

Ante Piteša

## **Predromanički kameni namještaj iz crkve sv. Petra Starog na Lučcu u Splitu**

### **Pre-Romanesque stone furnishings from Church of St. Peter the Old in Lučac, Split**

Ante Piteša  
HR, 21 000 Split  
Arheološki muzej - Split  
Zrinsko-Frankopanska 25  
ante.pitesa@armus.hr

UDK: 726.59 (497.5 Split) "10"  
Izvorni znanstveni članak  
Primljeno: 2. 5. 2007.  
Prihvaćeno: 21.5.2007.

Ante Piteša  
Croatia, 21 000 Split  
Archaeological Museum in Split  
Zrinsko-Frankopanska 25  
ante.pitesa@armus.hr

UDK: 726.59 (497.5 Split) "10"  
Original scientific paper  
Received: 2 May 2007  
Accepted: 21 May 2007.

Autor u radu obrađuje dva do sada zanemarena dijela oltarne ograde iz crkve sv. Petra Starog na Lučcu u Splitu. Uz poznati i nekoliko puta objavljivani zabat, prema fotografiji iz arhiva Arheološkog muzeja i inventarnoj knjizi identificiran je još jedan zabat iz iste crkve. Ponovno se interpretira i povezuje uz crkvu sv. Petra Starog davno objavljeni plutej, čije je podrijetlo s vremenom zaboravljeno. Oba spomenika datiraju se u kraj 11. st., kao radovi jedne već poznate splitske klesarske radionice koja djeluje na izmaku predromaničkog doba i izrađuje kameni namještaj za crkve u Splitu i Trogiru.

*Ključne riječi: Split, crkva sv. Petra Starog, Lučac, zabat i plutej oltarne ograde, klesarske radionice*

In this work, the author analyzes two until now neglected pieces of the altar screen from the Church of St. Peter the Old in Lučac, a section of Split. In addition to a well-known and oft-published pediment, based on a photograph from the Archaeological Museum's photo archives and the inventory log, one more pediment from the same church has been identified. A pluteus published long before is once more interpreted and linked to the Church of St. Peter the Old, as its provenance was forgotten with time. Both monuments date to the end of the eleventh century as works of one of the already known masonry workshops in Split which operated at the close of the pre-Romanesque period, producing stone furnishings for churches in Split and Trogir.

*Key words: Split, Church of St. Peter the Old, Lučac, pediment and pluteus of the altar screen, masonry workshop*





Slika 1.  
Zabat iz crkve sv. Petra Starog,  
Arheološki muzej u Splitu  
(foto: T. Seser)

Figure 1.  
Pediment from the Church of  
St. Peter the Old, Archaeological  
Museum in Split (photo: T. Seser)

Ovaj rad je potaknut sretnim nalazom jedne fotografije iz fotoarhiva Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu, na kojoj je, između različitih ulomaka predromaničkoga kamenog namještaja, zamijećen jedan trokutasti zabat oltarne ograde sastavljen po lomu iz dva dijela, na kojima su jasno vidljivi inventarni brojevi. Naišli smo na još starijih fotografija istih ulomaka na kojima su brojevi već bili potpuno izbrisani, pa su time i podaci o mjestu nalaza bili izgubljeni. Na prvom ulomku, vrhu zabata, ispisan je kataloški broj 250 E, koji je i upisan u inventarnu knjigu 1891. godine, dok drugi nosi oznaku 282 E i uveden je u inventarnu knjigu 1894. godine. Premda su ulomci dospjeli u Arheološki muzej tijekom vremenskog razmaka od nekoliko godina, nesumnjivo su dijelovi istoga zabata jer se spajaju po frakturi. U inventarnoj knjizi Muzeja kao mjesto nalaza uvedeno je: *Spalato, Chiesa di S. Pietro vecchio di Borgo*.

Sada se ovaj zabat, spojen po lomu, čuva u Muzeju hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, kamo je dospio zajedno s pripojenim spomenicima društva Bihać.<sup>1</sup> Oko prijenosa spomenika društva Bihać koji su se čuvali u Arheološkom muzeju izbio je spor s Muzejom hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, koji se otegnuo

This work was inspired by the fortuitous discovery of a photograph from the photo archives of the Archaeological Museum in Split, on which, among various fragments of pre-Romanesque stone furnishings, a triangular altar-screen pediment was noticed. It is composed of two parts due to a fracture, on which inventory numbers are clearly visible. More old photographs of the same fragments were found, on which the numbers were entirely erased, so that data on the discovery site were lost. The first fragment, the tip of a pediment, bears catalogue number 250 E and is entered in the inventory log of 1891, while the other bears number 282 E and is entered in the inventory log of 1894. Even though these fragments came to the Archaeological Museum over an interval of several years, they are undoubtedly parts of the same pediment, because they fit together at the fracture line. In the Museum's inventory log, the discovery site is listed as *Spalato, Chiesa di S. Pietro vecchio di Borgo*.

Currently this pediment, connected at the fracture line, is held in the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments, where it came together with attached monuments from the Bihać Society.<sup>1</sup> The transfer of the Bihać Society's monuments, which were held in the Archaeological Museum, became the subject of a dispute with the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments, which carried on for several years.<sup>2</sup> The formal hand-over did not proceed smoothly and was not professionally done, so that at the time, the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments received, besides monuments collected by the Bihać Society in the course of research mostly in the vicinity of Split and Solin and Kaštel Fields and recorded in the separate Bihać inventory logs, a part of the medieval monuments held in the Archaeological Museum, which were entered in the Museum's inventory logs. During these moves, valuable data on the origin of individual pre-Romanesque monuments, mostly from various sites in the city of Split, were lost.

Therefore this pediment, together with the other, multiply published pediment bearing an inscription on the arch and

1 U vodiču kroz postav lapidarija u Muzeju hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika kao mjesto nalaza pogrešno je navedena splitska crkva Svetog Duha, a čini se da je i datacija u 9.-10. stoljeće prerana.

1 The guide to the stone monument collection of the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments incorrectly specifies the Church of the Holy Spirit in Split as the discovery site, and it would appear that dating to the 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> centuries is too early.  
2 After World War II, the Bihać Society ceased functioning and its movable and fixed inventory was ceded to the Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Science, which decided to merge the Bihać collection with the Museum of Croatian Antiquities. The hand-over protocol was drafted in 1953. However, in 1955, when transfer of the artefacts began, the director of the Archaeological Museum at the time, B. Gabričević, opposed transfer of the Bihać collection and attempted to keep it in the Archaeological Museum. Thus a dispute arose with the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments, which was established by commission in that same year. Transfer of the Bihać collection was only concluded in May 1957. On this dispute see: Gunjača 1956, pp. 206, 207; Gunjača 1960, pp. 269, 270; Duplančić 1992, pp. 89, 90, note 10-12.



Slika 2.  
Zabat i plutej iz crkve sv. Petra  
Starog, fotografija Č. Ivekovića,  
Arhiv Arheološkog muzeja u  
Splitu

Figure 2.  
Pediment and pluteus from  
the Church of St. Peter the Old,  
photograph by Č. Iveković,  
Archives of the Archaeological  
Museum in Split

nekoliko godina.<sup>2</sup> Primopredaja očito nije tekla glatko i nije stručno provedena, te je tom prilikom u Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika - osim spomenika koje je društvo Bihać prikupilo istraživanjima pretežito u okolici Splita, u solinskom i kaštelanskom polju, koji su bili uvedeni u posebne inventarne knjige Bihaća - dospio i dio ranosrednjovjekovnih spomenika u posjedu Arheološkog muzeja, koji su bili uvedeni u inventarne knjige Muzeja. U ovim su se seljenjima izgubili i vrijedni podaci o podrijetlu pojedinih predromaničkih spomenika, većinom s različitih lokaliteta u gradu Splitu.

2 Nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata društvo Bihać je prestalo s radom te je pokretni i nepokretni inventar pripao Jugoslavenskoj akademiji znanosti i umjetnosti, gdje je odlučeno da se zbirka Bihaća pripoji tadašnjem Muzeju hrvatskih starina. Zapisnik o primopredaji sastavljen je 1953. godine. Međutim 1955. godine, kada su se počeli prenositi spomenici, tadašnji direktor Arheološkog muzeja B. Gabričević usprotivio se prijenosu zbirke Bihaća te ju je nastojao zadržati u Arheološkom muzeju. Time je izbio spor s Muzejom hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, koji je razriješila komisija osnovana iste godine. Prijenos zbirke Bihać okončan je tek mjeseca svibnja 1957. godine. O tom sporu: Gunjača 1956, str. 206, 207; Gunjača 1960, str. 269, 270; Duplančić 1992, str. 89, 90, bilj. 10-12.

back, signed by the Master Petar (Fig. 1),<sup>3</sup> would be the second pediment from the same church. Judging by the stylistic characteristics, both pediments are contemporary, so there is a possibility that the old Church of St. Peter at Lučac had several naves, and in this regard it may have had more than one pediment on the altar screen, or the stone furnishings were changed over a relatively brief period. Bulić published one more

3 Photograph of pediment in Kowalczyk, Gurlitt 1910, P.62. The pediment has been subject to numerous interpretations, both in the reading and elucidation of the inscription, and in the dating. The inscription has not been preserved in its entirety, and stone beams from the upper trabeation of the altar screen are missing. The inscription reads: (...CUM CONIUGE MEA EDIFICAVI DOMUS DEI AD ONORE S(AN)C(T)I PETRI ET S(AN)C(T)I ANDRE(A)... The inscription on the arch of the pediment was published by Jelić, at which time he erroneously interpreted its beginning as the name of the donor *Semea*, associating it with the name of the Split deacon who is mentioned in a document dated 1040, paradoxically correctly ascertaining the time of the pediment's origin. Jelić also recounts a tale, certainly inaccurate, that the pediment is originally from the Church of St. Peter in Solin (which at that time had not yet been located there), whence it was taken and incorporated into the old Church of St. Petar at Lučac, and then once again taken to the newly-constructed church with the same titular (Jelić 1887, pp. 171,172.) Bulić accepted Jelić's reading, but the palaeography of the letters led him to date the inscription to the second half of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, so in this regard he found the name *Semia* (Croatian *Semko*) and *Semna* in the list of pilgrims in the Aquileian church, who were entered in the Evangelistary from Cividale (from 850 to 896). (Bulić 1888, p. 42, 43, P. XVI, 48). A correct reading of the beginning of the inscription was provided by Ivačić, but he incorrectly located the church, stating that the pediment was originally from the Church of St. Peter of the Tower (*de Torre*). (Ivačić 1940, p. 49). Oddly, none of these older authors mentioned the two-line inscription on the back: EGO PETRVS NEPUTVS FECIT CANCELLV(M), published by Rapanić (Rapanić 1958, pp. 110-112; Rapanić 1963-1965, pp. 174, 175). Rapanić dated the pediment, as a very high quality work, to the high phase of braid-design tracery, at the end of the 9<sup>th</sup> and beginning of the 10<sup>th</sup> century. It was similarly dated by Flèche Mourgues, Chevalier, Piteša 1993, pp. 246, 247; Marasovic 1994, p. 266. Currently the overriding view is that the pediment dates to the second half of the eleventh century, and it is associated with the Split masonry workshop, which also made the altar screen in the Church of St. Theodore (Our Lady of the Tower). The stylistic characteristics of the massive peripheral hooks and cymatium, which consist of a series of deeply incised, small triple pronged arcades, with a central field in which a cross is engraved, bordered by a simply incised line and rosettes under the horizontal shafts, indicate the same masonry workshop. The inscription on the beams and arch of the pediment of the altar screen from the Church of Our Lady of the Tower, which mentions the Split Prior Furmin, whose name is also found in a document dated 1088/1089, fixes the time of production of the stonework quite well. Petricioli first noticed the link between these two monuments and asserted the existence of masonry workshop in Split at the end of the pre-Romanesque period. See: Petricioli 1994, pp. 287-292; Belamarić 1991, pp. 18, 23, 24, photograph on p. 30; Rapanić 1995, pp. 327-344. For more on the pediment of the altar screen from the Church of St. Peter the Old with the relevant literature, see Delonga 1997, pp. 8, 9.

Stoga bi ovaj, uz već poznati i nekoliko puta objavljivani zabat s natpisom na luku i na stražnjem dijelu, gdje se potpisao majstor Petar (sl. 1),<sup>3</sup> bio drugi zabat iz iste crkve. Sudeći po stilskim značajkama, oba zabata su iz istog vremena, tako da postoji mogućnost da je stara crkva sv. Petra na Lučcu imala nekoliko brodova i, sukladno tome, nekoliko zabata na istoj oltarnoj ogradi, ili se pak u kratkom vremenskom slijedu dogodila promjena kamenog namještaja. Bulić je objavio još jedan kameni spomenik iz iste crkve, plutej urešen pleternom ornamentikom s motivom križa u arkadi i palmetama ispod horizontalnih krakova, što uvelike proširuje spoznaju o izgledu kamenog namještaja te izgubljene predromaničke crkve.<sup>4</sup> Sada identificirani zabat i plutej iz sv. Petra Starog objavio je Iveković u svojem fotoalbumu kao 'sredovječne'

stone monument from the same church, a pluteus decorated with braid ornamentation and a cross motif in the arcade and palmettes under the horizontal shafts, which greatly expands our knowledge of the appearance of the stone furnishings from this lost pre-Romanesque church.<sup>4</sup> The now identified pediment and pluteus from St. Peter the Old were published by Iveković in his photo album as medieval fragments from Split, with no data on the discovery site, dating, and stylistic features, so on this occasion attention will be accorded to these two neglected elements of the altar screen (Fig. 2).<sup>5</sup>

### On the Church of St. Peter the Old at Lučac

The old Church of St. Peter was located in the eastern section of Split, called Lučac, along a natural rocky reef that descends in an arc from Gripe to the sea. In the Renewed Demarcation of the properties of the Split archbishop in 1397, this suburb was called *In Arcuzo ubi Slavice dicitur na luzaz*.<sup>6</sup> The site of the church is known, but not its appearance, because archaeological research was never conducted at the site.<sup>7</sup> The church probably dated back to the eleventh century, when the lay suburbs east of the Palace were in the process of forming. The church is drawn into several maps depicting Split and its environs. On the map of Martin Kolunić Rota, ca. 1550, a little church is shown on the small peninsula east of the Palace, between the Split harbour and Bačvice Cove, with the titular designated as San Piero.<sup>8</sup> On a drawing of Split with its environs made around the year 1570 by

- 3 Fotografija zabata u Kowalczyk, Gurlitt 1910, T. 62. Zabat je doživio brojne interpretacije, kako u čitanju i tumačenju natpisa, tako i u dataciji. Natpis nije u cijelosti sačuvan, nedostaju dijelovi kamenih greda na gornjoj trabeaciji predoltarne ograde. Natpis glasi: (...CUM CONIUG)GEMEA EDIFICAVI DOMUS DEI AD ONORE S(AN)C(T)I PETRI ET S(AN)C(T)I ANDRE(A)... Natpis na luku zabata prvi je objavio Jelić, koji pogrešno interpretira početak natpisa kao ime donatora *Semea*, povezujući ga s imenom splitskog đakona koji se javlja u dokumentu iz godine 1040.; paradoksalno je da je otprilike pogodio vrijeme nastanka zabata. Jelić donosi i predaju, zasigurno netočnu, da zabat potječe iz crkve sv. Petra u Solinu (koja u to vrijeme još nije bila ubicirana), odakle je bio prenesen i uzidan u staru crkvu sv. Petra na Lučcu, pa ponovo prenesen u novoizgrađenu crkvu istoga titulara (Jelić 1887, str. 171, 172). Bulić prihvaća Jelićevo čitanje, ali ga paleografija slova navodi da natpis datira u drugu polovicu 9. stoljeća, pa sukladno tomu pronalazi ime *Semia* (hrvatski *Semko*) i *Semna* u popisu hodočasnika u akvilejsku crkvu, koji su se upisali u evanđelistar iz Cividalea (od 850. do 896.) (Bulić 1888, str. 42, 43, T. XVI, 48). Ispravno čitanje početka natpisa donosi Ivačić, ali pogrešno ubicira crkvu, navodeći da zabat potječe iz crkve sv. Petra od Kule (*de Torre*) (Ivačić 1940, str. 49). Začudo, nitko od starijih autora ne spominje natpis u dva retka na poledini: EGO PETRVS NEPUTVS FECIT CANCELLV(M), koji donosi Rapanić (Rapanić 1963, str. 110-112; Rapanić 1971, str. 174, 175). Rapanić zabat, kao vrlo kvalitetan rad, datira u zrelo doba pleterne plastike, krajem 9. i početkom 10. stoljeća. Isto ga datiraju i Flèche Mourgues, Chevalier, Piteša 1993, str. 246, 247; Marasović 1994, str. 266. Sada prevladava mišljenje da zabat potječe iz druge polovice 11. stoljeća i vezuje se uz splitsku klesarsku radionicu koja je izradila i oltarnu pregradu u crkvi sv. Teodora (Gospa od Zvonika). Stiske značajke masivnih rubnih kuka i kimationa koji čini niz duboko zasječanih troprutih arkadica, sa središnjim poljem u kojemu je iskelesan križ obrubljen jednostavnom urezanim linijom i rozetama ispod horizontalnih krakova, odaju istu klesarsku radionicu. Natpis na gredama i luku zabata oltarne ograde iz crkve Gospe od Zvonika, na kojima se spominje splitski prior Furmin, čije ime nalazimo u dokumentu iz 1088/1089., vremenski dobro fiksira izradu kamenog namještaja. Petricioli je prvi uočio vezu ovih dvaju spomenika i utvrdio postojanje jedne splitske klesarske radionice na izmaku predromaničkog doba. Vidi: Petricioli 1994, str. 287-292; Belamarić 1991, str. 18, 23, 24, fotografija na str. 30; Rapanić 1995, str. 327-344. Još o zabatu oltarne ograde iz crkve sv. Petra Starog s relevantnom literaturom vidi kod Delonga 1997, str. 8, 9.
- 4 Bulić 1888, str. 43, T. XVI. 51; crtež je loš i ne reproducira točno izgled pluteja. U vodiču kroz mali lapidarij Muzeja hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, gdje je plutej izložen, piše samo da potječe iz Splita, bez približeg navođenja lokaliteta.

- 4 Bulić 1888, p. 43, P. XVI. 51; the sketch is poor and does not reproduce the exact appearance of the pluteus. The guide to the small stone monument collection of the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments, where the pluteus is exhibited, only states that it is from Split, without any more precise indication of the site.
- 5 Iveković 1926, plate on p. 244, Fig. 2, 3.
- 6 The Romanic terms for Lučac in the Middle Ages were *Arcutium* or *Arcuzum*. Farlati 1765, III, p. 344; Katić 1993a, p. 331; Marasović, Oreb 1977, p. 93; Petrić 1983, p. 60; Marasović 1996, p. 22; Ercegović 2002, p. 30. In a document dated 1256 pertaining to the division of land between a certain Mihovil and his sister Mara, land at the location *de Arcuz* is mentioned, but it is uncertain as to whether this refers to Lučac or the arches of the aqueduct, for in the recounting of the land obtained by Mara, land at the Gripe location is mentioned, which is near Lučac, but also land around Sveta Tekla, which is near the arches of the aqueduct (Codex diplomaticus 1998, document no. 177, p. 226). A document issued in Split in 1257 contains a more certain reference to land in Lučac, as it mentions the Church of St. Nicholas, which was located in Lučac, *apud sanctum Nicolaum de Arcuc*, Codex diplomaticus 1907, V, p. 58; Petrić 1984, pp. 19-21. In documents, the Croatian form Lučac appears in several variants as Lučač, Lucaz, Lusaz, Luzaz. See Petrić 1985, pp. 83, 95.
- 7 Over time, the Church's original form certainly changed, for not one of the authors who wrote about Split's monuments refers to the original architectural appearance of this pre-Romanesque church.
- 8 Petrić 1998, p. 151.

ulomke iz Splita, bez ikakvih podataka o mjestu nalaza, dataciji i stilskim značajkama, pa se ovom prigodom osvrćem na ta dva zanemarena elementa oltarne ograde (sl. 2).<sup>5</sup>

### O crkvi sv. Petra Starog na Lučcu

Stara crkva sv. Petra nalazila se u istočnom predgrađu Splita, koje je prema prirodnom kamenom grebenu što se poput luka spušta od Gripe prema moru, nazvan Lučac. U Reambulaciji dobara splitskoga nadbiskupa iz godine 1397. ovo predgrađe se naziva: *In Arcuzo ubi Slavice dicitur na luzaz*.<sup>6</sup> Poznat nam je položaj crkve, ali ne i njezin izgled, jer arheološka istraživanja na tom lokalitetu nikada nisu provedena.<sup>7</sup> Crkva vjerojatno potječe iz 11. stoljeća, kada se istočno od Palače formira pučko predgrađe. Crkva je ucrtana na nekoliko karata na kojima je prikazan Split s okolicom. Na karti Martina Kolunića Rote, iz vremena oko godine 1550., na malom je poluotoku istočno od Palače, između splitske luke i uvale Bačvice, prikazana crkva s označenim titularom *S. Piero*.<sup>8</sup> Na crtežu Splita s okolicom iz oko godine 1570., što ga je izradio Giovanni Francesco Camotio,<sup>9</sup> nacrtana je i crkva sv. Petra (*S. Pietro*), sumarno prikazana s dvoslivnim krovom i zvonikom na sjeverozapadnom dijelu. Crtež crkve nije pouzdan, jer su sve crkve shematski prikazane na isti način, a i položaj u prostoru je, zbog iskrivljene perspektive, samo približno točan. Osim sv. Petra u istočnom predgrađu prikazane su i crkva sv. Katarine (sv. Dominik), sv. Marije od Pojšana i sv. Lovre u Pazdigradu. Sačuvan je podatak o obnovi već trošne crkve na nepotpunom natpisu arhitrava pobočnih vrata crkve sv. Petra Staroga, što ga je dao postaviti splitski kanonik Ivan Mancini godine 1596., nakon što je crkvu, kao njezin rektor, restaurirao.<sup>10</sup> Slično kao na prethodno

Giovani Francesco Camotio,<sup>9</sup> a Church of St. Peter (*S. Pietro*) is also drawn in, generally depicted with a gable roof and belfry on the north-west side. The sketch of the church is not reliable, since all of the churches are schematically depicted in the same manner, and even its position, due to the warped perspective, is only approximate. Besides St. Peter's Church, also shown in the eastern suburbs are the Churches of St. Catherine (St. Dominic), St. Mary of Poیشان and St. Lawrence in Pazdigrad. An incomplete inscription on the architrave of the side door of the Church of St. Peter the Old, placed there by Split Canon Ivan Mancini in 1596, tells of the restoration of the already dilapidated church, after which Mancini, as its rector, had it restored.<sup>10</sup> The drawing of Split and its environs made around the year 1598 by Giuseppe Rossaccio indicates the church as in the preceding maps, but without designation of its titular, as in the drawing of Foscolo's siege of Klis in 1648.<sup>11</sup> The Church of St. Peter, near the sea and east of the semi-bastion of St. George (Giorgio, Cornaro), is also indicated in the map of Split and its fortifications made by Venetian military engineer Santini in 1666.<sup>12</sup> On the cadastral map of the demarcation between the Venetian Republic and the Ottoman Empire after the Candian War, which encompasses Klis, Solin, the slopes of Mosor and Kozjak, and the Split Peninsula, made by Zorzi Calergi in 1675, the Church of St. Peter the Old (San Pietro) is drawn in under number 2104, in the suburb of St. Dominic (*In Suburbo S. Dominic*), as Lučac was still called at that time.<sup>13</sup> The location of the church is also drawn on Coronelli's map of 1678, near the second external belt of baroque star-shaped ramparts on the eastern side of the Palace, roughly half way between the Gripe and Bačvice fortresses.<sup>14</sup> The Church of St. Peter is mentioned by the Split Archbishop Cosmi in his visitation, as he visited it on 4 January 1683, and he wrote that it is "at the beginning of the way leading to the Blessed Virgin of Poیشان" (*de Poissan*), and that it is a simple benefice.<sup>15</sup> The church is precisely indicated in the cadastral map of Split drafted in

5 Iveković 1926, tabla na str. 244, sl. 2, 3.

6 Romanski nazivi za Lučac u srednjem vijeku su *Arcutum* ili *Arcuzum*. Farlati 1765, III, str. 344; Katić 1993a, str. 331; Marasović, Oreb 1977, str. 93; Petrić 1983, str. 60; Marasović 1996, str. 22; Ercegović 2002, str. 30. U dokumentu iz 1256. koji se odnosi na diobu zemalja između Mihovila i njegove sestre Mare, spominje se zemlja na položaju *de Arcuz*, ali nije sigurno odnosi li se taj podatak na Lučac ili lukove akvedukta, jer u nabranju zemalja koje je dobila Mare spominju se zemlje na položaju Gripe, što je u blizini Lučca, ali i zemlje oko sv. Tekle, što je u blizini lukova akvedukta (Codex diplomaticus 1998, dokument br. 177, str. 226). Sigurniji je spomen zemlje na Lučcu u dokumentu izdanom u Splitu godine 1257., gdje se spominje i crkva sv. Nikole koja se nalazila na Lučcu, *apud sanctum Nicolaum de Arcuc*, Codex diplomaticus 1907, V, str. 58; Petrić 1984, str. 19-21. U dokumentima hrvatski se oblik Lučac javlja u nekoliko inačica kao: Lucač, Lucaz, Lusaz, Luzaz. Vidi Petrić 1985, str. 83, 95.

7 Tijekom vremena crkvi je zasigurno promijenjen izvorni oblik, jer se ni jedan od autora koji su pisali o splitskim spomenicima ne osvrće na arhitektonski izgled ove predromaničke crkve.

8 Petrić 1998, str. 151.

9 Buljević 1982, br. 2.

10 Ostojić 1975, str. 206, bilj. 675. Arhitrav se čuva u Arheološkome muzeju Split. (Natpis je objavljen: Inscrizioni dalmate 1880, str. 183, 184; Bulić 1897, str. 38.) Mancini se kao kanonik spominje od 1566. do 1597.

9 Buljević 1982, no. 2.

10 Ostojić 1975, p. 206, note 675. The architrave is kept in the Archaeological Museum in Split (the inscription has been published: Inscrizioni dalmate 1880, p. 183, 184; Bulić 1897, p. 38.) Mancini is mentioned as canon from 1566 to 1597.

11 Buljević 1982, no. 4, 5.

12 1961, p. 428, map on pp. 424, 425, Fig. 75.

13 Katić 1993b, p. 304; Petrić 1987, pp. 135, 139.

14 Novak 1961, p. 235, Fig. 35. On the Split fortifications see Duplančić 1989, pp. 117-156, Calergi's map, p. 119; Duplančić 2007.

15 In visitations it is mentioned as the "parish Church of St. Peter of Kukul (de Zuzulo)". *Kukul* is a Romanic diminutive of arch (Petrić 1983, p. 61; Bezić-Božanić 1991, p. 131). In 1613, the Fraternity of St. Peter the Apostle was formed (Novak 1961, p. 372). The Fraternity of fishers in the church of St. Peter in Lučac was mentioned earlier, during the apostolic visitation of M. Priuli in 1603, when it had already existed for three years, but without a matricula. The Fraternity's By-laws of 1693 on parchment are held in the Archaeological Museum in Split. Duplančić 1991, p. 112, note 16.

spomenutim kartama, crkva je naznačena, ali bez oznake titulara, i na crtežu Splita i okolice, nastalom oko godine 1598., Giuseppea Rossaccia, kao i na crtežu Foscolove opsade Klisa iz 1648. godine.<sup>11</sup> Na planu Splita i njegovih utvrda što ga je izradio mletački vojni inženjer Santini godine 1666., naznačena je i crkva sv. Petra, u blizini mora istočno od polubastiona sv. Jurja (*Giorgio, Cornaro*).<sup>12</sup> Na katastarskoj karti razgraničenja između Mletačke Republike i Turskog Carstva nakon Kandijskog rata, koja obuhvaća Klis, Solin, padine Mosora i Kozjaka, te splitski poluotok, što ju je 1675. godine izradio Zorzi Calergi, ucrtana je pod brojem 2104 crkva sv. Petra Starog (*San Pietro*), u predgrađu sv. Dominika (*In Suburbo S. Dominici*), kako se još nazivalo predgrađe Lučac.<sup>13</sup> Položaj crkve ucrtan je i na Coronellijevoj karti iz godine 1678., u blizini drugoga vanjskog pojasa baroknih zvjezdastih bedema s istočne strane Palače, a približno na pola puta između tvrđave Gripe i utvrde Bačvice.<sup>14</sup> Crkvu sv. Petra u vizitaciji spominje splitski nadbiskup Cosmi, koji ju je posjetio 4. siječnja 1683. godine, i piše da se nalazi "na početku puta koji vodi k Blaženoj Djevici od Pojišana", (*de Poissan*), te da je prost beneficij.<sup>15</sup> Crkva je precizno ubilježena na katastarskom planu Splita iz 1831. godine. Uz crkvu je bilo i manje groblje.<sup>16</sup> Nalazila se na uglu Ulice sv. Petra i Radovanove ulice.<sup>17</sup>

Kako se predgrađe Lučac širilo i stanovništvo povećavalo, trošna stara župna crkva sv. Petra bila je pretijesna, pa se ukazala potreba za izgradnjom nove crkve. Nova jednobrodna crkva, istog titulara, građena je u neoromaničkom stilu prema nacrtima splitskog inženjera Dujma Marcocchija od 1863. do 1871. godine. Imala je zvonik sa satom nad sjevernim pročeljem i nalazila se u blizini stare crkve.<sup>18</sup> Iz stare crkve sv. Petra prenesen je godine 1872. u novoizgrađenu barokni oltar klesan 1604. godine,<sup>19</sup> kao i predromanički zabat oltarne ograde koji se sada čuva u

1831. There was also a small cemetery next to the church.<sup>16</sup> It was located at the corner of Sv. Petra and Radovanova streets.<sup>17</sup>

As the Lučac suburb expanded and its population increased, the dilapidated, old parish Church of St. Peter became too narrow, so the need to build a new church arose. A new single-nave church with the same titular was built in the neo-Romanesque style based on the plans of engineer Dujam Marcocchi, a Split native, from 1863 to 1871. It had a belfry with a clock above the north facade, located near the old church.<sup>18</sup> In 1872, a baroque altar made in 1604 was taken from the old Church of St. Peter and moved to the newly-constructed one,<sup>19</sup> as was the pre-Romanesque pediment from the altar screen which is now held in the Archaeological Museum.<sup>20</sup> When the new main altar, made in the Dall' Ara workshop of Milan, was completed in 1884, the old altar was removed.<sup>21</sup> The new Church of St. Peter was levelled to its foundations on 3 January 1944 during the bombardment of Split, when all of Lučac sustained heavy damage. Only the belfry remained intact, although it was later taken down by explosives on 2 March 1946.<sup>22</sup> Based on urban planning, a thoroughfare on Poljana kneza Trpimira ('Meadow of Prince Trpimir') was expanded on the site where the church once stood.

11 Buljević 1982, br. 4, 5.

12 Novak 1961, str. 428, plan na str. 424, 425, sl. 75.

13 Katić 1993b, str. 304; Petrić 1987, str. 135, 139.

14 Novak 1961, str. 235, sl. 35. O splitskim utvrdama vidi Duplančić 1989, str. 117-156, Calergijeva karta, str. 119; Duplančić 2007.

15 U vizitacijama se spominje kao "župska crkva sv. Petra od Kukula (de Zuzulo)". Kukul je romanski deminutiv od luk (Petrić 1983, str. 61; Bezić-Božanić 1991, str. 131). Godine 1613. osnovana je Bratovština sv. Petra Apostola (Novak 1961, str. 372). Bratovština ribara u crkvi sv. Petra na Lučcu spominje se i ranije, u apostolskoj vizitaciji M. Priulija 1603. godine, kada je postojala već tri godine, ali bez matrikule. U Arheološkome muzeju u Splitu čuva se Pravilnik bratovštine na pergameni iz 1693. godine. Duplančić 1991, str. 112, bilj. 16.

16 Nakon što je izgrađena nova crkva, stara je prešla u privatno vlasništvo. Početkom 20. stoljeća vlasnik je bio Mate Čulić, koji je 1923. iskopao 18 grobova uokolo crkve, a kosti su prenesene na Sustipansko groblje. Iskopavanje je nadgledao profesor Antun Grgin, suradnik don Frane Bulića i tom prigodom ništa od nalaza nije bilo pronađeno. Piplović 2006, str. 458.

17 Petrić 1983, str. 61.

18 Nova crkva sv. Petra nije bila izgrađena na mjestu stare, kako neki autori navode, već u njezinoj blizini. Vidjeti kod Piplović 2006, str. 458. O gradnji nove crkve vidi Duplančić 1991, str. 113, bilj. 17.

19 Bezić-Božanić 1991, str. 131; Prijatelj 1995, str. 64.

16 After the new church was built, the old one became private property. At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century its owner was Mate Čulić, who exhumed 18 graves around the church in 1923, and had the bones taken to the Sustjepan cemetery. The exhumation was overseen by Prof. Antun Grgin, an associate of Fr. Frane Bulić, and on this occasion no artefacts were found. Piplović 2006, p. 458.

17 Petrić 1983, p. 61.

18 The new Church of St. Peter was not constructed at the site of the old church, as some authors state, but rather nearby. See Piplović 2006, p. 458. On construction of the new church, see Duplančić 1991, p. 113, note 17.

19 Božanić 1991, p. 131; Prijatelj 1995, p. 64.

20 Jelić 1887, p. 172. Precisely when the pediment arrived in the Archaeological Museum is unknown. The city guide *Vodja po Spljetu i okolici* of 1894 states that it is in the new Church of St. Peter. Kowalczyk, Gurlitt on a plate in 1910 mention it as a monument from the Archaeological Museum, while Ivačić mentions it among the remaining old Croatian monuments kept in the stone monument collection of the Archaeological Museum in 1940. Jelić, Bulić, Rutar 1894, p. 203; Kowalczyk, Gurlitt 1910, p. 62; Ivačić 1940, p. 49.

21 Prijatelj 1995, p. 64. Preserved photograph of the main altar from the R. Dall' Ara workshop: Prijatelj 1995, p. 62. The church still contained the altars of the Holy Family, Sts. Peter and Andrew (whose cult was moved from the main altar), St. Joseph (erected in 1879) and Our Lady of Good Health (raised in 1901). Prijatelj 1995, p. 64.

22 For photographs of the demolished church and the damaged archbishop's palace, see Piplović 1984, p. 128. Photograph of entire church, Delonga 1997, p. 8. A fragment of an antependium portraying the Last Supper, today in the Church of St. Rocco, was also preserved, as was a fragment of the head of St. Peter (?) kept in the Co-cathedral of St. Peter. Prijatelj 1995, pp. 63, 65.

Arheološkome muzeju.<sup>20</sup> Kada je godine 1884. bio dovršen novi glavni oltar izrađen u radionici Dall' Ara iz Milana, stari oltar je bio uklonjen.<sup>21</sup> Nova crkva sv. Petra do temelja je uništena 3. siječnja 1944. u bombardiranju Splita, kada je teško nastradalo cijelo predgrađe Lučac. Čitav je ostao samo zvonik, koji je uklonjen miniranjem 2. ožujka 1946. godine.<sup>22</sup> Na prostoru gdje je nekoć stajala crkva, urbanističkim je zahvatom proširena prometnica na Poljani kneza Trpimira.

### Zabat iz crkve sv. Petra Starog

Zabat, nažalost, nije u cijelosti sačuvan, nedostaje mu cijeli donji dio, ravno je prepiljen preko donje trećine figuralne kompozicije sa sučelice postavljenim pticama, pa nedostaje i najzanimljiviji dio, luk zabata gdje se nalazio posvetni natpis. Otučen je i donji dio desne strane rubnog istaka kimationa (sl. 3).

Dimenzije: sačuvana visina - 78 cm; širina donjeg dijela - 65 cm; širina plohe s kukama - 7 cm; širina plohe s arkadicama - 7 cm; debljina - 13 cm, mramor.

Zabat je po mnogočemu specifičan i slobodnim kompozicijskim pristupom odstupa od uobičajenih, simetričnih shema. Trokut zabata uzdiže se pod vrlo ostrim kutom kao i već poznati zabat iz iste crkve.

Trokutasti rub zabata podijeljen je, kako je i uobičajeno, na dva polja. Vanjskim rubom teku kuke sa spiralnim završetcima i plitkim udubljenim brazdama posredini, u donjem dijelu zabata su odvojene jedna od druge, a pri vrhu se nižu tako da jedna izlazi iz druge, te se iz suprotnih smjerova susreću u kitnjastom vrhu. Drugo polje čini plastično istaknuti kimation urešen nizom dvoprutih arkadica, gotovo okomito zasječen prema polju s kukama i blago zakošen prema središnjem polju zabata. Arkadice se u vrhu trokuta spajaju oblikujući trolatični cvijet, te nisu simetrično raspoređene na lijevoj i desnoj strani, kao da je klesar izgubio simetriju, a možda mu nije bila ni važna. Između lukova arkada isklesani su stilizirani listići. Arkade su profilirane u dvije razine; gornji luk je istaknutiji od donjeg, koji zatvara plitko udubljene niše arkada. Na desnoj strani zabata arkadice prestaju

### Pediment from the Church of St. Peter the Old

The pediment was not, unfortunately, preserved in its entirety. The entire lower portion is missing. It was cut straight across the lower third of the figural composition decorated with birds facing each other, so that the most interesting part is missing, the pediment's arch where the dedication inscription was located. The lower right side of the protruding edge of the cymatium is also damaged (Fig. 3).

Dimensions: preserved height, 78 cm; width of lower portion, 65 cm; width of surface with hooks, 7 cm; width of surface with small arcades, 7 cm; thickness, 13 cm, marble.

The pediment is specific in many ways, and its free composition deviates from customary, symmetric schemes. The triangle of the pediment rises at a very sharp angle, similar to the other pediment from the same church.

The triangular edge of the pediment is divided, as usual, into two fields. The external edge is lined with hooks that have spiral tips and shallow grooves in the middle; they are separate from each other at the bottom of the pediment, while at the top they are lined up so that one emerges from the other, and the meet from opposite directions at the leafy apex. The other field consists of a sculpted, prominent cymatium decorated with a series of small double-band arcades, almost horizontally intersected toward the field with hooks, and gently slanted toward the pediment's central field. The small arcades merge at the top of the triangle, forming a trefoil, not symmetrically arranged on the left and right sides, as though the mason lost his sense of symmetry, or perhaps felt it was unimportant. Stylized small leaves are carved into the arches of the arcades. The arcades are moulded into two levels, the extrados is more prominent than the intrados which closes the shallowly indented niches of the arcade. On the right side of the pediment, the small arcades stop at the upper edge of the horizontal shaft of the cross, because the entire surface beneath the horizontal cross shaft is occupied by the figure of a bird. A prominent sculpted rib, which divides the field with arcades from the central part of the triangle, is interrupted, like the small arcades, on the right side of the pediment. The central composition consists of a long Latin cross with expanded shafts open at the middle, resembling leaves. The edges of the cross are highlighted by an incised line, while in the middle, at the point where the shafts of the cross meet, three concentric circles were carved. The horizontal shaft of the cross on the left side crosses over the cymatium field, breaking the rhythm of the small arcades. Above the horizontal cross shafts, two eddied rosettes were carved, highlighted as reliefs. A small bird covering a series of arcades, protruding to the fore as a relief, was placed at the very apex of the triangle. The small arcades on this part of the pediment are smaller, placed together tightly, so they barely protrude in the background behind the bird. The small bird is crudely rendered, shaped like the letter S, with feathers indicated by short and longer incisions, and legs resting atop the cross. Below the horizontal cross shaft, on two unequal surfaces divided by the vertical cross shaft, the master mason carved two larger birds facing each other and touching the cross with their

20 Jelić 1887, str. 172. Kada je zabat dospio u Arheološki muzej, nije poznato. U *Vodji po Spljetu i okolici* iz 1894. godine spominje se da se nalazi u novoj crkvi sv. Petra. Kowalczyk, Gurlitt na tabli iz 1910. godine ga donose kao spomenik iz Arheološkog muzeja, a Ivačić ga navodi između ostalih starohrvatskih spomenika koji se čuvaju u lapidariju Arheološkog muzeja 1940. godine. Jelić, Bulić, Rutar 1894, str. 203; Kowalczyk, Gurlitt 1910, T. 62; Ivačić 1940, str. 49.

21 Prijatelj 1995, str. 64. Sačuvana fotografija glavnog oltara radionice R. Dall' Ara: Prijatelj 1995, str. 62. U crkvi su još bili oltari sv. Obitelji, svetaca Petra i Andrije (čiji je kult prenesen na glavni oltar), sv. Josipa (podignut 1879.) i Gospe od Zdravlja (podignut 1901.), Prijatelj 1995, str. 64.

22 Fotografija porušene crkve i oštećene nadbiskupske palače vidi kod Piplović 1984, str. 128. Fotografija cijele crkve Delonga 1997, str. 8. Sačuvan je ostao i fragment antependija s prikazom Posljednje večere, danas u crkvi sv. Roka i fragment glave sv. Petra (?) koji se čuva u konkatedrali sv. Petra. Prijatelj 1995, str. 63, 65.





*Slika 3.*  
Zabat iz crkve sv. Petra Starog,  
Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških  
spomenika (foto: T. Seser)

*Figure 3.*  
Pediment from the Church  
of St. Peter the Old, Museum  
of Croatian Archaeological  
Monuments (photo: T. Seser)

na gornjem rubu vodoravne haste križa, jer cijelu plohu ispod vodoravnog kraka križa zauzima figura ptice. Plastično istaknuto rebro, koje dijeli polje s arkadama od središnjeg dijela trokuta, prekinuto je, kao i arkadice na desnoj strani zabata. Središnju kompoziciju čini dugi latinski križ s proširenim i posredini rastvornim krajevima, koji izgledaju poput listova. Rubovi križa naglašeni su urezanim linijom, a u sredini, na mjestu gdje se sastaju krakovi križa, uklesane su tri koncentrične kružnice, jedna u drugoj. Horizontalni krak križa na lijevoj strani prelazi preko polja kimationa prekidajući ritam arkadica. Iznad horizontalnih krakova križa isklesane su, reljefno istaknute, dvije virovite rozete. U samom vrhu trokuta ubačena je jedna manja ptica koja prekriva niz arkadica, reljefno izbijajući u prvi plan. Arkadice na ovome dijelu zabata su manje, gusto zbijene, i tek proviruju u pozadini iza ptice. Ptičica je sumarno izvedena, ima oblik slova S, perje je naznačeno kratkim i dužim urezima, a nogom počiva na vrhu križa. Ispod vodoravnih hasta križa majstor je, na dvije nejednake plohe koje dijeli okomiti krak križa, isklesao dvije veće, sučelice postavljene ptice, koje kljunovima dodiruju križ. Lijeva ptica, vjerojatno orao, sudeći po masivnom zakrivljenom kljunu grabljivice, prikazana je u profilu, glave okrenute udesno. Na jakom vratu urezima su naznačene tri paralelne, zaobljene bore, dok je perje na trupu ptice stilizirano kratkim zarezima koji ritmički prate oblik trupa. Od kraja vrata uzdiže se rašireno krilo orla koje se spušta paralelno uz rubnu letvu kimationa. Perje krila

beaks. The bird on the left, probably an eagle judging by the massively bent raptor's beak, is rendered in profile, with head turned right. On its powerful neck, three parallel, rounded pleats were made by incisions, while the feathers on the bird's body are made with stylized short cuts that rhythmically follow the form of the body. The eagle's outspread wing rises from the end of the neck and descends parallel to the edge of the cymatium's batten. The feathers of the wing are indicated by a double row of spheres at the bend of the wing, while the long feathers are roughly indicated with four parallel lines. The other eagle, in the right field, is differently and less skilfully stylized. The body is placed frontally, with neck turned left, and the head with its thick bent back is shown in left profile. The eagle touches the edge of the cymatium with its raised left leg. The body is rendered differently than the eagle to the left. The feathers are indicated by lines incised like fish scales, with several parallel rounded lines to indicate the tip of the wing, and horizontal lines to indicate the beginning of the longer wing feathers.

It is unfortunate that the pediment is broken off so there is no way of knowing how the eagles were sculpturally formed as a whole.

Two contradictory tendencies can be observed on the relief: the decorative ornament of the two peripheral fields of spiral hooks and small arcades, which are rendered flatly as an ornamental, lattice frame of the main figural scene in the central field, in the image of the two eagles beneath the horizontal cross shafts and small bird on top, which stand out by the volume of rendering. The decorative frame is not really respected; the shaft of the cross exceeds it over the cymatium field, the bird at the top covers the small arcades, and the eagle in the right-hand field occupies the entire surface, breaking the rhythm of the field with small arcades. The two eagles facing each other are rendered sculpturally, in high relief, and the mason attempted to show different movements on their part, additionally highlighting them with graphic play in the formation of the bodies, feathers, beaks and wings.

Judging by the stylistic features, the pediment has been dated to the final phase of pre-Romanesque art, in the second half of the eleventh century.

If the two pediments from the Church of St. Peter the Old are compared, then some similarities, but also differences, in rendering can be observed. Both monuments lack braid-design motifs, and they have sharp angles on the sides of the pediment triangles and two peripheral decorative fields with spiral hooks and small arcades. There are also differences in the crafting of these decorative motifs. On the pediment known with the name of Master Peter, held in the Archaeological Museum, the hooks are more massive, densely packed together, so the background cannot be seen, while on the pediment from the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments they are clearly separate from the background. The cymatium with arcades on the pediment from the Archaeological Museum has a sharper grade and a higher relief with deeper shadows, while the small arcades on the other pediment are placed flatly. The pediment from the Archaeological

naznačeno je dvostrukim nizom kuglica na lomu krila, dok je dugo perje sumarno prikazano s četiri paralelne linije. Drugi orao, u desnom polju, ponešto je drugačije i nespretnije stiliziran. Trup je postavljen frontalno, dok je vrat okrenut ulijevo, a glava s debelim svinutim kljunom prikazana je u lijevom profilu. Podignutom lijevom nogom orao dodiruje rub kimationa. Obrada tijela drugačija je nego kod lijevog orla. Perje je prikazano urezanim linijama poput ribljih ljuski, s nekoliko paralelnih zaobljenih linija naznačen je početak krila, a okomitim linijama početak dužeg perja krila.

Šteta je što je zabat presječen pa ne znamo kako su orlovi bili kiparski izvedeni u cjelini.

Na reljefu se opažaju dvije suprotstavljene tendencije: dekorativni ures dvaju rubnih polja, spiralnih kuka i arkadica, koji su izvedeni plošno kao ornamentalni, čipkasti okvir glavne figuralne scene u središnjem polju, u liku dvaju orlova ispod horizontalnih krakova križa i malom pticom u vrhu, koje se ističu voluminoznošću obrade. Dekorativni okvir se odveć ne poštuje; krak križa prelazi preko polja kimationa, ptica u vrhu trokuta prekriva arkadice, a orao u desnom kutu zauzima cijelu plohu prekidajući ritam polja s arkadicama. Dva nasuprotno postavljena orla izvedena su plastično, u višem reljefu, klesar nastoji prikazati različite pokrete ptica, dodatno ih potencirajući grafičkim poigravanjem u obradi tijela, perja, kljuna, krila.

Sudeći po stilskim značajkama, zabat datiram u završnu fazu predromaničke umjetnosti, u drugu polovicu 11. stoljeća.

Usporedimo li dva zabata iz crkve sv. Petra Staroga, možemo uočiti sličnosti, ali i razlike u izvedbi. Na oba spomenika nema pleternih motiva, sličan je oštri kut stranica trokuta zabata i dva rubna dekorativna polja sa spiralnim kukama i arkadicama. Razlike postoje i u obradbi tih dekorativnih motiva. Na poznatom zabatu s imenom majstora Petra iz Arheološkog muzeja kuke su masivnije, gusto zbijene jedna uz drugu, tako da se pozadina ne vidi, dok su na zabatu iz Muzeja hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika jasno odvojene od podloge. Na zabatu iz Arheološkog muzeja kimation s arkadicama ima strmiji nagib i veću reljefnost, s dubljim sjenama, dok su na drugom zabatu arkadice plošno položene. Zabata iz Arheološkog muzeja je strogo geometrijski koncipiran, arkadice se simetrično nižu uz obje stranice trokuta, odijeljene rubnom letvom prema središnjem polju koja u cijelosti prati niz arkada, dok na zabatu iz Muzeja hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika klesar nije vodio računa o simetriji i zbog kompozicije u središnjem polju prekida ritam arkadica, na mjestima ih prekrivajući motivima koji izlaze iz središnjeg polja. Po obliku se razlikuju i križevi središnje kompozicije. Na jednome zabatu u središnjem polju isklesan je u čisto geometrijskoj, simetričnoj kompoziciji križ s dvije višetalne rozete, na drugome pak složeniji je prikaz križa s virovitim rozetama i figurama orlova.

Museum adheres to a rigid geometrical concept; the small arcades are lined up symmetrically on both sides of the triangle, divided by a peripheral batten toward the central field which entirely follows the row of arcades. On the pediment from the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments, the mason did not take its symmetry into account, so the composition interrupts the rhythm of the small arcades in the central field, as the arcades are covered at places by motifs that surpass the boundaries of the central field. The crosses in the central composition also differ in form. A purely geometric, symmetrically composed cross is in the central field on one pediment, with two multi-petal rosettes, while the cross on the other pediment is more complex, with wavy rosettes and eagle figures.

The dimensions are also different. The pediment in the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments is higher and narrower than the one in the Archaeological Museum.<sup>23</sup>

Despite all of these differences, both pediments could have been made in the same workshop by two masons, one who strictly adhered to geometric forms, and another who adopted a less restrictive approach and who was more prone to experimentation. Thus both reliefs are deemed to have emerged in the same period.

However, if this newly-located pediment from the Church of St. Peter the Old is compared to the other pediments that Petricioli distinguished as works of the Split masonry workshop of the late eleventh century,<sup>24</sup> to which the new example is also added, and whose general chronological exemplar is the pediment from the Church of Our Lady of the Tower bearing the name of the Split Prior Furmin,<sup>25</sup> despite all conceptual similarities (especially the decorative peripheral fields), the central fields in all of the pediments differ from each other. The closest analogy to the pediment from the Archaeological Museum is the one from Our Lady of the Tower, with its central cross motif and two rosettes below the horizontal shaft of the cross. The elongated Latin crosses with expanded shaft ends are almost identical; the cross from Our Lady of the Tower only has the addition of two small leaves at the lower portion of the crux itself. The difference is discernable in the rendering of the rosettes, and while the multi-petal flowers on the pediment from the Church of St. Peter the Old are rendered flatly within circles, those from the Church of Our Lady of the Tower have four petals which are sculpturally separate from the base. There is also a difference in the gradient of the triangle sides, for the pediment from Our Lady of the Tower has a gentler angle. The next one in this group is the pediment of the altar screen from the Church of St. Michael on the island of Koločep, with a figural portrayal of the Archangel Michael in the central field, which Petricioli ascribes to the same Split workshop, even though it was

23 The pediment from the Archaeological Museum is 74 cm from the tip of the triangle to the middle of the arch, and a portion next to the crown of the arch is missing.

24 Petricioli 1994, pp. 287-292.

25 See note 3.

Razlike postoje i u dimenzijama, zabat iz Muzeja hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika je viši i uži od onoga iz Arheološkog muzeja.<sup>23</sup>

Uza sve navedene razlike mogla su oba zabata biti klesana u istoj radionici od dvaju klesara, od kojih se jedan strogo držao geometrijskih obrazaca, dok je drugi bio slobodniji u pristupu i skloniji eksperimentiranju. Stoga oba reljefa datiramo u isto vremensko razdoblje.

Usporedimo li, pak, ovaj novo ubicirani zabat iz crkve sv. Petra Starog s ostalim zabatima koje je Petricioli izdvojio kao radove splitske klesarske radionice s kraja 11. stoljeća,<sup>24</sup> kojoj pridružujemo i novi primjerak, a čiji okvirni vremenski reper predstavlja zabat iz crkve Gospe od Zvonika s imenom splitskog priora Furmina,<sup>25</sup> uza sve sličnosti u osnovnoj koncepciji, osobito dvaju dekorativnih rubnih polja, kod svih zabata središnja polja se međusobno razlikuju. Najbliže su usporedbe zabata iz Arheološkog muzeja i onoga Gospe od Zvonika, sa središnjim motivom križa i dvjema rozetama ispod horizontalnih hasti križa. Izduženi latinski križevi s proširenim krajevima krakova gotovo su istovjetni; križ iz Gospe od Zvonika jedino ima dodatak dvaju listića na donjem dijelu križišta krakova. Razlika se zamjećuje u obradi rozeta; dok su višelatični cvjetovi na zabatu iz crkve sv. Petra Staroga izvedeni plošno unutar krugova, oni iz Gospe od Zvonika imaju četiri latice koje se plastično izdvajaju od podloge. Razlika je i u nagibu stranica trokuta: zabat Gospe od Zvonika ima blaži kut. Sljedeći iz ove skupine je zabat oltarne ograde iz crkve sv. Mihajla na otoku Koločepu s figuralnim prikazom arhanđela Mihovila u središnjem polju, koji Petricioli pripisuje istoj splitskoj radionici, premda je prilično dislociran od mjesta djelovanja te radionice.<sup>26</sup> Lik arhanđela zauzima cijelu središnju plohu zabata, pa i prelazi okvir kimationa prekrivajući glavom i krilima niz arkadica, kao što je slučaj i s kompozicijom na zabatu iz Muzeja hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika. Ovoj skupini zabata pridružen je još i zabat oltarne ograde iz Trogira, uzidan na pročelju crkve sv. Nikole na Čiovu. I ovaj tegurij ima isti dekorativni okvir, a središnju kompoziciju čini križ s rastvorenim završetcima krakova, dvije rozete iznad horizontalnih hasti i jednom na vrhu križa, dok su u donjem dijelu prikazane dvije sučelice postavljene ptice (paunovi) koje u kljunu drže grozd. Križ s rascijepljenim završetcima krakova nalikuje onome na zabatu iz Muzeja hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, ptice se volumenom izdvajaju od pozadine, detalji tijela fino su modelirani, a gustom mrežom linija naznačeno je perje. Trogirski je zabat, kao što je već primijećeno, najbliži ulomku zabata iz splitske crkve sv. Marije de Taurello, sa sličnom

quite far from this workshop's point of operations.<sup>26</sup> The image of the archangel covers the entire central surface of the pediment, and even exceeds the frame of the cymatium, covering a series of small arcades with its head and wings, similar to the composition on the pediment from the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments. The pediment of the altar screen from Trogir, walled into the façade of the Church of St. Nicholas on the island of Čiovo, also belongs to this group of pediments. This tegman also has the same decorative frame, and the central composition consists of a cross with open arm ends, two rosettes above the horizontal arms and one on top of the cross, while in the lower portion there are two birds (peacocks) facing each other and holding bunches of grapes in their beaks. The cross with split ends resembles the one on the pediment from the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments, the birds stand out from the background in terms of volume, and the details of the bodies are intricately modelled, with a dense network of lines to indicate the feathers. The Trogir pediment is, as already noted, the most similar to the pediment fragment from the Church of St. Maria de Taurello in Split, with a similar working of the bodies and details of the birds pecking at the grapes below the cross.<sup>27</sup>

Other, similar stone monuments of the eleventh century, which can be compared to the figural portrayals on the pediment examined here, will also be considered. Eleventh century Dalmatian sculpture was analyzed by I. Petricioli in his work of synthesis, dividing them into several categories based on masonry workshops. Some similarities in the rendering of images can be seen between the eagles on the pediment described here and certain figures in the Split-Zadar group of reliefs. The way in which the images of animals are carved—two antithetically placed dogs and a griffin on the ciborium of Proconsul Grgur (1033-1036), and two dogs facing each other on the ciborium of the Church of St. Thomas in Zadar, with the characteristic folds on the neck and fur portrayed with the help of sharp incisions—indicate certain

23 Zabata iz Arheološkog muzeja je od vrha trokuta do sredine luka visok 74 cm, a drugome je sačuvana visina 78 cm, i još mu nedostaje dio do sredine luka.

24 Petricioli 1994, str. 287-292.

25 Vidi bilješku 3.

26 Petricioli 2000, str. 18-22. S ovim mišljenjem se ne slaže I. Žile, budući da u Dubrovniku i Kotoru u 11. stoljeću djeluju kvalitetne kiparske radionice, a i zabat iz Koločepa izrađen je od dijela sarkofaga pronađenog na istom otoku. Dubrovački klesari mogli su predloške za rubna dekorativna polja preuzeti od splitske klesarske radionice. Žile 2003, str. 128.

26 Petricioli 2000, pp. 18-22. I. Žile does not agree with this view, since high-quality sculpture workshops operated in Dubrovnik and Kotor in the eleventh century, and the pediment from Koločep was made from parts of a sarcophagus found on the same island. The Dubrovnik masons could have assumed models for their peripheral decorative fields from the Split masonry workshops. Žile 2003, p. 128.

27 N. Jakšić ties this pediment with the pediment fragment from St. Maria de Taurello, dated to about 1060 (Belamarić 1981, p. 157, 158, P. XXIX. 1; Burić 1982, p. 139, P. XII. 58). Burić, in contrast to Petricioli, who attributes the pediment walled into the Church of St. Nicholas in Trogir to the altar screen from St. Barbara (St. Martin), ties the other pediment—the one walled into the reproduction of Our Lady of Good Health in the Trogir cemetery—to the architrave beam with inscription from the Church of St. Barbara in Trogir and dated it to the first half of the eleventh century. This pediment also has a double-moulded peripheral field with hooks and small arcades, and the motif of cross and birds below the horizontal arms surpasses the cymatium's peripheral field (Burić 1982, p. 153, P. XII. 57). The birds on this pediment are somewhat similar to the birds on top of the pediment from St. Peter the Old.

obradom tijela i detalja ptica koje ključaju grožđe podno križa.<sup>27</sup>

Još ćemo se osvrnuti na druge srodne kamene spomenike 11. stoljeća, s kojima možemo usporediti figuralne prikaze na našem zabatu. Skulpturu 11. stoljeća u Dalmaciji obradio je I. Petricioli u svojem sintetskom radu, podijelivši je u nekoliko skupina, odnosno klesarskih radionica. Neke sličnosti u obradi likova pronalazimo između orlova na našem zabatu i nekih figura na splitsko-zadarskoj skupini reljefa. Način na koji su isklesani likovi životinja, dva sučelice postavljena psa i figura grifona na ciboriju prokonzula Grgura (1033.-1036.), kao i dva sučelice prikazana psa na ciboriju iz crkve sv. Tome u Zadru, s karakterističnim borama na vratu i obradom krzna pomoću oštarih zarez, pokazuju određene sličnosti s likom orla na zabatu iz sv. Petra Staroga.<sup>28</sup> Donekle se mogu usporediti i ptičji likovi unutar pleternih medaljona na rubnom dijelu pluteja iz crkve sv. Nedjeljice u Zadru s figuralnim scenama Pokolja nevine dječice i Bijega u Egipat, ptice na pluteju s prikazom pentagrama iz splitske krstionice kao i s likovima orlova i grifona unutar dvotračnih kružnica na škropionici pronađenoj prigodom konzervatorskih radova u samostanu sv. Marije u Zadru.<sup>29</sup> Također se može komparirati modelacija dviju sitnih ptičjih figura sa strana pleternog križa na nadvratniku crkve sv. Barbare (sv. Martina) u Trogiru s prikazom desnog orla na zabatu,<sup>30</sup> na kojima je perje ptica obrađeno urezima poput ribljih ljuski.

Najsličniji orlu na lijevoj strani našeg zabata je lik desnog orla na nadvratniku južnih vrata splitske katedrale, izrađen u minijaturnoj formi, unutar medaljona (sl. 4). Isti je zakrivljeni položaj tijela dviju ptica, u desnom profilu, masivni kljun, nabori na vratu, obrada perja: na grudima u obliku sitnih ureza, i dužim zakrivljenim, paralelnim linijama za duže perje. Zanimljiva je usporedba ukrasa kuglica, bisernih zrna, na lomu krila orla sa zabata s ukrasom kuglica na gornjem rubu nadvratnika. Gotovo da bi se po cjelovitom liku orla na nadvratniku mogao rekonstruirati donji dio ptice sa zabata koji nedostaje. Najvjerojatnije je orao jednom nogom, pandžom, dodirivao križ, a drugom lučni dio zabata. Položaj tijela drugog desnog orla sa zabata donekle je sličan položaju orla na škropionici u splitskoj katedrali.

Način zasijecanja nadvratnika kako bi se mogao postaviti na dovratnike na portalu južnih vrata katedrale, što je uočio



Slika 4.  
Medaljon s prikazom orla na nadvratniku južnog portala splitske katedrale (foto: T. Seser)

Figure 4.  
Medallion bearing an image of an eagle door lentil of the southern gate of the Split cathedral (photo: T. Seser)

similarities with the image of the eagles on the pediment from St. Peter the Old.<sup>28</sup> To a certain extent, they can also be compared to the birds within the braid-design medallion on the edge of the pluteus from the Church of St. Dominica in Zadar, with figural scenes of the Slaughter of the Innocents and the Flight to Egypt, the birds on the pluteus with pentagram from the Split baptistery and with figures of eagles and griffins within the double-banded circles on the water font found during conservation works in the Convent of St. Mary in Zadar.<sup>29</sup> It can also be compared to the modelling of two tiny bird figures on the side of the braid-design cross on the door lentil of the Church of St. Barbara (St. Martin) in Trogir with the portrayal of an eagle on the pediment,<sup>30</sup> on which the feathers of the birds are made by incisions resembling fish scales.

The right-hand image of the eagle rendered in miniature within the medallion on the door lentil of the southern gate of the Split cathedral is the most similar to the eagle on the left of the pediment examined here. Both birds have the same curved position, with right profile, massive beaks, folds on the neck, and rendering of feathers: as tiny incisions on the breast, and longer, bent, parallel lines for the longer feathers. Interesting is the comparison of the small spherical decorations, pearl-like grains, at the bend of the wing from the pediment with the small spherical

27 N. Jakšić zabat povezuje s fragmentom zabata iz Sv. Marije de Taurello datiran oko godine 1060. (Belamarić 1981, str. 157, 158, T. XXIX. 1; Burić 1982, str. 139, T. XII. 58). Burić, za razliku od Petricioli koji zabat uzidan na crkvi sv. Nikole u Trogiru pripisuje oltarnoj ogradi iz Sv. Barbare (Sv. Martina), drugi zabat, onaj uzidan na preslici Gospe od Zdravlja na trogirskom groblju, vezuje uz arhitravnu gredu s natpisom iz crkve sv. Barbare u Trogiru i datira ga u prvu polovicu 11. stoljeća. I ovaj zabat također ima dvostruko profilirano rubno polje s kukama i arkadicama, a motivi križa i ptica ispod horizontalnih krakova prelaze rubno polje kimationa (Burić 1982, str. 153, T. XII. 57). Pticama na ovom zabatu donekle je slična ptica u vrhu zabata iz Sv. Petra Staroga.

28 Petricioli 1960a, str. 15-18, T. I., T. II; Petricioli 1983, str. 10-12.

29 Petricioli 1960a, str. 20-24, T. III. 2, str. 28-32, T. VII. 2, str. 63, T. XXIII. 1, 2, 3.

30 Bužančić 1995, str. 245-247.

28 Petricioli 1960a, pp. 15-18, P. I, P. II; Petricioli 1983, pp. 10-12.

29 Petricioli 1960a, pp. 20-24, P. III. 2, pp. 28-32, P. VII. 2, pp. 63, P. XXIII. 1, 2, 3.

30 Bužančić 1995, pp. 245-247.

Marasović,<sup>31</sup> karakterističan je za veći broj spomenika upravo 11. stoljeća: kao na timpanu portala Sv. Lovre u Zadru, ranoromaničkoj bifori zapadno od Vestibula u Splitu i ukrašenom portalu nekoć uzidanom na vratima župne crkve u Gradcu kod Drniša, sada u lapidariju Muzeja hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika. Spomenute analogije likova orlova sa zabata i nadvratnika južnih vrata katedrale navode nas da i cjelokupan portal datiramo u kraj 11. stoljeća.<sup>32</sup> Neki autori koji su raspravljali o južnim vratima splitske katedrale, oslanjajući se na podatak koji donosi Toma Arhiđakon da je prvi splitski nadbiskup Ivan Ravenjanin očistio Jupiterov hram od likova poganskih bogova i postavio vrata i zasune,<sup>33</sup> pripisali su otvaranje južnih vrata Ivanu Ravenjaninu i sukladno tomu rano su datirali portal. Možda je Ivan Ravenjanin jednostavno postavio na portal mauzoleja drvena vrata koja su propala ili ih nije bilo, te tako zatvorio crkvu, a ne otvorio nova vrata, za što sigurno nije bilo potrebe, jer je vjernički puk unutar Palače bio malobrojan, a novopridošli Hrvati u okolici tek su se preobraćali na kršćanstvo.

Otvaranje južnih vrata katedrale i postavljanje portala prije se moglo zbiti u vrijeme nadbiskupa Lovre (1059.-1099.). Ako je Toma i mislio da je nova vrata otvorio Ivan Ravenjanin (što nigdje izričito ne spominje), više od stotinu godina koje ga dijele od nadbiskupa Lovre dovoljan je vremenski razmak za zaborav, pa je Toma eventualno i mogao pripisati tom događaju davninu legendarnog nadbiskupa Ivana Ravenjanina.<sup>34</sup>

decoration on the upper edge of the door lentil. One could almost use the entire eagle image from the door lentil to reconstruct the missing lower portion of the bird on the pediment. The eagle probably held the cross in one talon, and the arch of the pediment in the other. The position of the other, right-hand eagle from the pediment is somewhat similar to the eagle on the water font in the Split cathedral.

The method for cutting the door lentil so it could be placed on the door jambs on the cathedral's southern portal, noted by Marasović,<sup>31</sup> was characteristic of many monuments of the eleventh century: as on the tympanum of the portal of St. Lawrence in Zadar, the early Romanesque double doors west of the Vestibule in Split and the decorated portal formerly walled into the doors of the parish church in Gradac near Drniš, now in the stone monument collection of the Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments. These analogies of the eagle images on the pediment and lentil of the cathedral's southern doors mean that the entire portal can be dated to the end of the eleventh century.<sup>32</sup> Some authors who discussed the Split cathedral's southern portal, taking for granted the data provided by Archdeacon Thomas that the first Split archbishop, John of Ravenna, cleared Jupiter's temple of images of pagan gods and installed doors and latches,<sup>33</sup> ascribed the opening of the southern portal to John of Ravenna, and thus dated the portal too early. Perhaps John of Ravenna simply placed wooden doors on the portal of the mausoleum which then fell into decay or simply were not there, and thus closed the church, and did not open a new portal, as there was no need for this, since the faithful within the palace were few in number and the newly-arrived Croats in the environs only then began their conversion to Christianity.

31 Marasović 1992, str. 171. O južnom portalu splitske katedrale sa svom relevantnom literaturom o problemu datiranja Marasović 1992, str. 165-180. Dovratnici i nadvratnik su iz istog vremena. Analogije za vegetabilni motiv sa savijenom lozicom i cvjetićima na dovratnicima možemo pronaći na primjerima iz Splita, kao na pilastaru oltarne ograde iz Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu, s motivom vegetabilnog ukrasa s peterolatičnim cvjetićima slične modelacije, koji izlazi iz kantarosa. I ovaj pilastar bi se mogao datirati u 11. stoljeće. Vijugavi biljni ornament na dovratnicima južnih vrata katedrale pojednostavnjen je u jednu stapku, dok su polukrugovi na kamenoj gredi iz Arheološkog muzeja ispunjeni listićima. Polupalmete koje izlaze iz usta maskerona na dovratnicima južnih vrata istog su oblika kao završetci listića na pilastru. Ovaj motiv je blizak i radovima kninske romaničke radionice, kao i onome na rubu trokutastog zabata s prikazom Maistas Domini sa Sustipana u Splitu, koji je djelo iste radionice, po Jakšiću prenesen u Split uoči provala Turaka. Za analogiju vegetabilnog ukrasa vijugave lozice mogu poslužiti još i portal Sv. Lovre te portal iz Gradca kod Drniša. Rapanić 1963, str. 112, sl. 15; Flèche Mourgues, Chevalier, Piteša 1993, str. 230, T. 5. II. 9; Jakšić 1981, str. 28, sl. 2, str. 31, sl. 9; Petricioli 1960a, str. 54-60, T. XVII, XVIII, str. 67.

32 Istu dataciju južnih vrata zastupa i Fisković 2002, str. 303-305.

33 Toma Arhiđakon 2003, str. 49.

34 Toma rabi gotovo iste riječi hvale za nadbiskupa Lovru kao i za prvog splitskog nadbiskupa. *Bio je tako revan u povećanju i ukrašavanju crkvenoga blaga da je jednog svog slugu poslao u Antiohiju da izuči zanat obrade zlata i srebra.* Uz ovaj podatak o Antiohiji mogu se dovesti u vezu i predložci, osobito na orijentalnom tekstilu, koje je mogao u Split donijeti izučeni majstor iz Sirije, a koji i jesu utjecali na likovnu koncepciju životinja prikazanih u medaljonima na nadvratniku (Toma Arhiđakon 2003, str. 69). Za prikaze fantastičnih bića u medaljonima obrubljenim kuglastim uresom na orijentalnom tekstilu 11. stoljeća vidi: Volbach, Salles, Duthuit 1933, str. 75, T. 90 primjer grifona u medaljonu, 9.-10. st., primjeri iz 11. st. na str. 77, 78, T. 96, T. 97.

31 Marasović 1992, p. 171. On the southern portal of the Split cathedral with all relevant literature on the dating problem, Marasović 1992, pp. 165-180. The jambs and lentil are coterminous. Analogies for the vegetation motif on the door jambs with curved grape vines and small flowers can be found on examples from Split, such as the pilaster of the altar screen in the Archaeological Museum in Split, bearing a plant decoration motif with a cinquefoil flower modelled similarly and coming out of a kantharos. This pilaster can also be dated to the eleventh century. The curvy plant ornament on the jambs of the cathedral's southern doors are simplified into a single stalk, while the semi-circles on the stone beam from the Archaeological Museum have full leaves. The semi-palmette coming out of the mouth of the mascarón on the jambs of the southern door is formed like the tips of the leaves on the pilaster. This motif is also similar to the works of the Romanesque workshop in Knin, and to the edge of the triangular pediment with portrayal of Maistas Domini from Sustjepan in Split, which is the work of the same workshop, according to Jakšić it was taken to Split on the eve of the Ottoman incursions. Other analogies to the curvy vine plant decoration can be found on the portal of St. Lawrence and the portal from Gradac near Drniš. Rapanić 1958, p. 112, Fig. 15; Flèche Mourgues, Chevalier, Piteša 1993, p. 230, P. 5. II. 9; Jakšić 1981, p. 28, Fig. 2, p. 31, Fig. 9; Petricioli 1960a, pp. 54-60, P. XVII, XVIII, p. 67.

32 The same dating for the southern portal is advocated by Fisković 2002, pp. 303-305.

33 Toma Arhiđakon 2003, p. 49.

### Plutej iz crkve sv. Petra Starog

Dimenzije: visina 94 cm; širina 45 cm; debljina 9 cm; debljina gornje izbačene letve 12 cm; mramor

Plutej na desnom boku ima istaknutu letvu koja je ulazila u utor pilastra, dok je s lijeve strane ravan. Relativno je uzak pa cijelu prednju plohu ispunja jedna arkada s poznatim motivom križa i palmeta (sl. 5). Uz rubove pluteja isklesana su dva masivnija tordirana stupa s naznačenim kapitelima stiliziranim poput dvaju trokuta. Stupovi drže luk arkade koji je ispunjen gustom troprutom pletenicom. Na središnjem dijelu unutar arkade isklesan je dugi križ ponešto neobične forme. Gornji i donji vertikalni krak izduženi su i istih dimenzija, završetci hasta su konkavno zaobljeni, dok su poprečni, horizontalni krakovi koji se spajaju u sredini križa kratki. Rubovi križa su profilirani, a cijeli križ ispunjava tropruta pletenica, koja se od romba u sredini grana na četiri kraka križa. Iznad horizontalnih krakova isklesane su dvije virovite rozete, a ispod dvije palmete. Grane palmi imaju neobičnu formu, oštri listovi poput riblje kosti stupnjevito se šire od vrha do dna biljke, pa oblikom podsjećaju na stabla čempresa ili jele, te se stilizacijom razlikuju od svih prikaza ovog motiva tijekom predromanike. Iznad luka arkade, u međuprostoru do istaknute gornje rubne letve, urešene jednostavnom troprutom pletenicom, isklesane su dvije ptice prikazane u letu iz suprotnih smjerova koje kljunovima dodiruju plod u sredini. Ptice imaju istaknuti volumen zaobljenih formi, s naznakama obrade perja o kojoj ne možemo puno kazati, jer je plutej na ovome mjestu prilično izlizan. Ptica na lijevoj strani nije u cijelosti sačuvana, tijelo joj je presječeno rubom pluteja koji je na lijevoj strani naknadno skraćeno. Najbliži ovome je mramorni plutej uzidan na vrhu stubišta unutar palače Gjeremija, nasuprot dvorišnih vrata crkve Svetog Duha.<sup>35</sup>

Motiv križeva u arkadama s palmetama podno horizontalnih hasta omiljeni je motiv splitskih klesarskih radionica tijekom cijelog razdoblja predromanike. Kompozicija križa s palmetama (rajski motiv) pojavljuje se već na reljefima prijelaznog razdoblja iz kasne antike u rani srednji vijek, kao na pluteju iz crkve sv.

The installation of the cathedral's southern door and installation of the portal more likely occurred during the time of Archbishop Lovre (1059-1099). Even if Thomas thought that the new door was installed by John of Ravenna (which he does not state explicitly at any point), the over one hundred years that separated him from Archbishop Lovre are a sufficient interval for this to be forgotten, so Thomas very well could have ascribed this event to the distant past of the legendary Archbishop John of Ravenna.<sup>34</sup>

### Pluteus from the Church of St. Peter the Old

Dimensions: height, 94 cm; width, 45 cm; thickness 9 cm; thickness of upper out-thrust batten 12 cm; marble

The right side of the pluteus has a prominent batten in which a pilaster slot was inserted, while it was straight on the left side. It is relatively narrow, so the entire frontal surface is filled with a single arcade with the well-known cross and palmette motif (Fig. 4). Two more massive twisted columns with marked capitals stylized as two triangles are carved along the edges of the pluteus. The columns support the arch of an arcade filled with a thick, tri-band braid. A long cross with a somewhat unusual form is carved into the central portion inside the arcade. The upper and lower vertical shafts are extended, with the same dimensions. The tips of the shafts are rounded and concave, while the perpendicular horizontal shafts that connect in the middle of the cross are short. The edges of the cross are moulded, and the entire cross is filled with tri-band braids, which branch from a rhombus in the middle to the four arms of the cross. Two wavy rosettes were carved above the horizontal arms, and two palmettes below. The palm branches have an unusual form, with sharp leaves like fish bones that gradually expand from top to bottom of the plant, so they recall a cypress or fir tree, and the stylization differs from all other portrayals of this motif during the pre-Romanesque period. Two birds are depicted flying from opposite directions with beaks touching a fruit between them, above the arcade arch, in the space between the prominent upper peripheral battens, decorated with a simple tri-band braid. The birds have the marked volume of rounded forms. Not much can be said of the rendering of the feathers, since the pluteus is considerably worn in this portion. The bird to the left was not entirely preserved

35 Plutej je uzidan iznad stranice rimskog sarkofaga s prikazom borbe lapita i kentaura, također uzidanog u hodniku Palače. Plutej je najprije objavio Bulić, ali ga ne uspoređuje s plutejem iz Sv. Petra Starog koji također donosi u radu (Bulić 1888, str. 43, T. XVII 53). Spominje ga i Jelić u *Vodji po Spljetu i Solinu* kao prsobran oltara i datira ga u 9. stoljeće (Jelić, Bulić, Rutar 1894, str. 209). Potom ga je obradio Fisković, komparirajući ga s plutejem iz Sv. Petra Starog, za koji, pak, ne navodi provenijenciju. (Fisković 1962, str. 21, slika na str. 22, slika na str. 24). Plutej je priklesan do luka arkade, nešto je lošije izvedbe i u ponekim sitnim detaljima razlikuje se od pluteja iz Sv. Petra. Križ je latinskog oblika, završetci horizontalnih krakova su konkavno zaobljeni, palmete su manje i imaju više slobodnog prostora na plohi pozadine, dvije rozete su različita oblika. Uza sve razlike u pojedinostima pluteji su očito djelo iste radionice, pa su možda i pripadali istoj oltarnoj ogradi u crkvi sv. Petra Starog.

34 Thomas uses almost the same words to praise Archbishop Lovre as he does for the first archbishop of Split. "He was so zealous in enhancing and embellishing church treasures, that he sent one of his servants to Antioch to learn the gold- and silversmith trades. This information on Antioch can be linked to models, especially on Oriental textiles, that may have been brought to Split by trained masters from Syria, which did influence the artistic conception of the animals depicted on the door lentil medallions (Toma Arhiđakon 2003, p. 69). On portrayals of fantastic creatures on medallions bordered with spherical decorations on Oriental textiles in the 11<sup>th</sup> century, see: Volbach, Salles, Duthuit 1933, p. 75, P. 90 example of griffin in medallion, 9<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> cent., examples from 11<sup>th</sup> cent. On pp. 77, 78, P. 96, P. 97.



Slika 5.  
Plutej iz crkve sv. Petra Starog,  
Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških  
spomenika (foto: T. Seser)

Figure 5.  
Pluteus from the Church of  
St. Peter the Old, Museum  
of Croatian Archaeological  
Monuments (photo: T. Seser)

Marte u Bijaćima kod Trogira,<sup>36</sup> a naročito krajem 8. i tijekom 9. stoljeća, kada se ovaj motiv, sada uokviren arkadama, u splitskim i trogirskim<sup>37</sup> klesarskim radionicama razrađuje i varira u nekoliko inačica. Većina pluteja iz Splita s ovim motivom datirana je u 9. stoljeće, a karakteriziraju ih lijepi, izduženi latinski križevi s linijski obrubljenim hastama, bez pletera, palmetama sa zaobljenim, linijama uokvirenim listićima koje se šire prema dnu, gdje završavaju volutama, a zaobljenim linijama na samom dnu povezani su s križevima i stupovima arkada u neprekinuti niz.

36 Što se tiče kronologije, iz brojnih rasprava o rustično obrađenim reljefima iskristalizirala su se dva mišljenja. Jedna skupina autora ovakve reljefe datira u prijelazno razdoblje završetka antike i početka ranoga srednjeg vijeka u prvoj polovici 7. stoljeća, a druga ih svrstava u razdoblje formiranja pleterne ornamentike krajem 8. stoljeća. Pregled razmišljanja o ovoj tematici vidi kod Milošević 2004, str. 238-242; Burić 1993, str. 186-188; Rapanić 1987, str. 115-130.

37 Trogirski radionica na prijelazu iz 8. u 9. stoljeće izrađuje kameni namještaj i u zaleđu. Pluteji s križevima i palmetama istih stilskih značajki pronađeni su u Kljajima kod Drniša, Brnazama kod Sinja, Pađenima kod Knina. O stilskim značajkama tih pluteja vidi kod Burić 1982, str. 131, 146, 147, T.V. 10. Za razliku od splitskih pluteja 9. stoljeća, na svim plutejima trogirski radionice križevi su urešeni pleterom. O trogirskoj klesarskoj radionici vidi Jakšić 2004, o spomenutoj kompoziciji str. 272, 273.

- the body is cut off at the edge of the pluteus, which was subsequently shortened on the left side. The marble pluteus at the top of the stairwell inside the Gjeremi Palace, opposite to the doors of the Holy Spirit Church, is most similar to this one.<sup>35</sup>

The motif of crosses in arcades with palmettes under the horizontal shafts was a favourite motif of Split's masonry workshops during the entire pre-Romanesque period. The composition of the crosses with palmettes (heaven motif) had already appeared on reliefs of the period of transition from Late Antiquity to the early Middle Ages, like the pluteus from the Church of St. Martha in Bijaći, near Trogir,<sup>36</sup> and particularly at the end of the eighth and during the ninth century, when this motif, now framed by arcades, began to develop in the masonry workshops of Split and Trogir<sup>37</sup> into several variants. Most of the plutei from Split with this motif have been dated to the ninth century, and they are characterized by lovely, elongated Latin crosses with shafts bordered by lines, without braid designs, but with palmettes having rounded, line-framed leaves that expand toward the bottom, where they end in volutes, and the rounded lines at the very bottom are connected to the crosses and arcade columns in an unbroken chain. The columns and arches of the

35 The pluteus is installed above the sides of a Roman sarcophagus bearing a scene of a battle between the Lapiths and the centaurs, also walled into the corridor of the palace. This pluteus was first published by Bulić, but he did not compare it to the pluteus from St. Peter the Old, which he also published in that same work (Bulić 1888, p. 43, P. XVII 53). Jelić also mentions it in a guide to Split and Solin (*Vodja po Spljetu i Solinu*) as the buffer stop of an altar, and dated it to the 9<sup>th</sup> century (Jelić, Bulić, Rutar 1894, p. 209). It was then analyzed by Fisković, who compared it to the pluteus from St. Peter the Old, but without citing the origin of the latter (Fisković 1962, p. 21, image on p. 22, image on p. 24). The pluteus was carved in next to an arcade crown, and the rendering is somewhat poorer and in certain minor details it differs from the pluteus from St. Peter's. The cross is Latin, the ends of the horizontal shafts are rounded and concave, the palmettes are smaller and there is more free space on the background surface, and the two rosettes have different forms. Despite all of the differences in details, the plutei are obviously the products of the same workshop, so they perhaps belonged to the same altar screen in the Church of St. Peter the Old.

36 As far as the chronology is concerned, two views have crystallized in the course of numerous discussions of the rustically rendered reliefs. One group of authors dates these reliefs to the period of transition from Antiquity to the beginning of the early medieval period in the first half of the seventh century, while the second places them in the period of development of braid ornaments at the end of the eighth century. For an overview of positions on this theme, see Milošević 2004, pp. 238-242; Burić 1993, pp. 186-188; Rapanić 1987, pp. 115-130.

37 At the turn of the 8<sup>th</sup> into the 9<sup>th</sup> century, the Trogir workshop also made stone furnishings in the hinterland. Plutei with crosses and palmettes bearing the same stylistic features were found in Kljajci at Drniš, Brnazi at Sinj, and Pađeni near Knin. On the stylistic features of these plutei, see Burić 1982, pp. 131, 146, 147, P.V. 10. In contrast to the 9<sup>th</sup> century Split plutei, all plutei from the Trogir workshop had crosses decorated with the braid design. On the Trogir masonry workshop, see Jakšić 2004, on this composition, see pp. 272, 273.

Stupovi i lukovi arkada kod nekih su pluteja ispunjeni pleterom,<sup>38</sup> kod nekih su glatki, bez ukrasa, s obrađenom kapitelnom zonom,<sup>39</sup> a negdje su stupovi tordirani s lukovima arkada ispunjenih pleterom.<sup>40</sup>

Iz 10. stoljeća u Splitu potječe samo jedan spomenik ovakve kompozicije koji je sigurno datiran, a to je sarkofag splitskoga nadbiskupa Ivana.<sup>41</sup> Čini se kao da je došlo do prezasićenosti tom kompozicijom tijekom 9. stoljeća, pa se u 10. stoljeću napušta, a prevladava čisto geometrijska koncepcija različitih apstraktnih

arcades on some of these plutei are filled with braid designs,<sup>38</sup> some are smooth, without decorations, but with worked capital zones,<sup>39</sup> and at places the columns are twisted with arcade arches filled with braid designs.<sup>40</sup>

- 
- 38 Kod dva pluteja iz Arheološkog muzeja, od kojih jedan sigurno potječe iz splitske katedrale, a najvjerojatnije i drugi, stupovi i lukovi arkada ispunjeni su pleterom, kao i na pluteju pronađenom prigodom istraživanja crkve sv. Mihovila "na obali" u Splitu (Fleche Mourgues, Chevalier, Piteša 1993, str. 216-219, T. III. I. 9, I. 10; Marasović, Zekan 1982, T. IV. 4). Jedan prilično izlizani fragment potječe iz crkve sv. Marije na Poljudu. Autorica fragment datira u prvu četvrtinu 11. stoljeća, sukladno prvom spomenu crkve sv. Marije *de Paludo*. Na osnovi fragmenta autorica donosi idejnu rekonstrukciju cijelog pluteja, koji je gotovo u potpunosti isti kao i pluteji iz Arheološkog muzeja; stoga taj ulomak također datiram u 9. stoljeće. Matetić 2002, str. 272, sl. 2, rekonstrukcija u crtežu str. 279, crtež 9.
- 39 Dva pluteja od prokoneškog mramora pronađena prigodom nedavnih restauratorskih radova u koru splitske katedrale, gdje su služili kao poklopnice dvaju grobova, posve su specifični i u genezi ove kompozicije unutar splitskoga klesarskog kruga čini se da su najstariji, iz posljednjih desetljeća 8. stoljeća. Križevi s rozetom u sredini, ukrašeni su kružicama s točkicom, pripadaju tipu *crux gemata*, poput križa na ranokršćanskom pluteju iz katedrale u Zadru. Stupovi su bez ukrasa, s kapitelima u obliku listića, a lukovi arkada ukrašeni su nasuprotno postavljenim spiralnim kukama, što je jedinstven slučaj u razradi ovakve kompozicije u Splitu (Nikšić 2002, str. 144, 145, crteži pluteja str. 160; Nikšić 2003-2004, str. 294, 295; Petricioli 1960b, str. 179-184). Spiralne kuke na luku arkade ima i pilastar oltarne ograde iz kripte župne crkve sv. Pelagija u Novigradu Istarskom, a i kopljaste forme palmeta s volutama pri dnu također su bliske splitskim plutejima. Pilastar je datiran krajem 8., i početkom 9. stoljeća (Matejčić 2000, str. 48, 49, I. 36). Luk arkade urešen spiralnim kukama nalazimo na još jednom istarskom primjeru, na pluteju iz crkve sv. Andrije u Betiki kod Barbarige. Ujčić 1992, str. 280, str. 279, T. IV. 9.
- 40 Osim pluteja iz Sv. Petra Staroga, koji je po našem mišljenju dosta mlađi, na primjerima iz 9. stoljeća tordirane stupove imaju plutej u oltaru crkve sv. Lovre u Pazdigradu, gdje su dva krajnja stupa tordirani dok je stupić u sredini ispunjen troprutom pletenicom. Burić je mišljenja da je taj plutej kao spolij ugrađen u oltar, a izvorno je pripadao oltarnoj ogradi splitske katedrale ili nekoj crkvi u episkopalnom sklopu Sv. Dujma (vidi plutej kod Karaman 1930, sl. 84; Burić 1997, str. 62, 63). Istu je sudbinu, nakon razvrgnuća cancelluma u splitskoj katedrali doživio i plutej pronađen u crkvi sv. Jurja na rtu Marjana. Taj plutej ima plitko tordirane stupove, tako da izgledaju vrlo plošno, a lukovi arkada imaju profilaciju bez ukrasa (vidi rekonstrukciju pluteja kod Marasović 1994, str. 264, kat. br. 39). Zanimljiv je jedan primjer uporabe dijela antičkog arhitektonskog sarkofaga sa dva stupa koji nose luk arkade, koji je u ranom srednjem vijeku iskorišten kao okvir središnje kompozicije s križem i palmetama, postavljen na stupu srama na zadarskom forumu. Cijela kompozicija obrubljena je troprutom pletenicom, lijevi stup je tordiran, dok je desni gladak. Na ovome primjeru najzornije se vidi kako se u ranom srednjem vijeku preuzimaju antički motivi, posebno za spomenuti tip kompozicije, Cambi 1995, str. 287-290.
- 41 Gabričević 1960.

- 
- 38 On the two plutei in the Archaeological Museum, of which one is certainly from the Split cathedral, and the other probably is as well, the columns and arches of the arcades are filled with braid designs, as on the pluteus found during research into the Church of St. Michael "on the shore" in Split (Fleche Mourgues, Chevalier, Piteša 1993, pp. 216-219, P. III. I. 9, I. 10; Marasović, Zekan 1982, P. IV. 4). One quite worn fragment is originally from the Church of St. Mary in Poljud. The author dated the fragment to the first quarter of the 11<sup>th</sup> century, in line with the first mention of the Church of St. Maria de Paludo. Based on the fragment, the author made a conceived reconstruction of the entire pluteus, which is almost entirely the same as the pluteus in the Archaeological Museum, so I also date this fragment to the 9<sup>th</sup> century. Matetić 2002, pp. 272, Fig. 2, drawing of reconstruction, p. 279, drawing 9.
- 39 Two plutei made of Proconese marble found during recent restoration works in the Split cathedral's choir, where they were used as covers to two tombs, are entirely specific and would appear to be the oldest in the genesis of this composition within the Split stonemasonry circle, i.e. from the last decades of the 8<sup>th</sup> century. Crosses with rosettes in the middle, decorated with small, dotted circles, are *crux gemata*, like the cross on the Early Christian pluteus from the cathedral in Zadar. The columns are undecorated with leaf-shaped capitals, while the arcade arches are decorated with spiral hooks placed opposite of each other, which is a unique case in the crafting of this composition in Split (Nikšić 2002, pp. 144, 145, pluteus drawing, p. 160; Nikšić 2003-2004, pp. 294, 295; Petricioli 1960b, pp. 179-184). Spiral hooks on the arcade arch can also be seen on the pilaster of the altar screen in the crypt of the parish Church of St. Pelagius in Novigrad in Istria, and the spear-like form of the palmettes with volutes at the bottom are also akin to the Split plutei. The pilaster has been dated to the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> or beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century (Matejčić 2000, pp. 48, 49, I. 36). The arcade arch decorated with spiral hooks can be found on another Istrian example, the pluteus from the Church of St. Andrew in Betika, near Barbariga. Ujčić 1992, p. 280, p. 279, P. IV. 9.
- 40 Besides the pluteus from St. Peter the Old, which is considerably younger in this author's opinion, among the examples from the 9<sup>th</sup> century, twisted columns can also be found on the pluteus on the altar of the Church of St. Lawrence in Pazdigrad, where the two end columns are twisted, while the small column in the middle is filled with a tri-band braid. Burić believes that this pluteus was built into the altar as a spolia, and that it was originally part of the altar screen in the Split cathedral or in a church of the St. Domnio episcopal complex (see the pluteus in Karaman 1930, Fig. 84; Burić 1997, pp. 62, 63). The same fate, after removal of the cancelli in the Split cathedral, was shared by the pluteus found in the Church of St. George on Cape Marjan. This pluteus has shallowly twisted columns, so that they appear very flat, and the arcade arches are moulded without decoration (see reconstruction of pluteus in Marasović 1994, p. 264, cat. no. 39). An example of the use of part of an Antique architectural sarcophagus with two columns supporting the arcade arch in the early Middle Ages as a frame for the central composition of a cross with palmettes, placed on the pillory in the Zadar forum. The entire composition is bordered with a tri-band braid design, the left column is twisted while the right column is smooth. This example most clearly shows that motifs from Antiquity were assumed in the early Middle Ages, particularly the aforementioned composition type. Cambi 1995, pp. 287-290.



prepleta. Na prednjoj plohi sarkofaga u plitkom je reljefu isklesano pet arkada; središnja nosi natpis, a po dvije sa strana imaju motive križeva s palmetama. U kompoziciji prevladava *horror vacui*; stupovi, lukovi arkada i križevi ispunjeni su gustim troprutim pletenicama, a međuprostori stiliziranim biljnim ornamentima.

Krajem 11. stoljeća, kao retrogradnu pojavu oživljavanja motiva križa s palmetama unutar arkade, možemo datirati plutej iz crkve sv. Petra Starog, pogotovo stoga što specifičnom formom križa i palmeta te voluminozno oblikovanih ptica i tordiranih stupova, odstupa od uvriježenih prikaza ove kompozicije tijekom ranijih razdoblja predromanike. Pleterni ures na križu, luku arkade i rubnoj letvi je decentan i u drugom planu u odnosu na cjelokupnu kompoziciju, kojom dominiraju vertikale masivnih tordiranih stupova, križa i palmeta.

Pleterna ornamentika je do kraja 11. st. sveprisutan element, pa je tako susrećemo kao dekorativnu borduru i na reljefima s figuralnim kompozicijama.

U drugoj polovici 11. st. dolazi do širenja grada Splita izvan zidina Dioklecijanove palače, što svjedoči o stupnju sigurnosti i prosperitetu grada. U osvit romanike iznimnu građevinsku djelatnost u Splitu potiču bogati građani (*nobiles*, plemići) i crkvena lica, čija imena su sačuvana na donatorskim natpisima crkvenoga kamenog namještaja te u onodobnim ispravama i dokumentima. To je doba reformirane Crkve s glavnim protagonistima u osobama kralja Zvonimira i splitskog nadbiskupa Lovre, koji je obilježio gotovo cijelu drugu polovicu 11. stoljeća. Na zapadnoj gradskoj strani formira se predgrađe Veli varoš, oko crkve sv. Mikule koju podiže plemić Ivan sa ženom Tihom i sestra mu Nemira, iz romanske obitelji Messagalina, s imovinom prve Ivanove žene.<sup>42</sup> Na istoku nastaje predgrađe Lučac oko crkve sv. Petra koju također podiže neki splitski građanin sa svojom ženom, čija imena nisu sačuvana, dok je oltarnu ogradu izradio nećak donatorov, Petar. Nadbiskup Lovre, zajedno sa splitskim priorom Valicom, utemeljuje izvan sjevernih gradskih zidina prvi ženski benediktinski samostan, sv. Benedikta (sv. Eufemije, sv. Arnira), kojemu pridružuje crkvu sv. Marije, podignutu u blizini zapadnih zidina grada, uz koju će poslije nastati također ženski benediktinski samostan sv. Marije de Taurello. Đakon Dobre sa svojom braćom Domčom i Fuskom podiže crkvu sv. Julijane, prislonjenu uz vanjsku stranu zapadnih zidina, te vodi isprave i sastavlja epitaf u stihovima splitskom plemiću Petru Crnome (Gumajevu) utemeljitelju i donatoru samostana sv. Petra u Selu (Krilo Jesnice). Splitski prior Furmin (Firmin) sa svojom suprugom Magi i drugom suprugom Bitom, uređuje crkvu sv. Teodora (Gospa od Zvonika) u stražarskom hodniku nad zapadnim vratima Palače, a prezbiter Dominik pregrađuje crkvu sv. Martina nad sjevernim gradskim vratima.

Građevinsku djelatnost prate i kvalitetne klesarske radionice u Splitu zadužene za izradu kamenog namještaja. Jedna radionica izrađuje kameni namještaj za crkvu sv. Benedikta, potom

Only one monument of this composition in Split has been dated to the tenth century with certainty, and that is the sarcophagus of Split Archbishop Ivan.<sup>41</sup> It would appear that this composition was overused in the ninth century, so that in the tenth century it was gradually abandoned, while the purely geometric concept of various abstract weaves became predominant. Five arcades are carved in bas-relief on the frontal surface of the sarcophagus, while the central surface bears an inscription, with cross and palmette motifs on each side. The composition is dominated by *horror vacui*: columns, arcade arches and crosses are filled in with dense tri-band braid designs, while the spaces between contain stylized plant ornaments.

The pluteus from the Church of St. Peter the Old can be dated to the end of the eleventh century, as a retrograde phenomenon of reviving the cross and palmette motif within arcades, particularly since the specific form of the cross and palmette and the voluminosly formed birds and twisted columns deviate from the established portrayals of this composition during the earlier periods of the pre-Romanesque. The braid decoration on the cross, arcade arch and peripheral batten is decent and in the background in relation to the overall composition, which is dominated by massive vertically twisted columns, crosses and palmettes.

The braid ornamentation was an ever-present element by the end of the eleventh century, so it can thus be seen as a decorative border and on reliefs with figural compositions.

In the second half of the eleventh century, the city of Split experienced an expansion outside of the walls of Diocletian's Palace, which demonstrates the city's level of security and prosperity. At the dawn of the Romanesque, construction in Split was initiated by wealthy citizens (*nobiles*, nobles) and clerical figures, whose names are preserved in the donor inscriptions on stone furnishings of churches and in the deeds and documents of the time. This was an era of a reformed Church, and the main protagonists were King Zvonimir and Split Archbishop Lovre, who marked almost the entire second half of the eleventh century. The suburb of Veli varoš formed in the city's western side, around the Church of St. Nicholas, which was commissioned by the noble Ivan and his sister Nemira from the Romanesque Messagalina family, together with his wife Tiha and the property of his first wife.<sup>42</sup> The suburb of Lučac appeared on the eastern side around the church of St. Peter, which was also commissioned by a citizen of Split with his wife, whose names were not preserved, while the altar screen was raised by the donor's nephew, Petar. Archbishop Lovre, together with the Split Prior Valica, established the first Benedictine Convent of St. Benedict (St. Euphemia, St. Rainerius) outside of the northern city walls, which was joined by the Church of St. Mary, raised near the city's western walls. Another Benedictine convent, that of St. Maria de Taurello, would later be built next to it. Deacon Dobre, together with his brothers Domčo and Fusko, commissioned the construction of

41 Gabričević 1960.

42 Delonga 1997, pp. 5, 18, 19.

42 Delonga 1997, str. 5, 18, 19.

*cancellum* u Sv. Martinu, prozorske okvire za jednu stambenu kuću u Splitu i za jednu crkvu u Trogiru, kao i za crkvu sv. Lovre u šibenskom Donjem polju.<sup>43</sup> Druga radionica izrađuje kameni namještaj za crkve sv. Petra Staroga, sv. Teodora i sv. Marije de Taurello u Splitu te sv. Martina (sv. Barbare) u Trogiru; njezin se utjecaj osjeća i na jugu, u izradi zabata za crkvu sv. Mihajla na Koločepu.<sup>44</sup> Još jedna klesarska radionica druge polovice 11. st. djeluje u kraljevskom Kninu; izrađuje kameni namještaj pronađen na kninskoj tvrđavi, koji je vjerojatno pripadao kninskoj katedrali, zabat s prikazom Bogorodice iz Crkvine u Biskupiji kao i zabat s prikazom *Maiestas Domini* sa Sustipana u Splitu.<sup>45</sup>

Svaka od spomenutih klesarskih radionica ima specifičan, prepoznatljiv likovni repertoar izrastao na višestoljetnoj tradiciji predromaničke umjetnosti, obogaćen u 11. stoljeću nekim novim likovnim elementima, što navješćuju pojavu romaničke umjetnosti.

the Church of St. Juliana, which leans on the external side of the western walls. The deacon maintained the documents and composed an epitaph in verse to the Split noble Peter the Black (Gumajevo), the founder and donor of the monastery of St. Peter in Selo (Krilo Jesnice). Split Prior Furmin (Firmin), with his wife Magi and second wife Bita, set up the Church of St. Theodore (Our Lady of the Tower) in the sentry corridor above the Palace's western gate, while Presbyter Dominik remodelled the Church of St. Martin above the city's northern gate.

The masonry workshops in Split, charged with making stone furnishings, kept pace with this construction activity. One workshop made the stone furnishings in the Church of St. Benedict, the cancelli in the Church of St. Martin, the window frames for a residential building in Split, a church in Trogir, and the Church of St. Lawrence in Donje polje in Šibenik.<sup>43</sup> Another workshop made the stone furnishings in the Churches of St. Peter the Old, St. Theodore and St. Maria de Taurello in Split, and the Church of St. Martin (St. Barbara) in Trogir, and its influence was even felt in the south, in the crafting of the pediment in the church of St. Michael on the island of Koločep.<sup>44</sup> Yet another masonry workshop of the second half of the eleventh century operated in royal Knin, making the stone furnishings found in the Knin fortress, which probably belonged to the cathedral in Knin, the pediment portraying the Madonna from Crkvina, in Biskupija, and the pediment portraying *Maiestas Domini* from Sustjepan in Split.<sup>45</sup>

Each of these masonry workshops had a specific, recognizable repertoire which grew out of the pre-Romanesque artistic tradition of the preceding centuries, and were enriched in the eleventh century with some new visual elements that heralded the appearance of Romanesque art.

---

43 Burić 1992.

44 Petricioli 1994; Petricioli 2000.

45 Jakšić 1981.

---

43 Burić 1992.

44 Petricioli 1994; Petricioli 2000.

45 Jakšić 1981.

## Literatura / References

- Iscrizioni dalmate 1880  
*Iscrizioni Dalmate d'epoca veneziana*, Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata III, Spalato 1880, 183, 184
- Bulić 1888  
F. Bulić, *Hrvatski spomenici u kninskoj okolini uz ostale suvremene dalmatinske*, Zagreb 1888
- Bulić 1897  
F. Bulić, *Iscrizione dell'epoca veneta*, Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata 20, Spalato 1897, 38
- Belamarić 1981  
J. Belamarić, *Novootkriveni zabat predromaničke oltarne pregrade u Trogiru*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku LXXV, Split 1981, 157-162
- Belamarić 1991  
J. Belamarić, *Gospe od Zvonika u Splitu*, Zagreb 1991
- Bezić-Božanić 1991  
N. Bezić-Božanić, *Župa sv. Petra na Luču u 19. stoljeću*, Kulturna baština 21, Split 1991, 131-150
- Buljević 1982  
Z. Buljević, *Tragovima staroga Splita-Crteži, slike i gravure panorama i pogleda na grad i luku od XVI-XX stoljeća*, Split 1982
- Burić 1982  
T. Burić, *Predromanička skulptura u Trogiru*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, III. serija, sv. 12, Split 1982, 127-160
- Burić 1992  
T. Burić, *Jedna splitska ranoromanička radionica iz treće četvrtine 11. stoljeća*, Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji 32, (Prijatelj zbornik I), Split 1992, 207-221
- Burić 1993  
T. Burić, *Posljednji salonitanski klesari*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 85, (Disputationes Salonitanae IV), Split 1993, 177-197
- Burić 1997  
T. Burić, *Predromaničke oltarne ograde-vijek uporabe i sekundarna namjena*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, III. serija, sv. 24, Split 1997, 57-76
- Bužančić 1995  
R. Bužančić, *Predromanička pregradnja sv. Martina u Trogiru*, Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji 35, (Petriciolijev zbornik I), Split 1995, 241-251
- Cambi 1995  
N. Cambi, *Reljef na stupu sramote na forumu u Zadru*, Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji 35, (Petriciolijev zbornik I), Split 1995, 385-291
- Codex diplomaticus 1907  
*Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, vol. V, Zagreb 1907
- Codex diplomaticus 1998  
*Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, Supplementa, vol. I., Zagreb 1998
- Delonga 1997  
V. Delonga, *Ranoromanički natpisi grada Splita, predkomunalno doba splitske prošlosti*, Split 1997
- Duplančić 1989  
A. Duplančić, *Prilog poznavanju obrane Splita u XVII i XVIII stoljeću*, Vesnik Vojnog muzeja 33, Beograd 1989, 117-156
- Duplančić 1991  
A. Duplančić, *Ulomci arhiva splitskih bratovština u Arheološkom muzeju u Splitu*, Croatica Christiana periodica 27, Zagreb 1991, 107-116
- Duplančić 1992  
A. Duplančić, *Arhiv društva "Bihać" kao izvor za poznavanje istraživanja starohrvatskog Solina*, Starohrvatski Solin, Split 1992, 89-93
- Duplančić 2007  
A. Duplančić, *Splitske zidine u 17. i 18. stoljeću*, Zagreb 2007
- Ercegović 2002  
A. Ercegović, *Pučka arhitektura starih splitskih predgrađa*, Split 2002
- Farlati 1765  
D. Farlati, *Illyricum sacrum III*, Venetiis 1765
- Fisković 1962  
C. Fisković, *O splitskom književniku Jurju Dragošiću de Caris*, Split 1962.
- Fisković 2002  
I. Fisković, *Reljef kralja Petra Krešimira IV.*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, III. serija, sv. 28-29, Split 2002
- Flèche Mourgues, Chevalier, Piteša 1993  
M. P. Flèche Mourgues, P. Chevalier, A. Piteša, *Catalogue des sculptures du haut Moyen-age du Musée Archéologique de Split*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 85, (Disputationes Salonitanae IV) Split 1993, 207-305
- Gabričević 1960  
B. Gabričević, *Sarkofag nadbiskupa Ivana pronađen u podrumima Dioklecijanove palače*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 62, Split 1960, 87-103
- Gunjača 1956  
S. Gunjača, *Rad Muzeja hrvatskih starina u g. 1953*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, III. serija, sv. 5, Zagreb 1956, 201-216
- Gunjača 1960  
S. Gunjača, *Troglodišnji rad Muzeja hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika (1955, 1956 i 1957)*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, III. serija, sv. 7, Zagreb 1960, 267-281
- Ivačić 1940  
A. Ivačić, *Starohrvatski spomenici u lapidariju Arheološkog muzeja*, Kalendar "Jadran", Split 1940, 49-61
- Iveković 1926  
Ć. M. Iveković, *Dalmatiens Architektur und Plastik*, Band VI-VIII, Wien 1926
- Jakšić 1981  
N. Jakšić, *Romanička klesarska radionica iz Knina*, Peristol 24, Zagreb 1981, 27-33
- Jakšić 2004  
N. Jakšić, *Reljefi Trogirske klesarske radionice iz crkve Sv. Marte u Bijačima*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, III. serija, sv. 26/1999, Split 2004, 265-286
- Jelić 1887  
L. Jelić, *Nadpis odnoseći se na starinsku crkvu S. Petra u Solinu*, Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata X, Spalato 1887, 171-172
- Jelić, Bulić, Rutar 1894  
L. Jelić, F. Bulić, S. Rutar, *Vodja po Spljetu i Solinu*, Zadar 1894
- Karaman 1930  
Lj. Karaman, *Iz kolijevke hrvatske prošlosti*, Zagreb 1930

- Katić 1993a  
L. Katić, *Reambulacija dobara splitskoga nadbiskupa 1397. godine*, u: L. Katić, *Rasprave i članci iz hrvatske povijesti*, Split 1993, 315-381
- Katić 1993b  
L. Katić, *Topografske bilješke solinskoga polja*, u: L. Katić, *Rasprave i članci iz hrvatske povijesti*, Split 1993, 293-314
- Kowalczyk, Gurlitt 1910  
G. Kowalczyk, C. Gurlitt, *Denkmaeler der Kunst in Dalmatien*, Berlin 1910
- Marasović 1992  
T. Marasović, *O južnom portalu splitske katedrale*, Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji 32, (Prijatelj zbornik I), Split 1992, 165-180
- Marasović 1994  
T. Marasović, *Graditeljstvo starohrvatskog doba u Dalmaciji*, Split 1994
- Marasović 1996  
T. Marasović, *Split u starohrvatsko doba*, Split 1996
- Marasović, Oreb 1977  
T. Marasović, F. Oreb, *Obrada graditeljskog nasljeđa u okviru projekta "Splitski poluotok" (program za provedbeni urbanistički plan)*, Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture 2/3, Zagreb 1976/1977, 75-108
- Marasović, Zekan 1982  
T. Marasović, M. Zekan, *Istraživanje ranosrednjovjekovne crkve sv. Mihovila "na obali" u Splitu*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, serija III sv. 12, Split 1982, 111-126
- Matejčić 2000  
I. Matejčić, u *Hrvati i Karolinzi, Katalog*, Split 2000, 48, 49
- Matetić 2002  
D. Matetić, *Pleterni ulomci iz predromaničke crkve Sv. Marije na Poljudu*, Zbornik Tomislava Marasovića, Split 2002, 270-286
- Milošević 2004  
A. Milošević, *Prva ranosrednjovjekovna skulptura iz crkve Sv. Marte u Bijaćima*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, III. serija, sv. 26/1999, Split 2004, 237-263
- Nikšić 2002  
G. Nikšić, *Novi nalazi u koru katedrale sv. Dujma*, Kulturna baština 31, Split 2002, 139-162
- Nikšić 2003-2004  
G. Nikšić, *Kor splitske katedrale*, Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji 40, Split 2003-2004, 263-305
- Novak 1961  
G. Novak, *Povijest Splita II*, Split 1961
- Ostojić 1975  
I. Ostojić, *Metropolitanski kaptol u Splitu*, Zagreb 1975
- Petricioli 1960a  
I. Petricioli, *Pojava romaničke skulpture u Dalmaciji*, Zagreb 1960
- Petricioli 1960b  
I. Petricioli, *Fragmenti skulpture od VI. do VIII. stoljeća iz Zadra*, Diadora 1, Zadar 1960, 175-195
- Petricioli 1980  
I. Petricioli, *Oko datiranja umjetničkih spomenika ranoga srednjeg vijeka*, Gunjačin zbornik, Zagreb 1980, 113-120
- Petricioli 1983  
I. Petricioli, *Tragom srednjovjekovnih umjetnika*, Zagreb 1983
- Petricioli 1994  
I. Petricioli, *Na tragu klesarske radionice iz 11. st.*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku 86, Split 1994, 287-292
- Petricioli 2000  
I. Petricioli, *Razmišljanja o ulomcima s Koločepa*, u: *Oltarna ograda s Koločepa*, Split 2000, 18-22
- Petrić 1998  
N. Petrić, *Iz hrvatske renesansne arheologije*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, III. serija, sv. 25, Split 1998, 139-166
- Petrić 1983  
P. Petrić, *Lučac u vizitaciji nadbiskupa S. Cosmija*, Kulturna baština 14, Split 1983, 60-63
- Petrić 1984  
P. Petrić, *Splitski toponimi*, Čakavska rič 1-2, Split 1984, 3-27
- Petrić 1985  
P. Petrić, *Splitski toponimi (nastavak)*, Čakavska rič 1, Split 1985, 79-98
- Petrić 1987  
P. Petrić, *Topografske bilješke splitskog polja*, Kulturna baština 17, Split 1987, 135-142
- Piplović 1984  
S. Piplović, *Razarenje povijesne jezgre Splita u II svjetskom ratu*, Kulturna baština 15, 1984, 126-134
- Piplović 2006  
S. Piplović, *Urbanistički i graditeljski razvitak predgrađa Lučac u Splitu*, Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru 48, Zadar 2006, 453-510
- Prijatelj 1995  
K. Prijatelj, *Glavni oltar bivše župne crkve sv. Petra na Lučcu*, Kulturna baština 26-27, Split 1995, 61-66
- Rapanić 1963  
Ž. Rapanić, *Kamena plastika ranog srednjeg vijeka u Arheološkom muzeju u Splitu*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku LX/1958, Split 1963, 98-124
- Rapanić 1971  
Ž. Rapanić, *Ranosrednjovjekovni latinski natpisi iz Splita*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku LXV-LXVII/1963-1965, Split 1971, 271-310
- Rapanić 1987  
Ž. Rapanić, *Predromaničko doba u Dalmaciji*, Split 1987
- Rapanić 1995  
Ž. Rapanić, *Oltarna ograda splitskog priora Furmina*, Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji 35, (Petriciolijev zbornik I), Split 1995, 327-344
- Toma Arhiđakon 2003  
Toma Arhiđakon, *Historia Salonitana-Povijest salonitanskih i splitskih prvosvećenika*, Split 2003
- Ujčić 1992  
Ž. Ujčić, *Ranosrednjovjekovni kameni spomenici sa simboličkim "rajskim" prikazom iz južne Istre*, Starohrvatska prosvjeta, III serija, sv. 20, Split 1992, 273-287
- Volbach, Salles, Duthuit 1933  
F. Volbach, G. Salles, G. Duthuit, *Art Byzantin*, Paris 1933
- Žile 2003  
I. Žile, *Predromaničko crkveno graditeljstvo otoka Koločepa*, Dubrovnik 2003