

Icon and Word
The Power of Images in Byzantium

Studies presented to Robin Cormack

Edited by

ANTONY EASTMOND AND LIZ JAMES

ASHGATE

Chapter 2

When all that is Gold does not Glitter: On the strange history of looking at Byzantine art¹

Rico Franses

Not long ago, as I was holding forth to students in an introductory college art history class about the Justinian and Theodora panels in the church of S. Vitale at Ravenna, a pair of good quality slides of which were projected onto the screen behind me, a shadow of doubt suddenly crossed my mind. I paused and asked, 'What colour is the background in these pictures?' Without the slightest hesitation, they answered, 'Yellow'. 'Are you sure?' I replied, giving them every opportunity to change their opinions, 'Nothing else comes to mind?' But they were insistent. Yellow it was. 'And what medium is it?' I continued. 'Paint', they affirmed confidently. 'Are you sure?' I repeated, somewhat desperately. 'Well, it may be a little cracked, but yes, paint, definitely', was the reply.

To be sure, this is hardly the fault of the students. It is rather the result of the fact that a particular paradigm of looking is in place in relation to images having gold as a major component, one which is specially active in museum displays and photography. Today, when we see the many such works of art either in photographic reproductions or in museums, we look at them under very carefully controlled light conditions which radically affect the nature of what we see. Unlike the regular pigments used in art, gold possesses not only hue (or colour), but, being a metal, it has a much higher degree of reflectivity than they do, sending much more of the incoming light back out into the world. This reflectivity is at its most intense when the light catches in the gold, that is, when the light source is directly reflected within it. This phenomenon causes contemporary curators and photographers no end of trouble because it

creates a sharp point of light concentration (called a hotspot) that has a blinding effect on the viewer, reducing the image to near-indecipherability.

Yet gold is not only the surface element of a painting most responsive to external lighting in this way, but also the most variable. When the gold does not catch the light (that is, when one cannot see a reflection of the light source in its surface), then it behaves much like other pigments. It ceases to appear metallic, and one is only really aware of its colour. This property, in turn, is put to use by the aforementioned curators and photographers who carefully position the lights around the works so that they do not catch in the gold; in museums, lights are placed high overhead and relatively close to the wall surfaces on which the paintings hang, and in photography studios they are placed at an oblique angle to the images. Under these conditions (which I will call conventional lighting), the glare of hotspots does not appear, and the gold returns to quiescence, becoming nothing more than another colour.

It is the argument of this paper, however, that this uniform method of lighting, which consistently reduces the gold to just another regular pigment, is entirely alien to the spirit of these images. Rather, they were specifically designed to be seen with the gold in its fully reflective state, although, to be sure, without the attendant hotspots. As will become evident, much of the detail, subtlety and sophistication (both optical and conceptual) of the images is lost when the reflecting gold is neutralized.

Whilst an appreciation of the special reflective qualities of gold is often voiced by writers on Byzantine art,² there has not been any attempt made to either reproduce or study specific images with it in its 'live' state. Our first step, then, will be to re-examine some of these scenes in both a 'before' and 'after' state. Yet, the issue is not simply one of returning to the gold its inherent properties. In their reflective condition, the pictures undergo an extraordinary transformation that has radical implications for almost every aspect of their interpretation, as well as for broader issues concerning regimes of visibility and the demands that we place upon vision itself.

Plates I and II demonstrate the changes that take place when the gold appears in its different guises. Both show the same scene, a Deposition and Lamentation from the Morgan Lectionary of 1050-1100 (New York, Pierpont Morgan Library, MS M639, fol. 280r).³ Plate I is taken under the conventional lighting conditions designed to minimize gold reflection. Plate II shows the scene with the lights positioned so as to allow the reflection of the gold to be visible. In order to appreciate these changes fully, however, it is necessary first to examine Plate I alone in greater detail.

Excluding momentarily the Lamentation in the foreground and focusing primarily on the Deposition, we find (as with almost all figural compositions) a clear hierarchy of elements within the scene. Least important is the background, which stretches from the upper frame down to the floorline, and



Plate I. Deposition and Lamentation, from the Morgan Lectionary, 1050-1100.
 New York, Pierpont Morgan Library MS M639, fol. 280r (courtesy of the trustees
 of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York).



Plate II. Deposition and Lamentation, from the Morgan Lectionary, 1050-1100. New York, Pierpont Morgan Library MS M639, fol. 280r (courtesy of the trustees of the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York).



Plate III. Virgin and Child Enthroned, c. 843-867. Apse Mosaic. Hagia Sophia, Istanbul (E.J.W. Hawkins).



Plate IV. Virgin and Child Enthroned, c. 843-867. Apse Mosaic. Hagia Sophia, Istanbul (E.J.W. Hawkins).

which contains nothing of significance in narrative terms. Next up the scale are the onlookers and corpse-bearers, who demonstrate their secondary nature by the fact that they direct their ministrations and attentions to Christ, with whom we finally reach the apogee, the narrative heart of the image: this is his story, his drama that is unfolding. This narrative hierarchy is matched by the formal structure of the scene. The neutral yellow background functions largely as a backdrop, a setting for the figures; whereas at the other end of the scale, Christ's body is accentuated in several different ways. It is naked when all others are clothed, and is strongly horizontal, as opposed to the standing figures (and cross) that surround him. Furthermore, the skin tones of Christ's body differentiate it from the pinks, blues, and reds of the other figures, and a significant proportion of its surface area is covered in white or near-white tones, making it the lightest object in the scene.

In Plate II, however, this hierarchical organization is dramatically unsettled. With the gold ground now very much alive, it is no longer merely a yellow backdrop, a passive foil against which the action takes place. Now a brilliantly glowing field, it becomes a commanding visual presence in itself, which, in turn, has a profound effect on the visual balance and accenting of the scene. Rather than automatically centring on Christ, or indeed even on the surrounding figures as subsidiary characters, as tends to happen in Plate I, one's gaze is now drawn as well by a glittering field of great beauty that stretches out over much of the surface of the image.

Yet, to say that the gold ground has become a new centre of attention is not to say that Christ's body disappears from view. On the contrary, it remains a corporeal presence of extreme importance, although its manifestation and significance are both highly complex and entirely different from the standard presentation of the scene. For as much as one's gaze is drawn by the shining field, it is simultaneously pulled back to the figure of Christ for two overlapping reasons. In the first place, it now stands out as an interruption, a gap, within that brilliant surface; it is felt as an absence, a caesura within a field of extraordinary beauty and intensity, and one is inexorably led back to it as the site of a cut, a rupture. Simultaneously, gap though it may now constitute, it remains the narrative centre of the image: Christ is still the character upon whom the whole story hinges.

Yet, in looking back at that narrative centre, now located as a pause within a field of light, we find that what is revealed there has itself been transformed. For, one of the effects of the brilliance of the gold, only partly reproducible in photographs, is a shimmer that dazzles the eye, and that tends to swamp the non-gold areas, partially blotting out or obscuring many of their details. The gap thus appears as a dark hole, a precipitous cavity that in contrast to its radiant surroundings appears to be sucking light in and swallowing it, allowing very little to escape. And what one discovers within it, instead of a clear, easy-

to-read body, is a dark world where rough outlines emerge only dimly from the gloom.

It is this constellation of effects that I take to cover something of the full range of functioning of many of these golden images when seen in their optimal state. The visual experience as one scans them in the process of reading them is entirely different from that on offer under conventional lighting; one is entranced simultaneously both by a kind of visual seduction emanating from the gleaming gold ground and by the gap within it, and further, one is confronted within that gap by obscurity, unclarity and mystery. The encounter with the image in this state is thus marked by a particular complexity and intensity. No longer drawn only to a few figures posed towards the centre of the scene, the gaze is lured by both an unpopulated, unlined, formless, but irresistible zone of pure optical repleteness, less colour than light itself, and narrative, figural forms that are difficult to see and require effort to decipher. There is no longer anywhere in the entire image that is not laden with significance of one sort or another, that is unstressed.

It needs to be emphasized at the outset, however, that the essence of this experience is founded on the armature of a fundamental dichotomy, or binary, between one part of the image that is light reflecting and another that is light absorbing. I call this the reflection-absorption binary, and it appears in Plate II not only at Christ's body in the Deposition, but in many other places as well, particularly in the left half of the Lamentation, and in all the faces in the scene as a whole. It forms a dominant and deliberate compositional principle, as surely as does the characteristic central triangle constituted by figures in carefully aligned postures within High Renaissance paintings (see, for example, Fig. 2.1.). Obviously, this binary only comes into play when the gold is live. Without it, the image has lost a fundamental aspect of its compositional structure.

This device can be clearly and spectacularly seen in Plate IV, a picture taken by Ernest Hawkins of the Hagia Sophia apse mosaic of the Virgin and Child. It is to be compared with Plate III, which shows the image as it is usually reproduced in publications. In Plate IV, it becomes clear that the entire scene has been structured as a sequence of alternating layers of reflection and absorption, with its gold ground, dark figure of the Virgin, and gold-robed Christ.⁴ The deliberateness with which the principle has been adhered to is evident in the rigour with which each layer has been closed off by its opposite. Christ is carefully centred so that he is entirely surrounded by the looming, dark form of the Virgin. She has no chrysography in her robe at all, so that at no point does the gold in the Christ layer meet up with gold in any other layer. Christ is sealed within darkness, just as the Virgin is sealed within light, from her halo to the suppedion to the gold bench. Nowhere does gold bleed into gold or dark into dark. This truly is a binary, the borders between

them strictly controlled.

As with the Morgan Lectionary Deposition, a transformation in terms of overall appearance and pictorial balance occurs in this scene, although here that transformation also radically affects the subject matter of the image. As it appears in its conventional guise (Plate III), the scene is heavily visually weighted towards the Virgin, who emerges as the dominant figure. She has size, mass and bulk on her side, and her face attracts attention both as a light coloured surface and as the bearer of personal identity. The Christ Child, by contrast appears much as a secondary figure. In Plate IV, however, with the reflection-absorption binary in effect, the entire balance is altered. Attention is now drawn towards two new gleaming optical zones, the gold ground and the figure of Christ. Leaving aside momentarily the gold ground, to which we will return shortly, it becomes evident, in a way that it certainly was not before, that the image lays a vast amount of stress on Christ, as one's eyes are pulled towards his resplendently glowing figure.

Yet, despite the fact that a visual re-weighting occurs in this image, just as it does in the Deposition, a closer comparison between the two reveals that the reflection-absorption binary is anything but a device uniformly applied. In both, Christ is the most important character, yet in the Deposition he is the darkest figure in the scene, and in Hagia Sophia he is the lightest. That there are iconographic consequences in relation to both will be obvious, but before turning to them, let us pause a little longer on the implications that this fact has for the processes of scanning and reading these images mentioned earlier. As we have seen, in the Deposition the reflection-absorption binary causes a distinctive, almost paradoxical, mode of reading. A blaze of light encompasses much of the image, yet the point to which one is led by the narrative drive (that is, the compulsion to look at Christ as the chief protagonist, the centre of meaning in the scene) is obscured and is not easy to decipher. Despite the brilliance, what one needs to see in terms of figural content cannot be made out clearly, and what one is given to see, entrancing and profoundly significant though it is, does not help in revealing the crucial part that resists one's visual grasp. In the Hagia Sophia Virgin and Child, however, this tension between the various parts of the image is not in play to quite the same extent. There is luminosity in the field, there is darkness covering one of the figures who carries the content, but the personality on whom the scene centres is clearly displayed. To be sure, some of that tension still exists. One still looks to the Virgin as a break within the gold ground, still searches within the gloom for signs of her body and face, as one does, indeed, even for Christ's face, but one is not forced by the structure of the image to grope around in the dark in an attempt to make out its figural core.

Clearly, the changes produced in both images by the new lighting mode have profound iconographic significance. The Hagia Sophia scene in its new

guise, for example, must be seen as the very visual embodiment of Christ's proclamation, 'I am the light of the world' (John 1.9). He is a light-emitting, divine figure, in contrast to the Virgin, who, without her characteristic chrysography, appears distinctly lacking in divine radiance. In the Deposition, by contrast, Christ is the only one amidst the company of John, Mary and Joseph of Arimathea who is not shot-through with light. The iconographic point here (entirely lost in the conventional reproduction of the scene) is evident as well. What better way to show the theological truth that it is as both fully man and fully god that he is murdered than to deprive him of divine light?

In this context of the significance of light, we may add the obvious point here that with the reflection-absorption binary active, the gold ground, long interpreted as being symbolic of divinity, is not so much symbolic of it as demonstrative of it, an actualization of it. It is a field of divine immanence, the very substance of divinity itself. It is the place where optics and theology coincide. And if a field of divine immanence it is, then we may say that the Hagia Sophia Virgin and Child visually makes the theological point that Christ is formed of the same stuff. He is composed of immanence, is immanence incarnate. Clearly, much work remains to be done in the investigation of other, similar pictures in this regard, but in a culture that has such a well developed verbal theology of light, stretching from Pseudo-Dionysios to Gregory Palamas, is it not time to consider images in gold as a parallel track in the development of a visual theology of light?⁵

Let us now turn to a more detailed examination of some of the physical conditions required for the optimal viewing of these scenes. One of the most striking aspects of these pictures is the smooth, even glow that the gold ground is capable of providing as it contrasts with the more textured and lined light-absorbing surfaces of the figures. The key difficulty here, as mentioned earlier, is how to get the gold to catch the light and yet avoid hotspots. This problem, it turns out, is easy to solve. Hotspots, as we have seen, are caused by point sources of light, usually light bulbs, being reflected in the metallic surface, and the extremely bright lights commonly used in contemporary photography make matters considerably worse. However, if these images are illuminated not by a direct point source of light, but an indirect, broadly spread light, for example an open window or door that allows some light, but not direct sunlight, to enter a room, the gold can pick up that ambient light without the attendant hotspots.

Indirect light of this sort, however, is generally not particularly strong, and not coincidentally, these images are at their arresting best in very low light, when counterintuitive though it may seem, the contrast between the light-reflecting and light-absorbing areas is at its peak. This occurs at the point just

before the dark zones fall off into indecipherability, where there is barely sufficient light available for their interior details and markings to be dimly glimpsed, yet they immediately abut the smoothly glowing fields of gold, the optical dazzle of which, as mentioned, compounds the effect of a creeping invisibility.

These conditions of low, indirect light, of course, recur in Byzantine churches every day at dawn or dusk. The most effective moment for viewing these pictures arrives at the moment when the church itself is almost completely black, yet a tiny amount of light still filters in. Suddenly, in a particularly dark corner, the gold of an icon or mosaic comes alive. Glowing impossibly brightly given the amount of dim light entering from a distant window or door, the image appears to be a source of light in itself, and the binary, in effect, seems to be not so much reflection and absorption as emission and absorption. And within the dark pauses that inhabit that incandescent field, one struggles to make out the forms of the godly. These images truly are magical, mystical meditations on theology and divinity.

Although the argument for the reflection-absorption model has so far been made primarily in visual terms, there is considerable evidence available that this was the way in which Byzantine viewers themselves regarded their images. Liz James, in *Light and Colour in Byzantine Art*, concludes that amongst Byzantine authors writing about art, images are particularly admired for their brightness and brilliance. Thus Paul the Silentiary, in his sixth-century description of the church of Hagia Sophia makes frequent use of the term 'glitter', and refers to 'the gilded tesserae from which a glittering stream of golden rays pours abundantly'.⁶ Much emphasis too, is placed on the contrast between areas of light and dark. Individual colours, by comparison, are considerably less appreciated, and terms for them are vague and imprecise. Sparkle and glitter are thus more highly valued than hue.⁷ These findings, of course, are entirely congruent with the contentions of this paper. With the reflection-absorption principle in operation, the pictures do indeed sparkle and glitter and there is great contrast between lights and darks, yet they are not particularly colourful because the optical dazzle and low-light conditions considerably diminish the eye's ability to perceive the local hues in the clothing and skin tones of the figures.

As James makes clear, this Byzantine concentration on brilliance and sparkle is diametrically opposed to our own modes of perception, in which colour plays a much more important role. This and other perceptual differences, I will argue, are ultimately responsible for the current, conventional displays of Byzantine images with the gold in its flat, unreflective state. In respect of those differences, however, it is not simply that we are out of step with the whole of history; rather, we are direct heirs to visual regimes that begin in the Renaissance, supplanting the earlier regimes under which

Byzantine images were made. In this last section, then, we will look briefly at the significance of some of the changes that take place in two-dimensional imagery as the use of gold falls out of favour during the Renaissance, and the reflection-absorption binary as a principle of composition is eclipsed.

Let us take as an example of the new Renaissance mode of painting Raphael's *Madonna of the Meadows*, of 1505 (Fig. 2.1; Vienna, Kunsthistorisches Museum). Most importantly, without the extreme of the dazzling gold, there are no longer any dark intervals in the image that are difficult to discern. Rather, all details are clearly visible; everything, including the most subtle shades of colour, is revealed to the eye. It is this, I believe, that marks a watershed in relation to both vision itself and painting, towards the visual paradigms that we ourselves now inhabit. The shift that takes place, evident in scene after scene in the Renaissance, is one away from anything in the visual field that is not absolutely clear and easy to see. Whatever does not reveal itself fully and distinctly to vision, the vague, obscure, and indiscernible, is refused. It is almost as though vision takes on a new arrogance, a heightened sense of its own importance, a sense of what it can do, and decides that it will not tolerate anything over which it does not have total dominion. What the new painting offers the eye, so evident in the clear, easy vistas of Raphael's *Madonna*, is proof that there is nothing that can resist the penetrations and grasp of vision. Byzantine vision, by contrast, as the golden images demonstrate when the reflection-absorption binary is active, is indeed tolerant of uncertainty, obscurity, and things that escape it, is not as demanding that everything be revealed to it.⁸

What this concerns, then, is the ideology of vision, the series of beliefs, expectations, and demands that coalesce around the act of looking itself. It will be evident that the current methods of displaying and photographing Byzantine images (which in fact amount to the mode in which this art is represented) are entirely dictated by that paradigm of vision that begins in the Renaissance, and is with us still. It demands that no bothersome reflections dazzle the eye and make areas difficult to see. Everything must be delivered up so that our gaze can march unimpeded across the surface of the scene, easily grasping all details, all colours that cross its path. No dark corners where objects withdraw from visibility. We now live the imperious reign of vision.⁹

Yet the case to be made for Byzantine vision is infinitely stronger in that it can more easily tolerate uncertainty and obscurity. The obscurity in the pictures is hardly deployed there simply because the period vision can tolerate it. Byzantine theology is full of the idea that there is much in the workings of Christianity that escapes human understanding.¹⁰ Not for nothing is reference constantly made to the 'sacred mysteries' of the Trinity, Incarnation, and Salvation, and it is difficult not to cite St Paul's 'Now we see through a glass, darkly' (1 Cor. 13.12) in reference to our images. But then, similarly, it is also

difficult not to cite Gregory Palamas's 'When it [our supernatural ability to see God] looks at itself, it sees light, when it looks at the object of its vision, it too is light, and if it looks at the means that it uses to see, there again, there is light.'¹¹ In these images, we both sense divine immanence and glimpse things that we cannot comprehend completely; we know that they are there, but cannot grasp them fully. These pictures are, again, visual theology in process. The shimmering light side by side with dematerialized, shadowy bodies and strange markings that do not reveal themselves fully are the workings of theology in vision. To represent these scenes with the gold unrecognizable as a lively metallic surface, to insist on the perfect scrutability of the figures in particular is to impoverish them indeed. It is to succumb to an ideology that believes that figures carry the only meaning in the scene and is blind to the light that surrounds them.

These points, incidentally, provide a response to a question that arises in relation to the reflection-absorption model for which I have been arguing. If these golden scenes were intended to be looked at with so many of the bodily and facial features, fabric folds, and colours all obscured by the dazzle of the gold and made almost indecipherable by the low light, why are all those details and colours still painted in? Why not use a much rougher, cruder outlining of the main parts, rather than wasting time and effort on refinements of colour and shading which would hardly be seen? The answer will be evident in the light of what has been said above. The details are not wasted, but are rather intrinsic to the mode of operation of these images, which is to provide a sense of things that withdraw from vision. To sense them eluding one's grasp, to know that one is not seeing them, is their point.

Yet this is only half of the story. I have been arguing so far in terms of opposite extremes, contrasting the low light reflection-absorption model with the bright but no-reflection model of contemporary displays. And although I stand by the argument that these pictures are at their best when the reflection-absorption binary is in force, the actual situation is far more fluid and variable. Byzantine churches are often dark, specially in the early mornings and late evenings when services are held, but they are also very often very light, as full daylight floods the building. What this means, then, is that at certain times of day, the reflection-absorption binary is in full force, whereas at others the images appear in circumstances that are not unlike the ones we now generally see them in, with the gold not reflecting and the central figures themselves easy to see. If they were designed to operate only in the reflection-absorption mode, and did not carry the full range of pictorial signs and colours, they would be unserviceable for large portions of the day. As they stand now, they are fully formed as images: the figures can be appreciated for their beauty, for the delicate pinks and blues of the robes in the Morgan Deposition, for the modelling in the face of the Virgin in Hagia Sophia. In low light, the gold field

takes over, the figures are darkened, and the visual theology in all its profundity, mystery, suggestiveness and allusiveness begins.

In comparison with Renaissance paintings, then, which constantly require high levels of light to be fully appreciated, and simply fade into the darkness without any further ado when those levels drop, these are the most flexible of images. They are not simply polysemic, as we students of Robin Cormack so often say, but polymorphously polysemic, entirely changing their appearance and meaning in response to ambient light conditions. They are, to this observer, the most subtle art and the most theologically complex pictures because they do not simply represent theology, but enact it.

To paint in gold is to paint in light rather than to represent it, as Renaissance painting does. Yet the images are for nought if observers are not allowed to see it. The key argument of this paper may be summed up with one rhetorical question: Why would metallic, reflective gold be inserted into the image if it were not intended to be seen in the full dynamic range of its optical possibilities? Within Byzantine art alone, as the two examples illustrated here begin to demonstrate, the gold is used in a startling variety of ways, the visual, iconographic, and theological implications of which have barely been indicated. And this is not even to mention Italian art of the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, which my own preliminary investigations show to be surprisingly different in ways both large and small to the Byzantine material. None of it has been studied in relation to the changes produced when that gold comes alive, because painting in light has dropped below our horizon of visibility. Contemporary modes of presentation and representation simply do not allow us to determine if, how much, or where there is gold in an image. Much work remains to be done. Might we not, perhaps, open some new sub-headings within the History of Art: the History of Vision, and the History of Painting in Light?

Notes

1. Special thanks are due to Liz James and Antony Eastmond for their assistance beyond the call of duty in the preparation of this essay, and to Dr Roger S. Wieck for his help with photography. Thanks also to Abbey Braden for help in digitizing images.
2. Two examples chosen at random are D. Janes, *God and Gold* (Cambridge, 1998), esp. chap. 4, and J. Gage, *Colour and Culture* (London, 1993), esp. chap. 3.
3. See *In August Company: The Collections of the Pierpont Morgan Library* (New York, 1993), 76-8, for more on this manuscript.
4. This is one of several pictures taken by Hawkins that demonstrate that he was clearly fascinated by the reflective capacity of gold in mosaics. I only came across these images after his death, and I greatly regret that I did not get a chance to discuss the topic with him personally.

5. See for example Pseudo-Dionysios, *The Divine Names*, in *Pseudo-Dionysius. The Complete Works*, trans. C. Luibheid (Mahwah, NY, 1987), 593B-C and 697B-700C; and Gregory Palamas, *Triad II*, 3, 6, in *Défense des Saints hésychastes*, ed. and French trans. J. Meyendorff (Louvain, 1959). In general, see V. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (London, 1957), esp. chapter 11, 'The Divine Light'.
6. Paul the Silentiary, *Descr. S. Sophiae*, in *Johannes von Gaza und Paulus Silentarius: Kunstbeschreibungen justinianischer Zeit*, ed. P. Friedländer (Leipzig, Berlin, 1912), 668; trans. C. Mango, *Art of the Byzantine Empire, 312-1453; Sources and Documents* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1972), 86.
7. L. James, *Light and Colour in Byzantine Art* (Oxford, 1996).
8. R.S. Nelson, 'To say and to see: ekphrasis and vision in Byzantium', in *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance*, ed. R.S. Nelson (Cambridge, 2000), 143-68.
9. Almost alone in the Renaissance it is left to Leonardo da Vinci to grapple with the issue of the obscurities of vision and those things that resist it.
10. In this regard see Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, and M.-J. Mondzain, *Image, Icon, Economy*, trans. R. Franes (Stanford, forthcoming).
11. Gregory Palamas, *Triad II*, 3, 6, in *Défense des Saints hésychastes*.



2.1 Raphael, *Madonna of the Meadows*, 1505 (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna).