

ΑΦΙΕΡΩΜΑ ΣΤΟΝ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΑΪΚΟ ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗ Λ. ΒΟΚΟΤΟΠΟΥΛΟ



ΑΡΧΙΤΕΚΤΟΝΙΚΗ • ΓΛΥΠΤΙΚΗ • ΜΙΚΡΟΤΕΧΝΙΑ • ΠΟΙΚΙΛΑ • ΨΗΦΙΔΩΤΑ • ΧΕΙΡΟΓΡΑΦΑ • ΤΟΙΧΟΓΡΑΦΙΕΣ • ΕΙΚΟΝΕΣ



ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΚΑΠΟΝ

Στα άρθρα του παρόντος τόμου ακολουθήθηκαν οι ορθογραφικές επιλογές των συγγραφέων.

Απαγορεύεται η αναδημοσίευση, η αναπαραγωγή, ολική, μερική ή περιληπτική, καθώς και η απόδοση κατά παράφραση ή διασκευή του περιεχομένου του βιβλίου με οποιονδήποτε τρόπο, μηχανικό, ηλεκτρονικό, φωτοτυπικό, ηχογράφησης ή άλλο, χωρίς την προηγούμενη έγγραφη άδεια του εκδότη, σύμφωνα με το νόμο 2121/1993 και τους κανόνες του διεθνούς δικαίου που ισχύουν στην Ελλάδα.

ISBN 978-960-6878-80-0

© 2015 ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΚΑΠΟΝ

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΚΑΠΟΝ
Μακρυγιάννη 23-27, 107 42 Αθήνα
τηλ. 210 9235 098, 210 9214 089
e-mail: info@kaponeditons.gr
www.kaponeditons.gr

ΑΦΙΕΡΩΜΑ ΣΤΟΝ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΑΪΚΟ ΠΑΝΑΓΙΩΤΗ Λ. ΒΟΚΟΤΟΠΟΥΛΟ

ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ
ΒΑΣΙΛΗΣ ΚΑΤΣΑΡΟΣ - ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΙΑ ΤΟΥΡΤΑ



ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΚΑΠΟΝ

PALAIOLOGAN ICONS IN TUSCANY

MICHELE BACCI

Professor of Medieval Art/Fribourg University, Switzerland

In the long-lasting debate about the figurative phenomenon known in art historical tradition as the 13th-century Tuscan “*maniera greca*”, many artworks have been labelled as “Byzantine” or “Byzantinizing” because of their more or less convincingly alleged connections with the artistic manifestations of the Eastern Empire. In many instances, the term “Byzantine” has been used as a very generic clue to identify stylistic solutions which could not properly suit the Darwinian approach to the history of art worked out in Italy in the 19th and 20th century.¹ Moreover, early scholars rarely took into account that the term may hint at many different phenomena, whose specific physiognomy—as in the case of the pictorial traditions of Thessaloniki, Crete, mainland Greece, Cyprus, and the Christian communities of the Levant—has been later reconstructed by those indefatigable scholars who, like Panagiotis Vokotopoulos, contributed so much to the discovery and publication of many hitherto unknown and neglected artworks.

Our expanded knowledge of 13th- and 14th-century art allows us perhaps to get a more precise picture of the multiplicity of Eastern Mediterranean models employed by Tuscan artists to work out their own figurative solutions. In the decoration of churches in Pisa, different models were originally appropriated, selected, combined and reshaped in order to provide artworks with a very special aesthetic efficaciousness and sumptuousness: Pisa's interest in the luxury arts produced in each of the great artistic cultures of the Mediterranean is evidenced by its use of Islamic decorative objects, including ceramics, bronze artefacts and textiles, ancient Roman marbles, and Byzantine or Byzantine-like sculptures and paintings. Yet, in the latter case, interest in luxury items overlapped with a more specifically religious sense of the worship-worthiness of icons, whose compositional, iconographic, and even stylistic features were commonly reputed to be imbued with a special aura of sacredness, stemming from their alleged role of visual documents of the holy people's outward appearance.

As I have pointed out elsewhere, the imitation of icons began in Tuscany, and especially in Pisa, when the rich trading families of the city and, on the other hand, many local members of both the regular and secular clergy were well established in the major ports of the Eastern Mediterranean and started imitating the Eastern Christian use of involving images in the performance

of both individual and collective devotional practices.² There is documentary evidence that, from the second half of the 12th century onwards, icons were used in Pisa as visual counterparts to individual prayer in domestic contexts and as fixed or provisional ornaments within churches; often located on side-altars used for the performance of private masses and being funded by individual donors, they were materially worshipped with kisses and prostrations and their lower parts were covered with

1. *Madonna dei Santi Cosma e Damiano*, ca 1260-1270. Pisa (neighbourhoods), Church of Santi Cosma e Damiano. (Photo: author's archive)



textiles, probably looking like the Byzantine *podeai*.³ As a consequence of their connections with the Levant, the inhabitants of Pisa worked out a religious sensibility implying a specific interest in icons which proved to be analogous to that experienced in the same period by the Latin settlers in the Holy Land and the Frankish territories in the Aegean and on Cyprus; in a similar way, this religious sensibility paved the way not only to the appropriation and import of Eastern icons, but also to the development of a local production of icon-painting meant to suit the specific religious needs of a Latin-rite population.⁴

Since the very beginnings of the debate about the origins of the “*maniera greca*”, scholars have wondered whether this local tradition of icon-painting had been started by Greek artists working for Latin patrons or by local painters striving—not always successfully, indeed—to reproduce original Eastern Mediterranean works. It may well be that Giorgio Vasari’s statement about the presence of Greek artists in Tuscany was something more than a pure rhetorical argument supporting his characterization of *pregiottesque* art in Italy as something thoroughly alien to its constitutive classicism; yet, the wide web of Pisa’s Mediterranean connections makes this argument not decisive, and it is much more natural to think that a wide range of Eastern icons became available in Pisa in the 12th and 13th century.⁵ The major difficulty in our understanding of the material process that engendered and made possible the imitation of icons has been indicated in the lack of extant paintings whose Eastern origins can be safely recognized. One such object is the “*Madonna di sotto gli organi*”, that since the late 15th century is known to have been preserved in the presbytery of the town cathedral, hanging from one of the columns to the north of the main altar: long thought to be a work of the Lucchese master Berlinghiero, it has been most recently attributed by myself and other scholars to a Greek artist from either Cyprus or, possibly, mainland Greece.⁶ On their turn, the stylistic and compositional features of the “*maniera greca*” icons can partly contribute to our understanding of their material models: inasmuch most of them are characterized by a linear rendering of the body parts and by bright colours, they prove to share the same conventions, rooted in the Komnenian tradition, which were widespread in Frankish Cyprus and the Crusader Kingdom.

Whereas a connection with the pictorial trends of the Levant can be clearly detected in the first half of the 13th century, already by the 1260s a number of paintings reveal a much more updated knowledge of the new painterly trend worked out in Constantinople and Thessaloniki, which art historians are used to label as “*Palaiologan*” art. In such Pisan works as the *Madonna from San Giovannino de’ Friari* (now in the National Museum of San Matteo in Pisa)⁷ and the *Virgin Mary from the Church of Santi Cosma e Damiano* (fig. 1),⁸ it is easy to recognize that painters made efforts to imitate the innovative technique of *chiaroscuro* modelling used in contemporary icons. The result is not excellent, if compared to their models, given that the de-

sired effect of creating a soft homogeneous surface, defined by soft brushstrokes, is not achieved, and what we see in its place are a web of white, concentric filaments and a sharp distinction between dark and highlighted zones. Indeed, such works testify to Pisan painters’ interest in the new way of rendering the body worked out in the same years in the metropolitan centres of the Byzantine empire; even if they failed to thoroughly appropriate their Eastern colleagues’ modelling technique, they were consequently encouraged to work out alternative solutions, which resulted in the invention of *Giottoesque chiaroscuro*.

There is indeed a painted panel in Pisa whose stylistic features are very much in keeping with contemporary *Palaiologan* icons, to such an extent that it may be considered to be the work of a Greek artist. The church of San Frediano houses a small icon (72×47 cm), whose early history is completely unknown (fig. 2). Its present oval shape indicates that, probably sometimes in the 17th or 18th century, it was reshaped in order to be inserted within the central opening of a tabernacle or niche. It displays the *Virgin Mary* in frontal pose, holding the *Child* on her left arm and indicating him with her right hand. She wears a blue *maphorion* decorated with golden pendentives and hems, and a brownish tunic ornamented with gems and pearls. Her head is covered by a reddish *palla*. The *Child* wears a golden *chiton* with red *clavi*, *himation*, and sandals, holds a *rotulus* in his left hand and blesses with his right one. Christ’s face is also represented almost frontal, only slightly turning to the left, with high forehead, curling hair, and small eyes staring at the beholder.

In the 1940s it was seen in a bad state of preservation by the American art historian Edward Garrison in the nearby parsonage; it was published in his *Illustrated Index of Italian Romanesque Panel Painting* (1949) as the work of a not better identified Pisan artist of the second half of the 13th century.⁹ The restoration made by the Soprintendenza ai beni artistici in 1971 succeeded in removing the oxidized varnishes that had been applied to the painterly surface in later periods, but in the same time it gave the panel an overall pale appearance, as is especially revealed by the faded tones of *Mary’s* and the *Child’s* lips. Yet, the intervention enabled scholars to remark that the especially refined, monumental quality of the icon, as well as some of its compositional and iconographic features (including the unusual frontal rendering of the *aristerokratousa* scheme), proved to be unparalleled in Pisan tradition, even if some generic similarities could be detected in the *Madonna dei Santi Cosma e Damiano* (fig. 1).¹⁰

Yet, a closer scrutiny reveals that the latter does not share the former’s soft flesh modelling, the accurate rendering of physiognomic and vestimentary details, and the monumental proportions of the heads. Such features as *Mary’s* sidelong face and slightly melancholic expression, with her long nose slightly turning to the right and frontal eyes avoiding to stare directly at the beholder, as well as the *Child’s* fleshy body, robust neck and chubby face with broad forehead, small and dark shaded



2



3

eyes, small lips defined by dense red brushstrokes and thick nose stressed at the tip are thoroughly foreign to the traditions of the “*maniera greca*” and prove to be much more in keeping with the pictorial devices of late 13th-century icon-painting in the area of Thessaloniki. An interesting comparison can be made with the partially repainted icon of the Hodegetria in Vatopaidi monastery on Mount Athos (fig. 3), which was recently published by Efthymios Tsigaridas as one of the leading works of the last quarter of the century in Macedonia.¹¹ From a technical viewpoint, they both share a modelling method, being characterized by gently graduating green shadows and white highlights on a broad ochre *proplasmos*, which is frequently found in the art of this period and is best mastered and worked out in the icons attributed to Manuel Panselinos (such as the Saint George and Saint Demetrius, also in Vatopaidi monastery).¹² Other features revealing the strong connections of the Pisan panel with Macedonian works of the same period are the thick chrysography of Christ’s garments, their soft fluid drapes, the delicate gestures of the hands, and even such minimal details as the diagonally oriented double lace wrapping the *rotulus*.¹³ On typological and compositional grounds, the Child’s imposing figure, its pose, and its physiognomy can be paralleled with analogous works from Macedonia, such as a late 13th-century Hodegetria in the Byzantine Museum in Athens.¹⁴

2. Icon of the Virgin *aristerokratousa*, last quarter of the 13th cent. Pisa, Church of San Frediano. (Photo: author’s archive)

3. Icon of the Virgin Hodegetria, last quarter of the 13th cent. Mount Athos, Vatopaidi monastery. (Photo: after Tsigaridas – Loverdou-Tsigarida 2007, fig. 55)

Many authors have observed that the encounter of Tuscan artists with Palaiologan painting must be seen as an unavoidable condition to understand the origins and development of Duccio’s style. In this respect, in an article published in 1982, Hans Belting proposed to interpret the enigmatic Kahn Madonna in the Washington Gallery of Arts as the work of one of those itinerant Greek artists mentioned by Vasari.¹⁵ The soft modelling of the Virgin’s face, obtained by applying wide greenish shades along the contour lines of the light ochre surface, looked very akin to the Sienese master’s rather original rendering of flesh, which proved to be so distinctively different from that worked out by Giotto with a right opposite technical procedure. Even if Belting’s arguments have been disputed and alternative attributions to either Constantinople, Cyprus, and the Crusader states have been worked out,¹⁶ the stylistic connections between the Washington image and Duccio’s earliest works, including especially the Crevole Madonna,¹⁷ can be easily detected, even if it is impossible to ascertain whether such similarities are due to the direct relationship of a Greek and an Italian artist or if they are just the outcome of two parallel, yet



autonomous, artistic developments stemming from a shared knowledge of the most recent trends of Early Palaiologan art.

Curiously enough, with the exception of some sporadic references, few authors have taken into account that an important item of Palaiologan art is still preserved in Siena, a tiny icon of the Mother of God Hodegetria (28×22 cm), which can now be better appreciated thanks to its recent restoration (figs 4 and 6). Presently preserved in the Pinacoteca Nazionale, it was originally shown in a side-altar within the church of the Carmelite convent of San Niccolò.¹⁸ It was traditionally considered to be the work of the Evangelist Luke — whose authorship was frequently evoked during the Counterreformation in Italy as an efficacious means to promote the public worship of images deemed to be miraculous and looking old and exotic.¹⁹ Even if its presence in Siena is not documented before 1575, when it was seen within its altar-monstrance by the Apostolic Visitor Cardinal Bossi,²⁰ its association with the Carmelites makes plausible that it may have been brought to Siena in Duccio's times. These friars, who had obtained a convent in Siena by 1261 and were widening their church in the same years, boasted of their origins from the Holy Land, where they had constituted their first hermitages somewhat after the Frankish conquest of Jerusalem on the top of the Mount of Carmel, and pretended to be the inheritors of a monastic tradition allegedly dating back to Prophets Elijah and Elisha.

Indeed, as is pointed out by modern commentators, their experience in the Crusader states had been probably stimulated by their encounter with the tradition of Greek monasticism in Palestine, as is especially revealed by their rhetoric of the desert, their structure modelled on the Byzantine *lavrai*, and their strong worship for the Virgin Mary.²¹

Since the first half of the 13th century, when they started settling in Italy and in the rest of the Latin West, the Carmelite friars became more and more actively engaged in the promotion of Marian cults.²² One distinctive tract of this process was represented by the tendency to make use of Byzantine or Byzantine-looking images as foci for collective devotion: not surprisingly, the earliest Carmelite icons known to us are half-length images of the Hodegetria, such as the *Madonna Bruna* in Naples or the icons in San Martino ai Monti and Santa Maria in Traspontina in Rome. Such objects were favoured inasmuch they managed to epitomize both the Order's special commitment to Marian worship and the auratic power connected to its Eastern ancestry.²³ In Siena itself, the *Madonna dei Mantellini* or *Madonna del Parto*, a "maniera greca" icon attributed to the author of the Pisan *Madonna dei Santi Cosma e Damiano*, was promoted by local Friars as a cult-object, being especially invoked by women longing for children.²⁴

Notwithstanding the devotional success of the *Madonna dei*



6



7

Mantellini, the small Palaiologan icon was considered to be more prestigious, because of its alleged ancestry and attribution to Saint Luke. Originally kept in a specific altar on the northern wall of San Niccolò and moved to the main altar by the early 17th century, it was alternatively known as the “Madonna di San Luca” or “Madonna del Carmine” (Our Lady of Carmel): both titles gave expression to the very special devotion to the Virgin Mary that shaped Carmelite identity. As witnessed by Cardinal Bossi and later authors, it was frequently involved in public exhibitions within the church or solemnly brought in processions through the town street on the Octaves of Easter.²⁵ Most probably, its tiny dimensions and old-looking appearance contributed to consolidate the perception of the Friars as custodians of venerable mementoes deemed to date back to the Apostolic era.

Admittedly, the image (fig. 4) had been originally thought for a thoroughly different purpose: its diminutive shape and its metal revetment clearly make plausible that it was made on behalf of some individual donor as an ex-voto gift to a church or as a private icon to be used in domestic cults. It represents a very conventional Hodegetria, holding Christ on her left arm while indicating him with her right hand. She wears a dark blue maphorion with golden ornaments on its ridge and her large, round head bends towards her Son with a slightly melancholic expression. The Child is represented in frontal pose and tiny

4. Icon of the Virgin *aristerokratousa* (“Madonna del Carmine”), ca 1260-1270. Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale. (Photo: author's archive)

5. Icon of the Virgin *dexiokratousa*, ca 1260-1270. Mount Athos, Chilandar monastery. (Photo: after K. Weitzmann (ed.), *Le icone*, Milan 1981, p. 161)

6. Metal revetment of the Madonna del Carmine, ca 1260-1270. Siena, Pinacoteca Nazionale. (Photo: author's archive)

7. Icon of the Virgin *Peribleptos*, late 13th century. Ohrid, Icon Gallery. (Photo: after M. Georgievski, *Icon Gallery - Ohrid*, Ohrid 1999, p. 49)

proportions, holding a white *rotulus* in his left hand and blessing with his right; he wears a brown himation and a red chiton, both richly decorated with chrysography. As the restoration works have revealed, the presence of a simple greenish preparation instead of a golden ground indicates that since the very beginnings the icon was meant to be covered with a silver-gilt revetment; the holes produced by the fastening of the latter are homogeneously scattered on the wooden surface, including the wooden frame. In the process of time, the revetment (fig. 6) has been partially reduced on its margins and altered with the superposition of the Virgin's new halo, crown, and hand covering, as well as gems and pearls on Christ's halo, probably in the 17th century. It is decorated with a low relief vegetal ornamentation, consisting of intertwined scrolls which enclose stylised leaf and flowers, whereas cross-shaped forms are included in the intermediate spaces.



Similar motifs are common in late 13th- and 14th-century Byzantine metalworks and are best paralleled by the revetments embellishing the “Madonna di San Luca” in Fermo Cathedral, Italy, and the Virgin Peribleptos in Ohrid (fig. 7).²⁶ The stylistic features of the painting reveal its author’s full conversancy with early Palaiologan painting. A most obvious comparison is with the *dexiokratousa* Virgin from Chilandar monastery on Mount Athos (fig. 5), whose painterly quality has been linked to the mural paintings at Sopoćani (ca 1265).²⁷ Most notably, the latter’s treatment of the Virgin’s figure is so closely similar to the Siena image that one can even go so far to postulate an attribution to the same painter. Indeed, the two icons share the same head proportions, the melancholic expression of Mary’s face, the gently bending pose of her head, the physiognomic type, as well as the same technical devices and chromatic palette, including the use of ochre surfaces interspersed with roseate tones, softly graduating greenish shades, and delicate linear outlines. By virtue of such similarities, I think that the Siennese icon can be considered to date from approximately the same period, around 1260–1270; Duccio’s research to achieve a more naturalistic rendering of flesh modelling would be better understood, if we could imagine that he had direct access to this exceptional work.

Be this as it may, it is worth remembering that Palaiologan icons kept arousing the interest of Tuscans still during and even

after the age of Duccio and Giotto. A case in point is represented by the often reproduced image of the Archangel Michael (fig. 8) in the National Museum in Pisa (32.8×24.5 cm), whose stylistic features (thick highlights, treatment of drapes, thin, elongated body, and pastel colours) seem to be thoroughly in keeping with the pictorial trends in Macedonia and Constantinople around the year 1300. Yet scholars have been puzzled by the Latin inscription (AR[CHANGELUS] MICHAEL) reported in Gothic majuscule scripture close to the archangel’s head and by its iconographic-compositional features, which prove to be unique: in no other Byzantine icon, Saint Michael is represented in this way, in frontal pose, holding a clypeus with the bust-image of Christ Emmanuel, weighing souls on a balance and combating the devil who is approaching one of them.²⁸ Yet, this peculiar combination of motifs is also unknown in contemporary Italian art, and cannot be understood simply in terms of iconographic taxonomy. Its meaning, by the way, is all the more easy to catch: with its double hint at the archangel’s role as psychopomp and demon-fighter it immediately reminds the viewer of the different iconographic schemes employed for him in the scenes of the Last Judgement. In this latter context, the introduction of the balance with the devil’s attack has been interpreted as a more peculiar allusion to the particular Judgement, i.e. to the specific destiny of individual souls in the intermediary period preceding the End of time.²⁹

The Pisan Saint Michael can therefore be approached as an efficacious devotional instrument, whose iconic composition imbued with eschatological imagery permitted to combine the performance of prayer and ritual acts with a deeper meditation on the perspective of eternal life. Yet, this implies a cultic context where worship for the archangel Michael was so rooted to encourage its representation in an autonomous and original way. Unfortunately our knowledge about the original setting of the icon is still unclear. The work is first mentioned in the 19th century as pertaining to the boys' orphanage in Pisa and as a gift of the Cathedral Chapter — which makes plausible its provenance from the Duomo. In the second half of the 15th century a local historian testifies to the fact that an icon of Saint Michael hanged from one of the columns in the presbytery, on the north side, more or less in the same setting as that reserved for another icon, the above-mentioned *Madonna di sotto gli organi*. As with the latter, which was said to have been looted from a castle in the territory of Lucca, even this other icon had been transferred by the Pisans from the Lucchese monastery of Guamo as a war trophy obtained during an expedition in the neighbourhoods of the rival town in 1313. An epigraph nearby stated that it was meant to serve as eternal witness to the Lucchese rashness and stupidity. By so doing, the Pisans happened to imitate the Byzantine practice of appropriating other people's revered images and exhibiting them, as symbols of victory and political prominence, on the columns and walls of the church space.³⁰

The identification of the looted panel with the small icon of Saint Michael would especially make sense if one considers its alleged provenance from Guamo. The latter Monastery, located to the south of Lucca, pertained to the Benedictine congregation of the “Pulsanesi”, which were largely established in both Pisa and Lucca since the 12th century and are known not only to have embellished their churches with Byzantine-looking artworks (such as the beautiful sculptures on the façade of San Michele degli Scalzi in Pisa, dating from 1203), but also to have made use of icons in their devotional and meditational practices.³¹ Their special worship for Saint Michael, which is witnessed, *inter alia*, by the dedication of their church in Pisa, was an obvious outcome of their connections with Apulia and the area of Gargano, where their founder Giovanni da Matera had established their first hermitage of Santa Maria di Pulsano in the very spot indicated to him by Saint Michael himself, in the vicinity of the archangel's most famous shrine in Southern Italy,

8. Icon of the Archangel Michael, late 13th century. Pisa, Museo nazionale di San Matteo. (Photo: author's archive)

9. Icon of the Virgin and Child, late 14th century. Colignola (Pisa), Church of Santi Jacopo e Cristoforo. (Photo: author's archive)

10. The Virgin Gorgoepikoos, bilateral icon, ca 1360. Rhodes, Archaeological Museum. (Photo: courtesy of the 4th Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities, Rhodes)

11. The Virgin Gorgoepikoos, bilateral icon, late 14th century. Kos, Metropolis. (Photo: courtesy of the 4th Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities, Rhodes)

10



11





12. Triptych with the Virgin Mary, the Akra Tapeinosis, prophets and saints, late 14th century. Venice, Museo Correr. (Photo: courtesy of the Fondazione Musei civici di Venezia)

the cave of Monte Sant'Angelo.³² Since the 9th century this latter site had housed an iconic image that had played the role of visual marker manifesting the holiness attributed to the place. Some scholars have proposed that it may have served as prototype for self-contained representations of the archangel in Western art, where he is shown fighting a dragon with a cross-topped lance and holding a clypeus in his right hand.³³ A peculiar variant worked out in Monte Sant'Angelo itself and known from two late 11th- or 12th-century reliefs preserved in the cave church combines the type of the demon-slayer with the balance of psychostasia as a prominent attribute.³⁴ It is worth wondering whether such very peculiar images may have worked as sources of inspiration for the author of the Pisan icon — possibly a Greek artist willing to suit, in his own way, the devotional needs of an Italian donor connected with the Pulsanesi and their special, site-bound worship for the Archangel Michael.

Another, later Palaiologan icon (48×38 cm) is preserved in the church of Santi Jacopo e Cristoforo in the small village of Colignola, in the neighbourhoods of Pisa (fig. 9). Presently worshipped as a miraculous image, it was originally connected to

the private devotion of the local family Dell'Hoste, which in the 18th century is known to have housed it in a small oratory. It displays the Virgin Mary holding the Child on her left arm with her right one touching Jesus' left leg. She wears a deep red tunic covered by a dark-blue maphorion, open on the chest and decorated with golden-striped hems, three foliate stars, and many pendentives falling from her left shoulder. Her head, encircled by a voluminous red *palla*, is bending towards Christ's figure and her dignified face is given a melancholic appearance, with almond-shaped eyes, thin eyebrows, small red lips, and sharp nose. The Child is shown in a diminutive scale, in a three-quarter view, with strongly elongated forehead, brownish curly hair, snub nose, and fleshy cheeks. He wears an orange himation over a white tunic ornamented with golden fleur-de-lis motifs and covered with dark-blue straps ending in a girdle of the same colour and embroidered with golden chrysography. His left hand has now vanished, yet one can assume that it was originally laying on the Virgin's hand or that it held a *rotulus*. His right hand is represented in the gesture of blessing with three fingers. Faces, hands, and feet are modelled on a brownish *proplasmos* (shaping the chiaro-scuroed zones) with extremely thin and concentric white brushstrokes, which manage to strongly highlight the prominent parts of the body. The folds prove to be strongly

marked and angular, ending in dynamically rendered edges, as is especially evident with the rendering of the maphorion hems encircling the Virgin's face.³⁵

On compositional and stylistic grounds, the work is best paralleled by a group of Palaiologan icons from the second half of the 14th and the early 15th century. The type, being characterized by such details as Mary's maphorion opening on the chest, Jesus' garments modelled on the *Anaperson* scheme, and his hand grasping the Virgin's hand, corresponds quite literally to that shown by a bilateral icon with the Virgin Gorgoepikoos (fig. 10) and Saint Luke in the Archaeological Museum in Rhodes (ca 1360)³⁶ and later repeated in another bilateral icon in the Metropolis of Kos (fig. 11)³⁷ and in a triptych in the Museo Correr in Venice, both dating from the late 14th century (fig. 12).³⁸ The Pisan work does not share the classicizing monumentality and the use of primary colours which are so prominent in the Rhodian work. The modelling technique with thin and concentric brushstrokes, the facial features (as is especially revealed by the rendering of the thin nose with three-partite end), and the sombre chromatic palette, make the work much more in keeping with the icon in Kos, even if both Mary's and her Son's heads

are represented in a more elongated way. The same solution is precisely repeated in the Venice triptych, although rendered in a more distinctly linear way.

The latter image has been interpreted as painted by a Greek painter working for a Latin donor in either Venice itself or the Venetian-ruled territories in the Aegean and the Levant. The strict connections with the image in Colignola make possible that it was brought to Pisa from Venice, rather than directly from the Eastern Mediterranean, even if this cannot be completely ruled out. Much more important is, however, that all of the above-mentioned paintings bear witness to the fact that icons continued to be appreciated as objects of individual and collective devotion not only in the territories of the Serenissima, but also in Pisa and the rest of Tuscany, well after that change of taste which has long been thought by art historians to have been incompatible with Byzantine art. Such an uninterrupted belief in the religious efficaciousness of icons probably paved the way to the developments that took place from the 15th century onwards, when a great deal of Post-Byzantine icons, deemed to be of utmost ancientness and venerable origins, became the protagonists of innumerable cultic phenomena throughout the Italian peninsula.

NOTES

1. Cf. **M. Bernabò**, *Ossessioni bizantine e cultura artistica in Italia: tra D'Annunzio, fascismo e dopoguerra*, Neaples 2003.

2. **M. Bacci**, Pisa e l'icona, in M. Burrelli – A. Caleca (eds), *Cimabue a Pisa*, Exhibition catalogue (Pisa, Museo nazionale di San Matteo, 25 marzo–25 giugno 2005), Pisa 2005 [hereinafter cited as *Cimabue a Pisa*], pp. 58–64; **id.**, Pisa bizantina. Alle origini del culto delle icone in Toscana [hereinafter cited as *Pisa bizantina*], in A. R. Calderoni Masetti – C. Dufour Bozzo – G. Wolf (eds), *Intorno al Sacro Volto. Genova, Bisanzio e il Mediterraneo (secoli XI–XIV)*, Venice 2007, pp. 63–78.

3. As witnessed in the mid–13th century by the *Life* of Blessed Gherardesca: cf. **Bacci**, *Pisa bizantina*, pp. 74–75.

4. On the use of icons as figurative furnishings in Latin-rite churches of the Holy Land see **J. Folda**, Icon to Altarpiece in the Frankish East: Images of the Virgin and Child Enthroned, in V. M. Schmidt (ed.), *Italian Panel Paintings of the Duecento and Trecento*, Washington, D.C. 2002, pp. 122–145; **M. Bacci**, El mobiliario de altar en la época románica, in M. Castiñeiras – J. Camps (eds), *El Románico y el Mediterráneo. Cataluña, Toulouse y Pisa. 1120–1180*, Exhibition catalogue (Barcelona, Museu Nacional d'Art de Catalunya, 29 February–18 May 2008), Barcelona 2008, pp. 195–205, esp. 203. On the much debated issue of Crusader icon-painting see **Γ. and M. Σωτηρίου**, *Εικόνες της Μονής Σινά*, Athens 1958; **K. Weitzmann**, Thirteenth-century Crusader icons at Mount Sinai, *ArtB* 45 (1963), pp. 179–203; **id.**, Icon painting in the Crusader Kingdom, *DOP* 20 (1966), pp. 49–83; **R. Cormack – S. Michalarias**, A Crusader painting of Saint George: “Maniera Greca” or “Lingua Franca”?, *BurlMag* 126 (1984), pp. 132–141; **D. Mouriki**, Thirteenth-century icon painting in Cyprus, *The Griffon* 1–2 (1985–1986), pp. 9–112; **ead.**, Εικόνες από τον 12ο έως τον 15ο αιώνα, in **K. A. Μανώλης** (ed.), *Σινά. Θεσσαυροί της Ιεράς Μονής της Αγίας Αικατερίνης*, Athens 1990, pp. 101–125; **V. Pace**, L'analisi “stilistica” come metodologia storica: possibilità e limiti. Con particolare riferimento alle icone crociate, in X. Barral i Altet (ed.), *Artistes, artisans et production artistique au Moyen Age*, Paris 1986–1990, vol. III, pp. 513–520; **L.-A. Hunt**, A woman's prayer to Saint Sergios in Latin Syria: Interpreting a thirteenth-century icon at Mount Sinai, *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 15 (1991), pp. 96–145; **J. Folda**, The Saint Marina icon: *Maniera Cyprica*, *Lingua Franca*, or Crusader Art?, in P. Davezac (ed.), *Four Icons in the Menil Collection*, Houston 1992, pp. 106–133; **id.**, *The Art of the*

Crusaders in the Holy Land 1098–1187, Cambridge 1995; **id.**, The figural arts in Crusader Syria and Palestine, 1187–1291: Some new realities, *DOP* 58 (2004), pp. 315–331; **id.**, *Crusader Art in the Holy Land, from the First Crusade to the Fall of Acre, 1187–1291*, Cambridge (Mass.) 2005; **D. Jacoby**, Society, culture, and the arts in Crusader Acre, in D. Weiss – L. Mahoney (eds), *France and the Holy Land: Frankish Culture at the End of the Crusades*, Baltimore 2004, pp. 97–137; **Τ. Παπαμαστοράκης**, Οι «σταυροφορικές» εικόνες της έκθεσης, in A. Drandaki (ed.), *Προσκήνιο στο Σινά. Θεσσαυροί από την Ιερά Μονή της Αγίας Αικατερίνης*, Exhibition catalogue (Athens, Benaki Museum, 20 July–26 September 2004), Athens 2004, pp. 46–63; **M. Immerzeel**, Icon painting in the County of Tripoli of the thirteenth century, in C. Hourihane (ed.), *Interactions. Artistic Interchange between the Eastern and Western Worlds in the Medieval Period*, Princeton 2007, pp. 67–83.

5. On the art-historical implications of the mutual connections between Tuscany (and Italy in general), the Byzantine Empire and the Crusader territories see, from different perspectives, **J. H. Stubblebine**, Byzantine influence in thirteenth-century Italian panel painting, *DOP* 20 (1966), pp. 85–102; **O. Demus**, *Byzantine Art and the West*, New York 1970; **K. Weitzmann**, Crusader icons and the Maniera Greca, in I. Hutter – H. Hunger (eds), *Byzanz und der Westen. Studien zur Kunst der europäischen Mittelalters*, Vienna 1984, pp. 143–170; **H. Belting**, The “Byzantine” Madonnas: New facts about their Italian origin and some observations on Duccio, *Studies in the History of Art* 12 (1982), pp. 7–22; **id.**, Die Reaktion der Kunst des 13. Jahrhunderts auf den Import von Reliquien und Ikonen, *Il Medio Oriente e l'Occidente nell'arte del XIII secolo. Proceedings of the 14th International Congress of the History of Art (Bologna, 1979)*, Bologna 1982, vol. II, pp. 35–53; **V. Pace**, Presenze e influenze cipriote nella pittura duecentesca italiana, *CorsiRav XXXII, 23/30 marzo 1985*, Ravenna 1985, pp. 259–298; **id.**, Fra la maniera greca e la lingua franca. Su alcuni aspetti delle relazioni fra la pittura umbro-toscana, la miniatura della Cilicia e le icone di Cipro e della Terrasanta, in *Il classicismo. Medioevo Rinascimento Barocco. Atti del colloquio Cesare Gnudi*, Bologna 1993, pp. 71–81; **id.**, Modelli da Oriente nella pittura duecentesca su tavola in Italia centrale, *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 44 (2000), pp. 19–43; **A. Derbes**, Siena and the Levant in the Later Dugento, *Gesta* 28 (1989), pp. 190–204; **A. Derbes – A. Neff**, Italy, the Mendicant Orders, and the Byzantine Sphere, in H. C. Evans (ed.), *Byzantium. Faith and Power (1261–1557)*, Exhibition catalogue (New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 23 March–4 July 2004),

- New York 2004, pp. 449–461; **I. Furlan**, Venezia, Costantinopoli, Palestina. Aspetti e circolazione della pittura “crociata”, *Saggi e memorie di storia dell’arte* 28 (2004), pp. 15–32; **A.-L. Imbert**, Byzance dans la peinture siennoise: tradition et ruptures, *Revue de l’art*, 158, pp. 53–61; **R. W. Corrie**, Sinai, Acre, Tripoli, and the “Backwash from the Levant”: Where did icon painters work?, in Sh. E. J. Gerstel – R. S. Nelson (eds), *Approaching the Holy Mountain: Art and Liturgy at St Catherine’s Monastery in the Sinai*, Turnhout 2010, pp. 415–448; **M. Bacci**, Toscana, Byzance et Levant: pour une histoire dynamique des rapports artistiques au XII^e et XIII^e siècles, in J.-P. Caillet – F. Joubert (eds), *Orient et Occident méditerranéens au XIII^e siècle. Les programmes picturaux*, Paris 2012, pp. 235–256.
6. See **M. Bacci**, Due tavole della Vergine nella Toscana occidentale del primo Duecento, *AnnPisa*, 4th ser., 2 (1997), pp. 1–59; **id.**, Pisa bizantina, p. 72; **Pace**, Modelli da Oriente..., *art.cit.* (n. 5), pp. 19–23. Cf. also **A. Μητσάνη**, Εικόνα της Παναγίας δεομένης στην Καταπολιανή Πάρου, *ΔΧΑΕ* 23 (2002), pp. 177–197, esp. 190–191, and **N. Χατζηδάκη**, Ο χαρακτήρας της ζωγραφικής εικόνων από Λατινοκρατούμενες περιοχές της ηπειρωτικής Ελλάδας και των νησιών, in P. L. Vokotopoulos (ed.), *Η βυζαντινή τέχνη μετά την τετάρτη σταυροφορία. Η τετάρτη σταυροφορία και οι επιπτώσεις της, Proceedings of a Congress (Athens, 9–12 March 2004)*, Athens 2007, pp. 113–132, esp. 114, who both warn against the tendency to overemphasize connections with Cypriot icons, given that still so little is known about icon-painting in Latin-ruled territories in mainland Greece and the Aegean.
7. **L. Carletti**, entry no. 54, in *Cimabue a Pisa*, p. 197 (with earlier bibliography).
8. **M. Bacci**, entry no. 70, in M. Vassilaki (ed.), *Mother of God. Representations of the Virgin in Byzantine Art*, Exhibition catalogue (Athens, Benaki Museum, 20 October 2000–20 January 2001), Athens 2000, pp. 442–443; **L. Carletti**, entry no. 53, in *Cimabue a Pisa*, p. 196.
9. **E. B. Garrison**, *Italian Romanesque Panel Painting. An Illustrated Index*, Florence 1949 [hereinafter cited as **Garrison, Index**], no. 646.
10. **L. Bertolini Campetti**, entry no. 4, in *Mostra del restauro Pisa 1972*, Exhibition catalogue (Pisa, National Museum of San Matteo, 26 September–5 November 1972), Pisa 1972, pp. 36–41; **E. Carli**, *La pittura a Pisa dalle origini alla “bella maniera”*, Pisa 1994; **L. Carletti**, entry no. 57, in *Cimabue a Pisa*, p. 204.
11. **E. N. Τσιγαρίδας**, Φορητές εικόνες στη Μακεδονία και το Άγιον Όρος κατά τον 13ο αιώνα, *ΔΧΑΕ* 21 (2000) [hereinafter cited as **Τσιγαρίδας**, Φορητές εικόνες], pp. 123–156, esp. 137 no. 46; **E. Tsigaridas – K. Loverdou-Tsigarida**, *Holy Great Monastery of Vatopaidi. Byzantine Icons and Revetments*, Mount Athos 2007, pp. 83–86.
12. **Τσιγαρίδας**, Φορητές εικόνες, pp. 138–141; **Tsigaridas – Loverdou-Tsigarida**, *op.cit.*, pp. 95–103.
13. See, for example, the analogous rendering in the early 14th-century icon of the Virgin “Peribleptos” in the Icon Gallery in Ohrid: **M. Georgievski**, *Icon Gallery – Ohrid*, Ohrid 1999, pp. 48–49.
14. **M. Acheimastou-Potamianou**, *Icons of the Byzantine Museum in Athens*, Athens 1998, pp. 32–33.
15. **Belting**, The “Byzantine” Madonnas..., *art.cit.* (n. 5), *passim*.
16. See especially **J. Folda**, The Kahn and Mellon Madonnas: Icon or altarpiece?, in C. Moss – K. Kiefer (eds), *Byzantine East, Latin West. Art-Historical Studies in Honor of Kurt Weitzmann*, Princeton 1995, pp. 501–506; **id.**, Icon to Altarpiece..., *art.cit.* (n. 4); **J. Polzer**, Some Byzantine and Byzantinizing Madonnas painted during the later Middle Ages, *Arte Cristiana* 87 (1999), pp. 83–90 and 167–182; **id.**, The “Byzantine” Kahn and Mellon Madonnas: Concerning their chronology, place of origin, and method of analysis, *Arte cristiana* 90 (2002), pp. 401–410; **R. W. Corrie**, The Kahn and Mellon Madonnas and their place in the history of the Virgin and Child Enthroned in Italy and the East, in M. Vassilaki (ed.), *Images of the Mother of God. Perceptions of the Theotokos in Byzantium*, Aldershot 2005, pp. 321–336.
17. Cf. the discussion by **L. Bellosi**, in A. Bagnoli – R. Bartalini – L. Bellosi – M. Laclotte (eds), *Duccio. Siena fra tradizione bizantina e mondo gotico*, Siena 2003, pp. 142–145, who tends anyway to emphasize Duccio’s quest for naturalism as opposed to what he simplistically labels as “Byzantine abstractism”.
18. The image has been sporadically mentioned in art-historical literature: cf. **Garrison, Index**, no. 126; **M. Bonfioli**, in *Mostra di opere d’arte delle provincie di Siena e Grosseto*, Genoa 1979, pp. 104–105; **H. van Os**, *Siensese Altarpieces 1212–1460*, Groningen 1984, vol. I, pp. 37–38; **J. Cannon**, Pietro Lorenzetti and the history of the Carmelite Order, *JWarb* 50 (1987), pp. 18–28, esp. 20; **H. Belting**, *Bild und Kult. Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst*, Munich 1990, p. 381.
19. See **M. Bacci**, *Il pennello dell’Evangelista. Storia delle immagini sacre attribuite a san Luca*, Pisa 1998.
20. Siena, State Archives, *Sante Visite*, 21, fols 687v–691v.
21. See especially the many studies by **A. Jotischki**, *The Perfection of Solitude. Hermits and Monks in the Crusader States*, University Park 1995; **id.**, Greek Orthodox and Latin monasticism around Mar Saba under Crusader Rule, in J. Patrich (ed.), *The Sabaitic Heritage in the Orthodox Church from the Fifth Century to the Present*, Leuven 2001, pp. 85–96; **id.**, *The Carmelites and Antiquity. Mendicants and their Past in the Middle Ages*, Oxford 2002.
22. **V. Hoppenbrouwers**, *Devotio mariana in Ordine fratrum B. M. V. de Monte Carmelo*, Rome 1960; **E. Boaga**, *La signora del luogo. Maria nella storia e nella vita del Carmelo*, Rome 2001.
23. **Cannon**, Pietro Lorenzetti..., *art.cit.* (n. 18); **C. Gilbert**, Some special images for Carmelites, circa 1330–1340, in T. Verdon – J. Henderson (eds), *Christianity and the Renaissance. Image and Religious Imagination in the Quattrocento*, New York 1990, pp. 161–207; **E. Boaga**, S. Maria dei Carmelitani. Note di iconografia, in *Confraternite, chiesa e società. Aspetti e problemi dell’associazionismo laicale europeo in età moderna e contemporanea* (a cura di L. Bertoldi Lenoci), Fasano 1994, pp. 655–716, esp. 656–658.
24. This cult-object is first witnessed in the early 16th century by the Sienese historian Sigismondo Tizio, *Historiae Senenses* (Siena, Biblioteca comunale degli Intronati, Ms. B.III.6, vol. I, fol. 478), and later again by Cardinal Bossi (Siena, State Archives, *Sante Visite*, 21, fols 687r–692v). Cf. also **G. Bassi**, *Origine della solenne processione solita farsi ogni anno per la città di Siena nella domenica in Albis e notizie delle sacre immagini e reliquie che in tale occasione sono portate processionalmente fino al presente anno 1806*, Siena 1806, p. 33.
25. **Bassi**, *Origine...*, *op.cit.*, pp. 25, 33.
26. **A. Grabar**, *Les revêtements en or et en argent des icônes byzantines du Moyen Age*, Venice 1975, pp. 11, 37 and 44.
27. **E. N. Τσιγαρίδας**, entry no. 2.9, in A. A. Karakatsanis (ed.), *Θησαυροί του Αγίου Όρους*, Exhibition catalogue (Thessaloniki, Museum of Byzantine Culture, 1 June–31 December 1997), Thessaloniki 1997, pp. 66–67 (with earlier bibliography); **id.**, Φορητές εικόνες, pp. 134–135.
28. See **Annemarie Weyl Carr**’s discussion of earlier bibliography in her entry no. 299, in H. C. Evans (ed.), *Byzantium*, *op.cit.* (n. 5), pp. 496–497. Cf. also **Bacci**, Pisa bizantina, pp. 72–74.
29. **M. Angheben**, Les Jugements derniers byzantins des XI^e–XII^e siècles et l’iconographie du Jugement immédiat, *CahArch* 50 (2002), pp. 105–134 (esp. pp. 127–129).
30. **A. Mancini**, Il “San Michele dei Lucchesi”, *Rivista d’arte* 11 (1929), pp. 373–377.
31. **A. R. Calderoni Masetti**, La committenza pulsanese in Toscana nei secoli XII e XIII: primi risultati di un’indagine, *Storia dell’arte* 44 (1982), pp. 45–56; **Bacci**, Pisa bizantina, pp. 66–69. On the historical connections of the Pulfanesi with Tuscany cf. **F. Panarelli**, *Dal Gargano alla Toscana: il monachesimo riformato latino dei Pulfanesi (secc. XII–XIV)*, Rome 1997.
32. **F. Panarelli**, San Giovanni da Matera e le origini della Congregazione Pulfanese, *Archivio storico per la Calabria e la Lucania* 57 (1990), pp. 5–105.
33. **G. Bertelli**, L’immagine dell’arcangelo Michele nel santuario di Monte Sant’Angelo. Ricerche sul tipo iconografico di un tipo garganico, *Puglia paleocristiana* 5 (1990), pp. 189–219; **A. Schiller**, *Der Erzengel Michael im frühen Mittelalter. Ikonographie und Verehrung eines Heiligen ohne Vita*, Bern 2006, pp. 113–118.
34. For the two reliefs see **G. Bertelli**, entries nos 16 and 17, in P. Belli D’Elia (ed.), *L’Angelo la Montagna il Pellegrino. Monte Sant’Angelo e il santuario di San Michele del Gargano*, Exhibition catalogue (Monte Sant’Angelo, Museo “G. Tancredi”, 25 September–5 November 1999), Foggia 1999, pp. 80–81 and 82.
35. Preliminary discussion of this almost unknown work by **L. Carletti – C. Giometti – M. Bacci**, entry no. 97, in *Cimabue a Pisa*, p. 268.
36. **M. Acheimastou-Potamianou**, entry no. 82, in *Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art*, Exhibition catalogue (Athens, Old University, 26 July 1985–6 January 1986), Athens 1985, pp. 79–82.
37. **M. Acheimastou-Potamianou**, entry no. 89, in *Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art (op.cit.)*, p. 88; **Θ. Αρχοντόπουλος – Α. Κατσιώτη**, Η ζωγραφική στη μεσαιωνική πόλη της Ρόδου από τον 11ο αιώνα μέχρι την κατάληψη της από τον Τούρκο (1522): Μια εκτίμηση των δεδομένων, in *15 χρόνια έργων αποκατάστασης στη Μεσαιωνική Πόλη της Ρόδου*, Athens 2007, pp. 454–466 (esp. 463).
38. **Garrison, Index**, no. 334; **G. Mariacher**, *Il Museo Correr di Venezia. Dipinti dal XIV al XVI secolo*, Venice 1957, pp. 138–139; **H. Papastavrou**, Influences byzantines sur la peinture de chevalet à Venise au XIV^e siècle, in T. Velmans (ed.), *Autour de l’icône. Origine, évolution et rayonnement de l’icône du VI^e au XIX^e siècle*, Paris 2006 (*Cahiers balkaniques* 34), pp. 37–52, esp. 45.