The medieval Bosnian state derived considerable prosperity from the exploitation of silver mines, and its wealthier inhabitants are known to have enjoyed use of luxury silver drinking bowls. It is suggested that such bowls had been manufactured for Bosnian usage in a recognizable Bosnian Kingdom style, here analyzed for the first time. The style as described is not confined to drinking bowls, but can be traced in architecture, tombstone design and manuscript illustration. Whilst using design elements from Hungary, France, Italy, Byzantium and Islamic north Africa, Bosnian style combines them in a unique way. Some facets of this Bosnian style have been previously isolated as «Hercegovinian style» in studies of post-Ottoman metalwork which, however, ignore their pre-conquest antecedents. In fact, it is here shown that certain basic design elements of Bosnian Kingdom metalworking style derive from high-fasion European design of the time of Stejpan II Kotromanić, once introduced to the Bosnian court, possibly on drinking bowls used to seal feudal contracts, such design elements became a permanent part of Bosnian design, distinguishing it from Serbian and Dalmatian styles.

In listing prominent examples of Bosnian style silver bowls, the mis-dating of some of them has been put to right.

It is my view that in asserting that items of the type of decorative metalwork under discussion cannot usually be assigned to manufacturing centres on stylistic grounds, since if lacking personal inscription they exhibit nothing beyond the traits of «international gothic», several recent writers have been far too persimistic; I hope that some of my reasons for greater optimism will emerge here.

Medieval metalwork of Dubrovnik manufacture has already received detailed consideration from a point of view quite different from that outlined above (Fisković 1949; page 191—215) and I think it ill now possible, using parallels from Bosnian architectural relief and steck decoration, to define a metalwork style for the Bosnian Kingdom which differs from both Dubrovnik and SerbIan-type work. An interesting contribution by Muhamed Karamehmedović on post-Kingdom Bosnia metalworking has stressed its connection with a little-understood preconquest tradition (Karamehmedović 1980; page 84—85), and it is possible that further research will spread more light on a whole aspect of regional creativity in a region renowned for little beyond tombstone art.

We can now turn to examination of a number of artefacts.

THE KOSOVO PRINT

I have suggested elsewhere (Wenzel 1982; page 64) that there is some indication that, in the medieval Bosnian state, members of the nobility were on occasion rewarded for faithful service to higher authority by a gift of some personalized precious object such as an heraldic ring, and the right to incorporate certain heraldic motifs on family tombstones. I would now add that decorated silver bowls were perhaps also given in this way; some features of several of the bowls I shall be discussing suggest the likelihood of this, and if the presumption is well founded it provides some explanation.
for the undoubtedly stylistic links which exist between a number of these bowls and some Bosnian tombstones. Since this function for decorated silver bowls might well form a background for the entire ensuing discussion, I should like first to examine an artefact which is suggestive of this function, and which I feel can be sensibly dated to as early a period as the time of Tvrtko I (1353—1391). It is a silver plaque about 5cm. in diameter which was found at Kosofo. On it an inscription surrounds an heraldic representation (fig. 1a) (Belgrade, Muzej Primjenjene umetnosti 4581; Radojković 1969; page 228, T. 162). Bojana Radojković, having suggested that the item might be a medallion either from a bowl or a belt buckle, continues her discussion on the assumption that it is from the latter; She claims that the heraldry represented corresponds with the arms of the Balšić family from Zeta, and suggests a mid-15th century date (ibid.; page 199, 228). All this can be successfully disputed.

Taking first the purpose of this item, it must be said that it is much more likely to be the central feature of a now lost bowl, than part of a belt buckle. There seem no surviving Balkan belt buckles from any likely period which carry a round heraldic medallion, and it is far from clear that the literary sources Radojković mentions imply that such once existed. On the other hand, drinking bowls do exist, from the 14th century and later which have stylistically related medallions. These are called «print» in English, and in the terminology of French medieval metalworking, «bouloz» (Lightbown 1978; page 21). More significantly, the inscription on the plaque has a formula involving enjoyment linked with obligation, which is quite typical of drinking-bowl inscriptions, as we shall see. Radojković does not mention the import of the inscription, or suggest why it might be appropriate to a belt.

As can be seen from the illustration (fig. 1a), the arms represented consist of a rampant wolf as crest, paws elevated in the air and facing right (a reversal of the normal heraldic direction, as would appear on a seal matrix), then a helm with veil and a shield with bend dexter. Since all surviving Balšić wolf crests lack from paws, and involve a shield changed with a second wolf’s head, Radojković has to take the heraldry on our plaque to be an otherwise unknown variant in order to make the connection she desires with the Balšić family. In my view the fact that there is no evidence that the Balšić ever carried a shield charged with a single bend (Marić 1956; T. XXI, page 19; T. XXII, page 1; Dimitrijević 1975; T. VII, page 19, 20), greatly outweighs the general arguments offered by Radojković concerning the small size of the basic stock of motifs shared by all European heraldry of the late Middle Ages (Radojković 1966a; page 24). Incidentally, in offering as another variant of known Balšić heraldry the crest which appears on a ring in the Muzej primjenjene umetnosti, Beograd (fig. 1b) inventory no. 4949 (Radojković 1969; page 199, sl. 113; Radojković, Milovanović 1981; page 18, no. 5) Radojković is relying on another misattribution, since as I shall show in a forthcoming book, this ring can be much more securely tied to a central Bosnian family, probably the Pribinichi, whose usage of this precise crest is attested on a family tombstone (fig. 1c).

Elsewhere, Radojković has offered reinforcement for her Balšić attribution of this plaque by mentioning a well-known belt in the Hermitage, Leningrad (fig. 1d) (Radojković 1969; page 199; 1966a page 34, citing L. Pavlovic, Prilog proučavanju srpskog srednjovekovnog dvorskog veza, pojas sevastokrata Branka—Neki spomenici kulture II, Smederevo 1963; page 6, sl. 5) which has a similar wolf crest motif embroidered onto its fabric, and which also bears a name which she and others have read as «Branko». Radojković has rejected (undoubtedly correctly, as confirmed by Dobrila Stojanović 1971; page 31) an earlier suggestion that the belt should be associated with Branko Mladenović, father of Vuk Branković (Radojković 1966a; page 34), but goes on to assert that it can only be associated with the Balšić family by making again the erroneous parallel between the wolf type depicted on the belt and the wolf’s head without paws which is always found on Balšić coinage. In fact, it is not at all clear that the name on the belt is not «Braiko» rather than «Branko» (from the photograph in Stojanović 1971; page 32, sl. 2) and indeed, if one were looking for a candidate for ownership, one could well suggest Brajko Pribinich 1333—1392 (Andelčić 1980; page 223, n. 46, 47), of whom more will be said below; the spelling «Brakko» for «Braiko» is attested on a stećak inscription from Svitava (Vego I; page 48, no. 30), Hutovo region, Hercegovina. However the point here is not to establish ownership of the Hermitage belt, but to make clear that, contrary to what Radojković suggests, it cannot be strongly linked to the Balšić family. It therefore provides no support for her attempt to connect the Kosovo plaque with that family.

If we are unable to accept Radojković’s interpretations of the various features of this Kosovo plaque we must look to see whether they provide other clues which we can accept. In my view this plaque recalls certain features of Dalmatian and West Bosnian metalwork of the mid-14th century. The two large, fanlike leaves which flank the heraldic motif are in the same style as those which flank several frontal portrait busts on a decorated garment fastener now in the Cathedral treasury at Split (fig. 2a), which is also made of engraved silver (Radojković 1966a, sl. 45). Radojković has dated this to the end of the 14th century, but hairstyles and costumes are more appropriate to the 1340s (Newton 1980; page 3, 71, 79), a period also suitable for the metalworking details. Somewhat similar leaves are found together with Standing figures on a belt buckle and tongue in silver gilt and enamel which, with numerous belt ap-
Fig 1 (a–d) — a: Circular medallion, silver engraved. Diameter 50 mm.
Beograd, Muzej primjenjene umetnosti (4581), from Kosovo; b: Ring, cast gold, chased, engraved. Height 24 mm., width 22 mm. Beograd, Muzej primjenjene umetnosti (4949), found near Janjevo; c: Tombstone, Zabrđe, Kreševo region, 1405—1420, west end. Length 240 cm., width 110 cm., height 120 cm; d: Embroidered belt band, Leningrad, Hermitage, acquired in Istanbul.

Pliques was found under a large stećak in the graveyard of Sveti Spas, Četina (fig. 2b) (Ganjčić 1955; page 233, st. 14). Parts of another belt very close in type were found at Stara Bila, Travnik (Kovačević-Kojić 1978; page 307), and might point to a west Bosnian workshop. Both belts can be dated around 1330 from details of the costumes which the figures wear.

Turning to the heraldry, there is no doubt that the wolf crest with elevated paws and the shield with single bend dexter are both important motifs in Bosnian medieval heraldry. We cannot at the moment say without doubt that any one person used both motifs at the same time, but the shield with a single bend dexter was carried by Ban Stjepan II Kotromanić 1314—1353, (fig. 2c), and subsequently by Tvrtko I during the years of his banate 1353—1377, (Andelić 1970; page 13—18, br. 4, 5, br. 6), and again by the latter’s son, King Stjepan Tvrtko II Tvrtković, in 1405 (ibid.: page 41, br. 17), whilst the wolf crest was used by the Bosnian noble family buried at Zabrđe, Tarčin, now generally taken to be the Friščić (fig. 1c). One interesting wolf crest ring (fig. 2d), found in the royal vaults at Arnaudović, is thought to have belonged to a Friščić retainer of Tvrtko I who was buried with his master (Andelić 1980: page 223).

The shield on this ring is charged with a large rosette, which is a known shield motif of Ban Stjepan II Kotromanić (fig. 2e), (ibid.: page 242), who was perhaps also buried in this vault (a possibility which I accept, although Andelić has recently turned against it (ibid.; page 230—232). There is here the indication of a faint possi-
bility that this wolf crest was simply yet another Kotromanić heraldic variant, but if this is not the case (and the evidence is too slight to firmly establish this conclusion), it would seem that the heraldry of Bosnian rulers and Bosnian retainers may have been to some extent interchangeable (as in Wenzel 1982; page 62—68).

Evidence from stecić shows that this was certainly the case at a later period, since there cannot possibly be a member of the Kosača family buried under every stecić bearing shields with the Kosača multiple bend (Wenzel 1965, T. LX, page 12—25, T. XC, page 10, 15).

If, as seems likely, the heraldy displayed on what, in view of the foregoing, we shall call the Kosovo bowl medallion, can be associated with the Bosnian nobility at the period of Tvrtko I's banate, then the possibility arises that the bowl to which it was once attached was given by Tvrtko to some follower, as an incentive to an award for military service. This speculation is encouraged by the inscription itself. The Cyrillic latters of the inscription are:

\[
\text{ΣΠΡΘΔΕΤΗΙΜΗΗΝΖΕΚΗΟΥΙ}
\]
which could be translated as:

«My lord, whoever want to enjoy themselves must all defend (or care for, brijanji or brijimi) the land. Are you a man?" The end of the inscription (fig. 1a) is separated from the beginning by a sort of cryptogram, which comprises four versions of the latter «T», two right-side up and two inverted, one pair of each above the other pair in inverse order. The right-hand pair functions as a cross to initiate the inscription, as customary, while the upper left-hand «T» provides the monogram signature to terminate the inscription. It is certain that the letter «T» was used as a monogram by King Tvrtko II (Andelić 1970; page 43—46, br. 19—21), but I have suggested elsewhere the probability that it was also used by Tvrtko I during his banate (Wenzel 1982; page 71, 72).

Finally, it should be said that the letter shapes of this inscription are close to those of 14th century Bosnian ecclesiastical writing; in particular, the «Z», «K» and «H» closely resemble those letters in the Divokev evangel of circa 1330 (Bordić 1971, sl. 187).

To sum up the foregoing, I think we must say that Bojana Radojković's suggestions regarding the dating, provenance and function of this piece should be rejected. The overwhelming likelihood is that we are here dealing with part of a bowl made for a member of the Bosnian nobility in the middle of the 14th century. In addition, we can suggest as an interesting possibility that the bowl was given and received in the context of a bond of loyalty.

THE SANKO BOWL

We should look now at an important silver bowl, about the date and provenance of which there is wide agreement; this is a silver-gilt bowl, 17.6 cm. in diameter, with repoussé and chiseled decoration (figs. 3a, 3b, 5b), which is now in the Cloisters Collection of the Metropolitan Museum of New York, inv. no 47-102-44 (Rorimer 1968; page 248—249). The comments put forward by Bojana Radojković to connect this bowl an important courtier of Ban Tvrtko, Kaznac Sanko Miltenović, first mentioned 1335, died between July 1370 and July 1372 (Mijusković 1961; page 22—30) can be accepted as entirely sensible (Radojković 1966b; page 53—60). They may be additionally supported by the observation that one letter «d» of the inscription (A) current in both cursive and glagolitic alphabets with the non-slavic sound «th», exemplified by the Greek letter theta (Θ). A similar letter shape is used for «d» in the tombstone inscription of Knez Vladislav Nikolić (died after 1287), a contemporary and close neighbor of Sanko Miltenović, who was buried on family land at Vranjevo Selo, Ston (Becac 1953; page 68—69; Vego 1960—61; page 268—270; Vego I 1962; page 42, br. 24). These two divergences from standard cursive, close both geographically and in time, obviously suggest a local and seemingly short-lived script variant affecting both texts. This in turn lends further support to the identification of the original owner of the Cloisters bowl as Sanko Miltenović of Hum, who lived in a period of transition of that land from Serbia to Bosnia.

The inscription on the Sanko bowl (Radojković 1966b; page 53, sl. 1, 3—7) compares interestingly with the one we have already discussed on the Kosovo print, although considerably longer. It reads:

After an invocation of the Holy Trinity, the reader is informed of the ownership of the cup (sija časa Sankova), and the hope is expressed that whoever drinks from it may be gladdened by God, and may not forget the poor. It will be seen that we have once again the formula of the attainment of a desirable state linked to the obligation to perform some task, perhaps in this case the distribution of alms. It is clear that this bowl also once had a separate medallion or print attached to its centre, but this has not survived with the bowl. This is of course a great pity, since a print for this bowl could have added to our currently rather scanty knowledge of Bosnian heraldry.

If the Sanko bowl is unhelpful about Bosnian heraldry, it is clearly valuable to any attempt to establish criteria for a late medieval Bosnian style, since it is agreed to be Bosnian, and of relatively early date. I hope to be able to show that a number of other bowls not usually thought Bosnian and ascribed to much later dates have much stronger parallels with this Sanko bowl than with the later material which has been used for the currently accepted datings. It is of course often claimed that decorative metalwork from this area is produced in such a conservative tradition that much which seems superficially medieval is in fact much later (in some versions of the argument, «must» in fact be much later). I have come to feel to the contrary, that many of these items are most probably as early as they first seem, both because details of costume and heraldry seem authentic to the earlier period in a way which would be most unlikely for late objects in a long tradition deriving ultimately from the 14th century, and because features which have been claimed as uncharacteristic of the earlier period, and therefore used to disqualify items from earlier dating, can in fact be found on items indubitably of the earlier date. There is then real promise in the possibility of observing some style criteria for work from Bosnia at a time when, as the archives tell us (Han 1972; page 163, 164) it became a cultural force in its own right, in contrast to Serbia, which at around the same period became an Ottoman vassal.

We can now proceed to look at the Sanko bowl in some detail. To anyone familiar with European medieval metalwork, the most striking aspect of the Sanko bowl is that it appears to present a somewhat rustic version of the French bowl tradition. This is quite possibly why it was originally published by James Rorimer, one-time director of the Metropolitan Museum, as 14th century Swiss, in spite of its obvious cursive inscription (Rorimer 1948; page 249). The type of French bowl it rather resembles was made during the first half of the 14th cen-
Fig. 3 (a, b) — a, b: Two views of the Sanko bowl. Silver, repoussé engroved, Diameter 17.6 cm. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Cloisters Collection, 1947 (47.101.42). Museum photo.

cury, rather than the second half when our Sanko was in his prime. The most typical feature of French secular bowls of this earlier period is some kind of geometric composition which surrounds a central arrangement of vine leaves, which itself encloses a separately manufactured and applied enamelled print. Some historical documentation about this type of bowl as used in France appears in an excellent book by Ronald Lightbown (1978).

An understanding of the chronology of 14th century French secular metalwork depends in a large degree on a group of objects discovered during the demolition of an old house in Rouen, which is known as the Rouen or Gaillon Treasure. Coins which were part of the find date to the period of Philippe VI, King of France between 1328 and 1350. Amongst the objects found were a number of silver and parcel-gilt bowls with central enamelled prints, of the type described as «hanap», a broad, shallow-type ob bowl used for drinking. Typical of this group is one with a Montpellier hallmark, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, no. 106—1865, (fig. 4a), which accords well in its appearance with descriptions in French sources dating from the first half of the fourteenth century, which incidentally give us some termi-
The Sanko bowl displays this type of nervure decoration. It also has in common with a number of the Rouen bowls the use a large, simple geometrical form to occupy much of the middle ground between the central feature and the generally plain band along the inside edge; a comparison of the Sanko bowl with a Montpellier bowl from the Rouen Treasure now in the Hermitage, Leningrad (fig. 4b) will illustrate this point (ibid.; Pl. IXb). These geometrical forms are made to stand out clearly by means of contrast between plain areas of undecorated silver and elaborately textured design areas in which repoussé elements are surrounded by ring-matting (small hammered circles in close proximity). In much the same way, the plain letters of the inscription on the underside stand out from a ground texture composed of zig-zags and gouging (fig. 3a).

Clusters of raised circles on the Sanko bowl are paralleled on another bowl from the Rouen Treasure in the Victoria and Albert Museum 107—1865, (fig. 4c) (Lightbown 1978, Pl. VIa).

Although the Sanko bowl also has non-French design features which we shall examine in a moment, and which confirm the south-west Bosnian State, Sanko’s hereditary territory, as the most likely place for its manufacture, we should just note here that historical events from that region in the earlier 14th century might well explain the out-moded French flavour of its overall design, a quality tenaciously preserved in a number of other metalwork items which I shall propose are of Bosnian manufacture, and which date from this period on through the 15th century. In 1326 the Bosnian Ban Stjepan II Kotromanić carried out a military drive into Serbian Hum, the region in which Sanko’s family held land. Stjepan centred his activity around Ston, a territory held by the Nikolić family whom we have mentioned as neighbors of Sanko, and who were relatives by marriage to the Ban. At the time of this first Bosnian attempt to win over west Serbia, Stjepan was vassal to the Hungarian King...
Charles Robert (1308—1342) house of Anjou in Naples, with whom he was on very good terms. At King Charles Robert's court hanap bowls decorated with enamel prints and nervures quite probably represented the peak of metalworking fashion; certainly his queen, Elizabeth Piastr, favoured metalwork in French taste, to judge from the elaborate metal and enamel folding shrine or house altar which was made for her personal use, and which survives in the Metropolitan Museum, New York (Freeman, M.: "A Shrine for a Queen", The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin 6, 1963; page 327—339).

If we now look at the Sanko bowl with a view to noting its major differences from its French counterpart's to see if these can be paralleled more locally, three things particularly strike us. Firstly, in place of the simple band of plain silver around the inside edge which the French bowls exhibit, the Sanko bowl has a scalloped plain area made by extending the rim band downwards into eighteen linked semi-ellipses (fig. 3). Secondly, the three semi-circular areas defined by the superposition of a triangle on a trefoil in the basic geometric design contain three winged beasts; a gryphon, a dragon and a crouching grotesque with human head, from whose bodies sprout rings on stems executed in the same manner as the foliage of some of the nervure decoration (fig. 5b). Thirdly, we can observe a disinclination to leave the large, solid areas of the geometrical design completely undecorated; they are scattered with small rings quite widely spaced.

The idea of a series of joined semi-ellipses as edging is to be found, in one form or another, on a number of the bowls which I shall later claim on other grounds to be of Bosnian manufacture. The idea may, of course, be fresh invention by local craftsmen, but it is worth mentioning that it may have its source in Egypt, where it has a long precedent in Islamic pottery design (fig. 5a), 11th—12th century, Fatimid period (Arts of Islam: page 222, no. 276; page 390, no. 658) 15th century, Mamluk period (Atli 1981: page 192, no. 98). Unfortunately there is no way of checking the probability that the presence of this idea on Fatimid pottery reflects its employment on Fatimid metalwork, since virtually none has survived.

Although no surviving French bowls known to me have figures such as the dragons and grotesques on the Sanko bowl, these images were extremely common throughout Europe in the 13th and 14th centuries, and indeed we have already seen dragons on the belt appliques from Sveti Spas, Cetina, where there is also a grotesque (fig. 2b), (Gunjača 1955; page 233, sl. 14). More distinctive are the rings on stems which grow from the bodies of all three figures on the Sanko bowl, a feature which cannot be precisely paralleled (figs. 3b, 5b). Rings on stems representing foliage, however, are to be found in Dalmatian metalwork of the 14th century, where they are used as border decoration. The early 14th century reliquary of St. Krševan in Zadar Cathedral (fig. 5e) has a framing border of such rings where, interestingly, the points at which their stems spring from the main branch are defined by naturalistic growth marks formed by two small lines across the branch, exactly as on the Sanko bowl nervures (Krišča, Gregić, Grčević 1972; page 59, 62, 162—166), a feature not found on the nervures of any French bowls. It seems likely, therefore, that the rings on stems which grow from the creatures on the Sanko bowl are simply representing foliage, and foliage growing from dragons and grotesques is a common enough feature of the decorative arts of the gothic period, as again on the Cetina belt (fig. 2b).

The sprinkling of small, well-separated circles over a space of abstract design area which we have observed on the Sanko bowl is a formula which was used by craftsmen making Orthodox ecclesiastical items in the west Serbian sphere prior to the formation of the Bosnian Kingdom. A surviving example is a pierced metal plate from an early medieval composite object, perhaps an icon lamp, found at Grahovo, which is now Crna Gora, but which once belonged to Herzegovina (fig. 5d), (Pa­rovic-Pešikan 1980; page 58, n. 118, T. XXII, b.) Scattered dots are also on initial edgings of the Miroslav Evangel (fig. 5e), Beograd, Narodni muzej, inv. br. 1536, f. 98 r, (Radojčić 1950, T. B).

To sum up, then, our discussion of the design of the Sanko bowl, we may say that it combines some basic features which reflect the design of the French hanap of the first half of the 14th century with some details which are not characteristic of the French bowls, but may represent the contribution of a more local tradition.

THE STOBI AND GO戈СI-MЕHEDIJNI BOWLS

The next two bowls to be discussed are conveniently taken together since they are very similar in size, shape and design. Both are silver gilt bowls, oval in shape, and measurig around 18 x 10 cm. Their decoration includes nervures and other embellishments which we have seen to be part of the French hanap tradition, but they also display features which we saw as characteristic of the Sanko bowl and which lie outside the Rouen Treasure bowl type. We have already said that such a stylistic combination might have developed during the period of Tvrtko I (1333—1381), and the dating to that period for the two bowls discussed here can be supported by observing related decorative material on stećak tombstones of known date. One of these bowls was found at Stobi, Macedonia (figs 6, 7a), together with a quantity of 14th century coins, the latest and most numerous being of the reign of King Vukašin (1366—1371). The other (fig. 7b) was found at Gogosi-Mehedinti near the Iron Gates in Rumania (Theodorescu 1974; page 332—333, fig. 45a,b). This bowl was discovered along with 232 Bulgarian coins of King Stracimir of Vidin (ruled 1360—1398), whose daughter Doroteja married Tvrtko I in 1374 (Cirković 1964; page 138).

---

1 This object has usually been taken to be the product of a Paris workshop, but László Gerevich has argued that, although very French, it might have been made in Hungary to conform with popular French style; either way, the taste for this style at Charles Robert's court is confirmed (Gerevich 1971; page 61, 63).
Fig. 5 (a—e) — a: Bowl, ceramic, lustre decoration on an opaque white glaze. Egypt, Fatimid period, 11th century. Diameter 27.5 cm. Cairo, Museum of Islamic Art (13478); b: San­ko bowl, rim detail; c: Reliquary casket of St. Krševan, detail. Wood covered by silver-gilt applique, enamelling. Zadar, first half of the 14th century. Dimensions, 28 x 17 x 17 cm. Zadar, Cathedral treasury; d: Plaque, pierced bronze, chance find from Grahovo, Crna Gora; e: Initial letter, paint on vellum, Miroslav Evangel, Hercegovina, late 12th century. Page dimensions, 28.5 x 41.5 cm. Beograd, Narodni muzej (1536), f. 98r.
It seems likely that the Gogoș-Mehedinti bowl was deposited in the earth when Stracimir’s small kingdom between Bulgaria and Rumania fell to the Turks in 1396; in the literature, the date of the bowl’s manufacture has been taken to be that of the coins with which it was found.1 On the other hand, the Stobi bowl has been thought by several authorities to be dated much later than this. In the catalogue to the exhibition Masterpieces of Serbian Goldsmiths’ Work, sent to London by the Muzaj primenjene umetnosti, Beograd in 1981, Dušan Milovanović dates the Stobi bowl to around 1490 (Radojković, Milovanović 1981; page 31, cat. 39). In this he follows Bojana Radojković (1977; page 89, sl. 67), who allows a Bosnian or Herzegovinian origin for the Stobi bowl, but around that late date, i.e., after the fall of the Bosnian Kingdom. Neither of the two publications mentions the undoubted parallel of the Gogoș-Mehedinti bowl, although attention has been drawn to the similarity by Verena Han (1964; page 113), and indeed possibly by Radojković herself in her earlier publication of 1962, where she cited a bowl »found in Rumania« in the course of a discussion on the Stobi bowl which she at that time dated to circa 1380. Her feeling then was that the Rumanian bowl and the Stobi bowl were probably work of the same master (Radojković 1962; page 38).

To play Devil’s advocate for a moment, we might say that the best argument for a late 15th century date for the Stobi bowl is not advanced by Radojković or Milovanović: this is that the central medallion, which contains traces of blue and brown enamel (despite Radojković, Milovanović 1981; page 31 which gives niello as the additional material), exhibits a profile portrait bust (fig. 7b), (Han 1960—61; page 33, 54, sl. 5), and such profile portraits did not gain wide popularity until the middle of the 15th century (Jones 1979; page 7, 28). However, close examination of the details of the collar and Germanic hairstyle of the figure portrayed leads me to conclude, in the light of all we know about dress and hair fashions throughout the period, that the medallion must date to around 1420. In both Hungary and Germany during the latter part of King Sigismund’s period (ruled 1387—1437) long hair styles for men were the fashion, although hair was being worn short in Italy at the same time. Hairstyles similar to the one shown on the Stobi medallion can be observed on three ivory saddles preserved in Budapest, which were probably made for members of Sigismund’s Dragon Order, which was founded in 1408, (fig. 7d), (Gerényi 1971; page 96, Figs. LXXIII, LXXIII, figs. 213, 214). Until at least 1425 people who wore their hair that way could also have been wearing a loose surcoat, which was common throughout Europe (fig. 7e), as (Kauffmann 1970; page 77). This style of coat fell in gentle folds from a fur or roll binding at the base of the neck, and this can be seen on the Stobi medallion, which shows the style as it is depicted between 1410 and 1420. Representations from the later 1420s and 1430s tend to show a high internal collar being worn with this neckline, while the previous gentle folds tend to become rather rigid pleats (Geoffrey Squire, Sothebys, London, personal communication). The evidence of the medallion, then, points to date around or a little before 1420 for the Stobi bowl, and I feel we must see the medallion as a precursor for the mid 15th century taste for portrait busts.1

Although the Gogoș-Mehedinti bowl also shows a profile bust (upside-down in fig. 7c), it is obviously not a portrait, and does not contribute anything helpful towards the dating of the object, which is probably best left at late 14th century.

In plan, the Stobi and Gogoș-Mehedinti bowls are not regular ellipses, their rims being worked into twelve fairly shallow scallops, which are left undecorated; thus the richly decorated interiors seem drawn into points between the scallops. In both cases the framework of the inner decoration within this field consists of two flattened ellipses (in fact, the shapes have more or less parallel sides and semicircular ends), one inside the other, with a circle at either end just touching the inner ellipse and interrupting the outer one. In both cases the ellipse is edged with raised beading, rather than the sort which edges the concentric circles on the early 14th century French bowls (fig. 4). The outer ellipses take the form of nervures. those of the Gogoș-bowl protruding outwardly directed semi-circular stems as well as foliage within them; the nervure treatment is also extended to the inner ellipse of the Gogoș-bowl, and forms the basis of the decoration within the circular areas.

Although these two bowls are so similar in many respects, and indeed in terms of their basic formal arrangements almost identical, they show radically different approaches to the decoration of their various space areas. The Stobi bowl here relates more closely to the Sanko bowl and the French examples we have discussed, in preserving the notion of the circle, enamel print, and adapting the nervure convention to fill out the rest of the central ellipse with two large leaves springing from the circle surrounding the print; the space between the inner and outer raised ellipses is filled with clusters of circles much like the ones we have observed on the French examples. Circular areas at either end of the central ellipse are occupied by single beasts in heraldic-looking postures. The Gogoș-Mehedinti bowl has rather similar elements in a somewhat different arrangement. This time the small circle sprouting leaves, nervure-type, is represented inside the larger circles to either end of the central ellipse, and inside this again are found the clusters of very small circles. On this bowl, the beasts are found in the central area, where they take form of two quite un-heraldic grotesque creatures which face each other and fill out the entire area of the smaller ellipse; the bowl has no enamel print. It seems most likely that

1 Bârcăciilă, »Tezaurul medieval dela Gogoș-Mehedinti, Cronica numismaticești arheologică XIV, nos. 113—114, București 1939: 126—127, 132, T. XI.

* It is perhaps worth mentioning here the 1350 Dubrovnik follar coin which has a profile portrait bust and is undoubtedly an imitation of some classical model (Jones 1979; page 7, fig. 4a).
these two different approaches to the filling out of one formal structure represent not two different periods or two different manufacturing locales, but the production on the one hand of a bowl personalized to a specific owner, by the inclusion of the portrait and perhaps some heraldry associated with him, and on the other hand a bowl in which the metalworker's, or perhaps the designer's own fantasy has been given much greater rein. My feeling in fact is that the two bowls must have been made in the same area and at much the same time. From what has been said above it will be obvious that this places them both in the period around 1380—1420; we must now turn to a discussion of the manufacturing locale.

As was mentioned above, Bojana Radojković has suggested Bosnian manufacture for the Stobi bowl, although at a late date, because she feels that certain decorative features are characteristic of Kotor metalwork of the late 15th century (1979; page 89), and I shall return to this matter later. There are several other features which can now be discussed which are suggestive of a Bosnian origin for the two bowls; these are the oval shape and lobed edging which can be paralleled from carving on two interesting tombstones at Turmenti, south of Trebinje, Herzegovina, as well as from (in reverse) the bezels of a number of medieval Bosnian rings; and the design structure comprising an ellipse flanked by two circle which is found in the Syro-Egyptian Mamluk art which I have argued elsewhere affected Bosnia in the period before the Turkish conquest (Wenzel 1982; page 57, 58).

To take the latter point first, it can be said that the use of the ellipse (or rectangle with rounded ends) flanked by two circle as a design framework became very common on later medieval Mamluk wares; prominent on 15th century Egyptian carpets where earlier examples do not survive, it is locatable in later 14th century Egyptian Koran decoration (Atil 1981; page 40, no. 6) and metal inlay (London, V&A 569—1897). The influence of this Mamluk art was widespread; it registers particularly strongly in Venetian art of this period, presumably because of Venice's trading links with North Africa, and on North Italian art in general. Mamluk influence was also felt in Bosnia, although in different ways; I have suggested (1982: page 58) that the hitherto mysterious word "možul", mentioned in the early 15th century inventories of the possessions of the family of Sandalj Hranić Kosača on deposit in Dubrovnik, derives from the name "Mosul", the centre for production of inlaid metal ob-

Fig. 6: Bowl, silver gilt, found in Stobi Baptistery, side view. Repousse, engraved. Rim dimensions, 18.6 x 10.2 cm. Beograd, Narodni muzej (343)
Fig. 7 (a—g) — a: Bowl from Stobi, silver-gilt, repousse engraved, silver central print with traces of blue and brown enamel. Rim dimensions, 18.6 x 10.2 cm. Print diameter 2.9 cm. Beograd, Narodni muzej (323); b: Stobi bowl, portrait bust on print, detail; c: Bowl from Gogoș-Mehedinti, silver-gilt, repousse, engraved. Rim dimensions, 19.3 x 11.3 cm. București, Muzeul de istorie al Republicii Socialiste România din București; d: Two carved bone saddles, details. First half of the 15th century. Budapest, Magyar Nemzeti Museum (55.3118, 55.3119); e: Marzal de Sas, Saxon painter working in Valencia around 1400, Altar-piece of St. George from Valencia, detail; the enchanter is executed. Valencia, circa 1410—1420. London, Victoria and Albert Museum (1217—1864); f: Ring from Sarajevo, cast, silver, engraved. Height 22 mm., width 23 mm. Bezel 17 x 12 mm. Author’s collection; g: Ring from Mostar, cast copper, engraved. Height 27 mm., width 24 mm. Bezel, 18 x 13 mm. Author’s collection.
jects in the 13th century, and refers to Mamluk inlaid metalwork of the type which can carry the ellipse-between-circles motif. Another more tangible result of Mamluk design affecting Bosnian taste may be seen in a characteristic finger-ring design from the 14th century, where a round back-knob (a Mamluk feature) was added to a characteristic Bosnian ring-type, which has been found in a distribution from Sarajevo to Trebinje, and which had the special feature of a basically oval bezel modified by hollow scalloped edging (figs. 7f, 7g). An exactly provenanced example from Gornji Turani, Trebinje, is now in the Zavičajni Muzej in Trebišje (Wenzel 1982; page 47, 48, pl. 1a–c).

These Bosnian rings are of further interest to us because of their close aesthetic similarity with the bowls (figs. 7a, 7c). The bezels of the rings are drawn into a series of points by the modifying action of the scallops on the basically oval raised sections while the scallops of the bowls, projecting outwards rather than inwards, modify the richly decorated interiors in a precisely similar way. It is interesting that whilst scalloped bezels are found on western European rings of the late medieval period (Wenzel 1982; page 48–50, fig. 2d, e), the only surviving examples show the scalloping applied to basically circular bezels, in contrast to the oval bezeled rings characteristic of Bosnia. It seem possible that a similar situation might have existed in respect to bowls; None of the surviving French bowls exhibits scalloping, but the French nomenclature already mentioned has a term «godet» for bowls of irregular shape, which might have been applied to such bowls (Litchbourn 1978; page 22, 23). The effect of these «godets» was said to be «flower-like», which does suggest scalloped modifications to a basically circular shape. Finally, although I previously suggested that the scalloped-shaped decorative band on the inside rim of the Sanko bowl might reflect the influence of North African pottery design, it is of course likely that the taste for scalloped decoration exemplified by the rings and the two bowls I have been discussing here was responsible for its adoption.

It is fortunate that representations of oval lobed bowls of the type under discussion are to be found on two tombstones at Turmenti, Trebinje region since these large slabs are not very portable, and were undoubtedly carved in the area where they are now found. The two slabs are built into the walls of the village church, and the carved surfaces now visible were undoubtedly originally the top surfaces of the slabs (Wenzel 1965, T. LXXV, 11; T. LXXXIII, 9). As well as a hollowed-out area in the shape of a lobed oval bowl, each slab bears decoration of the very widespread trefoil border type, which corresponds to the type of nervure work on the bowls. One of these tombstones (fig. 8), the one with the animal and the cross, can be dated roughly if, as I believe, the carver or group of carvers responsible also worked at Trsteno, Dubrovnik region, where there are two stones of workmanship so similar in detail as to make common authorship virtually certain. One of these stones at Trsteno includes in its decoration a short-lived...
M. Wenzel: A BOSNIAN KINGDOM METALWORKING TRADITION

Fig. 9 (a—d) — a: Silver-gilt bowl from Gogoši-Mehedinti, rim detail; b: Stone relief from Stari Bar, 14th century, detail; c: Stone relief from Dečani north portal, 1327—1335, detail; d: Repoussé silver applique from a reliquary, detail. Kotor, Cathedral treasury.

shield shape dated by Đurđica-Petrović (1976; page 98, 209, sl. 1) to the end of the 14th century, or the very early 15th. This confirms that the lobed, oval bowl shape was known in the south-west part of the Bosnian Kingdom, and at about the date we have proposed for the Stobi and Gogoši-Mehedinti bowls; the period of King Tvrtko I, or shortly after.

KOTOR AS A METALWORKING CENTRE

Bojana Radojković has seen the influence of Kotor craftsmen on the design of the Stobi bowl, although at a date when Kotor was under the control of Venice. Whilst I disagree with her date of circa 1490 for the Stobi bowl, and have suggested a date nearer 1420 as being realistic, I do feel there are factors which link Kotor to the bowl tradition presented by the Stobi and Gogoši-Mehedinti items. It will therefore be appropriate to mention here the evidence for Kotor metalworking during the period when the town formed part of the Bosnian Kingdom. Kotor, which had been an independent town in the earlier part of the 14th century with a prosperity comparable to that of Dubrovnik, found itself in decline by the second half of the 14th century (Cirković et al. 1970; page 23) and in 1370 or 1371 placed itself under the protection of Hungary (ibid.; page 28). It was obtained for Bosnia in 1385 when King Tvrtko I suggested to the Hungarian Queen Elizabeth, his cousin, that he would like it as a gift, since it had once belonged to his Nemanjan forebears (Štarić 1902; page 31, 32; Cirković 1964; page 152). It is unclear whether the town remained for a while under Bosnian jurisdiction following Tvrtko’s death in 1391 (Cirković 1964; page 371, n. 9). There are indications that Bosnian ownership of Kotor remained enforceable into the first decade of the 15th century (Cirković et al. 1970; page 87, 97).

By the time Tvrtko obtained Kotor for Bosnia the town had been long renowned for the manufacture of silver vessels, and as early as 1352 control stamps had been required for Kotor silverwork (Fisković 1949; page 146). Whether or not this practice was waived during the period when Kotor was part of the Bosnian Kingdom is not known, although Bosnia was always rather casual about such matters (Šakota 1981; page 74). Be that as it may, it is unlikely that Tvrtko would have lost time in making use of Kotor’s metalworking facilities to organize the production of metal items from the raw materials of his Bosnian silver mines. Also, doubtless Kotor goldsmiths would have been employed inland. According to Ivan Bach and Bojana Radojković (1956; page 14) one family of goldsmiths, the Desislavići, a member of which was active in Kotor as early as 1319, mo-
ved to Herzegovina and became attached to the court of Stjepan Vukčić Kosača, and later still settled in Sarajevo, where they were pursuing their trade into the 16th century. It is likely that during the period of Tvrtko, Kotor goldsmiths would have been adept in producing items in both the established «coastal» style, or in the apparently distinct «Bosnian» style, of which the archives about this time are beginning to speak; it is also likely that Kotor craftsman continued to make items in the Bosnian style, which was fashionable for some time after the Bosnian rule there ceased. An inventory of the possession of one Nicholas Archilupus of Kotor in 1445 includes silver cups made ad modo Bozînese (Han 1972; page 164, n. 31), although we do not know whether these cups were made in Kotor itself.

The motif on the Stobi bowl which Bojana Radiojković specifically links with Kotor is that of the leaves (she calls them oak leaves) branching from a wreath; in the nervation discussed above. This she claims to be typical of the Kotor craftsmen of the late 15th century, which implies that a number of parallels exist in Kotor work of that date, although the only example she gives in her 1977 work (p. 89, sl. 67a) is a repoussé silver embellishment to a reliquary in Kotor Cathedral (fig. 9d); on this basis the Stobi bowl is attributed to «an unknown workshop in old Herzegovina or Bosnia, obviously under Kotor influence» (Radiojković 1977; page 89), whilst Dušan Milovanović ascribes it to «a Kotor craftsman working in the interior» (Radiojković, Milovanović 1981; page 31, cat. no. 39). In fact it should now be obvious that the Kotor repoussé far more closely duplicates the arrangements inside the circular areas of the Gogosi bowl, concerning which Radiojković avoids discussion. I have already suggested a date for the Gogosi bowl as early or earlier than my date for the Stobi bowl, and have mentioned that it has ascribed to the end of the 14th century. It will be remembered that both the Stobi and Gogosi bowls contained coins dating to the middle and later 14th centuries, and it would be an unlikely coincidence indeed to find two bowls from the very end of the 15th century buried with such coins, which would have to be accepted if one accepted Radiojković’s style criteria for her dating, and ascription to Kotor influence, of the Stobi bowl.

However, as I have shown above, this motif on the Gogosi-Međedinti bowl (fig. 7c) reproduces the standard arrangement on early 14th century French bowls (figs. 4, a—c) by adapting the convention found on those surrounding an enamel with nervation into its repoussé—only technique. I feel that the likelihood is that this formula appears in Kotor metalwork, as on Radiojković’s example (fig. 9d), as the result of the influence of Bosnian taste on that town; that is, the opposite situation to the one proposed by Radiojković.

There is one aspect of the Gogosi bowl’s decoration, however, which might well demonstrate Kotor influence on Bosnian work at a time well before the period of Bosnian control of the town. Within the row of outwardly-directed semi-circles formed by the nervation of the bowl’s outer ellipse, we find a kind of wind-blown foliage with channels running the length of the leaves, and with the leaf clusters bent in one direction (fig. 9a). This leaf style is characteristic of southern Dalmatian stonemasonry in the 14th century. Examples survive on the Kotor ciborium at Sv. Tripun Cathedral, carved in the 1360s (Maksimović 1971; page 88, sl. 149), on a 14th century carving from Stari Bar (fig. 9b), (ibid., sl. 139) and at Dečani, where the carving was executed between 1327 and 1335, and signed by the builder Fra Vita of Kotor (ibid.; page 181, sl. 181). On the Kotor repoussé of the late 15th century cited by Radiojković (fig. 9d), this style of wind-blown, channelled leaf can still be seen; the form the space areas in which the Bosnian-style nervation appear.

THE TEMSKA BOWL

There is one more oval, lobed bowl which ought to be included in this discussion, since although it differs in a number of respects from the two bowls just discussed, it cannot be more closely paralleled from any other source. The bowl in question (figs. 10, 11a, 11c), (Belgrade, Etnografski Muzej no. 24421), was purchased in Temска, Pirot, in 1956 (Han 1964; page 111), along with an isolated medallion (fig. 11b) (Etnografski Muzej no. 244420), almost certainly from another bowl (Han 1960—61; page 45—55). The medallion attached to the bowl shows a rampant beast (lion or panther) with upraised tail (fig. 11a), whilst the separate medallion has a beathed couple surrounded by an inscription. The shape of the separate medallion is very much the same as that of the bowl medallion, and it is highly likely that the former was attached to a bowl of the same oval shape. Indeed, although the separate medallion lacks any trace of the enamel found on the bowl medallion, details of the working, especially the spiral formula used for depicting eyes, which is highly unusual, suggests that both pieces were products of the same workshop or even of the same hand. We shall attach some importance to this, since details of costume and lettering on the separate medallion are more useful than anything about the bowl or its medallion for suggesting a date for the bowl.

The bowl itself differs from the Stobi, and Gogosi-Međedinti bowls in that whilst on them the scalloping is confined to the areas nearest their rims, leaving large areas for rich repoussé decoration, the Temska bowl is more truly shell-like, in that the scalloping is carried down right to the base, so that the central medallion provides the only interior decoration. The bowl is divided by the scalloping into eighteen segments, and it differs further from the two previous examples in having a base, itself an inverted, lobed oval (fig. 10). Various dates have been suggested for this object by different authorities. Desanka Milošević, in a catalogue without supporting argumentation, suggests the end of the 14th century (1980: page 48), as does Verena Han in the work mentioned above. On the other hand, Bojana Radiojković (1966a; page 35) and (1981; page 38, no. 60 with Milovanović) proposes 1520—1530. Radiojković’s argument (1966a) is somewhat as follows: the object gives a superficial impression of being from the 14th century, but
can in fact be more realistically compared with German lobed cups of the 16th century; In his study of German cups of the Luneburg Treasure now in the Berlin Kunstgewerbe Museum M. Creutz (1909; pages 297) has presented an analysis of the lobing technique which draws a distinction between 14th and 16th century methods, in the light of which the Temska cup can only be seen as belonging to the latter period; the panther medallion of the Temska cup bears a very close relation with the lion medallion on the Ivan cup in Zagreb (fig. 15a), (Muzej za umjetnost i obrt, 10373 (Radojković 1966a; sl. 41), which Radojković dates for stylistic reasons well into the 16th century; and she seeks further parallels for these two medallions on vessels of known date, and mentions specifically the Smederevo incense boat of 1323 (Beograd, Muzej Srpske pravoslavne crkve, ibid sl. 40), and a cup from Skopje where the medallion represents peacocks (Skopje, Etnografski muzej, ibid., sl. 44). Radojković makes no mention in connection with the Temska cup of the separate medallion purchased with it, despite the extreme similarity of their workmanship, and the fact that the shape they share is otherwise unknown in Balkan medallions.

In reply to these arguments, one must say that the 16th century German lobed cups, none of which is of overall shape, are quite unlike the Temska bowl, and the comparison is unilluminating; that since Creutz’s analysis concerns only vessels of western European manufacture, its conclusions have no automatic relevance for material from the Balkan, of which Creutz had little knowledge; that the comparison of the Temska medallion with that on the Ivan cup (fig. 15a) is superficial indeed, since the workmanship is quite dissimilar (incidentally, when I recently examined the Ivan cup, its medallion showed no traces whatever of the blue enamel which Radojković claims as one of its chief characteristics, although I do not know whether Radojković’s description is mistaken, or whether enamel once present has been removed; and that the Smederevo and Skopje objects, quoted as having medallions resembling the two last, display such obvious Ottoman characteristics of the Abraham of Kutahja type, which was indeed widespread in the 16th century Balkans, as to be no help whatever in locating pieces which completely lack these characteristics. If on the other hand we turn to the separate Temska medallion, we must acknowledge that it has far more in common with the bowl’s medallion than any of the comparative pieces cited by Radojković, and that neither the combination of latter shapes of its inscription nor the costumes of its figures could conceivably date from the 16th century.

We have already mentioned two of the factors which are responsible for the impression of close similarity between, and probably common authorship for, the Temska bowl’s medallion and the separate medallion; their otherwise unparalleled shape and the unusual eye formula employed. We should now mention a third factor: the form of the background texture, which is a zig-zag patterning made by rocking an engraving tool from side to side. This form of patterning is not unknown as foundation for enamel apart from its use as such on the bowl medallion, and perhaps for this reason, Verena Han has suggested that the separate medallion may be unfinished, in the sense of having been prepared for enamel which was never applied (Han 1960—61; page 45). This need not however be the case, as the form of texture is also found without any enamel in Russia in the 13th century, in Germany France and England in the
Fig. 11 (a—d) — a: Oval medallion, silver, engraved, grey enamel. Central print on the oval, lobed bowl from Temska, Pirot. Dimensions, 6.7 x 5 cm. Beograd, Etnografski muzej (24421); b: Oval medallion from Temska, silver, engraved; formerly central print on a bowl. Dimensions, 6.8 x 4 cm, thickness 1 mm. Beograd, Etnografski muzej (24420); Beograd, Etnografski muzej (24421); c: Oval lobed bowl from Temska, Pirot, Silver repoussé. d: Royal Gold Cup of the kings of France and England, detail, London, British Museum, French, circa 1390.
14th and 15th century, and more widely still after that. An example from the late 14th century is the golden cup of the kings of France and England (fig. 11; Lightbown 1978; page 81 Pl. LXVIII), where this type of patterning is used to decorate the stem.

If we look at the separate medallion for clues as to date and provenance, there are several things which we can say. The letter shapes are of a type found in Bosnian epigraphy throughout the 14th century (Tomović 1974, no. 50; page 1349—1363, no. 76; page 1383—1391, no. 94; page 1405—1420), and some of them are types which, particularly in combination, disappeared after the early 15th century; the soft sign "ć", for instance, become rare. As a group these letters could not belong to the 16th century. Verena Han has linked the costume styles with examples in both western gothic and Serbian art of the 14th and early 15th centuries. The text of the inscription is as follows:

\[\text{\textit{Stančić}}\]

Voin, perhaps the affianced youth, made the cup, or had it made, for the priest Stančić. Verena Han is rightly rather circumspect in drawing conclusions about the provenance of the object from the inscription, but notes that the formula "a see" is extremely common in Bosnian-Hercegovinian tombstone epigraphy of the 14th and 15th centuries, whilst found only rarely in Serbian contexts; that the name Voin is occasionally found in Serbian medieval sources; and that that the name Stančić is traceable in 14th and 15th century Bosnian sources, although most common in Macedonia (Han 1960—61; page 52). Taking these facts together with style parallels in certain Bosnian miniatures, Han concludes tentatively that Bosnian manufacture is most likely, but that Serbian or Macedonian manufacture in conformity with Bosnian taste is also a possibility (ibid.; page 54), and that the date would be in the later 14th or early 15th century.

I think however that some clarification of the position can be afforded by further reference to the zig-zag backround technique. Maria Šakota, who has made an exhaustive study of metalwork items preserved in Serbian monastery collections, has concluded that this type of texture is not found on items of Serbian manufacture before the 16th century (personal communication). This would seem to rule out the possibility that the Temska medallion and the lost bowl to which it was once attached represent a Serbian style, since their date cannot be as late as that. A possible exception to the above generalization is the so-called "Dušan plate"; however, see note 8. It is also clear that this type of texture was not characteristic of Dalmatian metalwork of the late medieval period, but it can be observed on the relicary arm of St. Asel at Nin, donated between 1303 and 1311 by Pavao Šubić, ruler of north Bosnia at that period (Kričeša, Grgić, Grčević 72; page 63—67, cat. no. 24, 166, 167), although it here embellishes figure rather than serving as a background. Traces of the same patterning joins other forms of texture behind letters round the top of the Zadar relicary casket of St. Krševan,
dating from the first half of the 14th century (ibid.; page 59); we have already seen it serving as a background for the inscription on the slightly later Sanko bowl, which is widely accepted as Bosnian.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that whilst this zig-zag technique in Bosnian goldsmithry may be a reflection of the widespread influence of Hungarian culture on that area in the 14th century, I have not yet observed its use in Hungarian metalwork of the period. On the other hand, while the technique seems to have been generally avoided by Dalmatian metalworkers, there were certainly foreign goldsmiths active in Dubrovnik in the later Middle Ages, and it is conceivable that apprentices from the interior might have learned the technique from one of these, and later practiced it in their own workshops. An example of the possibility of this sort of thing is given by Fisković (1949; page 168), where he mentions the German goldsmith Gugljelmo, who joined the workshop of the Dubrovnik goldsmith Radoje, who we know did accept apprentices from the interior (ibid.; page 165). This Gugljelmo was the creator of the reliquary for the head of St. Laurence, which is now in Dubrovnik Cathedral, which he made, presumably in Radoje's workshop, in 1349.

To sum up this discussion of the Temska bowl, I can say that Bojana Radojković's reason for dating the object to the 16th century do not really stand up to examination, and in refusing to discuss the separate medalion in conjunction with the bowl, she neglect a most valuable piece of evidence. My observation indicates links between the bowl and the medallion which are so strong that we must take common origin as a high probability. The medallion can be dated rather firmly to the second half of the 14th or, at latest, the early 15th century, and there are indications of origin within the Bosnian sphere. Therefore conclude that the instinct of the various writers who have dated the bowl to the later 14th century has been in all probability correct. If my suggestion of a Bosnian origin is also correct, no other pat-

\[\text{ Seal of Ivaniš Vlatković, Vojvoda of Hum, circa 1488. After Andelić.}\]
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the 15th century. Having recently examined this cup, feel that its date can be no later than Fiskovic's suggestion, then we have a further example of the teste for scalloping which I have mentioned in connection with the bowls discussed earlier. Although Radojkovic is almost certainly wrong in her contention that no connection can be made between the designs of the Temska and Stobi bowls (1966a: page 35), she is certainly right to observe that there is a real difference. In my view, this is best explained by seeing the Temska cup (figs. 10, 11c) as a late representative of a tradition within the Slavic sphere for the lobed, oval shape, which may in itself have pre-disposed metalworkers to an acceptance of the French type of bowl design, and provide the background for its modification into the oval shape. If all this is true, the Temska bowl may indeed be a little earlier than the Stobi and Gogoski bowls (figs. 7a, 7c). It remains to add that one British expert has suggested as the probable background for such a Slavic tradition the lobed design of certain Sogdian vessels, which from Central Asia also affected both Byzantine and Chinese bowl design (Julian Raby, personal communication). For Sogdian examples, see Marshak 1971: page 112, no. 11, 31).

Both Radojković and Milovanović suggest a late 14th or early 15th century date for this objects, and claim it to be typical of Serbian goldsmithery of that period. Milovanović (p. 30), having commented correctly on the widespread occurrence of bowls of this general pattern (i.e. with hexafoil or octofoil central flower), adds «in Serbia the central medallion usually bears a heraldic sign or bird». To my knowledge there is only one example with a bird in this type of geometrical shape for the period under discussion, and the provenance of this is far from certain, and the one other bowl where such a shape contains heraldry which can be dated to our period, can also be strongly linked with pre-conquest Hercegovina, as I shall show later in this paper (fig. 18a). It would seem, then, that Milovanović is dealing with this bowl as a Serbian artefact by assigning it to a category which does not exist.

We can conclude this section of our paper by noting that there is some evidence that a variant of this bowl shape, with fewer and larger lobes, was current in Hungary in the later medieval period (see note 5), and the unique six-lobed silver-gilt bowl with handle (Radojković, Milovanović 1981: page 29, cat. no. 35, Muzej grada Beograda 2016), may well reflect that background. On the other hand, there existed in Hungary in the 1890s in the Budapest Museum of Decorative Arts a most interesting twelve-lobed bowl, of which the Victoria and Albert Museum, London obtained an electrotype (fig. 14) under the impression that it was of English manufacture). To judge from the electrotype, this silver-gilt bowl was in all probability of Bosnian origin; its central print was missing, but the familiar nervure work surrounded the place reserved for it, and the animal and foliace cross-in-ring decoration of the area between the base and the scallops was strongly reminiscent of various aspects of Bosno-Hercegovinian tombstone decoration. However, I am unaware of the current location of this bowl, so further discussion is not possible.

A HERCEGOVINIAN GODET?

If we are right to associate the term «godeet» in the French sources with lobed bowls of basically round plan, then we have an example which can probably be linked with the Bosno-Hercegovinian sphere of the earlier 15th century. This is a silver-gilt item in the Muzej primeznjene umetnosti, Beograd, inventory 2689 (fig. 12), which has been discussed by Bojana Radojković (1972-73; page 30—32, sl. 13) and which was exhibited in London in 1981 (Radojković, Milovanović 1981: page 30, cat. 38). Inside a repousse hexafoil at the base of this bowl is a round silver medallion showing a helm with a fleur-de-lys crest, flanked by rosettes within spirals which grow out of the helm's drapery (fig. 13a); and beneath this configuration a notched shield; such shields were definitely used in Hercegovina in the first half of the 15th century on the evidence of datable steclis, to be discussed in my forthcoming book. Three bends dexter on the shield form a favorite Hercegovinian blazon (fig. 13c) and the Vlatković to the west (figs. 13d, e) (Andelić 1970; page 66—68, 75, 78—81). The Kosača crest was a lion, but it is possible that the crest on this medallion relates to one of the numerous Vlatković, whose crests are not documented until the later 15th century. Be that as it may, the frequency with which the shield with three bends is found in 15th century Hercegovina, in contrast with its absence so far as we know from Serbia at that period does suggest a Hercegovinian origin for this bowl, which we would date to the first half of the 15th century, the hard edged spirals in a heraldic context and wide-sweeping helm drapery being widely paralleled on artefacts of that period. Incidentally, the zig-zag texture discussed in connection with the Temska bowl and medallion was used here to give key to niello, most of which has now disappeared.

A FURTHER FRENCH STYLE MODEL

There is another early 14th century French bowl type whose design is reflected in varying degrees, along with elements of the previously mentioned type, in three important bowls which I shall argue can be connected with the Hercegovina of the period of the Bosnian Kingdom, although again two of them have elsewhere been given much later dates. The model is exemplified in two bowls from the Rouen Treasure, one now in the Musée de Cluny, Paris (Lightbown 1978, Pl. IXa), the other in the Hermitage (fig. 16a), (ibid., Xb), and has as one of its chief features a type of arcaded structure, in which columns radiating outwards from the central medallion like spokes of a wheel are joined at their tops by arches. In the Hermitage example shown (fig. 16a) it is the base of the bowl which is treated in this way, and on each column, groups of raised circles represent capitals and bases. This feature is especially noted since it tends to be retained on, what we shall argue are derivatives of
Fig. 14: Electrotype copy of a bowl, the original in repoussé, decorated with rabbits, dogs, and branched motifs. Silver gilt. Copied in the late 19th century from the collection of a Budapest museum. Diameter 19.5 cm., height 5 cm. London, Victoria and Albert Museum (51.1886.62). Museum photo.

This bowl type, even when the divisions to which it is appended are no longer obviously architectural.

THE IVAN CUP

The structure of the central portion of the Rouen bowl with which we have exemplified the type (fig. 16a) is reflected on the bowl in the Muzej za umjetnost i obrt, Zagreb, which is known as the Ivan cup (fig. 15), inv. no MUO 10373. This is a silver gilt bowl which carries two inscriptions. The first of these appears on the central medallion and surround's the representation of a lion passant. It reads:

\[ \text{INOMEN H METOSPOANPHAEANPHAEW HELYOF} \]

The rest of the interior of the bowl is divided into ten areas by a quasiarchitectural system which rather resembles the central area of the French model, and each of these areas is occupied by a creature. Some of these creatures are paired, so that for instance, two lions confront each other, as do two dragons; various birds and griffons complete the menagerie. The space dividers are not quite columns as they are on the Rouen bowl, but retain clusters of circles as their bases (the middle one hollow) in a way reminiscent of the latter. At their "capital" ends the space dividers have pairs of leaves or leaf-like shapes, and all the dividers exhibit a twisted-rope type decoration (fig. 15b).

7 It is interesting to speculate as to whether this motif of a vertical "twisted rope" with a pair of leaves at the top and a ring at the bottom, when it appears on the north and south sides of the stele-like tombstone of Gost Milutin at
The import of the inscription seems to be that the bowl belongs to Ivan, that God should help whoever from it, and be near Ivan (the inscription is obscure, and its precise meaning is not agreed, but it can be said that the elimination of God from the inner inscription in the version offered by Vladimir Mošin, and recorded in the Museum's notes on the item, depends on the mistaken reading as a soft sign of what is certainly a "b", by clear analogy with comparable letter forms elsewhere.)

Humsko, (fig. 16b, c) Foća, flanking the figure of the deceased holding a book on the east side (Vego III; page 52, no. 190), could be a rustic derivation from a type of bowl decoration in which saints holding books appear under arches. A number of such bowls survive from a later period (fig. 16d-f); the earliest of these might date from 1515 (Šakota 1981; page 78), but it is of course possible that such bowls were being made in the 15th century, from which the tombstone dates. It is worth noting that at one time bowls of this type were thought to be characteristics of the mid-17th century, and to have originated with the style of one particular goldsmith in Ciprovac (Radojković 1966a; page 148, sl. 190). The discovery of examples dating to the 16th century made a revision of this view necessary (Šakota 1981; page 78, 80). Since we know that the arch formula appears on European bowls much earlier than this, it is not inconceivable that the decoration of the Milutin stele, which is otherwise hard to explain (the usual explanation, that we are being shown a belt of Manichees or Bogomil character is evidently preposterous), might be explained in this way. The precise date of the Milutin stele is still a matter of dispute, and will be discussed at length in my forthcoming book on stećci, but must fall within the first half of the 15th century.
Who, then, was the Ivan who owned this cup? Bojan-Radojković (1966a; page 130) feels that the bowl must be dated to the 16th century on stylistic grounds, claiming that although its general arrangement accords well enough with earlier models (she mentions especially the stylization of the animals, which she links with "Bosnian cups of the 70s of the 14th century, especially the Sanko cup" she doesn’t say which other bowls fall into the category), certain details, especially the arcades, betray 16th century handiwork. Feeling that the cup must have been in ownership of one of the important historical personages of 16th century Hercegovina, to which area she links the bowl on stylistic grounds, she puts forward as a likely candidate Vajvoda Ivan Banjanin, who, with his wife and sons, was mentioned as donor of the Church of the Archangel Michael in Petrović in 1605, and gives this attribution a semblance of firmness by claiming that the inscription does in fact mention a "vojvoda" Ivan, which as we have seen is not the case. In fact, the owner is named in the inscription as "Iv'an Car"; the "Iv'" is clearly a shortening of the "Ivan" mentioned in the other part of the inscription, and we should be awake to the possibility that the "Car" is also a short form of a longer name.

In my view, the dating of this bowl to the late 16th century is difficult to accept. The letter forms employed in the inscription are totally characteristic of the mid 15th century. The letters are quite dissimilar, for example, to those of the inscription of the 1523 Smederevo incense boat which, as we mentioned earlier, Radojković groups with the Ivan cup in an attempt to support a late dating for the Temska bowl, or the lettering on the late 16th century Banja monastery finds (Šakota 1981; page 41, 47, 52, 79, 98, 99, 101). The Ivan letter forms do, on the other hand, accord well with standard mid 15th century Bosnian tombstone epigraphy, and the closely related epigraphy from Zeta (Tomović 1974; page 17). The letters of the inscription on the central medallion are more squat, hence more "Bosnian looking" (Dorić 1971; page 133) that those of the inscription on the main body of the bowl. They have, for example, the double "c" form for "k" and characteristic "n" of mid 15th century Hercegovinian stećak lettering (Tomović 1974; page 118, 119). The open-topped "v" , on the other hand, can be seen on a seal of Ivan Crnojević, Lord of Zeta 1464—5 to 1490 (Cirković 1970; page 288, sl. 9). The letter forms of the inscription on the page 288, sl. 9). The letter forms of the inscription on the main body of the bowl are more elongated, but certain of them are also characteristic of the Crnojević — related inscriptions; for instance, the "d" like small, elevated triangle with supporting legs is found on Ivan Crnojević's donor inscription of 1483—1484 at Cetinje monastery (ibid.; page 499, fig. 94; Tomović 1974; page 120). The singular forked "a" with serif or bulb at the base of the left fork is on the tomb inscription to Ivan Crnojević's mother dated 1464—1465 (Tomović 1974, no. 118) and on a donor inscription relating to Herzeg Stjepan Vukčić Kosača dating 1454 (ibid.; no. 116).

I feel that for the purposes of dating this bowl, the evidence of the letter shapes must be given more weight than the lack of a precise parallel for the arcading amongst the anyway not very numerous surviving bowls conclusively dated to the 15th century.
We would also add that the creatures on the Sanko bowl (fig. 3b) appear beneath stylized ogee arches even closer to the French model than the plainer arch shapes of the Ivan cup, although because of the geometry of the Sanko bowl, there are of course no supporting columns.

If we look for an historical personage bearing the name "Ivan" around the middle and later 15th century, we have an obvious candidate in Ivan Crnojević, whom we have already mentioned, in connection with the latter shapes, as Lord of Zeta between 1464—5 to 1490. Obviously he can only be put forward rather tentatively, but some support for his candidacy may be afforded by the rather enigmatic "Car" which follows the short form of the name Ivan on the bowl's inscription. Since there is no Czar Ivan at any period possible for the manufacture of this cup, we cannot read the "Car" as simply denoting an emperor, and it does seem likely that it must be a shortened version of someone's name, for when names are shortened at this period, it is the first few letters that are given. Unfortunately, amongst the recorded variants of the Crnojević name accessible to me, there is none which begins "Car", but it does not seem inconceivable (given the rather casual attitude to spelling which prevailed at that period) that the name might have been so shortened. Certainly, on the printed page frames of an ecclesiastical book produced around 1494 at the Cetinje printing house of Ivan's son Djurdaj (Lord of Zeta or Crna Gora from 1490 to 1498), (fig. 17a), we can see the name Djurdaj Crnojević reduced to a few letters, after a similarly reduced formula for "blagoverni gospodin" (Corović—Ljubinković, Milošević and Tatić—Djurović 1969; page 71, cat. no. 91; Cirković et al. 1970; page 384—385, sl. 28, 30; page 398, 496—497, sl. 102—104).

This piece of pitting is also interesting because some of the creatures which appear amongst its leaf scrolls are duplicated in similar poses on the Ivan bowl. The design of this printed page is derived from a popular called "white—vine" (bianchi girari), and the feature of putting supporting family arms seen between the two lower evangelist symbols is also a standard feature of Italian manuscript frontispieces (Alexander 1977; page 12, fig. V, Pl. 5,32,25). It is further the case with these manuscript frontispieces that other motifs, such as animals and birds, which appear are nearly always emblems specifically meaningful to a courtly patron, and refer to knighthly orders, family connections and so on, and thus far, the fact that the Ivan cup decoration duplicates a number of the creatures of printed page frame, which is so obviously made under the influence of Italian manuscript frontispieces, would support a Crnojević attribution for the cup. A problems arises in connection with the double—headed eagle, since it is clear that this was the principal heraldic motif of Ivan Crnojević as well as of his son Djurdaj, and it does not appear on the cup where instead, a lion occupies the centre of the medallion. However, the circumstances of Ivan's life were such that it remains possible to claim the bowl for him and at the same time explain both the lion, and the bowl's rather "Bosnian" appearance, which has been remarked upon by Bojana Radojković. Ivan spent more than ten years of his early life at the court of Herceg Stepan Vukčić Kosača, to which he was sent by his father as a hostage around 1441 (Cirković et al. 1970; page 196), and in 1469 he married the Herceg's daughter Mara. Kosača cultural influence in fact affected him thoroughly; this is clear in his choice of design for the tombstones of his parents in Kom Island on Lake Skadar (figs. 17b,c). These follow a type of tombstone patterning characteristic of the Nikšić—Vilusi—Trebinje regions, and exhibit peculiarly stylized rings on bands; the Kosača were certainly the dominant cultural force in that region (ibid; page 472—475,496—497). I have previously mentioned in connection with the Kosovo medallion that there is some evidence of Bosnian lords presenting their own heraldry to their vassals, and that perhaps because there was a ritual drinking ceremony to cement fealty, such heraldry is apparent on the medallions of drinking bowls. There is reason to believe that the Kosača regarded the lion as their heraldic beast (Anđelić 1970; page 72, 73). It can be suggested that the bowl under discussion might have been given to Ivan Crnojević as a mark of his connection with the Kosača family.

Although this suggestion of Ivan Crnojević as the bowl's original owner can only be made tentatively, it accords better with the bowl's style features, from which incidentally Ottoman elements are completely lacking, than the suggestion of the very late 16th century Vojvoda Ivan Banjanin, the other so-far suggested candidate. It should also be said that Bojana Radojković (1966a; page 130—131) has supported her dating of the Ivan cup by claiming that the working of the animals corresponds closely to that on three other cups; the cup of Metropolitan Viktor at Dečani, dated by inscription 1593, and two cups which she ascribes to "the sphere of Dubrovnik goldsmithery", and dates to the 16th century — one, from Savina monastery, she so dates by implication; elsewhere (1960—61; page 12) she calls it 15th century. One can only say in reply that, leaving aside the facts that the Dečani cup contains many Ottoman elements, so conspicuously lacking on the Ivan item, and that the other two cups are much too arbitrarily dated to be very helpful, the differences in the animal stylizations are much more striking than the (very slight) similarities.
Fig. 16 (a–f) — a: Bowl (hanap) from the Rouen treasure. Silver, repoussé, engraved, parcel-gilt. First half of the 14th century. Diameter 20 cm. Leningrad, Hermitage (Basilewsky Collection); b: Grave stele from Humsko, Foča, south and north sides. Sarajevo, Zemaljski muzej. Present height 181 cm., original height in situ, 254 cm. Width these sides, 38 cm., width east and west sides, circa 50 cm; c: Grave stele. Humsko, Foča. Effigy of Gost Milutin, east side, and motifs which flank him on the adjoining south and north sides. 15th century; d: Bowl. Silver, repoussé, engraved. Diameter 16.2 cm. Fojnica, Muzej samostana; e: Bowl. Silver, repoussé, engraved, parcel-gilt. In the center an image of St. Nicholas worked on the base, no print. Diameter 15.7 cm., height 4 cm. Detail. Excavated at the monastery of Banja, Priboj Dated 1596/97. Banja monastery treasury (7/1); f: Bowl, silver, repoussé, engraved. Diameter 15 cm. Dated 1574. Detail. Budapest, Magyar Nemzeti Múzeum.
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THE CKOTOV AND HERMITAGE BOWLS

There is second bowl in this group, which owes its basic design to the radiating arcade idea, which I wish to argue was the property of a prominent Hercegovinian of the second half of the fifteenth century. As with the Ivan cup, it has been dated elsewhere to a later period but lacks any trace of Ottoman influence in its design. This bowl, now in Russia, (fig. 18a) was published in 1971 as in private ownership (Postnikova-Loseva 1971; page 73, 74, sl. 6), and again in 1972—1973 as in the collection of Zurab Ckotov (Radojković 1972—1973; page 28, 31, sl. 11). Postnikova-Loseva’s original suggestion was that the bowl was Dubrovnik work of the 15th century; Bojana Radojković, on the other hand, felt that Dubrovnik was disqualified because of the lack of control stamp and the presence of a cyrillic monogram on the attached medallion, and dated the bowl to the 16th or even 17th century (ibid.; page 28). She felt that the composition was too crowded and disorderly to be 15th century workmanship, motifs being «thickened», and «just thrown on the surface». Whilst Radojković’s observation that the lack of control stamp excludes the possibility of the bowl’s being Dubrovnik work may be accepted, her further statement that the cyrillic monogram shows that it cannot be coastal work cannot be accepted. It simply is not true that anything made in Dalmatia would necessarily use Latin letters; it would depend entirely on the patron for whom the object was made. Dubrovnik, after all, had its own style of cyrillic (Đordić 1971; page 149), and any coastal town which had dealings with the interior would certainly be a possible source for cyrillic letters. The characteristics of the decorative style, which lead Radojković to assign the bowl to a 16th or 17th century workshop of the Serbian interior (although she cites no similar known Serbian work of that period for comparison) seem to me to reflect the influence of a very distinct mid-15th century Italian style.

The aesthetic of Italo-French 15th century naturalism, which I see as a design influence on this bowl, was contemporary with but different from the ebullient Dalmatian sculptural reliefs of Juraj Dalmatinac and his school, and made itself felt on carved wood items and metal vessels (Lightbown 1977; page 82, 101—103, Pl. XVI) and equally in manuscript illumination (figs. 19a b) (Alexander 1977, fig. VI, VII, XV, Pl. 19, 20, 21). The style had an element of the surreal, which is apparent in the distortion of plant forms when used as design frames, and is pre-figured in the extraordinary
Combinations of architecture and foliage introduced by the Lombard miniaturist and sculptor Giovani dei Grassi (died 1399) in the book of hours he illuminated for Giangaleazzo Visconti (Meiss, Kirsch 1972; BR 3, BR48v, BR 90v, BR 108v, BR 145, etc.), and developed by his various successors. An initial letter (fig. 19a) from a mid 15th century Italian manuscript (Siena, Libreria Piccolomini, Graduale 28, 12, Saint Martin, f. 101v; Alexander 1977, Fig. XV) shows just the type of very crowded composition and fluidity between plant forms and architectural forms which are so prominent features of the Ckotov bowl. We can observe the earlier phase of this Italian stylistic development already at work as an influence in Bosnia in the Hval manuscript of 1403 (Bologna, Biblioteca universitaria, ms. 3575 B, f. 13v; Đurić 1957; page 39—51, sl. 8); the Annunciation miniature of folio 13v has a good example of architecture merging into plant forms (fig. 19c).

This late gothic «surrealist» style certainly affected French hanap decoration in the 15th century, and was doubtless also carried to the Balkans. Some evidence of the style affecting even architectural design in the interior can be seen on a bifora window surround at Castle Travnik, deep into Bosnia (fig. 19d), (Andeljić 1973; page 214), where a medallialike profile portrait wit-
hin a ring (which reminds us that the Dubrovnik medal list Pavko Antonijević, who engaged in building and fortification design as well as goldsmithery, and who worked as an assistant to the sculptor Donatello in Italy before returning to his native city, is just the sort of figure through whom this style might have been transmitted from Italy to the Balkans) is flanked by two plant forms surmounted by pod or flower clusters. These plant forms have their lowest leaves curling upwards, rather than downwards, very much as on the Čkotov bowl. The Travnik carving is dated to about 1450 by the short hairstyle and inner and outer collar arrangement on the profile portrait which is, incidentally, suggestive of a medal of Federigo da Montefeltro (fig. 19e) which the above mentioned Pavko Antonijević made in Italy in 1450, under his Italian name of Paolo d’Antonio da Ragusa (Plaković 1949; page 172–174). The Travnik work is not particularly distinguished, and gives the impression of being the work of a local carver following a design supplied by a more sophisticated artist.

The basic composition of the Čkotov bowl (fig. 18a) in fact accords with — what we have previously discussed as characteristics of pre-conquest Bosnian metalworking. A striking feature is its strong geometrical design articulated by areas of plain silver. Interestingly, there are three petal-type shapes: a cinquefoil on the central medallion, which is bounded by a circular wreath with some nacre treatment; a hexafoil which occupies the space between this wreath and the circle defining the base area; and an octofoil which takes up the remaining space, i. e. the side wall of the bowl. Directed outwards from the base ring and inwards from the upper rim of the bowl are series of plain scallops of the sort which featured so prominently on the Sanko bowl already discussed. On the other hand, the «arcaded» tradition is also strongly represented on the bowl, in the unmistakable ogee shapes within the lobes of the virous multifolies. Although the derivation from the arcaded style is very clear, the representation of its elements is much less «architectural» than is the case with the Ivan cup; this is especially true of the decoration of the side walls, where the columns and arches have become very plantlike, in the way we have seen to be characteristic of the Italian decorative manner we have suggested as an additional influence on the maker of this bowl.

The inside of the various «arches», and the spandrels which they form with their bounding circles, are decorated with an assortment of ebulliently-worked motifs. The interior of the medallion’s cinquefoil is taken up with an explicit crossbow motif flanked by the cyrillic letters B K (V II), and tiny radiating forms occupy the spandrels. The wreath surrounding the central print has springing from it two large leaves, which occupy two lobes of the hexafoil, and a number of rings on stems. Of the remaining lobes of the hexafoil, three are occupied by rosettes made of large raised circles (such circles also appear in the spandrels) and the sixth lobe, the one immediately above the central medallion when this is viewed for reading the letters, is occupied by a dog with a collar. The lobes of the outer octofoil are occupied alternately by fantastic plant forms and more collared dogs, some in contorted postures.

We have, it is hoped, already established that this mixture of traditional geometry and fantastic decoration is a possible style for a Hercegovinian workshop of the mid or later 15th century. We should therefore now turn our attention to the matter of the bowl’s ownership. Since there is no other surviving bowl with such a preponderance of dogs, and since a dog is placed immediately above the personalizing central medallion, it is reasonable to assume that, if we can find someone with the initials «VH» whose heraldic repertoire includes both a crossbow and a collared dog, we shall have a likely candidate.

There is an obvious suggestion in the person of the prominent Hercegovinian Vlach, Vojvoda Vukić Hrabren, died after August 1496 (Hrabak 1956; page 35, 36). In his period, the type of crossbow show on the medallion, which includes a version of the cranking-mechanism for drawing the string, known in English as a «crick» and in French as «etangouin», would be made obsolete by the introduction of firearms (this in itself, whilst not conclusive evidence of date, should make us cautious of seeing the bowl as a late 16th or 17th century product). Vukić Hrabren’s tombstone, a tall cross erected in the high mountains of Visočica at Prokletica (Vego III; page 44, no. 176) carries a motif of similar shape to the bow on the bowl medallion. Visiting the site in 1980, I found the stone too worn to be able to state with certainty that what is depicted is a crossbow, but this does seem the most likely interpretation of the shape which is clearly visible, and which furthermore appears under an ogee just as the bow on the bowl does. As to the dogs, the evidence again is suggestive, though not conclusive. Isolated dogs, that is, not forming part of hunting scenes, do appear on several stećci within Hrabreni-Miloradović hereditary territory at Gornje Bare and Gvoznio, Kalinović (Wenzel 1965, T. LXXIII, 1, 5, 4); further evidence connecting the territory with this family will be presented in my forthcoming book. Again, collared dogs are given on Hrabrenović — Miloradović coats of arms, both as crest and shield emblem, in heraldic sources from after the Turkish conquest (Bogičević 1952; page 143, Solovjev 1933, T. X. 97). These have to be treated with some caution, as the motives of their compilers were not always of the purest. However, as knowledge from other sources increases, they are being seen to be more reliable than was once thought, especially in respect to the better-known families.

As a result of all this, we can say that Vojvoda Vukić Hrabren seems the best candidate amongst Hercegovinian historical personages for the original owner of the Čkotov bowl. As with previous items, though, we feel that the bowl can be fairly conclusively dated from its style characteristics, despite the fact that the suggestion for ownership must remain tentative. It is perhaps worth adding that later generations of the Hrbreni-Miloradović emigrated to Russia, and from there sent gifts of metalwork to the Orthodox Church in Hercegovina (Bogičević 1952; page 154). This perhaps shows an appreciation of metalwork, which would explain the
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Fig. 19 (a—g) — a: Liberale da Verona, initial letter. Siena, Libreria Piccolomini. Graduale 28,12, Saint Martin, f. 101v., soon after the middle 15th century; b: Giorgio d’Alemagna, border decoration, Bible of Borso d’Este. Modena, Biblioteca Estense, VG. 12 (Lat. 422—23), Vol. I, f. 212r, mid 15th century; c: Annunciation miniature, Hval manuscript, Bosnia 1403. Bologna, Bibl. univ. ms. 3575 B, f. 13v.; d: Bifora window surround, Castle Travnik, 15th century; e: Pavko Antonijević or Paolo d’Antonio da Ragusa, bronze medal representing Federigo da Montefeltro, 1450; f: Tombstone, tall chest from Radimlja, Stolac, west end. Vojvoda effigy from the Hrabreni-Miloradović family, later 15th century; g: Tombstone, tall chest from Radimlja, Stolac, west end, detail.
careful preservation of our bowl, is it did indeed belong to Vukic Hrabren. It is also interesting that other Hrabren-Miloradović tombstones of the second half of the 15th century, at the famous Radimlja necropolis, have as their principal decoration full-length figures, presumably of the deceased, with a bow of much simpler style above their left shoulders, and above the other, near their raised and enlarged right hands, hollowed out circles, which might well represent bowls (figs. 19f, g). This matter is mentioned only briefly here, since many different interpretations have been given for these circles, and the matter will be discussed at some length in my forthcoming book on stećak decoration; meanwhile, it is worth recalling that as early as 1930, A. Benac suggested that these circles, appearing on the tombstones of vojvodes, might have been a specific mark of that status (Benac 1950; page 31).

The final bowl to be discussed in this group (fig. 18b) has many similarities with the previous bowl. Of silver gilt, it was excavated from a kurgan burial in the Belgrade region of the North Caucasus and is now in the Hermitage, Leningrad, no. 477 (Postnikova-Loseva 1971; page 72, sl. 5; Radojković 1972—73; page 23, 24, sl. 1). Bojana Radojković, discussing this bowl and the previous one together, notes that they have many similarities, but feels that whilst this Hermitage bowl can be dated to the 15th century, the greater extravagance of the decoration of the Čotov bowl must mean that it is substantially later. In my view she is correct in her dating of the Hermitage bowl. I have given above my reasons for dating the Čotov bowl to the 15th century also, and would conclude that the greater extravagance of the latter's decoration (which seems to me to be accompanied by a superior technical skill, insofar as one can make such judgments from photographs) is simply an indication of a greater measure of influence from contemporary Italian work. The points of correspondence between the two works are numerous: in both examples the decoration of the base area consists of a hexafoil pattern with internal decoration around a wreath central medallion; in both this is in turn surrounded by an octafoil pattern, the internal decoration of whose lobes alternates creatures and plant forms; and both exhibit shallow versions of the Sanko bowl-type scalloping around the rim. Unfortunately, the central print is missing from the Hermitage bowl, so we have no means of knowing whether it was once personalized to its owner.

The differences between the two bowls seem to be more of treatment than of style. For example, the incuse treatment is more complete, each of the lobes of the hexafoil decoration containing a plant form which sprouts from the wreath once surrounding the central print; the decorated areas in the lobes of the octafoil are separated by bands of plain silver, whereas on the Čotov bowl, a narrow band of decoration is in most instances worked between the lobes down to the ring of outwardly turned scallops; and as a result of this latter feature, the Hermitage bowl arcing does seem somewhat more «architectural» than that on the Čotov bowl, additional emphasis to the architectural conception being given on the former by the echoing of the three leaf groups from the hexafoil's spandrels as pendants from the spandrels of the octafoil. The plant forms on the Hermitage bowl, being slightly less fantastic and Italianise than those on the Čotov bowl, resemble even more closely those on the Travnik window surround already discussed (fig. 19d). Perhaps the most striking difference between the two bowls is that where the Hermitage example is obviously worked to a formula, so that, for instance, each outer spandrel contains a double palmette ending in the three-leafed pendant already mentioned and each lobe of the hexafoil contains a rather similar plant form springing from the wreath, on the Čotov bowl these ideas appear just once or twice, and the remaining corresponding areas are filled, or treated, quite differently. This difference, although it certainly implies a greater exhuberance on the part of the Čotov craftsman, does not imply a significantly later date for his work.

Most of the Balkan silver bowls in museums throughout the world date from the 16th century or later; of the exceptions, those discussed in this paper (all except one of which I believe to date from the 14th and 15th centuries) can be connected with the Bosno-Hercegovi­nian sphere and carry features which seem not to appear on Serbian metalwork in the period before the Turkish conquest. Many of the later bowls, however (twelve of which, incidentally, are in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London, unashamedly bearing the label «Russian» at the date of writing) carry on the «arcaded» structure in one form or another. As well as the rather severe examples where the arcades are filled with saints (fig. 16e), (Sabota 1981; page 76—81) or occasionally with beasts (figs. 16d, 16f), (Karaman-Medovło 1980; page 30, 31, sl. 4) there are a number with less restrained, more sinuous, arcades reminiscent of those on the Čotov and Hermitage bowls, the style of which remains recognizable despite numerous Ottoman and even 18th century baroque additions. In discussions of post-conquest «Serbian» metalwork, this is often described as a Hercegovi­nian style, with the implication that it burst into being there under combined Ottoman and Dalmatian stimulus during the period immediately after the conquest. When Heregovina was a politically undisturbed backwater, and repository of Old Serbian tradition, enjoying a fruitful calm, whilst the brunt of Turkish military activity was directed north, against still-unconquered areas (Radojković 1966a; page 55—57, 61, 91, 92). We hope to have shown, as a result of this discussion, that this style had antecedents in the pre-conquest period, when Heregovina was part of the Bosnian Kingdom, and indeed, was a facet of a distinct Bosnian Kingdom style, drawing on influences from France, Italy and Hungary, and traceable in metalwork, architecture tombstone design and manuscript illumination.
A BOWL IN ZAGREB

All the metalwork items so far discussed in this paper have previously appeared in the literature, some many times. The last bowl I want to mention has not, so far as I know, been previously published. It is in the collection of the Akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb, and I was recently able to examine it there along with the bowl bearing a Dubrovnik control stamp which I have already briefly mentioned (see note 8). Thanks are due to the authorities at the Academy for their kindness and cooperation in making these bowls available for study.

The bowl under discussion (fig. 20) is again of "hanap" shape, and its centre bulges upwards, rather in the manner of the one undecorated metal bowls of the same size which are shown hurled to the ground in the third episode of Bottecelli's Wedding of Nastagio degli Onesti, painted in 1483 and now in the Prado, Madrid (fig. 21a), (de Angelis 1980: page 4, no. 78). The diameter of the bowl is 13.3 cm., and its height, 3.2 cm. The inside of the bowl was once gilded, though little of this now remains. In its decoration, the bowl continues some elements of the Ckotov and Hermitage bowl style, but combines them with obvious north Dalmatian elements and some new Italian features. Its particular blend of decoration suggests that it may have been made by a craftsman in Hungarian controlled Bosnia, perhaps inland from Zadar around Livno, shortly before that territory fell to Ottoman occupation. At that period (i.e., the very late 15th or early 16th century), Turkish motifs were already beginning to combine with the traditional patterning in the occupied Balkans.

The working of the side wall of the bowl recalls the Ckotov and Hermitage bowls in that it is treated as an arcade of ten arches, partially filled with two types of design used alternately; an interesting difference is that one type of design, a tight, fish-scale pattern, fills only the lower halves of the arches it occupies leaving the upper portions quite plain, whilst the other design type, which is an undulating plant form including heart-shaped elements, occupies a larger amount of its arch spaces, and it completely surrounded with ring-matting. The base area of the bowl has a treatment rather different from the other arcaded bowls here discussed. There is no second arcaded or geometric form and there is no central print; instead the base is occupied by a large free design featuring a deer with large antlers standing out from a textured ground of ring-matting, and beneath the deer and coming up in front of it, a row of the same plant forms with heart-shaped elements which occupy half of the arcades on the bowl wall (figs. 20a, 20b).

Another feature of the bowl which distinguishes it from the others we have discussed is that although its essential decoration has been worked from beneath and engraved from above as usual, a degree of extra decoration has been added to the outside and underneath of the bowl. On the bottom of the bowl, engraved lines greatly strengthen the shape of the deer, and these seem to have been billed with a niello-like substance (fig. 20c). It should perhaps be said that the idea of making the outside of a bowl as interesting to look at as the inside is often taken up on the later Ottoman bowls, but achieved by different means; generally an extra piece of decorated metal was added to the bottom (Raby 1982: page 22, fig. 5).

Three design components which can be traced elsewhere contribute to the decoration of this bowl: the arcing itself which we have already argued is observable in middle and later 15th century Bosnian work, although it has a longer history; the heart-shaped leaf patterning which seems to originate in early 15th century Zadar metalworking; and the characteristic fish-scale motif, which here is probably copied from maiolica of Faenza made from 1470 to 1500, although its origin is in China.

The degree to which the bowl's arcing corresponds with that of the earlier bowls has already been mentioned, although we should add that the scallop border is also present in residual form on our Zagreb bowl, surrounding the base area; it is more irregular than the previous examples, the lobes varying in shape and size. The heart-shaped foliage motif is doubtless a transformation of the well-known Bolognese style of manuscript foliage; the earliest surviving example of its metalwork stylization seems to be on the reliquary arm of St. Dometius, made in 1414 in the Treasury of Zadar Cathedral (Krkčević 1972; page 92). This reliquary arm (fig. 21b) was manufactured in Zadar and donated by Antun Marušić, chaplain of the fraternity of St. James. On both the reliquary arm and the Zadar bowl this motif appears, as a plain silver area against a background of ring-matting, and doesn't have any internal delineation. The origin of the fish-scale pattern is the so-called "breaking-wave" in 14th century Chinese porcelain (Carswell 1982; page 83, Pl. 75-77). Of the various "breaking-wave" derivatives in the western and Islamic spheres, the versions on 16th and 17th century Iznik pottery retain many of the features of the original (Medley 1980: page 128, 188), whilst the Italian versions found in Faenza maiolica of the period are greatly simplified fish-scale patterning divorced from the other elements of their Chinese context. In some Faenza plates commissioned by the King of Hungary between 1480 and 1500, of which fragments have been excavated from Buda castle (Gerevich 1971, Pl. CXXI, 340, 341, 343), there are circular bands of fish-scale decoration (fig. 21c). It is undoubtedly from these Faenza models that the craftsmen who made our Zagreb bowl has taken the pattern; the use of segments of the pattern within arches is perhaps a specifically Balkan compromise.

This bowl is much harder to date conclusively than any of the others we have discussed. It obviously cannot be earlier than the end of the 15th century because of its peculiar conjunction of design elements, and the period of the end of the 15th and beginning of the 16th century is the most likely for the origin of its decorative style. Whether this actual example was made then or perhaps a little later (it could, for instance, have been made by a craftsman who emigrated from the Livno region and practiced somewhere north where the pattern, free from Turkish influence, was carried on) is something we would not wish to be dogmatic about. Nonetheless, since if our bowl had been made later than the
16th century, either around Livno or further north, the craftsman would have been subject to Turkish (on the one hand) or baroque (on the other) influences and in fact there is no trace of either in the bowl's design, we can have some degree of confidence in a late 15th or 16th century dating. Certainly, comparable forms of arcading and fish-scale decoration within them can be found on Ottoman metalwork, but in all probability as an example of Bosnian influence; I have not been able to find any truly comparable heart-shaped plant forms in that repertoire (Fehér, Köhry 1986; Karamehmedović 1980).

Fig. 20 (a–c): Bowl, silver gilt, repoussé, engraved. Diameter 13.3 cm., height 3.2 cm. Zagreb, Akademija znanosti i umjetnosti; three views.

That there was a massive mingling of styles in Balkan metalworking after the Ottoman conquest is well known, and has been much commented upon. What I wish to suggest is that a distinct Bosnian Kingdom metalworking style had been evolved before the conquest, and that has not been widely recognized. Since the cultural unity of Bosnia and Hercegovina in the days of the Bosnian Kingdom is also largely unrecognized (with the exception of
Bosnian Church manuscripts and the stećak phenomenon, writers who have allowed a contribution for Hercegovinian motifs in the formulation of later Ottoman design have failed to realize their Bosnian Kingdom origin; indeed they have sometimes claimed that Sarajevo metalworking after the conquest made an entirely fresh start with wholly Ottoman material, that no link with previous Bosnian metalworking was maintained. This latter notion has been shown to be erroneous by Muhamad Ka­ramehmedović (1980; page 66—85). Another opinion sometimes maintained is that where there was no racial or religious unity, there could be no cultural unity sufficiently strong to produce anything distinctive; thus, though it could not be denied that there was a Bosnian Kingdom and that there was a Bosnian Church, it was felt that since there was no «Bosnian nation», there could be no Bosnian style. One can only say that the facts seem to prove otherwise; nor incidently, can one so lightly disregard the implications of the stećak phenomenon.

Obviously a major factor that has led to the neglect of the Bosnian contribution to Balkan metalworking has been the, on my view, misdating of several major items (the Stobů bowl, the Temska bowl, the Ivan cup, the Čkotov bowl); in a number of influential works these have been correctly assigned to Hercegovina, but dated after the period of the Ottoman conquest for that territory, that is, to a period when the Bosnian Kingdom no longer existed, and could thus be ignored as a source of design inspiration.

It is possible that at least one of the late datings proposed simply results from insufficient experience of the peculiarities of 15th century «realism» as it affected metalwork, a subject which has only been recently explored (Lightbown 1978; page 100—109); much confusion has prevailed in the past between this «late gothic» realism and the later naturalistic Renaissance style. Whatever the reason for the late dates proposed, they have brought a number of major items of in my view, Bosnian Kingdom metalwork into a period when Ser­brian monasteries and churches had largely replaced pri
vate individuals as Christian metalworking patrons within Turkish-occupied South Slav lands, with the result that these items have generally been seen simply as examples of Serbian-style metalwork. I hope I have been able to establish the characteristics of a distinctive Bosnian metalworking style; if this style could be more accurately defined as Bosnian Kingdom period Hercegovian, then the situation is little different from that of the major recognized late-medieval Bosnian art contribution, the stečak, the major decorated examples of which, with a few exceptions, are also found in Hercegovina, and date from that period. No-one, of course, has attempted to claim stečak art as Serbian.
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M. Wenzel: A vrijeme nastanka s/dm ali na njoj nedostaje njim medaljonom izgubljene bosanske zdjele


Gornje teze su razrađene u interpretaciji određenog broja uprotnih metalnih predmeta. Kosovski medalj, općenito smatra kopčom remena iz polovice 15. stoljeća, na osnovu datacije i dekorativnih elemenata poreznog s podoricom Balašić, autorica smatra središnjim medaljonom izgubljeni bosanske zdjele.

Autorica donosi argumentaciju da ta zdjela predstavlja francuske tradicije ukrašavanja zdjela prema mišljenju autorice, rezultat prikaza veoma poznatih većina iz ranijeg stila. Komparativnom analizom s stoljećima 1420. i 14. stoljeća, o čemu autorica smatra neosnovanim, jer nemaju ništa zajedničko.

Prema mišljenju autorice, rezultat jasno geometrizacija ukrasa aristokrata (uvežbena u među sutrašnjim pravom a u stoljećima 1420. i 14. stoljeća) autorica donosi argumentaciju da ta zdjela predstavljaju ili bosansko hercegovečki ili zlatarski rad između drugog i trećeg stoljeća, čimbenika ili obitelji Balšića.

Autorka smatra da je u vrijemenu kojemu je u Gogoškoj-Mehdinti, nije predložena ista interpretacija, već za obradu medalja Bosanskog kraljevstva, a u tim stoljećima 1420. i 14. stoljeća, o čemu autorica smatra neosnovanim, jer nemaju ništa zajedničko.

Na takav rad, osnovan na "nužnim komparativnim osobama" iz ranijeg stila, autorica donosi argumentaciju da ta zdjela predstavljaju ili bosansko hercegovečki ili zlatarski rad između drugog i trećeg stoljeća, čimbenika ili obitelji Balšića.

Autorica donosi argumentaciju da ta zdjela predstavljaju ili bosansko hercegovečki ili zlatarski rad između drugog i trećeg stoljeća, čimbenika ili obitelji Balšića.

Autorica donosi argumentaciju da ta zdjela predstavljaju ili bosansko hercegovečki ili zlatarski rad između drugog i trećeg stoljeća, čimbenika ili obitelji Balšića.

U nastavku studije autorica objašnjuje grupu radova kojih je njezinu misao izgubljene bosanske zdjele.

Isto je već od kraja stoljeća, 15. stoljeća, auto­ rica i zarađiva zdjela i svježih stećka, autorica donosi argumentaciju da ta zdjela predstavljaju ili bosansko hercegovečki ili zlatarski rad između drugog i trećeg stoljeća, čimbenika ili obitelji Balšića.

Na kraju studije autorica predstavlja zdjelu koja se nalazi u posjedu Jugoslovenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti.
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A BOSNIAN KINGDOM METALWORKING TRADITION

The medieval Bosnian state derived considerable prosperity from the exploitation of silver mines, and its wealthier inhabitants are known to have enjoyed use of luxury silver drinking bowls. It is suggested that such bowls had been manufactured for Bosnian usage in a recognizable Bosnian Kingdom style, here analyzed for the first time. The style as described is not confined to drinking bowls, but can be traced in architecture, tombstone design and manuscript illustration. Whilst using design elements from Hungary, France, Italy, Byzantium and Islamic north Africa, Bosnian style combines them in a unique way. Some facets of this Bosnian style have been previously isolated as «Hercegovinian style» in studies of post-Ottoman metalwork which, however, ignore their pre-conquest antecedents. In fact, it is here shown that certain basic design elements of Bosnian Kingdom metalworking style derive from high fashion European design of the time of Stephen II Kotromanić. Once introduced to the Bosnian court, possibly on drinking bowls used to seal feudal contracts, such design elements became a permanent part of Bosnian design, distinguishing it from Serbian and Dalmatian styles.

In listing prominent examples of Bosnian style silver bowls, the mis-dating of some of them has been put to right.
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BRINJ BURG AND ITS CHAPEL

Early in the 15th century, Nikola IV, prince of Krk, built a stately burg in Brinj. The burg is planned polygonally, with a chapel, defence tower and comfortable living quarters. These features are very similar to Krakowec Burg in Bohemia and certain other Czech towns dating from the late 14th century. The best preserved building is a two-story chapel, with a polygonal nave and details similar to those in «The Column Hall» (Sloupova syn) on Hradčani in Prague and on several buildings done by Petr Parler. The style of both burg and chapel ascribes them to builders associated with the Prague court workshop of king Waclaw IV. Later, during 16th and 17th century the fortification was added to, because of the war with Turks.

Ivan Mirk

MEDALS BY DEPASTI IN THE NUMISMATIC COLLECTION OF THE ARCHEOLOGICAL MUSEUM IN ZAGREB

Six bronze medals from the Numismatic Collection of the Archeological Museum in Zagreb, all acquired before the First World War, are dealt with in this article. They were modelled by the famous Italian artist Matteo de'Pusti of Verona between 1446 and 1450. Their major part is directly or indirectly in connection with Sigismondo Malatesta, one of the most picturesque personalities of Italy of the fifteenth century. Malatesta was a gifted warrior and an accomplished patron of arts. Three of the medals bear his image on the obverse, with various scenes on the reverse (Catalogue Nos. 4–6). The beautiful Isotta degli Atti, Malatesta's mistress, later, wife is depicted on two more medals (Cat. Nos. 2–3), one with an elephant (the Malatesta device «Elephas Indus culices non timet») on the reverse, the other showing a closed book of elegies dedicated to Isotta. More space is dedicated to Timoteo Malatesta (died in 1470), whose portrait can be seen on one medal (Cat. No. 1). A citizen of Verona, just like the artist himself, he became canon at an early stage, and acquiring a profound learning, began the career as a famous preacher, writer and teacher, his fame spreading all over Italy. All this brought the favour of three Popes (Pius II, Nicolas V and Paul II) upon him. The latter nominated Malatesta first as his own secretary, in order to invest him as the forty-seventh Archishop of Dubrovnik in 1467. Malatesta arrived in Dubrovnik in the same year, but soon enough discovered that his own ideas about the ecclesiastical, as well as secular matters did not correspond to those of the Ragusan Senate. The strife ended in an excommunication cast by the Archbishop upon his people in 1469. Malatesta died in 1470 while preparing for a journey to Hungary, following the invitation of the Hungarian and Croatian King Mathias I, and was subsequently buried in the Romanesque Cathedral of Dubrovnik. His medal seems to have been cast around 1446.

Radovan Ivančević

MODEL FOR RENAISSANCE RELIEF BAPTISM OF CHRIST IN TROGIR

The relief of the Baptism of Christ above the entrance to the Baptistry (1467) of the Trogir Cathedral is the largest Renaissance relief in Dalmatia. Through the comparative analysis of the composition, spatial relations of figures, typology of angels and the perspective of landscape with the «low» river and two towns author states that this work must have been inspired by the invention of Piero della Francesca in his painting Baptist of Christ (London). For its classical composition and applied perspective Trogir relief has more Renaissance characteristics not only compared to contemporary (L. Dobričević) or even later painting of Baptism in Dalmatia (M. Hamzić, 1506) but also to some later Renaissance reliefs in Italy (G. Micelli). Rejecting the hypothesis that the outstanding features of the Trogir relief could be explained by the influence of Nicolas Florentin (proposed by Lj. Karaman and others) or George Dalmatian (A. M. Schulz) author states that actual attribution of the Trogir Baptism to Aleši, since it is better than most of his works, remains uncertain.
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JURAJ DALMATINAC IN ANCONA

Through critical interpretation of original documents and historical texts, the article has elucidated an important period in the life and work of the great master, Juraj Dalmati-