



2016

IL CAPITALE CULTURALE

Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage

JOURNAL OF THE SECTION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE

Department of Education, Cultural Heritage and Tourism
University of Macerata

Il Capitale culturale

Studies on the Value of Cultural Heritage

Vol. 14, 2016

ISSN 2039-2362 (online)

© 2016 eum edizioni università di macerata
Registrazione al Roc n. 735551 del 14/12/2010

Direttore

Massimo Montella

Co-Direttori

Tommy D. Andersson, Elio Borgonovi,
Rosanna Cioffi, Stefano Della Torre, Michela
Di Macco, Daniele Manacorda, Serge
Noiret, Tonino Pencarelli, Angelo R. Pupino,
Girolamo Sciuolo

Coordinatore editoriale

Francesca Coltrinari

Coordinatore tecnico

Pierluigi Feliciati

Comitato editoriale

Giuseppe Capriotti, Alessio Cavicchi, Mara
Cerquetti, Francesca Coltrinari, Patrizia
Dragoni, Pierluigi Feliciati, Enrico Nicosia,
Valeria Merola, Francesco Pirani, Mauro
Saracco, Emanuela Stortoni

Comitato scientifico - Sezione di beni culturali

Giuseppe Capriotti, Mara Cerquetti, Francesca
Coltrinari, Patrizia Dragoni, Pierluigi Feliciati,
Maria Teresa Gigliozzi, Valeria Merola,
Susanne Adina Meyer, Massimo Montella,
Umberto Moscatelli, Sabina Pavone, Francesco
Pirani, Mauro Saracco, Michela Scolaro,
Emanuela Stortoni, Federico Valacchi, Carmen
Vitale

Comitato scientifico

Michela Addis, Tommy D. Andersson, Alberto
Mario Banti, Carla Barbati, Sergio Barile,
Nadia Barrella, Marisa Borraccini, Rossella
Caffo, Ileana Chirassi Colombo, Rosanna
Cioffi, Caterina Cirelli, Alan Clarke, Claudine
Cohen, Gian Luigi Corinto, Lucia Corrain,
Giuseppe Cruciani, Girolamo Cusimano,

Fiorella Dallari, Stefano Della Torre, Maria
del Mar Gonzalez Chacon, Maurizio De Vita,
Michela Di Macco, Fabio Donato, Rolando
Dondarini, Andrea Emiliani, Gaetano Maria
Golinelli, Xavier Greffe, Alberto Grohmann,
Susan Hazan, Joel Heuillon, Emanuele
Invernizzi, Lutz Klinkhammer, Federico
Marazzi, Fabio Mariano, Aldo M. Morace,
Raffaella Morselli, Olena Motuzenko, Giuliano
Pinto, Marco Pizzo, Edouard Pommier, Carlo
Pongetti, Adriano Prospero, Angelo R. Pupino,
Bernardino Quattrococchi, Mauro Renna,
Orietta Rossi Pinelli, Roberto Sani, Girolamo
Sciuolo, Mislav Simunic, Simonetta Stopponi,
Michele Tamma, Frank Vermeulen, Stefano
Vitali

Web

<http://riviste.unimc.it/index.php/cap-cult>

e-mail

icc@unimc.it

Editore

eum edizioni università di macerata, Centro
direzionale, via Carducci 63/a - 62100
Macerata
tel (39) 733 258 6081
fax (39) 733 258 6086
<http://eum.unimc.it>
info.ceum@unimc.it

Layout editor

Cinzia De Santis

Progetto grafico

+crocevia / studio grafico



Rivista accreditata AIDEA

Rivista riconosciuta CUNSTA

Rivista riconosciuta SIMMED

Rivista indicizzata WOS

Musei e mostre tra le due guerre

a cura di Silvia Cecchini e Patrizia Dragoni

Altri contributi

Saggi

Reflections on the History of Dalmatian Culture and Art in the Immediate Post-War Period*

Ivana Prijatelj Pavičić**

Abstract

This paper deals with forming an idea of the old Dalmatian art and urban heritage within the new cultural paradigm that was created during the 1950s in Yugoslavia. It turns out that the period, marked in politics by the escalation of conflict between Yugoslavia and Italy, due to the Free Territory of Trieste, was one of the most encouraging periods for the development of professional paradigm in Croatian art history. Cvito Fisković, Grgo Gamulin, Ivo Petricoli and Kruno Prijatelj by exploring the Dalmatian cultural heritage, ranging from artists so-called Schiavoni to urbanism, recognised artistic discontinuities and the composite character of Dalmatian culture. One of the main topics of their research was the role of ethnic mass in creating Dalmatian art and cultural landscape as a whole. In this

* Translated from Croatian by Danica Šantić.

** Ivana Prijatelj Pavičić, Professor of Art History, Department of Art History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Split, Croatia, Sinjska 2, 21000 Split, e-mail: ivana.prijatelj.pavicic@ffst.hr.

way, by shifting the focus and direction of research, their aim was to free Dalmatian art of theoretical approaches resulting from the political and stylistic appropriation, in which it was considered as a passive reflection of external influences. It is this generation that recognized the key role of urban and rural space for the visual experience of Dalmatia. In the Fifties, in accordance with the new cultural paradigm, the image of old Dalmatian art was formed, which is still largely present in Croatian historiography.

L'articolo è incentrato sulla formazione dell'immagine dell'antica arte dalmata e del patrimonio urbanistico nell'ambito del nuovo paradigma culturale che si andava creando negli anni Cinquanta del secolo scorso in Jugoslavia. L'autrice dimostra che il periodo in questione, segnato dalle crescenti tensioni tra la Jugoslavia e l'Italia a causa del Territorio libero di Trieste, è stato uno dei più ricchi di stimoli dal punto di vista dello sviluppo dei paradigmi storico-artistici. Studiosi come Cvito Fisković, Grgo Gamulin, Ivo Petricoli e Kruno Prijatelj, analizzando il patrimonio culturale nel periodo che va dagli artisti cosiddetti Schiavoni all'epoca dell'urbanismo, hanno potuto riscontrare le discontinuità artistiche e il carattere composito della cultura dalmata. Uno degli assi tematici centrali delle loro ricerche è stato quello del ruolo delle masse etniche nella creazione dell'arte figurativa dalmata e del paesaggio culturale nel suo insieme. In questa maniera, spostando il baricentro e la direzione stessa delle ricerche, hanno voluto liberare l'arte dalmata dagli approcci teorici provenienti da appropriazioni politiche o correntistiche che l'hanno presa in esame come un riflesso passivo delle influenze esterne. La generazione di studiosi in questione ha finalmente riconosciuto il ruolo chiave dello spazio urbano e di quello rurale nell'esperienza visiva della Dalmazia. Negli anni Cinquanta, in concomitanza col crearsi del nuovo paradigma culturale, si è venuta formando anche una nuova concezione dell'antica arte dalmata che è ancora oggi, in buona parte, presente nella storiografia croata.

1. *Introduction*

Lowly and simple it does not matter
 Here I am owner; lord of my manor
 I'm the best hunter here, of that I have proof
 And happy I'll live under my own roof

What kind of person, so lacking in luck
 Would give up their home for some meagre tuck!¹

I have chosen the verses from *Hedgehog's Home*, once popular children poem written in 1949 by a famous Serbian writer from Bosnia, Branko Ćopić, as the beginning of my paper dedicated to a change in scientific and cultural paradigm in Dalmatian art history after 1945, because I think they clearly

¹ Ćopić 2011.

describe one of the key attitudes that Dalmatian art historians supported in their texts in the first post-war period.

Indicatively, it is only recently that we started the research on the texts of the generation of scientists born between 1910 and 1930, to which Grgo Gamulin, Cvito Fisković², Kruno Prijatelj³ and Ivo Petricioli⁴ belong. It is clear that reading their texts asks for a layered multiperspective relationship. It should be noted that the analysis of their scientific researches by methodology of cultural analysis is in the very early stages, and it seems to me that it is still a taboo subject. It is clear that, given a discursive space and the contemporary paradigms of art history, their ideological positioning, narrative paradigms and identification system in their texts were a reflection of their professional identity. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that the scientists who are the subject of our research had the opportunity to experience the powerful effects of hegemonistic ideology by the invading neighbouring country during the period of their youth and education, which certainly contributed to their critical involvement in the early post-war period and shaped their desire to re-examine some earlier interpretations. We still have to tell the story of how the history of the formation of the canon and (meta) narrative developed in both Dalmatian history of art and in culture at that time within the academic and museum institutions. Were some of these, now considered most notable art historians, perceived as cultural ideologues as early as then (Grgo Gamulin certainly was)?⁵ Among numerous issues that are arising, this research examines the extent to which class and ideological views determined the manner of their writing.

For this occasion I am going on a journey back to the time when they were young and in full swing, and the state in which they lived was also young⁶ and creating its cultural identity. As art historians they were involved in it, thus

² One should bear in mind both the historical circumstances such as the fact that Fisković as a historian of art and culture reached maturity during the period of Italian pursuing political and territorial interest in Dalmatia, and tasks that he was in charge of as the Head Conservator for Dalmatia during the restoration of the country immediately after the World War 2. During WW2 he was one of the participants in the *First Conference of cultural workers and artists*, held in Hvar in December 1943. In Split, he was Head of the Department of Education and Culture of the Regional National Liberation Committee. From 1945 to 1977 he was Director of the Conservation Institute for Dalmatia in Split. See: Fisković 1946; Foretić 1998, pp. 276-280.

³ He started his University degree in Rome in 1941, but soon transferred to the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Zagreb. In 1947 he took his doctorate with a dissertation on *Barok u Splitu* (*Baroque in Split*, see: Prijatelj 1947), and in 1950 he became director of the Art Gallery in Split. See: Belamarić 1992, pp. 7-11.

⁴ About his schooling and the beginning of his career see: Jakšić 1995, pp. 7-21. In the early Fifties, after having helped M. Krleža in the organization of the exhibition *Zlato i srebro Zadra* (*Gold and Silver of Zadar*), he participated in archaeological excavations and research in Zadar with M. Suić.

⁵ Maroević 2010, 2011, pp. 28-42, also discusses Gamulin's post-war function of the Head of the Ministry of Culture and his position of "an intellectual in a governing body".

⁶ On stages of global politics, on socio-political situation and on phenomena in Croatian society in the late 1940s and early 1950s, see: Jakovina 2003.

taking part in the creation and construction of the canonical way of thinking in their profession.

I will turn to the Fifties as the time significant for forming of the narrative that stands behind their analytical and scientific method and that influenced their narrative and interpretative position. Should we emphasize that it was an extremely turbulent time of exacerbating conflict between two ideologies, two value systems and the fierce polarization around ideological attitudes in the country?

In the post-war historiography numerous narrative forms, stereotypes and ideologemes which were formed between the two wars continued to exist in the national art history, as well as the defined paradigm of national art history at that time. During the formation of cultural paradigm in the first Yugoslavia, one of the goals of national art history was to prove the existence, originality and values of certain segments of the national, local fine art and artistic heritage.

If judging by the passionate tone and the overflow of ideological paradigms of individual essays, the impression is that in the first post-war decades in our art history behind the so-called *Iron Curtain*, ideological struggle against the former foes was still going on. The issue of the influence of the Venetian (semi) colonialism was at the centre of the Dalmatian historiography long after the physical presence of various Italian “colonizers” and occupiers had come to an end – as if the fight continued against the Italians usurping the Dalmatian and Istrian art⁷.

War wounds were slowly healing. In the time of turbulent changes of political and ideological paradigms within the state (Yugoslav-Soviet split; the Trieste crisis)⁸, the emphasis in the professional environment was on national consensus about characteristics and values of the artistic heritage in the region. At the same time, the issue of belonging to a particular cultural and civilization circle (such as the Adriatic, Mediterranean and Balkan) was yet to be defined. Therefore, the obsessive themes of this generation were the relationship between art and authorities, the limitation or creative freedom, indigenous environment, and the determinism of art that arises from social, collective and physical substrate.

⁷ Deep reading of Italian and Dalmatian historiography in the period between the two world wars and during the World War 2 gives an impression of a real ethnic war that took place between scientists from the two opposite sides of the Adriatic coast. At that time, Dalmatian monuments served Italian art historians as evidence of *italianità* of Dalmatia. Complete Dalmatian art was interpreted as evidence of Dalmatia belonging to Italy. Such tendentious attitude about Schiavoni artists and Dalmatian art before and during World War 1 was a typical product of then contemporary Italian cultural imperialism and political aspirations for Dalmatia. In the decades that followed in Italy and irredentist historiography the stereotypes of *venezianità* and *adriaticità* were redefined in new integrative context of a united Italy, in the function of acquiring the Italian Adriatic expansionistic policy. See: Karaman 1930, pp. 2-3; Scherke 2004, pp. 102-118; Prijatelj Pavičić 2008, pp. 133-169; Prijatelj Pavičić 2014, pp. 181-189.

⁸ Ballinger 2002; Jakovina 2003; Cattaruzza 2007, pp. 257-326; Goldstein I., Goldstein S. 2015, pp. 350-596.

During these decades in the records of the art history of eastern Adriatic coast, it was difficult to overcome the scientific phantasms of so-called “our”, “local” or “national” expression⁹. I have already mentioned the three often used terms. Were they part of the contemporary postulated collectivistic cultural norm? In some papers, depending on the theme, they praised the vitality and strength of the individual local artist or so called national collective artist-genius. It was a cultural, scientific and social mission of art historians around 1950.

Looking at the overall results of their research during the Fifties, it can be concluded that it was precisely the period of the policy of conflict between Yugoslavia and Italy, which escalated due to the Free Territory of Trieste, which was one of the most positive periods for the development of professional paradigm in Croatian art history.

Let us recall the cultural events that marked the years 1950-1951. Between March and September 1950, Miroslav Krleža¹⁰ organised the first post-war representative exhibition of medieval art of peoples of Yugoslavia in Paris. In spring 1951 the exhibition was set up in Zagreb¹¹. The same year in October a

⁹ «If art work is clearly created and powerful and if it naturally grows out of its environment and epoch, it has its own character and value. This is the yardstick we use to assess the Dalmatian monuments. They were created to our local needs and opportunities mostly by local masters/artisans, and collected and preserved for centuries» (Fisković 1946, p. 6). The topic was addressed in detail by Fisković in his work (Fisković 1948, pp. 241-265). I quote (p. 244): «Here in the narrow borderland it was impossible to create an area cleared of foreign interference, where our essentiality would then be shaped artistically, and in our own manner» (Reference translated from Croatian). The concepts of “local artist” and “national collective artistic genius” fitted in with the multinational concept which was then propagated by Yugoslav media policy. About the then “centripetal, integrative programme of brotherhood and unity” and ethno-political concept of the nation, see Zimmermann 2010, pp. 177-179.

¹⁰ Miroslav Krleža was at that time the most prominent left-wing writer of the new Yugoslavia and an unofficial ideologist of its cultural policy. Expressionist playwright, a poet and novelist of the modernist movement, since the 1920s Krleža was a declared supporter of the Communist Party and Tito's personal friend. However, as a modernist he sharply clashed with the ideas of socialist realism and Zhdanov's aesthetics which is why in the late 1930s he distanced himself from the Communist Party. This was the reason why unlike many Croatian writers he was not a participant of the partisan movement. After 1948 and the break between Tito and Stalin, Yugoslavia detached itself from the Soviet model of cultural policy. Krleža again got an important position and formulated such a policy in his famous speech at the Congress of Yugoslav Writers in 1950 in Ljubljana. As a communist and a prominent literary classic he got the major role in the new cultural life. He became the director of the Yugoslav Encyclopaedia and encouraged the establishment of the Faculty of Philosophy in Zadar. See Goldstein L., Goldstein S. 2015, 696-701; Visković 2015, pp. 71-80.

¹¹ The exhibition in Paris was held in the Palais de Chaillot from March 9 to May 22, 1950, and in the Art Pavilion in Zagreb between March 11 and April 30, 1951. Krleža 1951, pp. 5-11 wrote the preface. The same text was published in the journal «Umetnost» (Krleža 1950a, pp. 13-20) and the journal «Jugoslavija» (Krleža 1950b, pp. 52-61). Krleža wrote an essay on the occasion of the Izložba jugoslavenskog srednjevjekovnog slikarstva i plastike (Exhibition of Yugoslav Medieval Art and Sculpture) in Paris in 1950, published in «Republika» (Krleža 1950c, pp. 329-347). See: Petričević 1993, pp. 381-382; Visković 2009, 2015, pp. 71-80. Visković attributed to Krleža «the role of the architect of the new cultural paradigm of socialist Yugoslavia». Petrunaro 2011, pp. 122-138 was focused on the issue of the identity of the new state planning to create a new society.

catalogue with his preface for the exhibition “Gold and Silver of Zadar” in the atrium of the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts represented the city of Zadar destroyed in Allied bombing raids (November 1943 to October 1944), during which an exodus of Italian inhabitants happened, which emptied the city – later inhabited by the new settlers¹². In September 1950 in Dubrovnik, the first exhibition of old Dubrovnik painting was set up¹³. The trefoil of exhibitions was to symbolically demonstrate the originality of old art of Yugoslavia, Dalmatia and Dubrovnik to the local and international public. As if through great artistic events new, official cultural paradigm was symbolically established. Krleža’s preface to the Paris exhibition was conceived as a *plaidoyer pro domo* (the subtitle of his essay devoted to the exhibition). Krleža conceived the text in the catalogue for the exhibition “Gold and Silver of Zadar” as a «defence of our identity before Western Europe that persistently disputed our contribution to European culture and art»¹⁴.

Art history of Dalmatia as a specific region with its position of an edge, a cultural and civilizational boundary with a set of specific historical, political and cultural identities, was useful for the Dalmatian researchers at that time for a specific *case study*, both regarding denotation of the dividing line between the West and the East, and the issues of artistic heteronomy and autonomy. Inter alia, the forms in which the elements of the Western artistic canon in Dalmatia have penetrated, and the way in which the Western canon was accepted/received (for the period that we are interested in, that is, the Italian artistic canon) are understood from three cultural positions: the border (edge), the centre and the periphery.

For this theme the paradigmatic book is *O ulozi domaće sredine u umjetnosti hrvatskih krajeva. Problemi periferijske umjetnosti (On the Impact of the Local Milieu on the Art of Croatian Regions. Issues of peripheral art, 1963)* by Ljubo Karaman (1886-1971). In the book, which was a cultural and historical synthesis of decades of his art history studies, cultural views and system of values¹⁵, and the synthesis of current paradigm/of reflection on this subject in Croatian art history, the author through the history of artistic production in Dalmatia argued that for centuries it had had characteristics of the “provincial”,

He considered educational policy and history textbooks as key areas in the formation of the goals of the new state.

¹² Talpo, Brcic 2000; Lovrovich 2008; Markovina 2015, pp. 63-72.

¹³ Izložba starih dubrovačkih slikara (Old Dubrovnik Masters Exhibition), Dubrovnik Renaissance Festival, Dubrovnik Art Gallery, September 8-21, 1950.

¹⁴ Krleža 1950d, reference translated from Croatian.

¹⁵ Karaman 2001, pp. 7, 27 recalls the pattern of defining the provincial art of the Roman Empire: «Masters of the province do not regularly master the form when compared to masters of the leading centres but often they do not take care of it». The peripheral area milieu, according to Karaman, is «[...] the area which, distant from the leading cultural circles, receives inspiration from a few sources, adopts and processes it by developing a self-effacing artistic activity on its own soil» (reference translated from Croatian). It is characterized by retardation of style and long phases of transitional and mixed styles of the transition from one to another style period.

“bordering” (today we would say marginal, liminal) and “peripheral” region. He interpreted the term “bordering region milieu” as the milieu of the crossroads of two cultures, the “provincial” one as that dependent on a larger centre (and the art characterized by imitation), while he defined the “peripheral” as the one characterized by creativity and freedom of creation¹⁶.

In this connection, let us recall how in 1949 in Zagreb Miroslav Krleža in the discussion at the *Second Congress of the Yugoslav Writers* laid upside down the (hegemonic) idea of artistic transfer from the advanced West to the underdeveloped East, i.e. the Balkans, as a province on the edge of civilization, representing the idea of the periphery as centre or centre as the periphery¹⁷.

The idea advocated by Krleža and Karaman, which can now be linked to post-colonialism, appears in our history of art as a reaction to the writing of two prominent representatives of the Vienna School, A. Riegel and J. Strzygowski, on the external, political and artistic influences in Dalmatia as (*Bewegungskräfte*) external forces of the artistic exchange in the early 20th century¹⁸. Karaman also knew Strzygowski’s thesis on (*Beharrungskräfte*) internal, conservative forces of the (artistic) persistence¹⁹. After all, he knew Hippolyte Taine’s theses too. Do not forget that since the time between the two wars, the terms of “provincial”, “peripheral” and “bordering”/“marginal” were used by Karaman, and other Yugoslav art historians of his generation, such as Vojeslav (Wojsław) Molè and Izidor Cankar.

¹⁶ Prelog 1966, p. 8 considered that Karaman primarily defined artistic creation in the “local environment” by its so-called passive receptivity. See: Ivančević 1996, pp. 183-193, 2001, pp. 181-183; Bakoš 2004, p. 91; Gudelj 2007, pp. 261-271.

¹⁷ The radical reconceptualization of the art history that relationship of centre and periphery defines in terms of ideology, rather than of formal-stylistic characteristics. The art is not following the Stalinist dogma of the rejection of bourgeois art, but searching for an ideological humanistic base of socialist culture. Krleža 1950, 1988, p. 119: «In the art in Yugoslavia artistic and moral issues were mastered spontaneously and creatively, but not epigonic, or blindly eclectic». In the discussion, Krleža says that a hundred and fifty years before Newton’s discovery of the spectrum we discovered it, had hundreds of artists, builders, architects, sculptors, painters and ideologues, and before Cimabue and Buoninsegna had plastic painting. See: Editorial staff 1999, pp. 273-274; Zimmermann 2010, p. 176. Said 1979 suggests that such view of the centre in regard to the periphery and vice versa is typical of colonialism.

¹⁸ Białostocki 1989, pp. 51-52 interprets Strzygowski’s terms; *Bewegungskräfte* as dynamic power of centre, *Beharrungskräfte* as static power of periphery. He thinks that the result of the latter is stylistic inertia, or the coexistence of different stylistic levels simultaneously, as well as the assimilation of old and new stylistic solutions. More: Karaman 1963, p. 6. In this regard Karaman says, «movement forces are political power, [...] economic and trade connections (e.g. maritime affairs and trade of Dalmatian towns), and cultural flow between areas (e.g. from the Apennines, and the West, to the Balkans, and Eastern Adriatic), which affects the development of the art of an area» (reference translated from Croatian, Karaman 1963, p. 6).

¹⁹ Therefore in 1963 the quoted anthology of significant title, Karaman points out that in addition to external influences, art of an area is determined by the «permanent and unchangeable factors of geographical position, climate associated with the area, the climate-dependent material which domestic soil provides, as well as ethnic factor, which to a certain extent determines the attitude and aptitude of man to the arts» (reference translated from Croatian).

2. Vola, colomba (*Nilla Pizzi, Sanremo, 1952*)

On 15th April 1952 Zagreb hosted the first big protest meeting on the occasion of the proposed Free Territory of Trieste. Yugoslav Government was against the handover of the zone A, the Anglo-American zone, to Italy, and Tito made his famous speech in Glina against fascists and Pavelić.

The issue of Trieste, Zone A and Zone B in the period between 1945 and 1954 was strongly felt in Italy as well, not only in foreign policy but in “symbolic events” in Italian sports and culture as well, for example in 1948 Fulvia Franco, a girl from Trieste, won at the Miss Italy beauty contest. The winner of Sanremo Music Festival 1952 was the popular singer Nilla Pizzi. The lyrics of her song *Vola, colomba* were about a couple in love from Trieste who were separated when Zones A and B were created²⁰.

However, it is indicative that the year before the Treaty of London in elections in Italy in 1953 the Communists received 9,000,000 votes, 36% of the entire electorate. In a part of the press Italy was presented as “antemurale della Civiltà nel Mediterraneo”, in terms of its role (at the time of the Trieste crisis) in the East-West relations.

How did Italy celebrate the return of Trieste? I site the relevant eloquent description from the article published on 27th October 1954 in the daily newspaper «Il Piccolo»:

I bersaglieri giunsero finalmente sulla riva ma non riuscirono scendere alla radice del Molo Audace perché non erano soli, [...] giovani e non più giovani, donne e ragazzi, erano con loro, stretti a loro, e gli avevano portato via i piumetti che ora agitavano verso la folla che acclamava e lanciava i fiori ed era tutta intorno che premeva esultante²¹.

At noon of November 4th 1954 in Rome, the crowd welcomed the President of the Republic Luigi Einaudi, and the state’s celebration was concluded at the Altar of Homeland.

Moreover, a year earlier, in 1953 in Vicenza “Mostra dell’irredentismo Giuliano-Dalmata” was prepared together with the Dalmatian pavilion which was arranged by the architect Vincenzo Fasolo of Split origin and Manilio Cace, both of irredentist beliefs²².

One should bear in mind that the Dalmatian Italian emigrants felt in Italy as “esuli in patria”, seeking to defend their specific identity in relation to the Italian nationality. In Rome, the Čipiko Bakotić collection/Raccolta dalmata Cippico Bacotich was established in the Library of the Senate. A new edition was published of the two historiographical publications, *Storia di Zara dal*

²⁰ Cattaruzza 2007, p. 325.

²¹ *Il sole era nel cuore della folla*, «Il Piccolo», 27th October 1954, special issue, citation based on: Cattaruzza 2007, p. 322.

²² Semi, Tacconi V. 1992, pp. 529-530.

1797 al 1918 by Angelo de Benvenuti and *La Dalmazia preveneta* by Antonio Teja. Dalmatian *esuli* gathered and acted through several institutions and associations such as Deputazione di Storia per le Venezie²³, Ateneo Veneto and Società Dalmata di Storia Patria²⁴.

Ildebrando Tacconi (1888-1973) started editing «Rivista dalmatica» journal in 1953 by resuming it with the help of Associazione Nazionale Dalmata di Roma²⁵. The editorial policy of the journal, as well as in his own texts on the Dalmatian culture and art showed the current historical and political interests of *esuli* towards Dalmatia and the east Adriatic coast.

In 1956 Ildebrando Tacconi published an article titled *Vigore e vitalità della cultura latina in Dalmazia*²⁶. Here he expressed his attitude in regard to the duration of the Latin culture in the Dalmatian literature.

Ildebrando Tacconi perceived the Dalmatians (inhabitants of Dalmatia) as successors of the ancient Romans, their culture and manners, and as those who had for centuries participated in the Italian culture, and whose science, art and culture were imbued with Italian influence. These are the characteristics of Dalmatians' identity that Ildebrando Tacconi took over from the well-known fluctuating repertoire of the notions of collective personality, social and cultural characteristics of that community, recognised in its representatives by the representatives of Zadar historiographical school. In 1955, Marco Perlini published in «Rivista Dalmatica» romanticized biography of Ivan Duknović (Giovanni Dalmata) as a small shepard from the vicinity of Trogir, who became a skilled sculptor. The biography is abundant with stereotypes about Schiavoni artists that autonomists were inclined to during the second half of the nineteenth century²⁷.

Ildebrando Tacconi dealt with the four great Dalmatian artists: Giorgio Orsini (Juraj Dalmatinac), Luciano and Francesco Laurana, and Giorgio Schiavone (Juraj Čulinović) in 1966 in the article of significant title *Contributo della Dalmazia alla cultura italiana* (Dalmatian Contribution to Italian Culture)²⁸.

Ildebrando Tacconi actually obsessively researched the hermeneutics of his

²³ Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie was founded in Venezia in 1873, with the aim to promote scientific research in the history of the Venetian, Tridentine, Giulia and Adriatic regions in the period of Venetian dominance, as well as the provinces were part of the Venetian Republic.

²⁴ Giuseppe Praga (1893-1958) was in 1926 one of the founders of Società Dalmata di Storia Patria. From 1928 he was the honorary inspector for Zadar medieval art (ispettore onorario per l'arte medievale e moderna della provincia di Zara). Thanks to Praga, after he moved to Venice, several encyclopedia entries devoted to prominent Dalmatian scientists and artists were published in the Italian Encyclopedia Treccani. For our topic we find interesting his studies *Della patria e del casato di Andrea Meldola* (Praga 1930, pp. 80-94) e *Indagini e studi sull'Umanesimo in Dalmazia, Ciriaco de Pizzicolti e Marino de Resti* (Praga 1932, pp. 262-280). See: Praga 2015.

²⁵ Monzali 2015, p. 515.

²⁶ Tacconi I. 1994, pp. 629-642.

²⁷ Perlini 1955, citation based on Perlini 1992, pp. 180-185.

²⁸ Tacconi I. 1994, pp. 874-876, 877.

homeland, all his life remaining faithful to historiography of the Zadar School in the tradition of Vitaliano Brunelli, sharing the same historiographical and political ideas with Giuseppe Prag and Arturo Cronia.

Ildebrando Tacconi perceived topics of Dalmatian history and art history from bitter, nostalgic perspective of an intellectual-*esule*, a member of the Dalmatian Italian minority immigrant to Italy after the fall of fascism. His ideological and cultural constructions were built exclusively on old historical sources and literature written in Italian.

Tacconi's texts are a typical expression of nostalgia that occurs in emigration caused by events during the World War 2, which the cultural theorist Svetlana Boym calls "restorative". It is the nostalgia that is manifested at Tacconi as a political emigrant in his desire to preserve memory through essays and scientific texts that he wrote passionately for years²⁹. In this interpretative key it is also possible to recognize structures of "self" (as a representative of the Italian community of *esuli*) and "other" (Tito's Yugoslavia) in the texts by Ildebrando Tacconi.

3. *Behind the Iron Curtain: Dalmatian art history at the time of the Free Territory of Trieste*

Through exhibitions and studies, speech and press, the Academy will popularise our art history so that, based on the famous tradition of painting and sculpting, they build our own artistic self-awareness, worthy of all the tasks that await our art in regard to building our future socialist civilization³⁰.

At the beginning of the Fifties, Krleža as a key figure in the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts not only had a strong impact on the formation of national cultural ideology but, it seems, he was also a promoter of researching some themes in art history³¹. It is interesting that then, in 1950, Fisković and Krleža shared very similar ideas, both when interpreting artists originating from the area of present-day Croatia, the so-called Schiavoni, and when writing about gold and silver of Zadar. It should be pointed out that Krleža even cited Fisković! We should bear in mind that Krleža in the discussion at the *Second Congress of the Yugoslav Writers*, 1949, mentioned that Michelangelo, Bramante and El

²⁹ Writing about nostalgia S. Boym (Boym 2007, pp. 7-18) developed her two types, characteristic of the 20th century: restorative and reflective.

³⁰ Krleža 1949, p. 93.

³¹ Krleža 1985. Krleža, as indicated by Stanko Lasić, then actually finished his destructive phase of deconstruction of the national canon; thinking simultaneously about the encyclopedia, starting from his participation in Ljubljana at the *Congress of Yugoslav Writers* (1952) he built on his role of "internal dissident", who at the same time imitates the hegemonic narrative of the nation.

Greco learned from our artists, that without our architects «there would be no Avignon, no Palace in Urbino», and that without our poets there would be no humanism on the Danube and no Renaissance in Budapest! Numerous Cvito Fisković's³² and Kruno Prijatelj's³³ studies and monographs and encyclopaedic entries dedicated to visual artists called Schiavoni witnessed a really strong interest in this subject matter during the Fifties. Another, no less important thematic preoccupation of the Fifties was a research on the part that local artists and craftsmen had in the shaping of old Dalmatian art. In those years Fisković³⁴, Prijatelj³⁵, Jorjo Tadić³⁶ and Ivo Petricioli³⁷ paid great attention to the research of archives from which they derived information about the work of many local artists and craftsmen (architects, glassworkers, stone carvers, goldsmiths, wood carvers and military architects). Fisković devoted particular attention to local architects. Thus in his article *Naše urbanističko nasljeđe na Jadranu* (*Our Urban Heritage on the Adriatic*), in 1958, he said that «a large part of our coastal architecture and stone-carving is the work of local artists, raised and educated on Sub-Balkan ground»³⁸.

Kruno Prijatelj in his article *Naši umjetnici u svjetskim muzejima* (*Our Artists in the World Museums*), 1959 writes:

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, several painters and sculptors from the East Adriatic littoral – far from their homeland – created rounded opuses that represent important chapters of Quattrocento and Cinquecento art. Although these masters worked abroad, they never denied their homeland. Together with their names they always emphasized their origin by adding Dalmaticus, Dalmatian, Schiavone or Croata. Their origin is clearly reflected in the number of specific features of their style that distinguishes them from the environment in which they worked and gives them specific meaning; they can be interpreted only with the visual substrate they took from their homeland. In this context the most significant sculptors are Francesco Laurana and Ivan Duknović. The first left his major works in Italy and France, the other in Italy and Hungary. If we look back at some characteristics of their sculptural physiognomy and at the details of their life paths there is something in common, despite the undeniable differences of their styles³⁹.

The paper ends with this sentence:

When the Venetian historian and painter Carlo Ridolfi wrote about Andrea Meldola, he did not understand the essence and quality of his painting, but he noticed something new in his work, and he called it a reflection of the “instinct of his nation”⁴⁰.

³² Fisković 1950, 1957 e 1959a.

³³ Prijatelj 1950, 1952, 1954, 1955a, 1956a, 1956b, 1957 e 1960.

³⁴ Fisković 1948.

³⁵ Prijatelj 1951; Karaman-Prijatelj 1955; Prijatelj 1955b.

³⁶ Tadić 1952-1953.

³⁷ Petricioli 1955.

³⁸ Translated from Croatian, Fisković 1958, p. 45.

³⁹ Translated from Croatian, Prijatelj 1959, p. 84.

⁴⁰ Translated from Croatian, Prijatelj 1959, p. 111. Do the quoted sentences reflect the influence

It is this generation that recognised the key role of urban and rural space for the visual experience of Dalmatia (later associated with the *genius loci* and anthropology, or phenomenology of space and place).

The principal novelty was the attempt to look at urban heritage and art from “plebeian perspective” (I am paraphrasing Velimir Visković as an expression of awareness of the role of ethnic mass in the creation of the cultural landscape as a whole). Their historical function was – by shifting the focus and direction of research – to liberate Dalmatian art of theoretical approach resulting from the political appropriation and adaptation of stylistic characteristics in which it was considered to be a passive reflection of external impact. It is interesting from today’s perspective to emphasize that the new scientific paradigm equally affected intellectuals of bourgeois orientation and those who were left-wing oriented. Fisković already declared himself a young leftist intellectual as a participant of the first *Conference of Cultural Workers*, in Hvar, 1943⁴¹. Can we read from their texts which ideological and class position Ivo Petricoli or Kruno Prijatelj started from? For example, unlike Fisković, who was primarily interested in proving the values of local artists and collective creativity, Prijatelj was more concerned with quality imported works and international achievements of artists called Schiavoni. He was interested in elite culture of rich class that competed by their investments in culture with those of the neighbouring Adriatic coast. Some future researchers of Croatian art history will certainly take care of their ideological and class attitude.

To conclude, in the Fifties, in accordance with the new cultural paradigm, the idea of art history and urban heritage was formed, which is now omnipresent as sunken goods (*gesunkenes Kulturgut*). Therefore, those who intend to search for the cultural identity of Dalmatia today must inevitably walk through the gardens of articles and books that this remarkable generation planted. The generation behind the Iron Curtain and without a passport that did not lack scientific eros.

Riferimenti bibliografici / References

- Ballinger P. (2002), *History in exile, Memory and identity at the borders of the Balkans*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bakoš J. (2004), *From Universalism to Nationalism*, in *Die Kunsthistorographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der Nationale Diskurs* (Berlin, 28-30 Juny 2001),

of the theory of race and environmental determinism in the interpretations of works of the Croatian artists so-called Schiavoni?

⁴¹ Ninić 1973; Kuzmić 2010, p. 586.

- edited by R. Born, A. Janathová, A.S. Labuda, Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, pp. 89-91.
- Belamarić J. (1992), *Zbornik posvećen Kruni Prijatelju u povodu 70. godišnjice života*, in *Prijateljstvo zbornik*, «Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji», 32, n. 1, pp. 7-11.
- Białostocki J. (1989), *Some values of artistic periphery*, in *Center and Periphery: Dissemination and Assimilation of Style, Word Art, Themes of Unity and Diversity*, Acts of 26th International Congress of the History of Art (Washington D.C., 10-15 August 1986), edited by I. Lavin, Philadelphia: the Pennsylvania State University Press, vol. I, pp. 49-58.
- Boym S. (2007), *Nostalgia and its Discontents*, «The Hedgehog Review», 7, pp. 7-18.
- Cattaruzza M. (2007), *L'Italia e il confine orientale*, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Čopić B. (2001), *Hedgehog's Home*, London: Istros Books.
- Editorial Staff (1999), *Svjedočanstvo vremena*, in *Krležijana*, 2 (M-Ž), Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, pp. 273-274.
- Fisković C. (1946), *Dalmatinski spomenici i okupator*, Split: Izdanje Konzervatorskog zavoda u Splitu (Conservation Institute for Dalmatia in Split, 1).
- Fisković C. (1948), *Naši primorski umjetnici od 9. do 19. stoljeća*, «Hrvatsko kolo», 2, pp. 241-265.
- Fisković C. (1950), *Djela kipara Ivana Duknovića u Trogiru*, «Historijski zbornik», III, n. 1/4, pp. 233-239.
- Fisković C. (1956), *Hrvatski umjetnici u Mlecima*, «Mogućnosti», III, 1, pp. 1-25.
- Fisković C. (1957), *Ivan Duknović u zavičaju*, «Bulletin Instituta za likovne umjetnosti JAZU», IV, n. 1, pp. 28-32.
- Fisković C. (1958), *Naše urbanističko nasljeđe na Jadranu*, «Zbornik Društva inženjera i tehničara u Splitu», pp. 45-60.
- Fisković C. (1959a), *Aleši, Firentinac i Duknović u Trogiru*, «Bulletin Instituta za likovne umjetnosti JAZU», VII/ 1, pp. 20-43.
- Fisković C. (1959b), *Dubrovnik*, Beograd: Jugoslavija.
- Foretić V. (1998), *Fisković Cvito*, in *Hrvatski biografski leksikon*, 4 (E-Gm), Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, pp. 276-280.
- Goldstein I., Goldstein A. (2015), *Tito*, Zagreb: Profil.
- Gudelj J. (2007), *Ljubo Karaman e i problemi dell'arte periferica*, in *Arte e Architettura: Le cornici della storia*, a cura di F. Bardati, A. Rosellini, Milano: Paravia Bruno Mondadori Editori, pp. 261-271.
- Ivančević R. (2006), *Ljubo Karaman e la nozione dell'arte provinciale, dell'arte di frontiera e dell'arte periferica (Ljubo Karman and his Notions about Provincial, Boreder and Peripheral Art)*, in *La Scuola Viennese di storia dell'arte*, Atti del XX convegno dell'istituto per gli incontri culturali Mitteleuropei, a cura di M. Pozzatto, Gorizia: Istituto per gli incontri culturali Mitteleuropei, pp. 183-193.

- Ivančević R. (2001), *Prelogova kritika Karamanovih teza*, in Lj. Karaman, *Problemi periferijske umjetnosti*, Zagreb: Društvo povjesničara umjetnosti Hrvatske, pp. 181-183.
- Jakovina T. (2003), *Američki komunistički saveznik. Hrvati, Titova Jugoslavija i Sjedinjene Američke Države 1945.-1955.*, Zagreb: Profil International – Srednja Europa.
- Jakšić N. (1995), *Akademiku Ivi Petricioliju u povodu 70. obljetnice života*, in *Petriciolijev zbornik*, I, «Prilozi za povijest umjetnosti u Dalmaciji», 35, pp. 7-21.
- Karaman Lj. (1930), *O talijanskim aspiracijama na Dalmaciju, navodno baziranim na spomenicima umjetnosti te zemlje*, «Obzor», LXXI, n. 266, pp. 2-3.
- Karaman Lj., Prijatelj K. (1955), *O mjesnim grupama dalmatinske slikarske škole u XV. st.*, «Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji», 9, pp. 176-180.
- Karaman Lj. (1963), *O djelovanju domaće sredine u umjetnosti hrvatskih krajeva. Problemi periferijske umjetnosti*, Zagreb: Društvo historičara umjetnosti Narodne Republike Hrvatske.
- Karaman Lj. (2001), *Problemi periferijske umjetnosti*, Zagreb: Društvo povjesničara umjetnosti Hrvatske.
- Krleža M. (1950a), *Srednjevjekovna umjetnost naroda Jugoslavije. Izložba jugoslovenskog srednjevjekovnog slikarstva i plastike*, «Umetnost», 1, 2, pp. 13-20.
- Krleža M. (1950b), *Srednjevjekovna umjetnost naroda Jugoslavije. Izložba jugoslovenskog srednjevjekovnog slikarstva i plastike*, «Jugoslavija», 1950, pp. 52-61.
- Krleža M. (1950c), *Srednjevjekovna umjetnost naroda Jugoslavije. Izložba jugoslovenskog srednjevjekovnog slikarstva i plastike*, «Republika», 6, pp. 329-347.
- Krleža M. (1950d), *Riječ u diskusiji na Drugom kongresu književnika Jugoslavije*, the speech uttered on December 26, 1949 in Zagreb, «Republika», 1, p. 93 (reprinted in Krleža M. (1988), *Svjedočanstva vremena, Književno-estetske varijacije*, Sarajevo: Oslobođenje; Zagreb: Mladost).
- Krleža M. (1951), *Srednjevjekovna umjetnost naroda Jugoslavije*, in *Izložba jugoslovenskog srednjevjekovnog slikarstva i plastike*, Catalogue of the Exhibition (Palais de Chaillot, Paris, March 9 – May 22 1950; Art Pavilion, Zagreb, March 11 – April 30 1950), Zagreb: Izdavački zavod Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti, pp. 5-11.
- Krleža M. (1985), *Likovne studije*, edited by I. Frangeš, Sarajevo: Oslobođenje.
- Kuzmić M., edited by (2010), *Antifašistički Split, ratna kronika 1941.-1945.*, Split: Udruga antifašističkih boraca i antifašista grada Splita.
- Lovrovich G.E. (2008), *Zadar, Od bombardiranja do izgnanstva (1943.-1947.)*, Rijeka: Edit, Biblioteka Egzotika.
- Markovina D. (2015), *Povijest poraženih*, Zagreb: Naklada Jesenski i Turk.

- Maroević T. (2010), *Grgo Gamulin kao književni kritičar*, paper in *Od atribucije do filozofije umjetnosti*, Scientific conference dedicated to the hundredth anniversary of Grgo Gamulin's birth (Zagreb, 15-16 December 2010). (unpublished).
- Maroević T. (2011), *Socrealizam Grge Gamulina*, in *Desničini susretii, Intelektualci i vlast, 1945-1954*, Proceedings of symposium (Zagreb, 18-19 September 2009), edited by D. Roksandić, M. Najbar-Agičić, I. Cvijović Javorina, Zagreb: Centar za komparativnohistorijske i interkulturalne studije and FF press, pp. 28-42.
- Monzali L. (2015), *Gli Italiani di Dalmazia e le relazioni italo-jugoslave nel Novecento*, Venezia: Marsilio Editori – Società Dalmata di Storia Patria.
- Ninić T. (1975), *Hvarska konferencija 1943.-1973.*, Split: Čakavski sabor.
- Perlini M. (1992), *Giovanni Dalmata*, in Semi, Tacconi (1992), pp. 180-185.
- Petricioli I. (1955), *Prinove zadarskom slikarstvu XV. st.*, «Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji», 9, pp. 155-169.
- Petričević M. (1993), *Izložba srednjovjekovne umjetnosti naroda Jugoslavije*, in *Krležijana*, 1 (A-LJ), Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, pp. 381-382.
- Petrungaro S. (2011), *Novorođena država u potrazi za poviješću (i povjesničarima)*, in *Desničini susreti*, Proceedings of symposium (Zagreb - Islam Grčki, 18-19 September 2009), edited by D. Roksandić, M. Najbar-Agičić, I. Cvijović Javorina, I, Zagreb: Centar za komparativnohistorijske i interkulturalne studije and FF press, pp. 122-138.
- Praga G. (1930), *Della patria e del casato di Andrea Meldola*, «Archivio storico per la Dalmazia», vol. 9, fasc. 50, pp. 80-94.
- Praga G. (1932), *Indagini e studi sull'Umanesimo in Dalmazia, Ciriaco de Pizzicollis e Marino de Resti*, «Archivio storico per la Dalmazia», 7, vol. XIII, fasc. 78, pp. 262-280.
- Praga G. (2015), *Scritti sulla Dalmazia di Giuseppe Praga*, 3 volumes, edited by E. Ivetich, Rovinj: Centro di Ricerche Storiche di Rovigno – Venezia: Società Dalmata di Storia Patria di Venezia.
- Prelog M. (1966), *Problem valorizacije u historiji umjetnosti naše zemlje*, «Život umjetnosti», 1, pp. 4-14.
- Prijatelj K. (1947), *Barok u Splitu*, Split: KUD "Ivan Lozica".
- Prijatelj K. (1950), *Dalmatinski opus slikara Mateja Ponzonija*, «Hrvatsko kolo», III, 2, pp. 269-276.
- Prijatelj K. (1951), *Slike domaće škole XV. stoljeća u Splitu*, Split: Galerija umjetnina.
- Prijatelj K. (1952a), *Andrija Medulić Schiavone*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti.
- Prijatelj K. (1952b), *Federiko Benković*, Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti (Mala biblioteka).
- Prijatelj K. (1954), *Slikarski lik Jurja Čulinovića*, «Mogućnosti», 1, 2, pp. 231-232.

- Prijatelj K. (1955a), *Jedna nova Benkovičeva slika?*, «Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji», 9, pp. 304-308.
- Prijatelj K. (1955b), *Dalmatinska slikarska škola*, «Mogućnosti», II, 1, pp. 42-61.
- Prijatelj K. (1956), *Prinosi za monografiju o Ivanu Duknoviću*, «Anali Historijskog instituta JAZU u Dubrovniku», IV-V, pp. 305-321.
- Prijatelj K. (1957a), *Ivan Duknović*, Zagreb: Društvo historičara umjetnosti N. R. Hrvatske.
- Prijatelj K. (1959), *Naši umjetnici u svjetskim muzejima*, in *Iz umjetnosti četiri epohe*, «Jugoslavija», n. 18, pp. 81-112.
- Prijatelj K. (1960), *Profilo di Giorgio Schiavone*, «Arte antica e moderna», 9, pp. 47-63.
- Prijatelj Pavičić I. (2008), *L'identità storica degli artisti Schiavoni nella fortuna critica della prima metà del XX secolo*, «Atti e memorie della Società Dalmata di storia patria», n. 10, pp. 133-169.
- Prijatelj Pavičić I. (2014), *Razmišljanja o povijesti dalmatinske kulture i umjetnosti iza željezne zavjese: što je sve nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata umjetnost na tlu Dalmacije predstavljala za povjesničare umjetnosti*, in *Dalmacija u prostoru i vremenu. Što Dalmacija jest, a što nije*, Scientific conference (Zadar, 14-16 Juny 2012), edited by L. Mirošević, V. Graovac Matassi, Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru, pp. 181-189.
- Said E. (1979), *Orientalism*, New York: Columbia University.
- Scherke K. (2004), *Der formale Ansatz Alois Riegl und die Entwicklung nationaler Kunsthistoriographien in der osterreichisch-ungarischen Monarchie – dargestellt am Beispiel Ljubo Karamans*, in *Die Kunsthistoriographien in Ostmitteleuropa und der Nationale Diskurs*, (Berlin, 28-30 Juny 2001), edited by R. Born, A. Janathová, A.S. Labuda, Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, Berlin, pp. 102-118.
- Semi F., Tacconi V. (1992), *Istria e Dalmazia uomini e tempi. Dalmazia*, Udine: Del Bianco Editore.
- Tacconi I. (1956), *Vigore e vitalità della cultura latina in Dalmatia*, «Rivista Dalmatica», n.s., anno XXVII, fasc. II, pp. 47-60, reprinted in *Per la Dalmazia con amore e con angoscia. Tutti gli scritti editi ed inediti di Ildebrando Tacconi*, a cura di V. Tacconi, Udine: Del Bianco Editore, 1994, pp. 629-642.
- Tacconi I. (1966), *Contributo della Dalmazia alla vita e alla cultura italiana*, «Atti e memorie della Società dalmata e storia patria», vol. 5, pp. 60-115, reprinted in *Per la Dalmazia con amore e con angoscia. Tutti gli scritti editi ed inediti di Ildebrando Tacconi*, a cura di V. Tacconi, Udine: Del Bianco Editore, 1994, pp. 839-891.
- Tacconi I. (1976), *Numero speciale dedicato agli scritti di Ildebrando Tacconi*, «La rivista dalmatica», anno XLVII, anno XXII della nuova serie, serie IV, fasc. I-II, January-July.
- Talpo O., Brcic S. (2000), ... *Vennero dal cielo. 185 fotografie di Zara distrutta*

1943-1944, Trieste: Libero Comune di Zara in Esilio.

Tadić J. (1952-1953), *Građa o o slikarskoj školi u Dubrovniku XIII-XVI veka*, 2 voll., Beograd.

Visković V. (2009), *Utjecaj Miroslava Krleže na artikulaciju političke i kulturne paradigme, 1945-1954*, paper presented at the conference *Desničini susreti. Intelektualci i vlast, 1945-1954* (Zagreb, September 18-19 2009), (unpublished).

Visković V. (2015), *Krleža i Zadar*, «Književna republika», XIII, n. 7-9, pp. 71-80.

Zimmermann T. (2010), *Novi kontinent – Jugoslavija: politična geografija “tretje poti”*, «Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino», n.s., XLVI, pp. 165-190.

Direttore / Editor

Massimo Montella

Co-Direttori / Co-Editors

Tommy D. Andersson, University of Gothenburg, Svezia
Elio Borgonovi, Università Bocconi di Milano
Rosanna Cioffi, Seconda Università di Napoli
Stefano Della Torre, Politecnico di Milano
Michela Di Macco, Università di Roma 'La Sapienza'
Daniele Manacorda, Università degli Studi di Roma Tre
Serge Noiret, European University Institute
Tonino Pencarelli, Università di Urbino "Carlo Bo"
Angelo R. Pupino, Università degli Studi di Napoli L'Orientale
Girolamo Sciuillo, Università di Bologna

Comitato editoriale / Editorial Office

Giuseppe Capriotti, Alessio Cavicchi, Mara Cerquetti, Francesca Coltrinari,
Patrizia Dragoni, Pierluigi Feliciati, Valeria Merola, Enrico Nicosia,
Francesco Pirani, Mauro Saracco, Emanuela Stortoni

Comitato scientifico / Scientific Committee

Dipartimento di Scienze della formazione, dei beni culturali e del turismo
Sezione di beni culturali "Giovanni Urbani" – Università di Macerata
Department of Education, Cultural Heritage and Tourism
Division of Cultural Heritage "Giovanni Urbani" – University of Macerata

Giuseppe Capriotti, Mara Cerquetti, Francesca Coltrinari, Patrizia Dragoni,
Pierluigi Feliciati, Maria Teresa Gigliozzi, Valeria Merola, Susanne Adina Meyer,
Massimo Montella, Umberto Moscatelli, Sabina Pavone, Francesco Pirani,
Mauro Saracco, Michela Scolaro, Emanuela Stortoni, Federico Valacchi,
Carmen Vitale