

VLADIMIR PETER GOSS, VJEKOSLAV JUKIĆ

MEDVEDGRAD – ÓCSA – SPIŠ SOME STYLISTIC CONSIDERATIONS

Izvorni znanstveni rad
UDK: 725.96 (234 Medvednica)
73.033.4 (234 Medvednica)
Prilmljeno: 1. 7. 2007.
Prihvaćeno: 5. 7. 2007.

Vladimir Peter Goss
School of Arts and Sciences
University of Rijeka
vgoss@aol.com

Vjekoslav Jukić
School of Arts and Sciences
University of Rijeka
v.jukic@inet.hr

This article continues our investigations of the sculpture at Medvedgrad concentrating on non-figured materials, the portal and the non-figured capitals of the Chapel, and the fragments of the Palas capitals. Thanks to new insights into the patronage of Herceg Koloman in the Spiš area of Slovakia, and its monuments, it proposes a new, earlier dating of the Medvedgrad complex giving credence to proposals of Nada Klaić who ascribed Medvedgrad to the patronage of Herceg Koloman which, in our opinion, seems quite likely for the Chapel and the Palas.

Key words: Medvedgrad, Croatia, Slavonia, Slovakia, Spiš, Carpathian basin, Romanesque sculpture, Early Gothic.

In the previous issue of the *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* we have presented some thoughts on the iconography of the castle chapel at Medvedgrad, on the Medvednica mountain above Zagreb (fig. 1). In doing so we have relied primarily on what is iconographically most prominent, i.e., the figured elements. Although the iconographic program of the chapel is sadly incomplete, as the lunette and the key stone are missing, the analysis of what remains – the two atlas figures (one restored) above the entrance, and the two representations of column-eating lions above and behind the altar, have allowed us to reach some fairly definite and, we believe, useful conclusions¹. Additionally, in a number of studies, either published or in print, we have sketched out the framework for an analysis that we are proposing here. An attentive reader is therefore requested to bear with us, as we have to restate some of the facts that have been discussed elsewhere².

Both atlantes and column-devouring lions are rare, in the case of the latter, even exceptional in the Carpathian basin. The surviving original atlas figure is a nicely rounded chubby guy with a long incised beard covering also his neck. By raising his arms, bent at elbows, he supports the abacus above his head the top of which is at the same level as the fists. The figure, strictly frontal and symmetric, is executed in simple, bold strokes. It can be compared to a number of figured examples from elsewhere in the Carpathian basin, e.g., Vértesszenkereszt, Pécsvarad, Zalavár, all datable to the early decades of the 13th century.³ As another comparison, one could list a badly damaged head of a warrior in the Museum in Čazma, possibly a head of a small figure such as appear along the sides of the tomb of Queen Getrude the fragments of which were

¹ Goss, Vicelja 2006.

² Goss 2007.

³ Goss, Vicelja 2006, pp. 166-167. Takács 1994, p. 177, 242; Takács 2001, p. 440, 450, 452; Marosi 1984, p. 352

found at Pilisszentkereszt. The Čazma fragment however seems to convey a deeper expression than the Medvedgrad piece, and a hand of a more accomplished artist, although such a judgment should be taken with a grain of salt given the poor state of preservation of the piece.⁴

A hand of a more accomplished artist, as we have copiously demonstrated, is revealed by the two column-eaters, which, even in their damaged state, rank among masterpieces of the period in the Carpathian basin. As shown in the previous article, the Medvedgrad capitals are only the second identified example of that iconographic motif in this part of Europe⁵.

But their appearance is not quite random. The links between the art of the medieval Slavonia of the last decade of the 12th through the fourth decade of the 13th century, and the art of the royal domain of Esztergom and the Danube Bend in general, have been clearly identified in recent research. This is not only a question of style. The positioning of the column-eating lions in full view opposite to the entrance, and above the altar, clearly recalls the words from Peter I/5, 6-11. We do not believe it is accidental that a very similar inscription (preserved) was held by St. Peter at the Porta Speciosa of the Cathedral of Esztergom (late 12th ct.). It runs: “K(arissi)MI VIGILATE I(n)OR(ation)O(n)IBUS Q(ui)A ADV(er)SARIUS V(este)R DIABOL(u)S TA(m) Q(uam) LEO RUGIE(n)S C(ir)CUIT QUERENSQ(ue)m DEUORET. As we have pointed out in several studies, the “late Romanesque” links between Zagreb and Esztergom are brought home in a most graphic manner by two capitals, one in the Historical Museum of Croatia in Zagreb, the other *in situ* in the royal palace at Esztergom. They are simply the same, which did not elude Ernő Marosi’s attention. The provenance of the Zagreb capital remains a mystery as the original place of origin, i.e., Medvedgrad was rejected as non-existent at the time of the capital’s making; thus it was tentatively, and without any real evidence, ascribed to the workshop of Zagreb Cathedral, not impossible but also not conclusive⁶.

That Medvedgrad required an intelligent and influential patron seems quite obvious already from what we have said so far. Was such a patron, or patrons, available in the medieval Slavonia in the first half of the 13th century? The answer is, as we have also shown, yes⁷.

Thanks to physical discoveries in the course of last few decades, today we can at least have a glimpse at major monuments sponsored by a pair of extremely illustrious members of the elite in the medieval Slavonia, Bishop Stephen II of Zagreb from 1225-47 (believed by some to be a Babonić), and Herceg Koloman, viceroy of Croatia from 1226-41, and King of Galicia, brother of the Hungarian reformer-king Bela IV (1235-1270)⁸

“The Renaissance of the 12th century” reached Hungary and Croatia fully by the time of Bela III (1173-1196), who definitely turned his country toward the West, opening the door not only to numerous colonists, the process that would peak in the first half of the 13th century, but also to that wonderful culture of the major movers of the process, the Cistercians and related new orders, including the military ones. A vast new Europe of cleared woods and dried marshes, of new towns and new villages, appeared from Northern Wales to Transylvania, with sober and harmonious architecture, and beautiful and serene early Gothic architectural decoration primarily represented by a great variety of capitals “à crochet,” but also by purified and poetically realistic images of “domestic flora.” By the first half of the 13th ct. the Cistercians had become the key building advisors and builders to such potentates as Emperor Frederic II himself. They should also be credited with a major role in bringing the new style to the Carpathian basin.⁹

As Ernő Marosi has demonstrated, the key role in that process was played by the rebuilding of the cathedral and the royal palace at Esztergom launched in 1180 by two remarkable men, King Bela III and Archbishop Hiob. A similar albeit, of course, lesser pair appears on the

⁴ Goss, Vicolja 2006, loc. cit.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 167-168. Goss 2007, pp. 56-57.

⁶ Goss, Vicolja 2006, pp. 170-171. Goss 2007, pp. 59-60. Marosi 1984, p. 81

⁷ Goss 2007, passim.

⁸ Budak 2004, pp. 153-158; Gulín 2004, pp. 29-39; Kovačić 2004, pp. 41-69. Also Basić 2006., pp. 25-44.

⁹ Goss 2003, Marosi 1984, Cadei, 1980, Ghisalberti, 1994.

political and cultural scene of Croatia in the first half of the 13th century – Bishop Stjepan II of Zagreb (1225-1247) who was, until his appointment to the bishop's throne, the Chancellor to King Andrew II (1204-35) and Koloman, the younger son of King Andrew (born in 1208), appointed Herceg of the Ducatus of Slavonia in 1226, also nominally the King of Galicia. It is becoming more and more evident that the combined nomination was not a random event, but a planned political move, which becomes clear if we take a look at the two leaders. Koloman was the Herceg of Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia (1226-1241), brother to the future King Bela IV (1235-1270), a skilful ruler and great administrator, who brought about prosperity in Slavonia relying on King's free boroughs. Koloman's goal was to create a powerful and prosperous political unit consisting of Slavonia, Croatia, Dalmatia, and Bosnia within the Hungarian-Croatian Commonwealth, tying together those lands, or, in fact, *regna*, already parts of the Kingdom, by the rule of a single secular and a single religious leader. Bishop Stjepan was also a skilful administrator, man of the court and a great supporter of the dynasty, educated and cultured. His goal was to raise Zagreb to Archbishopric, as the central see of Herceg Koloman's kingdom¹⁰.

At least one site receiving the two leader's patronage has survived, and has been at least partially explored. This is Čazma, a new town, a unique case of a high class *bastide* in medieval Slavonia. By 1232, the date of Stjepan's privilege to the Chapter of Čazma, it must have already been provided with the necessary churches – of the Holy Spirit of the Chapter, the palace of the Canons, the Bishop's Palace, the Palace of the Herceg, the fortress and some kind of general fortifications. The church of St. Mary Magdalene (fig. 13) and the Dominican monastery also existed before the Tartar invasion (1242), as Thomas Archidiaconus tells us that Koloman was buried there in 1241. Other churches were mentioned in or close to Čazma in the Middle Ages – St. John, St. Andrew, St. Catherine¹¹.

The church believed to be St. Mary Magdalene stands in the center of the town. It has been thoroughly explored and is awaiting restoration and presentation, although we seem to be still far away from a final word on its building history. Yet, the architectural decor of a very high quality, as well as unfortunately badly damaged capitals in the interior, indicate a workshop of the first order, undoubtedly related, to the royal workshops, the presence of which is reconfirmed by the fragment of the head already mentioned above, as well as other fragments, such as capitals “à crochet” found at the fortress. Both Stjepan and Koloman could have seen before coming to Slavonia the flowering of major worksites at Esztergom, Pannonhalma, Vértesszentkerest, Pilis, Ják, etc. The huge western wall rose of St. Mary Magdalene (fig. 13) is close to the one on southern transept at Bamberg, and the presence of masters from Bamberg has been demonstrated for Ják between 1225-50¹².

The use of brick (as well as its dimensions), the architectural decor, and moldings more than indicate, as already pointed out decades ago, that the Čazma workshop was also active at Medvedgrad which is, of course, traditionally ascribed to Bishop Filip, and dated after 1250. Well-founded objections to such a date have been raised, e.g., by Nada Klaić, yet the issue remains unresolved. But before dealing with the tricky question of precise dating, let us attend to the central issue of our study, the style of non-figured sculpture of Medvedgrad, and its relation to the royal workshops of the Carpathian basin.¹³

¹⁰ Goss 2007, pp. 51-53, with abundant additional references in the footnotes.

¹¹ Goss 2007, p. 53, Štrk 2001, pp. 21-50, Horvat, 2001, pp. 9-20, Thomas Archidiaconus 1960, p. 83.

¹² Goss 2007, pp. 53-54 with the accompanying footnotes. Also Goss, Vicelja 2006, pp. 166-167.

¹³ Klaić 1984, pp. 36-41. What follows, as we have already pointed out in earlier studies (Goss 2007, etc.) is a striking case how two respectable scholars could (mis)use historical sources in order to bring home their argument. Nada Klaić (ibid., p. 41) states, we paraphrase, that Medvedgrad must have existed before the Tartar invasion as King Bela IV spent some time “around” Zagreb (“in partibus Zagrabiae,” see also Thomas Archidiaconus, 1960., p. 81) in 1241-42, and where would he have stayed unless in the royal castle of Medvedgrad already in existence. Drago Miletić (Miletić, Valjato-Fabris, 1987, p. 54) however claims that Medvedgrad could not have existed, as Thomas never mentioned it, and Thomas would have mentioned it if it had existed (*nota bene*, Thomas did not mention many things which may seem important to contemporary

The appearance of the Gothic in Continental Croatia is usually, and rightly, linked with the Cistercian monastery in Topusko and the *Domus* of the Templars at Gora, where the order had its seat already by 1196, and where a new early Gothic building was constructed over an earlier Romanesque one in the first decades of the 13th ct. Adding to that the already mentioned capital from Zagreb, it is evident that this important process occurred between ca. 1195 and 1230. The style of the beautiful “à crochet” capitals at Gora (fig. 16), of moldings, and of high quality ashlar is fully consistent with the current European standards. At Topusko, the 19th ct, excavations have apparently revealed a 12th ct. building with some, so it would seem, Romanesque elements (the rounded apse). More recent scholarship has considered the remains of the monumental facade as dating from the late 13th century at the earliest. The early Gothic phase before the newest investigations was documented only by fragments of moldings. The large recently published capitals (fig. 25) are not incompatible with the first half of the century as the style of the leafy decor strikingly recalls works executed at Pannonhalma around 1224. Moreover, the same capitals are a witness of an incredibly fast transfer of the decorative forms typical of the French Royal Domain (e.g., Cathedral of Reims) to the Medieval Slavonia via Pannonhalma. High quality workshops thus even precede the activity of Stjepan-Koloman team¹⁴

We believe that the decorative sculpture at Medvedgrad, in addition to being generally linked to Čazma, was a product of the same artistic milieu. In order to demonstrate this we will not only refer to related phenomena in the central part of the Pannonian plain, but will also have to review another of Herceg Koloman's project, that is, his attempt to conquer Galicia (Halič); the staging area for which was Spiš (Zips, Szepes) in eastern Upper Hungary, i.e., Slovakia¹⁵.

The importance of Koloman's Halič adventure (the Herceg seems to have been a kind of select hit-man for the borderlands of the Kingdom of St. Stephen) for Croatian history and culture was recognized only quite recently, and one must proceed with caution as there are as yet no joint Croatian-Slovak investigations into an important issue of common interest. Still, we believe that on the basis of what there is, certain interesting analogies would emerge and we will note them as we proceed with our argument. Now, however, let us go back to the formal issues¹⁶.

We will start our presentation of the non-figured sculpture at Medvedgrad with the Chapel portal¹⁷. It is a standard stepped-in portal, the recession being marked by alternating vertical elements, either rectangular or rounded (figs. 2-4). The base of the portal, with one recession and two projections belongs to the typical repertoire of the time. The moldings of the portal sides, interrupted by the capital zones reappear, somewhat enriched, around the lunette, itself never found and replaced by an uncarved stone panel. Here we also find the formal repertoire typical of the period, and reminiscent of the lunette at Čazma. All this has been exemplarily described by Drago Miletić, and it doesn't need to be repeated here in detail.

In his path finding work, Marosi has described the development of the portal in the architecture of ca. 1200 in the royal domain as a process of “tectonization,” whereby the portal, initially recessed into and flush with the surface of the facade grows toward being an individual architectural member projecting beyond the surface plane. In that line of development from simple and flat toward complex and spatial, from such works as the portals at Ócsa (ca. 1206-1234) and Halič (ca. 1213-1221), by the way of Bény (ca. 1198-1217) and Gyulafehérvár (ca. 1196- ca.1238, southern portal), to Karcsa (ca. 1196-ca. 1208) or the southern portal at Ják (ca. 1220-1256),

historians; on that issue also see Kovačić 2004, p. 64). Please note that both (opposing) conclusions have been made “ex silentio!”

¹⁴ Miletić 1979, pp. 127-152. Horvat 1966-67, pp. 121-134, Horvat 2005, pp. 8-10.

¹⁵ Pomfyova 1999, pp. 89-98; 2000, pp. 33-60; 2000-2001, pp. 295-315; 2003A, pp. 177-189; 2003B, pp. 38-109. Also, Prochazkova, 1998, pp. 64-75; 2003, pp. 243-250; and Klaty, 2003, pp. 251-255.

¹⁶ Basić 2004.

¹⁷ For the history of discovery and restoration as well as for detailed descriptions please see the excellent study by Miletić and Valjato-Fabris (Miletić, Valjato-Fabris, 1987).

Medvedgrad definitely joins the least developed examples, the two portals at Ócsa in particular (figs. 5-7) while, we dare to say, it also displays a somewhat higher degree of sophistication¹⁸. The moldings of the sides and the lunette frame are quite similar, but the latter is somewhat richer at Medvedgrad. The concepts ruling the capital zones are also close. In Ócsa, the capital zone of the southern, more ornate portal (figs. 6, 8) runs far into the facade surface, whereas that of the northern portal is in those terms very close to Medvedgrad (fig. 7, 9). As Medvedgrad chapel was built from brick, the portal is a sort of a stone insert, and the uprights underneath the ends of the capital zones (and so also the rest of the vertical elements) are individual pieces of stone, whereas at Ócsa the ends of the capital zones sit on top of the masonry courses of the facade. The fine, slim, but mostly damaged capitals of the Medvedgrad capital zones have a core surrounded by leaves which, like long tongues, curve forward and outward their tops ending in buds (all unfortunately broken off). They can be compared to the capitals of the northern portal at Ócsa (figs. 3, 4, 9), however, one should not insist too much on that comparison. Firstly, because of the state of preservation of the Medvedgrad capitals, and, secondly and more important, as the capitals at both places belong to a very frequently used type (with variations, of course), and, thus, in our opinion, should not alone represent a conclusive argument, an issue we will address again below. The ends of the capital zones at Medvedgrad are not the same, on the left (north) there is broad, open leaf bound together by a horizontal bar above which a massive, double bud seems to have stood (fig. 3). This unique “binding” has a lesser companion in a short, straight bar linking the volutes at the top row of buds of the southern portal at Ócsa (fig. 8), reflected in a related fragment from Spišske Vlchy to be discussed later (fig. 34). On the right (southern) side of the Medvedgrad portal (fig. 4) the center is occupied by a grape-like fruit surrounded by stylized leaves. Here, also, little could be added to Miletić’s description.

The disparity of the sides has not escaped the attention of previous investigators. This is a phenomenon well-known from Romanesque sculpture, it appears at the southern portal at Ócsa (fig. 6) too, and a blatant example not far from our region is the portal at Špitalič in Slovenia. Of course, as the differences between the Romanesque sections of the towers of Chartes Cathedral indicate, such a disparity was not considered a fault even in the most distinguished buildings¹⁹.

The Premonstratensian church at Ócsa (fig. 5) is a complex and baffling building, where “Romanesque” and “Gothic” elements intertwine in very unusual ways. Its short, two-bay nave (originally planned as three-bay with a two tower facade, which was moved eastward in the definitive version occupying the place of the first bay) uncannily recalls Čazma (fig. 13). It was, according to Marosi’s tables, completed by 1234. The building we see today is no doubt a result of rebuilding and repair work. Yet the portals, albeit damaged, belong to the original building campaign. To the best of our knowledge, Ócsa still awaits a comprehensive monograph²⁰.

The importance of Ócsa for our cause grows as it was independently identified as a point of reference for certain buildings and architectural forms in the Spiš area of eastern Slovakia, as already noted, Herceg Koloman’s staging grounds for his ambitions in Halič. Bibiana Pomfyjova has in several studies drawn attention to analogies between the capital zone of the southern portal at Ócsa and the similar architectural member from the church of St. John the Baptist at Spišske Vlchy, today at the Archeological Institute at Spišska Nova Ves (figs. 8, 34). Similarities in the formation of the upper tier buds are indeed striking²¹.

¹⁸ Marosi 1984, pp. 125, 137-138, 139-143, figs. 390-406.

¹⁹ On Špitalič most recently, Golob 2006, p. 16 and accompanying photograph.

²⁰ Marosi 1984, pp. 122, 125. On Ócsa, Lukács, Cabella, Csengel 1991; Lukács, Cabella, Csengel 1995; Gál 1995; Csengel, Gal 1996. I thank Dr. Pál Lővei of the National Office of the Preservation of Monuments in Budapest for his kind information and copies of the text, and to Dr. Imre Takács for our joint visit to Ócsa.

²¹ Please see note 15. Especially, Pomfyjova 2000, p. 35.

The Palas at Medvegrad, explored, restored, and never published, brings us to another Spiš complex, that of the Spišska Kapitula, i.e., the church of St. Martin (figs. 32-33), and the Castle (figs. 27, 33), in particular its Hall, all attributed to the patronage of Herceg Koloman, and dated by Ms. Pomfyova to the period of Koloman's activity in Spiš, 1214-1241, with an emphasis on the years 1221-1234. Both the Hall and the church of St. Martin feature capitals "à crochet." There are noticeable differences even between the portal and the interior capitals (figs. 10, 11), which could be assigned to the well-known practice of having different masters and workshops working side by side at the same locale or even on the same part of a building. The portal capitals feature somewhat more perfect buds (some of them, at the extreme ends, seem to have been replaced by 19th century replicas), whereas those in the interior, while similar, appear somewhat less accomplished. Some of them may have been at least retouched during the 19th century restorations. The two tower facade of St. Martin (fig. 32), incorporating an empora, links the building with the "sippenkloster" type known from north western Hungary (Türje, Zsambek, Ják), and also recalls the silhouette of the church in Čazma²². Spišska Kapitula with the Cathedral (i.e., praepositus' church) of St. Martin, and the cannons homes lined up along the centrally located street (recalling Kaptol in Zagreb) lies the foot of the castle hill (figs. 32-33). To the west of Kapitula there was a Benedictine abbey from the end of the 11th ct., whereas Kapitula itself was built after the arrival of Herceg Koloman around 1220. Presumably, it was built by the same masters as the castle. The cathedral was expanded in the Gothic (around 1460), and twice restored in the course of the 19th century.

Its short nave and the two tower facade strikingly recall the above mentioned Premonstratensian church in Ócsa (ca. 1234) (fig. 5). Today, there is a singing gallery between the towers, but traces of a large arch indicate that there was originally an empora reserved for persons of distinction. The presence of a fresco on the northern wall next to the empora showing the coronation of Robert I (1317), indicates a royal function. The fresco is perfectly positioned for viewing from the empora.

The western facade has been clearly reworked more than once but its general outline does not seem to have changed very much. According to existing literature the towers were completed in 1270, but they were obviously enlarged in the lower stories. The biforas of the towers feature capitals "à crochet," whereas the partly walled-in capitals in the eastern wall of the towers are cubic. All of them may be 19th century copies. The northern tower is a little taller than the southern one. The top pyramids were added in the Renaissance.

The entire Kapitula is a little, relatively regular town still within its mostly medieval walls. This regular planning aspect is according to Slovak literature unusual for the area, but is quite typical for settlements created by colonists from the West in the 12th and 13th century (Chalupecky et al. 66-83).

That different hands could work side by side within a very small space has been demonstrated by Miletić in his fine analysis of the Medvedgrad chapel capitals, to which in terms of description and division of hands little could be added²³. To sum up: Group One, half-capitals 1-4, rather robust body with two rows of leaves, bending forward or sideways and forming a double bud (central) or disclosing a palmette-like surfaces (sides) (fig. 21); Group Two, half-capital 5, skinnier and with longer, more elegant side leaves ending with a soft upward turn; Group Three, half-capital 6, further developing the naturalist tendencies of the previous piece approaching the world of the "domestic flora"; Group four, half-capitals of the triumphal arch and attached half-capitals of the half-columns. Here we encounter both the fleshy and solid forms of the Group one, and the naturalistic tendencies of the Groups two and three (especially the half-capitals of the half-columns) (figs. 20, 22, 23). If one should be tempted to add

²² Pomfyova 2000, pp. 41-42. I. Chalupceky et al. 2003, pp. 68-74 (also on what follows on the Kapitula).

²³ Miletić, Valjato-Fabris 1987, pp. 30-33.

anything to Miletić's description, one might speculate about a possibility that the bulkier and solid capitals of the hexagonal nave were made by the same master as the atlas figures, and the lighter, more elegant, and exquisitely stylized capitals of the sanctuary featuring also elements of the "domestic flora," would have been the work of the master of the column-eating lions. What a pity we do not have the key stone, and the lunette of the portal!

The only preserved bud of the Group one (capital no. 1, fig. 21) is quite close to capitals of analogous type at the Benedictine Abbey of Vértesszentkereszt (early 13th ct.), and the Castle Chapel at Esztergom (around 1200, definitely before 1220), as well as the already mentioned capitals in the interior of St. Martin at Spišska Kapitula (figs. 17, 18)²⁴. The half-capitals of the triumphal arch of the Medvedgrad chapel can also be compared to the examples just quoted, especially to Vértesszentkereszt (figs. 18, 20). The capitals of Medvedgrad chapel showing the introduction of the domestic flora find, in terms of turning toward observation of natural forms, numerous analogies throughout the Carpathian basin around and shortly after 1200 – in particular at Pannonhalma (ca. 1212-1240), Esztergom Cathedral (Marosi No. 62c), and Pilisszentkereszt (ca. 1200, and not later than 1220), all being royal workshops of the highest quality (figs. 22, 23, 24).²⁵ Analogous formal developments occur also on the southern portal at Ócsa (and on the fragment from Spišske Vlachy), thus within the sphere where we have initiated our search (figs. 8, 34).

Additional variety is encountered in the fragments from the Medvedgrad Palas. The five fragments from the Restoration of Monuments Office of Croatia were for the first time brought to the attention of the public in the exhibition of the Romanesque sculpture from the museums and collection between the Sava and the Drava rivers in the Fall of 2007 in the Archeological Museum in Zagreb²⁷. First of all there is a remarkable rounded bud decorated with a snail or volute motif, strikingly similar to numerous analogous pieces at Pilisszentkereszt and Vértesszentkereszt (figs. 14, 15)²⁸. The other form (fig. 19), that of a double "gaping" bud (rather damaged) has also numerous analogies in the royal domain – for example, at Esztergom (Marosi, no. 37) and Pilisszentkereszt, and is generically similar to those of the Chapel capitals.²⁹

Dating a building or establishing the provenance of its workshops on the basis of the forms of the "à crochet" and similar capitals alone may not appear to be a particularly fruitful enterprise. Witness just a variety of forms touched upon above. Miletić has quite rightly taken into consideration the capitals from the Cistercian church at Kostanjevica in Slovenia. The only point on which I would not agree, as abundantly obvious from the above, is seeing this as the only source. Exactly the same capitals as in Kostanjevica appear within the royal domain (Esztergom, Pécs, fig. 12, Vértesszentkereszt). It does not mean that some Cistercian masters from Kostanjevica could not look for work in the sphere of the royal workshops, or joined Kostanjevica after having worked in the royal domain. Pilisszentkereszt was, after all, both a Cistercian house, and a key royal endowment. Yet, analogies between the variety of the Medvedgrad forms and the top royal sites such as Esztergom, Vértesszentkereszt, Pilisszentkereszt, Ócsa, to which we should add Gora in Croatia (fig. 16), all datable around 1200, or to the early decades of the 13th century, are significant. And in Topusko, around the middle of the first half of the century there seem to appear forms of even more modern kind (fig. 25), indicating that what was going on in the Croatian Pannonia was *jour* when compared to the key royal sites, i.e.,

²⁴ Marosi 1984, pp. 42-50, 121, 125. Pomfyova 2000, pp. 41-42.

²⁵ Marosi 1984, pp. 120, 123, 125, figs. 219, 240-243. Also Mikó, Takács 1994, pp. 237-239.

²⁷ We would like to express once more our gratitude to Drago Miletić who drew our attention to the pieces and wrote the catalogues entries. The fragments of buds served as the basis for restoration works on the Palas.

²⁸ A ball-like bud occurs also at the capital found at the fortress in Čazma, only without the snail-like ornament. This type is also frequently found at Pilisszentkereszt. The form of the Medvedgrad «snail-buds» is also similar to buds of the wonderful capitals of the Templar church in Gora. See Miletić 1979.

²⁹ Marosi 1984, fig. 221. Mikó, Takács 1994, pp. 240-241

that, when quality was required, in Croatian Pannonia, as well as in the central part of the Pannonian basin, the royal workshops were called into action. Briefly, as we have proposed already elsewhere, such phenomena as Čazma and Medvedgrad cannot be excluded from the circle of the activities of the best workshops of the realm³⁰. After all, Gora, Topusko and Čazma were royal foundations. What about Medvedgrad?

Relying on remarkable intuition Nada Klaić has proposed that Medvedgrad was a royal castle built by a Herceg in the times of peace and prosperity before the Tartar invasion, rather than by a bishop (albeit a prominent one) in the turbulent times afterwards. Her attempt at proving her case by using Thomas Archidiaconus is not conclusive. However, she has very correctly pointed out that a careful reading of the 1252 confirmation charter issued by Pope Innocent IV clearly implied that Medvedgrad was a royal possession before it came into the Bishop Philip's hands³¹. Our analysis of Medvedgrad sculpture so far, be it figured or decorative, if also read in conjunction with Vladimir Bedenko's research makes, we believe, a strong case for the insights of the prominent historian.³² Additional weight is added by a closer look at the monuments ascribed to Herceg Koloman in the Spiš area, i.e., St. Martin at Spišska Kapitula, which we have already introduced, and Spišský Hrad.

Although the Spiš Castle (fig. 29) clearly displays its strategic location, until the 1970ies it was considered to have been built after the Tartar invasion. The newest archeological investigations carried out over the last few decades have confirmed an earlier date.

The castle hill has been inhabited since Prehistory. After the arrival of the Slavs who settled on the lower, neighboring hill (Drevenik), the story of the Spišski Hrad evolves with the Hungarian conquest of the land in the 11th century. That period is documented by a huge rounded tower, foundations of which have been found at the tallest spot of the hill. It collapsed due to seismic disturbances around 1200.

The second important chapter opens with the arrival of Herceg Koloman, King of Galicia, who could be credited with the oldest section of the castle – the palas and the rounded keep in the least accessible northeastern part of the hill. The palas is in a rather bad shape, but one can still observe the Romanesque method of planning placing the palas at the least accessible point of the plateau. Its plan is close to a rectangle but its northern wall follows the edge of the precipice, thus assuming a polygonal shape. The rounded tower stands nearby, somewhat withdrawn toward the center of the plateau which was itself surrounded by walls. From the top of the tower one can realize the strategic position of the castle. It dominates the entire Spiš area which has a shape of a big saucer with two hills in the middle, the early Slavic fort (Drevenik),

³⁰ Goss 2007.

³¹ Please see note 13 above. Klaić 1984, pp.29-36 (on Medvedgrad as a royal castle), pp. 36-41 on Herceg Koloman as a potential patron.

³² In an atmosphere of fear and general militarization of the realm after the brief but terrifying Tartar invasion of 1241-42 (Soldo 1968-69), the huge southern keep at Medvedgrad, rather than the sophisticated architecture of its palas and chapel, graphically illustrates what kind of building was going on around 1250. That massive fortification, a keep, was built on a *wrong* side, i.e. at the southern tip of the Medvedgrad plateau, the point totally unassailable within the scope of the military technology of the 13th century. Of course, Medvedgrad possesses another powerful keep, at the northern end, the only assailable point of the entire hill. That «second» keep was never thoroughly explored. The southern keep has been correctly identified as the tower the cannons of Zagreb were allowed to build as a refuge in case of danger, and has little to do with the rest of Medvedgrad and its defences. Please see Bedenko 1991, p. 17. However, if the words «Mons Gradyz» in the royal donation of 1247 refer to Medvedgrad, then they more than imply that at the spot where Medvedgrad stands today, there had been an older fort or fortified settlement! Bela's donation made in Zvolen in 1247, which is the basis of Bedenko's analysis, is also a good example of fears generated in the aftermath of the Tartar invasion. See Smičiklas 1906, pp. 323-324. We wholeheartedly agree with Mr. Bedenko that the southern keep (a fortified home and not a keep proper) is to be identified with what the cannons built at Medvedgrad, while at the same time (see Innocent's confirmation) the rest of the castle which had already been in existence, was held by the bishop. The most relevant and revealing section of the confirmation follows (italics are ours): «Quod carissimus in Christo filius noster B(ela) Hngariae rex illustris, quendam possessionem, prope Zagrabiam ad se pertinentem que nunc castrum episcopi appellatur, Zagrabinesi ecclesiae pie liberalitate donavit...» . Smičiklas 1906, p. 481.

and the Spiš Castle. The Castle is visible from almost any point of the Spiš plateau, and clearly keeps it under surveillance, thus reiterating its importance for the medieval times (Chalupecky et. al., 2003, 14-20).

The entire castle is a huge complex which came into being through additions of the succeeding centuries; yet its Romanesque core is not bigger than Medvedgrad's. The palas was rebuilt several times and, in spite of its poor shape, one can still see three original biforas. Two of them contain the original capitals, while the third was damaged by a seismic disturbance in 2006, and awaits restoration in the Museum in Levoča.

The first capital (fig. 28) is a classic "à crochet" piece, as already mentioned above. It carries stylized acanthus leaves placed in two zones. The leaves end in highly stylized buds consisting of three layers of tripartite petals. The buds of the lower zone stand in the middle, of the upper at the corners of the capital. In that it appears as a simplified version of capitals at the royal chapel at Esztergom (figs. 17, 28).

The second capital (fig. 29) is rather unusual in that it has, instead of buds, forms similar to armored bugs, somewhat recalling fragments from Gora (fig. 26). It is again a two zone capital, yet the leaves do not recall acanthus but branches with small leaves ending with buds. The interplay of forms is quite successful, and reveals a hand of an imaginative artist with a developed sense for ornamental decor. The capital is quite unique, and a very successful work of art.

The third capital (fig. 30), damaged after the collapse of the window, reveals highly stylized acanthus turning into geometric forms of volutes. The zone division has been retained and it appears more lively than in the first capital. In all that it is very close to a number of capitals from Vértesszentkereszt (fig. 15).

The story of the Spišski Hrad after the Tartar invasion closely recall the Medvedgrad experience. Bela IV in 1249 allowed the praepositus of Spišska Kapitula to attach his own fortified precinct to the castle, a rectangular tower west of the original walls and somewhat to the north of the original entrance (fig. 31). New walls were erected to secure the tower, and also a new entrance gate. The choice of the site was exclusively determined by the space available, and has no strategic importance. The script is strikingly similar to what happened in Zagreb. The clergy asks for protection and is assigned areas next to a royal castle to construct its own safe haven. One should add that there is also a secular settlement at the foot of the castle, Spišske Podhradie, a market town with its own Romanesque church (Chalupecky et al, 2003, 102-107).

Bearing all this in mind, a careful reading of sources, in particular of Pope Innocent's confirmation charter of 1252, allows for an earlier dating of Medvedgrad, as well as for declaring it a royal foundation. By itself, however, this and the entire dossier of evidence proposed by Nada Klaić, would not be enough. Our analysis of the forms of the sculpture at Medvedgrad (although somewhat marred by the poor state of preservation), clearly supports the above assumptions reached by a prominent historian. Medvedgrad sculpture could find its place within the output of the royal workshops of the first four decades of the 12th century, and, in particular, of the building projects linked with Herceg Koloman be it in Spiš or in Slavonia. In itself, such a formal analysis would not be enough either, and only when it is joined by firm bits of historical information, it becomes a strong bearer of historical evidence. Briefly, monuments of art history become historical documents, and together with historical sources they make a convincing case³³. Of course, we will not stubbornly assert that the case is definitive. Slovak scholars have, for example, suggested that Herceg Koloman used Italian masters at the Spiš castle who, subsequently, worked also at Spišska Kapitula. In a published study I have independently speculated with what I would carefully call a "Mediterranean presence" at Medvedgrad.³⁴

Anyone even somewhat familiar with the great foundations of the first half of the 13th century, be it by the monastic or secular clergy, as well as of the secular power in the Italian *Mez-*

³³ Klaić 1984, pp. 36-41. Panofsky 1955, p. 10.

³⁴ Goss 2007, p. 57. Chalupecky 2003, p. 19.

zogiorno, might wonder if a precise study of such analogies would be in order. Of course, such a study could be undertaken, but its outcome seems dubious. The capitals from the Palas at Spišsky Hrad (in particular the capital no. 1, fig. 28), at the portal and in the interior of Spišska Kapitula (figs. 10-11) certainly fall within the sphere of forms that one encounters at Fossanova (Cadei 1984, figs. 13, 17), St. Maria di Ripalta (Calò Mariani 1984, fig. 98; Ghislaberti 1994, fig. 19), at the Cathedral of Cosenza (Di Dorio Guida 1995, p. 346), or even at the Castel del Monte (Calò Mariani 1984, fig. 139). However, the variety of forms seems endless. Even within the same architectural member, such as the capital zones of the portal or of the piers at Spišska Kapitula (figs. 10-11) the general structure of the capitals and the basic form of their buds may be the same, but the details such the central leaf or the “eyes” differ from one capital to another. This may happen even within the same capital! The capital of that type from Spišsky Hrad has again, the same basic structure but is much less detailed. The bud of the half-capital at the northern side of the triumphal arch at Medvedgrad belongs to the same extended family.

At Ócsa the southern door capitals (fig. 8) featuring in their upper row volutes with vegetal decor also find analogies at Fossanova (Cadei 1980, fig. 22) and Ripalta (Ghislaberti 1994, fig. 19), and, as already stated, at Spišske Vlasy (fig. 34). But the format and the “physiognomy” of the lower tier of the well preserved capitals at Spišske Vlasy clearly reverts to the type described in the previous paragraph. The volutes are not dissimilar to what we encounter at Medvedgrad Palas fragments, and at the half-capital along the southern side of the triumphal arch (fig. 14, 20). However, as Cadei has demonstrated, analogous forms exist in France (Cadei 1984, fig. 14), which is also true of Germany or Austria. Eventually, let us not forget that the capitals we have been describing are a hallmark of the royal workshops, e.g. at Esztergom, Vérteszentkereszt, Pilisszentkereszt (figs. 15, 17, 18, 24), and elsewhere. One indeed shares Marosi’s (maybe one should say) implied frustration at inability to precisely define sources and transmission of forms. Such examples of formal identity as the already mentioned capital from the palace at Esztergom and from Zagreb are lucky exceptions. Thus, by itself, a formal analysis does little more than placing the works mentioned above (and many others) within a broad international circle which existed in the earlier decades of the 13th century. Specific cases, as the one we have tried to deal with in this paper, can, however, be seriously considered when judiciously joined with reliable historical sources and information. The role of Herceg Koloman and his double career, in Upper Hungary and in Slavonia, remains a corner-stone of such a discussion.

No doubt quite a few issues remain open. If we have opened doors for further work on those issues, our efforts have not been in vain.

This should be especially stressed in a volume dedicated to a pioneer who have opened, very widely, more than a century of research in the earliest phases of Croatian art. But as we look at the accomplishments of fra Lujo Marun, we cannot escape a feeling that Slavonia, Continental Croatia, did not have its Marun. This is not to say that they did not have dedicated and capable explorers – such as Josip Brunšmid and Viktor Hoffler among archeologists, or Đuro Szabo and Anđela Horvat among art historians. Yet, while they had to work alone, Marun had powerful allies – Trpimir, Krešimir, Zvonimir, the Šubićs and the Kačićs, the *pleiade* of the great historical figures from the distant and hazy, but still potent historical past. In spite of wars and migrations, Venetians and Turks, following the steps of Croatian rulers of the native dynasty was something that could, at least to some extent, ignite the fantasy of both the patriotic intellectuals and the masses, of scholars and politicians. To some extent, we say, as we could count innumerable instances of bans, failures and mistakes that occurred over the 150 years commemorated by this volume.

In the interior of the country, where the physical destruction brought by Turkish wars is matched only by the destruction of memory brought by endless “ethnic cleansings,” depopulations and repopulations down to the end of the previous century, we may be where Marun was

a century ago. Not that there were no great historical figures, but their names had no meaning for an average man from Slavonia, Lika or Banovina of the 19th and the 20th century. The only names which could ignite at least a tiny spark of imagination were those of the Zrinskis and Frankopans, and that mostly for the years of Turkish warfare, and for the territory of the Northern Coastland, the Western Highlands, and the Northwestern Croatia. The scope of historical memory ends with the Turks – so a “Turkish Castle” or a “Turkish Church” could refer to a site from any period before the Turks – prehistoric, Roman, medieval. We have to hurry, and we need allies.

One such ally, albeit of “foreign” blood, from the early 13th century Croatia, Koloman, Herceg of Croatia, Dalmatia and Slavonia, has been the key *dramatis persona* of this study. His fate is quite illustrative of what could happen to even the greatest figures from the past, as Koloman was undoubtedly one of the best administrators Croatia ever had. After the Hungarian-Croatian *Agreement* of 1868 a group of disgruntled Croatian “patriots” stole the Herceg’s tombstone, a large red marble plaque, from his tomb in Čazma, something even the Turks refrained from doing. The panel was too big to break in pieces overnight, or to carry far away, so let us hope we will find it once a thorough archeological investigation of Čazma is undertaken. What we are doing, to use again the words of Stanko Andrić, is bringing back “a sunken world.” Thanks to Lujko Marun, another such world was discovered, and it has been reemerging for over 100 years.³⁵

³⁵ The authors thank the following: Vladimir Bedenko, Drago Miletić, Bibiana Pomfyova, Inre Takács, Martin Vančo. The research for this article was made within the project “The Romanesque between the Sava and the Drava Rivers and European Culture” of the Ministry of Science, Education and Sports of the Republic of Croatia”.

LITERATURE

Basić 2006

I. Basić *O pokušaju ujedinjenja zagrebačke i splitske crkve u XIII. st.*, Pro Tempore, 3, Zagreb, 2006, 25-44

Bedenko 1991

V. Bedenko, *Mons Gradyz iuxta Zagrabiam*, Historijski zbornik, 44, Zagreb, 1991, 3-17

Budak 2004

N. Budak, *Zagrebački biskup Stjepan II, savremenik Tome Arhidakona*, in: Toma Arhidakon i njegovo doba, Split, 2004, 153-158

Cadei 1980

A. Cadei, *Fossanova e Castel del Monte* in: Federico II e l'arte del Trecento Italiano, Rome, 1980, 2 vols., vol. 1, 191-217

Calò Mariani 1984

M. S. Calò Mariani, *L'arte del duecento in Puglia*, Torino, 1984.

Chalupecky 2003

I. Chalupecky et. al, *Spišsky hrad*, Košice, 2003.

Csengel, Gall 1996

P. Csengel, T. Gál, *Vestige monastique de Moyen Âge*, Monuments historiques, 201, Paris, 1996, 87-90

Di Dario Guida 1995

M. P. Di Dario Guida, *Calabria Federiciana*, in: Federico II, arte e potere, Venice, 1995, 343-355

Gál 1995

T. Gál, *Az ócsai református templom helyreállítása*, Műemlékvédelem, 39, Budapest, 1995, 11-21

Ghislaberti 1994

C. Ghislaberti, *I legami culturali e stilistici tra la scultura architettonica Federiciana dell'Italia meridionale e il mondo cistercense*, in: Intellectual Life at the Court of Frederick II Hohenstaufen, Washington, D.C. 1994, 41-62

Golob 2006

N. Golob, *Srednjeveški rokopisi iz Žičke kartuzije (1160-1560)*, Ljubljana, 2006.

Goss 2003

V. P. Goss, *Renesansa 12. stoljeća i Hrvatska*, in press by the Proceedings of the Dani Cvite Fiskovća 2003.

Goss 2007

V. Goss, *Bishop Stjepan II and Herceg Koloman and the Beginnings of the Gothic in Croatia*, Hortus artium medievalium, 13/1, Zagreb, 2007, 51-63

Goss, Vicelja 2006

V. Goss, M. Vicelja, *Some Observations on the Chapel at Medvedgrad*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, s. III, 33, Split, 2006, 165-175

Gulin 2004

A. Gulin, *Uloga i čast Tome Arhidakona u splitskom kaptolu*, in: Toma Arhidakon i njegovo doba, Split, 2004, 29-39

Horvat 2001

A. Horvat, *Pogled na značenje Čazme i čazmanskog kraja u minulim vjekovima*, in: Čazma u prošlom mileniju, Zagreb, 2001, 9- 20

Horvat 1966-67

Z. Horvat, *Neke činjenice o cistercitskom samostanu i crkvi u Topuskom*, Peristil, 13-14, Zagreb, 1966-67, 121-134

Horvat 2005

Z. Horvat, *Cistercitski samostan i crkva Sv. Marije u Topuskom*, Glas Gradskog muzeja Karlovac, 4, Karlovac, 2005, 8-10

Klaić 1984

- N. Klaić, *Medvedgrad i njegovi gospodari*, Zagreb, 1984
- Klaty 2003
M. Klaty, *Uhri, Uhorsko a Spiš v haličskej kronikarskej tradícii*, in: *Terra Sepulcensis*, Levoča, 2003, 251-255
- Kovačić 2004
S. Kovačić, *Toma Arhiđakon, promicatelj crkvene obnove i splitski nadbiskupi, osobito njegovi suvremenici*, in: *Toma Arhiđakon i njegovo doba*, Split, 2004, 41-69
- Lukács, Cabello, Csengel 1991
Z. Lukács, J. Cabello, P. Csengel, *Az ócsai premontrei prépostáság kutatása*, *Műemlékvédelemi szemle*, 1, Budapest, 1991, 16-20
- Lukács, Cabello, Csengel 1995,
Z. Lukács, J. Cabello, P. Csengel, *Ócsa Református templon*, Budapest, 1995.
- Marosi 1984
E. Marosi, *Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn*, Budapest, 1984.
- Mikó, Takács 1994
Á. Miko, I. Takács, eds. *Pannonia regia* Budapest, 1994.
- Miletić 1979
D. Miletić, *Župna crkva Uznesenja B.D. Marije u Gori*, *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske*, 23, Zagreb, 1997, 127-152
- D. Miletić, M. Valjato-Fabris 1987
D. Miletić, and M. Valjato-Fabris, *Kapela Sv. Filipa i Jakova na Medvedgradu*, Zagreb, 1987.
- Panofsky 1955
E. Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, Garden City, 1955.
- Pomfyova 1999
B. Pomfyova, *Vaclav Mencl a spišska sakralna architecture 13. storočia*, in: *Život a dielo Vaclava Mencla na Slovensku*, Bratislava, 1999, pp. 89-98
- Pomfyova 2000
B. Pomfyova, *K niektorým otázkam hodnotenia stredovekej architektury na Slovensku*, *Ars*, 1-3, Bratislava, 2000, 33-60
- Pomfyova 2000-2001
B. Pomfyova, *Sučasny obraz spišskej sakralnej architektury do konca 13. storočia*, *Studia archeologica Slovaca medievalia*, 3-4, Bratislava, 2000-2001, 295-315
- Pomfyova 2003A
B. Pomfyova, *Výbrane problémy k dejinám Spišskej stredovekej architektury*, in: *Terra Sepulcensis*, Levoča, 2003, 177-189
- Pomfyova 2003B
B. Pomfyova, *Gotika*, in: Dušan Buran, ed., *Dejiny slovenskeho vytvarneho umenia*, Bratislava, 2003, 38-109
- Prochazkova 1998
N. Prochazkova, *Postavenie kaličskeho krala a slavonskeho knežata Kolomana z rodu Arpadovcov v uhorskej vnutarnej a zahraničnej politike v prvej polovici 13. storočia*, *Medea*, 2, Bratislava, 1998, 64-75
- Prochazkova 2003
N. Prochazkova, *Koloman Haličsky na Spiši pred rokom 1241*, in: *Terra Sepulcensis*, Levoča, 2003, 243-250
- Smičiklas 1906
T. Smičiklas, *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatie et Slavoniae*, vol. 4, Zagreb, 1906.
- Soldo 1968-69
J. A. Soldo, *Provala Tatara u Hrvatsku*, *Historijski zbornik*, 21-22, Zagreb, 1968-69, 371-388
- Štrk 2001
V. Štrk, *Povijesna kronologija Čazme*, in: *Čazma u prošlom mileniju*, Zagreb, 2001, 21-50
- Takács 2001

I. Takács, ed., *Paradisium plantavit*, Pannonhalma, 2001.

Thomas Archidiaconus

Thomas Archidiaconus, *Historia Salonitana*, Split, 1960.

SAŽETAK

Medvedgrad – Ócsa – Spiš, stilska razmatranja

Key words: *Medvedgrad, Hrvatska, Slavonija, Slovačka, Spiš, Karpatska kotlina, romanička skulptura, rana gotika..*

Ovaj prilog nastavlja s razmatranjem skulpture na Medvedgradu usredotočujući se na nefiguralne elemente – portal i nefiguralne kapitule kapele te fragmente kapitula palasa. Figuralna skulptura Medvedgrada, kako smo predložili u prošlom broju *SHP-a*, pokazuje veze medvedgradske skulpture s kraljevskim radionicama ranijih desetljeća 13. st., što još jasnije izražavaju nefiguralni radovi.

Novi uvidi u umjetnost vezanu uz patronat hercega Kolomana u regiji Spiša u istočnoj Slovačkoj (kapiteli palasa na Spišskom Hradu, Spiška Kapitula, fragment iz Spiških Vlachov u Spiškoj Novoj Vesi) mogu se, koliko je to uopće moguće pri studijama ranogotičkih kapitula (“à crochet” i slični), uspješno usporediti s medvedgradskim materijalima (ugaone volute fragmenata s palasa, oblik očuvanih pupova u kapeli i na fragmentina s palasa), unutar, naravno, opće produkcije takvog materijala u širokom krugu od talijanskog *Mezzogiorna* preko Bamberga do Panonsko - karpatskog bazena (Esztergom, Pilisszentkereszt, Vérteszentkereszt). Medvedgradski portal pokazuje nadalje sličnosti s portalima u Ócsi (dovršena oko 1234.), koji opet pokazuju veze sa spiškim materijalom. Ovime se proširuje zona patronata hercega Kolomana, i otvaraju se jasne mogućnosti datiranja palasa i kapele na Medvedgradu u predtatarsko razdoblje.

Također se potvrđuju i uvidi Nade Klaić o predtatarskom datumu Medvedgrada (odnosno, po našem mišljenju, nekih njegovih dijelova) i ulozi hercega Kolomana u njegovoj izgradnji. Potvrđuju se i nalazi Vladimira Bedenka o posttatarskom nastanku južne kule koju podiže zagrebački Kaptol.

Ni uvidi povjesničara, a niti formalna analiza sami po sebi ne bi bili dovoljni da se predloži da je dio Medvedgrada nastao u vrijeme uprave hercega Kolomana u dukatu Slavonije (1225.-1241.), no oni se međusobno potvrđuju i osnažuju.

Kompleks djelovanja kraljevskih radionica na području srednjovjekovne Slavonije u ranijim desetljećima 13. stoljeća, odnosno početci gotike u Hrvatskoj predstavljaju jedno od vrhunskih razdoblja u povijesti umjetnosti kontinentalne Hrvatske (Gora, Topusko, Čazma, Medvedgrad, Novo Mesto Zelinsko, Sv. Ivan Zelina, Vinica). Produbljeno razumijevanje tog sloja moglo bi biti temelj za buduće studije o velikim spomenicima o kojima znamo tako malo iz tog vremena, kao što su zagrebačka i đakovačka katedrala.



Fig. 1. Medvedgrad, view.



Fig. 2. Medvedgrad, Chapel portal.



Fig. 3. Medvedgrad, Chapel portal, capital zone, left.



Fig. 4. Medvedgrad, Chapel portal, capital zone, right.



Fig. 5. Ócsa, Premonstratensian church, from the west.



Fig. 6. Ócsa, Premonstratensian church, southern portal.



Fig. 7. Ócsa, Premonstratensian church, northern portal.



Fig. 8. Ócsa, Premonstratensian church, southern portal, detail.



Fig. 9. Ócsa, Premonstratensian church, northern portal, detail.



Fig. 10. Spišská Kapitula, St. Martin, portal, detail.



Fig. 11. Spišska Kapitula, St. Martin, capitals.



Fig. 12. Pécs, Cathedral Museum, capital.



Fig. 13. Čazma, St. Mary Magdalene, from the west.



Fig. 14. Medvedgrad, palas, fragment of a capital.



Fig. 15. Tata, Museum, capital from Vértesszentkereszt.



Fig. 16. Gora, Assumption of Our Lady, capital.



Fig. 17. Esztergom, castle chapel, capital.



Fig. 18. Tata, Museum, capital from Vértesszentkereszt.



Fig. 19. Medvedgrad, palas, fragment of a capital.



Fig. 20. Medvedgrad, chapel, capital next to the triumphal arch (south).



Fig. 21. Medvedgrad, chapel, capital of the nave.



Fig. 22. Medvedgrad, chapel, capital of the sanctuary (north).



Fig. 23. Medvedgrad, chapel, capital of the sanctuary (south).



Fig. 24. Pannonhalma, Benedictine Archabbey, capital.



Fig. 25. Topusko, Cistercian Abbey, capital.



Fig. 26. Gora, Assumption of Our Lady, capital, fragment.



Fig. 27. Spišský hrad, palas.



Fig. 28. Spišský hrad, capital No. 1.



Fig. 29. Spišsky hrad, capital No. 2.



Fig. 30. Levoča, Museum, Spišsky hrad, capital No. 3.



Fig. 31. Spišsky Hrad, Bishop's tower.



Fig. 32. Spiška Kapiula, St. Martin.



Fig. 33. Spišská Kapitula, view of Spišský hrad.



Fig. 34. Spišská Nova Ves, Archeological Institute, fragment from Spišské Vlchy.