



In memoriam

Cvito Fisković (1908–1996)

Izlazak iz Domovinskog rata, s velikim brojem uništenih povijesnih ambijenata i razrušenih spomenika, dočekujemo bez znanstvenog autoriteta i stručne pomoći Cvita Fiskovića. Ostavimo li čak po strani velik ljudski i kolegijalni gubitak, smrt ovoga povjesničara umjetnosti, konzervatora, kulturnog historika i istančana pisca čini gotovo neusporedivu prazninu na mnogim područjima, u mnogim prostorima i regijama, u različitim slojevima domaće umjetničke baštine, a posebice u poznavanju i tumačenju civilizacijskog supstrata cijele Dalmacije. S obzirom da je Fiskovićeve interpretacije polazila organski od zavičajnoga središta, od duboke uronjenosti u prošlost i neposrednu okolicu Orebića, korčulansko-pelješkog kanala, koordinata nekadašnje Dubrovačke Republike, ona nam također može (i treba) poslužiti pri obnovi i zaštiti ne samo pojedinačnih građevina nego i integralnoga odnosa kulturnih i prirodnih sastojaka, takoreći samoga duha podneblja. Sigurno je da nitko nije poduzeo i ostvario tako cjelovitu rekonstrukciju tragova i stečevina, taloga i tokova prošlosti, opet ne samo na riječima nego i djelom poticanja i provođenja restauratorsko-konzervatorskih zahvata.

Iskustvo Cvita Fiskovića posebno nam je dragocjeno jer je jednim dijelom izraslo na posljedicama sličnih razaranja i uništenja, prije pola stoljeća, za Drugoga svjetskog rata. Kao pisac i znanstvenik on je formiran mnogo prije, diplomiravši 1933. godine, doktoriravši 1938, zaposlivši se 1936. u splitskom Arheološkom muzeju i počevši objavljivati već 1932, no upravo su ga poratne prilike natjerale na specifičnu aktivnost i agilnost koja je rezultirala brojnim konkretnim spoznajama na terenu. Nema dvojbe da posve nova etapa Fiskovićeve rada započinje 1946, kada dolazi na čelo Konzervatorskog zavoda za Dalmaciju (postojeći Regionalni zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture), gdje kao ravnatelj i organizator ostaje pune trideset i tri radne godine.

Nema nekrologa ili komemoracije koji bi mogli ocrtati sve teme Fiskovićeve opusa; u tu svrhu nije dovoljna ni oveća studija, a jedva da bi zadovoljavala i cijela monografija. Ovom se prilikom osvrćemo na nj ponajprije iz rakursa spomeničke zaštite i konzervatorske prakse, u koje je uložio znatan kreativni napor a iz kojih je zauzvrat crpio mnoge dragocjene podatke, komplementarne širokim i iscrpnim arhivskim istraživanjima. Dok je »filološkom metodom« uspostavio posve novu genealogiju hrvatskoga graditeljstva, kiparstva, slikarstva i umjetničkoga obrta, donoseći na svjetlo dana stotine imena i atribucija, radom na terenu razvio je zavidnu stilsko-morfološku osjetljivost, stekao pouzdane instrumente povijesnoumjetničke klasifikacije i valorizacije.

Upravo na području konkretnih potreba i stručnoga angažmana vrlo je rano nadmašio izolirano promatranje pojedinačnoga spomenika, a prihvatio metodu sagledavanja i vrednovanja u kontekstu. Prvi takav rad je iz 1937. godine, naslovljen *Uređivanje okoline Dioklecijanova Mauzoleja*, za kojim uskoro slijedi analogno *Uređenje splitske obale*. Premda je riječ o člancima u dnevnom tisku, bez znanstvene aparature, odmah su ukazali na ozbiljnost i utemeljenost pristupa, na odlično poznavanje povijesne problematike i specifičnosti životnih potreba.

Drugi svjetski rat, spomenusmo već, izoštio je Fiskovićeve konzervatorske metode i uvećao potrebe profilakse i kurative, nužnost svjedočenja o stanju i prijedloga za rješavanje problematike ugrožene kulturne baštine. Poznato je da se založio za prijenos nekih umjetnina, kada su prijetile ratne operacije; konkretno, pobrinuo se za skidanje *Posljednje večere* iz hvarškoga Franjevačkog samostana i njezino otpremanje na sigurnije mjesto. Još za trajanja rata počeo je prikupljati dokumentaciju o gubicima na planu specifičnoga nam nasljeđa, jamca identiteta i nacionalnog opstanka, te ujedno signalizirati

značenje materijalne kulture u obrani autentičnosti, tekstem indikativna naziva *Zločini i barbarstvo okupatora nad kulturnim spomenicima Dalmacije* (1944). U sličnom duhu je, godinu dana kasnije, objavio radove kao što su *Svjedočanstvo o ubistvu Ivana Lozice, Zadar grad ustanka, Novi putovi graditeljstva, Okupator je spalio Medovićeve slike i Partizanski spomenici*, gdje je uglavnom afirmirao ideju našeg narodnog kontinuiteta u otporu prema talijanskim, zapravo fašističkim i iredentističkim presizanjima na hrvatsku obalu Jadrana. Danas bismo rekli da se aktivno suprotstavio i vlastitom nam »kratkim pamćenju«, a osobito tendencijama neprijateljskoga »kulturocida«, što je ubrzo stimuliralo i znanstveno uvjerljivu afirmaciju hrvatskog faktora u autohtonom umjetničkom stvaralaštvu dalmatinskih sredina impresivnom prezentacijom domaćim majstora raznih naraštaja i raznih škola, grupa-cija i formativnog podrijetla.

Dolaskom u Konzervatorski zavod za Dalmaciju Fisković preuzima mnoge akutne zadatke u cijeloj širini regije za koju je odgovoran i »zadužen«. Osobito su uočljivi problemi u bombardiranome Splitu i još znatno porušenijem Zadru (za koji se, istina, formira ekipa drugih stručnjaka). Knjižica *Dalmatinski spomenici i okupator* prva je inventura situacije i svojevrsni program preuzetih obaveza, ali iste 1946. godine nastaju i članci *Urbanizam i stari spomenici, Stara splitska kazališta i Započelo je čišćenje Dioklecijanove palače*. Nekadašnji suradnik Arheološkoga muzeja (ali i student odgovarajuće discipline) izvanredno se snalazi u kasnoantičkoj problematici, pa će tijekom nekoliko godina biti posebno zaokupljen istraživanjima i restitucijama u najužoj splitskoj gradskoj jezgri (*Čišćenje Dioklecijanove palače*, 1947; *Rekonstrukcija Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu*, 1950; *Popravlak Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu*, 1950; *Prilog proučavanju i zaštiti Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu*, 1950). Nasuprot purizmu »romanske« inspiracije Fisković ravnopravno vrednuje sve faze života u palači; dapače, sa stanovitim predilekcijom za neke srednjovjekovne fenomene, koji su određeni iskrsnuli upravo nakon urušavanja (stanovitih dijelova) kasnijih građevina. Tako objavljuje posebne studije o splitskim crkvama Sv. Eufemije i Sv. Nikole, zatim o splitskom lazaretu, luci i romaničkim kućama, a konačno i o rušenju i raznošenju solinskih spomenika. Kruna spalatinske konzervatorske prakse polemički je pledoaje *Za urbanističku cjelinu Peristila*, najavljen prethodno člankom *Uz zabranu uklanjanja kapelica na Protirinu Peristila* (1960). U tim je tekstovima načelno i stvarno obranio paralelno postojanje monumentalne antike i skromne pučke renesansno-barokne izgradnje. Naime, sitne kapelice Gospe od Pojasa i Gospe od Milosrđa interpolirane su, nakon (više no) milenijske cezure,

u najsvečaniju fasadu palače uopće, no Fisković nije dopustio njihovo rušenje u korist čistoće rimskog učinka, smatrajući i obrazlažući kako za splitsku sredinu one znače autentičnu mjeru mogućnosti i svjedočanstvo jedne linije urbanog kontinuiteta.

Zadržali smo se praktički na jednom jedinom lokalitetu i na jedva desetljetnom rasponu rada. A istodobno je Fisković obrađivao i pojedinačne slike, kipove, crkve i ljetnikovce, ili – češće – čitave grupe spomenika, uvijek u svezi s terenskim obilascima, novouočenim podacima i zaštitnim mjerama. Koliko god zazirao od sinteznih ili kumulativnih pregleda, preferirajući »induktivan pristup« (J. Belamarić) i »hermeneutiku zavičajnosti« (I. Babić), Fiskoviću dugujemo i tako guste priloge hrvatskoj umjetničkoj topografiji kao što su *Spomenici na Braču, Gotička drvena plastika u Trogiru, Prvi poznati dubrovački graditelji, Naši graditelji i kipari XV i XVI stoljeća u Dubrovniku, Zadarski sredovječni majstori, Segetski spomenici, Spomenici otoka Mljeta, Lokrumski spomenici, Dalmatinske freske, Lastovski spomenici, Spomenici otoka Visa od IX do XIX st., Dubrovački ljetnikovci i književnost, Spomenici grada Makarske*, itd.

S nekoliko uzornih monografija odužio se protagonistima likovne umjetnosti u Dalmaciji, počam od majstora Radovana, uključujući Jurja Dalmatinca i Ivana Duknovića, do Medovića i Lozice. Pojedinačne interpretativne priloge posvetio je drugim velikanima i nekim stranim majstorima nazočnima u našim prostorima i riznicama, u gotovo nevjerojatnom rasponu od Mihoja Brajkova i Blaža Jurjeva, Nikole Firentinca i Andrije Alešija, Ivana Rabljanina i Petra Jordanića, majstora Mavra i Nikole Dente, Paola Veneziana i Tiziana, Palme i Tintoretta, Nikole Grassija i Ignaca Macanovića, Ignjata Joba i Branka Deškovića, Emanuela Vidovića i Ivana Meštrovića, pa do niza likovnokritičkih prezentacija suvremenih nam autora. Uvijek u izravnom dodiru s djelom, a ambijentom, s lokacijom, s pitanjima očuvanja ili popravka.

Nadahnuti eseji o Dalmaciji općenito, o Dubrovniku i Trogiru, o Splitu i Omišu, o Korčuli i Rabu, o Kotoru i Hvaru, o Orebićima i Vrgorcu, o Marjanu i Majsanu, gotovo uvijek su ispisani lirskim senzibilitetom i impregnirani literarnim ulomcima što kao da emaniraju »genius loci«. Osim vlastitih književnih radova Fisković nam je ostavio ključne biografske studije o Marku Maruliću i Petru Hektoroviću, Hanibalu Luciću i Marinu Držiću, Petru Zoraniću i Marinu Gazaroviću, Slavku Gučetiću i Ignjatu Đorđiću, Ivanu Vidaliju i Petru Kanaveliću, Vlahu Stuliću i braći Ostojić, Anti Tresiću Pavičiću i Tinu Ujeviću. Nikada nije preuzeo ambicije književnokritičkog, estetičkog prosuđivanja, no pritom je

pokazao posve izniman dobar ukus, snisao za plastični jezični izraz i, više od svega, doživljaj konkretnoga nadahnuća, dimenziju zbiljskih referenci. Stoga je većinu književnih opusa i ostvarenja otčitao na podlozi materijalne kulture, graditeljskih kristalizacija, interdisciplinarnih veza, ostvarivši remek-djela integralne interpretacije u prilogima o kulturi dubrovačkoga ladanja ili u suptilnim hermeneutičkim traženjima odnosa Hektorovićeve, Lucićeve ili Gazarovićeve pjesničke riječi i (komplementarnih im ili pak kontrastnih) ambijenata njihovih kuća, odnosno, ljetnikovaca.

Obrađivane problemske jedinice i manje cjeline mogli bismo gotovo širiti unedogled, jer se njerodavno također bavio zlatarstvom i minijaturama, narodnim pjesništvom i glazbali-ma, hortikulturom i folklornim običajima, zdravstvom i sportskim manifestacijama. U posebnim člancima ili u brojnim fusnotama grupirao je tipološki kamine i zabate, kucala i mjedene drške, alabastrane kipiće i ikone, crkveno ruho i čipke, lucerne i ex vota, krune bunara i stupiće balustrada, kamena pila i okvire prozora, knjižne uveze i posvetne natpise, vrtno bilje i kuhinjsko posuđe... ukratko: opisao je ostatke svečanih zgoda i manifestacija svakidašnjeg života, po čemu je neiscrpan rudnik pobuda za najšire shvaćenu kulturnu povijest ili pak mikropovijest, blisku namjerama francuskih »analista«. Po horizontali i vertikali istraživao je veze naših krajeva s Venecijom i s Apulijom, s Markama i s Rimom, s Francuskom i s Mađarskom, s Engleskom i s Orijentom. U stotinama tekstova donio je tisuće novih podataka, uspostavio gustu mrežu relacija i međuzavisnosti s kojima će i kompjutor teško izaći nakraj.

Evidentno je Fisković najveći povijesnoumjetnički empiričar kojega smo ikada imali, duboki poznavalac zbirke i muzeja, arhiva i radionica, crkava i ateljea, udolina i otoka skromnih naselja i urbanih cjelina. Ni programatski nije želio ići dalje od što cjelovitije inventarizacije baštine, od njezina kompetentnog predočavanja javnosti kako bi se ona spasila, zaštitila, obnovila, sačuvala za buduće naraštaje. Smatrao je da prije potpune evidencije nije moguće načiniti sinteze, dedukcije, panorame, teorijske poglede. Ipak je, gotovo nehotice, obogatio i našu umjetničku teoriju, ne samo proširenjem svijesti o zavičajnim specifičnostima i uvođenjem kriterija usklađenosti, primjerenosti, punine, čovjekove mjere itsl., nego i primjenom interdisciplinarnih metoda a posebice otvorenosću za miješane stilske formacije, sinkretične i »nečiste«, tipično periferne fenomene, kao što su, primjerice, istovremena manifestiranja gotike i renesanse ili pak romanike i gotike.

Nekoliko polemičkih razmjena mišljenja s Ljubom Karamanom, neposrednim prethodnikom na istoj brazdi i neospor-

nim znanstvenim autoritetom, zadivljuju nas razinom i međusobnim razumijevanjem, no iz njih je evidentno kako je upravo Fisković nadmašio domete dotadašnjih općenitosti i produbio spoznaju razmatranoga djela, umjetnika ili epohe znatno većom konkretnošću detalja i uvjerljivošću vizije cjeline. Pojam »gotičko-renesansnog stila« ostaje nam kao čvrsta aktiva raspravljanja o dubrovačkoj Divoni, a svijest o snažnijem srednjovjekovnom verizmu neosporan je rezultat polemike o Radovanovu portalu. Paradoksalno ali istinito, »nadigravši« empirijski Karamana na njegovu vlastitom terenu, Fisković je dao novi zamah i značenje baš Karamanovim tezama o provincijalnosti ili graničnosti umjetničkoga stvaralaštva u nas, dodatne argumente za shvaćanje »periferne strukture«.

Obilježivši, dakle, bitno hrvatsku povijest umjetnosti, Cvito Fisković je ostavio trajan osobni pečat i kod niza naraštaja naših povjesničara umjetnosti. Premda nije bio sveučilišni nastavnik, već samo povremeni predavač na postdiplomskim studijima ili (vrlo česti) izlagatelj na simpozijima, kolokvijima, proslavama i otvorenjima izložaba, kao mentor mladih stručnjaka (na restauratorskom, konzervatorskom, »kunstopografskom« poslu), ostvario je neprocjenjiv izravni utjecaj. I mnoge od suradnika našega Instituta uveo je u terenski rad ili mu savjetima olakšao prve korake prema znanstvenom opredjeljenju. Zahvalni smo mu za sve to, posebice pak za stvaralačku suradnju u ovim *Radovima*, gdje je tijekom petnaestak godina objavio više značajnih priloga, a posljednji od njih (u svesku 18. iz 1994. godi.) posvećen je *Nicolinijevu opisu Dioklecijanove palače*, te na neki način simbolički zatvara krug dominantnih zaštitarskih preokupacija, kojima je posvetio više od pola stoljeća iznimno plodnog rada. Taj spis iz poodmakle životne dobi nipošto nije pokazivao zamor ili gubitak motivacije već zanos i znatizelju koje ga oduvijek karakterizirahu.

Fizičkim nestankom Cvita Fiskovića izgubila je mnogo cijela naša struka, a dakako najviše Dalmacija, koja je u njemu imala osobnost znatno iznad bilo kakvih profesionalnih okvira, svojevrstan »dobri duh« regije. Duhovna dimenzija njegova opusa, međutim, ostaje trajno nazočna, posebice u svim onim sredinama gdje se osjećao kao kod kuće, a to su svi oni gradovi i mjesta, otoci i mikropokrajine što ih je znanstveno obradio i afektivno posvojio. Ipak, najdublje je zaorao u dubrovačkom kraju, u ambijentima svoga nekoć idiličnoga djetinjstva, koji su pak u proteklom Domovinskom ratu pretrpjeli osobito snažne povrede i devastacije, od Cavtata do Slanoga i od Pridvorja do Stona, da o samom gradu ne govorimo. Fiskovićeva golema ostavština sa svoje nas strane obvezuje da prilikom obnove tih naselja, to jest vraćanja životnih ritmova u stare jezgre budemo što dostojniji poduka »dugoga trajanja«, njegovih vitalnih poduka.

Tonko Maroević

In memoriam

Cvito Fisković (1908–1996)

After the war has ended we must now face the task of rebuilding our devastated historical sites and destroyed monuments without the help of Cvito Fisković and the support of his scholarly and professional authority. Even leaving aside the great human and professional loss, the death of this art historian, conservator, cultural historian and writer has created an indescribable loss in many areas and regions, in various fields of study of the Croatian cultural heritage and especially in the study and interpretation of the foundations of Dalmatian civilization. This interpretation grew organically from the fountain-head of his origin: Orebić, the Korčula-Pelješac channel, the coordinates of what was once the Dubrovnik Republic and his profound sense of belonging to their history and geography. Fisković's work must therefore be relied on in the restoration and conservation not only of individual buildings but in the restitution of the integral relation of cultural and natural elements, of the very "soul" of the region. Because Fisković was unique in the thoroughness with which he reconstructed the traces and traditions, the streams and residues of the past, not only in his writings but in the infectious energy with which he put into his work of restorator and conservator of our heritage.

Cvito Fisković's experience is particularly precious for us because he was witness of similar destruction and devastation which occurred half a century ago, after World War II. As a writer and scholar he was formed before World War II: he graduated from the university in 1933, earned a Ph. D. in 1938, began working at the Archeological Museum in Split in 1936 and began to publish in 1932. However, it was the post-World War II scene that drove him to a specific type of activity, in the course of which he gained rich experiences solving concrete problems on location. A new phase in Fisković's professional life began in 1946 when he became the head of the Conservation Institute for Dalmatia (now the

Regional Institute for the Conservation of the Cultural Heritage), a position he held for thirty-three years of his active life.

No one commemorative text can outline all the themes of Fisković's oeuvre; it could not be done even in a longer study, perhaps not even in a full monograph. On this occasion we will only mention those aspects touching on the theory and practice of conservation to which he gave so much of his creative energy and from which he received in return a treasure trove of data subsequently fertilized by his extensive and painstaking archival research. With the help of his "philological method" he constituted an entirely new genealogy of Croatian architecture, sculpture, painting and the applied arts, bringing to light hundreds of names and attributions, while his work on location became the basis of his firm grasp of style and morphology, the reliable instruments of his subsequent classifications and evaluations of the Croatian heritage.

It was in meeting the challenge of concrete needs and professional interventions that he learned very early how to go beyond the isolated study of individual monuments and judge problems in a wider context. The first work showing the results of such an approach were his studies articles about the regulation of the area surrounding Diocletian's Mausoleum (1937) and the regulation of the Split waterfront. Although these were articles in the daily press, written without scholarly pretensions, they already reveal a serious and well-informed approach, an excellent knowledge of history and an awareness of contemporary life and its needs.

During and after World War II, as we have suggested already, he was placed in a situation where great activity and much decision making was required from this art historian. During the war he was already involved with the safekeeping of endangered art works: e.g. he saw that the painting of the *Last*

Supper was taken from the Franciscan monastery in Hvar and stored in a safer location. He began to collect documents and evidence of the destruction or disappearance of art works, aware that the cultural heritage was a guarantor of national continuity. In 1944 he wrote *The Crimes and Barbarisms Committed by the Occupation Forces on the Cultural Heritage of Dalmatia*. In a similar spirit in the following year he wrote about the murder of Ivan Lozica, the insurgent spirit of Zadar, the burning of Medović's paintings by occupation forces, and on Partisan memorial monuments, affirming the notion of national continuity, and the need to resist the fascist and irredentist Italian pretensions to parts of the Croatian Adriatic coastland. He has entrusted these facts and attitudes to our memory, warning against the "culturocide" of our heritage. He also re-affirmed with scholarly arguments the existence of the Croatian factor in the culture of Dalmatia through his massive and untiring presentation of artists of this region who were active in various periods and belonged to various schools, groups and orientations.

As director of the Conservation Institute for Dalmatia Fisković was faced with many pressing tasks to be performed throughout the region. An especially acute problem were the bombed sites in Split and the even greater war destruction in Zadar (for which another team was appointed). His small volume on the *Occupation Forces and the Dalmatian Monuments* took the first inventory of the damages and rebuilding programme. In the same year, 1946, Fisković also wrote "Town Planning and Ancient Monuments", "The Old Theatres of Split" and "The Clearing of Diocletian's Palace Has Begun". The one-time associate of the Archeological Museum who also studied this discipline at the university, had an extraordinary grasp of the Late Classical heritage, and for a number of years gave much of his time to the research and restitution of the ancient kernel of Split ("Clearing Diocletian's Palace" 1947, "The Reconstruction of Diocletian's Palace in Split" 1950, "Repairing Diocletian's Palace in Split" 1950, "A Contribution to the Research and Conservation of Diocletian's Palace in Split" 1950). Unlike the purists of "Roman" inspiration, Fisković was equally interested in all the phases of the Palace's existence. Indeed, he showed a predilection for some of the Medieval phenomena which had been revealed after the war had destroyed some of its more recent additions. He published separate studies of the churches of Saint Euphemia and Saint Nicholas in Split, also of the Split lazaretto, the harbour and the Romanesque housing, and finally the demolition and theft of the monuments in Salona. The crown of this phase of Fisković's interest in the conservation of the heritage of Split was his polemical appeal for the "Urbanistic Unity of the Peristyle", preceded by the paper "The Chapel near the Peristyle Must Not be Pulled Down" (1960). In these texts he defended in theory, as he did in his practice, the right of parallel existence of the monumental classical monuments and the modest Renaissance-Baroque popular housing. The theme of these articles were the tiny chapels of Our Lady of the Belt and Our Lady of Mercy which (after a cesura of more than one thousand years) had become interpolated into this truly monumental palace facade. But Fisković did not sanction their removal demanded by others in the name of Roman purity, arguing that they were authen-

tic additions showing a line of urban continuity characteristic of the growth of Split.

So far we have only spoken of one locality and one decade of Fisković's work, although at the same time Fisković was working on individual paintings, sculptures, churches and villas and even more often, groups of monuments, always studied on the spot, in the various locations where he collected new facts and made decisions regarding conservation. Although he was not fond of so-called "synthetic" and cumulative surveys, preferring the "inductive approach" (J. Belamarić) and the "hermeneutics of his native region" (I. Babić), Fisković also wrote rich surveys of the Croatian artistic topography, such as *The Monuments of Brač*, *Wooden Gothic Sculpture in Trogir*, *The First Recorded Builders of Dubrovnik*, *Medieval Artists in Zadar*, *Croatian Builders and Sculptors in Dubrovnik - 15th and 16th Century*, *The Monuments of Mljet*, *The Monuments of Lokrum*, *Dalmatian Frescoes*, *The Monuments of Lastovo*, *The Monuments of Vis, IX-XIX Century*, *Literature and the Villas of Dubrovnik*, *The Monuments of Makarska*, etc.

He also made some model monographs presenting the great artists of Dalmatia, from Master Radovan, Juraj of Dalmatia and Ivan Duknović, down to the moderns Medović and Lozica. He also wrote studies of other great masters, including foreign artists who lived in Croatia or whose works are in Croatian museums, in unbelievable diversity, including Mihoje Brajkov and Blaž Jurjev, Niccolo of Florence and Andreas Alexius, Ivan of Rab and Petar Jordanić, Master Mavro and Nikola Dente, Paolo Veneziano and Titian, Palma and Tintoretto, Nicolo Grassi and Ignac Macanović, Ignjat Job and Branko Dešković, Emanuel Vidović and Ivan Meštrović, as well as numerous contemporary artists. In all these works he always remains in direct contact with the works, their ambience and location, as well as the questions of conservation or repair.

His inspired essays on Dalmatia in general, on Dubrovnik and Trogir, Split and Omiš, Korčula and Rab, Kotor and Hvar, Orebići and Vrgorac, Marjan and Majsan, are almost always marked by lyrical sensibility, studded with literary quotations underlining the "genius loci". He also wrote crucial biographic studies about the writers Marko Marulić and Petar Hektorović, Hanibal Lucić and Marin Držić, Petar Zoranić and Marin Gazarović, Slavko Gučetić and Ignjat Đorđić, Ivan Vidali and Petar Kanavelić, Vlaho Stulić and the brothers Ostojić, Ante Tresić Pavičić and Tin Ujević. He never ventured into literary critical aesthetic judgements, but writing about writers and literature he showed exceptionally good taste, a sense for lively expression and above all, an awareness of the importance of concrete reference. This is why for the greater part he placed his literary subjects into the framework of material culture, architecture, interdisciplinary contexts, creating masterpieces of integral interpretation such as his descriptions of the culture cultivated in the Dubrovnik villas or his subtle hermeneutic probing into the relations of the poetry of Hektorović, Lucić and Gazarović and the (complementary or contrasting) ambiances of their houses and villas.

One might go on and on enumerating his discussions of various problems or smaller compositional units, because he also

wrote competently on goldsmiths' work and miniatures, folk poetry and instruments, horticulture and folk customs, health and sports. In individual articles and numerous footnotes he made typological groupings of fireplaces and tympani, door knockers and brass fittings, alabaster figurines and icons, church robes and lace, lucernes and ex vota, balustrade colonnettes and window frames, book bindings and memorial inscriptions, garden plants and kitchen utensils... In short: he described both the remains of celebrations and the manifestations of everyday life, which makes him an inexhaustible source of materials for cultural history in the broadest sense or for a kind of micro-history like that practiced by the French "analysts". Horizontally and vertically, Fisković researched our relations with Venice and Apulia, Germany and Rome, France and Hungary, England and the Orient. In hundreds of texts he included thousands of new facts, establishing a thick network of relations and interdependences which even a computer would find difficult to process.

Clearly, Fisković is the greatest empiricist art historian we have ever had, deeply conversant with the holdings of collections and museums, archives and workshops, churches and studios, modest settlements and urban structures. His deliberate aim was to achieve the fullest possible inventorization of the heritage, its competent presentation to the public in order to help save, protect and restore it for future generations. He believed that before a full inventory has been made there can be no synthesis, deduction, panorama or serious theoretical work. And yet, almost against his will, he enriched our art theory not only by extending our consciousness about whatever is specific of our country or by teaching us to respect harmony, integrity and human measure, but also by applying interdisciplinary methods and remaining open to mixed stylistic formations, syncretic and "tainted", typically peripheral phenomena, such as the contemporaneity of Gothic and Renaissance elements, or Romanesque and Gothic features in a work.

Several of his polemical exchanges with Ljubo Karaman, his immediate predecessor who ploughed the same soil and had unquestionable scholarly authority, force us to admire the level of the discussions and the mutual understanding of the two experts, although it is incontrovertible that Fisković was more successful in transcending the generalizations of the time and reaching a deeper insight into individual works, artists or epochs by offering us a considerably greater concreteness of detail and a more convincing vision of the whole. His notion

of the "Gothic-Renaissance style" remains a net gain in the interpretation of the Divona Palace in Dubrovnik, and so does the awareness of the Medieval verism of Radovan's portal. It may sound paradoxical that surpassing Karaman empirically on his own territory, Fisković in fact enhanced and gave new significance to Karaman's theories about the provinciality of art in our latitudes, adding new arguments to the understanding of "peripheral structure".

Leaving his decisive mark in Croatian art history, Cvito Fisković also had a lasting personal influence on several generations of our younger art historians. Although he did not teach in a university, apart from giving occasional lectures, he very often spoke at conferences, anniversaries and inaugurations of exhibitions, and acted as mentor of young conservators, restorators and other specialists, exercising a very important direct influence. Many members of our Institute had occasion to learn from him working on various locations or listening to his scholarly advice. We are grateful to him for this, and in particular for his creative contribution to this *Review* (The Papers of the Institute of Art History) in which in a dozen years he published several important papers. The last of them (Vol 18, 1994) entitled "Nicolini's Description of Diocletian's Palace" may also be seen as symbolically closing the circle Fisković's dominant preoccupation as conservator for more than half a century of his exceptionally rich career. This paper, written at his advanced age, shows no sign of decline or loss of motivation, and is still inspired by his legendary enthusiasm and curiosity.

The physical death of Cvito Fisković is a sad loss for our profession, particularly in Dalmatia, where he was active not just as a great professional, but a great personage, the "good spirit" of the region. However, the spiritual dimension of his achievement remains alive, especially in all those places where he felt "at home" - in all the cities and towns, islands and micro-regions which he has researched with his mind and adopted with his heart. He left the deepest furrow in Dubrovnik and its environs, in the ambiances of his idyllic childhood which however were most cruelly devastated in the recent war - from Cavtat to Slano, from Pridvorje to Ston, not to mention Dubrovnik itself. Fisković's enormous legacy leaves us with the duty and obligation to participate in the the great task of rebuilding what has been destroyed and bringing life back to so many time-hallowed places without ever forsaking the spirit of his teaching.

Tonko Maroević