

Ljubica Perinić

Je li doista riječ o Besu Silvanu?

Ljubica Perinić
Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti
Odjel za arheologiju
Ante Kovačića 5
HR, 10000 Zagreb
ljperinic@hazu.hr

UDK: 904:(251+255.2)](497.581.2Oklaj)
2-244.2

Izvorni znanstveni članak
Primitljeno: 30. 12. 2014.
Prihvaćeno: 6. 2. 2015.

Godine 1908. u Oklaju kod Promine u Dalmatinskoj zagori pronađena je malena posuda u obliku egipatskog boga patuljka Besa. Posudu su potom obrađivali, spominjali i objavili brojni autori. Jednom kad su okolnosti takvog nalaza ‘zaboravljene’, egipatsko božanstvo Bes povezano je sa Silvanom. Ta povezanost temeljena je na mjestu nalaza posude te općih sličnosti koje Silvan i Bes dijele. U ovom radu raspravljat će o pravom identitetu božanstva, a naglasak je na nekritičkom perpetuiranju citata.

Ključne riječi: Dalmacija, Oklaj, Promina, Bes, Silen, Silvan

Was it Bes-Silvanus?

Ljubica Perinić
Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts
Department of Archaeology
Ante Kovačića 5
CROATIA, 10000 Zagreb
ljperinic@hazu.hr

UDC: 904:(251+255.2)](497.581.2Oklaj)
2-244.2

Original scientific paper
Received: 30. 12. 2014.
Accepted: 6. 2. 2015.

In the year 1908 a small vessel in the shape of the Egyptian dwarf god Bes was found in the village of Oklaj (Promina – Roman Promona) in the area of Dalmatinska Zagora, and was subsequently published by several authors. Once the find circumstances were ‘forgotten’, the Egyptian dwarf god was linked to Silvanus. That connection was made possible on the basis of the area where it was found and also on the basis of some general similarities Bes and Silvanus shared. Since then the vessel has been described as one in the shape of Bes-Silvanus. In this paper the issue of the proper identity of the divinity in question is discussed, and the attention is brought to a risk of uncritical/unverified perpetuating of citations.

Key words: Dalmatia, Oklaj, Promina, Bes, Silenus, Silvanus



Sl. 1. Preuzeto iz R. Košćević, *Nekoliko rjeđih neobjavljenih nalaza iz Siscije, Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju 19, Zagreb 2002, 101-112, str. 110, T. 3.*

Fig. 1. From R. Košćević, "Nekoliko rjeđih neobjavljenih nalaza iz Siscije", *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju 19, Zagreb, 2002, 101-112, p. 110, Pl. 3.*

Nedavno sam u literaturi naišla na jednu figuricu Silvana-Besa-Silena, kako ju je niže navedena autorica opisala. S obzirom da se za temu Silvana iznimno zanimam, željela sam dalje istražiti figuricu. Osobitu pozornost privukao mi je sljedeći odlomak:

"Brončana itifalička figurica Silvana/Besa/Silena, iz zbirke Marka Golana (Sl. VIII) izražava izvornu verziju (Košćević, 2002, Pl. 1. 1), koja je zasnovana na poznatom ikonografskom modelu kombinacije grotesknog egipatskog patuljka Besa u rimskoj interpretaciji i italiskog Silvana. Njihov sinkretizam zasni-va se na osnovnim karakteristikama koje dijele: Bes je bio neizostavni sudionik u vjenčanim svečanostima

Recently I encountered a curious bronze figurine of Silvanus-Bes-Silenus, as the author defined it, in the literature. Given the fact that I am highly interested in Silvanus, I wanted to further investigate the abovementioned figurine.

One paragraph in particular drew my attention: "The bronze ithyphallic figurine of Silvanus/Bes/Silenus, from the Collection of Marko Golan (Fig. VIII) exhibits original version (Košćević, 2002, Pl. 1. 1), which is based on the known iconographic model of a combination of the grotesque dwarf Egyptian Bes in a Roman interpretation and the Italic Silvanus. Their syncretism is based on their common characteristics: Bes as an indispensable participant in wedding ceremonies and those devoted to Isis, and Silvanus as a participant in the Dionysian procession. Silenus is by his origin and nature connected to Dionysus."¹

Since Silvanus never participated in Dionysian processions, it occurred to me that the author made a simple mistake (*lapsus calami* or, rather, *digiti*), and put down the word *Silvanus* instead of *Silenus*. Furthermore, the image of the god represented by the figurine (a naked, crouching god with extremely erect phallus) was never typical of the Italic Silvanus, nor, for that matter, the Dalmatian or the Pannonian Silvanus. Then I noticed that the figurine was interpreted as Silvanus-Bes-Silenus on the basis of P. Selem's analysis of one vessel from Oklaj.² It seemed to me that the appearance of Silvanus in the interpretation of the vessel from Oklaj was the result of a misconstruction, and that it would be worthwhile to investigate this issue further.

The figurine of Bes-Silenus in question was made on the analogy of a specific bronze vessel from Oklaj, shaped like the Egyptian dwarf god Bes. It was found more than a 100 years ago, in the spring of 1908 when three graves were found on the site of Golobrig in the village of Oklaj (Promina, Roman *Promona*). They were built from plain stone slabs and were, unfortunately, previously robbed. The following finds were recovered from those graves: a glass jar/jug (damaged) with an inscription (*VICTORIAE AUGUSTORUM FELICITER*), a toilet vessel (*balsamarium*), three silver spoons with traces of gilding, a heavily damaged bronze vessel, two bronze strigils and, finally, a vessel in the shape of the Egyptian god Bes.³ An inscription (CIL III 9833) has been found in the close vicinity of those graves, and it mentions *Lucius Saturninus Volusius legatus Augustus pro praetore*. The

1 Košćević 2013, pp. 14-15; Košćević 2002, pp. 101-102, 105, 108: pl. 1.1.; 110: pl. 3.

2 Selem 1997, pp. 92-93.

3 Bulić 1909, pp. 45-48.

posvećenima Izidi, dok je Silvan bio sudionik u dionizijskoj povorci.¹

Budući da Silvan nikad nije bio sudionikom dionizijske povorke, pomislila sam da se tu potkrala jednostavna pogreška te da je umjesto Silena napisan Silvan. Nadalje, prikaz božanstva na figurici (golo božanstvo u čučnju s predimenzioniranim falusom) nikad nije bio tipičan za italjskog Silvana, pa ni za dalmatinskog ni panonskog Silvana. Sljedeće što sam primijetila jest da se kroz navedeni citat opisana figura identificirala kao Silvan-Bes-Silen na osnovi analogije s analizom koju je P. Selem iznio za posudu iz Oklaja.² Učinilo mi se da je pojava Silvana u interpretaciji posude iz Oklaja rezultat pogrešnog tumačenja te da bi vrijedilo dodatno istražiti nastalu situaciju.

Kao što sam rekla, figurica Besa Silena o kojoj je riječ (sl. 1.) interpretirana je na osnovi analogije s posudom u obliku Besa (Silena) iz Oklaja (sl. 2.). Posuda je pronađena prije više od stotinu godina, u proljeće 1908., kada su na lokalitetu Golobrig u Oklaju (Promina, rimska Promona) pronađena tri groba. Grobovi su bili izgrađeni od jednostavnih kamenih ploča te su, nažalost, prethodno bili opljačkani. Osim posude u obliku Besa u njima su pronađeni: staklena posuda s natpisom (*VICTORiae AUGUSTORum FELiciter*), toaletna posuda (*balsamarium*), tri srebrne žlice s tragovima pozlate, vrlo oštećena brončana posuda, dva brončana strugača (*strigila*).³ U neposrednoj blizini grobova pronađen je kamen međaš koji spominje Lucija Saturnina Volusija, propretorskog Augustovog legata (*Lucius Saturninus Volusius, legatus Augustus pro praetore*). Natpis je toliko oštećen da se ne može sa sigurnošću razaznati u kojem se kontekstu legat spominje.⁴ On se čita:

VOLUS / RNINO / PR .C . CAES / ERM
[L(ucio)] Volus[io] / [Satu]rnino [leg(ato)] /
[pr(o)] pr(aetore) C(ai) Caes(aris) / [Aug(usti) G]
erm[anici]

Natpis se vjerojatno nalazio na cipusu (*cippus*), niskom kamenom stupu koji je mogao biti cilindričnog ili, vjerojatnije, pravokutnog oblika. Cipuse su postavljali zemljomjernici (*agrimensores*) u svrhu obilježavanja podjele zemlje, no njihova najčešća upotreba bila je u svojstvu nadgrobnog spomenika.⁵ Natpis je,



Sl 2. Preuzeto iz P. Selem, *Izidin trag*, Tabla XXXII, 2.56.

Fig 2. From P. Selem, *Izidin trag*, Plate XXXII, 2.56.

inscription is heavily damaged, and the context in which *legatus* was referred to cannot be established.⁴ The inscription reads as follows:

VOLUS / RNINO / PR .C . CAES / ERM
[L(ucio)] Volus[io] / [Satu]rnino [leg(ato)] /
[pr(o)] pr(aetore) C(ai) Caes(aris) / [Aug(usti) G]
erm[anici]

The inscription was probably cut on a cippus, a low column of stone that could have been cylindrical in shape, but even more likely rectangular. Stone cippi were set up by the *agrimensores* to mark the divisions of lands but the most frequent use of the cippus, however, was as a sepulchral monument.⁵ The inscription, as well as the abovementioned grave finds, was dated to the 1st century AD.⁶ As for the differentiation of altars and cippi, N. Cambi recently pointed out that the cippus is characterized by its cylindrical or rectangular shape with a conical end.⁷

Although we would undoubtedly profit from a reassessment of the above numbered objects (today kept in the Archaeological museum in Split), it is not necessary to do that for the point I am trying to make, especially since one already exists.⁸ Furthermore, it might seem that my point would also be misconstrued if all objects found in the graves are not taken into

1 Košćević 2013, str. 14-15; Košćević 2002, str. 101-102, 105, 108; T. 1.1.; 110; T.3.

2 Selem 1997, str. 92-93.

3 Bulić 1909, str. 45-48.

4 CIL 03, 9833; Jagenteufel 1958, str. 17, Nr. 4, 7; Patsch 1897, str. 212 s. n. 76; Wilkes 1974, str. 263-264, Nr. 13; Mesihović 2014, str. 99; <http://edh-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/EDH/inschrift/053662>.

5 Suić 2003, str. 162-163.

4 CIL 03, 9833; Jagenteufel 1958, p. 17, Nr. 4, 7; Patsch 1897, p. 212 s. n. 76; Wilkes 1974, pp. 263-264, Nr. 13; Mesihović 2014, p. 99; <http://edh-www.adw.uni-heidelberg.de/EDH/inschrift/053662>.

5 Suić 2003, pp. 162-163.

6 Bulić 1909, pp. 45-48, P. III; *Antička bronza* 1969; p. 122; *Antički teatar* 1979, p. 90; Selem 1997, p. 93; for the spoons: Riha, *Stern* 1982, pp. 14-15, 24.

7 Paškvalin 2012, p. 13.

8 Bulić 1909, pp. 45-48.

jednako kao i spomenuti nalazi, datiran u 1. st. n. e.⁶ U pogledu razlikovanja cipusa i ara N. Cambi je nedavno istaknuo da je cipus cilindričnog ili pravokutnog oblika, ali je njegov završetak uvijek koničan.⁷

Iako nema sumnje da bismo svježom analizom predmeta pronađenih u grobovima (koji se danas čuvaju u Arheološkome muzeju u Splitu) profitirali, takva analiza, pored one prethodno učinjene,⁸ nije potrebna za svrhu koja se ovim tekstom želi postići. Neuzimanje u obzir ostalih predmeta nađenih u grobovima i izostanak njihove ponovne analize ili revalorizacije na prvi se pogled može činiti kao metodološki pogrešan put, te da će i ovaj zaključak biti pogrešan ili barem manjkav. Međutim, tome nije tako, s obzirom na to da ostali predmeti nisu povezani s pretpostavljenom pogrešnom atribucijom božanstva, niti su ostali predmeti u tom smislu povezani s posudom u obliku Besa. Konačno, analiza ostalih predmeta irelevantna je za ovaj rad jer ne utječe na njegovu svrhu i cilj koji se želi postići.

Prije svega, slijedi detaljnije objašnjenje toponima Promine. Promina, tj. *Promona* je planina sjeverno od Oklaja; danas taj naziv osim planine obilježava i općinu. U vrijeme rimskoga osvajanja Promona je vjerojatno pripadala Delmatima i imala je status paga (*pagus*).⁹ Stanovnici paga mogli su živjeti raštrkani u zaseocima (*vici*). Tvorili su npr. religijsku zajednicu za proslavu određenog festivala ili za održavanje lokalnog kulta, ili je zajednica stvorena u administrativne svrhe, kao što je popravak cesta ili raspodjela opskrbe vodom.¹⁰ Napomenula bih da se na brončanoj pločici spomenutoj u bilješci 9. regulira upravo korištenje vode. *Pagus* je administrativno bio dio municipija *Magnum* koji je, nažalost, neistražen. Uzimajući u obzir smještaj Promone, između rijeka Krke i Čikole, nije sasvim sigurno jesu li na tom prostoru živjeli Liburni ili Delmati. S. Čače ističe da je za vrijeme ekspanzije Delmata, 180.-160. pr. n. e., granica između dva etnička entiteta postala rijeka Krka, te da je ta granica ojačana za vrijeme rimskog osvajanja ovog područja. Nakon što je osvajanje završeno (barem njegov vojni dio) te nakon što se legija XI. smjestila u Burnum, granica između Delmata i Liburna više nije bila od tolikog značenja.¹¹ Dakle, Promona je utvrda, a spominje se u kontekstu građanskih ratova

consideration. However, it certainly is not the case, since those objects are not connected with the problem of a wrong attribution to a specific deity, as they are not in that sense connected to the discussed Bes jug. Therefore, their reassessment would be irrelevant for the purpose or the goal of this paper.

Before anything else, a detailed explanation of the toponym Promona is necessary. Promona, i.e. Promina is a mountain north of Oklaj and today, apart from the aforementioned mountain, it marks the municipality/county. At the time of the Roman conquest Promona was probably a fortification which belonged to the Delmatae with a status of *pagus*.⁹ The inhabitants of a county might live dispersed or in hamlets (*vici*). They formed a commune for such religious purposes as the celebration of the festivals and the maintenance of the local cult, and for such administrative purposes as the repairing of roads and the apportionment of the water supply.¹⁰ I will accentuate here that the brass plaque, already mentioned in the note 9, regulates the rights to the use of water. The *pagus* was administratively part of the *municipium Magnum* which is completely unexplored. Considering the location of Promona, between the rivers Krka and Čikola, there is uncertainty about the ethnicity of the population living there (Delmatae or Liburni). S. Čače points out that during the expansion of the Delmatae in the years 180 and 160 BC the border of two ethnic entities became the river Krka, and this border was further strengthened during the Roman conquest of this area. After the Roman conquest had been finished and the legion XIth garrisoned in Burnum, the border between Delmatae and Liburni was no longer of much importance.¹¹

Promona was a fortress and is mentioned in the context of the civil war between Pompey and Caesar, and, later, during Augustus' conquest of Illyricum. Given the fact that the Promona was stronghold which belonged to Delmatae, Ž. Miletić believes that after the Roman-Dalmatae wars, this fortification could have been bestowed on Liburni as a reward for their loyalty. Furthermore, he assumed that it probably retained its territorial integrity and autonomy, but that was briefly changed because of the settlement of Liburnian population.¹²

This vessel from Oklaj is 11 cm high, taking the shape of a deity, most likely the Egyptian dwarf god Bes (Bisu, Aha), who was a complex being, both a deity and a demonic fighter. He was a god of war,

6 Bulić 1909, str. 45-48, T. III; Antička bronza 1969, str. 122; Antički teatar 1979, str. 90; Selem 1997, str. 93; za žlice: Riha, Stern 1982, str. 14-15, 24.

7 Paškvalin 2012, str. 13.

8 Bulić 1909, str. 45-48.

9 Miletić 2008, str. 100: Promona se spominje kao *pagus* na oštećenoj brončanoj pločici, CIL III, 14969.

10 Abbot, Johnson 1926, str. 10-14.

11 Čače 1989, str. 78-79.

9 Miletić 2008, p. 100: Promona is mentioned as a *pagus* on one incomplete brass plaque CIL III, 14969.

10 Abbott, Johnson 1926, pp. 10-14.

11 Čače 1989, pp. 78-79.

12 Miletić 2008, p. 100.

između Pompeja i Cezara te kasnije za vrijeme Augustova osvajanja Ilirika. S obzirom na to da je Promona pripadala Delmatima, Ž. Miletić smatra da je nakon rimsko-delmatskih ratova mogla biti dodijeljena Liburnima kao nagrada za njihovu odanost. Nadalje, njegovo je mišljenje da je Promona vjerojatno zadržala svoj teritorijalni integritet kao i autonomiju, ali da se to nakratko izmijenilo zbog naseljavanja liburnske populacije.¹²

Dakle, na takvom zemljopisno raznolikom prostoru koji je početkom 1. st. n. e. pod izrazitom administrativnom i političkom kontrolom Rima, pronađena su ovdje spomenuta tri groba i međaš. Među nalazima iz grobova bila je i posuda u obliku egipatskog boga Besa (sl. 2.), na temelju koje je kasnije izvedena analogija za figuricu iz zbirke Mirka Golana u Sisku (sl. 1.).

Posuda iz Oklaja je visoka 11 cm i izrađena je u obliku egipatskog boga, patuljka Besa (Bisu, Aha), koji je bio i božanstvo i borac protiv demona. Bio je božanstvo rata, ali i pokrovitelj poroda. Povezan je sa seksualnošću, plodnošću, humorom, muzikom i plesom. Iako je u početku njegova uloga bila ona zaštitnika faraona, postao je vrlo omiljen među Egipćanima, iznad svega upravo kao zaštitnik žena i djece.¹³ Također je bio i pratitelj božice Hator, poznate kao "Velika s mnogo imena", koja je personifikacija principa radosti, ženstvene ljubavi i majčinstva. Bes nije imao hramova ni svećenika, a po svemu sudeći za dinastičkog razdoblja nije imao ni službenog kulta, već je štovao u kućnim svetištima. Usprkos tome bio je jedan od najomiljenijih bogova Egipta i često je prikazivan na kućanskim predmetima (pokućstvu, ogledalima, kozmetičkim posudama i aplikatorima, kao i na čarobnim štapićima i noževima). Posve u neskladu s egipatskim načinom prikazivanja božanstava, uvijek je prikazivan u cijeloj figuri *en face*.¹⁴

U svojstvu zaštitnika žena i poroda Bes je bio povezan s Hator, kao što je već rečeno, a to se vjerovanje zadržalo i u grčko-rimskim kućama za porode, gdje su pronađene posude u njegovu obliku kao i amuleti s njegovim likom.¹⁵

Božanstvo prikazano u obliku posude je zbita, mišićava figura patuljka, s kratkim i zdepastim nogama, istaknutom stražnjicom, lica iskrivljenog u zlokobni osmijeh, velikog nosa, otečenih usana, očiju širom otvorenih; uši su mu šiljate poput životinjskih, brkovi debeli, brada okrugla, a kosa u obliku lišća. Glava mu počiva izravno na ramenima koja su pokrivena

yet also a patron of childbirth and home. He was associated with sexuality, fertility, humour, music, and dancing. Although his initial role was of a protector of the pharaoh, he became very popular with everyday Egyptian people, above all as the protector of women and children.¹³ He also accompanies Hathor, a goddess who was known as "The great one with many names", who personified the principles of joy, feminine love, and motherhood. Bes had no temples or priests, and he does not seem to have received an official cult during the dynastic period, but he was probably worshipped in domestic shrines. Nevertheless, he was one of the most popular gods of ancient Egypt and was often depicted on household items such as furniture, mirrors, cosmetics containers and applicators, as well as magical wands and knives. Contrary to the Egyptian usual rule of representation, Bes was commonly shown frontally rather than in profile, since full-faced figures were marginal to the normal, ordered world.¹⁴

In his quality as a protector of women and childbirth he was connected with Hathor, and that belief lingered on in Graeco-Roman birth houses where vessels in the shape of this dwarf god and amulets were found.¹⁵

The deity represented on the discussed vessel is a paunchy, muscular figure of a dwarf, with short and stubby little legs, prominent backside, face twisted into a malicious smile, big nose, swollen lips, eyes wide open, animal-like pointed ears, thick moustache and rounded chin, and leafy hair. His head rests immediately on his shoulders, covered by an animal (panther) skin. Between the front legs lies his chest with a prominent belly bulge. He sits on his behind with bent legs, as an animal would, and his hands are resting on his curved knees. His entire figure stands on a round base. On the upper side of his dome-shaped head is an oval opening which is closed by a lid on his non-existent neck. At the top of the shoulders two rings are attached, through which two hoops of copper wire pass. Through those hoops passes the handle, which ends in the form of a duck's or other waterbird's beak. As already mentioned, this vessel was an item of toiletry.¹⁶

Cosmetic vessels featuring Bes can take the form of either a full figure or just the head of the deity. For example, containers in which the powder of antimony (used as a black make-up for the eyes) was kept were often made in the form of Bes. The use of Bes as an eastern deity in cosmetic containers is only expected,

12 Miletić 2008, str. 100.

13 LIMC 1986, str. 98.

14 Dasen 2013, str. 80-81.

15 Dasen 2013, str. 80.

13 LIMC 1986, p. 98.

14 Dasen 2013, pp. 80-81.

15 Dasen 2013, p. 80.

16 Bulić 1909, p. 47.

životinjskom kožom. Između nogu utisnuta su prsa i velik, izbočen trbuh. Sjedi na svijenim nogama, kao što to čini životinja, a dlanovi mu počivaju na zaobljenim koljenima. Čitava figura smještena je na okruglu bazu. S gornje strane glave koja je kupolasto oblikovana nalazi se ovalni otvor s poklopcem. Na ramenima su dva prstena kroz koje su provučena dva obruča, a kroz te obruče provučena je drška čiji su krajevi u obliku pačjeg kljuna, odnosno kljuna neke vodene ptice. Posuda je bila dio toaletnog pribora.¹⁶

Kozmetičke posude u obliku Besa mogu biti u obliku čitave figure ili samo njegove glave. Primjerice, posude za antimonov prah, koji se koristio kao sjenilo za oči, bile su u obliku Besa. Upotreba Besova lika na predmetima za čuvanje kozmetičkih pripravaka i mirisa je, s obzirom na njihovo u pravilu istočno porijeklo, očekivana.¹⁷ Ovakav koncept posuda u obliku Besa vjerojatno ukazuje na azijsko podrijetlo kao izvor inspiracije. Početkom Novog kraljevstva Besova ikonografija je sasvim izvjesno sirijskog podrijetla ili je barem inspirirana azijskim keramičkim posudama.¹⁸ Međutim, ne smijemo smetnuti s uma teoriju H. W. Von Bissinga u kojoj on tvrdi da su posude u obliku Besa mogle biti i isključivo egipatskog podrijetla, i to zbog toga što se u Novom kraljevstvu likovi demona s čarobnih štapića iz Srednjeg kraljevstva ponovno pojavljuju na kozmetičkim posudama, a među tim demonima je, dakako, i Bes.¹⁹ Grčko-rimsko razdoblje karakterizira polagano sjedinjavanje dvaju njegovih vidova božanstva, onog senzualnih zadovoljstava i onog podzemnog demona.²⁰ U Novom kraljevstvu pojavljuju se predivne posude za vino u obliku Besa, a s grčke strane već smo upoznati s neumjerenom ljubavi Satira i Silena prema vinu i pijankama. Izvan Egipta višestruki nalazi posuda u obliku Besa Silena potvrđuju postojanje tzv. miješane ikonografije.²¹

Kad je analizirao posudu iz Oklaja, F. Bulić je pisao F. W. von Bissingu, koji mu je odgovorio da postoje dva pravca prema kojima se može vući njihovo podrijetlo: jedan je egipatski bog Bes, a drugi je grčki, odnosno helenistički tip posude u obliku Silena. Prema Von Bissingu dva su se modela ujedinila u ranom rimskom carskom razdoblju. Ikonografski, Besova figura mogla je dobiti životinjske noge, koje je inače imao Silen.²² Od vremena Von Bissinga i tipologije

given that cosmetic substances and perfumes were supplied from the East.¹⁷ Also, it is necessary to bear in mind that the whole concept of Bes vessels possibly points to the Asian regions as a source of inspiration. Furthermore, at the beginning of the New Kingdom, the iconography of Bes is apparently of Syrian origin, or at least it was inspired by Asian pottery.¹⁸ However, we must not forget the theory of F. W. Von Bissing in which he states that Bes jugs/vessels could also be of purely Egyptian origin in the sense that the figures of demons from Middle Kingdom magical ivory wands reappear in the New Kingdom kohl-pots, and among those demons, of course, is the god Bes.¹⁹ The Graeco-Roman period is characterized by slow fusion of his aspects as the god of sensual pleasures and that of the underworld demon.²⁰ Regarding Bes, it's during the New Kingdom that spectacular wine jars took the shape of the body of the paunchy god. From the Greek point of view, we were acquainted with the immoderate love of Satyrs and Silenus for wine and drunken celebration. Outside of Egypt, multiple finds of Bes-Silenus vessels have been reported, confirming what can be described as 'mixed iconography'.²¹

When investigating the vessel from Oklaj, F. Bulić wrote to F. W. von Bissing. In his reply, F. W. von Bissing stated that there were two origins of this type of vessels: one in the form of the Egyptian minor god Bes, and another, Hellenic type vessels, in the form of Silenus. According to him, the two types of models merged in the early Roman Imperial period. Iconographical, Bes' figure could be provided with the animal feet, featured in Silenus.²² Since F. W. von Bissing, and his typology, our insight has (slightly) changed. Bes and Silenus do have a tendency of mutual merger; they both have a distorted face, protruding tongue, animal ears, and grotesque posture. In the same way, Bes also has a tendency of rapprochement with Gorgon. But, in the sense of the iconography of Bes and Silenus, their differences are also very noticeable. Bes is a dwarf with deformed legs, lion ears; he has a certain way of wearing his beard, making it difficult to confuse him with Silenus.²³ Y. Volokhine, on the other hand, thinks that regarding the merger/fusion of Bes and Silenus it must be noted that it happened after Silenus lost his equine character. The aged,

16 Bulić 1909, str. 47.

17 LIMC 1986, str. 98; Dasen 2013, str. 81; Charvat 1980, str. 47.

18 Charvat 1980, str. 47-48.

19 Von Bissing 1913, str. 70-84.

20 Charvat 1980, str. 49.

21 Volokhine 2010, str. 253.

22 Bulić 1926-1927, str. 105.

17 LIMC 1986, p. 98; Dasen 2013, p. 81; Charvat 1980, p. 47.

18 Charvat 1980, pp. 47-48.

19 Von Bissing 1913, pp. 70-84.

20 Charvat 1980, p. 49.

21 Volokhine 2010, p. 253.

22 Bulić 1926-1927, p. 105.

23 LIMC 1986, p. 107.

koju je stvorio naš se uvid donekle promijenio. Bes i Silen svakako imaju tendenciju združivanja; obojica imaju izobličeno lice, isplažen jezik, životinjske uši i groteskan stav. Na isti je način Bes bio blizak i Gorgoni. No u pogledu ikonografije, primjetne su i razlike između Besa i Silena. Bes je patuljak s deformiranim nogama i lavljim ušima, a brada mu je tako oblikovana da ga se ne može zamijeniti sa Silenom.²³ Y. Volokhine pak smatra da se stapanje/fuzija Besa i Silena moglo dogoditi tek onda kada je Silen izgubio svoje konjske noge i kada se počeo prikazivati u potpunosti u ljudskom obliku. Ostarjeli, bradati, zbiti, pohlepni i lascivni tip Silena pojavljuje se u 5. st. pr. n. e. Ipak, razlike među njima nisu takve da se između njih nije mogla dogoditi rečena fuzija.²⁴

Što se tiče faličkog prikaza Besa, egipatska ikonografija poznaje gole bogove (uključujući Besa) te itifaličke bogove, no ignorira predimenzionirani falus.²⁵ "Bes sa sedam lica" (magični papirus koji se čuva u Brooklynu) je, kao i likovi drugih božanstava prikazanih u erekciji (npr. Min), predstavljen s proporcionalnim falusom. Prema tome, u prikazima na kojima Bes ima predimenzionirani falus očituje se nešto sasvim drugo, kao što je govorio Herodot opisujući Dionizove, tj. Ozirisove svetkovine. Bes je često prikazivan gol, ali je tek kasnije, odnosno nakon njegova 'susreta' sa Silenom, 'prihvatilo' predimenzionirani falus i kao takav postaje dijelom obitelji grotesknih likova/bogova/božanstava.²⁶ Upravo spomenute razlike jasno su vidljive na dva ovdje prikazana predmeta: na figuri iz Siska²⁷ (sl. 1.) i posudi iz Oklaja²⁸ (sl. 2.). Ikonografija Silena jednako tako jasno pokazuje i orijentalne, odnosno egipatko-feničke utjecaje. Njegova čudovišna grimasa, frontalna postura, bliskost s lavom točke su po kojima se mogao približiti Besu.²⁹

Podtekst ovoj erotici svakako je funeralni kult, u kojem su slavne skupine božanstava prikazane u izvanrednim kopulacijama (*symplegma*). Opušteni falus s kojim se Bes nekad prikazuje nije prirodno orijentiran prema aktivnoj kopulaciji, ali vjerojatno ima apotropejski i, gotovo sigurno, komični značaj. Helenistička ikonografija groteske, kao i grčko-egipatska, poznaje patuljkov predimenzionirani falus i

bearded, paunchy, greedy and lascivious type of Silenus emerged in Greece in the 5th century BC. While the differences between Bes and Silenus exist, they are not insurmountable, and they do not diminish the possibility of interpretation in terms of similarity.²⁴

Another point deserves to be raised and it is the phallic appearance of Bes. The Egyptian iconography knows the naked gods (including Bes), and also the ithyphallic gods, however it ignores the exaggerated phallus.²⁵

"The Bes of seven faces" magic papyrus kept in Brooklyn, is, like other representations of such god(s) depicted with an erection, but with a phallus of proportionate size; it is the same for other ithyphallic gods (as Min). This, then, is a different kind of image with the presence of the excessive phallic statues, as Herodotus alludes, evoking festivals of Dionysus (Osiris). Bes is often represented naked, but it was not until later, however, that he 'adopted' oversized phallus. As such, this Bes with oversized phallus entered the family of "grotesque" characters/gods/divinities, i.e., upon his encounter with Silenus.²⁶

The above described differences (if they may be called differences) are clearly displayed on two objects: the figurine from Sisak²⁷ and the vessel one from Oklaj²⁸ (FIG. 1 and 2). The iconography of Silenus, especially in the era of its genesis, denotes oriental, especially Egypto-Phoenician influences. His grinning face is monstrous, the frontal position of his head, and his acquaintanceship with the lion, offer points of kinship with Bes.²⁹

Within this erotica obviously lies the funerary cult, where the famous statuary groups are shown in extraordinary copulations (*symplegma*). The flaccid phallus with which Bes is sometimes represented is not naturally oriented towards active copulation, but probably has apotropaic and most certainly comical significance. Oversized dwarf phalli and dragging animal tails are well known in Hellenistic grotesque iconography, also later in Graeco-Egyptian iconography. In effect, the more frequent occurrence of phallic Graeco-Roman Bes lies in the earlier times, and it is the result of the merger of various attributes already established in Egypt.³⁰

23 LIMC 1986, str. 107.

24 Volokhine 2010, str. 251.

25 Volokhine 2010, str. 252.

26 Volokhine 2010, str. 252.

27 Košćević 2002, str. 101-102, 105, 108: T. 1.1.; str. 110: T.3.

28 Bulić 1909, T. III.

29 LIMC 1986, str. 107.

24 Volokhine 2010, p. 251.

25 Volokhine 2010, p. 252.

26 Volokhine 2010, p. 252.

27 Košćević 2002, pp. 101-102, 105, 108: T. 1.1.; p. 110: T.3.

28 Bulić 1909, Table III.

29 LIMC 1986, p. 107.

30 Volokhine 2010, pp. 253-254.

životinjski rep koji vuče između nogu. Zapravo, falički grčko-rimski Bes već je ukorijenjen u Egiptu.³⁰

Iako Silvan, kao i Silenov otac Pan, imaju značajke koje su slične ili iste (razmatrajući njihove kultove općenito), oni se ipak u većini slučajeva razlikuju. U izvorima se pojavljuju zajedno, ali je uvijek i bez iznimke jasno da je riječ o dvama božanstvima.³¹ Ono što im je zajedničko jest: gospodarenje šumom, golo-tinja, društvo nimfa i pastira te bor. Upravo ono što razlikuje Fauna (kao rimskog pandana Panu) i Silvana, razdvaja i Pana od Silvana: seksualna agresija, muzički talent i tendencija k stvaranju panike. Te razlike vidljive su ne samo u literaturi već i u kulturnoj praksi iz koje proizlaze dva ikonografski različita božanstva.³²

Napokon, u ovakvu prilično zbunjujuću situaciju i između Besa i Silena, i u vezi sa samim porijeklom posude, P. Selem uvodi Silvana. On je isključivo na temelju mjesta nalaza (Dalmatinska zagora) zaključio da bi posuda mogla biti povezana sa Silvanom.³³ Tu, gotovo sigurno, pogrešnu pretpostavku bez dodatne analize prenijela je R. Košćević u dva navrata³⁴, uzimajući je kao analogiju figurici iz zbirke M. Golana u Sisku.

Jedna posuda u obliku Besa Silena pronađena je u Visu u grobnom sloju, ali izvan grobnog konteksta. Ona je pak izrađena od keramike, visine je 20, a širine 8 cm. Lik božanstva izrađen je na prednjoj strani posude, dok je stražnja ostavljena neobrađena. Posuda je datirana u razdoblje između druge četvrtine 1. st. n. e. i kraja 1. st. n. e.³⁵ Nadalje, u Kostolcu (*Viminacium*) u jednom je grobu pronađena posuda slična ovdje spominjanima, a uz nju je bio i strugač (*strigilum*), kao i u Oklaju. Posuda i strigil bili su dio kozmetičkog pribora pokojnika.³⁶

Posuda iz Oklaja datirana je u 1. st. n. e. Ne smijemo zaboraviti da je 1. st. razdoblje velikih i do tada neviđenih promjena na prostoru ilirske populacije. Te promjene, među ostalim, uključuju dolazak golemog vojnog stroja, administrativnog pogona, izgradnju cestovne mreže u duljini većoj od 400 rimskih milja te, napokon, uspostavu provincije Dalmacije. Sve su te promjene bez sumnje utjecale na svakodnevni život pojedinaca. U tako visoko romaniziranom okruženju, odnosno u okruženju korjenitih promjena dok su sami čimbenici tih promjena bili prisutni u velikom broju,

Although Silvanus, as well as Pan, Silenus' father, have the features that are, generally considering their cults, similar or the same, in most cases Silvanus and Pan differ. Silvanus and Pan appear in the literary sources together, but always and without exception, it is clear that they are two separate deities.³¹ They share several common characteristics: the forest as their domain, nudity, the company of the nymphs and shepherds, and the pine tree. Exactly that what distinguishes Faunus, as the Roman counterpart for Pan, and Silvanus, also separates Pan from Silvanus: sexual aggression, familiarity with satyrs and *Sileni*, the goat shape, a lack of interest in agriculture, musical talent and a tendency to create panic. These differences are visible not only in literature, but also in actual cult practices, as two different iconographic types of deities are represented.³²

Finally, P. Selem brings Silvanus into already (as we have seen) confusing situation between Bes and Silenus, and the origin of the vessels. He concluded, solely on the basis of the vessel's find spot, that it could be connected with Silvanus.³³ This almost certainly wrong assumption was iterated, and used as an analogy for the aforementioned bronze figurine from the Golan Collection.³⁴ One more ceramic bottle shaped in the form of Silenus-Bes was found in Vis in the funerary layer, but outside the tomb. It is 20 cm tall and 8 cm wide. The image of the deity was modelled on the front of the vessel, while the rear side was left plain. In Kostolac (*Viminacium*) a similar vessel was accompanied by a strigil, as well as in Oklaj. The vessel and the strigil are both parts of the cosmetic accessories of the deceased.³⁵ Furthermore, the Silenus-Bes vessel from Vis is dated to the period between the second quarter and the end of the 1st century.³⁶

The vessel from Oklaj is dated to the first century AD. It should be borne in mind that the 1st century is the era of great and, until then, unseen changes in the territory of the Illyrian population. These changes, among others, included the arrival of an immense military machine and of the administration, the construction of 400 miles³⁷ of road, and the establishment of the province of Dalmatia. All these changes certainly affected the daily life of an individual. In such highly Romanized environment or in an environment of

30 Volokhine 2010, str. 253-254.

31 Vergil. Georg. 2. 493-494; Ovid. Met. 14. 638-639.

32 Dorcey 1992, str. 16, 40.

33 Selem 1997, str. 92-93, T. XXXII. Uz bibliografiju vezanu za posudu.

34 Vidi bilj. 1.

35 Katić 2002, str. 106.

36 Katić 2002, str. 103-104.

31 Vergil. Georg. 2. 493-494; Ovid. Met. 14. 638-639.

32 Dorcey 1992, pp. 16, 40.

33 Selem 1997, pp. 92-93, Table XXXII. He also gives extensive bibliography on the vessel.

34 Note nr. 1.

35 Katić 2002, pp. 103-104.

36 Katić 2002, p. 106.

37 Roman miles

moramo se pitati je li ta posuda zbilja bila povezana sa Silvanom ili je, što je vjerojatnije, donesena u torbici nekog vojnika izravno iz Grčke ili Egipta.

Konačno, čak i bez pomnije analize tipologije kozmetičkih posuda ili ostalih predmeta pronađenih u grobovima u Oklaju, može se zaključiti da je gubitak konteksta u kojem je posuda pronađena, te naglašavanje isključivo šire lokacije nalaza posude, vrlo vjerojatno rezultirao gubitkom osnovnih karakteristika posude i/ili njezinog osnovnog značenja, koje je potom dovelo do ponavljanja pogrešnih pretpostavki. S obzirom na sve rečeno u tekstu, te usporednu analizu ikonografskih prikaza Silvana, Besa, i Silena, te njihovih osnovnih mitološko-religijskih karakteristika, ni posuda s prikazom Besa iz Oklaja, niti figurica Silena iz zbirke Mirka Golana, nisu bili povezani sa Silvanom.

extensive changes, and with those who implemented these changes, what needs to be answered is whether this vessel really was connected with Silvanus or whether it was brought to Oklaj in the purse of some soldier or Roman citizen, directly from e.g. Egypt or Greece. The latter possibility is much more likely, almost certain.

Even without engaging into the typology of cosmetic containers or other artefacts found in the graves in Oklaj, it can be concluded that the loss of the context of grave(s) in which the vessel was found, and emphasising only the location of its finding, may have resulted in the loss of the vessel's basic characteristics and fundamental meaning, which then led to lingering on false assumptions. Finally, with regard to all that has been written here, and through comparative analysis of iconographic display of Silvanus, Bes, and Silenus, together with their basic mythological and religious characteristics, neither the vessel depicting Bes from Oklaj, nor the Silenus figurine from the collection of Mirko Golan, were associated with Silvanus.

KRATICE / ABBREVIATIONS

CIL Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
 Von Bissing 1913 W. von Bissing, *Die Kultur des alten Ägyptens*, Leipzig 1913

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Johnson 1926 F. F. Abbott, A. Ch. Johnson, *Municipal Administration in the Roman Empire*, Princeton 1926.
- Antički teatar 1979 Antički teatar na tlu Jugoslavije, Novi Sad, 1979 (ur: D. Dimitrijević, B. Gabričević, D. Rnjak, J. Todorović)
- Antička bronza 1969 Antička bronza u Jugoslaviji, Lj. B. Popović, D. Mano-Zisi, M. Veličković, B. Jeličić, Beograd 1969
- Bulić 1909 F. Bulić, *Ritrovamenti antichi a Oklaj di Promina (Promona)*, *Bullettino di archeologia e storia Dalmata* 32, Spalato 1909, 45-48.
- Bulić 1926-1927 F. Bulić, *Dvije riječi o figuri "Bes-a" na jednoj brončanoj vazi u splitskom arheološkom Muzeju*, *Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku* 49, Split 1926-1927, 105.
- Charvát 1980 P. Charvát, *The Bes Jug, It's origin and development in Egypt*, *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde* 107, Heft 1, Berlin 1980, 46-52.
- Čače 1989 S. Čače, *Pogranične zajednice i jugoistočna granica Liburnije u kasno predrimsko i rimsko doba*, *Diadora* 11, Zadar 1989, 59-91.
- Dasen 2013 V. Dasen, *Dwarfs in ancient Egypt and Greece*, Oxford 2013.
- Dorcey 1992. P. F. Dorcey, *The Cult of Silvanus: A Study in Roman Folk Religion* (Columbia studies in the classical tradition XX). Leiden 1992.
- LIMC, 1986 A. Hermary, s.v. Bes, *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, Zurich 1986, 98-112.
- Jagenteufel 1958 A. Jagenteufel, *Die Statthalter der römischen Provinz Dalmatia von Augustus bis Diokletian*, *Schriften der Balkankommission; Antiquarische Abteilung*. 12, Wien 1958.
- Katić 2002 M. Katić, *Antropomorfná posuda sa sinkretističkim prikazom Silena-Besa iz Visa*, *Znakovi i riječi*, *Zbornik projekta 'Protohistorija i antika hrvatskog prostora'*, Zagreb 2002.
- Koščević 2002 R. Koščević, *Nekoliko rjeđih neobjavljenih nalaza iz Siscije*, *Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju* 19, Zagreb 2002, 101-112.
- Koščević 2013 R. Koščević, *Siscia, Pannonia Superior, Old and new finds*, *BAR International Series* 2461, Oxford 2013.
- Mesihović 2014 S. Mesihović, *Proconsules, legati et praesides*, *Rimski namjesnici Ilirika, Gornjeg Ilirika i Dalmacije*, *Filozofski fakultet u Sarajevu*, Sarajevo 2014.
- Miletić 2008 Ž. Miletić, *O teritorijalnim razgraničenjima oko Krke kod Miljevaca u rimsko doba*, *Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa Miljevci u prošlosti*, Visovac - Drinovci 2008, 87-103.
- Patsch 1897 C. Patsch, *Archäologisch-epigraphische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der römischen Provinz Dalmatien*. II. Teil. *WMBH* 5, 1897, 177-241.
- Paškvalin 2012 N. Cambi, *Predgovor*, str. 9-13 in: Veljko Paškvalin, *Antički sepulkralni spomenici s područja Bosne i Hercegovine*, *Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja*, Knjiga 9, *Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine*, Djela, Knjiga 83, B. Goveđarica, N. Cambi (eds.), Sarajevo 2012.
- Riha, Stern 1982 E. Riha, W. B. Stern, *Die römischen Löffel aus Augst und Kaiseraugst*, *Archäologische und metallanalytische Untersuchungen*, *Forschungen In Augst*, Band 5, Augst 1982.
- Roscher W. H. Roscher, *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, Band 1, Leipzig 1884-1890, s.v. Besas, coll. 784-785.
- Selem 1997 P. Selem, *Izidin trag*, Split 1997.

Ljubica Perinić, Je li doista riječ o Besu Silvanu?

- Suić 2003 M. Suić, *Antički grad na istočnom Jadranu*, drugo izmijenjeno i dopunjeno izdanje, Golden marketing, Zagreb 2003.
- Volokhine 2010 Y. Volokhine, *Bès dans les temples égyptiens de l'époque gréco-romaine*, in: *Isis on the Nile. Egyptian Gods in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Proceedings of the IVth International Conference of Isis Studies, Liège, November 27-29 2008, Laurent Bricault et Miguel Versluys (eds.), *Religions in the Graeco-Roman World* 171, Brill, Leiden 2010, 233-255.
- Wilkes 1969 J. J. Wilkes, *History of the provinces of the Roman Empire, Dalmatia*, University of Birmingham, London 1969.
- Wilkes 1976 J. J. Wilkes, *Boundary Stones in Roman Dalmatia I., The Inscriptions*, *Arheološki vestnik* 25, Ljubljana 1976, 258-274.
- Zaninović 1969 M. Zaninović, *Burnum. Castellum-Municipium*, *Diadora* 4, Zadar 1968, 119-129.

INTERNETSKE BAZE PODATAKA / INTERNET DATABASES

Vergil. Georg. – Vergilije, Georgike <http://sacred-texts.com/cla/virgil/geo/index.htm> posljednji pristup 1.12.2015.
Ovid. Met. – Ovidije, Metamorfoze <http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/ovid.html> posljednji pristup 1.12.2015.