

New archaeological finds from Postira on the island of Brač

Jelinčić, Kristina; Perinić Muratović, Ljubica

Source / Izvornik: **Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu, 2010, 27, 177 - 216**


Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:291:944216>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International](#)/[Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno 4.0 međunarodna](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-12-20**



INSTITUT ZA
ARHEOLOGIJU

Repository / Repozitorij:

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



Novi arheološki nalazi iz Postira na otoku Braču

New archaeological finds from Postira on the island of Brač

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Antička arheologija

*Original scientific paper
Roman archaeology*

UDK/UDC 904(497.5Postira)“652“

Primljeno/Received: 28. 04. 2010.
Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 09. 12. 2010.

KRISTINA JELINČIĆ
Institut za arheologiju
Ljudevita Gaja 32
HR-1000 Zagreb
kristina.jelincic@iarh.hr

LJUBICA PERINIĆ MURATOVIĆ
Odsjek za arheologiju
Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti
A. Kovačića 5
HR-10000 Zagreb
bperinic@gmail.com

U radu se obrađuju antički i kasnosrednjovjekovni nalazi iz Postira na otoku Braču koji su otkriveni tijekom zaštitnog arheološkog istraživanja na mjestu Pastoralnog centra, jugozapadno od ranokršćanske bazilike sv. Ivana. Istraživanjem je otkriven rimski žrtvenik posvećen Veneri, kasnoantička arhitektura, ostaci kasnosrednjovjekovnog groblja, pokretni nalazi iz rane i kasne antike, te kasnog srednjeg vijeka.

Ključne riječi: Postira, Brač, antika, kasni srednji vijek, Venera, žrtvenik, staklo, amfore

The work contains an analysis of finds dated to Antiquity and the Late Middle Ages from Postira, on the island of Brač, discovered during rescue archaeological research at the site of the Pastoral Centre, south-west of the Early Christian Basilica of St. John. During research, a Roman-era altar dedicated to Venus, architecture from Late Antiquity, the remains of a late medieval cemetery, movable finds from Early and Late Antiquity and the Late Middle Ages were discovered.

Key words: Postira, Brač, Antiquity, Late Middle Ages, Venus, altar, glass, amphora

Uvod

Mjesto Postira smješteno je na sjevernoj obali otoka Brača, u srednjoj Dalmaciji (karta 1). U zadnjih pedeset godina u Postirima je pronađeno više antičkih arheoloških spomenika koji nesumnjivo govore o nekom obliku organiziranog života još od prvih stoljeća nakon Krista.




Karta 1 Smještaj mjesta Postira na otoku Braču
Map 1 Location of Postira on the island of Brač

Introduction

The village of Postira is situated on the northern coast of the island of Brač, in central Dalmatia (Map 1). Over the past fifty years, a number of artefacts dating to Antiquity have been discovered in Postira, which definitely testify to some form of organized life since the first few centuries AD.

In 1958, in the vicinity of the “Sardina” company’s present-day cannery, during construction of a new road (Map 2: 1), a fragment of a Late Antique gravestone was found, while ten years later (1968) a sculpted child’s head (Eros?) was found north of the church (Map 2: 2) at the Grôdac site, Balatura, during construction of the family home of the late Živko Bižaca (Cambi 2004: 249–250). In 1970, part of a gravestone was discovered roughly one hundred meters east of the parish Church of St. John the Baptist (Map 2: 3), during works on what was at the time the house of Slavko Brtičević (son of Grabre), today the Glavinić family home; in 1977 this piece was purchased by the Local Heritage Museum of the Island of Brač (Gjurašin 1989: 18; 2001: 108).¹ During reconnaissance near the parish church in 1977, Emilio Marin found a Late Antique column capital from an altar screen dated to

¹ The authors would like to thank Hrvoje Gjurašin, Andrea Matoković, Branko Matulić and Fjodor Mudnić for details concerning the find. The bust was published by Cambi (Cambi 2004: 249–250), while the grave-stones have not yet been published.



Karta 2 1. Ulomak rimske stele pronađene 1958. g. u blizini današnje tvornice Sardina (neobjavljeno); 2. Glava dječaka (Eros?) pronađena 1968. u kući pok. Živka Bižace (Cambi 2004); 3. Ulomak rimske stele pronađene 1970. g. pronađene tijekom radova kod kuće Brtičević, danas Glavinici (Gjurašin 1989; 2001); 4. Položaj župne i ranokršćanske crkve; 5. Položaj istražen 2003. g. kojeg se ovdje obrađuje; 6. Ulomak ukrašenog kamenog građevinskog elementa koji je uzidan u kuću Peruzović (neobjavljeno); 7. Položaj današnje crkve Sv. Nikole

Map 2 1. Fragment of Roman stela found near today's Sardina cannery in 1958 (unpublished); 2. Bust of boy (Eros?) found in house of deceased Živko Bizača in 1968 (Cambi 2004); 3. Fragment of Roman stela found during works on the Brtičević (today Glavinici) house in 1970 (Gjurašin 1989; 2001); 4. Location of parish and Early Christian church; 5. Site researched in 2003 and analyzed herein; 6. Fragment of ornamented stone element built into wall of Peruzović home (unpublished); 7. Location of present-day Church of St. Nicholas

Godine 1958. u blizini današnje tvornice "Sardina", prilikom gradnje nove ceste (karta 2: 1), pronađen je ulomak kasnoantičkog nadgrobno spomenika, a deset godina kasnije (1968.), sjeverno od crkve (karta 2: 2) na položaju Grôdac, Balatura, prilikom gradnje obiteljske kuće pok. Živka Bižace pronađena je glava dječaka (Erosa?) (Cambi 2004: 249–250). Godine 1970. stotinjak metara istočno od župne crkve sv. Ivana Krstitelja (karta 2: 3), prilikom radova kod kuće tada Slavka Brtičevića, sina Gabre, danas kuće obitelji Glavinici, pronađen je dio nadgrobno spomenika kojeg je 1977. otkupio Zavičajni muzej otoka Brača (Gjurašin 1989: 18; 2001: 108).¹ Prilikom rekognosciranja u blizini župne crkve 1977. Emilio Marin pronašao je kasnoantički kapitel stupa oltarne pregrade iz prve polovine 6. st. (u konobi) (Marin 1977: 155). Uz župnu crkvu sv. Ivana Krstitelja, s njene istočne strane, ležao je veliki kameni blok. Uslijed radova kod sakristije 1988. na tom mjestu pronađeni su ostaci trobrodne ranokršćanske crkve. Ranokršćanska crkva sv. Ivana podignuta je u 6. st. i riječ je o trobrodnoj crkvi s polukružnom apsidom i bočnim prostorijama, a crkva je

¹ Na detaljima oko nalaza zahvaljujem Hrvoju Gjurašinu, Andrei Matoković, Branku Matuliću i Fjodoru Mudniću. Glavu je objavio Cambi (Cambi 2004: 249–250), a nadgrobni spomenici još nisu objavljeni.

the first half of the sixth century (in a cellar) (Marin 1977: 155). A large stone block lay next to the Church of St. John the Baptist, to its east. During works near the sacristy in 1988, the remains of a triple-nave Early Christian church were found at this site. The Early Christian Church of St. John was built in the sixth century, and this was a triple-nave church with semi-circular apse and adjunct chambers, and this church was also functional in the seventh century (Kovačić 1994: 42; Chevalier 1991: 264, 367; 1995: 283; Bužančić 1994: 39–50; Stančić et al. 1999: 135; 2004, 134).

Memory of a monastery and Church of St. Mary is also tied to Postira. It is mentioned by the Brač chronicler Andrea Ciccarelli (19th cent.)² when he spoke of the seven Benedictine monasteries on Brač. This monastery was mentioned as a benefice of the Split Cathedral Chapter even after the establishment of the Hvar Diocese. The Brač chronicler Vicko Prodić, writing in the seventeenth century,³ mentioned a

² Andrea Ciccarelli was born in Pučišća in 1759, and in 1803 published *Osservazioni sull'isola della Brazza* ('Observations on the Island of Brač'), an extensive work of exceptional value to the history of the island of Brač (Vrsalović 2003: 16–20).

³ Vicko Prodić, born in Pučišća, was the author of *Cronica dell'isola della Brazza*, published in 1662.

funkcionirala i u 7. st. (Kovačić 1994: 42; Chevalier 1991: 264, 367; 1995: 283; Bužančić 1994: 39–50; Stančić et al. 1999: 135; 2004, 134).

Uz Postira se veže spomen samostana i crkve sv. Marije. Njega spominje brački kroničar Andrea Ciccarelli (19. st.)² kada govori o sedam benediktinskih samostana na Braču. Taj se samostan spominje kao beneficij splitskog kaptola čak i nakon osnivanja hvarske biskupije. Brački kroničar Vicko Prodić u 17. st.³ spominje samostan u Postirima (ukrašen mozaikom) koji su Neretljani zapalili 841. za noćnog napada. S obzirom na to da je u Postirima i prije ranokršćanskog razdoblja neupitno postojao život, ostaje otvorenim i pitanje da li je zgrada sa sačuvanim mozaikom, koju spominje Prodić, dio samostana ili neke ranije antičke zgrade. Istraživanje ranokršćanske bazilike sv. Ivana Krstitelja pokazalo je kako ta crkva nije imala mozaike stoga se taj spomen sigurno ne odnosi na tu baziliku. U literaturi je prihvaćena posveta ranokršćanske crkve sv. Ivanu jer na nju upućuje toponim *Zastivônje* koji je iz sloja starijih sakralnih toponima, a tu je posvetu preuzela i današnja župna crkva. Postoji niz takvih toponima na Braču koji se vežu za ranokršćanske objekte kao što je *Stivôn/Sutivan*. S obzirom na to da je crkva sv. Marije prema zapisima bila u vlasništvu splitskog kaptola (*Sanctae Mariae de Postire*), kao i crkva koja je stajala na mjestu današnje kapelice sv. Nikole (karta 2: 7), na mjestu kapelice se pretpostavlja smještaj sv. Marije koja je u nekom trenutku promijenila svog titulara. Crkvu koja se nalazila na mjestu današnje kapelice sv. Nikole 1904. splitski kaptol je prepustio župnoj crkvi u Postirima nakon čega je ona u potpunosti obnovljena, a njen izgled je znatno izmijenjen. Da li je tu zbilja postojao samostan ili je riječ o manjem pratećem objektu crkve i zemljišta koje je prvo bilo u vlasništvu samostana sv. Petra u Jesenicama, a koje je kasnije prešlo u vlasništvo splitskog kaptola, nije moguće utvrditi bez ciljanih istraživanja tog položaja (Marin 1977: 155–156; 1992: 118; Eterović 1981: 32, 39–43; Glavinić 1981: 48–49; Mihojević 1981: 225; Šantić 1981: 18–22; Šimunović 1981: 265; Kovačić 1994: 42; Vrsalović 2003: 49, 54).


Prvi pisani spomen Postira nalazimo u srednjeovjekovnim izvorima. Godine 1337. Postira se u kontekstu ugovora za obradu zemlje u tom predjelu spominju kao *in portu Postire*. Godine 1345. spominju se u istom kontekstu, ali ovaj put kao *terre posito in Posterna* kada se spominju i prve suhozidne nastambe. Taj predio spominje se i u redigiranoj IV knjizi bračkog Statuta iz 1375. Petar Skok etimologiju imena izvodi od lat. *pastura* – pašnjak sa čime se slaže i Petar Šimunović (Mihojević 1981: 228; Šimunović 1981: 263–265; 2004: 121). Važno je znati da na sjevernoj obali Brača u srednjem vijeku nije bilo naselja sve do 1444. zbog omiških gusara, a to se mijenja nakon što je Omiš pao u mletačke ruke. Nakon toga grade se naselja i na obali, a broj sta-

monastery in Postira (decorated with mosaics) which was set afire by the Narentines in 841 during a night-time raid. Since organized human life undoubtedly existed in Postira even prior to the Early Christian era, the question remains as to whether the building with preserved mosaic mentioned by Prodić was part of a monastery or some earlier, Antique, building. Research into the Early Christian Basilica of St. John has shown that the church had no mosaics, so Prodić's observation does not refer to the basilica. The dedication to St. John is accepted in the relevant literature, for it is indicated by the toponym *Zastivônje*, which originated in the layer of older sacral toponyms, and this dedication was assumed by the present-day parish church. There are a series of such toponyms on Brač which are associated with Early Christian structures, such as *Stivôn/Sutivan*. Since according to records the Church of St. Mary was the property the Split Cathedral Chapter (*Sanctae Mariae de Postire*), like the church that once stood at the site of today's Chapel of St. Nicholas (Map 2: 7), it has been assumed that the Church of St. Mary was at the chapel's site, and that its titular changed at some point in history. The church which once stood at the site of the Chapel of St. Nicholas was relinquished by the Split Cathedral Chapter in 1904 to the parish church in Postira, after which it was fully renovated, and its appearance was considerably altered. Whether a monastery actually existed here or whether it was a smaller outbuilding for the church and a piece of land first owned by the Monastery of St. Peter in Jesenice, which later became the property of the Split Cathedral Chapter, cannot be ascertained without targeted research of this site (Marin 1977: 155–156; 1992: 118; Eterović 1981: 32, 39–43; Glavinić 1981: 48–49; Mihojević 1981: 225; Šantić 1981: 18–22; Šimunović 1981: 265; Kovačić 1994: 42; Vrsalović 2003: 49, 54).

The first written evidence of Postira can be found in the medieval sources. In 1337, Postira is mentioned in the context of a contract to cultivate land in this tract as *in portu Postire*. In 1345, it is mentioned in the same context, but this time as *terre posito in Posterna*, when the first dry stone houses are also mentioned. This tract is also mentioned in the revised Book IV of the Brač Statute of 1375. Petar Skok derived the name's etymology from the Latin *pastura* – pasture, with which Petar Šimunović agreed (Mihojević 1981: 228; Šimunović 1981: 263–265; 2004: 121). It is important to know that there were no settlements on the northern shore of Brač in the Middle Ages until 1444, due to the peril posed by pirates from Omiš, although this changed after Omiš came under Venetian rule. After this, were established on the coast, and the population grew as people moved in from the interior of Brač, as well as from the mainland. Besides the parish church, one of the more notable buildings was the Lazanić/Lazaneo castle, which was on the seashore, and which had been partially preserved until the end of the nineteenth century. The castle was probably erected during the period when the Postira parish had separated from Dol at the end of the sixteenth century. In 1579, Postira was mentioned as a place with a population of 100 during the canonical visitation in the Hvar Diocese, which included the

2 Andrea Ciccarelli rođen je u Pučišćima 1759. g., a 1803. objavljuje *Osservazioni sull'isola della Brazza* (Zapažanja o otoku Braču), opsežno djelo od izuzetne važnosti za povijest otoka Brača (Vrsalović 2003: 16–20).

3 Vicko Prodić, rođen u Pučišćima, autor je djela *Cronica dell' isola della Brazza* iz 1662. g.



Sl. 1 Položaj pronađenih kasnoantičkih zidova (unutar označenog pravokutnika) u odnosu na ranokršćansku i župnu crkvu (crtao: J. Beneta)

Fig. 1 Position of discovered Late Antique walls (inside indicated rectangle) in relation to Early Christian and parish church (drawn by: J. Beneta)

novnika raste tako što se doseljava stanovništvo iz mjesta u unutrašnjosti Brača, a jednako tako i s kopna. Pored župne crkve značajnija građevina bila je kaštel Lazanić-Lazaneo koja se nalazila na obali, a do kraja 19. st. bila je sačuvana djelomice. Kaštel je podignut vjerojatno u vrijeme kada se postirska župa odcijepila od dolske krajem 16. st. Godine 1579. Postira se spominju u vizitaciji Hvarske biskupije, Agostina Valiera, a time i otoka Brača, kao mjesto u kojem živi 100 duša. Sredinom 16. st. podiže se crkva sv. Ivana Krstitelja koja je dograđivana u 17. i 18. st. Ona se spominje i u navedenoj vizitaciji i to kao *presvođena crkva svetog Ivana koja prokišnja*, što se odnosi na današnju župnu crkvu, točnije njezin prezbiteralni dio koji i danas na vanjskoj strani apside nosi puškarnice iz kasnosrednjovjekovnog razdoblja. Isto tako u njegovo vrijeme u Sv. Ivanu nalazio se i sarkofag.

island of Brač, by Bishop Agostin Valier. In the mid-sixteenth century, the Church of St. John the Baptist was erected, which was expanded in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was also mentioned in the aforementioned visitation as *the vaulted Church of St. John with leaking roof*, which refers to the present-day parish church, or rather its presbytery, which even today has embrasures on the outside of its apse, a holdover from the medieval period. By the same token, there was also a sarcophagus in St. John's at the same time. During his visitation, Agostin Valier⁴ also mentioned the Church of St. Mary, under the jurisdiction of the Split Cathedral Chapter.

During this period, Postira was an important harbour not only for trade in agricultural goods, but also weapons. Sutivan, together with Postira, also offered assistance to the raiding soldiers known as Uskoks, for local residents had friendly relations with them despite the stance of the Venetians. This is also the reason why the Uskoks did not disturb nor loot Brač to the extent that they did the other islands which, naturally, contributed to the development of new settlements on the coastline (Jutronić 1950: 133; Mihojević 1981: 223–224; Vrsalović 2003: 91, 116–117, 119, 125; Jelinčić 2004: 7, 15). These facts are important because they help place the late medieval cemetery and other finds from this period within the proper chronological context.

Archaeological research in 2003


The parish rectory, gardens and what is today the Pastoral Centre are located south of the parish Church of St. John the Baptist (Map 2: 4). Prior to construction of the Pastoral Centre, the Conservation Department of Split, led by Dubravka Čerina,⁵ conducted archaeological rescue research in October 2003 which showed that there was contemporaneous Late Antique architecture (Fig. 1) south-west of the Early Christian basilica. Also discovered were finds older than the basilica and the remains of a late medieval cemetery.

The Pastoral Centre is east of the parish rectory, south of the apse of the parish Church of St. John the Baptist and south-west of the researched portion of the Early Christian basilica dedicated to St. John the Baptist (Chevalier 1991: 265) (Fig. 1–3). During rescue research which lasted ten days, the remains of Late Antique architecture (Fig. 1–4), a destroyed late medieval cemetery (Fig. 5), ceramic, glass, metal and stone finds and bone items dating from Antiquity to the Late Middle Ages were discovered (Pl. 1–8).


The area south of the Early Christian basilica was, prior to works, partially forested with cypress trees, while the other part was used as a garden. This is the assumed reason why the archaeological remains at this place were destroyed and taken away, so during the research nothing was found here.

4 Agostin Valier was the bishop of Verona and an ecclesiastical visitor. At the order of Pope Gregory XIII he toured the dioceses of Venetian Dalmatia, and he visited Brač in 1579 as part of his visit to the Hvar Diocese (Vrsalović 2003: 13, 443).

5 We would like to thank Dubravka Čerina, a member of the staff at the Conservation Department in Split and the research leader in Postira in 2003, for allowing us to examine the documentation and finds, and for her assistance during the writing of this work.



Sl. 2 Detaljni snimak kasnoantičkih zidova, temelja i položaj nalaza spomenika (crtao: J. Beneta)
Fig. 2 Detailed sketch of Late Antique walls, foundations and position of artefact finds (drawn by: J. Beneta)



Sl. 3 Uzdužni presjek kroz kanal (zapad–istok) i pogled na južno lice Zida 2 (crtao: J. Beneta)
Fig. 3 Lengthwise cross-section through channel (west-east) and view of southern face of Wall 2 (drawn by: J. Beneta)



Sl. 4 Pogled sa zapada na kanal, Zid 1 i Zid 2 (snimak: D. Čerina)
 Fig. 4 View from the west of the channel, Wall 1 and Wall 2 (photo by: D. Čerina)

Agostin Valier⁴ u svojoj vizitaciji također spominje crkvu sv. Marije pod jurisdikcijom splitskog kaptola.

Postira su u tom razdoblju važna luka ne samo za trgovinu poljoprivrednim dobrima već i oružjem. Sutivan je uz Postira nudio i pomoć uskocima s kojima su stanovnici ovih mjesta bili u dobrim odnosima unatoč Mlecima. To je ujedno i razlog zbog kojeg uskoci nisu uznemiravali i pljačkali Brač u mjeri u kojoj su to radili drugim otocima što je, naravno, pridonijelo razvoju tih novonastalih naselja na obali (Jutronić 1950: 133; Mihojević 1981: 223–224; Vrsalović 2003: 91, 116–117, 119, 125; Jelinčić 2004: 7, 15). Ove su činjenice važne zbog stavljanja kasnosrednjovjekovnog groblja i drugih pronađenih nalaza iz tog razdoblja u odgovarajući vremenski okvir.

⁴ Agostin Valier je bio veronski biskup i crkveni vizitator. Po nalogu pape Grgura XIII obilazio je biskupije mletačke Dalmacije, a Brač je posjetio 1579. g. u okviru posjeta hvarske dijeceze (Vrsalović 2003: 13, 443).

Prior to conducting research in the area south of the Early Christian basilica, and west of the garden in the direction of the parish rectory, a small storage shed of more recent date and two fencing walls were found. Using machinery, they were carefully removed, and then research commenced.⁶ Archaeological remains were only discovered south of the apse of the present-day parish church (Fig. 1: 4). After removal of recent structures (two fencing walls), undressed stone slabs of the type made for graves were found at a depth of 30 cm along the northern recent wall. All of the slabs were strewn about, and only Grave 1 was partially preserved (Fig. 5).

Grave 1 was made of undressed stone slabs and had an east-west orientation. Its interior was filled with charred earth and several tiny shattered and damaged human bones. Several fragments of seashells and some potsherds

⁶ Four labourers and archaeologist Katarina Cvitanić from Postira participated in the research.



Sl. 5 Grob 1 nakon čišćenja i micanja pokrovnih ploča. U gornjem desnom uglu, ispod recentnog zida nazire se Zid 1 (snimak: D. Čerina)

Fig. 5 Grave 1 after cleaning and removal of cover slabs. In the upper right-hand corner, Wall 1 can be discerned beneath the more recent wall (photo by: D. Čerina)

Arheološko istraživanje 2003. godine

Južno od župne crkve sv. Ivana Krstitelja (Karta 2: 4) nalazi se župni dvor, vrt i danas Pastoralni centar. Prije izgradnje Pastoralnog centra Konzervatorski odjel iz Splita pod vodstvom Dubravke Čerine⁵ obavio je u listopadu 2003. zaštitna arheološka istraživanja koja su pokazala da se jugozapadno od ranokršćanske bazilike nalazila istovremena kasnoantička arhitektura (sl. 1). Pored toga pronađeni su nalazi stariji od bazilike i ostaci kasnosrednjovjekovnog groblja.

Pastoralni centar nalazi se istočno od župnog dvora, južno od apside župne crkve sv. Ivana Krstitelja i jugozapadno od istraženog dijela ranokršćanske bazilike posvećene sv. Ivanu Krstitelju (Chevalier 1991: 265); (sl. 1–3). Prilikom zaštitnog istraživanja u trajanju od deset dana pronađeni su ostaci kasnoantičke arhitekture (sl. 1–4), uništenog kasnosrednjovjekovnog groblja (sl. 5), keramika, staklo, metal, kameni nalazi i koštani predmeti iz vremena antike i kasnog srednjeg vijeka (T. 1–8).

Prostor južno od ranokršćanske bazilike, prije radova bio je jednim dijelom pošumljen čempresima, dok se drugi dio koristio kao vrt. Pretpostavlja se da je to razlog zbog kojeg su arheološki ostaci na tom mjestu uništeni i razneseni, stoga prilikom ovog istraživanja na tom mjestu nije bilo nalaza. Prije provedenih istraživanja na prostoru južno od ranokršćanske bazilike, a zapadno od vrta prema župnom dvoru, nalazili su se manje recentno spremište i dva ogradna zida. Oni su uz pomoć mehanizacije pažljivo uklonjeni te se pristupilo istraživanju.⁶ Arheološki ostaci otkriveni su samo južno od apside današnje župne crkve (sl. 1: 4). Nakon uklanjanja recentne arhitekture (dva ogradna zida) na rela-

⁵ Zahvaljujemo se Dubravki Čerini, djelatnici Konzervatorskog odjela u Splitu, voditeljici istraživanja u Postirima 2003. na ustupljenoj dokumentaciji i nalazima te suradnji prilikom pisanja ovog rada.

⁶ U istraživanju su sudjelovala četiri radnika i arheologinja Katarina Cvitančić iz Postira.

were found around the strewn slabs. Three bone beads were found beneath one of the slabs of the destroyed graves. Grave 1 was north of Wall 1⁷ and cut into bedrock. The slabs of the other damaged grave walls were partially on the foundations of the older wall, north of Wall 1. It is assumed that these are the scattered slabs of a late medieval cemetery which lay around the present-day parish church, and they may be associated with its late medieval construction phase. Grave 1 was located above the Late Antique architecture, which may be associated with the Early Christian complex in the immediate vicinity, north-east of it.

After the stone slabs were removed, examination of the Late Antique architecture commenced (Fig. 1–4). The foundation to a Late Antique wall was found which has only been preserved in its lower row, with dimensions of 6 x 0.8 m. The wall was made of partially dressed stone blocks and slabs placed directly on bedrock, bonded by limestone plaster. The foundation extended eastward, where it terminates and westward as it turns northward at a right angle north of Wall 1. At this part it becomes looser and wider (1.7 m) and terminates after 1.6 m.

The dimensions of Wall 1 are 1.7 x 0.64 m, and it has been preserved to a height of a half meter. It exhibits quality construction, with finely crafted stone blocks that are bound with limestone plaster. On the south side, Wall 1 is connected to Wall 2 at a right angle, and the latter extends in east-west direction. At this point there was an entrance into another room or a passage between two rooms (Fig. 2).

The previously mentioned foundation probably formed the northern wall of the eastern room and it is parallel to Wall 2, which connects with Wall 1 at a right angle. Wall 2 is oriented east-west, and the quality of its construction and width are identical to that of Wall 1; it terminates in the east and west, so how long it actually was is not known. There is a channel for water, probably precipitation run-off, running all along the southern face of this wall. The entire interior of the channel is lined with a thick layer of lime plaster tempered with tiny fragments of brick (Fig. 3). Wall 2 thus became the northern wall of the drainage channel. The internal face of the external, southern wall of the channel is made of dressed stone plates and blocks, while the external edge of the wall was left unworked. The bottom of this channel is made of stone plates which were placed directly on bedrock. The interior of the channel was filled with earth and undressed stone plates. These stone plates may have initially covered the channel itself. The existence of this channel south of Wall 2 actually indicates that Wall 2 was a perimeter wall of the uncovered Late Antique structure.

All archaeological remains, graves and architecture were covered with a layer, or rather fill within which fragments of Antique pottery, glass (1st-2nd cent. and 5th-7th cent.), brick and late medieval glass, bone beads and pottery (15th-16th cent.) were found together, one next to the other.

The undressed slabs and Late Antique architecture that were found have their foundations in the bedrock. This is a

⁷ The walls are designated as Wall 1 and Wall 2 (each beginning with a capital letter) in the documentation which Dubravka Čerina so kindly provided, and the same applies to Grave 1. These designations were assumed during the writing of this work.



Sl. 6 Položaj Venerinog žrtvenika (snimak: D. Čerina)
 Fig. 6 Position of altar to Venus (photo by: D. Čerina)

tivnoj dubini od 30 cm uz sjeverni recentni zid otkrivene su neobrađene kamene ploče od kakvih su izrađivani grobovi. Sve ploče bile su razbacane, a djelomice je sačuvan samo grob 1 (sl. 5).

Grob 1 izgrađen je od neobrađenih kamenih ploča i bio je orijentiran I – Z. Njegova unutrašnjost bila je ispunjena nagorenom zemljom s nekoliko sitnih razlomljenih i poremećenih ljudskih kostiju. Uokolo razbacanih ploča pronađeno je nekoliko ulomaka školjaka i nešto ulomaka keramike. Ispod jedne od ploča uništenih grobova, pronađene su tri koštane perlice. Grob 1 nalazio se sjeverno od Zida 1⁷ i položen je na živoj stijeni. Ploče drugih poremećenih grobova nalazile su se dijelom na temeljima starijeg zida, sjeverno od Zida 1. Pretpostavlja se da je riječ o razbacanim pločama kasnosrednjovjekovnog groblja koje se nalazilo uokolo današnje župne crkve, a ono se može povezati uz njezinu kasnosrednjovjekovnu građevnu fazu. Grob 1 nalazio se iznad otkrivene kasnoantičke arhitekture koja se pak može dovesti u vezu s ranokršćanskim kompleksom u neposrednoj blizini, sjeveroistočno od nje.

Nakon što su kamene ploče uklonjene pristupilo se istraživanju kasnoantičke arhitekture (sl. 1–4). Otkriven je temelj kasnoantičkog zida koji je sačuvan samo u donjem redu, dimenzija 6 x 0,80 m. Zid je bio izrađen od djelomično

sloping limestone terrain. Thus, Grave 1 partially protruded into the Late Antique architecture (foundation) and was placed lower than Wall 1 despite being younger than it (Fig. 5). For this structure, it was essential to level the pedestrian surfaces because of the sloped terrain.

An interesting find is the altar⁸ from the eastern room which was found lying on its side. It was most likely used by the Late Antique builders for levelling the floor given that the entire terrain descends toward the sea, i.e., the north (Fig. 6). Similar levelling was recorded nearby, in Škrip (Faber, Nikolanci 1985: 1–38).

The secondary use of the classical Roman altar dedicated to Venus, and the battered condition of the upper surface on which sacrifices were made point to the idea that the Early Christian complex was built near an older pagan, Roman cult site dedicated to the Roman goddess Venus. An additional reason is also the fact that an area which abounds in high-quality stone and stonemasonry traditions does not seem a probable or logical choice to bring in a worked pagan stone block from some greater distance. A pagan cult site does not necessarily mean the existence of a Venerian shrine as a separate structure. It is equally likely that the altar stood in the shrine of a private home.

7 U dokumentaciji koju nam je ljubazno ustupila Dubravka Čerina zidovi su imenovani kao Zid 1 i Zid 2 (s velikim početnim slovom), a slično vrijedi i za Grob 1. Takvo nazivlje je preuzeto prilikom pisanja ovog rada.

8 The altar was first stored in the Postira municipal hall, while today it is held in the parish rectory in Postira, where these finds will be stored after analysis.

obrađenih kamenih blokova i ploča koje su postavljene direktno na živu stijenu, povezanih vapnenom žbukom. Temelj se pružao prema istoku gdje je prekinut i prema zapadu gdje sjeverno od Zida 1 pod pravim kutom skreće prema sjeveru. Na tom dijelu postaje rastresitiji i širi (1,70 m) te se prekida nakon 1,60 m.

Dimenzije Zida 1 su 1,70 x 0,64 m, a sačuvan je u visini od pola metra. Kvalitetno je zidan, od dobro obrađenih kamenih blokova koji su povezani vapnenom žbukom. Na južnoj strani Zid 1 se pod pravim kutom spaja sa Zidom 2 koji se pruža u smjeru istok – zapad. Na tom mjestu nalazio se ulaz u prostoriju ili prolaz između dvije prostorije (sl. 2).

Prethodno spomenuti temelj vjerojatno čini sjeverni zid istočne prostorije i on je paralelan sa Zidom 2 koji se spaja pod pravim kutom sa Zidom 1. Zid 2 je orijentiran I – Z, kvalitetom izrade i širinom jednak je Zidu 1, prekinut je na istoku i zapadu pa je nepoznato koliko se ustvari pružao. Duž južnog lica ovog zida nalazi se kanal za vodu, vjerojatno kišnicu. Cijela unutrašnjost kanala premazana je debljim slojem vapnene žbuke s primjesama usitnjene opeke (sl. 3). Zid 2 tako je postao sjeverni zid kanala za vodu. Unutrašnje lice vanjskog, južnog zida kanala izrađeno je od obrađenih kamenih ploča i blokova, dok je vanjski rub zida ostavljen neobrađen. Dno ovog kanala izrađeno je od kamenih ploča koje su postavljene direktno na živu stijenu. Unutrašnjost kanala bila je ispunjena zemljom i neobrađenim kamenim pločama. Te kamene ploče prvotno su mogle pokrivati sami kanal. Postojanje ovog kanala južno od Zida 2 zapravo govori kako je Zid 2 perimetralni zid ovdje otkrivene kasnoantičke građevine.

Svi arheološki ostaci, grobovi i arhitektura bili su prekriveni jednim slojem odnosno nasipom unutar kojeg su zajedno pronađeni, jedni uz druge, ulomci antičke keramike, stakla (1. – 2. st. i 5. – 7. st.), opeke i kasnosrednjovjekovnog stakla, koštanih perlica i keramike (15. – 16. st.).

Pronađene neobrađene ploče i kasnoantička arhitektura temeljeni su na živoj stijeni. Riječ je o koso postavljenom vapnenačkom terenu. Tako je Grob 1 djelomice zadirao u kasnoantičku arhitekturu (temelj) i položen je niže od Zida 1 unatoč činjenici što je mlađi od njega (sl. 5). Za ovaj objekt neophodno je bilo niveliranje hodnih površina zbog toga što je teren nagnut.

Kao zanimljiv nalaz ističe se žrtvenik⁸ iz istočne prostorije koji je pronađen pognut bočnom stranom. Najvjerojatnije je služio kasnoantičkim graditeljima za niveliranje podnice s obzirom na to da se cijeli teren spušta koso prema moru, odnosno sjeveru (sl. 6). Slično niveliranje terena zabilježeno je nedaleko, u Škripu (Faber, Nikolanci 1985: 1–38).

Sekundarna upotreba klasičnog rimskog žrtvenika posvećenog Veneri, te otučenost gornjeg dijela na kojem su se prinisile žrtve, navodi na pomisao da je ranokršćanski kompleks izgrađen u blizini starijeg poganskog rimskog kultnog mjesta posvećenog rimskoj božici Veneri. Razlog više je i činjenica da područje koje obiluje kvalitetnom ka-

At the end of the research work, a team of experts from the Conservation Department decided that the discovered walls would be disassembled in order to find any possible *spolia* inside them. During their dismantling several dressed stone blocks, pieces of beams/thresholds, blocks with grooves and lentils were found (Čerina 2003).

Analysis of movable archaeological materials (Pl. 1–8, tab. 1–2)

During research, a small quantity of Antique and late medieval items were found, as well as few Early Modern items. A part of the finds, particularly the ceramics, cannot chronologically be placed, because these are insufficiently researched kitchen ware, probably produced locally, or potsherds too small to determine their type, age and production site. Since all of the finds were discovered inside a single earthen embankment, above the bedrock, walls and graves, this stratigraphic picture does not help in the chronological isolation of individual finds. Determination of the types and times from which individual finds originated was done on the basis of comparative analysis of the items found here with the items found at other archaeological sites. Since a very small number of potsherds was found, and almost all have different structures of clay from which the ceramic was made, it was not possible to analyze the pottery on this basis.

Pottery (Pl. 1–6; tab. 1 – 2)

Given the very small number of potsherds, the pottery was not classified by vessel types, but rather simply by typological division into pots, jugs and amphorae. The earliest finds are fragments of a bowl or cup (cat. no. 13) from the first century AD and an Aegean juglet (cat. no. 10), from the first-to-second centuries AD. Nonetheless, as analysis will show, most of the ceramic finds can be dated to Late Antiquity.

Kitchen ware

Pots (Pl. 1: 1–5; Pl. 2: 4–5)

The pots were wheel-thrown, with the exception of cat. no. 7 (Pl. 2: 7), standard and well made, with rough, unpainted surfaces, with the exception of cat. no. 5 which was coated with red paint (Pl. 2: 5). These are pots of various profiles and dimensions. The circumstances of the find do not help in their dating, since they were found together with medieval and Antique items (Early Empire and Late Antique). The structures of all discovered pots differ from each other greatly, which may indicate different production sites and different production times. Nevertheless, the structure and shape of certain potsherds indicate that they may be Late Antique vessels (Pl. 1: 1, 3; Pl. 2: 7–9), while we are uncertain about a portion of them (Pl. 1: 2; Pl. 2: 4–6). The potsherd, cat. no. 9, probably belonged to the Aegean pottery (compare with Ilakovac 1968: Pl. IV: 1755, 1740, 1761), but as it is a small piece it is difficult to determine a specific vessel type and the time of its production.

Catalogue description:

⁸ Žrtvenik je prvo bio pohranjen u zgradi općine Postira, a danas se čuva u župnom uredu u Postirima gdje će se pohraniti i ovi nalazi nakon obrade.

menom sirovinom i kamenoklesarskom tradicijom, ne čini vjerojatnim i logičnim dopremanje obrađenog poganskog kamenog bloka s neke veće udaljenosti. Pogansko kultno mjesto ne znači nužno postojanje Venerinog svetišta u vidu samostalne građevine. Jednako je vjerojatno da je žrtvenik stajao u svetištu privatne kuće.

Na kraju istraživanja stručni kolegij Konzervatorskog odjela odlučio je da se pronađeni zidovi ručno demontiraju kako bi se eventualno pronašla *spolia* uzidana u zidove. Pri razgradnji pronađeno je nekoliko kamenih blokova koji su obrađeni, ulomci greda – pragova, blokovi sa žljebovima i dovratnici (Čerina 2003).

Analiza pokretne arheološke građe (T. 1–8, tab. 1–2)

Prilikom istraživanja pronađena je manja količina antičkih i kasnosrednjovjekovnih nalaza, te nekolicina novovjekovnih. Dio nalaza, naročito keramike, ne može se vremenski točno odrediti jer je riječ ili o nedovoljno istraženju kuhinjskoj keramici, vjerojatno lokalne proizvodnje ili o premalim keramičkim ulomcima kojima se ne može odrediti tip, vrijeme i mjesto proizvodnje. Budući da su svi nalazi pronađeni unutar jednog zemljanog nasipa, iznad živca, zidova i grobova, takva stratigrafska slika ne pomaže u vremenskom razlučivanju pojedinih nalaza. Određivanje tipova i vremena iz kojeg pojedini predmeti potječu učinjeno je na temelju usporedne analize ovdje pronađenih predmeta s predmetima pronađenim na drugim arheološkim lokalitetima. Kako je pronađen relativno mali broj keramičkih ulomaka, a gotovo svi pripadaju različitim strukturama gline od koje je izrađivana keramika, nije bilo moguće izraditi obradu keramike po tom kriteriju.

Keramika (T. 1–6; tab. 1–2)

Budući da se radi o vrlo malom broju ulomaka, nije učinjena podjela keramike po vrstama posuđa već samo tipološka podjela na lonce, vrčeve i amfore. Najraniji nalazi su ulomak zdjelice ili čaše (kat. br. 13) iz 1. st. po. Kr. i egejski vrčić (kat. br. 10), iz 1. – 2. st. po. Kr. Ipak, kako će analiza pokazati, većinu keramičkih nalaza može se datirati u kasnu antiku.

Kuhinjska keramika

Lonci (T. 1: 1–5; T. 2: 4–5)

Lonci su izrađeni na kolu, osim kat. br. 7 (T. 2: 7), pravilne su i dobre izrade, hrapave površine bez premaza, osim kat. br. 5 koji ima crveni premaz (T. 2: 5). Radi se o loncima različitih proflacija i dimenzija. Okolnosti nalaza ne pomažu pri njezinom datiranju ovih ulomaka budući da su pronađeni zajedno sa srednjovjekovnim i antičkim predmetima (ranocarskim i kasnoantičkim). Struktura svih pronađenih lonaca međusobno se jako razlikuje što može upućivati na različito mjesto proizvodnje, ali i na različito vrijeme proizvodnje. Ipak, struktura i oblik nekih ulomaka daju naslutiti da se radi o kasnoantičkom posuđu (T. 1: 1, 3; T. 2: 7–9), dok za dio nismo sigurni (T. 1: 2; T. 2: 4–6). Ulomak kat. br. 9 vjerojatno pripada egejskoj keramici (usporedi s Ilakovac 1968: T. IV: 1755,

1. Fragment of pot with curved rim with edge diagonal and sharply truncated on outside. Neck is short or, more precisely, visible only in transition of rim into diagonally formed shoulder. The fragment is small and rather regular. The colour of the interior and exterior walls varies from brown to black. The vessel was made with calcite and other additives which burned off during firing, while irregular circular and oval voids are visible in the vessel's cross-section.

2. Pot with curved and straight rim with edge diagonally truncated outward and lightly rounded. Neck is very short, shoulder is rounded, and the belly is widest at the recipient's mid-section. The base is slightly concave, with central portion thinner than portion where the pot's lateral walls ascend. The vessel has a considerable amount of voids on its surface and cross-section. The voids emerged after additives in the clay burned off during firing. They appear only on the interior wall at the base and near the bottom of the vessel's lateral wall. Additionally, a large quantity of calcite additives can be observed. The firing colour varies from dark brown and grey on the interior wall to black on the exterior.

3. Pot with large dimensions, with regular and uniform firing colour. Rim is outwardly drawn, edge of rim is diagonally truncated on outside. Neck and very short and transition to diagonal and high shoulder. Clay has considerable quantity of additives, generally fine-grain quartz of various dimensions. Surface is slightly coarse and non-friable.

4. Pot with convexly outwardly drawn rim and straight edge. Neck is short, and only visible at transition to diagonal shoulder. Surface is rough, and firing colour is not uniform. There is a considerable quantity of tiny calcite additives.

5. Pot with broad and short straight-edged rim, lightly curved outward. Neck is short and prominent on inside. Transition of neck into shoulder of pot is emphasized by thickening, and the vessel's width negligibly surpasses the width of the rim. Firing colour is not uniform on external side. Traces of red paint have been preserved on inside wall, particularly on the rim. This indicates the possibility that the vessel was used to store or prepare liquid food. Lid fit on rim very well. Clay has considerable quantity of tiny, and some larger, additives which are unevenly distributed.

Undefined forms of kitchen ware (Pl. 2: 6–9)

6. Flat base of large vessel with thick, coarsely rendered walls. Vessel has rough surface with considerable amount of large and tiny additives (calcite). Small and rather elongated cracks can be observed in the cross-section which are a result of various substances (additives or other matter present in the raw clay) burning out during firing. Firing colour is not uniform in cross-section nor on the external and internal surfaces of the walls.

7. Fragment of vessel belly, possibly a hand-crafted pot, with non-uniform firing colour, rough surface and considerable quantity of limestone and quartz additives and a small quantity of sand. The vessel is ornamented with a narrow band made of three shallow horizontal incisions. Traces of imprints can be seen in the inside wall where the potter shaped the vessel's lateral walls. This was probably a locally

1740, 1761), ali s obzirom na to da je riječ o malom ulomku teško je odrediti točan tip posude i vrijeme njegove izrade.

Kataloški opis:

1. Ulomak lonca izvijenog oboda čiji je rub s vanjske strane koso i oštro odrezan. Vrat je kratak, odnosno, vidljiv je samo u prijelazu oboda u koso oblikovano rame. Ulomak je mali i dosta pravilan. Boja unutrašnje i vanjske stijenke varira od smeđe do crne. Posuda je izrađena s primjesama kalcita i s drugim primjesama koje su izgorjele u postupku pečenja, a u presjeku posude vidljive su šupljine nepravilnog kružnog i ovalnog oblika.

2. Lonac izvijenog i ravnog oboda čiji je rub koso odrezan prema van i blago zaobljen. Vrat je vrlo kratak, rame je zaobljeno, a trbuh je najširi u sredini recipijenta. Dno je blago konkavno, u središnjem dijelu tanje od dijela gdje se dižu bočne stijenke lonca. Posuda ima dosta šupljina na površini i u presjeku. Šupljine su nastale nakon izgaranja primjesa tijekom pečenja. One se javljaju samo na unutrašnjoj stijenci na dnu i pri dnu bočnih stijenci posude. Pored toga uočavaju se u velikoj količini primjese kalcita. Boja pečenja varira od tamno smeđe i sive na unutrašnjoj stijenci do crne na vanjskoj.

3. Lonac većih dimenzija, pravilne i ujednačene boje pečenja. Obod je izvučen prema van, rub oboda je koso odrezan s vanjske strane. Vrat je vrlo kratak i prelazi u koso i visoko rame. Glina ima dosta primjesa, uglavnom usitnjelog kvarca različitih dimenzija. Površina je pomalo hrapava i ne otire se.

4. Lonac konveksno izvučenog oboda i ravnog ruba. Vrat je kratak i uočava se samo u prijelazu u koso rame. Površina je hrapava, a boja pečenja neujednačena. Ima dosta usitjenih primjesa kalcita.

5. Lonac širokog i kratkog oboda ravnog ruba, blago izvijenog prema van. Vrat je kratak i naglašen s unutrašnje strane. Prijelaz vrata u rame lonca naglašen je zadebljanjem, a širina posude neznatno prelazi širinu oboda. S vanjske strane neujednačene je boje pečenja. Na unutrašnjoj stijenci, osobito na obodu, sačuvan je premaz crvene boje u tragovima. To ukazuje na mogućnost da se posuda koristila za čuvanje ili pripremu tekuće hrane. Poklopac je jako dobro prijanjao na obod. Glina ima mnogo vrlo usitjenih i nešto krupnih primjesa koje su neravnomjerno raspoređene.

Nedefinirani oblici kuhinjske keramike (T. 2: 6–9)

6. Ravno dno veće posude, debelih stijenci grube izrade. Posuda je hrapave površine s puno krupnih i sitnih primjesa (kalcit). U presjeku se uočavaju nepravilne manje i jako izdužene pukotine nastale izgaranjem različitih tvari (primjesa ili materije prisutne u sirovoj glini). Boja pečenja je neujednačena u presjeku, na vanjskoj i unutrašnjoj stijenci.

7. Ulomak trbuha posude, moguće lonca izrađenog rukom, neujednačene boje pečenja, hrapave površine s dosta primjesa vapnenca, kvarca i malo pijeska. Posuda je ukrašena uskom trakom od tri plitka vodoravna ureza. Na unutrašnjoj stijenci uočavaju se tragovi prstiju lončara pri oblikovanju bočnih stijenci posude. Vjerojatno se radi o lokalno izrađenoj posudi.

8. Ulomak ramena posude, vjerojatno lonca, grube i hra-

made vessel.

8. Fragment of vessel shoulder, probably a pot, with coarse and rough surface and non-uniform firing colour. It contains many very fine limestone additives. Fragment is ornamented with irregular horizontal incisions of varying width.

9. Fragment of vessel rim and handle, coarse structure, probably part of pot. Surface is rough, and clay contains quartz, mica and some sand as additives. Handle is ribbon-like, lightly articulated and later applied to vessel. Rim is outwardly drawn and slightly drawn inward to better accommodate the lid. Handle begins immediately below rim and exceeds its height slightly. Traces of soot are on the handle, vessel's firing colour is not uniform. Fragment is small and it is difficult to say whether it was a jug or pot with several handles. 1st-2nd centuries AD (?).

Jugs (Pl. 3: 10 a,b-12)

The jugs which were found are made of clay of varying structure, and their shapes also vary. Most of the potsherds are too tiny to ascertain any type or any more accurate dating within Antiquity. Interesting is a juglet (cat. no. 10) which, in terms of its structure, shape and ribbed walls, is an exponent of Aegean production. Very similar juglets were found at a shipwreck off of the Pakleni Islands which were dated from the mid-first to second centuries (Ilakovac 1968: 184–185, Pl. 1: 1724, 1758; Pl. 2: 1724, 1758; 195–197). This would be an Aegean product which appeared at the Athenian Agora and Knossos (Robinson 1959: 41, Pl. 7: G 182; Pl. 42: G 183; Hayes 1983: 107, Fig. 6: 73). Aegean-produced pottery was frequent on the Adriatic (Pakleni Islands, Nerezine, Naron) (Ilakovac 1968: 184–185, Pl. 1: 1724, 1758; Pl. 2: 1724, 1758; 195–197; Jurišić 2000: 34–35; Topić 2004: 309, Pl. 65: 338–339, Pl. 65: 340; Parica 2008: 88, Map 3) and in the territory of Slovenia (Istenič 1988: 103–108, note 32, Pl. II: 4; Istenič, Schneider 2000: 341, 344, Fig. 3: 2). What distinguishes the Postira juglet from those from the Pakleni Islands and Nerezine is that it has no painted coating. The Postira example is similar to Hayes type II from Knossos, dated to the first to second centuries, as opposed to the variants from the third century which is painted, and this variant also appeared in Athens in the third century. Since the example from Postira is not painted, it can be dated to the first to second centuries.

Catalogue description:

10. Fragment of a small jug (preserved to a height of 6.6 cm). The vessel clearly had a handle, since there is visible damage at the shoulder where it was subsequently affixed. The vessel has a base shaped like a straight and hollow foot, while the body is shaped like an onion bulb. The walls are very thin and ribbed. The jug was wheel thrown, without coating or gloss (or none has been preserved). The clay contains mica and sand as additives; all additives are dark brown and black. The vessel's firing colour is orange to brown and grey. 1st-2nd centuries AD.

11. Fragment of jug rim and handle. Rim is straight, while handle begins at rim and is parallel to it. Vessel's rendering is high quality, well fired, and the clay is refined with some

Katalogski broj Catalogue number	Promjer oboda Rim diameter	Promjer vrata Neck diameter	Promjer ramena Shoulder diameter	Promjer grla amfore / vrča Neck diameter of amphora/jug	Promjer trbuha Diameter of belly	Promjer dna Base diameter	Visina posude Height	Širina drške Handle width	Visina noge Leg height	Debljina stijenke Wall thickness	Boja po Munsellu* Munsell colour*	Tvrdoća** Hardness**
1	13 cm	12 cm	15,3 cm							7,5 mm	GLE12,5/N black (V), 10R5/1 reddish gray (U), 10R5/4 weak red (P)	2
2	13,7 cm	11,8 cm	14,6 cm		16,5 cm	10,8 cm	17 cm			3 - 6 mm	GLE12,5/N black, 5YR4/2 dark reddish gray, 5YR5/4 reddish brown	2
3	22,9 cm	19,6 cm								7 - 9 mm	2,5YR7/6 light red (V, U), 2,5YR6/6 light red (P)	2
4	15,1 cm	13,1 cm	18,2 cm							7 mm	GLE12,5/N black, 2,5YR4/3, reddish brown, 2,5YR5/3 reddish brown,	2
5	20,8 cm	20,9 cm	21,6 cm		22,5 cm					5 - 7 mm	GLE12,5/N black, 10R5/4 weak red, 10R5/1 reddish gray (P)	2
6					21,8 cm (sačuvani dio)	13 cm				11 - 21 mm	2,5Y6/3 light yellowish brown, 2,5Y5/2 grayish brown (V); 10R5/6 red, GLE12,5/N black (U, P);	2
7										7,5 mm	7,5YR4/1 dark gray, 7,5YR3/1 very dark gray (U, P); 7,5YR5/3 brown, 7,5YR5/4 brown (V)	2
8										4 - 7 mm	7,5YR6/4 light brown (V); GLE12,5/N black (U); 5YR5/4 reddish brown (U)	2
9								2,5 cm		5,5 mm	10YR5/1 gray (U, P); 10YR4/1 dark gray 10YR5/2 grayish brown (V)	1
10					7,3 cm	4,1 cm			1,4 cm	3 - 4 mm	5Y5/1 gray (V); 2,5Y6/3 light yellowish brown (V, P, U)	1
11								2,2 cm		5 mm	10YR8/3 very pale brown (V, U); 7,5YR7/4 pink (V, U); 7,5YR6/4 light brown (P)	2
12	14,5 cm			14,9 cm						6 mm	7,5YR6/6 reddish yellow (V, U); 2,5YR5/6 red (P)	2
13						4,6 cm			0,7 cm	7 - 8 mm	GLE12,5/N black (premaz)	1
14						10,8 cm				5 - 9 mm	5YR7/6 reddish yellow (U, P), 10YR7/4 very light brown (V)	1
15										5 mm	10YR8/4 very pale brown (V); 5YR7/6 reddish yellow (P, U)	1
16	4,7-6,3 cm		7,2 cm	4,2 cm						5-8 mm	2,5YR6/8 light red (V, U, P); 10YR8/4 very pale brown (PR)	1
17						2 cm					7,5YR7/4 pink (V); 5YR6/4 light reddish brown (P, U);	1
18	>5,5 cm		6,9 cm	5 cm	5,9 - 7,7cm		> 24,9 cm			5,5 - 7,5 mm	5Y8/2 pale yellow	2
19								35 mm		10 mm	10YR7/4 very pale brown (V, U); 5Y6/6 reddish yellow (P)	1
20	9,7 cm			8,7 cm						8 mm	10YR7/4 very pale brown (V, U); 10YR7/4 very pale brown, 10R7/6 light red (P); 7,5YR8/4 pink (PR)	1

Tablica 1 Tablični prikaz katalogskih jedinica 1–20 (izradila: K. Jelinčić)
Table 1 Tabular breakdown of catalogue units 1–20 (made by: K. Jelinčić)

Katalogski broj Catalogue number	Promjer oboda Rim diameter	Promjer vrata Neck diameter	Promjer ramena Shoulder diameter	Promjer grla amfore / vrča Neck diameter of amphora/jug	Promjer trbuha Diameter of belly	Promjer dna Base diameter	Visina posude Height	Širina drške Handle width	Visina noge Leg height	Debljina stijenke Wall thickness	Boja po Munsellu* Munsell colour*	Tvrdoća** Hardness**
21										8 mm	7,5YR7/6reddish yellow (V); 5YR6/6 reddish yellow (U, P)	1
22								36 mm		36 mm	5YR6/6 reddish yellow (P, U); 2,5Y8/3 pale yellow (V)	1
23								2,2 cm		8 - 12 mm	5YR6/8 reddish yellow (P, U, V)	1
24										11 mm	5YR6/8 reddish yellow (P, U); 7,5YR7/6 reddish yellow (V)	1
25								28 mm		6 - 8 mm	10YR7/4 very pale brown,10YR6/4 light yellowish brown (V,U,P)	1
26	10,8 cm		16,7 cm	9,6 cm	> 22 cm			37 mm		11 mm	7,5YR6/8 reddish yellow (U, p, V)	2
27						4,2 cm				11 mm	2,5YR6/8 light red (U); 2,5YR5/8 red (V); 7,5YR7/8 reddish yellow (PR)	2
28										11,5 mm	2,5YR6/6 light red (V,P); 5Y8/2 pale yellow	1
29										8 - 9 mm	2,5Y8/4 pale yellow (V, P); 2,5YR6/8 light red (U, P)	1
30										10 mm	5YR7/6 reddish yellow (U, P); 10YR7/4 vely pale brown (V)	1
31								5,2 cm		7 - 10 mm	2,5YR6/8 light red (U,V,P)	1
32								3,8 cm		7 - 8 mm	10YR8/4 very pale brown (V,P); 2,5YR6/6 light red (P, U); 10YR8/4 very pale brown (U)	1
33								3,8 cm		12 mm	7,5YR7/6 reddish yellow	1
34								5 cm		7 mm	5YR6/6 reddish yellow (U); 5YR6/8 reddish yellow (P, U)	2
35								4,5 cm		8 mm	2,5Y8/2 pale yellow (V), 2,5YR6/6 light red (P, U)	2
36								3,6 cm		8 - 10 mm	5YR6/6 reddish yellow (P, U); 10YR7/4 very pale brown (V)	1
37					11,6 - 14,3 cm					6 mm	7,5YR8/6 reddish yellow (U, P); 2,5Y8/3 pale yellow (V,P)	1
Katalogski broj Catalogue number	Promjer vrata Neck diameter	Promjer noge Leg diameter	Promjer ramena Shoulder diameter	Dužina Length	Širina Width	Debljina (stijenke ili predmeta) Thickness (of wall or object)	Visina predmeta Object height	Promjer dna Base diameter	Promjer predmeta Object diameter	Težina predmeta Object weight	Boja po Munsellu* Munsell colour*	Tvrdoća** Hardness**
38	2,4 - 3,2 cm					2,7 mm	> 9 cm	6 cm				
39		1,3 cm				3,4 mm	> 2,1 cm	4,7 cm				
40						0,5 mm		4,6 cm	5,1 cm			
41						1,2 mm						
42							0,7 cm		1 cm			
43							1 cm		1 cm			
44							1 cm		1 cm			
45				8,2 cm	2,2 cm	9,1 mm				27 g		
46						2,6 cm					10YR8/4 very pale brown	1
47						2,6 cm					7,5YR8/4 pink (V); 7,5YR7/4 pink (P)	1
48							> 6 cm		7,5x8,1 cm			
49							>10,2 cm		8,6x7,7 cm			
* vanjska/exterior V, prevlaka PR, unutrašnja/interior U, presjek/cut P							** 1 može se zarezati noktom/can be scratched with a fingernail 2 može se zarezati nožem/can be scratched with a knife 3 ne može se zarezati nožem/cannot be scratched with a knife					

Tablica 2 Tablični prikaz katalogskih jedinica 21–49 (izradila: K. Jelinčić)
Table 2 Tabular breakdown of catalogue units 21–49 (made by: K. Jelinčić)

pave površine, neujednačene boje pečenja. Ima mnogo vrlo sitnih primjesa vapnenca. Ulomak je ukrašen nepravilnim vodoravnim urezima različite širine.

9. Ulomak oboda i drške posude, grube strukture, vjerojatno od lonca. Površina je hrapava, u glini ima primjesa kvarca, tinjca i nešto pijeska. Drška je trakasta, blago je profilirana i naknadno je dodana na posudu. Obod posude izvučen je prema van i s unutrašnje strane blago je uvučen kako bi poklopac bolje prijanjao. Drška počinje odmah ispod oboda te ga blago nadvisuje. Na drški se nalaze tragovi gara, posuda nije ujednačene boje pečenja. Ulomak je mali i teško je reći radi li se o vrču ili loncu s više drški. 1. – 2. st. (?).

Vrčevi (T. 3: 10 a, b –12)

Vrčevi koji su pronađeni izrađeni od gline raznolike strukture i različitog su oblika. Većina ulomaka presitna je da bi nam pomogla u određivanju tipa i točnijeg datiranja unutar razdoblja antike. Zanimljiv je vrčić (kat. br. 10) koji po svojoj strukturi, obliku i narebrenim stijenkama pripada egejskoj proizvodnji. Vrlo slični vrčići pronađeni su na brodolomu pored Paklenih otoka koji se datiraju od sredine 1. do kraja 2. st. (Ilakovac 1968: 184–185, T. 1: 1724, 1758; T. 2: 1724, 1758; 195–197). To bi bio egejski proizvod koji se javlja na Atenskoj Agori i Knossosu (Robinson 1959: 41, Pl. 7: G 182; Pl. 42: G 183; Hayes 1983: 107, fig. 6: 73). Keramika egejske proizvodnje česta je na Jadranu (Pakleni otoci, Nerezine, Narona) (Ilakovac 1968: 184–185, T. 1: 1724, 1758; T. 2: 1724, 1758; 195–197; Jurišić 2000: 34–35; Topić 2004: 309, T. 65: 338–339, T. 65: 340; Parica 2008: 88, karta 3) i na području Slovenije (Istenič 1988: 103–108, bilj. 32, T. II: 4; Istenič, Schneider 2000: 341, 344, Fig. 3:2). Ono što razlikuje vrčić iz Postira od onih s Paklenih otoka i Nerezina je i to što on nema nikakav premaz. Postirski primjerak bi bio srodan tipu II po Hayesu iz Knossosa koji se datira u 1. – 2. st. za razliku od varijante iz 3. st. koja je bojana, a u toj varijanti se u 3. st. javlja i u Ateni. Kako primjerak iz Postira nije bojan, možemo ga datirati u 1. – 2. st.

Kataloški opis:

10. Ulomci malog vrča (sačuvan u visini od 6,6 cm). Jasno je da je posuda imala dršku budući da je na ramenu vidljivo oštećenje gdje je ona bila naknadno priljepljena. Posuda ima dno u obliku ravne i šuplje noge, a tijelo u obliku lukovice. Stijenke su vrlo tanke i narebrene. Vrč je izrađen na kolu, bez prevlake i premaza (ili on nije sačuvan). U glini se nalaze primjese tinjca i pijeska, sve su primjese tamno smeđe i crne boje. Posuda je narančaste do smeđe i sive boje pečenja. 1. – 2. st.

11. Ulomak oboda i drške vrča. Obod je ravan, a drška počinje na obodu i paralelna je s obodom. Posuda je kvalitetne izrade, dobro je pečena, a glina je pročišćena uz nešto primjesa pijeska. Antika.

12. Ulomak vrča. Sačuvan je široki ravni obod. Odmah ispod oboda počinje profilirana naljepljena drška. Posuda je ujednačene boje pečenja s vanjske i unutrašnje strane (narančasta), a unutrašnjost je crvena. Nema mnogo vidljivih primjesa, samo nešto pijeska. Antika.

sand additives. Antiquity.

12. Jug fragment. Broad straight rim preserved. Immediately below rim, articulated and affixed handle begins. Vessel has uniform firing colour on interior and exterior (orange), while interior is red. Not many visible additives, only a small quantity of sand. Antiquity.

Indeterminate kitchen ware vessel types (Pl. 3: 13–15)

Under cat. no. 13 there is a fragment of a grey fired vessel with black to dark grey non-uniform coating. Such pottery was frequent throughout the Mediterranean during the Hellenistic era, and it was manufactured in many workshops in various regions, with several developmental phases. This is table and luxury ware which remained in use until the appearance of Roman table ware, *sigillatae* first and foremost. Interesting here is the final phase of this pottery's production in the latter half of the first century BC and in the first century AD (Robinson 1959; Grassi 1996, 53, 66, 67; Rotroff 1997: 232–233; Jurišić 2000: 27; Santoro Bianchi 2005: 105–106; Tarborelli 2005: 59, 73; Yntema 2005: 5). Such pottery was frequent in central Dalmatia, both as a local product and as imports (Kirigin et al. 1998: 16; Hayes 2008: 59). This is nonetheless a very small fragment, found in the fill together with Late Antique and late medieval finds, and it is difficult to determine precisely.

Catalogue description:

13. Base of a small vessel with foot, a bowl or cuPl. Vessel is made of refined clay with out visible additives. Firing colour is grey, non-friable, while on its external wall there is a dark grey to black coating of non-uniform intensity. Antiquity.

14. Base of vessel, probably a jug. Base is flat and prominent, surface is smooth and quite friable, made of refined clay. A negligible quantity of sand can be discerned. The firing colour is uniform, orange in the interior wall and cross-section, yellow on exterior. Antiquity.

15. Fragment of vessel, probably a jug. Exterior wall has yellowish coating, and is ornamented with bands made of shallowly engraved horizontal lines. Vessel is well and uniformly fired, with slightly rough, friable surface. It has small quantities of sand additives. Irregular cracks can be seen in the cross-section. Antiquity.

Amphorae (Pl. 4–6)

Neither the type nor production site, and thus not even a precise production date, nor time of use can be ascertained for most of the fragments in the catalogue. Nonetheless, here we have decided to present all of the fragments in sketch and photograph in order to demonstrate the diversity of materials and in order to provide an insight into the presence of such ceramics in the analysis of other, similar sites. Among the amphorae with defined types, the eastern Mediterranean amphora types LR1, LR2, and LR5 and African amphorae (e.g. miniature *spatheion* type amphorae) are present. Besides these, several other fragments are assumed to be African in origin due to the structure of the brick-red fragments with whitish coating (Raynaud, Bo-

Neodredivi tipovi posuda stolne keramike (T. 3: 13–15)

Pod kat. br. 13 nalazi se ulomak sivo pečene posude sa crnim do tamno sivim i neujednačenim premazom. Takva keramika česta je u helenizmu na cijelom Mediteranu, a proizvodila se u velikom broju radionica u različitim regijama s više svojih razvojnih faza. Radi se o stolnom i luksuznom posudu koje se zadržalo u upotrebi sve do pojave rimske stolne keramike, u prvom redu *sigillatae*. Ono što je ovdje zanimljivo završna je faza proizvodnje takve keramike u drugoj polovici 1. st. pr. Kr. i u 1. po. Kr. (Robinson 1959; Grassi 1996: 53, 66, 67; Rotroff 1997: 232–233; Jurišić 2000: 27; Santoro Bianchi 2005: 105–106; Tarborelli 2005: 59, 73; Yntema 2005: 5). Takva keramika česta je u srednjoj Dalmaciji, kao lokalna proizvodnja i kao import (Kirigin et al. 1998: 16; Hayes 2008: 59). Ipak riječ je o vrlo malom ulomku, pronađenom u nasipu s kasnoantičkim i kasnosrednjovjekovnim nalazima te ga je teško vremenski precizno odrediti.

Kataloški opis:

13. Dno manje posude s nogom, zdjelice ili čaše. Posuda je izrađena od pročišćene gline bez vidljivih primjesa. Sive je boje pečenja, ne otire se, a na vanjskoj stijenci nalazi se tamno sivi do crni premaz, neujednačenog intenziteta. Antika.

14. Dno posude, vjerojatno vrča. Dno je ravno i naglašeno, površina je glatka i jako se otire, od pročišćene gline. Uočava se neznatna količina pijeska. Boja pečenja ujednačena je, narančasta na unutrašnjoj stijenci i u presjeku, a izvana žuta. Antika.

15. Ulomak posude, vjerojatno vrča. Vanjska stijenska ima žučkasti premaz, a ukrašena je trakama od plitko urezanih vodoravnih linija. Posuda je dobro i ujednačeno pečena, malo hrapava i otire se na dodir. Ima malo primjesa pijeska. Na presjeku se uočavaju nepravilne pukotine. Antika.

Amfore (T. 4–6)

Za veći dio ulomaka u katalogu zbog fragmentarnosti nije moguće točno odrediti tip niti mjesto, a time i točno vrijeme njihove proizvodnje, te vrijeme korištenja. Ipak, ovdje smo odlučili prikazati sve ulomke u crtežu i fotografiji kako bi se vidjela raznolikost materijala i kako bi se pri obradi drugih sličnih lokaliteta imao uvid u zastupljenost takve keramike. Od amfora čiji su tipovi definirani zastupljeni su istočno mediteranski tipovi amfora LR1, LR2, LR5 i afričke amfore (npr. minijaturene amfore tipa *spatheion*). Pored njih, za još neke ulomke pretpostavlja se afričko podrijetlo zbog strukture ulomaka ciglasto-crvene boje i bjelkastog premaza (Raynaud, Bonifay 1993: 15); (kat. br. 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35 i 37). Takva situacija ne iznenađuje jer se afričke amfore na Jadranu često javljaju (Tassaux 2004: 29). Dijelu amfora nije bilo moguće odrediti tip zbog fragmentiranosti, ali su zbog narebrenog ukrasa opredijeljene kao istočno mediteranske kasnoantičke amfore (kat. br. 24, 25, 30). Afričke amfore na jadranskom području zastupljene su od 3. stoljeća (Jurišić 2000: 56) što znači da se ulomci koji su ovdje pripisani afričkoj proizvodnji mogu datirati od 3. st. do 7. stoljeća.

Nalaz kasnoantičkih afričkih i istočno mediteranskih amfora u Postirima svakako je u okviru očekivanja budući da je to čest slučaj na jadranskim lokalitetima (Jurišić 2000:

nifay 1993: 15); (cat. no. 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35 and 37). This situation is not surprising, since African amphorae appear frequently in the Adriatic zone (Tassaux 2004: 29). The type of certain amphorae could not be determined due to their fragmentary condition, but based on their ribbed ornamentation they were classified as eastern Mediterranean Late Antique amphorae (cat. no. 24, 25, 30). African amphorae were present in the Adriatic region since the third century (Jurišić 2000: 56), which means that the fragments here attributed to African production may be dated from the third to seventh centuries.

The discovery of Late Antique African and eastern Mediterranean amphorae in Postira is certainly within the framework of expectations, since this is often the case at Adriatic sites (Jurišić 2000: 57).

Amphorae remained in use for an extended period which makes them difficult to date (Katić 1999/2000: 42), while here they were found in fragments around Late Antique walls, without stratigraphy, together with finds from other periods. This is why it is difficult to precisely determine them chronologically and state when precisely they came to Postira and whether they played some secondary role and how long this lasted.

Amphora type LR1 (Beltran 82, Keays LIIIA, Class 44A) is present in one example (cat. no. 19), and it has been dated from the fifth to seventh centuries. It can be found from Britain, through the Mediterranean to Africa and the Black Sea and lower Danube Basin, but also in the Adriatic seaboard. Possible production sites for this type of amphora are the Eastern Mediterranean, Rhodes, Cyprus and the vicinity of Antioch (Beltrán 1970: 579–580; Keay 1984: 268–269, 273–274, 278; Peacock, Williams 1986: 185–187; Empereur, Picon 1989: 236–239; Laubenheimer 1990: 145; Sciallano, Sibella 1994: 100; Reynolds 1995: 71; Caravale, Toffoletti 1997: 162; Modrijan 2005: 157–158, Fig. 2: 1, Fig. 3: 3). This type is often found at Adriatic sites: Dugopolje (Jurišić 2000: 57; Borzić, Jadrčić 2007: 159), Naron (Mardešić, Šalov 2002: 119 cat. no. 64; Topić 2005: 30, cat. no. 75), Salona (Mardešić 1994: 294), Silba (undersea) (Babić 2008: 213–214), and Split (Topić 1999a: 81, Pl. IV: 10).

Amphora type LR2 (Class 43, Keay LXV) is present in several examples (cat. no. 20, 21, 22, perhaps: 24, 25, 30). Production of this type has been dated from the fourth to the end of the sixth century, and there are some indications of production even in the seventh century. It was particularly well-represented in the late fifth and sixth centuries. Their assumed production site is the territory of the Aegean and Black Seas, and due to the high quantity of such amphorae it is assumed that they were produced in other centres as well. They were used to transport wine. The type is present in Britain, Tunisia, Cyrenaica, Romania, Athens and Istanbul (Keay 1984: 352–356; Peacock, Williams 1986: 182–184; Sciallano, Sibella 1994: 101; Caravale, Toffoletti 1997: 170). Amphorae of this type appear on the Adriatic coast and islands (Vrsalović 1974: 140, no. 150; Jurišić 2000: 57), in Slovenia at the Tonovcov grad site (Modrijan 2005: 161), in Hvar (Katić 1999/2000: 26–26), in the Early Christian church in Gata (Katić 1994: 204), Novi Vinodolski, Premuda, Rogoznica,

57).

Amfore se dugo zadržavaju u upotrebi što otežava njihovo datiranje (Katić 1999/2000: 42), a ovdje su pronađene u ulomcima uokolo kasnoantičkih zidova, bez stratigrafije, zajedno s nalazima drugih razdoblja. Zbog toga ih je teško vremenski točno opredijeliti i reći kada su točno došle u Postira i jesu li doživjele neku sekundarnu ulogu i do kada je ona trajala.

Tip amfore LR1 (Beltran 82, Keays LIIIA, Class 44A) zastupljen je s jednim primjerom (kat. br. 19), a datira se od 5. – 7. st. Nalazi ga se od Britanije, preko Mediterana i Afrike do Crnog mora i donjeg Podunavlja, ali i na Jadranu. Kao moguća mjesta proizvodnje amfora ovog tipa smatraju se Istočni Mediteran, Rodos, Cipar i okolica Antiohije (Beltrán 1970: 579–580; Keay 1984: 268–269, 273–274, 278; Peacock, Williams 1986: 185–187; Empereur, Picon 1989: 236–239; Laubenheimer 1990: 145; Sciallano, Sibella 1994: 100; Reynolds 1995: 71; Caravale, Toffoletti 1997: 162; Modrijan 2005: 157–158, Fig. 2: 1, Fig. 3: 3). Ovaj tip često se nalazi na jadranskim lokalitetima: Dugopolje (Jurišić 2000: 57; Borzić, Jadrić 2007: 159), Naroni (Mardešić, Šalov 2002: 119, kat. br. 64; Topić 2005: 30, kat. br. 75), Salona (Mardešić 1994: 294), Silba (u moru) (Babić 2008: 213–214), Split (Topić 1999a: 81, T. IV: 10).

Tip amfore LR2 (Class 43, Keay LXV) zastupljen je s više primjera (kat. br. 20, 21, 22, možda: 24, 25, 30). Proizvodnja ovog tipa datira se od 4. do kraja 6., a postoje i neke naznake za proizvodnju i u 7. st. Naročito je zastupljen u kasnom 5. i 6. stoljeću. Pretpostavljeno mjesto proizvodnje je područje Egejskog i Crnog mora, a zbog velike količine ovakvih amfora pretpostavlja se da je njihova proizvodnja moguća i u drugim centrima. Bile su namijenjene za prijevoz vina. Tip je zastupljen u Britaniji, Tunisu, Kirenaici, Rumunjskoj, Ateni i Istanbulu (Keay 1984: 352–356; Peacock, Williams 1986: 182–184; Sciallano, Sibella 1994: 101; Caravale, Toffoletti 1997: 170). Amfore ovog tipa pojavljuju se na Jadranskoj obali i otocima (Vrsalović 1974: 140, br. 150; Jurišić 2000: 57), u Sloveniji na lokalitetu Tonovcov grad (Modrijan 2005: 161), u Hvaru (Katić 1999/2000: 26–26), u starokršćanskoj crkvi u Gatima (Katić 1994: 204), Novom Vinodolskom, Premudi, Rogoznici, Žrnovu, Šibenskom kanalu i njegovoj okolici (Brusić 1976: 33, 35, T. III: 2), na lokalitetu Fizine kod Portoroža (Gaspari et al. 2007: 180, T. 10: 279; T. 11: 280–282), Guranu na Križu (Bekić 2007: 34, sl. 30, T. 9: 20), u Dugopolju (Borzić, Jadrić 2007: 159), Naroni s više položaja (Mardešić 1998: 106, T. 4: 34; Mardešić, Šalov 2002: 116, 118, 121, 128, 133, kat. br. 49, 56, 70, 74, 112, 142; Topić 2005: 29, kat. br. 69–71), Srimi (Brusić 2005: 263), Hvaru (u moru) (Babić 2008: 213–214) i Splitu (Topić 1999a: 81, T. V: 2).

Tip LR 5 (Class 46, Palestinski tip) u Postirima zastupljen s kataloškim brojem 23. Proizvodnja tog tipa smješta se u sjevernu Palestinu, od 5. do 7. st., a osim u području gdje se proizvodila, zastupljena je u brojnim centrima na Mediteranu (Peacock, Williams 1986: 191–192; Caravale, Toffoletti 1997: 160). Ovaj tip zastupljen je općenito na Jadranu (Jurišić 2000: 57), npr. u Hvaru gdje je datiran u 6. – 7. st. (Katić 1999/2000: 37–38), na otoku Mljetu u Polačama gdje je datiran u 6. st. (Brusić 1988: 141, 146, sl. 4: 2).

U ovom istraživanju pronađena su tri ulomka mini-

Žrnovo, the Šibenik Channel and its vicinity (Brusić 1976: 33, 35, Pl. III: 2), at the Fizine site near Portorož (Gaspari et al. 2007: 180, Pl. 10: 279; Pl. 11: 280–282), Guran at Križ (Bekić 2007: 34, Fig. 30, Pl. 9: 20), in Dugopolje (Borzić, Jadrić 2007: 159), Naroni at several sites (Mardešić 1998: 106, Pl. 4: 34; Mardešić, Šalov 2002: 116, 118, 121, 128, 133, cat. no. 49, 56, 70, 74, 112, 142; Topić 2005: 29, cat. no. 69–71), Srima (Brusić 2005: 263), Hvar (undersea) (Babić 2008: 213–214) and Split (Topić 1999a: 81, Pl. V: 2).

Type LR 5 (Class 46, Palestine type) is present in Postira with catalogue number 23. Production of this type has been located in northern Palestine, from the fifth to seventh centuries, and besides the area in which it was produced, it was also present in numerous centres in the Mediterranean (Peacock, Williams 1986: 191–192; Caravale, Toffoletti 1997: 160). This type was generally present in the Adriatic (Jurišić 2000: 57), e.g. in Hvar, where it has been dated to the sixth-seventh centuries (Katić 1999/2000: 37–38), on the island of Mljet in Polače, where it has been dated to the sixth century (Brusić 1988: 141, 146, Fig. 4: 2).

Three fragments of miniature amphorae (cat. no. 16–18) were found in the course of this research. Two (cat. no. 16, 18) may be classified as type 33 C according to Bonifay (Bonifay 2004: 452–453; 2005: 127; 2008: 127–129). These are miniature amphorae with cylindrical bodies, or miniature *spatheia*.⁹ Cat. no. 17 is only a base, and its variant cannot be determined. Bonifay provided a typology and gathered the most important information for this amphora type. There is a large number of variants of this miniature amphora type, and some uncertainty as to their production site precisely due to the wide array of structures in the clay used to make them and the wide territory of their distribution in the Mediterranean, Danube Basin and the Alpine zone. The height of variant C was between 40 and 44 cm, while the diameter of the body was 8–9 or 12–13 cm. The type appears with and without handles, and both variants were found in Postira. Bonifay proposed dating these amphoras to the latter half of the seventh century (Bonifay 2005: 129) while some scholars dated them even earlier, but not prior to the second quarter of the sixth century (Villa 1998: 179, note 17). The production site of variant C was apparently in Africa, in the province of Africa Proconsularis/Zeugitana, in the city of Neapolis (Nabeul). The structure of the ceramic found there, if compared to the example under cat. no. 18. from Postira, would appear to be the same (Bonifay 2005, 39, Pl. I, no. 22). Presently it is assumed that they were used to hold wine and olives. Amphorae similar to cat. no. 18 were also found in Carthage, Athens, Ostia and in the territory of Slovenia. The amphorae found in the Saint-Gervais 2 shipwreck and at other sites of southern Gallia have been dated to the seventh century. In the case of variants of miniature cylindrical amphora produced in Africa, different structures from which they were made have been ascertained, while the examples from Postira fit into this picture. Examples of miniature *spatheia* (capacity: 0.96–1.43 l) were also found on the western coast of the Adriatic and in Moesia Superior.

⁹ From the problems associated with the term *spatheion*, see: Bonifay 2005: 452.

jaturnih amfora (kat. br. 16–18). Dva (kat. br. 16, 18) mogu odrediti kao tip 33 C po Bonifayu (Bonifay 2004: 452–453; 2005: 127; 2008: 127–129). Riječ je o minijaturnim amforama cilindričnog tijela odnosno minijaturnim *spatheionima*.⁹ Kat. br. 17 predstavlja samo dno i nije moguće odrediti varijantu. Bonifay donosi tipologiju te okuplja najvažnije informacije za ovu vrstu amfora. Postoji velik broj varijanti ovog tipa minijaturnih amfora kao i nedoumice koje se odnose na mjesta proizvodnje upravo zbog velikog broja struktura gline od kojih su izrađivane i velikog područja njihove rasprostranjenosti na Mediteranu, Podunavlju i alpskom području. Visina varijante C bila je između 40 – 44 cm, a promjer tijela iznosio je 8 – 9 ili 12 – 13 cm. Tip se javlja bez ručki i s njima, a u Postirima su pronađene obje varijante. Bonifay predlaže datiranje ovih amfora u drugu polovinu 7. st. (Bonifay 2005: 129) dok ih neki autori datiraju i nešto ranije, ali ne prije druge četvrtine 6. st. (Villa 1998: 179, bilj. 17). Mjesto proizvodnje varijante C, čini se, bilo je u Africi u provinciji *Africa Proconsularis/Zeugitana* u gradu *Neapolis* (Nabeul). Struktura keramike koja je tamo pronađena, ako se usporedi s primjerkom kat. br. 18. iz Postira, čini se ista (Bonifay 2005: 39, Pl. I, n°22). Za sada se pretpostavlja da su korištene za čuvanje vina i maslina. Vrlo slične amfore, kat. br. 18, pronađene su također u Kartageni, Ateni, Ostiji i na području Slovenije. U 7. stoljeće datiraju se amfore pronađene na mjestu brodoloma Saint-Gervais 2 kao i na drugim lokalitetima južne Galije. Za varijante minijaturnih cilindričnih amfora afričke proizvodnje potvrđene su različite strukture od kojih su izrađene, a primjeri iz Postira se uklapaju u takvu sliku. Primjerci minijaturnih *spatheiona* (kapacitet od 0,96 – 1,43 l) pronađeni su i na zapadnoj obali Jadrana i u Gornjoj Meziji. Njihova velika koncentracija uočena je na nekoliko ranokršćanskih lokaliteta i njihova se uloga povezuje s liturgijom (Tchernia 1969: 470–473; Beltrán 1970: 76–82, 570–571; Keay 1984: 215–216; Peacock, Williams 1986: 203–203; Guštin 1991: 44, kat. br. 20; Villa 1994: 390–391, T. 7: 11–12; Bjelajac 1996: 87–91, sl. XXXI: 165, 167–171, 173–176, 183; Bonifay, Pieri 1998: 371–372; Sagui 1998: 313; Siena et al. 1998: 704, 706, sl. 34: 15–26; Volpe et al. 2004: 361–362; Jézégou 1998: 345–346, sl. 306; Bitenc, Knific 2001: 35–36, kat. br. 95, 52–53, kat. br. 147, 57, kat. br. 166, 60–61, kat. br. 180; Murialdo 2005: 396; Bonifay 2005: 452–453, 464, fig. 5; Vidrih Perko, Župančić 2005: 534, fig. 9: 1).

Kataloški opis amfora:

16. Obod, vrat i rame minijaturne amfore tip *spatheion* 33 C. Sačuvana su dva ulomka koja se ne spajaju: obod i dio vrata; te vrat, rame i dio tijela. Zbog toga je nemoguće odrediti kolika je bila visina vrata. Obod je prstenastog oblika, polukružno ispupčen prema van i blago profiliran. Vrat je uži od oboda i cilindričnog je oblika, također je uži od ramena i cilindričnog tijela posude. Na stijenkama je sačuvana prevlaka žute boje u tragovima. Površina je hrapava, ujednačene boje pečenja, otire se na dodir i ima primjese vapnenca. Zbog premaza se pretpostavlja da je u posudi čuvana tekućina. Keramika je ujednačeno i dobro pečena. Zapremnina posude je bila vjerojatno nekoliko decilitara. Druga polovina 6. do 7. st.

⁹ Za problematiku naziva *spatheion* vidi: Bonifay 2005: 452.

A high concentration has been noted at several Early Christian sites and their role is associated with the liturgy (Tchernia 1969: 470–473; Beltrán 1970: 76–82, 570–571; Keay 1984: 215–216; Peacock, Williams 1986: 203–203; Guštin 1991: 44, cat. no. 20; Villa 1994, 390–391, T. 7: 11–12; Bjelajac 1996: 87–91, Fig. XXXI: 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 183, Bonifay, Pieri 1998: 371–372; Sagui 1998: 313; Siena et al. 1998: 704, 706, Fig. 34: 15–26; Volpe et al. 2004: 361–362; Jézégou 1998: 345–346, Fig. 306; Bitenc, Knific 2001: 35–36, cat. no. 95; 52–53, cat. no. 147; 57, cat. no. 166, 60–61, cat. no. 180; Murialdo 2005, 396; Bonifay 2005: 452–453, 464, Fig. 5; Vidrih Perko, Župančić 2005, 534, Fig. 9: 1).

Catalogue description of amphorae:

16. Rim, neck and shoulder of miniature *spatheion* type 33 C amphora. Two pieces which do not connect have been preserved: rim and part of neck; and neck, shoulder and part of the body. Because of this it is impossible to determine how high the neck was. The rim is ring-shaped, protruding outwardly semi-circularly and lightly articulated. The neck is narrower than the rim and is cylindrical, also narrower than the shoulder and the vessel's cylindrical body. Traces of white coating have been preserved on the walls. The surface is rough, with uniform firing colour, friable, with limestone additives. Due to the coating, it is assumed that the vessel was used to hold liquids. The ceramic is uniform and well fired. The vessel's capacity was probably several decilitres. Latter half of 6th-7th century.

17. Depressed base of miniature *spatheion* type amphora shaped like a point. There is very small quantity of limestone and mica additives, and a considerable quantity of sand. The vessel's firing colour is uniform, while the cross-section and interior have traces of burning which appeared after the vessel was destroyed. Small, irregular voids are visible in the cross-section, which were created by the burning of substances in the clay mass during firing of the vessel. Latter half of 6th-7th century.

18. Part of a miniature *spatheion* 33 C type amphora. The vessel has a uniform whitish firing colour. The surface is slightly rough, but not friable. The clay has almost no visible additives, only a small quantity of quartz. The neck has been preserved, and the handles begin at it and end at the vessel's shoulder (rim has not been preserved). The throat is somewhat narrower than the vessel's body. The body is cylindrical, narrowing lightly toward the base which has not been preserved. The preserved part of the vessel is 24.9 cm long, which indicates that this is a very small vessel, with capacity of 2-3 dl. Latter half of 6th-7th century.

19. Fragments of LR1 amphora. The rim is broad, banded, outwardly curved, lip is rounded. The central portion of the band is drawn inward, and the edge is curved like the base, which forms a clear transition to the vessel's throat. The handle is affixed to the rim (slightly below the actual edge of the rim) and ends at the amphora's shoulder. It bends at a right angle and is articulated. The throat is somewhat narrower than the rim and expands into the rounded shoulder. The surface of the vessel is rough, particularly on the exterior wall. The handles were added subsequently, which can be seen quite well at the connection between the handles

17. Udubljeno dno minijaturene amfore tip *spatheion* u obliku špica. Ima vrlo malo primjesa vapnenca i tinjca, te dosta primjesa pijeska. Posuda je ujednačene boje pečenja, a presjek i unutrašnjost imaju tragove gorenja koji su nastali nakon uništavanja posude. U presjeku su vidljive male nepravilne šupljine, nastale izgaranjem sastojaka u glinenoj masi prilikom pečenja posude. Druga polovina 6. do 7. st.

18. Dio minijaturene amfore tip *spatheion* 33 C. Posuda je ujednačene bjeličaste boje pečenja. Površina je malo hrapava, ali se na dodir ne otire. Glina gotovo nema vidljivih primjesa, tek nešto kvarca. Sačuvan je vrat gdje počinju drške koje završavaju na ramenu posude (obod nije sačuvan). Grlo je nešto uže od samog tijela posude. Tijelo je cilindrično, blago se sužava pri dnu koje nije sačuvano. Sačuvani dio posude je dug 24,9 cm, što govori da se radi o vrlo maloj posudi, zapremnine 2 – 3 dl. Druga polovina 6. do 7. st.

19. Ulomci amfore LR1. Obod je širok, trakast, izvijen prema van, usta su zaobljena. Središnji dio trake uvučen je, a rub je izvijen kao i dno koje tvori jasan prijelaz prema grlu posude. Drška je naljepljena na obod (nešto ispod samog ruba oboda) i završava na ramenu amfore. Lomi se pod pravim kutom i profilirana je. Grlo je nešto uže od oboda i širi se u zaobljeno rame. Površina posude je hrapava, osobito na vanjskoj stijenci. Drške su naknadno dodane što se dobro vidi na spoju drške i oboda. Vanjska stijenka i drške imaju površinu koja je grublja od unutrašnje i prekrivena je mnogobrojnim, jako usitnjenim mrvicama vapnenca, u manjoj mjeri tinjcem i pijeskom. One se ne uočavaju na presjeku i na unutrašnjoj stijenci. Nalaze se isključivo na drškama, vanjskoj stijenci i unutrašnjoj stijenci oboda. 6. – 7. st.

20. Ulomak oboda LR2 amfore. Obod je blago izvijen prema van i zaobljen na unutrašnjoj strani. Vrat posude sužava se prema tijelu. Unutrašnja i vanjska stijenka iste su boje pečenja, dok se u presjeku ona razlikuje. Na unutrašnjoj stijenci ispod oboda uočavaju se tragovi prevlake svijetlo žute boje. Površina je glatka. Posuda je s primjesama pijeska i dobro je pečena. 6. – 7. st.

21. Ulomak grla, ručke i ramena LR2 amfore. Površina se na dodir jako otire, a mjestimično je sačuvan premaz smeđe boje. Posuda je ukrašena vodoravnim uskim i plitkim žljebovima na ramenu. Vrat je uzak i cilindričan, a pri njegovu dnu počinje drška koja završava na ramenu posude. Posuda je ujednačene boje pečenja s vrlo malo primjesa (pijeska i vapnenca). U presjeku se ponegdje javljaju nepravilne šupljine. 6 – 7. st.

22. Ulomak ramena, trbuha i ručke LR2 amfore. Trbuh je ukrašen gustim vodoravnim žljebovima. Drška počinje na ramenu. Posuda je dobro pečena, a s vanjske strane nalazi se prevlaka što znači da je korištena za prijenos i čuvanje tekućine. Na površini, a osobito na presjeku, uočavaju se različite nepravilne pukotine. Ima primjesa pijeska i nešto vapnenca. 6. – 7. st.

23. Ulomak ramena i drška amfore tip LR5. Drška je naknadno dodana na rame amfore ukrašene vodoravnim žljebovima. Prstenastog je oblika i grubo izrađena. Površina je glatka i otire se. Glina ima malo primjesa pijeska i vapnenca. 6. – 7. st.

and rim. The exterior wall and handles have a coarser surface than the interior, and they are covered with numerous, very tiny particles of limestone and, to a lesser degree, mica and sand. These cannot be seen in the cross-section and on the interior walls. They can be found exclusively on the handles, exterior wall and on the interior wall of the rime. 6th-7th centuries.

20. Fragment of LR2 amphora rim. Rim is lightly curved outward and rounded on the inside. Vessel's throat narrows toward body. Interior and exterior walls have the same firing colour, while it differs in the cross-section. Traces of light yellow coating visible on the interior wall below the rim. Surface is smooth. Vessel has sand additives and is well fired. 6th-7th centuries.

21. Fragment of throat, handles and shoulder of LR2 amphora. Surface is very friable, while brown paint has been partially preserved. Vessel is ornamented with horizontal narrow and shallow grooves on the shoulder. The neck is narrow and cylindrical, while the handle begins at its base and ends at the vessel's shoulder. The vessel has a uniform firing colour with very small quantity of additives (sand and limestone). Irregular voids appear in the cross-section. 6th-7th centuries.

22. Fragment of shoulder, belly and handle of LR2 amphora. Belly is ornamented with thick horizontal grooves. Handle begins at shoulder. Vessel is well fired, while the exterior side has a coating which means that it was used to transport and hold liquids. Various irregular cracks are visible on the surface, and particularly at the cross-section. Contains sand and some limestone additives. 6th-7th centuries.

23. Fragment of the shoulder and handle of LR5 type amphora. Handle was subsequently affixed to shoulder of amphora, ornamented with horizontal grooves. It is ring-shaped and coarsely made. Surface is smooth and friable. Clay has small quantity of sand and limestone additives. 6th-7th centuries.

24. Fragment of Late Antique amphora ornamented with wavy shallow grooves. Vessel is well-fired with considerable quantity of limestone additives. Cracks of various sizes and shapes appear on the surface and in cross-section. Perhaps type LR2 (?). 6th-7th centuries.

25. Fragment of amphora belly and shoulder, perhaps type LR2. Fragment is decorated with three rows of very thickly engraved shallow grooves. Vessel is well fired, with coating on exterior, meaning it was used to hold liquids. Clay has sand and mica additives. 6th-7th centuries.

26. Fragment of rim and handle of amphora or jug. Rim is straight, with rounded edge. Vessel's handle begins immediately beneath rim. Vessel is well and uniformly fired, exterior and interior colour are the same, while cross-section is different. Clay has sand and mica additives.

27. Base of amphora shaped like onion bulb. Vessel has uniform firing colour. Orange coating on exterior wall partially preserved, while vessel has red fired colour. No visible additives, while irregular cracks caused by burning of substances in the clay mass are visible in the cross-section.

28. Fragment of amphora neck and shoulder. Vessel

24. Ulomak kasnoantičke amfore ukrašene valovitim plitkim žljebovima. Posuda je dobro pečena s dosta primjesa vapnenca. Na površini i u presjeku nalazi se dosta pukotina različitih veličina i oblika. Možda tip LR2 (?). 6. – 7. st.

25. Ulomak trbuha i ramena amfore, možda LR2 tiPl. Ulomak je ukrašen s tri reda vrlo gusto urezanih plitkih žljebova. Posuda je dobro pečena, a s vanjske strane nalazi se prevlaka, dakle koristila se za čuvanje tekućine. Ima primjesa pijeska i tinjca. 6. – 7. st.

26. Ulomak oboda i drške amfore ili vrča. Obod je ravan, a rub zaobljen. Ispod oboda odmah počinje drška posude. Posuda je dobro i ujednačeno pečena, vanjska i unutarnja boja jednake su, dok je presjek drugačiji. Ima primjesa pijeska i tinjca.

27. Dno amfore u obliku lukovice. Posuda je ujednačene boje pečenja. Na vanjskoj stijenci djelomično je sačuvana prevlaka narančaste boje, dok je posuda crveno pečene boje. Nema vidljivih primjesa, a u presjeku su vidljive nepravilne pukotine nastale izgaranjem sastojaka u glinenoj masi.

28. Ulomak vrata i ramena amfore. Posuda je dobro pečena bez primjesa. U presjeku se uočavaju pukotine različite veličine i različitih oblika, a manjim dijelom su vidljive i na unutrašnjoj stijenci. Na vanjskoj stijenci nalazi se prevlaka žućkaste boje. Posuda je ujednačene boje pečenja. Afrička proizvodnja. 5. – 7. st.

29. Ulomci ramena i trbuha amfore sa žutom prevlakom na vanjskoj stijenci. Posuda je dobro pečena, s dosta primjesa pijeska, nešto vapnenca. Površina je glatka, otire se na dodir (vanjska stijenska). Presjek i površina imaju nešto nepravilnih različitih pukotina. Afrička proizvodnja. 5. – 7. st.

30. Ulomak dna amfore ukrašen trakama usko urezanih vodoravnih linija. Posuda je dobro pečena s prevlakom na vanjskoj stijenci. Ima primjesa pijeska, nešto tinjca i vapnenca. Možda LR2. 6. – 7. st.

31. Ulomak drške i ramena afričke amfore. Posuda je dobro pečena, ujednačene boje pečenja bez premaza i prevlake. Na površini se javljaju manje i veće pukotine različitog oblika, stoga je malo hrapava i jako se otire na dodir. Drška je neznatno profilirana. Ima vrlo malo primjesa pijeska i vapnenca. Rame amfore bilo je koso postavljeno, a ručka se u odnosu na rame okomito diže te zaobljava.

32. Ulomak grla amfore i drške. Posuda je dobro pečena, a boja pečenja na unutrašnjoj stijenci malo varira. Vanjska stijenska ima prevlaku žućkaste boje. Površina je glatka i malo se otire na dodir. Glina ima primjesa vapnenca i pijeska. Na površini, a osobito na presjeku, uočavaju se pukotine različite veličine i oblika. Vrat posude jako je narebren s unutrašnje strane, sužava se prema obodu, a drška se koso i pomalo zaobljeno spušta prema tijelu posude.

33. Ulomak grla i drške amfore. Površina je glatka i jako se otire, ima nešto primjesa pijeska i vapnenca. Na površini i u presjeku javljaju se pukotine koje su nepravilne i različite po veličini. Vrat amfore je ravan, a ručka se koso spušta prema tijelu posude.

34. Ulomak grla i ručke amfore. Ručka je spojena s vratom i zaobljeno se spušta prema tijelu posude. Posuda je izrađena na kolu s primjesama vapnenca i pijeska. Dobro je pečena i ujednačene boje pečenja. Rijetko se javljaju puko-

is well fired, with no additives. Cracks of varying size and shape visible in cross-section, visible to lesser degree on interior wall. Yellowish coating on exterior wall. Vessel has uniform firing colour. African product. 5th-7th centuries.

29. Fragments of shoulder and belly of amphora with yellow coating on exterior wall. Vessel is well-fired, with considerable additives of sand and some limestone. Surface is smooth, friable (exterior wall). Cross-section and surface have some irregular different cracks. African product. 5th-7th centuries.

30. Fragment of amphora base ornamented with bands of narrowly engraved horizontal lines. Vessel is well fired with coating on external wall. Clay contains additives of sand, and some mica and limestone. Perhaps LR2. 6th-7th centuries.

31. Fragment of handle and shoulder of African amphora. Vessel is well fired, with uniform firing colour without coating or paint. Smaller and larger cracks of various shapes appear on surface, so it is slightly rough and very friable. Handle is negligibly articulated. Clay has very small quantity of sand and limestone additives. Amphora's shoulder was diagonally placed, and in relation to the shoulder the handle ascends vertically and is then rounded.

32. Fragment of amphora throat and handle. Vessel is well fired, and the firing colour varies slightly on the interior wall. The exterior wall has yellowish coating. Surface is smooth and slightly friable. Clay has limestone and sand additives. Cracks of various size and shape are visible on the surface and especially on the cross-section. Vessel's neck is very ribbed on interior, narrows toward rim, while the handle descends at slant and with slight arch toward vessel's body.

33. Fragment of amphora throat and handle. Surface is smooth and very friable, has some sand and limestone additives. Cracks appear on surface and on cross-section which are irregular and vary in size. Amphora's neck is straight, while handle descends toward vessel's body at slant.

34. Fragment of amphora throat and handle. Handle is connected to neck and descends toward vessel's body in an arch. Vessel wheel thrown, with limestone and sand additives. Well fired, with uniform firing colour. Cracks on vessel's cross-section and surface appear rarely, while actual surface is rough and friable.

35. Fragment of amphora throat and handle. Neck placed straight, while handle extends horizontally and then bends vertically toward vessel's body. Yellow coating on exterior wall, while vessel's firing colour is orange. Very little sand and quartz additives. Handle lightly articulated. Surface rough and friable. African product. 6th-7th centuries.

36. Fragment of amphora shoulder and handle thrown on wheel, with uniform firing colour. Shoulder diagonal and slightly rounded, connected to handle which ascends vertically and lightly rounded in lower portion. Cracks of various size and shape appear on the surface and cross-section. Clay contains sand and limestone additives. Exterior wall has yellow coating, and it is assumed that the vessel was used to transport or hold liquids. Surface is slightly rough and friable. 5th-7th centuries.

37. Fragment of lower part of belly of cylindrical ampho-

tine na presjeku i površini posude, a sama površina je hrapava i otire se.

35. Ulomak grla i drške amfore. Vrat je postavljen ravno, a ručka se vodoravno pruža i zatim okomito lomi prema tijelu posude. Na vanjskoj stijenci nalazi se žuta prevlaka, a posuda je ujednačene narančaste boje pečenja. Vrlo je malo primjesa pijeska i kvarca. Drška je blago profilirana. Površina je hrapava i otire se. Afrička proizvodnja. 6. – 7. st.

36. Ulomak ramena i drške amfore izrađene na kolu, ujednačene boje pečenja. Rame je koso i pomalo zaobljeno, spojeno je s drškom koja se okomito diže i u donjem dijelu je pomalo zaobljena. Na površini i presjeku javljaju se pukotine različite veličine i oblika. Glina ima primjese pijeska i vapnenca. Na vanjskoj stijenci nalazi se žuta prevlaka i pretpostavlja se da je posuda služila za transport ili čuvanje tekućeg sadržaja. Površina je blago hrapava i otire se. 5. – 7. st.

37. Ulomak donjeg dijela trbuha cilindrične amfore. Posuda je rađena na kolu, dobro je i ujednačeno pečena. Površina je hrapava i pri dodiru se otiru mrvice. U glini se nalaze ujednačeno raspoređene primjese kvarca. Struktura gline je jako slična kat. br. 18. zbog čega se pretpostavlja tuniško porijeklo. 5. – 7. st.

Građevinska keramika (T. 8: 46–47)

Pronađen je dio tegule s ukrasom i imbreks. Ovakve predmete teško je datirati budući da se građevinska keramika mogla koristiti kroz duže vrijeme i ponovno upotrebljavati. Ipak, ulomak opeke s ukrasom od troprute trake pronađen na Putalj, datiran je u kasnu antiku (Fadić 2001: 142–143, sl. 34).

46. Tegula koja je ukrašena troprutom trakom. Dobro je pečena, od pročišćene gline. 5. – 7. st.

47. Ulomak imbreksa. Vanjska površina je glatka dok se na unutrašnjoj nalazi tanki sloj žbuke. Keramika je dobro pečena, s malo primjesa vapnenca i kvarca. Na površini, a posebno u presjeku, nalaze se pukotine različitih veličina i oblika.

Staklo¹⁰ (T. 7: 38 a–c–41)

Ulomci staklenih predmeta malobrojni su i ne dozvoljavaju cjelovite rekonstrukcije, kao ni određivanje precizne tipologije niti definiranje podrijetla nalaza. Zastupljeni su ulomci posude iz razdoblja od 1. do 2. st., ulomci dvije posude 6. do 7. st. i ulomci kasnosrednjovjekovne boce iz razdoblja od 15. do 16. st.

Antika

Pronađeni su ulomci triju predmeta koji pripadaju antičkom razdoblju. Ulomci pod kat. br. 38 (T. 7: 38 a–c) su vjerojatno dio boce, ali su premaleni da bismo mogli rekonstruirati njezin izgled. Dno posude bilo je četvrtastog oblika, a takve boce korištene su češće u 1. i 2. stoljeću, a rjeđe u 3. i 4. st. Četvrtaste boce bile su vrlo praktične budući da su pri spremanju i pakiranju bolje iskoristavale prostor od cilindričnih (Glušćević 1991: 147; Lazar 2003: 152, 155).

Drugi ulomak (kat. br. 39) dio je staklene čaše na nozi i

ra. Vessel was thrown on a wheel, well and uniformly fired. Surface is rough and when touched particles crumble off. Uniformly distributed quartz additives in clay. Structure of clay very similar to cat. no. 18, which is why it is assumed to have come from Tunisia. 5th–7th centuries.

Construction ceramics (Pl. 8: 46–47)

Part of a tegula with ornament and an imbrex were found. Such items are difficult to date since construction ceramics could be used over longer periods and also reused. Nonetheless, the fragment of brick with a triple-striped band found in Putalj has been dated to Late Antiquity (Fadić 2001: 142–143, Fig. 34).

46. Tegula ornamented with a triple-striped band. Well fired, may of refined clay. 5th–7th centuries.

47. Imbrex fragment. External surface is smooth, while interior has thin layer of plaster. Ceramic is well fired, with small quantity of limestone and quartz additives. The surface, and especially cross-section, contain cracks of various sizes and shapes.

Glass¹⁰ (Pl. 7: 38a–c–41)

Pieces of glass items are few and they cannot be fully reconstructed, nor can a precise typology nor origin of the finds be determined. There are fragments of vessels from the first to second centuries, from the sixth to seventh centuries, and fragments of a late medieval bottle from the fifteenth to sixteenth centuries.

Antiquity

Fragments of three items were found which date to Antiquity. The fragments on cat. no. 38 (Pl. 7: 38a–c) are probably part of a bottle, but they are too small to allow for a reconstruction of its appearance. The vessel's base was rectangular, and such bottles were used more frequently in the first and second centuries, and more rarely in the third and fourth centuries. Rectangular bottles were very practical, since space was better used in their storage and packaging than in the case of cylindrical bottles (Glušćević 1991: 147; Lazar 2003: 152, 155).

Another fragment (cat. no. 39) is part of a glass cup on a foot which dates to Late Antiquity. This is type of cup that was in use from the fourth to eighth centuries. It is assumed that such cups were used in Europe until the Middle Ages, and it often, based on previous research, appeared at Early Christian sites, but also in urban centres at places with a profane character (?). Such cup types were found in Naron (Buljević 2002: 171, cat. no. 25), Gata (Fadić 1994: 213–214), Srima, Salona (Buljević 1994: 259, 262), Ubli, Majsan, Lučnjak, Putalj (Fadić 2001: 134–135, Fig. 31b–c), Červar Porto (Ettlinger Staričić 2006: 256–258, Fig. 11) and other sites in other variants. Such items could be used as cups for beverages, but they also had a liturgical role, and they also served as oil-lamps and holders for votive candles (Isings 1957: 140; Chevalier 1999: 180–181, Fig. 10).

A conical base is preserved under cat. no. 40, which is broken at the transition to the lateral wall, and it is difficult

¹⁰ Zahvaljujem Bartulu Šiljegu na konzultacijama vezanim za staklene predmete i na pomoći pri pronalaženju literature.

¹⁰ We would like to thank Bartul Šiljeg for consultations on the glass items and for his assistance in finding the relevant literature.

datira se u kasnu antiku. To je tip čaša na nozi koje se koriste od 4. do 8. st. Pretpostavlja se da su se takve čaše u Europi koristile do u srednji vijek, a često se, prema dosadašnjim istraživanjima, javljaju na ranokršćanskim lokalitetima, ali i u urbanim centrima na mjestima profanog karaktera (?). Ovakva vrsta čaša pronađena je u Naroni (Buljević 2002: 171, kat. br. 25), Gatima (Fadić 1994: 213–214), Srimi, Saloni (Buljević 1994: 259, 262), Ublima, Majsanu, Lučnjaku, Putalju (Fadić 2001: 134–135, sl. 31b–c), Červar Portu (Ettlinger Staričić 2006: 256–258, sl. 11) i drugim lokalitetima u različitim varijantama. Ovakvi predmeti mogli su služiti kao čaše za piće, ali su također mogli imati liturgijsku ulogu, ali su služile i kao svjetiljke i zavjetni lumini (Isings 1957: 140; Chevalier 1999: 180–181, sl. 10).

Kod kat. br. 40 sačuvano je konično dno koje je odlomljeno na prijelazu u bočnu stijenku te je teško odrediti je li riječ o čaši ili o zdjelici. Oba tipa posuda pronađena su na više lokaliteta kasne antike: Srma-Prižba (Fadić 2005: 224), Gata (Buljević 1994: 218), Putalj (Fadić 2001: 132, 135, sl. 31a, 32), Naroni na više položaja, a služile su kako svjetiljke (Buljević 1994: 171, 26; Chevalier 1999: 174–179, sl. 8–9), Split (Topić 1999b: 97, T. 17).

Kataloški opis staklenih predmeta:

38. Ulomci antičke staklene posude četvrtastog dna, vjerojatno boce. Staklo je plavo-zelene boje. Zbog čistoće i boje stakla pretpostavlja se da je riječ o posudi koja se datira u 1. i 2. st. Stijenke su tanke i posuda je vjerojatno izrađena u tehnici slobodno puhanog stakla. Sačuvana su tri ulomka za koje se pretpostavlja da pripadaju jednoj posudi: ulomak dna i dva ulomka bočnih stijenki na kojima se vidi prijelaz jedne stranice posude na drugu. 1. – 2. st.(?).

39. Konkavno konično dno čaše na šupljoj nozi od slobodno puhanog stakla maslinasto zelene boje, vidljivi tragovi razvlačenja stakla. 6. – 7. st.(?).

40. Dno kasnoantičke posude od slobodno puhanog stakla s ljevkastim dnom plavo-zelene boje. 6. – 7. st.

Srednji vijek

Od srednjovjekovnog stakla sačuvana su tri ulomka staklene boce (kat. br. 41). Boca se može datirati 14. – 16. st. u vrijeme kada započinje život današnjeg mjesta Postira (Šantić 1981: 20–22). Takve srednjovjekovne boce (kako su ovdje pronađeni ulomci teško je govoriti o pravim analogijama) prisutne su i u Italiji, na lokalitetu Monte Lecco s kraja 14. i početka 15. st., a služile su kao stolno posuđe za vodu i vino, i zovu se *ingastare* (Buljević 1998: 150, bilj. 78). Proizvodile su se i u Veneciji od 13. do 15. st., a u nekim varijantama sve do 17. st. Staklo muranskih venecijanskih radionica često se pronalazi na istočnoj obali Jadrana kao import ili kao imitacije (Stiaffini 1994: 202, 217, 218, 227; Buljević 1998: 150–151, 157–158). Boca ovakvog oblika pronađena je u Grobu 121 na Putalju u srednjovjekovnom grobu koji se datira u 14. st. Kako je kasnosrednjovjekovno groblje u Postirima uništeno, osim groba 1, ne možemo znati je li ova boca bila prilog pokojniku u nekom od uništenih grobova kao što je to slučaj sa staklenim bocama kakve donosi Tonči Burić u radu u kojem razmatra problematiku prilaganja staklenog i keramičkog posuđa u kasnosrednjovjekovne grobove (Burić 2001: 266, 311, T. V: 5; 2006: 223, 225–239, sl. 1: 5). To

to determine whether it is a cup or bowl. Both types of vessels were found at several sites of Late Antiquity: Srma-Prižba (Fadić 2005: 224), Gata (Buljević 1994: 218), Putalj (Fadić 2001: 132, 135, Fig. 31a, 32), Naroni at several locations, were used as oil-lamps (Buljević 1994: 171, 26; Chevalier 1999: 174–179, Fig. 8–9), and Split (Topić 1999b: 97, T. 17).

Catalogue description of glass items:

38. Fragments of Antique glass vessel with rectangular base, probably bottle. Glass is blue-green. The purity and colour of the glass lead to the conclusion that it is a vessel that dates to the first and second centuries. The walls are thin and the vessel was probably made by free blowing technique. Three fragments have been preserved which are assumed to have belonged to a single vessel: the transition from one side of the vessel can be seen in the fragment of the base and two fragments of the lateral walls. 1st-2nd centuries (?)

39. Concave conical base of cup on hollow foot made of olive green blown glass, with visible traces of stretching on the glass. 6th-7th centuries (?).

40. Base of Late Antique vessel made of free blown glass, with funnelled blue-green base. 6th-7th centuries.

Middle Ages

Among the medieval glass, three fragments of a glass bottle (cat. no. 41) have been preserved. The bottle may be dated from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries at a time when organized living began at the site of today's Postira (Šantić 1981: 20–22). Such medieval bottles (since only fragments were found here it is difficult to speak of genuine analogies) were present in Italy, at the Monte Lecco site from the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth centuries, and they were used as vessels to hold water and wine, called *Inghistera* (Buljević 1998: 150, note 78). They were also manufactured in Venice from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries, and even until the seventeenth century in some variants. Glass from the Venetian Murano workshops is often found on the Eastern Adriatic seaboard as an import or as an imitation (Stiaffini 1994: 202, 217, 218, 227; Buljević 1998: 150–151, 157–158). Bottles of this shape were found in Grave 121 at Putalj in the medieval grave dated to the fourteenth century. Since the late medieval cemetery in Postira was destroyed, except for Grave 1, there is no way of knowing whether this bottle was a good for one of the deceased in one of the destroyed graves, as was the case with the glass bottles published by Tonči Burić in a work in which he examined the problem of depositing glass and ceramic vessels in medieval graves (Burić 2001: 266, 311, Pl. V: 5; 2006, 223, 225–239, Fig. 1: 5; 227). This should be borne in mind given the fact that some of the people who inhabited this earliest Postira were originally from the mainland (Vrsalović 2003: 119). Since these fragments cannot reveal which variant of *Inghistera* bottles are involved here, it is difficult to set any precise dating. The question also remains as to whether it was a good in one of the destroyed graves or if it was used to serve beverages.

41. Fragments of a medieval glass *Inghistera* bottle. Preserved are two fragments of the neck which lightly narrows toward the rim, and a fragmented of the funnelled base.



Sl. 7 Žrtvenik posvećen Veneri (snimak: Lj. Perinić Muratović)
Fig. 7 Altar dedicated to Venus (photo by: Lj. Perinić Muratović)

treba imati na umu s obzirom na činjenicu da je dio stanovnika koji je nastanjivao ta najranija Postira bio porijeklom s kopna (Vrsalović 2003: 119). Budući da ovi ulomci ne mogu otkriti o kojoj varijanti boce *ingastare* je riječ, teško je dati neku preciznu dataciju. Također je otvoreno i pitanje je li ona bila priloga u nekom od uništenih grobova ili se koristila pri serviranju pića.

41. Ulomci srednjovjekovne staklene boce *ingastare*. Sačuvana su dva ulomka grla koji se blago sužava prema obodu i ulomak ljevkastog dna. Staklo boce je tamno zelene boje, vanjska stijenka je oštećena, a unutrašnja je glatka. Vjerojatno se radi o tipu boce s okruglim trbuhom. Od sredine 15. do 16. st.

Koštani predmeti (T. 7: 42–44)

Tri perle od obrađene riblje kosti. Pronađene su ispod kamene ploče uništenog groba, te je moguće da su njemu i pripadale. Vjerojatno je riječ o zrnima krunice, a tu pretpostavku potvrđuju nalazi koštanih krunica iz grobova kasnog srednjeg vijeka na području splitske, a moguće je i trogirke dijaceze. Isto tako se pretpostavlja da su lokalne proizvodnje. Datira ih se od 14. do 16. st., dok se kasnije javljaju i krunice drugog tipa sa staklenim perlama koje su import iz Venecije (Burić 2001: 266; 2007: 254–262).

42. – 44. Koštane perlice od ribljih kralježaka različite veličine. Pronađene ispod kamene ploče uništenog kasnosrednjovjekovnog groba. Od sredine 15 do 16. st.

Metalni nalazi (T. 7: 45)

Pronađen je željezni nožić, kojeg je teško datirati. Kako nije bilo stratigrafije, a na lokalitetu se zajedno javljaju kasnosrednjovjekovni i antički nalazi, nožić može pripadati jednom i drugom razdoblju.

The bottle's glass is green, the outer wall is damaged, while the inside wall is smooth. Probably a bottle type with a round belly. Mid-15th-16th centuries.

Bone items (Pl. 7: 42–44)

Three beads are made of fish bone. They were found under the stone slab of a destroyed grave, so it is possible that they belonged in it. These were probably rosary beads, and this assumption is confirmed by the discovery of rosaries in late medieval graves in the territory of the Split, and also possibly Trogir, Diocese. By the same token, they are assumed to be local products. They date from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries, while later a different type of rosary appeared with glass beads imported from Venice (Burić 2001: 266; 2007: 254–262).

42.-44. Bone beads made of fish vertebrae of different sizes. Found beneath stone slab of destroyed late medieval grave. Mid-15th-16th centuries.

Metallic finds (Pl. 7: 45)

A small iron knife was found which is difficult to date. Since there was no stratigraphy, and both late medieval and Antique finds appeared at the same place, the small knife may belong to either period.

45. Iron knife blade that tapers slightly toward tip.

Stone finds (Pl. 8: 48–49)

Among the stone finds, an altar and fragments of two columns were discovered. The columns are small, with a diameter of roughly 8 cm. The limestone from which one of the columns was made is probably local in origin, since Brač is abundant in high-quality construction stone. Stone from Brač was used to furnish numerous Early Christian churches in Dalmatia. The other column is made of marble. Marble was imported in large quantities from Greece and Asia Minor throughout the Empire, including the Adriatic. The most common marble was that from Proconnesus, which has green and blue veins (Jurišić 2000: 40). This description fits the column from Postira, but analysis is lacking. Marble columns of somewhat larger dimensions than these from Postira were found in Stari Grad on the island of Hvar in the Early Christian dual basilica, and they have been interpreted as the small columns of an altar mensa (Jeličić-Radonić 1994: 51–52, 60). Columns made of limestone and marble with dimensions like these from Postira were found at the Early Christian site of Srma-Prižba and they have also been interpreted as small altar mensa columns (Maršić 2005: 101–102, 149–151). Several fragments of small altar mensa columns were found at several places in the Early Christian basilica in Postira (Kovačić 1994: 48).

48. Fragment of limestone column. Column tapers lightly in the upper portion and expands in the lower portion. A part of the expansion at the bottom has been preserved, possibly the column's base. Column's surface is smooth. Column's cross-section does not form a perfect circle.

49. Fragment of marble column. Lightly tapers toward top, surface is very smooth.

50. Altar dedicated to Venus, damaged in the inscription

45. Željezni nož koji se blago sužava prema vrhu oštrice.

Kameni nalazi (T. 8: 48–49)

Od kamenih nalaza pronađeni su žrtvenik i ulomci dvaju stupova. Stupovi su manjih dimenzija, promjera oko 8 cm. Vapnenac od kojeg je izrađen jedan od stupova vjerojatno je lokalnog podrijetla budući da Brač obiluje kvalitetnim građevnim kamenom. Kamen s Brača upotrebljavan je za namještaj brojnih ranokršćanskih crkava u Dalmaciji. Drugi stup izrađen je od mramora. Mramor se u većoj količini izvezio iz Grčke i Male Azije diljem Carstva, pa tako i na Jadran. Najčešći mramor je onaj s Prokoneza koji ima zelene i plave vene (Jurišić 2000: 40). Tom opisu odgovara i stup iz Postira, ali za to nedostaju analize. Mramorni stupovi nešto većih dimenzija od postirskih pronađeni su u Starom Gradu na Hvaru u ranokršćanskoj dvojnoj bazilici, a interpretirani su kao stupići oltarne menze (Jeličić-Radonić 1994: 51–52, 60). Stupovi od vapnenca i mramora dimenzija kakvi su ovi iz Postira pronađeni su na ranokršćanskom lokalitetu Srima–Prižba i također se tumače kao stupići oltarne menze (Maršić 2005: 101–102, 149–151). U ranokršćanskoj bazilici u Postirima pronađeno je na različitim mjestima više ulomaka stupića od oltarne menze (Kovačić 1994: 48).

48. Ulomak stupa od vapnenca. Stup se lagano sužava u gornjem dijelu, dok se u donjem dijelu širi. Pri dnu je sačuvan dio proširenja, moguće baze stupa. Površina stupa je glatka. Stup u presjeku ne čini savršenu kružnicu.

49. Ulomak mramornog stupa. Prema vrhu se blago sužava, površina je jako glatka.

50. Žrtvenik posvećen Veneri, oštećen na natpisnom polju (sl. 7). Dimenzije su mu 50 x 4,5 x 30 cm, gornji dio je otučen. Žrtveniku nije obrađena samo stražnja strana, tako da je vjerojatno stajao prislonjen uz zid. Na profiliranoj bazi (dimenzija 34,5 x 12 cm) nalazi se natpisno polje (26,5 x 20 cm). Trokutasti znakovi interpunkcije nisu upotrijebljeni dosljedno, a nalaze se po dva u prva dva reda i jedan u trećem redu natpisa. Natpis je posvećen božici Veneri, pisan je kapitalom u tri reda, slovima visine 3 cm. Zbog oštećenosti žrtvenika nije sigurno da li nedostaje nekoliko slova na kraju prvog i/ili na početku drugog reda (sl. 8):

VENERI ARON(?)
(?)AE POSUIT LO
LLIA QUINTA

Predlažemo lekciju: Veneri Aron(i?)/ae posuit Lo/llia Quinta.

Venera se povezivala s grčkom božicom Afroditom i etruščanskom Turan zbog toga što je sa svakom od njih dijelila pojedine aspekte. Rana etruščanska ili latinska božica raslinja i vrtova kasnije se identificirala s Afroditom, te je jednako kao i Afroditu u Grčkoj postala jedna od glavnih rimskih božica prvenstveno povezana s ljubavlju, ljepotom i plodnošću. Općenito se drži da je iz veze s Marsom rodila Erosa, ali isto tako ju se povezuje s Vulkanom. Njena važnost i važnost njenog kulta rasla je s vremenom zahvaljujući utjecaju političkih vođa Rima. Dikator Sula izabrao ju je za svoju pokroviteljicu pod titulom Felix, a Julije Cezar i August

field (Fig. 7). Its dimensions are 50 x 34.5 x 30 cm, upper portion is battered. Only the back of the altar has not been worked, so that it probably stood flush against a wall. The articulated base (dimensions 34.5 x 12 cm) has an inscription field (26.5 x 20 cm). The triangular punctuation marks were not used consistently, and there are two each in the first two lines and one in the third line of the inscription. The inscription is dedicated to the goddess Venus, it is written in capitals in three lines, with letters 3 cm high. Due to the damage to the altar, it is uncertain as to whether several letters are missing at the end of the first and/or beginning of the second line (Fig. 8):

VENERI ARON(?)
(?)AE POSUIT LO
LLIA QUINTA

We propose this reading: Veneri Aron(i?)/ae posuit Lo/llia Quinta.

Venus was linked to the Greek Aphrodite and the Etruscan Turan, because she shared certain aspects with each of them. The early Etruscan and Latin goddess of vegetation and gardens was later identified with Aphrodite, just as in Greece Aphrodite became one of the principal Roman goddesses primarily associated with love, beauty and fertility. It is generally held that she gave birth to Eros in her liaison with Mars, although she is similarly associated with Vulcan. Her importance and the importance of her cult grew with time thanks to the influence of Rome's political leaders. The dictator Sulla chose her as his patron under the title Felix, while Julius Caesar and Augustus selected Venus and named her the predecessor to their own family (gens Julia) since Aeneas (the father of Iulus) was the son of Venus and the mortal Anchises. Furthermore, Caesar also introduced the cult of Venus Genetrix, the goddess of motherhood and marriage, and in 46 BC he built a temple dedicated to her. Venus was also venerated in the temple of Mars Ultor, constructed by Augustus. The last temple constructed in honour of Venus in Rome was raised by Hadrian near the Coliseum in 135. Venus, like many other Roman deities, also had numerous epithets which complied with the various aspects of her cult. Besides those already noted, these also included Venus Calva, Salacia, and Equestris. Nevertheless, the primitive character of the initial Italic goddess never disappeared, even in the Hellenized Venus. Venus played a crucial role as a dynastic and national goddess, and under the epithet Genetrix she remained a relatively authentic creation of the Roman spirit (Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. Venus, coll. 721–736).

The dedicant is Lollia Quinta. Women in Rome did not have praenomina, rather only the female form of the father's gentilicium, which was followed once more by the father's (or, if married, by the husband's) cognomen in the genitive case. If there were several daughters in the same family, then besides the aforementioned forms they also received, one may say, some type of descriptive name which simply indicated their order of birth in the family: Prima, Secunda, Tertia, and so forth. If only two daughters were born into a family, or only two daughters survived, then in addition to



Sl. 8 Natpisno polje Venerinog žrtvenika (snimak: Lj. Perinić Muratović)
 Fig. 8 Inscription field on altar to Venus (photo by: Lj. Perinić Muratović)

odabrali su upravo Veneru i imenovali ju pretkom vlastite obitelji (gens Julia) budući da je Eneja (Julov otac) bio sin Venere i smrtnika Anhiza. Nadalje, Cezar je isto tako uveo i kult Venere Genetrix, božice majčinstva i braka, te joj je 46. g. pr. Kr. izgradio hram. Veneru su častili i u hramu Marsa Ultora kojeg je izgradio August. Posljednji hram izgrađen Veneri u Rimu, podigao je Hadrijan 135. godine, u blizini Koloseja. Venera je, kao i mnoga druga rimska božanstva, imala i brojne epitete koji su bili u skladu s različitim vidovima njenog kulta. Osim već nabrojanih, tu su npr. i Venera Calva, Salacia, te Equestris. Ipak, primitivni karakter prvobitne italske božice nikad nije nestao, čak ni u heleniziranoj Veneri. Venera je svoju ključnu ulogu ostvarila kao dinastička i nacionalna božica, a pod epitetom Genetrix je bila i ostala relativno izvorna tvorevina rimskog duha (Daremberg-Saglio, s.v. Venus, coll. 721–736).

Dedikantica je *Lollia Quinta*. Žene u Rimu obično nisu imale *praenomen*, već samo ženski oblik očevog gentilicija za kojim je slijedio ponovno očevo (ili ako su bile udane, tada mužev) *cognomen* u genitivu. Ako je u obitelji bilo više kćeri tada su uz navedene oblike dobivale i, može se reći, neku vrst opisnog imena koje je jednostavno obilježavalo slijed rođenja u obitelji - *Prima*, *Secunda*, *Tertia* itd. U slučaju da su

the genitive form of the gentilicium they could have been designated as 'Minor' or 'Maior', also based on the order of their birth into the family. Until the time of the Late Republic, women adopted the female form of the cognomina of their fathers or husbands. At the end of the Republic and in the early Principate, daughters were ever more rarely given these depersonalized names. Now, besides the father's or husband's cognomen, they could also be given their mother's, either from the current or past generations. Such a name would generally be in the diminutive, ending with the suffix -ina or -illa. Furthermore, it became customary for women to obtain the characteristic cognomen derived, just as in the case of men, from specific qualities of the woman, such as, for example, *Pulchra* (beautiful) (Salway 1994: 125–127, 131).

Thus, we may assume that the dedicant *Lollia* was the fifth daughter of a father who belonged to gens *Lollius*. The *Lollii* were a plebeian gens, and their most prominent member was probably Marcus *Lollius Paulinus*, the first governor of Galatia (25 BC), who held the post of consul in 21 BC. Marcus *Lollius Paulinus* was ultimately accused of extortion and treason, and he committed suicide, allegedly by drinking poison (Velleius Paterculus II. 97, 102; Plinius, Nat. Hist. IX. 35, 58). *Lollius* is similarly the *nomen gentilicium* which be-

u obitelji bile rođene samo dvije kćeri ili ako su samo dvije kćeri preživjele, tada su uz genitivni oblik gentilicija mogle nositi i odrednicu *Minor* ili *Maior*, isto tako ovisno o slijedu rođenja u obitelji. Do vremena kasne Republike žene su posvojile ženski oblik očevog ili muževog kognomena. Krajem Republike i u ranom Principatu, kćeri su sve rjeđe dobivale navedena depersonalizirana imena. Sada, osim očevog ili muževog kognomena, mogu dobiti i majčin, i to bilo iz sadašnjih ili iz prošlih generacija. Takvo ime obično bi bilo u deminutivu te završavalo sufiksom *-ina* ili *-illa*. Nadalje, postalo je uobičajeno da žene dobivaju karakterističan kognomen izveden, upravo kao i kod muškaraca, iz određenih osobina žene, kao npr. *Pulchra* (lijepa) (Salway 1994: 125–127, 131).

Prema tome, možemo pretpostaviti da je dedikatnica Lollia bila peta po redu kćer u oca koji je pripadao gensu *Lollius*. Loliji su plebejski gens, a njihov najprominentniji član vjerojatno je bio *Marcus Lollius Paulinus*, prvi namjesnik Galacije (25. g. pr. Kr.) koji je 21. g. pr. Kr. obnašao dužnost konzula. Marko Lolije Paulin je konačno bio optužen za iznudu i izdaju države, te je izvršio samoubojstvo navodno ispijanjem otrova (Vell. Pat. II. 97, 102; Plin, HN IX, 35, 58). *Lollius* je isto tako *nomen gentilicium* koji spada u onu grupu imena s duplim suglasnikom koja su toliko česta da ih je moguće udružiti u grupe u kojima se pojavljuju zajedno (Schulze 1933: 424, 519). Izvedenicu ženskog imena, Lolliju, ne nalazimo kod Mócsyja, ali se kao gentilicij najčešće pojavljuje u Italiji (17) i Dalmaciji (12) (Mócsy 1983: 166). Kao ženski nomen *Lollia* se ponovno najčešće pojavljuje u Dalmaciji (7+2) i Italiji (9) (Lőrincz 2000: 30). Obitelj u kojoj se Lollija rodila očito je imala barem petoro kćeri, s obzirom na to da je njeno drugo ime Quinta koje je, opet, relativno često u Dalmaciji (Lőrincz 2002: 18). Ime Quinta, nažalost, ne otkriva previše podataka o dedikantici jer je bilo često i ni po čemu specifično.

Venera koja se spominje na našem natpisu svakako nije jedna od "uobičajenih" koje se mogu pronaći u leksikonu ili rječniku. Riječ je o Veneri Aron(i)ae. Njen epitet nameće nekoliko mogućih rješenja. Prema Marevićevom Latinsko-hrvatskom enciklopedijskom rječniku, Arona (ili Aronia) može se odnositi na grad Aronu koji se nalazi dvadesetak kilometara S – I od Milana na Lago Maggiore ili je pak riječ o određenoj vrsti biljke. Naseljenost grada Arone arheološki se može pratiti do u 18. st. pr. Kr., a kroz grad su svojedobno prohujali Kelti, Rimljani, te Langobardi. Dakle, obzirom na oštećenje natpisa na kraju prvog i na početku drugog reda, legitimno je pretpostaviti da je tamo stajalo još jedno slovo koje je danas, nažalost, izgubljeno. Isto tako, moguće je da na tom mjestu slovo uistinu ne nedostaje. Što se tiče biljke, iz rječnika doznajemo da je moguće riječ o *aron*, *-i*, *m*. – vrsti trave imenom teleća noga ili pak *aronia*, *-ae*, *f*. – nespola (Marević 2000: s.v. *aron*, *-i*; s.v. *aronia*, *-ae*; s.v. *Arona*). *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* nudi pak jedno sasvim drukčije objašnjenje za ovaj Venerin epitet Arona. Prema Tezauru, *aronae* se spominje kod Tacita (Annales: 14, 14, 4) u rečenici "*notos quoque equites Romanos operas aronae promittere subegit donis ingentibus, nisi quod merces ab eo, qui iubere potest, vim necessitatis adfert*".

longs to the group of names with double consonants which are so frequent that they can be placed in groups in which they appear together (Schulze 1933: 424, 519). The derivative of the woman's name, Lollia, cannot be found in Mócsy, but as a gentilicium is appeared most often in Italy (17) and Dalmatia (12) (Mócsy 1983: 166). As a female nomen, Lollia once more appears most often in Dalmatia (7+2) and Italy (9) (Lőrincz 2000: 30). The family in which Lollia was born obviously had a minimum of five daughters, given that her second name is Quinta, which, again, was relatively frequent in Dalmatia (Lőrincz 2002: 18). The name Quinta, unfortunately, reveals little about the dedicant, as it was common and not unique in any way whatsoever.

The Venus mentioned in this inscription was not one of the "customary" ones which can be found in a lexicon or dictionary. This is Venus Aron(i)ae. Her epithet imposes several potential solutions. According to Marević's Latin-Croatian encyclopaedic dictionary, Arona (or Aronia) may refer to the city of Arona which was twenty kilometres north-east of Milan on Lake Maggiore, or it may be a certain type of plant. The city's habitation can be archeologically viewed into the eighteenth century BC, and at one time or another the Celts, Romans and Lombards marched through it. Thus, given the damage to the inscription at the end of the first and beginning of the second line, it is valid to assume that there was an additional letter there which is today, unfortunately, lost. Similarly, it is possible that there is no missing letter at this position. As to the plant, according to the aforementioned dictionary it may be *aron*, *i*, *m*. – a species of grass called calf's foot, or *aronia*, *ae*, *f*. – loquat (Marević 2000: s.v. *aron*, *i*; s.v. *aronia*, *ae*; s.v. *Arona*). The *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* offers an entirely different explanation for the epithet Arona for Venus. According to the *Thesaurus*, *aronae* is mentioned by Tacitus (Annales 14, 14, 4) in the sentence "*notos quoque equites Romanos operas aronae promittere subegit donis ingentibus, nisi quod merces ab eo, qui iubere potest, vim necessitatis adfert*". However, this word could not be found at the place cited in an examination of the print edition of *Annals*, rather the word *arenae* appears here, which also complies with the translation ('He prevailed too on some well-known Roman knights, by immense presents, to offer their services in the amphitheatre; only pay from one who is able to command, carries with it the force of compulsion'; *Annals*, 14, 14, translated by Alfred John Church and William Jackson Brodrigg). Therefore, the citation in the *Thesaurus* may be discarded as a printing error (TLL: Vol. IX.2, pPl. 659, 663–669, 2). On the other hand, if the letter *l* was in the inscription and is no longer visible due to damage, then the *Thesaurus* offers another possible solution. This is the Aronia station mentioned in the Ravenna Cosmography: Aronia statio Dalmatiae (Ravenn. Pl. 209, 1) and Aronia id est Mucru (Ravenn. Pl. 380, 5), while the Tabula Peutingeriana cites the station as Inaronia (Tab. Peut. 6, 4) (TLL, Vol. II, 630, 11–Vol. II, 630, 13). The In Aronia station on the Peutinger map is 12 miles (18 km) by road from Oneum/Omiš. If this is section whose route corresponds to the modern Adriatic road, the In Aronia station would have been at Donja Brela at the beginning of the Makarska seaboard, while if going upstream along the Cetina Canyon, it could be somewhere between

potest, vim necessitatis adfert". Međutim, pregledavajući tiskano izdanje *Anala* ta se riječ na navedenom mjestu ne nalazi, već se na tom mjestu navodi *arenae* što je onda i u skladu s prijevodom (*I poznate rimske vitezove primora silnim darovima te obećaje svoje usluge u areni; istina je da nagrade onoga koji može zapovijedati donose prisilu*; (Annales: 14, 14). Stoga, spomenuti navod *aronae* u Tezauru možemo odbaciti kao tiskarsku grešku (TLL: IX. 2, str. 659, 663–669, 2). S druge strane, ako je na natpisu postojalo slovo *I* koje zbog oštećenja sada više ne možemo vidjeti, Tezaur navodi još jedno moguće rješenje. Riječ je o postaji Aroniji koja se spominje kod Ravenata: *Aronia statio Dalmatiae* (Ravenn. Pl. 209, 1) i *Aronia id est Mucru* (Ravenn. Pl. 380, 5), dok Peutingerova tabla navodi postaju kao *Inaronia* (Tab. Peut. 6, 4; TLL: II, 630, 11–13). Postaja *In Aronia* na Peutingerovoj karti je 12 milja (18 km) cestom od Oneja – Omiša. Ako je riječ o trasi koja svojim pravcem odgovara modernoj jadranskoj cesti, postaja *In Aronia* bila bi u D. Brelima na početku Makarskog primorja, a ako ide kanjonom Cetine uzvodno, mogla bi biti negdje između Zadvarja i G. Brela. Na Peutingerovoj tabli se nakon postaje *In Aronia*, od nje udaljeno 7 milja (10,5 km) nalazi jedna bezimena postaja s kojom cesta završava. S obzirom na udaljenost, vjerojatno se radi o mjestu Bistum – Bast. S obzirom na prijedlog *in* u cestovnoj toponimiji, *in Aronia* označuje mjesto unutar nekog područja – ne znamo, nažalost, što i gdje je zapravo Aronia.

Dakle, kao što je i razvidno, brojne su mogućnosti i načini na koje se može pokušati razriješiti ovaj neuobičajeni epitet Venere. Ukoliko se Venera Aron(i)a odnosi na grad – mjesto, tada su moguća dva rješenja, odnosno može se pretpostaviti da je Lolija Kvinta porijeklom iz sjeverne Italije te da je posvetom ovom tipu Venere jednostavno uz ispunjenje zavjeta Veneri, izrazila i nostalgiju za svojim rodnim krajem, budući da smo vidjeli da se njeno ime gotovo jednako često pojavljuje u Italiji i Dalmaciji. Jednako tako je moguće da je riječ o Veneri Aroniji koja bi se zbog epiteta vezivala uz mjesto Aroniju na dalmatinskoj obali. Činjenica je da se Aronia pojavljuje kod Ravenatskog Kozmografa koji donosi opis stanja iz prve polovice 6. ili s kraja 5. stoljeća, što je s obzirom na dataciju ovog natpisa prekasno. Međutim, to što se u izvorima naselje spominje tek tada, ne znači da ono nije postojalo i prije. Ravenat Aroniju na jednom mjestu navodi kao *Aronia id est Mucru* (vidi iznad), za što Medini smatra da nije autorova izvedenica već da je u pitanju naknadna intervencija u tekstu koju tumači kao svjedočanstvo preseljenja grada Aronije (Makarska) i njegova stanovništva na neki obližnji sigurniji položaj, odnosno Mukur (Makar) (Medini 1980: 74). Nadalje, Čače smatra da sastavljač *id est* koristi da bi spomenuo značajnija naselja koja se ne nalaze na trasi magistralne ceste, a da istovremeno ne poremeti slijed naselja na samoj magistralnoj trasi. Do toga je došao usporedbom mjesta kod kojih se javlja *id est* sa stanjem na terenu, a posebno se oslanjajući na rezultate sustavnog terenskog istraživanja I. Bojanovskog, zatim usporedbom korištenja tog izraza na drugim mjestima i u drugom kontekstu unutar Kozmografije, te konačno ukazivanjem na analogiju u drugom izvoru (Čače 1995: 57–67). Prema tome Čače smatra da je iz naselja

Zadvarje and Gornja Brela. On the Tabula Peutingeriana, after the *In Aronia* station, 7 miles (10.5 km) from it, there is an unnamed station at which the road terminates. Given its distance, it was probably Bistum/Bast. With regard to use of the preposition *in* in road toponymy, *in Aronia* indicates a place within a given area – but unfortunately, we do not know what and where Aronia actually was.

So it is apparent that there are numerous possibilities and ways to attempt to resolve this unusual epithet for Venus. Insofar as Venus Aron(i)a pertains to a city/settlement, then there are two possible solutions, for one may assume that Lollija Quinta was originally from northern Italy and that a dedication to this type of Venus was simply, over and above the fulfilment of a vow to this goddess, an expression of nostalgia for the place of her birth, since we her name appears almost equally in both Italy and Dalmatia. It is just as possible that this referred to Venus Aronia, who due to this epithet may be associated with the locale Aronia on the Dalmatian coast. The fact is that Aronia appears in the Ravenna Cosmography, which describing the situation from the first half of the sixth century, or the end of the fifth century. Given the dating on this inscription, this is too late. However, the fact that the settlement is only mentioned in the sources then does not mean that it did not exist previously. The anonymous cleric who compiled the Cosmography specified Aronia at one place as *Aronia id est Mucru* (see above), which Medini believed was not the author's derivative but rather a subsequent intervention in the text which he interpreted as evidence of the migration of the city of Aronia (Makarska) and its populace to some nearby, more secure position, i.e. Muccurum (Makar) (Medini 1980: 74). Furthermore, Čače believed that the compiler used *id est* to mention the more significant settlement which was not on a section of the trunk road, while simultaneously leaving undisturbed the sequence of settlements on the trunk road itself. He came to this conclusion by comparing the places at which '*id est*' appeared with the situation on the ground, depending in particular on the results of the systematic field research conducted by I. Bojanovski, and then by comparing the use of this phrase at other places and in other contexts within the Cosmography itself, and finally by pointing to an analogy in another source (Čače 1995: 57–67). Therefore, Čače believed that a branch road led to Muccurum (Makarska) from the settlement of Aronia, somewhere in the area of Cista along the main overland trunk road (Makarska) (Čače 1995: 67–77). Even though it would appear that both Aronia and Muccurum somehow avoided the limelight of major historical events (Vučić 2005: 164), I believe we should not so easily discount the possibility that the monument dedicated to Venus presented in this work was tied precisely to this site, of course, provided that the letter *I* is missing from it.

Thus, Lollija Quinta may have originally been from Italy or from Dalmatia. If she was originally from Italy, then she probably raised the monument to Venus Arona (a city on Lake Maggiore), while if she were originally from Dalmatia, then the second option is more likely, meaning that she erected the monument to Venus Aronia. However, if the word refers to the *aronia* as a plant/fruit, then the monument could

Aronia koje se nalazilo negdje na prostoru Ciste, uz glavnu kopnenu prometnicu, vodio odvojak do Mukura (Makarska) (Čače 1995: 67–77). Iako se čini da su i Aronia i Mukur nekako zaobišli pozornicu važnijih povijesnih događaja (Vučić 2005: 164), smatram da ne bismo olako trebali zaobići mogućnost da je ovdje doneseni spomenik posvećen Veneri povezan upravo s tim lokalitetom, naravno, ako je na spomeniku nedostajalo slovo *l*.

Dakle, Lolija Kvinta podrijetlom je mogla biti iz Italije ili iz Dalmacije. Ako je bila podrijetlom iz Italije tada je vjerojatnije da je spomenik podigla Veneri Aronskoj (grad na Lago Maggiore), a ako je bila podrijetlom iz Dalmacije vjerojatnija je druga opcija, odnosno da je spomenik podigla Veneri Aronijskoj. Međutim, ako je u pitanju *aronia* kao biljka/plod, tada su spomenik mogle postaviti obje Lolije, to jest sasvim je izvjesno da nije bilo važno otkud Lolija potječe.

Pitanje kontinuiteta

S obzirom na zatečenu situaciju na istraživanom lokalitetu, dozvoljeno je pretpostaviti postojanje neke vrste Venerinog svetišta na mjestu, odnosno u blizini gdje je izgrađena starokršćanska bogomolja. Ipak, i dalje ostaje upitno da li je prethodno Venerino svetište (ili čak hram) u potpunosti uništeno i presloženo ili su pak neke njegove komponente ostale sačuvane te iskorištene u gradnji kršćanske bogomolje. U Hrvatskoj su, prema sadašnjem stanju istraživanja, rijetki pouzdano zasvjedočeni primjeri izravne kristijanizacije hramskih prostora, a sakralni se kontinuitet najčešće pretpostavljeno rekonstruira na temelju poganskih zavjetnih natpisa i dijelova hramske arhitekture, zatečenih na mjestima ili u neposrednoj blizini ranosrednjovjekovnih i srednjovjekovnih crkava (Cambi 1989: 17 i d.), a upravo je takav slučaj i u Postirima gdje je pronađen spomenuti zavjetni natpis Veneri.

Ipak, sigurno je da se nastavak života ranokršćanske arhitekture u ranom srednjem vijeku odvija u nepromijenjenom namjenskom okruženju. Odnosno, crkva ostaje crkva, bez obzira na nadogradnje, preuređenja ili promjenu ukrasnog upotrebnog inventara. Sakralni kontinuitet je toliko snažan da se odražava i u slučajevima privremene, čak i višestoljetne prenamjene ili napuštanja crkvene građevine. Odnos kasnoantičke sakralne arhitekture prema ranijoj antičkoj drukčiji je utoliko što ranokršćanske crkve nastaju preuređenjem ili na temeljima namjenski raznorodnih antičkih ambijenata (Migotti 1989: 134 i d; 1992: 226). Primjerice ornamentalni rječnik pronađen u crkvi sv. Ivana i Teodora (Bol), te iz krstionica u Lovrečini i Poveljima, zatim iz ranokršćanskih sklopova u Gatima poviše Omiša, te Starom Gradu na Hvaru i drugdje, u kojemu su karakteristične peltete, srcoliki listovi, frizovi vriježa s rozetama unutar ovalnih polja, rozete nalik na šarenicu oka/zupčanik/koncentrične krugove – ponovno se vraća u romaničko slikarstvo i to izravnim ugledanjem na kasnoantičke freske koje su i same nastajale kao imitacije antičkih i kasnoantičkih mozaičkih zidnih intarzija (npr. opus sectile iz atrija krstionice u Lateranu u Rimu, 5. st.). Odnos ranokršćanskog sloja spram poganskog supstrata na Braču vidljiv je u prstenu bazilika na

have been commissioned by either Lolliia, for then it would be entirely certain that whence this Lolliia originated would not matter.

The question of continuity

Given the situation found at the researched site, one may allow for speculation as to the existence of some sort of shrine to Venus at the site or in its vicinity, where an Early Christian temple was constructed. However, some question remains as to whether the previous shrine (or even temple) of Venus was fully destroyed and buried or whether some of its components were preserved and used in the construction of the Christian place of worship. Based on the current level of research in Croatia, there are few reliably proven examples of direct Christianization of temple facilities, while sacral continuity is most often speculatively reconstructed on the basis of pagan votive inscriptions and components of temple architecture found at the sites or in the immediate vicinity of early medieval and medieval churches (Cambi 1989: 17 ff.), and this is precisely the case in Postira, where this votive inscription to Venus was found.

It is, however, certain that the continuation of the life of Early Christian architecture in the Early Middle Ages proceeded under unchanged circumstances of use. This means that a church remained a church, regardless of additions, renovations or alterations of the decorative/functional furnishings. Sacral continuity is so strong that it is even reflected in cases of temporary, and even centuries-long alterations or abandonment of church buildings. The difference between Late Antique sacral architecture and its earlier, Antique counterpart is that Early Christian churches emerged after renovation, or on the foundations, of Antique locales used for a variety of purposes (Migotti 1989: 134 ff.; 1992: 226). For example, the ornamental inventory found in the Church of Sts. John and Theodore (Bol), the baptisteries in Lovrečina and Povelje, and the Early Christian complexes in Gata, above Omiš, and in Stari Grad on the island of Hvar and elsewhere, characterized by peltas, heart-shaped leaves, friezes of stems with rosettes inside oval fields, and rosettes resembling irises/spokes/concentric circles – once more returned to Romanesque painting by direct modelling after Late Antique frescoes which themselves emerged as imitations of Antique and Late Antique mosaic wall intarsios (e.g. the opus sectile from the atrium of the baptistery in the Lateran in Rome, fifth century). The relationship between the Early Christian layer and the pagan substratum on Brač is reflected in the ring of basilicas on the coast, and several in the island's interior. Individual scholars believed that in this manner Christianity 'disinfected' the entire area of traces of the previous era's paganism, of which only the foundations of a temple in Škip and the occasional fragment remained visible. The dating of the Brač Early Christian basilicas has not been more precisely specified in the literature and researchers' reports, although there are a number of indications – stylistic and liturgical, but above all construction time (with the probable exception of St. Andrew's next to Škip) – which place them in the brief period of Justinian's reconquest in the Adriatic, in aftermath of the Byzantine-Goth wars, i.e. 535-555. (Belamarić et al. 1994: 7–8).

obali, te nekoliko njih u unutrašnjosti otoka. Pojedini autori smatraju da je kršćanstvo na taj način "dezinficiralo" čitav prostor od tragova antičkog poganstva od kojeg je ostao oku vidljiv samo temelj jednog hrama u Škripu i još pokoji ulomak. Datacija bračkih ranokršćanskih bazilika u literaturi i izvještajima istraživača dosad nije preciznije određena premda postoji više indikacija – stilskih i liturgijskih, da im se, prije svega vrijeme gradnje (osim vjerojatno Sv. Jadre (Andrije) kraj Škripa) stavi u kratko doba Justinijanove rekonkviste na Jadranu, u vrijeme nakon bizantsko-gotskih ratova, dakle 535.–555. (Belamarić et al. 1994: 7–8).

Preslojavanje na Braču za sada promatramo na nizu lokaliteta. Npr. u Donjem Humcu je srednjovjekovna crkva sv. Ilije podignuta na mjestu ranokršćanskog svetišta, uređenog na prostoru velebne antičke grobnice–mauzoleja (Vrsalović 1960: 76 i d.). Srednjovjekovna crkva sv. Duha na Škripu podignuta je na temeljima antičke profane i ranokršćanske sakralne arhitekture. Na novijem dijelu groblja isto su tako na vidjelo izašli ostaci antičke arhitekture, vjerojatno Kibelina svetišta, s obzirom na to da je tamo pronađen zavjetni natpis posvećen toj maloazijskoj božici. (Đurašin 1983: 27). Između Škripa i njegove luke Splitske na sjevernoj obali Brača nalazila su se tri rimska kamenoloma iz kojih potječe veći broj reljefnih kulturnih slika, odnosno zavjetnih natpisa posvećenih Jupiteru, Herkulu, Liberu, Silvanu i Mitri (Zaninović 1966: 29–30). U blizini su i ostaci ranokršćanske crkve sv. Andrije, za koju se pretpostavlja namjena bogomolje poslovne udruge radnika kamenoloma (Vrsalović 1960: 72 i d.; Fisković 1981: 106). S obzirom na to da se na kompleksnim arheološkim lokalitetima u pravilu pronalazi veći broj zavjetnih natpisa ili reljefnih prikaza poganskih božanstava, sasvim je logično pomišljati na kulturni kontinuitet iz pretkršćanskih razdoblja. Osim u Klapavica, ova se pojava zorno očituje u Bribiru, Danilu i Škripu na Braču (Migotti 1992: 235).

Općenito govoreći, s obzirom na neodgovarajuću arheološku dokumentiranost na našim lokalitetima, potreban je veliki oprez pri zaključivanju o načinima kristijanizacije poganskih sakralnih prostora, čak i ondje gdje se ta pojava nedvojbeno uočava. Usprkos tome kod nas se ipak ukorijenilo shvaćanje o netrpeljivosti prema poganskim vjernicima i razaralačkom zatiranju njihovih kulturnih prostora. Podrobno proučavanje prilika na mnogim lokalitetima (usPl. Migotti 1992: 225–249) nedvojbeno bi pružilo mnoštvo dragocjenih podataka o različitim materijalima i duhovnim vidovima neprekinutog kulturnog slijeda. Čak i ondje gdje su uočeni ostaci pretkršćanske sakralne arhitekture, prigodom istraživanja nije se obraćala odgovarajuća pažnja njenom odnosu prema kasnijim kršćanskim slojevima, a time je znatno smanjena mogućnost sagledavanja uvjeta i načina zamjene poganskih kulturnih sadržaja kršćanskima u materijalnome, te slijedom toga i u duhovnome pogledu. Pojedini vidovi preslojavanja mogu se utvrditi gotovo pouzdano. Jedan od njih je pojava preinačavanja kućnih lararija u privatne kapele, dokumentirana u Kašiću, a pretpostavljena u Pridrazi, Bijaćima i Podstrani. Na lokalitetu Mastirine u Kašiću, sjevero-istočno od Zadra, izdvojen je sakralno-kulturni i sepulkralni prostor o kojemu svjedoče zavjetni žrtvenici,

Currently we may observe overlaying on Brač at a number of sites. For example, in Donji Humac the small medieval Church of St. Elias was erected at the site of an Early Christian shrine, in the area of an immense Antique tomb/mausoleum (Vrsalović 1960: 76 ff.). The medieval Church of the Holy Spirit at Škrip was built on the foundations of profane Antique and sacral Early Christian structures. By the same token, the remains of Antique architecture have emerged in the newer portion of the cemetery, probably a shrine to Cybele, since a votive inscription dedicated to this goddess of Asia Minor was found there (Đurašin 1983: 27). Three Roman-era quarries were located between Škrip and its harbour Splitska on the northern shore of Brač, where considerable number of relief cult images dedicated to Jupiter, Hercules, Silvanus and Mithra originated (Zaninović 1966: 29–30). The remains of the Early Christian Church of St. Andrew are nearby, and this was believed to be a place of worship for the quarry workers' guild (Vrsalović 1960: 72 ff., Fisković 1981: 106). Since a higher number of votive inscriptions or relief portrayals of pagan deities are generally found at complex archaeological sites, it is entirely logical to assume cult continuity with pre-Christian times. Besides Klapavice, this phenomenon is clearly apparent in Bribir, Danilo and Škip on Brač (Migotti 1992: 235).

Generally, with regard to the inadequately archeologically documented sites in Croatia, considerable caution should be exercised when drawing conclusions about the ways in which pagan sacral facilities were Christianized, even at places where this phenomenon is unambiguously observed. Despite this, the established view which has taken root in Croatian scholarship is that there was intolerance toward pagan believers and that their cult sites were destroyed. A thorough study of the circumstances at many sites (cf. Migotti 1992: 225–249) would clearly provide valuable data on the various materials and spiritual aspects of an interrupted cultural sequence. Even in research at those sites where the remains of pre-Christian sacral architecture were observed, not enough attention was accorded to its relationship toward the subsequent Christian layers, thereby greatly curtailing the possibility of understanding the conditions and methods for replacing pagan cult content with its Christian counterpart in the material and, consequently, in the spiritual sense. Individual aspects of such replacement can be almost reliably ascertained. One of them is the remodelling of household *lararia* in private chapels, as registered in Kašić, and assumed in Pridraga, Bijaći and Podstrana. A sacral-cult and sepulchral space at the Mastirine site Kašić, north-east of Zadar, has been distinguished, to which votive altars, grave inscriptions and fragments of urns, cippi and architectural decorations all testify. During Late Antiquity, there was an oratory/house chapel which was subsequently remodelled into a six-apsed pre-Romanesque church. The site was researched in the 1950s, and it is an example of the selective approach of the archaeologists of that time, as they favoured medieval finds, relinquishing the possibility of viewing it as a whole (Delonga 1990, 39 ff., Migotti 1992: note 17). In compliance with individual provisions of Late Antique law, which varied depending on the emperor/law-giver, and the circumstances in that part

nadgrobni natpisi, te ulomci urni, cipusa i arhitektonske dekoracije. U kasnoantičkom razdoblju ondje je uređen oratorij – kućna kapela, koju naknadno preslojava šesterolisna predromanička crkva. Lokalitet je istraživao pedesetih godina prošlog tisućljeća i primjer je selektivnog pristupa tadašnjih arheologa koji su favorizirali srednjovjekovne nalaze, odričući se mogućnosti sagledavanja cjeline (Delonga 1990, 39 i d.; Migotti 1992: bilj. 17). Sukladno pojedinim stavkama kasnoantičkih zakona, koje se razlikuju ovisno o caru-zakonodavcu, te prilikama onog dijela Carstva na koje se odnose, kristijanizacija poganskih kulturnih prostora odvijala se u razdoblju od 4. do 6. st. na različite načine. Najradikalniji je pritom postupak spaljivanja hrama, raščišćavanje ruševina, te popločavanje dvorišta preostalom građom, kao znak simboličkog oskrvnuća, s time da se crkva radije gradi od novog, negoli ponovno upotrijebljenog materijala. U blažim se oblicima dokidanja poganskog kulta crkva podiže na mjestu razorenog poganskog oltara, dok temelji ostaju nedirnuti. Katkad dolazi do djelomičnog rušenja, odnosno adaptacije, a u najsretnijim slučajevima do preuzimanja cjelovite hramske građevine, s time da se mijenja funkcionalna i ukrasna oprema, a postupak "ozakonjuje" nizom posvetnih križeva na različitim mjestima (Migotti 1992: 231). Premda nema općeg pravila prema kojemu se kristijanizacija odvijala i iako pojedini zakoni djeluju strogo, drugi izvori daju naslutiti da su ipak prevladavale različite varijante mirnijeg suživljavanja, odnosno preslojavanja poganskih kultova kršćanskim. Prema svemu sudeći kršćanstvo je pribjelo jedinog mogućoj mudroj politici – borbi asimilacijom, a ne silom (Migotti 1992: 237). Međutim, kako se ta asimilacija provodila i što je ona točno značila u svakodnevnom životu antičkog čovjeka koji ostaje bez svojih bogomolja i dalje je nepoznanica, te otvorena tema za neke druge teoretsko-filozofsko-sociološke rasprave.

Jednako tako ne možemo pouzdano tvrditi što se točno dogodilo na ovom lokalitetu. Ipak, sasvim je legitimna pretpostavka da je riječ o djelomičnom uništenju poganskog svetišta (bilo kućnog bilo zasebne građevine), s obzirom na to da je sam zavjetni natpis posvećen Veneri prilično oštećen s gornje strane (upravo one na kojoj je eventualno stajala posuda za žrtvovanje), a k tome je pronađen bočno položen usred prostorije, te iskorišten za nivelaciju terena. Prema svemu rečenome, spomenik bismo datirali u 2./3. st., ali s obzirom na to da je dio keramike bilo moguće preciznije datirati u 1. i 2. stoljeće, moguće je da je i spomenik iz 2. st.

Zaključak

Manji broj nalaza potječe iz 1. – 2. st. govori u prilog postojanju života u Postirima u tim prvim stoljećima poslije Krista, što se već i ranije pretpostavljalo (glava dječaka, Erosa?), ali i zbog prirodnih preduvjeta kao što su dobra luka, plodno zemljište i izvori vode. Time se Postira uklapaju u okvir brojnih drugih ranocarskih lokaliteta na Braču koji od svojih početaka ukazuju na trgovačku povezanost s drugim gradovima i naseljima na Jadranu, ali i na moguće veze s istočnim Mediteranom. Ostaje nejasno na koji je način bio organiziran život u prvim stoljećima carstva, tj. da li se radilo

of the Empire to which they pertain, the Christianization of pagan cult sites proceeded from the fourth to sixth centuries in various ways. The most radical procedure in this process was the burning of temples, the clearance of their ruins, and the tiling over of their yards with the remaining construction materials as a symbolic desecration, while the preference was to build churches using new rather than already used materials. In less extreme forms of ending pagan cults, a church would be erected at the site of a destroyed pagan altar, while the foundations remained intact. Sometimes a partial demolition or adaptation occurred, while in the best cases the entire temple building was occupied, although the functional and decorative furnishings were altered, and the procedure would be 'legalized' by a series of dedicatory crosses at various places (Migotti 1992: 231). Although there were no general rules governing how Christianization proceeded, and even though individual laws appeared strict, other sources imply that various forms of more peaceful coexistence – a replacement of pagan cults with Christian ones – nonetheless prevailed. By all indications, Christianity resorted to the sole possible shrewd policy: waging its struggle by assimilation rather than force (Migotti 1992: 237). However, how this assimilation was conducted and what it meant precisely in the everyday life of the typical person of Antiquity who was left without a place of worship remains a mystery, and an open theme for some other theoretical/philosophical/sociological discourse.

Similarly, nothing can be reliably stated about what precisely occurred at this site. Even so, an entirely legitimate supposition is that a pagan shrine (either a household shrine or a separate building) was partially demolished, since the actual votive inscription dedicated to Venus was largely damaged on its upper side (precisely that side on which sacrificial vessels possibly stood), and it was additionally found turned to its side in the middle of the space, and used to level the ground. According to all of these aspects, the monument can be dated to the second/third centuries, but since some of the ceramics can be precisely dated to the first and second centuries, it is possible that the monument dates to the second century.

Conclusion

A small number of finds which originated in the first-second centuries AD indicate the existence of life in Postira in those first centuries after Christ, which had already been assumed earlier (bust of boy, Eros?), and also due to the natural conditions such as a good harbour, fertile soil and water sources. Postira thus fits into the framework of many other Early Empire sites on Brač, which from their very beginnings indicated to trade with other cities and settlements on the Adriatic Sea, and also to possible ties to the eastern Mediterranean. It remains unclear as to how life was organized in these first centuries of the Empire, i.e., whether it was, for example, a village or a villa rustica.

Based on the mason work, the discovered Late Antique architecture indicates a close tie with the Early Christian complex to its north-east. A high quantity of archaeological materials also originated in this period, which is apparent from the analysis of the materials provided in the text. Most

npr. o selu ili o rustičnoj vili.

Otkrivena kasnoantička arhitektura po načinu zidanja upućuje na usku povezanost s ranokršćanskim kompleksom koji se nalazi sjeveroistočno od nje. Iz tog vremena potječe i veća količina arheoloških nalaza što je vidljivo iz analize materijala donešenog u tekstu. Najviše je ulomaka različitih amfora, kuhinjskih lonaca različite strukture gline i oblika. Na temelju strukturalnih obilježja kuhinjske keramike pretpostavlja se da ona, kao i amfore, potječe iz kasnoantičkog razdoblja. Keramika svojim obilježjima navodi na zaključak da je arhitektura uz koju je pronađena bila stambenog značaja, a ta arhitektura vjerojatno je bila prateći objekt ranokršćanske crkve. Keramički nalazi iz vremena kasne antike upućuju na trgovačke veze s istočnim Mediteranom, ali i s Afrikom, što je također uobičajeno za jadranski prostor u tom razdoblju. Venerin žrtvenik vjerojatno je izvorno stajao u neposrednoj blizini ranokršćanske bazilike. Upitno je da li je pripadao stambenoj (?) arhitekturi pronađenoj neposredno uz baziliku ili je pak pripadao nekom samostalnom Venerinom svetištu čiji tragovi nisu otkriveni. Pretpostavka je da je spomenik oštećen i iskorišten za nivelaciju terena upravo u vrijeme gradnje ranokršćanske bazilike, a sam spomenik bismo datirale u 2./3. st., s obzirom na to da je dio keramike preciznije datiran u 1. i 2. st., moguće je da je i sam spomenik iz 2. st.

Iz kasnosrednjovjekovnog razdoblja pronađen je jedan grob i ploče drugih uništenih grobova. U prilog njihovom kasnosrednjovjekovnom podrijetlu govori stratigrafski odnos s kasnoantičkim temeljem kao i nalaz tri koštane perle od krunice ispod jedne od ploča uništenog groba. Iako nalazi koji su pronađeni mogu biti datirani i u 14. st., zbog povijesnih okolnosti nastanak naselja pretpostavlja se od sredine 15. st. kada su Mlečani pokorili omiške gusare. To bi značilo da se nalaz srednjovjekovne boce i koštane krunice mogu datirati od sredine 15. st. do u 16. st. Tada se, ujedno, podiže crkva sv. Ivana Krstitelja, a Postira se osamostaljuje kao župa. Nalaz ostataka kasnosrednjovjekovnog groblja i pokretne arheološke građe prvi su opipljiv nalaz iz najranijih dana župe Postira uz najstariju fazu današnje župne crkve (apsida s puškarnicama).

of the latter are fragments of various amphora and kitchen ware of different clay structures and shapes. Based on the structural features of the kitchen ware it is assumed that it, like the amphorae, originated in Late Antiquity. Based on their features, the pottery leads to the conclusion that the structure next to which it was found was residential, and this structure was probably an outbuilding to an Early Christian church. The pottery finds from Late Antiquity indicate trade with the eastern Mediterranean, but also with Africa, which was also normal for the Adriatic zone during that period. The altar to Venus probably originally stood in the immediate vicinity of the Early Christian basilica. There is some question as to whether it belonged to the residential (?) architecture found right next to the basilica or whether it belonged to an independent shrine to Venus of which no traces have been discovered. It is assumed that the monument was damaged and used to level the terrain precisely during construction of the Early Christian basilica, while the actual monument can be dated to the second/third centuries. Therefore, if we date the monument to the second/third centuries, since the ceramic can be precisely dated to the first and second centuries, it is possible that the monument itself dates to the second century.

A grave and the slabs of other destroyed graves are finds from the late medieval period. The stratigraphic relationship with the Late Antique foundations as well as the discovery of three bone rosary beads below one of the slabs of a destroyed grave speak in favour of their late medieval origin. Even though the finds discovered may be dated to the fourteenth century, due to the historical circumstances surrounding the emergence of the settlement, they are assumed to date to the fifteenth century, when the Venetians subdued the Omiš pirates. This would mean that the finds of a medieval bottle and bone beads may be dated from the mid-fifteenth to sixteenth centuries. This was also when the Church of St. John the Baptist was built, and Postira became an independent parish. The discovery of the remains of a late medieval cemetery and movable archaeological finds are the first tangible find from the earliest days of the Postira parish alongside the oldest phase of the present-day church (apse with embrasures).

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Babić, A. 2008, Keramika, in: *Arheološka zbirka Franjevačkog samostana u Sinju*, Sinj, 187–227.
- Bekić, L. (ed.), 2008, *Zaštitna arheologija na magistralnom plinovodu Pula-Karlovac*, Zagreb.
- Belamarić, J., Bužančić, R., Domančić, D., Jeličić Radonić, J., Kovačić, V. 1994, Ranokršćanski spomenici otoka Brača, Split.
- Beltrán, M. L. 1970, *Las amforas romanas en España*, Zaragoza.
- Bitenc, Pl., Knific, T. (eds.), 2001, *Od Rimljanov do Slovanov, Predmeti*, Ljubljana.
- Bjelajac, Lj. 1996, *Amfore gornjo mezijskog Podunavlja*, Beograd.
- Bonifay, M., Pieri, D. 1998, Les amphores, in: *Fouilles à Marseilles, Les mobiliers (Ier-VIle siècles aPl. J.-C.), études massaliètes 5*, Paris-Lattes, 371–372.
- Bonifay, M. 2004, *Etudes sur la céramique romaine tardive d'Afrique*, BAR International Series 1301, Oxford.
- Bonifay, M. 2005, Observations sur la typologie des amphores africaines de l'antiquité tardive, in: *Late Roman Coarse Wares, Cooking Wares and Amphorae in the Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry*, BAR Int. Ser. 1340, Oxford, 451–472.
- Borzić, I., Jadrić, I. 2007, Novi prilozi arheološkoj topografiji dugopoljskoga kraja, *Archaeologia Adriatica*, Vol. I, 145–173.
- Brecciaroli Tabarelli, L. 2005, Ceramiche a vernice nera, in: *La ceramica e i materiali di età romana*, (Gandolfi, D. ed.), Bordighera, 59–104.
- Brusić, Z. 1976, Late antique and Byzantine underwater finds along the eastern coast of the Adriatic, *Balcanoslavica*, Vol. 5, 31–39.
- Brusić, Z. 1988, Antička luka u Polačama na otoku Mljetu, *Izdanja Hrvatskog arheološkog društva*, Vol. 12, 139–151.
- Brusić, Z. 2005, Primjerci kasnoantičke keramike, in: *Srima – Prižba*, Maršić, D. (ed.), Šibenik, 260–265.
- Buljević, Z. 1994, Kasnoantičko staklo, in: *Salona Christiana*, Marin, E. (ed.), Split, 258–264.
- Buljević, Z. 1998, Stakleni inventar s lokaliteta Sv. Vid u Vidu kod Metkovića, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, Vol. 87–89 (1994/1996), 123–175.
- Buljević, Z. 2002, Stakleni inventar s Ereševih, Šiljegovih i Popovih bara u Vidu, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, Vol. 94, 165–193.
- Burić, T. 2001, Putalj u srednjem vijeku, in: Burić, T., Čače, S., Fadić, I. *Sv. Juraj od Putalja*, Split, 151–322.
- Burić, T. 2006, Boce, čaše i vrčevi kao grobni prilozi u kasnom srednjem vijeku na sjeverozapadnom i središnjem Balkanu, *Histria antiqua*, Vol. 14, 225–237.
- Burić, T. 2007, Najstariji nalazi krunice u Dalmaciji, *Diadora*, Vol. 22, 235–268.
- Bužaničić, R. 1994, Rekonstrukcija konfesije ranokršćanske crkve u Postirima na Braču, *Prilozi za povijest umjetnosti u Dalmaciji*, Vol. 34, 39–49.
- Cambi, N. 1989, Pristup razmatranju skulpturalnog programa Dioklecijanove palače u Splitu, *Kulturna baština* 14, 12–22.
- Cambi, N. 2004, Kiparstvo na Braču u antičko doba, *Brački zbornik*, Vol. 21, 239–272.
- Caravale, A., Toffoletti, I. 1997, *Anfore antiche. Conoscerle e identificarle*, Formello.
- Chevalier, Pl. 1991, Les fosses d'autel paleochrétiennes en Dalmatie, *Diadora*, Vol. 13, 251–267.
- Chevalier, Pl. 1995, *Ecclesiae Dalmatiae*, in: *Salona II - ecclesiae Dalmatiae, L'architecture Paléochrétienne de la province romaine de Dalmatie (en dehors de Salona) - IV-VII*, Duval, N., Marin, E. (eds), Rim – Split.
- Chevalier, Pl. 1999, Les luminaires paleochrétiens de Dalmatie romaine, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, Vol. 90–91, 161–199.
- Čače, S. 1995, *Civitates Dalmatiae u 'Kozmografiji' Anonima Ravenjanina*, Zadar.
- Čargo, B. 2010, *Grčko-helenistička keramika Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu*, katalog izložbe, Split.
- Čerina, D. 2003, *Izvešće o zaštitnim arheološkim istraživanjima na otoku Braču u Postirima, tijekom listopada 2003*, Split (elaborat).
- Darembert et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des Antiquités Grecques et Romaines*, Université du Mirail et la Mission Innovation Technologique et Multimedia, <http://dagr.univ-tlse2.fr/sdx/dagr/index.xsp> (ožujak, 2010).
- Delonga, V. 1990, Starohrvatska crkva na 'Mastirinama' u Kašiću kod Zadra, *Starohrvatska prosvjeta*, III/18, 39–89.
- Empereur, J.-Y., Picon, M. 1989, Les régions de production d'amphores impériales en Méditerranée orientale, *Atti del colloquio di Siena, École française de Rome*, 223–248.
- Eterović, I. 1981, Benediktinci na postirskom području, in: *Postira – spomenica*, Bižaca, E., Bižaca, N., Jelinčić, T., Jelinčić, V., Šantić, J. (eds.), Postira, 31–43.
- Ettinger Starčić, Z. 2006, Pregled staklene građe iz rimske vile u Červar portu kod Poreča, *Histria Antiqua*, Vol. 14, 245–259.
- Faber, A., Nikolanci M. 1985, Škrip na otoku Braču, *Prilozi*, 2, Zagreb, 1–38.
- Fadić, I. 1994, Kasnoantičko staklo u Gatima, in: Jeličić-Radonić, J. i suradnici, *Gata, Crkva Justinijanovog doba*, Belamarić, J. (ed.), Split, 213–226.
- Fadić, I. 2001, Putalj u kasnoj antici, in: Burić, T., Čače, S., Fadić, I. *Sv. Juraj od Putalja*, Split, 115–150.
- Fadić, I. 2005, Nalazi kasnoantičkog stakla na Srimi, in: *Srima – Prižba*, Maršić, D. (ed.), Šibenik, 217–257.
- Fisković, I. 1981, Ranokršćanski sarkofazi s otoka Brača, *Vijesnik za arheologiju i historiju Dalmatinsku*, 75, Split, 105–135.
- Gaspari, A., Vidrih Perko, V., Štrajhar, M., Lazar, I. 2007, Antični pristaniški kompleks u Fizinah pri Portorožu – zaštitne raziskave leta 1998, *Arheološki vestnik*, Vol. 58, 167–218.
- Gjurašin, H. 1983, Najnovija arheološka istraživanja u Škripu, *Obavijesti Hrvatskog arheološkog društva*, 15/2, 27.
- Gjurašin, H. 1989, *Vodič, Brački muzej, Škrip*, Supetar.
- Gjurašin, H. 2001, Ocjene i prikazi: Zoran Stančić, Nikša Vujnović, Branko Kirigin, Slobodan Čače, Tomaž Podrobnikar, Josip Burmaz. *The archaeological heritage of the island of Brač, Croatia. The Adriatic Islands Project, Volume 2, Archaeopress, BAR International Series (Oxford)*, 803, 1999, *Obavijesti Hrvatskog arheološkog društva*, 33/2, 105–109.
- Glavinčić, I. 1981, Sakralni lokaliteti, in: *Postira – spomenica*, Bižaca, E., Bižaca, N., Jelinčić, T., Jelinčić, V., Šantić, J. (eds.), Postira, 45–58.
- Gluščević, S. 1991, Kvadratične staklene boce s pečatom iz rimske luke u Zatonu, *Diadora*, Vol. 13, 147–168.
- Grassi, M. T. 1996, La ceramica a vernice nera, in: *Bedriacum, Ricerche archeologiche a Calvatone*, 1.2. Milano, 53–76.
- Guštin, M. 1991, *Koper zwischen Rom und Venedig/Capodistria tra Roma e Venezia*, Ljubljana.
- Hayes, J. W. 1983, The Villa Dionysos Excavations, Knossos: The Pottery, *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, Vol. 78, 97–169.
- Hayes, J. W. 2008, *The Athenian Agora, Roman pottery, fine-ware imports*, Vol. XXXII, Princeton and New Jersey.
- Ilakovac, B. 1968, Keramika iz antičkog broda potonulog kod Paklenih otoka, *Diadora*, Vol. 4, 183–203.
- Isings, C. 1957, Roman Glass from dated finds, *Archaeologica Traiectina* 2, Gröningen, Djakarta.
- Istenečić, J. 1988, Kuhinjsko posuđe egejskih tipova na nalazištu Rodik – nekropola pod Jezerom, *Diadora*, Vol. 10, 99–110.
- Istenečić, J., Schneider, G. 2000, Aegean cooking ware in the eastern Adriatic, *Rei cretariae Romanae Fautorum*, Acta 36, 341–348.
- Jeličić-Radonić, J. 1994, *Ranokršćanske dvojne crkve u Strom gradu na Hvaru*, Split.
- Jelinčić, J. 2004, *Na postirskim vrelima*, Zagreb.
- Jelinčić, K. 2005, *Topografija rustičnih vila na otoku Braču*, Zagreb, (magistarski rad) http://bib.irb.hr/datoteka/232727.Jelincic_magisterij.pdf (ožujak, 2010).
- Jézégou, M. Pl. 1998, Le mobilier de l'épave Saint-Gervais 2 (VIIe s.) à Fos-sur-Mer (B.-du-Rh), in: *Fouilles à Marseilles, Les mobiliers (Ier-VIle siècles aPl. J.-C.), études massaliètes 5*, Paris-Lattes, 343–351.
- Jurišić, M. 2000, *Antient Whipwrecks of the Adriatic*, BAR International Series 828, Oxford.
- Jutronić, A. 1950, Naselja i porijeklo stanovništva na otoku Braču, *Zbornik za narodni život i običaje*, Vol. 34, Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Zagreb.
- Katić, M. 1994, Keramika iz ranokršćanske crkve u Gatima, in: *Gata – crkva Justinijanovog doba*, Jeličić J. i suradnici, Split, 200–211.
- Katić, M. 1999/2000, Kasnoantički grad na Jadranu – primjer grada Hvara, *Prilozi za povijest umjetnosti u Dalmaciji*, Vol. 38, 19–49.
- Keay, S. J. 1984, *Late Roman Amphorae in the Western Mediterranean. A typology and economic study: the Catalan evidence*, BAR International Series 196, Oxford.
- Kirigin, B., Katunarić, T., Šešelj, L. 1998, Amfore i fina keramika (od 4. do 1. st. po. Kr.) iz srednje Dalmacije, preliminarni ekonomski i socijalni

- pokazatelj, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, Vol. 98, 7–24.
- Kovačić, V. 1994, Postira, in: *Ranokršćanski spomenici otoka Brača*, Belamarić, J. (ed.), Split, 42–51.
- Laubenheimer, F. 1990, *Le temps des amphores en Gaule. Vins, huiles et sauces*. Paris.
- Lazar, I. 2003, *Rimesko steklo Slovenije/The Roman Glass of Slovenia*, Ljubljana.
- Lórinz, B. 2000, *Onomasticon provinciarum Europae Latinarum (OPEL)*, ex materia ab A. Mócsy, R. Feldman, E. Marton et M. Szilágyi collecta, Vol. III: Labareus-Pythea, Wien.
- Mardešić, J. 1994, Amfore, in: *Salona Christiana*, Marin, E. (ed.), Split, 292–296.
- Mardešić, J. 1998, Keramički nalazi s lokaliteta sv. Vid u Vidu kod Metkovića, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, Vol. 87–89 (1994/1996), 96–121.
- Mardešić, J., Šalov, T. 2002, Keramički nalazi s istraživanja azilike u Erešovim barama – Vid kod Metkovića, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, Vol. 94, 165–193.
- Marević, J. 2000, *Latinsko-hrvatski enciklopedijski rječnik*, 1. svezak, A-L, Zagreb.
- Marin, E. 1992, Starokršćanski pluteji s Mirja kod Postira na Braču, *Prilozi za povijest umjetnosti u Dalmaciji*, Vol. 32, *Prijatelj zbornik*, Vol. I, 117–132.
- Maršić, D. 2005, Skulptura, in: *Srima – Prižba*, Maršić, D. (ed.), Šibenik, 71–188.
- Medini, J. 1980, O nekim kronološkim i sadržajnim značajkama poglavlja o Dalmaciji u djelu *Cosmographia* anonimnog pisca iz Ravene, *Putevi i komunikacije u antici, Materijali 12*, Beograd, 69–83.
- Migotti, B. 1989, Neka pitanja ranokršćanske topografije srednje Dalmacije, *Arheološki radovi i rasprave*, 11, 133–159.
- Migotti, B. 1992, Antičko-srednjovjekovni sakralni kontinuitet na području Dalmacije, *Opuscula archaeologica*, 16, 225–249.
- Mihojević, J. 1981, Roko Slovincić i njegov povijesno-opisni prikaz Postira, in: *Postira – spomenica*, Bižaca, E., Bižaca, N., Jelinčić, T., Jelinčić, V., Šantić, J. (eds.), Postira, 219–234.
- Mócsy, A. 1983, *Nomenclatur provinciarum Europae Latinarum et Galliae Cisalpiniae cum indice inverso, Dissertationes Pannonicae ex Instituto Archaeologico Universitatis de Rolando Eötvös nominatae Budapestinensis provenientes*, Series III, volumen 1, Budapest.
- Modrijan, Z. 2005, L'edificio 1 dell'insediamento tardoantico di Tonovcov grad presso Kobarid e i suoi reperti, *Quaderni friulani di archeologia anno XV*, Vol. 1, 157–162.
- Murialdo, G. 2005, Le anfore tra età tardiabtuca e protobizantina (V-VII secolo), in: *La ceramica e i materiali di età romana*, (Gandolfi, D. ed.), Bordighera, 395–406.
- Parica, M. 2008, Istočno mediteranska keramika iz antičke luke u Pakošanima, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu*, Vol. 25, 81–96.
- Peacock, D. P. S., Williams, D. F. 1986, *Amphorae and the Roman economy, an introductory guide*, London and New York.
- Perko, V., Župančić, M. 2005, Amphorae in western Slovenia and in northern Istria, in: *Late Roman Coarse Wares, I, Cooking Wares and Amphorae in the Mediterranean Archaeology and Archaeometry*, BAR International Series 1340, Oxford, 521–536.
- Raynaud, C., Bonifay, M. 1993, Amphores africaines, *Lattara 6*, 15–22, <http://www.lattara.net/ArcheOnLine/PUB1/PUB000001.pdf> (ožujak, 2010).
- Reynolds, P. 1995, *Trade in the Western Mediterranean, AD 400-700: The ceramic evidence*. BAR International Series 604, Oxford.
- Robinson, H. S. 1959, *Pottery of the Roman Period, The Athenian Agora*, V, Princeton.
- Rotroff, S. I. 1997, *The Athenian Agora, Hellenistic Pottery, Athenian and Imported Wheelmade Table Ware and Related Material*, Part I, Princeton and New Jersey.
- Sagui, L. 1998, Il deposito della Crypta Balbi: una testimonianza imprevedibile sulla Roma del VII secolo, in: *Ceramica in Italia, 6-7 secolo*, atti del convegno in onore di John Hayes: Roma, 11-13 maggio 1995, Sagui, L. (ed.), Vol. I, Biblioteca di archeologia medievale, 14, Firenze, 305–330.
- Salway, B. 1994, What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700, *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 84, 124–145.
- Santoro Bianchi, S. 2005, La ceramica grigia padana, in: *La ceramica e i materiali di età romana*, (Gandolfi, D. ed.), Bordighera, 104–114.
- Sciallano, M., Sibella, P. 1994, *Amphores, Comment les identifier*, Barceloneta.
- Schulze, W. 1933, *Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Berlin.
- Siena, E., Troiano, D., Verrocchio, V. 1998, Ceramiche dalla Val Pescara, in: *Ceramica in Italia, 6-7 secolo: atti del convegno in onore di John Hayes: Roma, 11-13 maggio 1995*, Sagui, L. (ed.), Vol. II, Biblioteca di archeologia medievale 14, Firenze, 665–704.
- Stančić, Z., Vujnović, N., Kirigin, B., Čače, S., Podobnikar, T., Burmaz, J. 1999, *The Archaeological Heritage of the Island of Brač, Croatia*, BAR International Series 803, Oxford.
- Stančić, Z., Vujnović, N., Kirigin, B., Čače, S., Podobnikar, T., Burmaz, J. 2004, Arheološka baština otoka Brača, *Brački zbornik*, Vol. 24, Supetar, 21–238.
- Stiaffini, D. 1994, La suppellettile in vetro, in: *Ad mensam*, Lusuardi Siena, S. (ed.), Udine, 189–227.
- Šantić, J. 1981, Povijest postirske župe, in: *Postira – spomenica*, Bižaca, E., Bižaca, N., Jelinčić, T., Jelinčić, V., Šantić, J. (eds.), Postira, 17–28.
- Šimunović, P. 1981, Postirska zemljopisna imena, in: *Postira – spomenica*, Bižaca, E., Bižaca, N., Jelinčić, T., Jelinčić, V., Šantić, J. (eds.), Postira, 263–267.
- Šimunović, P. 2004, *Bračka toponimija*, Zagreb.
- Tacit, 1970, *Anali*, preveo J. Kostović, Zagreb.
- Tassaux, F. 2004, Les relations entre la région nord-adriatique et l'Afrique dans l'antiquité, *Histria Antiqua*, Vol. 12, 25–38.
- Tchernia, A. 1969, Recherches archéologiques sous-marines, *Gallia*, Vol. 27, fasc. 2, 465–499.
- Thesaurus linguae latinae*, DVD izdanje. 2007.
- Topić, M. 1999a, Keramika, in: *Ad basilicas pictas*, Oreb, F., Rismondo, T., Topić, M. (eds.), Split, 66–94.
- Topić, M. 1999b, Staklo, in: *Ad basilicas pictas*, Oreb, F., Rismondo, T., Topić, M. (eds.), Split, 95–104.
- Topić, M. 2004, Posuđe za svakodnevnu uporabu grublje izradbe, amfore, terakote i kultne posude iz Augusteuma Narone, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku*, Vol. 96, 303–515.
- Topić, M. 2005, Nalazi keramike iz sloja grobova u celi Augusteuma Narone, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku*, Vol. 98, 6–97.
- Villa, L. 1994, Le anfore tra tardoantico e medioevo, in: *Ad mensam*, Lusuardi Siena, S. (ed.), Udine, 335–432.
- Villa, L. 1998, Alcuni aspetti della circolazione di prodotti di importazione in Friuli tra VI e VII secolo, in: *Ceramica in Italia, 6-7 secolo: atti del convegno in onore di John Hayes: Roma, 11-13 maggio 1995*, Sagui, L. (ed.), Vol. I, Biblioteca di archeologia medievale, 14, Firenze, 275–289.
- Volpe, F., Annese, C., Disantarosa, G., Leone, D. 2004, Ceramiche e circolazione delle merci in Apulia fra tardoantico e altomedioevo, in: *Circolazione delle ceramiche nell'Adriatico tra tarda antichità e altomedioevo, III Incontro di studio Cer.am. Is sulle ceramiche tardoantiche e medievali*, S. Gelichi, S., Negrelli, C. (eds.), Venezia, 353–374.
- Vrsalović, D. 1960, Pretpovijest i stari vijek, *Kulturni spomenici otoka Brača, Brački zbornik*, 4, Supetar, 33–110.
- Vrsalović, D. 1974, *Istraživanja i zaštita podzemskih arheoloških spomenika u SR Hrvatskoj: dosadašnji rezultati i prijedlozi za dalji rad*, Zagreb.
- Vrsalović, D. 2003, *Povijest otoka Brača*, Zagreb.
- Vučić, J. 2005, Ecclesia Naronitana/Prostor i granice, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest Dalmatinsku*, Vol. 98, Split, 159–170.
- Zaninović, M. 1966, Tri antička reljefa s Hvara, *Opuscula Archaeologica* 6, 15–25.
- Yntema, D. 2005, *Conspectus formarum of Apulian Grey Gloss Wares*, Amsterdam.

T. 1



1




2




3



T.2




T.3




T. 4







T. 5






T. 7




42

43

44




T. 8




46

47



48



49

