

Posude s toponimijskim a la barbotine natpisom na istočnoj obali Jadrana - prijedlog interpretacije

Konestra, Ana

Source / Izvornik: **Miscellanea Hadriatica et Mediterranea, 2020, 7, 43 - 68**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.15291/misc.3171>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:291:803683>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution 3.0 Unported/Imenovanje 3.0](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-11-19**



INSTITUT ZA
ARHEOLOGIJU

Repository / Repozitorij:

[RIARH - Repository of the Institute of archaeology](#)



POSUDE S TOPONIMIJSKIM *A LA BARBOTINE* NATPISOM NA ISTOČNOJ OBALI JADRANA – PRIJEDLOG INTERPRETACIJE



VESSELS WITH A TOPONYMIC *A LA BARBOTINE* INSCRIPTION ON THE EASTERN ADRIATIC COAST – A SUGGESTION OF INTERPRETATION

U radu se tematiziraju dvije posude s toponimijskim natpisom – *Felix Arba* i *Salona* – pronađene u Ninu i Janicama, a po svoj prilici podrijetlom s otoka Raba i Salone, uz osvrt na recentno identificiranu posudu, također s ninske nekropole, čije ju značajke svrstavaju u istovjetnu grupu predmeta iako je interpretacija njezina natpisa otežana. Prema morfološkim i tipološkim značajkama posude se smještaju unutar keramičkih vrsta kućanskoga ili transportnoga posuđa, što omogućava pokušaj njihove kronološke i funkcionalne atribucije, potkrepljujući pretpostavke o lokalnome podrijetlu. Na temelju navedenoga posude se interpretiraju kao antički suveniri, no ne samo kao zasebni predmeti već i kao mogući recipijenti za pretpostavljene namirnice ili druge tekućine. Alternativno, na temelju analogija s drugih područja Rimskog Carstva, predlaže se mogućnost njihove upotrebe za transport ili komercijalizaciju specifičnih lokalnih proizvoda namijenjenih određenoj klijenteli, u ovom slučaju pomorcima, no u svakom slučaju riječ je o posudama namijenjenima tržištu malih razmjera.

Neovisno o interpretaciji kojoj se priklonimo, posude s toponimijskim (i ne samo?) natpisima moguće je promatrati unutar različitih konteksta, što omogućava rekonstrukciju ne samo proizvodnoga i tržišnoga ciklu-

The paper deals with two vessels bearing a toponymic inscription - *Felix Arba* and *Salona* – found in Nin and Janice, in all likelihood originating from the island of Rab and Salona, and a recently identified vessel, also from Nin, possibly belonging to the same group, though the interpretation of its inscription is difficult. On the basis of morphological and typological characteristics, vessels are classified to pottery categories of tableware and transport pottery, which enables their potential chronological and functional attribution, corroborating assumptions on their local origin. On the basis of the aforementioned, the vessels are interpreted as ancient souvenirs, not only as ceramic objects but also as possible receptacles for assumed foodstuffs and other liquids. Alternatively, on the basis of analogies from other parts of the Empire, possibility of their use is suggested in transport or commercialization of specific local products intended for very specific clients, in this case sailors, anyhow these are vessels intended for small-scale market.

Regardless of the interpretation we might be inclined to accept, vessels with (not only?) toponymic inscriptions can be observed in various contexts, enabling reconstruction of not only productive and market cycle of

sa ovih predmeta već i njihove šire biografije, kao i određenih kulturnih praksi, npr. antička mobilnost, kreiranje memorije i „autoreprezentacija” antičkih lokaliteta, antička pismenost i dr., a iz čega proizlazi i njihova moguća višestruka funkcija kao i, barem u jednom slučaju, potvrđena reupotreba te pretpostavljeno dugo korištenje.

Ključne riječi: istočni Jadran; toponimi; *a la barbotine* ukras; antički suveniri; lokalna proizvodnja

these products but also their more extensive biography, as well as certain cultural practices, such as ancient mobility, creating memory and “self-representation” of ancient sites, ancient literacy etc., suggesting possibility of their multiple function as well as reuse, attested at least in one case, and assumed lengthy use.

Keywords: eastern Adriatic; toponyms; *a la barbotine* decoration; ancient souvenirs; local production

PREDMETI

Pojava natpisa nastalih tijekom proizvodnje na rimskome posuđu nije rijetkost i javlja se u nekoliko keramičkih klasa te kod pojedinih produkcija staklenoga i metalnoga asortimana. Najčešći su pečati koji obilježavaju proizvođača, odnosno radionicu, njezina vlasnika, zakupnika (*offinator, conductor*) ili majstora koji je predmet izradio (npr. Pucci 1993; Fülle 1997; Buonopane 2009: 250; Cooley 2012), dok se u specifičnim kontekstima mogu pojavljivati kultne i slične poruke (npr. Roffia 2002; Girardi 2016; Walters 1974: 157 za posude s mitričkim natpisima; Topić 2004: 318–319, 400, 515, kat. br. 478, no u obliku grafita). Uz ostale vrste natpisa često se na posuđu za posluživanje i konzumaciju pića javljaju različiti poklici i poruke, odnosno različito oblikovane zdravice koje je moguće povezati upravo sa samim činom ispijanja, po svoj prilici, alkoholnoga pića, odnosno vina (usp. Mudd 2014; npr. za staklene posude v. Lightfoot 2014: 29). Takve natpise nalazimo i urezane u obliku grafita (na istočnome Jadranu, npr. iz Osora, Makjanić 1985), što svjedoči o popularnosti zdravica u kontekstu kulture ispijanja (vina) u rimskome društvu, dok slikani natpisi – *tituli picti* – asociraju na transport i komercijalizaciju proizvoda koji je posuda sadržavala (Pesavento Mattioli 2000: 107; Buonopane 2009: 251). Slični se predmeti, zbog svojih epigrafskih značajki, klasificiraju kao *instrumentum (domesticum) inscriptum* (Buonopane 2009: 233–236; Matijašić 2002: 164–173).

Međutim, na istočnoj obali Jadrana zabilježene su za sada dvije posude s natpisima koji se zasigurno ne odnose na zdravice ili takozvane *motto* poruke (Mudd 2014: 91–93), ni na imena radionica ili proizvođača, već se radi o toponimima. Riječ je o više puta objavljenome vrču s dvije ručke iz jednoga ninskog groba,¹

¹ Nažalost, nisu sačuvane pojedinosti nalaza i eventualni popratni grobni prilozi (usp. *Führer durch das K. K. Staatsmuseum in S. Donato in Zara*, 1912: 88–89). Iz inventarne se knjige saznaje jedino godina istraživanja, odnosno 1895. (Sl. 3a); za problematiku ninskih nekropola posljednje v. Dubolnić Glavan & Maršić 2019: 6, n. 1. Posuda se čuva u Arheološkom muzeju Zadar, inv. br. A32354. Najljepša hvala kolegama iz Arheološkog muzeja Zadar na mogućnosti uvida u građu i njenu objavu, a posebno višoj kustosici Timki Alihodžić na pruženoj pomoći te višem dokumentaristu Ivanu Čondiću koji je izradio fotografije ninskih predmeta.

OBJECTS

Inscriptions on Roman pottery created during manufacture are not rare and they are present in several pottery groups as well as in certain productions of glass and metal artifacts. Most frequently the stamps denote a manufacturer, or a workshop, its owner, lessee (*offinator, conductor*) or an artisan who made the object (e.g. Pucci 1993; Fülle 1997; Buonopane 2009: 250; Cooley 2012), while cult and other messages may appear in specific contexts (e.g. Roffia 2002; Girardi 2016; Walters 1974: 157 for vessels with Mithraic inscriptions; Topić 2004: 318–319, 400, 515, cat. no. 478, but in form of graffiti). Ware intended for serving and consumption often bears various exhortations and messages as well as different toasts that can be associated with the act of drinking, most likely an alcoholic drink such as wine (cf. Mudd 2014; e.g. for glass vessels see Lightfoot 2014: 29). Such inscriptions can be found engraved in form of graffiti (on the eastern Adriatic e.g. from Osor, Makjanić 1985), testifying to popularity of toasts in the context of (wine) drinking culture in the Roman society, while painted inscriptions – *tituli picti* – can be associated with transport and commercialization of the product kept in the vessel (Pesavento Mattioli 2000: 107; Buonopane 2009: 251). Similar objects are classified as *instrumentum (domesticum) inscriptum* due to their epigraphic characteristics (Buonopane 2009: 233–236; Matijašić 2002: 164–173).

However, two vessels from the eastern Adriatic coast bear inscriptions that definitely do not relate to toasts or the so-called *motto* messages (Mudd 2014: 91–93), nor to the names of the workshops or producers, but toponyms. The first such vessel is a jug with two handles from grave in Nin that has been published more than once,¹ bearing an inscription *FELIX ARBA* (*CIL*

¹ Unfortunately the details of the find or possible accompanying grave goods were not preserved (cf. *Führer durch das K. K. Staatsmuseum in S. Donato in Zara*, 1912: 88–89). From the inventory book only the year of excavation is known, that is 1895 (Fig. 3a); latest on the problems of Nin's necropolises see Dubolnić Glavan & Maršić 2019: 6, n. 1). The vessel is kept at the Archaeological Museum Zadar, inv. num. A32354. We would like to thank the colleagues from the Archaeological Museum Zadar for the possibility to view the material and its publication, especially senior curator Timka Alihodžić for all her help and senior documentation curator Ivan Čondić for providing the images.

na kojemu se nalazi natpis *FELIX ARBA* (*CIL* III, 14336⁷; Nedved 1990: 27; Brusić 1999: kat. br. 414)² i vrču recentnijega pronalaska, također s dvije ručke, no drukčije morfologije, iz podmorja Pakoštana (antička luka na položaju Janice), na kojemu se nalazi natpis *SALONA* (Boetto *et al.* 2012: 108, fig. 8; Parica 2018: 220, sl. 4) (Sl. 1; T. 1). Osim ovih, iz Zaton i Zadra poznato je i nekoliko ulomaka s parcijalno sačuvanim mogućim natpisima ili na vrlo sličan način izvedenim ukrasima (Brusić 1999: 31, kat. br. 415–417).³ Nedavno je, pregledom dokumentacije o posudi s natpisom *Felix Arba* utvrđeno postojanje još jedne, morfološki gotovo istovjetne posude, no s ponešto drukčijim ukrasnim rješenjem i ne posve čitljivim natpisom, no s cjelovitije sačuvanim rubom (v. niže) (Sl. 1: 2; Sl. 3: a, c). Potonja također potječe s ninske nekropole.⁴ Izvan Dalmacije, slični su ulomci potvrđeni u Akvileji, na lokalitetu kanala Anfora, preciznije iz slojeva njegova funkcioniranja kao plovne spone između grada i mora, uz koje bi se mogao smjestiti i ulomak ruba amforete, ukrašen sličnim *a la barbotine* točkicama, s istoga lokaliteta (Mian 2017: 177, 203–204, Fig. 14: 8, 38: 2–5) (Sl. 2).⁵

MORFOLOGIJA OBLIKA I UKRASA

Istočnojadranske cjelovito sačuvane posude moguće je svrstati u kategoriju malih amfora/amforeta (visina *Felix Arba* posude je 15 cm, druge ninske amforete 14 cm, dok u slučaju posude iz Janica ona iznosi 14,7 cm) s obzirom na izduženi vrat i prisutnost dviju ručki, oblika pogodnoga i za posluživanje, skladištenje i za transport manjih količina vjerojatno tekućega ili svakako rasutoga tereta, a pojedini autori pretpostavljaju i voća (za definiciju npr. Cipriano & De Fabrizio 1996; Mian 2017: 174–175; Biondani 2014: 409–410; Morais *et al.* 2015: 52–56; Morais, Oliveira & Morillo Cerdán 2018).

² Moguće je, prema analogijama, i čitanje *Arba Felix* (usp. npr. Jeličić Radonić 2014 za Salonu).

³ Autor u katalogu kao mjesto nalaza navodi samo Zaton, međutim u tekstu jasno precizira koje su posude zatonski, a koje zadarski nalaz.

⁴ Posuda se čuva u Arheološkom muzeju Zadar s inv. br. A17577.

⁵ U Muzeju grada Umaga autorica je imala mogućnost uvida u slično ukrašene ulomke, na čemu zahvaljuje kolegici Branki Milošević.

III, 14336⁷; Nedved 1990: 27; Brusić 1999: cat. no. 414),² and the other one is a more recent find of a jug, also with two handles and the inscription *SALONA* but with different morphology, from the seabed in Pakoštane (ancient port at the position Janice) (Boetto *et al.* (eds.) 2012: 108, fig. 8; Parica 2018: 220, fig. 4) (Fig. 1; Pl. 1). Except for these examples, there are few more fragments with partially preserved possible inscriptions or ornaments executed in a similar way from Zaton and Zadar (Brusić 1999: 31, cat. nos. 415–417).³ Recently, during the analysis of the museum documentation regarding *Felix Arba* vessel, another, morphologically almost identical, vessel was identified. The latter, also originating from the necropolis of Nin,⁴ bears somewhat different decoration and not fully readable inscription, but it has a fully preserved rim (see below) (Fig. 1: 2; Fig. 3: a, c). Outside of Dalmatia, similar wall sherds have been found in Aquileia, at the site of Anfora canal, more precisely in the layers formed when it functioned as a naval connection between the city and the sea, from where also comes a fragment of a table amphorae rim decorated with *a la barbotine* dots (Mian 2017: 177, 203–204, Fig. 14: 8, 38: 2–5) (Fig. 2).⁵

MORPHOLOGY OF FORMS AND DECORATIONS

The eastern Adriatic complete vessels can be classified to the category of small amphorae/table amphorae (height of the *Felix Arba* example is 15cm, of the other Nin vessel 14cm, and in the case of the vessel from Janice it amounts to 14.7cm) on the basis of elongated neck and presence of two handles, in form suitable for serving, storage and transport of small amounts of probably liquid or definitely bulk cargo. Certain authors assume that fruit may have been transported in them (for the definition

² Reading *Arba Felix* is also possible, judging from analogies (cf. e.g. Jeličić Radonić 2014 for Salona).

³ The author in the catalogue mentions only Zaton as the findspot, however in the text, he clearly separates finds from Zaton from finds from Zadar.

⁴ The vessel is kept at the Archaeological Museum Zadar with inv. num. A17577.

⁵ The author had the opportunity to see fragments decorated in a similar way in the Umag City Museum, for which she owes gratitude to colleague Branka Milošević.



Slika 1. 1: Posuda s natpisom *FELIX / ARBA*; 2: posuda s natpisom iz Nina; 3: posuda s natpisom *SAL/ONA* (fotografije: I. Čondić; R. Mosković).

Figure 1. 1: Vessel with the *FELIX / ARBA* inscription; 2: vessel with inscription from Nin; 3: vessel from Janice with the *SAL/ONA* inscription (photographs by: I. Čondić and R. Mosković respectively).

Posudama sličnoga oblika ili makar funkcije po svoj prilici pripadaju i ulomci iz Zatonu i Zadra te oni iz Akvileje (Brusić 1999; Mian 2017: 177, 203–204).

Ipak, cjelovito sačuvane posude razlikuju se prema svojim morfološkim odlikama, pa su tako ona s natpisom *Felix Arba* i druga ninska posuda kruškolikoga oblika s niskim istaknutim dnom i tek lagano izvijenim rubom koji se, međutim, kod prve nije sačuvao, dok su u slučaju druge odmah ispod ruba vidljiva dva tanja ureza. Posuda s natpisom *Salona*, u potpunosti sačuvana, bikoničnoga je tijela s izrazito proširenim trbuhom, kratkim cjevastim vratom i vodoravno izvijenim rubom (T. 1; Sl. 1).⁶ Razlikuje se i oblikovanje ručki, koje su u prvoj skupini posuda krušnoga presjeka i elipsastoga protezanja, dok su u drugoj trakaste i kanelirane, a s vrata se prema tijelu spuštaju tvoreći pravi kut. Natpisi te

e.g. Cipriano & De Fabrizio 1996; Mian 2017: 174–175; Biondani 2014: 409–410; Morais *et al.* 2015: 52–56; Morais, Oliveira & Morillo Cerdán 2018).

Fragments from Zaton and Zadar as well as the ones from Aquileia belong to vessels similar in form or at least in function (Brusić 1999; Mian 2017: 177, 203–204).

The three complete vessels we are dealing with here, however, differ in morphological characteristics. The examples from Nin are piriform, with a low emphasized base, and only slightly everted rim that was not preserved on the *Felix Arba* vessel, while the other one bares two thin grooves immediately beneath the rim. Vessel with the inscription *Salona*, completely preserved, has biconical body with extremely wide belly, short tubular neck and horizontally everted rim (Pl. 1; Fig. 1).⁶ They also differ in

⁶ Kolegi Mati Parici (Odjel za arheologiju Sveučilišta u Zadru) najljepša hvala na ustupljenim crtežima i fotografijama posude iz Janica. U rekonstrukciji posude (v. Sl. 1: 3) natpis je istaknut bojom koja nije bila vidljiva po nalasku.

⁶ We would like to thank colleague Mate Parica (Department of Archaeology of the University of Zadar) for the drawings and photographs of the vessel from Janice. In the vessel reconstruction (see Fig. 1: 3), the inscription is emphasized with colour that was not visible on the vessel upon its discovery.

dodatni ukrasni elementi izvedeni su ponešto drukčije na sva tri primjerka, iako uvijek tehnikom *a la barbotine*: kod *Felix Arba* posude dio natpisa izveden je točkicama, a dio punim potezom kao i valoviti ukras ispod njega, dok su na posudi iz Janica i na drugoj ninskoj posudi natpis i ukrasna traka ispod i iznad njega izvedeni točkicama. Na potonji su način ukrašeni i ulomci iz Zaton i Zadra te pojedini primjeri iz Akvileje. Stoga je moguće govoriti o sličnim stilskim i tehnološkim modelima. Osim toga, natpisi se u oba čitljiva slučaja protežu duž cijeloga promjera ramena posude – podijeljeni *FELIX / ARBA* i *SAL/ONA* – tako zauzimajući obje strane posude i svu raspoloživu površinu ramena, što je moguće pretpostaviti i u kod „anonimne“ ninske posude, iako je ondje natpis teško čitljiv (Sl. 3: c), a s jedne strane gotovo potpuno nevidljiv (Sl. 1: 2). Dodatnu je analogiju ninskim posudama moguće pronaći u jednome od predmeta s nekropole Bakra, međutim poznatomu jedino s tabli koje donosi Š. Ljubić (1881, Tab. IV: 24). Iako je morfološki vrlo slična, na potonjoj se posudi nalaze samo valoviti ukrasi, a natpis, čini se, nedostaje.⁷ Nadalje, analogiju oblika moguće je pronaći u pojedinim amforama koje pripadaju ranorimskomu glaziranom posudu, datiranim u kasno 1. i 2. st., za koje je pretpostavljena funkcija sadržavanja mirisnih supstanci, no u ovome slučaju u funerarnome kontekstu (Brecciaroli Taborelli 2000: 138–138, 140, sl. 127, 128). Također, oblikovno su vrlo slične pojedine metalne posude, a u ovome slučaju značajno je izdvojiti one iz votivnoga (?) depozita iz Vicarella (*Aquae Apollinares*), koje su pojedini autori interpretirali u funkciji suvenira s ovoga termalnog lokaliteta (Künzel & Koepfel 2002: 18–19, Abb. 21, 22) ili kao zavjetni dar (Gasparini 2008).⁸ Što se morfologije posude iz Janica tiče, precizne analogije nisu pronađene (što bi moglo dodatno govoriti u prilog lokalnomu podrijetlu, posebice uzimajući u obzir slabu objavljenost kućanskoga posuđa s istočnojadranskih lokaliteta), iako je posudu moguće

handle modelling: in the first group they are circular in cross-section and ellipsoidal in shape, while in the second we have channelled strap-handles, descending from the neck to the body at right angles. There are also differences in rendering inscriptions and additional decorative elements, though in both cases in *a la barbotine* technique: on the *Felix Arba* vessel a part of the inscription is executed with dots, and the other part with a full stroke as well as a wavy decoration underneath, while in the case of the vessel from Janice and the other vessel from Nin, both inscription and decorative bands framing it are executed with dots. Fragments from Zaton and Zadar were decorated in the same way, as well as some examples from Aquileia. Therefore we can presume similar stylistic and technological models. Furthermore, in both cases the inscriptions spread along the entire diameter of the shoulder – divided in the following way: *FELIX / ARBA* and *SAL/ONA* – covering in that way both sides of the vessel and all available surface of the shoulder. This can be assumed for the “anonymous” vessel from Nin as well, though its inscription is difficult to read (Fig. 3: c), and on one side almost invisible (Fig. 1: 2). Additional analogy for the Nin vessels can be found in one of objects from the Bakar necropolis, known only from the plates in the publication by Š. Ljubić (1881, Tab. IV: 24). Although morphologically very similar to the latter, only wavy decorations can be found on it, and the inscription seems to be missing.⁷ Parallels for this form can be found in certain table amphorae belonging to the Early Roman glazed ware, dated to the late 1st and 2nd century, whose assumed function was keeping fragrances, but in this case in funerary context (Brecciaroli Taborelli 2000: 138–138, 140, fig. 127, 128). Certain metal vessels are also very similar in morphological terms; in this case we will single out the specimens from votive (?) deposit from Vicarello (*Aquae Apollinares*), that were interpreted as souvenirs from this thermal site by certain authors (Künzel & Koepfel 2002: 18–19, Abb. 21, 22), or as

⁷ Posuda nije pronađena tijekom pregleda materijala iz bakarske nekropole koji se nalazi u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu stoga njezin detaljni pregled nije bio moguć. Kustos AMZ-a Ozren Domiteru zahvaljujemo na susretljivosti i mogućnosti uvida u materijala.

⁸ Za ranije predložene analogije v. Nedved 1990: 7 i niže.

⁷ The vessel was not found among the artifacts from the Bakar necropolis kept in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb so its detailed analysis was not possible. We would like to thank Ozren Domiter, curator in the AMZ for allowing us kindly to see the finds.

smjestiti u raznovrsnu grupu vrčeva i amforeta s bikoničnim ili globularnim tijelom (npr. Ragazzi & Frontori 2018: Tav. III/1, 4).

Keramička struktura posuda smješta ih u kategoriju pročišćene keramike, odnosno tipična je za kućansko (uključujući i stolno) i pojedine vrste transportnoga posuđa; izrađene su od keramike svijetlih žućkastih tonova, dok je posuda *Felix Arba* nešto narančastija, a tako su opisani i ulomci iz Zatona i Zadra (Brusić 1999: kat. br. 415–417). Postoji mogućnost da je *Felix Arba* posuda bila premazana tamnijim premazom, na što bi upućivali značajniji tamni tragovi u unutrašnjosti posude, tek mjestimice vidljivi i na vanjskoj površini no koji bi mogli biti uzrokom površinskih narančastih mrlja (Sl. 3: b). Na drugoj posudi iz Nina ova vrsta tretmana površine nije zamoćena i površina je kromatski ujednačena, no nepostojani premaz mogao je nestati zajedno sa skramom koja je prekrivala posudu, a s nje je nedavno uklonjena. Kod obje se posude mjestimice javljaju veće crvenkaste primjese.

Navedene morfološke i strukturne karakteristike, iako pokazuju određene sličnosti, ipak bi upućivale na podrijetlo ovih posuda iz barem dviju različitih radionica, a na to bi upućivali i natpisi koji su na njima pronađeni – jedne koju bi valjalo smjestiti na Rab, gdje bi možda valjalo tražiti i porijeklo „anonimne“ ninske amforete,⁹ a drugu u Salonu. Obje lokacije, prema dosadašnjim spoznajama o keramičkoj proizvodnji u Dalmaciji, dolaze u obzir (Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra & Ugarković 2018; Konestra 2019: 43), iako ni na jednoj nije potvrđena proizvodnja upravo ovakvih ili sličnih posuda. Naime, na Rabu, preciznije u Loparu, istražena je peć u kojoj se po svoj prilici proizvodila građevinska keramika, pa iako su uz nju identificirani ostatci još jedne, a možda i dviju peći, za sada nema naznaka o drugim proizvodima (Lipovac Vrkljan & Šiljeg 2011). Ipak, na otoku se pretpostavlja postojanje keramičarskih peći na još dvije lokacije, no one nisu podrobnije istražene (Lipovac Vrkljan & Konestra

a votive offering (Gasperini 2008).⁸ As for the morphology of the vessel from Janice, precise parallels have not been found (possibly reinforcing the thesis about the local origin, in particular if we keep in mind the poor state of publication of common ware from the eastern Adriatic sites), although the vessel can be attributed to a group of diverse jugs and small amphorae with biconical or globular body (e.g. Ragazzi & Frontori 2018: Tav. III/1, 4).


Ceramic structure of the vessels classifies them within common ware, in other words it is typical of the household ware (including tableware) and certain kinds of transport ware, and they were made of ceramic in light yellowish tones, while the *Felix Arba* vessel is somewhat more orange, and the examples from Zaton and Zadar were described in a similar way (Brusić 1999: cat. nos. 415–417). Possibly, the *Felix Arba* vessel was covered with a darker slip, as traces of substantial brownish coating on the interior of the vessel might suggest, and fainter traces on its outer surface, the latter maybe being the cause of the sporadic orange tinting (Fig. 3: b). On the other vessel from Nin this type of surface treatment was not detected, and its surfaces is chromatically even, though a thin slip might have disappeared upon recent cleaning of the vessel. Within the fabric of both vessels sporadic reddish inclusions were noted.

Mentioned morphological and structural characteristics, though exhibiting certain similarities, still suggest origin in at least two different workshops, as indicated by the inscriptions found on them – one that should be located on Rab, from where the “anonymous” table amphora from Nin might also originate,⁹ and the other one in Salona. Both locations should be taken into consideration, judging from the present knowledge on pottery production in Dalmatia (Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra & Ugarković 2018; Konestra 2019: 43), though production of these or similar vessels has not been attested in any of them. Namely, on the island of Rab, more precisely

⁹ Potrebno je naglasiti da je posuda *Felix Arba* nešto „finije“ izrade (Sl. 1: 1): tanjih je stijenki, točkasti se ukras sastoji od jasnije definiranih elemenata, ručke su proporcionalnije tijelu. Ipak, zbog izrazite morfološke sličnosti, a i sličnosti u keramičkoj strukturi, nije nemoguće da su one proizvod iste radionice, no različitih majstora.

⁸ For previously suggested analogies see Nedved 1990: 7 and below.

⁹ It must be stressed that the *Felix Arba* vessel is of somewhat “finer” manufacture (Fig. 1: 1): thinner walls, better defined decorative elements, more proportional handles. Nevertheless, strong morphological and fabrics similarity might indicate provenance from the same workshop and manufacture by different potters.



Slika 2. Mjesta moguće provenijencije (crveno) i lokacije nalaza (plavo) posuda s natpisima i posuda sa sličnim ukrasom (podloga: Google Maps/Snazzy Maps; izradila: A. Konestra).

Figure 2. Sites of possible provenience (red) and findspots (blue) of vessels with inscriptions and those with similar decoration (Basemap: Google Maps/Snazzy Maps; elaboration: A. Konestra).

2018). U slučaju Salone, iako do sada nisu utvrđene keramičarske peći u bližoj okolini grada, prema pečatima također se pretpostavlja proizvodnja građevinske keramike (Lipovac Vrkljan & Konestra 2018: Tab. 1). Faktura i ukras bi pak, kao što je to već primijetio Z. Brusić (1999: 30–31), mogli smjestiti ove posude u isti kontekst s grupom keramičkih čaša (obično uvrštenih u kategoriju keramike tankih stijenki) koje se također javljaju u dvije, ali mahom svijetle (oker, žućkaste, ružičaste) fakture te ponekad s crvenkastim ili smeđim premazom, uz ukras *a la barbotine* točkicama kojima su oblikovana dva osnovna motiva: tri pomaknuta reda većih točkica i tri istovjetna reda manjih točkica međusobno odvojenih vodoravnim urezima. Uz ove Z. Brusić smješta i grupu morfološki sličnih čaša ukrašenih *a la barbotine* lunetama u dva ili tri reda, a mogli bismo

in Lopar, a kiln was excavated that was probably used for producing ceramic building material. Although remains of one or even two more kilns were located next to it, there are no indications of other products (Lipovac Vrkljan & Šiljeg 2011). However, presence of kilns is assumed on two more locations on the island, but they have not been explored thoroughly (Lipovac Vrkljan & Konestra 2018). In case of Salona, though pottery kilns have not been found in the city surroundings, production of ceramic building material is also assumed on the basis of stamps (Lipovac Vrkljan & Konestra 2018: Tab. 1). Fabric and decoration, as already noticed by Z. Brusić (1999: 30–31), could classify these vessels in the same context with a group of ceramic beakers (usually classified as thin-walled ware) that are also represented in two, usually light (ocher, yellowish, pink) fabrics, occasionally

joj dodati i za sada jedinstveni primjerak kruškolike šalice/vrčića iz Krka (Brusić 1999: 30–31, Fig. 58; Konestra 2016: 201–203; Ožanić Roguljić 2019). Isti autor smješta proizvodnju navedenih posuda u neutvrđenu radionicu u okolici Nina, vjerojatno na temelju velike količine opisanih čaša iz slojeva luke u Zatonu (Brusić 1999: 31), no u otpadnome materijalu jedine dosad utvrđene radionice na ovom području, one u uvali Plemići kod Ražanca, za sada nisu utvrđeni slični proizvodi (Parica & Ilkić 2017).

Dok tipologije ukrasa i fature pomažu u svrstavanju predmetnih posuda u istovjetnu keramičku grupu i mogući dalmatinski proizvodni milje, one nam ne pomažu u njihovoj dataciji, posebno u slučaju amforeta. Ranije je predložena datacija *Felix Arba* posude, no s obzirom na to da ipak ne može biti riječ, kako je tada navedeno, o tzv. vrsti *Sigillata chiara A* (= afrička sigilata A, podrijetlom iz današnjega Tunisa)¹⁰ (Nedved 1990: 7, n. 2; Starac 2000: 82), predložena je datacija upitna, dok je sama morfologija posude, iako slična navedenoj, vrlo uobičajena te ne dopušta preciznije datiranje na temelju morfologije. Ipak, pojedini recentniji nalazi čaša, a posebno onih s pomaknutim redovima, upućivali bi na dataciju u flavijevsko razdoblje i prvu pol. 2. st. (Brusić 1999: 31; Konestra 2016: 379–381), što bi mogli potvrditi i pojedini primjerci pronađeni u sigurnijemu ranoantičkom kontekstu i u Dalmaciji i drugdje (npr. u incineracijskim grobovima u Fulfinumu, Puli, Portorecanatiju) (Konestra 2014: kat. br. 17; Mercado 1974: 293–294, fig. 201b, 210g, 327c, 311, 306b). Analogno, i amforete bismo stoga smjestili u približno istovjetni kronološki raspon, dakako dopuštajući određene pomake, što dodatno potvrđuje moguća analogija iz Bakra (prema staklenomu materijalu nekropola je datirana od 1. do 3. st., Gregl & Lazar 2008: 96) te datacija slojeva korištenja luke u Janicama (1. st. – početak 3. st., Parica 2018: 220).

with reddish or brown slip, decorated with *a la barbotine* dots shaping two basic motifs: three shifted rows of bigger dots and three identical rows of smaller dots separated with horizontal notches. Z. Brusić adds to this group morphologically similar beakers decorated by *a la barbotine* lunettes in two or three rows, and we also might add an example of pear-shaped cup/juglet from Krk (Brusić 1999: 30–31, Fig. 58; Konestra 2016: 201–203; Ožanić Roguljić 2019). The same author located production of the mentioned vessels to undetermined workshop in the Nin surroundings, probably on the basis of great amount of described beakers from the layers of the port in Zaton (Brusić 1999: 31), but similar products have not been found in the waste material of the only workshop located in this region so far, the one in Plemići cove near Ražanac (Parica & Ilkić 2017).

While typologies of decoration and fabric are helpful in classifying mentioned vessels to the same pottery group and possible Dalmatian production milieu, they are not as instructive regarding dating, in particular in case of table amphorae. Earlier proposed dating of the *Felix Arba* vessel is questionable since it cannot be the so-called *sigillata chiara A* (= African *sigillata A*, originally from present-day Tunisia)¹⁰ (Nedved 1990: 7, n. 2; Starac 2000: 82). Morphology of the vessel, though similar to the mentioned type, is very common, which does not allow more precise dating. However, certain more recent beaker finds, especially the ones with shifted rows, suggested dating to the Flavian period and the first half of the 2nd century (Brusić 1999: 31; Konestra 2016: 379–381), which might be confirmed by certain examples recovered from a more certain context of early antiquity, in Dalmatia and elsewhere (e.g. cremation graves in *Fulfinum*, Pula, Portorecanati) (Konestra 2014: cat. no. 17; Mercado 1974: 293–294, fig. 201b, 210g, 327c, 311, 306b). By analogy, table amphorae could also be dated to roughly identical timespan, allowing certain shifts, which is corroborated by a possible parallel from Bakar (the necropolis was dated from the 1st to 3rd cent. on the basis of glass material, Gregl & Lazar 2008: 96), and dating of the layers of the port usage in Janice (1st – early 3rd cent., Parica 2018: 220).

¹⁰ Prema recentnim tipologijama Lamboglia forma 26a odgovara onoj Hayes 162, koju potonji datira u kasno 1. – 2. st., a poznata je iz samo jednoga primjerka pronađenoga u Ampuriasu (*Atlante I* 1981, 48, T. XXII/6).

¹⁰ According to recent typologies, Lamboglia form 26a corresponds to Hayes 162, dated by the latter to the late 1st–2nd cent.; it is known from only one example found in Ampurias (*Atlante I* 1981, 48, T. XXII/6).

INTERPRETACIJA NATPISA I FUNKCIJE POSUDA

Čitanje natpisa na dvjema posudama ne ostavlja mnogo sumnji i jasno je da se oni odnose na Arbu, odnosno otok i grad Rab, te na Salonu; doduše ovo je jedina epigrafska pojava epiteta *felix* uz ime antičkoga Raba (v. niže). Njihova interpretacija, međutim, dopušta različite mogućnosti, na koje ćemo se kratko osvrnuti u nastavku. U slučaju druge posude iz Nina, na kojoj je natpis nedvojbeno prisutan, njegovo je čitanje otežano zbog vrlo plitko sačuvanih barbotinskih točkica i mjestimice oštećenja na površini posude. Tako su, na jednoj strani nedvojbeno vidljiva slova A, D i A, između kojih se razabiru dvije okomite haste i dvije dijagonalno postavljene točkice,¹¹ dok se na drugoj raspoznaje tek okomita hasta, moguće slova I.¹²

Važno je napomenuti da su oba predmeta sa čitljivim natpisom pronađena izvan lokaliteta koji se na njima spominju, što bi moglo upućivati na to da je sama poruka nastala u svrhu izvoza posuda odnosno njihova možebitnoga sadržaja. Ipak, dosad potvrđene lokalne keramičarske radionice, mahom povezane s ruralnim posjedima liburnskoga dijela provincije Dalmacije, nisu pečatirale svoje transportne posude, a ni ostali asortiman posuda (npr. Lipovac Vrkljan 2017 s ranijom literaturom), dok se samo u slučaju one u Plemićima na malim amforama s ravnim dnom javlja ukras u obliku urezane valovnice (Bekić & Pešić 2014: 103, T. 5: 11). Također, ovaj način apliciranja natpisa i inače nije tipičan za rimsko transportno posuđe.

Općenito su natpisi nastali u proizvodnji, a koji donose toponim, dosta rijetki. Oni se javljaju, na primjer, na pojedinim uljanicama proizvedenima u Modeni (sjeverna Italija), gdje se uz ime različitih proizvođača javlja lokativ *Mutinae*, no uvijek uz skraćeni glagol *f(ecit)*, npr. *MVTINA / PRISCVS. F.* (Labate 2016: 24, Sl. 44, Tab. 1; Mongardi 2018: 29). Poznati su i iz Akvileje, no na staklenome posuđu i ponovno uz ime proizvođača, odnosno u ovome slučaju proizvođačice, i glagol *facere* – *Sentia Secunda / facit Aquileiae* (Zaccaria 2017: 147). Uz ove možemo još pridodati pečate na sigilatnome

INTERPRETATION OF THE INSCRIPTION AND VESSEL FUNCTION

Reading of the inscriptions on two vessels is quite unambiguous and it is clear that they relate to *Arba*, that is the island and the city of Rab, and *Salona*. This is the only epigraphic record of the epithet *felix* with the name of ancient Rab (see below). Their interpretation, however, allows different possibilities, that we will consider in continuation. In the case of the second Nin vessel, which undoubtedly bears an inscription, shallow preservation of the *a la barbotine* dots and occasional damage of the surface, render its reading difficult. On one side the letters A, D and A could be recognized, between which two vertical lines and two diagonally placed dots are visible,¹¹ while on the other only the vertical line – possibly of the letter I – is visible.¹²

It is important that both objects with clearly readable inscriptions were recovered from sites that are not mentioned in it which might suggest that the message was written in relation to the export of vessels or their possible content. However local pottery workshops that have been attested so far, usually associated with the rural estates of the Liburnian part of the province of Dalmatia, did not stamp their transport vessels, nor the remaining assortment of vessels (e.g. Lipovac Vrkljan 2017 with earlier literature), while only in the case of the one from Plemići, decoration in shape of an incised wavy line appears on small amphorae with flat base (Bekić & Pešić 2014: 103, T. 5: 11). This manner of applying inscriptions is not typical of the Roman transport pottery.

Inscriptions made during manufacture that contain a toponym are generally rather rare. They are present on certain lamps made in Modena (northern Italy) where the locative case *Mutinae* appears with names of various manufacturers, but regularly with abbreviated verb *f(ecit)*, e.g. *MVTINA / PRISCVS. F.* (Labate 2016: 24, Fig. 44, Tab. 1; Mongardi 2018: 29). They were also found in Aquileia, but on glass vessels and again associated with the name of the manufacturer, in this case a female

¹¹ Moguća transkripcija: A[II.]DA.

¹² Moguća transkripcija: [.]I[---].

¹¹ Possible transcription: A[II.]DA.

¹² Possible transcription: [.]I[---].

posuđu koji donose natpis *Arreti* ili *Arretinum verum* (Pucci 1993: 75) ili one na amforama (v. u Zaccaria 2017: 147). U slučaju Modene i Arezza, u antici prepoznatih centara keramičarske proizvodnje (Brando 2008), naglašavanje mjesta proizvodnje moglo bi se interpretirati kao marketinški postupak ili neka vrsta garancije kvalitete (Manacorda 1993; Cooley 2012: 95–96). Kao marketinška strategija interpretirani su i pojedini *tituli picti* na transportnome posuđu (Curtis 1986).


Međutim, na posudama iz Nina i Janica natpisi su u nominativu, čime se naglasak ne stavlja na mjesto u smislu proizvodnje, već samo na ime, odnosno lokalitet u smislu podrijetla, stoga natpisi na sačuvanim posudama nisu povezivi s momentima proizvodnje, distribucije i posjedovanja (usp. Cooley 2012: 83–84) kao što je to često slučaj s *instrumentum inscriptum*. Natpisi ovoga tipa javljaju se znatno rjeđe i time bi se dalmatinske posude mogle smjestiti unutar raznolike grupe antičkih i kasnoantičkih predmeta koji su interpretirani kao suvenir. ¹³ Riječ je vrlo često upravo o posudama na kojima se nalaze natpisi i/ili prikazi karakteristični za mjesto provenijencije, no treba uzeti u obzir i mogućnost da suvenir nisu činile samo posude, već i mogući sadržaj koji su prenosile. Slično je već predloženo za ranije keramičke klase, a sama transportna posuda nakon pražnjenja mogla je dobiti i novu funkciju (Small 1994: 44–45). Posuda je tako mogla poslužiti kao osobni memento, spomen prošlosti i sadašnjosti (Popkin 2018: 122), ali i kao dokaz putovanja, a prema tome možemo pretpostaviti da je i sadržaj, dakako, ako je postojao, mogao biti karakterističan za pojedino mjesto te su tako i posuda i sadržaj mogli biti značajni u kontekstu kulturne memorije i općepoznatoga značaja pojedinoga mjesta (Stoner 2019: 48). Osim prisjećanja, mogućnost repliciranja/produljivanja iskustva koje je kupac doživio tijekom putovanja također je značajka suvenira koji u sebi sadrže i funkcionalni aspekt, odnosno nisu samo ukrasni, a to bi se u našem slučaju moglo odnositi i na sam sadržaj ovih posuda, koji tako postaje „uzorak“ proizvoda tipičnoga za pojedinu lokaciju (Stoner 2019: 53, 56). Time se uz predmet stvara

manufacturer, with the verb *facere* – *Sentia Secunda / facit Aquileiae* (Zaccaria 2017: 147). We can also add stamps on sigillata ware bearing the inscription *Arreti* or *Arretinum verum* (Pucci 1993: 75), or the ones on amphorae (see in Zaccaria 2017: 147). In case of Modena and Arezzo, renowned pottery manufacturing centers in antiquity (Brando 2008), emphasizing of the production place might be interpreted as advertising procedure or some sort of quality guarantee (Manacorda 1993; Cooley 2012: 95–96). Certain *tituli picti* on transport vessels were interpreted as advertising strategy (Curtis 1986).

However, on the vessels from Nin and Janice the inscriptions are in the nominative case, whereby the emphasis is not on the place of manufacture but the name itself, i.e. locality as a place of origin, therefore the inscriptions on the preserved vessels cannot be associated with production, distribution and ownership (cf. Cooley 2012: 83–84), as it is often the case with *instrumentum inscriptum*. This type of inscriptions is not as common, therefore the Dalmatian vessels could be classified to a diverse group of artifacts dating to antiquity and late antiquity, interpreted as souvenirs. ¹³ These are often vessels bearing inscriptions and/or depictions characteristic of the place of provenance, but we should take into consideration the possibility that the souvenir did not consist only of the vessel, but also of its content. The situation is similar with earlier pottery classes, and the transport vessel could have been given a new function after being emptied (Small 1994: 44–45). In that way the vessel could be used as a personal memento, connection between the past and the present (Popkin 2018: 122), but also as a proof of travel, and in that regard we can assume that the content, if there was any of course, may have been characteristic of a certain place so that both vessel and its content might have been important in the context of cultural memory and common knowledge about a certain place (Stoner 2019: 48). Except for remembering, possibility of replicating/extending the experience that a buyer had during the journey is another characteristic of the souvenirs that also have a functional aspect, meaning that they are not purely decorative.

¹³ Za ovu mogućnost usp. i Parica 2018: 220.

¹³ For this possibility cf. also Parica 2018: 220.



Slika 3. a: Isječak iz inventarne knjige “Catalogo Cotti” s opisom dviju ninskih amforeta; b: tragovi mogućeg premaza na unutarnjoj stijenci posude *Felix Arba*; c: najčitljiviji dio napisa na posudi iz Nina – slova D i A (fotografije: A. Konestra).

Figure 3. a: Clipping from the inventory book “Catalogo Cotti” with descriptions of the small amphorae from Nin; b: traces of possible slip on inner surface of *Felix Arba* vessel; c: best preserved part of inscription on table amphora from Nin – letters D and A (photographs by: A. Konestra).

i narativ kojim se oživljava, reinterpreтира i manipulira stvarni doživljaj (Popkin 2018: 429 s ranijom literaturom). Na kraju, da bi zadovoljio svoju funkciju, osim u iznimnim slučajevima, suvenir mora biti lako prenosiv, odnosno portabilan (Popkin 2018: 429, 455), što su ovdje opisane posude nedvojbeno bile.

Tipični regionalni proizvodi često se spominju u antičkim izvorima, pa tako i u slučaju provincije Dalmacije (Lipovac Vrkljan & Konestra 2018: 20 s ranijom literaturom), no, nažalost, nepoznavanje sadržaja ovdje obrađenih posuda (a nije sigurno

In our case that might refer to the content of these vessels, becoming a “sample” of product typical of certain location (Stoner 2019: 53, 56). In that way a certain object is given a narrative that is used to bring to life the actual experience, to reinterpret and manipulate it (Popkin 2018: 429 with earlier literature). Finally, to satisfy its function, except in special cases, the souvenir has to be easy to carry, that is portable (Popkin 2018: 429, 455), as these vessels definitely are.

Typical regional products are often mentioned in ancient sources, including the province of Dalmatia

ni da su one doista i korištene za transport nekoga proizvoda, iako je to vrlo vjerojatno) ne dopušta širu raspravu u tome smislu. Dakako, asocijacija, makar morfološko-strukturna, s ranije spomenutim čašama mogla bi upućivati na mogućnost transporta pića (vina), iako su u sličnim posudama pronađenima u drugim krajevima Carstva transportirani i neki drugi proizvodi (usp. Liou & Morel 1977; Morais, Oliveira & Morillo Cerdán 2018).

Ipak, s obzirom na vrstu, stil i morfologiju natpisa te pretpostavljenu transportnu funkciju ovih predmeta, možemo pretpostaviti da su posuda i eventualni sadržaj zajedno tvorili suvenir, omogućavajući produljenje iskustva, moguće i njegovo dijeljenje s onima koji su ostali kod kuće, istovremeno ostavljajući, u obliku prazne, no još uvijek (multi)funkcionalne posude, memento putovanja. U tome bi se smislu naše posude uvjetno mogle usporediti s grupom staklenih boca (tip Isings 103, u jednom slučaju 104, Isings 1957: 121–125) koje u *cut-glass* tehnici prikazuju panorame Puteolija i *Baiae*, svojevrsnih antičkih turističkih resorta u Napuljskome zaljevu, a datiraju u drugu pol. 3. – prvu pol. 4. st. ili tek neznatno kasnije (Ostrow 1979: 91, 136–137; Popkin 2018: 429–430). Osim figuralnih prikaza na posudama se nalaze i legende/didaskalije (usp. Marchesini 2016: 56–58) koje pomažu u identifikaciji svake prikazane građevine ne pružajući tako prostor dvojbi, istovremeno reklamirajući lokalne znamenitosti, dok se na pojedinim primjercima nalaze i, moguće personalizirane, dedikacije ili poklici/zdravice (Cooley 2012: 109). Sveukupne karakteristike oblika i ukrasa te epigrafskoga sadržaja (Painter 1975; Stoner 2019: 50–53), kao i „turistički“ status koji su uživale obje prikazane destinacije (Popkin 2018: 448), naveli su istraživače na interpretaciju ovih posuda kao suvenira s putovanja u Napuljski zaljev, moguće povezivih i s posjetom termalnim sklopovima ovih dvaju kampanskih centara ili pak nekoga kulturnog mjesta, moguće Izidino svetišta u Puteoliju (Picard 1959: 28; Ostrow 1979: 89–90; Künzel & Koeppl 2002: 25–27; Roffia 2002: 427; Popkin 2018: 447; Stoner 2019: 52), odnosno njihova je dvojaka funkcija mogla biti ona mementa s putovanja i transporta manje količine ljekovite vode bilo kao popudbinu bilo za prinos božanstvu; mogle su međutim, sadržavati i neke druge tekućine (za raspravu o sadržaju v. Popkin

(Lipovac Vrkljan & Konestra 2018: 20, with earlier literature), but unfortunately since we do not know what the content in the analyzed vessels might have been (and it is not certain they were used for transporting a certain product though it is very likely), broader discussion in that sense would be unproductive. An association, at least morphological and structural, with previously mentioned beakers might suggest possibility of transporting drinks (wine), though some other products were transported in similar vessels found in other parts of the Empire (cf. Liou & Morel 1977; Morais, Oliveira & Morillo Cerdán 2018).

However, considering the kind, style and morphology of the inscription and assumed transport function of these objects, we can presume that the vessel and its potential content constituted a souvenir, enabling prolonged experience, possibly its sharing with the ones who stayed at home, leaving at the same time a memento of the journey, in shape of an empty but still (multi)functional vessel. In that regard our vessels might be tentatively compared to a group of glass bottles (type Isings 103, in one case 104, Isings 1957: 121–125) depicting panoramas of *Puteoli* and *Baiae*, a kind of ancient tourist resorts in the Bay of Naples, in the *cut-glass* technique, dating to the second half of the 3rd – first half of the 4th century or only slightly later (Ostrow 1979: 91, 136–137; Popkin 2018: 429–430). In addition to figural depictions, vessels bear legends/captions (cf. Marchesini 2016: 56–58) that help in identification of each depicted building, leaving no room for doubt, advertising at the same time local sights, while certain examples bear, possibly personalized, dedications and exhortations/toasts (Cooley 2012: 109). General characteristics of forms, decorations, epigraphic content (Painter 1975; Stoner 2019: 50–53), as well as “tourist” status of both depicted destinations (Popkin 2018: 448), suggested interpretation of these vessels as souvenirs brought from journeys to the Bay of Naples, possibly associated with a visit to thermal baths of these two Campanian centers or some cult place, perhaps Iseum in *Puteoli* (Picard 1959: 28; Ostrow 1979: 89–90; Künzel & Koeppl 2002: 25–27; Roffia 2002: 427; Popkin 2018: 447; Stoner 2019: 52), i.e. their double function might have included the one of a memento from a journey and transport of a small amount of healing water

2018: 449). Unutar slične funkcionalno-proizvodne skupine mogla bi se, prema J. Stoneru, svrstati i staklena boca iz Ptuja na kojoj se nalazi prikaz Aleksandrijskoga svjetionika, no bez natpisa i naznaka eventualnoga sadržaja (Künzel & Koepfel 2002: 41, sl. 77; Lazar 2009; Stoner 2019: 50),¹⁴ a česti su i drugi primjeri posuda (tanjura, zdjelica) od različitih materijala za koje pojedini autori predlažu funkciju suvenira (npr. zdjelica „Rudge Cup“ povezuje s Hadrijanovim zidom, tanjur „Salvs Umeritana“, staklene bočice s prikazom Tyche iz Antijoka i drugi), a posebno se za kasnoantičko razdoblje izdvajaju tzv. hodočasničke ampule, posebno one iz svetišta *Abu Mina* (Casson 1974: 286–287; Anderson 2007; Stoner 2019: 46–72). U potonjem je kontekstu zanimljiva mogućnost koju iznose C. Lambert i P. Pedemonte-Demeglio, odnosno da su se tekućine pribavljane tijekom posjeta svetih mjesta, a prije masovne proizvodnje tipiziranih hodočasničkih ampula sv. Mene (6. – 7. st.), prenosile u posudama „kućanske“ keramike (*contenitori di uso comune*) (Lambert & Pedemonte-Demeglio 1993: 212).¹⁵ Također, u tom se kontekstu spominju i potvrđene radionice za proizvodnju suvenira koje su djelovale kao sastavni dio hodočasničkoga kompleksa u *Abu Meni*,¹⁶ a moguće i drugih istočnomediterranskih svetih mjesta (Lambert & Pedemonte-Demeglio 1993: 213, 217 s ranijom literaturom; Stoner 2019: 67). Ondje se, osim ampula sv. Mene, proizvodio i niz drugih, uglavnom portabilnih predmeta, unutar kojih se ističu vrčevi raznih oblika i dimenzija, pa tako i u inačici s dvije ručke, koji često na ramenu nose natpis *τοῦ ἀγίου Μῆνα*, a čiju preteču pojedini autori prepoznaju u ranijoj proizvodnji (kulturnih) suvenira (Bangert 2010: 307–311, fig. 13 s ranijom literaturom).

U kategoriju suvenira mogu se smjestiti i predmeti koji služe kao komemoracijski memento pojedinih događaja, a koje čini također raznovrsna skupina predmeta, na primjer onih posvećenih

whether as traveling provisions or as an offering for the deity; however, they could also contain some other liquids (for discussion on contents see Popkin 2018: 449). According to J. Stoner, glass bottle from Ptuj could be classified to a similar group in terms of functionality and production. It bears a depiction of the lighthouse of Alexandria, but without an inscription and indications of possible content (Künzel & Koepfel 2002: 41, fig. 77; Lazar 2009; Stoner 2019: 50).¹⁴ Certain authors suggest souvenir function for a number of other examples of vessels (plates, cups) made of various materials (e.g. “Rudge Cup” that can be associated with the Hadrian’s Wall, “Salvs Umeritana” plate, small glass bottles depicting Tyche from Antioch, etc.), or pilgrim’s flasks which are specific for the late antique period, in particular the ones from *Abu Mina* sanctuary (Casson 1974: 286–287; Anderson 2007; Stoner 2019: 46–72). In this context, a possibility advocated by C. Lambert and P. Pedemonte-Demeglio is particularly interesting, claiming that the liquids acquired during visits to holy places, and before the mass production of standardized pilgrims’ flasks of St Menas (6th – 7th cent.), were transported in “household” ceramics (*contenitori di uso comune*) (Lambert & Pedemonte-Demeglio 1993: 212).¹⁵ In the same context we can mention attested workshops for souvenir production that worked within the pilgrimage center in *Abu Mena*,¹⁶ and possibly other eastern Mediterranean holy places (Lambert & Pedemonte-Demeglio 1993: 213, 217 with earlier literature; Stoner 2019: 67). Except for St Menas’ flasks, a number of other, mostly portable items were produced there, such as jugs in various shapes and dimensions, including the variant with two handles, often with the inscription *τοῦ ἀγίου Μῆνα*, whose harbinger is recognized, by some authors, in the earlier production of (cult) souvenirs (Bangert 2010: 307–311, fig. 13 with earlier literature).

¹⁴ Posude s prikazom Aleksandrijskoga svjetionika pronađene su i u Afganistanu (Casson 1974: 286; Künzel & Koepfel 2002: 40, sl. 75, 76).

¹⁵ Za dataciju v. Bangert 2010: 306; za ampule sv. Mene na istočnome Jadrano v. Ivčević 2020.

¹⁶ Moguće radionice za proizvodnju ampula sv. Mene smještaju se i u Kom-el-Dikka (kasnoantičko predgrađe Aleksandrije) (Stoner 2019: 67).

¹⁴ Vessels with depictions of the lighthouse of Alexandria were found in Afghanistan (Casson 1974: 286; Künzel & Koepfel 2002: 40, fig. 75, 76).

¹⁵ For dating see Bangert 2010: 306; for St Menas’ ampullae on the eastern Adriatic see Ivčević 2020.

¹⁶ Possible locations of workshops producing St Menas’ flasks could be in Kom el-Dikka (late antique suburbs of Alexandria) (Stoner 2019: 67).

gladijatorskim borbama i sportskim manifestacijama (Künzel & Koepfel 2002: 20–24), a ovdje su posebno zanimljivi oni keramički; u tom se kontekstu na istočnojadranskom prostoru ističe nalaz keramičke figuralne kompozicije iz Aserije od koje su sačuvana samo dva, vjerojatno carska portreta, a koja je povezana s proslavom Trajanova posjeta gradu, odnosno s podizanjem slavoluka/gradskih vrata (Eterović Borzić & Borzić *u tisku*),¹⁷ pa je i ona u svojoj osnovi suvenir.

Još jedan detalj povezuje ninske amforete s ranije opisanim staklenim Pozzuoli-Baia bocama, ali i s posudom iz Ptuja, a to je sepulkralni kontekst nalaza. Kako primjećuje M. L. Popkin, nakon ispunjavanja svoje funkcije kao suvenira, ove su posude često preuzimale funkciju grobnoga priloga, no i pojedine druge, sasvim različite funkcije (Popkin 2018: 452–454) što, s obzirom na malobrojnost i kontekst nalaza, nije moguće pretpostaviti za ovdje obrađene primjere. Zanimljivo je, međutim, da osim ninskih, oni mahom potječu iz lučkih konteksta (Brusić 1999; Mian 2017; Parica 2018), dodatno naglašavajući mobilnost kao jednu od značajki njihova korištenja. S druge strane, način na koji su natpisi postavljeni, upućuje na potrebu interakcije s predmetom da bi se poruka u potpunosti razumjela, stoga je njegova namjena zasigurno podrazumijevala manipulaciju, a ne statičku ukrasnu funkciju, što je ponovno usporedivo s Pozzuoli-Baia bocama (Popkin 2018: 455) i dodatno govori u smislu njihove multifunktionalnosti.

Način izrade ovdje analiziranih amforeta govori u prilog njihovoj standardizaciji, pa je teško da su izrađivane po osobnoj narudžbi kupca. Ipak, tehnika izrade i jednostavnost oblika i samih natpisa dozvoljavaju pretpostavku da su morfološki istovjetne posude izrađivane i bez natpisa¹⁸ koji se mogao nanositi, s obzirom na izbor *a la barbotine* tehnike, a ne recimo izrade u kalupu, na samo dio asortimana i time maksimalno optimizirati proizvodnju. Nadalje, uz izradu, sam izbor keramike kao materijala govori u prilog relativno niskoj cijeni ovih po svemu jednostavnih posuda, no ona je mogla narasti

Objects used as commemorative mementos of certain events can also be attributed to the souvenir category, that also consists of a diverse group of artifacts, such as the ones related to the gladiator fights and sport events (Künzel & Koepfel 2002: 20–24). Ceramic objects of that kind are particularly interesting, in that context find of ceramic figural composition from *Asseria* stands out in the region of the eastern Adriatic coast. Only two, probably imperial, portraits have been preserved of the entire composition, that was related to the Trajan's visit to the city, and with erecting a triumphal arch/city gate (Eterović Borzić & Borzić *forthcoming*),¹⁷ so basically it is also a souvenir.

Another detail associates the table amphorae from Nin with previously described glass bottles Pozzuoli-Baia, and with the vessel from Ptuj, and that is the sepulchral context of the find. As noticed by M. L. Popkin, after fulfilling its function as a souvenir, these vessels often functioned as grave goods, or they assumed totally different function (Popkin 2018: 452–454), which cannot be assumed for the examples analyzed here having in mind scarcity and context of the finds. It is interesting that except for the Nin examples, they originate from port contexts (Brusić 1999; Mian 2017; Parica 2018), additionally emphasizing mobility as one of characteristics of their usage. On the other hand, the manner of placing the inscriptions suggests a need for interaction with the object in order to understand the message fully, therefore its function definitely implied manipulation, instead of a static decorative function, which once more can be compared to the Pozzuoli-Baia bottles (Popkin 2018: 455), and implies their multifunctionality.

The manner of manufacturing supports standardization of the vessels, so it is not likely they were custom-made. However, manufacturing technique and simplicity of both form and inscriptions allow an assumption that morphologically identical vessels were made in variants without inscriptions,¹⁸ that could have been applied, using *a la barbotine* technique, and not mold technique for instance, on

¹⁷ Zahvaljujem kolegama A. Eterović Borzić i I. Borziću na omogućavanju uvida u rad.

¹⁸ To bi dodatno mogao potvrditi primjerak iz Bakra, ako doista nije imao natpis.

¹⁷ We would like to thank our colleagues A. Eterović Borzić and I. Borzić for sharing their paper with us before publication.

¹⁸ The specimen from Bakar could confirm this, if it really did not have an inscription.

s obzirom na mogući sadržaj, za razliku od sličnih predmeta izrađenih od skupljih materijala i raskošno ukrašenih koji su i sami imali određenu tržišnu vrijednost, a osim toga mogli su na neki način biti personalizirani (v. gore i usp. Popkin 2018: 449–450).

Morfologija i mogućnost sadržavanja nekoga, moguće prehrambenoga proizvoda, osim ranije navedene, dopušta još neke funkcije, a one bi se posebno mogle odnositi na posudu s natpisom *Salona*, koja je pronađena u lučkome kontekstu. U osnovi se slične posude, naime, često javljaju u kontekstu lučkih depozita i brodoloma južne obale francuske i italske tirenske obale (Marseille, Arles, Narbonne, Pisa i dr.) (Dijaoui *et al.* 2014: 186), a ono što ih povezuje s našim posudama jest morfologija, posebno dimenzije i prisutnost dviju ručki. Navedene posude, u literaturi poznate kao „posude iz Lacija“ (s obzirom na moguću provenijenciju) ili „posude za garum“ (s obzirom na sadržaj), na temelju rezultata istraživanja koje se zasniva na ranije spomenutim lučkim depozitima, interpretirane su kao dio brodske inventara, odnosno proizvod koji se u ovom slučaju u njima čuvao, *alec*, bio je namijenjen pomorcima (Dijaoui *et al.* 2014: 186–188; Botte 2018: 384). Slična je funkcija pretpostavljena i za morfološki drukčije posude, tzv. Pompejanski *urcei*, koji su također sadržavali riblje prerađevine i poznati su, među ostalim, i iz lučkih depozita (Botte 2009: 105–168; 2018: 383–384) te po svojim gotovo reklamnim natpisima, posebno onima koji se odnose na proizvođača i trgovca Aulus Umbricija Skaura (*Aulus Umbricius Scaurus*) (Curtis 1986: 225–226; Castiglione Morelli 1996: Fig. 7/2; De Carolis 1996: Fig. 1/4), kao i posude tipa Shoene I, unutar kojih su u Pompejima pronađeni ostatci ribljih kosti, a javljaju se u kućanskim kontekstima, ali i unutar depozita trgovina, npr. u Herculaneu (Castiglione Morelli 1996: Fig. 7/7; De Carolis 1996: Fig. 1/3). Prema navedenom, iako „posude za garum“ nemaju toponomastički natpis, njihovo ograničeno podrijetlo povezuje ih s lukom Ostije, pa nije nemoguće da su oblikom bile prepoznatljive te bi mogle ukazati na još jednu moguću interpretaciju naših amforeta, doduše ponovno povezanu s putovanjima i mobilnošću, dok bi se, na temelju kampanskih primjera, mogle dovesti u vezu i s posudom za lokalnu komercijalizaciju manjih količina namirnica. Uz navedene primjere sve se više oblika

only a part of the products, optimizing the production in that way. Furthermore, alongside manufacturing, selection of ceramic as a material indicates relatively low price of these generally simple vessels, but it could have increased with the possible contents, as opposed to similar objects made of more expensive materials, elaborately decorated that had higher market value, and they could be personalized in a way (see above and cf. Popkin 2018: 449–450).

Morphology and possibility of containing a certain product, possibly foodstuff, allows some other functions, in addition to the aforementioned. They could refer in particular to the vessel with the inscription *Salona* that was found in the port context. Basically similar vessels can often be found in the context of port deposits and shipwrecks of the southern coast of France and Italian Tyrrhenian coast (Marseilles, Arles, Narbonne, Pisa, etc.) (Dijaoui *et al.* 2014: 186), and what connects them with our vessels are morphology, dimensions and presence of two handles. On the basis of the research results based on previously mentioned port deposits, mentioned vessels, known as “Latium vessels” (considering their possible provenance) or “garum vessels” (considering their content), were interpreted as a part of a ship’s inventory, i.e. product that was kept in them in this case, *alec*, was intended for sailors (Dijaoui *et al.* 2014: 186–188; Botte 2018: 384). Similar function was assumed for morphologically different vessels, so-called *Pompeian urcei* that also contained fish products, and they were also found in port deposits (Botte 2009: 105–168; 2018: 383–384), characteristic for their almost advertising inscriptions, in particular the ones referring to the manufacturer and trader Aulus Umbricius Scaurus (Curtis 1986: 225–226; Castiglione Morelli 1996: Fig. 7/2; De Carolis 1996: Fig. 1/4), as well as the Shoene I vessels, in which remains of fish bones were found in *Pompeii*, and they are also present in household contexts, but also in store deposits, e.g. in *Herculaneum* (Castiglione Morelli 1996: Fig. 7/7; De Carolis 1996: Fig. 1/3). In accordance with the aforementioned, though “garum vessels” do not have toponomastic inscriptions, their limited provenance associates them with the port of Ostia, so it is not impossible they had recognizable form and could indicate another possible interpretation of our vessels, once

„kućanske“, odnosno „pročišćene“ keramike,¹⁹ a s obzirom na mjesto nalaza (npr. lučki depoziti), učestalost pojave izvan područja proizvodnje, metričke i morfološke značajke kao i epigrafske podatke, u posljednje vrijeme interpretira kao transportno posuđe koje svoje volumenski veće pandane nalazi, na primjer, u amforama ravnoga dna (posljednje u: Morillo *et al.* 2018 s ranijom literaturom). Tako jedan *titulus pictus* na amforeti pronađenoj u Marseju, na području antičke luke, sadrži ime grada *Massaliae* kao i područje provenijencije sadržaja – „iz zemlje Kavara (*Cavares*)“ (Liou & Morel 1977: 192; Piton & Djaoui 2009: 280), precizirajući i transportirani proizvod (ječam, iako su istovjetne posude korištene i za *liquamen*) u, vjerojatno, komercijalne svrhe.

BIOGRAFIJA PREDMETA I DRUŠTVENE PRAKSE

Ako je interpretacija ovdje analiziranih posuda kao suvenira ili makar kao posuda za tipične proizvode s pojedine antičke lokacije ispravna, tada je njihovo značenje zanimljivo u kontekstu antičke mobilnosti i putovanja te uz njih tipične prakse. Često je isticano kako u antičkom, ali i ranijim razdobljima putovati nije bilo neobično, strano ili rezervirano samo za određene pojedince ili grupe, a raširenost pojave svakako je znatno narasla tijekom rimskoga razdoblja (Laurence 2001). Jednako tako praksa kupnje predmeta koji će na ta putovanja asocirati bila je, prema većini autora, jednako rasprostranjena, iako je u izvorima izuzetno slabo zastupljena, a jednako tako bilo je moguće kupiti i tipične lokalne proizvode (Casson 1974: 33–34, 286, 289–290; i gore navedena literatura). Jesu li ovdje analizirane posude bile namijenjene upravo funkciji mementa s putovanja ili pak, kako je predloženo, određenomu društvenom krugu, teško je

¹⁹ Ovdje se termini koriste s obzirom na uobičajenu funkciju posuda kao što su lonci, vrčevi, boce (u kućanstvu u širem smislu) i fakturalne karakteristike koje ih odvajaju od „grube“ keramike obično namijenjene kuhanju. Time odgovaraju nazivima tal. *ceramica comune*, fr. *ceramique commune*, engl. *common ware*. Valja, međutim, spomenuti i pojedine posude „grube“ keramike za koje se smatra da su korištene za prenošenje određenih namirnica (usp. Gabucci 2017: § 10.1.5.1; Faleschini 2018: 238 s ranijom literaturom).

again related to traveling and mobility, while the Campanian examples indicate that they could be associated with ware for local commercialization of smaller amounts of foodstuffs. In addition to the mentioned examples, there is a growing number of “household” or common ware forms¹⁹ that are interpreted as transport vessels considering their findspots (e.g. port deposits), their number outside the production area, metric and morphological characteristics as well as epigraphic information. Counterparts for these vessels in terms of capacity can be found, for instance, in flat based amphorae (most recently in: Morillo *et al.* 2018, with earlier literature). In that way *titulus pictus* on a table amphorae found in Marseille, in the area of the ancient port, contains the name of the city of *Massalia* as well as a region of provenance of the content – “from the land of *Cavares*” (Liou & Morel 1977: 192; Piton & Djaoui 2009: 280), specifying the transported product (barley, though identical vessels were used also for *liquamen*) probably for commercial purposes.

BIOGRAPHY OF OBJECTS AND SOCIAL PRACTICE

If the interpretation of the analyzed objects as souvenirs or at least vessels for typical products from certain ancient locations is correct, then their significance is interesting in the context of ancient mobility, traveling and related practices. It has often been emphasized that traveling in antiquity and even earlier was not uncommon, strange or reserved only for certain individuals or groups, and it definitely became more popular during the Roman period (Laurence 2001). In the same way practice of buying objects that might evoke memories of the visited places was equally widespread, according to most authors, although it is exceptionally poorly

¹⁹ Terms used here are given with regard to usual function of vessels such as pots, jugs, bottles (in household in broader sense) and with fabric characteristics that distinguish it from “coarse” pottery usually intended for cooking. In that way they correspond to terms *ceramica comune* in Italian and *ceramique commune* in French. We should also mention certain coarse ware vessels that were probably used for transporting certain foodstuffs (cf. Gabucci 2017: § 10.1.5.1; Faleschini 2018: 238 with earlier literature).

reći, no vjerojatnije je da su zapravo imale višestruku namjenu koja je ovisila o kupcu.

Dodatna je zanimljivost sam natpis, a posebno u slučaju onoga *Felix Arba*, s epitetom koji, iako je često naglašavan i preuziman (a nerijetko i šire interpretiran) i u stručnoj i u popularnoj literaturi, inače nije poznat iz drugih izvora (Nedved 1990: 7–8; Starac 2000: 82–83 s ranijom literaturom).²⁰ Nameće se stoga pitanje je li *Arba* epitet *felix* nosila i službeno, kao što je bio slučaj s nizom rimskih kolonija kojima je on dodijeljen i pridodan u službenome imenovanju (npr. na istočnome Jadranu *Salona*, ali i šire Pesaro, *Lucus Ferroniae* i dr., pa i sam Rim; v.: Starac, A. 2000: 82; Jeličić Radonić 2014; Folcando 1996: 88) ili je on korišten propagandno (kao npr. u brojnim kasnoantičkim emisijama pojedinih gradova – *Ravenna felix* ili *Karthago felix*). Također, javlja se i problem datacije natpisa, koji je mahom povezivan uz onu same posude (v. gore), a koju je za sada nemoguće preciznije definirati. Međutim, iako interpretacijski dvojben, natpis bi mogao dodatno ojačati interpretaciju u smislu suvenira s marketinškom porukom koja u ovom slučaju ističe bogatstvo i blagostanje *Arbe*, pa time moguće dodatno naglašava proizvod/namirnicu, a inače se usko povezuje s antičkim lučkim gradovima. U potonjem se kontekstu može interpretirati i natpis *SALONA*.²¹ Nadalje, ako prihvatimo interpretaciju suvenira, tada natpisi sudjeluju u isticanju i osiguravanju prepoznatljivosti podrijetla predmeta i govore u prilog intencionalnoj proizvodnji, što bi predmete svrstalo u skupinu planski proizvedenih, tržišnih suvenira, koja se u literaturi suprotstavlja grupi „slučajnih“ suvenira, odnosno predmeta čija osnovna namjena nije putni memento, već im sam

represented in the sources, and it was also possible to buy typical local products (Casson 1974: 33–34, 286, 289–290; and literature cited above). It is difficult to say if the vessels analyzed in this paper were a sort of memento from a journey, or, as suggested, intended for a certain social circle, but it is more likely that they had multiple function that depended on the buyer.

The inscription is an additional curiosity, in particular in the case of *Felix Arba*, with an epithet that, although unknown from other sources, in professional and popular literature (Nedved 1990: 7–8; Starac 2000: 82–83 with earlier literature) has been frequently emphasized and used (and often interpreted more broadly).²⁰ The question is if *Arba* officially had the epithet *felix* as was the case with a number of Roman colonies that were given this attribute in official nomenclature (e.g. in the eastern Adriatic *Salona*, but also elsewhere Pesaro, *Lucus Ferroniae* etc., even Rome itself, see: Starac, A. 2000: 82; Jeličić Radonić 2014; Folcando 1996: 88) or it was used as propaganda (e.g. in many late antique issues of certain cities - *Ravenna felix* or *Karthago felix*). Another problem is dating of the inscription that was usually associated with the dating of the vessel (see above) that cannot be defined more precisely for the time being. However, though interpretation might be dubious, the inscription could reinforce the souvenir interpretation with marketing message that in this case emphasizes richness and welfare of *Arba*, typical also of other ancient port cities, possibly additionally stressing the product/foodstuff. The inscription *SALONA*²¹ can be interpreted in this context as well. If we accept the souvenir interpretation,

²⁰ S otoka Raba nisu poznati natpisi koji izrijekom spominju ime otoka ili grada, pa su jedini epigrafski izvor onaj iz Komina kod Pljevalja koji spominje općinskoga kuratora *Arbae* – M. Ulpija Gelijana (*Marcus Ulpius Gellianus*) i iz Zadra onaj M. Trebija Prokula (*M. Trebius Proculus*), duovira i edila *Arbae* (Starac 2000: 82, 222–223 s ranijom literaturom); toponim se javlja u antičkim izvorima (Starac 2000: 82–83, kao *Arva*), a u aktima salonitanskih crkvenih sabora spominje se *episcopus ecclesiae Arbensis* (Dodig & Škegro 2008: 17).

²¹ Zanimljivo je u okviru diskusije osvrnuti se i na to da je u slučaju potonje posude imenovanje kolonije Salone svedeno na minimum, odnosno bez ikakva dodatnog (službenog) epiteta, što bi moglo ojačati pretpostavku da je i u slučaju posude *Felix Arba* riječ o privatnoj, proizvoljnoj inicijativi.

²⁰ There are no inscriptions from the island that explicitly mention the name of the island or the city, so the only epigraphic sources are the ones from Komini near Pljevlja mentioning the municipal curator of *Arba* M. Ulpius Gellianus and the one from Zadar, of M. Trebius Proculus, duumvir and aedile of *Arba* (Starac 2000: 82, 222–223 with earlier literature); the toponym appears in ancient sources (Starac 2000: 82–83, as *Arva*), and *episcopus ecclesiae Arbensis* is mentioned in the acts of the Salonitan synods (Dodig & Škegro 2008: 17).

²¹ It is interesting, in context of the discussion, to notice that naming of *Salona* was utterly reduced in case of the latter vessel, without any additional (official) epithet, which might support the thesis that the *Felix Arba* vessel is related to a private, voluntary initiative.

putnik dodjeljuje takvo značenje (Hughes 2017: 195–196; Stoner 2019: 98). Planska proizvodnja, često po narudžbi i s izrazitim autoreprezentacijskim konotacijama, karakteristična je za metalno posuđe koje zbog skupocjenosti materijala, ali i kompleksnije tehnologije izrade pogoduje ciljanom prenošenju društvenih poruka (usp. Carile 2011: 31–33), no upravo nam ono ukazuje da je posuđe, pa tako i keramičko, osim funkcionalne moglo imalo i semantičku komponentu dobivenu kroz prikaze i/ili natpise.

Time posude s natpisima koje su obrađene u ovome radu omogućavaju rekonstrukciju ne samo proizvodnoga i tržišnoga ciklusa ovih predmeta već i njihove šire biografije (usp. Gosden & Marshall 1999), kao i određene kulturne prakse. Naime, ove posude/proizvodi nadilaze svoju temeljnu funkciju recipijenta (za moguće namirnice/proizvode) i, već samim natpisima, dobivaju nova značenja koje im pridaju proizvođač, a potom i kupac/putnik, od trenutka proizvodnje, preko akvizicije pa sve do onoga njihova raznovrsnog korištenja na završnoj destinaciji, i koji stoga ovise i o kontekstu u kojemu se odvija interakcija, a koji uključuje i onaj funerarani, prateći i obilježavajući tranziciju vlasnika kao njemu značajan predmet (Stoner 2019: 105; usp. za votivne situacije Hughes 2017: 198–199). Ako se pak priklonimo interpretaciji ovih posuda kao proizvodima namijenjenima određenoj populaciji ili komercijalizaciji određenih lokalnih proizvoda, oni nam sugeriraju sasvim novu dimenziju antičke trgovine, onu lokalno-regionalnu, malih razmjera i vrlo raznoliku u smislu uključenih dobara (usp. Morillo *et al.* 2018). Govore nam i ponešto novo o keramičarskoj proizvodnji i zahtjevima kojima je morala odgovoriti, a moguće da nam olakšavaju i interpretaciju često tipološki vrlo kompleksnih lokalnih proizvodnji (npr. crikveničke, s više od 100 tipova kućanske keramike, Ožanić Roguljić 2012).

Zaključno, iz obrađenih posuda, kako god ih odlučili interpretirati (a jedna opcija ne mora nužno posve isključivati drugu, usp. Stoner 2019: 105), možemo iščitati određenu (iako po svoj prilici neslužbenu, „civilnu“) „autoreprezentaciju“ antičkih lokaliteta, ciljanu tržišnu proizvodnju, mobilnost i različite oblike korištenja/funkcije ovih po svemu vrlo običnih i uobičajenih predmeta. Osim toga, svojom trenutačnom „biografskom“ funkcijom arheoloških predmeta, oni nam dakako govore i o

then the inscriptions contribute to prominence and recognizability of the object provenance and support intentional production, which would classify the vessels to the group of market souvenirs resulting from planned production that the literature opposes to the group of “accidental” souvenirs, i.e. objects whose main purpose was not to be a traveling memento, but travellers ascribed them such meaning (Hughes 2017: 195–196; Stoner 2019: 98). Planned production, often commissioned and with distinct self-representational connotations is characteristic of metal vessels, that are suitable for conveying social messages due to precious material and more complex technology of working (cf. Carile 2011: 31–33), but exactly these items suggest that vessels, including the ceramic ones, might have had not only functional but also semantical component acquired through depictions and/or inscriptions.

In that way vessels with inscriptions studied in this paper enable reconstruction of not only productive and market cycle of these objects, but also of their broader biography (cf. Gosden & Marshall 1999), as well as certain cultural practice. Namely these vessels/products surpass their basic function of receptacles (for possible foodstuffs/products), and with inscriptions they acquire new meanings ascribed by the producer, and then also the buyer/traveler, from the moment of manufacture, over acquisition, to their versatile usage in the final destination, which are therefore also dependent on the context of the interaction, including the funerary context, when the object accompanies its owner and marks the transition of the owner as his/her valuable asset (Stoner 2019: 105; cf. for votive situations Hughes 2017: 198–199). If we are inclined to accept interpretation of these vessels as products intended for a certain population or commercialization of specific local products, they suggest quite new dimension of ancient trade, the local/regional one, on a small scale and very diverse in terms of goods included (cf. Morillo *et al.* 2018). They also say something about pottery production and demands that had to be met, and possibly they facilitate interpretation of often very complex local productions (such as the one in Crikvenica, with over 100 types of household pottery, Ožanić Roguljić 2012).

Finally, from the analyzed vessels, regardless of our interpretation (and one option does not necessarily exclude the other, cf. Stoner 2019: 105), we

keramičarskoj proizvodnji, trgovini, uvjetno o „industriji suvenira“, a posebno o antičkoj pismenosti s aspekta svakodnevnih uporabnih predmeta – jer bez mogućnosti iščitavanja očito ciljano nanesenih natpisa ovi bi predmeti ostali tek još jedna amforeta na tržnici nekoga od priobalnih gradova antičke Dalmacije.

can read certain (though most likely unofficial, “civil”) “self-representation” of ancient sites, targeted market production, mobility and various forms of use/function of these most ordinary and common objects. Furthermore, through their current “biographic” function of archaeological objects, they offer information on pottery production, trade, tentatively on “souvenir industry”, and in particular on ancient literacy from the aspect of everyday utilitarian objects – because without the possibility of interpretation of obviously intentionally applied inscriptions these objects would be only another table amphorae in the market of some coastal city in ancient Dalmatia.




Tabla 1. 1: Posuda iz Janica s natpisom SAL/ONA; 2: posuda s natpisom FELIX/ARBA (crteži: 1: Z. Bakić, 2: A. Konestra).

Plate 1. 1: Vessel from Janice with the SAL/ONA inscription 2: Vessel with the FELIX/ARBA inscription; (drawings: Z. Bakić and A. Konestra respectively).

Bibliografija / Bibliography

- Anderson 2007 – William Anderson, Menas flasks in the West: pilgrimage and trade at the end of antiquity, *Ancient West and East* 6, 221–243.
- Atlante I 1981 – *Atlante delle forme ceramiche I. Ceramica fine romana nel bacino Mediterraneo (medio e tardo Impero)*, ed. A. Carandini, Roma: Istituto dell'Enciclopedia Italiana, 1981.
- Bangert 2010 – Susanne Bangert, The archaeology of pilgrimage: Abu Mina and beyond, *Late Antique Archaeology*, 6, Leiden, 2010, 291–327.
- Bekić & Pešić 2014 – Luka Bekić & Mladen Pešić, Pokazatelji pomorske trgovine na istočnoj obali Jadrana na osnovu nalaza amfora iz dvije rimske luke / Evidence of maritime trade on the eastern Adriatic coast based on underwater finds from two roman ports in Croatia, *Histria archaeologica*, 45, Pula, 2014, 95–112.
- Biondani 2014 – Federico Biondani, Ceramica di uso comune, u / in: *Scavi di Suasa I. I reperti ceramici e vitrei dalla domus dei Coiedii*, ed. L. Mazzeo Saracino, Bologna, 2014, 391–476.
- Boetto et al. 2012 – Giulia Boetto, Irena Radić Rossi, Sabrina Marlier, Zdenko Brusić, Céline Huguet, Claudio Capelli, Frédéric Guibal, Sandra Greck, Carine Cenzone-Salvayre, Valérie Andrieu-Ponel & Vincent Dumas, L'épave de Pakoštane, Croatie (fin IVe - début Ve siècle apr. J.-C.). Résultats d'un projet de recherche franco-croate, *Archaeonautica*, 17, Aix-en-Provence, 2012, 105–151.
- Botte 2009 – Emanuelle Botte, *Salaisons et sauces de poissons en Italie du sud et en Sicile durant l'Antiquité*, coll. Centre Jean Bérard, 31, Archéologie de l'artisanat antique, 1, Naples: Centre Jean Bérard, 2009.
- Botte 2018 – Emanuelle Botte, Fish Processing in Italy and Sicily During Antiquity, *Journal of Maritime Archaeology*, 13, 2018, 377–387.
- Brando 2008 – Massimo Brando, Samia Vasa, i Vasi „di Samo”, u / in: *Horti et sordes. Uno scavo alle falde del Gianicolo*, ed. F. Filippi, Roma: Edizioni Quasar, 2008, 127–174.
- Brecciaroli Taborelli 2000 – Luisa Brecciaroli Taborelli, Vasetti in ceramica invetriata, u / in: *Alle origini di Biella. La necropoli romana*, ed. L. Brecciaroli Taborelli, Biella: Umberto Allemandi & C., 2000, 135–142.
- Brusić 1999 – Zdenko Brusić, *Hellenistic and Roman Relief Pottery in Liburnia (North-East Adriatic, Croatia)*, BAR International Series 817, Oxford: BAR, 1999.
- Buonopane 2009 – Alfredo Buonopane, *Manuale di epigrafia latina*, Roma: Carocci, 2009.
- Castiglione Morelli 1996 – Vincenzina Castiglione Morelli, La ceramica comune nell'instrumentum domesticum della casa di C. Giulio Polibio a Pompei, u / in: *Les céramiques communes de Campanie et de Narbonnaise (Ie s. av. J.-C. - IIe s. ap. J.-C.)*. La vaisselle de cuisine et de table, Actes des Journées d'étude organisées par le Centre Jean Bérard et la Soprintendenza Archeologica per le Province di Napoli e Caserta. Naples, 27-28 mai 1994, ed. Michel Bats, Collection du Centre Jean Bérard, 14, Naples: Centre Jean Bérard, 1996, 105–112.
- Carile 2011 – Maria Cristina Carile, Memories of Buildings? Messages in Late Antique Architectural Representations, u / in: *Images of the Byzantine World: Visions, Messages, and Meanings: Studies Presented to Leslie Brubaker*, ed. A. Lymberopoulou, Ashgate; Farnham - Burlington, 2011, 15–33.
- Casson 1974 – Lionel Casson, *Travel in the Ancient World*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974.
- CIL III – *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, vol. III: Inscriptiones Asiae, provinciarum Europae Graecarum, Illyrici Latinae, eds. Th. Mommsen, O. Hirschfeld & A. Domaszewski, Berlin, 1873-1902.
- Cipriano & De Fabrizio 1996 – Maria Teresa Cipriano & Silvia De Fabrizio, Benevento. Il quartiere ceramico di Cellarulo: prime osservazioni sulla tipologia ceramica, u / in: *Les céramiques communes de Campanie et de Narbonnaise (Ie s. av. J.-C. - IIe s. ap. J.-C.)*. La vaisselle de cuisine et de table, Actes des Journées d'étude organisées par le Centre Jean Bérard et la Soprintendenza Archeologica per le Province di Napoli e Caserta. Naples, 27-28 mai 1994, ed. Michel Bats, Collection du Centre Jean Bérard, 14, Naples: Centre Jean Bérard, 1996, 201–223.
- Cooley 2012 – Alison E. Cooley, *The Cambridge Manual to Latin Epigraphy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Curtis 1986 – Robert I. Curtis, Product identification and advertising on Roman commercial amphorae, *Ancient society*, 15/17, Leuven, 1984-1986 (1986), 209–228.
- De Carolis 1996 – Ernesto De Carolis, Ceramica comune da mensa e da dispensa di Ercolano, u / in: *Les céramiques communes de Campanie et de Narbonnaise (Ie s. av. J.-C. - IIe s. ap. J.-C.)*. La vaisselle de cuisine et de table, Actes des Journées d'étude organisées par le Centre Jean Bérard et la Soprintendenza Archeologica per le Province di Napoli e Caserta. Naples, 27-28 mai 1994, ed. Michel Bats, Collection du Centre Jean Bérard, 14, Naples: Centre Jean Bérard, 1996, 121–128.

- Dijaoui, Piquès & Botte 2014 – David Djaoui, Gaël Piquès & Emmanuel Botte, Nouvelles données sur les pots dits « à garum » du Latium, d'après les découvertes subaquatiques du Rhône (Arles), u / in: *FISH & SHIPS. Production and commerce of salsamenta during Antiquity / Production et commerce des salsamenta durant l'Antiquité. Actes de l'atelier doctoral, Rome 18-22 juin 2012*, eds. E. Botte & V. Leitch, Bibliothèque d'Archéologie Méditerranéenne et Africaine 17, Aix-en-Provence, 2014, 175–197.
- Dodig & Škegro 2008 – Radoslav Dodig & Ante Škegro, Akti crkvenih sabora održanih 530. i 533. u Saloni, *Povijesni prilozi*, 35, Zagreb, 2008, 9–23.
- Dubolnić Glavan & Maršić 2019 – Martina Dubolnić Glavan & Dražen Maršić, Monumentalna nadgrobna arhitektura i reljefna skulptura rimske Enone (Aenona), *Radovi Zavoda za povijesne znanosti HAZU u Zadru*, 61, Zadar, 2019, 5–46.
- Eterović Borzić & Borzić u tisku / forthcoming – Anamarija Eterović Borzić & Igor Borzić, Terakotni portreti Trajana i Marcijane iz Aserije, *Asseria, u tisku / forthcoming*.
- Faleschini 2018 – Mirta Faleschini, L'insediamento romano di Moggio Udinese nella valle del Fella (Friuli Venezia-Giulia) / Rimska naselbina Mužac v dolini Bele v Furlaniji, *Arheološki vestnik*, 69, Ljubljana, 2018, 227–276.
- Folcando 1996 – Elisabetta Folcando, Un rilettura dell'elenco di colonie pliniano, u / in: *Epigrafia e territorio, politica e società: temi di antichità romane*, Vol. 4, ed. M. Pani, Bari: Edipuglia, 1996, 75–111.
- Fülle 1997 – Gunnar Fülle, The Internal Organization of the Arretine Terra Sigillata Industry: Problems of Evidence and Interpretation, *The Journal of Roman Studies*, 87, London, 1997, 111–155.
- Gabucci 2017 – Ada Gabucci, *Attraverso le Alpi e lungo il Po : importazione e distribuzione di sigillate galliche nella Cisalpina: Con un contributo di Paola Bordigone [online]*. Roma: Publications de l'École française de Rome, 2017. <<http://books.openedition.org/efr/3369>>. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/books.efr.3369>. (pregledano / accessed 08/11/2020)
- Gasparini 2008 – Lidio Gasparini, El tesoro de Vicarello. Un gran descubrimiento arqueológico del siglo XIX, *Gerión*, 26-2, Madrid, 2008, 91–102.
- Girardi 2016 – Cristina Girardi, Le raffigurazioni di divinità con didascalia su terra sigillata. Alcune considerazioni, u / in: *Le iscrizioni con funzione didascalico-espliativa. Committente, destinatario, contenuto e descrizione dell'oggetto nell'instrumentum inscriptum*. Atti del VI incontro INSTRUMENTA INSCRIPTA (Aquileia 26-28 marzo 2015), eds. M. Buora & S. Magnani, AAAd LXXXIII, Trieste, 2016, 439–448.
- Gosden & Marshall 1999 – Chris Gosden & Yvonne Marshall, The Cultural Biography of Objects, *World Archaeology*, 31/2, Abingdon, 1999, 169–178.
- Gregl & Lazar 2008 – Zoran Gregl & Irena Lazar, *Bakar. Staklo iz rimske nekropole / The glass from the Roman cemetery*, Katalozi i monografije Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu / Musei archaeologici zagrabienensis catalogi et monographiae, 5, Zagreb: Arheološki muzej, 2008.
- Hughes 2017 – Jessica Hughes, 'Souvenirs of the Self': Personal Belongings as Votive Offerings in Ancient Religion, *Religion in the Roman Empire*, 3/2, Tübingen, 2017, 181–201.
- Isings 1957 – Clasina Isings, *Roman glass from dated finds*, Archaeologica Traiectina, 2, Groningen: J.B. Wolters, 1957.
- Ivčević 2020 – Sanja Ivčević, Hodočasnička ampula sv. Mene iz Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu, u / in: *I. skup hrvatske ranokršćanske arheologije (HRRANA). Zbornik radova*, eds. M. Sanader, D. Tončinić, I. Kaić & V. Matijević, Zagreb: FF Press, 2020, 145–168.
- Jeličić Radonić 2014 – Jasna Jeličić Radonić, The Relief of the Salona Tyche, u / in: *Akti XII. međunarodnog kolokvija o rimskoj provincijalnoj umjetnosti. Datiranje kamenih spomenika i kriteriji za određivanje kronologije*, ed. I. Koncani Uhač, Pula: Arheološki muzej Istre, 2014, 59–63.
- Konestra 2014 – Ana Konestra, La ceramica dai corredi funerari della necropoli Kurilovo conservata nella collezione archeologica del JANAF, u / in: *Zbornik II. međunarodnog arheološkog kolokvija, Crikvenica, 28.-29. listopada 2011. Rimske keramičarske i staklarske radionice. Proizvodnja i trgovina na jadranskom prostoru. Tema kolokvija: Eksperimentalna arheologija*, eds. G. Lipovac Vrkljan, B. Šiljeg, I. Ožanić Roguljić & A. Konestra, Crikvenica: Muzej Grada Crikvenice, Institut za arheologiju, 2014, 259–277.
- Konestra 2016 – Ana Konestra, *Italiska terra sigillata i keramika tankih stijenki na području sjeverne Liburnije: tipologija, kronologija, distribucija, doktorska disertacija (rukopis) / Ph.D. diss. (manuscript)*, Sveučilište u Zadru / University of Zadar, Zadar, 2016.
- Konestra 2019 – Ana Konestra, Antičko i kasnoantičko keramičko posuđe, u / in: *Salona iza Porta Andetria. Arheološka istraživanja u ulici Stjepana Radića u Solinu*, ed. H. Anić, Split: Arheološki muzej u Splitu, 2019, 41–62.

- Künzel & Koepfel 2002 – Ernst Künzel & Gerhard Koepfel, *Souvenirs und Devotionalien*, Mainz am Rhine: Verlag Philip von Zabern.
- Labate 2016 – Donato Labate, MVTINA FECIT. Dalle herzblattlampen alle firmalampen: nuovi dati sulla produzione di lucerne a matrice dal territorio di Modena, u / in: *Rimske i kasnoantičke svjetiljke. Proizvodnja, distribucije, kontakti na Mediteranu / Roman and Late Roman Lamps. Production, distribution, contacts in the Mediterranean*, eds. G. Lipovac Vrkljan, I. Ožanić Roguljić & M. Ugarković, e-ZIA 1, Zagreb: Institut za arheologiju, 2016, 18–37.
- Lambert & Pedemonte-Demeglio 1993 – Chiara Lambert & Paola Pedemonte-Demeglio, Ampolle devozionali ed itinerari di pellegrinaggio tra IV e VII secolo, *Antiquité Tardive*, 2, Turnhout, 1994, 205–231.
- Lazar 2009 – Irena Lazar, La bottiglia di Poetovio con rappresentazione del faro di Alessandria. Un raffinato oggetto con decorazione incisa proveniente dall’Egitto, *Quaderni Friulani di Archeologia*, XIX, Udine, 2009, 147–158.
- Laurence 2001 – Ray Laurence, Afterword: Travel and Empire, u / in: *Travel and Geography in the Roman Empire*, eds. C. Adams & R. Laurence, Routledge: London – New York, 167–176.
- Lightfoot 2014 – Christopher S. Lightfoot, Ennion and the History of Ancient Glass, u / in: *Ennion: Master of Roman Glass*, ed. C. S. Lightfoot, New York: The Metropolitan Museum, 2014, 15–48.
- Lipovac Vrkljan 2017 – Goranka Lipovac Vrkljan, Lokalna proizvodnja amfora u Crikvenici / Local amphorae production in Crikvenica, u / in: *Zbornik III. međunarodnog arheološkog kolokvija „Rimske keramičarske i staklarske radionice. Proizvodnja i trgovina na jadranskom prostoru”*, Crikvenica 4.-5. studenog 2014., eds. G. Lipovac Vrkljan, B. Šiljeg, I. Ožanić Roguljić & A. Konestra, Crikvenica: Muzej Grada Crikvenice, Institut za arheologiju, ZIA 12, 2014, 185–195.
- Lipovac Vrkljan & Konestra 2018 – Goranka Lipovac Vrkljan & Ana Konestra, Approaching the Roman economy of the province of Dalmatia through pottery production – the Liburnia case study, u / in: *Pottery Production, Landscape and Economy of Roman Dalmatia. Interdisciplinary approaches*, eds. G. Lipovac Vrkljan & A. Konestra, Archaeopress Roman Archaeology 47, Oxford: Archaeopress, 2018, 14–36.
- Lipovac Vrkljan & Šiljeg 2011 – Goranka Lipovac Vrkljan & Bartul Šiljeg, Prilog antičkoj topografiji otoka Raba – rimska keramičarska peć na Loparu, *Senjski zbornik*, 39, Senj, 2012, 5–33.
- Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra & Ugarković 2018 – Goranka Lipovac Vrkljan, Ana Konestra & Marina Ugarković, Eastern Adriatic Hellenistic and Roman pottery and ceramics production sites, u / in: *Pottery Production, Landscape and Economy of Roman Dalmatia. Interdisciplinary approaches*, eds. G. Lipovac Vrkljan & A. Konestra, Archaeopress Roman Archaeology 47, Oxford: Archaeopress, 2018, 1–6.
- Liou & Morel 1977 – Bernard Liou & Myriam Morel, L’orge des Cavares : une amphorette à inscription peinte trouvée dans le port antique de Marseille, *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise*, 10, Montpellier, 1977, 189–197.
- Ljubić 1882 – Šime Ljubić, Arheološko izkapanje u Bakru (I, II, III), *Vjesnik arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, 4, Zagreb, 1882, 1–9, 48–54, 66–77.
- Makjanić 1985 – Rajka Makjanić, Terra sigillata iz rimskih nekropola u Osoru i Bakru, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu*, 2, Zagreb, 1985, 39–50.
- Manacorda 1993 – Daniele Manacorda, Appunti sulla bollatura in età romana, u / in: *The inscribed economy. Production and distribution in the light of instrumentum domesticum. The proceedings of a conference held at The American Academy in Rome on 10-11 January, 1992*, ed. W. V. Harris, *Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement*, 6, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1993, 37–54.
- Marchesini 2016 – Simona Marchesini, Il rapporto tra committente e destinatario nell’Instrumentum Inscriptum: la prospettiva del linguista, u / in: *Le iscrizioni con funzione didascalico-esplicativa. Committente, destinatario, contenuto e descrizione dell’oggetto nell’instrumentum inscriptum*. Atti del VI incontro INSTRUMENTA INSCRIPTA (Aquileia 26-28 marzo 2015), eds. M. Buora & S. Magnani, AAAd LXXXIII, Trieste, 2016, 57–72.
- Matijašić 2002 – Robert Matijašić, *Uvod u antičku epigrafiju*, Knjižnica Tabula, sv. 3, Pula: Filozofski fakultet u Puli, 2002.
- Mercando 1974 – Liliana Mercando, La necropoli romana di Portorecanati, *Notizie degli Scavi di Antichità*, s. 8, XXVIII, Roma, 1974, 142–445.
- Mian 2017 – Giulia Mian, Ceramica comune acroma, u / in: *Materiali per Aquileia. Lo scavo di Canale Anfora*, Scavi di Aquileia IV, eds. P. Maggi, F. Maselli Scotti, S. Pesavento Mattioli & E. Zulini, Trieste: Editreg, 2017, 163–205.
- Mongardi 2018 – Manuela Mongardi, *Firmissima et splendidissima populi romani colonia. L’epigrafia anforica di Mutina e del suo territorio*, Collezioni Instrumenta 62, Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 2018.

- Morais *et al.* 2005 – Rui Morais, Àngel Morillo Cerdán, David Djaoui & Pedro Pereira, Novos paradigmas de investigação: ânforas de fundo plano e cerâmicas comuns utilizadas no transporte de produtos, *Ex officina Hispana - Cuadernos de la SECAH*, 2/14, Madrid, 2005, 45–58.
- Morais, Oliveira & Morillo Cerdán 2018 – Rui Morais, César Oliveira & Àngel Morillo Cerdán, New paradigms for the Roman Economy. Flat-based Amphorae and Common Ware as Further Load Units, u / in: *Limes XXIII. Proceedings of the 23rd international Congress of Roman Frontier Studies*, eds. C. S. Sommer & S. Matešić, Mainz: Nünnerich-Asmus Verlag, 2018, 1099–1102.
- Mudd 2014 – Shaun Anthony Mudd, *Vinum vires*: Trier Black-Slipped ware in constructive drinking in Roman Britain, u / in: *The Edges of the Roman World*, eds. M. A. Janković, V. D. Mihajlović & S. Babić, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014, 86–104.
- Nedved 1990 – Branka Nedved, *Felix Arba. Pregled povijesti i spomenika otoka Raba u rano rimsko doba*, Rab, 1990.
- Ostrow 1979 – Steven E. Ostrow, The topography of Puteoli and Baiae on the eight glass flasks, *Puteoli, Studi di Storia Antica*, 3, Pozzuoli, 1979, 77–140.
- Ožanić Roguljić 2012 – Ivana Ožanić Roguljić, Pottery from the workshop of Sextus Metilius Maximus (Crikvenica-Igralište/Ad Turres, Northern Dalmatia), *Rei Cretariae Romanae Favtorvm acta*, 42, Bonn, 2012, 125–132.
- Ožanić Roguljić 2019 – Ivana Ožanić Roguljić, Thin walled pottery from Žuta Lokva, u / in: *Chronologie und vergleichende Chronologien zum Ausgang der Römischen Republik und zur Frühen Kaiserzeit. Tagungsband des internationalen Kolloquiums anlässlich 70 Jahre Archäologische Ausgrabungen auf dem Magdalensberg. Zugleich Festgabe für Eleni Schindler Kaudelka*, eds. H. Dolenz & K. Strobel, Kärntner Museumsschriften 87, Klagenfurt, 2019, 427–435.
- Painter 1975 – Kenneth S. Painter, Roman flasks with scenes of Baiae and Puteoli, *Journal of Glass Studies*, 17, Corning, 1975, 54–67.
- Parica 2018 – Mate Parica, Antička luka na položaju Janice, u / in: *Pakoštane. Veli Školj. Kasnoantički brodolom u geološko-geografskom i kulturno-povijesnom kontekstu*, eds. I. Radić Rossi & G. Boetto, Zadar: University of Zadar, *Ars Nautica*, 2018, 211–228.
- Parica & Ilkić 2017 – Mate Parica & Mato Ilkić, Podmorski arheološki nalazi u okolici Ljupča, u / in: *Župa Ljubač - zrcalo povijesnih i geografskih mijena u sjeverozapadnom dijelu Ravnih kotara*, eds. J. Faričić & J. Lenkić, Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru, Ljubač: Župa sv. Martina, 2017, 98–111.
- Pesavento Mattioli 2000 – Stefania Pesavento Mattioli, Anfore: problemi e prospettive di ricerca, u / in: *Produzione ceramica in area padana tra il II secolo a.c. e il VII secolo d.c.: nuovi dati e prospettive di ricerca. Convegno internazionale di Desenzano del Garda, 8-10 aprile 1999*, eds. G. P. Brogiolo & G. Olcese, Mantova: SAP, 2000, 107–120.
- Picard 1959 – Charles Picard, Pouzsoles et le paysage portuaire, *Latomus*, 18, Bruxelles, 1959, 23–51.
- Piton & Djaoui 2009 – Jean Piton & David Djaoui, Les céramiques communes et culinaires, u / in: *César. Le Rhône pour mémoire. Vingt ans de fouilles dans le fleuve a Arles*, eds. L. Long & P. Picard, Arles: Actes sud, 278–299.
- Popkin 2018 – Maggie L. Popkin, Urban Images in Glass from the Late Roman Empire: The Souvenir Flasks of Puteoli and Baiae, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 122/3, Boston, 2018, 427–462.
- Pucci 1993 – Giuseppe Pucci, I bolli sulla terra sigillata: tra epigrafia e storica economica, u / in: *The inscribed economy. Production and distribution in the light of instrumentum domesticum. The proceedings of a conference held at The American Accademy in Rome on 10-11 January, 1992*, ed. W. V. Harris, *Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplement*, 6, Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, 1993, 73–80.
- Ragazzi & Frontori 2018 – Linda Ragazzi & Ilaria Frontori, Ceramica comune da mensa, da dispensa e di uso vario, u / in: *Amoenissimis... Aedificiis. Lo scavo di Piazza Marconi*, Vol. 2 – I materiali, eds. L. Arslan Pitcher, E.A. Arslan, P. Blockley & M. Volonté, Mantova: SAP, 2018, 29–88.
- Roffia 2002 – Elisabetta Roffia, Alcuni vetri incisi, u / in: *Nuove ricerche sul Capitolium di Brescia. Scavi, studi, restauri*, ed. F. Rossi, Milano: Edizioni ET, 2002, 413–434.
- Small 1994 – Jocelyn Penny Small, Scholars, Etruscans, and Attic painted vases, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 7, Ann Arbor, MI, 1994, 34–58.
- Starac 2000 – Alka Starac, *Rimsko vladanje u Istriji i Liburniji. Vol. II, Liburnija*, Katalozi i monografije 10/II, Pula: Arheološki muzej Istre, 2000.

Stoner 2019 – Jo Stoner, *The Cultural Lives of Domestic Objects in Late Antiquity*, Late Antique Archaeology Supplementary series vol. 4, Leiden / Boston: Brill, 2019.

Topić 2004 – Miroslava Topić, Stolno posude i glinene svjetiljke iz Augusteuma Narone, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, 95, Split, 2003, 183–344.

Walters 1974 – Vivienne J. Walters, *The Cult of Mithras in the Roman Provinces of Gaul*, Leiden: Brill, 1974.

Zaccaria 2017 – Claudio Zaccaria, *L'instrumentum inscriptum di Aquileia*, u / in: *Made in Roma and Aquileia. Marchi di produzione e di possesso nella società antica*, eds. L. Ungaro, M. Milella, S. Pastor & A. Giovannini, Roma: Gangemi, 2017, 147–150.