

CRTICE O PALIMPSEST RELJEFU APOSTOLA IVANA IZ CRKVICE SV. JERE NA MARJANU



NOTES ON THE PALIMPSEST RELIEF DEPICTING JOHN THE APOSTLE FROM THE CHURCH OF ST. JEROME ON MARJAN

Dražen Maršić

Odjel za arheologiju / Department of Archaeology
Sveučilište u Zadru / University of Zadar
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV., 2
HR – 23000 Zadar
drazen.marsic@xnet.hr

UDK/UDC:

091.33:688.783(497.583 Split)“653“

doi: 10.15291/misc.1356

Izvorni znanstveni rad / Original scientific paper

Primljeno / Received: 16. XII. 2016.

Abstract:

Reljef Ivana Evanđelista, nekoć uzidan u marjanskoj crkvi sv. Jere, palimpsest je rimskog nadgrobno spomenika. Nakon vađenja vidljiv je sa svih strana, pa se u radu najprije donosi njihov opis. Posebno je interesantna gornja stranica s ostatkom dugačkog utora. U nastavku se iznosi mišljenje kako je svečev lik nastao preradom portreta žene prikazane u statuarnom obrascu Eumachia-Fundilia. To bi za posljedicu imalo činjenicu da mu je i kosa nastala preradom neke karakteristične ženske frizure te da je predmet u lijevoj ruci (*etui* s perom ili pero?) izrađen od draperije ili nekog tipičnog ženskog atributa. S obzirom na tehnologiju izrade i oblikovanje pročelja s dvije spojene niše, splitski je reljef mogao nastati samo od monumentalne stele ili reljefa uzidanog u veće grobno zdanje. Među spomenicima iz Salone i njezina bližeg zaleđa nažalost nema usporedivih primjeraka, što znači da je riječ o spomeniku osebujne izrade, tj. dosad nepoznatoj tipološkoj varijanti. S obzirom na to da više elemenata

govori protiv teze o pripadnosti ugradbenom reljefu (prisutnost natpisa, format portreta), autor se priklanja mišljenju da je riječ o monumentalnoj steli nastaloj prema sjevernoitalskom predlošku.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: palimpsest; Eumachia – Fundilia; portret; ugradbeni reljef; stela

Abstract

The relief depicting John the Evangelist which was once embedded in the Church of St. Jerome on Marjan is a palimpsest of a Roman funerary monument. Since the removal, it has been visible from all sides, and this paper first presents their description. The upper side is particularly interesting as it bears the remains of an insertion groove. In the author's opinion, the figure of the saint was made by reworking a portrait of a woman in the Eumachia-Fundilia statue type. This means that the hair was also re-carved from some characteristic female coiffure and that the object in the left hand (*etui* with a pen or a pen?) was made of drapery or some typical female attribute. Considering the manufacturing process and shaping of the front with two joint niches, the relief from Split could have been formed only from a monumental stele or a relief incorporated into a larger funerary object. There are no comparable examples in Salona and its close hinterland meaning that it was a monument of peculiar rendering, i.e. a previously unknown typological variant. Since several elements contradict the thesis on attribution to the embedded relief (presence of an inscription, portrait format), the author supports an opinion that it was a monumental stele made after a northern Italic model.

KEYWORDS: palimpsest, Eumachia, Fundilia, portrait, embedded relief, stele.

U dvorišnom zidu crkvice sv. Jere na splitskom Marjanu stajao je dugi niz stoljeća uzidan zanimljiv reljef s prikazom apostola Ivana (Evangelista), koji je tijekom restauratorskih radova 2012. godine skinut i zamijenjen kopijom. Reljef je potom premješten i privremeno izložen na prvom katu zgrade Splitske nadbiskupije, gdje ga je iste godine vidio i detaljno proučio autor ovih redaka (Sl. 1). U međuvremenu je izložen u palači Skočibušić-Lukaris na splitskom Peristilu jer je predviđen kao jedan od budućih vrijednih izložaka Muzeja crkvene umjetnosti.

O reljefu je tijekom proteklih stotinjak godina sud izreklo više uglednih povjesničara umjetnosti, a iz kruga hrvatske arheološke zajednice jedino akademik N. Cambi.¹ Cambijeva studija reljefa donijela je cijeli niz novih zapažanja i inspirativnih promišljanja te stubokom promijenila pogled na reljef. Do tada smatran renesansnim radom iz 15. ili 16. st., inspiriranim klasikom² ili još prije lokalnom salonitanskom sepulkralnom produkcijom,³ reljef se zahvaljujući Cambijevoj studioznosti pokazao kao renesansna prerada (palimpsest) nekog rimskog nadgrobno spomenika.⁴ Takva interpretacija izgrađena je na prepoznavanju i analizi mnogih detalja od kojih su najvažniji sljedeći:

1. Višedijelnost reljefa, odnosno činjenica da je izrađen iz četiri dijela: glavnog dijela s likom apo-

An interesting embedded relief depicting John the Apostle (Evangelist) stood in the courtyard wall of the Church of St. Jerome on Marjan in Split for years. It was taken down during restoration works in 2012 and replaced with a copy. Then the relief was replaced and temporarily exhibited on the first floor of the building of the Archdiocese of Split where the author had the opportunity to see and study it in detail (Fig. 1). In the meantime, it

has been exhibited in the Skočibušić-Lukaris Palace on the Peristyle in Split as it is supposed to be one of the valuable future exhibits of the Church Art Museum.

Several renowned art historians have voiced their opinions on the relief in the past hundred years, and only academician N. Cambi represented the Croatian archaeological community.¹ Cambi's study of the relief brought a series of new insights and inspirational considerations changing dramatically the view of the relief. Up to that point it was considered to be a Renaissance work from the 15th or 16th century, inspired by classical antiquity² or even more li-

kely by local Salonitan sepulchral production,³ but owing to Cambi's studious approach it turned out to be a Renaissance re-modelling (palimpsest) of some Roman tombstone.⁴ Such interpretation was based on recognition and analysis of a number of details, the most important being the following:



SLIKA 1. Palimpsest reljef Ivana Evanđelista iz crkve sv. Jere (foto: D. Maršić)

FIGURE 1. Palimpsest relief of John the Evangelist from the Church of St. Jerome (photo by D. Maršić)

¹ O. von KUTCHERA-WOBORSKY 1918: 1 i d., sl. 1 – 2; Lj. KARAMAN 1922: 112 i d.; D. KEČKEMET 1953: 81; C. FISKOVIĆ 1972: 52, bilj. 24; N. CAMBI 1997: 25 i d., sl. na str. 27 i 29; M. PELC 2007: 352 sa sl.

² O. von KUTCHERA-WOBORSKY 1918: 5, 32.

³ Lj. KARAMAN 1922: 113, 116; D. KEČKEMET 1953: 81; C. FISKOVIĆ 1972: 52, bilj. 24 (89–90).

⁴ N. CAMBI 1997: 27 i dalje.

¹ O. von KUTCHERA-WOBORSKY 1918: 1 ff, fig. 1-2; Lj. KARAMAN 1922: 112 ff.; D. KEČKEMET 1953: 81; C. FISKOVIĆ 1972: 52, note 24; N. CAMBI 1997: 25 ff., fig. on pp. 27 and 29; M. PELC 2007: 352 with fig.

² O. von KUTCHERA-WOBORSKY 1918: 5, 32.

³ Lj. KARAMAN, 1922, 113, 116; D. KEČKEMET 1953: 81; C. FISKOVIĆ 1972: 52, note 24 (89-90).

⁴ N. CAMBI 1997: 27 ff.

stola Ivana, lijevog pilastra umetnutog ispod luka niše, jednog manjeg komada postavljenog povrhnjega i vršnog profiliranog bloka u funkciji vijenca.

2. Ostaci prerade u vidu abociranja reljefa lijeve strane glave (gledano iz perspektive lika) od visine usta do sljepoočnica, sužavanja vrata, linije obaju ramena i podlaktice podignute desne ruke.

3. Neproporcionalno mala glava u odnosu na tijelo i ruke te njezino „bježanje“ nadesno u odnosu na zamišljenu os tijela i vrata.

4. Nepostojanje krajeva, tj. okomite profilacije natpisnog polja.

Mišljenja smo da su uočene pojedinosti izrade neosporne i da u najmanju ruku dokazuju da je reljef nastao preradom starijeg spomenika, što su uostalom prihvatili i neki drugi istraživači.⁵ Sve ukazuje na činjenicu da je to zaista bio neki rimski nadgrobni spomenik. Od Cambijeve studije utoliko smo u povoljnijem položaju što je reljef – kako je spomenuto – izvađen iz zida crkve i dostupan za analizu sa svih strana. Sada mu poznamo i točne dimenzije: u visinu mjeri 1,02 m, širina mu je 0,65 m, a debljina mu značajno varira od 0,235 u donjem do 0,16 m u gornjem dijelu. Izlaganje nastavljamo s detaljima izrade koji do sada nisu bili vidljivi ili su se samo nazirali na prednjici te preispitivanjem u kojoj mjeri potvrđuju ili dopunjuju iznijete postavke.

Lijeva bočna strana nesumnjivo je najinteresantnija i pokazuje nekoliko vrlo važnih detalja (Sl. 2). Prvi je onaj koji je uočio već Cambi analizom pročelja – da je lijevi pilastar (ili parasta, kako ga on naziva) posebno izrađen i naknadno dodan. Međutim, pogled na tu stranu otkriva još nekoliko zanimljivih pojmova. Prva je ta da se reljef prema vrhu značajno sužava. Nadalje, cijela je bočna ploha nepravilno odlomljena i bez tragova zubatog dljeteta, koji su pak na umetku (pilastru) vidljivi u punom opsegu. U gornjem dijelu lom ima najnepravilniji oblik (što se manifestira i u boji kamena), iz toga razloga umetak vrhom izlazi izvan gabarita stranice, pa je zato i bilo potrebno krpanje još jednim komadom, koji je kod vađenja i premještanja

1. A multipartite relief, that is the fact that it was made of four parts: the main part bearing a depiction of the John the Apostle, left pilaster inserted under the niche arch, one smaller piece placed above it and upper molded block functioning as a wreath.

2. The remains of re-modelling in the form of roughly worked relief on the left side of the head (seen from the perspective of the figure) from the mouth height to temples, narrowing of the neck, line of both shoulders and forearm of the raised right arm;

3. A disproportionally small head in relation to the body and arms and its “deviation” to the right in relation to an imaginary axis of the body and neck.

4. Lack of ends i.e. vertical molding of the inscription field.

In our opinion, the noticed details of rendering are indisputable and they prove that the relief was made by the re-carving of some older monument, which was accepted by some other researchers.⁵ Everything indicates that it really was a Roman funerary monument. The circumstances for our study have improved inasmuch that, from the time of Cambi's analysis, the relief was removed from the church wall and it is available for examination from all sides. Now we know its exact dimensions: it measures 1.02 m in height, 0.65 m in width, and it tapers from 0.235 m in the lower part to 0.16 m in the upper part. In continuation, we will discuss details of rendering that have not been visible or they could only be discerned on the front part, and we will consider the extent in which they confirm or supplement presented theses.

The left lateral side is definitely most interesting and it exhibits several very important details (Fig. 2). The first one was noticed by Cambi in his analysis of the front – that the left pilaster (or parasta in his words) was made separately and added subsequently. However, the view from this side reveals several more interesting details. The first one is a considerable narrowing of the relief toward the top. Further on, the entire lateral surface is broken

⁵ M. PELC 2007: 352; A. DUPLANČIĆ 2009: 162 (autor u radu inače donosi zanimljivo mišljenje da je reljef mogao biti donijet iz crkve sv. Ivana Evanđelista istočno od Bambine glavice).

⁵ M. PELC 2007: 352; A. DUPLANČIĆ 2009: 162 (the author expresses an interesting opinion that the relief might have been brought from the Church of St. John the Evangelist east of Bambina glavica).



SLIKA 2. Lijeve bočna strana reljefa s vidljivim tragovima „krpanja“ (foto: D. Maršić)

FIGURE 2. Left lateral side of the relief with visible traces of “patching up” (photo by D. Maršić)

očito zanemaren i zagubljen. Iz svega jasno proizlazi da je lijeva strana izvornog spomenika odlomljena još u antičko doba ili najkasnije za potrebe prerade. Umetanjem dvaju elemenata zapravo je zakrpano i preoblikovano pročelje, dok se stražnji nepravilni dio u strukturi zida nije niti vidio. U gornjem stražnjem dijelu lijeve strane nalazi se i u presjeku vidljivi utor za koji se prije nije znalo, duljine i dubine od po 11 cm te širine 3 cm. Njime je reljef danas pričvršćen za metalnu konstrukciju na kojoj stoji. Izrađen je na način da mu je danas

off irregularly, showing no traces of a toothed chisel that is visible on the entire insert (pilaster). The fracture is most irregular in the upper part (manifested in the colour of the stone), which is why the top of the insert protrudes out of the side borders. Therefore, it had to be patched up with another piece, evidently lost during removal and moving. It is clear that the left side of the monument was broken off in antiquity, or some time later, in order to be reworked. Two elements were inserted in order to fix and re-model the front side, while the back, irregular part could not be seen in the wall structure. In the upper back part of the left side is an insertion groove visible in the cross-section, 11 cm long and deep, and 3 cm wide, which was previously unknown. Presently it is used to fasten the relief on the metal construction it stands on. Its channel, presently visible and once inside the stone mass, is slightly slanted from the back towards the front part of the relief while its upper opening has an elongated and regular form. It is clear that it was broken lengthwise due to breaking/reworking the left side of the entire relief and that it definitely belongs to the original monument. A bird's eye view confirms this hypothesis, revealing that it was made precisely in the axis of the “hanging” arch support (once actually two arches) (Figs. 4–5), which must be related to the original composition of the monument and anchoring of some upper element. This will be discussed later on. Therefore, we can conclude that Cambi's observations were well-founded and that he recognized very observantly the details of rendering that could be noticed at the time. New details are amorphousness of the left lateral side and insertion groove which testify to the procedure and stage of production and also give certain details regarding the type of the original monument.

The right lateral side was cut off flatly and smoothed finely with a toothed chisel. It also tapers towards the top (Fig. 3). It is evident that the front part of the pilaster is deeply recessed in relation to the upper edge of the inscription field, almost in line with the drapery and to some extent with the figure's head. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that the original architectural framework, regardless of its appearance, was thoroughly reworked and recessed in relation to the original situation.



SLIKA 3. Desna bočna strana reljefa (foto: D. Maršić)
 FIGURE 3. Right lateral side of the relief (photo by D. Maršić)

vidljivi kanal, nekoć unutar „mesa“ kamena, lagano zakošen od stražnjeg prema prednjem dijelu reljefa, dok mu je gornji otvor izduženog i pravilnog oblika. Jasno se daje utvrditi da je po duljini prekinut lomom/preradom lijeve strane čitavog reljefa te da bez sumnje pripada izvornom spomeniku. Da je tome tako pokazuje pogled iz ptičje perspektive, koji otkriva da je izrađen točno u osi „visećeg“ nosača luka (nekada zapravo dvaju lukova) (Sl. 4 – 5), što mora stajati u svezi s izvornom kompozicijom spomenika i sidrenjem nekakvog gornjeg elementa. O tome će još biti riječi nešto kasnije. Iz

The lack of vertical molding of the inscription confirms that the right side of the relief was formed by cutting (even if only slight), i.e. shortening of this part of the original monument. Furthermore, as rendering of the lateral surface by a toothed chisel is uniform from the back towards the front part it is clear that its present look must be a consequence of a Renaissance intervention. Cambi's interpretation of reworking of the right edge with the pilaster and upper part of the monument is confirmed once more.

The upper side, except for the mentioned insertion groove, presently positioned on the left edge, has another interesting rendering detail. It is fine smoothing with a toothed chisel identical to the one on the right side (Fig. 4). This means that this part of the monument was lowered for at least a few centimeters. At first sight it seems that a base for some square element, a few millimeters deep, is located on the right edge of the surface, but after touching and careful examination it becomes clear it was just an optical effect.

As evident from all the aforementioned, removal of the relief from the wall enabled confirmation of the interpretation of the palimpsest character of the relief, but we still do not have new, crucial details which might help us in an attempt to reconstruct the iconography, form and attribution of the original monument. It is evident that these questions can be solved only through analysis and interpretation of the reworking of the monument's front. The question is, can the offered interpretation be supplemented or improved in some segment? We believe that the answer is affirmative and we will try to present our view briefly.

The first such detail is the question of attire and gender of the figure that John the Evangelist was made from. Definitely this figure wears a mantle, rectangular in shape (*pallium*, *palla*), as a Roman version of Greek *himation*, and the drapery for the most part represents remains of the original relief.⁶ However, if we consider the gesture of raising the right hand, and holding the edge of the mantle in the hand in a specific way, as a loop reaching high above the fingers while the rest of the drapery is thrown over the left arm (again from the figure's

⁶ N. CAMBI 1997: 30, note 10.



SLIKA 4. Gornja strana reljefa s ostatkom antičkog utora za sidrenje (foto: D. Maršić)

FIGURE 4. Upper side of the relief with the remains of a Roman-era groove for anchoring (photo by D. Maršić)

svoga proizlazi da su Cambijeva zapažanja bila na mjestu i da je izvanredno uočio detalje prerade koji su se u tom trenutku uopće mogli zamijetiti. Novi su detalji amorfnost lijeve bočne strane i utor, koji osim što također dokazuju tijek i stupanj prerade, daju određene smjernice i po pitanju kojoj je vrsti pripadao izvorni spomenik.

Desna bočna strana ravno je odrezana i fino završena zubatim dljetom te također pokazuje sužavanje tijela spomenika prema vrhu (Sl. 3). Uočljivo je da je prednjica pilastra duboko uvučena u odnosu na gornji rub natpisnog polja, s kojim su gotovo u ravnini draperija i donekle glava lika. To nas vodi k neminovnom zaključku da je tijekom prerade izvorni arhitektonski okvir – ma kako on izgledao – temeljito prerađen i po dubini snižen u odnosu na izvorno stanje. Da je i desna strana reljefa nastala rezanjem (makar neznatnim), tj. skraćivanjem tog dijela izvornog spomenika, potvrđuje jasno nedostatak okomite profilacije natpisa. Kako je uz to obrada bočne plohe zubačom jednolična od stražnjeg k prednjem rubu, jasno je da njezin današnji izgled mora biti rezultat renesansnog zahvata. Prema tome, i ovdje se u cijelosti potvrđuje Cambijevo viđenje karaktera prerade desnog ruba s pilastrom i gornjim dijelom spomenika.

Gornja stranica, osim već spomenutog utora, danas položajem na lijevom rubu, donosi još jedan zanimljiv detalj izrade. Riječ je o finom poravnavanju zubatim dljetom identičnom onom na desnoj strani (Sl. 4). To pak znači da je i taj dio spome-

perspective), it is almost certain that a female figure was used for re-modelling (Fig. 1). Other iconographic patterns were used in the Roman period for representing Roman *palliatii*, the most famous being the one with a similarly exposed right hand on the chest, depicted as in a bandage, which sometimes touches or holds part of the “bandage” on the left side of the chest, but never so as to form a loop or fold above the hand.⁷ The best illustrations of this type can be found on the multi-figural reliefs or reliefs depicting spouses from the city of Rome and central Italy where male figures mostly adhere to this convention and among which not a single male counterpart of our depiction can be found.⁸ Admittedly on these reliefs women are also most frequently depicted in the typical Pudicitia statue type or some other characteristic scheme, but a few examples without any doubt represent only women.⁹ Examples from statuary sculpture clearly indicate that the iconography recorded on the relief from Split was reserved for depictions of women in

⁷ Cf. e. g. M. BIEBER 1959: 374 ff, particularly 394 ff, sl. 34 ff. It was also used to depict *palliatiae*.

⁸ Except for a paper from the previous note, the following collections of such monuments were searched for this discussion: D. E. E. KLEINER 1977; H. G. FRENZ 1985; V. KOCKEL 1993.

⁹ D. E. E. KLEINER 1977: 54 ff, cat. no. 8, fig. 8a-b; H. G. FRENZ 1985: 98-99, cat. no. 35, tab. 16, fig. 2; 121, cat. 79, tab. 34, fig. 2; V. KOCKEL 1993: 228, cat. O55, tab. 137e. There is an interesting variant with the right arm completely covered with drapery on some reliefs (see e.g. D. E. E. KLEINER 1977: fig. 41, fig. 88).

nika snižen za barem pokoji centimetar. Na prvi pogled čini se kako se na desnom rubu plohe nalazi i par milimetara udubljeno ležište za neki četvrtasti element, no nakon opipavanja rukom i pažljivijeg promatranja postaje jasno da je riječ samo o optičkom efektu.

Iz dosad navedenog vidljivo je da smo vađenjem reljefa u mogućnosti potvrditi interpretaciju o palimpsest karakteru reljefa, ali ipak nismo u posjedu novih, krucijalnih detalja koji bi pripomogli u pokušaju rekonstrukcije ikonografije, oblika i pripadnosti izvornog spomenika. Očito je da se ta pitanja mogu rješavati samo u interakciji s analizom i interpretacijom prerade pročelja spomenika. Postavlja se pitanje može li se već ponuđena interpretacija u nekom dijelu dopuniti ili unaprijediti. Mišljenja smo da je odgovor potvrđan i to ćemo pokušati ukratko izložiti.

Prvi takav detalj pitanje je nošnje i spola lika od kojeg je izrađen Ivan Evđelist. Da je njegov lik odjeven u ogrtač pravokutnog kroja (*pallium*, *palla*), koji je zapravo rimska verzija grčkog himatija (*bimation*), te da je draperija u najvećoj mjeri preostatak izvornog reljefa, nije upitno i posve je točno zapažanje.⁶ Međutim, s obzirom na gestu podizanja desne ruke, koja je uhvatila skut ogrtača na jedan specifičan način i drži ga u šaci u formi omče koja visoko proviruje iznad prstiju, dok je nastavak draperije prebačen preko lijeve ruke (ponovno gledano iz perspektive lika), gotovo je sigurno da je za preradu poslužio ženski lik (Sl. 1). Za prikaze muških palijata (lat. *palliat*) u rimsko su doba korišteni drugi ikonografski obrasci, od kojih je najpoznatiji onaj sa slično izloženom desnom rukom na grudima, prikazanom kao u zavoju, koja katkad prstima dodiruje ili hvata dio „zavoja“ na lijevoj strani grudi, ali nikad na način da se iznad šake formira omča ili pregib.⁷ Najbolje ga posvjedočuju višefiguralni reljefi ili reljefi s prikazima supružnika iz grada Rima i srednje Italije, gdje muški likovi uglavnom slijede takvu konvenciju i gdje nije moguće pronaći ni jednu mušku usporedbu našem prikazu.⁸ Istina, na tim se reljefima i žene najče-

a palla (*palliatae*). One of the examples that named the mentioned statue type, is a famous honorary statue of Fundilia Rufa from Diana's shrine in the vicinity of Lake Nemi near Rome (Fig. 5), presently on display in Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen (inv. no. 708), dated to the period of Tiberius or early Claudius.¹⁰ A similar interpretation of the same pattern, though with minor differences (the main one being the head covering) can be recognized on a famous Pompeian honorary statue of the priestess Eumachia (Fig. 6), discovered in the building with the same name at the city forum, housed in the Museo Archeologico Nazionale in Naples (inv. no. 6232), also dated to the period of Tiberius.¹¹ Due to their evident iconographic correspondence, the Eumachia-Fundilia statue type of palliata has recently been mentioned in scholarly literature as one of the variants of the Pudicitia type, with an extensive number of replicas.¹² After comparing two eponymous statues with the figure of John the Evangelist it is easily noticeable that „his“ iconography exhibits mixed characteristics. Similarities with Fundilia include the specific modelling of mantle folds on the torso and back part of the left forearm, behind the draped edge, descending towards the forearm, but the difference is in the position of that arm, whose wrist and hand is farther from the body on Fundilia. The figure of John the Evangelist shares the identical positioning of the left hand with Eumachia, but the Pompeian statue's head is covered (*capite velato*) and folds on the mentioned position have a different direction. Important differences are reflected in the modelling of the edge of the mantle, which is formed under the right forearm by its pulling upwards. On Fundilia and Eumachia it has a regular rounded form (with minor differences), while on the relief from Split it was made almost at right angles forming in that way folds similar to those

⁶ N. CAMBI 1997: 30, bilj. 10.

⁷ Usp. npr. M. BIEBER 1959: 374 i d., osob. 394 i d., sl. 34 i dalje. Koristio se i za prikazivanje ženskih palijata.

⁸ Osim rada iz prethodne bilj., za ovu raspravu pretraženi su i sljedeći korpusi takvih spomenika: D. E. E. KLEINER 1977; H.

¹⁰ For an overview see F. JOHANSEN 1994: 184–185, cat. no. 80, with fig.; D. BOSCHUNG 2002: 109–110, cat. no. 35.5, tab. 83, fig. 1; J. FEJFER 2008: 285 ff, tab. 27; J. FEJFER 2015: 96, fig. 9. In the *Anachne* digital base, managed by the German Archaeological Institute and the Archaeological Institute of the University of Cologne, the statue is registered under no. 8572.

¹¹ For an overview see: E. D'AMBRA 2012: 404 ff, fig. 29.2; J. FEJFER 2015: 94 ff, fig. 8a-c. In the *Anachne* base the statue is registered under no. 13308.

¹² Cf. e. g. V. KOCKEL 1993: 27, note 229–230 and J. FEJFER 2015: 92, who mentions 33 replicas in her paper.

šće prikazuju u tipičnom statuarnom obrascu Pudicitije (*Pudicitia*) ili nekoj drugoj karakterističnoj shemi, no nekoliko primjera koji su nedvojbenu prikazuju isključivo žene.⁹ I primjeri iz statuarne plastike jasno pokazuju da je ikonografija zabilježena na splitskom reljefu bila rezervirana za prikaze žena u pali (*palliatae*). Jedan od takvih poznatih primjera, koji je i dao ime dotičnom statuarnom tipu, poznati je počasni kip Fundilije Rufe iz Dijanina svetišta kraj jezera Nemi pored Rima (Sl. 5), danas izložen u Ny Carlsberg Glip-toteci u Kopenhagenu (inv. br. 708), datiran u Tiberijevo ili ranije Klaudijevo doba.¹⁰ Sličnu, ali u nekim manjim pojednostavnostima drukčiju razradu istog obrasca (glavna je pokrivanje glave) iskazuju poznati pompejski



SLIKA 5. Posvetni kip Fundilije Rufe s jezera Nemi (J. FEJFER 2008: 289, tab. 27)

FIGURE 5. Honorary statue of Fundilia Rufa from Lake Nemi (J. FEJFER 2008: 289, tab. 27)

počasni kip sacerdote Eumahije (Sl. 6), otkriven u istoimenoj građevini na gradskom forumu, pohranjen u Museo Archeologico Nazionale u Napulju (inv. br. 6232), a datiran također u Tiberijevo doba.¹¹ Zbog njihove evidentne ikonografske podu-

G. FRENZ 1985; V. KOCKEL 1993.

⁹ D. E. E. KLEINER 1977: 54 i d., kat. br 8, sl. 8a–b; H. G. FRENZ 1985: 98–99, kat. br. 35, tab. 16, sl. 2; 121, kat. 79, tab. 34, sl. 2; V. KOCKEL 1993: 228, kat. O55, tab. 137e. Na nekoliko reljefa pojavljuje se zanimljiva varijanta s desnom rukom potpuno pokrivenom draperijom (v. npr. D. E. E. KLEINER 1977: sl. 41, sl. 88).

¹⁰ Pregledno: F. JOHANSEN 1994: 184–185, kat. br. 80, sa sl.; D. BOSCHUNG 2002: 109–110, kat. br. 35.5, tab. 83, sl. 1; J. FEJFER 2008: 285 i d., tab. 27; J. FEJFER 2015: 96, sl. 9. U digitalnoj bazi *Arachne*, koju vode Njemački arheološki institut i Arheološki institut Sveučilišta Cologne, kip je zaveden pod br. 8572.

¹¹ Pregledno: E. D'AMBRA 2012: 404 i d., sl. 29.2; J. FEJFER 2015: 94 i d., sl. 8a-c. U bazi *Arachne* kip je zaveden pod br. 13308.

under the neck. Since the drapery of this part definitely did not go through significant changes, such modelling can be considered as an original detail and it should not be given any deeper meaning.

Only a small number of monuments indicate that the Eumachia-Fundilia statue type in both variants was known in Roman Dalmatia. The most important example is definitely the well-preserved statue of Lolia Secunda discovered in the mausoleum of her family at the western Salonitan necropolis, close to the Fundilia variant in terms of iconography, which almost certainly depicts one of the daughters of the mausoleum owner.¹³ Another important example might easily be Livia's statue from Naron (‘‘Oxford – Opuzen Livia’’), also close

to Fundilia regarding iconographic characteristics, but since the right arm and set of folds under the hand were broken off at the most inconvenient place, this is not certain.¹⁴ It seems that on some funerary steles and so-called embedded reliefs the intention of stonecutters was to represent the deceased women in this pattern, in reduced height, but iconography was not elaborated, either because of shortage of space inside the field or lack of artistic

¹³ On the circumstances of the discovery and the statue's attire cf. F. LANZA 1856: 35, tab. 10, fig. 2; S. SCHÖNAUER 2001: 230 ff, no. 2, tab. IIb.

¹⁴ Attribution to the type is advocated by E. MARIN –A. CLARIDGE – M. KOLEGA – I. RODA 2004: 80, fig. on p. 83 ff (I. Roda [a picture of the statue is on the front page of the edition]; J. FEJFER 2015: 92 ff, fig. 7. A different opinion was once expressed by N. Cambi, who attributed the body of Livia to the type of the Small Herculaneum woman, which should definitely be rejected. N. CAMBI 1980: 141 ff, fig. 20; N. CAMBI 1998, 54 ff.

darnosti u novije se vrijeme u stručnoj literaturi s pravom govori o tzv. Eumachia-Fundilia statuarnom tipu palijate, kao jednoj od varijacija Pudicije, čija je lista replika pozamašna.¹² Uspoređujući lik Ivana Evanđelista s dvije eponimne statue, lako se primjećuje da „njegova“ ikonografija iskazuje mješovite karakteristike. S Fundilijom dijeli specifičnu izradu nabora ogrtača dijelom izrađenih na torzu, a dijelom na stražnjem dijelu lijeve podlaktice, iza drapiranog ruba koji se prema njoj spušta, ali je razlika u položaju te ruke, koja je kod Fundilije u zglobu i šaci udaljena od tijela. S Eumahijom dijeli upravo identičan položaj lijeve ruke, ali je Pompejanka prikazana pokrivena glave (*capite velato*) i nabori na spomenutom mjestu imaju drugačiji pravac. Značajne razlike očituju se u izradi savijenog okrajka ogrtača, koji se formira ispod desne podlaktice njegovim povlačenjem uvis. Kod Fundilije i Eumahije ima uobičajeni zaobljeni oblik (uz manje razlike), dok je na splitskom reljefu izveden gotovo pod pravim kutom formirajući na taj način nabore nalik onima ispod vrata. S obzirom na to da draperija toga dijela reljefa sigurno nije pretrpjela veće izmjene, takva se izvedba ima smatrati izvornim detaljem i ne treba joj pridavati dublje sadržajno značenje.

Da je statuarni tip Eumachia-Fundilia u objema varijantama bio poznat u rimskoj Dalmaciji pokazuje nažalost tek manji broj spomenika. Najvažniji je svakako dobro očuvani kip Lolije Sekunde otkriven u mauzoleju njezine obitelji na zapadnoj



SLIKA 6. Posvetni kip sacerdote Eumahije iz Pompeja (J. FEJFER 2015: 94 i d., sl. 8a)
FIGURE 6. Honoric statue of the priestess Eumachia from Pompeii (J. FEJFER 2015: 94 i d., sl. 8a)

capacity. One such example is almost definitely a figure of a woman in the lower field of the Salonitan stele whose details are known primarily owing to an excellent drawing of R. Martini.¹⁵ Due to the semi-figural composition and fracture of the stele, the woman's portrait is visible only to her waist, but a fold of the palla in the shape of a loop in her hand is clearly visible. With some effort we can discern the set of folds spreading and descending towards the left hand. We should mention a monument from Aenona, controversial in form (but undoubtedly embedded in some architectural composition), exhibiting very good craftsmanship with classicistic note, on which two young girls, similarly to Eumachia and Fundilia, appear in the left niche, while their mother is in the right niche (together with father) depicted in the Pudicitia statue type.¹⁶ The right girl is bareheaded, and the left one's head is covered. They hold the palla in an identical way, strongly resembling the woman from Martini's stela. Another embedded relief from Aenona might correspond to this example regarding the niche

modelling and iconography of the deceased woman. Unfortunately, the original look of this monument is known only from the drawing by M. Sabljari.¹⁷ Admittedly, the "loop" was not depicted on Sabljari's drawing, but a triangular set of folds under the right forearm points to the attribution to this type as they cannot be shaped in this way if

¹² Usp. npr. V. KOCKEL 1993: 27, bilj. 229–230 i J. FEJFER 2015: 92, koja u svom radu spominje 33 poznate replike.

¹⁵ For an overview see D. MARŠIĆ 2016: 13 ff, fig. 1-2, with older literature.

¹⁶ Cf. D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 79 ff, cat. A12, tab. 7, fig. 2.

¹⁷ See D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 31 ff, fig. 5, cat. A11, tab. 7, fig. 1.

salonitanskoj nekropoli, ikonografski blizak verziji Fundilije, koji gotovo sigurno prikazuje jednu od kćeri vlasnika grobnice.¹³ Još jedan važan primjer mogao bi lako biti Livijin kip iz Narone (tzv. Oxford-Opuzen Livija), ikonografski također na tragu Fundilije, ali budući da su desna ruka i skup nabora ispod šake odlomljeni baš na najnezgodnijem mjestu, to ipak nije posve pouzdano.¹⁴ Čini se da je i na određenom broju nadgrobničkih stela i tzv. ugradbenih reljefa namjera majstora bila prikazati pokojnice u tom obrascu, dakako u reduciranoj visini, ali ikonografija nije do kraja razrađena, ili zbog nedostatka prostora unutar slikovnog polja, ili zbog pomanjkanja umjetničkog kapaciteta. Jedan takav primjer gotovo sigurno je lik žene u donjem polju salonitanske stele čiji nam je izgled poznat prije svega zahvaljujući sjajnom crtežu R. Martinija.¹⁵ Zbog polufiguralnog formata i loma stele ženin je portret vidljiv samo do struka, no jasno se vidi pregib pale u obliku omče koji drži u šaci, a uz malo muke naslućuje se i skup nabora koji se širi i spušta prema lijevoj ruci. Spomenimo i zanimljivi enonski spomenik kontroverzne forme (ali nesumnjivo uzidan unutar arhitekture) te vrlo dobre izrade s klasicističkom notom na kojemu se poput Eumahije i Fundilije pojavljuju dvije mlade djevojke u lijevoj niši, dok je njihova majka u desnoj niši (zajedno s ocem) prikazana u statuarnom obrascu Pudicicije.¹⁶ Desna djevojka je gole glave, a lijeva pokrivena, dok im je držanje pale identično i jako podsjeća na ženu s Martinijeve stele. Oblikovanjem niša i ikonografijom pokojnice tome primjerku odgovarao bi još jedan enonski ugradbeni reljef, čiji nam je izvorni izgled nažalost poznat samo preko crteža M. Sabljara.¹⁷ Na Sabljarovu crtežu, istina, „omča“ nije prikazana, no ono što upućuje na pripadnost tipu je trokutasti skup na-

they are not clenched in a hand. This is definitely not an extensive list of monuments, but we can conclude that all the mentioned examples from Dalmatia are firmly dated to the period of Tiberius or Claudius, meaning that appearance and use of the type is generally synchronous with its introduction and popularity in Italy and other provinces.¹⁸

There is another reason why a pallium could hardly be represented on the example from Split, and that is a negative connotation implied by depiction of this type of male attire on a Roman funerary monument. It is reflected in the fact that the common Romans wore the pallium at home because it was practical and comfortable, but it was deemed inadequate for public presentation, particularly on funerary monuments on which attire was one of the elements of artistic expression used to send a quite specific message.¹⁹ A Roman citizen in civilian clothes is usually depicted in the type of toga popular at the time, and if he was a soldier with some Roman type of cloak, *paenula*, *sagum* or *palludamentum*.²⁰ If the deceased person was a peregrinus or did not have citizenship for some other reason (e.g. being a child of illegitimate marriage), an attempt was often made to conceal it, for instance by neutral clothing or draping a cloak which evidently resembles a toga.²¹ In other words, depiction on a funerary monument in a pallium would imply lack of citizenship (except in cases when the deceased person had a specific profession – e.g. philosopher, orator etc.), and that was not emphasized in practice. Having in mind all the aforementioned, the mantle of John the Evangelist should be recognized as a *palla*, a female variant of the same mantle used by Roman ladies, older

¹³ O okolnostima nalaza i nošnji kipa usp. F. LANZA 1856: 35, tab. 10, sl. 2; S. SCHÖNAUER 2001: 230 i d., br. 2, tab. IIb.

¹⁴ Pripadnost tipu zastupaju E. MARIN – A. CLARIDGE – M. KOLEGA – I. RODÀ 2004: 80, sl. na str. 83 i d. (I. Rodà) [slika kipa je i na naslovnici djela]; J. FEJFER 2015: 92 i d., sl. 7. Drukčije mišljenje izrazio je svojevremeno N. Cambi, koji je tijelo Livije pripisao tipu Male Herkulanke, što kao mogućnost treba odbaciti: N. CAMBI 1980: 141 i d., sl. 20; N. CAMBI 1998: 54 i dalje.

¹⁵ Pregledno: D. MARŠIĆ 2016: 13 i d., sl. 1 – 2, gdje se donosi i starija lit.

¹⁶ Usp. D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 79 i d., kat. A12, tab. 7, sl. 2.

¹⁷ V. D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 31 i d., sl. 5, kat. A11, tab. 7, sl. 1.

¹⁸ J. FEJFER 2015: 92 the type became popular from the 30s BC to 40s AD.

¹⁹ Cf. e. g. J. HESKEL 2001: 133 ff.

²⁰ For an overview in Croatian literature: S. SCHÖNAUER 2001: 397 ff, sl. 12-29 (toga), 402 ff, fig. 30-32 (other cloaks). On toga see H. R. GOETTE 1990: 2 ff.

²¹ One such example can probably be documented in the renowned Salonitan stele of Gaius Uttius who was probably an illegitimate son of a Roman citizen with an identical name judging from the filiation (D. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ 1987: 257, no. L, with fig.), and possibly also his brother Publius, but the figure on the stele is wearing a cloak identical to a toga regarding draping (S. SCHÖNAUER 2001: 229 ff, tab. I, where the author recognizes this toga type as Ac although it is evidently an Augustan type Ba. For this type cf. H. R. GOETTE 1990: 22 ff, tab. 5, fig. 4-5, tab. 6 ff.).

bora ispod desne podlaktice, koji se na taj način ne mogu formirati osim ako nisu stisnuti unutar šake. Iako se time popis spomenika zacijelo ne iscrpljuje, zaključit ćemo s konstatacijom da su svi navedeni primjeri iz Dalmacije dobro datirani u Tiberijevo ili Klaudijevo doba, što znači da je pojava i uporaba obrasca relativno suvremena njegovu uvođenju i popularnosti u Italiji i drugim provincijama.¹⁸

Još je jedan razlog zbog kojeg u splitskom slučaju teško može biti posrijedi *pallium*, a to je negativna konotacija koju nosi prikaz toga tipa muškog odijela na jednom rimskom nadgrobnom spomeniku. U čemu bi se ona ogledala? U tome što su palij obični Rimljani zbog praktičnosti i udobnosti nosili kod kuće, ali je smatran neadekvatnim za javnu prezentaciju, poglavito na nadgrobnim spomenicima, gdje je nošnja bila jedan od elemenata likovnog jezika kojim se odašiljala sasvim konkretna poruka.¹⁹ Na nadgrobnom spomeniku rimski građanin u civilu uobičajeno se prikazuje u suvremenom tipu toge, a kao vojnik s nekim rimskim tipom ogrtača kao što su *paenula*, *sagum* ili *paludamentum*.²⁰ Ako je pokojnik bio peregrin ili iz nekog drugog razloga nije imao civitet – npr. bio je dijete rođeno u nezakonitom braku – to se nerijetko pokušava prikriti, npr. neutralnim odijevanjem ili drapiranjem ogrtača koje evidentno podsjeća na togu.²¹ Drugim riječima, prikazati se na nadgrobnom spomeniku u paliju značilo bi u pravilu priznati izostanak civiteta (osim ako pokojnik nije bio specifičnog zanimanja – npr. filozof, orator i sl.), a to se u praksi zapravo nastojalo prikriti. Iz svega slijedi da ogrtač Ivana Evanđelista treba prepoznati kao palu (*palla*), žensku inačicu istog ogrtača, kojim su Rimljanke – jednako starije neudane djevojke ili udane žene – ogrtale tijelo

unmarried girls or married women, to keep them warm in cold weather. Young girls usually wore a plain tunic under the palla, and married women (*matronae*) or the mother of a family (*mater familias*) a wide upper tunic – *stola* – the Roman version of a long Ionic chiton.²²

If we have succeeded in proving that a portrait of a Roman deceased woman was used for the figure of John the Evangelist by presenting examples of statues and clarification of the pallium's function, then two further consequences come out of this conclusion: the first, that the head and hairstyle of John the Apostle were made by re-modelling the depiction of the deceased woman's head with some typical female hairstyle; and the second, that the object in the left hand can hardly be recognized as a *mappa* or *volumen* (roll i.e. *rotulus*).

Cambi has already indicated that traces of re-carving are visible on the head, primarily on the left side (once again, sides are presented from the perspective of the figure), as “roughly worked remains somewhat larger and wider than the finished part of the head”, “on these remains are drilled holes”, and “on the top of the head are the remains of levelling the relief surface with a toothed chisel”.²³ Cambi believed that the original head was re-modelled very carefully and thoroughly, that only its contours were left, and that most attention was paid to the hair.²⁴ After the relief was removed, the extent of re-modelling of the head can be perceived more completely. The first detail for supplementing the mentioned observations is the asymmetry in the shaping of a “new” hairstyle. It is evident that the left and right side of the hair next to the cheeks are not identical (Fig. 1). The left side, from the height of the eyes downwards has a more compact form and the mentioned holes at several spots. The remaining part of the hair consists of two rows of locks, the ones in the first row being more massive and more elaborately shaped. Only earlobes are visible. A large lock is in front of the right ear, and it is missing on the left side. These fashion details also lead to the conclusion that a female hairstyle was used as a basis. We believe that alterations wo-

¹⁸ J. FEJFER 2015: 92 popularnost tipa datira od 30-ih pr. Kr. do 40-ih po Kr.

¹⁹ Usp. npr. J. HESKEL 2001: 133 i dalje.

²⁰ Pregledno u hrvatskoj literaturi: S. SCHÖNAUER 2001: 397 i d., sl. 12 – 29 (toga), 402 i d., sl. 30 – 32 (ostali ogrtači). O togi v. i H. R. GOETTE 1990: 2 i dalje.

²¹ Takav jedan primjer može se po svoj prilici dokumentirati na poznatoj salonitanskoj steli Gaja Utija. Gaj Utije je prema filijaciji vjerojatno bio nezakoniti sin istoimenog rimskog građanina (D. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ 1987: 257, br. L, sa sl.), a moguće i njegov brat Publije, no lik prikazan na steli ipak na sebi nosi ogrtač koji je drapiranjem potpuno identičan togi (S. SCHÖNAUER 2001: 229 i d., tab. I, gdje autorica tip toge prepoznaje kao Ac, iako je posve očito da je u pitanju augustovski tip Ba. Za taj tip usp. H. R. GOETTE 1990: 22 i d., tab. 5, sl. 4 – 5, tab. 6 i d.).

²² For an overview of Roman female attire see J. LYNN SEBESTA 2001: 46 ff, particularly 48 ff.

²³ N. CAMBI 1997: 27–28.

²⁴ N. CAMBI 1997: 30.



SLIKA 7. Pogled na glavu Ivana Evanđelista i gornju plohu reljefa (foto: D. Maršić)

FIGURE 7. View of the head of John the Evangelist and upper side of the relief (photo by D. Maršić)

za hladnijeg vremena. Ispod pale mlade neudane djevojke nosile su običnu tuniku, a udane žene (*matronae*) ili majka obitelji (*mater familias*) gornju tuniku širokog kroja – stolu (*stola*) – rimsku verziju dugačkog jonskog hitona.²²

Ako smo prethodno donesenim primjerima statua i navodom o karakteru palija uspjeli dokazati da je za lik Ivana Evanđelista poslužio portret rimske pokojnice, tada iz te konstatacije neminovno proizlaze dva zaključka: prvi, da su glava i frizura apostola Ivana nastali preradom glave pokojnice s nekom tipičnom ženskom frizuricom, i drugi, da predmet u lijevoj ruci teško može biti prepoznat kao *mappa* ili *volumen* (svitak, odnosno *rotulus*).

Već je Cambi opravdano ukazao da se na glavi jasno vide ostatci prerade, a materijaliziraju se prije svega na lijevoj strani (ponovimo, strane navodimo iz perspektive lika), i to kao „abocirani ostaci koji su nešto veći i širi od dovršenog dijela glave“,

uld be far less extensive if it was a male coiffure, and the ears would have been depicted more clearly and certainly entirely visible.²⁵

The other detail we would like to emphasize is noticed when the head is observed from the upper left or right angle (Fig. 7). It reveals that the present-day hairstyle of John the Apostle – as well as the Roman original – consists of a front, elevated, wreathlike part framing the face (once again, with two rows of locks), and a back, lower part covering the top of the head. The previously mentioned roughly worked remains on the left side (with holes) should evidently be understood as the remaining part of the original hairstyle, which covered the ear in entirety or at least its larger portion, or it was laid in front of it, which was possible only on the

²² Dobar prikaz nošnje rimskih žena daje J. LYNN SEBESTA 2001: 46 i d., osob. 48 i dalje.

²⁵ A palimpsest of a relief from the Church of St. Michael in Zadar is interesting as the faces of the figures were evidently damaged and they were given new details, but the hairstyles and ears suffered no great changes: D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 33 ff, cat. A13, tab. 8, fig. 1 [picture of the relief is on the front page of the edition].

„na tim ostacima nalaze se svrdlom bušene rupe“, a „na tjemenu se pak zapažaju ostaci poravnavanja površine reljefa pomoću zubatog dlijeta“. ²³ Cambi smatra da je izvorna glava temeljito i vrlo pažljivo prerađena te da su ostali samo njezini obrisi, a da je kosa najtemeljitiše prerađena. ²⁴ Nakon vađenja reljefa stupanj prerade glave u svim pojedinostima može se još cjelovitije sagledati. Prvi detalj kojim možemo dopuniti navedena zapažanja jest nesimetričnost u oblikovanju „nove“ frizure. Notorna je naime činjenica da lijeva i desna strana vlasišta uz obraze nisu identičnog oblika (Sl. 1). Lijeva strana od visine očiju naniže ima kompaktniju formu i na nekoliko mjesta nalaze se spomenute bušene rupice. Ostali pak dio kose komponiran je uglavnom od dva reda kovrči od kojih su one u prvom redu masivnije i detaljnije artikulirane. Uši nisu cijele vidljive, već samo njihove resice. Ispred desnog uha je snažni pramen, dok ga ispred lijevog uha nema. Ti modni detalji također navode na zaključak da je kao „matrica“ poslužila ženska frizura. Da je bila riječ o muškoj frizuri, mišljenja smo da bi prerada bila izvedena u znatno manjem opsegu, a uši bi bile jasnije prikazane i zacijelo cijele vidljive. ²⁵

Drugi detalj na koji skrećemo pozornost uočava se pri pogledu na glavu iz gornjeg lijevog ili desnog kuta (Sl. 7). On otkriva da se današnja frizura apostola Ivana – a tako i rimski izvornik – sastoji od prednjeg, poput vijenca izdignutog dijela koji uokviruje lice (ponovimo, s dva reda kovrči) i stražnjeg, nižeg dijela koji pokriva tjeme. Prethodno spomenuti abocirani ostatak s lijeve strane (s rupicama) tako očito treba shvatiti kao preostatak prednjeg dijela izvorne frizure koji je u cijelosti ili znatnim dijelom pokriva uho ili bio položen ispred njega, a to je moguće jedino kod ženske frizure. Do snižavanja i poravnanja stražnjeg dijela došlo je očito stoga što je tijekom prerade glave i frizure morao biti preoblikovan, a time i nešto snižen prednji dio. Sve upućuje na pretpostavku da je rimska pokojnica možda bila prikazana s nekim od kladijevskih tipova frizure sa središnjim

female coiffure. The back part was lowered and levelled because it had to be reshaped during re-carving of the head and hairstyle, and in that process the front part was somewhat lowered as well. All these facts indicate that the deceased woman was depicted with some Claudian hairstyles with the central parting and curly locks passing over a larger portion of the ear, tied into a knot on the back part (of course this part could not be depicted on the relief) or possibly with an early Flavian coiffure which developed from this type with large locks in two rows forming a low *toupet*.

The look of the object in the left hand and the way in which it is held indicate that another explanation of its function should be considered (Fig. 8). The *volumen* was an exclusive attribute of a man, most frequently in a toga (sometimes also a soldier), so such a possibility should be considered if only for that reason. ²⁶ Women usually held some other attributes such as a mirror, jewelry box, apple, egg, pomegranate etc. or toiletries used daily or fruits symbolizing fertility or as a link to chthonic deities. ²⁷ Furthermore, the *volumen* is usually depicted in a vertical position and in an elongated form, so that its ends protrude out of the hand whose fingers are pushed straight forward in that case. On our statue, the object is not in the form of a roll as it is evident that its lower part, lying on the palm of the hand, is somewhat wider than the top and roughly hemispherical in form (Fig. 8). If we assume that there were minor changes in the upper part, which will be discussed later, this would mean that the original object was somewhat wider and flatter in form, again not supporting the roll thesis. Therefore, *mappa* (scarf, kerchief) seems like a more plausible solution in theory, but the problem is that its depiction appears on monuments only from the 3rd century, again most often in the hands of men, members of local municipal administration, representatives of the state apparatus, sometimes even those in the highest positions

²³ N. CAMBI 1997: 27–28.

²⁴ N. CAMBI 1997: 30.

²⁵ Zanimljiv je slučaj palimpsest reljefa iz zadarske crkve sv. Mihovila, gdje su lica likova očito bila oštećena pa su dobila nove detalje, ali frizure i uši nisu pretrpjele veće promjene: D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 33 i d., kat. A13, tab. 8, sl. 1 [slika reljefa je i na naslovnici djela].

²⁶ E. g. see the studies of *volumina* on steles from the Archaeological Museum in Split and the ones from northern Italy: S. RINALDI TUFFI 1971: 10 ff (Split); H. PFLUG 1989: 93 ff (Italy).

²⁷ For an overview of the repertory of female attributes on the steles from northern Italy see H. PFLUG 1989: 101, note 613–615.



SLIKA 8. Detalj lijeve ruke Ivana Evandelistu (foto: D. Maršić)

FIGURE 8. Detail of the left hand of John the Evangelist (photo by D. Maršić)

razdjeljkom i kovrčavim valovnicama bačenima preko većeg dijela uha i otraga skupljenima u čvor (taj se dio dakako na reljefu ne može predočiti) ili eventualno iz nje razvijenom ranoflavijevskom frizom s velikim kovrčama u dva reda formiranima u niski *toupet*.

Da za predmet u lijevoj ruci – kada je izvornik u pitanju – treba tražiti drugo objašnjenje, govore osim naprijed iznijetih razloga njegov izgled i način na koji ga osoba drži u šaci (Sl. 8). *Volumen* je isključivo atribut muškaraca i to najčešće toga (katkada i vojnika), pa već iz tog razloga takvu mogućnost treba staviti pod povećalo.²⁶ Za žene su zapravo karakteristični neki drugi atributi u rukama kao što su ogledalo, kutijica za nakit, češalj, jabuka, jaje, mogranj i sl., tj. toaletni predmeti koje je žena svakodnevno koristila ili plodovi koji simboliziraju plodnost, odnosno poveznica su s htoničkim bo-

(consuls, emperor).²⁸ In our opinion, the solution to this complex question can be analyzed in two ways. The first one is that it might have been a hem of the mantle held in a similar way as on Eumachia's statue (Fig. 6) or a more protruding mantle hem, which was reshaped as much as needed during the monument re-carving, with an intention of giving a new sense and message to it. The alternative solution is that it was a small vessel (bottle?) with a globular body, short neck and everted rim (balsarium?), facing forward and slightly lowered. An analogy for such a kind of depiction can be found only in an embedded stele in Nin (*Aenona*), where a similar, nearly pear-shaped object was depicted

²⁶ V. npr. studije volumena na stelama iz Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu i onima iz sjeverne Italije: S. RINALDI TUFI 1971: 10 i d. (Split); H. PFLUG 1989: 93 i d. (Italija).

²⁸ The most famous example of a "local" depiction of such attribute is the stele of Aurelius Valerinus from Salona: D. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ 1954-1957: 157 ff, fig. 1. The author does not state explicitly what kind of an object it was, but he believes that it was not a *volumen*, and perhaps that it might have been an etui with writing utensils. It is rightfully recognized as a *mappa* by N. CAMBI 1997: note 11. Cf. also H. R. GOETTE 1990: 62 ff, tab. 45 ff. (about the so-called magistrate type of toga often accompanied by a *mappa*).

žanstvima.²⁷ Osim toga, *volumen* je gotovo u pravilu prikazan okomito i izduženog oblika, na način da krajevima viri izvan šake čiji su prsti tada gurnuti ravno naprijed. U našem slučaju predmet nema formu svitka jer se jasno vidi da mu je donji, u dlanu položeni dio nešto širi od vrha i približno polulop-tastog oblika (Sl. 8). Ako bismo pretpostavili da je u gornjem dijelu bilo manjeg preoblikovanja, o čemu nešto kasnije, to bi značilo da je prvotni predmet bio nešto šire i plosnatije forme, što opet ne bi išlo u prilog svitku. Iz navedenih razloga složena *mappa* (rubac, marama) teoretski prije dolazi u obzir, ali je problem u tome što se ona prema današnjim spoznajama kao atribut pojavljuje tek na spomenicima od kasnog 3. st., i to opet najčešće u rukama muškaraca, pripadnika lokalne municipalne administracije, predstavnika državnog aparata, nerijetko i onih najviše pozicioniranih (konzuli, car).²⁸ Po našem mišljenju, razrješenje ovog složenog pitanja može se kretati samo u jednom od dva moguća smjera. Prvi je da je možda riječ o okrajku ogrtača koji je osoba držala na način kako ga otprilike drži Eumahija (Sl. 6) ili nešto više izbačenog, a koji je tijekom prerade spomenika preoblikovan onoliko koliko je to bilo potrebno, s namjerom da mu se dade novi smisao i poruka. Alternativa je da je eventualno bila riječ o naprijed okrenutoj i lagano spuštenoj posudici (bočici?) loptastog tijela, kratkog vrata i razvraćenog oboda (balzamarij?). Analogiju za takvu vrstu prikaza moguće nalazimo na jednoj uzidanoj steli u Ninu (*Aenona*), gdje je predmet slične, približno kruškoli-ke forme prikazan postrance i vrhom okrenut k tijelu pokojnice. Iako je prepoznat kao okrugla kutijica za nakit, takva je identifikacija upravo zbog forme i načina prikazivanja malo vjerojatna.²⁹ Oblikovno najbliža vrsta kutijice za nakit ona je pod nazivom *narthecium*, no ona je u cijelosti cilindrične forme s tek malim proširenjem na vrhu.³⁰ Neki drugi od

sideways, and directed at the statue with its tip. Although it was recognized as a jewelry box, such an interpretation is unlikely due to the form and manner of the depiction.²⁹ The morphologically closest type to the jewelry box is the one known as *narthecium*, but it is cylindrical in form with only a slight widening at the top.³⁰ Some other previously mentioned attributes are also out of the question, either because of the form, or the manner in which they are held. Therefore in our opinion, the solution of the depiction from Nin should be sought in some small bottle for cosmetic or pharmaceutical substances. If we observe closely the workmanship details on the relief from Split it is noticeable that its outer edge is cut sharply throughout its length, particularly strongly between the palm and thumb (Fig. 8). Only at these spots was the relief not rounded and polished! It is possible that these are remains of reworking, probably created due to a certain shortening and reshaping of the object. This is supported by the roughly worked remains between the thumb and peripheral folds of the body drapery. It seems that the re-modelling encompassed a part between the palm and thumb, and since this is a narrow space, the relief was left half-finished.

A triangular point at the top of the object under the left-hand thumb is also a new detail resulting from re-modelling (Fig. 8). It seems absolutely certain that it was made by cutting a semicircular nail-like element and by triangular molding of its upper part. Interpretation of this detail seems more reliable than recognizing and reconstructing changes on the object it was made on. The iconography of John the Evangelist includes only several recognizable attributes, such as a goblet, eagle, bible (book) or a pen.³¹ However, the depiction of each of these items was prevented in the beginning due to the decision to make his figure by reworking a Roman funerary monument with the already defined iconography. Perhaps each of them could have been made anew, but this would involve a thorough re-modelling of the body and drapery, demanding a lot of time and effort. However, the drapery shows that this definitely did not happen. In that

²⁷ Dobar pregled repertoara ženskih atributa pružaju stele sje-verne Italije: H. PFLUG 1989: 101, bilj. 613 – 615.

²⁸ Najpoznatiji primjer „domaćeg“ prikaza takvog atributa je salonitanska stela Aurelija Valerina: D. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ 1957: 157 i d., sl. 1. Autor se ne izjašnjava deciderano o vrsti predmeta, ali smatra da nije riječ o volumenu te da je možda u pitanju *etui* s pisarskim priborom. Kao mapu ga s pravom prepoznaje N. CAMBI 1997: bilj. 11. Usp. i H. R. GOETTE 1990: 62 i d., tab. 45 i d. (o tzv. magistratskom tipu toge uz koji se često pojavljuje *mappa*).

²⁹ M. KOLEGA 2001: 138 i d., sl. 5.

³⁰ K. A. GIUNIO 2010: 46, 92, kat. 120 – 124 sa sl.

²⁹ M. KOLEGA 2001: 138 ff, fig. 5.

³⁰ K. A. GIUNIO 2010: 46, 92, cat. 120–124 with fig.

³¹ LILSZK 1979: 279, s.v. Ivan Evandelist.

gore navedenih atributa također ne dolaze u obzir, što zbog oblika, što zbog načina na koji ga osoba drži. Zbog toga smatramo da rješenje ninskog prikaza treba tražiti u nekoj od bočica kozmetičke ili farmaceutske namjene. Promatrajući detalje izrade predmeta na splitskom reljefu iz neposredne blizine, jasno se zapaža da mu je vanjski rub cijelom duljinom oštro zasječen, a posebice naglašeno između dlana i palca (Sl. 8). Samo na tim mjestima reljef nije zaobljen i uglačan! To nas navodi na pomisao da je riječ o preostacima prerade, vjerojatno nastalim uslijed stanovitog skraćivanja i preoblikovanja predmeta. Tome u prilog govore i abocirani ostatci između palca i rubnih nabora draperije tijela. Prerada je, čini se, zahvatila i dio između dlana i palca, a kako je riječ o uskom prostoru, reljef je ostavljen u poludovršenom stanju.

Novi likovni detalj nastao preradom je i trokutasti šiljak pri vrhu predmeta, ispod palca lijeve ruke (Sl. 8). Čini se posve pouzdanim da je izrađen usijecanjem polukružnog elementa nalik noktu i trokutastim profiliranjem gornjeg mu dijela. Interpretacija toga detalja čini se pouzdanija od prepoznavanja i rekonstrukcije prekrajanja predmeta na kojem je izveden. Naime, Ivan Evanđelist prikazuje se u umjetnosti tek s nekoliko prepoznatljivih atributa među kojima su kalež, orao, biblija (knjiga) ili pero.³¹ No, prikazivanje svakog od tih predmeta bilo je u startu onemogućeno odlukom da se njegov lik izvede prekrajanjem rimskog nadgrobnog spomenika s već fiksiranom ikonografijom. Možda se svaki od njih i mogao iznova izraditi, ali to bi zahtijevalo temeljitu preradu tijela i draperije te odnijelo puno vremena i snage. Draperija međutim jasno pokazuje da do toga sigurno nije došlo. U tom svijetlu smatramo da je majstor koji je preradio reljef postupio krajnje pragmatično i sitnim detaljem ipak naznačio Ivanovu važnost za Crkvu i zapadno kršćanstvo. Po našem sudu, izrada trokutastog trna pokušaj je sugestivnog prikazivanja pera za pisanje ili još prije nekakvog etuija iz kojega viri njegov vršak. Razlog bi dakako bio taj što je apostol Ivan autor jednog od evanđelja, triju poslanica i Otkrivenja.

Na samom kraju neizbježan je osvrt na najvažniji i zacijelo najzamršeniji problem, bez predumišljaja

light, we believe that the stonemason who reworked the relief acted with utmost pragmatism and used a small detail to show John's importance for the Church and western Christianity. In our opinion, the modelling of the triangular protrusion was an attempt at suggestive depiction of a writing pen or some kind of etui, with a protruding tip of the pen. The reason was definitely the fact that John the Apostle was the author of one of the gospels, three epistles and the Book of Revelation.

Finally, we have to pay attention to the most important and possibly most complicated problem, without pretensions of providing the final answer – what kind of Roman funerary monument was reworked into the relief of John the Apostle? Cambi's statement that it was not a common funerary stele with an ordinary architrave (architectural, molded stela) is correct without any doubt because it would be impossible to explain several details of modelling, particularly those on the left side with the load-bearing console and a pilaster, but also the relation of the head to the right frame and the arch it bears.³² For the same reasons we have to eliminate the possibility that it was a stele with triangular pediment and an incorporated hemispherical vaulted niche (and possibly with a wreath behind the deceased person's back), particularly as this type of stela was characteristic of individual depictions of the deceased person, usually soldiers.³³ If it really was such a stele, the left edge of the arch support would not be reworked (and it is evident that it was) and the left pilaster would not be inserted underneath it. This re-modelling could not be explained by the good state of preservation of the (original) monument. Or more precisely – the relief from Split cannot be ascribed to such a stele or some other similar monument with only one niche! The question of the original form is determined to a great degree by the fact that it had to contain at least two semicircular vaulted niches resting on a common support (“blind arcades”) – the right one which was preserved and reworked and at least one more on the left side, whose existence is indicated by the presence of a

³² N. CAMBI 1997: 30 ff.

³³ For such stele type see e.g. S. RINALDI TUFII 1971: 97 ff, cat. 10, tab. 4, fig. 3; cat. 11, tab. 5, fig. 1. (stelae from Košute near Gardun). There are other, less well preserved examples.

³¹ LILSZK 1979: 279, s. v. Ivan Evanđelist.

da će se na njega moći dati konačan odgovor – od kakvog je rimskog nadgrobnog spomenika zapravo prerađen reljef apostola Ivana? Nema sumnje da se treba složiti s Cambijevom konstatacijom da za to sigurno nije poslužila tipična nadgrobna stela s arhitravom u bilo kojoj izvedbi (arhitektonska, profilirana stela) jer ne bi bilo moguće objasniti nekoliko detalja izrade, poglavito one na lijevoj strani s nosivom konzolom i pilastrom, ali i odnos glave s desnim okvirom i lukom koji on nosi.³² Međutim, iz istih razloga otpada i mogućnost da je bila riječ o steli s trokutnim zabatom i u njega uraslom poluloptasto zasvođenom nišom (i eventualno vijencem iza leđa pokojnika), posebice jer je taj tip stele bio karakterističan za individualno prikazivanje pokojnika, i to najčešće onih vojne profesije.³³ Da je bila riječ o takvoj steli, ne bi bilo potrebno prekrajanje lijevog ruba nosača luka (koje je očito) i umetanje lijevog pilastra podno njega, niti bi se to prekrajanje eventualno dalo objasniti uščuvanošću (izvornog) spomenika. Ili preciznije – otpada mogućnost da splitski reljef pripišemo takvoj steli ili nekom drugom sličnom spomeniku sa samo jednom nišom! Pitanje izvorne forme spomenika zapravo dobrim dijelom određuje činjenica da je ona neizostavno morala sadržavati najmanje dvije polukružno zasvedene niše oslonjene na zajednički nosač (tzv. slijepe arkade) – desnu koja je sačuvana i prerađena te najmanje još jednu na lijevoj strani, na čije postojanje nedvojbeno upućuje prisutnost nosača i izgled lijevog mu (prerađenog) ruba (Sl. 1). Ako smo lik u desnoj niši prepoznali kao ženu, razumno je pretpostaviti da je u lijevoj najvjerojatnije bio prikazan njezin suprug. Druge su kombinacije također moguće, ali manje vjerojatne. Konceptiju s dvije tako uvezane niše poznajemo samo s dvije vrste rimskih nadgrobničkih spomenika izvedenih u formi tanje ili deblje ploče: ugradbenih reljefa uzidanih u strukturu većih grobnih zdanja (mauzoleja) i monumentalnih nadgrobničkih stela. Zanimljivo je da među njihovim salonitanskim egzemplarima, uključivši tu i one iz bližeg zaleđa, nema takvih koji bi mogli poslužiti kao analogije, pa odatle zaključak da je bez obzira na pripadnost posrijedi osebujna i u Saloni prvi put

support and the look of its left (reworked) edge (Fig. 1). If we have recognized the figure in the right niche as a woman, it is reasonable to assume that most likely her husband was depicted in the right niche. Other combinations are also possible, but less likely. The concept with two such related niches is known from only two types of Roman funerary monuments made in the form of a thinner or thicker plate: embedded reliefs incorporated into the structure of larger funerary edifices (mausoleums) and monumental funerary steles. It is interesting that among the Salonitan examples of the kind, including the ones from the nearby hinterland, there are no close analogies, pointing to the conclusion that regardless of attribution, this was a special typological variant, recorded in Salona for the first time.

It has already been emphasized that the remains of another groove were found on the upper surface of the relief, originally made exactly in the axis of two niches, and intended for anchoring of a certain element (Figs. 4 and 7). Its appearance is definitely more characteristic of embedded reliefs as the built structure of the object or some building element was usually put on their upper surface, but we would have expected a channel for an iron clamp on the right edge, as they were connected with blocks of the walls at this position if the tomb was wider than the relief.³⁴ That is the case with the formatively similar relief from the collection of stone monuments in Rab, representing a togatus in a semicircular niche, with at least one more such niche on the left side, but it was broken off, and on the upper right end a channel for a clamp was made.³⁵ Similar reliefs were found in Nin and they have already been mentioned in the context of the Eumachia-Fundilia statue type.³⁶ What they all have in common is that the inscription was made on a separate stone block as opposed to the relief from Split! The lack of an inscription field is characteristic of all eastern Adriatic examples of embedded reliefs with portraits inside semicircular niches! The format of the portraits on the relief from Split (to the height of the groin) is also more indi-

³² N. CAMBI 1997: 30 i dalje.

³³ Za takav tip stele v. npr. S. RINALDI TUFFI 1971: 97 i d., kat. 10, tab. 4, sl. 3; kat. 11, tab. 5, sl. 1. (stela iz Košuta kod Garduna). Ima i drugih, lošije očuvanih primjeraka.

³⁴ On such installations see D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 15 ff, 20, tab. 3, fig. 3, tab. 4, fig. 1.

³⁵ D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 29 ff, cat. A8, tab. 6, fig. 1-2.

³⁶ Cf. notes 17 and 18.

zabilježena tipološka varijanta.

Već je istaknuta činjenica da su na gornjoj plohi reljefa prisutni ostatci dugoga utora, izvorno izrađenog točno u osi dviju niša, a namijenjenog sidrenju nekog elementa (Sl. 4 i 7). Njegova pojava definitivno je više karakteristična za ugradbene reljefe jer se s njihove gornje strane obično nastavljala zidana struktura građevine ili eventualno neki građevni element, ali bismo na desnom rubu očekivali i kanal za željeznu spojnicu (klamfu) jer su se tu – ako je grobnica bila šira od reljefa – spajali s blokovima ziđa.³⁴ Takav je npr. slučaj s formativno bliskim reljefom iz rapskog Lapidarija koji prikazuje lik togata u polukružnoj niši, s lijeve je strane bila najmanje još jedna takva niša, ali je otučena, a na gornjem je desnom kraju izrađen kanal za klamfu.³⁵ Slični reljefi dolaze i iz Nina i o njima je već bilo riječi u kontekstu statuarnog tipa Eumachia-Fundilia.³⁶ Svima njima zajedničko je i to da je natpis bio izrađen na posebnom bloku kamena, što je suprotno izvedbi splitskog reljefa! Izostanak natpisnog polja svojstven je zapravo svim istočnojadranskim primjercima ugradbenih reljefa s portretima unutar polukružnih niša! I format u kojem su bili izvedeni portreti na splitskom reljefu (do visine prepona) prije upućuje na stelu. Dok ugradbeni reljefi poprječnom koncepcijom teže k smanjivanju formata prikazanih likova (često u formi poprsja i biste), kod stela se on zbog okomite koncepcije s vremenom izdužuje (od polufigure k cijeloj figuri).³⁷ Prema tome, ako utora na gornjoj plohi govori u prilog ugradbenom reljefu, izvedba natpisa i portreta još više govore u prilog steli! Važno je naglasiti da se utora na gornjoj plohi eventualno može objasniti i drugim dijelom stele koji se tu učvršćivao i na taj način krunio glavni dio s portretima. Takva je praksa u Saloni bila rijetka i uglavnom je vezana uz druge krajeve rimskog svijeta (npr. Panoniju) ili unutrašnjost provincije, ali je ipak potvrđena.³⁸ Ono što na prvi pogled baca

cative of a stele. While embedded reliefs with their transversal concept aspire towards reduction of the size of depicted figures (often as busts), on steles it is gradually elongated due to the vertical concept (from half-figure to whole figure).³⁷ Accordingly, if the groove on the upper surface supports the thesis of an embedded relief, rendering of the inscription and portrait support it even more! It is important to emphasize that the groove on the upper surface could possibly be explained by the other part of the stele which was fastened there and crowned the main part with portraits in that way. Such a practice was rare in Salona and mostly related to the other parts of the Roman world (e. g. Pannonia) or the hinterland of the province, but still it was recorded in Salona as well.³⁸ The proximity of the niche vault to the upper edge of relief casts a shadow of doubt to such a possibility (Figs. 1 and 7), but we need to emphasize once more that it was a result of reworking when the preserved niche was considerably raised, but in such a way that its front, arch and segment above it were lowered and re-carved, so it is not surprising that the relief is 23.5 cm thick at the bottom, and 16 cm at the top! The support of the niche arches was probably originally somewhat lower, and its width was smaller at the bottom so that the figures' shoulders touched inside the niches. This is supported by the remains of rough working on the back part under the present-day support and between the pilasters-inserts and the figure of John the Evangelist. Since several substantial reasons contradict the thesis on an embedded relief, and the only Salonitan example of this type of monument is differently shaped (admittedly without the preserved field with portraits),³⁹ we will support the opinion that the relief was formed by re-carving the specially

³⁴ O takvim instalacijama D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 15 i d., 20, tab. 3, sl. 3, tab. 4, sl. 1.

³⁵ D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 29 i d., kat. A8, tab. 6, sl. 1 – 2.

³⁶ Usp. bilj. 17 i 18.

³⁷ Jedna od poznatih stepenica takvog razvoja je produljivanje polifiguralnog isječka u onaj do malo ispod prepona dokumentiran na steli Ser. Enija Fuska: S. RINALDI TUFU 1971: 99, kat. 13, tab. 5, sl. 3.

³⁸ Dvodijelna izrada dokumentirana je na steli Tita Fuficija,

³⁷ One of the stages of such development is the extension of a semi-figural segment into the one slightly beneath the groin documented on the stele of Ser. Enius Fuscus: S. RINALDI TUFU 1971: 99, cat. 13, tab. 5, fig. 3.

³⁸ The two-part composition was documented on the stele of Titus Fufitius where a trabeation with a pediment was made as a separate element, but this interesting detail is not mentioned in the literature: S. RINALDI TUFU 1971: 92 ff, cat. 1, tab. 1. The manner of connecting two elements cannot be checked, but it is evident that the upper part was not only leaning on the lower, but it was fastened by one or more pegs.

³⁹ D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 34 ff, kat. A15, tab. 8, fig. 5 (drawing). The relief saw the light of day during the recent renovation of the backyard of the Archaeological Museum in Split.

sumnju na takvu mogućnost jest blizina svoda niše gornjem rubu reljefa (Sl. 1 i 7), no treba iznova upozoriti da je to rezultat preradbe tijekom koje je sačuvana niša značajno povišena, ali na način da su joj pročelje, luk i dio iznad njega po dubini sniženi i iznova modelirani. Tako se i dogodilo da je reljef u dnu debljine 23,5 cm, a pri vrhu 16 cm! Nosač lukova niša izvorno je vjerojatno bio nešto niže položen, a njegova širina u dnu manja te su se likovi unutar niša dodirivali ramenima. U prilog tome govore ostatci abociranja pozadine ispod današnjeg nosača te između pilastra-umetka i lika Ivana Evanđelista. Kako dakle više sadržajnih razloga govori protiv ugradbenog reljefa, a i jedini je salonitanski primjerak toga tipa spomenika drukčijeg oblikovanja (istina, bez sačuvanog polja s portretima),³⁹ priklanjamo se mišljenju da je reljef nastao preradom jedne monumentalne stele osebujne izvedbe.⁴⁰

Teško je dati smisljeno objašnjenje unikatne izvedbe i pretpostavljene kompozitne naravi stele koja je eventualno prerađena za potrebe reljefa. Najrazumnije je krenuti od spoznaje da je tip stele s dvostrukom nišom u sjevernoj Italiji poznat već na prijelazu era i u širokoj uporabi početkom 1. st. po Kr., ali je u provincijama gotovo nepoznat ili zastupljen tek u 2. i 3. st.! U sjevernoj Italiji takvi su primjerci potvrđeni u Raveni, okolici Bologne (*Forum Cornelia*), Placenciji i Akvileji.⁴¹ Bila je to nešto manje raširena inačica arhitektonske stele (stela u obliku edikule), obično one koncipirane na kat (njem. *Stockwerkstelen*).⁴² Zanimljivo je da većina primjeraka iznad središnjeg nosača lukova ima rozetu, a katkada i u uglovima, što je slučaj i na splitskom reljefu. To čini razumnom pretpostavku da je nepoznati majstor tije-

gdje je trabeacija sa zabatom izrađena kao poseban element, ali se ta zanimljiva pojedinost u literaturi uopće ne navodi: S. RINALDI TUFİ 1971: 92 i d., kat. 1, tab. 1. Način vezivanja dvaju elemenata danas nije moguće provjeriti, no očito je da gornji dio nije samo naslonjen na donji, već učvršćen pomoću jednog ili više klinova.

³⁹ D. MARŠIĆ 2009: 34 i d., kat. A15, tab. 8, sl. 5 (crtež). Reljef je kod nedavnog preuređivanja stražnjeg dvorišta splitskog arheološkog muzeja ponovno izašao na svijetlo dana.

⁴⁰ N. CAMBI 1997: 33. O steli govore i kasniji autori koji su prihvatili Cambijevu interpretaciju (v. bilj. 5).

⁴¹ H. PFLUG 1989: 152 i d., kat. 7, tab. 2, sl. 1 (Ravena); 168, kat. 39, tab. 8, sl. 2 (*Forum Cornelia*); 181 i d., kat. 63, tab. 16, sl. 4 (*Placentia*); 192 i d., kat. 91, tab. 19, sl. 3 (Akvileja).

⁴² H. PFLUG 1989: 44.

designed monumental stele.⁴⁰

It is difficult to give a meaningful explanation of the unique rendering and assumed composite character of the stele which may have been re-modelled in order to make a relief. The most logical starting point is the fact that this stele type with a double niche had been known in Italy at the transition of eras and widely used at the beginning of the 1st century AD, but it is almost unknown in the provinces or it appears only in the 2nd and 3rd centuries! In northern Italy, such examples have been confirmed in Ravenna, Bologna region (*Forum Cornelia*), Placentia and Aquileia.⁴¹ It was a somewhat less widely distributed variant of architectural stele (stela in the shape of an aedicule), usually having two floors (German *Stockwerkstelen*).⁴² It is interesting that most examples have a rosette above the central arch support, and sometimes also in the corners, as was the case with the relief from Split. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the unknown stonemason repeated the motif that had already been on the stele. The other detail is that on some steles (from Ravenna or the Bologna region) figures on bases (Genii, caryatids) can appear instead of columns or pilasters with vegetal decoration. Elsewhere, these are columns or pilasters with vegetal decoration. The former have a much wider frame than the latter ones. The steles are monolithic (!) and they end in triangular pediments, except for the famous stele of Publius Longidenus from Ravenna which has a flat ending with three garlands and rosettes in their arches.⁴³ Although one would expect that this expression would spread very quickly from northern Italy to the provinces – as was the case with other types – for some reason this did not happen. In the deeper provincial hinterland of Salona such steles with portraits appear in the late 2nd century at the earliest, as indicated by examples from the Bihać region and Tegar near Srebrenica.⁴⁴ Unfortunately, their portraits exhibit

⁴⁰ N. CAMBI 1997: 33. The stele is mentioned by later authors who accepted Cambi's interpretation (see note 5).

⁴¹ H. PFLUG 1989: 152 ff, cat. 7, tab. 2, fig. 1 (Ravena); 168, cat. 39, tab. 8, fig. 2 (*Forum Cornelia*); 181 ff, cat. 63, tab. 16, fig. 4 (*Placentia*); 192 ff, kat. 91, tab. 19, fig. 3 (Akvileia).

⁴² H. PFLUG 1989: 44.

⁴³ Cf. note 41 (Ravena).

⁴⁴ For an overview see V. PAŠKVALIN 2012: 122 ff, 125 ff, cat. 68-69, fig. on p. 234 (type C – rectangular stele in form of an

kom prerade splitskog reljefa ponovio motiv koji se već otprije nalazio na steli. Druga je pojedinost da se na nekim stelama (iz Ravene i okolice Bologne) umjesto stupova ili pilastara znaju pojaviti figure na bazama (Geniji, karijatide), a drugdje su to ipak stupovi ili pilastri s vegetabilnim dekorom. One prve stoga imaju znatno širi okvir od potonjih. Stele su monolitne izrade (!) i završavaju trokutnim zabatima, osim poznate ravenatske stele Publija Longidijena koja ima ravan završetak s tri girlande i rozetama u njihovim lukovima.⁴³ Iako bi se očekivalo da se upravo iz sjeverne Italije taj izraz vrlo brzo proširio u provincije – kao što je to uostalom bio slučaj s drugim tipovima – do toga iz nekog razloga nije došlo. U dubljem provincijalnom zaleđu Salone takve se stele kao nosači portreta pojavljuju najranije u kasnijem 2. st., kako to pokazuju primjerci iz okolice Bihaća i Tegara kod Srebrenice.⁴⁴ Njihovi su portreti nažalost loše izrade i očuvanosti pa preciznija datacija nije moguća, no zanimljivo je da se na steli iz Tegara, koja je bila izrađena na kat, u gornjem polju pojavljuju rozete rasporeda istovjetnog italiskim primjercima. V. Paškvalin je po našem sudu uvjerljivo pokazao da te dvije stele vremenski i idejno korespondiraju s tri stele iz Krnjeuše kod Bosanskog Petrovca, kojima je unutar dvostruke niše (uokvirene profilacijom) natpis koji započinje posvetom Manima, a u gornjem dijelu (koji završava ravno) velika rozeta okružena s dva vijenca i neki sporedni motivi.⁴⁵ Da te stele vizualiziraju ideju polja s arhitektonski motiviranim nišama, dokazuje izvedba desnog okvira jedne od stela (kod Paškvalina označene br. 71), ispunjenog stiliziranim motivom grančice, kao očevidnom stilizacijom tordiranog stupića. Iako očito nastale u manjoj lokalnoj radionici ili od strane priučenih (putujućih?) majstora, stele iz Krnjeuše su u razvojnom smislu vjerojatno kasni izdanak sjevernoitalskih predložaka, moguće uz bihačku stelu kao razvojnu međustepenicu, naravno uz značajnu geometrizaciju i apstrakciju strukturalnih sastavnica.

⁴³ Usp. bilj. 41 (Ravena).

⁴⁴ Pregledno V. PAŠKVALIN 2012: 122 i d., 125 i d., kat. 68 – 69, sl. na str. 234 (tip C – stele pravokutnog oblika u formi edikule s dva polukružno presvođena svoda).

⁴⁵ V. PAŠKVALIN 2012: 126 i d., kat. 70 – 72, sl. na str. 235.

poor workmanship and preservation, preventing more precise dating, but it is interesting that on the stele from Tegar, which has two floors, there are rosettes in the upper field distributed identically as on the Italic examples. In our opinion V. Paškvalin has shown that these two steles correspond to three steles from Krnjeuša near Bosanski Petrovac in terms of chronology and concept. On the steles from Krnjeuša is an inscription starting with a dedication to Mani inside a double niche (bordered with molding), and in the upper part (ending flatly) is a large rosette surrounded with two wreaths and some less important motifs.⁴⁵ The rendering of the right frame of one of the steles (no. 71 in Paškvalin) filled with a stylized motif of a branch as evident stylization of a twisted column, proves that these objects visualize the idea of a field with architecturally motivated niches. Although they were evidently created in some smaller local workshop or by poorly trained (travelling?) stonecutters, in a developmental sense the steles from Krnjeuša probably represent a late extension of northern Italic models, possibly with the stele from Bihać as a developmental intermediate stage, with significant geometrization and abstraction of structural components.

The question if the stele from Split should be associated with earlier northern Italic production or its later reminiscences, possibly with a mediatory role of Pannonia, is determined to a great extent by the period when the Eumachia-Fundilia statue type was popular. This is definitely the very beginning of the Principate, particularly the period of Augustus and Tiberius although there are indications and opinions that it was used later on, definitely during Claudius' era (Arachne br. 79813 – Barcelona (Barcino); statue with a portrait head), possibly the Flavian period (Arachne br. 90062 – Ronda/Malaga; acephalous statue), even until the Antonine period (Arachne no. 30536 – Sousse in Tunisia; lower part of the statue). Later attempts at dating are questionable because they are based on stylistic criteria and related to the statues without preserved heads. It would be unreasonable to expect the emergence of one such monumental

aedicule with two semicircular vaults).

⁴⁵ V. PAŠKVALIN 2012: 126 ff, cat. 70-72, fig. on p. 235.

Na pitanje treba li onda splitsku stelu vezati uz raniju sjevernoitalsku produkciju ili njezine kasnije reminiscencije, moguće i uz posredničku ulogu Panonije, odgovor dobrim dijelom određuje vrijeme u kojemu je bio popularan statuarni tip Eumachia-Fundilia. To je svakako sam početak principata, posebice Augustovo i Tiberijevo doba, iako ima naznaka ili mišljenja da se koristio i kasnije, svakako tijekom Klaudijeva doba (Arachne br. 79813 – Barcelona (Barcino); kip s portretnom glavom), moguće flavijevskog razdoblja (Arachne br. 90062 – Ronda/Malaga; akefalni kip), pa čak i do u antoninsko razdoblje (Arachne br. 30536 – Susa u Tunisu; donji dio kipa). Kasnije su datacije međutim pod velikim znakom upitnika jer se zasnivaju na stilističkim kriterijima i vežu uz kipove kojima glave nisu očuvane. Bilo bi i teško očekivati pojavu jedne tako monumentalne stele u Saloni tijekom 2. st., kada stele polako iz mode potiskuju are i već nastupajući sarkofazi. Pretpostavljenu dvodijelnu izradu moguće je objasniti samo ranijim nastankom, a sve uslijed monumentalnosti ili specifičnog postavljanja na grobnom mjestu. I stilske pojedinosti u izradi draperije te format prikaza idu u prilog ranijoj dataciji. Stilske karakteristike definitivno govore u prilog predflavijevskog postanka (Tiberijevo ili Klaudijevo doba), a produženi format dopušta možda i malo kasniju dataciju. Njezinu unikatnu pojavu vjerojatno će trebati objasniti specifičnim razlozima nastanka, moguće podrijetlom ili poslovnim vezama i aktivnostima vlasnika. Razlog zašto se takav sepulkralni izraz nije dublje ukorijenio u salonitanskim radionicama po svoj je prilici taj što su već krajem 1. st. pr. Kr. uvedeni i postupno tipizirani drugi tipovi stela-nosača portreta, posebice „stele u obliku edikule“ (tj. s arhitravom i trokutnim zabatom) i njima srodne „stele s prekinutim zabatom“.

Ovaj skroman prilog zaključujemo zahvalom redovitom profesoru u miru Slobodanu Čači – kojem ga u svečarskoj prigodi i posvećujemo – za svu ljubav koju je izvođenjem nastave i znanstvenim radom produbio kod autora ovih redaka prema staroj povijesti i antičkoj arheologiji. Sa studentima povijesti i arheologije – dobro se sjećamo – imao je uvijek specifičan i blizak odnos, ali i tražio od njih nešto više. Nadamo se da smo ovim prilogom to barem djelomice opravdali.

stele in Salona in the 2nd century when steles were gradually replaced by altars and sarcophagi. The assumed two-part composition can be explained only by early formation, due to monumentality or specific positioning on the burial plot. The stylistic characteristics of the drapery definitely support a pre-Flavian formation (Tiberius' or Claudius' period), and the elongated format allows a somewhat later dating. Its unique appearance should be explained by specific reasons of formation, possibly owing to the origin or business contacts and activities of the owner. The reason why such sepulchral expression did not take deeper roots in the Salonitan workshops is probably that by the end of the 1st century BC other types of steles bearing portraits were introduced, particularly “aedicule-form steles” (with an architrave and triangular pediment) and related “steles with an interrupted pediment”.

On this solemn occasion, we would like to dedicate this modest contribution to the retired full professor Slobodan Čače, and to thank him for all the love for ancient history and classical archaeology that he deepened in the author of this paper by his teaching and scientific work. We remember well that he always had a specific and close relationship with students of history and archaeology, but he also expected something more of them. Our hope is that we have met his expectations with this paper at least to some extent.

BIBLIOGRAFIJA /
BIBLIOGRAPHY

- M. BIEBER, 1959 – Margarete Bieber, Roman Men in Greek Himation (Roman Palliati). A Contribution to the History of the Copying, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 103/3, 1959, 374–417.
- D. BOSCHUNG, 2002 – Dietrich Boschung, *Gens Augusta. Untersuchungen zu Aufstellung, Wirkung und Bedeutung der Statuengruppen des julisch-claudischen Kaiserhauses*, Monumenta artis Romanae 32, Mainz am Rhein, 2002.
- N. CAMBI, 1980 – Nenad Cambi, Antička Narona. Urbanistička topografija i kulturni profil grada, *Dolina rijeke Neretve od prehistorije do ranog srednjeg vijeka*, Izdanja HAD-a, 5, Split, 1980, 127–153.
- N. CAMBI, 1997 – Nenad Cambi, Studije o spomenicima uzidanima u kuće Splita i okolice (IV). Reljef Ivana Evanđelista u crkvi sv. Jere na Marjanu, *Kulturna baština*, 28-29, Split, 1997, 25–36.
- N. CAMBI, 1998 – Nenad Cambi, Skupine carskih kipova u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji, *Historia Antiqua*, 4, Zagreb, 1988, 45–61.
- E. D'AMBRA, 2012 – Eve D'Ambra, Women on the Bay of Naples, *A Companion to Women in the Ancient World*, eds. Sh. L. James – Sh. Dillon, Oxford: Blackwell, 2012, 400–413.
- A. DUPLANČIĆ, 2009 – Arsen Duplančić, Crkva sv. Ivana Evanđelista na splitskome Marjanu, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku*, 102, Split, 2009, 143–166.
- FEJFER, J., 2008 – Jane Fejfer, Roman Portraits in Context, Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter 2008.
- J. FEJFER, 2015 – Jane Fejfer, Statues of Roman Women and Cultural Transmission: Understanding the So-called Ceres Statue as a Roman Portrait Carrier, *Tradition: Transmission of Culture in the Ancient World*, eds. J. Fejfer – M. Moltesen – A. Rathje, Acta Hyperborea 14, Museum Tusulanum Press – University of Copenhagen, 2015, 85–116.
- C. FISKOVIĆ, 1972 – Cvito Fisković, Marko Marul Pečenić i njegov likovni krug, *Čakavska rič*, 1, Split, 1972, 45–94.
- H. G. FRENZ, 1985 – Hans G. Frenz, *Römische Grabreliefs in Mittel- und Süddalilien*, Roma, 1985.
- K. A. GIUNIO, 2010 – Kornelija A. Giunio, *Ars medica et pharmaceutica. Rimski medicinsko-farmaceutski instrumenti iz fundusa Arheološkog muzeja Zadar*, Katalozi i monografije 8, Zadar, 2010, 5–47.
- H. R. GOETTE, 1990 – Hans Rupprecht Goette, *Studien zu römischen Togadarstellungen*, Mainz am Rhein, 1990.
- J. HESKEL, 2001 – Julia Heskkel, Cicero as Evidence for Attitudes to Dress in the Late Republic, u: *The World of Roman Costume*, eds. J. Lynn Sebesta – L. Bonfante, The University of Wisconsin Press, 2001, 133–145.
- F. JOHANSEN, 1994 – Flemming Johansen, *Roman portraits*, I., Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, 1994.
- LJ. KARAMAN, 1922 – Ljubo Karaman, O nekim novijim publikacijama o historiji umjetnosti u Dalmaciji, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, 45, Split, 1922, 105–152.
- D. KEČKEMET, 1953 – Duško Kečkemet, Renesansna klesarsko-kiparska djela u Splitu, *Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji*, 7, Split, 1953, 59–82.
- D. E. E. KLEINER, 1977 – Diana E. E. Kleiner, *Roman Group Portraiture. The Funerary Reliefs of the Late Republic and Early Empire*, New York – London, 1977.
- V. KOCKEL, 1993 – Valentin Kockel, *Porträtreliiefs stadtrömischer Grabbauten*, Mainz am Rhein, 1993.
- M. KOLEGA, 2001 – Marija Kolega, Rimski nadgrobni spomenici s figuralnim prikazom u Enoći, *Diadora*, 20, Zadar, 2001, 121–155.
- O. von KUTCHERA-WOBORSKY, 1918 – Oswald von Kutchera-Woborsky, Das Giovannino-Relief des Spalätiner Vorgebirges. Ein allgemeiner Beitrag zur Geschichte der Antikennachahmung, *Jahrbuch des kunsthistorischen Institutes des deutsch-österreichischen Staatsdenkmalamtes*, 12, Wien, 1918, 1–43.
- F. LANZA, 1856 – Francesco Lanza, Monumenti Salonitani inediti, *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-Historische Classe*, 7, Wien, 1856, 1–40 (tiskano i kao: Monumenti Salonitani inediti, Vienna, 1856.).
- LILSZK, 1979 – *Leksikon ikonografije, liturgike i simbolike zapadnog kršćanstva*, ur. A. Badurina, Zagreb, 1979.

- J. LYNN SEBESTA, 2001 – Judith Lynn Sebesta, Symbolism in the Costume of the Roman Woman, *The World of Roman Costume*, eds. J. Lynn Sebesta – L. Bonfante, The University of Wisconsin Press, 2001, 46–53.
- E. MARIN – M. KOLEGA – A. CLARIDGE – I. RODÀ, 2004 – Emilio Marin – Marija Kolega – Amanda Claridge – Isabel Rodà, The Statues from the Augusteum, *The Rise and the Fall of an Imperial Shrine. Roman Sculpture from the Augusteum at Naronà*, ur. E. Marin – M. Vickers, Naronà 6, Split, 2004, 70–166.
- D. MARŠIĆ, 2009. – Dražen Maršić, *Ugradbeni i građevni portretni reljefi u Istriji i Dalmaciji*, Arheološki muzej Zadar, Zadar, 2009.
- D. MARŠIĆ, 2016. – Dražen Maršić, Portretna stela iz crteža R. Martinija i njezina grupa, *Tusculum*, 9, Solin, 2016, 13–32.
- V. PAŠKVALIN, 2012 – Veljko Paškvalin, *Antički sepulkralni spomenici s područja Bosne i Hercegovine*, ur. B. Govedarica – N. Cambi, Djela ANUBiH knj. LXXXIII, CBI knj. 9, Sarajevo, 2012.
- M. PELC, 2007 – Milan Pelc, *Renesansa*, Zagreb, 2007.
- H. PFLUG, 1989 – Hermann Pflug, *Römische Porträtstelen in Oberitalien. Untersuchungen zur Chronologie, Typologie und Ikonographie*, Mainz, 1989.
- D. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ, 1957 – Duje Rendić-Miočević, Nova kasnoantička stela iz Solina, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, 56-59/1954 – 1957, Split, 1957, 156–162.
- D. RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ, 1987 – Duje Rendić-Miočević, *Carmina epigraphica*, Split: Književni krug Split, 1987.
- S. RINALDI TUFİ, 1971 – Sergio Rinaldi Tufi, Stele funerarie con ritratti di età romana nel Museo Archeologico di Spalato. Saggio di una tipologia strutturale, *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, Anno CCCLXVIII, Memorie Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche, ser. VIII, vol. XVI, 87–166.
- S. SCHÖNAUER, 2001 – Srđana Schönauer, Odjeća, obuća i nakit u antičkoj Dalmaciji na spomenicima iz Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, 93/2000, Split, 2001, 223–515.

