INTRODUCTION: MOSAICS MATTER

In the middle of a golden hemisphere, a crucified Christ hangs against a black cross filled with doves and rising out of a mass of acanthus leaves (Fig. 1). This central image is almost concealed in a wealth of vine scrolling that curls its way across the vault in ordered, rhythmic rows, five across and five down. Buried in these vines are other plants, animals, birds and even figures: four seated Church Fathers, pens in hand; men feeding birds; little putti climbing the tendrils or riding dolphins. Either side of the cross stand Mary and St John the Evangelist, seemingly held in place by thorny tendrils. Above the cross, a hand bearing a wreath descends amid fluffy red and blue clouds from a tightly stretched canopy crowned by a small gold cross and then a monogram, the Chi-Rho for Christ, with the letters Alpha and Omega, signalling his role as the beginning and the end of all things. Along the bottom, deer drink from water flowing from the acanthus at the foot of the cross, a woman feeds hens, a man herds cattle. Below them twelve sheep emerge, six and six, from the building-filled, jewel-encrusted cities of Bethlehem and Jerusalem, making for a centrally positioned Lamb. The whole image is framed by an inscription, gold letters on a blue background, that hails the Church itself as the True Vine. Above and to each side are further mosaics on the triumphal arch: prophets; Saints Peter and Paul conversing with Saints Laurence and Clement; and at the centre, a majestic Christ in glory, amid yet more blue and red clouds and flanked by the symbols of his evangelists, blesses the church, the image and those below.

This mosaic in the apse of the church of S. Clemente in Rome is one of the largest and most spectacular, complicated and visually stunning works of art that survive from the Middle Ages, yet what we understand for certain about it could

Figure 1 Apse mosaic, S. Clemente, Rome, early twelfth century.

be written on a postcard. It is likely to have been installed in the early twelfth century when the church was built; it was presumably a part of the patronage of the church's builder, one Cardinal Anastasius, of whom little more is known. Its artist or artists have never been identified; where the materials for its manufacture, glass, stone, mother-of-pearl, came from is unknown; how it was put together is a mystery. Even the meanings of the elaborate, multifaceted, intertwined images are a matter of debate. What this mosaic is doing in this church at this point in time, and why, we can only speculate.

It is these conjectures that provide the basis for this book: how and where mosaics were made, why they might have been made, the materials, time and costs involved, and what people in the medieval world saw in them. Mosaics are the most beautiful, elaborate, complex and probably supremely expensive form of wall and vault decoration used in the medieval world. They survive from churches, mosques and palaces across the Mediterranean world from Spain, Italy and Greece in the west, to Syria and Israel in the east, taking in the Ukraine and Georgia to the north and Egypt to the south. And they are big, monumental art on a vast scale. But the stories of medieval wall mosaics are patchy and relatively little discussed. Considering their scale, they have played a comparatively minor part in the history of medieval art; considering their value and their costs, an even smaller role in our understanding of the medieval world. In this book, I have aimed to treat mosaics as indicators of history, woven in as a part of history, rather than passive illustrations of the past. As this book argues, they are a source material in themselves, employing a visual language that spoke powerfully and

influentially to the world in which they existed. Their eloquence lay not only in the identity of the image, but also in what it was made from, where it was, who caused it to be made, how it was understood and perceived. My view has been that mosaics mattered in the medieval world, not just as an art form but also as a very visible and often hugely public demonstration of piety, authority, prestige and money. Whilst the mosaics of major religious foundations such as Old St Peter's in Rome, the Great Mosque in Damascus or Hagia Sophia in Constantinople reveal political and dogmatic power games, the mosaics found in lesser buildings such as the diminutive church of Hosios David in Thessaloniki with its anonymous patron or the small Oratory at Germigny-des-Prés can also speak to the same effect.

To explore the use and potential of the medium, this book comes at mosaics from two angles. One is the technical aspect, the actual mosaic and what we can say about that; the other is a consideration of the place of mosaic, and of specific mosaics, in the society in which they were made. Part I explores what we know or can deduce about the actual physical making of mosaics from the mosaics themselves.[1] What do we know about the glass that mosaics were made from? What do we know about the logistics of mosaic-making? How much did mosaics cost? Do we know anything about their makers? It turns out that we know a surprising amount about both the technology used in making the materials for mosaics and the procedures for making them. This not only tells us about the sources and dispersal of materials and methods of construction but also informs the way we perceive and respond to them. But the relationships between centres of production in terms of materials, styles, techniques, iconography and artists are far less clear cut and therefore more interesting and complex than is often assumed. One goal of Part I is to establish just how expensive mosaic was as a medium and consequently to offer some clues as to the level of resources that a patron needed to install a mosaic. By and large, mosaic really was costly in the Middle Ages, and that suggests that it was also prestigious.

Part II looks at mosaics across a long time span, *c.* 300 to *c.* 1500, in an attempt to bring the range of mosaics together in one place and to see what a survey history, with all the drawbacks inherent in such a broad-brush study which smooths out so much detail, might indicate about the use of the medium. I have divided the time span into century or double century blocks, as a way of structuring this huge body of material, though it is an arrangement that provides its own problems because some mosaics are undated and others straddle more than one century. What this synthesis does show, however, is the astonishingly wide spread of mosaics across the Mediterranean world. It makes it apparent that there was more mosaic than has hitherto been realised. Part II also treats mosaics as products of cognitive choices made for a multitude of reasons relating in part to the socio-political contexts of the worlds in which their patrons operated. The basic question I have sought to answer in this section is: why did people choose mosaic for this building here and now? Mosaic was not the only medium employed in the medieval world to decorate walls and ceilings – paint, textiles, sculpture were some of the alternatives available – so what was special about mosaic?

So I will consider mosaics as snapshots of moments where people made deliberate choices about commissioning art, about spending money and about making public statements. What do these instances tell us? What statements were being made? Why did popes, caliphs and emperors choose in some instances to commission mosaic? And what of the humbler patrons? And what might all that suggest about networks between people, about trade and communications, about conflicts of ideas and beliefs, about

appropriation and reuse? The messages given by mosaics are not just those of the patrons, though this is where I have tended to focus. We should also ask, even if we cannot answer, how mosaics may have been received by their audiences, how they fitted into their buildings and cities, and we should recognise that the messages of mosaics changed over time, even to the point of becoming irrelevant and the mosaic destroyed.

The book seeks to decipher these questions in a context in which little is known about medieval wall mosaics. No contracts exist for mosaic-making until the fourteenth century, when such documents survive about the making of the façade mosaic at Orvieto Cathedral in Italy; almost no mosaics (at least until the twelfth century and the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem) are signed or associated with any artists; and written sources may identify a patron or state in whose reign (imperial, papal or caliphal) a mosaic was made, but are rarely more precise. No source tells us how mosaics were made or where the materials came from or what they cost; no medieval author really gives us much information on how mosaics were received by their audiences; no patron has left us an explanation of why he or she commissioned *this* mosaic looking like *this*. In the case of the church at Daphni in Greece, where one of the most beautiful and full programmes of mosaic decoration survives, there is no information about the dedication of the church (perhaps to the Mother of God), its function (it may have been a monastery), its patron (all we know is that he or she could afford to build a church and decorate it with mosaics), its artist (no idea) or even the date of the mosaics (the church itself may be eleventh century in terms of the architecture; the mosaics have been dated widely between the tenth and twelfth centuries). All that we know about mosaics tends to be concentrated within the mosaic itself.

But why is so little known about mosaics? There are various reasons. Most surviving mosaics are on the walls of churches, and for many of those churches full surveys do not exist. There are, for example, some very thorough studies of the mosaics of Torcello, of the church of San Marco in Venice, of the mosaics of twelfth-century Sicily, and there is an excellent study of the mosaics of the Eufrasian Basilica in Poreč. There is a very good book-length study of Nea Moni on Chios, an admirable slim guide to Hosios Loukas, but next to nothing since about 1899 on Daphni.[2] Many more of these individual studies are needed. There are also some broader surveys of mosaics covering a wider time period, including mosaics from Thessaloniki, Rome and Ravenna, but again these tend to consider these mosaics in relative isolation, as mosaics in Ravenna, rather than in the context of surviving sixth-century mosaics more widely.[3] Often as well studies of mosaics can be somewhat detached from their physical settings, with emphasis placed on their appearance and meaning rather than on pragmatic information about size, surface area and relative proportions of materials. The physical nature of wall mosaics has not always been presented as the fundamental part of understanding a mosaic that it is.[4] Only detailed study from the scaffold really allows for cogent remarks about style and also about the making of the mosaics, and such work other than at Ravenna is in short supply.[5] Analysing the setting of mosaics, and so recording appearance, restorations, possible patterns and sequencing of laying demands both scaffolding and specialised knowledge. And mosaics seem to fall into so many cracks: are they a part of the building's fabric (and hence architecture) or of its fixtures and fittings (and so decoration)? Are they Byzantine or Western medieval or Islamic? Are they a major or a minor art form, an art or a craft?

Another fundamental problem with many wall mosaics is that of their dating. Not many mosaics have an absolute date that can be accepted without question. A reasonable number are dated on

the supposition that they were installed at the time the building they grace was built, though this is not always the case, and understanding the dating of a building is not always as straightforward as it might be. For example, the Church of the Holy Apostles in Thessaloniki is dated by three inscriptions within it that claim it was constructed through the patronage of Patriarch Niphon (1310–14); dendrochronology suggested that the church was built all of a piece and dated it to 1329 or just after, some fifteen years after Niphon's removal from office. On one level, at least the dates are in the same century, but, on another, this has caused considerable debate because the mosaics in the church strongly resemble those in the Church of the Chora in Constantinople, built between 1316 and 1321: should the Salonikan mosaics therefore be dated before or after those of the Chora, a question with implications for understanding mosaicists working in the fourteenth century? In the case of S. Marco in Venice, the church itself was built in the eleventh century, but a very good case can be made that the mosaics were installed over a long period from then on, down into the present day in fact. Some mosaics are associated by texts with particular patrons, especially imperial or papal patrons, and so can, presumably, be dated to that patron's lifetime or time as pope or emperor; patrons are sometimes identified within the mosaics themselves and consequently we suppose that the mosaic reflects an act of patronage from a living person – but this need not always have been the case, as the thirteenth-century apse mosaic of S. Maria Maggiore in Rome warns us. This was the commission of Pope Nicholas IV, who is depicted in the mosaic, but it was almost certainly completed after his death. But critically, many mosaics are undated and there is no consensus as to their date. So, for example, the stunningly beautiful and lavish mosaic programme of the Rotunda in Thessaloniki has been dated to several points between the fourth and seventh centuries, with a general feeling that it might be fourth century; a small, slightly scruffy mosaic from Durrës in Albania has been dated to the fifth century on the basis of its style and the eighth to eleventh centuries on the basis of the sequencing of layers of plaster, paint and mosaic on the wall.[6]

Another basic problem is that we do not have much sense of the extent and spread of mosaic as a medium in the medieval world. This book looks to counteract that by providing a series of maps that plot the growth and spread of mosaics over time. The lists and details of the mosaics plotted on the maps are drawn from my database of medieval wall and vault mosaics.[7] At the point at which I am writing now, it tracks over 380 mosaics for which physical evidence survives. (Details of all these can be found in the Appendix.) These can be supplemented by a number of additional mosaics mentioned by textual sources (though these have not been mapped here). But the data presented here is inevitably incomplete. I have had to make decisions about where to date many mosaics. Some mosaics will have been missed, and there is no way of knowing how the number of the mosaics recorded in the database relates to the total number made. Certainly what survives is not all there was; this is the tip of an iceberg whose overall size is unknown. Chance of survival is another factor. Many more mosaics survive on walls from Western medieval Europe than from Byzantium (from Italy than from Asia Minor), and that owes something to the use and continued existence of churches in the two regions. On the other hand, much more archaeological data, in the form of scattered tesserae or mosaic fragments, is available for wall mosaics from the eastern part of the Mediterranean than from the western, and this may well reflect the emphases of Christian archaeologists in the Holy Land. In other words, this book inevitably makes assumptions based on incomplete data and the preserved

material presents the trap of the norm: the belief that, because it survives, it represents the usual rather than the exceptional, and that patterns and developments can and should be traced between mosaics.[8] As will become apparent, scholars have often drawn on what survives to create patterns of meaning, and material that does not fit into their theories has been overlooked or omitted. My belief is that we have lost too much to be able to draw many telling connections between surviving mosaics across the Mediterranean world. Consequently, I have looked instead to understand each mosaic in its own terms, at a local level, within its own building and society, rather than to make relationships and create narratives and answers where none might exist. Nevertheless, at times the temptation has been too great and I have also created a general narrative in which mosaic as a medium stood for something in the medieval world.

PROBLEMS WITH MEDIEVAL MOSAICS AND 'BYZANTINE' STYLE

The study of medieval wall mosaics has frequently been dominated by the analysis of their style. 'Style' essentially refers to the way in which a picture is created by an artist, partly how the medium is used and partly how the figures shown are constructed. Traditionally it is assumed that artists have individual methods of constructing the details of an image, the ears or hands or the draperies, for example, and these, coupled with the ways in which figures are conceived, the use of line and colour, and even the nature of individual brushstrokes, have been seen as ways to decipher the distinctive individual styles and detectable choices made by artists. It is a methodology largely developed for painting. It can be effective in spotting the differences between an image painted by two named artists where there is a body of work known through external evidence to have been produced by those artists, because identifiable comparative data exists. In the case of mosaics, stylistic analyses tend to begin from the premise that apparent differences within mosaics mean different artists potentially working at different times and very detailed descriptions of individual mosaics have been produced to make this point within the same building, as well as to allow comparisons to be drawn across monuments in a bid to establish artistic influences between mosaics and to produce temporal sequences for their making.

It is considerably more difficult to do this with a whole series of medieval mosaics where the media involved (cubes of glass and stone) and the techniques of making are completely different, and where there are fundamental questions about the date, the number of people involved in working on a mosaic at any one time, or over a period of time, and the question of whether the same person designed the mosaic and also stuck the tesserae into it. Nonetheless, much of the literature about mosaics has been written in these terms. This has much to do with the paucity of studies within Byzantine art, and the even shorter supply of work on mosaics outside of Byzantine Studies, which means that scholarship from the 1900s to the 1960s still resonates and still has to be engaged with. Although there is a definite shift in recent research, the study of mosaics is still stranded somewhere between current art historical concerns with the social history of art and the concept of visual culture and the concerns of previous generations which were primarily grappling with questions about how to define mosaics and how to attribute them to a particular set of makers, particularly within a system that gave primacy in medieval art to Byzantine art. Because these are key issues for understanding the history of mosaic, it seemed advisable to rehearse now the problems that the emphasis on stylistic analysis coupled with beliefs about

Byzantine artistic supremacy have presented in the study of wall mosaics.

Medieval mosaic has been and is still regularly presented first and foremost as a Byzantine art form. 'We cannot say with certainty where this artist [of the mosaic at St Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai] came from, but there is a high degree of probability that he came from Constantinople, first of all because the capital had a world-wide fame with regard to its mosaic workshops, whose artists had been called to Damascus, Toledo, Kiev, Norman Sicily, Venice and other places wherever an ambitious project of mosaic decoration was commissioned.'[9] Because the mosaics of Hosios Loukas were perceived as the least provincial of the eleventh-century mosaics in Greece, they had employed the best artists from Constantinople, working in the 'best spirit'.[10] 'Glass mosaic was a luxurious medium of decoration around the Mediterranean in regions that either belonged to or were influenced by Byzantine artistic traditions.'[11] Wall mosaics outside the Byzantine empire are vital for reconstructing the 'lost production of mosaics carried out in the capital by workshops active in the same period' for these were responsible for spreading through the Mediterranean what was regarded as a 'national art'.[12] 'The difference [in the phases of decoration in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem] is best defined on a scale measuring the level of intensity with which the Byzantine influence was adopted and applied: the wall mosaics show the highest degree of byzantinization, clearly indicating that Byzantine artists from imperial centres were directly involved in their making. No doubt this involvement strengthened the already extant inclination towards byzantinization of local artists of Eastern origin ... Traces of close cooperation between Byzantine and local artists can be followed throughout the whole cycle of mosaics in Bethlehem.'[13] There are Eastern and Western manuscripts or wall paintings or textiles, but over and again scholars assert that there are only Byzantine mosaics. It was indeed a view of mosaics that was my initial starting point in thinking about this book: my original opening ran something like 'Byzantine mosaics were the most beautiful, elaborate, complex and probably most expensive form of wall decoration used in the medieval world.'

Both as a result of these assumptions and as a way of bolstering them, stylistic analyses of mosaics revolve around revealing the Byzantine nature present within them. So, for example, Otto Demus offered a very detailed account of a large mosaic panel in S. Marco depicting Christ's Agony in the Garden, which he dated to the thirteenth century (Figs. 2 and 3). In it, he detected at least four different styles present in the panel; he ascribed these to the work or the hands of at least four different artists (plus assistants), all operating at slightly different levels of mastery. For Demus, the changes in style were indicative of the process and hierarchy of mosaic-making: work was begun by a 'Greek' master from Byzantium who laid out the panel, followed by a second master, who was perhaps a 'young Venetian only recently schooled in the technique of mosaic'. After this came the efforts of a workshop of two more mosaicists in a style that was in all its aspects a development of the style of the first master, but at a temporal remove (it is unclear why the first two mosaicists are labelled 'masters' and the other pair as a 'workshop', but the implication is one of quality).[14] Demus also offered a rationale for these changes in hands, suggesting that since the style of the fragments of the surviving thirteenth-century mosaics from S. Paolo *fuori le mura* in Rome matches those of the S. Marco panel, the first master was summoned to Rome to work at S. Paulo and was followed there by the second. In this way, the S. Paolo mosaics, which have a firm date, are used to provide a date for the S. Marco panel.[15] The scene in

Figure 2 Christ waking the apostles, from the Agony in the Garden, south transept, S. Marco, Venice, twelfth century. Demus attributes this part of the panel to the 'second master', the 'young gifted' artist.

Figure 2 of the standing Christ with the apostles shows work of the 'Greek' master, possibly responsible for the figure in profile at the top, and the 'young Venetian', who made the figure of Christ and the three apostles, the wall and parts of the rocky landscape.[16] In contrast, Figure 3 is part of the work of the 'workshop' of two mosaicists, though in this section, according to Demus, only differences of execution, not of style, are apparent.

In terms of distinguishing between these masters, it all comes down to details. The standing Christ in Figure 2 is said to be clearly by the same hand as the three apostles visible in this image, for all share the same generic character, the same palette, the same 'hard and flat' modelling, but the figure of Christ is superior to the others for it has a 'monumental grandeur of stance and gesture'. In its making, however, are details that suggest that the artist was gradually 'becoming familiar with the technique of mosaic-making in general'. The kneeling Christ and the standing Christ of Figure 3 (both from the 'workshop') can be differentiated from the standing Christ of Figure 2 because 'the modelling is much softer and more differentiated: the flatness is replaced by a carefully shaded relief'. The first master, the 'Greek', and the second master, the 'young Venetian', can be distinguished through details: 'the pattern of the medium-brown hair and beard is a little coarse, the design of the hand somewhat clumsy; the shadows in the face are heavier' in the 'Venetian' than in the 'Byzantine' work.[17] Elsewhere, in terms of its style, Byzantine mosaic work has been characterised as not coarse or crude; it can share a classical idea of statuesqueness; it is picturesque in its composition, refined in its colouring, developed in its feeling for the organic.[18] On the other hand, less positively, it has been called 'abstract' and 'anti-naturalistic', typified by the repeated use of static, large-eyed holy figures.

These are very detailed interpretations of the mosaics (probably through using photographs as well as first-hand observations), relying on the observation of minutiae and on the interpretation of those niceties, and the conclusions drawn from both. They are readings that present a great many questions now that were not seen as problematic for art historians trained and working in most of the twentieth century. First, over time, (subjective) observations and interpretations become (objective) facts. The two masters and the workshop posited for the creation of the panel suddenly become real and an indication of actual artistic practice on which further discussion is founded. But, even if Demus' four different hands and the similarities with the S. Paolo mosaics are apparent (and that's a question in

Figure 3 Christ praying and Christ confronting Peter, from the Agony in the Garden, south transept, S. Marco, Venice, twelfth century. The picture shows about half of the panel, which is 12.4 metres. Otto Demus argued that evidence for perhaps four separate artists, at different levels of competence, could be detected in the panel.

itself), do these visual shifts actually mean what he suggested? Do they indicate changes of mosaicists and establish that this one panel was made over a period of six years? How do we know, instead, that it was not a change of mind on the part of the artist or a response to a change in available materials, or a change of surface, or a reaction to the particular location of an image within a building and its viewing point, or even later restorations and repairs? Was it made by a lot of people very quickly? Did artists work in such a way that the minutiae reveal individuals? It may perhaps be true for painting (though that is another story) but mosaic is a very different medium, used in a very different way. Not enough is known about working practices to be sure whether the differences in style that art historians detect reflect different artists from different traditions or artists from the same team or workshop, or how far they reflect different levels of expertise or indicate technical shifts on the part of the same mosaicist, the break in a day's work for example, the short cut taken in an area of mosaic where it would not be seen, a fresh bucket of tesserae, a shift in the scaffold, just plain boredom and a desire to vary the monotony. And within these readings lurks another assumption, which is that artists worked only in one detectable style. But this ignores the fact that apparently changing styles and apparently changing hands may reflect the ability of the same artist to work in a variety of ways: Filippino Lippi worked in both

an austere and an ornate style in the 1490s, serving clients who were pro- and anti-Savonarola; El Greco produced art that looked Byzantine, Venetian and then distinctively his own.

Second, there are unspoken issues round definitions and distinctions. Demus tended to use 'Byzantine' and 'Greek' almost interchangeably.[19] But he did not explain what he meant by these, and neither had any real meaning in the Middle Ages. The Byzantines themselves did not define themselves as 'Byzantine' (a nineteenth-century label) or 'Greek'. They tended to call themselves Romans and a central part of their self-definition was in relation to the Roman Empire.[20] So was Demus imagining that the twelfth-century 'Greek' mosaicist of the Gethsemane panel was a man who lived, was trained and worked somewhere in the lands ruled by the Byzantine emperor? Was he Orthodox in his faith? Greek-speaking? And beyond S. Marco and its mosaicists, how should we understand the term 'Byzantine'? Would a fifth-century mosaicist born, raised and trained in Antioch, with Syriac as a first language and Monophysite Christianity as his professed creed, count as either 'Byzantine' or 'Greek'? What about a sixth-century Visigoth from Ravenna, Latin-speaking, but trained in Constantinople and professing Orthodoxy? If the artists of the twelfth-century Sicilian mosaics came from Greek-speaking south Italy, did that make them 'Byzantine' or 'Greek' or neither? Was Ephraim the monk, named in Greek and Latin as the artist of the twelfth-century mosaics in the Church of the Nativity in Bethlehem, Greek or Syrian or Constantinopolitan or Byzantine? What of Basilius, his fellow-mosaicist in the church, named in inscriptions in Greek, Latin and Syriac? In mosaic terms generally, the term 'Byzantine' has been used of (imagined) artists very loosely, with a lack of distinction between presumed ethnicity, nationality (an anachronistic concept in any case) and the physical location of a mosaic, and overlooking that individuals can and did simultaneously occupy more than one position in society.[21] These labels are divisive in a way not relevant to the Middle Ages and are simply not helpful.

A third problem relates to the association made between style and Byzantium, and that is in the implicit assumption regularly made that those elements of style defined as Byzantine are better than those not defined as Byzantine (or vice versa, that those elements of style defined as good then came to be perceived as Byzantine). This both leads to and is informed by the belief that Byzantine mosaicists were superior in skill and travelled the Mediterranean taking this expertise with them and teaching it to the less able natives. Time and again, the best mosaics are supposedly the work of the Byzantine masters, the less good are those of locals ('Romans', 'Sicilians', 'Venetians' and 'Syrians' to name but a few) trained by Byzantines and the poorest are the work of non-Byzantine-influenced local artists. And repeatedly, mosaics made outside the Byzantine Empire are ascribed to Byzantine artists. The mosaics of both Pope John VII's Oratory and of Pope Paschal's S. Prassede and its Zeno Chapel have been defined as the work of 'Greek' or 'Byzantine' artists working in a proto-Byzantine tradition and producing art for a 'Greek' pope.[22] In Rome, further Byzantine influences are apparently present in the mosaics of S. Paolo *fuori le mura*, said to be the work of either Constantinopolitan craftsmen completing and modifying a Roman design, or Roman artists operating with Byzantine inflections; at the Sancta Sanctorum chapel in the Lateran, it is claimed that the craftsmen actually were Byzantine.[23] Similarly, Nicholas IV's use of mosaic in Rome is supposedly a direct consequence of his time spent in Constantinople because the mosaics of S. Maria Maggiore (and of S. Maria in Trastevere) do not 'look Roman'.[24]