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ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ ΚΑΠΟΝ
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. 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. 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
textiles, probably looking like the Byzantine podesai. 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.

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 Mediterraneanean 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 pre-giottoesque art in Italy as something thoroughly alien to its constitutive classicism; yet, the wide web of Pisa’s Mediterraneanean 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. 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. On their turn, the stylistic and compositional features of the “maniera greca” icons can partly contribute to our understanding of their material models: inasmuch much 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 Giovanniino de’ Frieri (now in the National Museum of San Matteo in Pisa) and the Virgin Mary from the Church of Santi Cosma e Damiano (fig. 1), 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 desired 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. 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 aristokratousa 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).

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
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. 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 Demetrios, also in Vatopaidi monastery). 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*. 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.

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. 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, the stylistic connections between the Washington image and Duccio's earliest works, including especially the Grevole Madonna, 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
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 lavra, and their strong worship for the Virgin Mary. 

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. 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. 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.

Notwithstanding the devotional success of the *Madonna dei...
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. 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 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.
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 (ARCHANGELUS MICHAEL) reported in Gothic majuscule script 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. The 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.

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). 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 Sopočani (ca. 1265). 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 Sienese 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 (ARCHANGELUS MICHAEL) reported in Gothic majuscule script 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. 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.
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 vicinity of the archangel’s most famous shrine in Southern Italy,
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 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-lys 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 *prophasis* (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 mahorpion hems encircling the Virgin’s face.  

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 mahorpion opening on the chest, Jesus’ garments modelled on the Anaphes scheme, and his hand grasping the Virgin’s hand, corresponds quite literally to that shown by a bilateral icon with the Virgin Gorgoeptiko (fig. 10) and Saint Luke in the Archaeological Museum in Rhodes (ca 1360) and later repeated in another bilateral icon in the Metropolis of Kos (fig. 11) and in a triptych in the Museo Correr in Venice, both dating from the late 14th century (fig. 12). 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 rendered 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 13th century onwards, when a great deal of Post-Byzantine icons, deemed to be of utmost ancien- nesses and venerable origins, became the protagonists of in- numerable cultic phenomena throughout the Italian peninsula.

NOTES


7. L. Carletti, entry no. 54, in Cambuse a Pisa, p. 197 (with earlier bibliography).


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.


