PAMIĘTNIK TEATRALNY 71, 4 (2022)
ISSN 0031-0522, e-ISSN 2658-2899
CC BY 4.0
© Dorota Zaprzalska
DOI: 10.36744/pt.1284

Dorota Zaprzalska
Jagiellonian University Doctoral School in the Humanities
ORCID: 0000-0002-0597-3755

Assemblages within Assemblages

Performativity of Composite Icons in Liturgical and Museum Contexts

Abstract

This article analyzes the performativity of two composite icons in liturgical and museum contexts. Their unusual form, consisting of two panels combined as one work of art, is interpreted as an assemblage form, following Victor I. Stoichita use of the term. Moreover, the multivalency of the term *assemblage* is used to present the icons as part of dynamic social assemblages by applying the theoretical perspective of assemblage theory. It becomes crucial in seeing them as active agents in the assemblages of humans and non-humans as well as understanding the potential and agency of this unusual form and the way they function in various relations with other works of art, institutions, and people. Applying the categories of assemblage

and performative icon to the analysis of two examples of composite icons, the article characterizes the influence of assemblage form on the veneration and presentation of icons. Focusing on the issue of performativity, agency, and affordance made it possible to highlight the dynamics of the assemblage form and the icon itself. Depending on the context—the performances in which it participates and the assemblages of which it becomes a part—the icon can be perceived as a work of art and/or a devotional image that transcends the realm of artistic values. The article also reflects on the assemblage nature of the icon research and study process.

Keywords

composite icons, assemblage theory, icons in museum, cult images, affordance, agency, performative icons

Abstrakt

Asamblaż w asamblażu: O performatywności ikon kompozytowych w kontekście liturgicznym i muzealnym

Artykuł stanowi analizę performatywności dwóch ikon kompozytowych w kontekście liturgicznym i w kontekście muzealnym. Ich niezwykła forma polegająca na połączeniu dwóch paneli w jedno dzieło sztuki jest interpretowana jako asamblaż – w ślad za użyciem tego terminu przez Victora Stoichitę. Jednocześnie autorka akcentuje wieloznaczność tego terminu i korzysta z teorii asamblażu jako narzędzia interpretacyjnego, by ukazać funkcjonowanie ikon w ramach asamblaży społecznych. W perspektywie tej teorii można analizować aktywne uczestnictwo ikon kompozytowych w asamblażach ludzi i nie-ludzi oraz sprawczy potencjał tkwiący w ich niezwykłej formie, by pogłębić rozumienie ich funkcjonowania w relacjach z innymi dziełami sztuki, instytucjami, ludźmi. Dzięki zastosowaniu kategorii asamblażu i ikony performatywnej do analizy dwóch przykładów ikon kompozytowych w artykule scharakteryzowano wpływ asamblażowej formy na kult i prezentację obrazów. Skupienie się na kwestii performatywności, sprawczości i afordancji pozwoliło uwydatnić dynamikę formy asamblażowej i ikony samej w sobie. W zależności od kontekstu – performansów, w których uczestniczy, a także asamblaży, których staje się częścią – ikona staje dziełem sztuki lub/i obrazem dewocyjnym, który przekracza sferę wartości artystycznych. W artykule poddano także refleksji asamblażowy charakter procesu badania ikon.

Słowa kluczowe

ikony kompozytowe, teoria asamblażu, ikony w muzeum, kult obrazów, afordancja, sprawczość, ikony performatywne

Panayotis L. Vocotopoulos was the first to notice a rare category of icons consisting of two separate panels, often created at different times, one inserted into the other. He called them composite icons (*σύνθετες εικόνες*) and presented a considerable number in his two articles, where he briefly compared them to a similar Western art phenomenon and focused on the iconography, style, and purpose for the creation of composite icons.[1] Nevertheless, further questions can be asked in order to fully understand the unusual form of these images-within-images. Within this paper I will focus on the performativity of the form of composite icons—a form that is a dynamic assemblage of two works of art, often visually and conceptually apart, although acting as one physical whole.

I chose to study two composite icons—one in a liturgical context and one in a museum collection. The first one is a 16th-century icon of the Virgin Mary with Child called *Panagia Amirou* (**FIG. 1**) that Vocotopoulos did not include in his study, even though it has an older icon inserted into it.[2] The second is a 14th-century composite icon of Saints John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Nicholas the Miracle Worker, and Gregory the Theologian that is in the collection of

The text resulted from a doctoral seminar at the Jagiellonian University Doctoral School in the Humanities organized by Małgorzata Sugiera, who inspired me to apply performative methods to my research and I am indebted for her advice on this paper. I am also grateful to Mateusz Chaberski from the Jagiellonian University's Department of Performativity Studies for discussing the principles of assemblage theory with me. An additional library visit to London in March 2022, that contributed to the final version of the text, was possible thanks to the generous support of the De Brzezie Lanckoronski Foundation. The English version, although based on the Polish text, may at times differ from the original. It was written during the Anita Cecil O'Donovan Fellowship at the Cyprus American Archaeological Research Institute, where I was able to write and discuss my research with most excellent colleagues. I am especially grateful to Georgia Frank and Glenn Peers for their valuable comments and advice on this paper. I extend my warm thanks to Ariana Salvo who kindly agreed to proofread the final version of the text. I owe special thanks to everyone who helped me during my research in Cyprus, especially Ropertos Georgiou from the Andreas Pittas Art Characterization Laboratories (APAC Labs) of The Cyprus Institute for the expert technical photography of the Panagia Amirou icon. I would also like to acknowledge the Cyprus Department of Antiquities and the Bishopric of Limassol for their support and permission to study the icon. Finally, I want to thank the Abbess and the Sisterhood of the Monastery of Panagia Amirou for their generous support and hospitality.

[1] Panayotis L. Vocotopoulos, "Composite Icons," in *Greek Icons: Proceedings of the Symposium in Memory of Manolis Chatzidakis*, ed. Eva Haustein-Bartsch and Nano Chatzidakis (Athens: Benaki Museum, 2000), 5–10; "Synthetes eikones: Mia prōtē katagraphē," in *Sēma Menelaou Parlama*, ed. Lena Tzedakē (Ērakleio: E.K.I.M, 2002), 299–319. Vocotopoulos also provided a definition of a composite icon: "the inset panel of a composite icon is not necessarily a painting in tempera on wood. It may be a mosaic icon or a panel with decoration in relief, such as a steatite. On the other hand, the frame of a composite icon has to be a painting in egg tempera on wood," Vocotopoulos, "Composite Icons," 5. See also Dorota Zaprzalska, "Ikona tzw. kompozytowa w klasztorze Wlatadon w Salonikach—zagadnienie formuły ikonograficzno-kompozycyjnej i funkcji ideowo-dewocyjnej," *Modus. Prace z historii sztuki* 19 (2019): 5–21, https://doi.org/10.11588/diglit.51255.4.

[2] For more on the icon, see Sophocles Sophocleous, *Icônes de Chypre: Diocèse de Limassol 12e–16e siècle* (Nicosie: Centre du Patrimoine Culturel, 2006), 239–240.

FIG. 1 Icon of Panagia Amirou, 16th century Monastery of Panagia Amirou, Apsiou, Cyprus

PHOTO ROPERTOS GEORGIOU (STARC, CYI) © ιερά Μητρόπολις Λεμεσού

the Hermitage Museum in Saint Petersburg (**FIG. 2**).[3] I see the composite form as an assemblage, but my understanding of this term differs from the one most commonly used in art history to describe an art technique that is a three-dimensional alternative to collage. Victor Stoichita, in his work *L'instauration du tableau*, refined it, using it instead to describe inset images—images with additional images inserted into them, sometimes referred to as *Einsatzbild*.[4] In the following

[3] Vocotopoulos, "Composite Icons," 6.

[4] Victor I. Stoichita, *L'instauration du tableau: Métapeinture à l'aube des temps modernes* (Genève: Libraire Droz, 1999), 103. The same term *assemblage* is repeated in the English translation of his book: Victor I. Stoichita, *The Self-Aware Image: An Insight into Early Modern Meta-Painting*, trans. Anne-Marie Glasheen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 67. More on *Einsatzbild*, see Karl-August Wirth, "Einsatzbild," in *Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, Bd. 4, hrsg. Ernst Gall und Ludwig Heydenreich (Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag, 1958), 1006–1020; Martin Warnke, "Italienische Bildtabernakel bis zum Frühbarock," *Münchner*

© THE STATE HERMITAGE MUSEUM

FIG. 2 Portable Icon of Four Holy Hierarchs Surrounded with the Depictions of the Deesis and Saints (inv. no. W-1125), early 14th century, The State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg

pages I will refer to this type of assemblage, that is two icons combined into one, as being in *assemblage form* in order to distinguish it from the definition used in assemblage theory, which is equally crucial to me. This other meaning of the term assemblage appeared for the first time in the English version of the work *Mille Plateaux* by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, as a translation of the French *agencement*.[5] The concept was later developed into assemblage theory by Manuel DeLanda, who sees the world as an assemblage of multiple

Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst 19 (1968): 61–102. Even though Stoichita used the term *inset images* as an English translation, it should be noted that the term *Einsatzbild* appears in the original version as well in publications in languages other than German, see Steven Ostrow, *Art and Spirituality in Counter-Reformation Rome: The Sistine and Pauline Chapels in S. Maria Maggiore* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 156–158; Grażyna Jurkowlaniec, *Epoka nowożytna wobec średniowiecza: Pamiątki przeszłości, cudowne wizerunki, dzieła sztuki* (Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2008), 17–18, 290.

5 Although the translator provided separate notes on the translation and acknowledgements, he did not explain the choice of the term *assemblage*, see Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. and foreword Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), xvi–xix. For more on the differences between the terms *agencement* and *assemblage*, see John Phillips, "Agencement/Assemblage," *Theory, Culture and Society* 23, no. 2/3 (2006): 108–109, https://doi.org/10.1177/026327640602300219.

assemblages of humans and non-humans that are never static, and each of their elements modifying and affecting all the other elements.[6] DeLanda defined an assemblage as a multiplicity made up of many heterogeneous components and which establishes liaisons and relations between them. He emphasized that "the parts that are fitted together are not uniform either in nature or in origin, and that the assemblage actively links these parts together by establishing relations between them."[7] Although this concept served DeLanda mainly to analyze various social systems, assemblage theory can be used as a theoretical tool to examine phenomena in a variety of disciplines.[8] I believe that applying this concept to the analysis of the two above-mentioned composite icons, and seeing their contexts also as assemblages emphasizes the performative potential of their unusual assemblage form.

The dynamic nature of an assemblage is particularly evident in a composite icon. Each of its elements affects the others, has the potential to disassemble and reassemble, and can be a part of several assemblages simultaneously.[9] It is possible to understand a composite icon as an assemblage of two icons: two separate panels, which, although acting as one physical whole, are visually and conceptually separate. Moreover, this concept allows us to look at the social interactions of these images more broadly, allowing us to see composite icons, and icons in general, as active elements in a dynamic assemblage of humans and non-humans. I want to highlight how the performativity of specific icons changes according to different contexts and viewers—according to different social assemblages.

---

[6] Manuel DeLanda, *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity* (London: Continuum, 2006); *Deleuze: History and Science* (New York: Atropos Press, 2010), 3–27; *Assemblage Theory* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016). In Poland DeLanda's concept has been presented and further developed by Mateusz Chaberski, "Asamblaż," in *Performatyka: Terytoria*, ed. Ewa Bal and Dariusz Kosiński (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2017); "Performans jako asamblaż," *Didaskalia*, no. 133/134 (2016); *Asamblaże, asamblaże: Doświadczenie w zamglonym antropocenie* (Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2019).

[7] DeLanda, *Assemblage Theory*, 2.

[8] For an application of that approach in archaeology, see for example: Ben Jervis, *Assemblage Thought and Archaeology* (London: Routledge, 2019), https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158594; Emma-Jayne Graham, *Reassembling Religion in Roman Italy* (London: Routledge, 2020), https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315270562. It should also be emphasized that the principles of assemblage theory may differ; a good example of this is the concept of *polyphonic assemblage* proposed by Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing. She explains assemblages as gatherings of ways of being: the accidental and momentary intertwining life practices of humans and non-humans, which she compares in her acoustic metaphor to the intertwining autonomous melodies of a polyphonic piece of music; see Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing, *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), 23–25, 157–158, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc77bcc. See also Mateusz Chaberski, "What Performativity Scholars Can Learn from Mushrooms: Situated Knowing in Polyphonic Assemblages," in *Situated Knowing: Epistemic Perspectives on Performance*, ed. Ewa Bal and Mateusz Chaberski (London: Routledge, 2020), 171–188.

[9] DeLanda, *New Philosophy*, 10, 18; DeLanda, *Assemblage Theory*, 10.

Performativity, Agency, and Affordance of the Assemblage Form

Assemblages are processes that have a performative dimension. At the conception of performative studies, Richard Schechner claimed that "performativity—or, commonly, 'performance'—is everywhere in life,"[10] emphasizing that it can be used broadly to analyze all social, cultural, and political processes "as performance." Understood in this way, not as a subject of research, but as a metaphor and analytical tool, it was first adopted for the study of icons by Bissera Pentcheva, who created the term *performative icon*.[11] She was particularly interested in the engagement of the senses in the display and performance of Byzantine icons, especially mixed-media and relief icons.[12] Glenn Peers takes this further, arguing for the reversal of human-centered perception, pointing out that icons possess capacities that exceed the purview of the human senses or knowing.[13] Underlying both approaches is an interest in the interaction between an icon and its viewer and how human perception is influenced by setting and context.[14] Similarly, the idea that they have agency—the capacity to have an effect in the world—challenges the idea that agency is the unique province of conscious actors like humans. The concept of the agency of works of art had been elaborated on earlier by the anthropologist Alfred Gell, yet he saw the viewer as a primary agent and works of art as "secondary" agents.[15] Thus his theory remains primarily anthropocentric, lacking the symmetry of human and non-human agency. This symmetry is crucial in the concept of agency used by Bruno Latour in his Actor-Network Theory, where a "network" is sometimes seen as a concept loosely equivalent to

---

[10] Richard Schechner, *Performance Theory* (London: Routledge, 1988), 273. See also discussion of the concept in: Konrad Wojnowski, "Performatywność," in Bal and Kosiński, *Performatyka: Terytoria*, 171–179; Mateusz Borowski and Małgorzata Sugiera, *Sztuczne natury: Performanse technonauki i sztuki* (Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2016), 14–15.

[11] Bissera V. Pentcheva, "The Performative Icon," *The Art Bulletin* 88, no. 4 (2006): 631–655, https://doi.org/10.1080/00043079.2006.10786312.

[12] Bissera V. Pentcheva, *The Sensual Icon: Space, Ritual, and the Senses in Byzantium* (University Park, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010), 121–149. See also Bissera V. Pentcheva, "Moving Eyes: Surface and Shadow in the Byzantine Mixed-Media Relief Icon," *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 55/56 (2009): 222–234, https://doi.org/10.1086/RESvn1ms25608845.

[13] Glenn Peers, "Sense Lives of Byzantine Things," in *Knowing Bodies, Passionate Souls: Sense Perceptions in Byzantium*, ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey and Margaret Mullett (Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2017), 11–30, especially 17–20.

[14] It must be noted that the arguments of Pentcheva and Peers are certainly not entirely equivalent. On the differences in Peer's approach in comparison to that of Pentcheva, see Glenn Peers, *Animism, Materiality, and Museums: How Do Byzantine Things Feel?* (Leeds: Arc Humanities Press, 2021), 12–15.

[15] Alfred Gell, *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 19–21.

an “assemblage.”[16] Similarly, Jane Bennett’s “swarm of vitalities” calls attention to what animates both nonhuman things and their human companions in assemblages.[17] What all these theories share in common is a conviction that humans and things are in a coextensive and integrative relationship—one I will call assemblages—and possess dynamic agency that allows them to actively perform.

The icon of Panagia Amirou is considered to be miraculous—the agency of miraculous images is comprehensively problematic as the image is openly articulated as animated by virtue of being able to perform miracles.[18] In museums, outside of the primary liturgical context, such actions are far less common and icons are perceived rather differently—the icon at the Hermitage Museum is no longer seen as a liturgical object, but treated as a work of art.[19] Does this mean that their agency changes according to the context? I see the agency of an icon not as its property, but as its affordance.[20] In such an understanding,

[16] Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 63–86; Sonia Hazard, “The Material Turn in the Study of Religion,” *Religion and Society. Advances in Research* 4, no. 1 (2013): 65–66, https://doi.org/10.3167/arrs.2013.040104. For discussion of Latour’s theory in Poland, see Krzysztof Abriszewski, “Rzeczy w kontekście teorii Aktora-Sieci,” in *Rzeczy i ludzie: Humanistyka wobec materialności*, ed. Jacek Kowalewski et al. (Olsztyn: Instytut Filozofii Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, 2008), 103–129. For Latourian inspiration and agency in the research on Byzantine art, see Glenn Peers, “We Have Never Been Byzantine: On Analogy,” in *Byzantium/Modernism: The Byzantine as Method in Modernity*, ed. Roland Betancourt and Maria Taroutina (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 349–360.

[17] Jane Bennett, *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 20–38, especially 23–24, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv111jh6w. In Poland these approaches were presented and discussed in Ewa Domańska, “Humanistyka nie-antropocentryczna a studia nad rzeczami,” *Kultura Współczesna*, no. 3 (2008): 9–21; Agata Rybus, “Czy rzecz może być sprawcą? Perspektywa humanistyki i nauk społecznych,” in *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów: Przedmioty w świecie ludzi*, ed. Maciej Wiktor Kornobis and Agata Rybus (Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2016), 19–58.

[18] The issue of the agency of miraculous images was addressed by Robert Maniura, see Robert Maniura, “Agency and Miraculous Images,” in *The Agency of Things in Medieval and Early Modern Art*, ed. Grażyna Jurkowlaniec, Ika Matyjaszkiewicz, and Zuzanna Sarnecka (New York: Routledge, 2017), 63–72, https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315166940. Bleeding can be seen in a similar way; for more on this, see Maria Vassilaki, “Bleeding Icons,” in *Icon and Word: The Power of Images in Byzantium—Studies Presented to Robin Cormack*, ed. Antony Eastmond and Liz James (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003), 121–133.

[19] For more on icons in museums, see Sharon Gerstel, “The Aesthetics of Orthodox Faith,” *Art Bulletin* 87, no. 2 (2004): 331–341, especially 332; Peers, “Sense Lives of Byzantine Things,” 20; Glenn Peers, “Byzantine Things in the World,” in *Byzantine Things in the World*, ed. Glenn Peers (Houston: The Menil Collection, 2013), 45; Gary Vikan, “Bringing the Sacred into Art Museum,” in *Religion in Museums: Global and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, ed. Gretchen Buggeln, Crispin Paine, and S. Brent Plate (London: Bloomsbury, 2017), 205–210, http://doi.org/10.5040/9781474255554.ch-023. For more on categorization of exhibits in art museums and ethnographic collections, see Krzysztof Snarski, “Etnograficzne kolekcje staroobrzędowe w zbiorach muzealnych: Problemy budowy kolekcji,” in Kornobis and Rybus, *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów*, 149; Katarzyna Maniak, “Rzeczy znaczą różne rzeczy: Tożsamość obiektów w muzeach etnograficznych,” in Kornobis and Rybus, 114; Jerzy Świecimski, “Eksponat muzealny w aspekcie zagadnień ontologicznych, estetycznych i etycznych,” *Opuscula Musealia* 13 (2004): 13–18.

[20] The concept of affordances was introduced by ecological psychologist James Gibson; see James J. Gibson, “The Theory of Affordances,” in *Perceiving, Acting, and Knowing: Toward an Ecological Psychology*, ed. Robert Shaw and John Bransford (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1977), 67–82; *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception* (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1986), 127–143. For Polish adaptations of the term, see Andrzej Klawiter, “Co ze mną zrobisz, kiedy mnie zobaczysz? Percepcja jako wyszukiwanie ofert (affordances) w otoczeniu,” AVANT. *Pismo Awangardy Filozoficzno-Naukowej* 3, no. 2 (2012): 261–266.

agency is not an unchanging feature, but a potential inherent in objects. Instead of an action, the focus is on the possibility of action. The concept of affordances allows for a wider spectrum of variability as affordances are always defined by the relationship between the user and the object.

By examining two composite icons, one in a liturgical context and one in a museum context, I argue for the latent potentials in their unusual assemblage form. What does this assemblage form afford in those two different social assemblages? Does their performativity change depending on the assemblage they become a part of? To approach reality as an assemblage allows us to see the dynamism of various relations and the differences between them, and it makes it possible to see a research process as an assemblage as well. As a researcher, I have become an integral part of both assemblages, which by their very definition do not exist in separation from the individual studying them. Seeing the process of conducting research as an assemblage emphasizes the role of researchers and their relationship with the material being studied, as well as the impossibility of objectivity in the observation and presentation of results. My training and experience as an art historian and even the fact of being a woman play a significant role in this assemblage.[21] I am aware of the fact that the two composite icons to which I have deliberately limited my considerations are in fact my subjective choice, and that they would probably otherwise never have "met" or created an assemblage together. However, it seems to me that pairing and comparing them within this study may help in understanding the uniqueness of the assemblage form.

An Assemblage within a Liturgical Assemblage

A few composite icons still perform their original, religious function in churches. A good example of an icon in a liturgical context is the already mentioned icon of Panagia Amirou (**FIG. 1**). The icon depicts the Virgin Mary with Child and bears the inscription *Η ΝΕΑ ΦΑΝΕΡΩΜΕΝΗ*. It is kept in the Amirou Monastery near the village of Apsiou in Cyprus.[22] Originally a male monastery, it was closed

[21] Being a woman indeed influences the choice of the material, as some icons are not available to me. For example, due to Mount Athos's strict rule forbidding women to enter, I will never be able to study the social role played by the fascinating composite icon in Vatopedi Monastery: Athanasios A. Karakatsanis, ed., *Treasures of Mount Athos* (Thessaloniki: Museum of Byzantine Culture, 1997), 294–296, no. 9.6.

[22] I conducted the ethnographic research in the monastery using the methods of participant observation and in-depth individual and group interviews with nuns and visitors to the monastery during the procession with the icon (November 21, 2021) and additional visits (September 25–27, 2021, November 20–22, 2021, and December

FIG. 3 Icon of Panagia Amirou in the church (with the votive offerings on the left)

PHOTO DOROTA ZAPRZALSKA

at the end of the 18th century.[23] Most of the monastery buildings fell into ruin. Only the church, which continued to be used by the local community, survived. Although there was no regular liturgy there for many years, the faithful often came to see and venerate local icons, among them the icon of Panagia Amirou. According to local legend, the icon was protected by a snake and was considered

18–19, 2021). I would like to thank Prof. Janusz Barański from the Institute of Ethnology and Cultural Anthropology of the Jagiellonian University for his help and suggestions during the research.

[23] The exact date is not known. The 18th century is mentioned the most often, see Athanasios Papageōrgiou, "Amirous Panagias monastēri," in *Megalē Kypriakē Enkyklopaideia*, ed. Antros Paulidēs, vol. 2 (Leukōsia: Arktinos, 1985), 30–31. Nevertheless, Sykoutris noted in 1924 that the oldest inhabitants of Apsiou remember the last monk, and therefore it seems plausible that the monastery was closed in the 19th century, see Iōannēs Sykoutrēs, "Monastēria en Kyprō: Amirou," *Kypriaka Chronika* 2 (1924): 81–85.

PHOTO DOROTA ZAPRZALSKA

FIG. 4 Procession with the icon of Panagia Amirou, November 21, 2021

a miraculous image. As such, it was carried in procession annually on the Friday and later on the Sunday after Easter. In 1997 the monastery reopened as a female order. The nuns keep the traditions and beliefs in the healing power of the icon alive. Its status as a miraculous image is attested by a red veil covering the icon and votive offerings (*tamata*) offered by the faithful (**FIG. 3**): both visual ways of honoring the image, and consecration practices by adornment.[24] The icon is now used in a number of processions (**FIG. 4**) that culminate with the ritual of passing under the icon: two people hold the image above the entrance to the church as the faithful pass beneath the image one by one to receive a special blessing. Almost all participants try to touch the icon, and many people cry, which suggests a deep emotional and sensory connection with Panagia Amirou. The need for close contact with the image is also evident in the number of privately owned reproductions of the image, which—as emphasized by their owners—are believed to have healing power. The large number of copies sold proves that the mass-produced quality does not undermine the devotional value for potential

[24] For more on the role and practices of consecration, see David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 82–98. As Freedberg noted, consecration most often recognizes the miraculous powers that were in the image prior to consecration: "Images work *because* they are consecrated, but at the same time they work *before* they are consecrated," 98. See also Elżbieta Skokowska, "Synu, weź ten obraz na pamiątkę," in Kornobis and Rybus, *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów*, 63–64.

buyers. Whether the icon is a hand-made object or a printed, mechanically reproduced copy does not seem to matter much to the faithful, as they still see an equivalent cult object in the copy.[25]

The assemblage form of the icon is crucial for my considerations. The smaller, inset image is in a bad state of preservation, but it is still possible to recognize that it depicts the Virgin Mary with Child. This icon is connected through a legend with the origins of the male monastery. An Emir was travelling with his blind daughter searching for a way to heal her.[26] During a visit to Cyprus, even though she was blind, she noticed a light emanating from a cave that contained an icon and a fresh-water spring. After she washed her eyes with the water she was miraculously cured. As a gesture of gratitude, her father built a church on the site, and, in time, the local community constructed a monastery. Although only some versions of the legend mention the miraculous spring, visitors unanimously emphasize the connection of the smaller icon with the miracle. The current versions of the legend differ slightly from older, 20th-century versions recorded when the monastery was closed. According to one of them, written in 1924, it was the founder that was blind and later cured, and he was healed by the oil from a lamp, not the icon itself.[27] Does the central role of the icon in the stories today come from the desire to elevate the status of the image? Is their role simply to draw more visitors by making the icon the main "attraction" of the monastery? Certainly not, as this assemblage is more complex than it may seem.

The nuns very often call the icon "our icon," and the same expression is used often by the faithful. The icon is an important element in building a shared identity among the faithful who frequent the monastery. It not only confirms the continuity of tradition by giving a sense of connection to the past, but above all unites the community. The icon is also constantly described as "she" by the faithful, and her agency is especially visible in statements about the icon having healed or helped someone.[28] Emphasizing the miraculous appearance of the icon acts as a proof of

---

[25] More on this phenomenon in the contemporary cult of icons: Raymond Silverman, "Ethiopian Orthodox Visual Culture in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction: A Research Note," *Material Religion* 5, no. 1 (2009): 92–93, https://doi.org/10.2752/175183409X418766; Amy Slagle, "Pixelating the Sacred: Digital and Mechanical Reproduction and the Orthodox Christian Icon in the United States," *Material Religion* 15, no. 3 (2019): 295–296, https://doi.org/10.1080/17432200.2019.1603068 .

[26] According to other versions of the legend, a man called Emiras or Amiras; see also the monastery publication: *Iera Monē Panagias Amirous* (Thessalonikē: Melissa, 2009), 20–22.

[27] Sykoutrēs, "Monastēria en Kyprō," 85. The same version in Rupert Gunnis, *Historic Cyprus: A Guide to Its Towns and Villages, Monasteries, and Castles* (London: Methuen, 1936), 170–171. The daughter appears in the version written down by Raptopoulos in 1983; see Zacharias Raptopoulos, *Akolouthia kai istorika stoicheia tēs Ieras Monēs Panagias Amirous* (Lemesos: [n.p.], 1983), 10–11.

[28] This indicates not only that the faithful actually believe in the healing power of the icon, but also some of the mechanisms by which the separation between representation and the represented become blurred. For more

its special status and healing power from the very beginning.[29] Highlighting the connection of the icon with the beginning of the monastery, and more precisely with the miracle of the healing of the founder's daughter, leads to the legitimation of the image's status as exceptional. It is worth looking not only at the performativity of its form, but also at the current performances, such as processions, in which it plays a central role.[30] Through ritualized gestures, sounds, and communing with what is sacred, performances build and maintain a community.[31] Therefore, we should recognize the active role of the icon of Panagia Amirou in strengthening interpersonal ties and building the identity of the members of the community it helps to create. Still, there is one important set of questions we need to ask: why did the legend appear around this specific icon? Why is this icon considered special in this social assemblage? Could the belief in the uniqueness of the icon and the appearance of the legend be a response to its unusual appearance in an attempt to answer the question of why there is a smaller icon inside the icon? I will focus on the assemblage form of this icon in order to explore whether it is possible that its unusual form has afforded the appearance of the legend.

While analyzing the assemblage form of this icon, and composite icons in general, we should keep in mind the emergent properties of assemblages.[32] As a result of the mutual interaction of their various elements, new properties, and abilities arise in each assemblage and these new properties are not just a sum of the properties of the individual parts, but may be entirely different. If we consider the icon of Panagia Amirou as an assemblage of two icons, the two panels combined would be perceived differently than they would apart. In composite icons the larger image acts very often as a frame which creates a sense of uniqueness for the framed element.[33] Moreover, in the case of Panagia Amirou the smaller icon was additionally hidden behind a two-winged door, of which only a frag-

about the iconic images that are able to bring devoted viewers into contact with someone or some state of being they seek, see David Morgan, *Images at Work: The Material Culture of Enchantment* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 113–137, https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190272111.001.0001.

[29] Such images that miraculously appeared on earth repeat the pattern of an icon of the *acheiropoietos* type, and their traces can be found in contemporary religiosity and etiological legends of miraculous images; see Anna Niedźwiedź, *The Image and the Figure: Our Lady of Częstochowa in Polish Culture and Popular Religion*, trans. Anna Niedźwiedź and Guy Torr (Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 2010), 9–17. See also Joanna Tokarska-Bakir, *Obraz osobliwy: Hermeneutyczna lektura źródeł etnograficznych—Wielkie opowieści* (Kraków: Universitas, 2000), 281–282, 326–327.

[30] Religious rituals and rites are often interpreted as cultural performances; see Marvin Carlson, *Performance: A Critical Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2018), 20–21, 180.

[31] Richard Schechner, *Performance Studies: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2013), 46.

[32] Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*, 24; DeLanda, *Assemblage Theory*, 71.

[33] Glenn Peers, *Sacred Shock: Framing Visual Experience in Byzantium* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004), 1–2.

ment has survived. The door offers the possibility of a performative revealing or hiding, thus granting access to the smaller, and in this case miraculous, image. This element creates a hierarchy of form and space within one piece of art and visually raises the status of the central representation. Although it is not known how the icon of Panagia Amirou was originally used and presented, it is most likely the assemblage form that afforded the feeling of the uniqueness of the object captured within and the legend may have appeared as a response to the unusual form. By playing an important role in a specific theatre of memory, which serves to reinterpret the past, the icon, due to its assemblage form and through connecting the inset icon with the beginning of the monastery, becomes a visual confirmation of the continuity of the monastery's tradition and is an active part of this social assemblage.[34]

An Assemblage within a Museum Assemblage

A museum is another type of assemblage, insofar as it constitutes a collection whose parts interact. The objects in museums are still subject to dynamic changes—they are preserved, transformed or even destroyed; they live in museum collections, which are assemblages in themselves.[35] The status of an icon is in fact ambiguous—it can be seen as a work of art or as a cult object, and therefore it can be exhibited in an art museum or an ethnographic museum.[36] Museums and collections categorize a specific object and, in a way, co-create it, assigning it to a specific category through the act of displaying it. Whether as works of art or as artifacts, icons lose their original liturgical function there.[37] Therefore, while analyzing the composite icon from the Hermitage Museum (**FIG. 2**), we must remember that icons function differently within the museum assemblage.

[34] On the concept of a theatre of memory, see Raphael Samuel, *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture* (London: Verso Books, 1994).

[35] Stoichita, *Self-Aware Image*, 103; for more on collections and the relations between the collector and the collected, see John Elsner and Roger Cardinal, eds., *The Cultures of Collecting* (London: Reaktion Books, 1994); Susan M. Pearce, *On Collecting: An Investigation into Collecting in the European Tradition* (London: Routledge, 1995).

[36] The issue of practices towards works of art and their functions, which go beyond the sphere of artistic values, are discussed in numerous works in the field of the anthropology of art; see for example: Robert Layton, *The Anthropology of Art* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Howard Morphy, "The Anthropology of Art," in *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, ed. Tim Ingold (London: Routledge, 1994), 648–685; Mariët Westermann, "Introduction: The Objects of Art History and Anthropology," in *Anthropologies of Art*, ed. Mariët Westermann (Williamstown, MA: Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 2005), vii–xxxi. Janusz Barański, *Etnologia w erze postludowej: Dalsze eseje antyperyferyjne* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2017), 155–171.

[37] Gerstel, "Aesthetics of Orthodox Faith," 331–332; Peers, "Sense Lives of Byzantine Things," 20.

Moreover, the essence of the assemblage form of composite icons is sometimes misunderstood in the museum context. The history of the Hermitage icon illustrates this well. It consists of a miniature mosaic icon and an icon-frame in tempera on wood with representations of saints and inserted relics. When Pavel Kostrov worked on its conservation in 1954–1957, knowing no other examples of Byzantine composite icons, he believed that such an unusual form must have been the result of the relatively recent combination of two panels by art collectors in the 19th or 20th century. Therefore, he decided to separate them.[38] For almost half a century, the mosaic icon and its frame were exhibited separately, and it was not until 2000 that the mosaic icon was returned to its previous, composite form. It turned out that the fabrics originally covering the reverse are a piece of Chinese silk from the 17th century and Italian silk from the 16th century, which indicates that they had originally been joined together much earlier than conservators had assumed—according to Yuri Piatnitsky the painted frame was most probably added to the mosaic icon in Moscow in the 16th century.[39]

The act of separating the two parts of the icon is worth reflecting upon. Kostrov adapted the object based on his knowledge at the time. At first glance it was simply a mistake, but it is possible to examine his decision slightly more broadly. Through an error based on incomplete information, Kostrov became part of a dynamic assemblage, which consisted of his prior knowledge and experience, and of conservation possibilities, as well as the institution of the museum. The icon itself, with its assemblage form, was also an active part of this social assemblage, and here I would like to refer back to the concept of affordance—it is not so much that the icon forced Kostrov to act in a specific way, but rather that the assemblage form offered the possibility of separating the two icons. In actual fact we are dealing with the potential for change offered by the construction of the icon itself. In the new assemblage that was created at the moment of the separation, the icon functioned and was exhibited as two separate works of art—something that was possible only in that particular assemblage, in that specific time and place.

---

[38] Their way of presentation after separation—as two separate panels—is visible in the catalogues from that time; see among others *Vizantii͡a, Balkany, Rus': Ikony kont͡sa XIII–pervoĭ poloviny XV veka* (Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Gosudarstvennykh Muzeev Moskovskogo Kremli͡a, 1991), no. 14 and no. 40.

[39] Yuri Piatnitksy, "Portable Icon with Saints John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, Nicholas the Miracle Worker, and Gregory the Theologian in Frame with the Deesis and Seven Saints and Their Holy Relics," in *Byzantium: Faith and Power (1261–1557)*, ed. Helen C. Evans (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2004), 225–227. For more information on the icon with an earlier bibliography, see Yuri Piatnitksy, "Icône reliquaire de mosaïque," in *Sainte Russie: L'art russe des origines à Pierre le Grand*, éd. Jannic Durand, et al. (Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2010), 448–449, no. 196. I would like to thank Yuri Piatnitsky for his help in collecting publications and information regarding the history of the icon and the State Hermitage Museum, Saint Petersburg for sharing with me the photographs of the icon.

The above-mentioned history can be seen as part of a biography of this specific composite icon.[40] It perfectly illustrates not only the affordance and fragility of the assemblage form, but also the dynamism of assemblages of humans and non-humans and their accidental and momentary nature. The example from the Hermitage also confirms that the history of objects does not end with the moment they are included in museum collections. Catalogued, described, and categorized, they enter into relations with other exhibited objects and with the viewer. Moreover, exhibitions take place in a specific and pre-planned space, significantly influencing the perception of viewers. This space can even be called a performative space, using Erika Fischer-Lichte's term, who, although applying this concept to the relationship between actors and spectators in a theatre, stressed that different spatial arrangements structure and organize movement and perception.[41] In a museum, different arrangements offer the visitors different perceptual possibilities. The relationship between artifacts and visitors has been similarly designed and organized in a selected space, where the former often remain static, while the latter move in a strictly planned manner and the very act of visiting an exhibition might resemble a ritual.[42] The museum in which an object or piece of art is displayed significantly influences our behavior and the way we perceive the objects in it, and, above all, the way we experience them, as, in general, museums concentrate on the visual experience and exclude touch.[43] Therefore, composite icons and icons in general in a museum context will be perceived and experienced differently than they would have been in the original liturgical context—they undergo a process of museumification, a change in their status due to their recontextualization within a museum.[44] They are treated and

[40] On the concept of the social biography of things, see Igor Kopytoff, "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process," in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, ed. Arjun Appadurai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 64–91. On the biographies of museum objects, see Samuel Alberti, "Objects and the Museum," *Isis* 96, no. 4 (2005): 559–571. This approach has been adopted in studying works of Byzantine art as well, see Liz James, "Things: Art and Experience in Byzantium," in *Experiencing Byzantium: Papers from the 44th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Newcastle and Durham, April 2011*, ed. Claire Nesbitt and Mark Jackson (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013), 17–33.

[41] Erika Fischer-Lichte, *The Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics*, trans. Saskya Iris Jain (London: Routledge, 2008), 107–108.

[42] Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums* (London: Routledge, 1995), 7–20. See also Janusz Barański, "Dyskurs gęsty: W poszukiwaniu interpretatywnej teorii przedmiotu muzealnego," in Kowalewski et al., *Rzeczy i ludzie*, 272; Peter Vergo, "The Reticent Object," in *The New Museology*, ed. Peter Vergo (London: Reaktion Books, 1991), 41–59; Mieke Bal, "The Discourse of the Museum," in *Thinking about Exhibitions*, ed. Reesa Greenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson, and Sandy Nairne (London: Routledge, 1996), 202–217; Polish translations of these texts in Maria Popczyk, ed., *Muzeum Sztuki: Antologia* (Kraków: Universitas, 2005).

[43] On the role of the sense of touch in the history of museums, see Fiona Candlin, *Art, Museums and Touch* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010), 58–90.

[44] For more on museumification, see S. Brent Plate, "The Museumification of Religion: Human Evolution and the Display of Ritual," in Buggeln et al., *Religion in Museums*, 41–47, http://doi.org/10.5040/9781474255554.ch-004.

PHOTO DOROTA ZAPRZALSKA

FIG. 5 Fragment of an icon of Christ Pantocrator (inv. no. 101) in the Byzantine Museum of Ioannina, Greece

© MINISTRY OF CULTURE AND SPORTS / EPHORATE OF ANTIQUITIES OF IOANNINA / BYZANTINE MUSEUM OF IOANNINA

perceived there as works of arts and the way of their presentation determines significantly the way they are perceived by the viewers.

Here I would like to ask a broader question: does the museum context completely deprive an icon of its own performativity? Not necessarily. The manner in which it is presented significantly influences how viewers experience the object, but in this dynamic assemblage, changing relations connect not only the museum and the work of art, but also its viewer.[45] The reaction of a viewer might be far from the one that we would expect in a museum and nothing proves this better than instances of icon veneration (*proskynesis*) by visitors in museums.[46] Although this form of bodily interaction with icons seems like it would be excluded from the museum space, the trace of lipstick on the icon in the Byzantine Museum in Ioannina (**FIG. 5**) indicates that this is not always

[45] This issue is widely commented on within museum visitor studies; see for example: Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, "Studying Visitors," in *A Companion to Museum Studies*, ed. Sharon MacDonald (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 362–376; Laurajane Smith, *Emotional Heritage: Visitor Engagement at Museums and Heritage Sites* (New York: Routlege, 2021), https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315713274.

[46] On this behavior in museums, see Liz James, "Senses and Sensibility in Byzantium," *Art History* 27, no. 4 (2004): 526–527, https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0141-6790.2004.00436.x. On kissing icons and the role of the sense of touch in their veneration, see Béatrice Caseau, "Byzantine Christianity and Tactile Piety (Fourth–Fifteenth Centuries)," in Harvey and Mullet, *Knowing Bodies, Passionate Souls*, 217, 221.

the case. Since the icon had already been included in the museum collection, this detail indicates that someone kissed it while already in the museum.[47] We can see that even though the exhibition in the museum leads to an unavoidable recontextualization of the icon, some elements of the ways people interact with the icon may remain the same. This is because even if an image is always seen in a specific context, which significantly mediates its performativity, it does not completely deprive it of its affordance. Affordance opens up the possibility of agency—it may or may not materialize into observable actions and reactions, but this will depend on the assemblage. The icon from the Byzantine Museum in Ioannina proves that even in the museum space the icon can perform in some of the same ways as it did in the liturgical space, but it can do so only in the context of a specific assemblage with a specific viewer. It is possible because an icon creates a new assemblage with every viewer each time it is looked at and an important part of this assemblage is a devotional baggage—the visitor's prior ritual experience.[48]

Conclusions

The performative possibilities of the two composite icons discussed here are expanded and shaped by the unusual assemblage form which allows the separation of two panels or the creation of legends around the inserted image. Analyzing the performativity of composite icons in two different assemblages has emphasized the dynamics of the assemblage form, but also the dynamics of the icon itself. Seeing the icon as a dynamic part of various assemblages reminds us that depending on the context—and the assemblages that the icon becomes a part of—it may be perceived at times as a work of art, and at times as a devotional image whose power extends beyond the sphere of artistic value. This should prompt us to ask ourselves about the limits of art and even about the category of art as such, as David Freedberg noted: "what clouds our perception is exactly the compulsion to establish whether an object is art or not, and whether it belongs in a museum or not."[49] Composite icons, and icons in general, can be seen as both—works of

[47] I am grateful to the Byzantine Museum of Ioannina for their help during my research. I would also like to thank the Ephorate of Antiquities of Ioannina for permission to photograph and publish the icon.

[48] I am adapting the term after Steph Berns, although she means by it actual material objects brought by visitors to museums. Therefore, my understanding of the devotional baggage, although inspired by her considerations, is much broader; see Steph Berns, "Devotional Baggage," in Buggeln et al., *Religion in Museums*, 83–91, http://doi.org/10.5040/9781474255554.ch-009.

[49] Freedberg, *Power of Images*, 437.

art and devotional images—and their identities are constantly redefined by the assemblage in which they are placed. It is important to ask questions not only about the dating of icons, their iconography or style, but also about the ways they are presented today and how they interact with those who view them.

The multivalency of the term *assemblage* seems to be particularly useful in the case of analyzing composite icons. It allows one to define an assemblage form—the insertion of a specific icon into another one and the interaction of two images within one work of art. Above all, however, it points to the active participation of the icon in assemblages of humans and non-humans, and thus the changes in its performativity according to the relations with other works of art, institutions, and people. Thus, the use of the structure of assemblage to analyze two examples of composite icons invites broader questions than those asked by Vocotopoulos. Performativity focuses on action, assemblage on relations. Their combination allows one to draw attention to the current functioning of the composite icons, their ways of presentation, interactions with viewers, and how the composite form influences current forms of veneration and presentation.

Bibliography

Abriszewski, Krzysztof. "Rzeczy w kontekście Teorii Aktora-Sieci." In Kowalewski et al., *Rzeczy i ludzie*, 103–129.

Alberti, Samuel. "Objects and the Museum." *Isis* 96, no. 4 (2005): 559–571.

Bal, Ewa, and Dariusz Kosiński, eds. *Performatyka: Terytoria*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2017.

Bal, Mieke. "The Discourse of the Museum." In *Thinking about Exhibitions*, ed. Reesa Greenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson, and Sandy Nairne, 202–217. London: Routledge, 1996.

Barański, Janusz. "Dyskurs gęsty: W poszukiwaniu interpretatywnej teorii przedmiotu muzealnego." In Kowalewski et al., *Rzeczy i ludzie*, 261–298.

Barański, Janusz. *Etnologia w erze postludowej: Dalsze eseje antyperyferyjne*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego, 2017.

Bennett, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.

Berns, Steph. "Devotional Baggage." In Buggeln, Paine, and Plate, *Religion in Museums*, 83–91. http://doi.org/10.5040/9781474255554.ch-009.

Borowski, Mateusz, and Małgorzata Sugiera. *Sztuczne natury: Performanse technonauki i sztuki*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2016.

Buggeln, Gretchen, Crispin Paine, and S. Brent Plate, eds. *Religions in Museums: Global and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. London: Bloomsbury, 2017. http://doi.org/10.5040/9781474255554.

Candlin, Fiona. *Art, Museums and Touch*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010.

Carlson, Marvin. *Performance: A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2018.

Caseau, Béatrice. "Byzantine Christianity and Tactile Piety (Fourth–Fifteenth Centuries)." In Harvey and Mullet, *Knowing Bodies, Passionate Souls*, 209–211.

Chaberski, Mateusz. "Asamblaż." In Bal and Kosiński, *Performatyka: Terytoria*, 23–30.

Chaberski, Mateusz. *Asamblaże, asamblaże: Doświadczenie w zamglonym antropocenie*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 2019.

Chaberski, Mateusz. "Performans jako asamblaż." *Didaskalia*, no. 133/134 (2016): 84–91.

Chaberski, Mateusz. "What Performativity Scholars Can Learn from Mushrooms: Situated Knowing in Polyphonic Assemblages." In *Situated Knowing: Epistemic Perspectives on Performance*, edited by Ewa Bal and Mateusz Chaberski, 171–188. London: Routledge, 2021.

DeLanda, Manuel. *Assemblage Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016.

DeLanda, Manuel. *Deleuze: History and Science*. New York: Atropos Press, 2010.

DeLanda, Manuel. *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. London: Continuum, 2006.

Domańska, Ewa. "Humanistyka nie-antropocentryczna a studia nad rzeczami." *Kultura Współczesna*, nr 3 (2008): 9–21.

Duncan, Carol. *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Durand, Jannic, et al., eds. *Sainte Russie: L'art russe des origines à Pierre le Grand*. Paris: Musée du Louvre, 2010.

Elsner, John, and Roger Cardinal, eds. *The Cultures of Collecting*. London: Reaktion Books, 1994.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. *The Transformative Power of Performance: A New Aesthetics*. Translated by Saskya Iris Jain. London: Routledge, 2008.

Freedberg, David. *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Gell, Alfred. *Art and Agency: An Anthropological Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

Gerstel, Sharon. "The Aesthetics of Orthodox Faith." *Art Bulletin* 87, no. 2 (2004): 331–341.

Gibson, James J. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1986.

Gibson, James J. "The Theory of Affordances." In *Perceiving, Acting, and Knowing: Toward an Ecological Psychology*, edited by Robert Shaw and John Bransford, 67–82. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1977.

Graham, Emma-Jayne. *Reassembling Religion in Roman Italy*. London: Routledge, 2020. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315270562.

Harvey, Susan Ashbrook, and Margaret Mullet, eds. *Knowing Bodies, Passionate Souls: Sense Perception in Byzantium*. Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 2017.

Hazard, Sonia. "The Material Turn in the Study of Religion." *Religion and Society. Advances in Research* 4, no. 1 (2013): 58–78. https://doi.org/10.3167/arrs.2013.040104.

Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. "Studying Visitors." In *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Sharon MacDonald, 362–376. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006.

James, Liz. "Senses and Sensibility in Byzantium." *Art History* 27, no. 4 (2004): 526–527. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0141-6790.2004.00436.x.

Jervis, Ben. *Assemblage Thought and Archaeology*. London: Routledge, 2019. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315158594.

Jurkowlaniec, Grażyna. *Epoka nowożytna wobec średniowiecza: Pamiątki przeszłości, cudowne wizerunki, dzieła sztuki*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 2008.

Karakatsanis, Athanasios A., ed. *Treasures of Mount Athos*. Thessaloniki: Museum of Byzantine Culture, 1997.

Klawiter, Andrzej. "Co ze mną zrobisz, kiedy mnie zobaczysz? Percepcja jako wyszukiwanie ofert (affordances) w otoczeniu." *AVANT. Pismo Awangardy Filozoficzno-Naukowej* 3, nr 2 (2012): 261–266.

Kopytoff, Igor. "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process." In *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, edited by Arjun Appadurai, 64–91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Kornobis, Maciej Wiktor, and Agata Rybus, eds. *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów: Przedmioty w świecie ludzi*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 2016.

Kowalewski, Jacek, et al., eds. *Rzeczy i ludzie: Humanistyka wobec materialności*. Olsztyn: Instytut Filozofii Uniwersytetu Warmińsko-Mazurskiego, 2008.

Latour, Bruno. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Layton, Robert. *The Anthropology of Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Maniak, Katarzyna. "Rzeczy znaczą różne rzeczy: Tożsamość obiektów w muzeach etnograficznych." In Kornobis and Rybus, *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów*, 113–130.

Maniura, Robert. "Agency and Miraculous Images." In *The Agency of Things in Medieval and Early Modern Art*, edited by Grażyna Jurkowlaniec, Ika Matyjaszkiewicz, and Zuzanna Sarnecka, 63–72. New York: Routledge, 2017. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315166940 .

Morgan, David. *Images at Work: The Material Culture of Enchantment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190272111.001.0001.

Morphy, Howard. “The Anthropology of Art.” In *Companion Encyclopedia of Anthropology*, edited by Tim Ingold, 648–685. London: Routledge, 1994.

Niedźwiedź, Anna. *The Image and the Figure: Our Lady of Częstochowa in Polish Culture and Popular Religion*. Translated by Anna Niedźwiedź and Guy Torr. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 2010.

Ostrow, Steven. *Art and Spirituality in Counter-Reformation Rome: The Sistine and Pauline Chapels in S. Maria Maggiore*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Pearce, Susan. *On Collecting: An Investigation into Collecting in the European Tradition*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Peers, Glenn. *Animism, Materiality, and Museums: How Do Byzantine Things Feel?* Leeds: Arc Humanities Press, 2020.

Peers, Glenn. “Byzantine Things in the World.” In *Byzantine Things in the World*, edited by Glenn Peers, 21–84. Houston: The Menil Collection, 2013.

Peers, Glenn. *Sacred Shock: Framing Visual Experience in Byzantium*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2004.

Peers, Glenn. “Sense Lives of Byzantine Things.” In Harvey and Mullet, *Knowing Bodies, Passionate Souls*, 11–30.

Peers, Glenn. “We Have Never Been Byzantine: On Analogy.” In *Byzantium/Modernism: The Byzantine as Method in Modernity*, edited by Roland Betancourt and Maria Taroutina, 349–360. Leiden: Brill, 2015. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004300019_017.

Pentcheva, Bissera V. “Moving Eyes: Surface and Shadow in the Byzantine Mixed-Media Relief Icon.” *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics* 55/56 (2009): 222–234. https://doi.org/10.1086/RESvn1ms25608845.

Pentcheva, Bissera V. “The Performative Icon.” *The Art Bulletin* 88, no. 4 (2006): 631–655. https://doi.org/10.1080/00043079.2006.10786312.

Pentcheva, Bissera V. *The Sensual Icon: Space, Ritual and the Senses in Byzantium*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2010.

Phillips, John. “Agencement/Assemblage.” *Theory, Culture and Society* 23, no. 2/3 (2006): 108–109. https://doi.org/10.1177/026327640602300219.

Plate, S. Brent. “The Museumification of Religion: Human Evolution and the Display of Ritual.” In Buggeln, Paine, and Plate, *Religion in Museums*, 41–47. http://doi.org/10.5040/9781474255554.ch-004.

Popczyk, Maria, ed. *Muzeum sztuki: Antologia*. Kraków: Universitas, 2005.

Rybus, Agata. “Czy rzecz może być sprawcą? Perspektywa humanistyki i nauk społecznych.” In Kornobis and Rybus, *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów*, 19–58.

Samuel, Raphael. *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. London: Verso Books, 1994.

Schechner, Richard. *Performance Studies: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Schechner, Richard. *Performance Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Silverman, Raymond. "Ethiopian Orthodox Visual Culture in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction: A Research Note." *Material Religion The Journal of Objects, Art and Belief* 5, no. 1 (2009): 88–103. https://doi.org/10.2752/175183409X418766.

Skokowska, Elżbieta. "Synu, weź ten obraz na pamiątkę." In Kornobis and Rybus, *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów*, 59–68.

Slagle, Amy. "Pixelating the Sacred: Digital and Mechanical Reproduction and the Orthodox Christian Icon in the United States." *Material Religion. The Journal of Objects, Art and Belief* 15, no. 3 (2019): 293–321. https://doi.org/10.1080/17432200.2019.1603068.

Smith, Laurajane. *Emotional Heritage: Visitor Engagement at Museums and Heritage Sites*. New York: Routledge, 2021. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315713274.

Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge, 2006.

Snarski, Krzysztof. "Etnograficzne kolekcje staroobrzędowe w zbiorach muzealnych: Problemy budowy kolekcji." In Kornobis and Rybus, *Ludzie w świecie przedmiotów*, 131–152.

Sophocleous, Sophocles. *Icônes de Chypre: Diocèse de Limassol 12e–16e siècle*. Nicosie: Centre du Patrimoine Culturel, 2006.

Stoichita, Victor I. *L'instauration du tableau: Métapeinture à l'aube des temps modernes*. Genève: Libraire Droz, 1999.

Stoichita, Victor I. *The Self-Aware Image: An Insight into Early Modern Meta-Painting*. Translated by Anne-Marie Glasheen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Świecimski, Jerzy. "Eksponat muzealny w aspekcie zagadnień ontologicznych, estetycznych i etycznych." *Opuscula Musealia* 13 (2004): 9–21.

Tokarska-Bakir, Joanna. *Obraz osobliwy: Hermeneutyczna lektura źródeł etnograficznych—Wielkie opowieści*. Kraków: Universitas, 2000.

Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvc77bcc.

Vassilaki, Maria. "Bleeding Icons." In *Icon and Word: The Power of Images in Byzantium—Studies Presented to Robin Cormack*, edited by Antony Eastmond and Liz James, 121–133. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2003.

Vergo, Peter. "The Reticent Object." In *The New Museology*, ed. Peter Vergo, 41–59. London: Reaktion Books, 1991.

Vikan, Gary. “Bringing the Sacred into Art Museum.” In Buggeln, Paine, and Plate, *Religion in Museums*, 205–210. http://doi.org/10.5040/9781474255554.ch-023.
Vizantiia͡, Balkany, Rus’: Ikony konts͡a XIII–pervoĭ poloviny XV veka. Moskva: Izdatel’stvo Gosudarstvennykh Muzeev Moskovskogo Kremlia͡, 1991.
Vocotopoulos, Panayotis L. “Composite Icons.” In *Greek Icons: Proceedings of the Symposium in Memory of Manolis Chatzidakis, Recklinghausen, 1998*, edited by Eva Haustein-Bartsch and Nano Chatzidakis, 5–10. Athen: Benaki Museum, 2000.
Vokotopoulos, Panagiōtēs L. “Synthetes eikones: Mia prōtē katagraphē.” In *Sēma Menelaou Parlama*, edited by Lena Tzekadē, 299–319. Ērakleio: E.K.I.M, 2002.
Warnke, Martin. “Italienische Bildtabernakel bis zum Frühbarock.” *Münchner Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst* 19 (1968): 61–102.
Westermann, Mariët. “Introduction: The Objects of Art History and Anthropology.” In *Anthropologies of Art*, edited by Mariët Westermann, vii–xxxi. Williamston, MA: Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 2005.
Wirth, Karl-August. “Einsatzbild.” In *Reallexikon zur deutschen Kunstgeschichte*, Bd. 4, herausgegeben von Ernst Gall und Ludwig Heydenreich, 1006–1020. Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag, 1958.
Wojnowski, Konrad. “Performatywność.” In Bal and Kosiński, *Performatyka: Terytoria*, 171–179.
Zaprzalska, Dorota. “Ikona tzw. kompozytowa w klasztorze Wlatadon w Salonikach—zagadnienie formuły ikonograficzno-kompozycyjnej i funkcji ideowo-dewocyjnej.” *Modus. Prace z historii sztuki* 19 (2019): 5–21. https://doi.org/10.11588/diglit.51255.4.

DOROTA ZAPRZALSKA

PhD student at the Jagiellonian University Doctoral School in the Humanities within the Studies on Art programme. Her research interests revolve around Byzantine art, especially icon painting.