

Rapska osteoteka: novi pogled na sepulkralni spomenik Remije Maksime iz franjevačkog samostana u Kamporu na otoku Rabu

Konestra, Ana; Cambi, Nenad

Source / Izvornik: **Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku, 2020, 113, 351 - 375**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:291:812889>

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](#)



Ana Konestra, Nenad Cambi

Rapska osteoteka: novi pogled na sepulkralni spomenik Remije Maksime iz franjevačkog samostana u Kamporu na otoku Rabu

Osteotheca from Rab: new insights on the sepulchral monument of Remmia Maxima held in the Franciscan monastery at Kampor on the island of Rab

Ana Konestra
HR, 10000 Zagreb
Institut za arheologiju
Jurjevska ulica 15
ana.konestra@gmail.com

Ana Konestra
Croatia, 10000 Zagreb
Institute of Archaeology
Jurjevska ulica 15
ana.konestra@gmail.com

Nenad Cambi
HR, 10000 Zagreb
Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti
Zrinski trg 11
HR, 21000 Split
Književni krug Split
Ispod Ure 3
nenad.cambj@gmail.com

Nenad Cambi
Croatia, 10000 Zagreb
Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Zrinski trg 11
Croatia, 21000 Split
Književni krug Split
Ispod Ure 3
nenad.cambj@gmail.com

UDK: 726“653“(210.7Rab)(497.572Kamfor)
730:7.041.5]27.523.42
726.82(497.583Salona)“01“
726.82(497.585Sućurac)“01“

Izvorni znanstveni članak
Primljeno: 24. 4. 2020.
Prihvaćeno: 5. 10. 2020.

UDC: 726“653“(210.7Rab)(497.572Kamfor)
730:7.041.5]27.523.42
726.82(497.583Salona)“01“
726.82(497.585Sućurac)“01“

Original scientific paper
Received: 24 April 2020
Accepted: 5 October 2020

Sepulkralni spomenik s natpisom Remije Maksime (*Remmia Maxima*) uzidan u klasturu samostana sv. Bernardina Sijenskog u Kamporu na otoku Rabu poznat je od kraja 19. st. i objave u CIL-u (III 3125), no njegova tipologija dosad nije detaljnije analizirana. U radu se definira tipološka pripadnost spomenika, koji zbog svojih stilskih i oblikovnih značajki, a posebno dimenzija, odgovara osteotekama salonitanske produkcije, što zajedno sa sadržajem natpisa omogućuje njegovu precizniju dataciju. Nadalje, s obzirom na slabu zastupljenost, odnosno

The sepulchral monument with the inscription of *Remmia Maxima*, embedded in the cloister of the monastery of St. Bernardino of Siena in Kampor on the island of Rab, has been known since the end of the 19th century. It was published in the CIL (III 3125), but its typology has not been analysed in detail yet. This paper defines the typological affiliation of the monument, which corresponds to the osteothecae of Salonian production, on account of its stylistic and formal features, and especially its dimensions. This, together with the

nedovoljno poznavanje ovog tipa spomenika u provinciji Dalmaciji, rapska se osteoteka smješta u širu skupinu ovih i srodnih spomenika sa srednjodalmatinskog prostora. Analizom dostupnih podataka o samom spoliju te o drugim spomenicima s područja Kampora pokušava se rekonstruirati moguće područje njegova nalaza kao i modaliteti brojnih novih upotreba sve do uzidavanja na položaju gdje se danas nalazi.

Rapska osteoteka, kao novi tip sepulkralnog spomenika na otoku, ali i na širem području Kvarnera, obogaćuje dosadašnje spoznaje o antičkim grobnim spomenicima sjeverne Liburnije i njihovu porijeklu, ujedno upućujući na još jedno monumentalnije rješenje unutar rapskih (ruralnih?) nekropola.

Ključne riječi: *antički sepulkralni spomenik, osteoteka, otok Rab, salonitanska produkcija*

content of the inscription, facilitates its more precise dating. Furthermore, given the low abundance, and insufficient knowledge of this type of monument in the province of Dalmatia, the osteotheca from Rab is classified in a wider group of such and related monuments from the central Dalmatian area. The analysis of available information on the spolium itself and on other monuments from the area of Kampor is an attempt to reconstruct its possible find-spot as well as its numerous reuses, ultimately including embedment in its present location.

The osteotheca from Rab, as a new type of sepulchral monument on the island, as well as in the greater area of Kvarner, enhances previous knowledge about ancient funerary monuments of northern Liburnia and their origin, all the while pointing to another more monumental solution within the (rural?) necropolises of Rab.

Key words: *ancient sepulchral monument, osteotheca, island of Rab, Salonitan production*

Najraniji bibliografski podaci o antičkoj baštini otoka Raba vežu se, kao što je to često slučaj, uz natpisnu građu, odnosno kamene spomenike. Tako je i u slučaju Raba već u CIL-u (odnosno u izvorima koji su za njegovu izradu korišteni, npr. Farlati, Sabljari i dr.) zabilježen znatan broj epigrafskih spomenika, od kojih dobar dio pripada nadgrobnim, odnosno sepulkralnim spomenicima.¹ Potonja skupina, iako dijelom poznata iz raznih izvora,² sustavnije je obrađivana u novije vrijeme,³ dok su neki spomenici tek identificirani, a samo je jedan kasnoantički grob arheološki istražen.⁴ Navedenim je istraživanjima tako identificirano nekoliko tipova sepulkralnih spomenika, koji upućuju na raznolikost korištenih modela, te otok, barem za sada, ponešto izdvajaju iz njegova kvarnerskog okruženja.⁵ Riječ je o ugradbenim građevnim portretnim reljefima, skupini koja se svakako izdvaja svojom monumentalnošću, tzv. liburnskim cipusima, koji otok smještaju unutar kruga konzumenata ili čak proizvođača ovog tipično sjevernodalmatinskog spomenika⁶ te stela,⁷ ara i cipusa;⁸ u nešto kasnijem ritusu tome zasigurno možemo pridodati različite sarkofage, unutar kojih se izdvajaju oni antičkoga i oni kasnoantičkog salonitansko-bračkog tipa.⁹

Ovom pregledu grobnih spomenika valja svakako pribrojati i epitafe koji tek sugeriraju postojanje pripadnih spomenika,¹⁰ o čijoj se tipologiji međutim ne može spekulirati samo na

The earliest bibliographic information on the ancient heritage of the island of Rab is often associated with inscription material, i.e. stone monuments. Thus, in the case of Rab, a significant number of epigraphic monuments has already been recorded in the CIL (i.e. in the sources used for its preparation, e.g. Farlati, Sabljari, etc.), a good part of which belongs to funerary or sepulchral monuments.¹ The latter group, although partly known from various sources,² has been analysed more systematically in recent times,³ while some monuments have merely been identified, and only one late antique grave archaeologically researched.⁴ The researches identified several types of sepulchral monuments, which indicate the diversity of models used and, at least for the time being, distinguish the island from its Kvarnerian environment.⁵ These are embedded structural portrait reliefs, a group that certainly stands out for its monumentality, the so-called Liburnian cippi, which place the island within the circle of consumers or even producers of this typically north Dalmatian monument⁶ and stelae,⁷ aras and cippi;⁸ with respect to a somewhat later rite, we can certainly add various sarcophagi, of which the Attic and late antique Salonitan-Brač types are most prominent.⁹

1 Nedved 1990; Lazinica, Maršić 2017, str. 187.

2 Schleyer 1914; Brusić 1926.

3 Cambi 1987b, str. 175–176, sl. 1; Ivančević 1995; Glavičić 2003; Maršić 2009; 2012; Basić 2012; Jarak, Cambi 2016; Lazinica, Maršić 2017; Baraka Perica 2018, sve s ranijom literaturom.

4 Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra 2015, str. 129; Konestra *et al.* 2017.

5 Iako za Krk i cresko-lošinjsku skupinu zasad ne postoje sveobuhvatne studije antičkih i kasnoantičkih sepulkralnih spomenika, prema poznatim podacima slika je nešto manje raznorodna (za otok Krk vidi Kolega 1989; Fadić 1989; Rendić-Miočević, A. 2004; za Osor Cambi 1980; Šašel Kos 2017), a prema pojedinim spomenicima Rab se izdvaja i u odnosu na šire jadransko otočno okruženje (npr. Cambi 1987b, str. 176; Jarak, Cambi 2016, str. 308).

6 Lazinica, Maršić 2017, posebno str. 194–197, s ranijom literaturom.

7 Porijeklom problematičan fragment antičke stele, vidi Cambi 1987b, str. 179–180; nepublicirana stela sa Sv. Anastazija (Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra 2015, str. 129) te neobjavljena stela s epitafom iz grada Raba, obje u privatnom posjedu; možda spolij uzidan u gradu (Budak 2006, sl. 2).

8 CIL III 1021 (Nedved 1990, str. 23; Glavičić 2009, str. 58–59); Lazinica, Maršić 2017, str. 187. Jedan je cipus s likom tugujućeg Istočnjaka, koji se čuva kod benediktinki, u samostanu sv. Andrije, objavljen (Domijan 2007, str. 42), no moguće je da se uz njega čuva još jedan ulomak sa sličnim prikazom, ali možda drukčije tipologije spomenika (zahvaljujemo kolegici Nataliji Beg na informaciji i fotografiji), dok je još jedan cipus s analognim prikazom primijećen uzidan u sjeverni kut pročelja crkve sv. Katarine na Dorki tijekom njezine nedavne restauracije (na informaciji zahvaljujemo kolegici dr. sc. Saši Potočnjak, koja ga je primijetila).

9 Za literaturu vidi bilješku 3, a za nove nalaze sarkofaga unutar grada Jurković 2019, str. 116; niz ulomaka razasut je u okolici crkve Uznesenja Marijina (*ex katedrala*).

10 CIL III 3124, 10122 (13292), 10123.

1 Nedved 1990; Lazinica, Maršić 2017, p. 187.

2 Schleyer 1914; Brusić 1926.

3 Cambi 1987b, pp. 175–176, Fig. 1; Ivančević 1995; Glavičić 2003; Maršić 2009; 2012; Basić 2012; Jarak, Cambi 2016; Lazinica, Maršić 2017; Baraka Perica 2018, all with earlier literature.

4 Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra 2015, p. 129; Konestra *et al.* 2017.

5 Although there are currently no comprehensive studies of ancient and late antique sepulchral monuments concerning Krk and the Cres-Lošinj group, the situation is somewhat less diverse according to known information (for the island of Krk, see Kolega 1989; Fadić 1989; Rendić-Miočević, A. 2004; for Osor, see Cambi 1980; Šašel Kos 2017). With regard to respective monuments, Rab also stands out in relation to the wider Adriatic island setting (e.g. Cambi 1987b, p. 176; Jarak, Cambi 2016, p. 308).

6 Lazinica, Maršić 2017, in particular pp. 194–197, with earlier literature.

7 A fragment of an Attic stele of dubious origin, see Cambi 1987b, pp. 179–180; an unpublished stele from St. Anastasius (Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra 2015, p. 129), and an unpublished stele with an epitaph from the town of Rab, both in private possession; perhaps a spoliolum embedded in the town (Budak 2006, Fig. 2).

8 CIL III 1021 (Nedved 1990, p. 23; Glavičić 2009, pp. 58–59); Lazinica, Maršić 2017, p. 187. One cippus depicting the mourning Oriental, kept by the Benedictine nuns in the monastery of St. Andrew, published (Domijan 2007, p. 42). However, it is possible that another fragment with a similar depiction, albeit perhaps of a different typology, is also kept together with it (we are grateful to our colleague Natalija Beg for the information and photograph), while yet another cippus with an analogous representation was detected embedded in the north corner of the façade of the church of St. Catherine at Dorka during its recent restoration (we are grateful for this information to our colleague Saša Potočnjak, PhD, who spotted it).

9 For bibliography, see footnote 3, and for new finds of sarcophagi in the town, see Jurković 2019, p. 116; a series of fragments are scattered around the church of the Assumption of Mary (former

temelju natpisne građe. Naime, jedan dio spomenika čiji je epigrafski sadržaj poznat danas je izgubljen, no jedan spomenik poznat posredstvom epitafa, koji srećom nije zagubljen ili odnesen s otoka, dosad nije bio tipološki preciznije određen i njemu ćemo ovom prilikom posvetiti pozornost.¹¹

Rimskodobni sepulkralni spomenik iz klaustera franjevačkog samostana sv. Bernardina Sijenskog u Kamporu

U istočnom zidu klaustera franjevačkog samostana u Kamporu, odnosno zapadnom zidu kapele Svetog Križa, nedaleko od bočnog ulaza u crkvu sv. Bernardina, uzidano je nekoliko kamenih spomenika koji tvore neku vrstu lapidarne kompozicije, a svojom tipologijom i kronologijom upućuju na raznovrsno porijeklo (sl. 1). Riječ je o ulomcima ranosrednjovjekovnoga kamenog namještaja,¹² ploči s natpisom o osnutku samostana,¹³ o nekoliko pilastara i arhitektonskih elemenata možda kasnije datacije te tri ranonovovjekovne nadgrobne ploče.¹⁴ Zajedno s ovdje obrađenim antičkim spomenikom svi ti spomenici tvore eklektični skup raznovrsnih spolja koji su dijelom porijeklom iz samoga sklopa samostana, a dijelom su, po svoj prilici, onamo pristigli kao na jedno od rijetkih mjesta na otoku gdje se moglo očekivati njihovo sigurno čuvanje.¹⁵ Ovim spomenicima valja pridodati i ulomke ugrađenih reljefa i druge pokretne građe

This survey of funerary monuments should certainly include epitaphs that merely suggest the existence of associated monuments,¹⁰ whose typology, however, cannot be speculated upon based on inscriptions only. Namely, a part of the monuments whose epigraphic content is known is now lost, but one monument known through its epitaph, which is fortunately neither lost nor removed from the island, has not been more precisely determined in terms of typology, so we will focus on it here.¹¹

Roman-period sepulchral monument from the cloister of the Franciscan monastery of St. Bernardino of Siena in Kampor

In the east wall of the cloister of the Franciscan monastery in Kampor, i.e. the west wall of the chapel of the Holy Cross, not far from the side entrance to the church of St. Bernardino, several stone monuments were embedded, forming a sort of lapidary composition. Their typology and chronology indicate various origins (Fig. 1). These are fragments of early mediaeval stone furnishings,¹² a plaque with an inscription on the founding of the monastery,¹³ several pilasters and architectural elements possibly of later origin, and three early modern period tombstones.¹⁴ Together with the ancient monument discussed here, all these monuments form an eclectic set of various spolia that partly originate from the monastery itself, and partly, presumably, arrived there, since it was one

11 Na određenju spomenika, kao i interesu te odazivu da ga zajednički objavimo, suautorica najljepše zahvaljuje akademiku Nenadu Cambiju.

Obrada rapskih spomenika i arheoloških lokaliteta odvija se unutar projekta *Arheološka topografija otoka Raba*, koji provode Institut za arheologiju u Zagrebu (dr. sc. A. Konestra) i Institut za arheologiju Sveučilišta kardinala Stefana Wyszyńskog u Varšavi, Poljska (dr hab. F. Welc, prof. UKSW) uz suradnju Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu (A. Dugonjić, kustos), vanjskih suradnika (P. Androić Gračanin, dipl. arheol., B. Nowacki, dipl. arheol.) i uz sudjelovanje studenata i doktoranada. Projekt se financira sredstvima Ministarstva kulture i medija RH, lokalnih zajednica (posebno Centra za kulturu Lopar i Općine Lopar) i ustanova koje vode projekt.

Na susretljivosti, suradnji i pomoći pruženoj tijekom projektnih aktivnosti u Kamporu zahvaljujemo fra Ivanu Gavranu, donedavnom predstojniku franjevačkog samostana sv. Bernardina Sijenskog u Kamporu i fra Tomislavu Čuriću. Također, na suglasnosti za objavu spomenika i fotografija zahvaljujemo Zemaljskom muzeju Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu, Arheološkom muzeju u Splitu, don I. Matkoviću, župniku Župe sv. Martina u Vranjicu te Upravi za kulturnu baštinu Ministarstva kulture i medija.

12 Jarak 2017, str. 52–73.

13 Domijan 2007, str. 213–214.

14 Domijan 2007, str. 222–223.

15 Osim što su riznice sakralnih spomenika, samostani često čuvaju i profane antičke spomenike prikupljene na njihovu matičnom području (npr. samostani na Visovcu, Čokovcu, Košljunu na Krku, u Sinju i mnogi drugi, usp. Marin 2008); tako se i u drugim samostanima i crkvama na otoku Rabu čuvaju ne samo antički nego i srednjovjekovni spomenici, dijelom kao trag nekog ranijeg inventara, dijelom kao plod djelovanja ovih zajednica, često jedinih kulturnih ustanova koje su čuvale i baštinile umjetnička i druga kulturna dobra.

cathedral).

10 CIL III 3124, 10122 (13292), 10123.

11 The co-author would like to thank Academician Nenad Cambi for the identification of the monument, as well as his interest and response to publish it jointly.

The monuments and archaeological sites of Rab have been covered under the project of *Archaeological Topography of the Island of Rab*, implemented by the Institute of Archaeology in Zagreb (A. Konestra, PhD) and the Institute of Archaeology of the Kardynal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland (Dr hab. F. Welc, Prof. UKSW) with the collaboration of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb (A. Dugonjić, curator), part-time collaborators (P. Androić Gračanin, BArc, B. Nowacki, BArc), and with the participation of students and doctoral candidates. The project is funded by the Ministry of Culture and Media of the Republic of Croatia, local communities (especially the Lopar Cultural Centre and the Municipality of Lopar), and the institutions implementing the project.

We are grateful to Fra Ivan Gavran, until recently the warden of the Franciscan monastery of St. Bernardino of Siena in Kampor, and Fra Tomislav Čurić, for their kindness, cooperation and help provided during the project activities in Kampor. We would also like to thank the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Sarajevo, the Archaeological Museum in Split, Don I. Matković, the parish priest of the Parish of St. Martin in Vranjic, and the Directorate for Cultural Heritage of the Ministry of Culture and Media.

12 Jarak 2017, pp. 52–73.

13 Domijan 2007, pp. 213–214.

14 Domijan 2007, pp. 222–223.



Slika 1.

Istočni zid klaustura franjevačkog samostana u Kamporu na otoku Rabu s kompozicijom ugrađenih spolija – današnje stanje (foto: A. Konestra, Arhiva Instituta za arheologiju/Arheološka topografija otoka Raba)

Figure 1.

East wall of the cloister of the Franciscan monastery in Kampor on the island of Rab, configuration of embedded spolia – present situation (photograph: A. Konestra, the Archives of the Institute of Archaeology/Archaeological Topography of the Island of Rab)

koji se čuvaju u samostanskoj arheološkoj zbirci, ulomke rano-srednjovjekovne kamene plastike koji se nalaze u samoj crkvi sv. Bernardina te niz kapitela, baza, nadgrobnih ploča i sličnih ulomaka koji su ili nanovo upotrijebljeni ili su uzidani unutar samostanskog sklopa.

Rimski je nadgrobnni spomenik, odnosno njegov natpis, prvi put objavljen u CIL-u, na temelju podataka M. Sabljara i I. Gurata (vidi dalje), a na spomenik se osvrće i P. Sticotti.¹⁶ Najranije fotografske zapise donose W. Schleyer i Č. M. Iveković; na njima se doduše spomenik tek nazire, no razvidan je prvi smještaj ovog spolija i pojedinih drugih spolija iz navedenog skupa (vidi dalje, i sl. 15).¹⁷ Potom se na njega osvrće, no ponovno uglavnom na natpis, kampsorski franjevac V. Brusić,¹⁸ a

of the few places on the island where their safe preservation would have been expected.¹⁵ These monuments should be complemented with fragments of embedded reliefs and other movable material kept in the monastery's archaeological collection, fragments of early mediaeval stone sculptures in the church of St. Bernardino, and a series of capitals, bases, tombstones and similar fragments that were either reused or embedded in the monastery complex.

The Roman sepulchral monument, i.e. its inscription, was

16 CIL III 3125 za lokaciju navodi: "in hortis monasterii Franciscanorum S. Euphemiae pro sedili"; Sticotti 1893, str. 44.

17 Iveković 1928, sl. 5; Schleyer 1914, str. 122, sl. 90.

18 Brusić 1926, str. 56.

15 In addition to being treasuries of sacral monuments, monasteries often also keep profane ancient monuments collected in their home areas (e.g. monasteries on Visovac, in Čokovac, Košljun on Krk, in Sinj and many others, cf. Marin 2008). Likewise, other monasteries and churches on the island of Rab keep not only ancient but also mediaeval monuments, partly as traces of some earlier inventory, partly due to activities of such communities, often the only cultural institutions that preserved and inherited artistic and other cultural goods.



Slika 2.
Osteoteka u franjevačkom samostanu u Kamporu (foto: A. Konestra,
Arhiva Instituta za arheologiju/Arheološka topografija otoka Raba)

Figure 2.
Osteotheca in the Franciscan monastery in Kampor (photograph: A.
Konestra, the Archives of the Institute of Archaeology/Archaeological
Topography of the Island of Rab)

kao sarkofag u svojem ga pregledu rapskih spomenika objavljuje B. Nedved.¹⁹

Fragment natpisa ugrađen u zid samostana u Kamporu ima oblik rimskog sarkofaga (sl. 2). Očuvana je čitava površina njegove prednje strane. Srećom, ona nije znatnije oštećena i skraćena, osim što je, kao što je to bio običaj, odbačen “suvišni” dio sanduka (bočne strane i stražnja strana). Bez tog odstranjenja, naime, nije bilo moguće ugrađivanje, koje je uvijek znak poštovanja samog spomenika. Važno je svakako da je prednja strana ostala vidljiva u novoj dekorativnoj upotrebi. Čitavu stranu zauzima široka tabula kojoj anse sežu do obrubne vrpce. Pravokutna površina uokvirena je uskom vrpcom koja je također cjelovito očuvana (bila je obojena bijelom bojom tako da se ističe; srećom, boja je izbljedjela). U ansama su dva akantova lista, a u trokutastim poljima između ansa, tabule i rubova izrađeni su znatno manji akantovi listovi. Po sredini tabule uklesan je lapidarno koncipiran natpis:²⁰

D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum)
REMMIAE L(uci) F(iliae) MAXIMAE
ANNORVM XXVII, M(ensium) XI
D(ierum) XXVII MATER INFE
LICISSIMA

Slova su uredno ispisana plitkim žljebovima. Pismo je dobro čitljiva kapitala. Natpis kaže da je u recipijentu bila pokopa-

first published in the CIL, based on the information provided by M. Sabljar and I. Gurato (see below). The monument was also referred to by P. Sticotti.¹⁶ The earliest photographic records were made by W. Schleyer and Č. M. Iveković. Although the monument is barely discernible in them, the first location of this spolium and some other spolia from the mentioned set can be perceived (see below, and Fig. 15).¹⁷ Later it was discussed, but again mainly focusing on the inscription, by V. Brusić, the Kampor Franciscan,¹⁸ and it was published by B. Nedved as a sarcophagus in her review of monuments on Rab.¹⁹

The fragment of the inscription built into the wall of the monastery in Kampor has the shape of a Roman sarcophagus (Fig. 2). The entire surface of its front side has been preserved. Fortunately, it is not significantly damaged or shortened, except for the customarily discarded “excess” part of the coffin (sides and back). Namely, without this removal, installation, always a sign of respect for the monument itself, would not have been possible. What is important is that the front has remained visible in the new decorative role. The whole side is covered by a wide tabula whose ansae reach to the border

19 Nedved 1990, str. 26, str. 55 (autorica navodi da je spomenik prešeljen u Arheološki muzej Zadar, što ipak nije slučaj, iako je to, prema P. Sticottiju, čini se bila namjera, Sticotti 1893, str. 44).

20 CIL III 3125.

16 CIL III 3125 indicates the following concerning the site: “in hortis monasterii Franciscanorum S. Euphemiae pro sedili”; Sticotti 1893, p. 44.

17 Iveković 1928, Fig. 5; Schleyer 1914, p. 122, Fig. 90.

18 Brusić 1926, p. 56.

19 Nedved 1990, p. 26, p. 55 (the author stated that the monument had been moved to the Archaeological Museum in Zadar, which was not the case really, although, according to P. Sticotti, it had seemingly been intended, Sticotti 1893, p. 44).

na *Remmia Maxima*. Budući da je pripadala obitelji (*familia*) *Remmia*, može se zaključiti da joj je otac bio *Lucius Remmius*. Iako je to obiteljsko ime često u Italiji i općenito na Zapadu, ovo je jedini natpis iz Dalmacije s tim imenom.²¹ Stoga bi bio prihvatljiv zaključak da je obitelj podrijetlom iz sjeverne Italije. Pokojnica je, kao što je uobičajeno, nosila očev *nomen gentile*. U doba njezine smrti otac je očito bio već mrtav, jer u protivnom kćeri grob ne bi pripravljala samo majka. Ime *nesretne majke* nije navedeno, premda je na spomeniku bilo dovoljno mjesta. *Mater infelicissima* inače je veoma česta kvalifikacija za osobe koje postavljaju natpis, no repertoar sličnih oblika ožalošćenosti veoma je opsežan.²² Kognomen *Maxima* jedan je od najčešćih u Dalmaciji.²³ Preminula je u dobi od 27 godina, 11 mjeseci i 27 dana, dakle gotovo 28 godina, što je za ono vrijeme bilo zrelo doba. Najvjerojatnije nije bila udana, jer bi u protivnom bio naveden muž, eventualno i djeca. Na čelu natpisa u zasebnom retku stoji kratica DMS, posveta bogovima podzemlja (*mani*).²⁴ Dodatak *S(acrum)* samo se ponekad javlja u drugim dijelovima Dalmacije i nije bio nužan da bi značenje formule bilo jasno. Na neki način posveta *sacrum* sama se po sebi podrazumijeva, pojačava i potvrđuje religijsko značenje posvete. Grob, naime, spada među *res sacrae*, pa je tako sam po sebi *locus religiosus*, koji traži odgovarajuće poštovanje.²⁵ Općenito valja ustvrditi da je natpis lapidarno i precizno koncipiran pa je tako preostalo dosta slobodnog prostora.

Oblik spomenika veoma je sličan nekim rješenjima oblika i artikulacije domaćih sarkofaga pa se logično nameće pomisao da se radi o tabuli sarkofaga, bez trodijelne raščlambe prednje strane. Ali dimenzije spomenika su samo 112 × 33 cm. U tako malen prostor ne bi moglo stati tijelo odrasle osobe, čak ni u zgrčenom položaju. Druga bi stvar bila da se radi o dječjem sarkofagu. Stoga se ne može raditi o sarkofagu, nego o osteoteci, tj. recipijentu u koji se stavljaju kosti pokojnika nakon što propadne tkivo. To je samo varijanta standardne inhumacije.

U ovom trenutku s nekoliko riječi valja objasniti pogrebne običaje tijekom nekoliko stoljeća razvoja, s osobitim obzi-

band. The rectangular surface is framed by a narrow band which is also wholly preserved (it was painted white so as to be conspicuous; fortunately, the colour has faded). There are two acanthus leaves in the ansae, while the triangular fields between the ansae, the tabula, and the edges are embellished with much smaller acanthus leaves. In the middle of the tabula there is the following lapidary inscription:²⁰

D(is) M(anibus) S(acrum)
REMMIAE L(uci) F(iliae) MAXIMAE
ANNORVM XXVII, M(ensium) XI
D(ierum) XXVII MATER INFE
LICISSIMA

The letters are neatly written in shallow grooves. The script is majuscule, easily legible. The inscription reads that *Remmia Maxima* was buried in the receptacle. Since she belonged to the *Remmia* family (*familia*), it can be concluded that her father was *Lucius Remmius*. Although this family name was common in Italy and the West in general, this is the only inscription from Dalmatia with this name.²¹ Therefore, it would be acceptable to conclude that the family was originally from northern Italy. The deceased woman typically bore her father's *nomen gentile*. The father was obviously already dead when she passed away, because the daughter's grave was prepared only by her mother. The name of the *infelicitous mother* is not mentioned, although there was enough space on the monument. *Mater infelicissima* was a quite common qualifier for people putting up inscriptions. However, the range of similar forms of mourning is pretty extensive.²² The cognomen *Maxima* was one of the most common in Dalmatia.²³ She died at the age of 27 years, 11 months and 27 days, viz. she was almost 28 years, a mature age for the time. She was probably not married, since there is no mention of a husband or children. At the head of the inscription, in a separate line, there is the abbreviation DMS, a dedication to the gods of the underworld (*manes*).²⁴ The adjunct *S(acrum)* was only occasionally used in other parts

21 Alföldy 1968, str. 115.

22 O formulaciji natpisa na sarkofazima usp. Cambi 2010, str. 33–35.

23 U Alföldy 1969, str. 242–245, pod natuknicom *Maximus* navođenje tog nadimka zauzelo je više od tri stranice, bez derivacija, koje su zasebno popisane. D. Rendić-Miočević smatra da kognomen *Maximus/Maxima* rado upotrebljava autohtoni živalj (Rendić-Miočević, D. 1960, str. 163–171). Pitanje je samo označava li on fizičku ili emotivnu kvalitetu osobe. Moguće je da obuhvaća oba značenja. U ovom slučaju, s obzirom na italski nomen, po svoj prilici ipak nije riječ o osobi autohtonog podrijetla.

24 Ta posveta je česta na rimskim sepulkralnim spomenicima. Usp. Cambi 2010, str. 35–36. Ova je formula svakako imala religijsko značenje. Ona upućuje na to da je pokojnik/pokojnica prešao/prešla među podzemna božanstva i da se preporučuje njihovoj skrbi. Usp. Cumont 1922, str. 60–64, 72 i d.; Cumont 1949. Formula je važna i za kronologiju spomenika (o čemu poslije).

25 Lavagne 1987; Ducos 1995.

20 CIL III 3125.

21 Alföldy 1968, p. 115.

22 For the formulation of the inscriptions on the sarcophagi, cf. Cambi 2010, pp. 33–35.

23 In Alföldy 1969, pp. 242–245, under the headword *Maximus*, this epithet is listed on more than three pages, without derivations, which are listed separately. D. Rendić-Miočević believed that the cognomen *Maximus/Maxima* had been popular among the indigenous population (Rendić-Miočević, D. 1960, pp. 163–171). The only question is whether it signified physical or emotional qualities. It is possible that it encompassed both. In this case, given an Italic nomen, this person was probably not of indigenous origin.

24 This dedication is common on Roman sepulchral monuments. Cf. Cambi 2010, pp. 35–36. This formula certainly had a religious meaning. It indicates that the dead person joined the gods of the underworld and invoked their protection. Cf. Cumont 1922, pp. 60–64, 72 ff.; Cumont 1949. The formula is also important for the chronology of the monument (more on that below).

rom na tadašnje područje Dalmacije. Za trajanja tog razvoja izmjenjivala su se dva obreda: spaljivanje (*urere* ili *cremare*) i polaganje, odnosno pokapanje čitavog tijela (*humare*, *inhumare* ili *sepelire*).²⁶ I u jednom i u drugom slučaju bilo je potrebno preostatke dostojno pohraniti u odgovarajući spremnik. Obred je ovisio o nekoliko religijskih, socijalnih ili imovnih čimbenika, ali i o prevladavajućoj modi. Svaki od tih običaja zahtijevao je razvitak određenih vrsta i varijanti spomenika tako da svojom funkcionalnošću odgovaraju sepulkralnoj svrsi. U rimsko doba spaljivanje prevladava u 1. st. pr. Kr. pa do početka 2. st. po. Kr. To doduše ne znači da nema miješanja spomenutih vrsta pogrebnih običaja.²⁷ Do promjene s kremiranja na inhumaciju postupno dolazi tijekom 2. st., osobito u doba Hadrijana, prvog cara koji je dao pohraniti čitavo svoje tijelo u znamenitom mauzoleju. Promjena u širim slojevima društva, međutim, nije bila ni nagla ni sveobuhvatna. Postupno je dolazilo do prevladavanja jednoga ili drugog obreda. Neke obitelji čuvaju svoje drevne običaje, kao na primjer Korneliji Scipioni, koji su zadržali pokapanje čitavog tijela i u doba prevladavanja incineracije.²⁸ Kod spaljivanja tijelo sagori i preostane samo nešto nagorenih kostiju i pepela te ostatci staklenih balzamarija deformiranih u vatri, koji su sadržavali mirise za ublažavanje neugodnog zadaha spaljenog tijela. Svi se preostatci nakon lomače (*bustum* ili *ustrinum*), uključujući i pepeo, prikupljaju i stavljaju u staklenu vazuu (*olla*) koja se ulaže u jednostavnu urnu od kamena, mramora, metala, keramike, stakla, alabastra itd. Ima slučajeve da se ostatci stavljaju u urnu bez posude. Urne su obično okrugle i grubo isklesane, s odgovarajućim poklopcem koji je s tijelom recipijenta bio povezan metalnim spojkaama. Ima i drugačijih forma, koje su pogodnije kad se želi uklesati natpis. Tada je potrebna ravna ploha na pročelju pa se rade i kvadratne ili pravokutne urne. Među nagorenim kostima mogu biti i osobni predmeti pokojnika (prstenje i nakit). Izvan posude često se nalaze i lucerne.²⁹ Po svoj prilici svjetiljke imaju veze sa silaskom pokojnika u tamno podzemlje. Naziv za takav recipijent je osuarij (*ossuarium*).³⁰ Urne rijetko prelaze dimenzije 50 × 50 cm. Kad su urne grubo klesane, tada su zasigurno predviđene za ukapanje u zemlju, obično u okviru nekoga grobnog areala, kakvi su postojali u Saloni, ali i na čitavoj istočnoj obali Jadrana

of Dalmatia and was not essential for the meaning of the formula to be clear. In a way, the dedication *sacrum* was implied per se, enhancing and confirming the religious meaning of the address. Namely, the grave belongs to *res sacrae*, and is therefore in itself *locus religiosus*, who entailing appropriate respect.²⁵ In general, it should be noted that the inscription is concisely and precisely conceived, so there is a good deal of free space left.

The form of the monument is very similar to some other forms and expressions of local sarcophagi, so it is logical to think that it is a tabula of a sarcophagus, without the three-part articulation of the front. However, the dimensions of the monument are only 112 × 33 cm. No adult body would fit into such a small space, not even in a contracted position. Were it a children's sarcophagus, it would be an entirely different matter. Therefore, it cannot be a sarcophagus, but an osteotheca, i.e. a receptacle for the bones of a dead person after tissue decay. This is but a variant of standard inhumation.

At this point, funeral customs during several centuries of development should be briefly explained, with particular regard to the then area of Dalmatia. In the course of this development, two rites were alternated: cremation (*urere* or *cremare*) and inhumation, i.e. burial of the whole body (*humare*, *inhumare* or *sepelire*).²⁶ In both cases it was necessary to store the remains with dignity in a suitable container. The rituals depended on several religious, social or pecuniary factors, but also on the prevailing fashion. Each of these customs required the development of certain types and variants of monuments so that their functionality could correspond to the intended sepulchral purpose. In Roman times, cremation prevailed in the first century BC until the beginning of the second century AD. However, this does not mean that the mentioned types of funeral customs were not varied.²⁷ The shift from cremation to inhumation gradually occurred during the second century, especially in the time of Hadrian, the first emperor who had his entire body placed in the renowned mausoleum. The conversion in the wider strata of society, however, was neither sudden nor all-encompassing. Gradually, one or the other ritual was prevailing. Some families preserved their ancient customs, such as the Corneli Scipiones, who retained the burial of the whole body even when incineration prevailed.²⁸ During the process of incineration, the body is combusted, and only a few

26 Ciceron, De legibus II, 23, 58, navodi podatak iz XII tablica uz vlastiti komentar: "Hominem mortuum", inquit lex in XII "in urbe ne sepelito neve urito". Credo vel propter ignis periculum. Quod autem addit "neve urito", indicat non qui uratur, sed qui humetur, Loeb Classical Library, London 2015. Ta se stroga odredba, koja je imala zdravstvenu i sigurnosnu svrhu (sprječavanje širenja bolesti i požara), uvelike kršila.

27 Cambi 1988, str. 5–14.

28 Toynbee 1971, str. 113.

29 Kao na primjer na nekropoli u Lori u Splitu (usporedi Buljević 2009). Ovo je zapažanje N. Cambija na temelju vlastite autopsije.

30 Koch 1994, str. 11, 26. Taj je termin prisutan i u povijesnim izvorima, usp. Ducos 1995, str. 141, bilj. 44.

25 Lavagne 1987; Ducos 1995.

26 Cicero, De Legibus II, 23, 58, cites a piece of information from the Twelve Tables and adds his own comment: "Hominem mortuum", inquit lex in XII "in urbe ne sepelito neve urito". Credo vel propter ignis periculum. Quod autem addit „neve urito"; indicat non qui uratur, sed qui humetur, Loeb Classical Library, London 2015. This strict provision, which had a health and safety purpose (preventing the spread of diseases and fires), was largely violated.

27 Cambi 1988, pp. 5–14.

28 Toynbee 1971, p. 113.

na.³¹ U Rimu su se urne polagale i u nišama mauzoleja, koji su ili nadzemni ili hipogeji. Zbog mjesta (niše) za urne koje sličje golubarnicima takve građevine nazivaju se *columbaria*.³² U Dalmaciji za sada nisu pronađeni takvi kolumbariji. Postavlja se i pitanje kako, kada i zašto je došlo do promjene ritusa.³³

U trenutku kada se pogrebni običaji mijenjaju, tada se javljaju osteoteke i sarkofazi. Nije postojao jedinstven običaj pokapanja pa nisu jedinstveni ni tipovi spomenika u Rimskom Carstvu. Pojava osteoteka i sarkofaga kronološki je usporedna i zapravo je povezana s novim religioznim i kulturnim idejama o čuvanju čitavog tijela, odnosno odbacivanju spaljivanja. Kršćanstvo nema ulogu u pogledu te promjene, osim što se kršćani drže običaja polaganja čitavog tijela još iz Palestine. Razlika između osteoteka i sarkofaga je u tome što odražavaju dva stupnja procesa inhumacije. Prvi je da se tijelo pokojnika najprije oslobodi tkiva. U slučaju kad se želi upotrijebiti osteoteka, tijelo se položi na pripremljenu ravnu podlogu (mauzolej ili grobnicu) i kad se poslije godine dana (možda i ranije u toplim i sušnim krajevima) kosti ogole, smještaju se u osteoteku. Na takav se način očuvaju sve kosti i za njihovu pohranu neophodan je recipijent veći od osuarija, ali manji od sarkofaga. Dijelovi tijela ne polažu se po anatomskim načelima. U sarkofag se, pak, polaže čitavo, još neraspadnuto tijelo pokojnika, gdje kamen brzo "potroši" tkivo. I u osteoteku se kao i u sarkofag može položiti veći broj pokojnika. Sarkofazi i osteoteke razlikuju se samo po dimenzijama, dok po formi i ukrasu među njima nema većih razlika. I jedna i druga vrsta može biti više ili manje ukrašena, a na Istoku postoji cijeli niz izrazito raskošno ukrašenih osteoteka (ὄστοθήκη).³⁴ Unatoč tome što su bile jeftinije od sarkofaga običaj polaganja kostiju u osteoteke napušten je, jer je proces od trenutka smrti do konačnog polaganja kostiju dugotrajan – to je bilo neka vrsta *translatio cadaveris*.³⁵ U konačnici troškovi se izjednačavaju. Vjerojatno je u oba slučaja poticaj stigao s Istoka, iako su sarkofage upotrebljavali već Etruščani (i kod njih se obredi mijenjaju).³⁶

U Dalmaciji su sarkofazi kao i drugdje gotovo jednaki osteotekama i nije ih lako razlikovati po obliku i dekoraciji. Razlikuju se u dimenzijama. Osteoteke su manjih dimenzija jer se prikupljene kosti mogu lakše složiti u manjem prostoru. Pri

burnt bones and ashes remain, as well as the flame-deformed remnants of glass unguentaria, which contained scents to alleviate the unpleasant odour of the burned body. All the residues after the funeral pyre (*bustum* or *ustrinum*), including ash, were collected and placed in a glass vessel (*olla*) which was then inserted into a simple urn made of stone, marble, metal, ceramics, glass, alabaster, etc. In some cases, the remains were placed in an urn without a vessel. Urns were usually round and roughly worked, with a matching lid that was connected to the body of the receptacle by metal couplings. There were other forms as well, more suitable for engraving of inscriptions. In such cases, a flat surface on the front was needed, which is why square or rectangular urns were also made. Burnt remains can include personal effects of a dead person (rings and jewellery). Oil lamps can often be found outside the vessel.²⁹ Presumably, lamps were associated with the descent of the dead into the dark underworld. Such a receptacle is called an ossuary (*ossuarium*).³⁰ Urns rarely exceed the dimensions of 50 × 50 cm. The roughly worked urns were surely intended for burials in the ground, usually within a grave plot, like those that existed in Salona, as well as on the entire eastern coast of the Adriatic.³¹ In Rome, urns were also placed in mausoleum niches, which were either above ground or hypogea. Since the niches used for urns resemble pigeon lofts, such buildings are called *columbaria*.³² No such columbaria have been found in Dalmatia to date. The question also arises as to how, when and why was the rite changed.³³

Osteothecae and sarcophagi appeared at the moment when funeral customs were changing. There was no single burial custom, and therefore the types of monuments in the Roman Empire were not uniform either. The appearance of osteotheca and sarcophagi is chronologically parallel and actually associated with new religious and cultural ideas about preserving the whole body, that is, rejecting incineration. Christianity had no role in this conversion, except that Christians adhered to the custom of inhumation of the whole body from Palestine. The difference between osteothecae and sarcophagi is that they reflect two levels of the inhumation process. The first is stripping the dead body of tissue. When an osteotheca is to be used, the body is placed on a prepared flat surface (mausoleum or tomb), and when the bones dry out after a

31 Cambi 1987a, sl. 82–85, 88, 90–92.

32 Toynbee 1971, str. 118; von Hesberg 1992, str. 55–86, sl. 33–35.

33 Na to pitanje jednoznačan odgovor nije lako dati. Pitanje je očito veoma kompleksno i sadrži više komponenata (tradicija, moda, ideologija, ekonomski i drugi društveni odnosi). O tomu usp. Pietri 1983; Cambi 1988, str. 5–13. U novije doba Taglietti 2001.

34 Koch 1994, str. 154–162; Korkut 2006.

35 Estiez 1995, str. 101–108. Nije dopušteno imati dva groba (jedno tijelo na dva mjesta). Stoga je drugi grob kenotaf, što znači spomenik u čast pokojniku, a ne i grob u pravom smislu riječi. Kod translacije potrebni su rituali očišćenja mjesta staroga groba te posvećenja novoga.

36 Toynbee 1971, str. 14–24.

29 Like, for example, at the necropolis in Lora in Split (cf. Buljević 2009). This is based on N. Cambi's personal observation.

30 Koch 1994, pp. 11, 26. This term was also used in historical sources, cf. Ducos 1995, p. 141, footnote 44.

31 Cambi 1987a, Figs. 82–85, 88, 90–92.

32 Toynbee 1971, p. 118; von Hesberg 1992, pp. 55–86, Figs. 33–35.

33 It is not easy to give an unambiguous answer to this question. The matter is obviously quite complex and comprises several components (tradition, fashion, ideology, economic and other social relations). For more on this, cf. Pietri 1983; Cambi 1988, pp. 5–13. More recently, cf. Taglietti 2001.

određivanju vrste spomenika može se upasti u zamku miješanja sa sarkofazima za djecu. Logično je da za dječje tijelo, sukladno godinama, treba manji prostor. Smrtnost djece u antici bila je velika. Bogatiji roditelji pripremali su za njih sarkofage (za nježno doba osteoteke ne dolaze u obzir). Za dječje ukope služili su mali sarkofazi. Dječje tijelo nije pogodno za polaganje u osteoteku. Zbog toga je za utvrđivanje karaktera recipijenta bitno da su u natpisu zabilježene doživljene godine. Ako u natpisima i nema takvih podataka, u nekim se slučajevima ipak može odrediti karakter spomenika.

Upravo u tom smislu paradigmatičan je primjer osteoteka iz Kampora (sl. 2). Njezin oblik i dekoracija istovjetni su odgovarajućim primjercima iz Dalmacije.³⁷ Samo rijetki sarkofazi imaju tako izduženu tabulu. Da je riječ o osteoteci, jasno proizlazi iz usporedbe dimenzija jednih i drugih. Sarkofazi su obično dužine od 180 do 220 cm. Sanduk sarkofaga nije nikada niži od 50 cm. Visina sanduka sarkofaga uglavnom varira od 70 do 100 cm. U trenutku smrti *Remmia Maxima* imala je gotovo 28 godina i njezino tijelo ne bi moglo stati u postojeće dimenzije kamporskog spomenika (ni po dužini, ni po visini). Prema tomu, u takav recipijent mogle su biti pohranjene samo već ogoljene kosti. Neke urne pa i osteoteke imaju istovjetan oblik pokrova kao i sarkofazi, samo su obično pliće i stoga lakše. Nakon što se kosti umetnu u recipijent, on se polaže u zemlju ili, još češće, u obiteljski mauzolej ili grobni areal. Ako imaju natpis, recipijenti pouzdano nisu bili predviđeni za ukapanje u zemlju. Osteoteke nastaju i traju uglavnom u isto doba kad i sarkofazi (2. i 3. st.), ali potonji ih kasnije posve zamjenjuju i traju do kraja antike.

Što se pak datacije rapskog spomenika tiče, ona je potpuno jasna. Pojava formule DMS u Dalmaciji pada u kasno 1. ili rano 2. st.³⁸ Pojava filijacije također ukazuje na ranije doba, što znači početna desetljeća 2. st. Filijacija kao element imenske formule poslije nestaje. Kamen i oblikovanje spomenika tipično su salonitanski, što upućuje na import iz glavnoga grada provincije. Već je utvrđeno da salonitanski eksport nadgrobni spomenika seže do sjeverne Dalmacije.³⁹ Natpis je po svojoj prilici uklesan na licu mjesta, u već pripremljeno polje tabule. Salonitansko je podrijetlo logično, jer je tamošnja produkcija bila doista golema.

Možda najpouzdaniji primjer salonitanske osteoteke jest osteoteka Marka Fortunata, Titova roba (*verne*), koji ju je postavio sebi i svojim oslobođenim i oslobođenim još za života. Recipijent je širok 89 cm, a visok, s pokrovom, 55 cm (sl. 3).⁴⁰ U takav volumen ne može stati tijelo pokojnika, a

year (or perhaps earlier in warm and dry areas), they are placed in the osteotheca. In this way, all the bones are preserved and their storage requires a receptacle larger than an ossuary but smaller than a sarcophagus. Body parts are not inhumed according to anatomical principles. On the other hand, the whole, still undecomposed dead body is placed in a sarcophagus, where the stone quickly “annihilates” the tissue. A number of the dead can be placed in an osteotheca as well as in a sarcophagus. Sarcophagi and osteothecae differ only in dimensions, with no major differences between them in shapes and decorations. Both types can be more or less ornamented. In the East, there is a whole series of exceptionally richly embellished osteothecae (ὄστοθήκη).³⁴ Despite being cheaper than sarcophagi, the custom of placing bones in osteothecae was abandoned, because the process from the moment of death to the final placing of bones was time-consuming – a kind of *translatio cadaveris*.³⁵ Ultimately, the costs were equal. The inspiration in both cases probably came from the East, although sarcophagi had already been used by the Etruscans (whose rites had also been changing).³⁶

In Dalmatia, as elsewhere, sarcophagi are almost identical to osteothecae, and it is not easy to distinguish them based on their shapes and decorations. They differ in dimensions. Osteothecae are smaller because the collected bones can be more easily stacked in a smaller space. When identifying types of monuments, one can fall into the trap of confusing them with sarcophagi for children. It is logical that a child’s body, according to age, needs less space. Child mortality in antiquity was high. Wealthier parents prepared sarcophagi for them (osteothecae were out of the question for a tender age). Small sarcophagi were used for children’s burials. A child’s body is not suitable for placement in an osteotheca. Therefore, in order to identify the character of a receptacle, it is important that the inscription mentions the age at death. If there is no such information in the inscriptions, in some cases the character of a given monument can still be identified.

It is in this sense that the example of the osteotheca from Kampor is paradigmatic (Fig. 2). Its shape and decoration are identical to the corresponding examples from Dalmatia.³⁷ Few sarcophagi have such an elongated tabula. Comparison between the dimensions clearly indicates that this is indeed an osteotheca. Sarcophagi are usually 180 to 220 cm long. Sarcophagi chests are never lower than 50 cm. Their height usu-

37 Cambi 2010, tab. XXVI, 1, XCIV, 2C, VII, 2.

38 Toynbee 1971, str. 35, 38. Formula se u Rimu javlja od doba Augusta, ali u provincijama je znatno kasnija. U Dalmaciji se javlja na rijetkim arama u doba Flavijevaca, krajem 1. st.

39 Cambi 2010, str. 80–84.

40 Natpis glasi: *M(arco) T(it)i vernae Fortuna/to alumno infeliciss/mo set*

34 Koch 1994, pp. 154–162; Korkut 2006.

35 Estiez 1995, pp. 101–108. It was not allowed to have two graves (one body in two places). Therefore, the other grave is a cenotaph, viz. a monument in honour of a dead person, but not a grave in the true sense of the word. Translation required ritual purifying of the old grave and consecrating the new one.

36 Toynbee 1971, pp. 14–24.

37 Cambi 2010, Pls. XXVI, 1, XCIV, 2C, VII, 2.



Slika 3.
Osteoteka Marka Fortunata,
Titova roba (verne), iz Salone
(bila je uzidana u gradske
fortifikacije) (AMS A-5187)
(uz dopuštenje Arheološkog
muzeja u Splitu, foto: N.
Cambi)

Figure 3.
Osteotheca of Marcus
Fortunatus, Titus' slave
(verna), from Salona
(once embedded in urban
fortifications) (AMS A-5187)
(with permission of the
Archaeological Museum in
Split, photograph: N. Cambi)

kamoli više njih, a u natpisu se očito spominju odrasli pokojnici; samo se ogoljene kosti mogu složiti u zadani prostor. Na bočnim stranama su girlande, a oko njih izvijaju se zmije. I u ovom slučaju tabula obuhvaća cijelu prednju stranu. Pokrov je u obliku krova na dvije vode s krovnim crijepom. S gornje strane akroterija su rupe, a u jednoj se još sačuvala olovna vrpca za vješanje vijenaca ili drugih znakova pažnje.

Sličan primjer manjeg sarkofaga ili osteoteke s velikom tabulom je onaj uzidan u nekadašnju kuću Mihovila Šiška u Sućurcu, koji također ima veliku tabulu s ansama s florealnim ukrasima (sl. 4).⁴¹ Drugi je jedan teško čitljiv primjerak ugrađen u kameni pod dvorišta pred crkvom u Vranjicu, koji je upotrijebljen kao još nedovršen; tabula i okvir samo su naznačeni (sl. 5).⁴² Oba spomenika potječu približno iz sredine 2. stoljeća.

Glede osteoteka temeljni je problem kako ih razlikovati od dječjeg sarkofaga ili urne, jer po formi i dekoraciji mogu biti slični. Od tih triju vrsta nadgrobnih spomenika prve su se

ally varies from 70 to 100 cm. *Remmia Maxima* was almost 28 years old when she died, and her body would not have physically fit into the monument of Kampor (neither in length nor in height). Therefore, only bare bones could have been stored in such a receptacle. Some urns, and even osteothecae, have the same shape of their covers as sarcophagi. The only difference is that they are usually shallower and therefore lighter. When the bones are inserted into a receptacle, it is placed in the ground or, more often, in the family mausoleum or burial plot. Receptacles bearing an inscription were definitely not intended for burial in the ground. Osteothecae appeared and lasted mostly concurrently with sarcophagi (the second and third centuries), but the latter subsequently completely replaced them and were in use until the end of antiquity.

As for the dating of the monument from Rab, it is completely clear. The occurrence of the DMS formula in Dalmatia dates back to the late first or early second century.³⁸ The appearance of filiation also points to an earlier period, viz. the early decades of the second century. Filiation as an element of name formulae subsequently disappeared. The stone and design of the monument are typically Salonitan, suggesting import from the capital of the province. It has already been established that the Salonitan export of sepulchral monuments reached as far as northern Dalmatia.³⁹ The inscription was probably carved on the spot, in an already prepared field of the tabula. The Salonitan origin is logical, because the production there was really enormous.

Perhaps the most reliable example of Salonitan osteothecae is the one of Marcus Fortunatus, Titus' slave (*verna*), who had it prepared for himself and his freedmen and freedwomen in his lifetime. The receptacle is 89 cm wide and 55 cm tall with its cover (Fig. 3).⁴⁰ Such a volume is not sufficient for a dead body, let alone more than one, and the inscription obviously mentions dead adult individuals; only bare bones can be stacked in such a space. On the sides, there are garlands with snakes curling around them. The tabula covers the entire front side in this case as well. The cover is in the form of a gable roof with roofing tiles. On the upper side of the acroteria, there are holes, one with a preserved lead ribbon for hanging wreaths or other tokens of courtesy.

A similar example of a small sarcophagus or osteotheca with a large tabula is the one embedded in the former house of Mihovil Šiško in Sućurac, which also has a large tabula ansa-

(?) et sibi vivo/posuit et libertis/libertabus suis. Usp. Bulić 1924–25, str. 33, br. 5187 A. (AMS A-5187).


41 CIL III 2193 (8607), koji je pripadao dječaku Sekstu Atiliju Nikonu, preminulom u dobi od 8 godina. Specifičnost ovog sarkofaga jest ta što je mjesto (*locus*) na koje ga se odlaže ustupila (*donabit*) žena imenom *Pacuvia Tryfera*.

42 Natpis je integralno teško iščitati, jer je neprimjereno rustično uklesan (možda i u sekundarnoj upotrebi). Vidi Švonja 2018, str. 40, kat. br. 5, sl. 7.

38 Toynbee 1971, pp. 35, 38. The formula was used in Rome from the time of Augustus. However, it was adopted in the provinces much later. In Dalmatia, it can be found on rare areas from the time of the Flavians, i.e. the end of the first century.


39 Cambi 2010, pp. 80–84.

40 The inscription reads: *M(arco) T(iti) vernae Fortuna/to alumno infeliciss/mo set (?) et sibi vivo/posuit et libertis/libertabus suis*. Cf. Bulić 1924–25, p. 33, No. 5187 A. (AMS A-5187).



Slika 4.
Dječji sarkofag Seksta Atilija Nikona, uzidan u ex kuću Šiško u Kaštel Sućurcu (foto: N. Cambi)

Figure 4.
Children's sarcophagus of Sextus Atilius Nicon, embedded in former Šiško house in Kaštel Sućurac (photograph: N. Cambi)



Slika 5.
Osteoteka s natpisom Julija Apta i žene mu Elije u podu dvorišta crkve u Vranjicu (foto: N. Cambi, uz dopuštenje župnika Župe sv. Martina u Vranjicu)

Figure 5.
Osteotheca with the inscription of Iulius Aptus and his wife Aelia in the floor of the churchyard in Vranjic (photograph: N. Cambi, with the permission of the parish priest of the Parish of St. Martin in Vranjic)

formirale urne, krajem 1. st. pr. Kr. Osteoteke i sarkofazi nastaju pri samom kraju 1. st. ili na početku 2. st. Oblik i ukras pokazuju istovjetnu razvojnu liniju, a razlikuju se po dimenzijama. Urne i osteoteke će kao demodirane i neefikasne uskoro nestati, preostat će samo sarkofazi i neki oblici hipogeja, o kojima ovdje neće biti govora.

Kako bismo ilustrirali gore navedeno, treba navesti nekoliko primjera dječjih sarkofaga. Najraniji je dječji sarkofag onaj Gaja Flavija, nađen prigodom zaštitnih istraživanja u Vranjicu 2006.

ta with floral decorations (Fig. 4).⁴¹ Yet another, rather illegible example is built into the stone floor of the courtyard in front of the church in Vranjic, used while still unfinished; the tabula and frame are merely marked out (Fig. 5).⁴² Both monuments

41 CIL III 2193 (8607); of the boy Sextus Atilius Nicon, who died at the age of eight. This sarcophagus is specific for the location (*locus*) where it was placed, which had been donated (*donabit*) by a woman named *Pacuvia Tryfera*.

42 The inscription is difficult to read in its entirety, because it is improperly rustically carved (perhaps even in secondary use). See Švojnja 2018, p. 40, Cat. No. 5, Fig. 7.



Slika 6.
Dječji sarkofag Gaja Flavija
pronađen u Vranjicu (AMS
74343) (uz dopuštenje
Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu,
foto: T. Seser)

Figure 6.
Children's sarcophagus of
Gaius Flavius, discovered
in Vranjic (AMS 74343)
(with permission of the
Archaeological Museum in
Split, photograph: T. Seser)

godine (sl. 6).⁴³ To je sarkofag koji već ima razvijenu formu i dekoraciju serijski rađenih sarkofaga u Saloni. Sličan je i dječji sarkofag Klodije Sekundine iz Salone (sl. 7).⁴⁴ Ovaj primjerak pokazuje formu o kojoj je već bilo riječi, tj. tabulu rastegnutu na cijelu prednju stranu. Od ukrasa javljaju se samo središnje rozete u poljima ansa. Sličnost s osteotekama pokazuje i sarkofag Kvinta Cecilija Mesorina, koji je preminuo u dobi od samo 3 godine (sl. 8).⁴⁵ Ovaj je sarkofag značajan zbog razrađene dekoracije.

Urna je pak sasvim sigurno recipijent za kosti Ulpije Tertuline (sl. 9).⁴⁶ Kvadratnog je oblika, a ima samo jednostavno

approximately date from the mid-second century.

With regard to osteothecae, the basic problem is how to distinguish them from children's sarcophagi or urns, because they can be similar in shape and decoration. Of the three types of sepulchral monuments, urns were formed first, at the end of the first century BC. Osteothecae and sarcophagi appeared near the very end of the first century or at the beginning of the second century. The shapes and decorations exhibit the same line of development, while the dimensions are different. Urns and osteothecae soon disappeared as outmoded and inefficient, and only sarcophagi and some forms of hypogea remained, which will not be discussed here.

To illustrate the above, several examples of children's sarcophagi should be mentioned. The earliest children's sarcophagus is that of Caius Flavius, discovered during the 2006 rescue excavations in Vranjic (Fig. 6).⁴³ The form and decorations of this sarcophagus are as developed as those on the serial products from Salona. The children's sarcophagus of Clodia Secundina from Salona is similar (Fig. 7).⁴⁴ This example has the already mentioned form, i.e. its tabula is stretched over the whole front side. Its only decorations are central rosettes in the ansae fields. The sarcophagus of Quintus Caecilius Messorinus, who died at the age of only three years (Fig. 8), also resembles osteothecae.⁴⁵ This sarcophagus is significant for its elaborate decoration.

The receptacle of Ulpia Tertullina's bones is quite certainly an urn (Fig. 9).⁴⁶ It is square in shape, and has only a simply

43 Fotografija sarkofaga objavljena je u sklopu izvještaja s istraživanja, Vodička Miholjek 2008, str. 542. Natpis glasi: *D(is) M(anibus) na pokrovu /C(aius) Fl(avius) Secund(us)/v(ixit annis) III m(ensium) VII/C(aius) FL(avius) Secundvs pater*. Ovaj je primjerak poslijeflavijevski, ali vjerojatno nije mlađi od prvih desetljeća 2. st. (AMS 74343).

44 Usp. Bulić 1914, str. 67. Natpis glasi: *Clodiae Secvndi/nae d(e)f(unctae) an(orom) II d(ierum)/Cl(odia) Firmina et Aur(elius)/Secvndus parentes*. (AMS A-4658).

45 Bulić 1910, str. 81. Natpis glasi: *Q(iunto) Caecilio Messorino/signo Abundanti/dier... ann(orom) III et mens(ium).../Clodius Dardanus/et Aelia Messorina/filio*. Umrli je dječak *Q(iuntus) Caecilius Messorinus*, po još jednom nadimku (*signum*) *Abundantius*. Šteta što nije sačuvao očev *praenomen*, ali *cognomen* mu je *Dardanus*, što znači da je podrijetlom iz Dardanije. U rimskoj nomenklaturi poznat je način dobivanja kognomena po podrijetlu. *Nomen gentile* oca različit je od djetetova (*Clodius*). Očekivali bismo, naime, da je i on *Caecilius*. Majka je *Aelia Messorina*. Njezin *nomen* ukazuje da je sarkofag približno iz sredine 2. st. Preminuli dječak svoj je kognomen dobio po majci (*Messorina*), ali je već u tako ranoj dobi nazvan i *Abundantius* (AMS 74344).

46 Urna, čini se, nije objavljena, čuva se u Tusculumu (prije se nalazila

43 A photograph of the sarcophagus was published as part of the research report, Vodička Miholjek 2008, p. 542. The inscription reads: *D(is) M(anibus) on the cover/C(aius) Fl(avius) Secund(us)/v(ixit annis) III m(ensium) VII/C(aius) FL(avius) Secundvs pater*. This sarcophagus is post-Flavian, but probably not later than the first decades of the second century (AMS 74343).

44 Cf. Bulić 1914, p. 67. The inscription reads: *Clodiae Secvndi/nae d(e) f(unctae) an(orom) II d(ierum)/Cl(odia) Firmina et Aur(elius)/Secvndus parentes*. (AMS A-4658).

45 Bulić 1910, p. 81. The inscription reads: *Q(iunto) Caecilio Messorino/signo Abundanti/dier... ann(orom) III et mens(ium).../Clodius Dardanus/et Aelia Messorina/filio*. The dead boy's name was *Q(iuntus) Caecilius Messorinus*, and he had another epithet (*signum*) – *Abundantius*. It is a pity that his father's *praenomen* is not preserved, but his *cognomen* was *Dardanus*, which means that he was originally from Dardania. In the Roman nomenclature, the method of acquiring cognomens by lineage is known. The father's *nomen gentile* is different from the child's (*Clodius*). Namely, it would be expected that he would also have been *Caecilius*. The mother is *Aelia Messorina*. Her *nomen* indicates that the sarcophagus dates from approximately the mid-second century. The deceased boy got his cognomen after his mother (*Messorina*), but he was also named *Abundantius* at such an early age (AMS 74344).

46 It seems that the urn has not been published. It is kept in the Tusculum (previously it was located in Manastirine), so it probably originates from the area of Salona. The inscription reads: *D(is) M(anibus) on the cover/Vlpiae Tertvlinae infelicis/simae quae vixit annos XXXI m(nenses) VI Aurelius Felicio co(n)/ivgi incomparabili*. This urn is



Slika 7.
Dječji sarkofag Klodije
Sekundine, Salona (Tusculum)
(AMS A-4658) (uz dopuštenje
Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu,
foto: T. Seser)

Figure 7.
Children's sarcophagus of
Clodia Secundina, Salona
(Tusculum) (AMS A-4658)
(with permission of the
Archaeological Museum in
Split, photograph: T. Seser)



Slika 8.
Dječji sarkofag Kvinta Cecilija
Mesorina, Salona (AMS 74344)
(uz dopuštenje Arheološkog
muzeja u Splitu, foto: T. Seser)

Figure 8.
Children's sarcophagus of
Quintus Caecilius Messorinus,
Salona (AMS 74344)
(with permission of the
Archaeological Museum in
Split, photograph: T. Seser)



Slika 9.
Urna Ulpije Tertuline, Salona
(Tusculum) (AMS 74345)
(uz dopuštenje Arheološkog
muzeja u Splitu, foto: T. Seser)

Figure 9.
Urn of Ulpia Tertullina, Salona
(Tusculum) (AMS 74345)
(with permission of the
Archaeological Museum in
Split, photograph: T. Seser)

uokviren natpis, što je na sarkofazima rijetkost, i to samo na kasnijim dekadentnim primjercima. Urna ima pokrov s četiri

framed inscription, which is a rarity on sarcophagi, and only on later decadent examples. The urn has a cover with four lateral acroteria, like sarcophagi. Since the deceased woman died at the age of 31, her remains could only have been placed in the

na Manastirinama), pa vjerojatno potječe s područja Salone. Natpis glasi: *D(is) M(anibus) na pokrovu/Vlpiae Tertvlinae infelicis/simae quae vixit annos XXXI m(nenses) VI Aurelius Felicio co(n)ivgi incomparabili*. Ova je urna po svojoj prilici neznatno mlađa (druga polovica 2. st.) od one dječaka Mesorina (AMS 74345).

probably slightly later (second half of the second century) than that of the boy Messorinus (AMS 74345).



Slika 10.
Osteoteka vojnika XIV. legije gemine, Cista Velika (prema Gudelj 2011, str. 18)

Figure 10.
Osteotheca of a soldier from the 14th Twinned Legion, Cista Velika (after: Gudelj 2011, p. 18)

bočna akroterija kao i na sarkofazima. Budući da je pokojnica umrla u 31. godini, u mali prostor mogla je biti uložena samo poslije incineracije.

I u zaleđu Dalmacije bilo je osteoteka. Jedan karakterističan primjer relativno je nedavno otkriven u Cisti Velikoj (sl. 10).⁴⁷ Neki legionar XIII. legije gemine postavlja sebi i ženi spomenik recipijent. Natpis se čita: *Ex leg(ione) XIII Gemina(e)/vivis (sic!) sibi et Aeli/ae Victorinae/ Co(n)ivge (sic!) rarissim(a)e*.⁴⁸ S obzirom da je riječ o dvije odrasle osobe, jedina je mogućnost uzimajući u obzir dimenzije da je posrijedi osteoteka. Ukrašena je na uobičajen način kao i slični sepulkralni spomenici u zaleđu Dalmacije (sl. 11).⁴⁹ I među urnama u Bosni zasigurno je bilo osteoteka. Njih bi naravno trebalo detaljnije proučiti kako bi se pouzdano razlučio njihov karakter. Neke, međutim, bez obzira što nemaju natpis, treba smatrati osteotekama.⁵⁰ Osteoteka

small space after incineration.

There were osteothecae in the hinterland of Dalmatia as well. One characteristic example was discovered relatively recently in Cista Velika (Fig. 10).⁴⁷ A legionary from the 14th Twinned Legion erected a receptacle monument to himself and his wife. The inscription reads: *Ex leg(ione) XIII Gemina(e)/vivis (sic!) sibi et Aeli/ae Victorinae/ Co(n)ivge (sic!) rarissim(a)e*.⁴⁸ Considering that they were two adult persons, the only possibility, given the dimensions, is that it is an osteotheca. It is decorated in the usual way, like similar sepulchral monuments in the hinterland of Dalmatia (Fig. 11).⁴⁹ There were certainly osteothecae among the urns in Bosnia as well. They should, of course, be studied in more detail in order to identify their character reliably. Some, however, should be regarded as os-

47 Gudelj 2011, str. 18.

48 Vjerojatno nedostaje još zadnji redak, s glagolom *posuit*. Prije te riječi vjerojatno je stajalo i ime muža, legionara. Ženin *nomen gentile* (*Aelia*) upućuje na poslijehadrijansku dataciju. U to doba u Dalmaciji su boravili neki detašmani XIV. legije gemine, gdje su bili na službi kod namjesnika Dalmacije. O toj legiji usp. Cambi, Rapanić 1979, str. 98, također Pollard, Berry 2012, str. 190–191. Legija je nosila još i počasne naslove *Martia Victrix*.

49 Veoma su slični fragmenti dječjih sarkofaga iz Crkvine u Zmijavcima kod Imotskog. Usp. Cambi, Gamulin, Tonković 1999, str. 73–82. Riječ je o fragmentima od kojih neki imaju prikaz ljudskih likova i, nažalost, ne može se pouzdano utvrditi pripadaju li dječjim sarkofazima ili osteotekama. Na jednome je sigurno dječja figura s dugom kosom, pa je vjerojatno riječ o dječjem sarkofagu. Ovi fragmenti pokazuju znatnu radioničku sličnost sa spomenikom iz Ciste Velike.

50 Paškvalin 2012, str. 349–379, sl. 3–4, 42.

47 Gudelj 2011, p. 18.

48 The last line, with the verb *posuit* is probably missing. The word was probably preceded by the name of the husband, the legionary. The wife's *nomen gentile* (*Aelia*) indicates a post-Hadrian origin. At the time, some detachments of 14th Twinned Legion were stationed in Dalmatia, in the service of the province governor. For this legion, cf. Cambi, Rapanić 1979, p. 98, and Pollard, Berry 2012, pp. 190–191. The Legion also held the honorary title of *Martia Victrix*.

49 The fragments of children's sarcophagi from Crkvina in Zmijavci near Imotski are very similar. Cf. Cambi, Gamulin, Tonković 1999, pp. 73–82. Some of the fragments have depictions of human figures. Unfortunately, it cannot be reliably determined whether they belong to children's sarcophagi or osteothecae. One certainly has a figure of a long-haired child, so it is probably a children's sarcophagus. The design of the fragments resembles that of the monument from Cista Velika.



Slika 11.
Osteoteka dječaka iz Crkvine
u Zmijavcima, Franjevački
samostan u Imotskome
(foto: N. Cambi)

Figure 11.
Osteotheca of a boy from
Crkвина in Zmijavci, the
Franciscan monastery in
Imotski
(photograph: N. Cambi)



Slika 12.
Anepigrafska osteoteka iz
Stoca (BiH) (inv. br. 584, LUPA
30281) (Zemaljski muzej Bosne
i Hercegovine, uz dopuštenje,
foto: O. Harl)

Figure 12.
Anepigraphic osteotheca
from Stolac (BiH) (Inv. No.
584, LUPA 30281) (National
Museum of Bosnia and
Herzegovina, with permission,
photograph: O. Harl)

bi mogao biti primjerak iz Stoca s girlandom na pokrovu, koji se čuva u Zemaljskom muzeju Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu (sl. 12).⁵¹ Moglo bi se nanizati još takvih primjera, ali i ovoliko je dovoljno.

Zaključno valja kazati da osteoteke pripadaju zasebnoj kategoriji nadgrobnih spomenika, recipijenata koji služe za pohranu kostiju odraslih osoba. Fragment iz Kampora na Rabu došao je kao naručen da se otvori pitanje osteoteka i pokaže opravdanost pretpostavke da se u rimskoj Dalmaciji razvio i jedan ovakav tip sepulkralnog spomenika, dosad gotovo nezamijećen. Stoga bi bilo opravdano načiniti barem manju sintezu takvih spomenika nakon što se prouče postojeći prežitelji.

Rapska osteoteka u kontekstu topografije jugoistočnog dijela Kamporskog polja

Za većinu kamenih spomenika otoka Raba pa tako i onih sepulkralnih nije poznato točno mjesto nalaza, odnosno oni su, u razdoblju kada ulaze u epigrafske korpuse i stručnu literaturu, uglavnom već bili korišteni kao spoliji ili je poznata tek šira zona njihova pronalaska. Posebno se to odnosi na spomenike

teothecae, despite the fact that they have no inscriptions.⁵⁰ The specimen from Stolac with a garland on the cover, kept in the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Sarajevo could be an osteotheca (Fig. 12).⁵¹ More such examples could be mentioned, but this much will suffice.

In conclusion, it should be noted that osteothecae belong to a separate category of sepulchral monuments, as receptacles used to store the bones of adult persons. The fragment from Kampor on Rab is a godsend for addressing the matter of osteothecae and justifying the assumption that this type of sepulchral monuments, almost unnoticed so far, developed in Roman Dalmatia. Therefore, it would be justified to prepare at least a small-scale synthesis of such monuments after studying the surviving examples.

Osteotheca from Rab in the context of the topography of the south-eastern part of the Kampor polje

The exact find-spots are unknown for most of the stone monuments on the island of Rab, including the sepulchral

51 Sergejevski 1948, str. 170, br. 3, sl. 1, T. II: 2; Paškvalin 2012, str. 400, br. 43, sl. 43. (Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine, inv. br. 584, LUPA 30281).

50 Paškvalin 2012, pp. 349–379, Figs. 3–4, 42.

51 Sergejevski 1948, p. 170, No. 3, Fig. 1, Pl. II: 2; Paškvalin 2012, p. 400, No. 43, Fig. 43. (National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Inv. No. 584, LUPA 30281).

koji su zatečeni u gradu Rabu, a koji su mahom, kako navodi i CIL, uzidavani unutar plemičkih palača i drugih građevina,⁵² bilo u humanističkom duhu ljubavi prema starinama, bilo u svrhu njihove refunkcionalizacije ili upotrebe kao građevinskog materijala.⁵³ Dok je za pojedine spomenike, s obzirom na njihov epigrafski sadržaj, gradsko porijeklo neupitno (primjerice, brojne baze kipova),⁵⁴ kod sepulkralnih spomenika ono se ne mora nužno odnositi na još uvijek neubiciranu gradsku, već primjerice neku manju ruralnu otočnu nekropolu.

Za jedan dio spomenika ove potonje skupine, izvangradskog porijekla, ipak posjedujemo nešto preciznije podatke: ugradbeni reljefi iz okolice kamporske Kašteline, epitaf iz okolice crkve sv. Anastazija u Banjolu, liburnski cipusi iz Banjola i Barbata, sarkofag iz okolice crkve sv. Stjepana u Barbatu. Oni su se mahom i sačuvali, naravno, kada im trag nije posve izgubljen, nedaleko od samog mjesta nalaza. Također, prema spomenicima koji se čuvaju u Kamporu i drugdje na otoku, moglo bi se zaključiti kako gradski spomenici nisu iznošeni izvan urbane jezgre srednjovjekovnoga grada, osim kada su posve izmješteni s otoka,⁵⁵ no to se ne može sa sigurnošću tvrditi, kao što se ne može otkloniti ni mogućnost da spomenici iz ruralnih dijelova nisu donošeni u grad.

Prema oskudnim, već navedenim izvorima te općenito interpretacijskim problemima u analizi spolija, nemoguće je sa sigurnošću ubicirati mjesto nalaza rapske osteoteke, no moguće ju je, na temelju dostupnih podataka, makar pokušati smjestiti unutar šire topografije jugoistočnog dijela Kamporskog polja (sl. 13). Samostan se, naime, nalazi uz sam rub Kamporskog polja, na južnim padinama manjeg uzvišenja (lokalnog naziva Idila), uz sjevernu muljevitou obalu uvale sv. Eufemija/Fumija, nedaleko od manjeg vodotoka koji se iz smjera Palita (*Paludo*) ulijeva u more.

Iz današnjeg izgleda osteoteke moguće je razlučiti da je već prije prve objave i korištenja kao klupe te dvaju uzidavanja u samostanu korištena kao arhitektonski element, o čemu svjedoči kružna rupa koja se nalazi u donjem lijevom kutu tabule i upućuje na moguću sekundarnu upotrebu u funkciji nad vratnika ili eventualno praga.⁵⁶

Podaci o porijeklu spolija i ulomaka iz klaustara rijetki su, često i kontradiktorni, no neke informacije moguće je iščitati iz već navedenih najranijih objava o povijesti i baštini otoka⁵⁷ te iz *Velike kamporske kronike* fra Odorika Badurine.⁵⁸ Kako je

ones, that is, in the period when they started being presented in epigraphic corpora and professional literature they had mostly already been used as spolia, or only a wide area of their discovery is known. This is in particular the case with the monuments found in the town of Rab, which were mostly, as indicated in the CIL, embedded in noblemen's palaces and other structures,⁵² either in the humanistic spirit of love for antiquities, or for the purpose of their reuse or use as building material.⁵³ While for some of these monuments, in the light of their epigraphic content, the urban origin is indisputable (for example, numerous bases of statues),⁵⁴ when it comes to sepulchral ones, their provenance might not necessarily regard an as yet unlocalised urban necropolis, but rather a small rural insular one, for instance.

However, we do have somewhat more precise information for some monuments of this latter group of extra-urban origin: embedded reliefs from the environs of Kampor Kašteline, the epitaph from the vicinity of the church of St. Anastasius in Banjol, Liburnian cippi from Banjol and Barbat, the sarcophagus from the vicinity of the church of St. Stephen in Barbat. They have mostly been preserved not far from their find-spots, when their trace is not entirely lost, of course. Furthermore, judging by the monuments kept in Kampor and elsewhere on the island, it could be concluded that urban monuments have not been shifted from the urban core of the medieval city, except when they were completely relocated from the island,⁵⁵ but this cannot be said with certainty. In addition, the possibility that monuments from rural areas were not brought into the town also cannot be ruled out.

Based on the scarce, already mentioned sources and general interpretive issues in the analyses of spolia, it is impossible to localise the find-spot of the osteotheca from Rab with certainty, but it is possible, based on available information, to at least attempt to identify its place in a wider topography of the south-eastern part of Kamporsko polje (Fig. 13). Namely, the monastery is located by the very edge of Kamporsko polje, on the southern slopes of a hillock (with a local name of Idila), by the sludgy northern shore of the cove of St. Euphemia, not far from a small watercourse that flows into the sea from the direction of Palit (*Paludo*).

The present-day appearance of the osteotheca allows us to recognise that before its first publication and use as a bench, as well as its two embedments in the monastery, it was used as an architectural element, as evidenced by a circular hole in the lower left corner of the tabula, indicating possible second-

52 Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra, Šegvić 2017, str. 320.

53 Sena Chiesa 2012; Demicheli 2017.

54 Nedved 1990, str. 36–39; Cambi 1998, str. 56–57.

55 Zbirka Nani u Veneciji, muzeji u Zadru, Splitu i dr. (vidi npr. Cambi 1987b; Nedved 1990; Calvelli, Crema, Luciani 2017, str. 265).

56 Vjerojatnija je prva funkcija s obzirom da tabula nije izlizana kao što bi mogla biti da je korištena kao prag.

57 Sticotti 1893; Schleyer 1914; Brusić 1926.


58 *Velika kamporska kronika* (nadalje VKK) pisana je 40-ih godina 20. st., u duhu franjevačkih kroničarskih zapisa, kada je fra Odorik Baduri-

52 Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra, Šegvić 2017, p. 320.

53 Sena Chiesa 2012; Demicheli 2017.

54 Nedved 1990, pp. 36–39; Cambi 1998, pp. 56–57.

55 The Nani Collection in Venice, museums in Zadar, Split, etc. (see, e.g., Cambi 1987b; Nedved 1990; Calvelli, Crema, Luciani 2017, p. 265).



Slika 13.
Smještaj samostana u Kamporu i položaja koji se spominju u tekstu
(izradila: A. Konestra)

Figure 13.
Locations of the monastery in Kampor and the sites mentioned in the text
(made by: A. Konestra)

već rečeno, najraniji objavljeni podatak o rimskom sepulkralnom spomeniku iz klaustera onaj je iz CIL-a, u koji je uvršten posredstvom podataka M. Sabljara i I. Gurata. Upravo se u Sabljarovim bilježnicama iz 1852. – 1854. godine⁵⁹ nalazi crtež spomenika uz bilješku “u vrtlu”, kao jedini dodatni podatak (sl. 14). Sljedeće informacije donose već spomenuti prvi fotografski zapisi, koji svjedoče o prvom smještaju ovog spolija (sl. 15). Kamporski fratar V. Brusić u svojoj publikaciji *Otok Rab* osvrće se tek na natpis spomenika, iako je, kako ćemo vidjeti, njegova uloga u očuvanju cjelokupne skupine spolija vrlo značajna. Naime, time dolazimo do podataka iz VKK, unutar koje se, na više mjesta, autor dotiče i ovog spomenika. Ponajprije saznajemo da je upravo spomenuti V. Brusić zaslužan za sadašnji smještaj spomenika, koji je ovamo po svemu sudeći po drugi put uzidan, kada su u sklopu uređenja klaustera godine 1929. uklonjeni okviru gotičkih otvora unutar kojih je, prema fotografijama,⁶⁰ spomenik prvobitno bio uzidan (sl. 15).⁶¹ Na drugim se pak mjestima unutar VKK raspravlja i o lokaciji gdje je spomenik prvi

ary use as a lintel or perhaps a threshold.⁵⁶

The particulars on the origin of the spolia and fragments from the cloister is rare and often contradictory, but some information can be found in the mentioned earliest publications on the history and heritage of the island⁵⁷ and *Velika kamporska kronika* (The Great Kampor Chronicle) by Friar Odorik Badurina.⁵⁸ As already noted, the earliest published piece of information on the Roman sepulchral monument from the cloister is the one from the CIL, in which it was included by way of the information provided by M. Sabljara and I. Gurata. Sabljara's note-books from 1852–1854⁵⁹ contain a drawing of the monument with a note “in the garden” as the only additional information (Fig. 14). Subsequent information was provided by the already mentioned first photographic records, which testify to the first location of this spolium (Fig. 15). In his publication *Rab Island* (The Island of Rab), V. Brusić, a Kampor friar, referred only to the inscription on the monument, although,

na dovršio prikupljanje arhivskih, literarnih i usmenih podataka vezanih uz povijest otoka Raba (Domijan 2007, str. 227). Ovo kapitalno djelo, sastavljeno u šest rukopisnih knjiga i tri knjige indeksa, često je, zbog gubitka dijela otočne arhivske građe, jedini izvor za pojedine starije dokumente i podatke; ono međutim donosi i Badurina osobna svjedočanstva iz razdoblja prve pol. 20. st. Knjige VKK danas se čuvaju u arhivu i knjižnici kamporskoga samostana (o VKK vidi u Lajšić 2009).

59 Sabljara 1852 – 1854, 4, str. 44; za *Putne bilješke* Mijata Sabljara i problematiku nastanka vidi u Juranović-Tonejc 2010, str. 7, 15–21.

60 Domijan 2007, str. 221–222.

61 VKK, I, 173–174, 241 (uz potonji navod priložena je i onodobna fotografija, na kojoj je razvidno da je današnje stanje uzidanih spolija ono koje je poznavao i Badurina).

56 The former use is more likely since the tabula is not worn out as it could be had it been used as a threshold.

57 Sticotti 1893; Schleyer 1914; Brusić 1926.

58 *Velika kamporska kronika* (hereinafter: the VKK) was written in the 1940s, in the spirit of Franciscan chronicles, when Friar Odorik Badurina completed the collection of archival, literary and oral information related to the history of the island of Rab (Domijan 2007, p. 227). This capital work, composed of six manuscript and three index volumes, has often been the only source for certain earlier documents and information, due to the loss of a part of the island's archives. Furthermore, it also comprises Badurina's personal testimonies from the first half of the 20th century. Today, the VKK volumes are kept in the archives and library of the Kampor monastery (for the VKK, see Lajšić 2009).

59 Sabljara 1852–1854, 4, p. 44; for Mijat Sabljara's travel notes (*Putne bilješke*) and their origin, see Juranović-Tonejc 2010, pp. 7, 15–21.



Slika 14.
Crtež osteoteke prema M. Sabljaru, vol. 4, str. 44 (izvor: Ministarstvo kulture, Uprava za zaštitu kulturne baštine, MK – UZKB – SD, Mijat Sabljar, uz dopuštenje)

Figure 14.
Drawing of the osteotheca after M. Sabljar, vol. 4, p. 44 (source: Ministry of Culture, Directorate for the Protection of Cultural Heritage, MK – UZKB – SD, Mijat Sabljar, with permission)



Slika 15.
Smještaj ulomaka osteoteke i pluteja s prikazom crux gemmata u klasturu samostana (desno: prema Schleyer 1914, sl. 90; lijevo: prema Iveković 1928, sl. 5)



Bild 90. Im Kreuzgang von S. Eufemia.

Figure 15.
Locations of fragments of the osteotheca and pluteus depicting the crux gemmata in the monastery cloister (right: after Schleyer 1914, Fig. 90; left: after Iveković 1928, Fig. 5)

put zamijećen, odnosno o Sabljarovu “vrtlu”. Badurinin zapis, koji potječe iz dokumenta iz Provikarskog arhiva (VIII, 73.6), a moguće je da ga je sastavio već spomenuti I. Gurato,⁶² tako navodi da je spomenik u gornjem samostanskom vrtu korišten kao klupa te da je navodno nedaleko od ovog mjesta i iskopan, kako navodi Badurina, s još nekim ulomcima izrađenima od alohtonog vapnenca (potonjima se nažalost nakon ovog spomena gubi trag).⁶³ Prema citatu koji donosi i mišljenju O. Badurine osteoteka je mogla biti iskopana u blizini samostana, odnosno u „gornjem vrtu”, koji u 19. st. postaje kampsorsko seosko groblje (sl. 13). Badurina također navodi kako se na tom području tijekom radova na groblju nailazilo na zidove, dok bi sama refunkcionalizacija tabule kao klupe na tom području mogla ponešto osnažiti tvrdnju o ovom položaju kao mjestu njezina nalaska. Osim toga, nedaleko od samog samostana, dvadesetak metara istočnije, uz cestu koja prolazi s njegove sjeverne strane (sl. 13), godine 1942., pri radovima na proširenju ceste, pronađen je maleni kip božice Dijane, koji se također čuva u samostanskoj zbirci.⁶⁴ Oba Badurinina podatka daju naslutiti kako je na širem prostoru samostana moguće locirati arheološki (antički?) lokalitet, zasad dakako nepoznate tipologije i gabarita, o čijem bi postojanju mogli svjedočiti i pojedini nanovo upotrijebljeni kameni blokovi ugrađeni u zidove terasa s istočne strane samostana,⁶⁵ premda unutar šireg areala samostana opetovanim pregledima nisu zatečeni pokretni nalazi.

Valja, međutim, navesti još jednu mogućnost. U VKK Badurina navodi, prema usmenoj predaji, i podatke o nalazu ulomka pluteja s prikazom *crux gemmata*⁶⁶ koji je uzidan iznad osteoteke, a navodno je u samostan dospio godine 1836. s područja poznatog kao Polačine⁶⁷ u Palitu, gdje bi, ponovno prema

as we will see, his role in preserving the entire group of spolia was very significant. Namely, this leads us to the information from the VKK, in which the author mentioned this monument in several places. First, we can learn that the aforementioned V. Brusić is responsible for the current location of the monument, apparently embedded there for the second time when, during the 1929 refurbishment of the cloister, the frames of Gothic openings were removed; according to photographs,⁶⁰ the monument had originally been embedded in them (Fig. 15).⁶¹ Elsewhere in the VKK, the location where the monument was first spotted is discussed, i.e. Sabljara’s “garden”. Badurina’s record, which originates from a document in the archives of the provicar (VIII, 73.6), possibly compiled by the already mentioned I. Gurato,⁶² thus states that the monument was used as a bench in the upper monastery garden and that it had allegedly been excavated not far from that place, according to Badurina, together with some other fragments made of allochthonous limestone (whose whereabouts have been unknown since this mention, unfortunately).⁶³ According to the information O. Badurina cited and his opinion, the osteotheca could have been excavated near the monastery, i.e. in the “upper garden”, which became the Kampsor village cemetery in the 19th century (Fig. 13). Badurina also noted that walls had been found in the area during the works in the cemetery, while the reuse of the tabula as a bench in this area could somewhat strengthen the claim about this site as its find-spot. In addition, not far from the monastery itself, about twenty meters to the east, by the road that runs north of it (Fig. 13), a statuette of the goddess Diana was found in 1942 during road-widening works. It is also kept in the monastery collection.⁶⁴ Both

62 Badurina navodi da su podaci prikupljeni za potrebe L. Mascheka i njegova izdanja *Manuale del regno di Dalmazia* za 1872. godinu, no ondje, čini se, nisu preuzeti.

63 VKK, III, str. 762–763: “‘Nel orto superiore (=sjeverno i tik do zehoda!) del convento, vedesi una lapide sepulcrale romana, scavata a quanto dicesi, in quei dintorni, ed ora inserviente come sedile’ (Taj je kamen srećom p. VI. Brusić 1929. g. uzidao u zid klaustura pokraj ulaza u crkvu. O tom smo kamenu s natpisom već pisali ovdje. Ali isto tamo gore ‘na Lučarici’, do zida zgrade gdje je zahod, jest kameni sto. Kraj njega i još je jedan kamen bez natpisa, bijeli, vapnenac, koji nije sa ot. Raba. I taj je morao biti izvađen s gornjim! Gdje? Nitko nezna! Ali najprije da u današnjem proširenom groblju. I nedavno su, kopajući za grobove, pri jugozapadnom zidu groblja, naišli u podzemlju na nekakve drevne zidine, tvrde i jake!) – Dakle, po običaju, ovo u zaparkama jesu moje refleksije.”

64 VKK, V, str. 236–237; ovaj je put Badurina svjedočio nalazu. O kipu vidi Glavičić 1997.

65 Suautorica zahvaljuje kolegi Ranku Starcu, kustosu PPMHP Rijeka, koji nas je uputio da detaljnije pregledamo navedene terase.

66 Jarak 2005; 2017, str. 53.

67 Za ovaj novovjekovni lokalitet vidi sažetak neobjavljenoga rada A. Durmana, predstavljenog na kongresu *Arheološka istraživanja na Rabu i Pagu* (HAD), 2004. g. (<https://www.bib.irb.hr/173481>, 7. 4. 2020.).

60 Domijan 2007, pp. 221–222.

61 The VKK, I, 173–174, 241 (this information was accompanied by a photograph from that time, which shows that the current condition of the embedded spolia is the same as Badurina knew it).

62 Badurina noted that the information had been collected for L. Maschek’s 1872 volume of *Manuale del regno di Dalmazia*, but it seems they were not published there.

63 The VKK, III, pp. 762–763: “‘Nel orto superiore (=north-away and next to the privy!) del convento, vedesi una lapide sepulcrale romana, scavata a quanto dicesi, in quei dintorni, ed ora inserviente come sedile’ (Fortunately, Fr. VI. Brusić had this stone embedded in the cloister wall near the entrance to the church in 1929. We have already written about this stone with the inscription here. However, also up there, ‘on Lučarica’, next to the wall of the privy building, there is a stone table. Next to it is another stone without an inscription, white, limestone, not from the island of Rab. This one must have been unearthed together with the above-mentioned one! Where? No-one knows! The present-day expanded cemetery is the most likely location. Recently, while digging grave pits, near the south-west wall of the cemetery, some ancient walls were found under ground, hard and strong!) – Ergo, as per usual, my reflections are indicated in parentheses.”

64 The VKK, V, pp. 236–237; this time Badurina witnessed the discovery. For the statue, see Glavičić 1997.

Badurini, bila smještena crkva sv. Damjana *de Pessal* (sl. 13).⁶⁸ I ovaj lokalitet, dakle, dolazi u obzir kao moguće mjesto nalaza ne samo pluteja nego možda i drugih u klausturu uzidanih ulomaka kamene plastike. Iako se u samostanu čuvaju i drugi antički nadgrobni spomenici porijeklom s lokaliteta na krajnjem zapadu Kamporskoga polja te sitni nalazi s pojedinih drugih područja, ipak osteoteku ne bismo s njima povezali.⁶⁹

Kako bilo, podatak o nalazu ulomka pluteja s *crux gemmata*, u kombinaciji s ostalim poznatim i datiranim podacima, može nam poslužiti za rekonstrukciju barem posljednjih faza ponovne upotrebe kamporske osteoteke. Prema tim podacima u vrijeme Sabljarova posjeta Rabu (između 1852. i 1854. godine) osteoteka je još uvijek u gornjem samostanskom vrtu i služi kao sjedalo klupe (to bi značilo da nije “valorizirana” kao spomenik, što će poslije biti); između tih godina, a prije prvih desetljeća 20. st., možda nakon Sticottijeva podatka (1890. – 1891.), prvi je put uzidana zajedno s ulomkom pluteja (što svakako stoji ako je on pronađen 1836. g.) unutar gotičkog portala u samostanskom klausturu (sl. 15). Drugo uzidavanje, odnosno četvrta nama poznata nova upotreba osteoteke zbila se 1929. godine, kada V. Brusić preuređuje klaustar i seli gotičke elemente u unutrašnjost crkve te stvara kompoziciju spolija kakvu danas poznajemo (sl. 1).

Iako će nam po svoj prilici mjesto nalaza osteoteke, do nekih budućih terenskih istraživanja, ostati osnovna nepoznanica, obradom ovog spomenika rasvijetljeni su ključni podatci vezani uz njegovu prvobitnu funkciju. Oni se ponajprije odnose na njegovu tipologiju, koja je, kao što je izneseno, za sada slabo zastupljena na području provincije Dalmacije, dok je u njezini sjevernom dijelu bila posve nepoznata. Posljedično, time je dodatno obogaćena raznolikost tipologije grobnih spomenika otoka. Nadalje, osteoteku, pripisanu osobi italskoga porijekla, sada je moguće preciznije datirati u prva desetljeća 2. st. Osim što tipologija spomenika ukazuje na specifičan ritus pokapanja, njezine značajke govore i u prilog polaganju osteoteke iznad zemlje, dakle upućuju na monumentalnije sepulkralno rješenje unutar, možda, još jedne rapske ruralne nekropole.⁷⁰ Porijeklo osteoteke iz salonitanskih radionica upućuje pak na uključenost Raba i sjeverne Liburnije u trgovinske mreže provincijskoga središta već u ranom razdoblju 2. stoljeća, što će se poslije nastaviti i uvozom sarkofaga.⁷¹ U kontekstu povijesti istraživanja otoka Raba te fenomena spolija općenito osteote-

pieces of Badurina’s information suggest that it is possible to locate an archaeological (Roman?) site in the wider area of the monastery, at present of unknown typology and size, of course. Its existence could be substantiated by some reused stone blocks embedded in the terrace walls east of the monastery,⁶⁵ although no movable finds have been found in the wider area of the monastery through repeated surveys.

Notwithstanding, another possibility should be mentioned. In the VKK, Badurina presented information based on oral tradition concerning a discovered fragment of a pluteus depicting the *crux gemmata*,⁶⁶ embedded above the osteotheca. Allegedly, it ended up in the monastery in 1836 from the area known as Polačine⁶⁷ in Palit, where, again according to Badurina, the church of St. Damian *de Pessal* is supposedly located (Fig. 13).⁶⁸ This locality, therefore, also comes into consideration as a possible find-spot, not only of pluteus but perhaps also of other fragments of stone sculpture embedded in the cloister. Although the monastery also keeps other ancient sepulchral monuments originating from the sites in the extreme west of Kamporsko polje and small finds from some other areas, the osteotheca would nevertheless not be associated with them.⁶⁹

In any case, the information on the discovered fragment of the pluteus with the *crux gemmata*, combined with other known and dated information, can help us to reconstruct at least the final stages of reuse of the osteotheca from Kampor. According to the mentioned information, at the time of Sabljar’s visit to Rab (between 1852 and 1854), the osteotheca was still in the upper monastery garden and served as a bench seat (which would mean that it was not “evaluated” as a monument, which it would be at a later date). Between those years, but before the first decades of the 20th century, perhaps after Sticotti’s information (1890–1891), it was embedded for the first time together with the fragment of the pluteus (which is certainly viable if it had been discovered in 1836) in the Gothic portal of the monastery cloister (Fig. 15). The second embedment, i.e. the fourth reuse of the osteotheca that we know of, took place in 1929, when V. Brusić was refurbishing the cloister, moving the Gothic elements into the interior

68 VKK, III, str. 762–763. Vidi i Mlacović 2012, str. 171.

69 Lokacija nalaza ulomaka s Mirala, odnosno Kašteline poznata je, a i sam spomenik pripisan je autohtonoj obitelji *Baebii*, čiji se posjed uvjetno može povezati uz vilu na Kašteline (Maršić 2009; 2012 s ranijom literaturom; Jurković, Turković 2019); i za ostale položaje postoje detaljni, često i izravni podatci O. Badurine, koji je svjedočio njihovu nalasku.

70 Usp. Lazinica, Maršić 2017, sl. 197.

71 Cambi 2010, str. 84, sl. 43; Baraka Perica 2018, karta 1, sl. 3c, d.

65 The co-author is grateful to her colleague Ranko Starac, curator of the PPMHP Rijeka, who referred us to examine the terraces in detail.

66 Jarak 2005; 2017, p. 53.

67 For this modern-age site, see the abstract of the unpublished work by A. Durman, presented at the *Arheološka istraživanja na Rabu i Pagu* (Archaeological Excavations on Rab and Pag) congress (HAD), 2004. (<https://www.bib.irb.hr/173481>, 7. 4. 2020.).

68 The VKK, III, pp. 762–763. See also Mlacović 2012, p. 171.

69 The find-spot of the fragments from Miral, i.e. Kašteline is known, and the monument itself is attributed to the autochthonous family *Baebii*, whose property can be conditionally associated with the villa at Kašteline (Maršić 2009; 2012 with earlier literature; Jurković, Turković 2019). There are detailed, often direct witness information provided by O. Badurina with regard to other sites.

ka Remije Maksime odličan je primjer dugog “drugog života” antičkih spomenika, a otkriva nam i ponešto o stavu, tradiciji i odnosu prema otočnim starinama u podmaklom 19. i ranom 20. stoljeću.

of the church and creating the configuration of the spolia as we know it today (Fig. 1).

Although the find-spot of the osteotheca will probably remain our fundamental uncertainty until future field research, the analysis of this monument has shed light on key information related to its original purpose. The information primarily regards its typology, which, as already noted, is currently poorly represented in the area of the province of Dalmatia, while in its northern part it was completely unknown. Consequently, this has further enriched the diversity of the typology of sepulchral monuments on the island. Furthermore, the osteotheca, attributed to a person of Italic origin, can now be dated more precisely to the first decades of the second century. The typology of the monument not only indicates a specific burial rite, but its features also speak in favour of placing the osteotheca above the ground, thus pointing to a more monumental sepulchral solution within, perhaps, another rural necropolis on Rab.⁷⁰ The origin of the osteotheca from Salonitan workshops points to the involvement of Rab and northern Liburnia in trade networks of the provincial centre as early as the beginning of the second century, later continued with the import of sarcophagi.⁷¹ In the context of the history of research of the island of Rab and the phenomenon of spolia in general, the osteotheca of Remmia Maxima is an excellent example of the long “second life” of ancient monuments. It also reveals something about the points of view, tradition and attitude towards the antiquities on the island in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Prijevod / Translation: Denis Gracin

⁷⁰ Cf. Lazinica, Maršić 2017, Fig. 197.

⁷¹ Cambi 2010, p. 84, Fig. 43; Baraka Perica 2018, Map 1, Figs. 3c, d.

Kratice / Abbreviations

CIL – *Corpus inscriptionum latinarum*, Th. Mommsen et al., Berlin.

VKK – Badurina, O., *Velika kampska kronika*, vol. I – VI, rukopis, Arhiva i knjižnica samostana sv. Bernardina u Kampu, Rab.

LUPA – F. and O. Harl, *Ubi Erat Lupa*, <http://lupa.at>

Izvori / Ancient sources

Ciceron, *De legibus* II, Loeb Classical Library, London 2015.

Arhivska građa / Archival sources

M. Sabljarić, *Putne bilješke*, arhiva Uprave za zaštitu kulturne baštine (MK-UZKB-MS), Zagreb 1852. – 1854.

Literatura / Bibliography**Alföldy 1968**

G. Alföldy, *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatien*, Heidelberg 1968.

Baraka Perica 2018

J. Baraka Perica, *The late antique sarcophagi in Liburnia (between the 4th and the 6th century)*, in: *The Basilica of St Sophia During the Transition From Paganism To Christianity, International scientific conference, Sofia, March 11–13, 2014*, vol. VII, Serdica – Sredets – Sofia 2018, 397–417.

Basić 2012

I. Basić, *Prilog datiranja zlatnog enkolpija iz Barbata na Rabu*, in: J. Andrić, R. Lončarić (eds.), *Rapski zbornik II: Rab 2012*, 427–442.

Brusić 1926

V. Brusić, *Otok Rab*, Rab 1926.

Budak 2006

N. Budak, *Urban development of Rab – a hypothesis*, *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 12, Zagreb 2006, 123–135.

Bulić 1910

F. Bulić, *Escavi nella necropoli antica pagana di Salona detta Hortus Metrodori negli anni 1909 e 1910*, *Bulletino di archaeologia e storia dalmata* XXXIII, Split 1910, 3–66.

Bulić 1914

F. Bulić, *Trovamenti antichi ad Est dell' anfiteatro a Salona*, *Bulletino di archaeologia e storia dalmata* XXXVII, Split 1914, 60–67.

Bulić 1924 – 25

F. Bulić, *Trovamenti antichi*

nelle mura perimetrali e nelle torri di Salona ad Est dell' Anfiteatro, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* XLVII–XLVIII, Split 1924 – 25, 27–46.

Buljević 2009

Z. Buljević, *Rimskodobna nekropola u splitskoj Lori*, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku* 103, Split 2009, 80–190.

Calvelli, Crema, Luciani 2017

L. Calvelli, F. Crema, F. Luciani, *The Nani Museum: Greek and Latin inscriptions from Greece and Dalmatia*, in: D. Demicheli (ed.), *Illyrica Antiqua, In honorem Duje Rendić-Miočević, Proceedings of the international conference, Šibenik 12th–15th September 2013*, Zagreb 2017, 265–290.

Cambi 1980

N. Cambi, *Stela pomorskog centuriona Likeja u Osoru*, in: M. Kalčić (ed.), *Pomorstvo Lošinja i Cresa*, Mali Lošinj 1980, 151–155.

Cambi 1987a

N. Cambi, *Salona und seine Nekropolen*, in: *Römische Gräberstrassen. Selbstdarstellung – Staus – Standard*. Kolloquium in München vom 28. bis 30. Oktober 1985, München 1987, 251–279.

Cambi 1987b

N. Cambi, *Zapažanja o antičkoj skulpturi na otoku Rabu*, in: A. Mohorovičić (ed.), *Rapski zbornik. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenoga skupa o otoku Rabu održanog od 25.–27. listopada 1984. godine*, Zagreb 1987, 175–186.

Cambi 1988

N. Cambi, *Atički sarkofazi u Dalmaciji*, Split 1988.

Cambi 1998

N. Cambi, *Skupine carskih kipova u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji*, *Histria Antiqua* 4, Pula 1998, 45–61.

Cambi 2010

N. Cambi, *Sarkofazi lokalne produkcije u rimskoj Dalmaciji*, Split 2010.

Cambi, Rapanić 1979

N. Cambi, Ž. Rapanić, *Ara Lucija Granija Prokulina*, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* LXXII–LVIII, Split 1979.

Cambi, Gamulin, Tonković 1999

N. Cambi, A. Gamulin, S. Tonković, *Starokršćanska bazilika u Zmijavcima*, Split–Zmijavci 1999.

Cumont 1922

Fr. Cumont, *After Life in Roman Paganism*, New Haven 1922.

Cumont 1949

Fr. Cumont, *Lux perpetua*, Paris 1949.

Demicheli 2017

D. Demicheli, *Recikliranje antičkih epigrafskih spomenika na širem splitskom području*, in: I. Miloglav, A. Kudelić, J. Balen (eds.), *Recikliraj, ideje iz prošlosti*, Zagreb 2017, 181–207.

Domijan 2007

M. Domijan, *Rab grad umjetnosti*, Zagreb 2007.

Ducos 1995

M. Ducos, *Le tombe, locus*

religiosus, in: F. Hinard (ed.), *La mort au quotidien dans le monde romain*, Paris 1995, 135–144.

Estiez 1995

O. Estiez, *La translatio cadaveris. Le transport des corps dans l'Antiquité Romaine*, in: F. Hinard (ed.), *La mort au quotidien dans le monde romain*, Paris 1995, 101–108.

Fadić 1989

I. Fadić, *Krčka skupina liburnskih nadgrobnih spomenika tzv. liburnskih cipusa – prilog klasifikaciji*, in: Ž. Rapanić (ed.), *Arheološka istraživanja na otocima Krku, Rabu i Pagu i u Hrvatskom primorju*, Znanstveni skup Krk, 24.–27. 9. 1985., Zagreb 1989, 51–59.

Glavičić 1997

M. Glavičić, *Kipić božice Dijane iz Kampora na otoku Rabu*, Radovi. Razdio povijesnih znanosti 36/23, Zadar 1997, 33–43.

Glavičić 2003

M. Glavičić, *Nadgrobnii spomenik obitelji Baebius iz Arbe*, Senjski zbornik 30, Senj 2003, 83–96.

Glavičić 2009

M. Glavičić, *Magistrati i uglednici Arbe*, Senjski zbornik 36, Senj 2009, 57–66.

Gudelj 2011

Lj. Gudelj, *Crkvine, Cista Velika*, Split 2011.

Ivančević 1995

R. Ivančević, *Izgubljeni fragment a(n)tičkog sarkofaga iz Raba*, Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji 35, Split 1995, 81–87.

Iveković 1928

Ć. M. Iveković, *Ostrva. Rab. Hvar. Korčula*, Građevinski i umetnički spomenici Dalmacije, Sveska 6, Beograd 1928.

Jarak 2005

M. Jarak, *Plutej s otoka Raba iz kasnijeg 6. ili 7. st.*, *Opuscula archaeologica* 29, Zagreb 2005, 275–286.

Jarak 2017

M. Jarak, *Studije o kasnonatičkoj i ranosrednjovjekovnoj skulpturi s otoka Raba*, Zagreb 2017.

Jarak, Cambi 2016

M. Jarak, N. Cambi, *O Dobrom pastiru kao sepulkralnom motivu u povodu objave fragmenta sarkofaga s otoka Raba*, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 109, Split 2016, 305–337.

Juranović-Tonejc 2010

M. Juranović-Tonejc, *Putne bilješke Mijata Sabljara (1852. – 1854.)*, *Crkveni inventar*, Zagreb 2010.

Jurković 2019

M. Jurković, *The Transformation of Adriatic Islands from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, in: M. A. Cau Ontiveros, C. Mas Florit (eds.), *Change and Resilience. The Occupation of Mediterranean Islands in Late Antiquity*, Oxford 2019, 111–137.

Jurković, Turković 2019

M. Jurković, T. Turković, *Kaštelina – vila obitelji Bebija*, *Ars Adriatica* 9, Zadar 2019, 7–20.

Koch 1996

G. Koch, *Sarkophage der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Darmstadt 1994.

Kolega 1989

M. Kolega, *Dvije rimske stele arhitektonskog tipa s otoka Krka*, in: Ž. Rapanić (ed.), *Arheološka istraživanja na otocima Krku, Rabu i Pagu i u Hrvatskom primorju*, Znanstveni skup Krk, 24.–27. 9. 1985., Zagreb 1989, 45–50.

Konestra et al. 2017

A. Konestra, N. Šegvić, P. Androić Gračanin, R. Starac, *Arheološka topografija otoka Raba: geofizička, sondažna i topografska istraživanja u 2016. godini*, *Annales Instituti Archaeologici XIII*, Zagreb 2017, 103–110.

Korkut 2006

T. Korkut, *Girlanden Osteotheken aus Kalkstein in Pamphylien und Kilikien. Untersuchungen zu Typologie, Ikonographie und Chronologie*, Mainz 2006.

Lajšić 2009

S. Lajšić, *Velika kamporska kronika, knjiga blago rapske povijesti*, *Rapski list* 11/8, Rab 2009, 24–26.

Lavagne 1987

H. Lavagne, *Le tombeau, mémoire du mort*, in: F. Hinard (ed.), *La Mort, les Morts et l'Au-Delà dans le monde romain*, Caen 1987, 159–165.

Lazinica, Maršić 2017

B. Lazinica, D. Maršić, *Following the trail of the new Liburnian cippus from Rab. Arba – new production center of Liburnian cippi*, in: D. Demicheli (ed.), *Illyrica*

Antiqua, In honorem Duje Rendić-Miočević, Proceedings of the international conference, Šibenik 12th–15th September 2013, Zagreb 2017, 187–199.

Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra 2015

G. Lipovac Vrkljan, A. Konestra, *Projekt Arheološka topografija otoka Raba – rezultati terenskog pregleda na području grada Raba u 2014. godini i izložba Arheološka topografija: putovanje kroz prošlost Lopara*, *Annales Instituti Archaeologici XI*, Zagreb 2015, 128–132.

Lipovac Vrkljan, Konestra, Šegvić 2017

G. Lipovac Vrkljan, A. Konestra, N. Šegvić, *Felix Arba – reconstructing urban and rural economic capacities through GIS*, in: A. Plosnić Škarić (ed.), *Mapping urban changes*, Zagreb 2017, 315–335.

Marin 2008

E. Marin, *Uvod. Arheološka zbirka Franjevačkog samostana u Sinju i Aequum*, u: M. Topić (ed.), *Arheološka zbirka Franjevačkog samostana u Sinju*, Sinj 2008, 9–14.

Maršić 2009

D. Maršić, *Ugradbeni i građevni portretni reljefi u Histriji i Dalmaciji*, Zadar 2009.

Maršić 2012

D. Maršić, *Ugradbeni nadgrobnii reljefi Arbe*, Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva 30, Zagreb 2012, 19–29.

Mlacović 2012

D. Mlacović, *Plemstvo i otok. Pad i uspon Rapskoga plemstva*, Zagreb 2012.

Nedved 1990

B. Nedved, *Felix Arba. Pregled povijesti i spomenika Otoka Raba u rano rimsko doba*, Rab 1990.

Paškvalin 2012

V. Paškvalin, *Antički sepulkralni spomenici s područja Bosne i Hercegovine*, Sarajevo 2012.

Pietri 1983

Ch. Pietri, s.v. *Grabinschrift II (lateinsich)*, in: *Reallexicon für Antike und Cristentum XII*, Stuttgart 1983, 514–590.

Pollard, Berry 2012

N. Pollard, J. Berry, *The Complete Roman Legions*, London 2012.

Rendić-Miočević, D. 1960

D. Rendić-Miočević, *Ilirske onomastičke studije*, Živa Antika 10, Skopje 1960, 163–171.

Rendić-Miočević, A. 2004

A. Rendić-Miočević, *Ulomak antičkog sarkofaga iz Baške na otoku Krku s prizorom iz trojanskog rata*, Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu 3.s./XXXVII, Zagreb 2004, 191–203.

Schleyer 1914

W. Schleyer, *Arbe – Stadt und Insel, Ein Schatzkästlein der Natur und Kunst in Dalmatien*, Wiesbaden 1914.

Sena Chiesa 2012

G. Sena Chiesa, *Ipsa spolia docet*, in: G. Cuscito (ed.), *Riuso di monumenti e*

reimpiego di materiali antichi in età postclassica: il caso della Venetia, Antichità Altoadriatiche LXXIV, Trieste 2012, 17–31.

Sergejevski 1948

D. Sergejevski, *Nove akvizicije odjeljenja klasične arheologije Zemaljskog muzeja*, Glasnik Zemaljskog Muzeja BiH, n. s. III, Sarajevo 1948, 167–187.

Sticotti 1893

P. Sticotti, *Bericht über einen Ausflug nach Liburnien und Dalmatien 1890 und 1891*, Archäologisch-epigraphische Mitteilungen aus Österreich-Ungarn 16, Beč 1983, 141–155.

Šašel Kos 2017

M. Šašel Kos, *Bilješka o mornaričkom centurionu Likeju iz Apsora*, Miscellanea Hadriatica et Mediterranea 3, Zadar 2017, 111–124.

Švonja 2018

N. Švonja, *Natpisi kao spoliji u Vranjicu*, Tusculum 11, Solin 2018, 35–59.

Taglietti 2001

F. Taglietti, *Ancora su incinerazione e inumazione: la necropoli dell'Isola Sacra*, in: M. Heinzelmann, J. Ortalli, P. Fasold, M. Witteyer (eds.), *Römischer Bestattungsbrauch und Beigabensitten in Rom, Norditalien und den Nordwestprovinzen von der späten Republik bis in die Kaiserzeit/Culto dei morti e costumi funerari romani, Roma, Italia settentrionale e province nordoccidentali dalla tarda Repubblica all'età imperiale. Internationales Kolloquium, Roma 1–3 April 1998*, Wiesbaden 2001, 149–158.

Toynbee 1971

J. M. C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World*, London and Southampton 1971.

Vodička Miholjek 2008

K. Vodička Miholjek, *Lokalitet: Vranjic – južna obala (red. br. 250)*, Hrvatski arheološki godišnjak 4/2007, Zagreb 2008, 541–543.

Von Hesberg 1992

H. von Hesberg, *Römische Grabbauten*, Darmstadt 1992.

