.*, 2009, p. 58.
- <sup>16</sup> C. BERTELLI, "La Madonna del Pantheon", in: *Bollettino d'arte*, vol. 46, 1961, pp. 24-32; V. PACE, "Alla ricerca di un'identità: affreschi, mosaici, tavole dipinte e libri a Roma fra VI e IX secolo", in: *Roma e il suo territorio nel medioevo*, C. Carbonetti-S. Lucà-M. Signorini (eds.), Spoleto, Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 2015, pp. 471-498: 484.
- <sup>17</sup> C. DAVIS WEYER, "Das Apsismosaik Leos III in S. Susanna: Rekonstruktion und Datierung", in: *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, vol. 28, 1965, pp. 177-194; M. LUCHTERHANDT, "Famulus Petri. Karl der Große in der römischen Mosaikbildern Leos III.", in: 799. *Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit. Karl der Große und Papst Leo III. In Paderborn, II, Katalog der Ausstellung*, C. Stiegemann-M. Wemhoff (eds.), Mainz, von Zabern, 1999, III, *Beiträge*, pp. 55-70.
- <sup>18</sup> L. BRUBAKER, *op. cit.*, 2015; T.F.X. NOBLE, *op. cit.*, 2009, pp. 108-110.
- <sup>19</sup> M. LUCHTERHANDT, "II.10 Apsismosaik von SS. Nereo ed Achilleo", in: 799. *Kunst und Kultur*, *op. cit.*, 1999, I, pp. 48-50; G. CURZI, "The two *Triclinia* of Pope Leo III as «icons of power»", in: *Ikon*, vol. 9, 2016, pp. 141-152.
- <sup>20</sup> A. HERTZ, "Cardinal Cesare Baronio's restoration of SS. Nereo ed Achilleo and S. Cesare de' Appia", in: *Art Bulletin*, vol. 70, 1988, pp. 590-620; K. RICHTER, *Der Triumph des Kreuzes: Kunst und Konfession im letzten Viertel des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2009; A. ZUCCARI, "Il cardinale Baronio iconografo della Controriforma", in: *Studi Romani*, vol. 57, no. 1-4, 2009, pp. 182-197; A. ROCA DE AMICIS, "Rinnovare le basiliche romane, prima e dopo San Giovanni in Laterano", in: *Alla moderna: antiche chiese e rifacimenti barocchi. Una prospettiva europea*, A. Roca De Amicis-C. Varagnoli (eds.), Roma, Artemide, 2015, pp. 45-67.
- <sup>21</sup> G.B. DE ROSSI, *Mosaici cristiani e saggi dei pavimenti delle chiese di Roma anteriori al secolo XV*, Roma, Spithöver, 1899, fig. XXII.
- <sup>22</sup> 189 x 98,5 x 3,7 cm (including the frame).
- <sup>23</sup> U. NILGEN, "IX.24 Apsismosaik von SS. Nereo ed Achilleo", in: 799. *Kunst und Kultur*, *op. cit.*, 1999, II, pp. 638-640; U. UTRO, "Una "falsa testimonianza": il dipinto della Biblioteca Vaticana e il mosaico absidale perduto dei SS. Nereo e Achilleo", in: *Atti del IX Colloquio dell'Associazione Italiana per lo Studio e la Conservazione del Mosaico* (Aosta, 20 - 22 febbraio 2003), C. Angelelli (ed.), Ravenna, Edizioni del Girasole, 2004, pp. 507-518.
- <sup>24</sup> D. LONGHI, "The cosmic cross as Logos' theophany: first version of Sant'Apollinare in Classe's apsidal mosaic and Jerusalem's staurophany of AD 351", in: *Ikon*, vol. 6, 2002/2013, pp. 275-286.
- <sup>25</sup> R. WISSKIRCHEN, "Leo III und die Mosaikprogramme von S. Apollinare in Classe in Ravenna und SS. Nereo ed Achilleo in Rom", in: *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 34, 1991, pp. 139-151.
- <sup>26</sup> J. ENGEMANN, "Zu den Apsis-Tituli des Paulinus von Nola", in: *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 17, 1974, pp. 21-46.
- <sup>27</sup> K. QUEIJO, "Il mosaico absidale di San Pietro in Vaticano", *La pittura medievale a Roma: 312 - 1431. Corpus. V. Il Duecento e la cultura gotica: 1198 - 1287 ca.*, S. Romano (ed.), Milano, Jaca Book, 2012, pp. 62-66.
- <sup>28</sup> S. PIAZZA, "Paolino di Nola e il perduto mosaico della basilicula di Fondi : nuova proposta di restituzione", in: *Fondi nel medioevo*, M. D'Onofrio-M. Gianandrea (eds.), Roma, Gangemi, 2017, pp. 13-28.
- <sup>29</sup> *Le Liber Pontificalis*, II, L. DUCHESNE (ed.), Paris, Ernest Thorin, 1892, p. 33.
- <sup>30</sup> E. THUNØ, *The apse mosaic in early medieval Rome: time, network, and repetition*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2015, p. 58.
- <sup>31</sup> *Le Liber Pontificalis*, I, L. DUCHESNE (ed.), Paris, Ernest Thorin, 1886, p. 176.
- <sup>32</sup> M. ANDALORO-S. ROMANO, "L'immagine nell'abside", in: *Arte e iconografia a Roma. Da Costantino a Cola di Rienzo*, Milano, Jaca Book, 2000, p. 107.
- <sup>33</sup> A. TOMEI, *Jacobus Torriti Pictor. Una vicenda figurativa del tardo Duecento romano*, Roma, Argos, 1990, pp. 88-93.
- <sup>34</sup> H.L. KESSLER, *op. cit.*, 1996.
- <sup>35</sup> G. CURZI, "La decorazione musiva della basilica dei SS. Nereo e Achilleo in Roma: materiali ed ipotesi", in: *Arte medievale*, vol. 7, no. 2, 1993, pp. 21-45; L. BRUBAKER, *op. cit.*, 2015; T.F.X. NOBLE, *op. cit.*, 2009, p. 244.
- <sup>36</sup> F. DE MAFFEI, L'Unigenito consustanziale al Padre nel programma trinitario dei perduti mosaici del bema della Dormizione di Nicea e il Cristo trasfigurato del Sinai. II, in: *Storia dell'Arte*, no. 44-46, 1982, pp. 185-200: 199.

- <sup>37</sup> L. BRUBAKER, *op. cit.*, 2015; T.F.X. NOBLE, *op. cit.*, 2009, pp. 99-108.
- <sup>38</sup> I. GOTIA, "L'Annunciazione - Incarnazione come "porta della salvezza": fondamenti teologici ed iconografici antichi", in: *Studi sull'Oriente cristiano*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2013, pp. 73-165.
- <sup>39</sup> J.D. SIEGER, *Visual metaphor as theology: Leo the Great's sermons on the incarnation and the arch mosaics at S. Maria Maggiore*, in: *Gesta*, vol. 26, 1987, pp. 83-91; I. GOTIA, *op. cit.*, 2013.
- <sup>40</sup> G. CURZI, *op. cit.*, 1993.
- <sup>41</sup> J. OSBORNE, "Rome and Constantinople in the ninth century", in: *Rome across time and space: cultural transmission and the exchange of ideas c. 500 - 1400*, C. Bolgia (ed.), Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011, pp. 211-223;
- <sup>42</sup> E. DI NATALE, "L'immagine della cosiddetta "Etimasia" dal V al IX secolo", in: *Studi medievali*, vol. 54, no. 2, 2013, pp. 691-750.
- <sup>43</sup> A. BALLARDINI, "Dai Gesta di Pasquale I secondo il Liber Pontificalis ai monumenta iconografici delle basiliche romane di Santa Prassede, Santa Maria in Domnica e Santa Cecilia in Trastevere (prima parte)", in: *Archivio della Società Romana di Storia Patria*, vol. 122, 1999, pp. 5-67.
- <sup>44</sup> E. THUNØ, *op. cit.*, 2015, pp. 80-84.
- <sup>45</sup> F. DELL'ACQUA, "«Nihil mihi Plato... contulit»: Ambrogio Autperto, il rifiuto di Platone e l'eco dell'iconoclasmo bizantino", in: *Il secolo di Carlo Magno: istituzioni, letterature e cultura del tempo carolingio*, I. Pagani-F. Santi (eds.), Firenze, SISMEL. Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2014, pp. 247-272.
- <sup>46</sup> G. BORDI, "La cappella del *primicerius* Teodoto", in: *Santa Maria Antiqua tra Roma e Bisanzio*, M. Andaloro-G. Bordi (eds.), Milano, Electa, 2016, pp. 260-269.
- <sup>47</sup> J. WILPERT, "L'immagine della Madonna detta della Clemenza in Santa Maria in Trastevere", in: *L'arte*, vol. 9, 1906, pp. 161-164.
- <sup>48</sup> P.J. NORDHAGEN, "Un problema di carattere iconografico e tecnico a S. Prassede", in: *Roma e l'età carolingia*, Roma 1976, pp. 159-166; S. CASARTELLI NOVELLI, "Aula Dei claris radiat speciosa metallis: la politica 'iconofila' e lo speciale "génie des images" della Chiesa Apostolica di Roma mater ecclesia catholica; nei manifesti absidali plebi Dei "inspirés uniquement par l'Apocalypse" (secoli IV - XIII)", in: *Medioevo: immagini e ideologie*, A.C. Quintavalle (ed.), Milano, Electa, 2005, pp. 145-164.
- <sup>49</sup> C. BOLGIA, "The mosaics of Gregory IV at S. Marco, Rome: papal response to Venice, Byzantium, and the Carolingians", in: *Speculum*, vol. 81, no. 1, 2006, pp. 1-34.
- <sup>50</sup> L. BRUBAKER, *op. cit.*, 2015.
- <sup>51</sup> J. OSBORNE, "The portrait of pope Leo IV in San Clemente, Rome: a re-examination of the so-called "square" nimbus, in medieval art", in: *Papers of the British School at Rome*, vol. 47, 1979, pp. 58-65; ID., *Early Mediaeval wall-paintings in the lower church of San Clemente, Rome*, New York, Garland, 1984, pp. 43-44; G. MATTHIAE, *Pittura romana del medioevo, I, Secoli IV-X (aggiornamento scientifico e bibliografico di Maria Andaloro)*, Roma, Palombi, 1987, pp. 179-181.
- <sup>52</sup> For the different reconstructions see: J. OSBORNE, *op. cit.*, 1984; W. TRONZO, "Setting and Structure in Two Roman Wall Decorations of the Early Middle Ages", in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, vol. 41, 1987, pp. 477-492; F. GUIDOBALDI, *San Clemente: gli edifici romani, la basilica paleocristiana e le fasi altomedievali*, Roma, San Clemente, 1992, vol. 1, pp. 205-208.
- <sup>53</sup> J. OSBORNE, *op. cit.*, 1984.
- <sup>54</sup> W. TRONZO, *op. cit.*, p. 478-481.
- <sup>55</sup> H. GRISAR, "S. Saba sull'Aventino", in: *Civiltà cattolica*, vol. 52, no. 3, 1901, pp. 719-724; J. OSBORNE, *op. cit.*, 1984, p. 52; about the paintings see: G. BORDI, *Gli affreschi di San Saba sul Piccolo Aventino. Dove e come erano*, Milano, Jaca Book, 2008.
- <sup>56</sup> S. RICCIONI, *Il mosaico absidale di S. Clemente a Roma: "exemplum" della chiesa riformata*, Spoleto, Fondazione Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 2006, pp. 66-68.
- <sup>57</sup> M.L. RIGATO, "Il Titulus Crucis", in: *Gerusalemme a Roma. La basilica di Santa Croce e le reliquie della Passione*, R. Cassanelli-E. Stolfi (eds.), Milano, Jaca book, 2012, pp. 165-176.
- <sup>58</sup> S. RICCIONI, *op. cit.*, 2006, p. 68.
- <sup>59</sup> P. DE CASTRIS, "Un laborioso restauro e un raro affresco bizantino a Napoli: il palinsesto dell'abside di Santa Restituta", in: *Il duomo di Napoli dal paleocristiano all'età angioina: atti della I. Giornata di Studi su Napoli*, S. Romano (ed.), Napoli, Electa, 2002, pp. 107-118; G. CORSO, "La cattedrale in età romanica: indagini sulle sopravvivenze artistiche", in: *La basilica di Santa Restituta a Napoli e il suo arredo medievale*, G. Corso-A. Cuccaro-C. D'Alberto (eds.), Napoli, Zip, 2012, pp. 77-141.
- <sup>60</sup> M. VISCONTINI, "La decorazione pittorica delle navate e del coro di San Giovanni a Porta Latina", in: *La pittura medievale a Roma: 312 - 1431. Corpus. IV. Riforma e tradizione 1050-1198*, S. Romano (ed.), Milano, Jaca Book, 2006, pp. 348-371.
- <sup>61</sup> J. CIAMPINI, *Vetera Monumenta*, II, Roma, Komarek, 1747, fig. XLI.

---

<sup>62</sup> G. BORDI, “L’Agnus Dei, i quattro simboli degli evangelisti e i ventiquattro seniores nel mosaico della facciata di San Pietro in Vaticano”, in: *La pittura medievale a Roma: 312 – 1431. Corpus. I. L’orizzonte tardoantico e le nuove immagini*, M. Andaloro (ed.), Milano, Jaca Book, 2006, pp. 416-418.

<sup>63</sup> H. BELTING, “Der Einhardsbogen”, in: *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, vol. 36, 1973, pp. 93-121; K. BIERBRAER, “X.9 Einhardsbogen”, in: *799. Kunst und Kultur, op. cit.*, 1999, II, pp. 700-701.

<sup>64</sup> G.V. MACKIE, “Theodulf of Orléans and the Ark of the Covenant: a new allegorical interpretation at Germigny-des-Prés”, in: *Racar*, vol. 32, no. 1-2, 2007, pp. 45-58; I. FOLETTI, “Germigny-des-Prés, il Santo Sepolcro e la Gerusalemme celeste”, in: *Convivium*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2014, pp. 32-49.

<sup>65</sup> Especially from Bede: T.F.X. NOBLE, *op. cit.*, 2009, pp. 116, 215.