Frantová, Zuzana; Pecinová, Kristýna

The icon of Old Brno: a reconsideration

Opuscula historiae artium. 2013, vol. 62, iss. Supplementum, pp. 62-75

ISSN 1211-7390 (print); ISSN 2336-4467 (online)

Stable URL (handle): https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/129801
Access Date: 16. 02. 2024
Version: 20220831

The icon of Old Brno: a reconsideration*

Zuzana Frantová – Kristýna Pecinová

The article is focused on a panel painting of the Virgin Mary with Child kept in the Church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary in Old Brno. A review of all previous studies revealed a necessity to examine the panel from the perspective of Mediterranean icon painting. In view of the fact that contemporary sources relating to the origin of the panel do not exist, a thoroughgoing formal analysis remains the only instrument which could lead to a more probable time and place for its origin. From the formal point of view we can observe a fusion of the elements characteristic both for Eastern and Western icons. Therefore we can consider the Brno panel a result of the intersection of the two traditions and determine time and place when the intersection was not only possible, but in light of historical events, logical as well. We have found the closest analogous artistic features of works originating in Puglia in the second half of the 13th century. Puglia as one of the regions, steeped in Byzantine culture, could have given the icon its marked Eastern character, as well as permitting a broader dialogue with Western production. The analysis of this broader historical and geographical context explains the Brno panel's exceptionality in style and quality that ranks above production of Czech territory.

Keywords: Byzantine painting, Crusader kingdom, Cyprus, Hodegetria, Icon, Mediterranean icon painting, Old Brno, panel painting, Puglia, Virgin Mary, 13th century

Zuzana Frantová
Masarykova univerzita Brno / Masaryk University Brno
e-mail: zuzana.frantova@mail.muni.cz

Kristýna Pecinová
Masarykova univerzita Brno / Masaryk University Brno
e-mail: kristyna.pecinova@mail.muni.cz

A panel painting of the Virgin Mary with Child (86 × 50) is presently part of a silver baroque altar in the Church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary in Old Brno. [*fig. 1*] It is probably the oldest surviving panel painting in Czech territory, and by its style and quality ranks above local production. Its dating in the literature ranges from the 12th to the 14th centuries, and the question of its provenance has not been satisfactorily resolved.[1] If we leave the milieu of Czech art-history and examine the panel from the perspective of Mediterranean icon painting, a reappraisal of all previous studies seems to be inevitable. In the present article we will try to study the icon in this broader historical and geographical context. In view of the fact that contemporary sources relating to the origin of the panel do not exist, a thoroughgoing formal analysis remains the only instrument which could lead to a more probable time and place for its origin. As Hans Belting[2] and Milena Bartlová[3] have already pointed out, formal analysis is, with regard to the present state of the icon after a modern restoration, very complicated. In the present study we will thus proceed from a photo taken in 1945–1946 after the removal of all modern over painting, [*fig. 2*] i. e. before it was – in our opinion – very questionably restored.

As we have already pointed out, there is no series of written sources documenting the story of the Brno panel. The oldest documents come from 1493, and were probably created in the Augustinian monastery in Brno.[4] The icon's original location in the Church of the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary and St. Thomas at the Augustinian monastery in the centre of Brno remains the only certitude. Its founder was John Henry of Luxembourg, Margrave of Moravia and younger brother of Charles IV. The ceremonial consecration of part of the Church took place in 1356, and as early as the following year, Pope Innocent IV confirmed twelve episcopal indulgences of forty days, conditioned on a pilgrimage to the image of the Virgin in the monastery's chapel.[5]

One of Brno's baroque legends, from 1736, places the origin of the St. Thomas icon in Constantinople, whence it ended up in Milan. Then at some time between 1158 and 1165 it supposedly was taken as spoils of war by King Vladislaus II when his army plundered the town.[6] Its supposed Eastern origin is a common element in the majority

of previous studies.[7] While the Brno icon's Eastern *maniera* seems to be undeniable, we will soon see that several facts contradict this legend. If the panel had reached the Kingdom of Bohemia in this way, with the King, it would have been recorded in the St. Vitus treasury inventory,[8] just like a registered fragment of a seven-branched candelabrum originating in Palestine whose acquisition is also assumed to be connected with booty from Milan.[9] King Vladislaus could had donated the picture immediately after his arrival, but in that case it could not have been at the disposal of the Luxembourg dynasty at the time of the foundation of the Brno monastery.

Therefore, in view of the fact that it was not recorded as part of the treasury of St. Vitus, it is sensible to assume that the icon reached the Kingdom of Bohemia right in the middle of the 14th century, and was immediately placed in the church of the Augustinian monastery. A series of possible historical explanations of how the panel ended up in Moravia were proposed by Lubomíra Havlíková. In keeping with the previous studies, and accepting its possible Eastern origin, she focused on the Byzantine or broader Balkan area, and considered possible diplomatic contacts between Charles IV and the Eastern sovereign. However, she completely omitted information provided by the painting itself.[10] It is the only reliable historical source. The formal reappraisal we propose in this article leads us to the unambiguous conclusion that the Brno Virgin does not belong to the context of painting in the 12th century or before. It will be necessary to abandon the Brno legend of its Milanese origins as well as any attempt to date it to the 12th century.[11]

The only chance to examine it in detail fell to Hedvika Böhmová between 1945–1946, when all the accreted

1 – The Icon of Old Brno – state after the restoration, second half of the 13th century, Italian provenance. Church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary in Old Brno, Brno

2 – The Icon of Old Brno – state before the restoration, second half of the 13th century, Italian provenance. Church of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary in Old Brno, Brno

3 – Madonna Aracoeli, around 1360. Metropolitan Chapter by St. Vitus in Prague

layers were removed, and the panel was restored in the ateliers of the Moravian Museum in Brno. She claims that the panel was composed of three boards of which the right one is made of poplar wood and the two others of linden wood.[12] This fact led Milena Bartlová to the hypothesis that the right-hand third of the panel with figure of Jesus could be a fragment of a Byzantine or Italo-Byzantine panel that was completed in 14th or even 17th century. In order to more precisely establish the date, she calls for the restoration to be re-done. In the meantime she proposes a bold theory: that John Henry got hold of an already modified panel that had been reworked by the Prague court painters. She is more circumspect with the question of its attribution to the circle of Master Theodoric; this she considers impossible to judge given the state of the panel after its modern restoration. However, according to Bartlová, this could be a possible attribution given the painting's soft modeling, already pointed out by Böhmová, as well as some physiognomic features such as the "relatively large nose" of the Virgin Mary. She considers the Madonna Aracoeli from the treasury of St. Vitus in Prague, a "similar replica". [*fig. 3*] She sees another parallel with Czech 14th century painting in the way the back of the panel is painted in light gray, just like the Madonna Aracoeli with the painted frame in the National Gallery in Prague.[13] [*fig. 4*] That the panel is a composite of two kinds of wood is interesting, but does not tell us much about its provenance or dating. Whether the panel really used to be only a fragment, later completed by the addition of the figure of the Virgin Mary (or vice versa) painted on a different kind of wood, as Bartlová supposed,[14] is impossible to determine given the present state of knowledge. Böhmová, however, does not even indicate that there could be two different layers of painting.[15] In any case, the Prague Madonna Aracoeli panels mentioned above provide indisputable evidence that the Brno Madonna could not have been entirely the product of Charles' court artists, and the question of its origin becomes that much more intriguing.

Together with the Madonna of Březnice [*fig. 5*] which will be discussed later, three panel paintings [*figs. 4 and 6*, National Gallery in Prague; *fig. 3*, St. Vitus treasure in Prague] represent the most famous examples of conscious imitation of Italo-Byzantine icons by the artists of the Luxembourg court. These three copies from Prague, iconographically and typologically related to some venerated Roman icons, perhaps to the Madonna Aracoeli[16] [*fig. 7*]

4 – Master of the Třeboň Altar, **Madonna Aracoeli**, 1385–1390. National Gallery in Prague

or the Madonna S. Sisto,[17] [*fig. 8*] are still awaiting a more thoroughgoing study, and their mutual relations have not been clearly identified. A possible Italian origin has only been considered for the Madonna in the treasury of St. Vitus, [*Fig. 3*] chiefly because of its hard-edged drawing and different style of painting.[18] But both panel paintings from the National Gallery show, at first glance, that the artist made no attempt to imitate a style of expression he was not familiar with, and can be safely attributed to the circle of Master Theodoric [*fig. 6*] and the Master of the Třeboň Altar [*fig. 4*] While circumscribed by their Roman model, the artists do not follow it slavishly. The figures are more freely treated and have a different emotional tenor. The facial features and drapery, with their soft shading, become more plastic. Especially in the case of Madonna Aracoeli [*fig. 7*] we can observe more flatness and a graphical structure in the drapery, laid out in black lines. The Prague Madonna's give us an impression of massiveness, three-dimensionality and plasticity; in place of a diagram we see a corporeal being; "instead of a mask, Marie has the real face of a tormented woman." The two Madonna's of the Aracoeli type from the National Gallery represent "evidence of what the Byzantine impulse meant for us, and at the same time a classic example of the way the Czech artistic vision transformed the original model."[19] Nor do Italian icons have certain iconographic details such as the drops of blood on the coats of both the Prague Madonna's, or the slightly tilted head, contrasting with the strict frontal view in the Italian icons.

Similar features can be observed – albeit in a more limited way and with much less of a "Czech" imprint – in the case of the Madonna of Březnice.[20] [*Fig. 5*] Whereas with the examples from the National Gallery discussed above we are not entirely sure which models were used, nor how they were followed, in case of the Madonna of Březnice we can assume that the painter had the icon he needed to reproduce right in front of his eyes. This fact is confirmed by a surviving inscription on the back side of the panel which tells us that it was commissioned by King Wenceslas IV as a copy of an image of St. Luke present in Roudnice nad Labem in 1396.[21] The Madonna of Březnice was described by Hans Belting as a "mirror image" of the famous Sinai icon [*Fig. 9*] originating in Crusader Cyprus in the 13th century.[22] The prototype for both images, from Sinai and Březnice, has been identified as being the Madonna of Kykoss,[23] an image of St. Luke[24] transferred in the 12th century from Constantinople to Cyprus, which gave rise to numerous copies in the 13th century in this geographic area.[25] Despite the fact that the Sinai icon was probably painted by a Western painter,[26] it was created in a milieu where copying of venerated icons was more familiar to artists, and their approach to it showed much more experience than could be demonstrated by court painters in Prague. With the Madonna of Březnice, therefore, we can study much more closely the ability of the Luxembourg artists to imitate an Eastern icon (or a copy of one). From the formal point of view, our attention is first drawn to the strange execution and arrangement of the drapery in the coat of the Virgin Mary: it is grouped into gathering lines that are, compared with the drapery in the Sinai icon, illogical and incomprehensible, testifying rather to a decorative effect than an effort to imitate real cloth, whereas that on the Sinai icon gives us the impression of naturalness. While the drapery of Jesus and Mary is not created using light and shadow at all, the artists from the land of Wenceslas have not stinted on technique in the face and hand of the Virgin Mary; their soft modeling wholly corresponds to all the principles of the international style.

Now we shall try to compare the subject of our study – the panel in Brno – with the panels at the National Gallery in Prague. Are there, in the Brno icon, similar means of expression to those found in the Luxembourg artists' panels? The relatively poor state of the Brno icon, whose original state is best studied in photos taken after newer layers were removed in 1945, only allows a formal analysis to a limited extent. Nevertheless, we are able to observe, at first glance,

5 – Madonna of Březnice, 1396. National Gallery in Prague

6 – Madonna Aracoeli, around 1360–1370. Metropolitan Chapter by St. Vitus in Prague, exhibited in the National Gallery in Prague

7 – Madonna Aracoeli, 11th century. Church of S. Maria in Aracoeli, Rome

8 – Madonna S. Sisto, 6th century. S. Maria del Rosario, Rome

a much closer stylistic relationship to the Italian icons mentioned above [*fig. 2*] than to the Prague icons.

The features already mentioned above are evident: the flatness of the face and graphic treatment of drapery with the use of black lines. At this point, it is necessary to draw attention to the somewhat different formal conception of Jesus. He is modeled in light and shadow, the hair is made up of fine tufts and his face seems much less linear and more softly shaded. There could only be two possible explanations for this: first, the panel could really be made up of boards originating in two different areas and periods; second, the upper layers of the Virgin Mary's face, more finely modeled, could have been removed more assiduously than in the case of Jesus. But even if the face of Mary had been conceived in a much less linear manner than what we seem to see in photos taken before its restoration, the face of Jesus shows shading achieved by an altogether different technique. This is not a modeling using colored stains, but rather soft-focus black lines. What the current state of preservation does allow us to analyze is the design of Mary's nose – it passes into the brow marked by only one black line, tapered at its end. In all of the paintings from the National Gallery, discussed above, this detail of the human face is much more mimetic. Nor, in any of the Prague paintings, do we find a special and very significant feature: the deep dark shadows around the eyes of Maria and Jesus on the Brno panel. Finally, we would be so bold as to say that the overall effect of the Brno panel is much more natural and loose than the effects of the Prague paintings. The above-mentioned works, originating in the Luxembourg court, are so different formally as to make it impossible to find any relationship between them and the Brno panel. In spite of all the effort expended on putting the Brno panel (or even just a part of it) into the context of Czech art of the 14th century,[27] in such a context it would be totally unique not only from a formal point of view, as we have tried to show, but

9 – Icon of Sinai, Crusader icon from Cyprus, 13th century. Monastery of St. Catherine, Sinai

10 – Salus Populi Romani, 6th (?) and 13th century. S. Maria Maggiore, Rome

11 – Byzantine Master, **Icon of Sinai**, 13th century. Monastery of St. Catherine, Sinai

also from an iconographic and typological point of view, as we will now see. It would seem that the only thing the Brno icon has in common with the Czech environment is really just its location after the mid-14th century, as well as its restoration after the Second World War. Therefore, we believe that our attention should be focused elsewhere.

At this moment, as we have already said, all the specific formal characteristics found on the Brno panel could rather serve to link it to Italian icons. What is more, one of the most significant elements of the panel – its straight frontality and eye contact with the audience, lead our attention towards one of the most venerated of Roman icons, Salus Populi Romani in Santa Maria Maggiore,[28] [*fig. 10*] or the older Madonna at the Pantheon.[29] The same direct glance, along with the strict gesture of Mary's hand and her direct posture are known from Roman icons painted starting in the 6th century, as well as in a different type of Mary, without child, known as the Advocata,[30] the most famous example of which is the Madonna of S. Sisto.[31] [*fig. 8*] The best-known copy of this icon, which was even venerated as the original, is the Madonna Aracoeli.[32] [*fig. 7*] This Roman model of the Advocata circulated widely in the West, and was imitated in numerous reproductions, including the above-mentioned Czech copies.[33] (*figs. 3, 4 and 6*) We are aware of the obstacles to rendering more than the most basic judgment regarding the origin of these kinds of panels. In the study of icons, the questions of specific geographic origins, relationships between panels, models for transmission, the persistence of iconographic types, and the question of exchanges of experience between artists and schools, are all vexed ones. Only a precise formal analysis and comparison with surviving monuments from clearly identified geographic areas can serve as instruments to help determine the probable provenance of this unique painting. We shall attempt to overcome the limits imposed by the poor state of the painting by using the typology of the Virgin Mary and Child, and we shall outline the historical background that might be able to explain the characteristic features of the panel.

The Brno icon is an example of the Eastern type of Mother of God icons known as Hodegetria.[34] The Virgin Mary, in a rigid posture, is dressed in a heavy dark maphorion with a highlighted border, and with her direct gaze she enters into eye contact with the audience. The Virgin holds the infant Jesus in her left arm, pointing to him with her right hand. Christ is depicted with a scroll in his left hand and making a gesture of benediction with the right hand, all while turning his head toward his mother. [*fig. 1*] It is a widespread type of Mother of God with Child icon, as shown by the numerous surviving examples from the East as well as from a wide area around the Mediterranean.[35] Not only the iconography, but other stylistic features take us Eastwards at first glance. The face is shaped by peaceful, harmonious, simple and clean lines, stylized enough to achieve the impression of detachment, meant as an expression of the Divine.[36] The large almond-shaped eyes, immersed in deep shadows, are also Eastern features. The same goes for the high arched eyebrows, the lines of which connect at the bridge of the nose and flow into its sharply contoured ridge. We can meet analogously formed faces and melancholy expressions in a number of Byzantine icons.[37] From among all of these, we offer for comparison an example denoted by Kurt Weitzmann as "The typical Byzantine Virgin of the Hodogetria type",[38] [*fig. 11*] showing all the characteristics found in the Brno panel as well.

If we accept the possibility that we are dealing with a fusion of several elements – iconography and formal design based on venerated and widely copied Roman icons joined with elements characteristic of Eastern icons – we can

12 – Madonna della Fonte of Conversano, 1268–1269. Cathedral of Conversano

13 – Madonna della Madia of Monopoli, 80s of the 13th century. Cathedral of Monopoli

consider the Brno panel a result of the intersection of the two traditions. It would therefore have to have been produced at a time when the intersection was not only possible, but in light of historical events, logical as well.

All of Southern Italy was under the strong influence of Byzantine culture for several centuries.[39] This relationship went back to the early Middle Ages and took on a new intensity in the 11th century. The year 1071 saw two crucial events in the history of relations between East and West; the first was the conquest of the port of Bari (Puglia), the last foothold of the Eastern Empire in Italy, by Normans; the second was the dedication of a restored basilica at the monastery of Montecassino. For its decoration, Abbot Desiderius invited many Byzantine artists.[40] The decoration of the monastery at Montecassino,[41] along with the activity of Greek workshops in projects in Norman Sicily in the 12th and 13th centuries, had a crucial impact on the artistic production of the next periods.[42] Immediately upon the Normans' arrival in Sicily there was a renewal of artistic production by artists invited from Byzantium for the purpose of decorating prominent monuments. The mosaics in Monreale, Cefalù, the Capella Palatina in Palermo, or the frescoes of the Paterno Castle chapel are shining examples of this fact.[43] Moreover, it may be assumed that such an abundant concentration of Eastern workshops, all in the same place, did not survive for long, but rather that in the course of time some artists left for new projects in other areas of Southern Italy. Puglia, Calabria, Campania and Basilicata thus become the significant centers of Greek figurative artistic production, and they reached their peak in the 13th century.[44]

The other intensive dialogue between East and West arrived with the conquest of Constantinople by Crusader troops in 1204, at which point new direct contacts were initiated. This gave rise to the Crusaders workshops in Cyprus,[45] and brought new impulses to Italian artists as well as reinforcing and prolonging older relationships, resulting in new and non-traditional means of expression. Later on, of course, the stream began to flow in the opposite direction, with Western artists bringing their models to the East, many of which were successfully integrated into Eastern art – not least of all in iconography.[46]

We would like to propose that the Brno Madonna belongs to this milieu of lively circulation of models and artistic exchange in both directions. Comparison with surviving monuments from the above- mentioned environment, where the two cultures were mixed, leads us to a concrete region: Puglia. That is where we can find its closest parallels with respect to form and typology We will illustrate this premise with three other examples of icons: the Madonna della Fonte of Conversano (1268-1269)[47] the Madonna della Madia of Monopoli (1280),[48] and the Madonna of Andria (13th century).[49]

In the first of them [*fig. 12*] we find that Mary has an analogous posture, an oval shaped face and similar treatment of the details of her face. The solid eyebrow-line and its transition at the bridge of the nose, the setting of the eyes into deep shadows, the linear conception of the nose and way it ends – features found and described in more detail in the section of this paper describing the Brno panel – all suggest a similar artistic milieu. The conception of the child is quite different; for him, however, we find a close parallel on the panel of the Madonna della Madia. [*fig. 13*] It has been dated to the 80s of the 13th century, but we are less sure of its place of origin. Constantinople, or Italy with the use of Eastern models, are both worthy of consideration.[50] The particular form of the child's head, narrowing at the height of the ears, the glance towards his mother, his straight posture, the deep shadows around his eyes, the chubby chin and high forehead; all these features are also found on the Brno panel. Finally, a comparison with the Andria icon, [*fig. 14*] which is considered the work of either a Southern Italian or a Byzantine artist of the early 13th century, with a conscious nod to Cypriot icons of the

14 – Madonna of Andria, early 13th century. Cathedral of Andria

last decade of the 12th century Cypriot, provides us with the other plausible hypothesis - a relationship to contemporaneous Cypriot production.[51] We would like to point out the Virgin's face, harmoniously composed with lines, with delicate transition elements in the zones of the eyes and nose. Nevertheless, the shading is executed in a more gentle manner, with less contrast. It has already been said that the Brno panel could have had some upper layers wiped off, so we will not attempt to further analyze this formal feature. The Andria icon is considered, along with the Madonna della Madia, a prototype for the next series of icons that were produced in the above-mentioned circumstances in Southern Italy in the 13th century;[52] the Madonna of Brno could also have been produced there.

Considering the models we have looked at, Puglia seems to us the most plausible place of origin for the Brno panel. Its close affinity with Cypriot production, particularly the Andria icon [*fig. 14*] is also food for thought.[53] Since Cyprus had been conquered at the end of the 10th century by the Byzantines, the Byzantine culture had taken deep roots there. Above all, in the 12th century, many churches were decorated with frescoes of high quality, and this activity continued into the 13th century.[54] At the end of the 12th century, Cyprus was occupied by the Crusaders and became a Crusader kingdom. If the Crusaders were interested in Byzantine painting,[55] they could look to Cyprus not only as a source of models, but also as an important center of inspiration.[56] And Cyprus was also a place where the polarity we have so often mentioned in this paper – East meets West – could be found.

Valentino Pace explains the strong "Byzantinizing" tendencies of Puglia not only by contacts with the Holy Land, but with Cyprus as well. Pace supposes that after the losses of Jerusalem (1244) and Acre (1291), a diaspora of painters was unleashed, one which would even reach the shores of Puglia, and give rise to works such as the Madonna of Andria.[57] [*fig. 18*] Likewise, D'Elia explains the "iconism" of Puglian art by direct artistic influence from Palestine and Cyprus, with the main medium of this influence being icons.[58] The Brno icon might be considered a Puglian interpretation of Cypriot models from the 70s and 80s of the 13th centuries, already acculturated in Italy.

If we consider the relations between East and West in icon panel painting, we are aware of an immense space opening in front of us. We are not yet in a position to make a full estimate of the role Crusader art of the 13th century must have played in bringing and absorbing the Byzantine style to the Latin West, where it penetrated in waves into many regions of Europe. What impact Crusader icons may have exerted for example on Tuscan panel painting (the *maniera greca* par excellence) is a complex question which still waits to be explored in detail and should not be excluded in the examination of the Brno panel. However, the closest parallels we have discovered so far are to be seen in the three icons mentioned above.

The aim of present article was, above all, to reassess the previous studies of the Brno Madonna, call attention to how exceptional it is among surviving monuments in the Czech lands, and put it into a broader context of research into the production of icons. As one of our principal conclusions, we have noted the analogous artistic features of works originating in Puglia in the second half of the 13th century. We shall leave open the question of the icon's relations to contemporaneous Cypriot production. Both these regions, steeped in Byzantine culture, could have given the icon its marked Eastern character, as well as permitting a broader dialogue with Western production. Further research, if it is to lead to a better understanding of this work, should include a re-examination of the restoration carried out on the work, a restoration which we consider highly questionable and an impediment to full examination of the work. Much work also remains to be done, in a more general historical context, to determine how the Virgin of Brno could have ended up in the Czech lands.

Photographic credits: 1: Propagation reproduction provided by the Abbey of Old Brno 2009; 2: Photo: National Heritage Institute in Brno; 3–5: repro: Jiří Fajt (ed.), *Karel IV. – císař z boží milosti. Kultura a umění za vlády Lucemburků, 1310 – 1437*, Praha 2006, pp. 158, 488; 6: repro: Štěpánka Chlumská (ed.), *Čechy a střední Evropa 1200–1550, dlouhodobá expozice sbírky starého umění Národní Galerie v Praze v klášteře sv. Anežky České*, Praha 2006, p. 31;7, 8, 10, 14: author's archive; 9: repro: Hans Belting, *Likeness and presence. A history of the image before the era of art*, Chicago 1994, p. 339; 11: repro: Kurt Weitzmann, Icon painting in the Crusader kingdom, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 20, 1966, p. 66; 12, 13: repro: Pina Belli D'Elia (ed.), *Icone di Puglia e Basilicata dal Medioevo al Settecento*, Milano 1988, cat. no. 19, 18.

Notes

[*] We would like to express our sincere thanks for the opportunity to publish this text to Ivan Foletti. Special thanks go to Valentino Pace, whose specialist advice from his field of expertise, icon painting, made us sure of the necessity of studying the Brno icon in a broader Mediterranean context.

[1] Clemens Janetschek, *Das Augustiner-Eremitenstift St. Thomas in Brünn*, Brno 1898, p. 240. – Antonín Matějček – Josef Myslivec, České madony byzantských typů, *Památky archeologické* 40, 1937, p. 13. – Hedvika Böhmová, Obraz Madony v kostele na Starém Brně, *Časopis Moravského musea* 43, 1958, pp. 175–183. – Klement Benda, Byzantské a starokřesťanské památky v Československu, in: Jean Lassus (ed.), *Raně křesťanské a byzantské umění*, Praha 1971, p. 185. – Ivo Kořán – Zbigniew Jakubowski, Byzantské vlivy na počátku české malby gotické a roudnická madona v Krakově, *Umění* XXIV, 1976, pp. 218–246. – Karel Stejskal, *Umění na dvoře Karla IV.,* Praha 1978, p. 94. – Bohumil Samek, *Klášter augustiniánů v Brně*, Brno 1993, p. 31. – Hans Belting, *Likeness and presence. A history of the image before the era of art*, Chicago 1994, pp. 333–335. – Petr Zelinka, *Obraz Madony Svatotomské: Slavnost korunovace milostného obrazu Madony Svatotomské v klášteře augustiniánů poustevníků u svatého Tomáše v Brně roku 1736,* Brno 2001. – Milena Bartlová, Tři středověké mariánské obrazy od sv. Tomáše v Brně, *Opuscula historiae artium* 52, 2009, pp. 5–25. – Eadem, Black is Beautiful aneb Nigra sum sed formosa, in: Pavel Suchánek – Martin Čihalík (edd.), *Stříbrný oltář v bazilice Nanebevzetí Panny Marie na Starém Brně*, Brno 2011, pp. 25–35. – Lubomíra Havlíková, Cesty ikon. Madona Svatotomská a Jan Jindřich, Karel IV., Štěpán Dušan a Ioannes V. Palaiologos, in: ibidem, pp. 36–73. – Milena Bartlová, *Skutečná přítomnost. Středověký obraz mezi ikonou a virtuální realitou*, Praha 2012, p. 122.

[2] Belting (see note 1), pp. 333–335.

[3] Bartlová 2009 (see note 1), p. 10.

[4] Zelinka (see note 1), p. 46.

[5] Bartlová 2009 (see note 1), p. 6.

[6] Zelinka (see note 1), pp. 45–46. – Bartlová 2011 (see note 1), p. 26. – Havlíková (see note 1), pp. 38–39.

[7] e.g. Belting (see note 1), Bartlová 2009 (see note 1), p. 9. – Havlíková (see note 1). – Bartlová 2012 (see note 1).

[8] Antonín Podlaha – Eduard Šittler, *Chrámový poklad u sv. Víta v Praze. Jeho dějiny a popis*, Praha 1903.

[9] Havlíková (see note 1), p. 57.

[10] Havlíková (see note 1), p. 57.

[11] Kořán – Jakubowski (see note 1), p. 219. – Stejskal (see note 1), p. 94.

[12] Böhmová (see note 1), p. 176. From the published report of restoration we cannot conclude if this fact was carried out with scientific criteria.

[13] Bartlová 2009 (see note 1), pp. 9–10.

[14] Bartlová 2009 (see note 1), p. 9.

[15] Böhmová (see note 1), p. 177.

[16] Claudia Tempesta, Madonna Avvocata detta "Madonna d'Aracoeli" alias "Madonna Avvocata", in: Giorgio Leone (ed.), *Tavola miracolose. Le Icone medievali di Roma e del Lazio del Fondo Edifici di Culto*, *Catalogo della mostra, Roma 13 novembre – 15 dicembre 2012*, Roma 2012, pp. 46–48 with complete bibliography.

[17] Giorgio Leone, Madonna Avvocata detta "Madonna di San Luca" alias "Madonna del Monasterium Tempuli" o "Madonna di San Sisto" o "Nostra Signora del Rosario", in: Leone (see note 16), pp. 42–46 with complete bibliography.

[18] Ivo Kořán, Gotické Veraikony a svatolukášské madony v pražské katedrále, *Umění* XLIX, 1991, pp. 286–315, esp. p. 298. Jiří Fajt proposes an origin in the circle of Magister Theodoricus in: Jiří Fajt, Magister Theodoricus, dvorní malíř císaře Karla IV, in: Jiří Fajt (ed.), *Magister Theodoricus, dvorní malíř císaře Karla IV. Umělecká výzdoba posvátných prostor hradu Karlštejna*, Praha 1997, pp. 281–349, esp. p. 333.

[19] Kořán (see note 18), p. 299.

[20] Milena Bartlová, Černá madona březnická, *Dějiny a současnost: kulturně historická revue* 18, 1996, pp. 28–31.

[21] Ibidem, p. 28.

[22] Belting (see note 1); more about the icon of Sinai in: Kurt Weitzmann, Icon painting in the Crusader kingdom, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 20, 1966, pp. 49–83, esp. pp. 66–67. – Idem, *Studies in the Arts at Sinai*, Princeton 1982, pp. 340–341.

[23] Belting (see note 1), p. 336. – Weitzmann, Icon painting in the Crusader kingdom (see note 22), pp. 66–67; more about icon of Kykoss in: Michele Bacci, L' icona della Vergine di Kykkos, in: Maria Katja Guida (ed.), *La the Madonna delle Vittorie a Piazza Armerina*, Napoli 2009, pp. 37–42.

[24] More about St. Luke's origin of icons in: Belting (see note 1), pp. 57–59. – Michele Bacci, *Il pennello dell'evangelista. Storia delle immagini sacre attribute a san Luca*, Pisa 1998.

[25] Belting (see note 1), p. 336. – Bartlová (see note 10), p. 8.

[26] Belting (see note 1), p. 336.

[27] Bartlová 2009 (see note 1), p. 10.

[28] Gerhard P. Wolf, *Salus Populi Romani: Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kultbildes im Mittelalter*, Weinheim 1990. – Belting (see note 1), p. 70.

[29] Carlo Bertelli, La Madonna del Pantheon, *Bollettino d'arte*, 1961, pp. 24–32. – Belting (see note 1), pp. 39, 121–124. – Maria Andaloro, *Dal ritratto all'icona. Le antiche icone di Roma. Invisibilia per visibilia*, in: Maria Andaloro – Serena Romano, *Arte e iconografia a Roma da Costantino a Cola di Rienzo,* Milano 2000, pp. 48–59.

[30] David H. Wright, The Earliest Icons in Rome, *Arts Magazine* 38, 1963, pp. 24–31.

[31] Belting (see note 1), pp. 314–323, 335. – Maria Andaloro – Serena Romano, *Römisches Mittelalter. Kunst und Kultur in Rom, von der Spätantike bis Giotto*, Regensburg 2002, p. 47.

[32] Tempesta (see note 16).

[33] Olga Pujmanová, Madona Aracoeli a Veraikon v Praze, *Umění* XL, 1992, pp. 249–265, esp. p. 256.

[34] More about the type Hodegetria in: Konrad Onasch, *Liturgie und Kunst der Ostkirche in Stichworten*, Leipzig 1981, pp. 141–146. – Belting (see note 1), pp. 73–77. – Michele Bacci, The legacy of the Hodegetria. Holy icons and legends between East and West, in: Maria Vassilaki (ed.), *Images of the Mother of God*, Aldershot 2005, pp. 321–336. – Bissera V. Pentcheva, *Icons and power. The Mother of God in Byzantium*, University Park 2006, pp. 109–144.

[35] Kurt Weitzmann et al., *Les icônes*, Paris 2001. – Bacci (see note 35). – Belting (see note 1), pp. 73–77.

[36] Weitzmann, Icon painting in the Crusader kingdom (see note 22), p. 81.

[37] Kurt Weitzmann, *Icone: Sinai, Grecia, Bulgaria, Jugoslavia*, Milano 1968, pp. 9–15.

[38] Weitzmann, Icon painting in the Crusader kingdom (see note 22), p. 81.

[39] Vera von Falkenhausen, *La dominazione bizantina nell'Italia meridionale dal IX all'XI secolo*, Bari 1978. – Valentino Pace, Pittura bizantina nell'Italia meridionale (secoli XI – XIV), in: Guglielmo Cavallo, *I bizantini in Italia*, Milano 1982, pp. 427–494. – Maria Andaloro, De Byzance à la Méditerranée, in: Roberto Cassanelli (ed.), *La Méditerranée des croisades*, Paris 2000, pp. 192–218.

[40] Valentino Pace, Icone di Puglia, della Terra Santa e di Cipro: Appunti preliminari per un'indagine sulla ricezione bizantina nell'Italia meridionale,

in: Hans Belting (ed.), *Il Medio Oriente e l'Occidente nell'arte del XIII secolo*, Bologna 1982, pp. 181–191, esp. p. 181.

41 Antonio Iacobini, Il mosaico in Italia dall'XI all'inizio del XIII secolo: spazio, immagini, ideologia, in: Paolo Piva (ed.), *L'arte medievale nel contesto 300–1300. Funzioni, iconografia, tecniche*, Milano 2006, pp. 463–494; Leo Marsicanus, *Cronaca di Montecassino* (III, 26–33), in: Francesco Aceto – Vini Lucherini (edd.), Milano 2001, pp. 54–57.

42 Pace (see note 40), p. 181.

43 Valentino Pace, *La pittura medievale in Sicilia*, in: Carlo Bertelli (ed.), *La pittura in Italia*, Milano 1994, pp. 304–320.

44 Maria Teresa Rodriquez, I manoscritti greci della Biblioteca Regionale di Messina: tipologie e dispersioni, in: Maria Andaloro – Carmela Angela di Stefano – Antonio Cadei (edd.), *Federico e la Sicilia, Dalla terra alla coruna. Arti figurative e arti suntuarie*, Palermo 1995, p. 341.

45 Ntula Murikē, *Thirteenth-century icon painting in Cyprus*, London 1995.

46 Svetozar Radojčić, *Icones de Serbie et de Macédoine*, Zagreb 1960.

47 Pina Belli D'Elia (ed.), *Icone di Puglia e Basilicata dal Medioevo al Settecento*, Milano 1988, cat. No. 19.

48 Ibidem, cat. No. 18.

49 Pace (see note 40), pp. 184–185.

50 Belli D'Elia (see note 48), cat. number 18.

51 Valentino Pace proposes for comparation an icon from Bishop's palace in Kerynia, beginning of 13th century in: Pace (see note 40), pp. 184–185.

52 Pace (see note 40), pp. 181–191, esp. p. 184. – Belli D'Elia (see note 48), pp. 19–30.

53 Pace (see note 40), pp. 184–185.

54 Arthur H. S. Megaw – Andreas Stylianou, *Cyprus: Byzantine Mosaics and Frescoes*, London 1963. – Andreas Stylianou – Judith A. Stylianou, *The painted churches of Cyprus: treasures of Byzantine art,* London 1985. – Weitzmann, Icon painting in the Crusader kingdom (see note 22), p. 51.

55 Murikē (see note 45).

56 Weitzmann, Icon painting in the Crusader kingdom (see note 22), p. 52.

57 Pace (see note 40), p. 184.

58 Michele D'Elia, Per la pittura del duecento in Puglia e Basilicata: ipotesi e proposte*,* in: Pietro Borraro, *Antiche civiltà Lucane*, Galatina 1975, pp. 152–168.