

**St. Petersburg State University  
Lomonosov Moscow State University**

# **Actual Problems of Theory and History of Art**

**I**

**Collection of articles**

**St. Petersburg  
2011**

Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет  
Московский государственный университет имени М. В. Ломоносова

# Актуальные проблемы теории и истории искусства

## I

Сборник научных статей

Санкт-Петербург  
2011

УДК 7:061.3  
ББК 85.03  
А43

**Редакционная коллегия:**

В. Г. Власов, И. И. Тучков, А. П. Салиенко, С. В. Мальцева,  
Е. Ю. Станюкович-Денисова, И. Стевович

**Editorial board:**

Victor Vlasov, Ivan Tuchkov, Alexandra Salienko, Svetlana Maltseva,  
Ekaterina Stanyukovich-Denisova, Ivan Stevović

**Рецензенты:**

д. иск. проф. Т. В. Ильина (СПбГУ);  
к. иск. А. В. Захарова (МГУ имени М. В. Ломоносова)

**Reviewers:**

Tatyana Ilyina (St. Petersburg State University);  
Anna Zakharova (Lomonosov Moscow State University)

*Печатается по постановлению Ученого совета исторического факультета  
Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета и Ученого совета Московского  
государственного университета имени М. В. Ломоносова*

**А43 Актуальные проблемы теории и истории искусства** : сб. науч. статей. Вып. 1 / СПбГУ ; под ред. С. В. Мальцевой, Е. Ю. Станюкович-Денисовой. — СПб. : Профессия, 2011. — 432 с.

**Actual Problems of Theory and History of Art** : Collection of articles. Vol. 1 / SpbSU; Svetlana Maltseva, Ekaterina Stanyukovich-Denisova eds. — St. Petersburg: Profession. 2011. — 432 p.

**ISBN 978-5-288-05174-6**

Сборник научных статей содержит материалы Международной конференции молодых специалистов, проходившей на историческом факультете СПбГУ 1–5 декабря 2010 г. и посвященной актуальным вопросам искусства и культуры от античности до современности. В статьях отечественных и иностранных авторов (на русском и английском языках) представлены результаты исследований преимущественно в области изучения восточнохристианского и западноевропейского искусства от древности до нашего времени, а также в области археологии, реставрации, теории и методологии искусства.

Издание предназначено в первую очередь для специалистов. Может быть использовано в учебной, научно-практической деятельности, а также интересно широкому кругу любителей искусства.

The collection of articles consists of the materials of the International Conference of Young Specialists, held at the Faculty of History of St. Petersburg State University in December, 1–5, 2010. It deals with the actual problems of art theory and history from Antiquity to the 20th c. The articles by Russian and foreign researchers (in English and in Russian) mainly examine the problems of Eastern Christian and Western art, as well as of archeology, restoration, theory and methodology of art.

For art historians, historians, students and art lovers.

УДК 7:061.3  
ББК 85.03

ISBN 978-5-288-05174-6

© Авторы статей, 2010  
© Исторический факультет Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета  
© Исторический факультет Московского государственного университета имени М. В. Ломоносова

На обложке использована картина О. Лягачева – Хельги «Солнце», 2010. Частное собрание. Париж, Франция.  
On the cover: Oleg Liagatchev-Helgi. Soleil, 2010. Private collection. Paris. France.

# СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

# CONTENTS

<i>Т. В. Ильина, А. В. Захарова.</i> Предисловие. <i>Tatyana V. Ilyina, Anna V. Zakharova.</i> Foreword .....	10
<i>Олег Лягачев-Хельги.</i> По поводу «Солнца». <i>Oleg Liagatchev-Helgi.</i> Apropos of «The Sun» .....	14

## Средневековое искусство восточнохристианского мира. Medieval Art of the Eastern Christian World

<i>Д. Д. Ёлшин.</i> Некоторые материалы к реконструкции Десятинной церкви в Киеве. <i>Denis D. Jolshin.</i> Some Evidence for the Remodelling of the Desjatinnaya (Tithe) Church in Kiev .....	19
<i>Tatjana Koprivica.</i> Sacral Topography of Late Antique and Early Christian Doclea (Montenegro): the First Modern Preliminary Investigation. <i>Татьяна Копривица.</i> Сакральная топография позднеантичной и раннехристианской Дуклии (Черногория): первое современное предварительное исследование .....	25
<i>Valentina Cantone.</i> The Problem of the Eastern Influences on Byzantine Art during the Macedonian Renaissance: Some Illuminated Manuscripts from the National Library of Greece and the National Library of Venice. <i>Валентина Кантоне.</i> Проблема восточных влияний на византийское искусство в эпоху Македонского ренессанса: некоторые иллюстрированные рукописи из Национальной библиотеки Греции и Национальной библиотеки Венеции .....	33
<i>Lorenzo Riccardi.</i> Observations on Basil II as Patron of the Arts. <i>Лоренцо Риккарди.</i> Византийский император Василий II как покровитель искусств.....	39
<i>А. Л. Макарова.</i> Фрески церкви Св. Георгия в Бочорме (Грузия). <i>Anna L. Makarova.</i> Frescoes of St. George Church in Bochorma (Georgia).....	46
<i>Е. И. Морозова.</i> Эпистилии со сценами праздников в системе декорации византийской алтарной преграды (XII в.). <i>Ekaterina I. Morozova.</i> Epistyles with the Scenes of Feasts in Byzantine Altar Screen Decoration of the 12th Century.....	56
<i>С. В. Мальцева.</i> Значение приделов в формировании региональной традиции в сербской средневековой архитектуре. <i>Svetlana V. Maltseva.</i> Significance of Chapels in Forming the Regional Tradition of Serbian Medieval Architecture.....	63
<i>Jasmina S. Ćirić.</i> The Art of Exterior Wall 'Decoration' in Late Byzantine Architecture <i>Ясмина Чирич.</i> Искусство украшения внешних стен в поздневизантийской архитектуре .....	69

<i>Branka Vranešević. Problems in Studying the Heritage of Antiquity in the Middle Ages. The Case of Personifications of Divine Wisdom in the Leningrad Gospel.</i> <i>Бранка Вранешевич. Проблемы изучения наследия античности в Средние века: персонификации Божественной Премудрости в Ленинградском Евангелии</i> .....	77
<i>Miloš Živković. The Legendary Ruler in Medieval Guise: Few Observations on the Iconography of Belgrade Alexandride.</i> <i>Милош Живкович. Легендарный правитель в средневековых одеждах: об иконографии белградской Александрии</i> .....	79
<i>Silvia Pedone. A Critical Approach to the Byzantine Art in the First Half of 19th Century. The Case of C. M. Texier.</i> <i>Сильвия Педоне. Критический подход к византийскому искусству в первой половине XIX в. Шарль М. Тексье</i> .....	92
<i>Giovanni Gasbarri. Bridges between Russia and Italy: Studies in Byzantine Art at the Beginning of 20th Century.</i> <i>Джованни Газбарри. Мосты между Россией и Италией. Изучение византийского искусства в начале XX в.</i> .....	101
<i>E. A. Немыкина. О проблеме южнославянских влияний на монументальную живопись Новгорода XIV в.</i> <i>Elena A. Nemykina. On the Problem of "Southern Slavic Influence" on Novgorod Monumental Painting in the Second Half of the 14th Century</i> .....	109
<i>A. H. Шаповалова. Новгородская монументальная живопись и религиозно-философские течения восточнохристианского мира второй половины XIV в.</i> <i>Alexandra N. Shapovalova. The Novgorod Mural Paintings and Religious Theories of the East Christian World in the Second Half of the 14th Century</i> .....	115
<i>A. B. Трушникова. Древнерусские храмы с пристенными угловыми опорами (кон. XIV — нач. XV в.). Происхождение типа в контексте византийской и балканской архитектуры.</i> <i>Alexandra V. Trushnikova. Old Russian Cross-domed Churches with Corner Piers in the Late 14th — Early 15th Centuries. On the Origins of the Architectural Type in the Context of Byzantine and Balkan Architecture</i> .....	124
<i>A. A. Фрезе. Исихастские мотивы в иконографической программе росписи церкви Успения Богоматери в с. Мелётово.</i> <i>Anna A. Freze. Hesychast Concept in the Iconographic Programme of the Frescoes in the Church of Assumption in Melyotovo</i> .....	133
<i>И. Л. Федотова. К вопросу о псковских зодчих в Москве в последней четверти XV в. Историкографический аспект.</i> <i>Irina L. Fedotova. Some Observations and Historiography on Pskovian Architects in Moscow in the Last Quarter of the 15th Century</i> .....	140
<i>Н. М. Абраменко. Образы святых князей Владимира, Бориса и Глеба в храмовых росписях времени Ивана IV.</i> <i>Natalia M. Abramenko. Images of the First Russian Saint Princes Vladimir, Boris and Gleb in the Wall Painting during the Reign of the Tsar Ivan IV</i> .....	149
<i>А. И. Долгова. Об истоках и символике иконографии «Лабиринт духовный».</i> <i>Anastasia I. Dolgova. On the Origins and Symbolism of the Iconography of "Spiritual Labyrinth"</i> .....	156

## Русское искусство XVIII–XX вв. Russian Art in the 18–20th Centuries

<i>А. М. Васильева.</i> Русское и европейское в творчестве гравера петровского времени Ивана Зубова. <i>Alexandra M. Vasilyeva.</i> Russian and European Tendencies in the Work of Ivan Zubov, Russian Engraver of the Early 18th Century .....	167
<i>Е. Ю. Станюкович-Денисова.</i> Образцовые проекты в жилом строительстве Петербурга 1730–1760-х гг.: проблема типологии и модификации. <i>Ekaterina Yu. Stanyukovich-Denisova.</i> Exemplary Projects in House Building of the 1730s–1760s in St. Petersburg: Typology and Modifications .....	174
<i>А. А. Сурова.</i> Росписи часовни в д. Васильева Гора Торжокского района Тверской области: к вопросу западноевропейского влияния в культовой монументальной живописи кон. XVIII в. <i>Anna A. Surova.</i> Murals of the Chapel in the Village of Vasileva Gora in Torzhoksky District of Tver Region: the Problem of European Influence on Church Monumental Painting of the Late 18th Century .....	180
<i>Ю. И. Чежина.</i> Портреты-двойники кисти Ж.-Л. Монье и А. Е. Егорова: к проблеме заимствования в живописи. <i>Julia I. Chezina.</i> The Twin-Portraits by Jean-Laurent Mosnier and Alexey Egorov: to the Problem of Adoption in Painting.....	186
<i>А. Е. Кустова.</i> Русская тема в живописи Дж. А. Аткинсона. <i>Anna E. Kustova.</i> Russian Subjects in the Paintings by J. A. Atkinson .....	196
<i>Е. А. Скворцова.</i> Роль Дж. А. Аткинсона в развитии жанра панорамы в русском искусстве. <i>Ekaterina A. Skvortsova.</i> The Role of J. A. Atkinson in the Development of Panoramas in Russian Art .....	204
<i>Т. В. Белякова.</i> Особенности графики Козловского и Прокофьева в контексте предромантизма. <i>Tatyana V. Beliakova.</i> Peculiarities of Graphic Works by Kozlovsky and Prokofiev in the Context of Pre-Romanticism .....	214
<i>А. А. Варламова.</i> Источники композиции и декоративного оформления Погодинской избы. <i>Alexandra A. Varlamova.</i> The Sources of Composition and Decoration of the Pogodin Izba in Moscow .....	222
<i>А. В. Ганган.</i> Русская бронзовая пластика малых форм рубежа XIX–XX вв.: к вопросу о творческом методе. <i>Andrey V. Gangan.</i> Russian Small-Scale Bronze Sculpture in the Late 19th – Early 20th Century: the Problem of Creative Method .....	227
<i>А. А. Ларионов.</i> Конструктивизм и неоклассика на архитектурном факультете Академии Художеств в 1920-е гг. Учебные работы. <i>Andrey A. Larionov.</i> Constructivism and Neoclassicism at the Department of Architecture of the Russian Academy of Arts in the 1920s. Student Projects.....	234
<i>М. Ю. Евсеев.</i> «Я что-то должен сказать... в будущее». Н. Н. Пунин и Петербургский университет. <i>Mikhail Yu. Evseyev.</i> “I Am to Say Something... for the Future”. Nikolay N. Punin at the St. Petersburg University.....	242

<i>Г. Э. Аббасова.</i> Восток и Запад. Проблема традиции в творчестве художников Узбекистана 1920–1930-х гг. <i>Galina E. Abbasova.</i> The East and the West. The Problem of Tradition in the Works of Uzbekistan's Artists in the 1920s–1930s.....	250
---	-----

<i>К. В. Смирнова.</i> Памятники героям и жертвам Великой Отечественной войны. Мемориальные комплексы 1960–1970-х гг. Проблема исторической и художественной ценности. <i>Ksenia V. Smirnova.</i> Monuments to the Heroes and Victims of the World War II. Memorial Complexes of the 1960s–1970s and the Problem of Historic and Artistic Value.....	256
---	-----

### **Восток и Запад, от античности до современности. The East and the West, from Antiquity to the 20th Century**

<i>М. А. Семина.</i> Оригинал или римейк. Проблема сохранности и реставрации произведений античной скульптуры. <i>M. A. Semina.</i> Genuine or Remade Item. Condition and Restoration of Ancient Sculpture.....	265
--	-----

<i>А. А. Краснова.</i> К проблеме оценки достоверности реставрируемой скульптуры из раскопок античных городов Северного Причерноморья. <i>Anastasia A. Krasnova.</i> The Problem of Authenticity of Restored Sculpture Excavated in Ancient Greek Towns of the North Pontic Area .....	275
---	-----

<i>А. С. Винокурова.</i> Храмы династии Хойсала. Синтез архитектуры и скульптуры. <i>Anastasia S. Vinokurova.</i> Hoysala temples. A Synthesis of Architecture and Sculpture .....	285
---	-----

<i>А. А. Янковская.</i> Сообщения арабского путешественника XIV в. Ибн Баттуты о Малайском архипелаге: проблема интерпретации источника. <i>Aglaya A. Yankovskaya.</i> Accounts of the 14th Century Arab Traveller Ibn Battuta on the Malay Archipelago: the Problem of Interpretation of the Source .....	292
---	-----

<i>О. Д. Белова.</i> Карта «Смерть» из колоды тарокки Пирпонт Морган-Бергамо и макабрические сюжеты в искусстве Италии XIV–XV вв. <i>Olga D. Belova.</i> The “Death” Card from the Tarot Pack Pierpont Morgan — Bergamo and Macabre Themes in Italian Art of the 14th and 15th Centuries.....	298
--	-----

<i>М. А. Лопухова.</i> Классические мотивы в поздней алтарной живописи Филиппино Липпи. <i>Marina A. Lopukhova.</i> Classical Tradition in the Later Altarpieces by Filippino Lippi.....	307
---	-----

<i>Е. А. Титова.</i> Проблемы церковной архитектуры Возрождения в трактатах Антонио Филарете и Франческо ди Джорджо: развитие базиликального и центрического планов. <i>Elizaveta A. Titova.</i> The Problems of the Renaissance Church Architecture in the Treatises by Antonio Filarete and Francesco di Giorgio: the Development of Basilical and Central Plan.....	314
---	-----

<i>Л. А. Чечик.</i> «Свой–чужой» в «дипломатической» живописи Венеции эпохи Возрождения. <i>Liya A. Chechik.</i> ‘Friend-or-foe’ in the ‘Diplomatic’ Painting of the Renaissance Venice.....	322
---	-----

<i>Е. А. Павленская.</i> Эволюция жанра детского портрета в творчестве испанских придворных художников XVI–XVII вв. <i>Elizaveta A. Pavlenskaya.</i> The Evolution of Children's Portraiture in the Works of Spanish Court Painters of the 16th–17th Centuries .....	329
---	-----

<i>А. Е. Челован. Испанский ориентализм XIX в. Мариано Фортун.</i> <i>Anastasia E. Chelovan. Spanish Orientalism of the 19th Century. Mariano Fortuny</i> .....	335
<i>Е. Г. Гойхман. Традиция в творчестве Эжена Делакруа.</i> <i>Romantic painting of 1820s and the art of the old masters.</i> <i>Elena G. Goykhman. Tradition in the Work of Eugène Delacroix.</i> <i>Romantic Painting of the 1820s and the Art of the Old Masters</i> .....	341
<i>Vladimir Dimovski. An Approach to Avant-Garde Manifestoes.</i> <i>Владимир Димовски. Манифесты авангарда: попытка осмысления</i> .....	353
<i>Lora Mitić. The Achievements of the Rochester School</i> <i>in the Field of the Critical Art History.</i> <i>Лора Митич. Достижения Рочестерской школы в области теории</i> <i>и истории искусств</i> .....	359
<i>А. В. Григораш. Выставка «Документ немецкого искусства» (1901 г.) в контексте</i> <i>открытия Дармштадской колонии: гезамткунстверк или синтез искусств?</i> <i>Alyona V. Grigorash. The "Document of German Art" Exhibition (1901) in the Context</i> <i>of the Opening of the Darmstadt Colony: Gesamtkunstwerk or Synthesis of Arts?</i> .....	368
<i>Н. Л. Данилова. Архитектура Йозефа Хоффмана</i> <i>в зарубежной историографии 1990–2010 гг.</i> <i>Nina L. Danilova. Architecture of Josef Hoffman in Foreign Historiography</i> <i>of the 1990–2000s</i> .....	376
<i>В. О. ван дер Вестэйзен. Авторские права</i> <i>и проблема интерпретации современной живописи аборигенов Австралии.</i> <i>Valeria O. van der Westhuizen. The Problem of Copyright</i> <i>and the Interpretation of Australian Contemporary Aboriginal Painting</i> .....	383
<i>Е. И. Станиславская. Хэппенинг как действенно-зрелищная форма искусства XX в.</i> <i>Katerina I. Stanislavska. Happening as Action-Show Art Form of the 20th Century</i> .....	387
<i>Е. В. Барышникова. О студенческой фотовыставке «Мир глазами искусствоведов».</i> <i>Elizaveta V. Baryshnikova. The Students' Photo Exhibition</i> <i>"World Seen by Art Historians"</i> .....	395
Аннотации. ....	398
Abstracts .....	412
Сведения об авторах .....	424
About authors .....	427



Silvia Pedone  
(University of Rome “Tor Vergata”, Italy)

## A CRITICAL APPROACH TO THE BYZANTINE ART IN THE FIRST HALF OF 19th CENTURY. THE CASE OF C. M. TEXIER

“By style is usually meant the constant form — and sometimes the constant elements, qualities, and expression — in the art of an individual or a group”<sup>1</sup>. This is Meyer Schapiro in his much celebrated and rightly famous definition of the notion of artistic style. That might seem a commonsensical, well-tempered and highly reasonable definition, nevertheless a much more difficult issue hides in his lines. Indeed, Schapiro’s formula works very well as far as you can define “a group” (let’s put aside for now the individual problem) in the first place and on an independent ground. But that’s the rub, for the very identity of a group is often describable only in stylistic terms. From a substantive art historical point of view, what counts as a proper member of a group often depends on the recognizable stylistic features of the item. But then a begging question problem rises about where to search for and how to single out the relevant features we need to define a stylistic whole.

To be sure that is a very general issue, but it seems especially crucial in the case of Byzantine Art. Above all for historical and cultural reasons<sup>2</sup>. Perhaps more than other near disciplinary fields Byzantine Art Studies grew out of a disputed cultural “battlefield”, in the first half of 19th century. On one hand there was the shadow of Enlightenment, with its severe judgment that saw — through the eyes of authors like Montesquieu or Gibbon<sup>3</sup> — the Byzantine civilization as an age of decadence and dissolution, if not of “abominations of all kinds”, as in the infamous Hegel’s words<sup>4</sup>. On the other hand there were, besides the Romantic rediscovery of the national heritage of the dark and yet Christian Middle Age, the needs of the new-born research field of Art History. From this point of view, it’s quite revealing that most studies devoted in the first half of the 19th century to Late-Antique and Byzantine art involved, in a way or another, a kind of *excusatio*, a justification piece offered to the reader for the choice of this topic, because «it might be a matter of surprise that they should be deemed worthy of a critical examination» — as Charles Eastlake wrote in 1841, editing the English translation of Franz Kugler’s *Handbook*<sup>5</sup>.

Indeed, the “justification” of the historical role of Byzantine art became a problem of paramount importance, and it’s not so rash to say that the still much discussed question of continuity of Byzantine tradition with Classical Greek heritage<sup>6</sup> — with a number of positions between the opposite poles of lumpers and splitters — is a consequence of that “original sin”. In the pioneering works of the 19th century, the Byzantine monuments could be “worthy of critical examination” also because they “served”, at least, almost as a link in the chain of art historical development. No wonder, for example, we read in the introductory note of the guide to *Byzantine Court* in the Crystal Palace, in 1854, that “in architecture, as in all other works of creation, *there is no gap* [...]”. The very apparent

opposition existing between one ancient system — the Roman — and another — the Gothic — only renders more interesting the Byzantine style, which, with its offshoots, *served to connect the two*<sup>7</sup>.

So, the coinage of a reliable definition of Byzantine style turned out to be an essential question, if only in a negative, subtractive perspective. But in that time Byzantine art was still a roughly “covering term” that denoted objects and relations whose knowledge was to a great extent still fragmentary. In 1856 the Paduan scholar Pietro Selvatico rhetorically asked: “But when we speak about Byzantine art [...] have we exactly the right concept of it? Are we able to establish its distinctive feature?”<sup>8</sup>. His view was that «this name of Byzantine architecture has no other value than to hint at *a series of styles* stemming one from another within the boundaries of Eastern Empire»<sup>9</sup>. And that leads us again to the begging question problem of inductive definition of style according to Schapiro’s account. A formal problem no less pressing at the beginning of the history of Byzantine Studies than it is today. Indeed, in his famous ground-breaking repertory Séroux D’Agincourt complained, already in 1811, that “rather than trying to verify the dating of a product of art with the aid of erudition explaining the subject, we should on the contrary explain the subject by means of the style of the monument”<sup>10</sup>. D’Agincourt himself was aware that such a taxonomic task was possible only on the base of direct analytic description, but he was perhaps less aware that in order to describe the proper object, you have first to identify the right thing.

So, to secure a corner stone to stylistic analysis and inference the “right thing” had to be searched for in the “right place”, that is to say in the very birthplace of Byzantine art: Constantinople. In a sense, it’s for a necessary condition that Byzantine Art Studies were (and are) so close tied to archeological research since their beginnings. It was the work of field researchers like the French architect and archeologist Charles Felix-Marie Texier<sup>11</sup> (1802–1872) that providing a detailed repertoire of the ancient monuments of Byzantium made also tangibly clear in what extent style is a variable relative to space as well to time, a geographical as well as a chronological notion<sup>12</sup>.

The original contribution of Texier’s studies was not only in their systematic survey, but also in the visual exploration and recording of details and structures of different functional levels. An approach taking into account not merely a vague formal dimension, but also material, technique, constructive and decorative features. His painstaking drawings are a sure witness of such a multifarious interest.

As an architect and archeologist trained in the *Académie de Beaux-Arts* in Paris, Texier was not immune from a classicistic prejudice, but that didn’t prevent him to feel the fascination of the greatness and richness of Byzantine ancient relics<sup>13</sup>. Furthermore, between 1830 and 1840, thanks to the ideological open-mindedness of the Ottoman court — then ratified by the reforms of the so-called *Tanzimat*<sup>14</sup> — European voyagers could have access to churches and monuments that had remained unreachable for centuries. In a letter of 1833 Texier wrote:

“Je trouve dans cette ville un assez grand nombre de monuments de son ancienne richesse; et à chaque pas des souvenirs d’une grandeur qui ne s’efface pas encore. [...] quand on jette les yeux sur ce qui reste de l’époque byzantine on s’étonne qu’il reste encore tant de monuments intacts. Le colosse de St Sophie s’élève encore avec son antique majesté, huit autres églises byzantines converties en mosquée commencent à s’ouvrir à la curiosité des observateurs”<sup>15</sup>.

I want to consider here some of the drawings realized by Texier in Constantinople, to give a more direct idea of his working methods — only few pieces from a great collection I'm currently studying<sup>16</sup>.

Among the most interesting documents there are the colored drawings of the base of the Theodosian obelisk, erected in the middle of the Hippodrome in 390 A.D. and still standing along the *euripe* of the circus, today At-Meydani Square<sup>17</sup>. Texier devoted as much as 17 plates, dated 1838, to the marble pedestal, to the obelisk of pink granite and to the plan of the hippodrome<sup>18</sup>. As it's possible to judge from one of these drawings — obviously realized directly from life, as proved by the grid of squares slightly visible on the sheet under the colored sketch — the pedestal was partly buried at that time<sup>19</sup>, so that it was impossible to read completely the inscriptions in Greek and Latin on the *tabulae ansate* decorating the base, and to see the reliefs with the scenes of the horse race and the erection of the obelisk. Texier himself tried in vain to obtain a permission to dig out the pedestal of the monument<sup>20</sup>.

Single plates are specifically dedicated to the honorary columns of the city. That one of Constantine, also known as “Burnt Column”<sup>21</sup>, is recorded on many occasions in the diaries of the archeologist, also because its view was barred by buildings that diminished the greatness of the column and lend to it a somehow shabby look, as we can see also in an engraving published in the same year by William H. Bartlett as illustration of the book of Julia Pardoe<sup>22</sup>. Texier exactly describes the wreaths covering the joints between the drums of the column, but he didn't illustrate them.

We have 3 plates<sup>23</sup> pertaining to the column of Marcianus, erected by the *Praefectus Urbi*, *Tazianus*, in 445 A.D.<sup>24</sup>. In one of the drawings we can see the pedestal, decorated with two winged victories taking the wreath with the *Chrismon* and the discussed dedicatory inscription. Texier seems particularly interested in the plastic relief, conveyed in the drawing through the use of chiaroscuro that faithfully records also the broken parts of the monument. A comparison with another drawing dated about to a century before<sup>25</sup> allows us to check exactly the loss caused by time: for example, the winged figure on the right was almost completely destroyed when Texier portrayed it in his sketch. And the conditions of the sculpture had to get worse at the beginning of the 20th century, as several photos published by Ebersolt in 1918 demonstrate<sup>26</sup>. Only in recent years an excellent work of restoration has rescued the marble monument, until then almost completely stained by the old metallic retaining structures, so that it's now possible to appreciate again the carved surfaces, though hopelessly damaged by time.

The other two drawings of Texier depict the Corinthian capital of the column, crowned by its impost block with eagles at the four corners, better appreciable in the drawing than from life today.

Among the materials devoted to ecclesiastical buildings of early Byzantine period, 11 drawings represent Saint John of Stoudios<sup>27</sup>, the celebrated monastery near the Golden Gate, built around 450 by the Consul Stoudios<sup>28</sup>. The edifice with its *coenobium* had a central role in the life of the city and its fame remained well alive also when it was turned into a mosque by the equerry (*Imrahor*) of the sultan Bayezid II (1481–1512), changing definitively its name in Imrahor Camii. The heavy destructions suffered by the monument make much more precious the witness of Texier. He could see the building with the roof realized during the 19th century to remedy the damages of the fire that devastated the district of Psamathia in 1782; damages documented by the etching of count Choiseul Gouffier<sup>29</sup>. In the plan and the relative elevation it's possible to see the interesting details

of the staircase of the northern nave, leading probably to the galleries, and the profile of the 7 gallery windows, a detail that, if not a fanciful invention of the draughtsman, could bear witness of the look of the building updated according to the Ottoman taste, as in the case of the columns of the *naos*, covered with painted stucco. Two other sheets are devoted to the porch: the first one is a painterly watercolor, representing the molded decoration of the trabeation; the second one depicts the four columns with composite capitals — that Texier repeats also in more detail. In the same plate, on the left, we can see a light sketch of the plan of the porch with its wooden pergola on the front, also visible in a drawing of the Bibliothèque Nationale de France<sup>30</sup>. A quite exceptional, if not unique, case is that of the drawing of the cistern near the basilica. Texier depicts the vaulted ceiling, almost completely destroyed by a fire in the 1970s, together with the series of Corinthian capitals, today only partially visible. In the right low corner of the sheet, the author rapidly sketched the plan of the square structure, with its four rows of six columns, also documented in the graphic memory of Fauvel<sup>31</sup>.

A significant number of drawings — as much as eleven — are dedicated to the church of Saints Sergius and Bacchus<sup>32</sup>: a plan and a lot of details of the decoration, characterized by a vivid color scheme of the reliefs, in red and green, similar to that discovered after the recent restoration of the building. We have here the classic trabeation that separates the ground floor from galleries, the particular decorative features, and one of the polilobate capitals of the first order. We also see the long imperial inscription running along the perimeter of the *naos* and the medallions with imperial monograms. Furthermore, Texier reconstructs the section of the building in a plate in which it's possible to appreciate the chromatic play of columns of green Thessalian and pavonazetto marbles. Also the angelic figures inserted in the gores of the dome are noteworthy. We find an analogous setting, for example, in a plate illustrating the book of Ebersolt and Thiers of 1913<sup>33</sup>. In his drawing Texier carefully notes the staircase leading to the galleries, obtained with ancient pieces, as the proconnesian marble slabs, the little pillars and the decorated arch, dating from middle-byzantine period.

But the richest group of drawings is naturally reserved to the Justinian's church of Hagia Sophia<sup>34</sup>, 59 sheets including panoramic views, plans, elevations, sculptural details — especially capitals, cornices and marble slabs, but also sketches of the bronze doors and aniconic mosaic patterns. We have several watercolor views taken from outside, with the impressive volumes of the buttresses and the protruding structures that Texier referred to Ottoman period and that are well identifiable also in some 16th century images of the church. These structures, however, conceived to carry the thrust of the windowed walls and to accommodate the ever-urging static problems, conceal, now as well as then, the view of the lower walls of the building, «an unbecoming impediment» that precludes the possibility to represent carefully the original structure, «from the base to the dome» — as Texier himself complained in his manuscripts and in the two essays he devoted to the church in the *Revue Française*, in 1839 and 1840<sup>35</sup>.

The architect made also large drawings of the façade (similar to those ones, slightly later, by the Prussian engineer Wilhelm Salzenberg<sup>36</sup> or by the architect N. Jefimov<sup>37</sup>, for the book of Vladimir Petrovich Davydov<sup>38</sup>), the elevations of the longitudinal section and the counter-façade of the church. These are the most meticulous plates of the group and were probably sent to Paris, as we can infer from the records of the École des Beaux-Arts. There are a plenty of details, like the accurate indication of the alternate color scheme of the marble wall paneling and of colonnades of the first and second storey. This

notwithstanding, we can discern some liberty taken by the 19th century artist, for example: the seraphim realized according a typical style of the period, a feature that we find also, fifteen years later, in the drawings of the church mosaics by the Fossati brothers<sup>39</sup>. But as an architect Texier was no less interested in the roofing structures of the building, as witnessed in a sketch, perhaps a preparatory study for a larger plate, that represents, as far as I know, the first architectural visual survey of the domes. From the laconic notes in Texier's manuscripts we can suppose that he obtained access to the roof of the building, managing to measure what no other western observer has ever been able to see, as he recorded not without a bit of pride.

Texier carried a no less scrupulous survey also inside the church. It's interesting to consider the view of the *naos* and the *bema*, seen from the West<sup>40</sup>, from a point of view analogous to that chosen before him by Louis-François Cassas<sup>41</sup>. Texier's plate shows certain rigidity, perhaps caused by a greater attention to the proportions of the *naos* than to the contemporary arrangement of the interior. As a modern observer and as an archeologist he carefully noted the windows and the numerous slabs in the galleries. In particular, in a large plate<sup>42</sup> including several sketches the author analyzes the marble decoration of Justinian's age<sup>43</sup>, the slabs adorned with lozenges and crossed globes, a motif we find later in a lot of painted reproductions of the second half of the 19th century. In the same drawing there is also a study of the fine panels decorated with a vegetable-like tracery, and of the much-elaborated capitals that Texier considered "a highly original corruption" of the classical models. Here it's possible to appreciate the painstaking depiction of details<sup>44</sup>, that we may compare with analogous drawings by the Fossati<sup>45</sup>. These works, together with the scrupulous annotation of descriptions and dimensions, are of great documentary importance, as they witness the status of the complex original stucco decoration before the substitution with 19th century materials on the occasion of the restorations carried out by the Fossati<sup>46</sup>.

As for the mosaic decoration, however, Texier seems to show less interest about it, perhaps due to his preference for architecture and archeology, even if we can imagine that at that time many Byzantine mosaics were still hidden under the Ottoman decoration. As an exception we may cite a watercolor representing the mosaics of Justinian's dome, particularly those decorating the ribs near the windows<sup>47</sup>. Texier could possibly observe the detail — with the reversed red crosses on golden ground — during his examination of the roof.

To sum up our survey, I think we can say that Texier's drawings, reproducing their objects through the eye of the positive architect and archeologist, are a precious first-hand source, indispensable in order to construct a more systematic comparative analysis. To be sure, the eyes of Texier are not innocent ones, and his choices, as well as his omissions, pay the debt of an inescapable historical perspective. So, his contribution to a more rigorous and substantial definition of Byzantine style shows also how far the question of style is a matter of preference and operative, working concepts, in which exceptions are no less telling than rules. In this sense, the traditional idea of style is perhaps a too unitary and organic notion to apply safely to such a variegated phenomenon as "Byzantine art", not to say "Byzantine visual culture", in whose identity not only morphological, but also geographical, cultural, historical, technical and material factors interact. The descriptive stage, so conspicuous in the pioneering work of Texier, can attain a kind of objectivity but can also provide shifting categorical and taxonomical grids, indexed to our practical tasks. And description itself, on the other hand, is a never-ending task.

Сильвия Педоне  
(Римский университет «Тор Вергата», Италия)

## **КРИТИЧЕСКИЙ ПОДХОД К ВИЗАНТИЙСКОМУ ИСКУССТВУ В ПЕРВОЙ ПОЛОВИНЕ XIX В. ШАРЛЬ М. ТЕКСЬЕ**

Данная работа имеет своей целью исследовать роль тех эстетических теорий начала XIX в., которые находятся у истоков исторического изучения византийского искусства и архитектуры. В частности, на примере анализа текстовых и графических источников, относящихся к первым десятилетиям XIX в. — периоду, когда открытие границ Османской империи способствовало активизации научного исследования византийских памятников иностранцами, — показывается, как новые критические методы исследования возникли на стыке нескольких дисциплин: археологии, истории, истории искусства, истории литературы и филологии. Именно из этих критических методов на протяжении XIX в. постепенно развилось современное византиноведение.

В статье речь идет прежде всего о Константинополе, символическом месте, которое часто фигурирует в путевых заметках многих путешественников. Однако в начале XIX в. Константинополь почти не был изучен с научной и археологической точки зрения. Возможность тщательного обследования древних руин и непосредственного знакомства с византийскими памятниками привела к осознанию необходимости более точно определить собственно византийский художественный стиль. Действительно, систематическая каталогизация произведений дала огромный корпус византийских памятников, которые, в соответствии с классической энциклопедической периодизацией, часто смешивались с раннехристианскими. Таким образом, изучение памятников города позволило ученым научиться лучше отличать византийский стиль и зафиксировать память о том архитектурном пейзаже, который вскоре был подвергнут радикальной модернизации, по образцу западноевропейских столиц.

Между 1830 и 1840 гг., благодаря идеологической открытости Османского двора, которой во многом способствовали реформы т.н. Танзимата, такие первопроходцы как русский архитектор Николай Ефимов (1799–1855 гг.), французский археолог Шарль Тексье (1802–1871 гг.), немецкий архитектор Вильгельм Зальценберг (1803–1887 гг.) или братья Гаспаре (1809–1883 гг.) и Джузеппе (1822–1891 гг.) Фоссати из Швейцарии многое сделали для выработки более ясного представления об антинатуралистичном и декоративном характере византийского искусства и архитектуры.

На наш исторический взгляд на древнюю Византию неизбежно влияют представления предшественников, и в чем-то наша позиция сродни точке зрения карликов, стоящих на плечах великанов. Это, как кажется, вписывается в концепцию исторической обусловленности любого видения, весьма активно обсуждаемую ныне во всех областях гуманитарного знания. Однако, как мы стараемся показать в этой работе, сама возможность выявить историческую обусловленность искусствоведческих сочинений XIX в. показывает, в то же время, и нашу способность провести грань между различными историческими и культурными точками зрения.



## Примечания

<sup>1</sup> M. Schapiro, *Style*, in *Anthropology today*, ed. by A.L. Kroeber, Chicago 1953, p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> For an extensive introduction to the historical and cultural developments of the Byzantine Studies see *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, ed. by E. Jeffreys, J. Haldon, R. Cormak, New York 2008; *Early Christian and Byzantine Art History*, ed. by C. Hennessy, Copenhagen 2008. Further information can be found in the essays of the collection *Fifty Years of Prosopography*, ed. by A. Cameron (Proceedings of the British Academy 118), Oxford 2003. About a more specific art-historical perspective see the very useful text of R. S. Nelson, *Hagia Sophia, 1850–1950: Holy Wisdom Modern Monument*, Chicago 2004.

<sup>3</sup> For a recent overview of the debate between Montesquieu and Gibbon, see: *Edward Gibbon and Empire*, ed. by R. McKitterick, R. Quinault, Cambridge 1997. A more general reconstruction of the controversy is in Nelson, *Hagia Sophia* cit., pp. 24–28.

<sup>4</sup> G.W.F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Geschichte* (English edition by J. Sibree: *Lectures on the Philosophy of History*, London 1857, p. 353).

<sup>5</sup> F. Kugler, *Handbook of the History of Painting*, ed. by C. L. Eastlake, London 1841, p. 24.

<sup>6</sup> On the topic see G. Page, *Being Byzantine: Greek Identity Before the Ottomans, 1200–1420*, Cambridge 2008.

<sup>7</sup> M. Digby Wyatt, J. B. Waring, *The Byzantine and Romanesque Court in the Crystal Palace*, London 1854, p. 8.

<sup>8</sup> P. Selvatico, *Storia estetico-critica delle arti del disegno*, Venezia 1856, II, p. 54.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> J.B. Séroux D'Agincourt, *Histoire de l'art par les monuments, depuis sa décadence au IV<sup>ème</sup> siècle jusqu'à son renouvellement au XVI<sup>ème</sup> siècle*, Paris 1811–1823, p. 55.

<sup>11</sup> On the biography, the works and the travels of Texier in Asia Minor and Constantinople see: S. Yerasimos, s.v. *Texier, Charles*, in *Dünden Bugüne İstanbul Ansiklopedisi* (=DBIA) 7, İstanbul 1993/1994, pp. 260–261; L. Buter, s.v. *Texier, Charles*, in *The Dictionary of Art*, 30, New York 1996, pp. 536–537; D. Avon, s.v. *Texier, Charles*, in *Dictionnaire des Orientalistes de langue française*, Paris 2008, pp. 921–922. On Texier's drawings see also C. Mango, *Costantinopolitana*, in *Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts* 80 (1965), pp. 305–336, specially pp. 315–336 (reprinted in Id., *Studies on Constantinople*, Variorum Collected Studies, Adelrshot 1993); and the forthcoming my contributions: S. Pedone, *I monumenti di Costantinopoli della prima età bizantina nei disegni di Charles Texier (1802–1871)*, in *Atti del XV Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia Cristiana*, Toledo, September 8–12 2008 (in press); Ead., s.v. *Texier, Charles Felix-Marie*, in *Prosopografia Cristiana*, ed. by S. Heid (in press).

<sup>12</sup> Some of Texier's considerations on Byzantine art and architecture can be read in his volumes containing the records of his explorations in Near Eastern Asia: *Description de l'Asie Mineure faite par ordre du Gouvernement Française de 1833 à 1837 et publiée par le ministre de l'Instruction Publique*, Paris 1839; *Description de l'Arménie et de la Perse, de la Mésopotamie*, Paris 1842–1845; *Asie mineure. Description géographique, historique et archéologique des provinces et des villes de la Chersonnèse d'Asie*, Paris 1862 and *The Principal Ruins of Asia Minor*, London 1865, published with R. P. Pullan. See also Ch. Texier, R. P. Pullan, *L'Architecture byzantine, ou recueil de monuments des premiers temps du christianisme en Orient*, London 1864), where, more than in the other texts, the authors try to draw an evolutionary line connecting classic style and Byzantine style, in order to justify an artistic production that in reality is characterized by a quite autonomous language.

<sup>13</sup> For an overview of the art-historical theories developed in France at the beginning of the 19th century, see H.-W. Kruft, *Architectural Theory from Vitruvius to the Present*, New York 1994, specially chap. 21, *Nineteenth-century France and the Ecole des Beaux-Arts*, pp. 272–289.

<sup>14</sup> K.H. Karpat, *The Transformation of the Ottoman State, 1789–1908*, in *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 3/3 (1972), pp. 243–281; 256–262; S. Yerasimos, *A propos des réformes urbaines des Tanzimat*, in *Villes Ottomanes à la fin de l'Empire*, ed. by P. Dumont, F. Geogon, Paris 1992, pp. 17–32; A. Ersoy, *Architecture and the Search for Ottoman Origins in the Tanzimat Period*, in *Muqarnas. An Annual on the Visual Culture of the Islamic World* 24 (2007), pp. 117–139; G. Çelik, *Architectural Reflections of Political Authority During the Tanzimat Era*, in *Istanbul Mitteilungen* 59 (2009), pp. 431–452.

<sup>15</sup> The letter is preserved in the Archive of l'Institut de France (A. B. A 5E 24/26; A.I.B.L. E 80). The whole document is published in S. Pedone, “*Souvenirs d'une grandeur qui ne s'efface pas*”. *La Santa Sofia di Giustiniano in alcuni disegni di Charles Texier*, in *Vie per Bisanzio, Atti del VII Congresso Nazionale dell'Associazione Italiana di Studi Bizantini*, Venezia 25–28 novembre 2009 (in press).

<sup>16</sup> Till now, only few drawings were published by Mango (C. Mango, *Costantinopolitana* cit.). The study of unpublished drawings of Constantinople, and of the records of Texier's explorations in Asia Minor, is the subject of my Ph.D. thesis, *I disegni inediti di Costantinopoli dell'archeologo, architetto francese Charles Félix-Marie Texier (1802–1871)*, carried out under the supervision of prof. Claudia Barsanti, University of Rome “Tor Vergata”.

<sup>17</sup> For the history of this complex and the excavation of the site see the most recent study of G. Vespignani, *Ippodromos: il circo di Costantinopoli nuova Roma dalla realtà alla storiografia*, and the catalogue of the exhibition held in Istanbul in the 2010, *Hippodrom/Atmeydanı. A Stage for Istanbul's History*, Istanbul 2010 (with extensive bibliography).

<sup>18</sup> Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), SC 63/TEX [41] 1–2, 4–17; SA 30 [41] 38. See S. Pedone, *I monumenti di Costantinopoli* cit.

<sup>19</sup> The earlier photographs, depicting the Obelisk still partly buried, were taken by the famous English photographer James Robertson, during his stay in Constantinople from 1841. After a period of activity as an independent photographer Robertson founded, with his wife Matilda, the well-known firm “Robertson-Beato”. On the activity and the personality of Robertson see B. Öztuncay, *The photographers of Constantinople. Pioneers, studios and artists from 19th century Istanbul*, Istanbul 2003. In the same volume can be found the photos of the Hippodrome, striking for their similarity with the views represented in the drawings by Texier (see specially pp. 115, 121, figs. 103, 108). But the photos published in *Hippodrom/Atmeydanı* cit. (especially pp. 282, n. 61, 292, n. 69) are not less interesting as a witness of the conditions of the monuments of the Circus.

<sup>20</sup> Ch. Texier, *Phiale ou fontaine de l'hippodrome à Constantinople*, in *Revue Archéologique* II, 1 (1845), pp. 142–148. In this paper Texier says also that he witnessed the discovery of a mysterious object. According to his account the fragment was part of a larger fountain located in the area of the At-Meydanı. In fact it is the well-known *Kugelspiel* now in the Berlin Museum. See A. Effenberger, *Il Gioco delle Biglie. Corsa dei carri nell'ippodromo di Costantinopoli*, in *Konstantinopel. Scultura bizantina dai Musei di Berlino. Museo Nazionale di Ravenna, Complesso Benedettino di S. Vitale, Ravenna 15 aprile – 17 settembre 2000*, Verona 2000, pp. 54–56; Id., *Das Berliner “Kugelspiel”*, in *Jahrbuch der Berliner Museen* 49 (2007), pp. 27–56; S. Pedone, *I monumenti di Costantinopoli* cit.

<sup>21</sup> W. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie Istanbuls: Byzantion, Konstantinupolis, Istanbul bis zum Beginn d. 17. Jh.*, Tübingen 1977, pp. 255–257; C. Mango, *Constantine's porphyry column and the chapel of St. Constantine*, in *Deltion tes Christianikes Archaologikes Hetaireias* 4, Ser. 10 (1980/81), pp. 103–110.

<sup>22</sup> J. Pardoe, *The Beauties of the Bosphorus*, London 1838, p. 117.

<sup>23</sup> RIBA, SC 62/TEX [35] 1–3.

<sup>24</sup> W. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie* cit., pp. 54–55.

<sup>25</sup> *Le voyage à Constantinople du Chevalier de Clairac. Archéologie et architecture en Méditerranée orientale (1724–1727)*, pp. 50–53, fig. 30.

<sup>26</sup> J. Ebersolt, *Constantinople byzantine et les voyageurs de Levant*, Paris 1918, fig. 28.

<sup>27</sup> RIBA, SC 56/TEX [27] 1–11.

<sup>28</sup> On the history of the famous monastery and the church in particular, see C. Barsanti, A. Paribeni, “Broken bits of Byzantium”: frammenti di un puzzle archeologico nella Costantinopoli di fine Ottocento, in *Immagine e ideologia. Studi in onore di Arturo Carlo Quintavalle*, ed. by A. Calzona, R. Campari, M. Mussini, Milano 2007, pp. 550–565 (with comprehensive bibliography).

<sup>29</sup> *Byzance retrouvée* cit., p. 133, fig. 70.

<sup>30</sup> Bibliothèque de l'Institut de France (Ms 1931: Texier n. 106). The sheet measures 12×9,5 cm; the caption below reads “Mosquée du grand Ecuyer. St. Jean Studius”. In the on-line catalogue of the Réunion des Musées Nationaux the drawing is actually attributed – without further qualification – to Victor Texier (1777–1864), an homonymous French draughtsman and printmaker.

<sup>31</sup> *Byzance retrouvée*, cit., p. 136, fig. 73.

<sup>32</sup> W. Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexikon zur Topographie* cit., pp. 177–183.

<sup>33</sup> J. Ebersolt, A. Thiers, *Les églises de Constantinople*, London 1913, pl. XI bis.

<sup>34</sup> The works Texier dedicated to Hagia Sophia, together with documents and letters of the young architect, are analyzed in more detail in S. Pedone, “*Souvenirs d'une grandeur qui ne s'efface pas*” cit.

<sup>35</sup> Ch. Texier, *Sainte-Sophie de Constantinople*, in *Revue Française* XI (1839–1840), pp. 43–57; 257–288. On Texier's drawings representing Hagia Sophia see S. Pedone, “*Souvenirs d'une grandeur qui ne s'efface pas*” cit.

<sup>36</sup> W. Salzenberg, *Alt-christliche Baudenkmale von Constantinopel vom V. bis XII. Jahrhundert*, Berlin 1854, pl. IX.

<sup>37</sup> Cfr. C. Mango, *Materials for the Study of the Mosaics of St. Sophia at Istanbul* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies, 8), Washington D.C. 1962, p. 10, and *Die Hagia Sophia in Istanbul, Akten des Berner Kolloquiums vom 21. Oktober 1994*, ed. by V. Hoffmann, Bern 1997, pp. 178–180, cat. 19–20.

<sup>38</sup> V. Davidov, *Putevye zapiski vedennyja vo vremja prebyvanija na Ionicheskikh Ostrovakh, v Grecii, Maloj Azii i Turcii v 1835 godu*, St. Petersburg 1839–1840.

<sup>39</sup> *Die Hagia Sophia* cit., p. 207, cat. 48. See also S. Pedone, “*Souvenirs d'une grandeur qui ne s'efface pas*” cit.

<sup>40</sup> RIBA, SC 58/TEX [29] 59, cm 39×29.

<sup>41</sup> *Byzance retrouvée* cit., pp. 126–127, fig. 63.

<sup>42</sup> RIBA, SC 58/TEX [29] 47, cm 63×57.



<sup>43</sup> See M. della Valle, *I restauri ottocenteschi dei marmi e una prima affermazione del gusto neo-bizantino*, in A. Guiglia Guidobaldi — C. Barsanti, *Santa Sofia di Costantinopoli. L'arredo marmoreo della Grande Chiesa giustiniana* (Studi di Antichità Cristiana pubblicati a cura del Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, LX), Città del Vaticano 2004, pp. 739–792.

<sup>44</sup> RIBA, SC 58/TEX [29] 56, cm 24,5×15.

<sup>45</sup> *Die Hagia Sophia* cit., pp. 207–208, cat. 49; S. Pedone, “*Souvenirs d'une grandeur qui ne s'efface pas*” cit.

<sup>46</sup> E.J.W. Hawkins, *Plaster and stucco cornices in Hagia Sophia, Istanbul*, in *Actes du XII<sup>e</sup> Congrès International d'études byzantines* (Beograd 1963–1964), 2, Beograd 1964, pp. 131–135.

<sup>47</sup> RIBA, SC 58/TEX [29] 48, cm 38×26.