

ART HISTORY - The Future is Now : Studies in Honor of Professor Vladimir P. Goss

Edited book / Urednička knjiga

Publication status / Verzija rada: **Published version / Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)**

Publication year / Godina izdavanja: **2012**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:186:112791>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-11-21**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences - FHSSRI Repository](#)



ART HISTORY
THE FUTURE IS NOW



V. Goss
24.5.2010.

Studies in Honor of Professor Vladimir P. Goss
<html format>

ART HISTORY – THE FUTURE IS NOW
Studies in Honor of Professor Vladimir P. Goss

< pdf. format >

Title

Art History – the Future is Now. Studies in Honor of Professor Vladimir P. Goss

Publisher

Rijeka: Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

For the publisher

Predrag Šustar

Editors

Maja Cepetić

Danko Dujmović

Vjekoslav Jukić

Aleksandra Nikoloska

Proofreaders

Višnja Bedenko

Aleksandra Nikoloska

Mario Zaccaria

Recension

Vesna Mikić

Ivan Mirnik

Design and text preparation

Maja Cepetić, Danko Dujmović, Vjekoslav Jukić

Cover

Anton Cetin: Portret Vladimira P. Gossa, 2010.

(pencil on paper)

Cover design

Igor Sloković

Technical support

Marin Rogić

URL: www.romanika.net/art-history-the-future-is-now-studies-in-honor-of-professor-vladimir-p-goss/

Vesion 1.0

Publishing date: 12th November 2012

ISBN: 978-953-6104-90-1

Copyright © by the publisher and contributors.

Art History – the Future is Now

Studies in Honor of Professor Vladimir P. Goss



Rijeka, 2012.

Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	10
-----------------------	----

Vjekoslav Jukić

Vladimir P. Goss – A Sketch for Biography and Bibliography	12
--	----

The Masters and Their Heirs Apparent

Radoslav Katičić

Whiffs of Northern Fog under the Clear Mediterranean Sun	26
--	----

Vitomir Belaj

Cum Adi in Campo	38
------------------------	----

Vladimir Crnković

Pismo starom prijatelju ili pohvala jednoj pasiji /Letter to an Old Friend or In Praise of a Passion/	52
--	----

Ante Rendić-Miočević

Uz tragove carskog kulta u Sisciji. Fragmentarni mramorni portret Septimija Severa iz Siska i njegovo značenje u odnosu na stanje u Sisciji u doba Severa /The Traces of Imperial Cult in Siscia. A Fragmented Marble Portrait of Septimius Severus from Sisak and Its Importance with Reference to the Situation in the Severan Siscia/	62
--	----

Vlasta Begović, Ivana Schrunk

La chiesa di Santa Maria e castellum sulle isole Brioni	88
---	----

Nurith Kenaan-Kedar

Sculpted Palmyrian Funerary Female Portraits with Extensive Jewelry Sets: A Revisionist Reading of Their Meanings and Impact	108
---	-----

Martin Vančo

Research Methodology of Great Moravian Architecture	122
---	-----

Marina Vicelja-Matijašić

Symbolism of Light in Early Byzantine Art	142
---	-----

Arturo Calzona	
Alcune note sulla cronologia del battistero di Parma e la possibile presenza di Radovan tra i maestri della bottega antelamica	158
Gaetano Curzi	
Terra e potere. La porta bronzea di San Clemente a Casauria e il suo contesto	176
Christine B. Verzar	
Reflections on Some Italian Gothic Heads: From Original Context to Museum Collection	190
Klára Benešová	
Un capitolo nascosto della “rinascita romanica” nelle Terre boeme del XII secolo	198
Béla Zsolt Szakács	
Santo Stefano Rotondo through the Glasses of the Renaissance – and without Them	216

Young Lions

Aleksandra Nikoloska	
The Art and Cult of Cybele from the Northern Vardar Valley	260
Laura Chinellato	
I marmi altomedievali del Museo Cristiano di Cividale del Friuli. Dai caratteri del rilievo alla committenza	276
Michele Luigi Vescovi	
The ‘Westernization’ of an Image: The Fast of St Nicolas and the Monastic Connection	300
Emanuela Elba	
Oltreadriatico. Modelli figurativi e temi iconografici della “Riforma Gregoriana” in Dalmazia	314
Giorgio Milanese	
Tra storia del collezionismo e storia dell'arte: la tavola di Sant'Agata di Cremona e l'area Adriatica	330
Maja Cepetić	
Chapel of St Peter in Novo Mesto Zelinsko: Proposal for the Reconstruction of the Romanesque Rose Window	346

Ivana Peškan, Vesna Pascuttini-Juraga
Mystical Stone Figures from the Middle Ages in Northern Croatia 356

Tea Gudek Šnajdar
Did Counts of Cilli Own Veliki Tabor? 370

Danko Dujmović
An Introduction to Cultural Landscape 392

Final thoughts

Vladimir P. Goss
A Brief Note on the Present and Future of Art and Its History 412

Vitae auctorum 424

Foreword

Art History – the Future is Now!

The Editorial Board proudly presents the *Art History – the Future is Now*, Studies in Honor of Professor Vladimir Peter Goss celebrating his 70th birthday, 45 years of publication, and 40 years of university teaching.

In order to make it happen we have proposed a somewhat unusual volume of studies. The volume was publicly announced but we have made also a special effort to involve Professor Goss' life long friends, colleagues, and project associates, people who have known him well, and could speak with authority of their experiences. In addition to the Masters and their Heirs-Apparent, we were able to attract a number of “the young lions,” promising young scholars who passed through Goss' orbit getting to know in the process the spirit of inquisitiveness and curiosity Goss has never lacked. The contributors were free to select any scholarly topic provided that the resulting paper be not just an ordinary study of an art object, a problem, or a style, but a contribution to the issue in a novel, bold, “unusual” way. Of course, the simplest and most innocuous topic may hide a sting of a most ardent controversy and the genius of originality. The rich handful of essays which we are publishing here has fallen very much in line with our expectation.

The structure of the volume reflects our editorial intentions. The first section represents contributions by the Masters and their Heirs Apparent, the second by the Young Lions. The authors come from Austria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Macedonia, Slovakia, US (9 countries, 3 continents), the themes range from Classical Antiquity to the Modern Times. Among the authors there are Archeologists, Art Historians, Cultural Anthropologists, Linguists, reflecting Professor Goss' true interdisciplinary orientation – of looking for the best in related fields. They are University teachers, Preservation and Restoration of Monuments experts, Museum specialist, Research scholars, Art Management specialists, ranging from members of Academies to doctoral students.

Among the papers there is also a survey of Professor Goss' career and bibliography by Vjekoslav Jukić, and a paper on the current state in Art History by Professor Goss himself.

VLADIMIR P. GOSS – A SKETCH FOR BIOGRAPHY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

VJEKOSLAV JUKIĆ

Full biography and bibliography of Vladimir Peter Goss.

Vladimir Peter Goss/Vladimir Gvozdanović was born on January 3, 1942 in Zagreb - Croatia. One of his grandfathers, Eisenstaedter-Gvozdanović was a Jew from Gradišće-Burgenland, the other – Sekulić – an offspring of the Szekelys, Transylvanian remains of the Huns; one grandmother – Tymczyszyn – was half Polish, half Ukraninian, born in Srebrenica, the other one was from Lika (Croatian Highlands), but with a suspiciously Hungarian name – Petaj. Vladimir Goss, like the majority of the Croats, was born multiethnic and multicultural.

He went to the Classical Gymnasium of Zagreb, to later add to the Classical heritage the keen interest in the Middle Ages while at the University of Zagreb studying English language and Literature (B.A. 1965) and Art History (B.A. 1966, M.A. 1968), and Cornell University (Ph.D. 1972). He never abandoned an equally keen interest for the contemporary art as proven by numerous exhibitions of modern artists which he organized, wrote catalogues and exhibition guides for, and inaugurated.

Thirty years of his life (1969-1999) he spent in the U.S. (University of Michigan, University of North Carolina), with a break in 1979 (University of Tel Aviv).

Like many of his countryman Vladimir Goss was a traveler in space and spirit.

From 1991 through 1999 he was a U.S. correspondent of the then biggest Croatian daily, *Večernji list*. Throughout his life he wrote thousands of newspaper and journalist articles. As his contribution to Croatia's Liberation War, Goss was the Head of the Public Relations Department of the National Federation of Croatian Americans, in fact a Secretary of State for a small nation of some 2.500.000 people which was key to the American recognition of Croatia. For this he received the Order of the Croatian Interlace of the Republic of Croatia.

Goss is the author of six novels, two political chronicles, two collections of stories and some additional 50 short stories published in various collections, literary journals, weeklies and dailies.

Like many of his countryman Goss had more than one career, and switched in and out as forced and needed. Scholar, writer, critic, journalist, warrior.

Shall we say, all in all, a typical Croatian predicament.

From the earliest days of his scholarly research Vladimir P. Goss has sought to open new fields, and question or re-open those which had been believed to have been closed. And he ceaselessly shared his insights with his students. His approach has always been accompanied by a strict adherence to the best principles of scholarly research, by a profound knowledge of the history of a particular research topic and, its bibliography, by a methodological stand that hypothesis is just that and it should never be mistaken for a fact; and, maybe more than anything else, by respect and love for the work of art and the art phenomenon in general.

Many of Goss's proposals were at first summarily dismissed by standard art history to become, in a few decades, public intellectual property. Or else, they were simply disregarded by the official scholarship, lest they should be proven right by challenge and discussion. The vicissitudes of Goss's theses illustrate very well his stance that in "Art History the future is now," and, "I only deal in facts. If someone could prove to me that thousands of art works do not look as they do, I will promptly renounce my ideas".

Having extensively dealt with the Pre-Romanesque and Romanesque art, primarily architecture and sculpture, and the phenomenon of the rural Romanesque and its spread throughout Europe, in the last decade Goss has been developing a totally new field of research, that of "cultural landscape" meaning a segment of "cultural ecology" which embodies both palpable and spiritual elements of a certain cultural space, time and/or group, offering an integrated view of the Art (not arts) requiring an integrated, multidisciplinary approach. Stating that "no one even knows his own field well enough, so how can an individual be interdisciplinary," Goss has developed close cooperation with a number of outstanding cultural anthropologists, linguists, and archeologists. Maybe thanks to this attitude the reception of more recent among his ideas seems to be quicker and wider (as testified, for example, by Professor Katičić's wonderful article in this volume), leading to a reconsideration of the old issues such as the Mediterranean versus the North, the Romans versus the Barbarians, or the lost art and architecture in wood, all in need of an urgent reappraisal in a United Europe; which cannot maintain any longer its elitist and exclusivist Western Europe Only view of the European culture. The future seems to arrive faster these days; maybe one day it would really be happening *NOW*.

What interests us in this brief survey of Goss's bibliography is his scholarly output – books authored, co-authored, edited, and scholarly articles in journals and proceedings. We will leave out hundreds of his professional contributions – critical reviews, essays, comments, exhibition guides, biographic sketches, etc.

We divide the Goss opus as follows:

1. Pre-Romanesque and Romanesque Architecture;
2. Pannonia Medievalis and Rural Romanesque;
3. Syntheses and methodology;
4. East-West, *Materia Orientalis*, Crusades;
5. Romanesque Sculpture;
6. Slavica and Cultural Landscape;
7. Renaissance and Modern.

No classification is perfect. There are always overlaps, and some items could be listed in more than one group. But what unites the entire opus is a bend toward theory and methodology in general. In each group the books are listed first, then the articles and book chapters.

1. Pre-Romanesque and Romanesque Architecture.

This is definitely Goss' first love, and a red line running through his work, from his first book on the topic in 1969, his Dissertation at Cornell in 1971, through the classic and still widely quoted "The Southeastern Border of Carolingian Architecture," up to its *pendant* "The Southeastern Border of Carolingian Architecture Revisited" in 2010, and his chapter on the Pre-Romanesque and Romanesque in the first comprehensive history of art in Croatia – *Hrvatska umjetnost: povijest i spomenici*. Mark also his key theoretical contribution to defining the Pre-Romanesque and Romanesque styles ("Is there a Pre-Romanesque Style in Architecture"?, 1982).

Hrvatska umjetnost: povijest i spomenici (Croatian art: History and Monuments), co-author and co-editor, chapters on the Pre-Romanesque and Romanesque, Zagreb, IPU and Školska knjiga, 2010, 67 – 118.

Predromanička arhitektura u Hrvatskoj – Pre-Romanesque Architecture in Croatia, Zagreb: Art Studio Azinović, 2006

Predromanička arhitektura u Hrvatskoj – Pre-Romanesque Architecture in Croatia, Zagreb: Architectonica Croatica, 1996.

Early Croatian Architecture, London: Duckworth, 1987.

Prilozi proučavanju starohrvatske arhitekture (A Contribution to the Study of Early Croatian Architecture), Split: JAZU, 1978. (one of the authors).

- Starohrvatska arhitektura* (Early Croatian Architecture), Zagreb: DAH, 1969.
- “The 'Croatian Westwork' revisited” in *Ars* 43 (2010), 3 - 23.
- “The 8th ct. in the Eastern Adriatic – Facts and Fiction” in *L'VIII secolo: un secolo inquieto*, Valentino Pace, ed., Cividale del Friuli, Commune di Cividale del Friuli, 2010, 213 – 218
- “Predromanika i romanika” (Pre-Romanesque and Romanesque) in *Slavonija, Baranja i Srijem – vrela europske civilizacije*, vol. 1, Rasprave, Exhibition Catalogue, Branka Šulc and Vesna Kusin, eds., Zagreb, Klovićevi dvori 2009, 286 - 293.
- “What Josef Strzygowski did not Know” in *Immagine e Ideologia – Studi in onore di Arturo Carlo Quintavalle*, Parma, Electa, 2007, 583 - 593.
- “Josef Strzygowski and Early Medieval Art in Croatia” in *Acta historiae artium* 47 (2006), 335 - 343.
- “Croatian Art and the West: A Venerable Witness Recalled” in *European Integration for the 21st Century*, Symposium Proceedings, Vlado Šakić, and Ljiljana Kaliterna Lipovčan, eds., Zagreb: Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, 2001, 151 - 156.
- “Is there a Pre-Romanesque Style in Architecture” in *Persitil* 25 (1982), 33 - 51.
- “Carolingian and Ottonian Influences on the Monumental Sculpture and Painting of the Eastern Adriatic” in *Journal of Croatian Studies* 22 (1981), 3 - 48.
- “The South-Eastern Border of Carolingian Architecture” in *Cahiers archeologiques* 27 (1978), 85 - 100.
- “The Beginnings of the Romanesque Architecture in Croatia” in *Journal of Croatian Studies* 18/19 (1977/78), 3 - 73.
- “Two Early Croatian Royal Mausolea” in *Peristil* 18/19 (1975/76), 5 - 10.
- “O nekim oblikovnim principima starohrvatske umjetnosti” (About some formative principles of early Croatian art) in *Arhitektura* 99/100 (1969), 51 - 56.

2. Pannonia Medevalis and Rural Romanesque

Goss has definitely been a pioneer in the study of the earlier phases of medieval art in southwestern Pannonia, and related to that made epoch making discoveries concerning the qualities and spread of the rural Romanesque. The theme, linked to field work, appears in force in his early works, and even more prominently after 2000, linked to the project *The Romanesque in Between the*

Sava and the Drava and the Medieval Culture, which he conducted from 2003 through 2012. Note also the first, albeit brief, monograph of the key Slavonian site, Rudina.

Rudina, Split, MHAS, 2010

Stotinu kamenčića izgubljenog raja, (a Hundred Stones from a Lost Paradise) Catalogue Exhibition, Introduction, Zagreb: Archeological Museum, 2007.

“Note on the rose window in Čazma and on the presence of the royal workshops in Medieval Slavonia” in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/37 (2010), 183 - 192 (with Maja Cepetić).

“Fragment romaničke skulpture u Muzeju Sv. Ivan Zelina,” (Fragment of Romanesque sculpture at the Museum in St Ivan Zelina), in *Sv. Ivan Zelina. Povijest i kultura*, Ante Gulin, ed., Zagreb - Sv. Ivan Zelina: HAZU 2010, 7 - 14 (with Vjekoslav Jukić).

“A Note on Some Pre-Roman Sources of Medieval Art in Slavonia” in *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 33 (2009), 7 - 16.

“Hilltop Settlements in Medieval Slavonia” in *Histria Antiqua* 18/2 (2009), 321 - 330.

“Templari i kulturni pejzaž zelinskog Prigorja” (Templar and cultural landscape of Zelina foothills) in *Templari i njihovo naslijeđe*, Exhibition Catalogue, Mladen Houška, ed., Sv. Ivan Zelina: Muzej Sv. Ivan Zelina 2009, 30 - 39.

“Predgovor,” (Preface) in Mladen Houška, and Romana Mačković, *Zelinski kraj kroz prošlost*, Sv. Ivan Zelina: Muzej Sv. Ivan Zelina, 2007, 5.

“Renesansa 12. stoljeća i Hrvatska,” (Renaissance of the 12th century and Croatia) in *Renesansa i renesanse u umjetnosti Hrvatske*. Zagreb: IPU, 2008, 417-426.

“Medvedgrad – Ocsa – Spiš – Some Stylistic Considerations” in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/34 (2007), 295 - 307 (with Vjekoslav Jukić).

“Okrugli toranj?,” (The Round tower?) in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/34 (2007), 491 - 493.

“A Note on Some Churches with Rectangular Sanctuary in Medieval Slavonia” in *Peristil* 50 (2007), 21 - 40 (with Nina Šepić).

“Rural Romanesque and a Europe without Borders – The Case of St. Mark's Church in Vinica” in *Hortus artium medievalium* 14 (2008), 133 - 140 (with Vjekoslav Jukić).

“Oriental Presence and Medieval Art in Croatian Pannonia” in *Il Medioevo mediterraneo*, Parma, Electa, 2007, 447 - 455.

- “The Battle of Cathedrals: or how Zagreb almost Became an Archbishopric in the 13th century” in *Medioevo: L’Europa delle Cattedrali*, Parma, Electa, 2007, 146 - 154.
- “The Church and the Palace in the Southern Section of Pannonia between the 9th and the 13th century” in *Medioevo: La chiesa e il palazzo*, Parma, Electa, 2007, 136 - 141.
- “Bishop Stjepan II and Herceg Koloman and the Beginnings of the Gothic in Croatia” in *Hortus artium medievalium* 13/1 (2007), 51 - 63.
- “Some Observations on the Chapel at Medvedgrad” in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/33 (2006), 165 - 186 (with Marina Vicelja).
- “Elephant from Bjelovar” in *Peristil* 49(2006), 19 - 25 (with Marina Vicelja).
- “Gorjanskis and Horvats – Passage at Arms, Passage at Arts” in *Sigismund von Luxemburg, Ein Kaiser in Europa*, Mainz 2006.
- “Two Models of Romanesque Territorial Organization in Continental Croatia” in *Hortus artium medievalium*, 12 (2006), 221 - 228.
- “A Reemerging World – Prolegomena to an Introduction to Earlier Medieval Art Between the Sava and the Drava Rivers” in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/32 (2006), 91 - 112.
- “Kamen iz Križovljana nakon kamena iz Belca” (Stone from Križovljan after stone from Belec) in *Prilozi Instituta za Arheologiju*, 22 (2005), 187 - 198.
- “Fragments from Daruvar in the City Museum in Bjelovar – Framework for Investigation” in *Peristil* 48 (2005), 19 – 32 (with Marina Vicelja).
- “Uvodno o Kamenu iz Belca” (Introductory of a Stone from Belec) in *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu* 21 (2004), 223 - 228.
- “Sv. Marija u Bapskoj – ponovo nakon trideset i pet godina” (St Mary of Bapska Revisited After Thirty-Five Years) in *Peristil* 47 (2004), 5 - 14.
- “Crkva sv. Bartola u Novim Mikanovcima – romanika između Save i Drave i europska kultura,” (Church of St Bartholomew in Novi Mikanovci - Romanesque between the Sava and the Drava river and European Culture) in *Peristil* 46 (2003), 5 - 12.
- “Lobor – Klokoč – Morović – Prilog razmatranju karolinške prisutnosti u predromanici kontinentalne Hrvatske” (A Contribution to Carolingian Art in Continental Croatia) in *Marasovićev zbornik*, Split, 2003, 194 - 198.

- “Moravia’s History Reconsidered, the Tomb of St. Methodius and the Church of Our Lady at Morović” in *East European Quarterly* 16 (1980), 487 - 498 (Delta Tau Kappa Award).
- “The Romanesque Type of Fortifications in the Central Part of Croatia” in *Bulletin – Institut International des Chateaux Historiques* 28 (1970/76), 51 - 72.
- “Sv. Dimitrije u Brodskom Drenovcu” (St Dimitri in Brodski Drenovac) in *Vjesnik Arheološkog Muzeja u Zagrebu*, serija 3, 5 (1971), 211 - 222.
- “Stari gradovi i gradine u zagrebačkoj regiji” (The Old Castles of the Zagreb Region) in *Arhitektura* 109-110 (1971), 5 - 11 (with Sena Sekulić-Gvozdanović).
- “Vrijednost romaničke arhitekture u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj i kapela Sv. Marije u Bapskoj” (Romanesque Architecture in Continental Croatia and the Chapel of St Mary at Bapska) in *Arhitektura* 106 (1970), 64 - 68.
- “Crkva Majke Božje u Moroviću” (The Church of Our Lady in Morović) in *Peristil* 12/13 (1969/70), 15 - 22.
- “Stari grad Vitunj u Modruškoj županiji” (The Castle of Vitunj in the County of Modruš) in *Peristil* 10/11 (1967/68), 46 - 54 (with Sena Sekulić-Gvozdanović).
- “O starim gradovima u Hrvatskoj” (About Old Castles in Croatia) in *Arhitektura* 98/99 (1967), 85 - 90 (with Sena Sekulić-Gvozdanović).

3. Syntheses and Methodology.

There is hardly a Goss note that does not bear on theory and the method. Here we select the works which in particular emphasize this aspect of his work. The book from 2010, and the article in the *Melanges Barral* are, for the time being, the last on his view of what one may call theory and methodology of standard Art History.

Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti: 800.-1200. Pogled s jugoistoka. Four Centuries of European Art, 800-1200. View from Southeast, Zagreb, Golden Marketing, 2010.

“Against Written Sources? A Brief Essay on How not to recover the Past,” in R. Alcoy, D. Allios, M. A. Bilotta, L. Catalano, M. Gianandrea, V. Lucherini et G. Mallet, ed., *Le plaisir de l’art du Moyen Âge. Commande, production et réception de l’œuvre d’art. Mélanges en hommage à Xavier Barral i Altet*, Paris: Picard, 2012, 917 - 924.

- “A Pannonian’s Homage to Don Ante Skobalj” in *Studia mythologica slavica*, Supplement 4 (2011), 133 - 145.
- “Memories, Sources, Models” in *Medioevo: Immagine e memoria*, Parma, Electa 2009, 169 - 174.
- “Art Heritage in a Europe without Borders” in *Acta Historiae Artium*, XLIX, 2008, 242 - 246.
- “Monuments of Art as Historical Documents” in *Medioevo: arte e storia*, Parma, Electa, 2008, 458 - 461.
- “Monuments of Art History as Historical Documents” in *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju*, 24 (2007), 499 - 501.
- “Borders of Art History in a Europe without Borders” in *Ars* 40/2 (2007), 123 - 128.

4. East-West, Materia Orientalis, Crusades.

Although there may seem to be fewer items in this section, it represents another life long interest of V. P. Goss – the cultural exchange between the East and the West, to which are also linked the Renaissance of the 12th Century and the phenomenon of the Crusades, also reflected in his more recent interest in the Crusaders’ presence in the medieval Croatia.

- Meeting of the two Worlds*, Conference Proceedings (editor-in-chief, author of introduction, contributor), Kalamazoo: The Medieval Institute, 1986.
- Armenian Rugs*, Exhibition Catalogue (editor, preface author), Ann Arbor: The Museum of Art, 1983.
- An Armenian Treasury in Michigan*, Exhibition Catalogue (editor, co-author, preface author), Ann Arbor: The Museum of Art, 1983.
- “Military Orders Between the Sava and the Drava Rivers – Sculpture” in *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 30 (2006), 51 - 66.
- “East and West in Medieval Architecture,” Catalogue Chapter, Catalogue, *The Meeting of the Two Worlds*, The Museum of Art, University of Michigan, 1981.
- “The Twelfth Century Architecture of Aquitaine and the Cosmopolitan Character of the Occitan Culture” in *Peristil* 22 (1979), 37 - 46.

5. Romanesque Sculpture.

After Pre-Romanesque architecture possibly Goss' second most beloved theme – the rise of the monumental style in the Middle Ages, and its links with the atmosphere and the events presented in the previous section – the impact of the great medieval phenomena – heresy, the Crusades and the Investiture Contest, and their significance for the use of the Romanesque sculpture “as a public medium.” It is also important to note that much of his thinking derives from profound studies of the greatest among Croatia's medieval sculptors, Masters Radovan and Buvina.

“Radovan and Homer” in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, III/35, (2008), 123 - 132.

“Javna arhitektonska plastika i ‘zanimljiva’ vremena” (The public architectural plastic and 'interesting' time) in *Anali galerije Antuna Augustincica* 21/25 (2006), 73 - 79.

“The Altar – Relief of the Annunciation on the Tower of Split Cathedral” in *Hortus artium medievalium* 11 (2005), 251 - 254.

“Kulturni prostori Hrvatske i Bosne u zreloom srednjem vijeku: monumentalna umjetnost i dualistička hereza” (Cultural Landsacpe of Croatia and Bosnia in High Middle Ages) in *Pogled u Bosnu*, Zbornik Simpozija, Zagreb, 2003, 123 - 128.

“Master Radovan and the Drama of Medieval Church,” Conference Proceedings, *Per Raduanum 1240-1990*, Trogir, 1994, 131 - 136.

“Art and Politics in High Middle Ages – Heresy, Investiture Struggle, Crusades” in *L'art et artistes au Moyen-Age*, Conference Proceedings, Rennes, 1983, vol. 3. Paris 1990, 525 - 545.

“Miles Ensifer” in *Peristil* 30 (1987), 15 - 27.

“Romanesque Sculpture in Eastern Adriatic: Between the West and Byzantimu,” Conference Proceedings, *Romanico Mediopadano*, 1977, 176 - 192, Parma, 1983.

“Parma-Venice-Trogir: Peregrinations of a Thirteenth Century Adriatic Sculptor” in *Arte Veneta* 34 (1980), 26 - 40.

“Split Cathedral's Wooden Doors” in *Commentari* (1978/1982), 47 - 62.

“The Lunette of the Nativity at Trogir” in *Studies in Medieval Culture* 8/9 (1976), 85 - 98.

“Prilog problemu školovanja Majstora Radovana” (A Contribution to the Beginnings of Master Radovan) in *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 19 (1972), 41 - 46.

6. Slavica and Cultural Landscape.

The newest area of interest in the opus of V. P. Goss, logically growing from everything we have presented so far, was adumbrated, however, already by his master's thesis on the spatial organization of Vinodol in 1968. Here, as Professor Milan Pelc publicly stated in 2010 at the Congress of Croatian art Historians, “a new art history is coming into being.”

“Razbijanje porodičnog kristala” (Breaking of Family Crystal) in *Hrvatski identitet*, Romana Horvat, ed., Zagreb, Matica Hrvatska, 2011, 287 - 302.

“Jakob, Jelena, and Bogdin – Three miniatures on the Assigned Theme” in *Studia Mythologica Slavica* 13 (2010), 43 - 58.

“The Three-Header from Vaćani,” in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, III/36 (2009), 35 - 51.

“Some Very Old Sanctuaries and the Emergence of Zagreb's Cultural Landscape” in *Peristil* 52, (2009), 7 - 26 (with Tea Gudek).

“Landscape as History, Myth, and Art. An Art Historian’s View” in *Studia Ethnologica Croatica* 21, (2009), 133 - 166.

“Hiding in: Veles the Snake in the Landscape of Medieval Slavonia” in *Ikon* 2 (2008), 263 - 270.

“Two Saint Georges and the Earliest Slavic Cultural Landscape Between the Drava and the Sava Rivers” in *Peristil* 51, (2008), 7 - 28.

“Vinodolski teritorij i njegova prostorna organizacija” (Territorial Organization of Vindodol), *Zbornik Milana Preloga*, Zagreb, 1988/89, 90 - 95.

7. Renaissance and Modern.

Goss has made some important contributions to the Renaissance art, first of all to the early career of Francesco Laurana as a beginning of a never completed monograph (he said he honestly did not understand the issue well-enough to successfully deal with it), and to the issue of the sources of the art of Giorgio da Sebenico (Juraj Dalmatinac). In terms of modern art, he did important work, not just in terms of scholarship, on two leading Croatian diaspora painters, Marko Spalatin in the U.S., and Anton Cetin in Canada.

Marko Spalatin, A Retrospective Exhibition Catalogue, The Butler Institute of American Art, Youngstown, 1995, preface.

“The Dance of Death: Renaissance as Apocalypse” in *Journal of Croatian Studies* 31, (1990), 67 - 75.

“I due rilievi di Pietro da Milano e di Francesco Laurana nell’arco di Castelnuovo in Napoli” in *Napoli Nobilissima* 20 (1981), 102 - 113.

“The Schiavone in Vasari’s *Vita* of Brunelleschi” in *Commentari* 27 (1976), 18 - 32.

“The Dalmatian Works by Pietro da Milano and the Beginnings of Francesco Laurana” in *Arte Lombarda* 42/43 (1973), 113 - 223.

“Prilog radionici Nikola Firentinac-Andrija Aleši” (An Attribution to the Workshop of Nicholas of Florence and Andrija Aleši) in *Peristil* 10/11 (1967/68), 59 - 64.

There is a traceable pattern in the genesis of Goss’ contributions. First, there is usually a paper at a scholarly conference (or a session he chaired or organized), followed by a publication of a written text, an article or a chapter in a book/proceedings, then a book as a synthesis, and, not infrequently, elaboration in articles of some features of the synthesis. Goss was the chair, respondent or session organizer at 27 scholarly conferences and he delivered speeches at 52. Twice he was a key-note speaker. He spoke at the World Congresses in both Art History and Archeology. A number of publications linked to the most recent conference papers are pending.

His 2010 book *Four centuries of European Art* was inaugurated at five institutions of higher learning in Croatia, and also at the University of Parma, The Czech Academy of Arts and Sciences in Prague, the Association of Slovak Art Historians at Bratislava, and the Collegium Budapest in Budapest – as a half day workshop chaired by Xavier Barral i Altet, Erno Marosi, and Bela Szolt Szakacs.

Finally, it is necessary to say a few words about Vladimir Peter Goss as a teacher/boss. His scholarly work was always connected to young people. That was especially emphasized in last 10-15 years of Goss’ work when he was not just a university professor but he also gathered a number of colleagues around his project “The Romanesque between the Sava and the Drava River and European culture”.¹ Some of them (or better, some of us) were young people who become his assistants. But his effort and enthusiasm was spread even wider and he managed to implant love for medieval art and culture into numerous young people with whom he cooperated. No wonder that a term *Gossjugend* appear as reflection of his commitment to work with young scholars. He managed to connect the incompatible by encouraging young people to become open to new ideas and new disciplines, but also to respect each other. Because of him, we become attached to scholarship, but we also become good friends. I find lots of support in my young colleagues. We also learned a lot from different people and what is most important – we become a team of like-minded people with numerous different ideas about medieval art and culture.

Bearing in mind the purpose of this paper, firstly dedicated to Professor Goss’ bibliography and life, it may seem unusual to emphasize in the final paragraph Goss’ role as a teacher. But I consider it very important. Learning from experience, I am aware that it is not easy to become a

scholar. It is even harder to become a humanist (as professor Katičić already elucidated talking about Professor Goss in his paper in this volume). But the most difficult it is to discover and put together small pieces of our history and publish them so the whole world and the entire scholarly community may have use of them. Professor Goss definitely is an outstanding scholar. His bibliography (listed in this paper) is a palpable proof of that. But if someone manages to convince young people, scholars, and students in his/her scholarly ideas, and succeeds to evoke the glow in his students' eyes, he (or she) has succeeded in something even more important: in spreading humanism and good spirit among people. In my modest opinion, that is far more important than just spreading ideas. As I learned in philosophy classes at university, ideas are not eternal, but the spirit of humanism is.

I can only say that I am proud and happy because Professor Goss infected me with the spirit of humanism. As one of *Gossjugend* members, and a former assistant, it is my honor to say – I congratulate you, Professor Goss, not just on the first 70 years of your life, but also on your eternally young spirit.

¹ This project was financed by Ministry of Science, Education and Sport.

The Masters and Their Heirs Apparent

WHIFFS OF NORTHERN FOG UNDER THE CLEAR MEDITERRANEAN SUN

RADOSLAV KATIČIĆ

UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA

CROATIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS

I encountered Vladimir Goss relatively recently. First time in 1978 in Split, when a collection of studies on Early Croatian Architecture was published. Although he lived and worked in the USA since 1969 at that time he was still known as Vladimir Gvozdanović. His contribution to the Collection was entitled “The Importance of Early Croatian Architecture for the History of European Pre-Romanesque” (“Značaj starohrvatske arhitekture za opću povijest europske predromanike”). The title caught my attention because it suggested how our heritage should be addressed. I have never previously encountered such approach. The world, as well as we, should be aware that our culture is interesting because knowing about it makes all European culture easier to understand. It cannot be understood without previous knowledge and understanding of our culture. Relics of my youthful naïvete led me to believe that this is how the position of the Wide World towards our culture and cultural heritage can be influenced, how the World can be persuaded to encompass it into its *globus intellectualis*. I know now that truth and facts are of a secondary importance, that the World’s position is defined by short-sighted interests and convenience. This will go on as long as it is possible to be a great and respectful scholar in the field of early Medieval art and not be aware of Croatian pre-Romanesque art. In order to bring changes it seems that they will have to make their accounts even and start reproaching each other of ignorance when they lack any knowledge of it. In this we have no influence, which clearly demonstrates that we are still not part of the Wide World. This has yet to be reached by conducting research of our own heritage and presenting it in its entire relevance to broader cultural areas where it actually belongs. Exactly what Vladimir Gvozdanović did in this fundamentally relevant Collection on Early Croatian Architecture? To be both tireless and unbending for our own sakes, to be adequate to our great heritage, to really live with it and allow it to enrich us, regardless of any short-term success among international cultural historians.

That is why I was immediately attracted to Vladimir Gvozdanović's contribution. I read it quickly and yet very carefully, and was delighted, because what was indicated in the title could be found in the text. The text made me finally aware of the diversity and multiple layers of our Pre-Romanesque architecture and the variety of historical circumstances that it reflects, of the *Westwerk* and its significance for the church itself regarding liturgical, religious, and political circumstances. Although I read quite a lot of relevant literature I was still ignorant about all this. From then on, although we did not meet in person, and I knew nothing about him, Vladimir Gvozdanović became part of my life. Only after mentioning his excellent contribution towards understanding our Pre-Romanesque architecture to some of my colleagues, my interlocutor said "He is the son of Sena Gvozdanović." This positioned him genealogically.

I encountered him again at the beginning of the eighties when working intensively on my *Litterarum studia*. He was unavoidable in literature dealing with Pre-Romanesque period. Only now his name was Goss, Vladimir Peter Goss, the name under which I know him today. However, the connection between the two names was obvious in the bibliography, and I was glad that there was no interruption of this valuable continuity. Numerous dilemmas regarding Pre-Romanesque times on Croatian cultural territory that I had were resolved by these new books. I continued even more to live in company of Vladimir Goss. He forwarded me an integral and logically image of the Pre-Romanesque; or, let us not be ashamed to say: early Croatian art, although also he taught me that this rightful name should neither be taken exclusively nor be used as an absolute discriminant. Since then I continued even more to live in company of Vladimir Peter Goss.

Another unexpected encounter occurred somewhere around that time, albeit a little later and in a completely different mood. During the gloomy and difficult days of Croatian liberation war Vladimir Goss was reporting from the United States of America for *Večernji list*. I followed of course everything that he wrote, since it was very close to me in spirit and sense. In those days, both painfully sublime and somber, his contributions acted psychotherapeutically. Vladimir Goss thus remained for me a ray of light in that darkness.

Finally we met in person. Not much acquainting was necessary because we already knew a lot about each other. There is a certain symbolic significance in the fact that we actually met in the library of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. Common interests brought us there. Our conversation was short and subdued, as befitting a reading room. I was glad to find out that he now was active in Croatia, teaching at the University of Rijeka, and was absolutely delighted to learn that he was researching art in the medieval Slavonia. He took a task which is equally difficult and important. There are not many monuments, at least not many that are registered and studied. Without it history of early Croatian culture is dispossessed of one arm. No Dalmatian riches can

make up for it. It was great to find out that Vladimir Goss is doing just that – filling the gap.

After that, publications came into view. Goss composed a mosaic of artistic jewels which he managed to find and recognize. Around the time that we met in person in 2007 the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb published a splendidly illustrated catalogue with an exceptional study: *Stotinu kamenčića izgubljenoga raja. Romanička skulptura u muzejima i zbirkama između Save i Drave* (*One Hundred Stones from the Lost Paradise. Romanesque Sculpture in the Museums and Collections between the Sava and the Drava River*). A whole new world of spirituality and art, which was misplaced and therefore denied to us, opened unexpectedly in front of us. Among them, due to its powerful sculptural expression, a special place belongs to Rudina, a monastery situated on wooded hill-sides of Psunj, and its “weird monks” mentioned by unforgettable and irreplaceable Matko Peić, who once again hit the target with his writing. Figural stone sculptures in the Benedictine monastery that may seem rough, but by their facial expressions are extremely spiritualized, reminding the author of this text, despite the cultural-historic squintness of experience of the prehistoric Lepenski Vir, giving this knowingly composed and very competently interpreted collection a strong seal of a major artistic creation.

I continued more and more to be in company of Vladimir Goss without the life bringing us closer. We were truly brought together only by Perun. And this is literally so. *Perun* is the name of a mountain peak on a southeastern slope of Učka, just above Mošćenice. It is also the name of the Slavic thunder god. The peak and the name were already known, and written about. However, since the great expectations of national romanticism in 19th century remained unfulfilled, and Vatroslav Jagić, with his enormous authority, not without reason, rejected results of all efforts to come forward in this area, a sort of depression suppressed these studies. No one really dared notice even obvious traces of old Slavic religion. Thus the name of thunderer god was barely noticed even on the Istrian peninsula, despite the necessity of pushing forward Slavic antiquity.

Perun in the vicinity of Split was even better known, but the treatment was similar. Another one is the *Perun* mountain above Vareš, giving its name to the local mountaineering club, but almost no one, and then only lately, was interested in the Slavic thunder god. Same applied to another *Perun*, a mountain in the southern part of Rama basin. Mokošica in Rijeka dubrovačka and Veles peninsula below Povile near Novi Vinodolski also attracted very little attention. All interest had faded away. Nobody dared pay any attention. It happens that those who dislike pointing out this antiquity and discovering such continuities accuse us, who are systematically and persistently researching it of covering the Croatian land with names of the Russian pagan gods, as if we had made up those place names. An atmosphere has been created where even such argumentation might become likely.

All this started to change only after Russian comparative linguists, the Indo-Europeanists Vjačeslav Vsevolodovič Ivanov and Vladimir Nikolajevič Toporov, after making their names by working on Indian, Hittite, Greek, and of course, Baltic and Slavic material, demonstrated and convincingly proved in numerous publications since the sixties of the 20th century that oral heritage of all Slavic nations comprises parts of pre-Christian religious poetry, re-shaped but nevertheless authentic. These fragments can be recognized, and by comparing them, ritual formulas that tell us about hidden mythical happenings and relations on which our world is based, as we experience it directly, can be reconstructed. Those that know these relations that are covert to the ordinary human being, and use correct wording and formulas, followed by right actions, will gain rule of that world. This is the sense of rituals and its hieratic poetry. Indian Brahmins are champions in developing and elaborating such ritual legend.

By means of oral literature, which was, due to relatively late Christianization and long duration of oral culture in the early middle ages, exceptionally rich and diversified in nations of Slavic tradition, a remarkable amount of pre-Christian ritual heritage, that has been transformed into other genres of oral literature: poetry, proverbs and especially riddles, fairytales, sayings and texts describing rites, remained preserved throughout the Christian era. Parts of sacred ancient chants can be recognized primarily because usually they do not fit completely into new textual structures where they have been placed, not to say hidden. Hidden so that the stern Mr. Reverend Parish Priest cannot easily see them for what they are.

Baltic (Lithuanian and Latvian) oral legends are no less rich in that aspect. Of all Indo-European legends they are the most related to the Slavic. Together they relay to us a non-negligible part of pre-Christian religious legend which was Indo-European and thus related to Germanic as preserved in the Icelandic Edda, the Indian and Iranian as preserved in the Veda and Avesta, to the Hellenic, where transformed remains can be recognized in the Homeric epic and in the tragedies. Hittite ritual texts that reached us carved in cuneiform script on hard clay tablets are also of importance. Comparing fragments of the same textual transmission in this frame allows us to somewhat reach even the Indo-European temporal level. Together with the Slavic, the Baltic represents just one offshoot of the indoeuropean oral legend, being extremely archaic due to historical circumstances, lasting unchanged for centuries, and therefore telling us very much about the primeval nature of Indo-European religious poetry and of the religious conception that it expressed.

Ivanov and Toporov pioneered, and were followed by Boris Aleksandrovič Uspenskij, who contributed remarkably to their research in another field on the same theme. A broad field opened to research. In the poetry of St George's festivities in northwestern Croatia and neighboring areas in

Slovenia the author of this text recognized important fragments of the ancient Slavic and pre-Christian ritual songs, where mythical happenings are being narrated and mythical relations displayed. There was room for going even further than Ivanov and Toporov, so since 1983 he started to work on the issue. After receiving acknowledgement at the International Congress of Slavic Studies in Sofia in 1998 he consistently continued his research and published the results. The results were broadened and enhanced by Vitomir Belaj adding the ethnological point of view. He on the other hand received additional incentive from the Slovenian archaeologist Andrej Pleterski. They were joined by Croatian ethnologist Goran Pavel Šantek. Thus the negative judgment on studying ancient Slavic religion lost its power, and the research started to blossom.

Besides having reconstructed Slavic pre-Christian ritual texts I also gave my full attention to traces of this ancient religion on Croatian territory. In the first place the names of ancient gods as place names. Thus valuable information about mountain *Perun*, on the maritime hillside of the Mosor above the river Žrnovnica, is mentioned in the 12th century Split decree. The name of the mountain itself tells us eloquently about our cultural landscape, because Perun, whose name probably testifies about the shrine of pre-Christian Slavs in a full view of the Diocletian's palace, cradle of Split, acknowledged as successor to Salona, is the most powerful pledge of the continuity of ancient heritage, the Christianity and literacy amidst *Sclavinias*, Slavic lands in the eastern Adriatic. Just this visual connection can be regarded as first rate monument that might also be exploited for tourist purposes. Here, in as much as the circumstances allowed, I started field research.

Although the research did not fail, the results would have remained very scarce due to my lack of strength, but just then matters did start moving on a broader plan. The first incentive came from Veseljko Velčić, who, himself being born in Mošćenice, presided over the Čakavski sabor chair for Mošćenička Draga. He observed the *Perun* mountain in the background of his *kaštel* and the impressive landscape on Učka heights in the vicinity of (mošćenički) Potok. His thinking ran across similar lines as when I was observing Mosor from Sustipan in Split. He was satisfied that it was a first-class cultural and historic monument, and represented an excellent basis for developing tourism. Being head of the local chair of the Čakavski sabor he initiated "historic trails" with attractive panels that inform the visitor about the terrain and its historic significance. He planned to organize an ethno museum in the abandoned village of Trebišće near Potok below *Perun*, an important site in the context of a religious interpretation and starting point of a "mythological trail" leading towards *Perun* hilltop. As he required a professional team he addressed the agile ethnologist Tomo Vinščak, then docent at Zagreb University, who accepted it with enthusiasm. Being a regular listener of my lectures on reconstruction of ancient Slavic hieratic poetry texts at the Faculty of

Humanities in Zagreb, he immediately called on me. I contacted Velčić without delay and received from him data on the terrain and basic topography. At that time he had no knowledge about my research and their results. He might have been surprised by my immediate acceptance to come to Mošćenice. Tomo Vinščak brought us together. Beside myself there were the ethnologist Professor Vitomir Belaj, indologist and Vedic specialist Professor Mislav Ježić (both from Zagreb University) and Professor Georg Holzer, from the Slavic studies at Vienna University, all three diligent listeners of mine; then also the student of onomastics Petar Šimunović, scholarly advisor to the Croatian Language and Linguistics Institute in Zagreb, Zmago Šmitek, professor at Ljubljana University, and Ljubo de Karina, a local from Brseč, a first-rate artist and sculptor, who was of extreme importance in designing the trails.

This group met in June 2005 in Mošćenice, continued along Potok to Trebišće, even reached the top of *Perun* in the afternoon, and afterwards, during the memorable dinner on the terrace of “Perun” motel in Mošćenice, looking at Kvarner and Rijeka we concluded that we are actually on the trail of the ancient religion, and that we should systematically de-code the Slavic religious interpretation of this territory. A free group of independent researchers was thus created, working together by researching trails of our ancient pre-Christian religion. The project that was initiated, and successfully headed by Tomo Vinščak conducting regular scientific gatherings, also created a formal framework to support the independent group. Within this framework further visits to Mošćenice, Perun and Trebišće took place. In this we were joined by Vladimir Peter Goss. He too joined the group and has belonged to it ever since, immediately showing a lively interest for my research. Such a big interest that I was taken by surprise.

Thus Vladimir Goss and myself started meeting and conversing more often. It turned out that we had many subjects, more than we were aware of. Goss was not only into Romanesque and Gothic art between Sava and Drava, he was also looking for remains of old religion and endeavored to decipher Slavic religious interpretation of those terrains. He brought the entire area, where he discovered quite an array of relevant data, closer to us. All this created a broad basis for a fruitful discussion. He collected a multitude of place names whose relevance in context of tracking ancient religion could be recognized as undoubtedly important at the first glance. A great amount of research, time and vigor was still required in order to come into open. New horizons were opening to the project headed by Tomo Vinščak.

It was only then that I directly experienced what a productive writer Vladimir Peter Goss was. He overwhelmed me with prints and photocopies of his articles, one more interesting than the next. He presented me with many of his new books. I was not surprised by their high scientific level, I was already aware of it. I learned a lot about cultural impulses brought about by the

crusades, about the importance of Templars and Hospitallers for the cultural landscape, about the significance of various waves of foreign settlers in the Middle ages. Medieval contacts between Slavonia and Hungary became vivid and full of life previously unknown to me. I only regretted that I could not feel this to be generally known and taken as it should be, to make everyone feel as rich as we actually were. I wish that I was wrong, because the ways the real knowledge reaches those who will fertilize it are incomprehensible.

In the title of one of Goss's articles there was a name that gave me shivers: Strzygowski. The shivers caused by its profound attractiveness, and by the completeness of his failure. It was not possible to read that name and remain calm. In his notorious book on ancient Croatian art (Zagreb 1927) the Austrian art historian, professor in Graz and Vienna Josef Strzygowski stood for, and reasoned about, his opinion that peculiar forms of Croatian visual arts, and especially architecture and interlace ornaments, were due to a tradition of wooden artifacts that the settlers from the North brought with them when they settled in the Roman Dalmatia, who finally transferred this tradition onto stone and into decorative stonework. The settlers from the North would have left, having incorporated the southern heritage from the antiquity, durable evidence of their heritage in the artifacts made by stone masons and builders once they moved into the Roman province of Dalmatia. Their wooden constructions and carvings disappeared without a trace due to the wood's perishable character, but remained, according to that opinion, reproduced in stone, and they deeply affect our experience of ancient Croatian art.

Strzygowski's theory can without any doubt grip the reader with its far-reaching cultural implications. Next to the autochthonous pre-historical and the antique Mediterranean visual heritage, there is a northern heritage, deriving from the Great migration, marking us specifically as Croats. That is why we call the visual expression of this heritage Early Croatian.

Also, assuming that this theory holds water, and taking into account the exceptional analogy of early medieval Armenian architecture with Early Croatian need not only be parallel developments on distant margins of the Byzantine cultural domain; it can be explained again as the same tradition of wood construction and decoration that, coming to the South, replicated itself into stone. This impressive affinity then ceases to be only typological, but becomes genetic: testifying about the origin, which is of extreme importance for the people in our culture. Thus Croats can find in Armenia proof of their own individuality.

It is easily understandable that in the twenties' and thirties' of the last century this theory provoked remarkable attention, and that a lot of intellectuals were supportive of it. The problem remains in the fact that Strzygowski's theories lack the power of sustainable argument. The writer of this text, when reading his book, was quite aware of that. This is the reason why the theory,

despite interest and sympathy from all sides remained outside our standard cultural history, and was slowly covered by moss. Ljubo Karaman, champion of history of early medieval art at that time, was right.

Therefore, when I understood that Vladimir Goss has written about Strzygowski, I got slightly anxious. Somewhere in the crevices of my consciousness I was almost scared that he might have been deceived by attraction of Strzygowski's theories. However, after starting to read, it was immediately clear that this is not so. I realized that on matters of Strzygowski's arguments and documents Vladimir Goss shares the opinion of Ljubo Karaman, as well as mine. There was no room for doubt and uncertainty. But Goss made a distinction: the fact that Josef Strzygowski's theory and his results cannot survive scientific criticism does not mean that the questions he posed and research that he wished to encourage have no value. On the contrary, Vladimir Goss considered them very important and unjustly neglected and started looking carefully for cultural elements brought by settlers from the North to the soil of Roman provinces, inviting others to join him in this pursuit. Strzygowski's lack of success did not necessarily mean that nothing will be found by others. Perseverance is necessary. Here, Goss has demonstrated the first convincing results.

I suddenly realized that, by understanding him better and better, I was getting more and more involved. While I was still preparing to write the book published in Croatia under the title *Litterarum studia* (Zagreb 1998), I encountered "two dark centuries," mostly 7th and 8th, for which there were neither historic records, nor articulate archaeological findings. Within the frame of integral display of literature and entire education in early medieval Croatian culture those silent centuries were supposed to somewhat begin to talk. At the time two completely different cultural worlds were confronted there. Imperial Dalmatia: a number of coastal and insular towns with their unconnected territories: from Osor to Kotor, in principle under direct rule of Constantinople, and the Croatian lands with additional Sclavinias, all of them legitimized by their ancestral organization. Imperial Dalmatia maintained the continuity of antique life, Christianity and religious organization, municipalities and literacy. All this was very weak, but nevertheless survived. On the other hand, in Sclavinias, and therefore in Croatian lands, this continuity was interrupted and life was arranged according to Slavic law and observances, under Slavic court of judgment and order, and the world's image was determined by the ancient religion of the Slavic settlers. This is why it was only possible to bring the two dark centuries to "speak" by using alternate methods. Imperial Dalmatia's written documents were to be utilized and fragments of earlier texts within later documents deriving from dark ages interconnected. This method was well-tried in classical philology, and yielded results, which were most thoroughly published in the book *Uz početke hrvatskih početaka. Filološke studije o našem najranijem srednjovjekovlju* (Split 1993) (The Beginnings of Croatian Beginnings.

Philological Studies on our Earliest Middle Ages).

Russian linguists Indo-Europeanists Ivanov and Toporov in the sixties' of the 20th century started publishing results about their research on reconstruction of proto-Slavic texts, and they convincingly demonstrated, in oral literature of all Slavic peoples, presence of fragments of proto-Slavic religious poetry; ritual texts depicting mythical conditions and happenings, thus depicting the world's covert structure. Despite incomplete and scarce results of such research an integral mythical picture of the world can be outlined with the help of the necessary interpretative effort. The Russian philologist Boris Alexandrovich Uspenskij contributed remarkably to this research. By stepping into their trail I managed to bring dark ages under Slavic rule to talk, together with the entire world of Slavic languages, because at that time the Croatian Slavic territory could hardly be distinguished from the rest of the Slavic world. Some ritual religious texts telling about mythical conditions and happenings could be reconstructed, resulting in an image of religious experience of the world, and certain legal texts indicating about legal order and judicial processes in the territories under Slavic rule could be reconstructed. It turned out that Duke Trpimir and Duke Muncimir passed judgments according to Slavic law. This clearly demonstrates that their principality, and both introduced themselves as *duces Chroatorum*, was in facta Sclavinia, as mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus.

All this, ancient religion as well as ancient legislation, which cannot be strictly separated from each other, was brought into Roman Dalmatia in course of migration from the north, the same migration that brought into Dalmatia Slavic (at that time proto-Slavic) language, as we can discern ever more clearly. I was very deep into it without Strzygowski ever occurring to me. Contrary to him, my interest was not in artifacts but in texts, into traditional sets of words and their original meaning. Spontaneously it seemed to me that they were something completely different. Only the writing of Vladimir Peter Goss on and about Strzygowski opened my eyes. Artifacts or texts, both were elements of culture brought from the northern ambience and preserved in the southern context remaining visible to our research. Although not obvious at first glance, both are evidence disclosing a cultural layer which significantly defines us. Research and knowledge of our culture will remain incomplete if this layer does not receive full attention. This is why Goss is right: Strzygowski is important, if not by his results and his theory, then by the questions he raised and viewpoints that he brought into consideration. Only then did I understand Goss's great interest in my research. Since the moment when we started to converse about it I had a real interlocutor. No need to elaborate what an incentive it was to me.

However on one occasion I was confused and alarmed by Vladimir Peter Goss. He denominates opponents of his research orientation, historians of art and culture who do not see,

neither wishes to see, anything beyond antique heritage in our region, as humanists, and argues with them as such. But I, who am standing together with him, completely supporting his orientation and having already given my research contribution, consider myself a bearer and continuator of humanist tradition, and therefore a humanist. I will join every dispute with restricted scope, with whoever opposes the widening of horizons of space, but not against humanists. Humanists are the salt of earth. They seek and study mislaid layers of linguistic expression, cultivating and sustaining their values. They create an atmosphere that is beautiful and therefore worth living. The more they cover the better they are. A humanist is better if he remembers that Publius Ovidius Naso was not just one of greatest Latin poets, but also one who wrote in the language of the Getae, which he learned when banished in Tomis on Black sea, and still better if he regrets that this too was not preserved, instead of forgetting about it as something negligible in the name of classical Latin excellency. Knowing Ovid's language of the Gaetae would make us better humanists.

A humanist that includes other ancient italic languages, even Etruscan, into Latin expressive treasure, is a better humanist than the one that excludes all this. Humanistic tradition also shows this trait of exclusivity by rejecting, in the name of Cicero and Vergil, all remaining Latin, needless to say everything that is not Latin. In that spirit the Latin poet laureate of Rome Ilija Crijević (*Aelius Lampridius Cervinus*) called poetry in Croatian *stribiligo Illyrica* – “illyric squeaking,” although he too, being a nobleman from Dubrovnik, used to write occasional poems in Croatian because this was an unavoidable way of behavior among people of equal standing. Petrarca too thought that he gained poetical immortality by his Virgilian epic poem *Africa*, where he described the roman destruction of Carthage, and considered his sonnets to Laura in native Tuscan dialect as personal and unimportant. However today few people know of his epic poem and everyone with any education knows about his sonnets and Laura. Thus the humanistic exclusivism denies itself eloquently, and there is no reason to consider it a valuable and constitutive component of humanistic tradition. Those of us who include into our humanistic horizon the layer inherited from northern migrants are certainly better humanists than those that only see antique heritage in our territory and only want to know about it. They should be argued with, like Goss does, but not as with humanists, which would then deny us as such, but as with inferior humanists who are not up to challenges of fabric on which they work and care for.

It is evident that within a necessarily very restricted frame Vladimir Peter Goss is an important person in our scientific community, its valuable member, especially among those that are involved in cultural history in any of its disciplines. He is imperturbable in his singularity. He brought a lot of valuable from America, never permitting it to dominate him. He remained completely ours. By my contribution to this Collection of Studies I join this garland of

congratulators: his colleagues and friends, collaborators and disciples, all those who respect him. I wish him a lot of successful work and creative energy, to his satisfaction and joy, and to benefit and enrichment for all of us. *Vivat, crescat, floreat!*

Original title: *Pramenovi magle sa sjevera pod jasnim suncem Mediterana.*

Text translation from Croatian: Višnja Bedenko.

CUM ADI IN CAMPO

VITOMIR BELAJ

UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB, FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF ETHNOLOGY

Im vorliegenden Artikel wird gezeigt, dass auch in Biskupija bei Knin in Kroatien bei der Landnahme am Anfang des VIII. Jahrhunderts ein imaginäres vorchristliches „heiliges Dreieck“ mit den typischen Merkmalen der „bäuerlichen“ Funktion ($\alpha=23,^{\circ}27'$, $b:c= 1:1,6$) konstruiert wurde. Seine Ecken wurden den drei höchsten altslawischen Gottheiten Perunъ, Velesъ und Mokošъ gewidmet. Damit wurde das Gebiet der Biskupija zeremoniell sakralisiert. Bei der Christianisierung wurden die alten heiligen Stätten beibehalten und christlich umgedeutet.

Goss, Biskupija, heiliges Dreieck, Perun, Veles, Mokoš, kroatische Landnahme

Vor dem Beginn der Arbeit

Als mir Adi (für Uneingeweihte: *Professor V. P. Goss*) vor einigen Jahren vorschlug, mich in seinem Projekt “*Francia media – cradles of European culture*” zu beteiligen, stimmte ich freundschaftlich und leider allzu freudig zu. Ich hatte damals gar keine Ahnung, wohin mich diese Beschäftigung führen wird. Ich sah es erst als es schon zu spät war, herauszusteigen und den Freund allein sitzenzulassen. Es hat nämlich für einen kroatischen Volkskundler etwas prickelndes in sich, den vielleicht heiligsten Topos des frühmittelalterlichen Kroatien unter die Lupe zu nehmen. War ja dort, in der *Biskupija* (kroatisch *biskup* = „Bischof“, *Biskupija* dürfte man etwa mit „Bischofsdorf“ übersetzen), entweder ein früher bischöflicher Besitz, oder gar, wie manche glauben, nach 1050 der frühe Sitz des Bischofs von Knin. Sie musste seinerzeit ziemlich dicht besiedelt gewesen sein, denn in alten Dokumenten hiess dieser Ort schlicht *ad quinquae Ecclesias in campo* (im alten Kroatisch: *v petih crikvah na Kosovi*). Im *Feld* gab es also damals, in der Zeit als in unweitem Knin kroatische

Könige residierten, dem Namen nach zu urteilen wenigstens fünf Kirchen. Eine alte Kulturlandschaft also, und was für eine! Wurde doch dort, wie einige fest glauben, der berühmte König Zvonimir gekrönt (in Wirklichkeit geschah die Krönung in Solin) und am 20. April 1089 ermordet, obwohl er nicht vor 1090 starb. Haben ja (das ist aber wahr) Archäologen (es war fra Lujo Marun) am 14. Mai 1892 auf dem Flur *Crkvina* genannt (*crkva* = „Kirche“, *Crkvina* bezeichnet also die Stelle wo früher eine Kirche stand) im Schutt einer alten Ruine den dreieckigen Giebel eines steinernen Teguriums mit einem Marienrelief gefunden, welches später von der Kirche den Gläubigen als *Maria des grossen kroatischen Taufgelübdes* vorgeschlagen und vom frommen Volk mit Freude aufgenommen wurde. Heute ist dieses Bild für kroatische Gläubige in der ganzen Welt ein Identitätszeichen ohnesgleichen. So einen heiligen Ort kulturgeschichtlich zu interpretieren ist wohl ein sehr gewagtes Unternehmen. Später, als ich die nötige Fragestellung zu formulieren versuchte, sah ich aber, dass mein Unternehmen von der falschen Seite angepackt wurde. Und wie Lothar Sachs in seinen *Statistischen Methoden* (1982) trefflich bemerkte, *Es ist besser, eine angenäherte Antwort auf die richtige Frage zu geben, die oft unbestimmt sein wird, als eine exakte Antwort auf die falsche Frage, die stets präzise gefaßt werden kann.* Aber davon werde ich später berichten.

Ich sollte nämlich nachforschen, ob dort noch irgendwelche Spuren des vorchristlichen kroatischen (slawischen) Heidentums aufzuspüren sind, und wenn ja, ob man auf eine Kontinuität zwischen diesem vermuteten vorchristlichen Stratum und den nachfolgenden christlichen Strukturen denken darf. Die Bejahung dieser Fragen würde dem ganzen Problem eine wichtige neue Nuance geben.

Ausgangspunkte


Da ich aber befürchte, dass den meisten Lesern dieses Heftes mein Thema unbekannt sein dürfte, sollte ich zuerst das Problem selbst, sowie meine Vorgangsweise darlegen. Es handelt sich um Strukturen welche erstmals der slowenische Archäologe Andrej Pleterski aufspürte. Er bemerkte, dass in den vormals slawisch besiedelten Ostalpen Toponyme, welche womöglich auf den slawischen vorchristlichen Glauben hinweisen, manchmal zu dritt vorkommen, und zwar so, dass sie zueinander in gewissen regelmässigen räumlichen Verhältnissen stehen. Nachher gelang es ihm, seine Erkenntnisse auch auf das heutige Slowenien auszubreiten. Ich versuchte dann dasselbe in Kroatien zu tun, und es gelang mir wirklich mehrere solche regelmässig aufgestellte heilige Punkte aufzudecken.

Es handelt sich jeweils um drei Punkte in der Landschaft, welche den drei höchsten altslawischen Gottheiten gewidmet waren, dem gewaltigen Donnergott **Perunъ*, seinem

Gegenspieler *Velesъ* (dem Herrscher der Unterwelt) und der Göttin *Mokošъ*, Peruns Gattin (in der baltoslawischen Überlieferung der Sonne gleichgesetzt). Der vorchristliche Inhalt dieser Punkte wurde später bei und nach der Christianisierung durch christliche Interpretationen (oft durch Aufstellen von Kirchenbauten) verdeckt. Jedoch haben sich mancherorts Spuren in alten Aufzeichnungen, in der Toponymie, sowie in christlich umgedeuteten Überlieferungen bis heute erhalten.

Diese drei Punkte bilden ein Dreieck. Ein imaginäres, denn es wurde nirgends gezeichnet. Nur die Eckpunkte sind festgesetzt worden. Natürlich bilden irgendwelche drei Punkte überall im All Dreiecke. Aber diese heidnischen Dreiecke zeichnen sich durch gewisse Merkmale aus. Das wichtigste Merkmal ist ein Winkel der *immer* um $23^\circ (\pm 2^\circ)$; genau müssten es in unseren Breiten $23,^\circ 27'$ sein) aufweist. Das ist genau der Abstand zwischen den Höhepunkten der scheinbaren Sonnenbahnen am Himmel an den beiden Tagundnachtgleichen und den beiden Sonnwenden. Die Sonne ist deshalb im Sommer ihrem Gatten oben im Himmel nahe, und im Winter ihrem Liebhaber unten in der Unterwelt. Daraus erklärt sich die Ambivalenz ihres Charakters: einmal ist sie warm und trocken, ein anderes Mal aber feucht, kalt und gefährlich, ja sogar tödlich. Die dynamische Spannung, welche zwischen den Dreien herrscht, wurde auf die Form des Dreiecks projiziert. Oder, besser gesagt: auf die Art, wie die drei Punkte zueinander stehen. Die zwei grösseren Seiten des „Dreiecks“ verhalten sich in ihrer Länge als $1:\sqrt{2}$ (das ist 1,4142...).

So, das war ziemlich einfach. Jetzt kann ich versuchen, das Verhältnis $1:\sqrt{2}$ zu erklären. Beim Eindringen einer Stammesgruppe in ein neues Gebiet musste man diese bis dahin unbekannte und deshalb gefährliche, profane Landschaft zuerst *sakralisieren*, „kultivieren“. Das konnte man so tun, dass man eigene, von Zuhause bekannte Götter in sie hineinbrachte, und zwar so, dass sie den gut bekannten, vom Schöpfer geschaffenen Verhältnissen entsprechen. Deshalb haben die alten Slawen *Perunъ* und *Velesъ* an die Gegenpunkte der längsten Seite des fiktiven Dreiecks geheftet, und *Mokošъ* in den mittleren Winkel gestellt. Damit wurde ihre moralisch höchst zweifelhafte Rolle angedeutet. Die $\sqrt{2}$ kommt aber von der Weltauffassung her, in welcher die Erde als ein Quadrat vorgestellt ist. Das ist gut in der alten Mesopotamischen Kultur bezeugt, und man kann es auch aus einigen indogermanischen Überlieferungen herauslesen. Und in einem Quadrat stehen *Perunъ* und *Velesъ* diagonal gegenüber. Diese Diagonale wird dann im Dreieck zur Hypotenuse. Mit anderen Worten: die Linie *c* im heiligen Dreieck wurde wie eine Hypotenuse eines rechtwinkligen Dreiecks treten. Mit einem so konstruierten Dreieck, denkt Pleterski (und ich stimme ihm bei), haben die alten Stammespriester bei der Landnahme jene kosmische Ordnung, welche ihnen der Schöpfer in der alten Heimat gegeben hat, in die neue hineingesetzt. Oder besser: sie passten die neue Heimat den von Gott gestellten Regeln an. Das sieht in der Natur irgenwie so aus:



Ideelles heiliges slawische Dreieck nach Pleterski.

Die Aufstellung einer solchen *Triade* der Stammesgötter auf ihre neuen Stellen erfolgte offensichtlich in Rahmen eines Rituals, in welchem auch die wichtigsten Mythen (etwa von der Schöpfung, der Einführung der Ordnung in die Welt, Entstehung der Völker und ihrer Dynastien) erzählt, oder genauer, gesungen wurden. Damit gab der Priester zugleich den Stammesführern die Legitimität für ihre politische Macht, und Pleterski meint sogar, dass **jede** slawische territoriale Einheit (*župa*) so ein Dreieck haben sollte. Ein solches Dreieck hatte also eine wichtige politische Funktion. Natürlich war das nur zu einer Zeit möglich, in der die fürstliche Gewalt durch vorchristliche Rituale und Zeremonien legitimiert wurde. Nachher, als sie sich auf die Autorität der christlichen Kirche stützte, war die Errichtung solcher politischen Symbole nicht mehr möglich. Das gibt den Historikern *ein post quem non* Kriterium bei der Bewertung solcher Erscheinungen.

Pleterski (der, Nota bene, für sein Doktorstudium meine Vorlesungen über die Mythologie besuchte) hat ziemlich genaue Erwartungen von solchen Dreiecken:

- Einer der Winkel muss etwa 23 Grad haben (oft nur $22^{\circ}30'$ was als $\frac{1}{4}$ von 90° sehr leicht zu konstruieren ist);
- Die zwei längeren Seiten verhalten sich ungefähr als $1:\sqrt{2}$;

- Die längste Seite verbindet gewöhnlich die Punkte der männlichen Götter;
- Peruns Punkt ist immer auf einer höheren Stelle,
- die weibliche Gottheit ist gewöhnlich bei einem Wasser (Bach, Quelle),
zwischen dem Punkt der weiblichen Gottheit und jenem ihres Liebhabers steht in der Regel ein Wasser, gewöhnlich fließendes, welches die Grenze zwischen den zwei kosmischen Reichen symbolisierte.

Der Stammesgeometer konnte sich in der Praxis oft nur mit grösster Mühe an diese „Regeln“ halten, denn er musste sie an die Gegebenheiten in der Natur anpassen.

Es gelang mir mehrere solche Dreiecke auf dem kroatischen Gebiet zu finden. Aber ich fand auch einige Dreiecke die wesentlich kleiner ($\frac{1}{4}$, ja bis $\frac{1}{8}$) sind, zwar immer einen Winkel von ungefähr 23° aufweisen, aber *nie* das Verhältnis zwischen den Seiten von $1:\sqrt{2}$, sondern 1:1,2, 1:1,6 oder 1:1,8 haben. Das deutete wahrscheinlich auf andere Funktionen dieser Dreiecke hin. Zusätzliche Elemente verbinden sie nämlich mit dem Mythos von den Gotteskindern *Jarilo/Juraj* und *Mara/Morana*, welche als Götter der Fruchtbarkeit aufzufassen sind, sowie mit ihrem Verhältnis zu den Eltern. Diese kleinen Dreiecke sind aber nicht selten mit den grossen verbunden und wurden wahrscheinlich von Dorfpriestern für die Bedürfnisse der kleineren bäuerlichen Gruppen konstruiert. Sie dienten wohl den Fruchtbarkeitsriten. Die Errichtung einer solchen glaubensbedingten Struktur auf der bäuerlichen Ebene musste natürlich nicht unbedingt auf den Einfluss der Kirche Rücksicht nehmen und konnte auch später, solange der alte Glaube im Volk lebendig war, geschehen.

Uff! Es schwindelt mir schon von dieser mathematischen Exaktheit auf welche wir Humanisten nicht vorbereitet sind. Das habe ich nur Adi zu verdanken! Dort muss (in der Mathematik) alles punktgenau sein, wir können uns aber immer mit „möglicherweise“, „wie es scheint“ u. ä. aus den Sackgassen herausschleichen.

Pleterski ging als Archäologe vom Material aus. Er fand, wie ich sagte, einige Stellen (Punkte) welche auf das slawische Heidentum hindeuten, beobachtete sie *als ein Ganzes* und entdeckte ihren gemeinsamen Sinn. Er konnte aus der geometrischen Form, welche er fand, den Inhalt des Mythos von der Erschaffung der Weltordnung *herauslesen*. Man darf deshalb in diesen Dreiecken alte *Ideogramme*, also „Schriftzeichen“ sehen.

Das Vorschungsmaterial aus der *Biskupija*

Ich konnte in der *Biskupija* leider nicht mit dem gewöhnlichen volkskundlichen Material rechnen. Während der türkischen Besetzung (1522-1688) verliess nämlich die alte Bevölkerung vollkommen das gesamte Gebiet um Knin und die Türken siedelten eine neue, andersartige

Bevölkerung, die Morlacken, an. Die Neuankömmlinge hatten einen „anderen“ Glauben (es waren orthodoxe Christen), sprachen ein anderes Idiom (das ijekawische Štokawisch mit neuer Akzentuierung), eine andere Wirtschaftsform (sie waren transhumante Ziehbauern) und, natürlich, andere Überlieferungen. Man kann hier keinesfalls von einer Kontinuität sprechen und darf keine Spuren älterer Zustände im „Volksgedächtnis“ erwarten.

Es blieben mir nur archäologische Spuren der fünf fast mythischen Kirchen und einige wenige Toponyme, aus denen ich meine Gutachtung elaborieren konnte, übrig. Nichts davon konnte mich unmittelbar (und deshalb einwandfrei) mit den vorchristlichen Zuständen verbinden. Gut, eine der Kirchen, und zwar jene auf der *Crkvina*, war der Jungfrau Maria geweiht. Aber darf man ohne Weiteres daraus den Schluss ziehen, dass an dieser Stelle das Heiligtum der Göttin Mokoš gestanden haben muss? An der Stelle wo man kein Wasser finden kann, vom Regenwasser in der Zisterne abgesehen? Am Ende der längsten Seite des Dreiecks? Und höher, nicht viel, aber doch 60 cm höher als es der mögliche Punkt des Donnergottes ist? Keineswegs! Als wir im letzten Spätsommer (das war im Jahre 2011) auf der *Crkvina* standen und ich den anwesenden Kollegen über meine Aufgabe berichten sollte, überkam mich ein ungutes Gefühl. Darf ich hier an dieser heiligen Stätte dieser gelehrten Gesellschaft mit einer *Sim-Sala-Bim* Methode aufwarten?

Wie gesagt, ging Pleterski vom gesicherten Material aus, ich hatte aber keines. Er wusste aus meinen Vorlesungen wie die drei Götter zueinander stehen und entdeckte den Sinn der Anordnung dieser Punkte. Er las den Inhalt des Mythos von der Erschaffung der Weltordnung heraus. Ich musste aber aus den weiss Gott wie zusammengestellten archäologischen Objekten den schon vorher gewünschten Inhalt herausschöpfen. Herrjemine, war es mir *flau* in der Seele! Es überkam mich das Gefühl, Adi habe mich hereingelegt. War ich auf ihn wütend! Adi, Adi! *Kruzitürken*, würde in einer solchen Situation meine Grossmutter ausrufen, und ich wäre schnellstens in das weitestmögliche Loch hineingekrochen (sie hätte dann still in sich gelächelt, denn ansonsten war sie *a hearzensguate Omi, unsa liab's Modl*). Aber es hätte gar keinen Sinn gehabt, denn niemand von den Anwesenden würde mich verstehen und keiner hätte sich verkrochen, am wenigsten der Schuldtragende. So machte ich meine gute Miene zum bösen Spiel und stellte ihnen mein Vorhaben so kompliziert dar, dass es zwar keiner richtig verstehen konnte, aber eben deshalb sehr *g'scheit* klang.


In der *Invitation* stand *cordially*, der Aufgeforderte (das war in diesem Falle ich) sei *free to select any scholarly topic*, mit dem Wunsch, *that the resulting paper be... a contribution to the issue in a novel, bold, "unusual" way*. A-ha. Jetzt kann ich Adi *in a "unusual" way* heimzahlen!

So, die Ärmel sind hochgekrempt. Ich bin jetzt bereit, wir kommen endlich zur Sache. „Die Sache“ sind die Reste der fünf Kirchen *in Campo* über welche Adi in seinem schönen Buch aus 2010 schrieb. Drei davon bilden ein versprechendes Dreieck:

- Die südlichste von ihnen ist die vorhin erwähnte Marienkirche auf der *Crkvina*, unter dem Hang der Hochebene *Krš* (um 350 m), am rande des *Campus* in einer Meereshöhe von 278,6 m gelegen. Sie wurde in der ersten Hälfte des IX. Jahrhunderts gebaut, vielleicht schon zur Zeit des Fürsten Borna.
- Nördlich davon steht auf 278 m Höhe die orthodoxe Dreifaltigkeitskirche (*Sv. Trojica*) unter welcher Spuren einer alten frühmittelalterlichen Rotunde zu sehen sind. Leider lassen die kirchlichen Behörden dort keine Ausgrabungen zu.
- Der dritte Eckpunkt sind ausgegrabene Grundmauern eines namenlosen Kirchleins auf dem Hügel *Lopuška glavica*, 245 m, nordwestlich in Richtung Knin, von der Hl. Dreifaltigkeit 1.135, von *Crkvina* 1.820 m entfernt. Sie dürfte um 850 gebaut worden sein, in der Regierungszeit des Fürsten Trpimir.
- Die zwei weiteren Kirchen dienen nur als Staffage. Die (ebenfalls namenslose) Kirche an der *Bukorovića podvornica* (235 m) liegt etwa 50 m östlich von der Linie *Lopuška Glavica – Dreifaltigkeit* und die fünfte, die Hl. Cäcilie, *Stupovi* („Säulen“) genannt (um 260 m), liegt zwischen der *Crkvina* und *Lopuška glavica*. Die Kirche „an den Säulen“ wurde wahrscheinlich erst in der Zeit des Fürsten Branimir (879 – 892) errichtet.

Das ist das „Material“. Was können uns nun diese Punkte aussagen? Jeder einzelne gar nichts. Es könnte vielleicht interessant sein, dass die Linie *Lopuška Glavica – Apsis auf der Crkvina* genau über die Apsis der Kirche der Hl. Cäcilie geht. Nur ein Zufall?

Hm. Nichts? Oder doch? Denn die Linien *Lopuška glavica – Dreifaltigkeit* und *Lopuška glavica – Crkvina* bilden ein Eck von, genau gemessen, **punktgenau 23 Grad und 27 Minuten!** Nun wird es spannend. Wenn wir jetzt diese zwei Linien gegenüberstellen, können wir leicht und schön ausrechnen, dass sie sich als 1:1,6 verhalten. Und das ist **genau** das Verhältnis zwischen den zwei längeren Seiten bei der Hälfte der kleineren, „bäuerlichen“ Dreiecken. Die gemessenen Werte passen ihnen verblüffend genau. Ist es nun doch möglich, dass wir hier in Biskupija ein heiliges vorchristliche Dreieck vor uns haben?



Die quinque Ecclesiae in campo im Raum.

Aber das ist nicht alles. Dazu kommt noch, dass die dritte Linie, *Crkvina – Dreifaltigkeit*, **genau** dem Meridian folgt! Das habe ich schon bei den grossen „politischen“ Dreiecken bei Ivanec (*Ivanščica – Hl. Maria Magdalena*), Zagreb (*St. Marcus – Veliki Plazur*) und auf der Insel Rab (*Hl. Maria – Hl. Georg*), sowie bei einem kleinen „bäuerlichen“ bei Strožanac (*Gospa u Siti* [„Maria im Rohr“] – *Zmijski kamen* [etwa „Drachenstein“] gesehen. Nein, das kann wirklich kein Zufall mehr sein. Adi hat, zu meinem grössten Erstaunen, doch einen sehr guten Riecher gehabt! Alle Achtung!


Aber wir sollten auch noch andere Merkmale begutachten. Dem Donnergott gebührt der höchste Punkt, zwischen seinem Punkt (und jenem seiner Frau welcher beim Wasser sein müsste) und dem Punkt seines Widersachers müsste Wasser fliessen, und christliche Substitute sollten mit ihren Funktionen, oder wenigstens Namen, an ihre heidnischen Vorfahren erinnern können. Wie steht es damit?

Eines ist ziemlich klar. *Lopuška glavica* steht abseits, auf der anderen Seite einer ziemlich morastigen Ebene durch welche sich ein winziges Bächlein hindurchschlingt, und ist niedriger als die zwei übrigen Stellen. Dieser Punkt ist für *Veles* wie bestellt.

Bei den übrigen Zwei stossen wir aber auf Schwierigkeiten. *Perun* müsste auf der *Crkvina* seinen Platz haben, das ist der höchste Punkt und zugleich Eckpunkt der längsten Seite des Dreiecks. Für *Mokoš* bleibt dann die Stelle wo heute die Hl. Dreifaltigkeit steht. Aber dort gibt es auch kein Wasser. *Mokoš* wäre dann durch die (männliche) Hl. Dreifaltigkeit, und *Perun* durch die Heilige Jungfrau Maria ersetzt. Und das ziemt sich nicht gerade.

Versuchen wir aber die Situation umzukehren und *Mokoš* im Süden, *Perun* im Norden anzusiedeln. Auch auf Pag, bei Oštarije und am westlichen Papuk konnte ich Dreiecke konstatieren bei welchen die weibliche Gottheit an einem Ende der längsten Seite steht. In diesem Fall bekämen wir dazu die Möglichkeit einer inhaltlichen Kontinuität auf beiden Stellen. Es ist nicht unmöglich, sich *Perun* mehrgesichtig vorzustellen, so wie es auch die Hl. Dreifaltigkeit ist. Perun ist nämlich vielseitig, er weist mehrere Aspekte auf. Der berühmte vierköpfige *Svantevit* von Rügen wird heute meist als eine Hypostase von Perun, als einer seiner Aspekte angesehen. Dass selbe kann man auch von *Troglav/Triglav* (wörtlich: „Dreikopf“) annehmen. Dabei geht es nicht um den Namen der Gottheit, sondern um eine seiner wichtigen Eigenschaften. Der baltoslawische *Perkuns/*Perun* war zugleich Gott welcher die drei kosmischen Sphären kontrollierte. Damit hängt zusammen vielleicht auch die Linie *Crkvina – Dreifaltigkeit* welche genau gegen Norden gerichtet ist, oder genauer gesagt, gegen dem Nordstern welcher in dem ganzen All der einzige fixe Punkt ist und somit die ständige Weltordnung verkörpern kann.

Eine solche vorchristliche Dreifaltigkeitsvorstellung scheint für das frühmittelalterliche Dalmatien durch einen dreigesichtigen Kopf, gefunden bei Vaćani (etwa 30 Km W-SW von Biskupija) bezeugt zu sein:



*Split, MHAS, Dreigesichtiger Kopf von Vaćani
(Foto: Z. Alajbeg, MHAS Split). Nach: Goss 2009:157.*

In diesem Fall würde die christliche Gottesmutter der vorchristlichen Göttermutter (Mutter von *Jarilo* und *Mara*) auf *Crkvina* folgen. Falls wir das annehmen, sollen wir uns auch ein bisschen umsehen. Das würde sich auszählen, denn dann könnten wir kaum 440 m südöstlich in einer Senke den kleinen *Bračića* See finden. Dort könnte dann *Mokoš* auch ihr Wasser haben.


Also gut. Peruns Punkt würde dann zwar fast um einen Meter niedriger als jener von *Mokoš* sein, aber wenn man von der *Crkvina* gegen Norden schaut, hat man wirklich das Gefühl, die *Dreifaltigkeit* liege höher. Es handelt sich um eine leicht erklärbare optische Täuschung, aber es sieht wirklich so aus.

Ich könnte jetzt beruhigt aufatmen und sagen, ich habe meine Arbeit getan und kann gehen. Aber ich lasse nicht so leicht los. In der Umgebung gibt es noch mehrere wichtige Hinweise auf den vorchristlichen Glauben. Darüber schreibe ich soeben ein Artikel („*Crkvina i svete trokutne strukture. Iščitavanje mitskoga konteksta petih crkav na Kosovi*“) für ein anderes Buch dessen Titel ich noch nicht genau kenne.

Eine einzige Bemerkung muss ich mir noch erlauben, und dan bin ich hier zu Ende gekommen. Es handelt sich um die verlängerte Linie *Lopuška glavica – Crkvina*. Diese Linie weicht von der Nordlinie um $\omega 126^{\circ}35'$. Das ist nahe dem Azimut des Sonnenaufgangs am

Horizont, beobachtet von der *Lopuška glavica* am Tag der Wintersonnwende. Er beträgt eigentlich 123° , also $3^\circ 25'$ weniger, aber von der *Lopuška glavica* sieht man sowieso nicht den **idealen Horizont**, denn er ist versteckt hinter den Bergen *Kozjak* und *Dinara*. Die Sonne lugt also hinter den Bergen notwendigerweise, von der *Lopuška glavica* gesehen, etwas später als es die Astronomen ausgerechnet haben aus, und zwar mehr nach Süden gerückt. Man müsste das einmal vier Tage vor Weihnachten, an einem wolkenfreien Morgen, an Ort und Stelle beobachten und messen. Ich glaube aber nicht, dass sich der Messungswert sehbar vom Azimut des Blickes auf *Crkvina* unterscheiden würde. Mit der Nordrichtung der Linie *Crkvina – Dreifaltigkeit* macht diese Beobachtung einen schönen kosmologischen Komplex, obwohl wir ihn noch nicht genauer verstehen können.

So sieht das imaginäre heilige vorchristliche Dreieck von Biskupija aus:



Schlussfolgerungen

Ich muss am Ende ziemlich verblüfft und ehrlich feststellen, dass meine falsche Absicht fehlschlug. Ich wollte Professor Goss (Adi) zeigen, dass er mir eine methodisch nicht ausführbare Aufgabe aufstellte. Es hat sich aber herausgestellt, dass man hier in der Biskupija wirklich die Kontinuität der heiligen Stellen nicht nur auffinden, sondern auch beweisen kann. Insofern solche Dinge überhaupt „beweisbar“ sind. Adis Intuition hat hier Wunder gewirkt. Ich muss ihm danken. Es gibt jetzt genug Indizien, die seine Annahme bekräftigen. Vorchristliche Priester mussten hier in der Biskupija wirklich die Landschaft nach der slawischen Landnahme mit slawischen Göttern aufgefüllt haben, sie mussten mythische Erzählungen hineinstellen, die Gegend sakralisieren und sie so für die Slawen bewohnbar machen.

Wir wissen allerdings (noch) nicht, was für Verhältnisse hier früher herrschten. Hatten schon die ebenfalls indogermanischen Illyrier (hier wohnten Delmaten) solche Dreiecke? Vielleicht haben die Slawen nach der Ankunft einfach nur die illyrischen Heiligtümer slawisch interpretiert. Ebenso wissen wir nicht ob und im welchen Ausmasse frühe Christen der späten Römerzeit die „Völkerwanderung“ überlebt haben und den neuangekommenen Slawen vielleicht den Ort des Kultes der Gottesmutter *Jungfrau Maria* für deren Göttermutter *Mokoš* überliessen. Aber Nichtwissen darüber stört hier nicht, das Bild ist schon ziemlich gut geklärt.

Es wurde sichtbar, dass sich das mittelalterliche Christentum fest an das vorchristliche heilige Dreieck anlehnte. Das sieht man nicht nur an der Lage der Kirchen im Raum welche an den Ecken des imaginären heiligen Dreiecks liegen, sondern auch in der Tatsache, dass die Linie *Lopuška Glavica – Apsis auf der Crkvina* genau über die Apsis der Kirche der Hl. Cäcilie geht. Ich nehme an, dass dort wo man heute die Reste der christlichen Presbyterien mit ihren Altarstellen sehen kann, früher heidnische Opfersteine gestanden haben. Auf *Crkvina* selbst kam es wohl zur „Christianisierung“ des Heiligtums von *Mokoš*.

Aber etwas muss ich doch noch klarstellen. Wenn meine Interpretation der Grösse des Dreiecks und des Verhältnisses zwischen den zwei Seiten stimmt, handelt es sich hier um ein kleines, schlichtes „bäuerliches“ Dreieck. Das bedeutet, dass dieses Dreieck nicht für eine altkroatische politische Einheit, eine *župa* angelegt wurde welche sich zum Staat emporschwang, sondern nur für die bäuerliche Bevölkerung des *Feldes*. Das würde dann besagen, dass zu der Zeit, als die kroatische Elite noch nicht zum Christentum bekehrt wurde, die *Biskupija* noch nicht jene politische Bedeutung hatte welche wir heute aus dem späteren archäologischen Material und aus den spärlichen schriftlichen Dokumenten herauslesen.

Und was hat das Ganze mit der *Francia Media* zu tun? Ich weiss es nicht. Was ist überhaupt *Francia Media*? Kaum, dass diese Phrase „Mittelfranken“ bedeutet. Die *Crkvina* hat kaum was gemeinsames mit, sagen wir, Ansbach zu tun. *Francia Media* könnte besser das karolingische *Lotharii Regnum* bedeuten, ein Königreich welches in Verdun am 1. August 843 entstand und schon 855 in Prüm aufgeteilt wurde, so, dass Italien an das Ostfränkische Reich kam. Was war damals in unserem *Feld* los?

Am Anfang des IX. Jahrhunderts regierte in Kroatien Fürst Borna als *dux Guduscanorum*. Er erweiterte seine Macht auf ganz Kroatien und führte sogar den Titel *dux Dalmatiae atque Liburniae*. Archäologische Funde aus seiner Zeit, besonders Schmuck und Waffen, aber auch die Baukunst, zeugen von starkem fränkischen Einfluss. Zu seiner Zeit wurde wohl die kroatische Oberschicht bekehrt und das Land „offiziell“, aber noch immer nur oberflächlich christianisiert. Das würde bedeuten, dass das Dreieck in Biskupija noch vor Bornas Regierungszeit aufgestellt wurde. Nach Borna regierte zuerst Vladislav (821-835) und nach ihm Mislav (835-845). Gegen das Ende seiner Regierungszeit entstand 843 die *Francia Media*. Sie deckt sich zeitlich mit der Regierungszeit des Fürsten Trpimir (845-864).

Unser Dreieck in der Biskupija hatte also mit der *Francia Media* nichts zu tun. Umgekehrt war dies aber nicht der Fall: die *Francia Media* konnte beim Prozess der Umwandlung dieser heidnischen kroatischen Landschaft in eine christliche dabei sein. Aber nicht viel mehr.

Schrifttum zum thema

Darüber schrieb ich in mehreren leider nur kroatisch verfassten Schriften, aber auch in einer zusammenfassenden Darstellung in englischer Sprache:

„Sacred Tripartite Structures in Croatia“. *Space and Time in Europe: East and West, past and present*, ed. Mirjam Mencej. Ljubljana: Oddelek za etnologijo in kulturno antropologijo, Filozofska fakulteta, Zbirka Zupaničeva knjižnica, 305-319.

Als weitere Literatur in verständlichen Sprachen kann ich folgendes empfehlen:

GOSS, Vladimir P. 2009. „Landscape as History, Myth, and Art. An Art Historian’s View.“ *Studia ethnologica Croatica*. 21:133-168.

PLETERSKI, Andrej 1998. „Die altslawische župa – der Staat vor dem Frühstaat“. *Kraje słowiańskie w wiekach średnich: profanum i sacrum*. Hanna Kóčka-Krenz, Alina Łosiński, ed. Poznań : Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, 79–81.

Das angedeutete schöne Buch von Adi, in welchem auch die Rolle der Biskupija ausführlich und trefflich beschrieben wurde, ist (leider nur in Kroatisch):

GOSS, Vladimir P. 2010. *Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti 800.-1200. Pogled s jugoistoka*. Zagreb: Golden Marketing und Tehnička knjiga.

PISMO STAROM PRIJATELJU ILI POHVALA JEDNOJ PASIJI

VLADIMIR CRNKOVIĆ

THE CROATIAN MUSEUM OF NAÏVE ART

Dragi Vladimire ili, ako dozvoliš da ti se obratim više intimno, Adi.

Kada sam početkom prosinca 2011. dobio poziv da se priključim obilježavanju tvoje 70-e obljetnice života, bio sam i iznenađen i zatečen. Kako mi poziv bijaše upućen s tvoga riječkog Filozofskog fakulteta, logično sam se morao zapitati: što ja mogu pridonijeti tvojoj užoj specijalnosti, jer predromanika i romanika u svom cijelom zamahu, kao i gotika, odnosno srednjovjekovlje općenito, pa i renesansa, nisu u sferi mojih užih interesa i istraživanja da bih mogao na bilo koji kompetentan način participirati u tom projektu. To ne znači, dakako, da nemam interesa i za ta područja, pa i svoje preferencije u tim segmentima, naprotiv, ali sudjelovati u nekom stručnom ili znanstvenom projektu podrazumijeva podrobnu upućenost u materiju o kojoj se raspravlja, a ja za tvoja specijalistička područja zasigurno nisam dovoljno kvalificiran. No onda sam se prisjetio kako sam ti 2007. godine – a u svezi s izložbom *Romanička skulptura u muzejima i zbirnama između Save i Drave*, što bijaše upriličena u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu, a koju si koncipirao i popratio uvodnim tekstom u katalogu – izrazio priznanje i udivljenje, istinsku očaranost, ponajprije za skulpturalno obrađene konzole iz benediktinske opatije u Rudini, te fascinantne ljudske glave s lokaliteta nedaleko Požege. Potom smo se, krajem prosinca, sreli u velikoj dvorani Muzeja Mimara na proslavi 50-e obljetnice Instituta za povijest umjetnosti, gdje sam ti potvrdio primitak citiranog poziva, no istodobno izrazio skepsu da bih mogao u tomu projektu na bilo koji način sudjelovati. Tvoja tadanja dodatna osobna zamolba – uz napomenu kako prilog može biti kratak i potpuno slobodno koncipiran, da imam slobodu što, kako i koliko toga sročiti, te da bi ti bilo iznimno drago da se odazovem, da bi ti to mnogo značilo – nije me ostavila ravnodušnim. A i kako bi, kada se poznajemo čitavu vječnost.

Upoznali smo se početkom jeseni 1961. na Odsjeku za povijest umjetnosti zagrebačkoga Filozofskog fakulteta; iako sam samo nekoliko mjeseci mlađi od tebe, ti si tada imao već apsolviranu prvu godinu studija i bio si demonstrator kod profesora Milana Preloga (na kolegiju srednjovjekovne ikonografije, da bi potom postao njegov demonstrator i na kolegiju opće povijesti

umjetnosti srednjeg vijeka) te kod profesora Tihomila Stahuljaka (kolegij zaštita spomenika). Upravo prisjećanja na te davne dane, uz nekoliko fragmenata iz recentnog razdoblja, ukazali su mi se kao mogućnost kako se uključiti u obilježavanje tvog jubileja. I zato ispisujem ove retke. Ako će u tekstu biti riječi i o meni osobno, ne bih želio da to shvatiš – da se to shvati – kao nadmetanje, ali cijeli sam ovaj zapis koncipirao, kako bi to rekao moj profesor s komparativne književnosti Ivo Hergešić, kao sentimentalni *rendez-vous* s našom – tvojom i mojom – mladošću, što se potom, nakon više od pet desetljeća, protegnuo, eto, do dana današnjega.

Izdvojio sam nekoliko znakovitih fragmenata za koje pretpostavljam da bi mogli biti interesantni i za širi krug tvojih strukovnih kolega, medijevalista. Tu, dakako, neće biti riječ o tvojoj specijalnosti jer, kao što rekoh, za to nisam meritoran, ali ću pokušati podastrti nekoliko prisjećanja o Vladimiru (Peteru, Adiju) Gossu (Gvozdanoviću) kao čovjeku i zaljubljeniku u kulturu i umjetnost, u prošlost i sadašnjost, u ljudsku kreativnost, u Ljepote i u Život općenito. Mada nikada nismo bliže prijateljevali, ili se družili izvan uobičajenih strukovnih okupljališta, na otvorenjima raznoraznih izložaba i na promocijama knjiga, tvoja benevolentnost i srdačnost, istinska strast prema materiji koju smo studirali, neprestana intelektualna radoznalost, učtivost, ljubaznost i tvoj *bel esprit*, najposlije vječiti osmijeh kojim dočekuješ i pozdravljaš ljude – kolege, prijatelje i znance – privukli su me otrpe. U jednu riječ, tvoja vedra narav i komunikativnost svagda mi bijahu i simpatični i poticajni. Prisjećam se, nadalje, da si bio vrlo aktivno uključen u sva studentska zbivanja na našoj katedri, ne samo kao demonstrator, nego i kao sudionik (tada rijetkih) stručnih ekskurzija, pa vjerojatno i na nizu drugih razina. Upravo tim si se značajkama i izdvajao u tim davnim danima među brojnim kolegicama i kolegama. Bio si jedan od onih kojih ću se uvijek prisjećati s radošću – poput Tonka Maroevića, Željke Čorak i Zdenka Rusa, ili godinu-dvije-tri starijih Nade Grujić, Vladimira Markovića, Ferdinanda Medera i Zdenka Tonkovića. (Vrlo je simptomatično da su i Tonko i Vlado, i Feđa i Zdenko, jednako kao i ti, također bili demonstratori; time ne samo da ste se diferencirali od ostalih studenata, jer ste bili u gotovo svakodnevnom kontaktu s našim uvaženim nastavnicima – uz dvoje već spomenutih, navodim samo još dva imena: Grgo Gamulin i Vera Horvat Pintarić – nego ste si već tada izborili time stanoviti povlašteni status; valja pripomenuti također kako su svi netom pobrojani polaznici Odsjeka za povijest umjetnosti iz kraja pedesetih i prve polovice šezdesetih godina postali kasnije vrlo uvaženi predstavnici naše struke – kao vrsni povjesničari umjetnosti, likovni kritičari, muzealci, konzervatori ili sveučilišni nastavnici.)

Podsjetio bih te nadalje da sam s našom tadanjom kolegicom Lizom Hagenauer (s kojom sam se godinu dana nakon što smo diplomirali oženio) znao pokatkad zalaziti u tvoj stan u Rockefellerovoj ulici, kako bismo konzultirali knjige koje su nam bile neophodne za pripremanje

ispita, a što smo ih nalazili u knjižnici tvoje majke. Današnje mlade generacije ne mogu niti zamisliti u kakvim smo mi uvjetima studirali, kada nije bilo ni knjižnica, ni knjiga, ni dijateka, ni fototeka, pa je biblioteka Sene Sekulić-Gvozdanović bila pokatkad spasonosni promicatelj informacija i mjesto za stjecanje brojnih znanja. Spomenut ću također zgodu koju si zasigurno zaboravio: osim listanja i proučavanja monografija o (modernoj) arhitekturi, ali i drugih vidova suvremene umjetnosti – ponajprije slikarstva i kiparstva – u to sam doba, pa i nešto kasnije, nakon što smo već diplomirali, posudio od tebe nekoliko knjiga koje sam, nakon što sam ih pročitao i vratio, nabavio za sebe osobno; izdvojit ću samo dva naslova: *Ljubav i mržnja* Pierrea Janeta te *Eros i civilizacija* Herberta Marcusea. To spominjem s razloga kako bi se vidjelo što si i ti, kao student ili netom diplomirani povjesničar umjetnosti, čitao i čime si širio svoje horizonte. Jer obje te knjige ti si nam osobno preporučio. A to je vrlo znakovito. (Vjerujem da ne trebam podsjećati na staru poslovicu koja glasi: Reci mi što čitaš – i reći ću ti tko si.)

Nakon što smo oboje diplomirali, i to iste 1966. godine, u naredna smo tri desetljeća dijelili poprilično sličnu sudbinu. Kao što je znano, ti si 1969. otišao u Sjedinjene Američke Države, gdje si ostvario respektabilnu sveučilišnu karijeru, radeći kao docent i izvanredni, te najposlije redoviti profesor na University of Michigan. Bio si također gostujući profesor na Sveučilištu u Tel Avivu, zatim na University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill i Duke University Continuing Education. Bavio si se cijeli život ponajviše srednjovjekovnom umjetnošću i kulturom, arhitektonskim spomenicima i urbanizmom, predromaničkom, romaničkom i gotičkom arhitekturom i skulpturom, osobito Dalmacije i kontinentalne Hrvatske, zatim renesansnom skulpturom Dalmacije, vezama Istoka i Zapada u srednjem vijeku itd. Pisao si o Franji Laureani, vratnicama splitske Katedrale, majstoru Radovanu, o radionici Nikole Firentinca i o Andriji Alešiju, o Jurju Dalmatincu, o romaničkoj i gotičkoj arhitekturi u Moroviću, Drenovcu i Bapskoj itd. Objavljivao si kako u našim prestižnim stručnim i znanstvenim časopisima – *Peristil*, *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji*, *Arhitektura*, *Život umjetnosti*, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu*, *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti*, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* – tako i inozemnim – *Arte Lombarda*, *Commentari*, *Arte Veneta*, *Cahiers archéologiques*, *Studies in Medieval Culture* itd. Završno ću podsjetiti da si magistrirao još 1968. u Zagrebu (pod mentorstvom profesora Preloga), a doktorirao na Cornell University, Itaca, u državi New York, 1972, s tezom iz predromaničke i ranoromaničke arhitekture u Hrvatskoj. Krajem šezdesetih godina i ja sam otpočeo svoju profesionalnu djelatnost, surađujući ponajprije s brojnim inozemnim muzejsko-galerijskim institucijama i baveći se promocijom moderne umjetnosti, pretežito naivom i autsajderskim stvaralaštvom. Usudio bih se konstatirati da smo se od naše generacije, od brojnih kolegica i kolega,

upravo time bitno diferencirali – djelovali smo u inozemstvu (ti u potpunosti, ja pretežito), ali smo u najvećem broju slučajeva bili usredotočeni na promociju naše umjetnosti i kulture.

A onda, u svibnju 1998., nakon tri puna desetljeća djelovanja kao slobodni likovni kritičar i povjesničar umjetnosti, angažiran oko brojnih likovnih i izdavačkih projekata, na poziv i nagovor našega zajedničkog kolege još iz studentskih dana, Franje Mrzljaka, otpočeo sam raditi u Hrvatskom muzeju naivne umjetnosti. Samo dva mjeseca kasnije upoznao sam Michaela Milkovicha, direktora Museum of Fine Arts iz St. Petersburga, na Floridi, koji je doputovao u Zagreb radi dogovora u svezi izložbe hrvatske naive u njegovu muzeju. Suradujući vrlo intenzivno s tim iznimnim čovjekom, eminentnim stručnjakom i velikim patriotom, koji je dolazio potom u Hrvatsku u još niz navrata kako bi kontrolirao pripreme za taj projekt, prisjećam se kako me je u nekom razgovoru, dok smo prolazili Svačićevim trgom, upitao poznajem li Vladimira Gossa, na što sam, dakako, uzvratio potvrdno. Tada mi je kazao kako si, uz njega, jedini hrvatski povjesničar umjetnosti koji je uspio izgraditi respektabilnu karijeru na sjevernoameričkom kontinentu. Posebno ga je fasciniralo da si se, usprkos brojnim fakultetskim obvezama, uspio uspješno i nadalje baviti promocijom starohrvatske umjetnosti, što je u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama bilo tada potpuno nepoznato područje. Poznato mi je nadalje kako si tijekom nedavnih tragičnih ratnih godina vodio Odjel za promidžbu Nacionalne federacije američkih Hrvata, a Milkovich u to isto vrijeme bijaše angažiran na Floridi oko prikupljanja financijske pomoći za Staru domovinu, pa pretpostavljam da ste i na tom planu znali dolaziti u neki izravniji ili neizravni kontakt. Zaključno bih spomenuo kako mi je Michael Milkovich nedavno potvrdio da ste se u Americi tih godina nekoliko puta i osobno susreli. Spominjem taj fragment jer on znakovito svjedoči o tvom stručnom angažmanu, tvom renomeu u Sjedinjenim Američkim Državama i tvom moralnom habitusu.

Tvojim povratkom u Hrvatsku, 1999. godine, naši su se susreti intenzivirali, te smo čak započeli osebujnu suradnju. Prvo si radio kao gostujući profesor na Hrvatskim studijima Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, zatim u Ljetnoj školi hrvatskog jezika i kulture Filozofskog fakulteta, također u našoj metropoli (1999-2002), da bi potom postao redovitim profesorom na Odsjeku za povijest umjetnosti Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Rijeci. Zaredali su susreti na otvorenjima raznoraznih izložaba, na sastancima u Društvu povjesničara umjetnosti Hrvatske, zatim u Art studiju Azinović gdje smo, svatko iz svoje oblasti, pripremali i realizirali određene projekte itd. Dok si bio angažiran u Zagrebu, posjećivao si sa studentima kroatistike u više navrata i Hrvatski muzej naivne umjetnosti. Ne samo da si prepoznao iznimnost naše institucije, nego si takve vrijednosne sudove nastojao prenijeti i mlađim naraštajima, za što ti i ovom prigodom iznova zahvaljujem. Nikada nisam smatrao, pa to ne smatram ni danas, da su hrvatska naiva i njezini ključni majstori – pomišljam ponajprije na Generalića, Smajića, Feješša, Skurjenija i Rabuzina, a mogao bih tom nizu nadodati još

poneko ime – kao Viriusa, Gažija, Večenaja, Kovačića ili Lackovića – jedini visoki dometi naše moderne umjetnosti, naprotiv, ali da taj fenomen zadire u najviše i najkarakterističnije domete hrvatske umjetnosti, to je neprijeporno. Uspjeh naše naive na internacionalnom planu, podjednako kod publike i stručne kritike, kao i zainteresiranost stranih posjetitelja za našu instituciju o tomu zorno svjedoče. Jednako tako o tomu svjedoči tvoj odabir da sa studentima posjećuješ naš muzej. To bijaše dodatni motiv zašto sam odlučio da se priključim obilježavanju tvojih jubileja, jer sam smatrao – i smatram – da je to, radi svega pobrojanog, moja moralna obveza.

Postoji međutim iznova i jedan sentimentalni razlog zašto se uvijek s radošću – a usudio bih se nadodati: i ponosom – prisjećam tih i takvih tvojih dolazaka u Muzej naive. Riječ je o jednoj gotovo efemernoj činjenici, koja u mojoj memoriji ima iznimno značenje. Kako si dolazio pretežito sa stranim studentima, koji su učili ne samo naš jezik, nego su pohađali predavanja i iz povijesti, kulture i umjetnosti, njima, kao strancima, obraćali smo se svagda paralelno na hrvatskom i engleskom jeziku. Već sam ti u više navrata usmeno svjedočio, a to sada želim i pismeno potvrditi, kako između brojnih vodstava što sam ih odradio u Muzeju, a bijaše ih na stotine, upravo ona gdje si ti bio prisutan bijahu vjerojatno najuspješnija. O tomu svjedoči i podatak da ste se u našim izložbenim dvoranama znali zadržati ne samo uobičajenih 45 do 60 minuta, nego često i dva sata. Zašto je tome bilo tako? Više je razloga, a zasigurno je najvažniji što smo oboje bili predano i istinski motivirano uključeni u prezentaciju. Nakon što bih ja izgovorio rečenicu-dvije-tri na hrvatskom (čime su strani studenti prakticirali naš jezik), ti bi to simultano prevodio na engleski, a kako obojica dolazimo iz iste škole povijesti umjetnosti, sa zagrebačke katedre, i iz istoga kulturnog miljea, svi stručni nazivi, zatim određeni pojmovi, kao i prizivanje niza povijesnih činjenica tebi nikada nisam trebao izdvojeno pojašnjavati, jer si u sve to temeljito upućen i svagda si mogao meritorno sâm sve nadopunjavati i podrobnije objašnjavati, sukladno konkretnom trenutku i potrebama. Drugim riječima, ako je tvojim studentima trebalo bilo što dodatno pojasniti, ti bi to uvijek besprijeckorno odradio, a za to vrijeme ja sam mogao smišljati i formulirati nastavak izlaganja. Time su prezentacije dobivale ne samo na dinamici i sadržajnosti, nego i na poticajnosti. Kako tijekom svakog izlaganja nastojim uspostaviti dijalog s posjetiteljima, on se i u tim prigodama odvijao, dakako, ne samo između nas dvojice, nego i s tvojim studentima. A kako su oni dolazili iz različitih zemalja i različitih krajeva svijeta, pitanja i odgovori što su zaredali zadirali su u najrazličitiju problematiku. Upravo su stoga ta vodstva i bila toliko uspješna, jer su se pretvarala u poticajne razgovore o povijesti i kulturi, o politici i socijalnim pitanjima, o migracijama Hrvata u posljednjih stotinjak godina, o književnosti, filmu i muzici, a ne samo o likovnoj umjetnosti. Bez tebe, bez tvoje zavidne opće kulture, bez tvog znanja, tvog poznavanja povijesnih činjenica i

umjetnosti, tvoje elokventnosti, tvoga besprijelekovnog engleskog – to ne bi bilo moguće. I stoga, dragi Vladimire, još ti jednom iskreno zahvaljujem na tim iskustvima.

Eto, s ovih nekoliko slika naše zajedničke prošlosti priveo bih kraju ovo poduže pismo. Nastojao sam ne samo da pouzdano posvjedočim o nekim događajima što su se zbi(va)li u tom golemom luku od pet punih desetljeća, nego, jednako tako, da iznesem neke svoje krajnje osobne konstatacije i prosudbe. Robert Altman vjerojatno bi takav pristup nazvao *short cuts*, a mogli bismo ga okrstiti i kao *flash backs*, jer sam sa samo nekoliko slika iz naše zajedničke – bliže i dalje – prošlosti pokušao obuhvatiti cijeli jedan život.

Ne mogu a da zaključno ne spomenem još dva-tri detalja: kao prvo, uvodno nisam spominjao Buvinu, Majstora Radovana, Francesca Laureanu i Jurja Dalmatinca tek da podsjetim o kome si sve raspravljao, za mene navođenje tih imena ima dublje značenje. To su naime neprijeporni vrhunci hrvatske umjetnosti od romanike do renesanse. A kada sam pak spominjao vrhunske majstore naive, i to su, barem prema mom osobnom sudu, također autori čija stvaralaštva zadiru u vrhunce naše umjetnosti – i to ne samo 20. stoljeća. S tih nekoliko imena pokušao sam posvjedočiti dakle kako doista imamo respektabilne umjetnike koji mogu participirati na bilo kojoj razini svjetske kulture. Ako si se ti bavio i baviš poglavito majstorima prošlih vremena i povijesnih stilova, a ja uznastojim oko jednog segmenta moderne umjetnosti, oboje u biti djelujemo na promociji, interpretaciji i vrednovanju naše kulturne i umjetničke baštine – i to podjednako za Danas i Sutra. (Vjerujem da se barem time mogu u potpunosti uklopiti u okvir ovog projekta pod nazivom: *Art History – The Future is Now.*)

Nadalje, vrlo je signifikantno da si se u Americi bavio i prinosima moderne hrvatske umjetnosti u dijaspori, pišući uvodne tekstove kataloga i osvrte te priređujući izložbe, primjerice, Marku Spalatinu i još nekolicini suvremenih autora. (Tek uzgred podsjećam da je dvije Spalatinove izložbe u Muzeju na Floridi ugostio svojedobno i Michael Milkovich.) Tvoji interesi dakle nikada nisu bili jednoznačni, bio si otvoren prema različitim oblicima stvaralaštva, imao si i imaš pasiju prema svim oblicima Ljepote i dizao si svoj glas u pohvalu svakoj maštovitosti i svakoj stvaralačkoj ruci. I zato ti ispisujem ovu laudu.

I na samom kraju, dragi Vladimire, uvodno sam spomenuo Rudinu, taj ključni spomenik romaničke skulpture u Hrvatskoj, jer sam pripremajući i koncipirajući ovo pismo otkrio da si se tom temom višekratno bavio. Kao što u svojoj beletristici tražiš izvore određenih događaja u prošlim zbivanjima, bližim ili daljim pojavama, tako i u sinteznom tekstu o Rudini, što si ga objavio 2010., pokušavaš dati odgovore o genezi te fascinantne skulpture na više razina. Osobno me je najviše privukla teza o srodnosti rudinske antropomorfne plastike s kapitelima katedrale u Pečuhu. Prizivanje toga čudesnog južnomađarskog grada, ispod Mecseka, s njegovim brojnim spomenicima

– dakle ne samo s katedralom, nego i impresivnom i monumentalnom džamijom na glavnom gradskom trgu, Széchenyi téru, kojoj su isusovci, nakon odlaska Turaka, podarili novu funkciju, zatim s Muzejom Zsolnay, Muzejom Csontváry, Muzejom Vasarely, i da dalje ne nabrajam – u meni je potaknulo brojna sjećanja, zorno svjedočeći i o mojim različitim interesima i fascinacijama, iako se nijednim od tih spomenika, odnosno navedenih umjetnika, nikada nisam detaljnije bavio. Nikada međutim nisam pobliže izučavao ni arheološke lokalitete, od kojim me je plastika Lepenskog vira, primjerice, najviše fascinirala (izložbe tih kamenih skulptura, što bijaše održana u Galeriji Studentskog centra, u Zagrebu, početkom šezdesetih godina, zasigurno se dobro sjećaš), pa ipak, i to ulazi u sferu mojih osobnih preokupacija. Jednako tako kao i stećci, koje poznajem još iz davnih posjeta Narodnom muzeju u Sarajevu, a koje sam sretao potom na različitim lokalitetima kako u Hercegovini, tako i kod nas u Hrvatskoj (Lovreć, Cista). Nešto od te elementarne snage, snažne ekspresivnosti i jakih stilizacija – što se susreću na plastici od Lepenskog vira i glava iz Rudine do stećaka – može se otkriti i u skulpturama jednog autora kojeg sam detaljnije istraživao. Riječ je o Lavoslavu Tortiju, našem višestruko talentiranom samoukom umjetniku iz prvih desetljeća 20. stoljeća – osim što je klesao kipove, bio je također muzičar, podjednako kompozitor i interpret, a povremeno je pisao i popratne stihove za svoju glazbu. Dakle i na tom planu, po interesu za vrlo raznolike oblike ljudskog stvaralaštva, od prethistorije do današnjih dana, za različite oblike ljepota, i to ne samo klasičnog ustroja, vjerujem da dijelimo mnoge srodne interese. I zato ti šaljem ovo pismo: tebi da služi u čast, a nama za podsjećanje.

Srdačno te i prijateljski pozdravljam.

Vladimir Crnković

U Zagrebu, 23. travnja 2012.

P. S.

Nisam predvidio da dotaknem tvoje literarno djelo, tvoje romane i pripovijetke, pisane podjednako na hrvatskom i engleskom, ali ne mogu a da ipak ne spomenem tri fragmenta vezana uz taj segment tvog djelovanja. Kao prvo, knjigu tvojih kratkih priča *Moj prijatelj Fritz* potpisala je kao urednica Jelena Hekman, uz koju me također vezuju brojna prisjećanja još iz studentskih dana, i to ne samo kao studenta komparativne književnosti i štovatelja profesora Hergešića, na čijoj sam katedri s Jelenom studirao i diplomirao, nego i kao autora dviju knjiga koje je ona mnoga desetljeća kasnije poduprla kao urednica u njejoj hvalevrijednoj i nadasve uspješnoj djelatnosti u Matici hrvatskoj. Drugo, naslov te knjige nisam doživio samo doslovno, kao naziv jedne izdvojene priče, nego i u znakovitom značenju, jer se nalazi na naslovnici iznad slike Miroslava (Frica) Kraljevića,

koji me kao umjetnik duboko fascinira od mladosti (a po svemu sudeći i tebe, jer sam siguran da naziv knjige i likovno rješenje naslovnice nisi odabrao slučajno). I zaključno, u prvoj, uvodnoj priči vrlo nas potanko vodiš kroz niz lokaliteta naše Medvednice (ili da radije kažem: Sljemena?), koju s ljubavlju i pasionirano pohodim svaki slobodan trenutak još od djetinjstva. Dakle, dragi imenjače, kao što vidiš, više je razloga zašto sam se morao – i želio – odazvati pozivu koji ste mi ljubazno prosljedili.

Summary

Letter to an Old Friend or In Praise of a Passion

Translation: Graham McMaster

Vladimir Crnković, art critic and historian, museum professional and director of the Croatian Museum of Naïve Art in Zagreb, in *Letter to an Old Friend or In Praise of a Passion*, recalls and evokes various occurrences stemming from encounters with Vladimir Goss, a fellow student from long gone days at the University, when they studied together at the art history department of the Faculty of Philosophy of Zagreb University. Since Crnković is not a medievalist, and pre-Romanesque, Romanesque and Gothic, in fact, the Middle Ages in general are not sufficiently within his immediate research interests for him to be able to take part, as he states, in any specialised or academically competent way in a *festschrift* for Goss's 70th birthday, he has composed a completely freely conceived text, recalling first of all the student days when Goss was a teaching assistant first for Professor Milan Prelog (in the subject of medieval iconography; then for the subject of general art history of the Middle Ages) and subsequently for Professor Tihomil Stahuljak (in the course on protection of monuments). Summoning up those bygone days, he writes of Goss as a lover of culture and art, of past and present, of human creativity, of beauty and life in general. Although they never, as he states, became extremely close friends or associated outside the purview of the usual gathering places of the profession, Crnković was at once drawn by the other man's good will and cordiality, his genuine passion for the subjects they were studying, his unfailing intellectual curiosity, civility, kindness, his *bel esprit* and above all the eternal smile with which he met and greeted people – colleagues, friends and acquaintances. The whole of the text is conceived as a sentimental *rendez-vous*, with the youth of both Vladimir Goss and the author, stretching on a full five decades later, to the present day.

Crnković recalls, for example, that as a student he would sometimes go to the Goss' flat in Zagreb to consult the books that were indispensable for preparation for the exams, books to be found in the library of Goss' mother. The younger generations of today, he points out, can hardly imagine the conditions in which they had to study, when there were no worthwhile libraries, or books, or slide collections, or photo collections and of course no Internet – and the library of Sena Sekulić-Gvozdanović was a life-saving promoter of information and a place for the acquisition of all kinds of knowledge.

When they both took their degrees in 1966, in the following three decades they shared a fairly similar destiny. As we know, Goss went to the United States in 1969, where he had a respectable university career, dealing first of all with medieval art and culture, with the heritage of architecture and urban design, with the pre-Romanesque, Romanesque and Gothic architecture and sculpture, links between East and West in the Middle Ages and so on. He published in prestigious specialised and academic journals in Croatia and elsewhere. At the end of the sixties, Crnković too started his professional activity, as a freelancer, working first of all with numerous foreign museum-gallery institutions and becoming engaged in the promotion of modern art. It was this that set the two of them apart from others in their generation for they both worked abroad – Goss entirely, Crnković predominantly – and yet were mostly concentrated on the promotion and interpretation of Croatian art and culture. Crnković mentions several key Croatian artists and monuments that Goss was engaged with for decades – Buvina, Master Radovan, Niccolo da Giovanni Fiorentino, George of Dalmatia and Francesco Laurana, for example, as well as the Romanesque and Gothic architecture in Morović, Drenovac and Bapska, and the fascinating Romanesque sculpture from the Benedictine Rudine Abbey.

In the second part of the contribution, Crnković evokes several examples of their collaborative endeavours after Goss returned to Croatia in 1999, when he first worked as a visiting professor in the School of Croatian Studies, then in the summer school of Croatian language and culture of the Faculty of Philosophy, after which he became a full professor of the medieval art history at the Department of Art History at the Rijeka University. While he was at work in Zagreb, Goss would regularly take his Croatian studies pupils to see the Croatian Museum of Naïve Art. In connection with this, Crnković recalls that among the many guided tours he has personally conducted around the museum, it was those where Goss was present that were probably the most successful. Since Goss' students came from different countries and parts of the world, the questions and answers that came thick and fast at these presentations delved into the most diverse problem areas. It was for this reason that the guided tours were so successful and inspiring, for they turned into stimulating discussions about history and culture, politics and social issues, the emigration of

the Croats in the last century, literature and film, and not only about the fine arts. Without Goss, without his remarkable general culture, his knowledge, his understanding of historical facts and of art, his eloquence and his impeccable English – this would have been impossible. And thus in closing Crnković thanks him once again most sincerely for the experience.

With a number of such and similar images of their common past, he has endeavoured, as he says, not only to give a reliable testimony to the events that happened in this vast span of five decades, but also to put forward some extremely personal conclusions and judgements. At the end, he mentions that Robert Altman might probably call this procedure one of *short cuts*, and they could also be christened *flashbacks*, for with just a few images from their past, both closer and more distant, he has tried to encompass the whole of Goss' life.

**UZ TRAGOVE CARSKOG KULTA U SISCIIJ
FRAGMENTARNI MRAMORNI PORTRET SEPTIMIJA SEVERA IZ SISKA I NJEGOVO
ZNAČENJE U ODNOSU NA STANJE U SISCIIJ
U DOBA SEVERA***

ANTE RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ

U skupini rimskih kamenih spomenika pohranjenih u južnom dvorišnom depou zagrebačkoga Arheološkoga muzeja prije petnaestak godina otkrivena je fragmentarna mramorna portretna glava koja prikazuje odrasla bradata muškarca. Okolnosti i vrijeme njezina prispjeća u Muzej nisu poznate jer na glavi nema inventarskog broja, ali je umjesto toga na dva mjesta označeno da potječe iz Siska. Njegova rimska prethodnica Siscija nalazi se nedaleko od ušća Kupe u Savu i takav povoljan zemljopisni položaj omogućio joj je da postane jednim od najznačajnijih urbanih središta u Gornjoj Panoniji, važnim administrativnim, gospodarskim, trgovačkim, proizvodno-obrtnim i prometnim središtem, a nakon zauzeća Segestike i značajnim rimskim vojnim uporištem. Glava je neznatno veća od naravne veličine, a ikonografsko-fizionomski detalji (gusta kovrčasta kosa, brada, brkovi, visoko čelo i dr.) sugeriraju da bi mogla biti riječ o portretu Septimija Severa, cara čija je uloga u Panoniji, pa tako i Sisciji, bila vrlo zapažena. Status kolonije grad je, doduše, stekao u doba Flavijevaca, ali isti mu je rang bio potvrđen i u Septimijevo doba: od njegova vremena u imenu grada pojavljuje se stoga i epitet Septimia. S obzirom na njegovu ulogu u Panoniji, osobito u odnosu na podsticanje urbanizacijskih procesa te na obnovu ili izgradnju različitih infrastrukturnih sadržaja (cestovne mreže, gradskih utvrda i dr.), izostanak statua i bista s njegovim likom, kao i prikaza njegovih sinova i drugih članova obitelji, nije jednostavno objasniti, osobito stoga što su sačuvane epigrafske potvrde iz kojih je vidljivo da ih je siscijska zajednica podigla u počast pojedinih pripadnika severske kuće. Na osnovi tipološke podjele koju je predložio G. Daltrop u ovoj prigodi portret iz Siska derminiran je kao tip blizak onomu „s valovitim pramenovima“, premda se čini da nije u potpunosti lišen i elemenata koji karakteriziraju tip „s četiri kovrče“ i onaj „s malenim kovrčastim pramenovima“, a to znači da bi portret trebao biti raniji od 211. god., predložene prigodom njegova prvog objavljivanja. Mramorna portretna glava

iz zagrebačkoga Muzeja jedini je sačuvani portret Septimija Severa iz Siscije, ali i iz šireg područja Panonije pa značenjem svakako nadilazi lokalne okvire. Ona ujedno pokazuje da su Septimiju Severu, a vjerojatno i drugim članovima njegove obitelji, odnosno pojedinim njegovim nasljednicima iz severske kuće, u Panoniji bile podizane statue ili biste koje iz različitih razloga nažalost nisu sačuvane.

mramorni portret, Septimije Sever, tipološko determiniranje, Siscia, Gornja Panonija

Među rimskim urbanim središtima u Gornjoj Panoniji Sisciji (*Siscia*) svakako pripada važno mjesto. Značenje Siscije velikim se dijelom zasniva na njezinom jedinstvenom zemljopisnom položaju. Smještena je, naime, na jugozapadu Panonske nizine, na mjestu gdje Sava mijenja dotadašnji smjer toka od sjevera prema jugu i prema Dunavu nastavlja teći od zapada prema istoku.¹ Od osobite važnosti je i činjenica što tim područjem teku čak tri rijeke, Sava, Kupa i Odra, od kojih su dvije prvospomenute plovne.² Siscija je posjedovala i razgranatu cestovnu mrežu, a znatan broj magistralnih i sporednih cestovnih pravaca bio je trasiran još u ranijim, pretpovijesnim razdobljima. Potrebno je, također, istaknuti i blizinu rudnika željeza, poglavito onih u dolinama Japre i Sane. Sve navedene pogodnosti pridonosile su razvitku Siscije, a to se odnosilo i na susjednu keltsku naseobinu Segestiku (*Segestica*, također i *Segesta*) za koju se pretpostavlja da se nalazila na položaju današnjeg Pogorelca, na desnoj obali Kupe. Siscija je, međutim, bila locirana na suprotnoj, lijevoj obali Kupe, a u antičkim literarnim vrelima znatno više je zastupljena od Segestike ili Segeste.³ Odnos dviju susjednih naseobina u literaturi je bio različito interpretiran, često i na temelju podataka dostupnih iz relevantnih literarnih izvora. Nesporno je, međutim, da se toponim Segestika, nakon što je željeznodobna naseobina prestala biti autonomnim središtem, u izvorima pojavljuje iznimno rijetko. Jedno od mogućih objašnjenja izneseno je i u novije vrijeme i čini se dobro argumentiranim te stoga i prihvatljivim.⁴ O odnosu dviju susjednih naseobina i položaju grada u blizini ušća Kupe u Savu sačuvani su podaci i u antičkim literarnim izvorima. Za Strabona je, primjerice, Segestika (*Segestiké*) bila utvrdom, dok je Sisciju (*Siskía*) smatrao gradom.⁵ Plinije Stariji u znamenitome "Prirodoslovlju" (*Naturalis historia*) osvrnuo se i na položaj Siscije, a u središtu njegove pozornosti je zemljopisni položaj dviju susjednih naseobina: Sisciju je ispravno ubicirao u blizini ušća Kupe (*Colapis*) u Savu (*Savus*), dok je za Segestiku (Segestu) precizirao da se nalazila na „otoku“ oblikovanom dvostrukim koritom Kupe.⁶ U istom kontekstu potrebno je spomenuti da je Siscija, osim što je bila važnim urbanim središtem, ujedno bila i jednim od pogodnih prijelaza preko Save,⁷ a također i mjestom križanja brojnih cestovnih pravaca. Ne čudi

stoga što je takvom registrirana i na najvažnijim antičkim zemljopisnim kartama i itinerarima (*Tabula Peutingeriana*, *Itinerarium Antonini* i dr.), upravo onima koji potječu iz severskog doba, a sačuvani su u prijepisima iz kasnijega vremena.

Ima naznaka iz kojih je moguće pretpostaviti da je dolazak Oktavijanove vojske 35. god. pr. Kr. Segestika (Segesta) dočekala razmjerno dobro utvrđenom, okruženom rijekom i širokim jarkom,⁸ što ipak nije spriječilo poraz Segestana u sukobu s nadmoćnijim neprijateljem. U Apijanovoj (*Appianus*) Rimskoj povijesti, u poglavlju o Građanskim ratovima, naveden je i podatak da je nakon tridesetodnevne opsade rimskoj vojsci uspjelo skršiti otpor lokalnih Segestana, a tom je prigodom, po svemu sudeći, grad pretrpio temeljita razaranja.⁹ Isti literarni izvori ističu da su na tom području tada zadržani značajni vojni kapaciteti sa svrhom da sudjeluju u ostvarivanju temeljnih ciljeva rimske politike, daljnjem vojnom napredovanju prema Dunavu, a zatim i dalje prema zemlji Dačana. Od Tiberijeva vremena, prema navodima Veleja Paterkula koji je tomu i osobno svjedočio, Siscija postaje jednim od najznačajnijih vojnih uporišta na čitavom području Carstva.¹⁰ U njoj je, naime, stanovito vrijeme bio stacioniran velik broj legija i drugih pomoćnih vojnih jedinica.¹¹ U novonastalim okolnostima Siscija dobija na važnosti te postaje značajnim administrativnim, gospodarskim, lučkim, trgovačkim, proizvodnim i obrtnim središtem. O važnosti Siscije svjedoči i podatak da je status kolonije stekla u flavijejsko doba (*colonia Flavia Siscia*), najvjerojatnije tijekom vladanja Vespazijana, istodobno s drugim važnim gradom na Savi, Sirmijem (*Sirmium*). Na siscijsko područje tada su počeli pristizati Italici i došljaci iz istočnih dijelova Carstva, a dedukcijom su osigurani i uvjeti za naseljavanje mornara, pretežito veterana ravske flote, od kojih su mnogi podrijetlom bili iz tih krajeva pa im je dodjela zemlje bila svojevrsnom nagradom za vjerno služenje caru.¹² Prirodno je što tada u Sisciji jačaju prethodno započeti romanizacijski procesi, što se očitovalo u njezinoj ubrzanoj urbanizaciji. Stečeni status kolonije Sisciji je kasnije potvrđen i u doba Septimija Severa pa je u nazivu grada epitet flavijejske kolonije tada bio nadomješten epitetom *Septimia* (u punom obliku *colonia Flavia Septimia Siscia Augusta*).¹³ Logično je pretpostaviti da je, poput Vespazijana 71. god., Septimije Sever na taj način želio zahvaliti na vjernosti i podršci koja mu je iz te sredine bila pružena. Promjene što su se u Sisciji zbivale u doba Severa najviše su se odrazile na intenziviranje građevinskih aktivnosti, što se manifestiralo u gradnji novih i obnavljanju postojećih fortifikacija, a to su potvrdila i recentna arheološka iskopavanja provedena na Trgu bana Jelačića, nasuprot crkve sv. Križa, današnje sisačke katedrale.¹⁴ Ranija arheološka istraživanja također su pokazala da je u doba Septimijeva vladanja, krajem 2. i početkom 3. st., uz obalu Kupe bilo izgrađeno i gradsko kupalište, budući da su njegovi ostaci bili otkriveni 1954. god.¹⁵ Suprotno očekivanjima čini se, međutim, da je opseg gradskog područja tada bio djelomice reduciran.¹⁶

O prometnom značenju Siscije, osobito u odnosu na riječnu plovidbu, važan je podatak o djelovanju rimske flote na Savi (*Classis Flavia Pannonica*), osnovane s ciljem oživljavanja riječnog prometa dolinom Save te povezivanja dviju, iz motrišta rimskih strateških interesa, iznimno važnih lučkih kolonija, Siscije i Sirmija.¹⁷ Iz imena flote vidljivo je – iako je ona bila osnovana ranije – da je njezina aktivnost bila intenzivirana u flavijevsko, a potom i u seversko doba.¹⁸ Zanimljiv je, također, podatak da su na području Siscije, sudeći prema tekstu urezanom na jednoj od opeka pronađenih u Sisku, vjerojatno postojale dvije luke, jedna na desnoj, a druga na lijevoj obali Kupe.¹⁹ Za riječnim prometovanjem nije zaostajalo niti prometovanje kopnom. Siscija je, naime, gustom cestovnom mrežom bila povezana s većinom najvažnijih ondašnjih urbanih središta, što je moguće zaključiti na osnovi podataka zabilježenih u ondašnjim itinerarima i zemljopisnim kartama.²⁰ Prirodno je što su sve navedene okolnosti pogodovale napretku Siscije, a u nekim razdobljima, u flavijevsko i u Hadrijanovo i Trajanovo doba, a potom i u kasnom antoninskom i severskom razdoblju, to se na najbolji način manifestiralo u građevinskim i različitim proizvodnim aktivnostima, kao i u razvitku trgovine i obrta,²¹ a to je imalo utjecaja i na bujanje duhovnog života te procvat ukupnog kulturnog i umjetničkog stvaralaštva.²² U kasnijim vremenima važno je bilo i razdoblje Galijenova vladanja, budući da je tada, najvjerojatnije 262. god., zbog potreba podmirivanja troškova vojnih aktivnosti u Panoniji, u Sisciji s djelovanjem započela carska kovnica novca, uz koju niču i brojne specijalizirane radionice, poglavito one koje su se bavile obradom metala.²³

Sa šireg područja današnjeg Siska prikupljena su brojna svjedočanstva njegova bogatog arheološkog nasljeđa. Mnogi arheološki spomenici iz pretpovijesnog i antičkog doba, kao i iz kasnoantičkog i poglavito ranokršćanskog razdoblja te iz ranoga srednjovjekovlja, danas su pohranjeni u različitim muzejskim i privatnim zbirka i kolekcijama. Najviše ih je pohranjeno u zagrebačkome Arheološkome muzeju, ali se u novije vrijeme sve više obogaćuju i zbirke Gradskog muzeja u Sisku, u kojemu je pohranjena većina nalaza prikupljenih tijekom recentnih arheoloških istraživanja provedenih na nizu tamošnjih lokaliteta. Brojnim spomenicima iz zagrebačkoga Arheološkoga muzeja od nedavna treba pridružiti i ulomak mramornog portreta s prikazom odrasla bradatog muškarca koji je dugo vremena bio nezamijećen među kamenim spomenicima smještenim u južnom dvorišnom depou. O njemu nema podataka u Brunšmidovu katalogu muzejskih kamenih spomenika pa je očigledno da ga do vremena tiskanja navedenog izdanja tamo nije niti bilo. Budući da na njemu nema inventarskog broja ne zna se kada je i pod kakvim je okolnostima dospio u Muzej. Sretna je okolnost što je na dva mjesta, s lijeve strane na vratu i u pravokutnoj udubini na donjoj strani, namijenjenoj nasadiivanju glave na niže dijelove kipa, označeno da spomenik potječe iz Siska. Sprijeda se na lijevoj strani, od vrata preko brade, do

brkova i usta, zadržao trag nanesenog katrana, a mjestimice se na desnoj strani lica naziru i tragovi žarko crvene boje, iz čega bi trebalo zaključiti da je stanovito vrijeme glava bila u doticaju s katranom i crvenom bojom. Na navedeni spomenik prethodno sam se ukratko osvrnuo u dva navrata, najprije u priopćenju održanom na znanstvenom skupu u Puli koji je bio posvećen carskom kultu na istočnoj strani Jadrana,²⁴ a zatim i na skupu u Udinama koji je za temu imao odnose između područja Akvileje i Splita u rimsko doba. Iz naslova je vidljivo da se sadržaj priopćenja podnesenog u Udinama sadržajno se nije uklapao u temu tamošnjeg skupa, ali je, za razliku od prethodnoga, tekst održanog priopćenja bio objavljen u prigodnoj publikaciji.²⁵ U obje prigode portret sam pokušao tipološki i vremenski determinirati, ali se nisam upuštao u razmatranja o širem kontekstu njegova značenja za Sisciju. Činjenica je, međutim, da je fragmentarni Septimijev portret iz Siska zanimljiv iz aspekta pojavljivanja u Sisciji, ali je važan i za šire područje Panonije. Potrebno je ujedno napomenuti da je riječ o jedinom mramornom portretu Septimija Severa iz područja današnje Hrvatske.

Unatoč velikim oštećenjima mramorna glava bradatog muškarca iz Siska privlači pozornost iz nekoliko razloga, najviše, dakako, zbog činjenice što ju je s mnogo vjerojatnosti moguće atribuirati caru Septimiju Severu (Sl. 1-4, 5-6). Njegovi portreti, kao i portreti članova njegove obitelji, ranije nisu bili evidentirani, s izimkom carevih prikaza na novcu. Glava prikazuje odrasla muškarca s gustom kovrčavom kosom i zaliscima, a na licu su ostali vidljivi ostaci dugačke brade i tragovi izlizanih brkova. Unatoč velikim oštećenjima – gotovo u cijelosti je otučena prednja desna strana lica, odnosno čitava desna polovica glave – ipak je preostalo dovoljno karakterističnih detalja koji omogućuju razmjerno pouzdanu atribuciju prikazanog lika. Kada je o oštećenjima riječ, ona su takve naravi da ne treba isključiti mogućnost da su bila načinjena namjerno, možda još u kasnoantičkom, odnosno ranokršćanskom razdoblju.²⁶ Premda se pojedini karakteristični detalji, kosa, brada i brkovi, mogu usporediti s različitim portretima iz severskog doba, a također i onima iz kasnog antoninskog vremena, primjerice s nekim portretima cara Komoda,²⁷ ipak se čini da siscijski portret posjeduje elemente koji su tipični za fizionomiju Septimija Severa, osnivača severske dinastije.

Septimije Sever (*Lucius Septimius Severus Pertinax*, 193.-211.) prvi je rimski car podrijetlom sa sjevernoafričkog tla. Unatoč afričkim korijenima kasnijim je djelovanjem ostavio tragove u gotovo svim područjima Carstva, u istočnim kao i u zapadnim provincijama, a na osobit način i u Gornjoj i Donjoj Panoniji. Mjesto u kojemu je rođen tripolitska je metropola Leptis Magna u današnjoj Libiji. Dion Kasije, rimski senator i konzul, ujedno i namjesnik Gornje Panonije, autor Rimske povijesti napisanoj na grčkom jeziku u kojoj je Septimija Severa opisao kao čovjeka od malo riječi, ali s mnogo ideja, ujedno istaknuvši da je obnovio mnoge stare zgrade te da



Sl. 1-4 Ulomak mramornog portreta Septimija Severa iz Siska: prednja strana, stražnja strana, desni profil, lijevi profil.

je svojim novcem dao izgraditi nove.²⁸ Još od 191. god., dvije godine prije nego što je u dobi od 47 godina od dunavskih legija bio u Karnuntumu (*Carnuntum*), ujedno i glavnom gornjopanonskom gradu, proglašen carem, postao je namjesnikom (*Legatus Augusti pro praetore*) Gornje Panonije. Stoga je nekoliko godina proveo u tamošnjem vojnom logoru. Na prijestolju je naslijedio kompromitiranoga Komoda (*Aurelius Commodus Antoninus Augustus*), posljednjega od careva iz dinastije Antonina (ubijenog 192. ili 193. god.) ili točnije njegova kratkotrajnog nasljednika – na prijestolju je proveo nepuna tri mjeseca – Pertinaksa (*Publius Helvius Pertinax*), ubijenog 193. god. U istoj godini Septimije Sever započeo je obračun s ostalim pretendentima na prijestolje. S potporom dunavskih, a također i rajnskih legija, krenuo je prema Rimu da bi s prijestolja svrgnuo Didija Julijana (*Marcus Didius Severus Iulianus*), odabranika Senata, odnosno da bi neutralizirao moć pretorijanske garde koja je Didiju Julijanu bila glavnim osloncem. Nakon što je iz njemu vjernih vojnih struktura osigurao potporu uspjelo mu je stabilizirati svoju vlast u Rimu. Tada je prisvojio ime ubijenog prethodnika Pertinaksa te krenuo u obračun s ostalim suparnicima, najprije s namjesnikom Sirije Pescenijem Nigerom (*Pescennius Niger*), podržavanog od istočnih legija. Porazivši ga 194. god. preostao mu je još obračun s posljednjim ozbiljnim suparnikom, namjesnikom Britanije Klodijem Albinom (*Decimus Clodius Septimius Albinus*, 193.-197.). Njega su carem proglasile legije iz zapadnih dijelova Carstva. U početku nije ulazio u sukob s nekadašnjim prijateljem te mu je, kao i svojemu mladahnom starijem sinu Karakali, dodijelio titulu Cezara, što je značilo i mogućeg nasljednika. Svjestan, međutim, svoje vojne nadmoći odbio je s njime dijeliti vlast te ga konačno porazio i potom okrutno kaznio 197. god. Vratio se potom u Rim da bi kaznio najeksponiranije članova Senata koji su njegovim poraženim suparnicima pružali podršku.

U želji da sebi osigura puni legitimitet Septimije Sever je nakon preuzimanja vlasti od Senata zatražio divinizaciju Komoda, a sebe je proglasio zakonitim nasljednikom Antonina, odnosno sinom Marka Aurelija i Komodovim bratom. U sklopu te naknadne adopcije u antoninsku obitelj sedmogodišnjem sinu Basijanu (*Septimius Bassianus*), kasnijem caru Karakali, nadjenao je ime Marko Aurelije Antonin (*Marcus Aurelius Severus Antoninus*, 211.-217.).²⁹ Zanimljivo je da se među oskudnim literarnim podacima o njegovu fizičkom izgledu ističu kovrčava kosa i brada, dok je objašnjenje naglašenoj ekspresivnosti prepozato u mogućoj simbolici njegova punog imena (*vere pertinax, vere severe* – istinski čvrst, odnosno istinski strog, ozbiljan).³⁰ O Septimijevu izgledu bilo je različitih pretpostavki, od kojih su neke vrlo proizvoljne. Osim suglasja kad su u pitanju kovrčava kosa i brada, čine se prihvatljivima i navodi prema kojima je bio razmjerno malene stature, ali snažnog i energičnog karaktera. Spominje se i podatak da je tijekom čitavog života u govoru zadržao afrički akcent, nasljeđen od rane mladosti!³¹ Primjećeno je, također, da njegove portretne

biste tijekom mnogih godina vladanja pokazuju zanimljive promjene: u početku je, naime, želio biti prikazivan kao vojnik i čovjek od akcije, ali je kasnije preferirao stil koji je karakterističan za portrete careva iz antoninske dinastije, poglavito Marka Aurelija, kao i njegova prethodnika Antonina Pija (*Titus Aelius Hadrianus Antoninus Augustus Pius*, 138.-161.).³² Brada i kovrčava kosa karakteristični su, međutim, za još neke careve iz dinastije Antonina, osim za Antonina Pija i Marka Aurelija, još i za Komoda i Lucija Vera (*Lucius Aurelius Verus Augustus*), ali i za neke od Septimijevih nasljednika, poput njegova sina Karakale. Septimijevi portreti također nalikuju portretima pojedinih njegovih oponenta, osobito portretima Klodija Albina pa ih je ponekad vrlo teško razlikovati.³³ Osim na osnovi mjesta iz kojega potječe, što može biti svojevrsni putokaz, razlika među njima najviše se očituje u oblikovanju nosa, jer je on, kad je riječ o Albinu, doista specifičan budući da je izrazito prčast.³⁴ U takvom kontekstu dobro je imati na umu da su jedini sigurno atribuirani Septimijevi portreti reljefni prikazi na „četverostranom slavouku“ i na slavoluku „mjenjača srebrnog novca“ iz njegova rodnog grada Leptis Magna: na prvome je prikazan kao sudionik u prizoru prinošenja žrtve, a na drugom u trenutku dok u prisutnosti mlađeg sina Gete pruža ruku starijem sinu Karakali (*concordia Augustorum*).³⁵

U skladu s ondašnjim standardima Septimije Sever na vlasti se zadržao neuobičajeno dugo vremena, čak 18 godina. U tom je razdoblju, unatoč ratovima što ih je gotovo neprekidno bio prisiljen voditi diljem Carstva, od Mezopotamije na istoku, do Britanije na zapadu, čvrsto držao uzde vlasti i ostvario rezultate koji su podigli ugled Carstvu. U tom su pogledu prednjačili njegovi uspješni ratni pohodi protiv Parta, najprije 195. god., a zatim i 197. god. Tom prigodom je Sjevernu Mezopotamiju vratio pod okrilje Carstva, uspostavivši novu provinciju, što je to davno prije njega uspjelo i Trajanu. U istočnim oblastima zadržao se čak 5 godina. Tom prigodom nakratko je boravio i u Egiptu, gdje je u Aleksandriji uspio vidjeti balzamirano tijelo Aleksandra Velikog, a posjetio je i piramide, kao i hramove u Tebi. Za zasluge u ratu s Partima po povratku u Rim njemu je u počast na rimskom Forumu bio podignut slavoluk koji je i danas među bolje očuvanima u čitavom rimskom svijetu. U vrijeme Septimijeva vladanja rimska vojna moć bila je značajno ojačana, a su na području Carstva bile su aktivne 33 legije.³⁶ Pred kraj života Septimije Sever ratovao je u Britaniji, poglavito na području Škotske, a već bolesnog smrt ga je zadesila u Yorku 211. god., u dobi od 65 godina.


U znatno proširenom Carstvu, čemu je i sam u značajnoj mjeri pridonio, Septimiju je uspjevalo održavati stabilnost, dok je u Panoniji osigurao razdoblje relativnog mira i prosperiteta. Ta provincija tada se na različite načine počinje oporavljati od krvavih markomanskih ratova, a procesi obnove nisu mimoišli niti Sisciju pa se upravo u tom razdoblju njezin gradski teritorij širi i na desnu obalu Kupe.³⁷ I u doba vladanja Septimijeva starijeg sina Karakale (*Caracalla*) i njegova

kratkotrajnog suvladara, mlađega brata Gete (*Publius Septimius Geta*, 211.), u Sisciji je, kao i u čitavoj Panoniji, nastavljeno razdoblje svekolika napretka, što zorno potvrđuju i arheološki nalazi. Zanimljivi podaci zabilježeni su na epigrafskim spomenicima, osobito onima koji potječu iz najznačajnijih donjopanonskih središta hrvatskog dijela Panonije. U takvom je kontekstu vrlo dobro obrađeno područje Hadrijanove kolonije Murse (*Mursa*), današnjeg Osijeka,³⁸ kao i Cibala (*Cibalae*), današnjih Vinkovaca.³⁹ Navedenim donjopanonskim središtima u stanovitoj mjeri moguće je priključiti i gornjopanonsko središte Sisciju koja je tada, istodobno kad i *Aquincum* i *Carnuntum*, bila počašćena epitetom Septimijeve kolonije.⁴⁰ Upravo je navedena činjenica potaknula A. Mócsyja da Sisciju svrsta među gradove koji su u značajnoj mjeri ostvarili napredak upravo u doba Severa,⁴¹ iako takvo mišljenje, barem kad je riječ o Sisciji, nije bilo moguće potkrijepiti i dovoljnim brojem relevantnih arheoloških nalaza. Većina ih je, naime, otkrivena tek u novije doba. Bilo je, međutim, za očekivati da će osim epigrafskih spomenika Sisak biti nalazištem statua ili bista Septimija Severa, kao i drugih muških ili ženskih članova njegove obitelji, tim prije što su siscijske radionice pokazale zavidan stupanj zrelosti već u ranijem, antoninskom razdoblju. Takva očekivanja nisu se, međutim, ostvarila, iako nema dvojbe da su u sklopu provođenja carske propagande, odnosno carskog kulta, i u panonskim krajevima bili postavljeni kipovi ili biste istaknutih članova severske kuće, bilo u skupinama, bilo pojedinačno.⁴²



Sl. 5-6 Ulomak mramornog portreta Septimija Severa iz Siska: desni i lijevi poluprofil.

U prethodno opisanim okolnostima fragmentarni mramorni portret atribuiran Septimiju Severu – pod pretpostavkom da je doista o njemu riječ – zbog činjenice što je dugo vremena bio nedostupan i što stručna javnost još uvijek o njemu nije u dovoljnoj mjeri informirana, svakako je od osobita značenja pa se ne čini pretjeranim još jednom na njega svrnuti pozornost.⁴³ Glava je tek u novije vrijeme upisana u muzejsku inventarnu knjigu, u koju je zavedna pod brojem KS 938.⁴⁴ Dimenzije neznatno nadilaze naravnu veličinu: visina sačuvanog dijela glave, zajedno s dijelovima vrata, iznosi 33 cm, dok je od dna brade do vrha čela visina gotovo ista te doseže 32,5 cm.⁴⁵ Najveća širina glave, izmjerena u predjelu čela, iznosi 21,5 cm. Unatoč oštećenjima oblik glave posjeduje većinu karakterističnih fizionomskih detalja: na prednjoj strani jasno se ocravaju obrisi Septimijeva ovalnog i neznatno izduženog, gotovo asketski strogog lica (Sl. 7). Od karakterističnih fizionomskih detalja na licu je očuvan i manji dio širom otvorenog lijevog oka, s vidljivo naglašenim gornjim kapkom i arkadno oblikovanom obrvom, a postao je sačuvan i dio karakterističnih zatvorenih usta, s naglašeno zadebljanom donjom usnom. Nos je, nažalost, u cijelosti otučen, dok se iznad usta nejasno razabiru ostaci izlizanih brkova. Unatoč otučenosti



Sl. 7 Crteži portreta Septimija Severa, tip „s valovitim pramenovima“ (prema Georgu Daltropu).

moguće je ipak naslutiti da je čelo moralo biti visoko, što i priliči Septimijevoj fizionomiji. Glavu obavlja gusta kosa, s pramenovima koji su razmjerno plitko profilirani i uredno su počesljani na tjemenu: uokolo lica kovrče su plastično profilirane, a u visini očiju prema čelu su zaobljene i valovito raspoređene jedna iznad druge. Otraga su na zatiljku pramenovi gotovo u cijelosti izlizani, a u nižim dijelovima, u smjeru vrata, dijelovi glave su odlomljeni ili otkrnuti. S donje strane ostao je većim dijelom sačuvan pravokutno oblikovani utor koji je služio povezivanju nižih dijelova

skulpture s glavom: u unutrašnjosti utora manjim je slovima još jednom zabilježeno da glava potječe iz Siska. Za preciznije tipološko determiniranje portreta znakovito je da su uši u cijelosti ostale slobodne i nepokrivene, a vidljive su s obje strane: uši su precizno anatomske oblikovane, s detaljima koji nisu izostavljeni niti u ušnim šupljinama. Kovrčavi zalisci s obje strane lica neuredno se spuštaju i povezani su s bradom koja je sužena u donjim dijelovima. Na bradi je po sredini vidljiv trag okomito usječenog razdjeljka, a lijeva polovica brade djelomice je otučena. Brada je površinski plitko profilirana i nije sastavljena od dugačkih kovrčastih pramenova karakterističnih za neke tipove Septimijevih portreta. Očuvani su i dijelovi vrata koji su bolje uočljivi na stražnjoj i bočnim stranama: s lijeve strane je na površini vrata u okomito položaju označeno da glava potječe iz Siska. Zbog znatnih oštećenja glavu je teško sa sigurnošću atribuirati određenoj osobi, ali najvjerojatnijom se ipak čini usporedba s portretima Septimija Severa. Iz sličnih razloga problem predstavlja i tipološko determiniranje portreta. Prema tipološkoj razradi Georga Daltropa, koji je detaljno analizirao ikonografske osobine Septimijevih portreta, siscijska glava mogla bi pripadati tipu što ga je on nazvao „tipom s valovitim pramenovima“ („a ciocche ondulate“).⁴⁶ Objavljujući ga prvi put u zborniku radova skupa u Udinama zaključio sam da siscijska glava pripada tipu koji je Daltrop označio kao „tip s malenim kovrčastim pramenovima“ („a piccole ciocche ricce“).⁴⁷ Na takav zaključak potaknula me činjenica što su na portretima takvog tipa, kao i na portretima što ih je Daltrop tipološki označio „tipom s valovitim pramenovima“, uši u potpunosti vidljive i niti najmanjim dijelom nisu prekrivene pramenovima kose.⁴⁸ U prilog takvoj tipološkoj determinaciji, a također i predloženoj atribuciji, pozornost sam usmjerio na detalje za koje se smatra da su karakteristični za fizionomiju Septimija Severa, poglavito na oblik glave s tipičnim visokim čelom, na frizuru s pramenovima koja nalikuje frizuri iz antoninskog doba, zatim na brkove i dugačku bradu s razdjeljkom po sredini i dr. Za datiranje siscijskog portreta također sam u obzir uzeo sugestije istog autora: na osnovi pojedinih analognih detalja na Septimijevim portretima na novcu iz 211. god., ujedno i godini njegove smrti, pretpostavio sam, oslonivši se upravo na način prikazivanja ušiju, da bi siscijski portret trebalo povezati upravo s tipom koji je prikazan na navedenom novcu, a Daltrop ga je nazvao „tipom s malenim kovrčastim pramenovima“. Iz navedenih razloga smatrao sam da je Septimijev portret iz Siska kronološki determiniran navedenim tipom sačuvanim na novcu koji je ujedno bio i posljednji od poznatih tipova Septimijevih portreta. Nakon aktualne temeljitije analize danas sam, međutim, skloniji vjerovati da siscijski portret ipak ima više dodirnih točaka s tipom portreta što ga je Daltrop nazvao „tipom s valovitim pramenovima“. Argumenti koji govore tomu u prilog poglavito se odnose na karakterističan raspored pramenova: njihovi završeci raspoređeni u visini očiju valovito su, naime, poredani jedan iznad drugog. Čini se, također, da su zalisci na portretima takvog tipa prikazani na odgovarajućim

skicama više nalik onima na portretu iz Siska. Poteškoće, međutim, nastaju u razlikama u načinu oblikovanja brade: na portretima „tipa s valovitim pramenovima“ brada je, naime, prikazana dugom i većim je dijelom s prorijeđenim kovrčasto izduženim pramenovima. Oni se u donjim dijelovima sužuju, dok su dva razmaknuta kraka razdvojena širokim okomitim razdjeljkom. Na glavi iz Siska brada ima drugačiji izgled i samo je površinski sporadično profilirana plitkim polumjesečastim urezima. Ujedno se stječe dojam da je kraća, a na neki način i gušća i deblja, te da su razmaknuti krakovi zaobljeni, dok se razdjeljak pojavljuje tek u donjem dijelu. Vjerujem, međutim, da opisane razlike ne moraju nužno biti faktorom koji bi trebao dovesti u pitanje tipološko determiniranje portreta te da su u tom pogledu moguće stanovite varijacije. Portret iz Siska, prema Daltropovoj kategorizaciji, sadrži, dakle, elemente za koje smatram da su bliski starijem tipu, onome „s četiri uvojka“, što se osobito odnosi na prikazani detalj s valovito raspoređenim uvojcima u visini očiju. Ima, međutim, i elementa, osobito kad je riječ o oblikovanju brade, koji su bliski tipu „s malenim kovrčastim pramenovima“. Taj tip je u kronološkom slijedu stariji. Ne može se, međutim, isključiti niti mogućnost da je riječ o kombinaciji nekoliko različitih tipova Septimijevih portreta. U svakom slučaju dataciju (oko 211. god.) za koju sam se svojedobno opredijelio trebalo bi, na osnovi prethodno iznesenoga, djelomice korigirati i portret datirati nekoliko godina ranije nego sam ranije bio pretpostavio, najvjerojatnije u prvih nekoliko godina 3. st. Takvim datiranjem portret bi vremenski bio bliži godini u kojoj je Septimije Sever posjetio Sisciju, što ne mora značiti da je kip kojemu je glava pripadala bio postavljen u povodu njegova dolaska u Sisciju, što su zagovarali pojedini autori pišući o Septimijevom putovanju po Panoniji.⁴⁹ Skloniji sam, također, vjerovati da je glava pripadala kipu, a ne bisti, a to bi trebalo značiti da je, poput mnogih drugih carskih statua, i siscijska bila namjerno oštećena.

U odnosu na stilska obilježja Septimijev portret iz Siska sadrži elemente karakteristične za portrete severskog doba: forma je zatvorenija nego na portretima iz prethodnog razdoblja, u većoj je mjeri izražena komponenta koja ističe psihološko stanje, dok su koloristički naglasci, u usporedbi s onima nasljeđenim iz antoninskog vremena, također manje naglašeni.⁵⁰ Nakon novijih iznesenih gledišta koji u stanovitom smislu relativiziraju ranija stajališta u odnosu na itinerar kojim je Septimije Sever obilazio Panoniju 202. god.,⁵¹ trebalo bi se zapitati uolikoj mjeri, kao relevantan kriterij za utvrđivanje trase kojom se kretao, mogu poslužiti obilježja podignuta u znak odavanja počasti caru i članovima njegove obitelji. Nedavno je, naime, Zs. Mráv naveo primjere iz Cibala, natpise koji posvjedočuju važne urbanizacijsko-infrastrukturne zahvate u gradu koji nije bio među najvećima u Panoniji, a niti se nalazio u neposrednoj blizini limesa i krajeva koji su Septimiju tijekom inspeksijskog obilaska Panonije i tamošnjih vojnih uporišta svakako bili od prvorazrednog značaja.⁵²

Unatoč fragmentarnosti i izostanku podataka o okolnostima nalaza glavu iz Siska ipak je s velikom vjerojatnosti moguće pripisati Septimiju Severu. Manje se čini vjerojatnim da bi to mogao biti netko od careva koji su bili njegovim nasljednicima, ili netko tko bi bio iz ranije, antoninske dinastije. Osim opisanih fizionomskih osobina u obzir svakako treba uzeti i činjenicu da je riječ o caru koji je na mnogo načina bio povezan s Panonijom pa tako i sa Siscijom, koja je bila i njegovom kolonijom.

Vraćajući se iz rata s Partima Septimije Sever je, po svemu sudeći, s obitelji i pratećom svitom boravio i u Sisciji. S njime je u toj prigodi vjerojatno bila i zaručnica njegova starijeg sina Karakale, Fulvija Plautila (*Fulvia Plautilla*). To se najvjerojatnije zbilo neposredno uoči njihova vjenčanja.⁵³ Sjećanje na njezinu prisutnost u Sisciji sačuvano je, naime, na mramornoj bazi s natpisom, izloženoj u lapidariju zagrebačkoga Arheološkoga muzeja. Kasnije je ona poslužila nekoj drugoj svrsi i bila je u sekundarnoj upotrebi, o čemu svjedoči pravokutna šupljina načinjena na stražnjoj strani kamenog bloka.⁵⁴ U osnovi je riječ o kamenom bloku koji je pravokutnog oblika, a nad njim je najvjerojatnije stajao Plautilin kip, premda ne treba isključiti mogućnost da je bila riječ i o nekom drugom prikladnom obilježju. Na gornjoj površini kubusa vidljiv je utor koji je očigledno trebalo poslužiti za usađivanje kipa ili nekog drugog prikladnog predmeta nepoznata sadržaja (Sl. 8). Iz natpisa na prednjoj strani baze proizlazi da je spomenik postavila siscijska općina (*respublica Siscianorum*) u počast Karakalinoj zaručnici (*sponsa*) Plautili. Dijelovi natpisa, prva četiri retka s Plautilininim imenom te njezinim tadašnjim statusom, namjerno su bili eradirani (*damnatio memoriae*), očigledno u doba kad je Plautila već bila u Karakalinoj nemilosti, a možda više nije bila niti na životu, kao i sumnji o urotničkoj ulozi njezina oca Plautijana (*Gaius Fulvius Plautianus*), prefekta pretorijanaca i Septimijeve nekadašnjeg sumještana, s kojim je čak bio i u rodbinskoj vezi.⁵⁵ To je razlog što je nekoliko početnih redaka na natpisu vrlo teško čitljivo. Tekst je sa svih strana uokviren jednostavnom profilacijom, a na isti su način profilirane i obje bočne strane na kojima nema teksta. Unatoč oštećenjima tekst je ipak moguće pročitati u cijelosti te on glasi:

*Fulviae / Plautillae / Aug(ustae) / sponsae / imp(eratoris) Antonini / Aug(usti) / respubl(ica) /
Siscianorum*

U različitim je prigodama bilo riječi o tomu da spomenik potječe iz 202. god., iz vremena prije Plautiline udaje, budući da je iz natpisa vidljivo da je u vrijeme podizanja spomenika ona još bila Karaklinom zaručnicom. Zanimljivo je da je riječ upravo o godini u kojoj je Septimije Sever vjerojatno boravio u Sisciji. U svakom slučaju, pribroji li se tom spomeniku portretna glava Septimija Severa iz Siska riječ bi bila o dva spomenika podignuta u Sisciji u počast Septimiju

Severu i jednom od članova njegove obitelji. Upitno je, međutim, jesu li oba spomenika iz istog vremena te jesu li bili podignuti u povodu Septimijeva dolaska u Sisciju. Možda oni potvrđuju pretpostavku da je u Sisciji postojala skupina portreta podignutih u počast Septimiju Severu i članovima njegove obitelji, sinovima Karakali i Geti, a možda i ženi Juliji Domni, odnosno onima za koje se pretpostavlja da su sa Septimijem tada boravili u Sisciji. Treba se nadati da će u budućnosti takvu pretpostavku biti moguće potvrditi ili opovrgnuti odgovarajućim arheološkim nalazima.



Sl. 8 Baza s posvetnim natpisom Plautili iz Siska.

Poput Murse i Cibala, ali i drugih panonskih središta, Siscija je zajedno s okolicom također nalazište zanimljivih natpisa koji potječu iz severskog razdoblja. To su istaknuli i drugi autori navodeći, primjerice, da njezin prosperitet u seversko doba potvrđuju natpisi i drugi kameni spomenici, uglavito žrtvenici i statue kojima je bio obilježen tadašnji Septimijev boravak u Panoniji. Pretpostavljeno je da su tada bili podignute brojne javne građevine, hramovi, a mnogi su objekti, nimfeji, fontane i dr., bili obnovljeni, u čemu su sudjelovale privatne osobe. Gradske zajednice tomu su, također, pružile značajan doprinos dovodeći u veća urbana središta tekuću vodu, ukrašavajući unutrašnjost javnih objekata, i sl., te opasujući gradove bedemima.⁵⁶ Među spomenicima pretežu miljokazi, kao i nadgrobni spomenici te žrtvenici posvećenim različitim božanstvima, osobito onima orijentalnog podrijetla, što je bilo u skladu sa širenjem i propagiranjem orijentalnih kultova u seversko doba.⁵⁷ Većina natpisa odnosi se na pojedince koji su obnašali različite dužnosti, a u njihovu imenu sačuvana je neka od izvedenica imena *Severus*. Osobito su dragocjeni natpisi s podacima o urbanizaciji Siscije i o izvođenju različitih infrastrukturnih radova, izgradnji, odnosno proširenju i obnovi cesta, mostova i dr., što, međutim, nije tema ovog priloga.⁵⁸ Svojevrsnom iznimkom mogao bi biti natpis, nažalost izgubljen, ali objavljen u CIL-u, koji je siscijska općina (*respublica Siscianorum*) dala postaviti u počast nekom od careva.⁵⁹ Na njemu su reci s imenom cara također eradirani (*damnatio memoriae*), ali se čini da se izbrisano ime odnosilo na Septimijeva prethodnika Komoda, sina Marka Aurelija.

Premda ne potječe iz severskog razdoblja ipak je u razmatranjima širega konteksta korisno podsjetiti i na poznatu mramornu glavu djevojke iz zagrebačkoga Arheološkoga muzeja (Sl. 9).⁶⁰ Bibliografija o njoj vrlo je bogata, a bila je izlagana i na mnogim tematskim izložbama. Na glavi je zanimljiv tip frizure sa zategnutim pramenovima, s punđom i pletenicom na zatiljku, a karakteristično je i udubljenje nad čelom koje je vjerojatno trebalo poslužiti za naknadno usađivanje atributa koji je trebao stajati nad glavom. U mnogo navrata taj detalj bio je povod za atribuiranje glave liku Izidine svećenice.⁶¹ Zbog naglašenih individualnih crta lica glava je, međutim, u novije vrijeme determinirana kao portret mlade žene. Najprije je bilo riječi o mogućnosti da bi ga trebalo pripisati Komodovoj ženi Krispini (*Brutta Crispina*, 164-188.),⁶² a zatim nekoj privatnoj osobi, anonimnoj djevojci, što je protumačeno specifičnim načinom oblikovanja očiju na kojima nisu označeni karakteristični detalji, zjenice i šarenice.⁶³ Glava je, po svemu sudeći, iz antoninskog doba, odnosno iz sredine 2. st., što bi trebalo značiti da pripada najranijim sačuvanim portretima podrijetlom iz kontinentalnih područja Hrvatske, a svakako je i među najkvalitetnijima iz unutrašnjosti Hrvatske.⁶⁴ Pribrojivši joj nekoliko desetljeća kasniji portret Septimija Severa, koji kvalitetom oblikovanja mnogo ne zaostaje, trebali bismo zaključiti da su u antoninsko i seversko doba u siscijskim radionicama stvarani portreti vrlo visoke likovne kvalitete.

S iznimkom likova pokojnika prikazivanih na nadgrobnim spomenicima u Sisciji i gravitirajućim područjima iz tog su vremena razmjerno rijetki portreti privatnih osoba, a isto se odnosi i na ostala područja u unutrašnjosti Hrvatske. Jedan od rijetkih muških portreta iz tih krajeva je mramorna glava bradatog muškarca iz Arheološkoga muzeja u Zagrebu, slučajno pronađena u središtu Zagreba, u današnjoj Petrinjskoj ulici (Sl. 10).⁶⁵ U nekoliko izložbenih kataloga glavu sam datirao u treću četvrtinu 3. st.,⁶⁶ ali je to kasnije djelomice korigirano pa je za njezinu dataciju predloženo vrijeme oko sredine, odnosno neposredno prije sredine 3. st. To bi trebalo značiti da portret potječe iz kasnog severskog ili poslijeseverskog doba, odnosno iz ranog razdoblja vladavine tzv. vojničkih careva, premda treba imati na umu da su statue i portreti careva iz tog razdoblja malobrojni.⁶⁷ U raspravama o zagrebačkom portretu bilo je sugestija o sličnostima s portretima Makrinova (*Macrinus*) sina Dijadumenijana (*Marcus Opellius Antoninus Diadumenianus*, 208-218.), kao i Elagabala (*Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Varius Avitus Bassianus*, 218-222.), dvojice mladih careva koji su, u skladu s aktualnom modom, nosili bradu i frizuru poput onih na portretu mladog muškarca iz Zagreba.⁶⁸ Usporedba s Dijadumenijanom čini se u priličnoj mjeri uvjerljivom,



Sl. 9 Mramorni portret djevojke iz Siska.



Sl. 10 Mramorni portret mladog muškarca iz Zagreba.

budući da frizurom i bradom, ali i crtama lica, zagrebački portret nalikuje portretu Dijadumenijana. Manje se čini uvjerljivom usporedba s Elagabalom, a imajući u vidu zatvoreni volumen glave i kratku kosu s vlasima koje su naznačene kratkim urezima,⁶⁹ kao i zbog nekih manje uočljivih fizionomskih podudarnosti, primjerenijom bi mogla biti usporedba s Aleksandrom Severom (*Marcus Aurelius Severus Alexander*, 222-235.), odnosno s nekim portretima posljednjega od severskih vladara. Istaknuo bih, također, da sam svojedobno, na osnovi stilskih i nekih fizionomskih

podudarnosti, zagrebački portret pokušao pripisati nekome iz skupine tzv. vojničkih careva, najprije Filipu Arabljaninu (*Marcus Julius Philippus*, 244.-249.), a zatim, na osnovi usporedbe s portretima na novcu, Galijenu (*Publius Licinius Egnatius Gallienus*, 253.-268.), poznatom i po njegovoj sklonosti prema pjesničkoj riječi.⁷⁰ Pomisao na mogućnost atribucije Galijenu potaknuta je bila i činjenicom što je početak rada siscijske kovnice povezan upravo s razdobljem njegova vladanja.

Unatoč očiglednim zaslugama careva iz kuće Severa za napredak Siscije i čitave Panonije do pojave portreta iz zagrebačkoga Muzeja u Hrvatskoj ipak nije bilo evidentiranih kamenih (mramornih) carskih portreta. To se odnosi na panonska područja, ali niti u Dalmaciji stanje nije bilo bitno drugačije.⁷¹ Izostanak carskih portreta iz tog razdoblja ne odnosi se isključivo na Septimija Severa, nego i na njegove sinove i druge članove obitelji, ali i na njegove kasnije nasljednike. Nekome se to može činiti neobičnim, s obzirom na to što postoje indirektni dokazi o tomu da se nakon stanovita zastoja u seversko doba obnavlja običaj postavljanja skupina carskih portreta.⁷² Na osnovi nekoliko sačuvanih kamenih baza nad kojima su, po svemu sudeći, izvorno stajale statue s likovima članova severske carske obitelji, moguće je, naime, pretpostaviti da je u Dalmaciji bilo takvih portreta, ali oni nisu sačuvani ili im se možda još uvijek nije ušlo u trag.⁷³ Kad je o Panoniji riječ, a osobito o Sisciji, mnogo je elemenata koji omogućuju zaključak da je Septimije Sever u tim krajevima uživao iznimnu popularnost i naklonost stanovništva. Uspješnim političkim i gospodarskim potezima – ne isključujući niti druge moguće razloge – stekao je zasluge zbog kojih je Siscija imala povod odužiti mu se na najprikladniji način. Moguće je, dakle, pretpostaviti da je na nekom istaknutom mjestu u gradu u njegovu počast bio podignut kip s njegovim likom koji je vjerojatno stajao na odgovarajućoj bazi. Ne bi, dakle, trebalo isključiti mogućnost da je fragmentarni portret iz Siska pripadao tom kipu, što je, dakako, samo pretpostavka koju bi teško bilo dokazati. Septimije Sever podržavao je obnovu stanovito vrijeme zamrlih oblika carske propagande. Imajući u vidu sačuvane počasne natpise opravdano je pretpostaviti da carska propaganda nije bila ograničena samo na natpise nego je u njegovanju carskog kulta istaknuto mjesto pripadalo i kipovima, odnosno bistama s prikazima istaknutih članova carske obitelji. Dokaz tomu vjerojatno je i portretna glava Septimija Severa o kojoj je bilo riječi u ovom prilogu.⁷⁴ Dodao bih, također, da je stanovite nedorečenosti koje se primjećuju u završnoj obradi nekih detalja na glavi moguće objasniti njezinim lokalnim podrijetlom.⁷⁵

Zaključio bih da portret Septimija Severa, kao i drugi portreti o kojima je usputno bilo riječi, dokazuju da su se već od antoninskog doba siscijske radionice mogle pohvaliti vrlo kvalitetnom produkcijom kamenih portreta, uspjevajući ponekad dosegnuti visoke umjetničke domete u toj specifičnoj i možda najzahtjevnijoj grani cjelokupnog antičkog i poglavito rimskog likovnog stvaralaštva.

*Zadovoljstvo mi je u povodu obilježavanja 70. godišnjice rođenja ovaj prilog posvetiti kolegi i prijatelju dr. Vladimiru Gossu, istaknutom hrvatskom povjesničaru umjetnosti i osobi s kojim me vezuje dugogodišnje poznanstvo, a posljednjih godina i plodna, nadam se obostrano korisna stručna suradnja.

¹ Više o ukupnim geostrateškim karakteristikama položaja Siscije cfr. Durman 1992: 118 sqq.

² O rijekama u Sisciji više u Buzov 2003: 177-194.

³ Na epigrafičkim spomenicima, čak i onim najranijima, ne spominje se toponim Segestika, za razliku od Siscije koja se na ranijim natpisima pretežito pojavljuje kao flavijevska kolonija, a kasnije kao Septimijevska kolonija. Iz toga je moguće pretpostaviti da je Siscija bila doživljavana gradom, dok Segestika, osobito u carsko doba, više nije bila percipirana kao urbano središte. Sjećanje na nju ipak je, čini se, opstalo, ali je navedeni toponim vjerojatno korišten u drugačijem značenju (Radman Livaja, 2007: 168).

⁴ Cfr. Radman Livaja, o.c. 167. Na temelju natpisa na olovnoj teseri iz Siska, na kojoj je spomenut toponim *Segestica*, pisac je pretpostavio da su se u carskom razdoblju na Pogorelcu mogli nalaziti industrijski pogoni i lučka postrojenja, a područje Pogorelca u tom je slučaju moglo biti predgrađem Siscije, zadržavši nekadašnje ime, ali ne i identitet zasebnog urbanog središta. Pisac, dakle, smatra da se spominjanje Segestike na olovnoj teseri ne može pripisati autohtonoj, keltsko-rimskoj naseobini, nego je moguće pretpostaviti da je stanovništvo Siscije nekadašnje ime naseobine na lijevoj obali Kupe i dalje nastavilo upotrebljavati u svakodnevnom životu. To je, prema piščevu mišljenju, moglo potrajati još nekoliko stoljeća nakon što je Segestika prestala funkcionirati kao autonomna urbana cjelina.

⁵ Lolić 2003: 133.

⁶ *Praeterea amnes memorandi Colapis in Sauam influens iuxta Sisciam, gemino alveo insulam ibi efficit, quae Segestica appellatur ...* (C. Plinius Secundus, *Naturalis historia*, Lipsiae 1906, III, 148); cfr. također Vrbanović 1981: 187; Domić Kunić 2012: 60.

⁷ Prijelaz preko Save na području Siscije smatra se najvažnijom tradicionalnom vezom između Panonije i Dalmacije (cfr. Durman, o.c., 127).

⁸ *App., Romaike Historia* (Rimska povijest), poglavlje. *Illyrike* (Ilirski ratovi), 4. 22.

⁹ *App.*, 4. 24; cfr.: Vrbanović 1981: 188; Domić Kunić 2012: 48.

¹⁰ Lolić 2003: 133.

¹¹ Prema navodima Veleja Paterkula (*C. Velleius Paterculus, Historia Romana*) na području Siscije bilo je stacionirano 10 legija i 70 kohorta, kao i niz drugih pomoćnih vojnih jedinica (o tomu cfr. Zaninović 1986: 63).

¹² Vrbanović 1981: 188; Zaninović 1981: 203.

¹³ *Idem*, o.c.: 189.

¹⁴ Lolić 2003: 139.

¹⁵ Lolić 2003: 142.

¹⁶ Lolić 2003: 134.

¹⁷ Zaninović 1981: 203.

¹⁸ Zaninović 1993: 54.

¹⁹ Matijašić 1986: 206; Radman Livaja 2007: 167.

²⁰ O cestama koje su spajale Sisciju s drugim središtima, kao i o kontroverzama u vezi s identifikacijom pojedinih trasa i lokaliteta kojima su ceste prolazile, cfr. Durman, o.c., 121 sqq.

²¹ Lolić 2003: 141 sqq.

²² Cfr. Šašel 1974: 702-741; Vrbanović 1981: 187-200; Hoti 1992; Lolić 2003 te brojne monografije i radovi stranih i domaćih autora od kojih za ovu prigodu izdvajam sljedeća imena: A. Mócsy, J. Fitz, K. Póczy, L. Bakóczy, Zs. Mráv., odnosno J. Brunšmid, P. Selem, N. Cambi, R. Košćević, B. Migotti, M. Buzov, V. Nenadić, D. Vuković, Z. Burkowski, Z. Wiewegh, V. Vukelić te mnogi drugi.

²³ Lolić 2003: 134.

²⁴ Skup u Puli održan je u studenom 1997. god., a naslov priopćenja glasio je „Tragovi carskog kulta u središnjim i sjeverozapadnim područjima Hrvatske“.

²⁵ Jednodnevni skup u Udinama bio je održan 4. travnja 2006. (cfr. Rendić-Miočević 2006: 66-68, Fig. 15, 15a).

²⁶ Cambi 2000: 119.

²⁷ Zanimljivo je, a na neki način je i znakovito, što iz Siska potječe natpis što ga je siscijska zajednica (*respublica Siscianorum*) podigla u čast cara Komoda (CIL III, 3968 i 10850) čije ime je nakon njegove smrti bilo izbrisano, u skladu s tadašnjim običajem osude na zaborav onih za koje je smatrano da takvu počast nisu zaslužili (*damnatio memoriae*).

²⁸ *Cass. Dio (Dio Cassius Coceianus)*, Rimska povijest (*Romaike Historia*), LXXVII. 16.

²⁹ Daltrop 1986: 67.

³⁰ *Ibidem*.

³¹ Grant 1999: 113.

³² Scarre 1998: 130.

³³ Tomović 2002: 63 sqq.

- ³⁴ Tomović o.c.: 72.
- ³⁵ Daltrop 1986: 67 sqq.
- ³⁶ Grant 1999: 110.
- ³⁷ Hoti 1992: 145.
- ³⁸ Pinterović 1978: 63-65.
- ³⁹ Iskra-Janošić 2001: 59, 61, 64. O događajima u Cibalama u doba Severa svjedoče ulomci reprezentativnih carskih natpisa što ih je nedavno detaljno analizirao i protumačio Zs. Mráv, koji svjedoče o izgradnji uređaja za snabdjevanje vodom i o javnom kupalištu što ih je u čast caru podigla gradska zajednica, a koji su bili otvoreni 200. god. Iz toga je moguće zaključiti da nisu svi carski objekti građeni u seversko doba, u gradu koji se nije nalazio na granici (limesu), bili usklađeni s 202. god., odnosno boravkom Septimija Severa u Panoniji (Zs. Mráv 2012: 251-278; B. Migotti 2012: 13, s.v. 4.6. The Severan period).
- ⁴⁰ Barkóczy 1980: 102., s.v. The age of the Severans; Fitz 1980: 152, s.v. After the Marcomanic wars.
- ⁴¹ Mócsy 1974: 217; Migotti 2012: 12-13.
- ⁴² Takvih primjera nema u panonskim dijelovima Hrvatske, ali primjer iz Dalmacije, odnosno Raba, pokazuje da ih je u seversko doba moguće očekivati i na području Panonije (cfr. Cambi 2000: 117).
- ⁴³ Rendić-Miočević 2006: 66-69.
- ⁴⁴ Zahvaljujem se kolegi Ivanu Radmanu Livaji koji se pobrinuo da glava dobije inventarski broj, a ujedno je obavio izmjere na glavi koje su mi nedostajale.
- ⁴⁵ Prema nekim kalkulacijama, odnosno usporedbi s dimenzijama portzreta Kldija Albina iz Karataša, statua iz Siska kojoj je glava vjerojatno pripadala mogla bi dosezati visinu od približno 2,20—2,30 cm (cfr. Tomović 2002: 67).
- ⁴⁶ Daltrop 1986: 69, 71, Fig 3.
- ⁴⁷ Rendić-Miočević 2006: 68.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibidem.*
- ⁴⁹ Fitz 1959: 237-263; Pinterović 1960: 25; Pinterović 1978: 63.
- ⁵⁰ Cambi 2000: 65 sqq.
- ⁵¹ Riječ je o radovima J. Fitza i D. Pinterović (Fitz 1959: 237-263; Pinterović 1960: 25 sqq.).
- ⁵² Mráv 2012: 270-273.
- ⁵³ Pinterović 1960: 26 (na natpisu, bazi za njezin kip, Plautila je, naime, bila oslovljena titulom *Augusta*).
- ⁵⁴ Brunšmid 1904-1911: 141-142, nr. 278; Hoffiller-Saria 1938: 28, nr. 560; Zaninović 1981: 206.
- ⁵⁵ Grant 1999: 110.
- ⁵⁶ Fitz 1980: 153 (za Sisciju pisac pretpostavlja da je – a isto bi se trebalo odnositi i na Sirmij – imala i slavoluk).
- ⁵⁷ Nerijetko su spomenici bili podizani za zdravlje pojedinih careva: takav je, primjerice, slučaj s Mitrinim žrtvenikom podignutim za dobro zdravlje Karakale ili Elagabala (cfr. CIL III, 3958; Brunšmid 1904-1911: 137, n. 239; Hoffiller-Saria 1938: nr. 543; Zaninović 1981: 203). Zastupljeni su bili i egipatski kultovi pa se za ulomak Izidina žrtvenika vjeruje da je iz vremena Karakale ili Septimija Severa (cfr. CIL III, 3944; Hoffiller-Saria 1938: nr. 530; Zaninović 1981: 204). Sličnih primjera još je mnogo, u rasponu od Septimija Severa do Aleksandra Severa (cfr. Zaninović, o.c.).
- ⁵⁸ Jedan od natpisa spominje, primjerice, brigu stanovitog Flavija Severa u vezi s obnovom nekog važnog javnog objekta u Sisciji (cfr. CIL III, 10851; Hoffiller-Saria 1938:564; Zaninović 1981: 207).
- ⁵⁹ CIL III, Berlin 1902: 3968 i 10850; Rendić-Miočević 2006: 70.
- ⁶⁰ Brunšmid 1904-1911: 23, nr. 36.
- ⁶¹ *Ibidem* (Brunšmidovo gledište slijedili su mnogi autori koji su poslije njega o istoj glavi pisali iz vrlo različitih pobuda).
- ⁶² Rendić-Miočević 1987: 201, nr. 152; Cambi 1991: 103 sqq. (pisac navodi tip frizure koja je tipična za modu iz druge polovice 2. st.)
- ⁶³ Cambi 2000: 64, Tab. 135; *idem* 2002: 136, Fig. 198.
- ⁶⁴ *Ibidem.*
- ⁶⁵ Brunšmid 1904-1911: 38, nr. 68.
- ⁶⁶ Rendić-Miočević 1987: 222, nr. 197; *idem* 1994: 109, nr. 163; cfr. također Cambi 1991: 117 sqq. Čini se da ga s razlogom uspoređuje i s portretima Volusijana (*Gaius Vibius Afinius Gallus Veldumnianus Volusianus*, 251-253), sina Treboniana Gala (*Trebonianus Gallus*), odnosno Karina (*Marcus Aurelius Carinus*, cca 252-285.), ali s obzirom na mjesto nalaza u neurbaniziranoj sredini smatra ipak vjerojatnijim da je riječ o portretu nepoznate privatne osobe.
- ⁶⁷ Cambi 2000: 117 i 71 sqq., Fig. 151; *idem* 2002: 139, Fig. 205.
- ⁶⁸ Cambi 2000: 71.
- ⁶⁹ *Ibidem.*
- ⁷⁰ Rendić-Miočević 1987: 22, nr. 197; *idem* 1994: 109, nr. 163.
- ⁷¹ Cambi 2000: 66.
- ⁷² Cambi 1998: 56-57.
- ⁷³ *Ibidem.*
- ⁷⁴ Cambi 1987: 56.

⁷⁵ Podrijetlo mramora nije mi nažalost poznato, premda je uzorak mramora svojedobno bio podvrgnut odgovarajućim analizama.

Bibliografija

KRATICE

AIJ	Antike Inschriften aus Jugoslavien
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
HA	Histria Antiqua
IHAD	Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva
OA	Opuscula Archaeologica
OZ	Osječki zbornik
PIAZ	Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu
PWRE	Pauly-Wissova Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft
VAMZ	Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu

Barkóczy 1980 = L. Barkóczy, *History of Pannonia, The Archaeology of Roman Pannonia*, Ed. A. Lengyel and G.T.B. Radan, Budapest 1980, 85-124.

Brunšmid 1911 = J. Brunšmid, *Kameni spomenici Hrvatskoga narodnoga muzeja u Zagrebu, I. - Antikni spomenici*, Vjesnik Hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva, n.s. VII-XI, 1904-1911. Zagreb 1911.

Buzov 2003 = M. Buzov, *Siscia – grad na tri rijeke /Siscia – a city on three rivers*, HA 10, Pula 203, 177-194.

Cambi 1987 = N. Cambi, *Rimski portret /Roman Portraiture/*, u: *Antički portret u Jugoslaviji /Classical portraits in Yugoslavia/*, Novi Sad 1987, 45-94.

Cambi 1998 = N. Cambi, *Skupine carskih kipova u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji/ Groups of imperial statues in the Roman province of Dalmatia/*, HA, vol. 4, Pula 1998, 45-61.

Cambi 2000 = N. Cambi, *Imago animi – Antčki portret u Hrvatskoj*, Split 2000.

Cambi 2002 = N. Cambi, *Antika*, Zagreb 2002.

Daltrop 1986 = G. Daltrop, *Lucio Settimio Severo e i cinque tipi del suo ritratto*, in Consiglio Nazionale delle ricerche – Quaderni de „La Ricerca Scientifica“ 116 - Atti della II. Conferenza internazionale sul Ritratto Romano, „Ritratto ufficiale e ritratto privato“, Roma, 26-30 settembre 1984, Roma 1988., pp. 67-74.

- Domić Kunić 2012 = A. Domić Kunić, *Literary Sources Before the Marcomanic Wars*, The Archaeology of Roman Southern Pannonia – The state of research and selecte problems in the Croatian part of the Roman province of Pannonia, Ed. B. Migotti, BAR International Series 2393, Oxford 2012, 29-69.
- Durman 1992 = A. Durman, *O geostrateškom položaju Siscije /On geostrategic location of Siscia/*, Opuscula Archaeologica 16, 1992, Zagreb 1993, 117-131.
- Fitz 1959 = J. Fitz, Der Besuch des Septimius Severus, in Pannonien im Jahre 202. u: Acta Archaeologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, vol. XI, Budapest 1959, 237-263.
- Fitz 1980 = J. Fitz, *Population – The indigenous population*, The Archaeology of Roman Pannonia, Ed. A. Lengyel and G.T.B. Radan, Budapest 1980., 141-159.
- Hoffiller - Saria 1938 = V. Hoffiller – B. Saria, AIJ, Heft I, Noricum und Pannonia Superior, Zagreb 1938.
- Hoti 1992 = M. Hoti, *Sisak u antičkim izvorima /Siscia in the ancient sources/*, OA 16, Zagreb 1993, 133-163.
- Grant 1999 = M. Grant, *The Roman emperors – A biographical guide to the rulers of Imperial Rome 31 BC – AD 476*, London 1999.
- Iskra-Janošić 2001 = I. Iskra-Janošić, *Urbanizacija Cibala i razvoj keramičarskih središta*, HAZU – Centar za znanstveni rad u Vinkovcima – Gradski muzej Vinkovci, Posebna izdanja XIII., Zagreb – Vinkovci 2001.
- Lolić 2003 = T. Lolić, *Colonia Flavia Siscia*, The autonomous towns of Noricum and Pannonia, Pannonia I, Situla 41, Ljubljana 2003, 131-152.
- Matijašić 1986 = R. Matijašić, *Lateres Siscienses (ad CIL III 1138-11386)*, VAMZ, 3. ser. – vol. XIX, Zagreb 1986, 203-215.
- Migotti 2012 = B. Migotti, *Introduction and Commentaries*, The Archaeology of Roman Southern Pannonia (BAR), The state of research and selected problems in the Croatian part of the Roman province of Pannonia, ed. B. Migotti, BAR International Series 2393, Oxford 2012, 1-27.
- Mócsy 1974 = A. Mócsy, *Pannonia and Uper Moesia*, London-Boston 1974.
- Mráv 2012 = Zs. Mráv, *Building Munificences of Septimius Severus in the Cities of the Pannonian Provinces: Epigraphic Evidence*, The Archaeology of Roman Southern Pannonia (BAR), The state of research and selected problems in the Croatian part of the Roman province of Pannonia,

ed. B. Migotti, BAR International Series 2393, Oxford 2912, 251-278.

Pinterović 1960 = D. Pinterović, *Mursa za dinastije Severa /Mursa at the time of the Severi/*, OZ, vol. 7, Osijek 1960, 17-42.

Pinterović 1978 = D. Pinterović, *Mursa i njeno područje u antičko doba/Mursa und sein Raum in der Zeit der Antike*, Osijek 1978.

Radman Livaja 2007 = I. Radman Livaja, *In Segestica*, PIAZ, vol. 24, Zagreb 2007, 153-172.

Rendić-Miočević 1987 = A. Rendić-Miočević, s.v. *Glava djevojke* (nr. 152) i *Glava bradatog muškarca* (nr. 197), u: *Antički portret u Jugoslaviji /Classical portraits in Yugoslavia/* (katalog izložbe), Novi Sad 1987.

Rendić-Miočević 1994 = A. Rendić-Miočević, *163. Zagreb – Petrinjska ul. 3*, Zagreb prije Zagreba /Zagreb before Zagreb/ (katalog izložbe), Zagreb 1994.

Rendić-Miočević 2006 = A. Rendić-Miočević, *Tracce del culto imperiale nel retroterra dell'Adriatico orientale: esempi dalla Croazia centrale e nordoccidentale*, Le regioni di Aquileia e Spalato in epoca Romana, Udine- Tarvisio 2006, 51-80.

Scarre 1998 = Ch. Scarre, *Cronicle of the Roman emperors*, London 1998.

Šašel 1974 = J. Šašel, s.v. *Siscia (auch Segestica)*, PWRE, Supplementband XIV, München 1974, 702-741 (isto: J. Šašel, *Opera selecta*, s.v. *Siscia: V – The towns, settlements and topography of the northern Adriatic, eastern Alpine and western Balkan regions*, Situla, vol. 30, Ljubljana 1992, 600-621).

Tomović 2002 = M. Tomović, *A head from Karataš attributed to emperor Clodius Albinus*, *Starinar*, knjiga LII, Beograd 202, 63-77.

Vrbanović 1981 = S. Vrbanović, *Prilog proučavanju topografije Siscije*, IHAD, vol. 6, Arheološka istraživanja u Zagrebu i njegovoj okolini, Zagreb 1981, 187-200.

Zaninović 1981 = M. Zaninović, *Siscia u svojim natpisima /Siscia in its inscriptions/*, Izdanja HAD-a, vol. 6, Arheološka istraživanja u Zagrebu i njegovoj okolini, Zagreb 1981, 201-208.

Zaninović 1986 = M. Zaninović, *Pojava antike u središnjoj Hrvatskoj /The Appearance of Antiquity in Central Croatia/*, IHAD, vol. 10, Arheološka istraživanja na karlovačkom i sisačkom području, Zagreb 1986, 59-67.

Zaninović 1993 = M. Zaninović, *Classis Flavia Pannonica*, IHAD, vol. 16, Zagreb 1993, 53-59.

Summary

THE TRACES OF IMPERIAL CULT IN SISCIA

A FRAGMENTED MARBLE PORTRAIT OF SEPTIMIUS SEVERUS FROM SISAK AND ITS IMPORTANCE WITH REFERENCE TO THE SITUATION IN THE SEVERAN SISCIA

Fifteen years ago an unknown severely damaged marble portrait head of a bearded male was found in a group of Roman stone monuments kept in the yard depository of the Archaeological museum in Zagreb. No traces of an inventory number were recognized, but its provenance – Sisak – was noted twice. It is not known under what circumstances or when it arrived to the Zagreb Museum. The height of the head is 32,5 cm or 33 cm including the preserved part of the neck, which means it was of slightly larger than life size. Certain characteristic features of physiognomy are preserved, although the right side of the face, forehead and the front part of the vertex were broken off, allowing the suggested attribution of the portrait to the first Severan emperor, Septimius Severus, who has left his imprint from Mesopotamia to Britain, and, in a special way, in Pannonia, including Siscia. Although he was of North African ancestry, born in the Tripolis metropolis Leptis Magna, his stay in Pannonia was of a special importance for his career. He was a legate (*Legatus Augusti pro praetore*) of Upper Pannonia in Carnuntum, the metropolis of Upper Pannonia on the Danubian limes, and following the murder of Pertinax he was proclaimed emperor by the Danubian legions. He was very popular in the army, and his faithful legions followed him to the final victory in confrontations with other claimants to the throne and in his wars with the Parthian Empire. It seems that he visited Siscia during his return from the second victorious war with the Parthians, while visiting Pannonia with his imperial entourage in 202. This event could not have passed unnoticed.

The position of Siscia is unique for a number of reasons. It was located in the south-western part of the Pannonian plain near the Dalmatian border and it lay on three rivers, two of them, the Sava (*Savus*) and Kupa (*Colapis*), being navigable. It was located on the left bank of the Kupa, near its confluence with the Sava, at a location where the Sava changes its course continuing towards the Danube in an eastern direction. In the vicinity of Siscia, on the opposite, right bank of the Kupa, most probably on the site of Pogorelec, there was a Celtic Iron Age settlement of Segestica, captured and destroyed by Octavianus in 35 BC. Its name thenceforth appears very rarely, while Siscia was becoming an important urban centre of Upper Pannonia as well as an important administrative, industrial, trade, craft, and traffic (both riverine and land) centre; it also became one

of the most important military outposts of the Empire. The town had, it seems, two harbours, and in it were the headquarters of the Pannonian fleet (*classis Flavia Pannonica*), significant for connecting the most important harbours on the Sava, Siscia and Sirmium. The importance of Siscia is reflected in the fact that it acquired the status of a colony during Vespasian's reign (*colonia Flavia Siscia*), which was repeated in the reign of Septimius Severus (*colonia Flavia Septimia Siscia Augusta*). It was also the period of its prodigious development. The town expanded onto the right bank of the Kupa during the period of increased urbanisation which it shared with other Pannonian regions and the Empire in general. Old urban features were being rebuilt, new ones constructed (walls, baths, etc.), while the infrastructure of its wider urban region was being upgraded. All this was reflected in the development of road network, construction of bridges, etc. Parallel to this construction activity the trade was developing, and the flourishing is recognisable in various crafts, but also in spiritual life and cultural and artistic development in general.

This atmosphere should have yielded monuments erected for Septimius Severus and his family, especially his sons Caracalla and Geta, and his wife Julia Domna. There are some epigraphic testimonies, but hitherto no statues or busts were found, although Septimius Severus, after a certain hiatus, renewed the impetus of imperial propaganda. It should thus be supposed that such monuments were erected in Siscia, either individual or in groups, since the emperor conferred upon Siscia the epithet of a Septimian colony.

I have discussed in passing the fragmented marble portrait from Sisak on two occasions – at conferences in Pula and Udine, while the paper was also published in the proceedings. At both occasions I discussed the attribution of the portrait and its typological determination based on Daltrop's typology. I have concluded that this head most probably belongs to the 'type with small curls' (*a piccole ciocche ricce*). Notwithstanding the most probably intentional damaging – it could be supposed that the Sisak portrait was intentionally damaged in Early Christian period – it seems that the identification of the portrayal should not be in any doubt. It possesses the most typical physiognomic features characteristic for the iconography of Septimius Severus: curly hair and beard with moustaches. However, one should not disregard that the portraits of several emperors of the Antonine dynasty (Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, etc.), and also Septimius' adversaries in his claim to the throne, especially Clodius Balbinus, as well as some of his successors, shared these same characteristics (thick curly hair and long or short beard). On the Sisak head, however, the form of oblong, somewhat elongated ascetic face can be discerned. A high forehead is also recognisable, while the hairstyle (highlighted locks on both sides of the face) suggests the one popular in the Antonine age. A segment of an opened left eye is also preserved, with an emphasized upper eyelid and an eyebrow, as well as a segment of closed mouth with an

emphasized lower lip. The nose is completely broken off while the moustaches are much worn. Both ears, meticulously fashioned, are preserved. They are both uncovered (the curly locks do not cover them); the hair is carefully combed on the vortex and much worn on the back of the head. Short wavy locks are arranged in vertical lines on the sides, directed towards the face, approximately on the eye level. The sideburns are wide and in low relief and they adjoin the beard that is cut in low crescent-shaped incisions. The beard is bifurcated near the end by a short parting in the middle.

Daltrop has divided the portraits of Septimius into 5 different types, and both previously mentioned types differ from the others primarily in the rendering of the ears. I have determined that the portrait from Sisak should be classified in Daltrop's 'wavy locks' group (*a ciocche ondulate*). This type should be earlier than the previously proposed one (not earlier than 211, the year of the emperor's death). In both types the ears are completely visible and free, while in all other types they are partly or completely covered by hair. A certain difficulty is presented by the beard type, but this should not affect the determination. Variations are certainly possible, including the combinations of elements that appear on different types. If this is accepted, the date should be conformed with earlier types, which would mean that its production is nearer to the time of the emperor's visit to Siscia. In this context an inscription on a statue base of Caracalla's fiancée (*sponsa*) Plautilla, erected by the Siscia municipality (*respublica Siscianorum*), is of some importance. Initial lines, where her name was mentioned, eroded during time. It is clear that the inscription with the statue (?) was erected immediately after her wedding (she is addressed as *Augusta*), so it can be presumed that it happened during Septimius' visit to Siscia. Perhaps Septimius' portrait head – i.e. the statue to which it most probably belonged – which had to stand on an accompanying base, was produced for the same occasion and erected in a prominent location within the city.

Taking into account several other figural statues from Siscia, in the first place the well-known female head believed to represent a priestess of Isis (lately interpreted as a portrait of an unknown woman created in the Antonine period), which is the earliest and arguably the best portrait to be found in northern Croatia, it should be presumed that the Siscia workshops in the 2nd half of the 2nd c. attained an admirable level of artistic production.

LA CHIESA DI S. MARIA E CASTELLUM SULLE ISOLE BRIONI**VLASTA BEGOVIĆ, IVANA SCHRUNK**

ISTITUTO PER L'ARCHEOLOGIA, CROATIA; UNIVERSITY OF ST. THOMAS, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, MINNESOTA, USA

L'Istria (Histria) del V e del VI secolo può essere ritenuta di rilevante importanza per i cambiamenti geopolitici e culturali nell'area del Mediterraneo. Quel periodo era caratterizzato da un'intensa militarizzazione dell'Adriatico che si manifestò anche attraverso la ristrutturazione e la fortificazione degli insediamenti costieri e delle isole. I depositari del potere, sia dal punto di vista politico che spirituale, erano le autorità ecclesiastiche cristiane, ciò viene ampiamente dimostrato dalle presenza di numerosi luoghi di culto. Le isole Brioni sono testimonianza dei cambiamenti strutturali voluti dalla Chiesa, come dimostrato dall' edilizia dell' isola dove strutture civili vengono integrate con i luoghi di culto come nella Baia della Madonna, una ampia e protetta insenatura, nella quale in età tardonica si sviluppò una fortificazione a protezione di una villa rustica romana. La chiesa di S. Maria costruita in Baia della Madonna, vicino l'abitato tardoantico, nel V secolo, come chiesa con una sola navata, senza abside, contemporanea quindi a quella preeeufrasiana di Parenzo come pure della chiesa di Nesactium e del primo strato della cattedrale di Pola. La prima ricostruzione è datata all'epoca bizantina nel VI secolo. Durante la riconquista bizantina della penisola istriana, l'abitato tardoantico della Baia della Madonna si trasformò in un castellum bizantino come agglomerato militare ed ecclesiastico. Nell'area del castellum sono stati scoperti frammenti di pietra in stile tardoantico con motivi vegetali, attribuiti alla prima fase della chiesa di S. Maria e che di seguito vennero smontate durante la ristrutturazione bizantina e poi reimpiegate nel castellum. La ristrutturazione della chiesa di S. Maria nel VI secolo acquista dunque un significato di rilievo in relazione al fatto che si trattò della sistemazione della chiesa e della sede dell' Episcopus Cessensis. Negli atti dei sinodi del VI e VII secolo le isole Brioni vengono indicate come residenza dei vescovi Vindemius (Episcopus Cessensis) e Ursinus (Episcopus Cenetensis - Cesensis).

chiesa di S. Maria, isole Brioni, riconquista bizantina, VI/VII secolo, Episcopus Cessensis

Grazie agli studi del prof V.P Goss (1996 – 2006) nella chiesa di S. Maria e sugli edifici religiosi ubicati sulla costa orientale adriatica, sono entrata in possesso di rilevanti informazioni che mi hanno aiutato nella ricerca. La via marittima lungo l'Adriatico era d'estrema importanza nella tarda antichità, e particolarmente dopo il 410 quando Onorio trova rifugio a Ravenna che da allora diventa capitale dell'Impero Romano d'Occidente. L'arcipelago delle Brioni ha avuto un'importanza strategica come meta di navigazione della parte occidentale della penisola istriana, come via navale verso Ravenna. (Fig. 1) Sulle isole Brioni, proprietà imperiale del I secolo,¹ nella baia della Madonna, nella parte occidentale, accanto ad una grande villa romana del I secolo a.C. e agli annessi posteriori, si forma un abitato tardoantico con tanto di porto.² Un secondo porto sicuro si trova dalla parte orientale dell'isola di Brioni, nella baia di Verighe, accanto alla villa marittima del I secolo. La chiesa di S. Maria era costruita 120 m a nord dell'abitato tardoantico (parte occidentale di Brioni) nel V secolo come chiesa a unica navata, senza abside, dalle dimensioni $23,4 \times 10,4$ m, con narcece dalle dimensioni $5,0 \times 10,4$ m, in tutto $28,4 \times 10,4$ m, accanto al mare su di una piattaforma innalzata. La chiesa di S. Maria è contemporanea quindi a quella preeufrasiana di Parenzo come pure della chiesa di *Nesactium* e del primo strato della cattedrale a Pola. Le proporzioni 9:4 sono molto eleganti, infatti le stesse sono usate per il Partenone. La chiesa è costruita in *sectio aurea* sia nella parte esterna che nella divisione dell'interno. (Fig. 2)



Fig. 1 Foto aerea dell'arcipelago di Brioni.




Fig. 2 Pianta della chiesa di S. Maria.



Fig. 3 Chiesa di S. Maria – interno.

La parte esterna della chiesa è articolata da una serie di lesene. Le due lesene della facciata fiancheggiano l'ingresso centrale, mentre le altre due si trovano sugli spigoli dell'allungamento dei muri laterali. I muri longitudinali dell'edificio sono articolati da 7 lesene, dalle dimensioni 60×21 cm, a distanza di 2,97 m tra loro (2 piedi romani di lunghezza e 10 piedi romani di distanza). Solo le lesene che fiancheggiano l'ingresso principale hanno 9 piedi romani di distanza. Il muro orientale, invece, è costruito senza lesene, essendo questo il muro di sostegno parzialmente piantato nel terreno, che diventa qui abbastanza ripido. Le finestre sui muri longitudinali esterni, dalle dimensioni 140×90 cm, si trovano a un'altezza di 3,8 m dal livello del pavimento. (Fig. 3) Sono a volta semicircolare, costruite mediante la sovrapposizione di pietre scalpellate, disposte in forma arcuata. Il ritrovamento di una transenna di pietra nell'area della basilica dimostra che le finestre erano chiuse da transenne, nelle quali erano inseriti vetri. Le altre finestre sul muro settentrionale e meridionale, e la parte di frontone ornamentale sopra l'entrata principale sul muro occidentale, dimostrano che la chiesa era coperta da un unico tetto, a due spioventi, come le chiese a navata unica.

All'interno della chiesa due file di colonne monolitiche dividono lo spazio nella navata centrale. Le colonne, dalle dimensioni cca. 30 a 32 cm di diametro, altezza 2,51 m, sono disposte in un ritmo relativamente denso (2,1 m), ornate da semplici imposte decorate con una croce greca (*crux immissa*), senza capitello, strette verso la cima e poste su basi circolari divise in due, su piedistalli quadrati. Le imposte portavano gli archi, *intercolumnae*, uno dei quali è stato conservato *in situ*. Sotto gli archi c'era la galleria (*matronei*). Sono state trovate piccole colonne poligonali, di 25 cm di diametro, della galleria. Nella posizione della sesta colonna sono introdotti dei pilastri cruciformi, che sorreggono l'arco di trionfo. L'arco poggia sulle colonne con capitelli leggermente distaccati dalla superficie del muro. I capitelli sono uguali a tutti e quattro i lati, mentre nella parte

centrale si trova una croce con il monogramma di Cristo all'interno di un medaglione circolare a doppio nastro (*crux coronata*), uguale alla croce sull'epistilio minore trovato nel castello. Gli ornamenti sulle imposte dell'arco di trionfo sono a doppio nastro a zig-zag, nel quale è introdotta una croce greca (*crux immissa*). Le ultime colonne, che si trovano nello spazio dell'altare, sono di altezza maggiore, con capitelli a due zone (innovazione bizantina), di marmo proconnesio. L'area presbiterale era elevata di 0,5 m sopra il livello della chiesa. Per quanto riguarda l'inventario, appartenente a questa prima fase della chiesa, si è conservato soltanto il basamento dell'altare nel presbiterio, in cui furono fissate quattro colonnine in marmo, di sezione circolare (12 cm), con incavatura per le reliquie. Sui capitelli di queste colonnine posava la mensa dell'altare, di dimensioni 120 × 60 cm.³ L'ingresso principale è largo 1,8 m, quello laterale 1,1 m. L'ingresso a volta settentrionale, alquanto stretto (110 cm), coperto da un arco a forma di ferro di cavallo, assai più largo delle dimensioni della porta, eseguito in intonaco con lastre di pietra disposte in forma d'arco, rispecchia una maniera di costruzione bizantina.

Nel sacrario della chiesa sono state trovate colonne più alte, di 4,2 m. I capitelli sono formati a guisa di tipici capitelli bizantini “a due zone”. (Fig. 4) Spigoli di capitelli sono scolpiti con uccelli stilizzati, mentre sotto di essi si trovano due fusi a sezione arrotondata e una croce greca. Nella parte media dei capitelli si trova una croce greca, con aggiunta del monogramma di Cristo dentro un medaglione a doppi bordi (*crux coronata*), identico su tutti e quattro lati del capitello. La lastra della parete divisoria dell'altare è decorata con croce greca dentro un medaglione circolare (simile alle lastre della parete d'altare nel Duomo di Pola), motivo ornamentale del VI secolo. (Fig. 5)



Fig. 4 Il capitello a “due zone” nel sacrario della chiesa di S. Maria.




Fig. 5 Ricostruzione ideale dell'interno della chiesa di S. Maria (V. Begović).

Un terzo intervento nella chiesa di S. Maria è stato effettuato durante il IX secolo, quando le lastre della parete divisoria dell'altare vengono decorate con circonferenze a tre tralci, in modo di usare la parte posteriore delle lastre dell'epoca più antica. Il pavimento della basilica è selciato con grandi lastre di pietra a forma squadrata irregolare, che con ogni probabilità appartengono alla terza fase del rimaneggiamento della basilica. Necessari sono gli scavi archeologici sotto il pavimento della basilica. Numerosi sono i frammenti dell'inventario in pietra: lapidi della pergola, colonne, parti di finestre, colonne decorate con croce, transenne ecc. Nella rinnovazione del periodo bizantino sono stati cambiati gli epistili dell'ingresso principale e laterale, le lastre e le colonne della transenna dell'altare. I rinnovamenti più grandi sono stati eseguiti nello spazio dell'altare – erano state cambiate le colonne, i capitelli e le imposte (piane e angolari) decorate da un nastro a zig-zag.

Le indagini condotte dal 1976 al 1983 portarono alla luce frammenti dell'arredo scultoreo e delle decorazioni architettoniche della chiesa nell'ambito dell'insediamento tardoantico; alcuni di tali frammenti furono inseriti come *spoglie* nelle murature degli edifici più tardi.⁴ Si tratta di un capitello corinzio con foglie lisce congiunte per otto e un capitello corinzio che, a ogni angolo, presenta una foglia liscia curvata a forma di cuore.

Nell'area dell'abitato tardoantico (*castellum*) sono stati scoperti frammenti di pietra in stile tardoantico, con motivi vegetali che sono trasmessi quasi immutati dall'architettura paleocristiana. Gli epistili ritrovati nel *castellum* erano decorati con motivi vegetali:

1. L'epistilio più grande, lungo 204 cm e largo 78 cm, altezza 26,5 cm, con il motivo di edera, con al centro una croce greca (*crux immissa*); (Fig. 6)
2. L'epistilio più piccolo, lungo 110 cm, largo 15 cm e alto 27, ispirato alla forma di viticcio, e con al centro una croce dentro un medaglione circolare a doppio nastro (*crux coronata*). (Fig. 7)

Il grande epistilio era usato in una pressa per olive nel *castellum*; quello piccolo era parte della soglia in un edificio con lesene.

Altri frammenti di pietra:

3. Il capitello corinzio tardoantico con otto foglie lisce congiunte, dimensioni 35,5 × 35,5 × 32 cm;
4. Il capitello corinzio tardoantico con foglie a forma di cuore negli angoli; dimensioni 43 × 43 × 28,5 cm;
5. Imposta piana decorata con un nastro a zig-zag, dimensioni 58 × 58 × 12 cm;
6. Imposta angolare decorata con un nastro a zig-zag, analogo al precedente, dimensioni 22 × 22 × 10,5 cm;

7. Parte della cima su basamenti circolari, decorata con una croce, dimensioni $50 \times 50 \times 15$ cm;
8. Parte di colonna monolitica, dimensioni 11-14 cm, altezza 32 cm;
9. Parte di colonna poligonale, con diametro 30-33 cm, altezza 91 cm;
10. Lastra di parete divisoria dell'altare decorata con palmette stilizzate, dimensioni $51 \times 37 \times 13$ cm. (Fig. 8)

Colonne della parete divisoria dell'altare decorata con palmette come sopra (numero 10), dimensioni $21,5 \times 21,5 \times 37,8$ cm.⁵




Fig. 6 L'epistilio più grande, con il motivo di edera, con al centro una croce greca (*crux immisa*) (Marušić, 1986).




Fig. 7 L'epistilio più piccolo, ispirato alla forma di viticcio, e al centro una croce dentro un medaglione circolare a doppio nastro (*crux coronata*) (Marušić, 1986).

Le decorazioni lapidee rinvenute appartengono alla prima fase della basilica di S. Maria (come si desume dall'analogia con le decorazioni delle imposte trovate *in situ*). Vennero smontate durante la ristrutturazione bizantina e poi reimpiegate nell'insediamento (fortezza). I ritrovamenti, che evidenziano il rinnovamento dello spazio del presbiterio e dell'ambone nonché la sostituzione degli architravi sopra le entrate, sono datati al V e all'inizio del VI secolo in relazione ad analoghi ritrovamenti di capitelli nella chiesa di S. Felicità di Pola e l'autorità ecclesiastica nel 510.⁶ I capitelli in questione sono simili ai capitelli tardoantichi coevi rinvenuti nello strato più profondo del duomo di Ragusa. La distribuzione di questi rinvenimenti denota in modo indubbio l'area della fortezza che fu sotto l'ingerenza delle autorità ecclesiastiche.

Nel *castellum* sono trovati anelli di bronzo fuso o in lamina bronzea e recanti una piastra ovale, decorati con semplici incisioni formanti il motivo a croce. Si tratta ad es. della croce greca dai bracci uguali o della cosiddetta "Croce di S. Andrea" (*crux decusata*), che simbolizza anche la lettera greca "X" (chi), nonché il monogramma del nome di Cristo. La parte allargata degli anelli è decorata a costole, con il motivo a spina di pesce oppure con cerchietti punzonati. Questo tipo di anelli rientra nel gruppo degli oggetti d'ornamento del periodo tardoantico-paleobizantino. I reperti furono pubblicati da Ž. Ujčić che realizzò una pianta dell'area interessata dagli scavi archeologici e vi indicò i punti di ritrovamento.⁷ La posizione dove sono trovati gli anelli, indica anche allo stesso tempo il tratto del *castellum* appartenuto all'autorità ecclesiastica.

Sulle isole Brioni, proprietà imperiale dal I secolo,⁸ nella baia di Porto Buono (parte della baia Madonna) c'era un abitato tardoantico. Durante la costruzione di fortificazioni sull'abitato tardoantico esistente, le mura non hanno integrato tutta l'architettura preesistente, ma soltanto quelle parti che potevano essere utilizzate nel formare la fortificazione (probabilmente risale al periodo dopo il 452, cioè dopo l'avanzata degli Unni e la distruzione di Aquileia, quando in Istria vennero costruite mura attorno a parecchi abitati). Così le parti nell'angolo sudorientale, come l'edificio in cui è stata trovata un'ara dedicata alla dea Flora in uso secondario, o la chiesa di Santa Maria, costruita prima, sono rimaste fuori dalle mura difensive. Le fortificazioni sono evidentemente state costruite in due fasi – la zona inferiore porta delle caratteristiche del V secolo. La zona superiore delle mura risale alla prima metà del VI secolo, epoca della rioccupazione bizantina dell'Istria, durante la quale vennero riparate e completate le mura, secondo la politica giustiniana della costruzione di fortificazioni.⁹ L'assetto del *castellum* del primo periodo bizantino fu totalmente diverso dal precedente di età tardoantica. Il *castellum* più tardo, infatti, venne ridotto ad un centro militare ed ecclesiastico, mantenuto in funzione degli interessi imperiali e non di quelli locali. (Fig. 9)




Fig. 8 Pianta del castellum con scoperti frammenti di pietra in stile tardoantico della prima fase della chiesa di S. Maria (1-10) in uso secondario (Marušić, 1986).




Fig. 9 Pianta del castellum.

Bisogna chiarire il periodo nel quale le isole Brioni diventano proprietà della chiesa (forse solo in parte), documentato nell'atto di donazione di Eufrazio del 543, con cui il vescovo Eufrazio dona un terzo di provento delle saline di Brioni al proprio clero.¹⁰ Possiamo finalmente dare una risposta al quesito dell'ubicazione dell'episcopio (sede del *Episcopuis Cessensis*), oggetto dello studio del professore M. Suić basato sulle fonti storiche¹¹ e avvalorato dalle successive indagini archeologiche. Le attestazioni archeologiche attualmente disponibili permettono di identificare la chiesa di S. Maria sulle isole Brioni davanti alle coste dell'Istria (Histria romana) con l'*ecclesia Cessensis* menzionata negli atti dei sinodi del VI secolo. In tali documenti la chiesa in questione venne indicata come residenza dei vescovi Vindemius (*Episcopus Cessensis*)¹² e Ursinus (*Episcopus Cenetensis – Cesensis*), quest'ultimo attestato dalle fonti del VII secolo. Il nome Cessensis deriva dal toponimo Cissa Pularia utilizzato per l'arcipelago delle Brioni da Plinio il Vecchio (*Hist. Nat.*, III, pp. 151, 152) nella sua descrizione del mar Ionio e dell'Adriatico. Sulla Tavola Peutingeriana invece questo gruppo di isole viene indicato come *Pullariae*. I capitelli paleocristiani dell'architrave dell'ingresso, nonché diverse decorazioni architettoniche, rinvenute durante gli scavi in vari settori del *castellum*, contribuiscono alla formulazione della risposta a questa domanda. I reperti messi in luce furono pubblicati per la prima volta da B. Marušić che realizzò una pianta dell'area interessata dagli scavi archeologici e vi indicò i punti di ritrovamento.¹³ La posizione degli elementi recuperati, pertinenti alle decorazioni architettoniche e attribuibili alla prima fase della chiesa di S. Maria, indica il tratto del *castellum* appartenuto al vescovo. Al momento del ritrovamento gli elementi in questione furono reimpiegati, alcuni di loro incorporati nelle costruzioni successive. Le figure dei due vescovi, Vindemius (VI secolo) e Ursinus (VII secolo), sono attestate da fonti storiche. Il primo riferimento a Vindemius, menzionato tre volte come *Episcopus Cessensis*, è contenuto negli atti del sinodo tenutosi a Grado nel 579. L'altro documento storico lo pone in relazione con lo Scisma della Chiesa, un evento che vide radunati i vescovi dell'Istria e dell'Italia settentrionale, definito scisma dei "Tre Capitoli" di Giustiniano che condannò i testi stesi da tre teologi orientali (dall'interpretazione di alcuni passaggi controversi emerge il loro orientamento vicino all'arianesimo). Gli anatemismi furono inviati a tutti i vescovi per essere firmati, ma i vescovi delle chiese occidentali, soprattutto in Italia e in Gallia, nonché l'episcopato africano, si rifiutarono categoricamente (attenendosi alle conclusioni del Concilio di Calcedonia del 452). Le metropoli di Milano e di Aquileia non vollero accogliere la condanna dei "Tre Capitoli", si opposero alla decisione imperiale e ai canoni del concilio ecumenico quale organismo supremo, entrando in conflitto con il papa, la massima autorità ecclesiastica.¹⁴ Nel 588 Vindemius, assieme al patriarca di Aquileia e al vescovo di Parenzo (*Parentium*), venne posto agli arresti e condotto a Ravenna. I tre, dopo un anno trascorso nelle prigioni, abiurarono lo scisma e

furono liberati. L'episodio fu ripreso da Paolo Diacono nella sua "Historia Langobardorum" scritta nell'VIII secolo (Hist. Lang. III, p. 26). All'epoca dei fatti descritti una parte dell'Italia e dell'Istria appartenevano al regno dei Longobardi. Il terzo riferimento a Vindemius si ha nella documentazione relativa al sinodo di Marano del 591.¹⁵ Ursinus invece figura tra i firmatari degli atti del Concilio Lateranense del 680 come *Episcopus Cenetensis*, mentre ai margini di tali documenti è indicato come *Cesensis*. Nella documentazione preservata del Concilio Lateranense si legge che la chiesa di Ursinus si trovava in *Histria*. Proprio in quell'epoca cambiò il nome dell'arcipelago. Infatti, il toponimo Brevona comparve per la prima volta in epoca medievale con la dicitura *Insula Brevoni* nello Statuto cittadino di Pola.¹⁶ Ursinus fu il vescovo di Brioni e dopo il cambio del nome, ottenne un titolo (lui e la sua chiesa) derivato dall'ufficiale denominazione del territorio sul quale si estendeva la sua giurisdizione. Poiché sui Brioni, oltre le saline e le cave di pietra, vi era una bottega imperiale (*fulonica*), l'area insulare poteva essere chiamata *census*.¹⁷ Ancor oggi una parte dell'arcipelago delle Brioni si chiama Peneda (Ceneda). Si tratta dell'area a sud dell'insediamento fortificato di età tardoantica, nel quale sono ubicati i terreni più fertili di tutto l'arcipelago. Vindemius e Ursinus svolsero il ruolo di "*episcopus in castellis*", una situazione nota durante il dominio bizantino in Istria. Dopo questo periodo nei documenti della chiesa non vi è più alcun riferimento alla presenza di un vescovo sulle isole di Brioni. Nell'angolo nord-occidentale dell'insediamento tardoantico fu indagato archeologicamente un edificio con lesene antecedente alla costruzione della cinta muraria. Il tratto settentrionale di questa cinta muraria incorporò il muro nord della costruzione in questione, mentre il tratto occidentale delle mura intercettò le murature dell'edificio che si protraevano verso il mare. La situazione così delineata avvalorava l'ipotesi della preesistenza dell'edificio rispetto all'edificazione delle fortificazioni. La conferma più chiara di tale ipotesi è il tratto nord della cinta muraria che segue l'estensione dell'edificio antecedente. La disposizione delle lesene sul lato esterno dei muri est e sud è analoga a quella delle lesene sulla chiesa di S. Maria, il che potrebbe indicare un'edificazione coeva e una destinazione simile delle due costruzioni. In ambedue i casi i vani presentano una distribuzione ortogonale seguendo i canoni classici della tradizione romana. L'edificio possedeva un'uscita verso il mare che venne riutilizzata successivamente come entrata nord-occidentale della successiva struttura fortificata. Durante il dominio bizantino la costruzione fu ampliata. La capiente cisterna dotata di volta a botte, costruita a fianco dell'edificio preesistente e collocata nelle sostruzioni dell'edificio di epoca bizantina, attesta l'importanza del complesso.¹⁸ La superficie per la raccolta dell'acqua di tale complesso architettonico doveva essere piuttosto grande, poiché doveva essere in grado di riempire di acqua piovana una cisterna di ragguardevoli dimensioni. (Fig. 10) Il complesso era dotato di due cortili, dei quali quello con la vera da pozzo era elevato di 140 cm rispetto all'altro (i cortili 1° e 2° - uno

pubblico con cisterna e pozzo e l'altro privato). Si ipotizza che la comunicazione tra i due spazi avvenisse solo attraverso l'edificio stesso, in quanto non è stata rinvenuta alcuna rampa di scale tra i cortili. Oggi è visibile soltanto il livello più basso dell'edificio che in origine, molto probabilmente, era costituito da due piani sovrapposti. I vani conservati indicano la presenza di due ampie sale precedute da un atrio con due ambienti laterali (alcuni elementi architettonici sono affini a quelli della pianta dell'episcopio da Parenzo). Due uscite verso la corte – uno dall'atrio e l'altro dal vano laterale ovest – sono attestate dalla presenza di due soglie trovate *in situ*. (Fig. 11) L'edificio



Fig. 10 La grande cisterna.



Fig. 11 Due cortili della sede vescovile.

multipiano aveva una facciata dotata di lesene che, in seguito alla costruzione delle fortificazioni, guardava verso est e verso l'unico accesso dalla strada al *castellum*. L'accesso largo 2,4 m e corrispondente alla porta nord-occidentale. La larghezza della porta collocata nella cinta muraria è un'ulteriore conferma dell'importanza del complesso. Inoltre, vi era un'uscita diretta verso il mare attraverso un varco (larghezza 1,45 m) aperto nel tratto nord-occidentale della cinta muraria. Questa porta poteva essere utilizzata solo per il suddetto complesso architettonico, dato che non era accessibile dall'insediamento. Sotto tale porta è stato trovato un canale di scolo in pietra. Al complesso appartenevano anche gli ambienti adiacenti all'entrata nel cortile superiore, nonché gli annessi più tardi nord-occidentali della villa rustica nella corte inferiore. La ristrutturazione di alcuni ambienti preesistenti, adattati alla funzione di sede episcopale è un fenomeno frequente sulla costa adriatica orientale. Questo tipo di interventi è stato studiato a Salona,¹⁹ Parenzo²⁰ e a Pola.²¹ Il complesso è posizionato in modo analogo a quello dell'episcopio di Parenzo e a quello di Pola, quindi accanto alla cinta muraria, in prossimità del porto (dotato di un'apposita uscita attraverso la struttura muraria). Non è possibile stabilire la completa estensione dell'edificio, visto che due delle sue mura sono state inglobate nel perimetro urbano e la facciata verso la corte si è conservata solo in parte. Purtroppo questo tratto delle mura è andato completamente distrutto (fino alle fondamenta) e per questo motivo non si è potuto verificare con certezza le dinamiche di rielaborazione della cinta

muraria rispetto all'edificio. I rapporti stratigrafici sono stati letti chiaramente, invece, presso l'angolo sud-orientale del *castellum*, dove i muri dell'edificio preesistente si distinguono in modo netto dalle mura della cinta muraria costruita in un periodo successivo. Questa situazione si distingue anche sul lato esterno del tratto della cinta nord-occidentale, punto in cui vi è una serie di lesene che, oltre a svolgere una funzione statica, denotano il complesso di cui ci stiamo occupando (sulla cinta muraria, infatti, non compaiono altre lesene, oltre alle due presenti sull'abside nell'angolo sud-orientale). La distribuzione irregolare delle lesene suggerisce la loro costruzione più tarda rispetto all'edificio tardoantico che, invece, presenta le lesene distribuite in modo regolare.

Accanto alla chiesa manca il battistero, principale spazio di ogni chiesa vescovile, che tuttavia si trovava nella baia di Verighe, nel tratto ristrutturato delle terme della villa marittima. Sui fondali della baia di Val Catena fu trovato un pregiato vaso di colore rosso, decorato da una croce greca al centro del fondo. Si tratta di un raffinato prodotto della bottega di *Phocaea* in Asia Minore databile al V-VI secolo. Tali prodotti ceramici del V-VI secolo provenienti dall'Africa settentrionale e da Focea sono rari nell'area adriatica. Tali reperti nell'Adriatico orientale sono stati recuperati solo nei punti strategici, importanti per le funzioni amministrative, militari e navali: Polače sull'isola di Melena,²² Mogorjelo²³ e il palazzo di Diocleziano a Spalato.²⁴

Si tratta di un rinvenimento legato, con ogni probabilità, alla presenza di personaggi importanti che vivevano o soggiornavano nella villa della baia di Val Catena. Non vi sono attestazioni dirette sulla presenza del vescovo nella baia di Val Catena, anche se tale possibilità non è esclusa, visto che aveva sede nel *castellum*. Inoltre, il rinvenimento di sepolture attorno all'abside dell'aula delle terme della villa marittima è un indicatore della funzione sacrale assunta dall'edificio nella tarda antichità, allorché la piscina del *frigidarium* fu trasformata in battistero.²⁵ (Fig. 12) Due parti – 1. architrave – decorata con pesce, Tritoni e delfini e 2. capitello con delfini del frontone da tempio al culto di Nettuno (da villa marittima in Val Catena) sono trovati reutilizzati in la chiesa S. Maria e in *frigidarium* in Val Catena.

L'assetto del *castellum* fu totalmente diverso dal precedente di età tardoantica. Il *castellum* del primo periodo bizantino, infatti, venne ridotto ad un centro militare ed ecclesiastico, mantenuto in funzione degli interessi imperiali e non di quelli locali. Allo stato attuale delle conoscenze sappiamo che le zone utilizzate dal vescovo erano l'area settentrionale del castello e l'area della ex *villa rustica*, mentre la parte meridionale era sotto l'ingerenza delle autorità militari.

L'arcipelago di Brioni era un'unità amministrativa particolare, menzionata come *census* negli atti del Sinodo Lateranense del 680.²⁶ La ristrutturazione della chiesa di S. Maria acquista dunque un significato pieno in relazione al fatto che si trattò della sistemazione della chiesa e della sede dell'*Episcopus Cessensis*. Vindemius e Ursinus svolsero il ruolo di "*episcopus in castellis*",

una situazione nota durante il dominio bizantino in Istria. Dopo questo periodo nei documenti della chiesa non vi è più alcun riferimento alla presenza di un vescovo sulle isole Brioni.




Fig. 12 Ricostruzione ideale del battistero in Val Catena (V. Begović, M. Gregl).

-
- ¹ Tassaux 1982, p. 268.
 - ² Mlakar 1976, pp. 23-27.
 - ³ Marušić, 1967, p. 8.
 - ⁴ Marušić, 1990, pp. 403-429.
 - ⁵ Marušić, 1990, pp. 406-407.
 - ⁶ Marušić, 1990, pp. 407-408.
 - ⁷ Ujčić, 1995, p. 111.
 - ⁸ Tassaux, 1982, p. 268.
 - ⁹ Lawrence, 1983, pp. 190-191.
 - ¹⁰ Zaninović, 1991, p. 259.
 - ¹¹ Suić, 1987, pp. 202-209.
 - ¹² Jarak 1994, p. 35.
 - ¹³ Marušić, 1990, p. 416.
 - ¹⁴ Cuscito, 1977, pp. 231-252, 293-294.
 - ¹⁵ Marušić, 1990, p. 403.
 - ¹⁶ Suić, 1987, p. 192.
 - ¹⁷ Suić, 1987, p. 212.
 - ¹⁸ Mlakar, 1976, p. 29.
 - ¹⁹ Gerber, 1917, p. 60.
 - ²⁰ Cuscito, 1985/86, p. 57.
 - ²¹ Mirabella Roberti, 1943, p. 14.
 - ²² Brusić, 1988, p. 141.
 - ²³ Čermošnik, 1952, pp. 243-244.
 - ²⁴ Schrunk, 1989, p. 94.
 - ²⁵ Gnirs, 1915, pp. 141-142; Begović Dvoržak 1997-1998, p. 63.
 - ²⁶ Vicelja 2007, p. 48.

Bibliografia

<i>AAAd</i>	<i>Antichità altoadriatiche, Atti delle Settimane di Studi aquileisi, Aquileia-Udine</i>
<i>AMSI</i>	<i>Atti e memorie della Società Istriana di Archeologia e Storia Patria</i>
<i>ARR</i>	<i>Arheološki radovi i rasprave, Zagreb</i>
<i>Atti</i>	<i>Atti del Centro di ricerche storiche di Rovigno</i>
<i>Bilten HAZU</i>	<i>Bilten Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti</i>
<i>GZM</i>	<i>Glasnik zemaljskog muzeja, Sarajevo</i>
<i>HAM</i>	<i>Hortus Artium Medievalium</i>
<i>Izdanja HAD</i>	<i>Izdanja, Hrvatsko arheološko društvo, Zagreb</i>
<i>JÖAI</i>	<i>Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts, Wien</i>
<i>JRA</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Archaeology</i>
<i>MZK</i>	<i>Mitteilungen der Zentralkommission für erforschung und Erhaltung der Denkmalpflege, Wien</i>
<i>OpArch</i>	<i>Opuscula Archaeologica, Zagreb</i>
<i>Prilozi IARH</i>	<i>Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju, Zagreb</i>
<i>VAMZ</i>	<i>Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja, Zagreb</i>

A. Amoroso (1908), Basilica Eufrasiana, *Atti e Memorie della Societa Istriana di Archeologia e Storia Patria*, vol XXIV.

A. Badurina (1992), Bizantski plovni put po vanjskom rubu sjevernih jadranskih otoka, *Radovi IPU* 16, Zagreb, 7-9.

V. Begović Dvoržak (1997 – 1998), Raskoš rimskih ladanjskih vila – terme rezidencijalnog kompleksa na Brijunima, *VAMZ XXX-XXXI*, Zagreb, 47-68.

V. Begović Dvoržak (1997), Rekonstrukcija crkve sv. Marije na Velom Brijunu, *GIS u Hrvatskoj, INA-info*, Zagreb, str. 125-139.

V. Begović Dvoržak, M. Pavletić (1998), La basilica di S. Maria (Brijuni), *Acta XIII Congressus internationalis archaeologiae christianae*, Città del Vaticano – Split, 37-54.

V. Begović, I. Schrunk (1999–2000), Villae rusticae na Brijunskom otočju, *Opuscula archaeologica* 23–24, Zagreb, 425-439.

- V. Begović Dvoržak (2001), Fortifikacioni sklop Kastum – Petrovac na Brijunima, *Histria Antiqua* 7, Pula, 177-190.
- V. Begović Dvoržak (2001), Castrum e chiesa di Santa Maria sulle isole Brioni, *Atti del Convegno, L'Archeologia dell'Adriatico dalla Preistoria al Medioevo*, Ravenna, 671-677.
- V. Begović Dvoržak (2002), Crkva sv. Marije i samostan – faze izgradnje, *Izdanja I. kongresa povjesničara umjetnosti*, Zagreb, 469-474.
- V. Begović, I. Schrunk (2005), Fullonica na Brijunima, *Prilozi IARH*, vol. 22, Zagreb, 127-140.
- V. Begović, I. Schrunk (2007), *The Brioni Islands*, Zagreb.
- V. Begović Dvoržak, I. Dvoržak Schrunk, I. Tutek (2007), The Church of St. Mary nearby castellum in Madona bay - Brioni, *Prilozi IARH*, vol. 24, Zagreb, 229-240.
- T. Bezeczky (1998), *The Laecanius amphora stamps and the villas of Brijuni*, Wien.
- G. P. Brogiolo ed A. Chavarria Arnau (2005), *Aristocrazie e campagne nell'occidente da Costantino a Carlo Magno*, Florence.
- Z. Brusić (1976), Late antique and Byzantine underwater finds along the eastern coast of the Adriatic, *Balcanoslavica* 5, Beograd, 31-39.
- Z. Brusić (1993), Starokršćanski sakralni objekti uz plovidbenu rutu istočnom obalom Jadrana, *Diadora* 15/1993., 223-236.
- T. S. Burns, J. W. Eadie (2001), *Urban Centers and Rural Context in Late Antiquity*, East Lansing.
- J. P. Caillet, M. Jurković, P. Chevalier, I. Matejčić (1999), Velika Gospa près de Bale (Istrie), *HAM*, vol. 5, Zagreb-Motovun, 219-228.
- P. J. Casey (1996), Justinian, the limitanei, and Arab-Byzantine relations in the 6th c., *JRA* 9, Ann Arbor, 215-222.
- N. Christie (2004), *Landscape of change: rural evolutions in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages*, Burlington, VT.
- G. Cuscito (1971), Hoc subile sanctum: contributo per uno studio sulle origini cristiane in Istria, *AMSI*, n.s. XIX, 77-99.
- G. Cuscito (1977), Aquileia e Bisanzio nella controversia dei Tre capitoli, *AAAd*, XII, 231-262.
- G. Cuscito (1977), *Cristianesimo antico ad Aquileia ed in Istria*, Trieste.
- G. Cuscito (1978), Venanzio Fortunato e le chiese istriane, *AMSI XXVI*, 1978, 207-226.
- G. Cuscito (1980), La fede calcedonese e i concili di Grado (579.) e Marano (591.), *Antichità Altoadriatiche*, 17, 207-230.

- G. Cuscito (1985/86), Il primo cristianesimo nella “Venetia et Histria”, *Antichità Altoadriatiche* XXVIII.
- G. Cuscito (1985/86), I santi Mauro ed Eleuterio di Parenzo, *Atti*, XVI, 33-61.
- G. Cuscito (1995), Lo spazio sacro negli edifici culturali paleocristiani dell’alto Adriatico, *HAM*, vol. 1, Zagreb, 90-110.
- G. Cuscito (1999), L'arredo liturgico nelle basiliche paleocristiane della “Venetia” orientale, *HAM*, vol. 5, Zagreb – Motovun, 87-104.
- G. Cuscito, (2000), Cristianizzazione e modifiche dell' ambiente urbano e rurale in Istria fra II s V secolo, *AAAd*, 57, 439-469.
- G. Cuscito, (2003), Gli edifici di culto in area altoadriatica tra VI e VIII secolo, *HAM*, Vol. 9, 33-54.
- I. Čermošnik (1952), Keramika iz rimskog nalazišta Mogorjelo, *GZM* 7, 241-271.
- C. Delaplace (2005), *Aux origines de la paroisse rurale an Gaille meridionale (IVe - VIe siecles)*, Paris.
- N. Duval, E. Marin, C. Metzger (1994), *Salona I: katalog starokršćanske arhitekture i skulpture Salone*, Split-Rim.
- R. Farioli Campati, C. Rizzardi, P. Porta, A. Augenti, I. Baldini Lippolis (edd) (2007), *Ideologia e cultura artistica tra Adriatico e Mediterraneo orientale (IV-X secolo): il ruolo dell'autorità ecclesiastica alla luce di nuovi scavi e ricerche*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale Bologna-Ravenna.
- E. Dyggve (1951), *History of Salonitan Christianity*, Oslo.
- I. Fisković (1995), Apport des Reconstructions d'Eglises de l'Antiquité tardive dans la formation du premier art Roman sur le littoral Croate, *HAM*, vol. 1, Zagreb, 14-279.
- R. Frankovich, R. Hodges (2003), *Villa to village: The Transformation of the Roman Countryside in Italy, c. 400-1000*, London.
- W. Gerber (1912), *Altchristliche Kultbauten Istriens und Dalmatiens*, Dresden.
- W. Gerber (1917), *Forschungen in Salona*, Wien.
- A Gnirs (1911), Baudenkmale aus der Zeit ostromischen Herrschaft auf der Insel Brioni Grande, *Jahrbuch für Altertumskunde*, Wien, 75-97.
- A. Gnirs (1911), Frühe christliche Kultanlagen im südlichen Istrien, *Jahrbuch des Kunsthist. Inst. der K.K. Central-Kommission für Denkmalpflege V*, Wien, 41-45.

- A. Gnirs (1915), Forschungen über antiken Villenbau in Südistrien, *JÖAIBeibl* 18, 99-164.
- I. Goldstein (1992), *Bizant na Jadranu*, Biblioteka Latina et Graeca, *Radovi*, knjiga XIII, Zagreb.
- V. P. Goss (1981), East and West in Medieval Architecture, Catalogue Chapter, Catalogue, *The Meeting of the Two Worlds*, The Museum of Art, University of Michigan, 1981.
- V. P. Goss (1987), *Early Croatian Architecture*, London: Duckworth.
- V. P. Goss (1996), *Predromanička arhitektura u Hrvatskoj – Pre-Romanesque Architecture in Croatia*, Zagreb: Architectonica Croatica.
- V. P. Goss (2006), *Predromanička arhitektura u Hrvatskoj – Pre-Romanesque Architecture in Croatia*, Zagreb.
- V. P. Goss (2009), Some Very Old Sanctuaries and the Emergence of Zagreb's Cultural Landscape, *Peristil* 52, 7-26.
- V. P. Goss (2009), Memories, Sources, Models, in *Medioevo: Immagine e memoria*, Parma, Electa, pp 169-174.
- V. P. Goss (2010), The 'Croatian Westwork' Revisited, *Ars* 43, 3-23.
- A. Gri (1985), Ranosrednjevjekovna crkvena arhitektura i skulptura otoka Veliki Brioni, diplomski rad, Pula.
- M. Jarak (1994), Povijest starokršćanskih zajednica na tlu kontinentalne Hrvatske, *Od nepobjedivog sunca do sunca pravde*, Arheološki muzej, Zagreb, 17-40.
- M. Jurišić, M. Orlić (1987), Brijuni, uvala Verige, antička luka, *Arheološki pregled*, Ljubljana, 97-99.
- P. Kandler (1876), Palazzo di Antonia in Pola, *Notizie storiche di Pola*, Poreč, 120-121.
- M. Katić (1999–2000), Kasnoantički grad na Jadranu – primjer grada Hvara, *PPUD* 38, Split, 19-49.
- B. Kirigin, E. Marin (1988), *Vodič po srednjoj Dalmaciji*, Split.
- R. Krautheimer (1986), *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, Yale University.
- A. W. Lawrence (1983), A Skeletal History of Byzantine Fortifications, *Annual of British School at Athens*, Oxford, No 78, 171-227.
- E. Marin (1988), *Starokršćanska Salona*, Latina et Graeca, Zagreb.
- R. Marta (1989), *Tecnica costruttiva a Roma nel medioevo*, Roma.
- B. Marušić (1967), *Kasnoantička i bizantska Pula*, Pula.

- B. Marušić (1990), Še o Istrski Kisi (Cissa) in Kesenskem škofu (Episcopus cessensis), *Arheološki vestnik*, 41, 403-422.
- I. Matejčić (1995), The Episcopal Palace at Poreč, *HAM*, vol. 1, Zagreb, 84-89.
- R. Matijašić (1998), *Gospodarstvo antičke Istre*, Pula.
- M. Mirabela Roberti (1935), Notizario Archeologico, *Atti*, vol. XLVII, Pula, 293-295.
- M. Mirabella Roberti (1936), Restauri a Brioni che mettono in luce i preziosi segni della sua vita antica, *Corriere Istriano*, 18/1936.
- M. Mirabella Roberti (1943), *Il duomo di Pola*, Pula.
- Š. Mlakar (1971), *Brioni*, Uprava Brionskih otoka, Pula.
- Š. Mlakar (1976), Fortifikacijska arhitektura na otoku Brioni. "Bizantski kastrum", *Histria Archaeologica*, 6-7, Pula.
- A. Poulter (2000), The roman to Byzantine transition in the Balkans: preliminary results on Nicopolis and its hinterland, *JRA* 13, 347-358.
- A. Puschi (1898), Le Pullari, *AMSI* No 15, pp 540-549.
- I. Schrunk (1989), Dioklecijanova palača od 4. do 7. st., *VAMZ*, 3. s., XXII, Zagreb, 91-102.
- I. Schrunk, V. Begović (2000), Roman Estates on the Islands of Brioni, Istria, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 13, Ann Arbor, 253-276.
- A. Starac (1995), Carski posjedi u Istriji, *Opuscula Archaeologica* 18, pp 133-145.
- M. Suić (1976), *Antički grad na istočnoj obali Jadrana*, Zagreb.
- M. Suić (1987), Cissa Pullaria – Baphium Cissense – Episcopus Cessensis, *Arheološki radovi i rasprave*, 10, 185-215.
- M. Suić (1995), Bizantski limes na istočnoj obali Jadrana, *PPUD*, 35, Split, 133-145.
- A. Šonje (1981), *Bizant i crkveno graditeljstvo u Istri*, Rijeka.
- A. Šonje (1982), *Crkvena arhitektura zapadne Istre*, Zagreb – Pazin.
- Ž. Tomičić (1986/7), Novija ranosrednjovjekovna istraživanja Odjela za arheologiju, *Prilozi 3/4*, Zagreb, 141-174.
- F. Tassaux (1982), Laecanii, recherches sur une famille senatoriale d'Istrie, L'Ecole Française de Rome, *Antiquite* 94, 227-269.
- Ž. Tomičić (1988/9), Arheološka svjedočanstva o ranobizantskom vojnom graditeljstvu na sjevernojadranskim otocima, *Prilozi IARH*, 5-6, Zagreb, 29-53.

- M. Verzár Bass (1986), Le trasformazioni agrarie tra Adriatico nord-orientale e norico, pp. 647-685, a libro A. Giardina (ed.) *Società romana e impero tardoantico. Le merci, gli insediamenti*, Roma.
- A. Vitasović (2005), Crkva sv. Marija, kasnoantička crkva 5. st. – bizantska bazilika 6. st., *Histria archaeologica* 34/2003., 61-101.
- M. Vicelja (2007), *Istra i Bizant*, Rijeka.
- M. Wells (1996), Profuit invitis te dominante capi: social and economic considerations on the Roman frontiers, *JRA* 9, Ann Arbor 1996., 436-446.
- Ž. Ujčić (1995), Povodom nalaza brončanog prstenja iz “Kastruma” na Velom Brijunu, *Histria Archaeologica* 26, Pula, 1995, 107-130.
- M. Zanimović (1991), Sol u antici naše obale, *Zbornik Akademije Nauka Bosne i Hercegovine*, Sarajevo, 255-264.
- M. Zanimović (1995), Ranokršćanske crkve kao postaje plovnog puta duž istočnog Jadrana, *VAHD*, 86, Split, 125-146.

SCULPTED PALMYRIAN FUNERARY FEMALE PORTRAITS WITH EXTENSIVE JEWELRY SETS: A REVISIONIST READING OF THEIR MEANINGS AND IMPACT*

NURITH KENAAN-KEDAR

TEL-AVIV UNIVERSITY

Vladimir in admiration and great Love.

The wearing by women of large jewelry arrangements has been characteristic of eastern Mediterranean civilizations since ancient times. This paper focuses on the meanings and impact of the Palmyrian female funerary sculpture with jewelry arrangements. The author argues that it is most plausible that these representations of Palmyrian women reflect the belief of the patron in Ishtar, a major goddess of Palmyra. Ishtar's jewelry was described in the epic of her descent into the Netherworld. The goddess takes with her the seven divine powers – seven pieces of jewelry – and then hands them over at each of the seven gates to the Netherworld. Then, naked and dispossessed of her powers, she dies, only to be resurrected later. The sculptures of the deceased women of Palmyra, with their rich sets of jewelry, reflect a visual perception that is very similar to the jewelry of Ishtar. Perceptions of jewelry as a totality continued to exist in the East, where it apparently underwent a change from a ritual of the goddesses to representations of Byzantine-Christian empresses. It is also possible to detect a resemblance between the systems of head covering, the necklaces interwoven with chains, and the bracelets from Palmyra, and the Berber jewelry of Jewish women in North Africa. This resemblance between the jewelry in Palmyra and the sets of jewelry of the empresses of Byzantium on the one hand, and the appearance of a similar item of jewelry as part of the ceremonial costume of women in the Berber and Jewish communities surviving into modern times on the other hand, is a fascinating phenomenon.

Palmyra, funerary portraits, female portraits, descent of the Goddess Inanna/Ishtar into the netherworld, Byzantine jewelry, Moroccan Berber jewelry

The wearing by women of large jewelry arrangements, comprising chest, head, wrist, and finger elements, has been characteristic of eastern Mediterranean civilizations since ancient times. This paper focuses on one important source of this tradition – the meanings and impact of the Palmyrian female funerary sculpture with jewelry arrangements.

Among the vast quantity of Palmyrian funerary sculpture created between the first and third century AD, female images are depicted in various manners. Some are presented with a veil and draped in the Roman manner, with significant hand gestures, holding the spindle and distaff, while others wear rich sets of head and chest jewelry with bracelets and rings.¹ Recently, significant research was devoted to the meanings of the hand gestures, the holding of the staff and spindle, and to the forms and significance of the headgear.² (Fig. 1)

The jewelry sets of these sculptures have been described by various scholars and interpreted as reflecting the social status of the Palmyrian rich merchants' wives, or referred to as being the jewelry of "ladies of fashion."³ The difference between the Palmyrian and Roman portraits has been little discussed, and scholars have not noted that the Roman female portraits are depicted with very little jewelry. A comparison reveals a significant difference between the visual perceptions of these two centers.⁴ There are three principal components in representations of the women's funerary sculpture in Palmyra that do not feature in Roman women's portraits, either Imperial or civilian, nor in Roman Gaul, Germany, or Spain: a) the Roman women's portraits exhibit intricate hairstyles, differing according to place and period; b) these latter portraits are generally not completely frontal, but shown in three-quarter or profile view; and c) they seldom represent jewelry, as neither do depictions of Roman empresses on coins. The Roman women wear one or two necklaces, but not complete sets of jewelry. (Fig. 2) Thus, the particular choices of representation in Palmyra, where numerous jewelry sets feature the same patterns,⁵ have not been understood as a deliberate expression of identity and of religious beliefs of the depicted patrons.⁶

The Various Groups of Funerary Female Portraits in Palmyra and the Group of Women Wearing Jewelry

The Palmyrian funerary portraits, scattered today in museums throughout the world, constitute a large corpus of stone sculptures created over a period of more than two hundred years, between the first and third centuries AD, during the flourishing of that city in the period of the Roman Empire. Among the women's funerary sculptures discovered one can also distinguish several groups of sculpted portraits, which feature in common a frontal placement of the figure and a complex head covering. The figures don a turban, topped with a scarf that falls onto the shoulders, with only a few locks of the hair revealed. The head covering displays a variety of jewels. These

groups are also characterized by specific hand gestures, with the figure clasping her scarf or head covering. It should be noted that in the East the head covering constitutes an integral part of the overall costume, while in the West it appears among the Vestal priestesses, worn during special rituals.⁷

Among the various groups, that of female figures holding in one hand a distaff and spindle is prominent. Women holding these implements also appear on many Roman tombstones, alongside inscriptions noting that the deceased had diligently managed the household and also engaged in weaving. I would contend, however, that in Palmyra the intention was different. The representation does not relate to women's work during their lifetime, but rather to the role of the goddesses as weaving/spinning the fate of man. Weaving was perceived in Greek culture as the work of Clotho the spinning fate, one of the three Fate Goddesses (the three *Moirai*, or *Moirae*), and thus also already in Assyrian culture. Consequently, I consider it possible to assume that this image of the deceased represents her address to the goddesses, who determine the fate of humankind, to determine her good fate in the world beyond Fate Goddesses.⁸

Thus, I would like to contend that these visual depictions have ancient literary and pictorial sources, and possibly expressed the patrons' belief in a certain goddess—whose cult was current in Palmyra and which is related also to death and resurrection.⁹ I shall attempt to demonstrate this through an examination of these female sepulchral images and of the distinct groups and categories of jewelry, and their possible meanings.



Fig. 1 Funerary relief, woman holding staff and spindle in her left hand and head cover in her right hand (2nd/3rd century AD), Istanbul, Archaeological Museum. Courtesy, Dick Osseman, Amsterdam.



Fig. 2 Roman head, 1st century.

The group of women wearing jewelry

In a central and important group of women's funerary sculpture, there are detailed images depicting sets of jewelry on the portrait, constituting a focal point of the sculpted representation. This group depicts women wearing extensive sets of jewelry – on the head, chest, wrists, and fingers.


In contrast to studies devoted to specific aspects and meanings of the female funerary portraits in Palmyra as such, the significance of the clothing of different classes, or the hand gestures of the deceased, which have also been interpreted symbolically, and the images of the jewelry sets depicted on these funereal sculptures have been mainly studied from their formal aspect of patterns and models, but not in regard to their meaning. As noted above, the wearing of jewelry was also suggested as reflecting social status.¹⁰

Let us take a look at the Palmyrian funerary sculpture of a young woman wearing jewelry in the Archaeological Museum, Istanbul. Her face is broad, and above her hair, of which only the ends are seen, parted in the center and combed to either side of the head, there is a decorated ribbon. Above it is a kerchief encircling her head a number of times, and above this a veil, folded and descending to her shoulders. Beneath the kerchief encircling her head and above the ribbon are two chains in a half-circle. The woman is wearing earrings, and in her left hand (now broken) she appears to be clasping the train of the veil. She is attired in a blouse and wears four different necklaces, while a necklace of small beads encircles her neck. A round decorated fibula secures her upper tunic on the left side, and on her left arm she wears a decorative bracelet. (Fig. 3)



Fig. 3 Funerary bust relief: woman with fibula and chest ornaments (2nd/3rd century AD), Istanbul, Archaeological Museum. Courtesy, Dick Osseman, Amsterdam.

Another portrait of a Palmyrian woman (Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen) displays a similar jewelry scheme, including head and breast ornaments fashioned as individual items. On her head, in place of the decorative ribbon, is an ornate chain with an oval frame in its center, apparently once holding a precious stone. This frame is repeated as a brooch pinning the kerchief that functions as a turban, with the additional veil above it. This lady has seven chains on her breast, several of which are composed of individual circles which once held stones. The outermost chain incorporates two medallions engraved with male images. On the upper left part of her breast she wears a round fibula brooch. Her right hand rests in front of her, while in her left hand she holds the train of the kerchief. On both arms she wears two pairs of decorative bracelets, one round and the other broad and conical. She wears a ring on the little finger of her left hand. (Fig. 4)



*Fig. 4 Funerary relief: woman wearing chest ornaments with two medallions fixed to her chest, necklace installed on her breasts, bracelets, rings and head ornaments. (2nd/3rd century AD).
Courtesy of Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.*

Possible formal and literary-ritual sources

Formal sources: It seems to me that the sets of jewelry, sculpted as part of the female image of dozens of Palmyrian funerary portrait sculptures, engage in a dialogue with formal and mythological traditions. These formal traditions apparently continued the early Phoenician traditions and perhaps even those of a still earlier period. One can note four funerary sculptures of women seemingly Carthaginian-Iberian which show great connections in their headgear and jewelry to Phoenician colonies, mainly in Carthago: that of the Dama from Elche, dated to the fifth century

BC, near the Phoenician colony of Elche in southern Spain;¹¹ and, similarly, the sculptures of the woman from Baza (fourth – third centuries BC), and an additional woman called the *Dama del Cerro de los Santos* (*Gran Dama Oferente*) that are Ibero-Phoenician.¹² (Fig. 5) These funerary sculptures represent women wearing extensive sets of jewelry and costumes that cover their entire body. Their heads feature special jeweled head coverings, rare elements in Greek sculpture of the time. It would seem that in relating to this tradition, the sculptures reflect a clear and strong awareness of local identity, even if use is sometimes made of specific components of the Roman or Persian vocabulary of forms.

Literary-ritual sources: I would like to contend that the women's funerary portraits with the represented sets of jewelry express the belief of their patronesses or patrons in Ishtar – very close to Inana – who was venerated in Palmyra,¹³ and in her myth. Scholars of the Palmyrian pantheon concur that the cult of Ishtar, which seems to be very similar to that of Inana, was introduced during an earlier period from Sumerian Babylon to Palmyra, and accept the assumption that already in the epic tale of Gilgamesh there was a syncretism between these two goddesses.¹⁴ Ishtar is also identified with the Syrian goddess Atargatis and even with Aphrodite.¹⁵

I introduce here a section from the Sumerian myth of the goddess that describes her preparations for her descent into the Netherworld, the descent itself, her death, and resurrection. The similar Babylonian myth of the goddess Ishtar also portrays her descent into the Netherworld and what followed. Researchers noting certain differences between these two epics, note also much similarity.¹⁶



Fig. 5 *Dama del Cerro de los Santos* (*Gran Dama-Oferente*), 2nd century BC, Madrid Archaeological Museum (Photo: N. Kenaan-Kedar).

The following section depicts the preparations by Inana for her descent into the Netherworld. A clear picture arises of her jewelry set, some pieces of which are given seductive names and thus perhaps refer to the fertility ritual connected with these goddesses.

Inana's descent into the Netherworld

¹⁴⁻¹⁹She took the seven divine powers. She collected the divine powers and grasped them in her hand. With the good divine powers, she went on her way. She put a turban, headgear for the open country, on her head. She took a wig for her forehead. She hung small lapis-lazuli beads around her neck.

²⁰⁻²⁵She placed twin egg-shaped beads on her breast. She covered her body with a *pala* dress, the garment of ladyship. She placed mascara which is called "Let a man come, let him come" on her eyes. She pulled the pectoral which is called "Come, man, come" over her breast. She placed a golden ring on her hand. She held the lapis-lazuli measuring rod and measuring line in her hand.

²⁶⁻²⁷Inana travelled towards the underworld. Her minister Nincubura travelled behind her. (In: The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature)

The reference to the jewelry adorning the goddess' limbs establishes them as divine items in her attire: the crown encircling her head, the earrings, the necklace around her neck, the beads on her breast, the breast jewel calling the man to come, the bracelets, and only then the mention of the dress and cloak. All the noted jewelry here also appears on the women's funerary portrait sculptures at Palmyra.

I argue that it is most plausible that these representations of Palmyrian women wearing rich sets of jewelry reflect the belief of the patron in Ishtar, a major goddess of Palmyra. Ishtar's jewelry was described in the epic of her descent into the Netherworld, which continued the Sumeric epic of Inana entering the Netherworld. In both epics the goddess takes with her the seven divine powers – seven pieces of jewelry – and then hands over one piece after the other at each of the seven gates to the Netherworld. Then, naked and dispossessed of her powers, she dies, only to be resurrected later. In the literature discussing the descent of the goddess to the Netherworld, I found no consideration of the jewelry as such, not of the individual item nor of the whole set.¹⁷ The sculptures of the deceased women of Palmyra, with their rich sets of jewelry, reflect a visual perception that is very similar to the jewelry of Inana or Ishtar described in their descent to the Netherworld.

Furthermore, it is possible that such representation of these women on their tombstones is intended to manifest their journey to the Netherworld and their praying to the goddess to be

resurrected. In other words, this representation of the jewelry on funerary sculptures has a symbolic value and expresses the belief of the deceased in life after death that is parallel to jewelry placed in the tombs, also with the belief in resurrection.

Moreover, this perception of the symbolic significance of sets of jewelry continued to persist in the eastern parts of the Roman Empire, acquiring new meanings in the Byzantine Empire. The images of the dead women, probably expressing identification with the goddesses descending into hell and being resurrected later, seem to have been transferred to the images of the queens and empresses of the eastern part of the empire. These queens all wear sets of jewelry and not only single pieces.

Perceiving of the jewelry as a totality that included items for the head, breast, hands, and feet continued to exist in the East, where it apparently underwent change from a ritual of the goddesses and representations in funerary portraits of the women of Palmyra adorned with jewelry, to representations of the empresses in the eastern Roman Empire, as well as the Byzantine-Christian empresses. It is possible that these sets of jewelry of the goddesses became sets that symbolized the regal status of the queen. Indeed, already in writings describing the Palmyrian Queen Zenobia being conducted as a prisoner to Rome, there is mention of her extensive jewelry.¹⁸

Among the Roman and Byzantine-Christian empresses, we should note, for example, images on coins of Empress Aelia Eudoxia, consort of Emperor Arcadius. A similar process can be traced in various other examples, for instance among the queens associated with Theodosius in the fifth century, such as Licinia Eudoxia, wife of Valentinian the Third.¹⁹ The depictions of these empresses feature extensive sets of head and neck jewelry, in addition to the figures wearing the fibula that displays their patrician status.

Empress Theodora, too, in her familiar sixth-century representation in the mosaic in the church of San Vitale in Ravenna, is wearing extensive neck, breast, and head-covering jewelry in addition to her crown. (Fig. 6) I contended elsewhere that her breast jewelry resembled that of Egyptian royalty, while her head covering appeared Eastern.²⁰ It is certainly reasonable to assume that Theodora – like Zenobia the queen of Palmyra, who considered herself a descendant of Cleopatra²¹ – wished to call to mind the image of Cleopatra, despite her not being a Christian image, and to posit once again the ideal and the uniqueness of the Oriental Empress, compared with the Western perception. In other words, the sets of jewelry confer a sublime value upon the unique status of the queens of the East.

Finally, I avail myself of the type of research currently termed archaeological /anthropological, which studies the extent to which ancient findings of the material culture have

continued to exist into modern times, in order to examine the meaning of their continued existence in the twentieth century.²²

Moreover, historians of Palmyra and anthropologists have maintained that there is a link between Palmyra and the Yemen through the nomadic Arab tribes that wandered between these two regions already in the first centuries AD, as well as later, when the town was under Islamic rule. Mordechai Narkiss and other scholars of Yemenite jewelry, as well as those of the Eastern Jewish communities, also pointed to the possible influence of Palmyrian on Yemenite jewelry.²³



Fig. 6 Mosaic panel of the Empress Theodora on the left apse wall of San Vitale Church, Ravenna, 6th century AD.

Connections between Palmyra and North Africa had already existed during the hundreds of years following the establishment of the Phoenician colonies in North Africa. Moreover, various scholars perceive the existence of Berber culture over hundreds of years in North Africa, simultaneously with the Phoenician colonies there, as an autonomous culture²⁴ that preceded the Roman occupation, and certainly during the period of the Roman Empire.²⁵ These local cultures also continued to exist under Islamic rule. Various sources inform that Jews settled in these colonies as well as in the Berber settlements in North Africa.

The noted anthropologist Jean Besancenot²⁶ determined the Berber jewelry in North Africa to be pre-Islamic, and Berber/Moroccan jewelry – mainly in the creation of sets of chains, bracelets, and rings – indeed brings to mind those of the Palmyrian funerary sculpture. (Fig. 7, Fig. 3)

Indeed, in my own research I was able to distinguish that at least one item of jewelry had clearly been introduced from Palmyra to the sets of Berber jewelry and continued to exist also in modern-day twentieth-century Morocco. This finding is supported by the study of a particular item of jewelry whose images appear in the funerary portraits of the Palmyrian women and also in Berber jewelry in present-day Morocco. (Fig. 8, Fig. 4)



Fig. 7 A Moroccan Jewish woman in traditional costume, adorned with an array of chest and head jewelry, bracelets and rings. Tahala, Morocco, 1947. Courtesy, Israel Museum Collection, Jerusalem (Photo: J. Besancenot).




Fig. 8 A drawing of a Moroccan Jewish woman in traditional costume, adorned with a two round ornamental objects on each of her breasts, each hanging on a triangle fibula carried by a chain. In addition she wears an array of chest and head jewelry, bracelets and rings. Tahala, Morocco, 1947. Courtesy, Israel Museum Collection, Jerusalem (Drawing: J. Besancenot).

Several of these Palmyrian funerary portraits depict a piece of jewelry comprising a breast chain incorporating two circles or medallions located next to or on the two breasts. The medallions feature images of men. This item is similar in form to that described in the epic of Inana's descent into the Netherworld:

²⁰⁻²⁵ “She placed twin egg-shaped beads on her breast”... “She pulled the pectoral which is called “Come, man, come” over her breast.”²⁷

Among the Berbers of North Africa such jewelry acquired a ritual value, symbolizing the traditional roles of women, and is also known in the Maghreb among Jewish women: attached to the chain by two special fibulae are two silver circles, resting on the two breasts. It is reasonable to assume that the item of jewelry described as part of the costume of the goddesses and featuring on the Palmyrian funerary sculptures as part of the ritual of death, reached North Africa and the Jewish communities there as part of the ceremonial costume.

It would thus also seem possible to find a resemblance between the systems of head covering, the necklaces interwoven with chains, and the bracelets from Palmyra, and the Berber jewelry and ceremonial jewelry of Jewish women in North Africa. This resemblance between the jewelry in Palmyra and the sets of jewelry of the empresses of Byzantium, on the one hand, and the appearance of a similar item of jewelry as part of the ceremonial costume of women in the Berber and Jewish communities surviving into modern times, on the other hand, poses a fascinating phenomenon.

- * To my most beloved Vered Lev-Kenaan, who introduced me to Inana's descent into the Netherworld.
- ¹ Henri Seyrig, "Palmyra and the East," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 40, 1–2 (1950): 1–7; Anna Sadurska and Adnan Bounni, *Les sculptures funéraires de Palmyre* (Rome: G. Bretschneider, 1994).
- ² Maura K. Heyn, "Gesture and Identity in the Funerary Art of Palmyra," *American Journal of Archaeology* 114, 4 (October 2010): 631–61; Cynthia Sue Finlayson, "Veil, Turban and Headpiece: Funerary Portraits and Female Status in Palmyra" (PhD diss., University of Iowa, 1998).
- ³ Dorothy Mackay, "The Jewellery of Palmyra and Its Significance," *Iraq*, 11, 2 (Autumn 1949): 160–87; Maura K. Heyn, "Sacerdotal Activities and Parthian Dress in Palmyra," in *Reading a Dynamic Canvas: Adornment in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, ed. Cynthia S. Colburn and Maura K. Heyn (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2008), 170–94.
- ⁴ Kathia Pinckernelle, "The Iconography of Greek and Roman Jewellery" (M.Phil, University of Glasgow, 2008). Elisabeth Bartman, "Hair and Style of Roman Female Adornment" *AJA* (2001) 1–25.
- ⁵ Diana E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Sculpture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992), 325–28.
- ⁶ Mackay, "Jewellery," 167–87.
- ⁷ *Reading a Dynamic Canvas: Adornment in the Ancient Mediterranean World*, ed. Cynthia S. Colburn and Maura K. Heyn (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars, 2008).
- ⁸ Judith Lynn Sebesta, *Weavers of Fate: Symbolism in the Costume of Roman Women*, Harrington Lecture, 42 (Vermillion, SD: College of Arts & Sciences, University of South Dakota, 1994).
- ⁹ Ted Kaizer, *The Religious Life of Palmyra: A Study of the Social Patterns of Worship in the Roman Period*, *Oriens et occidentis*, 4 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2002), 99–107, 204–5.
- ¹⁰ Ivana Popović, "Braceletes from Viminacium and Sirmium as Evidence of Palmyra Goldsmithery Influences on Local Jewelry Production," *Starinar* 55 (2005): 97–106.
- ¹¹ José Gudiol, *The Arts of Spain* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1964), 15–18.
- ¹² John F. Moffitt, *The Arts in Spain* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2005), 13–23.
- ¹³ Kaizer, *Religious Life*.
- ¹⁴ Javier Teixidor, *The Pantheon of Palmyra* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 60; Christides Vassilios, *Religious Syncretism in the Near East: Allat-Athena in Palmyra*, *Analecta Gorgiana* 997 (Cordoba: Gorgias Press, 2004), 74–79; Michał Gawlikowski, "The Athena of Palmyra," *Archaeologia* (1996): 21–23.
- ¹⁵ Charles Penglase, *Greek Myths and Mesopotamia: Parallels and Influence in the Homeric Hymns and Hesiod* (London: Routledge, 1994).
- ¹⁶ Dina Katz, "Inanna's Descent and Undressing the Dead as a Divine Law," *ZA* 85 (1995): 221–23.
- ¹⁷ "Descent of the Goddess Ishtar into the Lower World," in Morris Jastrow, *The Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria: Its Remains, Language, History, Religion, Commerce, Law, Art, and Literature*, 2d ed. (Philadelphia and London: J.B. Lippincott, 1915).
- Compare with: **Inannas's Descent Into Netherworld**, translated by James W. Bell, 2004.

Innana abandoned her temples
And prepare to descend.

In her hands,
She gathered the seven Mes of office.
On her head,
She placed the *shugurra*, the crown of the steppe;
And arranged the dark locks of hair across her forehead.

She tied small lapis lazuli beads around her neck
And a double strand at her breast.

Gold bracelets she slipped on her wrists
And strapped on breast-shields named,
'Come hither, man, come hither.'

She wrapped the robe of queenship around her body
And daubed her eyes with an ointment of kohl
Called 'Let him, come, let him, come.'

Taking the lapis measuring rod and line in hand,
Inanna set out for the Netherworld.

-
- ¹⁸ Zosimus, *Historia Nova* Bk. 1, ca. 500 AD. (London: Printed for J. Davis by W. Green and T. Chaplin, 1814), (http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/zosimus01_book1.htm). Zosimus' account provides the most thorough history on the time of Zenobia. Most of what we know about Aurelian's campaign comes from Zosimus; *Historia Augusta*, sections on Aurelian and Zenobia. Translation by David Magie. (http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Historia_Augusta/home.html); Glanville Downey, "Aurelian's Victory over Zenobia at Immae, A.D. 272," *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, 81 (1950): 57–68.
- ¹⁹ J.F.W. De Salis, "The Coins of the Two Eudoxias, Eudocia, Placidia, and Honoria, and of Theodosius II, Marcian, and Leo I, Struck in Italy," *Numismatic Chronicle* 7 (1867): 203–15; Eleanor Shipley Duckett, *Medieval Portraits from East and West* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1972).
- ²⁰ Nurith Kenaan-Kedar, "Theodora, Harlot Queen or Oriental Empress," in *On Interpretation in the Arts*, ed. Nurit Yaari (Tel-Aviv: Tel- Aviv University, 2000), 99–112.
- ²¹ Zosimus, *Historia Nova*. Bk. 1 (above, n. 18).
- ²² Amy Rebecca Gansell, "From Mesopotamia to Modern Syria: Ethnoarchaeological Perspectives on Female Adornment during Rites of Passage," in *Ancient Near Eastern Art in Context: Studies in Honor of Irene J. Winter*, ed. Jack Cheng and Marian H. Feldman (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2007), 449-83.
- ²³ Mordechai Narkiss, *The Artistic Craft of the Jews of Yemen* (Jerusalem: Friends of the Bezalel Museum, 1941) (Hebrew). In the Middle Ages there were apparently connections between the Jewish communities in Morocco and the Yemen.
- ²⁴ Michael A. Cook, *A Brief History of the Human Race* (New York and London: Norton, 2003), 28–29.
- ²⁵ Ranuccio Bianchi Bandinelli, *Rome, la fin de l'art antique* (Paris: Gallimard, 1970), 215–97.
- ²⁶ Jean Besancenot, *Bijoux arabes et berbères du Maroc* (Casablanca: Éditions de la Cigogne, 1951).
- ²⁷ In: The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature (C:\Users\user\Documents\palmyra text\Inana's descent to the nether world translation.mht).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY OF GREAT MORAVIAN ARCHITECTURE¹

MARTIN VANČO

SLOVAK POST, POSTAL PHILATELIC SERVICE, POSTAL MUSEUM

During history of the Great Moravian religious architecture research on the Czech and Slovak territory many hypotheses shedding light on its original appearance and significance have been created. First basic methodological approach was traditional positivism which has been based on the comparison of disposition schemes of churches with similar ground plans coming from different cultural locations and periods. As a reaction to the positivism method of formal analysis, V. Richter joined the structural studies already in 1938, although he has never explicitly favored the structural method in the research of Great Moravian architecture as did J. Pošomourný who also used some features of iconography of architecture to identify symbolism of the 12th apostles through his own system of modular circles (1971). Combination of both structural studies and iconography was defined by M. Vančo at the beginning of 3rd millennium. Recently it was B. Pomfyová that applied the method of cultural anthropology, respectively the theory of cultural memory (2005). She focused her attention on the issue of stationary divine service and the family of churches in Great Moravian hillfort “Valy” near Mikulčice. Several features of phenomenology method we can find already in J. Cibulka’s hypothesis on the Hiberno-Scottish origin of the church in Modrá near Velehrad (1958). So far, premises of the hermeneutics method in the research of Great Moravian architecture have been dealt with only by V. Richter (1965). He based his views of the beginning of Great Moravian architecture on the Czech early medieval documents.

Methodology, Positivism, Structural studies, Iconology / Iconography, Cultural Anthropology, Phenomenology, Hermeneutics

Research of the Great Moravian religious architecture on the territory of the Czech Republic and Slovakia has got more than 60 years of history. Since the discovery of the first Great Moravian Church in 1949 by Vilém Hrubý in the Staré Město "Na valách", during the 2nd half of the 20th century, there were further discoveries of the old Great Moravian architecture generating a number of hypotheses explaining its original appearance, meaning and function. The main deficiency of the current state of research is however the absence of discussion of current methodological approaches of the interpretation of the Great Moravian religious architecture, with the exception of Pošmourný's original method of "modular circles." Except for this researcher, no one has actually tried to define an interpretive approach, so the individual elements of the methodology used by the individual authors are difficult to reconstruct in retrospect, because the main methodological instruments are often hidden in the intricate network of argumentation practices. Since the methods were to assist researchers in interpreting the artifacts examined, this study is purely methodological. It analyzes the current approaches according to art historical methods with which they have the most common features. I will point out the pros and cons, by which one could avoid some mistakes in the future. At the same time this study will contribute to a comprehensive discussion of the Pre-Romanesque architecture in the Czech and Slovak Republics, especially after the new discoveries of early medieval architecture in Kopčany and Kostol'any pod Tribečom.² (Fig. 1)



*Fig. 1 The Church of St Margaret of Antiochia in Kopčany.
Photo: M. Vančo.*

Traditional positivism

One of the main characteristics of positivism, apart from its empiricism, scientism, and geneticism is formalism, i.e., stylistic criticism.³ This is based primarily on visual comparison which is one of the most commonly used procedures in the research on the Great Moravian architecture. Its research has always been based on comparing the layout design of churches with similar plans from different cultural areas and different time horizons. Since the similarity factor is not an exact quantity but the subjective impression of an individual, it is logical that this approach could result in diametrically opposite conclusions about the origin of the Great Moravian architecture which can be illustrated, for example, in Great Moravian rotundas. From the 19th century on, the respective analogies were sought in the Byzantine Empire, given that the construction of churches was associated with the arrival of the mission of Cyril and Methodius. According to some researchers, such as K. B. Mádl, both missionaries were even responsible for bringing the ideological pattern of circular construction derived from St George's Rotunda in Thessaloniki.⁴

This hypothesis has been in force for more than half a century and has been disproved only after the discovery of the first Great Moravian foundations of buildings dating back to first half of the 9th century. Despite this, there were researchers who continued to search for construction patterns for Great Moravian architecture in Byzantine Empire. E. Bachmann compared the Mikulčice – "two-apsidal" rotunda on the basis of the axial arrangement of the circular hall and the apse to the monumental church of Emperor Justinian, the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople.⁵ Similar approach was presented by J. Cibulka, who compared the architectural concept of "two-apsidal" rotunda to the axial arrangement of the central area in the Bulgarian Peruščica from the 6th century.⁶ Given that the "two-apsidal" rotunda was dated to first third of the 9th century by its discoverer,⁷ the researchers were forced to look for patterns of rotundas in contact zones with the Byzantine Empire, especially in the Istrian-Dalmatian region. The theory of the origin of simple rotundas in the Adriatic region was proposed by A. Merhautová who sought a relevant analogy in those areas where they were in functional connection with a residential palace, which she demonstrated by the alleged seat of the Aquileia Bishop in Koper.⁸ Rotunda of the Virgin Mary in Koper in Slovenia, originally dedicated to St John the Baptist, however, dates back to the 12th century on the basis of ashlar masonry with arched frieze and pilaster strips. Therefore this building can not be regarded as a model for the Great Moravian rotundas which were built about three centuries earlier. (Fig. 2)

Ultimately the formalist method sought to prove the link between the Great Moravian rotundas and Frankish palace chapels, especially to Charlemagne's Palatine Chapel in Aachen. The relation of this complicated structure to simple rotundas was explained not only as the reduction of

the complex construction in simple rotundas but also by their functions as princely chapels.⁹ L. J. Konečný tried to prove the direct formal connection between the "two-apsidal" rotunda in Mikulčice and the Chapel of Charles the Great based on the interpretation of the western hall as westwerk with a gallery at the upper floor, typical for Carolingian princely buildings.¹⁰ Lately, it was G. Streich who derived the Great Moravian rotundas from the simple circular rotunda situated in the royal courts of Höfe by Dreihausen. This building was dated to the turn of the 8th – 9th centuries on the basis of pottery, and there are no contemporaneous written sources.¹¹ In terms of typology, this simple rotunda is, however, rare for the period of the Frankish Empire.¹²

In terms of formalist research, many researchers followed the spirit of traditional positivism, particularly notable during the Iron Curtain period of socialism, and joining hands with a kind of international Slavic brotherhood. Therefore, the patterns for the Great Moravian architecture were searched for in the area with a late antique construction tradition, which was mainly the Istrian-Dalmatian region of the old Croatia.¹³ As for the beginnings of the Moravian architecture, it is necessary to bear in mind that the Dalmatian architecture of beginning of the 9th century could hardly influence the form of the Great Moravian architecture, since the Slavic Croatia was, in the first half of the 9th century, also in the first phase of Christianity and, moreover, from a methodological point of view of the center and periphery, this region was until the beginning of the 9th century a Byzantine periphery what clearly corresponds to the conclusions of Croatian researchers.¹⁴

It is also essential that the northern part of Dalmatia was at the turn of 8th – 9th centuries affected by Carolingian Empire what was also reflected in the local architectural production of the first half of the 9th century.¹⁵ The problem of the Great Moravian religious architecture should be then examined in the relation of center and periphery, i.e., on the mechanism of epicenter affecting peripheral areas not only politically but also culturally. In the 9th century, Carolingian Empire was undoubtedly considered a centre which was, at that time the strongest point of formative influence from Central Europe almost all of Europe from the Pyrenees to Dalmatia. This fact, therefore, also relates to the beginning of Christianity of the Transdanubian Slavs, which took place as already stated by V. Vavrinek,¹⁶ at the direct order of Charles the Great through the mission of the Bavarian episcopate. From the 6th to the 9th centuries, Frankish architecture transformed a number of typological architectural elements of the Middle East, especially the Byzantine Empire architecture, the tradition of which was interrupted by the Carolingian Renaissance, reviving early Christian patterns. Significant example is the palace complex of Charles the Great in Aachen, based on the Early Christian and Byzantine traditions.

The chapel of Charles the Great is generally derived from Justinian architecture design (of course with some innovations). The northern annex basilica is considered to be of the Oriental type with typical side pastoforia and galleries over the side area.¹⁷ Finally, the palace Aula Regia is based on the model of a Byzantine royal palace – chrysotriklinium, assuming that the models themselves were based on the triclinium of Lateran Palace in Rome¹⁸ or Constantine's basilica in Trier.¹⁹ In the late 8th – 9th century Carolingian architecture used Merovingian traditional construction types based on the architecture of the Middle East with newly emerging structures reviving early Christian patterns.

Most types of buildings dating back to the days of the Great Moravian Empire in the early Middle Ages appear in general from the Visigoth Spain to the Byzantine periphery of the Caucasus. Although the plans of these buildings appear to be similar at a first glance, in the overall structure of architectural interiors, exteriors and construction details, they are quite different. By simply comparing the plan one can prove the association with those areas on which the researcher focused. It could be argued that in the case of the lost Great Moravian architecture, no other method of determining provenance of individual building types is possible. A possible solution may be to examine them also in terms of preserved architecture, reflecting the tradition of Great Moravian architecture in its area of its primary extension, what was done by L. J. Konečný in a study of rotundas with cylindrical towers.²⁰ Comparative studies can be used involving the churches of SS. Peter and Paul rotunda at Budeč, St George rotunda in Nitrianska Blatnica, St George Church in Kostol'any pod Tribečom or newly discovered Pre-Romanesque St Margaret at Kopčany.²¹ This approach is clearly not applicable to all types of Great Moravian religious architecture, such as the Basilica, because no similar Pre-Romanesque buildings of its kind in our region were preserved. The oldest single churches in Bohemia, Moravia, and Slovakia have the character of the Pre-Romanesque architecture of Western Europe, which is confirmed not only by masonry technologies used in buildings made of rubblework, but by the overall structure of the exterior and interior analogous to the Carolingian Renaissance sites.

Structural Approach

In response to the positivist formalism in 1938 V. Richter started to deal with the building structure because his basic idea was the factor of structure influencing the artwork, which means distinguishing between the objective and the subjective in art.²² This structural approach to the Great Moravian architecture was used by Richter mainly in the summary work entitled "The beginning of the Great Moravian architecture," where he tried to understand, with the help of the original construction the measures of the churches, stressing the non-visual structural aspect of

architecture.²³ Richter therefore follows the idea of main representative of structural approach, H. Sedlmayr, who followed the assumption that every work of art has its own central structural principle independent of the visual perception whereby we can understand that work.²⁴ For example, when analyzing the two-apsidal rotunda, Richter tried to identify the original intention of the builder through specific measure of 43 cm which he derived from the half-width of the church base, in the size of 86 cm. This construction unit of measurement he called the Langobard foot, the length of which he uncritically took over from the German scholar F. Behn. He then concluded that the rotunda was built by a North Italian architect which led him to establish Italy as the place of origin of the Great Moravian rotundas.²⁵

J. Pošmourný, unlike V. Richter, reconstructed Great Moravian buildings with the help of the Roman foot of 29,56 cm.²⁶ He first applied his structural method based on examining non-visual elements of architecture in the reconstruction of the small church "Na Valách" in Staré Město.²⁷ With the help of the Roman foot, he managed to identify, given the width of the apse of 360 cm, a hagiographic symbolism of the 12 Apostles. It was also the starting point for the reconstruction of the church through a system called modular circles to which he adapted the shape of archaeologically prepared foundations of the church.²⁸ As for the method of Mr. Pošmourný, it is necessary to draw attention to the fact that the circular system itself negatively affected his conclusions aimed at identifying the architectural process. He assumed the church had domes above side areas, the existence of which could not be confirmed, which led him to tie the identity of the concept of construction with the alleged Byzantine missionary architecture, such as the church in the Kubán, in Caucasus, which he considered a significant example thereof.²⁹ (Fig. 3) Many researchers paid attention to Pošmourný's modular system. For example, V. Vavřínek considered the modular system to be very beneficial for the evaluation of the Great Moravian architectural monuments, but also he opened a question of whether this system had to be brought exclusively from the Byzantine area.³⁰ V. Hrubý also considered the theory based on the prototype of the missionary church created in Byzantium to be very important. However, he did not agree with Pošmourný on the issue of origin.³¹ However there were even researchers who accepted this theory without reservations, for example, B. Dostál, who accepted the assumption of the formation of the Great Moravian churches with semicircular apses on the basis 12, yet in the case of the church in Pohansko, the apse did not have a diameter of 360 cm but 400 cm.³²

With the structural method we can come to diametrically different conclusions, depending on what construction unit the author may choose for the reconstruction.³³ On the other hand, it is likely that the regional differentiation of the Roman foot was related to the emergence of specialized architectural workshops associated with courtly circles in the late Middle Age.³⁴




Fig. 2 The plan of excavation around church Nr. VI so called double-apse rotunda in Mikulčice. Repro: Poláček, L.: *Die Ausgrabungen in Mikulčice. Führer durch die Ausgrabung von Mikulčice, Bd. 1. Brno 2008, p. 14.*




Fig. 3 System of modular circles according J. Pošmourný on the example of the church „Na valách“ located in Staré Město Reconstructed by programme AutoCAD.
Drawing: M. Vančo.

Despite that deficiency of the structural method made an effort to use exact sciences, such as mathematics and geometry, through which it was possible, as opposed to the formalist methods, to verify objectively the results of research. Critical verification of conclusions of the structural method must therefore also be done by exact means, not just by simple statements saying that destroyed foundations do not conform to the original foundations of buildings and therefore it is impossible to determine the initial measurement units.³⁵ The use of construction measure units shall not be examined only on some parts of the architecture, such as the diameter of the apse, as tried by J. Pošmourný, or the width of the foundations as preferred by V. Richter, but it should be based on all dimensions of the building. Just because most of the Great Moravian churches are in fragmentary conditions, the exact layout and orientation have a permanent heuristic value for future generations of researchers who were not able to participate personally in authentic or revision research. (Fig. 4)



Fig. 4 Fragments of foundations of the church called “Na valách” presented in Memorial of Great Morava in Staré Město. Photo: M. Vančo.

Iconology/Architecture Iconography

The beginning of the study of iconology in the former Czechoslovakia dates back to the 60's of the last century, when the new generation of art historians focused on the Middle Ages greatly influenced by the German expert R. Chadraba.³⁶ The use of methodological apparatus of iconology was already proposed by A. Merhautová when examining the origins of the Great Moravian rotundas, but ultimately she stayed with the position of the formalists.³⁷ The closest to this method was J. Pošmourný as, based on the modular system of circles derived from the size of the apse, he discovered the symbolism of 12 Apostles.³⁸ It is more than likely that J. Pošmourný progressed intuitively and he did not know the iconographic method in architecture, so that his findings lacked the final tertiary comparison point with the model, as correctly noticed by A. Merhautová.³⁹ A term of tertiary comparison was introduced in the research of the medieval architecture in the early 40's of the 20 century by R. Krautheimer who, after emigrating to the United States, became one of the main proponents of the iconological method, the so called "deep iconography" that was influenced by the American positivism and factography.⁴⁰ It was certainly not just by accident that R. Krautheimer formulated "The introduction to Iconography of Architecture," the main premise of which was that no medieval source emphasized design of building, but the practical liturgical purpose of the church, so the content of the construction stood at the heart of medieval architectural thinking, to which the research of the content from the perspective of architectural iconography is subject.⁴¹

For the research of the Great Moravian religious architecture, from which only fragments of foundations are preserved, the Krautheimer method, demonstrated on the example of a copy of the rotunda of the Holy Sepulcher in Jerusalem, can be used. The builders here took over not only the design and function from a model, but also the basic architecturally significant elements. These elements include the size of buildings which is one of the few features still observable in the Great Moravian buildings. The numerological significance of architectural elements of copied buildings was pointed out by R. Krautheimer, according to whom this significance was attributed in the Middle Ages not only to basic geometric shapes, such as the layout structure of the building or number of columns, windows, etc. (which are, however, unknown in the Moravian architecture) but also to the size of buildings.⁴² In the case of the rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem, for example, the measures of the sarcophagus of the tomb of Christ of 7 Roman feet was used in Paderborn Meinwerk Chapel or in the church of the Holy Sepulchre in Cambay. Conclusions of R. Krautheimer on the symbolic meaning of dimensions have yet not been questioned, and his very stimulating reflections were later followed by other renowned scholars such as C. Heitz.⁴³ Current methodological articles on the study of medieval architecture of Krautheimer⁴⁴ and Bandmann⁴⁵ are

appreciated for showing how the iconographic method can save contemporary research of architecture from formal and archaeological prejudices.⁴⁶

Copying measures from the model buildings, on the other hand, may have been required by patrons of the copied buildings suggesting another important methodological problem of the relationship of the patrons and the builders (organized group of masons). In the early Middle Ages patrons were exclusively secular and ecclesiastical dignitaries who selected prototypes often having devotional or commemorative significance for the faithful. On the other hand, however, it is necessary to realize that the Great Moravian society could not follow this religious tradition, as it was in a transition from paganism to Christianity, and where Christian architecture represented a completely new cultural import.

Structural-iconographic research method of Moravian architecture

As noted above, elements of both methods can be observed already in J. Pošmourný's work, albeit intuitive rather than analytical. Despite many stated reservations it is necessary to admit that in principle he acted in the right way. Indeed, he was trying to scientifically prove the intention of the original builder and the iconographic importance of the building elements. I have used the combination of both methods several times in the spirit of postmodern eclecticism,⁴⁷ a combination of different methods in an effort to discover the most objective conclusion. Given the state of the sites examined in which the basic architectural elements such as arches, columns and other architectural elements have disappeared, the absence of which does not allow for a classical formal analysis, this methodological eclecticism is necessary. First, it is important to attempt to determine the construction measure unit, i.e. the foot used, since in the Middle Ages the metric system did not exist. J. Pošmourný and V. Richter have already made progress in this way, however from only one dimension, in the first case the apse, in the latter case the width of the foundations, to which they adapted other dimensions of the buildings. It is therefore necessary to compare all the measurements of the building with the Roman and Carolingian foot, and identify their ideal size, using the nearest integers. The foot which achieves the smallest average deviation coefficient, may be most likely the original construction measure unit used in the construction of the church. This procedure is identical to the above method of structural analysis.

It is based on the detection of the originally planned size of buildings, as the churches can be examined from a point of view of medieval symbolic numerology, showing the intentional insertion of Christian symbols in measurements that belong to the iconography of the architecture. The next step is the attempt to identify the original plan of the church on the basis of structural and symbolic models used by the builder during the construction planning. This chart can be compared to the

other Great Moravian buildings, on the basis of which it is possible to define groups of buildings that could potentially be built by one architect or workshop. This assumption stems from the simple deduction that the builders might have had more than one building commissioned at the same time. Finally, it is important to determine, by tertiary comparison, the standard models in the contemporary European architecture, which could help in locating the architectural workshops acting in Great Moravia. (Fig. 5)




Fig. 5 Comparison of Charles the Great chapel in Aachen with double-apse rotunda in Mikulčice. Reconstructed by programme AutoCAD. Drawing: M. Vančo.

Of course, with the absence of written sources relating to the construction of the Great Moravian churches, these remain hypotheses, the likelihood of which increases with the weight of the argument. In the case of iconographic method, e.g., of inserting Christian symbols into the dimensions of the Great Moravian construction, it can naturally be argued that they may not have been deliberately placed in there, but could have proceeded from calculations of statics derived from the width of the foundations due to the width, length and height of the building. This would mean that the width of the foundations was a kind of basic unit, a module, as the base of the column in the Greek architecture. Roman architecture, from which early medieval architecture originates, had a different procedure. This is made obvious especially by Vitruvius' work "The Ten Books on Architecture", where the construction of the atriums and basilicas is described by determining the

interior width of the building, from which then, by the static or dynamic proportional ratios, other parts of the building were derived, such as the length, height and width of foundations.⁴⁸ In addition, the Great Moravian buildings are mostly of simple structure and small dimensions, what may lead to an ever so facile identification with the most frequent symbols such as the 12 apostles, the 24 Elders of the Apocalypse, etc. Therefore, there is a risk of misinterpretation, or attributing meaning to something that originally did not have any. On the other hand, it is necessary to take into account the fact that if these hagiographic symbols reverberate in the minds of contemporary scholars, they must have reverberated even more so in the mind of the medieval man.⁴⁹

Phenomenology

This method, which later turned into hermeneutics, which will be discussed later, has not yet been fully utilized in research of Moravian architecture. Its traces can be found in Cibulka's hypothesis on Irish-Scottish origin of the Church in Modrá u Velehradu.⁵⁰ J. Cibulka as a student of the Vienna School of M. Dvořák absorbed from the latter's mentor, Hegel, the theory of phenomenology of spirit, which in his case, resulted in non-critical connection of the Irish phenomenon, a single aisle church with a square apse. As he identified this type of church as a typical manifestation of the Irish insular Christianity, he proposed its expansion through Europe in connection with "Irish-Scottish" missionaries, and also on the territory north of the Danube before the emergence of Great Moravia.⁵¹ The main arguments against this hypothesis were published in particular by V. Vavrinek just a year after the publication of the book. Especially, he pointed to the absence of any written reports on activities of Irish missionaries in our area, and of any conclusive evidence of such in the archaeological material.⁵²

Extensive criticism of Cibulka's hypothesis from more researchers took place during the debate at the international conference „The Great Moravian Empire” held in Brno and Nitra in 1963. Cibulka's theory was mainly questioned by J. Poulik because of the absence of concrete evidence in written records,⁵³ and V. Hruby because of the dating to around 800.⁵⁴ Under the power of the arguments, J. Cibulka had to retreat from his position, and to admit that the church was not built by Irish-Scottish mission, but by a Bavarian one, based on Irish tradition.⁵⁵ Cibulka's hypothesis was revitalized by J. Lichardus,⁵⁶ joining the Irish missionary phenomenon in architecture with an earlier interpretation of V. Richter,⁵⁷ relating to the identification of rounded holes around the church with a religious building. Lichardus's interpretation was critically studied by R. Kožiak,⁵⁸ who I hope for good, ended the romantic image of the Irish monks spreading Christianity in Moravia before the year 800. (Fig. 6)




Fig. 6 Reconstruction of the foundations of the church in Modrá near Velehrad. Photo: M. Vančo.

Marginally, the issue of the Great Moravian architecture was touched upon by A. Novak, student of the dean of Czech phenomenology, J. Patočka, who tried to include, on the basis of the murals, the rotunda of the Twelve Apostles in Bina in Slovakia into the Great Moravian period.⁵⁹ This reveals his blatant ignorance of Slovak literature, since under the rotunda foundations, already in the 70's, a grave from 9th – 10th century was found proving that the rotunda was built in the Romanesque period on an earlier Great Moravian burial ground.⁶⁰ Given that Novák considered a mural to be a key source for understanding the Great Moravian architecture, we hardly need to go any further into the usefulness of phenomenology in this context. Just as a curiosity it may be noted that his attempt to reconstruct the church in the Sady at Uherské Hradiště according to canonical tables from the Gospel(!) led to a conclusion that the church had pillars with arcades in the transept.⁶¹

Cultural Anthropology

Methodological instruments in the field of cultural anthropology were intuitively used by a number of researchers of the Great Moravian architecture. This concerns in particular the methods

of bringing the mission operating in Great Moravia into relation with specific building types of churches. The method of acculturation in the interpretation of the Great Moravian religious architecture was only programmatically used by A. Avenarius, who focused mainly on defining the share of the three missions – from the Frankish Empire, Italy, and Byzantium. Although he expressed doubts about the merger of architectural types among different missions, he finally agreed with the researchers deriving the origin of most of the churches from the Adriatic area; where there was, presumably, a continuous ancient building tradition closely tied to the Byzantine culture, and it was imported to Moravia via so called mission from the Vlach (i.e. Northern Italian area).⁶²

The trend of linking the missionary activities with the origin of various architectural types goes back to the 19th century, when the biggest importance was given to the presumed Great Moravian churches in the view of the Byzantine mission of Cyril and Methodius. After the first discoveries of the lost Great Moravian churches after the 2nd World War, it became clear that many of them were built before the arrival of the Byzantine mission. Therefore, many researchers focused their attention on the more indirect evidence of the Great Moravian missionaries, especially on the letter from Rostislav to Byzantine Emperor Michael III, mentioned in the Life of Methodius (Chapter 5) describing the missionary work “from Vlachy, from Greece, and Germany.”⁶³ This report was for many researchers the proof of origin of each type of architecture, a sort of logical loop or circular thinking, as this methodology was exactly characterized by K. Benda.⁶⁴

A possible operation of a Byzantine mission in Great Moravia before the arrival of Cyril and Method was rejected by A. Avenarius, because of economic and political crisis in Byzantium in the first half of the 9th century.⁶⁵ Moreover, the operation of the mission from Vlachy, according to some scholars, coming from Aquileia, is not provable in the first half of the 9th century.⁶⁶ It is not proved either by the Great Moravian rotundas, as it was stated by A. Avenarius, who considered them as imported by missions from the Vlachy, based on the theory of A. Merhautová on the Great Moravian rotundas having been derived from the rotundas in Koper in Istria.

The method of cultural anthropology or the theory of cultural memory was then joined by B. Pomfyová within the research of the liturgical context of early medieval architecture.⁶⁷ She focused her attention on the problem of stationary worship and church family. This model operated in the liturgical practice of episcopal centers. The model was then applied to the Great Moravian fortified settlement “Valy“ at Mikulčice where the archaeologists located eleven religious buildings, six of which were built in the central area of the fortified acropolis. Based on the topography of an “urban” character, she eventually joined those researchers who located there the seat of the Moravian Mikulčice archbishop.⁶⁸ (Fig. 7)




Fig. 7 The map of Great Moravian hill-fort in Mikulčice with indication of churches. Repr.: Poláček, L.: *Die Ausgrabungen in Mikulčice. Führer durch die Ausgrabung von Mikulčice, Bd. 1. Brno 2008, p. 36.*

The hypothesis is ambitious, but it has many shortcomings. First, in terms of argumentation, the researcher first defines an axiom about stationary liturgy and church family in the areas with a long Christian tradition, or in the center of Christianity such as Rome, and then tries to apply it to the specific conditions of Great Moravia. From the topography of Mikulčice we can conclude that the churches were built along the road linking the western gate Church No. II with the eastern gate, behind which a separate "two-apsidal" rotunda – Church No. VI.⁶⁹ Metaphysical premise of a single kind of cultural memory can also be undermined by the fact that there was no pre-existing unity, cultural relationships were not metaphysical or anonymous, and the artwork was always the result of individual human contacts, exchanges or influences.⁷⁰

Hermeneutics

The relationship of the text to the visual design was not satisfactorily resolved through iconology, since the duality of art work content was the cause of the important limitations in its literary significance. Therefore, the shift from iconology to phenomenologically based hermeneutics was explained by some researchers as a new phase of the ontological understanding of art work and its meaning. The relationship of the word and image is now seen as a new reciprocity of articulation and an important embodiment, while maintaining its identity in different areas and levels of visibility.⁷¹ Only V. Richter did follow the premises of hermeneutic method in the research on the Great Moravian architecture, trying to determine the model under which it would be possible, in the absence of written sources and fragmentary state of monuments of Great Moravia, to determine the origins of architecture. In the "methodological reflection" from 1965, the research of the beginnings of the Great Moravian architecture was considered as a hermeneutic problem to be defined as the "right assumption" derived from Gadamer's hermeneutic method.⁷² Richter followed the data of Christian's legend of the baptism of Prince Bořivoj on which he created an assumption that Christianity was brought to the pagan Bohemia of the 9th century from above by the prince. This should have been reflected in the religious architecture on the one hand, in the construction of a church in the form of rotunda (Rotunda of St Clement at Levy Hradec) and on the other in buildings of votive churches in the old cult places (church of the Virgin Mary at the Prague Castle). The example of these two buildings led Richter to conclude that the result of the analysis seems to be natural, it is just needed to apply this assumption to the Morava material.⁷³ Richter did not understand the assumption in strictly hermeneutic meaning as an optional hypothesis, but rather in terms of existential ontology of M. Heidegger as a horizon in which the art historical research finds itself at the moment.⁷⁴ It is therefore natural that Richter, given his horizon, did not have the level of archeological information reached by the end of the 20th century; such as the results of the review research of the rotunda at Levy Hradec, in which in the base wall of the rotunda, so-called *lapis primarius* was identified. According to P. Sommer it is a habit that, based on written sources, is documented in Bohemia in the 13th century, which led to questioning the hypothesis that the rotunda at Levy Hradec originated from the 9th century, and that it is the church of Bořivoj as stated in the Christian's legend.⁷⁵

In defense of Richter's assumption it should be added that, for example in Slovakia *lapis primarius* was discovered in the foundations of the church in Liptovská Mara from the 11th century.⁷⁶ If this ritual was used for mission purposes in the peripheral area of Hungary around the year 1100, as per written sources, it can not be excluded with certainty that it had not been used two centuries earlier in the center of Premyslid principality, which was in that period a part of one larger

political formation – the Great Moravian Empire. If this assumption is correct, then the ritual would have been known by the 11th century, and it was also connected to missionary activities. It became the normal liturgical practice a few centuries later, as evidenced from pontifical letters of the 13th century. Also on the basis of a ritual of putting offerings into the foundations of St Clement Rotunda at Levy Hradec one may infer that the rotunda was built no later than the 11th century. Richter's correct assumption on princely rotundas built after their baptism can also be applied to the Moravian architecture, especially to the "two-apsidal rotunda" No. VI in Mikulčice, as I have tried to prove in the book on "Medieval Rotundas in the Slovak Republic."⁷⁷ Therefore, Richter's hermeneutic assumption is still present and is still valid for the beginnings of the Great Moravian architecture.

- ¹ This paper was supported by Slovak Research and Development Agency (Project APVV-0269-07) and Ministry of Education, Science, Research and Sport of Slovak Republic (Project VEGA Nr. 2/7066/27).
- ² Recent studies about Pre-romanesque architecture are unfortunately determinate by traditional positivism of protection of monuments, such as Maříková-Kubková, J.: *Nové směry ve výzkumu raně středověké architektury*. In: Doležalová, E. – Meduna, P. (eds.): *Co můj kostel dnes má, nemůže kníže odnítí*. Věnováno Petru Sommerovi k životnímu jubileu. Praha 2011, pp. 85-97.
- ³ Richter, V.: *Obrys filozofie historie umění*. In: *Václav Richter. Umění a svět. Studie z teorie a dějin umění*. Praha 2001, p. 58.
- ⁴ Mádl, K. B.: *Okrouhlé kostelíky v Čechách*. In: *Památky archeologické*, XIV, 1889, p. 431-438.
- ⁵ Bachmann, E.: *Vorromanische und romanische Architektur in Böhmen*. In: *Romanik in Böhmen*. Ed. E. Bachmann. München 1977, p. 27.
- ⁶ Cibulka, J.: *Grossmährischen Rundbauten und ihre Probleme*. In: *Actes du VII^e Congrès International des Sciences Préhistoriques et Protohistoriques*. Prague 1966, pp. 1174-1176.
- ⁷ Poulík, J.: *Dvě velkomoravské rotundy v Mikulčicích*. Praha 1963.
- ⁸ Merhautová, A.: *Einfache mitteleuropäische Rundkirchen. (Ihr Ursprung, Zweck und ihre Bedeutung)*. Praha 1970.
- ⁹ Molé, W.: *Deux problèmes des relations entre la France et le Sud-Est européen dans le domaine de l'art préroman*. In: *Biuletyn historii sztuki*, XX, 1958, pp. 132-138; Gervers-Molnár, V.: *A középkori magyarország rotundái*. Budapest 1972, pp. 12-18.
- ¹⁰ Konečný, L. J.: *Emporové rotundy s válcovou lodí*. In: *Umění*, 26, 1978, pp. 385-389; Richter, V.: *Die Anfänge der grossmährischen Architektur*. In: *Magna Moravia. Sborník k 1100. výročí příchodu byzantské misie na Moravu*. Praha 1965, p. 195.
- ¹¹ Streich, G.: *Burg und Kirche während des deutschen Mittelalters. Untersuchungen zur Sakraltopographie von Pfälzen, Burgen und Herrnsitzen I*. Sigmaringen 1984, pp. 86-87.
- ¹² Fehring, G. P.: *Die Archäologie des Mittelalters. Eine Einführung*. Darmstadt 2000, pp. 87-88.
- ¹³ Štefanovičová, T.: *Architektúra Veľkej Moravy v európskom kontexte*. In: Galuška, L. – Kouřil, P. – Měřínský, Z. (eds.): *Velká Morava mezi východem a západem*. Sborník z mezinárodní vědecké conference, Uherské Hradiště, Staré Město, 28. 9. – 1. 10. 1999. Brno 2001, pp. 397-406; Illiáš, M.: *Predrománsky kostol na Devíne*. In: *Historický zborník*, 21, 2011, pp. 19-39.
- ¹⁴ Gvozdanović, V.: *Starohrvatska arhitektura*. Zagreb 1969, pp. 30-31.
- ¹⁵ Goss, V. P. 2010: *Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti: 800.–1200. Pogled s jugoistoka*. Zagreb 2010, pp. 21-109.
- ¹⁶ Vavřínek, V.: *Historický význam byzantské misie na Velké Moravě*. In: *Velká Morava a počátky československé státnosti*. Eds. J. Poulík – B. Chropovský. Praha – Bratislava 1985, p. 215.
- ¹⁷ Krautheimer, R.: *The Carolingian Revival of the Early Christian Architecture*. In: *Studies in the Early Christian, Medieval and Renaissance Art*. London 1971, pp. 203-209.
- ¹⁸ Luchterhandt, M.: *Päpstliche Palastbau, und höfische Zeremoniel unter Leo III*. In: *799 Kunst und Kultur der Karolingerzeit. Karl der Grosse und Papst Leo III. in Paderborn*. Beiträge zum Katalog der Ausstellung Paderborn 1999. Ed. Ch. Stiegemann – M. Wemhoff. Mainz 1999, pp. 109-122.
- ¹⁹ D'Onofrio, M.: *Tipologia e simbologia di Alcuni palazzi imperiali*. In: *Riforma religiosa e arti nell'epoca carolingia*. Bologna 1983, pp. 23-26.
- ²⁰ Konečný 1978 (see in note 10), pp. 385-399.
- ²¹ Vančo, M.: *Kaplnka sv. Margity pri Kopčanoch. Príspevok k problematike výskumu predrománskej architektúry*. In: *Slovácko*, XL, 1998, pp. 123-134.
- ²² Richter, V.: *Príspevek k teorii výtvarného umění*. In: Richter 2001 (see in note 10), pp. 106-107.
- ²³ Richter 1965 (see in note 10), p. 184.
- ²⁴ Sedlmayr, H.: *Kunst und Wahrheit, zur Theorie und Methode der Kunstgeschichte*. Hamburg 1958, p. 63.
- ²⁵ Richter 1965 (see in note 10), p. 184.
- ²⁶ Pošmourný, J.: *Dvouapsidová rotunda v Mikulčicích*. In: *Almanach Velká Morava*. Brno 1965, pp. 104-109.
- ²⁷ Actually he defined this method 16 years later – Pošmourný, J.: *Památky velkomoravské architektury v oblasti Starého Města u Uherského Hradiště*. In: *Z dějin Slovanů na území ČSSR. Sborník studií u příležitosti oslav 20. výročí prvního objevu velkomoravské zděné církevní stavby ve Starém Městě „Na valách“*. Uherské Hradiště 1971, p. 113.
- ²⁸ Richter reconstructed this church with the Carolingian foot of 34 cm – Richter 1965 (see note 10), pp. 187-189.
- ²⁹ Pošmourný, J.: *Církevní architektura Velkomoravské říše*. In: *Umění*, XII, 1964, pp. 187-202.
- ³⁰ Vavřínek, V.: *Study of the Church Architecture from the Period of the Great Moravian Empire*. In: *Byzantoslavica*, XXV, 1964, pp. 288-301.
- ³¹ Hrubý, V.: *Staré Město. Velkomoravský Velehrad*. Praha 1965, p. 177.
- ³² Dostál, B.: *Několik poznámek objevu prvních velkomoravských kostelů ve Starém Městě*. In: *Staroměstská výročí*. Brno 1990, p. 74.

- ³³ From early medieval time we know only the Roman foot (10 + 1/8 fingers = 29,57 cm) and carolingian foot i.e. *pes druhianus* (13 + 1/8 fingers = 33,3 cm) – Hugot, L.: Die Pfalz Karls des Grossen in Aachen. Ergebnisse eine topographisch-archäologischen Untersuchung des Ortes und der Pfalz. In: *Karl der Grosse III. Karolingische Kunst*. Eds. W. Braunsfels – H. Schnitzler. Düsseldorf 1965, p. 542.
- ³⁴ For example in medieval England was used the the Roman foot (11 + 5/8 finger = 29,5 cm) and Norman foot (11 + 3/4 fingers = 29,7 cm). In contrast to it in France was used *piéd-du-roi* (12 + 3/4 fingers = 32,4 cm). More information is to be found in Harvey, J.: *The Mediaeval Architect*. London 1972, p. 108.
- ³⁵ Klanica, Z.: Náboženství a kult, jejich odraz v archeologických pramenech. In: *Velká Morava a počátky československé státnosti*. Praha – Bratislava 1985, pp. 111, 121.
- ³⁶ Bakoš, J.: *Štyri trasy metodológie dejín umenia*. Bratislava 2000, p. 351.
- ³⁷ Merhautová 1970 (see in note 8).
- ³⁸ Pošmourný, J.: Chrám cyrilometodějské na Velké Moravě. In: *Umění*, I, 1953, p. 44.
- ³⁹ Merhautová, A.: Antické tradice ve velkomoravské architektuře. In: *Umění*, 19, 1971, p. 500.
- ⁴⁰ Bakoš 2000 (see in note 36), p. 286.
- ⁴¹ Krautheimer, R.: Introduction to an “Iconography of Medieval Architecture”. In: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, V, 1942, pp. 1-33.
- ⁴² Krautheimer, R.: Introduction to an “Iconography of Medieval Architecture”. In: *Studies...* 1971 (see in note 17), p. 124.
- ⁴³ Heitz, C.: Symbolisme et architecture. Les nombres et l’architecture religieuse du haut Moyen Age. In: *Settimate di studio dell Centro italiano di studi sull’alto medioevo*. Spoleto 3-9 aprile 1975. Spoleto 1976, pp. 387-427.
- ⁴⁴ A collection of Krautheimer’s papers can be found in: *Studies...* (see in note 17).
- ⁴⁵ Bandmann, G.: *Mittelalterliche Architektur als Bedeutungsträger*. Berlin 1951.
- ⁴⁶ Crossley, P.: Medieval architecture and meaning: the limits of iconography. In: *The Burlington Magazine*, CXXX, 1988, pp. 116-121.
- ⁴⁷ Vančo, M.: Velkomoravská sakrálna architektúra na Slovensku. In: Bakoš, J. a kol.: *Problémy dejín výtvarného umenia Slovenska*. Bratislava 2002, pp. 40-44.
- ⁴⁸ Vitruvius: *Deset knih o architektuře*. Praha 1979, pp. 157-158, 210-211.
- ⁴⁹ Krautheimer, R.: Introduction to an “Iconography of Medieval Architecture”. In: *Studies...* (see in note 17), pp. 115-149.
- ⁵⁰ Cibulka, J.: *Velkomoravský kostel v Modré u Velehradu a začátky křesťanství na Moravě*. Praha 1958.
- ⁵¹ *Ibidem*, p. 110.
- ⁵² Vavřínek, V.: Velká Morava mezi Byzancí a latinským Západem. In: Galuška, L. – Kouřil, P. – Měřínský, Z. (eds.): *Velká Morava mezi východem a západem*. Sborník z mezinárodní vědecké conference, Uherské Hradiště, Staré Město, 28. 9. – 1. 10. 1999. Brno 2001, p. 414.
- ⁵³ Poulík, J.: Archäologische Entdeckungen und Grossmähren. In: *Grossmährische Reich. Tagung der wissenschaftliche Konferenz des Archäologischen Instituts der Tschechoslowakischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Brno – Nitra 1. – 4. 10. 1963. Praha 1966, pp. 11- 47.
- ⁵⁴ Hrubý, V.: Replik auf den Beitrag Prof. Jos. Cibulka’s. In: *Grossmährische Reich* (see in note 53), pp. 113-114.
- ⁵⁵ Cibulka, J.: Diskussionsbeiträge zu J. Poulíks Referat. In: *Grossmährische Reich* (see in note 53), pp. 103-105.
- ⁵⁶ Lichardus, J.: Grundriss einer altslawischen Holzkirche von Modrá. In: *Slovenská archeológia*, LI, 2003, č. 1, 109-118.
- ⁵⁷ Richter, V.: Předkřesťanské svatyně na Moravě. In: *Almanach...* (see in note 26), pp. 120-121.
- ⁵⁸ Kožiak, R.: Írski misionári a počiatky kresťanstva u Slovanov. In: Kožiak, R. – Nemeš, J. (eds.), *Pohanstvo a kresťanstvo*. Zborník z konferencie usporiadanej 5. – 6. II. 2003 v Banskej Bystrici. Bratislava 2004, pp. 103-124.
- ⁵⁹ Novák, A.: *Vědomí středověku. Z kulturních dějin prvního tisíciletí*. Praha 2007, p. 306.
- ⁶⁰ Vančo, M.: *Stredoveké rotundy na Slovensku. Od 9. do 13. storočia*. Bratislava 2000, pp. 101-103.
- ⁶¹ Novák 2007 (see in note 59), pp. 306-307.
- ⁶² Avenarius, A.: *Byzantská kultúra v Slovanskom prostredí v VI. – XII. storočí. K problému recepcie a transformácie*. Bratislava 1992, pp. 55-61.
- ⁶³ Vašica, J.: *Literární památky epochy Velkomoravské*. Praha 1996, p. 281
- ⁶⁴ Benda, K.: Josef Cibulka. In: *Kapitoly z českého dějepisu umění II*. Ed. R. Chadraba – J. Krása – R. Švácha – A. Horová. Praha 1987, pp. 164-165.
- ⁶⁵ Avenarius 1992 (see in note 62), pp. 62.
- ⁶⁶ Havlík, E. L.: Učitelé křesťané z Vlach i z Řecka a z Němec. In: *Sborník Josefu Poulíkovi k šedesátinám*. Brno 1970, pp. 117-119.
- ⁶⁷ Pomfyová, B.: Liturgický kontext ranostredovekej architektúry. In: *Ars*, 38, č. 2, 2005, pp. 108-134.
- ⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 123.
- ⁶⁹ This observation was already published by Konečný 1978 (see in note 10), pp. 385-389.
- ⁷⁰ Bakoš, J.: *Periféria a symbolický skok. Úvahy o teórii dejín umenia a kultúrnej histórii*. Bratislava 2000, p. 128.

-
- ⁷¹ Veselý, D.: Příspěvek k hermeneutice architektury. In: *I. Sjezd českých historiků umění*, 25. – 26. 9. 2003. Praha 2003 (unpublished).
- ⁷² Richter 1965 (see in note 10), p. 123.
- ⁷³ Richter, V.: Správný předsudek (model) o začátcích moravské architektury. In: Václav Richter... (see in note 3), p. 122.
- ⁷⁴ Bakoš 2000 (see in note 70), p. 122.
- ⁷⁵ Sommer, P.: Základová obětina a lapis primarius v českém raně středověkém stavitelství. In: *Začátky křesťanství v Čechách. Kapitoly z dějin raně středověké kultury*, Praha 2001, p. 158.
- ⁷⁶ Čajka, M.: Počiatky sakrálnej architektúry na Liptove (Súčasný stav výskumu). In: *Ars*, 2003, pp. 167-188.
- ⁷⁷ Vančo 2000 (see in note 60), p. 53-58.

SYMBOLISM OF LIGHT IN EARLY BYZANTINE ART

MARINA VICELJA-MATIJAŠIĆ

UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA, FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY

The article defines and explains some of the basic concepts related to the use of light in Byzantine art, both real light and artificial lightening in the spatial disposition as well as symbolic meanings of light in specific iconographic schemes, such as Transfiguration. Dominant influence on the formation of the aesthetics of light in Byzantine culture was made by the patristic philosophy and theology; therefore text and image are compared. Special accent is given to mosaic as the medium in which artists could manipulate material and techniques to obtain diverse symbolic compositions.

Byzantine art, theology, mosaic, light, space, color, Transfiguration, Poreč, Istria, basilica of Eufrasius

Researchers of the Byzantine culture emphasize as its essential characteristics undifferentiated philosophical-religious-art approach (Averincev, Medvedev, Byčkov, James). Citing fundamental features of Byzantine philosophy from the 4th to the 7th century, Averincev insists on impossibility of complete separation of philosophical and theological thought, pointing out, however, to their substantial differences. Precisely in the Byzantine philosophy, topics such as the theory of signs, symbols and aesthetics of light gained strong impulse of development in regard to the ideological determination of theological concepts. Antinomy of Byzantine thought, as a result of overcoming skepticism because of the crisis of the Hellenistic world, is established as a fundamental principle of aesthetization of reality, with its expression in art and rhetoric.¹ This aspect of Byzantine thought, through its repercussions in art, is of special interest to us, since antinomy, thanks to the semantic ambiguity of its form, represents structural basis of the relation between the theory and artistic creativity in Byzantine culture. This association is specifically expressed in the symbol as a unit of meaning, and therefore in the phenomenon of light through its

symbolic use. Light, both in its pure physical form, as well as in the active interaction with the pictorial properties of the formal features of the artistic media, carries the importance of the intermediary of the axiological principles.

Light is fundamental to religious experience and its symbolism affects strongly sacred landscapes in all religions. Light is envisioned as the essence of life, as darkness implies death, and its presence sets apart sacred from the profane and evokes emotions and responses in religious experience.² It is an important element in shaping sacred spaces as is witnessed in the Greek temples where the manipulation of light suggested a sublime and supernatural power of deities aimed at eliciting a sense of awe among the faithful present. Skills of articulating architectural and decorative elements of the religious spaces, in order to achieve adequate lighting effects, implied, especially in the late Antique period, a good knowledge of arithmetic, geometry, physics, astronomy and optical principles by trained architect. These principles were, with great skill, applied to other aspects of dramaturgy, cult and ritual practices, and theoretical explanation was provided by Archimedes, in connection with the use of different configurations of mirrors and Hero of Alexandria in his famous work *Catoptrica*, which constituted the theoretical basis of optical knowledge and related practices of Byzantine architects.³ Explaining the approach to the use of light in Greek temples, I. Potamianos accepts the thesis that their orientation, in most known cases, is determined by the sunrise on the feast day of the titular deity of the temple.⁴ Since the rituals in the temple were carried almost exclusively at dawn, the sun's rays are at the greatest possible angle orientated through the western entrance to the temple toward deity statue in its eastern part. Direct illumination of the statues decorated with gold, ivory and precious stones by sun light, with strong contrast to the dim surrounding area, had a powerful visual and emotional impact. Concepts and methods of lighting a sacred space developed in Antiquity exerted a strong influence on architectural practice of Byzantine architects, creating different theories on reflection and refraction of light.⁵ In the Byzantine church the function of the apse illumination was much complex and was affirmed in the aesthetic and gnoseological aspects. Potamianos, explaining the concrete form of its manifestation, supports the learning of a close relation of the architectural organization of the apse with the liturgy, which refers to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles in the form of "flow of light or flame onto the Church."⁶ With this episode the Church as an institution had been established and is celebrated by a separate liturgy, the feast of Pentecost, and has been also incorporated into the daily cycle of the liturgical Mass. Potamianos emphasizes, also, the connection between this moment in liturgy and the Eucharist through the presence of the Holy Spirit, by whose intervention the transformation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ happens. In both cases this manifestation is connected to light. In the case of the Eucharist, it

is accompanied by the reading of the Psalms, in which God is defined as light, or light is referred to as His "attribute" or indirect manifestations to the mind and the senses of the faithful. Another phenomenon to which Potamianos attaches great attention to is light of a dome or domed zone. Dome light is the dominant determinant of vertical axis illumination, which, in this capacity must have been practiced in Antiquity. Over time, the expressive power of this factor gained more diversity in Byzantium, and it is in this regard that it certainly changed the conception of its articulation. More specifically, changes in architectural form of sacred spaces underwent after the 6th century, from the longitudinal plan to the central one, resulted in the modification of lighting. In a longitudinal scheme the additive relationship of church parts as discrete, separate entities is accentuated, while in a central plan additivity is replaced by the organic unity manifested by directing beams of light that come from different openings towards one particular locus of the vertical axis. As the result, a dome acquires symbolical value of the space of the Pantocrator where light acts as a non-created divine energy emanated from God himself and not from any other known source.⁷ In addition to the above examples of direct use of (mostly) natural light in a symbolic differentiation of sacred space, the other media in Byzantine art reveal peculiar intertwining of the phenomena of light with the formal elements of art works, with light fulfilling the function of one of the formal elements of the visual form, so exterior light becomes a factor that determines the internal structure of the works. By placing external, physical light in the interaction with the pictorial features of mosaics, frescoes and icons, complex symbolic compositions are built. Typologically related instrument to include light and light effects in the structure of an image was achieved by emphasizing certain parts of a composition using colors and materials of more intense light values. This process, apart from establishing dynamics in the art form, exercised a significant symbolic effect in fresco painting and iconography. Representation of light in Byzantine painting include halo, mandorla, thin or trapezoidal stripes representing the beams of light as well as the application of different colors in their hues, tones and radiance which accentuate symbolic importance and establishing light transmission. Byzantine concept of color as "materialized light" and its complex symbolism allow special mode of installing pictorial values in the symbolic images.⁸

Light is one of the categories of Byzantine culture which conceptual modifications are encountered in various fields of creativity – in the commentaries on light, in philosophy, theology and the arts - during the entire period of its development. Both in texts and visual representations, light represents holiness and is a structural element of several of fundamental events and sacred visions. As the manifestation of God's presence it is depicted as brilliant and radiant emanation in the scenes of Annunciation, Baptism, Transfiguration or Ascension. The sacred is, as well, evoked

through the sparkling and shining materials – gold leaves, glass, gems and precious stones and other colored stones as well as through the emanating nimbuses. Many of the scenes in the early Byzantine art depict metaphysical space, transcendental space using glittering stars or illustrating candles and candlesticks with burning fire. Therefore, fire was an essential element in Byzantine symbolism that will be put in relation with the divine, uncreated light that was presented to Moses in his first encounter with God, as burning flames.

Dominant influence on the formation of the aesthetics of light in Byzantine culture was made by the patristic philosophy and theology. Patristic use and development of symbolism and phenomenology of light was, in turn, influenced by Greek culture as well as its preceding and parallel Near East cultures, particularly the Jewish one. As noted V. Byčkov: "Among the ancient Israelites light was (together with sound) the only mediator between man and god - hence its prime importance in their gnoseology and aesthetics."⁹ The same author, in considering the relationship of aesthetic categories of beauty and light, finds the latter in its independent existence, emphasizing the primary importance of light in Byzantine gnoseology, mystics and aesthetics, its exceptional coverage and equivocation. According to Byčkov, the most complete theory of light and its relationship with god and main aesthetic categories is to be found at Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.¹⁰ Despite the Schibille's ascertainment that "... light in the Late Antiquity is not recognized as an object of vision, just as the secondary element that facilitated seeing", the awareness of light as a physical phenomenon, a necessary condition for visual perception of physical reality, had long been present, in indirect or direct form, in the Byzantine and other cultures.¹¹ In Antiquity, the significance of this light is indirectly confirmed in attributing the dominance of sight to the other senses. This is characteristic of Aristotle, and his predecessors and followers, and in Byzantium this tendency further affirmed.¹² One of the most direct evidence of the physical properties of the aforementioned phenomenon of light is found in John Damascene: „In the beginning, then, that is to say on the first day, God created light, the ornament and glory of the whole visible creation. For take away light and all things remain in undistinguishable darkness, incapable of displaying their native beauty. And God called the light day, but the darkness He called night”.¹³ The words clearly and concisely reveal the ontological status of light and its gnoseological functions where ontology of light becomes defined by supreme authority and source of truth – the Holy Scripture. These conclusions are, especially with regard to their importance in connection with the iconoclastic disputes, general *topos* of the Byzantine philosophy. In considering the nature and dynamics of sensory perception, in accordance with ancient attitudes formulated in Aristotle's *Physics*, the primacy of vision in relation to the other senses is confirmed. John Damascene, relying on the Pseudo-Dionysius, argues about the sight as the "first among the senses," and the patriarch

Nikeforos in the 9th century explains that "looking is superior to hearing ... eye perceives faster and sharper than ear because vision travels faster than sound."¹⁴ The words of John Damascene reveal another crucial aspect of Byzantine aesthetics of lights inherited from the Antiquity and developed by Areopagite - its association with beauty and beautiful and its ontological connection with God and good as substantial elements: "That every divine illumination, while going forth with love in various ways to the objects of its forethought, remains one. Nor is this all: it also unifies the things illuminated. 'Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above and comes down from the Father of Lights' (James 1:17)".¹⁵ Therefore, light comes from "good" and is manifested through "good". Christ is light: „I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness, but will have the light of life" (John, 8:12). Following Johannine discourse on light, the patristic tradition as well as the hymnography of Eastern Church, introduced many references to divine light and to recognizing and understanding God as light. Within this context the Eastern theology developed specific teaching and guidance in approaching, experiencing and knowing God. The light of God is not just epiphany, it is experience and it is not associated only with theophany but also with eternal Christ and eternal life. Active principle of the unity of good and light in the transcendent sphere is characterized by the Plotinus' emanation theory that accentuates physical properties of light - light is a necessary condition of sight and, therefore, an extremely important source of knowledge. On the other hand, light was particularly important as the manifestations in sensory modifications, primarily as an object of vision, opposed to its complement - darkness. It is fundamentally the manifestation of shining of primary and secondary sources of light such as the sun, fire, candles and lamps, the moon, mirrors, metal objects (especially gold and silver), precious stones, etc., as well as the visual impact of light beams reflected in the spaces with low level of lighting. This manifestation of light was greatly used in ceremonial and ritual lightning achievable through manipulation of architectural and decorative material.

Specific importance for our dealing with iconic features of light in Byzantine culture is its distinctive character that Areopagite discussed in the writings *The Celestial Hierarchy* and *The Ecclesiastic Hierarchy*.¹⁶ The hierarchy is presented through the lower ranks being enlightened by spiritual light from their immediate superiors. Apart from the Creator, who acts only as a source, all beings in the hierarchy can receive this light to the extent of their capabilities, forwarding it to lower levels. Thus, spiritual light, the higher form of light, serves as a medium to transfer knowledge about the creatures in higher levels to the lower ones that sometimes, according to Byčkov, "takes visible form of shining" as is the case with the light of Christ's Transfiguration on Mount Tabor that represents "the highest form of light."¹⁷ Light, therefore, is dominantly non-representative and auto-referential phenomenon.

Among iconographic themes that employ symbolism of light, the *Transfiguration of Christ* is specific since it is a representation of *vision of light* and it discloses many aspects in the interpretation. Early Christian sources perceived it as the crucial event that solved doctrinal disputes and demonstrated model for the transfiguration of humanity and within orthodox Christianity it had become one of the most important visualized method to explain salvation. Christ is the ultimate connection between heaven and earth, divine and human in his nature; on one side God descended and left a part with humans (blood and body of Christ) and on the other, humanity will reach God through Christ and his deified human flesh.¹⁸ In the Transfiguration the divinity of Christ has been witnessed as light in the textual sources, the three synoptic gospels: “After six days Jesus took with him Peter and James and John, and led them up a high mountain apart by themselves; and he was transfigured before them, and his garments became glistening, intensely white, as no fuller on earth could bleach them” (Mark, 9:2-10), “And after six days Jesus took with him Peter and James and John his brother, and led them up a high mountain apart. And he was transfigured before them, and his face shone like the sun, and his garments became white as light” (Matthew, 17:1-9), “Now about eight days after these sayings he took with him Peter and John and James, and went up on the mountain to pray. And as he was praying, the appearance of his countenance was altered, and his raiment became dazzling white” (Luke, 9:28-36). Theological interpretations of Transfiguration in the early centuries developed in reference to Christological and Trinitarian disputes. Many fourth-century writers, such as John the Theologian, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa and later pseudo-Dionysius Areopagite were developing a theology of light,¹⁹ since light that illuminated Christ on the mount Tabor was defined as one of the visible forms of the divinity. The maturation of the Transfiguration theology was followed by the evolvement of the Transfiguration iconography as one of the images that could encompass theological issues especially those difficult to describe even by words: the theophany, the revelation of the glory of God and the inner nature of God, the confirmation of Incarnation, the prefiguration of Resurrection and the Second Coming as well as the unity and continuity of the two testaments. The visual transpositions of the subject were easy since the event was based on the strong visual elements used by the early writers as the focal topics. The representations of the theme had great power because they reproduced the visual experience of the apostles who witnessed the spiritual vision: they passed from the material to the spiritual world. Since the Transfiguration was the manifestation of both natures of Christ referring strongly to its theological prerequisite – Incarnation, the theme was particularly appropriate in the midst of the doctrinal disputes and controversy in the 5th and 6th centuries. Through the Incarnation God became man in Christ and descended to man so that man could be lifted and ascend to God, the concept that connects two events.²⁰

The iconography of the Transfiguration has developed in the late 5th century but the standard representation was set in the one of the earliest (to our knowledge) monumental representations, the mosaic in the apse of St Catharine Monastery on Mount Sinai in the 6th century (fig. 1).²¹ The very few pre-Sinaitic examples, such as the one on Brescia casket or in the Rabbula manuscript, are simple, non narrative compositions representing Christ (in mandorla or with God's hand pointing at him) and two figures that act both as apostles/witnesses and prophets that symbolize the unity of two testaments. The Sinai mosaic is an elaborated image that covers the walls of the apse and the triumphal arch depicting, from top to the bottom: two panels representing *Moses and the burning bush* and *Moses receiving the Law*, followed by *Lamb of God* flanked by two angels carrying the scepter and the orb and the busts of John and Mary. The intrados is decorated with the medallions of the twelve apostles (fig. 2). The mosaic in the apse conch represents Christ as full figure in blue, oval mandorla that emanates beams of white/silver light as the earliest known example of Transfiguration with rays.²² Christ is surrounded by the figures of Elijah, Moses and three apostles with dramatic gestures that express astonishment. The mosaic represents elaborated program with complex iconography uniting the ideas of Incarnation, Transfiguration and Resurrection. In the




Fig. 1 Transfiguration mosaic at St Catharine Monastery on Mount Sinai, 6th century.



Fig. 2 Church of St Catharine on Mount Sinai, mosaics of triumphal arch, 6th century.

scene of *Moses with the burning bush* the idea of the meeting of divine (light) and the human is illustrated symbolizing the descent of God. This was early elaborated by Gregory of Nyssa who interpreted the burning bush as the prefiguration of the Incarnation.²³ According to the Byzantine aesthetics, the dominating vertical axis reveals a divine plan of salvation that starts with the episodes of Moses followed by the Lamb, cross, glorified Son of God. In turn, it refers to the fulfillment of the promise of glory and the Second coming in the eschatological vision.²⁴ John

Chrysostom introduced the idea of gradual revelation of the mystery when he interprets the theophany on Sinai as a prefiguration of the one on Mount Tabor which, again, is the prefiguration of the Second Coming of Christ.²⁵ The Sinai Christ can be compared with the Christ in the Second Coming on the mosaics in the churches of Santi Cosma e Damiano in Rome and Hosios David in Thessaloniki.²⁶ Also, the Lamb of God, as a reference to the Apocalyptic lamb, is represented on the mosaic in Santi Cosma and Damiano (fig. 3)²⁷ and will be repeated in the 9th century mosaics of Santa Prassede and Santa Cecilia in Trastevere in Rome (figs. 4 and 5) and is depicted within the eschatological context. In the church of Santi Cosma and Damiano a new element has been introduced to the apocalyptic iconography: seven large candlesticks placed prominently at sides of the Lamb. It is influenced by a series of passages in the Revelation, especially by the verses in 1:12-13: "... I turned around to see the voice that was speaking to me. And when I turned I saw seven golden lampstands, and among the lampstands was someone like a son of man, dressed in a robe reaching down to his feet and with a golden sash around his chest." The representation of candlesticks can be seen on the western wall of the Eufrasius basilica in Poreč, in the heavily restored mosaic which once belonged to the scene of Christ in Glory in his Second Coming according to some researchers (fig. 6).²⁸ It was the conception of Early Christian writers that the image of the transfigured Christ contained the truth of the resurrection of his followers at the end of time, as is stated in Cyril of Jerusalem: "But in the time of resurrection a kind of divine transformation will take place, a change in glory rather than a change in form, and then the body clothed in divine glory will be radiant and the just will shine like the sun in the Kingdom of the Father, as the Savior said. And so we see the Transfiguration was an example of that glory that is to come, given to the Disciples and revealed in a bodily way to fall under the scope of mortal eyes, even though they could not bear the immensity of the radiance."²⁹ The vision of the future conveyed in the Transfiguration finds perhaps its most known expression in a passage of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite: "Hereafter, when we have come to be indestructible and immortal and have attained a most blessed and Christ-like lot, 'we shall', as the writings say, 'be always with the Lord' (I Thess. iv, 17) and shall be filled with his visible theophany in the holy contemplations which shall illumine us with the most brilliant splendours as the Disciples were in that most divine Transfiguration ... We shall share in the unity beyond intellect in the unknown and blessed radiations of the rays that are beyond every light. Thus shall we be a more divine imitation of the super-celestial intellects. For as the truth of the writings says, 'we shall be equal to the angels and will be sons of God by being sons of the resurrection'".³⁰ This concept will get more elaborated in later writings as well as in the visual programs.



Fig. 3 Mosaic on the triumphal arch (detail) in the Church of Santi Cosma and Damiano, Rome, 6th century.



Fig. 4 Mosaic decoration of the triumphal arch and the apse of the Church of Santa Prassede, Rome, 9th century.



Fig. 5 Mosaic decoration of the triumphal arch and the apse of the Church of Santa Cecilia in Trastevere, Rome, 9th century.



Fig. 6 Mosaic fragment on the western wall of the Eufrasius basilica in Poreč, 6th century.

There are not many monumental compositions of Transfiguration preserved from the early Byzantine period. One was probably adorning the interior of the church of Holy Apostles in Constantinople and is survived in the ekphrasis written by Nikolaos Mesarites in the 12th century, although its dating is under discussion.³¹ The external eastern wall of the Eufrasius basilica in Poreč, above the central apse, was originally decorated with a mosaic, seemingly depicting Transfiguration scene. Unfortunately, only few fragments of the decorative border survived (fig. 7) and the only preserved traces are the drawings published by the researchers in the beginning of the 20th century that reveal fragments of the mosaic with still visible composition: three figures on the right side (from Christ), inscription of Moses' name and portions of the scene setting.³²




Fig. 7 Eastern wall of the Eufrasius basilica in Poreč with traces of the mosaic decoration probably depicting Transfiguration.

Transfiguration is treated in a very different way in the mosaic in the apse of Sant'Apollinare in Classe (fig. 8). Here, the monumental scene of Transfiguration acquires symbolic representation that belongs to a unique iconographic type not related to the mentioned tradition. The focus of the image is the monumental cross in the medallion on the background of stars in its eschatological symbolism as is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: “Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory“ (Matthew 24: 29-30). The use of material (gold) and colors (gold, white, yellow) accentuate the symbolism of light in reference to Christ's glory, Transfiguration, Resurrection but also the glory of the kingdom of heaven as is depicted in the influential apocryphal text of the Apocalypse of Peter: “And the Lord showed me a very great country outside of this world, exceeding bright with light, and the air there lighted with the rays of the sun, and the earth itself blooming with unfading flowers and full of spices and plants, fair-flowering and incorruptible and bearing blessed fruit. And so great was the perfume that it was borne thence even unto us. And the dwellers in that place were clad in the

raiment of shining angels and their raiment was like unto their country; and angels hovered about them there. And the glory of the dwellers there was equal, and with one voice they sang praises alternately to the Lord God, rejoicing in that place. The Lord saith to us: This is the place of your high-priests, the righteous men."³³ The appearance of the monumental *crux gemmata* in the image can be related to many interpretation of the cross in the Early Christian thought and iconography: Constantinian vision of the theophanic cross, victorious instrument, sign of the divine presence in a liturgy and the eschatological sign of the Second Coming.³⁴ The cross is present in the image of hetimasia and in the scenes connotating the Last Judgment. A faintly visible image of the Christ's face on the cross is not a representation of Crucifixion, rather the visual identification of Christ and the cross. And the presence of stars illustrates "fixed universe",³⁵ a visual suggestion of heaven.³⁶




Fig. 8 Transfiguration mosaic in the apse of the Sant'Apollinare in Classe, 6th century.

Early Byzantine period was the formative period for the principle concepts and categories of the Byzantine aesthetics that were closely corresponding to the theological and dogmatic teaching of the period. Light was one of the fundamental categories and mosaic was the medium *par excellence* in which the artists could manipulate optical artifices to obtain rich compositions designed to be observed from a distance. Light represented a structural element of such compositions not only, as we have seen previously in the text, as the real light but also as an element of strong symbolic features. Byzantine mosaicists used the medium to express the metaphysical idea of divine illumination. Light within a mosaic image is represented either by highlighting in gold or white or by depicting light-giving objects such as candles, candlesticks, light beans, haloes etc. in their symbolic meaning. Using specific qualities of materials, employed in the mosaic compositions, has been proved by text or accompanying inscriptions. One of the earliest known belonged to the lost mosaic of one of Paulinus of Nola's early 5th century churches at Cimitile in South Italy: "In full mystery sparkles the Trinity."³⁷ Another mosaic inscription at Cimitile ("the star spangled dome and undulating form [...] is radiant from the source of piety in the centre and in a miraculous manner it makes and is new at the same time") expressed the acknowledgment of the effects of reflected light on the glass tesserae set into an undulating surface. One of the earliest surviving mosaics with an inscription of the type belongs to the archbishop's palace at Ravenna as the dedicatory text offered by Bishop Peter in the 5th century and was preserved in *Liber Pontificalis* by Agnellus, later reconstructed in its original site.³⁸ The text glorifies the work of the bishop whose masters turn the marbles to sparkle and glow brilliantly although not illuminated by the beams of light. In Rome, between 526 and 530 A.D., an inscription at the base of the apse mosaic of Santi Cosma e Damiano states that while God's hall radiates with the brilliance of its precious mosaic adornments, "the light of the faith gleams even more brightly."³⁹ Procopius, in the first volume of *De aedificiis*, writes with great interest about light.⁴⁰ Light seen by Procopius in Hagia Sophia is of two types: natural light and reflected light. The decorations were to contribute to intensify effects of natural and artificial light - marble, sectilia, mosaics and precious metals used to cover the liturgical furnishings. The materials were chosen for their value, but also for the quality of light and were processed in order to enhance the luster and shine, or the ability to catch and reflect light. The discourse on light takes special accent, almost speculative when it comes to mosaics. Both Paulus Silentiarius and Procopius emphasize the importance of mosaic in Byzantine culture. The mosaics were defined as "similar to soft fabrics woven of gold," the medium is presented as the most suitable to cover the curved walls and to produce an intense brightness on the sliding surfaces, dazzling the sight of the viewer. Procopius reveals the aesthetic value of the mosaic and the system of luminosity integrated in the sacred

buildings of Byzantium and focuses on two aspects of light: it comes from the mosaics and flows like molten gold, and lights - the light reflected from the marble and the one from gold mosaics - are contrasted and correspond well like in a well set scenery. Not only material, but also techniques were used to intensify the glittering of the mosaics. The curved walls in Christian domes and apse conches made gold mosaics sparkle more, and sometimes, to agitate the shimmer further, the plaster setting beds for the tesserae were deliberately made to undulate or they were tilting the tesserae, as could be seen in Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome, in the 6th century churches of Ravenna, in Poreč, Thessaloniki and practically all over the Empire.⁴¹ The most dramatic effects of shining were achieved by using silver in combination with gold which was a Byzantine specialty. We find early examples in the dome of Hagios Giorgios in Thessaloniki where Christ originally emerged from a burst of silver. It was also used for the tunics and nimbi of the angels accompanying the Virgin at Hagios Demetrios.

The interplay of light and darkness within Early Byzantine artistic structures is intrinsic to an evocation of the divine and holy. The dialectic of light proved to be one of the strongest aesthetic elements. Its role is to help make an image lifelike, to present the metaphysical qualities of the object represented and to enable viewer to respond to a scene. It is an essential element to the creation and understanding of the meaning of the image in the Byzantine art.

- ¹ J. Meyendorff, *Byzantine Theology: Historical Trends and Doctrinal Themes*, Fordham University Press, 1983.
- ² B. A. Weightman, Sacred Landscapes and the Phenomenon of Light, in: *Geographical Review*, vol. 86, n. 1, 1996, p. 59.
- ³ I. Potamianos, *Light into Architecture: Evocative aspects of natural light as related to liturgy in Byzantine churches*, Ann Arbor, 1996, pp. 97-104.
- ⁴ I. Potamianos, *op. cit.*, pp. 96-99.
- ⁵ G. Mathew, *Byzantine Aesthetics*, New York, 1971, pp. 29-33.
- ⁶ Potamianos, *op. cit.*, pp. 73-75.
- ⁷ These ideas created in the 6th century Byzantine philosophy of the sacred spaces will be developed in the later writers (Maximus the Confessor, Symeon the New Theologian, Gregorios Palamas) and especially within Hesychastic practice; see: G. A. Maloney, *The Mystic of Fire and Light: St. Symeon the New Theologian*, New Jersey, Denville Books, 1975. An interesting example of the textual illustration of the concept of the sacred space illumination is to be found in the Typicon of John II Komnenos for the commemorative liturgy, dated in 1136; see R. Ousterhout, Contextualizing the Later Churches of Constantinople: Suggested Methodologies and a Few Examples, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 54, 2000, pp. 241-250; R. Ousterhout, Architecture, Art and Komnenian Ideology at the Pantokrator Monastery, in: *Byzantine Constantinople. Monuments, Topography and Everyday Life*, Leiden - Boston - Köln, 2001, pp. 148-150; E. A. Congdon, Imperial commemoration and ritual in the typikon of the monastery of Christ Pantokrator, in: *Revue des Études Byzantines* 54, 1996, pp. 161-169. For the role of light and lightning in the church of Hagia Sophia in the ekphrasis of Paulus Silentarius see N. Isar, *Chôra: Tracing the presence*, in: *Review of European Studies* 1, 2009, pp. 39-55.
- ⁸ L. James, *Light and Colour in Byzantine Art*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996.
- ⁹ V. V. Byčkov, *L'estetica bizantina*, Bari, 1983, p. 110.
- ¹⁰ *Idem*, p. 108.
- ¹¹ N. Schibille, Astronomical and Optical Principles in the Architecture of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, in: *Science in Context* 22 (1), 2009, pp. 27-46.
- ¹² R. S. Nelson, To Say and to See: Ekphrasis and Vision in Byzantium, in: *Visuality Before and Beyond the Renaissance: Seeing as Others Saw*, Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 143-168.
- ¹³ John Damascene, *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, Book 2, Chapter VII (Concerning light, fire, the luminaries, sun, moon and stars), http://www.documentacatholicaomnia.eu/20_30_0675-0749-_Iohannes_Damascenus,_Sanctus.html
- ¹⁴ R. S. Nelson, *op. cit.*, 2000, p. 154.
- ¹⁵ Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *The Celestial Hierarchy*, Chapter 1, <http://www.esoteric.msu.edu/VolumeII/CelestialHierarchy.html>
- ¹⁶ The works are available at: <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/dionysius/works.html>
- ¹⁷ Byčkov, *op. cit.*, pp. 116-117.
- ¹⁸ A. Andreopoulos, *Metamorphosis. The Transfiguration in Byzantine Theology and Iconography*, New York, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2005, p. 35.
- ¹⁹ K. P. Wesche, The Union of God and Man in Jesus Christ in the Thought of Gregory of Nazianzus, in: *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly*, 28.2, 1984, pp. 83-98.
- ²⁰ S. Nes, *The Uncreated Light. An Iconographic Study of the Transfiguration in the Eastern Church*, Cambridge, 2007, pp. 41-46.
- ²¹ K. Weitzmann, Introduction to the Mosaics and Monumental Paintings in: *The Monastery of Saint Catherine at Mount Sinai: The Church and Fortress of Justinian*, Ann Arbor, 1965; K. Weitzmann, The Mosaic in St Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai: The Icons, in: *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 110, 1966, pp. 392-405.; J. Elsner, *Art and the Roman Viewer*, Cambridge, 1995; J. Miziolek, *Transfiguratio Domini* in the Apse at Mount Sinai and the Symbolism of Light, in: *Journal of Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 53, 1990, pp. 42-60.
- ²² On the symbolism of the number of rays see Miziolek, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59.
- ²³ Gregory of Nyssa, *The Life of Moses*, The Classics of Western Spirituality, New York-Toronto, 1978, vol. 20, p. 59.
- ²⁴ C. E. Carlston, Transfiguration and Resurrection, in: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 80, n. 3, 1961, pp. 233-240.
- ²⁵ John Chrysostom, Homily 56, in: *The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (P. Schaff ed.), Series I, Volume X, p. 349. Available online: <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf110.html>
- ²⁶ D. Kinney, The Apocalypse in early Christian monumental decoration, in: *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, Ithaca, 1992, pp. 200-216.
- ²⁷ The mosaic on the triumphal arch is part of the decorative program of the apse; some scholars contended that the mosaics have been realized in later, in time of Pope Sergius at the end of the 7th century (G. Matthiae, *SS. Cosma e Damiano e S. Teodoro*, Rome, 1948, pp. 49-65). However, recent discussions, largely confirmed by the technical analysis of the tesserae, consider the decorations of apse and arch form a unicum (J. Osborne, The Jerusalem Temple Treasure and the Church of Santi Cosma e Damiano in Rome, in: *Papers of the British School at Rome*, vol. 76, 2008, pp. 173-181). The composition focuses on the reclining Lamb of God, on a throne with a cross above and

the Scroll with the Seven Seals below. The Lamb is flanked by seven candlesticks representing the Seven Churches of God, and also four angels.

- ²⁸ B. Molajoli, *La Basilica Eufraiana di Parenzo*, Padova, 1943, p. 33; J. Maksimović wrote about the visible contours of the original mosaic representing Christ seated in a mandorla and four flanking figures at each side; see: Ikonografija i program mozaika u Poreču, in: *Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta*, knjiga VIII, Beograd, 1963, p. 259; M. Prelog, *Eufrazijeva bazilika u Poreču*, udruženi izdavači, Zagreb, 1986; K. Regan-B. Nadilo, Građevni sklop Eufrazijeve bazilike u Poreču, in: *Građevinar*, 62, 2010.
- ²⁹ J. A. McGuckin, *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition*, New York, 1986, p. 181.
- ³⁰ Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite, *The Divine Names and Mythical Theology*, translated by J. D. Jones, Milwaukee, 1980, p. 112.
- ³¹ Andreopoulos, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-177; H. Maguire, Truth and Convention in Byzantine Description of Works of Art, in: *Dumbarton Oaks Paper*, 28, 1974, pp. 111-140.
- ³² The most external figure is labeled as SCS ANDREAS which is strange, since he was not present at the event; it could be the result of the erroneous interpreting. Maksimović, *op.cit.*, p. 257, note 28; Molajoli, *op. cit.*, figs. 34, 35.
- ³³ E. Gardiner, *Visions of Heaven and Hell Before Dante*, New York, 1989, pp. 1-12
- ³⁴ For extensive bibliography see: D. Longhi, *La Crux coronata. Significato e diffusione del tema iconografico della croce cosmica in corona tra IV e VII secolo*, Ravenna, 2012.
- ³⁵ T. Matthews, *The Clash of Gods: A Representation of Early Christian Art*, Princeton, 1993, p. 149.
- ³⁶ Andreopoulos, *op. cit.*, pp. 121-122.
- ³⁷ R. C. Goldschmidt, *Paulinus' churches at Nola. Texts, translations and commentary*, Amsterdam, 1940, p. 38-39, 98; R. Gaston, *Studies in the Early Christian "Tituli" of wall decoration in the Latin West (The Tituli of St. Paulinus of Nola)*, PhD thesis, University of London, 1969, p. 271.
- ³⁸ *Codex Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis*, edited by Alessandro Testi Rasponi, Bologna, 1924, p. 149 f; J. Lowden, *Christian and Byzantine art*, London, 1997, p. 430.
- ³⁹ E. Borsook, Mosaics as Expressions of a Metaphysical Idea, in: *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz*, 44, Bd. H. 1, 2000, pp. 2-18.
- ⁴⁰ *Procopio di Cesarea: Santa Sofia di Costantinopoli. Un tempio di luce*, Jaca Book, Milano, 2011, pp. 110-130.
- ⁴¹ Borsook, *op. cit.* p. 9; I. Roncuzzi Fiorentini, L'effetto oro sulle pareti musive, in: *Atti del Io Colloquio dell' Associazione Italiana per lo Studio e la Conservazione del Mosaico (1993)*, Ravenna, 1994, p. 128.

ALCUNE NOTE SULLA CRONOLOGIA DEL BATTISTERO DI PARMA E LA POSSIBILE PRESENZA DI RADOVAN TRA I MAESTRI DELLA BOTTEGA ANTELAMICA

ARTURO CALZONA

UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

Anche dopo i recenti studi sul Battistero di Parma restano ancora dubbi sulla cronologia del termine dei lavori di costruzione e anche del ciclo dei dipinti all'interno. Il contributo intende proporre, attraverso l'analisi di alcuni elementi architettonici fino ad ora non presi in considerazione e grazie alla rilettura di una fonte documentaria conosciuta da tempo, una precisazione sulle fasi costruttive dell'edificio, su un possibile cambiamento di progetto e infine sui rapporti con il Mausoleo di Spalato e Radovan.

Parma, Battistero, Antelami/Radovan

Ho sentito parlare, e quindi conosciuto indirettamente, Vladimir Gvozdanović ormai molti anni or sono. Era l'autunno del 1976, mi trovavo nell'allora sede staccata dell'Istituto di Storia dell'arte dell'Università di Parma, e assieme ad alcuni colleghi stavamo lavorando alla preparazione della mostra *“Romanico medio padano. Strada, città, ecclesia”* che si doveva inaugurare di lì a pochi mesi.¹ Ricordo che a metà pomeriggio mi sento chiamare ad alta voce da Carlo Quintavalle che aveva l'ufficio alla fine di un lungo corridoio; Quintavalle mi viene incontro sorridendo con una lettera che mi allunga intimandomi di leggerla. Si trattava di un foglio di non grandi dimensioni di quella carta che un tempo si usava appositamente per la posta aerea scritto a mano con un inchiostro blu e con una calligrafia abbastanza minuta. L'ho letta partendo dalla firma ed è stata in quella occasione che ho incontrato Vladimir Goss, così era la firma, perché il cognome era stato americanizzato. Nella lettera Goss scriveva che era felice di potere inviargli l'estratto del suo

articolo *Master Radovan and the Lunette of the Nativity at Trogir*, comparso nella rivista “Studies in Medieval Culture” del 1976.² Goss si rivolgeva a Quintavalle, che da quel che ho immediatamente capito non conosceva ancora di persona, per comunicargli che l’ipotesi della sua ricostruzione di un possibile Portale dei Mesi da parte dell’Antelami per la Cattedrale di Parma formulata nel volume *Romanico Padano, civiltà d’Occidente* del 1969³ sembrava trovare un riscontro abbastanza preciso nel portale della Cattedrale di Trogir (Croazia) scolpito sicuramente, come indicato nell’iscrizione, da maestro Radovan nel 1240.⁴ È facile capire la soddisfazione di Quintavalle anche perché la sua ipotesi di collocazione dei Mesi antelamici in un portale, innovativa rispetto a quella di Geza de Francovich⁵ e diversa anche da quella suggerita due anni prima da Anna Rosa Masetti,⁶ sembrava trovare una conferma importante. Dopo quel primo incontro indiretto ho conosciuto di persona Vladimir, al Convegno di Modena nell’ottobre del 1977 dove ha presentato una relazione legata ancora a Radovan e alla cultura adriatica.⁷ Da quel momento è nato un rapporto di amicizia che dura ancora e che ci ha portato di tanto in tanto ad incontrarci in occasione del Convegno a Rennes del 1986, a Trogir nel 1990, successivamente con scadenza annuale a Parma e più di recente a Rijeka e a Mantova.

Ho voluto fare questa premessa perché col passare degli anni, allora ero ancora, come si dice, alle prime armi, ho avuto modo di interessarmi del Battistero di Parma in particolare a partire da quando è iniziato il restauro dell’edificio alla fine degli anni Ottanta del secolo scorso, in occasione della mostra dedicata a Benedetto Antelami (1991) e più di recente nel 2002. In questa ultima occasione ho provato a fare il punto sulla questione cercando di tenere conto il più possibile di tutte le osservazioni contenute nei diversi contributi pubblicati appunto dal 1992 in avanti da numerosi studiosi, cercando di comprendere quali fossero le soluzioni proposte per i punti nodali relativi al Battistero parmense, ovvero i tempi della sua costruzione, gli anni di attività della bottega antelamica e la cronologia della decorazione pittorica dell’interno.

Nel 2002⁸ mi era parso peraltro che la questione della cronologia della costruzione dell’edificio che inevitabilmente finiva per coinvolgere problemi ben più importanti tanto per i modelli culturali di riferimento dell’Antelami, quanto per la esecuzione dei dipinti, fosse ancora quella meno convincente, nonostante tutti coloro che avessero scritto sull’architettura del Battistero, in particolare mi riferisco al bel lavoro di Saverio Lomartire del 1995,⁹ abbiano alla fine dato credito alla antica tesi di Ireneo Affo¹⁰ e di Michele Lopez¹¹ che l’edificio compresa la volta e fino alla quarta loggetta esterna fosse ultimato nel 1216, quando si iniziò ad amministrare il battesimo, una data dunque arretrata che naturalmente trascinava con sé anche quella delle sculture nonostante alcune importanti osservazioni di Willibald Sauerländer, il quale, in particolare per la *Regina di Saba* e la *Primavera*, ha proposto una cronologia “non prima degli anni Venti” del XIII secolo e ha

ipotizzato che “l’età antelamica” si sia chiusa a Parma attorno al 1240.¹² Di contro all’ipotesi della fine dei lavori del Battistero nel 1216, Quintavalle aveva invece sostenuto che a quella altezza cronologica la costruzione fosse giunta soltanto al livello della cornice interna, dunque circa alla metà dell’altezza attuale, senza la volta, che sarebbe stata completata, assieme al resto dell’edificio, solo dopo il 1259 da una maestranza campionesa diversa da quella antelamica.¹³ Mi pareva nel 2002, ma naturalmente su questo tornerò più avanti, che le osservazioni di Lomartire sulla inusuale messa in opera della cornice alta del Battistero¹⁴ (Fig. 1), l’inserimento del pulvino di raccordo con questa al di sopra dei capitelli del secondo ordine (Fig. 2) dovuta, a suo avviso, al fatto che probabilmente il gruppo principale degli scultori che aveva preparato gran parte di pezzi avesse già abbandonato il cantiere, fosse non del tutto convincente perché quella prassi esecutiva era comunque del tutto anomala rispetto a quella sempre seguita nel cantiere, anche per le parti realizzate sicuramente più tardi come la quinta loggetta esterna (1259-1262). Oltre a questo ritenevo




Fig. 1 Parma, Battistero, interno.

che non fosse stata data alcuna risposta sia alle strane soluzioni adottate per le strutture che inquadrano i portali interni¹⁵ (Fig. 3), sia al fatto che i capitelli del primo ordine di colonne siano scolpiti su quattro lati, anche se uno di essi non è visibile, diversamente da quanto avviene invece in quelli della cornice alta in cui un lato è costituito da una piastra che si aggancia perfettamente al rivestimento in breccia veronese sotto la cornice,¹⁶ ma anche alla soluzione degli strani pulvini (Fig. 4) che fanno da plinto alle colonne *en délit* del secondo ordine e anche al fatto che queste ultime non siano in asse con quelle sottostanti (Fig. 5) del primo ordine ma anzi interferiscano con le

ghiere delle lunette. Tutto questo, come ho detto, mi pareva abbastanza strano e non si accordava con l'idea che una delle caratteristiche salienti del Battistero parmense sia la "unità di concezione dell'intera struttura", "il geniale coordinamento di tutte le componenti dell'edificio" e la precisione tecnica utilizzata sia nell'opera laterizia sia nel rivestimento marmoreo ma anche nella fattura degli elementi scolpiti.¹⁷ Ripartendo dunque da tali elementi e da una rilettura delle fonti documentarie, avevo sostenuto che nel 1216 le strutture perimetrali con il loro rivestimento marmoreo almeno fino alla quarta loggetta esterna fossero già realizzate assieme ad una copertura provvisoria che si appoggiava appena sopra la quarta loggetta esterna, mentre la volta sarebbe stata realizzata in un periodo successivo compreso tra il 1229 e il 1248.¹⁸ In quella seconda fase costruttiva il progetto antelamico originario sarebbe stato modificato e, seguendo una ipotesi già avanzata da Renate Wagner-Rieger,¹⁹ avevo suggerito seppure con molta prudenza, che all'adozione a Parma del modello dell'interno del mausoleo di Diocleziano a Spalato, con l'aggiunta però di costoloni non portanti nella volta, potesse avere contribuito Radovan la cui presenza a Parma, più che in parti scolpite a lui attribuibili, troverebbe un appiglio nel fatto che anche a Trogir realizza un portale con i Mesi e una lunetta a *double face* come quelle dell'Antelami.²⁰ Ciò che è successo dopo il 2002 riguarda soprattutto la cronologia del ciclo dei dipinti all'interno e anche chi, come Ludovico Geymonat, ha affrontato questioni architettoniche ha riproposto per le fasi di costruzione dell'edificio la data del 1216 e la realizzazione dei dipinti tra 1233 e il 1236.²¹



Fig. 2 Parma, Battistero, interno, capitello corinzio della cornice alla base della cupola.



Fig. 3 Parma, Battistero, interno, Portale nord, Davide che suona l'arpicordo.



Fig. 4 Parma, Battistero, interno, pulvino dello stipite destro del portale di David che suona l'arpicordo.



Fig. 5 Parma, Battistero, interno, colonne del primo e del secondo ordine.

Vorrei in questa occasione ripartire da quelle ipotesi per riesaminare nuovamente la questione della cronologia del Battistero emendando in primo luogo alcuni errori che ho commesso allora e che forse hanno anche pesato sulla valutazione complessiva di quello che avevo suggerito. Avevo insistito sul fatto che le sculture delle nicchie interne facessero parte dell'ipotetico portale dei Mesi e fossero state inserite nella collocazione attuale solo nella seconda campagna dei lavori (1229-1248),²² mentre ora, al di là delle considerazioni espresse da Bruno Zanardi,²³ mi pare che non esistano elementi archeologici sufficientemente fondati per sostenere l'ipotesi di Quintavalle e mi sono definitivamente persuaso che quelle sculture siano state pensate dall'Antelami e dalla sua bottega esattamente per il luogo in cui si trovano attualmente e così dicasi pure per le colonne e capitelli dell'ordine basso. Sgombrato dunque il campo da tale questione rimangono però ancora aperti tutti gli altri problemi. Iniziamo dai tre portali con le lunette a *double face* su cui si è soffermato recentemente con la solita finezza Adriano Peroni, insistendo molto e giustamente sulla "sottilissima strategia strutturale" adottata dall'Antelami, soprattutto all'interno, nel tentativo di assecondare la sequenza delle nicchie.²⁴ Ebbene questa logica si coglie molto bene anche nei basamenti delle semicolonne (per la precisione tre quarti di colonna) che non risultano essere in asse col portale come riportato nella planimetria del Lopez, ma divaricano verso l'esterno per consentire l'aggancio con la curvatura del paramento delle nicchie (Fig. 6) ma aumentando così, con questa raffinatissima soluzione, l'effetto di rotondità dovuto alla presenza all'interno del Battistero di sedici nicchie che raddoppiano i suoi lati esterni. Ciò che tuttavia sorprende maggiormente è il modo con cui si è cercato di ottenere tale effetto. Partendo dall'esterno dei portali e prendendo a riferimento quello della Vergine/Fuga in Egitto (lo stesso vale per gli altri due portali) è possibile notare come le strombature (Fig. 7) siano ottenute con l'incastro preciso di diversi blocchi di pietra che hanno una forma alquanto particolare. Quelli più interni (Fig. 8 B), in corrispondenza delle ante lignee, ottenuti in un unico blocco di pietra, hanno una lunghezza sul lato verso la piazza di 47/48 cm, uno spessore di 41/42 cm, risvoltano poi ad angolo retto di 13 cm e girano ancora di 13 cm con un taglio della pietra a 90 gradi. All'interno dell'edificio lo stipite prosegue invece dopo avere girato ad angolo retto per 20 cm e prosegue ulteriormente e perpendicolarmente per 27/28 cm (Fig. 9). La soluzione è ripetuta anche negli altri portali con una minima variante nello stipite destro del Portale di Barlaam. Addossato a questo strano stipite, che potremmo definire "passante" in quanto inizia all'esterno dell'edificio e prosegue all'interno, è stata aggiunta sempre al livello del pavimento una ulteriore pietra che va a formare il plinto vero e proprio (54 × 54 cm) (Fig. 8 C) su cui è collocato un ulteriore elemento ancora a forma di L rovesciata (Fig. 10) sul lato più lungo, che costituisce la base vera e propria dei tre quarti di colonna. Salendo verso l'alto la colonna è formata




Fig. 6 Parma, Battistero, interno, disposizione degli stipiti dei portali interni, Andrea Cattabiani (da A.C. Quintavalle 1991, p. 111).



Fig. 7 Parma, Battistero, esterno, particolare della strombatura del Portale della Vergine.




Fig. 8 Parma, Battistero, interno, restituzione della disposizione delle pietre del Portale della Vergine (i diversi colori indicano singoli blocchi lapidei).



Fig. 9 Parma, Battistero, particolare del basamento dello stipite destro del Portale della Vergine.



Fig. 10 Parma, Battistero, particolare del basamento dello stipite sinistro del Portale della Fuga in Egitto.

da blocchi unici di pietra che, come bene si vede nella sezione di Andrea Cattabiani (Fig. 11), pubblicata da Quintavalle,²⁵ vanno a costituire una specie di stipite interno del portale che però è addossato a quello esterno e su cui sono evidenti le tracce degli antichi cardini delle porte, mentre sul lato opposto delle nicchie sono evidenti in alcuni tratti gli agganci al paramento laterizio ottenuti in rottura. Un altro aspetto di grande interesse è il fatto che all'interno sul lato verso le nicchie del Portale della Vergine/Fuga in Egitto e anche nel Portale di Barlaam /Presentazione al tempio (nello stipite destro del Portale della Fuga in Egitto è presente invece un blocco di breccia di Verona e così anche nel portale con Davide che suona l'arpicordo (Fig. 12) sia visibile, dunque realizzata fin dall'origine della costruzione, una ulteriore pietra (Fig. 13 e 8 A) che ha la funzione di raccordare questo basamento al paramento laterizio della nicchia e che probabilmente doveva segnare il punto di inizio della realizzazione del paramento laterizio delle nicchie in corrispondenza dei portali i quali in questo modo non avevano la necessità di essere montati all'inizio del lavoro e consentivano peraltro di lasciare una apertura di maggiori dimensioni (circa 3.20 rispetto ai 2.38 attuali) che facilitava certamente il lavoro delle maestranze. Al di là della complessa struttura adottata per raccordare l'esterno e interno dei portali che però fa comprendere l'abilità e il grande sperimentalismo del cantiere antelamico, il fatto che questi elementi abbiano misure standard in tutti e tre i portali (solo in quello della Presentazione al tempio il tratto interno è lungo 31 cm invece di 27/28), induce a interrogarsi sulle ragioni di tale strana soluzione.




Fig. 11 Parma, Battistero, Sezione del Portale della Vergine, Andrea Cattabiani (da A. C. Quintavalle 1991, p. 112).



Fig. 12 Parma, Battistero, interno, particolare della pietra angolare del plinto dello stipite sinistro del Portale David che suona l'arpicordo.

Perché, ad esempio, non si è adottato fin dall'origine la soluzione di un blocco di pietra di dimensioni maggiori di quelle utilizzate, dal momento che quando si realizza la base della colonna essa viene ricavata da un unico blocco di breccia di Verona lungo mediamente 48 cm? Credo non azzardato ritenere che la soluzione prevista per gli stipiti interni dei portali, sulla base di quanto è emerso in relazione alla soluzione adottata al livello del pavimento, fosse diversa da quella che oggi vediamo e mi pare possibile che possa essere intervenuto un cambiamento di progetto nel momento in cui la maestranza ha iniziato a montare gli elementi in corrispondenza delle nicchie e dei portali. Va ricordato infatti che il sistema del doppio architrave e della cornice concava delle lunette (Fig. 14) è sostenuto dagli stipiti esterni e dunque non interferisce in alcun modo con quanto avviene all'interno. Tale ipotesi trova un'ulteriore conferma nel fatto che osservando la sezione del portale²⁶ (Fig. 11) risulta abbastanza evidente che la parte interna dello stipite (senza dunque i due /terzicolonna) risulta essere esattamente a filo con l'oggetto della ghiera dell'arco della lunetta. In sostanza, quanto siamo venuti dicendo consente di avanzare almeno due possibilità: nel progetto iniziale i portali all'interno dovevano essere inquadrati da paraste con capitelli che si raccordavano alla cornice della lunetta, mentre in corrispondenza delle nicchie non erano state previste le colonne,



Fig. 13 Parma, Battistero, interno, particolare della pietra angolare di raccordo con la nicchia del plinto dello stipite sinistro del Portale della Presentazione al Tempio.



Fig. 14 Parma, Battistero, interno, Particolare del sistema degli architravi e della cornice della lunetta del Portale della Presentazione al Tempio.

ma probabilmente semplici mensole che si collegavano alle cornici in pietra delle nicchie formando così un sistema di archi, continui oppure il sistema delle colonne e dei capitelli del primo ordine era stato previsto fin dall'origine, seguendo il modello lateranense²⁷ o quello del battistero neoniano di Ravenna, mentre in corrispondenza dei portali erano state previste le paraste meno complesse da realizzare e che riproponevano anche all'interno la soluzione dell'esterno. Tuttavia nel momento in cui si è iniziato a montare l'insieme di tali elementi entrambe le possibili soluzioni devono essere

sembrate poco soddisfacenti per garantire l'effetto di rotondità che si voleva perseguire con l'introduzione, all'interno dell'edificio, delle sedici nicchie che, come abbiamo detto, andavano a raddoppiare il numero dei lati esterni del Battistero. Dunque, in un momento che per ora rimane imprecisato, anche se, come abbiamo detto, può essere circoscritto al momento del montaggio degli stipiti interni dei portali, deve essere avvenuto il cambio di progetto, messo in atto però dalla stessa bottega antelamica, un cambiamento apparentemente di poco conto ma che di fatto ha avuto una ricaduta sostanziale sulla percezione della spazialità interna, perché nel momento in cui si è deciso di addossare alla parete le colonne e i capitelli, viene anche realizzato lo strano pulvino/basamento per un nuovo secondo ordine di colonne, ma soprattutto solo in quel momento deve essere avvenuta la costruzione della volta con i costoloni non strutturali.

Ma quando si sarebbe deciso di introdurre queste nuove soluzioni che allontanano il Battistero da un modello ancora sulla stessa lunghezza d'onda di quello di Cremona,²⁸ verso una nuova idea di spazialità gotica, evidente nel verticalismo della volta accentuato dalla presenza delle paraste angolari?

L'analisi archeologica delle murature non ha consentito fino ad oggi di individuare con certezza un cambio di muratura o qualche altro elemento che possa giustificare la interruzione dei lavori dal 1216 al 1259 ipotizzata da Quintavalle. L'unico cambiamento certo avviene al livello dell'inizio della quinta loggetta cieca la cui realizzazione, come abbiamo detto, può essere messa in relazione a quanto ricordato da Salimbene: "*Compleverant enim baptisterium in superiori parte usque ad elevationem cacuminis; et iam diu fuisset completum, nisi Ycilinus de Romano, qui Verone dominabatur, impedimentum dedisset. Solummodo enim de lapidibus Veronensibus baptisterium illud fiebat*".²⁹ Questi lavori devono tuttavia essere ormai conclusi nel 1262 in quanto gli *Statuti* riportano la decisione di ampliare una strada a sud del Battistero, verso la città, "[...] ita quod opus Batisterii possit videri, et possit in porta quae ibi est intrari, et quod circa Batisterium libere possit iri."³⁰ Oltre a questo esisteva certamente una copertura provvisoria le cui tracce non vanno però individuate nelle mensole presenti nel sottotetto in corrispondenza dell'inizio della quinta galleria.³¹

Anche le fonti documentarie, per quanto più volte analizzate, non hanno fornito indicazioni utili. L'unica certezza è la data di inizio della costruzione dell'edificio nel 1196³² e quella della somministrazione del battesimo a partire dal 1216. Tutto porta dunque a pensare che il nuovo progetto possa essere stato adottato quando, come abbiamo visto, il perimetro murario esterno era ormai giunto alla quarta loggetta ed era stata realizzata una copertura provvisoria.

Anche il passo sopra ricordato sulla impossibilità di completare la costruzione a causa dell'embargo della breccia veronese da parte di Ezzelino da Romano per quanto troppo generico, come si è giustamente sottolineato, lascia tuttavia trasparire alcuni dubbi sul fatto che alla

costruzione mancasse solo la quinta loggetta cieca e forse il rivestimento della quarta³³ perché Parma solo nel 1247 si scontra con Federico II e dunque fino a quella data Ezzelino da Romano, che era un fedelissimo dell'imperatore allo stesso modo della città emiliana, avrebbe potuto tranquillamente inviare dalla marca veronese la fornitura lapidea necessaria per concludere i lavori.³⁴

Esiste tuttavia una fonte tarda sulla quale, sebbene conosciuta da tempo e già utilizzata in relazione alla cronologia del Battistero, è giusto ritornare perché può forse aggiungere qualche nuovo elemento di riflessione. Si tratta della *Compilatio iurium et instrumentorum publicorum pertinentium ad Baptistarium Parmense*, noto come “Libro rosso”, conservato presso l'Archivio della Curia Vescovile di Parma, testo commissionato nel 1524 all'umanista Francesco Carpesano, consorziale della cattedrale, dai canonici del gruppo senario. Il testo, noto da molto tempo³⁵ è introdotto da un preambolo che anche Lomartire ha utilizzato per indicare la fine dei lavori del Battistero nel 1216,³⁶ anche se è la seconda parte, quella che fornisce importanti indicazioni. Carpesano dunque nel 1524 scrive: “[...] *Baptisterium Parmense, quod lateri ecclesiae Parmensis, via dirimente adhaeret, ut in annalibus vetustis reperimus, coeptum est a primis fundamentis erigi impensa publica, non a Comitissa Mathildi, ut vulgum creditum est, anno a partu Virginis millesimo centesimo nonagesimo sexto, consulibus tunc eiusdem civitatis Iordano et Bricillo de Sancto Michaele, qui magistratus in ea urbe per id tempus fuit supremus, operasum sane templum tam amplo et arduo fornice et marmoreis tabulis affabre fulctum, quod vix viginti annis, nunquam remissa fabrica, absolutum fuit. Nam sub annum christiani natalis MCCXVI illic primum salutari bus undis sunt perfusi et purificati, qui christianae religioni et fidei fuerunt initiati. Invenitur itidem in eisdem annalibus anno ab ortu Christi Jesu MCCLXXXII, videlicet post sexagesimum annum a dedicatione eiusdem ecclesiae numquam interiturae memoriae, praefatum R(everendissimi)mum D. Gerardum Blancum Parmensem, episcopum Sebinensem, sanctae Romanae ecclesiae cardinalem, quum ab urbe Roma profectus patriam revenisset, pro sua erga dictam ecclesiam pietate, non passum tam nobilem et augustam Basilicam negligi, nec in ea laudes divinas taceri multis muneribus doraiisque sacris ac fundis eam ornasse ac tunc erexisse collegium ibidem D. Cananicorum senarii numeri in illa [...]”.³⁷ Come abbiamo sopra ricordato, Lomartire ha fatto riferimento soltanto alla prima parte e da esso giustamente ha ricavato l'importanza del ruolo del Comune nella costruzione dell'edificio,³⁸ ma soprattutto perché, a suo avviso, la data del 1216 risulta essere cruciale per ipotizzare che i lavori si siano protratti ininterrottamente per consentire l'entrata in funzione dell'edificio.³⁹ La seconda parte del testo, come abbiamo detto, aggiunge però un nuovo elemento che è stato sottovalutato a causa probabilmente della data indicata per la dedizione dell'edificio che, da quanto riportato nel testo, sarebbe avvenuta, sulla scorta anche in*

questo caso di quanto desunto da “*annalibus vetustis*”, sessanta anni prima dell’anno MCCLXXXII, cioè nel 1222.⁴⁰ Tale data corrisponde esattamente a quella del terremoto, evento che sulla base di quanto riportato da Salimbene,⁴¹ secondo Quintavalle, confermerebbe invece che l’edificio era costruito soltanto fino alla cornice interna.⁴² Tuttavia se si amministrava il battesimo nel 1216 e la dedicazione era avvenuta nel 1222, è assai credibile che la conclusione dei lavori sia effettivamente avvenuta nel 1216, perché una nuova consacrazione dell’edificio viene tenuta il 25 maggio 1270, otto anni dopo (1262) la conclusione degli ultimi lavori iniziati dopo la morte di Ezzelino da Romano.⁴³ La questione relativa alla data del 1222 è tuttavia più complessa perché nel testo del Carpesano si afferma che in questi antichi annali da cui aveva attinto la notizia, nell’anno 1282 il Cardinale Gerardo Bianchi era tornato a Parma e a causa dello stato di degrado liturgico aveva fatto una ricca donazione al Battistero e aveva istituito anche un collegio di Canonici.

Le indicazioni del Carpesano trovano conferma in altre fonti più antiche dalle quali si ricava tuttavia che l’anno in questione non può essere il 1282 bensì il 1292 e dunque che l’umanista deve avere ommesso una X nell’indicazione della data, oppure che l’errore doveva già essere presente nella fonte utilizzata. Non esiste infatti alcuna notizia della presenza del cardinale a Parma nel 1282, anzi in quell’anno dopo la rivolta di Palermo del mese di marzo, papa Martino IV lo aveva inviato in Sicilia come legato apostolico.⁴⁴ È assolutamente certo invece che nel 1291 il cardinale vescovo Gerardo e il cardinale diacono Benedetto Caetani (il futuro Bonifacio VIII) erano stati inviati in Francia dal pontefice per una delicata missione legata alla questione aragonese,⁴⁵ missione che si era conclusa nel marzo 1291, in realtà 1292. Il *Chronicon* parmense riporta infatti che nel 1291 (ma 1292), di ritorno dalla legazione in Francia il cardinale si fermò nella sua città natale⁴⁶: “[...] *et, stando in Parma [...] emit a domino episcopo parmensi terram de Ammaçabove, et fecit et ordinavit beneficia praepositi et canonicorum Baptisterij parmensis pro divinis officiis perpetuo celebrandis, et dotavit eos multis possessionibus [...]*”.⁴⁷ Oltre a questo sappiamo che nello stesso anno “Johannes de Palasone”, lo stesso di cui è rimasta traccia epigrafica sulla vasca ottagonale del Battistero, era stato nominato prevosto del nuovo capitolo del Battistero.⁴⁸ Tutto dunque conferma che gli avvenimenti riferiti dal Carpesano al 1282 sono avvenuti in realtà nel 1292 e pertanto che la data indicata è con molta probabilità dovuta ad un errore.

Se così stanno le cose la questione della cronologia della edificazione del Battistero cambia non poco perché, se è certa la data del 1216 per l’inizio delle funzioni liturgiche si può tuttavia ipotizzare che la conclusione definitiva della costruzione possa essere avvenuta anche successivamente a quella data perché la cerimonia di dedicazione nel 1232, ma si potrebbe prendere a riferimento anche il 1233, guarda caso l’anno dell’Alleluia,⁴⁹ perché il documento ufficiale della

istituzione del collegio dei canonici è datato 15 gennaio 1293,⁵⁰ indica che l'edificio è certamente ultimato.⁵¹

Per quale motivo infatti si sarebbe lasciato trascorrere un arco di tempo di ben sedici anni per procedere al rito? È pensabile che siano occorsi venti anni per la edificazione dell'edificio comprendendo anche la volta e si siano lasciati trascorrere altri sedici per la dedicazione? Mi pare che sulla scorta anche di quanto abbiamo ricavato dall'analisi delle anomalie architettoniche riscontrate nelle strutture dell'edificio e del possibile cambio di progetto si possa ragionevolmente ipotizzare che nel 1216 fossero completate le strutture perimetrali, mentre il sistema delle colonne del primo e del secondo ordine e la volta con paraste angolari siano state allestite dopo quella data in cui però continua ad operare la bottega antelamica.

La dedicazione del 1232/1233, che sancisce dunque il completamento dei lavori, con la volta e la copertura definitiva impostata all'altezza della risega del muro interno in corrispondenza dell'inizio della quinta loggetta, pone però alcune ulteriori domande. Nel completamento dei lavori del 1232/1233 dobbiamo includere anche il grande ciclo dei dipinti oppure questo è stato realizzato negli anni successivi? Ma quando? E Radovan? È presente nel cantiere antelamico parmense oppure no? È possibile individuare qualche sua opera a Parma?

Per quanto riguarda le prime due domande occorrerebbe più spazio e dunque rimando ad un'altra occasione anche se la data di conclusione dei lavori nel 1232/1233, comprendendo anche la realizzazione del ciclo dei dipinti 'bizantini', sembra mettere in seria discussione la possibile committenza a Gerardo Boccabadati da Modena che peraltro, come a Parma, è impegnato in una missione di pace a Trogir nel settembre del 1243.⁵² Per quanto riguarda invece Radovan credo si possa rispondere affermativamente perché la singolarità della lunetta a *double face* adottata dall'Antelami e riproposta a Trogir può derivare solo da una conoscenza e da una pratica maturata direttamente nel cantiere parmense. Detto questo faccio invece enorme fatica su base stilistica a pensare che in Battistero si possano attribuire alla mano di Radovan le sculture dell'Annunciante e dell'Annunciata (Figg. 15 e 16) della decima e undicesima nicchia⁵³ e ora anche, secondo Goss, alcuni capitelli della cattedrale.⁵⁴ Lo stile delle due sculture del Battistero rispetto a quelle con lo stesso soggetto del portale traurino è completamente diverso, ma se come ha osservato Sauerländer, all'interno però di un discorso completamente diverso da quello che sto proponendo,⁵⁵ l'utilizzo del linguaggio bizantino è limitato a Parma esclusivamente a queste sculture, seppure, a suo avviso, realizzate dalla medesima maestranza, si potrebbe anche rovesciare quella ipotesi e ritenere che proprio la particolare scelta iconografica sia dovuta ad un maestro di cultura bizantina che adotta la cifra stilistica dell'Antelami per uniformarsi al resto delle sculture presenti in Battistero. Oltre a questo, seppure ancora con molta cautela, mi pare che la soluzione delle colonne *en délit*, dei

capitelli del primo e del secondo ordine e anche delle cornici, che a mio avviso è ricavata dalla Porta Aurea e dal mausoleo di Diocleziano di Spalato⁵⁶ e che è riproposta nell'abside esterna federiciana di Santa Maria in Valle Porclaneta,⁵⁷ potrebbero avvalorare l'ipotesi della attività di Radovan nel cantiere del Battistero e dunque si potrebbe anche pensare che il maestro traurino abbia avuto un ruolo non secondario per le soluzioni adottate al momento del cambiamento di progetto avvenuto probabilmente dopo il 1216, nel decennio tra 1220-1230. Su questo, però, occorre ancora lavorare.



Fig. 15 Parma, Battistero, interno, Annunciante. Fig. 16 Parma, Battistero, interno, Annunciata.

- ¹ *Romanico mediopadano. Strada, città, ecclesia*, Catalogo della mostra, Parma, Salone dei Contrafforti e Scuderie in Pilotta, novembre 1977-febbraio 1978, Parma 1983.
- ² W. Goss, *Master Radovan and the Lunette of the Nativity at Trogir*, in "Studies in Medieval Culture", 8-9, 1976, pp. 85-98.
- ³ A.C. Quintavalle, *Il trionfale arco dell'annunciazione e del Pantocratore nel Duomo di Parma*, in *Romanico padano, civiltà d'Occidente*, Firenze 1969, pp. 145-164. L'ipotesi di Quintavalle si basava allora sul fatto che, a suo avviso, l'archivolto con i mesi del portale della Cattedrale fosse stato realizzato attorno al 1240 e testimoniasse (p. 147) "indirettamente, ma in maniera non meno persuasiva, che esisteva nel portale di facciata [...] un motivo complesso e ricco iconograficamente come il ciclo dei mesi" appunto quelli dell'Antelami. Negli anni successivi in verità Quintavalle, nel volume sulla Cattedrale di Parma, ha modificato tale ipotesi (Id., *La cattedrale di Parma e il romanico europeo*, Parma 1974, pp. 147-152:151) e ha attribuito al cosiddetto "Maestro dei Mesi" attivo tra 1115-1120 l'archivolto dei mesi della Cattedrale. Da ultimo seppure in modo più sfumato l'ipotesi dell'appartenenza dei Mesi, delle sculture delle nicchie interne e di quelle all'esterno si veda Id., *Benedetto Antelami*, Catalogo della mostra, Parma, Salone delle Scuderie, 31 marzo-30 settembre 1990, Milano 1990, pp. 158-195. Nei contributi apparsi dopo la mostra del 1990 le ipotesi di Quintavalle non sono state accettate. Si veda in particolare, G. Romano, *Benedetto Antelami e il Battistero di Parma*, in *Battistero di Parma I*, Parma 1992, pp. 65-79; C. Frugoni, *La decorazione plastica. Il programma del complesso antelamico*, in *Ivi*, pp. 129-150.
- ⁴ La bibliografia su Radovan in questi anni si è molto arricchita. Oltre al volume ancora fondamentale di C. Fisković, *Radovan*, Zagreb 1989 e ai contributi contenuti negli Atti del Convegno tenutosi a Trogir nel 1990 (*Majstor Radovan i njegovo doba* a cura di I. Babić, Trogir-Split 1994), si vedano in particolare J. Richier, *Les sculptures des mois à Trogir et à Ferrare*, in "Bulletin monumental", CXXIII, 1965, pp. 25-35; W. Goss, *Parma-Venice-Trogir: hypothetical peregrination of a thirteenth century Adriatic sculptor*, in "Arte Veneta", XXXIX, 1980, pp. 26-40; G. Tigler, *Traù tra Venezia e Puglia*, in "Arte in Friuli Arte a Trieste", 16-17, 1997, pp. 289-326; Id., *La Porta dei Mesi del Duomo di Ferrara e le sue derivazioni ad Arezzo, Fidenza e Traù*, in *Il Maestro dei mesi e il Portale meridionale della Cattedrale di Ferrara. Ipotesi e confronti*, Atti della Giornata di studi, Ferrara, Venerdì 1 ottobre 2004, a cura di B. Giovannucci Vigi e G. Sassu, Ferrara 2007, pp. 71-100.
- ⁵ G. de Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami architetto e scultore e l'arte del suo tempo*, Milano-Firenze 1952, pp. 177-182:179. Sulla collocazione dei mesi e dei segni zodiacali in "altro luogo" M. Lopez, *Il Battistero di Parma*, Parma 1864, pp. 190-192; A. K. Porter, *Lombard Architecture*, New Haven 1917, ed. cons. New York 1967, III, p. 140; L. Testi, *Le Baptistère de Parme. Son histoire, son architecture, ses sculptures, ses peintures*, Florence 1926, pp. 134-135 e 148; A.O. Quintavalle, *Antelami "sculptor"*, Milano 1947, pp. 24-25.
- ⁶ A.R. Masetti, *Il portale dei Mesi di Benedetto Antelami 1, 2*, in "Critica d'Arte", n.s. XIV, 1967, n.86, pp. 13-31; n. 87, pp. 22-40.
- ⁷ V. Gvozdanović, *Romanesque Sculpture in Eastern Adriatic between the West and Bizantium*, in *Romanico padano romanico europeo*, Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Modena-Parma, 26 ottobre-1 novembre 1977, Parma 1982, pp. 175-192.
- ⁸ A. Calzona, *I maestri campionesi e la "lombardia": l'architettura del Battistero di Parma*, in *Medioevo: arte lombarda*, Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Parma, 26-29 settembre 2001, a cura di A.C. Quintavalle, Milano 2004, pp. 367-387.
- ⁹ S. Lomartire, *Introduzione all'architettura del battistero di Parma*, in *Benedetto Antelami e il Battistero di Parma*, a cura di C. Frugoni, Torino 1995, pp. 145-250.
- ¹⁰ I. Affo, *Storia della città di Parma*, Parma 1793, ed. cons. Parma 1957, vol. III, p. 20.
- ¹¹ M. Lopez, *Il Battistero di Parma*, Parma 1864, p. 106-107.
- ¹² W. Sauerländer, *Von Wiligelmo zu Giotto. Die Mediävistische Aphorismen zum Thema Frankreich und Italien*, in «*Il se rendit en Italie*». *Études offertes à A. Chastel*, Roma-Paris 1987, pp. 5-13; Id., *Benedetto Antelami. Per un bilancio critico*, in *Benedetto Antelami e il Battistero di Parma* cit., pp. 3-69:57 e 66. La cronologia delle sculture dei Mesi di Parma agli anni 1220-1240 è stata accettata da A. De Marchi, *Sulla «Madonna di Fontevivo»*, in *Antelami «Igago Lateritia Beatę Marię»*. *Per la fortuna e la storia del cantiere antelamico del Battistero di Parma*, a cura di G. Fiaccadori, Parma 1991, pp. 5-13. Sulla possibile cronologia delle sculture del Battistero credo sia necessario riflettere più di quanto sia avvenuto sulle ipotesi emerse, ormai diversi anni orsono, dall'analisi paleografica delle iscrizioni del Battistero (R.H. Bautier, *Un essai d'identification et datation d'oeuvres de B. Antelami à Parme et à Fidence d'après l'étude paléographique de leurs inscriptions*, in "Bulletin de la Société des Antiquaires de France", 1968, pp. 95-115).
- ¹³ A.C. Quintavalle, *Il Battistero di Parma. Il cielo e la terra*, Parma 1989; Id., *Benedetto Antelami* cit., pp. 99-131.
- ¹⁴ S. Lomartire, *Introduzione all'architettura del battistero di Parma* cit., pp. 220-221 ritiene che il montaggio dei capitelli e delle cornici possa essere avvenuto in un momento successivo ma non a distanza di decenni dalla messa in opera delle strutture murarie "quando il gruppo principale degli scultori, che aveva preparato gran parte dei pezzi, aveva ormai lasciato il cantiere".

- ¹⁵ A.C. Quintavalle, *Il progetto di Benedetto Antelami per il Battistero di Parma*, in *Studi di storia dell'arte sul medioevo e il rinascimento nel centenario della nascita di Mario Salmi*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Arezzo-Firenze, 16-19 novembre 1989, Firenze 1992, vol. I pp. 308-352. Si veda anche A. Calzona, *I maestri campionesi e la "lombardia"* cit., pp. 375-379.
- ¹⁶ A.C. Quintavalle. *Benedetto Antelami* cit., pp. 114-115. Quintavalle attribuisce anche una parte dei capitelli a una maestranza diversa da quella antelamica attiva dopo il 1259.
- ¹⁷ S. Lomartire, *Introduzione all'architettura del battistero di Parma* cit., pp. 187-188, 206 e 212. Su questo concetto aveva insistito anche P. Toesca, *Il Battistero di Parma. Architetture e sculture di Benedetto Antelami e seguaci. Affreschi dei secoli XIII e XIV*, Milano 1960, p. 10; G. De Francovich, *Benedetto Antelami architetto e scultore* cit., p. 294.
- ¹⁸ A. Calzona, *I maestri campionesi e la "lombardia"* cit., pp. 379-380.
- ¹⁹ R. Wagner-Rieger, *Die italienische Baukunst zu Beginn der Gothik. I. Teil: Oberitalien*, Graz-Köln 1956, I, pp. 144-156.
- ²⁰ A. Calzona, *I maestri campionesi e la "lombardia"* cit., p. 382.
- ²¹ Stranamente Ludovico V. Geymonat pur così attento e preciso nel suo lavoro (L.V. Geymonat, *The Parma Baptistery and its Pictorial Program*, PhD, University of Princeton 2006, I, pp. 5-40) mostra di non conoscere e dunque non cita il mio contributo del 2002, pubblicato nel 2004, anche se poi molti riferimenti, con qualche aggiunta di poco conto, sembrano derivare da quello.
- ²² A. Calzona, *I maestri campionesi e la "lombardia"* cit., p. 377.
- ²³ B. Zanardi, *Alcuni dati di cultura materiale osservati durante il restauro eseguito tra 1986 e 1992*, in *Benedetto Antelami e il Battistero di Parma* cit., 294.
- ²⁴ A. Peroni, *Echi di Wilhelm Vöge nella storiografia artistica italiana a proposito della 'questione provenzale'*, in "Arte Medievale", n.s, V, 2006, 2, pp. 65-84: 74-81.
- ²⁵ A.C. Quintavalle, *Benedetto Antelami* cit., pp.106-107.
- ²⁶ *Ivi*, p. 112.
- ²⁷ Per il San Giovanni laterano si veda O. Brandt, *Il battistero lateranense da Costantino a Ilaro: un riesame degli scavi*, in "Opuscola Romana. Annual of the Swedish Institute in Rome", 22-23, 1997-1998, pp. 7-65.
- ²⁸ A. Peroni, *Il Battistero di Cremona: saggio esplorativo*, in *Cremona: il Battistero*, catalogo della mostra, Cremona 1979, pp. 5-18; Id., *Problemi tecnici e interpretativi delle coperture nel battistero di Cremona*, in *Romanico padano, Romanico europeo* cit., pp. 306-309.
- ²⁹ Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica*, a cura di G. Scalia, Bari 1966, II, p. 759.
- ³⁰ *Statuta communis Parmae digesta anno MCCLV*, ed. A. Ronchini, Parmae 1856, p. 445 (*Monumenta historica ad provincias parmensem et placentinam pertinentia*; 6).
- ³¹ A.C. Quintavalle, *Il Battistero di Parma* cit., pp. 32-38; S. Lomartire, *Introduzione all'architettura del battistero di Parma* cit., pp. 217-218. Le mensole ancora oggi visibili nel sottotetto non potevano reggere una copertura provvisoria, più probabilmente servivano invece per reggere un piano in legno come quello è indicato nel disegno acquerellato di G. Francini del 1803 pubblicato da Lomartire (p. 167), piano che a sua volta reggeva la scala per raggiungere il vertice della lanterna.
- ³² La data di inizio dei lavori oltre che dalla iscrizione sul Portale della Vergine è confermata anche dal *Chronicon Parmense ab anno MXXXVIII usque ad annum MCCCXXXVIII*, a cura di G. Bonazzi, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, Città di Castello 1902, tomo IX – Parte IX p. 7 e p. 8, ma anche dalla Cronica di Salimbene (Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica* cit., I, p. 52 e II, pp. 849).
- ³³ S. Lomartire, *Introduzione all'architettura del battistero di Parma* cit., p. 218.
- ³⁴ A Parma Federico II si era fermato nel 1226 e ancora nel 1237 dopo la vittoria di Cortenuova. A Parma esisteva anche il palazzo imperiale che Federico II aveva ampliato e ricostruito nel 1238. Sul palazzo imperiale G. Valenzano, *Sulle tracce del Palazzo Imperiale*, in *Federico II. L'Emilia Occidentale*, Catalogo della mostra, Parma 3-30 giugno 1995, a cura di M. Dall'Acqua, Parma 1995, pp. 35-44.
- ³⁵ U. Benassi, *Storia di Parma*, Parma 1899, vol. II, pp. 193-195; E. Guerra, *La Collegiata Insigne del Battistero di Parma. Memorie Storiche Canoniche*, Parma 1923, pp. 12-15.
- ³⁶ S. Lomartire, *Introduzione all'architettura del battistero di Parma* cit., p. 145.
- ³⁷ U. Benassi, *Storia di Parma* cit., II, pp. 193-194.
- ³⁸ S. Lomartire, *Introduzione all'architettura del battistero di Parma* cit., p. 150.
- ³⁹ *Ivi*, p. 216.
- ⁴⁰ A. Bianchi, «*In Battistero Parme de novo incepto*». *Su due inedite pergamene dell'Archivio Capitolare di Parma*, in "Rendiconti", s. IX, XV, 2004, I, pp. 45-69: 57-58. Bianchi pubblica la seconda parte del testo, ma con la data MCCLXXXII. Ho controllato l'originale dove risulta chiaramente MCCLXXXII. Naturalmente si tratta di una svista probabilmente dovuta al fatto che lo studioso è a conoscenza che l'atto ufficiale della donazione fu firmato dal cardinale Gerardo Bianchi a Rieti il 14 gennaio 1293.
- ⁴¹ Salimbene de Adam, *Cronica* cit., I, p. 48.
- ⁴² A.C. Quintavalle, *Il Battistero di Parma* cit., p. 88.

⁴³ Vedi nota 29.

⁴⁴ P. Silanos, *Gerardo Bianchi da Parma*, Tesi di Dottorato di Ricerca, Università degli studi Parma, tutor prof. R. Greci, a.a. 2007/2008, pp. 182-201.

⁴⁵ *Ivi*, pp. 229-257, 315-318.

⁴⁶ *Chronicon Parmense* cit., p. 61.

⁴⁷ *Ivi*, p. 62.

⁴⁸ P. Silanos, *Gerardo Bianchi da Parma* cit., pp. 292-293.

⁴⁹ Sul movimento dell'Alleluia la bibliografia è molto ampia si rimanda in particolare a A. Vauchez, *Une champagne de pacification autour de 1233. L'action politique des Ordres Mendicants d'après la réforme des statuts communaux et les accords de paix*, in "Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire", 78, 1966, pp.503-549; M. Gazzini, *In margine all'Alleluia del 1233: la Milizia di Gesù Cristo di Parma (1233-1261)*, in *Uno storico un territorio: Vito Fumagalli e l'Emilia occidentale nel Medioevo*, a cura di R. Greci e D. Romagnoli, Bologna 2005, pp. 235-259.

⁵⁰ Il documento è riportato da M. Lopez, *Il Battistero di Parma* cit., p.130, nota 34.

⁵¹ Sulla distinzione tra dedicazione e consacrazione si veda R. Crozet, *Les consécration pontificales*, in "Bulletin Monumental", 104, 1946, pp. 5-46; F. Salet, *La chronologie de Cluny III d'après les fouilles*, in "Bulletin Monumental", CXXVI, 1968, pp. 235-292: 239-240; R. Oursel, *Invention de l'architecture romane*, St. Léger Vauban 1970 (Zodiaque), trad. it. *L'architettura romanica*, Milano 1986, pp. 63-100.

⁵² Sulla committenza del ciclo dei dipinti 'bizantini' a Gerardo Boccabadati si veda L.V. Geymonat, *The Parma Baptistery and its Pictorial Program* cit., pp. 73- 96 e anche Id., *Parma 1233: Pittura e iconografia in un battistero gotico*, in *L'arte medievale nel contesto (300-1300). Funzioni, iconografia, tecniche*, Milano 2006, pp. 509-515. Sulla missione di pace a Trogir del Boccabadati si veda *Diplomatički Zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije*, sabrao i uredio T. Smičiklas, Zagreb 1906, IV, pp. 197-198 doc. n. 177; p. 199 doc. n. 178.

⁵³ Si veda nota 2 e nota 4.

⁵⁴ V. P. Goss, *Four Centuries of European Art: 800-1200*, Zagreb 2010, pp. 111-113.

⁵⁵ W. Sauerländer, *Benedetto Antelami. Per un bilancio critico* cit., p. 49.

⁵⁶ S. McNally, *The Architectural Ornament of Diocletian's Palace at Split*, Oxford 1996.

⁵⁷ Sull'abside di Santa Maria in Valle Porclaneta in Abruzzo, realizzata negli anni trenta del Duecento si rimanda, anche per la bibliografia precedente, a F. Gandolfo, *Scultura medievale in Abruzzo*, Pescara 2004, pp. 209-219.

TERRA E POTERE.
LA PORTA BRONZEA DI SAN CLEMENTE A CASAURIA E
IL SUO CONTESTO

GAETANO CURZI

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI "G. D'ANNUNZIO" DI CHIETI-PESCARA

La porta di bronzo dell'abbazia di San Clemente a Casauria in Abruzzo venne eseguita al tempo dell'abate Gioele (1182-1191) ma è parte integrante di un programma di rinnovamento dell'abbazia avviato dal suo predecessore Leonate che promosse l'innalzamento di una nuova facciata con portali scolpiti e portico e la stesura di un cronaca-cartulario per tutelare il patrimonio della comunità. In questo contributo si analizza dunque la porta sottolineando i nessi che la legano a tale congiuntura storica, mettendo quindi in risalto come le ante siano parte di una strategia di comunicazione che prevedeva l'utilizzo di mezzi espressivi diversi.

Abruzzo, Arte medievale, San Clemente a Casauria, porta, bronzo, scultura

Preceduto da un elegante portico tripartito e inquadrato da un portale riccamente scolpito,¹ l'accesso principale all'abbaziale (Fig. 1) è ancora chiuso dall'imponente porta di bronzo, due ante alte quasi quattro metri suddivise in dodici registri di tre pannelli per un totale, in origine, di settantadue formelle incluse entro un'intelaiatura regolare fissata da centoquattro borchie poste alle intersezioni delle cornici.

Ancora sostanzialmente integra tra la metà del Settecento e i primissimi anni dell'Ottocento, quando venne descritta in pubblicazioni erudite,² doveva invece avere già subito qualche manomissione nel 1842, anno dell'incisione di Simone Cavallari (Fig. 2) che aveva accompagnato Heinrich Wilhelm Schulz nel suo pionieristico viaggio di studio³ nell'Italia meridionale.

Nei decenni successivi tutto il complesso monumentale conobbe un rapido deterioramento tanto da rischiare la completa distruzione, scongiurata grazie all'azione di tutela di Pier Luigi

Calore che negli anni novanta promosse il suo recupero.⁴ Sulla porta erano ancora applicati trentasette pannelli e undici si trovavano in deposito ma in seguito si registrò la dispersione di ulteriori quattro pezzi. Nel 1902 Henry Walters acquistò sul mercato romano due formelle – una completa di cornice – tutt’ora conservate a Baltimora nel museo da lui fondato, mentre altre due entrarono nel 1905 nel Kaiser Friedrich Museum di Berlino, almeno una delle quali era tra quelle in opera nel 1894.

L’aspetto attuale del manufatto (Fig. 1) è però scaturito dal restauro del 1933 quando le quarantaquattro formelle superstiti vennero integrate con elementi intagliati nel legno e patinati con una tinta verdognola che riprende il tono complessivo determinato dall’ossidazione delle lamine bronzee, tradendo dunque l’effetto originario della porta che le fonti descrivono impreziosita da inserti di oro purissimo.⁵



Fig. 1 San Clemente a Casauria, portale maggiore.




Fig. 2 San Clemente a Casauria, porta di bronzo, incisione di Simone Cavallari (da Schulz, 1860).

Gli studi di Herbert Bloch⁶ hanno cercato di ricostruire la disposizione originaria (Fig. 3, Fig. 4) delle partiture decorative e testuali, ricomposte in modo arbitrario in occasione dell'intervento restitutivo che assunse come guida la testimonianza iconografica di Cavallari.

Agli angoli delle ante sono inseriti quattro fioroni che sembrano una stilizzazione nel bronzo di quelli carnosì posti ai lati della lunetta, un motivo caratteristico della plastica abruzzese, ripreso entro pochi anni nel pulpito.⁷ Nel primo registro si riscontrano quindi quattro figure (Fig. 3, Fig. 4), le uniche del complesso, la cui sequenza corretta prevede ai lati i due sovrani che sorreggono uno scettro analogo nella terminazione a quello che sull'architrave viene consegnato da Ludovico II a Romano, primo abate, un attributo reiterato nella galleria di ritratti dei suoi successori dispiegata nelle pagine del *Chronicon casauriense*⁸ per sottolineare l'origine imperiale del potere abbaziale.



Fig. 3 San Clemente a Casauria, porta di bronzo, anta sinistra, fotomontaggio (da Bloch, 1986).

A sinistra dunque si trova, attualmente la sola in posizione corretta, la figura regale che esibisce il cartiglio, nella quale è stato riconosciuto proprio Ludovico II nell'atto di pubblicare il documento di fondazione del cenobio mentre all'estremità opposta andrebbe collocato, avanzandolo di una casella, l'altro personaggio coronato, ovvero Guglielmo II, regnante al tempo dell'abate Gioele, il committente, che un'iscrizione consente di collocare al terzo posto nel battente sinistro, la sua effigie è però oggi da riconoscere al margine destro nel monaco che compie un atto di omaggio ormai avulso, che in origine era però diretto al san Clemente in cattedra che doveva seguirlo sull'altra anta, cui faceva da contrappunto il gesto della mano di Guglielmo.

La coppia Gioele-Clemente nella sequenza originaria (Fig. 3, Fig. 4) era dunque disposta in posizione mediana, separata dall'apertura, e richiama nell'impianto gestuale il vescovo e i devoti della porta lignea di San Pietro in Albe.⁹ (Fig. 5)

Nelle file sottostanti, entro una trama che esclude la componente antropomorfa, spicca la reiterazione delle formelle raffiguranti una fortificazione a scarpa (Fig. 3, Fig. 4), forse una motta, su cui sveltano tre torri merlate, quella centrale sopraelevata, il cui apparecchio murario è simulato efficacemente da linee incise con andamento regolare.

Unico elemento distintivo è l'iscrizione posta alla base della cortina con il nome dei toponimi, da uno a tre, metaforizzati nell'architettura raffigurata, a volte preceduti dall'appellativo *castrum*, *castellum*, *roccam* o *podium*, o da indicazioni (*in Marchia*, *in Camerino*) che ne facilitano l'individuazione in caso di possedimenti fuori zona.¹⁰ Una attenzione alla topografia riscontrabile anche nel *Chronicon*, dove alcune tra le scarse note a margine chiariscono proprio l'ubicazione e l'etimologia di alcuni nomi di luoghi, evidenziando in tal modo l'importanza della notazione geografica,¹¹ sottolineata anche dalla natura stessa dell'elenco che comprende solo i possedimenti della "Terra di san Clemente", ovvero i suoi domini feudali, escludendo dunque le chiese dipendenti che invece nella porta di Montecassino occupano lo spazio maggiore.¹²



Fig. 4 San Clemente a Casauria, porta di bronzo, anta destra, fotomontaggio (da Bloch, 1986).

Anche la disposizione verticale enfatizza l'importanza di tale ostentazione che asseconda i lati maggiori delle ante, tracimando nel secondo registro con due formelle perdute che occupavano la seconda e la quinta casella, non a caso quelle sottostanti le figure dei sovrani. (Fig. 3, Fig. 4)

Se la figura di Ludovico potrebbe apparire una nota di richiamo all'architrave che illustra il mito di fondazione, assume invece nello specifico della porta una valenza autonoma in relazione al suo corrispettivo Guglielmo, al quale viene proposto in veste di *exemplum* nel difendere quel patrimonio rappresentato attraverso la metafora delle serie di castelli che iniziavano proprio ai loro piedi per svilupparsi lungo la cornice, lambendo così gli stipiti dove sono scolpiti altri quattro ritratti coronati. Questi, grazie ad una celebre illustrazione del *Chronicon*¹³ (Fig. 6) sono stati riconosciuti con Ugo, Lamberto, Lotario e Berengario ed esibiscono gli atti mediante i quali avevano contribuito alla prosperità del cenobio, la cui protezione veniva ora demandata a Guglielmo.

San Clemente a Casauria d'altronde fu l'ultima, in ordine di tempo, delle grandi fondazioni benedettine a ritagliarsi una dimensione di "latifondista" in una zona dove si sovrapponevano le aree di influenza di potenti istituzioni quali Farfa, Subiaco, San Vincenzo a Volturno e la stessa Montecassino, che tuttavia gradualmente nel corso del XII secolo avevano percepito come la loro ricchezza fondiaria fosse messa a repentaglio dall'ascesa di una nuova classe aristocratica e dalla progressiva autonomizzazione dei poteri locali.



Fig. 5 Celano, Museo d'arte sacra della Marsica, porta lignea da San Pietro in Albe, particolare.




Fig. 6 Parigi, Bibl. Nat., lat. 5411, *Chronicon casauriense*, c. 129v.

In questi anni dunque alcuni dei principali monasteri dell'Italia centro-meridionale promossero compilazioni storiche e documentarie¹⁴ come il regesto con cui Pietro diacono completò la cronaca cassinese di Leone Marsicano secondo una distinzione tra le due componenti che si ritrova nell'opera di Gregorio di Catino per Farfa ma anche, in parte, nella cronaca sublacense, una collezione di atti venne eseguita pure a Santa Sofia a Benevento¹⁵ e Sant'Angelo in Formis.

Un avvicendamento di brani narrativi e trascrizioni di documenti percorre invece il *Chronicon vulturense*¹⁶ mentre in Abruzzo alla fine del XII secolo fu approntata la cronaca-cartulario dell'abbazia di San Bartolomeo a Carpineto della Nora.¹⁷

Da questa esigenza di riaffermazione patrimoniale nacque anche il *Liber instrumentorum seu chronicorum monasterii Casauriensis*, redatto da Giovanni di Berardo e trascritto dal *magister Rustico*, secondo un progetto che prevedeva una rigorosa sinossi tra il racconto, confinato entro una stretta colonna di testo al margine interno, e gli atti relativi, cui è riservata la porzione principale del testo (Fig. 6).¹⁸

Questo sforzo editoriale fu però affiancato, in molti complessi, da strategie comunicative diversificate che fossero in grado di raggiungere pubblici più ampi.¹⁹

Di queste fa sicuramente parte la celeberrima porta di possesso che l'abate Oderisio II (1123-1126) fece realizzare a Montecassino, le cui formelle bronzee sono quasi interamente occupate dall'elenco dei possedimenti e delle chiese dipendenti, a questo impianto concettuale si rifercono poi, quasi un secolo più tardi, i battenti bronzei del duomo di Benevento che nella parte inferiore schierano le effigi dei ventiquattro vescovi suffraganei, risolvendo così in termini figurativi la questione delle dipendenze della sede arcidiocesana.²⁰

Il valore dell'esibizione all'ingresso dell'edificio sacro del patrimonio e degli atti che avevano arrecato benefici alla comunità, nella forma figurata o della carta lapidaria, costituì comunque un fatto ricorrente del monachesimo benedettino centroitaliano, confermato dal pannello con Innocenzo III che mostra una bolla al Sacro Speco di Subiaco in prossimità dell'accesso della chiesa, al sommo della scala Santa.²¹

Un impianto che si ritrova ancora in pieno quattrocento nel teramano a Santa Maria di Propezzano,²² nel cui portico compaiono i busti dei pontefici che avevano concesso privilegi al monastero, trascritti entro lunghe pergamene.

Infine a San Liberatore alla Maiella, nella zona absidale, venne dipinta una galleria eterogenea di personaggi che spaziava da San Benedetto a Carlo Magno fino ai principali abati della comunità, intervallati da testi che ancora una volta ne celebravano i possedimenti. Colpisce poi che questa decorazione, datata alla prima età angioina, venne rinnovata in pieno Cinquecento in forme rinascimentali ma con il medesimo valore semantico.²³

Del tutto originale dal punto di vista iconografico appare però la soluzione adottata a San Clemente dove la legittimità del dominio territoriale dell'abbazia è garantita dai cartigli esibiti dai sovrani protettori sugli stipiti e nel primo registro della porta mentre la sua consistenza è efficacemente visualizzata nella metafora del castello (Fig. 3, Fig. 4) che trova un precedente nella celeberrima pagina di dedica del lezionario di Desiderio,²⁴ la cui metà inferiore è popolata di

paesaggi ed edifici a richiamare il patrimonio fondiario che insieme a quello librario viene consacrato dall'abate a San Benedetto ma anche nei disegni di castelli e borghi che incorniciano alcune pagine degli annali genovesi di Caffaro.²⁵

Un apparato simile doveva essere inoltre dispiegato nell'abbazia cistercense dei Santi Vincenzo e Anastasio alle Tre Fontane, presso Roma, dove l'arco d'ingresso illustra attraverso un ciclo pittorico, lacunoso ma documentato da copie seicentesche, le gesta di Carlo Magno, che arrecò consistenti benefici al monastero e una carta con i possedimenti della comunità raffigurati come fortezze di diversa foggia,²⁶ un tema quest'ultimo riproposto anche nel portico dell'abbaziale, inframmezzato a soggetti agiografici.²⁷

Colpisce tuttavia che a Casauria per semantizzare la "Terra di san Clemente" sia stata adottata proprio la forma del castello la quale, diversamente, nel *Chronicon* assume una valenza fortemente negativa, tanto che descrivendo il paesaggio circostante l'autore lamenta la presenza di fortezze come conseguenza di un'epoca di scontri militari, ponendo quindi in contrasto l'antropizzazione del territorio con l'amenità arcadica dell'ambiente naturale che caratterizzava la zona al momento della fondazione.²⁸

Un'immagine edenica del luogo che Giovanni di Berardo accredita in più passi della sua opera, recuperando il *topos* letterario del *locus amoenus*, enfatizzato nel testo dalla ricorrente definizione dell'abbazia come *insula*,²⁹ aggettivata anche come *delectabilis*, e dalla menzione del rigoglio della vegetazione primigenia e che trova la sua trascrizione visiva nell'architrave del portale maggiore (Fig. 1) dove la zona su cui sorgerà il complesso è raffigurata come un quadrilatero delimitato da flutti e piante, ovvero l'isola, al cui interno prospera la vegetazione in una sorta di idealizzato *hortus conclusus*, un tema rilanciato dall'epigrafe che corre lungo il bordo inferiore dell'architrave dove si legge: *insula Piscarie Paradisi floridus ortus*.

La forte complementarità della porta bronzea con la sua cornice scolpita e l'intima consonanza tra testo, immagini e contesto, anche ambientale, suggeriscono dunque che il *Chronicon* e l'intervento di monumentalizzazione dell'accesso all'abbaziale siano partiture distinte di un discorso fortemente unitario, portato avanti con media diversi entro una sequenza cronologicamente piuttosto serrata imperniata intorno al 1182, anno della morte dell'abate Leonate.

Il racconto colloca infatti nel 1176 l'avvio il cantiere della facciata con i tre portali, il portico e l'oratorio sopraelevato, quest'ultimo tuttavia non era stato ancora consacrato quando gli succedette Gioele che completò l'impresa suggellandola con la porta bronzea.³⁰ E' stato però ipotizzato³¹ che anche il ritratto di Leonate al culmine del portale maggiore sia stato terminato in seguito alla sua scomparsa che costituisce anche l'ultimo evento registrato nella Cronaca.³² La presenza di Gioele nella porta ovviamente scala la sua realizzazione dopo l'anno fatidico ma forse

non di molto,³³ visto che egli appare abbigliato come un semplice monaco, l'assenza degli attributi della dignità abbaziale potrebbero indicare una successione non ancora pienamente compiuta oppure un atteggiamento di umile differenziazione dall'iconografia di Leonate.

Nell'esecuzione dei sovrani negli stipiti, della legenda di fondazione del cenobio nell'architrave e della lunetta con San Clemente affiancato da Leonate e dai Santi Cornelio e Febo, la critica recente ha colto l'avvicendamento di due maestri portatori di un linguaggio maturato sulle esperienze padane e adriatiche dei decenni precedenti, riconoscendo però che il più dotato autore delle parti sommitali è portatore di una cifra personale che sfugge alla logica del confronto dirimente.³⁴

Analogamente la decorazione figurata del manoscritto, per la quale la storiografia ha proposto un ampio spettro di confronti che spaziano da Montecassino a San Vincenzo al Volturno fino alla Francia,³⁵ appare pervasa da un tratto fortemente originale tale da sottrarla ad ogni inquadramento per via di comparazione, trovando forse il suo orizzonte di riferimento proprio nel cantiere della facciata,³⁶ sia nella sovrabbondanza decorativa delle vesti e dei dettagli che in alcune pose delle figure.

Anche i personaggi del primo registro della porta ripropongono, in forme ulteriormente banalizzate, il medesimo tono formale, nobilitato da un trattamento linearistico di superficie che raggiunge una certa efficacia decorativa mentre la figura di Guglielmo II (Fig. 4) indossa un mantello che gli ricade sul petto con una grossa ansa che sembra citare il dettaglio corrispondente dell'abbigliamento di alcuni sovrani nelle pagine del *Chronicon*,³⁷ così come alla medesima cultura grafica delle epigrafi del portale e della scrittura distintiva del codice appaiono assimilabili, nonostante alcuni impacci e un *ductus* più incerto, le didascalie delle formelle con i castelli o quella che consentiva di identificare Gioele.

D'altronde le ante stesse, per scelte compositive e modalità esecutive, appaiono piuttosto isolate rispetto al pur abbondante *corpus* di porte bronzee importate o realizzate in Italia centromeridionale nei secoli XI e XII. Se la suddivisione in un reticolo regolare (Fig. 1, Fig. 2) tramite cornici realizzate da listelli fissati con borchie angolari trova infatti confronti sostanzialmente coevi nell'opera di Barisano da Trani e illustri antecedenti in quella di Oderisio da Benevento, il procedimento costruttivo appare sottoposto ad una drastica semplificazione tecnologica.

Tutte le formelle sono riquadrate mediante elementi della stessa forma e dimensione (Fig. 7), semplici tratti a sezione rettangolare con gli spigoli ammorbiditi da una modanatura dritta, mentre il montaggio è assicurato da due chiodini per ogni lato obliterati da placchette di forma quadrata fissate alle intersezioni mediante una calotta poggiate su due dischi pure di metallo.

La componente decorativa (Fig. 7) è del tutto assente sulle borchie mentre nei listelli è costituita da incisioni che riproducono croci con terminazione pomellata, stelle a sei raggi e fiori a sei petali sempre inscritti in una doppia circonferenza inclusa in una cornice rettangolare, una serialità di *pattern*³⁸ che ricorre anche nel campionario delle formelle, le cui raffigurazioni sono realizzate in fusione con un tratto formale piuttosto grossolano, solo in parte riscattato dal trattamento superficiale a bulino e punzone.

Significativa in tal senso la figura di Gioele (Fig. 3) dove il piegamento del corpo è reso mediante l'andamento curvilineo del margine destro, assecondato anche dalle incisioni sull'abito, inserendo così l'unica variazione alla rigida frontalità esibita dai due sovrani e dal santo in cattedra.

Altrettanto peculiare risulta l'apparato iconografico, se infatti i quattro personaggi del primo registro compendiano le esigenze rappresentative della committenza e dell'evergetismo dei sovrani (Fig. 3, Fig. 4), ponendosi così in diretta connessione con i ventidue castelli sottostanti, non si può non rilevare che questo pur basilare nesso sintattico riempie poco più di un terzo dei riquadri.

Si potrebbe attribuire un mero valore ornamentale ai quattro fioroni angolari e ai due picchiotti, come da tradizione serrati entro le mascelle di una protome leonina, la cui dentatura è resa attraverso l'espedito di una semplice linea a zig-zag (Fig. 8). Rimangono tuttavia quaranta formelle occupate da motivi fortemente geometrizzati che difficilmente si possono collocare entro la categoria del semplice decoro. Si tratta di una decina di variazioni del tema della croce e del fiore a sei o otto petali inscritti entro circonferenze e quadrati (Fig. 7), cui vanno aggiunti i due rari crescenti sormontati da croce e fiore esapartito (Fig. 3, Fig. 4) nel secondo registro sotto Gioele e San Clemente.

E' stato ipotizzato³⁹ che questo repertorio, improntato ad un gusto lineare, realizzato con criteri di rigida bidimensionalità, trovi le sue radici nel cantiere di San Pelino a Valva. Motivi per certi versi simili si riscontrano però anche negli archivolti di Santa Maria a Vico a Sant'Omero e di Santa Maria del Lago a Moscufo, mentre il tema più rappresentato, dispiegato su almeno tre file



Fig. 7 San Clemente a Casauria, porta di bronzo, particolare della decorazione.

intere della porta casauriense, è costituito da un intreccio di archi di circonferenza organizzato su uno schema cruciforme (Fig. 9) che ricorda per la serialità il groviglio, tutto però risolto in chiave fitomorfa, che occupa la penultima fila della porta lignea di San Pietro in Albe.⁴⁰

Il contesto regionale, dal quale pure scaturisce il fiore carnoso angolare, tuttavia non riesce a scardinare l'isolamento della decorazione delle ante nel loro complesso, anche tenendo in forte considerazione la specificità del *medium* tecnico.



Fig. 8 San Clemente a Casauria, porta di bronzo, picchiotto.

La dimensione astrattizzante e la reiterazione dell'elemento segnico suggerirebbero motivi di derivazione cistercense ma i monaci di San Bernardo si diffusero piuttosto tardi nella regione, agli anni novanta risale infatti la fondazione di Casanova e solo al 1208 quella di Santa Maria di Arabona.⁴¹

Segnalo tuttavia che è stata ipotizzata l'appartenenza a tale ordine dei fonditori Pietro e Uberto che firmarono, definendosi *fratres* provenienti da Piacenza e da Losanna, due porte bronzee in Laterano al tempo di Celestino III.⁴² In particolare quella che oggi chiude l'oratorio di San Giovanni nel battistero, risalente al 1195, pur entro una ripartizione delle ante di gusto marcatamente classicista e una qualità formale superiore rispetto a Casauria, conserva la personificazione dell'*Ecclesia* realizzata in fusione e applicata alla lastra – ma in origine dovevano esserci otto figure a rilievo – mentre le specchiature sono riempite da fondali architettonici anche qui con funzione metonimica, per esempio la porta urbana simboleggia Roma, realizzati con una incisione a bulino, analogamente alle cortine murarie dei castelli della Terra di San Clemente.

Oltre alla difficoltà di individuare elementi di riscontro, nella porta abruzzese colpisce però anche il tratto marcatamente arcaizzante che ne avvicina il repertorio di intersezioni di cerchi e quadrati agli intrecci della scultura altomedievale che appaiono quasi reinterpretati con una sensibilità contemporanea,⁴³ come suggerirebbe proprio il motivo più rappresentato nella porta (Fig. 9), leggibile anche come una combinazione di quattro nodi salomonici, un *pattern* rappresentato in modo simile ad esempio in un frammento altomedievale provenienti dall'antica cattedrale di Teramo (Fig. 10).⁴⁴



Fig. 9 San Clemente a Casauria, porta di bronzo, particolare.



Fig. 10 Teramo, Museo Archeologico "F. Savini", frammento da Santa Maria Aprutiensis.

Un riferimento all'antico medievale che potrebbe essere non tanto indice di un gusto attardato o retrospettivo quanto di una forma di "storicismo", analogo per certi versi ai reimpieghi in alcuni cantieri di XII e XIII secolo di frammenti di medioevo seriore per sottolineare la vetustà del complesso, come si riscontra nella regione a San Giovanni in Venere⁴⁵ o a San Pietro ad Oratorium⁴⁶ dove è stata anche ipotizzata una esecuzione "tarda" di alcuni di questi pezzi.⁴⁷

La loro funzione sarebbe in accordo a tale lettura quella di evocare l'abbazia antica, raffigurata nella leggenda di fondazione sull'architrave identica a quella attuale ma letteralmente cancellata dalla ricostruzione di Leonate e Giole, tanto che se ne ignora persino l'esatta ubicazione.

Forse anche in questa inconsueta opzione figurativa la porta dunque partecipa a quel grande progetto scrittura e riscrittura della storia articolato dai due abati attraverso il *Chronicon* e il portale scolpito.

- ¹ Per la storia dell'abbazia e del cantiere nel contesto territoriale: C. Gavini, *Storia dell'architettura in Abruzzo*, 2 voll., Milano-Roma 1927-1928; M. Moretti, *Architettura medioevale in Abruzzo (Dal VI al XVI secolo)*, Roma s.d.; L. Feller, *La fondation de San Clemente a Casauria et sa représentation iconographique*, Mélanges de l'Ecole Française de Rome. Moyen âge, temps modernes 94, 1982, pp. 711-728; id., *Casaux et castra dans les Abruzzes: San Salvatore a Maiella et San Clemente a Casauria (XIe - XIIIe siècle)*, Ivi, 97, 1985, pp. 145-182; O. Lehmann-Brockhaus, *Abruzzen und Molise, Kunst und Geschichte*, München 1983; L. Pellegrini, *Abruzzo medioevale: un itinerario storico attraverso la documentazione*, Altavilla Silentina 1988; R. Paciocco, *I rapporti tra autorità regia, istituzioni monastiche e poteri locali nell'Abruzzo adriatico normanno. Le abbazie benedettine di S. Clemente a Casauria e S. Bartolomeo di Carpineto*, Benedictina 42, 1995, pp. 335-374; L. Feller, *Les Abruzzes médiévales: territoire, économie et société en Italie centrale du IXe au XIIe siècle* (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 300), Roma 1998; A. Ghisetti Giavaririna, *S. Clemente a Casauria. L'antica abbazia e il territorio di Torre de' Passeri*, Pescara 2001; F. Aceto, *San Clemente a Casauria. Le vicende architettoniche*, in *Dalla valle del Fino alla valle del medio e alto Pescara* (Documenti dell'Abruzzo Teramano, VI,1), Teramo 2003, pp. 243-271; F. Gandolfo, *Scultura medievale in Abruzzo. L'età normanno-sveva*, Pescara 2004.
- ² *Opuscoli eruditi latini ed italiani del P. M. Giuseppe Allegranza*, a cura di I. Bianchi, Cremona 1781, pp. 188-192; I. Di Pietro, *Memorie storiche della città di Sulmona*, Napoli 1804, pp. 140-142.
- ³ H.W. Schulz, *Denkmäler der Kunst des Mittelalters in Unteritalien*, Dresda 1860, tav. LV.
- ⁴ P.L. Calore, *L'abbazia di San Clemente a Casauria*, Archivio storico dell'arte 4, 1891, pp. 9-36; id., *La ricomposizione delle porte di San Clemente a Casauria*, Ivi, 7, 1894, pp. 201-217; id., *L'abbazia di San Clemente a Casauria*, Pescara 2000; R. Ciglia, *Pier Luigi Calore "l'uomo dell'abbazia"*, Pescara 2009.
- ⁵ F. Gandolfo, *San Clemente a Casauria. I portali e gli arredi interni*, in *Dalla valle del Fino*, pp. 272-297; id., *Scultura medievale in Abruzzo. L'età normanno-sveva*, Pescara 2004, p. 284.
- ⁶ H. Bloch, *Monte Cassino in the Middle Ages*, 3 voll., Roma 1986, I, pp. 571-573; id., *Le porte bronzee di Montecassino e l'influsso della porta di Oderisio II sulle porte di San Clemente a Casauria e del duomo di Benevento*, in *Le porte di bronzo dall'antichità al secolo XII*, atti del convegno, a cura di S. Salomi, Trieste 1987, Roma 1990, pp. 307-324; Gandolfo, *San Clemente*, pp. 283-285; M. Späth, *Verflechtung von Erinnerung. Bildproduktion, Historiographie und Urkundenfälschung im Kloster San Clemente a Casauria während des späteren 12. Jahrhunderts* (Orbis Medievalis. Vorstellungswelten des Mittelalters, 8), Berlino 2007, pp. 231ss.
- ⁷ Rigogliosi motivi fitomorfi compaiono anche nelle specchiature superiori della porta della cappella palatina di Palermo.
- ⁸ Parigi, Bibl. Nat., Lat. 5411. Sul manoscritto e la sua importanza come fonte si veda: scheda nr. 42, in *Manuscripts enluminés d'origine italienne, I, VIe-XIIe siècles*, a cura di F. Avril, Y. Zaluska, Parigi 1980, pp. 23-24; *Liber instrumentorum seu chronicorum monasterii casauriensis (cod. Lat. 5411 Bibl. Nat. di Parigi)*, edizione in facsimile, L'Aquila 1982; Y. Zaluska, scheda nr. 18, in *Dix siècles d'enluminure italienne*, catalogo della mostra, a cura di F. Avril, Parigi 1984, pp. 31-32; L. Feller, *Le cartulaire-chronique de Saint Clemente a Casauria*, in *Les cartulaires*, atti del convegno, Parigi 1991, Parigi 1993, pp. 261-277; V. Leonardis, *Le chronicon casauriense: problèmes d'illustration d'un texte historique et juridique*, in *Manuscripts et enluminures dans le monde normand (x-xv siècles)*, atti del convegno, Cerisy la Salle 1995, Caen 1999, pp. 129-150; A. Perriccioli Saggese, *Liber instrumentorum seu chronicorum monasterii casauriensis. Le illustrazioni*, in *Dalla valle del Fino*, pp. 519-528; A. Sennis, *Tradizione monastica e racconto delle origini in Italia centrale (secoli XI-XII)*, in Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Moyen âge 115, 2003, pp. 181-211; G.A. Loud, *Monastic Chronicles in the Twelfth-Century Abruzzi*, Anglo-Norman Studies 27, 2005, pp. 101-131; Späth, *Verflechtung von Erinnerung*, pp. 57ss.; A. Pratesi, *Il Chronicon Casauriense come fonte storica*, Bollettino della Deputazione abruzzese di storia patria 101, 2010, pp. 5-18.
- ⁹ G. Curzi, *Arredi lignei medievali. L'Abruzzo e l'Italia centromeridionale. Secoli XII-XIII*, Cinisello Balsamo 2007, pp. 19ss.
- ¹⁰ Bloch, *Monte Cassino*, pp. 571ss.; Späth, *Verflechtung von Erinnerung*, pp. 249ss.
- ¹¹ A. Pratesi, *Prefazione all'edizione in fac-simile del Liber instrumentorum seu chronicorum monasterii casauriensis (cod. Lat. 5411 Bibl. Nat. di Parigi)*, L'Aquila 1982, p. 11: cc. 6r, 31v, 32r, 54r, 66r.
- ¹² Bloch, *Le porte*, p. 318.
- ¹³ Parigi, Bibl. Nat., Lat. 5411, c. 129v.
- ¹⁴ Leonardis, *Le chronicon*, p. 133; Späth, *Verflechtung von Erinnerung*, pp. 249ss.
- ¹⁵ G.M. Fachechi, *Il Chronicon Sanctae Sophiae di Benevento: l'apparato decorativo e illustrativo*, Arte medievale 11, 1997, 1-2, pp. 75-91; *Chronicon Sanctae Sophiae* (Fonti per la storia dell'Italia Medievale: Rerum Italicarum scriptores 3), a cura di Jean-Marie Martin, Roma 2000.
- ¹⁶ *Chronicon Vulturense del monaco Giovanni*, a cura di M. Oldoni, Cerro al Volturno 2010.
- ¹⁷ F. Aceto, *Abbazia di San Bartolomeo a Carpineto della Nora*, in *Dalla valle del Fino*, pp. 298-306.

- ¹⁸ G. Curzi, *Figure di pergamena, di pietra e di bronzo: la decorazione del Chronicon casauriense e il portale maggiore dell'abbazia di San Clemente*, in *Illuminare l'Abruzzo*, catalogo della mostra, a cura di F. Manzari, F. Tentarelli, A. Tomei, Pescara 2012, in corso di stampa.
- ¹⁹ M. Späth, *Bild, Schrift und Sprache: Überlegungen zur Intermedialität in der italienischen Bauplastik des 12. Jahrhunderts am Beispiel der Westfassade von San Clemente a Casauria*, in *Bild und Text im Mittelalter*, cura di K. Krause, B. Schellewald, Colonia 2011, pp. 125-151.
- ²⁰ Bloch, *Le porte*, p. 318, pp. 307ss.; S. Moretti, "Cum valde placuissent oculis eius...": i battenti di Amalfi e Montecassino, in *Le porte del paradiso. Arte e tecnologia bizantina tra Italia e Mediterraneo*, atti del convegno, a cura di A. Iacobini, Roma 2006, Roma 2009, pp. 159-180.
- ²¹ F. Gandolfo, *Aggiornamento scientifico all'opera di G. Matthiae, Pittura romana del medioevo*, II, Roma 1988, p. 277.
- ²² F. Aceto, *Santa Maria di Propezzano. L'architettura e la decorazione scultorea*, in *La Valle del medio e basso Vomano* (Documenti dell'Abruzzo Teramano, II,1), Roma 1986, pp. 353-400; M. A. Pavone, *Santa Maria di Propezzano. Un'Annunciazione e scene relative alla fondazione della basilica*, Ivi, pp. 415-430.
- ²³ A. Ghisetti Giavarina, M. Maselli Campagna, *San Liberatore a Majella: l'antico monastero benedettino e il suo territorio*, Pescara 1998; I. Carlettini, *La decorazione pittorica medievale di S. Liberatore alla Maiella*, Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte, s. III, 24, 2001, p. 47-82.
- ²⁴ BAV, Vat. Lat 1202, c. 2r.
- ²⁵ Parigi, Bibl. Nat., lat. 10136: per esempio c. 3v, 7r.
- ²⁶ S. Waetzoldt, *Die Kopien des 17. Jahrhunderts nach Mosaiken und Wandmalereien in Rom* (Römische Forschungen der Bibliotheca Hertziana, 18), Wien 1964, nrr. 1149-1152; *La pittura medievale a Roma, 312-1431. Atlante*, a cura di M. Andaloro, I, Milano 2006, pp. 154-157.
- ²⁷ Waetzoldt, *Die Kopien*, 1136-1137; Späth, *Verflechtung von Erinnerung*, p. 244.
- ²⁸ *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, II, 2, coll. 797-798.
- ²⁹ E' stato ipotizzato che il corso del Pescara con un andamento diverso da quello attuale delimitasse una vera e propria isola, sul significato figurato del termine *insula* nelle cronache monastiche si veda però: Aceto, *Abbazia*, p. 305.
- ³⁰ Aceto, *San Clemente*, pp. 246ss.; Gandolfo, *San Clemente*, pp. 272ss.
- ³¹ Gandolfo, *San Clemente*, p. 281.
- ³² Leonardis, *Le chronicon*, p. 148.
- ³³ Comunque non oltre il 1191, quando è citato per l'ultima volta: Gandolfo, *San Clemente*, pp. 283-285.
- ³⁴ G. Fossi, *L'abbazia di San Clemente a Casauria: il monumento dal IX al XII secolo; Leonate e la decorazione plastica dei portali*, Quaderni dell'Istituto di Archeologia e Storia Antica 2, 1981, pp. 161-186; id., *Sulle tracce di uno scultore abruzzese del XII secolo nelle Marche*, in *Scritti di storia dell'arte in onore di Roberto Salvini*, Firenze 1984, pp. 77-79; Gandolfo, *Scultura*, pp. 116ss.; A. Trivellone, *Il romanico "lombardo" e la scultura abruzzese del XII secolo: Santa Maria in Cellis, San Clemente a Casauria e San Giovanni ad Insulam*, in *Medioevo: arte lombarda* (I convegni di Parma, 4), atti del convegno internazionale, a cura di A.C. Quintavalle, Parma 2001, Milano 2004, p. 488-499; sui rapporti con la Puglia: L. Derosa, *La scultura di San Leonardo e il magister Guilielmus*, in *San Leonardo di Siponto: cella monastica, canonica, 'domus Theutonicorum'*, atti del convegno internazionale, a cura di H. Houben, Manfredonia 2005, Galatina 2006, pp. 205-241. Un riferimento a Fidenza e Nonantola è invece proposto da Späth, *Verflechtung von Erinnerung*, pp. 187-190.
- ³⁵ Per il dibattito critico e la bibliografia precedente: Leonardis, *Le chronicon*, pp. 144ss.; Perriccioli Saggese, *Liber*, pp. 521ss.
- ³⁶ E. Bertaux, *L'Art dans l'Italie méridionale*, Parigi 1904, IV, p. 588.
- ³⁷ Cfr., per es., c. 181r.
- ³⁸ Motivi simili si riscontrano anche nella decorazione a "fuochi d'artificio" di alcune pagine del *Chronicon*, per es. c. 131r.
- ³⁹ Gandolfo, *San Clemente*, p. 284.
- ⁴⁰ Curzi, *Arredi lignei*, pp. 25ss.
- ⁴¹ M. Righetti, s.v. *Abruzzo. Architettura cistercense*, in *Enciclopedia dell'arte medievale*, I, Roma 1990, pp. 73-75.
- ⁴² A. Iacobini, *Le porte bronzee medievali del Laterano*, in *Le porte di bronzo*, pp. 71-95, id., s.v. *Porta*, in *Enciclopedia dell'arte medievale*, IX, Roma 1998, pp. 655-672.
- ⁴³ Una modalità di citazione analoga è forse rintracciabile nella lamina metallica della coperta dell'icona del Salvatore del *Sancta Sanctorum* a Roma dove Iacobini ha convincentemente ipotizzato che i motivi a *rotae* e intrecci delle parti eseguite sotto il pontificato di Innocenzo III siano il retaggio di una versione realizzata nei secoli precedenti di cui si voleva conservare almeno la memoria visiva: A. Iacobini, *La pittura e le arti suntuarie: da Innocenzo III a Innocenzo IV (1198-1254)*, in *Roma nel Duecento. Arte nella città dei papi da Innocenzo III a Bonifacio VIII*, a cura di A.M. Romanini, Torino 1991, pp. 237-320. La citazione di un motivo di sapore altomedievale si ritrova, ad esempio, anche sull'architrave del portale di Santa Maria D'Aurio presso Lecce.
- ⁴⁴ Teramo, Museo Archeologico "F. Savini": S. Antonelli, *Teramo e il suo territorio tra tardo antico e medioevo. Schede*, in *Museo Civico Archeologico "F. Savini" - Teramo*, a cura di P. Di Felice e V. Torrieri, Teramo 2006, pp.

314-318; F. Gandolfo, *Rilievi altomedievali*, in *Teramo e la Valle del Tordino* (Documenti dell'Abruzzo Teramano, VII,1), a cura di L. Franchi dell'Orto, Teramo, 2006, pp. 383-395. Ringrazio Antonella Madonna per la segnalazione.

⁴⁵ Nel portale sul lato settentrionale.

⁴⁶ C. D'Alberto, *A Rege Desiderio fundata milleno centeno renovata : i murali di San Pietro ad Oratorium presso Capestrano*, in *De re monastica, II, Cantieri e maestranze nell'Italia medievale*, atti del convegno, a cura di M.C. Somma, Chieti-San Salvo 2008, Spoleto 2010, pp. 235-264.

⁴⁷ S. Antonelli, *Decorazione architettonica altomedievale e arredi dai contesti monastici abruzzesi*, ivi, pp. 187-234.

REFLECTIONS ON SOME ITALIAN GOTHIC HEADS: FROM ORIGINAL CONTEXT TO MUSEUM COLLECTION

CHRISTINE B. VERZAR

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

*Tracing the story of fragmented medieval heads that are now in public and private collections from the time they were removed from their original architectural context is often a complex and varied one depending on their former and original cultural and geographic location. Forceful removal and decapitation occurred in Northern Europe, mostly due to the violence of the Reformation of the 16th century or that of the French Revolution of the 18th century. Scholars of Northern Medieval art have already recognized and stressed the violent nature of the removal of heads from bodies as “*membra disjecta*” where the guillotine severed not only the heads of the aristocracy but also those of the statues of biblical kings on cathedrals and monasteries by association. By contrast, in Italy their removal occurred for different reasons. There, the catalyst was a more artistic one, a change in taste in the Renaissance, when a deliberate wish by those who removed them was to own a piece of sculpture thought to be ancient. In some other cases by the 19th century, their removal was due to the restoration of monuments that had fallen into disrepair. However, it is important to note that, some Italian Gothic heads were consciously preserved as they were considered “ancient” by Renaissance patrons of the arts. For reasons of this association with the Roman past they were preserved for deliberate political and aesthetic reasons in the tradition referred to now as “*memorie dell’antico*.” This was part of a method of appropriation of fragments of historic works of art, rather than as random “*spolia*.” These earliest art collections were the catalyst for their preservation from destruction. Many of these heads are now in public collections.*

Gothic heads, Italy, museum collections, Nicola Pisano, Siena, Lucca

This paper focuses on two Italian Gothic heads that are fragments now displayed in public collections in the United States, and explores their journey from their original provenance to their present location. They were both published in the *Census of Gothic Sculpture in America* in 1989 and 2001, and later in *Set in Stone, The Face in Medieval Sculpture*, an international loan exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 2006. Interesting histories of their journeys-- different from similar fragmented heads from Northern Europe—tell of their removal from their original architectural contexts and display in museum collections in the United States.

As I showed in *Set in Stone*, the *Head of a Prophet* from the workshop of Giovanni Pisano, now in the Cleveland Museum of Art (Leonard C. Hanna, Jr. Fund, 1977.181)¹ (Fig. 1) exhibits many of the characteristics of the workshop associated with Giovanni Pisano, especially the sculpture made while he was master of works at Siena Cathedral between 1285-97. Instead of preserving the more idealized, generic features of ancient heads as his father Nicola had done, Giovanni was adept at combining classical techniques, such as drilling marble, with an individualized characterization of facial features, an ability he had acquired from his knowledge of northern Gothic sculpture. In this head the deeply set eyes shadowed by heavy brows, the sunken cheeks, the drill work in the beard and hair, and the open mouth, convey an energy comparable to other examples associated with Giovanni's oeuvre.

The head was sheared off at the back so that it now resembles a mask, a distinctive feature that has suggested to Dorothy Gillerman² that the head was originally located on a flat surface. Accordingly she proposed that the head might have been made for a location such as Siena's Baptistery, where there is a series of heads set in diamond shaped frames along the lower façade (Fig. 2). However, this piece is not the same size as the heads still *in situ* there; stylistically and proportionally the Cleveland Head is more akin to busts of prophets and the seated Four Evangelists surrounding the rose window on the façade, or to the full-length standing prophets on the exterior roof along the southern aisle (Fig. 3). Like most of the façade sculptures, the originals have long been replaced by copies and are now in the Museo del Duomo and other protected locations, or traveled to the art market from where they ended up in foreign museums.

On one of the Evangelists, that I discovered while buying postcards in the cathedral's souvenir shop, a modern head has been attached to the original body, and judging from the angle of the torso's neck, the original head must have been detached with a flat cut (Fig. 4). Yet even though the size of the Cleveland head matches that modern copy exactly, it cannot represent an Evangelist, since it is veiled and is thus apparently a prophet. It would have come from a similar statue of a prophet. Moreover, the Cleveland head is quite similar stylistically to recently published prophets and apostles attributed to Giovanni Pisano's workshop that are now at Castello Gallico in a private




Fig. 1 Head of Prophet, Cleveland Museum of Art (photo: C. Little).



Fig. 2 Head in Medallion, Siena Baptistery Façade, detail (photo: Christine. B. Verzar).

collection of a Tuscan noble family, near Siena,³ and thought originally to have come from the exterior of Siena Cathedral. It is unclear as to when they were removed but their removal suggests a wish to collect and preserve thirteenth-century sculptures early on.⁴ How early that may have happened cannot be determined for sure, but I shall suggest some rationale for this below. As I shall show below, it can be documented that such fragments of Italian Gothic heads from the Pisani workshops landed in the collections of Tuscan noble families already in the early 16th century. Some passed into the art market after the formation of the Italian Republic in the late 19th century when these same aristocratic families sold their collections to local dealers and from there were purchased by foreign art dealers from where they made it into collections in the United States.⁵ Such a dealer was Joseph Brummer, the famous dealer of medieval art came to New York after having left Hungary and then Paris and sold his collection to several American Museums.⁶ A similar *Bearded Head*, now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts was acquired from Joseph Brummer by Hanns Swarzenski for his museum in 1947. The Boston head had supposedly been bought by Brummer from a Florentine dealer, Barsanti who in turn had found it in the Florentine baptistery or acquired it from a noble collector in the 19th century. This head originally thought to be by the Giovanni Pisano workshop turns out to be attributed to by Tino da Camaino as Roberto Bartolini⁷ has shown convincingly. It too was removed about 200 years later when the taste for exterior sculpture on the Florentine Baptistery changed and was replaced by other sculptural groups. It is significant however that it should have been preserved rather than discarded.



Fig. 3 Exterior, Siena Cathedral, South side
(photo: Christine B. Verzar).



Fig. 4 Evangelist with Modern Head,
Siena Cathedral Shop (photo: C. Little).

In 1947, the curator, Hanns Swarzenski, purchased a fragmented small marble *Head of a King* for the Boston Museum of Fine Arts from the dealer Joseph Brummer (MFA Boston 1947.1446. Charles Amos Cummings Fund).⁸ This tiny head (H 41/8 W 3, D. 3 3/4 in) (Fig. 5) was broken off at the neck and is carved in the round but less finished on the right profile. As Anita Moskowitz already suggested, the figure was to be seen from the viewer's left as the back and side are less finished. The body was likely carved in high relief with a fully three-dimensional head, and may have come from a narrative relief depicting the Adoration of the Magi. Stylistically, technically and materially the Boston king must be attributed to the circle of Nicola Pisano. Moskowitz compares it to his heads on the Siena pulpit of Nicola Pisano, but no heads are missing there. She considers it closer in style to Giovanni Pisano's early work at the Perugia Fountain, where some heads are missing or have been replaced. One such bearded head is now in the Museo Guarnacci, now the Pinacoteca, in Volterra. Max Seidel⁹ suggests that this head is an early work by Giovanni Pisano and has identified it as the one head missing as early as the 19th century from the statue of Melchisedec on the Fontana Maggiore in Perugia and now replaced by a modern copy. How it got to Volterra is a mystery, but we do know that the Medici owned a villa in that region, the Villa Spedaletto at Orciatice (now belonging to the Orsini family) and this might explain its (forced?) journey from Umbria to the south of Tuscany at a later period.

The scale and style of the little Boston *Head of a King* suggest that it was removed from a narrative frieze on a liturgical monument such as a pulpit or an architectural setting like a lintel. It can be dated through formal comparisons to sometime after the middle of the 13th century when it must have been carved by a master from one of the main Pisani workshops. In fact, there is such a head of a king that is missing on Nicola Pisano's lintel for Lucca cathedral (Fig. 6).¹⁰ The

measurements and angle of the body of the kneeling king facing left would be perfectly completed by the Boston head.¹¹ Apart from offering this new attribution and provenance for the first time for this little marble head to Nicola Pisano's early work in Lucca, the question as to when this head was removed, and if so whether it was forcefully cut off through an act of vandalism or merely due to deterioration through time shall be further investigated. The fact that the rest of this complex lunette and lintel relief with the Nativity and the Adoration of the Magi, and the lunette with the Deposition of Christ are otherwise well – preserved, suggests that we might have a deliberate removal of this one head of one of the kings as a trophy of ancient art to preserve in an early art collection. It seems unlikely that the head had been removed in the nineteenth century when restorations on the entire cathedral were undertaken without touching the portal sculpture that was protected from weathering under the porch.¹² At that time, the wish was to return the cathedral back to its medieval character, in removing any later embellishments especially in the interior. The portal sculpture had remained untouched except for losing one head of the kneeling king on the lintel either through disrepair or conscious removal for other reasons. These might therefore be a clue for a forceful removal at an early period, when we know that fully carved heads were prized and detached from relief figures on narrative friezes at other Tuscan sites.




Fig. 5 Head of King, Boston Museum of Fine Arts (photo: Boston Museum of Fine Arts).



Fig. 6 Tympanum and Lintel, Lucca Cathedral Portal by Nicola Pisano (photo: Christine B. Verzar).

This in turn leads to a more general subject that interests me greatly and is related to the early history of collecting and preservation of medieval sculpted heads in Italy and to what period we may assign this phenomenon here in Lucca as well. Max Seidel was the first to draw our attention to the custom of collecting not only ancient but also classicizing medieval sculptures by

the Renaissance nobility.¹³ We know that especially the Medici consciously acquired not only ancient Roman and Etruscan works from their region and from Rome, but also some medieval works of art that they considered ancient due to their classicizing style. One such incident is well recorded when Cosimo de' Medici ordered his military deputy, Lorenzo de' Medici, "Lorenzaccio" to chop off several heads from Nicola Pisano's pulpit friezes in the Pisa Baptistery and had them brought back to Florence for his art collection. These are recorded in the early records of the Medici "Kunstammer" or "guardaroba" in the Palazzo Vecchio. The conscious wish to collect works that appeared to them to be Roman was a response to the Medici's aesthetic taste and showed an early historicizing attitude lacking in earlier medieval revivals of antiquity. It is a custom not found in the North of Europe. In Italy though, it helped to shape the classical sensibility of the 15th and 16th century Italian Renaissance. These "memorie dell'antico" had been so prevalent already at the court of Emperor Frederick II in Southern Italy out of which Nicola Pisano emerged.¹⁴ This new phenomenon of collecting art is much different from the appropriation of antique sculptures into the art and architecture of earlier medieval settings because there the reasons were political.¹⁵ By the 16th century, this urge to collect historic objects changes in tone and sets up a new tradition for private, and later public art collections.

- ¹ Gillerman, Dorothy ed, *Gothic Sculpture in America*, 2 vols., Publications of the International Center of Medieval Art, New York 1989 & 2001. Verzar, Christine, in *Set in Stone The Face in Medieval Sculpture*, exhibition catalog ed. Little, Charles, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New Haven/London 2006, #68, pp. 164-165 with bibliography.
- ² Gillerman, Dorothy, II, p. 341.
- ³ Kreytenberg, Gert, "Eine Frage des Stils: Zuschreibung und Methode über ein Hauptwerk der Sieneser Skulptur des frühen Trecento in Castello Gallico," *Arte Medievale* NS II/03/2 (2003) pp. 107-111. Bartalini, Roberto, "Una Nuova opera di Giovanni Pisano: il 'San Pietro' di Gallico," *Prospettiva* C (2000) pp. 19-26.
- ⁴ Keller, Harald, "Die Bauplastik des Sieneser Doms: Studien zu Giovanni Pisano und seiner künstlerischen Nachfolge," *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana I* (1937) pp. 141-221, esp. 163. Kosegarten, Antje Middeldorf, *Sieneser Bildhauer am Duomo Vecchio: Studien zur Skulptur in Siena 1250-1330 (Italienische Forschungen 3. Folge, vol. XII)* Munich 1984.
- ⁵ For a discussion of the history of collecting medieval Italian sculpture for American museums, see Castelnovo-Tedesco, Lisbeth, *Italian Medieval Sculpture in the Metropolitan Museum of Art and the Cloisters*, New Haven and London 2010, pp. ix-xiii.
- ⁶ Provenance of the head can be traced to the Royal Wuerttemberg Collections; Wuerttembergisches Landesmuseum, Stuttgart; Merz Bank Hamburg, by 1947; Dr. Salb, Hamburg; private Collection; Heim Gallery, London.
- ⁷ Bartalini, Roberto, "Tino di Camaino e il gruppo scultoreo del portale nord del battistero di Firenze", in *Opere e giorni: Studi su mille anni dedicati a Max Seidel*, Venice 2001, pp. 135-146. Earlier attributed by Moskowitz, Anita to a "Post- Giovanni Pisano Workshop", in *Gothic Sculpture in America, I New England Museums*, ed. Gillerman, Dorothy, New York/ London 1989, p. 99. Listed with photo in the Joseph Brummer Archive # P 15031, now at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Medieval Department. For collecting Medieval art in general, see Williamson, Paul, *The Thyssen-Bornemisza Collection of Medieval Sculpture and Works of Art, Sothebys*, London 1987, pp. 8-19.
- ⁸ I would like to thank Christine Brennan of the Medieval Department at the Metropolitan Museum of Art for help on investigating the Brummer Archives that has a photo and number P15031 for the Boston Head of a King. This was purchased by Hanns Swarzensky for the Boston Museum of Fine Arts from Brummer in 1947 for \$7800. Brummer had purchased it from the dealer E. Lacarde, St. Germain-en-Laye on July 23, 1938 for \$ 1450. No earlier history of the provenance is recorded. Another Boston bearded Head (Brummer Archive N3889) was purchased by Brummer from Jacques Cohen in Paris in 1936 for \$300 and sold to the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston in 1947 for \$1,200. For the History of the Brummer Collection, see Bruzelius, Caroline and Meredith, Jill, *The Brummer Collection of Medieval Art*, The Duke University Museum of Art, Durham/London 1991 pp. 1-11.
- ⁹ Seidel, Max "Ipotesi sulla statua di Melchisedec della Fontana Maggiore di Perugia," in *Arte Italiana del Medioevo e Rinascimento*, II, Venice 2003 (reprint of 1971), pp. 407-418, figs. 1-8; Gáldy, Andrea M., *Cosimo de' Medici as Collector: Antiquities and Archeology in Sixteenth Century Florence*, Cambridge, 2009. The Medici Villa near Volterra was the Villa di Spedaletto bought by Lorenzoi il Magnifico in 1486 and might have been the first location for this sculptural fragment. The Villa now belongs to the Orsini family.
- ¹⁰ For Lucca Cathedral, see Seidel, Max and Silva, Romano *Lucca: Città d'arte e i suoi archivi*, Venice 2001. Kopp-Schmidt, Gabrielle, *Die Skulpturen der Fassade von San Martino in Lucca*, Worms, 1981. *Lucca. Il Volto Santo e la Civiltà Medioevale*, (Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, 1982) Lucca 1984. For restoration of Lucca's medieval churches, see Dal Canto, Costanza, *Il restauro della Basilica di San Michele in Foro nelle "Carte Pardini" (1859-1866)*, Lucca 2007, introduction pp. 9-15.
- ¹¹ At the exhibition of Cimabue at Pisa in 2005, *La pittura pisana del Duecento da Guinta a Giotto*, Pisa 2005, p. 210 fig 62) I was able to measure the neck of the figure with a missing head on a plaster cast of the lintel and tympanum of Lucca cathedral. This Boston Head fits the dimensions exactly.
- ¹² Guisti, Maria Adriana, "...nunc in pristinum decorum restituit" Contributi sul restauro a Lucca nell'Ottocento, Torino 2000, for the cathedral of San Martino see esp. p. 44.
- ¹³ Seidel, Max, "Una scultura di Nicola Pisano nello "Studiolo" di Cosimo de' Medici", *Arte Italiana del Medioevo e del Rinascimento* II, Venice 2003, pp. 289-292, (first published in 1973) quotes documents of Montaigne, Roncioni, and Vasari relating to these incidences of vandalism by in particular, Lorenzo de' Medici to satisfy Cosimo de' Medici's passion for embellishing his study by collecting ancient or antiquizing works of sculpture. See also Gino Corti and Laurie Fusco, *Lorenzo de' Medici, Collector of Antiquities: Collector and Antiquarian*, Cambridge 2006. Gáldy, Andrea M. *Cosimo I de' Medici as Collector: Antiquities and Archeology in Sixteenth-Century Florence*, Cambridge, 2009, p. 83 n.166, p. 165, and p. 262 quotes the document of "una testina staccata dal pulpito di Pisa".
- ¹⁴ See Little, Charles and Verzar, Christine, "Gothic Italy: Reflections of Antiquity," in *Set in Stone, The Face in Medieval Sculpture*, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 2006, pp. 146-167. Thanks must go here to Charles Little and Lisbeth Castelnovo-Tedesco for the many fruitful discussions and collaborations before and during the reasearhc for the exhibiton. *EXEMPLA. La Rinascita dell'antico nell'arte italiana. Da Federico II ad Andrea Pisano*. (Exhibition catalogue of Rimini, Castel Sismondo, 2008) Pisa 2008. See also the exhibition catalog,

Die Staufer und Italien, ed. Alfried Wiczorek, Bernd Schneidmueller, and Stephan Weinfurter, 2 vols., Mannheim, 2010.

- ¹⁵ Settis, Salvatore ed., *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*. 3 vols. Turin 1984-86. Verzar, Christine, "Reflections of Jerusalem, Constantinople and Rome in Public Monuments of the Medieval Italian City-States," *Mediterranean Cultural Interaction* (The Howard Gilman International Conferences II), Tel Aviv, 2000, pp. 191-211, and "The Semiotics of the Public Monument in 13th and 14th Century City Squares," in *Arte d'Occidente: Temi e Metodi* (Studi in onore di Angiola Maria Romanini) vol. 1 Rome 1999, pp. 257-267. For the reuse of ancient sarcophagi in the 11th and 12th centuries, see *idem*, "Visualizing Politics and Authority of Countess Matilda of Canossa and Tuscany: Ideology and Myth," in *Pictorial Languages and their Meanings* ed. Christine Verzar and Gil Fishhof. Tel Aviv 2006, pp. 253-264. *Idem*, "Legacy and Memory of Matilda: The Semiotics of Power and Reform," in *Immagini e Ideologie*, ed. A.C. Quintavalle, Parma, 2005, pp. 432-447.

UN CAPITOLO NASCOSTO DELLA “RINASCITA ROMANICA” NELLE TERRE BOEME DEL XII SECOLO¹

KLÁRA BENEŠOVSKÁ

ISTITUTO DELLA STORIA DELL'ARTE, ACCADEMIA DELLE SCIENZE DELLA REPUBBLICA CECA, PRAGA

Frammenti delle sculture architettoniche del palazzo vescovile di Jindřich Zdík (metropolita moravo 1126-1150) a Olomouc e del portale (originamente ingresso al pronao di provenienza sconosciuta) della chiesa di San Procopio a Zábvoří, testimoniano la qualità delle opere, realizzate in Boemia e Moravia tra 1140-1160 da maestri-lapicidi stranieri. Il soggiorno di un anno di Zdík a Gerusalemme nel 1138 e il suo viaggio a Roma nel 1139 furono un'impulso decisivo per i successivi programmi nella sua cancelleria, la creazione a Olomouc di uno scriptorium, gli sforzi riformatori e la sua attività diplomatica. L'istruzione del vescovo, i viaggi compiuti e il rispetto guadagnato a livello internazionale influenzarono anche l'alto livello delle manifestazioni artistiche non solo nei suoi possedimenti vescovili, ma anche nella cerchia della corte reale di Vladislao II a Praga. L'Italia settentrionale costituiva una altra meta di destinazione non solo per i pellegrini, ma anche delle spedizioni militari guidate da sovrani accompagnati da diplomatici nobiliari a lui legati e da prelati. I partecipanti alla spedizione dell'imperatore Federico Barbarossa in Italia – il re boemo Vladislao II, suo fratello Děpolt, il vescovo di Praga Daniel con i suoi cappellani, Gervasius, prevosto e cancelliere di Vyšehrad, accompagnati dall'esercito, vi passarono in un primo tempo un avventuroso periodo bellico tra il giugno e il settembre del 1158. Le chiese di Pavia di quest'epoca offrono le analogie per Olomouc e Zábvoří, come Modena dopo Lanfranco per le teste del ponte Giudita a Praga o degli apostoli di Žitenice – rari testimoni delle opere sparite.

Boemia, Moravia, rinascita romanica del XII secolo, vescovo Jindřich Zdík, Olomouc, Zábvoří, scultura architettonica

Tra le sculture architettoniche di maggiore qualità nell'architettura della seconda metà del XII secolo conservatesi nelle Terre boeme si possono annoverare un gruppo di capitelli in marna provenienti dalle arcate cieche di quello che un tempo fu il palazzo vescovile di Olomouc, i cui resti furono rinvenuti nel 1867 nel piano superiore del chiostro della Chiesa metropolitana di San Venceslao.² A essi si rapportano anche i frammenti nelle incorniciature dei portali, nelle modanature, negli archivolti delle finestre e in altri elementi architettonici, tutti eseguiti in maniera ornamentale, provenienti dalla stessa bottega di lapicidi e che originariamente appartenevano sia al palazzo che alla casa capitolare nonché alla parte della chiesa completata da Jindřich Zdík, vescovo di Olomouc, sebbene non tutti raggiungano la stessa qualità dei capitelli in marna delle già citate arcate cieche.³ (Fig. 1) Oggi è ormai generalmente accettata l'opinione secondo la quale questo palazzo era destinato a essere la residenza originale del metropolita e non dei principi Přemyslidi; Jindřich Zdík (vescovo dal 1126 al 1150), è considerato come il suo fondatore, mentre il periodo per l'inizio dei lavori di costruzione del palazzo va arretrato a prima del 1141.⁴



Fig. 1 Olomouc, Palazzo Zdík, le finestre. Foto: Prokop Paul, Fototeca ÚDU AVČR.

Il felice ritrovamento dei resti del palazzo vescovile e della casa capitolare con chiostro nelle immediate vicinanze della Chiesa di San Venceslao nel 1867 e le indagini effettuate successivamente in quei luoghi hanno confermato l'importanza del loro fondatore – il metropolita moravo Jindřich Zdík e il suo eccezionale orizzonte culturale. L'istruzione del vescovo, i viaggi

compiuti, le capacità diplomatiche e il rispetto guadagnato a livello internazionale nelle più alte gerarchie, secolari e spirituali, della sua epoca influenzarono anche l'alto livello delle manifestazioni artistiche non solo nei suoi possedimenti vescovili, ma anche nella cerchia della corte di Praga. Tutto ciò riguarda quindi sia le sue proprie fondazioni sia quelle in cui ebbe un ruolo di mediatore o di ispiratore, compresi i capitoli di canonici e i monasteri fondati *ex novo*.⁵

La questione della provenienza dei capitelli ornamentali di Olomouc in una certa misura è legata ad alcuni capitelli romanici provenienti dal cosiddetto pronao di Zábouř.⁶ (Fig. 2) Sia Olomouc che Zábouř sono state studiate nel contesto della “rinascita romanica” del XII secolo.⁷

All'interno dell'ingente ed eterogeneo insieme degli elementi architettonici aventi una decorazione scolpita e tornita mi soffermo dapprima solo su quelli che collego cronologicamente con l'avviamento dei lavori dei lapicidi stranieri specializzati nei cantieri del vescovo Zdík. In accordo con la più recente letteratura sull'argomento, ritengo che l'inizio della loro opera a Olomouc possa essere circoscritto al ritorno del vescovo Zdík dal suo soggiorno di un anno a Gerusalemme nel 1138.⁸ Immediatamente l'anno successivo nel 1139 Zdík intraprese un viaggio a Roma presso la Corte Pontificia di Innocenzo II (1130-1143).⁹ L'importanza di questi viaggi fu fondamentale per Zdík (così come per la maggioranza dei pellegrini più sensibili) e ricordata più volte nella letteratura sull'argomento; soprattutto ebbero un'influenza sui successivi programmi della sua cancelleria, sulla creazione a Olomouc di uno scriptorium, sui suoi sforzi riformatori e sulla sua attività diplomatica.¹⁰ (Fig. 3)

Indubbiamente giocò grande ruolo il soggiorno a Gerusalemme tra il 1137 e il 1138, dove il vescovo prese parte alla vita del capitolo regolare, disciplinato dalla severa regola di Sant'Agostino, nella Cattedrale patriarcale del Santo Sepolcro. Dalle mani del patriarca Guglielmo di Malines (1130-1147) ricevette, tra le altre cose, una reliquia della Santa Croce, come dimostra la preziosità autentica conservata nel Tesoro del Capitolo di Olomouc.¹¹

Le frammentarie notizie sulle attività del vescovo purtroppo non riportano nulla sul suo rapporto verso le espressioni artistiche con cui entrò in contatto durante i suoi viaggi. Eppure l'intensità delle percezioni “estetico-visive” e sensoriali in genere, che era parte integrante dell'esperienza di un pellegrinaggio religioso, poteva aver giocato un ruolo importante soprattutto presso quei colti pellegrini “d'alto rango”, che una volta tornati in patria avrebbero avuto l'intenzione e la possibilità di reagire alle nuove esperienze e alle nuove conoscenze acquisite come committenti o come donatori.¹² Penso soprattutto ai contatti con le recenti costruzioni di edifici sacri monumentali, che simboleggiavano gli sforzi riformatori della Chiesa e che sorsero a partire dalla seconda metà dell'XI secolo lungo il percorso che portava i pellegrini in Terra Santa con sosta a Costantinopoli (sia che fosse stato attraverso l'Ungheria o attraverso Venezia), oppure a Roma



Fig. 2 Zábvoří nad Labem, chiesa di San Procopio, incorniciature del portale. Successivo alla metà del XII secolo. Foto: Vlado Bohdan, Fototeca ÚDU AVČR.



Fig. 3a Olomouc, Palazzo Zdik, capitelli delle finestre. Foto: Prokop Paul, Fototeca ÚDU AVČR.




Fig. 3b Cosidetto Horologium d'Olomouc, Kungliga Biblioteket Stockholm, Theol. Mss. A 144, f. 34v (Riproduzione del Facsimile), 1138-1142.

attraverso l'Italia settentrionale, eventualmente anche verso sud. Oltre che per i pellegrinaggi di tipo religioso, l'Italia era una meta frequente per i prelati che si recavano alla corte Pontificia. Un capitolo a parte sono la partecipazione nelle campagne militari e le crociate.¹³

A Venezia nella prima metà del XII secolo si poteva ammirare la nuova basilica di San Marco, avviata su iniziativa del doge Domenico Contarini (1043-1071). Si trattava del completo rinnovamento di un edificio religioso costruito nel IX secolo e già ricostruito una volta nel 976 in seguito a un incendio.¹⁴ Come noto, secondo la testimonianza delle fonti contemporanee il nuovo edificio fu costruito consapevolmente sul modello della Basilica dei Santi Dodici Apostoli a Costantinopoli, chiamato *Apostoleion* – edificio del periodo dell'imperatore Costantino ricostruito durante il regno di Giustiniano.¹⁵ La scelta di questa basilica come modello portò a un peculiare eclettismo con tutte le possibili connotazioni di significato verso l'architettura della tarda antichità. Da Costantinopoli furono trasportate, tra le altre cose, decine di capitelli antichi che vennero copiati dalle maestranze veneziane, di conseguenza nell'edificio erano visibili gli uni accanto agli altri capitelli classici corinzi, capitelli con foglie d'acanto appiattite, repliche dei modelli del V-VI secolo, modanature con fiori di palma o di loto e con foglie d'acanto schiacciate, e anche decorazioni *a niello*, note nell'oreficeria bizantina a partire dal X secolo. La costruzione della basilica procedeva dall'abside verso l'atrio e la facciata occidentale, attorno alla metà del XII secolo fu aperta a sud la Porta da Mar. L'utilizzo di rivestimenti, colonne e capitelli in marmo sulle facciate è però posteriore all'inizio del XIII secolo, successivamente al sacco di Costantinopoli da parte dei crociati nel 1206, quando furono portate in città sia delle spoglie bizantine che alcune loro copie (attualmente molte di queste sono copie neoclassiche). Di questo stesso periodo sono anche i capitelli a foglie d'acanto arrotolate del portale maggiore, che formano un certo parallelismo ad esempio coi capitelli del portale di Zábouř, menzionato in alto. (Figg. 4, 5)



Fig. 4 Venezia, San Marco, capitelli nell'incorniciatura del portale centrale. Successivo al 1206.
Foto: Jan Chlábec.



Fig. 5 Zábouř nad Labem, chiesa di San Procopio, capitelli nell'incorniciatura del portale.
Foto: Vlado Bohdan, Fototeca ÚDU AVČR.

In un certo qual modo fuori dall'itinerario principale del pellegrinaggio verso Gerusalemme, venne costruito nello stesso periodo della principale basilica veneziana un altro edificio ispirato all'arte bizantina e di Costantinopoli: sulle montagne a metà strada tra Roma e Napoli fu collocato il monastero principale dell'ordine benedettino, fondazione di San Benedetto e luogo della sua estrema dimora – Montecassino. La ristrutturazione della locale abbazia tra il 1066 e il 1071 durante il periodo in cui era abate Desiderio costituì nel campo edilizio e artistico il più significativo evento a sud di Roma per quei tempi. La basilica di Desiderio “forma materie rebus et arte placens”, così come dichiarava un distico sull'atrio della chiesa una volta terminata, diede un impulso alla costruzione di nuovi edifici monumentali che riutilizzavano consapevolmente materiali antichi oppure ad essi somiglianti, con la consapevolezza del loro riferimento al periodo di Costantino come per esprimere gli sforzi verso una “Renovatio Ecclesiae primitivae formae”.¹⁶

Oggi, a parte qualche frammento, l'opera distrutta è fortunatamente descritta in modo molto dettagliato nella cronaca del monastero per mano di Leone Ostiense, nei versi dell'arcivescovo Alfano (abate di Montecassino prima di Desiderio) e nella “Storia dei Normanni” scritta da Amato di Montecassino.¹⁷ Quando Desiderio, dopo essersi insediato nel marzo 1066, decise di ricostruire dalle fondamenta la basilica di Benedetto, a detta delle cronache si mise in viaggio per Roma, dove scelse una grande quantità di materiali di spoglio in marmo, che fece portare a Montecassino. A Costantinopoli trovò artisti per l'esecuzione dei mosaici dell'abside, dell'arco trionfale del vestibolo e delle pavimentazioni, vi ordinò le porte in bronzo per la chiesa e lo stesso imperatore bizantino gli procurò l'antependium in oro per l'altare principale, tempestato di gemme e di smalti, pittori bizantini realizzarono le icone per la splendida iconostasi. Le testimonianze dei suoi contemporanei riportano come nel 1065 ad Amalfi Desiderio rimase folgorato dalle opere d'arte bizantine.¹⁸ Alla consacrazione della chiesa il 1 ottobre 1071 erano presenti, oltre al papa Alessandro II, decine di vescovi e arcivescovi da tutta Italia, ed esponenti della nobiltà, sia longobarda che normanna.

La basilica a tre navate con tre absidi e transetto era lunga 105 metri, aveva un atrio con porticati a cui si accedeva attraverso una lunga scalinata, i vestiboli della chiesa e gli atri erano coperti da volte a crociera. Eccezionale e affascinante era soprattutto il consapevole sincretismo di stili e di generi applicato qui per la prima volta, quando la *Magistra Latinitas* si mischiava con la *Peritia Graeca*.¹⁹ Proprio per questo la chiesa voluta da Desiderio divenne un incentivo e un impulso per gli edifici che vennero a seguire, voluti da quei committenti per la maggior parte presenti alla solenne consacrazione di Montecassino, sia che si fosse trattato della cattedrale di Salerno (1076-1085), del rinnovamento delle basiliche romane, delle cattedrali dell'Italia settentrionale o delle costruzioni normanne del XII secolo in Sicilia, che dopo Ruggero II era passata in eredità all'imperatore Arrigo VI.²⁰

Non sappiamo chi tra i rappresentanti della gerarchia ecclesiastica o temporale boema visitò la nuova Montecassino immediatamente dopo la conclusione dei lavori. Solo nel settembre del 1191 vi venne seppellito per una pura fatalità il principe boemo Corrado II, deceduto in seguito alla contrazione della peste durante l'assedio di Napoli al fianco dell'imperatore Arrigo VI.²¹ Certamente però Zdík durante la sua visita nella Città Santa nel 1139 si incontrò con gli echi che provenivano da Montecassino presenti nelle basiliche romane da poco ricostruite. Non si trattava chiaramente di una “scopiazzatura” del modello di Montecassino, ma di uno specifico movimento collegato alla riforma gregoriana avviato attorno all'anno 1100, che portò anche a una febbrile attività edilizia. Sorsero botteghe di lapicidi specializzati orientati al lavoro col marmo, chiamati Cosmati; all'inizio lavoravano con i materiali di spoglio originali dell'età antica, successivamente ne facevano delle copie. Le famiglie di questi Cosmati diffusero in seguito fuori Roma per altri due secoli l'arte della lavorazione del marmo, identificata con la dicitura *Magistra Latinitas* o anche *Opus Romanum*.²² La loro tecnica funzionò come modello per altri lapicidi specializzati che operavano non solo nella penisola italiana ma anche al di là delle Alpi e nel secondo quarto del XII secolo anche in Terra Santa, principalmente a Gerusalemme.

In questo luogo a partire dal 1125, dopo la conquista della città da parte dei Crociati, la salita al trono dei re franchi Baldovino I e Baldovino II e il consolidamento della situazione, si sviluppò un'intensa attività edilizia, che continuò anche dopo la morte di Baldovino II (1131) durante il regno di sua figlia Melisenda e di Folco d'Angiò.²³ Per i nostri scopi legati alla figura di Zdík, ci interessa soprattutto la ricostruzione della Basilica del Santo Sepolcro, consacrata nel 1149. Come noto, Zdík soggiornò nel capitolo regolare della città dalla primavera del 1137 alla primavera del 1138, proprio nel periodo in cui si realizzava la ricostruzione. La nuova basilica accorpò i santuari dei luoghi più venerati che prima erano separati: la collina del Golgota, la cripta dove Sant'Elena secondo la tradizione avrebbe ritrovato la vera croce, e la grande rotonda sulla rocca del Santo Sepolcro - l'*Anastasis*, costruita da Costantino IX Monomaco prima del 1163.

Terminata dopo il 1150, la facciata del transetto meridionale della basilica, dove ancora oggi si trova l'ingresso principale a questo complesso, non presenta nessuna decorazione figurativa ma solo ornamentale, limitata a capitelli, modanature, archivolti delle finestre e degli ingressi. Nella loro “eterogeneità stilistica” decorativa però Jaroslav Folda²⁴ ha fatto emergere un progetto iconografico dal chiaro programma: nelle modanature superiori furono inseriti materiali di spoglio romani; per gli archi dei portali centrali i lapicidi utilizzarono resti delle tombe siriane paleocristiane del luogo; i capitelli dei portali e delle finestre soprastanti riprendevano motivi bizantini, compreso quello dei capitelli a foglie d'acanto arrotolate a noi note; nelle incorniciature a ogiva degli ingressi e delle finestre sono state utilizzate particolari forme a cuscinetto una sopra

all'altra, tipiche per l'architettura araba del Medio Oriente; i fregi sopra le finestre con tralci e frutti rimandano alla decorazione romanica floreale dell'Europa occidentale. Questo intero progetto non figurativo andava a completare la parte figurativa (non conservatasi) dei timpani: rimandava all'origine romana della Basilica del Santo Sepolcro nel periodo di Costantino e alle tombe paleocristiane di questo territorio, a una fase bizantina di questa chiesa più antica di un secolo durante il periodo di Costantino IX Monomacho, al passato arabo e al presente europeo della terra dei crociati. Sembrerebbe che queste citazioni fossero comprensibili ai visitatori della basilica di quel tempo, così come a coloro che stabilirono la composizione semantica dei motivi di origine diversa. La facciata fu terminata dopo la partenza del vescovo Zdík, ma che questo tipo di sensibilità a una comunicazione visiva chiaramente orientata a esprimere contenuti di significato nei motivi ornamentali fosse comune nella Gerusalemme di quel tempo, lo dimostra un manoscritto confezionato proprio nello scriptorium del capitolo regolare presso il Santo Sepolcro, dove Zdík trascorse un anno della sua vita. Si tratta di un salterio degli anni '30 del XII secolo appartenente alla regina Melisenda, in cui Folda intravede l'infiltrazione delle stesse iconografie figurative e ornamentali in un unico sistema di significati, non casuale ma consapevolmente concepito dai costruttori e dai loro aiutanti.²⁵

Anche il vescovo Zdík doveva aver percepito intensamente questo tipo di concezione e di utilizzo della ricchezza delle tradizioni culturali e artistiche connesse al più sacro dei luoghi per il mondo cristiano di allora. Non dovremmo sottovalutare il valore dichiarativo della “pura decorazione” nemmeno negli edifici di quel periodo nella nostra zona, soprattutto nei casi in cui Zdík operò come committente, come d'altronde lo dimostra la somiglianza dell'ornamento nelle miniature dei manoscritti di Hildebert coi rilievi di Olomouc. (Figg. 6, 7)



Fig. 6 Frammento dei rilievi del palazzo oppure della chiesa di S. Venceslao a Olomouc.
Foto: Klára Benešová.




Fig. 7 Decorazione del manoscritto dallo scriptorium del vescovo Zdík (*De civitate Dei*, Praga, Biblioteca capitolare A 21/1), 1142-1150.

L'Italia settentrionale costituiva un'altra meta di destinazione non solo dei pellegrini, ma anche delle spedizioni militari guidate da sovrani che venivano accompagnati da diplomatici nobiliari a lui legati e da prelati d'alto rango. I partecipanti alla spedizione dell'imperatore Federico Barbarossa in Italia – il re boemo Vladislao II, suo fratello Děpolt, il vescovo di Praga Daniel con i suoi cappellani, Gervasius, prevosto e cancelliere di Vyšehrad, e il fior fiore della nobiltà, accompagnati dall'esercito, vi passarono in un primo tempo un avventuroso periodo bellico tra il giugno e il settembre del 1158.²⁶

Le truppe, passando attraverso il Tirolo, giunsero a Verona, Brescia e Milano, dopo la cui caduta (in particolare per merito dell'esercito boemo) Vladislao fu pubblicamente incoronato re dall'imperatore. L'incoronazione e la celebrazione per la presa della città, accompagnata da una messa, si svolsero in una splendida tenda regalata all'imperatore dal re inglese. Il re con l'esercito ritornò in patria, mentre il vescovo Daniel rimase al servizio dell'imperatore, impegnandosi principalmente nella risoluzione dello scisma papale. Grazie a Vincenzo, cronista-cappellano e canonico di San Vito che lo aveva accompagnato, sappiamo che il vescovo, oltre a Milano, visitò anche Monza, Modena, Lodi, Cremona, siamo informati che a Bologna fece comprare dei manoscritti, che era a capo della delegazione presso il papa Vittore IV a Roma e che fu uno dei principali protagonisti del sinodo convocato a Pavia.²⁷ Ritornò in Boemia attraverso l'Ungheria solo dopo la Pasqua del 1160. Un'altra spedizione in Italia da parte dei Boemi a sostegno dell'imperatore ebbe luogo a partire dal maggio 1161, quando a Pavia venne convocato il sinodo, alla fine svoltosi a Lodi. A capo dei Boemi questa volta c'era Federico, figlio di Vladislao, e il duca Děpolt. In seguito parteciparono nuovamente alla conquista di Milano, anche se si arrivò alla sua definitiva sottomissione e distruzione solo poco prima della Pasqua del 1162, grazie anche al ripetuto intervento dell'esercito boemo. L'Italia settentrionale pertanto era intimamente nota ai Boemi, sebbene le devastazioni belliche non dimostrino una relazione di rispetto nei confronti delle espressioni artistiche, a meno che non si prendano in considerazione i bottini depredati (in nota candelabro di Milano nel tesoro della cattedrale di San Vito a Praga). D'altro canto le informazioni riguardanti gli acquisti di manoscritti da parte di Daniel confermano che i membri istruiti che partecipavano alle spedizioni in Italia erano ben consapevoli del valore dei tesori culturali e che si sforzavano di acquisirli con ogni mezzo, legalmente o meno. Nei momenti di pace e durante i loro viaggi al di fuori dell'infuriare delle guerre, sicuramente saranno stati affascinati dai nuovi edifici che vi sorsero a partire del XII secolo.

Per quanto riguarda la Lombardia, esisteva in questa regione una lunga tradizione nell'arte edilizia, anche se non così direttamente collegata con l'antichità, come a Roma o a Montecassino, o con Bisanzio, come nel caso di Venezia. Le maestranze specializzate che lavoravano nei cantieri

non solo con la pietra ma anche con altri materiali venivano definiti in questa regione *Maestri Comacini*, molto probabilmente in origine non per la loro provenienza dal Lago di Como, così come si tramanda, ma per il loro lavoro “cum machinis”, che comprendevano numerosi strumenti di ausilio per l'edilizia, comprese le impalcature. Per la prima volta vengono citati con questo nome in due articoli dell'Editto di Rotari del 634 e successivamente nell'Editto di Liutprando (712-744), a cui nel XII secolo vennero aggiunte tabelle con tariffe e doveri - *Memoratorium de mercedibus commacinatorum*.²⁸ Alcuni lapicidi specializzati cominciarono più tardi a lavorare con strumenti che permettevano lavorazioni di estrema precisione sulla pietra, ad esempio la tornitura delle colonne oppure la traforazione delle ricche decorazioni nei capitelli e nelle modanature. A partire dall'ultimo trentennio dell'XI secolo, questi lapicidi si formavano progressivamente nei cantieri dei grandi edifici nominati prima, ovunque fossero richieste riproduzioni di elementi dell'antichità e della sua ricca arte ornamentale.

Oltre a loro in questa zona operavano anche i *Maestri campionesi*, menzionati nella ricostruzione del duomo di Modena avviata nel 1099. Architetto dell'opera fu Lanfranco, capo scultore Wiligelmo, la chiesa completata fu consacrata nel 1184.²⁹ Il duomo di Modena aveva stretti rapporti con Pavia e anche col duomo di Novara, ora distrutto. I *Maestri campionesi* operavano sia nell'Italia settentrionale che al di là delle Alpi, soprattutto nei nuovi cantieri in Renania.

Gli artisti italiani e i tagliapietre specializzati della Lombardia e del sud Italia, così come gli amanuensi e i miniaturisti di qualità, a partire dalla fine dell'XI secolo ricevevano committenze dalla Sicilia fino alla Scandinavia; significativa fu la loro presenza nella ricostruzione della dimora imperiale a Spira.³⁰ Jindřich Zdík poteva aver conosciuto il loro lavoro durante i suoi viaggi oppure poteva essergli stato consigliato di ricorrere ai loro servizi per il completamento della chiesa e per la costruzione della casa capitolare e del palazzo. Nella letteratura sull'argomento, è già constatata la somiglianza dell'aspetto decorativo tipico dei capitelli corinzegianti di Olomouc, a foglie d'acanto, motivi a ovolo, tenie, e foglie di palma voltate, alla decorazione delle finestre poligonali di Spira nella parete orientale della cripta imperiale oppure nelle finestre del braccio meridionale del transetto e del coro orientale.³¹ In Renania d'altronde vengono ricercate anche delle analogie per l'arte miniaturistica di Hildebert.³²

Parallelamente a questo, a Olomouc e nell'ingresso al pronao di Zábouř ritroviamo una serie di motivi e di tratti stilistici che ci rimandano direttamente a Pavia, la quale dopotutto già nel 1857 era stata considerata in relazione con Zábouř da parte dello storico dell'arte ceco Vocel – nello specifico la Basilica di San Michele Maggiore del secondo quarto del XII secolo.³³ In questo edificio, che nella Lombardia del suo periodo funzionò come modello significativo in quanto eretto nel luogo della chiesa in cui venivano incoronati i re longobardi e in cui nel 1155 venne incoronato

anche Federico Barbarossa, ritroviamo i modelli per l'applicazione di decorazioni anticheggianti sui fusti delle colonne del portale di Zábοř, alti abachi in acanto, figure sporgenti (capitelli della cripta di San Michele), motivi zoomorfi e antropomorfi assemblati in fasce consecutive, oltre a composizioni delle forme strutturalmente imprecise e abachi che sopravanzano da un capitello all'altro. Per di più, nel portale settentrionale di questa basilica si trovano capitelli con la figura di una Sirena dai capelli lunghi e con una coda di pesce a due punte, ognuna tenuta in una mano – ovvero lo stesso motivo venuto alla luce durante l'ultimo restauro dello zoccolo alla base di una colonna dell'incorniciatura nel portale meridionale a Zábοř. (Figg. 8, 9) Modello per la Sirena di San Michele era stata una figura identica presente su un capitello del portale maggiore della basilica agostiniana di San Pietro in Ciel d'Oro, altra meta dei pellegrini diretti a Pavia nel XII secolo poiché vicino all'altare principale di questa chiesa conventuale agostiniana fu deposto il corpo dello stesso Sant'Agostino, traslatovi nel VII secolo dal re Liutprando.³⁴

San Michele e San Pietro sono le più significative chiese romaniche conservatesi a Pavia; nel XII secolo però il numero era notevolmente maggiore, come il caso della Cattedrale di Santa Maria del Popolo, oggi distrutta, la quale assieme all'annesso Santo Stefano si trovava fino alla fine del XV secolo nel luogo di un'abitazione odierna.³⁵ I frammenti di queste due chiese collegate (Santa Maria a cinque navate, Santo Stefano a tre) oggi sono conservati nel Castello Visconteo di Pavia. Tra capitelli quelli provenienti dalla fase principale della sua ricostruzione, tra la fine dell'XI e la metà del XII secolo, per noi sono di maggior interesse i capitelli corinzi dei pilastri nelle arcate della navata centrale a Santa Maria del Popolo,³⁶ dove possiamo vedere un'analogia del motivo a gruppi di foglie d'acanto legate da fasce attorcigliate o incise in verticale così come le conosciamo da Olomouc e, in una posizione dislocata – più stilizzata – anche da alcuni capitelli delle arcate celati sotto la muratura barocca nella navata meridionale della chiesa di San Procopio a Zábοř nad Labem. (Figg. 10, 11)

Sia il portale che i resti delle arcate erano considerati fino a poco tempo fa una parte del pronao meridionale aggiunto alla più antica chiesetta romanica dopo la metà del XII secolo. Che il pronao insieme col portale fossero stati composti da elementi scolpiti altrove, si tramandava nella letteratura sull'argomento già da parecchio tempo,³⁷ ciò nonostante la datazione di questo pronao è rimasta associata al periodo del regno di Vladislao II. Prove di un inizio più tardo di questa ricostruzione nella chiesa romanica sono state portate nel 2007 soprattutto da sonde archeologiche che hanno dimostrato come la muratura di base di questo cosiddetto pronao (oggi navata meridionale) gettata in modo trascurato attraversa un luogo di sepoltura del XIII-XVI secolo.³⁸ Ciò significa che durante il XVI secolo per la ricostruzione della più antica chiesetta romanica di Zábοř furono utilizzati resti di una costruzione romanica sconosciuta – più probabilmente il pronao di una



*Fig. 8 Pavia, sirene nel portale maggiore in San Pietro in Ciel d'Oro (1139).
Foto: Klára Benešová.*



*Fig. 9 Zábřeh, sirena sullo zoccolo della colonna del portale (attorno al 1150).
Foto: Vlado Bohdan, Fototeca ÚDU AVČR.*



*Fig. 10 Pavia, Castello Visconteo, capitelli delle arcate nella navata centrale provenienti dalla Basilica di Santa Maria del Popolo.
Foto: Klára Benešová.*



*Fig. 11 Olomouc, Museo dell'Arcidiocesi, capitelli dal cantiere di Zlík a Olomouc.
Foto: Klára Benešová.*

chiesa conventuale o di un edificio di rappresentanza, così come testimoniano i resti delle arcate con capitelli (oggi inglobate nella muratura barocca) e il grande arco d'entrata avente un'incorniciatura strombata con colonne e archivolto fornito di ricche sculture (che oggi serve come portale della chiesa). Tuttavia questo “portale” era in realtà un'apertura ad arcata utilizzata come ingresso; non fu mai un vero e proprio portale con timpano della chiesa, poiché l'arco inferiore del suo archivolto, fornito di una sequenza di figure pienamente plastiche, esclude un eventuale posizionamento del timpano, e lo stesso programma iconografico nelle fasce concentriche dell'archivolto si rivolge a una tematica mondana piuttosto che sacra. In queste fasce concentriche si alternano dal basso verso l'alto, oltre a decorazioni floreali e ornamentali, figure di guerrieri, pastori con bestiame e cani, e cacciatori con la selvaggina catturata. (Fig. 12)

Le figure stilizzate di guerrieri, con elmo o senza, aventi un mantello lungo, uno scudo alto, dimezzato e arrotondato nella parte superiore, e una lancia ricordano le armi e l'abbigliamento dei principi nella rotonda di Znojmo (quelli privi di mantello nobile), i capelli delle figure raccolti in trecce parallele sulla fronte invece ricordano la figura del uomo genuflesso sul rilievo del ponte Giuditta, che fu costruito al più tardi negli anni Sessanta del XII secolo. La fisionomia del suo volto, i capelli e il trattamento scultoreo della testa sono vicine alle teste delle figure nel ciclo di bassorilievi di Wiligelmo (storia di Caino e Abele) nella facciata del duomo di Modena, costruito nel primo decennio del XII secolo.³⁹ Nel caso della tipologia di testa e di capelli, si tratta sicuramente di un “topos” che esisteva lungo tutto il XII secolo; in Boemia si ritrova anche nelle teste degli apostoli a Žitenice (Galleria di Litoměřice). (Fig. 13)



Fig. 12 Zábvoří, chiesa di San Procopio, archivolto del portale/dell'ingresso al pronao, dettaglio.
Foto: Vlado Bohdan, Fototeca ÚDU AVČR.



Fig. 13 Testa di una figura del rilievo dalla torre del ponte Giuditta a Praga 1160-1170.
Foto: Prokop Paul, Fototeca ÚDU AVČR.

L'eterogeneità ricordata più volte della composizione strutturale nella strombatura del portale (arco dell'entrata), con l'inserzione di colonne e delle fasce nell'archivolto percepite in rilievo in modo non strutturale, non deve essere considerata la prova di un'altra epoca di costruzione o di una diversità di provenienza (Francia invece d'Italia), dunque in sufficiente declino già nel XII secolo, ma piuttosto può testimoniare la partecipazione di due differenti lapicidi istruiti. Il congiungimento di quest'arco d'ingresso (oggi portale) alle arcate del pronao, di cui si sono parzialmente conservate le colonne e i capitelli dei suoi fianchi nella parte frontale a sud all'interno della navata e frammenti di colonne e delle aperture delle arcate, a quanto pare provenienti anch'essi dalle parti laterali, è stato molto rovinato dagli interventi successivi e dai trasporti, ciò nonostante è ancora leggibile all'interno delle pareti barocche.⁴⁰

Il principale problema dei “resti romanici” a Zábouří rimane la risoluzione della questione su quando, da chi e perché vi furono trasportati i resti del pronao romanico. Una proposta può essere il periodo successivo al 1553, quando la famiglia Žerotínová ottenne il possesso di Zábouří assieme ad altre proprietà nella regione di Kolín.⁴¹ Entra così anche in gioco l'opinione di Milada Radová, la quale ritiene che i frammenti possano essere stati trasportati ad esempio dal monastero di Opatovice vicino a Pardubice, che stava andando in rovina e successivamente distrutto per costruire il canale Perštejn.⁴²

In questo modo ritorna in gioco anche il rapporto con l'officina di Zdík a Olomouc, sebbene non in modo diretto: siamo al corrente che i Benedettini di Klášterní Hradisko nei pressi di Olomouc furono cacciati dopo la morte dell'abate Bohuslav, allorché il monastero fu affidato ai Premonstratensi. Si ritirarono nel monastero di San Lorenzo a Opatovice, la cui nuova ricostruzione si fa risalire proprio alla data del loro arrivo. Per di più Mysloch (1148-1163), abate del luogo, soggiornò a lungo a Cluny. Dunque la costruzione di un simile pronao nella sua chiesa abbaziale non ci dovrebbe sorprendere, considerando che nella Borgogna del XII secolo questi pronai erano molto frequenti, così come le strombature dei portali.⁴³ La chiesa abbaziale fu terminata nel 1163 e alla sua consacrazione erano presenti il vescovo Daniel e il re Vladislao II col suo seguito.⁴⁴ Se si riuscisse a trovare nel luogo della chiesa scomparsa una prova del carattere monumentale della chiesa abbaziale di Mysloch, alla cui decorazione potevano aver partecipato i lapicidi che precedentemente avevano lavorato per Zdík, questo sarebbe un argomento decisivo a sostegno dell'ipotesi di Milada Radová. Un'indagine petrografica ha stabilito che la pietra con cui fu realizzato il portale è una “marna, simile a quelle della regione di Praga o alle rocce minerali litologiche vicine”,⁴⁵ non si può quindi nemmeno escludere il trasporto dei resti da qualche edificio praghese. In ogni caso la costruzione del pronao romanico nella chiesa protestante (!) di Žerotín a

Záboří nel XVI secolo potrebbe costituire una prova sorprendente del rispettoso rapporto dell'epoca verso i monumenti del passato, una testimonianza del suo peculiare “storicismo”.

La partecipazione di lapicidi specializzati ai cantieri di Zdík e ad altri commissionati dalle più alte gerarchie ecclesiastiche e secolari all'interno della corte di Vladislao II attorno alla metà del XII secolo e anche in seguito dimostra la naturale partecipazione delle Terre boeme di questa epoca alla cosiddetta “rinascita romanica” del XII secolo. La questione se questi lapicidi appartenessero davvero ai *maestri commacini* o *campionesi*, chiamati direttamente dall'Italia settentrionale o dalla Renania, a quanto pare rimane aperta, così come la partecipazione dell'artista esperto della contemporanea architettura francese nel caso del “portale” d'ingresso di Záboří. Che però fossero capaci di lavorare non solo “cum machinis”, ma anche con il compasso lo dimostra il blocco in marna murato nell'incorniciatura del portale di Záboří, su cui furono tracciati dei segni ausiliari alla costruzione.⁴⁶

- ¹ Questo contributo è stato pubblicato in lingua ceca in forma più ampia col titolo “Magistri cum machinis, Maestri commacini nebo Maestri campionesi v českých zemích 12. století?” In: Milada Studničková ed., *Čechy jsou plné kostelů/Boemia plena est ecclesiis*. Volume scritto in onore di PhDr. Anežka Merhautová, DrSc., Praga 2010, p. 228-244.
- ² Una ricapitolazione dei ritrovamenti e degli sforzi progressivi orientati alla loro conservazione, così come una divulgazione dei reperti, è stata compiuta negli anni '80 del XX secolo da Ivo Hlobil, “K vývoji a současnému stavu poznání Přemyslovského paláce v Olomouci” in: *Umění* 32, 1984, pp. 193-205; anche, “Neuzavřená diskuse k přemyslovskému paláci” in: *Umění* 36, 1988, pp. 166-169; anche in: Ivo Hlobil - Milan Togner, *Olomouc*, 1988, pp. 32-39; Jan Bystřický - Vít Dohnal - Ivo Hlobil et al., *Národní kulturní památka Přemyslovský palác v Olomouci*. (Guida della mostra) Olomouc 1988. La sintesi più recente delle ricerche è quella di Leoš Mlčák, “Arcidiecézní muzeum v Olomouci” in: *Zprávy památkové péče* 67, 2007, pp. 185-188.
- ³ Questi frammenti oggi appartengono al Museo regionale di Olomouc, quelli di maggiore qualità sono esposti nel Museo dell'Arcidiocesi presso la Cattedrale di San Venceslao. La più recente catalogazione è di Jana Hrbáčová, *Románské architektonické fragmenty s reliéfní výzdobou* in: Jana Hrbáčová (red.), *Jindřich Zdík (1126-1150). Olomoucký biskup uprostřed Evropy*, pp. 55-77, dove si può trovare la bibliografia finora esistente. Aleš Rozehnal in: *Národní kulturní památka Přemyslovský palác v Olomouci. Katalog expozice*, Pavel Zatloukal (red.), Olomouc 1988, n. di catalogo 48-65.
- ⁴ Anežka Merhautová, “K poslání a datování budovy na severní straně svatováclavské baziliky v Olomouci” in: *Historická Olomouc a její současné problémy* [I], František Novák - Ivo Hlobil (ed.), Praga 1979, pp. 67-70. Oltre che a questo, la datazione per la costruzione del palazzo di Olomouc, collegata al completamento della chiesa di San Venceslao e con l'istituzione in questa chiesa di un capitolo di dodici membri da parte del vescovo Zdík prima del 1141, si appoggia soprattutto al dettagliato lavoro di analisi delle fonti dello scriptorium di Zdík effettuata da Jan Bistřický. (Jan Bistřický, “Studien zum Urkunden; Brief und Handschriftwesen des Bischofs Heinrich Zdík von Olmütz,” *Archiv für Diplomatik, Schriftgeschichte, Siegel, und Wappenkunde* XXVI, 1980, pp. 135-258; anche “Písemnosti a rukopisy Jindřicha Zdíka” in: *Sborník k 850. výročí posvěcení katedrály sv. Václava v Olomouci*, Olomouc 1982; anche, “Historický obzor přemyslovského hradu v Olomouci v raném středověku” in: *Přemyslovský palác Olomouc, Národní kulturní památka*, Olomouc 1988, pp. 17-25. A questo è collegata anche la feconda polemica riguardante il cosiddetto “Orologio di Olomouc: Jan Bistřický, Dedikační obraz olomouckého kolektáře” in *Umění* 24, 1976, pp. 407-416; anche, “Ještě k dedikačnímu obrazu olomouckého kolektáře” in *Umění* 28, 1980, p. 382; anche, “Dvě poznámky k dedikačnímu obrazu olomouckého kolektáře” *Umění* 36, 1988, pp. 289-296 (polemica con A. Merhautová).
- ⁵ L'ultima valutazione in ordine cronologico della personalità del vescovo Jindřich Zdík, compresa la polemica riguardante la datazione del trasferimento della sede vescovile di “Olomouc dalla chiesa di San Pietro alla chiesa di San Venceslao una volta terminata e l'istituzione di un capitolo in loco entro il 1141” in: Josef Žemlička, *Čechy v době knížecí*, Praga 1997, pp. 245-249; anche, “Jindřich Zdík – biskup, diplomat a organizátor” in: *Jindřich Zdík (1126-1150)*. (nota 3), pp. 13-28.
- ⁶ In relazione al restauro del portale negli anni 2002-2003, e soprattutto alle indagini archeologiche, è stato necessario rettificare l'opinione fino ad allora dominante secondo la quale la costruzione dell'ingresso al pronao nella chiesa più antica risaliva già al XII secolo e propendere per una sua composizione in un periodo più recente che riutilizzò elementi romanici. I risultati di queste indagini sono pubblicati in: *Průzkumy památek* XIV, I, 2007, pp. 35-115. Vi ritornerò più avanti. Sull'ingresso al pronao di Zábouř prima dell'indagine archeologica: Klára Benešová, “Zábouř a Olomouc: vandrující umělci, skicáře, kopie, vzorníky a úloha uvědomělých stavebníků” in: Dalibor Prix ed., *Pro arte. Sborník k poctě Ivo Hlobila*, Praga 2002, pp. 51-65.
- ⁷ L'ingente letteratura sulla ricezione dell'età antica nell'ambito della “rinascita romanica” del XII secolo è stata sintetizzata ultimamente ad es. in: Peter Cornelius Claussen, “Magistra Latinitas - Opus Romanum. Aspekte kirchlicher Reform in der Sakralarchitektur und liturgischen Ausstattung in Rom” in: *Canossa 1077. Erschütterung der Welt. Geschichte, Kunst und Kultur am Aufgang der Romanik*. Band I, Essays (hsg. von Christoph Stiegemann und Matthias Wemhoff), Monaco di Baviera 2007, pp. 297-308; Arturo Carlo Quintavalle ed., *Medioevo: il tempo degli Antichi*, Parma/Milano 2006; Jean-Pierre Caillet, “L'antique dans les arts du Moyen Age occidental: survivances et réactualisations” in *Perspective* 2007, 1, pp. 99-128. Nelle Terre boeme, le opere che appartenevano a questo stile, in stretto rapporto con la riforma della Chiesa, furono di più e ovviamente non si limitavano solo a lavori in pietra. Su questo tema più dettagliatamente Jan Bažant, *Umění českého středověku a antika*, Praga 2000.
- ⁸ Questo fu già il suo secondo viaggio a Gerusalemme, se prendiamo in considerazione una citazione del cronista Cosma sul primo viaggio del giovane chierico nel 1123. Cosma in: Josef Emler ed., *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum* II, Praga 1874, pp. 183-184: “... 1123 mense Marti ... Heinricus, qui est Sdic ... Hierosolimam perrexerunt; ex quibus quidam ... interierunt ... et Bertholdus cliens Heinrici filii mei ... moritur.” Václav Novotný, *České dějiny* I. 2, (1034-1197), Praga 1913, p. 589. Secondo Novotný, Zdík effettivamente in quell'occasione intraprese un viaggio fino a Gerusalemme, ma non lo identifica con Jindřich, figlio di Cosma. Su questo tema ultimamente J. Žemlička (nota 5), p. 245.

- ⁹ Novotný (nota 8), pp. 643-647.
- ¹⁰ *Ibidem*, pp. 643-646; più volte sulla vita di Zdík Jan Bistřický, “Historický obzor přemyslovského hradu v Olomouci v raném středověku” in: *Přemyslovský palác*, NKP, Olomouc 1988, pp. 17-25 e anche, “Jindřich Zdík a jeho doba” in: *Sborník k 850. výročí posvěcení katedrály sv. Václava v Olomouci*, Olomouc 1982, pp. 7-19. Oltre che da Novotný, i pellegrinaggi dalla Boemia a Gerusalemme nell’Alto medioevo sono stati nuovamente valutati da J. Žemlička, “Wallfahrten aus Böhmen nach dem Heiligen Land und ihre kulturelle Bedeutung (bis Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts)” in: D. Doležal - H. Kühne (edd.), *Wallfahrten in der europäischen Kultur*, Francoforte 2006 (= Europäische Wallfahrtstudien 1), pp. 37-52.
- ¹¹ Novotný (nota 8) p. 713, nota 3; Miroslav Flodr, “Neznámá autentika Jindřicha Zdíka” in *Časopis Společnosti Přátel Starožitností* 1954, p. 222, allegato n. 1; Bistřický, *Písemnosti* (nota 4), p. 67, allegato n. 1.
- ¹² Sulla percezione estetica durante il XII secolo vedi Mayer Schapiro, “On the Aesthetic Attitude of the Romanesque Art” in: *Art and Thought, Issued in Honour of Dr Ahande K. Coomaraswamy on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, ed. K.B. Iyer, Londra 1947, pp. 140-150 (versione in ceco “O estetickém přístupu v románském umění”, in: M. Schapiro, *Dílo a Styl*, Praga 2006, pp. 53-78).
- ¹³ Sappiamo ad esempio che Vladislao II, di ritorno da una spedizione crociata fallimentare diretta nel 1147 in Palestina, sostò a Costantinopoli, dove venne ricevuto dall’imperatore Manuele I, con cui già precedentemente aveva avviato relazioni diplomatiche. Novotný (nota 8), p. 826.
- ¹⁴ Fulvio Zuliani, “La basilica di San Marco. Il cantiere (1063-1094)” in: *Cantieri medievali*, a cura di Roberto Cassanelli, Milano 1995, pp. 71-84.
- ¹⁵ Lo scritto *Translatio Sancti Nicolai*, composto nel monastero di San Niccolò del Lido all’inizio del XII secolo riporta che San Marco fu costruito “consimili constructione artificiosa” in base al modello di questa basilica bizantina. F. Zuliani (nota 14), p. 71.
- ¹⁶ Maria Andaloro, “Montecassino: memoria di una fabbrica perduta” in: *Cantieri medievali*, (nota 13), p. 51-69; *Desiderio di Montecassino e l’arte della riforma gregoriana*, Faustino Avagliano ed., (Biblioteca della Miscellanea Cassinese I), Montecassino 1997, pp. 189-230.
- ¹⁷ Sull’opera di Alfano vedi N. Acocella, *La decorazione pittorica di Montecassino dalle didascalie di Alfano I (sec.XI.)*, Salerno 1966; per la cronaca del monastero vedi Hartmut Hoffmann ed., *Die Chronik von Montecassino/Chronica Monasterii Casinensis, MGH Scriptores* 34, III, 18, Hannover 1980.
- ¹⁸ *Chronica Monasterii Casinensis* (nota 17), p. 27.
- ¹⁹ M. Andaloro (nota 16), p. 55.
- ²⁰ Nel 1091 Ruggero II conquistò la Sicilia, dopo di lui Arrigo VI ne ereditò il regno. Per questo nella Sicilia del XII secolo ritroviamo influenze provenienti dalla Lombardia accanto a quelle antiche e bizantine (es. Palermo verso il 1140, Monreale 1180-1190.). Oltre a questo ovviamente il ritorno all’antichità nella metà dell’XI secolo si stava sviluppando anche in Toscana nel battistero di Firenze o nel duomo di Pisa.
- ²¹ Novotný, *České dějiny* (nota 8), p. 1122.
- ²² Più volte su questo tema Peter Cornelius Claussen, ultimamente nel catalogo della mostra *Canossa 1077*, in cui si può trovare anche la più recente bibliografia (nota 7), p. 297.
- ²³ Karen Armstrongová, *Jeruzalém*, Praga 1999, pp. 284-287.
- ²⁴ Jaroslav Folda, “Problems in the Iconography of the Art of the Crusaders in the Holy Land 1098-1291 / 1917-1997” in: Colum Hourihane ed., *Image and Belief. Studies in Celebration of the Eightieth Anniversary of the Index of Christian Art*, Princeton 1999, pp. 11-24.
- ²⁵ Salterio della regina Melisenda, London B.L., ms. Egerton 1139. Folda, Problems... (nota 23), p. 16.
- ²⁶ Novotný (nota 8), pp. 880-902. Vincentius (1130?-1167) fu cronista, notaio, cappellano e canonico della chiesa di San Vito presso il Castello di Praga. Come ambasciatore del vescovo praghese soggiornò spesso in Italia, dove acquistò diversi manoscritti. Nel 1158 assieme al re Vladislao II partecipò alla spedizione militare in sostegno dell’imperatore Federico Barbarossa, alla cui corte fu attivo per un certo periodo come diplomatico. Autore della cronaca in latino *Letopis Vincentiův*, comprendente gli anni tra il 1140 e il 1167. /Josef Emler ed, *Fontes Rerum Bohemiarum* II., Praga 1874, pp. 407-461.
- ²⁷ *Ibidem*, pp. 913-915.
- ²⁸ Roberto Greci, “I cantieri: le corporazioni” in: *Arti e storia nel medioevo* (a cura di Giuseppe Sergi e Enrico Castelnuovo), II, Torino, 2003, pp. 69-106. – Marco Lazzati, “I Maestri Comacini tra mito e storia: conoscenze e ipotesi sulle origini delle maestranze dei laghi Lombardi” in: *La Valle Intelvi*, 8, 2003, pp. 155-176. Glossario, in: *Cantieri medievali* (nota 13), p. 355. Ultimamente su questo tema *I Magistri commacini. Mito e realtà del medioevo lombardo. Atti del XIX Congresso internazionale di studi sull’alto medioevo*, Varese – Como, 23-25 ottobre 2008, T. I-II, Spoleto 2009.
- ²⁹ Anna Segagni Malacart, “L’architettura romanica pavese” in: *Storia di Pavia III, L’arte dal XI al XVI secolo*, Milano 1996, pp. 115-168.
- ³⁰ Recentemente su Spira II e Cluny III Dethard von Winterfeld, “Wettstreit oder historischer Zufall: Cluny III-Speyer II”, in: *Canossa 1077* (nota 7), pp. 343-358.

- ³¹ Ad es. Aleš Rozehnal (nota 3). Mi sono dedicata a questa problematica più dettagliatamente in: Benešová 2002 (nota 5), dove viene riportata anche la bibliografia precedente.
- ³² Un ultimo contributo su questo Pavol Černý, “Iluminované rukopisy Zdíkova scriptoria” in: *Jindřich Zdík (1126-1150)*. (nota 3), pp. 88-147. Vedi anche, “Horologium olomoucké opět po dvaceti letech. Několik poznámek k jeho iluminátorské výzdobě.” In: Marek Perůtka ed., *Historia Artium IV. Sborník k 80. narozeninám prof. PhDr. Rudolfa Chadrabý, CSc. Acta universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis, Facultas Philosophica*, in occasione dell'80esimo compleanno di R. Chadrabý, pp. 87-110. Vedi anche Anton Legner, “Kollektar, sog. Olmützer Horologium”, in: *Ornamenta ecclesiae I, Kunst und Künstler der Romanik*, Colonia 1985, p. 250, voce B 48. Un'altra opinione in Antonín Friedl, *Hildegard a Ewervin. Románští malíři*, Praga 1927; vedi anche, *Moravská knižní malba XI.-XVI. století*. Catalogo della mostra nel Museo d'arte industriale di Brno, Brno 1954-1955, pp. 14-16; vedi anche Benešová 2002 (nota 5), p. 60.
- ³³ Jan E. Wocel, “Farní kostel w Zábouř” in *Časopis českého muzea* 1846, pp. 661-673; vedi anche, “Die romanische Kirchen zu Zábouř und St. Jakob in Böhmen” in *Mitteilungen d.k.k.C.C.* II, 1857, pp. 116-120; pure Jaromír Pečírka in: Zdeněk Wirth ed., *Dějepis výtvarného umění v Čechách I*, Praga 1931, pp. 50-51.
- ³⁴ Sul convento degli Agostiniani K. Benešová, “L'impresa italiana di Giovanni di Lussemburgo: testimonianze d'arte” in: *Medioevo europeo: Giovanni e Carlo di Lussemburgo in Toscana (1331-1369)*. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi Montecarlo, 14 luglio 2002. Lucca, Istituto Storico Lucchese 2002 (Quaderni Lucchesi di Studi sul Medioevo e sul Rinascimento 3, 2002, N. 1-2), pp. 209-225.
- ³⁵ Adriano Peroni, *Musei civici del Castello visconteo*, Bologna 1975, p. 7.
- ³⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 43, fig. n. 195-198.
- ³⁷ Vedi Benešová (nota 7), p. 56. Sul trasporto del pronao a Zábouř nel XVI secolo Milada Radová-Štiková, “Portál v Zábouři nad Labem” in *Průzkumy památek X - 1*, 2003, pp. 47-52.
- ³⁸ Filip Velímský, “Příspěvek k diskusi o charakteru a stáří stavby kostela sv. Prokopa v Zábouři nad Labem”, in *Průzkumy památek XIV, I/2007*, pp. 79-86.
- ³⁹ Augusto Bergamini, *La cattedrale di Modena. Capolavoro del Romanico*, Modena 1992, pp. 46-48. Ma vedi anche ad es. alcune teste di serafini nel portale di Moissac attorno al 1130. Meyer Schapiro, *The Sculpture of Moissac*, Londra 1985, p. 91.
- ⁴⁰ Attualmente il frammento è visibile solo con una sonda nella parete orientale.
- ⁴¹ Petra Načeradská, “Dějiny kostela sv. Prokopa v Zábouři nad Labem na základě písemných pramenů” in: *Průzkumy památek XIV, I*, 2007, pp. 43-62; Jan Žižka, “O kostele sv. Prokopa v Zábouři nad Labem”, *ibidem*, pp. 35-42.
- ⁴² M. Radová-Štiková, Portál v Zábouři nad Labem (nota 37), p. 50.
- ⁴³ Benešová (nota 7), pp. 56-58.
- ⁴⁴ Anály hradištsko-opatovické FRB II (nota 8), pp. 399-400.
- ⁴⁵ Zdeněk Štafen, “Petrologický průzkum portálu v jižním průčelí lodi kostela sv. Prokopa v Zábouři nad Labem” in *Průzkumy památek XIV, I/2007*, pp. 103-112.
- ⁴⁶ A mio avviso, queste precise circonferenze geometriche e le rette furono tracciate sulla superficie dei blocchi già durante la costruzione o la ricostruzione dell'originale architettura romanica.

SANTO STEFANO ROTONDO THROUGH THE GLASSES OF THE RENAISSANCE – AND WITHOUT THEM

BÉLA ZSOLT SZAKÁCS

PÁZMÁNY PÉTER CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY

CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MEDIEVAL STUDIES

Traditionally the original state of the church of Santo Stefano Rotondo in Rome is regarded as a perfectly symmetrical construction without orientation. Such an arrangement is not ideal for a Christian liturgy therefore scholars were debating the origin of this strange architectural idea. Since the Renaissance it has been argued that the church is originally a pagan building from the Antiquity; others regard it as a representative of Late Antique architectural principles. Nevertheless, all these speculations are based on the Renaissance tradition which is manifested in two drawings, attributed to Ps-Cronaca. None of them represents the state visible in the time of the author but contain tendentious modifications in order to present the building as perfectly centralized as it was possible. Thus, our reading of the church is still following the tradition of the Renaissance architects, who were not documenting the reality but searching prototypes for their own architectural ideas. If we try to see the church without the glasses of the Renaissance, we should notice that there are important element (height of the arcades in the east-west axis; decoration of the shafts at the west; larger spaces between the columns of the inner circle in the east-west direction etc.) that point to another direction: the church in reality had a well-articulated axis pointing towards the west where the original sanctuary is supposed to have been.

Santo Stefano Rotondo in Rome, Late Antique architecture, Renaissance architectural drawings

Introduction*

Richard Krautheimer gave his last lecture on Santo Stefano Rotondo in his age of ninety-five. It was published in an expanded and revised form two years later, shortly after the author's death.¹ This article is a summary of his sixty-year research dedicated to the church of Santo Stefano

Rotondo in Rome.² In this last paper the author presented a detailed reconstruction of the original state of the church, mentioning also the debates, an interpretation of the irregular form of the building, and a clear analysis of the related problems. Krautheimer, being always open for opinions different from his own, modified his previous conception on the church and opened new perspectives. However, his basic vision of the late Antique building remained more or less the same, as it was in 1935: he saw it as a perfect centrally planned building, in the same way as the church is regarded since the Renaissance, using for reconstruction some drawings of the 15th and 16th centuries. The aim of this paper is to re-evaluate these drawings from the perspective of the history of the church, and, understanding their original message, to arrive to a viewpoint which is less determined by the architectural theories of the Renaissance.




Fig.1 Ground plan of Santo Stefano Rotondo in Rome (after Gerő, 1940).

Santo Stefano Rotondo: actual state and ideal reconstruction

Santo Stefano Rotondo with its original measurements counts as one of the largest Early Christian churches, such as San Pietro or San Paolo fuori le mura.³ However, its primitive features have been shadowed by later modifications considerably. Before turning to the questions of the reconstruction of the original state, these alterations should be enumerated. Therefore our starting point is necessarily the present church, although in the immense literature it is rarely investigated.⁴

The present building is a double circle with annexes at the north-east side. The inner circle is surrounded by a trabeated colonnade of twenty columns and two piers, supporting a drum. Twenty-two windows served for lighting the drum, fourteen of which have been blocked. A diaphragm wall with three arches, supported by two columns, runs through the inner space of the circle between the piers. The high altar is positioned in the middle of this space, surrounded by an octagonal low chancel wall. There is an ambulatory around the inner circle. Its outer wall is decorated by blind arches (with *oculi* in the upper part of them), flanked by mostly Ionic columns. The arches form groups of five and six, divided by wall-piers. Two of the groups consisting of five arches are considerably higher than all the other groups.

On the north-east side of the ambulatory series of annexes are situated. In the north-east axis (from this point east for the sake of simplicity) the chapel of SS. Primus and Felicianus can be found, with a rounded apse. A sacristy, presently divided into two small compartments, is added to the north side, while a similar room is situated on the south side as well. The chapel, the sacristy, and the third room are covered by a common wooden roof. Further to the south, there is another chapel, dedicated to King St Stephen of Hungary and St Paul the Hermit. The main entrance to the church leads through an entrance hall at the north-east axis. Its main gate is protected by an open porticus, furnished with four columns. On the north side of the church, a monastery complex (presently used as a nunnery) has been built, with an open courtyard and a well. Opposite to the chapel of SS. Primus and Felicianus, another small apse breaks the wall of the ambulatory, furnished with an altar. Two other side altars are situated at the north and south axis of the church, opposite to the piers of the inner circle. None of these rooms are vaulted, with the exception of the entrance hall and the chapel of St Stephen, which are covered by barrel vault with interpenetrations.

In the garden of the nunnery, there is another circular wall around the church. This is lower than the ambulatory and shows many modifications. The outer wall of the ambulatory also presents a rich surface witnessing different alterations.⁵

On the basis of these signs, previous research has pointed out that many elements of the present state is the result of several modifications:

- a) The inner diaphragm wall is not in binding with the drum. The piers holding it incorporate Ionic columns, similar to the others of the inner circle. (Their outer side has been opened.)
- b) The blind arches of the ambulatory were originally real ones, blocked in a later period. There are 14th-century inscriptions on blocked face of some of the columns, which may suggest a later blocking. However, the columns of the north-west sector have been re-opened and re-walled once. According to Krautheimer, this happened in order to rotate these columns in the Renaissance, therefore the original blocking is earlier.⁶ The blocking is dated to the 12th century on the basis of the wall structure by Maria Elisa Avagnina as well.⁷
- c) The small apse of the chapels of SS. Primus and Felicius at the east is secondary because its wall is not in binding with the circular eastern wall of the building. The apse is dated on the basis of its wall structure to the 7th century by Alessandra Guiglia Guidobaldi.⁸
- d) The same is true for the small apse at the west, but the wall structure is similar to that of the ambulatory, thus it may be dated to the 12th century.⁹
- e) The present entrance system is from the Renaissance period, as the portals are from the time of Pope Nicholas V (1450-1454). The open porticus seems to be earlier, and fits well into the period of Pope Innocent II (1130-1143).¹⁰
- f) The original entrance system may have been based on the eight gates of the outer circular wall, many of them blocked (maybe soon after the building was finished).¹¹
- g) The chapel of King St Stephen¹² and the monastery complex are later additions.
- h) Finally, the present liturgical furniture and arrangement is from the Renaissance and Baroque periods.

Realising the secondary position of many of these elements, scholars reconstructed the original state of Santo Stefano Rotondo in the following way:¹³

- an inner circle with 22 columns holding a drum with 22 windows and maybe a kind of a dome,¹⁴
- an ambulatory around it,
- which was open to a second ambulatory,
- this latter was divided into 8 parts,
- four of them are higher and connected to the inner ambulatory by higher arches,
- the four others similarly consists of two parts: an inner part with a vaulting¹⁵ and an outer, narrower part, maybe without vaulting, with 2-2 original entrances.

At this point we have to realise that, although with minor differences, all of the previous reconstructions saw Santo Stefano Rotondo as a perfect symmetrical building. Many of the authors described it as a combination of the circle and the cross, which has no special orientation, and all the four axes are equivalent. Let me quote the most recent evaluations:

"Der Bau, bestimmt durch eine kreisrunde Gestalt und eine axialsymmetrische Auslegung der Räume und Baukörper, besitzt keine Ausrichtung und scheint somit gleichsam in sich zu ruhm." (Hugo Brandenburg, 1998, 10)

"Ein Rundbau ohne Ausrichtung, ohne Presbyterium und ohne Apsis, achsialsymmetrisch ausgelegt, im vollendeten Kreis in sich ruhend" (Hugo Brandenburg in *Santo Stefano Rotondo in Roma* 2000, 35)

In short, Santo Stefano Rotondo appears in the majority of the literature as the perfect centralised building. Certainly, the more perfect the building is, the less suitable for Christian liturgy.¹⁶ Christian worship needs well-defined axially. Altar, priest and people are normally positioned along a longitudinal axis, for which the usual basilical plan is the most appropriate. Santo Stefano Rotondo offers no similar possibility, therefore its unique arrangement, reconstructed as above, needs explanation.




Fig. 2 Reconstruction of the original state by Hugo Brandenburg (1998).

There are basically two types of explanations in the literature: one of them relates the building to late Antique architectural tradition, the other to Christian symbolism. The first is the older and the simpler. Renaissance authors were convinced that the building itself is of pagan origin. Giovanni Rucelai called it in 1449 "tempio d'idoli."¹⁷ More precisely, authors identified the church with the Temple of Faun (e.g. Flavio Biondo 1446, Andrea Fulvio 1527, Bartolomeo Marliano 1534, and many of the early maps of Rome).¹⁸ Other ancient titles connected to Santo Stefano Rotondo are the Temple of Bacchus¹⁹ and *Templum Divi Claudii*.²⁰ Later, its Antique predecessor was identified with the *Macellum Magnum* of Nero (Nardini 1665, D'Agincourt 1826, Canina 1848, Isabelle 1855, Lanciani 1891, Hülsen 1892, etc., latest Wulzinger in 1933).²¹ A further opinion saw the imperial *cenatio* in the building (Lugli 1931). All these speculations were rebutted by the excavations of Carlo Ceschi, proving that Santo Stefano Rotondo is an entirely new building from the fifth century, built over Roman ruins of totally different shape.²²

If the church is not an ancient Roman edifice in itself, it may mirror the influence of such buildings. This was the explanation of Krautheimer in the 1970s, referring to late Antique imperial palaces, criticised by more recent scholarship.²³ Another such source could be the Greek architecture, an influence which seems to be understandable under the emperor Anthemius of Greek origin.²⁴ Krautheimer, in his last study, built further this theory, pointing to the nostalgic imperial representation of Anthemius, and a fashionable neo-paganism as its spiritual background. As a concrete solution, he proposed an identification with a magnificent, never-finished *salutatorium*, which was later transformed to be Santo Stefano Rotondo.²⁵ In this latter hypothesis, the symbolic character of the building is explained by a late Antique cosmological theory. On the contrary, Brandenburg saw no symbolic meaning in the central form of the church, but connects it to the imperial tradition of Constantine (e.g. the cathedral of Antioch).²⁶

On the other hand, peculiarities of Santo Stefano Rotondo were explained from the beginning by Christian concepts, too. One type of these explanations operates with the commemorative function of many Early Christian centralised buildings, seeing in Santo Stefano Rotondo a kind of a mausoleum²⁷ or martyrrium.²⁸ More precisely, Wulff and more elaborately Krautheimer connected Santo Stefano Rotondo to the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem.²⁹ Other, less scholarly argumentation saw the church as an imitation of the Heavenly Jerusalem of the Apocalypse.³⁰

Finishing this brief overview of the most important interpretations of Santo Stefano Rotondo, one should realise that all of them are based on the ideal reconstruction of the church. In what follows, we have to examine the origin of this idea and the consequences of this historical investigation.

The origin of the ideal reconstruction: Renaissance drawings related to the church

The first reconstruction of Santo Stefano Rotondo as a perfectly centralised building is a drawing kept in the Uffizi (2059 A r).³¹ This is a ground plan and it is almost identical with the modern reconstructions, although it is not later than the early Cinquecento. This drawing is related to a larger group of the same master. In the same group there is another representation of the church, depicting its interior in a visionary way (U 161 Sant. r).³² Both of them are among the most influential representations of the building: the first is followed by most of the ground plan reconstructions, the second became the prototype of the usual interior representations, followed even by the postcards of our days.³³

Dating and attribution of these drawings are highly debated in the literature of the last hundred years. U 2059 A was first connected with some uncertainty to the oeuvre of Jacopo Sansovino by Ferri in 1885, accepted in the fourth volume of the catalogue of Bartoli (1919) but rejected by the same author in his sixth volume (1922).³⁴ Still, Sansovino remained the supposed master for Krautheimer as well as for Ceschi, although with different dating: 1550-60 respectively 1518-27.³⁵ The radical turning in the history of the evaluation of this representation was based on the recognition of the identity of the handwriting on this drawing and pieces from the so-called Ps-Cronaca group.³⁶ As far as I know, the first identification of the masters of these drawings with each other can be found in the article of Ch. L. Frommel from 1987.³⁷ From this point, the dating and attribution of the ground plan is strongly connected to those of the interior.

This latter drawing (U 161 Sant. r) was attributed to Cronaca in 1890 by Ferri, followed by Bartoli and the majority of the literature.³⁸ However, some of the authors doubted this since the middle of the 20th century.³⁹ Instead, the unknown master was connected to different territories and circles, as Lombardy,⁴⁰ Tuscany,⁴¹ the Raffaello circle,⁴² Siena,⁴³ or Florence.⁴⁴ At the same time, the dating of the drawing oscillated between the early 15th century and 1520.⁴⁵ The most recent attribution has been developed by Frommel, who identified the master of this and some other drawings with the young Baldassare Peruzzi of the years of 1503-04.⁴⁶ However, basic differences in handwriting,⁴⁷ style⁴⁸ and quality make the attribution questionable. Therefore it seems to be more advisable keeping a phantom name (Ps-Cronaca) as far as further proofs do not appear.⁴⁹

Although attribution and dating of these drawings are significant questions in themselves, for the purposes of this article it is enough to state, that both of them were drawn by a master of probably Tuscan origin around 1500 or somewhat earlier.⁵⁰ More advantageous could be a detailed analysis of the representation, which has never been done so far.

The ground plan (U 2079 A r) is a drawing on a sheet of paper of ca. 292 × 224 mm. No watermark can be observed. The master used stylus, straightedge, and compass preparing the drawing, and finalised it in brown ink and light brown wash. A peculiarity of the drawing is a scale at the bottom of the page. Although there is no indication of its meaning, it seems to represent five times ten *braccia*.⁵¹ The main measurements, inscribed in *braccio romano*, are more or less precise.⁵² However, the proportions of the inner ambulatory are erroneous, as it is too thick, comparing it to other details. Although according to the inscription its width should be 16 *braccia* (9.33 m), it was drawn as it were 7.5 *braccia* (4.38 m, measuring with the help of the scale). This mistake could be explained in the following way: although the measurements were correct, the master misunderstood them, and he calculated the 16 *braccia* for the inner ambulatory plus the inner part of the diagonal sectors (which are together ca. 16 *braccia* on the drawing, counting with the master's scale). Therefore the overall diameter of the whole structure is ca. 88 *braccia* (measured with the help of the given scale), identical with 51.35 m, which is considerably less than the real value of ca. 66 m.⁵³

Another inaccuracy of the master is that he indicated a column of the inner circle opposite to the apse, but omitted the piers of the north-south axis, which is just the contrary of the reality. Moreover, he registered only the two entrances of the north-west sector, neglecting all the others, including that of the north-east sector, still in use.

There is no inscription which would identify the plan with Santo Stefano Rotondo, nor an explanation if it represents the contemporary reality or it is a reconstruction of an earlier structure. What is more, the inscriptions of the (most probably west) chapel ("questo ene quadro") and the north-west section ("questi vani grandi sono involtti") indicate as they were still standing parts of the building. Regarding the accepted dating, the drawing is later than all the modifications of the 12th and mid-15th centuries, thus it is certainly a reconstruction. However, the master obviously could not carry out excavations, although he could see more than the visitor (or even the archaeologist) of today.⁵⁴ Still, as the church was reduced to its present form more than 300 years before the drawing was completed, the original arrangement could not be easily understandable, as other contemporary ground plans and reconstructions demonstrate it (see below). This reconstruction, be as accurate as it seems to be, is a product of a Renaissance artist, and it cannot be regarded as the result of a pure archaeological investigation but it was evidently influenced by scholarly and aesthetic speculation.

A good counterpart of this ground plan is another drawing of the same master, representing the interior of the church (U 161 Sant. r). However, the ground plan is a reconstruction, while the interior drawing depicts the contemporary state of the building, i.e. the reduced structure. The sheet

of paper is ca. 236×340 mm. The artist used first stylus and straightedge; at this point the columns were longer and the arrangement of the windows was different. Then he draw the main lines with brown ink, and marked the shadows similarly. He finished the drawing with brown wash, but later he corrected it with black ink (especially redrawing the pilasters and cornice of the drum⁵⁵). Measurements and inscriptions are also in black ink. As a title of the drawing, an inscription appears in the top of it: "Santto stefano rittondo."⁵⁶ There are two longer inscriptions indicating the height of the column (12 *braccia* = 7 m) and the drum (40 *braccia* = 23.34 m), and thirteen others related to the distance of the columns (4.5 *braccia* = 2.63 m), measurements of the cornice and the windows. Measurements indicated in the ground plan are not repeated.⁵⁷

The drawing seems to be quite accurate in general, especially if we find the original viewpoint. The horizon is almost parallel to the diaphragm arches of the inner circle, so the position of the artist was either at the west or the east part of the building. Opposite to it there is a large black whole which extends to at least two arches of the ambulatory. This could be the chapel of SS. Primus and Felicianus at the east, because the width of the western apse is only one arch. Thus the artist stood, or rather sat, at the western apse. As the viewpoint of the drawing is not absolutely symmetrical, he moved slightly to the right. I think, he sat before the southern column of the western apse.

If we compare the drawing to the present view from this point, not too many differences can be found. The position of the columns and their relation to each other seem to be correct in the drawing.⁵⁸ The arrangement, shape and blocking of the windows are more or less acceptable, although the drawing represents somewhat more than the present view.⁵⁹ The basic difference is the cornice and pilasters of the drum, which may reflect a structure which has been destroyed since then. Another important information is the arrangement of the altars (the high altar in the middle, side altars on the right and left; the low chancel wall, being later, is missing). A less important difference is linked to the diaphragm arches. The piers, partly hidden by columns, seem to be free-standing structures, not included into the row of columns. Thus the spectator may have the impression as if there were five arches. However, this is only because the inner half of the piers is drawn too long, longer than the other half of them, which fits well into the row of the columns (especially on the left).⁶⁰ A more serious error is the monotony of the arches of the ambulatory, although, as it has been mentioned above, these arches are not of the same height.⁶¹ Moreover, the piers dividing the row of columns into sectors are omitted totally in the drawing.

Some of the differences are certainly due to the difficulties of a perspective view of a circular interior (the nearest beams of the ambulatory are parallel to the horizon although they should have point to the corners; the inner circle is positioned into the inner half of the ambulatory

not in the centre, etc.). At this point, the rarity of this kind of drawings should be mentioned. This type, a perspective interior, is missing from the architectural drawings before Bramante.⁶² It was Bramante who utilised perspective interior in reality (e.g. S. Satiro in Milan) and in architectural drawing (cf. the etching of Prevedari representing the interior of a *Tempio*, 1481⁶³). This lack of interest in the interior among architectural drawings goes back to Alberti, who excluded the perspective view from such drawings, and incorporated it to the painters' genres.⁶⁴ Among the first examples of perspective interiors, a drawing connected to Filarete should be mentioned.⁶⁵ The House of Virtues, represented in the Florentine copy of his *Trattato*, is surprisingly similar to the arrangement of Santo Stefano Rotondo,⁶⁶ and this representation (or a similar one) may have been influential to the master of U 161 Sant. r, either. A basic difference is that Filarete's plan is a section, as well as other drawings of Francesco di Giorgio, Leonardo, and Bramante,⁶⁷ while the representation of Santo Stefano Rotondo is a pure interior drawing.⁶⁸ The best parallel to it is a drawing of the Pantheon, previously attributed to Raphael (U 164 A r), ca. 1506-07,⁶⁹ but our representation is earlier.

Thus, the significance of U 161 Sant. r is remarkable in the history of interior drawings. However, the latter parallel is meaningful from the point of view of the intentions of our drawing. Despite of its relation to a ground plan and the many measurements inscribed in it, it is not purely an architectural drawing but something more: a vision of an ideal centralised building. The same intention as that of the ground plan: visualizing a perfect centrally planned church from the Antiquity. The mistakes, although small in number and insignificant for the first sight, are tendentious. Positioning a column in the main axis (as U 2079 A did) and representing the arches of the ambulatory monotonously (as in U 161 Sant.) point to the same direction. The master did not pay attention to the signs which would contradict the ideal concept of the centralised building.

In order to understand the real purposes of this artist, his other drawings should be analyzed briefly.⁷⁰ Among the 35 drawings attributed to him, there are (1) representations of architectural and sculptural details (cornices, sarcophagi, obelisks etc.); (2) there are ground plans and facades of special buildings; (3) views of important edifices (Pantheon) and architectural complexes (the Palatine from the Circus Maximus); (4) and a series of fantastic reconstructions of Roman buildings.⁷¹ All of them are related to the monuments of the Antiquity, and their purpose is evidently to revitalise these buildings. The drawings related to Santo Stefano Rotondo seem to belong to the second group; but a close analysis proved that they rather belong to the third group, and their intention is not independent from the last group. They represent and partly reconstruct a very respectable monument of the Antiquity, which could serve as a prototype for the architectural plans of the Renaissance.

This intention is better understandable if we turn to some other Renaissance drawings related to Santo Stefano Rotondo. The earliest of this group is a sketch of Francesco di Giorgio from the years of 1470-80s (U 330 A v).⁷² This consists of a ground plan and a section with inscriptions and measurements.⁷³ The ground plan is a simplified drawing consisting of three circles, all of them with columns. The innermost circle is based on 22 columns and the middle one on 44 columns; numbers are correct if we include also the piers.⁷⁴ The measurements are in *piede romano*, and seem to be somewhat smaller than the real values.⁷⁵ The drawing marks two entrances, opposite to each other; the left one is connected to a kind of entrance hall.⁷⁶ At the bottom of the ground plan maybe a third entrance is signed, and the wall is open between three columns at the top of it, as well. The section represents the half of the church, with some details of the drum (windows with lines below and over them), the inner and the outer ambulatory (both of them covered by barrel vaults), and the columns and cornices (the inner circle is represented with Ionic columns and architrave correctly; the second circle is drawn with open arches, while the third one consists of blocked arches with oculi). In general, the drawings of Francesco di Giorgio, although of great value, should be utilised with great care. They are evidently fast sketches without smaller details, which is normal. However, they also omit later additions (diaphragm arches, apses), and at other points over-reconstruct the original structure (especially the section). The result is a circular building with no axiality, one of those centrally planned Roman buildings, which could serve as a model for a Renaissance architect. It is not by chance, that on the other side of the sheet the centralised edifice of the mausoleum of Romulus can be found.

Another drawing related to Francesco di Giorgio points to the same direction. This is from the Torino copy of his Trattato.⁷⁷ It is situated in the top right corner of a sheet, consisting of three exteriors and one interior of centralised buildings from the Roman Antiquity. Santo Stefano Rotondo is represented from the exterior, with an ambulatory open with arches. The inner circle is closed by a wall, decorated by pilasters and architrave, and broken by entrances. There is a tambour over this structure with windows and pilasters; the drum is covered by a dome. This drawing, which is the opposite of the real structure of the church (closed ambulatory with an open inner circle), could be understood with the help of the inscription above it. This states that the original structure is ruined and criticises the restoration of Pope Nicholas V. Thus, the exterior drawing is a free reconstruction of the original Late Antique edifice, imagined as a pagan temple with a cell and peripteros, as a Renaissance architect could expect it.⁷⁸

Francesco di Giorgio was not the only artist who enjoyed some freedom dealing with such reconstruction problems. Two further drawings should be mentioned which reflect the same intention. Both of them are ground plans from architectural sketch books from the early

Cinquecento. One of them,⁷⁹ previously attributed to Bramantino but more recently to an anonymous Lombard,⁸⁰ represents a circular building with the high altar in the centre, 20 columns around it (instead of the correct number of 22), an ambulatory with 36 columns (this number is correct if piers are excluded but the columns, destroyed by the Renaissance entrance, are counted), and four entrances in the main axes (never existed). The reconstruction seems to be quite far from the reality, and may reflect the conjecture of an artist who possibly had not seen the building himself.

The other ground plan can be found in the Taccuino Senese of Giuliano da Sangallo.⁸¹ The drawing, bearing the inscription "So. Issefano Ritondo i[n] Roma,"⁸² represents a circular building with 22 columns in the inner circle.⁸³ That is all which connects it to the real church, all the other features derive from other buildings: its narthex with two exedrae at the ends, the niches in the wall of the ambulatory, the round staircases in the corner between the narthex and the ambulatory. These features may come from Sta Costanza, which really owns a similar narthex, and which is really equipped by niches in the ambulatory. Certainly, the central circle of Sta Costanza consists of 12 double columns, its niches are smaller in number, and there is only one staircase at the entrance. Interestingly enough, there is a contemporary ground plan of the mausoleum in the Codice Coner, with 16 double columns in the middle, two staircases at the entrance, and the niches are as emphasised as in the case of Sangallo's drawing.⁸⁴ Thus, the ground plan can be regarded as a contamination of the two.⁸⁵ No direct connection between the artist and Santo Stefano Rotondo is known, and it is quite probable, that Sangallo utilised an earlier source for this drawing.⁸⁶ Therefore the drawing's documentary value is not too high, but this was not the purpose of it. In the ground plan of Sangallo, called Santo Stefano Rotondo but it could have been also entitled Sta Costanza, we can find a typical representation of an archetype of centralised Roman buildings. The Taccuino Senese of Sangallo is not a tourist's photo-album, but a sketchbook with future plans together with ground plans of existing buildings to be followed. The recreated ground plan of Santo Stefano Rotondo is nothing else than a remarkable architectural idea of a great Renaissance artist.

Comparing all these Renaissance drawings, one could doubt if they really represent the same building. Certainly, less fantastic representations of Santo Stefano Rotondo also exist from the same period, as one from the Kasseler Codex,⁸⁷ or another one from the Palladio workshop.⁸⁸ The drawings of Ps-Cronaca are closer to these representations. However, it would be misleading to separate "faithful" and "fantasy" representations. Actually, they are all reconstructions, and all modify more or less the reality. Renaissance architects were not interested too much in the actual state of the church. They saw Santo Stefano Rotondo as a valuable vestige of Roman Antiquity, most generally the remnants of the Temple of Faun. That is, why it is depicted in many early maps

of Rome (as on the map of Alessandro Strozzi from 1474⁸⁹). All the above mentioned drawings form part of larger collections of representations of Roman edifices.⁹⁰ Santo Stefano Rotondo served only as a starting point for artistic creations of Renaissance architects, partly as an antiquarian investigation, partly as the first step towards their own architectural plans. If they overemphasised the centralised character of the church, they did it because they regarded it as a source of inspiration for their own circular buildings.

It is needless to demonstrate how important a role the centrally planned churches played in High Renaissance architecture.⁹¹ Francesco di Giorgio, author of the earliest drawings related to Santo Stefano Rotondo, writing about the principal forms of churches stated that "the first and most perfect one is the circular church."⁹² Even earlier, the circular building was the most perfect type of churches in the theory of Alberti.⁹³ If we compare Santo Stefano Rotondo with the list of his requirements for the ideal church, we find surprising similarities: this is round; a portico is added to its facade; it was (although only partially and previously) vaulted; it has columns with entablature; it is white; the windows are high therefore one can see nothing but the sky.⁹⁴ Thus, Santo Stefano Rotondo should be considered as one of the most perfect churches according to Alberti's theory. It is quite probable that Pope Nicholas V selected for restoration this church on the advice of the architect, including it into the list of the seven most important churches of Rome.⁹⁵ The restoration works were carried out by Bernardo Rossellino, one of the closest followers of Alberti, in the years 1453-54.⁹⁶

Rosellino's work can be followed most easily after the papal accounts.⁹⁷ At the first glance these documents do not testify an extraordinarily ambitious plan. They speak about pavements, windows, doors, and altars; there is no mention of building or destroying entire rooms, walls, or vaults. A visit would affirm this impression: what is Renaissance in the church (and does not belong to later modifications) are basically door and window frames. The Pope, to avoid unnecessary costs, did not rebuild the church entirely, but only modernised it by decorating the openings. If we read the inscription on the double door, the term "ex integro instauravit" seems to be somewhat exaggerated.⁹⁸

However, with its simple and economical tools, the restoration changed profoundly the structure of Santo Stefano Rotondo. First, Rossellino focused on the entrance of the church. He kept the original system, but added two magnificent doors, and vaulted the entrance hall. Thus, as Frommel pointed out, the first Renaissance space in Rome had been created.⁹⁹ Moreover, the eastern part of the church was fundamentally reorganised. Previously, the only surviving cross arm of the Early Christian building was accompanied only on the north side by the entrance hall since the 12th century. Rossellino built a counterpart of it on the south side, the later chapel of SS.

Stephen of Hungary and Paul the Hermit.¹⁰⁰ Symmetry became a characteristic element of the sanctuary zone.

However, the most fundamental modification was related to the system of the altars. We do not know exactly the arrangement of Early Christian and medieval altars of the church (we have to come back to this question later). Certainly, an altar stood in the chapel of SS. Primus and Felicianus at the east and another one in the western apse. Rossellino positioned the high altar in the middle of the inner circle, and added at least two other altars to the existing ones, one on the north, and one on the south. Consequently the system of the altars formed from this time a cross, replacing the previously dominating east-west axis. Santo Stefano Rotondo became a truly centralised church through the restoration of Rossellino – the first really centralised church of the Renaissance.¹⁰¹

Renaissance artists found in Santo Stefano Rotondo ideal raw material for their own architectural ideas. They probably did not modify its image intentionally; they simply saw it in their own way. Thus, when they restored or depicted the church, they automatically corrected all the features deviating from the idea of the perfectly centralised building, determining the centralised character of the church for the future, by the restoration, and for the past, by the ideal reconstruction drawings.

Aspects of a non-conventional interpretation of the church

So far we have seen that the majority of the modern reconstructions of Santo Stefano Rotondo defined it as a perfectly symmetrical church without any orientation. The origin of this concept was detected in some of the Renaissance representations of the church. As the intention of Renaissance architects was not a precise documentation but finding a source of inspiration in Santo Stefano Rotondo, their testimony cannot be followed automatically. A new reconstruction should take into consideration this fact. At this point, it is not possible to present an entirely different reconstruction; this should be based on a much more detailed archaeological investigation. In the following, only some aspects of a non-conventional interpretation can be mentioned which could serve as a starting point for further research.

Naturally, many of these aspects have been mentioned by previous authors. The detailed description of the *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae* enumerated almost all of them, but did not draw a lesson from them. Ceschi differentiated the primary and secondary axes of the church.¹⁰² Frommel clearly described the three levels of hierarchy in the outer circle (normal Ionic capitals, simple Corinthian capitals, and more decorated Corinthian capitals with canelures).¹⁰³ The liturgical importance of the western part of the church was emphasized by Davis-Weyer and

Krautheimer,¹⁰⁴ to name only a few classics. All these observations call the attention to the asymmetrical character of the church, but its significance was underestimated up to now.

Turning to the details, first the outer colonnade of the ambulatory should be analyzed. It is usually noted that, contrary to the interior representation by Ps-Cronaca, it is not uniform: there are piers between the columns and the arches are not the same height. On the other hand, most of the reconstruction drawings, from Dehio – Bezold to Corbett,¹⁰⁵ represents the arches of the four axes constantly higher than the diagonal arches between them. On the contrary, the five arches at the east and the west are considerably higher than those at the north and the south. The latter arches seem to fit into the row of the others.¹⁰⁶

Not only the heights of these arches make the east and west sectors especially distinguished. Their capitals are Corinthian in contrast to all the others which are invariably Ionic. The marble impost blocks above the capitals are decorated by crosses here only. Moreover, the columns and capitals of the east and west cross arm are different: at the west, the leaves of the capitals are decorated and the marble columns bear fluting; at the east, the gray granite columns have no fluting and the foliage of the capitals is without serration.¹⁰⁷

The inner colonnade consists of 22 columns. This number is very odd for a centralised building, being unable to offer perfect symmetrical view.¹⁰⁸ A pair of columns is necessarily in one of the main axes: in Santo Stefano Rotondo it is in the north-south axis.¹⁰⁹ In addition, the distance of the columns is not identical in the central circle: it is usually 2.40-2.60 m, while in the main axis it rises to ca. 2.80 m.¹¹⁰

The archaeological investigations of Ceschi revealed a *schola cantorum* in the inner circle.¹¹¹ According to the archaeologist, it belongs to a later furnishing of the church, however, Krautheimer and Brandenburg argued convincingly that it is a more or less a structure contemporary with the church.¹¹² This type of chancel arrangements with a long solea and the wing walls can be found in Rome between the 4th and 6th centuries. This structure in Santo Stefano Rotondo is oriented towards the west, thus the high altar should be searched for that direction.

Archaeological have confirmed this presumption. Ceschi brought to light a marble slab, which has been vertically inserted into the original floor in the western sector of the ambulatory. Not far from this point, the imprint of a heavy cruciform object was dug out. According to Davis-Weyres, these discoveries indicate the presence of liturgical furnishing at the western part of the church.¹¹³

If we turn to the fragments of the third wall-circle, its western part seems to be also remarkable. As Krautheimer pointed out, there is a small niche (1 m wide, 1.8 m high and 0.20 m deep) in the wall just in the east-west axis.¹¹⁴ Although it is evidently secondary, it may reflect the

original, or in any case the medieval usage of the church, before it was reduced to its present form in the 12th century. Its original function is not clear, but its position suggests that it belonged to the liturgical furnishing and we cannot exclude that it served as the place of a bishop's throne.¹¹⁵

Finally, the entrance system should be investigated. The original entrance system is quite obscure, although six of the originally eight doors are observable. All the six have been blocked, but not at the same time. The wall structure of many of these blockings suggests that they have been closed at an early date, probably the majority of them may never have been used at all. The eastern door of the south-east sector, having been blocked much later, is an exception and the pair of it, the eastern door of the north-east sector is in use as the main entrance of the church continuously at least from the 12th century, when the porticus was built.¹¹⁶

Thus, the church could be entered from the early times from one of the eastern doors, arriving to a corridor, which led to the eastern cross arm. This was turned to a chapel in the 7th century by Pope Theodore I,¹¹⁷ but surely was not the liturgical focus point of the church before the 12th century. The visitor could follow the east-west axis from the east cross arm through the large arches of it to the ambulatory. Then the relatively larger distance of the columns of the inner circle opened a view through the solea in the centre of the church towards the west cross arm, decorated with the most splendid marble columns of the church, and ending in the niche of the bishop's throne. Although the north-south axis of the church was also distinguished by some special features,¹¹⁸ its significance was incomparably lower than that of the other axis. In short, the original arrangement of Santo Stefano Rotondo was far from to be a perfectly symmetrical structure but it was planned with a well-defined orientation in the direction of east and west.

This observation can be an answer, at least partially, to the problem of the liturgical usage *contra* centralised arrangement of the church. The efforts of Ceschi, interpreting the different parts of the church as those of a basilica seems to be unprofitable. He connected the outer corridors of the diagonal sectors of Santo Stefano Rotondo to the porticus of an Early Christian basilica; the inner parts of these sectors to an open courtyard of an atrium; the cross arms to the atrium; the ambulatory to the aisle and the inner circle to the nave of a basilica.¹¹⁹ In the final publication of Ceschi the entire chapter dealing with the original structure of the rotunda is entitled as "La basilica."

As a logical consequence of this interpretation, Ceschi supposed that the high altar stood originally in the middle of the church.¹²⁰ In this question he followed the opinion of Engelbert Kirschbaum.¹²¹ However, this assumption is implausible, because of the *schola cantorum*. This and many other signs pointed to the western part of the building, as an original liturgical focus point of the church. Krautheimer in his last article summarized the possibilities in the following way: "The original altar then may have stood in that very end sector of the nave [= the inner circle]; unless it

was placed further southwest in the ambulatory or even in the southwest [= west] cross arm."¹²² Frommel and Davis-Weyres choose the west cross arm as the presbytery of Santo Stefano Rotondo.¹²³ Brandenburg preferred the western part of the inner circle, near to the wings of the solea.¹²⁴ In any case, the high altar was not positioned originally in the geometrical centre of the church. This latter arrangement can be dated only to as late as the 15th century.

The position of the high altar in centralised churches was a debated question in the Renaissance.¹²⁵ A clear reflection to these polemics can be found in the writings of Francesco di Giorgio.¹²⁶ Dealing with the type of the circular church, which is the most perfect form,¹²⁷ he discusses two solutions of the position of the high altar: either in the centre, or at the perimeter opposite to the main entrance. He enumerates arguments on both sides without deciding between them. The reasoning on the side of the excentric position is based on liturgical practice, while the arguments in favour of the central position are more abstract (theological and geometrical). Serlio, a generation later, also argues in favour of the centralised churches, of which the circular one is the first, as "the circular plan is the most perfect."¹²⁸ For such a church, the author prefers a high altar in the centre, although he accepts also the opposite solution. Thus, Renaissance architects seemingly favoured the centrally placed high altar in centralised churches, even this practice was rarely followed. This may be due to the rejection of the ecclesiastical authorities, partially because of ideological, partially practical reasons. As early as 1471, it was mentioned in the debate on the *tribuna* of SS. Annunziata in Florence that the origin of its form is pagan (Giovanni Aldobrandini), and liturgically inconvenient for a large convent (Giovanni di Gayole); in this respect they followed the late Brunelleschi.¹²⁹ Hence, it would be hazardous to state that the central position of the high altar is a typical Renaissance solution. Still, this was preferred by many architects of this period, and Berdardino Rossellino stood on their side.

The importance of his modifications has been described above. Santo Stefano Rotondo became a truly symmetrical, centralised church only at that time, and this aspect is predominant since then in artistic representation as well as scholarly literature: we see Santo Stefano Rotondo still through the glasses of the Renaissance. This view served as a starting point for archaeologists and art historians analysing the typology of the building. Most recently, Hugo Brandenburg dedicated an entire book to this question, demonstrating, how the basic characteristics of the church can be connected to the circular and cruciform buildings of the Antiquity.¹³⁰ Since the studies of Wulff and Krautheimer the relationship between Santo Stefano Rotondo and the Anastasis rotunda in Jerusalem has been known.¹³¹ Brandenburg emphasised the importance of the Constantinian cathedral of Antioch as well.¹³² As a monumental and still standing parallel, the church of San Lorenzo in Milan can be also mentioned.¹³³ However, it should be stressed that none of the


mentioned churches met with the idea of the perfectly centralised building. The system of the rounded apses, surrounding the church of the Holy Sepulchre from three directions, was not complete before the 11th century, lacking the fourth apse until that time. The apses themselves were not positioned in the axes of the piers of the inner circle.¹³⁴ The symmetry of San Lorenzo is also not perfect because of the entrance hall. According to the observations listed above, Santo Stefano Rotondo was not an exception either. Its unquestionably centralised basic character is penetrated by the irregularity of its well-notable east-west orientation.

The same is true of later churches related to Santo Stefano Rotondo. The church of S. Michele Archangelo in Perugia is indeed a good parallel to the Roman building in many respects (its plan consists of an inner circle of twenty columns, an ambulatory, and four, partially rectangular radial chapels).¹³⁵ However, its rounded eastern apse is different from the other annexes, thus determining the fundamental orientation of the church. It is well questionable if the similarly centrally planned medieval churches provided by radial chapels could be related to Santo Stefano Rotondo¹³⁶ or they rather reflect the direct or indirect influence of the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem.¹³⁷ The liturgical usage of these churches is also problematic, which has unfortunately not been sufficiently studied. However, it seems to be a general rule that the main altar was placed at the eastern part of the church or, at least, the building was clearly oriented to the east.¹³⁸ The idea of the perfectly centralised church was not followed in the Middle Ages neither in the West, nor in the East. Despite the presence of the centralised form in Byzantium from the early times and the dominance of this type from the Middle Byzantine Period, the clear orientation of the church, usually emphasised by the entire sanctuary zone, can be detected without exception. The example of Santo Stefano Rotondo in this respect is especially elucidating – but only if we learn to regard the church in its Early Christian and medieval state without the glasses of the Renaissance.

APPENDIX

Catalogue of Renaissance drawings related to Santo Stefano Rotondo in Rome

1. Francesco di Giorgio Martini (1439-1501)



Francesco di Giorgio Martini, ground plan and partial section of the church.

a) Ground plan and

b) partial section

Firenze, Uffizi, Gabinetto degli Disegni, 330 A v


286 × 201 mm (full sheet), paper, pen and brown ink

Inscriptions: a) "sa[nto] stefano ritondo", "cholone 44", "cholone 22", "entrata", "p[iedi] 74 el vano", "p[iedi] 30 el vano", "entrata", "p[iedi] 30"; b) "p[iedi] 10 el vano fino al mezo della cholona", "sa[nto] stefano ritondo", "i[n] roma"

The authorship of Francesco di Giorgio is generally accepted. The sheet belongs to a group of drawings representing Roman antiquities. The drawings related to Sto Stefano are situated in the right half of the verso of the sheet. The ground plan is a fast sketch with measurements in piede romana (29,6 cm). Later additions, as the transversal arches in the middle or the apses, are omitted. The numbers of the columns of the inner and the outer circle (22 resp. 44) are correct, if piers are also counted. One of the entrances is a pure hypothesis. The section represents the inner ambulatory with vaulting which never existed.

Literature: Pasquale Nerone Ferri. *Indice geografico-analitico dei disegni di architettura civile e militare esistenti nella R. Galleria degli Uffizi in Firenze* (Rome 1885) 154; Alfonso Bartoli. *Monumenti antichi di Roma nei disegni degli Uffizi di Firenze* (Rome 1914-1922) vol. I fig. 16, vol. VI 7 (early 1490s); Wolfgang Lotz. "Das Raumbild in der italienischen Architekturzeichnung der Renaissance", in: *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Instituts in Florenz* VII (1953): 200, fig. 9 (= idem. "The Rendering of the Interior in Architectural Drawings of the Renaissance", in: idem. *Studies in Italian Renaissance Architecture* [Cambridge (MA) – London 1977] 10, fig. 9); Krautheimer – Corbett – Frankl 1970 201 (ca. 1470); Ceschi 1982 fig. 181 (1458-64); *L'edificio a pianta centrale. Lo sviluppo del disegno architettonico nel Rinascimento*. A cura di Meg Licht (Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizzi LXI) (Firenze 1984) no. 29 (1490); Frommel 1987 94-95, Abb. 8; Gustina Scaglia. *Francesco di Giorgio. Checklist and History of Manuscripts and Drawings in Autographs and Copies from ca. 1470 to 1687 and Renewed Copies (1764-1839)*. (Bethlehem – London – Toronto 1992) 53, no. 3 (Archaeological sketchbook, ca. 1470-1480s); *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*. Cat. Siena, Palazzo Pubblico. A cura di Francesco Paolo Fiore e Manfredo Tafuri. Milano: Electa, 1993, 343-346, no. XX.23. (H. Burns); Gustina Scaglia. "Drawings of "Roma antica" in a Vitruvius edition of the Metropolitan Museum of Art III". In: *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 30 (1995): 249-305, no. 7 (1469-1490s).

2. After Francesco di Giorgio Martini (1439-1501)



After Francesco di Giorgio Martini, fictional reconstruction of the exterior.

Fictional reconstruction of the exterior

Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale, Codice Saluzziano 148, fol. 84.


383 × 265 mm, parchment, pen and ink

Inscription: "hedifitio ruinato le cholonne et circulatione dele volte di fore el qual fu ornatissimo. Rafationallo papa Nichola. Ma molto più lo ghuastò. Dicesi Scto Stefano Ritondo"

The codex is a copy of the original version of Francesco di Giorgio. The last part of the codex, copying maybe an originally separate unit, contains representations of Roman antiquity (fol. 71-100). The reconstruction is in the upper left corner of a page with three other circular buildings. It represents a circular building with closed inner and open outer wall, just the opposite of the present structure. The details are also hypothetical.

Literature: Francesco di Giorgio Martini. *Trattati di architettura insegnerie e arte militare*. A cura di Corrado Maltese (Milano 1967) tav. 155, vol. I, 283-284 (transcription with commentary, 1479-86); Scaglia 1992 (see cat. no. 1) 61-63, no. 10 (Monumenti antichi, scribe of Monte Oliveto Maggiore, anonymous sienese artist, ca. 1490s); *Francesco di Giorgio architetto* 1993 (cat. no. 1) 362-365, no. XXI.4. (M. Mussini: the codex is a copy of ca. 1482-86), 412 (shortly after 1490); Scaglia 1995 (cat. no. 1) no. 8 (1490s, following an original of ca. 1480).

3. Ps-Cronaca (end of 15th cent.)



Ps-Cronaca, reconstructed ground plan.

Reconstructed ground plan

Firenze, Uffizi, Gabinetto degli Disegni, 2059 A r


292 × 224 mm, paper, stylus, straightedge, compass, pen and brown ink, light brown wash

Inscriptions: "questo vano di drentto ale cholone B 38", "vano di drentto B 38", "vano di drentto B 16", "vano della capella B 6 1/4", "de luno pilastro alalttro B 27 1/1", da luno pilastro piccholo vano B 22 1/1", "questi vani grandi sono involtti", "questo ene quadro", "la portta"

Attributed to Sansovino for a long time, it was connected to the other Ps-Cronaca drawing by Frommel in 1987 (same handwriting). The ground plan is a quite successful reconstruction of the original structure. The master marked his drawing and inscribed measurements in *braccio romano* (58,36 cm), what is more, he added a scale at the bottom of the page (measuring probably ten braccia although it is divided into eight units). Later additions are omitted, as the transversal arches in the middle; only the west apse is considered to be authentic (which is not). The two columns of the inner circle, which are in the north-south axe, are disposed in the east-west axe. Two of the original entrances, already closed at that time, are marked, others (including the functioning one) are not.

Literature: Ferri 1885 (cat. no. 1) 154 (Sansovino?); Bartoli (cat. no. 1) vol. IV fig. 616 (Sansovino), vol. VI p. 111 (not Sansovino but unknown master of 16th cent.); Krautheimer – Corbett – Frankl 1970 201, fig. 156 [with the note of 155] (Sansovino, ca. 1550-60); Ceschi 1982 59, 139, fig. 90 (Sansovino, 1518-27); Frommel 1987 95, Abb. 9 (same master as of U 161 S, Raffaello circle, ca. 1520); Christoph Luitpold Frommel. "Peruzzis römische Anfänge", in: *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 27-28 (1991-2): 173 (young Baldassare Peruzzi, 1503-4); Scaglia 1995 (cat. no. 1) no. 40 (Anonymus 1 not Cronaca, ca. 1500); Gustina Scaglia. "The Anonymous not Cronaca's drawings: a *Leucippidae* sarcophagus in Casa Fazio Santoro, other antiquities, and obelisks in Rome", in: *Palladio IX-N.18* (1996): 12, note 46, Addenda no. 27 (Anonymous not Cronaca, Florence, 1490s).

4. Ps-Cronaca (end of 15th cent.)



Ps-Cronaca, perspective view of the interior.

Perspectival view of the interior

Firenze, Uffizi, Gabinetto degli Disegni, 161 Sant. r (Santarelli collection)


236 × 340 mm, paper, stylus, pen and brown and black ink, brown wash

Inscriptions: "Santo Stefano rittondo", "chuarantta braca dove comica avogere la ttrebuna B 40", "la cholona chol chapittello e basa B 12"

Traditionally attributed to Cronaca, however, the handwriting is certainly different, but identical with that of the ground plan. This kind of inside view is quite rare among Renaissance architectural drawings. Although it is more or less faithful to the real building, there are differences. It represents five arches in the transversal wall instead of three, because its piers are not inserted into the colonnade in the drawing. The two columns of the inner circle, which are in the north-south axe, are disposed in the east-west axe, as in the ground plan. The arches of the outer circle are represented schematically with equal height and form. The decoration of the tambour, frequently cited in modern reconstructions, is later re-drawn by black ink. Measurements of smaller details are inscribed in *braccio romano*.

Literature: Pasquale Nerone Ferri. *Catalogo riassunto della raccolta di disegni antichi e moderni posseduta della R. Galleria degli Uffizi di Firenze* (Rome 1890) 115 (Cronaca); Bartoli (cat. no. 1) I fig. 31, VI p. 8-9 (Cronaca, 1489-1505); Luigi Grassi. "Disegni inediti di Simone del Pollaiuolo detto il Cronaca", in: *Palladio* VII (1943): 15 (not Cronaca); *Disegni italiani della collezione Santarelli, sec. XV-XVIII*. Catalogo critico a cura di Anna Forlani Tempesti, Maria Fossi Todorow, Giovanna Gaeta, Anna Maria Petrioli (Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi XXV) (Firenze 1967) 30-32 (not Cronaca); Gustina Scaglia. "Fantasy Architecture of Roma antica", in: *Arte lombarda* XV/2 (1970): 9-24 (Santorelli master, Lombard, ca. 1489); *Le Temple. Représentations de l'architecture sacrée*. Cat. Nice, 1982. Ed. by Pierre et Catherine Provoyeur (Paris 1982) 84, no. 61 (Florentine school, end of 15th-beginning of 16th cent.); Licht 1984 (cat. no. 1) no. 30 (Anonimo toscano, ca. 1490); *Raffaello in Vaticano*. Cat. Città del Vaticano, 1984-85 (Milano 1984) 98 (A. Nesselrath: Ps-Cronaca, Raffaello circle, ca. 1520); Frommel 1987 p. 95, Abb. 3; Hubertus Günther. *Das Studium der antiken Architektur in den Zeichnungen der Hochrenaissance*. Veröffentlichungen der Bibliotheca Hertziana, Max-Planck-Institut, Rom. (Tübingen 1988) 69 (not Cronaca, Siense); Frommel 1991/92 (cat. no. 3) 173, fig. 36 (young Baldassare Peruzzi, 1503-4); *Rinascimento da Brunelleschi a Michelangelo. La rappresentazione dell'architettura*. Cat. Venezia, Palazzo Grossi. A cura di Henry Millon e Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani (Milano 1994) 116, fig. 18 (in full colour) on p. 112-113 (Frommel); Scaglia 1995 (cat. no. 1) no. 40 (Anonymus 1 not Cronaca, ca. 1500); Scaglia 1996 (cat. no. 3) 12, note 46, Addenda no. 9 (Anonymous not Cronaca, Florence, 1490s).

5. Netherlandish master (ca. 1530)



Netherlandish master, ground plan and capital with architrave from the inner circle.

a) *Ground plan and*

b) *capitel with architrave from the inner circle*

Codex of Kassel, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Codex Fol. A 45, fol. 31v (15v of the "Kasseler Kodex"),


ca. 400 × 270 mm, paper, pen and ink

Inscriptions: a) "Temple de Faune a Rome", "NoB faire un jour un dessyn et Coupe pour un fasade a Cet Eglise mais il faut que ie retrauche le 2 Collones A et B, et y former une Couple sur la colonade circulaire come iay marque / PJRoman. / Item les Pilastres / C.C."; b) "Cestes corniche soit qu'il est antique ne vaut pas Grand Chose a mon sens / PJR.", with further remarks by P. Roman.

The author is of Netherlandish origin, working in the circle of Raphael ca. 1530, copying drawings of Serlio, G. C. Romano, Riniero da Pisa. The inscriptions are later additions of Pieter Jakobsz. Roman (1676-after 1733). The drawing represents the inner circle with the diagonal arches and the outer circle without further architectural details. Two entrances are in the main axe. Below, another detail represents a Ionic capital and architrave. Other drawings of the codex depict fantastic Roman buildings, related to works of Ps-Cronaca.

Literature: Günther 1988 (cat. no. 4) 370, Tafel 112a; Scaglia 1995 (cat. no. 1) nos. 297-298 (Anonymous North Italian and Netherlandish Artists, ca. 1530s).

6. Giuliano da Sangallo (1445-1516)



Giuliano da Sangallo, reconstructed ground plan.

Reconstructed ground plan

Taccuino Senese, Siena, Biblioteca Comunale, S. IV. 8, fol. 31r


183 × 122 mm, parchment, pen and ink

Inscription: "So.ISSEFANO RITONDO I[N] ROMA"

The authorship of G. Sangallo is not debated, although the drawing may follow another master's ground plan. It is a part of a small volume, containing ground plans and details of important buildings as well as future plans. In the top of the present drawing there is a scale of *braccia fiorentina*, frequently used in the codex. The representation is a free reconstruction of the original building. 22 columns form an inner circle, and 22 pilasters (bases of columns?) with 20 niches between them decorate the wall of the outer circle. An additional narthex with two niches and 3 columns. Stairs are in the corners of the entrance hall. These features are not typical of Sto Stefano Rotondo, thus the drawing seems to be a contamination of this church and Sta Costanza.

Literature: Rodolfo Falb. *Il taccuino senese di Giuliano da San Gallo* (Siena 1902) 44, tav. XXXI; Cornel von Fabriczy. *Die Handzeichnungen Giuliano's da Sangallo*. Kritisches Verzeichnis (Stuttgart 1902) 87; Ceschi 1982 139, fig. 184; Stefano Borsi. *Giuliano da Sangallo. I disegni di architettura e dell'antico* (Rome 1985) 286 with fig. on the same page (copy of another master's drawing, 1500-1510); Scaglia 1995 (cat. no. 1) no. 35 (1483-1513).

7. Anonymous Lombard (early 16th cent.)



Anonymous Lombard, reconstructed ground plan.

Reconstructed ground plan

Antiquarie prospettiche Romane, Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, S.P.10/33


ca. 215 × 157 mm [on the basis of the facsimile]

Inscription: "Questo sie lo tempio de Santo Stefeno aretondo pima che alfuse aretifichato sechondo quello che demostra la banda de uero meridionale e lo fondamento anchora de nouo setroua Li capitelij de marmo e li architraue e chornisone e li feghure chora torname alimesure de lo dito tempio che p diametro era chane. 13. e palme 2 nonchoputandelimure lidite mure ereno ghrose palme. 7 q li pilastre li cholone de mezo ereno ghrose palme 4. ereno due cholonate luno desopra alatro licholone pichulij ereno palme 3 ghrose La volta delanaue poneua suse liarchtraue de li chelone ghande li pichulij demostrauene la chornisa p fino alogocelatoio / chosi sta seueno cho qure porte alo mio parere psenio de lo schafito chera quadrato e de li mezo di cholone", "ero de de laulta" [era di dentro la volta], "questo si era il sacrificio" (transcription and explanation after Mongeri).

Once believed to be Bramantino, the master of this drawing is of Lombard origin (cf. dialect of the inscription). The present volume contains ground plan, details and perspective views of Roman buildings. This plan is a fantastic reconstruction of the Late-Antique Sto Stefano, with the following specialities: the inner circle consists of 20 columns instead of 22 (the outer is of 36 which is correct), there are four main entrances in the axes (never existed), the altar is situated in the centre (probably only after the restoration of 1452-54).

Literature: Giuseppe Mongeri. *Le rovine di Roma al principio del secolo XVI. Studi del Bramantino* (Milano 1875) tav. XXXIX (Bramantino); William Suida. *Bramante pittore e il Bramantino* (Milano 1953) 93 (not Bramantino); Gian Alberto Dell'Acqua and Germano Malazzani. *L'opera completa di Bramantino e Bramante pittore* (Milano 1978) 11 (not Bramantino); Ceschi 1982 p. 138-139, fig. 183 (Bramantino, ca. 1508); Maria A. Granieri Phillips. "Nuove ricerche sul codice ambrosiana sulle rovine di Roma", in: *Arte Lombarda* 64 (1983): 3-14 (Leonardo-Bramante circle, 1499-1527); Scaglia 1995 (cat. no. 1) no. 111 ("Prospettivo Milanese", Rome, 1500-1508).

8. Palladio workshop (?)



Palladio workshop (?), reconstructed ground plan.

Reconstructed ground plan

London, Royal Institute of British Architects, Burlington-Devonshire Collection, vol. VIII. [Ceschi: IX] fol. 3v

287 × 328 mm

Inscription: "questo cui santo stefano ritondo in roma"

The sheet is attributed to the Palladio workshop. On the verso site there is a ground plan of the former Sta Corce in Lateran. The reconstructed ground plan is a better proportioned version of that one of Ps-Cronaca, with the exception of the apse and entrances, here omitted.

Literature: Giangiorgio Zorzi. *I disegni della antichità di Andrea Palladio* (Venezia 1959) 106, no. 3, fig. 268; Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970 201, fig. 155 [with notes of 156] (Palladio workshop?, ca. 1560-70); Ceschi 1982 p. 139, fig. 1 (first half of 16th cent.)

- * This study is based on the research I carried out in Florence and Rome in 2000 as a Mellon Research Fellow at the Harvard University Center for Italian Renaissance Studies, Villa i Tatti. I am glad to dedicate this paper to Professor Vladimir Goss who has never been reluctant expressing his brave new ideas openly.
- ¹ Krautheimer 1994 (all the abbreviated forms are explained in the attached 'Selected Bibliography')
- ² Krautheimer 1935: 51-102, and its English version with a postscript: Krautheimer 1969; Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970; Krautheimer 1980/b; and shorter in his other books: Krautheimer 1980/a 92 and note on p. 338; Richard Krautheimer. *Three Christian capitals* (Berkeley—Los Angeles—London 1983): 107; Krautheimer 1986: note 48 on p. 469.
- ³ Brandenburg 1998: 2-3 and *idem*. "Santo Stefano Rotondo, der letzte Großbau der Antike in Rom: Die Typologie des Baues, die Ausstattung der Kirche, die kunstgeschichtliche Stellung des Kirchenbaues und seiner Ausstattung", in: *Santo Stefano Rotondo in Roma* 2000: 35. The diameter of the inner circle is 22 m, comparable to the naves of the mentioned basilicas, while the diameter of the whole circular building is 66 m (cf. note 53), similar to the entire width of the basilicas.
- ⁴ Practically all the descriptions start from the supposed original state, probably because the architectural concept is better understandable in this case (an important exception: Krautheimer 1935). However, the art historian's work is just the opposite, and we would like to follow this way, as methodological questions are in the main focus of this paper.
- ⁵ The most detailed description of the church is to be found in Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 204-232 and Ceschi 1982: 21-85.
- ⁶ Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 221; Ceschi 1982: 131-133.
- ⁷ Avagnina-Gaibaldi-Salterino 1976-77: 197-203 (Maria Elisa Avagnina).
- ⁸ Bertelli—Guiglia Guidobaldi—Rovigatti Spagnoletti 1976-77: 119-120 (Alessandra Guiglia Guidobaldi). Thus it is contemporary with the mosaics, carried out under Pope Theodore I (642-649). For these, see recently Davis-Weyer 1989.
- ⁹ Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 220; Ceschi 1982: 117.
- ¹⁰ There is a written source indicating that "ecclesiam Sancti Stephani in Celio monte pro nimio vetustate quassatam optime reparavit", Liber Pontificalis, II, p. 384 (Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 202). It is sometimes connected to the Normann destruction, although the name "Santo Stefano Rotondo" used in a source describing the invasion is the usual medieval name of another church (see below, note 18).
- ¹¹ Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 227-228, 232.
- ¹² This chapel is the follower of the former St Stephen church, the Hungarian national church nearby San Pietro, which was destroyed in 1776 to make place for the new sacristy. According to the papal bull of Pius VI of 20. 06. 1776, a new chapel dedicated to St Stephen should have been built to Santo Stefano Rotondo. That is why some of the literature dated the chapel to the 18th century. (Krautheimer 1935). As Hugo Brandenburg pointed out, the vaulting of the chapel is similar to that one of the entrance hall. Frommel 1987: 90 attributes these rooms to the same period, following Ceschi 1982: 55, note 45 and 167-168 (who dated it to the end of the 15th century in the period of the Hungarian Paulinians, owners of the building after 1454). A further evidence for an early dating is the map of Rome of G. B. Nelli, 1736-44 (long before the papal bull), where the chapel is already indicated, see Amato Frutaz. *Le piante di Roma* (Rome 1962) pianta CLXVII, tav. 393, and its edition of 1748, *ibidem*, pianta CLXIX, tav. 407.
- ¹³ The first modern reconstruction is by Krautheimer 1935; since then only a few points have been debated, see the works of Corbett, Ceschi, and Brandenburg; some of these points are mentioned below.
- ¹⁴ The cupole and its structure was highly debated, see: Deichmann 1952, most recently Brandenburg 1998: 59-62.
- ¹⁵ The vaulting of this part is debated: traditionally it is reconstructed with a vaulting, see Krautheimer 1935/1969: 79; Corbett reconstructed it with open courtyards, see Corbett 1960, accepted by Krautheimer as late as 1980/a: 338. According to Brandenburg, they were planned first open, and were vaulted afterward (Brandenburg 1998: 62-67). An overview of previous reconstructions: Ceschi 1982: 70-79.
- ¹⁶ See Krautheimer 1980/b: 124 and more elaborately Krautheimer 1994: 6-7, cf. Brandenburg 1998: 66.
- ¹⁷ Giovanni Rucellai, *Zibaldone*, quoted by Ceschi 1982: 135-136, and Gentile Ortona 1982: 100, 103, and note 2.
- ¹⁸ A long list of these authors can be found in: Polacco 1972: 65-66., note 2. The origin of this mistake goes back to the *Mirabilia Romae*, caput 29: "Santo Stefano Rotondo fuit templum Fauni". As the term "Santo Stefano Rotondo" referred to the rounded building near to Ponte Rotte ("Santo Stefano ritondo alle carozze", "S. Maria dell Sole", or "Tempio di Vesta"), this mistake is the result of a wrong identification. Cf. Christian Hülsen. *Le chiese di Roma nel medio evo* (Florence 1927): 484 and 474. For the maps see Frutaz 1962: (note 12), pianta XVI, tav. 25 (Pirro Ligorio 1553), pianta XXII, tav. 40 (Stefano Du Pérac, 1574), pianta XXIII, tav. 53 (Mario Cartaro, 1579) and the majority of the maps of the 17th century.
- ¹⁹ This is not a scholarly speculation but a simple mistake. Tempio di Baccho was the Renaissance name of Sta Costanza. The identification with Santo Stefano Rotondo appears on an etching of F. P. Duflos, 1763 ("Tempio di Baccho oggi S. Stefano Rotondo"), first edited in: R. Venuti. *Accurata e cuccinata descrizione topografica d'antichità di Roma* (Rome 1763): tav. 57. Although this clearly represents the building of Sta Costanza, it was used as illustration of Santo Stefano Rotondo recently in the Wetter Festschrift (*Kirchen am Lebensweg* 1988: 410), and

- the present official guide of the church (Peter B. Steiner. *Santo Stefano Rotondo auf dem Caelius in Rom* [Bozen 1991]: 4). For a Renaissance contamination of Santo Stefano Rotondo and Sta Costanza see below, the ground plan of G. Sangallo (Appendix cat. no. 6, note 85).
- ²⁰ First Pompeo Ugonio, later others, e.g. on the map of Rome of Giovanni Blaeu, 1663, see Frutaz 1962: (note 12) pianta XXIX, tav. 63.
- ²¹ A good overview of these opinions in Gerö 1940: 10-11; Polacco 1972: 41-42; Brandenburg 1998: 14, note 21.
- ²² Ceschi 1982: 7-19 and on the basis of more recent excavations the publications of Brandenburg (e.g. 1998: 14-15). This opinion was also present in the literature from the 19th century, and strongly supported by Krautheimer 1935.
- ²³ His lecture of 1977, see: Krautheimer 1980/b, for the critics: Brandenburg-Storz 1993: 278.
- ²⁴ Davis-Weyer 1989: 64-69. She also pointed out the influence of churches of Constantinople.
- ²⁵ Krautheimer 1994, refuted by Brandenburg 1998: 5, 14-15, 54-55.
- ²⁶ Brandenburg 1998: 18 ff.
- ²⁷ Georg Dehio — G. von Bezold. *Die kirchliche Baukunst des Abendlandes* (Stuttgart 1892), vol. I, 40-42; Richard Hamann. *Geschichte der Kunst* (Berlin 1933): 89; Heinrich Glück. *Der Ursprung des römischen und abendlandischen Wölbungsbaues* (Wien 1933): 132-133; cf. Gerö 1940: 12.
- ²⁸ Cf. André Grabar. *Martyrium* (Paris 1944): 312.
- ²⁹ Oskar Wulff. *Altchristliche und byzantinische Kunst* (Berlin 1914): 248; Krautheimer 1935/1963: 93-98.
- ³⁰ Sándor Ritz SJ in his many publications, as e.g. Ritz 1967, *Idem*. "Le Città celesti dei primi cristiani: quelle dell'apocalissa secondo Eusebio, e quelle sul Monte Celio in Roma", in: *L'Urbe* 33 (1970): nos. 1-6 and 34 (1971) no. 1; *Idem*. *Das Neue Jerusalem der Apokalypse und Santo Stefano Rotondo* (Rome s.a.); *Idem*. *The Supreme Creation of the Past, Present and Future. The Everlasting Temple of S. Stefano Rotondo in Rome. The New Jerusalem of the Book of Revelation* (Rome 1980); *Idem*. *Cielo* (Rome 1986).
- ³¹ See Appendix, cat. no.3.
- ³² See Appendix, cat. no.4.
- ³³ The interior, with its slightly asymmetrical viewpoint, is followed by one of the etchings of Piranesi (*Le Antichità Romane*, 1756, vol. I, plate XXV, fig. II, see John Wilton-Ely. *Giovanni Battista Piranesi: the complete etchings* [San Francisco 1994] vol. I: 377, no. 327), and other prints, ending with the recent postcard photograph of Daniela Gaus, Rome, printed by Athesia-Druck, Bosen, Nr. 49742, published also in *Santo Stefano Rotondo in Roma* 2000: fig. 2.
- ³⁴ See Appendix, cat. no. 3; surprisingly later literature quoted usually only vol. IV fig. 616 of Alfonso Bartoli's *Monumenti antichi di Roma nei disegni degli Uffizi di Firenze* (Vols. I-VI, Rome 1914-1922) and Bartoli's later opposite opinion (this and other drawings "non sono, a mio giudizio, del Sansovino, ma di ignoti del secolo XVI.", vol. VI: 111) remained almost completely unnoticed.
- ³⁵ Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 201, fig. 156, which confused the title of this drawing with that of the Palladio workshop (fig. 155); Ceschi 1982: 59 and 139. The dating of Krautheimer is quite late even for Sansovino.
- ³⁶ The similarity of the handwritings is admitted by Hubertus Günther. *Das Studium der antiken Architektur in den Zeichnungen der Hochrenaissance* (Tübingen 1988): 70, although he did not identify the masters with each other.
- ³⁷ Frommel 1987: 95, with a dating of 1517 or 1524. As a strange predecessor of this identification, a unique edition of the ground plan could be mentioned: Fabrizio Mancinelli. *Catacombes et basiliques. Les premiers chrétiens à Rome* (Florence 1981): 57, fig. 108 "Jacopo Sansovino, dit Cronaca", which is evidently a mistake, but points in the right direction.
- ³⁸ For full reference, see Appendix cat. no. 4; to name only a few important later studies: Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970; Ceschi 1982; Gentile Ortona 1982; as late as Brandenburg—Storz 1993: 283, and the study of Hubertus Günther. "La rinascita dell'antichità", in: *Rinascimento da Brunelleschi a Michelangelo. La rappresentazione dell'architettura*. Cat. Venezia, Pal. Grossi. A cura di Henry Millon e Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani (Milan 1994): 259-305, figs. on pp. 276 and 282.
- ³⁹ Luigi Grassi. "Disegni inediti di Simone del Pollaiuolo detto il Cronaca", in: *Palladio* VII (1943): 15 did not include this and some others into the oeuvre of Cronaca, partly because he could not consult the originals. L. Grassi and H. Burns rejected the identification more definitively: *Disegni italiani della collezione Santarelli*, sec. XV-XVIII. Catalogo critico a cura di Anna Forlani Tempesti, Maria Fossi Todorow, Giovanna Gaeta, Anna Maria Petrioli (Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi XXV) (Florence 1967): 30-32. However, they questioned also the unity of the Santarelli group (U 157-166 Sant.). This latter opinion is also expressed by Pierre et Catherine Provoyeur in: *Le Temple. Représentations de l'architecture sacrée*. Cat. Nice (Paris 1982): 84.
- ⁴⁰ Gustina Scaglia. "Fantasy Architecture of Roma antica", in: *Arte Lombarda* XV/2 (1970): 9-24.
- ⁴¹ *L'edificio a pianta centrale. Lo sviluppo del disegno architettonico nel Rinascimento*. A cura di Meg Licht (Gabinetto Disegni e Stampe degli Uffizi, LXI) (Florence 1984) no. 30.
- ⁴² *Raffaello in Vaticano*. Cat. Città del Vaticano, 1984-85 (Milan 1984): 98 (A. Nesselrath).
- ⁴³ Günther 1988 (note 36): 69.
- ⁴⁴ Gustina Scaglia. "The Anonymous not Cronaca's drawings: a *Leucippidae* sarcophagus in Casa Fazio Santoro, other antiquities, and obelisks in Rome", in: *Palladio* IX/18 (1996): 5-18.

- ⁴⁵ The earliest dating (Piero Tomei. *L'architettura a Roma nel Quattrocento* [Rome 1942]) was already criticised by Gentile Ortona 1982: 101, mentioning that Cronaca was born only in 1457. Other early datings (ca. 1460 in Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: fig. 196 and followed by Brandenburg-Storz 1993: 283) could have been rejected because of the same reason. Many of the scholars preferred a dating of the late 15th century, starting with Bartoli (as note 34, vol. VI 8-9: 1489-1505), and followed by others: L. Grassi and H. Burns in Santarelli cat. 1967 (note 39): 31: late 15th-early 16th century; Scaglia 1970: (note 40) 20: ca. 1489; Ceschi 1982: 137: ca. 1480; Gentile Ortona 1982: 100: ca. 1489; Licht 1984 (note 41): 58: ca. 1490; Günther 1988 (note 36): 69: early 16th cent.; Gustina Scaglia. "Drawings of "Roma antica" in a Vitruvius edition of the Metropolitan Museum of Art III", in: *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 30 (1995): 249-305., no. 40: ca. 1500; Scaglia 1996 (note 44): ca. 1490s. Ca. 1520 was suggested by Nesselrath (Raffaello in Vaticano 1984: [note 42] 98) and followed by Frommel 1987: 95.
- ⁴⁶ Christoph Luitpold Frommel. "Peruzzis römische Anfänge", in: *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana*, 27-28 (1991-2): 137-182. Accepted by Krautheimer 1994: 5 and fig. 3, and Brandenburg 1998: fig. VIIIb (although dating it to the 15th century, p. 61); refused by Scaglia 1996 (note 44): note 46.
- ⁴⁷ Characteristics of the handwriting of this group have been analyzed by Frommel 1991/92 (note 46) 139-145 and more briefly by Scaglia 1996 (note 44): note 46. Frommel's argumentation, that Peruzzi changed his handwriting in his early career, cannot be disproved. Successfully, beside his "humanistic" style, cursive handwriting appears time to time in Peruzzi's drawings, not always in the same form; however, they differ significantly from the uniformity of Ps-Cronaca's inscriptions. Among Frommel's examples (Frommel 1991/92 fig. 3) "a" and "b" are undoubtedly from Ps-Cronaca; "c-e" are from a codex in which Ps-Cronaca worked, but only in another folio (fol. 50r and v). The closest examples to Ps-Cronaca's handwriting are "g" and "h" (only the latter is published in the corpus of Peruzzi, with a question mark, among the drawings of 1531-36, Heinrich Wurm. *Baldassare Peruzzi. Architekturzeichnungen* [Tübingen 1984]: 443), however, even the word "alteza" in "h" is different from Ps-Cronaca's "laltteza" in "b/1". It is also characteristic that Ps-Cronaca prefers double "tt", in contrast to Peruzzi.
- ⁴⁸ Peruzzi's fast and dynamical freehand architectural drawings differ from Ps-Cronaca's accurate, somewhat insipid and tedious drawings, for which stylus, straightedge, and compass were always utilised. Some architectural details, such as e.g. the basis of a column, are typical for this author, not to be found in Peruzzi's oeuvre. The differences of the two masters are clear comparing their drawings representing the Basilica of Maxentius: U 437 A v by Ps-Cronaca (Bartoli [note 34]: 192) and U 543 A v by Peruzzi (Wurm 1987 [note 47]: no. 404).
- ⁴⁹ The identification was rejected by Scaglia 1996 (note 44): 12 and note 46. She proposed here, and earlier (Scaglia 1995 [note 45]: 256-257.) the name "Anonymous not Cronaca" resp. "Anonymus 1 not Cronaca", which is somewhat more complicated than the traditional nomination "Ps-Cronaca", cf. Raffaello in Vaticano 1984 (note 42); Vladimír Juřen. "Le 'Codex Chlumczansky'", in: *Monuments et Mémoires* 68 (1986), 108, note 30, 170-171.
- ⁵⁰ The fix point of the dating is an inscription on U 160 Sant. v, mentioning the house of "meser Fazio". As the house was bought by Fazio Santoro da Viterbo (1447-1510) in 1489 and he became a cardinal in 1505, this drawing (and more or less all the others) could be dated between 1489-1504. See Bartoli (note 34): VI 9, Frommel 1991/92 (note 46): 161, and Scaglia 1996 (note 44): 5.
- ⁵¹ Although the second unit from the left is divided to 8 sub-units, which contradicts the hypothesis, comparing the scale to the inscribed measurements, its meaning cannot be anything else. The purpose of the scale is different in another drawing of the same master (U 158 Sant. r, Bartoli [note 34]: 23), where he copied on the right side the exact length of the *palm* and *minuto* used in the representation.
- ⁵² Altogether 62 measurements are indicated in the drawing, some of them twice or more times. The main measurements are the following (counting with a braccio of 58.36 cm, see Wurm 1984 [note 47]: XV): diameter of the inner circle: 38 B = 22.18 m (in reality 22.26 m); width of the inner ambulatory: 16 B = 9.34 m (9.6 m); width of the outer ambulatory: 17.5 B = 10.21 m (10.4 m); distance of two piers of the ambulatory at the cross arms: 22.5 B = 13.13 m (12.8 m counting on the chord); distance of two piers of the ambulatory at the diagonal sectors: 27.5 B = 16.65 m (15.8 m, counting on the chord); width of the outer part of the outer ambulatory: 55.5 B = 3.21 m (3.2 m); width of a gate: 5.25 B = 3.06 m (3 m); width of the apse: 6.25 B = 3.65 m (less than 4 m). (Present measurements are after Ceschi 1982: 32 and his plans.)
- ⁵³ Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970, 232: 65.8 m; Ceschi 1982, 32: 66.06 m; Brandenburg 1998, 3: 66 m; Brandenburg 2000 (note 3), note 2: 64.46 m.
- ⁵⁴ This aspect is emphasized, among others, by Ceschi 1982: 59.
- ⁵⁵ This part of the drawing seemed to be cardinal for a long time, see Ceschi 1982: 137, Krautheimer 1994: 5, Brandenburg 1998: 60-61, etc. The fact that this part have been modified is not mentioned in previous literature. However, this fact does not necessarily invalidate the documentary value of the drawing, only puts a small question mark.
- ⁵⁶ Transcription of Bartoli (note 34): VI 9. The first word is not observable in the original, the second is hardly readable.
- ⁵⁷ Frommel 1987: 95.
- ⁵⁸ As the horizon is seemingly parallel with the diaphragm arches of the inner circle, the column in the middle of the picture seems to be a mistake, comparable to that one of the ground plan. However, if we assume a slightly asymmetrical viewpoint, described above, the panorama proves to be precise.

- ⁵⁹ This may be connected to the fact that this detail was slightly modified during the drawing process. The master wanted to show as much as possible.
- ⁶⁰ We may remember that this detail was also modified and the length of the columns and piers was not defined in the first version drawn by stylus. This problem, although not with the same explanation, is mentioned by Ceschi 1982: 138.
- ⁶¹ The arches of the chapel of SS. Primus and Felicianus are depicted somewhat higher than the others.
- ⁶² For the history of the representation of interior during the Renaissance fundamental is Wolfgang Lotz. "Das Raumbild in der italienischen Architekturzeichnung der Renaissance", in: *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* VII/3-4 (1956): 193-226 (and its English version with corrections: "The Rendering of the Interior in Architectural Drawings of the Renaissance", in: idem, *Studies in Italian Renaissance Architecture*. Cambridge [MA]—London 1977, 1-65); Christoph Luitpold Frommel. "Introduction. The Drawings of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger. History, Evolution, Method, Function", in: Ch. L. Frommel and Nicholas Adams. *The architectural drawings of Antonio da Sangallo the Younger, I*. (New York—Cambridge [MA]—London 1993): 1-60, esp. 5-10 (Architectural drawings before Antonio da Sangallo the Younger); and idem. "Sulla nascita del disegno architettonico", in: *Rinascimento* 1994 (note 38): 101-120.
- ⁶³ See Frommel in *Rinascimento* 1994 (note 38): 114, fig. on p. 100.
- ⁶⁴ Lotz 1956 (note 62): 196 and 1977 (note 62): 4, with the reference to Alberti's Ten book, II, 1.
- ⁶⁵ Lotz 1956 (note 62): 197 and 1977 (note 62): 7.
- ⁶⁶ Antonio Averlino Filarete. *Trattato di architettura*. Testo a cura di Anna Maria Finoli e Liliana Grassi (Milan 1972), tav. 108 (fol. 144r).
- ⁶⁷ This circle, active partly in Milan, apparently preferred different types of interior drawings, see Lotz 1956 (note 62): 201.
- ⁶⁸ Early examples of this type of representation are presented in Lotz 1956 (note 62), figs. 16 and 19.
- ⁶⁹ Bartoli (note 34): 99. The authorship of Raffaello is doubted by Lotz 1956 (note 62): 218 and Lotz 1977 (note 62): 27, cf. 41; refused by Frommel 1991/92 (note 46): 173 and Frommel in Frommel—Adams 1993 (note 62): 10 and ; still as Raffaello: Licht 1984 (note 41): no 5; *Rinascimento* 1994 (note 38), 442, cat. no. 29 (Ursula Kleefisch-Jobst), fig. on p. 280.
- ⁷⁰ Recently, this oeuvre has been analyzed by Frommel 1991/92 (note 46); the most complete catalogue of his works is published as an *Appendix* by Scaglia 1996 (note 44): 12-14.
- ⁷¹ This latter group has been analyzed by Scaglia 1970 (note 40). These are not original inventions but copies of an earlier collection. Other copies can be found e.g. in Prague (Juřen 1986 [note 49]), and Budapest (Rózsa Feuer-Tóth. "Un traité italien du XVe siècle dans le Codex Zichy de Budapest", in: *Les traités d'architecture de la Renaissance* (Paris 1990): 99-113.)
- ⁷² See Appendix cat. no. 1 with further literature.
- ⁷³ The best transcription is from Howard Burns in *Francesco di Giorgio architetto*. Cat. Siena, Palazzo Pubblico. A cura di Francesco Paolo Fiore e Manfredo Tafuri (Milan 1993): 365. The transcription of Ceschi should be corrected, e.g. he read "duomo" instead of "elvano", Ceschi 1982: 136.
- ⁷⁴ Meg Licht mentions that instead of 44 the number of 34 is correct (Licht 1984 [note 41]: 58). However, if piers are counted in the inner circle, they should be included into the ambulatory too, therefore either both of Francesco's numbers should be rejected or they should be equally accepted.
- ⁷⁵ The diameter of the inner circle is 74 *piede* = 21.978 m (counting with 29.7 cm per *piede*, cf. Wurm 1984 [note 47]: XV) instead of the real value of 22.26 m; the widths of the inner and outer ambulatory are both 30 *piede* = 8.91 m (in reality 9.6 and 10.4 m). H. Burns supposed (*Francesco di Giorgio architetto* 1993 [note 73]: 365) that Francesco used a *piede* of 30.1 m, which would give a more correct value for the inner circle (22.274 m). However, this method does not give much better results in the case of the ambulatories (9.03), and such an exceptional use of *piede* should be more profoundly proved. It is more probable that the architect made a mistake of 28 cm than that he made an exception in the case of Santo Stefano Rotondo.
- ⁷⁶ Meg Licht identified it with the only surviving arm of the cross (i.e. the chapel of SS. Primus and Felicianus), Licht 1984 (note 41): 54. See also Frommel 1987: 94-95.
- ⁷⁷ Torino, Biblioteca Nazionale, Codice Saluzziano 148, fol. 84. See Appendix cat. no. 2.
- ⁷⁸ Francesco di Giorgio Martini. *Trattati di architettura ingegneria e arte militare*. A cura di Corrado Maltese (Milan 1967): 284; Gentile Ortona 1982: 103 (Francesco di Giorgio's drawings published in the article as figs. 12 and 13 have been changed by mistake); Frommel 1987: 94.
- ⁷⁹ Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, S.P. 10/33. See Appendix cat. no. 6.
- ⁸⁰ It was attributed to Bramantino by the editor of the facsimile, Giuseppe Mongeri. *Le rovine di Roma al principio del secolo XVI. Studi del Bramantino* (Milan 1875); still followed by Ceschi, dating it to ca. 1508 (Ceschi 1982: 138-139). However, the attribution was rejected by William Suida. *Bramante pittore e il Bramantino* (Milan 1953): 93, and more recently by Maria A. Granieri Phillips. "Nuove ricerche sul codice ambrosiano sulle rovine di Roma", in: *Arte Lombarda* 64 (1983): 3-14, connecting it to the Leonardo-Bramante circle of Milan, 1499-1527. Scaglia called the master, whose dialect is evidently Lombard, the "Prospettivo Milanese", Scaglia 1995 (note 45): no. 111.

- ⁸¹ Siena, Biblioteca Communale, S. IV. 8, fol. 31 r. See Appendix cat. no. 5.
- ⁸² The transcription of Ceschi left out "in", Ceschi 1982: 139.
- ⁸³ This number, with the exception of the previously mentioned drawing (cat. no. 6), is to be found in all of the Renaissance ground plans.
- ⁸⁴ Codice Coner, fol. 13r. Thomas Ashby. "Sixteenth-century drawings of Roman buildings attributed to Andreas Coner", in: *Papers of the British School at Rome*, II (1904): 1-96.: 20, with the inscription: "Tenpli bachi apud Sanctum Agnexiam". The codex was later attributed to G. B. da Sangallo by Guglielmo De Angelis d'Ossat. "L'autore del codice londinese attribuito ad Andrea Coner", in: *Palladio*, NS 1 (1951): 94-98, more recently to Bernardo della Volpaia by Tilmann Buddensieg. "Bernardo della Volpaia und Giovanni Francesco da Sangallo", in: *Römisches Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* XV (1975), 89-108.
- ⁸⁵ This is not the only case when Sta Costanza and Santo Stefano Rotondo have been confused, cf. above, note 19.
- ⁸⁶ Stefano Borsi. *Giuliano da Sangallo. I disegni di architettura e dell'antico* (Roma 1985): 286.
- ⁸⁷ See Appendix cat. no. 7. The drawing is quite laconic, but it depicts the diaphragm arches, usually omitted. It also marks two entrances in the east-west axis, but eliminates the western apse and all the eastern rooms (the entrance hall and the two chapels).
- ⁸⁸ See Appendix cat. no. 8. This is very close to the ground plan of Ps-Cronaca, but it omitted the eastern apse as well.
- ⁸⁹ Frutaz 1962 (note 12): pianta LXXXIX, tav. 159. According to the hypothesis of Gustina Scaglia. "The origin of an archaeological plan of Rome by Alessandro Strozzi", in: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, XXVII (1964): 137-163, this map may go back to Flavio Biondo, who did not insert it into his manuscript (1444-46), but was copied by Strozzi in 1474. In reality, there is a circular building above the Colosseum, although without inscription. Scaglia identifies it with Santo Stefano Rotondo, with a question mark (op. cit. 161). Because Biondo wrote about the church indeed as the Temple of Faun (see note 18), and there are other Antique monuments not named in the map, this identification is quite probable.
- ⁹⁰ Maps and collections of representations of Roman buildings are closely related; e.g. the inscriptions of the above mentioned map are repeated in the series of Buonaccorso Ghiberti representing Roman fantasy architecture, cf. Saglia 1970 (note 40): 9.
- ⁹¹ It has been done excellently by Rudolf Wittkower. *Architectural principles in the age of humanism* (2nd edition, London 1952), Part I, 1-28; see also Staale Sinding-Larsen. "Some functional and iconographical aspects of the centralised church in the Italian Renaissance", in: *Acta ad Archaeologiam et Artium Historiam Pertinentia*, II (1965): 203-252; Licht 1984 (note 41): 13-19 ("Lo sviluppo del disegno architettonico nel Rinascimento"); and Arnaldo Bruschi in *Rinascimento* 1994 (note 38): 126 ff. with further literature.
- ⁹² Quoted by Sinding-Larsen 1965 (note 91): 211.
- ⁹³ Wittkower 1952 (note 91): 3-9; Sinding-Larsen 1965 (note 91): 210.
- ⁹⁴ These aspects are collected by Wittkower 1952 (note 91): 7-8.
- ⁹⁵ In the list Santo Stefano Rotondo replaced S. Agnese, see Frommel 1987: 85. Vita Nicolai V. summi pontificis auctore Jannotio Manetto Florentino. *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed. Ludovico Antonio Muratori, Tom. III, Pars II (Milan 1734): 931.
- ⁹⁶ The restoration started in 1450 with covering the roofless church, evidently in relation with the Holy Year. However, the main period of the restoration can be dated to a few years later. Cf. Ceschi 1982: 140 and Frommel 1987: 86.
- ⁹⁷ His restoration was analyzed most profoundly by Charles Randall Mack. *Studies in the architectural career of Bernardo do Matteo Ghamberelli called Rossellino*. PhD, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1972 (University Microfilms 1983): 174-178 (The Restoration of S. Stefano Rotondo) and 393-399 (Documents IV, nos. 21-34); Gentile Ortona 1982; and Frommel 1987. The question, whether the basic reduction of the church was carried out under Popes Innocent II or Nicholas V, is not discussed here, see notes 6-7.
- ⁹⁸ "ECCLESIAM HANC PROTOMARTIRIS STEPHANI DIVANTE COLLAPSAM / NICOLAUS V PONT. MAX EX INTEGRO INSTAURAVIT M.CCCCLIII" Cf. Ceschi 1982: 141; Gentile Ortona 1982: 104, note 6.
- ⁹⁹ Frommel 1987: 86. Cf. Ceschi 1982: 145.
- ¹⁰⁰ The Renaissance dating of this chapel is already proposed by Ceschi 1982: 157, 167-168 (end of the 15th century, ordered by the Hungarian Paulines), followed by Frommel 1987: 90 and Brandenburg-Storz 1993: 281. Cf. note 12.
- ¹⁰¹ It is always hazardous to name something as the first of a series. Indeed, Brunelleschi's S. Maria degli Angeli in Florence is earlier, but it is unfinished; and Michelozzo's SS. Annunziata is more-or-less contemporary, however, it is attached to a longitudinal building. Santo Stefano Rotondo, although it is an Early Christian building in its origin, became a truly centralised building through its Renaissance restoration.
- ¹⁰² Ceschi 1982: 30-31, fig. 39; Brandenburg also mentioned the main axis of the church, e.g. Brandenburg 1995, note 83, Brandenburg 1996: 14, 29.
- ¹⁰³ Frommel 1987: 83.
- ¹⁰⁴ E.g. Davis-Weyer 1989: 78-79 and Krautheimer 1994: 8.
- ¹⁰⁵ Dehio—Bezold (note 27) Atlas I, Tafel 11, Fig. 1; Corbett 1960, also published in Krautheimer 1980/b: fig. 4, Krautheimer 1994: fig. 4. A good collection of reconstruction drawings have been published by Ceschi 1982: 71-76, figs. 106, 111, 112, 113. See also Stefan Businger. *Santo Stefano Rotondo — Die Sphinx auf den Monte Caelius*.

- Visualisierung der Rekonstruktionsversuche seit der Renaissance.* Diplomfacharbeit CAAD. [Http://caad.arch.ethz.ch/~w96ss010/home_page](http://caad.arch.ethz.ch/~w96ss010/home_page).
- ¹⁰⁶ The differences in numbers according to Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 218-220: the height of the arcading of the east sector is 6.65 m, at the west 6.55 m, while the south arches are 5.6 m comparing with the 5.26 m of those of the south-west sector. The differences are ca 1.4 m contra 0.36 m.
- ¹⁰⁷ See Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 215, 220; Frommel 1987: 83. Brandenburg (1996: 13 and 29), analyzing the differences between the capitals, does not make a decision whether the east or the west is the more distinguished.
- ¹⁰⁸ That is why it has been changed in the ground plan of the Anonymous Lombard, cf. Appendix cat. no. 6.
- ¹⁰⁹ Ps-Cronaca, not realising the importance of the east-west axis, positioned it there by mistake on his ground plan, see Appendix cat. no. 3.
- ¹¹⁰ Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 209-210.; Ceschi 1982: 30: 2.71 m at the east and 2.82 m at the west.
- ¹¹¹ Ceschi 1982: 99-104 with the dating to the time of Pope Hadrianus I (772-795).
- ¹¹² Krautheimer 1994: 8 suggested a late 5th or early 6th century date; cf. Brandenburg 1995: 59 and Brandenburg 2000 (note 3): 55.
- ¹¹³ Ceschi 1982: 43-45, fig. 57; Davis-Weyres 1989: 78, note 99.
- ¹¹⁴ Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 229-230.
- ¹¹⁵ Davis-Weyres 1989: 78.
- ¹¹⁶ But most probably from the beginning; Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 227-228, 232.
- ¹¹⁷ For the analysis of the chapel of Pope Theodore see Davis-Weyres 1989.
- ¹¹⁸ The middle arch of the southern arm is a little higher than the arches to either side, Krautheimer—Corbett—Frankl 1970: 219.
- ¹¹⁹ Ceschi 1982: 39, fig. 44. Cf. earlier Krautheimer 1935/1969: 80.
- ¹²⁰ Ceschi 1982: 80-81.
- ¹²¹ Quoted by Frommel 1987: 96.
- ¹²² Krautheimer 1994: 8. Previously, he assumed that the altar was situated in the east chapel from the very beginning, Krautheimer 1935/1969: 80.
- ¹²³ Frommel 1987: 83; Davis-Weyres 1989: 78-79. The presence of the western apse is a further argument for this hypothesis. When the outer ambulatory was demolished in the 12th century, they intended to replace a liturgically important part of the church by building this small apse. On the north and south, such attachments are missing. Thus, the west cross arm was of primary importance, most probably the place of the high altar.
- ¹²⁴ Brandenburg 1995: 59 and Brandenburg 2000 (note 3): 55.
- ¹²⁵ A short summary of this question in Wittkower 1952 (note 91): 11; a detailed study of it: Sinding-Larsen 1965 (note 91), esp. part I, 204-218; the importance of this question in the case of Santo Stefano Rotondo have been studied by Frommel 1987: 93-94.
- ¹²⁶ See the analysis with successfully selected quotations in Sinding-Larsen 1965 (note 91): 211-212.
- ¹²⁷ See above, note 92.
- ¹²⁸ Quotations and translations are from Sinding-Larsen 1965 (note 91): 213-215.
- ¹²⁹ On the debate see Ludwig Heinrich Heydenreich. "Die Tribuna der SS. Annunziata in Florenz", in: *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches Institutes in Florenz* III/5 (1930): 277-279; Aldobrandini's text is quoted by S. Lang. "The programme of the SS. Annunziata in Florence", in: *The Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* XVII (1954): 289; for the liturgical problems see the letter of Giovanni di Gayole in: Willelmo Barghirolli. "Die Baugeschichte der Tribuna der S. Annunziata in Florenz", in: *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* II (1879): 272-273; cf. Sinding-Larsen 1965 (note 91): 205-206. Cf. Wittkower 1952 (note 91): 5.
- ¹³⁰ Brandenburg 1998.
- ¹³¹ See above, note 29. Cf. Krautheimer's self-critical evaluation in his book *Three Christian capitals* (note 2): 154, note 11.
- ¹³² Brandenburg 1998: 20-22.
- ¹³³ Especially because of its liturgical usage it is mentioned e.g. by Krautheimer 1994: 7; Brandenburg 1998: 58 and Brandenburg 2000 (note 3): 55. Cf. Luisa Giordano. "San Lorenzo nella cultura del primo Rinascimento", in: *La basilica di San Lorenzo*. A cura di Gian Alberto dell'Acqua (Milan 1985): 117-143.
- ¹³⁴ On the reconstruction of the Holy Sepulchre, see Virgilio C. Corbo OFM. *Il Santo Sepolcro di Gerusalemme. Aspetti archeologici delle origini al periodo crociato* (Jerusalem 1982).
- ¹³⁵ Donatella Scortecchi. "Riflessioni sulla cronologia del tempio Perugino di San Michele Archangelo", in: *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana* LXVII (1991): 405-428.; Paolo Castellani. "Un' ipotesi di lettura longobarda per la chiesa di S. Michele Archangelo a Perugia", in: *Arte Medievale*, II Serie, X (1996): 1-13. For its connections to Santo Stefano Rotondo see Dehio—Bezold 1892 (note 27) vol. I, 42; Wulff 1914 (note 29): 249; Krautheimer 1935/1969: 84-85; Ceschi 1982: 83-84.
- ¹³⁶ E.g. Prague, the rotunda of St Vitus I is mentioned by Ernő Marosi: *A középkor művészete I, 1000-1250* (Art of the Middle Ages, vol I, 1000-1250), (Budapest 1996): 20. The radiating chapels and burial spaces between them in the recently excavated Carolingian (basilical!) church at Zalavár "could have been influenced by the Santo Stefano

Rotondo in Rome as well," according to the archeologist Béla Miklós Szőke. "Mosaburg/Zalavár during the Carolingian period", in: *Paradisum plantavit. Bencés monostorok a középkori Magyarországon. Benedictine Monasteries in Medieval Hungary*. Cat. Pannonhalma. Ed. by Imre Takács (Pannonhalma 2001): 579, note 35.

¹³⁷ Cf. Richard Krautheimer. "Introduction to an «Iconography of Medieval Architecture», in: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* V (1942): 1-33.

¹³⁸ An example from Hungary could be the 11th century church at Feldebrő with its totally symmetrical ground plan (5 naves with 5 bays, rounded apses in the middle of all the four sides, cf. Júlia Kovalovszki. "A feldebrői templom régészeti kutatása" [Archaeological investigation of the church at Feldebrő], in: *Képzőművészeti emlékek védelme* [Eger 1982]: 37-42); however, its arches were of the same height therefore its usual cross shaped reconstruction with a transept (e.g. Ferenc Levárdy. "Feldebrő Kelet vagy Róma?" [Feldebrő: Orient or Rome?], in: *Műemlékvédelem* XX [1976]: 145-151) is unacceptable; Gergely Buzás reconstructed it recently with a basilican arrangement: *Magyar építészet I. A rómaiaktól a román korig* (Hungarian Architecture I. From the Romans to the Romanesque) (Budapest 2001): 66. In any case, the crypt at the east clearly points to an articulated east-west axis.

Selected bibliography on Santo Stefano Rotondo

(previous literature is listed extensively in Gerő 1940 and Krautheimer 1970; recent publications of Brandenburg and Storz are enumerated in detail in Brandenburg 1998, Note 1)

- Krautheimer, Richard. "Santo Stefano Rotondo a Roma e S. Sepolcro a Gerusalemme," in: *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana* XII (1935): 51-102.
- Gerő, László. *A római Santo Stefano Rotondo a magyarok nemzeti temploma*. (Santo Stefano Rotondo of Rome, the national church of the Hungarians) Budapest: MTA Római Történelmi Bizottsága, 1940, 1944 (2nd edition).
- Banfi, Florio. "La chiesa di Santo Stefano Rotondo a Monte Celio a Roma," in: *Annuario dell'Istituto Ungherese di Storia dell'Arte di Firenze*, I (1947): 3-21.
- Banfi, Florio. "Santo Stefano Rotondo," in: *L'Urbe* XV (1952) no.: 3-9
- Banfi, Florio. "La chiesa di Santo Stefano e il monastero dei frati Paolini al Monte Celio in Roma," in: *Capitolium* 28 (1953): 289-300.
- Deichmann, Friedrich Wilhelm. "Die Eindeckung von S. Stefano Rotondo," in: *Miscellanea Giulio Belvedere*: 437-450. Rome, 1955 (reprint in: *Rom, Ravenna, Konstantinopel, Nahes Oriente*: 416-429. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1984).
- Corbett, Spencer. "Santo Stefano Rotondo," in: *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana* XXXVI (1960): 249-261.
- Banfi, Florio. "S. Stefano Rotondo (Restauri)," in: *Palatino* VIII (1964): 41-42.
- Lipinsky, Angelo. "Santo Stefano Rotondo sul Monte Celio a Roma," in: *Arte Cristiana* LIII (1965): 289-298.
- Thiery, Antonio. "Il restauro di Santo Stefano Rotondo," in: *Italia Nostra*, X (1966) No. 49: 15-21.
- Ritz, Sándor. "La nuova Gerusalemme dell'Apocalisse e Santo Stefano Rotondo," in: *L'Urbe* XXX (1967) No. 4: 12-26., No. 5: 14-27.
- Krautheimer, Richard. "Santo Stefano Rotondo in Rome and the Rotunda of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem," in: *Studies in Early Christian Medieval and Renaissance Art*: 69-106. New York: New York University Press — London: University of London, 1969.
- Krautheimer, Richard, Spencer Corbett, and Wolfgang Frankl. *Corpus Basilicarum Christianarum Romae. The Early Christian Basilicas in Rome*, IV, Città del Vaticano 1970: 199-240 (Italian edition in 1976).

- Ceschi, Carlo. "Problemi architettonici di Santo Stefano Rotondo in Roma e limiti del suo restauro," in: *Il monumento per l'uomo. Atti del II Congresso Internazionale del Restauro* (Venice 1964): 523-529. Padova: Marsilio, 1971.
- Polacco, Renato. "La basilica di S. Stefano Rotondo a Roma," in: *Scritti storici in memoria di Paolo Lino Zovatto*: 39-67. Ed. Tagliaferri, Aurelio, Milan: Giuffrè, 1972
- Ceschi, Carlo, summary of his lecture "Nuove osservazioni sulle vicende architettoniche di S. Stefano Rotondo," in: *Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, Rendiconti*, LXIV (1971-72): XXIV-XXV.
- Buchowiecki, Walther. *Handbuch der Kirchen Roms*, Bd. 3, Wien: Hollinek, 1974, 943-979.
- Bertelli, Gioia, Alessandra Guiglia Guidobaldi, and Paola Rovigatti Spagnoletti. "Strutture murarie degli edifici religiosi di Roma dal VI al IX secolo," in: *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte XXIII-XXIV* (1976-77): 95-172.
- Avagnina, Maria Elisa, Vittoria Gaibaldi, and Claudia Salterino. "Strutture murarie degli edifici religiosi di Roma nel XII secolo," in: *Rivista dell'Istituto Nazionale d'Archeologia e Storia dell'Arte XXIII-XXIV* (1976-77): 173-255.
- Krautheimer, Richard. *Rome, Profile of a City*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980: 92, note 338.
- Krautheimer, Richard. "Success and Failure in Late Antique Church Planning," in: *Age of Spirituality: A Symposium*: 121-139. Ed. by Weitzmann, Kurt. New York: Metropolitan Museum, 1980.
- Gentile Ortona, Erminia. "Santo Stefano Rotondo e il restauro del Rossellino," in: *Bolletino d'Arte*, 67, 6. ser. 14 (1982): 99-109.
- Ceschi, Carlo. *S. Stefano Rotondo* (Atti della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, ser. 3: Memorie XV) Rome 1982.
- cf. H. Brandenburg's review in: *Gnomon* 57 (1985): 267-280.
- Krautheimer, Richard. *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture* (Pelican History of Art) New Haven—London: Yale University Press, 1986: 469, note 48.
- Frommel, Christopher Luitpold. Kirche, "Kunst und Denkmalpflege: Zum Problem des Hochaltares von Santo Stefano Rotondo," in: *Kunstchronik*, 40 (1987), no. 3: 81-98.

- Kirchen am Lebensweg. Festgabe zum 60. Geburtstag und 20. Bischofsjubiläum von Friedrich Kardinal Wetter.* Hrsg. v. Lothar Altmann und Hans Ramisch. München: Schnell-Steiner 1988.
- Davis-Weyer, Caecilia. "S. Stefano Rotondo in Rome and the Oratory of Theodore I.," in: *Italian Church Decoration of the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance*: 61-80. Ed. William Tronzo (Villa Spelman Colloquia I) Bologna: Nuova Alfa Editoriale, 1989.
- Brandenburg, Hugo. "La chiesa di S.Stefano Rotondo a Roma," in: *Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana* LVIII (1992): 201-232.
- Brandenburg, Hugo and Sebastian Storz. "Die frühchristliche Kirche S. Stefano Rotondo in Rom I-II," in: *Das Münster* 46 (1993): 277-299, 47 (1994): 33-46.
- Krautheimer, Richard. "Santo Stefano Rotondo: Conjectures," in: *Römisches Jahrbuch der Bibliotheca Hertziana* XXIX (1994): 1-18.
- Brandenburg, Hugo. "Kirchenbau und Liturgie. Überlegungen zum Verhältnis von Architekturischer Gestalt und Zweckbestimmung des frühchristlichen Kultbaues im 4. und 8. Jahrhundert," in: *Divitiae Aegypti. Koptologische und verwandte Studien zu Ehren von Martin Krause*: 36-69. Hrsg.v. Fluck, Cäcilia, Lucia Langener, Siegfried Richter, Sofia Schachten, and Gregor Wurst. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1995.
- Brandenburg, Hugo. "Die Verwendung von Spolien und originale Werkstücken in der spätantiken Architektur," in: *Antike Spolien in der Architektur des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*: 11-48. Hrsg. v. Joachim Poeschke. München: Hirmer, 1996.
- Brandenburg, Hugo. *Die Kirche von S. Stefano Rotondo in Rom. Bautypologie und Architektursymbolik in der spätantiken und frühchristlichen Architektur.* Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998.
- Santo Stefano Rotondo in Roma. Archeologia, storia dell'arte, restauro.* Ed. Brandenburg, Hugo and József Pál. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2000.
- H. Vladár, Ágnes. "A Caelius Sfinxe: mit rejteget, és mit jelent nekünk magyaroknak a római Santo Stefano Rotondo-templom?," in: *Détshy Mihály nyolcvanadik születésnapjára*: 35-51. Ed. Bardoly, I and A. Haris. Budapest: Kulturális Örökségvédelmi Hivatal, 2002.
- Brandenburg, Hugo. *Sanctus Stephanus in Coelio Monte, Santo Stefano Rotondo, Rom.* Regensburg: Schnell + Steiner, 2010.

Young Lions

THE ART AND CULT OF CYBELE FROM THE NORTHERN VARDAR VALLEY

ALEKSANDRA NIKOLOSKA

SS CYRIL AND METHODIUS UNIVERSITY IN SKOPJE, FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY, DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY

Cybele, the Great Phrygian Goddess, left a great mark in the art of the antiquity. However, remarkably little is known of her cult in the territory of the Republic of Macedonia. This study examines the monuments of Cybele from the Republic of Macedonia, more precisely, from the northern Vardar Valley, since her cult was mostly testified in this particular region. Besides to make an overview of the documentary evidence, the aim of the paper is to perceive the local cult better and its absence in Roman times by examining the material further, to give new perspectives, and open up new discussions of the local form.

Cybele, northern Vardar Valley, double naiscos, terracotta figurines, votive stelae

The northern part of the Vardar Valley is a region with a rarely seen richness of evidence of all dominant surrounding cultures where, through the narrow gorge of Demir Kapija, ancient Stenae, important cultural trends of the time came.¹ Stobi is the main center of the region, a Paeonian city, later a Macedonian one, flourishing in Roman times and especially in the times of early Christianity, when it became an important episcopal center. Further, there are the sites Marvinci and Vardarski Rid from the region of Amphaxitida,² part of the 3rd merida or Old Lower-Macedonia. This region was particularly important for introducing new cultic activities, beginning from Archaic times and especially lush all throughout the Hellenistic period, when the life in these cities reached its highest point. However, Cybele, a very important and nonetheless omnipresent deity throughout the antiquity, is surprisingly modest in the region; not as especially popular in Roman times as she was in the Hellenistic period, and even earlier.

By its content, the cult of the Great Goddess in the Hellenic world is a complex system containing Anatolian and Hellenic elements. The Bronze Age religion of Hattusa and Ugarit spread its branches and in the so-called “Orientalizing period”³ greatly contributed in the forming of the Hellenic culture and religion. So, certain Eastern elements of the cult of Cybele merged into the mythological-ritual system of the Hellenes. The Hellenes met Cybele during the times of their colonization of Asia Minor in the eighth century BC when they established active communication with Phrygia. It is almost impossible to distinguish the pure Anatolian form of the character of Cybele, and with that, nor the level of her Hellenization.⁴ Traditionally, Cybele is known by her image of a majestic mature woman, a powerful Regina, crowned and throned sovereign, holding a tympanum and a patera, and accompanied by lions;⁵ exactly how Agorakritos of Paros, the student of Phidias, depicted her in the fifth century BC for the Metroon in the Athenian Agora.⁶ This statue was certainly the most influential of how the Great Phrygian Mother was depicted throughout centuries. Unfortunately, it was never found. Although on the first glance the iconography of Cybele appears uniformly, if we take a closer look we will distinguish several different solutions of her visual treatment.



*Fig. 1 Doubled stele from Marvinci
(photo courtesy of the Archaeological Museum, Belgrade).*

Surely, the most representative monument depicting Cybele that deserves better attention is the doubled naiscos from Marvinci (Fig. 1), for the first time examined by Düll,⁷ and later mentioned and described among the Macedonian scholars.⁸ It is part of a very wide category of monuments that contain the motif *Cybele in a naiscos*, one of the most distinctive ways of depicting Cybele - framed within an architectural frame, a symbolically illustrated temple, known as naiscos or aedicule.⁹ The Goddess is throned and crowned with *corona muralis*, with lions beside her legs,

while holding a tympanum and a patera. The iconographical motif *Cybele in a naiscos* is in fact heritage from the eastern cultures, dating from the bronze period and shaped during the long processes of the development of the cult, originally connected to the holy dwellings of the Goddess, the mountains where temples devoted to her were build. This visual concept is actually seen on two votive stelae from the R. of Macedonia, if we include the Roman stele from Stobi.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the double nature of the Marvinci stele makes it desirable to consider it as a part of a certain iconographical subgroup. The double naiscoi are an iconographical typicality of a not so much wide region, mostly found in Athens and its vicinity. The traditional attributes such as lions, tympanum, and patera are also present and usually not doubled, but separately grouped with one of the figures. As a rule it seems that the left depiction of the Goddess is shown with a lion and a patera in her hands, while the right one is with the tympanum. The stele from Marvinci is not an exception, and at the same time it is important to notice the quality of its workmanship. The scholars paid attention to this iconographic emergence and had their discussions starting from the middle of the 19th century.¹¹ In the 70s of the last century Hadzisteliou-Price also makes an analysis of the doubled deities. According to her, the doubling of the Great Goddess alludes to the different aspects of her character. Namely, the “left” is the Hellenized one, known in the Hellenic world as Meter, while the “right” is the “Oriental” one, having in mind the attributes and their eastern origin.¹² Both Bitrakova and Sokolovska drew analogies with the double Cybele from Isthmus. Stylistically, this monument is truly closest; however, within the typology of these particular monuments, we find closer analogy in Athens, on a monument found on the Acropolis,¹³ in terms that this naiscos does not have the doubled roof as the one from Isthmus. Also, there is a certain disagreement about the dating. Namely, Sokolovska does not agree with Düll that this monument is from the fourth century BC but from the time of high Hellenism. Vermaseren includes it in his corpus¹⁴ and additionally mentions that it is undoubtedly and import from Eleusis.

Duality, whether ritual or iconographical, is not foreign to Cybele. A certain polarity is known through many manifestations of the Goddesses’ character, present, above all in two basic spheres of her reign – life and death. Her sanctuaries were built within the cities, but also high in the mountains, reminding the worshipers of her mythical abode. She is protective over the wild life, and, at the same time, over social order. The rituality that the Goddess requires in return for her divine favors is for the man to elevate the wild rhythm of the nature in order to redefine his position in the society. This is another way how to explain the background of the private mystery rituals, performed parallelly with the public ones. The multiplication of Cybele’s image is, in fact, an Egyptian – Phoenician tradition, seen among the Hittite seals, also known in the early Minoan period. We can trace the doubling of divine figures even in the Neolithic, in *Çatal Hüyük*, however,

there is no continuity that will confirm the development.¹⁵ In the late Classical period, in the Hellenic world this depiction becomes highly popular, so, besides Cybele, other great Goddesses such as Demeter, Kore, Athena, and Artemis, sometimes even male gods as Zeus or Hermes were depicted. It is also seen that even their names were in plural. In this way, according to the way of how people views were, the divine power and influence upon the believers strengthens. The doubled iconographical variation of the motif Goddess in naiskos does not continue in the following centuries. It remains as a specificity of the late Classical and early Hellenistic period.¹⁶

We should also consider the study of J. Hurwit,¹⁷ where the ratio between the image and the frame is explained in a wider conceptual context and given as an important category in the stylistic analyses of the art of antiquity. The divine figure is in interaction with the limitation of the space; by subordinating the figure within a frame, a value of stability and order is achieved. One part of the visual field of the viewer is isolated and organized. The enclosed form is the primary model in the Hellenic art, formulated in the eighth century. The “freeing” from the frame happens only after the framing is deeply established as a visual rule. The development of the iconographical treatment of Cybele, confirms this conclusion. The Archaic art knows Cybele mainly within an architectural frame, while, beginning from the Late Classical period, the Goddess is freed in the visual space. She is now presented within several other visual solutions and included in more complex figural compositions, certainly a result of her gradual integration in the Hellenic, and further in the Roman pantheon. The standard iconographical motif *Cybele in a naiskos*, from now on up until the time when the cult slowly ceases to exist during the fourth century, will be parallely followed by many other conceptions.



Fig. 2 Sculpture from Marvinci,
photo: Aleksandra Nikoloska.



Fig. 3 Sculpture from Marvinci,
photo: Aleksandra Nikoloska.

Let us return to the other material from the northern Vardar Valley, which again, opens up new perspectives of the cult, especially if we consider the rest of the material from Marvinci which alludes to a more organized local cult. Beside the double relief, there are two white marble sculptures of Cybele seated on a throne that most likely furnished a temple. The first marble statuette (Fig. 2)¹⁸ depicts the traditional Cybele, with a lion on the right, beside her legs, while the left arm is broken off with which she was holding the tympanum. On the other statue from Marvinci (Fig. 3),¹⁹ beside the depiction of the Goddess, again in the usual manner, there are two additional figures with smaller dimensions, often explained as attendants, but mostly as Hermes and Hecate. If we go over the whole corpus of Cybele's monuments, we will see that they were included in the iconography of the Hellenized Cybele instead of the Hittite musicians, a clear reflection of the chthonic nature of the Goddess. In early examples a woman standing beside the Goddess is holding the torch, while in Hellenistic depictions it is in the hands of Hecate. A triad of Hermes and Hecate together with Cybele is a common illustration of initiation rituals. Hermes, now as Mercury, remained a part of this triad in Roman art, but instead of Hecate, we see Attis. We see later that the female figure with torches becomes part of the Dionysian iconography, portraying the same mystery aspect of *katabasis*.

Hellenistic terracotta figurines with the image of the throned Cybele has greatly been found in the Vardar Valley; in Marvinci,²⁰ Vardarski Rid,²¹ and even further, in Ceramiae,²² nearby modern Prilep. The Goddess is depicted in the usual manner as she was, up until then, in marble or stone. In Marvinci, terracotta figures of lions were found as well, again alluding to the great acceptance of the cult. These kinds of votive figurines are typical for the wider region and found all over Ancient Macedonia, Thrace, and Asia Minor, but also in Moesia and all over the Bosphorus region.²³ If we look at the entirety of the Hellenistic terracotta figures, we find different solutions of the depiction of the Goddess. For example, the terracotta figure of Cybele from Marvinci depicts the Goddess sitting on a throne with lion paws and stepping on two male, bearded heads. One of the numerous figures often incorporated in the iconography of the cult is the bearded figure, most likely of Thracian - Phrygian origin and connected mainly to the mystery aspects of the cult. In some cases it is a depiction of Sangarius, the personification of the Phrygian river and the father of the nymph in which Attis fall in love with. Sometimes he is seen as Zeus or Jupiter, with whom the Goddess shares positions on the top of the divine hierarchy. But, in most cases, the bearded figure is not identified. He is present on compositions such as funeral symposia, as on the relief from Corcyra from the fourth century BC,²⁴ and beside the Goddess as on the Parian relief devoted to the muses and carved on a natural rock,²⁵ where a procession of gods is depicted. On the fresco from Zadar²⁶ we again see the bearded figure as part of a group of fourteen other figures including the Great

Mother, portraying an actual mystery ritual. The bearded figure is also part of one of the variations of the triadic conception of *Cybele in a naiscus*; by her right side there is a youth, while the older, bearded figure with a scepter is on the left.²⁷



Fig. 4 Terracotta figure from Prilep
(after Bitrakova Grozdanova 1999, Tab. 4, fig. 2).



Fig. 5 Terracotta figure from Marvinci
(after Sokolovska 1986, Tab. 34, fig. 1).

The molded terracotta figures were above all expressing the funeral aspect of the cult, having in mind that they are found mainly in graves. Considering that this aspect of the cult is attributed more to Attis, terracotta figures with his image were equally plentiful in Hellenistic times, especially in Ancient Macedonia, which again, is a puzzling notion. Attis is unsurpassable in the iconography of Cybele, unfortunately, not seen among the material from the Republic of Macedonia. We can only speculate about the reason why this god was not popular in the studied region. We know that Attis was not accepted among the Greeks because of the violent “barbaric” ways of his rituals. However, we know of his presence in Ancient Macedonia evidenced through the material, especially if we take into consideration an abundance of Attis Hellenistic terracotta from the region of Olynthos and Amphipolis.²⁸ Evidently, the religious idea that Attis was representing was not popular in the northern Vardar Valley.



Fig. 6 Roman votive stele from Stobi
(photo courtesy of the Archaeological Museum,
Belgrade).



Fig. 7 Roman sculpture from Novoselani
(after Sokolovska 1987, Pl. 78, fig. 3).

Stobi is, above all others, the city with most dynamic religious interchange due to its position on both *via Axia* and the so called Transversal road (Heracleia - Stobi – Serdica). However, the evidence of Cybele in Stobi is not in line with the general picture of the presence of the cult in Vardar Valley. The usual Hellenistic terracotta is not present, but we do have the already mentioned relief of Cybele in a naiskos,²⁹ with the iconographical motif of the crowned Goddess seated on a throne (Fig. 6). This monument is from later Roman times, although this iconographical type is typical for the late Classical and Hellenistic period. The Goddess is crowned and seated on a throne with lions beside her legs, while above her from the left, in a low relief, there is a tympanum as if it hangs on the wall. The tympanum is included in the iconography of Cybele in the sixth century and will follow her all the way to the late Roman times.³⁰ Above all, the tympanum is associated with music and the hypnotic rhythm of the rituals of Cybele.³¹ As opposed to the ritual instruments, the *corona muralis* alludes to a rather different aspect of the Great Goddess. With this attribute, Cybele is designated as founder of cities and protector of social order. It stands as an opposition of her untamed character that provokes the ecstatic mystery rituals usually held in the wild. On the contrary, this aspect of the Goddess is celebrated with a public ceremony, within the city walls, worthy of the standards of the urban aristocracy. The temple on this monument has Doric columns and an acroterium shaped as palmette above the right capital. Düll dates this monument in the middle of the third century and draws analogies with the monuments from Solun and Kozani. The other Roman statue of Cybele that we know of comes from Novoselani in the vicinity of Stobi (Fig. 7),³² again, most likely furnished a temple. We take into consideration one more monument from

Stobi - fragment of a sculpture, a head with a Phrygian hat that was identified as Orpheus.³³ Besides the hat, there are no other attributes that can reveal the identity of this figure, and, as we know, Attis is depicted in this manner as well. If this figure is after all Attis, an assumption which is not to be ruled out completely having in mind that Cybele was known in Roman times in Stobi, then this will be the only representation of this god on the territory of Republic of Macedonia.



*Fig. 8 Relief from Demir Kapija
(after Bitrakova Grozdanova 1999, Tab. 7, fig. 7).*



*Fig. 9 Votive lead tablet from Ežov Grad
(after Jovanova 2005, fig. 2).*

If we are to go deeper into the religious concept of the Great Mother of the region, then we must consider the group of monuments with a late Roman iconographical motif, a triad composed out of the divine twins Dioskouroi and a central goddess (Fig. 8). The religious idea behind this series of votive reliefs with a representation brings us, once again, closer to the cult of Cybele within the cultural sphere of Asia Minor. These monuments are frequent in the Vardar Valley,³⁴ but also found on the Greek inland, on some of the islands, and in the region of Syria and Egypt. They originate from Asia Minor, more precisely from Lycia and Pisidia from where, supposedly, they originally began spreading.³⁵ The enigmatic moment of this representation is certainly the Great Goddess in the middle,³⁶ whose identification is generally explained as a Moon Goddess, or as Helen, the sister of the Dioskouroi, later equaled with Selene.³⁷ Among the local scholars, the central goddess on the monuments from Macedonia is most often recognized as Artemis,³⁸ not only because her cult is attested in this region, but also because of the inscription on the relief from Živojno honoring Artemis Ephesia.³⁹ In the attempts to reveal the identity of the central deity,

Cybele was omitted among the local interpreters. Considering the relationship of Cybele with the Dioskouroi,⁴⁰ as well as some iconographical analysis in a wider context, another interpretative perspective opens. In Roman times Artemis was, after all, the most popular goddess in the Vardar Valley. Besides the typical huntress, in this region Artemis Ephesia was known as well, another ruling Great Mother Goddess from Asia Minor, attested through late Roman epigraphy.⁴¹ Cybele, as we have seen, had an inverse path of acceptance; she was worshiped in Hellenistic times, but rarely seen in the Roman period. Attis, who is unavoidable wherever the Romanized cult spread, is, as we already mentioned, also absent in the cultic imagery of the Vardar region. Bearing in mind the spreading of the cult of Artemis Ephesia, the syncretistic process with Cybele,⁴² and all that within the frames of the ritual trends of the second and third century, it is possible to establish the interpretational model of a general, abstract deity, incorporating both Cybele and Artemis Ephesia, two goddesses from Asia Minor, close by their spiritual structure and placed under protection of the divine twins. The same motif of the divine triad is seen on another group of monuments typical for the Danubian provinces – votive lead and marble tablets⁴³ where the triad is central. These votive objects actually portray an iconographical net of many cults, the one of Cybele, Mithras, Jupiter Dolichenus, Isis, Dioskouroi and the Kabiri. There are two known such tablets made in lead from the Republic of Macedonia; the one from Ežov Grad near Štip (Fig. 9) and the other from Nerezi near Skopje.⁴⁴

Our conclusion begins with the opening statement that the cult of Cybele never rooted deeper in these parts after the Hellenistic period. Let us consider several ideas of why is it so. In local art, she was known mostly through her Hellenized form, but also carrying some “Oriental” elements recognized through the pertaining attributes, and as we have seen, mostly alluding to the mystery aspect of the cult. According to the material, the cult’s main center was most probably in Marvinci. The studied region was traditionally more inclined to the cultural influences coming from Asia Minor, Thrace, and the Aegean, than it was to the ones of the Latin West, even at the peak of the local Romanization. If in the Hellenistic period Cybele was well known in the region, especially through her mystery and funeral aspects, than maybe here lies one of the reasons why Cybele is absent during Roman times - she was never recognized through her altered and purified Romanized variation from the times of the Republic. Namely, Cybele came to Rome in 204 BC as a national Goddess, but before she climbed the highly moral scales of the conservative republican pantheon, she must have cleansed her “Oriental” ways, introduced as a personification of only noble female virtues – maternity, stability, wisdom, successfully avoiding the “wild” aspects of her original character. She was accepted among the aristocracy and celebrated at the solemn festivities named Megalensia.⁴⁵ This variation of the Great Mother that spread during Romanization which happened

in these parts quite early, has not been recognized, as it seems, among the local population, except, of course, in Stobi among the urban elite that was more inclined to modern Roman influences. Also, if we compare the testimony of other cults of the region with similar characteristics, we can draw another conclusive fact. Considering the role of the divine figure as the most direct mediator and chosen as a personal god owing to its soteriological and eschatological prospects, a defying characteristic of the mystery cults, Cybele is closest to Dionysos.⁴⁶ Both deities have the most similar sensitivity considering these particular aspects. As opposed to Cybele, Dionysos was traditionally the most dominant deity of the region, especially considering his highly witnessed funeral cult in the second half of the second century and the beginning of the third.⁴⁷ This situation might demonstrate certain conservatism among the population that was traditionally more inclined to Dionysos and never fully accepted other mysteries that assured salvation. This, of course, surpasses Stobi where the cohabitation of the “Oriental” and mystery cults is in accordance to the more cosmopolitan character of the city, the only site that we find evidence of the cult in Roman times. The last clue of her absence in Roman times is given to us through the analysis of the group of votive stelae with the depiction of the triad of a goddess between Dioskouroi. The concept of the Great Goddess can be recognized behind the central figure of a triad which is an evidently dominant religious concept in the late second and the beginning of the third century. We believe here that we follow aspects of a certain religious transformation, both of Cybele and Artemis, influenced also of other, local variations of the concept of the Great Mother. Gods with similar characteristics underwent through certain symbiotic process, a sort of amalgamation, during which their spiritual structures were united in one divine figure, in this way creating a single deity composed of multiple divine figures. In this way, Cybele might have still been present in latter times, hiding behind the anonymous figure of the goddess in the triad conception.

- ¹ From the Archaic to the early Hellenistic period the local population is Paeonian, which changed with the massive influx of all kinds of different people during the Hellenistic times. The Roman conquest of 168 BC resulted in a division in three different areas (*merides*) ruled among Amphipolis, Pella, Thessalonica, and Pelagonia. Today's Republic of Macedonia covers areas not only of the Roman provinces of Macedonia, Moesia Superior, Thrace, but also part of Dardania, in this way archaeologically witnessing a multitude of different cultural influences.
- ² See Sokolovska 1986; Also Mitrevski 2005.
- ³ Burkert 1987, 13-14.
- ⁴ The key of the acceptance of the Phrygian cult lies, above all, in the Cretan- Mycenaean religious tradition where the Great Goddess is central. The Cretan Goddess of Ida is, both in ideological and iconographical sense, almost identical with the one from Troad, from the eponymous mountain. See Burkert 1979, 103.
- ⁵ The main attributes of the Goddess in the Hellenic – Roman iconography are almost without exception the tympanum, the patera, and certainly the lions. The Great Goddess is the Mistress of wild animals (*Πόντια Θηρών*), so lions are, understandably, her most recognizable symbols from the very beginnings of her visual formulation. They signify the divine power and at the same time connect her with her Anatolian roots. However, there are certain differences in their position regarding the Goddess. On the monumental Phrygian reliefs, the lions flank the Goddess, depicted in all their greatness, standing on their hind legs. On the Archaic votive stelae from Asia Minor, most often we see only one lion significantly smaller, sitting humbly by her right side. The lion on the late-Classical monuments from Athens are most often in the Goddess' lap, as it was first shown in Cyme. See Naumann 1983, 181-182.
- ⁶ The most detailed account was given by Arrian (*Peripous* 9).
- ⁷ Düll 1977, 153-154, 280, Abb. 69.
- ⁸ Sokolovska 1986, 76, 91-92, T. 40, 1; Bitrakova Grozdanova 1987, 124-125, T. V. 3; Sokolovska 1988, 117, n° 2; Bitrakova Grozdanova 1999, 130.
- ⁹ More on this iconographical motif see Nikoloska 2010a.
- ¹⁰ Both the stele from Marvinci and the one from Stobi are kept at the Archaeological Museum in Belgrade. For the references of the Stobi relief, see below endnote n. 29.
- ¹¹ Stephanis recognized the crowned goddesses as Rea-Demeter and Kore, Bötticher - as two priestesses of Cybele, while Friedrichs as Cybele and Aphrodite – Urania. Svoronos as well does not see doubled Cybele, but recognizes the "left" as Demeter; More on the interpretations and for the references see Naumann 1983, 188-190.
- ¹² Hadzisteliou Price 1971, 53-4; Naumann 1983, 190.
- ¹³ Vermaseren 1982, 328.
- ¹⁴ Vermaseren, 1977a, 14; Vermaseren 1989, 314.
- ¹⁵ Hadzisteliou Price 1971, 48-69.
- ¹⁶ The only known depiction of this motif from later times is on a Thracian bronze relief from the second century AD. (Vermaseren 1989, 377).
- ¹⁷ 1977, 1-30.
- ¹⁸ Sokolovska 1987, n°199; Sokolovska 1988, n° 1; Bitrakova Grozdanova 1999, 132.
- ¹⁹ Sokolovska 1987, n° 200; Sokolovska 1988, n° 3; Bitrakova Grozdanova 1999, 132.
- ²⁰ Sokolovska 1988, nos° 4-8
- ²¹ Here the actual workshop was discovered where these terracotta were made by the hand of Menek. See Mitrevski 2005.
- ²² Bitrakova Grozdanova 1999, 124-146.
- ²³ Naumann 1983, 269-274; See also the chapters of these regions in Vermaseren 1989.
- ²⁴ Vermaseren 1982, 519.
- ²⁵ Naumann 1983, 196-202.
- ²⁶ Cambi, 191, fig. 296, 297.
- ²⁷ Naumann 1983, 218-223.
- ²⁸ Vermaseren 1989, 206-210, 213-216, 221, 222-225, 229-262, 265-295.
- ²⁹ Düll 1977, 154, 282; Sokolovska 1988, 122, n° 10; Vermaseren 1989, 315.
- ³⁰ Roller 1999, 136. Despite the fact that this attribute is part of the Anatolian cultic tradition, it is not present on any of the Phrygian depictions. We see it on the votive reliefs from Thasos and Ephesus the earliest (Naumann 1983, 136).
- ³¹ The ecstatic character of her rituals is described in a few Athenian tragedies as barbaric and unsuitable for the refined taste of the Athenians. The legend of the mother, who, possessed by her own madness, roams through the hills and dances in a trance to the sound of the tympanum, has two versions. We read it in the Euripides' *Hellene* (1301-52) and in the hymns from Epidaurus written on two fragments (Vermaseren 1982, 473). Euripides accentuates her Asiatic origin and her Phrygian appearance, naming her as *ὄρεϊα Μάτηρ Θεῶν*, the mountain Goddess. In the hymn from Epidaurus the ritual is portrayed through the thunder of Zeus and the tympanum of Cybele, an illustration of the forces of Nature. The tympanum becomes a symbol precisely of this aspect of the worship of Cybele, but also as a demarcation of her eastern origin which, among the Greeks, was never forgotten. The ecstasy of the rituals of Cybele continues among the Romans. Lucretius tells us about the Roman *pompa* and the Galloi who danced to the

ecstatic rhythm of the sound of the tympanum and cymbals (For the description of the Roman *pompa* during Megalensia see Summers 1996). Moreover, In Roman Imperial times Cybele was exclusively worshiped by the Phrygian ecstatic form (see the account of Turcan 1996 on Imperial Phrygianism, 43-56). The well-known mystery formulas of Clement of Alexandria (*Protreptikos* 2,15,3), and the later one of Firmicus Maternos (*De errore profanorum religionum*, 18,1), speak of these instruments as crucial in the performance of Roman initiation rituals. It is not precisely clear what these Christian polemics described, but it is certain that *tympana* and *cymbals* had symbolic meaning during rituals through which one could have reached the religious secret.

³² Sokolovska 1987, n° 201; Sokolovska 1988, n° 9; Bitrakova Grozdanova 1999, 135.

³³ Sokolovska 1987, n° 202.

³⁴ Three votive reliefs from Demir Kapija; a relief from Živojno, Bitola; relief from Heracleia, now lost; relief from Stobi, also lost; relief from Kruševjani; relief from Dunje and the last found relief, the one from Negotino. For detailed account and bibliography on these monuments see Nikoloska 2010b.

³⁵ Smith 1997.

³⁶ This problem was first opened by Chapouthier 1935.

³⁷ Geppert 1996, 117-118.

³⁸ Bitrakova Grozdanova 1999, 198.

³⁹ Artemis Ephesia in iconographical connection with the Dioskouroi is documented only on one monument from Phrygia, now lost (Geppert 1996, 192, R64). Artemis Ephesia between horsemen, most probably the Dioskouroi can be seen on a reverse of a coin from the third century (Chapouthier 1935, 76, Pl. XII, n° 68).

⁴⁰ Despite the fact that in mythology there is no concrete correlation between Cybele and the Dioskouroi, they are conceptually similar in many ways. Their common characteristic of assuring safe sailing for those who vow to them leads us towards Samothrace and their local mystery rituals. Here, among the enigmatic *Theoi Megaloi*, Cybele and the Dioskouroi are to be found in a most direct relation. Namely, the cult of the Great Gods of Samothrace includes several groups of gods gravitating around one central goddess (Guettel Cole 1984, 3). Although there was enough discussion about the fact that the Dioskouroi are gods separately worshiped on Samothrace as late as the Archaic period, it is questionable to what degree they were assimilated with the Great Gods and to Cybele. It is certain, however, that the concept of two male gods and one goddess in a triadic structure makes the Dioskouroi adjustable in this religious phenomenon. The central figure of the Goddess from Samothrace is often identified with the Great Goddess Cybele, iconographically confirmed (Welch 1996) and evidenced by several antique sources; Lucian (*de Dea Syria* 15), Diodorus Siculus (3.55.7-9), and Dionysus of Halicarnassus (*Antiquitates romanae* 1.61.2-4)), which additionally reveals the Phrygian influence while forming the local mysteries.

⁴¹ Düll 1977, nos° 36, 39, 40, 67.

⁴² For the examples of this syncretization in detail see Horsley 1992.

⁴³ See Tudor 1969, Tudor 1976.

⁴⁴ Jovanova 2005.

⁴⁵ More on republican Megalensia see Nikoloska 2008. The ecstatic rituals did not come to Rome until later times, when Attis was introduced and worshiped at the March festivals. See also Vermaseren 1977, 113-125; also Turcan 1996, 38-50.

⁴⁶ Sfameni Gasparro 1985, 9-19, 119.

⁴⁷ Throughout the wider region as well as in Stobi Dionysos was exceptionally popular, especially in the second and the beginning of the third century. For the complete account of the finds see Düll 1977, nos° 89-112; Also Bitrakova Grozdanova 1999.

Bibliography

Abbreviations:

AJA - *American Journal of Archaeology*

AS - *Anatolian Studies*

CCCA - *Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attidisque*

CMRED - *Corpus Monumentorum Religionis Equitum Danuviorum*

EPRO - *Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire Romain*

HA - *Histria Antiqua*

JHS - *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*

MAA - *Macedonia Acta Archaeologica*

BITRAKOVA GROZDANOVA 1987

V. Bitrakova Grozdanova, *Hellenistic Monuments from S. R. of Macedonia*, Skopje 1987.

BITRAKOVA GROZDANOVA 1999

V. Bitrakova Grozdanova, *Religion et Art dans l'Antiquité en Macédoine*, Skopje 1999.

BURKERT 1979

W. Burkert, *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*, London 1979.

BURKERT 1987

W. Burkert, "Oriental and Greek Mythology: The Meeting of Parallels," Bremmer, J. (ed.) *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, London 1987.

CAMBI 2002

N. Cambi, *Antika*, Zagreb 2002.

CHAPOUTHIER 1935

F. Chapouthier, *Les Dioscures au service d'une déesse*, Paris 1935.

CUMONT 1914

F. Cumont, *Die orientalischen Religionen im Römischen Heidentum*, Leipzig - Berlin 1914.

DÜLL 1977

S. Düll, *Die Götterkulte Nordmakedoniens in Römischer Zeit*, München 1977.

GEPPERT 1996

S. Geppert, *Castor und Pollux. Untersuchung zu den Darstellungen der Dioskuren in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Münster: Lit, 1996.

GUETTEL COLE 1984

S. Guettel Cole, *Theoi Megaloi. The Cult of the Great Gods at Samothrace* (EPRO 96), Leiden 1984.

HADZISTELIOU PRICE 1971

Th. Hadzisteliou Price, "Double and Multiple Representations in Greek Art and Religious Thought," in *JHS* 91 (1971), 48-69.

HORSLEY 1992

G. H. Horsley, "The Mysteries of Artemis Ephesia in Pisidia: A New Inscribed Relief," in *AS* 42 (1992), 119-150.

HURWIT 1977

J. Hurwit, "Image and Frame in Greek Art," in *AJA* Vol. 81, No. 1 (Winter 1977), 1-30.

JOVANOVA 2005

L. Jovanova, "Two Lead Plaques from the cult of the Danubian Riders", in *MAA* 16 (2005), 177-187.

MITREVSKI 2005

D. Mitrevski, "Vardarski Rid, Excavations 1995-2004," in D. Mitrevski (ed.). *Vardarski Rid I*, Skopje 2005, 15-90.

NAUMANN 1983

F. Naumann, *Die Ikonographie der Kybele in der Phrygischen und der Griechischen Kunst*, Tübingen 1983.

NIKOLOSKA 2008

A. Nikoloska "Megalensia as a Pastime in Republican Rome," in *HA* 16 (2008), 43-50.

NIKOLOSKA 2010a

A. Nikoloska, "Genesis, development and prevalence of the iconographical motif Cybele in a Naiscos," in *Patrimonium* 7-8 (2010), pp. 139-150.

NIKOLOSKA 2010b

A. Nikoloska, "Goddess between Dioskouroi," in *Macedonian Heritage in honor of Blaga Aleksova*, Skopje 2010, 113-126.

ROLLER 1999

L. Roller, *In Search of God the Mother, The Cult of Anatolian Cybele*, University of California Press 1999.

SFAMENI GASPARRO 1985

G. Sfamemi Gasparro, *Soteriology and the Mysic Aspects in the Cult of Cybele and Attis*, Leiden 1985.

SMITH 1997

T. J. Smith, "Votive Reliefs from Balboura and Its Environs," in *AS* 47 (1997), 3-49.

SOKOLOVSKA 1986

V. Sokolovska, *Isar Marvinci and the Vardar Valley in Ancient Times*, Skopje 1986.

SOKOLOVSKA 1987

V. Sokolovska, *Antique Sculpture in S. R. of Macedonia*, Skopje 1987.

SOKOLOVSKA 1988

V. Sokolovska, "The Images of Cybele in Macedonia," in *MAA* 9 (1988), 113-127.

SUMMERS 1996

K. Summers, Lucretius' Roman Cybele, Lane, E., ed., *Cybele, Attis and related Cults*, 342-351.

TUDOR 1969

D. Tudor, *CMRED I, The Monuments*, Leiden 1969.

TUDOR 1976

D. Tudor, *CMRED II, The Analysis and Interpretation of the Monuments*, Leiden 1976.

TURCAN 1996

R. Turcan, *The Cults of the Roman Empire*, Trans. A. Nevill, Oxford 1996.

WELCH 1996

K. Welch, "A Statue Head of the *Great Mother* discovered in Samothrace," in *Hesperia* 65, 4 (October – December), 467-473, Pl. 89-92.

VERMASEREN 1977

M. J. Vermaseren, *Cybele and Attis, the Myth and the Cult*, Thames and Hudson 1977.

VERMASEREN 1977a

M. J. Vermaseren, *CCCA VII, Musea et Collectiones privatae, EPRO 50*, Leiden 1977.

VERMASEREN 1982

M. J. Vermaseren, *CCCA II, Graecia atque insulae, EPRO 50*, Leiden 1982.

VERMASEREN 1987

M. J. Vermaseren, *CCCA I, Asia Minor, EPRO 50*, Leiden 1987.

VERMASEREN 1989

M. J. Vermaseren, *CCCA VI, Germania, Raetia, Noricum, Pannonia, Dalmatia, Macedonia, Thracia, Moesia, Dacia, Regnum Bospori, Colchis, Scythia et Sarmatia, EPRO 50* Leiden 1989.

**I MARMI ALTOMEDIEVALI DEL MUSEO CRISTIANO
DI CIVIDALE DEL FRIULI.
DAI CARATTERI DEL RILIEVO ALLA COMMITTENZA**

LAURA CHINELLATO

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI UDINE

Le lastre altomedievali del Museo Cristiano di Cividale del Friuli sono documenti eccezionali, scolpiti per l'area episcopale e la Gastaldaga da botteghe operative tra i primi decenni del secolo VIII e gli inizi del IX. Pur nella frammentarietà di dati archeologici, l'analisi delle fonti storiografiche, unita a quella dei dettagli tecnico-formali ci consente di risalire ai modelli e gusti promossi dalla committenza.

lastre altomedievali, area episcopale, gastaldaga, botteghe, dettagli tecnico-formali, committenza

Varcata la soglia del Museo Cristiano e Tesoro del Duomo di Cividale, i marmi altomedievali dell'antica *Forum Iulii* ci si pongono innanzi nella prima sala espositiva, oggi con un rinnovato fascino per il suggestivo e curato riallestimento museale.¹ Si tratta di arredi liturgici e porzioni di lastre eccezionali per la loro integrità e in quanto testimoni di ciò che fu prodotto presso l'area episcopale e la Gastaldaga della città, senza soluzione di continuità, dai primi decenni del secolo VIII agli inizi del secolo IX.

Di fama internazionale, ampiamente citati e studiati sono l'altare del duca Ratchis (737-744) e il ciborio che il patriarca Callisto (730-756) fece erigere, qualche anno dopo;² di non minor interesse, le lastre inserite presso la balaustra del monumento callistino, tradizionalmente attribuite ai patriarchi Sigualdo (756-786) e Paolino (786-802);³ infine, i manufatti allestiti sulle pareti del Museo, qui giunti come "Raccolta del Tempietto".⁴

Dal punto di vista storico e geografico ci muoviamo intorno ai decenni che videro l'apice e l'epilogo della cultura longobarda, all'interno dell'antica *Forum Iulii*, sede del primo ducato longobardo dal 568 e del patriarcato di Aquileia dal terzo decennio del secolo VIII.⁵

Nel presente scritto, i sopra citati manufatti verranno presentati riassumendone lo stato della ricerca (*Le opere. Breve descrizione*), progredita negli ultimi decenni soprattutto grazie ai contributi di Cecchelli, L'Orange, Tagliaferri, Piva e Lusuardi Siena.⁶ Si cercherà di evidenziare alcune problematiche ancora aperte e in parte dovute alla frammentarietà dei pezzi, all'incognita delle loro vicende conservative e del contesto architettonico cui facevano riferimento in origine.⁷ Quindi, stimolati dall'analisi storiografica, dallo studio dell'impaginazione del repertorio iconografico, dei dettagli formali e tecnico-esecutivi si porgeranno ulteriori riflessioni a riguardo (*Dai caratteri del rilievo alla committenza: modelli e identità*).

Per i limiti posti dalle norme redazionali e in quanto monumenti intorno ai quali la bibliografia è assai vasta, verranno qui omesse le descrizioni dell'altare di Ratchis (Fig. 1) e quella degli archivolti del ciborio di Callisto (Fig. 2).⁸



Fig. 1 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, altare di Ratchis, cm 90 × 144 (foto di Laura Chinellato).



Fig. 2 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, ciborio di Callisto, altezza cm 354 (foto di Laura Chinellato).

Le opere. Breve descrizione

Il *pluteo di Sigualdo* fa memoria del patriarca che succedette a Callisto⁹ (Fig. 3). È una lastra di marmo rettangolare¹⁰ che il Della Torre ipotizzò essere parte dell'iconostasi presbiteriale dell'antica basilica cividalese, anticamente dedicata al S. Giovanni.¹¹ Su questa linea fu anche

Cecchelli,¹² mentre Gioseffi lo ritenne porzione del diaframma radiale che sbarrava l'ambulacro del Battistero ottagonale, anticamente antistante la chiesa maggiore.¹³ Recentemente, Lusuardi-Siena e Piva, riprendendo l'ipotesi del Mutinelli, propongono che il pluteo appartenga ad una mensa d'altare dell'antico Battistero.¹⁴

La lastra fu collocata in epoca imprecisata presso la balastra del ciborio di Callisto, al di sotto dell'archetto decorato coi pavoni affrontati. Il repertorio scolpito è rigorosamente distribuito con simmetria rispetto all'asse mediano, delimitato da una croce decorata a matassa¹⁵ e da un albero della vita con testine leonine: due grandi annodature a otto con all'interno i simboli degli evangelisti recanti tavolette con iscrizioni;¹⁶ due candelabri, palme¹⁷, rosette e grifi. Un listello con incisa la dedica di Sigualdo divide orizzontalmente la lastra.¹⁸

Pluteo frammentario. Di provenienza incerta, collocato in epoca imprecisata presso la balastra del ciborio di Callisto, in corrispondenza dell'archetto spurio, secondo il Tagliaferri si tratta di opera realizzata «alla seconda metà del secolo VIII, senza escludere una precisazione al terzo quarto del medesimo» (Fig. 4).¹⁹ Pur evidenziando tipologie iconografiche e caratteristiche stilistiche comuni ad altri pezzi della “Raccolta del Tempietto”, lo stesso studioso ne suppose l'appartenenza al complesso basilicale, divergendo da L'Orange che lo ritenne prodotto della cerchia artistica, operativa per il Tempietto e/o per il complesso palaziale e chiesastico qui annesso.²⁰



Fig. 3 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, pluteo di Sigualdo, cm 77 × 125 (foto di Laura Chinellato).



Fig. 4 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, lastra frammentaria (a sinistra), cm 76 × 41,5; pluteo di S.Paolino (a destra), cm 75,5 × 82,5 (foto di Laura Chinellato).

Si presenta come una porzione di lastra di marmo bianco venato decorato, con un motivo circolare a spina di pesce entro il quale è inscritta una rosa a nove petali, contornata da motivo a matassa. Da essa si dipartono gigli lanceolati. Il rilievo è raffinato e il repertorio è connotato da una stilizzazione d'insieme.

Lastra con alabarda. Allestita sulla parete destra della sala, appartenne alla “Raccolta del Tempietto” di Santa Maria in Valle²¹ (Fig. 5). Si tratta di un pluteo di recinzione presbiteriale in marmo proconnesio,²² scolpito, secondo Tagliaferri, sempre come il precedente negli anni centrali del sec. VIII.²³ Il decoro è incorniciato alla sommità da un tralcio a girello, nettamente stilizzato che Lusuardi Siena e Piva dichiarano essere ben documentato in area veneta, Trento e Verona.²⁴



Fig. 5 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, lastra con alabarda, cm 98,5 × 189
(foto di Laura Chinellato).

Un sottile racemo con elementi gigliati rifinisce il bordo inferiore,²⁵ mentre il decoro centrale, inscrivibile in tre regolari quadrati, presenta al centro una croce con alabarda e ai lati tondi con simbologie solari.

Timpani con girali e liocorni. Sono arredi in pietra calcarea datati da Tagliaferri gli inizi del sec. IX e da Lusuardi Siena e Piva «intorno al terzo quarto dell'VIII sec.»²⁶ (Fig. 6, Fig. 7). Secondo quest'ultime si tratta di lastre scolpite da una bottega che lavora per il patriarca Sigualdo e che è influenzata dalla quella callistina.

I timpani provengono, come la precedente lastra, dall'area del Tempietto e per Cecchelli più probabilmente dalla chiesa di S. Giovanni in Valle sulla cui facciata furono murati nel XVIII secolo.²⁷ Cattaneo, Cecchelli e Tagliaferri li supposero parti di un ciborio, mentre Lusuardi Siena e

Piva li ritengono, per l'assenza di aperture arcuate, coronamento di porte o edicole.²⁸ Le lastre appaiono segate ai lati, forse a seguito di un riuso.²⁹ L'intaglio del decoro è marcato e caratterizzato alla sommità da un coronamento a cani correnti e da una cornice con S raffrontate, legate con palmette e grappolo d'uva che per le sue peculiarità L'Orange definì «fregio a S cividalese».³⁰ Alla base è stato scolpito un tralcio d'acanto a volute, centrate da rosette.³¹



Fig. 6 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, timpano con girali, cm 97 × 165 (foto di Laura Chinellato).



Fig. 7 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, timpano con liocorni, cm 99 × 188 (foto di Laura Chinellato).

I due timpani presentano incorniciatura uguale, ma differente decoro centrale: una grande croce di Sant'Andrea gigliata inscritta in un rettangolo,³² e ai lati cerchi cordonati con dentro un vortice ed esagono, un giglio e un pavone; un clipeo laureato circonda una treccia a tre capi, ritorta in modo da disegnare una croce equilatera, e ai lati due leoni e unicorni.³³ Il rilievo è incompleto.³⁴

Timpano con motivo a matassa. Di calcare bianco, scolpito tra la fine del secolo VII e i primi dell'VIII secondo Tagliaferri, mentre per L'Orange e Lusuardi Siena nei decenni centrali del sec. VIII,³⁵ proviene anch'esso dalla "Raccolta del Tempietto" (Fig. 8). Per la forma quasi equilatera era adibito, secondo Tagliaferri e Lusuardi Siena, a sovrapporta.³⁶ Il decoro, rimasto incompleto, accoglie lungo l'asse mediano verticale due croci equilatera e una spaziatura rettangolare, forse cartella per qualche epigrafe; ai lati delle croci vi sono scolpiti cerchi e girelli; perimetralmente cani correnti e un motivo a matassa, simile a quello di un frammento cuspidato di pergula, custodito nel Museo di Zuglio.³⁷

La *lastra di S. Paolino*, porta il nome del grammatico cividalese, fedele amico di Carlo Magno e personalità di grande autorità morale che succedette al patriarca Sigualdo³⁸ (Fig. 4). L'opera, inserita presso la balaustra del ciborio di Callisto, fu datata da Tagliaferri tra l'ultimo decennio del sec. VIII e i primi anni del sec. IX,³⁹ e reimpiega il retro di una porzione di lastra di

calcare bianco cristallino di fine sec. VII, il cui calco è allestito sulla parete di questa sala.⁴⁰ Appartenne probabilmente al complesso basilicale e Cecchelli ipotizza che fu segata nella parte bassa proprio per il suo inserimento nel basamento del battistero.⁴¹ La lastra è caratterizzata da un rilievo assai marcato e, alla sommità, da un elaborato intreccio mistilineo; al di sotto, quattro riquadri (di cui due parziali) sono incorniciati da motivo a matassa.⁴² I due riquadri integri inscrivono i simboli degli evangelisti Luca (bue) e Giovanni (aquila) recanti cartigli sui quali sono incisi versi ispirati al poeta Sedulio.⁴³ Gli altri due riquadri mutili hanno scolpiti gigli, fiori e l'albero della vita.

Lastra con maglie annodate. È una porzione di pluteo in calcare chiaro, probabilmente in origine parte della cancellata presbiteriale della basilica.⁴⁴ (Fig. 9) Fu riadattata come lastra epigrafica e murata sulla parete destra del Duomo.⁴⁵ Presenta alla sommità il motivo del nastro a doppia asola in forma estremamente geometrizzata, ampiamente documentato tra la metà del sec. VIII e il sec. IX.⁴⁶ La superficie è dominata da una trama di cerchi con nastri a tre capi annodati tra loro, attraversati obliquamente da nastri continui e incrociati, decoro anch'esso assai documentato.⁴⁷




Fig. 8 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, timpano con matassa, cm 93 × 195 (foto di Laura Chinellato).




Fig. 9 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, lastra con maglie annodate, cm 93,5 × 137,5 (foto di Laura Chinellato).

Dai caratteri del rilievo alla committenza: modelli e identità

I manufatti lapidei custoditi nelle prime sale del Museo Cristiano sono stati ampiamente analizzati, descritti e interpretati dalla critica.⁴⁸ Uno dei più corposi e recenti contributi è quello di Lusuardi Siena e Piva che esaminano i pezzi ricontestualizzandone gli spazi architettonici e culturali ai quali erano destinati.⁴⁹ Con taglio e meticolosità archeologica le studiose propongono convincenti ricostruzioni degli arredi e una riclassificazione basata su “identità di mano”, caratteristiche formali, programma e modalità dell'ornato. In virtù di ciò Lusuardi Siena e Piva identificano all'interno della

Gastaldaga cividalese quattro gruppi operativi: quattro diverse botteghe di lapicidi. Si tratta di una classificazione che arricchisce e supera quella compiuta da L'Orange⁵⁰ e che, pur nella povertà di dati archeologici, si pone in linea con le tendenze della critica degli ultimi anni.⁵¹

Riguardo le maestranze altomedievali, le fonti giuridiche ci informano che in ambito edile potevano essere ingaggiati anche aiutanti a giornata.⁵² Siamo, quindi, indotti a pensare che ciò potesse avvenire anche in un cantiere o bottega di lapicidi, soprattutto a ridosso di qualche consegna. Lo studio condotto dalla scrivente sulle lastre dell'altare di Ratchis ha messo in luce come più scalpellini possono operare contemporaneamente su una stessa lastra, e che per l'intera opera può essere coinvolto anche uno staff di cinque o sei persone.⁵³ Fino a che punto, quindi, il discrimine tra aspetti formali, "identità di mano" e peculiarità tecniche ci consente di definire i caratteri di una bottega?

La frammentarietà delle lastre del Museo Cristiano, i soli dati visibili di ornato, iconografia e tecnica, uniti all'incognita del contesto architettonico a cui queste opere erano destinate ci pongono di fronte a non pochi problemi. Ci impediscono di risalire a quel progetto e *unicum* ideativo che è ogni prodotto dell'uomo: un manufatto progettato e costruito in base a calibrati rapporti geometrici e in stretta relazione con l'ambiente che lo doveva accogliere.⁵⁴ Inoltre, la frammentarietà di queste lastre ci aliena dal forte impatto visivo che gli arredi sicuramente avevano in origine, in quanto, come attesta l'antica trattatistica, spesso rifiniti da policromie, pietre e metalli.⁵⁵ Finiture che, sovrapponendosi sulla superficie lapidea avrebbero certamente cancellato e uniformato ogni segno lasciato dallo scalpello, quindi anche quelle diverse mani intervenute nella realizzazione di una stessa opera.

Considerato che il lapicida altomedievale era *in primis* un artigiano e un buon esecutore al servizio di un capo bottega,⁵⁶ e che il capo bottega era al soldo di una committenza, ritengo interessante analizzare le peculiarità scultoree di un'opera per comprendere i modelli e la cultura di riferimento di colui/coloro che la idearono; quindi, farsi guidare dai caratteri esecutivi dell'opera per risalire alla committenza.⁵⁷

Su questa linea, non rileveremo più, come qualcuno ancor oggi fa, sgrammaticature ed errori del rilievo, e accoglieremo eventuali anomalie come riflesso di precisi modelli e referenti formali. Forse a noi incomprensibili ed estranei, poiché inconsciamente condizionati da una visione evolutiva/involutiva dell'arte di stampo vasariano.

Uno sguardo a volo d'uccello sulle lastre della prima sala del Museo Cristiano ci consente di cogliere il comune carattere fortemente bidimensionale, stilizzato e astratto dei rilievi: un insistito gusto, definito da alcuna critica *horror vacui*⁵⁸ e le cui radici affondano, come ben illustrò Kitzinger⁵⁹, nei secoli del tardo-antico.

Analizzando, però, con maggior attenzione l'impianto disegnativo, i dettagli scultorei e la finitura delle superfici si evidenziano sulla lastra con alabarda e sui timpani con girali e liocorni lievi asimmetrie, deformazioni, rigidità nella definizione del contorno dei soggetti e segni piuttosto marcati lasciati dagli strumenti del lapicida. Diversamente, sui plutei dei patriarchi Sigualdo e Paolino, e sulla lastra con maglie annodate il repertorio decorativo è stato organizzato con tale cura, bilanciata simmetria e finitura che rare e poco evidenti sono le impronte lasciate da gradine, scalpelli e trapani.



Fig. 10 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, timpano con liocorni, particolare con leone (foto di Laura Chinellato).



Fig. 11 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, ciborio di Callisto, particolare con leone (foto da Gioseffi, 1978).

Il dettaglio fotografico di un medesimo soggetto (leone), scolpito sul timpano con liocorni e sul ciborio di Callisto ci aiuta a sottolineare tali divergenze e dati che non dipendono certo dalle proprietà della specie lapidea adottata, poiché trattasi per entrambe le opere di marmo (Figg. 10, 11). Su questa stessa linea comparativa, si osserva un'analogia tra il repertorio decorativo scolpito sulla lastra di Sigualdo e quello del fronte maggiore dell'altare di Ratchis per la simmetrica impaginazione d'insieme. La scelta, però, di un marmo greco⁶⁰ per la realizzazione del pluteo e l'estrema cura per disegno, intaglio e politura della superficie, uniti ad un minor affollamento del piano di fondo allontanano la lastra del patriarca dagli esiti dell'ara per avvicinarla inequivocabilmente al raffinato ciborio di Callisto: ad un gusto ancorato alla cultura latino-bizantina, familiare alla produzione artistica della Chiesa romana.⁶¹

Cecchelli e Mor definirono categoricamente “barbarico” e “bizantino” lo stile determinato da questi caratteri scultorei.⁶²

Tali dati, uniti a quelli emersi delle fonti storiografiche ci inducono a dipanare il filo rosso della committenza e a riorganizzare le lastre del Museo Cristiano in due macrogruppi: opere commissionate per il complesso episcopale e manufatti realizzati per l'area della Gastaldaga.

In base a tale discriminazione separeremo, quindi, il battistero di Callisto, il pluteo di Sigualdo, la lastra di S. Paolino e quella con maglie annodate (area episcopale) dall'altare di Ratchis, dalla lastra con alabarda e dai timpani con girali, liocorni e matassa (area della Gastaldaga).⁶³

Ripercorrendo lungo l'asse cronologico quanto prodotto per l'area episcopale, si osserva che, nell'arco di pochi decenni, il repertorio si fa sempre più aniconico, decorativo (Fig. 9)⁶⁴ e regolato da rigori geometrici (Fig. 4): da una modularità “*ad quadratum*”, spiccata nei manufatti del sec. IX.

Riguardo le maestranze che operarono nel secolo VIII, sollevo ulteriori criticità. Quali elementi abbiamo per escludere che i manufatti prodotti nello stesso arco di tempo siano stati realizzati da medesime botteghe? Le fonti giuridiche ci informano che in ambito edile i *magistri* potevano essere ingaggiati da un qualsivoglia committente.⁶⁵ Perché negare, allora, che una bottega di lapicidi potesse lavorare sia per la committenza ecclesiastica che per quella ducale, e che fosse in grado di riorganizzare le proprie maestranze in modo da interpretare per “forza di levare” gusti e modelli estetici di chi commissionava l'opera?⁶⁶

E ancora, osserviamo manufatti che sono frammentari e incompleti; lastre che molto probabilmente possedevano finiture policrome. Fino a che punto tali finiture correggevano l'incompiutezza di certo intaglio, uniformavano specie lapidee e, come sopra citato, mani diverse, sottolineando divergenze o consonanze estetiche con specifici codici comunicativi?⁶⁷

Le epigrafi scolpite sull'altare di Ratchis e sul ciborio di Callisto ci possono, forse, aiutare a formulare qualche risposta.

Altare ditabit marmoris colore Ratchis Hildeboholrit. Così si conclude l'epigrafe che il duca Ratchis fece scolpire sull'ara per ricordare ai posteri la sua munificenza ed il forte impatto visivo che l'opera, rifinita da rutilanti cromie, aveva in origine.⁶⁸ Con un intento non distante da quello del duca Ratchis, il patriarca Callisto fece incidere alla sommità del monumento le parole *vibrante marmorum scema*, fornendoci insieme all'esortazione un'istantanea di come doveva apparire il ciborio in origine.⁶⁹

Siamo tentati di interpretare queste parole come espressione di gusti ancorati a modelli molto diversi: il primo, quello dell'ara, dominato dal compiacimento per le policromie che, come hanno confermato le indagini,⁷⁰ rafforzavano leggibilità e valenza simbolica dei soggetti; la seconda, quella del ciborio, maggiormente compiaciuta per gli effetti vibranti e guizzanti di luce: un risultato che, per il termine impiegato, nessun impasto policromo poteva imitare e che doveva essere affidato a lamine metalliche, giustapposte. Forse lamine d'argento?⁷¹

Si tratta, per il ciborio, di una finitura in estrema sintonia con la scelta di un marmo greco⁷² e con quei modelli paleocristiani e bizantini che, precisò Tavano, caratterizzarono la ventata artistica promossa dal patriarca Callisto, e per i quali la città di Grado dovette costituire un forte referente

visivo;⁷³ modelli che persistono nella cattedra episcopale, alloggiata nella seconda sala del Museo (Fig. 12). Inoltre, si tratta di una finitura suggestiva e ammaliante che, nell'originario contesto architettonico, dialogava con l'epigrafe e con i materiali situati intorno al monumento: con le suppellettili sacre, con l'acqua consacrata e con la luce prodotta da lampade ad olio e candele,⁷⁴ elementi pregni di valenze simboliche.⁷⁵

Come osservarono Mutinelli e Marioni,⁷⁶ una preziosa finitura dovette avere anche il pluteo di Sigualdo: rutilante di ori, gemme e colori, quasi un prezioso damasco e stoffa siriana dai quali il codice espressivo è, parafrasando le parole del Gioseffi, "sbandato".⁷⁷



*Fig. 12 Cividale, Museo Cristiano del Duomo, cattedra patriarcale
(foto di Laura Chinellato).*

Pochi anni dopo la monumentalizzazione del fonte battesimale compiuta dal patriarca Callisto, la committenza ducal-regia longobarda ingaggerà maestranze altamente qualificate per decorare le pareti interne di un monumento prestigioso: il Tempietto di S. Maria in Valle.

Qui, il rigore tecnico-esecutivo si fuse mirabilmente con soluzioni polimateriche, ottenute dalla commistione di affresco, stucco policromo,⁷⁸ mosaico e inserti vitrei. Ammantati da tonalità sature⁷⁹ e, contemporaneamente, da effetti guizzanti di luce, i sacri soggetti raffigurati porsero, a metà del sec. VIII, un linguaggio innovativo e, contemporaneamente, evocativo, seme per i decenni a venire.⁸⁰

Sono profondamente grata al Prof. Valentino Pace per avermi incoraggiata ad intraprendere questo studio e ad Antonella Ballardini per l'amicizia e gli stimoli che mi ha fornito sull'argomento.

- ¹ Il Museo Cristiano allestito nel 1947 è stato ristrutturato e ampliato nei suoi spazi a giugno 2008. Per una sintesi delle vicende museali si veda MATTALONI 2009, pp. 75-106.
- ² Secondo Cecchelli, Callisto fu nominato patriarca dopo il 723 e prima del 733. Paschini restrinse questo arco di tempo al 731-733 e Lidia Capo al 731. Callisto era un latino e molto probabilmente si insediò in Cividale solo intorno al 737, trasferendo definitivamente la sede del patriarcato da Cormos. Ciò avvenne dopo aspri scontri interscorsi tra lui e l'allora duca Pemmone, frizioni che furono risolte grazie all'intervento di re Liutprando. Per le vicende del patriarca Callisto si rinvia a *l'Historia langobardorum* di Paolo Diacono, VI,45, 51; NICOLETTI 1928, pp. 10-12; LOCATELLI 1584; DE RUBEIS 1740, cc. 320-322; DE RUBEIS 1754, p. 378; STUROLO 1772, pp. 212-226; DELLA TORRE 1807; PASCHINI 1910, p. 2; CECHELLI 1943, nota 5, p. 49; MUTINELLI 1968, pp. 6-16; TAVANO 1969; CAPO 1992, p. 591.
- ³ Per le indicazioni cronologiche relative al mandato di duchi e patriarchi si veda STOLFA 1939; GASPARRI 1978; MENIS 2002. Per il contesto storico BOSIO 1977.
- ⁴ Le lastre allestite presso le pareti della prima sala del Museo Cristiano di Cividale provengono per la gran parte dall'area della Gastaldaga e "si trovavano raccolti nel vestibolo d'ingresso del Tempietto longobardo, aperto alla fruizione pubblica dal 1893". Giunsero al Museo come "Raccolta del Tempietto" ed è previsto il loro ricollocamento nei pressi del Tempietto longobardo (MATTALONI 2008, p. 131; MATTALONI 2009, p. 93).
- ⁵ Per una panoramica aggiornata sulla situazione politica di Cividale nei secc. VIII-IX si rinvia a GASPARRI 2012.
- ⁶ CECHELLI 1943; L'ORANGE 1979; TAGLIAFERRI 1981; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002; LUSUARDI SIENA, DEL PIANO 2010.
- ⁷ Lusuardi Siena sottolinea anche le problematicità dovute al fatto che non si conoscono le circostanze di rinvenimento di alcune lastre (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, II, pp. 493-594, in particolare pp. 521-522).
- ⁸ Per un *excursus* sulle fonti storiografiche riguardanti l'altare di Ratchis ed il ciborio di Callisto si veda TAGLIAFERRI 1981 pp. 206-207, 213-214. Inoltre, LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, pp. 551-556; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, pp. 300-301; CHINELLATO 2004; CHINELLATO, COSTANTINI 2005; CHINELLATO, COSTANTINI 2006; CUSCITO 2006, pp. 20-32; CHINELLATO, COSTANTINI, MANZATO 2009; CHINELLATO 2010; LUSUARDI SIENA, DELPIANO 2010. Sui marmi altomedievali del Museo Cristiano di Cividale si veda anche L. Chinellato, *Il battistero di Callisto, l'altare di Ratchis e i marmi del Museo Cristiano. Spunti per una rilettura*, in *Forum Iulii*, XXXV (2011), in corso di stampa, ove vengono approfonditi alcuni aspetti delle opere anche in relazione al territorio d'origine.
- ⁹ Sigualdo è nome che tradisce l'origine longobarda. Nativo di Cividale discendeva dalla *gens* di re Grimoaldo e convinse la principessa longobarda Piltrude, fondatrice di conventi in regione, Toscana e Nonantola, a trasferirsi in Cividale, accanto al suo palazzo patriarcale (DELLA TORRE 1899, nota 28, p. 31; CECHELLI 1943, nota 21, p. 58). Guidato dai dati paleografici, il Mor ritenne che il pluteo precedesse di qualche decennio l'età di Sigualdo e che il patriarca lo avesse utilizzato come materiale di reimpiego (MOR 1954-55, p. 169). A giudizio di Tagliaferri e Cuscito è difficile assegnare al dato epigrafico una così determinante importanza e, rileva Cuscito, i recenti lavori di Rugo e Gaberscek hanno contribuito a riportare a riportare il pluteo e le iscrizioni in esso presenti nell'ambito sigualdino (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 217-218; CUSCITO 2006, p. 39).
- ¹⁰ La lastra misura in altezza e lunghezza cm 77 × 125 (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 216).
- ¹¹ DELLA TORRE 1899, pp. 21-22.
- ¹² CECHELLI 1943, p. 53, nota 23.
- ¹³ GIOSEFFI 1978, p. 36.
- ¹⁴ MUTINELLI 1955, p. 3; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, pp. 508 e 559.
- ¹⁵ Tagliaferri osservò che la croce con decoro a matassa a due capi è un precoce esempio di motivo ampiamente diffuso «nella prima metà del secolo IX», riscontrabile anche nel dossale di cattedra cividalese e in un frammento del Museo Archeologico di Aquileia (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 132, tav. XL; per il dossale di cattedra pp. 266-268, tav. CXXXII). Un simile motivo a disco annodato con dentro animali si riscontra su un frammento di pilastro della chiesa di S. Maria in Otricoli (BERTELLI 1985, pp. 244-245, tav. LXX).
- ¹⁶ Le iscrizioni sono tratte con qualche variante dal *Carmen paschale* (I, 355-358) di Sedulio. Sui cartigli degli evangelisti Giovanni, Luca, Matteo e Marco si legge rispettivamente: + MORE VOLANS AQVI/LAE VERB PETITAS/TRA IOHANNIS; + IVRA SACERDOTIS / LVCAS TENIT ORE/IVVINCI; + HOC MATTEVS AGENS / HOMINEM GENERA/LITER IMPLENS; + MARCVS VT ALTA FRE/MENS VOX PER DI/SERTA LEONIS (CUSCITO 2006, p. 39).
- ¹⁷ La rappresentazione della croce tra due palme è apparsa fin dal sec. VI su monumenti ravennati e perdurò nei secc. IX-X (GRION, 1899, p. 346).
- ¹⁸ L'incisione ha *ductus* regolare e lettere allungate con numerosi legamenti (CUSCITO 2006, pp. 36-39). La dedica così recita: + HOC TIBI RESTITVIT SIGVALD BAPTESTA JOHANNES. Secondo Lusuardi Siena e Piva l'iscrizione dedicataria e il tetramorfo, suggeriscono l'appartenenza del pluteo ad un altare da collocare verosimilmente nell'ambito della chiesa di S. Giovanni Battista (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, p. 303). Riguardo gli evangelisti raffigurati in forma di tetramorfo Cecchelli segnala che le coppie sono state disposte interpretando male le parole del profeta Ezechiele, poiché collocate a sinistra e destra della croce rispetto a chi guarda e non rispetto alla croce stessa

- (CECHELLI 1943, p. 31). Wilczynski rileva, invece, che il tetramorfo del testo di Ezechiele è stato interpretato con estrema coerenza per la presenza dei piedi di vitello, raramente raffigurati (WILCZYNSKI 1954, p. 7). Per un percorso storiografico significativo sull'opera: DELLA TORRE 1807; EITELBERGER 1857, pp. 10-11; GARRUCCI 1880, p. 30; CATTANEO 1888, pp. 88-89; DELLA TORRE 1899; CECHELLI 1943, pp. 27-64; MOR 1954-55; MUTINELLI 1955; COSMI DE FANTI 1972, pp. 58-72; GIOSEFFI 1978; TAGLIAFERRI 1981, pp. 216-219; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002.
- ¹⁹ TAGLIAFERRI 1981, pp. 221-223. La lastra misura in altezza e lunghezza cm 76 × 41,5.
- ²⁰ TAGLIAFERRI 1981, pp. 221-222; L'ORANGE 1979, p. 156 e tav. CXLVII b. Riguardo la datazione del pezzo, Lusuardi Siena e Piva accolgono quella del Tagliaferri, ma, come L'Orange, suppongono che la lastra potrebbe appartenere al gruppo di manufatti prodotti da una bottega che opera per la Gastaldaga (nella loro classificazione "gruppo II"); inoltre, che il pezzo si armonizzerebbe «con il presbiterio del Tempietto, qualora si riuscisse a dimostrare che l'attuale recinto di reimpiego è stato messo in opera tardivamente» (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, p. 531).
- ²¹ L'ubicazione originaria e una persistente tradizione attestano la provenienza di questo pezzo dal complesso monumentale costituito in origine dalla chiesa di S. Giovanni Battista e dall'oratorio di S. Maria in Valle. Tagliaferri suppone un'appartenenza della lastra alla sola chiesa di S. Giovanni in Valle (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 245).
- ²² La lastra misura in altezza e lunghezza cm. 98,5 × 189 (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, pp. 244). Per un'ipotesi ricostruttiva del suo ingombro totale si veda LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, p. 302, fig. 17.
- ²³ «Datazione alla seconda metà del secolo VIII o terzo quarto del medesimo» (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 245).
- ²⁴ Il tralicio a girelli è ben documentato su plutei conservati al Lapidario del Castello di Trento e su archetti del ciborio di S. Giorgio in Valpollicella. La concezione ornamentale di questa lastra ritorna negli arredi di S. Pietro in Carnia, a Zuglio ed essa è caratteristica dominante di una bottega definita da Napione "berico-benacense". Nella classificazione di Lusuardi e Piva la lastra appartiene al "gruppo II" dei quattro identificati dalle studiose e operativi in Cividale tra il sec. VII e IX (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, p. 565; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, pp. 302-303; NAPIONE 2001, pp. 100-116; NAPIONE 2002).
- ²⁵ Gaberscek, L'Orange e Cecchelli osservarono che un decoro molto simile si riscontra su altri due frammenti, uno dei quali reimpiegato come lastra pavimentale del Tempietto e conservato al Museo Archeologico Nazionale. L'Orange ritenne che la "Lastra con alabarda" appartenesse alla stessa cerchia artistica che ha prodotto il pluteo frammentario inserito sulla balaustra del ciborio di Callisto ("gruppo B") (GABERSCEK 1976, p. 17; L'ORANGE 1979, pp. 154-177 e tavv. CXLVIIa, CLXIII; TAGLIAFERRI 1981, tav. CXV, pp. 249-250).
- ²⁶ Il timpano con girali misura in altezza e lunghezza cm 97 × 165; il timpano con liocorni cm 99 × 188 (TAGLIAFERRI 1981). Per la datazione e una ricostruzione del loro ingombro originario si veda TAGLIAFERRI 1981, pp. 253-254; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, n. 47-48, tav. XXII 1-2 e LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, p. 305, fig. 25.
- ²⁷ Entrambe le lastre furono viste da Gaetano Sturolo, nel sec. XVIII, murate sulla facciata della chiesa di S. Giovanni in Valle (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, pp. 253-254).
- ²⁸ Cecchelli corresse il Cattaneo che li riteneva volte del presbiterio del Tempietto longobardo, suggerendo che per «le vaste proporzioni» servissero come frontespizio di ciborio all'altare maggiore del S. Giovanni in Valle (CATTANEO 1988, p. 96; CECHELLI 1981, p. 81, nota 9). Lusuardi Siena e Piva non ne escludono un impiego in edicole funerarie (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, p. 305). Nella loro classificazione queste lastre appartengono al "gruppo IV" (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, pp. 573-574, tav. XXIV).
- ²⁹ TAGLIAFERRI 1981, pp. 253-254.
- ³⁰ Il «fregio a S cividalese» lo ritroviamo in Cividale scolpito su pietra e raggiunge «un'esecuzione particolarmente ricca nella scultura in stucco del Tempietto cividalese [...] Va rilevato che questa esecuzione speciale del fregio a "S raffrontate" non si incontra soltanto nella scultura a stucco del Tempietto, ma caratterizza tutta la cerchia artistica cividalese del tempo» (L'ORANGE 1979, p. 61).
- ³¹ Medesimi motivi si trovano in altri frammenti provenienti dalla "Raccolta del Tempietto" (si veda TAGLIAFERRI 1981, tavv. CXIII, CXIV).
- ³² È curioso riscontrare un medesimo decoro con croce di Sant'Andrea gigliata sul basamento dell'obelisco di Teodosio I, scolpito a Costantinopoli e destinato all'ippodromo (MOSCATI 1978, p. 149, fig. 40).
- ³³ Una leggenda medievale metteva a confronto l'unicorno e il leone per significare il conflitto tra il bene e il male (BISCONTI, MARIA BISCONTI 1988, p. 460). Riscontriamo una medesima iconografia su alcuni resti marmorei di epoca longobarda, rinvenuti dopo il terremoto del 1976, nella chiesetta castellana di Sant'Andrea di Mels (MENIS 2004) e sul ciborio di Citanova d'Istria (JURKOVIĆ *et alii* 2006, pp. 30, 47; CUSCITO 2010, p. 109, fig. 107).
- ³⁴ L'ORANGE 1979, p. 152; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, p. 305.
- ³⁵ L'ORANGE 1979, p. 216; TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 255, n. 380, tav. CXIX; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, p. 529, n. 46, tav. XX,7, nella loro classificazione "III gruppo".
- ³⁶ TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 255; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, p. 572. Il pezzo misura in altezza e lunghezza cm 93 × 195. Per la ricostruzione del suo ingombro originario si veda LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, p. 573.
- ³⁷ ORIOLO, VITRI 2005, fig. 59, p. 75.
- ³⁸ MENIS 1988, pp. 16-17.
- ³⁹ TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 219.

- ⁴⁰ La lastra misura in altezza e larghezza cm 75,5 × 82,5 (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 219). Rinvio a LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, fig. 47, p. 319, per la ricostruzione del suo ingombro originario. Per lo spiccato naturalismo e per l'esecuzione approssimativa, il decoro con serpenti e motivi vegetali scolpito sul retro di questa lastra, fu datato dal Tagliaferri fine sec. VII e inizi sec. VIII, ma ritenuta da Tavano di sec. VI (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 221; TAVANO 1988, p. 267). Lusuardi Siena e Piva accolgono la datazione del Tagliaferri (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, p. 295).
- ⁴¹ CECHELLI 1943, p. 34. Lusuardi Siena e Piva ipotizzano che la lastra sia stata realizzata per un intervento di rinnovamento del presbiterio «attuato forse in vista del concilio convocato dal patriarca a Cividale nel 796 e che si svolse proprio nella basilica» cividalese (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, p. 307). Rilevo che il *Chronica* del canonico Iuliani testimonia la presenza, nell'anno 1299, di un *altare sancti Paulini*, collocato presso il battistero ottagonale, allora ampliato sul lato ovest con altre costruzioni aventi funzione di cappelle (BROZZI 1979, p. 83, nota 11).
- ⁴² Il decoro a matassa che incornicia specchiature quadrate è assai diffuso nel sec. VIII e si riscontra, per esempio, in ambito cividalese, su una delle due lastre cividalesi del così detto «sarcofago della regina Piltrude», datato da Tagliaferri alla seconda metà del sec. VIII (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 252, tav. CXVII); inoltre, sui plutei delle chiese di S. Sabina a Roma e di S. Maria dell'Arco di Civita Castellana, datati al pontificato di Eugenio II (824-827) e a metà sec. IX da Cattaneo e Raspi Serra (CATTANEO 1888, fig. 92, p. 156; RASPI SERRA 1974, tav. XLIV, pp. 79-80).
- ⁴³ I versi sono incisi coi caratteri della capitale rustica un po' allungata: + IVRA SACERDOTI / S LVCAS TENIT OR / E IVVINCIM (evangelista Luca); + MORE VOLANS AQ / VILAE VERB PETITA / STRA IVHANNIS (evangelista Giovanni). Cecchelli ricorda che al Bertoli va il merito di aver indicato la fonte di questi versi (CECHELLI 1943, nota 59, p. 57; BERTOLI 1739, p. 440).
- ⁴⁴ La lastra misura in altezza e lunghezza cm 93,5 × 137,5 (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 223).
- ⁴⁵ La lastra fu murata sulla parete destra del Duomo, vicino alla precedente collocazione del ciborio di Callisto e giunse nel museo Cristiano nel 1969 (TAGLIAFERRI 1981, p. 223). Sul retro si legge la data 10 febbraio 1598. Dal momento che i riallestimenti più significativi del ciborio di Callisto sono sempre stati documentati con epigrafi, questa data serviva, forse, a ricordarne la risistemazione attuata dopo il concilio di Trento a seguito delle costituzioni emanate dal patriarca Francesco Barbaro, nel 1594? Tali disposizioni comportarono la sostituzione del rito a immersione con quello ad aspersione, e la risistemazione del ciborio «ponendovi all'interno una colonna con sopra una vasca di marmo». Sull'intervento del patriarca Francesco Barbaro si veda DELLA TORRE, 1807, c. 6; EITELBERGER 1857, p. 10; MATTALONI 2009, pp. 76-77.
- ⁴⁶ «[...] in misura crescente nel corso del primo quarto del IX secolo, il moltiplicarsi di schemi compositivi alternativi e il ricorso sempre più esclusivo al nastro vimineo hanno rapidamente formalizzato il linguaggio della scultura a intreccio, diffusosi così ampiamente nelle chiese di Roma e dell'intero *Patrimonium Sancti Petri*» (BALLARDINI 2008, p. 240). Si veda anche HUBERT *et alii* 1968, p. 28.
- ⁴⁷ Analoghi decori compaiono in area aquileiese, gradese e in Istria; inoltre, diffusamente nel centro e nord Italia: nelle provincie di Brescia, Torino, Genova, Ravenna, Bologna, Frosinone, Roma, Spoleto, Arezzo, e Perugia. Per le diocesi di Aquileia e Grado si veda TAGLIAFERRI 1981, n. 21, tav. VIII; n. 103, tav. XXXIII; n. 109 e 111, tav. XXXV; n. 276-277, tav. LXIX; n. 194, tav. XLIX; n. 341, tav. CII; n. 404 e 405, tav. CXXXIV. Per la diocesi di Brescia, PANAZZA, TAGLIAFERRI 1966, pp. 75-76, fig. 79. Per la diocesi di Torino, CASARTELLI NOVELLI 1974, pp. 207-208, 214-215, figg. 128, 136. Per la diocesi di Roma, ERMINI 1974, pp. 91-92, tav. XV e MELUCCO VACCARO 1974, p. 75, figg. 14-15. Per l'alto Lazio, RASPI SERRA 1974 p. 80, fig. 81, tav. XLV; inoltre, *Roma 1976*, figg. 251, 270. Per la diocesi di Spoleto, SERRA 1961, pp. 35-36, Tavv. XIII, XV, XVI, XVII. Per la diocesi di Arezzo, FATUCCHI 1977, pp. 79-81, fig. 57. Per l'Istria si rinvia a JURKOVIĆ *et alii* 2006. Riguardo il decoro si segnala come il colore sottolineasse diversificazioni di intrecci apparentemente simili (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002, p. 307).
- ⁴⁸ CECHELLI 1943; GABERSCEK 1976; TAGLIAFERRI 1981.
- ⁴⁹ LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001; LUSUARDI SIENA 2002; LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002.
- ⁵⁰ L'Orange identificò tra le opere scolpite per la Gastadaga due gruppi ("gruppo A" e "gruppo B"), limitandosi a classificare quanto prodotto tra metà sec. VIII e inizi IX (L'ORANGE 1979). Lusuardi Siena e Piva hanno ampliato questa classificazione includendo anche la produzione di fine sec. VII e proponendo l'esistenza di un terzo gruppo (gruppo II), affianco ai due individuati dal L'Orange. Le botteghe operative sarebbero per Lusuardi Siena e Piva le seguenti: bottega attiva alla fine del sec. VII (gruppo I); botteghe che operano a metà del sec. VIII (gruppo II e III); bottega coeva agli stucchi del Tempietto e dell'età di Sigualdo (gruppo IV) (LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001, pp. 528-529).
- ⁵¹ Per le botteghe, maestranze e relazioni tra i vari gruppi operanti si veda in particolare SENHAUSER, ROTH-RUBI 2009; NAPIONE 2001, pp. 100-116; NAPIONE 2002.
- ⁵² AZZARRA 2009. Si veda anche BARRAL I ALTET 1991.
- ⁵³ CHINELLATO 2004, p. 87.
- ⁵⁴ Per i rapporti di sezione aurea si veda: PETROVIĆ 1962; POZZETTO 1972; TAVANO 1975; BOULEAU 1998, p. 91; CORONEO 2009; CHINELLATO 2010, p. 85.
- ⁵⁵ Per un approfondimento delle antiche tecniche adottate nel campo delle arti si invita alla consultazione dei trattati di Plinio, Eraclio e Teofilo (PLINIO 1981; GARZYA ROMANO 1996; CAFFARO 2000). Riguardo le superfici policrome

- della scultura greca e romana si veda SWOBODA 1889 e *I colori* 2004; per un'ampia bibliografia sull'argomento KIILLERICH 2008.
- ⁵⁶ SALMI 1959. La mano dello scalpellino trasferisce su pietra un disegno/progetto concordato con la committenza, se non addirittura ideato da essa. L'impostazione del piano di fondo del rilievo, i dettagli tecnici e le finiture cromatiche sono scelte compiute dal/col committente e non arbitrii dell'artigiano.
- ⁵⁷ Per il rapporto tra estetica dell'oggetto e cultura di riferimento della committenza si veda SENNHAUSER, ROTH-RUBI 2009, pp. 685-686; *Discussione* 1992, p. 337; BALLARDINI 2008, p. 237; BALLARDINI 2010.
- ⁵⁸ Col termine *horror vacui* (letteralmente "paura del vuoto") la critica ha inteso definire quell'affollamento compositivo che caratterizza tutti i rilievi dell'arte barbarica. Tale termine, ampiamente adottato dagli storici d'arte, sebbene traduca con efficacia l'estetica della cultura barbarica, sottolinea contemporaneamente un approccio critico contaminato da preconcetti classicisti: la "paura del vuoto" non era, infatti, certamente un sentimento proprio di chi scolpì questi manufatti, ma di colui che, condizionato da un'estetica compositiva classicistica, osservò e commentò queste opere, provando un certo sgomento per l'anticlassica prevalenza di pieni su vuoti. Per il termine si veda CASARTELLI NOVELLI 1992, p. 548 e il suo riferimento a Bognetti in nota 32.
- ⁵⁹ KITZINGER 1940.
- ⁶⁰ Per le considerazioni sull'impiego del proconnesio e sull'attività delle cave in epoca altomedievale si veda MELUCCO VACCARO 1998, in particolare pp. 363-364.
- ⁶¹ BALLARDINI 2008.
- ⁶² CECHELLI 1943, p. 266; MOR 1954-55, p. 175. La medievalista Antonella Ballardini, da me interpellata per un parere in proposito, mi precisa che la categoria estetica "bizantino" è eredità dal Cattaneo, oggi superata in quanto troppo generica alla luce degli studi compiuti negli ultimi decenni in tale ambito.
- ⁶³ In questa riorganizzazione dei manufatti ometto volutamente la "lastra frammentaria", inserita presso la balastra del ciborio di Callisto, in quanto la critica non è concorde sulla sua originaria collocazione.
- ⁶⁴ Sull'intreccio geometrico e sul problema della iconoclastia carolingia si veda CASARTELLI NOVELLI 1976; MELUCCO VACCARO 1995, p. 56; MELUCCO VACCARO 1998.
- ⁶⁵ AZZARRA 2009, p. 25.
- ⁶⁶ Sulle lastre scolpite al tempo di Gregorio IV (827-844) e Leone IV (847-855) si registrano livelli qualitativi e stilistici diversi: livelli ritenuti compresi all'interno della medesima bottega (MELUCCO VACCARO 1995, p. 50). Di livelli qualitativi diversi su lastre coeve parla anche BALLARDINI 2010.
- ⁶⁷ Per i codici comunicativi e gli "sbandamento di codice" rimando a GIOSEFFI 1978, p. 19.
- ⁶⁸ Così recita l'epigrafe: [M]AXIMA DONA XPI ADCLARIT SVB(L)EIMI CONCESSA PEMMONI VBIQVE D(E)I REFO / RMARENTUR UT TEMPLA NAM ET INTER RELIQUA / DOMVM BEATI IOHANNIS ORNABIT PENDOLA TEGURO PVLCHRO ALT / ARE DITABIT MARMORIS COLORE RATCHIS HIDEBOHOHLRIT. Alla luce dei recenti studi condotti in ambito archeologico e conservativo restituiamo come segue la sua traduzione: "Ratchis Hidebohohrlit grandissimi fa risplendere i doni di Cristo concessi al sublime Pemmone affinché dovunque fossero ricostruiti i templi di Dio e infatti, tra le altre, ha ornato la casa del beato Giovanni di *pendola* per il bel tegurio e l'ha arricchita con l'altare di marmo dipinto" (CHINELLATO 2010, pp. 88-89, nota 10).
- ⁶⁹ Il testo dell'epigrafe, inciso con capitali rustiche con una specie di *kursus* imitante l'andatura dell'esametro, fu scolpito dopo la morte del patriarca Callisto, qui definito 'beato'. Interpretato con sfumature diverse dagli studiosi che se ne sono occupati, così recita: QUOS REGAT TRINITAS VERA + EX AQVA ET SPVREN/ATUS FVERIT NISI TESTANTE VITAM DO QVIS NON VIDE/IT AETERNAM MYSTICVM BAPTISMATE SACR/ABIT VENIENS XPS HOC IN IORDANEN/NITENS PIORVM PATVIT REGNVN TEGUR/IVM CERNITES VIBRANTE MARMORVM SC/EMA QVOD CALISTI BEATI ORNABI. Il Cecchelli lo tradusse come segue: «Se uno non rinasce dall'acqua e dallo Spirito Santo, non vedrà la vita eterna, l'assicura il Signore. Cristo rese sacra questa acqua col (suo) battesimo, quando scese nel Giordano e si aprì il luminoso regno dei giusti. Osservate il tegurio del beato Callisto che egli stesso ornò in forma di scintillanti marmi... i quali guida la Trinità vera» (COSMI DE FANTI 1972, pp. 48-49). Ultimamente, Lusuardi Siena, valorizzando un'ipotesi trasmessa da Bertoli, Cecchelli e Buora, propone di completare il testo con l'iscrizione LIVTPRAND FECIT NECNON HILPRAND PRINCIPES, visto dal Locatelli nella pavimentazione del Duomo di Cividale, e che nei manoscritti trascritti dal Pirona e dal Liruti da me visionati ritrovo come LIVTPRAND FECIT NEC NONET HILPRAND. PRINCIP. (si veda il citato LOCATELLI 1584 trascritto da Jacopo Pirona e dagli Aneddoti Friulani del Liruti). Per l'epigrafe si rinvia a BERTOLI 1739, p. 440; EITELBERGER 1857, pp. 9-10; CECHELLI 1943, pp. 44-45; COSMI DE FANTI 1973, pp. 47-54; CUSCITO 2006, pp. 26-31. *Schema* sta «pro schema» (CECHELLI 1943, nota 102, p. 62), quindi secondo un modello, una consuetudine.
- ⁷⁰ CHINELLATO, COSTANTINI 2005; CHINELLATO, COSTANTINI 2006.
- ⁷¹ Spiega Du Cange che «vibrantem est coruscatio» (CECHELLI 1943, nota 102, 62), per cui tutto ciò che come un lampo è fortemente connesso a guizzi di luce e scintillio. L'esaltazione di un'estetica incentrata sulla luce si ritrova espressa con vigore anche sull'epigrafe del ciborio di Cittanova d'Istria: + HOC TIGMEN LUCEFLVO ALMOQVE BAPTISTERIO DIGNO MARMORE [...] (CUSCITO 2006, p. 32). L'uso di impreziosire le superfici lapidee con foglie metalliche è molto antico e il *Liber Pontificalis* ci attesta che cibori decorati con argento erano presenti nelle

basiliche romane di S. Maria Maggiore e S. Pietro, sotto il pontificato di Leone III (795-816); inoltre, in S. Prassede, sotto Pasquale I (817-824) (DE BLAAUW 1994, pp. 383, 543; BALLARDINI 2008, p. 226).

⁷² «L'uso del marmo proconnesio si accompagna al pieno recupero di alcuni elementi della tradizione formale tardoantica che avevano fatto la loro comparsa in forme più o meno embrionali nella produzione liutprandea» (IBSEN 2007, p. 315). Proconnesio bordato con stucco dorato è attestato a Padova nella ristrutturazione attuata da Oplione nel complesso di S. Giustina (sec. VI), qui interpretato da Lusuardi Siena come documento dell'ideologia della grande aristocrazia di origine romana (LUSUARDI SIENA 1992, in particolare pp. 202-205).

⁷³ Non appena fu eletto, il patriarca Callisto occupò abusivamente Grado, ma dovette recedere per ordine di papa Gregorio III (TAVANO 1969, pp. 530, 535).

⁷⁴ CECHELLI 1943, p. 33 e nota 49. Lampade collocate nei sottarchi furono in uso fino alla fine del sec. XIX (BROZZI 1979, p. 90, nota 38).

⁷⁵ «[...] Il simbolo medievale si costruisce quasi sempre attorno ad una relazione di tipo analogico, vale a dire fondato sulla somiglianza – più o meno grande – tra due parole, due nozioni, due oggetti, oppure tra la corrispondenza tra una cosa e l'idea» (PASTOUREAU 2004, p. 9).

⁷⁶ MUTINELLI 1955, p. 3; MARIONI, MUTINELLI 1958, p. 348.

⁷⁷ GIOSEFFI 1978.

⁷⁸ Riguardo le ipotesi ricostruttive delle policromie degli stucchi si veda KIILERCH 2008, KIILERCH 2010.

⁷⁹ Nel Medioevo «i parametri di luminosità, densità e saturazione del colore sembrano più importanti di quelli che dipendono dalla sola tonalità» (PASTOUREAU 2004, p. 117).

⁸⁰ In S. Maria in Valle, nel codice di Egino, sugli affreschi di S. Vincenzo al Volturno, Malles e Müstair si enuclea «una analoga tradizione italiana di età e spiriti autenticamente pre-carolingi» (ROMANINI 1975, p. 783).

Bibliografia

- AZZARRA 2009 = C. AZZARRA, *Magistri commacini, maestranze e artigiani nella legislazione longobarda* in *I magistri commacini. Mito e realtà del medioevo lombardo*, Atti del XIX Congresso internazionale di studio sull'alto medioevo, Varese – Como, 23-25 ottobre 2008, I, pp. 19-33.
- BALLARDINI 2008 = A. BALLARDINI, *Scultura per l'arredo liturgico nella Roma di Pasquale I: tra modelli paleocristiani e Flechtwerk*, in A. C. Quintavalle (a cura di), *Medioevo: arte e storia*, Atti del Convegno internazionale di Studi, Parma 2007, pp. 225-246.
- BALLARDINI 2010 = A. BALLARDINI, *Scultura a Roma: standards qualitativi e committenza (VIII secolo)*, in V. Pace (a cura di), *L'VIII secolo: un secolo inquieto*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Cividale del Friuli 4-7 dicembre 2008, Udine, pp. 141-148.
- BARRAL ALTET 1991 = X. BARRAL I ALTET, *Artigianato*, in “Enciclopedia dell'arte medievale”, II, Roma, 1991, pp. 534-539.
- BERTELLI 1985 = G. BERTELLI (a cura di), *Le diocesi di Amelia, Narni e Otricoli*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, XII, Spoleto.
- BERTOLI 1739 = G. BERTOLI, *Le antichità d'Aquileia profane e sacre per la maggiore parte finora inedite*, Venezia.
- BISCONTI, MARIA BISCONTI 1988 = F. BISCONTI, L. D. MARIA BISCONTI, *Temi paleocristiani nei rilievi altomedievali altoadriatici: dagli animali simbolici all'immaginario zoomorfo*, in *Aquileia e le Venezie nell'Alto Medioevo*, “Antichità Altoadriatiche”, XXXII (1988), pp. 441-463.
- BOSIO 1977 = L. BOSIO, *Cividale del Friuli. La storia*, Udine.
- BOULEAU 1998 = C. BOULEAU, *La geometria segreta dei pittori*, Milano.
- BROZZI 1979 = M. BROZZI, *La chiesa di San Giovanni Battista a Cividale*, in *Memorie storiche forogiuliesi*, LIX (1979), pp. 81-110.
- CAFFARO 2000 = A. CAFFARO (a cura di), *Teofilo Monaco. Le varie arti*, Salerno.
- CAPO 1992 = L. CAPO (a cura di), *Paolo Diacono. Storia dei Longobardi*, Padova.
- CATTANEO 1888 = R. CATTANEO, *L'architettura in Italia dal secolo VI al mille circa*, Venezia, p. 85.

- CASARTELLI NOVELLI 1974 = S. CASARTELLI NOVELLI (a cura di), *La diocesi di Torino*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, VI, Spoleto.
- CASARTELLI NOVELLI 1976 = S. CASARTELLI NOVELLI, *L'intreccio geometrico del IX secolo, scultura delle cattedrali riformate e «forma simbolica» della rinascenza carolingia*, in *Roma e l'età carolingia*, Atti delle giornate di studio, Roma 1976, a cura dell'Istituto di Storia dell'Arte dell'Università di Roma, Roma, pp. 103-113.
- CASARTELLI NOVELLI 1992 = S. CASARTELLI NOVELLI, *Committenza e produzione scultorea 'bassa'*, in “Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale”, XXXIX Settimana di studi del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo (Spoleto, 4-10 aprile 1991), II, pp. 531-561.
- CECHELLI 1943 = C. CECHELLI, *I monumenti del Friuli dal secolo IV al'XI*, Milano-Roma.
- CHINELLATO 2004 = L. CHINELLATO, *L'altare di Ratchis. Nota storica ed iconografia*, in “Vultus Ecclesiae”, 5 (2004), pp. 9-21.
- CHINELLATO, COSTANTINI 2005 = L. CHINELLATO, M.T. COSTANTINI, *L'altare di Ratchis, L'originaria finitura policroma: prospetto frontale e posteriore*, in “Forum Iulii”, XXVIII (2004), 2005, pp. 134-156.
- CHINELLATO, COSTANTINI 2006 = L. CHINELLATO, M.T. COSTANTINI, *L'altare di Ratchis: proposta per la ricostruzione dell'originaria finitura policroma*, in “Vultus Ecclesiae”, 6 (2005), pp. 7-17.
- CHINELLATO, COSTANTINI, MANZATO 2009 = L. CHINELLATO, M.T. COSTANTINI, D. MANZATO, *L'altare di Ratchis: il restauro, le indagini scientifiche e le acquisizioni tridimensionali*, in “Forum Iulii”, XXXII (2008), pp. 107-132.
- CHINELLATO 2010 = L. CHINELLATO, *L'Altare di Ratchis*, in V. Pace (a cura di), *L'VIII secolo: un secolo inquieto*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Cividale del Friuli, 4-7 dicembre 2008, Udine, pp. 83-91.
- CORONEO 2009 = R. CORONEO (a cura di), *La scultura altomedievale in Sardegna: dal frammento al contesto*, in “Ricerche sulla scultura medievale in Sardegna II”, Cagliari 2009, pp. 9-25.
- COSMI DE FANTI 1972 = A. COSMI DE FANTI, *Il Battistero di Callisto a Cividale*, Bologna.
- CUSCITO 2006 = G. CUSCITO, *Epigrafia medievale in Friuli e in Istria (secc. VI-XIII). Per un corpus delle epigrafi medievali dell'Alto Adriatico*, in Atti e memorie della società istriana di archeologia e storia patria, vol. CVI della raccolta (LIV della Nuova Serie), Trieste, pp. 11-71.

- CUSCITO 2010 = G. CUSCITO, *Ancora sul ciborio del vescovo Maurizio a Cittanova d'Istria*, in V. Pace (a cura di), *L'VIII secolo: un secolo inquieto*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Cividale del Friuli, 4-7 dicembre 2008, Udine, pp. 109-113.
- DE BLAAUW 1994 = S. DE BLAAUW, *Cultus et decor: Liturgia e architettura nella Roma tardo antica e medievale: Basilica Salvatoris, Sanctae Mariae, Sancti Petri*, I, Città del Vaticano 1994.
- DELLA TORRE 1807 = M. DELLA TORRE, *Dissertazione sopra l'antico Battistero esistente nel Duomo dell'insigne Colleggiata di Cividale del Friuli*, ms. custodito negli archivi del Museo Archeologico Nazionale di Cividale.
- DELLA TORRE 1899 = R. DELLA TORRE, *Il Battistero di Callisto in Cividale del Friuli*, Cividale.
- DE RUBEIS 1740 = G.F.B.M. DE RUBEIS, *Monumenta Ecclesiae Aquileiensis. Commentario storico cronologico critico*, Strasburgo 1740.
- DE RUBEIS 1754 = G.F.B.M. DE RUBEIS, *Dissertationes duae, Venetiis*.
- Discussione 1992* = *Discussione sulla lezione Delogu*, in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale*, XXXIX Settimana di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, Spoleto, 4-10 aprile 1991, I, Spoleto, pp. 335-339.
- EITELBERGER 1857 = R. EITELBERGER, *Cividale in Friaul und Seine Monumente*, Wien.
- ERMINI 1974 = P. ERMINI (a cura di), *La diocesi di Roma*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, VII, 1, Spoleto.
- FATUCCHI 1977 = A. FATUCCHI (a cura di), *La diocesi di Arezzo*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, IX, Spoleto.
- GABERSCEK 1976 = C. GABERSCEK, *Frammenti decorativi «liutprandei» a Cividale*, in *Arte in Friuli Arte a Trieste*, Udine, pp. 17-31.
- GARRUCCI 1880 = R. GARRUCCI, *Sculture non cimiteriali in Storia dell'arte Cristiana nei primi otto secoli della Chiesa*, VI, Prato.
- GARZYA ROMANO 1996 = C. GARZYA ROMANO (a cura di), *Eraclio. I colori e le arti dei romani*, Bologna.
- GASPARRI 1978 = S. GASPARRI, *I duchi longobardi*, Roma.
- GASPARRI 2012 = S. GASPARRI, *Cividale longobarda*, in B. Figliuolo (a cura di) *Storia di Cividale nel Medioevo. Economia, società, istituzioni*, Cividale del Friuli, pp. 61-76.
- GIOSEFFI 1978 = D. GIOSEFFI, *La scultura altomedievale in Friuli*, Cinisello Balsamo.

GRION 1899 = G. GRION, *Guida Storica di Cividale e del suo distretto*, Cividale.

HUBERT *ET ALII* 1968 = J. HUBERT, J. PORCHER, W.F. VOLBACH, *L'impero carolingio*, Milano.

I colori 2004 = *I colori del bianco. Policromia nella scultura antica*, 1, Musei Vaticani, Roma 2004.

IBSEN 2007 = M. IBSEN, *La scultura in Italia settentrionale tra VI e VIII secolo* in G. P. Brogiolo, A. Chevarría Arnau (a cura di), *I Longobardi. Dalla caduta dell'Impero all'alba dell'Italia*, Catalogo della Mostra, Torino – Novalesa 2007, Milano, pp. 311-315.

JURKOVIĆ *ET ALII* 2006 = M. JURKOVIĆ, I. MATEJČIĆ, J. ZIHERL, *Novigradski lapidari. Lapidario di Cittanova*, Novigrad – Cittanova.

KIELERICH 2008 = B. KIELERICH, *Colour and context: reconstructing the policromy of the stucco saints in the Tempietto Longobardo at Cividale*, "Arte Medievale", VII (2008), 2, pp. 9-24.

KITZINGER 1940 = E. KITZINGER, *Early Medioeval Art in the British Museum & British Library*, London.

LOCATELLI 1584 = P.P. LOCATELLI, *Commentario delle cose di Cividale del Frioli*, ms. trascritto da Jacopo Pirona dagli apografi Lirutiani, Biblioteca Civica di Udine.

LOCATELLI 1584 = P.P. LOCATELLI, *Commentario della cose di Cividale di Frioli di Pier Paolo Locatello da Cividale per lui composto l'anno 1584*, ms. trascritto dal vol. I, Aneddoti Friulani di Gian Giuseppe Liruti, Biblioteca Bartoliniana.

L'ORANGE 1979 = H. P. L'ORANGE, *La scultura in stucco e in pietra del Tempietto di Cividale*, VII, 3, Roma.

LUSUARDI SIENA 1992 = S. LUSUARDI SIENA, *Committenza laica ed ecclesiastica in Italia settentrionale nel regno goto*, in *Committenti e produzione artistico-letteraria nell'alto medioevo occidentale*, XXXIX Settimana di studi del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, Spoleto, 4-10 aprile 1991, I, Spoleto, pp. 199-242.

LUSUARDI SIENA 2002 = S. LUSUARDI SIENA (a cura di), *Cividale longobarda. Materiali per una rilettura archeologica*, Milano.

LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2001 = S. LUSUARDI SIENA, P. PIVA, *Scultura decorativa e arredo liturgico a Cividale e in Friuli tra VIII e IX secolo*, in *Paolo Diacono e il Friuli altomedievale (sec. VI-X)*, Atti del XIV Congresso Internazionale di Studi del Centro Italiano di Studi

sull'alto Medioevo, Cividale del Friuli e Bottenicco di Moimacco, 24-29 settembre 1999, Spoleto, II, pp. 493-594.

LUSUARDI SIENA, PIVA 2002 = S. LUSUARDI SIENA, P. PIVA, *Da Pemmone a Paolino d'Aquileia: appunti sull'arredo liturgico e la scultura in Friuli tra il VII e IX secolo*", in "Hortus Artium Medevalium", 8, Zagreb-Motorum, pp. 295-323.

LUSUARDI SEINA, DELPIANO 2010 = S. LUSUARDI SIENA, M.L. DELPIANO, *Il battistero di Callisto: considerazioni archeologiche sull'impianto idraulico del primo fonte di Cividale del Friuli*, in V. Pace (a cura di), *L'VIII secolo: un secolo inquieto*, Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi, Cividale del Friuli, 4-7 dicembre 2008, Udine, pp. 103-108.

MARIONI, MUTINELLI 1958 = G. MARIONI, C. MUTINELLI, *Guida storico artistica di Cividale*, Udine 1958.

MATTALONI 2008 = C. MATTALONI, *Guida Storico Artistica, Guida al Museo Archeologico e al Museo Cristiano di Cividale del Friuli*, Tavagnacco (Ud).

MATTALONI 2009 = C. MATTALONI, *Il Museo Cristiano di Cividale del Friuli. La sua istituzione e il nuovo allestimento*, in "Forum Iulii", XXXII (2008), pp. 75-106.

MELUCCO VACCARO 1974 = A. MELUCCO VACCARO (a cura di), *La diocesi di Roma*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, VII, 3, Spoleto.

MELUCCO VACCARO 1995 = A. MELUCCO VACCARO, *Nota* in A. Melucco Vaccaro, Lidia Paroli (a cura di) *La diocesi di Roma. Il museo dell'alto Medioevo*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, VII, 6, Spoleto, pp. 47-66.

MELUCCO VACCARO 1998 = A. MELUCCO VACCARO, *Agere de arte, agere per artem: la trasmissione dei saperi tecnici fra tradizione colta e fonti materiche*, in *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra Tarda antichità e alto Medioevo*, Atti della XLV Settimana di studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'alto Medioevo, Spoleto 1997, Spoleto, pp. 343-377.

MENIS 1988 = G.C. MENIS, *Cultura in Friuli durante l'età carolingia*, in *Aquileia e le Venezie nell'Alto Medioevo*, "Antichità Altoadriatiche", XXXII (1988), pp. 15-42.

MENIS 2002 = G.C. MENIS, *Storia del Friuli. Dalle origini alla caduta dello Stato patriarcale (1420) con cenni fino al XX secolo*, Udine.

MENIS 2004 = G. C. MENIS, *L'unicorno nel pluteo longobardo di Mels*, in "Vultus Ecclesiae", 5, pp. 23-28.

- MOR 1954-55 = C. MOR, *Per la datazione del così detto "pluteo di Sigualdo" del battistero callistino di Cividale*, in "Memorie Storiche Forogiuliesi", XLI (1954-55), pp. 169-175.
- MOSCATI 1978 = S. MOSCATI, *Il volto del potere arte imperialistica nell'antichità*, Roma.
- MUTINELLI 1955 = C. MUTINELLI, *Il paliotto di «Sigvald»*, in "Il Friuli", 2 luglio 1955, p. 3.
- MUTINELLI 1968 = C. MUTINELLI, *Il Battistero di Callisto e la sua decorazione*, in "Quaderni della Face", 33, pp. 6-16.
- NAPIONE 2001 = E. NAPIONE (a cura di), *La diocesi di Vicenza*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, XIV, Spoleto.
- NAPIONE 2002 = E. NAPIONE, *Una mestranza altomedievale di lapicidi: l'officina berico-benacense*, in "Hortus Artium Medievalium", 8 (2002), pp. 325-336.
- NICOLETTI 1928 = M. A. NICOLETTI, *Il Ducato del Friuli durante la dominazione dei Longobardi e dei Franchi*, a cura di Pietro Zampa, Pradamano (ms. originale del 1568, custodito presso la Biblioteca Civica di Udine).
- ORIOLO, VITRI 2005 = F. ORIOLO, S. VITRI (a cura di), *Museo Archeologico Iulium Carnicum. La città romana e il suo territorio nel percorso espositivo*, Tavagnacco (Ud).
- PANAZZA, TAGLIAFERRI 1966 = G. PANAZZA, A. TAGLIAFERRI (a cura di), *La diocesi di Brescia*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, III, Spoleto.
- PASCHINI 1910 = P. PASCHINI, *Brevi note archeologiche sopra un gruppo di monumenti longobardi a Cividale*, in "Bollettino della Civica Biblioteca e del Museo", 1-2, Udine.
- PASTOREAU 2004 = M. PASTOREAU, *Une histoire du Moyen Âge occidental*, Édition du Seuil, per la citazione si fa riferimento alla Quarta edizione 2010, Biblioteca Universale Laterza, Bari.
- PETROVIĆ 1962 = N. PETROVIĆ, *Rapports et proportion dans les plans des basiliques du V^{ème} et VI^{ème} siècle de ravenne et du littoral septentrional de l'Adriatique*, in "Felix Ravenna", 85 (1962), pp.40-71.
- PLINIO 1981 = G. PLINIO SECONDO, *Storia Naturale*, V, Torino.
- POZZETTO 1972 = M. POZZETTO, *Appunti sul problema della configurazione spaziale delle basiliche eliane di Grado*, in "Felix Ravenn", CII - CIV (1972), pp. 235-260.
- RASPI SERRA 1974 = J. RASPI SERRA (a cura di), *Le diocesi dell'alto Lazio*, Corpus della scultura altomedievale, VIII, Spoleto.
- Roma 1976 = *Roma e l'età carolingia*, Atti delle giornate di studio, a cura dell'Istituto di Storia dell'Arte dell'Università di Roma, Roma, 1976.

- ROMANINI 1975 = A.M. ROMANINI, *Tradizione e 'mutazioni' nella cultura figurativa precarolingia*, in *La cultura Antica nell'Occidente Latino del VII all'XI secolo*, XXII, Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 18-24 aprile, Spoleto, pp. 759-798.
- SALMI 1959 = M. SALMI, *Premessa*, in I. Belli Barsali (a cura di), *La diocesi Lucca, Corpus della scultura altomedievale*, I, Spoleto, pp. 5-6.
- SENHAUSER, ROTH-RUBI 2009 = H.R. SENNHAUSER, K. ROTH-Rubi, *Scultura a intreccio della Raetia prima*, in *I magistri commacini. Mito e realtà del medioevo lombardo*, Atti del XIX Congresso internazionale di studio sull'alto medioevo, Varese – Como, 23-25 ottobre 2008, II, Spoleto, pp. 671-690.
- SERRA 1961 = J. SERRA (a cura di), *La diocesi di Spoleto, Corpus della scultura altomedievale*, II, Spoleto.
- STOLFA 1939 = E. STOLFA, *I duchi longobardi del Foro Giulio*, Venezia (ristampa Milano 1969).
- STUROLO 1772 = G. STUROLO, *Origine e vicende istoriali antiche e recenti della Mag.ca antichissima città di Cividale del Friuli raccolte l'anno 1772*, vol. I, ms. Biblioteca Civica di Udine.
- SWOBODA 1889 = H. SWOBODA, *Zur altchristlichen Marmorpolychromie*, in “Römische Quartalschrift“, 3, pp. 134-157.
- TAGLIAFERRI 1981 = A. TAGLIAFERRI (a cura di), *La Diocesi di Aquileia e Grado, Corpus della scultura altomedievale*, X, Spoleto 1981.
- TAVANO 1969 = S. TAVANO, *Callisto d'Aquileia e Liutprando re*, in Atti del IV congresso Internazionale di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, Pavia-Scaldasole-Monza-Bobbio, 10-14 settembre 1967, Spoleto, pp. 525-535.
- TAVANO 1975 = S. TAVANO, *Note sul 'Tempietto' di Cividale*, in *Studi Cividalesi*, “Antichità Altoadriatiche”, VII, pp. 59-88.
- TAVANO 1988 = S. TAVANO, *San Paolino e la sede patriarcale*, in *Aquileia e le Venezie nell'Alto Medioevo*, “Antichità Altoadriatiche”, XXXII (1988), pp. 255-279.
- WILCZYNSKI 1954 = M. WILCZYNSKI, *Una nota iconografica sul bassorilievo di Sigualdo a Cividale*, in “Ce fastu?”, XXX, pp. 3-7.

THE 'WESTERNIZATION' OF AN IMAGE: THE FAST OF ST NICHOLAS AND THE MONASTIC CONNECTION*

MICHELE LUIGI VESCOVI

UNIVERSITY OF YORK, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF ART

This article considers the diffusion of the image of the fasting St Nicholas in the monastic Medieval West, among other sites at Novalesa, Galeata and Saint-Maur-des-Fossés. Analysing in detail the history of each monastery in which this iconography appears, it is argued that its spread related to 'cluniac experiences'. In light of the literary tradition, it is demonstrated that the topos of the fasting infant Nicholas became a means of comparison with other local saints and a model of monastic holiness.

Novalesa, Galeata, Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, St Nicholas, Fasting, Cluny, Consuetudines

East-West relationships and the eastern perspective on medieval art have been at the core of the research of Vladimir Goss.¹ East and West were both involved in the diffusion of the cult and images of St Nicholas of Myra, who has been recently defined by Michele Bacci as “a ‘globalized’ saint.”² As Bacci has stressed, the cult in the West, particularly in Southern Italy, was present even before the ‘translation’ of the saint’s relics to Bari in 1087³ and, within a relatively short time, had a great impact on devotion.⁴ The spread of the cult coincided with the creation of miracle plays and with a host of new types of images.⁵ Considering the latter, one little-studied episode depicted from the life of St Nicholas, his fasting as an infant, has a curious history and its meaning has never been adequately explained.

According to the different Greek versions of the life of St Nicholas beginning with the first *Vita per Michaëlem*, the infant Nicholas refused to feed from his mother’s breast on each Wednesday and Friday;⁶ in the *Methodius ad Theodorum*, Nicholas was lactated in the fourth and

the sixth hour of the day, but only once on each Wednesday and Friday.⁷ A slightly different tradition appears in the *Encomium Methodii* where it is narrated that he fed once a day avoiding the left breast.⁸ The earliest Latin life, written by the deacon Giovanni, appears to follow the *Methodius ad Theodorum*, but uses the the *Vita per Michaëlem* for the fast.⁹

While images of this episode from St Nicholas's life are found in the western visual tradition, it is never illustrated in Byzantine art in the East.¹⁰ In Southern Italy, the earliest cycle of the life of St Nicholas in Santa Maria at Muro Leccese begins with the diaconal ordination of the saint. According to Marina Falla Castelfranchi, this cycle preceded the translation of the saint's relics to Bari.¹¹ Also the cycle of the frescoes in the Chapel of St Nicholas in the abbey of Santa Maria de Olearia (Maiori, Salerno), created in the last decades of the eleventh century, does not contain the scene of the fasting child.¹²

In 1964 Virginia Wyle Egbert brought together a group of images depicting the fasting St Nicholas, pointing to early examples of this iconography in an ivory crozier in the Victoria and Albert Museum (twelfth century); in the stained glass windows of Chartres cathedral (thirteenth century), of the St Severus Chapel of Rouen cathedral (thirteenth century), and in Tours cathedral; and in the frescoes in the chapel of Sant'Eldrado in Novalesa, which were then believed to date from the thirteenth century. Among other later examples, she noted the statue of the former abbey of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés.¹³ This latter statue shows a woman standing atop an animal and holding a child who with his right hand raised, pushes away the figure's breast. Wyle Egbert, had already recognized this image as a representation of the Fast of St Nicholas and justified its presence in the cloister not only on account of the widespread popularity of the saint and his legend, but also, considering its location there rather than on the portal, she read it as an exhortation to monastic abstinence. In a short review of this article, Leon Pressouyre agreed with the identification of the sculpture of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, and identified the same iconography in another statue, coming from the ruins of the cloister of Notre-Dame-en-Vaux at Châlons-sur-Marne.¹⁴ Subsequently other examples of this iconography have come to light: it appears in statues found in the Museo Mambrini of Galeata (Forlì) (Fig. 1), coming from the nearby abbey of Sant'Ellero; in the Diocesan Museum of Ancona, coming from the cloister of San Bartolomeo or San Gabriele;¹⁵ and in the Glencairn Museum in Bryn Athyn (Pennsylvania), coming from Metz (the so-called *Madonna of St Gangulf*; Fig. 2).¹⁶

Leon Pressouyre has stressed the relationship between monastic ideals and the iconographic programs of cloisters, suggesting that the adoption of the image of the Fast of St Nicholas stressed solemn exhortation, a *memento jejunare*, just as the pious action of the saint was emphasized in different textual examples of the twelfth century, by Nicholas of Clairvaux, Peter of Celle, Peter



Fig. 1 Galeata, Museo civico 'Mons. Domenico Mambrini', *The Fasting Nicholas*.



Fig. 2 Bryn Athyn (Pennsylvania), Glencarin Museum, Academy of the New Church, *Madonna of St Gangulf*.

Comestor and Alan of Lille.¹⁷ More recently, two other late twelfth century images have been added to the iconographic corpus of the Fasting St Nicholas: a fresco of Saint-Jacques-des-Guèrets (near Vendôme) and a scene from the tympanum of the portal of Saint-Martin-de-Pommierre in Lorain (Fig. 3).¹⁸ Yet in regards to the latter, the identification is problematic. In the lunette there are scenes from the infancy of Christ. In the lower portion, the capital on the right depicts the resurrection of Lazarus, and in the lintel is displayed, from right to left, the *Entry into Jerusalem*. In the extreme left portion of the lintel appears a standing woman, dressed with a long tunic and a mantle, clasped at the chest by a circular diadem. The tunic is open, and the left breast of the woman is bared; she holds a naked child, who touches her breast with his right hand. If this is a scene of the fasting St Nicholas, it is difficult to decipher. In fact, as attested to in the crozier of the Victoria and Albert Museum or in the frescoes of Novalesa, when Nicholas fasting is depicted with the lives of others - in these particular cases with scenes from the life of Christ and of Sant'Ellero,

respectively - usually the cycle of his life is more developed, and it is not restricted to only this one scene from his infancy.¹⁹ Further the dedication of the site does not support the identification of the child as Nicholas. Dorothy Glass, considering the late twelfth-century portals of Sant'Angelo in Campo near Lucca (now in the Palazzo Mazzarosa in the same city), San Leonardo al Frigido (now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art) and San Cassiano a Settimo, has convincingly argued for the visual connection between lintels depicting the Entry into Jerusalem and the image of the titular saint of the church at far left.²⁰ Unfortunately this pattern cannot be adopted for the Saint-Martin-des-Pompierre because the structure was not dedicated to St Nicholas and, as has been shown by Norbert Müller-Dietrich, there is no evidence of the cult of the saint at the site.²¹ Josef Adolf Schmoll has instead connected the image to the whole iconographic program of the portal, in particular with the *Entry of Christ in Jerusalem*, showing how the standing woman might be read as the New Jerusalem, the new Daughter of Sion, the Church.²² In other cases the visual context for the image of the child at a woman's breast suggests the iconography should be read as that of the *Virgo Lactans*, such as, for example, the depiction found in a capital coming from the collegiate church of Saint-Etienne in Dreux (mid-twelfth century),²³ or in the portal of Anzy-le-Duc in the Musée Eucharistique du Hieron (Paray-le-Monial, twelfth century).²⁴ If the similarities of the representations of the *Virgo lactans*, the Church, and the Fasting St Nicholas have caused confusion, I think that a difference can be highlighted for these image types, one that will allow us to better recognise the representations of St Nicholas. Consider that in the Pompierre image the child stands parallel to the body of the woman, facing the spectator, while in Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, as well in the images at Galeata and in Ancona, the child embraces the woman, and his head is unnaturally turned back.



Fig. 3 Pommierre, Saint-Martin, Portal. Photo: O. Petit.

The chronology of the earlier entries of this corpus of images representing the fasting St Nicholas places them in the second half of the twelfth century, with Saint-Maur-les-Fossés around 1140-1150,²⁵ the crozier of the Victoria and Albert around 1175,²⁶ Notre-Dame-en-Vaux around 1180-1190,²⁷ Sant'Ellero of Galeata²⁸ and San Gabriele of Ancona²⁹ at the end of the twelfth century, and the frescoes of Saint-Jacques-des-Guérets at the beginning of the thirteenth century.³⁰ The earliest of our representations are the frescoes of Novalesa, realised around 1096-1097.³¹

Considering the corpus just outlined, we should note that only at Novalesa and, later, at the Cathedrals of Chartres and Rouen, the scene of the fasting child appears together with other episodes from the life of St Nicholas,³² while in other coeval cycles the scene does not appear at all. For example, we do not find the scene in a sculpture of the Historisches Museum of Basel (1135);³³ in the front of the church of St Nicholas of Brighton (second half of the twelfth century);³⁴ in a capital from the abbey of Saint Pierre of Narbonne (now in the Musée des Augustins of Toulouse); in the portal of the church of San Juan de Rabaneda of Soria;³⁵ in the portal of San Salvatore in Mustiola at Lucca, analysed by Dorothy Glass,³⁶ and, in particular, in the late eleventh century cycle of frescoes of Verzuolo (Piedmont).³⁷

Is there a reason why the fasting Nicholas was represented at Novalesa, and not in the contemporary frescoes of Verzuolo, a church that is only 120 km away? Further, considering the thirteenth-century cycles of the life of St Nicholas in the stained glass of the cathedrals of Chartres (1210-1235) and Auxerre (1230-1250), their iconography, and the position of the images in the buildings, Anne Harris has recently argued for the relations between these images and the liturgical drama, promoted by bishops seeking to reach a lay audience.³⁸ Such connections cannot be made for the sculpture of Galeata and Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, as they were in the monastic cloister. Was there a particular reason why the iconography of the fasting child appeared within a monastic context? To answer this, it is necessary to briefly consider the history of the cult of St Nicholas.

Devotion to St Nicholas grew in the Greek Church between the sixth and tenth century, as well as in Rome, possibly on account of the presence of Greek monks in the city.³⁹ In Rome, between the seventh and the eighth century, evidence for the cult of St Nicholas can be found in the dedication of the church of San Nicola in Carcere, and in the *Passionario Romano* of the first half of the seventh century.⁴⁰ The cult spread also north of the Alps, in particular after the marriage of Otto II with the Byzantine princess Theophanu in 972. In this period a great number of churches in the Empire, in Germany and in Lorrain were dedicated to the saint;⁴¹ in England the cult developed in the early twelfth century.⁴² It is also attested to by the diffusion of texts related to St Nicholas in the twelfth century, described by Guy Philippart and Michel Trigalet as “un essor spectaculaire en Occident.”⁴³

The diffusion of the cult of St Nicholas, as analysed by Charles W. Jones, is also related to a particular legend that narrates the introduction of his liturgy into the Cluniac Office, in a cell named Cross, subject to La-Charité-sur-Loire.⁴⁴ According to this source, on the saint's feast day some Cluniac monks requested the permission of their prior to sing a new and popular history of the saint's life, but were denied this because it was not an ecclesiastical chant and was the facetious composition of secular clerks. On the following night St Nicholas appeared to the prior and compelled him to learn an antiphon used in his feast day service. When Gerard, the prior of La-Charité-sur-Loire hears of this miracle, he orders the history sung in all the subject monasteries. While the manuscripts that contain this legend are relatively late,⁴⁵ the miracle is related as having had taken place around 1050-1080,⁴⁶ which is the same chronology of a named breviary (Paris, Bibl. Nat., MS Lat. 12601), originating at Cluny, which contains the liturgy of St Nicholas.⁴⁷ Despite what has been indicated by Charles Jones,⁴⁸ this codex was in fact taken in the mid-twelfth century to the priory of Saint-Taurin.⁴⁹

Of great interest, in the present context, is the fact that the same liturgy of St Nicholas appears in the Antiphonary Lat. 12044 (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale)⁵⁰ of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, an abbey reformed by Maiolus of Cluny in 989 at the request of Hugh Capet and Count Bouchard.⁵¹ The abbey had a prolific scriptorium,⁵² as attested to by, among others, manuscripts Lat. 3778⁵³ and Lat. 12054⁵⁴ (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale), or the codex with the life and miracles of St Maur (Troyes, Médiathèque de l'Agglomération, Ms. 2273).⁵⁵ In the abbey, musical activity was also developed.⁵⁶ Significantly, as already noted, that abbey possessed one of the statues of St Nicholas fasting, which is in fact one of the earliest extant representation of the subject.

It seems there are no direct connections between Saint-Maur-des-Fossés and the other locations for which the images of the fast of St Nicholas were created. However, one connection we might make is with the abbey of Sant'Ellero of Galeata, in Romagna (cfr. fig. 1), stressing this abbey's relationship with Cluny, in the use of the *consuetudines* and in its obituaries.⁵⁷ This does not necessarily imply, however, that Sant'Ellero was a 'Cluniac' abbey. For it is not clear how the *consuetudines* of Cluny reached Galeata, possibly it can be connected to Abbot Maiolus' journey from Rome to Ravenna.⁵⁸ The only certainty is that the actual manuscript containing the *consuetudines* was written in the abbey around 1070-1080.⁵⁹ Moreover, it is important to recall that the earlier *consuetudines*—and the one adopted in Galeata is one of these—relate only to the celebration of the liturgy, which was, as Giorgio Picasso argued, “vissuta, incrementata, consolidata e propagandata da Cluny, ma che non è affatto nelle sue caratteristiche fondamentali [...] una liturgia cluniacense.”⁶⁰ Yet two different clues shed light on the relationship between Galeata and St Nicholas: his feast appears in their calendar (written around 1070-1080)⁶¹ and the *consuetudines*

contain prescriptions that relate to the liturgical vestments for the saint's feast.⁶² As in Saint-Maur-des-Fossès so too in the abbey of Galeata, St Nicholas was the subject of veneration. Yet another case better explains the reasons for the choice of representing this particular episode of the saint's life.



Fig. 4 Novalesa, chapel of St Eldradus, Life of St Nicholas.

In the chapel of St Eldradus at the Novalesa abbey in Piedmont, two cycles of frescoes were painted at the end of the eleventh century. One bay is dedicated to episodes of the life of St Nicholas (Fig. 4), while the other depicts scenes of the former abbot of Novalesa, St Eldradus (Fig. 5). Costanza Segre Montel has convincingly stressed the connection between the relics of St Nicholas preserved in the abbey, the images of the saint in the chapel, and his cult.⁶³ However, Nicholas' images in this chapel go beyond the cult of the saint and his relics: a visual connection is constructed between the lives of the two saints, whereby Eldradus is compared to Nicholas. This constructed analogy between the saints at Novalesa helps us better understand the meaning behind the presence of the fasting St Nicholas in Galeata. A sculpture coming from the very same abbey, now in the Metropolitan Museum of New York, has been recognised as an image of St Hilaire, the founder of the abbey.⁶⁴ Further, there are two additional known sculptures that come from the abbey of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, one in the sculpture reserve of the Dumbarton Oaks representing the

archangel Michael,⁶⁵ and another, in the collection of the Musée of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés. Unfortunately the latter is damaged, but it appears to represent a standing man holding a closed book.⁶⁶ If we compare this figure with folio 63v of Troyes MS 2273, already mentioned as having been produced in the abbey, it seems likely that this sculpture represents St Maur. Thus, in these three cases at Novalesa, Galeata, and Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, the images of St Nicholas are paired with images of respective figures relevant of the abbeys' history. The image of St Nicholas as a fasting child thus goes beyond a *memento jejunare*: in his Latin life (“quarta scilicet et sexta feria, semel bibere...”⁶⁷) the fast is described as it occurs in the monastic rules (“[fratres] quarta et sexta feria jejument usque ad nonam”⁶⁸). Moreover, in the liturgy of St Nicholas, as transmitted by the Ms. Lat. 12601 and by Ms. lat. 12044 of Saint-Maur-les-Fossés,⁶⁹ great attention is devoted to the fast of the young infant. Significantly, such an interest in the saint's early life appears also in the antiphons “Hic dum matris adhuc lacte nutriretur quarta et sexta feria semel in die papillas sugebat”; “Jam decus lactentium Nicolaus mirabili portendebat auspicio sanctae parsimoniae tempus” (fol. 222r); “Jam quodammodo sacri jejunii se futurum praesignans amatorem Nicolaus” (fol. 222v); and “Beatus Nicolaus adhuc puerulus multo jejunio macerabat corpus” (fol. 224r). The latter expression in particular is be found also in the life of St Aldricus, the ninth-century bishop of Sens, former abbot of the abbey of St Peter of Ferrières:⁷⁰ while describing his childhood, the narrator recounts that “nam beati Nicolai aemulus, multo jejunio tenerum corpus macerabat, et intempestiva abstinentia exiles attenuabat artus.”⁷¹ Is it a mere coincidence that Aldricus dedicated the abbey church of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés?⁷² We find, moreover, in the twelfth-century life of St Geraldus, the founder of the Sauve-Majeure abbey in 1079,⁷³ a comparison made with St Nicholas: “Audivimus sanctum Nicolaum ad matris adhuc ubera pendentem, quarta et sexta feria semel in die mammas bibere, et hac vice contentum tota die perseverare; et Dei opera considerantes non possumus conticere: hunc vero puerum nostris temporibus adeo benedictum talem se omnibus exhibere, ut ab omnibus amaretur, audientes, non ausi sumus Dei mirabilia non praedicare. Laudemus Dominum in sanctissimo Nicolao, magnificemus etiam eum in hoc puero, tam mirabiliter sancti Spiritus gratia repleto: non autem illum sancto Nicolao audemus aequiparare, sed in utroque Dei mirabilia volumus praedicare.”⁷⁴

Both lives were written in a monastic context, the abbey of Ferrières in the eleventh century⁷⁵ and the Sauve-Majeure around 1140.⁷⁶

Thus, the visual tradition and the texts correspond: the fast of St Nicholas became an item for comparison in the lives of the monks. As already stressed, we find these images in abbeys that were in some ways related with Cluny, Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, reformed by Abbot Maiolus and Galeata, which adopted the Cluniac *consuetudines*. Indeed, in the case of Novalesa it is also

possible to find a connection with Cluny: Aldrado II, abbot of Breme (of which the Novalesa was subject⁷⁷), had been a disciple of Odilon in Cluny, and also another abbot was a nephew of Odilon.⁷⁸



Fig. 5 Novalesa, chapel of St Eldradus, *Life of St Eldradus*.

While these facts do not altogether suggest that Galeata and Novalesa should be deemed 'Cluniac,' I think that it is possible to say that a 'Cluniac-connection' was important in the spread the cult and the liturgy of St Nicholas in the monastic West, and that within this context, as we have seen, emphasis was placed on the fasting of the saint during his infancy. An altar dedicated to St Nicholas is attested to in the abbey church of Saint-Bénign of Dijon,⁷⁹ and the feast of St Nicholas was celebrated also in Cluny, as evidenced by the lectionary that has been reconstructed by Raymond Étaix.⁸⁰ Otherwise, neither Ferrières nor the Sauve-Majeure were connected with Cluny, even if in the latter had developed a peculiar cult of the dead that recalls the one of Cluny.⁸¹

Glauco Maria Cantarella has recently stressed the risks of considering the "Cluniac model" a fixed pattern that does not take into account the richness and the variability of "Cluniac experiences".⁸² It appears that the development of the cult of St Nicholas in the West relates in part to these "experiences," which are attested to in the legend of the introduction of the St Nicholas

liturgy into the Cluniac Office, and, as I hope to have shown, in a new visual and textual tradition in which the fasting child Nicholas becomes a means of comparison and a model of monastic holiness.

- * This article could have not been written without the resources of the Dumbarton Oaks Library and The Library of Congress, Washington, DC. I thank the librarians of both institutions for their help, as well the curators of the Glencairn Museum, Bryn Athyn. I also thank Jessica N. Richardson for her hospitality and for her careful reading of the text.
- ¹ V. P. GOSS, *Four Centuries of European Art: 800-1200. A View from Southeast*, Zagreb 2010.
 - ² M. BACCI, *San Nicola. Il grande taumaturgo*, Bari 2009, pp. 148-180.
 - ³ *Ivi*, p. 148; P. CORSI, "La traslazione di San Nicola da Myra a Bari," in *San Nicola. Splendori d'arte d'Oriente e d'Occidente*, ed. M. BACCI, Milan 2006, pp. 89-96; P. J. GEARY, *Furta sacra. Thefts of relics in the Central Middle Ages*, Princeton 1978 (ed. cons. Princeton 1990), pp. 94-103.
 - ⁴ K. MEISEN, *Nikolauskult und Nikolausbrauch im Abendlande*, Düsseldorf 1931.
 - ⁵ C. W. JONES, *The Saint Nicholas Liturgy and its Literary Relationships*, Berkeley-Los Angeles 1963; E. G. CLARE, *St. Nicholas. His legends and Iconography*, Florence 1985; G. CIOFFARI, "S. Nicola nelle immagini anteriori al mille e nella pittura italiana medioevale," in *San Nicola nella musica liturgica e nell'arte medioevale tra Oriente e Occidente*, ed. M. A. CAROLA (*Nicholaus. Studi Storici*, VIII 1997), pp. 321-360.
 - ⁶ G. ANRICH, *Hagios Nikolaos. Der Heilige Nikolaos in der Grieschischen Kirche*, Berlin 1913, I, pp. 115-116; M. T. BRUNO, *S. Nicola nelle fonti narrative greche*, Bari 1985, pp. 18-19. Cfr. G. CIOFFARI, *S. Nicola nella critica storica*, Bari 1987, pp. 55-63.
 - ⁷ ANRICH, *Hagios Nikolaos*, p. 143.
 - ⁸ *Ivi*, p. 156.
 - ⁹ P. CORSI, "La 'Vita' di san Nicola e un codice della versione di Giovanni diacono," *Nicholaus. Rivista di teologia ecumenico-patristica*, VII/2 1979, pp. 359-380: 363. "Enim vero, cum matris adhuc lacte aleretur, coepit bino in eptomada die, quarta scilicet et sexta feria, semel bibere mammas et, hac vice contentus, tota die sic permanebat".
 - ¹⁰ N. P. ŠEVČENKO, *The Life of Saint Nicholas in Byzantine Art*, Turin 1983, p. 68
 - ¹¹ M. FALLA CASTELFRANCHI, *Pittura monumentale bizantina in Puglia*, Milan 1991, pp. 101-106.
 - ¹² H. BELTING, *Studien zur beneventanischen Malerei*, Wiesbaden 1968, pp. 112-115; R. P. BERGMAN, A. CERENZA, *Maiori. S. Maria de Olearia*, Amalfi 1994, pp. 24-27.
 - ¹³ The later examples consist of a chasuble in the Cathedral of Anagni and a miniature in the Queen Mary Psalter (British Museum, MS Roy. 2. B. VII, fol. 315r); V. WYLIE EGBERT, "St. Nicholas: The Fasting Child," *The Art Bulletin*, XLVI/1 1964, pp. 69-70.
 - ¹⁴ L. PRESSOUYRE, "Nouvelle identification d'une statue-colonne de Saint-Maur-des-Fossés," *Bulletin monumental*, CXXII/4 1964, pp. 393-394.
 - ¹⁵ ID., "Le Saint Hilaire de Galeata au Metropolitan Museum of Art," *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, LXXIII 1969, pp. 129-140.
 - ¹⁶ The iconographic identification was suggested by K. BAUCH, "The 'Madonna aus St. Gangulf'," *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft*, XXIV 1970, pp. 13-17. J. HAYWARD, W. CAHN, *Radiance and Reflection. Medieval Art from the Raymond Pitcairn Collection*, New York 1982, pp. 82-83.
 - ¹⁷ L. PRESSOUYRE, "St. Bernard to St. Francis: Monastic Ideals and Iconographic Programs in the Cloister," *Gesta*, XII 1973, pp. 71-92.
 - ¹⁸ A. MILONE, "Catalogue entry VI.4," in *San Nicola. Splendori d'arte d'Oriente e d'Occidente*, p. 327.
 - ¹⁹ W. S. A. DALE, "An English Crosier of the Transitional Period," *The Art Bulletin*, XXXVIII/3 1956, pp. 137-141. For the cycle at Novalesa: C. SEGRE MONTEL, "Gli affreschi della cappella di S. Eldrado alla Novalesa," *Bollettino d'arte*, XLIX 1964, pp. 21-40; EAD., "Ancora qualche precisazione sugli affreschi della cappella di S. Eldrado alla Novalesa e sui frammenti di affresco recentemente venuti alla luce nell'abbazia," in *I Congresso Nazionale di Storia dell'Arte*, Rome 1980, pp. 445-461.
 - ²⁰ D. F. GLASS, "'Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened': A Lintel from San Cassiano a Settimo," in *Reading Medieval Images. The Art Historian and the Object*, ed. by E. SEARS and T. K. THOMAS, Ann Arbor 2002, pp. 143-150.
 - ²¹ N. MÜLLER-DIETRICH, *Die romanische Skulptur in Lothringen*, München-Berlin 1968, p. 98.
 - ²² J. A. SCHMOLL GEN. EISENWERTH, "Sion – Apokalyptisches Weib – Ecclesia lactans. Zur ikonographischen Deutung von zwei romanischen Mater-Darstellung in Metz und Pompeyer," in *Miscellanea pro arte. Hermann Schnitzler zur Vollendung des 60. Lebensjahres am 13. Januar 1965*, Düsseldorf 1965, pp. 91-110. This interpretation has been recently accepted by F. WOCHNIK, "Die Übernahme normannischer Zickzackmotive in Franken," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, LXIX/4 2006, pp. 441-470: 454.
 - ²³ W. CAHN, "A King from Dreux," *Yale University Gallery Bulletin*, XXXIV/3 1974, pp. 14-29.
 - ²⁴ M. HAMANN, *Die burgundische Prioratskirche von Anzy-le-Duc und die romanische Plastik im Brionnais*, Würzburg 2000, I, pp. 165-170; M. GUÉNOT, "De la statique à la dynamique. Le fidèle face aux programmes iconographiques," in *Espace ecclésial et liturgie au Moyen Âge*, ed. A. BAUD, Lyon 2010, pp. 198-208: 206-207.
 - ²⁵ B. DIRLAM, *Les sculptures médiévales de Saint-Maur-des-Fossés*, Saint-Maur 1983, p. 24; D. V. JOHNSON, I. DEFERT, "La sculpture architecturale de la première moitié du XII^e siècle de l'ancienne abbaye de Saint-Maur-des-Fossés,"

- Bulletin archéologique du Comité des Travaux Historiques et Scientifiques. Moyen âge, renaissance, temps modernes*, XXXI/XXXII 2005, pp. 7-41.
- ²⁶ DALE, "An English Crosier of the Transitional Period."
- ²⁷ S. PRESSOUYRE, *Images d'un cloître disparu*, Paris 1976, pp. 30-36, 72, 90-112. For the church of Notre-Dame: K. CORSEPIUS, *Notre-Dame-en-Vaux. Studien zur Baugeschichte des 12. Jahrhunderts in Châlons-sur-Marne*, Stuttgart 1997.
- ²⁸ R. BUDRIESI, *Entrotterra ravennate e orizzonti barbarici. Matrici e uomini nuovi nei monumenti delle alte valli dal Lamone al Savio*, Ravenna 1984, pp. 299-305.
- ²⁹ P. PIVA, *Marche romaniche*, Milan 2003, p. 32.
- ³⁰ C. DI MATTEO, "Église de Saint-Jacques-des-Guérets," in *Congrès Archéologique de France. 139^e session 1981. Blésois et Vendômois*, Paris 1986, pp. 381-386: 385; F. GABORIT, "Lecture du mur peint. Le prieuré de Saint-Jacques-des-Guérets," in *Peintures murales romanes*, Paris 1988, pp. 20-28.
- ³¹ C. SEGRE MONTEL, "I percorsi delle reliquie, tra 'thece dignissime,' 'libri miraculorum' e 'imagines depictae,'" in *Uomo e spazio nell'alto Medioevo*, Spoleto 2003, II, pp. 891-919: 912.
- ³² Concerning the Chartres cycle, Colette Manhes-Deremble stressed the connections between the writings of Pierre de Celle, bishop of Chartres between 1195 and 1198, and the later stained glass: C. MANHES-DEREMBLE, *Les vitraux narratifs de la Cathédrale de Chartres*, Paris 1993, pp. 55-56.
- ³³ F. MAURER-KUHN, *Die Kirchen, Klöster und Kapellen*, II, *St. Katharina bis St. Niklaus*, Basel 1961, pp. 253-255.
- ³⁴ G. ZARNECKI, *Later English Romanesque Sculpture. 1140-1210*, London 1953, p. 58.
- ³⁵ M. CASTIÑEIRAS, "San Nicola attraverso e al di là del Cammino di Santiago," in *San Nicola. Splendori d'arte d'Oriente e d'Occidente*, pp. 127-136.
- ³⁶ D. F. GLASS, *Portals, Pilgrimage, and Crusade in Western Tuscany*, Princeton 1997, pp. 37-44. Cfr. C. TADDEI, "Un miracolo di san Nicola e l'officina di Biduino," in *Medioevo: le officine*, ed. A. C. QUINTAVALLE, Milan 2010, pp. 420-426.
- ³⁷ B. CILENTO, C. SEGRE MONTEL, "Il recupero delle perdute memorie di Verzuolo, un borgo dell'antico marchesato di Saluzzo," *Bollettino d'Arte*, XCV/5 2010, pp. 27-60.
- ³⁸ A. HARRIS, "Saint Nicholas in Context: Stained Glass and Liturgical Drama in the Archbishopric of Sens," in *Glasmalerei im Kontext. Bildprogramme und Raumfunktionen*, Nuremberg 2005, pp. 89-99.
- ³⁹ ANRICH, *Hagios Nikolaos*, II, pp. 473-478.
- ⁴⁰ MEISEN, *Nikolauskult und Nikolausbrauch im Abendlande*, p. 57; 527-30.
- ⁴¹ *Ivi*, pp. 77-83.
- ⁴² L. LAZZARI, *La versione anglosassone della Vita Sancti Nicolai*, Rome 1997, pp. 12-20.
- ⁴³ G. PHILIPPART, M. TRIGALET, "L'hagiographie latine du XI^e siècle dans la longue durée: données statistiques sur la production littéraire et sur l'édition médiévale," in *Latin Culture in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Medieval Latin Studies*, ed. by M. W. HERREN, C. J. MCDONOUGH, R. G. ARTHUR, Turnhout 2002, pp. 281-301.
- ⁴⁴ G. RALEIGH COFFMAN, *A New Theory Concerning the Origin of the Miracle Play*, Menasha 1914, pp. 50-57; JONES, *Saint Nicholas Liturgy*, pp. 47-52.
- ⁴⁵ Paris, Bibl. Nat. MS Lat. 5638, Lat. 5284: SOCII BOLLANDIANI, *Catalogus Codicum Hagiographicorum Latinorum in B. N. Parisiensis*, Brussels 1890, I, pp. 510-511, II, pp. 430-431.
- ⁴⁶ COFFMAN, *A New Theory Concerning the Origin of the Miracle Play*, p. 56.
- ⁴⁷ V. LEROQUAIS, *Les Bréviaires manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques de France*, Paris 1934, III, pp. 226-8; J. HOURLIER, "Remarques sur la notation clunisienne," *Revue Grégorienne*, XXX/6 1951, pp. 231-240; D. R. LAMOTHE, C. G. CONSTANTINE, *Matins at Cluny for the Feast of Saint Peter's Chains*, London 1968.
- ⁴⁸ JONES, *Saint Nicholas Liturgy*, p. 48.
- ⁴⁹ J. HOURLIER, "Le bréviaire de Saint-Taurin. Un livre liturgique clunisien à l'usage de l'échelle-Saint-Aurin (Paris B. N. Lat. 12601)," *Études grégoriennes*, III 1959, pp. 163-173.
- ⁵⁰ A. RENAUDIN, "Deux antiphonaires de Saint-Maur (Paris B. N. Lat. 12584 et 12044)," *Études grégoriennes*, XIII 1972, pp. 53-119; Ruth Steiner demonstrated the relationship between the two manuscripts also from the perspective of the invitatory tones: R. STEINER, "Reconstructing the Repertory of Invitatory Tones and their uses at Cluny in the Late 11th century," in *Musicologie Médiévale. Notations et séquences*, Paris 1987, pp. 175-182. During the period that separates the two manuscripts, several new tones and antiphons were introduced, and the assignment of tones to the antiphons was reworked.
- ⁵¹ P. GILLON, "Saint-Maur-des-Fossés," in *Encyclopedia of the Middle Ages*, Chicago-London 2000, II, p. 1282. Maiolus reformed different abbeys (G. M. CANTARELLA, *I monaci di Cluny*, Turin 1993, pp. 88-91); for the tensions between the abbeys "reformed" by Cluny, the priories and the mother abbey, cfr. *Ivi*, pp. 227-229.
- ⁵² C. DENOËL, "Un catalogue de Saint-Maur-des-Fossés au XII^e siècle," *Scriptorium* 60 (2006), pp. 186-205.
- ⁵³ *Les manuscrits à peintures en France*, Paris 1954, pp. 86-87.
- ⁵⁴ J. J. G. ALEXANDER, *Norman Illumination at Mont St. Michel, 996-1100*, Oxford 1970, pp. 144-145; ID., *Medieval Illuminators and their Methods of Work*, New Haven 1992, pp. 91-92; W. CAHN, *Romanesque Manuscripts: The*

- Twelfth Century*, London 1996, II, pp. 104-105; M. BESSEYRE, "Catalogue entry 268," in *La France romane au temps des premiers capétiens (987-1152)*, Paris 2005, p. 352.
- ⁵⁵ C. DENOËL, *Catalogue entry 103*, in *La France romane au temps des premiers capétiens (987-1152)*, p. 152.
- ⁵⁶ ID., "Guido Oacrius et l'enseignement du chant à Saint-Maur-des-Fossés au début du XII^e siècle," *Archivium Latinitatis Medii Aevii*, LXVI 2008, pp. 151-161.
- ⁵⁷ G. M. CANTARELLA, *Pasquale II e il suo tempo*, Naples 1997, pp. 10-14.
- ⁵⁸ F. ZAGHINI, *Sant'Ellero e il suo monastero. Frammenti d'una storia*, Cesena 1988, pp. 267-268.
- ⁵⁹ *Ivi*, p. 118.
- ⁶⁰ G. PICASSO, *Sacri canones et monastica regula. Disciplina canonica e vita monastica nella società medievale*, Milan 2006, p. 56.
- ⁶¹ ZAGHINI, *Sant'Ellero e il suo monastero*, p. 163.
- ⁶² *Corpus consuetudinum monasticarum*, VII, 2, *Consuetudines cluniacensium antiquiores cum redactionibus derivatis*, ed. K. HALLINGER, Siegburg 1983, p. 150.
- ⁶³ SEGRE MONTEL, "I percorsi delle reliquie".
- ⁶⁴ L. PRESSOUYRE, "Le Saint Hilaire de Galeata au Metropolitan Museum of Art," *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, LXXIII 1979, pp. 129-140; L. CASTELNUOVO-TEDESCO, "Column Statue of Saint Hilary of Galeata," in *Italian Medieval Sculpture in The Metropolitan Museum of Art and The Cloister*, New York 2010, pp. 93-94.
- ⁶⁵ P. Z. BLUM, "An Archaeological Analysis of the Statue-Column from Saint-Maur-Des-Fossés at Dumbarton Oaks," *Gesta*, XVII/2 1978, pp. 23-28.
- ⁶⁶ DIRLAM, *Les sculptures medievales de Saint-Maur-des-Fossés*, p. 57.
- ⁶⁷ CORSI, "La 'Vita' di san Nicola," p. 363
- ⁶⁸ BENEDICTUS NURSIAE, *S. P. Benedicti Regula (Patrologia Latina, LXVI)*, coll. 655-656.
- ⁶⁹ Another comparison can be made with the Antiphony of Toledo, *Biblioteca Capitular*, 44.2, produced in Aquitania, which comes from the liturgical practice of Cluny, and bears the stamp of Moissac (R. STENIER, "Introduction," in R. T. OLEXY, *An Aquitanian Antiphoner: Toledo, Biblioteca capitular*, 44.2, Ottawa 1992, pp. VII-XXI; for the list of chants for St Nicholas: *Ivi*, p. 71).
- ⁷⁰ M. BUCHNER, "Zur Biographie des hl. Aldrich Abtes von Ferrières und Erzbischofes von Sens (829-836)," *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens*, XXXV 1914, pp. 201-215.
- ⁷¹ *Vita Sancti Aldrici (Patrologia Latina, CV)*, col. 799.
- ⁷² *Ivi*, col. 805.
- ⁷³ G. M. OURY, "Gérard de Corbie avant son arrivée a La Sauve-Majeure," *Revue Bénédictine*, XC/3-4 1980, pp.306-314.
- ⁷⁴ *Vita S. Geraldii Abbatis (Patrologia Latina, CXLVII)*, coll. 1024-1025.
- ⁷⁵ *Acta Sanctorum Junii*, I, Antverpiae 1695, p. 752.
- ⁷⁶ OURY, "Gérard de Corbie," p. 307.
- ⁷⁷ M. SARACCO, "Migrazioni di comunità monastiche: Novalesa e Breme," in *Il monachesimo del secolo XI nell'Italia nordoccidentale*, ed. A. LUCIONI, Cesena 2010, pp. 69-92.
- ⁷⁸ G. TABACCO, "Dalla Novalesa a S. Michele della Chiusa," in *Monasteri in alta Italia dopo le invasioni saracene e magiare sec. X-XII*, Turin 1966, pp. 479-526: 496-497; G. CANTINO WATAGHIN, E. DESTEFANIS, "L'abbazia di Novalesa tra il secolo XI e il XIII nel quadro delle istituzioni monastiche contemporanee: fonti scritte e fonti archeologiche," in *Attraverso le Alpi: S. Michele, Novalesa, S. Teofredo e altre reti monastiche*, ed. F. ARNEODO, P. GUGLIELMOTTI, Bari 2008, pp. 73-94.
- ⁷⁹ C. M. MALONE, "Interprétation des pratiques liturgiques à Saint-Bénigne de Dijon d'après ses coutumiers d'inspiration clunisienne," in *From Dead of Night to End of Day. The Medieval Customs of Cluny*, ed. S. BOYNTON, I. COCHELIN, Turnhout 2005, pp. 221-250.
- ⁸⁰ R. ÉTAIX, "Le lectionnaire de l'office à Cluny," *Recherches augustiniennes*, XI 1976, pp. 91-159: 130.
- ⁸¹ CIROT DE LA VILLE, *Histoire de l'abbaye et congrégation de Notre-Dame de La Grande-Sauve, ordre de saint Benoît, en Guienne*, Paris-Bordeaux 1844-45, pp. 307, 318, 345, 499-503.
- ⁸² G. M. CANTARELLA, "È esistito un «modello cluniacense»?," in *Dinamiche istituzionali delle reti monastiche e canonicali nell'Italia dei secoli X-XII*, ed. N. D'ACUNTO, San Pietro in Cariano 2007, pp. 61-85.

OLTREADRIATICO.
MODELLI FIGURATIVI E TEMI ICONOGRAFICI
DELLA “RIFORMA GREGORIANA” IN DALMAZIA

EMANUELA ELBA

UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI BARI

L'articolo arricchisce di nuove osservazioni lo studio dell'Evangelistario Bodl. Canon. Lat. 61, il più prestigioso dei codici in beneventana realizzati nella seconda metà dell'XI secolo nello scriptorium di San Crisogono di Zadar, che fu centro di punta della Riforma gregoriana in Adriatico. La lettura in chiave “orientata” proposta per alcuni temi iconografici del manoscritto, contribuisce a documentare il ruolo di mediazione che i Benedettini, attraverso la cultura scritta, svolsero nella diffusione della dottrina riformista in Dalmazia. “Oltreadriatico” intende così richiamare la centralità degli scambi, quel flusso continuo e ininterrotto di uomini, manufatti e idee, che per decenni costituì la trama concreta delle relazioni tra le due sponde adriatiche, intensificatesi proprio all'epoca della Riforma, ma anche altro: una diversa prospettiva di ricerca che, invertendo la rotta intrapresa dai “modelli”, torna a riflettere su di essi, per indagare meglio le loro implicazioni con quel «renouveau paléochrétien» che grande incidenza ebbe sull'arte italomeridionale dell'XI-XII secolo.

Arte, Riforma gregoriana, XI secolo, Dalmazia, Benedettini, Scrittura beneventana, Miniatura, renouveau paléochrétien, iconografia

Nella storia della Dalmazia dell'XI secolo un episodio resta fra tutti emblematico a indicare quanto forte fu nella regione l'influenza esercitata dalla cosiddetta “Riforma gregoriana”. Nel 1076 Demetrius Zvonimir († 1089) venne incoronato solennemente da papa Gregorio VII (1073-1085) il quale, seppure per tramite di un suo delegato, gli riconosceva un privilegio mai concesso prima ad altro regnante croato; come è noto, per suggellare la memoria di questo evento, il re fece dono alla

Chiesa di Roma del monastero benedettino di San Gregorio a Vrana.¹ La scelta non casuale dell'8 ottobre, quale data per l'incoronazione, in coincidenza con la festa di san Demetrio protettore del monarca, della basilica di San Pietro a Solin, quale luogo deputato per l'evento, della donazione dell'abbazia che portava il nome del papa, sono indizi della forte carica ideologica che contraddistinse l'avvenimento. L'elezione di Zvonimir segnava il compimento di un'alleanza tra Chiesa e Stato croato,² marcata dalla piena e incondizionata accettazione da parte del sovrano del primato della cattedra petrina, vale a dire del principio fondante della concezione politica gregoriana, che solo un anno prima lo stesso papa aveva formalizzato nel celebre *Dictatus*.³ Un altro aspetto tuttavia di questa storia merita di essere ricordato: la donazione del monastero di Vrana, uno dei più importanti insediamenti benedettini della regione, acquistava maggiore valore per la presenza di un nucleo di arti sontuarie, tra cui, oltre a uno scrigno d'oro contenente le reliquie di san Gregorio, un ricco Evangelario in lettere d'argento.⁴ Che lo stesso Zvonimir, nel discorso pronunciato durante l'incoronazione, indugi ad elencare con precisione i manufatti del tesoro, controparte di quegli *insignia regalia* – il mantello, la spada, la corona e lo scettro – di cui egli era stato poco prima fregiato, è segno dell'intrinseco e profondo significato simbolico conferito a questi oggetti, ma anche dell'importanza che veniva formalmente riconosciuta alla cultura artistica, quella libraria in particolare, di cui i Benedettini erano i principali depositari e intermediari nella regione.

Questa vicenda, così rilevante sul piano storico e densa di risvolti ideologici, offre lo spunto di partenza per delineare lo sfondo entro cui si inserisce la tematica di questo articolo che, senza la pretesa di una trattazione esaustiva, intende piuttosto riannodare i fili di alcune riflessioni sparse intorno al binomio “arte/Riforma gregoriana” in Dalmazia, maturate nel corso dell'indagine sul nucleo principale dei codici miniati in beneventana della regione,⁵ la più eclatante delle testimonianze dalmate legate alla cultura benedettina della seconda metà dell'XI secolo, la cui realizzazione viene a coincidere cronologicamente con gli anni cruciali della Riforma. Indagare le modalità di trasmissione delle istanze riformiste oltreadriatico e quanto queste influirono sulla produzione artistica locale costituisce, d'altra parte, il presupposto perché, con il prosieguo della ricerca, si possa aggiungere un altro tassello all'articolato e complesso quadro di studi dedicati al rapporto tra arte e “Riforma gregoriana”, argomento tra i più interessanti e dibattuti,⁶ che in ambito croato risulta già in parte esplorato per quanto riguarda le testimonianze monumentali.⁷

Riforma e cultura benedettina in Dalmazia

La storiografia ha messo in evidenza il ruolo fondamentale che l'Ordine benedettino svolse in Dalmazia nel sostenere la politica di *renovatio* intrapresa dalla Chiesa dalla metà dell'XI secolo.⁸ L'espansione che i Benedettini conobbero sul territorio sin dal IX secolo, grazie all'appoggio della

Chiesa e dei nobili locali, aveva favorito la nascita di un cospicuo numero di insediamenti, distribuiti lungo la costa e nell'entroterra, che mantenevano attiva una fitta rete di contatti tra i maggiori centri della regione e tra questi e i monasteri situati oltreadriatico, in particolar modo in Italia meridionale.⁹ Nell'area del basso Adriatico la frequenza degli scambi aumentava in relazione all'estrema prossimità geografica delle due sponde, ma anche per l'esistenza di un vero e proprio cordone insediativo, che univa i cenobi sorti sull'arcipelago a ridosso di Dubrovnik con quelli situati tanto sulle isole prospicienti il promontorio del Gargano quanto nell'area settentrionale della Puglia.¹⁰

Un ruolo chiave nelle relazioni che l'Ordine tenne in Dalmazia con Roma, Montecassino e l'Italia meridionale fu svolto dal monastero zaratino di San Crisogono che, sin dalla fondazione aveva ricoperto un posto di primo piano tra i monasteri della zona per la rilevanza politica che Zadar rivestì nell'ambito del *thema* bizantino e, sul piano culturale, per la presenza del più attivo ed importante *scriptorium* della regione.¹¹ Fu principalmente quest'ultimo fattore che, nella seconda metà dell'XI secolo, rendendo l'abbazia centro nevralgico della circolazione libraria lungo la sponda adriatica orientale, fece di San Crisogono un vero e proprio baluardo della Riforma in Adriatico. A incentivare questa funzione dovettero essere innanzitutto i religiosi implicati nella divulgazione degli ideali di rinnovamento sostenuti dalla Chiesa, delegati pontifici, vescovi e abati che, consapevoli dell'importanza dei libri quale strumento d'insegnamento dei valori spirituali e, in subordine di propaganda di messaggi ideologici, ne veicolarono il trasferimento dall'Italia e, favorendo la diffusione dei modelli, incoraggiarono la produzione locale.

È in tale contesto che trova collocazione l'arrivo in Dalmazia della Bibbia, oggi a Dubrovnik, *Dominikanski Samostan*, 58 *sub vitro*, esemplare tra i più noti della tipologia delle "Bibbie atlantiche", che costituisce una delle manifestazioni artistiche caratterizzanti del movimento riformatore.¹² È verosimile ipotizzare che questa Bibbia, datata alla metà dell'XI secolo, sia emigrata oltre l'Adriatico in un'epoca assai prossima a quella della sua esecuzione, probabilmente al seguito di una delegazione pontificia o di un prelado direttamente in contatto con l'ambiente romano.¹³

Volgendo lo sguardo alla produzione libraria locale, una prova del peso che i sostenitori della Chiesa riformista ebbero nel promuoverla, è il nesso che lega alcune di queste figure all'Ordine benedettino e la concomitanza che le vede in contatto con le località di provenienza dei più importanti esemplari in beneventana prodotti nella regione.

È il caso dell'arcivescovo pugliese di Siponto, il monaco benedettino Gerardo che, nominato delegato papale per la Dalmazia, tra il 1074-75 fu in contatto con l'abate di Zadar,¹⁴ proprio negli anni in cui vedeva la luce il *Ms. K. 394* della Magyar Tudományos Akadémia di Budapest, codice

che segna l'avvio della vicenda miniaturistica zaratina della seconda metà dell'XI secolo, fortemente improntata sulla produzione libraria di origine pugliese.

Ma altrettanto degne di nota rimangono due figure nodali della storia religiosa della Dalmazia: l'arcivescovo di Split Lorenzo (1059-1099) e il vescovo di Trogir Giovanni Orsini (1064-1111), ecclesiastico di origine romana quest'ultimo giunto oltreadriatico con una delegazione pontificia inviata da Alessandro II e consacrato dallo stesso presule spalatino nel 1064.¹⁵ Quanto a Lorenzo, che prima della cattedra metropolitana di Split occupò la sede vescovile di Osor, succedendo al benedettino san Gaudenzio di cui era stato discepolo,¹⁶ egli non solo ebbe fama di essere il più accanito difensore dell'integerrima disciplina romana, nonché ferreo restauratore dell'autorità del papa ma, in quanto «amico, consigliere e “padre spirituale”» del re Zvonimir,¹⁷ dovette agire da saldo anello di congiunzione tra il papato e la monarchia croata. Entrambi questi personaggi, Lorenzo e Giovanni, sono menzionati tra i «sanctorum et praeclarissimorum virorum et episcoporum» che frequentarono l'abbazia di san Pietro a Osor,¹⁸ altro centro di punta della promozione degli ideali riformisti in Adriatico, assai prossimo al luogo di provenienza dell'Evangelistario ora alla Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, ms. *Vat. Borg. Lat. 339*. Inoltre essi compaiono in veste di testimoni nell'atto in cui nel 1066 il sovrano Krešimir pose sotto la sua protezione il cenobio di Santa Maria di Zadar,¹⁹ a dimostrare che anche questo monastero non rimase estraneo alla Riforma. Da questo luogo proviene il gruppo più compatto dei codici prodotti nello scriptorio zaratino, il già menzionato *ms. K. 394* di Budapest e i due esemplari ora alla Bodleian Library di Oxford, il Libro d'ore monastico *Bodl. Canon. Lit 277* e l'Evangelistario *Bodl. Canon. Lat. 61*, considerati da sempre tra i più eccezionali documenti dell'arte medievale dalmata.

Temi e modelli “orientati”

Il più prestigioso dei codici in beneventana della Dalmazia, l'Evangelistario di Oxford deve la sua notorietà anche allo spessore culturale della committente, la badessa Vekenega, che ne promosse la realizzazione probabilmente intorno al 1095-96, anno in cui prese il posto della madre Čika nella direzione del monastero di Santa Maria di Zadar.²⁰ Eseguito per ultimo tra i manoscritti del nucleo zaratino (lo precedono i già menzionati *ms. K. 394* di Budapest e *Bodl. Canon. Lit. 277* di Oxford,²¹ legato alla medesima badessa), il codice segna, per la qualità tecnico-esecutiva e per la competenza dimostrata nella *mise en page* e nella rielaborazione del repertorio ornamentale di matrice italomeridionale, il vertice più alto raggiunto dallo *scriptorium* di San Crisogono nella seconda metà dell'XI secolo. D'altra parte l'estrema ricchezza della decorazione, contraddistinta dall'uso di una variegata e smagliante gamma cromatica e dall'abbondante presenza dell'oro, lo rende un prodotto di lusso destinato ad entrare nell'arredo liturgico del monastero.

Le caratteristiche formali e stilistiche dell'*Initialornamentik* denunciano una chiara dipendenza dell'apparato decorativo dalla miniatura pugliese, specie nell'uso standardizzato dell'iniziale geometrica combinata con i simboli degli evangelisti, che costituisce un elemento distintivo degli Evangelistari prodotti nella regione²²: questa particolarità induce a credere che l'adozione sistematica di una simile modalità illustrativa, volta a potenziare la funzionalità del principale Libro della messa, possa collegarsi allo specifico valore liturgico che tale tipologia libraria assunse in Dalmazia al tempo della Riforma. Si spiegherebbe così anche un'altra peculiarità degli Evangelistari dalmati, l'inserimento del testo dell'*Exultet* che generalmente non è contemplato in questa tipologia libraria: sebbene si tratti di una scelta "ovvia", in quanto sia il Vangelo che il canto del preonio pasquale erano cantati dal diacono, l'allestimento di questa specifica soluzione codicologica potrebbe rinviare alla necessità di adottare una forma testuale combinata, che includesse nel più importante Libro della messa anche il più significativo e spettacolare dei cerimoniali liturgici, quello della Veglia pasquale.²³

I temi figurativi presenti nel manoscritto, assai singolari sul piano iconografico, contribuiscono a contestualizzare il codice nel periodo in cui venne realizzato: sia che questi soggetti ricalchino un ipotetico prototipo o che siano frutto di elaborazione autonoma, essi riflettono la volontà di reiterare una precisa valenza simbolica dell'immagine, che in ogni caso presuppone una scelta operata in modo consapevole.



Fig. 1 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodl. Canon. Lat. 61, c. 106r, "Ultima cena".



Fig. 2 Parigi, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 364, c. 23v, "Ultima cena".

L'analisi iconografica dell'*Ultima cena* a c. 106r (Fig. 1)²⁴ – un disegno isolato che va assegnato ad una mano diversa da quella che lavorò alle iniziali,²⁵ ma che fu eseguito contestualmente al resto della decorazione – dimostra la particolare declinazione in senso occidentale della scena che, discostandosi sensibilmente dall'iconografia bizantina, trova un punto

di contatto con la raffigurazione di medesimo soggetto contenuta nel Breviario, *Ms. 364* della Bibliothèque Mazarine di Parigi (c. 23v), esemplato a Montecassino per l'abate Oderisio e, dunque, dopo il 1087 (Fig. 2). Spetta a Helène Toubert aver suggerito per questa miniatura la portata innovativa del gesto di Cristo che – diversamente dalla tradizione orientale dove compare nell'atto di benedire – con il braccio destro proteso tende a Giuda un pane rotondo segnato da una croce, allusione all'ostia consacrata.²⁶ Nel disegno zaratino con la stessa incidenza visiva, seppure in un contesto marcato dalla tipologia bizantina della tavola a *sigma*,²⁷ la figura di Cristo torna a porgere all'apostolo il pane per mezzo di un lungo utensile, può darsi un coltello o un cucchiaio, reiterando così la pregnanza di quell'azione, che funge da esplicito richiamo all'Eucarestia come pilastro fondante della dottrina cristiana.²⁸ L'*Ultima cena* zaratina trova un'interessante chiave di lettura alla luce del lungo dibattito dottrinario incentrato sul tema eucaristico, che oppose occidentali e bizantini dalla metà dell'XI secolo e nel quale furono coinvolti i più autorevoli personaggi del movimento riformista.²⁹ L'interpretazione in senso "orientato" del disegno costituisce, d'altra parte, una valida spiegazione a quel dettaglio di ascendenza paleocristiana – Cristo con una croce intorno al capo privo di aureola – che per Maksimović richiamava più semplicemente l'influenza esercitata in Dalmazia dai modelli dell'arte carolingia e ottoniana.³⁰

Desto interesse che in un'altra miniatura del manoscritto il "tema eucaristico" torni a permeare il senso l'immagine: si tratta della *V* di *Vere dignum* a c. 117r (Fig. 3), posta in apertura del Prefazio dell'*Exultet*. Il fondo della lettera, interamente colorato in oro, denota già a prima vista l'eccezionale valenza figurativa della pagina, più spettacolare ancora di quella in cui, solamente due carte prima, alloggia la grande *E* dell'*Exultet*. Contraddistingue sul piano iconografico il monogramma la presenza di un tondo, agganciato alla forcilla della lettera mediante quattro nodi a intreccio disposti a modo di croce, nel mezzo del quale si staglia la nitida figura dell'*Agnus Dei*, con la zampa anteriore destra piegata a sorreggere una croce, il collo e la testa dritti a guardare il pavone crestato appollaiato sul vertice superiore sinistro.

L'iniziale non trova confronto in nessuno dei rotoli liturgici italomeridionali, dove il monogramma del *Vere dignum* accoglie la rappresentazione della *Maiestas Domini* o più semplicemente della figura benedicente di Cristo a mezzo busto.³¹ Quanto avviene, del resto, anche nell'*Exultet* dell'Evangelistario di Osor (Fig. 10), manoscritto che precede di un quindicennio il *Bodl. Canon. Lat. 61* e che venne copiato – forse in uno scriptorio situato sulla stessa isola – molto verosimilmente però sulla base di un esemplare di origine zaratina.³²

Lasciando per un momento da parte la questione del modello a cui il miniatore del *Vere dignum* oxoniense poté fare riferimento, l'analisi sposta nuovamente l'attenzione sulla scelta operata dall'artista, che colloca il motivo dell'agnello al posto della Maestà deputata a indicare,



Fig. 3 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodl. Canon. Lat. 61, c. 117r, "Vere dignum".

mediante l'esaltazione della figura di Cristo seduto sul trono e racchiuso in una mandorla, l'epifania divina secondo la visione apocalittica di Isaia (Is 66,1).³³ La preferenza accordata all'*Agnus Dei* non può risolversi semplicemente in un recupero *tout court* del simbolo paleocristiano di consueto associato a Cristo,³⁴ dato che una tale ripresa non spiegherebbe la connessione con la pagina, in cui esso è stato collocato. La singolarità della formula adottata nel codice sembra risiedere, invece, proprio nella decisione di inserire l'immagine dell'agnello nel contesto liturgico pasquale e di "deviare" in senso sacramentale la funzione espressiva associata generalmente al *Vere dignum*

dell'*Exultet*. Una scelta intenzionale, come dimostra l'aggiunta di quei dettagli – l'attributo della croce, allusione al trionfo di Cristo sulla morte, e il pavone-fenice, metafora della Resurrezione e dell'immortalità³⁵ – che intervengono entrambi a esplicitare il significato dell'agnello in qualità di emblema pasquale, piuttosto che come simbolo apocalittico o genericamente martiriale.³⁶

Sulla base di queste considerazioni viene da chiedersi se l'utilizzo dell'*Agnus Dei* in sostituzione della figura di Cristo nel monogramma del *Vere dignum* non sia riconducibile all'esigenza di rimarcare un legame concettuale tra la pagina dell'*Exultet* e la scena dell'*Ultima cena*, se cioè l'espedito iconografico non sia destinato ad amplificare e in qualche modo esplicitare il valore espressivo del disegno a c. 106r. Se così fosse, l'ipotesi interpretativa non potrebbe non tener conto della marcata funzione dottrina che la rappresentazione dell'agnello assumeva nella miniatura del Breviario oderisiano e, di riflesso, nel suo diretto precedente iconografico, l'affresco dell'*Ultima cena* di Sant'Angelo in Formis, dove l'animale, posato su una coppa al centro della tavola, sostituisce il tradizionale pasto del pesce, per richiamare – come sosteneva la Toubert – il valore sacrificale che esso aveva nella Pasqua ebraica.³⁷ Uno stesso orientamento ideologico, indirizzato ad avvalorare la centralità che il sacramento eucaristico aveva nella dottrina liturgica “riformata”, potrebbe aver suggerito nell'Evangelistario zarantino l'adozione del simbolo pasquale, piuttosto che dell'immagine di Cristo, come richiamo “concreto” a quel sacrificio che proprio durante la Veglia di Pasqua – quando cioè l'*Exultet* veniva cantato – trovava la sua massima esaltazione preannunciando la salvezza di Cristo e dell'umanità intera.

Tornando al modello da cui il miniatore prese ispirazione nell'allestimento della pagina, va rilevato che in ambito librario pugliese una rappresentazione dell'agnello mistico con una croce segnata sul capo, è presente nel Messale *ms. W 6* del Walters Museum di Baltimora (già Walters Gallery) (Fig. 4),³⁸ dove, tuttavia, esso non compare in corrispondenza del *Vere dignum*, illustrato dalla consueta *Maiestas Domini* (c. 67r; Fig. 5), ma accostato alla *T* del *Te igitur* (c. 68r), accoppiamento che trova un illustre antecedente in epoca precarolingia nel Sacramentario gelasiano della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *ms. Reg. Lat. 316* (c. 132r).³⁹ L'adozione di un elemento iconografico tratto dal Canone della messa, piuttosto che da un testo contenente l'*Exultet*, potrebbe contribuire a chiarire da dove derivi la stretta connotazione “eucaristica” del *Vere dignum* zarantino; ma avvalorerebbe anche l'operato artistico del miniatore che, trasferendo autonomamente l'immagine da una tipologia libraria ad un'altra e sganciandola dal contesto liturgico originario, dimostrerebbe (anche in questo caso) una notevole capacità elaborativa. Diversamente, se presupponessimo l'arrivo in Dalmazia di un rotolo (o di un codice) contenente il testo dell'*Exultet*,⁴⁰ dove la soluzione accolta dall'artista era già presente, il problema dell'arrangiamento della pagina del *Vere dignum* si sposterebbe ovviamente più a monte.⁴¹



Fig. 4 Baltimore, Walters Museum, Ms. W 6, c. 68r, "Te igitur".



Fig. 5 Baltimore, Walters Museum, Ms. W 6, c. 67r, "Vere dignum".

Miniatura in Dalmazia e «Renouvau paléochrétien»

Allo stato attuale della ricerca sarebbe azzardato pensare che la lettura in chiave "orientata" dell'*Ultima cena* – scena che, come è stato qui proposto, andrebbe collegata a livello simbolico-concettuale con il *Vere dignum* dell'*Exultet* – possa spiegare un altro elemento distintivo dell'apparato ornamentale del manoscritto, che non trova un adeguato parallelo in ambito italomeridionale. Mi riferisco all'insolito risalto che, rispetto al tradizionale repertorio zoomorfo pugliese, nell'Evangelistario di Vekenega viene dato al pavone (Fig. 6, Fig. 7),⁴² motivo paleocristiano assai diffuso nella scultura altomedievale della regione.⁴³ Il suggerimento di chi invita a ridimensionare il nesso «*Renouvau paléochrétien*» / Riforma gregoriana induce alla cautela⁴⁴: ma che interpretazione dare allora alle iniziali in cui pavoni di raffinata bellezza sostituiscono in posizione araldica il segno grafico, diventando un vero e proprio *leit motiv* del manoscritto e quasi un marchio di fabbrica del miniatore, che se ne serve per sostituire deliberatamente anche l'aquila giovannea? Occorre riflettere se la preferenza per un tale motivo non sia da ricondurre proprio all'enfasi che viene data nel manoscritto al tema del sacrificio di Cristo come preludio della vita eterna, di cui il pavone è il simbolo per eccellenza. Tale valutazione nasce anche in coincidenza del fatto che nell'Evangelistario, fatta eccezione per il disegno dell'*Ultima cena*, la figura di Cristo è omessa, a differenza di quanto avviene in tutti gli altri codici del gruppo, dove compare ed è per di più caratterizzata dalla formula del "Cristo imberbe", derivata anch'essa dall'arte tardoantica e poi ripresa in età carolingia.



Fig. 6 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodl. Canon. Lat. 61, c. 142v, iniziale "I".



Fig. 7 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodl. Canon. Lat. 61, c. 144r, iniziale "I".

Il recupero di motivi paleocristiani costituisce un tratto peculiare della miniatura dalmata dell'XI secolo sul quale bisognerà tornare a discutere; ma occorrerà valutare meglio anche quale incidenza ebbero in tal senso i "modelli" italomeridionali e nello specifico pugliesi. La circostanza per cui il motivo del "Cristo imberbe" caratterizza la decorazione del *Ms. K. 394* di Budapest (Fig. 8) e del *Vat. Borg. Lat. 339* (Fig. 9, Fig. 10), ossia dei codici più antichi del gruppo della seconda metà dell'XI secolo, circoscrivendo l'attività dello scriptorio zaratino all'arco cronologico tra l'ottavo e il nono decennio del secolo, in piena età gregoriana dunque, consente di individuare in questi due esemplari i più diretti testimoni dei prototipi librari pervenuti oltreadriatico nel corso dell'XI secolo.⁴⁵ Utilizzare la lente offerta dalla decorazione dei codici in beneventana prodotti in Dalmazia per fare chiarezza sui "modelli" presenti nella regione all'epoca della Riforma, apre la strada a un riesame del patrimonio librario italomeridionale e alle sue implicazioni con quel «renouveau paleochrétien», che larga parte ebbe nelle vicende artistico-culturali italomeridionali dell'XI-XII secolo.




Fig. 8 Budapest, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia, Ms. K 394, c. 69v.



Fig. 9 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Borg. lat. 339, c. 42v.



Fig. 10 Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Borg. lat. 339, c. 53r, "Benedictio cerei" e "Maiestas Domini".

- ¹ Si veda in particolare J. STIPIŠIĆ, *La Croatie dans les sources diplomatiques jusqu'à la fin du XI^e siècle*, in *Croatie. Trésors de la Croatie ancienne des origines à la fin du XII^e siècle*, Accadémie Croate des Sciences et Arts, Sous la direction de I. Supišić, Preface de J. Le Goff, I, Paris 1999, pp. 285-315: 294 ss.
- ² Si trattava dell'atto conclusivo di una vicenda cominciata all'indomani dello scisma di Michele Cerulario del 1054, che aveva visto intrecciarsi al piano di Riforma e di rivalsa politica avviato dalla Chiesa per attrarre definitivamente la Dalmazia nella sfera di influenza romana, le vicende relative all'ascesa politica dei principi croati, disposti ad appoggiare il Papato in cambio del riconoscimento del Regno nel quadro dello scacchiere politico europeo. Per un quadro d'insieme sull'argomento si rinvia alla terza sezione del volume *Croatie* cit., 147-237.
- ³ Della vasta produzione bibliografica esistente sull'argomento, mi limito a segnalare solo alcuni tra i lavori più recenti: M. GLAUCA CANTARELLA, *Il sole e la luna. La rivoluzione di Gregorio VII papa 1073-1085*, Bari 2005; M. GLAUCA CANTARELLA-TUNIZ DORINO, *Il papa e il sovrano. Gregorio VII ed Enrico IV nella lotta per le investiture*, Milano 1998; TESSORE DAG, *Gregorio VII. Il monaco, l'uomo politico, il santo*, Città Nuova 2003.
- ⁴ «...De plus, j'offre, je fais don et je confirme au Siège apostolique, le monastère Saint-Grgur nommé Vrana avec tout son trésor, c'est-à-dire avec un coffre d'or contenant les reliques du corps saint du même bienheureux Grgur, avec deux croix, un calice et une patène, deux couronne d'or ornées de pierres précieuses, avec des évangiles (écrits) en lettres d'argent, et avec tous ses biens meubles et immeubles...». La trascrizione integrale del discorso, riportato nel *Liber censuum*, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Cod. lat. 8486* (cc. 97-98), è in J. STIPIŠIĆ, *La Croatie* cit., p. 316-317, da cui è tratto il brano qui citato.
- ⁵ E. ELBA, *Sulle relazioni artistiche tra le due sponde adriatiche. La decorazione dei codici in beneventana della Dalmazia tra XI e XIII secolo*, Tesi di Dottorato, Università degli Studi di Bari, 2005; EAD., *Miniatura in Dalmazia. I codici in beneventana (XI-XIII secolo)*, (Collana di Studi del Dottorato di ricerca in Storia dell'arte comparata, civiltà e culture dei paesi mediterranei, Università degli Studi di Bari, 2), presentazioni di M. S. Calò Mariani e G. Orofino, Galatina 2011.
- ⁶ Per una disamina critica sulla nascita e sullo sviluppo della nozione storiografica di "arte della Riforma gregoriana" si rinvia a X. BARRAL I ALTET, *Arte medievale e Riforma gregoriana. Riflessioni su un problema storiografico*, «Hortus Artium Medievalium», Journal of the International Research Center for Late Antiquity and Middle Ages, 16 (2010), pp. 72-82, da cui risalire alla bibliografia precedente sull'argomento. Segnalo, inoltre, il recente convegno di studi "La reliquia del Sangue di Cristo: Mantova, l'Italia e l'Europa al tempo di Leone IX", tenutosi a Mantova il 23-26 novembre del 2011 dedicato alla fase iniziale della Riforma.
- ⁷ Non posso non menzionare a tal proposito la relazione che il prof. Vladimir Peter Goss ha tenuto nel corso del convegno di Mantova del 2011, dal titolo "Croatian Kingdom and Eastern Adriatic at the threshold of the Reform (1030-1060)-evidence of some dated monuments". Significativi contributi sono inoltre: M. JURKOVIĆ, *La réforme de l'église et l'architecture du premier âge roman en Croatie*, in «Les cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa», 33 (2002), pp. 183-194; M. JURKOVIĆ-N. MARASOVIĆ, *La nascita del primo romanico in Croazia nel contesto delle grandi riforme ecclesistiche del secolo XI*, in *Immagine e ideologia. Studi in onore di Arturo Carlo Quintavalle*, a cura di A. Calzona et al., Milano 2007, pp. 96-102.
- ⁸ Sull'Ordine benedettino in Croazia si veda I. Ostojić, *Benediktinci u Hrvatskoj i ostili našim kragevima*, I-III, Split 1963-1965; F. Šanjek, *Cristianesimo e statualità croata. Storia*, in *I Croati. Cristianesimo Cultura Arte*, Catalogo della mostra (Città del Vaticano, Musei Vaticani, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 29 ottobre 1999-15 gennaio 2000), Zagreb 1999, pp. 51-69: 64 ss.; ID. *L'Église et le Christianisme*, in *Croatie*, pp. 217-236: 225 ss.
- ⁹ Un'idea di quanto articolato sia il quadro di questi rapporti si ricava dalla cartina in F. Šanjek, *L'Église* cit., p. 233.
- ¹⁰ Sui rapporti religiosi e culturali tra l'Italia meridionale e l'opposta sponda adriatica, nonché sulla centralità della Puglia e del promontorio garganico quale direttrice privilegiata degli scambi interadriatici in epoca medievale, si rinvia a E. ELBA, *Miniatura* cit., p. 54 ss.
- ¹¹ Sulla storia del monastero e sul suo scrittorio si veda, oltre all'ormai datato, ma sempre valido, lavoro di G. Praga, *Lo scriptorium dell'abbazia benedettina di San Grisogono in Zara*, «Archivio storico per la Dalmazia», Roma 1929-1940, VII: fasc. 39 (127-146), fasc. 40 (177-190), fasc. 42 (279-298), VIII: fasc. 43 (314-325), fasc. 45 (438-453), fasc. 46 (481-494), fasc. 47 (542-562); IX: fasc. 49 (144-149), la miscellanea di studi *1000 godina Samostana Svetog Krševana u Zadru*, Prilozi sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 11. i 12. prosinca 1986. u Zadru, u povodu 1000. obljetnice Samostana Svetog Krševana i 30. obljetnice Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru, «Zadarska revija», (XXXIX), br. 2-3, Zadar 1990.
- ¹² Sul manoscritto si veda N. Togni, *La Bibbia 'atlantica' di Dubrovnik (ms. Dubrovnik, Dominikanski Samostan, 58 sub vitro*, «Segno e Testo», International Journal of Manuscripts and Text Transmission, Università degli Studi di Cassino, 5 (2007), pp. 341-393, con bibliografia precedente. Sulla tipologia delle Bibbie 'atlantiche', sulla loro produzione e diffusione si rinvia a *Le Bibbie Atlantiche. Il libro delle scritture tra monumentalità e rappresentazione*, a cura di M. Maniaci – G. Orofino, Milano 2000, nonché all'indirizzo web <http://bibbie.cea.unicas.it/tipologia> dell'Università di Cassino. In merito alla decorazione si vedano in particolare gli studi di G. OROFINO, *Per un'iconografia comparata delle Bibbie atlantiche*, in *Cicli e immagini bibliche nella*

miniatura, Atti del VI Congresso internazionale di Storia della miniatura (Urbino, 3-6 ottobre 2002), «Rivista di Storia della miniatura», 6/7 (2001-2002), 29-4029-40; EAD. *Bibbie atlantiche. Struttura del testo e del racconto nel Libro 'riformato'. Spunti di una mostra*, in *Medioevo: immagine e racconto*, Atti del IV convegno internazionale di studi (Parma, 27-30 settembre 2000), a cura di C. A. Quintavalle, Milano 2004, 253-264; EAD. *La decorazione delle Bibbie atlantiche tra Lazio e Toscana nella prima metà del XII secolo*, in *Roma e la Riforma gregoriana. Tradizioni e innovazioni artistiche (XI-XII secolo)*, Actes du colloque (Université de Lausanne, 10-11 décembre 2004), a cura di S. Romano-J. Enckell Juillard, Roma 2007, 357-379. Segnalo, infine, il recente convegno di studi tenutosi a Ginevra nel febbraio del 2010, “Les Bibles atlantiques. Le manuscrit biblique à l'époque de la Réforme ecclésiastique du XI^e siècle”.

- ¹³ Diversa è l'opinione di Nadia Togni, secondo la quale è inverosimile che la Bibbia sia giunta a Dubrovnik prima del 1228, anno di fondazione del convento domenicano (cfr. N. TOGNI, *La Bibbia* cit., p. 343).
- ¹⁴ Per la figura dell'arcivescovo Gerardo di Siponto si veda T. LECCISOTTI, *Due monaci cassinesi arcivescovi di Siponto*, «Japigia», XIV (1943), fasc. II, 155-165 (con bibliografia precedente alla nota 2). Per l'attività diplomatica che il monaco svolse in qualità di delegato papale si rinvia anche a J. STIPIŠIĆ, *La Croatie* cit., p. 303.
- ¹⁵ Una biografia essenziale sulla figura di Giovanni Orsini è in Enciclopedia cattolica, “Giovanni Orsini”, Città del Vaticano, 1952, coll. 357-376. Sull'incidenza che il vescovo ebbe nella vita religiosa della Dalmazia si veda, inoltre, A. LOVATO, *L'ufficio ritmico del beato Giovanni Orsini vescovo di Trogir/Traù (1064-1111)*, *Srednjovjekovne glazbene kulture. Na istočnoj i zapadnoj obali jadrana do početka 15. stoljeća* (Medieval Music Culture. On the eastern and western shores of the Adriatic until the beginning of the 15th Century), Proceedings of the International Musicological Symposium held in Split-Croatia (May 21-24, 1997), Zagreb 2000, pp. 85-123.
- ¹⁶ L. TOMAZ, *In Adriatico nell'antichità e nell'alto medioevo. Da Dionigi di Siracusa ai dogi Orseolo, un'altra faccia della storia*, Think ADV: Conselve, 2003, pp. 419-421. Gaudenzio lasciò il vescovato osserino intorno al 1040 per rifugiarsi a Portonovo d'Ancona dove morirà in santità.
- ¹⁷ F. ŠANJEK, *L'Église* cit., p. 227.
- ¹⁸ I. OSTOJIĆ, *Benediktinci* cit., p. 632.
- ¹⁹ Il documento è in V. NOVAK, *Zadarski kartular samostana svete Marije*, Zagreb 1959, pp. 243-244.
- ²⁰ Sul codice e sulla questione relativa alla sua datazione rinvio a E. ELBA, *La miniatura* cit., p. 82 ss., 157-168.
- ²¹ Su questi manoscritti EAD., p. 70 ss, 135-156.
- ²² L'uso sistematico di questa formula decorativa contraddistingue anche il più antico Evangelistario di Osor, *Vat. Borg. Lat. 339* della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, nonché il più tardo Evangelistario di Trogir, copiato nel XIII secolo a partire da un esemplare dell'XI secolo. Questa tipologia di iniziali, attestata in Puglia solo da codici del XII secolo come il *Vat. Ottob. Lat. 296* della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (per cui si rinvia a V. PACE, *Studi sulla decorazione libraria in area grafica beneventana*, in *L'età dell'abate Desiderio. La decorazione libraria*, II, Atti della tavola rotonda, a cura di G. Cavallo, Miscellanea cassinese 60, Montecassino 1989, 65-93: 76-78; G. OROFINO, *L'Evangelario Vat. Ottob. Lat. 296 della barese abbazia di Elia*, in *Fonti per la storia della liturgia*, a cura di N. Bux, Bari 1991, 23-30: 23-30) o i due Evangelistari dell'Archivio capitolare di Bisceglie e della Biblioteca Comunale di Bitonto (EAD., *Gli Evangelari in beneventana di Bisceglie e di Bitonto e la produzione miniaturistica in Puglia nel XII secolo*, in *I Codici Liturgici di Puglia*, Catalogo della mostra, a cura di G. Cioffari-G. Di Benedetto, Bari 1986, 199-232: 199-232), trova una diretta rispondenza a livello cronologico – specie per quanto attiene al *Borg. Lat. 339* nella produzione libraria cassinese della prima età desideriana, esemplata dai codici *Casin. 191* e *Casin. 424* (per i quali si rinvia a EAD., *I codici decorati dell'Archivio di Montecassino*. III. *Tra Teobaldo e Desiderio*, Roma 2006: 15, 155-164, 165-176 con bibliografia precedente e ricco apparato illustrativo). Per la bibliografia completa sui manoscritti qui citati cfr. BMB, *Bibliografia dei manoscritti in Beneventana*, I-XVI, Roma 1993-.
- ²³ Questa soluzione sarebbe del resto comprensibile in un contesto come la Dalmazia, dove la circolazione libraria si riduceva probabilmente a pochi esemplari di maggior pregio.
- ²⁴ Per una più dettagliata analisi iconografica della scena si rinvia a E. ELBA, *La miniatura* cit., pp. 88-90.
- ²⁵ Fa eccezione l'iniziale figurata da un evangelista a c. 38v, realizzata molto verosimilmente dallo stesso maestro dell'*Ultima cena*, come dimostra l'affinità del tratto, morbido e spedito, che contraddistingue la *silhouette* del santo rispetto alle altre iniziali dello stesso tipo. Una riproduzione a colori della lettera è in EAD., *La miniatura* cit., tav. 15b.
- ²⁶ Sul Breviario di Oderisio si veda H. TOUBERT, *Le Bréviaire d'Oderisius (Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms 364) e les influences byzantine au Mont-Cassin*, «Mélange de L'École Française de Rome». Moyen Age, Tempe Modernes, LXXXIII (1971), 187-261 (ed EAD., *Un'arte orientata. Riforma gregoriana e iconografia*, a cura di L. Speciale, Milano 2001, pp. 229-265: 239-241).
- ²⁷ Per restare in ambito librario la stessa tipologia di tavola si ritrova nell'*Ultima cena* dell'*Euclologio Vat. Gr. 155* (c. 178v), manoscritto datato tra la fine dell'XI secolo e la prima metà del XII secolo (G. OROFINO, *Miniatura in Puglia agli inizi dell'XI secolo: l'Omilario VI B 2 della Biblioteca Nazionale di Napoli*, «Rivista di Storia della miniatura», 3-4 [1990-91], 21-32: 28 n. 51), che già Jovanka Maksimović, *Beleške o iluminacijama južne Italije I Dalmacije u Srednjem veku*, «Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji», 21 (1980), Split 1980, 190-199: 192, metteva in relazione

al disegno zaratino per le strette corrispondenze iconografiche. Un confronto più dettagliato tra la scena del ms. di Oxford e quella del codice vaticano è in E. ELBA, *La miniatura* cit., p. 89 n. 169. Sull'Euclologio si veda, inoltre, A. GRABAR, *Les manuscrits grecs enluminés de provenance italienne (IX^e-XI^e siècles)*, Paris 1972: n. 37, 65-67, tav. 68, fig. 283.

- ²⁸ Sia nel manoscritto cassinese che in quello zaratino la carica emotiva che pervade l'immagine è accentuata dall'enfasi con cui l'apostolo Giovanni reclina la testa sulla spalla di Cristo, un dettaglio che contribuisce a inserire le due immagini nell'alveo della tradizione occidentale solita a illustrare il vangelo di Giovanni (Gv. 13, 21-26), piuttosto che quello di Matteo (Mt 26, 21-27).
- ²⁹ Questa diatriba, causa dello scisma del 1054, fu in origine incentrata sulla consuetudine di celebrare il rito eucaristico con il pane azzimo, come sostenuto dai cristiani d'occidente, e non con il pane lievitato, come volevano i bizantini. Nella seconda metà del secolo il dibattito trovò prosecuzione nella celebre controversia tra il monaco Alberico di Montecassino e il canonico Berengario di Tours sulla concezione simbolica o realistica del mistero eucaristico, che ebbe il suo momento cruciale nel concilio del 1078-79. Su quest'argomento, oltre a H. TOUBERT, *Un'arte* cit., p. 116 ss, si rinvia in particolare a C. M. RADDING-F. NEWTON, *Theology, Rhetoric, and Politics in the Eucharistic Controversy. 1078-1079*, Columbia University Press, New York 2003, con ampio apparato bibliografico.
- ³⁰ J. MAKSIMOVIC, *Beleške* cit., p. 192.
- ³¹ Unica eccezione è rappresentata dal più tardo rotolo di Mirabella Eclano (Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, *Exultet* 2), databile entro la prima metà del XII secolo, dove il monogramma con l'agnello è affiancato da un medaglione occupato dalla figura di Cristo. Sul rotolo si veda la scheda di G. OROFINO, *Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, Exultet 2 di Mirabella Eclano*, in *Exultet. Rotoli liturgici dell'Italia meridionale*, Roma 1994, pp. 313-314.
- ³² Sul manoscritto si veda E. ELBA, *La miniatura* cit., pp. 77-82, 169-176.
- ³³ Sul significato simbolico della *Maiestas Domini* si veda F. BISCONTI, "Mandorla", in *Temi di iconografia paleocristiana*, Città del Vaticano 2000, p. 211, con bibliografia.
- ³⁴ Per i vari significati che l'immagine dell'agnello acquista nella simbologia cristiana si rinvia a H.-M. SCHMIDT, *Il linguaggio delle immagini. Iconografia cristiana*, Città Nuova, pp. 68-75.
- ³⁵ Su questo motivo iconografico si veda F. BISCONTI, *Temi* cit., alla voce "Fenice", p. 180.
- ³⁶ È interessante far notare che in alcuni programmi figurativi monumentali realizzati a Roma all'epoca della Riforma gregoriana, il motivo dell'agnello, pur presente, non è caratterizzato dal dettaglio della croce, mentre compare di consueto in associazione ai simboli degli evangelisti che ne marcano il significato in senso apocalittico (come avviene, ad esempio, nell'oratorio mariano di Santa Pudenziana), o a rappresentare Cristo con gli apostoli, in riferimento ad una tematica martiriale (ad esempio nell'abside di S. Maria in Pallara). In merito agli esempi citati e alla pittura monumentale a Roma all'epoca della Riforma si rinvia a *Roma e la Riforma gregoriana, Tradizioni e innovazioni artistiche (XI-XII secolo)*, Atti del convegno (Losanna 2004), a cura di S. Romano, J. Enckell Juillard, Roma 2007 nonché S. Romano, *Riforma e tradizione, 1050-1189*, (La pittura medievale a Roma. Corpus e atlante), IV, Milano 2006. La formula iconografica dell'agnello con i simboli degli evangelisti era presente anche sulla facciata di San Pietro in Vaticano, come attesta la miniatura del codice *Eton, Ms. 124*, Eton College Library (c. 122r), dell'XI secolo e proveniente dall'abbazia di Farfa (una riproduzione è in *La basilica di San Pietro*, a cura di C. Pietrangeli, Firenze 1989, fig. 45). In ambito librario essa trova una significativa attestazione, inoltre, nella miniatura dell'*Exultet* Vat. Lat. 9820, della fine del X secolo, dove l'agnello, che reca sotto le zampe il rotolo con i sigilli, acquista chiara valenza apocalittica (cfr. V. PACE, *Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. lat. 9820, Exultet*, in *Exultet* cit., pp. 101-106: 102).
- ³⁷ Una riproduzione è in H. TOUBERT, *Un'arte* cit., fig. 61. Secondo la studiosa la rappresentazione dell'agnello serviva a collocare l'evento dell'Ultima cena in un momento cronologico preciso, ossia la sera di Pasqua. Questo, oltre a ricordare i riti ebraici aboliti – come si desume dal *titulus* che accompagna l'affresco e che è la chiave tipologica dell'intero programma figurativo – rinvia al canto dell'*Agnus Dei* intonato durante la *fractio panis* e poi spostato nel corso dell'evoluzione liturgica della messa al momento della comunione. La scena di Sant'Angelo in Formis verrebbe così a manifestare una risposta visiva agli argomenti elaborati dai cristiani d'occidente per difendere l'uso del pane azzimo contro i bizantini sostenitori del pane lievitato, ma anche un riferimento alla più recente controversia di cui era protagonista Alberico da Montecassino, uno dei più stretti collaboratori dell'abate Desiderio che, come è noto, fece decorare la chiesa (EAD., *Un'arte* cit., pp. 116-118). Più recentemente Francis Newton ha convalidato l'esegesi dottrinale dell'affresco campano, rilevando nel gesto di Giuda che mangia parte dell'agnello, il rinvio esplicito ad una delle argomentazioni che furono alla base della tesi formulata dal monaco cassinese in difesa dell'interpretazione realistica dell'Eucarestia e incentrata sul concetto filosofico del termine *substantia* (C. M. RADDING-F. NEWTON, *Theology* cit.).
- ³⁸ Il codice, genericamente datato all'XI secolo, venne eseguito per una chiesa della diocesi di Canosa: cfr. S. REHLE, *Missale Beneventanum in Berlin*, «Sacris erudiri», 28 (1985), 469-510. Sulla decorazione del Messale è in corso uno studio da parte di chi scrive.
- ³⁹ O. PÄCHT, *La miniatura medievale. Una introduzione*, Torino 2000, fig. 37.
- ⁴⁰ Sulla possibilità che in Dalmazia esistesse un rotolo di *Exultet* cfr. E. ELBA, *Miniatura* cit. p. 80 e di rinvio J. BELAMARIĆ, *Cenni per un profilo della storia e dell'arte medievale e rinascimentale della città di Traù (Trogir)*, in

Tesori della Croazia. Restaurati da Venetian Heritage Inc., Catalogo della mostra (Venezia, Chiesa di San Barnaba, 9 Giugno-4 Novembre 2001), Venezia 2001, pp. 16-28: 19.

⁴¹ Il problema del modello iconografico riguarda anche l'*Ultima cena*, contraddistinta dall'assenza del motivo dell'agnello, che segna l'intenzione di rispettare maggiormente la tradizione iconografica bizantina. Tale scelta, contravvenendo all'orientamento in senso occidentale segnalato nell'immagine dal gesto di Cristo, potrebbe essere imputata tanto all'ideatore della scena-prototipo che all'artista zaratino che la copiò, tenendo conto che entrambi poterono fare riferimento a fonti di tradizioni diverse.

⁴² Sono le iniziali *I* di *In illo tempore* alle cc. 33r, 68v, 139v, 142v, 144r, 163v.

⁴³ Si veda E. ELBA, *La decorazione dei codici in beneventana della Dalmazia tra XI e XIII secolo*, «Segno e Testo», International Journal of Manuscripts and Text Transmission, Università degli Studi di Cassino, 4 (2006), 107-147: 123-124, con relativo confronto alla tav. 5c-d). Alcuni esempi di epoca carolingia si ritrovano in *Bizantini, Croati, Carolingi. Alba e tramonto di regni e imperi*, Catalogo della mostra (Brescia, Santa Giulia-Museo della città, 9 settembre 2001-6 gennaio 2002), a cura di C. Bertelli et al., Milano 2001: si vedano in particolare i due bellissimi pavoni della lastra del IX secolo proveniente da Kotor (*Ibid.*: 187) o quelli sul coevo timpano di cancello presbiteriale ora al Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika di Split (*Ibid.*: 389 e n. IV.4).

⁴⁴ X. BARRAL I ALTET, *Arte medievale* cit., p. 80.

⁴⁵ A proposito della *Maiestas Domini* dell'*Exultet* di Osor, contraddistinta dalla raffigurazione del Cristo di aspetto giovanile e imberbe, essa rappresenta una soluzione iconografica piuttosto insolita nell'ambito dei rotoli liturgici italomeridionali, dove la figura di Cristo è presente per lo più con il volto barbuto, secondo l'accezione tipicamente bizantina. È interessante che la miniatura trovi una stretta corrispondenza, anche a livello cronologico, sia con la *Maiestas Domini* dell'*Exultet* 2 di Bari, datato al terzo venticinquennio dell'XI secolo, sia con la raffigurazione del *Vere dignum* nel Canone del già menzionato Messale di Baltimora, compiuto verosimilmente in epoca coeva al rotolo barese. Questi due esemplari, inoltre, dipendono a loro volta da testimoni più antichi: l'*Exultet Vat. Lat. 9820*, proveniente da Benevento e datato alla fine del X secolo e il Messale *ms. 33* della Biblioteca Capitolare di Benevento, di recente ricondotto alla prima metà dell'XI secolo e a uno *scriptorium* della stessa città. Una più approfondita discussione su questo argomento è nel mio contributo agli atti del seminario internazionale "Libri e Testi. Lavori in corso a Cassino" (Cassino, 30-31 gennaio 2012), dedicato alla decorazione dei Messali 'votivi' in beneventana, di prossima pubblicazione.

TRA STORIA DEL COLLEZIONISMO E STORIA DELL'ARTE: LA TAVOLA DI SANT'AGATA DI CREMONA E L'AREA ADRIATICA

GIORGIO MILANESI

UNIVERSITÀ DI PARMA

La Tavola di Sant'Agata conservata nell'omonima chiesa della città di Cremona è una delle icone tardo medievali più importanti conservate nell'Italia settentrionale. La storiografia si è tradizionalmente interrogata sui possibili modelli e sulla datazione specialmente in rapporto alla collocazione geografica apparentemente anomala in relazione alla tradizione d'immagine, qualunque essa sia, che sottende un'opera di questo tipo. Questo contributo affronta inoltre un'altra questione: cosa siamo in grado di dire sulle vicende collezionistiche della Tavola? Se si ipotizza un arrivo tardo della Tavola a Cremona, può cambiare il nostro approccio analitico? Saremmo ancora costretti a far collimare la collocazione geografica attuale con uno stile spiccatamente eterogeneo?

Tavola Sant'Agata, Cremona, collezionismo, Aleni

Tanto celebre e ammirata per la sua qualità artistica, quanto oggetto di studio estremamente problematico a causa dell'unicità che la caratterizza, la *Tavola di Sant'Agata* di Cremona va annoverata tra le emergenze tardo medievali che hanno goduto di grande fortuna critica nonostante il vuoto documentario che la circonda.¹

La tavola, ora conservata nell'omonima chiesa cremonese² nella cappella intitolata alla santa, è una pala di modeste dimensioni dipinta su entrambe le facce (Fig. 1, 2). Un lato mostra la vita e i miracoli della santa catanese,³ il lato opposto è caratterizzato invece da una *Madonna con Bambino* sormontato da una cornice curva sopra cui è inserita una scena di *Pentecoste* (Fig. 3). A dispetto della mancanza totale di documentazione diretta, il suo valore artistico e la eterogeneità dei



Fig. 1 Tavola di Sant'Agata, *Storie della santa*, Cremona, Chiesa di Sant'Agata, (da *Storia di Cremona*, 2007).




Fig. 2 Tavola di Sant'Agata, *Madonna con Bambino*, Cremona, Chiesa di Sant'Agata, (da *Storia di Cremona*, 2007).

modelli figurativi presenti hanno ingenerato tra gli storici dell'arte un interesse davvero notevole, interesse che si è palesato in posizioni critiche affatto omogenee. Studiosi del calibro di Mario Salmi, Roberto Longhi, Edward Benjamin Garrison, Pietro Toesca, Victor Lazarev, Carlo Ludovico Ragghianti, Ferdinando Bologna, Rodolfo Pallucchini, e ci fermiamo ai primi anni Sessanta del XX secolo, si sono espressi sulla tavola con valutazioni sorprendentemente distanti circa l'ambito culturale di provenienza e l'arco temporale della sua esecuzione. Non deve pertanto sorprendere, ma è comunque un dato significativo, che per la prima e finora unica monografia sull'opera occorra attendere il volume di Giulia Goi del 1988,⁴ esattamente sessant'anni dopo il primo contributo di Mario Salmi.⁵ Sostanzialmente, ciò che emerge dalle riflessioni della studiosa è l'idea di un *background* linguistico che non può prescindere dalla cultura figurativa veneziana. Se è vero che da un lato la Goi recupera le posizioni del Toesca⁶ e di Lazarev,⁷ dall'altro precisa l'ambito di formazione dello sconosciuto maestro della tavola, individuando nei primi decenni del XIV secolo l'*humus* culturale utile a comprendere e contestualizzare l'autore, *humus* che sarebbe assai prossimo a quello della produzione giovanile di Paolo Veneziano,⁸ in particolare degli anni che corrispondono alla realizzazione del paliotto con le *Storie di Sant'Orsola* datato 1320-1330 circa ora in collezione privata fiorentina. La "fucina" veneta e più in generale adriatica a cavaliere dei secoli XIII e XIV sembra poter chiarire il coacervo di elementi che costituiscono la *koiné* linguistica della tavola: elementi toscani – Cimabue *in primis*, nel manto della Vergine arricchito da lumeggiature – elementi eclettici bolognesi, elementi umbri e, senza entrare nell'infinito dibattito

sui rapporti tra Oriente e Occidente, non mancano, seppur filtrate, anche evidenti eleganze bizantine.⁹ Riflessioni queste che fanno leva su una considerazione di Ferdinando Bologna,¹⁰ secondo cui in «orbita padovano-veneta, alla fine del secolo, sono ripetuti i segni della conoscenza di Cimabue e del Cimabue maturo» e che «giusto dall'orbita padovano-veneta, del resto, e dalle sue propaggini lombarde, il 'Maestro di S. Agata' desunse gli altri elementi della propria cultura».

Per quanto ci riguarda crediamo sia opportuno inserirci nel dibattito partendo da un contributo del 1982 di Anna Tambini,¹¹ non preso in considerazione dalla stessa Goi, ma che al contrario, a nostro avviso, aiuta a procedere, in modo non risolutivo, ma certo significativo, nella direzione da lei stessa suggerita. Anna Tambini, osservando gli affreschi ora perduti, ma noti grazie a fotografie, della chiesa romagnola di San Pietro in Trento (Fig. 4), che, sulla scorta di Carlo Volpe,¹² ritiene tardo duecenteschi, individua nel bordo dentellato dell'arco che corona la *Madonna con Bambino* della tavola cremonese un elemento comune e caratterizzante della composizione che può aiutare a comprendere meglio le eventuali tangenze culturali.



Fig. 3 Tavola di Sant'Agata, part., Pentecoste, Cremona, Chiesa di Sant'Agata, (da Storia di Cremona, 2007).

spetterebbero invece le scene delle *Storie di Sant'Agata* e della *Pentecoste*.¹³ Tuttavia la Pasi,¹⁴ per quanto concerne l'area di provenienza del dipinto e la sua datazione, ha continuato a ritenere valide le argomentazioni del Salmi, di Garrison, di Longhi e di Bologna¹⁵ sull'attribuzione dell'opera a una bottega padana (finanche cremonese) arricchita da «legami con tradizioni e caratteristiche morfologiche bizantine».

Ma ripartendo proprio dalle finte mensole, come dicevamo, è possibile proporre qualche ulteriore riflessione.

Si consideri a questo proposito la *Madonna allattante* (Fig. 5) del Museo di San Marco a Venezia. Tale celebre tavola, datata da Pallucchini nel 1964 all'ultimo quarto del XIII secolo, denota una spiccata volontà mimetica di rendere l'immagine articolata in termini spaziali attraverso una serie regolare di mensole dipinte che reggono tanto le immagini dei santi laterali quanto la

Silvia Pasi peraltro soffermandosi ulteriormente su tale motivo decorativo ha sottolineato i possibili rapporti tra gli affreschi romagnoli e l'opera cremonese; secondo la studiosa poi, alla Tavola di Sant'Agata avrebbero lavorato due autori, forse un maestro e un suo allievo: al primo apparterebbe la *Madonna con Bambino*, maggiormente legato alla tradizione; al secondo, più interessato al racconto minuto

Madonna che allatta il figlio, entro cornice, al centro. Osserviamo ora il lato con la *Madonna e il Bambino* della tavola cremonese. Il registro con la *Pentecoste* è inquadrato ai lati da due architetture, nel bordo superiore da una cornice rossa a finti mattoni modellata a triangoli alternativamente concavi e convessi, mentre il lato inferiore è costituito da un complesso sistema decorativo che al contempo costituisce il piano di appoggio per i personaggi e corona efficacemente, almeno visivamente, il gruppo sottostante. Sotto la fascia gialla su cui poggiano i piedi i cinque personaggi in primo piano, sono dipinte due ulteriori fasce: una rossa, più sottile e uniforme, l'altra, ancora rossa nella dominante cromatica, è resa più elegante da un profilo curvo regolare, impreziosita da piccoli motivi di colore nero. Il passaggio tra tale fascia e quello che rimane del fondo oro su cui si staglia la *Madonna con Bambino* è mediato da una linea verde estremamente sottile e da un'articolata decorazione a dentelli che colma interamente la larghezza della superficie dipinta sino al limite dei lobi laterali che fungono da cornice. Se osserviamo attentamente l'ultima fascia possiamo notare la precisa volontà del pittore di dare profondità ai dentelli, profondità che probabilmente ha lo scopo di marcare, in termini spaziali, la decorazione, quasi a volerne sottolineare una funzione non solo decorativa quanto piuttosto una funzione illusoriamente architettonica. È azzardato ipotizzare che la volontà di elaborazione spaziale che ha spinto il pittore della *Madonna Allattante* del Museo di San Marco sia – non certo con il medesimo esito – la stessa che informa la *Tavola di Sant'Agata*?



Fig. 4 Affreschi perduti di San Pietro in Trento (Ravenna) (da *Pittura dall'alto medioevo al tardo gotico nel territorio di Faenza e Forlì*, 1982).



Fig. 5 *Madonna allattante*, Venezia, Museo di San Marco (da *La pittura veneziana nel Trecento*, 1964).

Tale soluzione pare sia individuabile anche nella *Madonna con Bambino in trono* (Fig. 6), detta delle Canossiane perché di proprietà dell'Istituto di Suore omonimo presso Sant'Alvise a Venezia, opera esposta dal 1997 alle Gallerie dell'Accademia, attribuita a Paolo Veneziano la cui datazione sembra attestarsi tra 1335 e 1339.¹⁶ Qui è ciò che rimane della cornice originale, nella metà superiore del dipinto, a fornire utili elementi di riflessione proprio in merito a una ricerca di spazialità costruita non solo e non tanto dall'impianto della Madonna assisa in trono e del Bambino plasticamente adagiato, ma anche dall'elaborata cornice lignea¹⁷ semicircolare caratterizzata da una corona regolare composta da piccole mensole poste a raggiera e in cui il chiaroscuro, per dare maggior consistenza alle figure, gioca abilmente un ruolo chiave. Non è certo una novità segnalare che il motivo a mensole (*alias* dentelli) che informa le opere ora menzionate pare essere un tratto caratteristico delle opere di Paolo Veneziano nei decenni centrali del secolo: ricordiamo il *Paliotto* proveniente dalla collegiata di San Giorgio a Pirano (1355), ora in deposito a Roma in Palazzo Venezia e il *Paliotto con la Crocifissione e sei santi* nella collezione della cattedrale di Arbe, opera che, alla luce della medesima composizione, è databile attorno agli stessi anni di quello di Pirano.¹⁸



Fig. 6 *Madonna delle Canossiane*, Venezia Gallerie dell'Accademia (da *Il Trecento adriatico e la pittura tra Oriente e Occidente*, 2002).



Fig. 7 Assisi, Basilica Superiore, *Storie di San Francesco, Sogno di Innocenzo III* (da *Giotto e il Trecento. "Il più Sovrano Maestro stato in dipintura"* 2009).

«La svolta paleologa di Paolo del 1333», secondo la definizione di Rodolfo Pallucchini, si paleserebbe proprio a partire dagli anni della *Madonna con Bambino* delle Canossiane¹⁹ anche se il motivo delle mensole architettoniche comparirebbe in area veneta, già in un affresco in San Giovanni Decollato che lo studioso, nel 1964, datava all'ultimo quarto del Duecento. È però lo stesso motivo che compare nella già citata *Madonna allattante* del Museo Marciano, opera che sempre il Pallucchini riteneva dell'ultimo quarto del Duecento. Tuttavia un analogo motivo è presente ancora nel paliotto di *San Francesco e Chiara*, ancora di Paolo Veneziano, conservato alle Gallerie dell'Accademia la cui datazione avanzata al sesto decennio del XIV secolo non è in discussione.²⁰



Fig. 8 *San Domenico e dodici storie della sua vita*, Napoli, Museo di Capodimonte (da *La pittura italiana delle origini*, 1962).

Se questi sono i dati, il motivo delle mensole sembra portarci però in un vicolo cieco perchè potrebbe suggerire sia una datazione alta sulla base della cronologia della *Madonna allattante* marciana o dell'affresco in San Giovanni Decollato ma, al contempo, anche una cronologia bassa se prendiamo in esame, per esempio, lo scomparto principale con l'*Incoronazione della Vergine* del già citato paliotto di Paolo Veneziano ora conservato alle Gallerie dell'Accademia²¹ la cui datazione è però concordemente fissata agli anni '50 del secolo XIV. Come da tempo riconosciuto, tale cronologia aiuta tuttavia a capire, e non solo limitatamente al motivo della cornice, i primi brani di Lorenzo Veneziano come la *Dormitio Virginis* del Duomo di Vicenza, datata 1366 o la antecedente *Crocifissione e i santi Giovanni Battista, Antonio abate, Matteo e Nicola di Bari*,²² ora a Milano al Museo Diocesano nella collezione Crespi, dipinto che è stato accostato a un'opera di formato simile attribuita a Guariento in collezione privata bergamasca e, a nostro avviso, accostabile nonostante il motivo dei dentelli sia più sofisticato ed elegante, al trittico con *Crocifissione e San Giovanni Battista, Bartolomeo, Andrea e Caterina*, in collezione privata a Düsseldorf, opera che recentissimamente Francesca Flores d'Arcais ha datato al 1344 circa.²³ Ma parlare di Guariento, nel secondo quarto del XIV secolo, significa parlare di eredità giottesca. Senza essere risucchiati in un "pangiottismo" dagli esiti

imprevedibili e incontrollabili, rimane comunque un punto fondamentale su cui riflettere il fatto che anche i riquadri delle *Storie Francescane* ad Assisi (Fig. 7) siano impostati su finte mensole.

Il cantiere di Assisi insomma può essere considerato un “laboratorio” cardine per potere pensare, come suggerito più volte da Luciano Bellosi, ad uno sviluppo successivo su larga scala di tale motivo decorativo dopo la fine dei lavori?²⁴ È del resto sulla scorta del motivo del dentello/mensola, che lo stesso Bologna, parlando del trittico di *San Domenico e dodici storie della sua vita* (Fig. 8), conservato al Museo di Capodimonte ma in origine probabilmente nell’ormai scomparsa chiesa di San Pietro Martire a Castello, retrodata di tre decenni la sua precedente proposta di datazione²⁵ abbassandone la cronologia dalla fine del XIII al primo decennio di quello successivo.




Fig. 9 Iesi, San Marco, Crocifissione (da *La pittura riminese del Trecento*, 1990).

Crediamo sia opportuno insistere ancora sul motivo delle finte mensole proprio alla luce del fatto che l’utilizzo in ambito “giottesco” non ne ha sancito, nei primi decenni del Trecento, una diffusione capillare e quindi laddove presente può ragionevolmente suggerire una provenienza, o, almeno, suggerire indizi attraverso i quali orientarsi verso un preciso ambito culturale piuttosto che un altro. Ritroviamo le finte mensole/dentelli, per esempio, a Fabriano, in ambito quindi adriatico non lontano peraltro da Assisi, in Sant’Agostino, nella *Cappella della Maddalena*, dove il

cosiddetto Maestro di Sant'Emiliano lavora con una rassicurante certezza documentaria attorno al 1310 circa.²⁶ Un analogo motivo decorativo a dentelli di spiccata connotazione architettonico-spaziale è evidente nella *Crocifissione* attribuita da Pier Giorgio Pasini a Giuliano da Rimini in San Marco a Iesi²⁷ (Fig. 9), ancora quindi in area adriatica. Qui la cornice ad arco acuto che inquadra il Cristo in croce al centro della scena è caratterizzata da una serie regolare di mensole che manifestano la volontà di dare profondità all'affresco ma il cui esito finale – si noti la parte posteriore del cavallo di destra che si sovrappone alla cornice stessa – lascia tuttavia un poco perplessi.

Prima di concludere con alcune riflessioni finali sulla storia collezionistica della Tavola di Sant'Agata, vorremmo aggiungere alcune considerazioni. Non è di poco conto, alla luce degli esempi riportati, ricordare che lo stesso Luciano Bellosi, giusto sulla scorta della novità rappresentata dalle mensole usate nel cantiere di Assisi, spostò la datazione dell'affresco di San Giovanni Decollato a Venezia al 1310 (per Palluchini, come abbiamo visto, fine XIII secolo)²⁸ e che abbassi la cronologia della *Madonna con Bambino* di Duccio di Buoninsegna (ex-*Madonna Stoclet*, Fig.10) ora al Metropolitan Museum di New York, al 1300 circa, dopo comunque il cantiere



Fig. 10 *Madonna con Bambino*, ex-*Madonna Stoclet*, New York, Metropolitan Museum (da Duccio. *Alle origini della pittura senese*, 2003).

assisiense, quasi che l'attività del cantiere fornisca una sorta di *terminus post quem* per la presenza delle finte mensole.²⁹ Pur non entrando nel delicatissimo dibattito relativo alla cronologia³⁰ del cantiere "giottesco" nella Basilica Superiore né tanto meno nella questione del possibile apprendistato del celeberrimo maestro di Vespignano e quindi ai possibili modelli romani,³¹ ci pare tuttavia importante sottolineare che anche alla luce di questo elemento le proposte cronologiche della Goi per la tavola cremonese possano forse trovare un ulteriore elemento di conferma. Tuttavia, se il motivo "giottesco" delle mensole può essere utilizzato per precisare meglio la cronologia, così come non ha senso, «etichettare Duccio di Buoninsegna quale "pittore giottesco"»³² analogamente sarebbe assurdo definire «giottesco» il Maestro di Sant'Agata. E d'altra parte non ci possono essere molti dubbi circa la diffusione del motivo per tutto il XIV secolo nei cantieri e città in cui Giotto è

stato protagonista. Limitiamoci a un esempio particolarmente significativo per le riflessioni che abbiamo sin qui condotto: a Padova, nella Cappella degli Scrovegni,³³ nel primo decennio del Trecento si può effettivamente osservare il motivo a finte mensole sotto le cornici losangate e alla base del *Giudizio Universale* di controfacciata.

Ma veniamo ora alle vicende “cremonesi” del nostro dipinto. Siamo assolutamente certi che la *Tavola di Sant’Agata* sia stata realizzata a Cremona, o almeno, sia stata pensata per Cremona come si è spesso ipotizzato? Se così non fosse, hanno ancora senso gli sforzi profusi da alcuni studiosi di tentare di fare collimare l’ubicazione attuale con i caratteri stilistici assolutamente eterogenei che la tavola presenta?

Già Ugo Gualazzini³⁴ ha tracciato una sorta di storia collezionistica dell’opera, intrecciando la ricerca con la sua genesi e la sua fortuna devozionale. Egli ricorda infatti che Sicardo, nel *Mitrato*, scritto entro il 1215, racconta di una liturgia cremonese nella quale un’immagine di Sant’Agata veniva portata in processione; ma è evidente che al di là del dato interessante per la storia religiosa cremonese, la notizia non può fornire alcun aiuto in relazione alla Tavola di Sant’Agata perché lo stile del dipinto non indica in alcun modo una datazione anteriore agli anni della stesura del testo del grande vescovo cremonese. Ciò implica, evidentemente, che esisteva un oggetto devozionale portato in processione diverso dall’attuale.

I dati che emergono dall’indagine condotta nell’archivio prepositurale di Sant’Agata da Giulia Goi e pubblicata in appendice al volume, mettono peraltro in serio dubbio il fatto che il dipinto fosse fin dall’origine a Cremona.³⁵ Sulla scorta delle visite pastorali (che a Cremona principiano dal 1566 con Nicolò Sfondrati), l’attuale tavola è documentata in città indubitabilmente solo nel 1599 come attestano queste parole della visita Speciano: «*Altare S.ti Jacobi [...] jconula decenti in qua est imago B.M.V. vitro obducta et tabula marmorea quae dicitur fuisse supra sepulcrum B. Agathae [...]. In eo factum fuit legatum per quondam D. Nicolaum Alenis*».³⁶ Non deve meravigliare che la tavola sia definita «*tabula marmorea*» perché già Gualazzini ha dimostrato che per molti secoli si è creduto che il legno conservasse veramente all’interno la lastra in marmo su cui in punto di morte, secondo la Vita di Sant’Agata, sarebbe stato adagiato il capo della santa. La notizia più significativa è invece la menzione di Nicolò Aleni, soprattutto alla luce di un altro dato: un testamento del 1582 attesta che una certa Margherita moglie di Francesco Meravigli abbia disposto una messa quotidiana all’altare di San Giacomo in Sant’Agata «*ad aram tabule dive Agathe, alias errectam per quondam Magnificum Dominum Nicolaum Alenum*».³⁷ Da tale lascito si ricaverebbe che Nicolò Aleni avesse munificato *alias* – cioè in altro tempo o luogo – la tavola. La Goi ritiene che la tavola citata in questo documento sia la medesima menzionata dallo Speciano nel 1599 e non ci sono fondati motivi per pensare il contrario anche se appare curioso che la visita

Sfondrati del 1566/67 nomina la cappella, l'Amidani e l'Aleni ma che nessuna visita fino al 1599 faccia menzione della tavola.

In realtà la data 1582 del testamento è foriera, a sua volta, di ulteriori riflessioni e complica ulteriormente la questione. La Goi scrive che di Niccolò Aleni non si conosce pressochè nulla se non che «eredi del legato relativo all'altare divennero degli Amidani». Scorrendo un contributo di Giorgio Politi del 1984 si scopre invece che Niccolò Aleni fu un protagonista della vita culturale ed economica cremonese del pieno Cinquecento in rapporto di parentela molto stretto con la famiglia Amidani.³⁸ Se anche Politi ammette che le notizie relative all'Aleni sono scarse tuttavia è possibile ricavare due dati importanti: il testamento di Nicolò Aleni è del 5 settembre 1547.³⁹ Se dunque le notizie ricavate dalla visita Sfondrati del 1566 e dal testamento di Margherita in Meravigli del 1582 sono corrette, occorre pensare che le disposizioni del testamento Aleni risalgano a non prima del quinto decennio del XVI secolo. Il secondo dato sulla base di quanto sostenuto da Giorgio Politi ci consente invece di conoscere l'origine bresciana dell'Aleni. Brescia, a metà Cinquecento, significa Venezia. Senza nessuna pretesa di risolutezza, è possibile ipotizzare in questo “*mare parvum*” di notizie relative alla *Tavola di Sant'Agata* che il manufatto che vediamo oggi nella chiesa omonima arrivi a Cremona, per lascito testamentario, solo attorno gli anni quaranta/cinquanta del XVI secolo. Se inoltre l'ambito culturale veneto-adriatico di provenienza ipotizzato a suo tempo da Giulia Goi e da noi ribadito per altra via può essere ragionevolmente preso in considerazione, l'origine bresciana dell'Aleni può essere probabilmente presa in considerazione per spiegare l'arrivo a Cremona di un simile manufatto.

Da ultimo dobbiamo tenere presente che Giulio Campi affresca nel 1537 il coro della chiesa di Sant'Agata con quattro episodi della *Vita* della Santa ma che analoghi episodi sono rappresentati anche sulla tavola. Gli *Acta Sanctorum*⁴⁰ aiutano a capire la fonte comune altomedievale da cui sia gli affreschi giulieschi sia le scene della tavola sono tratte e pertanto le eventuali analogie narrative non devono sorprendere. Ma se focalizziamo l'attenzione, ad esempio, sul secondo martirio di Agata, il supplizio dei carboni ardenti, le cose si complicano. Il supplizio è raccontato in questo modo nella *Vita*: «*Quintinianus dixit: 'Nunc videbo, si Christus tuus curabit te'. Tunc iussit testas acutas spargi et sub testas carbones vivos immitti et in iisdem nudo eam corpore volutari. [...] Sed et [sic] omnis civitas Catanensium vi terræmotus exagitata est*».⁴¹ Nella tavola, la sequenza narrativa e il nesso tra testo e iconografia è pressochè perfetta. Si noti, in particolare, che il supplizio su pietre appuntite («*testas acutas*») sotto cui sono posti carboni ardenti («*carbones vivos*») è assolutamente congruente al testo e giustamente, così come la *Vita* racconta che solo in quel momento il terremoto colpì Catania, così la tavola inserisce in modo cronologicamente corretto nel riquadro immediatamente successivo la scena del terremoto. Giulio Campi fa riferimento

evidentemente ad una altra fonte perché il martirio dei carboni ardenti si sviluppa in modo completamente diverso. Pertanto se la tavola attuale era già al tempo della stesura di Giulio Campi a Cremona, e se era, come ha ipotizzato Gualazzini, così importante per la vita cittadina, come mai le soluzioni iconografiche adottate dal maestro cinquecentesco ricalcano in percentuale minima e comunque disordinata, la medesima storia raccontata nella tavola? L'osservazione, siamo consapevoli, non è certo risolutiva, ma crediamo possa stimolare in una direzione alternativa future ricerche.

- ¹ Al momento della stesura di questo contributo la tavola è entrata in laboratorio per un restauro conservativo. Mons. Achille Bonazzi, che ringrazio per la disponibilità, ha rivelato la volontà, condivisibile, di sottoporre il legno (cm. 112×69) a un'indagine dendrocronologica. Qualunque storico dell'arte ha l'amara consapevolezza che l'importanza di un manufatto artistico non è in alcun rapporto proporzionale con la sua conoscenza materiale. Le cause sono evidentemente molteplici, non occorre in questa sede spingerci oltre in considerazioni che possono risultare banali. Uno spiraglio di luce si è creduto potesse provenire dalla cosiddetta scienza dura: le opportunità analitiche che essa offre possono effettivamente, talvolta, ovviare alle più diverse lacune, ma ormai è chiaro che nemmeno le più innovative indagini diagnostiche riescono a riempire il vuoto di notizie che caratterizza tutt'oggi un numero considerevole di emergenze.
- ² Per la documentazione relativa alla chiesa di Sant'Agata e al suo patrimonio documentario si veda V. LEONI, *Il patrimonio documentario cremonese anteriore alla fine del secolo XII*, sulla piattaforma *Codice diplomatico della Lombardia medievale (secoli VIII-XII)*: cdlm.unipv.it/edizioni/cr/leoni#fn1. La nota 13 riassume ottimamente tutte le edizioni diplomatiche relative a Sant'Agata. In particolare va segnalato *Per un codice diplomatico di S. Agata di Cremona: i registi fino all'anno 1200*, a cura di E. Falconi, Roma 1986. Per le vicende architettoniche, che in questa sede non è possibile affrontare, rimandiamo, anche per la bibliografia a P. PIVA, *Architettura, "complementi" figurativi, spazio liturgico (secoli IV/V – XIII)*, in *Storia di Cremona. Dall'Alto Medioevo all'Età Comunale*, a cura di G. Andenna, Azzano San Paolo (BG) 2004, pp. 364-445, in part. pp. 433-434; segnalò, per l'importanza che riveste anche in relazione ai secoli successivi, S. BINI, *La torre campanaria di Sant'Agata, con nuove notizie sulla riforma quattro-cinquecentesca della chiesa*, in «Bollettino Storico Cremonese», VIII (2001), pp. 35-63.
- ³ Per quanto concerne la storia della devozione di sant'Agata e la sua fortuna iconografica dobbiamo rimandare al volume, ricco di stimoli, *Agata santa: storia, arte, devozione*, catalogo della mostra (Catania, 29 gennaio – 4 maggio 2008), progetto e coordinamento a cura di G. Algranti, Firenze 2008.
- ⁴ Non è pensabile in questa sede ripercorrere la bibliografia sull'opera. Rimandiamo pertanto, fino al 1988, al volume di G. GOI, *La Tavola di Sant'Agata di Cremona*, Spoleto 1988, in part. pp. 13-18, e *passim*. Analogamente non deve meravigliare che per un secondo corposo intervento si debba saltare a due decenni dopo, all'intervento di Giorgio Voltini del 2007, il quale, dopo aver ripercorso e aggiornato il dibattito critico, accetta l'ipotesi della Goi: G. VOLTINI, *La pittura: testimonianze materiali e attestazioni documentaria*, in *Storia di Cremona. Il Trecento. Chiesa e Cultura (VIII-XIV secolo)*, a cura di G. Andenna e G. Chittolini, Azzano San Paolo (BG) 2007, pp. 436-457, in part. pp. 439-443. Nel medesimo volume appare meno parentoria LIA BELLINGERI, *La scultura*, in *Storia di Cremona. Il Trecento. Chiesa e Cultura (VIII-XIV secolo)*...cit., pp. 416-435.
- ⁵ Per Salmi, che data alla fine del Duecento, si tratta di pittore «operante in val padana», informato sui modi bizantini ma con tecnica da occidentale, lontano da Cimabue: M. SALMI, *La Tavola di Sant'Agata a Cremona*, in «Bollettino d'arte», VII (1927-1928), 2, pp. 49-60. Come contraltare critico le parole di Longhi sono ancora pungenti, tratte dall'immancabilmente citato *Giudizio sul Duecento*: R. LONGHI, *Giudizio sul Duecento*, in «Proporzioni», II (1948), pp. 5-54, ora in IDEM, *"Giudizio sul Duecento" e ricerche sul Trecento nell'Italia centrale*, Roma 1974, qui pp. 16-17, figg. 52-55, in part. p. 16: «Qui [la Tavola di Sant'Agata, n.d.a.], anche senza rammentare, [...] come a Parma, la solita remora degl'invasori orientali, v'è una persona artistica che basta da sola per costituirvi un apice di «románico» in pittura da non scadere neppure di fronte ai maggiori toscani dianzi citati, direi forse da superarli»; p. 17: «È facile immaginare che peso avrebbe potuto avere per la cultura figurativa un grande ciclo di affreschi di mano di questo pittore, se posto nell'Italia centrale».
- ⁶ P. TOESCA, *Il Trecento*, Torino 1951, p. 700 e p. 734.
- ⁷ Si veda almeno V. LAZAREV, *Saggi sulla pittura veneziana dei secc. XIII-XIV, la maniera greca e il problema della scuola cretese (I)*, in «Arte veneta», XIX, 1965, pp. 17-31, in part. pp. 19-21; IDEM, *Saggi sulla pittura veneziana dei secc. XIII-XIV, la maniera greca e il problema della scuola cretese (II)*, in «Arte veneta», XX, 1966, pp. 43-61.
- ⁸ Su Paolo Veneziano dobbiamo necessariamente rimandare al catalogo *Il Trecento adriatico e la pittura tra Oriente e Occidente*, catalogo della mostra (Rimini, Castel Sismondo, 19 agosto – 29 dicembre 2002), a cura di F. Flores d'Arcais, G. Gentili, Cinisello Balsamo 2002; da aggiornare bibliograficamente e criticamente con M. BOSKOVITS, *Paolo Veneziano: riflessioni sul percorso (parte I)*, in «Arte Cristiana», 97 (2009), 851, pp. 81-90 e IDEM, *Paolo Veneziano: riflessioni sul percorso (parte II)*, in «Arte Cristiana», 97 (2009), 852, pp. 161-170. Fondamentale per inquadrare storicamente e storiograficamente l'attività giovanile di Paolo Veneziano è C. GUARNIERI, *Il passaggio tra due generazioni: dal Maestro dell'Incoronazione a Paolo Veneziano*, in *Il Secolo di Giotto nel Veneto*, relazioni presentate al Seminario di Specializzazione in Storia dell'Arte (9-18 settembre 2002), a cura di G. Valenzano e F. Toniolo, Venezia, 2007, pp. 153-201.
- ⁹ Recenti voci dissonanti sono quelle di Valentino Pace (comunicazione orale) e quella di Carla Travi, la quale in un recente contributo sembra non accettare le considerazioni di Giulia Goi e arretra di nuovo la datazione alla fine del XIII secolo: C. TRAVI, *Johanes de Mediolano, Justus de Florentia e la pittura su tavola in Lombardia nel XIV secolo*, in *Giovanni da Milano. Capolavori del gotico fra Lombardia e Toscana*, catalogo della mostra (Firenze, Galleria dell'Accademia, 10 giugno – 2 novembre 2008) a cura di D. Parenti, Firenze 2008, pp. 73-87, in part. p. 81.

- ¹⁰ F. BOLOGNA, *La pittura italiana delle origini*, Roma-Dresda 1962, pp. 113-115, tavv. 74-75, p. 114: il maestro di Sant'Agata «coglie l'individuo nel momento della sua emergenza come natura fatta persona irripetibile, addirittura come realtà fisiognomica. Il Bambino benedicente diventa così, nell'afa che unge le carni di sudore, un grassone lento, contristato e contraffatto».
- ¹¹ A. TAMBINI, *Anonimo del XIII secolo, 1280-1290 circa. Due Apostoli (?)*. Affresco perduto, Già a San Pietro in Trento (RA), Pieve di S. Pietro, in *Pittura dall'alto medioevo al tardo gotico nel territorio di Faenza e Forlì*, Forlì 1982, pp. 41-42.
- ¹² Crediamo si possa riferire a C. VOLPE, "Il maestro del 1302", in «Arte antica e moderna», 1, 1958, 2, pp. 145-149 ora anche in una miscellanea C. VOLPE, *La pittura nell'Emilia e nella Romagna. Raccolta di scritti sul Trecento e Quattrocento*, a cura di D. Benati e L. Petrucci, Modena 1993, p. 35: realizzazione da collocare «nello scorcio del Duecento».
- ¹³ S. PASI, *La tavola di Sant'Agata di Cremona*, in *Milion. Studi e ricerche d'arte bizantina*, Atti della giornata di Studio (Roma, 4 dicembre 1986), a cura di C. Barsanti, A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, A. Iacobini, Roma 1988, pp. 351-365.
- ¹⁴ S. PASI, *Sulle persistenze bizantine nella pittura italiana del Duecento: l'Italia settentrionale*, in *Tra le due sponde dell'Adriatico: la pittura nella Serbia del XIII secolo e l'Italia. Gli affreschi medievali della Serbia nelle copie della Galerija Fresaka del Narodni Muzej di Belgrado e i rapporti con l'Italia*, catalogo della mostra, Ferrara 1999, pp. 89-109, in part. p. 97; S. PASI, *La pieve di San Pietro in Trento in La pittura monumentale in Romagna e nel ferrarese fra IX e XIII secolo*, Imola 2001, pp. 127-130; in quest'ultimo intervento, in particolare, la Tavola di Sant'Agata è citata in relazione ai brani a fresco (*Ivi*, pp. 128-129).
- ¹⁵ S. PASI, *La tavola di Sant'Agata di Cremona...cit.*, p. 358 e note relative per gli studiosi qui citati.
- ¹⁶ S. ROSSI, *scheda 12*, in *Guariento*, catalogo della mostra (Padova, Palazzo del Monte di Pietà, 16 aprile-31 luglio 2011), a cura di D. Banzato, F. Flores d'Arcais, A.M. Spiazzi, Venezia 2011, pp. 120-121, con relativa bibliografia.
- ¹⁷ Riteniamo sia corretto valutare in modo omogeneo motivi decorativi a mensola quale che sia la tecnica utilizzata (ora cornice lignea, ora dipinto) perché vi è alla base la medesima ricerca spaziale.
- ¹⁸ Si vedano, seppur datate, le lucidissime osservazioni di R. PALLUCCHINI, *Considerazioni sulla mostra "Paolo Veneziano e la sua cerchia" di Zagabria*, in «Arte Veneta», XXI, 1967, pp. 256-262, in part. p. 260.
- ¹⁹ R. PALLUCCHINI, *La pittura veneziana nel Trecento*, Venezia-Roma 1964, si veda il capitolo [*Paolo Veneziano e la sua bottega*] pp. 17-60, in part. alle pp. 61-63 [*La cultura pittorica veneziana contemporanea a Paolo Veneziano*]. Per la *Tavola delle Suore Canossiane* di Sant'Alvise, *Ivi*, pp. 30-35.
- ²⁰ Tale opera, che ha indotto illustri studiosi del calibro di Fiocco, Bettini e Berenson a ipotizzare un viaggio a Costantinopoli per giustificare un bizantinismo paleologo di ritorno è, a dispetto della data avanzata, perfettamente comprensibile a Venezia anche alla metà del XIV secolo; il bizantinismo è tale che Lazarev, ricorda R. PALLUCCHINI, *La pittura veneziana nel Trecento...cit.*, pp. 45-48, lo riteneva addirittura di fine XIII secolo.
- ²¹ J. GARDNER, *Paolo Veneziano as narrator*, in *Fondi oro della Collezione Alberto Crespi al Museo Diocesano di Milano: questioni iconografiche e attributive*, atti della giornata di studi (Milano, 11 ottobre 2004), Cinisello Balsamo 2009, pp. 16-23. Circa i rapporti tra la cultura figurative del giovane Paolo Veneziano in rapporto a San Giovanni Decollato (San Zan Degolà) si veda C. GUARNIERI, *Il passaggio tra due generazioni: dal Maestro dell'Incoronazione a Paolo Veneziano...cit.*, pp. 162-165.
- ²² C. GUARNIERI, *Problemi di attribuzione e classificazione tipologica nella pittura veneziana del Trecento, a partire da tre tavole della Collezione Crespi*, in *Fondi oro della Collezione Alberto Crespi...cit.*, pp. 24-47, in part. pp. 38 ss.
- ²³ F. FLORES D'ARCAIS, *scheda 8*, in *Guariento*, catalogo della mostra (Padova, Palazzo del Monte di Pietà, 16 aprile-31 luglio 2011), a cura di D. Banzato, F. Flores d'Arcais, A.M. Spiazzi, Venezia 2011, pp. 110-111.
- ²⁴ Luciano Bellosi dedica pagine importanti al tema delle mensole giottesche ancora nel recente L. BELLOSI, *Giotto e la grande mutazione della pittura occidentale*, in *Giotto e la sua eredità*, a cura di L. Bellosi, Firenze 2007, pp. 8-157, in part. pp. 25-28. Saggio da integrare – anche per la bibliografia, *ça va sans dire*, "imponderabile" – con *Giotto e il Trecento. "Il più Sovrano Maestro stato in dipintura"*, catalogo della mostra (Roma, Complesso del Vittoriano, 6 marzo – 29 giugno 2009), a cura di A. Tomei, 2 voll., Ginevra-Milano 2009; il contributo di Alessandro Tomei fornisce un ottimo *status quæstionis*: A. TOMEI, *La decorazione della Basilica di San Francesco ad Assisi come metafora della questione giottesca*, in *Ivi*, I, pp. 31-49, in part. pp. 31-43.
- ²⁵ F. BOLOGNA, *La pittura italiana delle origini*, Roma-Dresda 1962, p. 88, tav. 57, «fine sec. XIII»). Tre decenni dopo, lo studioso posticipa al 1305 circa l'opera attribuendola dubitativamente a Giovanni da Taranto e sottolineando come egli viaggiasse «da Bari a Napoli nel 1304» e come «la componente mediterranea è sopravanzata dalla conoscenza manifesta, anche se regredita a un'accezione duecentesca, delle "Storie francescane di Giotto"»: F. BOLOGNA, *Momenti della cultura figurativa della Campania medievale*, in *Storia e Civiltà della Campania. Il Medioevo*, a cura di G. Pugliesi Carratelli, Napoli 1992, pp. 171-276, in part. pp. 246-248.
- ²⁶ A. MARCHI, *La pittura della prima metà del Trecento nelle Marche. Presenze riminesi, pittori "stranieri" e pittori locali*, in *Il Trecento riminese. Maestri e botteghe tra Romagna e Marche*, catalogo della mostra (Rimini, Museo della Città, 20 agosto 1995 – 7 gennaio 1996), a cura di D. Benati, Milano 1995, pp. 112-123, in part. pp. 114-116. Da aggiornare con B. CLERI, *La Chiesa di Sant'Agostino in Le cappelle gotiche in Sant'Agostino e in San Domenico*

- di Fabriano. *La fondazione Carifac restaura l'antica pittura fabrianese*, a cura di B. Cleri, G. Donnini, Fabriano 2006, [on-line: <http://www.edixxon.com/fabriano/>]
- ²⁷ P.G. PASINI, *La pittura riminese del Trecento*, Cinisello Balsamo 1990, pp. 74-75.
- ²⁸ Per una diversa posizione, da connettere a quanto esposto alla nota 30, si veda I. FURLAN, *scheda 8*, in *Il Trecento adriatico e la pittura tra Oriente e Occidente...*cit., pp. 118-119.
- ²⁹ L.A. HERBERT, *Duccio's Metropolitan Madonna: between Byzantium and the Renaissance*, in «Arte Medievale», IV serie, I, 2010-2011, pp. 97-119; L. BELLOSI, *Giotto e la grande mutazione della pittura occidentale...*cit., p. 56 e p. 65.
- ³⁰ A. TOMEI, *La decorazione della Basilica di San Francesco ad Assisi come metafora della questione giottesca...*cit. Ai fini della nostra argomentazione è indifferente ritenere chiuso il cantiere dopo il 1292, o come vorrebbe Luciano Bellosi, nel 1292: L. BELLOSI, *Un'ampia indagine quantitativa su un virtuosismo giottesco nella raffigurazione dell'architettura e due riflessioni sulla pittura di Giotto e collaboratori nella Basilica superiore di San Francesco ad Assisi*, in *Giotto e il Trecento. "Il più Sovrano Maestro stato in dipintura"...*cit., I, pp. 379-387.
- ³¹ La questione è evidentemente troppo articolata per essere qui esposta. Occorre tuttavia ammettere che l'invenzione delle finte mensole dipinte non può essere ascritta certamente a Giotto o a Cimabue nel cantiere assisiense. L'ultimo corposo volume sulla pittura romana medievale di Serena Romana consente di capire che mensole dipinte erano state realizzate a Roma prima di Assisi. In questo senso si possono comprendere le osservazioni di Furlan, vedi nota 27. Si veda S. ROMANO, *I cantieri di Roma*, in EADEM, *Il Duecento e la cultura gotica*, Milano 2012, pp. 13-49, in part. il § 1280. *Assisi e Roma*, pp. 38-41. Per esempi di finte mensole si veda S. ROMANO, *Gli affreschi nel sottotetto della Basilica di Sant'Agnese fuori le Mura*, in *Ivi*, pp. 285-293, in part. p. 293; I. QUADRI, *La Sala dei Chiaroscuri nel Palazzo Apostolico Vaticano. La seconda fase pittorica*, in *Ivi*, pp. 346-352, in part. pp. 347-350; I. QUADRI, *La decorazione pittorica della "Quarta navata" di San Saba*, in *ivi*, pp. 367-372. Ciò tuttavia non pare sminuire il ruolo di volano del ciclo francescano assisiense per la diffusione del motivo a nord degli Appennini e in area adriatica. Si veda a questo proposito lo stimolante S. ROMANO, *La O di Giotto*, Milano 2008, pp. 39-59, in part. p. 43: «il caso di Assisi è al suo fondo isolato e diverso dagli altri».
- ³² A. TARTUFERI, *La nuova visione pittorica di Giotto a Firenze e in Toscana: giotteschi, non-giotteschi*, in *Giotto e il Trecento. "Il più Sovrano Maestro stato in dipintura"...*cit., I, pp. 73-83, in part. p. 75. Per un'idea circa il rapporto Duccio-Cimabue-Giotto si veda L. BELLOSI, *Il percorso di Duccio*, in *Duccio. Alle origini della pittura senese*, catalogo della mostra (Siena, 4 ottobre 2003 – 11 gennaio 2004), a cura di A. Bagnoli, R. Bartolini, L. Bellosi, M. Laclotte, Cinisello Balsamo 2003, pp. 118-145, in part. pp. 133-141.
- ³³ Per un ragguaglio critico e bibliografico possiamo solo rimandare a D. BANZATO, *L'impronta di Giotto e lo sviluppo della pittura del Trecento a Padova*, in *Giotto e il Trecento. "Il più Sovrano Maestro stato in dipintura"...*cit., I, pp. 143-155 e IDEM, *Guariento nella pittura veneta tra Trecento e Quattrocento*, in *Guariento...*cit., pp. 39-57. Come esempi significativi di quanto siamo venuti dicendo, si vedano anche le schede n.16, 43, 63, 71 e 85 del secondo volume della mostra romana *Giotto e il Trecento. "Il più Sovrano Maestro stato in dipintura"...*cit.
- ³⁴ U. GUALAZZINI, *La «Tavola di S.Agata», il Mitrato di Sicardo, e l'origine di una leggenda*, in *Scritti in memoria di Antonino Giuffrè. Rievocazioni, filosofia e storia del diritto, diritto romano, storia delle idee*, 3 voll., Milano 1967, I, pp. 578-613.
- ³⁵ G. GOI, *La Tavola di Sant'Agata di Cremona...*cit., pp. 107-113. La stessa studiosa, pur senza giungere a conclusioni drastiche, si accorge (p. 72) che non c'è alcuna certezza in tal senso.
- ³⁶ *Ivi*, p. 110. Non è stato possibile controllare *de visu* le fonti. Per tale motivo facciamo riferimento alle ricerche accurate di Giulia Goi.
- ³⁷ *Ivi*, p. 108.
- ³⁸ G. POLITI, *Ultimi anni d'attività di Gianfrancesco Amidani, mercante-banchiere cremonese (1569-1579)*, in «Archivio Storico Lombardo», CX, 1984, s. XI, vol. 1, pp. 44-91; Sigismondo Amidani (1478-1539/40) ebbe dalla moglie Cattolica Cambiaghi sei figli. La figlia Francesca verrà data in sposa a Nicolò Aleni (i due ebbero due figli, Silvestro e Ottavia): *Ivi*, p. 64 ss.
- ³⁹ *Ivi*, p. 70, nota 82: Particolare per noi importante è la clausola secondo la quale nella sfortunata circostanza che non gli soppravvengano e sopravvivano figli ma solo figlie, queste siano eredi in modo equo purchè sposino un mercante; si stabilisce inoltre che per venticinque anni la dirigenza dei suoi affari venga affidata al cognato Gianfrancesco Amidani, fratello di sua moglie, quindi suo cognato. Gianfrancesco è comunque designato, con qualche minima clausola, erede universale nel caso non fosse sopravvissuto nessun erede. Ancora, *Ivi*, pp. 72-74: cognato di Nicolò Aleni (fratello della moglie) era Marco Antonio Amidani, chierico che gravitava come protonotaro apostolico e canonico. Marco Antonio Amidani, cognato di Nicolò Aleni, acquisì in seguito la carica di commendatario perpetuo della ricca abbazia di Ognissanti e, verso la fine dell'esistenza, di prevosto di Sant'Agata. Marco Antonio diventerà anche vicario episcopale di Lodi, cameriere segreto di Niccolò Sfrondati (papa Gregorio XIV) e consultore dell'Inquisizione. Un altro Amidani, Vincenzo, fu prevosto di Sant'Agata tra il 1598 e il 1625.
- ⁴⁰ *De Sancta Agatha Virgine Martyre Catanæ in Sicilia*, in *Acta Sanctorum Februarii*, Antuerpiæ 1658, pp. 595-656. Per la disamina iconografica della Tavola rimandiamo a G. GOI, *La Tavola di Sant'Agata di Cremona...*cit., pp. 69-106.

⁴¹ *Ivi*, *Quæstio* III, § 12, *S. Agatha iterum torta, expirat, sepelitur, Catanam Servat*, pp. 617-618.

**CHAPEL OF ST PETER IN NOVO MESTO ZELINSKO:
PROPOSAL FOR THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE ROMANESQUE
ROSE WINDOW**

MAJA CEPETIĆ

UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA, FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY

This paper briefly analyses the medieval architecture of St Peter chapel in Novo Mesto Zelinsko situated near Sveti Ivan Zelina, on the main communication road from Poetovio via Andautonia to Siscia. During the reconstruction of the chapel's roof in 2010 parts of a small rose window were found. Reconstruction of the rose window has been made on the basis of the two preserved fragments clearly showing the Romanesque form which puts the mentioned rose window in the pre-Tartar building phase of the chapel.

Croatia, Slavonia, Novo Mesto Zelinsko, St Peter's chapel, Medieval architecture, rose window, reconstruction

The chapel of St Peter in Novo Mesto Zelinsko is situated on the left bank of the Lonja river, to the east of Zagreb, near an important road linking, since Antiquity, Sisak (Siscia) with Ščitarjevo (Andautonia) and Ptuj (Poetovio).¹ Sveti Ivan Zelina – a significant medieval point of this region thanks to its central role in the Moravče County during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries – is situated across the Lonja river towards west.²

St Peter chapel is a small aisleless building with a rectangular sanctuary set on a hilltop surrounded by a ditch. There are four round-headed Romanesque windows on the south nave wall – the one standing closest to the western wall is smaller because it was used to highlight the empura situated next to the western wall in the interior. Two of the round-headed Romanesque windows are situated in the sanctuary, one on the south and one on the east wall.³ In the interior the triumphal arch is pointed and the sanctuary is rib-vaulted. The ribs were supported by sculpted brackets

which, together with the capitals of the triumphal arch and the key stone, were made by the same workshop. On the west side of the nave, there are traces of an empora. Therefore, in order to fit the height of the empora the mentioned western window of the south nave wall is somewhat smaller than the others. The nave walls are covered by three layers of frescoes. The middle one depicting the legend of St Ladislav dates from the fourteenth century.⁴ The chapel was first mentioned in 1409, and later in 1501 as a parish church.⁵ In the literature the chapel of St Peter has been recognized as a late Romanesque – early Gothic building built in the thirteenth century, probably after the Tartars' invasion of 1241.⁶ It has also been connected to the patronage of the Herceg (Duke) Koloman and the Zagreb's Bishop Stjepan II from the beginning of the thirteenth century.⁷

The building has been recognized as a Templars' and Hospitalers' church due to its forms – the rectangular sanctuary, the empora in the west part of the nave and the position on a hilltop near a main communication route. Also the iconographic scheme inside the church and the vicinity of the Templars' lands contribute to such a conclusion.⁸ The Templars received their first estates in the medieval Slavonia in the twelfth century when they came into possession of the properties in Zdela and Haco. Also King Bela III donated them the land in the county of Gora⁹ and in 1209 King Andrew II granted them the great estate of St Martin on the east rim of the Medvednica mountain with the borders between the present town of Sesvete, the river Zelina and the creek Črnc, with all the privileges.¹⁰ Therefore the year 1209 is a *terminus post quem* for the construction of the chapel of St Peter. Thanks to the newly found Romanesque fragments of the rose window and the already known pieces of a Gothic bifora which was situated on the western wall above the Romanesque portal we can assume two Medieval building phases, at least on the western facade.

The first building phase on which we concentrate in this paper runs from the year 1209, the already mentioned *terminus post quem* for the chapel, probably to 1242 when the Tartars passed through pursuing King Bela IV on his way to Dalmatia. The chapel is built from brick which is typical for the medieval architecture of southern Pannonia particularly in the regions lacking good building stone.¹¹ Usually stone was used just for certain architectural pieces and decoration (portals, windows, rose windows, ribs, brackets, capitals) which is also visible in the architecture of St Peter's chapel, noting that the nave windows were shaped using bricks.

According to known facts and according to the visible forms we can assume that the original Romanesque chapel had the same dimensions as today.¹² It is an aisleless church with a rectangular sanctuary. On the western wall in the first building phase, between 1209 and 1242, it had a round-headed Romanesque portal, above which was situated a small rose window. Reconstruction of the rose window was made on the basis of two preserved fragments found during the reparation of the roof part of the chapel in 2010 (Fig. 1).



Fig. 1 One of the two preserved fragments of the rose window, found at Novo Mesto Zelinsko, now in Sveti Ivan Zelina Museum.
Photo: M. Cepetić.




Fig. 2 Proposed reconstruction of the rose window, St Peter, Novo Mesto Zelinsko.
Drawing: A. Laća, d.i.a.

The reconstruction (Fig. 2) shows a round opening incorporated within a four petal flower a few centimeters recessed into a square frame (dimensions: 66×66 cm). Circular tracery shows a symmetrical organisation of shapes revealed by the regular repetition of the motifs. Equilateral perforation triangles with rounded corners are situated diagonally within the square frame produced by drilling and then smoothly polished. The inner corners of the triangles directed to the center of the tracery are visually extended by short spokes. The motif of the double arch is somewhat indented and situated between the triangles which forms the petals of an imaginary rose. Each of the mentioned motifs is repeated four times inside of the rose window circle. It was probably made by first drilling the tracery openings and then by smoothly carving the final tracery shapes. It is legitimate that the rose window was on the western wall, above the portal, before the Tartar invasion (1242). That is also *terminus ante quem* for the rose window which in its form and technique still shows characteristics of the refined late Romanesque style at the rims of the Lands of the Crown of St Stephen, i. e. the period of the first half of the thirteenth century, more precisely its second quarter. The small dimensions of the St Peter's rose window (66×66 cm) fit with the small proportions of the chapel's western facade – width: 8,5 m; height (to the roof moulding): around 7 m. We also find the motif of triangles with rounded corners on the rose window at the Medvedgrad chapel (Fig. 3), presumably of the same date; however, the overall shape of the rose window differs. Similar formal expression can be also found on the rose window of the chapel of St Stephen protomartyr next to the Zagreb Cathedral. The chapel was built right after the Tartar invasion thanks to Bishop Stephen II (one of the reasons was the demolished cathedral). Both of the mentioned chapels are built from brick while stone was used for architectural decoration.¹³



Fig. 3 The rose window, the Medvedgrad chapel, around 1240. Photo: M. Cepetić.

Unfortunately the remains of the Romanesque portal are inserted as *spolia* in the western wall, but on the basis of the visible roundly shaped fragments of the jambs' profilation we can link the portal with the pre-Tartar building phase. In the same assumed first phase of the building there are also the already-mentioned round-headed Romanesque windows on the southern wall and sanctuary. The brackets that support the ribs in the sanctuary and the half-capitals underneath the triumphal arch (Fig. 4) display a high quality of carving which could be associated with the royal domain artists of the second quarter of the thirteenth century. The key stone (Fig. 5) also could be related to the same workshop working at Novo Mesto Zelinsko. The similarity of the sculpted floral forms to the fragments from St Mark in Vinica near Varaždin and to the pieces from Pilisszentkereszt is quite obvious.¹⁴

That suggests that the brackets and half-capitals at St Peter's chapel in Novo Mesto Zelinsko were produced in the second quarter of the thirteenth century by some significant patron who had connections with the royal workshops. This points to Bishop Stjepan II¹⁵ and is also visible in the above mentioned comparison of the rose window in Novo Mesto Zelinsko and the rose window of Medvedgrad chapel, which was certainly connected to the royal workshops working in the medieval Slavonia.¹⁶ The slightly pointed triumphal arch and rib-vault ceiling in the sanctuary are signs of the new Gothic style that first arrived in medieval Slavonia with the Templars and the Cistercians and with the building of their monasteries in Gora (around 1200, the Templars) and Topusko (first quarter of the thirteenth century, the Cistercians). These are monuments of a delayed "Renaissance of the twelfth century" which blossomed in medieval Slavonia in the times of Bishop Stjepan II (1225-1247) and Herceg Koloman (1226-1241).¹⁷ Still, it has yet to be clarified whether we are

dealing with the first or the second building phase. If we look at the ground plan (Fig. 6) it is visible that the sanctuary is not exactly aligned with the nave. No less important is the difference in construction – the round-headed east window in the sanctuary has a stone frame while the other four in the nave are shaped with brick.



Fig. 4 Half-capital (north side) underneath the triumphal arch, St Peter, Novo Mesto Zelinsko. Photo: M. Houška.



Fig. 5 Key stone, sanctuary, St Peter, Novo Mesto Zelinsko. Photo: M. Houška.

This all could be an indication that possibly around 1230-40 there occurred a considerable renovation that included new sanctuary and parts of the western facade with the rose window and the portal. Unfortunately the western facade was rearranged several times during the succeeding centuries, especially during the eighteenth and the nineteenth century,¹⁸ so it is impossible to clearly follow earlier building phases. Also, the layers of wall-paintings inside do not allow for exploring connections between the walls of the nave and the sanctuary in particular.

On the basis of the preserved fragments of the Gothic bifora we can assume another, second building phase, at least of the western wall in the times following the Tartar invasion, probably in the last quarter of the thirteenth century when the French Gothic style was spreading through the Lands of the Crown of St Stephen.¹⁹ The bifora was then placed above the Romanesque portal (Fig. 7) probably where the Romanesque rose window used to be.²⁰

As it was shown, St Peter's chapel at Novo Mesto Zelinsko is an important medieval monument of western Slavonia. The simple architecture and the preserved Romanesque fragments (brackets, half-capitals, rose window) reflect the high quality production of the royal domain workshops in the second quarter of the thirteenth century, i. e. Bishop Stjepan II who was, along with Herceg Koloman, a key person initiating and carrying out major building projects in western Slavonia (Čazma, Medvedgrad, Vinica...)²¹




Fig. 6 St Peter's chapel, ground plan. Authors: T. Kučinac, d.i.a., A. Suljić, d.i.a., Hrvatski restauratorski zavod, Zagreb (archive of Sveti Ivan Zelina Museum).




Fig. 10 Proposed reconstruction of the western facade of St Peter's chapel in Novo Mesto Zelinsko. Authors: T. Kučinac, d.i.a., A. Suljić, d.i.a., Hrvatski restauratorski zavod, Zagreb (archive of Sveti Ivan Zelina Museum).

-
- ¹ L. Dobronić, 1951, p. 301.
- ² M. Houška, R. Mačković, 2007, p. 40.
- ³ According to I. Srša, 1998, p. 81 only the eastern window of the sanctuary is preserved in original shape.
- ⁴ For more information please see: I. Srša, 1998, pp. 81-83; M. Cepetić, D. Dujmović, 2012, pp. 323-330 with the bibliography mentioned there.
- ⁵ L. Dobronić, 1979, pp. 59-60; A. Azinović, 2002, p.130.
- ⁶ J. Stošić, 1994, p. 121; I. Srša, 1998, p. 77; A. Azinović, 2002, p. 130.
- ⁷ V. P. Goss, 2009, p. 35; V. Jukić, D. Dujmović, 2010, pp. 171-182.
- ⁸ G. Curzi, 2002; B. Stossek, 2001, p. 249; V. P. Goss, 2010, p. 195; M. Cepetić, D. Dujmović, 2012, p. 324.
- ⁹ L. Dobronić, 2002, pp. 28-33; B. Stossek, 2001, p. 246.
- ¹⁰ L. Dobronić, 2002, pp. 38, 99; B. Stossek, 2001, p. 248.
- ¹¹ G. Horváth Zoltán, B. Gondos, 2004.
- ¹² I. Srša, 1998, p. 77.
- ¹³ For more information about the chapel of Stephen protomartyr please see Deanović, Čorak, Gattin 1998: pp. 24-38, especially p. 28.
- ¹⁴ V. P. Goss, V. Jukić, 2008: p. 137; For Hungarian works please see *Paradisum plantavit*, catalogue of exhibition, Pannonhalma, 2001, pp. 433-434.
- ¹⁵ V. P. Goss, 2009, p. 35, V. Jukić, D. Dujmović, 2008, pp. 178-9.
- ¹⁶ M. Cepetić, V. P. Goss, 2010, pp. 179-187.
- ¹⁷ V. P. Goss, 2007, pp. 51-63; V. P. Goss, 2008, pp. 417-426; V. Jukić, D. Dujmović, 2008, p. 173.
- ¹⁸ I. Srša, 1998, p. 91.
- ¹⁹ E. Marosi, 1984, p. 180.
- ²⁰ According to the proposed ideal reconstruction of the western facade of St Peter's chapel, authors: T. Kučinac, d.i.a., A. Suljić, d.i.a., Hrvatski restauratorski zavod, Zagreb.
- ²¹ Note of thanks: Ana Laća, d.i.a, for the drawings of the proposed rose window, Museum of Sveti Ivan Zelina for the photos and documentation, V. Jukić for the photos. Special thanks to Professor V. P. Goss, to whom this edition is dedicated, for the shared knowledge, patience and support in my work as a young researcher.

Bibliography

- A. Azinović, "Novo Mjesto – kapela Sv. Petra," in *Obavijesti* 3, god. XXXIV, 2002, pp. 130-141.
- G. Curzi, *La pittura dei Templari*, Milan, 2002.
- M. Cepetić, V. P. Goss, "A Note on the Rose Window in Čazma and on the Presence of the Royal Workshops in the Medieval Slavonia," in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 37, Split, 2010, pp. 179-187.
- M. Cepetić, D. Dujmović, "St Peter at Novo Mesto Zelinsko - New Iconography for Claiming Political Continuity," in *IKON* 5, Rijeka, 2012, pp. 323-330.
- A. Deanović, Ž. Čorak, N. Gattin, *Zagrebačka katedrala*, Zagreb, 1988.
- L. Dobronić, *Po starom Moravču*, Zagreb, 1979.
- L. Dobronić, *Templari i ivanovci u Hrvatskoj*, Zagreb, 2002.
- L. Dobronić, *Topografija zemljišnih posjeda zagrebačkih biskupa prema ispravi kralja Emerika iz god. 1201.*, Zagreb, 1951.
- V. P. Goss, *Four Centuries of European Art 800-1200: View from Southeast*, Zagreb, 2010.
- V. P. Goss, "Templari i kulturni pejzaž zelinskog Prigorja," in *Templari i njihovo nasljeđe; 800 godina od dolaska templara na zemlju Sv. Martina*, Catalogue of the exhibition, Museum Sveti Ivan Zelina, 2009, pp. 30-39..
- V. P. Goss, V. Jukić, "Rural Romanesque and a Europe without Borders. The Case of St. Mark's Church in Vinica," in *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 14, Zagreb – Motovun, 2008: pp. 133-140.
- V. P. Goss, "Bishop Stjepan II and Herceg Koloman and the Beginnings of the Gothic in Croatia," in *Hortus artium medievalium* 13, Zagreb – Motovun, 2007, pp. 51–63;
- V. P. Goss, "Renesansa 12. stoljeća i Hrvatska," in *Zbornik Dana Cvita Fiskovića II*, Zagreb, 2008, pp. 417 – 426
- G. Horváth Zoltán, B. Gondos, *Somogy, Tolna és Baranya középkori templomai a teljesség igényével*, Budapest, 2004.
- M. Houška, R. Mačković, *Zelinski kraj kroz prošlost*, Sveti Ivan Zelina, 2007.
- V. Jukić, D. Dujmović "The "Koloman Renaissance" in North Western Croatia – an Unfinished Project," in *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* 37, Split, 2010, pp. 171-182.
- E. Marosi, *Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn*, Budapest, 1984.
- I. Srša, "Kapela sv. Petra u Novom Mjestu," in *Kaj* XXXI, Zagreb, 1998, pp. 67-96.
- Paradisum plantavit*, exhibition catalogue, Pannonhalma: Pannonhalmi Bencés Főapátság, 2001, Takacs Imre (ed.).

B. Stossek, "Maisons et possessions des templiers en Hongrie," in *Crusades and Military Orders. Expanding the frontiers of Medieval Latin Christianity*, Budapest, 2001, Z. Hunyadi, J. Laszlovsy (ed.).

J. Stošić, "Srednjovjekovna umjetnička svjedočanstva o Zagrebačkoj biskupiji," in *Sveti trag, devetsto godina umjetnosti Zagrebačke biskupije 1094-1994*, Zagreb, 1994.

MYSTICAL STONE FIGURES FROM THE MIDDLE AGES IN NORTHERN CROATIA

IVANA PEŠKAN, VESNA PASCUTTINI-JURAGA

MINISTRY OF CULTURE, CONSERVATION DEPARTMENT IN VARAŽDIN

The aim of this paper is to present several sculptures, mostly representation of the human or animal heads, dated to the Middle Ages, embedded in the sacral and secular buildings in the area of north-western Croatia, in the villages of Nedelišće, Cirkovljan, Konjščina and the fort of Milengrad. In this study, the iconography and the style of the sculptures are analyzed. These examples provide an important addition to the material from continental Croatia that belongs to the Middle Ages, although, analogies are difficult to find within Croatia.

Medieval sculpture, Nedelišće, Cirkovljan, Konjščina, Milengrad

On the territory of northwestern Croatia, we encounter some extraordinary examples of medieval figural sculptures, located on the outer façades of the sanctuaries of several churches. In this paper, their iconography will be analyzed and put into the context of the Croatian figurative medieval sculpture.

Međimurje County is a triangle-shaped territory in the northernmost part of Croatia. In the past, it was called 'island between the Drava and the Mura' (or Latin *Insula intra Dravum et Muram*) referring to the two rivers bordering the region.

Nedelišće, the church of the Holy Trinity

Nedelišće is a village in Međimurje County, in a good strategic position, situated at the intersection of ancient roads, between the river Drava to the south and the Trnava to the north.

Several well-known and explored archaeological sites¹ tell us about the long continuity of settlement in this area.² The oldest document – a grant, in which king Bela IV donated the large estate Nedelišće to the magistrate Michael, dates from the year 1226. The settlement developed in the Middle Ages as a trading center – *oppidum*, while it was mentioned as a city - *Civitatis Nedelicencis*³ in some documents from the 15th century, thus confirming the importance of Nedelišće at the time. Moreover, the list of parishes in the diocese of Zagreb from the year 1334 mentions the parish in Nedelišće together with the Church of the Holy Trinity.⁴ The present Holy Trinity Church is an aisleless Gothic structure that includes a polygonal sanctuary vaulted with cross - ribbed vault. It was built in the second half of the 15th century.

The south chapel and the bell tower were originally attached to the nave in the Baroque period, however, the north chapel and the vestry were added later in the 19th century.

In the Gothic period, churches and cathedrals of Europe were covered with hundreds of carved figures, which represented a compendium of biblical characters and stories. These stone figures served the uneducated, that is to say - the majority of the population at the time, who could only understand the local dialect and nothing of the official Latin of the Church. Many areas of the church building feature carved forms of animals, monsters and humans, whereas some figures have ancient pagan roots and the others may have represented a purposeful warning meant to contrast with the solemnity of holy men.

Nevertheless, our main interest here is the whole range of extremely interesting and skillfully carved stone figures that originate from the second half of the 15th century. The figures are on the outer facade of The Holy Trinity Church in Nedelišće. They are placed on the cornice and the socle of the Gothic sanctuary – a unique example in the area of north-western Croatia. The figures were all done by a skilled master. In the upper zone, on the cornice, four sculptures can be seen. Sorting them out from left to right, they represent as follows: the head of a bearded man with long hair, open mouth and expressive, deep and rounded eye sockets (Fig. 1). The second figure represents the head of a beardless man, with chubby cheeks, bulging eyes and expressive eyebrows, with his mouth fully open (Fig. 2). The third figure is uncommon for the Croatian area. It represents a wild woman, who is shown crawling naked, with one hand holding her head, while the other is reaching towards the ground (Fig. 3). Her body position resembles an animal, with long, dishevelled hair, while the hand on her head indicates madness or insanity. Unfortunately, the details of the face are rather damaged; therefore, we can only perceive the place where the mouth and eyes had been located.



Fig. 1 Nedelišće, the church of the Holy Trinity, sculpture of a bearded man on the cornice, photo: V. Pascuttini-Juraga.



Fig. 2 Nedelišće, the church of the Holy Trinity, sculpture of a beardless man on the cornice, photo: V. Pascuttini-Juraga.



Fig. 3 Nedelišće, the church of the Holy Trinity, sculpture of a 'Wild Woman' on the cornice, photo: V. Pascuttini-Juraga.

Professor A. Horvat attributed these figures to the Parlers and their school, and compared them to the images on the cathedral in Prague.⁵ However, the closest similar scene of a crawling woman, though not naked, can be seen in the church of St George in Ptuj (Fig. 4), in the nearby Slovenia.⁶ The last of the four figures in the upper zone is a male head, completely covered in beard, moustache and hair, with very expressive eyes (Fig. 5).

The figure of the wild women and the three men's heads are very interesting and unique in this area. In the Middle Ages, 'wild people' were defined as the ones who lived outside the human culture, communities, customs and rules of behavior. On the one hand, wild people lived in a half-wild and primitive way, but on the other hand, they lived in total harmony with nature. The Church used them to show victory over the wild, or the evil and insanity, which they symbolize. Wild people are shown naked or dressed in animal skin. A wild man usually has a thick beard, his body is covered by hair, and he sometimes carries a club. Nonetheless, a wild woman is a more unusual sight. She is also shown covered with hair, and in most cases naked.

Wild people sometimes appear together with other characters that are far from God, like the devil and a fool. The exact four characters are shown on the vault brackets of the Rottweil Cathedral in Germany. After analyzing the four sculptures at the cornice in Nedelišće, we assumed that they could be representing these characters. The first figure may represent the devil, the following figure could be a fool, then a wild woman and at the end, the head of a wild man. From the aspect of iconology, these four characters together represent 'those who are distant from God and common sense.'



Fig. 4 Ptuj, the church of St George, sculpture of a crawling woman, photo: I. Peškan.

On the socle in the lower zone of the façade, there are five stone figures. The first one represents an animal with horns, most likely a goat. The body is oval, with bent front legs and bowed head. The horns are still very clearly visible. In the Christian symbolism, a goat is a symbol of the unholy in the final judgment, and especially to highlight the difference between the sinners and the righteous. In the Middle Ages it was also regarded as a symbol of sexuality. The next sculpture is a head covered with leaves – a so-called ‘Green Man’ (Fig. 6). Although the figure is damaged, leaves that cover the face are still visible. Eyes are modeled as deep holes, and leaves emerge toward the forehead. The ‘Green Man’ is a symbol of the eternal cycle of Nature and vegetation that comes from the ancient pre-Christian spirits and the gods of Nature. He is usually presented as a face made from or surrounded by leaves.⁷ To the medieval Christian mind, he became a symbol of rebirth after death. This representation of the ‘Green Man’ is the only known located on the outer side of a church in the Međimurje County. Yet, there is one more representation of the ‘Green Man’ that is inside the church of St Martin in village of Sveti Martin na Muri. The third figure is damaged, but by observing its form, it could be a bird. A. Horvat has identified the following image as a hedgehog. The body is modeled oval and is very similar to the goat figure. In the Christian symbolism, a hedgehog is a symbol of the devil, for ‘he steals the grape canes like the devil steals the human souls.’ Finally, there is the fifth figure, which is much damaged and cannot be recognized. If we compare these stone sculptures with only similar examples of architectural plastic decorations from the windows on the north side of the Cathedral in Zagreb, we can conclude that the characters in Zagreb are much more prominent and realistic, and that they were done in the high quality carving associated with the Parler workshop.⁸ The question is whether the characters from Zagreb cathedral had influenced the stone figures in Nedelišće, or the influence came from the nearby city of Ptuj in Slovenia?



Fig. 5 Nedelišće, the church of the Holy Trinity, sculpture of a male head on the cornice, photo: V. Pascuttini-Juraga.



Fig. 6 Nedelišće, the church of the Holy Trinity, sculpture of a ‘Green Man’ on the socle, photo: V. Pascuttini-Juraga.

Nonetheless, these mystical characters from the church in Nedelišće represent a valuable segment of the medieval heritage. They help us understand what people were afraid of in that period, but also about what they have secretly dreamed.

Cirkovljan, the church of St Lawrence

Cirkovljan is a village in the Medjimurje County, 18 kilometers east of Čakovec. The church of St Lawrence is located at the crossroads in the center of the triangular square on a somewhat elevated position at the altitude of 147 m. Church of St Lawrence is a site of archaeological findings from the Middle Ages; a necropolis from the 11th century was found here with Slavic culture skeletal burials.⁹ Nearby, on the main square of the village, artifacts from the Roman era, e.g., ceramic bowl with a lid were found,¹⁰ and not far from the village, on the gravel pile called Diven, an iron "K" sword was found, which is dated around the year 800.¹¹ All this tells us about the long and rich history of this settlement. The church of St Lawrence is an aisleless building with a sanctuary that is polygonal outside and semicircular inside. It was built in the late 14th and early 15th century in the Gothic style, and reconstructed in the Baroque style at the end of the 18th century. On the outer wall we can still see the remains of buttresses and walled-in Gothic windows. However, our subjects of interest here are four carved stone heads that are located on the cornice from the Gothic period. The first head is elongated, with a large full mouth that is open and dominates the entire face, and has a tongue stuck out (Fig. 7). It has a pug nose with visible derived nasal cavities and eyes that are also large, almond-shaped, and with holes. The second head has a very broad, rounded face, with a prominent elongated nose, almond-shaped eyes with large holes, and a smiling mouth (Fig. 8). The third head is oblong, with oval eyes, an elongated nose and full lips (Fig. 9). Beard is emphasized. The fourth head has an oval face, and it is the only one with ears (Fig. 10). These are oversized and made like two great circles adjoining the face. The eyes are oval and the nose is elongated. The large lips are strongly emphasized, the tongue sticks out. There are no analogies in northwestern Croatia, but certain similarities in the shape of the nose and eyes can be found with the heads at Konjščina. Although the carved stone heads in Cirkovljan were created during the construction of a Gothic church, that is 14/15th century, their shaping is reminiscent of earlier periods, and certain similarities in the formation of the elongated nose and oval face can be found with the heads outside the sanctuary of the Holy Trinity Church in Velika Nedelja, village in nearby Slovenia, which were made in the Romanesque period (Fig. 11). As the church in Velika Nedelja belonged to a knightly order, and there is a presumption that the church in the Cirkovljan also originally belonged to one, we can expect connections and stylistic influences.



Fig. 7 Cirkovljan, the church of St Lawrence, sculpture of a carved stone head on the cornice, photo: V. Pascuttini-Juraga.



Fig. 8 Cirkovljan, the church of St Lawrence, sculpture of a carved stone head on the cornice, photo: I. Peškan.



Fig. 9 Cirkovljan, the church of St Lawrence, sculpture of a carved stone head on the cornice, photo: I. Peškan.



Fig. 10 Cirkovljan, the church of St Lawrence, sculpture of a carved stone head on the cornice, photo: I. Peškan.



Fig. 11 Velika Nedelja, the church of the Holy Trinity, sculpture of a head in the sanctuary, photo: V. Pascuttini-Juraga.

Konjščina, the church of St Dominic and the fort of Milengrad

The cultural landscape between the mountains Ivanščica and Medvednica has preserved rich layers from medieval times. Through the past, the centres of political power have often been moved or demolished, but their sites are still preserved, sometimes as visible ruins, or, at least, in the collective memory of the locals. On the other hand, the spiritual centres have more often survived all wars and migrations. Throughout time, the churches have been rebuilt, renewed, refreshed, but very often the medieval nucleus is preserved somewhere under their, more or less recent, coats.

At the crossroads of ancient roads, by the river Krapina, where the village Konjščina has developed, stands the parish church of St Dominic. The church is well oriented, a single nave longitudinal structure, with a square sanctuary, lower and narrower than the nave. It was mentioned in the first list of parish churches in the Diocese of Zagreb in 1334,¹² as *item ecclesia sancti Nicolai de Zelnicha*. It changed the patron very soon after that, and in 1348, it was already mentioned as dedicated to St Dominic. The name of the settlement also changed, from Selnica to Konjščina.

This type of architecture, a rectangular church with a square sanctuary, was consistently used from the 9th to the 15th century in the northern part of Croatia.¹³ However, what is special about St Dominic is that it has two sculptural elements embedded in the eastern wall of the sanctuary that distinguish this church from all the others. Almost 100 years ago, Gjuro Szabo mentioned these sculptures in his book 'Hrvatsko Zagorje', and he defined them as the images of the Sun and the Moon. This has been repeated even in the recent literature, but the two figures embedded in the corners of the eastern wall represent human heads, similar, but slightly different in details (Fig. 12, 13).



Fig. 12 Konjščina, the church of St Dominic, sculpture on the eastern wall, photo: I. Peškan.



Fig. 13 Konjščina, the church of St Dominic, sculpture on the eastern wall, photo: I. Peškan.

The backsides of the heads are embedded into the block of stone, built into the corners of the church; however, almost three quarters of the heads are visible. The carving is of high quality, obviously done by a skilled artist. The faces are round, narrowing at the chin. The noses are wide and short and connected to the accentuated frontal arcs over the eyes. These arcs are stretched and styled with spiral carvings. The eyes on both heads are large and very expressive, a little bit bulging. The ears are round, relatively big and very far behind on the head. On both sculptures, the mouths are round, open, and strongly stressed, and, on the northern one, the tongue sticks out. The upper side of the head on both sculptures is flat, and they were a part of a larger whole. The figures look like warriors and there is an impression of something pagan, and even pre-Roman in their expression. They balance between welcome and intimidation. It is obvious that they had the power to communicate to medieval men. The sculptures are characterized by frontality and realistic representation of details. Stylistically, the sculptures are medieval, but which part of the fantastic medieval collection are they connected to? The first impression is that they belong to the façade of this church, but the flatness of the upper part of the heads means that they had some other element on the top, so it is possible that they were moved from the inside to the outside of the church. It is also possible that they originate from some other building, but it is more likely that they were a part of medieval decoration of this church. One possibility is that they were a part of medieval vaulting, having the function of brackets, carrying the ribs of a vault. In a description of the church from the year 1639, it stands that the nave and the sanctuary had a wooden ceiling, so there were no ribs to support.¹⁴ It is possible that something happened to the medieval vaulting, and that its brackets were embedded on the outside of the church, as a reminder of the past. The same destiny had the sculpture of a bear in Varaždin, once part of a medieval portal, and later, in the 15th century, it was embedded high on the church belfry.

The sculptures in Konjščina are not part of the Christian sacred iconography, or of the secular iconography, representing donors. Nevertheless, they do not seem to belong to the 'Wild Man' iconography, represented on the examples in Nedelišće. They are not ragged, bearded, undomesticated men, although the northern figure has a tongue protruding, which reminds one of a representation of a fool.¹⁵ Could they be related to the 'Green Man' iconography, the representation of pre-Christian spring God, translated into the Christian iconography of St George?¹⁶ The 'Green Man' is usually represented as a human face covered with leaves and branches, with the leaves coming out of his mouth. The 'Green Man' is a left over of pre-Christian vegetable cult as he was sometimes joined in pair to a similar head, that of the mythical God of the harvest called Jumis (Jumal) or Sporyš.¹⁷ Prof. Milan Pelc recognized that connection in the church in Beram, and in Lepoglava, so maybe the same pattern could apply here.¹⁸ The detail of a spiral carved beard on the

head from Lepoglava could be compared to the spiral carvings on the heads in Konjščina (Fig. 14). In both Beram and Lepoglava the 'Green Man' and its opposite are situated on the side entrance to the church. However, in Konjščina we find no attributes of a 'Green Man,' but it seems that these two heads represent some kind of dualism, good and evil, right and wrong, order and disorder. Considering the fact that in the Middle Ages the church in Konjščina was not vaulted, maybe the pair of heads were a part of a portal, maybe south portal, sending a message to the people that were entering the church.



Fig. 14 Lepoglava, the church of St Mary, sculpture on the northern portal, photo: I. Peškan.

In the search for comparative material, we examined the church of St Peter, in the nearby village Gotalovec. On the two consoles supporting the vault, there are also human heads, dated to the 15th century.¹⁹ The sculptures represent a bearded man with open mouth and stylized features. If we compare the heads from Gotalovec with the heads in Konjščina, there are many differences. The style of carving is not similar to Konjščina. A more skilled sculptor made the heads in Konjščina, and it is clear that his goal was not realism but fantasy.

There are no parallels or similar sculptures on the churches nearby Konjščina. However, browsing through the photographs of the medieval art it becomes obvious that these sculptures belong to the central European cultural circle, and its imaginative medieval world. For example, they show a remarkable similarity with the sculptures on the portal of the church of S. Nicholas at

Giornico in Switzerland.²⁰ The church and the sculptures in Switzerland are dated to the early 13th century. The church in Konjščina is first mentioned in 14th century. It is possible that it existed even earlier, and it looks like the two heads embedded on the façade belonged to the early church decoration. Based on that, and on stylistic grounds, the sculptures could be roughly dated to the 14th century.

The medieval centre of political power in that area was the fort of Milengrad. The fort stands on the top of a steep hill, and is almost hidden in the massive forest of the Ivanščica mountain. Written documents about the fort are scarce; however, indirectly it could be proven that Milengrad was the home of the landowners of Zajezda at least from the 13th century on.²¹ Apart from the defensive function of the fort, which is clearly recognizable in the strong, defensive walls, the fort had the residential, representative and economic function.

On the eastern façade of the keep, facing the entrance to the fort, there is a stone block embedded under the window, with two reliefs: a coat of arms and a human face (Fig. 15). The coat of arms represents a heart speared with a sword, and it is so far undetermined who it belonged to. It does not belong to the known owners of the fort, families Herkfy de Zajezda (Herković) and Patačić, so it is possible that it belonged to the previous, medieval owners of the estate.



*Fig. 15 The fort of Milengrad, sculpture on the eastern wall;
photo: Nino Vranić, 1953, source: MK, UZKB – F.*

The figure of the human face is in many ways similar to the heads embedded in the church wall in Konjščina. In the last 50 years the sculpture has kept wearing out, but on the photographs made in 1953 the expressiveness of the face is still visible, with the characteristic bulging eyes and mouth, and accentuated frontal arcs above the eyes, that we also find on the sculptures in Konjščina. However, the face on the fort is more stylized, flat and with the unusual and vivid expression, that slightly resembles the unique brackets – heads from Rudina.²² The style of carving and the provenance of the Milengrad sculpture are different, but the sculptors belonged to the same cultural circle. It is obvious that the Milengrad man had to communicate with the visitors, standing on the exposed position, high above the entrance to the fort. This stone block with the coat of arms and the human head engraved is unique, there is nothing similar preserved on the secular buildings in the region. The sculpture is stylistically similar to the two heads in Konjščina and it probably belongs to the same 14th century horizon.

Instead of conclusion

During the research in the area, we often come across interesting, so far unknown archaeological sites, recognizable by their remains in the landscape or because of the name of the site, like, for example, Gradišče, a term often used for remains of older, more or less fortified settlements. Sometimes, there are no visible remains, but the term Gradišče, which is still used, proves that people dwelled there in the past. Recently we discovered a Gradišče near the village Beletinec. This particular site is located at the top of the hill above the church in Beletinec, and is strategically very well positioned. From this location, Varaždin can be seen and the access road from the north. On the south side, there is the river Bednja and its valley. We hope that future archaeological researches will provide new data about the site.

During the reconstruction work on historical buildings, previously hidden elements are sometimes rediscovered, such as several *spolia* built into the old mortuary in Kalnička Kapela, the village near Varaždinske Toplice. Here, all we have left from the Middle Ages are fragments of architecture and architectural decoration, incorporated within today's building. The written documents about the site are scarce, but the embedded architectural elements change our view and deepen our knowledge about the history of the building and the site. There is a lot of work ahead because valuable artifacts from the past are still waiting to be discovered and evaluated.

-
- ¹ On the “Stara ves” meadow on the east side of Nedelišće, archaeological excavations were carried out on the oldest Slavic settlement that has been recorded in Croatia, the oldest dating early Slavic pit from 7th century; L. BEKIĆ, *Zaštitna arheologija u okolici Varaždina*, Zagreb 2006, pp. 203-206
- ² Archaeological research in Cirkvišće (or Gradišće), the site just north of today's settlement, indicates that during the Middle Ages there was a church and other buildings of the village there; *Nedelišće-monografija*, Nedelišće 1993, p. 31.
- ³ In two documents from the Archives of Slovenia; LJ. PERČI: “Dva ugovora iz 15. stoljeća s pečatom Nedelišća,” *Muzejski Vjesnik* 11, Varaždin 1988, pp. 48-49.
- ⁴ *Nedelišće-monografija*, Nedelišće 1993, p. 61
- ⁵ A. HORVAT, *O gotičkoj arhitektonskoj plastici u Nedelišću*, Novi Sad: Matica srpska, 1983, pp. 203-206.
- ⁶ It is very interesting that the same pose of the female figure is used on the capital in Ptuj. She also crawls toward the man, and it is possible that they represent “wild people.”
- ⁷ More about the Green Man in text by M. PELC, “*Insipiensis* iz Berma i poganska simbolika u srednjovjekovnoj kršćanskoj ikonografiji – hrvatski primjeri,” conference paper from the International Scholarly Seminar on the *Life and Work of Academician Branko Fučić* (1920 – 1999), Malinska-Rijeka-Zagreb, 2011, pp. 337-354.
- ⁸ More on architectural decoration in the Zagreb cathedral: A. HORVAT: “Čudovišna galerija zagrebačke katedrale,” *Kaj* II/79, pp. 39-58.
- ⁹ *Registar arheoloških nalaza i nalazišta sjeverozapadne Hrvatske*, Bjelovar 1997, p. 245, Cirkovljan 950.
- ¹⁰ *Registar arheoloških nalaza i nalazišta sjeverozapadne Hrvatske*, Bjelovar 1997, p. 245, Cirkovljan 951.
- ¹¹ *Registar arheoloških nalaza i nalazišta sjeverozapadne Hrvatske*, Bjelovar 1997, p. 246, Cirkovljan 952.
- ¹² J. BUTURAC, *Popis župa Zagrebačke biskupije 1334. i 1501. godine*, Zagreb, 1984.
- ¹³ V. P. GOSS, N. ŠEPIĆ, “A Note on some Churches with Rectangular Sanctuary in Medieval Slavonia,” *Peristil* 50/2007.
- ¹⁴ V. NORŠIĆ, “Konjščina,” *Tkalčić* 10/2006, Zagreb.
- ¹⁵ According to the “wild man” iconography.
- ¹⁶ M. PELC, “*Insipiens* iz Berma i poganska simbolika u srednjovjekovnoj kršćanskoj ikonografiji – hrvatski primjeri,” Conference paper from the International Scholarly Seminar on the *Life and Work of Academician Branko Fučić* (1920 – 1999), Malinska-Rijeka-Zagreb, 2011, pp. 337-354.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.* 4.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.* 5.
- ¹⁹ D. VUKIČEVIĆ – SAMARŽIJA, *Gotičke crkve Hrvatskog Zagorja*, Zagreb 1993.
- ²⁰ They have similar expressivness, prominent eyes, unusual ears, and the sculptures in Konjščina were maybe also placed on the church portal.
- ²¹ K. SUDEC, D. HRELJA, *Milengrad*, Varaždin, 2011.
- ²² Catalogue of the exhibition “A hundred stones from a lost paradise,” Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, 2007.

DID COUNTS OF CILLI OWN VELIKI TABOR?

TEA GUDEK ŠNAJDAR

MUSEUMS OF HRVATSKO ZAGORJE

Veliki Tabor, one of the best preserved Croatian castles, still hasn't been dated with certainty. Although different dating theories were suggested, the one that Rattkay family has built Veliki Tabor in 1502 has been generally accepted. However, this theory is opposed by folk tales, particularly the one about Veronika of Desinić, according to which counts of Cilli inhabited Veliki Tabor, a whole century before Rattkay family came there. Since this legend is based upon real historical people and events, which is also testified by historical sources, the author of this article attempted to reach an answer to the question from the title of the article. The relation of counts of Cilli to Veliki Tabor is also witnessed of in the wall paintings in the chapel of St John in Ivanić Miljanski, which is located near Veliki Tabor. As a conclusion, after an analysis of the architecture of Veliki Tabor central tower, it has come to conclusion that it definitely dates in XV century. Due to its high quality construction, some auxiliary architectural elements in its interior, and some other details, we can link it to Czech artisans who were active in these parts in the beginning of XV century, and whose work is also related to orders of counts of Cilli (i.e. Old Town Varaždin, pauline convent in Lepoglava etc.).

Veliki Tabor, Counts of Cilli, Veronika of Desinić, gothic, fortification, Ivanić Miljanski, defense tower, Czech workshop

Veliki Tabor (Fig. 1) is one of the largest and best preserved medieval castles in Croatia. It is an irreplaceable part of every discussion of our fortification architecture, and it is featured already by Gjuro Szabo, one of the first researchers of the Croatian defensive architecture, in his pioneer work “Sredovječni gradovi u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji.” (Fig. 2)

Although it has been studied since the late nineteenth century, many questions regarding Veliki Tabor still remain unanswered. The most disputed of them regards the time of its construction. During the last few years, most acclaimed is the beginning of the XVI century, nevertheless there are still some disagreements to this theory. Though it relies on a written document,¹ there is some evidence of an earlier dating, such as objects found in the archeological investigations that are dated to the XV century, but also the architecture of the pentagonal central tower that stylistically corresponds to the Late Middle Ages. But, aside from these material pieces of evidence, the traditions of not just the local folk, but also the visitors from Slovenia and other parts of Croatia substantiate this theory. Most of the visitors come to Veliki Tabor with a predetermined belief that Veliki Tabor was the home of counts of Cilli, who also built most of it.² Data showing that Cilli family were the owners of Veliki Tabor is also found in some of the literature, but there is no record of the source of this information.³ Taken the fact that the last male member of this family, Ulrik of Cilli, died in 1456,⁴ this would mean that the construction of Veliki Tabor took place in the first half of the XV century at the latest. The link of Veliki Tabor to the counts of Cilli was probably stimulated by the legend of an unfortunate girl, Veronika of Desinić, which happened at the beginning of the XV century.



*Fig. 1 Veliki Tabor, view from the south
(photo: Tea Gudek Šnajdar).*



*Fig. 2 Veliki Tabor from the first page of the
Gjuro Szabo's book from 1920.*

Previous Research

But, let us first take a look back at the works that focused on Veliki Tabor and the time of its construction.

One of the first people to write about this was L. Marjanović in 1890 in his article entitled “Veliki Tabor i Sv. Vid pod Vrbovcem” (*Veliki Tabor and Sveti Vid under Vrbovec*). He deemed that king Sigismund of Luxembourg gave the city to counts of Cilli in 1397, and that it later became

a property of Jan Vitovec and John Corvinus, who granted it to the Rattkays in 1502. He also considered the pentagonal tower to be of Roman origin.⁵ In his foreword to an exhibition of Oton Iveković with motifs from Veliki Tabor in 1921, G. Szabo claims that the pentagonal tower originates from the XV century. He also states that the city proprietors might have well been counts of Cilli, however that the city is not mentioned under this name until 1502. Meanwhile, the other name – *Vingrad* – indicates that this place had been fortified a long time ago, possibly even in Roman times.⁶ G. Kostić uses the same conclusions in his work “Kroz istoriju Zagorja” (*Through the history of Zagorje*), where he claims that the writings on the walls testify that the front turret is a relic of a Roman castrum, and that the bricks in it were designated by the mark of the Roman legion of Siscia. He also claims that the name *Vingrad* appears after the invasion of these parts by the Normans, and that the stone markings show that it was built in cooperation of workshops from Cologne and Prague. He sets the construction of the central pentagonal tower in 1350.⁷ A. Kovač also favors the “Roman thesis” in his work entitled “U ritterskom Velikom Taboru” (*In the knightly Veliki Tabor*) from 1930. He considers that, back in the classical period, this was a watchtower that was used to control the road *Celeia – Poetovio*. He further states that there was a medieval fortress there already in the XII century. He links the name *Tabor* to Jan Vitovec who was a Bohemian Hussite, and the stone markings to workshops from Nuremberg and Prague.⁸ E. Laszowski wrote about Veliki Tabor in 1938. He claims that the name *Vingrad* is not mentioned in any of the old documents, and he also links the castle to the counts of Cilli.⁹

T. Premerl, in his work “Veliki Tabor. Naša obaveza prema porukama baštine” (*Veliki Tabor. Our obligation towards the messages of the heritage*) brings some new conclusions. He presumes that an earlier fortification existed in the present location of the castle, and that Veliki Tabor is a part of a fortification system connecting Sutla and the eastern slopes of Ivančica. His idea of a defensive line is further considered by M. Obad Šćitaroci in his book of mansions and parks of Hrvatsko zagorje. In 1984, Z. Cikuša also dates the construction of Veliki Tabor in the XIV or XV century, and claims that the lords of the pentagonal tower were counts of Cilli, and that the ring with semicircular turrets may have been built by Jan Vitovec.¹⁰

A major change in the theory of the origination time of Veliki Tabor came in year 1990, in the work of M. Kruhek and M. Pandžić. They made an attempt, on grounds of archival sources,¹¹ to present an image of the development of the object since its construction to the beginning of the XVII century. They also believe that Veliki Tabor was built in 1502, and that the edifice that was granted by John Corvinus to Rattkay family was in fact Mali Tabor. According to this, the earliest phase of the construction of Veliki Tabor would supposedly be between 1502 and 1507.¹²

In his master degree thesis, A. Žmegač confirms these theories of M. Kruhek and M. Pandžić. He concludes, based on terminology used in the grant certificate of John Corvinus that it did not refer to Veliki, but instead Mali Tabor, which is mentioned already in the XV century. The new fortification, Veliki Tabor, was built during the first years of Rattkays' stay in Hrvatsko zagorje, between the property grant in 1502 and the first mentioning of both fortifications in 1507. According to this, the Rattkays were not granted Veliki Tabor, quite the contrary they built it themselves. A. Žmegač explains the fact that Ladislau Rattkay bought Mali Tabor in 1524, by stating that some changes have happened meanwhile, that are not known to us. He sets the first phase of the construction of Veliki Tabor in the period between 1502 and 1507 when, as he believes, the central pentagonal tower was built. The plateau on which it stands was surrounded by a weak wall or a palisade, and in the west there was a fortified entrance, but the bastion and the servants' quarters were not yet built. This phase was followed by a Renaissance phase in which the ring of walls with four semicircular turrets was built.¹³

Such view found its approval with the conservators that worked on the final stage of the restoration of Veliki Tabor, which ended in November 2011. K. Majer and E. Šurina also believe that it was built by the Rattkay family. According to their theory, the central tower was built during the first phase, which began in 1502, and it consisted of ground floor (wine cellar) and two upper floors. For the reasons of protection, it was surrounded by a wall of some sort. The second phase began in 1526, when the ring with the semicircular turrets was built. In the year 1537 the central tower got its third floor, which then served as a granary, and during the XVI century the outer defensive ring was built as well.¹⁴

D. Čikara and A. Ćurić offer a slightly earlier dating; they link the ring of walls with semicircular towers to the architecture of Italian citadels from the XV century. They consider the central pentagonal tower to be older, and that it was opened up by bigger windows and adapted to a more comfortable inhabitancy during John Corvinus' reign, which was only possible after the defensive ring of the walls was built. They contribute the construction of this part of the chateau to king Matthias Corvinus, who might have kept his mercenaries here, thus giving Veliki Tabor a role of military fortress which was a part of a bigger fortification system.¹⁵

From this insight into the previously published works concerning Veliki Tabor, one can conclude that the elder researchers were more prone to earlier datings. In their research, some of them did not cling to the XV century and the counts of Cilli as the initiators of the construction, but went as far as setting the initial phases of construction of the building at the present location of Veliki Tabor to the Classical age. Still, none of them refer to any substantial historical document, instead they determine the period on the basis of stylistic analysis, historic events and assumptions

based on the appearance of architecture of Veliki Tabor. A significant turn did not come until the 1990's, when M. Kruhek and M. Pandžić set its construction after 1502, based on a grant certificate by John Corvinus. This theory is further elaborated by A. Žmegač, who also based his theory primarily on that grant certificate from 1502, and later this theory is accepted by other authors as well.

Nevertheless, some ideas that the construction of Veliki Tabor took place before the XVI century, and that the Rattkay family were not just granted an estate but some sort of a building as well have emerged in the last twenty years.

Legend as a Source for Counts of Cilli Connection?

The widespread belief that the counts of Cilli ruled Veliki Tabor was certainly largely influenced by the *Legend of Veronika of Desinić*. It is about a misfortunate love between Fridrik II of Cilli and Veronika of Desinić.¹⁶ Fridrik was a son of Hermann II of Cilli, who, among others, performed the duty of the Croatian Ban. Hermann's daughter Barbara was married to king Sigismund of Luxembourg, king of Croatia, Hungary and Bohemia, and German emperor.¹⁷ This marriage was preceded by propinquity between her father Hermann II and king Sigismund, whom he had rescued from death in the battle of Nicopolis, 1396, and also by the support he had provided to him during a rebellion of the Croatian lords against the king.¹⁸ In return for all this, Sigismund granted Hermann Hrvatsko zagorje in 1397,¹⁹ and a few years later he sold him Međimurje as well, thus expanding Hermann's estates to a large part of Slavonia.²⁰ The land he gained included Vrbovec seigniory, that is, the estate that Veliki Tabor was built on, therefore if a building existed there already, it would have certainly belonged to the Cilli family.

A Historical Background of the Legend

Though this legend has several different endings and happens in several different places, an interesting fact is that the records of the described events can be found in several historical documents of the XV century, which testify that this legend is in fact based on true historical events.

The first to write about this is Eberhardt Windecke, king Sigismund's chronicler, who lived at his court during the first years of the XV century. He wrote that Elizabeth was murdered, and that the rumor is that she was murdered by her husband Fridrik II of Cilli, and because of a beautiful concubine.²¹ A historian Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini, later pope Pius II, in his work "Australis" describes the death of Elizabeth Frankopan, stating that Fridrik killed her because of another

woman. A few years later, in his another work “Europa,” he writes again on the subject, only then he states specifically that the woman's name was Veronika, but he doesn't mention her last name.²²

Nonetheless, the most important source on these events is “The Celje chronicle,” a work written by the chronicler of Cilli family in the first half of the XV century. Here all the events were described more amply, and the chronicler also states Veronika's full name: *Veronica von Dessnitz*.²³ However, it states that Veronika's assassination took place at the fortification of Ojstrica, and as for the events of 1428 it is written: “[...] so grofinjo Veroniko v Cele pripeljali ino jo ovde pred sodbo postavili. Njeni tast grof Herman II. jo je dolžil, da je ona njegovega sina očarala ino ga s tem toliko omotila, da jo je v zakon vzel. Zagovornik jo je pa temu obdolženju nasprot tako čversto zagovarjal, da so jo sodniki nedolžno spoznali. Tej razsodbi vkljub pošle razkačen tast svojo nedolžno sneho nazaj v Ojstrovce ino ukaže Joštu Soteskemu, njo tamo v kopeli vtopiti. Taj ljuti ukaz je Soteski spolnil 17. oktobra 1428. Truplo vtoplene Veronike so pokopali v Braslovčih. Grof Miroslav je pa pozneje njeno truplo tamo vzdignil, ga prepeljal v Jurjev Kloštar ino ga v tamošno cerkev pokopal.”²⁴ (*countess Veronika has been taken to Celje, and been brought before the judges. Her father-in-law, count Hermann II had her accused of bewitching his son, thus forcing him to marry her. However, her advocate defended her so well, that the judges proclaimed her innocent. Despite this verdict, her enraged father-in-law sent his innocent daughter-in-law back to Ojstrica, and ordered Jošt Soteski to drown her in a tub. Soteski accomplished this atrocious act on October 17, 1428. The body of drowned Veronika was buried in Braslovčani. Later, count Fridrik transferred her body to Jurkloštar, and buried it in a local church*). These events have been confirmed in an inscription in the Record of the deceased from Jurklošter, where the day of death of Veronika was inscribed by the following words: “On 18th of October died lady Veronika, countess of Cilli.”²⁵ Despite that this inscription leads to conclusion that Veronika was buried in the church of this monastery, in numerous excavations the body was never found, and the inscriptions on the headstones that cover the pavement of the church are so worn out that they are completely unreadable.²⁶

Chapel of St John in Ivanić Miljanski

However, the relation of these events to Veliki Tabor, at least partially, is confirmed by a mural in the chapel of St John in Ivanić Miljanski. The chapel is in a proximity to the castle itself, and they also have a direct visual communication. (Fig. 3)

I. Srša concludes, after a detailed study of the mural, that the wall paintings were made by Slovenian workshop that was employed by the Cilli family. The most probable founder of the chapel was Fridrik II of Cilli, and the chapel itself was built and painted between 1447 and 1450.²⁷

Hermann II and Fridrik II are remembered as distinguished sponsors of the ecclesiastical art. The particularly well-known is Hermann's sponsorship in Pauline convent in Lepoglava, and also in many churches in north-western Croatia and Slovenia.

His son Fridrik II was also a great patron of ecclesiastical construction, and the preserved wall paintings in the chapel in Ivanić Miljanski vouch that it wasn't the only one. Within the biblical scenery, some individuals and events can be recognized, that were involved in the tragic love between Fridrik of Cilli and Veronika of Desinić. Fridrik II of Cilli is represented as the donator kneeling before St Leonard.²⁸ This saint was a protector of prisoners,²⁹ and Fridrik himself was imprisoned twice in his life.³⁰ The accusation of John Frankopan against Fridrik for the murder of his first wife Elizabeth, is also recognized, as a *genre-scene* within the display of the *Visit and adoration of the three Kings*. In the procession moving towards the place of Christ's birth, two characters leading a brisk argument are particularly distinguished. From the remarkable resemblance to the donator character in the scene before, I. Srša concludes that this is again image of Fridrik II of Cilli, and that the other character can be recognized as John Frankopan, hereby accusing him of his cousin's murder.³¹



Fig. 3 View from the Chapel of St John in Ivanić Miljanski of Veliki Tabor
(photo: Siniša Žnidarec).

Fridrik's father, Hermann II, is displayed as a observer of betrayal in the scene of *Judas' kiss*, and also as one of the guests at *Herod's feast* immediately after the assassination of St John the Baptist. In both scenes he is found among the slayers, who unjustly killed the innocent. I. Srša rightfully considers this as an accusation by his son Fridrik for the murder of his second wife Veronika, because, as he states: “Za Fridrika je njegov otac bio jednak Herodu, on sam nije ubio Ivana Krstitelja niti je Herman II. ubio Veroniku Desinić, ali su obojica stajala iza tih ubojstava.”³² (*To Fridrik his father was equal to Herod; he did not kill Veronika of Desinić by his own hand, much like Herod did not kill John the Baptist, but they both stood behind the killings*). I. Srša describes their relationship after Veronika's murder as irreversibly broken, and: “u tolikoj mjeri da ni nakon sinovljeva oslobađanja iz tamnice pa sve do očeve smrti, Fridrik II. ocu nije oprostio Veronikino ubojstvo i vlastito utamničenje”³³ (*in such measure that even after his release from the dungeon and until his father's death, Fridrik II was unable to forgive his father for Veronika's murder and his imprisonment*).

In the scene of *Herod's feast*, some other contemporaries and participants of these events can be recognized. At that table, sitting beside Hermann are king Herod, king Phillip, queen Herodiade and her daughter Salome. In the characters of king Phillip and his wife Herodiade, by comparison to the displays of king Sigismund of Luxembourg and his wife Barbara of Cilli from the “Chronicle of Council in Konstanza,” one can notice great similarities. The fact is that the painter may have painted portraits of the king and his wife, by Fridrik II of Cilli's order, because they also influenced the unfortunate end of Fridrik and Veronika's love affair. Given all that, the characters sitting at the table are in fact Hermann II of Cilli, his daughter Barbara and her husband, king Sigismund of Luxembourg, together with the hated king Herod and Salome, who brought to the table the head of St John the Baptist. This may actually be an artistic interpretation of the king's personal judiciary, that brought the decision of Fridrik's incarceration and Veronika's death.³⁴

An interesting thing is that in the sanctuary there is a display of *Veronika's scarf*. Though this is a common medieval theme, this can incidentally contain a hidden symbolism. The founder of the chapel may have displayed a portrait of his second wife in a biblical figure, thus further emphasizing the link between the displayed characters and the events they resemble.³⁵

I. Srša finally concludes that the motivation for constructing and painting of the church was legitimation of illegitimate son John,³⁶ whom Fridrik of Cilli in fact had with his second wife Veronika. But, having been born at the time before Veronika and Fridrik were married, the Pope legitimized him upon Fridrik's appeal on November 15, 1447.³⁷

After all the forementioned, one must ask oneself why would Fridrik of Cilli build a chapel in which the wall paintings display events concerning him and Veronika, had they not indeed

happened? It is possible that he built the chapel exactly on a spot that was significant for them somehow. It may be the place where Veronika's family had their estate,³⁸ or perhaps a place where the lovers commonly spent time together after they met. Taking into consideration everything so far, the surroundings of Veliki Tabor were most likely Veronika's homeland, where the protagonists of the legend met. However, later events have most probably played out in locations stated in the particular historical sources, and folk tales later on have linked them all back to Veliki Tabor.

Since the chapel of St John provides a good view of Veliki Tabor, perhaps these two places were somehow linked together even before the construction of the chapel. It is also possible that this connection is further emphasized by Fridrik himself, having built a chapel over it to testify of events that occurred there.

The Time of Construction of Veliki Tabor


Considering the above, one can presume that even in the first half of the XV century there was an edifice of some sort in the present location of Veliki Tabor, and its owners were counts of Cilli, because at that time they ruled all of Hrvatsko zagorje.

Since the archaeological investigations never found any trace of an architecture other than the existing, there couldn't have existed another stone building instead of Veliki Tabor. Of course, there could have been a wooden construction, however wooden defensive architecture is characteristic of early Middle Ages, therefore it would have been outdated, since the older wooden fortifications in medieval Slavonia had started being replaced with stronger stone fortifications already after Tartarian invasion in 1242.³⁹




*Fig. 4 Central pentagonal tower
(photo: Tea Gudek Šnajdar).*


The oldest part of Veliki Tabor complex is most certainly its central pentagonal tower, which belongs to the period of late Middle Ages, according to its formative characteristics. (Fig. 4) By its shape, and also by older narrow openings and loopholes, it shows features of defensive architecture. It was most likely surrounded by wooden palisades, which bounded an area where some other buildings may have also existed, but they had to be wooden as well, and were probably used as auxiliary facilities.⁴⁰ The wall ring with four semicircular turrets was constructed after this building, which existed independently for some time, as can be seen by its defensive building elements.⁴¹ (Fig. 5, 6, 7)



*Fig. 5 Plan of Veliki Tabor, ground floor
(Martin Pilar).*



*Fig. 6 Plan of Veliki Tabor, first floor
(Martin Pilar).*



*Fig. 7 Plan of Veliki Tabor, second floor
(Martin Pilar).*

The Central Pentagonal Tower

Let us first say a few words about the central tower of Veliki Tabor. (Fig. 8) It is a building with a pentagonal layout, which consists of ground floor and three upper floors.⁴² The length from the facade in the east to the outermost angle of the pentagon in the west is 10.75 meters, and the north-south width is 7 meters. The ground floor (wine cellar) is a single room with a monumental L-shaped pillar in the centre. The massive pillar divides the space into four unequal bays, and the entire room is vaulted. The present entrance to the ground floor is on the eastern facade, shifted to the middle of the southern half, but it was probably originally somewhere else. In the northeastern bay there are remnants of an old staircase in the vault, but they are very poorly preserved. This has probably been the entrance to the ground floor of the tower during the Middle Ages, since back then the entrances to defensive structures were never built in the ground level, but instead they were approached by the movable ladder to the first floor. In a case of danger the ladder could have been withdrawn, thus preventing the enemy from gaining access to the tower.⁴³

The first and second floor are presently divided into three rooms, one larger in the eastern, and two smaller in the western part. The arrangement of the rooms is identical on both floors. But in the ground plans drawn by M. Pilar at the beginning of XX century, it is obvious that the northern part of the eastern room which contained a staircase, was also separated by a partition wall, and that there was also an additional wall separating the northern room of the second floor as well. However, since these were much thinner walls than the ones dividing the floor to three main rooms, it is probable they were built later.⁴⁴

The window openings were also preserved, but since their arrangement and size varied over centuries, today's situation is a bit unclear. In the ground floor there are smaller openings on the eastern, southern and northern side. On the southern facade there is a bay window extending through the first and second floor, with window openings on its southern, and one small window on each side. On the first floor there is also an entrance, which may have replaced the original medieval entrance to the building. East of it, there is another smaller window, while on the eastern facade there are two larger ones, so called "bohemian windows." This type of windows can also be found on the northern facade, one along the staircase, and the other in the northwestern room. In this room there is also a smaller window, located in a larger niche. In the second floor, the same window arrangement is repeated on the eastern facade, and in the northwestern room. But, instead of the small window on the southern facade, on this floor there is a Renaissance bifora with floral motifs between the two semicircular window openings.⁴⁵ (Fig. 9) The situation is somewhat different on the third floor, where the space is divided into two rooms, but according to the

preserved inscripted year on the outer facade of this wall (1537), and also the preserved ceramic tile with a female portrait bearing the year 1555, its construction took place some time later.

Therefore, when it was built, this tower had a ground floor and only two upper floors. Since its function has changed over time, its appearance has changed accordingly. It was built probably to serve as a defense tower that had a purpose of safe habitation along its regular defensive role, because it was then the only stone-built object on this estate. Z. Horvat defines defense towers as buildings intended for defense under siege, but also occupancy, which are usually located in the direction of a possible attack.⁴⁶ Veliki Tabor was normally approached from the West, so the potential attacks were expected from there as well. This is why one of the angles of this tower is also turned towards the West, which also testifies of its defensive purpose.

In the first and second floor were residence quarters, which can be recognized by some auxiliary elements. Through the middle of the tower there is a chimney, and there are fireplaces attached to it in the larger rooms of the first and second floor, and later tile stoves as well. A toilet was also found in the northern room, that is, its pipework and an opening that was used as drainage.

At the top of this tower, before the third floor was built, there may have also been a wooden defensive construction instead of a flat terrace, since in the period between the XIII to XV century most of defense was conducted from the wall or tower tops.⁴⁷ A wooden construction would have been set up on the top of a defense tower, from which the defenders could protect the fortress. It stood out a little more than the rest of the walls, so the defenders could move more easily, and have better control over foothill.

After the construction of the semicircular tower ring, the defensive function of this tower stopped being dominant, thus its residential purpose becomes increasingly important. This was probably the time when the bay window on the southern facade and the bifora were built, and some loopholes shut, and the interior was most probably set up to be more comfortable. The tower was increased with a third floor, which may have replaced the defensive wooden construction.

The Time of its Construction

After having established that the central pentagonal tower was, in its beginning, most certainly an independent structure, intended for defensive purposes, and a safe residence afterwards, another question pops up – its time of origin.

The pentagonal defense towers were definitely characteristic for the Middle Ages, in a period between XIII and XIV century, and in XV century a new type of circular turrets already appears, with adjustments to the new trends.⁴⁸ According to the typology of Z. Horvat, the Veliki Tabor tower would be categorized as a residential – defensive tower which are of somewhat larger

layout, and were used for both defense and safe residence.⁴⁹ Some similarities can be seen with the tower fortress Čaklovec, dated in the XIII century, and is also of pentagonal layout. Its protruding angle is again pointed towards the direction of a potential attack. Even though it had a few more floors, we can still find some common elements. They have the same pattern of vaulting, the ground floor is vaulted by a stone vault, while the other floors are vaulted in wood.⁵⁰ Also, chimney, fireplaces, remnants of narrow windows and staircase were found in its interior.⁵¹



*Fig. 8 Central pentagonal tower
(photo: Tea Gudek Šnajdar).*



*Fig. 9 Renaissance bifora on central pentagonal tower
(photo: Tea Gudek Šnajdar).*

The necessary data for determining the age of the central tower of Veliki Tabor can be provided by its “Bohemian windows.”⁵² (Fig. 10) This type of windows comes in use in our fortifications during the late XIV and XV century, and is brought to these parts by Bohemian artisans. They were first imported to Bohemia from France in the first half of the XIV century, and further developed by Peter Parler. His workshop, which was exceptionally productive in the second half of the XIV century, especially in Prague, produced many fine artisans. When the business ran low in Prague and its surroundings, these artisans moved across Europe in search of new jobs. Some of them also came to Croatia, where they worked on prominent buildings - on Zagreb cathedral, the church of St Mark in Zagreb, the Pauline churches and convents in Lepoglava, Remete, Kamensko, and the fortifications of Medvedgrad, Garić, Brinje, Krapina etc.⁵³ Most of them arrived in the first years of the XV century, which coincides with the counts of Cilli regency; it is possible that Cilli, as patrons of art, may have also invited these artisans themselves. This is further

supported by the fact that most of buildings from the start of the XV century, that were worked on by Czech artisans, were owned by the counts of Cilli.

Czech artisans also worked on the entrance tower of the Old Town Varaždin, which was thoroughly adapted in the Gothic period. (Fig. 10) This turret was described as a burg surrounded by palisades in the “The Celje chronicle,”⁵⁴ which would also correspond to the then appearance of the central tower of Veliki Tabor. Although its function was different, one can observe some similarities in this description of the Varaždin tower by Z. Horvat: “Prvobitno se gotička kula sastojala od dvije etaže – vrlo visokog prizemlja te kata, a sve je to vjerojatno krunilo manje-više komplicirano krovište, možda s potkrovnom obrambenom etažom, malo konzolno izbočenom...” (At first, the gothic turret consisted of two floors – a very high ground floor and an upper floor, and all of this was probably crowned by more or less complicated truss, perhaps with a defensive loft, slightly cantilevered ...).⁵⁵ Later another floor was added. It is also equipped by “Bohemian windows,” and Z. Horvat reckons that its architecture corresponds to one from the end of XIV and the beginning of XV century, and that it also stands out with its high quality construction, which is more suited for the social position of Cilli family. He considers it to have been built by Czech artisans of the Parler workshop, who have been actively been participating in nearly all of constructions undertaken by Herman II of Cilli.⁵⁶



*Fig. 10 Central pentagonal tower, eastern facade
(photo: Tea Gudek Šnajdar).*

An additional link of Veliki Tabor central tower to Czech artisans and construction sites of Cilli family are also the markings in its stone walls. Although still insufficiently researched, there is an obvious parallel between the stone markings in Veliki Tabor⁵⁷ and the examples from the Paulinian convent in Lepoglava⁵⁸, and also the gothic tower of the castle in Varaždin⁵⁹.

Another novelty of the XV century are tile stoves, which can also be found in this building, along with the fireplaces. Even though fireplaces have been in use since the XIII century,⁶⁰ they remain in use even after the invention of tile stoves which are described thus by Z. Horvat: “Prema našim dosadašnjim spoznajama, one [...] u nas javljaju tijekom 15. stoljeća, možda čak i od početka tog stoljeća, ili čak i ranije.” (*According to our current knowledge, their [...] usage in our country starts in the 15th century, maybe even in the beginning of that century, or even earlier*).⁶¹ They were likely used along with the fireplaces, and the discoveries of furnace stones from that period may well testify that their origin was exactly in the XV century. These furnace stones are presently exhibited in the museum of Veliki Tabor Castle.

Historical Situation - Who may have been the Owners?

History of Hrvatsko Zagorje followed the vicissitudes of the rest of former Slavonia. After the establishment of the Croatian-Hungarian personal union in 1102, Slavonia was governed by a Ban from a royal family. Most of the land was King's property, and he distributed it among nobility according to services rendered.⁶² Feudal relations were established at that time. The country was organized by counties which became the centers of regional state-legal transactions. Hence, two counties are formed in this area, counties of Zagorje and Varaždin.⁶³ The Zagorje county was abolished in 1486, and merged with the Varaždin county.⁶⁴ Starting from the XII century, landowners of Zagorje also became lords of the inhabitants of their lands.⁶⁵ Noblemen of Acha lineage were the first notable landowners in Hrvatsko zagorje. They governed estates that spread from Zagreb to river Sutla, and Krapina in the north. In the XIII century more and more members of this family were mentioned, and somewhere in the middle of the XIV century they were increasingly replaced by the Arland family.⁶⁶ Northern part of Hrvatsko zagorje, as opposed to the southern, was divided into many smaller estates.

In XIV and XV century the fort of Krapina was the largest edifice in western Slavonia, and it is mentioned in the documents from this time as *castrum de Zagoria*. It was already mentioned that in 1399 the Zagorje county was granted to counts of Cilli, who thus became the owners of all the forts in this area. Krapina was obviously their headquarters in Hrvatsko zagorje, since the royal wedding ceremony of marriage between Sigismund of Luxembourg and Barbara of Cilli took place in Krapina.⁶⁷

There was a large increase of construction activity in Hrvatsko zagorje in time of counts of Cilli reign, except for the ecclesiastical buildings, as well as fortifications, as shown i.e. by the entrance tower of the Old Town Varaždin. The counts of Cilli, who followed all the contemporary architectural trends in their Slovenian cities, undertook improvements in accordance to the spirit of the new time. Perhaps the arrival of Czech artisans was also an incentive for upgrades on existing fortifications. Hence, it is possible that the counts of Cilli in 1399, among the cities granted them by king Sigismund, gained Veliki Tabor where an older wooden construction may have already existed. By the arrival of the Czechs, the pentagonal turret may have been erected. Its quality construction and also its architecturally well-equipped interior testify that it was constructed by experienced builders. Such artisans could have been hired by no one less than a prominent noble family such as the counts of Cilli.

Counts of Cilli held Hrvatsko zagorje until the death of their last member, Ulrik II. He was killed in 1456 by Ladislaus Hunjadi, brother of future king Matthias Corvinus (1443-1490). The Zagorje estates that belonged to the counts of Cilli are subsequently taken over by Jan Vitovec, who was Cilli's military general. These estates were later inherited by Jan Vitovec's sons, to be later confiscated by king Matthias Corvinus himself for disloyalty to the crown,⁶⁸ because during the Hungarian-German conflicts they formed an alliance with the German Emperor Friedrich III. During archaeological research in 2009 in Veliki Tabor, a furnace stone was discovered with a figure of the German Emperor Friedrich III (1415-1493).⁶⁹ By a linkage to the concurrent historical events, this can well serve as an evidence of Vitovec's ownership of Veliki Tabor. Maybe he even put Friedrich's figure on a tile stove in his home just to confirm his alliance to the then emperor of Germany.⁷⁰ D. Čikara and A. Čurić believe that the construction of the wall ring with four semicircular turrets was undertaken in a period of reign of king Matthias Corvinus,⁷¹ and this was also the time when the central pentagonal tower may have been transformed gradually into a residential object, whilst slowly weakening its defensive function. The property was inherited by king's son and later ban, John Corvinus in 1490. Finally, the estates were granted by him to Pavao Rattkay and his brothers, which is also documented in the earlier mentioned grant certificate.

Hence, by the grant certificate of 1502 Rattkay family gained both the property and the entire edifice, which was in decades to come remodeled in a Renaissance, and later Baroque fashion. Since architecturally Veliki Tabor definitely belongs to the formative trends of the XV century, it is hard to imagine that the noble family Rattkays would have built a castle in outdated shapes as their Slavonian residence a whole century later. It is much more likely that they were granted a finished edifice, which was remodeled in accordance to their needs.

Conclusion

This article focuses on trying to resolve the problem of dating Veliki Tabor. By starting up with the general memory whereby the counts of Cilli were seen as the undisputed owners of this fortification, and by an insight into the historical situation, and through analysis of the architecture the thrust of this article is in line with that general memory.

Our reflections were indisputedly influenced by the *Legend of Veronika of Desinić*, which is based on historical events, and as such should be given heavier weightiness. Although the historical records do not place these events directly to Veliki Tabor, they definitely claim that its surroundings were Veronika's homeland. An additional confirmation to that theory is found in wall paintings of the chapel of St John in Ivanić Miljanski, which was commissioned by Fridrik II of Cilli, as a token of gratitude for the legalisation of his illegitimate son John whom he had with Veronika. Besides the scenes that were pictured in it, another interesting thing is its location. It is located close to Veliki Tabor, with which it visually communicates. Since in Middle Ages locations of both sacral and secular buildings were thoroughly picked out, one cannot consider the location of this chapel a mere coincidence. It testifies that already in the middle of the XV century there was an edifice at the present position of Veliki Tabor that was in a direct visual connection with the chapel atop the neighboring hill.

Since the counts of Cilli were great art and architecture patrons, and gathered a workshop of the finest artists, they impose themselves as the builders of Veliki Tabor. An additional confirmation is the presence of Czech artisans, a number of which worked for Cilli family, so it is no surprise that they may have taken part in the construction of this fortification. By analysis of the architecture it is clear that this edifice belongs to a type of defensive-residential towers such as were built during XIV and XV century, and by analysis of architectural equipment it is also clear that the construction was led by a quality workshop.

-
- ¹ The grounds to all this research is a grant certificate by John Corvinus in 1502 by which he grants (the property of) Veliki Tabor to the family Rattkay.
- ² The data was gathered by interviewing tourists in Veliki Tabor in the period between December 1st 2011 to May 5th 2012
- ³ This information can be found i.e. in the “Ilustrirana povijest Hrvata” (*Illustrated history of Croats*), where it is stated that Sigismund of Luxembourg grants the city of Varaždin with all the rights and privileges to the count of Cilli Hermann II, and also Vinica and Veliki Tabor in Zagorje some time later. (Marijan SINKOVIĆ (ed.), *Ilustrirana povijest Hrvata*, Stvarnost, Zagreb, 1990, 84.)
- ⁴ Nada KLAJČIĆ, *Zadnji knezi Celjski v deželah Sv. Krone*, Celjski zbornik, Tiskarna Slovenija, Ljubljana, 1982, 104.
- ⁵ L. MARJANOVIĆ, *Veliki Tabor i Sv. Vid pod Vrbovcem*, Vienac, no. 16, 1890, 254.
- ⁶ Andrej ŽMEGAČ, *Veliki Tabor – razvoj i značenje*, master's thesis, Filozofski fakultet, Zagreb, 1991, 2.
- ⁷ Andrej ŽMEGAČ, (note 6), 3.
- ⁸ Andrej ŽMEGAČ, (note 6), 3.
- ⁹ Andrej ŽMEGAČ, (note 6), 3.
- ¹⁰ Andrej ŽMEGAČ, (note 6), 4.
- ¹¹ The study of origination of Veliki Tabor on the grounds of archival sources is still very difficult, because of the unclear assignment between the nomenclature of Mali Tabor and Veliki Tabor. Namely, in the documents from the very end of the XV and the beginning of the XVI century, both forts appear under the name of *Tabor*. This issue has yet to be solved. See: Damir KARBIĆ, *Povijesni podaci o burgu Vrbovcu (1267.-1524.)*, Tatjana TKALČEC, *Burg Vrbovec u Klenovcu Humskome*, Zagreb, 2010, 203-222.
- ¹² Andrej ŽMEGAČ, (note 6), 6.
- ¹³ Andrej ŽMEGAČ, (note 6), 26-33.
- ¹⁴ Krasanka MAJER, Edita ŠURINA, *Veliki Tabor*, in: Goranka HORJAN (ed.), *Veliki Tabor u svjetlu otkrića*, Muzeji Hrvatskog zagorja, Dvor Veliki Tabor, Desinić, Hrvatski restauratorski zavod, 2007, 11-22.
- ¹⁵ Duško ČIKARA, Anka ĆURIĆ, *O prvotnom izgledu i dataciji velikotaborske utvrde*, *Peristil* 54/2011, Zagreb, 2011, 69-70.
- ¹⁶ The legend says that Hermann's son Fridrik, once riding across his father's estates near Veliki Tabor, met a young goldhaired beauty named Veronika. Veronika and Fridrik fell deeply in love, but this love was not favored by the old count Hermann. He was against it furthermore because Fridrik was already married, and to none other than Elizabeth Frankopan. Since he no longer lived with his legitimate wife, his father and the Frankopans tried together to reunite them, so they arranged a meeting of the spouses in the city of Krapina. Eventhough the relationship between Elizabeth and Fridrik was seemingly mended, the Frankopan woman was found dead in her bed the next morning, with a knife stuck in her belly. Although there were rumors that Fridrik himself killed her, and was publicly accused by Elizabeth's cousin John Frankopan, the guilt has never been proven. Following these events, Fridrik and Veronika fled to the city of Fridrichstein near Kočevje, in Slovenia, where they secretly married. But, count Hermann soon found out about the wedding and sent an army with a warrant for the lovers' arrest. Fridrik managed to save Veronika by getting her out of the city, so she hid for a while in the surroundings of Ptuj. However, he himself had not managed to escape his father's army, and the soldiers brought him as a captive to Veliki Tabor. Count Hermann was so mad that he would not even look at his son, but he ordered the soldiers to take him to the city of Celje and lock him up in a tower there, later named “Fridrik's tower” (*slo. Fridrikov stolp*). Promptly after imprisoning Fridrik, they bricked up all the openings on the tower, all but one, through which they gave him food. He spent over four years there, and when his father finally decided to release him, he was mentally broken. Unfortunately, Veronika had no better luck. Hermann's soldiers found her eventually and brought her to Veliki Tabor. Hermann decided to pour out his wrath on her, so he accused her of being a witch that put a spell on Fridrik. The trial was set up, that lasted for two whole days, and after discussion the judges decided that Veronika was not guilty. Count Hermann could not accept such a verdict, so, as soon as the judges were on their way out, he gave an order to the castellan to kill Veronika. The servants put a large wooden pot of water in the middle of the castle, seized Veronika and drowned her. And in order to hide the evidence of this crime, they bricked up her body into a wall that connects the walls of the central tower to the castle's entrance. (See: Ivana ŠKILJAN, *Legenda o Veroniki Desiničkoj*, Muzeji Hrvatskog zagorja, Dvor Veliki Tabor, Desinić, 2007)
- ¹⁷ Vjekoslav KLAJČIĆ, *Povijest Hrvata*, Nakladni zavod MH, Zagreb, 1988, 256.
- ¹⁸ Nada KLAJČIĆ, (note 4), 25-27.
- ¹⁹ Damir KARBIĆ, (note 11), 211.
- ²⁰ Vjekoslav KLAJČIĆ, (note 17), 383.
- ²¹ Viktor KUČINIĆ, *Veronika Desinička u svjetlu historije*, Jugoslavenska štampa, Zagreb, 1939, 36.
- ²² Viktor KUČINIĆ, (note 21), 36.

- ²³ Since “The Celje chronicle” have been rewritten numerous times over centuries, there were some errors in the writing of the place of Veronika's origin, so today we have twenty versions of the name Desinić: *Teschnitz, Teschniz, Teschenitz, Deschnitz, Deschnice, Dešnice, Dešnic, Dešenic, Dessnitz, Desnicze, Desenicz, Desenič, Deseniš, Desniz, Desinić, Dessewitz, Dessingen, Gesnicz, Hatschen, Kotschee* (See: Viktor KUČINIĆ, note 21, 36-37).
- ²⁴ Ignac OROŽEN (ed.), *Celska kronika*, Celje, 1854, 53-54.
- ²⁵ Viktor KUČINIĆ, (note 21), 34.
- ²⁶ Viktor KUČINIĆ, (note 21), 63.
- ²⁷ Ivan SRŠA, *Kasnogotičke zidne slike u crkvi sv. Ivana u Ivaniću Miljanskom*, *Peristil* 52/2009, Zagreb, 2009, 138-139.
- ²⁸ Ivan SRŠA, *Imaju li zidne slike u crkvi sv. Ivana u Ivaniću Miljanskom i skriveno značenje?*, *Kaj*, XLII, Zagreb 1-2 (2009), 65
- ²⁹ Anđelko BADURINA (ed.), *Leksikon ikonografije, liturgike i simbolike zapadnog kršćanstva*, *Kršćanska sadašnjost*, Zagreb, 2006, 406.
- ³⁰ Fridrik II of Cilli was first imprisoned in Celje per his father's orders, and the second time was when he was returning from a pilgrimage in Rome, when he was imprisoned by the ruler of Ferrara, Niccolo d'Este III, probably in conspiracy with the Frankopans, to whom he was related by blood. (See: Ivan SRŠA, note 28, 70.)
- ³¹ Ivan SRŠA, (note 28), 81.
- ³² Ivan SRŠA, (note 28), 79.
- ³³ Ivan SRŠA, (note 28), 78.
- ³⁴ Ivan SRŠA, (note 28), 80-81.
- ³⁵ Ivan SRŠA, (note 28), 84-85.
- ³⁶ Allegedly, Fridrik of Cilli and his second wife Veronika had three children, born in time before they were married. See: Ivan SRŠA, (note 28), 75.
- ³⁷ Ivan SRŠA, (note 28), 75.
- ³⁸ Ivan SRŠA, (note 28), 87.
- ³⁹ Tea GUDEK, *Srednjovjekovne utvrde u istočnoj Slavoniji*, diploma thesis, *Filozofski fakultet*, Zagreb, 2011, 18-19.
- ⁴⁰ The research has discovered some wooden material that the analysis C 14 have dated to XIII/XIV century.
- ⁴¹ Different datings were given as time of construction of this part of Veliki Tabor complex, in the last few years, the most used dating was the XVI century. But, D. Čikara and A. Ćurić have recently given a very persuasively argued new dating by which they place the construction of this part to the period of king Matthias Corvinus. (see: Duško ČIKARA, Anka ĆURIC, note 15)
- ⁴² The third floor was built in 1537, according to the inscription on the eastern facade of the turret.
- ⁴³ Zorislav HORVAT, *Branič kule na burgovima kontinentalne Hrvatske od 13. do 15. stoljeća*, *Prostor* 15 (2007), 1 (33), 30.
- ⁴⁴ It is possible that because of the functions of Veliki Tabor in the first half of the XX century, the partitioning of some spaces was necessary. It is known that it served as a prison in World War I, between the wars it was a home to painter Oton Iveković, and during the World War II it served as an orphanage.
- ⁴⁵ The bifora is placed in an old window frame, outlines of which are still visible, and which was similar to the one that is found on the floor under it.
- ⁴⁶ Zorislav HORVAT, (note 43), 27.
- ⁴⁷ Zorislav HORVAT, *Zidine i braništa na utvrdama kontinentalne Hrvatske 12. – 15. stoljeća*, *Prostor* 4 (1996), No. 2 (12), 195.
- ⁴⁸ Zorislav HORVAT, (note 43), 28.
- ⁴⁹ Zorislav HORVAT, (note 43), 29.
- ⁵⁰ Although Čaklovec turret had a basement, the interesting fact is it was also vaulted by a wooden vault. (See: Zorislav HORVAT, note 43, 30.)
- ⁵¹ Zorislav HORVAT, (note 43), 30.
- ⁵² “Bohemian windows” are found on the eastern and northern side of the pentagonal tower, while on the southern side there are two simpler single-winged windows (before the erker and the bifora upgrade). The reason for this may lie in the fact that the southern side was more exposed to potential attacks, so the double-winged “Bohemian windows” seemed more appropriate for the safer courtyard side.
- ⁵³ Zorislav HORVAT, *Prozori na burgovima XIII. – XV. stoljeća u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj*, *Prostor* 5 (1997), No. 1 (13), 52.
- ⁵⁴ Zorislav HORVAT, *Gotička kula varaždinskog Staroga grada*, *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske* 6 -7, Zagreb, 1980-1981, 78.
- ⁵⁵ Zorislav HORVAT, (note 54), 78.
- ⁵⁶ Zorislav HORVAT, (note 54), 80.
- ⁵⁷ A detailed analysis of the stonemasonry markings from Veliki Tabor will be published in an exhibition about Gothic in the seigniory of Veliki Tabor, whose opening is planned for Fall 2012.

-
- ⁵⁸ See: Zdenko BALOG, Znaci klesara i druge klesarske oznake u gotičkoj Lepoglavi, Lepoglavski zbornik, Lepoglava, 1994, 99-117.
- ⁵⁹ See: Zorislav HORVAT, (note 54), 75-87.
- ⁶⁰ Zorislav HORVAT, Grijanje u srednjovjekovnim burgovima kontinentalne Hrvatske: kamini, dimnjaci i kaljeve peći, Prostor, Vol. 2 (1994), No. 3 – 4, 216.
- ⁶¹ Zorislav HORVAT, (note 60), 227.
- ⁶² Andre MOHOROVIČIĆ, Hrvatsko zagorje, in: Drago ZDUNIĆ (ed.), Hrvatsko zagorje i Međimurje, Laurana, Zagreb, 8.
- ⁶³ Andre MOHOROVIČIĆ, (note 62), 8.
- ⁶⁴ Mladen OBAD ŠĆITAROCI, Bojana BOJANIĆ OBAD ŠĆITAROCI, O Hrvatskom zagorju, in: Drago ZDUNIĆ (ed.), Hrvatsko zagorje i Međimurje, Laurana, Zagreb, 117.
- ⁶⁵ Mirko MARKOVIĆ, Hrvatsko zagorje – stanovništvo i naselja, Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb, 2003, 31.
- ⁶⁶ Mirko MARKOVIĆ, (note 65), 32.
- ⁶⁷ Mirko MARKOVIĆ, (note 65), 33.
- ⁶⁸ Zorislav HORVAT, (note 54), 77.
- ⁶⁹ Ivana ŠKILJAN, Kasnogotički pećnjaci iz Velikog Tabora (seminar at the Postgraduate study of Archeology), Filozofski fakultet, Zagreb, 2010, 20-22. I would like to thank my colleague Ivana Škiljan for providing me valuable information.
- ⁷⁰ Mirko Marković brings also a datum that emperor Friedrich III appointed Jan Vitovec a title of *count of Zagorje*, although he never states his source. Despite that, this is also a fair testimony of the level of Vitovec's bond to then German emperor (See: Mirko MARKOVIĆ, note 65, 34.)
- ⁷¹ Duško ČIKARA, Anka ĆURIĆ, (note 15), 63-72.

Bibliography

- Andelko BADURINA (ed.), *Leksikon ikonografije, liturgike i simbolike zapadnog kršćanstva*, Kršćanska sadašnjost, Zagreb, 2006.
- Zdenko BALOG, "Znaci klesara i druge klesarske oznake u gotičkoj Lepoglavi," *Lepoglavski zbornik*, Lepoglava, 1994, 99-117.
- Duško ČIKARA, Anka ĆURIĆ, "O prvotnom izgledu i dataciji velikotaborske utvrde," *Peristil* 54/2011, Zagreb, 2011, 63 – 72.
- Tea GUDEK, *Srednjovjekovne utvrde u istočnoj Slavoniji* (diploma thesis), Filozofski fakultet, Zagreb, 2011.
- Goranka HORJAN (ed.), *Veliki Tabor u svjetlu otkrića*, Muzeji Hrvatskog zagorja, Dvor Veliki Tabor, Desinić, Hrvatski restauratorski zavod, 2007.
- Zorislav HORVAT, "Gotička kula varaždinskog Staroga grada," in: *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske 6-7*, Zagreb, 1980-1981, 75-82.
- Zorislav HORVAT, "Grijanje u srednjovjekovnim burgovima kontinentalne Hrvatske: kamini, dimnjaci i kaljeve peći," *Prostor*, Vol. 2 (1994), No. 3 – 4, 215–240.
- Zorislav HORVAT, "Zidine i braništa na utverdama kontinentalne Hrvatske 12. – 15. stoljeća," *Prostor*, Vol. 4 (1996), No. 2 (12), 175–200.
- Zorislav HORVAT, "Prozori na burgovima XIII. – XV. stoljeća u kontinentalnoj Hrvatskoj," *Prostor*, Vol. 5 (1997), No. 1 (13), 43–60.
- Zorislav HORVAT, "Branič kule na burgovima kontinentalne Hrvatske od 13. do 15. stoljeća," *Prostor* 15 (2007), 1 (33), 26–41.
- Nada KLAJČIĆ, "Zadnji knezi Celjski v deželah sv. Krone," *Celjski zbornik*, Tiskarna Slovenija, Ljubljana, 1982.
- Vjekoslav KLAJČIĆ, *Povijest Hrvata*, Nakladni zavod MH, Zagreb, 1988.
- Viktor KUČINIĆ, *Veronika Desinićka u svjetlu historije*, Jugoslavenska štampa, Zagreb, 1939.
- Luka MARJANOVIĆ, "Veliki Tabor i Sv. Vid pod Vrbovcem," *Vienac*, br. 16, 1890, 254-255.
- Mirko MARKOVIĆ, *Hrvatsko zagorje - stanovništvo i naselja*, Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb, 2003.
- Ignac OROŽEN (ed.), *Celska kronika*, Celje, 1854.
- Marijan SINKOVIĆ (ed.), *Ilustrirana povijest Hrvata*, Stvarnost, Zagreb, 1990.
- Ivan SRŠA, "Imaju li zidne slike u crkvi sv. Ivana u Ivaniću Miljanskom i skriveno značenje?," *Kaj*, XLII, Zagreb, 2009, 61–90.

- Ivan SRŠA, "Kasnogotičke zidne slike u crkvi sv. Ivana u Ivaniću Miljanskom," *Peristil* 52/2009, Zagreb, 2009, 125–142.
- Gjuro SZABO, *Sredovječni gradovi u Hrvatskoj i Slavoniji*, Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga, Zagreb, 2006.
- Ivana ŠKILJAN, *Legenda o Veroniki Desiničkoj*, Muzeji Hrvatskog zagorja, Dvor Veliki Tabor, Desinić, 2007.
- Ivana ŠKILJAN, *Kasnogotički pećnjaci iz Velikog Tabora* (seminar at the Postgraduate study of Archeology), Filozofski fakultet, Zagreb, 2010.
- Tatjana TKALČEC, *Burg Vrbovec u Klenovcu Humskome*, Muzeji Hrvatskog zagorja, Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb, 2010.
- Drago ZDUNIĆ (ed.), *Hrvatsko zagorje i Međimurje*, Laurana, Zagreb, 1994.
- Andrej ŽMEGAČ, *Veliki Tabor – razvoj i značenje*, master's thesis, Filozofski fakultet, Zagreb, 1991.

AN INTRODUCTION TO CULTURAL LANDSCAPE

DANKO DUJMOVIĆ

UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA, FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY

The interaction between man and surrounding nature produces the cultural landscape. The human activity creates numerous contents in the landscape on both physical and symbolical levels. The article gives an overview of scientific, historic and methodological approaches to the theme of cultural landscape and its aesthetics.

Cultural landscape, landscape aesthetics, cultural identity

The inevitable human connection with nature is an undeniable fact. It dates back to the biblical descriptions of the creation of the world when the newly created man, starting from the very beginning of his existence, lived in the Garden of Eden, surrounded by plants, animals and water, and continues further on to the present discussions about environmental issues, human oneness with nature that surrounds him and his indivisibility from it which is considered completely sacrosanct. Throughout history, nature was experienced in two aspects: on one hand, it was perceived as wilderness that cannot be controlled, one which arouses awe and suspicion, as well as a mystical space which is a source of various threats and dangers. On the other hand, nature was viewed as a perfect example of order and perfect form, God's work of art¹.

Despite Man's smallness before nature, whether it is conceived as an unpredictable and frightening force, or as an expression of God's creativity and perfection, man used to accept it primarily as a challenge and consequently adapted it to his needs using the acquired experience and skills. In the space which stands as a witness of time since its inception, man started to organize his habitat and continued to develop it until today. In this process, he used both space and time as excellent teachers which instilled logic and rules of conduct into his mind. He picked landscapes

and regions (areas) from the surrounding nature that, in his opinion, could provide security and comfort and consequently converted his environment into a landscape.

Region and landscape

A landscape is an area which the eye sees when observing the nature of a region (Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik)

An expanse of scenery that can be seen in a single view (Wordnet)

A portion of land or territory which the eye can comprehend in a single view, including all the objects it contains (Webster)

Based on these few common definitions of landscape, it is evident that the concept of landscape is explained as a section of land perceived by the observer. It is usually considered that landscape includes the observer, someone who captures an area with his eye i.e. the region in front of him exploring it by looking at it and experiencing its appearance. In this process, the emphasis is placed on the appearance, the visual manifestation, which is dependent on physical and material aspects of a certain space. Therefore, watching is considered as an activity which represents an integral part of the landscape's definition.

However, landscape includes far more activities than merely watching. By watching, the observer simultaneously reads and recognizes various shapes, explains and interprets them by linking them with his previous experience, his taste, feelings of comfort or discomfort. Moreover, while watching the region in front of him, the observer stays in it, moves and is spontaneously looking for a place, the most pleasant point of view, from which his eye picks out the most attractive segment of the respective region.

This process converts the observer into an active participant who is actually shaping the landscape. In fact, in his book *Landscape and Western Art*, Malcolm Andrews offered a hypothesis that the landscape does not exist without the observer i.e. that the observer SHAPES certain LAND into LAND-scape². However, this hypothesis was formed in connection with the development of artistic presentation of landscapes in which the observer - an artist in actual (real) landscape is looking for a place, chooses it, determines the scene, creates a framework and composition within it and in that manner shapes the work of art. However, we can actually apply the landscape that was created as a work of art to any subjective event in the eye and mind of the observer that he experiences when encountering scene in a certain region.

Landscape is a concrete, physical space with its own characteristics and visual aspects, but on the other hand, it is undoubtedly a subjective experience of the observer who is influenced by his own way of watching i.e. his cultural background. One and the same natural landscape which is perceived as the sum of physical characteristics and visual forms can simultaneously be attractive or repulsive to different observers depending on their cultural values, attitudes, expectations, ideologies, preferences, etc. In addition, the attitude of one and the same observer towards a particular landscape may depend on various aspects –he may watch from economic, political, military-strategic, aesthetic, psychological, recreational or other perspective. Specifically, evaluation criteria and the perception of landscape is not always unambiguous, but rather subordinate to specific needs or attitude of the observer.

The observer of landscape is not only an external, independent element that only observes, but an active participant, a passer-by, user or resident of a particular region. Landscape is mostly considered as an inhabited area in which people use natural resources, adapt them to their needs and shape i.e. change them physically. Having observed it, it was then that they chose a perfect place to live, started to use land as a source of food, building material, organized communication etc. within the space they had chosen. Thanks to this direct intervention, they introduce and generate new contents in the landscape, turning it into a cultivated area, thus forming a cultural landscape by injecting the newly created elements into the natural landscape³. This applies not only to physical and material interventions such as deforestation, draining of wetlands, agriculture, construction of houses, settlements, roads, division of territory and delimitation, but also to spiritual and nonmaterial contents that people bring into a region - names and items (toponyms and hydronyms), cult and religious beliefs and practices, collective memory, stories and legends associated with certain places. Such dynamic interaction between man and nature in a region gives a higher i.e. symbolic and spiritual meaning to the landscape than the one referring to a simple habitat.

Cultural landscape is composed of information stored in a space in a symbolic form, such as archives in the environment⁴. It can be described as a collective human experience, customs, beliefs and knowledge accumulated and deposited in it. W. J. T. Mitchell defined cultural landscape as a medium that communicates and expresses cultural meanings and values⁵.

Whatever occurs in landscape as a result of human intervention can almost never completely disappear; in principle, at least some clues remain. They can be hidden under the surface of earth or may seem unrecognizable at first glance, may have nonmaterial form, or can exist only as a record on paper, but nonetheless, they testify about the way of living and human activity in a certain area. Therefore, cultural landscape is the largest and most abundant monument of heritage and an inexhaustible source of new information.

Cultural landscape in science

Carl Sauer, a geographer and professor at the American Berkeley University, was the first to define cultural landscape in his work *The Morphology of Landscape* from 1925⁶. According to him, the aim of geography is to describe and study the landscape which he defined as an area consisting of different but interconnected natural and cultural forms - geography is based on the unity of natural and cultural elements of landscape, whereby the content of landscape includes physical qualities of an area which are important to man in terms of use; cultural elements refer to every human action in nature, i.e. the introduction of something new into the landscape. Sauer contrasts between natural and cultural landscapes – the natural meaning the original, untouched landscape which is not influenced by humans, and cultural as the one which is modified and adapted to humans. Cultural landscape is changing as a result of cultural development and alterations of different cultures, whereby the distinction and understanding of landscape forms is crucial to understand the importance of landscape and character of human activity. For Sauer, it is important that geography deals only with traces of human activity in the landscape, not beliefs, customs, etc. So, geographers find it interesting to examine and describe different types of population, population density, migration and the process of populating the settlements, types of settlement, manner of land use. Sauer's cultural landscape is defined as the end result of the interaction between nature (media) and culture (means).

In terms of methodology, Sauer was exclusively focused on the material manifestations of landscape, on a set of external, tangible and measurable facts and things that he observed and described.

The next key figure in the development of ideas on the study of cultural landscape is the British historian W.G. Hoskins⁷.

His major work *"The Making of the English Landscape"* was published in 1954. In his opinion, landscape falls into the historic area of interest and not in geographic one, whereby he interprets it as an area that is constantly changing due to continuous use and settlement over time, which consequently resulted in the creation of landscape layers. Based on landscape study, he reconstructed the rules and principles of human behavior within the landscape. Hoskins laid the foundation of studying the history of landscape i.e. the notion of landscape as a historical source that should be read not just by watching and observing, but also by digging (excavating). Hoskins was also a neutral observer of landscape, but unlike Sauer, he did not stick only to the description of what has been seen, but rather interpreted the landscape and reconstructed its development under the influence of human activity.

The point common to both of them is that their primary area of interest was the agricultural and non-industrialized landscape i.e. rural areas that remained unaffected by changes caused by sudden social and technological developments in the 20th century. Contemporary interventions in the landscape remained outside of their area of interest.

Breaking point in the study of landscape is characterized by J.B. Jackson, American editor and essayist who initiated the publication of the journal *Landscape* in 1951, in which he published his observations and results of landscape study⁸. In contrast to the neutral position of the first two, Jackson approaches the landscape from the perspective of users and active participants reliving it. His area of interest includes contemporary landscape and the surroundings of everyday, ordinary life. He describes and examines the changes that modern way of life brings into the landscape like highways, American suburbia and industry. In his texts, he used to call such landscape everyday (*vernacular*).

In contrast to Sauer and Hoskins, Jackson interprets landscape as a space containing embedded and nonmaterial contents such as myths, memories and spiritual elements, along with forms and physical manifestations of landscape.

This shift from a descriptive approach to the material, measurable and evident space as well as to the study of symbolic meaning of landscape, including both the imaginative and non-material content within it marks a major change in the approach to the landscape which occurred in the second half of the 20th century.

Furthermore, Jackson pays attention to the aesthetic acceptability of landscape: he says that *will have to see that an inhabited landscape is neither beautiful nor sound unless it makes possible an unfolding of the individual in work and social relationships just as much as in health and recreation*⁹.

This aesthetic value of landscape is beginning to gain more importance in considering the issues related to cultural landscape and the study of man's relationship to his environment.

The aesthetics of landscape from a scientific point of view

Landscape aesthetics was scientifically studied in the second half of the 20th century. However, the awareness of the impact the landscape appearance had on the observer existed in earlier times as well. At the turn of the 18th in the 19th century, Alexander von Humboldt, for example, examined whether the experience of landscape beauty depended on the order and composition of certain natural elements in the scene selected and defined by the observer, or whether there was an absolute beauty captured by the eye regardless of the place of observation. In his later works, he was more intrigued by the role of the mind in experiencing the beauty; in fact, he

recognized that the experience of landscape depends on the feeling and mood of the observer and that sensory perception of landscape causes and evokes certain feelings, whereby the pleasure created in this process derives from the imagination¹⁰. Humboldt also noted that written descriptions and depicted scenes of landscape can shape and condition the experience of real landscape, and that they can create expectations and imprint certain emotions that affect the perception of beautiful landscape¹¹.

Although Sauer argued that beauty falls under the issue of subjectivity and that it cannot be part of his scientific approach, some individual researchers emerged who believed that the phenomenon of attraction or aesthetic value of landscape should be subject to study.

Already in Sauer's time, British geographer Younghusband was of the opinion that since geographers were dealing with external aspects of earth and beauty was part of this aspect, it should be included in study and not ignored, whereby he emphasized that the qualities making a place beautiful should not be identified with the subjective experience of beauty, or emotions evoked in the observer by certain landscape. He even proposed a methodology for determining the beautiful i.e. he proposed a comparison of elements that determine the beauty of an area thanks to their characteristics. In his study he included both natural and cultural landscapes¹².

The 1960s in the United States were characterized by an increasingly strong emphasis which was placed on the issue of relationship to the environment¹³. As part of the environmental debate and studies on man's interaction with nature, the question of aesthetics of human environment emerged. In the work *Visual Blight in America*, American geographer Peirce F. Lewis was focused on that particular aspect, but he laid the hypothesis vice versa - he started from the recognition and determination of ugliness in landscape in order to better understand the beauty and thereby enable the planning of aesthetically satisfying and healthy environment¹⁴.

This approach of attitude towards the environment influenced the adoption of a series of laws in the U.S. during the 1960's and 70's which regulated the exploitation and management over landscape in order to create safe, healthy productive and aesthetically and culturally pleasant environment¹⁵.

Approach to the study of the aesthetics of landscape can be either objective or subjective¹⁶. In the objective approach, landscape is observed as an object, its forms and elements are analyzed, whereby attention is not paid to their meaning but rather to the effect provoked on the observer. Emphasis is placed on the relationship between visual appearance of the landscape and observer's perception in order to develop appropriate methods of management and landscaping. The purpose of this approach would be to discover general principles that form the experience of an aesthetically acceptable and pleasant environment, or that affect the observer's perception of the beautiful. The

study doesn't analyze the subjective attitude of the observer towards the landscape, nor does it test his emotions or attitudes; instead, the study (research) is focused on the established fact to examine whether the observer interpreted certain manifestations in the landscape as pleasant or not, without examining the reasons behind it. Thanks to such an approach, the relationship between the observer and landscape is perceived as a one-way interaction in which the observer is considered as a passive spectator.

Over time, various researchers who studied this topic offered methods in order to measure aesthetic qualities as well as their experience and evaluation. Linton for example offered a scale with numerical values of imagery by different categories, from lowland to mountain landscapes or inhabited landscape to wildlife; Ulrich compared projected landscapes with various elements and element relationships only to collect observer's impressions which he transformed into numerical values and gained information about dominant preferences in the perception of landscape; Penning-Rowsell tried to use different methods to determine which were the preferences of the public in their perception of beautiful landscape.

Subjective approach tends to explore the relationship between the manifestations of landscape and emotional reactions of the observer. Here, the emphasis is placed on the inner experience of the observer, not so much on the action of watching, thereby analyzing all factors which influence and form the experience, such as social, cultural, historical and personal values of the observer. The beauty of landscape is actually considered to be a result of a number of factors and it is thought that it denotes a projection of the observer's own emotions, ideas, memories, attitudes, values, etc. which are conditioned through education or particular culture. Beauty of the landscape is viewed as a personal, subjective observer interaction with the environment.

The question of mutual relationship between people and landscape is gaining increasing significance based on Jackson's definition according to which inhabited landscape can't be either beautiful or healthy if it doesn't provide an opportunity for normal development of social relations or if the action of shaping and exploiting the landscape doesn't create the possibility of normal, comfortable and healthy life.

Porteus, for example, thought that the importance of studying the aesthetics of landscape will increase if it is proven that cities and highly urbanized areas cause anxiety, nervousness and stress in humans, while natural landscapes create a sense of calmness¹⁷.

Jay Appleton presented his hypothesis that the experience of landscape beauty is associated with the inherited conditioning which was acquired by the need to search for the safest habitat. In his opinion, the landscape which offers safe shelter and dominant view over an area provides a satisfactory outlook¹⁸.

In terms of methodology, subjective approach to studying landscape aesthetics relies heavily on art, artistic depictions and interpretations of landscape, irrespective of whether we speak of painting or literature. Written descriptions of landscape or selected scenes, motives and the compositions of painted landscapes can reveal a lot, not only about the relationship between an individual (the poet, travel writer or painter) and the thing he sees, but also about the spirit of time which is reflected in the expression and selected manner of presenting a particular landscape. Relationship to the beauty of landscape changed through history and time, depending on the fashion and the respective spirit of time.

Aesthetics of landscape through history

After antiquity, aesthetic value of landscape was recognized in the 15th century when life in the countryside or rural environment was idealized due to the expansion of cities and frequent occurrence of plague associated with poor hygiene conditions within the city walls. It was then that the attitude towards the country (land) changed, after which it was no longer seen solely as a source of income or economic resource, but was recognized for its aesthetic value¹⁹. Sudden interest in the countryside started to show, promoting the construction of country villas as a place for comfortable stay (not only as a place with economic function), seeking to achieve a stronger relationship with the natural environment, not just with the real space that stretches in front of the observer, but also the artificial or artistic depictions of landscape in paintings with pastoral and bucolic scenes. The place for constructing a country villa is carefully selected and positioned in relation to the landscape - thoughtful attention is paid to the view stretching out of the house in front of the observer, or the owner and his guests. In general, the villa is regularly placed on elevated position, a hill which provides a good view of the surroundings and thus giving the villa a dominant position in the environment in order to be visible from afar²⁰.

Porches, terraces, walkways and fenced gardens with flower beds and manicured greenery constituted an important part of country architecture because they offered a pleasant stay in the open and a direct and immediate link with the surrounding nature, a visual delight in the beauty of the whole region. This pleasure and delight was carefully created by orienting the architecture itself, directing the view, shaping the scene using window openings, porch columns, pergolas etc. In this way the surrounding area was divided into sections which could be easily captured with a glance and – thus shaped into a series of landscapes through different ways of framing or controlling the view²¹.

Perception shaping of the landscape beauty in Renaissance was influenced by literary works in the 14th and 15th century, under the impact of ancient poetry and greatly influenced by the letters

of Pliny the Younger with descriptions of his villas and country life in ancient times. The perception and experience of landscape beauty were also greatly influenced by landscape painting. Evolved as an independent theme and genre in the 15th century art, upon discovery of geometric and atmospheric perspective, the landscape kept intriguing artists as a challenge in nature depiction, attracting them as an infinite source of inspiration²².

Due to great geographic discoveries in the course of the 16th century, an awareness of large land masses with unknown cultures evolved, and with it also a desire to expand own territory and dominate the newly discovered ones. Consequently, geographic maps gained in significance. They provided not only an overview of the territory, but also served as a symbol of own domination over it, as an expression of political power through the display of conquered regions. Besides, a map provided a privileged aesthetic delight from bird's or even God's view. Cartography strongly evolved in the 17th century, especially in the Netherlands, where geographic map became not only an indispensable item in naval, research or military expeditions, but a decoration element found in interiors of family homes²³.

In addition, the popularity of artistic landscape painting grew strongly in the Netherlands throughout the 17th century. Scenes of domestic, Dutch landscape depicting country life with mills, windmills, bridges and other canal crossings, all with endless views, were prevalent at that time. As a matter of fact, that was the time when the Netherlands successfully won its political independence from the Spanish Habsburg monarchy, so the painted scenes of domestic natural landscape also served as means to develop and expand the feeling of national and cultural identity. The beauty and value of the landscape was recognized in the existing lowland areas, snatched from the sea by building dyke and canal systems²⁴.

Since the second half of the 17th century in France, the perception of beautiful landscape was predominantly dictated by the royal absolutism of King Louis XIV. Garden architecture elements created around the Court of Versailles, derived from the renaissance Italy, were evolving and stretching over and out of the walled garden bordered by a path overlooking the landscape, thus turning the whole area into a large landscaped garden with manicured tree alleys bordering straight alleys, with parterres of flowers, pools and fountains and designed views stretching into the infinity. Significant interventions into the landscape were achieved by leveling the terrain and landscaping the terraces, thus creating the domination thereof by geometrical shapes, symmetry, inserted and elaborately designed contrasts, scenic effects achieved by reflection of the landscape in water surfaces, play with perspectives, arrangements of architectural elements and sculptures etc.²⁵.

Besides this literal and physical shaping of the landscape, great influence in the defining landscape beauty of the 17th century France was exercised by painters Nicolas Poussin and Claude

Lorrain, as well as Italian painter Salvator Rosa²⁶. All three of them created artistic landscape paintings inspired by Italian regions, in their classicizing, pastoral scenes with manicured and regularly inhabited landscapes, composed of open spaces. These often included water surfaces with endless views and closed forms in the shape of three tops, hills or architectural elements. Moreover, these painted scenes shaped the specific standards and models of the time, so in his letter to Richard Bentley, Walpole wrote he had found a place looking exactly like the one on Sadeler's graphics and having a well under the treetops resembling the scene of the *Good Samaritan woman* on Poussin's painting²⁷.

In his work from 1708, *Cours de Peinture*, French painter Roger de Piles discusses landscape painting as a genre allowing a painter more opportunities than any other to be satisfied by selection of motifs it provides. Among numerous various types of landscapes he pays attention only to two – heroic and pastoral or rural ones, since they are, according to Piles, the principal ones and all others are derived from these two. He defines heroic landscapes as idealized depictions of pleasant and decorated spaces; they are not the real landscapes but the ideas of them depicted as they should look like. These compositions include architecture like ancient temples, pyramids, mausoleums or modern country villas, the best examples of which can be seen in the paintings of Poussin. Pastoral or rural landscapes, though, are defined by him as depictions of specific areas, natural terrains having no cultivated elements or architecture; these are the scenes from the nature as such²⁸.

Throughout the 18th century in England, a completely different attitude towards the landscape beauty was forming. Unnatural symmetry and regularity was discarded for the sake of appreciation of more natural, irregular, asymmetric forms created using the contrast of full and empty surfaces made of tree groups and bare lawns or water surfaces. These forms were achieved by meticulous planning, whereby natural landscape was fully appreciated, i.e. interventions into the given terrain configuration were reduced to minimum, whereas there were many interventions into the composition and arrangement of elements in a landscape to create a picturesque garden or park with, apparently, spontaneous (natural) look. Whenever possible, there were attempts to combine a manicured and landscaped park with untouched landscape by an unobtrusive, gradual transition from the cultivated to the natural. A concept of scenic or picturesque was introduced into the perception of beauty, and the relation with nature means a manicured garden resembling its natural surroundings, being integrated in it without clearly indicated boundaries²⁹.

In his essay *Pleasures of the Imagination*, at the beginning of the 18th century, Joseph Addison wrote: “*The beauties of the most stately garden or palace lie in a narrow compass, the imagination immediately runs them over, and requires something else to gratify her; but, in the*

wide fields of nature, the sight wanders up and down without confinement, and is fed with an infinite variety of images, without any certain stint or number."³⁰

Such park landscaping for the purpose spending a delightful time in it had a great impact on planning park surfaces both in private estates and parks throughout the 19th century³¹.

However, near the end of the 18th and throughout the first half of the 19th century, a feeling towards nature underwent some changes – although in urban surroundings the connection with it was solved by landscaping green surfaces under the influence of the English practice in park designing, the spirit of time gave rise to romantic longing for forlorn, insurmountable and untouched natural areas that enticed excitement and feeling of helplessness and insignificance in the face of cruel and fiercely breathtaking landscapes³². An important role here is played by imagination which, more than the landscape itself makes adventurers undertake long journeys and feel enthusiastic about scenes of exotic regions and wide panoramic views from some of the mountain tops. The untouched nature of a landscape or better yet, the exaltation caused by that scene becomes an ideal, a feeling that the scene of the landscape captivates and renders one speechless.

So, already in 1765 during his visit to Scotland, Thomas Gray writes to his friend: "*The mountains are ecstatic and ought to be visited in pilgrimage once a year. None but those monstrous creatures of God know how to join so much beauty with so much horror. A fig for your poets, painters, gardeners, and clergymen, that have not been among them; their imagination can be made up of nothing but bowling-greens, flowering shrubs, horse-ponds, fleet ditches, shell grottoes, and Chinese rails.*"³³

Towards the end of the 19th century, following the strong swing of industrialization that brought pollution, overpopulation, noise and crowd to the cities, spending time in the countryside was considered a haven of rest and the best possible way out of the busy urban everyday life. Technical progress, development and expansion of railway and ferry lines simplified travel and made it accessible to the growing middle classes, whereby tourism gained in significance with its destinations on the sea or big lake coasts growing in popularity³⁴. Aesthetic perception was now dominated by the scenes of high seas i.e. blue waters. Long coastal alleys enabled immediate delight in such views and postcards and photos depicting marinas and coastal panoramas contributed to the popularity of idyllic summer resorts.

In the context of industrialization and large scale expansion of cities i.e. urban population growth, it is noteworthy that an idea appeared in USA at the end of 19th century related to the quality education and health of children, especially boys, pointing out the significance of spending time in the countryside³⁵. More specifically, it was considered that city life with its requirements for

certain home discipline, strict social rules, hard school training etc., resulted in alienation from the nature, since that way of life required prolonged stay in closed and artificially shaped places, which in turn led to young men being subjected to such circumstances and directing their excess energy towards wrong interests, such as alcohol, violence or gambling. Therefore young Americans were sent over the summer holidays to the camps with various activities in the countryside organized for them to learn and gain specific set of skills. The relaxed atmosphere outside their classrooms and home parlors of that time, allowing for more relaxed rules of behavior than usual etiquette manners, helped these boys grow into mature persons through mutual interaction as well as interaction with the nature. This set the foundation for scout boy movement and the American tradition of summer camps, both still alive to this day³⁶.

It is interesting to note that for such purposes the landscape was perceived and evaluated from the educational-pedagogical perspective – a certain set of criteria and standards was formulated with regard to natural and cultural contents an area had to contain to have a camp located therein. Thereby the landscape aesthetics was not ignored either. Moreover, the area itself had to be beautiful and pleasant enough for one to want to stay there, which included or at least considered desirable, hilly areas with woods, a lake or a river and, if possible, some cultural content - historical sight, a location having specific memories related to some historical event, archaeological locality or similar. With some selected facts of that landscape, new contents like accommodation barracks and technical requirements of the camp were introduced there, such as various courts, training paths, stage or muster station etc. In such organized and designed cultural landscape children were enabled to spend time in the countryside learning to differentiate among various flora species, recognize dangers and acquire new habits. They were also enabled to learn how to light a campfire, use an ax, orient themselves in the space - all this through games and activities like rowing, swimming, mountaineering and sports³⁷.

Affirmative attitude towards landscape, i.e. esthetic and cultural evaluation of it generally persisted throughout 20th century, but in practice the value of landscape was subordinated to the economic principles and activities. This is exactly why the aesthetic issues and landscape protection aroused such scientific interest in the second half of the 20th century, together with environmental sustainability issues. Value and beauty criteria were related to the level of landscape preservation, its authenticity i.e. its specificity, and the areas looking untouched, natural, wild, not cultivated became the focus of interest. Although such conditions were artificially maintained most of the times, the beauty ideal to the people today is preserved nature with no modern interventions. The attention in case of monument protection was expanded from the object itself towards wider area thus creating an indivisible whole with that object³⁸.

However, with all efforts and desires to use natural resources and environment in a controlled, planned and aesthetically acceptable manner, the process of expansion of human activities has been more and more aggressive, thus damaging the landscape value. The importance of its appearance and values it represents has been neglected and subject to the irreversible changes. In this context it is necessary to investigate and evaluate historical, cultural and aesthetic quality of any landscape and reconstruct the course of its development by interpreting traces that are still preserved in any form. The results thereof would, at least symbolically, protect and preserve our awareness of the area in which we live and with which we identify ourselves.

Landscape as an exponent of cultural identity

A personal identity is a set of attributes, feelings and experiences defining that particular person. Identity means affiliation to the specific group, community, organization, religion, ethnicity etc.³⁹. An area or a landscape is an important segment affecting the forming of one's identity, i.e. feeling of belonging to the specific community. Landscape is a world familiar to those who inhabit it, live in the specific place and travel through it, thus connecting different points within it⁴⁰. Through the time, landscape has been dictating and imposing its logic and way of life to the man – its qualities and shapes determined his place of residence, its appearance - his nutrition and use of land, clothing and behavior. Landscape affected ways and means of communications, moving and travel. It also influenced social, cultural and political forming of societies that inhabited it. It had an impact on defining boundaries and dividing territories.

When we live in a landscape, it becomes a part of us and vice versa⁴¹. It is clearly obvious from everything above that landscape defines the forming of social community and each individual within it. It is evident, therefore, that external factors play an important role in whether any community will develop farming or cattle-breeding culture, whether it will live in wooden or stone houses, whether its settlements will be compact or scattered, which directions will the roads take, where will they cross with its squares, bridges and river crossings. All of this has an impact on the community's way of life and specific rhythm, thereby absolutely defining its attributes and the experience shaping its identity.

However, the elements of cultural landscape, like houses or roads, can be recognized even by someone not necessarily its member. He can experience it as unusual, specific, i.e. inherent to the certain area and community, but he'll probably recognize their function. However, there are contents at symbolical, i.e. nonmaterial level which a community brings to its landscape and assigns them the meaning not immediately visible to an outsider. They are independent of the landscape;

moreover, they may come into being regardless of it but are imprinted in it, i.e. they attach a certain meaning to it, in accordance with already existing beliefs.

There are known examples in various cultures where landscapes were regarded as local cosmology exponents; beliefs related to the world creation, life functioning, time lapse, seasonal rhythm change, views of life and death etc. were imprinted into the landscape. The arrangement of elements into the landscape is often made according to astrological or geometrical principles⁴². Here we can mention, for instance, the theories on Slavic pagan customs related to consecration and adoption of the landscape they used to inhabit with their gods, according to the special principles and rules, most often in triangular shapes⁴³. When moving in from east over the European continent the Slavs used to take with them their already formed spiritual beliefs and bring them to the newly occupied regions. Based on this, there have been attempts in the last decade to reconstruct the cultural landscape of Slavic pre-Christian period and, related to that, introduction of Christianity to former pagan cultural localities.

The political iconography of a landscape is also a form of spiritual content affecting the identity of a community. Good position i.e. good view provided a special value and quality that made certain point in landscape stand out among all others and turned it into concrete, specific location with a specific meaning. Selection of such place and positioning on it meant domination and starting point to further establish the feeling of belonging to a community and thereby the identity itself. For instance, positioning of a fortress in a landscape was used to emphasize both its power and the protection and security it offered. The fortress became a symbol of political power's (or ruler's) presence as well as presence of law and order, and its place was in most cases very carefully selected to make it visible and recognizable from afar, and at the same time allowing for good overview and own territory control. To the community members, its view, overlooking the surroundings, had a higher meaning than a mere view of that landscape; it represented a panorama over own territory. Thereby the view encompassed the whole landscape, whole width of the area that the eye can see, but the feeling of "ownership" ended on the boundaries of that territory.

Generally speaking, the issue of "ownership" within the landscape – possession, entitlement, ownership of land, organizations and territorial division are symbolic non-material contents not caused by landscape, although brought into it as a consequence of human activity and thus affecting its forming. Actually, the boundaries can be included in a landscape, but they don't divide it, since their components are the part of the landscape; not one single landscape component is a boundary in itself, but can become one or its sign as a part of human activity⁴⁴. These are, therefore, more or less imaginary lines imprinted in landscape, having concrete meaning for particular community at the symbolic level. Boundaries in landscape identify the scope of political power and jurisdiction, as

well as the scope of affiliation to the specific location or territory. It is the boundaries that determine certain area and turn the part of landscape into a territory. Elements determining and identifying the boundary are clearly visible and recognizable to the local community, since they are the form of defining and protection of own territory and thereby own identity.

The identity of a community, together with the sense of belonging to the specific territory, also takes part in building collective experience, i.e. common history often associated with certain locations in landscape. Thereby the landscape becomes a memory exponent, and the specific places get a special meaning, either as pilgrimage destinations or memorial locations. With formed customs or legends about specific events being retold by one generation to the next, the traces of collective memory can be found in toponymy as well – names and toponyms of some places, settlements or whole regions. They also form the symbolic contents brought to the landscape which has become a part of the community identity.

These are the exact foundations of patriotism – the feeling of personal attachment to the area connected with activities and experiences of one's ancestors. An area, i.e. landscape and history related to it thus become permanent ethnic ideals⁴⁵.

The landscape is represented as a permanent inscription and testimony of lives and activities of the past generations that inhabited it and left behind a part of them. It reveals lives and times of one's predecessors living in that landscape and shaping it⁴⁶. It is, therefore, clear that an individual and a community do not identify themselves with a mere piece of land, but with the content that can be found in the landscape. It is exactly the identity that enables reading and understanding of these contents.

Understanding landscape means disclosing a memory – whereby the memory is not invoking the inner image we keep, but being experientially preoccupied with the surroundings impregnated by past realities⁴⁷. An awareness of connection between community and an individual, and of significance of landscape as the source of identity and own past should certainly become one of the core values in planning further use of the land as an economy resource. It is a space we inhabit, live in and feel as our own, but we often disregard that our use of it is only temporary. Our moral obligation should be preserving aesthetic quality as well as historical and spiritual values that have shaped and built our cultural landscape in place and time⁴⁸.

From everything stated above, it is clear that landscape has a meaning higher and deeper than mere looking, belonging and owning; landscape is a material and physical connection to history, it is the concrete area we share with all those who used to live and work there before us. It is also a spiritual area filled with beliefs, desires and inspirations that shaped and gave birth to the

contents we experience and evaluate today (or should be doing so) as our cultural heritage, which in itself is one of the core proponent of ethnic identity and pride.

-
- ¹ M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, p. 54.
- ² M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, pp. 1-22.
- ³ C. O. Sauer, *The Morphology of Landscape*.
- ⁴ L. B. Rowntree, M. W. Conkey, *Symbolism and the Cultural Landscape*, p. 461.
- ⁵ W. J. T. Mitchell, *Landscape and Power*, p. 14.
- ⁶ J. Wylie, *Landscape*, p. 20.
- ⁷ J. Wylie, *Landscape*, p. 18.
- ⁸ J. Wylie, *Landscape*, p. 18.
- ⁹ C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, *Landscape and Aesthetics*, p. 45; J.B. Jackson, *To Pity the Plumage and Forget the Dying Bird*.
- ¹⁰ C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, *Landscape and Aesthetics*, p. 33.
- ¹¹ C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, *Landscape and Aesthetics*, p. 34.
- ¹² C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, *Landscape and Aesthetics*, p. 37.
- ¹³ C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, *Landscape and Aesthetics*, p. 38.
- ¹⁴ C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, *Landscape and Aesthetics*, p. 39.
- ¹⁵ C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, *Landscape and Aesthetics*, p. 39.
- ¹⁶ C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, *Landscape and Aesthetics*, p. 40.
- ¹⁷ C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, *Landscape and Aesthetics*, p. 45.
- ¹⁸ W. J. T. Mitchell, *Landscape and Power*, p.16; J. Appleton, *The Experience of Landscape*.
- ¹⁹ M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, p. 57.
- ²⁰ M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, p. 55.
- ²¹ M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, pp. 61-63.
- ²² M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, pp. 25-51.
- ²³ M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, pp. 79-85.
- ²⁴ M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, p. 87.
- ²⁵ *The Genius of the Place* (ed. J.D. Hunt, P. Willis), p. 7-8.
- ²⁶ *The Genius of the Place* (ed. J.D. Hunt, P. Willis), p. 15; M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, p. 131.
- ²⁷ *The Genius of the Place* (ed. J.D. Hunt, P. Willis), p. 17.
- ²⁸ *The Genius of the Place* (ed. J.D. Hunt, P. Willis), p. 113.
- ²⁹ *The Genius of the Place* (ed. J.D. Hunt, P. Willis), pp. 8-42; M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, p. 129.
- ³⁰ *The Genius of the Place* (ed. J.D. Hunt, P. Willis), p. 38.
- ³¹ *The Genius of the Place* (ed. J.D. Hunt, P. Willis), p. 39.
- ³² M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, pp. 129-149.
- ³³ *The Genius of the Place* (ed. J.D. Hunt, P. Willis), p. 34.
- ³⁴ E. Hobsbawm, *Doba kapitala: 1848-1875*.
- ³⁵ C.P. Fint, *The American Summer Youth Camp as a Cultural Landscape*, pp. 73-89.
- ³⁶ C.P. Fint, *The American Summer Youth Camp as a Cultural Landscape*, pp. 73-89.
- ³⁷ C.P. Fint, *The American Summer Youth Camp as a Cultural Landscape*, pp. 73-89.
- ³⁸ W.H. Tishler, *The landscape: an emerging historic preservation resource*, pp. 9-25.
- ³⁹ *Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*.
- ⁴⁰ T. Ingold, *The Temporality of the Landscape*, p.156.
- ⁴¹ T. Ingold, *The Temporality of the Landscape*, p.154.
- ⁴² L. Sahlqvist, *Territorial Behaviour and Communication in Ritual Landscape*, p. 80.
- ⁴³ Further reading on this theme in the works of Vitomir Belaj and Andrej Pleterski.
- ⁴⁴ T. Ingold, *The Temporality of Landscape*, p. 156.
- ⁴⁵ D. Lowenthal, *Past Time, Present Place: Landscape and Memory*, p. 13.
- ⁴⁶ T. Ingold, *The Temporality of Landscape*, p. 152.
- ⁴⁷ T. Ingold, *The Temporality of the Landscape*, pp. 152-153.

Bibliography

American Geographers, Vol. 70, No. 4 (Dec., 1980).

M. Andrews, *Landscape and Western Art*, Oxford University Press, 1999.

J. Appleton, *The Experience of Landscape*, Hull University Press, 1986.

C. P. Fint, "The American Summer Youth Camp as a Cultural Landscape," in: *Cultural Landscapes, balancing nature and heritage in preservation practice*, University of Minnesota Press, 2008.

E. Hobsbawm, *Doba kapitala: 1848-1875.*, Školska knjiga-Stvarnost, 1989.

Hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik, Zagreb, 2002.

T. Ingold, "The Temporality of the Landscape," in: *World Archaeology*, Vol. 25, No. 2, Conceptions of Time and Ancient Society (Oct., 1993).

J. B. Jackson, "To Pity the Plumage and Forget the Dying Bird," in: *Landscapes, selected writings of J.B. Jackson* (ed. E. H. Zube), The University of Massachusetts Press, 1970.

C. B. Kennedy, J. L. Sell, E. H. Zube, "Landscape and Aesthetics," in: *Environmental Review: ER*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (Autumn, 1988).

Landscape and Power, (ed. W. J. T. Mitchell), The University of Chicago Press, 2002.

D. Lowenthal, "Past Time, Present Place: Landscape and Memory," in: *Geographical Review*, Vol. 65, No. 1 (Jan., 1975).

L. B. Rowntree, M. W. Conkey, "Symbolism and the Cultural Landscape," in: *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, Vol. 70, No. 4 (Dec., 1980).

C. O. Sauer, "The Morphology of Landscape" (1925.) in: *Land and Life; a Selection from the Writings of Carl Ortwin Sauer*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1963.

L. Sahlqvist, "Territorial Behaviour and Communication in Ritual Landscape," in: *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, Vol. 83, No. 2 (2001).

The Genius of the Place (ed. J. D. Hunt, P. Willis), The MIT Press, 1997.

W. H. Tishler, "The Landscape: An Emerging Historic Preservation Resource," in: *Bulletin of the Association for Preservation Technology*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (1979).

J. Wylie, *Landscape*, Routledge, 2007.

Final thoughts

A BRIEF NOTE ON THE PRESENT AND FUTURE OF ART AND ITS HISTORY

VLADIMIR PETER GOSS

UNIVERSITY OF RIJEKA, FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY

The author raises the question of the current predicament of “the art history,” and the claims that the discipline is dead. This may even be partially true as the “art historians” have given up on the basic aspect of their discipline – study of visual art language and artistic form.

The Visual Art Studies – much better name than “Art History” which should be reserved for historical studies of total art – cannot die as long as there is the material that they should study, i.e., the visual art itself, and the art instinct will thrive as long as there are human beings. Once we start making and buying “human” beings by specification, there will be no human race, thus no humanities, and no art studies.

Art, Art Studies, Art History, Humanities, visual art language, art criticism

What is Art? Incorporation of Spirit in inert matter.

It makes the intangible tangible, available for scrutiny by our senses – of sight, hearing, touch, smell, taste, and the sense of motion and space. There is no art without form, i.e., the solid matter. There is no art without the act of creativity endowing the Matter with the Spirit.

We live in the eternal space. It can change but it never disappears. It represents natural ecology, the eternal natural heritage. As soon as the Spirit touches Nature, Nature changes into Culture. Nature and Culture together form Total Ecology.

The Spirit touches Nature as soon as the carrier of the Spirit appears within Nature, primarily, but not solely, in the form of the Human Being. Only when the Matter and Spirit, Nature and Culture, are joined, our space makes sense. Matter is to Spirit what Form is to Content, as Spirit

makes the Matter specific, endowed with sense, content, emotion – endowed with meaning (Goss 2008, 2008A; Goss and Gudek 2009; Danto 2003).

Does the Spirit reside only in its carriers, i.e. the humans, the animals, and the plants – the animate nature – all endowed with energy, the capacity to grow, and change – which in itself is a manifestation of the Spirit, or does it exist independently elsewhere in the eternal space? As the energy and the capacity to change, the Force, are not limited to the animate nature, I should say that the Spirit resides everywhere. Aren't the smaller particles of matter in fact particles of spirit? Those entities in nature better endowed with the "Force" are also better positioned to recognize the Spirit and make it available to those less so endowed. For our purposes this question does not seem particularly relevant as the bodies most endowed with the Spirit, the artists, are, like the rest of us also part of Nature, just underlining the fact that the Nature is endowed with Spirit. Just as in the above mentioned case of two ecologies, the "eternal space" makes sense when seen as a whole, matter and spirit, nature and culture.

In order to orient ourselves in the eternal space, the human beings have invented a co-eternal category of time. Our lives and our lives activities happen in our measurable time. We enter this world of impermanence through birth, and leave it returning to eternity by dying. While in the finite world we keep in touch with the eternal through acts of creativity – science, love, dreams, and in particular art, as the art, as we have said, makes the intangible available to our senses. Although the Spirit resides in us and we are finite, it is as eternal as the Matter as it is constantly regenerated, and it stays alive in the products of our creativity even when we are gone. It accumulates. Art is an activity of an especially gifted, sensitive, being which shapes the Spirit so that it can be experienced. This being is the artist of creating. But art is not only creating, it is also experiencing, so there are also artists of experiencing, this is us, art historians, art students, critics. They interpret the art for the general public (Goss, in press).

We are well-aware how those interpretations differ. Imagine experiencing a beautiful blue vase holding a sprightly light red rose, standing on a table underneath a pergola of vine leaves on a pleasantly warm, sunny, summer day. Our eyes relish the colors and the play of sun and shadow, enjoy the subtle motion of the petals, we listen to the humming of the birds and bees, feel the sun and the light breeze on our skin, inhale the smell of baked summer soil, and of a fish being grilled around the corner. With all our senses we feel the surrounding space as a symphony of beauty, security, pleasure, desire.

Imagine that same vase empty under a dark, rainy sky, with the cold wind getting under our skin, with the stench of wetness and dirty water, all within a space that works hard on freezing, suffocating, and chasing us away. Well, just imagine!

And if you do so, you will realize how wrong the concept of “art” history is in its standard designation of fine or visual or spatial arts, as there may be architecture, sculpture, painting..., but there is also One Art bringing together into one unique experience all the areas open to our senses. Thus when I write “Art” I mean exactly that total creative phenomenon, along with the experiencing thereof (Goss, in press).

If “Art” requires amendments so also does “History,” a word I allowed into the title just so I can take revenge on it. Needless to say, there are activities which explore historical dimensions of art phenomenon, but this is just one aspect of art studies. So sacrificing the entire discipline to history flies in the face of reality. A key aspect of art studies is the “*Critica d’arte*,” judging how successful a certain art phenomenon is, or was, in conveying the spirit. Erwin Panofsky was right in stating that Art History as a humanist discipline is a continuous line of endless reinterpretations the eventual goal being seeking wisdom – applicable to all humanist disciplines, as opposed to sciences seeking practical application. We can close the entire circle by reiterating that Studies of Art as well as other humanist disciplines study the revelations of Spirit. As opposed to Archeology with which it is often confused “Art History” studies spiritual culture, not material culture. The line is often fuzzy but Archeology in principle need not bother about spirit, whereas Art students need not be concerned with the matter. The blue vase and the red rose described above is the in-capsulation of love and pleasure, and to express love one can do it by writing a poem about one’s beloved, or by building a skyscraper! It is our task, as artists of experiencing, to explain how (Goss 2007, 2008B, 2012; Panofsky 1955).

How did Art come into being?

I am sure there are numerous and various models, but in essence they all boil down to the same – recognizing a pattern of special spiritual quality impressing itself upon the receiver’s own spirit, and then presenting it to the less sensitive public. On a sunny summer morning, the Artist – the seer, augur, medicine man – summoned his flock to a hill above the huts. He turned toward the neat pyramidal peak shimmering in the morning mist, and exclaimed. “See that Mountain!? This is where your Gods live. We will call it Olympus (or Pirin, Kailes...)” By pointing he created an image centered on the peak (today he would have taken a snapshot and made a record of the view, but the Pre-Historic eye acted exactly as a contemporary camera). By naming the peak he created the arts of hearing, literature, by clasping his hands, music, by hopping rhythmically, the arts motion – dance. Mother Nature added Her own: the wind rubbed the naked skin, brought in the smell of wild strawberries, which made the mouths water. All that created an experience of space along the axis – the standing point of the group – the peak, the enveloping foil including the light, the air, the warmth of the sun, the sound of the wind, the shuffling of the feet... (Goss, in press).

Such units of cultural landscape as the one just described would most likely have centered on the key elements of one's life and survival, such as the residence, eternal home, sources of food, and the perpetuation of the race. Long before the Roman augur, the prehistoric seer-artist did a comprehensive ecological analysis of air, water, soil by watching the birds fly, the winds change, the entrails of a slaughtered animal telling him of its health. Then he looked for the orienting spots in the landscape that would insure the sense of protection and security. If in all that his spirit made a successful contact with the Good Spirit of the Place, it would have been safe to settle. You can construct many stories of your own, but the basic pattern would not differ. By the time of the cave painting the Artist did not limit himself to pointing and naming, but he created his own images. By the same time he must have composed also his own poems, dances, and songs (Goss and Gudek 2009).

Many would exclaim: "This is not art!" Indeed phenomena as above are relegated to the world of the folklore, the primitives, the exotica. Art should have been something else. I would however claim that the performance by the medicine man was as much art as a work by Praxiteles, Titian, or Frank Lloyd Wright. What has happened?

Watching the medicine man, somebody soon realized that being with the Spirit (Force) entails certain prestige. So those who yearned for prestige and have the means (Power) to seek it subverted the art and the medicine man. They clothed the power they usurped into the shiny aureole of the Spirit, themselves claiming the seat of the Divine. The seer realized that some of the prestige would rub off also at him, bringing along a very tangible material rewards. The new elite of Power and Spirit kidnapped the art to use it as means of enhancing the position of the ruling class, be it in terms of political, be it in terms of commercial, intellectual, or any other power which could be wielded within a society. Art became a part of the propaganda department and, as a good civil servant, stuck to political correctness, expressing the views of those who had the power and resources to declare what is politically correct. In that nothing has changed from the earliest elites until today. As in this process the art also became precious, as it was made by costly specialists, involved great expense of time, and great monetary investment, it also became an important area of trade. The elite decided what the art was, the rest became folk, exotic, rural, naïve, non-western... you name it, and it was handed over to ethnology and cultural anthropology. Opposition and dissenting movements, if strong enough to afford art, acted in the same way. The Amarna period in Egypt had its own art orthodoxy which was duly swept aside when the old political orthodoxy returned to power.

If the artist of creating joined the elite, the artist of experiencing did not lag much behind. His role was to praise the works of art praising those who had commissioned them. Today we call

those interpretation specialists critics or art students and scholars. Since the early modern scions of the trade, such as Aretino, they have been among the most corrupt people in the world. As they were tied with the established elites it was necessary that they conform to the ways and means of those elites; it is no wonder that this group (“the art historians”) is still enlisted from the ranks of the elites, rich, spoiled kids, hungering for power, prestige, and money, ignorant or at best *fachidiot* blindly and jealously claiming the tiny turf in which they consider themselves universally omniscient. No wonder again that the “profession” has no professional standards, or, that those are defined as what a certain establishment at some point deems professional. Dissenting voice in scholarship, and so also of art, is not allowed – until and unless the trend, the fashion, the policy changes. Then the dissenting voice may become the establishment and silence all other dissenting voices. In the so-called scholarly circles this is masked by endless calls for debates, reviews, round tables, data bases, information exchange (disciplinary, interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary...) which are nothing but a smoke screen, and only seldom do settle anything. Or if somebody or something is too dangerous to the accepted truth, he/she/it is simply ignored (Goss, in press A).

This is in brief the present of “art history.”

Let me make it abundantly clear that I do not claim that a hopping seer is a greater artist than Picasso. They both have their place in the chain of events and objects capturing the Spirit in the inert matter, which is the task of the artists of experience to judge and define. There is no high and low, courtly and folk, urban and rural, western and non-western art. Just art and non-art based on whether the Spirit is captured and conveyed or not (Goss 2007, 2012).

All those and similar distinctions were imposed since the day some of the seers were invited to become servants to the elite, and the rest was turned over to psychologists, sociologists, and anthropologists. They hold still today, meaning that the majority of art manifestations is excluded from art. Our present day West European art studies suffer from monofocality, elitism, and national and religious exclusivism. Remember the howling of the “Humanists” when Josef Strzygowski dared to declare that there is art outside Western Europe, as well as unrecognized non-mainstream art within it.

Having said that let me assert that the art of today in its core is neither any different nor better or worse off than the art of any other period. There is “mainstream,” “thrash,” “kitsch,” “the vanguard,” “the reactionary,” there is figured and abstract, narrative and decorative, learned and popular art, bearing in mind that none of the designations means much and that what is “progressive” today may be “retrograde” tomorrow. Of course these designations serve the purpose of eliminating what the ruling elite sees as politically incorrect, i.e., not serving their purposes and/or grand commercial schemes of establishment’s art dealers. Thus the art allowed to be studied

and praised in any period has nothing to do with the actual art output of the time. Simply, the picture of any art period is skewed and incomplete. This is also true of the present day art predicament.

Not exactly a nice picture (Goss, in press B)?

Well, no, so some very good minds have declared the death and doom of art history i.e. studies of art (Belting 1987). In that they are both right and wrong. They are right, as the “art history” as it is practiced today is untenable (and useless). They are also wrong, as “art history” cannot disappear unless it loses the field of its enquiry, i.e., art. For art studies or for any branch of the humanities to disappear, the human race itself must disappear or change beyond recognition. When we will be buying “humans” at supermarkets according select specification (“one unit with four hands and no brain..., on sale three for the price of two”) there will be no more human race, human activity. and humanist studies. In the meantime, “art history” cannot die unless the art itself dies. However, it could be successfully argued that the “art history” is trying to commit a suicide, playing into the hands of those who are trying to kill both art history, humanistic disciplines, and any other humanist activity whatsoever.

Let us take a look at some evidence.

We live in a period dominated by politicians and bureaucrats who together with their hit men, the media, serve as a front for power and money grab by those with the biggest computer. They are absolutely right to see humanities as their main enemy. Human race is unpredictable and must disappear, i.e., be replaced by more predictable, classifiable and controllable subjects. That this is not just my paranoia, is testified by the following e-mail I received from my colleague, Marina Vicelja, on March 18, 2012.

“You may have heard that the cultural heritage has been omitted from the proposal for the European Commission competition for the Eight Framework Program (FP 8) for research and innovation (HORIZON 2020). The funds from earlier programs earmarked for the research in this area (archeology, art history, history...) have been withdrawn. The area of preservation and conservation of cultural heritage is particularly in danger.” (My comment: Of course, as it especially stands in the way of big development and real-estate projects). “The European colleagues and organizations have launched a petition to change this decision, and in support of the EU assuming the responsibility and reintroducing the financing of the research in the cultural heritage into the Framework Program.”

Throughout Europe “art history” departments are being closed, truncated, merged, renamed. They are allowed to teach only recent periods. They have become departments of *beni culturali*, as *beni* – “the goods” – as opposed to works of art are easy to classify, quantify, and to market. So in

my opinion that malaise among the “art historians” has real roots. The historians of visual arts have abrogated their primary task – the analysis of visual forms language – and thus, in fact, walked out on their discipline. A discipline without practitioners is no discipline at all (Goss 2007, 2008B, 2012).

The history of fine arts is a history of visual forms. The main task of a historian of fine arts is to master the visual language, and its inflections and dialects at various times and places. Should this make me a „formalist,“ I am ready to admit it. But immediately I would protest: the art form is not just any visual form, but a form with content, or, as it was lucidly put not long ago, embodied meaning. Such forms bear a special message, they communicate, and the way they communicate makes a significant part of an art historian's study of the visual forms language. In fact, there are instances when only the content or the concept turns an otherwise formally insignificant piece of communication into a work of art. Back to the beginning: we witness and explain the incorporation of spirit in inert matter (Goss 2007, 2008B, 2012; Danto 2003).

Without art as a physical, material phenomenon there is no content, no communication, no grasping of the Spirit. Thus without an expert familiarity with the forms and their language, the historian of fine arts is not a historian of fine arts. We must all master the language of the materials studied by our discipline, before we can handle anything else (Goss 2008B).

How did our discipline get into the mess it is in?

The answer is very simple: Because we do not have a discipline, at least not a serious professional one. Because, we, ourselves, would rather be anything else but students of art. We want to be “scientists;” something we aren’t and cannot be.

Last five decades or so have witnessed a marked switch from studying works of art toward studying their context as we have sought to widen the scope of art history. We have sought to break borderlines between disciplines becoming interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, multi-disciplinary, all of which is absolutely laudable, as long as it means expanding the understanding of what is crucial in any art study – reading, understanding and interpreting the artistic language. Since contexts could be construed by using, allegedly, “scientific evidence” such as written sources, the practitioner of an art context study could claim a higher scientific status than a student of art form. A written source, or a C-14, or dendrology test, could be a valuable supplement to a study of art, not its replacement. In dealing with art we encounter too many unknowns to be ever able to claim absolute exactitude. In fact, such a feat would rob the work of art of its endless richness, and its ability to speak to each new generation of public. Art is made by a human being, interpreted by a human being, experienced by a human being. Human beings are different. We need say no more (Goss 2007, 2008B, 2012)!

So we have lost art history by becoming too dependent on information outside art history, forgetting that our contribution is the reading of artistic forms, which is no less important than correct reading of historical documents, or correct reading and interpretation of texts of literary arts. The visual art historians must reach their conclusions as art historians first, and then check their results with the help of other disciplines. And, to quote Erwin Panofsky's words that one man's monument could be another man's document, we should offer our "monuments," as "documents," to other disciplines (Goss 2007, 2008B, 2012; Panofsky 1955).

Sensitivity to and understanding of visual form is becoming even more important in a New Europe without Borders, as we realize, for example, that the "Carpathian basin" involves today sections of nine European states, and that cultural landscapes cross over what we have until recently accepted as "national" borders. Art history, as a unique discipline studying the incorporation of the spirit in inert matter, is well-positioned to contribute to a spiritual renaissance of the New Europe. To do so it should strive to be first of all Art History, and not something else. We have seen above the reactions of the EU bureaucrats (Goss 2008C).

In the later days of my career I have been involved in various ways and degrees with several "European projects." I have been disgusted with them for several reasons, and here I will limit myself to the sphere of art. Or, rather, I would do so, if there had been any art there. It is unbelievable how participants in the projects try to avoid even mentioning the word "art." In a project that I was actually partly responsible for launching, a highly graded enterprise, based for evidence about 60% plus on art materials, I have fought unsuccessfully to have the word "art" introduced into project documents. Intelligent people, alleged scholars, simply do not trust art. Is art so dangerous to the Eurocrats and their servants that it has to suffer "*deletio memoriae*?"

Does it have to be killed?

For if you think that Art is dead, you are wrong. It is enough to read the remarkable book entitled *The Art Instinct* by Denis Dutton (2009) to be reminded how deeply the art is linked to the human race, its evolution, and its predicament. What Denis has done comes, in my opinion, close to what I am arguing when explaining how art is related to the materialization of the Spirit. This need for the spiritual experience Denis sees as related to an instinct to art itself related to evolution. And Denis' site has been one of the most popular sites on the Internet! So, again, is the Art dead (Dutton 2009)?

Many would argue that the art of today is out of touch with the "people." But it has been so ever since the art world had been kidnapped by the elite. Video and conceptual art are as legitimate as fine arts or literature, and vice versa. Of course as art has also become commodity, there is an urge to keep the market flooded by "novelties" in order to sell. Or that some previously anonymous

objects are declared art in order to sell. This is as fake as the real fakes. Some ten years ago I was present at a respectable American University Museum at an event I would call ludicrous, although I must admit it was also amusing. It was meeting a collector of “sexually explicit art” which just then became a rage on the market, and to enjoy his newest acquisitions. The guest of honor, duly masked, talked enthusiastically about his early morning dash from Chicago to New York to obtain his prize acquisition, a desperately poorly painted “realistic” scene of a young man standing in front of a possibly somewhat older woman, both somewhat naked, he holding his not too erect prick in his hand, indecisively aimed at the woman. The viewing was followed by a learned discussion between the owner and the present art experts, some with quite a reputation as scholars or museum specialists, on whether we witness a pre- or post-coitus, or whether the young man just masturbated or was masturbated by his partner. In that the scholars “sucked up to” the millionaire owner in such a patent way I would call it disgusting if it had not been just plainly stupid. Of course, such nonsense is bound to give art and art students bad press.

Art is as immortal as the Spirit, i.e., as the bearers of the Spirit, primarily the human race. We, the students of art are responsible for the well-being of the entire art heritage to which we add the care of the art of our own time. Our task is to discover, study, publish, preserve, and present the art heritage.

The last sentence brings to the fore the complexity of art studies as profession. It involves scholarly acumen, critical insight, teaching ability, but also technical knowledge about preservation, restoration, and presentation of works of art. If we persisted in following faithfully what was said in the last four sentences we would have basically healthy and socially responsible discipline/profession, something we could stand by, something no outside force could endanger. And to achieve this is not too difficult in principle. We must bring together the art, and those who really want to study it – professionally. Who are ready to admit that they are not scientists but scholars. Who are truly concerned about truth inasmuch as it can be established in their discipline, i. e., the truth about art studies spiritual significance as it brings us in touch with the Spirit making our lives richer and more meaningful. And who understand very well that saving one monument from destruction is worth a pile of studies! In fact, saying that we are the keepers of the world art heritage and of the Spirit is the same. This is an enormous social responsibility which we do not properly understand, and our enemies deny us. What we need to do is to start teaching our young colleagues what art and studying art really is, and what it entails, rather than training them to conduct petty warfare in order to satisfy their vanity.

Bibliography

Belting 1987

Belting, Hans, *The End of the Art History?*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Danto 2003

Danto, Arthur, *The Abuse of Beauty*, Chicago: Open Court, 2003.

Dutton 2009

Dutton, Denis, *The Art Instinct*, New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2009.

Goss 2007

Goss, Vladimir P., "Monuments of Art History as Historical Documents," *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju*, 24 (2007): 499-501.

Goss 2008

Goss, Vladimir P., "Two Saint Georges and the Earliest Slavic Cultural Landscape Between the Drava and the Sava Rivers," *Peristil* 51, 2008, 7-28.

Goss 2008

Goss, Vladimir P., "Landscape as History, Myth, and Art. An Art Historian's View," *Studia Ethnologica Croatica* 21, 2009, 133-166.

Goss 2008B

Goss, Vladimir P., "Monuments of Art as Historical Documents," in *Medioevo: arte e storia*, Parma, Electa, 2008, 458-461.

Goss 2008C

Goss, Vladimir P., "Art Heritage in a Europe without Borders," *Acta Historiae Artium*, 49, 2008, 242-246.

Goss 2012

Goss, Vladimir P., "Against Written Sources? A Brief Essay on How not to recover the Past," in R. Alcoy, D. Allios, M. A. Bilotta, L. Catalano, M. Gianandrea, V. Lucherini et G. Mallet, ed., *Le plaisir de l'art du Moyen Âge. Commande, production et réception de l'œuvre d'art. Mélanges en hommage à Xavier Barral i Altet*, Paris: Picard, 2012, pp. 917-924.

Goss, in press

Goss, Vladimir P., *An Introduction to Cultural Ecology*, Zagreb: Antibarbarus.

Goss, in press A

Goss, Vladimir P., "Art and Political Correctness," *Ikon* 5, 2012.

Goss, in press B

Goss, Vladimir P., "Pre-Romanesque Art of the Pagan Slavs? More on what Josef Strzygowski did not know," The Proceedings of the Conference Josef Strzygowski und die Kunstwissenschaften, 2013.

Goss and Gudek 2009

Goss, Vladimir P., and Gudek, Tea, "Some Very Old Sanctuaries and the Emergence of Zagreb's Cultural Landscape," *Peristil* 52, 2009, 7-26.

Panofsky 1955

Panofsky, Erwin, "The History of Art as a Humanistic Discipline," in: Erwin Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, Garden City: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1955, pp. 1-25.

-B-

VLASTA BEGOVIĆ is a scientific adviser at Croatia's Institute of Archaeology in Zagreb and she was a professor of Art History at the University of Rijeka. She is a member of the Scientific Counsel for Remote Sensing of the Croatian Academy of Art and Science. Graduated at the Zagreb University (Faculty of Architecture), where she got her M.Phil. degree completed in 1991 (fields: architecture and urbanism). She completed doctoral studies at the Zagreb University, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, in 1993 (fields: history and archaeology). In her native country she has worked on several projects to revitalize historic towns, fortresses and archaeological excavations. She has published many articles on ancient sites in Istria and Dalmatia, and recently co-authored a book about The Brioni Islands with Ivančica Schrunk.

(**contact:** vlasta.begovic@iarh.hr)

VITOMIR BELAJ (1937) graduated in ethnology and German studies (1961) at the University of Zagreb. He has worked as a curator in Varaždin and Ptuj (Slovenia). In 1966 he got a master's degree, and in 1979 he received his Ph.D. degree. Since 1970 until his retirement he taught at the Department of Ethnology at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb, where today he is a *Professor emeritus*. He is studying the custom beliefs, history of ethnology thoughts, ethnological theory and ethnological cartography. Since 1969 he has worked with the practices and interpretations of ancient Slavic religion. In his later works he focuses on the study of folk, especially Marian devotion, and on the reconstruction of fragments of early Slavic paganism in folk traditions. He wrote a series of studies on a variety of persons from Croatian history and culture and their contributions to Croatian ethnological science (Antun Radić, Josip Bedeković, Matija Antun Relković etc.). He also wrote several publications on the history of Croatian ethnology.

(**contact:** vito@belaj.com)

KLÁRA BENEŠOVSKÁ (1950) graduated Art history and Classical archaeology from Masaryk University (Brno) and Charles University (Praha). The post-graduate studies leading to M.Phil. degree completed in 1975 on Charles University with thesis: *French masters and architecture in Bohemia and Moravia in the first half of the fourteenth century*. She got her Ph.D. degree in 1990 with dissertation: *The patrons of the royal court of John of Luxembourg*. Specialization: medieval art, especially architecture and architectural sculpture. Professional activities: Monument protection of Central Bohemia (1975-1981), Institute of Art History in Prague, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, a member of the Department of Medieval Art (since 1989), member of the Advisory Board of the Institute (1997-2011),

scientific secretary of the Institute (1997-2001), Head of the Department of Medieval Art (since 2004). She has a lot of international experience highlighted here: member of Comité de rédaction of the Perspective, La revue de l'INHA (since 2006); participant of the project "Transferts et circulations artistiques dans l'Europe gothique" – INHA Paris (since 2010). She was author and curator of the exhibition "Royal Marriage. Elisabeth Přemysl and John of Luxembourg – 1310," Prague House by the bell, November 2010-February 2011 (price of ICOM for international contribution). Also, she was one of the editors and authors of the exhibition "Story of Prague Castle" in 2004 (price of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic for the scientific contribution) and one of the editors and authors of the exhibition "Ten centuries of architecture", Prague Castle, in 2001. (**contact:** benesovska@udu.cas.cz)

-C-

ARTURO CALZONA (1950) spent his entire academic carrier at the University in Parma, where he started as an assistant (1977), latter to become researcher (1982), assistant professor (1990) and professor of Medieval History of Art (2000). Beginning from 2009 he is also coordinator of "Dottorato di Ricerca in Storia dell'arte e dello spettacolo" at the University in Parma. In 1998, together with prof. A. Tenenti in Mantova he founded the *Fondazione Centro Studi Leon Battista Alberti*. His research activities and his publications deal with medieval and early renaissance art of North Italy. The medieval topics are covered in several published books (*La rotonda e il palatium di Matilde*, 1991; *Benedetto Antelami*, 2008; *Il cantiere medievale della cattedrale di Cremona*, 2009) as well as in numerous articles published in scientific journals and proceedings of international conferences. He also organized conferences and exhibitions, as for example in 1991 in Mantova where he edited the catalogue (*Wiligelmo e Matilde. L'officina Romanica*), and in 2008 in Reggio Emilia (*Matilde e il tesoro dei Canossa tra castelli, monasteri e città*). Considering the renaissance topics, from 2004 until 2007 he was a secretary of "Comitato Nazionale VI centenario della nascita dell'Alberti", and together with F. P. Fiore, A. Tenenti and C. Vasoli organized all the conferences and edited all connected acts of the Foundation Alberti. Among other he published the *Mantova città dell'Alberti: il San Sebastiano: tomba, tempio, cosmo; Il San Sebastiano di Leon Battista Alberti*.

(**contact:** arturo.calzona@unipr.it)

MAJA CEPETIĆ (1984), MA in Art History (University of Zagreb, 2008), MA in Museum studies (University of Zagreb, 2010), is a PhD student at Medieval studies Department, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zagreb. She is working as assistant and research fellow at the Art History Department, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka, and on the project "Romanesque Art between the Sava and the Drava Rivers and European Culture", led by Professor Vladimir P. Goss. Her researches centers on the works of art in the medieval Slavonia between the 11th and the 14th century, in a historical and cultural context.

(**contact:** maja.cepetic@gmail.com)

LAURA CHINELLATO (1968), graduated in art restoration (1991) at the Scuola di restauro di Botticino (Brescia), and in art conservation (2004) at the University of Udine under the leadership of Prof. Valentino Pace. She received there the highest honors for her experimental graduation thesis "L'altare di Ratchis" ("The Ratchis altar"), a historiographical and iconographical research where the analyses of materials led us to understand the polychromy that the Ratchis altar originally showed. This work has been partially published and won the first prize in the *Forum Iulii* competition (2005), promoting the culture of Cividale del Friuli (Udine). She specialized in didactics of history of art (2006) at the University Ca 'Foscari (Venice) and teaches in high schools. She collaborates with museums and conservators and has recently taken part in the design of the new setting of the Ratchis altar at the Museo Cristiano of Cividale del Friuli, with the projection of the original colors on the altar surface (2011).

(**contact:** laura.chinellato@libero.it)

VLADIMIR CRNKOVIĆ (1942) is a Croatian historian of art, art critique and theoretician, museologist and essayist, as well as director and host of the collection of the Croatian museum of Naïve Art. He is also the author of more than hundred of independent, monographic, retrospective, critical and joint exhibitions, then the permanent collection of the Museum of Naïve Art in its many versions and thirty monographs, monographic catalogs and books, especially in the sphere of naive and outsider art. As editor, coauthor or commentator, he signed about twenty books and projects. He was, among other, an associate of the Museum Charlotte Zander in Bönningheimu, and on many occasions a member of the Organizing Committee and International Jury of prestigious triennale exhibitions *Insita* in Slovakian National Gallery in Bratislava. He is also the author of a series of exhibitions in the country as well as in Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Serbia, the United States and Japan. His studies, essays and short records are published in a number of catalogs, magazines, books and newspapers - both in Croatian and English, German, Italian, French, Slovak and Japanese.

(**contact:** info@hmnmu.org)

GAETANO CURZI (Rome, 1967) gained a degree (1991), a specialization degree (1994) and a PhD (1999) at the University "La Sapienza" in Rome. He received research scholarships in London, Munich and Chieti. From 1990 until 1999 he was editor of Encyclopedia of Medieval Art. From 1999 until 2002 he was art historian in the National Museum Capodimonte in Napoli. From 2002 until 2011 he was researcher at the University in Chieti-Pescara and in Siena. Presently, he works as an associate professor of Medieval History of Art at the University in Chieti-Pescara. He made research and published studies on various subjects, amongst others on the early medieval Rome, the figurative culture of Abruzzo, the art from the times of the Crusades, and wooden sculpture in central Italy.

(**contact:** g.curzi@unich.it)

-D-

DANKO DUJMOVIĆ was born in 1979. After graduating Art History and History at the University of Zagreb, he worked at the Museum of Arts and Crafts in Zagreb, holding the position of museum educator. In 2008 he became research assistant on the project Romanesque between the Sava and Drava Rivers and European Culture led by prof. Vladimir P. Goss at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at the University of Rijeka.
(**contact:** ddujmovic@ffri.hr)

-E-

EMANUELA ELBA was born in 1976. In 2005 she gained her PhD degree in “Storia dell’arte comparata, civiltà e culture mediterranee” (History of comparative art, civilization and Mediterranean cultures) at the University of Bari, with the theses “The Artistic Relationship between the two Shores of the Adriatic. Decorations of Codes in Beneventan script from Dalmatia (XI-XIII century).” In 2008 she was granted a research scholarship that she devoted to the study of the illuminated manuscripts of South Italy linked to the production of the Holy Land from the time of the Crusades. She published several articles on the art culture of south Italy and heritage of beneventan manuscripts in Dalmatia. In 2011 she published her first monographic study “Miniatura in Dalmazia. I codici in beneventana (XI-XIII secolo)”, published by Congedo Editore, Galatina. Since 2007 she has been teaching History of Miniature Painting at the University of Bari.
(**contact:** emelba76@hotmail.com)

-G-

TEA GUDEK ŠNAJDAR, was born on August 7th, 1986. in Zagreb. In 2009, she got a Bachelor degree in History of Art and History at the Faculty of Philosophy in Rijeka. The theme of her final paper, whose mentor was Vladimir P. Goss, was „Utvrdna Medvedgrad u kulturnom pejzažu Zagrebačkog prigorja“ (*Medvedgrad fort within cultural landscape of Zagreb Piedmont*). She continues her study of History of arts at the Faculty of Philosophy in Zagreb the same year. She defended her diploma thesis in the course *The classical period and the Middle Ages in 2011*. Her mentor was Predrag Marković, and the theme of the thesis „Srednjovjekovne utvrde istočne Slavonije“ (*Medieval forts in eastern Slavonia*). She held a presentation at the International Congress of Students of the History of Arts in 2011 about research at Medvedgrad fort within the cultural landscape of Zagreb Piedmont. Her articles on subjects from culture and arts are published both in some scientific and popular magazines. She also publishes her articles on a web site www.medievalwall.com, which she co-founded.

She worked part-time during college for the Museum of Arts and Crafts in Zagreb, and presently she is an intern for a curator in Veliki Tabor Castle (Museums of Hrvatsko Zagorje).
(**contact:** tgudek@medievalwall.com)

-J-

VJEKOSLAV JUKIĆ (Osijek, 1978), M.A. in Philosophy and Art History (University of Zagreb, 2002) and M.Phil. (Art History Department, University of Zagreb, 2009) is a Ph.D. student at Art history Department, University of Zagreb. He worked as assistant and research fellow at the Art History Department, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Rijeka from 2005 till 2011 and now is Senior Advisor in Ministry of Economy. He is involved in the project “Romanesque Art between the Sava and the Drava Rivers and European Culture”, led by Professor Vladimir P. Goss. His research covers art and cultural heritage in the medieval Slavonia. He helped in organization of several exhibitions dedicated to art heritage of Continental Croatia, published several papers about medieval art and history and a book, “*Otkrivena ravnica*”, about medieval art in Eastern Slavonia.
(**contact:** v.jukic@inet.hr)

-K-

RADOSLAV KATIČIĆ (1930), Croatian linguist, historian and culturologist. He graduated in classical philology at the University of Zagreb and received his Ph.D. degree with the thesis on the *Question unity of Indo-European verb flexion*. His early works were mostly about Greek philology. Since 1958 he worked at the Department of Indo-European comparative grammar at the University of Zagreb. He was also the founder of the Linguistics study and Indology at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Zagreb. Since 1977 until his retirement he was a professor of Slavic philology at the University of Vienna, where he is now Professor Emeritus. He is a member of the Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, the Austrian Academy of Sciences, ANUBiH, Norwegian Academy, Accademia dei Lincei at Rome and Academia Europaea. In the area of Slavic studies he is the foremost Croatian specialist as well as one of the most renowned experts in the world. With his huge scientific opus and scholarly work and teaching he has contributed, and continues to contribute, he looms large as one of the leading European humanists. The summary of his outstanding work in early Slavic linguistics, literature, and mythology is his monumental trilogy: *Božanski boj*, Zagreb 2008, *Zeleni lug*, Zagreb 2010, and *Gazdarica na vratima*, Zagreb 2011.

(**contact:** radoslav.katicic@univie.ac.at)

NURITH KENAAN-KEDAR, Professor Emerita of Medieval Art History and former Dean of the Faculty of the Arts at Tel Aviv University. She has published widely on Crusader art in the Holy Land (for example, "The Role and Meanings of Crusader Architectural Decoration: From Local Romanesque Tradition to Gothic Hegemony," in: H. E. Mayer (ed.), *Die Kreuzfahrerstaaten als multikulturelle Gesellschaft: Einwanderer und Minderheiten im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 37), München 1997, pp. 165-178); on Romanesque sculpture in Europe (*Marginal Sculpture in Medieval France*, Ashgate 1995); and on the images and roles of medieval queens ("Aliénor d'Aquitaine conduite en captivité: Les peintures murales commémoratives de Sainte-Radegonde de Chinon," *Cahiers de civilisation médiévale*, 41:4 (1998), pp. 317-330.) Her scholarly work focuses on iconography and imagery, their sources, role, and meanings in art. She considers the visual text to be a language with codes and symbols that can be deciphered. Research on these subjects has led her to investigate Christian visual art and culture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in the Holy Land which have received little scholarly attention, if at all. In her recent book, *The Madonna of the Prickly Pear Cactus, Tradition and Innovation in the 19th and 20th Century. Christian Art in the Holy Land* (Yad Ben-Zvi Press, Jerusalem 2010) she studies major artistic creations of diverse Christian communities during this period and discusses an extensive corpus of visual images never photographed and published previously. (contact: kenaank@post.tau.ac.il)

-M-

GIORGIO MILANESI was born in 1980. After he finished the science high school, graduated with honors at "Conservazione dei Beni Culturali" at the University of Parma under the mentorship of prof. Arturo Calzona. He got his PhD at the same University on the "Storia dell'Arte e dello spettacolo" with a thesis on the selection of images in the time gap between Innocent II and Anacleto II, especially in Aquitaine, in the diocese of Poitiers, Saintes and Angoulême. The main object of the study is an architectural and figurative art in the Middle Ages, particularly in the period 10th -14th century. Currently he is conducting research in the Department of Art History at the University of Parma. (contact: grgmilanesi@gmail.com)

-N-

ALEKSANDRA NIKOLOSKA studied History of Art and Archaeology at the *Ss. Cyril and Methodius* University in Skopje, while received her PhD dissertation at the University on Zagreb in 2007 on *Aspects of the Cult of Cybele and Attis with special attention on the Monuments from Croatia*, a work published in 2010 for the *British Archaeological Reports*. She participated in many archaeological excavations and researches in Macedonia, Croatia,

Italy, and Albania. Also, she gave papers and talks at many international conferences and symposia. Her field of study is mainly in the domain of antique religion and iconography, on which she published several articles in international and domestic scientific journals. Presently, she works as a visiting lecturer of Antique Art at the *Ss. Cyril and Methodius* University in Skopje.

(**contact:** nikoloska_aleksandra@yahoo.com)

-P-

VESNA PASCUTTINI-JURAGA, art historian, has been working since year 2000 in the Conservation Department of the Ministry of Culture at Varaždin. She is the author of several publications and scholarly papers about the medieval sculpture and the cultural landscape in the region of north-western Croatia.

(**contact:** vesna.pascuttini-juraga@min-kulture.hr)

IVANA PEŠKAN, art historian, has been working at Ministry of culture in the Conservation Department of Varaždin since 2001 where she has been actively involved in conservation and restoration of cultural heritage on the territory of Varaždin County. She has participated in several conferences and wrote papers for professional and scholarly journals, in which new findings from the Middle Ages were presented and linked with already known information about the historical and artistic development of Varaždin region.

(**contact:** Ivana.Peskan@min-kulture.hr)

-R-

ANTE RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ (1943.) attended classical High School at Split and Zagreb. Graduated in history of art and archaeology at the University of Zagreb. From 1970 until 1973 worked as a curator at the Archaeological Museum in Split. From 1973 until 2012 employed at the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb as a curator, senior curator (from 1979) and as museum consultant (from 1986), while from 1984 until his retirement as a museum director. Senior lecturer at the department of history of art, Faculty of Philosophy in Rijeka (2005-2010) teaching ancient iconography and art of the prehistoric and the Greco-Roman period in Croatia. As a researcher, participated in a series of significant archeological excavations of ancient sites (Solin Salon, Type-Narona -Prozor near Otočac etc.). Lecturer, and organizer or co-organizer of many scientific and professional conferences in Croatia and abroad. Organizer and author or co-author of numerous archaeological exhibitions held in Croatia and abroad, and initiator and editor of a number of editions of the Zagreb Archaeological Museum. Member of various state and city expert committees and

commissions, and also president of Croatian Archaeological Society (1993-2001). Honorary member of several foreign archaeological societies (Slovenia, Hungary), corresponding member of the German Archaeological Institute (DAI) in Berlin, a member of the Scientific Council of LIMC (Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae) based in Basel. Author of more than 220 scientific articles on various topics from ancient archeology and museology.

(**contact:** rendicmiocevic@xnet.hr)

-S-

IVANA SCHRUNK teaches history of the ancient world and archaeology at St. Thomas University in St. Paul, Minnesota and art history of the ancient world at the University of Minnesota, where she earned her Ph.D. She is a native of Croatia, and received her undergraduate degree in archaeology from the University of Zagreb. She has worked on archaeological sites in Croatia, Syria, Tunisia and Egypt and has authored many articles in various publications. Her most recent book is about The Brioni Islands, and was co-authored with Vlasta Begović.

(**contact:** idschrunk@stthomas.edu)

BÉLA ZSOLT SZAKÁCS is the head of the Department of Art History at the Pázmány Péter Catholic University (Budapest-Piliscsaba) as well as an Associate Professor at the Department of Medieval Studies at the Central European University (Budapest). He has studied history and art history and defended his doctoral thesis on the iconography of the Hungarian Angevin Legends (published in Hungarian in 2006, English edition is in preparation). He participated in the research project on Visual resources of medieval East Central Europe on which he edited a book (2001). His research centers on the Romanesque architecture, Christian iconography, and the history of monument protection.

(**contact:** szakacs@ceu.hu)

-V-

MARTIN VANČO (13. 2. 1970, Přerov, Czech Republic) studied Applied Information at Faculty of Material Science and Technology of Slovak University of Technology in Trnava (1988 – 1993) and Archaeology and Art History at Faculty of Arts of Comenius University in Bratislava (1991 – 1996). He followed post-graduate study at Department of Art History at Faculty of Arts of Comenius University in Bratislava and graduated with PhD thesis devoted to Central Great Moravian Buildings in 2001. He started his work as specialist in Slovak

National Gallery (1996 – 2001). Later he worked at the Institute of Art History at Slovak Academy of Sciences (2001 – 2009) in several functions such as Editor Staff of Journal ARS, Research Secretary, Deputy Director and Director (2005). During 2006 – 2007 he worked as Executive Head of machine works Chemstroj in Strážske. Since 2007 is the Head of Postal Philatelic Service and chief of Postal Museum of Slovak Post. He specializes in Great Moravian architecture and modern Slovak graphics art. He has published many scholarly articles in Slovak and foreign journals. Selection of publications: Vančo, M.: Medieval Rotundas in Slovakia. From the 9th until 13th Century. Bratislava: Chronos, 2000; Vančo, M.: Great Moravian Religious Architecture in Slovakia. In: Bakoš, J. et al.: Problems of Art history of Slovakia. Bratislava: Veda 2002, pp. 19-53, 256-259; Vančo, M. et al: Graphics artist, inspiration, muse and life: Albín Brunovský and his school. Bratislava: Artotéka, 2003; Vančo, M.: From Primeval Times to Middle Age. In: Gerát, I. (ed): Art in Slovakia. A short history of images. Bratislava: Slovart ,2007, pp. 10-31; Vančo, M.: From Prehistory to Great Moravia. History of Art of Slovakia. Bratislava : Perfekt, 2011; Vančo, M.: State Valuables. In: Albín Brunovský: Painting Works. Bratislava: Vir Var, 2011, pp. 224-265.
(**contact:** Vanco.Martin@slposta.sk)

CHRISTINE B. VERZAR received her Dr. phil. in Art History and Archeology at the University of Basel (Switzerland) in 1966. Her teaching career of Medieval art included Boston University (1966-69), Princeton University (1969-70), The University of Michigan (1973-1984), The Ohio State University (chair and professor 1984-2000). Recipient of numerous research grants and fellowships, among others: NEH, American Philosophical Society, Samuel H. Kress Foundation, A.W. Mellon Foundation. On editorial board of *Assaph* and *Fifteenth Century Studies*; Board of Directors International Center of Medieval Art (1985-88); co-chair of 50th Anniversary Development Committee of ICMA (2002-2007); member of exhibition committee, *Set in Stone: the Face in Medieval Sculptures*, The Metropolitan Museum of Art (September 2006-February 2007), New York and New Haven, 2006 (several catalog entries and co-author of essay, “Gothic Italy: Reflections of Antiquity”) , editorial Boards: *Different Visions*; *Versita*. Author of several books and many articles on Medieval art, especially Italian Medieval art and artistic cross currents in the Mediterranean in the period of the Crusades, (also known as Christine Verzar Bornstein).
(**contact:** c.verzar@gmail.com)

MICHELE LUIGI VESCOVI, (1980), PhD in History of Art (University of Parma, 2008), is Lecturer in Medieval Art and Architecture in the Department of History of Art of the University of York. His researches involve the analysis of the visual culture between 11th and 13th century, in relation to the historical and cultural context. He is the author of a number of articles, such as 'Reliques, images et tresors: la châsse de Saint Romain de Reiningue', *Les cahiers de Saint-Michel de Cuxa* (XLI 2010); 'Uno sconosciuto frammento del portale della Cattedrale medievale di San Pietro a Bologna', *Arte Medievale* (2008/2).
(**contact:** mlvescovi@gmail.com)

MARINA VICELJA-MATIJAŠIĆ, Associate Professor, Department of Art History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences; Director, Center of Iconographic Studies, University of Rijeka, Main editor of IKON – Journal of iconographic studies. Graduated Art history and English language and literature from Zagreb University (Faculty of Philosophy) in 1986, the post-graduate studies leading to M.Phil. degree completed in 1991 with thesis: *Early Medieval Stone Sculpture in Istria* and doctoral studies completed in 1999 with dissertation *Byzantium and the stone sculpture in Istria – origins and influences* at the University of Zagreb. Academic positions: 2008–2011 Vice Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences; 2007 – Associate professor at the Department of Art History - University of Rijeka; 2006 – the Head of the Department of Art History; 2000–2007 - Assistant Professor at the Department of Art History - University of Rijeka; 1987–2000 - Assistant Lecturer at the Department of Visual Arts (School of Education) University of Rijeka. Area of research: Late Antique and early Medieval art, Christian iconography, Iconology, medieval urbanism. Principal researcher at few research projects on the medieval art of Istria and Kvarner and a partner in the European project *Francia media*; collaborator at several international projects on iconography and iconology; member of several editorial boards and professional councils, organizer of the annual international conference of iconographic studies and the Art history day in Rijeka.

(contact: mvicelja@ffri.hr)

