

SCULPTURES FROM ZAGREB, MEDVEDGRAD AND ČAZMA AS DOCUMENTS OF GLORIOUS TIMES

Vjekoslav Jukić*

Abstract: The present article shows the political situation in Northwestern Croatia in the first half of the 13th century, to be more precisely its second quarter. That period is marked by one of the most fascinating phenomena in the Continental Croatian culture of the Middle Ages when this part of Croatia underwent a true local Renaissance in political, economic and cultural spheres. That happened under the aegis of two most capable leaders, Coloman, the son of Andrew II and brother to King Bela IV, and Bishop Stephen II of Zagreb, the former royal Chancellor of Andrew II. Although this rise was cut short by the Tartar invasion of 1241-1242, the little traces that have survived, represent a totally new quality in the Croatian medieval culture. That parts of art production can be seen not only as quality pieces of art, but also as a document, hard evidence that can show the strength and the power of the political and economic programs of Coloman and Stephen II.

Keywords: Northwestern Croatia, Medieval Art, Hungarian Court, Medieval Sculpture

The first half of the 13th century, more correctly its second quarter, is marked by one of the most fascinating phenomena in the Continental Croatian culture of the Middle Ages. Under the aegis of two most capable leaders, Koloman/Coloman, son of Andrija/Andrew II and brother to King Bela IV, and Bishop Stjepan/Stephen II of Zagreb, former royal Chancellor to Andrew II the land underwent a true local renaissance in political, economic and cultural spheres¹. Its great promises were unfortunately cut short by the Tartar invasion from 1241-1242, but its cultural contribution, i.e. the little of it that has survived, represents a totally new quality in Croatian medieval culture².

* Ph.D, Zadarska 75, Zagreb, Croatia, v.jukic@inet.hr.

¹ More data regarding political situation in the first half of 13th century can be found in Dujmović Danko and Jukić, Vjekoslav. "The <Koloman Renaissance> in North Western Croatia – An Unfinished Project." *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/37 (2010): 171-182.

² Nevertheless, the first half of the century is surprisingly poor in preserved art monuments, most of them being dedicated to personalities (or at least under partial completion), such as Zagreb Cathedral (1217) and the building of the Cistercian abbey at Topusko under the patronage of Andrew II.

A transformation of the power structure whereby the estates slowly accumulate in the hands of the gentry, both terrestrial and ecclesiastic, which would in the end, by 1300 cause the downfall of the Arpadian house, would also be reflected in the sphere of art ³. In comparison with the 12th century, the quality is often surprisingly high, and Croatian art is linked to the centres of power, be it of the landed gentry trying to assert their power, be it of the prelates and monasteries.

The rule of Andrew II would be remembered as a period of upheaval⁴. He came to the throne after a mutiny against his elder brother, Emerik/Emeric and the death of the latter's son, Ladislav/Ladislas III in 1205. As a king he heavily relied on foreign gentry from the entourage of his wife, Queen Gertrud, causing a rebellion of the local noblemen, leading to the murder of the queen in 1213 ⁵.

Andrew II also strengthened links with the Holy See and continued the pro-western policy of his father, Bela III⁶. Those links especially flourished during the papacy of Innocent III. Additionally, Andrew heavily supported the Military orders and himself undertook a Crusade in 1217, fulfilling the Crusader vows of his father ⁷. Also, the Hungarian kingdom was getting more and more involved into the Balkan affairs which meant among other things a clash with the heretical forces from Bosnia, and attempts to spread Christianity into Bosnia ⁸. No wonder the second Golden Bull of Andrew II (1231) recognized the Church as a key landholder of the Kingdom ⁹. All this meant the end of the relatively religious tolerance of the 12th century when some of the Hungarian rulers had leant on Byzantium, also having close ties with Constantinople ¹⁰.

There was also a change in the relations to religious orders. The Benedictines, the backbone of Hungarian Christianity lose ground vis-à-vis the mendicant and military orders. The most prominent role was played by the Dominicans after their introduction in the kingdom in 1221, thus

³ Engel, Pál. *Realm of St. Stephen: a History of Medieval Hungary*. London/New York: I. B. Tauris, 2001, 92. As an example of this transformation of power structure and the strengthening of nobility, one may list the churches from Lébény or Ják built by high nobility (Palatine Pat and Count Martin).

⁴ Kontler, László. *Povijest Mađarske*, Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2007, 82.

⁵ Engel, *ibid*, 90–91.

⁶ Engel, *ibid*, 83.

⁷ Engel, *ibid*, 83.

⁸ Engel, *ibid*, 88.

⁹ Engel, *ibid*, 96–97.

¹⁰ Engel, *ibid*, 97.

becoming the "official" order of the Hungarian Crown¹¹, closely followed by the Franciscans¹².

As already stated, Andrew II undertook a Crusade in 1217 (on his way, he was present at the dedication of Zagreb Cathedral)¹³. He spent just three month in the Holy Land, but used his trip to the Levant to establish ties with the ruling powers in the Eastern Mediterranean¹⁴. The dramatic rule of Andrew II was in spite of all a period of economic and cultural upsurge, a growth period which would continue and end under the rule of his son Bela IV (1235-1270), and the younger son, Coloman, who would prove an extremely supportive co-ruler and a very capable and ambitious administrator whose monumental plans were very unfortunately cut short by the bloody Tartar episode of 1241-42.

From the first moment he had set his foot into Southern Pannonia as a Herceg (Viceroy) of Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia, Coloman had an extremely capable partner, Bishop Stephen II of Zagreb (1225-1249). Under their leadership, Southern Pannonia embarked on a new page of its history. The grand political scheme of the Coloman – Stephen tandem could be reconstructed with a fair degree of certainty: it included a creation of a new powerful kingdom within the kingdom consisting of Slavonia, Croatia and Dalmatia, and meant also to include Bosnia. *Pannonia Savia* was to become the heartland of this new political power, and Zagreb was to succeed Split as its religious center – the archdiocese. Zagreb would thus become a major religious center of the Hungarian Kingdom and the new political center would be created some 40 km to the east, in Čazma, to feature the palace of the Viceroy (Herceg) as the seat of the terrestrial power, the palace of the Archbishop as the seat of ecclesiastical authority accompanied by a number of churches, the Chapter and the curia's of the canons¹⁵.

¹¹ Engel, Pal. *Realm of St. Stephen: a History of Medieval Hungary*. London/New York: I. B. Tauris, 2001., 96.

¹² Engel, *ibid*, 96–97.

¹³ Engel, *ibid*, 91.

¹⁴ Engel, *ibid*, 91.

¹⁵ Budak, Neven. „Zagrebački biskup Stephen II, suvremenik Tome Arhiđakona.“ In *Toma Arhiđakon i njegovo doba*, edited by Mirjana Matijević-Sokol and Olga Perić, 153 – 158. Split: Književni krug, 2004., 153-158; Basić, Ivan. „O pokušaju ujedinjenja zagrebačke i splitske crkve u 13. stoljeću.“ *Pro tempore* 3 (2006): 25–43; Goss, Vladimir P. „Bishop Stephen II and Herceg Koloman and the Beginnings of the Gothic in Croatia.“ *Hortus artium medievalium* 13/1 (2007): 211-223; Goss, Vladimir P. „The Battle of Cathedrals: or how Zagreb almost Became an Archbishopric in the 13th century.“ In *Medioevo : l'Europa delle cattedrali : atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Parma, 19-23 settembre 2006*, edited by Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, Milano: Electa, 2007., 146-154; Dujmović Danko and Jukić, Vjekoslav. „The “Koloman Renaissance” in North Western Croatia – An Unfinished Project.“ *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/37 (2010): 171-182.

For a project of such a scope Coloman and Stephen needed the full support of the Court, the King and the Heir Apparent and the future king Bela IV, of the ecclesiastical structures and the orders, primarily the Dominicans, Cistercians and Templars, as well as the cooperation of the new power to be, the Slavonian cities, the King's Free Boroughs, which turned out to be a very strong link in the chain of Colomanian policy.

As opposed to Dalmatia, the ancient urban centers of Pannonia mostly disappeared in the period of the Barbarian invasions¹⁶. The Roman Pannonia, a highly organized and civilized area in the Roman times, with a well-functioning network of roads, transformed itself into a new type of space in which Antique tradition played only a minor role. New centers emerged as newly formed settlements or groups thereof without any explicit ancient tradition. Zagreb's Roman credentials are extremely thin, yet when bishopric was reintroduced in Pannonia Savia it was located in the hills of Zagreb not in the flatlands of Sisak. From a handful of marshland huts in Antiquity, Vukovar emerges as a major urban center in the 13th century, to receive privileges exactly from Herceg Coloman.

Old Roman urban centers – *Cibalae*, *Mursa* or *Sirmium* – have lost their importance or almost completely disappeared. Not physically, though, as the ruins were visible and available for spoliation when the newcomers built their own new settlements to develop independently of any ancient urban tradition.

This is an additional reason why the Pannonian area was easier to integrate into the Land of the Crown of St. Stephen than, for example, Dalmatia. With an insight of a genius, Coloman and Stephen realized that by shifting the center of power of the triune Kingdom to its Pannonian, Savian, section would break the residual resistance of the Dalmatian cities and tie them closer to the Kingdom.

The beginning of the 13th century also means a renewed pressure of Venice in Dalmatia, bringing about stagnation of its cities¹⁷. The planned moving of Archbishopric to Zagreb did not seem to have raised any particular resistance. It failed because of external, not internal factors. The Arpadian Kings of the first half of the 13th century kept making their Dalmatian expeditions, and are received with the cities struggling for their favors. One should only recall the fight of Split and Trogir over the goodwill

¹⁶ Andrić, Stanko. *Vinkovci u srednjem vijeku*. Slavonski Brod: Hrvatski institut za Povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje, 2007., 13–18, 26–32. A large number of important ancient sites had (almost) ceased to exist, but small new settlements grew around them, e.g., the village of St. Ilija (Vinkovci) at the Roman *Cibalae*.

¹⁷ Klaić, Nada. *Povijest hrvata u srednjem vijeku*. Globus, Zagreb, 1990, 171–186. I repeat that this should not be taken literally (and generally), but that the assertion was made in the context of stagnation of Split as opposed to Northehrn Croatia.

of Bela IV, their support for the King during the Tartar episode, and the presence of the Hungarians at the Archbishop's throne. All this was possible as the first four decades of the 13th century were the best and the most shining period of the Arpadian House. Granted, political situation was not ideal, Andrew was a flamboyant knight rather than a wise bureaucrat, but in terms of economy and culture, the Lands of the Crown of St. Stephen were well in their way to become a major European player. Having two brothers, both capable politicians and soldiers, and also linked by the sense of true brotherly love and cooperation, this certainly was a major asset ¹⁸. The cultural upsurge had begun in the second half of the 12th century, in the time of Bela III and the Archbishop Hiob/Job when a great building site of Esztergom Cathedral became the polygon for creating and spreading the art of the Court workshops throughout the Kingdom ¹⁹. After the conflict between Emeric and Andrew, this cultural upsurge resumes under the patronage of Andrew II, Bela IV and Herceg Coloman. Even the spendthrift Andrew is to be credited with supporting the creativity of the Cistercians of Topusko where the French Gothic appears via Pannonhalma in the first quarter of the 13th century, building upon a few decades earlier support of the royal house to the Templars of Gora building their wonderful and wonderfully French Early Gothic church. Bela and Coloman made Southern Pannonia a highly civilized and well administered royal land, a bulwark of Christianity, a dam against the heretical threat from the Balkans, with a dozen King's Free Boroughs moving the wheels of economic boom. An incredible success of integration through decentralization. The upsurge was also partly due to the immigration into the rural areas of Pannonian basin of the people from the European Northwest who also impacted the area in a cultural sense, primarily by bringing the forms of all over the European rural Romanesque and village typology ²⁰. Andrew II was also obsessed with Galicia (Halič), as he kept on winning and losing the lands behind the Carpathians ²¹. Before becoming Herceg, Coloman was from 1214 to 1219 as a child imposed as the administrator of Galicia, to be finally crowned its king ²². Even as Halič was lost, Coloman remained a crowned King to whom Pope himself had sent the crown, even when the administrator became

¹⁸ Engel, *ibid.*, 91–93.

¹⁹ Goss, „The Battle of Cathedrals...,” 146; Marosi, Ernő. *Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó; 1984, 78-89. Bela III was the father of Andrew II.

²⁰ Dujmović and Jukić, *ibid.*, 171-182.

²¹ Engel, *ibid.*, 54. Galicia (Halič), i.e. eastern Slovakia and western Ukraine were already conquered by Bela III. It remained an area of keen interest of the Hungarian Crown for many years to come. With dubious success, though, which was reflected in the life story of Herceg Coloman.

²² Engel, *ibid.*, 90.

Coloman's younger brother, Andrew²³. This happened at the time when Coloman became Herceg of and de facto ruler of Continental Croatia and Dalmatia²⁴, and when with the support of Bishop Stephen, he embarked upon the reforms already mentioned above, bringing Continental Croatia into the focus of the policies of the realm²⁵.

Coloman proved to be a strong support for his brother, King Bela IV on several fronts. His policy of supporting King's Free Borough and the "Saxon" immigrants had a powerful economic impact, as well as serving as a counterpoise to the restless nobility²⁶. Next, he intervened in Bosnia combating heresy, and protected the Slavonian parts of Pécs Bishopric from heretical danger.

Many of those activities could be linked to the founding and developing of the new Coloman's capital – Čazma. Čazma was founded around 1230 by Herceg Coloman at the place of an earlier, not well-known settlement²⁷. Herceg Coloman chose it as his capital while Bishop Stephen, issued privileges to the Cathedral Chapter of Čazma in 1232²⁸. As already noted, the new building was impressive – several churches, palaces of the Herceg and the Bishop, the fortress, the Chapter seat, the homes of the Canons²⁹. All this made Čazma the center of the new prosperity of the *Pannonia Savia*. The moving of the Archbishopric from Split to Zagreb would have only enhanced Čazma's position³⁰.

However, there are unsolved issues concerning that move. For example,

Herceg Coloman was apparently ready to abdicate and turn over the entire power, secular and religious to the Bishop³¹. Bishop Stephen was certainly a fine secular administrator, too, but Herceg's alleged offer may be understood only in the light of his possible hopes to regain his rule over

²³ Engel, *ibid.*, 90. Andrew of Halič was the youngest son of Andrew II thus a younger brother of Bela IV and Coloman. He died in 1234.

²⁴ Engel, *ibid.*, 90, 96.

²⁵ Goss, „Bishop Stephen II and Herceg Koloman...”, 211-223; Dujmović and Jukić, *ibid.*, 171-182.

²⁶ Goss, „Renesansa 12. stoljeća i Hrvatska,” 417-426; Dujmović and Jukić, *ibid.*, 171-182. This process took place mostly in the 12th ct., but in Northern Croatia it extended into the 13th ct.

²⁷ Goss, „Bishop Stephen II and Herceg Koloman...”, 211-223; Dujmović and Jukić, *ibid.*, 171.

²⁸ Smičiklas, Tadija (ed). *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae Vol. III*. Zagreb: HAZU, 1905., 369-374 (Document 324).

²⁹ Goss, „The Battle of Cathedrals...”, 146-154; Goss, „Renesansa 12. stoljeća i Hrvatska,” 421-423; Dujmović and Jukić, *ibid.*, 171-182.

³⁰ Basić, *ibid.*, 25-43. Basić has provided a detailed description of the Bishop's career and the events that preceded the nomination.

³¹ Basić, *ibid.*, 33; Goss, „The Battle of Cathedrals...”, 146-154; Dujmović and Jukić, *ibid.*, 171-182.

Galicja, exchanging his title of Herceg by the title of other *de facto* and *de iure* king. Was Coloman a sort of an "expert for rim lands" who, having pacified one, now moves to another?

The Tatar invasion of 1241-42 put a stop to all planning. Herceg Coloman was wounded in the battle of Muhi near the Sajó River and died in Čazma a few months later. He was buried probably in the Dominican church at Čazma, under a red marble tomb stone, stolen and broken up in the 1860s by a group of local "Croatian patriots" and finally built into the walls of sacristy and rectory³². This is the way in which the country repaid one of the best rulers it ever had!

Also, Pope Gregory IX, who had authorized the moving of the bishopric, died in August 1241, followed by a 17 day papacy of Celestine IV, and a 22 month period of interregnum, until Innocence IV became pope in 1243 and finally revoked his predecessor's decision about uniting Split and Zagreb into one Archbishopric³³.

The death of Herceg Coloman meant the end of the positive trends in the administrative and political field, although Bishop Stephen until his death in 1247, continued as an active patron of arts and culture.

The post-Tatar years were ones of stagnation and slow recovery. The fears of possible Tartar return forced militarization of the land, accompanied by a building boom in the area of fortification. And fortifications do not need sculptural embellishment! One positive aspect was that Bela IV was forced to recognize many "old rights" of those who allegedly saved the country. Those post-Tartar charters are a mine of information on the cultural landscape of Croatia in the 13th century³⁴.

In spite of the collapse of the grandiose plans of Herceg Coloman and Bishop Stephen, what had been done in Zagreb and Čazma before the Tartars did not disappear. There are several places where architecture and sculpture exist as an attractive document of a highly sophisticated culture enhanced by the presence of very capable royal workshops, including top artists in sculpture and architectural decor. Thus the entire period until the death of Stephen II can be seen as one of the brightest and most active in arts and culture in the Croatian Middle Ages.

Three most important sites are Zagreb, Medvedgrad and Čazma where some traces of royal workshops can be found. In addition to their high

³² Cepetić, Maja. *Biskupski posjedi Dubrava, Ivanić i Čazma u 12. i 13. stoljeću: teritorijalna organizacija, naselja i spomenici*. (PhD Thesis). Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2015., 308-310.

³³ Basić, *ibid.*, 25-43; Goss, „Bishop Stephen II and Herceg Koloman...”, 51-63; Dujmović and Jukić, *ibid.*, 177.

³⁴ Smičiklas, Tadija (ed). *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae Vol. IV*. Zagreb: HAZU, 1906., 172-176 (Document No. 155). Among other places the King in Virovitica granted royal freedom to Zagreb.

class art, there is a number of secondary sites which still need much exploration. The attempts are marred by the fragmentary state of the monuments but what has been recognized in Novo Mesto Zelinsko, Sveti Ivan Zelina or Vinica, as fragmentary as it recalls force and quality which makes us regret that we have just a tiny portion of a considerable artistic output. It should also be highlighted the fortune of Zagreb which seemed to have lost out to Čazma, but in fact rallied and dominated a wide area in terms of arts and culture, and could afford, in the lean post Tartar years to replace the ruins of the large Romanesque Cathedral with a high quality Gothic building. As the rest of Herceg Colomans efforts, Čazma seeks to fall within the area of great dreams which depended for their realization on the dreamer himself.

So, one can conclude that art can be seen as a documentary of those political times. Especially regarding the preserved art from Zagreb, Medvedgrad and Čazma. The most important project in the medieval Continental Croatia was certainly Zagreb Cathedral. The most important, but also until the second half of the 13th century, the most mysterious one. We know next to nothing about its history in the 12th century. The things are no better for the first decades of the 13th. The Romanesque cathedral was consecrated in 1217, and seriously damaged, if not totally destroyed in 1242.

From the pre-Tartar cathedral, we have only four sculptural fragments, and for some of them the provenance is not absolutely certain. Out of the four fragments, one is vegetal, one is so damaged that one cannot tell if it bore figural elements, and two are figural. Two of the fragments are in the Museum of Croatian History – a pilaster with palm leaf decoration, and a capital with birds at the corners. The other two fragments are kept in the Dioceses Museum - a relief of St. Paul, and a rather damaged capital. The dating and provenance of the three of the fragments is not certain³⁵.

The fragment of the pilaster from the Museum of Croatian History was published by Josip Brunšmid in 1912, but he failed to note where it came from to the then National Museum³⁶. After Brunšmida, the pilaster was considered as possibly from Zagreb, according to Mirko Valentić, but he did not date it. It was included into the Catalogue of the exhibition *Stotinu kamenčića izgubljenog raja* and a book by Vladimir P. Goss as possibly

³⁵ Deanović, Ana et al. *Zagrebačka katedrala*. Zagreb: Globus and Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1988., 21; Goss, Vladimir P. (ed.). *Stotinu kamenčića izgubljenog raja*. Zagreb: Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2007., 109. According to existing literature the capital from the Diocesan Museum is definitely from the old cathedral.

³⁶ Brunšmid, Josip. „Kameni spomenici Hrvatskog narodnog muzeja u Zagrebu, part II.“ *VHAD N. S. 12* (1912): 127–197., 153–154. The sculpture was at first in the National Museum and later in the Museum of Croatian History.

from the pre-Tartar cathedral³⁷. The capital with the birds in the Museum of Croatian History was also listed as probably from the Cathedral³⁸. As it was never mentioned by Brunšmid, one may cautiously suggest that it arrived at the National Museum after 1912, although in literature, it is known as the capital donated by Ferdinand Kulmer in 1911. As Count Kulmer was the owner of Medvedgrad and Šestine, it was assumed that the capital came from Medvedgrad fortress³⁹. Doubts about it were already expressed by Drago Miletić, whereas in the Catalogue of the *Sveti trag* (The Holy Trace) it was listed as from Medvedgrad, but it was also stated that it may not be from the fort⁴⁰. This was accepted by Mirko Valentić and Lada Prister, while the Hungarian scholar Tibor Rostás was the first to indicate that the capital may have belonged to the Cathedral⁴¹. The provenance of St. Paul is pretty much certain, though. The relief was already created in the 19th century and linked to the altar of Saints Peter and Paul, dedicated by Bishop Timotej (Timotheus) in 1275⁴². The figure was exposed to weather in the Archbishop's garden and it is barely legible.

Also, various dates have been assigned to the fragments: the capital and the fragment from the Museum of Croatian History have been dated to the 12th century, St. Paul to the early 13th century, and a capital in the Diocese Museum of which we have already spoken on the 11th or the 12th century⁴³.

³⁷ Valentić, Mirko, *Kameni spomenici Hrvatske 13. – 19. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Povijesni muzej Hrvatske, 1969), 79; Goss (ed.), *ibid.*, 101 (the Catalogue entry by Lada Prister); Goss, Vladimir P. *Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti 800. – 1200., pogled s jugoistoka*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga, 2010., 191.

³⁸ Marosi, Ernő. *Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó; 1984, 302; Goss (ed.), *ibid.*, 103, Goss, *Četiri stoljeća...*, 190.

³⁹ Lukšić, Tugomir and Reberski, Ivanka (ed.). *Sveti trag: devetsto godina umjetnosti zagrebačke nadbiskupije*. Zagreb: Muzejsko-galerijski centar : Institut za povijest umjetnosti : Zagrebačka nadbiskupija, 1994., 165. Anđela Horvat has also listed the capital as from Medvedgrad.

⁴⁰ Miletić, Drago and Valjato-Fabris, Marina. *Kapela Sv. Filipa i Jakova na Medvedgradu*. Zagreb: [s. n.], 1987., 22-25; Lukšić and Reberski, *ibid.*, 165.

⁴¹ Valentić, Mirko and Prister, Lada. *Zbirka kamenih spomenika*. Zagreb: Hrvatski povijesni muzej, 2002., 48.

⁴² Tkalić, Ivan Krstitelj. *Prvostolna crkva zagrebačka: nekoč i sada*. Zagreb: Knjigotiskara Karla Albrechta, 1885., 10. It was also discussed by Kocijanić, Juraj. *Zagrebačka katedrala (handwriting)*. Zagreb, 1946., 20; Dobronić, Lelja. *Biskupski i kaptolski Zagreb*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1991., 24.

⁴³ Goss (ed.), *ibid.*, 101, 103, 108 and 109; Goss, *Četiri stoljeća...*, 191. The late 12th century date was proposed by Lada Prister in a Catalogue entry. Vladimir P. Goss has dated it to around 1200 which is quite probable. The capital from the Diocesan Museum was discovered in the foundations of the pre-Tartar cathedral. Hence the early dating.

But, the most important piece of art is the capital with the birds and possible a sheep (Fig. 1). Although that theme is quite frequent in Romanesque art, and despite considerable damage, one can establish the date on the basis of a fairly precise datable comparative material, as for all practical purposes, an identical capital was built into one of the walls of a chamber in the royal castle at Esztergom⁴⁴. This "twin", as Vladimir P. Goss called it⁴⁵, is better preserved and many details, such as the twisted columns in the middle and the animal heads with *garlands* at the corners are clearly legible and analogous to those in Zagreb⁴⁶.



Fig. 1

⁴⁴ Marosi, Ernő. *Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984., 302; Goss, Vladimir P. and Jukić, Vjekoslav. „Medvedgrad – Ócsa – Spiš, Some Stylistic Consideration.“ *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/34 (2007): 295-308., 296; Goss, Vladimir P. *Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti 800. – 1200., pogled s jugoistoka*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga, 2010., 190. The capital is *in situ* and only two animal heads are visible but it is almost identical to the one from Zagreb.

⁴⁵ Goss, *Četiri stoljeća...*, 190-191.

⁴⁶ The capital have a good analogy at Óbuda too, and their stylistic sources are Italian: Modena and southern Italy. For this please see Tóth, Sándor: *Román kori kőfaragványok a Magyar Nemzeti Galéria Régi Magyar Gyűjteményében*. Budapest, 2010. pag. 42-43 and Raffay, Endre: *Esztergom, Vértesszentkereszt*. Újvidék, 2006.

Now we can recognize the same careful carving of Zagreb capital, we can follow the lines on the leaves as well as the eyes and the nostrils of animals. One must underline that both "twins" are very high quality pieces, harmonious products of a royal workshop.

Moreover, there are analogies with a number of vegetal capitals from Esztergom sharing details with the twins, and obvious products of the same workshop, as well as similarities with some other sites, e.g. the vegetal capitals from Pilisszentkereszt. Given the dating of the Hungarian examples, but also the documentary data, all those works, including the capital from Zagreb could be dated around 1200, which is also the date mentioned by recent literature on the topic ⁴⁷. A capital from Óbuda should be added to the group ⁴⁸.

All those examples make a stylistic definition of Zagreb, in spite of possible damages. The rest of the group is a fine work of late Romanesque/early Gothic art as practiced in the Royal Domain and by the workshops connected to it throughout the Kingdom, an art in which the tendency towards firm structure and decorative effect of the Romanesque is joined with the new tendencies towards an incipient realism of the Early Gothic. And what is most important, his twin brother makes him not just the remains of the medieval cathedral, but also a document of importance for the Hungarian Court of Northwestern Croatia.

Medvedgrad was another key project of Herceg Coloman in *Pannonia Savia*. It is a castle on top of a steep hill on the southern flank of the Medvednica (Zagreb) Mountain. The hill, called Mali Plazur is 593 meter high. The plan of the fortress is irregular and it stretches with a slight deviation from North to South. It consists of two parts surrounded by walls. The northern section consists of a powerful keep, of which only the lowermost section has been preserved and of the Chapel of Saints Philip and Jacob and the palace, both restored in the 1980s. The southern part consists of another powerful tower raised to almost its original height during the restoration. The two parts are obviously separated, but they are surrounded by one single system of walls.

For many years, it was believed that Medvedgrad was built after the Tartar invasion, Nada Klaić being the only dissenting voice. Nowadays, after careful re-reading and interpretation of relevant documents, the stylistic analysis of its architecture and sculpture primarily in relation to another Coloman's project of the same time, the alterations at the Spišsky Hrad in Slovakia, and historical parallels between the two Coloman's castles, it is clear that the northern section with the keep, the chapel and the palace has its

⁴⁷ Goss, *Četiri stoljeća...*, 190–191.

⁴⁸ Takács, Imre (ed). *Pannonia Regia*. Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, 1994, 110.

origins before the Tartar invasion, probably from the fourth decade of the 13th century parallel to or slightly postdating Čazma⁴⁹.

The southern keep, useless as a part of the Medvedgrad fortifications as it stands at the spot where no attack is possible, was constructed as a refuge for the Bishops of Zagreb in case of another catastrophe, in the same way the tower was built at Spišsky Hrad to protect the Provost of Spišska Kapitula⁵⁰. Kukuljević was the first to propose a later date and he was followed by the majority of investigators⁵¹ and all of it was based on a document, a letter by Pope Innocent IV from 1252 confirming Bela IV's donation of Medvedgrad to Bishop Filip (Philip)⁵². This was accepted by Tkalčić and by most investigators down to Drago Miletić and Marija Valjato-Fabris, the able investigators and restorers of Medvedgrad⁵³.

Nada Klaić objected to such contentions pointing out, correctly, that the document in question stated that Medvedgrad was once a royal castle to become later known as the Bishop's castle⁵⁴. The fact that Bishop was allowed to build a tower at Medvedgrad in no ways indicates that Medvedgrad did not exist earlier.

Medvedgrad was also dealt with by Vladimir Bedenko who, in his article *Mons Gradyz iusta Zagrabiāmi*, has concluded that Medvedgrad has existed before Bishop Filip and that the southern tower was built after the Tartar invasion on the "wrong side" whereas the real fortification element

⁴⁹ Goss and Jukić, *ibid.*, 295–308.

⁵⁰ Smičiklas, Tadija (ed). *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae Vol. IV*. Zagreb: HAZU, 1906, 481; Smičiklas, Tadija (ed). *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae Vol. VI*. Zagreb: HAZU, 1908, 52; Goss and Jukić, *ibid.*, 295–308.

⁵¹ Tkalčić, Ivan Krstitelj. *Povjestni spomenici slob. kralj. grada Zagreba prijestolnice kraljevine Dalmatinsko-Hrvatsko-Slavonske, vol I*. Zagreb: Knjigotiskara Karla Albrechta, 1889, 183. Already Baltazar Krčelić questioned whether the donation was meant for Medvedgrad: Krčelić, Krčelić, Baltazar Adam. *Historiarum cathedralis ecclesiae Zagrabiensis*. Zagreb: Institut za suvremenu povijest, 1994, *passim*.

⁵² Klaić, Nada. *Medvedgrad i njegovi gospodari*. Zagreb: Globus, 1987., 29-36. Ms. Klaić has pointed out that the confusion about the date of Medvedgrad is due to Kukuljević. Still, she at first accepted his dating to correct it, as she says "in later works."

⁵³ Miletić, Drago and Valjato-Fabris, Marina. *Kapela Sv. Filipa i Jakova na Medvedgradu*. Zagreb: [s. n.], 1987., 54.

⁵⁴ Smičiklas, Tadija (ed). *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae Vol. IV*. Zagreb: HAZU, 1906., 481; Klaić, *ibid.*, 32. Although the argument of the work is not quite clear; it is evident that the situation concerning the building of Medvedgrad was not as simple as Kukuljević had proposed.

was the northern tower built before the Tartars⁵⁵. This defense tower has never been thoroughly explored. Stylistic consideration supporting the pre-Tartar date rely upon the comparisons with Ócsa and Spiš⁵⁶.

The sculpture material at Medvedgrad shows analogies with Čazma, but also with a number of important sites within central Pannonia, in particular Ócsa, and Spišsky Hrad. All those works indicate that basically the same Early Gothic workshop operated on all those sites which were all important to the Royal house.

Bishop Filip has to be credited with the southern keep to be used as a refuge in case of renewed trouble. In the same way, the Provost of Spišska Kapitula, top local churchman was granted a piece of land within the Spišsky Hrad to build himself a tower to retreat to in case of a repeated invasion.

The key preserved monument at Medvedgrad attributable to Herceg Coloman is the Chapel of Saints Philip and Jacob where investigations and restoration were initiated in 1981. The beautifully restored chapel is octagonal with a polygonal sanctuary. It was built from brick, but the details of the portal, window frames and corners are made of stone. Each corner of the interior is flanked by a column carrying a capital. Those support ribs abutting the key stone which is unfortunately missing. The capitals are vegetal, but there are also four figural capitals, three original, one restored. Next to the entrance door, there are two atlas figures supporting the impost blocks and the ribs, and in the sanctuary, two capitals behind the altar turn into lion heads biting the top of the column. Above the entrance way, there was once a semicircular lunette which has never been recovered, so it was replaced by a simple piece of undecorated stone.

Another building within Medvedgrad that was investigated and restored is the *palas*, a rectangular two story structure decorated by architectural sculpture and vegetal capitals mostly belonging to the biforae, some still *in situ*, some placed back onto the facade after the restoration, while some fragments are kept at the Croatian Restoration Institute in Zagreb⁵⁷. The capitals bear rose buds at the corners and are a fine examples of incipient Gothic.

⁵⁵ Bedenko, Vladimir, "Mons Gradyz iuxta Zagrabiam." *Historijski zbornik* 44 (1991): 3–17.; Goss, Vladimir P. and Jukić, Vjekoslav, "Medvedgrad – Ócsa – Spiš, Some Stylistic Consideration." *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/34 (2007): 295-308, 302.

⁵⁶ Goss and Jukić, *ibid.*, 295-308.

⁵⁷ Goss, Vladimir P. (ed.). *Stotinu kamenčića izgubljenog raja*. Zagreb: Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2007., 106 – 107. Five fragments from Medvedgrad ended up in the Croatian Restoration Institute, and were shown in the exhibition the *Stotinu kamenčića izgubljenog raja*.

In addition to the atlantes and the column biting lions, there were probably figured elements on the key stone and the lunette ⁵⁸.

The figures of the atlantes were made by a skillful sculptor ⁵⁹. (Fig. 2) They are voluminous but not aggressively so, firmly handled and with an interest in detail (e.g., the beard and hair). There are numerous analogies throughout Europe, and within the lands of the Crown of St. Stephen, although the motif is not too frequent there ⁶⁰. One can quote examples from Bény (today Bina, Slovakia), Kalocsa and Arača ⁶¹.

⁵⁸ Goss, Vladimir P. *Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti 800. – 1200., pogled s jugoistoka*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga, 2010., 214.

⁵⁹ Today, only northern is original, while southern is copy.

⁶⁰ Goss, Vladimir P. *Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti 800. – 1200., pogled s jugoistoka*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga, 2010., 214. Examples can be seen at Arača, Kalocsa, and Bény, and brackets with heads carrying the load at Esztergom and Jánoshida.

⁶¹ Marosi, Ernő. *Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó; 1984., 355. More recent about Aracs (Serbia): Raffay, Endre: *Az aracsi templomrom*. Újvidék, 2005, Forum.



Fig. 2

However, in all these examples the figures are elongated supporting imposts with extended upright arms (Kalocsa), or by arms and the head (Arača). There are also abbreviated version consisting of just a head with upright arms holding the abacus in Esztergom and Arača⁶². Just one bracket-head from Arača recalls more closely, by the closed form of the rounded head and a fattish body, the Medvedgrad atlantes⁶³. This need not come as a surprise as Arača was not a Benedictine abbey church as it was once believed, but a church of a not negligible and fortified urban settlement which can also be associated with the activities of Herceg Coloman, and it

⁶² Marosi, *ibid.*, 335; Stanojev, Nebojša. *Arača – crkve, nekropola, manastir*. Novi Sad: Muzej Vojvodine, 2004., 28-29.

⁶³ Stanojev, *ibid.*, 30. The example from Arača is *in situ* but it is too damaged to be used for a stylistic analysis.

may have shared some of its artists with Medvedgrad⁶⁴. All this may indicate they were made by the royal workshops but one must not miss that the Medvedgrad atlantes bear in fact more likeness to the Mediterranean type where the atlantes are a stock form, in particular in Apulia and in the monuments associated with the art of the court of Frederick II. This may indicate a Dalmatian connection, or, at least awareness of the Imperial art of the *Mezzogiorno* (the southern part of Italy) and Germany. To the same circle may belong also the truly fascinating representation of the column eating lions, quite unique in the Pannonian basin⁶⁵.

The fine dynamics of the form, discretely bulging and subtly rounded surface creating a sophisticated interplay of light and shadow reverberating also among the rich detail of the face and the locks clearly shows that their master had little to do with the master of the atlantes, albeit they may both belong to the Imperial circle⁶⁶.

The sculptural decor of the Medvedgrad chapel stands out among the achievements of the transitional style in the Pannonian basin. One should, therefore, also look into its message. The atlantes are a frequently used motif in the Romanesque sculpture, stemming from the antique tradition. They appear on the capitals, but also as supporting elements of Romanesque portals, representing, for example, exotic figures of Moorish slaves suffering the burden of their error. As such, they are frequent in Northern Italy, especially Emilia where their suffering under the burden of the building is often also expressed through appropriate inscriptions; or of prophets of the Old Testament forming the fundaments of the New⁶⁷.

⁶⁴ Stanojev, *ibid.*, 5-33; Stanojev, Jermina (ed). *Monatur [MOHATVP]*. Novi Sad: Muzej Vojvodine, 2013., 117-138. This information communicated to me by the author was confirmed by excavations that followed, i.e., that the traces of a 15th ct. monastery were found to the North of the church whereas the church itself was built in the first half of the 13th ct. The sculpture preserved *in situ* is close to Medvedgrad but also to Ócsa, Spiš, Gora, etc. This also meant that the church was not originally linked to a Benedictine abbey, and I would carefully venture to say that it may have been the cathedral of the Sirmium Bihopric, founded along with the Bosnian and Cuman Bishoprics at the beginning of the 13th ct. as a protection against heretics.

⁶⁵ Goss, Vladimir P and Vicolja Matijašić, Marina. „Some Observations on the Chapel at Medvedgrad.“ *Starohrvatska prosvijeta* III/33 (2006): 165-185., 165-185.

⁶⁶ Goss and Vicolja Matijašić, *ibid.*, 167.

⁶⁷ Evans, Edward Payson, *Animal Symbolism in Ecclesiastical Architecture*. London: W. Heinemann, 1896., *passim*; Wood Rendell, Alan. *Physiologus a Metrical Bestiary of Twelve Chapters by Bishop Theobald* (translation). London: John and Edward Bumpus, 1928, *passim*; Ghislerberti, Carla. „I legami culturali e stilistici tra la scultura architettonica federiciana dell'Italia meridionale e il mondo cistercense.“ In *Intellectual Life at the Court of Frederick II Hohenstaufen*, edited by William Tronzo, 41-62. Washington: NGW-Stud Hist Art, 1994, 41-62; Porter, Artur K.

The motif of the column eating lion appears not infrequently in the sculpture of England, France, and Spain ⁶⁸ (Fig. 3). As already mentioned in literature, the source of this motif (the wider motif of the *engoulant* can be found in two different traditions: the Roman decorative head and the grotesque masks produced in manuscript illumination (especially in Anglo-Saxons manuscripts) ⁶⁹. Yet, in the sculpture of the Pannonian basin, only one more example could be found - a rather awkward representation from Somogyvár⁷⁰.

Although lions sometimes represent good and virtue, in this type of representation, as a voracious creature, the lion is rather a symbol of devil. That motif could be indirectly also found in the famous *Porta Speciosa* from Esztergom. Although, they are partially destroyed, they are present on the paintings from the 18th centuries ⁷¹. Among many interesting motifs and inscriptions, St Peter holds an inscription where devil and lion are mentioned⁷². Consequently, when the lion is shown as a roaring beast, he has negative connotations, while atlantes could be understood as personification of the prophets.

Lombard Architecture, vol. 4. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1967, *passim*; Goss and Vicelja Matijašić, *ibid.*, 170.

⁶⁸For example Mariani, Maria Stella Caló, *L'arte del duecento in Puglia*. Torino: Istituto Bancario San Paolo di Torino, 1984, 64-135; Goss and Vicelja Matijašić, *ibid.*, 169; Kahn, Deborah. "The Engoulant: Development, Symbolic Meaning and Wit." In *Ex quadris lapidibus. La pierre et sa mise en oeuvre dans l'art medieval*, edited by Yves Gallet, 313-322, Turnhout: Brepols, cop. 2011, 313-322.

⁶⁹ Goss and Vicelja Matijašić, *ibid.*, 169; Kahn, *ibid.*, 313. Professor Khan wrote study exactly about this topic. Ms. Vicelja has also helped me here for which I remain truly grateful.

⁷⁰ Takács, Imre (ed), *Paradisum plantavit: Bencés monostorok a középkori Magyarországon/ Benedictine monasteries in medieval Hungary/*. Pannonhalma: Pannonhalmi Bencés Főapátság, 2001 423. Today in Rippl-Rónai Museum in Kaposvár.

⁷¹ Ragusa, Isa, "Porta patet vitae sponsus vocat intro venite and the Inscriptions of the Lost Portal of the Cathedral of Esztergom" *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 43 Bd., H. 4 (1980): 345-351, 346; Takács, Imre (ed). *Pannonia Regia*. Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, 1994, 161.

⁷² Marosi, Ernő, *Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó; 1984, 81; Goss, Vladimir P and Vicelja Matijašić, Marina, "Some Observations on the Chapel at Medvedgrad" *Starohrvatska prosvijeta* III/33 (2006): 165-185, 171. It ruos: "K(arissi)MI VIGILATE I(n)OR(ation)O(n)IBUS Q(ui)A ADV(er)SARIUS V(este)R DIABOL(u)S TA(m)Q(uam) LEO RUGIE(n)S C(ir)CUIT QUERENSQ(ue)m DEUORET.



Fig. 3

To conclude, as already pointed out in literature, atlantes and column eating lions together refer to the Last Day – lions at the apse referring to sin, and the atlantes, at the exit, “...in a noble function of expiating the sins by supporting by the labors of their hands the ‘dome of Heaven’ above”⁷³.

Yet, there is another and a rather surprising analogy. The sophisticated modulation and the dynamic and active line working hand in hand with the taut volume of curving surfaces, as well as the finely etched in detail cannot but recall the drawings of Villard de Honnecourt, who probably visited the Lands of the Crown of St. Stephen⁷⁴.

⁷³ Goss and Vicelja Matijašić, *ibid.*, 171.

⁷⁴ Takács, Imre, “The French Connection – On the Courtenay Family and Villard de Honnecourt a propos of the 13th century Incised Slab from Pilis Abbey” in *Künstlerische Wechselwirkungen in Mitteleuropa*, edited by Jiří Fajt and Markus Hörsch, 11-26. Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2006, 11-26; Goss and Vicelja Matijašić, *ibid.*, 167; Goss, Vladimir P. *Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti 800 – 1200, pogled s*

The Mediterranean-Imperial connection of Medvedgrad and the Colomanian mini-Renaissance needs to be pursued in some more depth. As it is shown, some connections could be found even in manuscript illumination and other forms of minor art. This is especially important when so little direct comparison could be found. But one should not neglect comparative materials, especially in terms of architectural decor at closer quarters. First of all there are moldings of architectural elements in Čazma, but the forms of the Medvedgrad capitals with their à crochet elements are foreshadowed by the beautiful „French“ forms of the capitals of the Templar church at Gora from ca. 1200⁷⁵. Ócsa, some 20 kilometers to the south east of Budapest features a late Romanesque church (ca. 1200-1220) with strongly mixed in Gothic forms of architecture, not yet systematically presented in the Hungarian scholarship. It has retained two well-preserved late Romanesque portals which recall certain works from the Spiš region, but also from Medvedgrad. Although it is a question of vegetal forms – and formulas – encountered rather frequently, the analogies are in some cases so close that they cannot be overlooked. Moreover, let us recall that we have demonstrated above the involvement of Herceg Coloman with both Medvedgrad and Spišsky Hrad. Let us not forget that the Herceg started his career in Spiš, and terminated it in Slavonia, never completely losing touch with Spiš and Galicia⁷⁶.

Medvedgrad, first of all its Chapel, and to a lesser extent not so well preserved palas are the apogee, and not at all a mean one, of the art of that wonderful style of the Pannonian Plain between ca. 1170 and 1250, the art of Bela III, and Archbishop Hiob, of Andrew II and the first “French connection”⁷⁷ of Bela IV, Herceg Coloman and Bishop Stephen II; an art not any more Romanesque and not yet fully Gothic, but always strikingly fresh and original, an idiom in which the domestic and the foreign blend in such a way that they are indeed difficult to disentangle. A wonderful example of what Barral i Altet called “the Third Romanesque Art” which he in particular recognized in the Imperial lands but also noticed in the Pannonian plain⁷⁸.

Finally, maybe most important ”document“ can be found in Čazma. One has already emphasized the importance of Čazma as a new city founded

jugoistoka. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga, 2010, 215. Villard de Honnecourt's activities in Hungary were recently dealt with by Imre Takács.

⁷⁵ Gora has been dealt with in this study but this is an earlier phase. The later church shows some analogies with Medvedgrad. It is being reconstructed after the damage during the Liberation War. The high quality sculpture is exclusively vegetal so it is not taken into consideration here.

⁷⁶ Goss, Vladimir P. and Jukić, Vjekoslav, “Medvedgrad – Ócsa – Spiš, Some Stylistic Considerations“ *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/34 (2007): 295-308.

⁷⁷ Takács, *ibid.* 11-26.

⁷⁸ Barral I Altet, Xavier, *Protiv romanike? Esej o pronađenoj prošlosti*, Zagreb: IPU, 2009, 261-268.

and developed by Herceg Coloman and Bishop Stephen II, its role as a new administrative, political and religious center of Pannonia Savia and of the new political entity planned by the Herceg and the Bishop. Čazma's importance must not be overlooked, but neither overstressed. It would certainly function as the capital of Coloman's kingdom had it ever really come into being, it would be a co-cathedral city to Zagreb, but it could not match Zagreb's role in economy, commerce and local politics (the seat of the Slavonian Sabor). Its role recalls that of Washington, Pretoria, Canberra and Brasilia in much later times. It provided, as we have already seen much room for new art commissions. But of all that we have listed, what in Čazma remains today is the church of St. Mary Magdalene, reasonably well explored representative building of the transitional style attached most probably to the Dominican monastery traces which have been located (and destroyed) in the south of the church, the remains of the fortress are still in the process of investigation, and a huge pile of mostly decorative sculpture from the 13th to the 16th century. But within all that treasure, we have just one very damaged fragment of figural sculpture! And at least records of the already mentioned tomb plaque of Herceg Coloman have apparently been lost forever ⁷⁹.

The preserved decorative sculpture of St. Mary Magdalene, still to be completely sorted out and studied and including a monumental western rose window and a somewhat smaller one on the eastern presbytery wall, confirms the high, royal origins of the workshop. The same is true of an unusual plan, an aisled church with a transept, rectangular presbytery and a westwork flanked by two recessed towers, not unlike the Cathedral at Esztergom a smaller and unfinished copy of which it appears to have been ⁸⁰. Toma Arhidakon (Thomas Archidiaconus) mentioned it as Dominican and the place of Herceg Coloman's burial ⁸¹. We know that the Coloman's tomb plaque was

⁷⁹ Kukuljević-Sakcinski, Ivan, *Nadpisi sredovječni i novovjekni*. Zagreb, 1891, 102; Stošić, Josip, "Crkva sv. Marije Magdalene u Čazmi" in *Čazma u prošlom mileniju*, edited by Josip Pandurić and Nino Škrabe, 69-72. Zagreb: Disput, 2001, 69-72; Štrk, Vjekoslav, "Povijesna kronologija Čazme (1094-1606)" in *Čazma u prošlom mileniju*, edited by Josip Pandurić and Nino Škrabe, 21-50, Zagreb: Disput, 2001, 21-50, Cepetić, Maja, *Biskupski posjedi Dubrava, Ivanić i Čazma u 12. i 13. stoljeću: teritorijalna organizacija, naselja i spomenici*, PhD Thesis, Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2015, 308-309. The disappearance of the panel was discussed in the introduction to this chapter.

⁸⁰ In addition to Čazma there are analogies to Medvedgrad, Ócsa, and Spišski hrad.

⁸¹ Rački, Franjo (ed) & Toma Arhidakon: *Historia Salonitana*. Zagreb: in taberna Libraria eiusdem societatis typographicae 1894., 83; Štrk, *ibid.*, 24; Štrk, Vjekoslav. "O problemu vremena i mjesta ukopa slavonskog Hercega Kolomana u Čazmi." *Rusan, časopis za književnost, kulturu i druga društvena zbivanja Matice hrvatske Bjelovarsko – bilogorske županije* 1-2 (2006): 101-106.; Stošić, *ibid.*, 69-72; Cepetić, *ibid.*, 308-309.

made of red marble, quarried near Esztergom and regularly used for Hungarian royal burials.

The only other figural fragment we have may be linked to the place of Coloman's tomb. It is a small, 20 cm tall fragment of a warrior's head, the only preserved section being the right side of its face ⁸² (Fig. 4).



Fig. 4

Only parts of an eye, of a cheek and of the helmet have been preserved. The back of the sculpture is not carved so one may assume that the fragment is a part of a relief. The ear protection of the helmet descends down the face. The helmet itself is half-round with a thicker ring at the edge. The face appears to have been elongated and curved, somewhat like a crescent. The mustache stems radially from the mouth. Between the mustache and the almond shaped eye slanting from the forehead to the nose one can see the cheek bone. Above

⁸² Štrk, "O problemu vremena i mjesta ukopa...", 101-106; Stošić, *ibid.*, 69-72; Cepetić, *ibid.*, 338.

the eye there is a trace of the ridge bone. In spite of (or because of?) the damage, one cannot but notice a certain oriental look.

A monument, recently reconstructed might help linking this head to Coloman's resting place. It is the tomb monument of Queen Gertrude, the first wife to Andrew II and Coloman's mother, who was killed in a rebellion of 1213, and buried at Pilisszentkereszt⁸³. It was destroyed by the Turks in 1526, excavated between 1967 and 1981, and eventually recently reconstructed by Imre Takács⁸⁴. The sarcophagus in red marble with the figure of the Queen was richly decorated by small figures along its sides. Could the head of a warrior now in the Museum in Čazma belong to a smaller figures carved along the tomb stone of the Herceg? Vjekoslav Štrk was the first to draw attention to the head of which only right side of the face has been preserved⁸⁵, but neither he nor anybody else has yet been able to provide a strong underpinning to the idea.

Another possible suggestion is that the little head may have been a part of the western portal. This one is also heavily damaged, the sides are totally gone, but the preserved upper part with the arches which once surrounded the lunette show that it was a monumental, rich and a high quality work. The white limestone the head was made of looks the same as that of the preserved sections of the portal. And, finally, the head was found in front of the western façade of the church⁸⁶.

Be it as it may, the fragment is a fine work of carving comparable, not just with already mentioned tomb monument of Queen Gertrude, but also with several other examples from Hungary such as at Pécsvárad, Zalavár,

⁸³ Marosi, Ernő, *Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó; 1984, 357; Takács, Imre (ed). *Pannonia Regia*. Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, 1994, 248-256; Engel, Pal. *Realm of St. Stephen: a History of Medieval Hungary*. London/New York: I. B. Tauris, 2001, 90-91.

⁸⁴ Takács (ed.), *ibid.*, 248-251.

⁸⁵ Štrk, Vjekoslav, "O novim nalazima sakralne arhitektonske plastike u Čazmi." *Muzejski vjesnik* 13 (1990): 24-29; Štrk, Vjekoslav. "Arheološka istraživanja povijesne urbane cjeline Čazme u 1993. godini." *Muzejski vjesnik* 16 (1993): 25-40.; Štrk, Vjekoslav. "Povijesna kronologija Čazme (1094–1606)." In *Čazma u prošlom mileniju*, edited by Josip Pandurić and Nino Škrabe, 21-50. Zagreb: Disput, 2001, 21-50; about the warrior head see Štrk, Vjekoslav. "O problemu vremena i mjesta ukopa slavonskog Hercega Kolomana u Čazmi." *Rusan, časopis za književnost, kulturu i druga društvena zbivanja Matice hrvatske Bjelovarsko – bilogorske županije* 1-2 (2006): 101-106; Goss, Vladimir P. (ed.). *Stotinu kamenčića izgubljenog raja*. Zagreb: Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2007, 56. Vjekoslav Štrk is the local archeologist in Čazma who for several decades has actively participated in local excavations. He has dealt with the head in a text concerning the burial of Herceg Koloman, and in the Catalogue of the exhibition *Stotinu kamenčića izgubljenog raja*, where he linked it to the presumed sarcophagus of the Herceg.

⁸⁶ Štrk, *ibid.*, 101-106.

Tata or Vértesszentkereszt. Some of them have already been mentioned in literature ⁸⁷.

Despite the heavy damage, the head of the warrior displays high quality execution. One can still admire the fineness of carving of the eye or the beard. The carving is simple yet fully functional. The face from Čazma indeed has oriental features (e.g. also Vértesszentkereszt or Pécsvárad), and it somewhat recalls the slanted, large almond shaped eyes at Zalavár ⁸⁸. The above quoted sites are somewhat earlier and together with Čazma reveal the type of a face that was elaborated in the Pannonian late Romanesque and the quality of its workshops.

In those terms one should not reject out of hand the suggestion made by Vjekoslav Štrk that the face was a part of the tomb of Herceg Coloman, although it could have also been a part of the main portal.

Another important, non-figural, piece is the monumental rose window (diameter 6,36 m) ⁸⁹ of the western facade of the church which seems to be comparable to the rose on the southern side of the western transept at Bamberg ⁹⁰. The connections of Hungary with Bamberg around the middle of the century are well documented, and a Bamberg workshop appears at Ják. Again, it seems that King Bela IV did not spare funds to embellish the mausoleum of his late brother ⁹¹. Also, there is large number of fragments belonging, apparently, to the capitals of the church, also of exceptional quality. Some of those show kinship with the sculpture of the chapel of Saints Phillip and Jacob at Medvedgrad to be discussed in a moment, and with some of the capitals of the Spišsky Hrad in Slovakia, another of Herceg Coloman's project ⁹².

⁸⁷ Goss (ed.), *ibid.*, 22.

⁸⁸ For Vértesszentkereszt see Takács, Imre (ed). *Pannonia Regia*. Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, 1994, 177; for Pécsvárad and for Zalavár see Takács, Imre (ed). *Paradisum plantavit: Bencés monostorok a középkori Magyarországon/ Benedictine monasteries in medieval Hungary/*. Pannonhalma: Pannonhalmi Bencés Főapátság, 2001, 449-450, 452.

⁸⁹ Cepetić, Maja. *Biskupski posjedi Dubrava, Ivanić i Čazma u 12. i 13. stoljeću: teritorijalna organizacija, naselja i spomenici*, PhD Thesis, Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2015, 303.

⁹⁰ Goss, Vladimir P. *Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti 800. – 1200., pogled s jugoistoka*. Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga, 2010., 212; Cepetić, Maja, and Goss, Vladimir P. „A Note on the Rose Window in Čazma and on the Presence of the Royal Workshops in Medieval Slavonia, “ *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/37 (2010): 179–187.

⁹¹ Goss, *ibid.*, 212; Cepetić and Goss, *ibid.*, 179-187. Presence of Bamberg masters has been confirmed for Ják between 1225 – 1250. The influence on Čazma need not be direct, but it is undeniable.

⁹² Goss, Vladimir P. and Jukić, Vjekoslav. „Medvedgrad – Ócsa – Spiš, Some Stylistic Consideration.“ *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/34 (2007): 295-308, 295–308.

In particular, in her thorough analysis of the church, Maja Cepetić has demonstrated the existence of two sub-phases of the building characterized by a brief interruption noticeable in architectural elements, but too brief to impact the decorative sculpture in the two “different” parts of the church. She has concluded that the break was due either to the Tartar invasion in the winter of 1241-1242, or to a change of workshops⁹³. All this indicates that Čazma in the thirties and the forties was served by a high quality workshop (workshops?), either royal, or at least close to the Hungarian court.

Consequently, instead of conclusions, one can point out that the presented traces of art can be seen as a document of glorious times of Northwestern Croatia in the Middle Ages. Although a wider context for those remains is missing, they strongly show not only the quality of sculpture, but also the importance of this part of Croatia for the Hungarian Court in first half of 13th century.

List of illustrations:

Fig. 1 Capital from Zagreb cathedral, Croatian Museum of History, photo by Vjekoslav Jukić

Fig. 2 Sculpture of Atlant from Medvedgrad, Archeological Museum in Zagreb, photo by Filip Beusan

Fig. 3 Column eating lion from Medvedgrad, Archeological Museum in Zagreb, photo by Filip Beusan

Fig. 4 warrior's head from Čazma, Archeological Museum in Zagreb, photo by Filip Beusan

All permission granted

Bibliography:

Andrić, Stanko, *Vinkovci u srednjem vijeku*. Slavonski Brod: Hrvatski institut za Povijest, Podružnica za povijest Slavonije, Srijema i Baranje, 2007.

Barral I Altet, Xavier, *Protiv romanike? Esej o pronađenoj prošlosti*, Zagreb: IPU, 2009.

Basić, Ivan, “O pokušaju ujedinjenja zagrebačke i splitske crkve u 13. stoljeću.” *Pro tempore* 3 (2006): 25–43.

Bedenko, Vladimir, “Mons Gradyz iuxta Zagrabiam”, *Historijski zbornik* 44 (1991): 3–17.

Brunšmid, Josip, “Kameni spomenici Hrvatskog narodnog muzeja u Zagrebu, part II”, *VHAD N. S. 12* (1912): 127–197.

⁹³ Cepetić, *ibid.*, 302.

- Budak, Neven**, "Zagrebački biskup Stjepan II, suvremenik Tome Arhiđakona" In *Toma Arhiđakon i njegovo doba*, edited by Mirjana Matijević-Sokol and Olga Perić, 153 – 158, Split: Književni krug, 2004.
- Cepetić, Maja**, *Biskupski posjedi Dubrava, Ivanić i Čazma u 12. i 13. stoljeću: teritorijalna organizacija, naselja i spomenici*, PhD Thesis, Zagreb: Filozofski fakultet, 2015.
- Cepetić, Maja**, and **Goss, Vladimir P.**, "A Note on the Rose Window in Čazma and on the Presence of the Royal Workshops in Medieval Slavonia", *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/37 (2010): 179–187.
- Deanović, Ana et al.**, *Zagrebačka katedrala*, Zagreb: Globus and Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1988.
- Dobronić, Lelja**, *Biskupski i kaptolski Zagreb*, Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1991.
- Dujmović Danko** and **Jukić, Vjekoslav**, "The "Koloman Renaissance" in North Western Croatia – An Unfinished Project", *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/37 (2010): 171-182.
- Engel, Pal**, *Realm of St. Stephen: a History of Medieval Hungary*, London/New York: I. B. Tauris, 2001.
- Evans, Edward Payson**, *Animal Symbolism in Ecclesiastical Architecture*. London: W. Heinemann, 1896.
- Ghisleberti, Carla**, "I legami culturali e stilistici tra la scultura architettonica federiciana dell'Italia meridionale e il mondo cistercense." In *Intellectual Life at the Court of Frederick II Hohenstaufen*, edited by William Tronzo, 41-62, Washington: NGW-Stud Hist Art, 1994.
- Goss, Vladimir P.**, "Bishop Stjepan II and Herceg Koloman and the Beginnings of the Gothic in Croatia" *Hortus artium medievalium* 13/1 (2007): 211-223.
- Goss, Vladimir P.** (ed.), *Stotinu kamenčića izgubljenog raja*. Zagreb: Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, 2007.
- Goss, Vladimir P.**, "The Battle of Cathedrals: or how Zagreb almost Became an Archbishopric in the 13th century" In *Medioevo : l'Europa delle cattedrali: atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Parma, 19-23 settembre 2006*, edited by Arturo Carlo Quintavalle, 146-154, Milano: Electa, 2007.
- Goss, Vladimir P.**, "Renesansa 12. stoljeća i Hrvatska" in *Renesansa i renesanse u umjetnosti Hrvatske, Zbornik Dana Cvita Fiskovića 2*, edited by Predrag Marković, Jasenka Gudelj, 417-426, Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2008.
- Goss, Vladimir P.**, *Četiri stoljeća europske umjetnosti 800 – 1200, pogled s jugoistoka*, Zagreb: Golden marketing – Tehnička knjiga, 2010.
- Goss, Vladimir P.** and **Jukić, Vjekoslav**, "Medvedgrad – Ócsa – Spiš, Some Stylistic Consideration." *Starohrvatska prosvjeta* III/34 (2007): 295-308.
- Goss, Vladimir P.** and **Vicelja Matijašić, Marina**, "Some Observations on the Chapel at Medvedgrad." *Starohrvatska prosvijeta* III/33 (2006): 165-185.
- Kahn, Deborah**, "The Engoulant: Development, Symbolic Meaning and Wit." In *Ex quadris lapidibus. La pierre et sa mise en oeuvre dans l'art medieval*, edited by Yves Gallet, 313-322. Turnhout: Brepols, cop. 2011.
- Klaić, Nada**, *Medvedgrad i njegovi gospodari*. Zagreb: Globus, 1987.
- Klaić, Nada**, *Povijest hrvata u srednjem vijeku*. Globus, Zagreb, 1990.
- Kocijanić, Juraj**, *Zagrebačka katedrala (handwriting)*. Zagreb, 1946.
- Kontler, László**, *Povijest Mađarske*, Zagreb: Srednja Europa, 2007.

- Krčelić, Baltazar Adam**, *Historiarum cathedralis ecclesiae Zagradiensis*. Zagreb: Institut za suvremenu povijest, 1994.
- Kukuljević-Sakcinski, Ivan**, *Događaji Medvedgrada*. Zagreb, 1854.
- Kukuljević-Sakcinski, Ivan**, *Nadpisi sredovječni i novovjeki*. Zagreb, 1891.
- Lukšić, Tugomir and Reberski, Ivanka (ed.). *Sveti trag: devetsto godina umjetnosti zagrebačke nadbiskupije*. Zagreb: Muzejsko-galerijski centar : Institut za povijest umjetnosti : Zagrebačka nadbiskupija, 1994.
- Mariani, Maria Stella Calò**, *L'arte del duecento in Puglia*. Torino: Istituto Bancario San Paolo di Torino, 1984.
- Marosi, Ernő**, *Die Anfänge der Gotik in Ungarn*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1984.
- Miletić, Drago and Valjato-Fabris, Marina**. *Kapela Sv. Filipa i Jakova na Medvedgradu*. Zagreb: [s. n.], 1987.
- Porter, Artur K.**, *Lombard Architecture, vol. 4*. New York: Hacker Art Books, 1967.
- Rački, Franjo** (ed). **Toma Arhidakon**, *Historia Salonitana*. Zagreb: in taberna Libraria eiusdem societatis typographicae 1894.
- Raffay, Endre**: *Esztergom, Vértesszentkereszt*. Újvidék, 2006.
- Ragusa, Isa**, "Porta patet vitae sponsus vocat intro venite and the Inscriptions of the Lost Portal of the Cathedral of Esztergom." *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 43 Bd., H. 4 (1980): 345-351.
- Smičiklas, Tadija** (ed). *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae Vol. III*. Zagreb: HAZU, 1905.
- Smičiklas, Tadija** (ed). *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae Vol. IV*. Zagreb: HAZU, 1906.
- Smičiklas, Tadija** (ed). *Codex Diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae Vol. VI*. Zagreb: HAZU, 1908.
- Stanojev, Jermina** (ed). *Monatur [MOHATVP]*. Novi Sad: Muzej Vojvodine, 2013.
- Stanojev, Nebojša**, *Arača – crkve, nekropola, manastir*, Novi Sad: Muzej Vojvodine, 2004.
- Stošić, Josip** "Crkva sv. Marije Magdalene u Čazmi." In *Čazma u prošlom mileniju*, edited by Josip Pandurić and Nino Škrabe, 69-72. Zagreb: Disput, 2001.
- Štrk, Vjekoslav**, "O novim nalazima sakralne arhitektonske plastike u Čazmi." *Muzejski vjesnik* 13 (1990): 24-29.
- Štrk, Vjekoslav**, "Arheološka istraživanja povijesne urbane cjeline Čazme u 1993. godini." *Muzejski vjesnik* 16 (1993): 25-40.
- Štrk, Vjekoslav**, "Povijesna kronologija Čazme (1094–1606)." In *Čazma u prošlom mileniju*, edited by Josip Pandurić and Nino Škrabe, 21-50. Zagreb: Disput, 2001.
- Štrk, Vjekoslav**, "O problemu vremena i mjesta ukopa slavonskog Hercega Kolomana u Čazmi." *Rusan, časopis za književnost, kulturu i druga društvena zbivanja Matice hrvatske Bjelovarsko – bilogorske županije* 1-2 (2006): 101-106.
- Takács, Imre** (ed). *Pannonia Regia*. Budapest: Magyar Nemzeti Galéria, 1994.
- Takács, Imre** (ed). *Paradisum plantavit: Bencés monostorok a középkori Magyarországon/ Benedictine monasteries in medieval Hungary/*. Pannonhalma: Pannonhalmi Bencés Főapátság, 2001.
- Takács, Imre**, "The French Connection – On the Courtenay Family and Villard de Honnecourt a propos of the 13th century Incised Slab from Pilis Abbey." In

Künstlerische Wechselwirkungen in Mitteleuropa, edited by Jiří Fajt and Markus Hörsch, 11-26. Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2006.

Tkalčić, Ivan Krstitelj, *Prvostolna crkva zagrebačka: nekoč i sada*. Zagreb: Knjigotiskara Karla Albrehta, 1885.

Tkalčić, Ivan Krstitelj, *Povjestni spomenici slob. kralj. grada Zagreba prijestolnice kraljevine Dalmatinsko-Hrvatsko-Slavonske, vol I*. Zagreb: Knjigotiskara Karla Albrehta, 1889.

Tóth, Sándor, *Román kori kőfaragványok a Magyar Nemzeti Galéria Régi Magyar Gyűjteményében*. Budapest, 2010.

Valentić, Mirko, *Kameni spomenici Hrvatske 13. – 19. stoljeća*. Zagreb: Povijesni muzej Hrvatske, 1969.

Valentić, Mirko and **Prister, Lada**, *Zbirka kamenih spomenika*. Zagreb: Hrvatski povijesni muzej, 2002.

Wood Rendell, Alan, *Physiologus a Metrical Bestiary of Twelve Chapters by Bishop Theobald* (translation), London: John and Edward Bumpus, 1928.