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implies that there is a consensus or solution out there somewhere that has only to be discovered if the concerned parties are willing to discuss and debate long enough. Indeed, this was a basic tenet of classical liberalism, i.e., of western political theory. This is not to say that there is no hope in negotiation, but rather that the necessary compromise may require more than is comfortable for western sensibilities. Dulles’s seeming change may have been less a transformation of religious thought than a head-on collision with cultural barriers.

If in the final assessment this book does not refute those historians who have viewed the early Dulles through the lens of the later—if his early open-mindedness existed only in the absence of the cultural opposition he would face as an actual policy maker—Mark Toulouse has still made an important contribution. He has shown that Dulles’s religious thought did have an impact on his views on international relations and thus on his policy making. Toulouse has demonstrated how at least one strain of American thought, as it was manifest in this important historical figure, interpreted and reacted to events in this era and so contributed to the development of the Cold War.

Mark L. Kleinman
University of California, Los Angeles


The *Monumenta Artis Croatiae* series put out by Associated Publishers of Yugoslavia has announced its third volume *St. Simeon’s Shrine in Zadar* by Ivo Petricioli, a study of one of the most unusual art treasures in the city, a topic that should demand the attention of historians and art historians alike. Petricioli has successfully solved the major iconographical and chronological problems of the unique fourteenth century gilded silver chest which holds a mummified body said to be that of the prophet Simeon who held the Christ child in his arms in the Temple at Jerusalem and who allegedly became a patron saint of Zadar during its period of economic and cultural flourishing in the Middle Ages. Petricioli explains the origins of the work using archival documents, provides the contract commissioning the sarcophagus to be built and elucidates on the artistic achievements of its craftsman, Franjo of Milan, within the context of Trecento European art.

In establishing Franjo as a first-rate craftsman and draftsman and in verifying the unity and quality of the composition Petricioli departs from five centuries of historiography which had either obscured the chest’s origins or
underestimated its artistic merits. Though nineteenth century art historians had recognized the sarcophagus as a work of art which derived its theme panel “The Presentation in the Temple” from Giotto’s fresco in the Scrovegni Chapel in Padua, Petricioli is the first, by a careful explication of each panel, to acknowledge Franjo’s skills as a draftsman and to appreciate how he applied knowledge of the most advanced achievements in Italian painting to figural compositions, thus introducing new elements into Dalmatian art.

Fourteenth century Dalmatian painting followed the Byzantine style of Paolo Veneziano. Trecento painters, especially Giotto’s school, tried to create an illusion of space in a way wholly different from what is found in Byzantine and Romanesque painting. Franjo attempted to solve the problems of perspective in a way similar to the Giottoesque manner. The Italian goldsmith portrayed realistic details in facial expression, differentiation of dress between noblemen and plebeians and other physical features of individual figures in an approach characteristic of Giotto and his followers. The precise lines of the head and hands make the saint’s reclining figure on the front side of the chest’s roof one of the best reliquaries in the city.

Petricioli breaks from previously neutral evaluations of the Renaissance interior reliefs by Toma Martinov when he estimates them as better than average draftsmanship for Dalmatia, though, not in advance of Dalmatian Renaissance painting. The author however does not need to expand upon the scholarship about the reconstruction of the orthorhombic-shaped chest in the seventeenth century nor on the votive gifts that have been placed in it over the centuries because these themes have been exhausted.

While Petricioli advances our understanding of the artistic value of St. Simeon’s shrine, his interpretation of the political and social background of Zadar prior to the chest’s construction distorts the reasons for its execution. His discussion of Queen Elizabeth Kotromanic of Hungary and her motives for requesting the work is necessarily speculative, but he buries the most plausible explanations in the iconographical explication of the panels. The bulk of the original scholarship (about which the dust jacket boasts) that reveals the origins of the shrine focuses on a chronology of events surrounding the commissioning of the chest and a biography of the goldsmith, Franjo.

The author extrapolates from the historiographical tradition about the significance of the saint, his assertion that Simeon had become popular in Zadar at a time when the city was entering its most prosperous period in the Middle Ages. In keeping with its growing economic independence Zadar sought to rival Venice for control of the Adriatic Sea in the fourteenth century. Simeon in some way represented this drive, in part, because Venice also claimed to possess the saint’s body and patronage. A thirteenth century Dalmatian legend alleges that a Venetian nobleman traveling to Venice from Palestine was forced by a storm to stop in Zadar, and, by a series of accidents, the city came to own the relic.
Yet other scholars, notably Giuseppe Praga, fifty years ago, had wondered about how little the populace in Zadar revered Simeon in the fourteenth century. This forces the question of why in 1377 Elizabeth felt compelled to have built a sarcophagus to care for the neglected body of this particular saint, when the shrines of the more important patron saints, Anastasia and Chrysogonus, needed repair? Some historians have tried to find reasons for Queen Elizabeth’s action in the tumultuous political events occurring in Zadar at the time. While the Hungarian-Croatian king, Louis of Anjou, Elizabeth’s husband, wished to consolidate his influence in Dalmatia and tie it to his south Italian domain, his treaty with Venice in 1358 freed Dalmatia from Venetian rule and left Louis the support of the nobles and Archbishop of Zadar who backed his alliance with Florence and Genoa, thus antagonizing the Pope. In retaliation, the papal ally in Zadar, the abbot of the monastery of St. Chrysogonus condemned the Florentines living in the city and threatened to organize a rebellion of craftsmen, merchants, and citizens against the king. Petricioli argues that the queen possibly ordered the construction of the chest to honor a popular saint in order to mitigate a potential uprising against her husband.

Zadar could not compete equally with Venice for power in the Adriatic. If anything, the saint could have been a symbol of independence from Venice after 1358, but nothing verifies Simeon’s popularity in the fourteenth century. Without differentiating her political from her personal mission, Praga had postulated that the queen tried to mystify the population by enshrining her favorite saint.

If the historical events do not provide a clear insight into the queen’s motives perhaps the panels on the chest suggest them, an interpretation to which Petricioli alludes but does not explore. One panel shows Elizabeth stealing a finger from one of the saint’s hands. She could have been seeking an amulet to help her conceive a male child since she had not produced an heir to the throne. Simeon’s hands after all had held the Christ child. Another panel shows the saint blessing the queen’s father, Stephan Kotromanic, Ban of Bosnia, on his deathbed, probably to prove his Catholic piety against attacks that he protected heretical Bogomils, an accusation traditionally leveled at the leaders of that country. Both weighty concerns could have kindled the queen’s personal devotion to the saint.

Ironically, Simeon’s body was not placed in the chest until nearly two hundred years after its construction in 1571, which supports Petricioli’s observation that the art treasure outstrips the relic in importance. The social and political significance of both the sarcophagus and St. Simeon’s body, however, remains a puzzle for historians.
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