

PEJO ČOŠKOVIĆ: SUSRET SA ZAGUBLJENOM POVIJEŠĆU

Područje Bosanske Gradiške u razvijenom srednjem vijeku

Biblioteka Glasnika Banjalučke biskupije, Svezak 5, Zagreb 2001, 212 stranica, 6 karata i 5 slika

PEJO ČOŠKOVIĆ: ENCOUNTER WITH THE FORGOTTEN PAST

The Territory of Bosanska Gradiška in the High Middle Ages

The Library of Banja Luka Diocese Journal, Vol. 5, Zagreb 2001, 212 pp., 6 maps and 5 illustrations

Knjiga Peje Čoškovića s privlačnim i obećavajućim naslovima, od svojeg izlaska do danas, nije izazvala nikakve reakcije u historiografiji i arheologiji, što upućuje na to da je slabo zapažena, a i meni samom je tek krajem 2004. došla u ruke. Njezin je autor danas djelatnik u Leksikografskom zavodu u Zagrebu i profesor povijesti srednjeg vijeka na Filozofskom fakultetu u Sarajevu. Knjiga je proizišla iz, kako sam autor piše u predgovoru, nerealiziranog znanstvenog projekta monografije o Bosanskoj Gradišci od najstarijih vremena do sadašnjosti, čija je izrada prije posljednjeg rata bila povjerena Institutu za istoriju u Banjoj Luci u kojem je autor tada bio znanstveni djelatnik.

Najveći dio knjige obuhvaća tri dijela koja se odnose na tri razdoblja srednjovjekovne prošlosti tog područja: prvi se odnosi na vladavinu ugarske dinastije Arpadovića od kraja 11. do početka 14. st. Drugi se odnosi na postupno jačanje političkog utjecaja Bosne prema autoru (a zapravo je riječ o političkom utjecaju moćne plemićke obitelji Hrvatinića koja je vladala dijelovima Hrvatske u sastavu Bosanske Banovine, kasnijeg Kraljevstva - Donjim krajevima i Zapadnim stranama) od početka 14. st. do 1463. Treći se odnosi na Jajačku Banovinu od 1463. do 1527. Svaki se dio sastoji iz većeg broja manjih poglavlja s poprilično dramatičnim naslovima. Prva su dva dijela popraćena i kartama, ali je vjerojatno previdom za različite povijesne situacije stavljena ista i to zastarjela i prevladana karta (str. 33 i 69).

Na samom početku mogu se staviti dvije metodološke primjedbe.

Prva: U naslovu knjige i u predgovoru autor je razdoblje koje obrađuje označio kao razvijeni srednji vijek, dok je kao apsolutno kronološki okvir zapravo uzeo raspon od kraja 11. do početka 16. st. Neshvatljivo je i začuđujuće da je jedan specijalist za srednji vijek odstupio od opće prihvaćene periodizacije, po kojoj razvijeni srednji vijek traje od polovice 11. do polovice 13. st., a kasni srednji vijek od polovice 13. do polovice ili kraja 15. st. (gornja granica nije ista u svim dijelovima Europe). Znači li to da je njemu razdoblje razvijenog feudalizma od 12. do 15. st. identično s razvijenim srednjim vijekom? Znači li to da je njemu razdoblje kasnog feudalizma od 16. st. na

This book by Pejo Čošković with its attractive and promising titles has not prompted any response from the fields of historiography and archaeology since its publication, which indicates that it was scarcely noticed, and this writer only acquired it at the end of 2004. The book's author today works for the Lexicographic Institute in Zagreb and he is professor of medieval history at the Faculty of Philosophy in Sarajevo. As the author himself notes in the foreword, the book is the result of a never actualised science project to write a monograph on Bosanska Gradiška from the earliest times to the present. This project was initially entrusted to the Institute of History in Banja Luka, where the author was then employed as a research associate.

The majority of the text is encompassed in three sections that correspond to three medieval periods in this region: the first covers the reign of the Hungarian Arpad dynasty from the end of the 11th to the beginning of the 14th centuries. The second section deals with the gradual strengthening of Bosnia's political influence – in the author's view (actually the political influence of the powerful Hrvatinić noble family, who ruled over parts of Croatia within Bosanska Banovina, later to be Kingdom – the Low Regions and the Western Reaches) from the beginning of the fourteenth century to 1463. The third section covers the Jajce Banovina from 1463 to 1527. Each section consists of a number of shorter chapters with rather dramatic titles. The first two sections are also accompanied by maps, although due to what was probably an oversight, one outdated and superseded map refers to different historical situations (pp. 33 and 69).

Two methodological remarks can be made at the very beginning.

First: In the book's title and in the foreword, the author refers to the period he analyses as the High Middle Ages, while his absolute chronological framework covers the period from the end of the eleventh to the beginning of the sixteenth centuries. It is incomprehensible and puzzling that a medieval specialist would deviate from generally-accepted periodization, wherein the high medieval period lasts from the middle 11th to the middle 13th centuries, while the late medieval period lasts from the middle 13th to the end of the 15th centuries (the upper limit is not the same in all parts of Europe). Does this mean that for him the period of developed feudalism from the 12th to the 15th centuries is identical to the High Middle Ages? Does it mean that for him the period of late feudalism from the 16th

dalje (gornja granica također nije ista u svim dijelovima Europe) kasni srednji, a ne novi vijek?

Druga: Autor je kao geografski okvir uzeo područje današnje općine Bosanske Gradiške, a zapravo obrađuje srednjovjekovnu Vrbašku županiju i Vrbaški crkveni distrikt koji su zauzimali mnogo veće područje. Zbog toga rješenje problema najčešće traži unutar granica današnje općine, a rijetko izvan njih. Da bi se zadatci koje si je autor postavio pravilno riješili mora se sasvim zanemariti okvir današnje općine i rješenja tražiti na širem području između rijeke Save i Banje Luke s jedne strane i planine Kozare i rijeke Ukrine s druge strane.

Tijek povijesnih događaja prikazan je vrlo korektno i argumentirano što se, međutim, ne može reći za topografiju srednjovjekovnih mjesta na označenom području. Iako je autor godinama živio i radio u Banjoj Luci, slabo mu je poznata topografija i toponimija označenog područja. Istina, poznati su mu glavni podatci o srednjovjekovnim nalazištima koje je preuzeo iz arheološke literature, posebno iz *Arheološkog leksikona Bosne i Hercegovine*, ali je slabo iskoristio njihovu vrijednost u svojoj knjizi. Zbog svega toga su njegova određenja položaja, karaktera i međusobnog odnosa srednjovjekovnih mjesta, koja se spominju u pisanim izvorima, najčešće netočna ili neuspješna. Budući da sam osobno između 1986. i 1991. obilazio arheološka nalazišta na tom području i bez obzira što sam se vremenom posvetio razdobljima starijima od srednjeg vijeka, smatram nužnim iznijeti svoje podatke i razmatranja o temi knjige (temi koja mi je uvijek bila i ostala omiljena), prvenstveno što se nude rješenja niza krupnih problema.¹

U proučavanju povijesne i arheološke topografije srednjovjekovne Slavonije južno od Save, Donjih krajeva i Jajačke Banovine (današnja sjeverozapadna Bosna) velike teškoće stvara slaba očuvanost ili potpuni nedostatak srednjovjekovnih toponima. Uzrok tome jest nagla smjena stanovništva, odnosno masovno iseljavanje domaćeg hrvatskog katoličkog stanovništva pred definitivnim osmanskim osvajanjem početkom 16. st. (poslije višedesetljetnih iscrpljujućih borbi) i masovno doseljavanje pravoslavnog (srpskog i vlaškog) stanovništva, a zatim višekratno doseljavanje muslimana različitog etničkog porijekla u te krajeve. Srednjovjekovni toponimi su se na tom području očuvali samo u onim enklavama u kojima se hrvatsko katoličko stanovništvo u većem ili manjem broju zadržalo do danas (točnije do posljednjeg rata krajem 20. st., kada se s tog područja iselila većina preostalih Hrvata). Pravoslavno stanovništvo koje su masovno doselile Osmanlije, dalo je mnogim mjestima (brdima, selima, pa čak i crkvama koje su obnovili) nova imena i time prekinulo svaku vezu sa srednjovjekovnom tradicijom tog područja. Jedino su se imena rijeka i potoka nešto bolje

century onward (again, the upper limit varies from region to region in Europe) is the same as the Late Middle Ages, rather than the early modern period?

Second: The author used the territory of today's Bosanska Gradiška municipality as his geographic framework, but he actually covers medieval Vrbas County and the Vrbas Ecclesiastical District, which occupied much larger territories. Because of this, he most often seeks a solution to the problem within the boundaries of the current municipality, but rarely outside of them. To correctly resolve the tasks that the author placed before himself, the boundaries of the modern municipality should be disregarded and a solution sought in the broader territory between the Sava River and Banja Luka on one side, and Mountain Kozara and the Ukrina River on the other.

Presentation of historical events is very accurate and well-argued. However, the same cannot be said of the topography of medieval sites in the designated territory. Although the author lived and worked in Banja Luka for many years, his knowledge of local topography and toponymy is very poor. To be sure, he is acquainted with the most important data on medieval sites which he took from archaeological literature, particularly from the *Archaeological Lexicon of Bosnia and Herzegovina*, but he made scant use of their value in his book. Because of this, his determination of the position, character and mutual relationships between medieval places mentioned in written sources are often inaccurate or, at best, ineffectual. Since I personally toured archaeological sites in this territory between 1986 and 1991, and regardless of the fact that I later dedicated my study to periods prior to the Middle Ages, I believe it is necessary to present some of my own data and considerations on the topic covered by the book (the topic which I am still very fond of), primarily as they offer solutions to a series of major problems.¹

Examination of the historical and archaeological topography of the medieval Slavonia south of the Sava, Low Regions and Jajce Banovina (today's north-western Bosnia), is rendered difficult by the poorly preserved or completely missing medieval toponyms. The reason for this is the sudden change in populations, meaning the mass flight of the domestic Croatian Catholic population before the final Ottoman conquest at the beginning of the 16th century (after many decades of debilitating armed conflict) and the mass influx of Orthodox (Serbian and Vlach) populations, followed by several waves of immigration of Muslims of various ethnicities to this region. The medieval toponyms have only been preserved in those enclaves in which the Croatian Catholic population remained in larger or smaller numbers up to the present (or more specifically, until the last war at the end of the 20th century, when most of the remaining Croats left this region). The Orthodox population that was massively settled here by the Ottomans gave many places (hills, villages and even the churches they renewed) new names and thereby severed all ties with the region's medieval tradition. Only the names of rivers and creeks

¹ Za potrebe ove recenzije obišao sam sa svojim prijateljem Borom Anđelićem iz Banje Luke 13. siječnja 2005. Bakince i 16. travnja 2005. Mašiće i Bakince.

¹ For the needs of this review, together with my friend Boro Anđelić from Banja Luka, I visited Bakinci on 13 January 2005, and Mašići and Bakinci on 16 April 2005.

očuvala u krajevima koje su oni naselili, a to su preuzeli u kontaktu sa zatečenim domaćim stanovništvom (ne treba zaboraviti da je domaće katoličko stanovništvo prelazilo na Islam, ali i na Pravoslavlje).

Daleko najveće probleme u proučavanju povijesne i arheološke srednjovjekovne topografije šireg područja južno od Save predstavlja određenje granica Glaške županije i smještaj grada Glaža. Autor na dosta mjesta u knjizi piše o Glažu i Glaškoj županiji, ali ne nudi nikakva rješenja tih problema, iako je ta županija bila usko i višestruko vezana s Vrbaškom županijom i s njom činila Vrbaški crkveni distrikt.

Franjo Rački se prvi konkretnije pozabavio smještajem Glaža i određenjem granica Glaške županije. On je vjerovao da je ime Glaž očuvano u imenu sela Klašnice koje je po njemu izvedeno iz imena Glasnice na lijevoj obali Vrbasa, sjeverno od Banje Luke. Zbog toga je zaključio da se Glaška županija prostirala na lijevoj obali Vrbasa, južno od Vrbaške županije (Rački 1881, 100-101).

Vjekoslav Klaić je Glašku županiju smjestio na područje oko rijeke Ukrine, a takvo su mišljenje zastupali i Ferdo Šišić te Nikola Bilogrivić (Klaić 1882, 21; Šišić 1902, 5; Bilogrivić 1998, 194).

Zatim se određenjem granica Glaške županije i smještajem Glaža iscrpno pozabavio Đoko Mazalić, ali su njegov pristup i zaključci neprihvatljivi. On je mjesta iz Glaške županije, koja se navode u povelji što ju je izdao bosanski kralj Stjepan Tomaš 1446., vezao za današnje toponime na širokom području između donjih tokova rijeka Vrbasa i Bosne, iako je u mnogo slučajeva riječ samo o prividnoj sličnosti. Na primjer, varoš Sridu koja se nalazila u blizini grada Glaža vezao je za selo Osredak kod Prnjavora, iako nema sumnje da je varoš dobila svoje ime po mjestu gdje se prije njezinog osnivanja održavao tjedni sajam i to srijedom (*sridom* na ikavskom dijalektu) dok je današnje spomenuto selo dobilo svoje ime po središnjem položaju u luku rječice Male Ukrine. Budući da je najviše sličnih toponima našao na području Vrbanjske županije, proizvoljno je zaključio da se Glaška županija proširila na njezin račun. Glaž je smjestio na brdo s imenom Gradina na spoju Velike i Male Ukrine, iako to mjesto nije bio ni obišao (Mazalić 1950, 227-229). Takav smještaj brzo je otpao jer se pokazalo da na tom mjestu ne postoji srednjovjekovni utvrđeni grad (Basler 1952, 422).

Granice Glaške županije pokušao je odrediti i Gojko Ružičić na osnovi povelje bosanskog bana Prijezde iz 1287. u kojoj se navode rubna sela Zemljaničke županije; nizanje počinje sa selom Bulkackom na granici Glaža, a završava sa selom Grabroom. On nije poznavao dovoljno topografiju i toponimiju tog područja, dok je mogao zaključiti da imena mjesta iz te povelje danas ne postoje, osim možda Kola. Isto tako, nisu mu bili poznati radovi Milana Karanovića i Vladislava Skarića koji su pokušali odrediti granična mjesta Zemljaničke županije. Obojica su imala najviše problema upravo s određenjem Bulkacke,

were better preserved, as they assumed these from contacts with the remaining domestic population (it is worth remembering that the domestic Catholic population often converted to Islam, but also to Orthodoxy).

By far the greatest problem involved in the study of the historical and archaeological topography of the wider territory south of the Sava is determination of the border of Glaž County and the location of the fortified town (castle) of Glaž. The author mentions Glaž and Glaž County in a number of places in his book, but he provides no solution to this problem, even though this county had multiple ties with Vrba County and together with it formed the Vrba Ecclesiastical District.

Franjo Rački was the first to seriously speculate on the location of Glaž and the borders of Glaž County. He believed that the name Glaž was preserved in the name of the village Klašnica, which he thought was derived from the name Glasnica on the left bank of the Vrba River, north of Banja Luka. Because of this, he concluded that Glaž County was located on the left bank of the Vrba, south of Vrba County (Rački 1881, 100-101).

Vjekoslav Klaić placed Glaž County in the area around the Ukrina River, and this view was shared by Ferdo Šišić and Nikola Bilogrivić (Klaić 1882, 21; Šišić 1902, 5; Bilogrivić 1998, 194).

Thereafter, the determination of Glaž County's borders and the location of Glaž were exhaustively studied by Đoko Mazalić, but his approach and conclusions were not sound. He associated sites in Glaž County, which are cited in the charter issued by Bosnian King Stjepan Tomaš in 1446, to present-day toponyms in a wider region between the lower courses of the Vrba and Bosna Rivers, even though in many cases these are simply a matter of deceptive similarities. For example, he associated the township of Srida, which was near the Glaž castle, with the village of Osredak near Prnjavor, even though there can be no doubt that the former village acquired its name on the basis of a site where, prior to its foundation, a weekly fair was held every Wednesday (from *srida* – Wednesday in the Ikavian dialect), while the name of the present-day village is derived from its central (*sredina* - center) location in a bend of the small Mala Ukrina River. Since he found the largest number of similar toponyms in the territory of Vrbanja County, he arbitrarily concluded that Glaž County expanded at the former's expense. He claimed that Glaž was situated on a hill called Gradina where Velika and Mala Ukrina Rivers meet, even though he never actually examined this site personally (Mazalić 1950, 227-229). The proposed location was quickly disregarded, because there was no medieval castle there (Basler 1952, 422).

Gojko Ružičić also attempted to determine the borders of Glaž County by referring to the charter of the Bosnian Ban Prijezda, of 1287, in which the peripheral villages of Zemljanik County are cited. The list begins with the village of Bulkacka on the border with Glaž, and ends with the village of Grabroa. He lacked sufficient knowledge of the topography and toponymy of this territory, because he concluded that the names of the places in this charter no longer exist, with the possible exception of Kola. By the same token, he was not familiar with the works of Milan Karanović and Vladislav Skarić, who attempted to determine the places along

odnosno granicom Zemljaničke i Glaške županije koju su tražili kod Banje Luke u vrljetima oko ušća rječice Suturlije (Surtolije) u Vrbas (Karanović 1936, 27-36; Skarić 1937, 37-46). Na kraju je G. Ružičić zaključio da se Glaška županija prostirala zapadno od rijeke Vrbasa između Zemljaničke županije na jugu i Vrbaške županije na sjeveru. Također je na osnovi podatka da se Glaž nalazi na granici Usore zaključio da se Usorska zemlja prostirala do rijeke Vrbasa (Ružičić 1972, 103, 106-107). Njegov je pristup u osnovi pravilan, ali zaključci nisu prihvatljivi zbog razloga koji će biti izneseni u ovoj recenziji.

Na sličan je način granice Glaške županije pokušao odrediti Miloš Blagojević. On vjeruje da je Glaška županija bila formirana tek pod bosanskom vlašću od dijela Vrbaške županije i da je obuhvaćala područje s lijeve strane donjeg toka Vrbasa, preciznije od rječica Jurkovice i Osorne na zapadu i Vrbasa na istoku te Save na sjeveru kao i rječice Crkvene na jugu. Grad Glaž i varoš Sridu smjestio je u zaselak Sredane u Lamincima kod Bosanske Gradiške zbog prividne toponimijske sličnosti koja postoji samo ako se Srida neispravno izgovara ekavskim dijalektom (Sreda), kako to on radi (Blagojević 1995, 69-75).

Smatram da se položaj grada Glaža i granice Glaške županije mogu odrediti bez većih problema, ako se neki podatci ispravno protumače. U povelji bosanskog bana Prijezde iz 1287. navodi se sljedeće: *videlicet prima meta incipit in Bulchazka in terminis Glas*. Smještaj srednjovjekovnog sela Bulkacke topografska je točka važna za određenje ne samo granica triju županija (Zemljaničke, Vrbaške i Glaške), već i smještaj grada Glaža. Sjevernu granicu Zemljaničke županije činila su, idući od zapada ka istoku, sela: Bistrica, Grabroa i Bulkacka. Oko 12 km sjeveroistočno od Banje Luke nalazi se selo Bukovica koje je smješteno na ušću istoimenoga dugačkog potoka koji se ulijeva u Vrbas. Selo je hrvatsko i katoličko i nema sumnje da je to srednjovjekovna Bulkacka. Potok Bukovica izvire i protječe kroz jugoistočne obronke planine Kozare, tako da je odredio granicu između Zemljaničke i Vrbaške županije. Vrelo tog potoka nalazi se dosta blizu vrela potoka Bistrice koji teče prema jugu i ulijeva se u rječicu Gomionicu. Dakle, srednjovjekovno selo Bistricu treba smjestiti uz lijevu obalu istoimenog potoka. Selo Grabroa danas ne postoji, ali nema sumnje da se nalazilo između vrela ta dva potoka i da je ime dobilo po grabu koji i danas tu raste. Ušće potoka Bukovice bilo je u neposrednoj blizini ne samo Glaške županije, već samog grada Glaža na desnoj obali Vrbasa, o čemu će još biti riječi. U popisu župnih crkava Vrbaškog distrikta Zagrebačke biskupije iz 1334. za Glaž se navodi sljedeće: *Item ecclesia sancti Nicolai de Galaas in metis Wzore*. Srednjovjekovni latinski izričaj *meta* ili *metis* označavao je krajnju granicu ili rub nekog područja, dok je izričaj *terminus* označavao granicu u širem smislu. To se jasno vidi iz već citiranog dijela iz Prijezdine povelje. Dakle, crkva sv. Nikole, kako se precizno navodi, nalazila se u Glažu na krajnjoj granici ili rubu Usore, a ne na granici s njom kako su to smatrali

Zemljanik County's borders. Both of them encountered the largest number of problems precisely with the determination of the location of Bulkacka, i.e. the border between Zemljanik and Glaž Counties, which they sought near Banja Luka, at the cliffs around the mouth of the small Suturlija (Surtolija) River on the Vrbas (Karanović 1936, 27-36; Skarić 1937, 37-46). Ultimately G. Ružičić concluded that Glaž County extended westward from the Vrbas River between Zemljanik County in the south and Vrbas County in the north. Additionally, based on the fact that Glaž was located on the boundary of Usora, he concluded that the Usora territory extended to the Vrbas River (Ružičić 1972, 103, 106-107). His approach is essentially sound, but his conclusions are not acceptable for reasons that will be stated in this review.

Miloš Blagojević attempted to determine the borders of Glaž County in a similar manner. He believes that Glaž County was formed only under Bosnian rule from a part of Vrbas County and that it encompassed the territory from the left bank of the Vrbas River's lower course, from the small Jurkovicica and Osorna Rivers in the west and the Vrbas in the east and the Sava in the north, as well as the small Crkvena River in the south. He places the Glaž castle and the township of Srida in the hamlet of Sredane in Laminci, near Bosanska Gradiška, due to the apparent toponymy similarities that exist only if Srida is incorrectly pronounced using the Ekavian dialect (Sreda), as he does (Blagojević 1995, 69-75).

I believe that the location of Glaž and the borders of Glaž County can be determined without greater problems, provided that certain data are correctly interpreted. At one point in the charter of Bosnian Ban Prijezda from 1287 the following is stated: *videlicet prima meta incipit in Bulchazka in terminis Glas*. The location of the medieval village of Bulkacka is a point that is vital not only to determine the borders of three counties (Zemljanik, Vrbas and Glaž), but also the location of the Glaž castle. The northern border of Zemljanik County consisted, going from west to east, of the villages: Bistrica, Grabroa and Bulkacka. The village of Bukovica is situated approximately 12 km north-east of Banja Luka, on the mouth of a long creek of the same name which flows into the Vrbas River. The village is inhabited by Catholic Croats, and there is no doubt that this is the medieval Bulkacka. Bukovica Creek commences and flows through the south-eastern foothills of Mountain Kozara, such that it determined the border between Zemljanik and Vrbas County. The source of this creek is located quite near the source of Bistrica Creek, which flows toward the south and flows into the small Gomionica River. Thus, the medieval village of Bistrica must be placed along the left bank of the creek of the same name. The village of Grabroa does not exist any more, but there is no doubt that it was situated between the sources of these two creeks and that its name was derived from the hornbeam (*grab*) trees that grow there even today. The mouth of Bukovica Creek was not only in the immediate vicinity of Glaž County, but also of the Glaž castle itself on the right bank of the Vrbas, of which more will be said later. In the census of parish churches in the Vrbas District recorded by the Zagreb Diocese in 1334, the following is said of Glaž: *Item ecclesia sancti Nicolai de Galaas in metis Wzore*. The medieval Latin expression *meta* or *metis* designated the extreme boundary or edge of a given area, while the

pojedini povjesničari. Isto tako, nije riječ o rijeci Usori već o srednjovjekovnoj zemlji s tim imenom. Usorska zemlja obuhvaćala je područje oko donjeg toka rijeke Bosne i njezinih pritoka Usore i Spreče, a na zapadu je mogla najdalje dopirati do donjeg toka Vrbasa, gdje je graničila s Vrbaškom županijom koja je pripadala Slavonskoj Banovini i djelomično sa Zemljaničkom županijom koja je pripadala Donjim krajevima kao dijelu Bosanske Banovine. Ako se grad Glaž nalazio na rubu Usorske zemlje, a pripadao Vrbaškom crkvenom distriktu, onda se on morao nalaziti na desnoj obali donjeg toka Vrbasa, a to je bila i zapadna granica Glaške županije. To je u potpunosti u skladu s podatkom o položaju Glaža u Prijezdinoj povelji. Istočna granica Glaške županije morala je biti na rijeci Ukrini, jer to je prva prirodna granica. Sjeverna joj je granica bila na rijeci Savi na potezu između ušća Vrbasa i Ukrine, gdje je graničila s Požeškom županijom koja je pripadala Slavonskoj Banovini. Na jugu je Glaška županija graničila s Vrbanjskom županijom koja je pripadala Donjim krajevima, a prirodnu granicu je određivao hrbat planine Uzlomac i donji tok rijeke Vrbanje.

U pisanim se izvorima Glaž, administrativno središte istoimene županije, prvi put spominje 1244. kao utvrđeni grad (*castrum*) kada je tu boravio ugarsko-hrvatski kralj Bela IV. i u lipnju i srpnju izdao nekoliko povelja. Zatim se spominje u Prijezdinoj povelji iz 1287. gdje se spomen može odnositi i na županiju, ali i na utvrđeni grad. Glaž se kao utvrđeni grad ponovno spominje 1299., kada se Babonići obvezuju vratiti ga ugarsko-hrvatskom kralju Andriji III. Tijekom 14. i 15. st. Glaž se kao utvrđeni grad i naseobinski kompleks u dokumentima spominje još 10-ak puta. Razvoj kompleksa Glaža izvrsno je i temeljito u dva navrata na osnovi srednjovjekovnih pisanih izvora rekonstruirao Mladen Ančić, iako nije znao gdje se točno nalazio. Iz tih izvora doznajemo da se ispod tog utvrđenog grada ubirao porez od trgovaca koji su tuda prolazili, da je u njegovoj blizini bila župna crkva sv. Nikole, da su stanovnicima podgrađa dane olakšice s namjerom da se u njega privuku novi stanovnici, zatim da su stanovnici podgrađa imali uređenu autonomiju kojoj je na čelu stajao dužnosnik s uobičajenom titulom *villicus*, da su franjevci podigli svoj samostan i dobili od pape dozvolu za podjeljivanje svih svetih sakramenata, što upućuje da su preuzeli staru župnu crkvu, da se krajem 14. st. u blizini razvila varoš Srida koja je postupno preuzela privredne funkcije od podgrađa (Ančić 1999, 94-97; Ančić 2001, 204-206). M. Ančić je jedino propustio navesti kako se Glaž posljednji put spominje u poznatom papinomu pismu iz 1469. kojim se raznim crkvama naređuje da franjevcima iz nekoliko samostana, među kojima je i glaški, vrate crkvene stvari koje su oni kod njih ostavili kada su bježali pred Osmanlijama.

Još u ranoj mladosti, tragajući za Glažom na području uz desnu obalu donjeg toka Vrbasa, obišao sam 1987. i Gradinu u Šušnjarima koja je u arheološkoj literaturi bila poznata kao brončanodobno i željeznodobno gradinsko

expression *terminus* meant border in the broader sense. This is clearly seen in the already cited segment of Prijezda's charter. Thus, the Church of St. Nicholas, as it states precisely, was in Glaž at the extreme boundary or edge of Usora, and not on the border with it as some historians believed. By the same token, this did not refer to the Usora River, but to a medieval estate of the same name. The Usora estate encompassed the area around the lower course of the Bosna River and its tributaries, the Usora and Spreča, while to the west it could reach to as far as the lower course of the Vrbas, where it bordered Vrbas County, which belonged to the Slavonian Banovina, and partially Zemljanik County, which belonged to the Low Regions as part of the Bosnian Banovina. If the Glaž castle was situated on the edge of the Usora estate, and belonged to the Vrbas Ecclesiastical District, then it had to be on the right bank of the Vrbas River's lower course, and this was also the western border of Glaž County. This completely corresponds to the description of Glaž's location in Prijezda's charter. The eastern border of Glaž County had to be on the Ukrina River, as this is the first natural boundary. The northern border was on the Sava River, between the mouth of the Vrbas River and the Ukrina River, where it bordered Požega County, which belonged to the Slavonian Banovina. To the south, Glaž County bordered Vrbanja County, which belonged to the Low Regions, and its natural border was set by the crest of Mt. Uzlomac and the lower course of the Vrbanja River.

Glaž, the administrative seat of the eponymous county, was first mentioned in written sources in 1244 as a castle (*castrum*) when the Hungarian-Croatian King Bela IV stayed there, and issued several charters in June and July. Then it is mentioned in Prijezda's charter of 1287, where the name may refer to the county or to the fortification. Glaž is again mentioned as a castle in 1299, when the Babonić family pledged to return to Hungarian-Croatian King Andrew III. During the 14th and 15th centuries, Glaž is mentioned approximately ten times in documents as either a castle or residential complex. The development of the Glaž complex was exceptionally and thoroughly reconstructed by Mladen Ančić on two occasions, on the basis of medieval written sources, even though he was not certain as to its exact location. From these sources we learn that under this castle taxes were collected from passing merchants, that the Church of St. Nicholas was nearby, that the residents of the settlement below the castle were given incentives in order to attract new residents, that these same residents enjoyed a degree of autonomy under the leadership of an official bearing the customary title *villicus*, that the Franciscans raised a monastery here and received permission from the pope to confer all holy sacraments – which means they took over the old parish church, and that at the end of the 14th century the township of Srida developed nearby which gradually assumed the commercial function of the settlement below the castle (Ančić 1999, 94-97; Ančić 2001, 204-206). M. Ančić only forgot to mention that Glaž was last mentioned in the well-known papal letter of 1469, wherein he orders various churches, including the one in Glaž, to return to the Franciscans church property from several monasteries, which they left behind when they fled before the Ottomans.

In my early youth in 1987, while searching for Glaž in the area on the right bank of the Vrbas River's lower course, I

naselje i rimska utvrda (Pašalić 1960, 25; Miletić 1971, 17, 20; Miletić 1988, 50-51). Obišavši to nalazište, na svoje veliko iznenađenje, zatekao sam ne rimsku, već srednjovjekovnu utvrdu. Utvrda je izgrađena na izdvojenom stjenovitom brežuljku koji se diže usred ravnice na desnoj obali Vrbase, ali u neposrednoj blizini brdovitog područja na jugoistočnoj strani. Iako je brežuljak visok svega 20-ak metara, pristupačan je jedino s jugoistočne strane, a s njega se može kontrolirati široki prostor. Na vrhu brežuljka nalazi se zaravan orijentirana u pravcu sjeveroistok-jugozapad, dugačka 40 m i široka 35 m. Utvrda je zaštićena bedemima izgrađenim od lomljenog kamena vezanog žbukom. Bedem je najbolje očuvan na sjeveroistočnoj strani, gdje ukošeni podzid visok nekoliko metara upućuje da se na tom mjestu mogu očekivati ostatci jake branič-kule kakve su uobičajene na romaničkim utverdama. Na uzoranoj zaravni našao sam (posebno 1990.) ogroman broj ulomaka kasnosrednjovjekovnih keramičkih posuda koji najbolje potvrđuju vremensku pripadnost te utvrde.

Smještaj utvrde na području koje je nesumnjivo pripadalo Glaškoj županiji, njezin položaj i izgled koji upućuju da je izgrađena znatno prije pojave vatrenog oružja i neočuvanost njezinog srednjovjekovnog imena kod stanovništva Šušnjara govore nam da upravo tu treba smjestiti srednjovjekovni utvrđeni grad Glaž. U prilog tome ide i činjenica da je utvrda smještena nasuprot ušća Bukovice za koju smo rekli da je bila sjeveroistočna granica Zemljaničke županije, odnosno u blizini srednjovjekovnog sela Bulkacke koje se nalazilo na granici s Glažom. Zemljanička županija je u 13. st. bila najsjeverozapadniji dio Bosanske Banovine pa to objašnjava zašto je Bela IV. svoje kažnjeničke pohode protiv bosanskog bana Matije Ninoslava i njegovih saveznika počinjao upravo iz Glaža. Smještaj utvrđenog grada Glaža na Gradinu u Šušnjariima omogućava nam i uspješno određenje ostalih dijelova njegovog naseobinskog kompleksa. Oko 600 m jugoistočno od Gradine, na uzvišenju Zidine od prije su poznati ostatci srednjovjekovne crkve veličine približno 15 x 8 m, a oko nje se prostire groblje s nadgrobniim pločama. To mjesto može se odrediti kao župna crkva sv. Nikole. Dakle, podgrađe se nalazilo između utvrde i crkve. Tu se i danas na oranicama mogu naći ulomci keramičkog posuda. Varoš Srida koja je preuzela gospodarske funkcije od podgrađa (koje u 15. st. stagnira i pretvara se u selo), morala je biti na određenoj udaljenosti, ali ne predaleko. Oko 3 km jugoistočno od Gradine na brdovitom području današnjeg sela Malo Blaško nalazi se kasnosrednjovjekovno groblje s kamenim pločama i toponimi Stara crkva i Selište, što sve upućuje na srednjovjekovno naselje. U dolini je današnja varoš Slatina koja svoje postojanje i razvoj duguje ljekovitim termalnim vrelima i pogodnom smještaju na prirodnom putu. Dakle, upravo tu treba smjestiti i srednjovjekovnu varoš Sridu.

Za našu je temu od posebne važnosti i kamena ploča s glagoljskim natpisom, crtežom lova konjanika na jelena,

passed by Gradina in Šušnjari, which is known in the archaeological literature as a Bronze and Iron Age hillfort settlement and Roman fortification (Pašalić 1960, 25; Miletić 1971, 17, 20; Miletić 1988, 50-51). Passing through this site, to my great surprise I came upon not a Roman, but medieval fortification. The fortification was constructed on an articulated rocky hill which rises in the middle of a plain on the right bank of the Vrba, but in the immediate vicinity of the hilly terrain on the south-eastern side. Although the height of the hill is only about 20 m, it can only be approached from the south-east, while a wide area can be controlled from it. There is a plateau on top of the hill lying in a north-easterly-south-westerly direction, 40 m long and 35 m wide. The fortification was protected by a defensive wall made of broken stone and bonded with mortar. The wall was best preserved on the north-eastern side, where a slanted sub-wall several meters high indicates that there may have been a heavily reinforced defensive tower at this place, which would have been customary for Romanesque fortifications. On the heavily cultivated plain I found (especially in 1990) an enormous quantity of fragments of late medieval pottery which best confirm the dating of the fortification.

The location of the fortification in the territory that undoubtedly belonged to Glaž County, its position and appearance, which indicate that it was erected long before the appearance of firearms, and the lack of records of its medieval name by the natives of Šušnjari indicate that here is precisely where the medieval castle of Glaž should be placed. This theory is backed by the fact that the fortification is situated opposite to the mouth of the Bukovica, which, as noted above, was the north-eastern border of Zemljanik County, and also in the vicinity of the medieval village of Bulkacka, which was on the border with Glaž. In the 13th century, Zemljanik County was the north-westernmost part of the Bosnian Banovina, and this explains why Bela IV launched his punitive raids against Bosnian Ban Matija Ninoslav and his allies from Glaž. The location of the Glaž castle at Gradina in Šušnjari makes it possible to successfully determine the remaining parts of its residential complex. Approximately 600 m south-east of Gradina, at the elevated point Zidine, the remains of a medieval church were known even before. It has dimensions of 15 x 8 m, and around it there is a cemetery with tombstones. This site can be deemed the parish Church of St. Nicholas. Thus, the settlement below the castle was located between the fortification and the church. Even today, pottery fragments can still be found on the cultivated fields. The township of Srida, which assumed the economic function of this settlement (which by the 15th century had stagnated and became a village), had to be at a certain distance, but not too far away. About 3 km south-east of Gradina in the hilly area of today's village of Malo Blaško, there is a late medieval cemetery with stone slabs and the toponyms Stara crkva and Selište, all of which indicate a medieval settlement. In the valley, there is the township of Slatina, which owes its existence and development to the medicinal hot springs and favourable location on a natural route. So it is precisely here that the medieval township of Srida should be placed.

For the topic covered here, particularly important is the stone slab with a Glagolitic inscription, a drawing of a hunt with a horse-rider and deer, a swastika and several other im-

kukastim križem i još nekim prikazima, datirana u 15. st., a koja se čuva u Zemaljskom muzeju u Sarajevu (Lovrić 1937, 31-35; Vego 1970, 98-99; Fučić 1982, 326-327). Nju objavljuje i P. Čošković u knjizi koju imamo pred sobom (njezinu fotografiju čak stavlja na korice). Ploča je nađena između dva svjetska rata, a kao nalazište je zabilježena Slatina. Danas raspolažemo s preciznim podacima o njezinom nalazištu i okolnostima pod kojima je nađena. Prilikom obilazaka Šušnjara, od najstarijih stanovnika sam čuo priču da je između dva svjetska rata na Gradini nađena ploča s čudnim slovima, ali i crtežima životinja. To me navelo na zaključak kako se ta priča odnosi na spomenutu ploču s glagoljskim natpisom i scenom lova. Tome ne proturječi ni podatak da je ploča nađena u Slatini, jer Šušnjari njoj administrativno pripadaju. Već je Nada Miletić zabilježila (arheološki je rekognoscirala Šušnjare 1959.), nesumnjivo po pričanju mještana, da je na Gradini 1923. nađena kamena ploča s natpisom i reljefom, ali nije znala o kojem je pismu riječ (Miletić 1988, 50-51). Da je ta ploča zaista nađena na Gradini u Šušnjari, definitivno je potvrđeno izlaskom na svjetlo dana dokumenata koji se čuvaju u Arhivu Bosanske krajine u Banjoj Luci, a u kojima se precizno govori o okolnostima pod kojima je ploča nađena i od strane žandarmerije transportirana u Zemaljski muzej u Sarajevu.

Toponimija i topografija Glaške županije omogućavaju da se osvijetle još neki problemi, a to je smještaj posjeda reda cistercita s crkvom sv. Ivana Krstitelja, sela Turije i Mračaja te posjeda Biskupaca. S tim se problemima bezuspješno pozabavio i autor, a na jednom mjestu piše sljedeće:

“Prema podacima iz isprave kralja Bele IV, kojom je 1258. darovao cistercitema iz Kostanjevice u Kranjskoj (de Landestrost) zemljište u Vrbaskoj županiji na području Turjaka (apud sanctum Johannem) koje pripada današnjoj bosanskogradiškoj općini, doznaje se da se spomenuti posjed nalazio između dvaju potoka od kojih se jedan zvao Turia (danas Turjak), a drugi Cercyka, za koji je danas teško utvrditi na što se odnosio. N. Bilogrivić misli da tragove davne prisutnosti cistercita u tom kraju kriju ostaci zidina na desnoj obali potoka Lubine između selâ Gornjih Kijevaca i Grbavaca. Teško je prihvatiti njegovo mišljenje kao odraz stanja nastalog prvih godina po dolasku cistercita u taj kraj, budući da kraljeva isprava u opisu međa darovanog posjeda ne spominje rijeku Lubinu, koja bi tada svakako bila spomenuta da ju je novostečeni cistercitski posjed bilo gdje dodirivao.

Kada se već ne može pouzdanije odrediti smještaj darovanog zemljišta s obzirom na njegove navedene međe, treba barem spomenuti da je iznosio tri pluga, odnosno tri dana oranja te da se u blizini nalazila crkva sv. Ivana. Prema popisu župa Zagrebačke biskupije iz 1334. u vrbaskom distriktu je doista postojala župna crkva posvećena sv. Ivanu Krstitelju, ali nije naveden naziv mjesta u kome je bila, pa se pretpostavljalo da je možda riječ o Ivanjskoj. Može se tvrditi da se darovani posjed nije

ages, dated in the 15th century, which is held in the National Museum in Sarajevo (Lovrić 1937, 31-35; Vego 1970, 98-99; Fučić 1982, 326-327). This piece is also published by P. Čošković in this book (a photograph of it is even featured on the cover). The slab was found between the two World Wars, with Slatina recorded as the site of its discovery. Today we have precise data on its find-site and the circumstances in which it was discovered. During visits to Šušnjari, I heard a story from the oldest residents that between the World Wars a slab with strange letters, and drawings of animals, was found at Gradina. This led me to conclude that this story is actually about the aforementioned slab with the Glagolitic inscription and hunting scene. This does not even contradict the fact that the slab was found in Slatina, because Šušnjari are within the latter's administrative borders. Nada Miletić already noted (she conducted archaeological reconnaissance in Šušnjari in 1959), no doubt based on the accounts of local residents, that a stone slab bearing an inscription and relief was found at Gradina in 1923, but she did not know in which script the inscription was written (Miletić 1988, 50-51). That a slab was truly discovered at Gradina in Šušnjari was definitively confirmed by the release of documents held in the Archives of the Bosanska Krajina in Banja Luka, which precisely recount the circumstances under which the slab was found and had been transported by train by gendarmerie to the National Museum in Sarajevo.

The toponymy and topography of Glaž County make it possible to throw light on certain other problems, such as the estate of the Cistercian order with the Church of St. John the Baptist, the location of the villages of Turija and Mračaj, and the Biskupci estate. The author's attempt in this regard remains unsuccessful, as he writes the following:

“According to the data from a document of King Bela IV, whereby in 1258 he granted to the Cistercians from Kostanjevica in Carniola (de Landestrost) an estate in Vrbas County in the Turjak area (apud sanctum Johannem) which belongs to what is nowadays Bosanska Gradiška municipality, it can be concluded that this estate was situated between two creeks, one called Turia (today Turjak), and the other Cercyka, the present designation of which is difficult to determine. N. Bilogrivić believes that traces of the presence of the Cistercians in this region in the distant past are concealed in the remains of walls on the banks of Lubina Creek, between the villages of Gornji Kijevci and Grbavci. It is difficult to accept his opinion as a reflection of the situation that emerged in the first years after the arrival of the Cistercians in this region, since the king's grant does not mention the Lubina in its description of the estate's boundaries, which would have certainly been mentioned at the time if the new Cistercian estate touched it at any point.

Since the location of this estate cannot be determined by means of the boundaries cited in the records, it should at least be noted that it took three days to plough the land, and that the Church of St. John was located nearby. According to the census of parishes of the Zagreb Diocese of 1334, there truly was a parish church dedicated to St. John the Baptist in the Vrbas Ecclesiastical District, but the name of the settlement in which it was located is not mentioned, so it is assumed that it may have been in Ivanjska. It can be said that the granted estate

nalazio u tadašnjem mjestu Turjaku koje je imalo župnu crkvu posvećenu sv. Mihovilu” (str. 36-37).

Autor nije uočio da kroz područje istočno od donjeg toka Vrbasa paralelno protječu dvije rječice - Turjanica i Crkvena (od kojih je prva nesumnjivo *Turia*, a druga *Cercyka*) koje se ulijevaju u Vrbas. Te rječice ograničavaju široki pojas obradive zemlje i upravo tu treba tražiti cistercijski posjed. Crkva sv. Ivana Krstitelja najvjerojatnije se nalazila u Čardačanima, na brdu gdje je krajem 19. st. izgrađena pravoslavna crkva, a za koje kod lokalnog stanovništva postoji tradicija da je na njemu postojala stara crkva. Ipak, najveće je iznenađenje činjenica da se blizu donjeg toka rječice Turjanice, odnosno cistercijskog posjeda, nalazio utvrđeni grad Glaž. Takav nas smještaj navodi na zaključak da se 1258. Vrbaška županija prostirala i istočno od Vrbasa, odnosno da tada nije postojala Glaška županija. Takav zaključak ipak nije prihvatljiv, jer je nemoguće da je Vrbaška županija sama obuhvaćala ogromno područje između rijeka Jablanice i Ukrine, da je grad Vrbas (o kojem će posebno biti riječi) mimo već postojećeg grada Glaža bio administrativno središte istočne polovice tog područja i da je Glaška županija osnovana u vrijeme kada je oblikovanje županijskog sustava bilo davno završeno. Činjenica da se 1280. Ivan Gisingovac spominje kao župan Vrbasa i Sane, a da do 1285. posjedi Gisingovaca prelaze u ruke Radoslava I. Babonića, koji je nosio naslov župana Glaža, Vrbasa i Sane, također ne govori kako je tek tada osnovana Glaška županija. Slavenska plemićka obitelj Babonići bili su otprije gospodari dijela Usore, i to onog dijela kojem je pripadao grad Glaž. To je vjerojatno i bio razlog zašto je Glaška županija za razliku od ostatka Usore, ušla u Zagrebačku biskupiju i postupno se vezala za Slavonsku Banovinu. Iz svega izloženog može se jasno vidjeti da cisterciti nisu došli u Vrbašku županiju, već na područje Vrbaškog crkvenog distrikta, u čiji je sastav ulazila Glaška županija.

Određenje rječice Turije kao Turjanice upućuje nas da upravo uz nju, a ne u selu Turjacima kod Bosanske Gradiške, trebamo tražiti srednjovjekovno selo Turiju i crkvu sv. Mihovila. Oko 6,5 km od utvrde Glaž, na lijevoj obali Turjanice i ispod brda na kojem je smješteno selo Kadinjani, očuvan je toponim Turija. U blizini se nalaze toponimi Rimov brijeg, uz koji je vezana tradicija o staroj crkvi, što upućuje na katoličku crkvu i Kućište koji ukazuje na staro naselje. Sve to govori da se upravo tu treba smjestiti srednjovjekovno selo Turija, odnosno crkva sv. Mihovila.

Za selo Mračaj autor nije rekao ništa konkretno, osim da je današnji Mračaj u Uskoplju predaleko od Vrbaške županije. Ponovno nije računao s tim da se i to mjesto treba tražiti izvan područja Vrbaške županije, odnosno na području Glaške. Tako nije zapazio da se dio velikog sela Lišnje kod Prnjavora i danas naziva Mračaj. Da se upravo u Lišnju treba smjestiti to srednjovjekovno selo, osim očuvanog toponima, govori podatak da je Lišnja još u 17. st. bila velika katolička župa. Biskup fra Nikola

was not located in the settlement of Turjak of that time, which had a parish church dedicated to St. Michael” (pp. 36-37).

The author did not notice that the area east of the Vrbas River's lower course is traversed by two small parallel rivers: the Turjanica and Crkvena (of which the first is undoubtedly the *Turia*, and the second the *Cercyka*) which flow into the Vrbas. These little rivers form the boundaries around a wide belt of arable land and it is precisely here that the Cistercian estate should be sought. The Church of St. John the Baptist was most likely located in Čardačani, on a hill where an Orthodox church was erected at the end of the 19th century. According to the lore of local residents, an older church stood at this site. Nonetheless, the greatest surprise is that Glaž castle stood near the lower course of the Turjančica River, i.e. near the Cistercian estate. Such a location leads to the conclusion that in 1258 Vrbas County extended east of the Vrbas River, which would mean that at that time Glaž County did not exist. Such a conclusion is nonetheless unacceptable, because it would not have been possible for Vrbas County to encompass the enormous territory between the Jablanica and Ukrina Rivers, and forth Vrbas castle (which will be considered separately), to be the administrative seat of the eastern half of this territory in spite of the already existing Glaž castle and for Glaž County to be established when the formation of the county system had long been complete. The fact that in 1280 Ivan Gisingovac is mentioned as the prefect of Vrbas and Sana Counties, while by 1285 the possessions of the Gisingovacs were handed over to Radoslav I Babonić, prefect of Glaž, Vrbas and Sana Counties, also indicate that Glaž County was not established only at that time. The Babonić noble family of Slavonia had already been the lords of Usora, in that portion which encompassed the Glaž castle. This is probably the reason why Glaž County, as opposed to the remains of Usora, became part of the Zagreb Diocese and gradually became tied to the Slavonian Banovina. Therefore, it is apparent that the Cistercians did not come to Vrbas County, but rather the territory of the Vrbas Ecclesiastical District, which included Glaž County.

The determination of the small river Turija as the Turjanica indicates that right along it, and not in the village of Turjaci near Bosanska Gradiška, is where one should seek the medieval village of Turija and the Church of St. Michael. Approximately 6.5 km from the Glaž castle, on the left bank of the Turjanica and under the hill with the village of Kadinjani, the toponym Turija has been preserved. The nearby toponym Rimov brijeg is associated with the traditional existence of an old church, which leads to the Catholic church and Kućište, indicating an old settlement. All of this leads to the conclusion that the medieval village of Turija and the Church of St. Michael must be placed here.

The author says nothing specific about willage of Mračaj, except that today's Mračaj, in Uskoplje, is too far from Vrbas County. He once more failed to consider that even this place should be sought outside of Vrbas County, in the territory of Glaž County. Thus he failed to note that part of the large willage of Lišnja near Prnjavor is even today called Mračaj. That the medieval willage should be placed in Lišnja is – besides the preserved toponym – backed by the fact in the 17th century Lišnja was still a large Catholic parish. When administer-

Olovčić je 1672. u Lišnji prilikom davanja sakramenta krizme zatekao župu bez crkve s ukupno 1180 župljana koju je opsluživao franjevac iz Visokog. N. Bilogrivić je pravilno zaključio da tako velika župa nije mogla nastati u vrijeme progona katoličkog stanovništva, nego je morala biti srednjovjekovni prežetak, ali nije znao reći o kojem je srednjovjekovnom mjestu riječ (Bilogrivić 1998, 215). Inače, Lišnja je ime kasabe koju su krajem 16. st. osnovale Osmanlije, što spominje i P. Čošković (str. 138). Ime su joj dali po rječici Lišnji koja tuda protječe. (Slično je bilo i s osmanskim kasabama Sanski Most i Županj Potok na Duvanjskom polju). Tako je novo ime potisnulo staro, ali je ono ipak ostalo očuvano.

Budući da se Mračaj ne spominje kao crkvena župa, postavlja se pitanje kojoj je crkvenoj župi moglo pripadati to mjesto. Vjerujem da odgovor treba tražiti u Biskupcima u kojima se prema popisu župnih crkava Vrbaškog distrikta nalazila crkva sv. Jurja. Već je N. Bilogrivić pravilno zaključio da je ta crkva bila na nekom biskupskom posjedu koji je po tome i dobio ime, jer se jedino za tu crkvenu župu izričito kaže da od nje dubički arhiđakon nema nikakvog prihoda. On nije znao smjestiti taj posjed, ali je opet pravilno zaključio kako bi se mjesto te crkve možda moglo odrediti da su sačuvane najstarije povelje vakufa, odnosno džamijskih posjeda na tom području, jer je vrlo vjerojatno kako su Osmanlije njezin posjed kao biskupsko dobro odmah pretvorile u džamijsko dobro (Bilogrivić 1998, 184). Upravo u blizini Lišnje nalazi se Prnjavor, gdje se krajem 18. st. oko džamije i karavan-saraja naglo počela razvijati osmanska kasaba, koja je prerasla u moderni gradić. Sama riječ Prnjavor izvedena je od grčke riječi *pronia* i označava crkveni zemljišni posjed, tako da tu s velikom vjerojatnošću trebamo smjestiti Biskupce.

P. Čošković nije uspio odrediti ni granice Vrbaške županije, ali je za granicu između Dubičke i Vrbaške županije na jednom mjestu napisao sljedeće: “*Prema opisu zemljišnih međa doznaje se da su rijeke Ispijaš (Izpyas) i Meščenica (Mesenycha) razdvajale Dubičku od Vrbaske županije. Utvrđujući međe dubičkog zemljoposjeda prema Vrbaskoj županiji, I. Kukuljević navodi da je granica od rijeke Nagadine išla dugim putem uz Savu do mjesta, gdje rijeka Ispijaš utječe u Savu, te da se tu razdvajaju granice Dubičke i Vrbaske županije, a odatle je skretala prema jugu i vodila je uz rijeku Ispijaš do utoka rijeke Likovice (Lykonch) u Ispijaš. Potom je kroz šumu vodila do brda Rakova glava, a odatle do mjesta Rasoj, zatim preko brda Kosmareva do mjesta Kališta. Odatle je preko vrha brda izbijala na veliku cestu koja je vodila u Vrbas, a cestom je potom vodila prema zapadu na brdo između Rakovca i Jastrebece (Istrobyca), a zatim preko visokih gora išla je do mjesta Simiga (Symiga), a odatle je vodila u Gvozd i kroz njega do rijeke Meščenice, gdje je bila granica Vrbaške županije*” (str. 39-40). Od tog opisa nemamo velike koristi, ako se te granice ne odrede na terenu. Zapravo, taj se opis i ne odnosi samo na razgraničenje između Dubičke i Vrbaške županije, već na granice Dubičke županije u

ing the sacrament of confirmation in Lišnja in 1672, Bishop Nikola Olovčić found the parish without a church, where a total of 1,180 parishioners were being served by a Franciscan from Visoko. N. Bilogrivić rightfully concluded that such a large parish could not have emerged during that era of persecution of Catholics, rather it had to be a medieval holdover – although he could not determine which medieval site it may have been (Bilogrivić 1998, 215). Lišnja is otherwise the name of a township which was established by the Ottomans at the end of the 16th century, which is also mentioned by Čošković (p. 138). It was named after the small Lišnja River which flows here. (The same applied to the Ottoman's townships of Sanski Most and Županj Potok on in the Duvno Field). Thus the new name pushed away the old, which has, nonetheless, been preserved.

Since Mračaj is not mentioned as a parish, the question arises as to which parish it may have belonged. I believe that the answer should be sought in Biskupci, where, according to the census of parishes of the Vrbas Ecclesiastical District, the Church of St. George was located. N. Bilogrivić had already correctly concluded that this church was on some diocesan estate, from which it acquired its name, because it is only for this parish that it is explicitly stated that the Dubica archdeacon derived no revenues. He did not know where to place this estate, but he once more rightfully concluded that the site of this church could have been determined if the oldest *vakuf* charters had been preserved, meaning the mosque holdings in this area, because it is very likely that the Ottomans immediately transformed this diocesan estate into the property of a mosque (Bilogrivić 1998, 184). Prnjavor is in the immediate vicinity of Lišnja, and it was here that a Ottoman township began to quickly grow around a mosque and caravanserai at the end of the 18th century, and then grew into a modern little town. The very word Prnjavor is derived from the Greek word *pronia* and designates a clerical land holding, so it is very likely that Biskupci should be placed here.

P. Čošković did not manage to determine the borders of Vrbas County, but at one place he wrote the following about the border between Dubica and Vrbas County: “*According to the description of the land border, we learn that the Ispijaš (Izpyas) and Meščenica (Mesenycha) Rivers divided Dubica from Vrbas County. In establishing the boundary between the Dubica estate toward Vrbas County, I. Kukuljević states that the boundary ran from the Nagadina River and extended along the Sava to the point where the Ispijaš River flows into the Sava, and that the border dividing Dubica and Vrbas Counties was here, moving south along the Ispijaš River to the mouth of the Likovica (Lykonch) into the Ispijaš. Then it ran through a forest to the hill Rakova glava, and to Rasoj, and then over Kosmarev Hill to Kalište. Thence it passed over a hill and came to the large road that led to Vrbas, and it followed the road toward the west between Rakovci and Jastrebece (Istrobyca), and from there over highlands to Simiga (Symiga), and to Gvozd and through it to the Meščenica River, where the border of Vrbas County lay*” (pp. 39-40). This description is not very useful if the terrain on which these borders lie is not determined. This description actually does not pertain only to the demarcation between Dubica and Vrbas Counties, rather it encompasses the entire border of Dubica County.

celini. Iz opisa doznajemo da se sjeverna granica Dubičke županije nalazila na rijeci Savi između ušća rijeka *Nagadine* na sjeverozapadu i *Izpyas* na sjeveroistoku. Dovoljno je baciti samo površan pogled na geografsku kartu pa možemo zaključiti da *Nagadina* može biti samo Una na čijoj se desnoj obali nalazila srednjovjekovna Dubica, a da *Izpyas* čije ušće dolazi nakon dugog puta uz Savu, može biti samo rijeka Jablanica. Granica Dubičke i Vrbaške županije išla je, dakle, rijekom *Izpyas* prema jugu do ušća rijeke *Lykonch* u nju. Na jugu se u Jablanicu kao najvažnija pritoka ulijeva rijeka Vrbaška, ali nju moramo isključiti kao granicu, jer se na njezinoj lijevoj obali nalazi grad Vrbaš s podgrađem, odnosno političko središte Vrbaške županije. Osim toga, rijeka Vrbaška ne odgovara opisu, jer svojim donjim dijelom protječe kroz polje. Dakle, granica je morala biti zapadnije, a jedina pritoka koja ostaje jest rječica Bukovica. Ona izvire i protječe kroz brdovito i šumovito područje, kako je i opisano. Koliko su sela i brda spomenuta u opisu bila blizu Bukovice danas ne možemo reći, jer njihova imena nisu očuvana. Cesta na koju je granica zatim izmila i koju je pratila prema zapadu, išla je iz grada Vrbaša do brda Mrakovice, gdje se vezivala s cestama koje su išle iz srednjovjekovnih gradova Dubice i Kozare (današnji Kozarac) u Sanskoj županiji. Sjeverno od Mrakovice izvire dugački potok koji se i danas naziva Rakovica, dok bi se *Istrobyca* koja se nalazila s druge strane, mogla zbog fonetske sličnosti odnositi na potok Bistricu koji izvire jugoistočno od Mrakovice. (Potok Bistrica je inače bio granica između Zemljaničke i Sanske županije). Pogrješku bi u tom slučaju napravio srednjovjekovni ugarski zapisničar neupućen dobro u slavenska imena mjesta, što nije ništa neobično. Na Mrakovici se završavala granica između Dubičke i Vrbaške županije. Granica Dubičke županije se okrenula prema zapadu i, kako piše u izvoru, išla preko visokih gora, odnosno hrptom Kozare, do rijeke koju je srednjovjekovni zapisničar zapisao ili Ivan Kukuljević-Sakcinski prepisao kao *Mesenicha*. To može biti samo rječica koja se danas zove Mekinja. Dakle, *Mecenicha* (Mekenica)! Osim imena, takav zaključak potvrđuje i činjenica da se Mekinja ulijeva u riječicu Strigovu, a ona u Unu uzvodno od Dubice, tako da zatvara okvir Dubičke županije.

Sada se možemo vratiti na ostale granice Vrbaške županije. Južna granica je išla od brda Mrakovice do vrela potoka Bistrice, odnosno uz potok Bukovicu do njegovog ušća u Vrbaš, gdje je graničila sa Zemljaničkom županijom. Sjeverna granica bila je na Savi, a istočna na Vrbašu, gdje je graničila s Glaškom županijom.

Autor naglašava da srednjovjekovni gradovi Vrbaš i Banja Luka nisu istovjetni, a to uopće nije sporno, jer se zajedno spominju u čak četiri ista dokumenta iz 1494., 1495., 1519. i 1522. (Bilogrić 1998, 189-190). Zastupa mišljenje da se srednjovjekovni grad Vrbaš, administrativno središte Vrbaške županije, nalazio u današnjoj Banjoj Luci i smješta ga u utvrdu Kastel na ušću rječice Crkvene u Vrbaš. Takav smještaj

From this description, we learn that the northern border of Dubica County was on the Sava River between the mouth of the *Nagadina* River on the north-west and the *Izpyas* River in the north-east. Only a superficial glance at a map is sufficient to realise that the *Nagadina* can only be the Una River, on whose right bank medieval Dubica lies, while the *Izpyas*, whose mouth forms after running parallel to the Sava for a great distance, can only be the Jablanica River. The border between Dubica and Vrbaš County thus ran along the *Izpyas* River to the south to the mouth of the *Lykonch* River into it. In the south, the Vrbaška River flows in the Jablanica in the south as its most important tributary, but it cannot be deemed a border, because the Vrbaš castle with its surrounding settlement, the political seat of Vrbaš County, is situated on its left bank. Additionally, the Vrbaška River does not correspond to the description, because its lower course passes through a field. The border thus had to be farther west, and the only tributary left is the small Bukovica River. It springs and flows through a hilly and forest-covered terrain, as noted in the description. Today there is no way of telling how close to the Bukovica the villages and hills mentioned in the description were, because their names have not been preserved. The road that intersected the border at that point and which it followed westward ran from the Vrbaš castle to Mrakovica Hill, where it connected with roads that went from the medieval castles of Dubica and Kozara (today's Kozarac) in Sana County. A long creek springs north from Mrakovica which is today called Rakovica, while the *Istrobyca* on the other side may, due to phonetic similarity, refer to Bistrica Creek, which springs forth south-east of Mrakovica. (Bistrica Creek was otherwise the border between Zemljanik and Sana Counties). In this case a mistake may have been made by a Hungarian scribe not well-grounded in Slavic place-names, which would be nothing unusual. The border between Dubica and Vrbaš Counties terminated at Mrakovica. The border of Dubica County turned to the west and, as noted in the record, passed over hilly terrain, the ridge of Kozara, to a river that a medieval scribe recorded, or Ivan Kukuljević-Sakcinski transcribed, as *Mesenicha*. This can only be the small river that is today called the Mekinja. Thus, *Mecenicha* (Mekinja)! Besides the name, this conclusion is backed by the fact that the Mekinja flows into the small Strigova River, while the Strigova into Una upstream from Dubica, thus closing the framework of Dubica County.

We can now go back to the remaining borders of Vrbaš County. The southern border ran from Mrakovica Hill to the source of Bistrica Creek, that is along Bukovica Creek until its mouth on the Vrbaš River, where it bordered with Zemljanik County. The northern border was on the Sava River, while the eastern border was on the Vrbaš River, where it bordered with Glaž County.

The author stresses that the medieval castles of Vrbaš and Banja Luka are not synonymous, which is not even in dispute, because they are mentioned together in a total of four documents from 1494, 1495, 1519 and 1522 (Bilogrić 1998, 189-190). His opinion is that the medieval castle of Vrbaš, the administrative seat of Vrbaš County, was in today's Banja Luka, and he places it in the Kastel fortification at the mouth of the small Crkvena River on the Vrbaš. This location is entirely unacceptable, because Banja Luka is in the territory of

potpuno je neprihvatljiv, jer je Banja Luka smještena na području Zemljaničke županije. Opsežnim arheološkim iskopavanjima na Kastelu prije posljednjeg rata (u kojima sam i sâm sudjelovao) nisu otkriveni arhitektonski ostatci koji bi sa sigurnošću upućivali na nekakav kasnosrednjovjekovni utvrđeni grad na mjestu Kastela. Pa i sam položaj Kastela na blagom uzvišenju u ravnici ne odgovara položaju kasnosrednjovjekovnih utvrđenih gradova ili kastruma, kako se oni (pa tako i Vrbas i Banja Luka) nazivaju u srednjovjekovnim pisanim izvorima. Također, nije otkriven ni kasnosrednjovjekovni kulturni sloj, a za keramičko posuđe s prijašnjih iskopavanja koje je pripisano kasnom srednjem vijeku (Žeravica, Žeravica 1984, 33), ustanovljeno je da pripada sloju iz 16. st., odnosno razdoblju rane osmanske vladavine. Na Kastelu je, istina, nađeno nešto keramičkog posuđa iz ranog ili razvijenog srednjeg vijeka, ali ono može pripadati nekom manjem kratkotrajnom naselju nastalom unutar ruševina rimske utvrde, odnosno na mjestu na kojem će kasnije biti izgrađena velika i kompleksna osmanska utvrda. Inače, srednjovjekovni utvrđeni grad Banja Luka, koji se prvi put spominje tek 1494. bio je smješten na desnoj obali kanjonske rječice Suturlije blizu njezinog ušća u Vrbas, dakle svega 3 km od Kastela.

Na brdu Pavetnjaku u Gornjim Podgradcima kod Bosanske Gradiške smješten je snažni srednjovjekovni utvrđeni grad koji današnje stanovništvo naziva Gradom Marije Terezije, a ispod njega su ostatci prostranog srednjovjekovnog podgrađa s crkvom. U historiografskoj i arheološkoj literaturi taj je kompleks već identificiran kao grad Vrbas, ali autor u to ne vjeruje i pravi veliku zbrku. On je čvrsto uvjeren da su njegovi prethodnici, osim N. Bilogrivića, bili u zabludi dok nisu razlikovali grad Vrbas od grada Vrbaske i da potonji treba tražiti na području današnjeg sela Vrbaške na istoimenoj rijeci, a ne u Gornjim Podgradcima koji su po njemu na lijevoj strani Vrbasa. Autor kao da ne zna da se i Gornji Podgradci nalaze na rijeci Vrbaškoj! Autor dalje samouvjereno piše: *“Povjesničari koji su grad Vrbasku (castrum Urbazca) tražili na mjestu ruševina srednjovjekovnog grada na području Gornjih Podgradaca, griješili su ponajprije stoga što nisu slijedili nit izvornih svjedočanstava koja neprijeporno ukazuju na činjenicu da je Vrbaska samostalna utvrda i da ne pripada nijednom gradu, te da se stoga ni po čemu ne bi mogla smatrati podgrađem (suburbium), budući da je pojava gradskih naselja u to doba već bila dobro poznata činjenica. Neuočavanju te razlike pogodovale je i činjenica da se grad Vrbaska nije uspjela razviti u znatnije gradsko naselje kakvo je, primjerice, u razvijenom srednjem vijeku postojalo na području Gornjih Podgradaca, ili pak ono poznato pod imenom Vrbas”* (str. 30). Neopravdano je samo na osnovi izričaja *castrum Urbasca* zaključivati da je riječ o dva različita grada i da je Vrbaska samostalna utvrda. (Autor je inače sasvim neodlučan u kategorizaciji tobožnjeg grada Vrbaske: to mu je prvo grad, a zatim samostalna utvrda

Zemljanik County. During extensive archaeological excavations at Kastel prior to the last war (in which I myself participated), no archaeological remains were discovered that would indicate with any certainty the existence of a late medieval fortified town at the Kastel site. Even the location of Kastel on a slightly elevated point does not correspond to the position of late medieval castles or *castra*, as they (including Vrbas and Banja Luka) are called in medieval written sources. Additionally, no late medieval cultural layer was found, and the pottery discovered in earlier excavations and attributed to the late medieval period (Žeravica, Žeravica 1984, 33), was later determined as belonging to a layer from the 16th century, that is, the period of early Ottoman rule. To be sure, some pottery from the early or high Middle Ages was indeed found at Kastel, but it may have belonged to some smaller, short-lived settlement that emerged within the ruins of the Roman fortification, or at the site where a large and complex Ottoman fortification would be erected. Otherwise, the medieval castle of Banja Luka, which is first mentioned in 1494, was situated on the right bank of the small canyon of the Suturlija River near its confluence with the Vrbas, i.e. 3 km from Kastel.

On Pavetnjak Hill in Gornji Podgradci near Bosanska Gradiška, there is powerfully reinforced medieval fortified town (castle) that today's residents call the Castle of Maria Theresa. Beneath it, there are ruins of a spacious medieval settlement with a church. In the historiographic and archaeological literature this complex has already been identified as the Vrbas castle, but author does not believe this, thereby creating considerable confusion. He is firmly convinced that his predecessors, with the exception of N. Bilogrivić, were mistaken for not distinguishing between the Vrbas and Vrbaska castles, and that the latter should be sought in the territory of today's village of Vrbaška on the eponymous river, and not in Gornji Podgradci, which in his view is located on the left bank of the Vrbas. The author seems unaware that Gornji Podgradci is only on the Vrbaška River! He continues with assurance: *“Historians who sought the Vrbaska castle (castrum Urbazca) at the site of the ruins of a medieval castle at Gornji Podgradci are mistaken first because they did not follow the thread of original testimonies which undisputedly indicate that the independent Vrbaska fortification did not belong to any castle, so it cannot be deemed a subsidiary settlement (suburbium), since the castle settlements were already a well-established fact at the time. Failure to note this difference was also fomented by the fact that the Vrbaska castle did not manage to develop into an urban settlement as, for example, the Gornji Podgradci area, or the settlement known under the name Vrbas, did in the high Middle Ages”* (p. 30). There is no justification for concluding that these are two different castles and that Vrbaska was an independent fortification only on the basis of the expression *castrum Urbasca*. (The author is entirely indecisive in classifying the supposed Vrbaska castle: first it is a castle, then an independent fortification that is not associated with any other castle, and then in the end he stresses that it may not be deemed a subsidiary settlement below a castle!). For example, geographically and chronologically nearby Glaž is first mentioned only as a castle, and then with a subsidiary settlement and finally with such a settlement and township in the vicinity, but it is actually a simple complex.

koja ne pripada ni jednom gradu, a na kraju naglašava da se ne može smatrati podgrađem!). Na primjer, geografski i vremenski bliski Glaž najprije se spominje samo kao utvrđeni grad, a zatim s podgrađem i na kraju s podgrađem i varoši u blizini, a riječ je o jedinstvenom kompleksu.

Autor vjeruje da na Gradu Marije Terezije treba tražiti Gradec u kojem je prema popisu župnih crkava Vrbaškog distrikta postojala crkva sv. Jurja. Odmah dodaje da je Gradec imao i svoje podgrađe u kojem je postojala župna crkva sv. Martina. Više je nego očito da u istom mjestu (utvrđenom gradu s podgrađem) nisu mogle biti dvije župne crkve, pogotovo što crkva sv. Martina u spomenutom popisu nije vezana za Gradec već za podgrađe nekoga grada kojem je izostavljeno ime, o čemu će još biti riječi.

Autor proizvoljno zaključuje da je uspomena na naselje Gradec očuvana u imenu današnjih sela Gornji i Donji Podgradci i da se njihovo ime ne izvodi iz riječi kojom se općenito označavalo podgrađe već od grada kojem je dotično naselje pripadalo. Kao paralele navodi primjere podgrađa srednjovjekovnih bosanskih gradova (gradova čija su imena i danas očuvana): Podborač, Podkreševo, Podvisoki i Podvišegrad. Prema autorovoj logici, Podgradci bi bili podgrađe Gradeca. Ako je tako, kako to da se utvrđeni grad danas naziva Grad Marije Terezije, a ne Gradec, ako su Podgradci po njemu dobili ime? Nema sumnje da je riječ o selima koja su svoja imena dobila po starom gradu ispod kojeg su nastala, a kojem je, zbog naglog prekida u kontinuitetu naseljavanja i potpune smjene stanovništva, zaboravljeno srednjovjekovno ime. Ono se očuvalo u imenu rijeke Vrbaške. Treba spomenuti da još u srednjem vijeku podgrađe nije moralo imati poseban naziv izveden od imena utvrđenog grada. Najbliži je primjer opet Glaž gdje se naselje ispod utvrđenog grada u povelji kralja Tomaša iz 1446. jednostavno zvalo Podgradie.

Autor još naglašava sljedeće: “*Također se ne bi smjelo Podgrađe, odnosno trgovište grada Vrbasa, koje se pod nazivom Orbazvasarhel, Vrbazvasarhel spominje 1353. i 1383-1384, izjednačavati s Vrbaskim gradom*” (str. 30). Međutim, upravo on ne razlikuje, odnosno pogrešno izjednačava satelitska naselja grada Vrbasa: podgrađe i trgovište koje je preraslo u varoš. Da je riječ o dva različita naselja najbolje potvrđuje popis župnih crkava u Vrbaškom distriktu iz 1334. u kojem su navedene crkva sv. Martina *sub castro* (ispod utvrđenog grada), sv. Elizabete *de foro* (u trgovištu) i sv. Ilije *de campo* (u polju). S jedne strane, ne navode se precizno imena naselja u kojima se ili pored kojih se te crkve nalaze, dok s druge strane grad Vrbaš nije posebno naveden (jer je popisivač, gorički arhidakon Ivan, očito smatrao da za tim nema potrebe) pa nije teško zaključiti da se prva crkva nalazila u podgrađu grada Vrbasa, a druga u trgovištu na određenoj udaljenosti. Dakle, imamo sličnu situaciju kao s Glažom. Odmah ispod grada Vrbasa nalazi se srednjovjekovno naselje u kojem je iskopana srednjovjekovna crkva (Bilogrivić 1935, 192) koja može biti samo crkva sv. Martina. Oko 7 km

The author believes that Gradec should be sought in the Castle of Maria Theresa, since according to the census of parishes of the Vrbaš District, there was a Church of St. George there. He immediately adds that Gradec also had its sub-settlement which included a Church of St. Martin. It is more than apparent that two parish churches could not have existed in the same place (in a castle and in the settlement beneath it), particularly since the Church of St. Martin is not associated with Gradec in the aforementioned census, rather it is associated with a settlement whose name is missing, of which more will be said later.

The author arbitrarily concludes that the memory of the settlement of Gradec is preserved in the names of today's villages of Gornji and Donji Podgradci and that their names are not derived from the words that generally referred to settlements below castles (*podgrađe*) but rather from the castle to which the settlement in question belonged. As parallel examples, he cites the settlements surrounding medieval Bosnian castles (whose names have been preserved to this day): Podborač, Podkreševo, Podvisoki and Podvišegrad. According to the author's logic, Podgradci would be the subsidiary settlement of Gradec. If this is so, why is this fortified town today called the Castle of Maria Theresa, and not Gradec, if Podgradci derived its name from it? There is no doubt that these are villages which derived their names from the old castle beneath which they emerged, and whose medieval name was forgotten due to a sudden rift in continuity of habitation and the complete change of the population. It was preserved in the name of the Vrbaška River. It should be noted that even in the Middle Ages a settlement below a castle did not necessarily have to have a specific name derived from the name of the castle. The closest example is Glaž, where the settlement below the castle was simply called Podgradie in the charter of the Bosnian King Tomaš from 1446.

The author goes on to stress: “*Also, Podgrađe, the market-town of the Vrbaš castle, mentioned under the name Orbazvasarhel, Vrbazvasarhel in 1353 and 1383-1384, should not be equated with the Vrbaska castle*” (p. 30). However, he does in fact fail to distinguish them, or rather he mistakenly equates the satellite settlements of the Vrbaš castle: the subsidiary settlement and the market-town that grew into a township. That these are two different settlements is best confirmed by the census of parish churches in the Vrbaš District of 1334, in which the aforementioned Churches of St. Martin *sub castro* (beneath a castle), St. Elizabeth *de foro* (in a market-town) and St. Elias *de campo* (in a field). On one hand, the precise names of the settlements in or next to which these churches are located are not mentioned, while on the other the Vrbaš castle is not specifically mentioned (because the census-taker, the Gorica archdeacon Ivan, obviously saw no need to do so) so it is not difficult to conclude that the first church was located in the settlement beneath the Vrbaš castle, while the other was in the market-town some distance away. Therefore the situation is the same as with Glaž. Immediately below the Vrbaš castle there was a medieval settlement in which a medieval church was excavated (Bilogrivić 1935, 192). It can only be the Church of St. Martin. Approximately 7 km north-east of the settlement below the Vrbaš castle, in today's village of Donji Podgradci, an open medieval settlement was discov-

sjeveroistočno od podgrađa grada Vrbasa, u današnjem selu Donjim Podgradcima otkriveno je na desnoj obali rijeke Vrbaške otvoreno kasnosrednjovjekovno naselje i upravo tu treba smjestiti Vrbaško trgovište koje je najkasnije do 1353. preraslo u varoš (za razlike i odnos između trgovišta i varoši vidjeti: Anđelić 1963, 180-186).

Za crkvu sv. Ilije *de campo* autoru se čini da bi ju trebalo vezati za srednjovjekovnu Poljanu (str. 56), a to uopće ne dolazi u obzir, jer riječ je o posjedu duboko u Dubičkoj županiji, što uostalom i sam autor prethodno navodi (str. 34-35). Kao i prethodne dvije i tu crkvu također treba tražiti u okolici grada Vrbasa i to - kako sam dokument kaže - u polju. I zaista, oko 9 km istočno od njega, usred Lijeve polja, na nalazištu Manastirište u Gornjim Kijevcima otkriveni su ostatci srednjovjekovne crkve i samostana, groblje s nadgrobnim pločama i arhitektonski kameni blok s urezanim osobnim imenom na glagoljici, datiranoj u 12. st. (Vego 1970, 94-95; Fučić 1982, 212). Izdvojenost crkve i samostana iz kompleksa grada Vrbasa, njihova rana datacija i župni status govore nam kako su bili izgrađeni prije tog grada i da su pripadali nekoj monaškoj zajednici.

Autor na više mjesta piše o srednjovjekovnom posjedu i utvrđenom gradu Livaču u Vrbaškoj županiji, ali ga nigdje precizno ne smješta. U jednoj ispravi Požeškog kaptola iz 1449. jasno se kaže da posjed Livač s istoimenim utvrđenim gradom pripada Vrbaškoj županiji. Prema Sanutovom itineraru, koji donosi udaljenosti između gradova Jajačke Banovine, Livač je bio udaljen 5 milja od Banje Luke. Kombinacija ta dva podatka nas upućuje da Livač treba tražiti u blizini granice između Zemljaničke i Vrbaške županije, ali naravno u okvirima druge. Broj od 5 milja previše je mali već za udaljenost od srednjovjekovne Banje Luke do granice Vrbaške županije, što upozorava na to da je broj milja bio znatno veći, odnosno da je pri pisanju ili prepisivanju ispao broj 1 koji je stajao ispred broja 5. Upravo oko 15 milja ili 20-ak km sjeverno od srednjovjekovne Banje Luke u današnjim se Bakincima nalazi kasnosrednjovjekovni utvrđeni grad koji je u arheološkoj literaturi određen kao rimska utvrda s netočnim imenom Gradina (Bojanovski 1974, 98).² Stanovnici Bakinaca to mjesto zovu Gradom Marije Terezije. Grad je smješten u brdovitom krajoliku Potkozarja, u gornjem toku rječice Osorne i to na visokom brdu, na njezinoj desnoj obali. Vidljivi su ostatci velikog i složenog kasnosrednjovjekovnog utvrđenog grada s barem dvije obrambene linije. Danas je cijelo brdo zaraslo u šumu i prekriveno debelim naslagama humusa (od lišća), a zidovi su jako urušeni tako da se izgled grada ne može sagledati bez arheoloških iskopavanja. Da upravo tu

ered on the right bank of the Vrbaška River, and it is here that one should place the Vrbaška market-town, which grew into a township not later than 1353 (for the differences and relationship between market-town and township, see: Anđelić 1963, 180-186).

The author believes that the Church of St. Elias *de campo* should be associated with medieval Poljana (p. 56), although this cannot be so, because this is a holding that was situated deep inside Dubica County, which the author himself notes earlier in the book (pp. 34-35). As in the preceding two cases, here the church should be sought in the surroundings of the Vrba castle in – as the document itself says – a field. And sure enough, approximately 9 km to the east, in the middle of the Lijeve Field, at the Manastirište site in Gornji Kijevci, the ruins of a medieval church and monastery, cemetery with tombstones and a sculpted stone block bearing engraved names in the Glagolitic script were found and dated in the 12th century (Vego 1970, 94-95; Fučić 1982, 212). The distance of the church and monastery from the Vrba castle complex, their early dating and parish status indicate that they were built prior to the castle and that they have belonged to a monastic community.

At several places, the author writes about the medieval estate and castle of Livač in Vrba County, but he does not provide a precise location. A document from the Požega canonical chapter from 1449 clearly states that the Livač estate with the eponymous castle belongs to Vrba County. According to Sanut's itineraries, which cite the distances between the castles of the Jajce Banovina, Livač was 5 miles from Banja Luka. The combination of these two facts indicates that Livač should be sought in the vicinity of the border between Zemljanik and Vrba County, albeit naturally within the bounds of the latter. The figure of 5 miles is too small for the distance between medieval Banja Luka and the border of Vrba County, which would indicate that the distance in miles is considerably greater, meaning that during recording or transcription, the digit 1 that was originally written before the 5 was left out. Approximately 15 miles or about 20 km from medieval Banja Luka, in today's Bakinci, there is a late medieval fortification which is specified in the archaeological literature as a Roman fortress with the inaccurate name Gradina (Bojanovski 1974, 98).² The residents of Bakinci call this place the Castle of Maria Theresa. The castle is located on the hilly terrain of the Kozara Mountain foothills, in the upper course of the Osorna River on a high hill on its right bank. The ruins of a large and complex late medieval fortification with at least two defensive lines are still visible. Today the entire hill is overgrown with a forest and covered with thick layers of humus (of leaves), and the walls are severely collapsed, so that the appearance of the castle remains unclear without archaeological excavations. This is where the castle of Livač should be placed, based not only on archaeological and topo-

2 Ivo Bojanovski vjerojatno nije osobno obišao nalazište već je podatke dobio od nekoga. U suprotnom bi, s obzirom na svoje veliko iskustvo, na licu mjesta vidio da je riječ o kasnosrednjovjekovnom utvrđenom gradu. Naravno, nije isključeno postojanje rimske utvrde na tom mjestu, ali to se može dokazati samo arheološkim iskopavanjem.

2 Ivo Bojanovski, probably hadn't visited the site himself, but acquired information from someone else. On contrary, having in mind his vast experience, he would have seen at the very location that it is about late medieval castle. As a matter of course the existence of Roman fortification is not excluded, but it can be proved only by archaeological excavation.

treba smjestiti grad Livač, osim arheoloških i topografskih dokaza, svjedoči nam i ime potoka Ljevčanice (Livčanica na ikavskom dijalektu) koji izvire u blizini. (Prostrano Lijeve polje dobilo je današnje ime po osmanskoj nahiji Livač!). Oko 400 m istočno od grada, na jednom sedlu između dva brda smještena je mala zemljana utvrda koju stanovnici Bakinaca zovu Karaula. Utvrda ima unutrašnjost u obliku eliptičnog uzvišenja, zaštićenog jarkom i zemljanim bedemom. Svojom je arhitekturom identična kasnosrednjovjekovnim zemljanim utverdama u Lijeve polju, o kojima će još biti riječi. Ta je utvrda štitila prilaz gradu Livaču.

U Bakincima se, u blizini grada Livača, i danas vide ostatci srednjovjekovne crkve. Iz pisanih se izvora zna da se u podgrađu Livača krajem 15. i početkom 16. st. nalazio franjevački samostan, ali nije zabilježeno kome je crkva posvećena (Bilogrić 1998, 270-271). Isto tako, u popisu župnih crkava Vrbaškog distrikta iz 1334. ne spominje se Livač, ali se navodi Gradec (*Gradech*) sa župnom crkvom sv. Jurja. Ime tog mjesta upućuje na grad, odnosno na neagrarno naselje. Kasnije se Gradec više nikada ne spominje, a Livač mnogo puta, što nas upućuje da je riječ o jednom te istom gradu. U popisu župnika Zagrebačke biskupije iz 1501. Livač se ne spominje, ali to ništa ne smeta našoj postavci, budući da su franjevci u međuvremenu preuzeli staru župnu crkvu od dijecezanskog svećenstva.

Autor vjeruje da su se u Vrbaškoj županiji, osim Vrbasa i Livača (uz Gradec i tobožnju Vrbasku), nalazile još tri utvrde koje naziva gradovima: Osik, Gočelovac i Dolac. Toliki broj utvrđenih gradova u nevelikoj Vrbaškoj županiji već je upitan sam po sebi, pa se nameće pitanje kakvog su karaktera zaista bila ta mjesta. Sva tri mjesta se spominju kao posjedi, ali i kasteli. U nekoliko dokumenata iz 15. i početka 16. st. koji se odnose na Vrbašku županiju, Slavoniju i Jajačku Banovinu uz kastrume se spominju kasteli, što svjedoči da je riječ o dvije različite kategorije (prijepisi dokumenata u autorovim bilješkama 311, 332, 387 i 421). O kakvim je razlikama riječ? Usporedbom mnogobrojnih srednjovjekovnih pisanih izvora i terenskih podataka jasno je da se pod kastrumima podrazumijevaju kamenim bedemima utvrđeni visinski gradovi. Kasteli, koji se znatno rjeđe spominju od kastruma, očito su se morali razlikovati veličinom ili smještajem.

U Lijeve polju dosada je otkriveno 15-ak zemljanih utvrda, smještenih u nizini ili na blagim uzvišenjima na koje se autor posebno ne osvrće, jer se priklanja mišljenju da pripadaju ranom srednjem vijeku (str. 13). Međutim, novija istraživanja tih utvrda i proučavanje njihovog keramičkog materijala pokazali su da su ona, zapravo, nastala u kasnom srednjem vijeku (Simonović 1996, 200-208). Zajedničko obilježje većine tih utvrda je relativno mala okrugla (a sasvim iznimno pravokutna) unutrašnjost koju prstenasto okružuje jedan ili dva zemljana bedema s jarcima. Osim tih zemljanih utvrda, u Mašićima je na rubu Lijeve polja otkrivena i jedna kasnosrednjovjekovna utvrda, zaštićena kamenim bedemima. Dakle, kasnosrednjovjekovni kasteli

graphic evidence, but also on the name of the creek that has its source nearby: Ljevčanica (Livčanica in the Ikavian dialect). (The spacious Lijeve Field acquired its name from the Ottoman Nahiye Livač!). Approximately 400 m east of the castle, in a pass between two hills, there is a small earthen fortress that the residents of Bakinci call Karaula. The interior of the fortress takes the form of an elliptical elevation, protected by a moat and an earthen wall. The architecture is identical to the late medieval earthen fortification in the Lijeve Field, of which more will be said. This fortress protected the communication that led to the Livač castle.

In Bakinci, near the Livač castle, the ruins of a medieval church can still be seen. Written sources note that there was a Franciscan monastery in the settlement below Livač in the 15th and 16th centuries, but the church's patron saint was not recorded (Bilogrić 1998, 270-271). By the same token, the census of parish churches of the Vrba District of 1334 makes no mention of Livač, but it does contain a reference to Gradec (*Gradech*) with the parish church of St. George. The place-name testifies to a castle, or a non-agrarian settlement. Later Gradec has never been mentioned, but Livač has been mentioned many times, which indicates that it is one and the same castle. In the census of parishes of the Zagreb Diocese from 1501, Livač is not mentioned, but this does not overturn our theory, since the Franciscans in the meantime assumed the old parish church from the diocesan clergy.

The author believes that in Vrba County, besides Vrba and Livač (together with Gradec and the supposed Vrbaska), there were three more fortifications that he describes as castles: Osik, Gočelovac and Dolac. This number of castles in the none-too-large Vrba County is dubious in and of itself, so the question arises as to the character of these sites. All three are mentioned as estates, but also as strongholds (*castella*). In several documents from the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century that deal with Vrba County, Slavonia and the Jajce Banovina, mention is made of a type of stronghold called *castella* in addition to *castra*, which shows that these are two different categories (transcripts of the documents are contained in the author's end-notes 311, 332, 387 and 421). What are these differences? By comparing numerous medieval written sources and field data, it is clear that a *castrum* implies a high fortified town (castles) defended by stone walls. *Castella* mentioned less frequently than *castra*, obviously had to differ in terms of size or location.

So far about 15 earthen fortifications have been discovered in the Lijeve Field, situated on the plain or on slightly elevated locations to which the author does not dedicate particular attention, as it is his opinion that they date back to the early Middle Ages (p. 13). However, more recent research into these fortifications and examination of the pottery found in them has shown that they actually emerged in the late Middle Ages (Simonović 1996, 200-208). A common element of most of these fortifications is the relatively small, round (and only exceptionally rectangular) interior that is encircled by one or two earthen walls with moats. Besides these earthen fortifications, a late medieval fortification, protected by stone walls, was discovered in Mašići on the edge of the Lijeve Field. Thus, the late medieval strongholds in Vrba County could only refer to lowland fortifications, regardless of whether they

u Vrbaškoj županiji mogu se odnositi samo na nizinske utvrde, bez obzira jesu li bile zaštićene zemljanim ili kamenim bedemima. Te su utvrde bile sjedišta gospodara posjeda, ali i pribježišta za stanovništvo u opasnosti.

Iako ni jedno današnje selo svojim imenom ne čuva uspomenu na njih, ima naznaka gdje su se nalazili kasteli Osik (*Ozek* ili *Ezeek*) i Gočelovac (*Gochelowcz*). Oba su se nalazila na posjedu Osiku koji je u drugoj polovici 15. st. u rukama plemićke obitelji Cerničkih iz Požeške županije. Zabilježeno je da je ta obitelj na tom posjedu uz stari izgradila istoimeni novi kastel koji se nazivao i Gočelovac, a onda se i sam posjed Osik nazivao Gočelovcem (Bilogrić 1998, 185-186). Taj se kastel u pisanim izvorima često spominje, za razliku od drugih u Vrbaškoj županiji, što govori da je bio i značajniji od njih. Između ostalog, zabilježeno je da je 1479. imao dvojicu kaštelana i da je 1491. osobno ugarsko-hrvatski kralj Vladislav II. naredio da se ispita slučaj u vezi tog kastela, jer se oko njegovog vlasništva već 12 godina vodio spor. Ti nam podatci govore da kastel Gočelovac (ili novi Osik) ne može biti neka mala zemljana nego jača kamena utvrda, a takva je poznata samo u Mašićima. Utvrda se nalazi na istočnom rubu izduženoga blagog uzvišenja zvanog Đurića brdo, na rubu Lijevča polja, na lijevoj obali potoka Borne, u blizini njegovog ušća u rječicu Osornu. Kameni bedemi bili su dobro vidljivi prije 20-ak godina, ali su danas najvećim dijelom uništeni vađenjem kamena za gradnju okolnih kuća i obradom zemlje. Na površini se mogu naći ulomci kasnosrednjovjekovnog keramičkog posuđa. Smještaj Gočelovca ili novog Osika u utvrdu na Đurića brdu potvrđuje i činjenica da se oko 1,5 km sjeverno od nje, u samom Lijevču polju, u blizini sela Berek nalazi zemljana utvrda (Simonović 1996, 196) koja može biti samo stari kastel Osik. Takav smještaj potvrđivao bi i podatak da je herceg Stjepan 1353. posjed Osik pridružio gradu Vrbasu. Utvrde u Mašićima i Bereku su svega 19 km daleko od njega, što upućuje da je srednjovjekovni posjed kojem su oni bili sjedište mogao graničiti s područjem koje je pripadalo gradu Vrbasu. Iznesene zaključke o Osiku ili Gočelovcu potvrđuju i podatci iz Popisa Bosanskog sandžaka iz 1604. u kojem se u nahiji Livač navodi posjed koji je upisan kao zemljište ruševne tvrđave Osik, a za selo Gočelovac se navodi da mu je drugo ime Trošelj. Današnje selo Trošelj nalazi se u blizini Mašića i Bereka, što upućuje da je zaista riječ o širem području istog srednjovjekovnog posjeda.

Situacija je još povoljnija za smještaj posjeda Kosirjevca (*Kozyryewach*). Zabilježeno je da je 1479. Stjepan Pesth, provizor grada Jajca, s kmetovima s posjeda Livač, Kosirjevac i Hizdarić porobio posjed i kastel Gočelovac. Na temelju tog podatka autor zaključuje da su se posjed Kosirjevac i Hizdarić nalazili blizu grada Livača, ali o njihovom smještaju ne piše ništa. Očito mu nije poznato da se i danas jedno selo u Lijevču polju, na lijevoj strani Vrbasa, zove Kosjerovo. (Taj dio Lijevča polja je donedavno bio naseljen i muslimanskim, barem djelomično

were protected by earth or stone ramparts. These fortifications were the seats of farm estates, and also served as shelters for the population in times of danger.

Although there are no present-day villages with names that would recall them, there are indications of where the strongholds called Osik (*Ozek* or *Ezeek*) and Gočelovac (*Gochelowcz*) were located. Both were on the Osik estate, which was held by the Cernički noble family from Požega County during the second half of the 15th century. It was recorded that in addition to the old stronghold, this family commissioned the construction of a new one with the same name, but which was also called Gočelovac, and then the entire Osik estate was called Gočelovac (Bilogrić 1998, 185-186). This stronghold is frequently mentioned in written sources, as opposed to others in Vrbas County, which means that it was more important. Among other things, it was recorded that in 1479 it had two castellans and that in 1491 Hungarian-Croatian King Ladislav II personally ordered the investigation of a case involving this stronghold, because title to it had been disputed for the 12 preceding years. These data indicate that Gočelovac (or new Osik) stronghold could not have been some small earthen fortress, but rather a reinforced stone structure, and this type of fortification is only known to exist at Mašići. The fortress is located on the eastern edge of an elongated, gentle slope called Đurić Hill, at the edge of the Lijevče Field, on the left bank of Borna Creek near its mouth on the Osorna River. The stone walls were clearly visible approximately 20 years ago, but today they have been largely destroyed by extraction of the stone for construction of local houses and by land cultivation. Fragments of late medieval pottery can be found on the surface. Placement of Gočelovac or new Osik at the fortification on Đurić Hill is also confirmed by the fact that approximately 1.5 km north of it, in the Lijevče Field, there is an earthen fortification near the village of Berek (Simonović 1996, 196) which can only be the old stronghold of Osik. This location can also be confirmed by the fact that Duke Stjepan joined the Osik estate to the Vrbas castle in 1353. The fortifications in Mašići and Berek are only 19 km from it each, which may mean that the medieval estate in which they held the central position could have bordered with the territory that belonged to the Vrbas castle. These conclusions on Osik or Gočelovac are additionally proven by the date from the Census of the Bosnian Sanjak of 1604, in which an estate described as the site of the ruins of Osik fortress is cited in the Livač Nahiye, while the village of Gočelovac is cited as having another name, Trošelj. Today's village of Trošelj is located near Mašići and Berek, demonstrating that this is truly the broader territory of the same medieval estate.

The situation is even more favourable for the location of the Kosirjevac (*Kozyryewach*) estate. It was recorded that in 1479 Stjepan Pesth, the superintendent of the Jajce castle, together with the serfs from the estates of Livač, Kosirjevac and Hizdarić, seized the estate and stronghold of Gočelovac. Based on this data, the author concludes that the estates of Kosirjevac and Hizdarić were close to the Livač castle, but he says nothing of their location. Obviously he is not aware that even today there is a village in the Lijevče Field, on the left bank of the Vrbas, called Kosjerovo. (This part of the Lijevče Field was until recently inhabited by Muslims,

autohtonim stanovništvom, tako da se srednjovjekovno ime očuvalo usprkos tome što Kosjerovo danas naseljava srpsko pravoslavno stanovništvo). Osim sličnosti imena, takav smještaj potvrđuje i blizina Bakinaca u kojima se nalazio utvrđeni grad Livač. U okolici Kosjerova, kod sela Vakufa, nalazi se i nizinska utvrda pravokutnog oblika zaštićena zemljanim bedemom. U unutrašnjosti utvrde ima građevinskog kamena koji upućuje na kamenu arhitekturu (Simonović 1996, 199, 208). Ta je utvrda nesumnjivo bila sjedište srednjovjekovnog posjeda Kosirjevca, odnosno kastel vjerojatno istog imena.

Posjed Rastik spominje se u više pisanih izvora (*Rastigh*, *Rasthych*, *Raschich* i sl.). U popisu župnih crkava Vrbaškog distrikta iz 1334. navodi se da je u tom mjestu postojala crkva, ali nije zabilježeno kome je bila posvećena. Iz jedne povelje iz 1351. doznajemo da je tu bila drvena kapela Blažene Djevice Marije. Ni jedno srednjovjekovno mjesto sa župnom crkvom dosada nije bilo smješteno u sjeveroistočni dio Vrbaške županije, a nemoguće je da to veliko područje nije bilo pokriveno ni jednom crkvenom župom. Upravo zbog toga sam sklon u tom dijelu tražiti Rastik i to na području između današnjih sela Kočićeva i Laminaca. U zaselku Sredanima u Laminima postoji toponim Rastik, a tu se nalazi i zemljana utvrda (Simonović 1996, 197), tako da nema sumnje kako je upravo ona bila sjedište istoimenog posjeda. Kočićevo je u prošlosti bilo naseljeno muslimanskim stanovništvom (vjerojatno djelomično autohtonog porijekla) i zvalo se Junuzovci, ali je vremenom postalo većinski srpsko pravoslavno, da bi poslije nestanka i posljednjeg muslimana tijekom Drugog svjetskog rata bilo promijenjeno ime sela u Kočićevo i tako je izbrisana posljednja uspomena na muslimane. Ono što je za našu temu zanimljivo i važno jest to da selo ima tri zaselka koja se zovu Gornji, Srednji i Donji Rastovac. To jasno govori kako postoji još stariji toponimijski sloj i da je riječ o području srednjovjekovnog posjeda Rastika. Naseljenost tog mjesta u srednjem vijeku potvrđuje nam groblje bjelobrdske kulture koje je tu otkriveno (Korošec-Vračko 1943, 271-280). U susjednom selu sa znakovitim imenom Razboj Župski nalazi se kasnosrednjovjekovno groblje s kamenim nadgrobnim spomenicima.

U popisu župnih crkava Vrbaškog distrikta iz 1334. navodi se i crkva sv. Luke, ali ne i gdje se nalazila. Dakle, situacija je slična kao s crkvama sv. Ivana Krstitelja i sv. Ilije u polju, za koje spomenuti popis ne navodi naselja, jer su, kako smo vidjeli, pripadale monaškim zajednicama i nalazile se izvan njih. Sudeći po tome i crkva sv. Luke bi pripadala nekoj monaškoj zajednici, ali kojoj i gdje se nalazila to ne možemo reći sve dok na svjetlo dana ne iziđe neki konkretni pisani izvor kao u slučaju crkve sv. Ivana Krstitelja ili topografski podatci i građevinski ostatci kao u slučaju crkve sv. Ilije u polju.

Veliku pozornost u svojoj knjizi autor je obratio i srednjovjekovnoj Gradišci, a na jednom mjestu piše sljedeće:

“Podatak iz 1295. obično se uzima kao prvi spomen Gradiške, iako je sasvim jasno da tu nije riječ o gradskom

who were at least partially autochthonous inhabitants, so that the medieval name was preserved despite the fact that Kosjerovo is today inhabited by a Serbian Orthodox population). Besides the similarity in the names, this location is also confirmed by the proximity of Bakinci, in which the Livač castle was located. There is a lowland rectangular fortification protected by earthen walls near Kosjerovo at the village of Vakuf. The fortification's interior contains construction stone, which would indicate that the original structure was made in stone (Simonović 1996, 199, 208). This fortification was undoubtedly the seat of the medieval Kosirjevac estate, i.e. a stronghold that probably bore the same name.

The Rastik estate is mentioned in a number of written sources (*Rastigh*, *Rasthych*, *Raschich*, etc.). In the 1334 census of parish churches of the Vrba District, it states that there was a church here, but its patron saint is not cited. A charter from 1351 tells us that the wooden Chapel of the Blessed Virgin Mary stood here. Not one medieval place with a parish church has yet been recorded in the north-eastern part of Vrba County, although it is impossible that such a large territory was not encompassed by at least one parish. This is why I prefer to seek the location of Rastik in this area, in the territory between today's villages of Kočićevo and Laminici. The toponym Rastik exists in the hamlet of Sredane in Laminici, and there is an earthen fortification here (Simonović 1996, 197), so that there can be no doubt that it was the seat of an estate of the same name. In the past, Kočićevo had a Muslim population (probably partly of autochthonous origin) and was called Junuzovci, but with time the Serbian Orthodox population became the majority, so that after the disappearance of the last Muslim during World War II the village's name was changed to Kočićevo, thereby erasing the final trace of the Muslim presence. The fact that the village has three hamlets called Gornji, Srednji and Donji Rastovac is interesting and important to the topic in question here. This fact clearly indicates the existence of an older toponymy layer and points to the fact that this was the territory of the medieval estate of Rastik. The habitation of this place in the Middle Ages is confirmed by the Bijelo-Brdo-culture cemetery which was discovered here (Korošec-Vračko 1943, 271-280). There is also a late medieval cemetery with stone grave markers in the neighbouring village bearing the significant name Razboj Župski.

The 1334 census of parishes in the Vrba District also mentions the Church of St. Luke, but not its location. Thus, the situation was similar to that of the Churches of St. John the Baptist and St. Elias in the Field, for which this census does not cite settlements they belonged to because, as we have seen, they belonged to monastic communities and were thus situated outside settlements. Judging by this fact, the Church of St. Luke would have belonged to some monastic community, but to which one and where cannot be determined until a specific written source with this information is found (as in the case of the Church of St. John the Baptist), or topographic data (as in the case of St. Elias in the Field).

The author dedicated considerable attention in his book to the medieval Gradiška, and at one place he wrote the following:

“The data from 1295 is normally taken as the first mention of Gradiška, although it is entirely clear that this does

naselju nego o mjestu prijelaza preko Save (*portus supra Sawam, vadum Gradischi*) koje je dobilo naziv po obližnjem slobodnom kraljevskom gradu na lijevoj obali spomenute rijeke. Posjed Gradiška spominje se na lijevoj strani Save 1330. i pripadao je magistru Nikoli Giléthffju iz Požege. Na traženje vlasnika utvrđene su mu međe, pa se na temelju njihova opisa može ustvrditi da se spomenuti posjed nalazio na lijevoj strani Save, u Požeškoj županiji, između utvrde Kutjevo (*castrum Gothow*) na sjeveru i slobodnog kraljevskog grada Gradiške, na jugu.

Spominjanje slobodnog kraljevskog grada Gradiške (*prope liberam villam de Gradisca*) u ispravi kralja Karla I. Roberta od 29. svibnja 1330. te u onoj Požeškoga kaptola od 29. ožujka iste godine, nepobitan su dokaz da srednjovjekovni grad Gradišku treba tražiti na lijevoj strani Save, a događaje poznate iz izvorne građe ne bi se smjelo interpretirati kao da se odnose na Bosansku Gradišku, koja kao naselje pod tim imenom tada nije postojala” (str. 52-53).

Uopće nije sporno da se srednjovjekovna Gradiška nalazila na lijevoj obali Save, na mjestu današnje Stare Gradiške, ali su sporni svi autorovi zaključci o njezinom karakteru i statusu. Na osnovi isprave ugarsko-hrvatskog kralja Karla I. Roberta ne može se zaključivati da je Gradiška bila slobodni kraljevski grad, jer se u ispravi izričito kaže da je to slobodno naselje (*libera villa*). Takvo što se ne može zaključiti ni iz dokumenata iz posljednje četvrtine 15. st., koje autor donosi u latinskom prijepisu, jer se u njima redovito spominje *castellum Gradicza* ili *Gradiska* (str. 105-107, bilj. 321, 325, 326, 328 i 330). Da se kategorija kastel i u tom slučaju može odnositi samo na ravničarsku utvrdu ili utvrđeno ravničarsko naselje, dovoljno je pogledati položaj današnje Stare Gradiške koja leži u ravnici, gdje kilometrima u polukrugu nema ni najblažeg uzvišenja. Budući da u hrvatskom jeziku riječ gradište označava ograđeni prostor, odnosno utvrdu i to prvenstveno ravničarsku, možemo pretpostaviti da takvoj utvrdi srednjovjekovna Gradiška i duguje svoj nastanak i svoje ime.

Zaključci izneseni u ovoj recenziji pokazuju do kojih se sve rezultata može doći kombiniranim proučavanjem pisanih izvora, arheološke topografije i toponimije. Takav pristup, pa s njim i rezultati, izostali su u Čoškovićevoj knjizi. Njegovi zaključci o mjestima u Vrbaškoj županiji i Vrbaškom crkvenom distriktu uglavnom su identični sa zaključcima koje je N. Bilogrivić iznio u svojoj knjizi napisanoj do davne 1925., a spletom okolnosti objavljenoj tek nedavno. P. Čošković je bio zakašnjeli recenzent Bilogrivićeve knjige, ali očito i veliki korisnik u vrijeme dok je još bila u rukopisu.

not refer to an urban settlement but rather a crossing over the Sava River (*portus supra Sawam, vadum Gradischi*) which acquired its name from the free royal borough on the left bank of this river. The Gradiška estate is mentioned on the left bank of the Sava in 1330, and it belonged to the magistrate Nikola Giléthffy from Požega. Its boundaries were established at the owner's request, so that on the basis of their description it can be stated that this estate was on the left bank of the Sava, in Požega County, between the Kutjevo fortification (*castrum Gothow*) in the north and the free royal borough of Gradiška in the south.

The citation of the free royal borough of Gradiška (*prope liberam villam de Gradisca*) in a document of King Charles Robert I from 29 May 1330 and in the document of the Požega canonical chapter of 29 March of the same year, are irrefutable evidence that the medieval castle of Gradiška should be sought on the left bank of the Sava River, while events known from original sources should not be interpreted as referring to Bosanska Gradiška, which did not exist as a settlement with that name at the time” (pp. 52-53).

There is no disputing that medieval Gradiška was on the left bank of the Sava River, at the site of today's Stara Gradiška, but the author's conclusions about its character and status are disputable. The document of Hungarian-Croatian King Charles Robert I cannot be the basis for the conclusion that Gradiška was a free royal borough, because the document explicitly states that it is a free settlement (*libera villa*). Something like this cannot even be concluded from documents from the end of the 15th century, which the author presents in their Latin transcripts, because the *castellum Gradicza* or *Gradiska* is regularly mentioned in them (pp. 105-107, note 321, 325, 326, 328 and 330). If the category *castellum* in this case can only refer to a flatland fortification or a fortified settlement on a plain, it is sufficient to observe the position of today's Stara Gradiška, which lies on a plain, with not even the slightest elevation in a semi-circular radius of several kilometres. Since in the Croatian language the word *gradište* designates an enclosed space, or a fortification normally on a plain, we can assume that medieval Gradiška owes its origin and name to such a fortification.

The conclusions presented in this review show the kind of results that can be achieved by means of combined examination of written sources, archaeological topography and toponymy. Such an approach, and the ensuing results, are lacking in Čošković's book. His conclusions on locations in Vrba County and the Vrba Ecclesiastical District are generally identical to those which N. Bilogrivić presented in his book written in 1925, although only recently published due to a specific set of circumstances. P. Čošković was a belated reviewer of Bilogrivić's book, but he obviously also made great use of it while it was still in manuscript form.



Karta 1 Položaj pojedinih srednjovjekovnih mjesta u Vrbaškoj, Glazhkoj i Zemljaničkoj županiji

Map 1 Position of certain medieval sites in Vrbaška, Glazh and Zemljaničkoj County

LITERATURA/BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ančić M., 1999, *Jajce. Portret srednjovjekovnoga grada*, Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika, Scintillae Stephano Gunjaca dicatae 2, Split
- Ančić M., 2001, *Na rubu zapada. Tri stoljeća srednjovjekovne Bosne*, Biblioteka Hrvatska povjesnica, Zagreb
- Andelić P., 1963, Trgovište, varoš i grad u srednjovjekovnoj Bosni, GZMS Arh XVIII, Sarajevo, 179-194.
- Basler Đ., 1952, Gornji tok Ukrine (Kulaši - Kremna), GZMS VII, Sarajevo, 420-424.
- Bilogrić N., 1935, Srednjovjekovni grad Vrbaška i kraj pod njim, Napredak, Hrvatski narodni kalendar X, Sarajevo, 179-194.
- Bilogrić N., 1998, *Katolička crkva na području današnje Banjalučke biskupije do invazije Turaka*, Studia Vrhbosnensia 10, Sarajevo
- Blagojević M., 1995, Severna granica bosanske države u XIV veku, u: *Bosna i Hercegovina od srednjeg veka do novijeg vremena*, Beograd, 59-76 (ćir.).
- Bojanovski I., 1974, *Dolabelin sistem cesta u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji*, Djela ANUBiH XLVII, CBI 2, Sarajevo
- Fučić B., 1982, *Glagoljski natpisi*, Djela JAZU 57, Zagreb
- Karanović M., 1936, Granice srednjovjekovne bosanske župe Zemljanik, GZMS XLVIII, Sarajevo, 27-36 (ćir.).
- Klaić V., 1882, *Poviest Bosne do propasti kraljevstva*, Zagreb
- Korošec-Vračko P., 1943, Rano srednjovjekovni nalaz u Junuzovcima, GZMS LIV (1942), Sarajevo, 271-280.
- Lovrić A., 1937, Glagoljski natpis na kamenu iz okolice banjalučke, GZMS XLIX, Sarajevo, 31-35.
- Mazalić Đ., 1950, Gdje je ležao grad Glazh? GZMS IV-V, Sarajevo, 224-231.
- Miletić N., 1971, Do završnih stoljeća srednjeg vijeka, u: *Laktaši*, Laktaši, 15-28.
- Miletić N., 1988, Gradina, Šušnjari, Laktaši, ArhLekBiH, 2, Sarajevo, 50-51.
- Pašalić E., 1960, *Antička naselja i komunikacije u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Posebno izdanje Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu, Sarajevo
- Rački F., 1881, Hrvatska prije XII vieka glede na zemljišni opseg i narod, Rad JAZU 56, Zagreb
- Ružičić G., 1972, Prilozi istorijskoj geografiji srednjovjekovne Bosne, IstGlas 2, Beograd, 101-107 (ćir.).
- Simonović G., 1996, Srednjovjekovna zemljana utvrđenja u okolini Bosanske Gradiške, Glasnik SAD 13, Beograd, 191-210 (ćir.).
- Skarić V., 1937, Župa Zemljanik i stara nahija Zmijanje, GZMS XLIX, Sarajevo, 37-53 (ćir.).
- Šišić F., 1902, *Vojvoda Hrvoje Vukčić Hrvatinić i njegovo doba*, Zagreb
- Vego M., 1970, *Zbornik srednjovjekovnih natpisa Bosne i Hercegovine IV*, Sarajevo
- Žeravica Z., Žeravica L., 1984, Arheološka istraživanja na Kastelu u Banjaluci, NS XVI-XVII, Sarajevo, 19-46.