Acta Illyrica
Godišnjak Udruženja BATHINVS
Godina III/Broj 3

Izdavač / Publisher:

Udruženje za proučavanje i promoviranje ilirskog naslijeđa i drevnih i klasičnih civilizacija BATHINVS

Topal Osman Paše 20, Sarajevo, Bosna i Hercegovina

<http://bathinvs.com/>

Za izdavača / For the Publisher: Dženan Brigić

Glavni i odgovorni urednik / Editor-in-chief: Edin Veletovac

Redakcija / Editorial Board:

Enver Imamović (Sarajevo, BiH), Branka Migotti (Zagreb, Hrvatska), Milan Lovenjak (Ljubljana, Slovenija), Snežana Ferjančić (Beograd, Srbija), Salmedin Mesihović (Sarajevo, BiH), Bego Omerčević (Tuzla, BiH), Ivan Basić (Split, Hrvatska), Drago Župarić (Sarajevo, BiH), Marcel Burić (Zagreb, Hrvatska), Siniša Bilić-Dujmušić (Zagreb, Hrvatska), Ivan Radman Livaja (Zagreb, Hrvatska), Lucijana Šešelj (Rijeka, Hrvatska), Amra Šaćić Beća (Sarajevo, BiH)

Sekretar redakcije / Secretary of the Editorial Board: Arnela Selimović

Recenzentski odbor / Advisory Board:

Salmedin Mesihović, Adnan Busuladžić, Domagoj Tončinić, Alka Domić Kunić, Mersiha Imamović

Prijevod na engleski / English translation: Samra Čebirić

Lektor / Proofreader: Aida Hasović

DTP: Amra Mekić

UDK: Elvira Poljak Bajramović

Vizualni identitet naslovnice / Cover page design: Amra Mekić

Naslovnica: Fragment rimskog mozaika sa Ilidže / ***Cover page:*** The Roman mosaic fragment from Ilidža

© Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine / © National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina

Štampa / Print: Agencija PERFECTA

Tiraž / Print run: 200

Časopis je indeksiran u: / Journal indexed in:
C.E.E.O.L. (Central Eastern European Online Library)
Complementary Index (EBSCO host)

Časopis je štampan uz podršku Ministarstva kulture i sporta Kantona Sarajevo
Printing of the journal supported by the Ministry of Culture and Sports of Canton Sarajevo

*Udruženje za proučavanje i promoviranje ilirskog naslijeđa i
drevnih i klasičnih civilizacija*
BATHINVS

Acta Illyrica

Godišnjak Udruženja BATHINVS
Godina III/Broj 3

SARAJEVO, 2019.

SADRŽAJ

PREDGOVOR.....	7
----------------	---

NAUČNI I PREGLEDNI RADOVI

Feda Milivojević - <i>Gnaeus Sicinius and the Third Macedonian War: new approach to Livy's information</i>	15
Amra Šaćić Beća / Edin Veletovac - <i>Roman conquest of the Sarajevo Region and its consequences on the example of urbanism and Early Christian (Late Antique) architecture</i>	31
Goran Popović - <i>The methodology of Roman communication research in the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	63
Almir Marić - <i>Cohortes equitatae in Humac: Kombinirane kohorte na Humcu u doba principata</i>	79
Arneta Selimović - <i>Municipium S</i>	97

PRIKAZI/REVIEWS

Goran Popović - <i>Prikaz knjige: A Companion to Ostrogothic Italy, (ed.) Jonathan J. Arnold, M. Shane Bjornlie, Kristina Sessa, Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016, xii + 551 str.</i>	121
Dženana Kahriman - <i>Prikaz knjige: Salmedin Mesihović / Amra Šaćić, Historija Ilira, Univerzitet u Sarajevu, Sarajevo, 2015, 365 str.</i>	127
Fadil Hadžiabdić - <i>Prikaz knjige: Salmedin Mesihović, Geneza zla – Agrarna kriza: ekonomski i socijalni pad Republike, Udruženje za proučavanje i promoviranje ilirskog naslijeđa i drevnih i klasičnih civilizacija BATHINVS, Sarajevo, 2017, 210 str.</i>	131
Zerina Kulović - <i>Prikaz knjige: Adnan Busuladžić, Tragovi antičkog teatra, muzike, gladijatorskih borbi i takmičenja iz arheoloških zbirki u Bosni i Hercegovini, Zemaljski muzej Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo, 2017, 314 str.</i>	135
Sanda Hasagić Terzić - <i>Prikaz publikacije: Vodič za antičko naslijeđe u gradu Sarajevu i njegovoj okolini, Udruženja za proučavanje i promoviranje ilirskog naslijeđa i drevnih i klasičnih civilizacija BATHINVS, Sarajevo, 2018, 31 str.</i>	139

UPUTSTVA AUTORIMA	143
CONTRIBUTOR GUIDELINES.....	145
UPUTSTVA RECENZENTIMA	147
REVIEWER GUIDELINES	148
AUTORI OBJAVLJENIH RADOVA	149

Dr. sc. Amra Šaćić Beća

Filozofski fakultet Univerziteta u Sarajevu

Dr. sc. Edin Veletovac

Udruženje za proučavanje i promoviranje ilirskog
naslijeđa i drevnih i klasičnih civilizacija “BATHINVS”

Pregledni rad / Review article

UDK/UDC 72.032(497.6 Sarajevo)”652”

Roman conquest of the Sarajevo Region and its consequences on the example of urbanism and Early Christian (Late Antique) architecture¹

Abstract: Observed from the Roman perspective, the territory of the modern capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina and its wider area was a deep and inaccessible heartland of Illyricum, subsequently the Roman province of Dalmatia. This territory had been conquered by the Romans for many decades, as evidenced in the works of Greco-Roman authors. Based on the analysis of source materials and the critical approach of the modern literature, in this paper, the authors have offered a chronological review of Roman conquests of the Sarajevo Region. Following the military and political events that refer to the oldest population of the Daesitiates, that we know by name, in the period of 33 BC to AD 9, we have established the conquest phases of the upper course of the Bosna River and the valleys of Željeznica and Miljacka Rivers. The second part of the paper lists all the arguments why Roman itineraries and other geographic sources do not mention the Roman settlement near Ilidža or the administrative unit (*municipium*) whose territory included the Sarajevo Region. The issue of administrative development of *municipium Aquae* was interpreted through a critical analysis of the epigraphic monuments. In this context, we paid attention to the name of this municipal unit. By comparing the text carved on two epigraphic monuments that holds the name of the municipal unit of *Aquae*, it was determined that we need to give precedence to the name carved on the base of the statue of Emperor Diocletian (AD 284-305) because this inscription belongs to the category of public inscriptions unlike the inscription found on a tombstone of a member of local elite in Krivoglavci. In addition, the second part of

¹ This paper was the result of the project *Cultural and historic development of Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Roman period with a focus on the Sarajevo Region* under the auspices of the Ministry of Culture and Sports of Sarajevo Canton.

the paper analyses the Early Christian architecture found in the Sarajevo Region. The analysis includes the period from the 4th to the 6th centuries AD, and in its final part, it will offer certain guidelines regarding the Christianization process and the earliest Church organization in this region for the purpose of posing new questions that will assist in finding a solution to this important problem in future research.

Keywords: Sarajevo, Daesii (Daisioi), Daesitiates, *Bellum Pannonicum*, *Bellum Batonianum*, Octavian, Tiberius, the Bosna River, *municipium*, *colonia*, *res publica*, *Aquae S*, Roman emperors, *beneficarii consularis*, epigraphy, Early Christianity, Late Antiquity, Late Antiquity basilicas, Bestoen bishopric

The chronology of Roman conquests of the Sarajevo Region

In the Roman period, most of the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina was part of the inland of the province of Dalmatia. With the exception of the mining district of Argentaria, which can be treated as a separate administrative unit within Dalmatia due to its different administrative system, the territory of south-eastern Bosnia, the middle of the Bosna River (the upper and central course of the Bosna and Vrbas Rivers), the majority of western Bosnia (Bihačka Krajina, Petrovačko polje, Duvanjsko polje, Livanjsko polje, Glamočko polje), and the entire present-day Herzegovina region were under the jurisdiction of the Governor of Dalmatia. With the help of written sources and epigraphic monuments, scholars have located nine Roman municipal units in this region (*Colonia Ris*, *municipium S (...?)*, *municipium / colonia Aquae*, *municipium Bistuensium / Bistue Nova*, *municipium Raetinium*, *municipium Sarziaticum*, *municipium Salvium*, *municipium Delminensium / Delminium* and *municipium Dilluntum*). We should also not dismiss the possibility that the southern part of Herzegovina belonged to the *ager* of *colonia Narona* (*ager colonia Iulia Narona*). Following the above-mentioned facts, we should point out that the systematic archaeological research conducted by Carl Patsch and Esad Pašalić in the 19th and the 20th centuries have proved that the Sarajevo Region comprised of the territory of *Aquae* *municipium*. Research has established that the seat of this Roman administrative unit was in Ilidža near Sarajevo.² However, when studying Roman conquests of the Sarajevo Region, we should bear in mind the fact that in the pre-Roman period this region was the territory of the indigenous people of the Daesitiates.³ Consequently, the Roman conquest of the Sarajevo region can be followed only through military and political interactions of Rome with this community.⁴ This means that military and political events can only be perceived

² Patsch, 1894, 341-358; Pašalić, 1959, 113-136; Pašalić, 1960, 69; Pašalić, 1975, 188-199.

³ Strab. 7, 5; Vel. Pat. 2. 115; Plin. 3, 143; Dio, 56. 15; Wilkes, 1969, 170; Bojanovski, 1988, 143; Paškvalin, 1992-1995, 95 - 97; Paškvalin, 2000, 192-195; Mesihović, 2011b, 82, fn. 201; Mesihović, 2018, 191.

⁴ Through the comparison of literary works and the results of archaeological explorations and texts carved on epigraphic monuments, we concluded that the territory of the Daesitiates encompassed

from the point of view of a Roman conqueror while scholars are still unfamiliar with the story of the conquered community.

Using literary sources, that mostly originate from the Principate period, we can follow the Roman conquest of the Sarajevo Region through the prism of three military campaigns: Octavian's campaign against the communities in the inland after defeating the Delmatae in AD 33, Tiberius's conquest of Pannonia (*Bellum Pannonicum* 12-11 BC), and the Great Illyrian Revolt (*Bellum Batonianum* Octavian AD 6-9).⁵ These three military campaigns can also be defined as three phases of the Roman occupation of present-day Sarajevo Region.

The scholarship is still concerned with the unanswered question of whether Octavian came to the territory of the Daesitiates in AD 33 and possibly conquered the territory of the upper course of the Bosna River and its tributaries Miljacka and Željeznica. Namely, the thesis that Octavian had subdued the Daesitiates is founded on the information preserved in Appian's Illyrian book (*Illyrike*), according to which the greatest resistance to Octavian was shown by "*the Dalmatae, the Daesii and the Paeones*".⁶ It is likely that the term "Paeones" hides the ethno-geographic name for the inhabitants of Pannonia, but it is not clearly corroborated that the term "Daesii" refers to the Daesitiates who inhabited the upper and central course of the Bosna River. Syme believes that Appian only mentions the Daesitiates, as well as the majority of the peoples in the inland of Dalmatia, but that they were not subdued during Octavian's campaign.⁷ Šašel Kos disagrees with the aforementioned opinions because she concluded that such important people as the Daesitiates could not have been mentioned so vaguely in terms of geography as Appian does. According to Šašel Kos, there is a possibility that the *Daesii* (*Daisioi*) could have been one of the powerful Daesitiates tribes or that this could be a corrupted name of the Daesitiates with whom Octavian only made diplomatic contacts after he judged that a successful war against them would be impossible.⁸ Džino and Domić Kunić assume that the *Daesii* (*Daisioi*) were not the Daesitiates in their homeland, today's Central Bosnia, but their allied troops who may have fought with the Delmatae in the war of 33

the upper and central course of the Bosna river as well as the valley of the Lašva River. The southern border of this territory consisted of mountains Bjelašnica, Treskavica, and Igman; the eastern border was mountains Jahorina, Devetak, and Zvijezda; the north-west border was mountain Vlašić; whereas the north-eastern border was the mountain Ozren (Mesihović, 2018, 191-193; Šačić Beća, 2018, 153).

⁵ Fragmented data regarding this issue can be found in the works of authors from Late Antiquity such as Festus, Eutropius, Hieronymus, Jordanes, etc. Nevertheless, the sources from Late Antiquity rely on earlier data, so they cannot be regarded as a primary sources unlike the works from the Principate (more in Veletovac, 2017, 151-162).

⁶ App. *Ill. XVII*, 49.

⁷ Syme, 1933, 71.

⁸ Šašel Kos, 1999, 255; Šašel Kos, 2005, 459.

BC as equal members or as subordinate allies within the Delmatae Alliance. On the other hand, all scholars emphasize the possibility of this being a community living in the fort Pod near Bugojno.⁹ Moreover, Džino notes that archaeological explorations do not corroborate the existence of a single identity narrative in the pre-Roman period since the spatial concentration of forts bears witness of development and formation of different regions within the Central Bosnian group that is identified as the Daesitiates.¹⁰ On the other hand, scholars such as Swoboda, Vulić, Pašalić, Bojanovski, and Marić believe that the people of the *Daesii* (*Daisioi*), mentioned by Appian, are in fact the Daesitiates who lived in the upper and central course of the Bosna River.¹¹ Among contemporary scholars, such opinion is most typically represented by Mesihović.¹² His argument that the *Daisioi* are in fact the Daesitiates from the upper course of the Bosna River is based on the conclusion that the Roman troops had to cross the Central Bosnian region in order to conquer the eastern Pannonian countries north of the lower course of the Sava River. In that case, the territory of the Lašva River and upper course of the Bosna river represent the crucial hub on the road from the central Adriatic Sea to the north-eastern Bosnia and central Podunavlje region.¹³ Although Mesihović's hypothesis is founded on exhaustive and methodologically good source criticism, it is not traceable since there are no material or written sources to corroborate the movement of Octavian's army in 33 BC to the east of the upper course of the Sava River. This region, in the sense of territory, belonged to the Breuci and, judging by the source material, it was conquered only in 12 BC, i.e. in the first year of Tiberius's Pannonian war (*Bellum Pannonicum*).¹⁴ Following the above-mentioned facts, we can conclude that the indigenous community of the *Daesii* (*Daisioi*), mentioned by Appian, inhabited the inland of present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina. However, it is likely that these are not the Daesitiates, but one of the communities who were part of the Daesitiatian alliance during the Bato's rebellion. The question of ethnographic affiliation of the indigenous community of the *Daesii* (*Daisioi*) needs to be left open. We cannot speak of the Roman rule in the territory of central, northern and eastern Bosnia in the period before *Bellum Pannonicum*, meaning that the present-day Sarajevo Region, as part of the Daesitiates territory, fell under the Roman rule around 20 years after the conquest of Herzegovina, western, and northeast Bosnia.

⁹ Domić Kunić, 2006, 100; Džino, 2010, 113-114; Džino & Domić Kunić, 2013, 157.

¹⁰ Džino, 2009, 82; Džino, 2010, 166.

¹¹ Swoboda, 1932, 72; Vulić, 1934, 166; Pašalić, 1975, 399-400; Bojanovski, 1988, 32; Marić, 2000, 121.

¹² Mesihović, 2011b, 50-51; Mesihović, 2018, 106-107.

¹³ Mesihović, 2018, 106-107.

¹⁴ Dio. *LIV, XXVIII, 1-2*; Dio. *LIV, XXXI, Vell. II, CXI, 4*; Suet. *Tib. XVIII*; Džino, 2012, 462; Domić Kunić, 2006, 102-115; Džino & Domić Kunić, 2013, 165; Šašel Kos, 2015, 65-66; Zani-
nović, 2015, 435-436.

Since Roman historians ignored Tiberius's military success in the Pannonian war, it is difficult to follow the course of events of this important military campaign.¹⁵ In all likelihood, this war lasted for two seasons (12-11 BC).¹⁶ In addition, the Roman goal of this war was to conquer the entire valley of the Sava River and the inland of Bosnia. The analysis of ancient sources indicates that the northern neighbors of the Daesitiates, the Breuci, offered the most resistance to Tiberius's troops.¹⁷ However, following the victory of the Breuci, it is certain that Augustus's legate and later his successor, Tiberius, directed his campaign to the territory of the Daesitiates.¹⁸ At that moment, Tiberius most certainly found it very important to put the Daesitiates, i.e. the Daesitiatian alliance under his control.¹⁹ Firstly, he should not have allowed leaving behind unconquered Pannonian communities that would have likely offered support to the rebelled Delmatae against which the provincial administration had been waging war for years.²⁰ These conflicts are attested in ancient written sources.²¹ The Romans, by all means, had economic as well as strategic interests. Namely, the territory controlled by the Daesitiatian communities contained precious metal and iron mines of central Bosnia. Moreover, they controlled thermal springs from the territory of present-day Ilidža, as well as the Sarajevo polje. Furthermore, the relatively large number of the Daesitiates was important for the Romans due to the recruitment of soldiers into their auxiliary units, vital for the wars against the Germanic peoples at the northern borders of the Empire. In the light of the above, Tiberius likely brought the Sarajevo Region under the Roman control in the second year of *Bellum Pannonicum*. Therefore, we can conclude that the territory of the present-day capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina came under Roman control in 11 BC.

Nevertheless, *Bellum Pannonicum* was not the final Roman military campaign at the territory of the present-day Sarajevo region. Namely, after conquering the Daesitiates, the Romans initiated the pacification process of this region which was

¹⁵ This war is mostly mentioned in the works of Cassius Dio. Apart from Dio, sporadic information about this war when the Sarajevo Region was also conquered is given by Velleius Paterculus, Suetonius, Frontinus, Livy, Florus, Festus, and Eutropius, as well as Augustus in his *Res gestae* (Dio. LIV, 28, 1-2; Dio. XXXI, 2-4; Dio. XXXIV, 3-4; Dio. XXXVI, 2; Dio. LV, 2, 4; Vell. II, 39, 3; Vel. Pat. 2. 96, 2-3; Suet. Aug., 20; Suet. Aug., 21; Suet. Tib., 9; Suet. Tib., 14, *Res gestae divi Augusti*, 30, 1; Frontinus, *Strat.* II. 1, 5; Liv. *Ab urbe*, 141; Flor. II. + 24; Fest, *Brev.*, 7; Eutrop., *Brev.*, 7. 9).

¹⁶ Domić Kunić, 2006, 102-115; Džino & Domić Kunić, 2013, 165.

¹⁷ Suet. Tib. IX, 2. Fest. *Brev.*, 7, 5; Mesihović & Šaćić, 2015, 199; Veletovac, 2017, 156.

¹⁸ Ozren Mountain separated the territory of the Breuci and Daesitiates.

¹⁹ Like other indigenous peoples, the Daesitiates were likely to be composed of many smaller related communities with certain cultural links. Unfortunately, unlike the Maezaei or Breuci, there are no epigraphic evidence to support this hypothesis.

²⁰ In this period, the Romans perceived the Daesitiates as a Pannonian people because they lived in a region far from the coast, their land was wooded, and it is likely that their habitus as well was more like the Pannonian than Dalmatian one. This in a sense confirmed by Strabo who included the Daesitiates in the Pannonian community (*Strab.* VII, 5).

²¹ Dio. LIV, XXXIV, 3.

an important part of the Daesitiatian alliance. This must have been a painful and long process not favored by the local population and its elite. Given that the inland of Dalmatia, which in the Roman period encompassed the Sarajevo Region, was far away from the provincial center of Salona (present-day Solin), the malpractice of local Roman officials in time became more evident. Improper tax collection was most certainly the motive for the Great Illyrian Revolt in AD 6. Dio gives a graphic account stating that regarding the cause of the rebellion, Bato the Daesitiate said to Tiberius “*You Romans are to blame for this; for you send as guardians of your flocks, not dogs or shepherds, but wolves.*”²² Fiscal obligations had to be paid in cash which the Daesitiatians did not have, so they paid it in goods. This means that they *de facto* paid higher taxes than e.g. the citizens of present-day Greece, although they should have *de iure* paid the tax rate.²³ Apart from the dissatisfaction with the economic policy, the Daesitiatian leaders (as well as the leaders of other indigenous communities) were also dissatisfied with the loss of power they had before the arrival of the Roman occupier.²⁴

Through source analysis, we can conclude that the motive for the Great Illyrian Revolt or *Bellum Batonianum* was the mobilization of Illyrian auxiliary units with the purpose of sending them to the Marcomanni-Bohemian battlefield.²⁵ The revolt began under the leadership of Bato the Daesitiate in the central Illyricum, and scholars assume that the revolt began in the territory of central Bosnia.²⁶ During the first two years of warfare, the battles most certainly did not occur in the territory of Sarajevo.²⁷ Namely, until the surrender of Bato the Breucian at the *Bathinus* (Bosna) River, the battles largely took place in the Pannonian part of Illyricum, in the territory of the Breuci. Upon realizing that they cannot win the war, Bato the Breucian betrayed Breucian king Pinnes, who advocated the continuation of the

²² *Dio*, LV, 29.

²³ In his monograph, “Bitka za Ilirik” (eng. The battle for Illyricum), Mesihović presented a detailed analysis of the causes of the rebellion when it comes to the historiography of Bosnia and Herzegovina. He believes that insolent and greedy utilization of natural and human resources of the Illyrian countries, including the Daesitiatian *civitas*, was evident in the eyes of the Daesitiatians and their political leaders. Through the methods of internal and external source criticism, Mesihović concluded that the fundamental causes of an increasing dissatisfaction of the indigenous people were primarily economic, not political in nature (Mesihović, 2018, 240-249).

²⁴ Džino, 2010, 145; Džino & Domić Kunić, 2013, 174-175.

²⁵ *Vell.* II, 108-110; *Dio*, LV, 28, 7, *Tac. Ann.* 2, 26, *Strab.*, VII, 1-3.

²⁶ *Vell.* II, 110; Woodman, 1977, 158-159; Bojanovski, 1988, 50; Mesihović, 2011b, 174; Mesihović & Šačić, 2015, 210; Zaninović, 2015, 443; Mesihović, 2018, 265-273.

²⁷ The works of Greco-Roman authors mostly contain fragmented information on the Great Illyrian Revolt from AD 6 to 9. The following authors write about this revolt: Strabo, Velleius Paterculus, Ovid, Pliny the Elder, Suetonius, Tacitus, Florus, Cassius Dio, Orosius, Jordanes (*Strab.* V, 3; *Strab.* VII, 3; *Vell.* II, 110-117; *Vell.* II, 110-125; 60. 15; Ovid. *Ex Ponto*, II, 1; *Plin.* III, 149; *Seut. Aug.* 25; *Suet. Tib.* 16; *Flor.* II, 25; *Dio*, LV, 29-34; LVI, 11-17; LVII, 4; 59. 18; *Oros.* V, 23, 17; *Iord.* 219). However, chronology is largely constructed using the writings of Velleius Paterculus and Cassius Dio.

battle, to Tiberius.²⁸ The modern regional historiography that glorifies Bato the Daesitiate characterized this action of Bato the Breucian as a betrayal. Nevertheless, by objectively observing the circumstances that led to the betrayal, we conclude that Bato the Breucian did the best he could to protect his people from further tribulation. This decision cost him his own life since Bato the Daesitiate caught him in a trap and executed him.²⁹ The surrender of Bato the Breucian, as well as his execution, possibly took place in northeastern Bosnia at the border between the Breucian and Daesititian territories.³⁰ Dio wrote that Bato the Daesititian “took [Bato the Breucian] in front of the army where he was convicted and executed in place”.³¹ This is an important event for the overall history of Bosnia and Herzegovina as this is the first form of parliamentarism in the country. Not before the summer of AD 9 did the Roman legions led by Tiberius penetrated the land of the Daesitiates and Pirustae.³² Velleius Paterculus described their land as mountainous and overflowing with gorges which posed an additional obstacle for the Romans. This description indicates that the battles took place in the territory of the upper course of the Bosna River (including the Bjelašnica massif) and the central and upper Podrinje.³³ This means that the Sarajevo Region was conquered in AD 9.

However, Bato the Daesititian was not captured in his homeland; instead, he retreated into the territory of the Delmatae where he had to surrender himself to Tiberius in AD 9.³⁴ After capturing Bato the Daesititian, Tiberius spared him his life as a sign of gratitude to Bato the Daesititian for sparing his life once during his captivity.³⁵ However, it should be noted that apart from personal gratitude, Tiberius also catered state interests. The future emperor most certainly did not want to turn Bato into a martyr inspiring the future generations of the Daesitiates to rebel against the Roman Empire.³⁶

The end of Bato's uprising marked a new epoch in the historical development of the Sarajevo Region. We can rightfully say that only after AD 9 this region shifted

²⁸ *Vell.* II, 114; *Dio.* LV, 34, 3-7.

²⁹ *Dio.* LV, 34.

³⁰ Mesihović, 2009, 31-34.

³¹ *Dio.* LV, 34

³² *Vell.* II, 115, 1.

³³ Bojanovski, 1988, 51; Mesihović, 2011b, 411; Mesihović, 2011c, 62.

³⁴ *Dio.* LVI, 14-16.

³⁵ Suet. *Tib.* 20.

³⁶ Source materials do not hold information about Bato's life. Sources reveal that he came from the people of the Daesitiates and that he had a son Sceuas. Dio's text offers an indirect conclusion that he could speak Latin and that he had probably served in the Roman army before the revolt (*Dio.* 56. 16). There is a reasonable doubt that a monument of the family Bato from Breza can be associated with his relatives or descendants who lived there in the second half of the 1st century (*ILJug III*, 1591). Thus, it is possible that Bato came from the wider region of Sarajevo, i.e. the present-day Breza.

from the pre-historic to the historic period. In the following five centuries, this will be the region where the local population will live their lives in accordance with the Roman civilizational heritage. Following Bato's uprising, the Sarajevo Region became a part of one of the most important cultural and historical phenomena in human history.

Urban and administrative development of the Sarajevo Region under the Roman administration

Unfortunately, written sources have not preserved a single piece of information to witness the existence of an urban unit in the wider territory of the Sarajevo Region. It is especially unusual that Roman itineraries and geographical sources (Antonine Itinerary, Peutinger Map, Ravenna Cosmography) do not mention a Roman settlement in Ilidža that has been confirmed by archaeology and epigraphy. It is difficult to pinpoint the cause. Roman itineraries usually followed road stations associated with the stations of *beneficarii consularis*, and so far, no evidence of *beneficarii* centers in Sarajevo have been found. The fact that, for example, sources do not mention *Domavia*, one of the most important Roman urban units in Bosnia and Herzegovina, suggests the relationship between the stations of *beneficarii consularis* and Roman itineraries. The name of *Domavia*, as well as the Roman settlement of *Aquae* in Ilidža, has been corroborated only on the basis of epigraphic monuments.³⁷ This analogy proves the thesis that the lack of stations of *beneficarii consularis* can be associated with the absence of Roman settlement from Ilidža (*Aquae*) on ancient itineraries and other geographic sources.

When it comes to chronology, we can assume that the Romans found a pre-Roman settlement in present-day Ilidža which became a *vicus* already in the 1st century.³⁸ In this case, we could say that, initially, this settlement was a semi-

³⁷ Inscriptions preserving the name of Domavia: *AE* 1893, 0129. (B) = *CIL* III, 12732. (B). *CIL* III, 8359 = *CIL* III, 12720; *CIL* III, 8360 = *CIL* III, 12720b. We should also mention the thesis that there was a station of *beneficarii consularis* in Sase, near Srebrenica, which is the location of Domavia (Glavaš, 2016, 35). This thesis is based on a votive monument erected in the honor of goddess Diana and dedicated by *Aurelius Ga[-]anus*, *beneficiarius consularis* of Pannonia Inferior (*CIL* III, 12723). However, one monument which was not found *in situ* cannot stand as an evidence of a station of *beneficarii consularis* in the territory of Domavia. Moreover, this *beneficiarius consularis* could have been stationed in neighboring Skelani where epigraphic monuments have confirmed the existence of a station (*AE* 1910, 214 = *ILJug* III, 1532; *ILJug* I, 81; *ILJug* III, 1522; *CIL* III, 14219; *CIL* III, 14219, 15; *CIL* III, 14218 = *ILJug* III, 1529; *CIL* III, 14219, 5 = *ILJug* III 1530; *ILJug* III, 1524. (B); *CIL* III, 14219, 4). The wider region which encompasses Skelani was confirmed on Peutinger Map within the mining district of Argentaria (Tab. Peut. 5, 3-6, 2).

³⁸ *Vici* are rural and sub-urban settlements whose organization differed among provinces. It is believed that the name of this form of settlement comes from the word *via* (*via*, *vae* f. – road) meaning that the buildings in these settlements were built near the road. The authors who left us with the most data about these settlements were Frontinus and Isidore of Seville (Front. *Strat.* 502 &

Romanized village with a predominately local Daesititan population. This was probably a small provincial settlement near the thermal springs in Ilidža that will later develop into one of the largest Roman urban centers in the inland of the Roman province of Dalmatia. In support of the thesis of a settlement existing in Ilidža in the 1st century are the findings of Roman coins originating from the period of Claudius (AD 41-54) and Vespasian (AD 69-79).³⁹ Unfortunately, no epigraphic monuments have been discovered that would have allowed a more distinct definition of the cultural and historic period of this region in the 1st century. Namely, the uncovered inscriptions that are a crucial source for the study of the administrative organization and urban development of the Sarajevo Region, can at least be dated to the 2nd century. In this context, we should point out the tombstone of a *quaestor* and *quattuorvir quinquennalis*, from *municipium Aquae*, Publius Aelius Victorinus, and his family. The monument was discovered *in situ* at the settlement Krivoglavci near Vogošća, indicating that the entire upper region of the Bosna River belonged to the municipium's territory.⁴⁰ It should be noted that this is the oldest discovered epigraphic monument mentioning the administrative status of the ancient settlement of *Aquae*. The monument is dated to the 2nd century.⁴¹

The analysis of the text carved on the monument suggests that the name of the municipium in the Early Empire period was *Aquae*, without any epithets. The monument of the local elite from Krivoglavci leads us to conclude that the settlement became a municipium in the 2nd century, probably under Trajan (AD 98-117) or Hadrian (AD 117-138).⁴² Under these emperors from the Antonine Dynasty, urban development in the Balkan provinces was intensified, thus it is no surprise that the Sarajevo Region was merged into one administrative unit named *Aquae*, its seat being the largest urban center of this region – Ilidža. In fact, the entire administrative unit, as attested by epigraphic monuments, was named after the largest urban complex developed around thermal springs in Ilidža. It should certainly be noted that the municipium of *Aquae* is one of the rare Roman administrative units in the territory of contemporary Bosnia and Herzegovina where there are archaeological confirmations of the exact location of the administrative center.

508L; Isidor, *Etym.* XV. 2. 11-12). As the towns developed, these *vici* lost their identity and became part of an urban unit (Curchin, 1985, 328-329). This form of settlements in the wider territory of Western Balkans has not been sufficiently investigated due to the lack of sources.

³⁹ Bojanovski, 1988, 145; Ćeman, 2004, 129; Šačić Beća, 2018, 154.

⁴⁰ [---] *Vict[orino] dec(urioni) m(unicipii) Aq(uae) fili[o]q(ue) infelicissi/[mo] vixit ann[os] X(!) me(n)s(es) L(?)I(!) dies XIII et Ulp(iae) Galli(a)e / [coniugi? i]ncomparabili. P(ublius) Ael(ius) Victorinus / [---] q(uaestor) II[[II]]vir q(uin)q(uennalis) ed (!) sibi vi(v)us fecit* (AE 2006, 1022).

⁴¹ For more details about the monument, see: Paškvalin & Forić, 2006, 161-177; Mesihović, 2008, 33-36; Mesihović, 2011, 111-114; Šačić Beća, 2018, 167-170.

⁴² Šačić Beća, 2018, 154-155.

Alexander Severus (AD 222-235) and his mother Julia Mamaea, dated to the period from AD 229 to 235, mention *Domavia* as a *municipium*.⁵¹ In the light of what was mentioned above, we can conclude that the term *res publica* on the inscription from Ilidža represents one of the confirmations of *Aquae*'s municipal status, and by no means a special status that this settlement could have had under Macrinus.

While the text carved on the above-mentioned monument from Krivoglavci may be a guarantee that the *municipium* was originally named *Aquae*, the monument from Ilidža erected in the honor of Emperor Diocletian confirms that there were certain changes in the name of this administrative unit in the 3rd or at the beginning of the 4th centuries. The word beginning with the letter S appears in the name of the settlement during this period. Since the center of this municipal unit was close to sulfuric springs, Pašalić rightfully assumed that the settlement was named *Aquae Sulfureae* or *Aquae Sulfuratae*.⁵² It should be noted that there are other theses in the scholarship. Thus, Čeman stated that the letter S could refer to Septimius Severus since an economic boom in the Balkan provinces occurred during his reign.⁵³ However, when Čeman defined his hypothesis about *Aquae*'s name, the monument from Krivoglavci had not been discovered, so Mesihović rightfully concludes that Čeman's assumption is not reasonable since the Krivoglavci monument proves that *Aquae* became a *municipium* under Antoninus and not the Severan dynasty.⁵⁴ Although it is highly plausible that we

⁵¹ *Imp(eratori) Caes(ari) [[M(arco)]] / [[Aurel(io) Severo]] / [[Alexandro]] / [[Pio Fel(ici) inv[i]c[t]o]]* ⁵ / *[[Aug(usto) pont(ifici) ma[x]imo]] / [[trib(unicia) pot(estate) X[I? p]at(ri)]] / [[p(atriciae) co(n)s(uli) I[I]I [[i]ndul]] / [[gent[i]ss[imo]]]] / [[principi]] ordo* ¹⁰ / *mun(icipii) Dom(avianorum) d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) / p(ecunia) p(ublica) dedicante / Iul(io) Tacitano / v(iro) e(gregio) proc(uratore) Aug(usti) [[n(ostri)]] / [[num[ini] ei]u[s]]* ¹⁵ / *[[devotissimo]] / [[[e]t d[i]c[a]t[issimo]]]* (CIL III, 8360 = CIL III, 12720b).

[[[Iuliae Ma]]] / [[maeae Aug(ustae)]] / [[matri]] Imp(eratoris) / Caes(aris) [[M(arci) Aur(eli)]] ⁵ / *[[Seve[ri] Alexa]] / [[n[dri] P]ii Fel(ici) in]] / [[v[ic]ti]] Aug(usti) [[e[t]]] / [[[castr(orum) e[t]]] senat(us) / ac patr(iae) ordo / mun(icipii) Domav(ianorum)* ¹⁰ / *d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) p(ublica) dedicante / Iul(io) Tacitano / v(iro) e(gregio) proc(uratore) Aug(usti) [[n(ostri)]] / [[devotissimo]] / [[numini eorum]]* (CIL III, 8360 = CIL III, 12720b).

⁵² Pašalić, 1959, 119; Pašalić, 1960, 99.

⁵³ Čeman, 2004, 137.

⁵⁴ Guided by the Krivoglavci inscription, Mesihović entirely rejected the possibility that the settlement had the letter S in its name during any period of its existence. According to him, S was a suffix that had nothing to do with the official name of this administrative unit located in Ilidža. His analogy for this thesis lies in the simplified contemporary name of this settlement – Ilidža – meaning “spa” in Turkish. Mesihović noted that there are no epithets in its contemporary name (Mesihović, 2008, 19, fn. 19). Although he rightfully refers to the Krivoglavci inscription, we should nevertheless have in mind that Diocletian's monument from Ilidža is an official monument erected by the entire community (*res publica*), meaning that the official name must have been carved on this monument. On the other hand, the Krivoglavci inscription is a private (tombstone) monument and the full name of the settlement might have been left out. Nevertheless, the name of this administrative unit changed depending on the circumstances which are still open to interpretation.

will never know the full name carved on Diocletian's monument, the most accurate text reconstruction is the one about the epithet referring to natural characteristics of the urban unit in Ilidža. When it comes to this scholarly problem, we should finally note the difference in the type of discovered monuments where the name of this administrative unit had been inscribed. The Krivoglavci inscription was carved on a tombstone so it categorized as an inscription of a private character, which does not necessarily require a full name of the municipium. On the other hand, the text on Diocletian's bust was carved in a public inscription implying that the settlement name had to be carved in its full form, meaning that *Aquae* undoubtedly had an epithet *Sulfureae* or *Sulfuratae* in the 3rd or 4th centuries.

On the issue of ancient urbanism, this term can be equated with the term of municipium as clearly seen in the example of *municipium Aquae* or *Aquae S(...?)*. This municipal unit encompasses a wider territory of rural settlements, private farms (*villa suburbana*, *villa rustica*), pastures and similar.⁵⁵ Ilidža settlement was the only urban settlement and its administrative center. During the 19th and 20th centuries, significant remains of Roman architecture were discovered at this site.⁵⁶ There is also an epigraphic monument suggesting a high level of urbanism in present-day Ilidža under the Roman administration. This is a fragment of a monument from the 3rd century erected in the honor of the *Catii* family.⁵⁷ This was a prominent Roman family whose members acted as important state officials under the Severan dynasty. The preserved fragments mentioning the *Catii* family was a part of a larger architectural unit, possibly a temple.⁵⁸ In larger urban centers, it was customary to erect temples in patrons' honor. The existence of such temple in Bosnia and Herzegovina has been confirmed only in Ilidža, corroborating the fact that it is one of the largest Roman complexes that had existed in the territory of our country. All municipal administrative buildings were most certainly located in Ilidža. The most recent systematic archaeological research from 2016 and 2017 confirmed certain indicators that suggest that the urban center of the settlement in Ilidža was much larger than previously believed. New findings have been discovered more to the east, indicating that the urban unit of *Aquae* had been spreading toward the Sarajevo field. Moreover, the most recent research implies that there were housing units at

⁵⁵ This is corroborated by *Lex Irnitana* (*Lex Irnitana*, 76. 10-20; Translation by: González, 1986).

⁵⁶ Patsch, 1894, 341-358; Sergejevski, 1947, 13-50; Pašalić, 1959, 113-156; Pašalić, 1960, 69; Pašalić, 1975, 188-199.

⁵⁷ -----]dus I(?)[---] / [---] co(n)s(ul) fetial[is ---] / cum Publicia Quar[ta] / et Catiis Maximina C[---] / S/ Clementino Clemente LI[---]. // [---]us Afrodisius flam[en] ----- (AE 1948, 0241 = ILJug I, 90).

⁵⁸ It is a well-known fact that *Sextus Catus Clementinus Priscillianus* acted as a governor in Germania Superior under Alexander Severus in AD 230. It is possible that he was a patron or protector of the Roman settlement in Ilidža (Sergejevski, 1941, 15-18; Sergejevski, 1947, 36-37; 45-46; Bojanovski, 1988, 149; Ćeman, 2004, 135; Mesihović, 2008, 25-27; Mesihović, 2011, 107-108; Šačić Beća, 2018, 156, 162-165).

the right bank of the Željeznica River, which most certainly supports the thesis that the urban center of *Aquae* extended on both banks of the Željeznica River.⁵⁹

Concerning the urbanism problem, it should be pointed out that the leader of the urban development of *municipium Aquae or Aquae S(...?)* was the local Romanized Illyrian population who lived peacefully and harmoniously with settlers. This is an important fact given that sources frequently and wrongly emphasize that the settlers were responsible for the urban development of present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina during the antiquity. Epigraphic and prosopographical analyses suggest that the number of foreigners who lived in this region during the Roman period was quite small. However, the indigenous Illyrian population in Bosnia and Herzegovina was in time Romanized as a result of the Roman policy that strived for citizen equality. The development of urban units is a consequence of cultural Romanization. In view of this, it is likely that the largest portion of the Roman population in the settlement of *Aquae S(...?)* comprised of Illyrian (Daesitatian) population with Roman citizenship who accepted the Roman culture, religion, and the way of life.

The first written evidence of the development of Christianity in the Roman province of Dalmatia appear already in the 1st century, i.e. immediately following the death of Jesus Christ, only several decades later.⁶⁰ Nevertheless, the deep inland of this administrative unit, which is part of the state of Bosnia and Herzegovina today, became familiarized with this religion relatively late compared to some other regions of the Roman Empire. The first specific traces of its presence in this territory have been found at the site of Panik near Bileća, and they are dated to the last third of the 3rd century.⁶¹ However, Christianity did not spread evenly in the inland of Dalmatia, nor in the equal time interval; instead, it was a process that lasted longer than two centuries. Having in mind that the region of Herzegovina was in the immediate hinterland of large littoral centers, and was, therefore, more susceptible to the flow of new information and ideas, it is reasonable to expect its population being familiarized much sooner with the “new” religion unlike the regions which nowadays belong to the central and eastern Bosnia. The Sarajevo basin with the city of Sarajevo as its urban center is located in this central Bosnian region.

⁵⁹ Kaljanac, 2017, 12, 21, 47, 88; Šačić Beća, 2018, 158.

⁶⁰ *Do your best to come to me quickly, for Demas, because he loved this world, has deserted me and has gone to Thessalonica. Crescens has gone to Galatia, and Titus to Dalmatia* (New Testament, 2 Timothy 4:9). Translation taken from BibleGateway

(<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=2+Timothy+4&version=NIV>).

⁶¹ Čremošnik, 1974, 243-248.

As already mentioned, the Illyrian community of the Daesitiates lived in this territory in the pre-Roman and early Roman period. During the later phase of the Roman conquest of the Western Balkans, they were one of the leaders of the resistance of the indigenous population of Dalmatia and Pannonia.⁶² The indigenous population of Dalmatia, particularly the one in the inland of the province also including the Daesitiates, was renowned for its extreme conservatism in terms of spirituality.⁶³ We can rightfully believe that, apart from numerous others, this one was of the main reasons why Christianity could not find a stronghold among the local population in the earliest period of its existence. Therefore, having this in mind, as well as the information offered or not offered by written and archeological material, we can conclude with a large degree of certainty that there are not even slightest indications that would affirm the presence of Christianity in this territory before AD 313. Nevertheless, this finally does not imply the absence of isolated worshippers of Jesus; instead, it primarily implies the non-existence of organized Christian communities.

Thus, it is no surprise that the first traces of Christianity in the territory of Sarajevo and its approximate surrounding date only to the second half of the 4th century. Namely, during the 1939 excavations conducted by the Orthodox Church, one of the most attractive discoveries was a floor mosaic at the site of Carina in the present-day Marijin Dvor, among other ancient-period findings.⁶⁴ Its dimensions were 4.20 m × 1.40 m and its orientation was east-west. The quality of this mosaic was fairly low, as shown by the lime mortar patches at certain places. Although it had a simple geometric character, the most interesting part of this piece of artwork is certainly the ornaments. Namely, inside a rhombus field there are representations of crosses made of white tesserae.

However, the discovery of this mosaic poses a question about the character of the facility where the mosaic was found. Despite the fragmentary discovery of the building, Sergejevski undoubtedly concluded that it originates from the Roman period.⁶⁵ Other smaller findings from this site helped him make such a conclusion.⁶⁶ However, Đuro Basler went a step further and on basis of this mosaic discovery concluded that the building where the mosaic had been found was, in fact, a cult object from Late Antiquity, i.e. a church from the mid-6th century.⁶⁷ This opinion remains quite questionable and should only be observed as one of the possible

⁶² More about the Daesitiates in: Bojanovski, 1988, 144-154; Mesihović, 2007; Mesihović, 2011b.

⁶³ More details about pagan cults in the inland of the Roman province of Dalmatia in: Imamović, 1975-76, 13-26; Imamović, 1976, 457-484; Imamović, 1977; Imamović, 1983, 131-144. Also see: Paškvalin, 1963, 127-153.

⁶⁴ More about the discoveries from the site of Carina (Vasiljeva Bašča) in: Sergejevski, 1947, 13-27.

⁶⁵ Sergejevski, 1947, 15-16.

⁶⁶ An interesting finding from this site is a piece of brick with a carved cross. Sergejevski (1947, 22-23) could not make a precise dating of this fragment, except presenting a fact that this cross shape had been seen in churches since the 4th century onwards.

⁶⁷ Basler, 1972, 112-113. The fact that the wall structure was weak, made of shattered stones and mortar, supports Basler's hypothesis. Namely, the majority of churches from Late Antiquity in the

assumptions given that only one wall of this building has been excavated, which is not sufficient to determine its role. This sub-structure could have easily been part of a private dwelling or some larger complex such as a *villa rustica*, whose owner was a member of the Christian faith.

In regards to the dating of the building, as well as mosaic itself, the opinions are divided. On the basis of color and ornaments on the mosaic, Basler dated it to a relatively later period, while a coin of Emperor Justin I (*Flavius Iustinus Augustus*, AD 518-527) helped him to propose a more precise time of origin – the mid-6th century.⁶⁸ However, dating using a single coin is a fairly uncertain method, because the mosaic and the building where it was found could have existed for a longer period. Furthermore, the building could have been deserted until the period when this coin appeared. Moreover, we should not dismiss the assumption that the coin could have easily appeared at this site by accident, meaning that it was not associated with the persons living or working at this building. Therefore, in this case, we are more prone to accept the opinion of Irma Čremošnik who conditionally dated the mosaic to the 4th century based on the method of its production, as well as based on the analogy with the mosaics from Ljubljana.⁶⁹

The second Christian site from Late Antiquity from the wider territory of the city of Sarajevo is Gradac on Ilidnjača in Gornji Kotorac near Ilidža. The site itself has been the place where people lived for many generations and it may have been settled for the first time during the transition period between the Neolithic Period and the Bronze Age (around 1800 BC).⁷⁰ On the basis of yet unpublished research, we can conclude that “life” in Gradac had continued during the later periods, from the Iron Age, the Roman administration, all the way to Late Antiquity and the beginning of the Early Middle Ages.⁷¹ Therefore, it is quite reasonable that a church from Late Antiquity was discovered at this site, as one of the most representative examples of Christian sacral architecture. The church was part of a larger complex that included a refugium. The best evidence for this fact is its northern wall that also made up the external part of the fortification.⁷² During the excavation, it was

inland of the province of Dalmatia was built without a sense of structure and using a low-quality building technique. Nevertheless, as already noted, the discovery of parts of a single wall is not enough to make a more specific conclusion.

⁶⁸ Basler, 1972, 112-113.

⁶⁹ Čremošnik, 1984, 102.

⁷⁰ More on the pre-historic settlement of Gradac in: Benac, 1963, 25-31; Čović, 1966, 9-17.

⁷¹ The largest number of historians and archaeologists has recognized the importance of this site, and many of them have pinpointed the city of Katera mentioned by Constantine Porphyrogenitus in his work “*De administrando imperio*”. See: Konstantin Porfirogenit, *Spis o narodima*, in: *Vizantiski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije*, Tom II, /obr. B. FERJANČIĆ, urednik G. OSTROGOR-SKI/, Srpska akademija nauka, Posebna izdanja, knjiga CCCXXIII, Vizantološki institut, knjiga 7, Beograd, 1959, 59, and footnote 203. Also see the most recent work: Mesihović, 2010, 20-29.

⁷² Topolovac, Fekeža, 1988, 44: 15. 105.

determined that the orientation of the church was west-east, and the discovery included narthex, naos with an apse, and its southern room. The findings of stone decorations are quite rare since only several fragments of different columns and poles have been found, as well as an impost and its smaller parts, and a fragment that may have belonged to a frame of some plate.⁷³

More precise dating of the church is problematic given that we still do not have reliable elements. In its construction method and style, it is in no way different from other Christian sacral buildings in the territory of present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina. Nevertheless, the church may have been built earlier than the refugium as its portion since the fourth decade of the 6th century.⁷⁴ The beginning of a defense wall leaned against the north-western corner of the church naos is an indicator. The presence of crushed brick in the mortar of the defense wall supports the thesis that the refugium and the church were built in different periods. Therefore, it seems that the church in Gradac in Gornji Kotorac was built by the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 6th century, whereas analogous examples of this finding are located at the sites in Dabravine and Lepenica.⁷⁵ It is hard to say with confidence for how long did the church together with the fortification managed to survive. Nevertheless, thick layers of soot at certain spots in the church suggest its violent disappearance. This act could certainly be associated with the Avar-Slavic break-in by the end of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th century. Despite being rare, the apparent presence of early Slavic material represents legitimate evidence of their presence at this site. We may debate that the Pagan-oriented newcomers set the church on fire after conquering the refugium, and shortly after used the complex to settle their population.

A fragment of capital with abacus, volutes, and leaves, was found accidentally at the site of Tekija in Podlugovi near Ilijaš.⁷⁶ Although such an isolated and fragmented finding is without context, and therefore cannot offer much information about the site due to its characteristics, dating, and possible analogies, it should nevertheless be taken into consideration. The capital contains one line of eight leaves, whereas

⁷³ For a detailed description of the church from Late Antiquity and its supporting findings, see: Fekeža, 1990, 159-163.

⁷⁴ Referring to an earlier opinion of Basler regarding the fortification at Debelo Brdo (1972, 56) who dated it to around AD 535 when Dalmatia was re-incorporated to the Empire, Fekeža (1990, 164-165) dated the construction of the refugium in Gradac to the same period, with a conclusion that they are built simultaneously using the same concept. Fekeža notes that the construction of these fortifications was the result of shifting the border of the Eastern Roman Empire, including the province of Dalmatia, to the Bosna River.

⁷⁵ Fekeža, 1990, 165, and footnote 20.

⁷⁶ Although this specific region does not belong to the urban center of the city of Sarajevo, it still can be considered to have gravitated to Sarajevo.

the volutes were replaced by geometric shapes of peculiar and undefined shapes.⁷⁷ The type of this capital is the capital with two zones originating from the Orient and was mostly found in Constantinople. The basic characteristic was that volutes and helixes with fading caules were replaced by characters such as four snake-like figures between abacus and leaves. The concept of capital from Podlugovi is the same, provided that there are no animal figures, but obscure and incomprehensible figures, which could be primarily ascribed to local influences and art. Such type of capital is dated to the very end of the 5th century and first years of the 6th century, but they did not last long.⁷⁸ The capital with two zones discovered at the site of Tekija is not the only one in the territory of present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina. This finding could be compared to the remains of a basilica from Late Antiquity in Dabravine, where another type of capital was found. The top zone of this capital has four birds with spread wings, whereas the bottom part is missing entirely since only a part of this volute has remained.⁷⁹ The difference in ornaments between these two capitals is evident, but the scheme was, in fact, the same. The basilica in Dabravina and the discovered capital was dated to the end of the 5th or the first half of the 6th century, which corresponds to the above-mentioned timeline of the capital with two zones. With regard to everything that was written regarding the capital from Tekija and the comparison with the capital from Dabravina, there are serious indications that we could search for a church or basilica from Late Antiquity at this site. Nevertheless, the fact that the capital was found *in situ* means that its actual purpose is still unknown.⁸⁰ Together with the capital, a square Roman brick was discovered built in the walls of weaker construction that may be dated to a more recent period.⁸¹ This could mean that the capital was relocated from the ruins of an original building, and then used for secondary purposes, a common practice of local residents in this territory. However, it is hard to believe that the source building was located at a greater distance than the site of the capital's discovery, so the prospective church should be searched for in the capital's proximity.

Following the presentation of the archaeological material, we should reflect on the written source data that could be directly or indirectly associated with this territory. The only such data can be taken from the Acts of the Councils of Salona held in

⁷⁷ Sergejevski, 1948, 182.

⁷⁸ More on capitals with two zones in: Kautzsch, 1936, 152 and Tbl. 30, 31, 32

⁷⁹ Sergejevski, 1956, 23. Also in: Basler, 1972, 81-82. A line of leaves was probably under the volute, which was a custom, just as on the capital from Podlugovi.

⁸⁰ The capital fragment was discovered by Đorđe Balorda, the resident of the village of Odžak near the railway station Podlugovi, while ploughing the land. Together with this fragment, he uncovered a square Roman brick. Balorda donated both finds to the National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

⁸¹ Sergejevski, 198, 182.

AD 530 and 533 in the capital of the province of Dalmatia – Salona.⁸² Namely, the Councils, chaired by Salona Archbishop Honorius Iunior, was attended by Andreas, the Bishop of the Bestoen bishopric (*Ecclesia Bestoensis*), who had a prominent role in both of these events. The territory of the municipium *Aquae* and its center in present-day's Ilidža, was most certainly under the jurisdiction of this bishopric, to which present-day Sarajevo and its wider surrounding belonged under the Roman administration.⁸³ In his letter, Bishop Andreas writes: “*sicut nuper bestoensis ecclesie scriptum tenentes agnoscimus, que tanto est divino honore comodata, ut non solum oppressis adesse non cogitet, sed nec sue a deo valeat subvenire pressure.*”⁸⁴ Thus it is visible that the Bestoen bishopric was in a grave situation, meaning that not only were the common people poverty-stricken but the church as well, since, according to Andreas, the church could not help itself or the local population. The evidence for this is the churches from Late Antiquity built without structure, smaller in size, and most commonly using spolia of older buildings and pagan tombstones. This applies to Christian sacral objects from the Sarajevo Region. The construction of the refugium on Gradac in Gornji Kotorac could be associated with the period when Andreas was the leading man of the Bestoen bishopric, if the proposed dating to the fourth decade of the 6th century would be accurate. That would be one of the rare direct pieces of evidence about the building activities in the territory of not only the present-day Sarajevo but also the entire territory of the Bestoen bishopric under Bishop Andreas.

Translation: Samra Čebirić, MA

⁸² More on the Acts of the Councils of Salona see: *Illyrici sacri tomus secundus. Ecclesia Salonitana. A quarto saeculo aere christianae usque ad excidium Salonae. Accessere Vita Diocletiani Imperatoris, Acta Sanctorum ex ejus genere, Marmora Salonitana*, (izd. D. FARLATI), Venetiis, 1753, 162-163, 173-174; *Leges ecclesiasticae regni Hungariae et provinciarum adiacentium, opera, et studio Ignatii comitis de Batthyani episcopi Transilvaniae coelected, et illustratae, Tomus primus*, (izd. I. BATTHYÁNY), Albae Carolinae, 1785, 285-293; *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, (izd. I. KUKULJEVIĆ-SAKCINSKI), Zagreb, 1874, 195-198; *Thomas Archidiaconus: Historia Salonitana*, (izd. F. RAČKI), Zagrabiae, 1894, 13-18; *Priručnik izvora hrvatske historije. Dio I. Čest 1. (do god. 1107). Uvod, natpisi i isprave*, (izd. F. ŠIŠIĆ), Zagreb, 1914, 157-164; *Historia Salonitana maior*, (izd. N. KLAJČ), Beograd, 1967, 76-85; *Ispravci i dopune starijoj hrvatskoj historiji. Knjiga 1. Izvori (analiza i kritika)*, (izd. S. GUNJAČA), Zagreb, 1973, 50-56; “Izvori”, u: *Salona Christiana*, (izd. M. IVANIŠEVIĆ), Split, 1994, 159-162; *Akti crkvenih sabora održanih 530. i 533. u Saloni*, (izd. i prev. R. DODIG – A. ŠKEGRO), Zagreb, 2008, 13-22.

⁸³ For more details on the Bestoen bishopric see: Škegro, 2005, 369-389; Škegro, 2008, 111-141.

⁸⁴ *Historia Salonitana maior*, (izd. N. KLAJČ), Beograd, 1967, 77.

Sažetak: Rimsko osvajanje sarajevske regije i posljedice istog na primjeru urbanizma i ranokršćanske (kasnoantičke) arhitekture

Na osnovu literarnih vrela koja u najvećem broju potječu iz perioda principata, rimsko osvajanje sarajevske regije može se pratiti kroz prizmu tri vojne kampanje, a to su: Oktavijanova kampanja protiv zajednica u unutrašnjosti nakon što je porazio Delmate 33. godine, potom Tiberijevo osvajanje Panonije (*Bellum Pannonicum* 12-11. god. pr. n. e.) i Veliki ilirski ustanak (*Bellum Batonianum* 6-9. god.). Oktavijan je po svemu sudeći 33. godine pobijedio jednu od zajednica koje su činile Dezidijatski savez (*Daesii (Daisioi)*), ali o uspostavljanju rimske vlasti na prostoru srednje, sjeverne i istočne Bosne, ne može se govoriti prije *Bellum Pannonicum* (12-11. god. pr. n. e.). To znači da je današnja sarajevska regija, kao dio dezidijatske teritorije, pod rimsku vlast došla dvadesetak godina nakon osvajanja Hercegovine, zapadne i sjeveroistočne Bosne. Analiza antičkih izvora ukazuje da su sjeverni susjedi Dezidijata, tj. Breuci pružili Tiberijevim trupama najjači otpor. Međutim, nakon pobjede nad Breucima, izvjesno je da je Augustov legat i kasniji nasljednik Tiberije svoju kampanju usmjerio na teritoriju Dezidijata. U tom trenutku za Tiberija je zasigurno bilo veoma važno da pod svoju kontrolu stavi Dezidijate, odnosno, dezidijatski savez i između ostalog osvoji i sarajevsku regiju. Kao pronicljiv vojskovođa nije smio dopustiti da mu iza leđa ostanu nepokorene panonske zajednice koje bi zasigurno pružile podršku pobunjenim Delmatima protiv kojih je već godinama ratovala provincijska uprava. On je vjerovatno u drugoj godini *Bellum Pannonicum* pod rimsku vlast stavio i prostor sarajevske regije. *Bellum Pannonicum* ipak nije bio posljednja rimska vojna kampanja na teritoriji današnje sarajevske regije. Naime, nakon što su pokorili Dezidijate, Rimljani su pristupili pacifikaciji ovog prostora koji je bio važan dio teritorije dezidijatskog saveza. To je svakako morao biti bolan i dugotrajan proces na koji domaće stanovništvo i njegova elita nisu gledali blagonaklono. U unutrašnjosti Dalmacije, kojoj je u rimsko doba pripadalo i sarajevsko polje, geografski udaljeno od središta provincije koje je bilo u Saloni (današnji Solin), zloupotrebe lokalnih rimskih činovnika vremenom su postale sve izražajnije. Nepravilno ubiranje poreza bilo je sasvim sigurno povod za Veliki ilirski ustanak 6. godine. Bez sumnje autohtono stanovništvo koje je naseljavalo sarajevsku regiju činilo je značajan dio pobunjeničke vojske. Kraj Batonovog ustanka je označio novu epohu u historijskom razvoju sarajevske regije. Najznačajnije promjene koje su nastupile nakon 9. godine se ogledaju u kontekstu urbanizma i arhitekture. Iako je arheološki i epigrafski posvjedočeno postojanje urbanog kompleksa na Ilidži, to naselje koje je bilo središte značajne administrativne jedinice se ne spominje u pisanim izvorima. Prateći analogiju sa Domavijom može se zaključiti da razlog za izostanak *Aquae S(...?)* u antičkim itinerarijima treba tražiti u tome što na prostoru sarajevske regije nije bilo stanica konzularskih beneficijara. Zahvaljujući spomeniku lokalne elite

iz Krivoglavaca dâ se zaključiti da je naselje dobilo rang municipija u drugom stoljeću vjerovatno u vrijeme Trajanove (98-117) ili Hadrijanove (117-138) vladavine, dok kolonijalni status *Aquae S(...?)* nije epigrafski potvrđen. Opet, kroz komparaciju epigrafskih spomenika iz Istočne Bosne utvrđeno je da ranije teze o posebnom administrativnom rangu *Aquae S(...?)* koji se odnosi na pojam *res publica* nisu utemeljene. Puno ime municipalne jedinice kojoj je u antičkom periodu pripadala sarajevska regija još uvijek je misterija za naučnike. Tekst uklesan na nadgrobnom spomeniku domaće elite iz Krivoglavaca je potencijalno jamstvo da se *municipium* prvobitno zvao *Aquae*. S druge strane, spomenik sa Ilidže koji je podignut u čast cara Dioklecijana potvrđuje da je došlo do određene promjene u nazivu tê administrativne jedinice u trećem ili početkom četvrtog stoljeća. Iako postoji velika mogućnost da se nikada neće saznati puni naziv koji je bio uklesan na Dioklecijanovom spomeniku, rekonstrukcija teksta u smjeru epiteta koji se odnosi na prirodne odlike urbane cjeline na Ilidži čini se najispravnijim. U vezi sa ovim naučnim problemom za kraj treba istaći razliku u vrsti pronađenih spomenika na kojima je uklesano ime ove municipalne jedinice. Natpis iz Krivoglavaca uklesan je na nadgrobnom spomeniku i stoga se ubraja u tekstove privatnog karaktera što nužno ne zahtijeva da je navedeno puno ime municipija na spomeniku. Nasuprot tome, natpis sa biste cara Dioklecijana je uklesan na javnom natpisu što samo po sebi implicira da je ime naselja moralo biti uklesano u punom obliku, odnosno, da je neosporno da je *Aquae* u svom nazivu u trećem i četvrtom stoljeću imalo epitet *Sulfureae* ili *Sulfuratae*.

Na osnovu do danas poznatog arheološkog materijala, može se zaključiti da se na prostoru uže i šire okoline Sarajeva nalaze dva lokaliteta na kojima se sasvim sigurno nalaze tragovi kršćanske sakralne arhitekture iz razdoblja kasne antike, te jedan za koji se opravdano pretpostavlja da je istog takvog karaktera. Vremenski raspon između objekata na ta tri lokaliteta iznosi oko stotinu i pedeset godina, što bi sugerisalo da se kristijanizacija na ovom prostoru odvijala sporo i postepeno. Ta činjenica, iako je u pitanju svega dva, odnosno, tri lokaliteta, u potpunosti je u skladu sa prethodno navedenim razlozima zbog čega je kršćanstvo sporo napredovalo u unutrašnjosti provincije Dalmacije. Pronađene građevine sa prostora Sarajeva uklapaju se u opšti karakter kasnoantičkih crkava iz unutrašnjosti provincije Dalmacije, odnosno, teritorija današnje Bosne i Hercegovine. To se, prije svega, odnosi na njihovu veličinu koja je uglavnom manjih dimenzija, a zatim i tehniku gradnje s obzirom na to da su sagrađene prilično neuredno, uglavnom od spolija starijih objekata i paganskih nadgrobničkih spomenika.

Ključne riječi: Sarajevo, *Daesii* (*Daisioi*), Dezidijati, *Bellum Pannonicum*, *Bellum Batonianum*, Oktavijan, Tiberije, rijeka Bosna, *municipium*, *colonia*, *res publica*, *Aquae S*, rimski carevi, konzularski beneficijari, epigrafija, rano kršćanstvo, kasna antika, kasnoantičke bazilike, Bestoenska biskupija

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

- AE* *L'année épigraphique*, Paris
- CBI* Centar za balkanološka ispitivanja, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti
BiH, Sarajevo
- CIL III* *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum III* (ed. Th. Mommsen), Berlin
1873; Supplementa 1889-1902.
- ILJug* *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMXL
e MCMLX repertae et editae sunt* (ed. A. et J. Šašel), Situla 5,
Ljubljana 1963 (št. 1–451); *Inscriptiones Latinae quae in Iugoslavia
inter annos MCMLX e MCMLXX repertae et editae sunt* (ed. A.
et J. Šašel), Situla 19, Ljubljana 1978 (št. 452–1222); *Inscriptiones
Latinae quae in Iugoslavia inter annos MCMII et MCMXL repertae
et editae sunt* (izd. A. et J. Šašel), Situla 25, Ljubljana 1986 (št.
1223–3128).
- LCL* The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge (Massachusetts) – London

Literary Sources

- *Akti Salonitanskih sabora 530. i 533. godine* u: *Leges ecclesiasticae regni Hungariae et provinciarum adiacentium, opera, et studio Ignatii comitis de Batthyán episcopi Transilvaniae colectae, et illustratae, Tomus primus*, (ed. I. BATTHYÁNY), Albae Carolinae 1785, 285–293.
- *Akti Salonitanskih sabora 530. i 533. godine* u: “Izvori”, u: *Salona Christiana*, (ed. M. IVANIŠEVIĆ), Split 1994, 159–162.
- *Akti Salonitanskih sabora 530. i 533. godine* u: *Akti crkvenih sabora održanih 530. i 533. u Saloni*, (izd. i prev. R. DODIG – A. ŠKEGRO), Zagreb 2008, 13–22.
- *Akti Salonitanskih sabora 530. i 533. godine* u: *Codex diplomaticus regni Croatiae, Dalmatiae et Slavoniae*, (ed. I. KUKULJEVIĆ-SAKCINSKI), Zagreb 1874, 195–198.
- *Akti Salonitanskih sabora 530 i 533. godine* u: *Historia Salonitana maior*, (ed. N. KLAČIĆ), Beograd 1967, 76–85.
- *Akti Salonitanskih sabora 530 i 533. godine* u: *Illyrici sacri tomus secundus. Ecclesia Salonitana. A quarto saeculo aere christianae usque ad excidium Salonae. Accessere Vita Diocletiani Imperatoris, Acta Sanctorum ex ejus genere, Marmora Salonitana*, (ed. D. FARLATI), Venetiis 1753, 162–163, 173–174.

- *Akti Salonitanskih sabora 530. i 533. godine* u: *Ispravci i dopune starijoj hrvatskoj historiji. Knjiga 1. Izvori (analiza i kritika)*, (ed. S. GUNJAČA), Zagreb 1973, 50–56.
- *Akti Salonitanskih sabora 530. i 533. godine* u: *Priručnik izvora hrvatske historije. Dio I. Čest 1. (do god. 1107). Uvod, natpisi i isprave*, (ed. F. ŠIŠIĆ), Zagreb 1914, 157–164.
- *Akti Salonitanskih sabora 530. i 533. godine* u: *Thomas Archidiaconus: Historia Salonitana*, (ed. F. RAČKI), Zagrabiae 1894, 13–18.
- Appian, *Appian and Illyricum*, (ed. M. Š. KOS) Situla 43, 52 – 81. Ljubljana, 2005.
- August, *Res Gestae Divi Augusti*, (ed. R. MATIJAŠIĆ), Zagreb, 2007.
- Dio Cassius, *Dio's Roman history* (ed. E. CARY), LCL, Cambridge (Mass.) 1954.
- Dio Cassius, *Roman History, Dio's Roman History in Six Volumes* (Halcyon Classics), (ed. H. B. FOSTER), Houston (Tex.), 2010.
- Eutropius, *Eutropius, Breviarium ab urbe condita*, (ed. F. RUEHL), Stuttgart 1975.
- Eutropius, *Eutropius, Breviarium ab urbe condita*, (ed. H. DROYSEN), MGH AA 2, München 2000 (1. izd. 1879).
- Frontinus, *Frontinus: Stratagems. Aqueducts of Rome* (ed. C. E. BENNETT — M. B. McELWAIN), LCL, Cambridge (Mass.) 1925.
- Orosius, *Historiae adversus paganos*, (izd. A. LIPPOLD), I-II, Milano 2001.
- Iordanes, *Getica* (ed. TH. MOMMSEN), MGH AA 5/1, München, 1982, 53–138. (II.) Jordanes, *O izvoru in dejanjih Gotov. Getika* (izd. Ž. ŠMIT), Ljubljana 2006.
- Isidorus Hispalensis, *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, (ed. S. A. BARNEY, W. J. LEWIS, J. A. BEACH, O. BERGHOF), Cambridge 2010.
- Konstantin Porfirogenit, *Spis o narodima*, u: *Vizantiski izvori za istoriju naroda Jugoslavije*, Tom II, (obr. B. FERJANČIĆ, urednik G. OSTROGORSKI), Beograd 1959.
- Livy, *History of Rome (Complete)*, (ed. N. BURTON), Chicago (Illin.) 2012.
- Lucius Annaeus Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*; Cornelius Nepos (ed. E. SEYMOUR FORSTER & J. C. ROLFE), LCL, Cambridge (Mass.) 1960.
- *Novi Zavjet*, Čakovec 2010.
- Ovid, *Tristia. Ex Ponto* (ed. A. L. Wheeler), LCL, Cambridge (Mass.) 1924.
- Plinije Stariji, *Plinije Stariji Zemljopis starog svijeta*, (ed. U. PASINI), Split 2004.
- Plinius Secundus (C.), *Naturalis historia*, Libri III/IV (ed. G. WINKLER – R. KÖNIG), München – Zürich 1988.
- Rufius Festus, *The Breviarium of Festus*, (ed. J. W. EADIE), London 1967.

- Strabo, *The Geography of Strabo*, (ed. H. L. JONES), LCL, Cambridge (Mass.) 1954.
- Svetonije, Gaj Svetonije Trankvil, *Dvanaest rimskih careva*, (ed. S. HOSU), Zagreb 1978.
- *Tabula Peutingeriana* u: Monumenta cartographica Jugoslaviae, I antičke karte, Posebna izdanja knj. 17, (ed. G. A. ŠKRIVANIĆ), Beograd 1974.
- Tacitus, *Annales*, (ed. J. JACKSON), Cambridge (Massachusetts) – London 1970; (II.) *Anali* (trans. F. BRADAČ), Maribor 1968.
- Velleius Paterculus, Gaj Velej Paterkul, *Rimska povijest*, (ed. J. MIKLIĆ), Zagreb 2006.
- Velleius Paterculus, *Compendium of Roman History*, (ed. F. W. SHIPLEY), LCL. Cambridge (Mass.) 1955.

Literature

- Basler Đ. 1984, *Arhitektura kasnoantičkog doba u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo 1972.
- Benac B. 1963, *Gradac Ilinjača kod Kotorca*, Prilozi za proučavanje istorije Sarajeva, god. I, knj. I, Sarajevo 1963, 25–31.
- Bojanovski I. 1988, *Bosna i Hercegovina u antičko doba*, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Djela LXVI, CBI 6, Sarajevo 1988.
- Busuladžić A. 2018, *Antički tragovi putovanja na prostoru današnje Bosne i Hercegovine*, Godišnjak Udruženja za proučavanje i promoviranje ilirskog naslijeđa i drevnih i klasičnih civilizacija “BATHINVS”, “Acta Illyrica”, br. 2, Sarajevo 2018, 267–299.
- Curchin A. L. 1985, *Vici and Pagi in Roman Spain*, Revue des Etudes Anciennes, vol. 87, Bordeaux 1985, 327–343.
- Čović B. 1966, *Novi podaci o praistorijskom naselju Gradac kod Kotorca*, god. II, knj. II, Prilozi za proučavanje istorije Sarajeva, Sarajevo 1966, 9–17.
- Čremošnik I. 1974, *Prvi tragovi kršćanstva na nalazima vile u Paniku*, Narodni muzej Slovenije, Situla, br. 14/15, Ljubljana 1974, 243–248.
- Čremošnik I. 1984, *Mozaici i zidno slikarstvo rimskog doba u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo 1984.
- Ćeman M. H 2004, *Res Publica Aquarum S...*, In: *ILIDŽA – SARAJEVO – Cultural and Historical Monograph* (ed. M. HASAN ĆEMAN), Sarajevo 2004, 122–169.

- Domić Kunić A. 2006, *Bellum Panonicum (12 - 11 pr. Kr.) posljednja faza osvajanja Južne Panonije*, Vjesnik arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, 3s, vol. XXXIX, Zagreb 2006, 59–164.
- Džino D. & Domić Kunić A. 2013, *Rimski ratovi u Iliriku – povijesni narativ*, Zagreb 2013.
- Džino D. 2009, *Dezidijati: Identitetski konstrukt između antičkih i suvremenih percepcija*, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Godišnjak, XXX-VIII, CBI 36, Sarajevo 2009, 75–97.
- Džino D. 2010, *Illyricum in Roman Politics, 229 BC – AD 68*, Cambridge 2010.
- Džino D. 2012, *Bellum Pannonicum: The Roman armies and indigenous communities in southern Pannonia 16 – 9 BC*, u: *Actes du Symposium international. Le livre. Le Roumanie. L'Europe. 4^{ème} édition*, 20–23 Septembre 2011. Tome III, Bucarest 2012, 461–480.
- Fekeža L. 1990, *Kasnoantičko utvrđenje i crkva na lokalitetu Gradac na Ilinjači u Gornjem Kotorcu kod Sarajeva*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, arheologija, nova serija, sv. 45, Sarajevo 1990, 159–163.
- González J. 1986, *The Lex Irnitana: A New Copy of the Flavian Municipal Law*, The Journal of Roman Studies, vol. 76, Cambridge 1986, 147–243.
- Imamović E. 1975–76, *Interpretatio Romana u odnosu na indigene kultove rimske provincije Dalmacije*, Prilozi, br. 11–12, Sarajevo 1975–76, 13–26.
- Imamović E. 1976, *Opći pogled na antičku religiju i kultove na području Bosne i Hercegovine*, Radovi, knj. VIII, Sarajevo 1976, 457–484.
- Imamović E. 1977, *Antički kultni i votivni spomenici na području Bosne i Hercegovine*, Sarajevo 1977.
- Imamović E. 1983, *Konzervativizam Ilira jugozapadnog dijela Bosne u odnosu na domaće kultove*, u: *Arheološka problematika zapadne Bosne*, Zbornik, knjiga I, Arheološko društvo Bosne i Hercegovine, Sarajevo 1983, 131–144.
- Kaljanac A. 2017, *Izveštaj o arheološkim prethodnim radovima istražnog karaktera – plan preventivne prospekcije arheološkog potencijala na lokalitetu nacionalnog spomenika: Arheološko područje – prahistorijsko naselje u Butmiru. (Faza 2)*, Sarajevo 2017.
- Kautzsch R. 1936, *Kapitelstudien. Beiträge zu einer Geschichte des spätantiken Kapitells im Osten*, Berlin 1936.
- Kellner I. 1895, *Rimski gragjevni ostanci u Ilidžama kod Sarajeva*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, VII, sv. 2, Sarajevo 1895, 161–198 + Tbl I – 10.
- Marić Z. 2000, *Od Butmira do Dezitijata*, in: Monografija Ilidža, Sarajevo 2000, 98–121.

- Mesihović S. 2007, *Dezitijski*, Sarajevo (u rukopisu). Dopunjena verzija doktorske disertacije: *Dezitijski: kulturna i narodnosno-politička zajednica u Iliriku i osvajanja Oktavijanovog doba*, Zagreb 2007.
- Mesihović S. 2008, *Inscriptiones Latinarum Saraevonensis*, Historijska traganja, vol. 1, Sarajevo 2008, 9–68.
- Mesihović S. 2009, *Baton Breučki – predaja i kazna (prilozi antičkoj historiji sjeveroistočne Bosne)*, Gračanički glasnik, XIII, broj 27, Gračanica 2009, 24–50.
- Mesihović S. 2010, *Katera (Kasnoantička i ranosrednjovjekovna utvrda)*, Hrvatski narodni Godišnjak, br. 57, Sarajevo 2010, 20–29.
- Mesihović S. 2011, *Antiqui homines Bosnae*, Sarajevo 2011.
- Mesihović S. 2011b, *Rimski vuk i ilirska zmija – posljednja borba*, Sarajevo 2011b.
- Mesihović S. 2011c, *Plinijevske peregrinske civitates na prostoru današnje Bosne i Hercegovine / The Plinian peregrine civitates in the territory of present-day Bosnia-Herzegovina*, Vjesnik za arheologiju i povijest dalmatinsku, Vol. 104, Split 2011c, 55–78.
- Mesihović S. & Šaćić A. 2015, *Historija Ilira*, Sarajevo 2015.
- Mesihović S. 2018, *Bitka za Ilirik*, Sarajevo 2018.
- Pašalić E. 1959, *Rimsko naselje u Ilidži kod Sarajeva (Prvi prethodni izvještaj o iskopavanjima 1955-1958 god.)*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, arheologija, nova serija, sv. XIV, Sarajevo 1959, 113–136.
- Pašalić E. 1960, *Antička naselja i komunikacije u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo 1960.
- Pašalić E. 1975, *O antičkim naseljima uz mineralna vrela na području Bosne*, u: *Sabrano djelo*, Sarajevo 1975, 188–199.
- Pašalić E. 1975, *Questiones de bello dalmatico pannonique*, u: *Sabrano djelo*, Sarajevo 1975, 376–421.
- Paškvalin V. & Forić M. 2006, *Slučajni rimski nalaz iz Krivoglavaca kod Vogošće*, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, BiH, XXVX, CBI, 33, Sarajevo 2006, 161–179.
- Paškvalin V. 1963, *Kultovi u antičko doba na području Bosne i Hercegovine*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, arheologija, nova serija, sv. XVIII, Sarajevo 1963, 127–153.
- Paškvalin V. 1992–1995, *Prilozi proučavanju ilirsko-panonskog plemena Dezitijski i njegovog teritorija u krajevima srednje Bosne u predrimsko i rimsko doba*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, N. S. Arheologija, sv. XLVII, Sarajevo 1992–1995, 93–117.

- Paškvalin V. 2000, *Ilirsko-panonsko pleme Desidijata srednje Bosne u rimsko doba i rekognosciranje njihova područja*, Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine, Godišnjak XXXI, CBI 29, Sarajevo 2000, 191–241.
- Paškvalin V. 2003, *Kršćanstvo kasne antike u zaleđu Salone i Narone: arheološka istraživanja kasnoantičkog kršćanstva u Bosni i Hercegovini*, Sarajevo 2003.
- Patsch C. 1894, *Novi i revidirani natpisi*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, god. VI, sv. 2, Sarajevo 1894, 341–358.
- Sergejevski D. 1941, *Rimski natpisi novi i revidirani*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, god. LII, sv. 1, Sarajevo 15–26.
- Sergejevski D. 1947, *Arheološki nalazi u Sarajevu i okolici*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, društvene nauke, nova serija, sv. II, Sarajevo 1947, 13–50.
- Sergejevski D. 1948, *Nove akvizicije odjeljka klasične arheologije Zemaljskog muzeja*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, nova serija, sv. III, Sarajevo, 1948, 167–188.
- Sergejevski D. 1956, *Bazilika u Dabrovini (Revizija)*, Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine, arheologija, nova serija, sv. XI, posebno izdanje, Sarajevo 1956.
- Swoboda E. 1932, *Oktavian und Illyricum*, (Parerga 1), Wien 1932.
- Syme R. 1934, *Octavian und Illyricum* by E. Swoboda, The Journal of Roman Studies vol. 23, 66–71 (= id. The Campaigns of Octavian, in Danubian Papers 1971, 135–144; Addendum, 143–144), Cambridge 1934, 66–71.
- Šaćić Beća A. 2018, *Koji je administrativni status rimskog naselja na Ilidži?*, Godišnjak Udruženja za proučavanje i promoviranje ilirskog naslijeđa i drevnih i klasičnih civilizacija “BATHINVS”, “Acta Illyrica”, br. 2, Sarajevo 2018, 149–178.
- Šašel Kos M. 1999, *Octavian’s Campaigns (35–33 BC) in Southern Illyricum*, in: *L’Illyrie méridionale et l’Empire dans l’Antiquité. Actes du IIIe colloque international de Chantilly* (16–10 Octobre 1996), Paris 1999, 255–264.
- Šašel Kos M. 2005, *Appian and Illyricum*, Situla 43, Ljubljana 2005.
- Šašel Kos M. 2015, The Final Phase of the Augustan Conquest of Illyricum, *Antichità Altoadriatiche LXXXI*, Trieste 2015, 65–87.
- Škegro A. 2005, *The Bestoen bishopric in the light of prior research*, Arheološki vestnik, 56, Ljubljana 2005, 369–389.
- Škegro A. 2008, *Bestoenska biskupija u svjetlu dosadašnjih istraživanja*, u: *Zbornik o Pavlu Anđeliću*, Sarajevo 2008, 111–141.
- Topolovac K., Fekeža L. 1988, *Gradac (Ilinjača)*, u: *Arheološki leksikon Bosne i Hercegovine*, Tom III, Sarajevo 1988, 44: 15. 105.

- Veletovac E. 2017, *Oktavijanovo osvajanje Zapadnog Ilirika u djelima kasnoantičkih autora*, Godišnjak Udruženja za proučavanje i promoviranje ilirskog naslijeđa i drevnih i klasičnih civilizacija “BATHINVS”, “Acta Illyrica”, br. 1, Sarajevo 2017, 148–167.
- Vulić N. 1934, *The Illyrian War of Octavian*, The Journal of Roman Studies, vol. 24, Cambridge 1934, 163–167.
- Wilkes J. J. 1969, *Dalmatia – History of the provinces of the Roman Empire*, London 1969.

Photo 1: The remains of the Roman *caldarium* (hot bath) in Ilidža
(authors' photo)

Photo 2: The remains of the Roman *hospitium* (thermae) in Ilidža
(authors' photo)

Photo 3: Roman *hypocaustum* in Ilidža
(authors' photo, 2019)

Photo 4: Roman mosaic fragment with a depiction of birds and theatre mask from the 3rd century
(authors' photo, 2019 © National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina)

Photo 5: An honorary inscription on the base of the statue erected in the honour of Emperor Diocletian (284-305) by *res publica Aquae S(...?)*
(authors' photo, 2019 © National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina)

Photo 6: A fragment of the column with a base mentioning a prominent senatorial family *Catii*, the patrons of the Roman settlement in Ilidža (authors' photo, 2019 © National Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina)

Photos 7 and 8: Obverse and reverse of the sestertertius of Emperor Antoninus Pius (138-161) (authors' photo, 2019 © Museum of Sarajevo)