

LACHLAN TURNBULL

The Man of Sorrows and the King of Glory in Italy, c. 1250-c. 1350

ABSTRACT

The Man of Sorrows – an iconographic type of Jesus Christ following his Crucifixion – has received extensive analytical treatment in the art-historical literature. Following a model that draws scholarly attention to the dynamics of cross-cultural artistic exchange in the central Middle Ages, this article reconsiders recent advances in the scholarly literature and refocusses analysis upon the Man of Sorrows within the context of its ‘shared’ intercultural heritage, suspended between Byzantium and the West, as an image ultimately transformed from liturgical icon to iconographic device.

Introduction

The image of Jesus’ Crucifixion was originally believed to be either so scandalous, or considered so absurd, that the iconographic means by which to depict it constituted an almost reluctantly-developed theme in Christian art.¹ Recent research indicates that Christian Crucifixion iconography emerged in the fourth century and emphasised the salvific – which is to imply, triumphal – aspect of Jesus’ death.² ‘The Passion’, commencing with the betrayal of Jesus by his disciple Judas Iscariot, culminating in Jesus’ redemptive sacrifice by his Crucifixion and ending with his Resurrection, is a critical narrative in Christian faith.³ The reality of the Crucifixion, including the penetration of Jesus’ side and the issuing of blood and water,⁴ are pivotal mystic concepts linked to the key Christian doctrines of transubstantiation and sacrificial resurrection, and thus to the efficacy of the Eucharistic Mystery and Christian communion.⁵ The twinned natures of Jesus, his humanity and divinity, underpin the salvific significance of his death, and the image of his crucified body reinforces the memory of, identification with, and sympathy for Jesus whilst reinforcing the message of his ultimate return.

The period from c. 1250 to c. 1350 is but a brief one in the long history of the image of the sorrowful, agonised and dead Christ, the image-type herein called the ‘Man of Sorrows’. The Man of Sorrows is taken to be the figure of Christ, clearly marked by the wounds of the Passion, subsequent to the events of his Crucifixion and Death on the Cross. The image is grounded in the Passion narrative, but refers to no

I thank the editors and the anonymous reviewer for their kind collective wisdom which has saved me from many infelicities. All errors and omissions that remain are my own. I would also like to thank Dr Felicity Harley-McGowan, of the Art History discipline at the University of Melbourne, for reading and commenting on a version of this paper. This paper is based upon a part of the author’s minor thesis submitted in 2008 toward the BA (Hons) at the University of Melbourne, supervised by Dr Harley-McGowan.

¹ An insightful and accurate summary can be found in Jensen, 2000, pp. 133-37.

² See here Harley, 2007, pp. 227-32; and most recently Harley, 2009, esp. pp. 321-25.

³ The relevant Gospel citations for this definition of the Passion narrative are Matthew 26:1-27:61; Mark 14:1-15:47; Luke 22:1-23:56; John 11:45-19:42. It is also possible to include the earlier events of Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem.

⁴ John 19:34.

⁵ A large body of analytic and interpretative literature surrounds medieval thought on the Eucharist. Representative scholarship includes Burr, 1984; Rubin, 1991; Bynum, 2007.

particularepisode in it: thus, it is more like a portrait icon than a narrative scene.⁶ The name by which the Western image is commonly known comes not from the New Testament, but rather from the Old Testament book of *Isaiah*, and a particular subsection of that book known as the Song of the Suffering Servant, or the fourth Servant Song (*Isaiah* 52:13-53:12):

He was despised and rejected by men, a man of sorrows, and familiar with suffering. Like one from whom men hide their faces he was despised, and we esteemed him not (*Isaiah* 53:3).⁷

The theological and moral implications of an image that claims to depict the body of a 'dead god' are complicated.⁸ 'Suspending' one's knowledge of Christ's divinity is not enough to render the image comprehensible when the basic content of the image appears to be an epistemic fallacy. In order to convey varying understandings of the significance of Christ's death, the image of the dead Christ has accrued both a variety of titles and iconographic types with differing theological connotations. The two most common are the Byzantine Greek *basileus tes doxes*, rendered in English as 'King of Glory' or 'Lord of (Right) Faith', and the Latin *imago pietatis*, or 'Image of Pity'. Hans Belting writes that the King of Glory was 'integrated into the Byzantine liturgy' and thus 'possessed an ontological reference' to both Christ's divine and human natures.⁹ Consequently, to borrow Sixten Ringbom's expression, such an image was 'by its very form and its origin a panegyric, a glorification of its prototype'; moreover,

⁶ And yet, as Belting notes, 'it is neither a pure portrait icon, lacking any element of action, nor a scenic icon, in which the action is dominant': Belting, 1990, p. 91 (originally published in German as *Das Bild und sein Publikum im Mittelalter*, Berlin: Mann, 1981; citations in this paper are from the English translation, *The Image and its Public in the Middle Ages*, by Mark Batusis and Raymond Meyer). See also Belting, 1980-1981, p. 4. Importantly, the figure of Christ as the Man of Sorrows need not be attended by any iconographic accoutrements or indicators beyond the wounds of the Passion: Schiller, 1972, II, pp. 197 ff.

⁷ 'Man of Sorrows' is the English rendering of *vir doloris* from the Latin Vulgate. On the consistency of Christian reference to parts of the Old Testament that are read as prefiguring the life and death of Christ see O'Kane, 2005 and particularly Markschie, 2004, pp. 245-68 on Justin Martyr's use of *Isaiah* 53 in the *First Apology* and the *Dialogue with Trypho*, both of which date from the mid-first century. Quotation from the Song of the Suffering Servant assisted in making conceptually licit the actual humiliation and death of God as Man: Markschie, 2004, pp. 250-51. The four 'Songs' have been subject to thoroughgoing analysis of their relationship to post-Exilic Judaism: Hyatt, 1944, pp. 79-86. A recent and helpful summary of the scholarship on the fourth Servant Song (*Isaiah* 52:13-53:12) can be found in Walton, 2003, pp. 734-35. More recently, on personhood and the complexity of corporate and individual identity in the fourth Song, see Wilks, 2005, pp. 207-9. However, attempting to connect explicitly the text of *Isaiah* 53 to later developments in the iconography of Christ's suffering is problematic, as the notion of 'a suffering king or messiah' is absent in Israelite theology: Walton, 2003. The notion of the 'sacrificial' king, however, clearly was a part of Israelite theology: see Walton, 2003, p. 734, esp. pp. 738-40. Walton convincingly presents the fourth Song as reflecting the adaptation of the ancient practice of installing a substitute (and thus sacrificial) king, upon whom evil omens would be cast, in order to 'exhaust' divine anger when the true king was considered to be in danger. That said, the appeal of using the Song to illustrate the textual crucible of early manifestations of the Man of Sorrows in Italy is clear: the exercise indicates the relationship between Jewish Septuagint exegesis and its Christian cousin, and casts light upon the text from which the common Western name of the type arises.

⁸ The Eucharistic significance of Christ's body – made most clear in allusions to the blood and water issuing from Christ's side – had long been a part of Christian imagery: see, e.g., Kartsonis, 1986. The iconography of the Greek hero (*heros*) Orpheus furnishes a Classical antecedent for a semi-divine figure portrayed in death: Charles Murray, 1981, pp. 37-63, esp. pp. 46-49, 55. So too does the iconography of Actaeon: Weitzmann, 1961, pp. 487-90.

⁹ Belting, 1990, p. 44.

‘this image partook of the existence of the Deity itself.’¹⁰ Hence, an epithet such as the King of Glory does not seem so ironic despite the overt pathos of the image: it is, in fact, a citation of Christ’s death as his glory.¹¹ The early King of Glory image is, despite its later accretions and transformations, manifestly that of a liturgical icon for the Passion rituals of Holy Week: a citation of Christ’s human nature and a stilled graphic mnemonic of his actual bodily death on the cross. The Image of Pity, the Latin type, is – as we shall see – bound up with the story of the miraculous Mass of St. Gregory.¹²

This paper argues that the Western Man of Sorrows, and its Eastern counterpart and antecedent, the King of Glory shared a significant conceptual identity. The King of Glory is one of two principal Byzantine image-types that depict the dead Christ, the other being the *Amnos Aer*.¹³ The *Amnos Aer* image, which displays the dead Christ laid out for burial, appears on the *epitaphios* cloth, a liturgical cloth used in the ‘Great Entrance’, the offertory procession of the Byzantine rite.¹⁴ The *epitaphios*, with its image of the dead Christ, survives in twelfth- and thirteenth-century works that have either liturgical ‘overtones’ or a clear liturgical function, such as the example preserved in the Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, Belgrade ([Fig. 1](#)).¹⁵ The King of Glory, by contrast, depicts Christ crucified,¹⁶ and in the East, was often depicted in side chapels coordinating the image with broader iconographic programmes, including Christ *Pantokrator* (Greek for ‘all-powerful’, or less literally, ‘Sustainer of the World’).¹⁷ In what follows, I will chart the complex transformation of the King of Glory/Man of Sorrows image-type during the crucial period of its early reception and reinterpretation in the Italian peninsula. Because of the variety and

¹⁰ Ringbom, 1983, p. 40.

¹¹ See John 13:31 in which Christ prepares the disciples for his death: ‘When he [Judas Iscariot] was gone, Jesus said, “Now is the Son of Man glorified and God is glorified in him”’. See also Philippians 2:8: ‘[Christ] humbled himself and became obedient to death – even death on a cross!’ Larsson, 2008 provides a brief summary of scholarship on the theology of John. Some of the surviving Byzantine/Greek images that take this name (‘King of Glory’) predate Italian Man of Sorrows-images: e.g., the Kastoria painted icon is of the twelfth century ([Fig. 4](#)), on which see Francis, 2004 *passim*; see also the opening comments of Hetherington, 1990.

¹² The Mass of St. Gregory is discussed briefly below.

¹³ On the *Amnos Aer*, see Johnstone, 1967, pp. 25-26, 36-40, 52-53; Taft, 1975, pp. 216-19; Belting, 1980-1981, pp. 3-4; and more recently, Woodfin, 2004, pp. 295-98, esp. pp. 296-97.

¹⁴ *Epitaphios* derives from the Greek *epitáphion*, literally ‘upon the tomb’, which indicates the cloth’s liturgical use and placement, as well as its appearance: Taft, 1975 *passim*, esp. 210, 216; Woodfin, 2004, p. 296. Belting notes that the similarity of the *Amnos Aer* Christ to the Christ of the Lamentation is ‘superficial’: Belting, 1980-1981, p. 3.

¹⁵ This is demonstrated most clearly by Belting, 1980-1981, pp. 12-15. On Belting’s argument that earlier (i.e., twelfth century) documents ‘testify to the existence of the veil image’, see Taft, 1975, p. 216 (‘Around the 14th century the embroidered aer appears’) and Johnstone, 1967, pp. 10-11 (who describes the difficulty in attempting to trace the earliest history of liturgical vestments). The interpretation of the ‘Eucharistic overtones’ (Belting, 1980-1981, p. 13) of the text on a twelfth-century enamel that displays an *epitaphios* remain, in Belting’s words, ‘open to discussion’. Byzantine (Serbian), *Epitaphios*, known as the *Epitaphios of King Stefan Uroš II Milutin*, c. 1282-1321. 210 x 132 cm, embroidered silk and velvet. Belgrade, Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, inv. no. 4660. New York, 2004, pp. 315-16, cat. 189.

¹⁶ Bauerreiss, 1960, p. 52, citing Schäfer’s 1855 edition of Dionysius of Fourna’s eighteenth-century *Hermeneia (Das Handbuch der Malerei vom Berge Athos)*, Trier: Lintz), a collation of Gospel scenes, iconographic and technical information in Byzantine art intended for the use of painters.

¹⁷ Bauerreiss links the use of the King of Glory to the various branches of Greek liturgy (‘die griechische Liturgie in ihren Verzweigungen’), including that of St. John Chrysostom: Bauerreiss, 1960, p. 53.

complexity of the image-type, the termini of this ‘early’ period are unfixed. A reasonable early date of 1250 is provided by the panel painting known as the Stoclet Man of Sorrows (c. 1250-60), a work of Umbrian origin, now in the National Gallery, London (Fig. 2).¹⁸ A cut-off date of 1350 marks a point at which the surviving Western instances of the Man of Sorrows indicate its use in contexts different to its Eastern liturgical origin. Certainly by the time of the arrival in Rome of a thirteenth-century Byzantine mosaic icon (Fig. 3)¹⁹ in c. 1385-86, the Carthusian community at Santa Croce in Gerusalemme, where the icon was housed, rapidly re-imagined the icon as an Italian production, by means of an apocryphal tale. While celebrating the Eucharist, Pope Gregory I (Gregory the Great, c. 540-602) was said to have experienced a vision of the living Christ bearing the wounds of the Passion, and standing in a tomb. The icon was said to be an accurate depiction of the pope’s vision, and was thus looked upon as the privileged (and Italian) ‘prototype’ of the Man of Sorrows.²⁰ This form of appropriation was symptomatic of a broader process in which Western ideas of the origin and significance of the type were altered.²¹ This process sought first to strip the Man of Sorrows of its Byzantine origin and second to displace the type from its liturgical foundation.²²

Scholarship that attempts a cross-cultural study of the Man of Sorrows is indebted to Hans Belting’s seminal work on the image-type. Much recent research has investigated the links between the Byzantine antecedent-images and the Western Man of Sorrows by reference to the type’s ‘afterlife’ in the West, as opposed to a simple model of either stimulus and response, or supposed Italian invention. Formal differences previously ascribed to the ‘Italian origin’ of the Man of Sorrows are now understood as accretions to an existing Byzantine icon-type, impelled by liturgical functions shared by both Greek and Latin Christian communities. The evidence thus provides an important case-study for the kinship of late thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century Italian painting with contemporary Byzantine production.²³ During this period, the Man of Sorrows was appropriated and re-imagined in the West as being of Italian origin. This myth was perpetuated by the apocryphal story of the Mass of St. Gregory and, as we shall see, by the rise of the completely Western image of St. Francis of Assisi bearing the stigmata. The fact that this myth is still followed

¹⁸ Fig. 2. Italian (Umbrian), *The Man of Sorrows*, known as *The Stoclet Man of Sorrows*, c. 1250-60. 32.4 x 22.8 cm, tempera on panel. London, National Gallery, inv. no. NG6573. Cannon, 1999, fig. 55.

¹⁹ Fig. 3. Byzantine, *The King of Glory*, c. 1300. 19 x 13 cm, mosaic. (On the reverse, *St Catherine*.) Rome, S. Croce in Gerusalemme. New York, 2004, pp. 221-22, cat. 131.

²⁰ The inclusion of the tomb in the image indicates a relationship of this variety of the Man of Sorrows to the episode of Christ’s Burial: cf. Belting, 1994, p. 313 (originally published in German as *Bild und Kult*, Munich: C.H. Beck, 1990). In contrast, Edgar Breitenbach argues that the story of this ‘Gregorian Mass’ is apocryphal, and arose from ‘folk belief’ around the time of the Jubilee Year 1400: Breitenbach, 1974, p. 25.

²¹ As suggested by Carlo Bertelli in his insightful article: Bertelli, 1967, pp. 43-46. Bertelli furthered linked the mosaic icon at Santa Croce to the person of Raimondello Orsini del Balzo (1361-1406) by his identification of heraldic arms upon enamels.

²² It should be noted here that the image of the Man of Sorrows possesses a history of representation quite separate from that of its related type, the narrative scene of the Crucifixion. The image of the Crucifixion, including the images on painted processional and altar crosses, lies outside the bounds of this brief study. The key summary study of the Crucifixion is Schiller, 1972, II, pp. 88 ff. Representative literature on the image of the Christ of the Crucifixion includes Pickering, 1980 (1953) and Raw, 1990, pp. 156-60.

²³ Other studies on Byzantine influence on early Italian painting include the seminal Demus, 1970; Belting, 1974; and more recently, the articles collected in Hourihane, 2007.

by some modern scholars has occluded the real history of the Man of Sorrows and its early life in the West.²⁴

Seeing and Knowing

What does it mean to say that any image is an image of a dead God? The depiction of Jesus following his death and before his resurrection raises immediate conceptual problems around the relationship between the human and divine natures of the man called *Messiah* and *Christ* by his Apostles (from, respectively, the Hebrew-Aramaic and Greek words for ‘anointed one’).²⁵ The argument surrounding the nature of Christ spilt over into what Christoph von Schönborn brands a contested ‘theology of the image’, growing from the ‘ultimate root’ of the image of God: whether God possesses (and thus has made) ‘a perfect icon of himself’ in Christ.²⁶ The theological contest came to a violent head in the two periods of iconoclasm (from *eikonoklastes*, Greek for ‘image-breakers’) now summarily labelled the Byzantine Iconoclastic Controversy.²⁷ The Controversy lasted, in broad terms, from 726 to 843, although it must be recognised that the final establishment of the iconophile (from *eikonophiloï*, the Greek ‘image-lover’) position as orthodoxy did not mean an immediate end to iconoclasm.²⁸ According to iconophile orthodoxy, to ‘use’ an image correctly requires empathy with the divine persons depicted in icons, expressed as proper veneration (*proskynesis*); a fundamental part of Byzantine Christianity no matter the theological concept that sits ‘behind’ the image.²⁹ Paul Corby Finney discusses the problem of the visualisation of the divine in the Late Antique Mediterranean by reference to the concept’s ‘epistemological impropriety’, arguing that:

there are two ways to “see” God, the inner noetic path and the outer route, which rests on an appeal to external evidence... [and] in both examples “seeing” is a form of knowledge.³⁰

Unlike the image of Christ as vital and triumphant over death, the image of the suffering or dead Christ without a depicted narrative context requires the viewer to

²⁴ The present author notes that terms such as ‘Byzantine’, ‘medieval’, ‘Eastern’, ‘Western’, and particularly ‘type’, have been used without mounting an attempt at definition, each term taking its inherited or received meaning connoted by common scholarly usage. Yet the notion of an ‘ordinary meaning’ of these terms – umbrella concepts such as ‘Western’, for instance – is far from simple. Some, such as ‘medieval’, are anachronistic, referring to cultural phenomena *avant la lettre*. Some, such as ‘type’, indicate a certain relationship between objects, but are not more closely defined. I am content for these terms to take their received meaning. A useful consideration of problems in ‘medieval’ studies following on from discourses of nationalisms and, particularly at the current time, the discourse of globalisation, can be found in Oostrom’s recent survey article: Oostrom, 2006. Recent work on anachronism in the context of art history, albeit of a later period, includes Powell, 2006, pp. 707-28; and Wood, 2008, p. 19, note 50, by way of a response to Powell.

²⁵ ‘Christ’: Acts 17:3, 18:5.

²⁶ Schönborn, 1994, p. 13.

²⁷ See here John Lowden’s summary account of Byzantine Iconoclasm: Lowden, 1997, pp. 147-84; also, Barber, 2002, esp. pp. 6-15; Cormack, 1977 *passim*.

²⁸ As noted, the iconodule ‘victory’ of 843 did not mean an immediate end to Iconoclasm, though iconoclastically-aligned thought was necessarily precluded from orthodoxy: see Schulz, 1986, p. 50; Barber, 2002, p. 9.

²⁹ See Barber’s recent work, though with reservations: e.g., ‘we should be wary of considering... [divine] presence to be a general condition of icons or a necessary consequence of the prayer directed at them’: Barber, 2007, p. 151.

³⁰ Finney, 1994, pp. 277, 278.

engage with their knowledge of the Passion narrative and, significantly, the key salvific incidents of Christ's condemnation and execution. It also requires the viewer to focus upon Christ's humanity, that is, to 'suspend' knowledge of Christ's divinity.³¹ For instance, whilst the triumphal *Pantokrator* image is used to assure the viewer of the divinity of Christ, the King of Glory/Man of Sorrows image references his bodily agony and mortal termination. Where the *Pantokrator* sits in eternal and knowing judgement, one hand raised in benediction or declamation and the other holding a codex, the Man of Sorrows of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries embodies the silence and stillness of the tomb.³²

Approaches to the Man of Sorrows

As already noted, the Man of Sorrows-type does not depict any particular moment in the Passion narrative, yet possesses an 'assumed' narrative context by means of the clearly-marked wounds of the Passion on the Christ-figure.³³ Despite this seemingly unavoidable contextualisation of the Man of Sorrows in the Passion narrative, the image-type both interrupts the Passion narrative and juxtaposes key theological concepts of the Passion. In emphasising the death of Christ and adumbrating the Resurrection, the image possesses both liturgical and devotional importance. Discussion of the image similarly ranges across the gamut of medieval art, from middle-Byzantine icons to sixteenth-century German painting, seemingly without locating problems in such chronological variety.³⁴ Discussing the Man of Sorrows thus becomes a matter of reconciling apparent anachronisms. Ringbom's important study, *Icon to Narrative*,³⁵ adapted the model initially used by Erwin Panofsky to study the 'iconographical correspondences' of an image-type, 'in spite of formal differences' exhibited by the objects under investigation.³⁶

³¹ Although, as noted earlier, it is a part of John's theology that Christ's death is his glory: Larsson, 2008.

³² Here the clear reference is to the image of the *Amnos Aer* on the *epitaphios*, and the liturgy of the Passion service, which (as Belting writes) addresses 'the funerals of Christ': Belting, 1980-1981, pp. 1, 4. It should also be noted that some Man of Sorrows images that show the tomb of Christ, or depict Christ as the Man of Sorrows standing in the tomb, must exhibit the same liturgical resonance.

³³ In the imagery of Christ's Passion, the major scenes including the dead Christ are the Crucifixion, the Deposition (or Descent from the Cross), the Lamentation and the Burial. The Man of Sorrows is, as noted above, not clearly connected to any single point in the narrative, but appears to present Christ following the Crucifixion and Deposition (although the upright *stipes* of the cross in some images may indicate the moments before or after the disengagement of Christ's body: see Figs. 2 and 3), and before the Burial (although the inclusion in some images of Christ's tomb complicates this reading: see Figs. 6 and 10).

³⁴ The most powerful studies of the type are also of the broadest chronological span: Panofsky, 1927 (twelfth through sixteenth centuries); Belting, 1990 (approximately 1200 through 1500). Belting's extraordinary *Likeness and Presence* similarly deals with an extremely wide field of inquiry: Belting, 1994 (fourth through seventeenth centuries).

³⁵ Ringbom, 1983.

³⁶ The text on p. 6 of *Icon to Narrative* constitutes Ringbom's major statement of method (Ringbom, 1983, p. 6). He borrows the method used by Panofsky (Panofsky, 1927), insofar as the notion of 'Typus' (type), that is, basic and significant iconographic and iconological commonality, permits an analysis of 'das Dugentobild' (thirteenth-century images) in Italy alongside 'byzantinischen Ikonen' (Byzantine icons) and 'nordischen Versperbild' (the northern *Pietà*): Panofsky, 1927, pp. 268, 269. Belting also uses the idea of 'type', but does not want to define the term too closely (Belting, 1990, p. 33) and later explains its problematic nature (Belting, 1990, p. 131). This presumes that a perception of stability provides adequate grounds for the consideration of transformations in an image-type, where 'stability' is used advisedly: i.e., only in so far as such 'stability' yields a series of images identifiably of 'a type' from, admittedly, vastly different times and places.

The Man of Sorrows is an image-type that does not simply illustrate the concept of transformation across both time and place, but demands it, ‘incarnating’ not only the most basic precepts of Christian faith but some of its most complex manifestations. The task of providing a broadly analytical art-historical account of the Man of Sorrows image was undertaken initially by Panofsky in 1927 and then, with serious revisions, by Belting in the 1980s and 1990s.³⁷ Panofsky’s study partly relied upon earlier German work, most notably J.A. Endres’ 1917 study of the iconography of the Mass of St. Gregory and Hans Löffler’s oft-cited yet unpublished thesis on the Man of Sorrows, defended at Berlin in 1922.³⁸ Panofsky proposed a new type of image, the *Andachtsbild* (‘devotional image’),³⁹ a formal-functional synthesis in which the subject depicted (a religious figure) is intended to achieve the viewer’s ‘contemplative immersion’ in the image.⁴⁰ Belting later modified Panofsky’s project by reference to the concepts of an image’s function and its material form.⁴¹

Conventional art-historical accounts of the Man of Sorrows begin from one of two basic contentions around the image’s ‘origin’: either the type arises from a Byzantine liturgical icon, or it is basically a medieval Italian invention. Yet, the early literature that seeks to identify a tightly defined, compartmentalised ‘source’ of the type is misdirected.⁴² As Henk van Os argued in 1978, ‘discussion in the literature on the origin of the theme... is extremely confused... [and] desire to credit either the East or West (Italy) with the invention of this subject had led to a chronological grouping of the earliest examples which is as artificial as it is hypothetical.’⁴³ In fact, the Eastern origin of the image-type is now such a commonplace that the fact no longer appears to merit much discussion.⁴⁴ That the Byzantine icon of the King of Glory in turn provided the model for the Western type of the Man of Sorrows is also now widely accepted, despite the fact that there exist prominent formal differences between the two image-types: most notably, the early King of Glory only ever extends to the lower part of Christ’s breast, with an embossed or punched cruciform nimbus (Fig. 4).⁴⁵ In these Byzantine images, Christ’s head is slumped forward, on to his right shoulder. The Western image is, by contrast, commonly a half-length figure, Christ’s bust imitating the form of the Byzantine image, but extending the image to Christ’s waist

³⁷ Panofsky, 1927; Belting, 1980-1981; Belting, 1990.

³⁸ J.A. Endres, ‘Die Darstellung der Gregoriusmesse im Mittelalter’, *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst*, 30, 1917, pp. 152 ff. H. Löffler, ‘Ikonographie des Schmerzensmanns’ (Berlin, 1922). The ‘leider ungedruckte Berliner Dissertation von 1922’: Panofsky, 1927, p. 295, n. 3; ‘Es war der erste dankenswerte Versuch, zu den eigentlichen Wurzeln des Bildes vorzudringen’: Bauerreiss, 1960, p. 49.

³⁹ The German term ‘*Andachtsbild*’ seems to be of eighteenth-century origin: Falkenburg, 1988, p. 117, note 70.

⁴⁰ ‘[D]urch die Tendenz, dem betrachtenden Einzelbewußtsein die Möglichkeit zu einer *kontemplativen Versenkung* in den betrachteten Inhalt zu geben, d.h. das Subjekt mit dem Objekt seelisch gleichsam verschmelzen zu lassen’: Panofsky, 1927, p. 264, emphasis in the original.

⁴¹ E.g., Belting, 1990, pp. 3, 44, 71. Belting makes a serious concession as to the limitations of the project: ‘[the] conclusions [reached] must still be validated for the fourteenth century, when... [the Man of Sorrows] image reaches the acme of its diffusion and its highest degree of internal complexity’: Belting, 1990, p. 187.

⁴² Representative scholarship on the ‘origin’ of the type includes Bauerreiss, 1960, pp. 52 ff; Bertelli, 1967 *passim*; Stubblebine, 1969 (writing *contra* the majority view); Eisler, 1969, pp. 240 ff; Os, 1978 *passim*; La Favia, 1980 *passim*; Belting, 1980-1981, pp. 1-5.

⁴³ Os, 1978, p. 68.

⁴⁴ Cf. Schiller, 1972, II, p. 199; Belting, 1990, pp. 131 ff.

⁴⁵ Byzantine, *The King of Glory*, 12th century. 19 x 13 cm, mosaic. (On the reverse, *Virgin and Child*.) Kastoria, Byzantine Museum. Neff, 1999, fig. 13.

and showing his (typically) crossed arms and hands with the clearly-marked wounds of the Passion (Fig. 5).⁴⁶ Many Western images from the fifteenth century onward display the Man of Sorrows with attendant figures or iconographic accretions, such as the *Arma Christi*, the instruments of Christ's Passion, or additional figures, such as sorrowing angels (as seen on the early Stoclet panel in London: see Fig. 2) or the Virgin Mary and John the Evangelist (Fig. 6).⁴⁷

The image of the Man of Sorrows, 'unmoored' from any immediate iconographic reference to Christ's divinity, is free to engage wholly with the discourse of human suffering.⁴⁸ Recently, Martin O'Kane has explored the image's scriptural source, and posited the notion that the Gospel passages are not the best means by which to explain the Man of Sorrows image, but rather that the text of *Isaiah* provides the best and most appropriate means of analysing the type.⁴⁹ For O'Kane, the fourth Servant Song is a text that relies upon the visual as a means of comprehension, but within which the key fragment, 'a man of sorrows, and familiar with suffering', is only awkwardly linked with the person of Christ.⁵⁰ O'Kane's contribution is to suggest that such suffering can be explained partly as the suffering of Israel in exile, but more generally as the suffering implied by a wounded dead figure (thus, connoting pain and physical privation), and the viewer/reader's predisposition to respond in sympathy. Such a response is achieved by visual means where the empathetic capacity of text, even sacred text, is insufficient.⁵¹ For Panofsky, the suffering of the Man of Sorrows is exclusively the concentrated, denoted suffering of Christ's Passion, made available to the pious viewer for complete, subjective, mutual identification.⁵² Belting posits that much of the pictorial stamina of the King of Glory-type is the result of its being 'the perfect example of a liturgical use as well as of a given phase in Byzantine icon painting',⁵³ a crucial formulation for comprehending the shared meaning and intercultural transformations of the 'Byzantine' King of Glory and the 'Western' Man of Sorrows.⁵⁴

⁴⁶ Riminese (possibly Pietro da Rimini), *The Man of Sorrows*, c. 1310-25. 26.7 x 16.8 cm, tempera on panel. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. no. 28.887.

⁴⁷ Roberto Oderisi (d'Odorasio), *The Man of Sorrows and Arma Christi*, c. 1354. 62.2 x 38 cm, tempera and gold on panel. Cambridge (Massachusetts), Fogg Art Museum, inv. no. 1937.49. Examples such as this may well reflect an emerging practice of private devotion, and thus their difference in form may derive from their different function: see Ringbom, 1983, pp. 6 ff. On the *Arma Christi* see Schiller, 1972, II, pp. 184-197, and esp. pp. 207-11.

⁴⁸ Here borrowing a turn of phrase from O'Kane, 2005, p. 67.

⁴⁹ O'Kane, 2005 *passim*.

⁵⁰ O'Kane, 2005, pp. 65, 67. See also Christoph Marksches's exhaustive analysis of the Christological model for the interpretation of *Isaiah* 53: Marksches, 2004, pp. 245-319.

⁵¹ O'Kane, 2005, pp. 72, 74, 93-94. Also consider here Elaine Scarry's *The Body in Pain*, wherein Scarry notes that the empathetic capacity of text is limited, as physical pain is absolutely individualised and un-shareable due to 'its resistance to language': Scarry, 1985, p. 4.

⁵² Panofsky, 1927, p. 261; Belting, 1990, p. 103.

⁵³ Belting, 1980-1981, p. 2.

⁵⁴ The power of the Byzantine image can be essentially understood through its liturgical function; thus, Belting avers that the 'history of [Christian] art leads to the history of liturgy': Belting, 1980-1981, p. 2. Belting's conclusion does not allow the image-type influence outside its liturgical context, which follows demonstrably from Belting's promotion of liturgy to a determinative position in relation to the image. See Bauerreiss, 1960, pp. 52-55.

Intercultural Connections

It is apparent that intercultural (or ‘cross-cultural’) exchange played an important role in the Italian transformations of the Man of Sorrows-type. Recent studies on the notion of intercultural artistic exchange have steadfastly avoided using concepts of ‘precedence’ and ‘influence’, and have generally dealt with the politically neutral idea of ‘reception’.⁵⁵ The Man of Sorrows, in its Italian forms of the fourteenth century, reveals the importance of both ‘connectivity’ and ‘hybridity’, to use the key terms proposed by Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell in their book, *The Corrupting Sea*.⁵⁶ The early Italian Man of Sorrows demonstrates its ‘connectivity’ by its close formal and functional relationship with the Byzantine type of the King of Glory, and demonstrates its cultural ‘hybridity’ by means of its transformed significance and the appropriation of the type into exclusively Western subjects, including the Mass of St. Gregory and, as we shall see, the image of St. Francis bearing the stigmata. The differences in theme can be explained through Kurt Weitzmann’s notion of ‘two iconographical realms’, despite their stylistic kinship, in Byzantium and the West.⁵⁷ However, cross-cultural exchange, in terms of both style and iconography, in the wake of the Latin conquest and sack of Constantinople in 1204 – the outcome of the disastrous Fourth Crusade – was unavoidable. As Jaroslav Folda writes, the ‘amount of Byzantine artistic booty said to have been seized and sent back to Western Europe from Constantinople and Frankish Greece as a result of the conquest of...1204 was prodigious.’⁵⁸ Belting firmly links the diffusion of the King of Glory/Man of Sorrows image to the conquest of 1204, stating that ‘following the first sack of [Constantinople]...icon painting was limited to a repertory which was reduced in extent as well as in generative power.’⁵⁹ Thus, in Belting’s view, the Man of Sorrows-type did not occupy any special place among liturgical icons in the East, of which ‘it was just one among many formulas.’⁶⁰

Given this observation of an apparent Western/Latin predilection for the image of the Man of Sorrows, it is not surprising that some scholars have seen the image as Western in origin.⁶¹ In his doctoral dissertation, Louis M. La Favia forcefully presented his case for the fourteenth-century Italian Man of Sorrows as a Florentine ‘invention’, indebted to but fundamentally different from its Byzantine cousin, based upon the evidence of two leaves from a manuscript called the *Supplicationes variae*,

⁵⁵ There are multiple studies utilising these ideas and terminological and conceptual developments, but the most relevant for our purposes are the collected papers in Hourihane, 2007; also Folda, 1996. Cultural pluralism, now a commonplace in scholarly literature, emerged from frameworks of cultural-historical investigation that were both European and nineteenth-century in their origin. These frameworks, which were intrinsically Eurocentric, were singularly unsuitable for application to Mediterranean culture of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The rise of postcolonial criticism has not only rendered the notion of centre and periphery – long applied to Byzantine art and the art of the West – problematic, but revealed the division as incorporating a solidly discriminatory political agenda. Edward Said’s seminal study, *Orientalism*, diagnosed latent xenophobia in the creation of the Orient as both a fabulous and dysfunctional anthropological ‘Other,’ against which Westerners could, reasonably and tacitly, posit an orderly and progressive Occident: Said, 2003, e.g. pp. 58, 65.

⁵⁶ Horden & Purcell, 2000.

⁵⁷ Weitzmann’s argument is based upon a closely affiliated, yet differentiated, relationship of Crusader icons produced in the East with ostensibly Byzantine contemporary painting: Weitzmann, 1966, p. 59.

⁵⁸ Folda, 1997, pp. 389 ff, quote from p. 390.

⁵⁹ Belting, 1980-1981, p. 11.

⁶⁰ Belting, 1980-1981, p. 11.

⁶¹ Including Stubblebine, 1969; La Favia, 1980.

now in the Biblioteca Laurenziana.⁶² The physically larger of the two images of Christ upon which La Favia bases his analysis extends to the waist and is marked by the wounds of the Passion, and is thus an early type of the Man of Sorrows image.⁶³ A Byzantine icon of the twelfth century, known as the 'Kastoria icon' (Fig. 4) provides ample grounds for comparison with the *Supplicationes variae* image. Both exhibit the near-identical inclined head and closed eyes of the King of Glory type. The inclined head, it should be noted, is typical of Christ on the Cross (Fig. 7).⁶⁴ The formal differences and correspondences between the *Supplicationes variae* images and the Kastoria icon are the same central differences and correspondences between the majority of Eastern/Byzantine and of Western/Latin examples: the Western extension of the Eastern image to the waist and the inclusion of the wounds of the Passion.

La Favia's promotion of the *Supplicationes variae* images to a position of primacy in the history of the Western Man of Sorrows is based upon his dating of the manuscript and its images to 1293, suggesting that this early date for the codex furnishes art historians with the earliest known painted Man of Sorrows image produced in the West. He identifies the inclusion of Christ's side wound and wounded hands as a Florentine invention, and thus this Man of Sorrows becomes an 'original'.⁶⁵ Rona Goffen, in her review of La Favia's study, characterised the work as 'sadly muddled' and, in the face of La Favia's doubtful conclusion, argued that scholars are best to remain with Panofsky's analysis.⁶⁶ It is clear that La Favia errs in deciding that the date written neatly upon the final page of the manuscript is the date of the production of the entire manuscript-as-bound. He also errs in attempting to find the 'original' Man of Sorrows hidden in what was clearly a manuscript of limited audience and limited impact. On the contrary, the Western Man of Sorrows arises from its widely-seen and understood Byzantine prototype, the King of Glory, an increasing iconographic presence on the Italian peninsula following the sack of Constantinople in 1204, and invariably set within a liturgical context. It is surely significant that the important Umbrian painting called the Stoclet Man of Sorrows (Fig. 2) is an earlier picture than La Favia's dating of the *Supplicationes variae* manuscript,⁶⁷ and that it mimics the Byzantine type. Unlike the *Supplicationes variae* image, the Stoclet panel depicts the wounded hands folded across Christ's chest, with the fingers turned upward. The lack of an identifiable side wound indicates that the Stoclet panel presents a transitional image-type, between the Passion rituals of Holy Week and the Eucharistic significance of the later medieval efflorescence of the type.⁶⁸ The dark

⁶² La Favia, 1980. As La Favia notes, the title *Supplicationes variae* is one supplied solely for cataloguing purposes, but is now the common name of this particular codex: La Favia, 1980, p. 29.

⁶³ This is also the case with the smaller image, albeit contained within a decorative frame at the lower part of a page.

⁶⁴ Paolo Veneziano and workshop, *Crucifixion*, c. 1349. 96.8 x 67.7 cm (max. height and width, irregular), tempera and gold on panel (poplar). Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria, inv. no. 1966/4. Hoff, 1995, p. 208-9. Even where the cross is absent from the image, the inclined head functions as a visual mnemonic of its presence and of the Crucifixion.

⁶⁵ La Favia argues that the text that appears alongside the image on f. 183v of the manuscript is sufficient to inspire the image 'without necessarily requiring a previous illustration' as a guide, and therefore, 'the supposition that the present illumination of the "Man of Sorrows" could be original, is legitimate': La Favia, 1980, p. 35.

⁶⁶ Goffen, 1985, p. 168.

⁶⁷ See Cannon, 1999, wherein the Stoclet Man is dated on stylistic grounds to '[t]he years around 1250-60': p. 111.

⁶⁸ Giovanni Bellini's *Imago Pietatis* of c. 1460-65, now in the Museo Poldi Pezzoli, Milan, exhibits the same anomalous exclusion; his dead Christ bears the side-wound, but lacks wounded hands. This is

medial bars of the cross are evident behind Christ's body and nimbus, and the inclusion of sorrowing angels either side of the *titulus* panel echoes Byzantine images of the sorrowing Virgin with the Christ Child (see [Fig. 4](#)).

Appropriation: St. Francis

Latin appropriation of the Man of Sorrows transformed its appearance, then, and led to a general re-conceiving of the image as originally Western, based largely upon apocryphal stories that arose, particularly in Italy, during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The appropriative tales *par excellence* are those of the Mass of St. Gregory, and the stigmata of the great mystic, St. Francis of Assisi (c. 1181-1226). Gertrud Schiller, noting the medieval Latin popularity of the Man of Sorrows, traces that popularity through a desire for imitation of, and compassion for, Christ: 'A Christian of the Late Middle Ages sought union with Christ by following in his footsteps along the way of the Passion. To follow him thus... meant at that time to 'imitate' (*imitatio*) or to share the suffering (*compassio*) of Christ in the world of sin.'⁶⁹ Reflection on Christ's Passion, encouraged and focussed by contemplation of his wounded body, was thought to encourage both *imitatio* and *compassio*, and the examples of pious men and women who sought to become 'like Christ' were recorded and disseminated widely.⁷⁰ Henk van Os emphasises that representation of devotional identification with the example of Christ extended into the realm of the image. Writing on the phenomenon of St. Francis' assumption of Christlike qualities, to the point of his identification as a 'second Christ' (*Franciscus alter Christus*), he observes that the '*Franciscus alter Christus*...was even more marked [i.e., apparent]...in the narrative scenes' of the fifteenth century that depicted Francis receiving the stigmata.⁷¹ The identification of Francis as a second Christ appears to be a logical conclusion in the conceptual chain from Francis's desire to imitate Christ (*imitatio*) through to his complete conformity with Christ (*conformitas*).⁷² The ostentation of the stigmata in the manner of Francis is in complete conformity with Christ's example. This is illustrated by a retable by Giotto, now in the Louvre ([Fig. 8](#)),⁷³ which represents the moment of Francis' 'stigmatisation' through a hovering, crucified, seraphic Christ. Similarly, an icon-image of Francis, attributed to Niccolò di Segna (active c.1330-50)

noted by Bächtmann (Bächtmann, 2008, p. 68), but, generally, is not addressed satisfactorily in the literature.

⁶⁹ Schiller, 1972, II, p. 197.

⁷⁰ Cousins, 1987; Hellmann, 1987. A great volume survives on the lives of saints and holy martyrs who had sought to be 'like Christ.' Jacobus de Voragine (c. 1229-98) produced an extraordinary sourcebook of saints' lives in Latin in the thirteenth century, called the *Legenda Sanctorum* or *Legenda Aurea* ('Golden Legend', or 'Saints' readings'). A useful English edition of the *Legenda* is that of Granger Ryan and Helmut Ripperger (trans. & eds.), *The Golden Legend of Jacobus de Voragine*, 1969 ed., New York: Arno Press, 1969.

⁷¹ Os, 1974, p. 130.

⁷² A painting in the church of San Francesco a Ripa in Rome, an image of St. Francis exhibiting a book inscribed with what Os calls the 'text [which] is the historical foundation for the *imitatio Christi*' (Os, 1974, p. 120) reads: 'If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me': cf. Matthew 10:38; John 12:26.

⁷³ Fig. 8. Giotto di Bondone (c. 1266-1337), *St. Francis of Assisi Receiving the Stigmata, with Scenes from the Life of the Saint*, c. 1295-1300. 313 x 163 cm (including predella, irregular), tempera on panel. Paris, Louvre, inv. no. 309. Gnudi, 1959, pl. 66.

and currently in Pisa ([Fig. 9](#)),⁷⁴ illustrates the Italian adoption of the depiction of Christ's wounds into the image of St. Francis and, thereby, the explicit iconographic comparison drawn between the wounded Christ, that is, as the Man of Sorrows, and the Umbrian saint (compare, for example, [Fig. 9](#) and [Fig. 10](#)).⁷⁵ These examples reveal the primary role of *Franciscus alter Christus* imagery in indicating the ideal state of Franciscan devotion. Schiller writes that the Man of Sorrows is 'not only the divine image... but also the image of man, which the faithful sought to realize in themselves in imitation of Christ'.⁷⁶ Through visualising the Franciscan example of being 'like Christ', the faithful sought such realisation through conformity with Christ's suffering. The Franciscan appropriation of the Man of Sorrows is further explained by Scarry: 'The greatness of human vulnerability is not the greatness of divine invulnerability. They are unrelated and therefore can occur together: God is both omnipotent and in pain.'⁷⁷

Representations of St. Francis as 'another' Christ owe much to the picturing of Christ performing the gesture called *ostentatio vulnerum* ('showing of the wounds'). Formally the figure of Christ performing *ostentatio vulnerum* may be clothed in the robe of the Judge at the Last Judgement,⁷⁸ or in some other form that does not obviously emphasise either the emotive qualities of the Passion or the suffering that is imputed with the display of the wounds in the Man of Sorrows-type. A non-emotive *ostentatio vulnerum* emphasises the triumphal quality of the Passion, and thus, whilst explicitly calling to mind the events of the Passion and marking them upon the image of Christ's body, it yet bears more relation to the triumphal Christ of the Resurrection than the agonised Christ of the Passion.⁷⁹ Joseph Leo Koerner, writing on one of Albrecht Dürer's self-portraits – that of the artist in the guise of a grieving Man of Sorrows⁸⁰ – notes that the *ostentatio vulnerum* stems from a long theological ancestry that 'regarded the wound as sign of the redemptive power of the Word and as fountain of life'.⁸¹

The iconography of the *Franciscus alter Christus* is thus a transformation, or adaptation, of the Man of Sorrows into a distinctly Western pictorial form with an accreted *ostentatio vulnerum* gesture.⁸² In the light of a similar conclusion, van Os has

⁷⁴ Fig. 9. Niccolò di Segna, *St. Francis of Assisi*, c. 1340. 25.8 x 20.1 cm, tempera and gold on panel. Pisa, Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Reale, inv. no. unassigned.

⁷⁵ Fig. 10. Naddo Ceccharelli, *Man of Sorrows*, c. 1347. 71 x 50 cm, oil on panel. Vaduz, Princely Collections, currently held at Vienna, Liechtenstein Museum, inv. no. GE862. Kräfner, 2004, p. 23.

⁷⁶ Schiller, 1972, II, p. 198, spelling as in the original.

⁷⁷ Scarry, 1985, p. 214.

⁷⁸ Panofsky, 1971 (1953), p. 124, p. 408, n. 5. Panofsky cites M. Weinberger, who had argued that the *ostentatio vulnerum* gesture of the Man of Sorrows could not be linked to the benediction and condemnation gestures of the Christ of the Last Judgement, but was a formal corollary of showing the wounds. As Panofsky explains, the earliest instances of the *ostentatio vulnerum* are seen exclusively in images of the Christ of the Last Judgement. Also see the comments made by Weitzmann on the Last Judgement in Crusader art, and the impact of Byzantine iconography: Weitzmann, 1966, p. 58-59.

⁷⁹ Harley, 2007, pp. 227-32.

⁸⁰ Albrecht Dürer, *Man of Sorrows*, c. 1493. 30 x 19 cm, oil on panel. Karlsruhe, Staatliche Kunsthalle. Bailey, 1995, pl. 5.

⁸¹ Koerner calls the wound an indicator as 'to the redemptive power of his sacrifice and to Christ's incarnation as man': Koerner, 1993, p. 179; also bibliography at note 48. Also see Lewis, 1996 *passim* on the feminine 'gendered' devotional approach to Christ's wounds.

⁸² E. James Mundy has written on the intercessory qualities of St. Francis in the guise of Christ, using the evidence of painted panels in the *Franciscus alter Christus* line to reveal the saint as a 'surrogate Redeemer': Mundy, 1977, esp. pp. 7 ff.

argued that wherever the Man of Sorrows-type appears, we must ‘look for a region of origin where Eastern and Western traditions intermingle’.⁸³ Oskar Bätschmann, in his recent monograph on the Venetian painter Giovanni Bellini (c. 1432-1516), has emphasised the role of cultural hybridity in the formation and dissemination of the Man of Sorrows.⁸⁴ Though later than the period covered by this brief paper, Bätschmann argues that Giovanni Bellini’s transformations of the type emphasise ‘the reception and diffusion of Byzantine passional images’, mixed with only ‘timid’ formal experimentation.⁸⁵ Bätschmann also notes the relationship of a handful of Bellini’s paintings of St. Francis with images of the Man of Sorrows that were in wide circulation at the time.⁸⁶ What Bätschmann calls the transformation of the Man of Sorrows *into* St. Francis – a striking instance of the Man of Sorrows-type becoming the model of a *Franciscus alter Christus* image – is all the more convincing when the novelty of Bellini’s Francis is realised (Fig. 11).⁸⁷ These formal innovations – here characterised as iconographic appropriation – indicate the value of the Man of Sorrows-type as a model for the depiction not only of highly pietistic subjects shared between Byzantium and the West, but also for particular subjects that are quintessentially Western, which is to say alien to the Byzantine sphere.

Conclusions

The Man of Sorrows embodies both historical/narrative and cultic/iconic significance in a manner that many other Christian images cannot. The image-type also illustrates the strength of intercultural exchange in the central medieval period, extending to the reception and understanding of the objects exchanged and ‘influenced.’ This article has focussed on a single direction in terms of such exchange, from a nebulous East to an equally nebulous West, but the mutuality of exchange can be demonstrated by the fourteenth-century spread of Passional textiles from the West for ritual use by Greek Christians. The key example is that of the *epitaphios*, which exhibits an altogether different pattern of development to the King of Glory/Man of Sorrows, involving its transformation from use in the Divine Liturgy into its adoption for the Passion liturgy of Great Friday and the Paschal cycle.⁸⁸ During the period c. 1325-1400, *epitaphios* cloths gradually incorporate iconographic characteristics that move the compositional value of the ‘funeral portrait’ toward the form and function of the narrative scene known as the *Threnos* (Greek for ‘Lamentation’).⁸⁹

Italian representations of the Man of Sorrows reveal that shared image-traditions were subject to appropriation and parochial re-imagining, as well as the powerful,

⁸³ Os, 1978, p. 67.

⁸⁴ E.g., Bätschmann, 2008, pp. 65-66, citing Belting.

⁸⁵ Bätschmann, 2008, pp. 66, 71.

⁸⁶ Bätschmann, 2008, pp. 113-14.

⁸⁷ Bätschmann draws principally on Bellini’s *St. Francis in the Desert* of ca. 1475, now in the Frick Collection: Fig. 11. Giovanni Bellini, *St. Francis in the Desert*, c. 1475-80. 124.5 x 142 cm, oil and tempera on panel (poplar). New York, Frick Collection, inv. no. 1915.1.03. Bätschmann, 2008, p. 110, fig. 95.

⁸⁸ Woodfin, 2004, p. 296

⁸⁹ New York, 2004, cats 187A-192. See Weitzmann’s conclusion in his brief study of *Threnos* imagery: the ‘transformation of the narrative...of the Entombment...into the self-contained, hieratic, and complex picture of the *Threnos*...[was partly an outcome of] the emphasis on the liturgical aspects’ of the image: Weitzmann, 1961, p. 490.

transforming imperative of Christian ritual practice. The transformation of the Man of Sorrows from liturgical Passion-portrait into an appropriated iconographic device is not a dry phenomenon confined to the art-historical literature, but rather the real transformation of an image-type and its theological and ritual meanings.

Lachlan Turnbull is a postgraduate research student in art history at the University of Melbourne.

Bibliography

Bailey, 1995: Martin Bailey, *Dürer*, London: Phaidon, 1995.

Barber, 2002: Charles Barber, *Figure and Likeness. On the Limits of Representation in Byzantine Iconoclasm*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.

Barber, 2007: Charles Barber, *Contesting the Logic of Painting. Art and Understanding in Eleventh-Century Byzantium*, Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2007.

Bätschmann, 2008: Oskar Bätschmann, *Giovanni Bellini*, trans. Ian Pepper, London: Reaktion, 2008.

Bauerreiss, 1960: Romuald Bauerreiss, 'ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΗΣ ΔΟΞΗΣ: Ein frühes eucharistisches Bild und seine Auswirkung', in *Pro Mundi Vita. Festschrift zum Eucharistischen Weltkongress 1960*, Munich: Max Hueber Verlag, 1960, pp. 49-67.

Belting, 1974: Hans Belting, 'Byzantine Art among Greeks and Latins in Southern Italy', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 28, 1974, pp. 1-29.

Belting, 1980-1981: Hans Belting, 'An Image and its Function in the Liturgy: The Man of Sorrows in Byzantium', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 34, 1980-1981, pp. 1-16.

Belting, 1990: Hans Belting, *The Image and its Public in the Middle Ages. Form and Function of Early Paintings of the Passion*, trans. Mark Batusis and Raymond Meyer, New Rochelle, New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1990.

Belting, 1994: Hans Belting, *Likeness and Presence. A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, trans. Edmund Jephcott, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Bertelli, 1967: Carlo Bertelli, 'The Image of Pity in Santa Croce in Gerusalemme', in *Essays in the History of Art Presented to Rudolf Wittkower*, edited by Douglas Fraser, Howard Hibbard and Milton J. Lewine, London: Phaidon, 1967, pp. 40-55.

Breitenbach, 1974: Edgar Breitenbach, 'Israhel van Meckenem's *Man of Sorrows*', *The Quarterly Journal of the Library of Congress*, 31, 1974, pp. 21-26.

Burr, 1984: David Burr, 'Eucharistic Presence and Conversion in Late Thirteenth-Century Franciscan Thought', *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, new ser., 74, no. 3, 1984, pp. 1-113.

Bynum, 2007: Caroline Walker Bynum, *Wonderful Blood. Theology and Practice in Late Medieval Northern Germany and Beyond*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.

Cannon, 1999: Joanna Cannon, 'The Stoclet "Man of Sorrows": A Thirteenth-Century Italian Diptych Reunited', *The Burlington Magazine*, 141, no. 1151, 1999, pp. 107-12.

Charles Murray, 1981: Mary Charles Murray, *Rebirth and Afterlife. A Study of the Transmutation of Some Pagan Imagery in Early Christian Funerary Art*, Oxford: B.A.R., 1981.

Cormack, 1977: Robin Cormack, 'The Arts during the Age of Iconoclasm', in *Iconoclasm. Papers Given at the 9th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Birmingham, March 1975*, edited by Anthony Bryer and Judith Herrin, Birmingham: Centre for Byzantine Studies at the University of Birmingham, 1977, pp. 35-44.

Cousins, 1987: Ewert Cousins, 'The Humanity and the Passion of Christ', in *Christian Spirituality. High Middle Ages and Reformation [World Spirituality, 17]*, edited by Jill Raitt, New York: Crossroads Publishing, 1987, pp. 375-91.

Demus, 1970: Otto Demus, *Byzantine Art and the West*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1970.

Eisler, 1969: Colin Eisler, 'The Golden Christ of Cortona and the Man of Sorrows in Italy: Part Two', *Art Bulletin*, 51, no. 3, 1969, pp. 233-46.

Falkenburg, 1988: Reindert Leonard Falkenburg, *Joachim Patinir. Landscape as an Image of the Pilgrimage of Life*, trans. Michael Hoyle, Amsterdam & Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 1988.

Finney, 1994: Paul Corby Finney, *The Invisible God. The Earliest Christians on Art*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Folda, 1996: Jaroslav Folda, 'Crusader Art in the Twelfth Century: Reflections on Christian Multiculturalism in the Levant', in *Intercultural Contacts in the Medieval Mediterranean. Studies in Honour of David Jacoby*, edited by Benjamin Arbel, London & Portland: Frank Cass, 1996, pp. 80-91.

Folda, 1997: Jaroslav Folda, 'Crusader Art', in *The Glory of Byzantium. Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era, A.D. 843-1261*, exh. cat., edited by Helen C. Evans and William D. Wixom, New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1997, pp. 389-91.

Francis, 2004: Philip Francis, 'Harness the Dying Breath: The 12th Century Kastoria Icon in the Christian Imagination', *Spiritus*, 4, no. 2, 2004, pp. 211-25.

Gnudi, 1959: Cesare Gnudi, *Giotto*, trans. R.H. Boothroyd, Milan: Aldo Martello, 1959.

Goffen, 1985: Rona Goffen, 'Review of *The Man of Sorrows* by Louis M. La Favia', *Speculum*, 60, no. 1, 1985, pp. 167-68.

Harley, 2007: Felicity Harley, 'The Crucifixion', in Jeffrey Spier, *Picturing the Bible. The Earliest Christian Art*, exh. cat., Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth, Texas, New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2007, pp. 227-32.

Harley, 2009: Felicity Harley, 'Christianity and the Transformation of Classical Art', in *A Companion to Late Antiquity*, edited by Philip Rousseau with Jutta Raithel, Malden & Oxford: Blackwell, 2009, pp. 306-26.

Hellmann, 1987: J.A. Wayne Hellmann, 'The Spirituality of the Franciscans', in *Christian Spirituality. High Middle Ages and Reformation* [*World Spirituality*, 17], edited by Jill Raitt, New York: Crossroads Publishing, 1987, pp. 31-50.

Hetherington, 1990: Paul Hetherington, 'Who is this King of Glory? The Byzantine Enamels of an Icon Frame and Revetment in Jerusalem: For Hugo Buchthal at 80', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 53, no. 1, 1990, pp. 25-38.

Horden & Purcell, 2000: Peregrine Horden and Nicholas Purcell, *The Corrupting Sea. A Study of Mediterranean History*, Malden: Blackwell, 2000.

Hoff, 1995: Ursula Hoff, with Emma Devapriam, *European Paintings before 1800 in the National Gallery of Victoria*, Melbourne: National Gallery of Victoria, 1995.

Hourihane, 2007: *Interactions. Artistic Interchange between the Eastern and Western Worlds in the Medieval Period* [*The Index of Christian Art, Occasional Papers*, 9], edited by Colum Hourihane, Princeton & University Park: Index of Christian Art at Princeton University & Pennsylvania State University Press, 2007.

Hyatt, 1944: J. Philip Hyatt, 'The Sources of the Suffering Servant Idea', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, 3, no. 2, 1944, pp. 79-86.

Jensen, 2000: Robin Margaret Jensen, *Understanding Early Christian Art*, London: Routledge, 2000.

Johnstone, 1967: Pauline Johnstone, *The Byzantine Tradition in Church Embroidery*, London: Alec Tiranti, 1967.

Kartsonis, 1986: Anna D. Kartsonis, *Anastasis. The Making of an Image*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Koerner, 1993: Joseph Leo Koerner, *The Moment of Self-Portraiture in German Renaissance Art*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Kräftefner, 2004: Johann Kräfner, *The Liechtenstein Museum. The Princely Collections*, trans. Paul Aston, Munich & New York: Prestel, 2004.

La Favia, 1980: Louis M. La Favia, *The Man of Sorrows. Its Origin and Development in Trecento Florentine Painting. A New Iconographic Theme on the Eve of the Renaissance*, Rome: Edizioni 'Sanguis', 1980.

Larsson, 2008: Tord Larsson, 'Glory or Persecution: The God of the Gospel of John in the History of Interpretation', in *The Gospel of John and Christian Theology*, edited by Richard Bauckham and Carl Mosser, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2008, pp. 82-88.

Lewis, 1996: Flora Lewis, 'The Wound in Christ's Side and the Instruments of the Passion: Gendered Experience and Response', in *Women and the Book. Assessing the Visual Evidence*, edited by Lesley Smith and Jane H.M. Taylor, London: The British Library & Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996, pp. 204-29.

Lowden, 1997: John Lowden, *Early Christian & Byzantine Art*, London: Phaidon, 1997.

Markschies, 2004: Christoph Marksches, 'Jesus Christ as a Man before God: Two Interpretive Models for Isaiah 53 in the Patristic Literature and their Development', in *The Suffering Servant. Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian Sources*, edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher, trans. Daniel P. Bailey, Grand Rapids & Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2004, pp. 225-320.

Mundy, 1977: E. James Mundy, 'Franciscus alter Christus: The Intercessory Function of a Late Quattrocento Panel', *Record of the Art Museum, Princeton University*, 36, no. 2, 1977, pp. 4-15.

Neff, 1999: Amy Neff, 'Byzantium Westernized, Byzantium Marginalized: Two Icons in the *Supplicationes variae*', *Gesta*, 38, no. 1, 1999, pp. 81-102.

New York, 2004: *Byzantium. Faith and Power (1261-1557)*, exh. cat., edited by Helen C. Evans, New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art & Yale University Press, 2004.

O'Kane, 2005: Martin O'Kane, 'Picturing "The Man of Sorrows": The Passion-Filled Afterlives of a Biblical Icon', *Religion and the Arts*, 9, no. 1-2, 2005, pp. 62-100.

Oostrom, 2006: Frits van Oostrom, 'Spatial Struggles: Medieval Studies between Nationalism and Globalization', *Journal of English and German Philology*, 105, no. 1, pp. 5-24.

Os, 1974: H.W. van Os, 'St. Francis of Assisi as a Second Christ in Early Italian Painting', *Simiolus*, 7, no. 3, 1974, pp. 115-32.

Os, 1978: H.W. van Os, 'The Discovery of an Early Man of Sorrows on a Dominican Triptych', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 41, 1978, pp. 65-75.

Panofsky, 1927: Erwin Panofsky, '“Imago Pietatis”: Ein Beitrag zur Typengeschichte des “Schmerzensmanns” und der “Maria Mediatrix”', in *Festschrift für Max J. Friedländer zum 60. Geburtstag*, Leipzig: E.A. Seemann, 1927, pp. 261-308.

Panofsky, 1971 (1953): Erwin Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting. Its Origins and Character*, 2 vols., New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Pickering, 1980 (1953): F.P. Pickering, 'The Gothic Image of Christ: The Sources of Medieval Representations of the Crucifixion', in F.P. Pickering, *Essays on Medieval German Literature and Iconography*, Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1980, pp. 3-30.

Powell, 2006: Amy Powell, 'A Point "Ceaselessly Pushed Back": The Origin of Early Netherlandish Painting', *The Art Bulletin*, 88, no. 4, 2006, pp. 707-28.

Raw, 1990: Barbara C. Raw, *Anglo-Saxon Crucifixion Iconography and the Art of the Monastic Revival*, Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Ringbom, 1983: Sixten Ringbom, *Icon to Narrative. The Rise of the Dramatic Close-Up in Fifteenth-Century Devotional Painting*, second ed., Doornspijk: Davaco, 1983.

Rubin, 1991: Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi. The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture*, Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Said, 2003: Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, revised 2003 ed., London: Penguin, 2003.

Scarry, 1985: Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain. The Making and Unmaking of the World*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1985.

Schiller, 1972: Gertrud Schiller, *Iconography of Christian Art*, 2 vols., trans. Janet Seligman, Greenwich, Connecticut: New York Graphic Society, 1972.

Schönborn, 1994: Christoph von Schönborn, *God's Human Face. The Christ-Icon*, trans. Lothar Krauth, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1994.

Schulz, 1986: Hans-Joachim Schulz, *The Byzantine Liturgy. Symbolic Structure and Faith Expression*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell, New York: Pueblo Publishing, 1986.

Stubblebine, 1969: James J. Stubblebine, 'Segna di Buonaventura and the Image of the Man of Sorrows', *Gesta*, 8, no. 2, 1969, pp. 3-13.

Taft, 1975: Robert F. Taft, *The Great Entrance. A History of the Transfer of Gifts and other Preanaphoral Rites of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, Rome: Pontificium Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1975.

Walton, 2003: John H. Walton, 'The Imagery of the Substitute King Ritual in Isaiah's Fourth Servant Song', *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 122, no. 4, 2003, pp. 734-43.

Weitzmann, 1961: Kurt Weitzmann, 'The Origin of the Threnos', in *Essays in Honor of Erwin Panofsky [De Artibus Opuscula, 40]*, edited by Millard Meiss, New York: New York University Press, 1961, pp. 476-89.

Weitzmann, 1966: Kurt Weitzmann, 'Icon Painting in the Crusader Kingdom', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 20, 1966, pp. 49-83.

Wilks, 2005: John G.F. Wilks, 'The Suffering Servant and Personhood', *Evangelical Quarterly*, 77, no. 3, 2005, pp. 195-210.

Wood, 2008: Christopher S. Wood, *Forgery, Replica, Fiction. Temporalities of German Renaissance Art*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.

Woodfin, 2004: Warren Woodfin, 'Liturgical Textiles', in *Byzantium. Faith and Power (1261-1557)*, exh. cat., edited by Helen C. Evans, New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art & Yale University Press, 2004, pp. 295-98.

List of Illustrations

Fig. 1. Byzantine (Serbian), *Epitaphios*, known as the *Epitaphios of King Stefan Uroš II Milutin*, c. 1282-1321. 210 x 132 cm, embroidered silk and velvet. Belgrade, Museum of the Serbian Orthodox Church, inv. no. 4660. New York, 2004, pp. 315-16, cat. 189.

http://www.metmuseum.org/special/Byzantium/images/gallery_5/cccccc/Cat189.R.jpg

Fig. 2. Italian (Umbrian), *The Man of Sorrows*, known as *The Stoclet Man of Sorrows*, c. 1250-60. 32.4 x 22.8 cm, tempera on panel. London, National Gallery, inv. no. NG6573. Cannon, 1999, fig. 55.

<http://www.nationalgallery.org.uk/paintings/italian-umbrian-the-man-of-sorrows>

Fig. 3. Byzantine, *The King of Glory*, c. 1300. 19 x 13 cm, mosaic. (On the reverse, *St Catherine*.) Rome, S. Croce in Gerusalemme. New York, 2004, pp. 221-22, cat. 131.

http://www.metmuseum.org/special/Byzantium/images/gallery_4/cccccc/Cat131Alt1.R.jpg

Fig. 4. Byzantine, *The King of Glory*, 12th century. 19 x 13 cm, mosaic. (On the reverse, *Virgin and Child*.) Kastoria, Byzantine Museum. Neff, 1999, fig. 13.

<http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Tapeinosis-Kastoria-12C.jpg>

Fig. 5. Riminese (possibly Pietro da Rimini), *The Man of Sorrows*, c. 1310-25. 26.7 x 16.8 cm, tempera on panel. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. no. 28.887.

<http://72.5.117.144/fif=fpix/e/E9920CR-d1.fpx&obj=iip.1.0&wid=400&cvt=jpeg>

Fig. 6. Roberto Oderisi (d'Odorisio), *The Man of Sorrows and Arma Christi*, c. 1354. 62.2 x 38 cm, tempera and gold on panel. Cambridge (Massachusetts), Fogg Art Museum, inv. no. 1937.49. Ringbom, 1983, fig. 60.

http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUAM:VRS10625_mddl

Fig. 7. Paolo Veneziano and workshop, *Crucifixion*, c. 1349. 96.8 x 67.7 cm (max. height and width, irregular), tempera and gold on panel (poplar). Melbourne, National Gallery of Victoria, inv. no. 1966/4. Hoff, 1995, p. 208-9.

<http://www.ngv.vic.gov.au/climages/large/Fd1/Fd100208.jpg>

Fig. 8. Giotto di Bondone, *St. Francis of Assisi Receiving the Stigmata, with Scenes from the Life of the Saint*, c. 1295-1300. 313 x 163 cm (including predella, irregular), tempera on panel. Paris, Louvre, inv. no. 309. Gnudi, 1959, pl. 66.

http://www.louvre.fr/media/repository/ressources/sources/illustration/atlas/image_58622_v2_m565775_69830597887.jpg

Fig. 9. Niccolò di Segna, *St. Francis of Assisi*, c. 1340. 25.8 x 20.1 cm, tempera and gold on panel. Pisa, Museo Nazionale di Palazzo Reale, inv. no. unassigned.

<http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Saint-Francis- Niccolo di Segna, Pisa.jpg>

Fig. 10. Naddo Ceccharelli, *Man of Sorrows*, c. 1347. 71 x 50 cm, oil on panel. Vaduz, Princely Collections, currently held at Vienna, Liechtenstein Museum, inv. no. GE862. Kräftner, 2004, p. 23.

<http://www.liechtensteinmuseum.at/de/pages/showImage.asp?src=/assets/images/BA04D.jpg&width=440>

Fig. 11. Giovanni Bellini, *St. Francis in the Desert*, c. 1475-80. 124.5 x 142 cm, oil and tempera on panel (poplar). New York, Frick Collection, inv. no. 1915.1.03. Bäschmann, 2008, p. 110, fig. 95.

<http://collections.frick.org/media/Previews/Objects/1915/19151003.jpg>