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And so that you might see yourself there
and gently look at it,
this pious mirror for your own good
we bring before your eyes,
in visible form, with characters.
—Arnauld Gréban, *Le mystère de la Passion* (mid-1400s)¹

In Christianity’s preeminent narrative image, the Crucifixion, Jesus of Nazareth hangs dead on the Cross, there for all to see. Ridiculed as the King of the Jews, victim of the most abhorrent of punishments, focal point of mystery and wonder, he embodies in death a harrowing paradox. For at the climax of the Passion drama, the epochal moment toward which the Gospels point again and again, Jesus’s messianic identity was still hanging in the balance. Miracles had testified to his nature as a “divine man [θεὸς ανήρ, theios anēr],” and his own christological utterances had led many to ponder the peculiar nature of his identity.² Some of those present on Golgotha watched and waited for divine power to become manifest in events, and passersby scoffed out loud at the claims made about him, challenging him to come down from the Cross. While family and friends mourned, soldiers gambled for his clothes; others simply mocked him (Mark 15:24–32).

Measured by the diverse responses among the crowd on Golgotha, both those recorded in the Gospels and those imagined for centuries, the spectacle of Christ crucified counts as a radically bewildering event—“unto the Jews a stumbling block, and unto the Greeks foolishness,” as Paul wrote in 1 Corinthians (1:23). Unlike its predecessor in pagan tragedy, it is a spectacle of suffering and death that brings to the fore the experience of incoherence. This incoherence, spinning out from the half-disclosed reality of Jesus’s divine nature, exists both for the characters inside the Gospel text, those present on Golgotha as witnesses, and for participants outside, the Passion story’s readers and listeners, for whom the role of “witness” must always be constituted through an act of recollection or remembering. Each and every participant in the story must find his or her own path toward coherence; each one must, in a very fundamental way, put it all together, make sense of what has happened—the core imaginative demand that all narratives place on their readers. For believers past and present, entering personally into the Crucifixion image, there to recollect not only its terrors and sufferings but also the claims and counterclaims made about Jesus’s identity, has therefore meant standing at an existential crossroads, a place where opposing trajectories, both objective and subjective, meet and collide.³ Confronted by the image of Jesus crucified, Christian conscience faces a demand that precedes the fundamental impulse toward imitation (*imitatio Christi*) and the desire for conversion and union: the comprehension of a paradox uniting identity and presence that, in itself, constitutes an ever-renewing challenge to faith—an “enduring predicament” brought about by grace itself.⁴

From the mid-thirteenth century on, European artists projected this demand onto their depictions of protagonists and antagonists, models and antimodels, within the narrative Passion image for the discernment of those outside it. Figures who had once been mere agents, embodiments of a narrative function, would henceforth be fleshed out as characters, embodied moral types possessed of human idiosyncrasies and passions, capable of a full range of situated responses—from belief to incredulity, from faith to doubt, from compulsion to cruelty—indicative of human will. Especially striking in this regard, as we will see, is the interest altar painters begin to show in the figure of the witness, developing in the process three general, though not always distinguishable, character types: 1) those who see the reality of divinity through the twin veils of Incarnation and human death, recognizing Jesus as the Christ of prophecy and the Son of Man; 2) those who, trapped in a mere “carnal seeing,” remain blind to that divinity, failing to recognize Jesus as Christ; and 3) those who appear suspended, as it were, between acceptance and rejection of Jesus’s messianic identity, hovering at the threshold between blindness and seeing, between refusing and welcoming truth’s disclosure.

By the middle of the fifteenth century, masters at the forefront of religious realism in northern Europe, for example, Dieric Bouts of Haarlem, in his *Descent from the Cross* triptych in Granada, had made it de rigueur to endow certain witness characters, even in complex multifigured compositions, with minutely described signs of awareness and interiority (Fig. 1).⁵ Such faces, captured in what appears to be the dawning of comprehension, could become galvanizing points of interest and subjective identification for beholders, even, or especially, if they have stepped into the scene of witnessing as unbelievers. Watching this form of watching, we are imbricated in narrative; we place ourselves, as Karl Morrisson has put it, “into the position of looking over the shoulders of the people to whom the events happened as they put together what had happened to them.”⁶ What may rightly be counted as a normative condition of all visual narrative—the beholder’s “putting together” of what has or had happened—is here intensified by the beholder’s need to take the measure of his or her own response before the terrifying spectacle of suffering that sin has brought about, and his or her own worthiness to receive the gifts of that sacrifice, to find coherence in the experience of inner transformation and conversion to God. In this sense each and every Crucifixion image poses a challenge to the Christian beholder, one that is ever-renewing and also ever-haunted by failure. Conversion
can never be a fait accompli, discipleship never perfected, not when their highest criterion is inner transformation.\(^7\) Any phenomenology of spiritual seeing we might wish to reconstitute with the help of the Crucifixion must, I suggest, take account of both the probationary nature of conversion and the aspirational nature of its most powerful narrative sign: recognition (a term whose specific meaning will be unpacked shortly).

Rather than focusing on positive examples of conversion, such as Bouts’s sensitively drawn witness to the Crucifixion, a phenomenology of recognition will be developed here with the help of an antimodel: a witness figure who embodies “spiritual blindness” and thematizes the failure to overcome it, in a characterization both outwardly derogatory and inherently reflexive. The figure in question was conjured up by Hans Burgkmair the Elder (1473–1531) in a Crucifixion scene painted for the Dominican nuns of St. Katherine’s in Augsburg (Fig. 2), the city where the artist was born, where his father, Thoman (1444–1523), trained him, and where he ran his own workshop as a member of the guild of painters, glaziers, and carvers from 1498 on.\(^8\) Striding in from stage left onto the Golgotha Burgkmair composed for the convent’s chapter house (part of a series of six so-called Basilikabilder, to be discussed below), the strange figure—turbaned, partly armored, dressed in robes of Levantine patterning, and shown in profile—diverts the attention of the Good Centurion and another military officer. A cross fire of contemptuous glares isolates him against the painting’s right edge, and a dispute of some sort seems to be under way (Fig. 3). But it is not simply the adversarial role he is poised to play that attracts the ire of those who encounter him; his very appearance is antagonistic. From the dark countenance and grey hair that mats his face to the beady, bloodshot eyes, cracked teeth, bulbous lips, and, above all, long, hooked nose, this strange foreigner could hardly be mistaken for anyone, or anything, other than what Burgkmair paints him to be: a monstrously ugly Jew. What is more unsettling, the artist has depicted the creature confronted by his own mirror reflection, glaring out at him from the centurion’s polished epauliere. The dark-faced Jewish soldier, however, does not see it; rather, it “sees” him—it recognizes him—and registers what it sees with an unmistakable look of horror (Fig. 4).

Completed by Burgkmair in 1504, the large, arched composition with the Crucifixion at its center was the fourth in a series of so-called Basilikabilder, painted “portraits” of the seven basilican churches of Rome (the Sette Chiese), commissioned by the Dominican nuns of Augsburg’s Katharinenkloster (Fig. 24).\(^9\) It was Hans Holbein the Elder who, in 1499, executed the inaugural panel, devoted to S. Maria Maggiore; the second, third, and fourth panels, San Pietro, San Giovanni Laterano, and Santa Croce respectively, were done by Burgkmair and his shop; an unknown Master L.F. brought together imagery relating to S. Lorenzo and S. Sebastiano into a single panel in 1502; and finally, in 1504, a sixth commission representing S. Paolo fuori le mura was executed by Holbein in a command performance. Arrayed around the chapter house of the Katharinenkloster and shaped to fit its vaulted bays, the series has long been associated with a papal indulgence granted to the nuns by Pope Innocent VIII (1484–92), permitting them to earn a remission of sins equivalent to those granted pilgrims visiting the Sette Chiese. Numerous scholars have inferred from this that the Basilikabilder functioned within a regimen of “virtual pilgrimage” for the recluses, but it must be admitted that the evidence takes us only so far in this direction. For reasons that will later become clear, I subscribe to a soft version of this thesis, one that sees the Basilikabilder as multifunctional images, geared to the penitential, commemorative, and political dimensions of the nuns’ aspirations for self-regeneration and consolidation.

How should we approach this bizarre catoptric motif and its embeddedness in a major cycle of paintings made for a prestigious monastic institution—a multiyear project that ultimately brought together three leading Augsburg painters and five successive abbess-patrons, each from a wealthy patrician family with its own stakes in the cloister’s tradition of prominence? At first sight, Burgkmair’s dark-faced character is merely an inventive bit of Passion staffage with a noxious ethnographic (or patently anti-Semitic) twist, thus not far from the routine of countless late medieval and Renaissance painters. He appears onstage as something of a nobody: both soldier and passerby, the figure is not grouped among
Golgotha’s henchmen and seems to have arrived on the scene too late to have had a hand in the bloodshed. But the reflected face in the polished armor—demonstrably gesturing to Eyckian catoptrics, as we will see—tells a different story, and signals the ethical as well as pictorial ingenuity behind the motif. Burgkmair’s specularized Jewish soldier emblematizes a strong penitential theme running through the _Basilikabilder_ cycle, one that connected the humanist aspirations of the painter to the spiritual regimen favored by the nuns: the theme of Christ’s “perpetual Passion.” At the risk of overtaxing a single motif with big claims, I find that Burgkmair’s embedded mirror motif in the Augsburg Crucifixion amounted to a kind of reflexive lens for compelling Christian penitential conscience toward another form of recognition, one that likewise entailed the overcoming of blindness: recognition of the Self. What the doubled image of the blind Jew and his seeing reflection figures forth, in other words, is a “Judaizing” perversity within the Christian Self—that part of the subject that perennially slides back into blindness and sin, fails the test of recognition, denies Christ, and afflicts his suffering body again and again. Burgkmair’s half-hidden motif is directed against a narrative “nobody,” and, given its marginal visibility, it practically addresses nobody, too. Yet it is precisely for these reasons that, in the end, it accuses everybody. It does so in its negative capacity as double failure of recognition.

---

2 Hans Burgkmair the Elder, _Crucifixion_, apex section of _Basilikabild_ depicting S. Croce in Gerusalemme, 1504, oil on pine panel, 63 × 43½ in. (160 × 110 cm). Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Staatsgalerie in der Katharinenkirche, Augsburg, 5338 (artwork in the public domain; photograph provided by BPK, Berlin / Art Resource, NY)
“Recognition” (ἀναγνώρισις, anagnōrisis), as poets since Homer, dramatists since the Greek tragedians, and theorists since Aristotle have known, functions poetically within storytelling to explode the boundedness of evidence, overcome the resistance to truth, and signal the inner conversion of the individual. An unusual word formed by a double privative, literally meaning “not not knowing,” anagnōrisis is typically translated as “recognition,” but sometimes as “discovery,” or even “disclosure.” In the closest thing he gives to a formal definition in the Poetics (chapter 11), Aristotle calls it, simply, “a change from ignorance to knowledge.”

Within his scheme for the tragic arts, recognition was one of two key ingredients he claimed poets and playwrights must deploy in crafting the best kind of plot, or mythos (the other key ingredient being peripeteia, usually rendered as “reversal”). In Sophocles’s Electra, for example, the twinned moments in which identity unfolds between sister and brother, wrenching trials of proof that bring a release of passionate joy when knowledge becomes certain, qualify as the anagnōrisis, while the attendant realization that Orestes will, after all, take his revenge against Clytemnestra is the peripeteia. These narrative devices, as Aristotle explains earlier in the book (chapter 6), represent the surest means by which the poet discharges his essential duty of arousing the emotions of his audience. Complex plot may be achieved solely
through the use of *anagnōrisis* or solely through *peripeteia*, but the plots Aristotle prefers employ them both and derive both from the action itself.

As a dynamic pivot of narrative, recognition pervades the Western canon (as well as monuments of Islamic literary culture) and operates across the full spectrum of genres, from scripture, tragedy, and comedy to epic, romance, and the novel. Recent literary studies have highlighted the ways recognition doubles as a device for structuring action within narrative and as a trope for the reader’s comprehension outside it. Critics who have pursued the theme speak of a broad-based “poetics of revelation” that enfoldsaesthetic concepts old and new—concepts such as “epiphany,” “insight,” “luminous perception,” even the “experience of coherence.”12 Art history, for its part, is well equipped with models for analyzing visual narrative and its own methods for characterizing the *forms of attention* that artists thematize within their pictures,13 and we have grown ever more sophisticated in how we infer and describe that attentiveness. Despite all of this, art historians have been slow to grasp recognition’s signal importance as a trope of *visual* disclosure and reflexive comprehension for the beholder.14 And it’s no wonder. Recognition is freighted with far-reaching epistemological problems and comes packed with the meanings its historically shifting uses have engendered. The word feels both generic and overdetermined. But the potential is there to make productive use of the concept alongside literary history’s “poetics of disclosure.” To venture as much, while avoiding the pitfalls of a rote methodological transfer from another discipline into our own, is one of my goals. Setting aside the question of Aristotle’s currency among late medieval dramatists (let alone painters), it seems clear that the narrative function of recognition and recognition tropes found an important place in the poetic, visual, and dramatic arts long before the Elizabethan playwrights began consciously redeploying it.

Our interest here, of course, lies in recognition’s function within a Christian narrative poetics, verbal and visual, where it is often keyed as a conversion trope.15 To see this requires first of all an understanding of the dramatic and structural roles reserved for recognition in Christianity’s own charter narratives. As Diana Culbertson has shown, the Gospels employ recognition frequently. Across the gamut of scenes from Infancy and Ministry to Passion and Resurrection, from the Adoration of the Kings, say, to the Supper at Emmaus, the disclosure of identity, together with the character transformations urged by new knowledge function as something like the very “model of the subjective apprehension of revelation.”16 Recognition is strategically combined with plot reversals, *peripeteia*, in several crucial instances, notably, the Crucifixion, while it appears independent of any significant plot shifts in others, for example, the Transfiguration or the Noli me tangere. In all of these scenes, and for all the characters involved, the transforming knowledge at issue unfolds around the challenge of christological presence: Jesus’s half-disclosed divine nature, his messianic identity as the Son of Man foretold in Daniel, the Christ of prophecy.

Exemplary as a moment of recognition is the conversion of the Good Centurion, the Roman legionnaire who watched Jesus expire at close range and, on hearing the final cry from the Cross, pointed upward to declare, “Truly, this was the Son of God” (Matt. 27:54; Mark 15:39; compare Luke 23:47). Once the scales of experience tip in favor of revelation and faith, the Good Centurion becomes a powerful foil for those figures of lesser conviction surrounding him within the narrative, characters to whom he is sometimes shown giving eloquent instruction. To those outside the narrative, meanwhile, he often appears as a theatrical interlocutor, as he does with breathtaking verve in Pordenone’s great scene of 1521 in Cremona Cathedral; the Good Centurion may even serve as a kind of “delegate,” to use Andrea Catellani’s term, a figure who offers the beholder a running course in spiritual self-observation from within the picture.18 His clear-eyed confession holds up a mirror, an exhortation to the inner conversion everyone must undergo on witnessing God (as we will see, this role elevates the reflective armor the character often sports into something far more significant than military wardrobe).19

Still, there is more to the character’s exemplarity than this. As the Gospel story unfolds, the Centurion makes his confession on Calvary and then later testifies to Jesus’s death before Pilate (Mark 15:45), making the reader aware that his proclamation of christological identity is, and has to be, twofold: “Jesus was the Son of God” *and* “Jesus is dead.”20 Two otherwise incompatible affirmations are radically enfolded into a single transformative knowledge: Christ’s death happened for the sake of human salvation, for my sake (*pro me*) and everyone else’s (*pro nobis*). And it is this enfolding that is paradigmatic for Christian subjection. Typological exegesis is woven into the “complex plot” of the Gospels at nearly every turn, producing a comprehensive set of demands for any reader who aspires to proceed from knowledge to experience, from disclosure to discipleship, from flesh to spirit. Prophecy has been fulfilled, and so must the comprehension of the beholder, who, like the reader addressed by Mark, watches not just a new story unfold but, along with it, “the negation of one’s past self,” the self embedded in the old story and the old text.21 The Centurion’s confession, according to Werner Kelber, “turns the bystanders” [carnal]
concept of seeing right side up. He ‘sees’ (kai idon) the Son of God revealed in the void of godforsakenness and death, and thus becomes the [Markan narrative’s] first and only true believer.” Abrogated in this nearly instantaneous passage from sense perception to the “putting together” of understanding, from seeing to knowledge, is the very crisis of experience Christ’s closest disciples endure until the story’s closing episodes. Thomas’s nonrecognition of Jesus’s divine nature, for example, is not overcome until sensuous proof, in the form of touch, is vouchsafed him in John 20:29, and even then it is proclaimed to be an inferior path to knowledge.

As transformative experience, the reckoning of salvific identity in the person of Jesus recurs throughout the Gospel texts and anchors several kinds of epistemological problems with which the Evangelists were concerned. Commenting on the reflexive function of christological recognition in Mark, Culbertson writes:

The disciples in Mark’s chapter 10 are told what will happen and so are the readers, the primary hearers of this announcement, but information is not enough because the weight of the message goes beyond cognitive enlightenment. To comprehend the message in its fullness requires an experience that the characters at this point in the narrative do not have and, for that matter, the readers may not have either. Mark’s Gospel is about the difficulty of understanding, not the difficulty of getting the right information. The message is frequently subjectively incomprehensible at the time it is uttered. The fullness of truth is present to characters in Mark’s narrative only as promise. It is not difficult to wonder why the content of such a message was not grasped: experience had not caught up to the message.

Readers and listeners outside the narrative, and participants inside, burdened by the same liabilities, must make the same difficult passage from knowledge to experience. Yet transformative experience often lags behind revelation; the past-anchored self resists the challenge of the new. Aware of this, ancient dramatists, the Evangelists included, sought ways to stagger the pace of these two passages—from disclosure to knowledge, from knowledge to experience—within the same diaphragm. At the Passion story’s climax, however, at the moment when the hero’s very death becomes disclosure, the two are forced into sudden alignment. A gauntlet is thrown down; subjectivity finds itself at a crossroads. Brought to acknowledgment of events for which we are not prepared, we face a dizzying incoherence and are compelled to test ourselves against those models and antimodels around us: not only models of conversion in the Confessions—remains an ever-present possibility, not least of all for the reader before the text or the beholder before the image. Disclosure requires eyes to see, but inner transformation requires a heart that recognizes, “sees” spiritually, and knows. “The hidden metaphor of that text is not a closed room nor even an enigma, but a half-blind reader.”

This dynamic reflexivity in the experience of disclosure, self-knowledge, and inner transformation is what assures recognition’s figurative reach beyond the objective happenings of literary plot. A whole phenomenology of Christian devotional art, one suspects, might be organized around this notion. More modestly, it can be used to test a visual motif that is itself already a challenging metapicture, a reflection motif that crystallizes the pressures and challenges of anaagnoiβis. Burgkmair’s conceit rises to this level not simply by virtue of its metamorphic and reflexive potentials (attributable to nearly all mirroring motifs) but by dint of its functional context: through the situated intentions of its maker, and with the tacit sympathies of its patron and its principal audience. To see how our motif thematizes the challenge of recognition, its opportunities and pitfalls, its powers and dangers, we must first get to know a group of Passion players who have, by and large, flown under the radar of iconographers, despite their noisy and ostentatious presence on Golgotha. I’m referring to the colorful and critical mass of characters arrayed at the base of the Cross, some of them directly in the company of the Good Centurion.

**Centurion and Soldier in South German Passion Tradition**

For late medieval altar painters in northern Europe, the cast of characters around the Good Centurion was a Farrago of bit players, loosely derived from the four Gospel accounts of the Crucifixion, elements of local visual tradition, including Passion plays, and the manuscript tradition that set “sacred realism” on its brilliant course. As efforts to further augment the mass of Fußvolk on Calvary intensified—Elisabeth Roth dates the emergence of the true “volkreiche Kalvarienberg” to the 1420s—German and Austrian painters in particular, seeing great opportunity in this “assembly of the wicked,” transformed the biblical metaphor into a motley crew composed of Jewish priests, scribes, and officials mingling with passersby, outcasts, vagabonds, and a soldiery of decidedly multiethnic hue. Altar painters outfitted some of those military men as feudal knights, some as flamboyant mercenaries or grunting knaves, still others as turbaned foreigners of swarthy skin, kinky hair, and bad teeth, with exotic or exaggerated features both comical and monstrous (Fig. 5).

Sometimes subtly, sometimes crassly, fifteenth-century altar painters conjured up soldier figures with markedly “Jewish” physical traits or other identifying signs. Perhaps they imagined them as Caiphas’s henchmen, or members of Herod’s palace guard, to distinguish them from Pilate’s Roman forces. Pushed off to the margins or engulfed in a crush of bodies and horses below the crosses, some hurl curses, snicker, or snarl like dogs; others watch the execution with silent expressions of contempt. Contrary to what their marginal position might suggest, however, these ruffians and cutthroats are hardly incidental to the dialectic of witnessing around the Cross. In fact, these ruffians and cutthroats could, in the hands of some painters, find their way to the center of the action as individualized characters. No scriptural, apocryphal, or dramatic source of which I am aware gives them tradition-honored names of the kind...
Arms extended toward the Centurion in profile. Without the benefit of view, allowing the head to turn more or less convincingly but the painter has rotated the upper body to a three-quarter length figure against the right edge of the panel (Randfigur/C211 domain; photograph technique on spruce panel, 58⅝ in. (149 × 110 cm). Erst Kriegsman’s “first soldier and the Good Centurion’s troop, the casting in the extant Passion dramatists put in the mouths of the executioners Gestas, respectively); for all the colorful vulgarity German rion (Longinus), or the Good and Bad Thieves (Dysmas and bestowment on the sponge-bearer (Stephaton), the blind centurion’s polished breastplate reflection in half-length, emerging from the dark translucent depths of the Good Centurion’s polished breastplate (Figs. 6, 7). Its fleshly counterpart, a flamboyantly dressed soldier, who from his position near the panel’s right edge looks up toward the Bad Thief with a grimace, is added as staffage.

A second version of Calvary by the same painter, roughly equal in size to the Kaisheim Crucifixion, is set against a gold-ground sky (Fig. 8). To offset the gold’s flattening effect the painter has pulled back the point of view for a more organic integration of spatial zones, while also tempering the herky-jerky expressivity of the Thieves’ bodies. For the Kaisheim panel’s sullen Randfigur, the painter has traded a magistrate type, fashionably dressed and fully the Centurion’s equal in dignity and good looks. One hand signals polite inquiry, while the other rests on an antique shield adorned with a repoussé head that seems to glare across the foreground space toward the swooning Virgin. Turning toward the man, the Centurion leans casually on his halberd (Fig. 9).

We have little information about the origins or training of the Swabian painter known as the Master of 1477, named after the numerals he illusionistically “carved” into the bone-strewn turf of Golgotha in the second painting just described. But the awareness of Westphalian, lower Rhenish, and north Netherlandish modes and models he demonstrates across his small oeuvre—which includes several drawings and book illustrations—has been apparent to scholars since 1928, when Ernst Buchner proposed a coherent group of works around the dated Augsburg panel. Whether or not the master discovered his Netherlandish models on his own or found them mediated in the works of south German painters who had already assimilated the Rogierian and Boutsian raw material is not important for our present purposes. At issue is what the combined Netherlandish, Rhenish, and Westphalian traditions had to teach an Augsburg painter of the generation preceding Burgkmair’s about the Centurion-soldier motif, its narrative meanings, and what could be accomplished by situating metallic reflections within the zone of dramatic repartee.

Two fourteenth-century Passion altarpieces, studied in tandem, take us deeper inside the iconographic tradition and the Centurion-soldier pair’s meaning before 1400. The first resides in the so-called Felsenkirche (“Crag Church”) rising above the town of Idar-Oberstein (Rhineland Palatinate); this Crucifixion, by an unknown Westphalian artist, possibly from Mainz, surveys a riotous crowd of onlookers, a scene enlivened further by the profusion of gilded haloes and ostentatious headgear (Fig. 10). Despite the fact that the Centurion’s pointing gesture is half hidden behind another figure’s head, his confession is made visible by the banderole unfurling on the opposite side of his ermine-lined hat. This positioning gives his speech act a twofold aspect: in one respect, a confession universally addressed, in another, a
kind of argument aimed at the mounted figure facing him, whom we see in profile (Fig. 11). Bearded and swarthy, armored and richly turbaned, this figure must be counted among the close ancestors of Burgkmair’s caricature in Augsburg. Dialogue between the men is strongly implied; in all likelihood it was conceived as the kind of exchange Passion playwrights used to expose the gap between the converted and the hard of heart, which they often elaborated to comic effect.Whatever recalcitrance may have been imputed to his character, however, remains unspoken: no speech scroll is afforded the soldier, only an uncomprehending stare.

What is merely implied by the Centurion-soldier confrontation at Idar-Oberstein is played out explicitly in the dueling banderoles of a slightly earlier work, also of Westphalian origin, from the Church of St. Mary in Dortmund, a commemorative Passion altarpiece made for the Berswordt family (Fig. 12). Here, the Centurion’s visible speech arcs gracefully from a pointing finger. Situated behind him is a fellow military man, a helmeted knight dressed in fine chain mail, who replies by casting an insouciant sidelong glance at him while unfurling his own scroll with abbreviated Latin lines from Matthew 27:40, SI FILI DESCE [N]DAT . . . DE[CRUCE] (“if thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross”), referring to the castigations and vain seeking for miracles of the unbelievers. This and the succeeding taunt in verse 42 reprised the psalmist’s lament, “All they that saw me have laughed me to scorn: they have spoken with the lips, and wagged the head [saying], ‘He hoped in the Lord, let him deliver him:
let him save him...” (Ps. 21/22:9). Although there is nothing explicitly Jewish about the figure offering the taunt in the Berswordt Altar (Fig. 13), his placement close by a figure bearing a dark, dirty, and diabolical countenance similar to that of Burgkmair’s soldier in Augsburg fixes his bloodguilt by association, as it were. In fact, the Centurion is nearly engulfed by Jewish denunciations of the christological moment: below his upraised right arm, in a rare iconographic motif derived from John 19:21–22, two Jews dispute with a seated Pilate who holds a quill and an inkpot to signify his authorship of the titulus, still held in his lap. “Write not king [of the Jews] [Noli scribere Rex (Iudaeorum)],” complain the chief priests. Unfurling opposite theirs, Pilate’s speech scroll supplies the retort, “What I have written, I have written [Quod scripsi scripsi].”39

Indulging a fascination with the physiognomic signs of spiritual and moral perversity, late medieval altar painters seem to have relished the opportunity for creative mischief in representing the biblical crowd [ochlos] that called for Jesus’s crucifixion.40 Every artist knew how to supplement his own inventiveness with borrowings, grafting, adaptations, and downright thefts. A drawing now in London, once attributed on stylistic grounds to Holbein the Elder’s younger brother Sigmund,41 assembles four character studies from various Netherlandish and Westphalian sources: a scowling Jew (upper left) taken from the Boutsian Arrest of Christ in the Alte Pinakothek, Munich;42 a half-bald man (lower left), adapted from the Master of Schöppingen’s Halderner Altar in the Landesmuseum, Münster;43 a beardless man, perhaps a beadle (lower right), similar to heads found in two drawings associated with Albert Bouts;44 and a turbaned “chief priest” (upper right) whose source has not yet been identified but who reappears with different headdress in one of two surviving apostle-martyrdom panels from a dismembered altarpiece attributed to Sigmund Holbein, now in Rödelheim, near Frankfurt (Fig. 14).45 Each of these heads, in all likelihood, came from other drawn intermediaries, not the “source” paintings themselves. Of key interest in the present context is the head craning up from the lower left: adorned with unruly eyebrows, forelock, and muttonchops, he bares his teeth and snaps out a curse, inscribed on the sheet: “Vach qui destruis demplum!” (Ah, you who destroyed the temple). Adapted from the words of “they that passed by” in Mark 15:29–30, “Vah, thou that destroyest the temple of
God, and in three days buildest it up again; Save thyself, coming down from the cross [Vah qui destruis templum Dei, et in tribus diebus reaedificas: salvum fac temetipsum descendens de cruce],” and from Matthew 27:40, the curse derides Jesus’s claim that in dying and returning to everlasting life, he would destroy the temple and rebuild it in three days (recall that the psalmist foresaw these as blasphemies exclaimed by the wicked while “wagging their heads”). That the man suffering on the Cross cannot even save himself becomes “proof,” in the blind eyes of the evildoers, that Jesus is no messiah. In Matthew this is the first of two taunts from the crowd for Jesus to come down from the Cross; the second of these, as we saw earlier, uttered “in like manner also” by “the chief priests, with the scribes and ancients” (27:42), formed the basis of the soldier-interlocutor’s dramatic utterance in the Berswordt Altar (Fig. 13).

At Idar-Oberstein the same blasphemous utterance, visible in a furling banderole, is “spoken” by a passerby on stage right, next to the spear bearer wearing a peaked “Jewish” cap (Fig. 10). With white hairs sprouting from under a black hood and tongue a-wag, this comic miscreant is a close counterpart to the cursing scoundrel of the London model sheet. He is also half bald, and shaved or bald heads, as Ruth Mellinkoff has shown, are typically signs of evil.46 Suspended between the monstrous and the burlesque, products of both grotesque imagination and pictorial rummaging and reuse, the tormentors and blasphemers late medieval artists littered through the Calvary crowd were broadly evocative of that primitive state of “godlessness” deplored in the opening verses of Psalm 52/53:1–2: “The fool said in his heart: There is no God. They are corrupted, and [have] become abominable in [their] iniquities.”

The Jew in the Mirror

Grotesque faces in “the crowd” were often interchangeably generic; just as often they were interchangeably Jewish, and caricatured as such. Devotional art, literature, and drama all shared this preoccupation. Late medieval Passion tracts such as John of Caulibus’s Meditations on the Life of Christ (ca. 1300), to take but one example, made it abundantly clear that the mocking demands for “proof” of Jesus’s divinity came from the mouths of impious Jews,47 and late medieval panel painters were equally determined to populate their pictures with specifically Jewish jeers and sneers. Rising above the farrago of gamblers, soldiers, and vagrants assembled around the cross of the Bad Thief in the Kempten Master’s boisterous Calvary of about 1460–70, now in Nuremberg, a pair of Jewish officials sniff and snort behind the back of the Centurion, whose bright-eyed glint of recognition is matched only by the gleam of his armor and the jeweled brooch of his headdress (Fig. 15).48 One of the deriders, cast in the visual clichés of a “chief priest,” enumerates proofs against Christ’s kingship with his right hand, while a banderole held in his left—the verbal supplement to his pointing gesture—speaks the character’s impossible challenge from Matthew 27:42: “Alios salvos fecit seipsu[m] no[n] potest salvu[m] facere: Si rex Isr[ae]l est descendat [nunc de cruce, et credimus ei]” (He saved others; himself he cannot save. If he be the king of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him). Meanwhile, a wart-faced toady, a minor official flying a flag emblazoned with an “armorial” of Jewish authority, a peaked red cap,49 listens with malevolent delight (Fig. 16).
Such derogatory characterizations could be endlessly multiplied, as the pioneering work of scholars such as Eric Zafran, Moshe Lazar, Ruth Mellinkoff, Heinz Schreckenberg, Deborah Strickland, and others has amply shown. Seen in the light of this depressingly vast visual archive, Burgkmair’s portrayal of the dark-faced soldier in the Augsburg Crucifixion, with its weird fusion of stereotypy and ethnography, might appear as a radical final stage in the late medieval escalation of dehumanizing caricature. All that he seems to lack are the ersatz Hebrew letters that branded his many relatives across the length and breadth of the pictorial Passion narrative tradition. Arguably, Burgkmair had the stereotyped features associated with “the Turk” in mind, or also in mind, for Orientalizing traits and motifs played quite loosely across late medieval stereotypes of Muslim and Jew, particularly in the eclecticism of costume.

He also shares in that mythologically evocative “monstrous” feature that so fascinated Italian humanists, physicians, and artists later in the sixteenth century: hirsutism. These “also” illustrate the point: Burgkmair’s ugly soldier enfolds a semiotic surplus. Given this surplus, I would argue that we need not engage in motif hunting so as to arrive at a better iconographic or folkloric pedigree for the figure; the larger problematic it crystallizes does not, in other words, require that we pin down the particular physiognomic codes of Otherness the artist is deploying.

Veritable galleries of malevolently ugly and subhuman “Jewish” faces fill out the mult figured Passion scenes by Burgkmair’s senior colleague on the Augsburg painting scene, Hans Holbein the Elder (ca. 1460–1524), in particular, the three great altarpiece projects Holbein and his shop completed between 1494 and 1502 (at least one of these projects, the altarpiece made for the Kaisheim monastery and now in Munich, Burgkmair would have had ample opportunity to study). Following this lead,
Burgkmair has constructed his grotesque Jew from a collection of negative signifiers, producing a hypertrophied mask of Otherness that borders on the comic. The perennial question of the artist’s social experience with living Jews is close to moot in Burgkmair’s case, since not only his own but his father’s generation as well came of age in a Christian community whose last enfranchised Jewish residents had been expelled by its town council—in apparent defiance of the German king—in 1439. This is not to say that Jews could not have figured strongly in the collective memory of the imperial city; one suspects that the absence of real Jewish neighbors, and the lack of those close commercial ties that were the norm in south German cities after the dislocations of the plague years, catapulted “the Jew” into the Christian cultural imaginary all the more intensely as a reification, a figure of reprobacy compelling outer fascinations and introspective anxieties. Although neither of these issues can be properly pursued here, there can be little doubt that the protoethnographic perspective Burgkmair adopted for other projects is also a factor: the ambitious, multisheet woodcut project of 1508, *Peoples of Africa and India* (1508), for example, seems anticipated in the purposeful description of “ethnic” traits the artist lavished on the dark face of the Augsburg Crucifixion’s blaspheming soldier.

14 Workshop of Hans Holbein the Elder, *Model Sheet with Four Heads*, pen and ink and washes and white highlights on red-toned paper, 10⅞ × 7 in. (27.4 × 17.8 cm). University College of London Art Museum (artwork in the public domain; photograph © UCL Art Museum, University College London, U.K., provided by The Bridgeman Art Library)

15 Kempten Master, *Calvary*, ca. 1460–70, oil on spruce panel, 65⅞ × 55¼ in. (165.5 × 140.5 cm). Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg (artwork in the public domain)

16 Kempten Master, detail of Fig. 15, showing the Good Centurion, Jewish scoffer, and toady on horseback (artwork in the public domain)
We have seen how, even when deprived of speaking parts, the anonymous soldier figures that stand opposite the Good Centurion in many late medieval images were understood to be agents of blasphemy, pitting their will against God to denounce Jesus’ messianic identity. In the Augsburg Crucifixion, that denunciation is expressed in gesture (Fig. 3). Degrading what the Centurion exalts, the ugly Jewish soldier points downward with a mailed hand, joining those who demand that Jesus demonstrate his divinity by coming down from the Cross (Matt. 27:40, 42). What the character enacts is a resistance to transformative knowledge, a rebellion against God, a stubborn refusal to “see” anything beyond the carnal immolation of the Cross, thus, an unwillingness to join the Centurion in conversion.

Hardly content to make his figure the mere embodiment of a narrative function, however, Burgkmair fleshes out the soldier’s moral character, and this troubles any straightforward attribution to him of a demonic or subhuman enmity. A closer look tells us that the stereotyped Jewish ugliness of the figure is no mere mask of hatred (Fig. 4). As he addresses the Centurion a perverse smile spreads over his face. Fawning in the presence of his superiors, he seems intent on playing the fool. For their part, the Centurion and his fellow officer look on the display of obsequiousness with angry condescension, on the one hand, and something like bemused pity, on the other. And there is more, as we have already noted: another judging gaze, this one hurled back on the Jew by his own image. This specular doppelgänger appears to be visible to no one within the scene, least of all its flesh-and-blood counterpart, who looks right past while smirking at the Centurion. And far from miming the Jew’s oafish grin, as we have already observed, this mirrored other, glinting out from the shiny surface, mouth agape, seems to recoil in horror at the spectacle before it.

What does the spectral Jew in this metamorphic reflection see that the real Jew cannot, or will not? What does it mean that the reversed visage offered up by the mirror, the “other” of the Self, recognizes the truth about the Self while itself being overlooked, unrecognized, by its other? Assuming that Burgkmair adopted the reflection motif from the Master of 1477’s Calvary (Figs. 6, 7) and that he grasped its reflexive potential as an image within an image, what compelled him to develop the borrowed motif in this particular way? It is tempting to interpret the gesture as little more than a painterly exercise in imagination or classical citation, a critique of the “godless fool,” or anti-Semitic caricature, and by ruling out these possibilities we are led to the following question: What would it have meant to the Christian viewer to see his archetypal Other, the Jew, ridiculed in his blindness by his specular Other, and this precisely at the moment of the Savior’s death—at the scene of christological recognition, conversion, and their “Jewish” opposites?

The answer to be developed here begins from an acknowledgment of the ethical importance late medieval Christian culture placed on the subject’s penitential self-recognition as a sinner, as a being burdened with death and the reprobate carnality Adam’s disobedience brought upon the human race. Drawing on a key figuration within patristic and medieval thought of Judaism’s inherent dangers, I argue that Burgkmair’s moral target turns out to be that “Judaizing” part of the Christian Self, the carnal enemy within who, through its ceaseless sinning, betrays Christ to his enemies, abandons him on the Cross, and meets his loving mercy with ingratitude. Failed recognition of God and failed recognition of Self reflect one another and arouse the same anxiety. By tracing the ever-present challenge of self-recognition back into the Gospel story’s foundational challenge of christological recognition, in other words, the artist situates the beholder at the intersection of these two inescapable tests of Christian identity.

Art historians have long understood mirror reflections to be a special kind of image-within-an-image. Never neutral or passive relays of reality, catoptric motifs are always, in one sense or another, meta-images: that is, they are either transformative (metamorphic), coded (metaphoric), reflexive (metapictorial), or some combination of these. Our perspective here must be limited to the century preceding Burgkmair’s work at the Katharinenkloster. For the Netherlandish masters who exploited the transfluence of oil painting to produce flawless visions of optical reality, and for whom the convex mirror was a standard workshop tool, the pictured mirror became, in Meyer Schapiro’s memorable words, “a model of painting as a perfect image of the visible world.” Numerous scholars since have shown how reflective convex surfaces of all kinds, not just mirrors proper, could function within paintings “to create a more complete and substantial representation of space,” as Jan Bialostocki has described the panoptic reach of Saint Michael’s cuirass in Hans Memling’s Last Judgment altarpiece now in the National Museum in Gdańsk. Credit for the most far-reaching innovations in this arena is usually awarded to Jan van Eyck, who famously used reflections to situate the moment of witnessing within the visual field as it crystallized in his gaze. In his sparkling devotional epitaph of 1436, the Virgin with the Canon George Van der Paele, van Eyck distributed multiple images of the enthroned Queen of Heaven across the scalloped round ridges of the saint’s polished helmet, as well as fixing his own presence, his own act of artisanal spectatorship, in the gleaming bronze of the epauliere. Recent scholarship attuned to medieval and early modern image theory has elevated the embedded mirror reflection into something like the preeminent meta-image, a supermotif that insistently refers discourse to the problematic veracity of images, the variability and fallibility of sight, the dangers and pleasures of illusion—but also, ironically, the superiority of painting over...
other arts. Scholarly interest has massed around Leon Battista Alberti’s original interpretation of the Narcissus myth in book 2 of Della pittura (1435–36), where the pool’s reflective image paints the young hunter as a primal desiring subject and, simultaneously, as the first beholder of pictures. “What is painting but the act of embracing by means of art the surface of the pool?” asks Alberti in the famous passage, winking to his humanist readers with a clever appropriation of Philostratus the Elder’s ekphrastic exercise in the Eikones.

More germane for my interpretation of Burgkmair’s soldier motif in the Augsburg Crucifixion is the ethical thread running through classical and postclassical interpretations, verbal and visual, of the Narcissus myth: the mirror image’s status as a trope of philosophical self-examination, its risks, and its rewards. Ancient writers implicitly understood that the mirror could serve the subject as an instrument of moral betterment, for it provided, as Shadi Bartsch explains, “a tool for the splitting of the viewer into viewing subject and viewed object.” Ovid’s portrayal of Narcissus at the moment of his self-recognition in the pool is the classic negative exemplum of this self-splitting: “iste ego sum: sensi, nec mea fallit imago” (I am he. I realize. My image/my reflection no longer deceives me) (Metamorphoses 3.463). Yet the ethical challenge wrought by the illusion’s fracture is one this particular subject fails, since, as Hérica Valladares points out, the experience “does not result in a corresponding critical distance from his own reflection” but only an “awareness of the erotic paradox in which he is caught and its attendant impossibility of fulfillment.” The result, in Ovid’s telling of the tale, was “a new kind of madness [novitasque furor]” (Met. 3.350). What Narcissus failed to achieve every mirror image promises: a therapeutic reversal of subject and object relations. When it succeeds, the viewer, the owner of the gaze, simultaneously becomes the viewed, the target of the gaze; the possibility of self-knowledge flits into view. Yet the enterprise, like any effort to transmute sense impression into understanding, was always understood as inherently vexed. Commenting on the ancient motto Nosce te ipsum (Know Thyself), inscribed alongside a Narcissus-like mirror-gazing figure in the decorative program of his own villa outside Bologna, the physician and naturalist Ulisse Aldrovandi (1522–1605) expresses the conventional wisdom, “Admiring one’s face is most easy. To know one’s internal self has always been reputed to be difficult.”

Bartsch aptly terms the subject-object reversal that opens the door to self-knowledge a “momentary dislocation of self-identity” and distinguishes it from the self-splitting that leads to Cartesian enlightenment—the familiar trope of the cogitating mind reflexively mirroring its own operations. In face-to-face societies the mirror’s disclosure of a newly objective point of view for the subject is not that of the introspective mind becoming self-aware; nor is it necessarily a surrogate for the omnivincence of God, whose surveillance elicits shame and compels penitential self-correction. Rather, the dislocated subject is caught enacting a second-order, social role, learning to judge himself in light of commonly held values and norms. Momentarily divided into subject and object, one sees oneself as others would, beyond appearances. And it is here, at the scene of dawning self-knowledge, that the mirror, despite its capacity to deceive, discloses a most unsettling prospect onto truth, one that ancient and medieval authors alike comprehended: the potential to confront the subject with the horror of the Self. In Christian thought this was the Self mired in sin, corrupted by worldly attachments, deformed by self-seeking, forgetful of Last Things, and alienated from God. Wishing only to escape from the dissociating shock such a reflection produces, the penitential subject finds the choice laid bare: either flee into the fantasy of mere appearances and remain blind to his true self, accepting sin and death as his lot, or use the mirror to convert, to “turn” away from sin and toward God. A rhymed inscription encircling Death’s reflection in a fifteenth-century engraving, pasted into a Book of Hours in Dublin and preserved today as a unicum, recommends just this: “In this mirror, so may I learn, how from sin, I ought to turn [In desen speigell, soe mach ik leeren, hoe ik mij sal, van sonden kerens].”

The need for constant self-examination and vigilant reflection on death was a major theme in ancient ethics, particularly Stoicism, and in the long history of Christian monasticism, where penitential exercises served as a method for purifying the soul and making way for the birth of the “new man.” In the Middle Ages this preoccupation stimulated a proliferation of didactic and pastoral works, reaching far beyond the monastery, bearing the title Speculum. As the idea of spiritual exercise was progressively retooled for the needs of the laity, the broad-based ethos of self-observation gave birth to a whole new domain of Christian ethical art, tied largely to the imperative to prepare for death: ars moriendi, vanitas, memento mori, and related macabre and penitential themes. A whole regimen of spiritual therapy for the laity was organized around their common logic. Eventually disseminated in popular form by the printing press, the new class of emblematic meditative images began as novelties styled for elites. A two-page opening from a Book of Hours made about 1500, probably in Bruges, for Joanna (“the Mad”) of Castile marks the transition from the book’s calendar pages to its battery of meditative lists (Ten Commandments, Seven Deadly Sins, Five Senses, Works of Mercy, Virtues, Gifts of the Holy Spirit, and so on). It includes the proleptic spectacle of a skull gazing out from inside a convex crystal, encircled by the text’s putative title, “Speculum conscience,” or “Mirror of Conscience.” Trompe l’oeil flower, pod, and berry specimens, interspersed with two butterflies and a snail, surround the inset word-image composite (Fig. 17). By offering up to fleshly eyes a future vision of the Self unclothed by flesh, reminding us of what we will become and, in a sense, always were, the mirror, combining mimesis and metamorphosis in a single figure, proves itself the instrument par excellence of a penitential optics. Such opportunities as mirrors afforded—to “see” what carnal vision was too limited, and imagination too fear-struck, to furnish—constituted something like a heavenly therapy. This takes the form of competing parables in a roughly contemporary German broadsheet preserved in Stuttgart (Fig. 18). The mirror held up to the luxury-loving young couple on the left appears empty, tempting them to peer closer; whatever pleasing image comes to fill it will, the Devil holding it knows, guarantee their souls to him (likewise if it remains empty). What the angel’s mirror furnishes the prudent burghers on the right, by contrast, is that painful shock of recognition
that leads from ignorance to insight, and from there to penance. The horror of this "true image" will send them fleeing—fleeing from sin.

Narrative imagery, too, and Passion imagery in particular, could serve as a kind of "mirror of conscience," a site for prudent self-reflection, imitation of Christ, and spiritual therapy. Consider the admonition set forth by Arnoul Gréban, the mid-fifteenth-century dramatist and canon of the church of Le Mans, in his great 35,000-verse vernacular play Le mystère de la Passion (already quoted in part in our epigram):

Thus he moderates his pains
by looking into this mirror,
where every heart, to see its sorrow
ought to profoundly consider itself.
And so that you might see yourself there
and gently look at it,
this pious mirror for your own good
we bring before your eyes,
in visible form, with characters.
Look at yourself, if you are wise,
each of you sees his form there:
Anyone who really looks will really see himself.
May God grant that if we look at ourselves
by looking we may perceive,
after this moral life,
the powerful immortal essence
that reigns inexhaustibly.78

Put into play here is a certain kind of sensual didacticism that fosters proper (that is, spiritual) seeing and hearing as ethical activities for the audience. Gréban deploys the mirror metaphor to privilege what is visible to human eyes ("sensibilité") and what is performed "with characters [par personnaiges]," the whole enterprise of the play geared to individualized opportunities for self-examination, imitation, and ethical-spiritual improvement.

Turning back to Burgkmair’s Crucifixion in Augsburg, we recall the character whose appearance onstage coincides with the chance to see himself in the Passion’s mirror, though he proves himself unable or unwilling to do so. Imprisoned in his own subject position by a contumacious will set on blasphemy, he is suspended before the possibility of self-splitting and self-awareness. Only his specular doppelgänger registers any kind of awareness, disclosing the truth of a sinful reprobacy while going unheeded. Flashing into view as an alien Other, the Jew’s horrified reflection becomes, in other words, an ethical Other. Burgkmair’s obsequious soldier makes himself risible and contemptuous not only to those surrounding him but to himself as well.
Knowledge limps behind disclosure, and experience doesn’t stand a chance. Paradoxically, the agency capable of recognition remains the exclusive possession of the being who is not a person at all but a mere image: an illusory “subject” who has nothing to gain, and nothing to lose, in possessing true knowledge of the self.

The profound difficulty of seeing oneself for the sake of spiritual or moral improvement preoccupied a broad swath of sixteenth-century writers and artists who understood it to be an anthropological as well as ethical problem. On the heels of Sebastian Brant’s hugely popular Narrenschiff (1494), but in an entirely different rhetorical mode, Erasmus of Rotterdam placed the critique of foolish self-regard in the mouth of Dame Folly herself, asking, “is there any duty throughout life which you can perform gracefully as regards yourself or others ... unless you have self-love at hand to help you?” In 1515 Hans Holbein the Younger glossed this passage with a piquant pen and ink miniature in Basel schoolmaster Oswald Myconius’s personal copy of the Moriae encomium, depicting a fool, epitome of the false man, deflated by the mockery of his own reflection (Fig. 19). Wisdom requires, first and foremost, recognizing folly as the pre-existing condition, so to speak, of both humanity and the self. Tricksters and folk heroes such as Till Eulenspiegel, whose name (meaning “owl’s mirror”) evidently derives from the old saying, “One sees one’s own faults no more clearly than an owl sees its own ugliness in a looking glass,” made a career of wearing down the defenses that keep discomfiting recognitions at bay. In a far less humorous vein Sebastian Franck commented in his Sprichwörter of 1541:

Man remains forever in his affairs and towards himself blind and a fool. ... Likewise if a monkey and an owl were to be looking at themselves in a mirror, the nature of animal or man is so blind that each creature, obsessed by self-love, does not know himself, does not see himself, and cannot do so.

Midcentury contemporaries willing to think beyond the bounded categories of confessional knowledge—Protestant and Catholic—concurred. Pieter Bruegel’s drawing of about 1558 (now in the British Museum) known as Elck embeds a tableau that likewise laments the hollow prospects for self-knowledge (Fig. 20). As a foil for the bespectacled Everyman shown scrambling across a mound of detritus with a lamp, searching for something he will never find, Bruegel offers a paradoxical double, Nobody (Nymant), dressed in a fool’s costume and regarding himself in a mirror. Posted on a placard of some sort on the wall (Fig. 21), this image within the
image carries the inscription, “Nymant en ekent sy selven” (nobody knows [or recognizes] himself). 82

I have written elsewhere about the prominent role Nobody acquired as a stock character in the European satirical tradition, and I invoke him here because something of the Nobody paradox, it seems to me, finds berth in Burgkmair’s Jewish soldier as he wanders in on the scene at Golgotha, almost innocently, unprepared for the challenge of recognition. 83 Neither a tormentor in the strict sense nor a sympathetic witness, neither daemonic nor convert, a target for neither hostile ostracization nor empathetic identification, the soldier-fool is invested with a strange form of “nobodyness,” a universalizing anonymity that turns the drama of the subject’s failed self-recognition into an indictment, not of Jewish reprocity per se, but of Christian godlessness generally. That is, what Burgkmair stages as a stereotypically Jewish blindness stands here for the blindness of those Christians who refuse to look into the penitential mirror—that reflective surface out of which their own image is ungrateful, reprobate sinners stares back. It is a truthful vision of the soul’s alienated relationship to God that the Jew, by his nature, remains unable to overcome, while the Christian, distracted by the vanities of the world and immersed in his own foolish self-regard, remains unwilling. Confronting one’s sinful self meant feeling the shock of recognizing the Jew within, oblivious to one’s own guilt, ready to deny Christ again and again. To see Burgkmair’s Nobody failing the test of salvific recognition on Golgotha thus renders the image emblematic: its verbal equivalent, once unraveled, is the argument that nobody meets the challenge of self-recognition, nobody properly sees himself. The indictment mounts a challenge to everybody, every Christian faithful who witnesses Christ crucified.

Given his ambitions and humanist connections, the Burgkmair of about 1504 would no doubt have agreed with the coming generation of moralists and reformers who railed against a Christian society in which nobody recognizes himself. That the painter, later in his life, understood the twin imperatives of facing the horror of the Self without false con-

At the Vienna panel, dated 1529 (Fig. 22), 84 Building on a tradition of macabre portraiture stretching back to the early fourteenth century—one that eventually came to include the subgenre macabre portraiture stretching back to the early fourteenth century—one that eventually came to include the subgenre of mortifying marriage portraits—the Vienna panel presents us with a troubling double aspect: the couple as they are (or once were), and the couple as they will be (or always were). Folding time, it thus addresses a simultaneous audience of present and future beholders, making it what Joseph Koerner has called a “proleptic epitaph.” Above the painter’s head begins the panel’s cascade of admonitory inscriptions, with words set against the black recess: “Such was our human form, but in the mirror nothing more than this.” 86 Above Anna’s head a banderole calls out the ages of the sitters on the precise day (May 10, 1529) they were captured in mortal likenesses, while inside the crystalline orb she holds, embryonic doppelgängers float through a dark ether (Fig. 23). Terrible in their fixation on the flesh-and-blood others, the simian skull of Frau Burgkmair appears amid a spray of red hair that mocks Anna’s thinning locks, while a spectral Meister Hans, intent on chastising the painter’s vanity, glares across the breadth of the panel, mouth open, as if barking out a curse. Inscribed around the mirror’s edge is the admonition to recognize our true selves: ERKEN DIC SELF.

This complex humanist conceit for a vanitas double portrait is almost certainly Burgkmair’s own. 89 Whether or not the portrait truly illustrates “the antithesis between sinful and prudent self-reflection,” as James Marrow has argued, 89 there is no doubt we are being called to witness an act of self-recognition on the couple’s part and admonished to recognize ourselves in the process. The mirror conjures up a glimpse of that which is blocked by the world of appearances and earthly attachments—paradoxically, by the very body whose material presence brings it into focus in the first place. That the metamorphic motif of a specular Other horrified by what it sees—an absent presence possessed of its own, terrifying agency—would reappear in Burgkmair’s oeuvre twenty-five years later, in a painting conceived as a visual testament to the painter’s own Christian virtue, casts a retrospective light on the importance of this visual trope of recognition in the painter’s repertoire. Attentive to his chances for artistic self-display and intellectual self-assertion within the bounds of an important commission, Burgkmair projected into the Augsburg Crucifixion’s reflection motif a moment of autho- rial self-recognition, stolen back as a form of Christian virtue from a fleeting moment of narcissistic blindness.

Basilikabilder: Imaginative Pilgrimage and Perpetual Passion
What place, what role, what meaning did Burgkmair’s reflection motif assume within the larger cycle of paintings for which the Crucifixion was designed, the six Basilikabilder commissioned between 1499 and 1504? As noted earlier, Burgkmair’s scene, with its frieze of monumental standing figures and its Christ type adapted from his father’s allegorical Crucifixion in St. Maximilian, 90 forms the upper two-thirds of the center section of a tympanum-shaped painting, measuring 7 feet 9¾ inches (2.38 meters) high and 11 feet 2¾ inches (3.415 meters) wide along the bottom edge, dedicated to the Roman church of S. Croce in Gerusalemme (Fig. 24). Occupying the lower tier of the center section is a separate view of the church, freely rendered and perspectively folded, it seems, to allow us to glimpse the eastern choir’s exterior and at the same time something of the carved western portal. Whatever else might be seen of the portal, and the painter’s coy invitation to peek inside, is half hidden by a courtyard gate, on which Burgkmair signed the panel with an ersatz antique inscription: HANNS / BVRGKMAIR / ANNO 1504. Pilgrims identified by their badges, hats, and traveler’s staves come and go: the main group, led by a local guide, seems to be departing and passing advice along to a couple who are entering, accompanied by their dog. Completing the tympanum ensemble are the half lunettes (each 80½ by 45¼ inches, or 204.5 by 115 centimeters) bracketing the stacked central panels; together they comprise a sumptuous panorama taken from the Life of Saint Ursula, specifically, her martyrdom among the eleven
thousand companions, a scene based principally on the Golden Legend. High horizon lines allow Burgkmair to draw the virgin-martyr armada into the upper zones of the tapered panels. Above a beautiful riverscape, simulated shrinework integrates the overall composition, rationalizing its considerable shifts in figure scale.

Earlier, I pointed out that of the six Basilikabilder commissioned by the Dominican nuns, Burgkmair completed three, Hans Holbein the Elder two, and a certain Master L.F., probably also from Augsburg, one. Designed for installation in the convent’s newly renovated chapter house, each of the ensembles, with notable variations, is set in a pointed-arch tympanum and adheres to the basic scheme just described for S. Croce: a Passion image placed above a “view” of one of Rome’s basilican churches, complemented by hagiographic vignettes or votive saints’ portraits, corresponding either to the basilica’s eponymous patron or the saint venerated by the panel’s donor. Both notable exceptions to this scheme are from Holbein’s hand: the Santa Maria Maggiore of 1499, which replaces Passion imagery with a Coronation of the Virgin in the apex, and the San Paolo fuori le mura of 1504, which displaces architectural portraiture in the lower zone with a complex staging of the apostle’s martyrdom. In only a few places do we find donor portraits or family escutcheons. One of the five documented donors, shown kneeling with a rosary in a panel long ago detached from the San Paolo ensemble, is Veronica Welser (d. 1531), daughter of the influential Augsburg merchant and banking family (Fig. 25). Then-prioress of the Katharinenkloster, Welser is identified in an eighteenth-century chronicle (which refers to an older lost source) as the donor of both the S. Paolo and S. Croce panels, for which she paid the two painters, Holbein and Burgkmair, a total of 187 gulden. Whereas the former artist portrayed her directly, the latter commemorated her patronage through the choice of martyrological legend (Welser’s given name was Ursula?), on the one hand, and the inclusion of her family’s coat of arms (lower right corner), on the other. Four other members of the order—Dorothea Rehlinger, Anna Riedler, Helena Raphon, and Barbara Riedler—are recorded as project donors, along with the honoraria they paid the painters. Like Welser, each hailed from one of Augsburg’s wealthiest and most influential patrician and merchant families.
Singular in the history of convent arts, the Augsburg Basilikabilder were conceived as touchstones of an ambitious campaign of communal self-regeneration and consolidation extending over several decades. This campaign would eventually see, in 1498, much of the cloister refurbished by the Stadtbaumeister Burkhart Engelberg (1447–1512) and later, between 1516 and 1517, the monastery church rebuilt in the newly fashionable Renaissance idiom by the Augsburg architect Hans Heber (d. 1522), under Welser’s watchful eye. Of the city’s seven convents, the Katharinenkloster was the richest, largest, and “most emphatically civic”; its elite status was confirmed by a series of papal and royal privileges, granted since its foundation in the thirteenth century.

The privilege scholars have linked specifically to the Basilikabild project was an indulgence issued by Innocent VIII in 1487. Continuing a papal tradition of corporate dispensations begun in the early fourteenth century, it bestowed on the nuns and other visitors to the convent the opportunity to earn the same remission of sins granted those who journeyed to the seven basilicas of Rome—without ever leaving the convent. These benefits could be fully earned by anyone willing to visit “three stations in the cloister with special devotion [in sonderhait andechtlich haymsucht drey stet in disem closter],” as specified by the abbess reigning at the time (“durch ain pryorin zu zeyten geordnet send”), and at each place pray three Our Fathers and three Ave Marias (“an yeglicher der drey stet drew pater noster und dreiw Aue maria”). Although the original Latin bull has been lost, the German text excerpted here was worked up for display around 1500 in the form of triptych, an object meant, in all likelihood, to serve as a commemorative plaque, or Gedenktäfel, somewhere inside the convent. This suggests an effort to promote the convent’s privilege, and its special relationship to Rome, within the specific context of the Jubilee year of 1500.

On the face of it, then, each of the painted basilican “portraits” would seem to represent one station on a virtual Roman pilgrimage to the Sette Chiese, contained within the convent walls for the benefit of those traditionally forced to make do with peregrinatio in stabilitate. Were the images intended to serve as spaces for imaginative journeys and meditations, a set of visual prompts for the kind of pious visualizations scholars have long associated with late medieval devotional images, Passion images in particular? Endorsed by a number of scholars, this understanding of the images as surrogates has also met with criticism. Christopher Wood, for
example, has emphasized that the text of the 1487 indulgence letter stipulates only that one must visit three different “places” within the convent, as specified by the abbess, in order to earn the grant, not that one must pray in specific locations, let alone before specific objects, in some kind of sequence. Needless to say, it would be unreasonable to expect the document of 1487 to refer to paintings that had not yet been commissioned; the “three places” in the cloister to which indulgence seekers were guided at the time were almost certainly existing altars. A closely related, and close by, instance of a plenary jubilee indulgence designed to provide the sick, the lame, or the cloistered similar access to the full “römischen Gnaden” is the 1501 grant given to the Cistercians of nearby Kaisheim; fulfilling the terms of the grant in this instance entailed prayerful pilgrimage to seven altars within the monastery.

Even so, it is not necessary to assume such grants were understood as either fixed or limited to the same stations of prayer in perpetuity: the principle of commutatio, so widely applied in medieval pilgrimage culture, continually gave rise to new relations of surrogacy based on equivalent indulgences. For instance, just as pilgrims to the seven Roman basilicas could earn the same remissions granted to those traveling longer distances to worship Christ at the loca sancta in Jerusalem—medieval guidebooks emphasized this advantage—the possibility existed to replace that intramural church-to-church itinerary with a visit to the seven main altars of St. Peter’s alone or even with visits to designated surrogates (churches or altars) in northern Europe. Some degree of flexibility in how the terms of the grant might have been fulfilled at the Katharinenkloster may therefore be assumed; it would appear, furthermore, that such flexibility opened the door to innovation, including the idea of a picture cycle. By leaving the designation of the surrogate prayer sites (Stellvertreterstätten) within the convent to the discretion of the ruling prioress, Innocent’s bull of 1487 tactfully anticipated a new configuration of liturgical stations, one made possible by the very renovations it helped finance.

Even if a strict version of the virtual pilgrimage thesis cannot be sustained by the evidence at the Katharinenkloster (let alone other monasteries in the city), it is hardly out of the question to imagine the “prayer in three places” stipulation being satisfied by the paintings, especially if we regard the six panels as three pairs, something their installation in the chapter house recommends. Medieval chapter rooms—distinct within European monastery complexes from the eleventh century on—were multifunctional spaces for business and ritual. There the community might engage in commemorative prayer on behalf of the house’s dead benefactors, especially the notables among its own members (some of whom might find privileged burial in the chapter room itself); participate in quasiliturgical rituals such as collations, the reception of novices, or the weekly washing of feet (mandatum); or conduct institutional business of various kinds, including daily community meetings, elections, and the disciplining of errant brothers or sisters. All such ceremonies were served by a long tradition of centralizing design that oriented participants toward a central bay of the room, typically furnished with an altar.

Still preserved, St. Katherine’s chapter room—completed, along with the adjoining cloister (Kreuzgang), in 1499—is a square space with a round center column and net vaults divided into four equal bays; fenestration on the west wall left space for only six tympanum-shaped panels, two on each of the remaining walls. Working from the slight variations in shape and size, Magdalena Gartner has resolved the discrepancies in previous attempts to reconstruct the hanging arrangement of the six panels, with the following result: the cycle began on the north wall, with Burghkmair’s San Pietro on the left and Master L.F.’s combined San Lorenzo and San Sebastiano on the right; it continued clockwise with, on the east wall, Burghkmair’s San Giovanni (shaped to fit over the doorway) and Holbein’s San Paolo next to it on the right; the cycle concluded on the south wall with Burghkmair’s Santa Croce and Holbein’s Santa Maria Maggiore (Fig. 26).
extent that this arrangement constituted a viewing order based on the Passion sequence, it significantly lacks any correspondence with the order of the commissions (in fact, the first painting completed and paid for, Holbein’s *Santa Maria Maggiore*, occupies the “last” position in such a sequence). Close by the central column, the nuns finally installed an altar; consecrated in 1503, it was evidently adorned with Holbein’s *Saint Katherine Altarpiece* of 1512, its now-lost shrine housing a Marian cult figure.  

There can be little doubt that the lavish set of commissions, as Pia Cuneo has argued, marked an effort on the part of this wealthy enclave of Dominican nuns to reassert their place within a “tradition of powerful and holy women,” pledge their allegiance to the Roman Church, and thereby resist destabilizing reform efforts at a time of escalating anticlericalism. However, female sanctity, patronage, and community building do not tell the whole story, and too great an emphasis on these factors leaves the prominence of Passion imagery in the overall project insufficiently explained. As noted, five of the six panels feature Passion scenes in their central panels’ upper fields, setting each at the apex of its pointed-arch frame and aligning it with the architectural “portrait” below. Two of these five, both products of the Holbein workshop, originally featured images of their donors kneeling in devotion before the scene of martyrdom: the *Santa Maria Maggiore* of 1499, with Dorothea Rehlinger embedded in Saint Dorothy’s beheading at the lower right, and the *San Paolo fuori le mura*, to which the panel featuring Veronica Welser with her rosaries (Fig. 25) was once attached, also in the lower right position.

26 Schematic reconstruction of the chapter room in the Katharinenkloster, Augsburg, showing the original disposition of the *Basilikabild* panels, ca. 1505, from Gärtner, *Römische Basiliken*, p. 38, fig. 10 (drawing © Magdalene Gärtner)
Passion themes are also prominent in a number of tympanum epitaphs, closely similar in shape to the *Basilikabilder* and of roughly equal dimensions, produced by the Holbein workshop for display in the adjoining *Kreuzgang*. One of these, completed in 1499 for the three cloistered daughters of the Vetter family—Veronica (d. 1490), Christine (d. 1499), and Walburga (d. 1500)—showcases the mysticism associated with the rosary cult favored by the nuns (Fig. 27).111 Separated from the scenes they witness by slender trompe l’oeil tracery, the sisters kneel together beneath a dedicatory plaque: the Coronation of the Virgin in the apex, family escutcheons on either side, six Passion scenes, and a vignette portrait of Saint Veronica take their places on a multilevel stage spotlighted against a deep black. A continuous span of turf unites the space of the nuns with the three scenes on the lower tier (Gethsemane, the Crucifixion, and the Carrying of the Cross) and Veronica standing with her sudarium, while a receding expanse of tiled floor does the same for the three above (the Flagellation, the Crowning with Thorns, and Pilate Washing His Hands). In order to reach the climax, the six-figure Crucifixion in the lower tier, beholders must scan this “out of order” sequence that apparently seeks to harmonize John 19 (where the hand washing is omitted) and Matthew 27 (in which the Crowning *folllous* Pilate’s declaration of his own innocence). Just below Christ’s outstretched left arm in that final scene, the Good Centurion makes his confession to a man in a yellow tunic and flat-topped hat—the same figure visible among the henchemen in the Flagellation and Hand Washing scenes above. Striding into the frame from its margins, he likewise points upward toward Christ on the Cross as if posing a question.

One additional detail in the Vetter epitaph deserves attention for what it tells us about the penitential mysticism of the nuns. At the far left end of the second tier, continuous with the artfully contrived stage space of the torture scenes, two of the Passion’s instruments, the birch rod and the flagellum, lie discarded on the floor; signlike in their isolation, they uncannily point toward the nuns below, as if animated by the wish to be wielded anew. Read as mute testimony that the souls of the deceased have paid their debts of conscience—even if that penitential task must be renewed among the living—they stand here as vivid symbols of a total spiritual program. Grounded in Passion mysticism, Eucharistic piety, and, from the later fifteenth century on, the cult of the rosary as well, the regimen fostered in south German convents such as St. Katherine’s kept ascetic discipline enshrined in the order’s history as a focal point of the cloistered life. Mystics such as Catherine of Siena (1347–1380), who transformed herself through flagellation into “an anvil for the blows of God,” or Elspeth of Oye (from the Oetenbach cloister in Zurich), who allegedly spatred bystanders with blood from the fury of her self-torment, or Christina Ebner of the Engelthal convent near Nuremberg were extolled in convent chronicles and contemporary hagiographies as charismatic penitents who attained holiness, ascetics who became “earthly angels” through their mortifying efforts to conform to Christ in suffering and love.112 Massively documented in a still-growing scholarly literature, that tradition requires no review here.113 But it should be remarked that one of the two extant copies of the German translation of Catherine of Siena’s *vita* to feature illustrations was transcribed, and dated 1466, by a nun of the Katharinenkloster, Elisabeth Warrinsin.114 Communal rites of penance, including ritual flagellation, likewise sustained these histories and brought them into a living present. It is no coincidence that the performance of penitential discipline has been called—with special reference to the Dominicans—“perhaps the most important ceremony conducted in the chapter house.”115

To the extent that the *Basilikabilder* offered its beholders a vehicle for sequential meditation on the Passion, the series conjures it as a virtual participation in Rome’s Good Friday liturgy. And because participation in the liturgies of Holy Week condensed much of the spiritual fervor pilgrims to Rome were invited to feel, it stands to reason that the

---

**27** Attributed to Hans Holbein the Elder, *Epitaph for the Vetter Sisters*, 1499, oil on pine panel, 70⅞ × 107 in. (179.7 × 271.8 cm). Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, Staatsgalerie in der Katharinenkirche, Augsburg, 4669 (artwork in the public domain; photograph provided by BPK, Berlin / Art Resource, NY)
pictures could indeed, in the right ritual setting, function as surrogate stations on an inner pilgrimage. This, or some other closely related, ritual imperative clearly guided their arrangement within the chapter room and may have been the determining factor. If we follow the apex imagery around the room, we have: Gethsemane by Burgkmair (San Pietro), Christ’s Arrest by Master L.F. (San Lorenzo and San Sebastiano), the Flagellation by Burgkmair (San Giovanni), the Crowning with Thorns and Mocking of Christ by Holbein (San Paolo), the Crucifixion by Burgkmair (Santa Croce), and the Coronation of the Virgin by Holbein (Santa Maria Maggiore). Correspondences between these Passion scenes and particular Roman churches, however, remain loose—just as they do in an interesting trio of devotional panels (ca. 1470–80) by the so-called Master of the Riedener Altar, today preserved in Munich.

Figure 28 reproduces the third panel in the sequence, which was originally painted for display in the Franciscan priory in Kaufbeuren (founded 1315), possibly as part of a Stations of the Cross installation (Kreuzweg). Shown schematically, the full cycle, encompassing all three panels, presents the following pairings from left to right:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper scene</th>
<th>Passion scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christ Taking Leave of His Mother San Giovanni Laterano</td>
<td>Arrest and Beating of Christ Christ before Pilate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pietro</td>
<td>Flagellation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Paolo</td>
<td>Crowning with Thorns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Croce</td>
<td>Carrying of the Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>Christ Awaiting Crucifixion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Maria Maggiore</td>
<td>Deposition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Sebastiano</td>
<td>Entombment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Selbdritt</td>
<td>Resurrection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inasmuch as the Augsburg cycle facilitates contemplative absorption in their individual schemes, Burgkmair’s Santa Croce is perhaps the one panel most consistently dedicated to the symbolic and ritual nexus connecting Passion, pilgrimage, and martyrdom. S. Croce was, after all, Rome’s Passion relic headquarters since its consecration in 325, built on the site of the Sessorian Palace, where Empress Helena allegedly deposited her collection of holy antiquities. Later known as the Roman Calvary, in part because its floor was packed with Holy Earth brought from Jerusalem, S. Croce was also the pope’s sanctuary for Good Friday masses, home to the famed mosaic icon of the imago pietatis and numerous Passion relics. Given these associations, it is conceivable that the Augsburg cycle performed double duty for recluses or visitors seeking simulated passages and spectacular indulgences: in addition to the Roman basilican itinerary, the panels might have facilitated surrogate Jerusalem pilgrimages as well.

Conjectures such as this aside, what do the demonstrable connections with Passion pilgrimage and devotion tell us about the situated intention behind Burgkmair’s ugly soldier in Augsburg? Informing the motif, I submit, is a theological and homiletic theme that had far-reaching resonances in northern Passion piety—a theme that effectively bridged the elite mysticism practiced by the nuns and the practical penitentialism at the heart of lay devotion before the Reformation. I refer to the notion scholars sometimes call the perpetual Passion: the characteristically late medieval idea that, with every sin committed inside the community of believers, with every new transgression, Christ is not only denied and betrayed but tortured and crucified anew. Because sin persists in human affairs, the reasoning goes, the work of redemption, the God-man’s rescue of humanity from the clutches of death and the Devil—thus, his suffering—remains ongoing. Among its emblematic images are the living Man of Sorrows, shown actively bleeding and suffering in a perpetual present between Crucifixion and Resurrection, and the so-called Sunday Christ (Feiertagsschristus), depicting Christ afflicted by the tools and implements of those who sin by working on Sundays. On the ancient Cross of Golgotha, Christ atoned for the offenses of humanity, suffering in every part of his body, but in the present the sins of everyday life and the workaday world rack his body just as mercilessly. In his sermon cycle on the themes of Brant’s Narrenschiff, Strasbourg’s great cathedral preacher Johann Geiler von Kaysersberg (1445–1510) argued the point, castigating those “fool-blasphemers” who pierced and sliced up Christ’s body every time they swore oaths on its members. More evil than
the Jews who crucified him on Golgotha—who at least spared breaking his bones!—were those Christians who “pulled and ripped apart the body of Christ with their devilish tongues [zerzeren und zerreisen den leib Jesus Christi mit Iren füffelischen zungen].” Unknowing sin is one thing, argued Geiler, but Christians who blaspheme through sacrilegious oaths and curses turn directly, and knowingly, against the living God—staging the Passion anew.

Images of Christ’s ongoing suffering have their origins in the Passion liturgy and the high medieval theology of intercession, in particular, the idea of a tribunal misericordiae before the Heavenly Throne, where Christ and the Virgin offer a confluence of perfect sacrificial substances—blood on the one side, milk on the other—as proof of martyrological merit in overcoming sin, a scene first visualized in early manuscripts of the typological-devotional treatise Speculum humanae salvationis (composed about 1310 in Dominican circles). Whether it was due to the broad dissemination of the Speculum itself in manuscript, block book, and numerous incunable editions, or to the castigations of preachers like Geiler, the perpetual Passion’s currency was widespread in German piety, elite and vernacular, and in Christian humanism in Burgkmair’s time: Albrecht Dürer and the Viennese abbot Benedict Chelidonius (ca. 1460–1521), for example, drew strongly on the idea in their collaborations on the large and small woodcut Passion folios between 1508 and 1511.

A dubious orthodoxy shadows the idea of the perpetual Passion. Nevertheless, its implications are profound, and they reveal how incisively the notion could serve intra-Christian polemics and pastoral care. For what the perpetual Passion demands is that the penitent sinner glimpse the atonement etched on that face. Good Centurion’s epauliere and the look of horrified recognition etched on his face—informs Burgkmair’s specular Jew in the Good Centurion’s epauliere and the look of horrified recognition etched on that face.

For the Dominican nuns of the Katharinenkloster, the gravest threat to their distinctive form of discipleship, the real “Judaizing” menace haunting their spiritual vocation, was none other than their own bodies—at least according to the guidance they received from their advisers. In a poem known as the Allegory of the Spiritual Scourge, from a manuscript in Nuremberg, a figure of the flagellum whose iron-studded tips stand for Love of God, Brotherly Love, Patience, Obedience, Generosity, Moderation, and Chastity is accompanied by these verses:

O inhabitant of the cloister, take note / How you lead your life / You have fled from the world and the devil / So that you could come into the cloister / But you still have your greatest enemy by you. / That, say I to you, is your own body. / You should strike it with this scourge / So that it does not overcome the soul. / You may well make it suffer, / But you should not, however, kill it completely.

Gratitude for God’s loving mercy, dramatized to the emotional breaking point by the spectacle of Christ’s tortures on Golgotha, which the practices of meditative pilgrimage enabled the nun to witness with her own spiritual vision, had to be coupled with a vigilant awareness of her own responsibility for that suffering, a horrific comprehension of the carnal self, and, thus, a painful, ongoing confrontation with the enemy within.

The Look of Recognition

Motifs of recognition function in narrative with a double aspect that distinguishes them from simple devices of plot: they serve both to represent the passage from ignorance (or self-deception) to knowledge (or self-knowledge) intratextually, and to effect it extratextually—or, in the present case, extrapictorially. Yet it is the nature of that passage to be slow and often painful: as experience, it is strewn with pitfalls and provisions; as aspiration, it is haunted by failure. However well-informed readers and beholders outside the narrative may be of the story’s outcomes, however sure of its necessity, the most important disclosures of truth—those that demand a radical “negation of one’s past self”—produce a temporal gap, a period following the dawn, in which experience must struggle to come to terms with knowledge. In religious narrative, recognition motifs therefore carry something of an almost sacramental value: more than tokens of the individual’s inner transformation, they become agents of it. I have presented here diverse material and carried out an extended reading across three domains of analysis—semiotic, iconographic, contextual—of an embedded meta-image that, despite its marginality in the situation provided for it, proves uniquely adept at posing the challenge of recognition. Put in different terms, I have been concerned with the motif’s effect or work (Wirkung), seen as an integral expression of those demands a given work (Werk) imposes on its beholders. It performs this work negatively by locating a single, exemplary breakdown of recognition at the crossroads of human history itself—the Crucifixion, when all eyes were fixed on the paradoxical identity of the dead man said by some to be the Son of God. And it performs this work reflexively, by conflating the drama of the Self’s blindness to its own, true nature with that paradigmatic failure of christological recognition. This was a failure the painter, like generations of Christian theologians, polemicians, and moralists before him, saw embodied,
and carried forward into the new era *sub gratia*, not only by the reprobate Jews but also by the “Judaizing” impulses of Christian believers.

Hans Burgkmair thematized this double failure in the Crucifixion painted for the Katharinenkloster’s chapter room. In the process of reinterpreting a catoptric motif he had learned from Augsburg painters of the preceding generation, he struck on something of the dialectical entanglement of salvific recognition and the self-recognition of the sinner as an abject being tyrannized by carnality and cursed by death. Intuitively, it seems, he sensed that the Good Centurion’s confession—which splices two otherwise contradictory testimonies, “Jesus was the Son of God” and “Jesus is dead” into a double helix of salvific recognition—finds its structural double in the Christian subject’s self-recognition. The code embedded in that confession of identity we might recover from the important credal formulation of 1 Corinthians 15:22, “And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive,” and render its twofold testimony this way: “I am a sinner descended from Adam” and “I am rescued from death by Christ’s death.”

Gazing out from the depths of the Vienna double portrait, dated two years before the painter’s own death, the Burgkmair of 1529 is surely believable as the author of a morally astringent admonition to self-recognition and a devastating indictment of a corrupt world in which nobody sees himself. At the risk of overtaxing the Augsburg motif, I have proposed a personalized meaning for it as well, regarding it as emblematic of the artist’s *authorial* self-recognition. Without doubt, the Burgkmair who eventually came to dominate the *Basilikabilder* project between 1501 and 1504—in the end contributing three of the six panels, commanding progressively higher fees with each new commission, and having his panels prominently placed in the cycle’s clockwise pairings—was keenly on the lookout for ways to impress his patrons, one-up his rivals, and register his presence in the project. This happens emphatically in his final statement for the nuns, the *Santa Croce* panel, which he signed...
and dated 1504 over the threshold gate. In the course of seeking the best pictorial solution for harmonizing the shifts in figure scale across its component scenes, Burgkmair took time to study Holbein’s compositions for the flanking half lunettes of the San Paolo tympanum, eventually recording them in meticulous line sketches. This attentiveness to his rival’s contributions to the project is significant. As Katharina Krause has shown, in the opening two decades of the sixteenth century patrician taste and patronage in Augsburg crystallized around the great “alternative” of Holbein versus Burgkmair. Thirteen years separated the two men, whose families had close ties stretching back through the fifteenth century. From all indications the younger Burgkmair challenged himself to claim the mantle “Maler von Augsburg,” courting the new taste for Italianate forms, Orientalizing splendor, crystalline realism, unexpected narrative twists, and psychologically rich character portrayals.

Among these portrayals is the foolish, quasibestial soldier entering stage left in the Santa Croce panel. No open-and-shut case for the “Jewishness” of that visage has been made here, nor, as I have argued, is one needed. That Burgkmair was ready to label as “Jewish” the whole range of exotic attributes and Orientalizing characteristics in his tormentor figures is more than suggested by the pseudo-Hebrew lettering he used on the soldier wearing a green tunic, shown wielding an iron-spiked flagellum and eyeing his victim with a malicious glint in the Flagellation scene that crowds the San Giovanni panel, an ensemble he designed for prominent placement over the door of St. Katherine’s chapter room. But his purpose, here and elsewhere, was not anti-Jewish invective. Drawing on his own inventiveness, and his own, growing resources as a Christian-humanist ethnographer, the artist reached for an oddly humanizing portrayal of “Jewishblindness” and transformed it into an allegory of Christian conscience poised for conversion yet stubbornly resistant to the new story—the new text and the new self—disclosed on Golgotha. In the Katharinenkloster’s telescoped Passion cycle, Christ is set upon by his enemies and abandoned by his followers: the three-panel Gethsemane in the apex of Burgkmair’s San Pietro (the opening Passion image in the chapter room’s viewing sequence) is precisely about this breakdown of disciplership and the imminence of betrayal. As Christ prays for God to remove the chalice of suffering, the apostles remain in fitful sleep around him, while in the background Judas leads Caiphas’s police under a banner with the SPQR armorial: “behold the Son of man shall be betrayed into the hands of sinners” (Mark 14:41).

Perhaps this is why the figure of the Jewish witness on Calvary, the one who finally opens his eyes to see spiritually and truthfully—something we encounter in Dieric Bouts’s evocative Randfigur in the Granada triptych’s left panel, his headpiece adorned with eratz Hebrew (Fig. 1)—could be imbued with such poignancy. Perhaps this also is the reason why the “look” of recognition, to the extent we can identify it, became such a highly valued attribute of patrician virtue, indeed, a commodified form of distinction, in commercial cities like Augsburg, where painters excelled in flattering the piety of their patrons. Across the rich panorama of modish costumes, gleaming armor, and bristling weaponry painted for the Rehlingers by Ulrich Apt the Elder (1460–1532) and his workshop, we have a frieze of portrait heads with expressions ranging from sorrowful absorption to awe-struck wonder, from sober comprehension to electrifying recognition (Fig. 29). When it was installed (about 1517), the altarpiece, designed for the newly founded family chapel in the Dominican church of Mary Magdalene, took its place in a stream of high-profile patrician donations equipped with keenly observed portrait likenesses, a body of works that eventually included Leonhard Beck’s Adoration of the Magi of around 1520, the epitaphs made for the Vetter, Walther, and Schwarz families in the Katharinenkloster (ca. 1499, 1502, and 1508 respectively), and the Basilikabild panels themselves. Through the looking glass conjured by the painter’s skill, these pious Augsburgers invite us into an ennobling fiction—the fiction that each and every one of their own recognitions of Christ as Savior, as the living God hanging dead on the Cross, stands as a fait accompli. By implication, they tell us that their self-recognition as sinners—penitent, grateful, and worthy of the fruits of Christ’s sacrifice, as well as the prayers of the living—is likewise exemplary, praiseworthy to all who witness their act of turning to God.
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36. The great throng artists imagined as trailing the judicial procession through the city gates and then encamp-
ning on Calvary has no warrant in the Gospels.

37. University College of London Art Museum, inv. no. 1223 Gere. Ori-
ginally proposed by Ernst Buchner (“The Master of the Martyrdom of the Apostles,” Old Master Drawings, March 1930: 69–71), the attribution was taken up by Christian Beutler and Gunther Thiem, Hans Holbein d. A. Die spätmittelalterlichen Altar- und Glasgemälde (Augsburg: H. Rössler, 1960). 83–84; see also Hans Holbein der Ältere und die Kunst der Spätgotik, exh. cat. (Augs-
burg: J. P. Himmer, 1965), 159–60, cat. no. 186; and Elisabeth Wiemann, Hans Holbein d. A. Die Passion in ihrer Zeit, exh. cat. (Ottweiler: Haftje Cantz, 2010), 296–99, cat. no. 55. The drawing’s reverse is inscribed with the nicknames of Holbein the Elder’s two artist sons, “blessy” (Hans the Younger) and “brosy” (Ambrosius); Krause, Holbein der Ältere, 194, adduces (correctly, in my view) this as further evidence against Sigmund’s authorship.


39. Landesmuseum, Münster, inv. no. 1038. Nearly obscured by Christ’s Cross, in the triangular space below the thrusting lance, is a bald mock-
ing figure with a hand-on-hip reading “Vach qui destruim tempum dei et in triduo” (“Yah, thou that destroyest the temple of God, and in three 
days [dost rebuild it]”) (adapted from Matthew 27:40, not Mark 15:29); see Paul Pieper, ed., Pietàs: Norddeutsche und italienischen Tafel-
bilder aus dem 15. Jahrhundert (Münster: Aschendorff, 1986). 102–36, figure at 120. Cf. Krause, Holbein der Ältere, 378 n. 16, who notes the rarity of a blas-
pheming figure placed stage left in a Calvary; also Roth, Volksbereiche Kalvatur, 1014.


42. John of Caulibus, Meditations, 254 (no. 78, meditations for Sext and None). See also James H. Morrow, Passion Iconography in Northern Euro-
pean Art of the Late Middle Ages and Early Renaissance (Kortrijk, Belg.: Van Ghentum, 1979), 40–41.

43. Clearly derogatory in this context, the Judenhat was used by local Jewish councils in the Middle Ages as an official insignia, sometimes combined with imperial symbols, as in Augsburg, where the city’s double-headed eagle (Doppeltoter) was used in combination with the hat by the Jewish council of elders; Israel Schwarz, Steinerne Zeugnisse jüdischen Lebens in Bayern: Eine Dokumentation, 2nd ed. (Munich: Bayerische Landeszentrale für politische Bildungswerk, 1992), 244. Kempten bei Allgäu was home to a Jewish community until 1938.

44. Melkínnótt, Outcasts, vol. 2, figs. VIII.24, IX.5, overlooked this ugly fellow, yet precursors and comparanda can be found in sufficient numbers there that any argument one might like to make here about his place in our archives of historized hatreds would be an empty exercise.


46. Melkínnótt, Outcasts, vol. 2, figs. VIII.24, IX.5, overlooked this ugly fellow, yet precursors and comparanda can be found in sufficient numbers there that any argument one might like to make here about his place in our archives of historized hatreds would be an empty exercise.

47. See Strickland, Saracens, Demons, & Jews, esp. 137–40, 175–82; and Lieselotte E. Saarm-Jeltsch, ”Müslime im Bild des Spätmittelalters: Unterschiedliche Blicke auf die ‘Anderen,’” in Wechselwirkende Wahrnehmungen der...
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On Orientalizing military garb, see Hafez, Artists and Warfare, 253–65.

53. As in the 1583 encounter between the Bolognese physician and naturalist Ulisse Aldrovandi (1522–1605) and the hircine Göttingen family, then residing at the Gonzaga court in Parma, or Lavinta Fontana’s portraits of Tognina Gonzalez, cases illuminated in Frederika H. Jacobs, The Loving Image in Renaissance Art (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 136–46.


55. In particular: a) the twelve surviving panels of the Grey Passion now in Stuttgart (original provenance unknown, dated to stylistic evidence to the years after Holbein’s return from Ulm to Augsburg in 1494); b) the seven surviving large panels and the multiscene predella from an altar made for Frankfurt’s Dominican church (completed 1591), now in the Stadelsches Kunstinstitut, Frankfurt; and c) the Kaishme altarpiece (signed and dated 1502 on the exterior of the wings). For all three projects, see Kneusel, Holbein der Ältere, 113–89. In the Grey Passion’s scene of the Arrest of Christ, Jesus is accosted by a leonine Judas with a mopey expression, a profile that bears comparison with Burgkmair’s ugly sol- dier in Augsburg—though Holbein’s caricature is itself based on established stereotypes; see Willfried Franzen, Die Karlsruher Passion und das Diekte der Sammlung Thyssen-Bornemisza, “Between Artistry and Documentation.”

56. See David G. Carter, “Reflections in Armor in the Canon Van de Paele Madonna,” Art Bulletin 36, no. 1 (March 1954): 60–62; and Preimes- berger, “Zu Jan van Eycks Dyptichon,” 473, 483–84, who considers the multiplying metallic reflections here and elsewhere in van Eyck’s oeuvre a response to a topos found in Seneca and Pliny (472–75). A later example from Antwerp, more relevant to our theme, is the Ecce Homo by Quinten Massys (ca. 1515, Museo del Prado, Madrid), in which the polished helmet of one tormentor on the proscenium near Christ stands in for the Eyckian convex mirror.

57. As in the logo attached to the all-seeing divine eye at the center of Hier- ony whole Jost’s Ecce Homo, published in Kühn’s Antitrinitarianism in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century, ed. Ulisse Aldrovandi, quoted and discussed in Jacobs, Living Image, 151.

58. As in the logo attached to the all-seeing divine eye at the center of Hier- ony whole Jost’s Ecce Homo, published in Kühn’s Antitrinitarianism in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century, ed. Ulisse Aldrovandi, quoted and discussed in Jacobs, Living Image, 151.

59. As in the logo attached to the all-seeing divine eye at the center of Hier- ony whole Jost’s Ecce Homo, published in Kühn’s Antitrinitarianism in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century, ed. Ulisse Aldrovandi, quoted and discussed in Jacobs, Living Image, 151.

60. For theEyckian convex mirror.

61. As in the logo attached to the all-seeing divine eye at the center of Hier- ony whole Jost’s Ecce Homo, published in Kühn’s Antitrinitarianism in the Second Half of the Sixteenth Century, ed. Ulisse Aldrovandi, quoted and discussed in Jacobs, Living Image, 151.
Allegory and Mirror: Tradition and Structure in Middle English Literature

66. Folio 1r is preceded by a full-page miniature (fol. 1v) depicting the Fall and Expulsion from Paradise; see Otto Pacht, “René d’Anjou—Studien I,” Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Kunstsammlungen Wien 69 (1973): 85–126, at 89–90; Marrow, “In desen speigell,” 156–57, fig. 2; and idem, Pictorial Invention in Netherlandish Manuscript Illumination of the Late Middle Ages: The Play of Illusion and Meaning, ed. Brigitte Dekeyzer and Jan van der Stock (Paris: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2005), 27–28, fgs. 68, 69, where the artist is identified as the Master of the David Scenes of the Grimani Breviary. See also Belting and Kruse, Erfindung des Bildes, 75–76.


80. See Todd M. Richardson, “To See Yourself within It: Pieter Bruegel the Elder’s Nobody and the Ambivalence of Medieval Drama,” 181–82.

82. This is among the eighty-two drawings made by Hans (79) and his brother Ambrosius (5) for Myconius’s book; see Erika Michael, The Drawings by Hans Holbein the Younger for Erasmus’s “Praise of Folly” (New York: Garland, 1986), pl. XIII, as discussed in “drawing 13” (71–73, at 75), and for a fundamental discussion of Erasmus’s and Holbein’s sources, 249–49.


89. Translation from Gerta Calmann, “The Picture of Nobody,” Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 23, nos. 1–2 (January–June 1960): 60–104, at 92. Such examples could be multiplied; cf. Andrea Alciati’s epigram of 1549 (designed to illustrate the figure of the misguided youth), which claims blindness as the consequence of self-love: “It is a flaw and lack of judgment to love oneself. Such love has driven many men to blindness, because, abandoning the ancient ways, they only desire to follow their fantasies”; quoted and discussed in Jacobs, Living Image, 149.


99. This panel was detached from the San Paolo panel at an undetermined time before 1628, when it was relocated to Augsburg from the Oettingen-Wallerstein collection; Goldberg et al., Alte deutsche Gemälde Katalog, 129–38; Gisela Goldberg, “Zum Zyklus der Augsburger Basilikabilder,” 627–31. Falk, “In the mirror the form of us both was nothing but this.”

104. By the Ulm Master, ca. 1460–70, divided by Ernst Buchner, Das deutsche Bildnis der Spätgotik und der frühen Dürerzeit (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1953), 173–75, cat. no. 197, where the painter is called the “Meister der Aachener Schranktaler und der englischen Literatur des 13. bis 17. Jahrhunderts (Jena: Niemeyer, 1975); also discussed in Göttler, Lost Things, 168–69.

112. See also Belting and Kruse, Erfindung des Bildes, 75–76.

183. Jacobus de Voragine, Golden Legend, 627–31. Falk, Hans Burgkmair, 34, calls attention to unusual elements of the Ursula legend, which Burgkmair drew instead from Elizabeth of Schonau’s Liber revelationum, undoubtedly at the behest of his patron.


202. This panel was detached from the San Paolo panel at an undetermined time before 1628, when it was relocated to Augsburg from the Oettingen-Wallerstein collection; Goldberg et al., Alte deutsche Gemälde Katalog, 129–38; Gisela Goldberg, “Zum Zyklus der Augsburger Basilikabilder,” 627–31. Falk, “In the mirror the form of us both was nothing but this.”

221. By the Ulm Master, ca. 1460–70, divided by Ernst Buchner, Das deutsche Bildnis der Spätgotik und der frühen Dürerzeit (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1953), 173–75, cat. no. 197, where the painter is called the “Meister der Aachener Schranktaler und der englischen Literatur des 13. bis 17. Jahrhunderts (Jena: Niemeyer, 1975); also discussed in Göttler, Lost Things, 168–69.

290. This phrase is repeated many times in the works of the period, especially in the Baselica Cycle.

333. By the Ulm Master, ca. 1460–70, divided by Ernst Buchner, Das deutsche Bildnis der Spätgotik und der frühen Dürerzeit (Berlin: Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft, 1953), 173–75, cat. no. 197, where the painter is called the “Meister der Aachener Schranktaler und der englischen Literatur des 13. bis 17. Jahrhunderts (Jena: Niemeyer, 1975); also discussed in Göttler, Lost Things, 168–69.
105. For example, the Holy Land fresco painted by Gumpold Gtitinger in 1495 for the refectory of Sts. Ulrich and Afra, which reportedly included a view of Jerusalem and other sites in Palestine; see Krause, Holbein d. A., 37; and Gätter, Römische Basiliken, 22, both with references.

106. For centrally planned Gothic chapter houses as sites of commemorative, liturgical, and disciplinary rituals, see Sieglinde Bonde and Clark Maines, *Monastic Struggle and Ritual Resolution: Centrality and Community in the Gothic Chapter Room,* in Saint-Jean-des-Vignes in Soissons: Approaches to Its Architecture, Archeology and History (Tournai: Brepols, 2008), 292–92; for late medieval convenants specifi-

107. This confirms the arrangement first proposed by Falk, *Hans Burschmair,* 27–28; see Gätter, Römische Basiliken, 37–38, fig. 10; also discussed in Krause, Holbein d. A., 290, who bases her reconstruction directly on Falk (Krause’s and Gätter’s books were both published in 2002).

108. Only two of the original, double-sided wing panels, each of them since sown apart for a total of four paintings, survive in late Augsburg (Staatgalerie Alte Deutsche Malerei in the Katharinenkirche, inv. nos. 5296, 5297, 5364, 5365); see Norbert Lieb and Alfred Stange, *Hans Holbein der Ältere* (n.p.: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1960), cat. no. 35, 102–105; Goldberg et al., *Alte Deutsche Gemälde Katalog,* 82–82; Krause, Holbein d. A., 290, 257ff., 154–56; and Schawe, Staatgalerie Augsburg, 85–85.


110. San Pietro = Gethsemane / San Lorenzo e Sebastiano = Arrest / San Giovanni = Flagellation / San Paolo = Crowning and Mocking / Santa Croce = Crucifixion. The exception is Holbein’s Santa Maria Maggiore, which features the Coronation of the Virgin in the apex.

111. Lieb and Stange, *Hans Holbein, no. 14; Goldberg et al., Alte Deutsche Gemälde Katalog, 60–61 (with older literature); Krause, Holbein d. A., 140–41; Schawe, Staatgalerie Augsburg, 83; and Wiemann, Hans Holbein d. A., 260–63, cat. no. 52. Preserved in Basel (Kunstmuseum, Kupferstichkabinett, inv. no. U.1.17) is a pen, ink, and wash drawing prepared sometime after 1500, presumably to document the commission; see Wiemann, *Hans Holbein d. A.,* 300, cat. no. 66.


117. Massing, *Burkmair's Depiction,* sketches the expanding network of associates from whom Burkmair received ethnographic information, drawings, and even artifacts associated with the non-European peoples he would portray in woodcut; see also Leitch, *Mapping Ethnography.* However, everything we can document about these activities postdates the commissions at the Katharinenkloster.

118. For documentation on Bouts’s Descent from the Cross altarpiece, see n. 5 above. The symbolic importance of the “Jewish witness” figure, which emerges as an identifiable type in the twelfth century, is expertly traced and historicized in Sara Lipton, *Unfeigned Witness: Jews, Matter, and Vision in Twelfth-Century Christian Art,* in Kesseler and Nirenberg, *Judaism and Christian Art,* 45–75.
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