

Matevž REMŠKAR*, matevzremskar@gmail.com

IVAN UGRINOVIĆ AND HIS WORKSHOP: SOME NEW REFLECTIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

ABSTRACT: *Ivan Ugrinović emerged as a central figure in Ragusan quattrocento artistic community. Despite the lack of surviving works, extensive archival records in Dubrovnik provide valuable insights into his painting production. Previous writings have often attributed the Koločep polyptych to Ugrinović, but recent restoration and analyses have confirmed that this work dates to the late trecento. Ugrinović is first mentioned in Dubrovnik records in 1420, with his known commissions spanning from 1427 to 1460, documenting at least 33 years of active career. His early contracts with the Ragusan elite suggest he was trained in a prominent painting center before establishing his workshop in Dubrovnik. The peak periods of his commissions were from about 1438 to 1442 and again from 1447 to 1450. Ivan Ugrinović was one of the most productive painters in fifteenth century in Dubrovnik, with an extensive social network and collaborations with masters of related crafts. We hypothetically include in Ivan's oeuvre a fragment of a polyptych from the Dubrovnik Franciscan collection depicting St. Blasisu.*

KEYWORDS: *Ivan Ugrinović, painting production, Dubrovnik, quattrocento*

In the midst of the fifteenth century Dalmatia, as Nikola Vladanov (*Nicolao de Sebenico*)¹ dominated in Šibenik, Blaž Jurjev² (*Biaggio di Gior-*

* Autor je doktorand istorije umjetnosti na Univerzitetu u Ljubljani, zaposlen na Institutu za zaštitu kulturne baštine Slovenije. /The author is a PhD student at the Art history department of the University of Ljubljana, working at the Institute for the protection of the cultural heritage of Slovenia.

¹ See J. Belamarić, Prilozi opusu Nikole Vladanova u Šibeniku, *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji*, 41/1 (2008), 159–185 and E. Hilje, Zablude o šibenskom slikaru Nikoli Vladanovu, *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti*, 35, 2011, 65–92 with older references listed.

² For Blaž Jurjev, see *Blaž Jurjev Trogirinanin* (Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, Split, September – November 1986, Muzejski prostor, Zagreb, January – March 1987), A. Sorić

gio di Traù) in Trogir, and Dujam Vučković (*Doymus Marini*)³ in Split and Zadar, Ivan Ugrinović (*Johannes Zornea*)⁴ emerged as one of the central figures in Dubrovnik's artistic community. In the first half of the fifteenth century, the Dubrovnik painting scene⁵ was primarily, though not exclusively, shaped by artists of Dalmatian origin. Amidst this *milieu*, the archival records reveal the presence of Antonio di Jacopo and Laurentius da Florentia, but they are still without attributed works. Unfortunately, only a few works from fifteenth century survived in Dubrovnik, which makes any serious stylistic or iconographical analysis virtually impossible, but the well-preserved extensive archival records preserved in Dubrovnik provide a valuable resource for delving into the realm of painting production. In this study, we will try to employ a microhistorical approach concentrating on the artistic endeavors of Ivan Ugrinović.⁶

What has been written about »life and work« of Ivan Ugrinović has mainly been based on the thesis that Ugrinović is the author of the *Koločep polyptych*.⁷ The altarpiece from the church of St. Anthony the Abbot on the

(urednik), Zagreb, 1987. He also worked in Dubrovnik between 1421 and 1427 and was employed by the state with an initial salary of 30 perperes, which increased to 60 over the years. He brought his permanent associates to Dubrovnik and made contacts with wealthy merchants and craftsmen, such as Jacobus de Goze and Pietro Pantella, whom he mentions in his will (K. Prijatelj, *Profilo artistico del pittore Biagio di Giorgio da Trau, Biagio di Giorgio da Trau, Venezia, 1989, 13*).

³ E. Hilje, *Gotičko slikarstvo u Zadru*, Zagreb, 1999, 122–130.

⁴ Vojislav J. Đurić, in his *Dubrovačka slikarska škola* (Beograd 1963, 38–48), devoted several pages to Ugrinović, primarily drawing upon information gleaned from documents, which were previously published by Jorjo Tadić (*Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku XIV–XVI veka I*, Beograd, 1952). See also: I. Prijatelj Pavičić, *Prilog poznavanju poliptiha Bogorodice s djetetom iz Koločepa, Croatica Christiana periodica*, 30/58 (2006), 63–85.

⁵ The painting workshops were involved in the production of altarpieces, paintings, and frescoes, as well as in polychroming and gilding wood. They produced complex murals and altarpieces and - as Michael Baxandall (*Painting and Experience in 15th Century Italy: A Primer in the Social History of Pictorial Style*, Oxford, 1972, 11) also notes for Italy at this time - marriage chests and painted shields.

⁶ In 1443, Ugrinović is mentioned among the members of the carpenters' Brotherhood of St. Andrew (St. Joseph). DAD, Div. Canc, vol. 57, fol. 279. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 297. Although we may never learn the specific reasons for Ivan's entry into the carpenters' brotherhood, it is certainly true that the brotherhood community was affluent and likely took good care of its members. The question remains open as to whether members of the painters' brotherhood could simultaneously be members of the carpenters' brotherhood. P. Bonča, *Dubrovačke bratovštine slikara u 15. i 16. stoljeću* (diplomski rad, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet, Odsjek za povijest umjetnosti), 2020, 25–26.

⁷ The polyptych's style serves as the foundation for the widely embraced argument that 15th-century Dubrovnik painting can be seen as a belated reflection of the Venetian *trecento*, particularly in the works of Paolo and Lorenzo Veneziano. This viewpoint has been succinctly articulated by numerous both popular and scholarly authors. Cf. R. Harris, *Dubrovnik: A History*, London 2003, 274: »It (polyptych) was completed in 1434 or 1435. The

Elaphite island of Koločep was attributed to Ugrinović by Vicko Lisičar. Polyptych comprising sixteen painted panels, arranged symmetrically in two rows is consistent with the typology of altarpieces from that period, the central section is accentuated both in width and height, featuring the largest panels depicting Madonna and Child. Flanking this central section, saints are depicted in two horizontal registers: the lower register contains full-length figures standing within narrow arcades, while the upper register features an equal number of busts in half-height panels. Attribution to Ugrinović was grounded on a document dated in January 1434, wherein the chaplain and two representatives from the island of Koločep engaged Ugrinović for the creation of an altarpiece, referred to as *unam anconam*:⁸

...facere et completam dare de omni laborerio opportuno, tam de figuris, pictura et auro fino, quam de omnibus aliis necessariis unam anconam illius qualitatis, forme, picture, auro et laborerio et auratura qualiscuius et quaemadmodum est ancona parva nova quae est in monasterio sancte Clare, omnibus expensis ipsus magistri Johannis...⁹

The first analytical account of Ugrinović and his work in a broader context was written by Vojislav J. Đurić in his *Dubrovačka slikarska škola*, where he referred to the morphological development of painting at that time as an era of certain stylistic divisions: some painters began to lean more towards the art emerging from the workshops of Paolo and Lorenzo Veneziano, while others towards the art of Venetian painting workshops from the early quattrocento.¹⁰ He was, of course, aiming at Ugrinović's venetian trecento-style painting on one hand and Blaž Jurjev's international gothic style, related to Jacobello del Fiore, Gentile da Fabriano and Nicolo di Pietro, on the other.

In 1965, shortly after the monographic reconstruction of Blaž Jurjev's oeuvre,¹¹ after, according to Grgo Gamulin, Croatian art had acquired a personality of universal significance, Gamulin attempted to reconstruct the oeuvre of Ivan Ugrinović.¹² Convinced that it was not possible that all the polyp-

style, strongly resembling that of Paolo Veneziano, is a mixture of Byzantine and Gothic. Ugrinović's work was prolific, so it evidently suited and thus is an indicator of the taste of his Ragusan contemporaries.«

⁸ V. Lisičar, *Koločep nekoć i sad*, Dubrovnik 1932, 81–86.

⁹ Državni arhiv u dubrovniku (here: DAD), *Diversa Notariae* (here: Div. Not.), vol. 18, fol. 169^v. K. Kovač, Nikolaus Ragusinus und seine zeit. Archivalische beträge zur geschichte der malerei in Ragusa im XV. und der ersten hälfte des XVI. jahrhunderts, *Jahrbuch des Kunsthistorisches Institutes der K. K. Zentralkommission für Deenkmalpflege* 11 (1917), 44 and J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 211.

¹⁰ ... »odredene stilske podele: jedni slikari počeli su da se opredeljuju više za umetnost izišlu iz radionica Paola i Lorenca Venecijana /.../, a drugi za umetnost mletačkih slikarskih radionica iz ranog kvatročenta.« V. J. Đurić, *Dubrovačka slikarska škola*, 37.

¹¹ K. Prijatelj, *Slikar Blaž Jurjev*, Zagreb 1965.

¹² G. Gamulin, Hipoteza za Ugrinovića, *Telegram* 273, 23. srpnja 1965, 8.

tychs (he himself counted thirty of them from documents at the time) and other works by Ugrinović had simply disappeared, he presented a »working hypothesis«, which he wrote was inspired by Pallucchini's *La pittura veneziana del Trecento*¹³ and the painter whom Pallucchini tentatively called *Maestro del Memento Mori*. According to Gamulin, the reason why Pallucchini couldn't identify the author of the group of works among the painters he had recognized in Venice, specifically the »Memento Mori« from the castle of Rohoncz, was because most of these works were created by Ivan Ugrinović. Gamulin thus attributed the group of five paintings - but not the painting from Rohoncz castle - to Ugrinović.¹⁴

In his monograph on fifteenth and sixteenth century painting in Dubrovnik, published in 1968, Kruno Prijatelj did not endorse Gamulin's suggestion. Instead, he insisted that Ugrinović is the painter of (only) the *Koločep polyptych* and the miniature of St. Blaise in the Dubrovnik Statute¹⁵ (based on the fact that the initial was signed by the artist Johannes/Ivan).¹⁶ Later, in 1994, Prijatelj advocated for the deattribution of the *Koločep polyptych*.¹⁷ However, this viewpoint did not gain much traction within the realm of Croatian art history. In his catalogue entry for *The Gothic Century in the Adriatic*, Igor Fisković did not question authorship and, like previous writers, connected the *Koločep polyptych* with Ugrinović.¹⁸

In 2006 Ivana Prijatelj Pavičić demonstrated that the work described in the published document from 1434¹⁹ is larger than the actual polyptych is in fact of older origin.²⁰ Recent restoration efforts and technological analyses have substantiated the suspicions raised by Prijatelj Pavičić (and previously by Kruno Prijatelj) that the polyptych attributed to Ivan Ugrinović is not his work but rather a piece dating back to the late *trecento* period.²¹

Still, no works can be attributed with great confidence to one of the most productive painters of the Dubrovnik *quattrocento*. However, archival

¹³ R. Pallucchini, *La pittura veneziana del Trecento*, Venezia 1964.

¹⁴ G. Gamulin, *Hipoteza za Ugrinovića*, 8.

¹⁵ K. Prijatelj, *Dubrovačko slikarstvo 15–16 st.*, Zagreb 1968.

¹⁶ K. Prijatelj, *Doprinos Ugrinoviću, Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji*, 15/1 (1963), 56–60.

¹⁷ K. Prijatelj, *La pittura in Dalmazia nel Quattrocento e i suoi legami coll'altra sponda*, Charles Dempsey (ur.), *Quattrocento Adriatico: Fifteenth-century art of the Adriatic rim: Papers from a colloquium held at the Villa Spelman, Florence, 1994* [Villa Spelman Colloquia, Vol. 5], Bologna 1996, 19.

¹⁸ I. Fisković, Ivan Ugrinović, Bogorodica sa svecima, poliptih, 1434, *Paolo Veneziano. Stoljeće gotike na Jadranu* (Galerija Klovićevi dvori, 19. X.–28. XI. 2004), Zagreb 2004, 154.

¹⁹ DAD, Div. Not., vol. 18, fol. 169', cf. n. 8.

²⁰ I. Prijatelj Pavičić, *Prilog poznavanju poliptiha Bogorodice s Djetetom iz Koločepa*.

²¹ K. Alamat Kusijanović, »Nepoznata slikarska radionica 14. stoljeća«, 23–39.

sources fortunately provide enough information for us to attempt to reconstruct his activity, which can serve as an illustration of the painting scene in late medieval Dubrovnik.

Đurić noted that Ugrinović is first mentioned in Dubrovnik records in 1420, when he assumed the role of tutor to a certain Bjelosava, the daughter of the late Obrad Pribisaljčić.²² Ugrinović's first known painting contract is from 1427,²³ and his last commission dates in 1460²⁴ - documenting at least around 33 years of an active painting career. In July 1470, Radosav Vukčić (*Alegreto*) a woodcarver and a sculptor in wood, once a close (even almost exclusive, it seems)²⁵ associate of Ugrinović, signed for a piece produced in collaboration with the painter Božidar Vlatković.²⁶ In February of 1467 his son Stjepan Ugrinović²⁷ was identified as *Jo Stepan de Goan Zornea*²⁸ and in April 1471, he is mentioned as *qondam Johannis Zornea* for the first time, signifying he was the son of the late Ivan Ugrinović.²⁹ Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that Ugrinović died probably between 1467 and 1470.

The fact that Ugrinović's earliest contracts were with members of the Ragusan elite indicates that he probably received training in one of the established painting centers,³⁰ before establishing his own workshop in Dubrovnik, that was likely also his birthplace.³¹ Perhaps the process of selecting artists cannot be compared to the situation in the cities of the Italian Peninsula, where painters were essentially subjected to competition for prestigious commissions.³² However, the significance of commissions from prominent Dubrovnik citizens should not be overlooked. In February of 1427, he signed a contract with one of the most prominent and influential Dubrovnik

²² DAD, Cons. Min., vol. 2, fol. 119. V. J. Đurić, *Dubrovačka slikarska škola*, 38. Unfortunately a transcript of the document has not been published.

²³ DAD, Diversa Cancelariae (here: Div. Canc.), vol. 44, fol. 104. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 174.

²⁴ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 44, fol. 29. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 447.

²⁵ There are even cases, where Vukčić and Ugrinović signed the document together: DAD, Div. Canc. vol. 55, fol. 247, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 258.

²⁶ DAD, Div. Not., vol. 54, fol. 139. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 520.

²⁷ In literature sometimes also called Stjepan Zornelić.

²⁸ DAD, Div. Not. vol. 51, fol. 4, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 485.

²⁹ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 75, fol. 37. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 528.

³⁰ It is important to note that caution is required when reading these documents, as in several of the documents now associated with him, he is mentioned only by first name without a surname or nickname.

³¹ Đurić makes this presumption due to the presence of several of Ivan's relatives in Dubrovnik. V. J. Đurić, *Dubrovačka slikarska škola*, 38.

³² Cf. M. O'Malley, Finding fame: painting and the making of careers in Renaissance Italy, *Renaissance Studies*, 24/1 (2010), 12.

noblemen of the 1420s and 1430s, Georgius de Gozze,³³ who at that time was renovating his first house in Pustjerna.³⁴ After Gozze ordered wooden interior furnishings from the carpenter Pribisan Bogdanović and the *petrarius* Radan Klapčić received the final payment for work on the building, Ugrinović received an order to paint the bedroom and bed.³⁵ In February 1428, Gozze additionally commissioned Ugrinović to paint a wooden room with azure and golden stars, for twenty ducats.³⁶ In May of 1427, Martolo de Zamagna ordered four mezzanine wooden structures, wooden partitions for the rooms on the upper three floors and for the kitchen, four beds with benches, two studies, benches, and a ballroom in the hall.³⁷ Three years later, in May of 1430, Martolo de Zamagna and his son Blaxio commissioned Ugrinović to paint a room with azure, gold, and stars for twelve and a half ducats.³⁸

In the late 1420s, Ugrinović painted a large hall (*sala magna*) in the palace for the Bosnian duke Sandalj Hranić Kosača, who, during that time, rose even higher in the social hierarchy and was arguably the most influential figure in the Bosnian state. The work was commissioned by Dubrovnik state.³⁹ In the summer of 1429, Ugrinović was absent from Dubrovnik. Unfulfilled orders were awaiting his attention in Dubrovnik, prompting the *Consilium Minus* to decree that Ugrinović should not be pursued by any party, considering the delays incurred by his absence and duties for the duke.⁴⁰ The details regarding his tasks and exact location while working for Sandalj Hranić remain uncertain,⁴¹ but evidently, Hranić was content with his work in Dubrovnik and desired the painter's services outside of Dubrovnik. It is rea-

³³ *Diversa Cancelariae*, vol. 44, fol. 225. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*: 1952, doc. 178.

³⁴ R. Novak Klemenčić, Locating and analysing the appearance of private houses in 15th century Dubrovnik: the case of Georgio de Gozze house, Ana Plosnić Škarić (ur.), *Mapping Urban Changes = Mapiranje Urbanih Promjena*, Zagreb 2018, 181–183.

³⁵ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 44, fol. 104. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 174.

³⁶ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 44, fol. 225. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 178.

³⁷ We know that Pribisav, during the production of benches in the hall and panels for the mezzanine structures in Martolo de Zamagna's house, had to draw inspiration from these elements in Georgius de Gozze's house. For wooden furnishing in Dubrovnik 15th century houses see R. Novak Klemenčić, *Nekoliko zapažanja o drvenoj opremi dubrovačkih kuća u 15. stoljeću*, *Zbornik dubrovačkih muzeja* 3 (2015), 85–98.

³⁸ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 46, fol. 138. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 193.

³⁹ DAD, Cons. Min., vol 4, fol. 120, 24th of November 1442. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 177. DAD, Cons. Min., vol. 4, fol. 142. *Dubrovnik: Civitas et Acta Consiliorum 1400-1450*, (ur.) D. Zelić, A. Plosnić Škarić, Zagreb 2017, 253.

⁴⁰ Cons. Min., vol. 4, fol. 251. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 189.

⁴¹ V. J. Đurić, *Dubrovačka slikarska škola*, 254.

sonable to assume that this task included painting the church of St Stephen in Šćepan Polje, now located on the Montenegrin side of the Bosnian-Montenegrin border.⁴² Ivan Ugrinović was probably sent to the duke by specific request after he had observed how Ugrinović had adorned the ceiling of his palace in Dubrovnik with gold and azure, and the painter stayed there for almost a year in 1429.⁴³ While we cannot assert with certainty that he painted at the church of St. Stephen, the alignment of Dubrovnik painter Ugrinović's stay with Duke Hranić and the period of construction and completion of the funerary church suggests a strong case in support of this connection.

While nobles commissioned expensive paintings for wood-clad spaces and ceilings adorned with azure and stars, there is a documented case of an order for painted fabrics, known as *cortine*,⁴⁴ depicting figures such as St. George or St. Stephen, castles, the sun, the moon, and golden stars for the homes of wealthy merchants, like Juraj and Dobrašin Veselković, members of the Confraternity of St. Anthony (*Antunini*).⁴⁵ Surprisingly, the cost of these large curtains,⁴⁶ despite being adorned with figural motifs, was lower than that of painting a room with azure and gold.⁴⁷

It seems that Ugrinović was also a mural painter. In three (known) contracts, Ugrinović is mentioned as the author of frescoes. Firstly, in 1431, Junije Gradić, the procurator of the St. Andrew's Monastery, commissioned the painting of the choir and left chapel with scenes determined by the abbess of the monastery, for a little over 13 ducats. Ugrinović was using colors provided for him.⁴⁸ Five years later, in Ston, he painted frescoes in a chapel of Vitko Ivanov, for the same price as at the St. Andrew's Monastery, having already painted three chapels in that church.⁴⁹ In 1438, he accepted an order for paintings for the church of St. Nicholas in Dubrovnik.⁵⁰ In 1449, he entered

⁴² T. Mićević-Đurić, V. Soldo-Rešetar, *Likovne umjetnosti i obitelj Kosača, Hercegovina*, 3 (2017), 331–363.

⁴³ N. Grujić, D. Zelić, Palača vojvode Sandalja Hranića u Dubrovniku, *Anali Zavoda za povijesne znanosti Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Dubrovniku*, 48 (2010), 76.

⁴⁴ V. J. Đurić, *Dubrovačka slikarska škola*, 44–45.

⁴⁵ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 52, fol. 41'. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 233.

⁴⁶ The measurements of these three *cortine* were 6.7x3.6m, 7.2x2m and 2.6x2.6m. ... *prima peza brazia XIII longa, larga brazia 7 ... Ancora un altra peza longa brazia XIII e larga brazia III... Terza peza de tela longa brazia 5 e larga brazia 5...* DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 52, fol. 41'. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 233.

⁴⁷ The fabric was provided by the Dobrašin and Juraj. Ibid.

⁴⁸ DAD, Div. Not. vol. 17, fol. 143'. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 200.

⁴⁹ DAD, Div. Not., vol. 20, fol. 207'. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 224.

⁵⁰ Given that the consequences of the fall of these images are defined in the contract, we can assume that they are indeed murals DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 52, fol. 91'. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 234.

into an agreement with a well-known Dubrovnik, already mentioned above Radan Klapčić, who, among other things, was a lime manufacturer. According to the agreement, Ugrinović would produce a painting in just over two months, with the specific figures to be determined by Klapčić. In exchange, Klapčić would provide him with 140 *modi* (about six tons) of lime.⁵¹

Almost exactly half of all the works for which Ivan Ugrinović signed contracts, either individually or in collaboration with other masters, consist of panel paintings and polyptychs. A more detailed specification of a larger number of commissions is challenging, as the documents do not define the iconography or provide more specific commitments; rather, they merely stipulate a demand for aesthetic and executional quality.

We can discern ten documents pertaining to the commissioning of artworks for private devotion,⁵² along with additional documents whose classification as such cannot be definitively confirmed. Three of those commissions were specifying that painting should depict Madonna.⁵³ First one was commissioned in 1441 by Brailo Trabutinić.⁵⁴ Next year Ivan Đžore Palmotić commissioned *unam anconam Sancte Marie* for four and a half golden ducats; all the material, except for wood, would be provided by Ugrinović; The agreement, however, does not state any specific elements of the painting.⁵⁵ The second one is commissioned by Dobrašin Veselković

⁵¹ DAD, Div. Not., vol. 34, fol. 67'. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 359. We cannot conclude with certainty that Ugrinović used the lime for one of the commissions - it could have been used for his own purposes. However, Radan Klapčić did not receive the painting until at least February 1452. DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 63, fol. 72'. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 386.

⁵² The practice of domestic devotion was recently explored by Matko Marija Marušić. Three aspects were analyzed in this study: privately owned chapels attached to the residences of nobility, prayer areas and holy images inside the houses, and relics in the possession of individuals. With its source-driven approach, a significant portion of this paper was devoted to addressing the terminology of devotional items as presented in contemporary documents. On a more general level, the paper aimed to show how, even though no direct evidence of domestic devotional practices survived (such as in-depth textual evidence), all indications suggested that it was a deeply family-centered matter. For private devotion in Dubrovnik see: M. M. Marušić, Hereditary Ecclesiae and Domestic Ecclesiolae in Medieval Ragusa (Dubrovnik), *Religions*, 11/1, 2020, 1–14.

⁵³ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 56, fol. 186'. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 274; DAD, Div. Not. vol. 34, fol. 202', J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 366. It seems that the painters Ivan and (later) his son Stjepan Ugrinović, along with the woodcarver Radosav Vukčić, had a dominant monopoly on the market for depictions of Madonna during this period. Throughout their activities, the trio secured all (documented to date) commissions for paintings of Madonna, with contracts consistently specifying that a particular master should create a new painting modeled after another, which was owned by a fellow *cittadino*.

⁵⁴ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 55, fol. 154. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 253.

⁵⁵ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 56, fol. 186'. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 274.

in 1449.⁵⁶ Price is very similar, four ducats, three perperos and six grosso.⁵⁷ Interestingly, Dobrašin already had a painting of Madonna at home which Ugrinović was familiar with, as the agreement states *similem uni alter figure quam habet dictus Dobrassinus in domo*. Another smaller sized painting – unfortunately we do not know the iconography or any other specifics of it – was commissioned in Dubrovnik by a local of Korčula island, Petar Branković, together with two bigger paintings.⁵⁸

Ugrinović crafted at least three smaller altars for private houses in Dubrovnik, referred to in archival records by various names, such as *anchonam seu ecclesiola a camera* and *altariolo*.⁵⁹ *Mihael Lukarević* commissioned an altar featuring the Crucifixion with Mary and St. John the Evangelist, alongside Mary Magdalene on the right and St. James on the left. A different, perhaps more interesting form of object was commissioned by Nikola Serafine Bunić: *gilded and polychromed object - unam capelam ligni intagliatam*. Although detailed information about the appearance of Nicola's altar, made by Ugrinović, is not discernible from the commission, it is known that three figures were depicted. Considering the price, eight perperos, that is 4 ducats, we can predict it is a smaller triptych, perhaps crafted in a manner that allows the side wings to be closed.⁶⁰ Radosav Vukčić was commissioned *quadrum seu unam anchonam cum ecclesiola a camera*, that is, probably, with a closing flap,⁶¹ in 1448. Furthermore, Ugrinović finished it in couple of months. Ugrinović frequently painted these similar objects, as evident from contracts, similar to the one from 1459: *promisit ... dare completum et fornitum unum quadrum ... et de pluri clisuram pro ipso quadro...*⁶²

The first commission for a polyptych, a prestigious painting task of the time, frequently found in Ugrinović's works, was received by the paint-

⁵⁶ It specifically states that Madonna should be depicted with a Child in her arms. DAD, Div. Not. vol. 34, fol. 202, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 366.

⁵⁷ Even though very little works of art remain a surviving instance offers insight into the appearance of these domestic images. The Madonna and Child, attributed to Blaž Jurjev, stands as a significant example of a painting tailored for personal devotion. The restoration process has confirmed the originality of the outer rectangular frame, suggesting that the image was not intended with hinged wings. Cf. Z. Demori Staničić, *Catalogue, Blaž Jurjev Trogirani: Exhibition catalogue*, Zagreb, 1986, 86.

⁵⁸ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 57, fol. 177, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 293. The two were one meter high and one and a half meter long, carved, and gilded. On the opposite, last one was not carved nor gilded. The price for the three was thirty ducats, but it is not specified how much each of the painting cost.

⁵⁹ M. M. Marušić, *Hereditary Ecclesiae and Domestic Ecclesiolae in Medieval Ragusa (Dubrovnik)*, 7.

⁶⁰ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 38, fol. 7. J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 299.

⁶¹ I. Fisković, *Tipologija i morfologija oltarnih slika 15. stoljeća u Dalmaciji, Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji*, 23, 1990, 113–155

⁶² *Ibid.*

er in 1434 for a church on Koločep, which was discussed briefly above.⁶³ Among the commissions accepted by Ugrinović, polyptychs undoubtedly commanded the highest prices. In total, fifteen polyptychs⁶⁴ by Ugrinović are documented in the records, with an average price of just under 17 gold ducats. Some insights into the nature of these polyptychs can be gleaned from the more precisely defined terms in the contracts. For instance, Ugrinović accepted commissions for different polyptychs such as the one featuring Madonna and four saints in 1438,⁶⁵ a polyptych with ten figures with gilded halos and garments adorned with gold in 1440 or a polyptych with a series of seven full-length and a series of seven smaller, bust-length figures in 1448.⁶⁶

The preceding discussion suggests that relationships were essential both for the creation of artworks and for shaping the careers of painters.⁶⁷ The collaboration between Ivan Ugrinović, whose prominence rose immediately after Blaž's departure, and Radosav Vukčić was a common practice. Although Ugrinović occasionally collaborated with others such as Ivan Ognjanović, Matko Junčić,⁶⁸ and Laurentius da Florentia, it appears that his partnership with Vukčić⁶⁹ became almost exclusive, especially after 1438. Ugrinović seldom worked with other sculptors, and Vukčić rarely collaborated with other painters; instead, they primarily operated as individuals.⁷⁰ The nature of their collaboration—whether temporary, project-specific, or more formalized—is not fully known. However, it can be assumed that the relationship between Ivan Ugrinović and his son Stjepan followed the principle of *paternae compagniae*. In relation to Ugrinović, Ivan Ognjanović is mentioned several times as someone who evidently had a relationship with him that surpassed the status of a mere collaborator. At the end of 1441, Ugrinović promised that he would produce eighteen (painted) coats of arms.

⁶³ K. Almat Kusijanović, Nepoznata slikarska radionica 14. stoljeća i deatribucija Matka Junčića i Ivana Ugrinovića, *Portal. Godišnjak Hrvatskog restauratorskog zavoda* 6, 2015, 23–39.

⁶⁴ Although such a comparison is challenging, as the amount of preserved archival material may not be entirely consistent and not every commission can be precisely categorized, it is worth noting that we have documented a total of 16 paintings by Nikola Božidarević. V. Gjukic-Bender, Nikola Božidarević. Životopis i djela, Nikola Božidarević. Veliki slikar dubrovačke renesanse (P. Vilač ur., Dubrovački muzeji), 2017, 14.

⁶⁵ DAD, Div. Canc. vol. 53, fol. 6', J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 237.

⁶⁶ DAD, Div. Canc. vol. 61, fol. 138, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 349.

⁶⁷ M. O'Malley, *Finding fame: painting and the making of careers in Renaissance Italy*, 28.

⁶⁸ DAD, Div. Canc. vol. 61, fol. 67', J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 345.

⁶⁹ DAD, Div. Canc. vol. 43, fol. 153, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 164.

⁷⁰ Cf. V. J. Đurić, *Dubrovačka slikarska škola*, 40.

As Ugrinović didn't finish the work by the end of January of 1442, he was even imprisoned, Ivan Ognjanović stood surety for him.⁷¹

The period from 1438 to 1442 witnessed the highest volume of documented commissions for Ivan Ugrinović, with another peak observed between 1446 and 1450. The decline in commissions during the 1450s suggests possible factors beyond the complexity of artworks, hinting at personal challenges Ugrinović faced, including issues stemming from gambling.⁷² In 1459, he was unable to pay the rent for his house, so the judges seized his money, one polyptych, and several other items. The reason for the lower number of commissions could have been the creation of more demanding works, but it seems that Ugrinović also faced some difficulties in his private life. In the 1450s, he took on fewer tasks, suggesting that his son Stjepan was gradually taking over the business. On average, documented and known commissions secured by Ivan Ugrinović amounted to approximately 20 ducats annually.⁷³ However, notable exceptions occurred in 1440 and 1447, during which Ugrinović undertook commissions for significant projects like crafting a wreath for the Franciscan church and creating a polyptych for the church of St. Mary of the Angels.⁷⁴

We can confidently assert that Ivan Ugrinović was one of the most productive painters in mid-fifteenth century Dubrovnik. He had an extensive social network and collaborated with practically all the masters of related crafts who achieved comparable results in their field at the time. We can reiterate the thoughts of Ivo Petricioli and later Emil Hilje,⁷⁵ who, in connection with the oeuvre of Menegelo Ivanov de Canalis, wondered whether such a body of work could entirely disappear. Therefore, in the future, we can still hope for the recognition of Ugrinović's oeuvre.⁷⁶

It might be worthwhile to revisit Kruno Prijatelj's contribution from 1963, when he attributed the miniature from the Dubrovnik statute to

⁷¹ DAD, Div. Canc. vol. 55, fol. 245, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 278. For brief discussion about polyptychs see also V. J. Đurić, *Dubrovačka slikarska škola*, 41–42.

⁷² DAD, Div. Canc. vol. 54, fol. 122, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 243.

⁷³ In 1430, he owned two oxen and two cows, and in 1451, in the second half of his career (DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 46, fol. 133, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 191), he sold a cottage for 20 perpers and an annual rent of 4 perpers, 11 dinars, and one hen on land near Dubrovnik. He leased this land previously with an annual rent of 8 perpers and two hens (DAD, Div. Not., vol. 36, fol. 8, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 382).

⁷⁴ Regrettably, precise measurements and descriptions for these works are unavailable for most of them.

⁷⁵ E. Hilje, *Gotičko slikarstvo u Zadru*, Zagreb 1999, 57.

⁷⁶ It would be worthwhile to revisit the less consistent oeuvres of other painters and the (albeit rare) works without identified authors.

Ivan Ugrinović.⁷⁷ At that time, Prijatelj was still accepting the attribution of the Koločep polyptych to Ivan, but also proposed another miniature for Ivan's opus: »Ivanovu signaturu (IOANES PINXIT) nalazimo na samo jednom Ugrinovićevu radu, maleno po formatu, ali veoma značajnu za historiju i za rekonstrukciju Ugrinovićeve slikarske ličnosti.«⁷⁸ It is an initial „S” depicting Dubrovnik's patron saint, St. Blaise, in the manuscript *Liber Statutorum civitas Ragusii*, which is kept in the Državni arhiv u Dubrovniku. On a small format, the artist illuminated the letter in scarlet color on a gold background, in front of which he painted the image of the saint sitting on a Gothic throne. With a golden mitre, in a scarlet red pleated chasuble over a white alb, the saint blesses with his right hand while holding a model of a fortified town in his left. Since the Statute book was written between 1430 and 1437, this miniature can be dated to that period.⁷⁹

Ivana Prijatelj Pavičić later noted that, according to the documents published by Tadić, at least one,⁸⁰ if not two painters named Ivan were active in Dubrovnik during the 1430s alongside Ivan Ugrinović.⁸¹ Prijatelj Pavičić also pointed out the stylistic inconsistency between the polyptych and the miniature, which we can agree with.⁸² The fact is actually irrelevant today because we know that the miniature and polyptych were created in different time periods. And even though Ivan Ognjanović was extremely active in Dubrovnik at the same time as Ugrinović (although he often appears in documents related to matters not directly connected to painting),⁸³ it would be difficult to consider him as an artist capable of executing a commission such as the miniature in the Dubrovnik statute. Therefore, for now, we can conditionally affirm the thesis of Kruno Prijatelj, who attributed the miniature of St. Blaise to Ugrinović.

⁷⁷ K. Prijatelj, Doprinos Ugrinoviću, *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 15, 1, 1963, 56–60.

⁷⁸ K. Prijatelj, *Dubrovačko slikarstvo*, 14.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ I. Prijatelj Pavičić, Prilog poznavanju poliptiha Bogorodice s Djetetom iz Koločepa, 68.

⁸¹ Ivan, son of Petar Ognjanović, a contemporary of Ugrinović, is mentioned in two documents 1430s, and is later employed by the Dubrovnik state, but most of his commissions were related to painting furniture, and in terms of status and likely skill, he can hardly be compared to Ugrinović. DAD, Div. Not., vol. 19, fol. 134, 134', Consilium Minus (here: Cons. Min.) vol. 7, fol. 172, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 218, 232.

⁸² “Lik sv. Vlaha blizak je venecijanskom slikarstvu prve trećine XV. stoljeća, primjerice slikarstvu poliptiha sv. Ivana iz župne crkve u Omišlju na Krku, koji se daje Jacobellu del Fioreu.” I. Prijatelj Pavičić, Prilog poznavanju poliptiha Bogorodice s Djetetom iz Koločepa, 69.

⁸³ Cf. I. Prijatelj Pavičić, *U potrazi za izgubljenim slikarstvom. O majstoru Lovru iz Kotora i slikarstvu na prostoru od Dubrovnika do Kotora tijekom druge polovice XV. stoljeća*, Dubrovnik 2013, 33.

The image of St. Blaise indeed carries elements of Venetian stylization in the saint's physiognomy and the shape of the throne. However, it is stylistically more advanced than post-Paolo miniatures, for example, those attributed to Menegelo Ivanov de Canalis, reflecting the continuity of influence from Paolo and Lorenzo Veneziano in the manner reflected by the Koločep polyptych. The image of St. Blaise is closer to Venetian painting of the first third of the fifteenth century, for example, the painting of the polyptych of St. John from the parish church in Omišalj on Krk, which is attributed to Jacobello del Fiore, noted Prijatelj Pavičić.⁸⁴

In the absence of other works, we can hypothetically attribute to Ugrinović, in addition to the initial „S” in the Dubrovnik statute, a fragment of a polyptych with St. Blaise from the collection of the Franciscan monastery in Dubrovnik, which is commonly attributed to (the circle of) Lovro Dobričević.⁸⁵

In 1956, Cvito Fisković proposed that this fragment is part of a polyptych made for the Franciscans by Lovro Dobričević between 1455 and 1458, and determined the year 1444 as the *terminus post quem* for the creation of the work, based on the depiction of the angular Minčeta Tower and the city bell tower, which was built in that year.⁸⁶ Prijatelj Pavičić pointed out the inconsistency in the typology of the depictions of St. Blaise on Dobričević's altar for the Dominicans from 1448 and on the fragment at the Franciscans. The latter does not reflect the Vivarini-Dobričević type. She suggests searching for another possible author among the painters who appeared in Dubrovnik after 1444.⁸⁷

We can certainly concur with her disagreement; beyond the typological differences, the stylistic ones may be even more significant. Although a thorough analysis is constrained by the fragment's poor preservation, we can nonetheless observe that the brushstrokes on the Franciscan fragment are less decisive compared to those in Dobričević's work. While Dobričević applies color opaquely, the brushstrokes in the depiction of St. Blaise in question appear almost glazed. Although we cannot examine the drapery due to the absence of the figure's base, the facial type is convincingly different from Dobričević's St. Blaise at the Dominicans. Therefore, the attribution of the Franciscan St. Blaise to Dobričević can be dismissed without extensive explanation, given the clear differences. Instead, considering the stylistic char-

⁸⁴ I. Prijatelj Pavičić, Prilog poznavanju poliptiha Bogorodice s Djetetom iz Koločepa, 69.

⁸⁵ First in C. Fisković, Nekoliko podataka o starim dubrovačkim slikarima, *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 19 (1956).

⁸⁶ C. Fisković, Nekoliko podataka o starim dubrovačkim slikarima, *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji* 19 (1956), 140–145.

⁸⁷ I. Prijatelj Pavičić, *U potrazi za izgubljenim slikarstvom*, 145.

acteristics, particularly in connection with the miniature, we might propose Ugrinović as the artist.

Although comparing miniature and panel painting can be an ungrateful task, and the format of both works in question prevents a thorough stylistic analysis, the figures align in basic stylistic traits; the first impression of the vibrant red drapery and gilding speaks of their relatedness. Both figures are characterized by narrow faces, which seem almost gaunt. With a lighter color (although now darkened) incarnate, they have accentuated cheekbones above which are sunken dark eyes. Both figures have distinctly elongated noses. Similarly shaped are the ears, and the mustache, although thick, quickly blends with the beard, concealing the upper lip.

It is almost inevitable that Ugrinović, given his numerous commissions, also accepted a commission for the Franciscan monastery. After 1444, there is one Dubrovnik document that might support this – in a commission from 1447, the patron refers to a polyptych in the Franciscan chapter hall, of which a fragment could very well be the preserved figure of St. Blaise.⁸⁸

Ivan Ugrinović, certainly an important, if not the most important, representative of the Dubrovnik School of Painting, which, in light of discoveries in recent decades, will need to be reconsidered as a concept, will undoubtedly continue to engage art historians of Dalmatian painting. With this writing, we have attempted to portray Ugrinović as an enterprising painter who held a significant position in the Dubrovnik painting scene. Until a fortunate coincidence will provide us with a good insight into his painting style, the miniature in the *Liber statorum* remains the most tangible evidence for the (hypothetical) construct of Ivan's oeuvre. Despite the challenges with attributions, the extensive archival records provide a glimpse into his active and diverse career. Ugrinović's contributions were not confined to one type of artwork; instead, his commissions spanned polyptychs, frescoes, and even small private devotional objects, reflecting the dynamic and multifaceted nature of his practice. His collaborations with other prominent craftsmen of the time, particularly with Radosav Vukčić, highlight the interconnectedness of artistic production in Dubrovnik. As research advances and new discoveries emerge, the potential for uncovering additional lost works by Ugrinović may provide further insight into the legacy of this prolific painter.

⁸⁸ DAD, Div. Canc., vol. 60, fol. 217, J. Tadić, *Građa o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku*, doc. 340.

Matevž REMŠKAR

IVAN UGRINOVIĆ AND HIS WORKSHOP: SOME NEW REFLECTIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

Summary

Ivan Ugrinović emerged as a central figure in Ragusan quattrocento artistic community. Despite the lack of surviving works, extensive archival records in Dubrovnik provide valuable insights into his painting production. Previous writings have often attributed the Koločep polyptych to Ugrinović, but recent restoration and analyses have confirmed that this work dates to the late trecento. Ugrinović is first mentioned in Dubrovnik records in 1420, with his known commissions spanning from 1427 to 1460, documenting at least 33 years of active career. His early contracts with the Ragusan elite suggest he was trained in a prominent painting center before establishing his workshop in Dubrovnik. The peak periods of his commissions were from about 1438 to 1442 and again from 1447 to 1450. Ivan Ugrinović was one of the most productive painters in fifteenth century in Dubrovnik, with an extensive social network and collaborations with masters of related crafts. We hypothetically include in Ivan's oeuvre a fragment of a polyptych from the Dubrovnik Franciscan collection depicting St. Blasisu



Figure 1: Koločep polyptych (used to be attributed to Ivan Ugrinović)
(K. Alamat Kusijanović, *Nepoznata slikarska radionica 14. stoljeća i deatribucija Matka Junčića i Ivana Ugrinovića*, Portal. Godišnjak Hrvatskog restauratorskog zavoda 6, 2015.)



Figure 2: Madonna and Child from Korčula (attributed to Ivan Ugrinović by Grgo Gamulin)
(Matevž Remškar, personal archive)



Figure 3: Ivan Ugrinović, Miniature of St. Baise in Dubrovnik Statute, 1430–1437 (Sv. Vlaho u povijesti i sadašnjosti = St. Blaise in History and in the Present, P. Vilać et. al. (edd.), Dubrovnik 2012)



Figure 4: Lovro Dobričević, St. Blaise from the Dominicans monastery polyptych (Matevž Remškar, personal archive)



Figure 5: St. Blaise, fragment of Franciscans polyptych (?), here attributed to Ivan Ugrinović

(Sv. Vlaho u povijesti i sadašnjosti = St. Blaise in History and in the Present, P. Vilać et. al. (edd.), Dubrovnik 2012)