

Miroslav Katić

*Castella qui sunt super
civitatem Salonitanam*

Miroslav Katić
Muzej hrvatskih arheoloških spomenika
S. Gunjače 3
HR, 21000 Split

UDK: 904:725.96](398Salona)
Izvorni znanstveni članak
Primljeno: 23. 8. 2018.
Prihvaćeno: 6. 9. 2018.

Sažetak

U tekstu se obrađuju kasnoantičke utvrde u zaleđu Salone. One se spominju u nekoliko pisanih povijesnih izvora: u djelu *De bellis* Prokopija iz Cezareje, zatim u jednom necjelovitom kodicilu iz 6. st. gdje se navode *Castella qui sunt super civitatem Salonitanam*. Klis se spominje u 29. i 30. glavi djela *De administrando Imperio* Konstantina Porfirogeneta u kontekstu opisa avaro-slavenskog osvajanja Salone. On je bio jedna od utvrda podignutih uz rimske ceste koje su vodile od Salone prema Andetriju (Muć), Osiniju i Tiluriju. Na istim cestovnim pravcima nalazile su se utvrde: Klis, Markezina greda, Šutanj, Grubuša (Decimin), Gradina iznad Kukuzova klanca, Sinj (Osinij), Trilj (Tilurij). Neke od njih su u podnožjima imale crkve i ruralna naselja. U drugoj polovici 6. st. Markezina greda, Šutanj i Gradina iznad Kukuzova klanca dobivaju “predzid”; riječ je o protehizmi – karakterističnom ranobizantskom načinu utvrđivanja.

*Castella qui sunt super
civitatem Salonitanam*

Miroslav Katić
Museum of Croatian Archaeological Monuments
S. Gunjače 3
CROATIA, 21000 Split

UDC: 904:725.96](398Salona)
Original scientific paper
Received: 23 August 2018
Accepted: 6 September 2018

Abstract

Late Roman forts in the hinterland of Salona are analyzed in this paper. They are mentioned in several written historical sources: in the work *De bellis* by Procopius of Caesarea, then in an incomplete codicil from the 6th century mentioning *Castella qui sunt super civitatem Salonitanam*. Klis is mentioned in chapters 29 and 30 of *De administrando Imperio* by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the context of his description of the Avaro-Slav conquest of Salona. It was one of the forts erected along the Roman roads that led from Salona to Andetrium (Muć), Osinium and Tilurium. Forts were situated on the same road routes: Klis, Markezina greda, Šutanj, Grubuša (Deciminum), Gradina above Kukuzova Canyon, Sinj (Osinium), and Trilj (Tilurium). Some of them stood above churches and rural communities. In the latter half of the 6th century, Markezina greda, Šutanj and Gradina above the Kukuzova canyon were reinforced

Ove su utvrde nadzirale prilaze Saloni i bile su dio njezinog obrambenog sustava.

Ključne riječi: Salona, kasnoantičke utvrde, rimske ceste, proteihizma

with outer defensive walls (proteichismas), typical early Byzantine fortification methods. These fortified structures ensured control over the approaches to Salona and were part of its defensive system.

Keywords: Salona, Late Roman forts, Roman roads, proteichismas

Antička Salona imala je specifičan razvojni put, od vojnog punkta iz kojeg su rimske legije od 2. st. pr. Kr. do početka 1. st. započinjale svoje akcije prema unutrašnjosti Ilirika. Bila je glavni grad rimske provincije Dalmacije kojemu je *Pax Romana* omogućila snažan urbani razvoj. Salona je u kasnoj antici postala metropolija, njezini biskupi su se dopisivali s papama u Rimu i patrijarsima u Konstantinopolu, crkvenim ocima poput Ivana Zlatoustog, Jeronima i Augustina.¹ Civilna i crkvena vlast pretvorile su je u snažno upravno središte s reprezentativnim sakralnim i javnim objektima. Prostrana luka, pomorski i kopneni putovi omogućili su dobru povezanost s ostalim dijelovima Carstva. Važan izvor gospodarskog blagostanja antičke Salone bio je njezin ager razvučen preko splitskoga i kaštelanskoga polja, dok je *saltus* zauzimao pašnjake na padinama brda Kozjaka. Osojna padina Kozjaka danas izgleda pusta, no kroz cijelu povijest do druge polovice 20. st. ona je bila usko povezana sa solinskim i kaštelanskim prostorom. Dolci i vrtače, lokve i gajevi bili su idealni za uzgoj stoke sitnoga zuba. Kameni reljefi delmatskog božanstva Silvana, zaštitnika šuma, usjeva i stoke, isklesani su na Babi – velikom kamenom kuku s južne strane brda, iznad Kaštel Sućurca, zatim na Klisu u Varoši iznad izvora vode.² To su bila prastara svetišta *sub divo*; Delmati su ih u vrijeme rimske vlasti ukrali reljefnim prikazima svoga božanstva. Neke ilirske gradine poput Klisa ili Birnja iznad Kaštela ponovno su se koristile u kasnoj antici. One su kontrolirale brdske prolaze i prijevoje. Biranj je štitio stočarsku populaciju koja je u kozjačkim Dubravama napasala svoja stada. Sličnu ulogu imala je i Markezina greda smještena blizu Klisa. Treba razlikovati ponovno korištene gradine u kasnoantičkom razdoblju smještene uz rimske ceste od onih koje su bile udaljene od komunikacija. Krški prostor kroz povijest funkcionira na svoj način. Tamo gdje nije bilo cesta, a gdje su se nalazili važni pašnjaci, bunari i lokve prostor se također koristio i naseljavao. Uzgoj stoke sitnog zuba postao je značajniji s povećanjem ugroženosti stanovništva, u ratno se vrijeme stoka uvijek lakše sklanjala i čuvala od pljačke neprijatelja.

Kasnoantičke utvrde dočekale su novu slavensku populaciju. Neke od njih postale su važna ranosrednjovjekovna županijska središta. Osim vojno-upravne organizacije prostora formirala su se i staroslavenska svetišta. Brdo Perun nalazilo se u današnjim Poljicima istočno od Salone, a nedavno je utvrđeno da se dio Kozjaka kod vrha Biranj nazivao *Borun*, tj. Perun.³

Ancient Salona traversed a specific developmental path from its beginnings as a military outpost, whence the Roman legions launched their campaigns into the Illyrian interior from the 2nd century BC to the beginning of the 1st century AD. It was the capital of the Roman province of Dalmatia, which experienced intense urban growth thanks to the *Pax Romana*. In Late Antiquity, Salona became a metropolitan seat, and its bishops corresponded with the popes in Rome and the patriarchs in Constantinople, and church fathers such as John Chrysostom, Jerome and Augustine.¹ Civic and ecclesiastical authority transformed it into a powerful administrative seat with notable sacral and public buildings. The spacious harbour and maritime and overland routes ensured that it was well connected to the rest of the Empire. A major source of ancient Salona's economic well-being was its ager extending over the Split and Kaštela plains, while the *saltus* encompassed pastures on the slopes of Mt. Kozjak. The non-sunward slope of Kozjak appears barren, but throughout history until the latter half of the 20th century, it was closely linked to the Solin and Kaštela areas. Depressions and sinkholes, ponds and meadows were ideal for the small livestock. Stone relief portrayals of the Delmataean deity Silvanus, the patron of forests, crops and livestock, are carved onto Baba – a large stone crest on the southern side of the mountain, above Kaštel Sućurac, and then on Klis in Varoš, above a natural spring.² These were primeval *sub divo* shrines; the Delmataeans decorated them with relief portrayals of their deity during the era of Roman rule. Certain Illyrian hillforts, such as Klis or Biranj above Kaštela, were once again put to use in Late Antiquity. They oversaw the mountain passes. Biranj safeguarded the livestock herding population which pastured their herds on Kozjak's Dubrave. A similar role was played by Markezina greda situated near Klis. A distinction should be made between the once more used hillforts in Late Antiquity situated along Roman roads and those that were remote from such communication routes. The karst zone functioned in its own way over the course of history. Where there were no roads, but where vital pastures, wells and ponds were located, the area was also used and inhabited. The raising of small livestock became more important as threats to the population grew, as during wartime it was always easier to conceal and protect the animals from enemy plunder.

In Late Antiquity, existing fortifications welcomed a new Slav population. Some of them became important early medieval county seats. Besides the military-administrative organization of this territory, old Slav

1 Dyggve 1989, str. 26; Ivanišević 1994, str. 110-187.

2 Rendić-Miočević 1955, str. 5-40.

3 Burić 2011, str. 342; Burić 2011a, str. 60.

1 Dyggve 1989, p. 26; Ivanišević 1994, pp. 110-187.

2 Rendić-Miočević 1955, pp. 5-40.

Arheološka istraživanja izvedena zadnjih desetljeća omogućuju cjelovitije sagledavanje zaleđa antičke Salone. Riječ je mahom o kasnoantičkim nalazištima koja prilikom objave u stručnoj literaturi nisu povezana s utvrdama kojima gravitiraju. Utvrde su bile središta s kojih su se kontrolirale komunikacije, okolna krška polja i brdski pašnjaci; imale su svoju vlastitu infrastrukturu te je stoga neophodno započeti proučavati njihov smještaj, prostorne odnose, povijesni i kulturni kontekst. Zbog vojnog značaja zabilježene su u pisanim povijesnim izvorima; tako *castella* u zaleđu Salone prepoznajemo u Prokopijevom opisu bizantsko-ostrogotskog rata. Ostrogoti se, naime, povlače iz Salone u *okolne utvrde* jer se ne osjećaju sigurnima u gradu.⁴ Izravno spominjanje: *Castella qui sunt super civitatem Salonitanam* u jednom kasnoantičkom kodikulu, iskoristio sam za naslov ovoga rada.⁵ Utvrde koje su "iznad" grada Salone možemo jasno determinirati u solinskom zaleđu. Bile su podignute uz rimsku cestu koja je iz Salone vodila prema sjeveru, čuvale su pristup gradu i bile dio *salonitanskog defenzivnog sustava*. Taj je sustav naslijedio pretpovijesni način kontrole prostora utemeljen na vizualnoj vezi između starih delmatskih gradina. Središte Delmata bilo je na Duvanjskom polju i njima je opasnost prijetila s mora, odnosno priobalja, posebno u vrijeme rimske ekspanzije. Markezina greda i Koštak imale su dobar vizualni kontakt s gradinama u unutrašnjosti, a dobro su nadzirale i salonitanski zaljev. Signal za opasnost upućen s njih u kratkom je roku, od gradine do gradine, mogao biti prenesen u središte delmatskog teritorija, na Livanjsko i Duvanjsko polje. Sličan način signalizacije uspostavio se u kasnoj antici, samo u suprotnom pravcu. Takav defenzivni sustav omogućio je uspješniju obranu glavnoga grada, no nije ga sačuvao od konačne propasti. Pisani povijesni izvori i ostave novca u Saloni s kraja prve polovice 7. st.⁶ svjedoče o kraju antičkoga grada u vrijeme snažnog prodora Avara i Slavena na jadransku obalu; ako je pao grad, onda su zasigurno pala i *castella* u njegovu zaleđu.⁷

4 Barišić 2007, str. 33.

5 Marini 1805, str. 121, T. LXXVIII.

6 Marović 1984, str. 306; Gjurašin 2000, str. 86; Šeparović 2017, str. 1008.

7 U našoj historiografiji raširena je teorija o "odumiranju Salone" koja se pojavila osamdesetih godina u radovima Ž. Rapanića. On smatra da se Salona rurificirala i postala selo, a Split postao gradom (Rapanić 1980, str. 200-201). Autor ističe kontinuitet naseljenosti u salonitanskom ageru te smatra kako ni u jednom trenutku nije potpuno ugasnuo. Do tog zaključka dolazi putem hagiofornih toponima, tj. naslovnika crkava u salonitanskom ageru. Preživljavanje dijela starosjedilačkog stanovništva ne dovode u pitanje ni pisani povijesni izvori,

shrines were also formed. The hill called Perun was located in today's Poljice east of Salona, and recently it has been ascertained that a part of Kozjak near Biranj Peak had been called *Borun*, i.e., Perun.³

Archaeological research conducted over the past decade has allowed for more comprehensive insight into ancient Salona's hinterland. These are mostly sites dating to Late Antiquity which, in their publications in the scholarly literature, were not linked to the forts to which they gravitate. Forts were focal points that afforded control over communication routes, the surrounding karst plains (polje) and pastures; they had their own infrastructure, so it is essential to begin studying their location, spatial relations and historical and cultural contexts. Due to their military importance they were recorded in written historical sources; thus the *castella* in Salona's hinterland may be recognized in the description of the Gothic War by Procopius. The Ostrogoths, he asserted, retreated from Salona to *nearby fortifications* because they did not feel safe in the city.⁴ I used the direct reference to *Castella qui sunt super civitatem Salonitanam* in a codicil from Late Antiquity as the title to this paper.⁵ The fortifications "above" the city of Salona can be clearly ascertained in Solin's hinterland. They were built adjacent to the Roman road which led northward from Salona, safeguarding access to the city and functioning as part of the *Salonitan defensive system*. This system had inherited the prehistoric method of overseeing an area based on the visual link between the old Delmataean hillforts. The centre of the Delmataean was situated in the Duvno plain (Duvanjsko polje), and the greatest threat they faced came from the sea and the coast, particularly during the era of Roman expansion. Markezina greda and Koštak had good visual contact with the hillforts in the interior, and the Salonitan gulf could also be monitored from them. An alert sent from them could rather quickly be conveyed from hillfort to hillfort to the heart of Delmataean territory, in the plains of Livno and Duvno. A similar signalization method was established in Late Antiquity, only running in the opposite direction. Such a defensive system enabled the more successful defence of the capital city, but this did not save it from its ultimate demise. Written historical sources and coin hoards in Salona from the end of the first half of the 7th century⁶ testify to the end of the Roman-era city at the time of the intense incursions of the Avars

3 Burić 2011, p. 342; Burić 2011a, p. 60.

4 Barišić 2007, p. 33.

5 Marini 1805, p. 121, Pl. LXXVIII.

6 Marović 1984, p. 306; Gjurašin 2000, p. 86; Šeparović 2017, p. 1008.

međutim fluidno provlačenje života u salonitanskom ageru, isticanje preživjelih sanktorema, kao i nedostatak arheološkog materijala 7.-8. st. pojačali su dojam o "odumiranju" Salone, a onda i drugih antičkih gradova na Jadranu. Navodi također da je starosjedilačko stanovništvo nastavilo živjeti na svome zemljištu bez većih povijesnih potresa. Rapanićeva su razmišljanja uvijek znalačka i poticajna pa je teorija o odumiranju gradova brzo prihvaćena. S njom se počelo nekritički baratati kao s povijesnom činjenicom (Klaić 1986, str. 33-36; Rapanić 1987, str. 59-61; Goldstein 1995, str. 115-122; Budak 1995, str. 76). Takvo je stajalište u cijelosti negiralo pad Salone opisan u DAI. U svojoj knjizi o Splitu Rapanić i dalje zastupa isto stajalište (Rapanić 2007, str. 137-152). Također je 2016. godine objavio članak s pregledom dosadašnjih osvrtâ na problem pada Salone donoseći nove "argumente" o kontinuitetu života u ageru (Rapanić 2016). Nisu svi prihvatili Rapanićevu teoriju o Saloni. Obradujući premještanje Crkve iz Salone u Split, Radoslav Katičić smatra da je moralo doći do pada, a ne do odumiranja grada (Katičić 2008, str. 441). U novije su se vrijeme pojavili važni radovi koji ukazuju na najstariji slavenski jezični sloj ranoga srednjeg vijeka upravo na prostoru za koji Rapanić smatra da je neometano egzistirao tijekom 7.-8. st. Tonči Burić je dokazao da se vrh Biranj na Kozjaku zvao *Monte Borun*. Dakle, vrh Birnja i prostor istočno od njega očito su se zvali "Perunovo brdo" (Burić 2011a, str. 64). Osojni dio Kozjaka na tom mjestu naziva se *Dubrava*, ona se spominje u darovnici kralja Zvonimira splitskom nadbiskupu Lovri 1078. g. Burićevi radovi uvjerljivo pokazuju da su obronke Kozjaka nastanjivali Slaveni u svojoj poganskoj fazi (Burić 2011, str. 342). Sakralni kontinuitet na koji se Rapanić poziva nije samo prisutan u Salonitanskom ageru, nego i u zaleđu. Za njega je sigurno zaslužno preživjelo romansko stanovništvo, ali i salonitanska Crkva koja je također preživjela preseljenjem u Split. Međutim isticanje sakralnog kontinuiteta bez cjelovitijeg uvida u toponimiju salonitanskog prostora nije dovoljno da bi se došlo do dalekosežnog zaključka o "odumiranju" Salone. Ruralizacija Salone ne znači njezino odumiranje, sličan proces doživjeli su i drugi antički gradovi. Salona se transformirala u kasnoantički grad, zbijen u kontekst vlastitih fortifikacija. Od 3. st. počinje opadanje kvalitete urbanog života u antičkim gradovima. Oni doista "odumiru", no to je složen proces urbanih i ruralnih transformacija koji se ne iscrpljuje u "odumiranju", nego pruža velik spektar promjena od 3. do 6. st. među kojima i nastanak cijelog niza novih kasnoantičkih *civitates* (Katić 2003, str. 523-527). Nisu točni novi "argumenti" na koje se Rapanić poziva pogrešno tumačeći još jednu ostavu s Heraklijevim novcem kao "obredno uzidavanje", odnosno popravak crkve u 7. st., što bi potvrđivalo priču o nesmetanom življenju u salonitanskom ageru tijekom 7. st. (vidi bilj. 84). Na krive zaključke Rapanić je bio naveden pogrešnim opisom nalaza u članku Hrvoja Gjurašina (Gjurašin 2000, str. 86). Konačno, tema kojom se

and Slavs onto the Adriatic coast; if the city fell, then the *castella* in its hinterland certainly fell as well.⁷

- 7 The theory on the "decay of Salona," which appeared in the 1980s in the works of Ž. Rapanić, is rather widespread in Croatian historiography. Rapanić believes that Salona was ruralized and became a village, while Split became a city (Rapanić 1980, pp. 200-201). He underscored the continuity of human habitation in the Salonitan ager and assessed that it did not dwindle at any point in time. He came to this conclusion via hagiophoric toponyms, i.e., the titulars of churches in the Salonitan ager. The survival of a part of the indigenous population has not been brought into question by written historical sources, either, although the fluid progress of life in the Salonitan ager, the emphasis on surviving religious place-names, as well as the absence of archaeological materials from the 7th-8th centuries enhanced the impression of the "wasting away" of Salona, followed by other ancient cities on the Adriatic coast as well. He also stated that the indigenous population continued to live on their lands in times of increased historical turbulence. Rapanić's views were always knowledgeable and stimulating, so the theory on the decay of cities was rapidly accepted. It began to be uncritically taken as historical fact (Klaić 1986, pp. 33-36; Rapanić 1987, pp. 59-61; Goldstein 1995, pp. 115-122; Budak 1995, p. 76). Such a stance is entirely contradicted by the account of the fall of Salona in *De administrando imperio*. In his book on Split, Rapanić continued to advocate the same view (Rapanić 2007, pp. 137-152). He also published an article in 2016 with a review of previous debated on the problem of Salona's fall, providing new "arguments" on the continuity of life in the ager (Rapanić 2016). No everyone accepted Rapanić's theory about Salona. When considering the transfer of the Church from Salona to Split, Radoslav Katičić believed that there had to be a collapse rather than a slow decay of the city (Katičić 2008, p. 441). In more recent years, studies have appeared which indicate the oldest Slavic linguistic layer of the early Middle Ages precisely in the area which Rapanić believes existed undisturbed during the 7th-8th centuries. Tonči Burić proved that Biranj Peak on Kozjak had been called *Monte Borun*. Thus, Biranj and the area east of it were obviously called "Perun's mountain" (Burić 2011a, p. 64). The non-sunward side of Kozjak in this area is called *Dubrava*, and it is mentioned in the charter of King Zvonimir granted to Split Archbishop Lovro in 1078. Burić's studies persuasively show that the foothills of Kozjak had been settled by Slavs while still in their pagan phase (Burić 2011, p. 342). The sacral continuity to which Rapanić refers was not only present in the Salonitan ager, but also in its hinterland. In his view, this was due to the surviving Romanic population, as well as the Salonitan Church, which also survived by moving to Split. However, stressing this sacral continuity without comprehensive insight into the toponymy of the Salona area is not enough to draw a far-reaching conclusion on the "dying" of Salona. The ruralisation

Među utvrdama koje su se nalazile “iznad” Salone, možemo ubrojiti Asinij i Tilurij, a trećem imenu utvrde sačuvan je samo zadnji dio: ...*bielio*. Kako dokument nije u cijelosti sačuvan, nedostaje mu početak, može se tek utvrditi da se radi o oporuci nekoga tko je imao veliki posjed na otoku Mljetu. On ostavlja sto solida za rasvjetu crkava i za siromahe svih crkava na otoku Mljetu i onih koji pripadaju istoj dijecezi. Osigurava sto solida za utvrde iznad grada Salone, rasvjetu njihovih crkava i pomoć sirotinji. Za oslobođenike oporučitelj također ostavlja sto solida, a ako sredstava pretekne, treba ih potrošiti na otkup zarobljenika (*redemptione captivorum*).⁸ Na ovaj kodicil prvi je upozorio Dominik Mandić datiravši ga u 7. st.⁹ Teško se složiti s tvrdnjom Stjepana Gunjače da se ne radi o oporuci. On se ne slaže ni s povijesnim kontekstom u kojem se dogodilo otkupljivanje zatvorenika pa datira dokument kao i njegov objavljivač G. Marini u 6. st.¹⁰ O istoj temi je u nekoliko navrata raspravljala Ivanka Nikolajević obrađujući veliki posjed u Dalmaciji.¹¹ Brinući se za spas svoje duše, oporučitelj osigurava rasvjetu crkava, za što su trebale veće količine ulja. Postojanje gospodarskih objekata kod bazilike na Kapljuču i na Manastirinama u Saloni govore o jačanju zemljoposjedničke uloge crkve u kasnoj antici, ali i o zadovoljavanju vlastitih potreba za uljem i vinom.¹² Potražnja za uljem bila je velika i stalna briga svećenstva i biskupa.¹³

Crkve koje se spominju u dokumentu također su pripadale utvrdama. One su se gradile uz rimske ceste, no evidentna je njihova veza s utvrđenjima i podgrađima. Utvrda s podgrađem i crkvom najvjerojatnije je bila jedna ranokršćanska *parochia*.

Kako ćemo vidjeti kasnije, u crkvi na Klapavicama nađena je ostava ostrogotskog novca. To se podudara s pisanjem Prokopija iz Cezareje o velikoj vojsci

Asinium and Tilurium may be counted among the fortifications situated “above” Salona, while only the last part of the third fort’s name has been preserved: ... *bielio*. Since the document has not been entirely preserved, i.e., its beginning is missing, all that may be ascertained is that it is the will and testament of an individual who had a large estate on the island of Mljet. He left one hundred solidi for the illumination of churches and for the poor of all churches on the island of Mljet and those who belong to the same diocese. He left one hundred solidi for a fortification above the city of Salona, the illumination of their churches and alms for the poor. He also left one hundred solidi to his freedmen, and if there were excess funds, then they were to be used to purchase the freedom of captives (*redemptione captivorum*).⁸ This codicil was first noted by Dominik Mandić, who dated it to the 7th century.⁹ It is difficult to agree with Stjepan Gunjača’s assertion that this is not a will. He does not even agree with the historical context in which the ransoming of captives occurred, so he dated the document to the 6th century, as did the scholar who published it, G. Marini.¹⁰ Ivanka Nikolajević, when analysing a large estate in Dalmatia,¹¹ dealt with this topic on several occasions. Out of concern for the salvation of his soul, the testator saw to the illumination of churches, which required immense quantities of oil. The existence of utility buildings next to the basilica at Kapljuč and Manastirine in

of Salona did not signify its death, as a similar process was endured by other ancient cities. Salona had transformed into a late Roman city, squeezed into the confines of its own fortifications. The quality of urban life in ancient city began to decline as of the 3rd century. It truly began to “die,” but this was a complex process of urban and rural transformation which did not play itself out by “dying,” but rather as a broad spectrum of change from the 3rd to 6th centuries, which included the emergence of an entire series of *civitates* in Late Antiquity (Katić 2003, pp. 523-527). The new “arguments” put forth by Rapanić are not accurate, as he incorrectly interpreted another hoard of coins minted by Heraclius as “ritual depositing into a wall,” i.e., the repair of a church in the 7th c., which would have confirmed the story of unimpeded life in the Salonitan ager during the course of that century (see note 84). Rapanić was led to draw the wrong conclusions by a mistaken description of the finds in an article by Hrvoje Gjurašin (Gjurašin 2000, p. 86). Finally, the topic I examine herein demonstrates the expansion of Salona’s defensive zone toward Cetina and further enhancement of fortifications prior to its collapse.

ovdje bavim pokazuje širenje defenzivnog prostora Salone prema Cetini i dodatno fortificiranje utvrda pred njezin pad.

8 Nikolajević 1971, str. 287.

9 Mandić 1963, str. 90.

10 Gunjača 1991a, str. 148-149.

11 Nikolajević 1971.

12 Škegro 2002, str. 24.

13 Nikolajević 1979, str. 167. Salonitanski metropolit se zajedno sa svojim biskupima brinuo o ovim potrebama. Poznat je spor salonitanskog biskupa Januarija (505.-515.) koji je kupio *sexaginta orcas olei*, što nije bila mala količina ulja, od nekog trgovca kojemu je odugovlačio s isplatom. U cijelom sporu posreduje i sam ostrogotski kralj Teodorik nalažući biskupu da trgovcu isplati ulje. Ovaj događaj zrcali stalnu potrebu nabave ulja u crkvama. Vidi Bulić, Bervaldi 1912, str. 45-46; Ivanišević 1994, str. 157-158.

8 Nikolajević 1971, p. 287.

9 Mandić 1963, p. 90.

10 Gunjača 1991a, pp. 148-149.

11 Nikolajević 1971.



Karta rimskih cesta i utvrda u zaleđu Salone
Map of Roman roads and forts in Salona's hinterland

Ostrogota koja je prešla iz Italije u Dalmaciju te se sukobila s romanskom vojskom u blizini Salone.¹⁴ Sljedeća opasnost nastupila je krajem 6. st. Avari i Slaveni su nakon pada Sirmija imali otvoren put prema unutrašnjosti zapadnog Balkana. U gradove na obali pristižu izbjeglice i opasnost je izravna. Te povijesne događaje najbolje zrcali DAI. Iako se radi o izvoru u koji je utkano puno toga legendarnog, zbog čega ga treba s oprezom koristiti, u prostoru nalazimo arheološke tragove koji upućuju na snažnu defenzivnu, bolje reći fortifikacijsku aktivnost o kojoj se govori u 29. glavi DAI. Izvor spominje limes na neimenovanoj rijeci. Vojska koja ga je čuvala prije odlaska se skupljala kod Klisa. Neimenovana rijeka iz 29. glave DAI bila je Cetina, a limes se nalazio na njoj.¹⁵ Ona je neko vrijeme dijelila Romane od Slavena uspješno braneći Salonu. Car Konstantin Porfirogenet piše kako je Salona osvojena nakon što su Slaveni ratnom varkom, prurušeni u romanske odore, s istaknutim romanskim ratnim znakovljem izbili ravno pred salonitanska gradska vrata. Iako se najvjerojatnije radilo o izmišljenoj priči koja je “opravdavala” poraz Romana, činjenica je da su napadači uistinu morali proći pored niza utvrda koje su kontrolirale cestu prema Saloni. One su bile dio toga limesa i ovdje ćemo ih opisati kako su se pružale od Salone prema sjeveru. To su: Klis, Markezina greda (1), Šutanj (2), Grubuša iznad Dicma (Decimin), Gradina iznad Kukuzovca (8), Sinj i Gardun iznad Trilja. Uz njih su se nalazile crkve i naselja, odnosno podgrađa koja su ucrtana na priloženoj karti. Ovdje neću obrađivati kasnoantička naselja i utvrde na cestovnom pravcu prema Andetriju, to će biti tema posebnoga rada.

Klis i Markezina greda (1)

Kao i većina ostalih utvrda koje ćemo ovdje opisati, Klis je počeo egzistirati kao pretpovijesna gradina. Krajem osamdesetih godina prošloga stoljeća arheolog Frane Buškariol iskopao je jednu sondu ispod sjeverozapadne litice Klisa i našao tragove željeznodobnog naselja. Rezultati nisu objavljeni zbog prerane smrti istraživača. Može se pretpostaviti da je i južna, za život povoljnija strana, također bila naseljena. U užem prostornom kontekstu s kliškom gradinom treba promatrati i gradinu na Markezinoj gredi.¹⁶ Uz kozjački hrbat sjeverno od Klisa nalaze se gradine Odža i Koštak. Gradina iznad zaselka Odže najvjerojatnije je bila naseljena u brončano doba, no kao strateško mjesto mogla je biti korištena i u željezno doba. Ona

Salona indicate the growth of the Church’s landowner role in Late Antiquity, as well as the fulfilment of its need for oil and wine.¹² Demand for oil was a major and constant need of priests and bishops.¹³

The churches mentioned in the document also came under the aegis of the forts. They were built along Roman roads, but their links to fortifications and *suburbia* are evident. A fort with a *suburbium* and church was probably an Early Christian *parochia*.

As will be shown below, a hoard of Ostrogothic coins was found in the church at Klapavice. This corresponds to the accounts by Procopius of Caesarea on a large army of Ostrogoths that had crossed from Italy into Dalmatia, and fought with a Romani army near Salona.¹⁴ The next threat emerged at the end of the 6th century. After the fall of Sirmium, the way to the interior of the western Balkans had been opened for the Avars and Slavs. Refugees began arriving in the coastal cities, and the threat became direct. These historical events are best described in *De administrando imperio* (DAI). Even though this is a source into which many legends had been interwoven, so that it must be used with caution, there are physical archaeological traces which point to the intense defensive, or rather fortification, activities mentioned in the chapter 29 of DAI. The source mentions a *limes* on an unnamed river. The army that had guarded it mustered at Klis prior to departure. The unnamed river in chapter 29 of DAI was the Cetina, and it was the *limes*.¹⁵ For a time it separated the Romani people from the Slavs, successfully defending Salona. Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus wrote that Salona was conquered after the Slavs came right to the city gates by wartime subterfuge, disguised in Roman uniforms and prominently brandishing Roman military insignia. Although this was most likely a fabricated story that “excused” the Romani defeat, the attackers indeed had to pass by a series of forts that oversaw the road to Salona. They were a part of that *limes*, and here I shall describe them as they extended northward from Salona. They are: Klis, Markezina greda (1), Šutanj (2), Grubuša

12 Škegro 2002, p. 24.

13 Nikolajević 1979, p. 167. The Salonitan metropolitan and his bishops saw to these needs. A known lawsuit involved the Salonitan Bishop Ianuarius (505-515), who had purchased *sexaginta orcas olei*, not a small quantity of oil, from a merchant whom he delayed paying. The Ostrogothic king, Theodoric himself, mediated in this dispute, ordering the bishop to pay the merchant for the oil. This event reflects the constant need for the procurement of oil in churches. See: Bulić, Bervaldi 1912, pp. 45-46; Ivanišević 1994, pp. 157-158.

14 Barišić 2007, p. 33; Goldstein 1992, pp. 20-21.

15 Novaković 1972, p. 16.

14 Barišić 2007, str. 33; Goldstein 1992, str. 20-21.

15 Novaković 1972, str. 16.

16 Katić 2010, str. 14.



Sl. 1. Pogled na Kliška vrata, Klis i Markezinu gredu
Fig. 1. View of the Klis pass, Klis and Markezina greda

je bila smještena blizu manjega brdskog prolaza čija je kontrola u kriznom vremenu bila važna. Riječ je o gradinama jedne plemenske zajednice, razvučene u dva kilometra zračne linije. Uloga im je bila čuvanje prilaza moru i cjelovita kontrola prostora oko Kliških vrata.

U kasnoj antici, u novim povijesnim okolnostima, vrijedit će ista defenzivna pravila. Strateška uloga Klisa odrazit će se na njegovu pojavu u pisanim povijesnim izvorima. Prvi put se neizravno spominje u djelu *De bellis (Bellum Gothicum)* Prokopija iz Cezareje. Na Klis se odnosi opis zauzimanja klisure (τὴν στενοχωρίαν) u predgrađu Salone, tijekom bizantsko-ostrogotskog rata. Bizantski vojskovođa Konstancijan, krenuvši brodovljem na Salonu, poslao je odabranu četvu od 500 vojnika da ga zauzmu. Tako je spriječio prodiranje Ostrogota iz unutrašnjosti prema Salonu. Zauzimanjem Kliških vrata osigurao je svoju vojsku i uspješno dovršio pomorski desant. Nakon što su Romani zauzeli Klis, sutradan su ušli u Salonu i odmah započeli obnovu gradskih bedema. Sedmoga dana po dolasku bizantske vojske u Salonu Goti napuštaju Dalmaciju i odlaze u Ravenu.¹⁷

Kliška utvrda spominje se i u 29. glavi djela cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogeneta *De administrando imperio*, ovaj put konkretnije, u kontekstu opisa pada Salone. Dio o Klisu glasi: *Naiime blizu mora, za tim (tj. Splitom) je grad, nazvan Salona, koji je velik kao pola Carigrada, gdje su se svi ti Romani skupili i naoružali, i kad su otišli odanle, išli su prema utvrđenom klancu, udaljenom od toga grada 4000 koraka; i taj se dosada naziva Kleisa (Κλεῖσα), jer zatvara one koji odlaze odanle.*¹⁸ Iako se kod Prokopija ne navodi ime Kleisa, to ne znači da se u 6. st. Klis tako ne zove.

above Dimeo (Decimin), Gradina above Kukuzovac (8), Sinj and Gardun, above Trilj. There were churches and settlements, *suburbia*, next to them that have been indicated on the attached map. I shall not cover the settlements and forts along the road to Andetrium in Late Antiquity, as that will be the topic of a separate paper.

Klis and Markezina greda (1)

Like most other forts that will be described herein, Klis began its existence as a prehistoric hillfort. At the end of the 1980s, archaeologist Frane Buškariol excavated a trench beneath the north-western cliffs of Klis and found traces of an Iron Age settlement. The results were not published due to the researcher's untimely death. It may be assumed that the southern side, more conducive for living, was also inhabited. The hillfort on Markezina greda should also be considered in the narrower spatial context with the Klis hillfort.¹⁶ The hillforts of Odža and Koštak are situated north of Klis along the ridge of Kozjak. The hillfort above the hamlet of Odža was most likely inhabited in the Bronze Age, but as a strategic site it may have been used in the Iron Age as well. It was situated near a small pass, control of which was vital in times of crisis. These were the hillforts of a tribal community, 2 km from one another in a straight line. Their role was to safeguard passage to the sea and comprehensively oversee the area around the Klis gate.

In Late Antiquity, under new historical circumstances, the same defensive rules would apply. The strategic role of Klis would be reflected in its appearance in written historical sources. It was first indirectly mentioned in *De bellis (Bellum Gothicum)* by Procopius of Caesarea. The description of the seizure of a narrow pass (τὴν στενοχωρίαν) in the outskirts of Salona during the Gothic War is a reference to Klis. The Byzantine military commander, Constantianus, setting off for Salona with his fleet, deployed 500 soldiers to take it. He thus prevented an incursion of the Ostrogoths from the interior toward Salona. By taking the pass at Klis, he safeguarded his army and successfully completed his naval assault. After the Romani took Klis, on the next day they entered Salona and immediately began to restore the city's fortifications. On the seventh day after the Byzantine army entered Salona, the Gothic army departed from Dalmatia and set off for Ravenna.¹⁷

The Klis fort is mentioned in chapter 29 of the work *De administrando imperio* by Emperor Constantine

17 Barišić 2007, str. 33; Katić 1962, str. 268.

18 Prijevod prema Klaić 1972, str. 4-5; Constantine Porphyrogenitus 1967, str. 122.

16 Katić 2010, p. 14.

17 Barišić 2007, p. 33; Katić 1962, p. 268.

Tada je sa sjeverne strane tvrđave izgrađena cesta. Ona je povećala stratešku važnost Klisa. Nalaz jedne cisterne iz rimskog doba ukazuje na mogućnost da je na kliškom grebenu boravila manja posada rimske vojske.¹⁹ Na žalost, barokne dogradnje utvrde uništile su i prezidale ranije fortifikacije. U vrijeme mira Klis je mogao služiti kao idealno mjesto za kontrolu prometa. Kada je zaprijetila opasnost, moralo se osim ceste kontrolirati brdske prijevoje i prolaze. Oni su od pretpovijesti kontrolirani gradinama smještenim na strateškim točkama. Jednu stratešku defenzivnu cjevinu činili su gradina Klis, Markezina greda i Koštak, što se lijepo vidi na priloženoj zračnoj snimci (sl. 1). U kasnoj antici ponovila se slična situacija, Klis i Markezina greda bili su povezani uskom stazom u kozjačkoj "Gredi" (litici). Litica Kozjaka ispod Markezine grede čini se prestrmom i nesavladivom za pješaka, međutim postoje "skalice", tj. staza kojom se može sigurno popeti od podnožja do vrha litice. Potrebno je oko pola sata hoda da bi se došlo od Megdana – zaravni zapadno od Kliške tvrđave do Markezine grede.²⁰ Na površini utvrđenog dijela Markezine grede nalazi se dosta ulomaka kasnoantičke keramike; Ivan Šuta pretpostavlja, prema analogijama s gradinom na Birnju, da su veći kameni blokovi ugrađeni u suhozidni bedem gradine iz kasnoantičkog razdoblja.²¹ Ono što jasnije pokazuje dodatno utvrđivanje gradine u vrijeme kasne antike je predzid, odnosno proteihizma

VII Porphyrogenitus, this time more specifically, in the context of the description of Salona's fall. The part about Klis reads: "For near the sea, beneath that same city [i.e., Split], lies a city called Salona, which is half as large as Constantinople, and here all the Romani would muster and be equipped and thence start out and come to the frontier pass, which is four miles from this same city, and is called Kleisa [Κλεῖσα] to this day, from its closing in those who pass that way."¹⁸ Even though the name Kleisa is not mentioned by Procopius, this does not mean that Klis was not called that in the 6th century. At that time, a road was built north of the fort, enhancing the strategic importance of Klis. The discovery of a Roman-era cistern points to the possibility that a small contingent of the Roman army was stationed on the Klis ridge.¹⁹ Unfortunately, additional construction in the Baroque era devastated and reconfigured the walls of the earlier fortification. In peacetime, Klis may have served as an ideal point to oversee traffic. When danger loomed, passes had to be controlled in addition to roads. Since prehistory, they had been controlled by hillforts situated at strategic points. One strategic defensive unit was formed by the hillforts of Klis, Markezina greda and Koštak, which may be seen quite well in the attached aerial photograph (Fig. 1). In Late Antiquity a similar situation was repeated, Klis and Markezina greda were linked by the narrow trail on Kozjak's "Greda" (ridge). The Kozjak ridge below Markezina greda seems excessively steep and impassable by pedestrians, although there are "stairs," i.e., a trail that may be used to safely climb from the foot to the peak of the ridge. Roughly a half hour on foot is required to go from Megdan, a plateau west of the Klis fort, to Markezina greda.²⁰ On

19 Alduk 2014, str. 53, sl. 2. Na sjeverozapadnoj padini ispod tvrđave Klis na površini se nalaze ulomci rimske keramike, doduše na istome mjestu gdje se nalazilo i pretpovijesno naselje. Koliko je bilo potrebno u vrijeme *Pax Romana* graditi utvrdu na grebenu, teško je reći. Međutim, činjenica je, kako ističe Ivan Alduk, da nađena cisterna ima sve značajke rimskodobne gradnje.

20 Šuta 2016, str. 23-25. Interpretirajući grafiku Pierrea Mortiera iz 1704. godine koja prikazuje Klis, Ivan Šuta na Markezinu gredu stavlja tursko groblje. Ono se najvjerojatnije nalazilo negdje oko stare željezničke postaje na Klisu, a Mortier je crtao pogled na Klis baš s Markezine grede. Nacrtao je sjenu koju Kozjak baca na svoje jugoistočno podnožje. Na rubu sjene našlo se groblje i onome tko dobro poznaje okoliš Klisa to uistinu djeluje kao Markezina greda, a ne sjena ljetnoga popodneva. Tako se slikar oslobodio prikazivanja nepotrebnih detalja pejzaža, rad mu je bio fokusiran na tvrđavu Klis. Misleći da je sjena zapravo hrbat Kozjaka, a groblje na Markezinoj gredi, Ivan Šuta je povisio perspektivu crteža. Muslimani iz vjerskih razloga imaju običaj formirati groblja blizu naselja, ona su često i dio naselja. Tako se vjernici podsjećaju na smrt i mire s onim što ih sigurno čeka. Zato je manje vjerojatno da su groblje postavili na vrh brda, dalje od naselja.

21 Šuta 2016, str. 24.

18 Croatian translation according to: Klaić 1972, pp. 4-5; Constantine Porphyrogenitus 1967, p. 122.

19 Alduk 2014, p. 53, Fig. 2. Roman potsherds were found on the surface of the north-western slope beneath the Klis fort, albeit at a site where there a prehistoric settlement was located. It is difficult to say how necessary it would have been to build fortifications on the ridge during the *Pax Romana*. However, the fact is, as Ivan Alduk stressed, that the discovered cistern has all of the features of Roman-era construction.

20 Šuta 2016, pp. 23-25. When interpreting the illustration by Pierre Mortier from 1704 which depicts Klis, Ivan Šuta placed a Turkish cemetery on Markezina greda. It was most likely situated somewhere around the old rail station at Klis, and Mortier drew the view of Klis precisely from the vantage point of Markezina greda. He drew the shadow which Kozjak casts on its south-eastern foot. The cemetery is at the edge of the shadow, and to anyone who is familiar with the surroundings of Klis this truly resembles Markezina greda, and not the shadow of a summer afternoon. The artist thus freed



Sl. 2. Gradina na Markezinoj gredi, strelicama označen predzid (proteihizma)

Fig. 2. The hillfort on Markezina greda; the arrows indicate the proteichisma

(προτείχισμα).²² Riječ je o nižem zidu koji se pruža paralelno s glavnim bedemom.

Ova vrsta fortifikacija često se dobro ne zamjećuje u prostoru jer se radi uglavnom o loše sačuvanim suhozidima. Tamo gdje ne prevladava krš ostaci proteihizme mogu se pojaviti kao duguljasta humka ispod koje se tek nazire zid. Na Markezinoj gredi proteihizma je od glavnog bedema udaljena oko 14 m (sl. 2). Uz obnovljene bedeme u megalitnoj tehnici ovaj predzid predstavlja kasnoantičko fortificiranje i prilagođavanje gradine novim povijesnim okolnostima. Isti predzid nalazimo i na Birnju, drugoj kozjačkoj gradini smještenoj iznad Kaštela. Zadnja arheološka istraživanja otkrila su dobro očuvanu kasnoantičku fazu gradine. Njoj pripadaju cisterne za vodu, manje groblje, obnovljeni su bedemi i izgrađena proteihizma ispred gornjeg glavnog pretpovijesnog zida, koji je također popravljan i ojačan u megalitskoj tehnici.²³ Ozbiljni fortifikacijski zahvati na Birnju pokazuju vojni značaj utvrde. Ona je kontrolirala brdski prijevoj, tj. stazu kojom su Kaštela bila povezana sa Zagorom. Važnije kasnoantičko središte bili su Sikuli u Resniku. Markezina greda i Biranj čine jednu posebnu temu koja treba zahvatiti dublje u zaleđe brda Kozjaka. Radi se o sličnim lokalitetima od kojih prvi stoji jasno u odnosu na Salonu, a drugi na Sikuli.

the surface beneath the fortified section of Markezina greda there is a considerable quantity of late Roman potsherds; Ivan Šuta assumed, based on analogies with the hillfort on Biranj, that large stone blocks were installed in the stacked stone rampart of the hillfort from Late Antiquity.²¹ Something that demonstrates the additional fortification of the hillfort in Late Antiquity is the proteichisma (προτείχισμα).²² This is a lower wall that extends parallel to the main rampart.

This type of fortification is often not well-perceived in the landscape because usually it consists of poorly-preserved stacked stone walls. Where karst features do not prevail, the remains of proteichismas may appear as oblong mounds below which a wall may be vaguely discerned. At Markezina greda, the proteichisma is roughly 14 m from the main rampart (Fig. 2). Together with the ramparts restored in the megalith technique, this proteichisma constitutes a fortification of Late Antiquity and an adaptation of the hillfort under new historical circumstances. The same type of proteichisma can also be found at Biranj, the other Kozjak hillfort situated above Kaštela. The most recent archaeological excavation has yielded a well-preserved late Roman phase of the hillfort. Water cisterns and a small cemetery were a part of it, the ramparts were reconstructed and a proteichisma was built in front of the upper main prehistoric rampart, which had also been repaired and reinforced in the megalithic technique.²³ Serious fortification works at Biranj demonstrate the fort's military significance. It oversaw the hill pass, i.e., the trail that linked Kaštela to the Dalmatian hinterland region, Zagora. A major hub in Late Antiquity was Siculi in Resnik. Markezina greda and Biranj constitute a separate theme which should go farther into the hinterland of Kozjak. These are similar sites, of which the first stands clearly in relation to Salona and the second to Siculi.

himself from the portrayal of needless landscape details, as his work was focused on the Klis fort. Thinking that the shadow was actually the ridge of Kozjak and the cemetery on Markezina greda, Ivan Šuta raised the drawing's perspective. For religious reasons, Muslims have the custom of forming cemeteries close to settlements, and they are often even parts of settlements. Believers are thus reminded of death and make peace with their certain fate. This is why it is less likely that they had placed a cemetery at the peak of a hill, farther away from their settlement.

22 Ravegnani 1983, str. 41-43.

23 Šuta 2013, str. 96.

21 Šuta 2016, p. 24.

22 Ravegnani 1983, pp. 41-43.

23 Šuta 2013, p. 96.



Sl. 3. Ranokršćanska crkva u Klapavicama
Fig. 3. The Early Christian church in Klapavice

Šutanj s podgrađem (2), Klapavice (3) i Bubrigovac (4)

Ova tri lokaliteta čine prostornu cjelinu, posebno Šutanj i ranokršćanska crkva u Klapavicama (sl. 3) koje su paralelno egzistirale. Na Bubrigovac stižemo kročeći rimskom cestom tri kilometra od Klisa prema sjeveru. Tu se u manjim vrtačama naziru zatrpani bunari. Pod plitkim duguljastim humkama vide se konture zidova. Zbog smještaja na samoj cesti može se pretpostaviti da se na Bubrigovcu nalazila putna postaja (sl. 4). Lokalitet nije istraživani pa je teško o njemu nešto više reći. Prostorno je također vezan s utvrdom na Šutnju, no izražajnija je njegova naslonjenost na cestu. Pravo podgrađe, odnosno naselje utvrde smješteno je sjeveroistočno od Šutnja, o čemu ću kasnije.

Zapadno od Bubrigovca između lokalne ceste koja vodi od Grla prema Dugopolju i brze ceste Klis – Dugopolje nalazi se ranokršćanska crkva u Klapavicama. Nju je započeo istraživati don Frane Bulić,²⁴ a u cijelosti je istražena 2006.-2007. godine.²⁵ Tijekom zadnjih istraživanja nađena je ostava novca zakopana u narteksu crkve. Od 17 komada novca bilo je 14 zlatnih tremisa i 3 srebrne četvrtsilikve. Novac se većim dijelom može pripisati kovnicama ostrogotskih vladara. Uz jedan vjerojatno Odoakarov kov nađene su i četvrtsilikve ostrogotskog vladara Atalarika kovane u Justinijanovo ime. One su *terminus post quem* za dataciju ostave.²⁶ Crkvine – Klapavice su tijekom 5.-6. st., zatim u 9.-10. i u 16. st. korištene kao groblje.²⁷

Šutanj with suburbium (2), Klapavice (3) and Bubrigovac (4)

These three locales form a spatial unit, particularly Šutanj and the Early Christian church in Klapavice (Fig. 3), which existed simultaneously. Bubrigovac is reached by walking down the Roman road 3 km northward from Klis. Buried wells may be discerned here in smaller sinkholes. The contours of walls can be seen under shallow longish hummocks. Due to its location right next to the road, it may be assumed that there was a way-station at Bubrigovac (Fig. 4). The site has not been excavated, so it is difficult to say anything more about it. Spatially it is also linked to the fort on Šutanj, but its dependence on the road is even more marked. The actual *suburbium*, i.e., the settlement, was situated north-east of Šutanj, about which more will be said later.

The Early Christian church in Klapavice is situated west of Bubrigovac between the local road from Grlo to Dugopolje and the Klis – Dugopolje expressway. Fr. Frane Bulić initiated excavations there,²⁴ and it was entirely excavated in 2006-2007.²⁵ During the most recent excavations, a coin hoard was found buried in the narthex of the church. Out of the 17 coins, there were 14 gold tremisses and 3 silver quarter-siliquae. The coins can largely be attributed to the mints of the Ostrogothic rulers. Besides one likely issue of Odoacer, quarter-siliquae of the Ostrogothic ruler Athalaric minted in Justinian's name were also found. They are the *terminus post quem* for dating the hoard.²⁶ Crkvine-Klapavice was used as a cemetery during the 5th-6th centuries and then in the 9th-10th and 16th centuries.²⁷

The archaeological find of Ostrogothic coins in the narthex of the church in Klapavice and the arrangement of the fortifications in the immediate hinterland of Salona correspond to the writings of Procopius of Caesarea on the withdrawal of the 'Germani' from Salona into the "nearby fortifications" during the Gothic War. Šutanj was one of the forts in Salona's vicinity held by the Ostrogoths. Under wartime circumstances, it would not have been unusual had the 'Germani', having withdrawn from Salona and being left without their places of worship, made use of a church near their fort for their own religious services. But Hrvoje Gračanin and Jana Škrkulja used precisely this hoard as an example when examining the problem of ethnic identities in southern Pannonia and Dalmatia during

24 Bulić 1907.

25 Gjurašin 2006, str. 99-103; Gjurašin 2007, str. 406-407.

26 Šeparović 2009, str. 28-29.

27 Jurčević 2007, str. 257.

24 Bulić 1907.

25 Gjurašin 2006, pp. 99-103; Gjurašin 2007, pp. 406-407.

26 Šeparović 2009, pp. 28-29.

27 Jurčević 2007, p. 257.



Sl. 4. Lokalitet Bubrigovac s trasom rimske ceste
Fig. 4. Bubrigovac site with a section of the Roman road

Arheološki nalaz ostrogotskog novca u narteksu crkve u Klapavicama i raspored utvrda u neposrednom zaleđu Salone podudaraju se s pisanjem Prokopija iz Cezareje o povlačenju Germana iz Salone u okolne utvrde u vrijeme bizantsko-ostrogotskog rata. Šutanj je bio jedna od utvrda iz salonitanske okoline koju su držali Ostrogoti. U ratnim okolnostima ne bi bilo čudno da su Germani, sklonivši se iz Salone i ostavši bez bogomolja, iskoristili za bogoslužje crkvu koja se nalazila u blizini njihove utvrde. No upravo primjer ove ostave Hrvoje Gračanin i Jana Škrgulja uzimaju pri razmatranju problematike etničkih identiteta u južnoj Panoniji i Dalmaciji u Justinijanovo vrijeme, pozivajući na oprez pri etničkom određivanju depozitora ostave iz Klapavica.²⁸ Naime, ne može se reći da je baš neki Ostrogot zakopao novac u narteks crkve jer se germanskim novcem koristilo i romansko stanovništvo. S druge strane, pojavilo se mišljenje kako se ranokršćanska crkva u Klapavicama mogla pripisati istočnogotskim graditeljima.²⁹ Mirno razdoblje istočnogotske vladavine od gotovo pola stoljeća potaknulo je izgradnju sakralnih objekata,³⁰ te je stoga ova tema sve više u fokusu istraživača. Mislim ipak da prostorni i povijesni kontekst ostave novca omogućuju da je vežemo uz bizantsko-ostrogotski rat, pa i da odredimo germansko podrijetlo depozitora ostave bez pretjeranog metodološkog formalizma oko “etničko identitetske skupine” kojim se ograđuju Gračanin i Škrgulja.

Justinian's era, calling for caution when specifying the ethnic identity of the depositor of the hoard from Klapavice.²⁸ Namely, it cannot be asserted that some Ostrogoth buried the money in the narthex of the church, because Germanic coins were also used by the Romani population. On the other hand, according to another view, the Early Christian church in Klapavice may be ascribed to Ostrogothic builders.²⁹ The peaceful, almost half-century period of Ostrogothic rule was conducive to the construction of sacral structures,³⁰ so this topic has increasingly come into the focus of researchers. I believe, however, that the spatial and historical context of the coin hoard allow us to associate it with the Gothic War, and even to specify the Germanic origin of the hoard's depositor without any of the excessive methodological formalism on an “ethnic identity group” warily used by Gračanin and Škrgulja.

The church in Klapavice was used by the population of the Šutanj fort and its *suburbium*, secluded from the Roman road.

It was situated on the north-eastern side of the fort. Only the bare vestiges of a dwelling, livestock pens and buried wells can be discerned on the spacious plateau, while the remains of iron slag can be found on the surface. This is obviously a large rural complex; any wider examination thereof is impeded by the dense undergrowth of hornbeam and downy oak that covers Mosor. A wide stacked-stone wall on the north-eastern slope of Šutanj forms a powerful spatial link between the fort on the heights and its *suburbium*. It was made of large stone blocks, and extends like a lateral rampart alongside the mountain trail from the proteichisma to the fort's rampart. Its most likely role was to protect residents when they withdrew from the settlement into the fort. The wall should have led to an entrance which I have not managed to locate with any certainty during my inspections of Šutanj. This settlement shows that forts did not stand independently. Similar circumstances can be found at Decimin, i.e., the Grubuša hillfort above Dicmo.

Šutanj was originally a hillfort erected at the peak of a hill. Fr. Frane Bulić designated it as the location of the Delmataean Setovia.³¹ Damir Kliškić excavated and recorded the site, and during his excavations a coin from the Salona mint was found there.³² The Šutanj hillfort was a strategic point from which the Roman road and access to Klis could be monitored. It also

28 Gračanin, Škrgulja 2016, str. 28-29.

29 Peković, Babić 2016, str. 156-171, bilj. 80.

30 Basler 1972, str. 65.

28 Gračanin, Škrgulja 2016, pp. 28-29.

29 Peković, Babić 2016, pp. 156-171, note 80.

30 Basler 1972, p. 65.

31 Bulić 1907a. The hillfort was excavated about ten years ago by Damir Kliškić.

32 Šeparović 2009, p. 32.

Crkvu u Klapavicama koristilo je stanovništvo utvrde Šutanj i njezinog podgrađa zaklonjenog od trase rimske ceste.

Nalazilo se sa sjeveroistočne strane utvrde. Na prostranom platou tek se naziru tragovi nastambi, torova za stoku, zatrpanih bunara, na površini se mogu naći ostateci željezne troske. Očito je riječ o većem ruralnom sklopu; njegovo šire sagledavanje otežava gusta šikara crnoga graba i hrasta medunca koja prekriva Mosor. Snažnu prostornu poveznicu između utvrde na uzvisini i njezinog podgrađa čini širok suhozid na sjeveroistočnoj padini Šutnja. Izrađen je od većih kamenih blokova te se poput bokobrana pružao uz brdsku stazu od podgrađa prema bedemu utvrde. Najvjerojatnije mu je uloga bila zaštita stanovnika naselja prilikom povlačenja iz naselja u utvrdu. Zid bi morao voditi prema ulazu koji nisam uspio sa sigurnošću locirati tijekom mojih obilazaka Šutnja. Ovo naselje pokazuje da utvrde nisu stajale samostalno. Slične okolnosti nalazimo kod Decimina, odnosno gradine Grubuša iznad Dicma.

Šutanj je izvorno bio gradina podignuta na vrhu uzvisine. Na nju je don Frane Bulić ubicirao delmatsku Setoviju.³¹ Damir Kliškić je istraživao i snimio lokalitet te je tijekom njegovih istraživanja nađen novac salonitanske kovnice.³² Gradina Šutanj bila je strateška točka s koje se kontrolirala rimska cesta, odnosno pristup Klisu. Nadzirala je i drugi cestovni pravac koji se preko Kočinjega brda odvajao prema Andetriju.

Pretpovijesni bedemi gradine pratili su konfiguraciju terena. Istočna padina Šutnja je strmija, tu bedem mjestimice prati istaknuti kameni kuk. Manje su strme južna i zapadna strana, dok je sa sjevera pristup bio najlakši. Na sjeveru je osipina pretpovijesnog bedema veća, na hrbatu se vide tragovi kasnoantičkog zida građenog u vapnenom mortu. On je na jugoistočnoj strani bio širine 2 metra. Na južnom potezu bedema podignut je suhozid sačuvan do visine od 1,5 m. U vanjsko su mu lice uzidani veći kameni blokovi; moguće je da su i oni iz kasnoantičkog vremena. Sa sjeverne strane izgrađen je predzid, tj. proteihizma (sl. 5). Ona je postavljena kojih 6-7 m niže od bedema, a udaljena je od njega 8 do 13 m, ovisno o konfiguraciji terena. Između bedema i proteihizme je plato širine 5 metara. Proteihizma je bila napravljena u suhozidu, širine 1,5-1,7 m. Na krajnjoj jugoistočnoj strani podignuta je iza jedne prirodne škrape, što je povećalo njezinu defenzivnu učinkovitost. Napadač je morao preskakati škrapu, a onda svladati predzid, što ga je usporavalo i izlagalo projektilima branitelja. Škrapa

oversaw the road that led to Andetrium via Kočinje Brdo.

The prehistoric ramparts adhered to the configuration of the terrain. The eastern slope of Šutanj is steeper, and here the rampart follows a prominent stone crest at places. The southern and western slopes are less steep, while the approach from the north was the easiest. In the north, the ruins of the prehistoric rampart are larger, and traces of the late Roman wall built with limestone mortar can be seen on the ridge. It was 2 m wide on the south-eastern side. A stacked stone wall, preserved to a height of 1.5 m, was raised on its southern span. Large stone blocks were built into its external face; it is possible that these date to Late Antiquity. A proteichisma was built on its northern side (Fig. 5). It was built roughly 6-7 m lower than the ramparts, and 8 to 13 m from it, depending on the ground configuration. A 5-meter wide plateau lies between the rampart and proteichisma. The proteichisma was made in the stacked stone technique, with a width of 1.5-1.7 m. It was erected on the south-eastern side behind a natural crevice, which enhanced its defensive effectiveness. Any attackers had to leap over the crevice, and then surmount the proteichisma, which would slow them down and expose them to projectiles launched by the defenders. The crevice served in lieu of a ditch, something often dug out on the soil in front of proteichismas.³³ If the enemies overcame the proteichisma, they had to deal with 4-5 meter-high slope and the rampart atop it. The northern slope of Šutanj thus became the side of the fort that was most difficult to negotiate.

I have already stressed that Šutanj was held by the Ostrogoths during the Gothic War. In his study on the province of Liburnia, Julijan Medini highlighted the Gothic settlements in the Dalmatian interior. They certainly influenced the Byzantine military campaigns in Dalmatia, restricting them exclusively to naval operations, which was apparent in the naval assault on Salona staged by Constantianus described above.³⁴ When seizing Salona, the Byzantine military incursion into the mainland never went farther than Klis. Ostrogothic rule in Dalmatia was largely dependent on military force. They attempted to entrench their rule by preserving the old social organization; Theodoric wanted to leave the impression that he loved the Romani as much as his own Goths. In mixed disputes between Romani and Goths, a Gothic consul always adjudicated together with a Romani counterpart.³⁵ But the Romani could not bear arms nor be soldiers.³⁶ The army

31 Bulić 1907a. Gradinu je prije desetak godina istraživao Damir Kliškić.

32 Šeparović 2009, str. 32.

33 Milinković 2015, pp. 71-72.

34 Medini 1980, pp. 421-422, note 189.

35 Uglešić 1992, pp. 67-68.

36 Šišić, 1990, pp. 168-169.



Sl. 5. Gradina Šutanj s označenom proteihizmom na sjevernoj strani
Fig. 5. The Šutanj hillfort with proteichisma indicated on the northern side

je zamijenila rov koji se često na zemljanim terenima kopao ispred proteihizme.³³ Ako bi neprijatelj svladao predzid čekala ga je 4-5 m visoka strmina i na njoj bedem. Sjeverna padina Šutnja tako je postala teže osvojiva strana utvrde.

Već sam naglasio da se Šutanj tijekom bizantsko-ostrogotskog rata nalazio u rukama Ostrogota. Julijan Medini u svojoj je studiji o provinciji Liburniji upozorio na gotska naselja u unutrašnjosti Dalmacije. Ona su zasigurno utjecala na vojne akcije Bizanta u Dalmaciji, ograničivši ih isključivo na pomorske operacije, što je vidljivo kod spomenutog Konstancijanovog pomorskog desanta na Salonu.³⁴ Bizantski vojni prodor u kopno prilikom zauzimanja Salone nije odmaknuo dalje od Klisa. Ostrogotska vladavina Dalmacijom snažno se oslanjala na vojnu silu. Svoju vlast su nastojali utvrditi čuvanjem stare društvene organizacije; Teodorik je htio ostaviti dojam kako

was held firmly in the hands of the Germanic *comes*. The forts of Late Antiquity were certainly part of the Ostrogothic military strategy for maintaining their rule in the mainland interior. At the onset of the 6th century, they attempted to renew the exploitation of Pannonian-Dalmatian mines, and later the early Byzantine emperors would attempt to do the same.³⁷ Mines for various ores from the territory of today's Bosnia-Herzegovina had strategic importance due to the need for military arms.

Šutanj compensated for the lower elevation of Klis, whence the remaining fortifications in the hinterland could not be seen. Besides Klis, it had outstanding visual communication with the Grubuša hillfort (Decimin) and the fort above Kukuzovac, which controlled access from the Sinj plain (Sinjsko polje). During the Middle Ages and the Early Modern era, it did not have the vital role that it did in Late Antiquity. The stacked stone wall that intersects the peak of Šutanj in

33 Milinković 2015, str. 71-72.

34 Medini 1980, str. 421-422, bilj. 189.

37 Škegro 1999, pp. 127-128.

jednako voli Romane kao i svoje Gote. U mješovitim sporovima između Romana i Gota uz gotskog je namjesnika sudio i romanski namjesnik.³⁵ No Romani nisu smjeli nositi oružje niti biti vojnici.³⁶ Vojska je čvrsto bila u rukama germanskog *comesa*. Kasnoantičke utvrde zasigurno su bile dio ostrogotske vojne strategije održavanja vlasti u kopnenoj unutrašnjosti. Oni su početkom 6. st. pokušali obnoviti eksploataciju panonsko-dalmatinskih rudnika, isto će kasnije nastojati i ranobizantski carevi.³⁷ Rudnici raznih metala s prostora današnje Bosne i Hercegovine imali su strateško značenje zbog naoružavanja vojske. Prisutnost željezne troske na utvdama i podgrađima govori o aktivnosti kovačkih radionica.

Šutanj je kompenzirao nižu razinu Klisa s kojeg se nisu mogle vidjeti ostale utvrde u zaleđu. Osim s Klisom imao je odličnu vizualnu komunikaciju s gradinom Grubuša (Decimin) i utvrdom iznad Kukuzovca koja je kontrolirala pristup iz Sinjskog polja. Tijekom srednjega i novoga vijeka nije imao tako važnu ulogu kao u kasnoj antici. Suhozid koji siječe vrh Šutnja u smjeru istok–zapad mogao bi biti međa spomenuta godine 1283. u jednom kupoprodajnom ugovoru gdje se spominje da granica kupljene zemlje ide po sredini brijega koji se zove *Sutan*.³⁸ Očito da je u 13. st. brdo bilo nenaseljeno; da se tada na Šutnju nalazilo naselje ili utvrda, bili bi spomenuti u dokumentu, a i malo je vjerojatno da bi utvrda bila presječena suhozidom.

Decimin – gradina Grubuša, Banjače (5), Pupavica (6) i kasnoantički sklop u Vučipolju (7)

Riječ je o još jednoj skupini prostorno povezanih arheoloških nalazišta u čijem je središtu gradina Grubuša. Ona se nalazi na 615 metara nadmorske visine. Brdo na kojem se nalazi dijeli dva manja krška polja: Dicmo na sjeveru i Dugopolje s Koprivnom na jugu (sl. 6). Preko krške zaravni Podi u Dugopolju prolazila je rimska cesta. Grubuša kontrolira sjecište dvaju rimskih putova, jedan je vodio prema sjeveroistoku, odnosno Tiluriju i mostu na rijeci Cetini (*Pons Tiluri*), a drugi prema Osiniju – Sinju.³⁹ I danas se to područje naziva Križice. Početkom devedesetih godina na Grubuši sam ubicirao kasnoantički *Decimin*.⁴⁰

On se prvi put spominje u djelu *Cosmographia* Anonima Ravenjanina, napisanom krajem 6. st. ili

the east-west direction may have been the boundary mentioned in a purchase contract in 1283, in which it is stated that the boundary of the purchased land runs over the middle of a hill called *Sutan*.³⁸ It is obvious that the hill was uninhabited in the 13th century; if there had been a settlement or any fortifications on Šutanj at the time, they would have been mentioned in the document, and it is highly unlikely that a fort would have been intersected by a stone wall.

Decimin – Grubuša hillfort, Banjače (5), Pupavica (6) and the Late Antique complex in Vučipolje (7)

This is a group of spatially linked archaeological sites with the Grubuša hillfort in their centre. It lies at an elevation of 615 m ASL. The hill on which it is situated separates two small karst depressions (polje): Dicmo in the north and Dugopolje with Koprivno in the south (Fig. 6). A Roman road traversed the karst plateau Podi in Dugopolje. Grubuša overlooked the intersection of two Roman roads, one leading to the north-east, i.e., Tilurium and the bridge over the River Cetina (*Pons Tiluri*), and the other to Osinium (Sinj).³⁹ Even today this area is called Križice (from the Croatian *križ*: cross). At the beginning of the 1990s, I determined that Grubuša was the location of Decimin from Late Antiquity.⁴⁰

It was first mentioned in the work *Cosmographia* written by an anonymous cleric of Ravenna at the end of the 6th or in the 7th century.⁴¹ The name of today's Dicmo is derived from Decimin, a settlement which should have been located at the tenth mile from Salona (*ad decimum miliarium*). Therefore, Decimin's location should be at the present-day hamlet of Butige, where there are no archaeological traces that would indicate the existence of any manner of way station or a similar facility. In Vučipolje, on the ninth mile of the Roman road, there is an agglomeration of archaeological sites, but they are more oriented toward Dugopolje and a hillock divides them from Dicmo. When considering the stratum of toponyms that appeared for the first time in the *Cosmographia* by the anonymous Ravennese cleric, Julijan Medini correctly concluded that this was a toponym from Late Antiquity.⁴² Decimin belongs to the group of settlements that did not appear in earlier itineraries, rather they first appeared in written sources in Late Antiquity. In his toponomastic research, Stjepan Gunjača placed Decimin in the

35 Uglešić 1992, str. 67-68.

36 Šišić 1990, str. 168-169.

37 Škegro 1999, str. 127-128.

38 Kužić 2001, str. 153.

39 Bojanovski 1974, str. 14.

40 Katić 1992.

38 Kužić, 2001, p. 153.

39 Bojanovski 1974, p. 14.

40 Katić 1992.

41 Ravennatis Anonymi 1860, p. 210.

42 Medini 1978, p. 71.



Sl. 6. Grubuša – Decimin
Fig. 6. Grubuša – Decimin

u 7. st.⁴¹ Današnje Dicmo dobilo je ime po Deciminu, naselju koje se trebalo nalaziti na desetoj milji od Salone (*ad decimum milliarium*). Prema tome, Decimin bi se trebao nalaziti u zaseoku Butige, gdje nema arheoloških tragova koji bi upućivali na postojanje nekakve putne postaje ili sličnog lokaliteta. U Vučipolju, na devetoj milji rimske ceste nalazi se grozd arheoloških nalazišta, ali ona su više okrenuta prema Dugopolju i od Dicma ih odvaja uzvisina. Razmatrajući sloj toponima koji se prvi put javljaju u *Kozmografiji* Anonima iz Ravene, Julijan Medini ispravno je zaključio da se radi o kasnoantičkim toponima.⁴² Decimin pripada toj skupini naselja kojih nema u ranijim rimskim itinerarima, nego se prvi put javljaju u kasnoantičkom pisanom izvoru. U svojim toponomastičkim istraživanjima Stjepan Gunjača Decimin smješta u skupinu preživjelih antičkih toponima koji ukazuju na prisutnost starosjedilačkoga stanovništva nakon provale Avara i Slavena.⁴³ Istu temu proširio je Nikola Jakšić. Proučavajući toponime između rijeke Zrmanje i Cetine, primijetio je kako su sačuvana imena Dicma, Sinja, Trilja, Klisa, Bribira, Skradina, Knina itd., redom mjesta veće strateške važnosti koja su u kasnoj antici pružala sigurnost svojim stanovnicima. S druge strane, nisu se sačuvala imena važnijih antičkih središta.⁴⁴ Ne znajući tada za kasnoantičku utvrdu na Grubuši, Jakšić je jedino dvojio oko Decimina. Ubikacijom Decimina na Grubuši razriješana je i ta praznina.

group of surviving Roman-era toponyms that indicated the continued presence of the indigenous population after the Avar and Slav incursions.⁴³ Nikola Jakšić expanded on this same topic. Examining the toponyms between the Rivers Zrmanja and Cetina, he noticed that the names Dicmo, Sinj, Trilj, Klis, Bribir, Skradin, Knin, etc., all places with considerable strategic importance that provided security to their residents in Late Antiquity, had been preserved. On the other hand, the names of the major hubs of Antiquity had not been preserved.⁴⁴ Without knowing about the Late Antique fort at Grubuša at the time, Jakšić only had doubts about Decimin. The location of Decimin at Grubuša has also resolved this uncertainty.

The location of Decimin in Grubuša has been rejected by Ante Milošević. He placed it in Sičane, farther north of Dicmo, in the fence of M. Jokić, where an undoubtedly important Roman-era site is located, with remains visible on the surface.⁴⁵ According to Milošević, the finds of monumental architectural sculpture and Roman coins, as well as an altar to the goddess Diana, are evidence for the location of Decimin in Sičane. Herein he neglected what is written in the historical sources, and he also only read my text superficially, because he incorrectly wrote Mala Grubuša as the location I had determined for Decimin. Mala Grubuša, which is roughly 800 m in a straight line north-west of Grubuša, was also mentioned in my work, but I did not specify it as the location of Decimin, as Milošević read it, but rather in Grubuša.⁴⁶ Milošević did not even mention the latter in his own work on local topography. There is a Roman site in Sičane, and probably also some manner of shrine, which could hardly have existed in the 5th-6th centuries, when Christianity had already become predominant. If we know that Decimin acquired its name because it was at the tenth mile, then it is difficult to place it in Sičane, on the thirteenth mile from Salona. It is indicative that the path which led to the Grubuša fort branches from the Roman road at exactly the tenth mile.

As I have already stressed, Decimin was a settlement dating to Late Antiquity. Medini and Jakšić arrived at this conclusion without knowledge of the local topography. The find of a tomb from Late Antiquity in

41 Ravennatis Anonymi 1860, str. 210.

42 Medini 1978, str. 71.

43 Gunjača 1991a, str. 152-154.

44 Jakšić 1991, str. 428. N. Jakšić slijedi rad Stjepana Gunjače u kojem raspravlja o preživjelim toponimima u Dalmaciji: Gunjača 1991a, str. 147-154.

43 Gunjača 1991a, pp. 152-154.

44 Jakšić 1991, p. 428. N. Jakšić followed the work of Stjepan Gunjača, in which he discussed the surviving toponyms in Dalmatia: Gunjača 1991a, pp. 147-154.

45 Milošević 1998, pp. 227-229.

46 A. Milošević reiterated his stances on the location of Decimin in his dissertation in 2005, once more speaking of Mala Grubuša, repeating the same mistake. See: Milošević 2005, p. 52, note 139.



Sl. 7. Gradina iznad Kukuzovca
Fig. 7. Hillfort above Kukuzovac

Ubikaciju Decimina na Grubuši negira Ante Milošević. On ga stavlja u Sičane, sjevernije od Dicma, u ogradu M. Jokića, gdje se nedvojbeno nalazi važan antički lokalitet čiji se ostatci uočavaju na površini.⁴⁵ Prema Miloševiću nalazi monumentalne arhitektonske plastike i rimskog novca te žrtvenik božice Dijane dokazi su za ubiciranje Decimina u Sičane. Pri tome zanemaruje na što upućuju pisani povijesni izvori, također je i moj tekst površno pročitao, jer netočno piše o Maloj Grubuši kao mjestu gdje sam ubicirao Decimin. Malu Grubušu, koja se nalazi kojih 800 m zračne linije sjeverozapadno od Grubuše, u svom radu također spominjem, ali Decimin ne ubiciram na nju, kako je Milošević shvatio, nego na Grubušu.⁴⁶ Nju Milošević uopće ne spominje u svojoj *Topografiji*. U Sičanima se nalazi rimski lokalitet, vjerojatno

Vučipolje on the south-eastern side of Grubuša⁴⁷ and the find of another tomb in that same site in 2005, and then the cistern from Late Antiquity (7), excavated approximately 100 m west of the tomb, as well as the residential architecture on the Pupavica heights (6)⁴⁸ and the rural complex at the Banjače site in Vučipolje,⁴⁹ show that there was a rural community below the eastern slope of Grubuša in Late Antiquity. This may be compared to the *suburbium* at Šutanj. The settlement in Vučipolje was dispersive. Banjače and Pupavica were most likely communities of livestock herders. The cemetery and the remains of a complex with a cistern in Vučipolje should be considered within the same spatial context. Because of the toponym Crkvine and the tombs from Late Antiquity, researchers have justifiably assumed that this was the site of an Early Christian church.⁵⁰ The settlement developed at a

45 Milošević 1998, str. 227-229.

46 A. Milošević ponavlja stavove o ubicaciji Decimina u svojoj disertaciji 2005. godine, ponovno raspravljajući o Maloj Grubuši, ponavljajući istu pogrešku. Vidi Milošević 2005, str. 52, bilj. 139.

47 Cambi 1993; Cambi 2001.

48 Borzić, Jadrić 2007.

49 Durman *et al.* 2006.

50 Borzić, Jadrić 2007, pp. 162-163.



Sl. 8. Ostatci sjevernog bedema Gradine iznad Kukuzovca s ulazom

Fig. 8. Remains of the northern rampart of the Hillfort above Kukuzovac with its entrance

i nekakvo svetište koje teško da je egzistiralo u 5.-6. st., kada je kršćanstvo već dominiralo. Ako znamo da je Decimin dobio ime po tome što se nalazio na desetoj milji, onda ga je teško smjestiti u Sičane, jer su oni na trinaestoj milji od Salone. Indikativno je da se staza koja je vodila na utvrdu Grubuša, odvaja od rimske ceste upravo oko desete milje.

Kako sam istaknuo, Decimin je bio kasnoantičko naselje. Medini i Jakšić došli su do tog zaključka bez poznavanja lokalne topografije. Nalaz kasnoantičke grobnice u Vučipolju s jugoistočne strane Grubuše⁴⁷ te nalaz druge grobnice na istom lokalitetu 2005. godine, zatim kasnoantička cisterna (7) iskopana stotinjak metara zapadnije od grobnica, kao i stambena arhitektura na uzvisini Pupavica (6)⁴⁸ i ruralni sklop na lokalitetu Banjače u Vučipolju⁴⁹ pokazuju da je ispod istočne padine Grubuše postojalo kasnoantičko ruralno naselje. Ono se može usporediti s podgrađem kod Šutnja. Na Vučipolju se nalazilo naselje disperzivnog tipa. Banjače i Pupavica bili su najvjerojatnije stočarska naselja. Groblje i ostatke kompleksa sa cisternom u Vučipolju valja također promatrati u istom prostornom kontekstu. Zbog toponima Crkvine i kasnoantičkih grobnica istraživači nalazišta opravdano pretpostavljaju da se tu nalazila ranokršćanska crkva.⁵⁰ Naselje se razvilo na raskrižju cesta; u Vučipolje su se slijevali putnici iz pravca Sinja i oni iz pravca Trilja.

U podnožju Grubuše zatječemo istu situaciju kao i kod Šutnja: kasnoantičku utvrdu na najdominantnijoj koti, ruralno naselje u podnožju i ranokršćansku

crossroads; travellers coming from Sinj and also from Trilj poured into Vučipolje.

The situation found at the foot of Grubuša is identical to that in Šutanj: a fort from Late Antiquity at the most prominent elevated point, a rural settlement at its foot and an Early Christian church. Travellers coming from the direction of Tilverium and from the direction of Osinium passed under this fort. This is why it was a very significant point in Salona's defence system, as the wider area in which the two branches of a Roman road extended could be overseen from it: one led to the north-east, and the other to the north and north-west. For now, I can see no other more suitable place to locate Decimin than Grubuša, where I had determined its location in the 1990s.

Besides forts which had their own settlements in lower-lying areas, there were also those that had an exclusively strategic significance. One such was Gradina hillfort above Kukuzovac.

Gradina hillfort above Kukuzovac (8)

It had already been known by Fr. Stjepan Zlatović, who designated it as the location of medieval *Breč*.⁵¹ Breč, or Brečevo, was more firmly located by Stjepan Gunjača near the hamlet of Bračevići in Muć,⁵² so that this fortification should not be sought on Visoka hill above Kukuzovac. The fortification that is actually there is different from the others mentioned herein. It had an irregular quadrilateral shape, with proteichismas on all four sides (Fig. 7). It remains quite visible to this day. It is situated on the eastern slope of Visoka, at an elevation of 652 m ASL. The southern wall of the fort was erected on the highest ridge. Its length is 58 m, and from it the fort projects northward on a gentle karst slope. The northern span of the ramparts is 63 m long, and traces of a 2 m wide entrance can be seen on its western half (Fig. 8). The western span of the ramparts is 46 m long, while the eastern rampart is approximately 49 m long. The fortress covers a surface area of 3,080 m².

The stacked stone rampart had a width of approximately 1.5-1.6 m, composed of uncut or semi-dressed stone blocks. The proteichisma irregularly extended nearer or farther from the rampart depending on the configuration of the terrain. On the eastern side, it was 12 m from the rampart, on the southern side 16 m, on the western side approximately 14 m, and closer on the northern side, only about 8 m. At places the original width of the proteichisma of 1 to 1.2 m can be measured. On the north-western side it was made of

47 Cambi 1993; Cambi 2001.

48 Borzić, Jadrić 2007.

49 Durman *et al.* 2006.

50 Borzić, Jadrić 2007, str. 162-163.

51 Zlatović 1897, p. 11.

52 Gunjača 1991, p. 95.



Sl. 9. Tvrđava Sinj
Fig. 9. Sinj fortress

crkvu. Pod ovu utvrdu stizali su putnici iz pravca Tilurija i iz pravca Osinija. Zato je ona bila vrlo značajna točka u defenzivnom sustavu Salone, s nje se nadzirao širi prostor na kojem su se odvajala dva kraka rimske ceste: jedan je vodio na sjeveroistok, a drugi na sjever, odnosno sjeverozapad. Za sada ne vidim primjerenijeg mjesta za ubikaciju Decimina nego na Grubuši, gdje sam ga i ubicirao devedesetih godina.

Osim utvrda koje su imala svoja naselja u nizini, postojale su i one isključivo strateškog značenja. Jedna takva je Gradina iznad Kukuzovca.

Gradina iznad Kukuzovca (8)

Bila je poznata još fra Stjepanu Zlatoviću, koji je na nju ubicirao srednjovjekovni *Breč*.⁵¹ Breč, tj. Brečvo sigurnije je locirao Stjepan Gunjača kod zaselka Bračevići u Muću,⁵² stoga ovu utvrdu ne treba tražiti na brdu Visoka iznad Kukuzovca. Ondje se nalazi utvrda različita od drugih koje ovdje spominjem. Bila je nepravilnog četvrtastog oblika, s proteihizmom sa sve četiri strane (sl. 7). Njezini ostatci i danas su dobro vidljivi. Smještena je na istočnoj padini brda Visoka, na 692 m nadmorske visine. Južni zid utvrde podignut je na najvišem hrptu uzvisine. Dužine je 58 m, od nje je utvrda nagnuta prema sjeveru na blagoj krškoj padini. Sjeverni potez bedema dužine je 63 m, na njegovoj zapadnoj polovici vidi se trag ulaza širok oko 2 m (sl. 8). Zapadni potez bedema dužine je 46 m, dok je istočni dužine oko 49 m. Utvrda je imala površinu oko 3080 m².

Suhozidni bedem izvorno je bio širine oko 1,5-1,6 m, zidan od neobrađenih i poluobrađenih kamenih blokova. Predzid (proteihizma) nepravilno se pružao

a mound of loosely-piled large stones. Viewed in general, the fort was not suitable for living; its openness to the north meant that it was exposed to strong gusts from bora winds. The hillfort loomed over the small Kukuzovac plain, which was traversed by the Salona-Decimin – Osinium road. It afforded control over the entire Sinj plain, with a direct view of the Sinj fortress, situated to the north-west, and approximately 3.5 km by air from Gradina. It has a good view of Grubuša (Decimin) to the south, and of Markezina greda and Gardun (Tilurium) to the east. It had strategic importance because it controlled access from the north-west, from the direction of Sinj.

Sinj – Osinium

The Sinj fortress (Fig. 9) was also one of the Delmataean hillforts. Its name was revealed by an inscription from the Roman era dedicated to the genius of the settlement *Osini...*, so based on the ethnonym *Osiniates* the settlement name Osinium may be derived.⁵³ The cemetery found at Ruduša belonged to the indigenous population which had continued to live there in the Roman era. B. Gabričević dated it to the first half of the 1st century.⁵⁴ During the Roman era, the settlement was situated in the lowlands, while during times of unrest in Late Antiquity a fortification was raised which ensured a secure existence for the local population. In Marini's aforementioned document, *Asinio* is also mentioned among the *castellae* in Salona's hinterland.

Archaeological finds such as a helmet similar to the Narona-Baldenheim type⁵⁵ and an *S*-fibula found on the southern slope of the rise prove that the fortress was a stronghold during Late Antiquity.⁵⁶ At the beginning of the 20th century, an Early Christian church was found at the Općinska lokva site. It had belonged to Osinium; its remains were published by Fr. Frane Bulić.⁵⁷ Jasna Jeličić-Radonić believes that it is not a church, because finds of Early Christian sculpture are lacking, while the architecture itself does not indicate a sacral building.⁵⁸ Ante Milošević believes that it was a secular building in the 4th century that was transformed into a sacral building in some later phase, as indicated

53 Jadrijević 1940, pp. 157-159.

54 Gabričević 1983, pp. 66-77.

55 Vinski 1982, p. 28.

56 Librenjak, Čerina 2005, p. 273, note 7; the authors believe that the *propugnaculum* in front of the main western entrance and the ramparts reinforced by small towers indicate the fortification of the Sinj fortress in Late Antiquity.

57 Bulić 1904.

58 Jeličić 1984, p. 172.

51 Zlatović 1897, str. 11.

52 Gunjača 1991, str. 95.

bliže ili dalje od bedema ovisno o konfiguraciji terena. S istočne strane bio je udaljen 12 m od bedema, s južne 16 m, sa zapadne oko 14 m, dok je sa sjeverne bio smješten bliže, tek na oko 8 m. Mjestimice se može izmjeriti izvorna širina proteihizme od 1 m do 1,2 m. Sa sjeverozapadne strane bila je izrađena od gomile nabačenoga krupnijeg kamena. Općenito gledajući, utvrda nije bila pogodna za život; zbog otvorenosti prema sjeveru bila je izložena jakim udarima bure. Gradina je dominirala nad malim poljem Kuku-zovac preko kojeg je prelazila cesta Salona – Decimin – Osinium. Kontrolirala je veći dio Sinjskog polja, s izravnom vizualnom komunikacijom sa sinjskom tvrđavom, smještenom sjeverozapadno, udaljenom oko 3,5 km zračne linije od Gradine. Prema jugu je imala dobar vizualni kontakt s Grubušom (*Decimin*) i Markezinom gredom, a prema istoku s Gardunom (*Tilurium*). Imala je stratešku važnost jer je kontrolirala prilaz sa sjeverozapada iz pravca Sinja.

Sinj – Osinium

Tvrđava Sinj (sl. 9) također je bila jedna od delmatskih gradina. Ime joj je otkrio natpis iz rimskoga doba posvećen geniju naselja *Osini...*, pa se od etnika *Osiniates* moglo izvesti ime naselja *Osinium*.⁵³ Groblje pronađeno na Ruduši pripadalo je autohtonom stanovništvu koje je nastavilo živjeti u rimsko doba. B. Gabričević ga datira u prvu polovicu 1. st.⁵⁴ U rimsko doba naselje se nalazilo u nizini, dok je u nemirno doba kasne antike podignuta utvrda koja je omogućila sigurnu egzistenciju lokalnog stanovništva. U spomenutom Marinijevu dokumentu među kaštelima (*castella*) u zaleđu Salone spominje se i *Asinio*.

Arheološki nalazi poput kacige srodne tipu *Narona-Baldenhaim*⁵⁵ i *S*-fibule nađene na južnoj padini uzvisine dokaz su da je tvrđava Sinj bila kasnoantičko uporište.⁵⁶ Početkom 20. st. na lokalitetu Općinska lokva nađena je ranokršćanska crkva. Pripadala je Osiniju, njezine ostatke objavio je don Frane Bulić.⁵⁷ Jasna Jeličić Radonić smatra da se ne radi o crkvi, jer su izostali nalazi ranokršćanske plastike, a i sama arhitektura ne upućuje na sakralni objekt.⁵⁸ Ante Milošević smatra da je profana zgrada 4. st. u nekoj kasnijoj fazi pretvorena u sakralni objekt, na što upućuje

by the altar in the apse. He also assumed that another Early Christian church may have been at the Kula site, south of the Sinj fortress. The *Chiesa Vecchia* position was registered here in a cadastral map from 1710. If this is not the Church of St. Mary from the 14th century, it may be some Early Christian church.⁵⁹ In any case, the existence of one or more Early Christian churches should be assumed around the Sinj fortress. There was a Roman-era settlement in Sinj, which Marin Zaninović believes was either a *vicus* or *pagus* with the local Delmataean population under the military administration of the Romans.⁶⁰ It was on the road which led to the Roman colony of Aequum (Čitluk) and continued via Kamešnica to the territory of Castra (Banja Luka) and farther to Servitium. As in the previous cases, in Late Antiquity a fort was formed at the site of the Sinj fortress, and there was an Early Christian church at its foot. Osinium with Gradina above Kuku-zovac formed a single strategic unit. The latter was set on the eastern slope of Visoka hill in order to have a better visual link with the Sinj fortress. It was at a higher elevation than Osinium, so hostile activity in the Sinj plain could be observed from it earlier.

Trilj – Tilurium

Tilurium was located on the right bank of the Cetina River, on an elevated plateau in the village of Gardun. Until the 1930s, when Stjepan Gunjača finally pinpointed the location, there was considerable debate on the narrower location of this camp.⁶¹ In the 1960s, Marin Zaninović ascertained that the Delmataean hillfort was above the Stražbenica heights, at the Church of St. Peter.⁶² The *Pons Tiluri* was located below the camp on the Cetina River, sixteen Roman miles from Salona, as recorded in the *Itinerarium Antonini* (337.5). A settlement developed next to the bridge, which was visited by travellers on the Salona – Argentaria road, as well as those travelling on the main southern Salona – Narona route.⁶³ This intersection of two major overland routes necessitated constant supervision, particularly in Late Antiquity. The urban development of the Roman camp was unclear after the army departed from it in the 3rd century. The archaeological research at Gardun that is being conducted by the Archaeology Department of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Science in Zagreb has primarily uncovered the remains

53 Jadrijević 1940, str. 157-159.

54 Gabričević 1983, str. 66-77.

55 Vinski 1982, str. 28.

56 Librenjak, Čerina 2005, str. 273, bilj. 7; autorice smatraju da *propugnaculum* ispred glavnog zapadnog ulaza i bedemi dodatno ojačani manjim kulama upućuju na kasnoantičko fortificiranje sinjske tvrđave.

57 Bulić 1904.

58 Jeličić 1984, str. 172.

59 Milošević 2017, pp. 89-91.

60 Zaninović 2011, p. 506.

61 Gunjača 1937.

62 Zaninović 1967, p. 16; Zaninović 1996, p. 280.

63 Zaninović 1996, pp. 286-287.



Sl. 10. Pogled na Stražbenicu i rijeku Cetinu (foto: Z. Alajbeg)

Fig. 10. View of Stražbenica and the Cetina River (photo: Z. Alajbeg)

oltar u apsidi. On također pretpostavlja da se druga ranokršćanska crkva mogla nalaziti na lokalitetu Kula, južno od sinjske tvrđave. Tu je na katastarskoj mapi iz godine 1710. zabilježen položaj *Chiesa Vecchia*. Ako se ne radi o crkvi sv. Marije iz 14. st., moglo bi se raditi o nekoj ranokršćanskoj crkvi.⁵⁹ U svakom slučaju, oko sinjske tvrđave treba pretpostaviti postojanje jedne ili više ranokršćanskih crkava. U Sinju je postojalo antičko naselje za koje Marin Zaninović smatra da je bilo *vicus* ili *pagus* s lokalnim delmatskim stanovništvom pod vojnom upravom Rimljana.⁶⁰ Bio je na cesti koja je vodila prema rimskoj koloniji *Aequum* (Čitluk) i dalje preko Kamešnice izbijala na područje *Castra* (Banja Luka) i dalje na *Servitium*. Kao i u prethodnim slučajevima u kasnoj antici se na mjestu sinjske tvrđave formirala kasnoantička utvrda, a u njezinom podnožju bila je ranokršćanska crkva. Osinij je s Gradinom iznad Kukuzovca činio stratešku cjelinu. Potonja je postavljena na istočnu padinu brda Visoka da bi što bolje vizualno komunicirala s utvrdom Sinj. Nalazila se na većoj nadmorskoj visini od Osinija, pa je ranije mogla zamijetiti neprijateljsku aktivnost na Sinjskom polju.

Trilj – *Tilurium*

Tilurij se nalazio na desnoj obali rijeke Cetine, na uzvišenoj visoravni u selu Gardunu. Do tridesetih godina dvadesetog stoljeća, kada ga je Stjepan Gunjača konačno ubicirao, trajala je rasprava o užoj lokaciji logora.⁶¹ Marin Zaninović šezdesetih je godina

of the Roman military camp. A simply-made tomb⁶⁴ and finds of coins and glass⁶⁵ have been dated to Late Antiquity. Unfortunately, besides the descriptive analysis of archaeological materials, there has been no discussion as to what these finds mean, whether they can be linked to any architecture and, if possible, which kind. Since the excavations at Gardun are still ongoing, more specific answers to the questions that necessarily arise will certainly be forthcoming.

Certain topographic indicators point to the possibility that besides a hillfort, there was also a fort at the aforementioned Stražbenica in Late Antiquity (Fig. 10). Enduring a Slav incursion in Late Antiquity, *Tilurium* had to have been spatially reduced in relation to the old Roman military camp. The ideal position can be found precisely in the vicinity of the Church of St. Peter, immediately above the River Cetina. During the recent expansion of the graveyard east of the church, the foundations for the fence wall were excavated. In this excavated soil, I found fragments of Late Antique cylindrical amphorae with yellow-white glaze and several pieces of iron slag. Such amphorae were found in the town of Hvar and they were in use there until the 7th century.⁶⁶ There were also small fragments of coarse black cooking pots made of clay abundantly mixed with limestone. The ruins of a rampart from a prehistoric building have been preserved, visible on the eastern, north-eastern and northern side. On the southern side, along the edge of a plateau on which construction of a new cemetery has been planned, traces of washed away limestone mortar are visible; the larger pieces of mortar indicate that they were made of sand and soil mixed with limestone. Here archaeological excavations could show whether these were the remains of a rampart, i.e., whether the *castellum Tilurium* of Late Antiquity was on Stražbenica above the River Cetina.

Conclusion

The described fortifications show that there was a defensive system in the Salonitan hinterland during Late Antiquity which functioned “in depth.” It defended the local rural population living around the fortifications, and it was part of the historical fabric of the Salonitan montane hinterland whose defensive

59 Milošević 2017, str. 89-91.

60 Zaninović 2011, str. 506.

61 Gunjača 1937.

64 Sanader 2003, p. 79, sl. 74.

65 Šeparović 2003, p. 193. He believed that out of the five examples of coins from Late Antiquity, some belong to the 5th century; Buljević 2003, Pl. 10. 6-11. She dated the pieces of these glass vessels broadly, from the 4th to 8th centuries.

66 Katić 2000, p. 40, Pl. X. 1.

utvrdio da se delmatska gradina nalazila na uzvisini Stražbenica, kod crkve sv. Petra.⁶² Ispod logora, na rijeci Cetini nalazio se *Pons Tiluri* na šesnaest rimskih milja od Salone, kako bilježi *Itinerarium Antonini* (337.5). Uz most se razvilo naselje u koje su stizali putnici sa ceste Salona – Argentaria, te oni koji su putovali južnim magistralnim pravcem Salona – Naronna.⁶³ Ovo sjecište dvaju važnih kopnenih pravaca zahtijevalo je stalan nadzor, posebno u kasnoj antici. Nije jasan urbani razvoj rimskog logora nakon što ga je napustila vojska u 3. st. Arheološka istraživanja na Gardunu koja provodi Odsjek za arheologiju Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu otkrila su uglavnom ostatke rimskoga vojnog logora. Kasnoantičkom razdoblju pripada jedan jednostavno izrađen grob⁶⁴ te nalazi novca i stakla.⁶⁵ Na žalost, osim deskriptivne obrade arheološkog materijala nije bilo nikakve rasprave što bi navedeni nalazi značili, mogu li se vezati uz nekakvu arhitekturu i, ako mogu, uz kakvu. Kako istraživanja na Gardunu još traju, zasigurno će biti konkretnijih odgovora na pitanja koja se nameću.

Neki topografski pokazatelji upućuju da se na spomenutoj Stražbenici, osim gradine, nalazila i kasnoantička utvrda (sl. 10). Kasnoantički Tilurij koji je dočekao provalu Slavena morao je biti prostorno reduciran u odnosu na stari rimski logor. Idealan položaj nalazimo upravo u okolici crkve sv. Petra, neposredno iznad rijeke Cetine. Prilikom nedavnog širenja groblja istočno od crkve iskopani su temelji za ogradni zid. U iskopanoj zemlji našao sam ulomke kasnoantičkih amfora cilindričnog oblika sa žućkastobijelim premazima i nekoliko komada željezne troske. Ovakve amfore nađene su u gradu Hvaru i ondje su bile u upotrebi do 7. st.⁶⁶ Bilo je i manjih ulomaka grubih crnih lonaca za kuhanje izrađenih od gline bogato miješane s usitnjenim vapnencem. Na Stražbenici je ostala sačuvana sipina bedema pret-povijesne gradine, dobro vidljiva na istočnoj, sjeveroistočnoj i sjevernoj strani. S južne strane po rubu zaravni na kojoj se planira gradnja novoga groblja vide se tragovi ispranog vapnenog morta; veći ulomci morta pokazuju da se izrađivao od pijeska i zemlje pomiješane s vapnom. Ovdje bi arheološka istraživanja mogla pokazati radi li se o ostacima bedema,

features were activated at times of crisis from prehistory to the Middle Ages.

Here I have only initiated a topic which should be better elaborated through archaeological excavations, although the spatial picture of the fortifications, churches and settlements corresponds to the written historical sources, whether the description of the Gothic War in the vicinity of Salona by Procopius, the aforementioned codicil or DAI by Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. It is precisely the latter source from the 10th century which best reflects the events that led to the Salonitan defensive system. Unfortunately, this first-class historical source has been relegated to a “mythological” level in recent decades. New methodological approaches, with their theoretical constants and persistent negation of written sources, dominate practice. “Methodological reality” is imposed, which is blossoming in its theoretical autonomy to the verge of opacity. As much as I respect the effort put into attempts to open new historical horizons with theoretical interpretations and approaches, in practice I have felt the need to back away from the offered paradigms to which I have often referred within the framework of this topic by inappropriately resorting to footnotes. It is, after all, difficult to place them in the text.

As I have stressed, throughout history the Salonitan hinterland functioned similarly all along the natural communication route that led from the mouth of the River Jadro, through the Klis pass toward the Sinj plain. Seven forts situated over a 35 km distance from Salona toward the interior constitute an unusually dense arrangement (see map). In the other overland direction, from Salona to Andetrium, there was only one fort from Late Antiquity, at the hamlet of Bračevići. Such a statistical ratio demonstrates the importance of controlling the area from Klis toward Cetina and the efforts to maintain complete control over it: hillforts in prehistory or forts in Late Antiquity.

During the Gothic War, the forts in the hinterland were used by the Ostrogoths to mount a land-based blockade of Salona. At that time, the need arose to organize a deeper defence that would defend the city and safeguard the immediately adjacent rural area. It was inseparable from Salona’s urban space, because it was relevantly present in all of the existential and developmental constants of the Roman-era city. This is why a *limes* was formed on the River Cetina, the first natural barrier traversed by the roads from Salona farther into the interior. In the chapter 29 of DAI, only the *limes* on the river is mentioned, without any mention of its name, while in chapter 30 the *limes* on the Danube is mentioned. The unsustainability of the *limes* on the Danube was convincingly shown by R. Novaković,

62 Zaninović 1967, str. 16; Zaninović 1996, str. 280.

63 Zaninović 1996, str. 286-287.

64 Sanader 2003, str. 79, sl. 74.

65 Šeparović 2003, str. 193. On smatra da od pet primjjeraka kasnoantičkog novca neki pripadaju 5. st.; Buljević 2003, T. 10. 6-11. Ulomke navedenih staklenih posuda datira široko, od 4. do 8. st.

66 Katić 2000, str. 40, T. X. 1.

odnosno je li kasnoantički *castellum Tilurium* bio na Stražbenici iznad rijeke Cetine.

Zaključak

Opisane utvrde pokazuju da se u kasnoj antici u salonitanskom zaleđu nalazio obrambeni sustav koji je funkcionirao "po dubini". On je čuvao lokalno ruralno stanovništvo naseljeno oko utvrda, a dio je povijesnog toposa salonitanskog brdskog zaleđa čije su se defanzivne pojavnosti aktivirale u kriznim vremenima od pretpovijesti do srednjega vijeka.

Ovdje sam tek načeo temu koju će trebati bolje obrađivati kroz arheološka istraživanja, no prostorna slika utvrda, crkava i naselja podudara se s pisanim povijesnim izvorima, bilo da je riječ o Prokopijevu opisu bizantsko-ostrogotskog rata oko Salone, spomenutom kodicilu ili djelu DAI cara Konstantina Porfirogeneta. Upravo nam potonji izvor iz 10. st. najbolje zrcali događaje koji su iznjedrili salonitanski defanzivni sustav. Nažalost, ovaj se prvorazredni povijesni izvor zadnjih desetljeća degradira na "mitološku" razinu. Novi metodološki pristupi svojim teoretskim zadatostima i ustrajnim negacijama pisanih izvora dominiraju nad praksom. Nameće se "metodološka realnost" koja buja u svojoj teoretskoj autonomiji do granica nepreglednosti. Koliko god respektiram trud oko nastojanja da se teoretskim interpretacijama i pristupima otvore novi povijesni horizonti, toliko mi se u praksi nametnula potreba otklona od ponuđenih paradigmi na koje sam se, u okviru ove teme, često osvrtao neprimjereno bježeći u prostor bilježaka. Teško ih je, naime, smjestiti u tekst.

Kako sam istaknuo, salonitansko zaleđe kroz povijest funkcionira na sličan način duž prirodne komunikacije koja je vodila od ušća rijeke Jadro, preko Kliških vrata prema Sinjskom polju. Sedam utvrda razmještenih na oko 35 km udaljenosti od Salone prema unutrašnjosti predstavljaju neuobičajeno gust raspored (vidi kartu). Na drugom cestovnom pravcu, od Salone prema Andetriju, nalazila se samo jedna kasnoantička utvrda, kod zaseoka Bračevići. Takav statistički odnos pokazuje važnost kontrole prostora od Klisa prema Cetini i nastojanje da ga se u cijelosti nadzire – gradinama u pretpovijesti ili utverdama u kasnoj antici.

U vrijeme bizantsko-ostrogotskog rata utvrde u zaleđu poslužile su Germanima za kopnenu blokadu Salone. Tada se jasno pokazala potreba organiziranja dublje obrane, koja bi sačuvala grad i štitila njegov neposredni ruralni prostor. On je neodvojiv od salonitanskog urbaniteta jer je relevantno prisutan u svim egzistencijalnim i razvojnim datostima antičkog grada. Zato je formiran limes na rijeci Cetini, prvoj prirodnoj prepreci preko koje su vodili putovi

moving it to the nearby River Cetina.⁶⁷ This was also accepted by N. Jakšić,⁶⁸ while A. Milošević provided a specific proposal for its forward extent. In Milošević's view, it consisted of two rows of Late Antique fortifications to the left and right sides of the River Cetina.⁶⁹ The crisis and intense changes that beset the inland interior during Late Antiquity prompted the construction of forts, so it is certainly necessary to more clearly examine their positions, morphology and broader spatial context. I am not viewing the forts considered herein as the *limes* on the Cetina, but rather as part of the *Salonitan defensive system* which could be part of this *limes*. It is essential to become familiar with the morphology of this system. We shall return to their conformity with written historical sources subsequently.

The described forts can be generally divided into four types: the first consists of those with settlements at their foot, clearly situated in relation to the Roman road. These are: Klis, Šutanj, and Decimin (Grubuša); the second type has a longer continuity and developed from an older Roman settlement (Osinium) or a Roman military camp (Tilurium). The third type has no direct contact with Roman roads, such as Markezina greda on Kozjak. It underwent similar development to the aforementioned hillfort on Biranj. Both controlled the mountain passes of Kozjak and dominated the karst areas suited for pasturing. Markezina greda complemented Klis, additionally fortifying the Klis pass, while Biranj safeguarded the pass at Grebine, which connected Zagora with the Siculi of Late Antiquity. Gradina above Kukuzovac belonged to the fourth type. It was not permanently settled and had a notably strategic significance.

Settlements at the foot of the forts certainly existed at Šutanj and Grubuša. A similar relationship between forts and the settlements at their foot existed at certain Early Byzantine *castra*. Such settlements were focal points for artisanal production. I have noted the archaeological traces of a blacksmith's workshop at the foot of Šutanj, and there is iron slag at Grubuša as well. The settlement at the foot of the Corinthia *castrum* on the island of Krk probably had a glass workshop.⁷⁰ Smithies were essential to the functioning of rural settlements, and to the maintenance and production of weapons in forts, particularly during wartime.

A direct threat of attack required additional reinforcement of ramparts. *Proteichismas* can clearly be

67 Novaković 1972, p. 16.

68 Jakšić 1991, p. 436.

69 Milošević 2007, pp. 107-112; he also dealt more extensively with the problems surrounding the Cetina *limes* in: Milošević 2017, pp. 88, 99-104.

70 Šiljeg 2008, p. 86.

od Salone dalje u unutrašnjost. U 29. glavi DAI spominje se samo limes na rijeci, bez navođenja njezina imena, dok se u 30. glavi spominje limes na Dunavu. Neodrživost limesa na Dunavu uvjerljivo je dokazao još R. Novaković, premještajući ga na obližnju rijeku Cetinu.⁶⁷ To je prihvatio i N. Jakšić,⁶⁸ dok je A. Milošević dao konkretan prijedlog njegovog frontalnog pružanja. Kako Milošević smatra, činila su ga dva niza kasnoantičkih utvrda s lijeve i desne strane rijeke Cetine.⁶⁹ Kriza i snažne promjene koje su zahvatile kopnenu unutrašnjost tijekom kasne antike potaknule su izgradnju utvrda pa je svakako potrebno jasnije ispitati njihov smještaj, morfologiju i širi prostorni kontekst. Utrvrde koje ovdje obrađujem ne promatram kao limes na Cetini, nego kao dio *salonitanskog defenzivnog sustava* koji je mogao biti dio tog limesa. Neophodno je upoznati se s osnovnom morfologijom ovog sustava. Kasnije ćemo se vratiti na podudarnosti s pisanim povijesnim izvorima.

Opisane utvrde možemo okvirno podijeliti u četiri vrste: prvoj pripadaju one s naseljima u podnožju, jasno postavljene u odnosu na rimsku cestu. To su: Klis, Šutanj, Decimin (Grubuša); druga vrsta ima duži kontinuitet i razvila se iz staroga rimskog naselja (*Osinium*) ili rimskog logora (*Tilurium*). Treće nemaju izravan kontakt s rimskim cestama, poput Markezine grede na Kozjaku. Ona je imala sličan razvoj kao spomenuta gradina na Birnju. Obje su nadzirale brdske prijevoje Kozjaka i dominirale iznad krških prostora pogodnih za ispašu. Markezina greda nadopunjavala je Klis, dodatno utvrđujući Kliški prolaz, dok je Biranj čuvao prijevoj na Grebinama koji je spajao Zagoru s kasnoantičkim Sikulijem. Četvrtoj vrsti utvrda pripada Gradina iznad Kukuzovca. Ona nije bila stalno naseljena i imala je izrazito strateški značaj.

Naselja u podnožju utvrda sigurno su postojala kod Šutnja i Grubuše. Sličan odnos utvrda – naselje u podnožju postoji kod nekih ranobizantskih utvrda. Takva su naselja bila žarišta zanatske proizvodnje. Spomenuli smo arheološke tragove kovačnica u podnožju Šutnja, željezne troske ima i na Grubuši. Naselje u podnožju utvrde Korintija na otoku Krku vjerojatno je imalo staklarsku radionicu.⁷⁰ Kovačke radionice bile su neophodne za funkcioniranje ruralnih naselja, ali i za održavanje i izradu oružja u utverdama, osobito tijekom rata.

seen at Markezina greda, Šutanj and Gradina above Kukuzovac. It is possible that the hillfort at Grubuša, i.e., Decimin, had one as well, but this will have to be verified by archaeological excavations. Such proteichismas can be found only at hillforts that had been used in Late Antiquity, which clearly indicates the time in which they emerged. Biranj on Kozjak above Kaštela and Kulina in Nisko had proteichismas. The possibility that they will appear at other hillforts cannot be excluded, but for now I have observed them in a significant number only in the area that gravitates toward Salona.⁷¹ These are generally stacked stone walls raised at distances of 5 to 16 m in front of the main ramparts, depending on the defensive characteristics of the terrain. It should be stressed that these are not classic proteichismas that often had a ditch dug out in front of the wall. These are proteichismas adapted to the karst area and morphology of old hillforts reused in Late Antiquity. Their more precise dating to the Early Byzantine era is enabled by analogies with the *castra* at Žirje, Vrgada, and Svetojanje; proteichismas have also been discovered in Asseria, and Slavko Ciglonečki considers them typical Early Byzantine defensive elements.⁷² The proteichisma in Asseria was also made simply and in haste. Numerous spolia from the Liburnian cippi, thresholds, lintels, moulded stone beams, pieces of columns, fragments of altars and other gravestones, etc. were built into it. It was bonded with only a small quantity of limestone mortar, obviously over a brief period as some researchers have stressed.⁷³ The Gradina hillfort in Biograda near Mostar also had a proteichisma.⁷⁴ Their application was broader, but their number in the Salona hinterland is significant. The *limes* mentioned in DAI reflects the intense militarization that can be discerned in the appearance of Early Byzantine proteichismas at forts. They were also erected in haste; on the northern side of Gradina above Kukuzovac, only large stone blocks were piled. The aforementioned stacked stone lateral rampart at the Šutanj hillfort also belonged to Late Antiquity. Its role was to safeguard the population when

67 Novaković 1972, str. 16.

68 Jakšić 1991, str. 436.

69 Milošević 2007, str. 107-112; isti se autor opširnije pozabavio problematikom cetinskog limesa u: Milošević 2017, str. 88, 99-104.

70 Šiljeg 2008, str. 86.

71 A hillfort catalogue for the territory of Kaštela's Zagora hinterland was made with high quality aerial photographs by Tonko Bartulović and texts by Ivan Šuta (see: Šuta, Bartulović 2007). The catalogue makes possible an overview of the hillforts of Kaštela's Zagora; the stacked stone proteichismas can best be observed in the aerial photographs. Biranj and Kulina in Nisko have confirmed the conclusions at which I arrived by touring the hillforts of the Salonitan hinterland.

72 Ciglonečki 2009, p. 215; Fadić, Štefanac 2014, pp. 114-115.

73 Fadić, Štefanac 2014, p. 88.

74 Čremošnik 1989, pp. 90-91.

Izravna opasnost od napada zahtijevala je dodatna ojačavanja bedema. Kod Markezine grede, Šutnja i Gradine iznad Kukuzovca jasno se uočavaju predzidi, odnosno proteihizme. Moguće da ih je imala i gradina na Grubuši, tj. Decimin, što će trebati provjeriti arheološkim iskopavanjima. Ovakve predzide nalazimo samo kod gradina koje su korištene u kasnoj antici, što jasno pokazuje u kojem su vremenu nastale. Proteihizme imaju Biranj na Kozjaku iznad Kaštela i Kulina u Niskom. Nije isključeno da će se pojaviti i na drugim gradinama, ali za sada sam ih u znatnijem broju uočio samo na području koje gravitira Saloni.⁷¹ Riječ je uglavnom o suhozidima koji se podižu ispred glavnog bedema na udaljenosti od 5 do 16 m, ovisno o defenzivnim značajkama terena. Treba naglasiti da se ovdje ne radi o klasičnim proteihizmama koje su često ispred zida imale iskopan jarak. Radi se o predzidima prilagođenim krškom prostoru i morfologiji starih gradina ponovno korištenih u kasnoj antici. Njihovu precizniju dataciju u ranobizantsko doba omogućuju analogije s utverdama na Žirju, Vrgadi, Svetojanju; proteihizme su otkrivene i u Aseriji, a Slavko Ciglenečki ih smatra karakterističnim ranobizantskim obrambenim elementom.⁷² Proteihizma u Aseriji je također rađena jednostavno i u žurbi. U nju su uzidani i brojni spoliji od liburnskih cipusa, pragovala, nadvratnika, kamenih profiliranih greda, ulomaka stupova, ulomaka ara i drugih nadgrobnih spomenika. Zidana je tek s malo primjesa vapna, očito u kraćem vremenskom razdoblju, kako ističu istraživači.⁷³ Proteihizmu je imala i Gradina u Biogracima kod Mostara.⁷⁴ Njihova je primjena bila šira, no ipak im je brojnost u salonitanskom zaleđu znakovita. Limes koji se spominje u DAI reflektira snažnu militarizaciju koju u prostoru uočavamo u pojavi ranobizantskih proteihizmi na utverdama. One su podizane također nabrzinu; na sjevernoj strani Gradine iznad Kukuzovca nabacani su samo veći kameni blokovi. Spomenuti suhozidni bokobran na gradini Šutanj također pripada kasnoantičkom razdoblju. Njegova je uloga bila da zaštiti stanovništvo pri povlačenju iz podgrađa u utvrdu. Kao da su računali na to da će se morati povlačiti u zadnji

retreating from the *suburbium* into the fort. It was as though they had counted on the fact that they would have to withdraw at the last moment, i.e., that the enemy was near so the very approach to the fort had to be partly fortified. Preference for simple stacked stone architecture in the Salonitan hinterland was not just a result of the poverty and lagging development of the rural population, rather it also reflected an adaptation to the constant threat of enemy attacks. Stacked stone dwellings were easily erected and just as easily demolished, wherein the property damage was not extensive. Such a picture of this area clearly points to the times of crisis which ensued after the fall of Syrmium in 582. The way to the south was opened to the Avars and Slavs, so Theophylact Simocatta wrote about the incursion of Khagan Bayan into Dalmatia in 597. Bayan seized the fortified town of Bonka (Vonka) and demolished another forty forts with the help of siege engines. Bonka was probably Baloie, which was south-west of Banja Luka, on the Roman road from Salona to Servitio.⁷⁵ If he had set off on this road while he was taking down these forty forts, he very easily could have arrived at the foot of the Dinaric Alps. In any case, by the end of the 6th century, the Avars and Slavs were in contact with the people of Salona. This is indicated by a letter from Pope Gregory I ('the Great'; 590-604) to the Salona metropolitan Maximus in the summer of the year 600: "I am very saddened and concerned by the Slavs, who have perilously threatened you; I am sad because I share your sorrow, I am concerned because (the Slavs) have already begun to penetrate through Istria into Italy."⁷⁶ At that time, the lintel on the entrance to the basilica in Manastirine, where the bones of St. Domnio rested, already bore the inscription: *Deus noster, propitius es(to) Rei publicae romanae*.⁷⁷ A similar invocation for God's help can be

71 Za područje Kaštelanske zagore napravljen je katalog gradina s kvalitetnim zračnim snimkama Tonka Bartulovića i tekstem Ivana Šute (vidi: Šuta, Bartulović 2007). Na zračnim snimkama najbolje uočavamo suhozidne predzide, katalog omogućuje pregled gradina Kaštelanske zagore. Biranj i Kulina u Niskom potvrdile su moje zaključke do kojih sam došao obilazeći gradine salonitanskog zaleđa.

72 Ciglenečki 2009, str. 215; Fadić, Štefanac 2014, str. 114-115.

73 Fadić, Štefanac 2014, str. 88.

74 Čremošnik 1989, str. 90-91.

75 Barišić, Marković 2007, p. 121.

76 Šišić 1990, p. 226.

77 Duval *et al.* 2000, pp. 306-307, Fig. 130. If this inscription on the lintel of the church in Manastirine is examined more closely, it appears as though originally there were three deeply engraved Early Christian crosses, and that the inscription was added later. Namely, the final word *Romanae* is stretched to fill in the remaining part, the entire inscription is clustered in the upper portion, and it can be noted in the lower line that the carver had encountered a problem with the spacing between the letters. If it had been a single project, i.e., the simultaneous engraving of the inscription and the crosses, it certainly would have appeared more harmonious and uniform. Despite the quality of the rendering of the letters, the carver could not avoid the of subsequently fitting the text between the three crosses. When analysing the epigraphic monuments of Salona, Jean-Pierre Caillet and Emilio Marin dated the inscription to the 5th c.,

čas, odnosno da je neprijatelj blizu pa treba djelomice fortificirati i sam pristup utvrdi. Preferiranje jednostavne suhozidne arhitekture u salonitanskom zaleđu nije uzrokovano samo siromaštvom i zaostalošću ruralnog stanovništva nego se radilo o prilagođavanju stalnoj prijetnji neprijateljskoga napada. Suhozidne nastambe su se lako podizale i lako rušile, pri čemu nije bilo veće materijalne štete. Ovakva slika prostora jasno upućuje na krizno vrijeme koje je nastupilo nakon pada Sirmija 582. godine. Avarima i Slavenima otvorio se put prema jugu pa Teofilakt Simokata piše o prodoru kagana Bajana godine 597. u Dalmaciju. Bajan je osvojio grad Bonke (Vonke) i srušio drugih četrdeset utvrda pomoću opsadnih sprava. Grad Bonke je najvjerojatnije Baloie, koji se nalazio jugozapadno od Banje Luke, na rimskoj cesti Salona – Servitio.⁷⁵ Ako je krenuo niz navedenu cestu, dok je naredao tih četrdeset utvrda, vrlo lako je mogao izbiti pred Dinaru. U svakom slučaju, Avari i Slaveni su krajem 6. st. bili u kontaktu sa Salonitancima. Na to upućuje pismo pape Grgura I. Velikog (590.-604.) salonitanskom metropolitu Maksimu u ljeto 600. godine: *Zbog Slavena, koji vam opasno zaprijetiše, veoma sam žalostan i zabrinut; žalostan sam jer dijelim vašu tugu, zabrinut sam, jer su (Slaveni) već počeli prodirati kroz Istru u Italiju.*⁷⁶ U to vrijeme na nadvratniku ulaza u baziliku na Manastirinama, gdje su ležale kosti sv. Dujma, već stoji natpis: *Deus noster, propitius es(to) Rei publicae romanae.*⁷⁷ Sličan zaziv Božje pomoći nalazimo urezan na teguli iz Sirmija,⁷⁸ dok se na dovratku manjih salonitanskih vrata tzv. *Porta Suburbia* nalazi urezan grafit: *Σύ, Κ(ύρι)ε, ὄρα (Ti, Gospode, pogledaj!).* Frane Bulić smatra da je natpis urezan u dovratak

found carved into tegulae from Sirmium,⁷⁸ while the jamb on the small gate of the so-called *Porta Suburbia* in Salona contains the engraved graffiti: *Σύ, Κ(ύρι)ε, ὄρα (You, Lord, look!).* Frane Bulić believed that the inscription was carved into the door jamb during the military crisis of the 6th-7th centuries.⁷⁹ It was written in Greek, which is indicative in the epigraphic context of Salona. The letter from Pope Gregory I and these inscriptions reveal the extent of the crisis in Dalmatia. The wars of the 6th century spurred the repair of Salona's ramparts and the digging of ditches.⁸⁰ Besides the Salona fortifications, the forts in the hinterland were also obviously reinforced. The document which mentions the *Castella qui sunt super civitatem Salonitanam* shows the concerns of the wealthier Roman class of the population for the fort and maintenance of the church. We have seen that any more important fort also had an Early Christian church at its foot. The functioning of the *castella* had to be supported by militarily and financially. The purchase of slaves also indicated that the enemy was somewhere in the vicinity and that the threat was direct.

Even in chapter 29 of DAI, we can find a detail on the forts described herein. After the description of the wartime deception of the Slavs and the conquest of Salona, the writer continued: "There they settled and thereafter began gradually to make plundering raids and destroyed the Romani who dwelt in the plains and on the higher ground and took possession of their lands."⁸¹

The information in DAI on the conquest of the Romani settlements in the plains and on higher ground reveals a knowledgeable narrator familiar with the landscape of the Salonitan hinterland in Late Antiquity. The forts and settlements which have been described herein correspond to what had been conquered.⁸²

75 Barišić, Marković 2007, str. 121.

76 Šišić 1990, str. 226.

77 Duval *et al.* 2000, str. 306-307, sl. 130. Ako se bolje pogleda ovaj natpis na nadvratku crkve u Manastirinama, čini se kao da su izvorno stajala tri duboko uklesana ranokršćanska križa, a da je kasnije nadodan natpis. Naime, zadnja riječ, *Romanae*, razvučena je da bi popunila preostali dio, cijeli natpis je zbijen u gornji dio, a vidi se i u donjem retku da je klesar imao problema s razmakom između slova. Da se radilo o jedinstvenom projektu, tj. istodobnom klesanju natpisa i križeva zasigurno bi sve bilo skladnije i ujednačeno. Usprkos kvaliteti izvedbe slova klesar nije mogao izbjeći problem naknadnog uklapanja teksta između tri križa. Obradujući epigrafske spomenike Salone Jean-Pierre Caillet i Emilio Marin datiraju natpis u 5. st., ostavljajući mogućnost datacije u 6. st. (Caillet, Marin 2010, str. 180-182). Nadvratnik na kojem su izvorno bila uklesana tri križa pripada crkvi 5. st. Crkva na Manastirinama u 6. st. dobiva narteks. Moguće je da je tada nadodan i natpis na nadvratniku.

78 Šišić 1990, str. 223.

leaving open the possibility of dating to the 6th century (Caillet, Marin 2010, pp. 180-182). The lintel on which three crosses had originally been engraved dates to the 5th c. The church in Manastirine obtained a narthex in the 6th c. It is possible that the inscription was added to the lintel at that time.

78 Šišić 1990, p. 223.

79 Bulić 1912, p. 19; On the inscription: Dukić 2008, pp. 255-257; Rapanić 2017, pp. 91-92.

80 Jeličić-Radonić 1998, p. 32.

81 Croatian translation according to: B. Ferjančić 2007, pp. 11-12; Constantine Porphyrogenitus 1967, p. 125.

82 A recent trend is the publication of books and articles with hypercritical stances on written historical sources. Thus, in his book *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat*, Daniel Džino considered written historical sources without presenting anything that has not already been discussed in Croatian historiography in the context of

tijekom vojne krize u 6.-7. st.⁷⁹ Napisan je na grčkom, što je indikativno u salonitanskom epigrafskom kontekstu. Pismo pape Grgura I. i navedeni natpisi otkrivaju razmjere krize u Dalmaciji. Ratovi u 6. st. potaknuli su popravak salonitanskih bedema i iskopavanje opkopa.⁸⁰ Osim salonitanskih fortifikacija očito su dodatno utvrđivane i utvrde u zaleđu. Dokument koji spominje *Castella qui sunt super civitatem Salonitanam*, pokazuje brigu imućnijeg romanskog sloja stanovništva oko utvrda i skrb za crkve. Vidjeli smo da svaka značajnija utvrda u svom podnožju ima i ranokršćansku crkvu. Funkcioniranje *castella* trebalo je podupirati vojno i ekonomski. Otkup zarobljenika također upućuje na to da je neprijatelj negdje blizu i da je opasnost izravna.

I u 29. glavi DAI nalazimo jedan detalj o utvrdama koje ovdje opisujemo. Nakon opisa slavenske ratne varke i osvajanja Salone pisac nastavlja: *I naselivši se tamo, posle kratkog vremena počnu pljačkati Romane koji su živeli po ravnici i po uzvišenijim mestima, unište ih i zavladaju njihovim zemljištem.*⁸¹

Podatak iz DAI o osvajanju romanskih naselja u ravnici i uzvišenim mjestima otkriva upućenog pripovjedača upoznatog s kasnoantičkim krajolikom salonitanskog zaleđa. Utvrde i naselja koja smo ovdje opisali odgovaraju opisu onoga što je osvojeno.⁸² Mislim

79 Bulić 1912, str. 19. O natpisu piše Dukić 2008, str. 255-257; Rapanić 2017, str. 91-92.

80 Jeličić Radonić 1998, str. 32.

81 Prijevod prema Ferjančić 2007, str. 11-12; Constantine Porphyrogenitus 1967, str. 125.

82 U zadnje vrijeme pojavljuju se knjige i članci s hiperkritičkim stavom prema pisanim povijesnim izvorima. Tako se D. Džino u knjizi *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat* osvrnuo na povijesne pisane izvore ne iznoseći ništa o čemu se već u našoj historiografiji nije raspravljalo u kontekstu njihovog kritičkog proučavanja. U svojim "dekonstrukcijama" uloge Slavena o kojima se govori u DAI i drugim izvorima, Džino ne ostavlja mjesta mogućnosti da se radi o Slavenima (Džino 2010a, str. 92-99). Ako se potraži odgovor kako onda tumači slavenske toponime poput Peruna, Perunića i druge koji potvrđuju prisutnost Slavena u njihovoj ranoj poganskoj fazi, naiđe se na složenu raspravu o sličnosti između slavenske religije i ostalih "religijsko – duhovnih" sustava, poput sarmatskih ili germanskih, odnosno zajedničkih vjerovanja transdanubijskih naroda. Imigrantske skupine sa sjevera donose svoje predačke tradicije... sve su to na kraju znanstvenici kodificirali i pretvorili u narodnu konstrukciju slavenske religije (Džino 2010a, str. 168). Ovakva isprazna generaliziranja neki povjesničari u Hrvatskoj prepoznaju kao ozbiljan "objasnidbeni model". Džinov rad opterećuje pristup vrlo sličan onome Florina Curte iznesen u knjizi *The making of the Slavs*. Koliko god je Curta

their critical scrutiny. In his "deconstructions" of the role of the Slavs mentioned in DAI and other sources, Džino leaves no place for the possibility that these were actually Slavs (Džino 2010a, pp. 92-99). Whosoever seeks an answer to the question of how he then interprets Slav toponyms such as Perun, Perunić and others which confirm the presence of the Slavs in their early pagan phase, will come upon a complex discourse on similarities between "Slavic religion" and other ('Germanic' or Sarmatian) "religious/spiritual" systems, or "shared popular beliefs of the trans-Danubian population. Immigrant groups from the north brought some ancestral traditions ... which the scholarship has codified into a modern construct of 'Slav religion/mythology'" (Džino 2010a, pp. 167-168). Such empty generalizations have been acknowledged by certain historians in Croatia as a sound "explanatory model." Džino's work is burdened by an approach rather similar to that of Florin Curta, put forth in his book *The Making of the Slavs*. As original as Curta was in his approach, Džino has in fact demonstrated the untenability of this approach in his adherence to similar standpoints.

The crisis in the 7th century may be discerned in the archaeological-topographic picture of the Salona hinterland and in a comparative analysis of historical sources. The well-preserved historical space of the Salonitan hinterland brings us closer to the truth. To relegate all of this to a "narrative discourse on the arrival of the Croats" (Džino 2010, pp. 157-159) is forced methodologization. In his reading of DAI, Džino underscored the myth of the fall of Salona in chapter 29 (Džino 2010, p. 158). The literarily described fall of Salona and the Byzantine standpoint of Porphyrogenitus on this historical event are questioned by few. However, the seven Late Antique fortifications along the Roman road that were components of the Salonitan defensive system and the monitoring of the *limes* on the Cetina show that there is some truth in chapter 29 of DAI. It contains data obtained from a knowledgeable narrator, well apprised of events in the field and the military tactical constants of the Salonitan hinterland. Thus the conclusions on the mythological nature of individual sources must be weighed more precisely.

And what, in the end, to say about the unfortunate Slavs and the fall of Salona? More recent excavations conducted by Maja Petrinc in Orlić near Knin have made an essential step in recognizing early Slav cemeteries in Dalmatia. When analysing the results of this research, she touched on the problem of the erroneous dating and interpretation of archaeological materials by Florin Curta (Petrinc 2015, pp. 124-130). She also referred to the similar approach by Džino (Petrinc 2015, pp. 126-128). In Orlić, we can see for the first time early medieval burials under mounds in Dalmatia, which clearly correspond to other Slavic areas where the same types of interments appear. Petrinc justifiably concluded that these were Slavic grave mounds (Petrinc 2015, p. 129), believing that such graves had been there earlier,

da se termin iz 29. glave DAI, τοὺς κάμπους, odnosi na salonitanski ager.⁸³ U ageru su postojala kasnoantička naselja na mjestima starih rimskih ladanjskih vila (*villa rustica*). Resnik, gdje su se nalazili antički Sikuli, također je bio kasnoantičko naselje koje nije imalo urbani karakter. *Uzvišena mjesta* su utvrde koje smo opisali. Kako smo vidjeli, i ona su imala naselja u nizini, koja su zajedno sa Salonom uništena tijekom slavenske provale.

Ostave novca jasan su znak opasnosti koja prijeti Saloni. Onoj koju je Ivan Marović koristio pri

originalan u svom pristupu, toliko Džino u podržavanju sličnih stavova pokazuje neodrživost Curtina pristupa. U arheološko-topografskoj slici zaleđa Salone i komparativnoj analizi pisanih povijesnih izvora može se prepoznati kriza 7. st. Dobro očuvan povijesni prostor salonitanskog zaleđa približava nas istini. Sve strpati u "narativni diskurs o dolasku Hrvata" (Džino 2010, str. 157-159) nategnuto je metodologiziranje. Iščitavajući DAI, Džino ističe mit o padu Salone u 29. glavi (Džino 2010, str. 158). Literarno opisan pad Salone i Porfirogenetov bizantski kut gledanja na povijesni događaj malo tko dovodi u pitanje. Međutim, sedam kasnoantičkih utvrda uz rimsku cestu koje su bile dio salonitanskoga defenzivnog sustava te naziranje limesa na Cetini pokazuju da u 29. glavi DAI ima istine. Ona sadrži podatke dobivene od upućenog pripovjedača, dobro upoznatog s terenom i vojnotaktičkim datostima salonitanskog zaleđa. Stoga zaključke o mitologiji pojedinih izvora treba preciznije vagati.

I što na kraju reći o nesretnim Slavenima i padu Salone? Novija istraživanja Maje Petrinec u Orliću kod Knina napravila su bitan iskorak u prepoznavanju ranoslavenskih grobalja u Dalmaciji. Obradujući rezultate tih istraživanja, dotakla se problema pogrešnog datiranja i interpretacije arheološkog materijala od strane Florina Curte (Petrinec 2015, str. 124-130). Osvrnula se također na sličan pristup D. Džina (Petrinec 2015, str. 126-128). U Orliću se prvi put susrećemo s rano-srednjovjekovnim ukopima pod humcima u Dalmaciji koji se jasno podudaraju s drugim slavenskim područjima gdje se javlja isti način sahranjivanja. M. Petrinec opravdano zaključuje da se radi o slavenskim nadgrobnim humcima (Petrinec 2015, str. 129), smatrajući da se ovakvih grobova nalazilo i ranije, međutim nisu konstatirani zbog devastiranosti grobalja obradom zemljišta ili nepažnjom istraživača starije generacije.

Što se pada Salone tiče, ostaje pitanje čemu dodatno ojačavanje proteihizmama utvrda u njezinom zaleđu? Od koga prijete opasnost? Zasigurno ne od "transformiranog indogenog stanovništva". Džinov izrazito kritičan pristup i pretjerana negacija pisanih i arheoloških izvora daju povijesti karikaturno lice. Jer, koliko god bilo zamotano u postmoderni pristup, negiranje Slavena na Balkanu u osnovi se ne razlikuje od dokazivanja postojanja piramida u Bosni i Hercegovini.

83 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, str. 124.

I believe that the term from chapter 29 of DAI, τοὺς κάμπους, pertains to the Salonitan ager.⁸³ There were Late Antique settlements at the site of old Roman *villae rusticate* in the ager. Resnik, the location of ancient Siculi, was also a settlement in Late Antiquity that did not have an urban character. The "higher ground" was actually the forts described herein. As we have seen, they also had settlements in the low-lying flatlands, which together with Salona were destroyed during the Slav invasions.

Coin hoards are a clear indication of the danger which threatened Salona. The one used by Ivan Marović to determine the year of Salona's fall may be joined by another consisting of five gold coins from the Hollow Church (*Šuplja crkva*), situated a few kilometres east of Salona. The most recent coin from this hoard also dates to the time of Emperor Heraclius (610-641). Unfortunately, a misunderstanding in the description of the context of the find led to an erroneous interpretation of the hoard as a ritual deposit of coins into the basilica's foundations.⁸⁴ In the legends of the Dalmatian cities,

although they were not found due to the devastation of cemeteries due to soil cultivation and the lack of attention by researchers in earlier generations.

As to the fall of Salona, the question remains as to why the proteichismas at forts in its hinterland were reinforced. Certainly this was not done by the "transformed indigenous population." Džino's extremely critical approach and excessive refutation of written and archaeological sources accord a caricatural face to history. Because however much it is wrapped in a postmodern approach, the negation of the Slavs in the Balkans does not essentially differ from proving the existence of a pyramid in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

83 Constantine Porphyrogenitus, p. 124.

84 Marović 2006, p. 259; Gjurašin 2000, p. 86; Šeparović 2017, pp. 1008-1009. Gjurašin mistakenly asserted about the gold coins from the Hollow Church that they were discovered in the foundations of the northern lateral wall of the Early Christian basilica. They were not found in any wall foundations. The coins were found by Marijan Lozo. As far as I know, they were deposited into a fissure between a pew and the northern wall of the Early Christian church. This is known by everyone who had participated in the excavations, and by those to whom Marjan Lozo recounted the story of his discovery. Due to these inaccurate data on the site and circumstances of the find, Željko Rapanić also drew erroneous conclusions, interpreting them as the ritual depositing of coins during construction or repair of this part of the basilica during the reign of Emperor Heraclius (Rapanić 2007, p. 141). In another work, the same "ritual depositing of coins into walls" was interpreted as evidence that there was an "orderly community under placid circumstances" lived in Salona's environs (Rapanić 2016, p. 100), which, according to him, proves the theory on the

određivanju godine pada Salone, može se pridružiti još jedna od 5 zlatnika iz Šuplje crkve, smještene koji kilometar istočno od Salone. Zadnji novac iz te ostave također je iz vremena cara Heraklija (610.-641.). Na žalost, zbog nesporazuma u opisu konteksta nalaza došlo je do krive interpretacije ostave kao obrednog uzidavanja novca u temelje bazilike.⁸⁴ U predaji dalmatinskih gradova bizantski car Heraklije bio je spasitelj Carstva, s njim venecijanska tradicija povezuje postanak svoga grada,⁸⁵ također počinju značajnija nastojanja Carigrada oko pokrštavanja barbara.⁸⁶ Navedene dvije ostave novca iz njegova vremena ukazuju na turbulentne događaje oko Salone. Nakon salonitanske epizode zasigurno se više aktivirala diplomacija, stoga bi Budakovo upozorenje na Heraklijevu važnost imalo osnove. Nisu, naime, samo čvrsti zidovi Splita i insularnost Trogira zaustavili daljnja slavenska osvajanja. Sudeći po ostavama Heraklijeva novca u Solinu i Potkomu kod Zrmanje,⁸⁷ vjerojatno se prišlo staroj praksi kupovanja mira.

Pad Salone realan je povijesni događaj, a postojanje salonitanskog limesa moglo je produžiti egzistenciju grada nekoliko desetljeća duže. Ivan Marović je upozorio da u Naroni nema bizantskog novca nakon Mauricija Tiberija pa pretpostavlja da je do uništenja Narone došlo negdje krajem 6. i početkom 7. st.⁸⁸ To se može uzeti kao dobra radna pretpostavka koju će još trebati provjeravati tijekom budućih istraživanja. Ona uz Salonu moraju obuhvatiti i salonitansko zaleđe. Nakon što su zauzeli utvrde i *zavladali njihovim zemljištem* Slave ni počinju formirati vlastite prostornoupravne cjeline.

84 Marović 2006, str. 259; Gjurašin 2000, str. 86; Šeparović 2017, str. 1008-1009. Gjurašin pogrešno navodi za zlatnike iz Šuplje crkve da su nađeni u temelju sjevernog bočnog zida ranokršćanske bazilike. Oni nisu nađeni ni u kakvom temelju zida. Novac je našao Marijan Lozo. Koliko mi je poznato, bili su sklonjeni u razdjelu između klupe i sjevernog zida ranokršćanske crkve. To znaju svi koji su tada sudjelovali u istraživanju, a i oni kojima je Marijan Lozo pričao o ovome nalazu. Zbog netočnih podataka o mjestu i okolnostima nalaza pogrešne zaključke donio je i Željko Rapanić protumačivši ih kao obredno stavljanje novca prilikom gradnje ili popravka tog dijela bazilike u vrijeme cara Heraklija (Rapanić 2007, str. 141). U drugom radu je isto "obredno uzidavanje novca" protumačio kao dokaz kako u okolini Salone živi "sređena zajednica u smirenim okolnostima" (Rapanić 2016, str. 100), što je, po njemu, dokaz teorije o odumiranju Salone. Upravo ta ostava ukazuje na suprotan zaključak jer je riječ o još jednoj ostavi novca iz 7. st.

85 Budak 1995, str. 75.

86 Maksimović 1996, str. 169.

87 Mirnik 1990, str. 163-168.

88 Marović 2006a, str. 249.

the Byzantine Emperor Heraclius was the saviour of the Empire, while in the Venetian tradition he is linked to the origin of that city,⁸⁵ and it was under him that the more serious efforts to convert the barbarians to Christianity commenced.⁸⁶ These two coin hoards from his time indicate the turbulent events around Salona. After the Salona episode, diplomacy certainly became more active, so that Budak's point about the importance of Heraclius has valid grounds. The sturdy walls of Split and the insularity of Trogir were not, after all, solely responsible for halting the Slavic conquests. Judging by the hoards of coins minted by Heraclius in Solin and Potkom near the River Zrmanja,⁸⁷ the old practice of buying peace was very likely employed.

The fall of Salona was an actual historical event, and the existence of the Salonitan *limes* may have extended the city's existence several decades longer. Ivan Marović pointed out that there were no Byzantine coins in Narona after Emperor Maurice, so he assumed that the destruction of Narona had occurred some time at the end of the 6th and beginning of the 7th century.⁸⁸ This may be taken as a good working hypothesis that will still have to be verified by future research. Besides Salona, the latter must also encompass its hinterland. After they seized the forts and "took possession of their lands," the Slavs began to form their own territorial administrative units. Individual forts from the Salona hinterland continued to exist. Over the course of the subsequent century, Klis would become the seat of the Littoral County, Brečevo near Vrba in Muć the seat of Zmina County, and the Sinj fortress the seat of Cetina County. A part of the indigenous population was certainly incorporated into the old counties, particularly groups that had the resourcefulness to seek refuge in the Dalmatian karst during times of crisis.⁸⁹

slow decay of Salona. That hoard actually proves the opposite conclusion, because this was yet another coin hoard from the 7th century.

85 Budak 1995, p. 75.

86 Maksimović 1996, p. 169.

87 Mirnik 1990, pp. 163-168.

88 Marović 2006a, p. 249.

89 I would point out the indicative find from the Katunište cavern near the Koštak hillfort. This cavern enters the spatial and historical context of the Late Antique forts we are discussing. Namely, it is situated roughly 2 km north-west of Markezina greda. In order to enter, one must negotiate a vertical climb of 14 m. In the 1970s, Mate Zekan published the archaeological materials from this cavern. A fragment of an LR 1 amphora, the bottom of a Palestinian sack-shaped amphora, another amphora bottom that is difficult to determine, a Late Antique clay oil-lamp and plate similar to Hayes type 3. There was a spring in the cavern, but traces of fire and residence in it indicate a refuge during times of unrest.

Pojedine utvrde iz salonitanskog zaleđa nastavljaju s egzistencijom. Klis će tijekom idućeg stoljeća postati središte Primorske županije, Brečevo kod Vrbe u Muću središte Župe Zmina, Tvrđava Sinj – Cetinske županije. Zsigurno je u stare županije bio inkorporiran dio starosjedilačkoga življa, posebno skupine koje su se u krizno vrijeme znale skloniti u dalmatinskom kršu.⁸⁹ Snažno oslanjanje županija na kasnoantičku infrastrukturu, na utvrde i mrežu starih rimskih cesta, ukazuje na njihovu ranu organizaciju. Utvrde u zaleđu Salone ključne su i za razumijevanje novoga razdoblja koje je nastupilo nakon pada Salone.

The considerable dependence of the counties on the infrastructure of Late Antiquity, on the forts and network of old Roman roads, reveals their early organization. The fortifications in Salona's hinterland are the key to understanding the new era which ensued after that city's fall.

89 Upozorio bih na jedan indikativan nalaz iz jame Katišće kod gradine Koštak. Ta jama ulazi u prostorni i povijesni kontekst s kasnoantičkim utvrdama koje obrađujemo. Naime, nalazi se oko 2 km sjeverozapadno od Markezine grede. Da bi se u nju ušlo, treba svladati vertikalnu od 14 m. Mate Zekan je sedamdesetih godina objavio arheološki materijal iz te jame. Nađeni su ulomci amfore LR I, dno palestinske vrećaste amfore, još jedno dno amfore koje je teško determinirati, jedna kasnoantička glinena svjetiljka i tanjur koji sliči tipu Hayes 3. U jami je bio izvor vode, no tragovi paljenja vatre i boravka u njoj upućuju na zbjeg tijekom nemirnih vremena. Iako M. Zekan amfore, svjetiljku i tanjur ispravno datira u 6. st., datacija materijala slobodno se može produžiti u 7. st. Vidi Zekan 1977, str. 71-74.

Even though Zekan had dated the amphorae, oil-lamp and plate to the 6th c., dating of the material may easily be extended to the 7th c. See: Zekan 1977, pp. 71-74.

IZVORI / SOURCES

Constantine Porphyrogenitus 1967

Constantine Porphyrogenitus 1967, *De administrando imperio*, Gy. Moravcsik (ed.), Eng. trans. R. J. H. Jenkins, Washington 1967.

Ravennatis Anonymi 1860

Ravennatis Anonymi 1860, *Cosmographia et Gvidonis Geographica*, Berolini 1860.

KRATICE / ABBREVIATIONS

BASD	Bullettino di archaeologia e storia dalmata, Spalato
DAI	De administrando imperio, Washington
GZM	Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo
HAG	Hrvatski arheološki godišnjak, Zagreb
PPUD	Prilozi povijesti umjetnosti u Dalmaciji, Split
SHP	Starohrvatska prosvjeta, Split
VAHD	Vjesnik za arheologiju i historiju dalmatinsku, Split
VAMZ	Vjesnik arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, Zagreb
VAPD	Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku, Split
ZRVI	Zbornik radova Vizantološkog instituta, Beograd

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alduk 2014 I. Alduk, *Razmišljanja o Klisu u antici*, Tusculum 7, Solin 2014, 51-65.
- Barišić 2007 F. Barišić, *Prokopije*, Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije, Tom I, Beograd 2007, 17-72.
- Barišić, Marković 2007 F. Barišić, M. Marković, *Teofilakt Simokata*, Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije, Tom I, Beograd 2007, 103-126.
- Basler 1972 Đ. Basler, *Arhitektura kasnoantičkog doba u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo 1972.
- Bojanovski 1974 I. Bojanovski, *Dolabelin sistem cesta u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji*, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti BiH, Djela, knj. XLVII, Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, knj. 2, Sarajevo 1974.
- Borzić, Jadrić 2007 I. Borzić, I. Jadrić, *Novi prilozi arheološkoj topografiji dugopoljskog kraja*, Archeologia Adriatica I, Zadar 2007, 145-173.
- Budak 1995 N. Budak, *Tumačenje podrijetla i najstarije povijesti Hrvata u djelima srednjovjekovnih pisaca*, Etnogeneza Hrvata, N. Budak (ed.), Zagreb 1995, 73-78.
- Bulić 1904 F. Bulić, *Ritrovamenti antichi cristiani a Sinj*, BASD 27, Split 1904, 17-20.
- Bulić 1907 F. Bulić, *Sterro di una Chiesa antica cristiana del VI. sec. nella localita detto Crkvina a Klapavice nel Comune censuario di Klis (Clissa)*, BASD, Split 1907, 101-122.
- Bulić 1907a F. Bulić, *Gradina Šutan (Soetovia)*, BASD 30, Split 1907, 123-127.
- Bulić 1912 F. Bulić, *Scavi nelle basiliche urbane di Salona durante gli anni 1907, 1908, 1909*, BASD 35, Split 1912, 3-34.
- Bulić, Bervaldi 1912 F. Bulić, G. Bervaldi, *Kronotaksa solinskih biskupa*, Tiskara hrvatskog katoličkog društva, Zagreb 1912.
- Buljević 2003 Z. Buljević, *Stakleni inventar*, Tilurium I, Zagreb 2003, 271-338.
- Burić 2011 T. Burić, "In montibus Dubraue", *povijesno-topografska skica iz srednjovjekovne kliške županije*, Zagora između stočarsko-ratarske tradicije te procesa litoralizacije i globalizacije, zbornik radova, M. Matas, J. Faričić (eds.), Zadar – Split 2011, 341-353.
- Burić 2011a T. Burić, *Perunovo brdo (monte Borun) – prilog poznavanju poganske slavenske toponimije u Kaštelima*, SHP, III serija, sv. 38, Split 2011, 59-82.

- Caillet, Marin 2010 J. P. Caillet, E. Marin, *Formule propitiatoire, sur le linteau de l'entrée principale de la basilique de manastirine (vers le milieu du V^e siècle ou VI^e siècle)*, Salona IV, Inscriptions de Salone chrétienne IV^e-VII^e siècles, I, Split – Rim 2010.
- Cambi 1993 N. Cambi, *Stele iz kasnoantičke grobnice u Dugopolju*, VAHD 86, Split 1993, 147-181.
- Cambi 2001 N. Cambi, *Dugopolje u antici*, Zbornik radova općine Dugopolje, Zagreb – Dugopolje 2001, 79-107.
- Ciglonečki 2009 S. Ciglonečki, *Justinijanovo utvrđivanje Ilirika*, Archaeologia Adriatica 3, Zadar 2009, 205-222.
- Čremošnik 1989 I. Čremošnik, *Rimsko utvrđenje na Gradini u Biogracima kod Lištice*, GZM (A), n.s. 42/43, (1987-1988), Sarajevo 1989, 83-128.
- Dukić 2008 J. Dukić, *Salonitanske molitve u kamenu*, Salonitansko – splitska crkva u prvom tisućljeću kršćanske povijesti, Split 2008, 239-260.
- Durman et al. 2006 A. Durman, I. Ožanić, I. Roguljić I. Miloglav, *Izvišće sa zaštitnih istraživanja na lokalitetu Banjače, dionica Jadranske auto ceste Dugopolje - Bisko*, Obavijesti Hrvatskog arheološkog društva XXXVIII, Zagreb 2006, 113-119.
- Duval et al. 2000 N. Duval i ostali, Salona III, Manastirine, Split – Rim 2000.
- Džino 2010 D. Džino, *Pričam ti priču: ideološki narativni diskursi o dolasku Hrvata u De administrando imperio*, Radovi, Zavod za hrvatsku povijest 42, Zagreb 2010, 153-165.
- Džino 2010a D. Džino, *Becoming Slav, Becoming Croat. Identity Transformations in Post-Roman and Early Medieval Dalmatia*, Leiden – Boston 2010.
- Dyggve 1989 E. Dyggve, *Povijest salonitanskog kršćanstva*, Izabrani spisi, N. Cambi, T. Marasović (eds.), Književni krug, Split 1989, 19-137.
- Fadić, Štefanac 2014 I. Fadić, B. Štefanac, *Fortifikacije Aserije*, Asseria 12, Zadar 2014, 37-118.
- Ferjančić 2007 B. Ferjančić, *Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije*, Tom II, Beograd 2007.
- Gabričević 1983 B. Gabričević, *Antička nekropola u Sinju. Prilog proučavanju prapovijesnih vjerovanja*, VAHD 76, Split 1983, 5-101.
- Gjurašin 2000 H. Gjurašin, *Šuplja crkva u Solinu – Arheološka istraživanja 1998.-2001. godine*, SHP, III ser., br. 27, Split 2000, 83-87.
- Gjurašin 2006 H. Gjurašin, *Klis – Klapavice – Crkvina. Istraživanja tijekom godine 2006.*, Obavijesti HAD-a 3, Zagreb 2006, 99-103.
- Gjurašin 2007 H. Gjurašin, *Klapavice – Crkvina*, HAG 3/2006, Zagreb 2007, 406-407.
- Goldstein 1992 I. Goldstein, *Bizant na Jadranu*, Zagreb 1992.
- Goldstein 1995 I. Goldstein, *Hrvatski rani srednji vijek*, Zagreb 1995.
- Gračanin, Škrgulja 2016 H. Gračanin, J. Škrgulja, *Etnički identiteti u južnoj Panoniji i Dalmaciji u Justinijanovo doba*, Povijesni prilozi 50, Zagreb 2016, 9-48.
- Gunjača 1937 S. Gunjača, *Topografska pitanja na teritoriju stare Cetinske županije s ekskursima o ubikaciji Setovije i Tilurija*, Split 1937.
- Gunjača 1991 S. Gunjača, *Ubikacija srednjovjekovnog castruma Brečevo*, Izbor iz djela, Književni krug, Split 1991, 95-123.
- Gunjača 1991a S. Gunjača, *Tri preživjela prethrvatska toponima*, Izbor iz djela, Književni krug, Split 1991, 125-154.
- Ivanišević 1994 M. Ivanišević, *Povijesni izvori*, Salona Christiana, Split 1994, 105-195.
- Jadrijević 1940 A. Jadrijević, *Novi rimski natpis s grada Sinja*, VAHD 51 (1930-1934), Split 1940, 157-159.
- Jakšić 1991 N. Jakšić, *Vijesti o padu Salone u djelu Konstantina Porfirogeneta*, Antička Salona, N. Cambi (ed.), Split 1991, 427-441.
- Jeličić 1984 J. Jeličić, *Tragovi ranokršćanske arhitekture od izvora do ušća rijeke Cetine*, Cetinska krajina od prehistorije do dolaska Turaka, Znanstveni skup – Sinj 3-6. lipnja 1980, Hrvatsko arheološko društvo, Split 1984, 169-180.
- Jeličić Radonić 1998 J. Jeličić Radonić, *Nova istraživanja gradskih zidina Salone*, PPUD 37, Split 1998, 5-36.

- Jurčević 2007 A. Jurčević, *Kasnoantičko i srednjovjekovno groblje na lokalitetu Crkvine u Klapavicama*, SHP, III, br. 34, Split 2007, 249-265.
- Katić 1962 L. Katić, *Veza primorske Dalmacije kroz kliški prolaz od prehistorije do pada Venecije*, Starine 51, Zagreb 1962, 267-434.
- Katić 1992 M. Katić, *Prilog ubikaciji Decimina*, Obavijesti, Hrvatsko arheološko društvo, br. 24, 2, Zagreb 1992, 49-52.
- Katić 2000 M. Katić, *Kasnoantički grad na Jadranu – primjer grada Hvara*, PPUD 38, Split 2000, 19-49.
- Katić 2003 M. Katić, *Nova razmatranja o kasnoantičkom gradu na Jadranu*, Opuscula archaeologica 27, Zagreb 2003, 523-528.
- Katić 2010 M. Katić, *Prehistorijske gradine solinskog i kliškog područja*, Tusculum 3, Solin 2010, 7-19.
- Katičić 2008 R. Katičić, “*Ecclesia Salonitana*” u svojem novom sjedištu do X. st., Salonitansko – splitska crkva u prvom tisućljeću kršćanske povijesti, Split 2008, 435-451.
- Klaić 1972 N. Klaić, *Izvori za hrvatsku povijest do 1526. godine*, Zagreb 1972.
- Klaić 1986 N. Klaić, *Najnoviji radovi o 29., 30. i 31. poglavlju u djelu De administrando imperio cara Konstantina VII. Porfirogeneta*, SHP, ser. 3, sv. 15, Split 1986, 31-60.
- Kužić 2001 K. Kužić, *Povijest Dugopolja i njegovih sela*, Dugopolje – Zbornik radova općine Dugopolje, Zagreb – Dugopolje 2001, 149-248.
- Librenjak, Čerina 2005 A. Librenjak, D. Čerina, *Preliminarno izvješće o zaštitnim arheološkim istraživanjima na tvrđavi Grad u Sinju 1998. i 1999. godine*, VAHD 98, Split 2005, 271-282.
- Lončar 1992 M. Lončar, *Porfirogenetova seoba Hrvata pred sudom novije literature*, Diadora 14, Zadar 1992, 375-448.
- Mandić 1963 D. Mandić, *Osnutak splitske metropolije*, Rasprave i prilozi iz stare hrvatske povijesti, Rim 1963, 77-108.
- Maksimović 1996 L. Maksimović, *Pokrštavanje Srba i Hrvata*, ZRVI 35, Beograd 1996, 155-174.
- Marini 1806 G. Marini, *I papiri diplomatici*, Roma 1806.
- Marović 1984 I. Marović, *Reflexsions about the year of destruction of Salona*, VAHD 77, Split 1984, 293-314.
- Marović 2006 I. Marović, *O godini razorenja Salone*, VAPD 99, Split 2006, 253-273.
- Marović 2006a I. Marović, *Ostava bizantskih zlatnika iz Narone*, Split 2006, 235-252.
- Medini 1978 J. Medini, *O nekim kronološkim i sadržajnim značajkama poglavlja o Dalmaciji u djelu Cosmographia anonimnog pisca iz Ravene*, Materijali SADJ 17 (Putevi i komunikacije u antici, Simpozij Saveza arheoloških društava Jugoslavije, Peć, 1978.), Beograd 1980, 69-83.
- Medini 1980 J. Medini, *Provincia Liburnia*, Diadora 9, Zadar 1980, 363-444.
- Milinković 2015 M. Milinković, *Ranovizantijska naselja u Srbiji*, Beograd 2015.
- Milošević 1998 A. Milošević, *Arheološka topografija Cetine*, Split 1998.
- Milošević 2005 A. Milošević, *Arheološki izvori za srednjovjekovnu povijest Cetine*, Disertacija, Sveučilište u Zadru, Odjel za arheologiju, Zadar 2005.
- Milošević 2007 A. Milošević, *Gramatika prostora uz rijeku Cetinu*, Dalmatinska zagora – nepoznata zemlja, Galerija Klovićevi dvori, Zagreb 2007, 95-113.
- Milošević 2017 A. Milošević, *Arheologija Sinjskog polja*, Split 2017.
- Mirnik 1990 I. Mirnik, *Skupni nalazi novca iz Hrvatske IX. Skupni nalazi Heraklijevih zlatnika iz Zrmanje*, VAMZ, 3.s., XXIII, Zagreb 1990, 163-171.
- Nikolajević 1971 I. Nikolajević, *Veliki posed u Dalmaciji u V i VI veku u svetlosti arheoloških nalaza*, ZRVI XIII, Beograd 1971, 277-292.
- Nikolajević 1974 I. Nikolajević, *The redemption of Captives in Dalmatia in the 6th and 7th Century*, Balcanoslavica 2, Prilep 1974, 73-79.
- Nikolajević 1979 I. Nikolajević, “*Salona christiana*” u VI i VII veku, VAHD LXXII-LXXIII, Split 1979, 151-170.
- Novaković 1972 R. Novaković, *Neka zapažanja o 29. i 30. glavi De administrando imperio*, Istorijski časopis XIX, Beograd 1972, 5-54.

- Peković, Babić 2016 Ž. Peković, K. Babić, *Kasnoantička sakralna arhitektura u doba Istočnih Gota u Dalmaciji*, Prostor 24, 2(52), Zagreb 2016, 156-171.
- Petrinec 2015 M. Petrinec, *Frühmittelalterliche Gräber aus Orlic angesichts bisheriger Erkenntnisse über den Horizont mit heidnischen Bestattungsmerkmalen*, SHP, III ser., 42, Split 2015, 81-131.
- Pohl 1995 W. Pohl, *Osnove hrvatske etnogeneze: Avari i Slaveni*, Etnogeneza Hrvata, N. Budak (ed.), Zagreb 1995, 86-96.
- Prokopije 2007 Prokopije, *Vizantisko – Gotske borbe u Dalmaciji*, 3, Vizantijski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije, Tom I, Beograd 2007, 31-33.
- Rapanić 1980 Ž. Rapanić, *Prilog proučavanju kontinuiteta naseljenosti u salonitanskom ageru u ranom srednjem vijeku*, VAHD LXXIV, Split 1980, 189-217.
- Rapanić 1987 Ž. Rapanić, *Predromaničko doba u Dalmaciji*, Split 1987.
- Rapanić 2007 Ž. Rapanić, *Od carske palače do srednjovjekovne općine*, Književni krug Split, Split 2007.
- Rapanić 2016 Ž. Rapanić, *Propast Salone*, SHP, sv. 43, Split 2016, 91-139.
- Rapanić 2017 Ž. Rapanić, *Dalmatinski grad i zaleđe u ranom srednjem vijeku*, Split 2017.
- Ravegnani 1983 G. Ravegnani, *Castelli e città fortificate nel VI secolo*, Ravenna 1983.
- Rendić-Miočević 1955 D. Rendić-Miočević, *Ilirske predstave Silvana na kulturnim slikama s područja Dalmata*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Sarajevu, n.s. 10, Sarajevo 1955, 5-40.
- Sanader 2003 M. Sanader, *Tilurium I*, Zagreb 2003.
- Skok 1927 P. Skok, *Kako bizantiski pisci pišu lična i mjesna slovenska imena*, SHP, Vol. I, No.1-2, srpanj 1927, 60-76.
- Šeparović 2003 T. Šeparović, *Nalazi novca*, Tilurium I, Zagreb 2003, 189-218.
- Šeparović 2009 T. Šeparović, *Skupni nalaz novca iz 5.-6. stoljeća na lokalitetu Klapavice – Crkvina kod Klisa*, SHP, III, sv. 36, Split 2009, 27-34.
- Šeparović 2017 T. Šeparović, *Notes on Byzantine Coins from the 7th to 9th century found in Croatia*, XV International Numismatic Congress Taormina 2015, vol. II, Roma – Messina 2017, 1008-1012.
- Šiljeg 2008 B. Šiljeg, *Arheološko istraživanje lokaliteta Mala Luka i Baška na otoku Krku 2007*, Annales Instituti Archaeologici IV, Zagreb 2008, 84-87.
- Šišić 1990 F. Šišić, *Povijest Hrvata u vrijeme narodnih vladara*, Zagreb 1990.
- Škegro 1999 A. Škegro, *Gosudarstvo rimske provincije Dalmacije*, Zagreb 1999.
- Škegro 2002 A. Škegro, *Upravitelj dobara Salonitanske crkve*, Povijesni prilozi 22, Zagreb 2002, 19-28.
- Šuta, Bartulović 2007 I. Šuta, T. Bartulović, *Gradine Kaštela i okolice*. Izložba fotografija, Kaštela 2007.
- Šuta 2013 I. Šuta, *Prapovijesna gradina Biranj na Kozjaku i topografija prapovijesnih nalazišta u okolici*, Kaštelanski zbornik 10, Kaštela 2013, 93-117.
- Šuta 2016 I. Šuta, *Prapovijest Kozjaka*, katalog izložbe, Muzej grada Kaštela, 2016.
- Uglešić 1992 A. Uglešić *Rimska provincija Dalmacija pod vlašću istočnih Gota*, Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta u Zadru 30 (17), Zadar 1992, 65-78.
- Vedriš 2015 T. Vedriš, *Pokrštavanje i rana kristijanizacija Hrvata*, Hrvatske zemlje u ranome srednjem vijeku (o. 550. – o. 1150.), Zagreb 2015, 173-200.
- Vinski 1982 Z. Vinski, *Šljem epohe seobe naroda nađen u Sinju*, SHP, III, 12, Split 1982, 7-34.
- Zaninović 1967 M. Zaninović, *Ilirsko pleme Delmati*, Godišnjak Akademije nauka BiH V, Sarajevo 1967.
- Zaninović 1996 M. Zaninović, *Vojni značaj Tilurija u antici*, Od Helena do Hrvata, Zagreb 1996, 280-291.
- Zaninović 2011 M. Zaninović, *Tilurium, Aequum i Osinium: Arheološko – povijesna povezanost*, Kačić, Zbornik u čast Emilija Marina, god. XLI-XLIII/2009-2011, Split 2011, 499-508.
- Zekan 1977 M. Zekan, *Jama Katunište i u njoj nadjeni arheološki materijal*, Naše jame 18 (1976), Ljubljana 1977, 71-74.
- Zlatović 1897 S. Zlatović, *Topografske crtice o starohrvatskim županijama u Dalmaciji i starim gradovima na kopnu od Velebita do Neretve*, SHP, III, Knin 1897, 9-13.