

Anamarija Kurilić

Rimska stela iz Miraca (o. Brač)

Anamarija Kurilić
Sveučilište u Zadru
Odjel za povijest
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV., 2
HR, 23000 Zadar
akurilic2011@gmail.com

UDK: 904:726.82(497.583Mirca)“652”
Izvorni znanstveni članak
Primljeno: 1. 8. 2017.
Prihvaćeno: 10. 8. 2017.

U radu se obrađuje rimska stela iz Miraca na otoku Braču. Stela oblikom spada u relativno brojnu skupinu jednostavnih nearhitektonskih stela s upisanim trokutastim zabatom (pseudozabatom), kakve u rimskoj Dalmaciji nalazimo najčešće tijekom druge polovice 2. st. i tijekom 3. st. po. Kr. S paleografskoga gledišta, međutim, stela pokazuje neka odstupanja od standarda, poput zrcalnog pisanja slovâ (kako u vodoravnom, tako i u okomitom smislu). Stelu je svojem miljeniku (*delicatus*) Ursinu, starom kojih 25 godina, postavio *Saufeijs Valens*. Čini se da je uz njega kao komemorator spomenut još i neki *Saufeijs(?) Valentinus*.

Ključne riječi: rimska Dalmacija, Mirca (o. Brač), rimskodobna stela, latinska epigrafija, latinska paleografija

The Roman stele from Mirca (island of Brač)

Anamarija Kurilić
University of Zadar
History Department
Obala kralja Petra Krešimira IV., 2
CROATIA, 23000 Zadar
akurilic2011@gmail.com

UDC: 904:726.82(497.583Mirca)“652”
Original scientific paper
Received: 1 August 2017
Accepted: 10 August 2017

The work contains an analysis of the Roman stele from Mirca on the island of Brač. The stele's shape puts it in a relatively numerous group of simple non-architectural stelae with an inscribed triangular gable (pseudo-gable), of the type found in Roman Dalmatia most often during the latter half of the 2nd century and during the 3rd century AD. From the palaeographic standpoint, however, the stele exhibits certain deviations from the standard, such as the mirrored rendering of the letters (both in the horizontal and vertical sense). The stele was placed by Saufeijs Valens for his darling (*delicatus*) Ursinus, 25 years old. It would appear that besides commemorator, a certain Saufeijs(?) Valentinus was mentioned.

Key words: Roman Dalmatia, Mirca (island of Brač), Roman stele, Latin epigraphy, Latin palaeography



Sl. 1. Stela iz Miraca (foto: P. Dragičević)

Fig. 1. The stele from Mirca (photo: P. Dragičević)

U mjestu Mircima na sjeverozapadnoj strani otoka Brača, između Supetra i Sutivana, prije kojih petnaestak godina spašena je od uništenja jedna rimska stela (sl. 1). Izašla je na svjetlo dana posve slučajno, prilikom proširenja lokalnog puta i bila bi završila u drobilici kamena da ju nije spasio g. Pero Dragičević iz Supetra, kod kojega se i nalazi.¹ Prema njegovim riječima, nađena je na predjelu Mala Bonda/Priko potoka (sl. 2), udolini na zapadnom dijelu glavnog naselja, kod kuće Ivana Brtičevića, uz grob u kojem je bilo kostiju i jedna keramička posuda (navodno lekit, koji je P. Dragičević predao Vanji Kovačić iz Konzervatorskog ureda u Splitu). No kad je dr. sc. Branko Kirigin obišao taj položaj 2. ožujka 2013. g., nisu se vidjeli nikakvi drugi arheološki tragovi (primjerice, ulomci keramike, opeka i sl.).

Upravo me je B. Kirigin obavijestio o ovom zanimljivom epigrafskom nalazu i predložio mi da ga

A Roman stele (Fig. 1) was rescued from destruction in the settlement of Mirca on the north-western side of the island of Brač, between the towns of Supetar and Sutivan, roughly 15 years ago. It came to the light of day entirely by chance during the expansion of a local road, and it would have ended up in a rock crusher if it had not been rescued by Mr Pero Dragičević of Supetar, who still possesses it today.¹ According to Dragičević, it was found in a tract called Mala Bonda/Priko potoka (Fig. 2), a depression on the western side of the settlement, near the house of Ivan Brtičević, next to a grave that contained bones and one ceramic vessel (supposedly a lekythos, which Dragičević turned over to Vanja Kovačić from the Conservation Office in Split). But when Branko Kirigin, Ph.D., visited the site on 2 March 2013, no other archaeological traces (e.g., potsherds, brick fragments, etc.) were found.

It was Kirigin who notified me of this intriguing epigraphic find and suggested that I present it to the scholarly public.² He provided me with all of the information on the monument that he had found, including data on the discovery circumstances and the dimensions of the piece, and the type of material, while Pero Dragičević granted me photographs of the monument and additionally helped me ascertain the dimensions on the stele, for which I sincerely thank them both. I furthermore owe Kirigin a debt of gratitude for his many years of selfless collaboration, going back to the time when I was still a student, which grew into a firm and earnest friendship over the years. I am therefore particularly pleased that I am publishing this small stele from Mirca on the island of Brač, the original home of Branko's grandfather Kuzma, in a journal that the Archaeological Museum is preparing for him as a long-time member of its staff, where he spent a full 38 years and where he would still be working had not the letter of the law dictated his retirement. This, naturally, has not stopped him, as a tireless enthusiast, from continuing to actively engage in research.

The small, slightly asymmetric, rectangular stele was made of local limestone. It was preserved with

1 Na tome mu od srca zahvaljujem, jednako kao i na pomoći koju mi je pružio prilikom pisanja ovog rada.

1 For which I sincerely thank him, and for the assistance he rendered to me during the writing of this paper.
2 The stele has not undergone a scholarly presentation thus far, even though a photograph of it taken by Pero Dragičević has been published in monographs dedicated to the entire island and to Mirca specifically; the anthology *Kamen: Brač: Jadrankamen*, 2002, p. 25, featured a small photograph of the stele and a detail from its inscription, while a monograph on Mirca (Nigoević, Domančić 2010) included a large photograph of the stele (p. 13). See also Šimunović 2014, pp. 119-121.



Sl. 2. Mjesto nalaza stela iz Miraca (foto: A. Mandić)
Fig. 2. Find-site of the stele from Mirca (photo: A. Mandić)

predstavim stručnoj javnosti.² Prenio mi je sve informacije o spomeniku do kojih je došao, uključujući podatke o okolnostima nalaza, kao i dimenzije spomenika, vrstu materijala, dok mi je Pero Dragičević ustupio fotografije spomenika i dodatno pomogao oko detaljnih dimenzija na steli, na čemu im obojici od srca zahvaljujem. Uz to, Branku Kiriginu dugujem i veliku zahvalnost zbog njegove dugogodišnje nesebične suradnje, još iz dana dok sam bila studentica, što je vremenom izrasla i u čvrsto i iskreno prijateljstvo. Stoga mi čini posebno zadovoljstvo što ovu malu stelu iz Miraca na Braču, odakle potječe Brankov djed Kuzma, objavljujem upravo u zborniku koji mu Arheološki muzej u Splitu priprema kao svom dugogodišnjem djelatniku, gdje je proveo punih 38 godina i gdje bi možda i dalje radio da po slovu zakona nije morao u mirovinu. No, naravno, to ga ne sprječava da se kao neumoran entuzijast i dalje aktivno bavi znanstveno-istraživačkim radom.

2 Stela do sada nije bila ni stručno ni znanstveno prezentirana, iako je njezina fotografija autora Pere Dragičevića publicirana u monografijama posvećenima kako cijelom otoku, tako i samim Mircima; u zborniku *Kamen: Brač: Jadrankamen*, 2002, str. 25, prikazani su manja fotografija stela te jedan detalj natpisa, dok je u monografiji o Mircima (Nigoević, Domančić 2010) objavljena velika fotografija stela (str. 13). Vidi još i Šimunović 2014, str. 119-121.

its shaft for fastening to a base, and it has sustained only slight damage at its edges. It has a markedly red patina from the soil in which it was found.

It belongs to the non-architectural stele type with an inscribed triangular gable (pseudo-gable) above the simple inscription field (Fig. 1).³ The inscription field is framed with only a concave groove, so it lacks moulding, as does the pseudo-gable and the triangular spaces to its left and right (pseudo-acroteria). In this manner, the inscription field was framed by simple straight bands (5 cm wide), similar to the catheti of the pseudo-gable, which are 3 cm wide. A plastically rendered rosette (dim. 8 x 9 cm) and antithetically set leaves (height: 11.5 cm) are inside the pseudo-gable (h. 12 cm); the leaf situated to the right of the rosette may have been inspired by acanthus leaves or palm fronds, while the one to the left of it was rendered much more fleshily, so that it is more stylized than its counterpart on the right. Plastically rendered palmettes are also in the pseudo-acroteria. They are similarly not entirely symmetric, so that there are minor but nevertheless notable differences in their appearance.

Together with the fastening shaft, the stele has a height of 68-72.5 cm (and 57.5-62 cm without it), a

3 For such terminology, cf. Maršić 1997 (especially p. 102 and note 2), who analysed a series of stelae of this type (nos. 1-2, 4-5) in that work.



Sl. 3. Stražnja strana stele iz Miraca (foto: P. Dragičević)

Fig. 3. Rear side of the stele from Mirca (photo: P. Dragičević)

Manja, lagano asimetrična, pravokutna stela izrađena je od domaćeg vapnenca. Sačuvana je zajedno s trnom za nasadivanje u bazu i tek je neznatno oštećena po rubovima. Ima izraženu crvenkastu patinu od zemlje u kojoj se nalazila.

Pripada tipu nearhitektonskih stela s upisanim trokutastim zabatom (pseudozabatom) iznad jednostavnog natpisnog polja (sl. 1).³ Natpisno polje uokvireno je tek udubljenom brazdom, pa stoga nema nikakvih profilacija, jednako kao ni pseudozabat te trokutasti prostori lijevo i desno od njega (pseudoakroteriji). Na taj je način natpisno polje postalo obrubljeno i jednostavnim ravnim trakama (šir. 5 cm), slično kao i katete pseudozabata, koje su široke 3 cm. U pseudozabatu (vis. 12 cm) nalaze se, plastično izvedeni, četverolisna

width of 40-42.5 cm, and a thickness of roughly 6 cm. As indicated by these measurements, the right side is somewhat longer than the left, which is also reflected in the horizontal dimensions and the dimensions of the inscription field.

The frontal surface is slightly better worked on the inscription field and the relief elements, while the bands which frame the inscription field were left without the final smoothing of the surface, so that traces of a denticulate chisel can still be clearly discerned (Fig. 1). The lateral sides were similarly worked, while the rear side was only roughly sketched (Fig. 3).

The inscription field (32 x 38-39 cm) contains eight lines of text, while the beginning of the epitaph (*D M*) was carved on the band between the inscription field and the pseudo-gable, so that the inscription contains a total of nine lines of text. The letters were carved rather inelegantly,⁴ in *scriptura capitalis* of very rustic features and with many errors or irregularities - both classical carver's mistakes and various and rather unusual palaeographic deviations from the standard, which renders the reading and interpretation of the text rather difficult.

The text extends over the entire length of the lines (and sometimes, as in the second line, it surpasses the inscription field's frame) and does not show any tendencies toward a visual ordering of the text (e.g. symmetry - except in the first line) nor toward any separation of words either by spaces or possible punctuation marks, which also makes a reading of the text more difficult.

A particular feature of the palaeography of this inscription is the mirrored carving of the letters, both the classical horizontal (as though the letters are being viewed in a mirror), rotated around the vertical axis, and the much rarer vertical (when the letters are turned 180°), around the horizontal axis. So already in the first line of the inscription, the mirrored carving of the letter *D*⁵ may be observed, and then, from the second line onward, all of the letters *A* are rendered as mirrored vertically like the letters *V*, but with a horizontal line drawn almost at the level of the lower third of the letters. This manner of carving the letter *A* is unique, and I could not find analogies in any other inscriptions, either from Dalmatia or in any other parts of the Roman world.⁶ The letters *T* are frequently carved the

3 Za ovakvu terminologiju usp. Maršić 1997 (osobito str. 102 i bilj. 2), koji u dotičnom radu obrađuje niz stela toga tipa (br. 1-2, 4-5).

4 Height of the letters: 1st-4th lines and 6th-8th lines: 4 cm; 5th line: 3.8 cm; 9th line: 3.5 cm.

5 The *D* carved this way can be found elsewhere, such as, for example, on monuments of cruder make from northern Africa (Cagnat 1914, pp. 13-14).

6 See the variants of their carving in Hübner 1885, pp. LII-LIV; Cagnat 1914, pp. 11-12.

roseta (dim. 8 x 9 cm) i antitetički postavljeni listovi (duž. 11,5 cm); list smješten desno od rozete mogao bi biti inspiriran akantovim ili možda palminim listom, dok je onaj lijevo od nje izveden mnogo mesnatije, zbog čega je stiliziraniji od svog desnog pandana. I u pseudoakroterijima su izvedene plastično modelirane palmete. Ni one nisu posve simetrične izrade, tako da postoje manje, ali ipak zamjetne razlike u pogledu njihovih izvedbi.

Zajedno s trnom za usađivanje stela je visine 68-72,5 cm (bez njega 57,5-62 cm), širine 40-42,5 cm, debljine oko 6 cm. Kako se vidi iz navedenoga, desna strana je nešto duža nego lijeva, što se prenosi i na vodoravne dimenzije te na dimenzije natpisnog polja.

Prednja površina nešto je bolje obrađena na natpisnom polju i reljefnim elementima, dok su trake koje uokviruju natpisno polje ostale bez finalnog ravnjanja površine pa se još jasno poznaju tragovi zubače (sl. 1). Slično su obrađene i bočne strane, dok je stražnja strana tek grubo abocirana (sl. 3).

Natpisno polje (32 x 38-39 cm) sadrži osam redaka natpisa, dok je početni dio epitafa (*D M*) uklesan na traci između natpisnog polja i pseudozabata, pa tako natpis ukupno sadrži devet redaka teksta. Slova su klesana prilično nevješto,⁴ kapitalom vrlo rustikalnih obilježja i s mnogo pogrešaka ili nepravilnosti - kako klasičnih klesarskih pogrešaka tako i s raznovrsnim i vrlo neobičnim paleografskim odstupanjima od standarda, što uvelike otežava čitanje i interpretaciju teksta.

Tekst se rasprostire cijelom dužinom retka (a ponekad, kao u 2. r., izlazi iz okvira natpisnog polja) i ne pokazuje nikakvih tendencija ni prema vizualnom uređenju teksta (npr. simetričnosti - osim u 1. r.) ni prema razdvajanju riječi bilo razmacima bilo eventualnim interpunkcijskim znacima, što također otežava čitanje teksta.

Osobita je značajka paleografije ovog natpisa zrcalno klesanje niza slova, kako klasično vodoravno (kao kad se slova gledaju u zrcalu), rotirano oko okomite osi, tako i ono mnogo rjeđe - vertikalno (kad su slova okrenuta za 180°), okrenuto oko vodoravne osi. Tako se već u prvom retku natpisa zapaža zrcalno isklesano slovo *D*,⁵ a potom se od 2. retka nadalje sva slova *A* pišu okomito zrcalno - poput slova *V*, ali s vodoravnom crtom povučenom približno u ravnini donje trećine slova. Takav način klesanja slova *A* jedinstven je i ne nalazim mu analogija na drugim natpisima, kako

same as the letter *I* (as, e.g., in the fourth and ninth lines, although there are also different ways; see, e.g., the comments for the second line), while the letters *L* normally do not have the classical lower portion (the shorter horizontal line which connects with the lower end of the vertical line), rather the shorter lower line begins at roughly the first third of the second fifth above the lower end of the vertical line (thus, closer to its middle than its beginning) and extends diagonally toward the lower level of the line, so that it resembles an incomplete letter *K* (which would be lacking the upper diagonal line).⁷ The letters *N* are carved very non-uniformly: sometimes they are notably slanted rightward (as, e.g., in both instances in the fifth line and at the end of the seventh line), sometimes the left vertical line is not entirely connected to the remainder of the letter (and in which case it is, e.g., also slanted rightward, while the remaining portion of the letter is entirely vertical, so it appears at first glance to be an *I* and *V* - see, e.g., the middle of the sixth line), and sometimes it even approaches the expected standard form (eighth line). The letters *M* also appear in several different carving variants: the more or less expected standard form (e.g., in the first and second lines of the text), with a narrower upper portion in comparison to the lower (end of the fifth line and in the eighth line) or with very widespread bars (end of the ninth line). Furthermore, some letters were only sometimes carved in non-standard fashion, such as, for example, the (assumed) letter *P* in the middle of the second line of the text (as though it was carved in a single motion and the belly does not connect to the vertical line) as opposed the classical form at the beginning of the ninth line.⁸

The classical carver's mistakes are rarer than the palaeographic specificities described above. Thus, near the end of the seventh line, recarving in an attempt to correct an error carved into text is noticeable (Fig. 4): it appears that initially a normal, albeit wide letter *A* had been carved, but then it was recarved with a specific form of that letter for this inscription, which ultimately gives the impression of two letters *X* in ligature.

4 Visine slova: 1.-4. r. i 6.-8. r.: 4 cm; 5. r.: 3,8 cm; 9. r.: 3,5 cm.

5 Tako klesano *D* zna se naći i drugdje, kao na primjer na spomenicima lošije izrade iz sjeverne Afrike (Cagnat 1914, str. 13-14).

7 Such carving of the letter *L* has been confirmed in other parts of the Roman world; see Hübner 1885, p. LXI; Cagnat 1914, p. 18.

8 For other variations on the carving of the letter *I*, see Hübner 1885, pp. LIX-LX, Cagnat 1914, pp. 16-17; the letter *M* Hübner 1885, pp. LXI-LXII, Cagnat 1914, pp. 18-19; the letter *N* Hübner 1885, p. LXIII, Cagnat 1914, p. 19; the letter *P* Hübner 1885, pp. LXIII-LXIV, Cagnat 1914, p. 20; the letter *T* Hübner 1885, p. LXVI, Cagnat 1914, p. 22.

onima iz Dalmacije tako i s drugih područja rimskog svijeta.⁶ Slova *T* nerijetko su klesana jednako kao i *I* (kao npr. u 4. i 9. r., iako ima i drugačijih načina; v. npr. dalje, komentar uz 2. r.), a slova *L* obično nemaju klasičan donji dio (kraća vodoravna crta koja se spaja s donjim završetkom okomite crte), već kraća donja crta započinje otprilike oko prve trećine do druge petine iznad donjeg završetka okomite crte (dakle, bliže njezinoj sredini nego početku) i koso se proteže prema donjoj razini retka, tako da izgleda poput nedovršenog slova *K* (kojemu bi nedostajala gornja kosa crta).⁷ Slova *N* klesana su vrlo neujednačeno: ponekad su izrazito nakošena udesno (kao npr. oba puta u 5. r. i na kraju 7. r.), ponekad lijeva okomita crta nije posve spojena s ostatkom slova (pri čemu je ona, npr., još i nakošena udesno, dok je preostali dio slova posve okomit pa se na prvi pogled čine kao *I* i *V* - v. npr. po sredini 6. r.), a ponekad se čak približava očekivanom standardnom obliku (8. r.). Slova *M* također se javljaju u nekoliko različitih inačica klesanja: manje-više očekivanog standardnog oblika (npr. u 1. i 2. r. teksta), suženog gornjeg dijela u odnosu na donji (kraj 5. r. i u 8. r.) ili jako raširenih krakova (kraj 9. r.). Nadalje, neka slova samo su ponekad klesana nestandardno, kao npr. (pretpostavljeno) slovo *P* po sredini 2. retka teksta (kao da je isklesano u jednom potezu i trbuh se ne spaja s okomitom crtom) za razliku od klasičnog oblika na početku 9. retka.⁸

Klasične klesarske pogreške mnogo su rjeđe od upravo opisanih paleografskih posebnosti. Tako se pred kraj 7. r. zapaža preklesavanje kojim se nastoji prepraviti pogrešno isklesan tekst (sl. 4): kako se čini, isprva je bilo uklesano obično, iako široko slovo *A*, ali je onda preklesano za ovaj natpis specifičnim oblikom tog slova, što u konačnici daje dojam dva slova *X* u ligaturi.

Osim toga, otprilike po sredini 2. r. nalazi se još nekoliko osobito izvedenih slova (v. dalje, komentar uz 2. r.).

Sve ove pogreške u klesanju ukazuju na to da klesar nije bio vješt, ali postavlja se pitanje koji su sve razlozi doveli do ovakvog krajnjeg proizvoda: je li to posljedica njegove ili naručiteljeve nestručnosti i/ili



Sl. 4. Detalj natpisa stele iz Miraca (foto: P. Dragičević)

Fig. 4. Detail from the inscription on the stele from Mirca (photo: P. Dragičević)

Additionally, in roughly the middle of the second line, there are another few peculiarly rendered letters (see below, comments on the second line).

All of these carving errors indicate that the carver was not very skilled, but they impose the question as to the reasons that led to such an end product: was it due to his or the client's lack of expertise and/or illiteracy, or a combination of factors?⁹ Since the observed irregularities do not fall within the linguistic sphere, it may be concluded that the fault did not lie with the client nor with the text provided to the carver as his model, so the carver remains as the only culpable individual for the text carved in this manner. Given the considerable differences in the quality of the production of the stele and its decorative elements in comparison to the poorer rendering of the inscription, it would appear that the Saufiei ordered the stele as a semi-product, while the inscription was carved by someone who did not normally do this. What comes to mind immediately - given the well-developed exploitation of stone on the island of Brač during the Roman era - is someone who worked in one of the nearby quarries;¹⁰ to be sure, the stele may have also been made in this assumed quarry, wherein one may easily imagine that its carver was much more skilled in making monuments than in carving texts,¹¹ i.e., that the stele was

6 Vidi različite inačice njihova klesanja kod Hübner 1885, str. LII-LIV; Cagnat 1914, str. 11-12.

7 Takvo klesanje slova *L* potvrđeno je i u drugim dijelovima rimskog svijeta; vidi Hübner 1885, str. LXI; Cagnat 1914, str. 18.

8 Za različite inačice klesanje slova *I* v. Hübner 1885, str. LIX-LX, Cagnat 1914, str. 16-17; slova *M* Hübner 1885, str. LXI-LXII, Cagnat 1914, str. 18-19; slova *N* Hübner 1885, str. LXIII, Cagnat 1914, str. 19; slova *P* Hübner 1885, str. LXIII-LXIV, Cagnat 1914, str. 20; slova *T* Hübner 1885, str. LXVI, Cagnat 1914, str. 22.

9 Cf. Keppie 2001, pp. 14-15; Edmondson 2015, pp. 117-118, 122; Bodel 2015, p. 746.

10 For the Brač quarry, see Didolić 1957; Parica 2012, pp. 345, 350-352; cf. also, e.g., Donelli *et al.* 2012; Marinković, Miliša 2015, p. 12 ff; Stančić *et al.* 2004, p. 40 (cf. also p. 29).

11 Cf. Edmondson 2015, pp. 114-115, who stressed that the workshops normally kept in stock a certain number of finished or semi-finished products which could later be completed in accordance with the wishes of the buyer; certain monuments (such as those which Edmondson cited in note 14 on p. 115) may even indicate that the inscriptions could be added later, by the hands of a less

nepismenosti ili pak kombinacije čimbenika?⁹ Budući da uočene nepravilnosti ne pripadaju jezičnoj sferi, može se zaključiti da uzrok ne leži u naručitelju, odnosno tekstu koji je klesaru služio kao predložak, pa preostaje klesar kao jedini krivac za ovako isklesani tekst. S obzirom na znatnu razliku u kvaliteti izrade stela i njezinih dekorativnih elemenata u odnosu na lošiju izvedbu natpisa, čini se da su Saufeki stelu naručili kao poluproizvod, dok je natpis klesao netko tko se time inače nije bavio. Na pamet - s obzirom na dobro razvijenu eksploataciju kamena na Braču u rimsko doba - odmah pada netko tko je radio u jednom od obližnjih bračkih kamenoloma;¹⁰ dapače, i stela je možda mogla biti napravljena u dotičnom pretpostavljenom kamenolomu, pri čemu se lako može zamisliti da je njezin klesar bio mnogo vičniji oblikovanju spomenika nego teksta,¹¹ odnosno, da je stelu ipak klesala jedna te ista ruka, ali različito vješta u različitim fazama izrade. K tomu, zrcalno klesanje slova snažno ukazuje na to da je dotični klesar bio nepismen (ili polupismen), i još k tome disleksičan (što bi bilo razlogom i neobičnog zrcaljenja slova A).¹²

9 Usp. Keppie 2001, str. 14-15; Edmondson 2015, str. 117-118, 122; Bodel 2015, str. 746.

10 Za bračke kamenolome vidi Didolić 1957; Parica 2012, str. 345, 350-352; usp. još i npr. Donelli *et al.* 2012; Marinković, Miliša 2015, str. 12 i dalje; Stančić *et al.* 2004, str. 40 (usp. i str. 29).

11 Usp. Edmondson 2015, str. 114-115, koji ističe da su radionice obično imale na zalihi određeni broj dovršenih ili poludovršenih proizvoda koji su se kasnije mogli dovršiti u skladu sa željama naručitelja; neki spomenici (poput onih koje Edmondson navodi u bilj. 14 na str. 115) čak bi ukazivali na to da su se natpisi mogli dodavati i kasnije, i to od ruke manje ili više umješnog klesara u vlastitom domaćinstvu, što bi onda moglo vrlo dobro objasniti zašto su na nekim jednostavnim nadgrobnim ili votivnim spomenicima tekstovi bili loše isklesani. Primjer are *CIL* 6, 22479 sličan je ovom bračkom primjeru utoliko što je sam spomenik klesan mnogo kvalitetnije od teksta, pa Edmondson (2015, str. 115) pretpostavlja da je tekst, nakon što je spomenik kupljen u nekoj profesionalnoj radionici, klesao netko vrlo nevičan tomu, možda čak i sam komemorator. S druge strane, N. Cambi (2005, str. 126) ukazuje na to da su reljef Herkula u bračkom kamenolomu u Rasohama napravili upravo lokalni "kavaduri" (radnici u kamenolomu) i ističe da oni nisu bili vješti u kiparskom umijeću ("radnici u kamenolomu zapravo nisu imali prave veze s kiparstvom").

12 Suvremena interdisciplinarna istraživanja odnosa zrcalnog pisanja i nepismenosti/polupismenosti kod odraslih ljudi jasno su pokazala blisku korelaciju između nepismenosti (i općenito niske razine vještine čitanja) i zrcalnoga pisanja (Erlikhman *et al.* 2017, osobito str. 5). Taj se poremećaj u razlikovanju orijentacije slova

nonetheless carved by a single hand, but with different levels of skill in different phases of production. Also, the mirrored carving of the letters strongly indicates that this carver was illiterate (or semi-literate), and additionally also dyslexic (which would have been the reason for the unusual mirroring of the letter A).¹²

The connection of letters, or ligatures, only appears once, in the third line (*VF*). At first glance it appears as though there is another ligature – the letters *L* and *E* – at the end of the seventh line, but this is, however, the lower serif on the letter *N* which is connected to the lower line on the letter *E* (see Fig. 4).¹³

Only when all of the peculiarities of this inscription are understood can one turn to its transcription, restoration and interpretation; thus, after these palaeographic peculiarities are "translated" into customary letter shapes, the text of the epitaph reads:

D M
VSECPV'TI'TVLVM
SAVFEVS VALEN sic!
DELICA'T'O SVO V
5 RSINO ANOISM sic!
LVS MINVS XXV(?)
SAIEEIVS VAEN sic!
T'INVS ITEM V
POSVI'T T'I'T'VLM

or more skilled carver in his own home, which would explain quite well why the texts were poorly carved on some simple funerary or votive monuments. The example of an altar, *CIL* 6, 22479, is similar to this Brač example insofar as the monument itself was carved much better than its text, so Edmondson (2015, p. 115) assumed that the text, after the monument had been purchased in a professional workshop, was carved by someone very unskilled in this work, perhaps even the commemorator himself. On the other hand, N. Cambi (2005, p. 126) pointed out that the relief of Hercules in the Rasoh quarry on Brač was made precisely by local 'kavaduri' (quarry workers) and stressed that they were not skilled in the sculpting arts ("the workers in the quarry actually did not have anything to do with sculpture").

12 Contemporary interdisciplinary research into the link between mirrored writing and illiteracy/semi-literacy among adults clearly shows a close correlation between illiteracy (and a generally low level of reading skill) and mirrored writing (Erlikhman *et al.* 2017, especially p. 5). This disorder in differentiating between the orientation of letters is also linked to dyslexia, and then also with the different functioning of the left and right sides of the brain (Gross, Bornstein 2009, especially p. 141 ff; cf. also Erlikhman *et al.* 2017, p. 3 ff).

For a more general discussion of the (il)literacy of carvers of ancient inscriptions, cf. Bodel 2015, pp. 476-751.

13 I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer who pointed out this possibility, as well as other very useful observations.

Spajanje slova, odnosno ligatura, javlja se samo jednom, i to u 3. r. (*VF*). Na prvi pogled se čini da postoji još jedna ligatura - slovâ *L* i *E* - na kraju 7. retka, no tu se ipak radi o donjem serifu slova *N* koji se spaja s donjom crtom slova *E* (v. sl. 4).¹³

Tek kad se razumiju sve specifičnosti klesanja ovoga natpisa, možemo prijeći i na njegovu transkripciju, restituciju i interpretaciju; tako, nakon što se ove paleografske osobitosti "prevedu" u uobičajene oblike slova, tekst epitafa glasi:

D M
VSECPV^{TI}TVLVM
SAVFEVS VALEN sic!
DELICA^TO SVO V
5 RSINO ANOISM sic!
LVS MINVS XXV(?)
SAIEEIVS VAEN sic!
^TINVS ITEM V
POSVI^T^T^TVLM

1. r. in.: zrcalno isklesano *D*;

2. r.: lako je moguće da su prva dva slova *V* u ovom retku klesarska pogreška do koje je došlo tijekom prijenosa iz faze ordinacije (*ordinatio*) u fazu klesanja na kamenu; čini se kao da je ordinator teksta tu mislio staviti trokutaste interpunkcijske znakove koje je klesar zamijenio slovima *V* (usp. sličnu mogućnost i na kraju 8. r.); 2. r. m.: prvo slovo *T* u riječi *titulum* isklesano poput *I* jače izraženog donjeg serifa na desnoj strani pa podsjeća na slovo *L* vrlo kratke vodoravne crte, slovo *I* koje mu slijedi isklesano je kao slovo *T* kojemu nedostaje lijeva polovica vodoravne crte, dok je sljedeće slovo (drugo *T*) isklesano kao ligatura *T* i *L*; 2. r. ex. slovo *M* je desnom polovicom izašlo izvan natpisnog polja i isklesano je na okvirnoj traci;

5. r. ex.: umjesto slova *P* uklesano je slovo *M*;

6. r. ex.: po sredini gornjeg dijela drugog numeralâ *X* nalazi se kraća okomita crtica koja bi se možda trebala povezati s ostalim numeralima, čime bi se dobila dob od 24, a ne 25 godina;

7. r. in.: slova *FE* uklesana su gotovo identično, poput dva *E*;

8. r. in.: prvo slovo u retku isklesano je poput slova *E* kojemu nedostaje srednja vodoravna crta, no s obzirom na kontekst i već zamijećene varijetete

1st line, in.: mirrored carving of *D*;

2nd line: it is easily possible that the first two letters *V* in this line are a carver's error which was made during the transition from the *ordinatio* phase to the stone carving phase; it would appear that the text's *ordinator* here sought to place triangular punctuation marks which the carver then replaced with letters *V* (cf. a similar possibility at the end of the eighth line); 2nd line m.: the first letter *T* in the word *titulum* was carved like an *I* with a more prominently expressed lower serif on the right side, so it recalls a letter *L* with a very short horizontal line, the letter *I* which follows was carved like a letter *T* missing the left half of its horizontal line, while the next letter (another *T*) was carved like a ligature of *T* and *L*; 2nd line ex. the right half of the letter *M* exceeds the inscription field and was carved on the framing band;

5th line ex.: instead of the letter *P* the letter *M* was carved;

6th line ex.: in the middle of the upper part of the second numeral *X* there is a short vertical line which possibly had to be connected to the other numerals, which would then indicate an age of 24, rather than 25;

7th line in: the letters *FE* are carved almost identically, like two letters *E*;

8th line in: the first letter in the line is carved like a letter *E* missing the middle horizontal bar, but given the context and the already noted variants of carving of the letter *T*, it may be concluded that this was the letter *T*; 8th line ex.: it may be that here, as in the second line, the letter *V* at the very end of the line, after the word *item*, should be interpreted as an outsized triangular punctuation mark;

9th line m.: in the middle of the line, after the letters *POSV* there follows a group of five vertical lines; given the context and the already established method of carving the letter *T*, there is no doubt that some of these letters should be read as *T*,¹⁴ or that *POSVIT TITVLVM* was carved here.

The restoration of the text would therefore be: *D(is) M(anibus) / V(?) sec(uritati) p(erpetuae) V(?) ^{ti}tulum / Saufe<i>us Valen(s) / delica^to suo U^rrsino an(n)o{i}s ^p/lus minus XXV(?). / Sa{i}<u>^feius Va<l>en^tinus item v(ivus)(?) / posuit titul<u>m.*¹⁵

povezuje i s disleksijom, a onda i s različitim funkcioniranjem lijeve i desne strane mozga (Gross, Bornstein 2009, osobito str. 141 i d.; usp. i Erlikhman *et al.* 2017, str. 3 i d.).

Općenito za pitanje (polu)pismenosti klesara antičkih natpisa usp. Bodel 2015, str. 476-751.

13 Zahvaljujem anonimnom recenzentu koji je ukazao na ovu mogućnost, jednako kao i na njegovim drugim vrlo korisnim zapažanjima.

14 Cf. Edmondson 2015, p. 112, Fig. 7.1. (slab from Rome, *CIL* 6, 9956) where a similar situation is noted with the carving of the letters *TIT* in the word *titulus* as in this Brač inscription.

15 The symbols used in the restoration of this text adhere to contemporary standards (the so-called Krummery-Panciera standard; see, for example, Lassère 2005, pp. 62-63, or legends of the type that can be found in *L'Année*

klesanja slova *T*, može se zaključiti da se i ovdje radi o slovu *T*; 8. r. ex. moguće je da i ovdje - kao i u 2. r. - slovo *V* na samom kraju retka, nakon riječi *item*, valja tumačiti kao predimenzionirani trokutasti interpunkcijski znak;

9. r. m.: po sredini retka, nakon slova *POSV* slijedi skup od pet okomitih crta; s obzirom na kontekst i već ustaljen način klesanja slova *T*, nema sumnje da neka od tih slova treba čitati kao *T*,¹⁴ odnosno, da je tu uklesano *POSVIT TITVLVM*.

Restitucija teksta bi, prema tome, glasila:

*D(is) M(anibus) / V(?) sec(uritati) p(erpetuae) V(?) "ti"tulum / Saufe<i>us Valen(s) / delica"t"o suo U"rsino an(n)o{i}s "p"/lus minus XXV(?). / Sa{i}<u>"f ei us Va<l>en"t inus item v(ivus)(?) / posuit titul<u>m.*¹⁵

Drugim riječima, ovo je nadgrobni spomenik, točnije, natpis (*titulus*) koji je Saufej Valent (*Saufeius Valens*) posvetio Bogovima Manima (tj. bogovima zagrobnog svijeta) i vječnoj sigurnosti te postavio svom miljeniku (*delicato suo*) imenom Ursin (*Ursinus*) koji je doživio manje-više 25 godina. Jednako tako (*item*), ovaj je natpis postavio i Saufej Valentin (*Saufeius Valentinus*); možda se ovdje ističe da je Valentin to učinio još za života (*vivus*) - ukoliko se ipak radi o skraćenici *V*, a ne o interpunkciji, iako ostaje nejasno zbog čega bi sastavljač natpisa imao potrebu to istaknuti samo za njega, a ne i za Valenta.

Zaziv Bogovima Manima javlja se u provinciji Dalmaciji već od kraja 1. st. po. Kr., ali tada se obično piše punim riječima, dok ovako skraćen, samo na sigle *D* i *M*, postaje uobičajen upravo od prijelaza 1. na 2. st. po. Kr. i dominira kroz cijelo vrijeme kasnog principata (druga polovica 2. st. i 3. st. po. Kr.), a javlja se i kasnije, o čemu izvrsno svjedoči epigrafska praksa. Za kasni principat tipični su i neskraćeno pisanje glagola *posuit*, spominjanje miljenika (*delicati*) i fraza *annos plus minus* kojom se označava dob

In other words, this gravestone, i.e. the inscription (*titulus*) was dedicated by Saufeius Valens to the Manes gods (i.e., the gods of the afterlife) and eternal security and placed for his darling (*delicato suo*) named Ursinus who lived to an age of more or less 25 years. Likewise (*item*), this inscription was also placed by Saufeius Valentinus; perhaps here it was stressed that Valentinus did so during his lifetime (*vivus*) - insofar as this is in fact the abbreviation *V*, and not a punctuation mark, although it remains unclear as to why the composer of the inscription would have the need to stress this for himself, but not for Valens.

The invocation to the Manes gods had already appeared in the province of Dalmatia at the end of the 1st century AD, but at that point the complete words were written out, while abbreviated in this manner to the initial letters *D* and *M* it became customary precisely at the turn of the 1st into the 2nd century AD and it dominated throughout the entire period of the late Principate (latter half of the 2nd and 3rd century AD); it also appeared later, to which epigraphic practice testifies in exemplary manner. The unabbreviated rendering of the verb *posuit*, the mention of darlings (*delicati*) and the phrase *annos plus minus* to designate the age of the deceased are all typical of the late Principate.¹⁶ The joint invocation to the Manes and *securitati perpetuae* (although more often in the form *perpetuae securitati* and with the conjunction *et* between them) already appeared as of the late 2nd and during the 3rd century.¹⁷ It has thus far been found on few monuments in the province of Dalmatia, specifically once without the adjective *perpetuus* (*Dis Manibus et securitati*),¹⁸ and twice with it,¹⁹ just the same as on this monument from Brač.

As seen above, the text of the epitaph does not contain a single epigraphic element that would

14 Usp. Edmondson 2015, str. 112, sl. 7.1. (ploča iz Rima, *CIL* 6, 9956) gdje se uočava slična situacija s pisanjem slova *TIT* u riječi *titulus* kao i na ovom našem bračkom natpisu.

15 Znaci korišteni prilikom restitucije teksta prate suvremene standarde (tzv. Krummrey-Panciera standard; vidi npr. kod Lassère 2005, str. 62-63, ili legende kakve se nalaze u *L'Année épigraphique* - vidi npr. *AE* 2013, str. 15); ovdje ću istaknuti samo one koji odskaku od kod nas uobičajenog standarda (tzv. Leiden standard): među oznakama " " nalaze se znakovi koje je ispravio suvremeni priređivač natpisa, među oznakama < > nalaze se znakovi koje je zaboravio klesar, a dodao ih je suvremeni priređivač natpisa, među oznakama { } nalaze se suvišni glasovi koje je klesar pogreškom uklesao.

épigraphique - see, e.g. *AE* 2013, p. 15); here I shall stress only those that deviate from standards accepted in Croatian scholarship (the so-called Leiden standard): the designations " " enclose elements which were corrected by the contemporary editor of the inscription, the designations < > enclose elements that were omitted by the carver, and were added by the contemporary editor of the inscriptions, the designations { } contain superfluous letters which the carver placed by mistake.

16 For more on epigraphic criteria for dating monuments, see Alföldy 1969, pp. 28-30.

17 Ditsch 2009, p. 83; Borhy 2000, p. 255. For the frequency of such invocations see Gregori 1997, p. 166 (and see the other relevant literature cited therein).

18 Salona, *CIL* 3, 2154 (+ p. 1031).

19 Salona, *CIL* 3, 9497; Prijedor, *ILJug* 163 = *AE* 1958, 66.

pokojnika.¹⁶ Združeni zaziv Bogovima Manima i *securitati perpetuae* (iako češće u obliku *perpetuae securitati* i s veznikom *et* među njima) javlja se već od kasnog 2. stoljeća i tijekom 3. stoljeća.¹⁷ U provinciji Dalmaciji ga zasad nalazimo na malobrojnim spomenicima, i to jednom bez pridjeva *perpetuus* (*Dis Manibus et securitati*),¹⁸ a dva puta s njim,¹⁹ slično kao i na ovom spomeniku s Brača.

Kako se vidi iz prethodno izloženog, u tekstu epitafa nema ni jednog epigrafskog elementa koji bi ukazivao na to da je spomenik mogao nastati u vrijeme ranog principata.

I antroponimijska analiza vodi k istom kronološkom okviru. Oba komemoratora imenovana su samo s gentilnim imenom i kognomenom, bez prenomena, filijacije ili navoda glasačkog okruga (*tribus*), što je posve uobičajeno već od 2. polovice 2. st. po. Kr.²⁰ Također, i ime *Ursinus* u Dalmaciji je ograničeno gotovo isključivo na kasni principat (nema ni jedne potvrde iz ranog principata, ali je nekoliko puta potvrđeno u razdoblju dominata).²¹

Na isto razdoblje upućuje i stilski analiza; ovakve stele, osobito kad su ovakvih skromnijih dimenzija, tipične su upravo za razdoblje od sredine 2. st. i za 3. stoljeće.²²

Dakle, svi datacijski kriteriji (stilski, epigrafski i onomastički) vrlo složno ukazuju na to da je ova stela morala nastati tijekom kasnog principata, odnosno u zadnjim desetljećima drugog stoljeća ili u trećem stoljeću, ali zasad nije moguće pokušati uže odrediti vrijeme njezina nastanka.

Podjednako tako, ne može se puno reći ni o osobama koje se spominju na spomeniku; najviše podataka saznajemo o pokojniku: zvao se *Ursinus*, imao je otprilike 25 godina i bio je *delicatus* komemoratoru Saufeju Valentu. Njegovo je ime, kako je već spomenuto, u rimskoj Dalmaciji zastupljeno gotovo isključivo tijekom kasnog principata, i to ponajviše u Saloni i okolici.²³ Njegov status (*delicatus*), također

indicate that the monument had been made during the early Principate.

The anthroponymic analysis also leads to the same chronological framework. Both commemorators are named only by their gentilicium and cognomen, without a praenomen, filiation or specification of their voting district (*tribus*), which was entirely customary already since the latter half of the 2nd century AD.²⁰ Additionally, in Dalmatia the name *Ursinus* was limited almost exclusively to the late Principate (there is not a single confirmation from the early Principate, but it has been confirmed several times in the Dominate).²¹

The stylistic analysis also points to the same period; such stela, especially when they have such, more modest, dimensions, were typical of the period as of the mid-2nd and in the 3rd century.²²

Thus, all dating criteria (stylistic, epigraphic and onomastic) very unanimously show that this stela had to be produced during the late Principate, i.e., in the final decades of the 2nd century or in the 3rd century, but for now it is impossible to attempt to more narrowly specify the time of its production.

Similarly, not much may be said about the persons mentioned on the monument; the most data can be gleaned about the deceased: he was named *Ursinus*, he was roughly 25 years of age and he was the *delicatus* of commemorator Saufeius Valens. His name, as already noted, appeared in Roman Dalmatia almost exclusively during the late Principate, mostly in Salona and its environs.²³ His designation (*delicatus*), also already confirmed on a considerable number of monuments in Roman Dalmatia,²⁴ has normally been interpreted as meaning an attractive boy or girl of slave status whom their adult masters kept close by as 'pets' or as adornments, for entertainment and play, and not rarely for sexual pleasures as well.²⁵ Although epigraphic monuments in Dalmatia normally

16 Više za epigrafske kriterije za datiranje spomenika vidi kod Alföldy 1969, str. 28-30.

17 Ditsch 2009, str. 83; Borhy 2000, str. 255. Za učestalost takvih zaziva vidi Gregori 1997, str. 166 (kod kojega vidi i za ostalu relevantnu literaturu).

18 Salona, *CIL* 3, 2154 (+ p. 1031).

19 Salona, *CIL* 3, 9497; Prijedor, *ILug* 163 = *AE* 1958, 66.

20 Usp. Alföldy 1969, str. 27-28; prenamen gubi svoju imensku funkciju već od razdoblja Flavijevaca (vidi npr. Salomies 1987, str. 228 i dalje, 300 i dalje, 390 i dalje, usp. Kurilić 2006, str. 22-24).

21 Alföldy 1969, str. 317, s.v.

22 V. Maršić 2000, str. 79-80; Maršić 1997, str. 118-119.

23 Alföldy 1969, str. 317, s.v.

20 Cf. Alföldy 1969, pp. 27-28; the praenomen lost its naming function already during the Flavian era (see, e.g., Salomies 1987, pp. 228 ff, 300 ff, 390 ff, cf. Kurilić 2006, pp. 22-24).

21 Alföldy 1969, p. 317, s.v.

22 See Maršić 2000, pp. 79-80; Maršić 1997, pp. 118-119.

23 Alföldy 1969, p. 317, s.v.

24 At the international symposium *Natales grate numeras?* (Zadar, 7-8 April 2017), research on all darlings and wards (*delicati* and *alumni*) from Roman Dalmatia (A. Kurilić, *Alumni/-ae* and *delicati/-ae* in Roman Dalmatia) was presented, and which should be published in the proceedings of that symposium, so here I shall not delve into a deeper analysis of their presence in the province.

25 Besides *delicati*, other, similar terms were used, such as, e.g., *deliciae*; see, e.g., Rawson 2005, p. 261 (who translated these terms as "delights" or "little darlings").

već potvrđen na većem broju spomenika u rimskoj Dalmaciji,²⁴ obično se tumači kao lijepi dječak ili djevojčica robovskog statusa koje su odrasli gospodari držali u svojoj blizini kao mezimce i kao ukras, za zabavu i igru, a nerijetko za seksualno zadovoljstvo.²⁵ Iako epigrafski spomenici i u Dalmaciji obično svjedoče da su tim izrazom označavana djeca,²⁶ poznato je i nekoliko na kojima su tako nazivani i mladići u dvadesetim godinama, poput Ursina iz Miraca. Tako je, primjerice, na spomeniku iz Salone, kako se čini, također možda spomenut jedan 25-godišnji delikat,²⁷ dok je na spomeniku iz Baške Vode (*CIL* 3, 1903 (+ p. 1499)) komemoriran 24-godišnji *Valerius* kojeg su njegovi gospodari (ili, radije, patroni) tretirali poput sina (*Valerio delicato quam ut filio*).²⁸ S područja Epetija, iz Drage, potječe nadgrobni spomenik koji je svojoj dvadesetogodišnjoj delikati postavila *Vibia Lione*,²⁹ iz Zadra potječe nadgrobni spomenik 19-godišnje delikate Isidore,³⁰ a s nepoznatog nalazišta u Dalmaciji potječe epitaf delikate Fortunate koja je imala 18 godina.³¹ Kako se može vidjeti, komemoracije odraslim ljubimcima nisu rijetke i u njih se lijepo uklapa i Ursin iz Miraca.

Njega je komemorirao Saufej Valent, a naknadno se pridružio i Saufej Valentin. Nažalost, nije moguće

indicate that this expression denoted children,²⁶ several are known on which it designated young men in their twenties, like Ursinus from Mirca. Thus, for example, a monument from Salona - as it seems - also possibly mentions a 25 year-old *delicatus*,²⁷ while a monument from Baška Voda (*CIL* 3, 1903 (+ p. 1499)) commemorates 24 year-old Valerius, whom his masters (or, rather, patrons) treated like a son (*Valerio delicato quam ut filio*).²⁸ A gravestone from Draga in Epetium territory was set up by Vibia Lione to her twenty year-old *delicata* set up,²⁹ a gravestone from Zadar mentions a 19 year-old *delicata* Isidora,³⁰ while an epitaph from an unidentified site in Dalmatia mentions a *delicata* named Fortunata who was 18 years of age.³¹ As can be seen, the commemoration of adult darlings was not rare and Ursinus from Mirca nicely fits into this practice.

He was commemorated by Saufeijs Valens, who was subsequently joined by Saufeijs Valentinus. Unfortunately, it is impossible to ascertain the relationship between these two individuals, but one may expect that they were members of the same family, and not just of the Saufeijs *familia*, perhaps father and son or two brothers. The gentilicium Saufeijs was not particularly common in Dalmatia, and according to G. Alföldy, it was only widespread there during the early Principate, and even then only among persons of Italic origin.³² Out of the total of eight monuments which he recorded, only three are from the territory of the island of Brač, and Saufeijs Valentinus is mentioned

24 Na međunarodnom skupu *Natales grate numeras?* (Zadar, 7.-8. travnja 2017.) predstavljeno je istraživanje o svim miljenicima i gojencima (*delicati* i *alumni*) iz rimske Dalmacije (A. Kurilić, *Alumni/-ae* and *delicati/-ae* in Roman Dalmatia) koje bi trebalo biti i objavljeno u zborniku radova s navedenog skupa, pa se stoga ovdje neće ulaziti u dublju analizu njihove prisutnosti u ovoj provinciji.

25 Uz naziv *delicati* koriste se i drugi slični, poput npr. *deliciae*; vidi npr. Rawson 2005, str. 261 (koja te nazive prevodi kao "delights" ili "little darlings").

26 V. npr. Salona, *CIL* 3, 2411 (= *CIL* 3, 8633) (3 godine); Zadar, *AE* 1992, 1383 = *AE* 2010, 1231 (4 godine); Salona, *CIL* 3, 2130 (+ p. 2135) (4 godine); Omiš, *CIL* 3, 1905 (+ p. 1499) (9 godina); Baška Voda, *CIL* 3, 1899 (+ p. 1499) (11 godina); itd.

27 *CIL* 3, 14749. Spomenik je oštećen, pa postoji i prijedlog čitanja njegove dobi kao 25 dana (tako predlažu i urednici *CIL*-a te epigrafska *on-line* baza podataka EDCS-32700308), dok Zidek (2012, str. 50, br. 27) smatra da se tu ipak radi o navođenju dobi u godinama.

28 Dodatnu zanimljivost čini to da se na spomeniku javlja još jedna komemoratorica, *C(laudius) Vendemia*, koja žali za svojim mužem Valerijem, koji može biti kako sam *delicatus* tako i njegov komemorator (*V(alerius?) Maximus*), o čemu će više biti riječi u radu A. Kurilić (vidi ovdje bilj. 24); vidi Zidek 2012, str. 45, br. 12.

29 *CIL* 3, 12816.

30 *CIL* 3, 10004 (+ p. 2328.¹⁵, 2328.¹⁶⁹).

31 *CIL* 3, 6429 = *CIL* 3, 8478.

26 See, e.g., Salona, *CIL* 3, 2411 (= *CIL* 3, 8633) (3 years old); Zadar, *AE* 1992, 1383 = *AE* 2010, 1231 (4 years old); Salona, *CIL* 3, 2130 (+ p. 2135) (4 years old), Omiš, *CIL* 3, 1905 (+ p. 1499) (9 years old); Baška Voda, *CIL* 3, 1899 (+ p. 1499) (11 years old); etc.

27 *CIL* 3, 14749. The monument is damaged, so there have been suggestions to interpret the age as 25 days (this was proposed by the editors of *CIL* and the online epigraphic database EDCS-32700308), while Zidek (2012, p. 50, no. 27) believed that this was nonetheless a case of specifying the age in years.

28 The monument is additionally interesting in that it contains mention of another commemorator, *C(laudius) Vendemia*, grieving for her husband Valerius, who may have either been a *delicatus* himself and also his commemorator (*V(alerius?) Maximus*), on which more shall be said in the work by A. Kurilić (see note 24 herein); see Zidek 2012, p. 45, no. 12.

29 *CIL* 3, 12816.

30 *CIL* 3, 10004 (+ p. 2328.¹⁵, 2328.¹⁶⁹).

31 *CIL* 3, 6429 = *CIL* 3, 8478.

32 Alföldy 1969, p. 118, s.v. A search of online epigraphic databases has shown that until the discovery of this stele from Mirca, the number of confirmed monuments with this name had not changed in the least.

ustanoviti prirodu odnosa između njih dvojice, no očekivati je da su bili članovi iste obitelji, a ne samo familije Saufejâ, možda otac i sin ili dva brata. Gentilno ime *Saufei*us nije osobito često u Dalmaciji i prema G. Alföldyju bilo bi ondje rasprostranjeno samo tijekom ranog principata, i to samo kod Italika.³² Od ukupno osam spomenika koje on bilježi, čak tri su s područja otoka Brača, a na čak dva od njih imenovan je *Saufei*us *Valentin*us,³³ pa se čini opravdanim zaključiti da su Saufej Valent i Saufej Valentin s ove stele iz Miraca potomci jedne te iste familije koja već duže vrijeme živi na otoku. Nažalost, njihova *cognomina* *Valens* i *Valentin*us nisu od osobite pomoći kako bi se na osnovi njih moglo još ponešto zaključiti o ovoj dvojici komemoratora,³⁴ osim onoga što se već moglo zaključiti na osnovi same imenske formule i distribucije gentilnog imena, a to je da su slobodni građani čija obitelj živi na području sjeverozapadnog dijela otoka Brača već više generacija i tradicionalno koristi ime *Valentin*us.

Nažalost, ni za jedan od dotična tri spomenika ne znamo točno mjesto nalaza, pošto je jedan, onaj iz crkve sv. Ilije, nađen u sekundarnom položaju (uzidan u crkvu), dok za druga dva nije navedeno točno mjesto nalaza. Za oba ova natpisa u *CIL*-u se lakonski bilježi *ad S. Ioannem*,³⁵ dakle, "kod Sv. Ivana", ali bez ikakve pobliže topografske lokacije. G. Alföldy za oba navodi da su iz Supetra, ali bez argumenata,³⁶ slično kao i *EDH* (br. HD061073 i HD061075), gdje se, međutim, smještaju u Sutivan. U arheološkoj karti otoka Brača natpisi nisu pobliže kartografski locirani, no ondje se očito smatra da se oznaka *ad S. Ioannem* odnosi na neku od crkava posvećenih sv. Ivanu.³⁷ S obzirom na njihovu geografsku distribuciju na otoku

by name on two of them,³³ so it would appear justified to conclude that Saufei

us Valens and Saufei

us Valentinus on this stele from Mirca were descendants of one and the same *familia* which had lived on the island for a considerable time. Unfortunately, their cognomina Valens and Valentinus are not particularly helpful as a basis from which to conclude anything more about these two commemorators,³⁴ except that which may already be concluded on the basis of their naming formulas themselves and the distribution of their gentilicium, and this is that they were free citizens whose family had lived on the north-western part of the island of Brač for several generations and had traditionally used the name Valentinus.

Unfortunately, the exact finding place is not known for any of these three monuments, as the one from the Church of St. Elias was found in a secondary position (built into the church's wall), while the find site of the other two has never been specified. For both of these inscriptions, the *CIL* provides the laconic notation *ad S. Ioannem*,³⁵ thus, "at St. John's", but without any more precise topographic location. Alföldy stated that both were from Supetar, but without any backing arguments,³⁶ just as in the *EDH* (nos. HD061073 and HD061075), in which, however, they are placed in Sutivan. On the archaeological map of the island of Brač, the inscriptions are not cartographically specified with any precision, but there the designation *ad S. Ioannem* is apparently deemed one of the churches dedicated to St. John.³⁷ Given their geographic distribution on the island of Brač,³⁸ the church with this titular saint closest to Mirca would

32 Alföldy 1969, str. 118, s.v. Pretraga epigrafskih *online* baza podataka pokazala je da se, sve do pronalaska ove stele iz Miraca, broj potvrda spomenika s ovim imenom nije nimalo promijenio.

33 *CIL* 3, 10112 i *CIL* 3, 10115; treći brački spomenik na kojem je potvrđeno ovo gentilno ime je *CIL* 3, 13291 (uzidan u istočni zid apside crkve sv. Ilije, sjeverozapadno od Donjeg Humca kod Nerežišća; usp. Stančić *et al.* 2004, br. SP 31.04, str. 152).

34 Naime, oba imena posvuda su vrlo česta, uključujući i Dalmaciju, i to kako kroz rani, tako i kroz kasni principat, iako je Valentin nešto češće prisutan tijekom kasnog principata; vidi Alföldy 1969, str. 318-320, ss.vv.

35 *CIL* 3, p. 1647, ad nos. 10112 i 10115.

36 Alföldy 1969, str. 118, s.v. Saufei

us. Ostaje nejasno što ga je nagnalo na to da pomišlja na Supetar, pošto ondje nema crkve s tim titularom; vidi Barbarić, Ursić 2015, str. 64-65.

37 Stančić *et al.* 2004, OM 63.00 (= *CIL* 3, 10112) i OM 64.00 (= *CIL* 3, 10115).

33 *CIL* 3, 10112 and *CIL* 3, 10115; the third monument from Brač which this gentilicium has been confirmed is *CIL* 3, 13291 (built into the eastern wall of the apse in the Church of St. Elias, north-west of Donji Humac near Nerežišće; cf. Stančić *et al.* 2004, no. SP 31.04, p. 152).

34 Both names were quite common everywhere, including Dalmatia, throughout the early and also late Principate, even though Valentinus was somewhat more prevalent during the late Principate; see Alföldy 1969, pp. 318-320, ss.vv.

35 *CIL* 3, p. 1647, ad nos. 10112 and 10115.

36 Alföldy 1969, p. 118, s.v. Saufei

us. It remains unclear as to what prompted him to think of Supetar, since there are no churches there with this titular saint; see Barbarić-Ursić 2015, pp. 64-65.

37 Stančić *et al.* 2004, OM 63.00 (= *CIL* 3, 10112) and OM 64.00 (= *CIL* 3, 10115).

38 Barbarić, Ursić 2015, the map on p. 66 and the unmapped churches: p. 46 (small Church of St. John in Dol), 48 (cemetery Church of St. John the Baptist in Bol), 50 (Church of St. John the Baptist in Nerežišće) and 58 (Church of St. John the Baptist in Osibina Cove in Milna).

Braču,³⁸ Mircima najbliže crkve tog titulara bile bi u Sutivanu te nešto udaljenijim Postirima, koje su obje nastale na mjestu starijih, starokršćanskih crkava; do-
duše, crkva sv. Ivana Krstitelja u Postirima župna je crkva, za razliku od one u Sutivanu (koja je posvećena Uznesenju Marijinu),³⁹ no u tome ne bi trebalo tražiti neke indicije za određivanje mjesta iz kojeg potječu dotični natpisi. Ovdje, međutim, valja podsjetiti na to da sastavljači *CIL*-a podatak o mjestu nalaza prenose ne samo iz rukopisâ nego i iz časopisa *Ephemeris epigraphica*,⁴⁰ gdje su ova dva natpisa prikazana nakon jednoga za koji se navodi da se nalazio “u Sv. Ivanu u oružarnici g. Jerolima Capogrossa” (a *S. Giovanni della Brazza nell’armeria del Sig. Girolamo de Capogrosso*),⁴¹ odnosno, u njegovoj palači u Sutivanu, gdje je J. Capogrosso naslijedio zemlje s majčine strane,⁴² što jasno svjedoči da se Sutivan znao nazivati *San Giovanni* (Sveti Ivan), pa bi se onda na osnovi toga, kao i redovite prakse kako u *Ephemeris epigraphica* tako i u *CIL*-u grupiranja natpisa s obzirom na to odakle potječu, možda smjelo pretpostaviti da se lokacijska oznaka Sv. Ivan za natpise koji spominju Saufeja Valentina također odnosi na mjesto - Sutivan, a ne na crkvu tog titulara. No tek će ili ponovni nalazak tih natpisa ili neki drugi novi nalazi moći pomoći oko određivanja njihova mjesta nalaska (bilo primarnog bilo sekundarnog).

Unatoč tomu, može se zaključiti da sva tri otprije poznata bračka natpisa koji spominju Saufeje potječu s područja ne previše udaljenih od Miraca, tako da se time sužava prostor na kojemu treba tražiti njihov posjed, i to upravo u širem arealu sjeverozapadnog dijela otoka Brača, između Sutivana, Miraca i Postira, a u unutrašnjosti sežući prema Nerežišćima. S područja

be the one in Sutivan and the somewhat more distant Postira, both of which were built on the sites of older, Early Christian churches; to be sure, the Church of St. John the Baptist in Postira is a parish church, as opposed to the parish church in Sutivan (which is dedicated to the Assumption of Mary),³⁹ but this does not mean one should seek indications here for pinpointing the site whence the inscriptions in question originated. However, it would be worthwhile recalling that the compilers of the *CIL* cited the data on the find site not only from manuscripts but also from the journal *Ephemeris epigraphica*,⁴⁰ in which these two inscriptions are shown after one described as located “in St. John’s in the armoury of Mr Girolamo de Capogrosso” (a *S. Giovanni della Brazza nell’armeria del Sig. Girolamo de Capogrosso*),⁴¹ i.e., in his palace in Sutivan, where Capogrosso inherited land from his mother’s side of the family,⁴² which clearly testifies to the fact that Sutivan was sometimes called *San Giovanni* (Saint John), so on this basis, in line with the regular practice in both *Ephemeris epigraphica* and in the *CIL* of grouping inscriptions based on where they originated, it could be assumed that the location designation of St. John for the inscriptions mentioning Saufeius Valentinus also referred to the settlement of Sutivan, and not the church with this titular saint. But only either the rediscovery of these inscriptions or some new finds would help determine their finding places (either primary or secondary).

Despite this, it may be concluded that all three of the known Brač inscriptions which mention the Saufei came from areas not far from Mirca, thereby narrowing the area in which their estate should be sought to precisely the wider north-western part of the island of Brač, between Sutivan, Mirca and Postira, and in the interior toward Nerežišće. Besides this stele and the grave, no other Roman finds are known from the

38 Barbarić, Ursić 2015, karta na str. 66 te nekartirane crkve: str. 46 (crkva sv. Ivana u Dolu), 48 (grobjanska crkva sv. Ivana Krstitelja u Bolu), 50 (crkva sv. Ivana Krstitelja u Nerežišćima) i 58 (crkva sv. Ivana Krstitelja u uvali Osibina u Milni).

39 Barbarić, Ursić 2015, str. 42-43 (Postira) i 63-64 (Sutivan); usp. i Stančić *et al.* 2004, str. 134, OM 16.00 (Postira) i 169, SU 6.00 (Sutivan).

40 Mommsen 1881, str. 119-120, br. 406-407 (= *CIL* 3, 10112 i 10115); ondje stoji da natpisi prema Ljubavcu potječu iz mjesta koje se zove Brarghia (*Brarghiae GLIVB.*), što nisam uspjela povezati ni sa jednim suvremenim toponimom; lako je moguće da se tu radi o pogrešci u prijenosu imena otoka Brača, pri čemu je u rukopisu možda stajalo *Brazzia* (slično misli i doc. dr. sc. Nikola Vuletić sa Sveučilišta u Zadru, kojemu zahvaljujem na kratkoj, ali plodonosnoj raspravi o ovom toponimu).

41 Mommsen 1881, str. 119, br. 405 (= *CIL* 3, 10111).

42 O palači, kao i o Capogrossovu kolekcionarstvu, vidi Bezić-Božanić 1996, str. 393 i dalje, osobito 395-397.

39 Barbarić, Ursić 2015, pp. 42-43 (Postira) and 63-64 (Sutivan); cf. also Stančić *et al.* 2004, p. 134, OM 16.00 (Postira) and 169, SU 6.00 (Sutivan).

40 Mommsen 1881, pp. 119-120, no. 406-407 (= *CIL* 3, 10112 and 10115); there it states that the inscriptions, according to Ljubavac, came from place called Brarghia (*Brarghiae GLIVB.*), which I have been unable to connect with any contemporary toponym; it may very well be that this was an error in conveying the name of the island of Brač, wherein *Brazzia* may have been written in the manuscript (a similar view is shared by Nikola Vuletić Ph.D. from the University of Zadar, whom I would like to thank for a brief but fruitful conversation on this toponym).

41 Mommsen 1881, p. 119, no. 405 (= *CIL* 3, 10111).

42 On the palace, and Capogrosso’s collecting activities, see Bezić-Božanić 1996, p. 393 ff, esp. 395-397.

Miraca, osim ove stele i groba, nisu poznati drugi rimskodobni ostatci,⁴³ za razliku od ostalih spomenutih lokacija s kojih su poznati značajniji (kasno)antički nalazi.⁴⁴ Nalaz iz Miraca sigurno neće ostati usamljen, jer indicira postojanje posjeda u vlasništvu Saufeja ili čak ruralnog naselja. Nadati se da će buduća istraživanja to uspjeti dokazati, jednako kao i da će možda omogućiti preciznije odrediti odnos među potvrđama ove familije na svim otočkim lokacijama na kojima se javljaju njihovi natpisi.

Mirca area,⁴³ as opposed to the other aforementioned locations from which are known important (Late) Antique finds.⁴⁴ The find from Mirca will certainly not remain alone, because there are indications of the existence of an estate owned by the Saufeii or even a rural settlement. It is to be hoped that future research will succeed in proving this, and that it may perhaps enable the more precise determination of the relationship between the members of this *familia* at all of the island locations at which their inscriptions appeared.

-
- 43 Sustavna i detaljna arheološka rekognosciranja nisu registrirala nikakve arheološke nalaze na području Miraca (Stančić *et al.* 1999; Stančić *et al.* 2004), unatoč povoljnim životnim uvjetima na tom području zbog kojih je bilo očekivano da će se otkriti neki ostatci, a što sad dodatno osnažuju nalazi ove stele i groba. Osim toga, i toponim Mirca ukazuje na arheološki potencijalno zanimljiv lokalitet; naime, ime se povezuje s latinskom riječju za zid - *murus* (Mirca = deminutiv od *mir* < lat. *murus*; vidi Skok 1950, str. 175; usp. Šimunović 1972, str. 117), a koja se često nalazi kao osnova toponimima područja s antičkim ostacima, o čemu lijepo svjedoče npr. kasnoantički lokalitet Mirje na Braču (Stančić *et al.* 1999; Stančić *et al.* 2004, nalazište OM 12.00) ili kod Grohota na Šolti (Šimunović 1987, str. 150) i drugi; općenito v. Skračić 1995, str. 141; usp. Šimunović 1987, str. 150, 152.
- 44 Sutivan: osim već spomenute starokršćanske crkve poznat je i natpis *CIL* 3, 10111 (Stančić *et al.* 2004, SU 60.00 i SU 60.01); Postira: u mjestu je istražena već spomenuta starokršćanska crkva (Stančić *et al.* 2004, OM 16.00); Donji Humac kod Nerežišća: osim ulomaka skulpture uzidanih u mjestu (Stančić *et al.* 2004, SP 57.00 i SP 58.00) te natpisa uzidanih u crkvu sv. Ilije (SP 31.02-31.04) nedaleko od koje je i rimski mauzolej (SP 31.01), ostatci iz rimskog doba nalaze se i na položaju Sv. Jadre (Stančić *et al.* 2004, SP 51.01 i SP 51.02), kao i na više nešto udaljenijih položaja, kao što su Ježe, Bunje, Trišćenik (Stančić *et al.* 2004, SP 4.00, 5.00-6.00, 9.00-9.01) i drugdje, što svjedoči o vrlo gustoj naseljenosti ove zone u rimsko doba.

-
- 43 Systematic and detailed archaeological surveys have not registered any archaeological finds in the Mirca area (Stančić *et al.* 1999; Stančić *et al.* 2004), despite favourable living conditions there, which fuelled expectations that some remains would be found there – now reinforced by the discovery of this stele and the grave. Additionally, the toponym Mirca points to a potentially archeologically interesting site; for the name has been linked to the Latin word for wall, *murus* (Mirca = diminutive of *mir* < Lat. *murus*; see Skok 1950, p. 175; cf. Šimunović 1972, p. 117), and which is often found as the basis for toponyms of areas with ancient remains, nicely demonstrated, for example, by the Late Antique site Mirje on Brač (Stančić *et al.* 1999; Stančić *et al.* 2004, site OM 12.00) or at Grohote on the island of Šolta (Šimunović 1987, p. 150) and others; in general see Skračić 1995, p. 141; cf. Šimunović 1987, pp. 150, 152.
- 44 Sutivan: besides the already mentioned Early Christian church, also known is the inscription *CIL* 3, 10111 (Stančić *et al.* 2004, SU 60.00 and SU 60.01); Postira: the already mentioned Early Christian church in the settlement was researched (Stančić *et al.* 2004, OM 16.00); Donji Humac at Nerežišće: besides the sculptural fragment built into walls in the settlement (Stančić *et al.* 2004, SP 57.00 and SP 58.00) and the inscription built into the wall of the Church of St. Elias (SP 31.02-31.04) not far from a Roman mausoleum (SP 31.01), Roman-era remains are also located at the Sveti Jadre site (Stančić *et al.* 2004, SP 51.01 and SP 51.02), and at several more distant positions, such as Ježe, Bunje, Trišćenik (Stančić *et al.* 2004, SP 4.00, 5.00-6.00, 9.00-9.01) and elsewhere, which testify to how densely settled this zone was in the Roman era.

KRATICE / ABBREVIATIONS

<i>AE</i>	<i>Année épigraphique</i> . Paris, Presses universitaires.
<i>CIL</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum</i> . Berlin, Accademia litterarum regia Borussica.
<i>EDCS</i>	<i>Epigraphik-Datenbank Clauss / Slaby</i> (http://db.edcs.eu/epigr/epi_en.php).
<i>EDH</i>	<i>Epigraphic Database Heidelberg</i> < http://edh-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/edh/inschrift/HD004074 > (konzultirano / last update 17. 07. 2017.)
<i>ILLug</i>	Anna et Jaro Šašel, <i>Inscriptiones latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMXL et MCMLX repertae et editae sunt</i> (Situla 5, Ljubljana, 1963); <i>Inscriptiones latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMLX et MCMLXX repertae et editae sunt</i> (Situla 19, Ljubljana, 1978); <i>Inscriptiones latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMII et MCMXL repertae et editae sunt</i> (Situla 25, Ljubljana, 1986).

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alföldy 1969 G. Alföldy, *Die Personennamen in der römischen Provinz Dalmatien*, Heidelberg 1969.
- Barbarić, Ursić 2015 V. Barbarić, L. Ursić, *Sakralna baština otoka Brača*. Kulturno-turistički vodič, Split, s.a. [2015].
- Bezić-Božanić 1996 N. Bezić-Božanić, *Doprinos obitelji Kavanjin i Capogrosso dalmatinskom baroku*, Dani Hvarškoga kazališta: Grada i rasprave o hrvatskoj književnosti i kazalištu 22, Split 1996, 393-400.
- Bodel 2015 J. Bodel, *Inscriptions and Literacy*, The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy, C. Bruun, J. Edmondson (eds.), New York, Oxford University Press, New York 2015, 745-763.
- Borhy 2000 L. Borhy, *Aeternae Quietis Perpetuae Securitati: Ein Sarkophagfund aus Brigetio*, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 130, Bonn 2000, 253-256.
- Cambi 2005 N. Cambi, *Kiparstvo rimske Dalmacije*, Split 2005.
- Cagnat 1914 R. Cagnat, *Cours d'Épigraphie Latine*, Paris 1914, četvrto (obnovljeno i dopunjeno) izdanje.
- Didolić 1957 P. Didolić, *Historijski brački kamenolomi*, Brački zbornik 3, Split 1957, 98-106.
- Ditsch 2009 S. Ditsch, *Dis Manibus. Die römischen Grabdenkmäler aus der Pfalz*, doktorska disertacija (rukopis), Rupert-Karls-Universität Heidelberg, Impflingen 2009.
- Donelli et al. 2012 I. Donelli, M. Matijaca, I. Paduan, *Ancient quarries on the Eastern Adriatic coast with specific reference to the Island of Brač (Croatia)*, Interdisciplinary Studies on Ancient Stone, Proceedings of the IX Association for the Study of Marbles and Other Stones in Antiquity, Tarragona 2009., A. Gutiérrez García M., Pilar Lapuente Mercadal & I. Rodà de Llanza (eds.), Tarragona 2012, 636-640.
- Edmondson 2015 J. Edmondson, *Inscribing Roman Texts: Officinae, Layout, and Carving Techniques*, The Oxford Handbook of Roman Epigraphy, New York: Oxford University Press Christer Bruun - Jonathan Edmondson (eds.), New York 2015, 111-130.
- Erlikhman et al. 2017 G. Erlikhman, L. Strother, I. Barzakov, G. P. Caplovitz, *On the Legibility of Mirror-Reflected and Rotated Text*, Symmetry 9(3), 28, Basel 2017, doi:10.3390/sym9030028
- Gregori 1997 G. L. Gregori, *Alcune iscrizioni imperiali, senatorie ed equestri nell'Antiquarium Comunale del Celio*, Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik 116, Bonn 1997, 161-175.
- Gross, Bornstein 2009 C. G. Gross, M. H. Bornstein, *Left and Right in Science and Art*, in: Charles G. Gross, *A Hole in the Head. More Tales in the History of Neuroscience*, Cambridge - London 2009, 131-159.
- Hübner 1885 A. Hübner, *Exempla scripturae epigraphicae latinae a Caesaris dictoris morte ad aetatem Iustiniani*, Berlin 1885.
- Kamen: Brač: Jadrankamen 2002 Kamen: Brač: Jadrankamen, S. Vrandečić (ed.), Pučišća: Jadrankamen 2002.

- Keppie 2001 L. Keppie, *Understanding Latin Inscriptions*, Frome - London 2001 (first published 1991 by B. T. Batsford Ltd).
- Kurilić 2006 A. Kurilić, *Vladajući sloj Aserije: magistrati i dobročinitelji, te njihove familije i obitelji*, Asseria 4, Zadar 2006, 7-72.
- Lassère 2005 J.-M. Lassère, *Manuel d'épigraphie romaine*, vols. I-II, Paris 2005.
- Marinković, Miliša 2015 V. Marinković, M. Miliša, *Marmore lavdata Brattia: katalog izložbe (svibanj - lipanj 2015, Galerija, Muzej grada Splita) / Marmore lavdata Brattia: exhibition catalogue (May - June 2015, Gallery, The City Museum of Split)*, ASMOSIA XI, Split: Muzej grada Splita 2015.
- Maršić 1997 D. Maršić, *Novi nadgrobni natpisi s jugoistočne salonitanske nekropole*, Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru 35(22), 1995/1996, Zadar 1997, 101-126.
- Maršić 2000 D. Maršić, *Nekoliko bilješki o steli Svetonija Jonija (CIL 3, 6427, 10106)*, Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru 38(25), 1999, Zadar 2000, 67-84.
- Mommsen 1881 T. Mommsen, *Additamenta secunda ad Corporis volumen III*, Ephemeris epigraphica 4, Roma 1881, 3-191.
- Nigoević, Domančić 2010 J. Nigoević, F. Domančić, *Mirca*, Mirca: Grad Supetar - Župa pohoda BDM, Mirca, Turistička zajednica grada 2010.
- Parica 2012 M. Parica, *Nekoliko primjera lučkih instalacija antičkih kamenoloma na dalmatinskim otocima*, Histria Antiqua 21, Pula 2012, 345-353.
- Rawson 2005 B. Rawson, *Children and Childhood in Roman Italy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2005.
- Salomies 1987 O. Salomies, *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namengebung*, Helsinki 1987 (Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae, 82).
- Skok 1950 P. Skok, *Slavenstvo i romanstvo na jadranskim otocima. Toponomastička istraživanja*, Zagreb 1950.
- Skračić 1995 V. Skračić, *Imena mjesta i otoka Murtera*, Folia onomastica croatica 4, Zagreb 1995, 127-142.
- Stančić et al. 1999 Z. Stančić, N. Vujnović, B. Kirigin, S. Čače, T. Podobnikar, J. Burmaz, *The Archaeological Heritage of the Island of Brač, Croatia*, BAR international series 803, Oxford 1999.
- Stančić et al. 2004 Z. Stančić, N. Vujnović, B. Kirigin, S. Čače, T. Podobnikar, J. Burmaz, *Arheološka baština otoka Brača*, Brački zbornik 21, Supetar 2004, 16-238.
- Šimunović 1972 P. Šimunović, *Toponimija otoka Brača*, Supetar 1972.
- Šimunović 1987 P. Šimunović, *Pristup jezičnoj i onomastičkoj problematici otoka Šolte*, Rasprave Zavoda za jezik 13, Zagreb 1987, 147-161.
- Šimunović 2014 P. Šimunović, *Brač. Krajolici i spomenici*, R. Barilla (ed.), Dračevica - Žun 2014.
- Zidek 2012 N.-C. Zidek, *Delicati und deliciae. Versuch einer Begriffsbestimmung*, magistarski rad (rukopis), Universität Wien, Wien 2012.