

Dino Demicheli

Perditum et repertum: sarkofag đakona Flavija Julija (ad CIL III 2654)
Perditum et repertum: the sarcophagus of Deacon Flavius Julius
(ad CIL III 2654)

Dino Demicheli
HR 10000 Zagreb
Filozofski fakultet
Odsjek za arheologiju
I. Lučića 3
ddemiche@ffzg.hr

UDK: 904:726.829 (497.5 Split) "03"
Izvorni znanstveni članak
Primljeno: 2. 3. 2009.
Prihvaćeno: 14. 4. 2009.

Dio sarkofaga koji je pronađen prilikom sanacije podnice kora splitske katedrale, nekoć je bio dio natpisne zbirke Dmine Papalića, a do današnjih se dana smatrao izgubljenim. Od sarkofaga koji je imao dva natpisa, ostao je sačuvan samo ulomak prednje lijeve stranice s dijelom natpisa. Zna se da je sarkofag s prednjim natpisom nastao najkasnije godine 358. i da je nekoć bio postavljen u Saloni, a za života su ga postavili đakon Flavije Julije i žena mu Aurelija Januarija. Rad analizira onomastičke i jezične karakteristike natpisa, odnosno odlike vulgarnog latiniteta kasnoantičke Salone.

Ključne riječi: kasna antika, Dalmacija, Salona, Marulić, Papalić, salonitanska crkva, Flavius, Aurelius, vulgarni latinitet, pausatio, prijetnje na natpisima

Dino Demicheli
Croatia 10000 Zagreb
Faculty of Arts and Letters
Archaeology Department
I. Lučića 3
ddemiche@ffzg.hr

UDK: 904:726.829 (497.5 Split) "03"
Original scientific paper
Received: 2 March 2009
Accepted: 14 April 2009

The part of a sarcophagus discovered during the renovation of the floor of the choir section in Split's cathedral was formerly part of the inscription collection of Dmine Papalić, and until recently it was considered lost. Of the sarcophagus, which bore two inscriptions, only a fragment of the front left side has been preserved with a portion of its inscription. What is known is that the sarcophagus with the frontal inscription emerged not later than 358, and that it was formerly installed in Salona, and that it was commissioned by Deacon Flavius Julius and his wife Aurelia Januarina during his lifetime. This paper analyzes the onomastic and linguistic characteristics of the inscription, i.e. the forms of Vulgar Latin in Salona during Late Antiquity.

Key words: Late Antiquity, Dalmatia, Salona, Marulić, Papalić, Salona Church, Flavius, Aurelius, Vulgar Latin, pausatio, threats on inscriptions

Godine 2001. obavljena je sanacija pločnika kora katedrale sv. Duje u Splitu koji se zbog slijeganja bio raspucao. Kor je početkom 17. st. bio sagrađen zaslugom splitskoga nadbiskupa Markantuna de Dominisa koji je dao napraviti zasebnu građevinu radi manjka prostora unutar Dioklecijanova mauzoleja. Pri gradnji kora, kako je to i inače običaj, korišteni su spoliji, u ovom slučaju dijelovi antičke i srednjovjekovne arhitekture. To je potvrđeno arheološkim sondiranjem koje je obavljeno prilikom sanacije. Pronađen je antički zid te nekoliko antičkih kamenih ulomaka, među kojima je bio i dio kasnoantičkog sarkofaga s natpisom.* Rezultati su istraživanja i konzervatorsko-restauratorskih zahvata, kao i spomenuti ulomak kasnoantičkog sarkofaga objavljeni,¹ no u objavi materijala samom natpisu nije posvećena veća pozornost; to je bio poticaj da se nešto više napiše o njemu. Od ostalih nalaza valjalo bi izdvojiti grobnicu splitskog nadbiskupa Sforze Ponzonija (Pončuna) koja je pronađena tri godine prije ovog ulomka sarkofaga.²

Prilikom pisanja ovog rada utvrđeno je da je natpis već objavljen u zbirci natpisa *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*,³ na osnovi koje je poznato kako je izgledao čitav tekst natpisa. No, već se u vrijeme njezina tiskanja nije znalo gdje se natpis nalazi, pa se Mommsen pozivao na kodekse i tiskana djela u kojima je navođen. Marko Marulić prvi je zabilježio ovaj natpis, a svi kasniji autori citirali su isti izvor, tj. kodeks s Marulićevim djelom.⁴ To djelo, odnosno epigrafski traktat nazvan *In epigrammata priscorum commentarius* (*Tumač uz natpise starih*) sadrži 141 natpis, od kojih jedan dio otpada na domaće, odnosno salonitanske natpise. Svaki je od natpisa popraćen komentarom, od kojih su neki samo realni komentari, neki samo moralistički, a neki filološki; no najčešće se radi o kombinaciji tih triju pristupa epigrafskoj građi.⁵ Djelo još nije objavljeno u cijelosti, no upravo je dio o salonitanskim natpisima, poznat pod naslovom *Inscriptiones Latinae antiquae Salonis repertae*, za tisak bio priredio Šime Ljubić.⁶ U njemu je navedeno i komentirano 27 natpisa koji su se dijelom nalazili u "muzeju" velikoga splitskog humanista i Marulićeva osobnog prijatelja Dmine Papalića, a neke je

In 2001, the choir section of the Cathedral of St. Dominus in Split was renovated, because it had cracked due to subsidence. It had been constructed in the early seventeenth century thanks to the Archbishop of Split, Marco Antonio (Markantun) de Dominis, who commissioned the construction of a separate building due to the shortage of space inside Diocletian's Mausoleum. During construction of the choir, as was customary, spolia were used, in this case parts of Roman-era and medieval architecture. This was confirmed by archaeological test digs which were conducted during the aforementioned renovation. A wall and several stone fragments from Antiquity were found, among which there was a sarcophagus with inscription from Late Antiquity.* The results of research and conservation/restoration works, as well as the aforementioned sarcophagus fragment from Late Antiquity, were published,¹ but no particular attention was accorded to the actual inscription, a fact that prompted this author to write something more about it. Among the remaining finds, worth particular attention is the tomb of the Split Archbishop Sforza Ponzoni (Pončun) which was discovered three years prior to this sarcophagus fragment.²

During the writing of this paper, it was ascertained that the inscription had already been published in the inscription collection *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*,³ which presents the appearance of the entire text of the inscription. However, already at the time of its printing, the location of the actual inscription was not known, so Mommsen cited the codices and printed works in which it appears. Marko Marulić was the first to record this inscription, and all later authors cited this same source, i.e. the codex with Marulić's works.⁴ This work, the epigraphic tract called *In epigrammata priscorum commentarius* contains 141 inscriptions, of which a part consists of domestic inscriptions from Salona. Each of the inscriptions is accompanied by commentary, wherein some inscriptions are only accompanied by actual commentary, while others have only moralist or psychological commentary, but most feature a combination of these three approaches to epigraphic materials.⁵ The work is no longer fully in print, but precisely this portion on the Salona inscriptions, known under the title *Inscriptiones*

* Ovom prilikom zahvaljujem dr. sc. Radoslavu Bužančiću koji mi je ukazao na ovaj spomenik

1 Nikšić 2002, str. 263-307; Nikšić 2003, str. 139-162.

2 Oreb 1999, str. 87-98.

3 CIL III 2654 (=8652).

4 Rukopis iz kojeg su citirani Marulićevi natpisi kod starijih autora je iz Vatikanske knjižnice (cod. Vat. 5249, f. 1-15), odnosno iz njegova prijepisa koji je napravio Ivan Lučić, a nalazi se u Marciani u Veneciji (Lat. Class. XIV. Cod. 112.99.3). Lučić je potom skupio sve natpise podrijetlom iz Dalmacije koji su bili objavljeni po dotadašnjim najpoznatijim europskim natpisnim zbirkama i objavio ih kao dodatak svome djelu *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae*. Tako donosi i natpise Papalićeve zbirke iz spomenutog vatikanskog rukopisa Marulićeva djela (Lučić 1673).

5 Stepanić 2007, str. 241.

6 Ljubić 1876; osim ovog djela, do unatrag desetak godina napisano je i nekoliko rasprava o Marulićevoj zbirci salonitanskih natpisa, usp: Šrepol 1901, str. 154-220; Šegvić 1901, str. 1-8; Marin 1977, str. 205-215; Marin 1978, str. 251-257; Marin 1994, str. 88-89.

* I would like to take this opportunity to thank Radoslav Bužančić, Ph.D., for pointing out this monument to me.

1 Nikšić 2002, pp. 263-307; Nikšić 2003, pp. 139-162.

2 Oreb 1999, pp. 87-98

3 CIL III 2654 (=8652)

4 The manuscript from which Marulić's inscriptions are cited by older writers is from the Vatican Library (cod. Vat. 5249, f. 1-15), or a transcript thereof done by Ivan Lučić, located in the Marciana in Venice (Lat. Class. XIV. Cod. 112.99.3). Lučić then collected all inscriptions originally from Dalmatia which had been published in the best known European inscription codices until then and published them as an appendix to his work *De regno Dalmatiae et Croatiae*. Thus he also cited the inscriptions from Papalić's collection from the aforementioned Vatican manuscript of Marulić's work (Lučić 1673).

5 Stepanić 2007, p. 241.



Slika 1.
(foto: D. Demicheli)

Figure 1.
(photo: D. Demicheli)

od njih Marulić vidio *in situ* u Saloni.⁷ U novije je doba pronađen još jedan Marulićev rukopis, za koji je utvrđeno da se radi o najstarijem poznatom prijepisu djela *In epigrammata priscorum commentarius*, a iz kojeg saznajemo da je broj salonitanskih natpisa bio 29, a ne 27, koliko ih je bilo poznato iz drugih prijepisa.⁸ Od natpisa koji su zapisani kod Marulića, u Arheološkom se muzeju u Splitu čuva samo njih pet,⁹ dok je većina izgubljena ili otuđena, a za neke je pak utvrđeno da su lažni ili izmišljeni.¹⁰ Tako se jedan od otuđenih natpisa, koji je vjerojatno i najznačajniji natpis iz Papalićeve zbirke, danas čuva u Padovi, a onamo je dospio sredinom 16. st. iz Venecije, u koju se donosio kamen iz Salone za gradnju tamošnjih građevina.¹¹ Marulić, kao i većina ranijih epigrafičara, odnosno

Latinae antiquae Saloniis repertae, was prepared for publication by Šime Ljubić.⁶ In it, 27 inscriptions are cited and commented; these were partially held in the “museum” of the great humanist of Split and Marulić’s personal friend, Dmine Papalić, and Marulić saw some of them *in situ* in Salona.⁷ In more recent years, another manuscript by Marulić has been found, and it has been proven to be the oldest known transcript of the work *In epigrammata priscorum commentarius*. From this, we learn that the number of Salona inscriptions was 29, not 27, the number known based on other transcriptions.⁸ Among the inscriptions recorded by Marulić, only five are held in the Archaeological Museum in Split,⁹ while most have been lost or taken, and some have even been proven forgeries or fabrications.¹⁰ Thus, one of the appropriated inscriptions, which was probably the most important inscription in Papalić’s collection, is today held in Padua, and it made its way there in the mid-sixteenth century via Venice, whence stone from Salona was transported for use in the construction of local buildings.¹¹ Marulić, like most earlier epigraphers and compilers of inscriptions, did not transcribe all inscriptions directly from the original, rather he found some of them in the manuscripts of other collectors and transcribers of Classical inscriptions. In this fashion, forgeries were doubtlessly included in his collection, of which Marulić could not even have been aware.¹² Theodor Mommsen, when analyzing such sources and compiling them for *CIL*, indicated that many of Marulić’s inscriptions are not backed by documentation, and he suspected that some of them were fabricated by Marulić himself (*fortasse quaedam ab ipso Marulo ficta*), for it is possible that, like many humanists, he could not resist the temptation to envision what was missing from the ancient heritage.¹³ Namely, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, epigraphic forgeries were commonplace, and they were not generally made for some kind of financial gain, nor to mislead readers, but rather with the intention of illuminating the image of an idealized, but still insufficiently known Antiquity.¹⁴ Mommsen, nonetheless praising Marulić’s work when considering the Salona inscriptions from the Papalić Museum (*museum Papalini*), believed

7 Kao npr. CIL III 1979; usp. Lučin 2008, str. 104.

8 Novaković 1997, str. 7; usp. Stepanić 2007, str. 240-241; Lučin 2009, str. 102. Dva natpisa kojih nema u Ljubića su CIL III 2035 i 2249, a na informaciji o kojim se točno natpisima radi, zahvaljujem mr. sc. Bratislavu Lučinu koji će čitavo djelo prirediti za tisak.

9 CIL III 1935, 1961, 1979, 2096, 2551; usp. Marin 1994, str. 88; Marin 1977, str. 214.

10 CIL III *130-136, odnosno kod Marulića natpisi br. 1, 14, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26.

11 CIL III 1933; Bulić 1910, str. 103-105, T. XIX; Fisković 1952, str. 197-206.

6 Ljubić 1876; besides this work, up to the last roughly ten years, several discussions of Marulić’s collection of Salona inscriptions have been written, cf. Šrepel 1901, pp. 154-220; Šegvić 1901, pp. 1-8; Marin 1977, pp. 205-215; Marin 1978, pp. 251-257; Idem 1994, pp. 88-89.

7 Such as, for example, CIL III 1979; cf. Lučin 2009, p. 104.

8 Novaković 1997, p. 7; cf. Stepanić 2007, pp. 240-241; Lučin 2009, p. 102. Two inscriptions not found in Ljubić’s work are CIL III 2035 and 2249; I would like to thank Bratislav Lučin, who prepared the entire work for publication, for the information on the exact inscriptions in question.

9 CIL III 1935, 1961, 1979, 2096, 2551; cf. Marin 1994, p. 88; Marin 1977, p. 214.

10 CIL III *130-136, i.e. in Marulić’s work, inscriptions no. 1, 14, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26.

11 CIL III 1933; Bulić 1910, p. 103-105, P. XIX; Fisković 1952, pp. 197-206.

12 Lučin 1998, p. 48.

13 CIL III, XXIX; Novaković 1997, p. 9; Lučin 1998, p. 48.

14 Novaković 1997, p. 9.

sastavljača zbirki natpisa, nije sve natpise prepisivao izravno s izvornika, već je neke od njih pronašao u rukopisima drugih sakupljača i prepisivača antičkih natpisa. Na takav su način bez sumnje u njegovu zbirku ušle i krivotvorine, kojih sam Marulić nije ni morao biti svjestan.¹² Theodor Mommsen, analizirajući takve izvore i priređujući ih za *CIL*, govori da za mnoge Marulićeve natpise ne postoji dokumentarna potvrda, a za neke pretpostavlja da ih je sam Marulić izmislio (*fortasse quaedam ab ipso Marulo ficta*), jer je moguće da, kao mnogi humanisti, nije mogao odoljeti porivu da izmisli ono što je nedostajalo antičkoj baštini.¹³ Naime, u 15. i 16. st. epigrafske su krivotvorine bile uobičajena pojava, i uglavnom nisu nastajale iz želje za nekakvim materijalnim dobitkom, a niti u nakani obmanjivanja čitalaca, nego iz želje da se rasvijetli slika idealizirane, no tada još uvijek nedovoljno poznate antike.¹⁴ Ipak, hvaleći Marulićev rad na mjestu gdje govori o salonitanskim natpisima iz Papalićeva muzeja (*museum Papalini*), Mommsen smatra da je vjerno opisao i donio natpise iako nije pazio na raspored redaka natpisa i nije donio najreprezentativnije primjere.¹⁵ Osim toga, čini se da je Marulić, vođen duhom antike, namjerno iz svoje zbirke izostavio kršćanske natpise, usredotočivši se samo na one poganske. Ipak, spomenuo je jedan natpis iz kršćanskog razdoblja, i to upravo ovaj natpis, koji je u komentaru popratio napomenom kako je "očito da je u to doba u Saloni bilo kršćana".¹⁶ No nema sumnje da je Maruliću kršćanska baština Salone bila dobro poznata, u prvom redu preko štovanja salonitanskih mučenika sv. Duje i sv. Staša, a potom i iz djela Tome Arhiđakona *Historia Salonitana*.¹⁷

Kako je iz objave vidljivo, sarkofag je imao dva natpisa, jedan na prednjoj strani, a prema grafičkom uređenju natpisa u *CIL*-u drugi je bio na lijevoj bočnoj strani. Nije poznato je li Papalić u svome "muzeju" imao čitav sarkofag s poklopcem ili samo njegove fragmente. Kako bilo, sarkofag je u nekom trenutku bio razbijen, slučajno ili namjerno, a njegov je barem jedan dio upotrijebljen kao građevni materijal. Kažemo barem jedan dio, jer je moguće da su i ostali dijelovi sarkofaga negdje bili postavljeni. Naime, s obzirom da stranice sarkofaga čine relativno tanke i ravne ploče i da je i dio s ovim natpisom bio ugrađen u pod, vrlo je vjerojatno da su svi dijelovi sarkofaga bili ugrađeni, no nije nužno da se radi o podu iste građevine u kojoj je natpis pronađen. Natpis se danas čuva u hodniku pred ulazom u riznicu katedrale sv. Duje u Splitu, gdje je izložen s još nekoliko ulomaka koji su otkriveni istom prilikom.

Pronađeni je dio, kako je spomenuto, pripadao prednjoj lijevoj stranici sarkofaga izrađenog od vapnenca (dimenzije: 85 x 63 x 10,5 cm; veličina slova 3,5 - 4 cm.) Po rubovima ploče vide se tragovi dlijeta kojim je poravnata kamena površina radi prilagodbe za novu namjenu. Natpisno je polje bilo omeđeno

that he faithfully described and cited inscriptions, even though he did not pay scrupulous attention to the order of lines in inscriptions and did not provide the most illustrative examples.¹⁵ Additionally, it would appear that Marulić, guided by the spirit of Antiquity, intentionally left Christian inscriptions out of his collection, concentrating only on pagan examples. Even so, he did mention one inscription from the Christian era, and it was this very inscription which he accompanied with the comment that "it is obvious that there were Christians in Salona at the time".¹⁶ But there is no doubt that Marulić was quite familiar with Salona's Christian heritage, primarily through veneration of the Salona martyrs Sts. Dominus and Anastasius, and then through the work by Thomas the Archdeacon, *Historia Salonitana*.¹⁷

As apparent from the publication, the sarcophagus bore two inscriptions, one on the front, while according to the graphic layout of the inscription in *CIL*, the other was on the left lateral side. It is not known as to whether Papalić had the entire sarcophagus with its lid in his "museum", or whether it was fragment. Regardless, at some point the sarcophagus was broken, either accidentally or purposely, and at least one part of it was used as construction material. At least one part, because it is possible that the remaining parts of the sarcophagus were placed somewhere. Given that the sides of a sarcophagus consist of relatively thin and straight slabs and that this part was incorporated into a floor, it is very possible that all parts of the sarcophagus were similarly incorporated, although not necessarily on the floor of the same building as the one in which this piece was found. The inscription is today held in the corridor in front of the entrance to the vault of the Cathedral of St. Dominus in Split, where it is exhibited with several other fragments discovered on the same occasion.

As noted above, the discovered part belonged to the front left side of the limestone sarcophagus (dimensions: 85 x 63 x 10.5 cm; size of letters 3.5-4 cm). Traces of the chisel used to smooth the stone's surface to adapt it for its new use are visible on the edges of the slab. The inscription field was bordered by moulding (*cymatium rectum*) which framed the decoration called *tabula ansata*, but only the left ansa is visible, i.e. the triangular handle and the left portion of the frame. Within the ansa, there is a luxuriously rendered shallow relief depicting a six-leaf rosette from which a flower extends, bordered by two garlands. Above the ansa there is a relief portrayal of a grass blades which entwine into a stylized palmette at the top, while below there is a dolphin with mouth open. At this point the monument is damaged, so it cannot be said with certainty as to whether or not this is a motif of a dolphin devouring a polyp, which is a relatively frequent motif on Christian sarcophagi. The actual motif emerged much earlier, but the Christians adopted it and bequeathed it with a new meaning in

12 Lučin 1998, str. 48.

13 CIL III, XXIX; Novaković 1997, str. 9; Lučin 1998, str. 48.

14 Novaković 1997, str. 9.

15 CIL III, 274.

16 Kod Marulića je to natpis br. 8.

17 Lučin 2008, str. 108-109.

15 CIL III, 274.

16 In Marulić's work, this is inscription no. 8.

17 Lučin 2009, pp. 108-109.

profilacijom (*cymatium rectum*) koju omeđuje ukras zvan *tabula ansata*, a vidljiva je samo lijeva ansa, odnosno trokutasta drška, te lijevi dio okvira. Unutar anse izrađen je raskošno ukrašen plići reljef koji prikazuje šesterolisnu rozetu iz koje izlazi cvijet, a omeđena je dvama vijencima. Iznad anse je reljefni prikaz vladi koje se pri vrhu umataju i predstavljaju stiliziranu palmetu, dok je ispod nje prikazan dupin otvorenih usta. Na tom je mjestu spomenik oštećen, pa ne možemo sa sigurnošću potvrditi radi li se o motivu dupina koji proždire polipa, što je relativno čest motiv na kršćanskim sarkofazima. Taj je motiv nastao mnogo prije, no kršćani su ga prihvatili i dali mu nov smisao u skladu sa svojim vjerovanjima, pa bi mogao simbolizirati Krista Spasitelja.¹⁸ Na dnu je natpisnog polja uklesan listić, a prema stilizaciji sarkofaga iz *CIL*-a jedan se listić nalazio iza riječi *Salon(itanae)*, no moguće je da se radi o istome, jer u *CIL*-u ovaj nije naznačen.

Natpis je bio uklesan u devet redaka, a sačuvani dio glasi:

FL IVLIVS Z
AVREL IA
IVX EIVS H
GVM SIBI
SI QVIS POS
SATIONEM
GVM APE
FERIT AECL
GENTI LIBR

Prema *CIL*-u, natpis na prednjoj stranici glasi:

Fl(avius) Iulius z[aconus] et/ Aurel(ia) la[nuaria con]/iux eius h[oc sarcofa]/gum sibi [vibi posuerunt]¹⁹ Si quis pos[t nostram pau]/sationem [hoc sarcofa]/gum ape[rrire voluerit in]/ferit aec(c)[[esiae Salon(itanae) ar]/genti libr[as quinquaginta]

Natpis na bočnoj stranici glasi:

Dep(ositio)/luli/ zaco/nis/¹⁹die/IIII/Nonas/ Novem/bres/¹⁰ Datia/no et /Cerea/le/co(n)s(ulibus)

Prijevod obaju natpisa:

Flavije Julije đakon i žena mu Aurelija Januaria su za života postavili sebi ovaj sarkofag. Ako tko poslije naše smrti bude htio otvoriti ovaj sarkofag, neka odnese salonitanskoj crkvi pedeset libri srebra.
Sahrana Julija đakona na četvrti dan prije novembarskih nona u godini kada su Dacijan i Cereal bili konzuli.

Iz prvog je natpisa vidljivo da su supružnici još za života odredili gdje će im biti posljednje počivalište, a prijeti se kaznom za sve one koji budu htjeli otvoriti sarkofag nakon njihove smrti. Iz drugog natpisa saznajemo datum kada je tijelo Flavija Julija položeno u sarkofag. Prema dataciji navedenoj na natpisu ta se

line with their ideas, so it may symbolize Christ the Saviour.¹⁸ There is a leaflet carved at the bottom of the inscription field, and based on the stylization of the sarcophagus from *CIL*, one leaflet was also located behind the word *Salon(itanae)*, but it may be possible that it was the same one, for this one is not indicated in *CIL*.

The inscription is written in nine lines, and the preserved portion reads:

FL IVLIVS Z
AVREL IA
IVX EIVS H
GVM SIBI
SI QVIS POS
SATIONEM
GVM APE
FERIT AECL
GENTI LIBR

Based on *CIL*, the inscription in the front reads:

Fl(avius) Iulius z[aconus] et/ Aurel(ia) la[nuaria con]/iux eius h[oc sarcofa]/gum sibi [vibi posuerunt]¹⁹ Si quis pos[t nostram pau]/sationem [hoc sarcofa]/gum ape[rrire voluerit in]/ferit aec(c)[[esiae Salon(itanae) ar]/genti libr[as quinquaginta]

On the side:

Dep(ositio)/luli/ zaco/nis/¹⁹die/IIII/Nonas/ Novem/bres/¹⁰ Datia/no et /Cerea/le/co(n)s(ulibus)

Translation of both inscriptions:

Flavius Julius and his wife Aurelia Januaria have placed this sarcophagus to themselves during their lifetime. If anyone should open this sarcophagus after our death, may he take to the Salona church fifty libras of silver.
Interment of Julius the deacon on the fourth day prior to the nones of November in the year when Datianus and Cerealis were consuls.

Based on the first inscription, it is apparent that the spouses determined where their last resting place would be already during their lifetimes, and a fine was also stipulated for anyone who intended to open the sarcophagus after their death. The second indicates when the body of Flavius Julius was interred in the sarcophagus. According to the dating specified in the inscription, this interment occurred on 2 September 358, so the first inscription can be dated to the same year at the very latest. In contrast to pagan grave inscriptions, Christians frequently and readily dated grave inscriptions. This probably resulted from the Christian belief that the *dies depositionis*, the burial day, was also the *dies natalis*, the day of birth.¹⁹ If the sarcophagus was whole in Marulić's time, then no data Aurelia Januaria's death were carved onto it, but this

18 Cambi 1977, str. 93, 94; usp. Delonga 2002, str. 155.

18 Cambi 1977, pp. 93, 94; cf. Delonga 2002, p. 155.

19 Kajanto 1963, p. 11.

sahrana dogodila 2. septembra godine 358.; stoga prvi natpis moramo datirati najkasnije u istu godinu. Za razliku od poganskih nadgrobnih natpisa, kršćani su nadgrobnice natpise često i rado datirali. To najvjerojatnije proizlazi iz kršćanskog shvaćanja da je *dies depositionis*, odnosno dan sahrane ujedno i *dies natalis*, odnosno dan rođenja.¹⁹ Ako je u doba Marulića sarkofag bio čitav, tada na njemu nisu bili uklesani podaci o smrti Aurelije Januarije, no nije isključena ni mogućnost da je već u doba renesanse nedostajao dio sarkofaga koji je nosio natpis o njezinoj sahrani.

Premda su neki autori tretirali riječ *zaconus* kao pokojnikov kognomen *Zaconus* ili *Ziaconus*, smatramo da u donjem tekstu ima dovoljno elemenata da se takvo stajalište posve odbaci.²⁰ Kad bi njegovo ime uistinu glasilo Flavije Julije Zakon, rasprava oko tog imena bila bi kudikamo jasnija i manje komplicirana. Ovako smatramo da se čovjek zvao Flavije Julije i da mu je ime sastavljeno od dva imena koja su po postanku gentiliciji. Na prvi pogled to nije uobičajeno u latinskoj onomastici, pa bi situaciju trebalo malo pojasniti. Kako je to rekao Iro Kajanto, razvoj latinskog imenskog sustava može se shvatiti kao krug: u početku su Rimljani imali samo jedno ime, što je općenito značajka indoeuropskog imenskog obrasca.²¹ Uvođenjem gentilnog imena, individualna su imena reducirana na predimena (*praenomina*), a premda im je broj smanjen (17), i dalje su ostala u uporabi kako bi se potomci (uglavnom muški) jedne obitelji mogli međusobno razlikovati. Uvođenjem kognomena, odnosno nadimka, latinski imenski sustav doživljava svoj najveći razvoj (shema *tria nomina*), no predime gotovo izlazi iz uporabe, jer postaje bespotrebno uz kognomina, čiji je broj bio daleko veći te tako i prikladniji za razlikovanje ljudi općenito. Nakon toga, i gentilicij postupno doživljava sudbinu predimena, pa je ostao samo kognomen. Tako se latinski imenski sustav opet vratio na samo jedno ime (tzv. *single name system*).²² Dakako, sve izrečeno ne može se primijeniti na sva imena u rimskom sustavu, jer se gentilicij i dalje zadržao uglavnom među višim staležom, ali se može reći da je u načelu imenska slika tako izgledala. Ono što bi trebalo napomenuti, jest to da su u republikanskom i ranocarskom razdoblju, bez obzira na višečlani imenski sustav, postojali ljudi s jednim imenom, a to su bili robovi i peregrini.²³

Iako je ime *Flavius* po postanku gentilicij, u razdoblju kasne antike ono uglavnom nije samo ime koje se dobiva rođenjem nego i višim staležom u društvu. Tako *Flavius* u kasnoj antici ne bi trebali više shvaćati kao gentilicij u tradicionalnome smislu, nego kao oznaku društvenog statusa.²⁴ Naime, veliki broj važnih ljudi u razdoblju od Konstantina (čije je gentilno ime *Flavius*) pa sve do 7. st. nosi ovaj gentilicij, a taj se fenomen upravo radi staleža tih ljudi ne može objasniti carskim oslobađanjem

does not exclude the possibility that the part of the sarcophagus bearing the inscription on her interment was already missing during the Renaissance.

Although some scholars have treated the word *zaconus* as the cognomen of the deceased, *Zaconus* or *Ziaconus*, this author believes that there are sufficient elements in the lower text to entirely reject such views.²⁰ Were his name truly Flavius Julius *Zaconus*, the debate around this name would be somewhat more clear and less complicated. As it is, this author believes that the man was named Flavius Julius and that his name was composed of two names which are gentilicians by origin. At first sight, this is not customary in Latin onomastics, so the situation requires some clarification. As stated by Iro Kajanto, the development of the Latin name system can be understood as a circle: in the beginning the Romans had only a single name, which is the general characteristic of the Indo-European name formula.²¹ With the introduction of the gentile name, the individual name was reduced to the forename (*praenomina*), and even though their number was reduced (17), their use continued so that descendants (generally male) could differentiate from one another. With the introduction of the cognomen, an epithet or nickname, the Latin name system experienced its highest development (the *tria nomina* scheme), but soon the praenomen fell into disuse, because it became superfluous due to the cognomen, as their far greater number was more suited to differentiating among people in general. Thereafter, even the gentilician gradually suffered the same fate as the praenomen, so that only the cognomen remained. Thus the Latin name system once more returned to a single name (the so-called single name system).²² To be sure, all of the preceding considerations cannot be applied to all names in the Roman system, for the gentilician persisted generally among the higher classes, but it can be said that in principle this was the appearance of the name situation. It should be noted that during the Republic and Early Empire, regardless of the multi-component name system, there were people with a single name, and these were slaves and peregrines.²³

Even though the name *Flavius* is a gentilician by origin, during Late Antiquity it was not only a name accorded by birth but also by higher social status. Thus *Flavius* in Late Antiquity should no longer be understood as a gentilician in the traditional sense, but rather a designation of social status.²⁴ Namely, a large number of people during the period from Constantine (whose gentile name was *Flavius*) until to the seventh century bore this gentilician, and precisely due to the class of these people, this phenomenon cannot be explained by the imperial liberation of slaves or the

19 Kajanto 1963, str. 11.

20 Npr. Mócsy 1965, str. 218; Alföldy 1969, str. 36, 41.

21 Kajanto 1977, str. 421.

22 Kajanto 1977, str. 421, 422.

23 Kajanto 1977, str. 421, 422.

24 Keenan 1974, str. 302.

20 For example, Mócsy 1965, p. 218; Alföldy 1969, pp. 36, 41.

21 Kajanto 1977, p. 421.

22 Kajanto 1977, pp. 421, 422.

23 Kajanto 1977, pp. 421, 422.

24 Keenan 1974, p. 302.

robova ili dodjelom civiteta barbarima.²⁵ Kako pokazuje studija načinjena na osnovi imenâ *Flavius* i *Aurelius* u Egiptu, ovi su potonji bili u inferiornoj poziciji naspram Flavijâ. Naime, oni koji su nosili to ime bili su visoki državni činovnici, viši gradski vijećnici (*curatores civitatis*), bogati zemljoposjednici, vojnici, veterani i ostali bolje rangirani ljudi u društvu, dok su Aureliji bili zemljoradnici, obrtnici i trgovci.²⁶ Osim toga, dokaz su i sačuvani obrasci ugovora za zajmove koji su unaprijed imali ispisana imena *Flavius* za zajmodavca i *Aurelius* za zajmoprimca. Iza tih su se dvaju gentilicija trebala upisati imena, odnosno kognomina stvarnih osoba, ali na ovim su pronađenim obrascima ona ostala neispisana.²⁷ Naposljetku, čini se da sam naziv *Flavius* nije bio nasljedan (osim među najvišim odličnicima), jer se pokazalo da se djeca vojnika koji su bili *Flavii* često zovu *Aurelii*.²⁸ Kako je to bio slučaj u Egiptu, a i drugdje, osoba koja bi zaslužila ime *Flavius*, odbacila bi gentilicij dobiven rođenjem, koji je u najvećem broju slučajeva bio *Aurelius*.²⁹ Nakon Karakaline odluke o darivanju rimskoga građanskog prava svim slobodnim ljudima Carstva (*Constitutio Antoniniana*) godine 212., golem je broj ljudi počeo nositi ime koje se sastojalo od carskog gentilicija *Aurelius* i njihovog dotadašnjeg imena, koje je došlo na mjesto kognomena kako bi se svi Aureliji uopće mogli međusobno razlikovati. Nakon Karakale, taj se gentilicij dodjeljivao vojnicima koji su iskazali privrženost vladajućoj carskoj dinastiji, kao što je potom bio slučaj s gentilicijem *Valerius* u vrijeme Tetrarhije. Ista se stvar događala i s gentilicijem *Flavius*, koji je došao u uporabu od Konstantina, a njegova je dodjela nastavljena preko nasljednika sve do u bizantsko vrijeme. Za bizantske careve i germanske kraljeve to je ime bilo dio njihove titule, a za germanske vojnike u službi Rimskoga Carstva dokazivalo je rimsko građansko pravo i vojnički status. Svim ostalim ljudima, koji su već kao rimski građani služili u carskoj vojsci ili civilnoj upravi, ime *Flavius* bilo je neka vrsta oznake statusa kojim su se ovi vojnici i službenici razlikovali od većine ljudi koji su i dalje bili Aureliji.³⁰

Ono što do kraja nije dokučeno, jest kako se ta dodjela regulirala. Sigurno je trebalo postojati neko državno tijelo ili odbor koji je odobravao dobivanje carskog imena prilikom stupanja u državnu ili vojnu službu. No, jednom dobiveno ime radi funkcije koja je trajala određeno vrijeme, zadržavano je i nakon prestanka mandata.³¹

conferral of citizenship to barbarians.²⁵ As shown by a study formed on the basis of the names *Flavius* and *Aurelius* in Egypt, the latter were in an inferior position in comparison to *Flavius*. Those who bore this name were high state officials, senior city councillors (*curatores civitatis*), wealthy landowners, soldiers, veterans and other higher-ranking personages in society, while those named *Aurelius* were manual labourers, craftsmen and merchants.²⁶ Additionally, preserved loan contract forms also serve as evidence, for they had the name *Flavius* written in advance for the creditor and *Aurelius* for the debtor. After these two gentilitians, the names or cognomens of the actual persons had to be entered, albeit on the forms that were discovered they were not written out.²⁷ Finally, it would appear that the actual designation *Flavius* was not inherited (except among the very highest notables), for it has been shown that the children of soldiers who were *Flavii* were often called *Aurelii*.²⁸ The case in Egypt, as elsewhere, was that a person who earned the name *Flavius* would reject the gentilitian given at birth, which in most cases was *Aurelius*.²⁹ After Caracalla's decision to grant Roman citizenship to all freemen of the Empire (*Constitutio Antoniniana*) in 212, an enormous number of people began to bear names which consisted of the imperial gentilitian *Aurelius* and their previous names which were placed in the position of the cognomen so that all of the *Aurelii* could be distinguished from one another. After Caracalla, this gentilitian was accorded to soldiers who demonstrated an affinity for the ruling imperial dynasty, which was subsequently the case with the gentilitian *Valerius* during the Tetrarchy. The same occurred with the gentilitian *Flavius*, which came into use with the reign of Constantine, and its conferral continued through successors until the onset of the Byzantine era. For the Byzantine emperors and the Germanic kings, this name was a component of their titles, and for Germanic soldiers serving the Roman Empire, it indicated Roman citizenship and military status. To all other people, who were already serving in the imperial military or civil service as citizens, the name *Flavius* was some form of denotation of the status whereby these soldiers and civil servants were distinguished from the majority of people who were still *Aurelii*.³⁰

What has not been entirely ascertained is how this conferral was regulated. There certainly had to be a state body or committee which approved the conferral of the imperial name during admittance to the civil or military service. However, a name once

25 Salway 1994, str. 137-138.

26 Keenan 1973, str. 52-55; Keenan 1974, str. 301.

27 Keenan 1982, str. 248; usp. Keenan 1974, str. 286-288.

28 Salway 1994, str. 138.

29 Npr. braća *Aurelius Martyrius* i *Aurelius Apphos* postali su *Flavius Martyrius* i *Flavius Apphos*. Zanimljivo je to što je u dokumentu u kojem se spominju kao Aureliji, njihov otac, isluženi vojnik, spomenut kao Flavije. U drugom su dokumentu spomenuti kao Flaviji, što govori o tome da su to ime u međuvremenu zaslužili i dobili, a ne naslijedili; Keenan 1974, str. 297-298.

30 Keenan 1973, str. 51.

31 Keenan 1974, str. 302.

25 Salway 1994, pp. 137-138.

26 Keenan 1973, pp. 52-55; Keenan 1974, p. 301.

27 Keenan 1982, p. 248; cf. Keenan 1974, pp. 286-288.

28 Salway 1994, p. 138.

29 E.g. the brothers *Aurelius Martyrius* and *Aurelius Apphos* became *Flavius Martyrius* and *Flavius Apphos*. It is interesting that the document which mentions them as Aurelii, mentions their father, a decommissioned soldier, as *Flavius*. In another document they are mentioned as Flavii, which indicates that in the meantime they earned and acquired the name, rather than inheriting it; Keenan 1974, pp. 297-298.

30 Keenan 1973, p. 51.

Kako je spomenuto, to su ime nosili ljudi koji su bili bolje pozicionirani u društvu, a u Dalmaciji su osim vojnika nositelji ovog imena bili i ljudi iz gradske uprave i crkvene hijerarhije. Tako među vojnicima nalazimo dva protektora,³² jednog centuriona,³³ jednog veterana i jednog vojnika nepoznatog ranga. U nevojničkoj su upravi od Flavijâ poznati *Flavius Iulius Rufinus Sarmentius, praeses provinciae Dalmatiae*,³⁴ potom *Flavius Fidentius, comes*,³⁵ kao i razni državni službenici.³⁶ Ono što nas posebno zanima su osobe koje su bile dio crkvenog klera, a to su *Flavia Vitalia presbytera*,³⁷ *Flavius Crescentianus diaconus*, koji je, kao i naš *Flavius Iulius*, također bio đakon.

Andras Mocsy je, tumačeći njegovo ime kao Flavije Julije Zakon, zaključio da mu je izvorno ime Julije Zakon samo dopunjeno novim gentilicijem Flavije u nekom životnom razdoblju.³⁸ Nadopuna postojećeg imena novostečenim gentilicijem nije neobična, premda je, konkretno u slučaju imena *Flavius*, praksa bila malo drugačija. Kako je već spomenuto i kako pokazuje kasnoantička prozopografija, bilo je mnogo ljudi koji su zaslužili zamijeniti svoj dotadašnji gentilicij (uglavnom *Aurelius*) novim, *Flavius*.

Uzimajući sve izneseno u obzir, moguće je da se on zvao Aurelije Julije, pa je, primivši novo ime, zamijenio gentilicij *Aurelius s Flavius*. No, ipak smatramo da je ime našega đakona izvorno glasilo samo *Iulius*. Tome u prilog ide i bočni natpis na kojem je oslovljen samo *s Iulius*, čime bismo konačno utvrdili da mu *Iulius* nije bio gentilicij, već kognomen i da je, kao i većina kršćana, imao samo jedno ime koje je po svom podrijetlu bilo kognomen.³⁹ Ime *Iulius* je, suprotno situaciji kada je u prva tri stoljeća bilo vrlo rasprostranjen gentilicij, u razdoblju kršćanstva bilo vrlo popularno kao kognomen i nije moralo nastati samo od istoimenog gentilicija nego i od imena za mjesec, što je također bilo vrlo često u uporabi.⁴⁰ *Iulius* se ipak i dalje održao kao gentilicij, a nekolicina pripadnika obitelji Julijâ iz 4. i 5. st. prema natpisima iz Salone i njezine okolice, potomci su ranijih salonitanskih obitelji.⁴¹ Ime je Julijeve žene bilo Aurelija Januarija, premda je kod Marulića njezino ime pročitano kao *Aurelia Meria*, što je kasnijim intervencijama ispravljeno. Gentilicij *Aurelius* je i u razdoblju kasne antike ostao najviše zastupljeni gentilicij

Perditum et repertum: sarkofag đakona Flavija Julija (ad CIL III 2654)
Perditum et repertum: the sarcophagus of Deacon Flavius Julius...

granted for the sake of a function served for a definite period was retained even after the end of such duties.³¹

As already mentioned, this name was borne by people who had better social positions, and in Dalmatia, besides soldiers this name was borne by those serving in the municipal authorities and church hierarchy. Thus, among the soldiers there are two protectors,³² one centurion,³³ one veteran and one soldier of unknown rank. Among the Flavii in the non-military administration, there were *Flavius Iulius Rufinus Sarmentius, praeses provinciae Dalmatiae*,³⁴ then *Flavius Fidentius, comes*,³⁵ and various civil servants.³⁶ Of particular interest here are persons who were members of the clergy, such as *Flavia Vitalia presbytera*,³⁷ *Flavius Crescentianus diaconus*, who, like our *Flavius Iulius*, was also a deacon.

Andras Mocsy, interpreting his name as Flavius Julius Zaconus, concluded that his name had originally been Julius Zaconus, only supplemented with the new gentilician Flavius at some later point in life.³⁸ Supplementing a name with a newly-acquired gentilician was not uncommon, although in the specific case of the name *Flavius*, the practice was slightly different. As already noted and as the prosopography of Late Antiquity shows, there were many people who earned the right to change their previous gentilician (generally *Aurelius*) into a new one, *Flavius*.

Taking all of this into consideration, it is possible that his name had been Aurelius Julius, so that, when applying his new name, he replaced the gentilician *Aurelius* with *Flavius*. However, this author nonetheless believes that the name of the deacon in question was originally *Iulius*. This is backed by the lateral inscription on which he is referred to simply as *Iulius*, whereby it can finally be established that *Iulius* was not his gentilician, rather his kognomen, and that, as among most Christians, he had only a single name which was a kognomen in terms of its origin.³⁹ The name *Iulius* was, in contrast to the situation when it was a very widespread gentilician in the first three centuries, quite popular during the Christian era as a kognomen, and it was not necessarily derived from the eponymous gentilician, but rather from the name of the month, which was also quite frequently in use.⁴⁰ *Iulius* nonetheless persisted as a gentilician, and several members of the Julius family

32 CIL III 8741, 8742.

33 CIL III 14694.

34 CIL III 1982, 1983, 2771, 8710.

35 CIL III 1987.

36 ILJug 2444, *Fl. Thalassius ex corniculario*; ILJug 2469, *Fl. Marcianus memorialis*; CIL III 14245 *Fl. Serenus ex primicerio*.

37 ILJug 2789.

38 Mocsy 1965, str. 218.

39 Samo za usporedbu, CIL III 9506, bivši prokonzul Afrike, *Paulus Constantius, vir clarissimus*, pokopan je godine 375. u Saloni samo kao *Constantinus*.

40 Kajanto 1963, str. 22; Kajanto 1965, str. 61.

41 Alföldy 1969, str. 32. s. v. *Iulius*.

31 Keenan 1974, p. 302.

32 CIL III 8741, 8742.

33 CIL III 14694.

34 CIL III 1982, 1983, 2771, 8710.

35 CIL III 1987.

36 ILJug 2444, *Fl. Thalassius ex corniculario*; ILJug 2469, *Fl. Marcianus memorialis*; CIL III 14245 *Fl. Serenus ex primicerio*.

37 ILJug 2789.

38 Mocsy 1965, p. 218.

39 Just for the sake of comparison, CIL III 9506, the former consul of Africa, *Paulus Constantius, vir clarissimus*, was buried in Salona in 375 only as *Constantinus*.

40 Kajanto 1963, p. 22; Kajanto 1965, p. 61.

u Dalmaciji.⁴² Kao i *Iulius*, i ime *Ianuarius* pripada skupini tzv. kalendarskih kognomina, a bilo je posvuda rasprostranjeno.⁴³ U Dalmaciji ga najviše ima u razdoblju kasnog principata, dok je u razdoblju dominata prisutan samo u Saloni, i to s tri natpisa.⁴⁴ Iz ranokršćanskog razdoblja Salone poznato je na desetke Flavija i Aurelija, no spomenut ćemo sarkofag koji spominje preminulu djevojčicu Aureliju Julijanu. Zanimljivo je to što se njezin otac zvao Flavije Julije, a majka Aurelija.⁴⁵

Ono što je na natpisu đakona Flavija Julija iznimno upadljivo, jesu vulgarnolatinski oblici pojedinih riječi. Sam naziv titule đakona uklesan je na takav način. Naime, *zaconus* ili *zacon* je riječ koja u svojoj izvornosti glasi *diaconus* ili *diacon*, a, kako je rečeno, označava službu đakona koju je Flavije Julije obnašao u salonitanskoj crkvi. U slučaju kada se dental *d* nađe ispred *i* ili *e*, iza čega slijedi neki vokal, tada *d* postaje spirant, odnosno prelazi u *z*.⁴⁶ Za takvu pojavu, koja se najviše javlja u jeziku kasne antike, imamo nekoliko potvrda i na natpisima.⁴⁷ U rimskoj književnosti upravo među kršćanskim tekstovima nailazimo na takve oblike.⁴⁸ Što se tiče imenice *zaconus*, ona je jedini takav slučaj u Dalmaciji, no isti se oblik javlja na natpisima u Sjevernoj Africi, odnosno u Numidiji (*Aemilius zaconus*),⁴⁹ Mauretaniji (*memoria Victoris zaconi*)⁵⁰ i Prokonzularnoj Africi (*Aemilianus zaconus*)⁵¹ i sve označavaju isto, tj. osobe koje su bile đakoni.

Izraz *hoc sarcophagum* spominje se dvaput, a na oba je mjesta uklesan na isti način. Dvije su stvari ovdje na neki način dvojbene: prva je ta što je riječ *sarcophagus* muškoga roda, pa bi ispravan gramatički oblik bio *hunc sarcophagum*. Druga se odnosi na grčki glas *f* koji se obično na latinski transkribira kao *ph*, ali pisanje slova *f* umjesto *ph* javlja se učestalo od 4. stoljeća.⁵² Još jedna jezična pojava na natpisima koja je rasprostranjena posvuda po Carstvu zove se betacizam, a očituje se u zamjeni glasa *v* glasom *b* kad se *v* nađe između vokala.⁵³ Na natpisu je vidimo u riječi *vibi* koja stoji umjesto *vivi*.

in the fourth and fifth centuries were, according to inscriptions in Salona and its environs, descendants of earlier Salona families.⁴¹ The name of Julius' wife was Aurelia Januaria, although her name was read by Marulić as *Aurelia Meria*, which was corrected in later interventions. The gentilician *Aurelius* remained the most widespread in Dalmatia in Late Antiquity.⁴² Like *Iulius*, *Ianuarius/a* belonged to the group of so-called calendarial cognomens, and it was everywhere widespread.⁴³ In Dalmatia, it was most common during the late Principate, while in the period of the Dominate it was present only in Salona, on three inscriptions.⁴⁴ Dozens of Flavii and Aurelii are known from the Early Christian period in Salona, but a particularly noteworthy case is the sarcophagus which mentions the deceased little girl Aurelia Juliana. It is interesting that her father was named Flavius Julius, and her mother Aurelia.⁴⁵

Something incredibly striking on the inscription of Deacon Flavius Julius is the Vulgar Latin forms of individual words. The very title deacon is engraved in this manner. Namely, *zaconus* or *zacon* is a word which should authentically read *diaconus* or *diacon* and, as stated, it denotes the post of deacon which Flavius held in the Salona church. In cases when the dental *d* is in front of an *i* or *e*, followed by a sonant, then the *d* becomes a fricative, i.e. it transforms to a *z*.⁴⁶ There are several confirmations, in inscriptions among others, of this phenomenon, which mostly appeared in the language of Late Antiquity.⁴⁷ Such forms can be found in Roman literature, precisely among the Christian texts.⁴⁸ As to the noun *zaconus*, this is the only case in Dalmatia, but the same form appeared on inscriptions in Northern Africa, in Numidia (*Aemilius zaconus*),⁴⁹ Mauretania (*memoria Victoris zaconi*)⁵⁰ and Proconsular Africa (*Aemilianus zaconus*)⁵¹ and all mean the same thing, i.e. persons who were deacons.

The expression *hoc sarcophagum* is mentioned twice, and at both places it is engraved in the same fashion. Two things are somewhat dubious here: the first is that the word *sarcophagus* is masculine, so the correct grammatical form would be *hunc sarcophagum*. The other pertains to the Greek phoneme *f* which was generally transcribed in Latin as *ph*, while writing of the letter *f* instead of *ph*

42 Alföldy 1969, str. 47, s.v. *Aurelius*.

43 Kajanto 1965, str. 218, s. v. *Ianuarius*.

44 Alföldy 1969, str. 220, s. v. *Ianuarius*.

45 Egger, Forsch. II, str. 76, 83. Majčin kognomen je nejasan, a prema Eggeru, moguće je da se radi o imenskom dodatku poznatom kao *signum*, a glasio je *Emerius*.

46 Kent 1915, str. 52, § 46.

47 *oze* od *hodie* (CIL VIII 8424); *Zonisius* od *Dyonisius* (CIL III, 3174a ;VIII 7933), *zeta* od *dieta* (CIL VIII, 9433), *zebus* od *diebus* (CIL VI 23646; CIL VIII, 20786 , CIL XIV 1137).

48 Comm. Instr. 2, 26, 1: *Mysterium (ministerium) Christi, zacones, exercite casti*; usp. Väänänen 1981, 53, *zabolus* od *diabolus*.

49 AE 1894, 0025.

50 AE 1969/70, 0737c.

51 AE 1975, 0871.

52 Skok 1915, str. 57; ima i primjera prije 4. st, usp. *filologus*, CIL III 2096; *Dafine* CIL III 1834.

53 *habe, vibi*, CIL III, 14292; *Flabius*, CIL III, 2328; *Octabia*, CIL III 14820; usp. Skok 1915, str. 51.

41 Alföldy 1969, p. 32. s. v. *Iulius*.

42 Alföldy 1969, p. 47, s.v. *Aurelius*.

43 Kajanto 1965, p. 218, s. v. *Ianuarius*.

44 Alföldy 1969, p. 220, s. v. *Ianuarius*.

45 Egger, Forsch. II, pp. 76, 83. The mother's cognomen is unclear, and according to Egger, it is possible that it was name suffix known as a *signum*, and it read *Emerius*.

46 Kent 1915, p. 52, § 46.

47 *Oze* from *hodie* (CIL VIII 8424); *Zonisius* from *Dyonisius* (CIL III, 3174a ;VIII 7933), *zeta* from *dieta* (CIL VIII, 9433), *zebus* from *diebus* (CIL VI 23646; CIL VIII, 20786 , CIL XIV 1137).

48 Comm. Instr. 2, 26, 1: *Mysterium (ministerium) Christi, zacones, exercite casti*; cf. Väänänen 1981, 53, *zabolus* from *diabolus*.

49 AE 1894, 0025.

50 AE 1969/70, 0737c.

51 AE 1975, 0871.

Još je jedna korist od toga što je natpis ponovno pronađen, a ta je što se može vidjeti i riječ koja je od samog početka krivo prepisana, pa je kao takva ušla u sva ostala izdanja. Radi se o glagolu *inferre* koji je uklesan u obliku *inferit* umjesto *inferat*.⁵⁴ Moguće je da je sam Marulić, prepisujući natpis, zamijetio pogrešku i automatski je prepravio u ispravan oblik koji je naposljetku dospio u *CIL*.

U predzadnjem retku vidimo početak riječi za crkvu koja je uklesana kao *aeclesiae*, što ukazuje na to da se u kasnoj antici, ali i ranije, na području Salone dvoglas *-ae* počeo čitati kao *-e* i da ni sami klesari nisu bili sigurni kad se riječ piše sa *-ae*, a kada sa *-e*. O tome svjedoče mnogi natpisi na kojima se prati rasprostranjenost vulgarnog latinитета.⁵⁵ Osim s dvoglasom, riječ je uklesana s jednim *c*.

Spomen se crkve (*ecclesia*) na natpisima Salone javlja tridesetak puta, a uz ovaj je na još nekoliko natpisa spomenuta s pridjevom "salonitanska" (*ecclesia Salonitana*).⁵⁶

Ovaj natpis ima sve odlike klasičnih kasnoantičkih natpisa na sarkofazima: osim podataka tko je sahranjen, tu je i prijetnja mogućim oskvrniteljima groba sastavljena na sličan način kao i ostale. Naime, prijetnja se očituje u novčanoj kazni za onu osobu koja na bilo koji način bude htjela otvoriti sarkofag i tako poremetiti vječni pokoj preminulih. Zanimljiva je riječ kojom su sastavljači natpisa izrazili smrt, a glasi *pausatío*, koja inače znači stanka, odnosno pauza. Nadalje, *pausatío* označava i mir, pokoj općenito, ali i pokoj u smrti, što je potvrđeno u kasnoantičkim i srednjovjekovnim tekstovima.⁵⁷ Ta riječ nije često upotrebljavana na ranokršćanskim natpisima, štoviše, poznata su nam samo dva primjera, i to oba iz Salone. Osim na ovom natpisu, *pausatío* se u istom kontekstu spominje na sarkofagu koji su za života postavili supružnici Septimija Sabina i Gracin Euzebije,⁵⁸ no uobičajeni je izraz *post obitum*.⁵⁹

Preostalo je još spomenuti podatak o kazni za oskvrnjivanje groba, što je vrlo uobičajena pojava na ranokršćanskim spomenicima Salone. Već smo spomenuli da je kazna za oskvrnuće ovog sarkofaga bila 50 libara srebra, što je iznosilo nešto više od 16 kg i, u usporedbi s ostalim iznosima izraženim u srebru, ovaj je jedan od najvećih. Osim toga, pokazalo se da većina natpisa s prijetnjama za oskvrnuće spominju salonitansku crkvu kao instituciju kojoj se morala platiti ta svota.⁶⁰

appeared frequently since the fourth century.⁵² Another linguistic phenomenon which was widespread throughout the Empire is called betacism, and it is manifested in the shift of the *v* sound to *b* when the *v* is between sonants.⁵³ In the inscription, it can be seen in the word *vibi* which is written instead of *vivi*.

There is another benefit in the rediscovery of the inscription, and that is that one can also see the word which had been incorrectly transcribed from the very beginning, so it entered all later editions as such. This is the verb *inferre*, which was engraved in the form *inferit* instead of *inferat*.⁵⁴ It is possible that Marulić himself, in transcribing the inscription, may have observed the error and automatically corrected it to the proper form as it ultimately appeared in *CIL*.

In the penultimate line, there is the beginning of the word for church which is engraved as *aeclesiae*, indicating that in the Salona area during Late Antiquity and earlier, the diphthong *ae* began to be read as *e* and that not even the engravers were certain when a word was written with *ae*, and when with *e*. Many inscriptions on which the extent of Vulgar Latin can be observed testify to this.⁵⁵ Besides the diphthong, the word is engraved with a single *c*.

The word for church (*ecclesia*) appears roughly thirty times on Salona's inscriptions, and along with this one it is mentioned with the adjective "Salona" (*ecclesia Salonitana*)⁵⁶ on several others.

This inscription has all of the features of the classic inscriptions on sarcophagi in Late Antiquity: besides data on who is buried, there is also a threat to potential grave desecrators composed in a manner similar to others. The threat takes the form of a monetary fine for that person who dares to open the sarcophagus and disturb the eternal rest of the deceased. Interesting is the word used to express death by the writers, *pausatío*, which otherwise means a pause. Furthermore, *pausatío* also denotes peace, rest in general, and also repose in death, which has been confirmed in Late Classical and medieval texts.⁵⁷ This word was not often used in Early Christian inscriptions. Moreover, it is known in only two examples, both from Salona. Besides this inscription, *pausatío* is mentioned in the same context on a sarcophagus placed during their lifetimes by the spouses Septimius Sabinus and Gratin Eusebia,⁵⁸ although the customary expression is *post obitum*.⁵⁹

All that remains is a consideration of the fine for grave desecration, which was very common on the Early Christian monuments of Salona. It has already been noted that the fine

54 Na još se jednom natpisu iz Salone javlja ista pogreška, ILJug 2373.

55 *aeclesiae*, Bulić 1904, str. 3357A + 1296 A; *cum aea*, CIL III 9770; *aeam arcam*, CIL III 2017, *baenemerenti*, Bulić 1911, str. 62, 4527 A; *Saecundinus*, CIL III 2328; *Paetronio* 14321²⁶; *diae*, CIL III 9538; usp. Skok 1915, str. 14, 22-23.

56 CIL III 9535, 12872, 13124, 13142, 13147, 13174, 14905.

57 TLL, vol. X. 1, 858, s. v. *pausatío*.

58 ILJug 2366.

59 CIL III, 2115, 9632, 13964, ILJug 2369, 2372, 2467, 2511.

60 Zugravu 2007, str. 284-286; Caillet 1988, str. 35-38.

52 Skok 1915, p. 57; there are also examples prior to the fourth century, cf. *filologus*, CIL III 2096; *Dafine* CIL III 1834.

53 *habe, vibi*, CIL III, 14292; *Flabius*, CIL III, 2328; *Octabia*, CIL III 14820; cf. Skok 1915, p. 51.

54 The same error appears on another inscription from Salona, ILJug 2373.

55 *Aeclesiae*, Bulić 1904, p. 3357A + 1296 A; *cum aea*, CIL III 9770; *aeam arcam*, CIL III 2017, *baenemerenti*, Bulić 1911, p. 62, 4527 A; *Saecundinus*, CIL III 2328; *Paetronio* 14321²⁶; *diae*, CIL III 9538; cf. Skok 1915, p. 14, 22-23.

56 CIL III 9535, 12872, 13124, 13142, 13147, 13174, 14905.

57 TLL, vol. X. 1, 858, s. v. *pausatío*.

58 ILJug 2366.

59 CIL III, 2115, 9632, 13964, ILJug 2369, 2372, 2467, 2511.

Ponovno otkriće ovog natpisa pokazalo je nekoliko podataka koji dosad nisu bili poznati stručnoj javnosti; naime, barem djelomično se može vidjeti kako je sarkofag bio ukrašen, što je svakako novi prinos tipologiji salonitanskih sarkofaga. Što se tiče vulgarnog latiniteta, iz sačuvanog se dijela natpisa on može dobro potvrditi, ali i nadopuniti jednom riječju koja dosad nije bila zamijećena kao takva. Sarkofag đakona Flavija Julija dosad je pripadao nemaloj skupini natpisa koji su nekoć zabilježeni, a potom uništeni ili otuđeni, ili su na bilo koji drugi način bili nedostupni za proučavanje. Ipak, katkad se dogodi da oni, dugo vremena skriveni, izrone na svjetlo dana pa opet postanu predmetom proučavanja i provjera, odnosno potvrda onoga što je već napisano i raspravljeno o njima. Također se mogu i ispraviti eventualna pogrešna čitanja ako je natpis kao krivo pročitano dospio u zbirke poput *CIL*-a.⁶¹ Kako je prije rečeno, od 29 salonitanskih natpisa koje je Marulić opisao, sedam su falsifikati, mnogi od njih su izgubljeni, a najmanje je onih koji su preostali do danas: tek njih sedam, od kojih je pet izloženo na počasnome mjestu na ulazu u zgradu Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu.⁶² Stoga se nadamo da će se i ovaj natpis, iako fragmentiran, naći u istom društvu spomenika u kojem je bio prije pet stoljeća i tako krasiti ulaz jednog drugog, ali i dalje splitskog muzeja.

for desecrating this sarcophagus was 50 libras of silver, which was slightly more than 16 kg and, in comparison with the other amounts expressed in silver, is among the highest. Additionally, it has been established that most inscriptions with threats for desecration mention the Salona church as the institution to which the amount must be paid.⁶⁰

The rediscovery of this inscription has illuminated several facts which were thus far unknown to the scholarly public, and they pertain to the fact that it is now possible to at least partially see how the sarcophagus was decorated, which is certainly a new contribution to the typology of the Salona sarcophagus. As to Vulgar Latin, it can be soundly confirmed based on the preserved portion of the inscription, and it was also supplemented with a word which had previously not been noted as such. The sarcophagus of Deacon Flavius Julius had thus far belonged to a not insignificant group of inscriptions which were once recorded, and then destroyed, taken away or in some other manner rendered unavailable for study. Nonetheless, it sometimes happens that they, long concealed, re-emerge in the light of day and once more become subject to study and verification, i.e. a confirmation of what had already been written and discussed about them. It provides an opportunity to correct any possible errors made insofar as they were incorrectly read and as such recorded in collections such as *CIL*.⁶¹ As stated above, out of the 29 Salona inscriptions described by Marulić, seven were forgeries, and many of them were lost, while those that remain to this day are the fewest in number: there are only seven, of which five are exhibited in a place of honour at the entrance to the Archaeological Museum in Split.⁶² Therefore it is the hope of this author that this inscription, although fragmentary, will join those monuments in whose company it was five centuries ago and thus grace the entrance of another museum, albeit one still in Split.

61 Usp. Demicheli 2009, br. 2.

62 Pred kraj pisanja ovog članka saznali smo za još jedan natpis koji je pripadao Papalićevoj zbirci; o njemu će biti riječi u novome radu. Informaciju nam je dao Arsen Duplančić, knjižničar Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu, kojem ovom prigodom najljepše zahvaljujem.

60 Zugravu 2007, pp. 284-286; Caillet 1988, pp. 35-38.

61 cf. Demicheli 2009, no. 2.

62 As this paper was being completed, the author learned of yet another inscription which had belonged to Papalić's collection, and which will be covered in another work. The information was provided by Arsen Duplančić, the librarian of the Archaeological Museum in Split, whom I would like to thank on this occasion.

Kratice / Abbreviations

AE - L'Anée épigraphique

BASD - Bulletino di archeologia e storia dalmata

CIL - Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum

Forsch. Sal. II - R. Egger, Forschungen in Salona II, Wien 1926.

ILJug - Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia repertae et editae sunt

JRS - The Journal of Roman Studies

KB - Kulturna baština

OA - Opuscula Archaeologica

PPUD - Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji

TLL - Thesaurus Linguae Latinae

VAHD - Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku

VAPD - Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku

ZPE - Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik

ŽA - Živa antika

Literatura / Bibliography

Alföldy 1969
G. Alföldy, *Die Personennamen in der römische Provinz Dalmatia*, Heidelberg 1969.

Bulić 1904
F. Bulić, *Iscrizioni trovate nei dintorni del cimitero antico cristiano di Manastirine*, BASD XXVII, Split 1904, 157-166.

Bulić 1910
F. Bulić, *Due importanti lapidi dalmate nel Museo civico del Padova*, BASD XXXIII, Split 1910, 103-105.

Bulić 1911
F. Bulić, *Iscrizioni inedite*, BASD XXXIV, Split 1911.

Caillet 1988
J.-P. Caillet, *L'amende funéraire dans l'épigraphie chrétienne de Salone*, VAHD 81, Split 1988, 33-45.

Cambi 1977
N. Cambi, *Krist i njegova simbolika u likovnoj umjetnosti starokršćanskog perioda u Dalmaciji*, VAHD LXX-LXXI (1968-1969), Split 1977, 57-106.

Delonga 2002
V. Delonga, *Hedonijev epitaf iz Splita - novi izvor za antičku prozopografiju*, u: *Zbornik Tomislava Marasovića*, Split 2002, 154-169.

Demicheli 2009
D. Demicheli, *Natpisi iz "podruma" Dioklecijanove palače*, OA 32 (2008), Zagreb 2009, 145-160.

Fisković 1952
C. Fisković, *Rušenje i raznošenje solinskih spomenika*, VAHD 53, Split 1952, 197-206.

Kajanto 1963
I. Kajanto, *Onomastic studies in the early christian inscriptions of the Rome and Carthage*, Helsinki 1963.

Kajanto 1965
I. Kajanto, *The latin cognomina*, Helsinki 1965.

Kajanto 1977
I. Kajanto, *The emergence of the latin single name system*, u: *Ōnomastique latine*, Paris 1977, 421-430.

Keenan 1973
J. G. Keenan, *The names Flavius and Aurelius as the status designations in the later Roman Egypt (part 1)*, ZPE 11, Köln 1973, 33-63.

Keenan 1974
J. G. Keenan, *The names Flavius and Aurelius as the status designations in the later Roman Egypt (part 2)*, ZPE 13, Köln 1974, 283-304.

Keenan 1983
J. G. Keenan, *An afterthought on names Flavius and Aurelius*, ZPE 53, Köln 1983, 250-255.

Kent 1915
G. Kent, *The Sounds of Latin. A Descriptive and Historical Phonology*, Language 8/3, Washington 1915, 11-216.

Lučić 1673
Ivan Lučić (*Ioannes Lucius*), *Inscriptiones Dalmaticae*, Venetiis 1673.

Lučin 1998
B. Lučin, CIL X, 190*: *Prijedlog za Marulića*, *Colloquia Maruliana VII*, Split 1997, 47-58.

Lučin 2008
B. Lučin, *Salona - slava starine / Salona: gloria dell'antichità*, u: B. Lučin, *Iter Marulianum. Od Splita do Venecije tragovima Marka Marulića*. Roma 2008, 97-108.

Ljubić 1876
M. Marulić, *Inscriptiones Latinae antiquae Salonis repertae a Marco Marulo Spalatensi collectae et illustrate*, Š. Ljubić (ur.) RAD Jazu XXXVI, XXXVII, Zagreb 1876, 82-102.

Marin 1977
E. Marin, *Od antike do Marulića*, ŽA XXVII, Skopje 1977, 205-217.

Marin 1978
E. Marin, *Kasnoantički kontinuitet i renesansa u Dalmaciji (Marulićeva zbirka latinskih natpisa)*, ŽA XXVIII, Skopje 1978, 251-257.

Marin 1994
E. Marin, *Civitas splendida Salona*, u: *Salona Christiana*, Split 1994, 15-104.

Mócsy 1965
A. Mócsy, *Zur Bevölkerung in der Spätantik*, u: G. Alföldy, *Bevölkerung und Gesellschaft der römischen Provinz Dalmatien*, Budapest 1965.

Nikšić 2002
G. Nikšić, *Novi nalazi u koru katedrale sv. Dujma*, KB 31, Split 2002, 139-162.

Nikšić 2003
G. Nikšić, *Kor splitske katedrale*, PPUD 40 (2002-2003), Split 2003, 263-307.

Novaković 1997

D. Novaković, *Dva nepoznata Marulićeva rukopisa u Velikoj Britaniji: Ms. Add. A. 25 u Oxfordskoj Bodleiani i Hunter 334 u sveučilišnoj knjižnici u Glasgowu*, *Colloquia Maruliana* VI, Split 1997, 5-31.

Zugravu 2007

N. Zugravu, *Din nou despre Basilica-Biserică*, *Classica et Christiana* 2, Iași 2007, 249-299.

Oreb 1999

F. Oreb, *Grobnica nadbiskupa Ponzonija u koru splitske katedrale*, KB 30, Split 1999, 87-98.

Salway 1994

B. Salway, *What's in a name? A survey of Roman Onomastic practice from 700 B. C. to 700. A. D.*, JRS 84, Oxford 1994, 124-145.

Skok, 1915.

P. Skok, *Pojave vulgarnog latiniteta na natpisima provincije Dalmacije*, Zagreb 1915.

Šegvić 1901

K. Šegvić, *Marco Marulo Pecinić (1450-1524)*, BASD XXIV, (prilog), Split 1901, 1-8.

Šrepel 1901

M. Šrepel, *O Maruliću*, Rad JAZU 146, Zagreb 1901, 154-220.

Väänänen 1981

V. Väänänen, *Introduction au latin vulgaire*, Paris 1981.

Stepanić 2007

G. Stepanić, *Prvi iza Petrarke: Receptijski i preceptijski putovi Marulićeve zbirke In epigrammata priscorum commentarius*, *Colloquia Maruliana* 16, Split 2007, 239-253.

Zaccaria 1752

F. A. Zaccaria, *Marmora Salonitana in ordinem digesta, ac brevibus observationibus illustrata*, u: D. Farlati, *Illyricum sacrum* vol. 3, Venetiis 1752.