

SUBLIME AND RIDICULOUS PAIN; SACRED AND PROFANE SUFFERING: SOME ICONOGRAPHICAL REMARKS ON THE BYZANTINE CONCEPT OF PAIN

Vassilis PASCHALIS

University of Athens

The aim of this paper is to attempt some remarks concerning the modes of conceptualization of pain underlying the representation of pain-involving situations in Byzantine art. These modes are in fact general theological strategies which come to determine: i) the ways and limits of the careful introduction of natural data in the schema of the icon; and ii) the exact psychic significance (e.g., sorrow, mourning, horror) that is allowed to characterize the represented persons—a significance which nevertheless is invariably considered as "pain" or "passion". The Byzantine icon presents versions of "somatic" pain as complex, hybrid emotions. These versions obviously "spiritualize" the image of pain by censoring or complementing its expression, as the motivation behind it is not the denotation of physical pain, but rather the symbolic signification of human suffering within a perspective of consolation. The paper examines the manipulation of the "natural" in the schema of pain, suggesting that it is affected by three factors: i) the axiological assessment of the represented persons; ii) the interrelation, and the complementary role of, visual and non-visual (literary, prosaic) expressions; and iii) the idea that pain involves the represented persons collectively, rather than in isolation.

The significance of pain in the realm of ideas is enormous. As Konrad Ehlich has put it, "Whatever its psychological characteristics, in most theoretical accounts, pain is conceptualized as ... *the* form of individual sensation," and "the pain-suffering individual is thus a very good example for the traditional conceptualization of 'man'".⁽¹⁾ The elevation of pain to such a status underwent a historical development and presupposed a change in the structure of its conceptualization toward a more inward, endochthonous version.⁽²⁾ The exact process and the historical locus of such a change can be a matter of perennial dispute, yet it is safe to say, that despite the variety of the contributors, certain phases of the Hebrew civilization played a particularly decisive role in cultivating an expansion and absolutization of the endochthonic scope of pain within the context of a consolatory dualism between the "world" and the suffering "soul". In the Christianized version of this view—which was never homogenized—pain was considered as a *par excellence* part of the "holy economy" (God-motivated teleology) and was considered as possessing a

purgative (ἰλαστήριος) power and as indicating some Holy scheme, inexplicable to human beings.

The concept of the "representation of nature" is far too vast to be tackled in this paper; a minimum naturalism, based on the idea of the ability to compare, is presupposed here. How far this comparison can go is probably an issue that cannot be settled once and for all, independent of specific historical periods. Obviously, the means to judge the significance of this "ability to compare" in older forms of art is scarce-it is not easy to determine how a Byzantine would assess the natural faithfulness of the art of his/her times. Still, the internal discrepancies of the iconographical idiom, which have been covered under the term "selective naturalism"⁸, indicate that awareness of "a representation according to the senses" (κατ'αἴσθησιν ἀναπαράστασις) has not been obliterated simply because it does not constitute the exclusive factor motivating the artistic form. This selectiveness can either form more or less isolated "islands" of naturality, or can be diffused throughout the iconographic idiom; the latter indicates that, in fact, the artistic form which is considered as forming the antithetical pole to "naturalism" (such as "schematism") is not its logical contrary, but is itself a hybrid, invariably involving a naturalistic element up to a certain degree. The Byzantine artist infiltrates "nature" by introducing bits and pieces of naturality and "frozen realism" within a basic idiom of schematicity. Therefore, although the difference between the two idioms may be *grosso modo* obvious, and thus the distinction has to be preserved, the "histology" of the concepts can reveal a complex structure. The interrelation of the two modes forms a delicate algorithm, a ratio between naturality and schematicity, which does not always receive the same value.

The combination of these two, apparently antithetical iconographical idioms, is not simply a matter of inevitable eclecticism or the outcome of separate, not enough homogenous traditions-an opinion shared, among others, by Titus Burkhardt, according to whom "Christianity did not succeed in imposing a complete transformation of the environment in which it was extended (*)." For Burkhardt, Christianity, unable to set aside the artistic heritage of antiquity, assimilated various naturalistic elements, in the *anti-spiritual sense*, unlike Islamic art which managed to cut links with tradition and to develop along a consistent theological rule. However, in Christianity the combination of the two idioms reflects the combination of the two orders of Being (the human and the divine in the face of Christ) so convincingly, that it seems almost inevitable that the Christian religion would follow such a path, once visual representation was allowed to enter its premises, and was not left outside as an unwelcome θύραθεν remnant. Therefore, since the divine was considered as by definition ἀνείκαστον (non picturable), any iconographical strategy would necessarily involve transformations of the natural in

order to acquire sacred significance. John of Damascus resorted to the concept of embodiment (ενσάρκωσις) in order to defend icons theoretically,⁽⁴⁾ by connecting the idea of the person of Jesus Christ with the concepts of "image" and "picture" themselves (in Greek both are served by the same term), thus extending theologically senses which already inhere in the vague concept of the Greek word εἰκών : Christ Himself is an εἰκών of the Divine, a sublime exemplification of God's presence in the world. The idea of image involved here signifies the *reflection* of the Divine, suggesting also the point that God could well have stayed apart from the World, as it is transient to it like an image: there is a huge gulf between the Creator and the creata which can never be surpassed⁽⁵⁾.

John of Damascus attempted to defend the very idea of the sacred representation rather than to analyze further the internal structure of iconography. Had he opted for this path as well, he could have employed the concept of κένωσις (purgation)-which denoted the mystery of Christ's Advent along with a kind of a minimal explanation (God came to the world by purging Himself of [a part of] the Holy Essence)-in order to point out the way that Christian thinking functions. In fact, the conceptualization of Christ's body is an inverted κένωσις : the body is "purged" of certain natural characteristics in order to make room for (the signification of) the holy. It is not clear how far this double process can go (i.e., how human the image of God should be, how non-natural the body of God should appear), yet it could not be absolutely fixed dogmatically-it could only be stipulated formally. In fact, κένωσις was not a Christian theological trademark, although it was Christianity that created a full-blown theology out of it. Its philosophical origins could be traced to the Platonic idea of participation (μετοχή), or even to the medico-philosophical idea of κρύσις. But its roots are far wider and deeper: every anthropomorphic conceptualization of (a) God and a fortiori of his/her bodily presence, had to indicate certain points of digression which affected either anatomical elements (e.g., blood) or certain biological attributes (e.g., exemption from disintegration). It is interesting that imperviousness to pain was not a typical characteristic of the Gods (in the *Iliad*, E Rhaps.), where Diomedes strikes Aphrodite in the hand.

The representation of pain gets entangled with the problem of representation of psychic states. Corresponding instances of "overt, muscular behavior"⁽⁶⁾ with psychic instances, or, simply, drawing the significance of certain bodily expressions may be, in several cases, problematic as, despite the fact that the reservoir of bodily expression seems inexhaustible, it demands, on the other hand, certain vertebrae of meaning. "Pain" is not exempt from such a demand, as its place within the spectrum of psychic states is considerably wide not only "vertically" (i.e., by denoting either sensations or emotions of pain), but also "horizontally", i.e., by absorbing and homogenizing, within its concept, *other kinds* of psychic states. Therefore,

devoid of any contextual parameters, the expression of pain can be occasionally conflated with that of wild laughter or even with that of yawning. This characteristic becomes apparent through consideration of the etymology and the itinerary of meaning of the term. For the word derives from the Greek word πόνος, the most ancient meaning of which was closer to fatigue, than to the sense of something being sore. This suggests that *dolor* (in classical Greek άλγος-άλγημα), which is central in the perception of pain as sensation, did not make the older senses redundant, but rather left the door open to a conglomeration with other genera or species of emotions. "Pain" therefore can easily indicate a hybrid emotion, whose pain-significance is not the sole constituent, but rather the final result.⁽⁷⁾

The factors associated with the conceptualization of pain did not invariably create representational difficulties. They could also work the other way around and facilitate representation, by offering a way to unify, complete, or simplify the artistic schema of pain. Therefore, the axiological element present in a sense, liquidated within the emotion of pain can be magnified, encouraging schemata of pain more easily recognizable because of the actual axiology. Thus, axiology may shape the expression of pain by presenting clarified versions of pain-behavior in the stead of the habitually chaotic spasms of the mimic muscles or the (even more difficult to be conceptually and representationally tamed), expression of agony. It is therefore explainable why "naturalism" in art seldom made any serious attempts to become reasonably naturalistic in the case of pain, even during the periods that succeeded the Middle Ages. Naturalistic representation had created a convincing, three-dimensional space. Yet the field of psychic states such as pain ceded so frequently to an axiologically-based rhetoric, that it seemed that representations had to opt between two antithetical poles, namely, one in which pain-expression was attenuated, and another one in which pain-expression was somehow underplayed or even muffled. (By pain-expression one should understand an expected response to the pain-causing factors).

It is natural to expect that Christian sacred art would be particularly interested in the representation of pain. Within its religious context, pain was enhanced with meaning and was ascribed a teleology which was considered as providing meaning to the whole of the created world. Therefore, the significance was such that, once the road to the iconography was open, the significance of pain had to be both denoted and exploited. In fact, the denotation of pain could itself cause a particular reaction. Borrowing and altering a term coined by J.L. Austin, one could dub the sacred images "image-acts": what was important was not to ascribe pain-significance to the holy or unholy dramatis personae, but rather, to invoke through it a specific emotional and mental stance in the observer-believer. Apart from being mere descriptions of Sacred acts, such images were somehow further hypostatized,

as they were substantial liturgical elements as well.

Now tying up pain to such a strategy did not result in a standard, immutable visual pattern. In fact, the central figure supporting the iconographical theology of pain, namely, the figure of the crucified Jesus, underwent (at least) two significant changes—from the image of *Christus Triumphans* to the image of *Christus Patiens*—without altering the essential core of the respective theology. In the former type, whose origins should probably be sought in Syria, pain-behavior is completely absent from the crucified Christ, who is presented with minimal—or even no—facial response, and with a virtually senseless body completely covered with a dark *colobium*. Nevertheless, the fact that pain was totally absent did not mean that the painters had any intention of diverging from Holy Scripture, which definitely, and in some detail, referred to the suffering of Christ on the cross. Rather, it suggested that pain was in some way already present in the image as well, despite the fact that, for certain reasons, this pain had to be deciphered rather than perceived directly. (Even if such icons were influenced by heresies favoring an underestimation of the human nature of Jesus, there are no good reasons to consider these modes of representation as being their dogmatic expression, in the realm of iconography. On the contrary, the fact that they had become the typical expression of the mainstream ecclesiastical iconographical vernacular at the time when the bitter strife over the Christological dogmatic issues was still fresh indicates that they are by no means to be ascribed to credos of the heretical periphery). Although the Crucifixions of the Syriac-originated school could, too, allow for differences in the (minimal, anyway) expression of pain, they should probably be the icons in which the pain-significance is provided almost completely indirectly, arising from the antithesis between the represented image and the holy text. The text provides elements that the image conceals; nevertheless, the beholder, who is well aware of the text or, at least, with the information concerning the scene of Crucifixion, draws the necessary elements from without the image and projects them back into the image itself. However, pain-significance, although absent as pain-behavior, is still provided by the various elements constituting the scene of the Crucifixion—by the fact that Christ and the thieves are shown nailed to the crosses, by the signs of bleeding, by the presence of the two persons holding the sponge and the lancet, etc.. The refusal to present a full-fledged version of the pain of Christ was not due to the fact that such a presentation would offend the image of Christ's presence as God. Probably a far stronger reason was the desire to make clear the teleology of Christ's suffering (His final Triumph), which otherwise would be in danger of being overshadowed by an overemphasis on the suffering itself. Moreover, even a heavily censored image could convey analogous meanings by compensating for the lack of naturalism through indirect expressionistic means. In the Crucifixion scene of the Rabula Gospels

(Syriac, c.586, treasure of the Sancta Sanctorum of the Lateran, now in the Vatican), for instance, the unnatural stiffness of the bodies nailed on the crosses conveys the particularly chilling feeling that is naturally expected in an execution scene.

The dialogue between the texts and the images varies, allowing for different degrees of antithesis and for different modes, as both the text and the images complement each other in a complex way. Images draw their inspiration from a wide variety of courses apart from the Bible, therefore important iconographical sources are to be found amongst the rest of the ecclesiastical literature as well (hymns, liturgies, homilies, etc.) which in turn are influenced by older sources, frequently pagan ones. Each of these literary forms had its own expressive mode, yet the idiom of the corresponding visualization program had to be much more homogenous and intrinsically consistent. Moreover, since images had always to be subordinated to the Word, the power of images should always be under control, the convincing-ability of this image-literature (*litteratura illiterato*) should be checked and, if needed, refuted. Despite its relegated position with respect to literature, or perhaps because of this, visual arts had to be more closely censored. The delicate, and in fact amphithymic stance of the Byzantines towards the visual arts, which found its expression in the Iconoclastic case, is apparent in the acknowledgment that εἰκόνες are at once characterized as "theology in colors" and yet deemed ontologically incapable of expressing the Holy, apart from a metaphorical level. It was therefore considered that the image was not able to express the Word, although it was going beyond a simple "embroidering", and "*demonstrating* it with greater breadth and clarity".(*8) Byzantine literature sounds baroque by comparison with its contemporary art, in which, despite the occasional golden *fondo*, the figures themselves, as well as the whole character of the composition, remain extremely reserved and austere, sometimes to a minimalistic point. Therefore, Maguire's suggestion to consider the great influence of rhetoric upon Byzantine art, although fruitful, should also be necessarily complemented by an equal emphasis on the sharp difference, in terms of the manner of expression, between Byzantine painting and the corresponding literature. Byzantine poets, and even more, ecclesiastical orators are far more flamboyant than the fellow painters, and the represented figures in painting behave themselves, whereas in literature and prose, are, in general, far more uninhibited. Pain is a *par excellence* issue for such a comparison since the writers tend to be *particularly descriptive* (by employing the rhetorical mode bearing the same name, i.e., "description" [ἐκφρασις]). In fact, their ways of expression has been cited for opting for a "description that is distinguished more for its vivid detail than for its good taste"(*)- according to Maguire, who considers that there is a definite "Byzantine taste for horror."(*)¹⁰ Painters, meanwhile, invariably opt for far less loquacious modes, and

tend to depict movements and emotions in a far less histrionic way. Nonetheless, the modes of literature "lurk" behind the visual austerity, and this poses an interesting problem concerning perception: how "much" could a Byzantine see in these pictures which to a modern viewer (ignorant of the respective literature) can appear undeniably austere? Byzantine ecclesiastical writers tend to express their wonder about the "liveliness" of the paintings, and to declare that they have been overwhelmed by the emotional expression of the represented holy persons: Asterius of Amasia is moved to tears by seeing the picture of the martyrdom of Saint Euphemia.⁽¹¹⁾ Basil the Great praises the power of the "illustrious" painters to offer a glorification of the sufferings of the martyrs: "ἀνάστητε μοι νυν, ὦ λαμπροὶ τῶν ᾠθητικῶν κατορθωμάτων ζωγράφοι. Τὴν τὸν στρατηγὸς κολοβωθείσαν εἰκόνα τὰς ὑμετέρας μεγαλύνετε τέχναίς (...) φλεγόμενη πάλιν ἀντοῖς ἡ χεὶρ καὶ νικῶσα δεικνύσθω."⁽¹²⁾ Basil urges painters to depict the "κολοβωθείσαν εἰκόνα" (the mutilated image/icon) of the Saint, thus employing the same term (εἰκὼν) to indicate both the martyr's body and the actual icon that is going to bear the scene of the martyrdom. (This mode of metaphorical discourse was to be elevated to a vehicle of expressing dogmatic truths by the VII Ecumenical Synod and by the ecclesiastical theorists John of Damascus and Theodore the Studite). More evocatively, Gregory of Nyssa asks the prospective painter to use "the flowers of his art" to depict "as in a language-having book" (ὡς ἐν γλωττοφόρῳ τινὶ βιβλίῳ) the material objects, the personal characteristics, and the virtues or the vices of all the participating persons in the "athletics" (ἀθλημα) of martyrdom, the "happy finishing of the athlete", and "the human form of the ᾠωνοθέτης' Christ."⁽¹³⁾ Therefore, although Byzantine visual versions of pain were "materially" independent from the ones offered through other artistic means, their coexistence within the same liturgical space could not but have affected each other by extending their borders, by shaping a dialogue between the abundant and the austere as modes of expression and even by suggesting two ways (οδοί) of perceiving a holy drama.⁽¹⁴⁾

The exhortations of the fourth-century Fathers to the painters to offer a detailed and convincing description of the pain of martyrs does not lose its significance because of later developments in the Byzantine art. Although it may be true to some extent that, "after iconoclasm figures and other motifs drawn from Nature became subject to a system of stylization which transferred even the most narrative or figural representations into something approaching abstract compositions,"⁽¹⁵⁾ it is equally true that, after the eleventh century, the emphasis on the Holy Passion was far stronger, and that both the theological and the iconographical interest in pain was considerable. Post-iconoclasm art certainly looks much more unified and homogenized: the various strains, ranging from eastern schematism to iconographical remnants of Hellenistic art, are liquidated and, although several "schools" and

digressions from the standard crop up here and there incessantly, a common idiom seems to have been achieved. Christ now is shown in pain, yet, despite His change from "Triumphans" to "Patiens", the "triumph" is still there, the way "pain" was present in the previous type of icon. The image of the suffering Christ digresses from naturality not simply because of the Holy "ἀλλοίωσις" (which is a kind of general rule prohibiting the conflation of the iconographical idiom of a holy figure with a "κατ'αίσθησιν" idiom), but because it proposes a kind of suffering which is radically different from expected pain-behavior, and is not simply a "restrained" or "frozen" image of it. In a sense, in the figure of Christ on the Cross, the denotation of pain (i.e., of grand corporeal pain which has turned into general suffering) is even more distant than in the case of the ancient Syriac school; in the latter it is absent, yet the form of Christ gives the impression of a full-body mask, which, by concealing the actual expression of pain incites the imagination to fill the gap. Therefore, in that iconic type, the figure of Christ was an extended sign of pain, absolutely convincing to those who could decipher its full meaning. By denying the use of icons, iconoclasts formed various other ways of bypassing bodily representations which were in the same line with the Syriac School, albeit, of course, far more radical: Christ was replaced by various symbols or the holy initials, and saints, martyrs and prophets by their names. Thus, it was considered that the minimization of the pictorial means did not result in a loss of meaning-after all, the very symbol of the Cross could by itself convey the sense of the Holy Passion by "alluding to it" ("Ὁ Σταυρός τὸ Πάθος ὑπαινίσσεται"⁽¹⁶⁾). In fact, in the Syriac school there were representations of the Crucifixion in which the figure of Christ almost merged with the form of the cross. This conglomeration of the body with the actual sign of the Cross produced peculiar images (in which only the head seems to have an independent form, whereas the hands and the body of the Lord resemble pieces of wood, rather than members of a living body) that were the closest materialization of the idea of "living symbol". (One could mention here the 10th century cross from Ephesos, and also the impressive 8th century *fresco* from Santa Maria Antiqua, Rome). Another example, although more anatomical in construction, are the extremely lean (ultra-Greco) figures of the crucified Jesus along with the thieves. Here the three figures are almost identical, and what distinguishes Christ from the others is only the halo and the twin currents of blood and water running from His side (Miniatur, Ms Grec.74, Paris, Bibliotheque Nationale).

Suffering Christ is still an ideogram. The acquisition of a more natural appearance is, in a sense, superficial, as it is undermined by a completely unnatural stance. The avoidance of presenting the bodily pain of Jesus has more serious reasons than the offense to His face by presenting him in a humiliated way; it rather reminds that the visualized bodily pain is only a metonymic instance of the general

pain of humanity. The focal points of bodily pain and suffering are cautiously censored while the face is governed by an expression of deep sadness, which seems to set the emotional tenor of the whole scene. The conceptualization of pain as sadness involves the substitution, at a first level, of pain by sadness (it remains as its attribute, i.e., as painful sadness⁽¹⁷⁾) yet it does not eliminate the general significance of "pain" from the Crucifixion. (In fact, one could still argue the natural element inhering in the *imago doloris* in this case has gone one step further, by making use of the προσωπεῖον of "chronic pain", i.e., a case of suffering which is of greater symbolic interest). The figure of Christ, combining an almost naked body with a face of sorrow seems to offer a visual metaphorical transliteration of the concept of pain that fits the theological context of the scene.

"Sadness" (λύπη, θλίψις) had such a long career in ecclesiastical literature and had been so vastly cultivated that it seems plausible that resorting to it would facilitate the shift towards a new representation of the Suffering of Christ. Its use as a homeopathic medication was deemed indispensable ("ἁμαρτία λύπην ἐγέννησεν, λύπην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἠγάλωσε"⁽¹⁸⁾) yet not without qualifications; it was considered to be two "kinds" of sadness, one "κατὰ κόσμον" (profane, in accordance with the world) and one "κατὰ θεόν" (in accordance with God).⁽¹⁹⁾ Only sadness "in accordance with God" was seen as legitimate, the other being suspect for expressing an excessive care for the world. Sadness also possessed an obvious visual advantage that made it fit smoothly within the context of holy forms, namely solemnity and decency (κοσμιότης) - holy figures were typically presented as "bearing up the passion in a modest -not in an improper way." Basil the Great counseled the mourners not to exceed certain limits: "the mother of the Maccabees saw the death of seven of her children without any woes, without shedding an immodest tear."⁽²⁰⁾

Discussing Aby Warburg's "Pathos Formula" (Pathos Formel) Mose Barasch suggested the tragic mask as one of its origins. Barasch himself applied his idea to the face of John the Baptist, adding that, in the transformation of the mask into a face, the need of the gaping mouth disappeared.⁽²¹⁾ Practical utility (the reason that masks were also used for intensifying sound), along with the need to give the idea of the tragic a human face simultaneously expressing awe, fear, and psychic pain, had resulted in a whale's mouth. Although accepted by the ancients as a "visual formula of nobility and pain," this sharply violated Christian standards of decency. Barasch suggested that the characteristics of the tragic mask did not survive beyond the face of John the Baptist, yet the main structure of the face (its division in three) along with its upper part (mainly the sharply grimacing eyebrows and the long, calm, unwrinkled nose) seem so close to the "painful sadness"-formula that indicate that such schemata did not perish with the coming of the Middle Ages.

The body of Christ initially was depicted in an absolutely upright, rather stiff

position, nevertheless, His limbs were presented with far greater liveliness and His head leaned towards the right side, intensifying the general expression of sorrow by giving it an air of abdication. The arbitrary manipulation of the natural was sharply obvious in the moving of the heart wound towards the right side (this also created a better visual effect, since the little currents of blood and water were seen in profile, appearing *contre lumière*. After it was stipulated that the image of Passions should represent the dead Christ, it was necessary to expect that this conceptual change would acquire an alteration of the schema.⁽²²⁾ As usually, this extra change would *prima facie* have some naturalistic significance-no matter how deep or "superficial" might that significance be. In this case, the change affected the shape of Christ's body by giving to it an S-like form, which was supposed to indicate the fact that the body could not support itself in such a condition. On the other hand, the feet seemed to step steadily on the footstool, in a position (open, separated, nailed with *two* separate nails rather than one) that was to create some petty disputes of dogma with the Latin West, which preferred Christ's feet to be nailed with the same nail. There was something theatrical in the position of the hands of Jesus who, while being suspended from the Cross, made a gesture resembling that of preaching or symbolical embracing, yet the whole scene had an impressive solemnity.

In Dickens' *Hard Times*, when asked whether she feels pain, Mrs Grandgrind answers that "there is a pain somewhere in the room but I couldn't positively say that I have got it."⁽²³⁾ In the typical scene of Middle-Byzantine crucifixion in which only the figures of the Christ, the Virgin and John are present, it is interesting to realize that the faces of all three share the same expression, namely, that of sorrow. The identity of expression between a crucified person (alive or dead) and a loving by-stander is obviously far from reality, yet it is employed in order to present a community of pain in which Jesus occupies the highest position. He appears as a kind of Atlas, lifting the common pain of humanity; rendering different facial expressions to each of the *dramatis personae* of the crucifixion would imperil such meanings, isolating pain within the body of the Christ, and neglecting the dogmatic fact that Jesus was only a suffering mediator. The difference concerning the expression (or better, the *reception* of pain) among the participants comes not from the visual field (their face) but from the Logos accompanying the images, i.e. from the characterization of the suffering of Jesus as "Passions"-a term which is ascribed neither to the Virgin nor to John. The reason is not an exclusiveness concerning the person of Jesus; in other contexts, martyred saints can have their martyrdom characterized as "passions".⁽²⁴⁾ Apparently the utilization of this term in the Crucifixion indicates not only the increased intensity, multiplicity, and corporeality of the suffering of Jesus compared with that of the others, but also the need for a concept of suffering which could transcend radically (individual and more or less

internal) psychic space since the very essence of the symbolism is the "exodus" from individuality; this is the reason for the selection of the term "passion", a multifaceted, yet much more ontologically robust, concept which was employed up to 19th century as a nosological term as well ⁽²⁵⁾.

The community of pain was not restricted to the sacred dialogue among the holy persons. It also made its presence in the inclination of the footstool indicating the respective fates of the good and the bad thief ⁽²⁶⁾. The general idea is not confined to the Passions circle. In fact, it is spread in every case of the "sacrificial" pain shaping new clusters of meanings, as in the cases of the massacre of the holy innocents. This theme, when translated into a visual narrative, presents some of the most naturalistic scenes in Byzantine and medieval art. The pain of the mothers is connected with that of the innocents, not only causally, but rather ontologically, as if it were a common entity which is distributed among the participants, as if the mothers were the face and the infants the limbs of a collective body which is under attack. ⁽²⁷⁾

Scenes of martyrdom are another important iconological focal point in Byzantine art. It is interesting that the martyrs resemble much more the humiliated figures *sub poena mortis* found in the Roman triumphant monuments (e.g., the executed barbarians in the monument of Marcus Aurelius) than the tragic heroes of Hellenistic art which, too, represents a tradition involving a vast repertory of bodily suffering. Yet, despite the heavy loans from Hellenistic art, the Christians avoided entanglement in its heroic modes of representation, and for obvious ideological reasons: the sense of tragedy was alien to the Christian Weltanschauung. The tormented individualism of the tragic hero—an individualism which, quite usually, had been molded in the context of some Θεομαχία (struggle against the Gods)—made his/her *exempla doloris* particularly unwelcome in the realm of Christian theology. Therefore, the Christians opted to exalt the *actae* of their martyrs through the same mode that the Romans employed to exalt the *res gestae* of their Emperors, albeit through a transmutation of their iconic form. For, while the Romans in their art humiliated their enemies by exposing visually their physical torments and their death (a practice obviously preexisting Roman iconography), the Christians, for whom humility was a supreme virtue, glorified their martyrs as heroes and "athletes in the name of Christ" (Ἐν Χριστῷ ἀθληταί) through forms traditionally ascribed to the defeated.

The relative development in the respective iconographical mode in Byzantium brought a consolidation of the scenes of martyrdom round the 10th century, the paradigm for this being probably the famous *Menologion* for the Emperor Basil II (early 11th century). In the *Menologion*, the pain-behavior of the martyrs is not uniform and *prima facie* seems diminished; however, it is not the case that

"only in a very few of the martyrdom scenes depicted do the victims give any sign of discomfort through their gestures" (*28). Maguire admits only of one case of suffering which he calls "muted", yet he neglects the fact there are indeed cases with a reasonably clear presentation of suffering. The reason that cases were given iconographical approval was that their image was already sufficiently "spiritualized", and its "overt, muscular behavior" (*29) minimized, therefore resembling naturally the approved iconographical schema even in their natural realm. A case in point is the depiction of the martyrdom of Saint Ignatius, a picture that has been rightly considered as showing the "final agonies" of the Saint. (*30) Such cases of petrified naturalism possess a strong expressive power which dissociates this picture from both the excessively schematic renderings and the pseudo-naturalistic holy ideogram of the Passions. The expression of suffering is compressed rather than muted, and in fact comes very close to an expected pain-behavior, where the mingling of pain with horror inevitably reduces the reaction of the subject. The obvious difference with other cases of Martyrdom (e.g., Saint Aristion's standing unaffected in the midst of the flames) is again a realistic indication of the differing individual stance towards suffering and imminent violent death. One could compare here the aged hosiomartyr Sissinius (fol.103r) with the three youths (fol 132v).

The distribution of suffering in the facial repertory of the *Menologion* allows for subtle varieties: it is interesting that, at least as far as iconography can show, it does not concern exclusively the living person but the dead as well. This is apparent from the fact that the faces of the dead and especially of the severed heads, seem to present a *facies doloris* which is more intense than that of the living. The representation of the dead is generally influenced by the sorrow-images of the Passions, yet their countenances are far more intense and complex, and possess no standard significance. It apparently mingles grief and pain with an indication of the state of death—mainly suggested by the firmly shut eyes (especially in the fol. 85r). Therefore although the ἀλλοίωσις of the natural still exerts its influence, the dead here are occasionally granted an air of naturalism that is prohibited to the living. Decapitation, by dismembering the body, destroying its unity and bringing it closer to *natura naturrata*, is allowed an extra degree of naturalism. On the other hand, the suffering Christ Himself, which is the point of reference and the object of ομοίωσις of the martyr, is presented through an image that liquidates the natural elements rather than accommodates them in a recognizable way in its schema. Nevertheless, the limits for expressing such differences are narrow, and the criteria supporting it change. Now the parallels (the affinity as well as the points of difference) between martyrdom and the Passions of Jesus can be expressed in various ways apart from the general visual simulation of the form: a characteristic example is the one concerning the miraculous change of the liquids of the wounds according

to which, from the neck of the decapitated saints came blood and milk.⁽³¹⁾

Is there a correspondence between the degrees of natural expression allowed in person and his/her position in the hierarchy of the holy? The answer is positive, yet with various qualifications: the lower the position is, the stronger the expression seems to be. In the Middle Ages the cosmic hierarchy prohibits the "communion of light with the dark" ("τις δε κοινωνία φωτί πρὸς σκότος;").⁽³²⁾ Thus, it might be natural to expect that the different orders of the world should be rendered in a different representational idiom. The theory of "ἀλλοίωσις" (alteration) provides theological vindication of the dissociation of the holy figure from natural representation, by suggesting that this digression is based on an ontological fact: in the cases of holiness, Nature (which, since Adam's Sin is "fallen" [ἐκπεπωκυία φύσις], too, therefore in need, also, of ἀποκατάστασιν) was transcended.⁽³³⁾ Therefore the holy persons could never be presented totally *naturale* (an Italian term, nevertheless employed by Dionysios of Fournas⁽³⁴⁾ as "they are not biological representations but prototypes of the future-within-the-Church."⁽³⁵⁾ However, the theology of ἀλλοίωσις does not directly account for the representation of the "sinful nature", i.e., the damned, the "Prince of Evil" and his "Angels". As it is usually labelled, Byzantine art is essentially ἁγιογραφία (hagiography/ representation of the Saintly) and was involved in the representation of the sinners exclusively for narrow pedagogical reasons and probably, as regards the Evil itself, it was attempted on theological grounds not shared by everyone-as in the case of the Cappadocean Fathers who denied the hypostatization of Evil.⁽³⁶⁾

Although the issue was not directly set on this point, a *prima facie* interpretation of ἀλλοίωσις seems to leave some room for establishing an iconographical polarity between the holy and the unholy spheres in the very basic sense: on the structural and dimensional levels, i.e., on the levels bearing resemblance with natural entities. Yet, in terms of the corresponding iconography, such a sharp difference is not immediately apparent-a typical hagiography involving martyrs and executioners seems to have been articulated in a common representational idiom. Nevertheless, it does involve minor differences (which, as a matter of fact, point toward more important distinctions) connected with problems of structure and volume, although they are not tackled in the ways suggested by mathematical perspective. The reason for such an apparent compromise was again, theological: thus, since it was considered that between good and evil there could be no ontological gap but rather a volitional and praxiological difference, sharpening the visual differences among the persons might create false impressions about the nature and the coming-to-be of Evil.

Therefore, in Byzantine art the sinners are not separated from the blessed by a representational abyss. The executioners do not acquire the "therioanthropic"

characteristics to which Barasch refers⁽³⁷⁾, despite the fact that, again, there are various instances in the field of prose that could serve as vehicles of iconological inspiration: Gregory of Nyssa refers to the beastly forms of tyrants (τὰς θηριώδεις τῶν τυρράνων μορφάς⁽³⁸⁾). Whereas religious art in the Latin West makes frequent use of the image of the sinners or the damned as caricatures, in Byzantium this was left, almost exclusively, to the provision of ecclesiastical or profane literature.

Byzantine prose was particularly eloquent in expressing cases in which the pain of the sinner was seen as "bestializing" and ridiculing the subject that bears it, rather than as enhancing and purifying it. What motivated such expressive modes, was a variety of reasons, starting from the aggressiveness towards the outcast sinner (the "scapegoat" analyzed by René Girard⁽³⁹⁾) or the need to condemn his/her acts, a stance bred the need for ονειδισμόν (ridiculing) and laughing at the face of the condemned. "Laugh" is invariably accompanied by a derogatory sense within the ecclesiastical realm, not only in the narrow sense of mocking, which is synonymous with a *sui generis* kind of violence. The very act of laughing is considered as a "distortion" of the face, a kind of rictus that has no place in the modesty of hieratic decorum; moreover, laughing threatens to shatter concentration, to diffuse the mind (μετεωρισμός τοῦ νοῦς), to make prayer impossible. Being particularly fierce in the condemnation of laugh, the ascetic literature more or less regarded it as a trope of the demons, as a specific type of temptation. Demons poke fun at the fathers of the desert⁽⁴⁰⁾, or try to make them laugh: "A large mob of demons gather in two groups ... and pull a leaf from a tree, pretending that they try as hard as they can, urging one another to try even harder. And these poor souls made all these in order to make him [Pachomius] laugh"⁽⁴¹⁾; as expected, the fathers never appreciated the sense of humor of the demons.

The relation of the demonic and the laughable is so close that demons seem to be the guild which is involved in it by profession. Their appearance can, up to some point, account for this connection: demons had been seen as living caricatures long before their introduction in the Christian universe, and throughout the pagan world they were characterized by a playful, ironic mischievousness-despite the fact that there was also a dark side to their jest. In the Hebrew tradition, although demons underwent considerable historical development, they were, from the beginning, considered as the first sinners (there are many versions of their Fall⁽⁴²⁾ and therefore the subsequent polarization of the angelic and the demonic only stressed the dark side. According to Grabar, some kind of humor probably survived⁽⁴³⁾, yet it was excessively gloomy and violent, apt for the new role ascribed to the demons in the transformation of Sheol to Hell.

The sinister character of laughter was apparent also in theological treatises⁽⁴⁴⁾ and in the non-ecclesiastical literature as well, both⁽⁴⁵⁾ and "popular"-the latter

being particularly expressive of the various shades of violent, humiliating and painful laughter. In the libel known as *Ακολουθία του Σπανού*⁽⁴⁶⁾, an archetype of the *bouc emissaire*, Spanos, is offered a verbal attack, a ritual ridicule, an application of the lynch-law and a post mortem defamation, all magnified to the wildest possible degree; the association of laugh with pain is a basso continuo of every stage of these acts, characterizing not only the attitude of others to spanos ("αἱ γενεαὶ πάσαι γέλωτα ποιούσιν, σπανέ όταν σε βλέπουν")⁽⁴⁷⁾ but also his own stance; spanos keeps laughing since this seems to be the trademark of misery, being, also, related to crying ("κλαίετε καὶ θρηγεῖτε σπανοί, ὅτι πολὺς ὁ γέλως υμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς")⁽⁴⁸⁾. Spanos's pain is laughable because of internal affinity of pain and laughter in the case of sin: laugh, no less than crying, can become the pain-behavior of the sinner, a grotesque mask which blends in it several psychic states signifying the state of Fall.

In the laughter of Spanos an old conviction seems to make its appearance, namely that if pain is left unchecked, i.e., if it is abandoned without the aid of a telos that can serve as a consolatory agent, the human psyche collapses into an animal reaction as it faces the maddening horror, what James Joyce had characterized as the "pain of the dread"⁽⁴⁹⁾, and to which all the Apocalypses, Christian and Hebrew, canonical and apocryphal refer.⁽⁵⁰⁾ The expansion of the concept of pain in the direction of horror was not new. Such an emotional state invokes the advent of meaning, and the consolatory agency of meaning sometimes demands the mediation of a mental faculty characterized as "φέρειπνονος" (pain-bearing)-John of the Climax is uncertain whether it should be categorized as "sense" (αἴσθησις) or "habit" (ἔξις)⁽⁵¹⁾; it is interesting that this faculty appears in the mystic theology, rather than in the mainstream "analytical" theology -which was always more open to traditional philosophical influences. Thus, if Sublime sorrow was the type of pain that should be rendered to the suffering God, ridiculous horror was the form of pain that could be its pertinent antipode.

In Byzantine art the above are not directly depicted -usually they are alluded to or they are shown selectively or in degrees. One of the calmest representations of the damned is at the Torcello Cathedral) in which the damned, whose composure is indeed impressive, are immersed in burning flames while they sit contemplating in a slightly melancholic manner. Even wild acts such as self-injury (if Barasch is right in deciphering the gesture) are performed with a calmness that comes close to ataraxia⁽⁵²⁾. This suggests that, apart from major theological reasons preventing a naturalistic or an expressionist approach, there may be other factors such as the general fit with the whole composition: more dramatic figures might endanger the hieratic solemnity of the synthesis by adding (through the cruelty of the torments and the agony of the damned) an air of Colosseum inappropriate to the place. Inevitably, the milieu (in the wide as well as the narrow sense of the term) of the

holy pictures affected the actual form of pain expressed by the figures and in some cases made them impossible.

The attributes of the damned that were shaped in the ecclesiastical literature (yet they were minimally presented iconographically in the Byzantine iconography) were passed over, albeit in magnified version, to the demons. When their visualization was attempted, the latter were given greater iconographical liberties, not only because of the mythology that accompanied them, but also because of their ability to symbolize the state of sin. Having meager ontological rooting (at least according to the Cappadocean School), demons were in a position to become pure symbols, and this symbolic function allowed the materialization of metaphors that were allowed to the human body. The pain of the damned was an individual pain-its borders was their own skin. Yet Hell, as a whole, was a place of universal suffering -- Satan was given the title of "King of the dolorous realm".⁽⁵³⁾ In the *Interpretation of the Art of Painting*, Dionysios of Fournas was referring to the "sinners, that are being pursued by demons which have been condemned *along with them* and with Judas the traitor."⁽⁵⁴⁾ Evil suffered for being such; once again, (the demonic) laughter was a spasm of pain. In the basement of the cosmic edifice, in the root of the Axis Mundi, Evil offered a direct image of sin as pure suffering.

Pain was the focal point of the Byzantine world and its transubstantiation, metaphorical extension, sublimation, or transformation towards the grotesque was a vital element of its theology; yet pain was not offered an apotheosis -not even a negative one. On the contrary, its subjugation to Logos along with the resistance to its image, which is subject to a continuous distillation, shows clearly that is utilized as a vehicle for the articulation of a secure consolatory and soteriological way. Byzantine art aimed not at becoming art therapy, but a way of salvation exploiting the "power of the Sign"⁽⁵⁵⁾, the proper conjugation of Logos and image. The result could never be guaranteed, yet its path was offered on an all-or-none basis, and everything -even its artistic survival-- was secondary to it, and therefore had to pay the price.

Notes

1. Ehlich, Konrad. "The language of pain," *Theoretical Medicine*, 1985 (6):177-87.
2. The terms roughly suggesting "coming from inside" and "coming from outside" respectively, have been coined up by Dana Copeland for differentiating states of disease with respect to their cause. In : Arthur Caplan, H.Tristram Engelhardt, James McCartney, eds. *Concepts of Health and Disease*, London, 1981.
3. Titus Burkhardt, *Sacred Art in East and West*, trans. A. Georgiou, Athens, 1989.
4. "Εἰκὼν μὲν οὖν ἔστιν ὁμοίωμα χαρακτηρίζον τὸ πρωτότυπον μετὰ τοῦ καὶ τινὰ διαφορὰν ἔχειν πρὸς αὐτό. Οὐ γὰρ κατὰ πάντα ἡ εἰκὼν ὁμοιοῦται πρὸς τὸ ἀρχέτυπον" John of Damascus, *Πρὸς τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὰς Ἀγίας Εἰκόνας Λόγοι* τρεῖς, 9,2.
5. Man as mirror in Plato's *Timaeus* 19d.
6. The expression belongs to Gilbert Ryle (*The Concept of Mind*, Harmondsworth, 1983).
7. This is just a crude schema. In fact the terms involved as well as their function and alterations is a much more complicated issue. See : *The History of Pain*. Rey, Rosalyn. Trans. LS Wallace, JA Cadden, and SW Cadden, Cambridge, Mass, 1995.
8. "Τὰ δὲ ἱεράμορφώματα, οὐ τὸ πάθος μόνον ποικίλλουσι καὶ λεπτότερον διαγράφουσιν, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ τὰ θαύματα καὶ τὰ τεράστια, ἅπερ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐξεργάσατο, πλατύτερον καὶ σαφέστερον ἡμῖν διασημαίνουσιν." Patriarch Nicephoros, *Ἀντιρρητικός* III, PG, 100, 380b-d.
9. Maguire, Henry. *Art and Eloquence in Byzantium*, New Jersey, 1981, page 26.
10. Ibid., page 34
11. Asterius of Amasia, *Εἰς Μαρτύριον τῆς πανευφήμου μάρτυρος Εὐφημίας ἑκφρασις*, PG 40, 333c-337c.
12. "O illustrious of these 'athletic' feats painters. The mutilated icon of the general glorify through your art (...) let his hand, burning, yet victorious, be shown"
Basil the Great, *Ὁμιλία VII Εἰς Βαρλαάμ Μάρτυρα*, PG 31, 489 a.
13. "Ἐπέγχρωσε δὲ καὶ ζωγράφος τὰ ἄνθη τῆς τέχνης ἐν εἰκόνι διαγρῶμενος, τὰς ἀριστείας τοῦ μάρτυρος, τὰς ἐνστάσεις, τὰς ἀληδόνas, τὰς θηριώδεις τῶν τυρράων μορφάς, τὰς ἐπηρείas, τὴν φλογετρόφον ἐκείνην κάμνον, τὴν μακαριωτάτην τελείωσιν τοῦ ἀθλητοῦ, τοῦ ἀγωνοθέτου Χριστοῦ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης μορφῆς τὸ ἐκτύπωμα, πάντων ἡμῖν ὥς ἐν βιβλίῳ τινὶ γλωττοφόρῳ διὰ χρωμάτων τεχνουργησάμενος, σαφῶς συνηγόρευσεν τοὺς ἀγόνas τοῦ μάρτυρος, καὶ ὥς λειμῶνα τὸν νεῶν καταγλάϊσεν" Gregory of Nyssa, *Εγκώμιον εἰς τὸν μέγα μάρτυρα Θεόδωρον*, PG 46, 737 D.
14. The striking antithesis between Λόγος and Εἰκὼν in the approach and presentation of the sacred drama may indicate that the bipolar Logos -Image/Picture is summoned to convey meanings that usually concern the bipolar soul-body. Literary Logos seems to express more directly the internal man (εἶσω ἄνθρωπον), as it offers exhaustive descriptions of the internal reactions of the holy persons, by aspiring to present their pain. This is particularly important in the case of the Virgin -a figure in which the discrepancy between her reserved iconographical reactions and her uninhibited literary laments is indeed striking (See, for example, her stance in *Χριστὸς Πάσχων* or the *Σταυροθεοτόκια*). Now such an application of a quasi-Platonic dualism here should be done with much caution as the Byzantine general theory of soul, although influenced by Platonism, it never went all the way in separating the two poles -on the contrary, it apparently seems to have gone towards the opposite direction, i.e. towards their reconciliation. Such a study would illuminate the eclectic assimilation of the platonic and neoplatonic influences in the fields both of theory of art and theory of art.
15. Talbot-Rice, David. *Byzantine Art*. London, 1972.
16. "The Cross alludes to the Passion". Patriarch Nicephoros, *Ἀντιρρητικός* III PG 100, 380b).
17. "Ὁδυνηρά λύπη. Κανὼν Μ. Σαββάτου, Ωδή θ'. The characterizations attributed to emotions of sorrow regularly involve terms that belong to the concept of pain. It seems that painting becomes involved in their rendering as visual metaphors. The internal antitheses found in the iconized personae (antitheses between the body and the face of the crucified Christ, or between the characteristics constituting his face) -could, up to some point, be seen as characterizing the attempts for visualizing these metaphors.
18. "Sin gave birth to sorrow, yet sorrow consumed sin", John Chrysostom, PG 49, 74-75.
19. "Ἔστιν λύπη ἐπωφελὴς καὶ γύπη φθοροποιός. Τῆς μὲν οὖν χρησίμης λύπης λύπης τὸ μὲν ἔστι τὸ περὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἁμαρτιῶν στένειν, τὸ δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν πλησίον ἀγνωσίας." Saint Athanasios, (*opera dubia*) *Βίος καὶ πολιτεία συγκλητικῆς*.
20. "Ἡ τῶν Μακκαβαίων μήτηρ ἐπτά παῖδας εἶδεν θάνατον καὶ οὐκ ἀναστέναν, οὐδὲ ἀφήκεν ἀγενεῖς δάκρυον." Basil the Great, *Περὶ Θανάτου Λόγος*, A1.
21. See the chapter: "Pathos Formula': some reflections on the structure of a concept" in Moshe Barasch's "Imago

- Hominis" (p.119, fol.)
22. "Ce naturalisme n'est pas la cause du changement radical intervenu dans la representation de la crucifixion, mais il découle. En vertu d'un nouveau théorème mystique, le corps (abandonné du Verbe et de l'âme) pouvait malgré cela être représenté." (page 137) Grondijs, LH. *L'Iconographie Byzantine du Crucifié Mort sur la Croix*, Bruxelles, 1956.
23. Dickens, Charles. *Hard Times*, New York: Bantam, 1978.
24. For example: *Passio St Blassii*, *Passio St. Christianae*, etc.
25. For example, diabetes is characterized as "πάθος" (passion). For the conceptual distinctions between the various terms denoting disease states, along with their history: Riese, Walter. *The Conception of Disease: Its History, Versions and Nature*. New York: Heinemann, 1943. Now I do not want to suggest that subjectivity is absent from the senses found in "passion", I want only to suggest that, compared with the term "pain", "passion" is much more hypostatized. The subjectivity of "passion" becomes apparent when the term is compared with "νόσος" in the context of denoting states of disease.
26. Evdokimov, Paul. *L'art d'icon: théologie de la beauté*, Paris, 1970
27. Lucius, E. *Les origines du culte des saints dans l'église chrétienne*, Paris, 1908
28. Maguire, op.cit., p.36.
29. The expression belongs to Gilbert Ryle (*The Concept of Mind*, Harmondsworth, 1983)
30. Quennel, Peter. *The Colosseum*, New York, 1981.
31. In these cases what flows from the severed neck is either milk solely ('Αγίας Αικατερίνης: "γάλα τε γὰρ εἶδον οἱ παρόντες ἀντι αἵματος" (PG 116,301), 'Αγίου Παντελεήμονος: "γάλα ἀντι αἵματος ἐρρύν" (PG 115, 476D), or both milk and blood ('Αγίου Παντελεήμονος, PG117, 561C). See also: Halkin, F. *Légendes grecques des "martyres romaines"*, Bruxelles: Subsidia Hagiographica, 1973. Grabar, Andre. *Martyrium: Recherches sur les culte des reliques et l'art chrétien antique*, London, 1976.
32. 2Co. 6.14.
33. Delehayé has offered classic analyses of the senses and the types of martyrdom and the changing position of the early Church towards it. Delehayé, H. *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, Bruxelles, 1921. Rordolf has focused on the subjective/emotional repertory involved in Martyrdom: Rordorf, W. *L'espérance des martyrs chrétiens*, Forma Futuri 18:445-461
34. Dionysios uses the term transliterating it in Greek as νατοτράλε: Dionysios of Fourná: *Ερμηνεία τῆς Ζωγραφικῆς Τέχνης*. (Interpretation of the Art of Painting), ed. A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, Petrogrand, 1909.
35. Trubetskoi, R. *Icons, Theology in Color*. New York, 1977. P.20.
36. Basil the Great. Ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν αἷτιος τῶν κακῶν Θεός.
37. Barasch. Op. Cit.
38. Gregory of Nyssa: op.cit. PG 46, 737D . Also in Περί ἀνθρώπου Κατασκευῆς where he speaks about "θηρία ἐν ἐαυτῷ" (beasts/monsters within the self). Theophylactos of Achrid refers to the "θηριομορφία τῆς ὑποδούλης ψυχῆς". (Εἰς τὸν Πορφυρογέννητον Κυρ Κωνσταντίνον).
39. Girard, René. *Le bouc émissaire*, Paris, 1982.
40. Anthonius pokes fun on demons: "Καὶ δέδεται μὲν παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ὡς στρουθίον εἰς τὸ καταπαίεσθαι παρ' ἡμῖν" (traditionally attr.) St Athanasios, Βίος τοῦ Ὁσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν 'Αντωνίου, 24, 15.
41. Doresse, Jean. *Les livres secrets du Gnostique d'Egypte*, Paris, 1969
42. There is a variety of versions concerning the Fall of the demons: in the legend in the cosmic war of stars (Ho14,2), in the battle between Jehovah and the monsters-personifications of the Sea, in the tradition of the sons of God (Nephilim) that fell in love with mortal women (Gen 6,1, Pe2,4).
43. Grabar, Andre. *Christian Iconography: A Study of its Origins*. London: 1969. Barasch agrees with Grabar: "The facial type [of the devil] is quite plebeian, and not devoid of a touch of humor." (Imago Hominis, p.102)
44. Clement of Alexandria, *Παιδαγωγός*, 2,5
45. Ioannes Tzetzes, *Χιλιάδες* V728-739, Nicephoros Vlemmydes, *Βασιλικὸς Ἀνδριάς* 18-19
46. Spanos ('Ακολουθία τοῦ Σπανοῦ). *Eine Byzantinische Satire in der Form einer Parodie*. Einleitung von Hans Eideneier, Berlin-New York: Supplementa Byzantina. Band 5, 1977.
47. ibid. D1411.
48. ibid. D1640.
49. Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. Harmondsworth 1992.
50. The emotional-behavioral repertory of the damned is not common in the Apocalypses. For example, whereas in the Revelation of St John, horror is the pivotal emotion, in the Apocryphal Apocalypsis Iohannis, weeping (κλαίειν) is the term most commonly characterizing the damned: "... ἐλασθήσονται ὡς ἀνδράποδα καὶ κλαύσουσιν ὡς νῆπια" (24,6), "κλαίοντες ὡς μὴ ἔχοντες παραμυθίαν", (28) "ταπεινοὶ τί κλαίετε" Constantinus Tischendorf, edit. *Apocalypses Apocryphae, Mosis, Esdrae, Pauli, Iohannis, item Mariae Dormitio*, Lipsiae: Hermann Mendelssohn,

MDCCCLVI.

Now "weeping" seems to encompass, as an umbrella term, various "partial" psychic states; therefore, it must somehow "incorporate" pain not as a behavioral reaction but as a subjective feeling as it is apparent that the state of the damned involves much actual somatic pain through the physical torments. Thus, their reaction vindicates their characterization as νήπιοι -a baby reacts to pain by crying.

51. St John of the Climax: "Ἔστι τις αἴσθησις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἔξις, φερέπονος λεγομένη, ὑφ' ἧς ὁ ἁλοὺς οὐκέτι δειλιάσει ἢ ἀποστραφήσεται πόνον ποτέ. Ταύτη τῇ ἀοιδίμῳ αἱ τῶν μαρτύρων ψυχαὶ κρατηθεῖσαι τῶν βασάνων εὐχερῶς κατεφρόνησαν καὶ ἐσώθησαν" Κλίμαξ Λόγος ΚΣτ', Περὶ διακρίσεως, 293, μθ'.
52. Barasch, Mose. *Gestures of Despair in Medieval and Early Renaissance Art*, New York, 1976. According to Barasch such movements express the "archetype of sinner wounding himself". (p.5). This may well be the case, nevertheless it should be also connected with demonic possession, either through an extension of meaning (some version of "possession" may be considered as taking place in Hell) or through a borrowing of pictorial forms. (See the case of the possessed nun in *Λειμωνάριον* by Ioannes Moschos (E. Mioni edition, ch. I A.) "ἦν γὰρ ἡ μονάστρια δεινῶς κατεσθίουσα τὰς σάρκας αὐτῆς". Also the case of the monk φρόντων eating his flesh in St Athanassios, op.cit. 57, 4.
53. Dante, *Inferno*, Canto XXXIV.
54. Dionysios of Fourna, op.cit. "ἔξ ἀριστερῶν δὲ ὅλοι ὁμοῦ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ διωκόμενοι ὑπ' αὐτῶν καὶ καταδικαζόμενοι μετὰ τῶν δαιμόνων καὶ τοῦ προδότου 'Ιούδα"
55. Aries, Philippe. *Images of Man and Death*, trans. Janet Lloyd, Cambridge, Mass, 1985.