

JOSIP BELAMARIĆ

Arsen Duplančić – čuvar zavičajnog plamena

Arsen Duplančić – guardian of the native flame

Josip Belamarić
Institut za povijest umjetnosti – Centar Cvito Fisković /
Institute of Art History – Cvito Fisković Centre
Kružićeva 7
HR - 21000 Split
josipbelam@gmail.com

UDK: Duplančić, A. 023.4AMS(497.593Split) 7.072.2
001.891:902/904)(497.583Split)
001.891.7:Salona(497.583Split)
(001.891+069.8+069.9)
(341.462.2+7.072.2)
Duplančić, A.341.462.2 A.:Split
Duplančić. A.:012
Duplančić, A. (045)
2-523.3:AMS(497.593Split)
39(497.583Split)

Primljeno / Received: 24. 12. 2023.

Prihvaćeno / Accepted: 10. 1. 2024.

Tekst valorizira razgranat opus Arsena Duplančića, dugogodišnjeg knjižničara Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu. Poentirajući najvažnije teze iz niza knjiga, studija, članaka i izložbenih kataloga, naglašava se versatilnost njegovih interesa i pluridisciplinarnih stručno-znanstvenih metoda kojima je načinio djelo znatnih gabarita u okvirima arheološke i povijesnoumjetničke discipline, odnosno povijesti zavičajne kulture, a pišući karakterističnim stilom, uvijek beskompromisno precizno i sveobuhvatno.

Ključne riječi: *povijest umjetnosti, arheologija, spomenici, Arheološki muzej u Splitu, Split, Salona, Arsen Duplančić.*

This article valorizes the extensive body of work by Arsen Duplančić, a long-time librarian at the Archaeological Museum in Split. By summarising the most important theses from a series of books, studies, articles, and exhibition catalogues, it explores the breadth of his interests and multidisciplinary scholarly approach through which he created a work of considerable scope within the framework of archaeological and art historical disciplines, specifically focusing on the history of local culture. He writes in a characteristic style, always uncompromisingly precise and comprehensive.

Key words: *art history, archaeology, monuments, Archaeological Museum in Split, Split, Salona, Arsen Duplančić.*

Postoji prizor u filmu *Andrej Rubljov*, u režiji Andreja Tarkovskog, koji mi je iznenada pao na pamet nakon što sam za potrebe pisanja ovih nekoliko stranica danima čitao tekstove Arsena Duplančića, *da capo al fine*. Riječ je o sekvenci koja pretihodi čuvenom prizoru lijevanja zvona izvan samostana u Suzdalju. Boriska (sin pokojnog ljevača zvona, koji se prisjeća uputa koje mu je otac dao na samrti, po kojima će se upustiti u gotovo nemoguć pothvat), grozničavo kopa jamu za lijevanje. U jednom času naiđe na korijen koji je najprije tanak pa postaje sve čvršći. On ga čupa, prati mu tok u blatu, a onda podigne pogled i zapanjen ugleda golemu krošnju osamljenog stabla. Nakon četiri desetljeća rada, u kojemu nije bilo besposlenih dana, prateći bezbroj različitih žila svojih interesa, naš slavljenik Arsen Duplančić može dići oči i vidjeti stablo koje je u međuvremenu naraslo, s granama punim plodova, koje se pružaju u svim smjerovima humanističkih disciplina kojima je u međuvremenu sâm postupno ovladao.

Arsen i ja susretali smo se otkad sam ga prvi put sreo u Arheološkom muzeju u Splitu godine 1981., sve do danas kad ga povremeno vidim kada se vrati iz svoga vrta, negdje u drniškom kraju, gdje zadnje tri godine često boravi sa svojom životnom družicom. Sve to vrijeme Arsen je sačuvao izgled mladića jednako zanesenog potragom za korijenima zavičajne baštine. Kada bih jednom jedinom riječju trebao opisati njegov karakter, onda i sada, rekao bih: *dobrota, sušta dobrota*. Dokazao se kao knjižničar i arhivist. Englezi bi rekli: *full stop*. Kao povjesničar svih splitskih i solinskih stvari: *full stop*... Ali, iza svih knjiga i članaka, izložbi i kataloga stoji njegova dobrota, ne samo kao skup moralnih i krjeposnih osobina nego i kao vjera u temeljnu dobrotu društva unutar kojeg djeluje. Sačuvao je duboko poštovanje prema prethodnicima i učiteljima. Nosi i dalje svijeću Francesca Carrare, don Frane Bulića, Mihovila Abramića i njihovih nasljednika u znamenitoj ustanovi, koja je za njegova radnog vijeka, posve prirodno, prolazila svoje uspone i padove, a da ni jedan od događaja iz njezinog svakodnevnog djelovanja nije poljuljao njegovu potpunu lojalnost i uvjerenje da pridonosi kontinuitetu jednog od stupova lokalne i nacionalne kulture. Njegov nevelik ured, recepcija goleme knjižnice koju je iz temelja preuređio, bio je poput oaze u koju ste dolazili ne samo po pametan savjet, po knjigu za koju niste znali, nego iznad svega radi razgovora koji bi vas uvijek podigao malo iznad zemlje po kojoj svaki dan hodamo.

U ovom zborniku se govori o njegovom doprinosu knjižničarstvu i arhivistici, njegovim afinitetima prema etnografiji... Moja zadaća je da se osvrnem na njegov znanstveni rad u okvirima arheološke i povijesnoumjetničke discipline, odnosno povijesti zavičajne kulture. Postoji Duplančićev tekst *Kad sporedno postaje glavno: neki primjeri iz knjižnice Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu* (2012.), koji se rijetko citira, a otkriva nekoliko ključeva kojima možemo pristupiti njegovoj metodi. Jedan se odnosi na ono što je Leibniz zvao *petites perceptions*, pojam koji se odnosi na percepciju koja se javlja ispod razine svijesti, ili urođen senzibilitet koji smatra da je najmanji detalj vrijedan pa-

There is a scene in *Andrei Rublev*, directed by Tarkovsky, that suddenly occurred to me after spending days reading the texts of Arsen Duplančić, in their entirety, for the purpose of writing these pages. This sequence precedes the famous scene of bell casting outside the monastery in Suzdal. Boriska, the son of the late bell caster, feverishly digs a pit for casting, recalling the instructions his father gave him on his deathbed, according to which he will embark on an almost impossible endeavour. As he digs, he finds and pulls out first a thin and then a stronger root, tracing its course in the mud before raising his astonished gaze to the immense canopy of a solitary tree. After four decades of tireless work, during which there were no idle days, and exploration across a myriad of interests, our honouree, Arsen Duplančić can now raise his eyes and see the tree that has grown in the meantime, with branches full of fruits extending into all directions of the humanistic disciplines that he has gradually mastered.

I have known Arsen ever since I first encountered him at the Archaeological Museum in Split in 1981, and our occasional meetings continue to this day. I sometimes see him returning from his garden, somewhere in the Drniš area, where he has spent much of the past three years with his life partner. Throughout this time, Arsen has maintained the demeanour of a young man, equally enthusiastic in his pursuit of local heritage roots. If I were to describe his character in a single word, it would be *kindness—pure kindness*. He has proven himself as a librarian and archivist. The English would say, *full stop*. As a historian of all things Split and Solin, *full stop*... But behind all the books, articles, exhibitions, and catalogues stands his kindness, not only as a collection of moral and virtuous qualities but also as a belief in the fundamental goodness of the society within which he operates. Duplančić holds deep respect for his predecessors and teachers, carrying on the torch of Francesco Carrara, Don Frane Bulić, Mihovil Abramić, and their successors at the illustrious institution, which during his tenure naturally experienced its ups and downs; not a single event from its daily operations shook his complete loyalty and conviction that he contributes to the continuity of one of the pillars of local and national culture. His modest office, the reception area of the vast library, which he redesigned entirely, served as an oasis where you came not only for wise counsel or a book you didn't know about, but above all for a conversation that would always lift you a little above the ground we walk on every day.

This anthology delves into Arsen's contributions to librarianship and archival science, as well as his affinity for ethnography. My task is to examine his scholarly work within the framework of archaeological and art historical disciplines, particularly the history of local culture. One of Duplančić's texts that is rarely cited but provides insight into his methodology is *When the Subsidiary Turns into the Principal: Some Examples from the Library of the Archaeological Museum in Split* (2012). This text unveils several keys through which we can apprise

žnje istraživača, da zaslužuje da ga se smjesti u mrežu unakrsnih referenci, da bi uskrsnuo u novom kontekstu, u kojemu će često dobiti novo, izmijenjeno značenje. Duplančić se pita do koje granice knjižničar treba ići u kataložnoj deskripciji povijesne knjige. U njegovoj praksi nebrojeno puta način kojim obrađuje sadržaj knjige postaje nalik intervjuu! To možda najbolje pokazuje izložba *Doba francuske uprave u Dalmaciji*, koju je priredio 1989. u povodu 200. obljetnice Francuske revolucije.

Knjige imaju svoje biografije. Do nas su došle kroz desetljeća i desetljeća „ovisnosti“ o uzastopnim vlasnicima i vremenima, u kojima su ponekad služile kao katekizam, nekad bile zaboravljene, a nekad ostale čak nerazrezanih stranica. Paradigmatički primjer je izdanje Vitruvija iz 1567. (u knjižnici AMS-a), koje je pripadalo arhitektima Ivanu i Ignaciju Macanoviću, koji su u knjizi nacrtali skicu za pročelje župne crkve u Nerežišćima na Braču (iz četrdesetih godina 18. stoljeća). Tim je nacrtom osnažena atribucija poznatim trogirskim graditeljima. Nakon kratke panorame vlastitih iskustava iz susreta s brojnim knjigama iz knjižnice Arheološkog muzeja, zaključuje da *očito nema sporednih stvari, već je samo pitanje kada će i u kojem kontekstu što postati glavno. Knjižničar starih i rijetkih knjiga morao bi dakle imati 'istraživačku žicu' kako bi iz njih izvukao što više informacija koje će moći ponuditi zainteresiranim čitačima i korisnicima*. Duplančić pritom podcrtava nužnost sporog, pažljivog čitanja kao što glasi jedna od maksima Erwina Panofskog: *Sporo čitanje štedi vrijeme!*

Od prvog članka, koji je objavio još kao student, s nepunih dvadeset godina, nastojao je biti beskompromisno precizan i sistematičan. To potvrđuje serija tekstova kojom je obrađivao probleme provenijencije spomenika koji se čuvaju u Arheološkom muzeju u Splitu, a koji su ih na posve nov način kontekstualizirali. U tim člancima i studijama nastojao je utvrditi podrijetlo niza arheoloških objekata, skulptura, reljefa, sarkofaga i natpisa, od trenutka otkrića i okolnosti njihova pronalaska do dolaska u Muzej. U tu je svrhu detaljno pregledavao inventarne knjige, arhivske dokumente, prepisku muzejskih kustosa i ranijih vlasnika, dakle sve što bi mu omogućilo da utvrdi što jači pedigree kojim će se potvrditi njihov izvorni i stečeni značaj, koji će potvrditi tek cjelovit uvid u kulturni i povijesni kontekst unutar kojega su nastali, otkriveni, interpretirani i prezentirani.

Pedantnost i sveobuhvatnost tog istraživanja omogućili su mu da stvori prave biografije za niz kapitalnih spomenika, biografije u koje je upleo konkretne ljude, mjesta, datume, često s rekonstrukcijom uzbudljivih putovanja – stvarnih i metaforičkih. Sve to podrazumijeva sate istinskog detektivskog rada na praćenju tragova povijesti tih predmeta, tragova raspršenih po arhivima, među listovima onodobnih službenih dopisa, računa, kustoskih zabilješki, objava, među starim fotografijama i otiscima na papiru (tzv. *abklatsch*), u drugim zbirkama i knjižnicama, muzejima i privatnim kolekcijama u zemlji i svijetu, konačno – i među dostupnim digitaliziranim izvorima, upotrebom novih internetskih alata.

his approach. One of these keys is Leibniz's concept of *petites perceptions*, which denotes perception occurring below the level of consciousness or an innate sensitivity that considers even the smallest detail worthy of the researcher's attention, deserving to be placed in a network of cross-references, to be resurrected in a new context, where it often acquires a new modified meaning. Duplančić explores the extent to which a librarian should delve into the catalogue description of a historical book. In his practice, countless times, he approached the content of a book akin to conducting an interview! This methodology is perhaps best demonstrated in the exhibition *The Era of French Administration in Dalmatia*, which he curated in 1989, commemorating the 200th anniversary of the French Revolution.

Books possess their own biographies, having reached us after decades of "dependence" on successive owners and eras. During this journey, they have sometimes served as catechisms, been forgotten, and sometimes even retained uncut pages. A paradigmatic example is the 1567 edition of Vitruvius (housed in the library of AMS), once owned by architects Ivan and Ignacije Macanović. Within its pages, they sketched the façade of the parish church in Nerežišća on the island of Brač (dating back to the 1740s), strengthening the attribution to these renowned builders from Trogir. Following a brief overview of personal experiences encountered while exploring numerous books from the Archaeological Museum's library, Duplančić concludes that *obviously nothing is inherently subsidiary; rather, it's only a matter of when and in what context something will become the principal. A librarian of old and rare books should therefore have a 'researcher's instinct' to extract as much information from them as possible for interested readers and users*. Duplančić emphasises the necessity of slow, careful reading, echoing one of Erwin Panofsky's maxims: *Slow reading saves time!*

From his first article, published while still a student at just under twenty years old, Duplančić strove to be uncompromisingly precise and systematic. This dedication is evident in a series of texts where he tackled the provenance of monuments housed in the Archaeological Museum in Split, which he contextualised in an entirely new way. Through these articles and studies, he aimed to trace the origins of various archaeological objects, including sculptures, reliefs, sarcophagi, and inscriptions, from the moment of their discovery and the circumstances of their finding to their acquisition by the Museum. To achieve this, he meticulously examined inventory books, archival documents, museum curators' correspondence, and records of previous owners. Each piece of information contributes to establishing a stronger pedigree that would confirm their original and acquired significance. Duplančić understood that a comprehensive understanding of the cultural and historical context surrounding these objects—from their creation to their discovery, interpretation, and presentation—was essential in affirming their importance.

Spomenut ćemo samo nekoliko primjera Duplančićeva dalekosežnog istraživanja podrijetla spomenika, uglavnom iz fundusa Arheološkog muzeja, iz kojeg će se shvatiti važnost teme. U članku Četiri skulpture iz Salone i zapisi o njima (2015.) obrađuje arhivske zapise i prve objave vezane uz arheološka istraživanja u Saloni 1805. godine; zatim vijesti o zbirci trogirске obitelji Garagnin i s tim u vezi nabavi spomenika iz Visa; potom dokumente o velikoj mramornoj skulpturi muškarca odjevena u togu u lapidariju Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu i, konačno, o jednom Apolonovom torzu koji je bio predmetom žučne polemike između Francesca Lanze i Francesca Carrare oko prvenstava otkrića – pri čemu će u središte prijepora, koji se razvukao godinama, izbiti teme časti, gorčine, uvrijeđenosti i ponosa antagoniziranih protagonista onodobnog Splita – prethodnog i aktualnog ravnatelja Muzeja.

U žarištu Arsenova teksta je zapravo atmosfera u kojoj se tijekom prve polovine 19. stoljeća radala svijest, veoma postupno, o arheološkoj važnosti solinskih iskopina. Manirom *story-tellera* (kako se to danas veli) pripovijeda nam o aferi vezanoj uz kip Venere koji je 1839. godine, obrađujući svoju zemlju, pronašao neki težak iz Solina, koji je bio i vlasnik krčme kraj mosta na Jadru, gdje ju je koristio kao stalak za vješanje odjeće. Kip je ondje vidio slikar Vincenzo Poiret i otkupio ga. Uslijedila je protiv njega prijava i zahtjev da spomenik preda Arheološkom muzeju uz naknadu sume koju je platio. Poiret se na to obratio žalbom namjesniku u Zadar, objašnjavajući okolnosti kupnje, pritom naširoko iznoseći, u svoju obranu, opći i institucionalni nemar prema spomenicima, tvrdeći primjerice da je kanonik Josip Čobarnić, tadašnji ravnatelj Muzeja, kip smatrao nedostojnim muzejske zbirke; da težaci prodaju starine privatnicima i strancima, osobito Englezima; da dr. Francesco Lanza i braća Solitro javno kupuju kipove, poprsja, novac i geme; da neki klesar od velikoga kamenja iz amfiteatra izrađuje pragove vrata i prozora; da se ispred spomenute krčme nalazi mramorni kip koji su braća Garagnin svojedobno darovala Muzeju, ali stoji *zlostavljan*, pa čak služi kao meta za gađanje, te su veličanstveni nabori odjeće potpuno uništeni. Kao da slušamo odjek elegije *Uzdasi i plač starca Milovana varh rasuchja solinskoga i izroda sadascniega jadtoga i velle xalosnoga splitskoga* (još uvijek anonimnog pjesnika), napisane koncem prethodnog stoljeća, u kojoj se iznosi prosvjed protiv rušenja i raznošenja solinskih i splitskih spomenika.

Duplančić donosi pregršt arhivskih vijesti o službenim i privatnim reakcijama na Poiretovu žalbu, te o sudbini mramornog kipa što su ga Garagninovi poklonili Muzeju. No, vezuje uz to i opaske uz zbirku starina obitelji Garagnin, odnosno kamene spomenike u njihovu vlasništvu koji su se nalazili u Solinu i Trogiru, osvrćući se na jedan popis antičkih predmeta i pripadajući crtež Ivana Danila iz kojih je salonitanskoj baštini mogao pripisati jedan iznimno važan spomenik koji se čuva u Arheološkom muzeju u Splitu, dotad interpretiran u kontekstu viških spomenika. Riječ je o fragmentima arhitekture s triglifima i metopama koji su činili dio iste arhitektonske

His meticulousness and comprehensive approach to research enabled him to craft true biographies for a number of significant monuments, narratives intertwined with specific individuals, locations, and dates, often featuring reconstructions of captivating journeys, both tangible and metaphorical. These endeavours entailed hours of genuine detective work while tracing the history of these objects through scouring the archives, poring over contemporary official correspondence, bills, curatorial notes, publications, old photographs, and squeeze paper impressions. In addition to these endeavours, he extensively explored other collections, libraries, museums, and private collections within the country and around the world. He even utilised available digitised sources and new internet tools to enhance his research.

We will highlight just a few examples of Duplančić's extensive research into the origin of monuments, primarily from the collection of the Archaeological Museum, illustrating the significance of the topic. In his article, *Four Sculptures from Salona and Writings on Them* (2015), he delves into archival records and early publications related to archaeological research in Salona in 1805. He then explores news about the collection of the Trogir family of Garagnin and the acquisition of monuments from Vis. Up next, he examines documents about a large marble sculpture of a man dressed in a toga in the lapidarium of the Archaeological Museum in Split. Finally, he investigates a torso of Apollo that sparked a bitter rivalry between Francesco Lanza and Francesco Carrara over the primacy of the discovery. Themes of honour, bitterness, offence, and pride among the antagonised protagonists of Split at the time—former and current directors of the Museum—fueled a dispute that persisted for years.

At the core of Arsen's narrative lies the atmosphere in which awareness of the archaeological significance of the Salona excavations gradually emerged during the first half of the 19th century. With the flair of a storyteller, he recounts an incident involving a statue of Venus discovered in 1839 by a labourer from Solin while tending to his land. This labourer also owned a tavern near the bridge over the Jadro River, where he used the statue as a clothes hanger. Painter Vincenzo Poiret noticed the statue and purchased it, leading to a complaint against him and demanding the monument's transfer to the Archaeological Museum, with a promise of reimbursement for the amount paid. Poiret appealed to the administrator in Zadar, explaining the circumstances of the purchase and, in his own defence, extensively detailing the general and institutional neglect of monuments. He cited instances such as that of Canon Josip Čobarnić, the then-director of the Museum, deeming the statue unworthy of the museum collection; peasants selling antiquities to private individuals and foreigners, particularly the English; Dr. Francesco Lanza and the Solitro brothers openly purchasing statues, busts, coins, and gems; a sculptor crafting door and window frames from large stones from the amphitheatre; and a marble statue donated to the Museum by

cjeline, a potom bili preklesani u prvoj polovini 4. stoljeća u vrijeme namjesnika Flavija Julija Rufina Sarmentija, da bi bili upotrijebljeni za spomenik podignut, očito usred kasnoantičke Salone, u čast careva Konstanta i Konstancija. Ne treba govoriti u kolikoj mjeri čvrsto utvrđena činjenica takve provenijencije mijenja pogled na povijesni kontekst jednoga i drugoga grada, Salone i Ise.

Kao u većini svojih tekstova Duplančić se domislio jednom spisateljskom receptu koji se doima kao *encore* na kraju koncerta, pa u dodatku gotovo u pravilu dobijemo temu, uvijek važnu i relevantnu, makar na prvi pogled izlazi izvan granica naslova. U ovom slučaju razlaže zanimljivu pretpostavku po kojoj bi don Franin znameniti Tusculum na Manastirinama mogao imati inspiraciju u kući prošaranom spolijima i s lijepom prigrađenom odrinom što ju je 1851. podigao Ivan Parać da bi koncem stoljeća ušla u vlasnost obitelji Mikelić.

Na isti će mu način jedan kraći tekst naslovljen *Kutije za numizmatičke zbirke iz Visa i Trogira* (2006.) dati povod i mogućnost da iznese cjelovit pregled povijesti numizmatičkih zbirki u srednjoj Dalmaciji.

Važan doprinos razumijevanju arheološkog konteksta u kojemu je pronađen znameniti mozaik s natpisom dječaka Tita Aurelija Aurelijana donosi tekst *Membra disiecta jednoga salonitanskog mauzoleja* (2017.). Riječ je o mauzoleju s kraja 3. ili početka 4. stoljeća, uništenom proširenjem tupinoloma Klanac. Nalazio se istočno od Manastirina, odnosno Tusculuma, a sjeverno od gradskih bedema antičke Salone po kojima je Bulić uredio tzv. Put mira. Dosadašnji istraživači nisu imali cjelovite i točne informacije o mauzoleju i dvjema nadgrobnim pločama koje su u njemu nađene. U Duplančićevoj studiji objedinjeni su svi arhivski podaci i dokumentacija o raštrkanim fragmentima izvorne cjeline, temeljem kojih mu je bilo moguće donijeti idealnu rekonstrukciju tog mauzoleja, shvatiti njegovu važnost, odnosno magnitudu danas (jedva shvatljivog) gubitka. Pritom autor na diskretan način piše i o disonancama između Bulića i njegova nasljednika Abramića koje su u stanovitaj mjeri opterećivale svakodnevni rad Muzeja.

Duplančić je napisao više tekstova u kojima analizira razvoj arheoloških istraživanja u Saloni i Naroni, upozorava na zaboravljene nalaze, rekonstruira izgled nestalih lokaliteta... Članak *Prilog povijesti početaka arheologije u Saloni* (2020.) iznosi podatke o termama otkrivenim 1771. godine u Saloni, sjeveroistočno od teatra. Konstatira da je to lokalitet na kojem su 2. listopada 1821. započela prva sustavna arheološka institucionalna istraživanja u Saloni (čitaj: u Hrvatskoj). Premda je taj sklop tijekom 19. stoljeća uništen, uvjeren je – prateći njegov prikaz na onodobnim i kasnijim tlocrtima Salone – da bi se ostatci tih terma vjerojatno mogli naći u novim istraživanjima.

Na liniji istih istraživanja je i njegov katalog izložbe *U temeljima hrvatske arheologije. Istraživanja Salone od 1821. do 1850. na temelju rukopisne i tiskane građe iz Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu* (2021.). Povod je bila dvjestota obljetnica osnivanja Muzeja (1820. – 2020.) i dvjestota obljetnica sustavnih istraživanja

the Garagning brothers, which stood in front of the aforementioned tavern, being *abused* and even used as a practice target, resulting in the destruction of its magnificent folds of clothing. These echoes resemble the elegy titled *Sighs and Tears of the Old Man Milovan on the Ruins of Solin and the Present Wretched and Lamentable State of Split*, an anonymous poem from the end of the previous century, that protests against the destruction and dispersal of monuments in Split and Solin.

Duplančić extensively documents official and private responses to Poiret's appeal, as well as the outcome of the marble statue donated to the Museum by the Garagnin family. Furthermore, he delves into the Garagnin family's collection of antiquities, particularly the stone monuments they owned in Solin and Trogir. He refers to a list of ancient objects and an accompanying drawing by Ivan Danilo. The list and drawing attribute significant importance to a monument from the Salona heritage, now housed in the Archaeological Museum in Split. Previously interpreted within the context of Vis, this monument comprises fragments of an architrave adorned with triglyphs and metopes, originally part of the same architectural ensemble. These fragments were later recarved in the first half of the 4th century during the tenure of the governor Flavius Julius Rufinus Sarmentius and were subsequently used for a monument erected in late antique Salona, honouring emperors Constans and Constantius. It goes without saying how firmly established facts regarding such provenance alter our understanding of the historical context of both cities, Salona and Issa.

As in most of his texts, Duplančić employs a literary formula reminiscent of an *encore* at the end of a concert. Consequently, we consistently encounter a topic that always remains important and relevant, even if it initially appears to extend beyond the confines of the title. In this instance, he proposes an intriguing theory suggesting that the renowned Tusculum of Don Frane in Manastirine could have been inspired by a house built by Ivan Parać in 1851. This house, adorned with spolia and a beautifully constructed pergola, was later acquired by the Mikelić family by the end of the century.

In a similar vein, a shorter text titled *Boxes for the Numismatic Collections in Vis and Trogir* (2006) offers him the opportunity and means to present a comprehensive overview of the history of numismatic collections in central Dalmatia.

The text *Membra disiecta of a Salona Mausoleum* (2017) makes a significant contribution to understanding the archaeological context surrounding the renowned mosaic featuring the inscription of the boy Titus Aurelius Aurelianus. It focuses on a mausoleum from the late 3rd or early 4th century, which was destroyed due to the expansion of the quarry at Klanac. Situated east of Manastirine, or Tusculum, and north of the city walls of ancient Salona, the mausoleum was located along what Bulić arranged as the "Path of Peace." Previous researchers lacked comprehensive and accurate information about the mausoleum and the two tombstones found within

u Saloni (1821. – 2021.). Javnosti je prikazao putove kojima se tijekom prvih trideset godina postojanja razvijao Muzej i kojima su se vodila istraživanja u Saloni. Izložba je iznijela na vidjelo zamašnu rukopisnu i tiskanu građu iz Muzeja, izvještaje i grafičku dokumentaciju, dotad mahom nepoznatu, a temeljem koje mu je uspjelo brojne artefakte precizno „usidriti“ u konkretne koordinate tog lokaliteta koji je u to doba polako počeo dobivati obrise uskoro najznamenitije hrvatske arheološke cjeline.

Arsen je s vremenom postao *connoisseur* u određenim segmentima arheološke i povijesno-umjetničke discipline. U tom smislu valja spomenuti članak *Arhivski izvori o dvjema statuetama i dva natpisa iz Dalmacije* (2021.). U radu najprije objavljuje nepoznate podatke i crteže o dvjema statuetama za koje se pretpostavljalo da su bile cimatiji na nekoj funerarnoj cisti, da su etruščanskog podrijetla i da su došle iz *Pharosa*. Protivno mišljenju domaćih autoriteta, detaljnom analizom dokumenata iz arhiva Arheološkog muzeja i vlastitom potragom za komparativnom građom, Duplančić odbacuje dosadašnje pretpostavke i dokazuje da je riječ o falsifikatima iz druge polovine 19. stoljeća kojima usporedbe nalazi u istim muškim statuetama (The British Museum u Londonu, muzeji u Boulogne-sur-Mer, u Dijonu i Muzeul municipiului u Bukureštu). U istom članku – temeljem analize čitave serije dosad nepoznatih dokumenata – rekonstruira provenijenciju jednog važnog natpisa sa stihovima na spomeniku koji je u čast mužu i sinu Kvintu Eniju Severu podignula tugujuća Lutacija Venerija, za koji se smatralo da potječe iz Salone, dočim Duplančić dokazuje da je pronađen u Naroni. Natpis je važan, naravno, za latinsku epigrafsku poeziju, ali i za praćenje prisutnosti III. kohorte alpinaca u Dalmaciji, pa stoga nije samo riječ o ispravljanju netočnosti u muzejskim inventarima nego i o znatnom priloгу za bolje poznavanje povijest antičke Narone.

Izuzetno važne su i spoznaje koje donosi članak, naoko skromna naslova *Bilješka o rimskom reljefu s vojnom opremom iz Splita* (2015.), a odnosi se na spomenik čije podrijetlo i vrijeme nalaza do tada nisu bili poznati, a moglo se pretpostaviti da je bio dio friza nekog tropeja (s time da je u literaturi postojalo prilično nesuglasje u vezi s datacijom). Duplančić je, međutim, utvrdio da je reljef otkriven u podrumu kuće Capogrosso, u dijelu srednjovjekovnog Splita neposredno iza zapadnih zidina Dioklecijanove palače. Taj signal ohrabrio je Nenada Cambija da – nakon što je ranije u više navrata reljef razmatrao kao ulomak nekog tropeja iz Salone, ili čak kao dio znamenitoga gardunskog tropeja, datirajući ga dakle u Augustovo doba – poveže ovaj ulomak s natpisom uzidanim u ugao romaničke kuće na vrhu današnje Bosanske ulice u Splitu, u neposrednoj blizini sjeverozapadne kule Palače, te posve blizu kuće Capogrosso u kojoj je pronađen reljef s vojnom opremom. Ukoliko je to povezivanje točno, bila bi riječ o monumentalnom trijumfalnom spomeniku koji je 277. godine – govori natpis – postavio namjesnik provincije Dalmacije *Aurelius Marcianus* u čast Dioklecijanova neposrednog prethodnika, cara Proba, dakle u

it. Duplančić's study compiles all archival data and documentation on scattered fragments of the original structure, and with it, an ideal reconstruction of the mausoleum was possible, shedding light on its importance and the magnitude of today's (barely understandable) loss. Additionally, the author subtly addresses the disagreements between Bulić and his successor Abramić, which somewhat impacted the Museum's daily operations.

In his various writings, Duplančić analyses the development of archaeological research in Salona and Narona, highlighting forgotten finds and reconstructing the appearance of lost sites. In the article *Contribution to the History of the Beginnings of Archaeology in Salona* (2020), Duplančić provides insight into the *thermae* discovered in Salona in 1777, situated northeast of the theatre. He notes that this site marked the beginning of the first systematic institutional archaeological research in Salona (and in Croatia) on 2 October 1821. Despite the destruction of this complex during the 19th century, Duplančić is convinced, based on its depiction in contemporary and later plans of Salona, that remnants of these *thermae* could likely be found in new research.

As part of the same research endeavour, Duplančić authored a catalogue for the exhibition titled *In the Foundations of Croatian Archaeology: Research in Salona from 1821 to 1850 based on Manuscript and Printed Materials from the Archaeological Museum in Split* (2021). The exhibition commemorated the bicentennial of the Museum's founding (1820–2020) and the bicentennial of systematic research in Salona (1821–2021). It introduced the public to the Museum's development during its initial thirty years and the research trajectories pursued in Salona. The exhibition unveiled a significant amount of manuscript and printed material from the Museum, including reports and graphic documentation, most of which was previously unknown. These materials enabled him to precisely “anchor” numerous artefacts to specific coordinates of the site, which was gradually emerging as the most prominent archaeological complex in Croatia at the time.

Over time, he became a *connoisseur* in specific archaeological and art historical disciplines. One notable contribution is his article, *Archival Sources Concerning Two Statuettes and Two Epigraphs from Dalmatia* (2021). In this article, he presents previously unknown data and drawings about two statuettes assumed to be mouldings of a funerary cista, believed to be of Etruscan origin and originating from Pharos. Contrary to local authorities' opinions, Duplančić meticulously analysed documents from the Archaeological Museum's archives and conducted his own comparative research. As a result, he debunked previous assumptions and proved that the statuettes are forgeries from the second half of the 19th century. He supported his findings with comparisons to similar male statuettes found in the British Museum in London, museums in Boulogne-sur-Mer, Dijon, and the Muzeul Municipiului in Bucharest. Additionally, in the same article, Duplančić used previ-



Slika 1.
Rimski reljef s vojnom
opremom nađen u Splitu
(foto: Ž. Bačić)

Figure 1.
Roman relief with military
gear in Split (photo: Ž. Bačić)

godini kada je taj u Panoniji pobjedonosno ratovao sa Sarmatima i Germanima. Reperkusije takve hipoteze su dalekosežne, jer ukazuju na postojanje jednog važnog javnog spomenika pred-Dioklecijanova doba, koji je gradnja Palače respektirala. *Svi ti razmjerno brojni nalazi upozoravaju – pretpostavlja Cambi – na jedan poseban odnos tadašnjeg naselja s carem i namjesnikom rimske provincije Dalmacije Aurelijem Marcijanom, ali ne u Saloni, nego u Aspalatu.* Arsen, inače, u kodi svog članka donosi veoma koristan, iscrpan pregled arheoloških signala naselja koje je prethodilo gradnji Dioklecijanove palače.

Jednako poticajan je i tekst *Arhivsko-bibliografski podaci o nekim splitskim spomenicima iz Arheološkog muzeja* (2007.), u kojemu ispravlja niz netočnosti koje su se potkrale prigodom inventarizacije i, posljedično, interpretacije nekih spomenika iz Muzeja. Objašnjava i razloge zbog kojih je često teško utvrditi podrijetlo pojedinih artefakata: *To je posljedica svojedobno lošeg muzeološkog pristupa i nerazvijene dokumentacije, osobito u prvoj polovini 19. stoljeća. Problemi s prostorom i seljenje spomenika iz jednog spremišta u drugo, sve do podizanja današnje muzejske zgrade uoči Prvog svjetskog rata, prouzročili su gubitak dijela potrebnih podataka. Tome je pridonijelo i brisanje inventarnih brojeva te njihovo odljepljivanje s predmeta,* etc. Kao i u prethodno spomenutim tekstovima, temeljem službenih dopisa, računa, zabilježaka, objava, fotografija i otisaka na papiru, Arsen je uspio razriješiti problem podrijetla niza kamenih spomenika podrijetlom iz Splita, koji se nalaze ili su se prije nalazili u Arheološkome muzeju i zbirci društva *Bihać*. U ovom tekstu obrađuje spomenike iz crkve Sv. Trojice, starog samostana sv. Klare, crkve sv. Andrije *de fenestris*, katedrale sv. Duje, kripte sv. Lucije, crkve sv. Nikole (Mikule), crkve sv. Jakova *de colonia*, samostana sv. Stjepana *de pinis*, crkve sv. Fabijana i Sebastijana (sv. Barbara) i samostana sv. Marije *de Taurello*, a posebnu pažnju posvećuje problemu provenijencije stupa nadbiskupa Pavla iz 11. stoljeća za koji je utvrdio da je u Muzej došao iz Sutivana na Braču, a da je tamo mogao dospjeti u 17. stoljeću,

ously unknown documents to reconstruct the provenance of an important inscription found on a monument erected by the grieving Lutatia Veneria to honour her husband and son, Quintus Ennius Severus. While it was believed to have originated in Salona, Duplančić's research confirmed it was found in Narona. The inscription is not only significant for Latin epigraphic poetry but also for tracing the movements of the Third Alpine Cohort in Dalmatia, thus correcting inaccuracies in museum inventories and contributing significantly to a better understanding of the history of ancient Narona.

The article *A Note on the Roman Relief from Split Depicting Military Gear* (2015) offers crucial insights into a monument previously shrouded in mystery. Initially assumed to be part of a frieze from a tropaion, with experts disagreeing regarding its dating, the relief's origin and discovery remained unknown. However, Duplančić's research revealed that the relief was found in the basement of the Capogrosso House, located in mediaeval Split behind the western walls of Diocletian's Palace. This discovery prompted Nenad Cambi to reconsider the relief's significance, previously thought to be a fragment of a tropaion in Salona or the famous Gardun tropaion, dating it to the Augustan period. Cambi now associates this inscription-bearing fragment with an inscription embedded in the corner of a Romanesque house located at the top of Bosanska Street in Split, in the immediate vicinity of the northwest tower of the Palace, and very close to the Capogrosso House where the relief with military gear was found. If this connection is accurate, it suggests that the relief is part of a triumphal monument erected in 277 CE by Aurelius Marcianus, the governor of the Dalmatia province, in honour of Diocletian's immediate predecessor, Emperor Probus, who successfully campaigned against the Sarmatians and Germans in Pannonia that same year. This hypothesis holds significant implications, indicating the existence of a prominent public monument predating Diocletian's Palace and underscoring its respect for the Palace's construction. As noted by Cambi, *these findings suggest a unique relationship between the then-settlement and the emperor and governor of the Dalmatia province, Aurelius Marcianus, but in Aspalathos rather than Salona.* Arsen's article provides a comprehensive overview of archaeological signals from the settlement that preceded the construction of Diocletian's Palace.

Equally enlightening is the text *Archival and Bibliographic Data on Certain Monuments from Split in the Archaeological Museum* (2007), in which he corrects a series of inaccuracies that crept in during inventory keeping and, consequently, the interpretation of certain monuments from the Museum. He also explains the reasons for occasional difficulties in determining the origin of individual artefacts: *This is the consequence of the once poor museological approach and undeveloped documentation, especially in the first half of the 19th century. Problems with space and the relocation of monuments from one storage to another, until the construction of the current museum building be-*

možda kada je splitski kanonik Jeronim Natalis 1655. dogradio tamošnju crkvu sv. Ivana Krstitelja. Donosi pritom niz zapažanja koja omogućuju da se s posve novih osnova rasprave problem izvorne liturgijske opreme ranosrednjovjekovne splitske katedrale, ili grozda manjih crkava oblikovanih u prostoru nekadašnjeg triklinija careve palače. Utvrđuje, na primjer, jedinstvo nekoliko fragmenata pronađenih u kripti sv. Lucije – (na jednome je natpis koji glasi: † ASPICE HOC CLAUSTRVM O[...], koji je zadavao dosta muke dosadašnjim interpretima) – s fragmentima koji su nađeni u Kaštel Sućurcu, a koji su svi zajedno morali činiti arhitrav oltarne pregrade u katedrali sv. Dujma iz 11. stoljeća. Obratio je pažnju i na poznati luk oltarne pregrade iz druge polovine 8. stoljeća iz Kaštel Sućurca, za koji je Stjepan Gunjača svojedobno pretpostavio da je prenesen iz Splita u 16. stoljeću, kada se utvrđivao nadbiskupov kaštel u Sućurcu. Duplančićevo otkriće ulomaka arhitrava iz katedrale u Sućurcu neizravno potvrđuje Gunjačino pisanje i upozorava na mogućnost da u Sućurcu budu pronađeni još neki spomenici koji potječu iz Splita. Neka zapažanja u ovoj studiji tek trebaju dobiti širu interpretaciju, na primjer, konstatacija da je jedan ranoromanički natpis iz Velog varoša, na kojemu se nalazi spomen kralja (nažalost bez imena), morao doći iz crkve sv. Mikule.

Za Arsenov način interpretiranja osobito indikativnom mi se čini deskripcija natpisa na nadvratniku stare benediktinske crkve ili samostana na Sustipanu koji je 1814., kada se gradila nova crkva sv. Stjepana, uzidan kao donji prag portala. Nosi heksameterske stihove: AD PATRIE PORTVS HEC PORTAT PORTA VENITE / ET PERPETVE UITE SECVRUM LITVS ADITE – *Ova vrata vode k luci domovine: dodite i pristupite sigurnoj obali trajnog života. Pojednim segmentima natpisa nalazi biblijske izvore: pozivaju vjernike ka Kristu, luci u koju treba pristati da bi se ušlo u nebesku domovinu (Fil 3, 20) jer su tuđinci i putnici na zemlji koji traže svoju pravu domovinu (Heb 11, 13-14), a On je ujedno taj koji će smiriti oluju na moru i odvesti ih u željeni kraj, kako ovozemaljski, tako i onozemaljski (Ps 107, 23-30; Mt 8, 23-27).* Konstatira na kraju: *Stihovi su ne samo znakoviti nego i veoma prikladni za položaj crkve iznad litica sustipanskog poluotoka iza čijeg se rta pruža sigurna luka. Ovi lijepi heksametri ne bi, dakle, došli samo kolažiranjem rečenica iz golemog rezervoara Svetog pisma, nego bi bili inspirirani izravnim doživljajem jedinstvenih krajobraznih datosti Sustipana, koji će uostalom postati jedna od nultih točaka imaginarija splitskih pjesnika.*

Sličan refleks (rekao bih na tragu povezivanja karakterističnih za pisanje Cvita Fiskovića, koji mu je bio trajnim uzorom) nalazimo u više drugih Arsenovih tekstova. Na primjer, kad opisuje narav glavne splitske ulice koja je poput srednjovjekovnog *cardo* vodila od Vrata luke preko trga ispred palače Milešić, pa uz crkvu sv. Mihovila do upravnog središta grada, tj. do Komunalne i Kneževke palače, opisuje i berlinu na malom trgu uz crkvu sv. Mihovila, tj. mjesto gdje su kažnjenici izvrgavani ruglu, zaključuje: *Uzme li se u obzir ustaljena predodžba o sv. Mihovilu kao pobjedniku nad Sotonom, odnosno zlom, i kao anđelu*

*fore World War I, caused the loss of part of the crucial data. This was also contributed to by the erasure of inventory numbers and their detachment from objects, etc. As in previous instances, using official correspondence, accounts, notes, publications, photographs, and imprints on paper, Duplančić managed to identify the origin of a series of stone monuments from Split, which are or have previously been in the Archaeological Museum and the collection of the Bihać Society. In this text, he discusses monuments from various locations, including the Church of Holy Trinity, the old convent of St. Clare, the Church of St. Andrew *de Fenestris*, the Cathedral of St. Domnius, the crypt of St. Lucia, the Church of St. Nicholas (Mikula), the Church of St. Jacob *de Colonia*, the Monastery of St. Stephen *de Piniis*, the Church of St. Fabian and Sebastian (St. Barbara), and the Convent of St. Mary *de Taurello*. He pays particular attention to the problem of the provenance of the column of Archbishop Paul from the 11th century, determining that it came to the Museum from Sutivan on the island of Brač and that it could have ended up there in the 17th century, perhaps when the Split canon Jeronim Natalis expanded the local Church of St. John the Baptist in 1655. He presents several observations that allow for a completely new discussion of the original liturgical equipment of the early mediaeval Split cathedral, or a cluster of smaller churches formed in the space of the former triclinium of the imperial palace. For example, he establishes the unity of several fragments found in the crypt of St. Lucia—one of which bears the inscription: † ASPICE HOC CLAUSTRVM O[...], which has caused quite a bit of trouble to previous interpreters—with fragments found in Kaštel Sućurac. Together, these fragments must have formed the architrave of the altar screen in the 11th-century Cathedral of St. Domnius. He also pays attention to the well-known arch of the altar screen from the second half of the 8th century from Kaštel Sućurac, for which Stjepan Gunjača once assumed that it was transferred from Split in the 16th century when the archbishop's castle in Sućurac was being fortified. Duplančić's discovery of fragments of the cathedral's architrave in Sućurac indirectly confirms Gunjača's writing and points to the possibility that some monuments originating from Split could still be found in Sućurac. Some observations in this study still need to receive wider interpretation, such as the observation that an early Romanesque inscription from Veli Varoš, which mentions a king (unfortunately without a name), must have come from the Church of St. Nicholas.*

His method of interpretation is particularly illuminating in his description of the inscription on the lintel of the old Benedictine church or monastery on Sustipan. In 1814, when the new church of St. Stephen was built, this lintel was incorporated as the lower threshold of the portal. It bears hexameter verses: AD PATRIE PORTVS HEC PORTAT PORTA VENITE / ET PERPETVE UITE SECVRUM LITVS ADITE (*These gates lead to the harbour of the homeland. Come and approach the safe shore of eternal life.*) Duplančić found biblical sources for certain seg-



Slika 2.
Relikvijar iz crkve sv. Klare,
bočna strana
(foto: Z. Alajbeg)

Figure 2.
Reliquary from the Church
of St. Clare, side view
(photo: Z. Alajbeg)



Slika 3.
Capsella reliquiarum iz crkve
sv. Klare u Splitu
(foto: Z. Alajbeg)

Figure 3.
Capsella reliquiarum from the
Church of St. Clare in Split
(photo: Z. Alajbeg)

koji važe duše pokojnika na posljednjem sudu, onda je postavljane berline u blizini njegove crkve još logičnije.

Magistralan prilog dao je tekstom *Dva starokršćanska relikvijara iz Splita* (2013.). Prvi od njih ima formu sarkofaga sa zaobljenim poklopcem (tip *a baule*). U kućnu kapelu samostana klarisa bio je prenesen – dokazuje Duplančić – iz donjeg dijela oltara sv. Staša u katedrali. Prigodom rekognosciranja u njemu su zatečene moći sv. Dujma, sv. Staša i sv. Jurja Mučenika. U kasno barokno doba bio je umetnut i ulomak ruha (moći) makarskog biskupa Stjepana Blaškovića (1731. – 1776.). Moći sv. Jurja odnose se na enigmatičnog sv. Jurja Solinskog, biskupa i mučenika, vrlo štovano u srednjem vijeku u Splitu i okolo njega, kojemu je Farlati posvetio tolike stranice svojega monumentalnog djela *Illyricum sacrum*, da bi raspravu o njemu don

ments of the inscription: *they invite believers to Christ, the harbour to be reached to enter the heavenly homeland (Philippians 3:20), because they are strangers and travellers on earth seeking their true homeland (Hebrews 11:13–14), and He is also the one who will calm the storm at sea and lead them to the desired destination, both earthly and heavenly (Psalms 107:23–30, Matthew 8:23–37)*. He concludes: *The verses are not only significant but also very suitable for the position of the church above the cliffs of the Sustipan peninsula, behind whose cape extends a safe harbour*. He suggests that these beautiful hexameters would not have come merely from collaging sentences from the vast reservoir of Holy Scripture but by a direct experience of the unique landscape features of Sustipan, which would ultimately become one of the focal points of imagination for poets in Split.

A similar reflex, akin to the linking typical of Cvito Fisković's writing, who was his enduring role model, is evident in several other texts by Duplančić. For instance, when describing the nature of the main street in Split, which, like a mediaeval *cardo*, led from the Port Gates through the square in front of the Milesi Palace, past the Church of St. Michael, to the administrative centre of the city, i.e., to the Communal and Ducal Palaces, he also delves into the description of the pillory in a small square near the Church of St. Michael, where the convicts were ridiculed. Duplančić concludes: *Taking into account the established notion of St. Michael as the victor over Satan or evil and as the angel who weighs the souls of the deceased on Judgement Day, then the placement of the pillory near his church is even more logical*.

He made an outstanding contribution with *Two Early Christian Reliquaries from Split* (2013). The first is a sarcophagus with a rounded lid (type *a baule*). Duplančić demonstrated that it was transferred to the chapel of the Clarisse monastery from the lower part of the altar of St. Anastasius in the cathedral. During inspection, relics of St. Domnius, St. Anastasius, and St. George the Martyr were found within it. In the late baroque period, a fragment of the robe (relic) of Makarska Bishop Stjepan Blašković (1731–1776) was inserted into it. The relics of St. George refer to the enigmatic St. George of Salona, a bishop and martyr highly revered in the Middle Ages in Split and its surroundings, whom Farlati extensively discussed in his monumental work *Illyricum sacrum*. This discussion was swiftly resolved by Frane Bulić with a few succinct words. More importantly, according to Duplančić's convincing evidence, this reliquary fits neatly into the events in Diocletian's Palace during the late antique period of the 6th century, confirming the continuity of spiritual and secular life within it. Therefore, it offers an extensive exploration of the development of Christianity in Split itself.

The second reliquary, a *capsella reliquiarum* bearing the name of St. Severus, previously unknown in Split's hagionomy presents an even more intriguing narrative. Duplančić convincingly suggests that the appearance of the relics of this saint should be associated with Bishop Johannes de Ravenna,

Frane Bulić lakonskim riječima skinuo sa stola. Važnije je to što se ovaj relikvijar, po uvjerljivom Duplančićevom dokazivanju, lijepo uklapa u zbivanja u Dioklecijanovoj palači u kasnoantičko doba 6. stoljeća, potvrđujući kontinuitet duhovnoga i svjetovnog života u njoj. Donosi stoga opsežan ekskurs o pitanjima razvoja kršćanstva u samom Splitu.

Još interesantniji je drugi relikvijar, *capsella reliquiarum*, koja nosi natpis s imenom sv. Severa, koji dosad nije bio poznat u splitskoj hagonimiji. Uvjerljiva je Duplančićeva pretpostavka da pojavu moći ovog sveca valja vezati uz ime biskupa Ivana Ravenjanina, prvog biskupa srednjovjekovnog Splita, odnosno, moguće, uz donaciju Severa Velikog koji je jugoistočni dio Dioklecijanove palače ustupio za biskupsko sjedište. Ovim se povećao broj ravenskih svetaca u Splitu, dodatno osnažila njegova veza sa sjedištem Egzarhata. To ujedno znači da se Duplančić priklanja onima koji ne dvoje o historicitetu biskupa Ivana Ravenjanina iz sredine 7. stoljeća, kako ga prikazuje *Historia salonitana* Tome Arhidakona. U raspravu je upeo i novo razmatranje o pečatu egzarha Pavla s početka 8. stoljeća kojemu je Bulić kao mjesto nalaza, čini se po inerciji, upisao – Salonu. *Common sense*, a Arsen ga se uvijek nastoji držati, upućuje na zaključivanje kako je zaista teško zamisliti da je u prvim desetljećima 8. stoljeća, u *napuštenoj i dijelom srušenoj Saloni* postojala nekakva kancelarija kojoj se egzarh službeno obraćao, te da bi najizglednije mjesto nalaza trebalo tražiti u Splitu: *U svakom slučaju, on ništa ne dokazuje o postojanju nadbiskupije jer se bez obzira na to što se vlast egzarha u velikoj mjeri odnosila i na crkvene poslove ničim ne može dokazati da se isprava na kojoj je bio pričvršćen ticala nadbiskupa ili nadbiskupije, a ne svjetovnih pitanja.*

Znatnu pažnju pobudila je monografija *Crkve kraljice Jelenne u Solinu* (1999.), kojom je unio nove argumente u raspravu, koja još nije zaključena, o crkvama kraljice Jelenne na Otoku u Solinu. Pažljivom analizom akvarela splitskog slikara Petra Zečevića, iz sredine 19. stoljeća – naravno, na fondu svih već poznatih povijesnih isprava i kurentnih teza i hipoteza niza istraživača – Duplančić je donio dokaze postojanja dviju Jeleninih crkava, otkrivši pritom izgled jedne od njih, s upečatljivim vanjskim lezenama koje nedvojbeno svjedoče o ranosrednjovjekovnoj arhitekturi.

Postoji niz Duplančićevih tekstova čije su znanstvene reperkusije u disproporciji s duljinom članaka. U tekstu *Pečat splitskog kneza Ivana iz 12. stoljeća* (1997.) objavljuje crtež danas izgubljenog olovnog pečata splitskog kneza Ivana koji se spominje između 1167. i 1174. godine. Pečat se nalazio u zbirci Vicka Solitra. Članak daje i potpun pregled do sada objavljenih splitskih pečata i pečatnjaka. Uz to se analizira kada se prvi put u Splitu javlja titula *comes* (knez). Kratka studija *Pečat splitskog i šibenskog kneza Domalda* (2008.) izniman je doprinos poznavanju splitske, odnosno dalmatinske sfragistike. U njemu objavljuje do sada nepoznati crtež Domaldova pečata koji se nalazi u rukopisnom grbovniku Dujma Srečka Karamana, prenesen iz zasad zagonetnog izvora. Njegov izgled bio je poznat

the first bishop of mediaeval Split, or possibly to a donation from Severus the Great, who may have donated the southeastern part of Diocletian's Palace for the bishop's seat. This expanded the roster of saints from Ravenna in Split and further solidified its connection to the Exarchate. This also means that Duplančić aligns himself with those who do not doubt the historicity of Bishop Johannes de Ravenna from the mid-7th century, as portrayed by Tomas the Archdeacon in his *Historia Salonitana*. He also introduces a new consideration regarding the seal of Exarch Paul from the early 8th century, which Bulić, somewhat habitually, attributed to Salona as the place of discovery. Employing common sense, which Arsen consistently upholds, leads to the conclusion that it is indeed improbable that in the first decades of the 8th century, *in the abandoned and partly ruined Salona, there existed an office to which the exarch officially corresponded*, suggesting that the most likely place of discovery should be sought in Split. *However, this proves nothing about the existence of an archbishopric, regardless of the fact that the authority of the exarch largely related to church affairs, as there is no evidence to suggest that the document to which it was attached pertained to an archbishop or archbishopric rather than secular matters.*

Considerable attention was drawn to his monograph, *The Churches of Queen Helen in Solin* (1999), wherein new arguments were introduced into the ongoing debate about the churches of Queen Helen on the Island in Solin. By carefully analysing watercolours by the Split painter Petar Zečević from the mid-19th century—naturally, based on all the previously known historical documents and the current theses and hypotheses of various researchers—Duplančić provided evidence for the existence of two of Helen's churches, thereby revealing the appearance of one of them, characterised by striking external lesenes that unquestionably testify to early mediaeval architecture.

The scientific impact of several of Duplančić's texts is disproportionate to the length of the articles. In the article *The Seal of Split's Count Ivan from the 12th Century* (1997), he published a drawing of the lost lead seal of Count Ivan of Split, mentioned between 1167 and 1174. The seal was part of Vicko Solitro's collection. The article also provides a complete overview of the seals and seal-makers of Split published to date. Additionally, it examines the first appearance of the title *comes* (prince) in Split. Another short study, *The Seal of Count Domald of Split and Šibenik* (2008), is an exceptional contribution to understanding Split's and Dalmatia's sigillography. In it, he publishes the previously unknown drawing of Domald's seal found in the heraldry manuscript of Dujam Srečko Karaman, transferred from a still mysterious source. Its appearance was already known to Ivan Lučić Lucius, as evidenced by his correspondence with Zadar's Archdeacon Valerio Ponte and Frano Divinić (Difnik). The seal is significant because the coat of arms on it indicates that Domald (ca. 1160–ca. 1243) did not belong to either the Kačić or Nelipić tribes. Thus, it becomes an

već Ivanu Lučiću Luciusu, što pokazuje njegova prepiska sa zardarskim arhidakonom Valerijem Ponteom i Franom Divnićem (Difnikom). Pečat je važan jer grb na njemu pokazuje da Domaldo (o. 1160. – o. 1243.) nije pripadao ni plemenu Kačića ni plemenu Nelipića. Time postaje izvor važan ne samo za sfragistiku i heraldiku nego i za genealogiju.

Među splitskim temama koje je obrađivao, jedna zaslužuje da je se posebno apostrofira, jer joj je posvetio više priloga. U jednom od „ranih radova“, iza skromnog naslova *Trgovina u splitskoj luci u svjetlu nekoliko nacrtu iz XVIII. stoljeća* (1991.) krije se krasna analiza splitske obale kao pozornice grada na kojoj se obavljaju, uz čitav kaleidoskop svakodnevnih zbivanja, događaji poput dolazaka raznih uglednika, biskupa, gradskog kneza i vojske, uz počasne salve, glazbu, raskošnu rasvjetu i vatromete, prigodna natjecanja (poput alke, kukanje i regate), uz brojne crkvene svečanosti, procesije, žalobne povorke. Na obali su otvorene prve gradske kavane. Neke su imale igračnice. Početkom 19. stoljeća u lazaretu je djelovalo i liliputansko kazalište. Uza sve to, u tekstu se pažljivo analizira funkcionalna stratifikacija raznih dijelova prostora obale. Lazaretu na splitskoj obali Duplančić je posvetio nekoliko priloga u kojima (1987., 1988., 1994., 1995.), između ostaloga, donosi nekoliko novih nacrtu koji su važni za razumijevanje unutrašnjeg preoblikovanja čitava sklopa tijekom 18. i 19. stoljeća.

Izložba na kojoj je 2019. radio s Dankom Radić, *Splitska luka i povijesna jezgra grada na prikazima do polovice XIX. stoljeća iz Hrvatskog pomorskog muzeja Split i Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu* (priređena u povodu 40. obljetnice uvrštavanja povijesne jezgre Splita s Dioklecijanovom palačom u Popis svjetske kulturne baštine UNESCO-a), dala je Duplančiću prigodu da u katalogu donese svojevrni generalni korpus morskog lica Splita, s prikazima u rasponu od najstarijeg plana (ma koliko dijagramski bio) na *Tabula Peutingeriana*, preko karte Šibenčanina Martina Kolunića Rote (oko godine 1570.), do vedute Splita objavljene 1877. godine. Uz zapažanje dokumentarnih vrijednosti karakteristično je za njegovu metodu da za neke od najpoznatijih planova i karata uspijeva rekonstruirati „genealoška stabla“. Neke od veduta, naime, imale su dugo trajanje u različitim inačicama, pa otud Duplančić poziva na oprez pri njihovu korištenju kao izvora za povijest grada.

Sve alate kojima se Duplančić služi kao povjesničar možda najplastičnije pokazuje zamašna studija *Regesta zapisnika splitskoga Velikog vijeća od 1620. do 1755. godine* (1998.), u kojoj je znanstvenokritički objavio neveliki rukopis koji se čuva u arhivskoj zbirci splitskoga Arheološkog muzeja pod naslovom *Registro di tutte le materie essenziali esistenti nelli pocchi volumi, che s'attrovano nell'Archivio della Citta* (Registar svih važnih sadržaja koji postoje u malobrojnim svescima što se nalaze u Arhivu Grada). Neki od tih sažetaka dopunjavaju izgubljene sveske Zapisnika splitskog Vijeća, koje Arsenovi opsežni komentari s brojnim popratnim bilješkama uspijevaju gotovo rekonstruirati. Rigoroznom raščlambom brojnih, na prvi pogled lapidarnih iznesenih podataka, on pokazuje u kolikoj mjeri su bitni za

important source not only for sigillography and heraldry but also for genealogy.

Among Duplančić's explorations of topics related to Split, one is especially noteworthy, as he dedicated several contributions to it. Despite its unassuming title, *Trade in the Port of Split in Light of Several 18th Century Drawings* (1991), this work offers a comprehensive analysis of the Split coastline as a vibrant backdrop for the city's daily life. It unveils a kaleidoscope of activities, ranging from the arrivals of dignitaries, bishops, city counts, and military personnel, accompanied by ceremonial salutes, music, and grand spectacles like fireworks, to competitive events such as alka (a chivalric tournament), pole climbing, and regattas, as well as numerous church festivities, parades, and funeral processions. Along the waterfront, the city's first coffee houses emerged, some featuring gaming rooms. Furthermore, in the early 19th century, a miniature theatre operated within the lazaretto. The text also meticulously examines the functional stratification of various sections of the waterfront area. Duplančić's dedication to the lazaretto on the Split waterfront (1987, 1988, 1994, 1995) is evident, wherein he presents, among other things, several new drawings crucial for understanding the complex's internal evolution during the 18th and 19th centuries.

In 2019, Duplančić collaborated with Danka Radić on an exhibition titled *The Port of Split and the Historical Core of the City in Images up to the Middle of the 19th Century from the Croatian Maritime Museum Split and the Archaeological Museum in Split*. The exhibition, commemorating the 40th anniversary of Split's historic core and Diocletian's Palace being included in the UNESCO World Heritage List, provided Duplančić with an opportunity to compile a comprehensive overview of Split's maritime façade in the accompanying catalogue. This overview ranged from the earliest diagrammatic plan on the *Tabula Peutingeriana*, through Marin Kolunić Rota's map of Šibenik (ca. 1570), to the 1877 panorama of Split. In addition to noting their documentary values, Duplančić's methodology involves reconstructing "genealogical trees" for select prominent plans and maps. Some panoramas, however, endured for a long time in their various versions, hence Duplančić's call for caution when using them as sources for the city's history.

Duplančić's prowess as a historian is vividly exemplified in the extensive study titled *Summaries of the Minutes of the Split Grand Council from 1620 to 1755* (1998), where he critically and scientifically examines a small manuscript from the archival collection of the Archaeological Museum in Split entitled *Registro di tutte le materie essenziali esistenti nelli pocchi volumi, che s'attrovano nell'Archivio della Citta* (Register of All Important Contents Existing in the Few Volumes Found in the City Archives). These summaries often complement the lost volumes of the Minutes of the Split Council, a reconstruction nearly achieved through his extensive commentary and numerous accompanying. By critically analysing extensive data presented in a seemingly concise manner, he highlights their signifi-

razumijevanje funkcioniranja tog formalnopravno najvišeg tijela splitske komune, i još više – za shvaćanje položaja i uloge Crkve u komunalnom životu, s važnim vijestima o prostorima grada, o školstvu i zdravstvu, gospodarstvu, fortifikacijama, o katedralnoj riznici i umjetninama, etc. Možemo samo ponoviti ocjenu koju je ovom izdanju dao prof. Antun Cvitanić, najautoritativniji tumač strukture splitske komunalne vlasti: u [Duplančićevoj] knjizi nalazimo ne samo kritički izloženu građu nego i njezinu znanstvenu, historiografsku obradu, i k tome ona može poslužiti ne samo kao solidan temelj za daljnje proučavanje organizacije i djelovanja splitskoga Velikog vijeća nego i brojnih drugih aspekata društvenog života i aktivnosti u Splitu tijekom poznijih desetljeća mletačke vladavine Dalmacijom.

Jednako značajna je studija *Ceremonijal splitskog nadbiskupa iz kraja XVII. stoljeća* (2012.) u kojoj se objavljuje ceremonijal splitskog nadbiskupa sastavljen između 1682. i 1699. godine, uz komparativnu analizu nekoliko protokola onodobnih svjetovnih i crkvenih ceremonija, koje su se odvijale u posve konkretnim prostornim koordinatama grada. Pritom, često u srazu naslijeđenih principa i pojedinačnih taština, svjedočimo – danas nam se čini – burlesknim sporovima (npr. oko redosljeda ljubljena evanđelja i *paxa*, te kađenja nadbiskupa, kneza i članova gradske uprave tijekom mise, ili oko obožavanja križa na Veliki petak). Propisano je sve – od obreda i odjeće do detalja podvorbe kavom i čokoladom, sorbetom, *con acque gelate*, u šalicama s tanjurićima... Riječ je o dokumentima koji na sugestivan način pokazuju dinamiku podrobno elaboriranih rituala adventa novog nadbiskupa ili prijenosa kneževske funkcije, prikazuju raznovrsne aspekte simboličkog reprezentiranja crkvene i svjetovne vlasti koje su konstruirale stvarnost prema idealima vlastite ideologije i propagande.

Mehanizme na kojima se kodiraju simboličke poruke vlasti, a ujedno zrcale okolnosti društveno-povijesne stvarnosti na limesu katoličke i osmanske Dalmacije, ocrtava članak *Odjeća splitske općinske straže iz sredine XIX. stoljeća* (2002.), koji se logično veže uz prethodno spomenute. Izgled općinskog stražara iz tog doba bio je izrazito orijentalan, upravo turski, posebno zbog turbana – kako piše u svom dnevniku car Franjo I. godine 1818., kada je posjetio Dalmaciju. Arsen, koji je razvoju narodnog ruha i građanske odjeće u Splitu, Solinu i Kaštelima posvetio zasebne monografije, zaključuje da takav izgled komunalnih stražara ne treba čuditi, jer splitska gradska nošnja poprima svoj današnji oblik tek četrdesetih i pedesetih godina 19. stoljeća. S druge strane, ljudi iz Zagore svakodnevno su silazili u Split zbog trgovine i posla, pa su na ulicama grada gotovo prevladavali ljudi odjeveni po narodnu, sve do početka 20. stoljeća, pa i između dva svjetska rata. Tragovi Orijenta kojima je bio prošaran Split tog vremena bili su vidljivi, dakako, ne samo u načinu odijevanja, običajima, kulinarstvu, nego i u unutrašnjoj opremi kuća, donekle i u nekim arhitektonskim motivima.

Među Duplančićevim prilozima koji se izravno ili neizravno tiču splitske stolnice, svakako na prvom mjestu treba izdvojiti opsežnu studiju *Opis oltara sv. Staša u splitskoj katedra-*

cance in comprehending the operations of this formally highest body of the Split commune. Furthermore, Duplančić sheds light on the role and influence of the Church in communal life, providing valuable insights into the city's spaces, education, healthcare, economy, fortifications, cathedral treasury, and art, among other aspects. We can only echo the evaluation provided in this edition by Prof. Antun Cvitanić, an eminent authority on the structure of Split's communal governance: [Duplančić's] book contains not only critically presented material but also its approach to scientific, historiographical processing. Moreover, it can serve not only as a solid foundation for further study of the organisation and activities of the Split Grand Council but also for numerous other aspects of social life and activities in Split during the later decades of Venetian rule in Dalmatia.

Equally noteworthy is the study *The Ceremonial of a Split Archbishop from the End of the 17th Century* (2012), which presents the ceremonial practices of a Split archbishop compiled between 1682 and 1699. The publication includes a comparative analysis of several protocols detailing contemporary secular and ecclesiastical ceremonies, each set within specific spatial coordinates of the city. Within these descriptions, we observe apparent, albeit now seemingly trivial, disputes arising from clashes between inherited principles and individual vanities. Examples include debates over the order of kissing the Gospel and the *pax*, the incensing of the archbishop, the count, and members of the city administration during Mass, as well as regarding adoration of the cross on Good Friday. The study describes every aspect of the ceremonies, from the ritual and attire to the specifics of serving coffee, chocolate, sorbet, and *con acque gelate* in cups with saucers. These documents vividly depict the intricacies of elaborate rituals surrounding the investiture of a new archbishop or the transfer of princely functions, while also portraying various aspects of the symbolic representation of ecclesiastical and secular authority, illustrating how these ceremonies constructed reality according to the ideals of their own ideology and propaganda.

The mechanisms through which symbolic messages of authority are encoded, while also reflecting the socio-historical realities at the border of Catholic and Ottoman Dalmatia, are elucidated in the article *Split Municipal Guard Uniform from the mid-19th Century* (2002), which logically ties into the previously discussed themes. The appearance of the municipal guard from that era was distinctly oriental, specifically Ottoman, especially due to the turbans, as noted in the diary of Emperor Franz I during his 1818 visit to Dalmatia. Duplančić, who authored separate monographs on the evolution of folk costumes and civilian attire in Split, Solin, and Kaštela, concludes that the Oriental appearance of municipal guards should not be surprising, considering that the attire of Split inhabitants only solidified its present form in the 1840s and 1850s. Additionally, individuals from the hinterland frequented Split daily for trade and work, resulting in a prevalence of folk attire in the city streets until the early 20th century, extending even



Slika 4.
G. B. Camozzini, crtež oltara kasnogotičke kapele sv. Staša (prema D. Farlati, *Illyricum sacrum*, 1751.)

Figure 4.
G. B. Camozzini, Drawing of the Altar of the late Gothic Chapel of St. Anastasius (after D. Farlati, *Illyricum Sacrum*, 1751)

li iz *dvadesetih godina XVIII. stoljeća* (1997.), napisanu temeljem pedantno ispitane građe prikupljene za Farlatijev *Illyricum sacrum*, koja se do 1910. čuvala u knjižnici trogirске obitelji Fanfogna-Garagnin. U njoj se nalazio opis oltara sv. Anastazija u splitskoj katedrali, koji se može datirati između 1725. – 1726. i 1730. godine. Komparativnom analizom tog opisa i vijesti iz niza biskupskih vizitacija, te proučavanjem dostupne ikonografske građe, Arsen je uspio uspostaviti uvjerljivu kronologiju brojnih faza u transformaciji oltara splitskog suzaštitnika sv. Staša – od njegova prijenosa iz Salone sredinom 7. stoljeća do naših dana. Pritom je razriješio pitanja njegova izgleda u vrijeme nadbiskupa Bernarda (1209./1210.) te narav zahvata Jurja Dalmatinca koji je prilikom podizanja nove svečeve kapele 1448. iskoristio stari sarkofag s ranijeg oltara, ugrađivši ga u stipes, dodavši mu podnožje i gornji dio s menzom, da ga izgledom uskladi s oltarom u kapeli sv. Dujma, koju je dvadeset godina ranije podigao Bonino iz Milana. Ustanovio je da je Juraj na sjevernoj strani ostavio (ili napravio) otvor (*fenestella confe-*

between the two World Wars. The traces of Oriental influence that permeated Split during this period were evident not only in clothing, customs, and cuisine but also in the interior decoration of houses and, to some extent, in certain architectural motifs.

Among Duplančić's contributions directly or indirectly related to the Split Cathedral, one of the most notable is his extensive study titled *Description of the Altar of St. Anastasius in the Split Cathedral from the 1720s* (1997), which is based on meticulously examined material gathered for Farlati's *Illyricum Sacrum*. This material was previously housed in the library of the Trogir-based Fanfogna-Garagnin family until 1910 and contained a description of the St. Anastasius altar in the Split Cathedral, dating between 1725–1726 and 1730. Through a comparative analysis of this description and information from several episcopal visitations, as well as the study of available iconographic material, Duplančić managed to establish a convincing chronology of numerous phases in the transformation of the altar of Split's co-patron saint, St. Anastasius, from its transfer from Salona in the mid-7th century to the present day. In this manner, he addressed inquiries about its appearance during the tenure of Archbishop Bernard (1209–1210) and clarified the nature of Juraj Dalmatinac's intervention. In 1448, Dalmatinac repurposed the old sarcophagus from the previous altar when constructing the new St. Anastasius chapel. He incorporated it into the stipes, adding a base and upper part with the mensa to align its appearance with the altar in the chapel of St. Domnius, erected twenty years earlier by Bonino from Milan. He established that Juraj left (or created) an opening (*fenestella confessionis*) as a counterpart to Domnius' sarcophagus. He illustrated that these two altars, quite logically, evolved over the centuries, following the principle of aesthetic harmony to achieve symmetry in the confined space of the Split Cathedral. Therefore, sheer common sense implies that the current presentation of the chapels of St. Domnius and St. Anastasius should adhere to this principle, which was nearly disrupted by the archaeological reinterpretation of their appearance after the conservation research conducted in 1858 (the Chapel of St. Domnius) and in 1874 and 2020 (the Chapel of St. Anastasius).

Regarding the main altar in the cathedral of St. Domnius, it is noteworthy to mention the article *Preinake glavnog oltara splitske katedrale u XVII. stoljeću* (*Alterations to the Main Altar of the Split Cathedral in the 17th Century*, 2016 <2017>), which examines pastoral visitations and several other previously unknown sources to establish a more precise chronology of alterations made to the main altar of the Split Cathedral during the 17th century. Particularly, it draws upon the report of Petar Nicolini, the procurator of the Confraternity of the Most Holy Sacrament, from 1689. The article also delves into the arrangement of the Virgin's altar managed by the Kuparić family, tracks the fate of the silver trecento plate made by Iohannes Gerardini de Pesaro, provides new insights into the creation of

ssionis) – kao pandan Dujmovu sarkofagu. Pokazao je da su se ta dva oltara tijekom stoljeća mijenjala, posve logično, slijedeći načelo usklađivanja izgleda, uspostavljanjem simetrije u tijesnom prostoru splitske stolnice. Goli *common sense* implicira, konsekventno, da bi se današnja prezentacija kapela sv. Dujma i sv. Staša trebala povesti za tim načelom, koje je gotovo drastično narušeno arheologiziranjem njihova izgleda nakon konzervatorskih istraživanja provedenih 1958. (kapela sv. Dujma), odnosno 1974. i 2020. (kapela sv. Staša).

Govoreći o glavnom oltaru u Sv. Duje svakako valja dodati i članak *Preinake glavnog oltara splitske katedrale u XVII. stoljeću* (2016. <2017.>) u kojemu su mu pastoralne vizitacije ukrštenne s više drugih dotad nepoznatih izvora omogućile da preciznije utvrdi kronologiju mijena glavnog oltara splitske stolnice tijekom 17. stoljeća. Osobito se pritom oslanja na izvještaj Petra Nicolinija, prokuratora bratovštine Presvetog Sakramenta, iz 1689. godine. Piše i o uređenju Gospina oltara o kojem je brinula obitelj Kuparić, prati sudbinu srebrne trećentističke pale koju je izradio Ivan Gerardov iz Pesara, donosi nove podatke vezane uz izradu velikog nadbiskupskog križa i podizanje baroknog oltara sv. Dujma, objavljuje, konačno, i neke dosad neobjavljene nacрте za proširenje katedrale.

Splitskoj katedrali Duplančić je posvetio, rekosmo, izravno i neizravno, više tekstova. Članak *Pitanje izgradnje nove katedrale u Splitu do II. svjetskog rata* (1989.) doima se kao skica veće monografije. U njemu se iznosi kronološki pregled svih poznatih zamisli o proširenju, odnosno gradnji nove katedrale, od 16. stoljeća do 1970-ih godina, to jest do podizanja konkatedrale sv. Petra (1979./1980.). Kao i niz drugih njegovih tekstova, potaknuo je na daljnja istraživanja, koja su u međuvremenu iznijela na vidjelo više novih planova, osobito iz baroknog vremena. Valja podsjetiti: iza svih tih namjera, idealnih i konkretnih projekata, stoji činjenica da je katedrala sv. Dujma, ušavši u prostor nekadašnjeg carskog mauzoleja, čitavu gamu svojih liturgijskih potreba trebala oblikovati na površini koja je, bez niša, obasezala samo 144 četvorna metra.

Jedna od Arsenovih tema vezana je uz sv. Dujma, pri čemu osobito odskaka njegova dionica posla u monografiji *Sveti Dujam – štovanje kroz vjekove* (2004.), koju je priredio s Milanom Ivaniševićem i don Slavkom Kovačićem.

Svojim istraživanjima „pokrio“ je mnoge točke kunst-topografije staroga Splita otkrivajući njihov nekadašnji izgled. U članku *Iščeznuli detalj staroga Splita u Dioklecijanovoj palači* (2012.) interpretira i valorizira dotad nekomentirani konzervatorsko-restauratorski zahvat proveden 1928. godine prema uputama Frane Bulića i Ljube Karamana na jednoj od najvažnijih točaka unutar splitske povijesne jezgre, na početku Krešimirove ulice uz Željezna vrata, gdje je tada srušena slikovita gotička kuća koja je izvorno pripadala ob. Ciprianis. Gubitak je to veći ako imamo na umu da je u isto vrijeme (danas smatramo – bezrazložno) uklonjena i romanička kuća na drugom kraju iste strane ulice, pred Peristilom. Autor pokazuje da su tadašnji konzervatori nastojali u takvoj situaciji sačuvati ba-

the large archbishop's cross, the erection of the baroque altar of St. Domnius, and unveils previously unpublished designs for the cathedral's expansion.

Duplančić dedicated several texts, both directly and indirectly, to the Split Cathedral. His article *The Question of Building a New Cathedral in Split until World War II* (1989) serves as a preliminary sketch for a larger monograph. It presents a chronological overview of all known proposals for expanding or constructing a new cathedral, spanning from the 16th century to the 1970s, preceding the construction of the co-cathedral of St. Peter (1979–1980). This text, like many others by Duplančić, prompted further research, leading to the discovery of several new plans, particularly from the baroque period. It is noteworthy that behind all these intentions, ideal concepts, and tangible projects lies the inherent challenge faced by St. Domnius Cathedral. Built within the space of the former imperial mausoleum, the cathedral had to accommodate its entire range of liturgical needs on a surface area of only 144 m², not counting the niches.

A notable contribution of Arsen's work related to St. Domnius is the section he authored in the monograph *Saint Domnius: Worship Through the Centuries* (2004), which he edited alongside Milan Ivanišević and Don Slavko Kovačić.

Through his research, he reconstructed various facets of the kunst-topography of old Split, unveiling their former appearance. In his article *Vanished Elements of the Old City of Split as Revealed Within Diocletian's Palace* (2012), he scrutinises and assesses the previously overlooked conservation-restoration intervention carried out in 1928 according to the instructions of Frane Bulić and Ljubo Karaman. The intervention took place at one of the pivotal locations within the historical core of Split, near the Iron Gate at the beginning of Krešimirova Street, where a picturesque Gothic house belonging to the Cipriani family was demolished at that time. The magnitude of this loss becomes even more pronounced when considering that, concurrently (albeit now deemed unjustified), a Romanesque house was also demolished at the opposite end of the same street, in front of the Peristyle. The author illustrates that the conservators of that era sought to preserve at least some of the more prominent architectural elements from the Gothic house by incorporating them into the adjacent house of Marini on today's Adamova Street. However, this assimilation, along with the authentic Romanesque house to its south, resulted in a stylistic pastiche. Duplančić cross-references all available written and iconographic archival material, providing a comprehensive overview of the events at the time while offering valuable new insights on houses with oriel windows, of which there were several within the city.

In his article *Plans of Jesuit Houses in Split from the 18th Century* (1999), Duplančić publishes *ensign Moser de Filseck's* plans of two houses from 1762, which the Jesuits used as a hospice. They were located next to the northern wall of Diocletian's Palace, in today's Carrarina Poljana. However, the

rem neke izrazitije elemente arhitektonske dekoracije gotičke kuće ugrađivši ih u susjednu kuću Marini, u današnjoj Adamovoj ulici, makar su takvom prezentacijom, uz autentičnu romaničku kuću južno od te, stvorili stanoviti stilski pastiš. Arsen pritom unakrsno koristi svu dostupnu pisanu i ikografsku arhivsku građu, iznoseći potpun pregled događaja iz tog vremena, usputno donoseći i dragocjene nove napomene o kućama „s doksatom“ kakvih je bilo više unutar grada.

U članku *Nacrt isusovačkih kuća u Splitu iz XVIII. stoljeća* (1999.) objavljuje nacрте zastavnika Mosera de Filsecka iz 1762. godine za dvije kuće u kojima su isusovci uredili hospicij, uz sjeverni zid Dioklecijanove palače, na današnjoj Carrarinoj poljani. No članak je i skica znanstvene studije koja prati postupni razvoj tog dijela grada, kao i nastanak ove Poljanice staroga grada sredinom 19. stoljeća. Njezin nastanak, nagađam, treba možda vidjeti kao dio šire urbanističke regulacije potaknute otvaranjem Zlatnih vrata 1857. godine. Duplančić izlaže i (srećom) nerealizirane ideje o proširenju ulica u tom dijelu grada prema Schürmanovom regulacijskom planu iz 1924. i novom iz 1939. godine. Članak, konačno, podsjeća da je Carrarina poljana danas neuralgična točka povijesne jezgre, makar od najvišeg urbanističkog potencijala.

Važan prilog je i članak *Nekoliko splitskih kuća u XVIII stoljeću* (1987.) u kojemu izlaže i nekoliko nacрта zanimljivih za poznavanje izgleda povijesne jezgre Splita na izmaku mletačke uprave. Bonus članka čini detaljan opis srednjovjekovne crkve sv. Jakova *de colonia* koja se nalazila iza palače Milesi, srušene 1928., u doba kada je iz srca staroga grada iščupano još nekoliko crkvice, sve važnih urbanističkih orijentira.

Više puta se vraćao na razna pitanja vezana uz crkvu sv. Andrije na kriptoportiku Dioklecijanove palače. U članku *Kamena kustodija iz crkve sv. Andrije de Fenestris u Splitu* (1995.) daje i lijep pregled načina čuvanja euharistije koji se mijenjao kroz stoljeća, kao i kratku povijest te važne i zanimljive crkve.

Kapitalan prinos dao je u studiji *O splitskim zvoncima* (2011.). U žarištu je rasprava o zvoniku (zapravo zvoncima) vezanom uz samostan benediktinki Sv. Arnira (Sv. Eufemije) pred sjevernim zidinama Dioklecijanove palače koji je prethodnim istraživačima zadavao muke u pogledu definicije stilskih odlika, a time i u određivanju vremena gradnje. Karaman je smatrao da je riječ o karakterističnom primjeru *dalmatinsko-mletačkog zvonika renesansnog doba*. Cvito Fisković u njemu vidi utjecaj romanike, a poslije je pisao da je *skladan poput obeliska u svom klasicističkom jednostavnom obliku*. U opsežnoj raspravi Duplančić je objasnio povijesne okolnosti u kojima se današnji zvonik gradio od 1691. do otprilike 1710. godine. Donosi i niz dosad nepoznatih vijesti o samostanu, od kojih su neke gotovo bizarne. U vezi s kapelom sv. Arnira, koju je podigao Juraj Dalmatinac, navodi podatak apostolskog vizitatora M. Priulija iz 1603. koji kaže da su iznad nje neki mrtvački kovčezi, za koje je tražio da se uklone. Ta odredba očito nije bila po volji Splitana: u pregradnji napuštenog samostana 1827. u prostoru između krova i svoda kapele nađeni su mali ljesovi i u njima tri-

article also serves as a framework for a scientific study tracing the gradual development of this part of the city and the emergence of this square within the old city in the mid-19th century. Its establishment, I speculate, may be perceived as part of a broader urban regulation prompted by the opening of the Golden Gates in 1857. Duplančić also presents (thankfully) unrealized ideas for expanding the streets in that area of the city, based on Schürman's regulatory plan from 1924 and a new one from 1939. Finally, the article highlights the significance of Carrarina Poljana as a new crucial point in the historic core, despite its significant urban potential.

Another significant contribution is the article *Several Split Houses in the 18th Century* (1987), where Duplančić presents several drawings that offer insight into the appearance of Split's historical core at the end of Venetian rule. A bonus part of the article includes a detailed description of the mediæval church of St. Jacob *de Colonia*, located behind the Mileši Palace and demolished in 1928, during a time when several churches, once vital urban landmarks, were torn out from the heart of the old town.

He revisited various issues related to the Church of St. Andrew in the cryptoportico of Diocletian's Palace several times. In the article *Stone Custody from the Church of St. Andrew de Fenestris in Split* (1995), he provides a comprehensive overview of the methods of preserving the Eucharist that have evolved over the centuries, along with a brief history of this significant and intriguing church.

He made a significant contribution with the study *The City of Split Bell Towers* (2011). Central to the discussion is the bell tower (or rather, bell towers) associated with the Benedictine convent of St. Raynerius (St. Euphemia), located near the northern walls of Diocletian's Palace. The towers had previously posed challenges for researchers in defining their stylistic characteristics and determining their construction period. Karaman regarded them as typical examples of a *Dalmatian-Venetian bell tower from the Renaissance period*. Cvito Fisković identified Romanesque influences, later describing them as *harmonious in their classicist simplicity, akin to obelisks*. In a detailed analysis, Duplančić elucidated the historical circumstances surrounding the construction of the present bell tower, dating from 1691 to around 1710. He also unveiled a series of previously unknown facts about the convent, some of which are quite peculiar. Regarding the chapel of St. Raynerius, built by Juraj Dalmatinac, Duplančić cited a statement from the apostolic visitor M. Priuli from 1603, who reported the presence of some coffins above it and requested their removal. This directive evidently met with resistance from the people of Split. During the renovation of the abandoned convent in 1827, in the space between the roof and the vault of the chapel, small coffins were found containing thirty-four skeletons of newborns and two older children, along with wreaths of flowers, wax crosses, and other items typically used in children's burials. Duplančić concludes that a special commission



Slika 5.
Kamena
kustodija iz crkve sv. Andrije
de Fenestris u Splitu

Figure 5.
Stone Custody from the
Church of St. Andrew de
Fenestris in Split

deset četiri kostura novorođenčadi i dvoje starije djece, a uz njih vijenci od cvijeca, križići od voska i slične stvari uobičajene prigodom pokapanja djece. Posebno povjerenstvo – nalazi Duplančić – ustvrdilo je da je prema tradiciji taj prostor služio za pokapanje djece obitelji koje su u crkvi imale svoje grobove. Slične *capsae illae cadaverum* spominju se 1579. ispred oltara u crkvi sv. Dominika, a jednog je 1604. vidio nadbiskup De Dominis u kapeli sv. Jerolima u crkvi Svetog Duha. Možda na liniji iste tradicije valja vidjeti postavljanje malog sarkofaga s tijelima dviju kćeri kralja Bele IV. iznad glavnog portala splitske katedrale? U drugom dijelu članka donosi kronološki pregled svih splitskih zvonika do sredine 19. stoljeća s nizom novih arhivskih vijesti važnih za ispravke i dopune dosadašnjih interpretacija. Na kraju Arsen, u svom stilu, iznosi podatke o crkvi sv. Leonarda i ubicira je sjeverno od Srebrnih vrata Dioklecijanove palače.

determined that according to tradition, this space was used for the burial of children from families who had their own tombs in the church. Similar *capsae illae cadaverum* were mentioned in 1579 in front of the altars in the Church of St. Dominic, and one was seen in 1604 by Archbishop De Dominis in the chapel of St. Jerome in the Church of the Holy Spirit. Perhaps, in line with the same tradition, the placement of a small sarcophagus containing the bodies of two daughters of King Bela IV above the main portal of Split Cathedral should be observed. In the second part of the article, he provides a chronological overview of all the bell towers in Split up to the mid-19th century, along with a series of new archival reports important for corrections and additions to previous interpretations. Finally, in his style, Duplančić presents data on the Church of St. Leonard and its location north of the Silver Gates of Diocletian's Palace.

In the article *The Church of St. John the Evangelist on Marjan Hill, Split* (2009), through cross-referencing of archbishop visitations, old cadastres, archival photographs, and the establishment of a catalogue of archaeological finds from the period, as well as by utilising two field notebooks of Luka Jelić, he managed to ascertain accurate data regarding the discovery of stone furniture associated with the Church of St. Michael on the hill called Bambina glavica and the Church of St. John the Evangelist, situated east of it on the southern side of Marjan mountain. The latter was built in the early Christian period and then renovated in the early Middle Ages, during which it received new lintels. This enabled Duplančić to present a comprehensive overview of early Christian sites in the broader area of the Split ager.

A significant addition to his body of work is the brief examination of the well-known relief portraying St. John the Evangelist, previously embedded above the entrance to the courtyard of the hermitage of St. Jerome. This relief gained attention in scholarly literature thanks to Austrian art historian Oswald von Kutschera-Woborsky, who interpreted it as a work originating from the circle of *Niccolò di Giovanni Fiorentino* and *Andrea Alessi*, inspired by Roman funerary monuments. Offering a fresh perspective, Nenad Cambi conducted a detailed analysis of subsequent interventions on the relief and concluded that it is a relief palimpsest, an original Roman funerary monument from the early imperial period that underwent significant reworking in the second half of the 15th century. Predrag Marković redirected the discussion to its origins with a polemical text, highlighting the logic behind subsequent interventions on the relief, which he views as an assemblage composed of four parts. He referred back to von Kutschera-Woborsky's conclusion that it is a work created through direct observation of a Roman stele, as well as to the opinion of Cvito Fisković that it was crafted by an unknown sculptor from Split in the circle of *Niccolò di Giovanni Fiorentino*. In contrast, Duplančić raises the question of whether the relief was once part of an altar in the Church of St. John, similar to

U tekstu *Crkva sv. Ivana Evanđelista na splitskome Marjanu* (2009.) uspio je unakrsnim istraživanjem nadbiskupskih vizitacija i starog katastra, arhivskih fotografija i uspostavom kataloga arheoloških nalaza iz vremena, te temeljem dvaju terenskih notesa Luke Jelića utvrditi točne podatke o otkriću kamenog namještaja koji se vezuju uz crkvu sv. Mihovila na Bambinoj glavici, odnosno crkve sv. Ivana Evanđelista istočno od nje, na južnoj strani Marjana. Potonja je podignuta u starokršćansko doba, a zatim obnovljena u ranom srednjem vijeku, kada je dobila nove nadvratnike. To mu je dalo pretekst da donese cjelovit pregled ranokršćanskih lokaliteta u širem prostoru splitskog agera.

Značajan dodatak je i kratko razmatranje o poznatom reljefu s prikazom sv. Ivana Evanđelista, donedavno uzidanom nad ulazom u dvorište eremitaže sv. Jere. U znanstvenu literaturu ga je uveo austrijski povjesničar umjetnosti Oswald von Kutschera-Woborsky interpretirajući ga kao djelo iz kruga Nikole Firentinca i Andrije Alešija nastalo ugledanjem na rimske nadgrobne spomenike. Novu perspektivu donio je Nenad Cambi koji je detaljnom analizom naknadnih intervencija na reljefu zaključio kako je riječ o reljefu-palimpsestu – izvornom rimskom nadgrobnom spomeniku iz ranocararskog doba, znatnije prerađenom u drugoj polovici 15. stoljeća. Raspravu je na početak vratio Predrag Marković u polemičkom tekstu, ukazujući na logiku naknadnih intervencija na reljefu koji je svojevrsni asamblaj, sastavljen od čak četiri dijela. Vratio se zaključku von Kutschere-Woborskog, da je riječ o djelu koje je nastalo izravnim gledanjem neke rimske stele, te mišljenju Cvita Fiskovića da ga je izradio neki nepoznati splitski kipar u orbiti Nikole Ivanova Firentinca. Duplančić se pak pita nije li možda taj reljef bio na oltaru u crkvi sv. Ivana *poput kamenih triptiha i reljefa iz crkva sv. Jere, Gospe od Betlema i Gospe od Sedam žalosti, također na Marjanu, izrađenih u XV. stoljeću?*

Suverena demonstracija Arsenove cjelovite interpretativne metode vidljiva je i u članku *Kameni ukrasi s crkve sv. Mihovila in ripa maris u Splitu* (2011.). Riječ je o crkvi srušenoj 1906., čime je dijelila sudbinu još nekoliko značajnih sakralnih građevina nestalih iz tkiva povijesne jezgre grada u prvim desetljećima 20. stoljeća, ilustrirajući pragmatične obzore tadašnje konzervatorske discipline. Autor je temeljem fotografije crkve sv. Mihovila, prije rušenja, uspio iznijeti pedantnu deskripciju njezinih pojedinih dijelova. Edikula iznad ulaznih vrata može se po grbu nadbiskupa Bartolomeja Zabarelle (1428. – 1439.) datirati u njegovo vrijeme. Vezano uz konzole te edikule, Duplančić izlaže zanimljivu genealogiju motiva isklesanih glavnica na njima, s nizom lokalnih komparacija – rekao bih na način koji je bio svojstven Cvitu Fiskoviću, Arsenovom trajnom uzoru. Posebno valorizira glavu koja je vjerojatno pripadala kipu (sv. Mihovila?) koji je stajao u edikuli, a po njemu ukazuje na mogući antički izvor. U svakom slučaju, ova interesantna djela možemo možda vidjeti na liniji splitske onodobne skulpture koja se obnavljala na koordiniranim graditeljskim pothvatima, u gradnjama Kneževe palače, obnovi nadbiskupske kurije, etc.

the stone triptychs and reliefs from the churches of St. Jerome, Our Lady of Bethlehem, and Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows, also located on Marjan and dating back to the 15th century?

An independent demonstration of his comprehensive interpretative method is evident in the article *Stone Decorations from the Church of St. Michael in ripa maris in Split*, (2011). The article discusses a church demolished in 1906, sharing the fate of several other significant religious buildings lost from the fabric of the city's historical core in the early decades of the 20th century, thereby illustrating the pragmatic horizons of the conservation discipline at the time. Based on a photograph of the Church of St. Michael before its demolition, the author provided a meticulous description of its individual parts. The niche above the entrance doors can be dated to the time of Archbishop Bartolomeo Zabarella (1428–1439) based on his coat of arms. Regarding the consoles of this niche, Duplančić presents an interesting genealogy of motifs carved on them, drawing local comparisons with local examples, a method reminiscent of Cvito Fisković, who remains an enduring exemplar for Duplančić. He particularly values the head, likely belonging to a statue (possibly of St. Michael) that stood in the niche, and suggests a possible ancient source for it. In any case, these intriguing works may be viewed in line with contemporary Split sculpture, which underwent renewal through coordinated building endeavours, including the construction of the Duke's Palace and the renovation of the Archbishop's Palace.

One of Duplančić's themes involves the interpretation of earlier-century sepulchral monuments in Split. In his text *About Older Tombstones in Split* (2007), he examines six sepulchral plaques from Split churches and identifies their owners. Duplančić attributes a fragment of a plaque featuring a portrait of the deceased, housed in the Archaeological Museum, to Archbishop Jakobín Badoer († 1451) and credits the craftsmanship to Andrea Alessi. Furthermore, he offers a fresh interpretation of the inscription on the plaque of Canon Ivan Fabijanov from the periphery of the cathedral, dating back to the second half of the 15th century. The inscription, which has garnered attention from numerous interpreters *due to its grandiose patriotism*—from John Mason Neale in 1860 and Don Frane Bulić to Mihovil Abramić and Cvito Fisković—has been interpreted as the declaration of an honourable citizen of Split who takes pride in his birthplace and disregards all other glory: *O passerby, stop for a moment. I, Ivan Fabiani, lie here. I was a Split native and scorned all other glory* (as translated by Fisković). However, Duplančić relies on a more accurate translation by Bratislav Lučin: *Hey, you who pass by, stop for a moment. I, Ivan [son of] Fabiani, was a Split native. Having achieved another glory, I scorned it. I cultivated piety and integrity. Pray for me, noble traveller. And be greeted. And move on.* (Heu tu qui transis parum persta, Johannes Fabiani Spalatensis fui. Aliam gloriam nactus sprevi, pietatem et innocentiam colui. Ora pro me viator optime et vale et ambula.)



Slika 6.
Crkva sv. Mihovila *in ripa maris* prije rušenja 1906. godine (fototeka Konzervatorskog odjela u Splitu)

Figure 6.
The Church of St. Michael *in ripa maris* before its demolition in 1906 (photo archive of the Conservation Department in Split)

Jedna od Duplančićevih tema odnosi se na interpretaciju splitskih sepulkralnih spomenika ranijih stoljeća. Tako u tekstu *Prilog o nadgrobnim spomenicima starijeg doba u Splitu* (2007.) obrađuje šest nadgrobnih ploča iz splitskih crkava i utvrđuje kome su pripadale. Ulomak ploče s likom pokojnika iz Arheološkog muzeja pripisuje nadbiskupu Jakobinu Badoeru († 1451.) i dlijetu Andrije Alešija. Natpisu na ploči kanonika Ivana Fabijanova iz periptera katedrale (druga polovina 15. stoljeća) daje novo tumačenje. Riječ je o natpisu koji je privukao pažnju niza interpreta *zbog njegovog pompoznoeg patriotizma* (od Johna Masona Nealea 1860. i don Frane Bulića, do Mihovila Abramića i Cvita Fiskovića) koji su na njemu čitali iskaz jednog čestitog Splitsanina koji se ponosi svojim rodnim mjestom i za drugu slavu ne mari: *O prolazniče, zastani malo, ja, Ivan Fabjanić, ovdje ležim. Bijah Splitsanin i prezreh svu ostalu slavu* (u Fiskovićevevu prijevodu). Duplančić se, međutim, oslonio na točniji prijevod Bratislava Lučina: *Hej, ti, koji prolaziš, zastani nakratko. Ivan [sin] Fabijanov Splitsanin bijah. Drugu slavu stekaviši, nju prezreh: pobožnost i čestitost gajih. Moli za mene, valjani putniče. I buđi pozdravljen. I hodi dalje.* (Heu tu qui transis parum persta, Johannes Fabiani Spalatensis fui. Aliam gloriam nactus spre-

From this, Duplančić deduces: *It's not that Ivan did not need any other glory besides being a Split native, but rather he was just a Split native who rejected other acquired glory because piety and integrity were more important to him.* However, I would hesitate to dismiss the eloquent manifestation of what could be considered typical Split megalomania, innocent and endearing, as Ljubo Karaman would say, always mixed with a healthy dose of self-irony rooted in the sincere and boundless love of Split natives for Split, which ultimately condensed into that unusual maxim: *What's London compared to the city of Split?* So, here, I would emphasise Ivan's declaration: *I was a Split native!* In other words, I encountered another glory, but I scorned that other one (apart from being a Split native). So, parochialism to the fullest extent. Parochialism like the one we hear, for example, when reading the inscription on the sarcophagus of Prior Petar, the first known magistrate of Split, in the peripteros of the cathedral, that he was *natus, nutritus et eruditus in Spalato*—born, raised, and educated in Split. As the saying goes, a Split native from Split.

In the same text, he describes the tombstone of Canon Ivan Krstitelj Augubio, located in the middle of the floor of the current church on Sustipan, which was transferred there in 1814 along with the flooring of the old Benedictine church. Initially perceived as a depiction of a Renaissance-era bishop, Duplančić, drawing from records found in Farlati's church history of Illyricum, identifies it as belonging to a canon of the Split Church who assumed the permanent commendatorship of St. Stephen in 1748, at the age of eighteen. This description provides him with an opportunity to present a nice overview of Split's sepulchral sculpture and to assert that Augubio's slab is not a later creation of the "Poljud Renaissance School" but rather marks the beginning of a series of similar works. Continuing his analysis, he examines the tombstone of the Tisičić family from the chapel of Our Lady of Health (better known as Our Lady of the Girdle) in Prothyron above the Peristyle. Through this process, he rectifies previous assertions that the chapel was later named after St. Charles Borromeo and successfully dates its construction between 1663 and 1672 (in contrast to earlier claims of it being erected in 1650, according to the inscription on the lintel, or based on the year that actually marked the vow of thanks for deliverance from the plague that occurred that year).

Another exemplary instance of his work is seen in *The Reutilisation of Roman-Era Sarcophagi and Two Canons of Split from the 15th and 16th Centuries* (2014), where, alongside discussing the phenomenon in the title, he provides a comprehensive overview of the use of sarcophagi in the vicinity of the cathedral. The study yields new biographical medallions that complement the research on the old Split chapter by Don Ivan Ostojić, and it also presents fresh data concerning the sarcophagus of Don Frane Bulić at the Solin Manastirine.

At the outset of this series of texts is the article *The Former Cemetery near the Split Conventual Franciscans* (1985), in which

vi, pietatem et innocentiam colui. Ora pro me viator optime et vale et ambula.)

Arsen iz tog zaključuje: *Nije, dakle, riječ o tome da Ivanu nije trebala druga slava osim one da je Splitsčanin, već je on samo Splitsčanin koji je odbacio drugu stečenu slavu jer su mu pobožnost i čestitost bile važnije.* Pa ipak, žao bi mi bilo odreći se tog elokventnog znaka nekako logične splitske megalomanije, nedužne i simpatične, kako bi rekao Ljubo Karaman, uvijek pomiješane s dozom zdrave autoironije kojoj je korijen u iskrenoj i neograničenoj ljubavi Splitsčana prema Splitu, koja se na kraju zgusnula u onu neobičnu maksimu: Ča je pusta Londra kontra Splitu gradu. Ja bih dakle ovdje stavio naglasak na Ivanovu deklaraciju: *Splitsčanin bijah!* Hoće reći: susreo sam i drugu slavu, ali sam tu drugu (osim da se bude Splitsčanin) prezreo. Kampanilizam, dakle, na potenciju. Kampanilizam kakav čujemo, na primjer, kad na sarkofagu priora Petra, prvog poznatoga splitskog načelnika, u peripteru stolne crkve, čitamo da je *natus, nutritus et eruditus in Spalato* – rođen, othranjen i odgojen Splitu. Što se kaže – Splitsčanin iz Splita.

U istom tekstu opisuje nadgrobnu ploču kanonika Ivana Krstitelja Augubija sred pada današnje crkve na Sustipanu, prenesenu onamo 1814., zajedno s pločnikom iz stare benediktinske crkve. U literaturu je ušla kao prikaz nekog biskupa iz doba renesanse, dočim Duplančić, prema zapisu u građi za Farlatijevu crkvenu povijest Ilirika, otkriva da je riječ o kanoniku splitske Crkve, koji je 1478. postao trajni komendatar Sv. Stjepana, dakle u dobi od osamnaest godina. Taj opis mu daje prigodu da napravi lijepu panoramu splitske sepulkralne plastike i zaključi da Augubijeva ploča nije, dakle, kasniji rad „poljudske renesansne škole“, nego da stoji na početku niza sličnih djela. U nastavku teksta govori o nadgrobnoj ploči obitelji Tisičić iz crkvice Gospe od Zdravlja (poznatije pod naslovom Gospe od Pojasa) u Protirovu nad Peristilom. Ispravlja pritom ranije pisanje da bi ta kapela kasnije bila nazvana imenom sv. Karla Boromejskog, te uspijeva njenu gradnju datirati u vrijeme između 1663. i 1672. (naspram ranijih tvrdnji da je podignuta 1650., po natpisu s nadvratnika, odnosno prema godini koja zapravo donosi spomen zavjeta u znak zahvalnosti za izbjavljenje od kuge koja se javila te godine).

Paradigmatičan je njegov rad *Reutilizacija antičkih sarkofaga i dvojica splitskih kanonika iz XV. i XVI. stoljeća* (2014.) u kojemu će, pored raspređanja o fenomenu iz naslova, dati lijep pregled uporabe sarkofaga u prostoru oko katedrale. Dobitak su novi biografski medaljoni koji upotpunjavaju istraživanja o starom splitskom kaptolu don Ivana Ostojića, te na kraju – novi podaci o sarkofagu don Frane Bulića na solinskim Manastirinama.

Na početku tog niza tekstova stoji članak *Nekadašnje groblje kod splitskih konventualaca* (1985.), u kojemu analizira nekoliko nacrti koji su nastali kao refleks kuge koja se u Splitu javljala tijekom 18. stoljeća. Dodatak tog teksta su razmatranja o beneficiju sv. Feliksa, jednom od najstarijih u kojemu se spominju zemlje čiji su prihodi išli za uzdržavanje orguljaša i orgulja splitske stolnice (*beneficium Organi* koji se spominje najkasnije g. 1450.).

he analyses several sketches that emerged in response to the plague that struck Split during the 18th century. Additionally, this text delves into considerations regarding one of the oldest benefices, the benefice of St. Felix, where the income from lands was allocated to support the organist and organ of the Split Cathedral (*beneficium Organi* mentioned no later than 1450).

Bulić's understanding of the delicate balance between science and politics is also apparent in his association with the esteemed Victorian architect Thomas Graham Jackson. Jackson conducted three extensive autumn campaigns in 1882, 1884, and 1885, traversing the length and breadth of the Croatian coastline and compiling his observations into three substantial volumes of the book *Dalmatia, the Quarnero, and Istria*, published in Oxford in 1887. In Split, he relied on two authoritative guides: the young conservator Don Frane Bulić and Josip Alačević. Bulić had recently been transferred from Zadar to Split in 1883 to become the director of the *Lyceum Classicum* and conservator for the Split district, and subsequently as director of the Archaeological Museum in 1884. However, it appears that Alačević made a stronger impression on Jackson, which may surprise only those unfamiliar with the intellectual prowess of this now unfortunately little-known polymath from Split. Alačević, a judge, historian, archaeologist, and conservator of antiquities for the archives of the Split district (1878–1887), served as a corresponding member of archaeological institutes in Berlin and Vienna. Together with his cousin Mihovil Glavinić, Alačević launched the *Bullettino di archaeologia e storia dalmata*, which later came under the editorship of Bulić in 1884, eventually evolving into today's *Journal of Dalmatian Archaeology and History* of the Split Archaeological Museum.

In the article *Thomas Graham Jackson, Don Frane Bulić, and Salona* (2018), Duplančić delineates the nature of their relationship, characterised by mutual respect, and highlights Bulić's efforts to translate and publish several chapters of Jackson's book in the *Bullettino*. As an addition to the issue for 1889, an Italian translation of chapters covering the history of the island and town of Korčula, the cathedral, important monuments, the islet of Badija, and Mljet was printed. Bulić then intended to publish the Italian translation of chapters X, XI, and XII from the second book, which pertains to the history of Split, Diocletian's Palace, the cathedral with its bell tower and treasury, the baptistery, the Peristyle, the Church of Holy Trinity, the Franciscan Monastery in Poljud, and Salona. Clarendon Press in Oxford granted permission for publication. Jackson translated the chapters himself, with proofreading provided by the British botanist and politician of Italian descent, Charles Carmichael Lacaita, and the historian and publicist from Zadar, Vitaliano Brunelli. He also enlisted Bulić's help to find better solutions for translating certain technical terms. However, despite these efforts, as noted by Duplančić, Bulić's *Bullettino* did not report any news about the book upon its publication,

Bulićevu svijest o tankoj liniji koja dijeli znanost i politiku, pokazuje i njegov odnos s poznatim viktorskim arhitektom Thomasom Grahamom Jacksonom koji je u tri višetjedne jesenske kampanje 1882., 1884. i 1885. prokrstaro hrvatskom obalom uzduž i, ukoliko se može kazati, poprijeko, te svoja zapazanja ukoričio u trima zamašnim svescima knjige *Dalmatia, the Quarnero and Istria*, tiskane u Oxfordu 1887. U Splitu je imao dva autoritativna vodiča, mladoga konzervatora don Frane Bulića i Josipa Alačevića. Prvi je upravo 1883. bio premješten iz Zadra u Split na mjesto ravnatelja Klasične gimnazije i konzervatora za splitski okrug, a od 1884. za ravnatelja Arheološkog muzeja. Čini se pak da je Alačević na nj ostavio jači dojam, što može začuditi samo onoga koji ne poznaje intelektualnu staturu toga danas, nažalost, malo poznatog splitskog polihistora enciklopedijske širine – suca, povjesničara i arheologa, konzervatora starina za arhive splitskog okruga (1878. – 1887.), dopisnoga člana arheoloških instituta u Berlinu i Beču, koji je s rođakom Mihovilom Glavinićem pokrenuo *Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata* (od 1884. u uredništvu s Bulićem) – današnji *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* splitskog Arheološkog muzeja.

Duplančić, u članku *Thomas Graham Jackson, don Frane Bulić i Salona* (2018.) opisuje narav njihova odnosa, uzajamno poštovanje, te Bulićevo nastojanje da nekoliko poglavlja Jacksonove knjige prevede i tiska u *Bullettinu*. Zaista, kao dodatak broju za 1889. tiskan je talijanski prijevod poglavlja koje obuhvaća povijest otoka i grada Korčule, katedralu, važnije spomenike, otočić Badiju i Mljet. Potom je kanio objaviti talijanski prijevod X., XI. i XII. poglavlja iz druge knjige, koji se odnose na povijest Splita, Dioklecijanovu palaču, katedralu sa zvonikom i riznicom, krstionicu, Peristil, crkvu Sv. Trojice i franjevački samostan na Poljudu te Salonu. *Clarendon Press* u Oxfordu je kao izdavač dopustio objavljivanje. Jackson je poglavlja sam preveo, uz lekturu britanskog botaničara i političara talijanskoga podrijetla Charlesa Carmichaela Lacaitea te zadarskog povjesničara i publicista Vitaliana Brunellija, a Bulića je molio da nađe bolja rješenja za prijevod nekih tehničkih izraza. No, pored svega toga – zapaža Duplančić – Bulićev *Bullettino* nije donio nikakvu vijest o knjizi nakon njezina objavljivanja, po svojoj prilici nastojeći izbjeći polemiku, s obzirom na to da su se u stručnoj literaturi (poput zagrebačkoga *Viestnika Hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva*), javili oštri napadi na Jacksonovu knjigu, osobito na povijesne dijelove koji su interpretirani kao autorov protalijanski stav.

Inače, i u spomenutom članku daje nam na kraju poseban bonus: piše o članku arhitekta Georga Hubbarda iz 1910. u kojem se govori o Saloni te spominju Bulićeva istraživanja i dalmatinska nošnja. Hubbard je putovao duž naše obale 1884. i 1901. te potom u Oxfordu održao predavanje (u Jacksonovoj nanočnosti), izloživši pritom i zbirku dalmatinskih nošnja, predmeta iz Crne Gore te srebrni i zlatni filigranski nakit sa šireg prostora Balkana. Nekoliko nošnja posudio je i sâm Jackson. Ako se smije dodati nešto na tu temu: o interesu koji je u to

presumably to avoid controversy, given the sharp criticisms of Jackson's book that began to appear in scholarly literature (such as the *Viestnik Hrvatskoga arheološkoga društva* from Zagreb), particularly targeting the historical sections interpreted as the author's pro-Italian stance.

Additionally, in the aforementioned article, Duplančić provides a special bonus by discussing architect George Hubbard's 1910 article on Salona, in which Bulić's research and Dalmatian attire are mentioned. Hubbard, who had travelled along the Croatian coast in 1884 and 1901, delivered a lecture in Oxford (with Jackson in attendance), during which he showcased a collection of Dalmatian attire, items from Montenegro, as well as silver and gold filigree jewellery from the broader Balkan region. Jackson himself borrowed several costumes for the occasion. It is worth noting the interest in England during that time for such artefacts, as evidenced by the relatively numerous items displayed in the Pitt Rivers Museum in Oxford, which should be carefully documented and evaluated by our ethnologists.

A significant focus in his bibliography is dedicated to articles that trace the origins and evolution of the journal *Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata*, examining its trajectory through the biographies of its founders and editors, particularly Don Frane Bulić. In a 2008 article, Duplančić sheds light on the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the journal by drawing from contemporary newspapers, journals, official documents, and the personal correspondence of its editors, M. Glavinić, J. Alačević, and Don F. Bulić. The journal emerged under the formal patronage of Theodor Mommsen, whose allegedly anti-Catholic views and denigration of Italian literature, Slavic culture, and French politics sparked vehement backlash in local and Zagreb publications. Duplančić's research uncovered a more pragmatic side of that Don Frane. For instance, upon Mommsen's death, Bulić, on behalf of himself and the editorial board, conveyed condolences to the family and the German Archaeological Institute but refrained from publishing an obituary in the *Bullettino*, despite Alačević's desire to write one.

Furthermore, given the abundance of texts containing news, often very detailed, about a series of museum directors, from Lanza and Carrara, Glavinić, Čobrnčić, and Alačević, to Bulić and Abramić, one could easily imagine that Duplančić, at some point, considered writing an intellectual biography for each of them.

In his article *Sources for the History of Freemasonry in Split* (1992), Duplančić analyses documents, primarily collected by Bulić, from the archives of "Bihać," the *Croatian Society for the Study of Domestic History in Split*, as well as from the legacy of Mihovil Abramić, initially Bulić's right-hand man but later turned antagonist. In addition to providing insights into the period between the two World Wars, Duplančić offers a detailed description of the operations of the Split lodge, which is particularly intriguing. He also publishes a floor plan of the

vrijeme u Engleskoj vladao za takvu vrstu artefakata mnogo govore i relativno brojni predmeti izloženi u Pitt Rivers Museum u Oxfordu, koje bi naši etnolozi jednom trebali pažljivo registrirati i vrednovati.

Značajan temat u Arsenovoj bibliografiji čine članci koji prate pokretanje i razvoj časopisa *Bullettino di archeologia e storia dalmata / Vjesnika za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku*, čiju sudbinu promatra kroz prizmu biografija njegovih osnivača i urednika, nadasve don Frane Bulića. U jednom članku iz 2008., temeljem tekstova iz onodobnih novina i časopisa, službenih spisa i osobne prepiske, njegovih urednika M. Glavinića, J. Alačevića, potom don F. Bulića, osvjetljava okolnosti pokretanja časopisa koji je izašao pod formalnom zaštitom autoriteta Theodora Mommsena, čiji su navodno antikatolički stavovi i omalovažavanje talijanske književnosti, slavenske kulture i francuske politike izazvali žučno negodovanje u lokalnoj i zagrebačkoj publicistici. Duplančićevo istraživanje je pokazalo da je don Frane znao biti pragmatičniji nego što to obično mislimo. U prigodi Mommsenove smrti, na primjer, Bulić je u svoje ime i u ime uredništva izrazio osjećaje sućuti obitelji i Njemačkom arheološkom institutu, ali je izbjegao u *Bullettinu* objaviti nekrolog, premda ga je Alačević želio napisati.

Inače, iz broja tekstova u kojima se javljaju vijesti, često veoma opširne, o nizu ravnatelja muzeja – od Lanze i Carra, Glavinića, Čobrnića i Alačevića te don F. Bulića i Abramića – mogli bismo lako zamisliti da je Duplančić u nekom času imao na umu da napiše intelektualnu biografiju svakog od njih posebno.

U članku *Izvori za povijest masonstva u Splitu* (1992.) analizira dokumente (sabrane mahom Bulićevom rukom) iz arhiva „Bihaća“, hrvatskog društva za istraživanje domaće povijesti u Splitu, te iz ostavštine Mihovila Abramića (prvo Bulićeve „desne ruke“, no ubrzo antagonista). Uz vijesti iz razdoblja između dva svjetska rata posebno je zanimljiv podroban opis rada splitske lože. Objavljuje i tlocrt lože iz 1814., kada se ona nalazila u tzv. Generalatu, u zapadnom dijelu lazareta na gradskoj obali.

Buliciana čini važan segment Duplančićeva opusa, koji je, zapravo, u svom dobrom dijelu, svojevrsni dijalog s don Franom, čije djelo mu je uvijek bilo uzorom, pa i kada ispravlja pojedine Bulićeve navode, posebno u pitanju provenijencije brojnih predmeta iz muzejskih zbirki. Među tekstovima koje Bulića imaju izravno u fokusu, ovdje bih naveo samo jedan – *Jedno Bulićevo pismo o spomeniku Grguru Ninskome* (1986.). Don Franina borba protiv postavljanja spomenika Grguru Ninskome na Peristilu Dioklecijanove palače dobro je poznata. Zaista, duh prvih desetljeća splitskog 20. stoljeća možda najbolje razumijemo kada ga zovemo iz boce s etiketom „don Frane Bulić“. Duplančić ovdje skreće pažnju na nepoznat detalj iz polemike oko Grgura, na zadnji potez koji je don Frane odlučio povući u nastojanju da spriječi *nečuven atentat* na Peristil: dne 15. svibnja 1929. napisao je opsežnu predstavku kralju Aleksandru, koja je, navodno, utjecala na to da kralj na kraju ne nazoči sve-

lodge from 1814, when it was located in the so-called Generalate, in the western part of the lazaretto on the city's waterfront.

Buliciana constitutes a significant portion of Duplančić's body of work, representing a continuous dialogue with Don Frane, whose legacy has always served as his inspiration, even when rectifying certain assertions made by Bulić, particularly concerning the origins of numerous items in museum collections. Among the texts that directly focus on Bulić, I will highlight one: *A Letter from Bulić Regarding the Monument to Gregory of Nin* (1986). Don Frane's opposition to the placement of the monument to Gregory of Nin in the Peristyle of Diocletian's Palace is well documented. Indeed, the spirit of the first decades of Split in the 20th century can perhaps be best understood through the lens of "Don Frane Bulić." Duplančić sheds light on an unknown detail from the controversy surrounding Gregory: Don Frane's final attempt to prevent the unprecedented intrusion on the Peristyle. On 15 May 1929, he penned an extensive petition to King Alexander, which purportedly influenced the king's decision not to attend the unveiling ceremony of Meštrović's Gulliver. However, Duplančić underscores the mutual respect between Bulić and the esteemed sculptor, highlighting that their disagreement was a debate *ad rem*, not *ad hominem*. Indeed, it appears that the monument itself was not a point of contention for Don Frane, neither in terms of its design nor its political message, but solely regarding its proposed location. He himself suggested that the monument be placed in Botičeva Poljana (today's Trg Republike), where its *combative character against the imposition of foreign elements on our shores* would be accentuated, as it was the site of the Gabinetto di Lettura frequented by Italian sympathisers.

During forty years of continuous daily research, Duplančić honed his increasingly narrative style of writing. While always distinct, he avoided indulging in anecdotal tones, despite recognising the potential for such presentations on many of the topics he explored. However, he occasionally departed from this approach when engaging in imaginary conversations with the shadow of the esteemed Don Frane, whose actions were largely expressed through public statements and gestures. In one such instance, Duplančić vividly recounts a pasquinade that Bulić himself, today we would say, "posted" on the newly erected railing of the monument to Gregory. He wrote: *VICTRIX CAUSA DIIS PLACUIT, SED VICTA CATONI*—*The victors pleased the gods, but the vanquished Cato* is a famous maxim from Lucan's *Pharsalia* (1:128), cited when referring to someone who persists in a just cause despite facing hopeless odds. *Someone had it cut out and took the inscription to be kept in the City Library. The people of Split having their fun.* Bulić notes contentedly, adding: *Abomination in loco sancto*, according to Mat 24:15 (*So when you see the abomination of desolation spoken of by the prophet Daniel, standing in the holy place*).

Alongside that text, I would like to mention another one, *Information on Meštrović and His Works from the Correspond-*



Slika 7.
Kip Grgura Ninskog Ivana
Meštrovića na Peristilu
(fototeka Konzervatorskog
odjela u Splitu)

Figure 7.
Statue of Gregory of Nin by
Ivan Meštrović on the Per-
istyle (photo archive of the
Conservation Department
in Split)

čanosti inauguracije Meštrovićevog Gulivera. No Arsen podcrtava činjenicu da su se Bulić i veliki kipar uzajamno poštovali i da je ovdje bila riječ o polemici *ad rem*, a ne *ad hominem*. Dapače, čini se da don Frani sâm kip nije bio sporan ni po oblikovanju ni po političkoj poruci, nego samo po mjestu na kojemu ga je trebalo podići. Sâm je predlagao da se spomenik postavi na Botičevu poljanu (danas Trg Republike), gdje bi do izražaja došao njegov *borben karakter proti presizanja tuđeg elementa na ovim našim obalama*, budući da se tu nalazio Gabinetto di lettura u kojem su se skupljali talijanaši.

Tijekom četrdeset godina kontinuiranog svakodnevnog istraživanja Duplančić je postupno brusio svoj sve narativni način pisanja. Uvijek apartan, nije se rado prepuštao anegdotalnom tonu, premda je itekako bio svjestan da se mnoge od tema kojih se laćao nude takvoj prezentaciji. Možda bi se moglo kazati da u tome odstupa jedino kada je zapodijevao imaginarni razgovor sa sjenom velikog don Frane čije je djelovanje bilo dobrim dijelom sazdano od javnih istupa i gesta. U ovom slučaju iznosi *con gusto* paskvilu koju je Bulić sâm postavio na netom podignutoj ogradi Grgurova spomenika. Napisao

ence of Mihovil Abramić (1987), where Arsen provides a comprehensive overview of extensive and diverse materials about Meštrović and his Split monuments found in the archive of the Archaeological Museum. The focus then shifts to the correspondence between the artist, Mihovil Abramić, and their mutual friend, Dr. Rudolf Sieber, an Austrian professor who worked in Bosnia in the 1920s and later became a major promoter of Yugoslav tourism in Vienna. Dr. Sieber dedicated a significant portion of his activities to promoting Meštrović's work in Austria and worldwide. The article offers an unexpected perspective on the long list of high honours bestowed upon Meštrović after World War II, primarily due to the persistent efforts of this unusual Viennese Kulturträger, who was almost obsessed with Meštrović's art. However, it is worth noting that all of Sieber's grandeur apparently annoyed the sculptor to some extent.

The article *Trogir and Its Heritage During the War Years 1941–1943 Based on Documents from the Archaeological Museum in Split (2017)* stands out for its significant value due to the extensive and diverse data it presents, as well as the analytical methods employed. Drawing from official documents within the museum's archive and the legacy of its then director, Dr. Mihovil Abramić, the article places special emphasis on the correspondence of Roko Slade Šilović. Considering the literary sensibility of this Trogir pharmacist, honorary conservator, publicist, chronicler, and one of the founders of the archaeological society *Radovan*, some of his letters and reports are imbued with a chronicle-like quality, vividly capturing the wartime events that unfolded in the small town. Some descriptions within his correspondence seem like sketches for a film, with an ironic nod to Italian neorealism. Furthermore, the article offers valuable insights into the organisation of museum and conservation services in Dalmatia during fascist rule, with detailed examinations of the conservation efforts led by engineer Luigi Crema, head of the Commissariat for Antiquities, Monuments, and Galleries of Dalmatia (*Commissariato per la antichità, i monumenti e le gallerie della Dalmazia*), and Abramić, who, in wartime circumstances and within understandable ideological frameworks, managed to work on the preservation of Dalmatian cultural heritage. This is vividly illustrated by Duplančić's notes on the protection of architectural features on Čiovo, preservation efforts surrounding the birthplace of Ivan Lucić Lucius, and the "Little Cipiko Palace" in the town square. Of course, one of the focal points of the article is the fate of the Venetian lions, which were destroyed or removed in 1932, and the Italian government sought to replace them with new sculptures during the war. While the plan to install new lions above the city gates was deemed feasible aesthetically, as they would be placed in their former niches, the proposal to insert a modern sculpture into the monumental Altar of Justice, originally sculpted by Niccolò di Giovanni Fiorentino into the loggia on the town square, raised concerns of inconsistency with the Renaissance sculptural framework,

je: VICTRIX CAUSA DIIS PLACUIT, SED VICTA CATONI – *Pobjednici su ugodili bogovima, a pobijedeni Katonu*, što je čuvena maksima iz Lukanove *Farsalijske* (1, 128.), koja se navodi kada se govori o nekome koji radi za pravednu stvar i kad nestane nade u uspjeh. *Netko dao to izpilati, te se natpis odnio, da ga se čuva u Gradskoj Biblioteci. Hoće Spalatrini, da se šale.* – zapisuje zadovoljno Bulić, dometnuvši: *Abominatio in loco sancto*, prema Mat 24, 15 (*Kada dakle vidite da grozota pustoši, po proroštvu Daniela proroka, stoluje na svetome mjestu.*).

Uz taj tekst volio bih navesti još jedan, *Podaci o Meštroviću i njegovim djelima iz korespondencije Mihovila Abramića* (1987.), u kojemu Arsen daje pregled obimne i raznovrsne građe o Meštroviću i njegovim splitskim spomenicima u arhivu Arheološkog muzeja, nakon čega se posvećuje prepisci između umjetnika, Mihovila Abramića i njegovog prijatelja dr. Rudolfa Siebera, austrijskog profesora koji je 1920-ih godina služio kao profesor u Bosni, a potom djelovao kao veliki propagator jugoslavenskog turizma u Beču, posvetivši znatan dio svoje djelatnosti promicanju Meštrovićeva djela u Austriji i svijetu. Članak donosi neočekivan pogled na dugi niz visokih priznanja koja je Meštar stekao nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata, ponajviše zahvaljujući upornom zalaganju tog neobičnog bečkog Kulturträgera, gotovo opsjednutog Meštrovićevom umjetnošću. Valja, međutim, dodati da je sva ta Sieberova pompa našem kiparu očito pomalo dodijavala.

Po količini i raznovrsnosti podataka, kao i metoda kojima ih obrađuje, veoma je vrijedan i rad *Trogir i njegova baština tijekom ratnih godina 1941. - 1943. na temelju spisa iz Arheološkoga muzeja u Splitu* (2017.), koji temelji na službenim spisima iz arhiva Muzeja i ostavštini njegovog tadašnjeg ravnatelja dr. Mihovila Abramića, pri čemu posebnu pažnju obraća dopisima Roka Slade Šilovića. S obzirom na literarni senzibilitet tog trogirskog ljekarnika, počasnog konzervatora, publicista, kroničara i jednog od osnivača starinarskog društva *Radovan*, neki njegovi dopisi i izvještaji imaju atmosferu kronike maloga mjesta okovanog ratnim događajima, s opisima koji se doimaju kao nacrti scenarija za filmove, ironično je reći, talijanskog neorealizma. Članak je zanimljiv i po nizu podataka o ustrojstvu muzejske i konzervatorske službe u Dalmaciji tijekom fašističke uprave, po veoma obzirnom razmatranju konzervatorskog djelovanja ing. Luigija Creme (na čelu Komesarijata za starine, spomenike i galerije Dalmacije – *Commissariato per le antichità, i monumenti e le gallerie della Dalmazia*) i Abramića, koji su, u ratnim okolnostima i u razumljivim zadanim ideološkim okvirima, uspjeli raditi na čuvanju dalmatinske spomeničke baštine, o čemu plastično govore Duplančićevi navodi o zaštiti terminacijskih biljega na Čiovu, nastojanjima da se očuvaju ambijenti rodne kuće Ivana Lucića Luciusa i „Male Cipikove palače“ na gradskom trgu, itd. Naravno, u jednom od fokusa je tema mletačkih lavova koji su 1932. bili uništeni, odnosno uklonjeni, a talijanske ratne vlasti su ih željele vratiti – i to kao nove kipove inspirirane originalima. Pritom je procijenjeno da postavljanje novih lavova iznad gradskih vrata neće predstav-

so the new lion was to take the place of the already removed Meštrović relief of Ban Petar Berislavić. Although three enormous blocks of Brač stone were quarried in Pučišća and transported to Venice, Italy's capitulation was faster than the stonecutters.

Arsen inherited a love for art, particularly painting, from his father. This passion for art manifested in numerous texts about newly discovered paintings significant for the iconography of Split and Salona, such as *Solin in Watercolours by Edmund Misera* (2008) and *Salona in a Painting by Carl Haase* (2006), among others. His dedication extended to creating a comprehensive catalogue of old paintings in the museum, which were meticulously restored through his efforts and rightfully earned their place in the Museum's pinacotheca (*Collection of Paintings of the Archaeological Museum in Split*, co-authored with Radoslav Tomić, 2004).

Duplančić's articles *Gleanings for Understanding the Older Artistic Heritage of Split* (2005) and *Contribution to the Knowledge of Painters and Artworks in Split from the Mid-17th to the Mid-18th Century* (2011) hold particular significance for art history, reaffirming the value of the extensive archive of documents preserved in the Split Museum. Drawing from these archival treasures, he presents new insights into numerous known and lost artworks from Split churches and family collections. He shed light on the works of local artists such as Petar Zečević, Franjo Kopač, Franjo Bratanić, and others, thereby expanding our understanding of their oeuvres. Notably, Arsen's attention to detail often enriches the broader interpretation of these artworks. For instance, in his analysis of Petar Zečević's paintings, renowned for their depictions of Poljica and Dalmatian attire, Arsen doesn't miss mentioning that Zečević's father was a tailor of folk clothing, hints at potential influence on Zečević's artistic appetites for depicting local attire from an early age, possibly through a familial connection.

Exhibitions have been a vital aspect of Duplančić's work from the very beginning of his career at the Museum, whether as a co-author or sole author. Without repeating the titles of the aforementioned exhibitions, which practically ran with a well-established rhythm year after year, we will mention a few more, usually accompanied by comprehensive catalogues: *Don Frane Bulić* (1984), with a separate section on Bulić's portraits, *290 Years of the Lyceum Classicum in Split* (1990), *Saint Domnius and His Feast Through the Centuries* (1991), *Ex Libris in the Library of the Archaeological Museum in Split* (1993), *The First International Congress for Early Christian Archaeology Split-Solin 1894* (1994), *The Library of the Split Family of Martinis-Marchi* (2001), *Marko Antun de Dominis, Archbishop of Split and Scientist* (2002), *Discovering Marjan* (2018), *Sacral Heritage of Marjan Hill* (2018 and 2019), *Helena Regina and Solin in 1898* (2018), *Craftsmanship and Trades in Split from Antiquity to the Beginning of the 20th Century* (2023).

Fortification architecture has long been a central focus of Duplančić's research, evident in his extensive series of texts

ljati estetski problem, jer su trebali stajati u nekadašnjim nišama. No umetanje moderne skulpture u monumentalni Oltar Pravde, koji je Nikola Firentinac isklesao u loži na gradskom trgu, nužno bi bilo u neskladu s renesansnim skulpturalnim okvirom, pa je novi lav trebao zauzeti mjesto već uklonjena Meštrovićevog reljefa bana Petra Berislavića. Premda su tri golema bloka bračkog kamena ubrana u pučiškim kamenolomima i prebačena u Veneciju, kapitulacija Italije bila je brža od klesara.

Ljubav prema umjetnosti, osobito slikarstvu, Arsen je naslijedio od oca (koji je godinama radio u ULUH-u, poslije HD-LU-u), što je rezultiralo brojnim tekstovima o novopronađenim slikama važnim za ikonografiju Splita i Salone, npr., *Solin na akvarelima Edmunda Misere* (2008.), *Salona na slici Carla Haasea* (2016.), etc. Uspio je načiniti potpun katalog starih slika u svom muzeju, koje su restaurirane upravo njegovim zalaganjem i dobile zasluženo mjesto kao pinakoteka Muzeja (*Zbirka slika Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu*, zajedno s Radoslavom Tomićem, 2004.).

Za povijest umjetnosti osobito su važni i njegovi članci *Pabirci za poznavanje starije likovne baštine Splita* (2005.), te *Prilog poznavanju slikara i umjetnina u Splitu od sredine XVII. do sredine XVIII. stoljeća* (2011.), koji još jednom potvrđuje važnost nepresušnog izvora dokumenata koji se čuvaju u splitskome Muzeju, temeljem kojih iznosi nove bilješke o brojnim poznatim i nestalim umjetninama iz splitskih crkava i obiteljskih zbirki. Proširio je opuse nekih od zanimljivih domaćih umjetnika poput Petra Zečevića, Franje Kopača, Franje Bratanića i drugih. Pritom često još jednom pokazuje senzibilitet prema detalju koji može obasjati cjelinu interpretacije. Govoreći, na primjer, o slikarstvu Petra Zečevića, poznatog po slikama poljičke i općenito dalmatinske nošnje, ne propušta spomenuti da mu je otac bio krojač narodne odjeće, što mu je moglo odmalena oblikovati ukus prema prikazivanju domaćeg ruha.

Izložbe bijahu osobito važan segment Duplančićeva djelovanja od samog početka njegova radnog vijeka u Muzeju – negdje kao koautor, drugdje kao jedini autor. Ne ponavljajući naslove već spomenutih izložbi koje su tekle praktički uhodanim ritmom godinu za godinom, navest ćemo još nekoliko – u pravilu s itekako korisnim katalozima: *Don Frane Bulić* (1984.) – sa zasebnom cjelinom o Bulićevim portretima, *290 godina klasične gimnazije u Splitu* (1990.), *Sveti Dujam i njegov blagdan kroz stoljeća* (1991.), *Ex libris u biblioteci Arheološkog muzeja u Splitu* (1993.), *Prvi međunarodni kongres za starokršćansku arheologiju Split–Solin 1894.* (1994.), *Knjižnica splitske obitelji Martinis-Marchi* (2001.), *Marko Antun de Dominis, splitski nadbiskup i znanstvenik* (2002.), *Otkrivanje Marjana* (2018.), *Crkvena baština Marjana* (2018. i 2019.), *Helena regina i Solin godine 1898.* (2018.), *Zanatstvo i obrtništvo u Splitu od antike do početka 20. stoljeća* (2023.).

Fortifikacijska arhitektura zauzimala je dugo vremena možda središnje mjesto u Duplančićevim istraživanjima: otud cijela kolajna tekstova o splitskim i kliškim utvrdama, tvrđa-

exploring the forts, fortresses, and towers of Split and Klis, as well as topics concerning the Split city fortress of Kaštel. He delves into the lives of military engineers like Mihovil Luposignoli and surveyors like Franjo and Petar Kurir and Aleksandar Barbieri, whose profiles he has already outlined, I believe, for potential future monographic treatments. Of course, the pinnacle of his work in this domain is the book *The Walls of Split in the 17th and 18th Centuries* (2007). Drawing from a wealth of archival textual and illustrative sources from various domestic and international archives and libraries, this book meticulously chronicles the construction of Split's defensive system during the baroque era, year after year, decade after decade, as well as its gradual decline throughout the 19th century.

The article *Defining the Boundaries Between Split and Trogir on the Island of Čiovo in the 15th Century* (1995) serves as a link to all these texts, as it focuses on the publication of boundary markers between Split and Trogir. Duplančić extensively utilised Mihovil Abramić's unpublished work *Border stones between Split and Trogir* from 1941, significantly supplementing it with contemporary observations in the area.

There isn't enough space here to cover all of the major themes in Duplančić's bibliography, but some notable ones include his research on the brotherhoods of Split, which will, hopefully, someday receive his comprehensive publication. Additionally, his articles about monuments he cherishes, such as the Church of Our Lady of Pojišan in Split, which was the topic of his scientific debut! His writings on depictions of various locations, including Makarska (1990), Klis (1993), Kaštela (1993), Palagruža (1996), Omiš (2004), Blato on the Cetina River (2004), and the Bay of Kotor (2009), are crucial for understanding the monuments and urban development of the areas he studied.

Duplančić's extensive body of work encompasses approximately 10,000 footnotes, demonstrating his meticulous attention to scholarly literature. A subject index would reveal the expansive nature of his research while still maintaining coherence. He approached each of his topics with the understanding that the history of his homeland cannot be understood as a linear sequence of facts, dates, names, styles, and periods but is instead a complex tapestry of interwoven layers, comprehensible only when viewed as a unified whole.

In the last ten years, I have consistently sought his guidance on every topic aligned with his interests and expertise. I doubt that any *Artificial Intelligence* could ever provide greater assistance. And I lament not having sent him the texts for review earlier.

These pages are dedicated to him with a heartfelt expression of longstanding friendship and enduring respect, honouring a colleague distinguished by his unwavering devotion to his homeland—the parochial love that new generations will likely never understand again. Whether that is good or bad, I no longer know, but it is a love that has never been lost in

vama i kulama, o splitskom gradskom Kaštelu, ili o vojnim inženjerima poput Mihovila Luposignolija i mjernicima poput Franje i Petra Kurira, ili Aleksandra Barbierija kojima je već naznačio oris, vjerujem, budućih monografskih obrada. Naravno, najvažnije djelo u tom smislu je knjiga *Splitske zidine u 17. i 18. stoljeću* (2007.), koja temeljem bogatih arhivskih tekstualnih i ilustrativnih vrela iz niza domaćih i inozemnih arhiva i knjižnica kronološki prati, godinu za godinom, desetljeće za desetljećem, izgradnju obrambenog sustava grada Splita tijekom baroknih stoljeća, ali i njegovo postupno propadanje tijekom 19. stoljeća.

Na sve te tekstove veže se nekako i članak *Razgraničenje između Splita i Trogira na Čiovu u 15. stoljeću* (1995.), u kojemu se objavljuju granični stupovi između Splita i Trogira. Pritom je koristio neobjavljeni članak *Pogranični stupovi između Splita i Trogira* Mihovila Abramića (1941.), u znatnoj mjeri ga nadopunivši, naravno s registracijom današnjeg stanja u prostoru.

Premalo je prostora da bismo i ovlašno spomenuli još neke veće temate u Duplančićevoj bibliografiji – na primjer tekstove o splitskim bratovštinama (koje će, nadamo se, jednom dobiti njegovu zaokruženu objavu) ili članke o njemu toliko milom spomeniku – crkvi Gospe od Pojišana u Splitu, s kojom je i debitirao u znanosti! Njegovi radovi o starim prikazima Makarske (1990.), Klisa (1993.), Kaštela (1993.), Palagruže (1996.), Omiša (2004.), Blata na Cetini (2004.) i Boke kotorske (2009.) važni su za poznavanje spomenika i urbanizma obrađenih prostora.

Duplančićev je opus fundiran na možda 10.000 fusnota, na savršenoj orijentaciji u literaturi. Jedan predmetni indeks bi pokazao u kojoj je mjeri taj opus razgranat, a koherentan. Svaki od njegovih tekstova temelji se na svijesti da se povijest zavičaja ne da shvatiti kao linearni slijed činjenica, datuma i imena, stilova i razdoblja, nego je u toj slici uvijek sve prepleteno i preslojeno, i razumljivo samo u totalu. U zadnjih desetak godina u pravilu sam mu se obraćao kad sam pisao o stvarima koje su tangirale njegove interese. Ne vjerujem da bi mi ikakva *Artificial Intelligence* mogla ikad biti od veće pomoći. I žalim za tekstovima koje mu nisam ranije davao na recenziju.

Ove stranice mu posvećujem uz iskaz starog prijateljstva i trajnog poštovanja, kao kolegi kojeg odlikuje upravo starinska ljubav prema zavičaju, ona kampanilistička ljubav kakvu novi naraštaji neće više nikad moći razumjeti (bilo to loše ili dobro, više ne znam), ali ljubav koja se nikad nije izgubila u nekritičnosti. Arsen je među zadnjim čuvarima tog zavičajnog plamena. U 18. i 19. stoljeću za njega bi rekli da je polihistor, s obzirom na versatilnost njegovih interesa i pluridisciplinarnih stručno-znanstvenih instrumenata kojima je načinio opus sad već znatnih gabarita. Ostvario je ideal provincijske erudicije bez koje nema napretka opće povijesti umjetnosti ni ozbiljne zaštite kulturno-povijesne baštine.

uncriticality. Arsen is among the last custodians of that local flame. In the 18th and 19th centuries, he would have been called a polymath, given his expansive interests and multidisciplinary scholarly-scientific approach, which he used to create a considerable opus. He has achieved the ideal of provincial erudition, without which there is no progress in the general field of art history or in the serious protection of cultural and historical heritage.