

Igor Loinjak

Odjeci crkvenih reformi u sakralnoj arhitekturi 11. stoljeća u Splitu

Igor Loinjak
Umjetnička akademija u Osijeku
Odsjek za vizualne i medijske umjetnosti
Ul. kralja Petra Svačića 1/f
HR, 31000, Osijek
igor.loinjak@gmail.com

UDK: 728(497.583Split)“10”
272-722.51:728](497.583Split)“10”
Pregledni članak
Primljeno: 8. 5. 2018.
Prihvaćeno: 29. 5. 2018.

Sažetak

Ideje crkvenoga reformatorskog pokreta na istočnoj obali Jadrana snažno su odjeknule u Osorskoj biskupiji, što ne iznenađuje zna li se da je tamošnji biskup sveti Gaudencije uspostavio dobre osobne kontakte s talijanskom reformatorskom opatijom u Pomposi, a preko nje i sa samostanom u Clunyju. Početkom 11. stoljeća u Istri je boravio Romuald, utemeljitelj kamaldoljana, posebnog ogranka benediktinskog reda, koji je prije dolaska na područje Osorske biskupije boravio u Pomposi, gdje je uspostavio jako dobre odnose s tadašnjim opatom reformiranog Clunyja Odilonom. Prisni prijateljski kontakti Romulda i Odilona odrazili su se i na polju arhitekture, što

The impact of ecclesiastical reforms on sacral architecture in Split in the 11th century

Igor Loinjak
The Academy of Arts and Culture in Osijek
Department of Visual and Media Arts
Ul. kralja Petra Svačića 1/f
CRO, 31000, Osijek
igor.loinjak@gmail.com

UDC: 728(497.583Split)“10”
272-722.51:728](497.583Split)“10”
Review article
Received: 8 May 2018
Accepted: 29 May 2018

Abstract

In the Eastern Adriatic seaboard, the ideas of the ecclesiastical reform movement reverberated considerably in the Osor Diocese, which is not surprising if one bears in mind that the local bishop, St. Gaudentius, established close personal relations with the Italian reformist abbey in Pomposa, and through it with the abbey in Cluny. At the beginning of the 11th century, Romuald, the founder of the Camaldolese order, a separate branch of the Benedictine community, resided in Istria. Prior to his arrival in the territory of the Osor (Oszero) Diocese, he had been in Pomposa, where he befriended the abbot of Cluny at the time, Odilo. The close friendly contacts between Romuald and Odilo

je vidljivo u translaciji nekih arhitektonskih elemenata nastalih u Pomposi na područje Osorske biskupije. Do širenja novih umjetničkih ideja na druge dijelove istočnoga Jadrana dolazi zahvaljujući ustrojstvu crkvene administracije i rasprostiranju njezine jurisdikcije. Osorska je biskupija već u prvoj polovici 11. stoljeća počela baštiniti nove arhitektonske primjere koji su se u to doba razvijali u talijanskoj Pomposi. Sredinom 11. stoljeća bivši osorski biskup Lovro postaje splitskim nadbiskupom. Gotovo u isto vrijeme kada nadbiskupsku stolicu u Splitu preuzima Lovro, na mjesto trogirskog biskupa zasjeo je Ivan, također iz Osora. Na taj je način došlo do prenošenja reformističkih umjetničkih modela iz arhitekture Osorske biskupije na dalmatinski prostor. Ovaj rad nastoji u prvom redu razmotriti do kakvih je promjena došlo u arhitekturi grada Splita u razdoblju druge polovice 11. stoljeća, kada je Splitskom nadbiskupijom upravljao Lovro. Kako je u tom razdoblju vrlo važan bio i odnos Lovre prema tadašnjim hrvatskim kraljevima, osobito Zvonimiru, ali i prema papi, osobita će se pozornost posvetiti analizi Lovrine uloge u tadašnjoj sakralnoj arhitekturi Splita.

Ključne riječi: benediktinci, Cluny, crkvene reforme, nadbiskup Lovro, Osorska biskupija, Split

were reflected in the field of architecture, which is visible in the translation of certain architectural elements in the Osor Diocese which had their origin in Pomposa. The spread of new artistic ideas to other parts of the eastern Adriatic seaboard occurred thanks to the structure of ecclesiastical administration and the extent of its jurisdiction. Already in the first half of the 11th century, the Osor Diocese began to nurture new architectural models which had been developed in Italy's Pomposa in that period. In the mid-11th century, the former Osor bishop, Lawrence, became the archbishop of Split. At virtually the same time as Lawrence's assumption of the archdiocesan see in Split, John, also from Osor, became the bishop of Trogir. The reformist artistic models from the architecture of the Osor Diocese were thus conveyed to the Dalmatian sphere. This paper constitutes an attempt to first and foremost examine the type of changes that occurred in the architecture of the city of Split in the latter half of the 11th century, when the Split Archdiocese was administered by Lawrence. Since relations between Lawrence and the Croatian kings of that time, particularly Zvonimir, as well as the pope, were quite important, particular attention shall be accorded to an analysis of Lawrence's role in Split's sacral architecture at that time.

Key words: Benedictines, Cluny, ecclesiastical reforms, Archbishop Lawrence, Osor diocese, Split

Crkvene reforme i raskol iz godine 1054.

Govoreći o crkvenim reformama provedenim u 10. i 11. stoljeću, nezaobilaznom se polazišnom točkom u kreiranju novih crkvenih običaja i pravila nameće samostan Cluny. Već se u 9. stoljeću javila potreba za reorganizacijom monaškoga života, koji je zbog niza razloga bio ugrožen. Hubert Jedin navodi četiri razloga propadanju monaškoga života na Zapadu: sekularizacija od strane vladara, rasipanje imovine pod upravom monaha laika, nedostatak zaštite zbog sve slabije kraljevske vlasti te pustošenja Normana, Saracena i Mađara.¹ U ovom su se benediktinskom samostanu redovnici vodili regulama sv. Benedikta, a na čitavom je kršćanskom zapadu bio na glasu zbog moralne čistoće svojih redovnika, njihova propovjedničkog žara i političke aktivnosti. Uprava je samostana bila ovisna samo o papinskoj vlasti čime se izbjegao utjecaj lokalnih biskupa i moćnika na opata samostana.² Opat samostana Cluny imao je jurisdikciju nad mrežom samostana koji su administrativno ovisili o odlukama opata Clunyja. Ta je tzv. *kongregacija Cluny* u počecima obuhvaćala tristotinjak samostana diljem zapadne Europe.³ Utjecaj se Clunyja brzo širio Francuskom, ali i čitavom Europom pa se odjeci klinijevskoga modela javljaju u Italiji već u 10. stoljeću, u Španjolskoj ih se nalazi početkom 11. st., a od 1050. šire se Lotaringijom, Njemačkom i Engleskom.⁴ Osnovna je želja reformatora bila obnoviti narušene čudorednosti i suzbiti trend posvjetovljene duhovnosti. Glavnu su ulogu preuzeli benediktinci, tako da je klinijevski model *nove crkve*, utemeljen na Benediktovim pravilima, u velikoj mjeri ovisio o širenju mreže samostana tog reda. Reformama se nastojao i osnažiti položaj te uloga Crkve u društvu, što je rezultiralo drugačijim zahtjevima u oblikovanju crkvene arhitekture. Uz samostan u Clunyju drugo je važno izvorište crkvene obnove bio samostan u Camaldoliju na padinama Apenina. Utjecaj kamaldoljanskog reformatorskog duha na području hrvatske obale Jadrana imao je puno veći odjek od klinijevskog.⁵

Uz crkvene reforme druga je značajna komponenta za razumijevanje promjena u arhitekturi 11. stoljeća na području istočne obale Jadrana i crkveni raskol te podjela Crkve na Zapadnu (Katoličku) i Istočnu (Pravoslavnu). Zapadna je Crkva prije raskola bila moćna i to je željela iskoristiti kako bi se što više osamostalila

Ecclesiastical reforms and the Schism of 1054

When speaking of the ecclesiastical reforms implemented in the 10th and 11th centuries, the Cluny Abbey necessarily becomes the point of departure for any discussion of the creation of new ecclesiastical rules and practices. The need for the reorganization of monastic life already emerged in the 9th century, as it had been under threat for a number of reasons. Hubert Jedin listed four reasons for the deterioration of monastic life in the West: secularization by rulers, the dissipation of assets administered by lay monks, a lack of protection due to the diminishing power of monarchs and the devastation wreaked by the Normans, Saracens and Magyars.¹ In this Benedictine abbey, the monks adhered to the precepts set forth by St. Benedict, and throughout the Christian West it had a reputation for the moral rectitude of its monks, their proselytizing zeal and political activities. The administration of the abbey was dependent upon papal authority in order to avoid the influence of local bishops and potentates on its abbot.² The abbot of Cluny exercised jurisdiction over a network of monasteries which were administratively dependent upon his decisions. This so-called *Congregation of Cluny* initially encompassed approximately three hundred monasteries throughout Western Europe.³ The influence of Cluny rapidly spread throughout France, and then to all of Europe, so the reverberations of the Cluny model appeared in Italy already in the 10th century, in Spain in the early 11th century, and by 1050 it had spread to Lotharingia, Germany and England.⁴ The basic desire of the reformers was to rejuvenate morality and halt the trend of secularized spirituality. The Benedictines became the vanguard, so that the Cluny model of a *new church*, rooted in Benedict's precepts, largely depended on the expansion of the network of this order's monasteries. These reforms were also an attempt to bolster the status and role of the Church in society, which resulted in differing demands in the formation of church architecture. Besides the Cluny Abbey, another major source of ecclesiastical renewal was the monastery in Camaldoli on the Apennine slopes. The influence of the Camaldolese reformist spirit on the Croatian Adriatic seaboard was much greater than that of Cluny.⁵

Besides ecclesiastical reforms, the other major component for an understanding of changes in

1 Jedin 2001, str. 358.

2 Jedin 2001, str. 362.

3 Goldstein 1995, str. 364. Kasnije se taj broj povećavao.

4 Jedin 2001, str. 362.

5 Šanjek 1988, str. 71.

1 Jedin 2001, p. 358.

2 Jedin 2001, p. 362.

3 Goldstein 1995, p. 364. Later this number grew.

4 Jedin 2001, p. 362.

5 Šanjek 1988, p. 71.



Sl. 1. Crkva sv. Petra na Priku, 9. ili 10. st., Omiš, (prvi spomen o crkvi iz 1074. g.), foto: I. Loinjak
Fig. 1. Church of St. Peter at Priko, 9th or 10th c., Omiš (first mentioned in 1074), photo: I. Loinjak

u odnosu na svjetovnu vlast. Na Istoku je situacija bila drugačija jer je tamošnja Crkva bila u simbiotičkom odnosu s državnom vlasti, ali ipak u podčinjenom položaju. Osim navedene političke problematike, između Zapada i Istoka postojala su neslaganja i u nekim teološkim postavkama.⁶

Sukob je kulminirao za vrijeme pape Lava IX. (1048. - 1054.), koji je ujedno bio i veliki pristaša klinijevskog reformatorskog modela. U tu je svrhu organizirao i brojne crkvene sinode u razdoblju svoga pontifikata uz pomoć kardinala Humberta i opata Hildebranda (poslije pape Grgura VII.), na kojima se osuđivala ženidba svećenika, simonija te upletanje državne vlasti u crkvene poslove. Inzistirajući na provedbi spomenutih ideja, Papa je došao u sukob s carigradskim patrijarhom Mihajlom Kerularijem (1043. - 1058.) što je u konačnici dovelo do konačnog raskida između Zapadne i Istočne Crkve 1054. godine.⁷ Posljedice tog raskida igrat će važnu ulogu na području tadašnje Hrvatske i Dalmacije budući da se ovi krajevi nalazili na granici tek odijeljenih Crkava. To će se osjetiti i na području arhitekture, gdje će i dalje biti prisutan suodnos zapadnih i istočnih (bizantskih)

6 Teološke su prirode bili problemi o potrebi korištenja beskvasnog (Zapad) ili kvasnog (Istok) kruha u liturgiji, celibata, rimskog posta te načina na koji Duh Sveti proizlazi od Oca i Sina. Goldstein 1995, str. 364-365. Međutim, vjerojatno su mnogo ozbiljnije prirode bili spomenuti politički problemi koji su se ticali crkvene dominacije, ali i odbijanje Crkve na Istoku da prihvati primat Rima.

7 Goldstein, Grgin 2008, str. 237-238.



Sl. 2. Crkva sv. Petra na Priku, 9. ili 10. st., Omiš, (prvi spomen o crkvi iz 1074. g.), pročelje crkve, foto: I. Loinjak
Fig. 2. Church of St. Peter at Priko, 9th or 10th c., Omiš (first mentioned in 1074), frontispiece of the church, photo: I. Loinjak

architecture in the 11th century in the eastern Adriatic seaboard is the schism of the Church into Western (Catholic) and Eastern (Orthodox). The Western Church was powerful prior to the schism, and wanted to exploit this to become more independent from secular authority. In the East, the situation was different, because the Church was in a symbiotic bond with the state authorities, but nonetheless in a subordinate position. Besides these political problems, there were also certain theological disagreements between the West and East.⁶

The conflict culminated during the papacy of Leo IX (1048-1054), who was also a major adherent to the Cluny reformist model. To this end, he had organized numerous synods during his papacy with the help of Cardinal Humbert and Abbot Hildebrand (later Pope Gregory VII), at which the marriage of clergymen,

6 The theological problems included the use of unleavened (West) or leavened (East) dough in the liturgy, celibacy, the Roman fast and the manner in which the Holy Spirit passed from the Father to the Son. Goldstein 1995, pp. 364-365. However, the aforementioned political problems were probably far more serious in nature, as they pertained to ecclesiastical domination and the Eastern Church's refusal to accept the primacy of Rome.

utjecaja. Split i Trogir su, naime, još uvijek bili pod vlašću Bizantskoga Carstva, dok je Zadar izdvojen.⁸ Jedan od primjera koji to zorno ocrtavaju je crkva sv. Petra na Priku kod Omiša, datirana u drugu polovicu 11. stoljeća. Riječ je o jednobrodnoj trotravejnoj crkvi s kupolom nad središnjim travejom.⁹ Ivan Ostojić se u djelu *Benediktinci u Hrvatskoj* poziva na Viktora Novaka, koji je pretpostavljao da je ova crkva izgrađena i ranije, u 8. st., te da je sredinom 11. stoljeća samo restaurirana te je dobila nov izgled.¹⁰

Promjene u crkvenoj arhitekturi 11. stoljeća u Dalmaciji – utjecaj reformi

Proučavanjem crkvene arhitekture na području istočnog Jadrana uočava se kako je u razdoblju provođenja crkvenih reformi došlo i do novih pristupa u oblikovanju sakralne arhitekture. Odjeci reformacije u Hrvatskoj mogu se pratiti još od prvih godina 11. stoljeća. Godine 1001. u Istru je došao Romuald, poslije utemeljitelj reda kamaldoljana¹¹ gdje je boravio nekoliko godina. Romualda su podupirali lokalni moćnici, a bio mu je naklonjen i tadašnji porečki biskup germanskoga podrijetla Engilmar. Ubrzo se za njegovim učenjem poveo sv. Gaudencije iz Osora, tako da već od tog razdoblja osorska opatija sv. Petra postaje istočnojadransko središte reformacije.¹²

Zaslugom benediktinaca na prostoru istočnog Jadrana dolazi do značajnih arhitektonskih promjena. Osim njih važnu su ulogu imali i ostali crkveni velikodostojnici, kraljevi te lokalni aristokrati koji su se u svom djelovanju pozivali na reformatorske ideje.¹³ Od 10. stoljeća uveden je običaj služenja privatnih misa bez sudjelovanja vjernika, što je dovelo do velike vjerske nadmoći redovnika, a time i ostatka klera nad laicima. Kako bi i osobe koje nisu pripadale crkvenoj hijerarhiji mogle zaslužiti spas duše, donirale su crkvi brojne darove.¹⁴

Sve su omiljenije postale trobrodne bazilike.¹⁵ O vezi između inauguracije trobrodnih bazilika i benediktinskih crkvenih reformi svjedoči činjenica kako se na otoku Krku takva tipologija bazilika javlja tek u 12. stoljeću, kada otok dolazi pod vlast Zadarske

Simony and the interference of state authorities in ecclesiastical affairs were condemned. Insisting on the implementation of these ideas, the pope came into conflict with the patriarch in Constantinople, Michael Cerularius (1043-1058), which ultimately led to the final schism between the Western and Eastern Churches in 1054.⁷ The results of this schism would play a major role in the territory of Croatia and Dalmatia at the time, since these regions were on the boundary between the now divided Churches. This would also be felt in the field of architecture, where a co-mingling of Western and Eastern (Byzantine) influences would remain in effect. Split and Trogir were, namely, still under the authority of the Byzantine Empire, while Zadar was separate.⁸ An example that clearly illustrates this is the Church of St. Peter at Priko near Omiš, dated to the latter half of the 11th century. This is a single-nave, three-bay church with a dome above the middle bay.⁹ Ivan Ostojić, in the book *Benediktinci u Hrvatskoj* [The Benedictines in Croatia], cited Viktor Novak, who assumed that this church had been built even earlier, in the 8th century, and that in the mid-11th century it was only restored and acquired a new appearance.¹⁰

Changes in church architecture in 11th century Dalmatia – the impact of reforms

When studying sacral architecture in the Eastern Adriatic seaboard, new approaches to its formation during the period of ecclesiastical reforms can be seen. The impact of this reformation in Croatia can be followed from the very first years of the 11th century. Romuald, who would later establish the Camaldolese order, came to Istria in 1001¹¹ and resided there for several years. Romuald was supported by local potentates, and he also earned the favour of Engilmar, then the bishop of Poreč, who was Germanic in origin. St. Gaudentius of Osor (Ossero) quickly became an adherent of his teachings, so that already at that time St. Peter's Abbey in Osor became the Eastern Adriatic centre of the reformation.¹²

Significant architectural changes occurred in the Eastern Adriatic due to the Benedictines. Besides them, a major role was also played by other ecclesiastical

8 Šišić 1990, str. 496.

9 Jurković, Marić 2012, str. 155.

10 Ostojić 1964, str. 352.

11 Kamaldoljani su ogranak benediktinskog reda, a osnovao ih je Romuald 1027. godine. Jurković 1990, str. 196.

12 Jurković 1990, str. 196.

13 Jurković, Marić 2012, str. 169.

14 Šanjek 1988, str. 342, 345.

15 Šanjek 1988, str. 76-77.

7 Goldstein, Grgin 2008, pp. 237-238.

8 Šišić 1990, p. 496.

9 Jurković, Marić 2012, p. 155.

10 Ostojić 1964, p. 352.

11 The Camaldolese order is a branch of the Benedictines, established by St. Romuald in 1027. Jurković 1990, p. 196.

12 Jurković 1990, p. 196.

nadbiskupije.¹⁶ Trobrodne bazilike nisu bile novost na području istočnog Jadrana. Neke crkve koje su bile građene ili pregrađivane u 9. stoljeću također su posjedovale podjelu na tri broda. Miljenko Jurković u članku *Sv. Spas na vrelu Cetine i problem westwerka u hrvatskoj predromanici* donosi tlocrte nekih od njih: Crkvina u Biskupiji kod Knina, crkva sv. Cecilije u Biskupiji, crkva u Žažviću te katedrala u Biogradu, a trobrodna je organizacija prostora postojala i u crkvi sv. Stjepana na Otoku u Solinu.¹⁷ Uz trobrodnost je bila povezana i troapsidalnost,¹⁸ koja također nije, kako pokazuje Nikola Jakšić, potpuna tipološka novina jer se niz crkava s jednakim tipološkim rješenjem može naći u Dalmaciji još u 9. stoljeću.¹⁹ Tri apside su u 9. stoljeću posjedovale crkva sv. Cecilije u Biskupiji, Lopuška glavica u Biskupiji, Sveti Spas na vrelu Cetine.²⁰ U 11. stoljeću javlja se drugačiji odnos prema samom načinu oblikovanja i organizaciji prostora unutar crkava – smanjuju se prozori u odnosu na ranokršćanske trobrodne bazilike, oblikuje se pročelje koje više nije posve neutralan i zanemaren element, na širem europskom prostoru dolazi do gradnje svodova, javljaju se duboki redovnički korovi (u pravilu kod benediktinaca), ujednačeni simbolički kapiteli s akantovim ili plitko klesanim palmetnim listovima te oltarne prograde.

José Puig i Cadafalch u djelu *Geografija i izvori prve romanike (La geografía y los orígenes del primer románico)* naveo je neke od spomenutih promjena, a sve s ciljem stilskog određenja arhitekture 11. stoljeća. Jurković i Marić u članku *Le „premier art roman“ en Istrie et en Dalmatie* pokazuju kako neke teze Puig i Cadafalcha – kao što su pojava vanjske artikulacije pročelja i svodnje – nemaju opravdanje u sakralnoj arhitekturi na području istočnog Jadrana. Na području Dalmacije još se od 5. i 6. stoljeća može pratiti pojava artikulacije vanjskoga plašta crkava pomoću plitkih niša uokvirenih lezenama.²¹ Ni svodovi nisu iznašasće 11. stoljeća. Crkve sa svodom javljaju se već u 9. stoljeću, o čemu svjedoči Sv. Cecilija u Biskupiji kod Knina. S druge strane, u 11. stoljeću na istočnojadranskom se području bilježi povratak klasičnom tipu bazilike s krovštem, a ne svodom. Pri tome rijetke

dignitaries, kings and local aristocrats who advocated reformist ideas in their activities.¹³ The custom of serving private masses without the participation of believers was introduced in the 10th century, which led to the great religious predominance of monks, but also the rest of the clergy, over laypersons. Those who did not belong to the ecclesiastical hierarchy could earn their salvation by making many donations to the Church.¹⁴

Triple-nave basilicas became increasingly favoured.¹⁵ Testimony to the link between the inauguration of triple-nave basilicas and the Benedictine ecclesiastical reforms includes the fact that on the island of Krk such a basilica typology appeared only in the 12th century, when the island came under the jurisdiction of the Zadar Archdiocese.¹⁶ Triple-nave basilicas were not a novelty in the eastern Adriatic seaboard. Some churches that had been constructed or reconstructed in the 9th century were also divided into three naves. Miljenko Jurković, in his article “Sv. Spas na vrelu Cetine i problem westwerka u hrvatskoj predromanici” [The Holy Redeemer Church at the Source of the River Cetina and the Problem of *Westwerk* in the Croatian Pre-Romanesque], provided the floor-plans of several of them: Crkvina in Biskupija near Knin, the Church of St. Cecilia in Biskupija, the church in Žažvić and the cathedral in Biograd, while the triple-nave arrangement of space also existed in the Church of St. Stephen at Otok in Solin.¹⁷ The three naves were connected the triapsidal structure¹⁸ which was also, as Nikola Jakšić showed, not an entirely new typological novelty, because a series of churches with identical typological solutions could be found in Dalmatia already in the 9th century.¹⁹ The Church of St. Cecilia in Biskupija, Lopuška Glavica in Biskupija, and the Holy Redeemer Church at the source of the River Cetina all had three apses in the 9th century.²⁰ A different stance on the very method of formation and organization of space inside a church emerged in the 11th century: windows were reduced in comparison to Early Christian triple-nave basilicas, frontispieces

16 Jurković 1990, str. 197. O tome da su benediktinci donijeli novinu u arhitekturu istočnojadranskog prostora pisao je i Karaman. Karaman 1930, str. 62.

17 Jurković 1995, str. 66-70.

18 Različitim tumačenjima morfologije trobrodних bazilika pozabavio se Miljenko Jurković u članku *Crkvena reforma i ranoromanička arhitektura na istočnom Jadranu*. Jurković 1990, str. 191-213.

19 Jurković 1990, str. 197.

20 Jurković 1995, str. 66.

21 Jurković, Marić 2012, str. 164-167.

13 Jurković, Marić 2012, p. 169

14 Šanjek 1988, pp. 342, 345.

15 Šanjek 1988, pp. 76-77.

16 Jurković 1990, p. 197. Karaman also wrote about the Benedictines bringing novelties to architecture in the eastern Adriatic seaboard. Karaman 1930, p. 62.

17 Jurković 1995, pp. 66-70.

18 Miljenko Jurković covered the various interpretations of the morphology of triple-nave basilicas in the article *Crkvena reforma i ranoromanička arhitektura na istočnom Jadranu*. Jurković 1990, pp. 191-213.

19 Jurković 1990, p. 197.

20 Jurković 1995, p. 66.



Sl. 3. Crkva sv. Petra i Mojsija (Šuplja crkva), Solin, 11. st., foto: I. Loinjak

Fig. 3. Church of St. Peter and Moses (Šuplja crkva), Solin, 11th c., photo: I. Loinjak

iznimke predstavljaju Sv. Dominik u Zadru te Sv. Petar i Mojsije u Solinu, koji su bili nadsvođeni.²² Zbog navedenih problema Jurković i Marić predlažu da se umjesto Puig i Cadafalchova prijedloga “premier art roman” govori o “premier âge roman”.²³

Naglasak se u tom razdoblju počeo stavljati na svetište glavnog broda pa ono počinje zauzimati veći njegov dio, dok se kretanje usmjerava prema bočnim brodovima.²⁴ U isto se vrijeme počinju javljati i tornjevi²⁵ ispred crkava. Oni se nameću kao vizualni znakovi u prostoru i predstavljaju vanjski izraz nove moći Crkve.²⁶ Iz tog ih je razdoblja sačuvan vrlo malen broj. Vladimir P. Goss ističe kako je na području Dalmacije kao uzor brojnim kasnijim tornjevima poslužio onaj nad Našom Gospom od Zvonika (Sv. Teodor) unutar zidina Dioklecijanove palače, koji je podignut u drugoj polovici 11. stoljeća.²⁷ Drugi važan splitski toranj onaj je nad krstionicom, a datira se u isto razdoblje kao prethodno spomenuti.²⁸ Važnost tornjeva na hrvatskom primjeru ogleda se i u tome što se jedan od njih navodi kao prvi spomenik zrele



Sl. 4. Toranj crkve sv. Teodora (Gospa od Zvonika), 11. st., Split, (prvi se put spominje 1275. g.), foto: I. Loinjak

Fig. 4. Tower of the Church of St. Theodore (Our Lady of the Tower) 11th c., Split (first mentioned in 1275), photo: I. Loinjak

began to be formed so there were no longer entirely neutral and neglected elements, the construction of vaults appeared in the wider European sphere, and deep monastic choirs (generally among the Benedictines) appeared, as did uniform symbolic capitals with acanthus and shallowly carved palmette leaves on altar screens.

José Puig i Cadafalch, in his work *Geografija i izvori “prve romanike”* (*La geografía y los orígenes del primer románico*), cited some of these changes, all with the objective of stylistically classifying the architecture of the 11th century. Jurković and Marić, in their article “Le “premier art roman” en Istrie et en Dalmatie,” showed that some of the arguments put forth by Puig i Cadafalch – such as the appearance of external articulation of frontispieces and vaulting – cannot be confirmed on the basis of sacral architecture in the Eastern Adriatic. The appearance of external articulation on church frontispieces with the help of shallow niches framed by pilaster-strips can be observed in Dalmatia’s territory from the 5th and 6th

22 Jurković, Marić 2012, str. 169.

23 Jurković, Marić 2012, str. 173.

24 Jurković 1990, str. 197-200.

25 Oni nisu bili potpuna novost na području crkvene arhitekture budući da su više ili manje intenzivno prisutni još od kasne antike.

26 Milošević 2011.

27 Goss 2006, str. 196. Detaljniji opis zvonika Naše Gospe od Zvonika daje Marasović. Marasović 1994, str. 195.

28 Ante Milošević tvrdi kako je na splitskoj katedrali stajao još stariji zvonik od ovog romaničkoga koji je ostao sačuvan. Milošević 2011.

romanike u nas. Riječ je o tornju crkve sv. Marije u Zadru, datiranom u 1105. godinu.²⁹

Novi način oblikovanja crkava doveden je u izravnu vezu s promjenom funkcije crkava i same liturgije, a upravo je to istraživačima poslužilo kao model za razlučivanje predromanike, rane romanike i romanike, odnosno za objašnjavanje umjetničkih promjena koje se nastupile krajem 10. st. i u 11. stoljeću.³⁰

Međutim, postoje još uvijek povjesničari umjetnosti koji promjenu arhitektonskih formi tog razdoblja vide ponajprije kao posljedicu stilskih modifikacija. Tako Goss i dalje inzistira na stilskom pristupu³¹ iako ga takav pristup dovodi u nedoumicu pri analizi pojedinih crkava koje, ne uspijevajući ih detaljnije odrediti, smješta između predromanike i romanike. Među prijelaznim crkvama autor navodi Sv. Ivana u Biokovu, Sv. Petra u Supetarskoj Dragi na Rabu, Sv. Petra u Osoru, Sv. Mariju u Ninu, Sv. Mariju u Zadru, Sv. Andriju na Rabu, Sv. Martina u Lovreću, samostansku crkvu na Lokrumu te Sv. Mihovila na Limu.³² Jurkovićovo oslanjanje na pitanje funkcije te napuštanje ustaljenoga pozivanja na primat stila dovelo je do novih i bolje argumentiranih spoznaja upravo o problematičnim *prijelaznim* crkvama koje spominje Goss. Jurković za gotovo istovjetan popis gore spomenutih crkava napominje kako su nastale zbog talijanskih utjecaja, pri čemu ponajprije misli na razmjenu ideja među učenim benediktincima reformatorima, točnije na odnos na relaciji Pomposa – Osor. Tome u prilog ide i prodor skulpture na vanjski plašt crkava,³³ pojava koja se na istočnoj obali Jadrana prvi put javlja u opatijskoj crkvi u Osoru u prvoj polovici 11. stoljeća.³⁴

29 Goss 2006, str. 197.

30 Jurković 1990, str. 194.

31 Goss 2006, str. 51.

32 Goss 2006, str. 190-191.

33 Veliki kiparski ansambli ubrzo su zauzeli najvažnije mjesto u okrilju crkvene dekoracije, osobito zato što su se pojavili u doba kada je umjetnost bila podložna moći i htijenju naručitelja. Crkveno pročelje igra važnu ulogu, jer dopušta da se crkvena načela i feudalna moć izraze već u eksterijeru. Takav ćemo tip dekoracije naći i na civilnim zgradama, posebice na palačama, ali na jedan više fragmentiran i rascjepkan način. Ta su romanička pročelja, dakle, bila instrumentom političke propagande i iznošenja na vidjelo vjerske moći, naizgled tako novotarske, makar su bila izravno naslijeđena i kopirana iz antike. Barral i Altet 2009, str. 167.

34 Jurković 1990, str. 198. Ta novina nastala je pod utjecajem bazilike u Pomposi. Jurković navodi vrlo malen broj primjera skulpture iz tog razdoblja koja je uklopljena u eksterijer crkava na području Europe: nadvratnik crkve St. Genis-des-Fontaines (1019. - 1020.), nadvratnik crkve St. André de Sorrede, križ iz Glanfeuil,

centuries onward.²¹ Even vaults were not an invention of the 11th century. Churches with vaults had already appeared in the 9th century, to which the Church of St. Cecelia in Biskupija near Knin testifies. On the other hand, the 11th century in the Eastern Adriatic seaboard was marked by the return to the classical type of basilica with a roof rather than a vault. Herein some rare exceptions include the Churches of St. Dominic in Zadar and St. Peter and Moses in Solin, which were vaulted.²² As a result of these problems, Jurković and Marić suggested that instead of Puig i Cadafalch's proposal of '*premier art roman*', we instead speak of '*premier âge roman*'.²³

The emphasis during this period began to be placed on the sanctuary of the primary nave, so it began to occupy the largest space, while movement was diverted to the lateral naves.²⁴ Towers²⁵ in front of churches began to appear at the same time. They imposed themselves as visual symbols in space and served as an external expression of the Church's new might.²⁶ Only a very small number from this period have been preserved. Vladimir P. Goss stressed that in Dalmatia the tower above Our Lady of the Tower (St. Theodore) inside the walls of Diocletian's Palace, was the model for numerous later towers.²⁷ Another important tower in Split is the one above the baptistery, and it dates to the same period as the aforementioned one.²⁸ The importance of towers based on the Croatian example is further reflected in the fact that one of them is cited as the first monument of the high Romanesque in Croatia. This is the tower of the Church of St. Mary in Zadar, dated to 1105.²⁹

The new method for forming churches was directly tied to changes in the function of churches and the liturgy itself, and this is precisely what served researchers as the model for distinguishing between the pre-Romanesque, the early Romanesque and the Romanesque, i.e., the explanation for the artistic changes

21 Jurković, Marić 2012, pp. 164-167.

22 Jurković, Marić 2012, p. 169.

23 Jurković, Marić 2012, p. 173.

24 Jurković 1990, pp. 197-200.

25 They were not a complete novelty in the field of church architecture, since they had already been more or less widely present since Late Antiquity.

26 Milošević 2011.

27 Goss 2006, p. 196. A detailed description of the tower of Our Lady of the Tower was provided by Marasović. Marasović 1994, p. 195.

28 Ante Milošević asserts that there was a campanile at the Split cathedral older than the currently preserved Romanesque one. Milošević 2011.

29 Goss 2006, p. 197.



Sl. 5. Crkva sv. Petra na Priku, 9. ili 10. st., Omiš, (prvi spomen o crkvi iz 1074. g.), bočna strana crkve raščlanjena lezenama, foto: I. Loinjak

Fig. 5. Church of St. Peter at Priko, 9th or 10th c., Omiš (first mentioned in 1074), side view of the church divided by the lesenes, photo: I. Loinjak

Crkve nastale na području Istre i Dalmacije u 11. stoljeću mogu se podijeliti u dvije skupine. Prvu čine one u kojima je prisutno snažno oslanjanje na lokalnu tradiciju te korištenje postojećih modela, kao i primjena elemenata prve romanike. U drugu se, pak, skupinu svrstavaju crkve tzv. internacionalne skupine. One se po svojim značajkama izravno vezuju na neke europske primjere u kojima su se počele javljati arhitektonske promjene izazvane širenjem reformatorskog pokreta.³⁵

Odjeci reformacije u Splitu

Odjeci su crkvenih reformi u početku na području Dalmacije i Hrvatske uzeli maha samo na području opatije sv. Petra u Osoru. Ista je opatija i u narednom razdoblju ostala rasadištem novih crkvenih ideja, koje su se širile i u druge gradove zahvaljujući osnivanju novih benediktinskih samostana u gradovima uz obalu – Zadru, Trogiru i Splitu.³⁶ Tijekom 11. stoljeća dolazi i do bogaćenja pojedinih građanskih obitelji, što se pozitivno odražava na napredak gradova i umjetničku produkciju u njima jer se sada uz kraljevski dvor i crkvene velikodostojnike javlja i treći sloj naručitelja.

Rasprostranjenost crkvenog teritorija i njegov ustroj u ranom je srednjem vijeku bio naslijeđen iz ranokršćanskog doba. Vodeći se tom tradicijom,

neki fragmenti iz Normandije te bazilika u Pomposi. Usp. Marasović 2008, str. 369.

35 Jurković, Marić 2012, str. 18; Barral i Altet 2009, str. 143-229.

36 Goldstein 1995, str. 356.

that emerged at the end of the 10th and during the 11th century.³⁰

However, there are still art historians who see the changes in architectural forms of this period as a consequence of stylistic modifications. Thus Goss continues to insist on the stylistic approach,³¹ even though this leads him to ambiguities when analyzing individual churches which, in his inability to classify them in greater detail, he placed between the pre-Romanesque and Romanesque. This scholar classifies as transitional churches St. John's in Biokovo, St. Peter's in Supetarska Draga on the island of Rab, St. Peter's in Osor, St. Mary's in Nin, St. Mary's in Zadar, St. Andrew's in Rab, St. Martin's in Lovreć, the monastic church on the island of Lokrum and St. Michael's at Lim.³² Jurković's reliance on the question of function and abandonment of the established call for the primacy of style has led to new and sounder insights precisely with regard to those problems surrounding the transitional churches mentioned by Goss. Jurković says about a virtually identical list of aforementioned churches that they appeared due to Italian influences, wherein he refers primarily to the exchange of ideas between learned Benedictine reformers, more accurately relations between Pomposa and Osor. This is backed by the appearance of sculpture on the external façades of churches,³³ a phenomenon which first appeared on the Eastern Adriatic coast in the abbey church in Osor in the first half of the 11th century.³⁴

30 Jurković 1990, p. 194.

31 Goss 2006, p. 51.

32 Goss 2006, pp. 190-191.

33 Large sculptural ensembles began to assume the most important position in the array of church decorations, particularly because they began to appear in the period when art was subject to the power and desires of patrons. Church frontispieces played an important role, because they allowed ecclesiastical principles and feudal power to be expressed on the exterior. By the same token, such a decoration type can also be seen on secular buildings, particularly palaces, but in a more fragmentary and disjointed manner. These Romanesque frontispieces were thus an instrument of political propaganda and the exhibition of religious power, seemingly novel, even though they were directly inherited and copied from Antiquity. Barral i Altet 2009, p. 167.

34 Jurković 1990, p. 198. This novelty appeared under the influence of the basilica in Pomposa. Jurković cites a very small number of examples from this period incorporated into the exterior of churches in Europe: the lintel of the Church of St. Genis-des-Fontaines (1019-1020), the lintel of the Church of St. André de Sorrede, the cross from Glanfeuil, some fragments from Normandy and the basilica in Pomposa. Cf. Marasović 2008, p. 369.

Splitska je nadbiskupija kao nasljednica salonitanske Crkve pokušala preuzeti administrativnu dominaciju ne samo nad dalmatinskim nego i nad hrvatskim područjima. Međutim, krajem 11. stoljeća i prodorom Ugara ona gubi svoju snagu, a od sredine 12. stoljeća sve snažnijom postaje Nadbiskupija u Zadru.³⁷

Reformatorski je pokret na splitskom području uhvatio veći zamah tek nakon što je na nadbiskupsku stolicu zasjeo Lovro. Postojala je u Splitu i prije borba protiv "heretičkoga" klera, o čemu piše Vedrana Delonga u članku o stupu nadbiskupa Pavla (1015.–1030.). Delonga u svom tekstu govori o borbi za prevlast između svećenika glagoljaša ("apostata *a fide*") i onih pravovjernih, odanih papinskim odredbama.³⁸ Iz toga se može zaključiti kako su već s nadbiskupom Pavlom pripremljeni temelji za provođenje velikoga dijela odredaba Lateranskoga sabora, što je bila glavna zadaća splitskoga sabora s početka šezdesetih godina 11. st. Zanimljivo je kako gotovo paralelno s Lovrom na mjesto trogirskog biskupa dolazi Ivan.³⁹ Vjerojatno nije slučajno što je Ivan također prije toga boravio u osorskoj opatiji.⁴⁰ Biskup Ivan je, kako piše Šišić, bio "potomak odlične rimske porodice Ursina" koji je bio u pratnji papinskog legata koji je došao "k njima i gradu povratiti mir"⁴¹ od heretika, tj. dalmatinskoga klera koji je još uvijek odbijao prihvatiti odluke Lateranskoga sabora. Budući da je nakon crkvenoga raskola 1054. godine Hrvatska bila na granici utjecaja Zapadne i Istočne Crkve, Papi je bilo u interesu proširiti tim područjem svoju dominaciju i osnažiti administrativnu upravu. Iz tog je razloga u Dalmaciju slao svoje izaslanike kako bi se preustrojilo dalmatinsko (i hrvatsko) svećenstvo,⁴² a odmah nakon Lateranskog koncila u Split dolazi papinski izaslanik Majnard

The churches which appeared in the territory of Istria and Dalmatia in the 11th century may be divided into two groups. The first consists of those in which the strong dependence on the local tradition and use of existing models – as well as application of initially Romanesque elements – were present. The second consists of churches in the so-called international group. In terms of their features, they are directly linked to certain European examples in which architectural changes prompted by the spread of the reform movement began to appear.³⁵

Echoes of the reformation in Split

The impact of ecclesiastical reforms in Dalmatia and Croatia initially only took root in the area of St. Peter's Abbey in Osor. Even in the subsequent period, the same abbey would remain a seedbed of new ecclesiastical ideas that spread to other cities thanks to the establishment of new Benedictine monastic communities in the cities along the coast: Zadar, Trogir and Split.³⁶ During the 11th century, individual urban families gained wealth, which was positively reflected in the progress of their cities and artistic production therein, because now besides the royal court and ecclesiastical dignitaries, there was a third class of patrons.

The extent of ecclesiastical territory and its organization in the Early Middle Ages were passed down from the Early Christian era. Following this tradition, the Split Archdiocese, as the successor to the Salona Church, attempted to assume administrative domination over not only the Dalmatian but also the wider Croatian regions. However, by the end of the 11th century and the incursions of the Hungarians, it had lost its strength, and by the mid-12th century the archdiocese in Zadar increasingly gained strength.³⁷

The reformist movement in the Split area only gained greater impetus after Lawrence assumed the archbishop's seat. There had been a struggle against the "heretical" clergy in Split even before, about which Vedrana Delonga wrote more in her article on Archbishop Paul (Pavao). Delonga stresses that Archbishop Paul (1015-1030) spoke about the

37 Marasović 2008, str. 25-26. Naime, krajem 10. stoljeća od Splitske se biskupije odvaja Dubrovačka, a 1154. godine Zadarska biskupija biva uzdignuta na razinu nadbiskupije te od tada prestaje dominacija Splitske nadbiskupije na prostoru od Zadra do Kvarnerskih otoka (Raba, Krka i Osora). O tome u: Budak, Raukar 2006, str. 269.

38 Delonga 2009, str. 128.

39 O Ivanovoj ulozi u širenju reformacije u Dalmaciji vidi: Ivanišević 1980.

40 Toma Arhiđakon navodi kako je nadbiskupu Lovri Ivan bio osobito drag. To je vjerojatno posljedica sličnih stavova, ali i prijašnjeg poznanstva.

41 Šišić 1990, str. 517.

42 Toma Arhiđakon piše kako je izaslanik Ivan došao oko 1050. godine zbog neprimjerenog vladanja splitskog nadbiskupa Dabrala [Dobralja]. Toma Arhiđakon 2003, str. 65-67.

35 Jurković, Marić 2012, p. 18; Barral i Altet 2009, pp. 143-229.

36 Goldstein 1995, p. 356.

37 Marasović 2008, pp. 25-26. Namely, at the end of the 10th c. the Dubrovnik diocese was separated from Split, and in 1154, the Zadar diocese was elevated to an archdiocese, so from that point forward the domination of the Split Archdiocese over the area from Zadar to the Kvarner islands (Rab, Krk and Osor) ceased. More on this in: Budak, Raukar 2006, p. 269.



Sl. 6. Crkva sv. Nikole (Mikule) u Velom varošu, 11. st., Split, pročelje crkve, foto: I. Loinjak
Fig. 6. Church of St. Nicholas in Veli varoš, 11th c., Split, frontispiece of the church, photo: I. Loinjak

kako bi proveo odredbe Koncila.⁴³ Odmah po njegovu dolasku u Splitu je organiziran sabor kako bi se realizirao Papin naum, a slični su sabori organizirani i u nekim gradovima Zapadne Europe. Na saboru nema spomena hrvatskoga kralja, a nisu sačuvani ni njegovi izvorni zaključci, već samo neke potvrde pape Aleksandra II. (1061.–1073.).⁴⁴ Gotovo je sigurno kako je do sabora u Splitu došlo da bi se ograničili i suzbili običaji Istočne Crkve u Dalmaciji te istisnula liturgija na staroslavenskom jeziku.⁴⁵ Do legitimacije saveza

struggle for predominance between the Glagolite priests (“apostates *a fide*”) and the orthodox, loyal to papal decrees.³⁸ This is the reason why it may be concluded that under Archbishop Paul the foundations had already been laid for enforcement of most of the provisions of the Lateran Council, which was the primary task of the Split synod from the beginning of the 1060s. It is interesting that almost at the same time that Lawrence became Split’s archbishop, John (Ivan) became the bishop of Trogir.³⁹ It is probably not coincidental that John had been in the Osor Abbey prior thereto.⁴⁰ Bishop John was, as Šišić wrote, a “scion of the exemplary Roman Ursini family” who had been in the entourage of the papal legate who came “to restore to them and the city relief”⁴¹ from heretics, i.e., the Dalmatian clergymen who still refused to accept the Lateran Council’s decisions. Since Croatia was on the boundary between the influences of the Western and Eastern Churches after the Schism of 1054, the pope had an interest in expanding his domination over this territory and bolstering his administrative authority. This is why he sent his envoys to Dalmatia in order to reorganize the Dalmatian (and Croatian) clergy,⁴² and immediately after the Lateran Council the papal envoy Maynard arrived in Split to implement the Council’s decisions.⁴³ Upon his arrival in Split, a synod was convened in order to implement the pope’s intent, and similar synods were convened in other cities in Western Europe. There was no mention of the Croatian king at the synod, nor were its original conclusions preserved, rather only some confirmations made by Pope Alexander II (1061-1073).⁴⁴ It is almost certain that the synod in Split was held in order to limit and suppress the customs of the Eastern Church in Dalmatia and push out the liturgy in the Old

43 Majnard je bio nekadašnji opat u Pomposi (talijanskom središtu reformacije, odakle je ona i došla do Osora). On je u Splitu krajem 1061. ili tijekom 1062. održao sabor na kojem je zabranjeno služenje liturgije na slavenskom jeziku. Toma Arhidakon 2003, str. 71. Vidi i: Šišić 1990, str. 502.

44 Goldstein 1995, str. 366.

45 “Uspomena na inače od papâ odobreni rad svete braće Ćirila i Metodija očito je tada već dosta izbljedila, jer samo se tako može shvatiti, da su se Latini usudili na sinodu glasno ustvrditi da je 'gotska pismena (glagoljicu) iznašao neki heretik Metodije, koji je nekoć mnogo toga lažno napisao na slovenskom jeziku protiv propisa katoličke crkve, zbog čega je Božjom odredbom

38 Delonga 2009, p. 128.

39 On John’s role in spreading the reformation in Dalmatia, see: Ivanišević 1980.

40 Thomas the Archdeacon stated that John was particularly favoured by Archbishop Lawrence. This was probably due to their similar standpoints, but also their prior acquaintance.

41 Šišić 1990, p. 517.

42 Thomas the Archdeacon wrote the envoy John came in around 1050 due to the inappropriate conduct of Split Archbishop Dabral [Dobralj]. Toma Arhidakon 2003, pp. 65-67.

43 Maynard was the former abbot in Pomposa (the Italian seat of the reformation whence it made its way to Osor). At the end of 1061 or during 1062, he held a synod in Split at which liturgy in the Slavic language was banned. Toma Arhidakon 2003, p. 71. See also: Šišić 1990, p. 502.

44 Goldstein 1995, p. 366.

između pape i hrvatskog kralja dolazi petnaestak godina kasnije, za pontifikata pape Grgura VII. (1073. - 1085.), pa se može pretpostaviti da je veliku ulogu u povezivanju Hrvatske s papom u to doba odigrao tadašnji splitski nadbiskup Lovro.

Nadbiskup Lovro u kontekstu propapinske politike hrvatskoga dvora

Postavljanjem Lovre na mjesto nadbiskupa u Splitu godine 1060. (ili 1059.) omogućeno je da se na tom području ukorijene reforme koje su do tada zamah uzele pretežito na području osorske opatije i dijelova pod njezinom jurisdikcijom. Lovri je u dobivanju nadbiskupske časti u Splitu pomogao papinski legat Majnard, koji je bio zadužen za provedbu odluka Lateranskoga sabora u Splitskoj biskupiji. Majnard je uspio ishoditi od tadašnjeg biskupa Ivana, koji je tada "bio slabašan starac",⁴⁶ da se odrekne nadbiskupske titule budući da "su se spremala vremena, kad je bilo nužno, da na čelu metropolije stoji čovjek vrstan, da s uspjehom provede sinodalne zaključke, od kojih su neki duboko vrijeđali hrvatski kler i narod",⁴⁷ a kvalitete je za taj posao Majnard nalazio kod osorskog biskupa Lovre.

Splitska je nadbiskupija za vrijeme nadbiskupa Lovre bila vrlo bogata, a bogatstvo je temeljila na zemljišnim posjedima. Bogatstvo je Splitske nadbiskupije poraslo i ranije zahvaljujući spomenutom nadbiskupu Petru, podrijetlom iz patricijske obitelji Prestancija,⁴⁸ koji je u prvoj polovici 11. stoljeća osnovao samostan sv. Marije na Poljudu. Porastu utjecaja Crkve, kao i njezina bogatstva, pogodovalo je Lovrino održavanje prisnih odnosa s hrvatskim kraljevima,⁴⁹ poglavito Zvonimirom. Već i prije dolaska na mjesto nadbiskupa Lovro je bio poznat kao ugledan benediktinac i osorski biskup. Velika su bila njegova zalaganja za povezivanje područja istočne obale Jadrana s rimskom maticom, a predstavljao je najangažiranijeg zagovornika Zvonimirove propapinske politike.

U vrijeme dok je Lovro bio nadbiskup, u Splitu i Solinu boravili su papinski izaslanici Girard (Gerard)

Slavic language.⁴⁵ The alliance between the pope and the Croatian king was legitimized about fifteen years later, during the papacy of Gregory VII (1073-1085), so it may be assumed that a major role in connecting Croatia to the pope in that period was played by Split Archbishop Lawrence.

Archbishop Lawrence in the context of the propapal policy of the Croatian court

The installation of Lawrence to the post of archbishop in Split in 1060 (or 1059) enabled reforms to take root in that area. Such reforms had previously been limited to the area of the Osor abbey and places under its jurisdiction. Lawrence was assisted in receiving the archbishop's mitre in Split by the papal legate Maynard, who was charged with enforcement of the Lateran Council's decisions in the Split Diocese. Maynard had managed to compel the incumbent bishop, John, who was a "weak old man" at the time,⁴⁶ to resign from the archbishop's post since "times were coming, which necessitated that the metropolitan see be headed by an exemplary man to successfully implement the council's conclusions, of which some deeply offended the Croatian clergy and people,"⁴⁷ and Maynard found the qualities for such a job in Osor Bishop Lawrence.

The Split Archdiocese during the time of Archbishop Lawrence was rather wealthy, and its wealth was based on its land holdings. The wealth of the Split Archdiocese had already begun to increase previously thanks to the aforementioned Archbishop Peter, from the patrician Prestancius family,⁴⁸ who established St. Mary's Abbey at Poljud in the first half of the 11th century. The growth of the Church's influence, as well as its wealth, was conducive to Lawrence's maintenance of close relations with the Croatian kings,⁴⁹

– kako kažu – kažnjen naprasitom smrću." Šišić 1990, str. 507.

46 Šišić 1990, str. 507.

47 Šišić 1990, str. 507.

48 Delonga 2009, str. 127.

49 Šanjek često navodi koliko je važnu ulogu imao nadbiskup Lovro u tadašnjoj Hrvatskoj: "Ne treba zaboraviti da se nadbiskup Lovro smatra duhovnim ocem kralja Zvonimira i njegovom desnom rukom u obnoviteljskim nastojanjima Crkve u Hrvatskoj." Šanjek 1988, str. 141.

45 "The memory of the work of the holy brothers, Cyril and Methodius, otherwise approved by the popes, had obviously faded considerably by that point, for it is only in this way that one can understand that the Latins at the synod dared to vocally speak of 'the Gothic script (Glagolitic) devised by some *heretic* Methodius, who had already written many falsehoods in the Slavic language against the precepts of the Catholic Church, which is why he was by divine judgement – as they say – punished by abrupt death.'" Šišić 1990, p. 507.

46 Šišić 1990, p. 507.

47 Šišić 1990, p. 507.

48 Delonga 2009, p. 127.

49 Šanjek often stressed how important Archbishop Lawrence's role in Croatia at the time was: "It should not be forgotten that Archbishop Lawrence was deemed the spiritual father of King Zvonimir and his right hand in

i Gebizon.⁵⁰ Gebizon je značajan jer je okrunio Zvonimira za kralja u crkvi sv. Petra i Mojsija u Solinu te mu predao znakove kraljevske vlasti koje je hrvatskom kralju poslao papa Grgur VII. – zastavu, žezlo, mač i krunu – dok je zauzvrat tražio Zvonimirovu potporu.⁵¹ Zasluge za takav razvoj događaja u velikoj mjeri pripadaju splitskom nadbiskupu.

Iako je Zvonimir održavao dobre političke odnose s papom, njegov blagonaklon odnos spram glagoljaša pokazuje kako možda i nije bezrezervno bio u službi Rima. Tomu u prilog svjedoči podatak s Bašćanske ploče na kojoj se spominje kako je Zvonimir kasnije dao zemlju glagoljašima na otoku Krku,⁵² a upravo su oni – s inzistiranjem na nelatinskoj liturgiji i održavanjem običaja iz predreformatorskog doba – bili velika prijetnja papinskoj politici na hrvatskim prostorima. Franjo Šanjek pokušao je razriješiti ovu nejasnoću. Naime, kada je godine 1074. završio Rimski sabor, papa Grgur VII. poslao je u Hrvatsku svog predstavnika Girarda da na saboru hrvatskih i dalmatinskih biskupa u Splitu 1075. odredi plan obnove. Tada su rehabilitirani popovi glagoljaši i crkvenoslavenska liturgija nakon što ih je sabor u Splitu 1060. godine osudio,⁵³ a papa Nikola II. (1058. - 1061.) iduće godine zabranio.⁵⁴ Ubrzo nakon sabora iz 1075. splitski nadbiskup Lovro posvećuje Firmina za biskupa Ninske biskupije, koja nakon jednog i pol stoljeća (ukinuta na splitskom saboru 928.) biva ponovno utemeljenom.⁵⁵

Hrvatski kraljevi i crkveni posjedi

U 11. stoljeću dolazi do širenja crkvenih posjeda, u čemu veliku ulogu imaju hrvatski vladari koji slično carevima na zapadu Europe Crkvi poklanjaju brojna zemljišta, dajući im i različite povlastice.⁵⁶ Istodobno i lokalni bogataši grade crkve ili samostane. Petar Crni tada je dao izgraditi benediktinski samostan te crkvu i samostan u Selu kraj Splita.⁵⁷ Reformatorski je pokret ojačao položaj samostana u društvenom i vjerskom kontekstu jer ih se smatralo simbolom vraćanja

particularly Zvonimir. Even before his ascension to the post of archbishop, Lawrence was known as a respected Benedictine and the bishop of Osor. His commitment to tying the territories of the Eastern Adriatic seaboard to the Roman mother Church was considerable, and he was the most engaged advocate of Zvonimir's pro-papal policy.

During Lawrence's tenure as archbishop, papal envoys Girard (Gerard) and Gebizon resided in Split and Solin.⁵⁰ Gebizon was important because he crowned Zvonimir king in the Church of St. Peter and Moses in Solin and gave him the insignia of royal authority sent to the Croatian king by Pope Gregory VII – a flag, sceptre, sword and crown – while he sought Zvonimir's support in return.⁵¹ The Split archbishop largely deserves credit for such a turn of events.

Even though Zvonimir maintained good political relations with the pope, his benevolent attitude toward the Glagolites showed that he was not unwaveringly in Rome's service. Testimony to this fact is the Baška Tablet, on which it is noted that Zvonimir later gave land to the Glagolites on the island of Krk,⁵² and it was they – with their insistence on the non-Latin liturgy and the nurturing of customs from the pre-reform period – who constituted a major threat to papal policies in the Croatian lands. Franjo Šanjek attempted to resolve this ambiguity. Namely, when the Council of Rome was concluded in 1074, Pope Gregory VII sent his representative Girard to Croatia to set forth the renewal plan at the synod of Croatian and Dalmatian bishops in Split in 1075. At that time, the Glagolite priests and the Old Church Slavic liturgy, condemned by the synod in Split in 1060⁵³ and banned by Pope Nicholas II (1058-1061) in the following year,⁵⁴ were rehabilitated. Soon after the synod of 1075, Split Archbishop Lawrence consecrated Firmanus as bishop of the Nin Diocese, which was once more established after a century and half (it had been abolished at the Split synod in 928).⁵⁵

50 Na crkvenom saboru u Splitu 1075. obnovljena je bila Ninska biskupija, a taj je sabor vodio Girard. Godinu dana kasnije održan je sabor u Solinu na kojem je Gebizon okrunio Zvonimira. Stipišić 1997.

51 Budak, Raukar 2006, str. 138.

52 Goldstein 1995, str. 368.

53 Tada još nije posve zabranjena liturgija na narodnom jeziku, ali je određeno da svećenici moraju znati latinski. Usp. Kostrenčić 1967, str. 95-96.

54 Šanjek 2008, str. 16.

55 Šanjek 2008, str. 16; Goldstein 1995, str. 361.

56 Goldstein 1995, str. 375.

57 Goldstein 1995, str. 377.

the Church reconstruction efforts in Croatia." Šanjek 1988, p. 141.

50 The Nin Diocese was restored at the synod in Split in 1075, and it was led by Girard. A year later, a synod was held in Solin at which Gebizon crowned Zvonimir. Stipišić, 1997.

51 Budak, Raukar 2006, p. 138.

52 Goldstein 1995, p. 368.

53 The liturgy in the native language had not yet been banned then, but it was stipulated that priests had to know Latin. Cf. Kostrenčić 1967, pp. 95-96.

54 Šanjek 2008, p. 16.

55 Šanjek 2008, p. 16; Goldstein 1995, p. 361.

istinskoj čudorednosti, a šezdesete godine 11. stoljeća bijahu najintenzivnije razdoblje gradnje samostana. U roku od samo dvadesetak godina osniva se veliki broj samostana: Sv. Petar u Supetarskoj Dragi na Rabu, Sv. Petar u Selu kod Splita, kao i ženski samostani: Sv. Benedikt u Splitu, Sv. Duje (poslije Sv. Nikola) u Trogiru, Sv. Toma u Biogradu na Moru, Sv. Marija u Zadru i Sv. Platon u istom gradu.⁵⁸

Toma Arhidakon u *Historia Salonitana* u poglavlju o nadbiskupu Lovri navodi kako se nadbiskup tužio hrvatskom kralju Zvonimiru tražeći da se Splitskoj nadbiskupiji vrate crkve sv. Stjepana i sv. Marije u Solinu⁵⁹ s pripadajućim zemljišnim posjedima. Lovro se u procesu povratka zemljišta mogao pozvati i na zaključke Lateranskog sabora među kojima piše kako se određeno vlasništvo (crkveno dobro) koje je netko primio od svjetovne ili crkvene vlasti treba vratiti prvobitnom vlasniku. Iz tog je razloga Zvonimir, budući da je imao obvezu izvršavanja papinskih odluka, bio primoran vratiti crkve, a temelj Zvonimirove isprave iz 1079./80. donosi Toma Arhidakon.⁶⁰ Treba, međutim, istaknuti kako je problem u tome što ne postoje arheološki nalazi za obje crkve, a uz to je i nedosljedna upotreba naziva titulara pa se pretpostavlja kako se radi o jednoj crkvi iz 10. stoljeća s dvostrukim titularom.⁶¹

Splitska arhitektura i skulptura u kontekstu crkvenih reformi

Crkva sv. Stjepana na Otoku u Solinu još uvijek pripada predromaničkom razdoblju, a sagrađena je kako bi u njoj bila pokopana kraljica Jelena. Otok u Solinu na rijeci Jadru bio je pod vlašću hrvatskih knezova i u njegovoj je blizini pronađen veći broj crkava, od kojih je najvažnija ona sv. Stjepana jer bijaše mauzolej hrvatskih vladara. Prema Ejnaru Dyggveju postojala je i crkva sv. Marije koja je bila preteča današnje župne crkve. Dyggve je pretpostavljao da Sv. Marija potječe iz istog vremena kao i Sv. Stjepan. Iz tog razloga govori o dvostrukoj crkvi, koja je uzor imala u ranijoj građevini stare Salone. Takve su crkve

Croatian kings and ecclesiastical estates

Ecclesiastical estates were enlarged during the 11th century, a process in which the Croatian rulers, in a manner similar to the emperors in Western Europe, played a major role by donating numerous lands to the Church, while also granting it various privileges.⁵⁶ At the same time, local wealthy individuals commissioned the construction of churches or abbeys. At that time, Petar Crni arranged for the construction of a Benedictine abbey and a church and monastery in Selo next to Split.⁵⁷ The reformist movement reinforced the status of monastic communities in the social and religious context, because they were seen as symbols of the restoration of genuine morality, and the 1060s were the time of the most intensive construction of monasteries. Over a period of only about twenty years, a high number of abbeys were founded: St. Peter in Supetarska Draga on the island of Rab, St. Peter in Selo near Split, as well as the Convent of St. Benedict in Split, St. Domnius (later St. Nicholas) in Trogir, St. Thomas in Biograd na Moru, St. Mary in Zadar and St. Plato in the same city.⁵⁸

Thomas the Archdeacon, in his chapter on Archbishop Lawrence in the *Historia Salonitana*, stated that the archbishop sued Croatian King Zvonimir, seeking the return of the Churches of St. Stephen and St. Mary in Solin⁵⁹ with the accompanying land to the Split Archdiocese. In this process of restitution, Lawrence could also cite the conclusions of the Lateran Council, among which it is specified that property (ecclesiastical assets) which anyone had received from the secular or ecclesiastical authorities had to be restored to the original owner. This is why Zvonimir, since he was obliged to carry out papal decisions, was compelled to return these churches, and the basis of Zvonimir's charter from 1079/80 was cited by Thomas as the Archdeacon.⁶⁰ It should, however, be stressed that the problem is that there are no archaeological finds confirming the existence of two churches, while the names of their titulars were used inconsistently, so it is assumed that this was a single church from the 10th century with dual titulars.⁶¹

58 Goldstein 1995, str. 384.

59 Ostojić 1964, str. 311-312.

60 Toma Arhidakon 2003, str. 80-81. Usp. Matijević - Sokol, Sokol 2010, str. 415-431.

61 Matijević - Sokol, Sokol 2010, str. 422. Još su u ranijih istraživanjima Rapanić i Jelovina pronašli samo jednu crkvu iz 10. stoljeća na Otoku kod Solina u čijem atriju se nalazi i sarkofag. Zato su predložili da se crkvu sv. Marije traži na Gradini kod Solina, no Marasović je pokazao kako je crkva na Gradini ranobizantska građevina iz Justinijanova doba.

56 Goldstein 1995, p. 375.

57 Goldstein 1995, p. 377.

58 Goldstein 1995, p. 384.

59 Ostojić 1964, pp. 311-312.

60 Toma Arhidakon 2003, pp. 80-81. Cf. Matijević - Sokol, Sokol 2010, pp. 415-431.

61 Matijević - Sokol, Sokol, 2010, p. 422. Already in earlier research, Rapanić and Jelovina found only one church from the 10th c. at Otok near Solin which also had a sarcophagus in its atrium. This is why they suggested that the Church of St. Mary should be sought



Sl. 7. Crkva sv. Petra i Mojsija (Šuplja crkva), Solin, 11. st., foto: I. Loinjak

Fig. 7. Church of St. Peter and Moses (Šuplja crkva), Solin, 11th c., photo: I. Loinjak

poznate kao *basilicae geminae*,⁶² a dvostrukost se očitovala funkcijama – kongregacijskoj i memorijalnoj. Toj skupini pripada i salonitanska katedrala. Tomislav Marasović također se slaže s tezom da se Sv. Stjepan na Otoku oslanja na neke velike ranokršćanske građevine koje je moguće naći u obližnjoj Saloni.⁶³ Ta crkva, međutim, odražava i utjecaje bizantske arhitekture u oblikovanju kupole, a karolinška se tradicija nazire u postojanju *westwerka*.⁶⁴

Sv. Stjepan na Otoku u Solinu poslužio je Jurkoviću kako bi naznačio neke esencijalne razlike između predromaničke i ranoromaničke arhitekture, pri čemu inzistira na nekoliko elementa. Sv. Stjepan je oblikovan tako da pod jedinstvenim vanjskim plaštem sadrži veći broj autonomnih prostora – predvorje koje je podijeljeno u tri odjeljka, *westwerk* te glavni brod s neujednačenim ritmom stupova. Za razliku od Sv. Stjepana, u Sv. Petru i Mojsiju postoji pregledan prostor, ali i dio nalik *westwerku* koji je sada kao zasebna masa izdvojen izvan osnovnog pravokutnika crkve, dok je ritam kretanja ujednačen.⁶⁵ Na ovoj se crkvi vidi još jedan pomak u odnosu između predromaničke i ranoromaničke arhitekture, a to je ujednačavanje vanjskih i unutarnjih lezena na bočnim zidovima.⁶⁶ U Sv.

Architecture and sculpture in Split in the context of ecclesiastical reforms

The Church of St. Stephen at Otok, in Solin, still belonged to the pre-Romanesque era, and it was built so that Queen Helena could be interred in it. Otok in Solin on the River Jadro was under the authority of the Croatian dukes and many churches were found in the vicinity, of which the most important is that of St. Stephen, because it was the mausoleum for Croatian rulers. According to Ejnar Dyggve, there was also a Church of St. Mary, which was the predecessor to the present-day parish church. Dyggve assumed that St. Mary's Church originated at the same time as St. Stephen's Church. This is why he spoke of a dual church, which was modelled after an earlier building in old Salona. Such churches were known as *basilicae geminae*,⁶² and their duality manifested itself in their functions: congregational and commemorative. This group also included the Salonitan cathedral. Tomislav Marasović also agreed with the hypothesis that St. Stephen's Church at Otok had rested against a large Early Christian building that could be found in nearby Salona.⁶³ This church, however, also reflected the influences of Byzantine architecture in the formation of the dome, while the Carolingian tradition could be discerned in the existence of *westwerk*.⁶⁴

The Church of St. Stephen at Otok in Solin was used by Jurković to denote several essential differences between pre-Romanesque and early Romanesque architecture, wherein he insisted on several elements. St. Stephen's Church was formed so that beneath the external façade it contained a high number of autonomous rooms: the vestibule, divided into three sections, *westwerk* and the primary nave with an irregular arrangement of columns. In contrast to St. Stephen's Church, the Church of St. Peter and Moses contained an unobstructed space, as well as a section resembling *westwerk* which was now a separate unit outside of the church's basic rectangle, while the rhythm of movement was uniform.⁶⁵ Yet another shift in the relationship between pre-Romanesque and early Romanesque

62 Tezu o dvostrukim crkvama prvi je iznio Kandler 1852. godine, a njegovo su mišljenje prihvatili Svoboda, Gerber, Egger i Dyggve. Dyggve 1996, str. 40.

63 Marasović 1994, str. 19.

64 Marasović 1994, str. 21. O bizantskom je utjecaju ranije govorio Dyggve. Dyggve 1996, str. 96. O *westwerku* crkve sv. Stjepana piše i Jurković. Jurković 1995, str. 66-69.

65 Jurković 1990, str. 200-201.

66 Marasović 1994, str. 80. Tezu o ujednačavanju vanjske i unutarnje artikulacije zidova i podjeli prostora kao

at Gradina near Solin, but Marasović showed that the church at Gradina was an early Byzantine building from Justinian's time.

62 The hypothesis on dual churches was first proffered by Kandler 1852, and his view was accepted by Svoboda, Gerber, Egger and Dyggve. Dyggve 1996, p. 40.

63 Marasović 1994, p. 19.

64 Marasović 1994, p. 21. Dyggve spoke about the Byzantine influence earlier. Dyggve 1996, p. 96. Jurković also wrote about the *westwerk* in the Church of St. Stephen. Jurković 1995, pp. 66-69.

65 Jurković 1990, pp. 200-201.

Petru i Mojsiju na oltarnoj se ogradi nalazi zapis ime-na Mojsijeva,⁶⁷ tadašnjeg opata benediktinskog samostana, a natpis s ograde glasi: “Presvijetli Petre, primi dar od časnog Mojsija, svetog sluge tvojega...”⁶⁸ Ta je crkva trebala biti novim krunidbenim mauzolejom nove dinastije⁶⁹ koju je Zvonimir nastojao stvoriti uz pomoć crkvenih dostojanstvenika i nadbiskupa Lovre. Dyggve piše kako izvori o Zvonimirovoj krunidbi (1076.) govore da je ona obavljena upravo u toj crkvi, *in Salonitana basilica sancti Petri*.⁷⁰

Lovro je u Splitu utemeljio ženski benediktinski samostan sv. Benedikta ubrzo nakon što je postao nadbiskup.⁷¹ Samostan je bio smješten uz istoimenu crkvu, poslije zvanu Sv. Arnir. Točniju dataciju crkve bilo je moguće odrediti zahvaljujući natpisu s Lovrinim imenom. Crkva se tipološki svrstava u skupinu trobrodskih crkava s upisanim transeptom i tri polukružne apside na istoku.⁷² Tom tipu pripada i osorska crkva sv. Petra, budući da je i ona trobrodna bazilikalna gradnja koja posjeduje upisani transept s tri polukružne apside.⁷³

Istom modelu crkve s upisanim transeptom i kupolom (kao što je slučaj sa Sv. Arnirom) pripada crkva sv. Nikole u Velom varošu u Splitu. Ta je građevina posjedovala kupolu, a pretpostavlja se da je vjerojatno u razdoblju romanike dobila konstrukciju nalik zvoniku. Sv. Nikola u Velom varošu nije troapsidalna crkva, nego ima samo jednu apsidu pravokutnog oblika.⁷⁴ Crkvu je nakon 1068. godine dala izgraditi Nemira Mesagaline.⁷⁵ Kupola se, međutim, nije

architecture can be seen on this church, and this is the uniformity in the external and internal pilaster-strips on the lateral walls.⁶⁶ In the Church of St. Peter and Moses, the altar screen bears the name Moses,⁶⁷ then the abbot of the Benedictine abbey, and the inscription on the screen reads: “Illustrious Peter, receive the gift from honourable Moses, your holy servant ...”⁶⁸ This church should have been the new coronation mausoleum of the new dynasty⁶⁹ which Zvonimir was attempting to create with the help of ecclesiastical dignitaries and Archbishop Lawrence. Dyggve wrote that sources on Zvonimir’s coronation (1076) indicate that it was done precisely in this church, *in Salonitana basilica sancti Petri*.⁷⁰

Lawrence established the Convent of St. Benedict in Split for Benedictine sisters soon after he became archbishop.⁷¹ The convent was situated next to a church of this same name, which was later called St. Raynerius. The precise dating of the church could be determined thanks to an inscription bearing Lawrence’s name. The church can be typologically classified into the group of triple-nave churches with an inserted transept and three semi-circular apses in the east.⁷² The Church of St. Peter in Osor also belongs to this type, since it is a triple-nave basilica which has an inserted transept with three semi-circular apses.⁷³

The same model of a church with inserted transept and dome (as is the case in St. Raynerius) can also be seen in the Church of St. Nicholas in Veli varoš in Split. This building had a dome, and it is assumed that

razlikovnom obilježju između predromanike i romanike postavlja Goss. Međutim, Vežić kao protuprimjer navodi crkvu sv. Krševana u Zadru, koja je primjer romanike, ali ne postoji ujednačavanje vanjske i unutrašnje artikulacije zidova. Marasović 2008, str. 54 [bilj. 75].

67 Dio liturgijskoga namještaja iz ove crkve završio je u krstionici splitske katedrale, što u svojim istraživanjima potvrđuje Dyggve. Ostojić 1964, str. 309.

68 Marasović 2008, str. 161.

69 Po uzoru na crkvu sv. Stjepana na Otoku gdje su se sahranjivali njegovi prethodnici. Budak, Raukar 2006, str. 139.

70 Dyggve 1996, str. 97.

71 Ostojić 1964, str. 354.

72 Marasović 1994, str. 89. Upisani transept dovodi se u vezu s bizantskom tradicijom.

73 Marasović 2008, str. 191. O još nekim primjerima trobrodskih i troapsidalnih crkava ranoromaničkog doba na Jadranu vidi: Jurković 1990, str. 206-207.

74 Marasović 1994, str. 88.

75 Marasović 1994, str. 182. Vidi i: Marasović 2008, str. 386.

66 Marasović 1994, p. 80. The hypothesis on the uniform articulation of exterior and interior walls and the division of space as distinguishing features between the pre-Romanesque and Romanesque was proposed by Goss. However, Vežić cited the Church of St. Chrysogonus in Zadar as a counter-example, as it is Romanesque, but there is no uniformity of articulation on the external and internal walls. Marasović 2008, p. 54 [note 75].

67 A part of the liturgical furnishings from this church ended up on the baptistery of the Split cathedral, which was confirmed by Dyggve in his research. Ostojić 1964, p. 309.

68 Marasović 2008, p. 161.

69 Modelled after the Church of St. Stephen at Otok, where his predecessors were interred. Budak, Raukar 2006, p. 139.

70 Dyggve 1996, p. 97.

71 Ostojić 1964, p. 354.

72 Marasović 1994, p. 89. The inserted transept is associated with the Byzantine tradition.

73 Marasović 2008, p. 191. For several more examples of triple-nave and triapsidal churches of the early Romanesque era on the Adriatic coast, see: Jurković 1990, pp. 206-207.



Sl. 8. Crkva sv. Nikole (Mikule) u Velom varošu, 11. st., Split, foto: I. Loinjak
Fig. 8. Church of St. Nicholas in Veli varoš, 11th c., Split, photo: I. Loinjak

koristila samo na području Splita.⁷⁶ Poznato je da ju je imao i Sv. Lovro u Zadru te najvjerojatnije Sv. Stjepan u Trogiru.⁷⁷

Još je jedna splitska crkva primjer arhitektonskih promjena koje su nastupile u drugoj polovici 11. stoljeća – Gospa od Zvonika ili Sv. Teodor. Nastala je preuređenjem stražarskih hodnika Dioklecijanove palače, a kao godinu gradnje Marasović navodi 1089. Crkva se povezuje s priorom Firminom, splitskim gradonačelnikom.⁷⁸ Posjedovala je jedan od rijetkih sačuvanih tornjeva iz tog razdoblja pa predstavlja važan spomenik za razumijevanje motiva tornja kao komponente koja također u određenoj mjeri proizlazi iz novog odnosa crkvenih dostojanstvenika prema potrebi za reprezentacijom moći.⁷⁹

Bazilika benediktinskog samostana sv. Stjepana na Sustipanu u Splitu zanimljiva je jer se njezino



Sl. 9. Crkva sv. Nikole (Mikule) u Velom varošu, 11. st., Split, detalj prozorskog otvora, foto: I. Loinjak
Fig. 9. Church of St. Nicholas in Veli varoš, 11th c., Split, detail of the window opening, photo: I. Loinjak

it probably obtained a structure similar to a steeple in the Romanesque period. St. Nicholas in Veli varoš is not a triapsidal church, rather it has only a single rectangular apse.⁷⁴ The church's construction was arranged after 1068 by Nemira Mesagalina.⁷⁵ The dome, however, was not only used in the territory of Split.⁷⁶ It is known that the Church of St. Lawrence in Zadar and, probably, the Church of St. Stephen in Trogir had them.⁷⁷

Another church in Split serves as an example of the architectural changes that emerged in the latter half of the 11th century: Our Lady of the Tower, or St. Theodore's Church. It emerged after the remodelling of the sentry corridors of Diocletian's Palace, and Marasović cited 1089 as the year of its

76 O razvijanju takvog jednobrodnoga kupolnog tipa crkvene tipologije koji se može naći u južnoj Dalmaciji. Marasović 2008, str. 568.

77 Marasović 1994, str. 92.

78 Marasović 1994, str. 159.

79 Milošević 2011.

74 Marasović 1994, p. 88.

75 Marasović 1994, p. 182. See also: Marasović 2008, p. 386.

76 On the development of such a single-nave domed type of church typology that may be found in southern Dalmatia, Marasović 2008, p. 568.

77 Marasović 1994, p. 92.



Sl. 10. Toranj crkve sv. Teodora (Gospa od Zvonika), 11. st., Split, (prvi se puta spominje 1275. g.), foto: I. Loinjak

Fig. 10. Tower of the Church of St. Theodore (Our Lady of the Tower) 11th c., Split (first mentioned in 1275), photo: I. Loinjak

pročelje u velikoj mjeri poklapa s onim iz Pompose. Neki autori tu baziliku zbog tipske podudarnosti s ranokršćanskim bazilikalnim tipom datiraju u ranije razdoblje, dok Marasović predlaže dataciju u predromaničko doba, budući da su poznati i drugi slučajevi u kojima su crkve slijedile ranokršćanski obrazac gradnje.⁸⁰ Ta je crkva vjerojatno krajem 11. stoljeća dobila i novu unutrašnju opremu. Pronađen je zabat iz tog razdoblja koji prikazuje Krista na prijestolju koji u ruci drži knjigu okružen dvama anđelima.

U razdoblju nadbiskupa Lovre mnoge su crkve u Splitu dobile novi liturgijski namještaj, što je vjerojatno jednim dijelom proistjecalo iz novih liturgijskih zahtjeva proizašlih iz promjena u služenju liturgije, odnosno iz potrebe za drugačijim oblikovanjem unutrašnjega prostora crkava. U tom razdoblju novi namještaj dobiva i crkva sv. Nikole u Velom varošu. U njezinoj je novoj oltarnoj ogradi zadržan predromanički tegurij koji je sada, međutim, bio ispunjen

construction. The church was associated with Prior Firmin, the mayor of Split.⁷⁸ It possessed one of the rare preserved towers from this period, so it is a vital monument for an understanding of the tower motif as a component which to some degree emerged from the new attitude of church dignitaries toward the need for symbols of power.⁷⁹

The basilica of the Benedictine Abbey of St. Stephen at Sustipan in Split is interesting because its frontispiece largely corresponds to the one in Pomposa. Due to its similarities to the Early Christian basilica type, some scholars dated it to an earlier period, while Marasović proposed dating it to the pre-Romanesque period, since other cases are known in which churches adhered to the Early Christian construction model.⁸⁰ This church probably acquired new interior furnishings at the end of the 11th century. A pediment from this period was found which features a scene of Christ on the throne holding a book and flanked by two angels.

During the time of Archbishop Lawrence, many churches in Split obtained new liturgical furnishings, probably due in part to new liturgical requirements that ensued from the changes in serving the liturgy, i.e., the need for a differently arranged church interior. During this period, the Church of St. Nicholas in Veli varoš also obtained new furnishings. A pre-Romanesque tegurium was retained in its altar screen, although it was now filled with stair-like profiles such as plutei and capitals.⁸¹ Lawrence was also given credit for the interior decoration of the Split cathedral and the Church of St. Peter and Moses in Solin. The liturgical furnishings in the Church of St. Peter and Moses on the one hand indicate continuity with the pre-Romanesque in sculpture, as manifested in the interlace decorations rendered in shallow sculptures, but also the arrival of new tendencies in art reflected in the reappearance of the human figure.⁸² It is assumed that these relief sculptures were made by a Zadar-Split stonemason workshop that Ivo Petricioli also recognized in the ciborium of Proconsul Gregory (1030) and the plutei from the Church of St. John the

78 Marasović 1994, p. 159.

79 Milošević 2011.

80 Marasović 2008, p. 268.

81 The liturgical furnishings in the Church of St. Nicholas in Veli Varoš date to the very end of the 11th and early 12th century. Marasović stated that construction of the church was commissioned by Nemira at around 1070, but Ivan and his wife Tiha are specified as the donors on the lintel and altar screen, so Marasović dated the sculpture in this church to several years after the death of Archbishop Lawrence. Marasović 2008, p. 386.

82 Marasović 2008, pp. 387-388.

80 Marasović 2008, str. 268.



Sl. 11. Crkva sv. Nikole (Mikule) u Velom varošu, 11. st., Split, nadvratnik, foto: I. Loinjak
Fig. 11. Church of St. Nicholas in Veli varoš, 11th c., Split, lintel, photo: I. Loinjak

stepenastim profilima poput pluteja i kapitela.⁸¹ Lovri se pripisuju zasluge za unutrašnje uređenje splitske katedrale i solinske crkve sv. Petra i Mojsija. Liturgijski namještaj Sv. Petra i Mojsija ukazuje s jedne strane na kontinuitet predromanike u skulpturi, što se očituje u pleternim ukrasima izvedenim u plitkoj plastici, ali isto tako i na dolazak novih tendencija u umjetnosti koje se ogledaju u ponovnom javljanju ljudskog lika.⁸² Pretpostavlja se kako ti reljefi pripadaju zadarsko-splitskoj klesarskoj radionici koju je Ivo Petricioli prepoznao i na ciboriju prokonzula Grgura (1030.) te na plutejima iz Sv. Ivana Krstitelja u Zadru (Sv. Nediljica).⁸³ Sličnu stilizaciju pokazuju i kamene ploče iz splitske katedrale pa se pretpostavlja kako i one potječu iz iste radionice kao i liturgijski namještaj Sv. Petra i Mojsija.⁸⁴

Zadarsko-splitska klesarska radionica obavljala je većinu radova u drugoj polovici 11. stoljeća u Splitu. Budući da je njezina aktivnost bila izrazito razvijena u trećoj četvrtini 11. stoljeća, njezin se rad vezuje uz

81 Liturgijski namještaj koji se nalazi u crkvi sv. Nikole u Velom varošu pripada već samom kraju 11. i početku 12. stoljeća. Marasović navodi kako je crkvu sagradila Nemira oko 1070. godine, ali se kao donatori na nadvratniku i oltarnoj ogradi spominju Ivan i njegova žena Tiha pa Marasović skulpturu te crkve datira ipak nekoliko godina nakon smrti nadbiskupa Lovre. Marasović 2008, str. 386.

82 Marasović 2008, str. 387-388.

83 Petricioli 1983, str. 7-26.

84 To je, međutim, samo pretpostavka. Za detaljnije informacije o tome upućuje se na literaturu predloženu u Marasovićevoj *Dalmatia praeromanica*. Vidjeti i u: Babić 2010, 203-215; Fisković 2002, str. 33-78; Marasović 1997, str. 11-20.



Sl. 12. Crkva sv. Petra na Priku, 9. ili 10. st., Omiš, (prvi spomen o crkvi iz 1074. g.), ulazna vrata, foto: I. Loinjak
Fig. 12. Church of St. Peter at Priko, 9th or 10th c., Omiš (first mentioned in 1074), entrance door, photo: I. Loinjak

Baptist in Zadar (Sveta Nediljica).⁸³ A similar stylization is exhibited by the stone slabs from the Split cathedral, so it is assumed that they came from the same workshop as the liturgical furnishings in the Church of St. Peter and Moses.⁸⁴

The Zadar-Split stonemason workshop performed most of the works in Split in the latter half of the 11th century. Since its activity was particularly developed in the third quarter of the 11th century, its work has been tied to the ecclesiastical reforms implemented by the Benedictine abbeys headed by the archbishop. This workshop also produced the sculptural pieces in the Church of St. Raynerius, as well as the altar screen in Split's Church of St. Martin above the Golden Gate, so that the comprehensive restoration of this church and the construction of its steeple may be dated to

83 Petricioli 1983, pp. 7-26.

84 This, however, is only a hypothesis. For more detailed information on this, see the relevant literature suggested in Marasović's *Dalmatia praeromanica*. See also: Babić 2010, 203-215; Fisković 2002, pp. 33-78; Marasović 1997, pp. 11-20.

crkvene reforme koje su provodili benediktinski samostani na čelu s nadbiskupom. Proizvod su te radionice i kiparska ostvarenja u crkvi sv. Arnira, a iz iste je radionice i oltarna ograda u splitskoj crkvi sv. Martina nad Zlatnim vratima, pa se s velikom sigurnošću temeljita obnova te crkve i izgradnja njezina zvonika može smjestiti u isto razdoblje.⁸⁵ Djelovanje te radionice pokazuje prelazak iz rane romanike u skulpturu zreloromaničkoga stila koju označava sve češće javljanje ljudskoga lika te narativnost scena, što pokazuje odmak od ranosrednjovjekovne statičke skulpture i određuje nov smjer u kojem će se skulptura u budućem razdoblju kretati na čitavom kršćanskom Zapadu.⁸⁶

Zaključak

Svaki primjer iz arhitekture odražava suživot oblika i namjene, odnosno funkcije kojoj je namijenjen. Promjene koje su se u povijesti događale na području arhitekture nisu bile uvjetovane promjenom stila, nego trenutnim zahtjevima naručitelja koji su pred graditelje ili arhitekta u svakom razdoblju stavljali nove zadaće. Stil je posljedica, a ne uzrok takvih promjena. Proučavanjem funkcija građevina i naknadnim razumijevanjem njihovih oblika postale su jasnije stilске promjene nastale u arhitekturi 11. stoljeća. Stilski gledano, arhitektura tog doba bila je vrlo heterogena, što je predstavljalo velike probleme ranijim istraživačima koji su na temelju opisa oblika građevina to razdoblje nastojali definirati služeći se stilskom terminologijom. Promjene u arhitekturi 11. stoljeća nastale su najvećim dijelom kao odraz tadašnjih crkvenih reformi i novih liturgijskih potreba. U radu se pokušalo pojasniti u kakvom odnosu stoje spomenute reforme prema novim arhitektonskim ostvarenjima druge polovice 11. stoljeća u gradu Splitu, odnosno u razdoblju kada je na nadbiskupskom stolcu sjedio Lovro, koji je na to mjesto došao iz Osorske biskupije, povezane s opatijom u talijanskoj Pomposi. Njegov odnos prema crkvenoj reformaciji i protureformaciji, kao i političke veze s papama i hrvatskim kraljevima odrazili su se i na arhitektonsku morfologiju tog doba u Splitu. Time je potvrđena teza na kojoj inzistira Jurković, a to je da se u analizi arhitekture ne mogu u obzir uzimati samo formalni, odnosno stilski parametri nego da je jednako tako potrebno voditi brigu i o funkciji, naručiteljima i ostalim čimbenicima koji sudjeluju u oblikovanju arhitekture, a nisu uvjetovani stilom.

the same period.⁸⁵ The functioning of this workshop indicates the transition from the early Romanesque to the sculpture of the high Romanesque style which was marked by the increasingly frequent appearance of the human form and narrative scenes, reflecting a move away from early medieval static sculpture and signalling the new direction in which sculpture would move throughout the Christian West in the coming period.⁸⁶

Conclusion

Every example of architecture reflects the interplay between form and the purpose, or function, which it serves. The changes that ensued over the course of history in the field of architecture were not dependent upon changes in style, but rather on the immediate demands of patrons who placed new tasks before builders or architects in every period. Style is a consequence rather than a cause of such changes. The stylistic changes in the architecture of the 11th century became clearer by needs of studying the function of buildings and gaining an understanding of their forms. In stylistic terms, the architecture of that era is very heterogeneous, which created considerable problems for previous researchers, who attempted to define that period on the basis of descriptions of the forms of buildings by using stylistic terminology. The changes in 11th-century architecture emerged largely as a reflection of the ecclesiastical reforms and the resultant new liturgical needs of that period. This paper constitutes an attempt to explain the nature of the relationship between the aforementioned reforms and the new architectural output in Split in the latter half of the 11th century, i.e., during a period when the archdiocesan see was occupied by Lawrence, who came to this post from the Osor Diocese, which was in turn linked to the Pomposa Abbey in Italy. His attitude toward ecclesiastical reforms and the counter-reformation, as well as political relations between the popes and the Croatian kings, were reflected in the architectural morphology of the time in Split. This validates the hypothesis upon which Jurković insisted, and that is that an analysis of architecture cannot be limited to formal or stylistic parameters alone, for equal consideration must be accorded to its function, the patrons who commissioned it and other factors which interact in the formation of architecture that were not contingent upon style.

85 Marasović 2008, str. 387.

86 Burić 1992; Barall i Altet 2009, str. 143-229.

85 Marasović 2008, p. 387.

86 Burić 1992; Barall i Altet 2009, pp. 143-229.

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Babić 2010 I. Babić, *O reljefu s prikazom kralja iz Splitske krstionice*, Archeologia Adriatica IV/1, Zadar 2010, 203-205.
- Barral i Altet 2009 X. Barral i Altet, *Protiv romanike? Eseji o pronađenoj prošlosti*, Institut za povijest umjetnosti, Zagreb 2009.
- Budak, Raukar 2006 N. Budak, T. Raukar, *Hrvatska povijest srednjeg vijeka*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb 2006.
- Burić 1992 T. Burić, *Jedna splitska ranoromanička radionica iz treće četvrtine 11. stoljeća*, Prijatelj zbornik I: Zbornik radova posvećenih sedamdesetogodišnjici života Krune Prijatelja/Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji 32, Split 1992, 207-221.
- Delonga 2009 V. Delonga, *Dobrotvorni križ nebeskog Boga (razmišljanja uz dva splitska ranosrednjovjekovna natpisa)*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta III/36, Split 2009, 125-161.
- Dyggve 1996 E. Dyggve, *Povijest salonitanskog kršćanstva*, Književni krug Split, Split 1996.
- Fisković 2002 I. Fisković, *Reljef kralja Petra Krešimira IV*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, Split 2002.
- Goldstein 1995 I. Goldstein, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek*, Novi Liber/Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb 1995.
- Goldstein, Grgin 2008 I. Goldstein, B. Grgin, *Europa i Sredozemlje u srednjem vijeku*, Novi Liber, Zagreb 2008.
- Goss 2006 V. P. Goss, *Predromanička arhitektura u Hrvatskoj/Pre-Romanesque Architecture in Croatia*, Art studio Azinović, Zagreb 2006.
- Ivanišević 1980 M. Ivanišević, *Sveti Ivan trogirski biskup*, Croatica Christiana Periodica V/4, Zagreb 1980, 41-54.
- Jedin 2001 H. Jedin, *Velika povijest crkve (Srednjovjekovna crkva)*, Kršćanska sadašnjost, Zagreb 2001.
- Jurković 1990 M. Jurković, *Crkvena reforma i ranoromanička arhitektura na istočnom Jadranu*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta III/20, Split 1990, 191-213.
- Jurković 1995 M. Jurković, *Sv. Spas na vrelu Cetine i problem westwerka u hrvatskoj predromani*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta III/22, Split 1995, 55-80.
- Jurković, Marić 2012 M. Jurković, I. Marić, *Le "premier art roman" en Istrie et en Dalmatie // Le "premier art roman", cent ans après. La construction entre Saône et Po autour de l'an mil. Etudes comparatives. Actes du colloque international / E. Vergnolle; S. Bully (eds.), Presse Universitaires Franc-Comtoises, Besançon 2012, 147-173.*
- Karaman 1930 Lj. Karaman, *Iz kolijevke hrvatske prošlosti*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb 1930.
- Kostrenčić 1967 M. Kostrenčić (ed.), *Diplomatički zbornik kraljevine Hrvatske, Dalmacije i Slavonije I*, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb 1967.
- Marasović 1994 T. Marasović, *Graditeljstvo starohrvatskog doba u Dalmaciji*, Književni krug, Split 1994.
- Marasović 2008 T. Marasović, *Dalmatia praeromanica. Ranosrednjovjekovno graditeljstvo u Dalmaciji. 1. Rasprava*, Književni krug Split/Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika/Arhitektonski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Split 2008.
- Marasović 2008a T. Marasović, *Ranosrednjovjekovne crkve pseudobazilikanog tipa u Dalmaciji*, Archeologia Adriatica II, Zadar 2008, 555-572.
- Milošević 2011 A. Milošević, *Predromanički zvonici u Dalmaciji i ranosrednjovjekovnoj Hrvatskoj*, Omega engineering d.o.o. Dubrovnik/Centar studia Mediterranea pri Filozofskom fakultetu u Splitu, Dubrovnik - Split, 2011.
- Petricioli 1983 I. Petricoli, *Tragom srednjovjekovnih umjetnika*, Društvo povjesničara umjetnosti SR Hrvatske, Zagreb 1983.
- Matijević – Sokol, Sokol 2010 M. Matijević – Sokol, V. Sokol, *Quedam Helena regina*, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu XLIII/1, Zagreb 2010, 415-431.
- Ostojić 1964 I. Ostojić, *Benediktinci u Hrvatskoj i ostalim našim krajevima (sv. 2, Benediktinci u Dalmaciji)*, Benediktinski priorat, Split - Tkon 1964.

- Stipišić 1997 J. Stipišić, *Pitanje godine krunidbe kralja Zvonimira*, in: Zbornik radova "Zvonimir, kralj hrvatski", HAZU/Zavod za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta, Zagreb 1997, 57-66.
- Šanjek 1988 F. Šanjek, *Crkva i kršćanstvo u Hrvata 1*, Kršćanska sadašnjost, Zagreb 1988.
- Šanjek 2008 F. Šanjek, *Uloga papinstva u afirmaciji Hrvatske u ranom srednjem vijeku (7.-12. st.)*, Problemi sjevernog Jadrana 9 (2008), Zavod za povijesne i društvene znanosti u Rijeci i Područna jedinica u Puli, Zagreb - Rijeka 2008, 7-25.
- Šišić 1990 F. Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*, Nakladni zavod Matice hrvatske, Zagreb 1990.
- Toma Arhidakon 2003 Toma Arhidakon, *Historia Salonitana. Povijest salonitanskih i splitskih prvosvećenika*, Književni krug Split, Split 2003.