

# Različite razine sinkretizma na tri Silvanova spomenika

---

**Perinić, Ljubica**

*Source / Izvornik:* **Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu, 2015, 32, 215 - 228**

**Journal article, Published version**

**Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)**

*Permanent link / Trajna poveznica:* <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:291:161524>

*Rights / Prava:* [Attribution 3.0 Unported](#)/[Imenovanje 3.0](#)

*Download date / Datum preuzimanja:* **2024-12-22**



INSTITUT ZA  
ARHEOLOGIJU

*Repository / Repozitorij:*

[RIARH - Repository of the Institute of archaeology](#)



UDK 902  
ISSN 1330-0644  
VOL 32/2015.  
ZAGREB, 2015.

# Prilozi

Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu

Izdavač/*Publisher*  
INSTITUT ZA ARHEOLOGIJU  
INSTITUTE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

Adresa uredništva/*Address of the editor's office*  
Institut za arheologiju/*Institute of archaeology*  
HR-10000 Zagreb, Ulica Ljudevita Gaja 32  
Hrvatska/*Croatia*  
Telefon/Phone ++385/(0)1 61 50 250  
Fax ++385(0)1 60 55 806  
e-mail: urednistvo.prilozi@iarh.hr  
<http://www.iarh.hr>

Glavni i odgovorni urednik/*Editor in chief*  
Marko DIZDAR

Uredništvo/*Editorial board*  
Marko DIZDAR, Snježana KARAVANIĆ, Viktória KISS (Budapest, HUN) (prapovijest/Prehistory),  
Marija BUZOV, Goranka LIPOVAC VRKLJAN (antika/Antiquities), Katarina Katja PREDOVNIK  
(Ljubljana, SLO), Tajana SEKELJ IVANČAN (srednji vijek/Middle Ages), Natascha MEHLER  
(Wien, AUT), Juraj BELAJ, Tatjana TKALČEC (kasni srednji vijek i novi vijek/Late Middle Ages  
and Modern era), Predrag NOVAKOVIĆ (Ljubljana, SLO) (metodologija/Methodology)

Izdavački savjet/*Editorial advisory board*  
Dunja GLOGOVIĆ (Zagreb), Ivor KARAVANIĆ (Zagreb), Timotej KNIFIC (Ljubljana,  
SLO), Laszlo KÓVACS (Budapest, HUN), Kornelija MINICHREITER (Zagreb),  
Mladen RADIĆ (Osijek), Aleksandar RUTTKAY (Nitra, SK), Ivančica  
SCHRUNK (Minneapolis, USA), Željko TOMIČIĆ (Zagreb), Ante UGLEŠIĆ (Zadar)

Prijevod na engleski/*English translation*  
Jadranka BOLJUNČIĆ, Stašo FORENBAHER, Sanjin MIHELIĆ, Ákos PETŐ, Marta RAKVIN  
Anita RAPAN PAPEŠA, Mladen TOMORAD, Ivan VALENT

Prijevod na hrvatski/*Croatian translation*  
Jadranka BOLJUNČIĆ, Sanjin MIHELIĆ

Prijevod na njemački/*German translation*  
Marina ŽANIĆ

Lektura/*Language editor*  
Ivana MAJER (hrvatski jezik/Croatian)  
Sanjin MIHELIĆ, Emmet MARRON (engleski jezik/English)  
Marina ŽANIĆ, Katharina HART (njemački jezik/German)

Korektura/*Proofreads*  
Marko DIZDAR  
Katarina BOTIĆ

Grafičko oblikovanje/*Graphic design*  
Roko BOLANČA

Računalni slog/*Layout*  
Hrvoje JAMBREK

Tisak/*Printed by*  
Tiskara Zelina d.d., Sv. I. Zelina

Naklada/*Issued*  
400 primjeraka/400 copies

## Sadržaj

## Contents

### Izvorni znanstveni radovi

### Original scientific papers

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 5   | STAŠO FORENBAHER<br>ZLATKO PERHOČ<br>Izrađevine od lomljenog kamena iz Nakovane (Pelješac): kontinuitet i promjene od ranog neolitika do kraja prapovijesti        | STAŠO FORENBAHER<br>ZLATKO PERHOČ<br><i>Lithic Artifacts from Nakovana (Pelješac): Continuity and Change from Early Neolithic until the End of Prehistory</i>              |
| 75  | MARTA RAKVIN<br>Naselje na gradini Marić kod Mikleuške tijekom kasnoga brončanog i starijeg željeznog doba   | MARTA RAKVIN<br><i>The Marić Hillfort Settlement near Mikleuška during the Late Bronze and the Early Iron Age</i>  |
| 111 | MORANA ČAUŠEVIĆ-BULLY<br>IVAN VALENT<br>Municipium Flavium Fulfinum<br>Dijakronijska studija gradske strukture s posebnim osvrtom na forumski prostor              | MORANA ČAUŠEVIĆ-BULLY<br>IVAN VALENT<br><i>Municipium Flavium Fulfinum<br/>Diachronic study of the city structure with a special attention to the forum</i>                |
| 147 | ANA KONESTRA<br>Keramika s Foruma Municipia Flavia Fulfinuma (otok Krk, Hrvatska) – istraživanja od 2007. do 2013. godine  | ANA KONESTRA<br><i>Pottery from the Forum of Municipium Flavium Fulfinum (Krk Island, Croatia) – research between 2007 and 2013</i>  |
| 215 | LJUBICA PERINIĆ<br>Različite razine sinkretizma na tri Silvanova spomenika   | LJUBICA PERINIĆ<br><i>Different levels of syncretism on three Silvanus' monuments</i>  |
| 229 | JADRANKA BOLJUNČIĆ<br>JOSIP HAT<br>Macroscopic and CT Diagnostic Approach in Interpreting a Non-traumatic Calvarial Lesion in a Medieval Man from Northern Croatia | JADRANKA BOLJUNČIĆ<br>JOSIP HAT<br><i>Makroskopski i CT dijagnostički pristup u tumačenju netraumatske lezije na kaloti srednjovjekovnog muškarca iz sjeverne Hrvatske</i> |

## Prethodno priopćenje

- 243 MLADEN TOMORAD  
JOACHIM SLIWA  
Tri staroegipatska skarabeja iz Arheološke zbirke  
franjevačkog samostana u Košljunu, Hrvatska
- 251 VESNA LALOŠEVIĆ  
Integracija pogana u ranokršćanskim legendama
- 261 ANITA RAPAN PAPEŠA  
ÁRPÁD KENÉZ  
ÁKOS PETŐ  
Arheobotanička analiza uzoraka iz  
kasnoavarodobnih grobova iz Nuštra (istočna  
Hrvatska)

## Recenzije

- 289 SUZANA ČULE  
Rimske keramičarske i staklarske radionice.  
Proizvodnja i trgovina na jadranskom  
prostoru: zbornik II. međunarodnog arheološkog  
kolokvija, Crikvenica, 28. –  
29. listopada 2011.

- 293 UPUTE AUTORIMA

## Preliminary communication

- MLADEN TOMORAD  
JOACHIM SLIWA  
*Three Ancient Egyptian scarabs from the  
Archaeological Collection of the Franciscan  
Monastery on Košljun, Croatia*
- VESNA LALOŠEVIĆ  
Conversion von Heiden in frühchristliche Legenden
- ANITA RAPAN PAPEŠA  
ÁRPÁD KENÉZ  
ÁKOS PETŐ  
*The Archaeobotanical Assessment of Grave  
Samples from the Avar Age Cemetery of  
Nuštar (Eastern Croatia)*

## Book reviews

- SUZANA ČULE  
*Roman Ceramic and Glass Manufactures.  
Production and Trade in the Adriatic Region:  
Proceedings of the 2nd International  
Archaeological Colloquium, Crikvenica, 28 – 29th  
October 2011*

- GUIDELINES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

# Različite razine sinkretizma na tri Silvanova spomenika

## *Different levels of syncretism on three Silvanus' monuments*

Izvorni znanstveni rad  
Antička arheologija

*Original scientific paper*  
*Romanarchaeology*

UDK/UDC 904:255.6(497.5–3 Dalmacija)

Primljeno/Received: 09. 01. 2015.

Prihvaćeno/Accepted: 15. 05. 2015.

LJUBICA PERINIĆ  
Odsjek za arheologiju  
Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti  
A. Kovačića 5  
HR-10 000 Zagreb  
ljperinic@hazu.hr

*Ovaj članak temelji se na predavanju s međunarodnog simpozija Romaniziranje orijentalnih bogova? Religijske transformacije u balkanskim provincijama tijekom rimskog razdoblja: novi nalazi i nove perspektive, održanog u Skopju između 18. i 21. rujna 2013. godine. Članak je u međuvremenu prerađen tako da uključi istraživanja različitih razina sinkretizma Silvanova kulta.*

*Cljučne riječi: Silvan, kult, sinkretizam, spomenici, Dalmacija*

*This article originated as a lecture at the International symposium Romanising Oriental Gods? Religious transformation in the Balkan provinces in the Roman period: New finds and novel perspectives, held in Skopje 18–21, September 2013. It has since been rewritten to investigate different levels of syncretism of Silvanus' cult.*

*Key words: Silvanus, cult, syncretism, monuments, Dalmatia*

U članku ću se baviti istraživanjem razloga na kojima se temeljilo stapanje dvaju kultova, od kojih jedan uvijek Silvanov. Usredotočit ću se na tri spomenika, na primjeru kojih ću pokušati predstaviti tri različite razine spajanja (ili sinkretizma) kultova. Sva tri spomenika potječu iz rimske provincije Dalmacije: reljef iz Pridrage, Silvanov reljef i svetište iz Močića te reljef Silvana i Dijane iz Zenice u Bosni i Hercegovini. Namjera mi je raspoznati različite situacije u kojima je moguće očekivati sinkretizam te, naposljetku, vrste poveznica ili zajedničkih crta koje su taj sinkretizam pospješivale. Nadalje, nastojat ću utvrditi pitanje promjene unutar kulta ili kultne slike i/ili uvjete promjene, ograničavajući se na tri odabrana spomenika. Iznosi se pretpostavka da su mjesta nalaza spomenika utjecala na fuziju raznih elemenata u kultovima božanstava. Razmatranje tih pitanja će, nadam se, ponuditi svježje i korisne uvide ili perspektive u probleme vezane uz sinkretizam.

Religijski sinkretizam proces je zbližavanja ili fuzije/prožimanja elemenata dvaju različitih sustava religijskog vjerovanja, a uključuje promjenu ili konverziju, ili oboje. U tom slučaju, religija ili kult preuzima ili primjenjuje određena svojstva iz nekog drugog religijskog sustava ili kulta. Problemi koji se tiču sinkretizma naizgled su jednostavni. Sfere

I shall be exploring the grounds on which two cults were brought together. One of the cults is always Silvanus'. I shall use three monuments through which I will try to demonstrate three different levels of fusion (or syncretism) of cults. All three monuments are from the Roman province of Dalmatia: Relief from Pridraga, Silvanus relief and sanctuary from Močići, and relief of Silvanus and Diana from Zenica, Bosnia and Herzegovina. My intention is to discern the different ways in which syncretism could be expected, and finally, what kind of connections or common ground promoted said syncretism. Furthermore, I will try to establish the subject of change within the cult or cult image and/or the condition of the change, confined to the three selected monuments. It is proposed that the locality where the monuments were found had an impact on the fusion of various elements in the cults of the deities. Reflections on these matters will, hopefully, offer some fresh and productive insight or perspective on issues of syncretism.

Religious syncretism is the process of alignment or the fusion/permeation of elements of two different systems of belief in religion, and it includes modification or conversion, or both. In that case, religion or cult adopts or implements certain features from another religious system or

interakcije dvaju religijskih sustava, kultova ili božanstava, odvijale su se na različitim razinama. Sinkretizam označava kombinaciju ili savezništvo suprotstavljenih religijskih ili filozofskih doktrina, što rezultira javnim ili privatnim ritualima te općeprihvaćenim lokalnim praksama koje u očima promatrača povezuju suprotna usmjerenja, iako ne nužno. Termin sinkretizam poglavito se odnosi na opis stanja, ili bivanja u jedinstvu, no može ga se proširiti i na opis procesa kojim se dolazi do takvog pomirenja/spajanja. Ovdje nas ne zanima toliko sam sinkretistički ishod toga procesa spajanja koliko onaj temeljni "element" koji dovodi do takvih kombinacija. Kao što sam već navela, u ovom bih članku željela predstaviti tri različite razine, kao i pokušati razlučiti mogući obrazac. Jednako je problematično odrediti trenutak u kojem je došlo do sinkretizma, odnosno je li se dogodio u već etabliranoj kulturi ili kultnom liku određenog božanstva, ili pak u situaciji u kojoj ikonografija božanstva i njegova kulta nije čvrsto ukorijenjena u svijesti štovatelja, kojemu zatim, zbog "neznanja", elemente jednog kulta pridaju drugom.<sup>1</sup>

Proces približavanja i kontaminacije između pojedinih vjerovanja na Istoku odigravao se tijekom helenizma. U Rimskom Carstvu sinkretizam je postao primjetniji tijekom antoninske dinastije, a zatim naročito za vlasti Severa. U početku je bila riječ o usklađivanju božanstava i kultova, a zatim o njihovu sve čvršćem zblizavanju, do konačnog izjednačavanja. Dok je na Istoku takvo približavanje ili čak izjednačavanje dvaju božanstava/kultova vrlo rijetko, u zapadnim je provincijama gotovo riječ o pravilu (Beard, North, Price 1998: 317–318, 338–348; Ando 2003: 50–51). Kao što je S. Price naglasio, točan način na koji su se religije općenito širile Rimskim Carstvom tek je naizgled jednostavan. Kultovi se, očigledno, ne pokreću sami od sebe nego njihovo kretanje ovisi o pokretima ljudi. U svom je nedavnom članku predložio podjelu kultova na dvije vrste, kao ključnu za razumijevanje religijske mobilnosti: etnički i izborni kultovi. Navedena podjela razlikuje na jednoj strani kultove koji pripadaju stvarnoj ili zamišljenoj baštini predaka unutar roda ili etnosa te, na drugoj, kultove kojima se pristupa po vlastitom odabiru. U suvremenoj znanosti, razlika između ova dva tipa kultova ogleda se u podjeli između djela Toutaina koji naglašava građanske (ili etničke) kultove na latinskom Zapadu te onog Cumonta o "orijentalnim" (ili izbornim) religijama (Price 2012: 2).<sup>2</sup> Dakako, u praksi je odnos između

cult. Problems of syncretism are seemingly simple. Spheres of interaction between two religious systems, cults or deities, were happening at different levels. Syncretism denotes the combination or alliance of opposing religious or philosophical doctrines, which results in public and private rituals and commonly accepted local practices that appear to the observer to link disparate orientations, but not necessarily. The term syncretism favours the description of a state, or condition of union, but can be extended also to describe the process by which such conciliation/merger occurs. It is not only the syncretistic outcome of this process of combination that concerns us, as much as the basic 'element' leading to such combinations. In this paper, I would like to show, as I already said, three different levels and also try to discern the possible pattern. It is equally troublesome to determine when syncretism occurred, whether it happened in an established culture and cult figure of a particular deity, or it occurred where the iconic image of the deity and its cult are not very rooted in worshipers who then, from their 'ignorance', include elements of one cult into the other.<sup>1</sup> The process of rapprochement and contamination between individual beliefs in the East took place during Hellenism. In the Roman Empire syncretism got more noticeable during Antonine dynasty, and then especially in the reign of Severus. First, it was a convergence of deities and cults, and then their close affiliation until identification. In the East, such a rapprochement or even identification of two deities/cults is very rare, while in the western provinces it is almost the rule (Beard, North, Price 1998: 317–318, 338–348; Ando 2003: 50–51). As S. Price accentuated, it is also a deceptively simple question to determine how exactly religions, in general, spread through the Roman Empire. The cults, obviously, don't move on their own, their movements depend on the movement of the people. In his recent article he proposed the following distinction of two sorts of cults as crucial for understanding religious mobility: ethnic cults and elective cults. The said distinction is between the cults which are part of the actual or imagined ancestral heritage of a *genos* or *ethnos*, on the one hand, and on the other, cults which a person chooses to join. In modern scholarship, the distinction between these two types of cults is mirrored in the divide between the work of Toutain, who emphasized civic (or ethnic) cults in the Latin West, and that of Cumont on 'Oriental' (or elective) religions (Price 2012: 2).<sup>2</sup> Of course,

1 Izabrana bibliografija: Beard, North, Price 1998; Ando, C. 2005, *Interpretatio Romana*, *Classical Philology*, Vol. 100 (1), 41–51; Webster, J. 1997, Necessary comparisons: a post-colonial approach to religious syncretism in the Roman provinces, *World Archaeology*, Vol. 28 (3), 324–338; Webster, J. 1995, 'Interpretatio': Roman word power and the Celtic gods, *Britannia*, Vol. 26, 153–161; Woolf, G. 1998, *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilisation in Gaul*, Cambridge; Zoll, A. L. 1994, Patterns of worship in Roman Britain: double named deities in context, in: *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology conference*, TRAC 94, Cottam S., Dungworth D., Scott S., Taylor J. (eds.), Oxford, 32–45.

2 S. Price nudi izabranu bibliografiju: Toutain, J. 1907/1920, *Les cultes païens dans l'empire romain*, Paris; Cumont, F. 1929, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, 4.éd., rev., Paris (Bonnet, C., Van Haepelen F. (eds.), Paris, 2006. Cf. Bonnet, C. 2009, L'empire et ses religions. Un regard actuel sur la polémique Cumont-Toutain concernant la diffusion des "religions orientales", in: *Die Religion des Imperium Romanum Koine und Konfrontationen*, Cancik H., Rüpke J. (eds.), Tübingen, 55–74. MacMullen 1981:, naročito 94–130, proučio je kretanje kultova; za neke

1 Selective bibliography: Beard, North, Price 1998; Ando, C. 2005, *Interpretatio Romana*, *Classical Philology*, Vol. 100 (1), 41–51; Webster, J. 1997, Necessary comparisons: a post-colonial approach to religious syncretism in the Roman provinces, *World Archaeology*, Vol. 28(3), 324–338; Webster, J. 1995, 'Interpretatio': Roman word power and the Celtic gods, *Britannia*, Vol. 26, 153–161; Woolf, G. 1998, *Becoming Roman: The Origins of Provincial Civilisation in Gaul*, Cambridge; Zoll, A. L. 1994, Patterns of worship in Roman Britain: double named deities in context, in: *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Theoretical Roman Archaeology conference*, TRAC 94, Cottam S., Dungworth D., Scott S., Taylor J. (eds.), Oxford, 32–45.

2 S. Price gives selective bibliography: Toutain, J. 1907/1920, *Les cultes païens dans l'empire romain*, Paris; Cumont, F. 1929, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, 4.éd., rev., Paris (Bonnet, C., Van Haepelen F. (eds.), Paris, 2006. Cf. Bonnet, C. 2009, L'empire et ses religions. Un regard actuel sur la polémique Cumont-Toutain concernant la diffusion des "religions orientales", in: *Die Religion des Imperium Romanum*



dva idealna tipa, etničkog i izbornog, vrlo složen. Neki, pa čak možda i mnogi kultovi bili su istodobno i etnički i izborni. Imali su etničke temelje, no privlačili su i strance. Bez obzira na to, ova opća tipologija je korisna, a dvije vrste kultova krasile su prilično različite dinamike (Price 2012: 2–3). U takvoj podjeli kultova, Atis i Mitra su pripadali sferi izbornih kultova. Situacija sa Silvanom, pak, nije tako jasna. Ako je njegov kult u provinciji Dalmaciji autohton (ukoliko bi se to moglo potvrditi bez sumnje), onda bi ga trebalo svrstati u sferu etničkih kultova. No, s druge strane, ne možemo biti apsolutno sigurni u identitet posvetitelja spomenika.<sup>3</sup>

Među tri obrađena spomenika, u našem je slučaju najeklatantniji primjer sinkretizma poznati Silvanov oltar iz Pridrage (sl. 1).<sup>4</sup> Sljedeću, "nižu" razinu sinkretizma (nevidljivu u ikonografskom prikazu božanstava) predstavlja svetište u Močićima kraj Dubrovnika (sl. 2 i 2a),<sup>5</sup> dok je treće mjesto zauzeo spomenik s prikazom Silvana i Dijane iz Zenice (sl. 3).<sup>6</sup>

Reljef Silvana-Atisa iz Pridrage kraj Novigrada (lokalitet Mijovilovac) čuva se u Arheološkom muzeju u Splitu. Načinjen je od vapnenca, a oštećen je na desnoj strani te mu nedostaje komad stupa koji je nosio edikulu. Silvan je prikazan frontalno. U visoko podignutoj desnici drži siringu, dok lijevom ruku drži zmiju uvijenu u obliku slova "S". Na glavi nosi frigijsku kapu i odjeven je u neku vrstu tunike koja mu doseže tek do pupka, ostavljajući donji dio tijela ispod pupka golim. Spomenik je oštećen i u donjem dijelu, tako da Silvanova stopala nisu u potpunosti sačuvana. Silvanu se zdesna nalazi koza postavljena okomito, što je vjerojatno bio pokušaj da je se prikaže propetu, kao što je uobičajeno na Silvanovim spomenicima iz Dalmacije. N. Cambi datira spomenik iz Pridrage od ranog 3. stoljeća do vremena nadmoći kršćanstva (Cambi 1968: 139–141). Recenzent članka ljubazno mi je skrenuo pozornost na činjenicu da bi nalaz donjeg dijela ovog spomenika mogao u potpunosti promijeniti naše razumijevanje samog spomenika. S obzirom na to da još nije objavljen, nismo u mogućnosti uvidjeti njegovu važnost, no unatoč tomu mogao bi nam biti koristan, barem u pedagoškom smislu, jer nam pokazuje da jedan spomenik, pa čak i tek dio spomenika, može promijeniti naše teorije ili uvriježena mišljenja.<sup>7</sup>

Interpretirajući primjer sinkretizma iz Pridrage (sl. 1), N. Cambi spominje dvije različite težnje. Prva se ogleda više u naznakama i utjecajima nego u sinkretističkim postupcima u punom smislu riječi. Iskazuje se također u nekim, Silvanu novim svojstvima i značajkama, koje nije imao prije rimske

in practice, the relationship between the two ideal types of the ethnic and the elective is very complex. Some, perhaps many, cults were both ethnic and elective. They had an ethnic base, but also attracted in the outsiders. Nonetheless, the overall typology is useful, and the two sorts of cults involved quite different dynamics (Price 2012: 2–3). In order with such distinction of the cults, both Attis and Mithras belong within the sphere of the elective cults. As for Silvanus the situation is not that clear. If his cult was autochthonous (without a doubt) in the province of Dalmatia, it should fall into the sphere of the ethnic cults. But then again, we cannot be absolutely sure who the dedicators of the monuments were.<sup>3</sup>

Of the three monuments, the most egregious example of syncretism, in our case, is the well-known Silvanus altar from Pridraga (Fig. 1).<sup>4</sup> The next, 'lower' (invisible in the iconographical appearance of the deities), level of syncretism is represented by the shrine in Močići near Dubrovnik (Fig. 2 and 2a),<sup>5</sup> and finally the third place is taken by the monument representing Silvanus and Diana from Zenica (Fig. 3).<sup>6</sup>

Relief of Silvanus-Attis from Pridraga near Novigrad (locality Mijovilovac) is kept in Archaeological Museum in Split. It was made of limestone and it is damaged on the right side, missing a piece of the pillar that supported the aedicule. Silvanus is shown *en face*. The highly raised right hand holds the syrinx, and left – holds the snake curled in the form of the letter S. Silvanus is wearing the Phrygian cap and is dressed in a kind of tunic that goes down only to his navel, leaving his body naked, from the navel downwards. The monument was also damaged at the bottom in a way that Silvanus' feet are not completely preserved. On the right side of his body a goat is placed vertically, probably as an attempt to show the goat reaching up, as it was the usual representation in Silvanus' monuments from Dalmatia. N. Cambi dates the monument from Pridraga from early 3<sup>rd</sup> cent. to the time of the supremacy of Christianity (Cambi 1968: 139–141). The reviewer of this paper was kind enough to inform me that the finding of the bottom part of this monument could completely change our understanding of it. Since it is not yet published we are unable to see its significance, but it can still be useful to us, at least in the pedagogical sense, as it shows us that one monument or even one part of the monument can shift our theories or preconceptions.<sup>7</sup>

komentare njegova djela, vidi Price, S. 1982, R. MacMullen, Paganism in the Roman Empire. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981. Pp. xvi + 241, 2 pls., 3 text figs., 1 map, *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 72, 194–196.

3 Mnogi dedikanti obično su predstavljeni dvama imenima te se interpretacije (kao u slučaju određivanja podrijetla dedikanata) takvih natpisa mogu razlikovati.

4 Cambi 1968: 131–141, odakle je preuzet crtež spomenika.

5 Fotografije: D. Perkić i Lj. Perinić.

6 Fotografirao A. Karamehić iz Muzeja grada Zenice.

7 Tijekom spomenutog simpozija, prof. Ž. Miletić sa Sveučilišta u Zadru obavijestio me da je nedavno pronađen donji dio spomenika te da se na njemu spominje samo Silvan (a ne Silvan-Atis), na čemu mu izražavam najdublju zahvalnost. Nažalost, nije pružio nikakve druge informacije.

*Koine und Konfrontationen*, Cancik H., Rüpke J. (eds.), Tübingen, 55–74. MacMullen 1981; naročito 94–130, proučio je kretanje kultova; za neke komentare njegova djela, vidi Price, S. 1982, R. MacMullen, Paganism in the Roman Empire. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1981. Pp. xvi + 241, 2 pls., 3 text figs., 1 map, *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 72, 194–196.

3 Many dedicators are usually represented by two nomina and interpretations (as for the determination of the dedicators origin) of such inscriptions may vary.


4 Cambi 1968: 131–141, from where the drawing of the monument is retrieved.

5 Photographed by D. Perkić and the author of this paper.

6 Photographed by A. Karamehić, Municipal Museum Zenica.

7 During the mentioned symposium, prof. Ž. Miletić, University of Zadar, informed me that recently the bottom part of the monument has been





Sl. 1 Reljef s prikazom Silvana, Pridraga (prema Cambi 1968)  
Fig. 1 Relief depicting Silvanus, Pridraga (after Cambi 1968)

prevlasti (Cambi 1968: 138).

Spomenik iz Pridrage potječe s područja Liburna, koje je za sada dalo manje spomenika posvećenih Silvanu (bilo reljefa bilo onih u isključivo epigrafskom obliku) od područja nastanjenog Delmatima. Prevladavajuće mišljenje prema kojem liburnski Silvan pokazuje bitno različite značajke od delmatskog,<sup>8</sup> kao i to da je mnogo bliži italском nego delmatskom Silvanu zbog svoje povezanosti s poljoprivredom, a potom i to da liburnski Silvan ima više antropomorfnih obilježja (on je mladolik, golobrad muškarac s pastoralnim atributima poput siringe, koze, pastirskog štapa te psa) (Rendić-Miočević 1955: 13, 21; Raknić 1965: 85–88; Cambi 1966: 137), nije više održivo. Osim antropomorfnoг Silvana iz Karina<sup>9</sup> te onog na reljefu iz Pridrage, Silvan u Liburniji ne pokazuje neke bitnije ikonografske razlike u odnosu na delmatskog ili dalmatinskog Silvana. Na liburnskom području također susrećemo delmatskog Silvana – na reljefu iz Čulišića kraj Skradina (Pedišić 1992: 268–273) te na reljefu iz Sonkovića, također kraj Skradina (Rendić-Miočević 1989: 461–507, T. LXVIII: 2). Razlog zbog kojeg u ovom području nije bilo toliko spomenika posvećenog Silvanu N. Cambi nalazi u popularnosti epihorskih ženskih božanstava. Njih objašnjava zaostalim matrilinearnim odnosima očuvanima u kultu Liburna (Cambi 1968: 137). Silvanovi atributi na spomeniku iz Zadra (Raknić 1965: 85–91) te Silvanova komponenta na pridraškom reljefu bliži su prikazima delmatskog

8 Na reljefima iz Dalmacije, Silvan izgleda drugačije nego na panonskima. Dosad je prevladavalo mišljenje da njegova kulturna slika u Dalmaciji nije svugdje bila jednaka. Mislilo se da je u dalmatinskom zaleđu Silvan najčešće prikazivan kao mlad i golobrad antropoteriomorfni bog, dok je na obali prikazivan kao bradati starac (kao u Panoniji). S obzirom na to mišljenje uvela sam dva termina (za lakše snalaženje), sukladna dvjema kulturnim slikama/prikazima Silvana: jednog za obalne gradove (dalmatinski), a drugog za zaleđe (delmatski).

9 Reljefna ploča iz Karina čuva se u Zbirci Belvedere u Beču (Rendić-Miočević 1989a: 472).

In the interpretation of the syncretism from Pridraga (Fig. 1), N. Cambi refers to two different aspirations. The first is reflected more by touches and influences than syncretistic procedures in the true sense of the word. It manifests itself also in some properties and characteristics that are new to Silvanus, the ones he never had before Roman domination (Cambi 1968: 138).

Pridraga monument originates from the area of the Liburnians, which has, so far, 'produced' less monuments dedicated to Silvanus (either in the relief or in the epigraphic form exclusively) than the area inhabited with the Delmatians. Predominant opinion that the Liburnian Silvanus shows significantly different characteristics from the Delmatic,<sup>8</sup> and that he is much closer to the Italic than to the Delmatic Silvanus, because of his connections with agriculture, and furthermore that Liburnian Silvanus shows more anthropomorphic traits (he is a youthful, beardless man and has pastoral attributes such as syrinx, goat, pedum, and a dog) (Rendić-Miočević 1955: 13, 21; Raknić 1965: 85–88; Cambi 1966: 137), is no longer sustainable. Apart from anthropomorphic Silvanus from Karin<sup>9</sup> and one on the Pridraga relief, Silvanus in Liburnia shows no significant iconographical differences from any Delmatic or Dalmatian Silvanus. In Liburnian area we also see the Delmatic Silvanus - on the relief from Čulišić near Skradin (Pedišić 1992: 268–273) and on the relief from Sonković, also near Skradin (Rendić-Miočević 1989: 461–507, Pl. LXVIII: 2). The reason that in this area not as many monuments were dedicated to Silvanus, N. Cambi sees in popularity of epichoric female deities. He interprets it with retarded matrilineal relations preserved in the cult of the Liburnians (Cambi 1968: 137). Attributes of Silvanus from the monument from Zadar (Raknić 1965: 85–91) and Silvanus' component from Pridraga relief are closer to the representations of the Delmatic Silvanus, undeniably pointing to the existence of kinship between the two neighbouring populations (*Liburni* and *Delmatae*), at least with respect to the cult of Silvanus.


As for Silvanus, according to all known parameters, it is indeed difficult to say that the inhabitants of Dalmatia (whether coastal or its hinterland) did not know either his iconic image or his domain. Therefore, we can say that these elements, otherwise unfamiliar with Silvanus and his cult, were consciously added, possibly as a sign of the widening of the scope, or as the recognition of certain similarities of the two (or more deities). Numerous reliefs testify about Silvanus approaching to Priapus, Liber, Mercury, Italic Silvanus

found, and apparently it mentions Silvanus only (not Silvanus-Attis) for which I extend my deepest gratitude. Unfortunately, he gave no further information.

8 On the reliefs from Dalmatia, Silvanus' appearance is different than on those from Pannonia. So far the predominant opinion was that in the province of Dalmatia his cult image was not the same everywhere. It was thought that in the Dalmatian hinterland Silvanus was predominantly portrayed as young and beardless anthropomorfic god, while on the coast he was represented as an old man with a beard (like in Pannonia). Given this opinion, I introduced two terms (for easier reference) that are compatible with the two cult images/representations of Silvanus: one for the coastal cities (Dalmatian) and the other in the hinterland (Delmatic).

9 The relief panel from Karin is kept in the Belvedere Collection in Wien (Rendić-Miočević 1989a: 472).





Sl. 2 i 2a Reljef s prikazom Silvana, Močići (slika: D. Perkić)  
 Fig. 2 and 2a Relief depicting Silvanus, Močići (photo by D. Perkić)

Silvana, nedvojbeno upućujući na postojanje srodstva između dviju susjednih populacija (*Liburni* i *Delmatae*), barem kada je riječ o Silvanovu kultu.

Što se Silvana tiče, prema svim poznatim parametrima uistinu je teško ustvrditi da stanovnici Dalmacije (bilo na obali ili u zaleđu) nisu poznavali njegovu kultnu predodžbu ili njegovo polje djelovanja. Stoga možemo reći da su ti elementi, inače nekarakteristični za Silvana i njegov kult, svjesno dodani, možda kao znak proširenja opsega djelovanja, ili kao znak priznavanja određenih sličnosti između dvaju božanstava (ili više njih). Brojni reljefi svjedoče o Silvanovu približavanju Prijapu, Liberu, Merkuru, italskom Silvanu te drugim božanstvima (reljefi iz Salone i okolice: CIL III, 1960; Maršić (1997) 1998: br. 3; Brunšmid 1905: 70–71, br. 130; Rendić-Miočević 1989: T. LXXVIII: 1, 473; Brunšmid 1905: 128; Rendić-Miočević 1989: T. LXXIX: 2). Kada je riječ o Liberu (Matijašić, Tasseaux 2000: 65–119), on se pojavljuje sa živom panterom (a ne s kožom), a Silvan ponekad nosi životinjsku kožu, kao što je prikazano na jednom reljefu iz Salone (Rendić-Miočević 1989: T. LXXVIII: 1). D. Rendić-Miočević pojavu životinjske kože u Silvanovoj ruci skloniji je smatrati elementom ikonografije Herkula nego Libera (Rendić-Mioče-

and other deities (reliefs from Salona and its surroundings: CIL III, 1960; Maršić (1997) 1998: no. 3; Brunšmid 1905: 70–71, no. 130; Rendić-Miočević 1989: Pl. LXXVIII: 1, 473; Brunšmid, 1905: 128; Rendić-Miočević 1989: Pl. LXXIX: 2). As for Liber (Matijašić, Tasseaux 2000: 65–119), he appears with a live panther (not its skin) and Silvanus sometimes carries an animal skin, as represented on one relief from Salona (Rendić-Miočević 1989: Pl. LXXVIII: 1). D. Rendić-Miočević considers the appearance of an animal skin in Silvanus' hand as the element of the Hercules iconography rather than that of Liber (Rendić-Miočević 1989: 473). D. Toulec thinks that animal skin, when worn as a cloak, falls within the domain of the Hercules symbolism, while simultaneously it is also the way to show the differences between life in the city or in the countryside. In Gaul, where Silvanus was identified with Sucellus on various levels, the appearance of a dog or a wolf on the monument is interpreted as an expression of life in the wilderness, or as the opposite of the city life (Toulec 1998: 38–40).

But, back to Silvanus-Attis (?) monument. There are many indicators that the cults of Cybele and Attis were widespread on the Croatian coast. Apart for Salona, which

vić 1989: 473). D. Toulec misli da životinjska koža nošena kao ogrtač ulazi u polje Herkulova simbolizma, dok istodobno služi i kao način za iskazivanje razlika između života u gradu te na selu. U Galiji, gdje je Silvan izjednačen sa Sucellusom na različitim razinama, pojava psa ili vuka na spomenicima tumači se kao izraz života u divljini, odnosno kao suprotnost gradskom životu (Toulec 1998: 38–40).

No, vratimo se sada spomeniku Silvana-Atisa (?). Mnogo je pokazatelja da su kultovi Kibele i Atisa bili široko rasprostranjeni na hrvatskoj obali. Osim Salone koja je vjerojatno bila središte kulta, iskopavanja na zadarskom forumu dokazala su i da su ovi kultovi na neki način bili službeno priznati i u Zadru (Suić 1965: 122). Stoga ne iznenađuje da je u takvom religijskom okruženju moglo doći do sinkretizma između Silvana i Atisa. Reljef iz Pridrage je spomenik na kojem možemo vidjeti elemente, simbole i atribute raznih božanstava i raznih kultova, koji nedvojbeno upućuju na prodor različitih elemenata u postojećim religijskim sustavima domorodačkih Ilira, kao i u religijskim sustavima Grčke i Rima. Kada je riječ o zmiji, N. Cambi ju je sklon protumačiti kao simbol magičnih moći predstavljenog lika te Silvanovih najvjerojatnije liječničkih i iscjeliteljskih vještina. Cambi smatra da na ovom spomeniku svjedočimo osobitom primjeru kulturnog sinkretizma ilirskog boga Silvana i maloazijskoga diviniranog pastira Atisa. Prema njemu, glavna djelatnost božanstva s pridraškog spomenika proširuje se kroz/uz preuzimanje novih atributa i epiteta, dok se istodobno njegovo izvorno značenje nije znatnije promijenilo. Kao ishod toga, Silvan kao šumsko, pastoralno božanstvo zadobio je još jedan atribut, čime je njegov temeljni karakter proširen na drugu dimenziju: onu liječništva/iscjeliteljstva (Cambi 1966: 136).

Ipak, moramo imati na umu da je i sam Silvan već ranije posjedovao određene značajke povezane s iscjeliteljstvom ili liječništvom. Neki natpisi zazivaju Silvana u nadi da će time zajamčiti zdravlje članova obitelji, prijatelja, cara ili samog dedikanta (Dorcey 1992: 26, bilj. 59; također AE 1994: 1406; Mirković 1994: br. 7 iz Sirmija), a neki od tih natpisa potječu i iz Dalmacije (Perinić Muratović 2008: 19–33). Silvanovu vještinu liječenja/iscjeljenja, odnosno Silvanusa Salutarisa, može se prepoznati na sljedećim spomenicima iz Panonije: na natpisu posvećenom Silvanu Erbariusu (CIL III, 3498)<sup>10</sup> te naročito na natpisu na kojem se Silvan pojavljuje s Asklepijem (*L'Année Épigraphique*, www.ubi-erat-lupa.org, br. 10776).<sup>11</sup>

Konačno, spomenik iz Pridrage pronađen je u kontekstu svetišta rustične vile. Ovo nalazište odlikuje se kontinuitetom kulturnog mjesta od (najmanje) rimskog vremena do predromanike, kada je ondje sagrađena privatna kapelica (Cambi 1968: 139–141; Migotti 1992: 231).

Vratimo se sada na drugu težnju sinkretizma koju je primijetio N. Cambi, a koja se odnosi na sinkretizam Silvana i orijentalne mistične religije. Promjene kroz koje može proći

probably was the centre of the cult, excavations of the Zadar forum proved that these cults received a certain official recognition in Zadar, too (Suić 1965: 122). It is therefore not surprising that in such a religious environment a syncretism between Silvanus and Attis could have occurred. The Pridraga relief is the monument on which we are able to see the elements, symbols and attributes of various deities and various cults, undeniably suggesting penetration of the different elements in the existing religious systems of the indigenous Illyrians, as well as in the religious systems of Greece and Rome. As far as the snake is concerned, N. Cambi is most likely to see in it a symbol of magical power of the represented figure, and Silvanus' most probable medical/healing ability. He thinks that on this monument we are witnessing a remarkable cult syncretism of Illyrian god Silvanus and Asia Minor's divinised shepherd Attis. According to him, the main activity of divinity from Pridraga monument widens through/with adoption of the new attributes and epithets, whereas at the same time its original meaning has not significantly changed. As a result, Silvanus as a forest, pastoral deity obtained another attribute by which his basic character expanded to another dimension: the one of medicine/healing (Cambi 1966: 136).

Nevertheless, we must bear in mind that Silvanus himself already had some features that corresponded with healing or medicine. Some inscriptions invoke Silvanus in the hope of safeguarding the health of the family members, friends, the emperor, or the dedicator himself (Dorcey 1992: 26, note 59; also AE 1994: 1406; Mirković 1994: no. 7 from Sirmium), some of them from Dalmatia too (Perinić Muratović 2008: 19–33). Silvanus' medicinal/healing ability, or Silvanus Salutaris can be identified on the following monuments from Pannonia: inscription dedicated to Silvanus Erbarius (CIL III, 3498)<sup>10</sup> and especially the inscription where Silvanus appears with Aesculapius (*L'Année Épigraphique*, www.ubi-erat-lupa.org, no. 10776).<sup>11</sup> Finally, monument from Pridraga was found within the context of villa rustica's sanctuary. This locality has shown cult place continuity, from (at least) Roman period to the Pre-Romanesque period when a little private chapel was built (Cambi 1968: 139–141; Migotti 1992: 231).

We now return to the second aspiration in the syncretism that N. Cambi noticed. It refers to the syncretism of Silvanus and Oriental mystical religion. Changes that indigenous deity could undergo are threefold. Sometimes Silvanus is in some kind of symbiosis with the oriental deity while his cult did not experience particular changes. Occasionally, iconography of Mithras and Attis impacted the one of Silvanus, but these elements are almost inconspicuous and appear to be exclusively of visual nature with no religious background. Example of such syncretism where the cult of Silvanus remained unchanged can be seen in the shrine located in

10 Iz Budimpešte (*Aquincum*). Silva/no Erba/rio Sep/timia / Consta/ntina/v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

11 Natpis iz Budimpešte (*Aquincum*). Aesculapio / pro sal(ute) Imp(eratoris) / Silvano / Domitius / Victorinus / (centurio) leg(ionis) IIII Fl(aviae) / Dis Conser/vator(ibus) sacr(um).

10 From Budapest (*Aquincum*). Silva/no Erba/rio Sep/timia / Consta/ntina/v(otum) s(olvit) l(ibens) m(erito).

11 Inscription from Budapest (*Aquincum*). Aesculapio / pro sal(ute) Imp(eratoris) / Silvano / Domitius / Victorinus / (centurio) leg(ionis) IIII Fl(aviae) / Dis Conser/vator(ibus) sacr(um).



domorodačko božanstvo su trostruke. Silvan se ponekad može naći u nekoj vrsti simbioze s istočnjačkim božanstvom, a da u njegovu kultu nije došlo do većih promjena. U nekim slučajevima, ikonografija Mitre i Atisa utjecala je na Silvanovu, no ti su elementi gotovo neprimjetni i čini se da se svode isključivo na vizualnu komponentu lišenu religijske pozadine. Primjer takvog sinkretizma kod kojeg je Silvanov kult ostao nepromijenjen može se vidjeti u svetištu u malenoj špilji u Močićima (sl. 4).<sup>12</sup> Nije zapravo riječ o špilji u pravom smislu riječi nego prije o velikoj rupi u stijeni, reklo bi se čak i jazbini, s izvorom pitke vode. Silvan i Mitra dijelili su isti prostor, isto svetište. Prikazi dvaju bogova nalaze se na suprotnim stranama, odnosno zapravo stoje sučelice jedan drugome. Nažalost, prikaz Silvana gotovo je potpuno uništen, zajedno sa stijenom u kojoj je isklesan. Jedino što je preostalo su Silvanova stopala, nalik kozjima. Mitraički prikazi, iako izlizani, još su očuvani. Likovni prikazi Silvana u Dalmaciji obično su uništeni, ili barem teško oštećeni, zbog njegove sličnosti s vragom iz katoličke religijske tradicije.

I dok se Silvanova veza s Atisom mogla koristiti da se proširi njegov djelokrug na liječništvo i iscjeljenje (no, kao što smo vidjeli, ne nužno), njegov odnos s Mitrom, ratničkim bogom, čini se posve neobičnim. Međutim, Silvan je imao snažnu sljedbu među vojnicima, iako ne toliku kao Mitra. Većina Silvanovih štovatelja bili su jednostavni ljudi iz nižih slojeva društva, uključujući robove i oslobođenike, no s druge strane, i vojnici su uglavnom bili skromnijeg podrijetla. Mjernici (Scriptores gromatici veteres, I, 302) upućuju na tri aspekta Silvana: *domesticus* – s domaćinstvom kao poljem djelovanja, *agrestis* – čiji su djelokrug divljina i pašnjaci, te *orientalis* – čuvar granica. Kao *Orientalis*, zaštitnik granica, bio je, ili je mogao biti, vrlo koristan vojnicima.

Poznato je da je Silvan nosio frigijsku kapu, poput Mitre. Nadalje, Mitra je ponekad prikazivan s psom u pratnji, kao i Silvan, no ovdje ikonografske sličnosti prestaju. Što se tiče uloge žena u ovim dvama kultovima, Silvanov kult im je također bio nedostupan, iako ne tako strogo kao Mitrin (Griffith 2006: 48–77), a ni sljedba mu nije bilo tako hijerarhizirana. Silvan se jamačno obraćao i ženama, iako one nisu bile tako zamjetne i djelatne u njegovu kultu kao muškarci. Podzastupljenost žena sama po sebi teško se može smatrati neuobičajenom i ne implicira nužno postojanje bilo kakvog spolnog tabua. U samo nekoliko rimskih kultova dominirao je isključivo jedan ili drugi spol, iako su neka božanstva muškarcima ili ženama zabranjivala sudjelovanje u određenim prilikama ili na određenim mjestima, ili su neki njihovi aspekti bili prilagođeni muškom ili ženskom ukusu. Na primjer, žene nisu mogle prinostiti žrtve Herkulu na Velikom oltaru (*Ara Maxima*) u Rimu, dok je muškarcima (uključujući i vrhovnog svećenika; *Pontifex Maximus*) bio zabranjen pristup unutrašnjem svetištu Vestina hrama na rimskom Forumu te svetištu Dijane na *Vicus Patricius* u Rimu (Dorcey 1989: 143, bilj. 6).

O sudjelovanju žena u Silvanovu kultu postoje dvije uglavnom proturječne grupe dokaza. Nekoliko rimskih pisaca upućuje na postojanje određenih ograničenja za žene, dok natpisi pokazuju da je bog imao mnoštvo privrženica.

the small cave in Močići (Fig. 4).<sup>12</sup> It is not a cave in the true sense of the word, but rather a large hole in the rock, lair if you like, with a spring of drinking water. Silvanus and Mithras shared the same space, same sanctuary. Image of one god stands on the opposite side of the other, they are practically facing each other. Unfortunately, Silvanus' representation was almost completely torn down, together with a rock upon which it was carved. All that is left are Silvanus feet, resembling that of a goat. Mithraic images, though worn, are still preserved. Figural representations of Silvanus in Dalmatia were usually torn down, or they were at least heavily damaged, because of his resemblance to a devil in the catholic religious tradition.

While Silvanus connection with Attis could have been used to widen his scope to medicine and healing (but, as we have seen, not necessarily), his relation to Mithras, military god, seems quite unusual. However, Silvanus enjoyed a strong following amongst the troops, but not as much as Mithras. Most of Silvanus' worshipers were simple people of the lower classes, including slaves and freedmen, but then again, most soldiers were of simple origin. Land surveyors (Scriptores gromatici veteres, I, 302) suggest three aspects of Silvanus: *domesticus* – the one with scope on the household; *agrestis* – the one with the scope in the wild and in the pastures, and *orientalis* – the safe guarder of borders. As *Orientalis*, the safe guarder of borders, he was or could have been very useful to soldiers.

Silvanus is known to wear a Phrygian cap, as Mithras does. Furthermore, Mithras is sometimes depicted followed by a dog as was Silvanus, but iconographical similarities stop there. As for the role of women in these two cults, Silvanus' cult was also closed to them but not as strictly as Mithras' (Griffith 2006: 48–77), and its worshippers were not so hierarchically structured. Silvanus certainly appealed to the women, even though they were not as visible and active in his cult as men. Underrepresentation of women in itself is hardly unusual and does not necessarily imply the existence of any sort of sexual taboo. Few other Roman cults were dominated entirely by one sex or the other, although some deities forbade the participation of men or women at particular times or in certain places, or had aspects appealing to masculine or feminine taste. For example, women could not sacrifice to Hercules at the *Ara Maxima* in Rome, and men (including the *Pontifex Maximus*) were denied access to the inner sanctuary of the temple of Vesta in the Roman Forum and the shrine of Diana on the *Vicus Patricius* in Rome (Dorcey 1989: 143, note 6).

There are two generally conflicting bodies of evidence regarding female participation in the cult of Silvanus. A few Roman authors suggest some restriction against women, while inscriptions show that the god had many female adherents. A disparity between literary and epigraphic sources also confounds our understanding of sexual exclusion in the worship of Bona Dea. In regard to Silvanus, inscriptions are the more reliable source, not to minimize the importance of literature. They are often closer to real life - and thus more representative of the humble individuals who vene-

12 Fotografirala Lj. Perinić.

12 Photographed by Lj. Perinić.

Nesuglasje između literarnih i epigrafskih izvora zamaglju-je i naše razumijevanje spolne isključivosti u štovanju Bone Dee. U pogledu Silvana, natpisi su pouzdaniji izvor, čime ne umanjujemo važnost literature. Često su bliži stvarnom životu – a time i vjernije predstavljaju skromne pojedince koji su štovali boga – te svojom brojnošću znatno natkriljuju usputne spomene božanstva kod antičkih pisaca. U svakom slučaju, literarni tekstovi ne progovaraju toliko jasno o Silvanovu stavu prema ženama te je moguće da upozoravaju na to da su tek neki obredi ograničeni na muškarce (Dorcey 1989: 144, bilj. 9–10). Iz grčkog nam je svijeta poznata isključenost muškaraca ili žena iz kultova na određenim lokacijama. To je pružilo osnovu za mišljenje prema kojem se praksa isključenja nije vezivala uz božanstvo nego uz mjesto štovanja (Dorcey 1989: 143, bilj. 7). Konačno, P. F. Dorcey je zaključio kako Silvan nipošto nije bio božanstvo usmjereno samo na muškarce, na što bi upućivali određeni dokazi, nego je privlačio i žene. Štovanje ženskih Silvanā pokazuje da se ovaj pomoćni kult definitivno obraćao ženama. One su podizale svetišta, prisustvovala svetim gozbama (ako se pouzdamo u svjedočenje Pseudo-Ambrozija),<sup>13</sup> a možda su čak ustanovile i žensko svećenstvo da bi vodile obrede. Njihove brojne posvete pokazuju da se Silvan znao pozabaviti i pitanjima koja su zanimala žene (Dorcey 1989: 151).

Iz ovog kratkog izvješća možemo zaključiti da po svemu sudeći ne trebamo ženama zahvaliti na postojanju ovog svetišta u Močićima, barem kada je riječ o Silvanu. Ono što ostaje čvrsta poveznica između Silvana i Mitre jest činjenica da su obojica bila vrlo popularna među vojnicima. Međutim, razmjerno je mala šansa da je ovo svetište izgradio vojnik (ili vojnici) koji je štovao oba boga (Miletić 2014: 243–251). Iako je tako nešto moguće, to ipak nije baš vjerojatno. Ako razmišljamo dalje, uvidjet ćemo da je moguće da je najvjerojatniji razlog zašto su Mitra i Silvan dijelili ovo svetište u njihovoj zajedničkoj sklonosti bunarima ili izvorima vode te špiljoli-kim svetištima.

U Rimu je postojao bazen kojemu je, po Silvanovoj zapovijedi, ženama bio zabranjen pristup. Takav je bazen mogao služiti za ritualno pročišćenje vodom (CIL VI 579). Amijan Marcellin (28. 4. 19.) spominje jedan drugi bazen (*lavacrum*), nazvan prema Silvanu ili prema osobi istog imena (*Silvanus* je bio čest *cognomen*). Ovaj su *lavacrum* posjećivali aristokrati tijekom 4. stoljeća te su ondje vjerojatno spajali liječilišno-kupališni tretman sa štovanjem Silvana (Dorcey 1992: 94), što predstavlja još jedan dokaz (iako dosta kasan) Silvanovih liječničkih sposobnosti. P. F. Dorcey vjeruje da se natpisi koji spominju Silvana, a uklesani su u živoj stijeni, ne mogu odnositi na mjesto štovanja Silvana, jer je taj aspekt svetišta spomenut, i to samo posredno, jedino kod Propercija (Dorcey 1992: 94 (Propertius, 4.4.11.)). Osim toga, kako dalje naglašava, Propercije je jedini antički pisac koji

rated the god - and in sheer numbers they dwarf the casual references to the divinity in ancient authors. At any rate, literary texts are not so clear about Silvanus' attitude toward women and may merely indicate that only particular rites were limited to men (Dorcey 1989: 144, notes 9–10). From the Greek world we know of the exclusion of men or women from cults in certain locations. For this reason it has been suggested that exclusionary practice was attached not to the divinity, but to the site of veneration (Dorcey 1989: 143, note 7). Finally, P. F. Dorcey has concluded that far from being solely a male oriented deity, as some evidence suggests, Silvanus also attracted women. The worship of the Silvanae shows that this ancillary cult definitely appealed to women. They erected shrines, attended sacred feasts (if the testimony of Pseudo-Ambrosius is credited),<sup>13</sup> and may even have formed a priestess hood to administer rites. Their many dedications show that Silvanus could address feminine concerns (Dorcey 1989: 151).

From this short report we can conclude that women most probably were not the ones to whom we should thank for the existence of this sanctuary in Močići, at least in the case of Silvanus. What remains solid in connection between Silvanus and Mithras is the fact that both were very popular among soldiers. However, there is a reasonably small chance that this shrine was built by soldier(s) who worshipped both gods (Miletić 2014: 243–251). Even though it is possible it is not highly probable. But, thinking a bit further, the most likely reason Mithras and Silvanus shared a shrine can be found in their common appreciation of water wells or springs and cave-like shrines.

In Rome, there was a pool from which women were banned, by the command of Silvanus. Such pool could have served for ritual purification by water (CIL VI 579). Ammianus Marcellinus (28. 4. 19.) mentioned another pool (*lavacrum*), which was named by the god Silvanus, or by a person carrying the same name (*Silvanus* was a frequent *cognomen*). This *lavacrum* was visited by the aristocrats in the 4<sup>th</sup> cent., where they probably combined medical-bathing treatment along with the worship of Silvanus (Dorcey 1992: 94), which is yet another evidence (even though late as it is) of Silvanus' medicinal capacity. P. F. Dorcey believes that the inscriptions that mention Silvanus and which are carved in the bedrock, cannot refer to the place of worship of Silvanus, because this aspect of the sanctuary was mentioned, and only indirectly, solely by Propertius (Dorcey 1992: 94 (Propertius, 4.4.11.)). Furthermore, he emphasizes, Propertius is the only ancient author who associated Silvanus with water resources (and ivy). At the same time P. F. Dorcey is forgetting to mention the pool in Rome dedicated to Silvanus or even the trireme that carried Silvanus' name (CIL X 3398, 3408, 8211). So, from the pool

<sup>13</sup> Pseudo-Ambrozije, Epistolae 2.12, daje drugačiji pogled na ulogu žena u kultu. Tekst možda pokazuje da žene nisu samo štovale Silvana u privatnosti nego da su i sudjelovale u gozbama koje su organizirali kolegiji u kojima su dominirali muškarci. U odjeljku se pripovijeda o sudbini Valerije, majke svetaca Gervazija i Protazija, koja je naišla na muškarce koji su prinosili žrtvu Silvanu. Kada su joj ponudili da im se pridruži, odbila je ponudu zbog toga što je bila kršćanka, a ne zbog svoga spola. Dakle, moguće je da ženama nije uvijek bilo zabranjeno sudjelovanje u štovanju, no da im je poziv za to trebao uputiti muškarac.

<sup>13</sup> Pseudo-Ambrosius Epistolae 2.12, gives a different view of the female role in the cult. The text may suggest that women not only venerated Silvanus privately, but also participated in feasts held by male-dominated collegia. The passage narrates the fate of Valeria, mother of Saints Gervasius and Protasius, who happened upon men sacrificing to Silvanus. When asked to worship along with them she refused because she was a Christian, not because of her sex. Thus, possibly women were not always forbidden to join in worship, but required an invitation from men.

povezuje Silvana s izvorima vode (te s bršljanom). No, P. F. Dorcey istodobno zaboravlja spomenuti bazen u Rimu posvećen Silvanu, pa čak i triremu koja je nosila njegovo ime (CIL X 3398, 3408, 8211). Prema tome, od bazena do trireme, trebali bismo prihvatiti Silvanovu povezanost s vodenim elementom općenito, ne dijeleći ga na izvore, stajaću vodu, ili more. Močići su bili upravo jedno takvo svetište, isklesano u čvrstoj stijeni zajedno s izvorom vode. Sveti gajevi i vrtovi svakako su jedna od najčešćih vrsta Silvanovih svetišta te su činili neodvojivi dio njegova kulta i svakodnevnih kultnih prakse, prema literarnim izvorima (Plautus, Aulul. 674, 766; Vergilius, Aen. 8. 600; Propertius, 4.4.11; Gratianus. Cyneg. 1.20; Lucan, De bel. civ. 3. 402; Nemesian, Ecl. 2. 56; Gromatici veteres 302, 13–19; Statius, Theb. 6. 110).

Važnost vode za raznovrsne ritualne svrhe u Mitrinu kultu očituje se u bazenima za vodu i cisternama, u prikazima oceana kao i u očiglednoj želji da se hramovi smjeste u blizini rijeke ili izvora. Bazeni za vodu očigledno su bili dio temeljne opreme svakog mitreja, a svježja voda je po svemu sudeći bila neophodna u nekim mitraičkim ritualima. Shodno tomu, bazeni su često bili ugrađeni u samo zdanje (Claus 2000: 73). Na ulazu je obično postojao narteks ili pretkomora, a često i druge pomoćne prostorije za skladištenje i pripremu hrane. *Mitrej* (*mithraeum*) je moderan termin; u Italiji se na natpisima obično spominje kao *spelaeum*; izvan Italije obično se naziva *templum* (Claus 2000: 22). Mitrej iz Močića je također imao pretkomoru i komoru, ali nije imao drugih prostorija zbog svojih prirodnih prostornih ograničenja (Rendić-Miočević 1989: 532).

D. Rendić-Miočević pretpostavio je da je u ovom slučaju prvo "uređeno" Silvanovo svetište, a zatim Mitrino (Rendić-Miočević 1989: 533–535). U tom slučaju, moglo bi se ustvrditi kako je Silvanov spomenik namjerno oštećen u vrijeme kada se u stijenu klesao Mitrin lik, no vjerojatnije je da bi u tom slučaju Silvan bio potpuno uništen. Budući da je Silvanov reljef krajnje izlizan i tek djelomično očuvan, teško ga je zamijetiti, što je vjerojatno i razlog zbog kojeg je N. Cambi u svom nedavnom članku i doveo u pitanje njegovo postojanje (Cambi, 2013: 26–27, bilj. 46). Međutim, najvažnija činjenica je miroljubiv suživot dvaju kultova, tj. dvaju božanstava koja su jedno kraj drugog dijelila isti prostor i isto svetište.

Ovaj pregled tri različite razine sinkretizma željela bih zaključiti reljefnom pločom iz Zenice (sl. 3) (Paškvalin 1968: 154–155; Imamović 1977: 31). Spomenik je sačuvan tek u gornjem dijelu, a prikazuje glave božanstava, konkretno Silvana i Dijane. Silvanova glava je na lijevoj strani, dok je Dijanina na desnoj. Oboje su prikazani *en face*. Nažalost, Silvanovi nos, brada i usta teško su oštećeni, što ukazuje na to da je spomenik možda bio postavljen na mjestu na kojem ga je bilo moguće dosegnuti. Kosa mu je kovrčava, a čini se da je vjerojatno bio bradat. S obje strane glave nalaze mu se rogovi, jedva vidljivi zbog uvojaka. Oboje bogova imalo je ispupčene oči. Dijanina je glava jednake konstrukcije kao Silvanova, s debelom kovrčavom kosom koja joj pada na ramena ili je ispletena u jednu pletenicu ovijenu oko glave. I njezino je lice oštećeno, no ne toliko kao Silvanovo. Spomenik je datiran u 3. stoljeće (Imamović 1977: 31). Njihove su oči, obrve i obrazi geometrizirani u zapanjujućoj mjeri.

over to the trireme, we should accept Silvanus' connection with the element of water in general, not separating springs, stagnant water, or sea. Močići sanctuary was exactly such shrine, carved out of solid rock along with the water source. Sacred groves and gardens are certainly one of the most common types of Silvanus sanctuaries and they were an inseparable part of his cult and everyday cult practices, according to the literary sources (Plautus, Aulul. 674, 766; Vergilius, Aen. 8. 600; Propertius, 4.4.11; Gratianus. Cyneg. 1.20; Lucan, De bel. civ. 3. 402; Nemesian, Ecl. 2. 56; Gromatici veteres 302, 13–19; Statius, Theb. 6. 110).

The importance of water for all manner of ritual purposes in Mithras' cult is revealed by the water-basins and cisterns, by the representations of Oceanus, and also by the evident desire to locate temples in the vicinity of a river or a spring. Water-basins were clearly part of the basic equipment of all Mithraea and fresh water appears to have been required for some Mithraic rituals. Because of that a basin is often incorporated into the structure (Claus 2000: 73). There is usually a narthex or ante-chamber at the entrance, and often other ancillary rooms for the storage and preparation of food. The term *mithraeum* is modern; in Italy inscriptions usually call it a *spelaeum*; outside Italy it is referred to as *templum* (Claus 2000: 22). Močići's Mithraeum also had ante chamber and chamber, but no other rooms, because it was limited by its natural surroundings (Rendić-Miočević 1989: 532).

D. Rendić-Miočević assumed that Silvanus' shrine was the first one to be 'arranged' in this case, and Mithras followed (Rendić-Miočević 1989: 533–535). In that case, it could be argued that Silvanus' monument was deliberately damaged at the time the representation of Mithras was being carved, but it would be more likely that it would have been destroyed completely. Since the relief of Silvanus is extremely worn down and saved only partially, it is hard to perceive it, which is probably why its existence was questioned in recent article of N. Cambi (Cambi 2013: 26–27, note 46). However, the most important fact is the peaceful coexistence of the two cults, i.e. the two deities who side by side shared the same space and shrine.

I would like to conclude the overview of three different levels of syncretism with the relief panel from Zenica (Fig. 3) (Paškvalin 1968: 154–155; Imamović 1977: 31). The monument has been preserved only in the upper part, showing the heads of the deities, namely Silvanus and Diana. Silvanus' head is on the left side and Diana's is on the right. Both are shown *en face*. Unfortunately, his nose, chin and mouth are heavily damaged, indicating that maybe the monument was in the place where people could reach it. His hair is curly and it seems that the god probably had a beard. On both sides of his head are two horns, hardly visible because of the curls. Both gods had bulging eyes. Diana's head is of the same construction as Silvanus', with thick curly hair falling on her shoulders or it is braided in single braid around her head. Her face was also damaged, but not to the extent Silvanus' was. Monument is dated to the 3rd century (Imamović 1977: 31). Their eyes, eyebrows and cheeks are geometricized to an astonishing degree. The simplification of forms lead to domination of the big, round eyes to which





Sl. 3 Reljef s prikazom Silvana i Dijane, Zenica (slika: A. Karamehić)  
 Fig. 3 Relief depicting Silvanus and Diana, Zenica (photo by A. Karamehić)

Pojednostavljenje oblika dovelo je do dominacije velikih, okruglih očiju kojima su pridodani plastično izbočeni profil i lice. S obzirom na glavne značajke spomenika, naglašene u ukočenom izrazu lica i jednako ukočenom pogledu moguće je pomaknuti datiranje reljefa do u rano 4. stoljeće.

Reljef je pronađen tijekom sustavnih iskopavanja nalazišta Putovići, Dvorišta Ograj kraj Zenice. Otkrivene su tri složene građevine, koje su nazvane Zgrada A, B i C. Unutar gabarita zgrade B, prema sjeveroistočnom zidu, pronađena je izdvojena duguljasta zgrada, sagrađena na šest kamenih stupova. Spomenik je pronađen na zidu koji je dijelio duguljastu zgradu od zgrade B. Što se tiče zgrade C, vjerojatno je bila riječ o kupalištu (*thermae*). Ranokršćanska bazilika Bilimišća nalazi se vrlo blizu ovog nalazišta (Paškvalin 1968: 155; 1990: 35).

Ovaj spomenik, za koji pretpostavljamo da pripada vremenu kasne tetrarhije ili ranom Konstantinovu dobu, ima nedvojbeno istočnjačke značajke, nepoznate kod Silvana i Dijane u Dalmaciji. Ovo je treća razina sinkretizma koji ovdje

both plastic projection of the profile and the front face are added. Considering monument's main features highlighted in an intensification of the expression to a stiff, icon-like stare it is possible to push the dating of the relief into the early 4<sup>th</sup> cent.

The relief was found during systematic excavation of the locality Putovići, Dvorišta Ograj near Zenica. Three elaborate structures were found and named Building A, B and C. Within the parameter of building B, towards the north-east wall, there was a separate oblong building, constructed on 6 stone pillars. The monument was found at the wall separating oblong building and building B. As for the building C, it probably was a bath (*thermae*). Early Christian basilica Bilimišća is located very close to this locality (Paškvalin 1968: 155; 1990: 35).

This, presumably, late tetrarchy or early Constantine monument has undoubtedly Eastern traits/features unknown to Silvanus and Diana in Dalmatia. This is the third level of syncretism described here, in which none of the main fea-



opisujemo, kod koje nije promijenjeno nijedno obilježje ili atribut bogova, pa ipak je čitav njihov izgled različit. Portretirani na ovaj način, bogovi izrazito nalikuju portretima carskih parova Konstantinova doba. Ako je to slučaj, možemo teoretizirati ili nagađati bez čvrstih dokaza o sinkretizmu Silvana i njegove pratiteljice s carem Konstantinom i njegovom suprugom Faustom. Također, vrlo je vjerojatno da je ovakvo portretiranje poslužilo da naglasi značenje ovog para (Silvana i Dijane) u rimskoj provinciji Dalmaciji, ili barem važnost koju je ovaj par imao u životu osobe koja je naručila spomenik. Ovakav razvoj morao je biti rezultat svjesne namjere (jednog ili više) naručitelja djela, a čini se da je glavni pokretač odnosno *spiritus movens*, sâm car Konstantin. Sličan je spomenik pronađen na drugom kraju Rimskog Carstva, u Aldsworthu, Gloucestershire. Prikazuje Merkura i Minervu, jedan neočekivan par. Merkurovo lice izlzano je poput Silvanova. Spomenik iz Aldswortha datiran je novcem u rasponu od Konstantina (306.–337.) do Konstancija II. (337.–361.) (Henig, Cleary, Purser 2000: 362–363).

Tijekom svoje vladavine, Konstantin je za radove na svom slavoluku upošljavao najbolje kipare koji su glave s posuđenih reljefa prerađivali u portrete njega i Licinija. Suvremeni frizovi i likovi iz Konstantinova vremena bili su tehnički znatno slabije izvedeni. Konstantin je vrlo spretno za svoj slavoluk iskoristio reljefe sa spomenika careva s kojima je želio da ga se povezuje (Trajan, Hadrijan i Marko Aurelije) (Harrison 1967: 84). Budući da je pitanje (kasno)antičkog portreta vrlo složena tema o kojoj postoji opsežna literatura, ovdje se neću dalje time baviti. Ipak, dojmama sam da je između careva Trajana, Hadrijana i Konstantina Velikog te boga Silvana postojala neka vrsta posebnog odnosa i povezanosti. Iako aristokracija, kao što je već rečeno, nije naročito cijenila Silvana, on se ipak pojavio u carskoj ikonografiji tijekom vladavine Trajana (Simon 1981: 7–9), Hadrijana te Antonina Pija (Dorcey 1992: 91). P. Dorcey objašnjava ovu pojavu kroz prizmu Silvanove uloge zaštitnika lova, s obzirom na to da su navedeni carevi, kako se čini, gajili naročitu sklonost lovu (Dorcey 1992: 142). No, pretpostavka da su, od svih careva, Trajan i njegovi izravni nasljednici odlučili prikazati Silvana na javnim spomenicima samo zbog svoje ljubavi prema lovu ne čini se kao da ima čvrsto uporište. Samo jedan natpis toga tipa (koji povezuje Silvana s lovom) pronađen je u Panoniji, u Budimpešti (CIL III, 13368). Drugi razlog zašto se Silvan pojavljuje u carskoj ikonografiji upravo tih triju careva mogao bi se temeljiti na nizu događaja. Prije nego što je pokorio Daciju, Trajan je u Panoniji rasporedio brojne trupe, najbrojnije do tada. Budući da je dokazano da su vojnici bili važan čimbenik u Silvanovu kultu u provinciji Dalmaciji (kao štovatelji te sudjelovanjem u širenju kulta (Perinić Muratović 2008: 310–315), vrijedi ispitati i jednu drugu mogućnost. Moguće je da je Trajan, upućujući počast svojim pobjedničkim trupama (koje su dokazano štovale Silvana), osjetio određenu zahvalnost prema Silvanu te mu je stoga odlučio udijeliti javnu pohvalu. Taj je čin preuzeo i nastavio kao obiteljsku tradiciju njegov posinak Hadrijan, a potom i Antonin Pio.

Važno je naglasiti da je još nekoliko komada reljefa pronađeno na istom nalazištu Putovići Ograja, koji također



Sl. 4 Svetište Mitre i Silvana, Močići (slika: Lj. Perinić)

Fig. 4 Sanctuary of Mithras and Silvanus, Močići (photo by Lj. Perinić)

tures or attributes of the gods are changed yet their complete appearance is different. Portrayed like this, the gods carry a strong resemblance to the portraits of Constantine emperor couples. If that is the case, we can form a theory or conjecture without firm evidence about syncretism of Silvanus and his consort with the emperor Constantine and his wife Fausta. Also, it is highly probable that this portraiture is only emphasizing the importance of this duo (Silvanus and Diana) in the Roman province of Dalmatia or at least the importance this duo had in the life of that one person who commissioned the monument. Development of this kind must be the result of a deliberate intention on the part of the patron(s) who commissioned the work, and it would seem that the moving spirit must have been the arch patron, the Emperor Constantine himself. There is a similar monument found at the other end of the Roman Empire, in Aldsworth, Gloucestershire. It represents Mercury and Minerva, an unexpected couple. Mercury's face was similarly worn as was Silvanus'. Monument from Aldsworth was dated by the coins ranging from Constantine (306–337) and Constantius II (337–361) (Henig, Cleary, Purser 2000: 362–363).

During his reign, Constantine employed the best sculptors on the arch who recut the heads of the borrowed reliefs into portraits of Constantine and Licinius. Contemporary friezes and figures from the time of Constantine were technically far less accomplished. He made a virtue of necessity by reusing in the arch reliefs from monuments of emperors with whose image he wished to be associated (Trajan, Hadrian and Marcus Aurelius) (Harrison 1967: 84). Since the issue of (late) antique portraiture is very elaborate subject with extensive literature, I will not take this any further. Nevertheless, it seems to me that some kind of special relationship and connection existed between emperors Trajan, Hadrian and Constantine the Great and the god Silvanus. Although Silvanus was not particularly revered by aristocracy, as already said; he, however, did appear in the imperial iconography during the reign of Traianus (Simon 1981: 7–9), Hadrianus, and Antoninus Pius (Dorcey 1992: 91). P. Dorcey explained this phenomenon through linking Silva-



Sl. 5 Reljef s prikazom Silvana pronađen u Ograji, Putovići (slika: A. Karamehić)  
 Fig. 5 Relief depicting Silvanus, found in Ograji, Putovići (photo by A. Karamehić)

prikazuju Silvana i/ili Dijanu (sl. 5–7). Ovi drugi ulomci spomenika s prikazom bogova s istog nalazišta prikazuju nam boga kojeg smo vidjeli na većini spomenika iz Dalmacije. Na osnovi te činjenice, sasvim je opravdano pretpostaviti da je ovo nalazište bilo Silvanovo (i Dijanino) svetište.

Konačno, za razliku od spomenika iz Močića ili Zenice, na reljefu iz Pridrage sigurno su vidljive duboke promjene, pri čemu su kultovi Atisa (?) i Silvana nesumnjivo pretrpjeli alteracije i tranzicije. Slični primjeri dubokog prožimanja mogu se naći u Italiji gdje je Silvan kontaminiran mitraičkim i drugim orijentalnim kultovima, poprimivši dotad nepoznat sadržaj. Sinkretizam na spomeniku iz Pridrage dogodio se zbog prepoznavanja pastoralnih i iscjeliteljskih elemenata obaju božanstava. Jednako je tako moguće da je bilo sličnosti i u ritualnim elementima obaju kultova. M. Suić je pretpostavio da su ilirski kultovi u svojim ritualima sadržavali orgijastičke elemente, pa čak i u razdobljima tijekom kojih su bili posve agrarnog karaktera. U skladu s tim, i u ovom detalju postoji osnova za sinkretizam ili kontaminaciju orijentalnim božanstvima (Suić 1965: 97, bilj. 16). Kulturni rituali vezani uz Silvanov epitet *dendrophoros*, koji je često nosio u Italiji, odražavali su sličnost s Velikom Majkom u svečanim proslavama božanstava (Dorcey 1992: 82).

Za kraj ove rasprave možemo zaključiti da smo kroz tekst vidjeli tri različite razine sinkretizma (prihvatimo li predloženo tumačenje zeničkog spomenika), i to u tri, kako se čini, donekle različita tipa svetišta. Vrlo je opravdano zaključiti kako spajanje ovih elemenata nije bilo rezultat kolektivne kognitivne promjene nego prije svega osobne. Ponekad nas mogu zvesti naše tradicionalne pretpostavke o pojavnim oblicima pojedinih kultova. Prema riječima S. Pricea, navikli



Sl. 6 Reljef s prikazom Dijane pronađen u Ograji, Putovići (slika: A. Karamehić)  
 Fig. 6 Relief depicting Silvanus, found in Ograji, Putovići (photo by A. Karamehić)

nus patronage over hunting because mentioned emperors, apparently, were particularly fond of it (Dorcey 1992: 142). The possibility that of all of the emperors, Trajan and his direct descendants chose to show Silvanus on public monuments simply because they loved hunting, does not seem to have a firm foothold. Only one inscription of that type (linking Silvanus with hunting) was found in Pannonia in Budapest (CILIII, 13368). Another reason why Silvanus appears in the imperial iconography of these three emperors specifically could be the result of a series of the events. Before conquering Dacia, Trajan placed a large number of troops in Pannonia, the largest number so far. Since soldiers have been proved to constitute an important factor in the cult of Silvanus in the province of Pannonia (as worshipers and as those who contributed to the spreading of the cult (Perinić-Muratović 2008: 310–315), there is another possibility worth investigating. It could have been that Trajan, when honouring the victory of his troops (which have proven to worship Silvanus), felt certain gratitude towards Silvanus that he decided to praise him publicly. That was taken over and continued as a family tradition by his stepson Hadrian, and then by Antoninus Pius.

It is important to stress that several more pieces of reliefs were found on the same locality in Putovići Ograja, also representing Silvanus and/or Diana (Fig. 5–7). These other fragments of the monuments representing the gods from the same locality show us the god we used to see on most of the monuments from Dalmatia. Due to this fact, it is quite legitimate to presume this locality was Silvanus' (and Diana's) sanctuary.

Finally, as opposed to the Močić or Zenica monument, the relief from Pridraga surely shows deepest changes where the cult of Attis (?) and Silvanus both undoubtedly experienced alterations and transition. Similar examples of deep permeation can be found in Italy, where Silvanus got contaminated with Mithraic and other Oriental cults, assuming





Sl. 7 Reljef s prikazom Silvana pronađen u Ograji, Putovići (slika: A. Karamehić)

Fig. 7 Relief depicting Silvanus, found in Ograji, Putovići (photo by A. Karamehić)

smo, na primjer, razmišljati o dokazima za Mitrin kult kao vrlo čvrstima, no postaje jasno da je ta čvrstina tek jedan dio slike. Od sedamnaest Mitrinih svetišta otkrivenih u sjeverozapadnim provincijama od vremena Drugoga svjetskog rata većina ih nije obilježena čvrsto građenom arhitekturom u kamenu ili onime što doživljavamo kao konvencionalne skulpturalne spomenike (Mitra ubija bika itd.). Na primjer, svetište u Tienenu u Belgiji, datirano u treće stoljeće, slijedilo je konvencije svojim dimenzijama (12,5 × 7,5 m), kao i činjenicom da je ukopano 1,2 m ispod razine rimskog tla, vjerojatno da bi se dobio utisak "pećine", no s druge strane nije bilo sagrađeno od kamena i nije sadržavalo kamene skulpture. Manje pažljivim iskopavanjem ovo bi se svetište u potpunosti previdjelo, s možda tek nekim izvještajem o slučajnom otkriću nekih mitraičkih "malih nalaza". Price naglašava: "Recimo to ovako, preveliko oslanjanje na dobro poznate objavljene ostatke moglo bi nas dovesti do karte na kojoj su ucrtane naše vlastite pretpostavke o mitraizmu, radije nego ostaci samoga kulta" (Price 2012: 3).

Izbor lokacija na kojima se štovalo bogove nikada nije bio slučajan (Ando 2000: 429–445). Sva su ranije spomenuta svetišta smještena u ruralnom ambijentu. Jednako tako, sva se nalaze blizu izvora ili su sadržavala izvor vode u svetištu. S obzirom na to da ne možemo sa sigurnošću utvrditi put kojim je došlo do sinkretizma na ova tri spomenika, imajući na umu prije spomenute čimbenike, možda bismo trebali razmotriti mogućnost da je lokacija svetišta (ili svetištā) utjecala na izbor božanstava i njihovu integraciju/spajanje, kao i to da je lokacija također dovela do prepoznavanja određenih elemenata kroz koje su potom spojena dva božanstva.\*

Prijevod i lektura / Translation and proofreading  
Sanjin Mihelić

\* Zahvaljujem kolegama, Domagoju Perkiću iz Arheološkog muzeja u Dubrovniku, i Alenu Karamehiću iz Gradskog muzeja Zenice, na fotografijama.

hitherto unknown content. This syncretism on Pridraga monument happened due to the recognition of the pastoral and healing elements of both deities. It is equally possible that there were similarities in the ritual elements of both cults. M. Suić assumed that the Illyrian cults in their rituals had orgiastic elements, even in the era when they were completely agrarian in character. Consequently, there is a basis for syncretism or contamination with Oriental deities in this detail too (Suić 1965: 97, note 16). Cult rituals related to the Silvanus epithet dendrophoros which he often wore in Italy, were reflecting the similarity with magna Mater respectively in the ceremonial celebration of the deities (Dorcey 1992: 82).

In conclusion to this discussion, we have seen three different levels of syncretism (if we accept proposed interpretation of Zenica monument), and in, what appears to be, three somewhat different shrine types. It is very justifiable to conclude that the merger of these elements was not the result of collective cognitive shift but rather of the personal one. Sometimes we can be misled by our traditional assumptions about the physical form that particular cults took. As S. Price said, we are used, for example, to thinking of the evidence for the cult of Mithras as very solid, but it has become clear that such solidity is only part of the picture. Of the seventeen sanctuaries of Mithras discovered in the north-western provinces since the Second World War, most are not marked by well-built stone architecture, or by what we think of as the conventional sculptural monuments (Mithras killing the bull, etc.). For example, at Tienen in Belgium the sanctuary, dating to the 3<sup>rd</sup> cent., was conventional in its size (12.5 by 7.5 m) and in the fact that it was sunk 1.2 m below Roman ground-level, presumably to produce the effect of a 'cave', but it was not built of stone and had no stone sculpture. In the age of less careful excavation it would have been missed entirely, with perhaps just a report of the chance discovery of some Mithraic 'small finds'. He points out: "To put this another way, if we rely too heavily on the well-known reported remains, we may end up with a map that plots our own preconceptions of Mithraism rather than the cult itself" (Price 2012: 3).

The selection of places where gods were venerated was never random (Ando 2000: 429–445). All the above mentioned shrines were located in the countryside. Likewise, all of them are close to the springs or they had water source within the sanctuary. Given that we cannot determine with certainty the path through which the syncretism on these three monuments occurred, and with previously mentioned factors in mind, perhaps we should consider that the location of the sanctuary (sanctuaries) influenced the choice of the deities and their integration/merger and that the location also lead to the recognition of certain elements through which were then the two deities joined.\*

\* I thank colleagues, Domagoj Perkić from the Archaeological museum in Dubrovnik, and Alen Karamehić from the City museum of Zenica, for their contribution of photographs.

**IZVORI / LIST OF SOURCES**

*L'Année Épigraphique. Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum III*, www.ubi-eratlupa.org (21. 12. 2014.)

**LITERATURA / BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- Ando, C. 2003, *Roman Religion*, Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Ando, C. 2000, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Beard, M., North, J., Price, S. 1998, *Religions of Rome*, Vol. 1 (A History), Vol. 2 (A Sourcebook), Cambridge.
- Brunšmid, J. 1905, Kameni spomenici hrvatskoga narodnoga muzeja u Zagrebu, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, Vol. 8, 37–104, 70–71.
- Cagnat, R. 1914, *Cours d'épigraphie Latine*, 4. éd., Paris.
- Cambi, N. 1968, Silvan – Atis, primjer kulnog sinkretizma, *Diadora* Vol. 4, 131–141.
- Cambi, N. 1998/2000, O svetištima Silvana u Dalmaciji, *Adrias*, Vol. 8–10, 99–112.
- Cambi, N. 2013, Religija Silvana i Nimfa u rimskoj Dalmaciji, in: *Kultovi, mitovi i vjerovanja u Zagori. Zbornik radova sa znanstvenog skupa održanog 14. prosinca 2012. u Unešiću*, Kapitanović V. (ed.), Split, 15–31.
- Clauss, M. 2000, *The Roman Cult of Mithras: The God and his Mysteries*, Routledge, New York.
- Dorcey, P. F. 1989, The Role of Women in the Cult of Silvanus, *Numen*, Vol. 36, Fasc. 2, 143–155.
- Dorcey, P. F. 1992, *The cult of Silvanus, A study in Roman folk religion*, Leiden–New York–Köln.
- Griffith, A. B. 2006, Completing the Picture: Women and the Female Principle in the Mithraic Cult, *Numen*, Vol. 53, No. 1, 48–77.
- Harrison, E. B. 1967, The Constantinian Portrait, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Vol. 21, 81–96.
- Henig, M. 2000, Robert Cleary and Philip Purser, *Britannia*, Vol. 31, 362–363.
- Imamović, E. 1997, *Antički kultni i votivni spomenici na području Bosne i Hercegovine*, Sarajevo.
- MacMullen, R. 1981, *Paganism in the Roman Empire*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Maršić, D., 1998, Tri Silvanova žrtvenika iz Salone, *Radovi Filozofskog fakulteta*, 36 (23/1997), Razdio povijesnih znanosti, Zadar, 45–69.
- Matijašić, R. Tasseaux, F. 2000, Liber et Silvanus, in: *Les cultes polythéistes dans l'Adriatique Romaine*, Delplace Ch., Tasseaux F. (eds.), Bordeaux, 65–119.
- Migotti, B. 1992, Antičko-srednjovjekovni sakralni kontinuitet na području Dalmacije, *Opuscula archaeologica*, Vol. 16, 225–249.
- Miletić, Ž. 2007, Mithras Sol, *Archaeologia Adriatica*, Vol. 1, 129–143.
- Miletić, Ž. 2014, Religija i religijska kretanja u zapadnom Iliriku (orijentalne religije), in: *Klasični Rim na tlu Hrvatske. Arhitektura, urbanizam, skulptura*, Šegvić M., Marković D. (eds.), Galerija Klovičevi dvori, Zagreb, 243–251.
- Paškvalin, V. 1968, Dvorišta, Ograj u Putovićima kod Zenice – rimske građevine, *Arheološki pregled*, Vol. 10, 153–155, T. LII–LIII.
- Paškvalin, V. 1990, Arheološko nalazište Ograja u Putovićima kod Zenice, *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Sarajevo*, n. s. 45, 35–92.
- Pedišić, I. 1992, Reljef Silvana iz Čulišića, *Diadora*, Vol. 14, 265–278.
- Perinić Muratović, Lj. 2008, Podrijetlo i narav kulta Silvana u rimskim provincijama Dalmaciji i Panoniji, doktorska disertacija, Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb.
- Price, S. 2012, Religious mobility in the Roman Empire, *Journal of Roman Studies*, Vol. 102, 1–19.
- Raknić, Ž. 1965, Kulturna slika Silvana s područja Liburna, *Diadora*, Vol. 3, 85–91.
- Rendić-Miočević, A., Pedišić, I. 2005, Nouveaux témoins épigraphiques du culte de Sylvain à Rider, in: *Illyrica antiqua: ob honorem D. Rendić-Miočević. Radovi s Međunarodnoga skupa o problemima antičke arheologije, Zagreb, 6.–8. XI. 2003.*, Sanader M. (ed.), Odsjek za arheologiju Filozofskog fakulteta, Arheološki muzej, Zagreb, 415–425.
- Rendić-Miočević, D. 1989a, Ilirske predstave Silvana na kulturnim slikama s područja Delmata, in: *Iliri i antički svijet*, Split, 461–507.
- Rendić-Miočević, D. 1989b, Neki ikonografski i onomastički aspekti Silvanove kultne zajednice u Panoniji i Iliriku, in: *Iliri i antički svijet*, Split, 507–523.
- Rendić-Miočević, D. 1989c, Da li je *spaeleum* u Močićima kraj Cavtata (*Epidaur*) služio samo Mitrinu kultu?, in: *Iliri i antički svijet*, Split, 531–539.
- Suić, M. 1965, Orijentalni kultovi u antičkom Zadru, *Diadora*, Vol. III, 112.
- Toulec, D. 1998, Images de Silvanus dans l'Occident romain, in: *Images romaines, Actes de la table ronde organisée à l'Ecole normale supérieure 1996.*, Dupont F., Auvray-Assayas C. (eds.), Paris, 37–61.