

## “Kamen iz Križovljana” nakon “Kamena iz Belca” – pitanja konteksta

“*Stone from Križovljan*” following the “*Stone from Belec*”: *Some Questions concerning the Context*

**Stručni rad**  
Srednjovjekovna arheologija

*Professional article*  
*Mediaeval archaeology*

Prof. dr. sc. VLADIMIR PETER GOSS  
Filozofski fakultet  
Sveučilište u Rijeci  
HR – 51000 Rijeka

UDK/UDC 73.04:726.591(497.5 Križovljan) «11/12»

Primljeno/Received: 01. 04. 2005.

Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 15. 09. 2005.

*Nakon što se u prošlom broju Priloga pozabavio “Kamenom iz Belca”, rijetkim primjerom figuralne srednjovjekovne skulpture iz kontinentalne Hrvatske (vjerojatno 12. stoljeće), autor ovdje obrađuje “Kamen iz Križovljana”, sedmoglavi reljef (sve glave su izgleda muške) visoko na fasadi crkve Sv. Križa u Križovljanu između Ludbrega i Varaždina (12. ili 13. stoljeće). Znanstvenici su “kamen” dosada smatrali rimskim provincijalnim radom (Gorenc-Vikić), rimskom spolijom “resemantiziranom” u kršćanskom kontekstu (Stošić), ili romaničkim prikazom donatora (A. Horvat). Pažljivom analizom djela, posebice njegove kompozicije, zaključuje se da je rad najvjerojatnije romanički reljef pod utjecajem rimske provincijalne plastike, te nekih zasad ne sasvim jasnih keltskih izvora inspiracije. Kao i onaj iz Belca, “Kamen iz Križovljana” je bez konteksta bilo u hrvatskom dijelu Panonije, bilo u ostatku Karpatskog bazena. Izražava se nada da bi se strpljivim radom na drugim fragmentima “bez konteksta” (Arača, Somogyvár, itd.) takav kontekst mogao pojaviti. Pri tome dobro razumijevanje rimskog i pred-rimskog konteksta Panonije može igrati veliku ulogu. Reljef iz Križovljan, čak ako i “resemantiziran”, predstavlja vjerojatno braću templarske (kasnije ivanovačke) “kuće”, koja je možda postojala u Križovljanu, iako oko toga postoje velika razmimoilaženja u znanosti.*

*Ključne riječi: Križovljan, romanika, srednjovjekovna skulptura, rimska provincijalna umjetnost, Kelti, kontinentalna Hrvatska*

*Having introduced in the latest issue of the Prilozi, “The Stone from Belec,” a rare example of figured medieval sculpture from Continental Croatia (probably 12<sup>th</sup> century), the author deals here with “The Stone of Križovljan,” a relief bearing seven heads (all apparently male) high on the facade of the 12<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup> century church of the Holy Cross at Križovljan (between Ludbreg and Varaždin). The scholars have so far seen the stone as a provincial Roman work (Gorenc-Vikić), as a Roman spoliium reused and “resematicised” within a Christian context (Stošić), or as a Romanesque representation of donors (A. Horvat). By a careful analysis of the piece, especially its composition, the author concludes that the relief is a Romanesque work based on a Roman provincial model, and also, possibly, on some at this point still difficult to identify Celtic sources of inspiration. Just like the “Stone from Belec” that of Križovljan is “out of context” be it in Croatian Pannonia, or in the entire Carpathian basin, but there is a hope that by future careful scholarship of all available “out of context” pieces (Aracs, Somogyvár, etc.), such a context would emerge. In achieving this, pre-Slavic, Roman, and pre-Roman contexts of Pannonia, and their proper understanding, may play in important role. The relief from Križovljan, even if “resematicised” probably represents members of a Templar (later Hospitaler) “domus”, which may have existed at Križovljan, although on this point there is a considerable degree of disagreement among scholars.*

*Key words: Križovljan, Romanesque period, Medieval sculpture, Roman provincial art, the Celts, continental Croatia.*

U posljednjem broju *Priloga Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu* objavili smo preliminarnu ocjenu “Kamena iz Belca”, rijetkog i neobjavljenog primjerka srednjovjekovne figuralne plastike iz kontinentalne Hrvatske. Rad je jedinstven,

In the latest issue of the *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu*, I published a preliminary report on the “Stone from Belec”, a rare and previously unpublished piece of figured medieval sculpture from continental Croatia. As I stated myself, the stone

bez izravnih analogija u panonskom bazenu (Goss 2004).<sup>1</sup> U smislu konteksta, dakle, riječ je o jednome radu, a to ne pomaže naporima istraživača. Ova će studija nastojati proširiti područje rada analizom još jednoga "kamena" iz sjeverozapadne Hrvatske. Radi se o "Kamenu iz Križovljana" koji je već duže vrijeme poznat stručnjacima, no usprkos toga nikad nije dovoljno uvjerljivo povezan s nekim određenim kontekstom. Mogu li naša dva kamena, kad ih se uspoređi, pomoći da ih bolje razumijemo? Pokušat ćemo barem djelomično odgovoriti na ovo, prema našem uvjerenju, važno pitanje.

No najprije, još nekoliko riječi o kamenu iz Belca. Da podsjetimo, pronađen je 1997. g. tijekom restauratorskih radova u drenaži crkve sv. Marije Snježne u Belcu, spomenika koji svoj današnji izgled duguje 18. stoljeću. Na temelju iscrpnih razgovora s kolegama u našoj zemlji kao i u inozemstvu<sup>2</sup> – došao sam do zaključka da se radi o fragmentu oveće lunete, kojoj ne možemo utvrditi mjesto porijekla (iako sam osobno bio sklon ideji da je kamen donesen s ruševina grada Belca u 18. stoljeću tijekom pregradnje crkve), te da je nastao oko 1150. g. ili nešto kasnije (Goss 2004).

Nastavljajući tijekom godinu dana studij nekih drugih, ranijih srednjovjekovnih "kamenčića" bez konteksta u međuriječju Save i Drave, imali smo puno prilika ponovno razmišljati o Belcu i porazgovarati s nizom kolega. Tako sam došao do nekih novih zaključaka, prvenstveno o porijeklu fragmenta. Pokušaj da se odredi približna izvorna veličina reljefa dovodi do zaključka da, ukoliko se zaista radilo o luneti, ta i ne bi bila odviše velika za važniju seosku crkvu. Slijedeći kurvaturu luka, dobio sam približno ove mjere: širina oko 140 cm, visina približno 70 cm za unutarnje polje lunete, čemu valja dodati 20 cm za okvir. Tako dobivamo 180 x 90 cm, pod pretpostavkom da je luneta bila polukružna i da nije imala okvir na bazi, što naravno ne mora biti točno. Iako se radi o aproksimacijama, i to govori kako luneta nije bila prevelika za Sv. Mariju. U susjednoj Mađarskoj i Sloveniji lunete seoskih crkava su obično od jedne petine do jedne trećine šire od svjetlosnog otvora, što bi ovdje bilo oko 120-130 cm<sup>3</sup>. Sv. Marija Snježna je izvorno srednjovjekovna crkva. U stvari, "anomalija" tlocrta, posebice oblik svetišta i njegov spoj s lađom, pokazuju da pretpostavljeno gotičko zide, koje je poslužilo kao elevacija za velik dio barokne zgrade (Vukičević-Samaržija 1993, 146-147) vjerojatno stoji na ostacima ranije, romaničke crkve. Lunete sličnih mjera mogu se naći u Mađarskoj (Csempeskopács) ili

is quite unique, and has no closer analogies in Pannonia, be it in Croatia or elsewhere (Goss 2004).<sup>1</sup> Speaking of context, we are, in fact, dealing with a context of one, which is not a particularly favourable position for any researcher to be in. This paper will attempt to extend the field of research by presenting another "stone" from the north-western Croatia, that from Križovljan, which, although known to the academic community for some time, has not yet been convincingly tied to any definite context of its own. Could the two stones, if put one next to the other, help us understand them better? We will attempt to provide some, at least provisional answers, to this rather important question.

First of all, a few words on the "Stone from Belec". It is worth reminding ourselves that it was discovered during the 1997 restoration works in the drainage system underneath the floor of the church of Our Lady of the Snow at Belec, which received most of its present-day form in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. In my opinion – and I came to this conclusion having consulted a number of colleagues both at home and abroad, to whom I remain continuously grateful<sup>2</sup> – the fragment was a part of a fairly large lunette, and its provenance could not be established with any certainty (although I personally leaned toward the idea of the stone having been brought from the ruins of the Castle of Belec during the 18<sup>th</sup> century reconstruction of the church). It should probably be dated in around 1150 or maybe a little later (Goss 2004).

Having continued, over the past year, to study several "out of context" pieces of earlier Croatian medieval sculpture from the area between the Sava and the Drava river, I have had quite a few opportunities to talk about and reconsider my initial findings concerning the Stone from Belec. This has led me to change some of my conclusions, primarily the one regarding provenance. I tried to establish the approximate size of the piece it once belonged to, and reached the conclusion that if the stone had been a part of a lunette, the latter would not have been too large for a village church. The dimensions I got by following the curvature of the arch were approximately as follows: width of 140 cm and height of 70 cm for the inner field of the lunette. Some 20 cm need to be added to that for the frame, which brings us to a total of ca. 180 cm width, and ca. 90 cm height, assuming that there was no framing at the bottom, and that the lunette was a precise semi-circle, which need not have been the case. Still, as approximate as these figures are, the size of the lunette is not overwhelming. Given the fact that comparable lunettes, e.g. in Slovenia and western Hungary, are about one-fifth to one-third wider than the door openings, the entrance itself would have been ca. 120-130 cm wide.<sup>3</sup> The Church of St. Mary of the Snow was originally a medieval building, the fact that I did not take sufficiently into consideration. In fact, the "anomaly" displayed by the plan, especially in the sanctuary, indicates that the Gothic church which provided most of the elevation for the Baroque restoration (Vukičević-Samaržija 1993, 146-147), may have been pre-

1 Trajno sam zahvalan prof. dr. sc. Željku Tomičiću, glavnom i odgovornom uredniku *Priloga* za njegovu vrlo poticajnu suradnju.

2 Navedeni u: Goss 2004. Ovome dodajem izraze moje zahvalnosti Anti Rendiću-Miočeviću, prof., dr. sc. Ivanu Mirniku, dr. sc. Marku Dizdaru, dr. sc. Jurju Belaju, Jasminki Ćus-Rukonić, prof.; mojim mladim kolegama, studentima postdiplomskog studija na Filozofskom fakultetu u Zagrebu, Nikolini Maraković i Tinu Turkoviću dugujem zahvalnost za korisne sugestije, pomoć na terenu i dozvolu za objavljivanje njihovih fotografija.

3 Kao usporedni materijal u Mađarskoj može se navesti: Magyarszeceőd, Pápóc, Újudvar, Böde-Zalaszentmihályfálva, Ják – katedrala – južni portal, Ják – Sv. Jakob, Csempeskopács, Vasalja-Pinkaszentkirály (Valter 2004, sl. 98, 130, 177, 178, 185, 186, 187, 190). U Sloveniji: Špitalič, Domanjševci, Kostanjevica (Sv. Jakob), Kamnik, Cmurek (Zadnikar 1970, sl. 9, 13, 18, 19, 42, 52).

1 I am grateful to prof. Željko Tomičić, Editor-in-Chief of *Prilozi*, on his extensive support.

2 Duly listed in Goss 2004, to which I would like to add thanks to the following scholars: Ante Rendić-Miočević, Ivan Mirnik, Marko Dizdar, Juraj Belaj, Jasminka Ćus-Rukonić; and to my young colleagues, graduate students at the University of Zagreb, Nikolina Maraković and Tin Turković for their welcome suggestions, assistance provided at the site, and permission to use their photographs.

3 As comparative material from Hungary one can list: Magyarszeceőd, Pápóc, Újudvar, Böde-Zalaszentmihályfálva, Ják, Cathedral, south portal, Ják – St. Jakob's, Csempeskopács, Vasalja-Pinkaszentkirály (Valter 2004, pl. 98, 130, 177, 178, 185, 186, 187, 190). In Slovenia: Špitalič, Domanjševci, Kostanjevica (St. Jakob), Kamnik, Cmurek (Zadnikar 1970, pl. 9, 13, 18, 19, 42, 52).



Sl. 1 Kamen iz Belca (Hrvatski restauratorski zavod)

Fig. 1 Stone from Belec (Croatian Restoration Institute)

Sloveniji (Domanjševci) na crkvama koje su čak manje od Sv. Marije (Valter 2004, sl. 187, sl. 189). Patronat nad obližnjom romaničkom crkvom Sv. Jurja bio je u rukama zagorskih župana, a kasnije vlasnika grada Belca, a to je često bila ista osoba (Vukičević-Samaržija 1993, 142-145). Prisustvo eminentnog patrona moglo je utjecati i na "posebni tretman" Sv. Marije, osobito ako pretpostavimo tradiciju marijanskog prošteništa. Dakle, i ne osobito velika srednjovjekovna crkva mogla je imati romaničku kiparsku dekoraciju.

Crkva sv. Križa u Križovljanu nalazi se na važnom raskrižju<sup>4</sup>, gdje glavna cesta uz Dravu iz Ludbrega (rimski Iovia, te kasnije važan srednjovjekovni feud) za Varaždin (nedaleko Petrijanca, antičke *Aquae vivae*, i prvi slavonski slobodni kraljevski grad, 1209.), sastaje također važnu prometnicu koja vodi za Varaždinske Toplice, mondene rimske *Aquae Iase* i cijenjani posjed zagrebačkog Kaptola u srednjem vijeku (Ludbreg 1997, 213-249, 276-282; Dobronić 1952, 177-183; Kugly 1977, 14-15). Oduvijek je taj put nosio pustolove i trgovce, hodočasnike i osvajače, te je to, uz posvetu Sv. Križu, navelo neke istraživače da pripisuju crkvi viteškim redovima, templarima, odnosno nakon njihova ukinuća, ivanovcima. Iz svoje "kuće" u Križovljanu (crkva je na nešto povišenom položaju koji se pedesetak metara na sjever strmo ruši do dravske aluvijalne ravnice) mogli su nadzirati promet i pružati usluge hodočasniciima za Svetu Zemlju koji su, pretpostavlja se, koristili "podravsku magistralu".

Nedavno je to pitanje ponovno razmotrio u svom magistarskom radu Juraj Belaj, zaključivši kako nema jasnih indikacija da bi Križovljan ikad bio sjedište križara (Belaj 2001, 84-86). No arhitektura crkve, ukoliko se može rekonstruirati njezinu povijest, i oblici, ukazuju na suprotno. Izvorni dio crkve (12. ili 13. st.) bio je, izgleda, pravokutna dvorana, kakve nerijetko koriste viteški redovi (Ludbreg 1997, 121-124, 276-279). Desetak kilometara na zapad nalazi se još jedna dvoranska crkva istoga tipa, Sv. Klement u Kelemenu, romanička zgrada više puta pregrađena i dozidana. Crkva Sv. Marije na ključnom templarskom (kasnije ivanovačkom) položaju u Gori kod Petrinje pripada istom tipu. Toj dvorani dodano je kasnogotičko svetište, a crkva je uvelike popravljana i pregrađivana nakon oštećenja koja je zadobila za turskih provala. Sasvim je sigurno pregrađen cjelokupni južni zid (Ludbreg 1997, 279; Stošić 1994, 123; Miletić 1997; Buturac 1984, 74-76).<sup>5</sup>

Vidljivi dijelovi sjevernog zida pokazuju začuđujuće dobro ziđe od velikih, lijepo izglacanih kvadara. Ti, kao

ceded by a Romanesque building. Lunettes of similar size may be found in Hungary (Csempeskopács) and Slovenia (Domanjševci) in Romanesque churches smaller than St. Mary of the Snow (Valter 2004, sl. 187, sl. 189). The patronage over the nearby Romanesque church of St. Juraj at Belec was exercised by Župans (Counts) of the Zagorje County, and later, by owners of the Castle of Belec, often the same persons (Vukičević-Samaržija 1993, 142-145). The presence of an eminent patron might account for a "special treatment" of the church of St. Mary, too, especially in light of the popularity of the site among pilgrims, which may have had a long tradition.

It was necessary to revert to this point, in order to understand that a relatively small medieval church may have borne figured sculpture decoration in the Romanesque period.

The church of St. Križ (Holy Cross) at Križovljan stands at an important crossroads<sup>4</sup> where the old main road that goes along the Drava river from Ludbreg (an important medieval feudal estate and the Roman *Iovia*), to Varaždin (near Petrijanec, the Roman *Aqua viva*, and the earliest King's Free Borough in continental Croatia, 1209), meets an important side road leading from Varaždinske Toplice, a valuable possession of the Zagreb Cathedral Chapter in the Middle Ages, and the famous Roman site of *Aquae Iasae* (Ludbreg 1997, 213-249, 276-282; Dobronić 1952, 177-183; Kugly 1977, 14-15). This key position on a road which was since times immemorial used by both travellers and invaders, as well as the church's dedication to the Holy Cross, have led some scholars to suggest that it belonged to the military orders, first the Templars, then the Hospitalers. From their "house" at Križovljan – and the church stands on a slight elevation, which steeply drops some fifty meters to the north of the church toward the Drava river valley – they could control the traffic, and aid the pilgrims which, presumably, used the road on their way toward the Holy Land.

The question of whether the Holy Cross was a military orders' station was most recently re-examined by Juraj Belaj, who, on the basis of available historical documents, found no convincing links between Križovljan and the Crusaders (Belaj 2001, 84-86). However, the architecture of the church, in as much as its history and forms could be reconstructed, seems to indicate the opposite. The original portion of the church (dating from the 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> century) seems to have been an elongated rectangular hall of the kind usually associated with military orders (Ludbreg, 1997, 121-124, 276-279). About ten kilometres to the west of Križovljan, there is another similar church, St. Klement at Kelemen, a well-preserved Romanesque building that has been rebuilt several times since. The church of Our Lady in the key Templar (and Hospitaler) seat at Gora is of the same type. A late Gothic sanctuary was added to the original hall, and the church was substantially rebuilt after it was damaged during Turkish incursions. The reconstruction certainly included rebuilding of the entire southern wall (Ludbreg, 1997, 279; Stošić 1994, 123; Miletić 1997; Buturac, 1984 74-76).<sup>5</sup>

4 Crkva, na maloj uzvisini, vidljiva je izdaleka.

5 Povijest umjetnosti je prvenstveno povijest umjetničkih oblika. To se često zaboravlja pa tako povjesničar umjetnosti, posebice medijevalist, pokušava biti i povjesničar i arheolog i arhivist i lingvist itd. Količina podataka koja se nakupila do danas teško da se može svladati i unutar vlastite specijalizacije. Stvarni interdisciplinarni pristup pretpostavlja timski rad, u kojem se materijali raznih disciplina važu i odabiru. To je, nadam se, i metodološki temelj ove studije. Ne odbacujem zaključke magistra Belaja u njegovu uzornom radu, već naglašavam, a to će se vidjeti iz teksta i kasnije, da dokazni materijal povijesti umjetnosti ukazuje da je Križovljan zaista mogao biti "kuća" križara. Taj se dokazni materijal ovdje samo nudi stručnjacima drugih disciplina i na njima je da odluče kako ga usuglasiti s vlastitim radom.

4 The church, on a small eminence, is visible from afar.

5 Art history is primarily the history of artistic forms. This is forgotten only too often, and thus an art historian, medievalist in particular, tries to be his own historian, archaeologist, archivist, linguist, etc. The amount of data nowadays available makes it difficult to handle one's own domain. True, professional interdisciplinary approach is that of team work, in which evidence from all participating disciplines is sifted through, weighed, and applied. This is also, I believe, the methodological approach of this study. Therefore, I am not rejecting conclusions reached by Belaj in his fine thesis, but would like to point out, as it will also transpire later in the text, that the evidence examined from the point of view of the history of art supports the idea that Križovljan was a "domus" of the Crusaders. This evidence I hereby offer to the experts in other disciplines to evaluate and decide how to incorporate it into their own research.



Sl. 2 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, Reljef sa zapadne fasade (foto: Tin Turković/Nikolina Maraković)

Fig. 2 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, relief on the western façade (photo by Tin Turković/Nikolina Maraković)

i mnogi drugi klesani ulomci u zidu crkve, mogli bi biti spolije s nekoga antičkog nalazišta. Lijepi kvadri su izgleda karakteristika mikroregije. Romanička crkva u Martijancu Donjem, oko 2 km zapadno od Križovljana, srušena u 18. stoljeću, bila je, znamo iz dokumenata, izgrađena na sličan način. Još tri kilometra na zapad i stižemo u Jalžabet (rimsko nalazište), gdje je crkva, relativno recentno zdanje, podignuta na brežuljku unutar trokuta određenog prometnicama, što je tipičan srednjovjekovni (prvenstveno romanički) smještaj. Identičan je slučaj u Kelemenu, samo što je brežuljak viši i romanička struktura pejzaža bolje očuvana. Zapadno od crkve u Jalžabetu mogu se još uvijek vidjeti veliki klesani blokovi, popločenje seoskog dvorišta (Ludbreg 1997, 292).<sup>6</sup>

Spolije – rimske i romaničke – vide se u južnom zidu Sv. Križa. Njih će trebati izbliza proučiti tijekom neke buduće, nadamo se skore, restauracije. Današnji zapadni portal također je rezultat rekonstrukcija i spoliranja. Ulaz je izvorno romanički, no izgubio je pobočne stupove, tako da kapitelne zone vise “u zraku”. Izvorno širi, sužen je u kasnoj gotici ili baroku, kad je polukružna luneta pretvorena u blago zašiljenu,

The visible section of the northern wall reveals surprisingly good masonry work consisting of large, well-made pieces of ashlar. These, and many other pieces all over the building, may be spolia of an ancient structure. Such well-polished blocks are not unknown in this region. The old, most likely Romanesque church at Martijanec Donji (two kilometres to the west of Križovljan), pulled down in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, is known to have been built in a similar way (Ludbreg 1997, 292). Three more kilometers to the west stands the church at Jalžabet, a relatively recent structure built on an elevation within a triangle made by intersecting roads, which is a typical feature of the medieval landscape (exactly the same, but even more pronounced, is the location of the church at Kelemen). To the west of the church, similar large blocks are still visible in the pavement of a farm yard (Ludbreg 1997, 292).<sup>6</sup>

The spolia – Roman and Romanesque - are especially noticeable within the reconstructed southern wall. They should be studied more carefully in the course of some future restoration, which the church badly needs. The present form of the church portal is also the result of reconstruction and reuse. The originally Romanesque entrance has lost its side columns so that capitals are now “hanging in the air”. In the beginning it was wider, but during Gothic or Baroque interventions it was narrowed and the lunette arch was cut

6 Primijećeni tijekom posjeta u siječnju 2005., u pratnji kolegice Maraković i kolege Turkovića.

6 Noticed during the January 2005 visit, when I was accompanied by Ms. Maraković and Mr. Turković.



Sl. 3 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, Reljef sa zapadne fasade, detalj, srednja glava (foto: Tin Turković/Nikolina Maraković)

*Fig. 3 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, relief on the western façade, detail, head in the centre (photo by Tin Turković/Nikolina Maraković)*

ispunjenu pločom, na kojoj je križ unutar trokutnog polja. Prema nedavnom mišljenju, ta je ploča nekoć bila unutar crkve.<sup>7</sup>

Konačno, ispod i nešto nalijevo od okulusa, visoko na zapadnom pročelju uzidan je sedmoglavi kamen. Oblikom kamen je izduženi trapez uvinutih kraćih strana, dimenzija približno 100 x 40 cm. Visoki položaj na pročelju i površinska oštećenja zbog duge izloženosti atmosferilijama znatno otežavaju istraživanje.

Sredinu kompozicije predstavlja frontalni prikaz bradate glave (brada pokriva konični vrat, koji se vidi u slučaju dvaju postranih glava), s dugim, uskim i oštro rezanim nosom, izbuljenim očima prikazanim kao dvije koncentrične krivulje s još jednom koja označuje čeonu lukove. Čelo i obrazi su blago zakrivljeni, obrazi ponešto napuhani. Usta su jako oštećena, no na temelju ostalih dvaju likova može se zaključiti da su prikazana kao dvije paralelne crte. Usnice su stisnute i ispučene, dok se uši prikazuju *en face* kao zalijepljene na lubanju. Lik, kao i onaj na desno, nosi čini se traku u kosi, ili nešto poput dijadema, nad kojim se vide kovrčavi uvojci. U sredini dijadema naziru se možda tragovi križa (?).

Lice na lijevoj strani je kruškoliko, s kratkom bradom nad koničnim vratom i kosom od uzdužnih, paralelnih poteza. Ostale pojedinosti su kao i u središnjem lika. Najbolje je očuvan od sva tri glavna aktera.

Lice na desnoj strani je šire, "deblje", s jasno označenim čeonim lukovima. Čelo je nisko, a dijadem označuje donju liniju kose koja se jedva vidi. Nosi bogatu no kratku bradu, možda i brk, a sjedi na širokom koničnom vratu.

Zajedno s okvirom, tri glavne osobe određuju kompoziciju i položaj svih drugih motiva. Kraće strane trapeza se uvijaju i usko prate oblike glava, stvarajući učinak ravnoteže između okvira (kadra) i figuralnog elementa. To ide tako daleko da okvir čini mali, no jasno vidljivi zavijutak, u kojem se smješta uho postranoga lika. Kadar je, dakle, isprva odredio kompoziciju, no zatim joj se i podredio. Kratke, zavojite strane, zajedno s krivuljama obrisa velikih glava, stvaraju niz eliptičnih (u sredini), ili gotovo kružnih (na strani) "džepova" za prikazivanje manjih glava. Te su jasno kruškolike, one postrane su sigurno bradate, i sve naizgled muške. Prikazan je tek djelić vrata, a detalj vjerno slijedi stil velikih glava. Opći dojam kompozicije je podosta impresivan – radi se o nizu eliptičnih ili kvazi-kružnih elemenata, poredanih tako da se pravilno izmjenjuju isti oblici kao ispuččenja ili praznine, dodatno ispunjene manjim glavama. Skulptor uspješno postiže dekorativni dojam koji se obično pripisuje ranosrednjovjekovnoj skulpturi, no koji je kompatibilan sa svakim područjem ili razdobljem sklonim dekorativnom izrazu.

Ozbiljno je pitanje ekscentričnog odnosa okulusa i reljefa. Kao da je okululus otvoren nakon što je reljef postavljen na pročelje ili, pak, kao da je reljef postavljen nakon otvaranja okulusa. Je li se reljef nalazio negdje drugdje i stiže li na današnje mjesto tijekom kasnijih preinaka? I, naravno, je li napravljen za crkvu ili je, poput mnogih ulomaka na Sv.

in such a way that the original semi-circular shape became pointed, and the lunette area was filled with a stone slab bearing a cross within a triangular field. This panel, according to a recent opinion, may have originally been a part of the interior of the church.<sup>7</sup>

And finally, high up on the western façade, just beneath the oculus, and a little bit to the left in relation to the latter, there is the seven-headed "Stone from Križovljan". The stone of approximately 100 x 40 cm, presents seven heads within a narrow, irregular, short trapeze frame. Its position high up on the façade make any research difficult, and the weathered state of the stone surface makes conclusions even more tentative. This analysis was assisted by new photographs which were additionally blown up on the computer screen. Nonetheless, the details are difficult to read with absolute certainty.

The centre of the composition is occupied by the portrait of a bearded head (the beard covers a conical neck, visible also in two side figures), with a long, narrow and sharply cut nose, bulged eyes rendered as two concentric lines, and another line marking the forehead ridges. The cheeks and forehead are smoothly rounded, while the cheeks are somewhat puffy. The mouth and ears are badly damaged but judging from what can be seen and comparing this with the face at the left end of the relief, the mouth was rendered by two parallel undulating lines, lips pressed together and pouting, whereas ears were shown *en face* as if glued to the sides of the skull at the eye level. The figure, as well as its neighbour to the viewer's right, seems to wear a sort of headband, or a diadem, with curly locks above it. In the middle of the diadem there is a formation which might be a remaining part of a cross. The face to the left, clearly pear-shaped, has a short beard, conical neck, and a growth of hair in parallel, well distinguished strips. The rest of the features correspond to those of the central face. This is also the best preserved of the three main figures. The face on the right is broader, "fatter", with very well marked forehead ridges. The forehead is quite low and a diadem marks the lower end of the hair which is barely distinguishable. The face wears a rich but short beard, possibly also a moustache, and sits upon a broad, conical neck.

Together with the frame, the three main "heads" determine the composition and placement of all other elements. The short sides of the trapeze are curved and, together with the outlines of the heads, produce a balanced effect between the frame (*cadre*) and the figured elements. The attempt to achieve this balance went as far as to make a small but clearly visible curve on the frame to accommodate the ear of the figure on the left. The frame had initially determined the composition, but then bent in order to accommodate it. The short, curving sides, together with curved outlines of the larger faces produce a serious of elliptical (in the centre), or almost circular (on the sides) pockets to display smaller heads. These are clearly pear-shaped, the two side ones are probably bearded, and all of them are apparently male. They are shown with just a trace of a neck, and, in terms of details, they follow the style of the larger faces. The overall effect of the composition is quite impressive – it is a sequence of elliptical, or quasi-circular elements based on a regular interchange of the same element shown as either solid or void, and the voids are additionally filled with smaller solid elements of the same kind. All this reminds us of decorative patterns of the early medieval sculpture, but is equally compatible with any environment or period leaning toward the decorative.

A serious question is also posed by the eccentric relation between the relief and the oculus straight above it. It would appear that either the oculus was opened after the relief had been put in

7 Vrlo dobar sažeti pregled crkve i njene problematike s bibliografijom u primjedbama donosi Katarina Horvat-Levaj u: Ludbreg 1997, 276-279, koji smo već više puta naveli.

7 See a very good brief outline of the church and problems involved with pertinent bibliography, in Katarina Horvat-Levaj's footnotes (Ludbreg 1997, 276-279). The work has already been quoted several times.



Sl. 4 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, zapadni portal (foto Nikolina Maraković/Tin Turković)

Fig. 4 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, western portal (photo by Nikolina Maraković/Tin Turković)

Križu, spolij donesen s nekoga drugog mjesta? Način na koji se reljef "rastopio" pod utjecajem atmosferilija, ukazuje da je izrađen od sličnog materijala, kao barem dio zidova crkve, dakle od lokalnog je kamena.

Znanstvenici koju su se pozabavili s "kamenom iz Križevljana" smatrali su ga rimskom spolijom, ponovno upotrijebljenim u srednjovjekovnoj crkvi (Gorenc-Vikić 1984, 60; Ludbreg 1997, 276); rimskom spolijom "resematiziranim" na novom položaju (Stošić 1994, 123) ili romaničkim reljefom s prikazom donatora (Horvat 1979, 174). U prvome slučaju kamen bi se našao u poširokom kontekstu. Zaista, oblik lica i izvjesna "provincijalna" oporost podsjećaju na rimske provincijalne stele, poput one iz Kerestince u dvorištu Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu.<sup>8</sup> No izgled kamena nije uobičajen za stelu. Je li bi to mogao biti gornji dio stele? No koliko je poznato, stele su obično u jednom komadu. Kamen je vrlo širok i kratak, a zahtijevao bi isto tako široko postolje. Okvir jasno pokazuje da se radi o zasebnoj jedinici, a ne o komadu odsječenom od veće cjeline. I kakva bi to obitelj

<sup>8</sup> Ponovno se zahvaljujem ravnatelju Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, Anti Rendiću-Miočeviću na pomoći i suradnji.



Sl. 5 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, zapadna fasada (foto Nikolina Maraković/Tin Turković)

Fig. 5 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, western façade (photo by Nikolina Maraković/Tin Turković)

place, or that the relief was installed after the opening of the oculus. Was the relief somewhere else, before it was put where it stands today, presumably, during some late restoration? And, was it made for the church, or, is it like many other pieces within the walls of St. Križ, a piece of spolia brought from somewhere else? The way the stone "has melted" indicates that it was made of similar material as at least some portions of the church walls, in other words, of local stone.

Scholars who dedicated their attention to the "Stone from Križovljan" considered it to be a Roman spolium reused in a medieval church (Gorenc-Vikić 1984, 60; Ludbreg 1997, 276), a Roman spolium "resemanticised" (Stošić 1994, 123), or a Romanesque piece showing the family of donors (Horvat 1979, 174). In the first case, one would expect an extensive context, and in terms of specific features, such as the form of the head, or a certain "provincial" roughness, there are analogies with the late Roman steles (for example, the one from Kerestinec nowadays kept in the courtyard of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb).<sup>8</sup> However, the shape itself is strange. Could it be seen as a part of a stele? They are usually made from a single piece! It is very short and wide, and would have required an equally wide lower section (podium). As the frame

<sup>8</sup> Once again, I express my gratitude to Mr. Ante Rendić-Miočević, Director of the Archeological Museum in Zagreb, for drawing my attention to that piece.



pokojnika bila u kojoj su samo muškarci? Možda skupina vojnika, no nema niti jednoga vojničkog atributa!

Duhovita misao o "resemantizaciji" vodi nas korak dalje. Ako je "kamen" ponovno upotrijebljen unutar okvira kršćanske crkve, očito ga se smatralo kompatibilnim s teorijama i praksom kršćanstva. Teško bi se moglo reći da se radi o obitelji donatora jer, opet, gdje su žene? Ne radi se niti o svecima jer nema aureola niti bilo kakvih svetačkih atributa. Ali, ako je Sv. Križ pripadao križarima, kako misli Stošić koji je i predložio ideju "resemantizacije" (Stošić 1994, 123), kamen bi mogao prikazivati skupinu križara, glavu "kuće" u sredini između dva druga čelnika, te skupinu braće nižega ranga.<sup>9</sup> Ako je tako, radi li se o rimskom spoliju ili o romaničkoj skulpturi koja se nadahnula rimskim provincijalnim radom? Može li u takvoj situaciji kamen iz Belca poslužiti kao kontekst?

Postoje očite analogije. Oblik glava (lica), prikaz detalja kose (vidjeti lijevu veću glavu u Križovljanu), detalji lica. Zaobljenost oblika (obrazi) podsjeća također na Belec. No postoje i razlike. U Belcu, za razliku od Križovljana, uši nisu *en face* "prilijepljene" na lubanju. Smisao za reljef i izvjesna vedrina (smije li se reći dostojanstvo?) figure iz Belca ne odražava se u Križovljanu. Majstor iz Belca je "plastičniji", dok je njegov kolega iz Križovljana "slikovitiji" (ne zaboravimo, barem djelomično zbog utjecaja atmosferilija). U Arači, danas u SiCG, likovi, bili oni dio ponovno upotrijebljene rimske ploče ili ranosrednjovjekovne, pokazuju ponešto sličan oblik glava, pa i osjećaj za reljef kao u Belcu, no urezani detalji su strani majstoru iz Belca (Tóth 2000, 430-434). Luneta iz Gyulaféhvára (Sedmogradska) pokazuje neke opće analogije s našim kamenjem (glava i crte lica), no osobno ne zapažam neku izrazitu bliskost (Tóth 2000, 435).<sup>10</sup>

Možda najzanimljiviji komad u tom nepostojećem kontekstu je dvostrani reljef iz Somogyváru u južnoj Ugarskoj (sredina 12. st.), rad koji i sam već duže vrijeme traži kontekst unutar mađarske romaničke skulpture. Radi se o komadu poput lunete koji je možda služio kao dio oltarne pregrade, a prikazuje za sada neidentificiranu scenu (misa sv. Gillesa?). Postoje sličnosti u formaciji glava i ličnih detalja (vidjeti oči u Belcu), no postoji i sklonost urezivanju detalja, čega u Belcu nema. Valja zapaziti sličnosti između desne veće glave u Križovljanu i lika na prijestolju u Somogyváru (vidjeti obris lica, bradu, nos i posebice pokrivalo glave), (Goss 2004, 225; Takacs 2001, 421-422; Tóth 2000, 432).

No postoji nešto u kompoziciji somogyvarskog reljefa, što znakovito, iako ne i izravno, podsjeća na Križovljan. To je ono "rasipanje" bestjelesnih glava koje se slažu u uspravnim nizovima, plutajući pred neodređenim, beskonačnim i, ako se smije tako reći, "besprostornim" prostorom. Slična se impresija, po mom viđenju, stječe kad se promatraju kompozicijski i prostorni (ili "ne-prostorni") odnosi u križovljanskom reljefu.

clearly indicates, this was a self-contained piece, not a cut-off from a larger whole. And, what kind of a family is it, that has only male members!?! One might think of a group of soldiers, but there are no military attributes.

The clever "resemantisation" idea takes us a step further. If the "stone" was reused within a Christian church, it was obviously considered to be compatible with theories and practices of Christianity. Due to the mentioned gender issue, it could not represent a family of donors. It is not a group of saints either, since there are no indications of a halo or any saintly attributes. If St. Križ had belonged to military orders, as Stošić, who championed the idea of "resemantisation", wanted us to believe, then the stone could represent a group of knights – three leaders, with the Head in the middle, and a group of lesser brethren.<sup>9</sup> If so, was it a Roman spoliu or a Romanesque relief made, most certainly, after an antique model? And if it were Romanesque, could the Stone from Belec provide a context for it?

There are, certainly, points of analogy (it is worth remembering that we must limit ourselves to heads only). The shape of the head, the treatment of details of the hair (e.g. on the left large head at Križovljan) and facial features reveal similarities. The rounded forms (e.g. the cheeks) also recall Belec. Equally, there are differences. Unlike the ears on the Križovljan stone, those at Belec adhere to the skull. The sense of relief and certain serenity and repose (may we even say, dignity?) of the Belec figure is not reflected in the Križovljan piece. The Belec master was more "sculptural" in his expression, whereas his Križovljan colleague was "painterly" (although this impression may also be due to the weathered state of relief). At Aracs (Arača, today in SCG), the figures, be they parts of reused Roman slabs, or early medieval ones, have head forms that are rather similar (but more clearly oval). There is also the sense of relief reminiscent of Belec, but equally incised linear details not found at Belec (Tóth 2000, 430-434). The lunette from Gyulaféhvár (Transylvania) again presents some broad analogies with our material (head form and facial features), but there are no close parallels (Tóth 2000, 435).<sup>10</sup>

Perhaps the most interesting piece of this context-which-it-is-not is a two-sided relief from Somgyvár in the southern Hungary (dating from the mid 12<sup>th</sup> century). Needless to say, this piece has been looking for its own context within Hungarian art history for quite some time. It is a lunette-type slab, possibly of a choir-screen, with a scene identified as "The Mass of St. Gilles", but without any certainty. Again, there are similarities in terms of head form and facial details (see the eyes in Belec!), but this relief also reveals a tendency toward linear incisions, despite of the clear sense of relief which recalls the Belec artist (Goss 2004, 225; Takacs 2001, 421-422; Tóth 2000, 432). Similarities of some details on the right-hand head from Križovljan and the face of the enthroned figure from Somogyvár should not go unnoticed (the outline of the face, beard, nose, and, especially, the head gear!).

However, there is something in the composition of the Somogyvár relief which strikingly, albeit not directly, recalls the "Stone from Križovljan". It is the "scattering" of bodiless heads lined up in vertical rows, heads which float in front of an unde-

9 Prema: Dobronić 1984, 11, glavari templarskog "domusa" je praeceptor, a njegov pomoćnik prepraceptor.

10 Članak i zbornik u kojem je objavljen donose najnovija razmatranja o južnopanonskoj skulpturi 11. i 12. st. Zahvaljujem se prof. Tóthu na dugoročnoj suradnji i potpori. Zanimljiva, iako ne sasvim bliska analogije je i skupina glava (neke i s kratkim tjeleščima) na portalu Sv. Nikole i Elizabete u Egeru (oko 1210.) u Češkoj (Bachman 1977, 126).

9 According to Dobronić 1984, 11, the head of a Templar "domus" was a "praeceptor" who was assisted by a "prepraceptor".

10 This paper, as well as the entire book of proceedings, bring together the latest research on the 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> century sculpture in the southern Pannonia. I would like to thank Prof. Tóth for his collegial advice. An interesting albeit not too close analogy is a collection of rather "painterly" heads (some with very short bodies), possibly inspired by the Antiquity on the portal of St. Nicholas and Elizabeth at Eger, Bohemia, dated in around 1210 (Bachmann 1977, 126).

Ova posljednja i teško određiva značajka uvodi nas podosta neočekivano u još jednu kulturu - naroda koji je ostavio jaki biljeg na svijet srednje Europe, a to su Kelti. Želim izrazito naglasiti da nisam nikakav stručnjak za to područje i da nemam namjeru proglašiti kamen iz Križovljana prvim primjerkom kamene keltske skulpture na području Hrvatske. Prilažem tu temu za raspravu uz svu dužnu skromnost, no uz isto tako jak osjećaj kako u okvirima razmatranja konteksta ovu sastavnicu treba pretrresti.

Uzmimo kulturni predmet keltske povijesti umjetnosti, srebrni kotao iz Gundestrupa u Danskoj (2. st. pr. Kr.), (Die Kelten 1980, 68-75, 284-286). Rasipanje kompozicijskih elemenata (prvenstveno onih figurativnih) ima, po mom viđenju, jake vizualne veze sa Somogyvárom, a također i s "razbacivanjem" glava u "ne-prostornom prostoru" u Križovljanu, s napomenom kako klesar Križovljana ima jači osjećaj za apstraktne kompozicijske uzorke. Pogledajmo prikaze poput Taranisa kao gospodara munje, Boginju Majku u društvu Tamisa i Esosa, Odlazak Teutatesove vojske, Dioskure u potrazi za tri vola, itd. (Die Kelten 1980, Abb. 1,3,7,9). Oblik glava i lični detalji su također neobično slični. Usporediti treba lik na prijestolju u Somogyvaru s Teutatesom koji sudi palim ratnicima na kotlu iz Gundestrupa, te s desnom većom glavom u Križovljanu, ili lijevu glavu iz Križovljana s Esusom s jelenjim rogovima i konačno srednju s Taranisom Gromovnikom! (Die Kelten 1980, Abb. 1,2).

Ostava keltskog novca nađena je u Križovljanu, što ne mora značiti ništa jer je može ostaviti bilo tko i u bilo koje vrijeme, a ona ne mora indicirati postojanje naselja. Slična je ostava nađena pokraj Đurđevca, a na nekim od kovanica nalaze se "lišca" koje neobično podsjećaju na materijal s kojim smo se pozabavili u ovoj studiji (Göbl 1973, 31-33, T. 19-21,25-30).<sup>11</sup>

Začitali smo tri konteksta koji se presijecaju na zaista upečatljiv način. Koji je pravi?

Ostavljajući po strani tezu da se radi o prvoj kamenoj keltskoj skulpturi, identificiranoj na području Hrvatske, ipak ne smijemo izgubiti iz vida što taj kontekst može značiti za rimsku i srednjovjekovnu plastiku u međuriječju Save i Drave. Prihvatimo li zamisao da je kamen iz Križovljana neprepoznatljiv kao tipična rimska stela (iako ne odbacujemo u potpunosti da bi se moglo raditi o provincijalnom rimskom radu), moramo razmisliti o načinima recepcije poganske (i kršćanske) rimske plastike u vremenu koje slijedi političku i vjersku stabilizaciju Panonije nakon godine 1000., zatim i u kolikoj mjeri je upravo provincijalni Rim bio put do ranijih, bogatih slojeva predromanske Panonije.

Konačno, ako kamen iz Križovljana datira iz 12. ili 13. st. kao srodnik (iako ne najbliži) kamenja iz Belca, Arače i Somogyvára, vjerujem da smo stigli do obrisa konteksta, možda još uvijek jako maglovitog, no u kojemu, ne zaboravimo, prijašnja razdoblja igraju itekako važnu oplođujuću ulogu.

fined, indefinite, and, if one is allowed to say so, "space-less" space! In my view, a similar impression in terms of composition and spatial (or non-spatial) relations may be gathered from the Križovljan relief.

This latest feature, very difficult to define, leads us somewhere else, into the world of yet another nation which has left a powerful mark on the history of Central Europe – the Celts. I want to make it abundantly clear that I have very limited knowledge about the subject, and no intention to claim the Križovljan stone for the realm of Celtic sculpture. I am bringing up the subject with due humility, but also with a strong sense, that as far as our discussion of contexts goes, it should be raised.

We can take the example of a cult object of Celtic scholarship, the silver caldron from Gundestrup in Denmark (2<sup>nd</sup> c. B.C.) (Die Kelten 1980, 68-75, 284-286). The scattering of compositional (and primarily figured) elements has, in my opinion, strong visual ties with the Somogyvár relief, as well as the "scattering" of heads in the "space-less space" from Križovljan (bearing in mind that the Križovljan sculptor had slightly stronger sense of abstract compositional pattern). Particularly interesting scenes on the cauldron are those of Taranis depicted as the Lord of Lightning, Mother Goddess with Taranis and Esus, or the Departure of the Army of Teutates, Dioskouroi Searching for Three Oxen, etc. (Die Kelten 1980, Abb. 1,3,7,9). Next, the head forms and facial features are also quite similar, especially if you compare the enthroned figure from Somogyvár to Teutates judging the Fallen Warriors from Gundestrup, and also to our Head on the right side. Furthermore, the Head on the left side can be compared with Esus with Deer Horns, and the Head in the middle with Taranis the Lightning-Wielder! (Die Kelten 1980, Abb. 1,2)

An important hoard of Celtic coins was found at Križovljan, which need not give any more weight to the "Celtic argument", as hoards could be left behind any time and by anybody, and need not indicate a settlement. Another similar hoard found near Đurđevac contains coins with faces strikingly similar to most of the material we have surveyed in this study (Göbl 1973, 31-33, T. 19-21,25-30).<sup>11</sup>

We have sketched three contexts, which seem to intersect in a striking fashion. Which of them is the right one? In a way, all of them are the right ones.

Ruling out the thesis that we have identified the first Celtic stone sculpture in Croatia, we must nonetheless seriously ponder to what extent the analogies we just pointed out bear on the history of both Roman provincial art, and medieval sculpture in the area between the Sava and the Drava rivers. If we accept that the "Stone from Križovljan" does not fit the description of a typical Roman stela (although it cannot be entirely disregarded that it could be indeed a work of Roman provincial art), we should think about the modes of reception of pagan (and Christian) Roman art in the period after the year 1000, following the stabilization of both political and religious situation in Pannonia. Similarly, it is worth considering to what extent could provincial Roman art lead us earlier cultural layers of Pannonia's rich pre-Roman history.

Finally, if the Stone from Križovljan is dated in the 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> century, as a companion piece (albeit not too close) to the stones from Belec, Aracs, and Somogyvár, we have come within a stone's throw of what may be, vague as it remains, an outline of a context,

11 Zahvaljujem dr. Ivanu Mirniku na informaciji o keltskim ostavama u Hrvatskoj i na poticajnu raspravu o "keltskoj vezi". Bilo bi zaista dobro jednom pregledati naš reljef iz neposredne blizine. Mnogi profili na kovanicama u Göblovu katalogu pokazuju vrlo sličnu formaciju glave (pokrivalo plus kosa) našoj glavi na desno. A lica pokazana "en face" slične našoj glavi na lijevo (Göbl 1973, T. 25-30).

11 I thank Ivan Mirnik for information on Celtic hoards in Croatia, and for an inspiring discussion about the "Celtic connection". It would be indeed good to inspect the relief from close quarters. Many of the coins in Göbl's catalogue depict a face in profile with what seems to be very similar headgear to our head on the right; whereas Göbl's "en face" faces resemble our head on the left, (Göbl 1973, T. 25-30).



Sl. 6 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, s jugoistoka (foto Vladimir Peter Goss)

Fig. 6 Križovljan, Sv. Križ, view from the south-east (photo by Vladimir Peter Goss)

Negativnom metodom, eliminacijom, ali i pozitivnim pristupom, analizom kompozicijskih odlika, stižemo do zaključka koji bi barem zasada predložili našim čitateljima. Kamen iz Križovljana je romanički rad 12. ili, manje vjerojatno, 13. st. Nalazi se na zgradi za koju je izrađen, iako možda ne na izvornome mjestu. U ovom času nije lako biti precizan, no na neki način vidim ga vezanog uz izvorni portal. Slični surugati lunete nisu nepoznati s druge strane Drave (Valter 2004, sl. 188).<sup>12</sup>

Pojava sedmoglavog kamena na fasadi Sv. Križa u Križovljanu (a to vrijedi i u slučaju "resematizacije") bio bi dodatni argument da se crkva, usprkos sumnji povjesničara i arheologa, pripíše viteškim redovima. Četiri moćna reljefa kanonika Sv. Groba Jeruzalemskog (Sepulkralaca) sačuvanih nedaleko, na području Glogovnice s druge strane Kalnika (Dobronić 1998, sl. 10-15), pokazuju da redovi nastali u vrenju Svetog rata nisu izbjegavali vlastite prikaze unutar religioznih zgrada.<sup>13</sup>

in which, let us not forget, earlier periods and styles continue to play a fertilizing role.

Through negative method of elimination, and positive consideration of compositional elements, we have reached a conclusion which we would like to offer to the reader. The Stone from Križovljan indeed seems to be a work of Romanesque sculpture. It was made most likely for the building it still decorates today, although it may not be in its original place. Without being able to be more precise, at this point I see it in some way related to the original portal. Analogous lunette surrogates have also been found on the other side of the Drava (Valter 2004, Fig. 188).<sup>12</sup>

The appearance of the seven-headed stone on the façade of the Holy Cross at Križovljan (and this holds true even if it was "resemantised") also supports the thesis that it belonged to military orders, despite of the doubts expressed by archaeologists and historians. As four powerful reliefs of Canons of the Holy Sepulchre still extant in the area of Glogovnica, just across Kalnik Mountain (Dobronić 1998, Pl. 10-15) exemplify, the orders generated by the fervour of the Holy War were not shy about depicting themselves within sacred buildings.<sup>13</sup>

12 Reljef iz Sitke. Ovdje bi se mogli također podsjetiti križa iz "lunete" u Križovljanu. Na njemu se vide anomalije, npr. izdanak dolje lijevo kao da, u stvari, nosi siluetu raspelog Krista. Kolega Turković ukazuje da slični križevi postoje unutar templarskog konteksta u Poljskoj. Potaknuo bih mladoga kolegu da nastavi istraživanja u tom pravcu. A križ treba očistiti od žbuke tijekom buduće restauracije.

13 Glogovnica i cjelokupna jugoistočna padina Kalnika predstavlja izvanredno obećavajući teren za istraživanje ranijega srednjeg vijeka, i to ne samo u svezi s križarima – templarima, hospitalcima, sepulkralcima. Brilljantna intuicija dr. Dobronić da bi veliki sjedeći križnik (oko 97 x 47 cm) u substrukтури kuće br. 61 u Gornjoj Glogovnici mogao biti prvi križarski kralj, Godefroy de Boulogne (1099.-1100.), trebao bi biti intenzivna tema daljnjeg istraživanja.

12 Relief from Sitke. One should also remember the cross from Križovljan. It shows some anomalies (see the protrusion on the lower left side), as if it actually represented a silhouette of the Christ Crucified. Turković pointed out to me that similar crosses exist within the Templar context in Poland. I encourage my young colleague to pursue this line of research. And the cross should be cleaned during a future restoration.

13 The Glogovnica complex, as well as the entire south-eastern slope of Kalnik, is one of the most promising areas of early medieval research in continental Croatia, not just as regards the Crusaders (Templars, Hospitalers, Canons of the Holy Sepulcher). Dobronić's brilliant intuition led him to believe that the large seated Crusader (Canon of the Holy Sepulcher, ca. 97 x 47 cm) in the substructure of the house no 61 in Gornja Glogovnica may be Godefroy of Boulogne, the first Crusader king (1099-1100) This should be a topic of intense future research.

## LITERATURA/BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bachmann E. et al., 1977, *Romanik in Böhmen*, München
- Belaj J., 2001, *Arheološko naslijeđe viteških redova na sjeverozapadnom prostoru središnje Hrvatske*, magistarski rad, Filozofski fakultet, Zagreb
- Buturac J., 1984, Popis župa Zagrebačke biskupije 1334. i 1501. godine, *StarineJAZU* 59, Zagreb, 43-107.
- Die Kelten in Mitteleuropa 1980, katalog izložbe, Salzburg
- Dobronić L., 1952, Topografija zemljišnih posjeda zagrebačkog kaptola prema izvorima XIII. i XIV. stoljeća, *RadJAZU* 286, Zagreb, 177-183.
- Dobronić L., 1998, Glogovnica – regularni kanonici Sv. Groba Jerusalemskog, glogovnički prepoziti i crkva Blažene Djevice Marije, *TkaZb* 2, Zagreb, 42-102.
- Göbl R., 1973, *Typologie und Chronologie der Keltischen Münzprägung in Noricum*, Wien
- Gorenc M., Vikić B., 1984, Antičko naslijeđe ludbreškog kraja, *Ludbreg*, Ludbreg, 59-72.
- Goss V., 2004, Uvodno o "Kamenu iz Belca", *PrilInstArheolZagrebu* 21, Zagreb, 223-228.
- Horvat A., 1979, Über die Steinskulptur der Arpadenzeit in Kontinental Kroatien, *Alba Regia* 17, Székesfehérvár, 173-183.
- Kugly Lentić I., 1977, *Varaždin – povijesna urbana cjelina grada*, Zagreb
- Ludbreg, 1997, *Ludbreg-Ludbreška Podravina*, (K. Horvat-Levaj i I. Reberski.), Zagreb
- Miletić D., 1997, Župna crkva Uznesenja B. D. Marije u Gori, *Godišnjak ZSKH* 23, Zagreb, 127-152.
- Stošić J., 1994, Srednjovjekovna umjetnička svjedočanstva o Zagrebačkoj biskupiji, u: *Sveti trag*, Katalog izložbe, Zagreb, 110-130.
- Takacs I., 2001, *Paradisium Plantavit – Benedictine Monasteries in Medieval Hungary*, Archabbey of Pannonhalma, katalog izložbe, Budapest
- Toth S., 2000, Az aracsí kő rokonsága, u: *A középkori Dél-Alföld és Szer*, Szeged, 429-447.
- Valter I., 2004, *Árpád-kori téglatemplomok nyugat-dunántúlon*, Budapest
- Vukičević-Samaržija D., 1993, *Gotičke crkva Hrvatskog Zagorja*, Zagreb
- Zadnikar M., 1970, *Romanska umetnost*, Ljubljana