

In Segestica ... In Segestica ...

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Antička arheologija

Original scientific paper
Roman archaeology

UDK/UDC 904:003.071](497.5 Sisak) "652"
930.271(497.5 Sisak) "652"

Primljeno/Received: 11. 04. 2007.

Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 10. 09. 2007.

IVAN RADMAN LIVAJA
Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu
Trg Nikole Šubića Zrinjskog 19
HR – 10000 Zagreb
iradman@amz.hr

U ovom radu autor obrađuje natpis na jednoj od brojnih rimskih olovnih tesera, pronađenih u rijeci Kupa kod Siska. Riječ je o znakovitom nalazu jer se na natpisu spominje toponim Segestica, to jest predrimsko ime grada. To je ujedno i jedini epigrafički spomen Segestike. Autor je, analizirajući natpis, pokušao odrediti kronološki i historijski okvir u kojem je natpis mogao nastati te iznio određene hipoteze o sudbini predrimske Segestike i kontinuitetu uporabe tog toponima tijekom rimskog razdoblja.

Ključne riječi: Segestica, Siscia, olovna tessera, trgovina

In this paper the author examines the inscription on one of numerous Roman lead tesserae found in the Kupa river near Sisak. This is a significant find as the inscription mentions the toponym Segestica, the pre-Roman name of the town. This is at the same time the only epigraphic mention of Segestica. In his analysis of the inscription the author attempted to determine the chronological and historical context in which the inscription may have been created and put forward certain hypothesis regarding the destiny of the pre-Roman Segestica and the continuity of usage of that toponym during the Roman period.

Key words: Segestica, Siscia, lead tessera, trade

U antičkoj zbirci Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu čuva se vjerojatno najveća svjetska zbirka rimskih olovnih tesera, odnosno robnih markica. Riječ je o zbirci koja broji više od 1100 primjeraka tesera pronađenih u Sisku, uglavnom tijekom jaružanja rijeke Kupe 1912. i 1913. god. Iako dosad nije bila sustavno proučavana i prezentirana, ta zbirka nije nepoznata u stručnim krugovima. Redovito se spominje u znanstvenim publikacijama koje se bave predmetima tog tipa, ali i problematikom rimskog gospodarstva te poviješću Siscije.¹ Razumljivo da u ograničenim okvirima ovog članka nije moguće cjelovito prikazati tu iznimno veliku kolekciju, pa je bilo nužno suziti izbor na vrlo mali segment, točnije, samo jedan primjerak koji, kako vjerujem, zaslužuje posebnu pozornost zbog spomena toponima koji dosad nije bio zabilježen među epigrafičkim natpisima, iako se višekratno spominje u pisanim izvorima. Mada u ovom radu obrađujem samo jednu sisačku tесeru, pronađenu tijekom jaružanja Kupe 1912. god., pri njezinoj analizi bio sam u mogućnosti poslužiti se i podacima koje nam pružaju drugi sisački primjerci. Stoga se nadam da će ovaj članak poslužiti kao mali uvod i na-

1. Brunšmid 1901, 124-125; Mócsy 1956, 97-104; Šašel 1974, 729; Fitz 1980, 325; Frei-Stolba 1984, 134-135; Römer-Martijnse 1990, 232-233; Hoti 1992, 144; Feugère 1993, 304; Schwinden 1993, 216; Paci 1995, 33; Bassi 1996, 207, 216; Römer-Martijnse 1996-1997, 5; Košćević 2000, 96; Lovenjak 2005, 43.

The Greek and Roman Collection of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb holds what is probably the world's largest collection of Roman lead tesserae, that is commodity tags. The collection contains more than 1100 pieces of tesserae found in Sisak, mostly during the dredging of the Kupa river in 1912 and 1913. Although it had not been systematically examined and presented until now, the collection is not unknown in professional circles. It is regularly mentioned in scholarly publications dealing with the objects of that type but also with the body of issues regarding the Roman economy and the history of Siscia.¹ Understandably, within the limited scope of this paper it is not possible to present comprehensively this exceptionally large collection, and it was therefore necessary to restrict the selection to a very small segment, more precisely one piece only, which, in my opinion, deserves specific attention due to the mention of the toponym that had not been registered before among the epigraphic inscriptions, even though it was repeatedly mentioned in the written sources. Though in this work I analyze only one Sisak tessera found during the dredging of the Kupa in 1912, in its analysis I had the opportunity to use also the information provided by the other pieces from Sisak. I therefore hope that this

1. Brunšmid 1901, 124-125; Mócsy 1956, 97-104; Šašel 1974, 729; Fitz 1980, 325; Frei-Stolba 1984, 134-135; Römer-Martijnse 1990, 232-233; Hoti 1992, 144; Feugère 1993, 304; Schwinden 1993, 216; Paci 1995, 33; Bassi 1996, 207, 216; Römer-Martijnse 1996-1997, 5; Košćević 2000, 96; Lovenjak 2005, 43.



Sl. 1 Olovna tessera iz Siska (snimio F. Beusan; crtež: M. Galić)
 Fig. 1 The lead tessera from Sisak (photo by F. Beusan; drawing by M. Galić)

java za sveobuhvatnu znanstvenu objavu sisačke zbirke rimskih olovnih robnih markica.

Riječ je o dosta oštećenoj olovnoj pločici nepravilna pravokutnog oblika, s kružnom perforacijom u jednom kutu (približno 2,4 x 3,4 cm; inv. broj 12346). Kako je riječ o trgovačkim etiketama, ta je rupica bila namijenjena privezivanju žice ili špage kojom se etiketa vezivala za robu. Natpis je obostran i još uvijek je razaznatljiv:

Prva strana

INS II
 GIISTICA

Druga strana

RMI
 FII

(Tragovi starijeg natpisa)
 . M

paper will serve as a small introduction and an announcement for a comprehensive scholarly publication of the Sisak collection of the Roman lead commodity tags.

The object in question is a considerably damaged lead tag of irregular rectangular shape with a circular perforation in one corner (ca 2,4 x 3,4 cm; inv. no. 12346). As those were commercial labels, this small hole was used for attachment of the wire or string with which the label was tied to the commodity. The inscription is bilateral and it has remained discernible:

The first side

INS II
 GIISTICA

The opposite side

RMI
 FII

(Traces of an earlier inscription)
 . M

Čitanje i interpretacija natpisa na prvoj strani ne postavlja pretjerane poteškoće jer tekst nije pisan u kraticama. Prijedlog *in* slijedi imenica u ablativu, *Segestica*, te se natpis može prevesti «u Segestici».² Tekst na drugoj strani je neusporedivo teže interpretirati. Kratice *RM* i *F* su dosta česte u raznim kombinacijama na etiketama iz Siska. Čini se prilično vjerojatnim da se oznaka *I* u prvom redu i *II* u drugom mogu interpretirati kao brojke 1 i 2. Naime, kratica *RM* se na drugim etiketama pojavljuje ispred raznih brojki, od broja *II* do *XX*, preko *III*, *IIII*, *VII*, *VIII*, *X*, itd., a isti je slučaj s kraticom *F*, koju također na većem broju pločica prate razne brojke, poput *I*, *IIII*, *VI*, *IX*, itd. Ostaje pitanje kratice *R*, *M* i *F*.³ Među raznim primjerima kratice *R* u latinskim natpisima i tekstovima, kao moguća analogija se čini kratica *R* iz nekih pisama iz Vindolande, za koju su A. K. Bowman i J. D. Thomas ponudili kao jednu od mogućih interpretacija glagol *recipio*, *recipere*.⁴ Kratica *M* je svakako češća u latinskim tekstovima, a posebice je uobičajena kratica za *m(odius)*, što bi, s obzirom da je riječ o robnoj markici, mogla biti odgovarajuća interpretacija. No treba napomenuti kako se prema raspoloživim podacima natpisi na sisačkim tesserama uglavnom mogu povezati s trgovinom i izradom tekstilnih proizvoda, a ta mjerna jedinica teško da može imati veze s odjevnim predmetima. Inače se kratica *M* pojavljuje i na nekim drugim olovnim tesserama, te je za nju ponuđena kao moguća interpretacija riječ *m(antus)* ili *m(antellum)* (Egger 1963, 187-188; Römer-Martijnse 1990, 218). Iako privlačno, takvo tumačenje u slučaju sisačkih tesera vjerojatno ne stoji, jer se kratica *M* ponekad pojavljuje popraćena decimalnim razlomcima, a ne cijelim brojevima. To dovodi u ozbiljnu sumnju mogućnost da je riječ o kratlici za neki odjevni premet, odnosno ogrtač. Ipak, postoji realna mogućnost kako ta kratica ima veze s tekstilnom industrijom jer se ona u jednom dopisu iz Vindolande pojavljuje upravo u zajedničkom kontekstu s odjevnim predmetima. A. K. Bowman i J. D. Thomas su kao moguću interpretaciju naveli tri mjerne jedinice, i to *m(odus)*, *m(odulus)* ili *m(ensura)*. Nažalost, ni za jednu od

- Inače je ovaj natpis nedvojbena primjer vulgarnog latiniteta, odnosno govornog jezika. Na pitanje gdje, odnosno ubi, prijedlog *in* uvijek slijedi ablativ, kao što je to slučaj i u ovom natpisu. No u klasičnom latinitetu se to pravilo ne odnosi na imena naselja već samo na imenice koje označavaju neku općenitu lokaciju, poput primjerice grada, brda, vrta, šume, itd. Prijedlog *in* se ne bi trebao rabiti ispred imena naselja jer se u tom slučaju sačuvala uporaba starog lokativa koji se u I. i II. deklinaciji po obliku izjednačio s genitivom. Ispravan bi odgovor stoga na pitanje gdje, to jest ubi, bio *Segesticae* a ne *in Segestica*, isto kao što bi na pitanje kamo, odnosno quo, slijedilo ime mjesta u akuzativu, također bez prijedloga, dakle *Segesticam*. S obzirom da brojni natpisi pokazuju elemente govornog iliti vulgarnog jezika već i u I. st. (dovoljno je spomenuti grafiti iz Pompeja), nisam siguran da neispravna uporaba prijedloga u ovom slučaju upućuje na kasniju dataciju natpisa. Iako je pisac tih redaka nedvojbena bio pismen, sumnjam da je bio toliko obrazovan da bi jako mario za jednu takvu gramatičku finesu. Kako se u svakodnevnom jeziku nesumnjivo govorilo *in urbe*, nitko ne bi bio zbunjen sintagmom *in Segestica* umjesto gramatički ispravnog *Segesticae*, a vjerojatno bi rijetko tko i uočio grešku. Stoga mislim da ovaj detalj ne može bitno pridonijeti pokušaju datacije ove tesere.
- Treba napomenuti da je svojedobno A. Mócsy u svojoj objavi sisačkih tesera koje se čuvaju u Narodnom muzeju u Budimpešti (sveukupno 21 primjerak) ponudio kao interpretaciju za kraticu *RM* sintagmu *r(utila) m(ixta)*, što bi valjda bila jedna vrsta vune crvene boje (André 1949, 85-88; Ancillotti 1993, 231-232) i mješovite, odnosno neujednačene kvalitete, dok za kraticu *F* nije ponudio objašnjenje. Skloniji sam interpretaciji koju sam ponudio, no Mócsy's mišljenje nedvojbena treba uzeti u obzir (Mócsy 1956, 102).
- Bowman, Thomas 2003, 36-37, cat. 583-585; u jednom pismu se navodi kratica *rec* koja je također interpretirana kao *rec(epi)*, Bowman, Thomas 1994, 161-162, cat. 193.

The reading and interpretation of the inscription on the first side does not present too many difficulties as the text is not written in abbreviations. The preposition *in* is followed by a noun in the ablative, *Segestica*, so the inscription can be translated as "in Segestica".² The text on the other side is incomparably more difficult to interpret. The abbreviations *RM* and *F* are fairly frequent in various combinations on the labels from Sisak. It seems quite probable that the mark *I* in the first row and *II* in the second can be interpreted as numbers 1 and 2. On other labels the abbreviation *RM* appears before various numbers, from number *II* to *XX*, through *III*, *IIII*, *VII*, *VIII*, *X*, etc., and the same case is with the abbreviation *F*, which is likewise followed on many tags by various numbers, such as *I*, *IIII*, *VI*, *IX*, etc. We are left with the question of the abbreviations *R*, *M* and *F*.³ Among various examples of the abbreviation *R* in the Latin inscriptions and texts, I find a possible analogy in the abbreviation *R* from some of the Vindolanda letters, for which Bowman and Thomas offered as one of possible interpretations the verb *recipio*, *recipere*.⁴ The abbreviation *M* is certainly more frequent in the Latin inscriptions, and it is particularly used as the abbreviation for *m(odius)*, which could, considering that we are discussing a commodity label, be appropriate interpretation, but it deserves mention that judging by the available data the inscriptions on the Sisak tesserae are generally connected with the trade and manufacture of textile products, and this measurement unit can hardly have anything to do with clothing items. The abbreviation *M* otherwise appears also on some other lead tesserae, and the word *m(antus)* or *m(antellum)* was put forward as a possible interpretation (Egger 1963, 187-188; Römer-Martijnse 1990, 218). Albeit appealing, this interpretation, in the case of the Sisak tesserae, probably does not hold as the abbreviation *M* sometimes appears accompanied by decimal fractions, and not integers, which casts serious doubts on the possibility that this was an abbreviation for a clothing item, more precisely a mantle. There is, however, a realistic possibility that this abbreviation is connected with the textile industry as on a letter from Vindolanda this abbreviation appears precisely in the

- Otherwise, this inscription is an undeniable example of vulgar Latin, or spoken language. Upon the question where, or ubi, the preposition *in* is always followed by the ablative, as is the case in this inscription as well. However, in classical Latin this rule does not apply to the names of settlements but only to the nouns denoting a general location, e.g. a town, hill, garden, forest, etc. The preposition *in* should not be used in front of the name of a settlement, as in that case the use of the old locative was retained, whose form in the I and II declinations became identical to the genitive. Therefore, the correct answer to the question "where", i.e. ubi, would be *Segesticae*, not *in Segestica*, just as in the case of the question "where to", i.e. quo, would follow the name of a settlement in the accusative, also without the preposition – *Segesticam*. Considering that numerous inscriptions show elements of spoken or vulgar language already in the 1st cent. (it suffices to mention the graffiti from Pompeii), I am not sure that incorrect use of a preposition in this case indicates a later date for the inscription. Even though the author of these lines was undoubtedly literate, I doubt that he was educated enough to worry much about a grammatical finesse such as this one. As the everyday language undoubtedly used the form *in urbe*, nobody would be confused by a syntagm *in Segestica* in the place of the grammatically correct *Segesticae*, and there would probably be few of those who would spot the error in the first place. I therefore believe that this detail cannot contribute significantly to the attempt at dating this tessera.
- It deserves mention that formerly A. Mócsy in his publication of the Sisak tesserae kept in the National Museum in Budapest (a total of 21 piece) put forward as the interpretation of the abbreviation *RM* the syntagm *r(utila) m(ixta)*, which would presumably denote a type of a red-coloured wool (cf. André 1949, 85-88; Ancillotti 1993, 231-232) of mixed, i.e. unbalanced quality, whereas for the abbreviation *F* he did not offer any explanation. I am more inclined toward the interpretation I offered myself, but Mócsy's opinion should nevertheless be taken into consideration (Mócsy 1956, 102).
- Bowman, Thomas 2003, 36-37, cat. 583-585; one letter mentions the abbreviation *rec*, which was also interpreted as *rec(epi)*, Bowman, Thomas 1994, 161-162, cat. 193.

njih ne znamo točno koliko su iznosile, ali nema sumnje da su sabrane kao mjerne jedinice za tekstil (Bowman, Thomas 2003, 57, cat. 596).

Za slovo *F* kao moguću interpretaciju predlažem jednu sasvim uobičajenu kraticu u rimskoj epigrafičkoj baštini, skraćenicu glagola *facio, facere* (Cagnat 1914, 428).

Moguća interpretacija natpisa bi stoga glasila:

in Segestica
r(ecepi) m(ensuram) (unam), f(eci) (duos, duas ili duo),

odnosno u prijevodu: „primih (ili preuzeh) jednu mjeru (podrazumijeva se sukna), napravih dva (ili dvije, ovisno o rodu odjevnog predmeta koja se podrazumijeva u natpisu)“. Umjesto *m(ensuram)*, moguća bi interpretacija bila i *m(odum) unum* ili pak *m(odulum) unum*.

Razumljivo, ponuđena interpretacija kratica *RMI* i *FI* se ne može smatrati apsolutno sigurnom i konačnom, ali u nedostatku sigurnijeg tumačenja vjerujem da je riječ o prihvatljivom prijevodu.⁵ Ukoliko je interpretacija kratica točna, spominje se izrada nekih odjevnih predmeta koji nisu naznačeni u natpisu, valjda zato što je točna vrsta robe autoru natpisa i osobama kojima je tekst na etiketi bio namijenjen bila poznata ili se podrazumijevala. S obzirom na natpise s ostalih sisačkih tesera u obzir bi, primjerice, mogli doći odjevni predmeti kao što su *sagum, tunica* ili *paenula*. Stariji natpis, naopako okrenut u odnosu na najrecentniji natpis, teško je interpretirati s obzirom da su naizgled vidljiva samo dva slova, od kojih se posljednje možda može tumačiti kao slovo *M*, dok je prvo slovo nejasno. Treba napomenuti kako se na istoj strani, otprilike ispod brojke *II*, možda nazire i gotovo izbrisana oznaka za denar. S obzirom da je postojeći natpis jasno urezan i da je stariji natpis *.M* također donekle čitak, za pretpostaviti je kako je eventualna oznaka za denar trag jednoga još starijeg natpisa.

U odnosu na ostale olovne tesere iz Siska, natpis na ovoj pločici ne sadrži nikakvo osobno ime⁶, no tu je toponim *Segestica* koji dosad nije registriran na sisačkim teserama. Nema ni cijene, odnosno navoda o vrijednosti robe, inače uobičajene stavke na većini ostalih sisačkih tesera.⁷

S obzirom da nam arheološki kontekst nije od neke pomoći pri pokušaju datiranja ove tesere, moramo se, ukoliko želimo odrediti kronološki okvir, osloniti na druge kriterije. Natpis je napisan kurzivnom majuskulom, poznatom i pod nazivom starija rimska kurziva (J. Mallon u svojoj terminologiji preferira termin klasično opće pismo - *l'écriture commune classique*), tj. pismom koje se rabilo tijekom principata, otprilike do sredine 3. st., pa i koje desetljeće duže. Ovo se pismo donekle razlikuje od monumentalnog pisma, uobičajenog na kamenim spomenicima carskog doba (*litterae lapidariae*), iako oba pisma vuku podrijetlo od arhaičnog latinskog alfabeta, odnosno kapitale koja se rabila u kasnorepublikanskom razdoblju. Kurzivno se pismo rabilo u svakodnevnoj korespondenciji te ga susrećemo kako na papirusima i voštanim pisacim pločicama tako i na natpisima

5. Postoji, naravno, i Mócsyeva interpretacija spomenuta u bilješci 2, koja se također može ozbiljno razmatrati.

6. Osobna imena su vrlo česta na ostalim pločicama iz Siska, a na temelju dosadašnje obrade čitljivih natpisa čini se da su na više od 70% pločica očuvana imena ljudi.

7. Na temelju dosadašnje obrade natpisa na pločicama iz Siska, izgleda da se cijene navode na približno 80% primjeraka.

common context with clothing items. As a possible interpretation, Bowman and Thomas put forward three measurement units: *m(odus)*, *m(odulus)* or *m(ensura)*. Unfortunately, we do not know for any of them how much they amounted to, but there is no doubt that they were used as measurement units for textile (Bowman, Thomas 2003, 57, cat. 596).

As a possible interpretation for the letter *F*, I suggest an entirely common abbreviation in the Roman epigraphic legacy, the contraction of the verb *facio, facere* (Cagnat 1914, 428).

The possible interpretation would thus be:

in Segestica
r(ecepi) m(ensuram) (unam), f(eci) (duos, duas or duo)

or, in translation, "I received (or took over) a measurement (of cloth, which is implicit), I made two (masculine, feminine or neuter noun, depending on the gender of the clothing item implicit in the inscription)". Instead of *m(ensuram)*, a possible interpretation would also be *m(odum) unum* or *m(odulum) unum*.

Understandably, the offered interpretation of the abbreviations *RMI* and *FI* cannot be considered absolutely certain and final, but in the lack of a more certain interpretation I believe that the translation can be considered acceptable.⁵ If the interpretation of the abbreviations is correct, a production is mentioned of certain clothing items that are not indicated in the inscription, presumably because the precise type of commodity was known or implicit to the author of the inscription and to the persons for whom the text on the label was intended. Taking into account the inscriptions from other tesserae from Sisak, possible candidates are clothing items such as *sagum, tunica* or *paenula*. The earlier inscription, turned upside down with regard to the most recent one, is difficult to interpret as apparently only two letters are visible, the last of which could perhaps be interpreted as the letter *M*, while the first one is unclear. It merits mention that on the same side, approximately below the number *II*, an almost erased mark for a denarius is perhaps discernible. Considering that the existing inscription is clearly incised, and that the earlier inscription *.M* is likewise legible to a degree, it can be assumed that the possible mark for denarius is the trace of an even earlier inscription.

In comparison with the remaining lead tesserae from Siscia, the inscription on this tag does not contain any personal name,⁶ but there is the toponym *Segestica*, previously unregistered on any tessera from Sisak. There is also no price, or declaration of the value of the commodity, otherwise a regular entry on the majority of the remaining tesserae from Sisak.⁷

Considering that the archaeological context is not of much help in the attempt to date this tessera, we have to rely on other criteria if we wish to determine the chronological frame. The inscription was written in cursive majuscule also known as earlier Roman cursive (J. Mallon in his terminology prefers the term "general classical script" - *l'écriture commune classique*), that is the script used during the principate, approximately until the mid-3rd cent., and even a decade or two longer. This script differs to a certain extent from the monumental script usual on the stone monuments of the imperial period (*litterae lapidariae*), although both scripts trace their origin from the archaic Latin alphabet, that is the capital script used in the late republican period. The cursive script was used in the everyday correspondence and one encounters it on the papyri and wax writing tablets as much as on the inscrip-

5. There is also Mócsy's interpretation mentioned in the note 2, which can also be taken into serious consideration.

6. Personal names are very frequent on the other tags from Sisak, and on the basis of the so far conducted analysis of the legible inscriptions it appears that the names of people are preserved on more than 70% of the tags.

7. On the basis of the analysis of the inscriptions on the tags from Sisak carried out so far, it seems that price is mentioned on more than 80% of the pieces.

na olovu (robne markice i kletve – *defixionum tabellae*) te grafitima na keramici ili na zidovima.⁸

Zato se i ova tesera može okvirno datirati u prvih 250 godina nakon Krista. Ukoliko želimo suziti kronološki okvir, možemo uzeti u obzir datacije tesera istog tipa koje su više ili manje precizno datirane zbog konteksta nalaza. One se općenito datiraju od 1. do 3. st., izgleda s većom zastupljenošću u prva dva stoljeća,⁹ no neki su primjerci zahvaljujući arheološkom kontekstu datirani u uži kronološki okvir. Tesere iz Magdalensberga datirane su tako u augustovsko razdoblje (Egger 1967, 193-210), primjerci iz Uska u vrijeme Neronove vladavine (Wright et al. 1975, 291-293), tesera iz Mooshama (*Immurium*) u kasno 1. st. ili rano 2. st. (Weber 1971, 229-234), dok se tesere iz mjesta Forggensee bei Dietringen mogu datirati u prvu polovicu 1. st. (Römer-Martijnse 1996-1997, 23). Olovna tesera pronađena tijekom nedavnih istraživanja u Vrhnici se može datirati u kasnorepublikansko, odnosno augustovsko vrijeme, možda i koje desetljeće kasnije, s obzirom na procvat koji je u tom razdoblju doživjelo naselje Nauport (*Nauportus*), da bi zatim vrlo brzo zbog osnutka kolonije Emone izgubilo na važnosti i prestalo se razvijati kao značajno urbano središte.¹⁰ Tesere iz Kalsdorfa bi se okvirno mogle datirati u sredinu 2. st., odnosno otprilike između 120. i 180. godine.¹¹

Budući da na ovoj teseri nema spomena cijene ili osobnog imena, gospodarska povijest, numizmatika i onomastika nam ne bi bile ni od kakve pomoći da kojim slučajem ne raspoložemo i s drugim sisačkim tesserama. One bi se, zahvaljujući cijenama koje se na njima često spominju, mogle okvirno datirati u vrijeme od Augustove vladavine pa približno do sredine 3. st., a dio cijena se može usporediti s nekim poznatim iznosima za odjevne predmete iz 1. st.

Onomastička analiza stotina očuvanih imena muškaraca i žena na sisačkim tesserama nadilazi okvire ovog članka, no zanimljivo bi bilo spomenuti kao svojevrsni kronološki pokazatelj izrazito slabu zastupljenost gentilicija *Aurelius*.¹² Taj

tions on lead (commodity labels and curses – *defixionum tabellae*) and graffiti on pottery or on walls.⁸ This is why also this tessera can be generally dated to the first 250 years after Christ. If we wish to narrow the chronological frame, we can take into consideration the dates of the tesserae of the same type, more or less precisely dated owing to the context of finds. They are generally dated from the 1st to the 3rd cent., apparently with greater frequency in the first two centuries,⁹ but certain pieces, thanks to the archaeological context, were dated within a narrower chronological range. The tesserae from Magdalensberg are thus dated to the Augustan period (Egger 1967, 193-219), the pieces from Usk to the time of Nero's reign (Wright et al. 1975: 291-293), the tessera from Moosham (*Immurium*) to the late 1st or early 2nd cent. (Weber 1971, 229-234), while the tesserae from Forggensee bei Dietringen can be dated to the first half of the 1st cent. (Römer-Martijnse 1996-1997, 23). A lead tessera found in the recent excavations in Vrhnika should be dated to the late republican or the Augustan period, perhaps a few decades later at most, taking into account prosperity experienced in that period by the settlement of *Nauportus*, soon after which, due to the foundation of the colony at Emona, it lost its importance and ceased developing as an important urban centre.¹⁰ The lead tags from Kalsdorf could be dated to the mid-2nd cent., i.e. approximately from 120 to 180 AD.¹¹

As there is no mention of a price or a personal name on this tessera, the economic history, numismatics and onomastics would be of no help to us whatsoever if by chance we did not dispose with other tesserae from Sisak. Thanks to the prices frequently mentioned on them, they can be generally dated to the period from Augustus' reign up until approximately the mid-3rd cent., and a part of the prices can be compared with some known prices for clothing items from the 1st cent.

The onomastic analysis of hundreds of preserved names of men and women on the Sisak tesserae surpasses the framework of this paper, but it would be interesting to mention as a chronological indicator of sorts the extremely poor representation of the gentilicium *Aurelius*.¹² This fact would point to a possibility that most

8. Cagnat 1914, 6-11; Mallon 1952, 17-73; Cencetti 1954, 63-66; Bowman, Thomas 1983, 51-71; Marichal 1988, 21-56; Tomlin 1988, 84-93; Bischoff 1993, 62-72; Speidel 1996, 31-34.

9. Römer-Martijnse 1990, 230; Paci 1995, 33. Treba napomenuti da novi nalazi iz Fréjusa ukazuju na mogućnost da su se takve olovne tesere rabile ne samo i tijekom cijelog 3. st. već također i u 4. st.: Pasqualini et al. 2006, 318-319.

10. Na teseri je očuvan natpis Arius Nauportanus, cf. deplijan izložbe „Nauport med Jadranom in Donavo, nova arheološka raziskovanja na Vrhniki“, postavljene od 14. 11. do 06. 12. 2006. god. u Galeriji Cankarjeva doma u Vrhnici, autora dr. Jane Horvat i dr. Milana Lovenjaka.

11. Alföldy 1991, 118; Römer-Martijnse 1991, 112; Alföldy 1993, 26

12. Točnije, registrirana je samo jedna osoba s tim gentilicijem, Aurelia Prima. Inače su registrirani gotovo svi carski gentiliciji do početka 3. st. S gentilicijem Aelius registriran je također samo jedan čovjek, Aelius Tastus. Za razliku od toga, ime Iulius registrirano je u barem 13 navrata, mada treba napomenuti da se uglavnom javlja kao žensko ime, bilo samostalno bilo popraćeno imenom oca u genitivu. Ipak, među nositeljima tog imena javljaju se i osobe koje sasvim vjerojatno posjeduju rimsko građansko pravo te nose gentilicij Iulius, kao što su Iulius Taurus, Iulia Acuta, Iulius Vianda ili Iulia Trepena. Ime Claudius se pojavljuje u barem tri navrata, od tog u dva slučaja svakako kao gentilicij (Cladius Vale(n)s, Claudia Iucunda), dok u jednom slučaju može biti riječ i o idionimu. U gradu kao što je Siscia gentilicij Flavius nije iznenađujuć, što potvrđuje barem 7 imena spomenutih na tesserama, među kojima se pojavljuje Flavius Celsinus, Flavius Capito, Flavia Procula ili Flavius Albanus. Gentilicij Ulpius je zastupljen na barem 6 tesera pa tako nailazimo na osobe kao što su Ulpius Lucanus, Ulpius Mucellinus ili Ulpius Cnidius.

Čak se i ime Cocceius pojavljuje jednom no samostalno tj. bez kognomena, pa nije isključeno da je u ovom slučaju to ime idionim. Inače, Cocceius je kao kognomen već registriran kod Panonaca: CIL III 14359 20; CIL VI 3297; Mócsy 1959, 27, 170.

8. Cagnat 1914, 6-11; Mallon 1952, 17-73; Cencetti 1954, 63-66; Bowman, Thomas 1983, 51-71; Marichal 1988, 21-56; Tomlin 1988, 84-93; Bischoff 1993, 62-72; Speidel 1996, 31-34.

9. Römer-Martijnse 1990, 230; Paci 1995, 33; it deserves mention that the new finds from Fréjus indicate the possibility that such lead tesserae were used not only throughout the 3rd cent., but also in the 4th cent., cf. Pasqualini et al. 2006, 318-319.

10. The inscription Arius Nauportanus is preserved on the tessera, cf. the brochure of the exhibition “Nauport med Jadranom in Donavo, nova arheološka raziskovanja na Vrhniki” (Nauportus between the Adriatic and the Danube, the new archaeological excavations in Vrhnika), displayed from November 14th to December 6th 2006 in the Gallery of the Cankarjev Dom in Vrhnika, by authors Jana Horvat and Milan Lovenjak.

11. Alföldy 1991, 118; Römer-Martijnse 1991, 112; Alföldy 1993, 26.

12. More precisely, only one person is registered with that nomen – Aurelia Prima. Otherwise, almost all imperial gentilicia are registered until the beginning of the 3rd cent. There is also only one person registered with the gentilicium Aelius – Aelius Tastus. In contrast to this, the name Iulius is registered in at least 13 cases, although it deserves mention that it generally appears as a woman's name, either independently or accompanied by the name of a father in the genitive. Still, among the bearers of that name persons also appear that most probably have Roman citizenship and bear the gentilicium Iulius, such as Iulius Taurus, Iulia Acuta, Iulius Vianda or Iulia Trepena. The name Claudius appears in at least three cases – of that twice certainly as a gentilicium (Cladius Vale(n)s, Claudia Iucunda), while in one case it may be an idionym. In a town like Siscia the gentilicium Flavius is not surprising, as substantiated by at least 7 names mentioned on the tesserae, which include e.g. Flavius Celsinus, Flavius Capito, Flavia Procula or Flavius Albanus. The gentilicium Ulpius appears on at least 6 tesserae, so thus we encounter persons such as Ulpius Lucanus, Ulpius Mucellinus or Ulpius Cnidius.

Even the name Cocceius appears once, but independently, i.e. without a cognomen, so it is not excluded that in this case the name is an idionym.

bi podatak ukazivao na mogućnost da većina sisačkih tesera pripada vremenu prije 212. god., kada taj gentilicij, stekavši građansko pravo zahvaljujući Karakalinom ediktu (*Constitutio Antoniniana*), dobivaju brojni stanovnici Panonije. Ipak, s obzirom na, do tog trenutka, više nego dvostoljetnu povijest rimske Siscije, naseljavanje brojnih Italika i veterana te činjenicu da je grad bio kolonija još od Vespazijanove vladavine, nije isključeno kako je znatni dio stanovnika Siscije, odnosno njihovih predaka (pri tome, razumljivo, mislimo na one čije su obitelji izvorno bile peregrine), stekao rimsko građansko pravo davno prije 212. god. Postotak novopečenih rimskih građana koji su stekli gentilicij *Aurelius* nakon stupanja na snagu Karakalinog edikta u ukupnom slobodnom stanovništvu Siscije tijekom 3. st., nije nužno morao biti izrazito velik jer su većinu stanovništva, bez obzira na nesumnjiv neprestani priljev došljaka, sasvim vjerojatno činili ljudi čije su obitelji generacijama živjele u tom gradu i čiji su preci ili već došli kao rimski građani ili su pak stekli rimsko građansko pravo na razne načine. Stoga slaba zastupljenost Aurelija među osobama spomenutima na tesarama, iako nedvojbeno zanimljiva, ne mora nužno biti presudan čimbenik pri određivanju određenog kronološkog okvira. Osim toga, gentilicij *Aurelius* se mogao steći i puno godina prije Karakalinog edikta, odnosno još od vladavine Marka Aurelija i brata mu Lucija Vera. Iako među imenima na sisačkim tesarama pretežu idionimi, često popraćeni patronimikom u genitivu (a možda i imenom vlasnika, ukoliko je riječ o robovima), određen postotak čine i pojedinci koje s popriličnom sigurnošću možemo smatrati rimskim građanima, a ne peregrinima ili robovima. Zanimljivo je napomenuti da se na sisačkim tesarama, kad je riječ o onomastičkoj formuli rimskih građana muškog roda, izgleda isključivo pojavljuje dvoimena formula, tzv. *duo nomina*, i to prvenstveno kasniji oblik *nomen + cognomen*¹³, no ponekad i raniji oblik *praenomen + nomen*.¹⁴ Taj bi nas podatak mogao navesti na mišljenje da natpisi na većini tesera nisu raniji od 2. st., no ostaje upitno možemo li primijeniti iste kriterije kao za datiranje natpisa na kamenim spomenicima i na predmetima strogo utilitarnog, a ujedno i neslužbenog karaktera kao što su ove olovne pločice, tim više što je prostor za pisanje na njima bio ograničen (što je uostalom i sasvim jasno vidljivo iz upotrebe brojnih kratica). Naime, zbog njihovih malih dimenzija nije isključeno da su zapisivači, kako bi uštedjeli na raspoloživom prostoru, svjesno izbjegavali zapisati *praenomen* koji je ionako poprilično izgubio na važnosti već od sredine 1. st. pos. Kr. (Thylander 1952, 77-81; Kajanto 1963, 3, 13-17; Salomies 1987, 390-396). Stoga nije isključeno da se barem dio natpisa s tesera u kojima se muški pojedinci imenuju gentilicijem i kognomenom, može datirati već u 1. st. Naravno, rana datacija se čini sasvim izgledna u slučajevima kad se rabi *duo nomina* u ranijem obliku (*praenomen + nomen*). Takve sisačke tesere se mogu okvirno datirati od Augustova vremena do sredine 1. st., ako ne i nešto kasnije. Isto tako, argument o manjku prostora za pisanje na tesarama se može koristiti i ukoliko prihvatimo mogućnost da određen postotak tesera potječe iz 3. st. U tom slučaju rijetkost gentilicija *Aurelius* bi se mogla objasniti pretpostavkom kako je

of the Sisak tesserae belong to the period before 212, when that gentilicium was acquired by numerous inhabitants of Pannonia, after they had been given full citizenship thanks to Caracalla's edict (*Constitutio Antoniniana*). Nevertheless, taking into consideration the until that time already more than a bicentennial history of Roman Siscia, the settling of numerous Italics and veterans as well as the fact that the town had been a colony ever since Vespasian's reign, it is not excluded that a good part of the inhabitants of Siscia, that is their ancestors (in this, understandably, I have in mind those whose families were originally peregrine), acquired Roman citizenship well before 212. The percentage of new Roman citizens who acquired the gentilicium *Aurelius* after Caracalla's edict took effect in the sum of the free inhabitants of Siscia during the 3rd century was not necessarily particularly great as the majority of the population, irrespective of undisputed steady influx of newcomers, was in all probability formed of people whose families had lived in that town for generations and whose ancestors either arrived as Roman citizens already or acquired Roman citizenship in various ways. Therefore the poor representation of the Aurelii among the persons mentioned on the tesserae, although undisputably interesting, is not necessarily the decisive factor in determining a specific chronological frame. Moreover, the gentilicium *Aurelius* might also have been acquired many years before Caracalla's edict, that is already during the reign of Marcus Aurelius and his brother Lucius Verus. Although idionyms predominate among the names on the Sisak tesserae, often accompanied by a patronimicus in the genitive case (or perhaps also by the name of the owner, in case those persons were slaves), certain percentage is also formed by individuals who can with a great degree of certainty be considered Roman citizens, instead of peregrines or slaves. It is interesting that on the Sisak tesserae, as regards the onomastic formula of the Roman citizens of male sex, almost exclusively a binominal formula appears, the so-called *duo nomina*, above all its later form *nomen + cognomen*,¹³ with occasional appearance of the earlier form *praenomen + nomen*.¹⁴ This information could lead us to think that the inscriptions on most tesserae do not predate the 2nd cent., but it remains open whether we can apply the same criteria as for the dating of the inscriptions on stone monuments to the objects of strictly utilitarian, and at the same time unofficial character, such as these lead tags, all the more so as the space for writing on them was limited (as is in fact entirely clear from the use of numerous abbreviations). Owing to their small dimensions, it is not excluded that the recorders, in order to save available space, deliberately omitted mention of the *praenomen*, which anyway lost in importance already from the mid-1st cent. A.D. (Thylander 1952, 77-81; Kajanto 1963, 3, 13-17; Salomies 1987, 390-396). It is therefore not excluded that at least part of the inscriptions from the tesserae in which male individuals are named by a gentilicium and a cognomen can be dated to as early as the 1st cent. Naturally, the early dating appears entirely plausible in the cases when *duo nomina* is used in its earlier form (*praenomen + nomen*). Such tesserae from Sisak can be approximately dated from Augustus' period until the mid-1st cent., if not also somewhat later. In the same vein, the argument about the lack of space for writing on the tesserae can be used even if we accept the possibility that a certain percentage of tesserae dates from the 3rd cent. In that case the rarity of the gentilicium *Aurelius* could be explained by the assumption that it became perfectly re-

13. Među njima su, primjerice, uz već spomenute s carskim gentilicijima, Aponius Proculus, Domitius Paulinus, Lucius Quadratus, Omullius Surus, Pacius Speratus, Plinius Carus, Stadius Quartus ili Vibius Firminus. Među ženama koje možemo s popriličnom sigurnošću smatrati rimskim građankama su, primjerice, Aconia Catta, Marcia Valentina, Octavia Drusila, Octavia Secunda, Silia Ce(n)sorina, itd.

14. Npr., Caius Vesidius ili Marcus Valerius.

Cocceius is otherwise registered as a cognomen among the Pannonians, cf. CIL III 14359 20, CIL VI 3297; Mócsy 1959, 27, 170.

13. Among those, in addition to the already mentioned ones with imperial gentilicia, are e.g., Aponius Proculus, Domitius Paulinus, Lucius Quadratus, Omullius Surus, Pacius Speratus, Plinius Carus, Stadius Quartus or Vibius Firminus. Among the women that can with a great degree of certainty be considered Roman citizens are for instance Aconia Catta, Marcia Valentina, Octavia Drusila, Octavia Secunda, Silia Ce(n)sorina, etc.

14. For example, Caius Vesidius or Marcus Valerius.

postalo sasvim izlišno zapisivati *nomen* koji je nakon 212. god. postao sveprisutan u Panoniji pa se brojne Aurelije ionako moglo međusobno razlikovati samo pomoću njihova kognomena. Zbog svega toga, onomastičkim mjerilima za dataciju sisačkih tesera se nužno moramo služiti s oprezom, no i oni idu u prilog pretpostavci da je riječ o predmetima koji su rabljeni tijekom dužeg razdoblja, odnosno od 1. st (pa možda čak i kraja 1. st. pr. Kr.), sasvim sigurno tijekom cijelog 2. st., a vjerojatno i znatni dio 3. st.

Ova tessera sadrži i jedan podatak koje druge sisačke tesere, kako zasad stvari stoje, nemaju. Kao što je već navedeno, riječ je o spomenu toponima Segestica. Stoga bi bilo zanimljivo obratiti pozornost na *spominjanje* tog toponima u očuvanim povijesnim izvorima.

Toponim Segestika, odnosno Segesta, se u pisanim izvorima spominje razmjerno rijetko u usporedbi s imenom Siscia, koje je daleko više zastupljeno u sačuvanim tekstovima.¹⁵ To nije začuđujuće jer se ime Segestika vezuje uz pret-povijesno naselje te se spominje isključivo u ranijim tekstovima ili pak kod autora, konkretno Apijana, koji citirajući starije izvore, spominje događaje iz vremena prije konačne uspostave rimske vlasti na tim prostorima.¹⁶ Strabon tako taj grad, koji on naziva Σεγεςτική, spominje u tri navrata u svom djelu dovršenom vjerojatno tijekom Tiberijeve vladavine, približno do 23. ili 24. god.¹⁷ Segestiku prvi put, nakon kratkog opisa japodskog područja, spominje kao grad u japodskom susjedstvu koji se nalazi u ravnici pored rijeke Save i pored kojeg se Kupa ulijeva u Savu, na trgovačkom putu koji povezuje Akvileju preko Nauporta s panonskim prostorom, na idealnom mjestu za pokretanje pohoda protiv Dačana (IV. 6, 10). Nekoliko poglavlja kasnije (VII. 5, 2), osvrće se na etnički sastav panonskih prostora te opisuje Segestiku kao grad na nekoliko plovnih rijeka, ponovno ističući njezin pogodan strateški položaj za polaznu točku u pohodima protiv Dačana. Ujedno naglašava ulogu Segestike kao trgovačkog središta u koje se slijeva roba iz raznih krajeva i iz same Italije. Nadasve je zanimljivo da Strabon na kraju tog odlomka izričito spominje postojanje u blizini grada Segestike i utvrđenja zvanog Siskija (Σισκία).¹⁸

Segestiku Strabon spominje još jednom u svojoj knjizi, ali samo uzgred, pri opisu teritorija Skordiska (VII. 5, 12), kad opet navodi da rijeka Noarus teče pored Segestike.

15. Za iscrpan pregled spomena imena grada Siscije, odnosno Segestike u antičkim izvorima: Šašel 1974, 705-714.
16. Kasije Dion, opisujući iste događaje, usprkos činjenici da je vjerojatno koristio barem jedan isti izvor kao i Apijan, (Augustove memoare, Commentarii) isključivo rabi ime Σισκία, odnosno Siscija. Čini se sasvim vjerojatnim da je Kasije Dion staro ime grada u svojim izvorima namjerno zamijenio imenom koje je njegovim čitateljima nedvojbeno bilo dobro poznato, ne želeći opterećivati tekst suvišnim podacima i objašnjenjima. Nije isključeno da Apijan, koji za razliku od Diona vjerojatno nikad nije boravio u Panoniji, čitajući stare izvore u kojima se Siscia razumljivo ne spominje, uopće nije bio svjestan da je Segesta iz njegovih izvora naselje na istome mjestu kao i Siscija njegova vremena: Šašel Kos 1986, 33; Šašel Kos 1997, 191-192.
17. Za najnovije rasprave o Strabonu i vremenu u kojem je živio i pisao svoje djelo: Potheary 1997; Dueck 1999; Potheary 2002.
18. Istina, u istoj rečenici kaže da je i Sirmij u blizini Segestike, što donekle dovodi u sumnju pouzdanost njegovih navoda, tim više što spominje da se Drava pored Segestike ulijeva u inače nepoznatu rijeku Noarus. Informaciju o rijeci Noarus koja teče pored Segestike ponavlja i u odlomku VII. 5. 12. Nije isključeno da je Noarus starije ime za rijeku Savu, odnosno naziv za tu rijeku preuzet iz nekog nama nepoznatog jezika, manje je vjerojatno da je riječ o rijeci Odri (Šašel Kos 2002, 151-152; Šašel Kos 2005, 426), no spominjanje Drave u ovom kontekstu je nesumnjivo Strabonova pogreška ili pak greška u izvoru kojim se služio Strabon.

dundant to write a *nomen* that became omnipresent in Pannonia after 212, and numerous Aurelii could at any rate be distinguished only with the help of their cognomen. On account of everything mentioned here, we have to be very cautious when using the onomastic criteria for dating the Sisak tesserae, even though they also speak in favour of the assumption that these were objects used through a longer chronological period, more precisely from the 1st (perhaps even from the end of the 1st cent. B.C.), most certainly throughout the entire 2nd cent., and probably also through the good part of the 3rd cent.

This tessera contains also a piece of information that the remaining tesserae from Sisak, in the present state of things, lack. As has already been mentioned, we are talking about the mention of the toponym *Segestica*. It would therefore be interesting to direct attention to the mention of that toponym in the preserved historical sources.

The toponym *Segestica*, or *Segesta*, appears in the written sources relatively rarely in comparison with the name *Siscia*, which is far more present in the preserved texts.¹⁵ This is not surprising as the name *Segestica* is connected with the prehistoric settlement and is mentioned exclusively in the earlier texts or by the authors, more precisely Appian, who, in quoting earlier sources, mentions the events from the time prior to the final establishment of the Roman authority in these territories.¹⁶ Thus Strabo mentions that town, which he calls Σεγεςτική, on three occasions in his work completed probably during Tiberius' reign, approximately until the year 23 or 24.¹⁷ He mentions *Segestica* for the first time, after a short description of the lapodian territory, as a town in the neighbourhood of the lapodes, which lies in a plain adjacent to the Sava river, and near which the Kupa joins the Sava, on a trade route connecting Aquilea through Nauportus with the Pannonian region, on an ideal place for starting a campaign against the Dacians (IV. 6, 10). Several chapters later (VII. 5, 2) he comments the ethnic composition of the Pannonian territories and describes *Segestica* as a town on several navigable rivers, again laying emphasis on its suitable strategic position as a starting point in the campaign against the Dacians. At the same time he emphasizes the role of *Segestica* as a trade centre into which commodities flow from various lands and from Italy itself. It is interesting most of all that at the end of that chapter Strabo makes a specific mention of the existence of a fort called *Siskia* (Σισκία) in the neighbourhood of the town of *Segestica*.¹⁸ Strabo makes another –but only perfunctory– mention of *Segestica* in his book, when he describes the territory of the

15. For a comprehensive survey of the mention of the name of the town of *Siscia*, or *Segestica* in the sources from antiquity cf. Šašel 1974, 705-714.
16. Cassius Dio, describing the same events, in spite of the fact that he was probably using at least one identical source as Appian (Augustus' memoirs, Commentarii) uses exclusively the name Σισκία, that is, *Siscia*. It seems quite likely that Cassius Dio deliberately replaced the old name of the town by a name indisputably known to his readers, not wishing to burden the text with excessive information and explanations. It is not excluded that Appian, who, in contrast to Dio, had probably never spent time in Pannonia, in reading old sources in which *Siscia* is understandably not mentioned at all, was probably not even aware that *Segesta* from his sources was the settlement lying at the same spot as the *Siscia* of his time; cf. Šašel Kos 1986, 33; Šašel Kos 1997, 191-192.
17. For the most recent discussions on Strabo and the period in which he lived and wrote his work cf. Potheary 1997, Dueck 1999, Potheary 2002
18. True, he says in the same sentence that *Sirmium* is also in the neighbourhood of *Segestica*, which casts doubts to an extent on the reliability of his claims, all the more so as he mentions that near *Segestica* the *Drava* river joins the river *Noarus*, otherwise unknown. He repeats the information about the *Noarus* river, which flows by *Segestica*, in the chapter VII. 5. 12. as well. It is not excluded that *Noarus* is an older name for the *Sava* river, or a name for that river taken from a language we are unfamiliar with; it is less likely that the name signifies the *Odra* river (cf. Šašel Kos 2002, 151-152; Šašel Kos 2005, 426), but the mention of the *Drava* in this context is undoubtedly a mistake on Strabo's part or perhaps an error in the source of which Strabo made use.

Smatra se da se za opis položaja i uloge Segestike u odlomku *IV. 6, 10.* služio nekim izvorom iz prve polovice 1. st. pr. Kr., vjerojatno Posidonijem, dok mu je za odlomak *VII. 5, 2.* možda osim Posidonija poslužio i nešto raniji izvor, vjerojatno ne kasniji od ranog 1. st. pr. Kr., ali možda još i stariji, iz sredine 2. st. pr. Kr. (Šašel 1974, 705-706; Šašel Kos 2002, 147-148, 150-151; Tassaux 2004, 172).

Plinije Stariji u djelu *Naturalis Historia*, opisujući granice Panonije, spominje Sisciju zajedno s Emonom kao kolonije u toj provinciji (*N. H. III 147*), no za našu temu je puno zanimljiviji sljedeći odlomak u kojem, govoreći o rijekama, spominje i Sisciju i Segestiku (*N.H. III 148*): *Colapis in Saum influens iuxta Sisciam gemino alveo insulam ibi efficit quae Segestica appellatur.* Iz njegova je opisa sasvim jasno da je poluotoku (Plinije kaže otok)¹⁹, pored kojeg teče Kupa prije utjecanja u Savu kod Siscije, ime *Segestica*. Nedvojbeno je riječ o današnjem Pogorelcu, a za Plinija taj toponim nije ime nekog naselja.

Apijan u svom djelu grad naziva Segesta (*III. XXIII, 67*), a koristi i oblik Segestika (*Σεγεστικῆ; III. XXII, 62*), ali češće spominje njegove stanovnike, *Σεγεστανοί* (*III. X, 30; XVII, 49; XXII, 62; XXII, 65; XXIII, 67; XXIII 68; XXIV, 69; XXIV, 70*).

M. Šašel Kos opravdano je upozorila da bi, što se grčkog jezika tiče, grad bilo pravilnije zvati Segesta zato što je oblik Segestika pridjevna izvedenica (Šašel Kos 1997a, 34-35; Šašel Kos 2002, 148; Šašel Kos 2005, 437). No s obzirom na Plinijev tekst i natpis na ovoj sisačkoj teseri, čini se da se u latinskom jeziku uvriježilo oblik *Segestica*, kako u književnom tako i u govornom jeziku.

O etimološkom porijeklu imena Segesta (odnosno Segestika) postoji više hipoteza. Filolozi su, ovisno o svojoj specijalnosti, pretpostavljali kako je riječ o imenu ilirskog (Mayer 1957, 308), latinskog (Ernout, Meillet 1932, 880, s. v. *seges*) ili keltskog podrijetla (Holder 1904, 1439-1440). Ova se potonja hipoteza čini najvjerojatnijom (Šašel 1974, 704; Šašel Kos 1997, 191; Šašel Kos 1997a, 35).

Toponim Siscia koji su Rimljani preuzeli kao ime svog naselja se također može interpretirati kao ime keltskog ili čak vjerojatnije panonsko-ilirskog porijekla (Mayer 1957, 308; Holder 1904, 1584-1587; Šašel Kos 1997, 192; Šašel Kos 1997a, 35).

Već je duže vremena u literaturi prihvaćeno da se pretpovijesna Segestika nalazila na prostoru današnjeg Pogorelca, poluotoka kojeg opasuje Kupa u posljednjem meandru prije ušća Save.²⁰ Riječ je, dakle, o prostoru na desnoj obali Kupe, na suprotnoj obali od rimske Siscije. Osim na antičkim izvorima, ta se hipoteza temelji i na arheološkim istraživanjima koja su nedvojbeno dokazala postojanje pretpovijesnih slojeva na Pogorelcu.²¹

Ako je suditi po izvorima, Segest(ik)a se vjerojatno može smatrati keltskim naseljem, možda nastalom na mjestu ili u neposrednoj blizini ranijeg naselja na Pogorelcu, koje se na temelju arheoloških tragova može datirati u halštatsko razdoblje. Pretpovijesna Siscija je, pak, možda bila željezno-

Scordisci (*VII. 5, 12*), where he again says that the *Noarus* river flows past Segestica.

It is thought that for the description of the position and the role of Segestica in the chapter *IV. 6, 10.* he used a source from the first half of the 1st cent. B.C., probably Posidonius, while in the case of the chapter *VII. 5, 2.* he probably made use, in addition to Posidonius, of an earlier source, probably not later than the early 1st cent. B.C., but perhaps even older, from the mid-2nd cent. B.C. (Šašel 1974, 705-706; Šašel Kos 2002, 147-148, 150-151; Tassaux 2004, 172).

Pliny the Elder, while describing the borders of Pannonia in his work *Naturalis Historia*, mentions Siscia together with Emona, as the colonies in that province (*N. H. III 147*). But far more interesting for our topic is the following paragraph, in which, talking about rivers, he mentions both Siscia and Segestica (*N.H. III 148*): *Colapis in Saum influens iuxta Sisciam gemino alveo insulam ibi efficit quae Segestica appellatur.* It is perfectly clear from his description that the pensinsula (insula in Pliny's words)¹⁹ past which the Kupa flows before joining the Sava at Siscia is named *Segestica*. We are indisputably dealing here with the present-day Pogorelec, and for Pliny this toponym does not denote the name of a settlement.

In his work Appian calls the town Segesta (*III. XXIII, 67*), and he also uses the form Segestica (*Σεγεστικῆ; III. XXII, 62*), but more often mentions its inhabitants, *Σεγεστανοί* (*III. X, 30; XVII, 49; XXII, 62; XXII, 65; XXIII, 67; XXIII 68; XXIV, 69; XXIV, 70*).

M. Šašel Kos justifiably cautioned that, as regards the Greek language, that it would be more appropriate to call the town Segesta, because the form Segestica is an adjectival derivation (Šašel Kos 1997bis, 34-35; Šašel Kos 2002, 148; Šašel Kos 2005, 437), but considering Pliny's text and the inscription on this Sisak tessera, it appears that the form *Segestica* became accustomed in the Latin, as in the standard so too in the spoken language.

Regarding the etymological origin of the name Segesta (or Segestica) several hypotheses are extant. Depending on their specialities, the linguists supposed that the word was of Illyrian (Mayer 1957, 308), Latin (Ernout, Meillet 1932, 880, s. v. *seges*) or Celtic origin (Holder 1904, 1439-1440). The last hypothesis appears the most plausible (Šašel 1974, 704; Šašel Kos 1997, 191; Šašel Kos 1997bis, 35).

The toponym Siscia, which the Romans took over as the name of their settlement can likewise be interpreted as a name of Celtic or even more probably of Pannonian-Illyrian origin (Mayer 1957, 308; Holder 1904, 1584-1587; Šašel Kos 1997, 192; Šašel Kos 1997bis, 35).

It has been accepted in the literature for a long time that the prehistoric Segestica lay at the position of the present-day Pogorelec, a peninsula surrounded by the Kupa in the last meander before the confluence with the Sava.²⁰ This is a zone on the right bank of the Kupa, on the bank opposite the Roman Siscia. In addition to the sources from antiquity, this hypothesis is based also on the archaeological excavations, which proved beyond doubt the existence of prehistoric layers at Pogorelec.²¹

If we are to judge by the sources, Segest(ic)a can probably be considered a Celtic settlement, perhaps formed on the spot or in the immediate vicinity of an earlier settlement at Pogorelec, which on the basis of archaeological remains can be dated to the Hallstatt period. The prehistoric Siscia in turn may have been an Iron Age settlement lying closer to the Sava river, positioned opposite

19. Plinije Stariji taj poluotok možda naziva otokom zbog velikog jarka kojeg je dao iskopati Tiberije (ukoliko je Tiberije taj jarak uopće dao iskopati na tom mjestu, a ne na drugoj obali, odnosno kod Siscije): Cassius Dio, 49, 37, 3, ili pak zbog obrambenog jarka koji je branio kopneni prilaz Segestici: Appianus, III., XXII, 62.

20. Faber 1973, 152; Šašel 1974, 726; Nenadić 1987, 73; Buzov 1993, 48-49; Šašel Kos 1997, 192; Burkowsky 1999, 18-19; Buzov 2003, 178.

21. Šašel 1974, 723, 729-730; Vrbanović 1981, 187; Nenadić 1987, 73; Durman 1992, 120; Buzov 1993, 51-52; Burkowsky 2000, 15-16; Durman 2002, 25; Lolić 2003, 135, 137-138.

19. Pliny the Elder perhaps calls the peninsula an insula on account of a large ditch that Tiberius ordered dug (if Tiberius had the ditch dug at that spot in the first place and not on the opposite bank, i.e. at Siscia), cf. Cassius Dio, 49, 37, 3, or perhaps on account of the defensive ditch which protected the land access to Segestica, cf. Appianus, III., XXII, 62.

20. Faber 1973, 152; Šašel 1974, 726; Nenadić 1987, 73; Buzov 1993, 48-49; Šašel Kos 1997, 192; Burkowsky 1999, 18-19; Buzov 2003, 178.

21. Šašel 1974, 723, 729-730; Vrbanović 1981, 187; Nenadić 1987, 73; Durman 1992, 120; Buzov 1993, 51-52; Burkowsky 2000, 15-16; Durman 2002, 25; Lolić 2003, 135, 137-138.

dobno naselje bliže rijeci Savi, smješteno nasuprot Pogorelcu na lijevoj obali Kupe (Šašel Kos 1997, 192). Ukoliko Strabon nije pogrešno interpretirao svoje izvore, ili pak ako spominjanjem utvrde Siscija pored Segestike ne opisuje zapravo stanje tijekom Augustove vladavine, čini se mogućim istodobno postojanje oba naselja u vremenu koje je prethodilo rimskom osvajanju. No nema sumnje da je, u tom slučaju, Segestika bila bitno veće i daleko važnije naselje, dok je Siscija mogla biti samo manje utvrđeno mjesto, vjerojatno s ulogom nadzora trgovačkog puta koji je išao Savom. Ipak, treba napomenuti kako zasad na prostoru rimske Siscije arheološkim istraživanjima nisu pronađeni pretpovijesni slojevi pa je nemoguće išta reći o nekakvom eventualnom pretpovijesnom lokalitetu na tom mjestu (Lolić 2003, 138). U svakom slučaju, rimski je grad koji se tijekom principata razvio pored ušća Kupe u Savu, dobio ime po Sisciji, a ne po Segestici, sasvim vjerojatno zbog već postojećeg toponima lokacije na kojoj je izraslo rimsko naselje. Postavlja se pitanje zašto se u doba Carstva nije očuvao kontinuitet velikog naselja kao što je to bila Segestika. Odgovor na to pitanje možda ima veze sa stanjem u kojem se Segestika našla nakon osvajanja. Grad je nesumnjivo pretrpio razaranja, no svaka se šteta može popraviti pa je malo vjerojatno da bi Rimljani samo zbog toga odlučili podići novo naselje na suprotnoj obali. Za razliku od materijalne štete, ljudske je gubitke znatno teže nadomjestiti. Broj poginulih među stanovnicima nakon tridesetodnevnog opsade sigurno nije bio zanemariv, no Apijan izričito tvrdi da je Oktavijan poštedio preživjele nakon što je osvojio grad te da je od stanovnika samo zahtijevao novčani namet. Neovisno o tome je li njegov čin bio motiviran humanošću ili čistim pragmatizmom, čini se više nego vjerojatnim kako je dobar dio Segeščana ipak preživio opsadu i nastavio živjeti u gradu. Međutim, ni Apijan ni Kasije Dion nam ne kažu kakva je bila sudbina stanovnika Segestike nakon gušenja pobune nedugo nakon što je Oktavijan napustio to područje i vratio se u Rim. Naime, već u ranu zimu 34. god. pr. Kr. do Rima je doprla vijest o napadu domorodaca na garnizon koji je Oktavijan ostavio u Segestici. Po primitku neugodne vijesti, Oktavijan je pohitao natrag za Segestiku no rimska je posada uspjela svladati otpor Segeščana prije njegova dolaska s pojačanjem.²² Milost koju je Oktavijan pokazao prema stanovnicima nakon opsade bila je ionako iznimna s obzirom na onodobne običaje u opsadnom ratovanju i malo je vjerojatno da bi Rimljani opet bili jednako milostivi, tim više što su pobuna stanovnika zaposjednog grada i napad na rimski garnizon po ondašnjem ratnom pravu mogli biti protumačeni samo kao mučki i izdajnički čin (Ziolkowski 1993, 69-91; Kern 1999, 323-351). Stoga nije isključeno da je nakon gušenja pobune veći dio Segeščana bio pobijen i porobljen te da se Segestika odjednom našla bez većine svojih predratnih stanovnika. Možda je u tom trenutku grad silom prilika prestao funkcionirati kao urbano središte te se *de facto* pretvorio u vojnu utvrdu. Ipak, kako nema arheoloških tragova rimskog vojnog logora, zasad je nemoguće sa sigurnošću odrediti njegovu lokaciju. S obzirom na burna događanja od 35. god. pr. Kr. do 9. god. po. Kr. i na veliku koncentraciju rimskih trupa u tom razdoblju (Šašel 1974, 734), vjerovati u postojanje samo jednog rimskog vojnog logora na prostoru Segestike odno-

22. O opsadi Segestike 35. god. pr. Kr. i pobuni 34. god. pr. Kr.: Appianus, III. XXII-XXIV; Cassius Dio 49, 36-38; Veith 1914, 49-58; Mócsy 1962, 538-539; Wilkes 1969, 52-53; Mócsy 1974, 22; Šašel 1974, 732-733; Šašel Kos 1986, 138-142; Zaninović 1986, 62-63; Nenadić 1987, 73; Hoti 1992, 137-138.

Pogorelec on the left bank of the Kupa (Šašel Kos 1997, 192). Unless Strabo erroneously interpreted his sources, or if by mentioning the fort of Siscia near Segestica he in fact describes the actual state of things during Augustus' reign, it appears possible that both settlements coexisted in the time preceding the Roman conquest. However, there is no doubt that in that case Segestica must have been a far larger and far more important settlement, while Siscia could only have been a minor fortified settlement, probably with the role of controlling the trade route along the Sava river. Still, it has to be said that so far in the area of Roman Siscia the archaeological excavations have not led to a discovery of prehistoric layers, so it is impossible to say anything about a possible prehistoric site at that place (Lolić 2003, 138). In any case, the Roman town, which developed during the principate at the confluence of the Kupa and the Sava rivers, was named after Siscia and not after Segestica, quite probably on account of the already existing toponym of the site on which the Roman settlement grew. The question poses itself why the continuity of a large settlement such as Segestica was not maintained during the Empire. The answer to that question perhaps has to do with the situation in which Segestica found itself following the conquest. The town undoubtedly suffered destruction, but as every damage can be repaired, it is improbable that the Romans would decide to erect a new settlement on the opposite bank only because of that. In contrast to material damage, the human losses are much more difficult to replace. The number of the killed among the inhabitants at the end of the thirty-day siege was certainly not negligible, but Appian explicitly asserts that Octavian spared those who survived after he had conquered the town and that he demanded from the inhabitants only a tribute in money. Regardless of whether his action was motivated by humanity or sheer pragmatism, it seems more than likely that a good part of the citizens of Segesta managed to survive the siege and continued living in the town. However, neither Appian nor Cassius Dio say anything about the fate of the inhabitants of Segestica after the quelling of the insurrection soon after Octavian left the area and returned to Rome. Already in early winter of 34 B.C. the news of the attack of the natives on the garrison which Octavian left in Segestica reached Rome. Upon the receipt of the awkward news Octavian rushed back for Segestica, but the Roman garrison succeeded in crushing the resistance of the citizens of Segestica prior to his arrival with the reinforcement.²² The mercy shown by Octavian toward the inhabitants after the siege was exceptional in the first place, if one considers the customs of siege warfare of the time, and it is improbable that the Romans would again be equally merciful, all the more so as the insurrection of the citizens of an occupied town and the attack to a Roman garrison could by the laws of war of the time be interpreted only as a perfidious and treacherous act (Ziolkowski 1993, 69-91; Kern 1999, 323-351). It is therefore not excluded that subsequent to the quelling of the insurrection the majority of the citizens of Segesta were murdered and enslaved and that Segestica suddenly found itself missing the most of its pre-war inhabitants. Perhaps in that moment owing to the circumstances the town ceased functioning as an urban centre and was *de facto* transformed into a military fort. Nevertheless, as there are no archaeological traces of a Roman military camp, it is at present impossible to ascertain its position. Considering the tumultuous events from 35 B.C. until 9 A.D. and a large concentration of Roman troops in that period (Šašel 1974, 734), placing firm belief in the existence of only one Roman camp in the area of Segestica or Siscia would perhaps be an oversimplified view to this complex body of issues. During the siege of Segestica in 35 B.C. the Romans indis-

22. On the 35 B.C. siege of Segestica and the 34 B.C. insurrection, cf. Appianus, III. XXII-XXIV; Cassius Dio 49, 36-38; Veith 1914, 49-58; Mócsy 1962, 538-539; Wilkes 1969, 52-53; Mócsy 1974, 22; Šašel 1974, 732-733; Šašel Kos 1986, 138-142; Zaninović 1986, 62-63; Nenadić 1987, 73; Hoti 1992, 137-138.

sno Siscije, možda bi bilo previše pojednostavljeno promatranje te složene problematike. Tijekom opsade Segestike 35. god. pr. Kr., Rimljani su nesumnjivo izgradili cirkumvalaciju oko grada te barem nekoliko logora za smještaj trupa koje su opsjedale grad. Uzmemo li u obzir da je Oktavijan nakon osvajanja grada u njemu ostavio posadu od 25 kohorti, što bi odgovaralo snazi dvije i po legije, te da se u Italiju sigurno nije vratio sam, za pretpostaviti je kako je vojska kojoj je bio na čelu tijekom opsade Segestike bila i bitno veća.²³ Teoretski je posada koja je ostala u Segestici 35. god. pr. Kr. trebala brojati više od 12.000 ljudi, ali tih 25 kohorti vrlo vjerojatno nisu bile u punom brojnom stanju. Možemo pretpostaviti da se ta brojka kretala oko 10.000 vojnika²⁴, što svakako nije malo. Ne možemo znati jesu li svi ti vojnici bili smješteni unutar bedema Segestike ili je barem dio ostao u privremenim taborima, izgrađenima tijekom opsade.²⁵ Garnizon vjerojatno nije bio bitno smanjen ni nakon gušenja pobune 34. god. pr. Kr., jer je tijekom cijele Augustove vladavine to mjesto bilo jedno od glavnih rimskih vojnih uporišta u Iliriku.²⁶ Tijekom panonskog rata, od 6. do 9. god., koncentracija trupa je u jednom trenutku dosegla impresivne razmjere, o čemu svjedoči Velej Paterkul. Riječ je bilo o 10 legija, više od 70 auksilijarnih kohorti, 10 ala (ili možda 14, sačuvani manuskripti unose neke dvojbe u ovu brojku), više od 10.000 mobiliziranih veterana uz brojne dobrovoljce i savezničku konjicu kralja Remetalka (*Velleius Paterculus*, 2.113.1-2) (Sumner 1970, 272), dakle, između 80.000 i 100.000 ljudi, možda čak i nešto više. Naravno, u pitanju je iznimna situacija, koja uostalom i nije dugo potrajala jer je opskrba toliko ljudi na jednom mjestu predstavljala težak logistički problem. Međutim, sve upućuje na to da se garnizon tijekom koja četiri desetljeća sastojao od većeg broja vojnika i nije isključeno kako za njihov smještaj nije bio predviđen samo jedan logor. U trenucima veće koncentracije trupa više je nego vjerojatno da je istodobno u funkciji bilo više logora, a uz mogućnost postojanja paralelnih logora na Pogorelcu i lijevoj obali Kupe, također tako nije isključeno da se položaj stalnog vojnog logora pomicao, ovisno o okolnostima i trenutačnim potrebama kao i o smjeni jedinica koje su sačinjavale garnizon.²⁷ Zbog svega toga ne treba odbaciti ni

putably constructed a circumvalation around the town and at least several camps to accommodate the troops laying siege to the town. If we consider that Octavian, having conquered the town, left in it a garrison of 25 cohorts, which would correspond to the force of two and a half legions, and that he certainly did not return to Italy all alone, we can assume that the army he was commanding during the siege of Segestica was considerably larger.²³ In theory, the garrison left in Segestica in 35 B.C. should have numbered more than 12000 persons, but in all likelihood those 25 cohorts were not fully manned. We can assume that that number was around 10000 soldiers,²⁴ which is certainly not small. We cannot know whether all those soldiers were accommodated within the fortifications of Segestica or at least part of them remained in temporary camps built during the siege.²⁵ The garrison was probably not significantly diminished even after the quelling of the 34 B.C. insurrection, as during the entire Augustus' reign that place was one of the main Roman military strongholds in Illyricum.²⁶ During the Pannonian war, from 6 to 9, the concentration of troops at one moment reached impressive proportions, of which Velleius Paterculus bears testimony. There were 10 legions, more than 70 auxiliary cohorts, 10 alae (or perhaps 14, the preserved manuscripts introduce certain doubts into this number), more than 10000 mobilized veterans, along with numerous volunteers and the allied cavalry of king Rhoemetaces (*Velleius Paterculus*, 2.113.1-2) (Sumner 1970, 272), altogether approximately between 80000 and 100000 people, perhaps even somewhat more. Naturally, an exceptional situation was at play, which anyway did not last long, because the supply of so many people at one place represented a grave problem for the logistics. However, everything indicates that during four decades or so the garrison consisted of a large number of soldiers, and it is not excluded that more than one camp was designated for their accommodation. In the moments of greater concentration of the troops it is more than probable that several camps were simultaneously in function. In addition to the possibility of the existence of parallel camps at Pogorelec and on the left bank of the Kupa, it also cannot be excluded that the position of a permanent camp was shifted depending on the circumstances and requirements of the moment as well as on the changing of the units that made up the garrison.²⁷ On account of all that one should nei-

23. Procjene o broju legija koje su pod Oktavijanovim zapovjedništvom sudjelovale u pohodu na Ilirik dosta variraju, pa ne znamo ni s koliko je trupa točno raspolagao krenuvši u rat, a ni koliko ih je morao izdvojiti za osiguranje zaposjednutog područja i opskrbenih komunikacija prije nego što je uopće stigao do Segestike. Ipak, pretpostavka da je za opsadu Segestike Oktavijan imao na raspolaganju oko 5 legija zvuči dosta vjerojatno: Domić-Kunić 2006, 92.

24. Ne nužno isključivo legionara jer su među njima mogli biti i pripadnici pomoćnih trupa.

25. W. Schmid je smatrao da je za potrebe garnizona od 25 kohorti nakon osvajanja izgrađen dvojni logor (Doppel Lager) za smještaj dvije legije, no osim navođenja dobro poznate činjenice o veličini prvotnog garnizona, ne obrazlaže svoje mišljenje drugim argumentima: Schmid 1925, 213.

26. S obzirom na raspoložive podatke, nemoguće je sa sigurnošću procijeniti veličinu i sastav garnizona između 34. god. pr. Kr. i 6. god. po. Kr. Možemo pretpostaviti kako su Rimljani cijelo to razdoblje u Sisciji držali snage dovoljne za brzo i učinkovito gušenje eventualne pobune domaćeg stanovništva u tom dijelu Panonije, dakle barem jednu legiju s pratećim auksilijarnim jedinicama, no to je samo hipoteza. A. Domić-Kunić uvjerljivo obrazlaže da je veliki vojni logor u Sisciji morao biti izgrađen najkasnije tijekom Tiberijeva panonskog rata, odnosno 12. god. pr. Kr., no s obzirom na stratešku važnost Segestike, tj. Siscije, sasvim je vjerojatno da rimska vojska nakon 35. god. nikad nije ni napustila grad, iako je veličina garnizona nesumnjivo varirala: Schmid 1925, 213-214; Mócsy 1959, 25; Mócsy 1962, 612-613; Mócsy 1974, 23; Hoti 1992, 138; Zaninović 1993, 53-54; Domić-Kunić 2006, 104.

27. U augustovskom razdoblju je bila uobičajena praksa da legije često mi-

23. The assessments of the number of legions taking part under Octavian's command in the campaign in Illyricum vary considerably, as we do not know how many troops he disposed with when he set out for war, nor how many he was forced to designate to securing the occupied territory and supply lines before he even reached Segestica. Nevertheless, the assumption that Octavian had around 5 legions at his disposal for the siege of Segestica sounds fairly plausible; Domić-Kunić 2006, 92.

24. Not necessarily exclusively the legionaries, as members of auxiliary troops may have been among them.

25. W. Schmid believed that for the requirements of a garrison of 25 cohorts following the conquest a double camp (Doppel Lager) was built to house two legions, but except the mention of a well-known fact about the size of the original garrison, he does not expound his opinion with other arguments; Schmid 1925, 213.

26. Considering the available data, it is impossible to ascertain the size and composition of the garrison between 34 B.C. and 6 A.D. We can assume that during that entire period the Romans kept in Siscia sufficient forces for a rapid and effective quelling of a possible insurrection of local population in that part of Pannonia, i.e. at least one legion with accompanying auxiliary units, but this is only a hypothesis. A. Domić-Kunić convincingly explains that the large military camp in Siscia must have been built during Tiberius' Pannonian war at the latest, i.e. in 12 B.C., but considering the strategic importance of Segestica, i.e. Siscia, it is entirely plausible that the Roman army never left the town after 35, even though the size of the garrison undoubtedly varied; Schmid 1925, 213-214; Mócsy 1959, 25; Mócsy 1962, 612-613; Mócsy 1974, 23; Hoti 1992, 138; Zaninović 1993, 53-54; Domić-Kunić 2006, 104.

27. It was an accustomed practise in the Augustan period that legions frequently change garrisons and even rebuild the camp anew if they returned to their previous station after a military campaign, not necessarily at the same location, cf. Syme 1933, 22.

hipoteze o logoru na Pogorelcu (Šašel 1974, 726, 732; Zani-
nović 1993, 54; Lolić 2003, 140), kao ni hipoteze o logoru na
lijevoj obali Kupe, odnosno na mjestu buduće rimske Sisci-
je.²⁸ Izvori nam tu, nažalost, nisu od velike pomoći. Strabon,
istina, spominje Segestiku kao grad i Sisciju kao utvrdu, što
bi išlo u prilog hipotezi da je u Augustovo vrijeme vojni lo-
gor bio na lijevoj obali Kupe, ali samo ukoliko bi bili sigurni
da je Strabon koristio suvremeni izvor.²⁹ No kao što je već
spomenuto, nije isključeno da se za taj pasus Strabon poslu-
žio bitno starijim izvorom. Velej Paterkul, suvremenik i sudi-
onik panonskog rata, uopće ne spominje Segestiku, dok
Sisciju opisuje kao mjesto gdje su se koncentrirale rimske
trupe pod Tiberijevim zapovjedništvom (*Velleius Paterculus*,
2.113). Međutim, i njegov je opis previše općenit te nam ni-

jenjaju garnizon pa čak i da ga iznova grade, ukoliko bi se nakon bojnog
pohoda vratile u svoju prethodnu postaju i to ne nužno na istoj lokaciji:
Syme 1933, 22.

28. Veith 1914, 51-58; Faber 1973, 153-154; Nenadić 1987, 72-73; Buzov
1993, 49; Burkowsky 1999, 30. Veithova pretpostavka da se Segestika
nalazila na lijevoj obali Kupe, tj. na mjestu gdje se razvila Siscija po
svemu sudeći ne stoji. No njegova argumentacija o postojanju logora na
lijevoj obali Kupe ne može se sasvim zanemariti, tim više što bi bilo za
očekivati da se tu nalazio jedan od tabora koji su bili dijelom cirkum-
valacije koju je Oktavijan dao izgraditi tijekom opsade Segestike. Ipak,
treba napomenuti kako se G. Veith u svom radu prvenstveno zanimao za
Oktavijanovu opsadu Segestike te, s izuzetkom rasprave o Tiberijevu
šancu odnosno kanalu, nije posebno spekulirao o stanju u narednim
desetljećima. A. Faber je pretpostavljala da se vojni logor, koji po njoj
nema veze s logorom ili logorima izgrađenima tijekom Oktavijanove
opsade, nalazio na prostoru Siscije te da se civilno naselje, koristeći
postojeću infrastrukturu, preselilo i razvilo na prostoru logorskog
teritorija nakon premještanja vojske, u nekom nedefiniranom trenutku,
odnosno kako ona kaže „kada legije se na Dunav“. Slično mišljenje
dijele V. Nenadić i M. Buzov, iznoseći hipotezu da se rimski garnizon
prvotno smjestio na prostoru Segestike, ali se ubrzo premjestio na lijevu
obalu Kupe, gdje je nakon odlaska vojske na temeljima logora niknulo
civilno naselje, dok je na drugoj strani rijeke Segestika postupno gubila
na značaju, odumirala kao naselje te u konačnici prestala postojati. I
one početak razvoja Siscije smještaju u vrijeme kad se vojska pomicala
prema Dunavu. Premještanje većeg broja vojnih jedinica prema Dunavu
i izgradnju limesa nije lako kronološki precizno odrediti, no u svakom
slučaju je riječ o dugotrajnom i postupnom procesu, koji se može pratiti
barem od klaudivijevskog vremena, ako ne i prije, pa sve do flavijevskog
razdoblja. Limes sa stalnim vojnim utvrđenjima na Dunavu svoj više-
manje konačan oblik dostiže tek za Trajanove i Hadrijanove vladavine.
U slučaju Siscije, čini se dosta vjerojatnim da se legijska posada zadržala
do 43. god., odnosno do trenutka kada IX. legija napušta Sisciju i odlazi
za Britaniju. No ukoliko i prihvatimo tezu da se legijski logor nalazio na
lijevoj obali Kupe, početak razvoja grada ne trebamo nužno povezivati s
odlaskom legijskog garnizona jer je malo vjerojatno da se civilno naselje
na lijevoj obali Kupe počelo razvijati tek u klaudivijevskom razdoblju.

29. To mišljenje zastupa A. Domić-Kunić (Domić-Kunić 2006, 68). Strabon
se, pišući svoje djelo, uz starije izvore nesumnjivo služio i njemu suvremeni-
m podacima i informacijama, tako da brojni opisi odgovaraju stanju
koje je vladalo tijekom redakcije teksta, odnosno stanju tijekom Tiberijeve
vladavine, a spominje i brojne događaje koji su se odigrali za Augustove
vladavine. Kao što je to uvjerljivo dokazala S. Potheary, Strabon se sig-
urno služio suvremenim podacima opisujući stanje i događaje primjerice
u Germaniji i na istoku Carstva: Potheary 2002, 398-434. Iako je sasvim
vjerojatno da mu je Posidonije bio glavni izvor za opis panonskih prostora,
možemo pretpostaviti kako je starije tekstove pokušavao osuvremeniti
novijim informacijama kojima je raspolagao: Tassaux 2004, 173. Kada je
u njegovu djelu riječ o Segestici, odnosno Sisciji, teško je sa sigurnošću
razlučiti suvremene od starijih podataka. Spominjanje utvrde Siscije kod
Segestike bi moglo ići u prilog hipotezi da je među Posidonijeve podatke
interpolirao i neke informacije vezane uz Augustovo i Tiberijevo vrijeme.
Nepostojanje jasnih arheoloških potvrda o postojanju pretpovijesnog
sloja na prostoru buduće rimske Siscije dodatno osnažuje pretpostavku
da bi Strabonova Σισκία φρούριον mogla biti rimski vojni logor pored
Segestike, a ne neko hipotetično pretpovijesno utvrđenje. Ipak, s obzirom
na nedovoljnu istraženost tog prostora, bojim se da je još uvijek prerano
zauzeti konačan stav o tom pitanju.

ther discard the hypotheses about the camp at Pogorelec (Šašel
1974, 726, 732; Zani-
nović 1993, 54; Lolić 2003, 140), nor the hypoth-
eses about the camp on the left bank of the Kupa, that is on the
spot of the future Roman Siscia.²⁸ The sources, unfortunately, are
not of great help here. True, Strabo does mention Segestica as a
town and Siscia as a fort, which would speak in favour of the hy-
pothesis that in the Augustan period the military camp lay on the
left bank of the Kupa, but only if we were certain that Strabo used
a contemporary source.²⁹ However, as it has already been men-
tioned, it is not excluded that for that chapter Strabo made use of a
considerably earlier source. Velleius Paterculus, his contemporary

28. Veith 1914, 51-58; Faber 1973, 153-154; Nenadić 1987, 72-73; Buzov
1993, 49; Burkowsky 1999, 30; Veith's assumption that Segestica lay on
the left bank of the Kupa, that is on the spot where Siscia developed is in
all likelihood without grounds, but his arguments regarding the existence
of a camp on the left bank of the Kupa cannot be neglected altogether,
all the more so as it could be expected that here lay the spot of one of the
camps forming part of the circumvallation that Octavian had built during
the siege of Segestica. It should nevertheless be stated that Veith was pri-
marily interested in his work about Octavian's siege of Segestica and that,
with the exception of the discussion on Tiberius' ditch or channel, he did
not specifically speculate about the situation in the subsequent decades.
A. Faber supposed that a military camp, which in her opinion has nothing
to do with the camp or camps built during Octavian's siege, was situated
in the area of Siscia and that the civilian settlement, by using the existing
infrastructure, shifted and developed in the area of the camp zone sub-
sequent to the redeployment of the army, in an indefinite moment, or, in
her words, "when the legions moved to the Danube". A similar opinion is
shared by V. Nenadić and M. Buzov, who put forward the hypothesis that
the Roman garrison was first positioned in the area of Segestica but soon
shifted to the left bank of the Kupa, where following the departure of the
army a civilian settlement sprouted on the foundations of the camp, while
on the opposite riverbank Segestica was gradually losing its importance,
withering as a settlement and eventually ceased existing. They too place
the beginning of the development of Siscia to the time when the army
was shifting towards the Danube. A shift of a large number of military
units towards the Danube and the construction of the limes are not easily
determined chronologically with precision, but in any case the process
lasted long and in gradual steps, and can be followed at least starting with
the time of Claudius, if not earlier, up until the Flavian period. The limes
with permanent military fortifications on the Danube reached its more or
less final shape only during Trajan's and Hadrian's reigns. In the case of
Siscia, it seems quite probable that the legionary garrison remained there
until 43, that is until the moment when the IX legion left Siscia and went
to Britain. But, even if we accept the thesis that the legionary camp lay on
the left bank of the Kupa, the beginning of the development of the town
should not necessarily be connected with the departure of the legionary
garrison, because it is improbable that the civilian settlement on the left
bank of the Kupa started developing as late as the Claudian period.

29. This opinion is advocated by A. Domić-Kunić, cf. Domić-Kunić 2006,
68; Strabo, in writing his work, in addition to earlier sources undoubt-
edly used data and information contemporary to him, so that numerous
descriptions correspond to the situation prevailing during the editing
of the text, that is the situation present during Tiberius' reign, while he
also mentions numerous events that took place during Augustus' rule.
As has been convincingly proved by S. Potheary, Strabo certainly used
contemporary data in his descriptions of circumstances and events tak-
ing place e.g. in Germania and in the east of the Empire, cf. Potheary
2002, 398-434. Although it is quite probable that Posidonius was his
main source for the description of the Pannonian areas, we can assume
that he made efforts to modernize the earlier texts with more recent
information at his disposal, cf. Tassaux 2004, 173. When Segestica or
Siscia are mentioned in his work, it is hard to distinguish with certainty
the modern data from the earlier ones. His mention of the fort of Siscia
near Segestica could speak in favour of the hypothesis that he interpolated
among the Posidonius' information also that connected with Augustus'
and Tiberius' times. The lack of clear archaeological evidence about the
existence of a prehistoric layer in the territory of the future Roman Siscia
further strengthens the assumption that Strabo's Σισκία φρούριον could
stand for the Roman military camp adjacent to Segestica, and not some
hypothetical prehistoric fort. Still, considering the insufficient level of
investigation of that area, I am afraid that it is still too early for taking a
final attitude regarding that issue.

šta ne govori o eventualnom razmještanju trupa na prostoru današnjeg Siska, ali izričito spominjanje Siscije bi moglo ukazivati na smještaj Tiberijeva logora na lijevoj obali Kupe. Sisciju kao Tiberijevu operativnu bazu tijekom panonskog rata spominje i Kasije Dion, također ne ulazeći u detalje (*Cassius Dio*, 55, 30, 4). Zanimljivo je kako u jednom drugom pasusu, prilikom opisa Oktavijanove opsade Segestike, izričito kaže da je Tiberije naknadno dao prokopati kanal kojim je dodatno osigurao grad (*Cassius Dio*, 49, 37, 3). Nema razloga sumnjati u tu Dionovu tvrdnju jer je na taj podatak zasigurno naišao u svojim izvorima. Tiberije je taj jarak nesumnjivo dao prokopati kako bi bolje utvrdio rimski vojni tabor, vjerojatno već 12. god. pr. Kr., kad je prvi put preuzeo zapovjedništvo u Sisciji ili najkasnije 6. god. kad je započeo panonski ustanak. Utvrđivanje točnog položaja Tiberijeva jarka (šanca) ujedno bi omogućilo i ubiciranje vojnog logora, barem u razdoblju od 12. god. pr. Kr. do panonskog ustanka. Prema Dionu, zbog tog šanca Kupa okružuje Sisciju i u njegovo doba, dakle u 3. st., pa je shodno tome i vojni logor tijekom Tiberijeva boravka morao biti na lijevoj obali Kupe, odnosno na prostoru gdje se razvio rimski grad. No je li time riješeno pitanje ubikacije vojnog logora? To ovisi o tome kako procjenjujemo pouzdanost Dionova teksta kao i o usporedbi njegovih podataka s podacima koje nam pružaju drugi izvori. Kad je već o šancu riječ, zanimljivo bi bilo Dionov podatak dovesti u vezu s već spomenutim Plinijevim riječima o otoku zvanom Segestika pored Siscije (*N.H. III 148*). Pogorelec, dakle, mjesto koje se smatra položajem na kojem se nalazila domorodačka Segestika, samo je umjetnim putem, odnosno prokopavanjem jarka mogao od poluotoka biti pretvoren u otok. Opisuje li dakle Plinije izgled tog prostora nakon što je Tiberije dao prokopati jarak? Ako je to tako, čini se da je Tiberije utvrđivao prostor na kojem se izvorno nalazila Segestika, a ne Siscija, pa bi se shodno tome logor u trenutku dok je on tamo zapovijedao trebao nalaziti na prostoru Pogoreleca. Dion, pak, izričito kaže da Kupa sad, odnosno u njegovu vremenu, opasuje cijeli grad upravo zbog izgradnje Tiberijeva šanca, no da tijekom Oktavijanove opsade to nije bio slučaj jer je Kupa tekla uz dio bedema, ali je između grada i Save postojao nenaseljen prostor koji su Rimljani tijekom opsade utvrdili palisadama i jarcima.³⁰ Upravo je taj podatak zbunjujući: iako se Segestika po svemu sudeći morala nalaziti na Pogorelcu, Dionov opis se poklapa s položajem rimske Siscije, smještene na prostoru između Kupe i Save. Dion, dakle, nedvosmisleno kaže kako se domorodačko naselje nalazilo na istom mjestu gdje je kasnije nikla rimska Siscija, a ne na Pogorelcu. G. Veith je, prateći Dionov tekst, razumljivo došao do zaključka da se pretpovijesna Segestika nalazila na istom mjestu kao i rimska Siscija (Veith 1914, 51-58).

J. Šašel argumentirano je odbacio njegovu hipotezu, a smještaj Segestike na Pogorelcu uostalom nedvojbeno potvrđuju i brojni pretpovijesni nalazi kojih na suprotnoj, lijevoj obali zasad nema (Šašel 1974, 726). Kako onda interpretirati Dionov tekst kad je i jedan vrsni poznavatelj topografije i

30. Iako Dion ističe samo utvrđivanje tog prostora, s obzirom na uobičajenu rimsku praksu izgradnje cirkumvalacije oko opsjedanih gradova i utvrda, vrlo je izvjesno da su Rimljani jednako postupili tijekom opsade Segestike. To nam uostalom potvrđuje i Apijan, koji piše da je Oktavijan dao okružiti grad palisadama i jarcima sa svih strana (*Ill. XXIII, 67*). S obzirom da su opsjedali naselje smješteno na Pogorelcu, zasigurno su utvrdili svoje položaje i na poluotoku smještenom između Kupe i Save (dakle, na prostoru budućeg rimskog grada) kao i na južnom dijelu Pogoreleca, gdje se nalazio jedini kopneni prilaz Segestici.

and a participant in the Pannonian war, makes no mention of Segestica whatsoever, whereas he describes Siscia as a place where Roman troops concentrated under Tiberius' command (*Velleius Paterculus*, 2.113). However, his description is likewise overly general and tells us nothing about the possible deployment of the troops in the territory of present-day Sisak, but the explicit mention of Siscia might indicate the position of Tiberius' camp on the left bank of the Kupa. Cassius Dio also mentions Siscia as Tiberius' operational headquarters during the Pannonian war, similarly not entering into details (*Cassius Dio*, 55, 30, 4). It is interesting that in another chapter, in his description of Octavian's siege of Segestica, he explicitly says that Tiberius subsequently had a ditch dug, with which he additionally secured the town (*Cassius Dio*, 49, 37, 3). There is no reason to doubt that Dio's assertion, as he must have encountered that piece of information in his sources. Tiberius indubitably had the ditch dug in order to better fortify the Roman military camp, probably already in 12 B.C. when he first took over the command in Siscia, or in 6 A.D. at the latest, when the Pannonian insurrection began. Determining the precise position of Tiberius' ditch would at the same time enable the location of the military camp, at least during the period from 12 B.C. to the Pannonian insurrection. In Dio's opinion, it is due to that ditch that the Kupa encircles Siscia in his time as well, i.e. in the 3rd century, so in accordance with this the military camp during Tiberius' residence must also have been positioned on the left bank of the Kupa, that is on the spot where the Roman town developed. But, is this also the answer to the question of the location of the military camp? This depends on how we assess the reliability of Dio's text as well as on the comparison of his information with that provided by other sources. While we are discussing the ditch, it would be interesting to bring Dio's information in connection with the already mentioned Pliny's words about the island called Segestica lying near Siscia (*N.H. III 148*). Pogorelec, i.e. the place considered the position of the native Segestica, could only artificially, by digging a ditch through, be transformed from a peninsula into an island. Is Pliny therefore describing the appearance of that area after Tiberius had ordered the ditch dug? If this is so, it appears that Tiberius was fortifying the space where Segestica, not Siscia, originally lay, so accordingly, in the moment when he was in command there the camp should have been located in the zone of Pogorelec. Dio in turn explicitly states that the Kupa now – that is, in his time – encircles the entire town precisely due to the construction of Tiberius' ditch, but that this was not the case during Octavian's siege, because at that time the Kupa flowed by a part of the fortifications, but there was an inhabited space between the town and the Sava, which the Romans fortified by palisades and ditches during the siege.³⁰ It is precisely that piece of information that is confusing matters: although Segestica in all likelihood lay at Pogorelec, Dio's description matches the position of the Roman Siscia, positioned in the zone between the Kupa and the Sava. Dio thus unambiguously says that the native settlement lay at the same spot where Roman Siscia later sprouted, and not at Pogorelec. G. Veith, following Dio's text, understandably reached the conclusion that the prehistoric Segestica was situated at the same place as the Roman Siscia (Veith 1914, 51-58).

J. Šašel rejected his hypothesis on the strength of arguments,

30. Even though Dio makes mention only of a fortification of that zone, considering the usual Roman practise of building a circumvallation around the towns and forts under siege, it is quite certain that the Romans did the same during the siege of Segestica. This is at any rate confirmed also by Appian, who writes that Octavian ordered the town encircled with palisades and ditches from all directions (*Ill. XXIII, 67*). Taking into consideration that they laid siege to the settlement situated at Pogorelec, they certainly fortified their positions also on the peninsula positioned between the Kupa and the Sava (i.e. on the spot of the future Roman town) as well as on the southern part of Pogorelec, where the only land access to Pogorelec lay.

vojne taktike, kao što je to bio G. Veith, na temelju Dionovih riječi zaključio kako se rimski grad razvio na mjestu pretpovijesnog naselja? Je li Dion, u namjeri da bude što koncizniji, kombinirajući podatke iz različitih izvora u konačnici nena-mjerno napisao donekle zbunjujući opis opsade Segestike, iz kojeg nam nije baš jasan ni točan raspored Oktavijanovih opsadnih fortifikacija kao ni točan položaj naknadno izgrađenog Tiberijeva velikog šanca? Ili je citirajući izvore iznio i svoje osobne spoznaje o tom mjestu? Kao što je i sam isticao, dobro je poznao Panoniju, a sasvim vjerojatno je i osobno posjetio Sisciju. Možemo stoga pretpostaviti kako je imao jasnu predodžbu o topografiji tog grada (Šašel Kos 1986, 34). Isto tako je nesumnjivo bio svjestan da je Segestika iz njegovih izvora naselje koje je na tom prostoru postojalo prije izgradnje rimskog grada te je stoga, da ne zbunjuje svoje čitatelje, isključivo koristio općepoznato ime Siscija, a ne širokoj publici nepoznato ime Segestika (Šašel Kos 1997, 191-192). No je li bio svjestan činjenice kako pretpovijesno naselje nije bilo na istoj lokaciji kao i Siscija, već da se nalazilo na suprotnoj obali Kupe? Kako god bilo, on to u svom tekstu nigdje ne spominje. Opisujući opsadu Segestike, izgleda da on opisuje mjesto na kojem se nalazila Siscija njegova vremena, vjerojatno stoga jer je bio uvjeren kako je rimski grad koji on poznaje bio izgrađen na položaju naselja kojeg je osvojio Oktavijan. No što s Tiberijevim šancem? Je li Dion mogao toliko pogriješiti i potpuno krivo ga smjestiti? Ne kaže li, uostalom, kako jarak postoji i u njegovo vrijeme pa je za pretpostaviti da ga je i osobno vidio. Čini se, dakle, da je u 3. st. Siscija bila opasana nekakvim opkopom, no kako možemo biti sigurni da je baš riječ o Tiberijevu djelu? Čitajući u nekom od svojih izvora o kanalu kojeg je dao prokopati Tiberije, Dion je možda jednostavno zaključio da obrambeni opkop grada Siscije potječe još iz tog vremena. U opkop oko Siscije bi se nesumnjivo ulijevala voda iz Kupe, pa Dionova tvrdnja da Kupa teče oko cijelog grada ima smisla. Treba uzeti u obzir da je Dion svoje djelo pisao početkom 3. st., odnosno da ga je dovršio najkasnije do 229. god. (Šašel Kos 1986, 44). Iako je nesumnjivo dobro poznao Panoniju, pa vjerojatno i Sisciju, treba napomenuti da je on taj kraj upoznao više od dva stoljeća nakon Oktavijanove opsade i Batonova ustanka. Za podatke o tim davnim događajima morao se osloniti na pisane izvore, a sve njegove opaske i interpolacije koje se temelje na njegovu osobnom iskustvu se isključivo tiču vremena u kojem je živio te se ne mogu primijeniti na augustovsko razdoblje. Nema spora da Plinije Stariji u svom djelu posvećuje neusporedivo manje pažnje Sisciji nego Dion, jer taj grad spominje samo uzgred, ali za razliku od Diona on jasno razlikuje otok Segestiku i grad Sisciju. Diona dijele stoljeća od događaja koje opisuje, dok je Plinije rođen 23. ili 24. god., dakle svega 15 godina nakon gušenja velikog panonskog ustanka. Mada nije nemoguće, teško je sa sigurnošću tvrditi da je Plinije, makar kao dijete, mogao poznavati nekoga tko je sudjelovao u opsadi Segestike pod Oktavijanovim zapovjedništvom. No zato je u svojoj mladosti sasvim vjerojatno bio u prilici osobno upoznati ljude koji su se borili pod Tiberijem i koji su možda tijekom panonskog rata i boravili u Sisciji. To naravno nije nikakav argument, ali je bitno naglasiti kako osvajanje Segestike i panonski ustanak za Plinija nisu bili davna prošlost, već događaji u kojima su sudjelovali ljudi generacije njegovih dje-dova i roditelja. Iako navodi samo nekoliko podataka o Sisciji i Segestici, Plinijev tekst ima određenu težinu upravo zbog male vremenske distance koja ga dijeli od događaja koji nas

and the position of Segestica at Pogorelec is at any rate indisputably corroborated by numerous prehistoric finds, absent so far on the opposite, left bank (Šašel 1974, 726). How is one then to interpret Dio's text when even an excellent connoisseur of topography and military tactics as Veith concluded on the basis of Dio's words that the Roman town developed on the spot of the prehistoric settlement? Did Dio, in his wish for to be as concise as possible, while combining information from various sources eventually inadvertently write a somewhat confusing description of the siege of Segestica, from which we cannot ascertain clearly either the precise arrangement of Octavian's siege fortifications or the exact position of the subsequently constructed Tiberius' large ditch? Or was he, while quoting the sources, at the same time expressing his personal knowledge about that place? As he himself used to point out, he knew Pannonia well, and it is quite probable that he visited Siscia in person. We can therefore assume that he possessed a clear idea about the topography of that town (Šašel Kos 1986, 34). It is likewise indisputable that he was aware that Segestica from his sources was the settlement that existed at that place before the construction of the Roman town and he therefore, in order not to mislead his readers, exclusively used the widely known name of Siscia instead of Segestica, which was unknown to the wider public (Šašel Kos 1997, 191-192). But, was he aware of the fact that the prehistoric settlement did not lie on the same position as Siscia, but on the opposite bank of the Kupa? Be as it may, he never mentions it in his text. While describing the siege of Segestica, it seems to me that he describes the place on which Siscia of his time stood, probably because he was convinced that the Roman town he knew had been built on the spot of the settlement conquered by Octavian. However, what about Tiberius' ditch? Could Dio have made such a big mistake as to place it inaccurately? Does he not say after all that the ditch was present in his time as well, so one can assume that he saw it himself. It would thus appear that in the 3rd cent. Siscia was encircled by a ditch of sorts, but how can we be sure that this was precisely the work of Tiberius? Having read in one of his sources about the ditch that Tiberius ordered dug, Dio perhaps simply concluded that the defensive encircling ditch of the town of Siscia dates from that time. The ditch surrounding Siscia would undoubtedly receive water from the Kupa, so Dio's claim that the Kupa flows around the entire town makes sense. It should be taken into consideration that Dio was writing his work at the beginning of the 3rd cent., more precisely he finished it by 229 at the latest (Šašel Kos 1986, 44). Even though he without a doubt knew Pannonia well, and probably also Siscia, it deserves mention that he became acquainted with that region more than two centuries after Octavian's siege and the Bato's insurrection. For information about these long-gone events he had to rely on written sources, and all his commentaries and interpolations based on his personal experience relate exclusively to the time in which he lived and cannot be applied to the Augustan period. There is no contention that Pliny the Elder devotes in his work much less attention to Siscia than Dio, as he mentions that town only sporadically, but in contrast to Dio he makes a clear distinction between the island of Segestica and the town of Siscia. Dio is separated by centuries from the events he describes, while Pliny was born in 23 or 24 A.D., i.e. mere 15 years after the quelling of the great Pannonian insurrection. Although not impossible, it is difficult to claim with certainty that Pliny, at least as a child, may have known someone who took part in the siege of Segestica under Octavian's command. However, in his youth he most probably had the opportunity to personally meet people who fought under Tiberius and who may have resided in Siscia during the Pannonian war. This, naturally, is no argument, but it is important to stress that the conquest of Segestica and the Pannonian insurrection were not ancient history for Pliny but events in which people from the generation of his grandparents and parents took part. Even though he mentions only a couple of

zanimaju. Segestika je zbog smještaja na polutoku sa svih strana, osim s jugoistočne, bila okružena Kupom, a prokopavanjem jarka na toj strani bi efektivno bila pretvorena u otok na Kupu. Ta se interpretacija čini logičnim objašnjenjem Plinijeve tvrdnje kako je Segestika otok. Ako je prokopavanjem nekakvog šanca Pogorelec umjetno pretvoren u otok, može li to biti onaj jarak kojeg je dao prokopati Tiberije i kojeg Dion spominje nekoliko stoljeća kasnije? Ili je Segestika bila *de facto* otok još tijekom Oktavijanove opsade, s obzirom da Apijan spominje postojanje nekakvog obrambenog opkopa? To se čini manje vjerojatnim jer Apijanove riječi ne upućuju na takvo što. Ipak, nije isključeno da je Tiberije samo dao dublje iskopati stari obrambeni jarak na jugoistočnom prilazu Pogorelcu, pretvorivši ga tako u veću prepreku za potencijalne napadače. Ukoliko je Tiberije stvarno prokopao šanac preko Pogorelca, za pretpostaviti je kako je u Plinijevo vrijeme taj šanac još postojao, no s protokom desetljeća i stoljeća, izgubivši svaku vojnu važnost, bio je postupno zatrpan. U 3. st. od njega više nije bilo vidljivih tragova, pa je Dion mogao pogrešno zaključiti da opkop oko Siscije potječe još iz Tiberijeva vremena, što bi uostalom bilo u skladu s njegovim mišljenjem da je rimski grad nastao na temeljima pretpovijesnog naselja. Naravno, s obzirom da tragovi tog velikog šanca nisu pouzdano identificirani (Veith 1914, 55), ne možemo u potpunosti odbaciti ni mogućnost da je Tiberije ipak dao prokopati jarak na lijevoj obali Kupe, odnosno pored Siscije. Ipak, da je kojim slučajem Tiberijev jarak bio prokopan preko poluotoka između Kupe i Save na kojem je izrasla rimska Siscija, postavlja se pitanje ne bi li Plinije naglasio kako je Siscija na riječnom otoku? Analiza pisanih izvora nadilazi okvire ovog članka, no čak i ovih nekoliko pitanja bez sigurnog odgovora jasno pokazuje koliko nedoumica još postoji vezano uz osvajanje Segestike i najranije razdoblje rimske okupacije tog prostora.

U nedostatku nedvosmislenih i pouzdanih podataka iz izvora, samo arheološka istraživanja mogu ponuditi odgovor na pitanje o ubicaciji rimskog vojnog logora ili rimskih logora na području današnjeg Siska, no zasad to nije slučaj pa svaki pokušaj ubiciranja mora ostati hipotetičan.

Ukoliko prihvatimo mogućnost da je autohtono stanovništvo Segestike mahom stradalo tijekom 35. i 34. god., možemo pretpostaviti da su tijekom narednih desetljeća veći dio civilne populacije koja je obitavala na tom mjestu činili došljaci, ljudi privučeni dobiti koja se može ostvariti životom i radom pored velikog garnizona na razmeđu važnih trgovačkih putova. Prije svega, tu mislimo na trgovce i obrtnike te pružatelje raznih usluga prijeko potrebnih mnogobrojnim vojnicima, stacioniranim relativno daleko od rodnog kraja i mediteranske civilizacije. Broj tih civila je nesumnjivo bio proporcionalan broju vojnika, pa je velik garnizon svakako privlačio i brojne pridošlice.³¹ Ti ljudi, naravno, nisu mogli

31 O naseljavanju i djelatnostima civila, trgovaca i obrtnika u blizini garnizona u Panoniji: Mócsy 1959, 93-94; Mócsy 1962, 610-611, 678, 694-695; Mócsy 1974, 71-73; Fitz 1980, 142-143.

Treba napomenuti da je bilo sasvim uobičajeno da rimske trupe na bojnemu pohodu prati i podosta civila vrlo šarolikog statusa, i to podjednako onih koji su *de facto* bili neodvojiva pratnja vojske poput služinčadi, ali i onih čiji je formalni status bio vrlo upitan, poput raznoraznih preprodavača, živežničara, trgovaca robljem i prostitutki, dakle ljudi privučeni isključivo zaradom i možebitnim plijenom. O toj problematici: von Petrikovits 1980, 1027-1035; Speidel 1989, 239-247; Gilliver 1999, 29-31; Roth 1999, 91-115; Feig Vishnia 2002, 265-272. Sasvim je vjerojatno kako je određen broj civila, vjerojatno dobrim dijelom podrijetlom iz Italije ili barem prethodno nastanjenih u Italiji, došao do Segestike već 35. god. pr.

pieces of information about Siscia and Segestica, Pliny's text carries a certain weight precisely due to the small chronological distance separating it from the events we are interested in. Due to its position on a peninsula, Segestica was surrounded by the Kupa from all sides except from the southeast, and by digging a ditch on that side it would effectively be transformed into an island on the Kupa. This interpretation appears a logical explanation of Pliny's assertion that Segestica was an island. If Pogorelec was artificially transformed into an island by the digging of a ditch of sorts, could that be the same ditch that Tiberius ordered dug and that Dio mentions several centuries later? Or was Segestica *de facto* an island already at the time of Octavian's siege, considering that Appian mentions the existence of a defensive ditch of sorts? This seems less likely, because Appian's words do not point to anything such. Nevertheless, it is not excluded that Tiberius only instructed that the old defensive ditch on the southeastern access to Pogorelec be dug deeper, transforming it thereby into a greater obstacle for potential attackers. If Tiberius really dug a ditch across Pogorelec, the assumption would be likely that the ditch was still in existence in Pliny's time, but that with the passage of decades and centuries, having lost all military significance, it gradually became filled up. By the 3rd century no visible traces were left of it, so Dio could have reached erroneous conclusion that the ditch surrounding Siscia dated from as early as Tiberius' time, which would at any rate be consistent with his opinion that the Roman town grew on the foundations of the prehistoric settlement. Naturally, taking into consideration that the traces of that large ditch have not been identified with certainty (Veith 1914, 55), we cannot wholly reject the possibility that Tiberius after all had the ditch dug on the left bank of the Kupa, that is next to Siscia. Nevertheless, had by chance Tiberius' ditch been dug across the peninsula between the Kupa and the Sava on the spot where the Roman Siscia developed, the question poses itself would not Pliny lay stress on the fact that Siscia lay on a river island? The analysis of written sources surpasses the limits of this paper, but even these few questions without certain answers clearly demonstrate how many ambiguities are still left regarding the conquest of Segestica and the earliest period of Roman occupation of that territory.

In the lack of unambiguous and reliable information from the sources, only archaeological excavations can offer an answer to the question of the location of the Roman military camp or Roman camps in the territory of present-day Sisak. As this is presently not the case, every attempt at the location must remain only hypothetical.

If we accept the possibility that the autochthonous population of Segestica by and large perished during 35 and 34 B.C., we can assume that in the course of the subsequent decades the larger part of the civilian population residing in that place was made up of newcomers, those attracted by the profit obtainable by living and working next door to a large garrison on the crossroads of important trade routes. Here I primarily have in mind traders and craftsmen and those offering various services required by numerous soldiers stationed relatively far from their native lands and the Mediterranean civilization. The number of those civilians was without a doubt proportional to that of the soldiers, so a large garrison certainly attracted numerous newcomers.³¹ These people could

31. On the settling and activities of civilians, traders and craftsmen in the vicinity of the garrisons in Pannonia cf. Mócsy 1959, 93-94; Mócsy 1962, 610-611, 678, 694-695; Mócsy 1974, 71-73; Fitz 1980, 142-143

It deserves mention that it was entirely customary that the Roman troops on a campaign are followed by a fair number of civilians of diverse status, comparably those that were *de facto* an indivisible escort of the army, such as servants, and those whose formal status was quite dubious, such as all sorts of hucksters, grocers, slave traders and prostitutes, i.e. people attracted primarily by profit and potential booty. On that body of issues cf. von Petrikovits 1980, 1027-1035; Speidel 1989, 239-247; Gilliver 1999, 29-31; Roth 1999, 91-115; Feig Vishnia 2002, 265-272; It is entirely

živjeti unutar logora, pa su se nastanili u neposrednoj blizini. Ukoliko je vojni tabor stalno bio na Pogorelcu, na prostoru keltske Segestike, civilno naselje se moglo slobodno razvijati na suprotnoj obali. Isto tako, ukoliko je logor ili jedan od njih bio smješten na prostoru buduće rimske Siscije, moguće je da su pridošlice zajedno s ostacima autohtonog stanovništva iskoristile lokaciju koju je vojska u određenom trenutku napustila i tu postupno podigle civilno naselje. Uopće je odnos autohtonog naselja i kanaba koje su izgradili došljaci, kao i općenito strukturu grada Siscije u predflavijevskom razdoblju teško definirati s obzirom na trenutni stupanj istraženosti, no čini se sasvim vjerojatnim da su se u tom ranom razdoblju doseljavali brojni Italici (Mócsy 1959, 25; Mócsy 1962, 708; Zaninović 1993, 54). Na nekoliko lokacija u Sisku, u slojevima ispod rimskih zidanih temelja otkriveni su ostaci drvenih konstrukcija i pilota.³² Vjerojatno je riječ o elementima sustava drvene pilotaže kojim se pokušalo učvrstiti povremeno močvarno tlo između Kupe i Save. Nesumnjivo je riječ o prvim tragovima rimskih konstrukcija na prostoru antičke Siscije, a neki ih autori pripisuju ranom vojnom logoru. Ukoliko je njihova pretpostavka točna, rimska vojska je tu možda izgradila prve objekte na prostoru buduće Siscije, a premještanjem vojske je naknadno oslobođeno područje za naseljavanje civila (Faber 1973, 153-154; Lolić 2003, 142-143).

Točan trenutak kada se to moglo dogoditi je teško za sigurnošću odrediti, no kako je legionarska posada napustila Sisciju tek u Klaudijevo vrijeme, čak i u slučaju da se istraživanjima potvrdi postojanje legijskog logora na lijevoj obali Kupe u razdoblju od Augustove pa sve do Klaudijeve vladavine, malo je vjerojatno da je razvoj civilnog naselja započeo tek nakon 43. god., preuzimanjem lokacije toga hipotetičnoga vojnog tabora. U tom slučaju, mogli bi s dosta sigurnosti pretpostaviti kako je neko civilno naselje, koje bi mogli okarakterizirati kao kanabe, na toj istoj obali određeno vrijeme koegzistiralo sa susjednim logorom te da se jednostavno proširilo na bivši logorski teritorij nakon odlaska vojske.

Osobno sam sklon vjerovati, dok istraživanja ne potvrde ili opovrgnu tu pretpostavku, da je vjerojatno već za Tiberijeva boravka 12. god. pr. Kr., a najkasnije nakon slamanja pobune 9. god., kao konačna lokacija za legijski logor izabran Pogorelec, ne isključujući nimalo pritom mogućnost kako se u vremenu nakon 34. god. pr. Kr. pa sve do konačnog gušenja panonskog ustanka vojni logor, odnosno jedan od vojnih logora, u nekom trenutku mogao nalaziti i na lijevoj obali Kupe.³³ Na lijevoj obali Kupe su tijekom opsade Segestike gotovo sigurno bile izgrađene poljske fortifikacije koji su činile dio cirkumvalacije pa je sasvim vjerojatno da je rimska vojska već 35. god. pr. Kr. izgradila neke objekte na prostoru buduće rimske Siscije, možda čak i jedan od logora u kojem je bio smješten dio Oktavijanovih trupa. Ukoliko ta pretpostavka stoji, nema sumnje da bi taj prostor, kada ga je vojska definitivno napustila, bio vrlo pogodno mjesto za razvoj civilnog naselja zbog izgrađene infrastrukture i tla

naturally not have lived within the camp, so they took residence in the immediate vicinity. If the military camp was permanently at Pogorelec, on the territory of the Celtic Segestica, the civilian settlement could freely develop on the opposite bank. Likewise, if the camp or one of the camps was situated on the territory of the future Roman Siscia, it is possible that the newcomers, together with the remnants of the autochthonous population, used the site deserted by the army at one moment, to build a civilian settlement there. It is generally difficult to define the relationship of the autochthonous settlement and canabae built by the immigrants, as well as the general structure of the town of Siscia in the pre-Flavian period, with regard to the present-day state of research, but it seems quite probable that numerous Italians were arriving in that early period (Mócsy 1959, 25; Mócsy 1962, 708; Zaninović 1993, 54). Remains of wooden constructions and piles were discovered on several spots in Siscia, in the layers beneath the Roman foundations.³² These are probably elements of the system of wooden pilotage intended to reinforce the occasionally marshy soil between the Kupa and the Sava. These are undoubtedly the first traces of Roman structures on the territory of ancient Siscia, which some authors attribute to the early military camp. If their assumption is correct, the Roman army built there what are perhaps the first structures on the territory of the future Siscia, while the shifting of the army subsequently freed space for the settling of the civilians (Faber 1973, 153-154; Lolić 2003, 142-143).

The precise moment when that may have happened is difficult to ascertain, but considering that the legionary garrison left Siscia only during Claudius' rule, even in the case that the excavations prove the existence of a legionary camp on the left bank of the Kupa in the period from Augustus' reign up until that of Claudius, it is improbable that the development of the civilian settlement started only after 43 A.D., by taking over the site of that hypothetical military camp. In that case, we could be fairly certain in assuming that a civilian settlement, which we could characterize as canabae, coexisted on the same bank during a certain time with the adjacent camp, and that it simply extended to encompass the former camp territory following the departure of the military.

My personal belief is that, until the research has confirmed or refuted that assumption, it was probably already during Tiberius' stay in 12 B.C., and at the latest after the quelling of the insurrection in 9 A.D., that Pogorelec was chosen as the final site for a legionary camp, not excluding in the least the possibility that in the period after 34 B.C. up until the final quelling of the Pannonian insurrection, the military camp, that is one of the military camps, at a certain point may have been situated on the left bank of the Kupa as well.³³ Field fortifications that formed part of the circumvallation were almost certainly built on the left bank of the Kupa during the siege of Segestica, so it is quite likely that the Roman army already in 35 B.C. built certain structures in the territory of the future Roman Siscia, perhaps even one of the camps that accommodated a part of Octavian's troops. If this assumption is correct, there is no doubt that that space, once the military left it for good, would represent a suitable spot for the development of a civilian settlement, owing to the existing infrastructure and the soil reinforced by the

probable that a certain number of civilians, probably a good part of those with origins in Italy or at least with previous residence in Italy, reached Segestica already in 35 B.C. by escorting Octavian's troops. It is not excluded that some among them decided to settle permanently next to a large garrison that could represent a good source of income for them. The number of those first immigrants is impossible to assess with arguments, but considering the size of the garrison, the number may have reached hundreds of people, while even a number of several thousand would not sound entirely unconvincing.

Kr. prateći Oktavijanove trupe. Nije isključeno da su se neki među njima odlučili trajno nastaniti u blizini velikog garnizona koji im je mogao biti dobar izvor zarade. Broj tih prvih doseljenika je nemoguće argumentirano procijeniti no, s obzirom na veličinu garnizona, može biti riječ o stotinama ljudi, a čak ni brojka od nekoliko tisuća nije sasvim neuvjerljiva.

32. Vrbanović 1981, 196; Nenadić 1987, 76; Buzov 1993, 55; Burkowski 2000, 42-44; Lolić 2003, 141.

33. Na tu mogućnost uostalom upućuje i Strabonovo spominjanje utvrde Siscije u odlomku VII. 5, 2.

32. Vrbanović 1981, 196; Nenadić 1987, 76; Buzov 1993, 55; Burkowski 2000, 42-44; Lolić 2003, 141

33. This possibility is at any rate indicated also by Strabo's mention of the fort of Siscia in the chapter VII. 5, 2.

učvršćenog sustavom drvene pilotaže. Ipak, treba primijetiti da, zapravo, i nema nepobitnih dokaza kojima bi se ti rani građevinski slojevi s drvenim konstrukcijama povezali s vojskom. Oni, s obzirom na nalaze keramike, kronološki nesumnjivo pripadaju 1. st., odnosno njegovoj prvoj polovici, ali to ne mora nužno značiti da iza te gradnje stoje rimski vojnici, makar bi to bilo sasvim vjerojatno.

U svakom slučaju, neovisno o pretpostavljenoj lokaciji rimskog vojnog logora (odnosno vojnih logora) nema dvojbe da se rimski grad razvio na lijevoj obali Kupe, a ne na prostoru Pogoreleca, što upućuje na zaključak kako je došlo do zamiranja urbanog života na prostoru pretpovijesne Segestike.

Toj hipotezi ide u prilog i epigrafija: dok epigrafički spomeni imena rimskog grada Siscije sasvim razumljivo nisu rijetki³⁴, Segestika se na dosad otkrivenim natpisima ne spominje. Posebno je zanimljivo da se i u ranijim natpisima, odnosno onima datiranim u 1. st. po. Kr., isključivo spominje Siscia.³⁵ Istina, u tim ranijim natpisima Siscija se uglavnom spominje kao *colonia Flavia Siscia*, što bi ih datiralo u zadnju četvrtinu 1. st., odnosno u vrijeme nakon 71. god. U nekoliko tih ranih natpisa Siscija se navodi i kao mjesto rođenja, odnosno porijekla raznih pojedinaca.³⁶ Takav podatak nedvojbeno potvrđuje da je toponim Siscia, odnosno poimanje Siscije kao urbanog središta tada bilo sasvim uvriježeno kod lokalnog stanovništva. Zbog svega toga nema sumnje kako je toponim Siscia tijekom 1. st. pos. Kr. (svakako najkasnije tijekom druge polovice stoljeća, ali vrlo vjerojatno još i prije) zasjenio ime Segestika, koje se u carsko doba, po svemu sudeći, više ne rabi kao ime neke zasebne urbane cjeline.

Mada nema nikakve sumnje da se rimski grad na ušću Kupe u Savu nazivao *Siscia*, kako u natpisima službenog karaktera, tako i od strane njegovih stanovnika, spomen Segestike na jednoj od olovnih tesera iz Siska predstavlja nedvojbena dokaz o kontinuitetu korištenja ovog toponima i nakon rimskog osvajanja. Plinijev navod bi išao u prilog hipotezi da je toponim još bio u uporabi i tijekom znatnog dijela 1. st., barem do početka flavijevskog razdoblja, osim ako autor nije rabio neki stariji izvor što se, s obzirom na prirodu njegova djela, ne čini vjerojatnim. Već je spomenuto da se ova tesera može okvirno datirati u prva dva stoljeća nakon Krista, vjerojatno i koje desetljeće duže, no kako je ne možemo precizno datirati unutar toga dugog razdoblja, nemoguće je točno reći do kada je toponim Segestika još bio u uporabi, mada ona nedvojbeno potvrđuje da se to ime barem još neko vrijeme zadržalo u govoru stanovnika Siscije.

Kakva god da je bila sudbina staroga grada na Pogorelcu, bilo da je bio razoren i da su mu stanovnici pobijeni i prodani u roblje, bilo da je to naselje postupno odumrlo zbog razvoja novog rimskog grada na suprotnoj obali, nije bilo razloga da mu stanovnici Siscije zaborave ime. Naime, na Pogorelcu su tijekom carskog razdoblja, osim hipotetičnog vojnog logora, zasigurno postojali elementi urbane infrastrukture. Osim jedne veće nekropole i pojedinačnih

34. Za popis epigrafičkih spomenika na kojima se spominje Siscia: Šašel 1974, 714-718, a za detaljniji osvrt o epigrafičkoj baštini tog grada: Mócsy 1959, 25-26, 211-212; Barkóczy 1964, 259-261, 329-331; Zaninović 1981, 201-207.

35. Primjerice, u 1. st. se mogu datirati spomenici CIL III 3951, 3961, 4373, a vjerojatno i CIL III 3953 te 11029. Posebno je zanimljiva jedna diploma datirana 30. svibnja 73. god. (CIL XVI 18), na kojoj su zapisana imena četiri svjedoka porijeklom iz Siscije. Treba napomenuti da su natpisi iz Siscije među najranijima iz Panonije, što svakako svjedoči o ranoj romanizaciji tog mjesta: Mócsy 1974, 230; Zaninović 1981, 201.

36. CIL III, 4373, 11029 te XVI, 18.

system of wooden pilotage. One nevertheless has to point out that there are in fact no irrefutable proofs connecting these early construction layers with wooden structures with the military. They, considering the finds of pottery, in terms of chronology without a doubt belong to the early first century, more generally to its first half, but this does not necessarily mean that Roman soldiers stand behind that construction, even though it is quite likely.

In any case, irrespective of the presumed location of the Roman military camp (or camps) there is no doubt that the Roman town developed on the left bank of the Kupa, and not in the area of Pogorelec, which points to the conclusion that urban life waned in the zone of prehistoric Segestica.

That hypothesis is corroborated by epigraphy too: while epigraphic references to the name of the Roman town of Siscia were, quite understandably, not rare,³⁴ Segestica is not mentioned on the inscriptions discovered so far. It is of special interest that even the earlier inscriptions, those dated to the 1st cent. A.D., mention Siscia exclusively.³⁵ True, in those earlier inscriptions Siscia is mostly mentioned as *colonia Flavia Siscia*, which would date them to the last quarter of the 1st cent., more precisely to the time after 71 A.D. In several of these early inscriptions Siscia is mentioned as the birth place, or the place of origin of various persons.³⁶ Such information unambiguously confirms that the toponym Siscia, that is the conception of *Siscia* as an urban centre was entirely ingrained in the local population. On account of all that there is no doubt that the toponym Siscia during the 1st cent. A.D. (certainly at the latest during the second half of the century but quite likely even earlier) obscured the name Segestica, which in the imperial period, in all likelihood, is no longer in use as a name of a distinct urban unit.

Although there is no doubt that the Roman town on the confluence of the Kupa and the Sava was called Siscia, in the inscriptions of official character as much as by its inhabitants, the mention of Segestica on one of the lead tesserae from Sisak is an indisputable proof of the continuity of the use of that toponym even after the Roman conquest. Pliny's statement would speak in favour of the hypothesis that the toponym was still in use through the good part of the 1st century, at least until the beginning of the Flavian period, except in the case the author made use of an earlier source, which, taking into consideration the nature of his work, seems improbable. It has already been mentioned that this tessera can be generally dated to the first two centuries after Christ, probably a decade or two longer, but as we cannot date it with precision within that long period, it is impossible to be precise about the time until which the toponym Segestica remained in use, even though it unambiguously proves that this name was kept in the spoken language of the citizens of Siscia for at least a little longer.

Whatever the fate of the old town at Pogorelec, whether it was destroyed and its citizens killed or sold into slavery, or the settlement gradually withered due to the development of a new Roman town on the opposite bank, there was no reason for the citizens of Siscia to forget its name. During the Empire, at Pogorelec, in addition to the hypothetical military camp, certainly existed elements of urban infrastructure. In addition to a larger necropolis and individual grave units on several spots at Pogorelec (Vrbanović 1981,

34. For a list of epigraphic monuments on which Siscia is mentioned cf. Šašel 1974, 714-718, and for a more detailed review of the epigraphic legacy of that town cf. Mócsy 1959, 25-26, 211-212; Barkóczy 1964, 259-261, 329-331; Zaninović 1981, 201-207.

35. For instance, the monuments CIL III 3951, 3961, 4373, and probably also CIL III 3953 and 11029 can all be dated to the first century. Of special interest is a diploma dated May 30th 73 A.D. (CIL XVI 18), on which names of four witnesses with origin from Siscia are mentioned. It deserves mention that the inscriptions from Siscia are among the earliest in Pannonia, which certainly bears testimony to the early romanization of that place; Mócsy 1974, 230; Zaninović 1981, 201.

36. CIL III, 4373, 11029 and XVI, 18.

grobni cjelina na više lokacija na Pogorelcu (Vrbanović 1981, 199; Nenadić 1987, 93; Buzov 1993, 62; Buzov 2002, 184-185), arheološkim istraživanjima su na desnoj obali Kupe otkriveni tragovi rimske luke, to jest pristaništa³⁷, a brojni nalazi upućuju kako su se na tom dijelu Pogorelca nalazile i razne manufakture te skladišta (Šašel 1974, 725; Nenadić 1987, 97; Lolić 2003, 144-145). Po svemu sudeći, riječ je bilo o metalurškim i keramičarskim radionicama te o ciglani, pa se stoga može pretpostaviti da je na Pogorelcu u carskom razdoblju bio koncentriran značajan dio gospodarskih i industrijskih aktivnosti rimske Siscije. Osim industrijskih pogona i lučkih postrojenja, tamo su se vjerojatno nalazili i neki stambeni objekti, pa bi se cijelo to područje moglo definirati kao predgrađe Siscije. Taj prostor vjerojatno nije imao poseban status ni zaseban urbani identitet, ali je sasvim logično za pretpostaviti da je zadržao svoje staro ime. U svijetlu natpisa na ovoj sisačkoj teseri, možemo pretpostaviti da se u svakodnevnom govoru stanovnika Siscije lučka i industrijska zona na desnoj obali Kupe nazivala Segestika, i to vjerojatno dugo vremena nakon što je Segestika prestala funkcionirati kao posebna urbana cjelina, možda čak i do samog kraja Siscije kao rimskog grada. S obzirom na analogije iz Magdalensberga i Vrhnike, ova tesera bi mogla pripadati i vrlo ranom razdoblju, odnosno augustovskom vremenu pa nije isključeno da se natpis na njoj možda odnosi i na tada još živuće autohtono naselje, ili pak na rimski vojni logor koji se smjestio na prostoru Segestike. Ukoliko prihvatimo tu mogućnost, možemo pretpostaviti da je autor natpisa na teseri svoju robu preuzeo odnosno prodao u Segestici, bilo to mjesto tada naselje ili logor. Teško se može reći je li dotična osoba boravila u naselju preko puta, tj. u Sisciji ili je riječ o nekome tko je došao iz nekog udaljenijeg mjesta, kako bi poslovao sa stanovnicima Segestike. Na teseri se izgleda ne spominju velike količine robe (osim ako se brojevi ne odnose na bale, a ne na pojedinačne komade sukna ili odjeće), što bi prije upućivalo na maloprodaju, odnosno sitnu trgovinu za koju se u načelu ne isplati prevaljivati velike razdaljine (ukoliko nije riječ o luksuznoj i skupoj robi). Kako natpisi na ostalim sisačkim teserama uglavnom navode niske cijene i male količine robe, čini se vjerojatnijim da one predstavljaju trag trgovine na lokalnoj razini, tj. u bližjoj okolici i unutar grada Siscije.

Zbog nemogućnosti užeg datiranja ove tesere, ne bih špekulirao o tome je li u natpisu riječ o autohtonoj Segestici ili pak o kasnijem rimskom predgrađu na desnoj obali Kupe, koje je moglo imati isto ime. Osobno sam skloniji pretpostavci da natpis na teseri, ukoliko je točna interpretacija kratice R, ukazuje na preuzimanje robe u lučkoj zoni na desnoj obali gdje su se, uz skladišta i druga industrijska postrojenja, mogle nalaziti i manufakture za preradu i bojanje vune te izradu i čišćenje odjeće (*officinae lanificariae, tinctoriae*,

37. Već postojeće pretpostavke o postojanju rimske luke na desnoj obali Kupe potvrdila su arheološka istraživanja 1985. god., prilikom kojih su otkriveni značajni ostaci rimskih lučkih postrojenja na lokalitetu „Kovnica“, no rezultati istraživanja, s izuzetkom keramičkih nalaza (Wiewegh 2001), još nisu objavljeni. Neke podatke o tom lokalitetu prenose: Šarić 1986, 28-29; Durman 1992, 120; Zaninović 1993, 54; Wiewegh 2001, 89-92, 103-104; Durman 2002, 29; Durman 2005, 21-22; Lolić 2003, 141-142. Važno je napomenuti da je Z. Wiewegh svojom analizom keramičkih nalaza nepobitno ustanovio kako je taj dio luke bio u funkciji od 1. do 4. st. Siscija je po svemu sudeći imala dvije luke (CIL III 11382), a druga luka se vjerojatno nalazila južno od gradskih bedema na lijevoj obali Kupe, bliže ušću Save: Šašel 1974, 725; Nenadić 1987, 79; Buzov 2003, 179.

199; Nenadić 1987, 93; Buzov 1993, 62; 2002, 184-185), archaeological excavations led to the discovery of a Roman port, or quay,³⁷ on the right bank of the Kupa, and numerous finds suggest that also various manufactures and warehouses stood on that part of Pogorelec (Šašel 1974, 725; Nenadić 1987, 97; Lolić 2003, 144-145). In all likelihood, these were metallurgical and pottery workshops and a brick factory, so one can assume that during the imperial period at Pogorelec was concentrated a significant portion of economic and industrial activities of Roman Siscia. In addition to industrial plants and port facilities, probably also some residential structures were located there, so that entire area might be defined as the suburbs of Siscia. That area most certainly did not have a special status nor a distinct urban identity, but it is quite logical to assume that it retained its old name. In the light of the inscription on this Sisak tessera, we can assume that in the everyday spoken language of the inhabitants of Siscia the port and industrial zone on the right bank of the Kupa was called Segestica, probably a long time after Segestica ceased functioning as a separate urban unit, perhaps up until the very end of Siscia as a Roman town. Taking into consideration the analogies from Magdalensberg or Vrhnika, this tessera could belong to a very early period, more precisely the Augustan time, so it is not excluded that the inscription on it perhaps relates to the autochthonous settlement still living at the time, or to the Roman military camp established on the territory of Segestica. If we accept that possibility we can assume that the author of the inscription on the tessera took over –or sold– his goods in Segestica, irrespective of whether the place at the time was a settlement or a camp. It is difficult to say if the person in question stayed in the settlement opposite, i.e. in Siscia, or if it was someone who arrived from a more remote place in order to do business with the inhabitants of Segestica. It appears that no great quantities of goods are mentioned on the tessera (unless the numbers refer to bale goods instead of individual pieces of cloth or clothes), which would be more suggestive of retail, or small trade for which it is generally not cost-effective to cross great distances (unless the objects of trade are luxury and expensive items). As the inscriptions on the remaining Sisak tesserae mostly mention low prices and small quantities of goods, it seems more probable that they represent a trace of trade on the local level, i.e. in the closer neighbourhood and within the town of Siscia.

Due to the impossibility of a more precise dating of this tessera, I do not wish to speculate about whether the inscription refers to the autochthonous Segestica or to a subsequent Roman suburbs on the right bank of the Kupa that may have had the same name. Personally, I am much more inclined to the assumption that the inscription on the tessera, if the interpretation of the abbreviation R is accurate, indicates the taking over of goods in the port zone on the right bank, where, in addition to warehouses and other industrial plants, manufactures for processing and colouring of wool and production and cleaning of clothes may have been situated (*officinae lanificariae, tinctoriae, infectoriae, fullonicae, of-*

37. The already existing assumptions about the existence of a Roman port on the right bank of the Kupa were confirmed by archaeological excavations in 1985, when considerable remains of Roman port facilities were discovered at the site of “Kovnica” (the Mint), but the results – with the exception of pottery finds (Wiewegh 2001) have not been published yet. Some information about that site is provided by Šarić 1986, 28-29; Durman 1992, 120; Zaninović 1993, 54; Wiewegh 2001, 89-92, 103-104; Durman 2002, 29; 2005, 21-22; Lolić 2003, 141-142; It is important to mention that Z. Wiewegh’s analysis of pottery finds irrefutably established that that part of the port was in function from the 1st to the 4th cent.; In all probability Siscia had two ports (CIL III 11382), and the second one was probably situated south of the town fortifications on the left bank of the Kupa, closer to the confluence with the Sava, cf. Šašel 1974, 725; Nenadić 1987, 79; Buzov 2003, 179

infectoriae, fullonicae, officinae fullonum, textrinae). Naime, prijedlog in kad ga slijedi imenica u ablativu, kao što je to slučaj na ovom natpisu, podrazumijeva lokaciju u kojoj se boravi ili nešto obavlja (dakle, odgovara na pitanje gdje), a ne mjesto prema kojem se ide (što bi bio slučaj da piše *in Segesticam*, odnosno pravilnije samo *Segesticam* bez prijedloga in).³⁸ Zato ne vjerujem da sintagma *in Segestica* označava konačno odredište robe, već lokaciju gdje je posao sklopljen ili obavljen (ili pak mjesto gdje je roba proizvedena), odnosno ako sam točno interpretirao kraticu, mjesto gdje je preuzeto sukno od kojeg su u konačnici izrađeni gotovi odjevni predmeti. Zasad je još uvijek teško pokušati definirati proizvodne procese, oblik i razmjere trgovine tekstilnim proizvodima u Sisciji. To nisu jedina pitanja na koja je trenutno teško dati uvjerljiv odgovor. Primjerice, možemo se upitati zašto je autor natpisa imao potrebu posebno spominjati Segestiku, tim više što se taj toponim ne spominje na drugim sisačkim tesarama? Koliko god bile brojne sisačke tesere koje se čuvaju u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu, ipak je riječ o slučajnom uzorku i statistički vjerojatno zanemarivom postotku olovnih robnih markica koje su nekoć bile u svakodnevnoj uporabi u Sisciji, pa nepostojanje više tesera na kojima se spominje Segestika (ili bilo koji drugi toponim) u muzejskoj zbirci može biti samo plod slučajnosti. Ipak, činjenica da među više od 1000 sačuvanih pločica iste namjene nema ni jedne druge na kojoj se spominje Segestika, navodi na razmišljanje. Je li nakon nekog vremena bilo samo po sebi razumljivo da se roba preuzima ili isporučuje na desnoj obali Kupe, gdje su uz luku bila skladišta i proizvodni pogoni pa nitko više nije imao potrebe naglašavati gdje ide po robu (ili s robom)? Ili se taj oblik trgovine samo iznimno odvijao na prostoru Pogorelca? A možda je stvarno riječ o teseri iz ranog razdoblja rimske okupacije kad je starosjedilačka Segestika još mogla postojati kao zasebna urbana cjelina? Zašto nema cijene ili imena osobe zadužene za robu, kao što je to slučaj na većini ostalih tesera? Preostaje nam samo nadati se kako će daljnja analiza velike kolekcije rimskih robnih markica iz Siska ponuditi odgovor na ta i brojna druga pitanja, vezana uz gospodarski život Siscije.

ficinae fullonum, textrinae). The preposition *in*, when followed by a noun in the ablative case, as is the case on this inscription, implies the location in which one spends time or does something (i.e. answers the question: where), not a place to which one is directed (which would be the case if it were written *in Segesticam*, or more accurately only *Segesticam* without the preposition *in*).³⁸ I therefore do not believe that the syntagma *in Segestica* denotes the final destination of the commodity, but rather the site where the business was concluded or carried out (or the site where the commodity was produced), or, if my interpretation of the abbreviations is correct, the site where the cloth was taken over, from which eventually finished clothing items were produced. It is at present still difficult to attempt to define the production processes, the form and proportions of the trade in textile products in Siscia. These are not the only questions to which it is presently difficult to give a convincing answer. For instance, we may ask ourselves why did the author of the inscription feel the need to specifically mention Segestica, all the more so as that toponym is not mentioned on the other Sisak tesserae? As numerous as the Sisak tesserae kept in the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb are, they are still a random sample and a statistically probably insignificant percentage of lead commodity labels once in everyday use in Siscia, so a lack of more tesserae mentioning Segestica (or any other toponym) in the Museum collection is perhaps fortuitous. Nevertheless, the fact that among more than 1000 preserved tags of the same purpose there is no other one on which Segestica is mentioned does lead one to think. Was it after some time self-understanding that the commodities are taken over or delivered on the right bank of the Kupa, where in addition to the port were also warehouses and production plants so nobody felt a need any longer to specifically state where he goes to collect goods (or with the goods)? Or was that form of trade only exceptionally carried out at Pogorelec? Or perhaps we really have here a tessera from the early period of Roman occupation when the autochthonous Segestica may still have existed as a separate urban unit? Why is there no price or name of the person in charge of the goods, as is the case on the majority of the remaining tesserae? We are left only with the hope that the further analysis of the large collection of Roman commodity labels from Sisak would offer us the answers to those and many other questions relating to the economic life of Siscia.

38. Usp. bilješku 2.

38. cf. note 2.

LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY :

- Alföldy G., 1991, Die Personennamen auf den Bleietiketten von Kalsdorf (Steiermark) in Noricum (Kurzfassung), *Specimina Nova*, vol. VII/I, Pécs, 115-120.
- Alföldy G., 1993, Die Personennamen auf den Bleietiketten von Kalsdorf (Steiermark) in Noricum, *Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft* 78, Festschrift für Jürgen Untermann, Innsbruck, 1-32
- Ancillotti A., 1993, Le denominazioni di colore nelle lingue dell'Italia antica, *Annali della Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, Università degli studi di Perugia*, vol. XXIX-XXX, nuova serie XV-XVI-1991/1992-1992/1993, Perugia, 199-239.
- André J., 1949, *Étude sur les termes de couleur dans la langue latine*, Paris
- Barkóczy L., 1964, The Population of Pannonia from Marcus Aurelius to Diocletian, *ActaArchHung* 16, Budapest, 257-356.
- Bassi C., 1996, *Tre lamellae perforatae* da Savazona-Quistello (Mantova), *Epigraphica, Rivista italiana di epigrafia* LVIII, Bologna, 207-216.
- Bischoff B., 1993, *Paléographie de l'Antiquité romaine et du Moyen Âge occidental*, Paris (prijevod njemačkog izdanja Paléographie des römischen Altertums und des abendländischen Mittelalters, Berlin 1979)
- Bowman A. K., Thomas J. D., 1983, *Vindolanda: The Latin Writing Tablets (Britannia Monograph Series No. 4)*, London
- Bowman A. K., Thomas J. D., 1994, *The Vindolanda Writing-tablets (Tabulae Vindoladenses II)*, London
- Bowman A. K., Thomas J. D., 2003, *The Vindolanda Writing-tablets (Tabulae Vindoladenses III)*, London
- Brunšmid J., 1901, Arheološke bilješke iz Dalmacije i Panonije, Sisak (Siscia), *VHAD* ns. 5, Zagreb, 121-125.
- Burkowsky Z., 1999, *Sisak u prapovijesti, antici i starohrvatskom dobu*, katalog izložbe, Sisak
- Burkowsky Z. (ur.), 2000, *Pregled zaštitnih arheoloških istraživanja 1990-2000*, Sisak
- Buzov M., 1993, Segestika i Siscija – topografija i povijesni razvoj, *PrillnstArheolZagreb* 10, Zagreb, 47-68.
- Buzov M., 2002, Grad mrtvih uz grad živih – nekropole Siscije, *HistriaAntiq* 8, Pula, 175-191.
- Buzov M., 2003, Siscia – grad na tri rijeke, *HistriaAntiq* 10, Pula, 177-194.
- Cagnat R., 1914, *Cours d'épigraphie latine, 4ème édition*, Paris
- Cencetti G., 1954, *Lineamenti di storia della scrittura latina*, Bologna
- Domić-Kunić A., 2006, *Bellum Pannonicum* (12.-11. pr. Kr.), posljednja faza osvajanja južne Panonije, *VAMZ XXXIX*, Zagreb, 59-164.
- Dueck D., 1999, The Date and Method of Composition of Strabo's Geography, *Hermes* 127.4, Berlin, 467-478.
- Durman A., 1992, O geostrateškom položaju Siscije, *OpusA* 16, Zagreb, 117-131.
- Durman A., 2002, Iron resources and production for the Roman frontier in Pannonia, *Historical Metallurgy* 36/1, London, 24-32.
- Durman A., 2005, Zalihe i proizvodnja željeza za rimsku državnu granicu u Panoniji, *Godišnjak GMS* 5, Sisak, 17-24.
- Egger R., 1963, Epigraphische Nachlese. Bleietiketten aus dem rätischen Alpenvorland, *ÖJh* 46 (1961-63), Wien, 185-197.
- Egger R., 1967, Fünf Bleietiketten und eine Gußform. Die neuesten Magdalensbergfunde, *AnzWien* 104, Wien, 193-210.
- Ernout A., Meillet A., 1932, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris
- Faber A., 1973, Građa za topografiju antičkog Siska, *VAMZ* 6-7 (1972-1973), Zagreb, 133-162.
- Feig Vishnia R., 2002, The Shadow Army – The Lixae and the Roman Legions, *ZPE* 139, Bonn, 265-272.
- Feugère M., 1993, Une étiquette inscrite en plomb, Les fouilles de la Z.A.C. des Halles à Nîmes (Gard), sous la direction de M. Monteil, *Bulletin de l'École Antique de Nîmes, Supplément* 1, Nîmes, 1993, 301-305.
- Fitz J., 1980, Population, u: *The Archaeology of Roman Pannonia*, ed. A. Lengyel, G. T. B. Radan, Budapest, 141-158.
- Fitz J., 1980, Economic Life, u: *The Archaeology of Roman Pannonia*, ed. A. Lengyel, G. T. B. Radan, Budapest, 323-335.
- Frei-Stolba R., 1984, *Die Bleietiketten von Oberwinterthur-Vitodurum*, *Arch-Schweiz* 7, Basel, 127-138.
- Gilliver C. M., 1999, *The Roman Art of War*, Stroud
- Holder A., 1904, *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz II*, Leipzig
- Hoti M., 1992, Sisak u antičkim izvorima, *OpusA* 16, Zagreb, 133-163.
- Kajanto I., 1963, *Onomastic studies in the early Christian inscriptions of Rome and Carthage*, *Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae*, vol. II:1, Helsinki
- Kern P. B., 1999, *Ancient Siege Warfare*, Bloomington
- Košćević R., 2000, Olovne pločice posebne namjene, *PrillnstArheolZagreb* 17, Zagreb, 95-101.
- Lolić T., 2003, Colonia Flavia Siscia, u: *The Autonomous Towns of Noricum and Pannonia / Die autonomen Städte in Noricum und Pannonien – Pannonia I*, eds. M. Šašel Kos, P. Scherrer, Situla 41, Ljubljana 200, 131-152.
- Lovenjak M., 2005, Roman lead tablet from Ribnica with an inscription in cursive writing, *Instrumentum* 21, Montagnac, 42-43.
- Mallon J., 1952, *Paléographie romaine*, Madrid
- Marichal R., 1988, *Les graffites de La Graufesenque*, Paris
- Mayer A., 1957, *Die Sprache der alten Illyrier*, Band I, Schriften der Balkankommission, Linguistische Abteilung, XV, Wien
- Mócsy A., 1956, Olom árucímkek Sisciából (Bolli romani da Siscia), *FoIArch* 8, Budapest, 97-104.
- Mócsy A., 1959, *Die Bevölkerung von Pannonien bis zu den Markomannenkriegen*, Budapest
- Mócsy A., 1962, s.v. *Pannonia*, RE, Supplementband IX, 516-776.
- Mócsy A., 1974, *Pannonia and Upper Moesia*, London
- Nenadić V., 1987, Prilog proučavanju antičke Sisciae, *PrillnstArheolZagreb* 3/4 (1986-1987), Zagreb, 71-102.
- Paci G., 1995, Etichette plumbee iscritte, *Acta Colloquii Epigraphici Latini, Helsingiae* 3.-6. sept. 1991 habiti, *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 104, Helsinki, 29-40.
- Pasqualini M. et al., 2006, M. Pasqualini, P. Excoffon, J. M. Michel, E. Botte, Fréjus, Forum Iulii, Fouilles de l'espace Mangin, *Revue archéologique de la Narbonnaise* 38-39 (2005-2006), Montpellier, 283-341.
- Von Petrikovits H., 1980, Lixae, u: *Roman Frontier Studies 1979*, eds. W. S. Hanson, L. J. F. Keppie, *BARIntSer* 71, Oxford, 1027-1035.
- Pothecary S., 1997, The Expression „Our Times“ in Strabo's Geography, *Classical Philology* 92, No. 3, Chicago, 235-246.
- Pothecary S., 2002, Strabo, the Tiberian author: past, present and silence in Strabo's Geography, *Mnemosyne*, LV, fasc. 4, Amsterdam, 387-438.
- Römer-Martijnse E., 1990, *Römerzeitliche Bleietiketten aus Kalsdorf, Steiermark*, Wien
- Römer-Martijnse E., 1991, „Fullones ululamque cano...“ (CIL IV 9131), *Specimina Nova*, vol. VII/I, Pécs, 111-114
- Römer-Martijnse E., 1996-1997, Eine frühkaiserzeitliche Handelsstation an der Via Claudia Augusta im Forggensee bei Dietringen, Lkr. Ostallgäu (Teil II), *Die beschrifteten Bleietiketten, Jahrbuch des Historischen Vereins Alt Füssen*, Jg. 1996 und Jg. 1997, Füssen, 5-48.
- Roth J. P., 1999, *The Logistics of the Roman Army at War (264 BC - AD 235)*, *Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition*, Vol. 23, Leiden-Boston-Köln
- Salomies O., 1987, *Die römischen Vornamen, Studien zur römischen Namengebung*, *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 82, Helsinki
- Schmid W., 1925, Römische Forschung in Österreich 1912-1924, II. Die südlichen Ostalpenländer, *BRGK* 15 (1923/24), Frankfurt a. M., 178-241.
- Schwinden L., 1993, Zwei römische Bleietiketten mit Graffiti aus Bliessbruck, *Blesa* 1, Festschrift für Jean Schaub, Bliessbruck-Reinheim, 215-222.
- Speidel M. P., 1989, The Soldiers' Servants, *Ancient Society* 20, Leuven, 239-248.
- Speidel M., 1996, *Schreibtafeln aus Vindonissa*, Veröffentlichungen der Gesellschaft Pro Vindonissa, Band XII, Brugg
- Sumner, 1970, The Truth about Velleius Paterculus: Prolegomena, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 74, Harvard, 257-297.
- Syme, 1933, Ronald Syme, Some Notes on the Legions under Augustus, *JRS* 23, London, 14-33.
- Šarić I., 1986, Zaštitno arheološko istraživanje lokaliteta «Kovnica» u Sisku 1985. godine, *Obavijesti HAD* 18/1, Zagreb, 28-29.
- Šašel J., 1974, s.v. Siscia, RE, Supplementband XIV, 702-741.
- Šašel Kos M., 1986, *Zgodovinska podoba prostora med Akvilejo, Jadranom*

- in Sirmijem pri Kasiju Dionu in Herodijanu*, SAZU, Znanstvenoraziskovalni center, Inštitut za arheologijo, Ljubljana
- Šašel Kos M., 1997, Appian and Dio on the Illyrian Wars of Octavian, *ŽA* 47, Skopje, 187-198.
- Šašel Kos M., 1997a, The End of the Norican Kingdom and the Formation of the Provinces of Noricum and Pannonia, u: *Akten des IV. Intern. Kolloquiums über Probleme des provinzialrömischen Kunstschaffens*, Celje 8.-12. Mai 1995, eds. B. Djurić, I. Lazar, Situla 36, Ljubljana, 21-42.
- Šašel Kos M., 2002, The Noarus River in Strabo's Geography, *Tyche* 17, Berlin, 145-153.
- Šašel Kos M., 2005, *Appian and Illyricum*, Situla 43, Razprave Narodnega muzeja Slovenije, Dissertationes Musei Nationalis Sloveniae, Ljubljana
- Šašel Kos M., 2005a, The Pannonians in Appian's Illyrike, u: *Illyrica Antiqua*, Ob honorem Duje Rendić-Miočević, Radovi s Međunarodnog skupa o problemima antičke arheologije, Zagreb, 6.-8. XI. 2003., ed. M. Sanader, Zagreb, 433-439.
- Tassaux F., 2004, Les importations de l'Adriatique et de l'Italie du Nord vers les provinces danubiennes de César aux Sévères, u: *Dall'Adriatico al Danubio. L'Illirico in età greca e romana*, Atti del convegno internazionale, Cividale del Friuli, 25-27 settembre 2003, a cura di G. Urso, Pisa, 167-205.
- Thylander H., 1952, *Étude sur l'épigraphie latine*, Lund
- Tomlin R. S. O., 1988, The curse tablets, u: *The Temple of Sulis Minerva at Bath*, Vol. 2, The Finds from the Sacred Spring, ed. B. Cunliffe, Oxford University Committee for Archaeology, Monograph No. 16, Oxford, 59-277.
- Veith G., 1914, *Die Feldzüge des C. Iulius Caesar Octavianus in Illyrien in den Jahren 35-33 v. Chr.*, Schriften der Balkankommission, Antiquarische Abteilung, VII, Wien
- Vrbanović S., 1981, Prilog proučavanju topografije Siscije, *IzdanjaHAD* 6, Zagreb, 187-200.
- Weber E., 1971, Ein Bleietikett aus Immurium-Moosham, *ÖJh* 49 (1968-1971), Wien, 229-234.
- Wiewegh Z., 2001, Rimska keramika iz Siska s lokaliteta „Kovnica“, Istraživanja iz godine 1985., *OpuscA* 25, Zagreb, 89-149.
- Wilkes J. J., 1969, *Dalmatia*, London
- Wright R. P. et al., 1975, Wright R. P., Hassall M. W. C., Tomlin R. S. O., Roman Britain in 1974, II. Inscriptions, *Britannia* 6, London, 284-294.
- Zaninović M., 1981, Siscia u svojim natpisima, *IzdanjaHAD* 6, Zagreb, 201-208.
- Zaninović M., 1986, Pojava antike u središnjoj Hrvatskoj, *IzdanjaHAD* 10, Zagreb, 59-67.
- Zaninović M., 1993, *Classis Flavia Pannonica*, *IzdanjaHAD* 16, Zagreb, 53-58.
- Ziolkowski A., 1993, *Urbs direpta*, or how the Romans sacked cities, u: *War and Society in the Roman World*, eds. J. Rich and G. Shipley, Leicester-Nottingham Studies in Ancient Society, Volume 5, London, 69-91.