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Abstract

The presence of Greek artists has been consistently attested in the broad Adriatic area from the Late Middle Ages through the entire Early Modern period. Renowned for their ability to work in both the Byzantine and Western iconographic traditions, Greek icon painters appealed to an extensive patronage network that transcended ethnic, socio-economic, and confessional boundaries. The high demand for icons from such a vast demographic resulted into a notable rise in the import of works of Orthodox art in the Adriatic markets, and culminated in the establishment of flourishing icon-painting workshops along the Italian and Dalmatian coasts.
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In his life of Cimabue Giorgio Vasari writes: “It happened that in those days certain Greek painters came to Florence, having been summoned by those who governed the city, for no other purpose than that of introducing there the art of painting, which in Tuscany long had been lost.”¹ According to Vasari, young Cimabue closely studied the paintings created by these Greek artists, and even worked alongside them, only to later turn away from their Byzantine manner, and develop his own artistic style. Vasari also comments that these “Greek painters” cared little for advancing the art
of painting, and produced works “not in the fine ancient Greek manner” but in the “awkward, modern style of their times.” Vasari’s account of ‘Greek painters’ has not so far been confirmed by archival sources, and is often believed to be nothing but a narrative device to trace the roots of Florentine painting; nevertheless, it remains a valuable historical commentary, as it provides evidence for a long-lasting tradition of Greek-speaking artists crossing borders to work in the West, and at the same time, it reflects the perceptions of early art historiography on artworks following the Byzantine tradition. This paper will demonstrate how the “rough, awkward, and commonplace” Byzantine style reproached by Vasari, managed to live on in the Catholic milieu of the Adriatic, allowing for the vibrant circulation of Greek icons, and the establishment of flourishing icon-painting workshops.

Over the last fifty years an extensive body of literature has been produced on the topic of icons and icon painters in the Latin-ruled territories of the Eastern Mediterranean, specifically in the territories of the Venetian state. Of key importance was the discovery of a rich archival material in the State Archives of Venice, which helped elucidate our insights on icon production in the Stato da Màr from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries. Byzantinists and art historians brought to light valuable documents from the Archives of the Duke of Crete, and the records of the notaries of Candia, revealing the names of a large number of icon painters working predominantly in Venetian Crete. In the same archives, scholars also discovered substantial evidence documenting the presence of Greek, mainly Cretan, artists in Venice, and the Orthodox community, thereby linking Cretan painting with European art. In light of these findings, and as the field of Cretan studies was expanding, a substantial number of publications, far too numerous to list here, was produced, focusing overwhelmingly on the artistic developments in
Venetian Crete, and the cultural interactions between its capital, Candia, and Venice. As a result, geographic areas such as Central and South Italy or the East Adriatic coast remained largely underresearched.

Besides Greek historiography, international scholarship has also shown reduced interest in the reception of icon painting in the Adriatic again with the sole exception of Venice. Based on widely published data regarding the Greek community of Venice and its most prominent artists, scholars of the Italian Renaissance have reviewed the circulation of icons *alla greca*, and the production of Greek icon painters as a side chapter of Venetian social and cultural history, relevant to the extent that it highlights the openness of the Venetian state, or the influence of Byzantine art on Renaissance painting. Despite the growing tendency to contest the categories of artistic ‘centers’ and ‘peripheries’, and expand the focus of Renaissance studies to more ‘marginal’ geographic areas, icon painting has yet to become part of the discourse.

In recent years, attempts have been made by Byzantinists and Medievalists to expand the scope of research in Byzantine and ‘post-Byzantine’ art, discussing the cross-cultural interactions in the wider Eastern Mediterranean, and investigating various channels of contacts between Byzantium and the West. Yet the Adriatic was glaringly absent from these studies too. On the other hand, the emergence of fragmentary contributions of a regional focus and audience underlined the need for more global approaches to the cultural history of the Adriatic, which have been so far limited to the Middle Ages. The comprehensive study of icon painting in the broad Adriatic region has attracted scholarly attention only very recently, and has since sparked a growing interest in the area.
Building on previous scholarship, this study will explore the circulation of icons and icon painters of Greek origin and Byzantine artistic formation in the broad region of the Adriatic Sea, aspiring to expand our fragmentary knowledge of a research area so far considered marginal in terms of both geography and content. By applying a cross-cultural and long durée approach, this article aims to demonstrate how the artistic language of icon painters and the reception of their works were transformed with regard to the political situation and the ethno-confessional development of the receiving societies, especially in the context of the Tridentine reforms, and the migration waves triggered by the Ottoman-Venetian wars. As this article was tailored for the special issue of the journal *re*•*bus* on ‘Mobility, Movement and Medium: Crossing Borders in Art’, particular emphasis will be given on the aspects of transregional mobility of artists and the circulation of artworks across the fluid borders of the Mediterranean and Adriatic Seas [fig. 1].
Tradition and Appropriation: The Influence of Byzantine Culture in the Adriatic

The dissemination of Orthodox art and the circulation of Greek-speaking artists in the Adriatic territory were the fruit of a long and complex process that went back to the era of the Byzantine dominion. From the sixth to the late twelfth century the city-states of the Adriatic were developing under the direct or indirect control of the Byzantine Empire, which exerted a unifying influence on the diverse cultures and societies of the region. The Byzantine influence did not cease with the decline of the Empire’s political and ecclesiastical supremacy, but instead, it survived as a basic structural element of the succeeding power in the region, the Republic of Venice.

The Venetian appropriation of Byzantine culture defined the future reception of Greek-Orthodox art in the Adriatic region, and allowed for the diffusion of hybrid artistic styles, based on the creative dialogue between Eastern and Western traditions. Drawing from Ejnar Dyggve, who first introduced the conventional term ‘Adrio-Byzantium’ (adriobizantinismo, adriobizantinizam) to describe the presence of Early-Christian features in Dalmatian Medieval architecture, scholars adopted the all-encompassing term ‘Adrio-Byzantine’ to define the artistic production of the Late Medieval Adriatic manifesting the coexistence of Byzantine, Romanesque and Gothic elements. Although the ‘Adrio-Byzantine’ style covered the whole spectrum of artistic production, from architecture and sculpture to monumental painting and manuscript illumination, it was mostly diffused through mural- and especially icon painting. From the thirteenth to the fourteenth century the whole Adriatic region was flooded with
Byzantine and Byzantinizing icons, which were often considered miraculous and held a prominent place in local cults, especially in the regions of Apulia and Dalmatia.

While it is estimated that most of the icons venerated in the Medieval Adriatic were imported from Constantinople, Cyprus and the broader Greek world, the sheer volume of extant Byzantinizing icons and frescoes in the region probably indicates the presence of local or travelling icon-painting workshops, such as the ‘Greek painters’ mentioned in Vasari’s *Lives* (1550). As early as the late Middle Ages artists of Greek origin or Byzantine formation were frequently attested in archival documents throughout the Adriatic, especially in Venice and the former Byzantine administrative centres of South Italy, Dalmatia and Venetian Albania.
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*Saints Ambrose and Augustine*, ca. 1331, Saint Tryphon’s Cathedral, Kotor
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*Details from the Crucifixion and the Deposition from the Cross*, ca. 1331, Saint Tryphon’s Cathedral, Kotor
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One of the earliest accounts of Greek painters is that of a certain Ioannes Klerikopoulos, who in all probability lived and worked in Zadar around the year 1314, when he signed an icon of Saint Demetrios for the city’s eponymous church. According to archival sources, the Greek painters Emmanouel (*Hemanuel Grecus pictor*), Ioannes from Durrës (*magistro Johanni pictori de Durachio greco*), and Georgios from Kotor (*Georgius Grecus pictor olim de Catharo*) worked in fourteenth-century Dubrovnik, while Greek painters were also invited to decorate the rector’s palace in the event of Tsar Stefan Dušan’s visit to Dubrovnik in 1350. Wall paintings that could be associated with those artists can be found today in the churches of Saint John in Šipan, Saint Nicholas in Koločep, and in the Franciscan monastery in Dubrovnik. Moreover, in the State Archives in Kotor, there are several documents attesting to the presence of Greek artists in the first half of the fourteenth century, as were the painters Nikolaos (*Nycole pictoris Greci*), Emmanouel (*Hemanuel Grecus pictor*), Ioannes (*Jani Greci*), and possibly Michael (*Micho Grechi*). In addition, in 1331 ‘Greek painters’ (*pictoribus graecis*) worked at Saint Tryphon’s cathedral in Kotor [fig. 2a-b], while during the same period artists of Greek origin or at least of Byzantine formation painted the churches of Saint Luke, Colleghiata, Saint James, and Saint Nicholas in Kotor, as well as the church of the Deposition of the Precious Robe of the Virgin (Riza Bogorodice) in Bijela [fig. 3a–b].
A similar pattern can be identified along the Italian coast of the Adriatic, especially in the region of Apulia, which was an important hub of Greek monasticism during the Middle Ages. Several Greek artists were active in the area in relation to the Basilean monastery of Saint Nicholas of Casole,\textsuperscript{31} while numerous monuments throughout the whole Terra d’Otranto were decorated with Byzantine wall paintings. These varied from larger, urban churches, such as the Otranto Cathedral or the church of San Pietro in the same city [fig. 4],\textsuperscript{32} to rural rock-cave chapels that functioned for the needs of the local Italo-Greek communities in the Apulian countryside.\textsuperscript{33}
In Venice, Greek-speaking painters and mosaicists were documented since the mid-twelfth century, such as masters Ioannes and Philippos. This tradition was preserved up until the fifteenth century, as testified by the case of Nikolaos Philanthropenos from Constantinople, who in 1430–1436 participated in the mosaic decoration of Saint Mark’s together with renowned Early-Renaissance painters such as Jacobello del Fiore, Michele Giambono and Paolo Uccello. It appears that Philanthropenos held an honorary position among his fellow painters, as the title of *magister artis musaice* and *prothomagister musaici in ecclesia Sancti Marci* was bestowed upon him.

In the fifteenth century, the fall of the Byzantine Empire and later of the Serbian state resulted in the gradual decline of the Eastern-Orthodox influence in the Adriatic. Meanwhile, the emergence of humanism brought about the abandonment of the Byzantine style— the medieval *maniera greca*—and expedited its replacement by the more naturalistic innovations of the Renaissance. As previously mentioned, already in 1550 Giorgio Vasari was writing about the “awkward Greek manner,” and was discussing how after Cimabue and Giotto the “*maniera*
greca ... died out in every aspect.” As we shall see, however, this was not entirely the case. Unlike the rest of Catholic Europe, where the Byzantine culture was less influential, in the region of the Adriatic traces of the medieval maniera greca persisted to a greater or lesser extent even while the Renaissance was in full bloom.
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Andreas Ritzos, *Virgin Hodegetria (Madre della Passione)*, Church of Saint Blaise (crkva Svetog Vlaha), Ston © Vinicije Lupis ©Margarita Voulgaropoulou
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Giovanni Bellini, *Greek Madonna (Madonna Greca)*, Pinacoteca di Brera, Milan © image in the public domain

In Venice, Renaissance masters continued to draw on Byzantine pictorial forms, such as golden backgrounds and imitations of mosaic interiors; they often used Greek inscriptions, and even created Byzantine-inspired iconographic types, such as the popular half-length Madonna and Child, the Venetian variant of the Byzantine Hodegetria [fig. 5a–b]. The product par excellence of this fruitful contact between Venetian and Byzantine traditions was Saint Mark’s Basilica, where all works for the renovation of the mosaic decoration were executed according
to the Byzantine ways, a practice respected even by renowned Renaissance painters, such as Paolo Uccello, Andrea del Castagno, Paolo Veronese, Titian, and Tintoretto.\textsuperscript{38}

But while the Byzantine heritage was appropriated in Venice as a symbol of prestige and an “obvious anachronism,”\textsuperscript{39} in the rest of the Adriatic it was preserved as an intrinsic element of regional artistic traditions. Compared to more advanced artistic centres, the Adriatic periphery often lacked the educated patrons that would cultivate the need for artistic innovations and exhibited a great delay in the replacement of older art forms. In Southern Italy, for example, Byzantine elements were discernible in the local artistic production, reflecting the preferences of the local patronage at least until the official abolition of the Orthodox rite in the late sixteenth century. Byzantine iconographic types, such as the \textit{Hodegetria} or ‘Our Lady of Constantinople’ (\textit{Madonna di Costantinopoli}) were well rooted into the local traditions, and featured on wall paintings and icon-like images, namely half-length portraits of saints on a golden background, such as the ones produced by the painter known by the initials ‘ZT’ [fig. 6].\textsuperscript{40}
Likewise, on the East coast of the Adriatic Byzantine influences survived well into the period of the so-called Dalmatian Renaissance, and were most evident in the use of gold backgrounds, two-dimensional compositions, but sometimes also Greek inscriptions. It appears also that certain painters were familiar with the ‘Greek style’, as was Lovro Dobričević, who in 1455 painted the small church of the Assumption at Savina Monastery in Montenegro according to the rules of the Byzantine tradition [fig. 7], or his son, Vicko Lovrin, who in 1510 executed the wall paintings at Tvrdoš monastery in Herzegovina ‘more greco’.
Even more pronounced was the presence of Byzantine tendencies in the Bay of Kotor. The confessional coexistence of Orthodox and Catholic populations left a marked and lasting imprint on the art of the region, with the most illustrative example being the dual Church of the Dormition of the Virgin (or of Saint Basil) in Mržep, near Donji Stoliv. The church was founded in 1451 by the Serbian chancellor and interpreter Stefan Kalođurđević, and was decorated by painter Michael from Kotor. Uniquely reflecting the ethno-confessional diversity of the bishoprics of Kotor and Zeta, and the political imagery of the period that followed the Union of Ferrara–Florence (1439), the frescoes bear inscriptions in Latin, Greek and Cyrillic, and feature a combined Byzantine and Late Gothic style and iconography. In particular, although the main scenes of the iconographic program remain faithful to the Eastern Orthodox pictorial
tradition, a distinct Western influence is evident in the inclusion of saints typically associated with the Catholic Church, such as Tryphon, Sebastian and Francis of Assisi, and in their contrasting depiction according to Late Gothic precepts.

The Pious Art of the Schismatics: Orthodox art for a Catholic Patronage

By the late sixteenth century, the various remnants of medieval forms were gradually abandoned in the official artistic schools of the Adriatic urban centres. Nevertheless, while Byzantine monumental painting slowly went out of fashion, the demand for Byzantinizing devotional images remained undiminished, and icon painting continued to survive on the margins, now almost entirely limited in the production of ‘post-Byzantine’ Greek-Orthodox icons. It should be noted, however, that the steadfast popularity of icons in the region was not as much as an aesthetic preference for archaic forms, as it was a manifestation of deeply rooted religious practices within the Adriatic societies. As we shall see, religious icons were almost exclusively intended to satisfy a specific set of market needs as their main function was not to embellish the décor of domestic or ecclesiastical settings, but rather to inspire devotion and piety in the faithful.

Since the the Council of Ferrara–Florence for the union of the Greek and Latin Churches, and especially after the fall of Constantinople, Byzantine icons had been entering Italian collections either as diplomatic gifts or relics of a fallen Empire, thus kindling a renewed interest in icon painting. But although this “icon enthusiasm of the later fifteenth century” was mainly reserved for audiences of higher intellectual and social status, by the mid-sixteenth century icons became popularized and accessible to a much wider public. The cult of icons grew immensely
in popularity after the Council of Trent, which considered art as a useful instrument in the toolset of Catholic propaganda, and promulgated the educational and spiritual role of images rather than their aesthetic value. According to the engineer of the Tridentine reforms, Cardinal Gabriele Paleotti, religious images were primarily intended to “educate, to delight and to move” (*docere, delectare, movere*), and artists were advised to portray the Virgin half-length with the infant Jesus in her arms, as she was depicted in Greek icons. Paleotti himself was a documented collector of icons made *alla greca*, as were in fact numerous cardinals and ecclesiastical prelates, such as Carlo and Federico Borromeo.

For conservative theological circles of the post-Tridentine era Eastern icons had remained more faithful to the Early Christian tradition, by reputedly reproducing the authentic portraits of saints. As copies of divine prototypes icons were often considered to bear miraculous properties, therefore providing the Catholic Church with a compelling argument against Protestant iconoclasm. It was in this ideological context that post-Tridentine ecclesiastical authors, such as Giovanni Andrea Gilio da Fabriano and Federico Borromeo promoted the piety of Byzantine icons to the profanity of Renaissance paintings, despite remaining advocates of the more naturalistic style of their time. Particularly illuminating are the instructions of the bishop of Bisceglie, Pompeo Sarnelli, to the painter Angelo Solimena to paint religious images “half-length, according to the old Christian custom, which has been preserved by the Greeks.” Sarnelli justified his recommendations by stressing that Greek icons “inspired devotion and superhuman majesty, even though they did not conform to the rules of art,” compared to “the painters of our age, who have profaned the sacred images to the point where not only is it impossible to worship
them, it’s also impossible to look at them with pure eyes, for they have introduced nudity even on the altars.”

Apart from serving the goals of post-Tridentine propaganda, Orthodox icons were also in high demand among the Catholic populace of the Adriatic, and formed an integral part of private and public devotional practices. From Venice and the Veneto to Dalmatia and the Venetian Albania there was hardly a Catholic household that did not treasure devotional icons among other works of art. Usually, devotional icons were kept in the most private and secluded places of the home, especially in the bedchamber, where their owners would retire to pray, although in Venice they often made their way to the shared reception areas that were commonly decorated with Italian or Flemish paintings. In a rather lively account of his travels in Northern Italy, the sixteenth-century painter and historian, Giambattista Armenini, complains about the presence of poorly made devotional images next to “admirable works of art,” which could be found even in the most lavishly decorated houses and palaces. These “lesser images” he described as “small pictures of some figures made in the Greek manner (alla greca), very awkward, displeasing, and covered with soot.”

A review of relevant archival sources from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries confirms Armenini’s narration. Inventories, household registers, and testaments document the presence of Greek icons in Catholic households throughout the Adriatic, and even in the Republic of Ragusa, where the Orthodox rite remained banned until the eighteenth century. Archival records equally manifest the mass production of icons for Catholic patrons and their exportation to the Western markets. We know for instance that on 4th July 1499 three Cretan icon painters were commissioned to deliver seven hundred icons of the Virgin within a period
of roughly a month. Out of these icons, only two hundred were to be painted “in forma greca,” while the rest five hundred were expected to be “tuto in forma a la latina [sic],” therefore mainly destined for Catholic patrons.55

Art and Migration: The establishment of Orthodox communities in the Adriatic

Although the positive reception of icon painting among Catholic audiences substantially boosted the imports of icons in the West, on its own it fails to explain the extraordinary production and circulation of icons and icon painters in the Early Modern Adriatic, which rather implies the existence of a much broader customer base that could sustain an increased and continuous demand for Orthodox art. This customer base should be sought among the Greek- and Serbian-Orthodox populations of the Adriatic, for whom icons constituted the primary means of artistic expression. Indeed, from the late fifteenth century onwards, the radical change of the geopolitical status quo in the Eastern Mediterranean profoundly altered the ethno-confessional composition of the Adriatic societies and cultivated a fertile ground for the reception of Orthodox art in the region. The loss of the major Venetian possessions in the Eastern Mediterranean and its gradual transformation into a ‘Turkish lake’ triggered the mass migration of Orthodox populations to the West, especially to the Venetian territories of the Adriatic.56 Meanwhile, the advancement of the Ottomans through the Western Balkans pushed populations of Slavic origin towards the East Coast of the Adriatic, completely reshuffling the demographic equilibrium of the region. Under the pressure of these geopolitical developments the Early Modern Adriatic was essentially
shaped into a dynamic contact zone, “where disparate cultures met, clashed, and grappled with each other.”

As a result of the waves of migrations from the Eastern Mediterranean, numerous Greek communities and churches emerged in the whole Adriatic region from the sixteenth up to the eighteenth century, often mixed with Orthodox populations of Slavic or Albanian origin. In 1511 a Greek confraternity was established in Venice, followed by the construction of an Orthodox church dedicated to Saint George, which was started in 1539 and was completed in 1577. The foundation of a Greek-Orthodox community in Venice encouraged the further migration of Greek refugees to the Adriatic and kindled the establishment of Orthodox churches along both shores.

Besides Venice, in the Italian Peninsula Orthodox churches and crypts existed as early as the Middle Ages, especially in the Italo-Greek village communities of the Terra d’Otranto. However, from the sixteenth century onwards, new churches were established, this time in the urban centres of the littoral. In Ancona, for instance, the church of Saint Anne was conceded in 1524 to Greek merchants and sailors that frequented the city’s port. Further to the south, in Barletta the church of Our Lady of Angels (Santa Maria degli Angeli) was handed over to Peloponnesian refugees that had been invited by Charles V to settle in the Kingdom of Naples. In Lecce the church of Saint Nicholas was assigned to the local Greek and Albanian Orthodox community. Two Greek churches dedicated to Saint John and Saint Peter, also functioned in the city of Brindisi.

On the East coast of the Adriatic on the other hand, in Venetian Istria and Dalmatia, numerous Orthodox communities were formed as part of the Republic’s strategic project to
channel the refugee inflow from their former Mediterranean territories, while at the same time repopulating abandoned settlements and protecting their borders from Ottoman incursions. Thanks to the petitions of Greek mercenaries (*stradioti*) in 1547 the church of Saint Elijah was founded in Zadar, followed in 1569 by the concession of the church of Saint Julian to the Greeks of Šibenik. In addition, in 1561 the monastery of Saint Paraskeve (Santa Veneranda) was established on the island of Hvar to service the spiritual needs of passing sailors and mercenaries. Furthermore, in 1583 refugees from Cyprus, Nafplio and Monemvasia were granted the church of Saint Nicholas in the city of Pula, which serviced the whole Istrian peninsula. A significantly larger number of Orthodox religious institutions functioned in the Venetian Albania, as was the church of Saint Luke in Kotor, which was converted to the Orthodox rite in 1657. In addition to the Venetian-ruled coastline, numerous Orthodox churches and monasteries were documented in the Montenegrin and Dalmatian hinterland (Zagora), which were constantly changing hands between Venetian and Turkish rule. Contrary to the urban communities of the littoral, these Orthodox villages were mainly populated by Slavic-speaking rural populations (Serbs, Bosnjaks, and Morlachs) that had migrated from the Balkan mainland.

These Orthodox communities that were established in the broad Adriatic region created a vast new market for Byzantinizing icons that were intended to supply the spiritual needs of the newcomers, and decorate the newly founded Orthodox churches and monasteries. Given the dire financial straits of these refugee communities, the decoration of Orthodox churches was usually carried out over several decades, and was heavily dependent on private donations, bequests or even on the collective charity of other Orthodox communities. Having as a model the churches
of their homelands, and the church of Saint George in Venice, the Orthodox communities of the Adriatic employed workshops that could deliver the desired outcomes, by producing works strictly executed according to the rules of Byzantine tradition and after popular iconographic prototypes.

The significance of adhering to Byzantine pictorial forms is highlighted by the fact that even renowned Italian artists were expected to ‘Byzantinize’ their painting style when involved in the decoration of Orthodox churches. From Lorenzo Lotto’s memoirs, for example, we learn that in 1551 the Venetian painter was commissioned to paint three panels for the Orthodox church of Saint Anne in Ancona, but was “forced” by his Greek patron, Ioannes Argentes (Zuane de Argenta), to adhere to the ‘Greek style’ (‘forzarme che tira alla grecha’).

Likewise, when in 1598 Jacopo Palma il Giovane competed for the apse mosaic of the church of Saint George in Venice, he had to redo his original study in the Byzantine style in order not to be disqualified. In the end, however, Palma still lost to the Greek Thomas Bathas, who was faithful to the “devout Greek manner,” according to the jury’s assessment. It is evident, therefore, that despite their ability to employ highly skilled Italian artists, the Greek communities of the Adriatic preferred to entrust church decorations to icon painters of Byzantine formation, knowing that they would best fulfill the specific requirements of their commissions.
Imported Art and Art of the Diaspora: Travelling Icons and Icon Painters in the Adriatic

The increasing demand for icons from a multicultural demographic resulted in an unprecedented rise in the import of works of Orthodox art in the Adriatic during the Early Modern Period. Until the sixteenth century the icons that reached the Adriatic markets were almost exclusively the product of imports from the iconographic centres of the Eastern Mediterranean, primarily from Crete, but also from Cyprus or the islands of the Aegean and the Ionian Seas. Treated as a commodity, religious icons reached the Adriatic ports through Venetian maritime trade routes and were further distributed to the markets of the Italian Peninsula and the Western Balkans.

In this trading network merchants performed the role of intermediaries, by purchasing icons directly from painting workshops, and then reselling them in foreign markets. Archival sources estimate that about fifteen per cent of the total orders received by Cretan painters were destined for Venetian and Greek merchants. For example, in 1497 the dealer Zuan Giustinian commissioned a substantial number of icons from the painter Ioannes Salivaras in order to distribute them to the Western markets; the painter, however, failed to meet the demanding terms of the contract and the commission was never completed. Highly illustrative is also the previously mentioned case of a massive commission recorded in a series of contracts from 1499. The contracts were stipulated in Candia between the merchants Giorgio Basejo from Venice and Petro Varsamà from the Morea on the one hand, and the painters Michael Fokas (Migiel Fuca), Nikolaos Gripiotes (Nicolò Gripioti) and Georgios Miçoconstantin on the other, who agreed to execute seven hundred icons of the Virgin within the period of forty-five days. It is noteworthy that in order to fulfill the demands of the order, one of the painters, Michael Fokas, employed
the carpenter Georgios Sklavos to construct a thousand wooden panels in three different sizes, and also hired the painter Antonio Tajapiera to assist him, by creating seven busts of the Virgin on a daily basis.76

This mass production of icons, evidenced in the afore-mentioned cases, implies the existence of a thriving trading network of icons between Greek—especially Cretan—and European markets. Moreover, the amount of surviving icons in Italian and Dalmatian churches and collections suggests that a large percentage of these exported works was destined precisely for the markets of the broad Adriatic region. The vast majority of the icons that reached the Adriatic originated from Candia, which remained the largest and liveliest artistic centre of the Greek world until its ultimate conquest by the Ottomans in 1669. Works signed by the most prominent painters of the time were dispersed all over the Adriatic: Icons signed by or attributed to Andreas Ritzos and his workshop are located in Bari, Ston, Dubrovnik, Trogir, Šibenik and Krpanj, but even in regions more remote from the shore, such as Tuscany, Emilia-Romagna and Bosnia, whereas icons signed by his son, Nikolaos, can be found as far as Florence, Sarajevo and the Dalmatian village of Islam Grčki. Likewise, works that bear the signature of Nikolaos Tzafoures were documented in Trieste and Brezovica, with a much larger number of attributed icons located in Fermo, Pesaro, Drniš, Prčanj, Korčula, Savina monastery, and Podgorica.

From the sixteenth to the seventeenth century the conditions of the trade of icons underwent a gradual change, as a considerable percentage of orders were now addressed to painters established in Venice or the rest of the Adriatic. Still, however, the imports of Cretan and other Greek icons in the Adriatic continued unabated, responding to the needs of newly established Greek-Orthodox communities. Among the most productive workshops of the time
was that of Georgios Klontzas, whose works have been located in Venice, Drniš, Šibenik, Berat but also in Sarajevo and the village Osimo of the Italian Marche. Icons signed by the prolific painter Emmanouel Lambardos can be found as far as Dubrovnik, the Croatian village Mali Grđevac or the monastery of Ozren in Bosnia. Moreover, icons by master Viktor ended up in collections in Bari, Zadar, Koprivnica and the village of Maini in Montenegro.

The fall of Candia in 1669 witnessed a sudden drop in the imports of artworks from Crete and a respective growth of the art trade between the Adriatic and the Ionian Islands. For example, when in 1699 the Orthodox confraternity of Šibenik had a new iconostasis constructed for their church, they commissioned twenty-four icons from the workshop of the Corfiot painter, Demetrios Foskales [fig. 8a–b]. In the meantime, the monks of Krka decorated the renovated
katholikon of Archangel Michael with icons of Heptanesian provenance, in all probability ordered from the workshop of Gerasimos Kouloumbes in Zakynthos. Signed icons of Heptanesian masters, such as those of Elias Moskos in Kotor or Konstantinos Kontarines in Hvar and Savina, also testify to the thriving commerce between the Islands and the lower Adriatic.

Along with the mass import of icons, in the Early Modern period new professional opportunities were created for Greek artists and artisans in the broad Adriatic area. Greek icon painters travelled to the Adriatic after receiving important commissions or in search of new markets due to the high competition in their homelands. This was particularly evident in highly saturated markets, as was the one of Candia, where approximately one hundred and eighty icon painters worked in the period 1450–1600, a considerable number if we take into account that the overall population of the city reached fifteen thousand people.

After the sixteenth century numerous artists also migrated to the Adriatic as part of the refugee waves that followed the capture of major icon painting centres in the Eastern Mediterranean by the Ottomans. To name but a few, Ioannes Permeniates fled Rhodes after the capitulation of the Island to the Ottomans in 1522; Georgios Margazines and Theodoros Poulakes left the city of Chania around the time of its conquest in 1645; while Elias Moskos or Emmanouel and Konstantinos Tzanes settled in Venice after the fall of their hometown, Rethymno, in 1646.
The vast majority of the Greek painters that travelled to the West settled in Venice, recognizing the importance of the city as leading artistic centre, but also as a flourishing hub of the Greek Diaspora. The icon painters of the Greek community of Venice were primarily involved in the decoration of the newly built church of Saint George or were employed by Orthodox churches and monasteries throughout the Adriatic and the Balkans. In particular, Ioannes Permeniates created the icons for the church of Saint Anne in Ancona [fig. 9]; Michael Damaskenos and Emmanouel Tzanes worked at the church of Saint George in Venice; Ioannes Apakas painted the icons for the katholikon of the monastery at Krupa [fig. 10]; and Thomas Bathas worked for the church of Saint Nicholas in Pula and the church of Our Lady of Angels in Barletta.
The artistic production of the icon painters of Venice was not limited to the execution of works for Orthodox commissioners, but extended to the creation of images in the Italian fashion. In his 1599 will for instance, the aforementioned Thomas Bathas writes that he wished for his student, Emmanouel Tzanfournares, to receive ‘all of his designs, both those in the Greek and those in the Italian style (‘tutti i miei desegni, cosi grechi, come all'italiana’), thus confirming his involvement with Western art, besides his proficiency in the ‘devout Greek manner’. Raised and trained in the multicultural environments of the Eastern Mediterranean, Greek and especially Cretan icon painters were renowned for their dual ability to work in both the Byzantine and Western iconographic traditions. Departing from the austere formality and schematization of Byzantine art, icon painters from Latin-ruled territories blended in their works Late-Gothic or Renaissance elements in order to achieve a more ‘Westernized’ look, which consisted in a softer modelling of the facial features in *chiaroscuro*, a smoother and less geometric rendering of the
draperies, and sometimes the replacement of the traditional golden background with a naturalistic landscape [fig. 11].

Fig. 11
Comparison of icons *alla greca* and *alla latina*: (left) *The Virgin Hodegetria* (detail), 16th century, Venice, Istituto Ellenico di Studi Bizantini e Postbizantini (image in the public domain); (right) *Madre della Consolazione* (detail), ca. 1500, Museum, Savina Monastery © Margarita Voulgaropoulou

In Venice these ‘bilingual’ icon painters had the opportunity to further study the trends and techniques of contemporary Venetian painting, either by copying popular works of art, or directly as apprentices at the workshops of renowned Renaissance artists. This fruitful contact resulted in the enrichment of the iconographic repertoire of Greek icon painters, their further familiarization with Italian art, and sometimes even their complete conversion to the Western style, as was the case of Antonios Vassilakes or Domenikos Theotokopoulos.87 Perhaps the most striking example is that of Ioannes Permeniates, a member of the Greek community of Venice, who, depending on the demands of his clientele, would either produce icons in the Byzantine tradition or paintings in the spirit of the Venetian Quattrocento, easily recognizable by his signature-‘Bellinesque’-landscape [fig. 9 and 12].
It was exactly this dual ability of Greek-speaking icon painters to work in both the Byzantine and Western iconographic traditions, which permitted them to respond to the demands of a multicultural patronage network that transcended ethno-confessional and socio-economic borders. Indeed, apart from their work for Orthodox patrons, Greek icon painters often received commissions from a Catholic clientele: for example, Michael Damaskenos executed the altarpiece of the Virgin of the Rosary at the Benedictine monastery in Conversano, while Konstantinos Tzanes painted a pala d’altare for the Carmelite church in Trogir.88 Besides these larger commissions, the icon-painting workshops of Venice were also associated with the mass production of devotional images in the style of the Venetian mannerists, which they sold in mass in the Adriatic markets. Such works are commonly attributed to lesser artisans, collectively referred to in literature by the derogatory term madonneri,89 even though a closer observation allows us to identify in them the hand of notable icon painters, such as Michael Damaskenos, Thomas Bathas or Emmanouel Tzanfournares.90
Alongside Venice, a small but not insignificant number of Greek icon painters also settled in cities and villages of the Adriatic periphery. Mostly they were less qualified artists, who struggled to cope with the high competition in larger artistic centres and sought work in provincial regions of the Adriatic, exploiting the artistic conservatism and the unsophisticated taste of the local patronage. Such was the case of Angelos Bitzamanos,91 an icon painter from Candia, who in 1518 travelled to Komolac, a village near Dubrovnik, after receiving a commission for an altarpiece in the Italian style [fig. 13].92 The arrival of Angelos in Dubrovnik was in all likelihood related to the death within the span of a year (1517–1518) of the three major painters of the city, Mihajlo Hamzić, Nikola Božidarević and Vicko Lovrin, which marked the abrupt end of the so-called Ragusan Painting School, and created an immediate need for artistic hands. In order to cope with the high demands of the commission, Angelos probably employed the assistance of his younger relative –probably son– Donatos, who also left works in
Dubrovnik. The two painters later crossed the Adriatic and settled first in Barletta, and then permanently in the town of Otranto, where they formed a thriving icon-painting workshop. Despite producing mainly small portable icons that often lacked refinement, the Bitzamanos family workshop managed to flourish in the provincial milieu of the Terra d’Otranto, and even attract apprentices and followers, as were the locals Giovanni Maria and Fabrizio Scupula.

From the late seventeenth century onwards, the geopolitical changes in the Mediterranean and Adriatic Seas completely reshuffled the dynamics of art trade and the mobility of Greek artists. The redefinition of the Ottoman-Venetian borders after the treaties of Karlowitz and Passarowitz brought under Venetian rule regions with a majority of Orthodox population, such as the Dalmatian hinterland and the rural area around Kotor and Budva. Contrary to previous times, the new settlers were mainly of Slavic origin, since most Greeks would rather settle permanently in Venice or the Ionian Islands. Furthermore, the relative political stability that followed led to the demographic and economic growth of the Orthodox communities of the Adriatic periphery, allowing them to afford larger commissions, and attract increasingly more icon painters. Meanwhile, the fall of the cities of Rethymno, Chania and ultimately Candia to the Ottomans suspended the supply of Cretan icons and artists to the Adriatic markets, thus permitting the appearance of a new generation of Heptanesian icon painters working between the Ionian and Adriatic Seas. These painters found a steady market for their works in the Orthodox communities of the Adriatic, exploiting the lack of competition in the area, and thus monopolizing the artistic production.

In 1756 the painter Eustathios Karousos travelled from Cephalonia to Naples, commissioned to decorate the church of Saints Peter and Paul, while in 1767 he painted the
icons for the Orthodox church of Villa Badessa in Abruzzo. At about the same time, the Corfiot Spyridon Romas created the icons for the Orthodox church in Livorno, and also left works in Lecce and in Dalmatia. In the last decades of the eighteenth century Spyridon Sperantzas from Corfu painted the iconostasis of the church of Saint Spyridon in Trieste together with his son, Michael, who would later travel to Zadar, commissioned to construct a new iconostasis for the church of Saint Elijah [fig. 14]. Around the turn of the century, another Corfiot painter, Demetrios Bogdanos was active in the Orthodox communities of Barletta, Brindisi, and Lecce, where he also served as a priest for almost sixty-six years (ca. 1775–1841).

A similar picture is observed on the East coast of the Adriatic. In the parish archives of the church of Saint Elijah in Zadar, for example, there can be found several records of artists hailing from the Ionian Islands or other Greek-speaking territories. An illustrative example from the eighteenth century is that of the Corfiot painter Georgios Michalakes, mentioned in the
sources in 1727 and 1735, who left behind works in Zakynthos, Skradin, Dalmatinsko Kosovo and the monastery of Krka [fig. 15]. Even more striking was the case of Spyridon Rapsomanikes, also from Corfu, who served as chaplain at the church of Saint Elijah from 1750 to 1769. Rapsomanikes was active along the entire East coast of the Adriatic, and was responsible for creating among others the iconostasis of the church of Saint Spyridon in Skradin [fig. 16], and possibly that of the chapel of Saint Spyridon at the church of Saint Luke in Kotor. Another Greek painter active in Zadar was Antonios Makres, who signed an icon of Saint Elijah for the homonymous church, commissioned by Milos Ghikas, a registered member of the local community. Makres’ style is evident in several unsigned icons in Zadar and Krka, but can also be identified in the iconostasis of the church of Saint Nicholas at the Dalmatian village Bratiškovci [fig. 17].
Another case from the second half of the eighteenth century is that of Matthaios Vegias from Corfu, priest and archimandrite of the Orthodox Church of Šibenik. Vegias enjoyed widespread popularity throughout the Adriatic, especially in Northern Dalmatia, and was responsible for decorating the iconostases of the churches of the Saviour and the Dormition of the Virgin in Šibenik, as well as that of the church of Saint Nicholas in Rijeka [fig. 18]. Vegias’ long-term success is easily explained by the complete absence of competition in the market, which was explicitly noted by his contemporary Gerasim Zelić in his autobiography: “we have no icon painters in Dalmatia, with the sole exception of priest Matthaios Vegias in Šibenik.”
Apart from the Ionian Islands, painters from other Greek-speaking regions also travelled to the Adriatic seeking work. Hailing from the city of Methoni in the Peloponnes, the painter Ioannes Trigones produced several icons for the church of Villa Badessa, but was also active in the Orthodox community of Trieste from 1786 until his death in 1833. Somewhat different was the case of Naoum Tzeteres from the village Grabovo in modern-day Albania, who travelled to Budva in 1833 to create the iconostasis for the church of the Holy Trinity along with his nephew Georgios and the woodcarver Athanasios [fig. 19].
The presence of these travelling icon painters in the Adriatic fostered a vibrant dynamic of cross-cultural exchanges especially between the Greek- and Serbian-Orthodox elements of the Eastern Adriatic. Greek artists strongly influenced the work of local workshops, either indirectly by introducing new artistic tendencies and iconographic themes, or directly by forming collaborations with local artists and artisans. Highly illustrative, for example, is the case of the parish church of the village Višnjeva in Grbalj, modern-day Montenegro, which was decorated jointly by master Titos from Corfu, his assistant Tripo Dabović from Škaljari, and the woodcarver Ižepo from Kotor.¹¹³

Despite the initial predominance of the Greek cultural element in the Adriatic communities, the longterm coexistence of Greeks and Serbs resulted in their gradual but inevitable assimilation. As the numbers of Slavic-speaking congregants were rising within mixed communities, Serbian chaplains were recruited along with Greeks to perform the liturgy, and Serbian language gradually replaced Greek and Italian both in everyday and religious life.
Moreover, Greek community members were now able to communicate in Serbian, and were often registered in the sources by their slavicized names. This cultural amalgamation is perfectly reflected in the artistic production of the time. From the mid-eighteenth century on, works of art would feature bilingual inscriptions in Greek and Cyrillic in order to be understood by both ethnic contingents [fig. 20], and Greek painters would sign their works interchangeably in Greek or in Slavic, such as Spyridon Rapsomanikes, who signed several of his works in Cyrillic, and also appeared in the archival sources by the slavicized name Spiro Rapsomanić. On the other hand, Serbian patrons would be commemorated in dedicatory inscriptions by their hellenized names, as we can observe in an icon of the Dormition of the Virgin (1747) from Bratiškovci, which commemorates the donor Filip Knežević, or an icon of Saint Nicholas (1766) now at the Archeological Museum of Split, which bears the name of the donor Stanko Porović.

From a stylistic point of view, in order to respond to the aesthetic preferences of a now almost exclusively Orthodox and conservative patronage, Greek icon painters had to revert to
more traditional pictorial ways, at a time when strong Westernizing and naturalistic tendencies had been dominating Orthodox religious art in the Adriatic and Ionian Seas. This becomes evident in a letter recommending the Corfiot painter Spyridon Romas to the Greek community of Livorno as the only artist in the Levant that was capable of painting in the ‘Romeic’ style, in other words, according to the ‘Byzantinizing’ tradition of the Orthodox Church.115 Considering that Romas was perfectly skilled in painting according to the Western fashion, his promotion as a representative of the Greek tradition illustrates the conservative horizon of expectations of his prospective clientele, rather than the spectrum of his artistic repertoire.116

Within this system of aesthetics it is possible to interpret the extraordinary popularity that Greek icon painters enjoyed in the Adriatic region up until the late nineteenth century, by which time religious art in the newly established Greek state had long departed from the strict Byzantine tradition, and was being ‘improved’ under the influence of academic tendencies.117 One of the most prolific artists of that time was Nikolaos Aspiotes from Corfu, a traditional icon painter who failed to succeed in the artistic scene of the modern Greek state, but who nevertheless managed to establish his fame in the Adriatic world, and was responsible for decorating a striking number of churches and monasteries throughout the Italian Peninsula, Dalmatia, and Montenegro [fig. 19 and 21].118
Despite his extraordinary artistic production Nikolaos Aspiotes is still perceived as a marginal figure in Greek art historiography, while his overseas work is essentially unknown to scholars. Indeed, for all its remarkable geographical and chronological expansion, the work of the travelling icon painters of the Adriatic remains largely uncharted territory in scholarship. Eclectic in style, uneven in quality, and often oblivious of major artistic tendencies their production is often subject to scholarly misconceptions and has not yet earned a concrete place within the various European and Balkan art histories. Within its limited space this article aimed to provide a first comprehensive overview of the activity of itinerant Greek-speaking icon painters, with the purpose of revealing heretofore unexplored aspects of their work, and thus highlighting its obscure historical significance. As we have seen, the mass influx of Greek icons and icon painters in the Early Modern Adriatic was the combined outcome of the region’s deeply
rooted aesthetic traditions that set the stage for their favourable reception, and on the other hand of intense geopolitical upheavals, which reshaped the Mediterranean and the Adriatic Seas, resulting in the culmination of the vibrant cross-cultural exchanges between the Greek-speaking world, the Italian Peninsula and the Western Balkans. Versed in both Eastern and Western artistic traditions, and aware of the challenges of their time, Greek icon painters were willing to travel beyond the borders of their homelands, transform their pictorial language, and, much like traders, adapt their product to the demands of the multicultural patronage networks of the receiving societies. More than a creative choice, the iconographic and stylistic development of their work was dependent on their entanglements with either Catholic or Greek- and later Serbian-Orthodox populations, therefore perfectly reflecting the socio-political, confessional and artistic dynamics of coexistence between the diverse cultural groups that crossed paths in the Early Modern Adriatic.
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