

Laris Borić

The innovative nature of Karaman's concepts of the peripheral and provincial and their application to the architecture of the Dalmatian Cinquecento

The traditional, Eurocentric art-historical narrative follows regional and national paradigms of political and cultural dominance, whereby style and form radiate from centres of power toward nearby and distant areas. These trajectories are subject to constant shifts through time and space, determined as they are by ever-changing relations between incoming ideas and their appropriation by the local environment (Foucault's "heterotopia").¹ The resulting melting pot of innovations, traditions, and paradigm shifts generates various atypical forms, as witnessed in the liminal context of the eastern-Adriatic Cinquecento.

The earliest, methodologically structured art-historical research on architectural and visual phenomena in historical Croatian lands was commonly based on the Viennese school of art history: it recognised the idiosyncrasies of regional forms throughout the centuries and ascribed the origins of particularly atypical variations to powerful European and eastern cultural centres whose influence changed with historical, social, political, and institutional circumstances. Early-to-mid-20th-century art historians who followed a fragmentary and nationally biased essentialist interpretation usually described the medieval and early modern art of the eastern Adriatic as a declining, provincially imported reflection of cross-Adriatic cultural centres, whose specific regional expression merged a multitude of locally transformed typologies. The convoluted nature of this visual language was often misused in the context of political and territorial claims and for the construction of national and supranational identities, particularly during the first half of the 20th century.

1 Zrinka Blažević, "At the Crossroads. Methodologies for Liminal Spaces," in *Liminal Spaces of Art between Europe and the Middle East*, ed. I. Prijatelj Pavičić, M. Vicolja Matijašić et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge Scholar Publishing, 2018), 1–11.

Karaman, regional idiosyncrasies and Croatian art history

Vienna-educated Ljubo Karaman, one of the most influential 20th-century Croatian art historians, was able to identify the methodological flaws of these interpretations critically and to provide a sounder contextualization of regional architectural and visual idiosyncrasies. He thus paved the way for a new understanding of national heritage in its natural developmental context, emancipated from both colonial and nationalistic manipulative discourses.² Although he preserved a traditional geographical paradigm, Karaman did not see the transfer of style from artistic centres exclusively as a process of political or cultural domination but as a function of what Strzygowski calls the “forces of movement” that accompany political dominance, trade routes, and other forms of social and cultural flow. Concurrently, “forces of persistence” are generated by indigenous traditions and tendencies. Realising that previous art historians had overemphasised one or the other force, Karaman develops three paradigmatic concepts that determine the position of local artistic production: *liminal*, *provincialized*, and *peripheral*.

Liminal architectural and visual features belong to areas that merge – often competently and with interesting results – heterogeneous influences from different artistic centres. *Provincialized* art is fundamentally influenced by major centres and transformed by social and economic circumstances, including the use of local material, modest and restrained forms, and a lesser degree of craftsmanship. Social circumstances are reflected in naive or misinformed iconographical interpretations, an inorganic and arbitrary use of decorative elements, almost grimacing expressivity, fantastic features, unusual colour palettes, and the repetition and emulation of locally established types. Although Karaman believes that provincial art lacks a solid organic link with indigenous (or, more precisely, regional) tendencies, he does not see this as a shortcoming: in his dialectic, a certain amount of freedom enables a symbiosis between local/regional elements and the weaker influences that emanate from centres of artistic and political power.

Karaman’s dialectic eventually leads to the most creative category of regional art: the *peripheral*, whose more indigenous and authentic expression anticipates, at least to a degree, postcolonial methodology. This category corresponds to the most appreciated and wide-ranging synthesis of heterogeneous influences, received and reinvented in the creative freedom of the peripheral context. Such liberty of development, unrestricted by artistic authorities and by the examples of great masters, enables the emergence of art forms that would be suppressed in cultural centres. Peripheral art

2 Karaman gradually developed these ideas in his seminal publications *Iz kolijevke hrvatske prošlosti* (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1930) and *Umjetnost u Dalmaciji: XV i XVI vijek* (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1933) before finally elaborating them in *O djelovanju domaće sredine u umjetnosti hrvatskih krajeva* (Zagreb: Društvo historičara umjetnosti NRH, 1963), reprinted as *Problemi perifernje umjetnosti* (Zagreb: Društvo povjesničara umjetnosti Hrvatske, 2001). For a survey of Karaman’s ideas in Italian, see Jasenka Gudelj, “Ljubo Karaman e i problemi dell’arte periferica,” in *Arte e architettura: le cornici della storia*, ed. F. Bardati et al. (Milan: Mondadori, 2008), 261–72.

thus reaches the full potential of regional artistic expression, preserving a link with the style of European artistic centres but freely developing the possibilities of regional *genius loci*. In this interpretation, the periphery is therefore much more than a passive recipient of ideas and style.

Even though Karaman's categories lack a thorough theoretical elaboration, they were well received by several Croatian art historians, who appreciated their empirical premises and the dialectic contextualization that firmly grounds the discipline. Another reason for their success is the fact that they do away with the ideological, political, and nationalist mythologems that dominated the troubled 20th-century history of the Adriatic rim. Radovan Ivančević, for example, acknowledges that Karaman's approach played a cohesive role in preventing the atomization of the discipline, as reflected in university curricula.³ However, his categories have also been subjected to a degree of criticism, particularly because of their positivistic nature and their adherence to a linear, bipolar relation between centre and periphery. Milan Prelog notes that Karaman's approach fails to bring together the interrelations among the heterogeneous layers of regional art's metabolism within a single art-historical or ethnic unit.⁴ Božidar Gagro deplores Karaman's attachment to national or geographical paradigms, insofar as even "liberated" peripheral art is seen in relation to that of the centre. The peripheral phenomenon, Gagro adds, should be observed outside of the standard thesis-antithesis system (central-peripheral, universal-national), and regional art should be articulated and interpreted according to its own values, not those of the centre. However, Gagro's questioning of the essence of regional or national art seems to draw on Karaman's description of peripheral specificities: "it is different from all that is outside and different, it is always its own, always something else: the other structure".⁵

Gagro does not dismiss the importance of artistic communication with the centres: "despite the basic impossibility of transferring the more advanced, exogenous style, a series of subsequent attempts to implant the shoots of another species has had a favourable impact on endogenous tendencies, encouraging their appearance and formation". However, these tendencies should be judged based on their context and values, not on the preconstructions and clichés of the art history of the centre. By setting an alternative system of values, regional art history would be able to re-interpret and critically evaluate local production, regardless of the period. Since their early reception, Karaman's concepts have been modified, updated, and methodologically reinvented. However, they are still included in contemporary contextual methodologies, to the extent that we should wonder whether their traditional geographical paradigm might

3 Radovan Ivančević, "Ljubo Karaman, Mit i stvarnost?," *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 11 (1987): 165–85.

4 Milan Prelog, "Umjetnost na tlu Jugoslavije između Europe i Mediterana," *Peristil* 21 (1978): 13–14.

5 Božidar Gagro, "Peripheral Structure from Karas to Exat," *Život Umjetnosti* 78–79 (2006): 154–65. English translation of the article originally published in *Život Umjetnosti* 1 (1966): 15–25.

act as a hindrance to the wider acceptance of alternative methodologies. Although contemporary Croatian medieval and early-modern art history has since turned its focus to contextualizing and identifying the manifold relations that connect the artwork, the artist, and society, most of these insights are still imbued with the concepts of periphery and province. Karaman's insistence on the emancipatory nature of peripheral art is based exclusively upon its relation to artistic centres and thus maintains some semi-colonial aspects. And yet, his focus on the regional conditions of the periphery, including their internal energies and developmental logic, was a first attempt to challenge what was then perceived as a colonial or nationalistic narrative of the regional history of art and architecture. This narrative still needs to be revisited and repositioned in the broader context of ideas emerging from the global network of art history.

Contemporary art historians informed by postmodern (and in particular postcolonial) theories would comment that Karaman (and similar scholars) focus almost exclusively on the somewhat obsolete and reductive model of centre vs. periphery. On the one hand, such a remark does have its points, particularly when deconstructing would-be universalist interpretations of visual phenomena. On the other hand, the adaptive and transformative qualities of Karaman's model – at least in Croatian art history – laid down a sound and constructive framework for the interpretation of regional art-historical phenomena. Their idiosyncratic features (structures, proportions, and decorative programs) either follow or diverge from models and sources that originated elsewhere, proving that peripheral art is not unequivocally environmentally deterministic and is even less the product of cultural essentialism.

Literary/linguistic and architectural shifts during the Cinquecento

This state of affairs is particularly evident in several features of eastern-Adriatic 16th-century architecture, whose genesis can be traced to contemporary classical models of Venice and Veneto. Moreover, the approach can be broadened to an interdisciplinary comparative study of contemporary literary trends in both regions. For the Veneto region, the groundwork has been laid by P. Davies and D. Hemsoll, who recognised the interrelation between the formation of the architectural idioms of Sanmichelli and Sebastiano Serlio and the contemporary literary theories of Pietro Bembo and Girolamo Fracastoro, as well as the one between the “pure”, classical Roman idiom and its Venetian variants.⁶ In this sense,

6 Paul Davies and David Hemsoll, “Sanmichelli's Architecture and Literary Theory,” in *Architecture and Language. Constructing Identity in European Architecture c. 1000 – c. 1650*, ed. Georgia Clarke and Paul Crossley (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 109–11. On the one hand, Sanmichelli's use of a classicist vocabulary for the Canossa palace appears to reflect the commissioner's endeavour to universalize the Italian language. The same can be said of Sanmichelli's emblematic use of the composite order (sometimes called “italic”). On the other hand, the references to local, Veronese features, such as the arch impostes of the front façade, based on those on the Arena, are inspired by Baldassare Castiglione's call for the use of other Italian dialects (and not only Tuscan) in the creation of modern Italian.

two particularly interesting examples are those of Giulio Carlo Delminio, who transposed to architecture his own idea of eloquence, and Daniele Barbaro, who compared various linguistic structures to architectural ones.⁷ This suggests that a survey of the Cinquecento architecture in Venetian Dalmatia should also be based on a comparison between 16th-century architectural and visual models and their regional linguistic and literary counterparts.

Although Croatian architecture was different, in its genesis and environment, from the classical architectural language that it imported across the Adriatic (particularly in the sense that it seemed to lack the educated and thoughtful conceptualization found in Sanmichelli's work), I believe that it lends itself to a comparison between architectural and visual languages. Such a comparison should consider not only the translations of texts and architectural features but also the structural nature of their innovative adaptations. Moreover, it should also take into account the fragmented citations, paraphrases, reductions or even misunderstandings of the original literary models and concepts.

Davies and Hemsoll point out that when Serlio elaborates on the classical orders in the Fourth Book of his *Trattato di architettura* (architectural treatise), he also describes the thriving Italian architecture and literature of his time by comparing the original creation of an architectural concept to the process of literary creation, with particular emphasis on what he calls *giudizio* (the author's judgment in discerning a beautiful and appropriate choice of words from a poor, misleading, affected, vague or confusing one). Girolamo Fracastoro writes in his poetical treatise *Naugerius* that theoretical principles should be integrated into the structure of a creative composition in a comprehensive and systematic way in order to generate eloquence and concludes that such a method applies to both arts and crafts (for example, shipbuilding also follows a set of precise rules and principles).⁸

Comparing the trajectories of classical architecture to those of literature makes up for an intriguing and abundant corpus of data that may lead, however, to convoluted and contrived conclusions. In other words, the operation requires a serious and suitable interdisciplinary approach. I will briefly focus on the most obvious Croatian literary examples of this transfer, namely the adaptation of literary models in which Arcadian settings can be recognised in the local topography of Zadar's hinterland, thus strongly relating the classical frameworks and references to their indigenous Dalmatian (or, as they were prevalently called at the time, *Illyrian*⁹) counterparts.

The inflow of humanist concepts to the eastern Adriatic shores began in

7 Davies and Hemsoll, "Sanmichelli's Architecture," 115.

8 Davies and Hemsoll, "Sanmichelli's Architecture," 106–7.

9 On the importance of the Illyrian ideologeme in early Modern humanist circles and its subsequent role in the formation of a national identity, see Zrinka Blažević, *Ilirizam prije ilirizma* (Zagreb: Golden marketing, 2008).

the early Quattrocento. The first contacts and correspondence with Italian humanists, recorded in the 1420s,¹⁰ prompted a need for continuity between local communal features and classical Antiquity through archaeological interests and *all'antica*, architectural and cultural forms. Early Croatian humanist circles (particularly the poets of Dubrovnik) were influenced by the first wave of Petrarchism throughout the 15th century,¹¹ but it was after the second half of Quattrocento that the literary production in Latin, Croatian and Italian became truly impregnated with Bembo's Petrarchism, accompanying a process of affirmation of the Croatian language – similar to the one taking place for Italian on the western Adriatic shores.¹²

Perhaps the most interesting case is that of the earliest Croatian novel, *Planine* (The Mountains) by Petar Zoranić (written in 1536 and published in Venice in 1569), modelled after Jacopo Sannazaro's pastoral prosimetrum *Arcadia* (written around 1480, published in Naples in 1504).¹³ Zoranić's *Planine* takes place in the hinterland of Zadar, depicted as an Arcadian setting with multiple references to contemporary social, political, and occasionally even apocalyptic features.¹⁴ Similarly, the eclogues pronounced by the shepherds comment on reality in an allegorical manner. In the novel's opening dedication to canon Mattheo de Mattheis, Zoranić emphatically remarks on the lack of Croatian equivalents to Greek Arcadian models whose topographies (from mountains to bushes) are charged with references to *transformations* (*privotri* in Croatian) provided by "deceitful writers".¹⁵ Moreover, these tales and transformations of "heroes and maidens" (*pripovisti i privotri junakov i deklie*), are the author's most valid contribution to the genre.¹⁶

On the one hand, it has been noted that *Planine* does not merely translate the Arcadian models of Jacopo Sannazaro but also testifies to Zoranić's acquaintance with Roman and early Christian authors (Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Virgil's *Eclogues*, as well as Cato the Elder, St. Augustus, and St. Jerome) and late-medieval ones (Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio). On the other hand, Zoranić is also the heir of the indigenous, late-medieval (cultural and linguistic) Glagolitic tradition: Dalmatian-born St. Jerome – believed at the period to be the inventor of mediaeval Croatian Glagolitic script – takes the role of Dante's Virgil as the author's guide and leads him in on a seven-day journey through the Zadar hinterland, in a revival of

10 Giuseppe Praga, "Il codice marciano di Giorgio Begna e Pietro Cippico," *Archivio storico per la Dalmazia* 7 (1932): Luka Špoljarić, "Korespondencija prvih dalmatinskih humanista: Juraj Benja Zadranić," *Colloquia Maruliana* 28 (2019): 73–110.

11 Slobodan Prosperov Novak, *Slaveni u renesansi* (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 2009), 147–50.

12 Prosperov Novak, *Slaveni*, 273–74, 291.

13 Josip Torbarina, "Strani elementi i domaća tradicija u Zoranićevim Planinama," *Zadarska revija* VIII/8 (1959): 7–24; "Zoranićeve Planine i ostale Arkadije," *Zadarska revija* XVIII/5 (1969): 421–33. Both articles are reprinted in Josip Torbarina, *Kroatističke rasprave* (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997), 85–101, 104–16.

14 Prosperov Novak, *Slaveni*, 505.

15 Petar Zoranić, *Planine* (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 2000), 6–7.

16 Torbarina, *Kroatističke*, 116.

Slavic-Dalmatian heritage, prompted by a search for purification from the pain of unrequited love. Zoranić also refers to his immediate predecessor, Split humanist Marko Marulić, by including a shepherd named Marul among the protagonists of *Planine*.¹⁷

Methodological shifts between literature and art history in the 1960s: Josip Torbarina and Karaman

Interestingly enough, the Croatian literary scholarship of Karaman's time witnessed a transformation comparable to that of art history. In his analysis of the influential literary scholar (and Karaman's contemporary) Josip Torbarina, literary historian Slobodan Prosperov Novak dates this methodological shift to the early 1960s. A Cambridge graduate student and an authority on borrowings and influences in early Croatian literature, in his early studies Torbarina generally emphasized a form of *reductionism* similar to that of minor early modern Italian writers.¹⁸ However, his later writings managed to broaden this limited focus on originality and literary innovations, that ignored "minor" literary groups, nations, and regions. In his studies published in the early 1960s, roughly contemporary to Karaman's monograph *O djelovanju domaće sredine u umjetnosti hrvatskih krajeva* (On the impact of the local milieu in the art of Croatian regions, 1963), Torbarina shifted his focus from issues of originality, translation, and transcription to the integration and homologation of early Croatian writers with the European literature of their time. This eventually led him to a polemical debate with distinguished European scholars who denied any authenticity and originality to these writers. Torbarina acknowledged and demonstrated the crucial influence of Italian writers but also noted their positive effect on the integration and harmonization of Croatian literature with the European currents of the time.¹⁹ In 1959, in his first text on Zoranić's *Planine*, Torbarina elaborates on the Arcadian parallels with Sannazaro's model and identifies several references not only to Dante and Virgil but also to the local Dalmatian literary tradition. Zoranić, according to Torbarina, "does not imitate: he transforms by merging what is borrowed with his inventions".²⁰ Therefore, *Planine* should be contextualised within the 16th- and 17th-century European literary Arcadias created by Italian, Spanish and French authors who followed Sannazaro's revival of classical Greek and Roman bucolic poetry, which he combined with

17 Franjo Švelec, "Proslavljanje domovine u djelu Petra Zoranića," *Zadarska revija* XVIII/5 (1969).

18 Slobodan Prosperov Novak, "Kroatist Josip Torbarina," in *Kroatističke teme* (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997), 7. One of the most esteemed Dubrovnik writers, Dinko Ranjina, was recognized as the mere translator (almost a plagiarist) of Italian writers.

19 Prosperov Novak, "Kroatist," 10.

20 Torbarina, *Kroatističke*, 86–101.

prose.²¹ However, Torbarina was adamant that the Croatian novel, written in 1536, was the earliest direct reflection of Arcadia outside of Italy.²² By insisting on the emancipation of local identity within a humanist culture, Zoranić and his contemporaries formed a cultural hybrid that evolved into one of the most prominent national Slavic literary corpora of the period, despite a highly complicated political environment.²³ For example, Petrarchism and neo-platonic concepts of love were reflected in the writings of Hanibal Lucić (from Hvar) and in those of Petar Hektorović (from nearby Stari Grad), who wrote a fishermen's eclogue loaded with references to and citations of peasant chants and proverbs.²⁴ One of the most significant early Croatian authors, Dubrovnik-born Marin Držić, was also influenced by Arcadian settings in his comedies *Tirena* and *Gržula*. Moreover, his play *Dundo Maroje* closely follows the patterns of comedies by Ludovico Ariosto, Niccolò Machiavelli, and Pietro Aretino.²⁵ These instances can be seen as localised transfers of trans-Adriatic literary models that were not only translated but seamlessly adapted into a regional key, generating entirely innovative literary values. The extensive oeuvre of Benedictine monk Mavro Vetranović, for example, includes the drama *Orfeo*, which draws on the eponymous play by Agnolo Poliziano, Petrarchist verses, as well as on harsh political satires and Old-Testament morality plays,²⁶ while his fellow citizens Nikola Nalješković, Nikša Ranjina, and Mikša Pelegrinović wrote dramas, poems and sometimes lascivious masques plays.²⁷ There are also examples of more or less exact translations of Torquato Tasso's pastoral *Aminta*: Dominko Zlatarić translated it in 1581 before publishing in 1597 an adaptation of the play (under the Croatian title *Ljubmir*) in which all the shepherds were given new Croatian names.²⁸ These works, along with several others published in the 16th century, can roughly be categorised according to their degree of reinterpretation of the original as translations, analogues, adaptations, paraphrases, or mere citations of a few elements. Whatever the case, all these kinds of cultural transfer undoubtedly formed a new cultural phenomenon that needed to be assessed in terms of indigenous values rather than in strict relation to the original models.

21 Torbarina, *Kroatističke*, 104–16. Torbarina had also noticed Sannazaro's influence on the work of 16th-century Dubrovnik writers such as Marin Držić and possibly Dinko Ranjina, Mavro Vetranović and Dominko Zlatarić. This influence was previously recognised by M. Kombol.

22 Torbarina, *Kroatističke*, 115.

23 Prosperov Novak, *Slaveni*, 470.

24 Torbarina, *Kroatističke*, 112.

25 Prosperov Novak, *Slaveni*, 470, 529–35.

26 Prosperov Novak, *Slaveni*, 500–2.

27 Prosperov Novak, *Slaveni*, 507–8.

28 Prosperov Novak, *Slaveni*, 687.

Karaman's concepts and stylistic shifts applied to the architecture of the Dalmatian Cinquecento

These literary transfer scenarios can be applied to comparative research of early modern architectural phenomena in the eastern Adriatic. Nevertheless, these concepts need to be considered in light of the variety of 16th-century cultural processes, whose manifold and often perplexing transmissions and adaptations include the notion of *licentia* (freedom) in the treatment of their classical sources. Our understanding of the term should consider Giorgio Vasari's standpoint, which welcomes inventive compositions that not only feed on the classical sources but skilfully elaborate on them, even exceeding their scope. The concept of *licentia* should be distinguished from that of *a caso* (at random), which Vasari rejects as a monstrosity to the erudite eye. To him, random invention is pointless, as freedom should result from a dialogue with known rules.²⁹ A knowledge of *usanza comune* (common usage), referring to the set of preceding (re) interpretations of classical language, distinguishes the former from the latter. The distinction can, *mutatis mutandis*, be mapped upon Karaman's differentiation of provincial and peripheral features in the visual language of geographically distant areas.

A case in point can be found in the recently developed small insular town of Cres and its harbour gate, constructed around 1550 on the ground floor of the clock tower (*Torre dell'Orologio*) (Fig. 1). Local builder Sidar Stošić probably owned Serlio's architectural treatise or was at least acquainted with its drawings,³⁰ as his town gate is modelled after the city gate depicted on page XII of the Fourth Book, combined with the attic shown on page VII.³¹ The so-called "small gate" (*Porta Bragadina*), dated 1581, is a lower and somewhat wider version of Stošić's harbour gate, but without the pediment and attic, while the half-columns are reduced to pilasters. In other words, the earlier model was freely interpreted by reducing the motifs and adapting the proportions to the width of the street. The third Cres example is even more telling: the great gate (*Porta Marcella*), constructed between 1584 and 1586 by local stonemasons Marko Soldatić and Frane Stošić. The latter was the son of Sidar Stošić (author of the harbour gate and the original local transmitter of Serlio's model).³² It is interesting to

29 Alina Payne, *The Architectural Treatise in the Italian Renaissance. Architectural Invention, Ornament, and Literary Culture* (Cambridge University Press, 1997), 15–20.

30 For a comprehensive survey on the circulation of architectural knowledge and models between the Adriatic shores, see: Jasenka Gudelj, "Architectural Treatises and the East Adriatic Coast: Cultural Transfers and the Circulation of Knowledge in the Renaissance," in *Artistic Practices and Cultural Transfer in Early Modern Italy. Essays in Honour of Deborah Howard*, ed. Nebahat Avcioglu and Allison Sherman (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 107–27.

31 Sebastiano Serlio, *Tutte l'opere d'architettura. Libro 4: Regole generali di architettura di Sabastiano Serlio Bolognese sopra le cinque maniere de gli edifizii: cioè, thoscano, dorico, ionico, corinthio, e composito, con gli esempi de l'antiquita, che per la maggior parte concordano con la dottrina di Vitruuio*, Venetia: Francesco Marcolini, 1540.

32 Laris Borić and Jasenka Gudelj, *Uveliko i u malo: lik i likovnost renesansnog Cresa* (Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru: 2019), 148–54.



Fig. 1

- Cres:
a) harbour gate,
b) Porta Bragadina,
c) Porta Marcella

notice the liberty with which this last gate departs from its classical model, even at the cost of disregarding some essential structural rules. As in the case of the Porta Marcella, its proportions were freely adjusted to the width of the new main road that led straight into the newly organised town square, while its height was increased, probably to create a sense of monumentality suited to the main land entrance into town. However, the 1580s masters who also used Serlio's model (Fourth Book, page XLIII)³³ were not aware that the main structural function of the Ionic half-columns was to support the entablature whose enhanced proportions rest directly on the ashlar of the arch. Even though Marko Soldatić and Frane Stošić may have relied on the copy of Serlio's book that belonged to Frane's father. Their *licentia* failed to consider an essential construction principle. Vasari would probably have frowned upon their work as an invention *a caso*, lacking *usanza comune*, while Karaman would categorise it as provincial rather than peripheral art. However, when these gates are considered within the scope of local culture and particularly of intense urban development, they certainly constitute an architectural phenomenon in its own right. In the Cinquecento architecture of the eastern Adriatic, similar examples can be analysed by combining Karaman's categories with Vasari's issue of *licentia*. This methodological lens allows us to discern not only the trajectories and models of their transfer but also the specific practices of appropriation and application of novel architectural features employed by local architects, builders, and stonemasons. For example, the somewhat irregular and unexpectedly reduced proportions of Michele and Giangirolamo Sanmichelli's land gate (*Porta Terraferma*) in Zadar are determined by the width of the Roman and medieval *decumanus* on which it was constructed, while its copious and tightly packed architectural decoration does not appear in other examples of Michele and Giangirolamo Sanmichelli's town gates.³⁴ Some contemporaries strongly criticised this abundant decoration as improper for military use.³⁵ These features, along with the delicately chiselled decorative details, may be due to the collaboration with Dujam Rudičić, a stonemason based in Korčula who merged the classical vocabulary introduced by Michele Sanmichelli's designs with the inherited and overabundant syntax of Korčula's stonecutting workshops,³⁶ as accu-

33 Serlio, *Libro 4*: XLIII.

34 Andrej Žmegač, "Zadarske utvrde 16. stoljeća," *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 27 (2003): 113; Pavuša Vežić, "Vrata Michelea Sanmichellija u Zadru," *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 29 (2005): 93–106; Jasenka Gudelj, "Lo Stato da Mar: l'architettura. Il Cinquecento in Istria e in Dalmazia," in *Storia dell'architettura nel Veneto: il Cinquecento*, ed. Donata Battilotti and Guido Beltramini (Venice: Marsilio, 2015), 262–3.

35 Stefano Zaggia, "Fortitudo e Maiestas Reipublicae. Le porte urbane delle città venete nel Rinascimento: evoluzione strutturale e formale," in *L'architettura militare di Venezia in Terraferma e in Adriatico fra XVI e XVII secolo* (Firenze: Olschki, 2014.), 166.

36 Laris Borić, "Dujam Rudičić, Sanmichellijevi i Girolamo Cataneo u procesu prihvaćanja klasičnog jezika arhitekture od Zadra do Dubrovnika tijekom druge četvrtine 16. stoljeća," *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 39 (2015): 41–54; "I collaboratori dalmati dei Sanmichelli: la trasmissione dei modelli e il linguaggio classico del primo Cinquecento est-adriatico," in *Norme e modelli: Il rinascimento e l'Adriatico orientale*, ed. Jasenka Gudelj (Rome: Aracne, 2023), 65–93 .

rately noticed by Karaman.³⁷ Rudičić's earlier style, formed on Codussian influences, was influenced and transformed through his collaboration with Michele and Giangirolamo Sanmichelli on the gates of Zadar and Šibenik fortress of St Nicholas. The same style can also be seen in his Dubrovnik projects, such as the palace of Frano Gundulić for which he collaborated with a builder named Girolamo Cataneo from Ancona in the 1540s.³⁸ In the same years, Rudičić probably collaborated on another example of classicizing Dalmatian Cinquecento architecture: the Šibenik loggia, a project that reflects – at least to a degree – the Paduan style of Giovanni Maria Falconetto while preserving a few late-Quattrocento elements.³⁹ The next stage in the transfer of classical architectural language to the eastern Adriatic can be observed on the southern axis of Zadar's main square (*Platea Civitatis*), where two public buildings were planned and went under construction after the mid-16th century: the so-called *Gran Guardia* (started in 1562), and a new, reconstructed communal loggia (dated 1565 by an inscription) (Fig. 2, 3).⁴⁰ Both are traditionally considered expressions of Sanmichelli's style and are sometimes incorrectly attributed to either Michele or Giangirolamo. However, although they indeed reproduce some architectural features of the Sanmichelli, these features are too generic to confirm such an attribution. Moreover, several proportional, structural, and decorative features noticeably deviate from Sanmichelli's classical norms.

The loggia's paired Tuscan columns conspicuously depart from the usual proportions in the eight of their shafts and particularly in the necking of the capitals, more than freely modelled after the nearby capitals of *Porta Terraferma*: the columns, including the base and capital, are 470 cm high, corresponding to 11,7 modules instead of the 6 suggested by Serlio or the 7 suggested by Palladio;⁴¹ the height of their base corresponds to two-thirds of the module instead of one-fourth; the most notable anomaly, however, is in the height of the capitals: their hypotrachelia are 40cm high, equivalent to one full module instead of a mere one-sixth. Even

37 Karaman, *O djelovanju*, 85–6. Karaman sees this in the context of a transition from late-Gothic to Renaissance not only in the work of Marko Andrijić but also in his son Petar Andrijić's dense classical decoration on the façade of the St. Saviour Church, built in Dubrovnik in the 1520s. Cvito Fisković subsequently used the expression "Gothic-Renaissance style" for similar phenomena. Cvito Fisković, "O vremenu i jedinstvenosti gradnje dubrovačke Divone," *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 7/1 (1953): 33–57, 54. For the most recent and comprehensive study of the church, see Danko Zelić, "Gradnja crkve Sv. Spasa u Dubrovniku (1520–1534)," *Analiz Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Dubrovniku* 60 (2020), 71–112.

38 Borić, "Dujam Rudičić," 47–8; "I collaboratori dalmati," 76–81.

39 Jasenka Gudelj, "La loggia di Sebenico e la costruzione dell'identità locale tra Venezia e l'antico," *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorischen Institutes in Florenz* 60 (2018): 126–47. About the Šibenik loggia see also: Danko Zelić, "O gradskoj loži u Šibeniku," *Ars Adriatica* 4 (2014): 299–321; Emil Hilje, "Uz nekoliko arhivskih podataka o gradnji šibenske lože," *Ars Adriatica* 10 (2020): 63–74.

40 Pavuša Vežić, "Platea civitatis jadre: prostorni razvoj Narodnog trga u Zadru," *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 36 (1996): 337–58; Gudelj, *Stato da Mar*, 264–5.

41 James Ackermann, "The Tuscan/Rustic Order: A Study in the Metaphorical Language of Architecture," *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 42/1 (1983): 15–16.



Fig. 2

Zadar, Tripun Bokanić
(attr. upper part and the
provveditore Zane's bust
in the southern niche),
Gran Guardia, 1562/1608



Fig. 3

Zadar, Jeronim Bokanić,
Petar from Cres,
communal loggia,
northern axis, 1565

though such divergences from architectural norms are not uncommon in the Italian Cinquecento,⁴² their extent on the Zadar loggia indicates that their author was unaware of the standard proportions of Vasari's *usanza comune*. This is understandable, as he was one of the pioneers of classical architectural language in the region. The archival sources mention that stonemasons Jeronim Bokanić and Peter from Cres were commissioned by Zadar captain Antonio Cocco on 12 October 1564 to construct a loggia after a *disegno* (drawing, plan) that most probably did not provide precise measurements or detailed descriptions of its elements. Even though they were ordered to prepare "il rustico, come le colone, pedestalli, base, capitelli, architravi, cornice, collonette, scalini et arme delli clarissimi rettori della qualità, quantità et misura come si contresi nel disegno mostratoli et cheseli dara",⁴³ the comparison between the loggia capitals and those by Sanmichelli on the *Porta Terraferma*, some 500 meters away and built twelve years earlier, demonstrates that the authors of the loggia columns reinterpreted this earlier model. Unfamiliar with the "proper" elements of a Tuscan capital, the authors misunderstood Sanmichelli's interleaving of rustic rings with the bare column shafts and treated the uppermost strip as part of the capital, considerably raising its necking.⁴⁴ As in the example of Cres, these Zadar transfers and transformations create an interesting hybrid between a recently imported classical language and the authors' monumental intentions, unrestrained by knowledge of and/or adherence to classical *regole* (rules), and regardless of whether captain Cocco's design was carried out by an unknown author or by Jeronim Bokanić and Petar from Cres.

Bokanić was the founder of what was to become, by the end of the century, the busiest Dalmatian family workshop, and his son Tripun is credited with the upper part of Zadar's *Gran Guardia*. Like the loggia, the ground floor of this building also presents distant similarities with the Sanmichelli model, while the *guglie* (spires) on the upper part (that was constructed in the second phase) are typical of Tripun's style. Tripun is also credited with the bust of *provveditore* (superintendent) Giangiacomo Zane in one of the niches, dated around 1608.⁴⁵ As one of the most sought-after Dalmatian builders and stonemasons of the period, Tripun was commissioned at least two altars in Zadar – for the churches of St. Mary of the Benedictines and St. Francis – of which only the first currently survives in a parish church in

42 Payne, *Architectural Treatise*, 19.

43 "The rustication, as well as the columns, the pedestals, the bases, the capitals, the architraves, the cornices, the collonettes, the stairs and the coats-of-arms of the most illustrious rectors, in the quality and the quantity and the measures indicated by the design which has been shown to him and will be given to him."

44 Laris Borić, "Izgradnja Gradske lože u Zadru (1565.) u urbanističkom i stilskom kontekstu formiranja venecijanske upravno-obrambene četvrti," in *Likovne umjetnosti, arhitektura i povijesni identiteti: zbornik radova znanstvenog skupa "Dani Cvita Fiskovića" održanog 2016. godine*, ed. A. Marinković and A. Munk (Zagreb: FF press, 2018), 89.

45 Laris Borić, "Zadarsko poprsje providura Giangiacoma Zanea: prijedlog za Tripuna Bokanića," *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 34 (2020): 91–100.

Nin.⁴⁶ Its classical composition also testifies to Tripun Bokanić's reliance on more precisely defined models, with properly fluted Ionic columns carrying the entablature with a pulvinated frieze and a broken segmental pediment. The profuse decoration is sharply chiselled but atomized and comminuted.

Part of Tripun Bokanić's structural and decorative repertoire, presumably gathered in a workbook (such as the one preserved in Korčula and dated to the 17th century)⁴⁷ was also used by another branch of the family workshop, led in Zadar by his cousin Stjepan Vickov Bokanić. In 1595 he was commissioned with the front façade of the rotund of Our Lady of Health,⁴⁸ and in 1599 with the façade of the new church of Saint Simeon, based on the *disegno d'un architetto Veneto* (drawing by a Venetian architect).⁴⁹ The project for the church, destined to hold Zadar's most venerated relic (the body of St. Simeon the Just), was ill-fated and remained unfinished. Four Corinthian columns carry an inaccurate Doric frieze with the relief busts of Old-Testament prophets.⁵⁰ The decoration of the main portal and lateral windows, featuring a profusion of grotesque features, is dated to 1600. Vladimir Marković's analysis of the unfinished façade (Fig. 4) and his depiction of a dedicatory medal, coined in 1600, identifies the combination of two Venetian architectural sources in the original project: the simple rectangular plan of the interior reflects Sansovino's project for the Venetian church of San Zulian, while the Zadar façade is comparable to that of Santa Maria Formosa, also in Venice.⁵¹ Jasenka Gudelj also points out the strong similarities with the almost contemporary reconstruction of Saint George's church in Piran, which probably followed a similar influence.⁵² The unusual construction of the Doric frieze, with the busts of Old Testament prophets, cannot be related to a project initiated in Sansovino's circle, and is probably an architectural afterthought, a post-1600 change of the original design (which used the Corinthian order). Although the reason for including such a diversion from classical *regole* is still unclear, this patchwork of orders is most likely due to the predominance of the iconographic programme during a fundamentally turbulent period in which the commune was trying to evoke the vanished values of its Medieval civic

46 Davor Domančić, "Bokanićev ninski oltar," *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 19 (1959): 211–16. The altar was transferred from the church of the women's Benedictine monastery in 1841. It was commissioned by Petar Bortolazzi in 1595.

47 Cvito Fisković, "Crteži graditelja i kipara u korčulanskoj bilježnici," *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 31 (1991): 237–48; Jasenka Gudelj, "Radionice i klasični jezik u ranome novome vijeku: traktati i crteži na istočnoj obali Jadrana," in *Majstorske radionice u umjetničkoj baštini Hrvatske. Zbornik radova znanstvenog skupa "Dani Cvita Fiskovića" održanog 2012. godine*, ed. D. Milinović, A. Marinković, and A. Munk (Zagreb: FF Press, 2014), 101–21; Gudelj, *Stato Da Mar*, 266.

48 Cvito Fisković, *Zadarski sredovječni majstori* (Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1959), 27.

49 Bojan Goja, "Prilog poznavanju izgradnje nedovršene crkve Sv. Šimuna u Zadru," *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti* 32 (2008): 99–106.

50 All the metopes with relief busts – except the one featuring Jeremiah – were transferred in 1708 to the belltower of the church that took on the name of St. Simeon after the project of San Simeone Novo was dropped.

51 Vladimir Marković, "Škrinja sv. Šimuna i arhitektura u Zadru oko 1600.," *Peristil* 28 (2005): 95–108.

52 Gudelj, *Stato da Mar*, 266.



Fig. 4

Zadar, the incomplete façade
of San Simeone Novo, 1600

glory. In this communal endeavour to construct an appropriate temple for its patron saint, the city wanted to emphasise the idea of St. Simeon as the last in the line of the prophets, one who experienced the arrival of the Messiah.

Nevertheless, this unusual intervention can be seen in the context of both 16th-century *licentia* and *a caso* constructions, in an environment that around the year 1600 was seeking to free architectural compositions from the rules set by cultural centres. Furthermore, Stjepan Bokanić's distinctive treatment of the figural and floral decoration, along with its busy and caricatural treatment of the grotesque repertoire, also fits this categorisation, thereby confirming its applicability. All of the projects carried out in Zadar by the Bokanić family – Jeronim, Tripun, and Stjepan Vickov – can be analysed in terms of Karaman's concepts, based on his informed conservation practice, field experience and extensive knowledge of regional architectural and artistic phenomena. Moreover, when applied to the architecture of the Dalmatian Cinquecento, Karaman's categories can be liberated from their reductive elements, extended to a comparative study of 16th-century literary and linguistic processes, and successfully enriched with contemporary theoretical frameworks. This paper or *bozzetto* modestly aims to point out the potential of such a methodological approach, which undoubtedly calls for broader interdisciplinary collaboration.

This article is part of a project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (GA n. 865863 ERC-AdriArchCult).

Laris Boric

University of Zadar

laris.boric@gmail.com