

Late Iron Age coins of the Đurđevac (Gjurgjevac) tradition from Kuzelin (southwestern Pannonia)

Bilić, Tomislav

Source / Izvornik: **Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu, 2023, 40, 63 - 87**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

<https://doi.org/10.33254/piaz.40.2.2>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:291:287651>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution 4.0 International](#)/[Imenovanje 4.0 međunarodna](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-12-27**



INSTITUT ZA
ARHEOLOGIJU

Repository / Repozitorij:

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



UDK 902
ISSN 1330-0644
Vol. 40/2
ZAGREB, 2023.

PRILOZI

Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu

Pril. Inst. arheol. Zagrebu
Str./Pages 1–186, Zagreb, 2023.

PRILOZI INSTITUTA ZA ARHEOLOGIJU
U ZAGREBU, 40/2/2023
STR./PAGES 1–186, ZAGREB, 2023.

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, Jurjevska ulica 15
Hrvatska / Croatia
Telefon / Phone ++385 / (0)1 61 50 250
Fax ++385(0)1 60 55 806
e-mail: urednistvo.prilozii@iarh.hr
<http://www.iarh.hr>

Glavni i odgovorni urednik / Editor in chief
Marko DIZDAR

Tehnički urednici / Technical editors
Marko DIZDAR
Katarina BOTIĆ

Uredništvo / Editorial board
Prapovijest / Prehistory:
Marko DIZDAR, Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb,
Hrvatska
Snježana VRDOLJAK, Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb,
Hrvatska
Viktória KISS, Hungarian Academy of Sciences,
Institute of Archaeology, Budapest, Hungary
Antika / Antiquities:
Goranka LIPOVAC VRKLJAN, Institut za arheologiju,
Zagreb, Hrvatska
Ivan RADMAN-LIVAJA, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu,
Zagreb, Hrvatska
Srednji vijek i novi vijek / Middle Ages and Modern era:
Tajana SEKELJ IVANČAN, Institut za arheologiju,
Zagreb, Hrvatska
Katarina Katja PREDOVNIK, University of Ljubljana,
Faculty of Arts, Ljubljana, Slovenia
Natascha MEHLER, Eberhard Karls University of
Tübingen, Tübingen, Germany
Tatjana TKALČEC, Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb,
Hrvatska
Juraj BELAJ, Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska
Metodologija / Methodology
Predrag NOVAKOVIĆ, University of Ljubljana, Faculty
of Arts, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Izdavački savjet / Editorial advisory board
Dunja GLOGOVIĆ, Zagreb, Hrvatska
Ivor KARAVANIĆ, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski
fakultet, Odsjek za arheologiju, Zagreb, Hrvatska
Kornelija MINICHREITER, Zagreb, Hrvatska
Alexander T. RUTTKAY, Nitra, Slovakia
Ivančica SCHRUNK, University of St. Thomas, St. Paul,
Minnesota, USA
Željko TOMIČIĆ, Hrvatska Akademija znanosti i
umjetnosti, Zagreb, Hrvatska
Ante UGLEŠIĆ, Sveučilište u Zadru, Odjel za
arheologiju, Zadar, Hrvatska

Prijevod na engleski / English translation
Tomislav BILIĆ, Sara ESSERT, Makso HERMAN,
Tamara LEVAK POTREBICA, Marko MARAS

Prijevod na hrvatski / Croatian translation
Danijel DŽINO

Lektura / Language editor
Marko DIZDAR (hrvatski jezik / Croatian)
Marko MARAS (engleski jezik / English)

Korektura / Proofreads
Katarina BOTIĆ

Grafičko oblikovanje / Graphic design
Umjetnička organizacija OAZA

Računalni slog / Layout
Hrvoje JAMBREK

Tisak / Printed by
Sveučilišna tiskara d.o.o., Zagreb

Naklada / Issued
400 primjeraka / 400 copies

Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu indeksirani su u /
Prilozi Instituta za arheologiju u Zagrebu are indexed by:
DYABOLA – Sachkatalog der Bibliothek – Römisch-
Germanische Kommission des Deutschen
Archaeologischen Instituts, Frankfurt a. Main
Clarivate Analytics services – Web of Science Core
Collection
CNRS / INIST – Centre National de la Recherche
Scientifique / L'Institut de l'Information Scientifique et
Technique, Vandoeuvre-lès-Nancy
EBSCO – Information services, Ipswich
ERIH PLUS – European Reference Index for the
Humanities and Social Sciences, Norwegian
Directorate for Higher Education and Skills, Bergen
SciVerse Scopus – Elsevier, Amsterdam

E-izdanja. Publikacija je dostupna u digitalnom obliku i
otvorenom pristupu na
<https://hrcak.srce.hr/prilozi-iaz>
E-edition. The publication is available in digital and
open access form at
<https://hrcak.srce.hr/prilozi-iaz?lang=en>

DOI 10.33254

Ovaj rad licenciran je pod Creative Commons
Attribution By 4.0 međunarodnom licencom /
this work is licenced under a Creative Commons
attribution By 4.0 international licence
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



SADRŽAJ

CONTENTS

Izvorni znanstveni radovi

Original scientific papers

5

DOLORES KNEŽIĆ
RENATA ŠOŠTARIĆ
MARTINA ČELHAR
**Arheobotanička analiza
„liburnske“ keramike s lokaliteta
Nadin – Gradina**

DOLORES KNEŽIĆ
RENATA ŠOŠTARIĆ
MARTINA ČELHAR
**Archaeobotanical Analysis of
“Liburnian” Pottery from the
Nadin – Gradina site**

63

TOMISLAV BILIĆ
**Late Iron Age coins of the
Đurđevac (Gjurgjevac)
tradition from Kuzelin (south-
western Pannonia)**

TOMISLAV BILIĆ
**Mlađeželjeznodobne kovanice
đurđevačke tradicije s Kuzelina
(jugozapadna Panonija)**

89

EWAN SHANKS COOPEY
**Inscribed funerary monuments
of *Legio VII* and the emergence
of military communities in 1st
century AD *Dalmatia***

EWAN SHANKS COOPEY
**Epigrafski nadgrobnji spomenici
VII. legije i pojava vojničkih
zajednica u rimskoj provinciji
Dalmaciji u 1. stoljeću po Kr.**

129

SARA ESSERT
PETAR SEKULIĆ
**Archaeobotanical analysis
of a medieval “pantry” in the
courtyard of Banski dvori
Palace (Zagreb, Croatia)**

SARA ESSERT
PETAR SEKULIĆ
**Arheobotanička analiza nalaza
iz srednjovjekovne „smočnice“
iz dvorišta palače Banski dvori
(Zagreb, Hrvatska)**

147

RENATA ŠOŠTARIĆ
TATJANA KOLAK
**Karbonizirane žitarice iz
udbinske Gradine te pregled
nalaza o uzgoju usjeva u
srednjem i novom vijeku u
Hrvatskoj**

RENATA ŠOŠTARIĆ
TATJANA KOLAK
**Carbonized cereals from the
Udbina – Gradina site and the
overview of evidence of crop
cultivation in the medieval and
post-medieval periods in Croatia**

SNJEŽANA VRDOLJAK
**Spheres of Interaction. Con-
tacts and Relationships be-
tween the Balkans and Adjacent
Regions in the Late Bronze Age
/ Iron Age (13th–5th Centuries
BCE), Proceedings of the Con-
ference held at the Institute of
Archaeology, Belgrade 15-17
September, 2017, Gavranović
M., Heilmann D., Kapuran A.,
Verčák M. (eds.), Perspectives
on Balkan Archaeology 1, Verlag
Marie Leidorf GmbH, Rhaden/
Westfalen, 2020.**

SNJEŽANA VRDOLJAK
Spheres of Interaction.
Contacts and Relationships
between the Balkans and
Adjacent Regions in the Late
Bronze Age / Iron Age (13th–5th
Centuries BCE), Proceedings
of the Conference held at
the Institute of Archaeology,
Belgrade 15-17 September,
2017, Gavranović M., Heilmann
D., Kapuran A., Verčák M.
(eds.), Perspectives on Balkan
Archaeology 1, Verlag Marie
Leidorf GmbH, Rhaden/
Westfalen, 2020.

LATE IRON AGE COINS OF THE ĐURĐEVAC (GJURGJEVAC) TRADITION FROM KUZELIN (SOUTH-WESTERN PANNONIA) MLAĐEŽELJEZNO DOBNE KOVANICE ĐURĐEVAČKE TRADICIJE S KUZELINA (JUGOZAPADNA PANONIJA)

Izvorni znanstveni rad / prapovijesna arheologija

Original scientific paper / Prehistoric archaeology

UDK UDC 737.1(497.5 Kuzelin)'638.7''

Primljeno / Received: 22. 2. 2022. Prihvaćeno / Accepted: 17. 8. 2022.

doi.org/10.33254/piaz.40.2.2

TOMISLAV BILIĆ

Archaeological Museum in Zagreb

Trg Nikole Šubića Zrinskog 19

HR-10000 Zagreb

tbilic@amz.hr

The Late Iron Age hillfort site of Kuzelin on Medvednica in south-western Pannonia has yielded a not negligible number of coins, most of which can be classified among the types that are traditionally labelled "Tauriscan". A single coin can be categorized as an East Celtic type from Transdanubia, while two further coins were struck by pairs of dies that also occur in the Samobor–Okić hoard and were thus produced simultaneously with the bulk of the hoard, whereas the remainder can be classified as recently recognized group of coins produced in the Đurđevac (Gjurgjevac) tradition. The latter represent the debased and reduced in weight and size coins inspired by the tetradrachms deposited as the Đurđevac hoard. They were issued at various sites in south-western Pannonia, testifying to different phases of striking and local developments in their production. Two subtypes of such coins were recognized in the numismatic record of Kuzelin and are here separated out as Kuzelin A and B types. The date of these coins corresponds to the archaeological material excavated at the site, i.e., to the Lt D1 period, ca. 150/130–70/50 BC.

KEY WORDS: Kuzelin, Tauriscan coins, Late Iron Age, Lt D1, coins produced in the Đurđevac (Gjurgjevac) tradition, south-western Pannonia



Copyright © Autor(i)
The Author(s) 2023

Open Access This work is distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.
Open Access Ovaj rad dijeli se prema odredbama i uvjetima licence Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), koja dopušta neograničenu ponovnu upotrebu, dijeljenje i reprodukciju u bilo kojem mediju, pod uvjetom da je izvorno djelo ispravno citirano.

Na mlađeželjeznodobnom visinskom utvrđenom lokalitetu Kuzelin na Medvednici (jugozapadna Panonija) pronađen je nezanemarivi broj kovanica, većina kojih se može klasificirati, u tradicionalnim terminima, kao tauriščanski tipovi. Jedna kovanica može se kategorizirati kao istočnokeltski kov iz Transdanubije; dvije kovanice izrađene su parovima pečata koji se također pojavljuju u ostavi Samobor–Okić te su otkovane istovremeno s predmetima iz te ostave; preostale kovanice mogu se podvesti pod nedavno prepoznatu grupu kovanica izrađenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji. Ova posljednja kategorija predstavlja devalvirane kovanice reducirane težine i promjera, čiji nastanak je inspiriran tetradrahmama odloženima u ostavi pronađenoj kod Đurđevca. Takve kovanice bile su producirane na različitim lokacijama u jugozapadnoj Panoniji, svjedočeći na taj način različitim fazama kovanja i lokalnim obrascima razvoja proizvodnje. Unutar numizmatičkog zapisa s Kuzelina bilo je moguće izdvojiti dva podtipa takvih kovanica, Kuzelin A i B. Kronološki položaj tih kovanica odgovara onome arheološkog materijala pronađenog na lokalitetu, tj. razdoblju Lt D1, oko 150./130. – 70./50. g. pr. Kr.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: Kuzelin, tauriščanske kovanice, mlađe željezno doba, Lt D1, kovanice izrađene u đurđevačkoj tradiciji, jugozapadna Panonija

INTRODUCTION

In a series of papers V. Sokol has published a total of seven Late Iron Age (LIA) coins from the Kuzelin hillfort, all recovered in archaeological excavations directed by Sokol himself (Sokol 1994a; 1994b; 2001).¹ In these works Sokol offered his identifications and interpretations of the coins, which were later revised and updated by other scholars (Mirnik 1998; Bilić 2022: 136–138). It appears that many of Sokol's interpretations stand, but some were shown to have been less convincing, which was indeed recognized by later authors. Also, much more is known today of the wider numismatic context in which these coins were commissioned, produced, handed out, used and deposited, so a reappraisal of the LIA coin record of Kuzelin does not seem superfluous. In addition, two new coins, unknown to Sokol, have been found at the site in the last two decades. Finally, after Sokol's latest publication a significant shift has occurred in our understanding of the chronology of local coinage, regularly referred to as Tauriscan, which has moved back the production dates of Tauriscan coin-types for almost a full century.² This has important consequences

1 I would like to thank Morena Želja Želle, the director of the Museum of Prigorje, for allowing me to study and publish the coins. I am also grateful to Irena Vidošević of the Prigorje Museum for all her help in accessing the coins. My gratitude also extends to the pioneer of Kuzelin excavations, Vladimir Sokol; my debt to him is clear from the number of instances I refer to his work in the present paper. All coins were photographed by Igor Krajcar of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb.

2 On the appropriateness of the term "Tauriscan coinage" see Schachinger 2020: 60.

UVOD

U nekoliko radova V. Sokol je objavio ukupno sedam mlađeželjeznodobnih kovanica pronađenih na visinskom utvrđenom lokalitetu Kuzelin tijekom arheoloških iskopavanja koja je sâm vodio (Sokol 1994a; 1994b; 2001).¹ U tim radovima Sokol je ponudio svoje determinacije i interpretacije kovanica, koje su kasnije revidirali i nadogradili drugi autori (Mirnik 1998; Bilić 2022: 136–138). Čini se da je većina Sokolovih interpretacija validna, ali neke su se pokazale manje uvjerljivima, što su kasniji autori prepoznali. Nadalje, danas se zna mnogo više o širem numizmatičkom kontekstu unutar kojeg su te kovanice bile naručene, proizvedene, izdane, korištene i odložene, tako da se re-evaluacija mlađeželjeznodobnog numizmatičkog zapisa s Kuzelina ne čini suvišnom. Uz to, dvije nove kovanice, nepoznate Sokolu, pronađene su na lokalitetu tijekom posljednja dva desetljeća. Naposljetku, u razdoblju nakon Sokolove zadnje rasprave došlo je do značajnog pomaka u našem razumijevanju kronologije lokalnih kovanica – u pravilu se one nazivaju tauriščanskima – kojim se proizvodnja tauriščanskih tipova kovanica pomaknula unatrag za gotovo čitavo stoljeće.² Ovo ima važne posljedice po

1 Ovom prigodom želio bih zahvaliti ravnateljici Muzeja Prigorja, Moreni Želji Želle, što mi je omogućila uvid u materijal te njegovu objavu. Također zahvaljujem kolegici Ireni Vidošević iz Muzeja Prigorja, što mi je pomogla prilikom pristupa kovanicama. Moja zahvalnost Vladimiru Sokolu, pioniru iskopavanja na Kuzelinu, najbolje se ogleda se u broju referenci na njegove radove u ovom tekstu. Sve predmete fotografirao je Igor Krajcar iz Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu.

2 O prikladnosti termina „tauriščanske kovanice“ vidjeti Schachinger 2020: 60.

on the chronology of the numismatic assemblage from the Kuzelin hillfort, which almost exclusively consists of Tauriscan coins.³

As already noted, a vast majority of LIA coins from Kuzelin – eight out of nine, to be more precise – belong to Tauriscan coin-types. Therefore, it is necessary to present a short preliminary overview of Tauriscan coinage, with an emphasis on the latest developments in the field.

TAURISCAN COINS

The coins usually labelled “Tauriscan” are for the most part a facet of the material culture of the La Tène-period Mokronog group. In terms of currently somewhat outdated ethno-cultural affiliations, it could be said that they were issued within the orbit of the Taurisci tribe or tribal alliance (Božič 1999: 192; Dizdar 2011: 71–73, 89–90; 2013: 11–12; Potrebica, Dizdar 2014: 137). Here, the term “Tauriscan coinage” is used as a convenient heuristic term for a tightly connected, including direct association of types in relative chronological series, group of coin-types current in the – for the most part – late La Tène period in south-western Pannonia, without any desire to impute ethnicity to the coins’ commissioners, producers or users.⁴ At the same time, this does not mean that the exonym Taurisci does not correspond, at least partially (for example, in terms of the language(s) they used), to (some of) the individuals and groups of people that were involved in the production, use and deposition of these coins. It is simply very hard to estimate the level of correspondence between the terms and the actual historical situation, if any indeed existed in the first place.

These considerations notwithstanding, it is currently possible to date the appearance of the earliest Tauriscan coin types to the late first half of the 2nd century BC, i.e., to the late Lt C2 period or the Lt C2/D1 transition.⁵ The earlier horizon of Tauriscan coins follows the development in quick succession from the VES-tetradrachms through Varaždin and Samobor to Đurđevac coin-types, which were all issued during perhaps a decade or so after ca.

3 As briefly noted in Bilić 2017: 236.

4 I will not insist on the use of quotation marks, as proposed by Mihajlović (2019: 268) for the “Scordisci”, since this would, I feel, be overly pedantic. But they always need to be understood as being present.

5 The key work on the dating of Tauriscan coinage is Kos, Šemrov 2003; see also Kos 2007; 2012; Kos, Mirnik 2011.

kronologiju numizmatičkih nalaza s Kuzelina, koji su gotovo isključivo predstavljeni tauriščanskim kovanicama.³

Kao što je već primijećeno, golema većina mlađeželjeznodobnih kovanica s Kuzelina – preciznije, osam od ukupno devet pronađenih – mogu se podvesti pod tauriščanske tipove. Iz tog razloga nužno je iznijeti kratki preliminarni pregled tauriščanskog kovanja, s naglaskom na recentne spoznaje na tom polju.

TAURIŠČANSKE KOVANICE

Kovanice koje se uobičajeno nazivaju „tauriščanskima” uglavnom su obilježje materijalne kulture mokronoške skupine mlađeg željeznog doba. U terminima sad već pomalo zastarjelih etno-kulturalnih grupiranja moglo bi se tvrditi da su bile izrađivane u okviru utjecaja plemena ili plemenskog saveza Tauriska (Božič 1999: 192; Dizdar 2011: 71–73, 89–90; 2013: 11–12; Potrebica, Dizdar 2014: 137). U ovom se radu termin „tauriščanske kovanice” koristi kao prikladan heuristički termin za usko povezanu, uključujući izravno povezivanje tipova u relativnokronološke nizove, skupinu tipova kovanica prisutnu tijekom – uglavnom – kasnolatenskog razdoblja u jugozapadnoj Panoniji, bez želje za imputiranjem etniciteta naručiteljima, izrađivačima ili korisnicima kovanica.⁴ Istovremeno, ovo ne znači da egzonim Taurisci ne odgovara barem djelomično, primjerice, u terminima jezika koje(g) su koristili, (nekim) pojedincima i skupinama ljudi koji su bili uključeni u proizvodnju, upotrebu i odlaganje tih kovanica. Ipak, vrlo je teško procijeniti razinu podudarnosti između termina i stvarne povijesne situacije, ukoliko je ta podudarnost uopće prisutna.

Bez obzira na ta razmatranja, u ovom trenutku moguće je datirati pojavu najranijih tauriščanskih tipova kovanica u kasnu prvu polovicu 2. st. pr. Kr., tj. u kasni dio razdoblja Lt C2 ili prijelaz Lt C2/D1.⁵ U najranijem horizontu tauriščanskih kovanica vidljivo je brzo smjenjivanje tipova u nizu od tetradrahmi s natpisom VES-preko kovanica tipa Varaždin i Samobor do đurđevačkog tipa, koje su sve izrađene tijekom možda jednog desetljeća nakon oko 150. g. pr. Kr.⁶ Situaciju

3 Kao što je kratko primijećeno u Bilić 2017: 236.

4 Smatram da nema potrebe inzistirati na dosljednoj upotrebi navodnika, kao što predlaže Mihajlović (2019: 268) za „Skordiske” jer bi to bilo previše sitničavo. Ali, oni se čitavo vrijeme imaju smatrati prisutnima.

5 Ključni rad za datiranje tauriščanskih kovanica je Kos, Šemrov 2003; vidjeti također Kos 2007; 2012; Kos, Mirnik 2011.

6 O kronologiji đurđevačkih kovanica, najmlađeg tipa među starijim

150 BC.⁶ The situation is somewhat complicated by the latest coin series, the one named after the find site of the hoard near modern Đurđevac. I will discuss this group of coins in due time, but two circumstances related to these coins must be emphasized at the moment. First, they seem to have circulated for an extended period and had a much wider reach in comparison to other earlier Tauriscan types; second, they seem to have inspired the development of a class of debased coins reduced in weight, among which several subtypes can be distinguished, which can be subsumed under an umbrella category of coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition. These seem to have been produced mainly during the Lt D1 period, but possibly also somewhat later, although certainly not after the Roman conquest (Bilić 2022).

KUZELIN COIN RECORD

All Kuzelin LIA coins were found in a secure archaeological context of the late La Tène stratum of the site, widely distributed throughout the hillfort (Sokol 2001: 14). It seems that the archaeological material from the site belongs exclusively to the La Tène D1 phase (Dizdar 2011: 87–88), in absolute dates, ca. 150/130–70/50 BC, which would thus make the latter date the *terminus ante quem* for the appearance of these types of coins. At the same time, this archaeological period would naturally provide the deposition context for the Kuzelin finds. After the end of the La Tène occupation of the site, most probably at the end of the 1st c. BC, there are no traces of Roman presence whatsoever at the site during the entire 1st c. AD, but only in the second half of the 2nd century AD (Sokol 1994c: 200–201; 1997: 221; 1998: 10; 2003: 201; 2009: 154). The Late Iron Age coins at Kuzelin were thus found in a secure (although incompletely published) archaeological context; moreover, there is no (for the time being) documented continuation of monetary activity at the site until the second part of the 2nd century. Therefore, it is safe to presume that those coins were used exclusively by the late La Tène population settled on the site in a pre-Roman conquest period.

donekle komplicira posljednja serija kovanica, nazvana po mjestu pronalaska ostave u blizini suvremenog Đurđevca. Ova grupa kovanica bit će predmet rasprave u kasnijem dijelu teksta, ali dvije okolnosti vezane uz taj tip moraju biti naglašene već sada. Prvo, čini se da su one u optjecaju bile duže vremena te da su bile rasprostranjene na većem području u odnosu na druge ranije tauriščanske tipove; drugo, čini se da su one istovremeno inspirirale razvitak skupine devalviranih kovanica reducirane težine, među kojima je moguće razlučiti nekoliko podtipova, a koje se mogu podvesti pod široku kategoriju kovanica izrađenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji. Izgledno je da su te kovanice bile izrađivane uglavnom tijekom razdoblja Lt D1, ali možda i nešto kasnije, iako zasigurno ne nakon rimskog osvajanja (Bilić 2022).

NUMIZMATIČKI ZAPIS S KUZELINA

Sve mlađeželjeznodobne kovanice s Kuzelina pronađene su u sigurnom arheološkom kontekstu kasnolatenskog sloja, rasprostranjene preko čitavog lokaliteta (Sokol 2001: 14). Čini se da arheološki materijal s lokaliteta pripada isključivo periodu La Tène D1 (Dizdar 2011: 87–88), u terminima apsolutne kronologije oko 150./130.–70./50. g. pr. Kr., što bi značilo da je ovaj posljednji datum ujedno i *terminus ante quem* za pojavu tih tipova kovanica. Istovremeno, ovaj arheološki period ujedno predstavlja kontekst odlaganja kuzelinskih numizmatičkih nalaza. Nakon završetka kasnolatenske aktivnosti na lokalitetu, vjerojatno krajem 1. st. pr. Kr., nema nikakvih tragova rimskog prisustva tijekom čitavog 1. st. po Kr., sve do druge polovice 2. st. po Kr. (Sokol 1994c: 200–201; 1997: 221; 1998: 10; 2003: 201; 2009: 154). Tako su mlađeželjeznodobne kovanice s Kuzelina pronađene u sigurnom (iako ne sasvim temeljito objavljenom) arheološkom kontekstu; štoviše, (trenutno) ne postoji dokumentirani kontinuitet monetarne aktivnosti na lokalitetu sve do druge polovice 2. stoljeća. Na taj način može se sa velikom sigurnošću pretpostaviti da su te kovanice bile isključivo korištene u kontekstu kasnolatenske populacije naseljene na lokalitetu u razdoblju prije rimskog osvajanja.

⁶ On the chronology of the Đurđevac coinage, the latest among the earlier types, see: Bilić 2017: 230; 2022: 124–126; forthcoming; Bilić, Dizdar 2016: 118–119; Bilić, Falileyev 2021: 11.

tauriščanskim kovovima, vidjeti Bilić 2017: 230; 2022: 124–126; u tisku; Bilić, Dizdar 2016: 118–119; Bilić, Falileyev 2021: 11.



Fig. 1 — Late Iron Age coins from Kuzelin (see: Tab. 1) (photo by: I. Krajcar)
Sl. 1 — Mlađeželjeznodobne kovanice s Kuzelina (vidjeti: tab. 1) (snimio: I. Krajcar)

As already noted, the coin record of the Kuzelin hillfort consist almost exclusively of Tauriscan coins, with only a single exception. It is a tetradrachm of the Zickzackgruppe (Sztálinváros/Dunaújváros) (MPS inv. 166/94; Bilić 2017: 228, 236, 240, Tab. 1: cat. no. 17). This type of coin was issued in the period from the late 3rd to the 1st half of the 2nd century BC in Transdanubia and thus represents an import to south-western Pannonia (Pink 1939: 100; Allen 1987: 29, 80, Map 3; Dembski 1998: 46, 112; Torbágy 2000: 30; Ziegauš 2010: 215). Moreover, its Lt C2-date apparently suggests a different temporal horizon in comparison to the rest of the Kuzelin assemblage, both archaeological in general and numismatic in particular. In one way or another, it testifies to the connections – either direct or by way of intermediaries – of the inhabitants of the hillfort with a region dis-

Kao što je već navedeno, numizmatički zapis s Kuzelina sastoji se gotovo isključivo od taurišćanskih kovanica, uz jednu iznimku. Riječ je o jednoj tetradrahmi tipa Zickzackgruppe (Sztálinváros/Dunaújváros) (MPS inv. 166/94; Bilić 2017: 228, 236, 240, tab. 1: kat. br. 17). Taj tip kovanica izrađivan je u periodu od kasnog 3. do prve polovice 2. st. pr. Kr. u Transdanubiji te na taj način predstavlja import u jugozapadnu Panoniju (Pink 1939: 100; Allen 1987: 29, 80, karta 3; Dembski 1998: 46, 112; Torbágy 2000: 30; Ziegauš 2010: 215). Nadalje, njegov kronološki položaj (Lt C2), izgledno sugerira različit vremenski horizont u odnosu na ostatak kuzelinskih nalaza – arheoloških općenito i numizmatičkih specifično. Na ovaj ili onaj način ova kovanica svjedoči o povezanosti – bilo izravnoj ili preko posrednika – stanovnika ovog visinskog utvrđenog naselja s područjem udaljenim više od 200 km

tant more than 200 km to the north-east. Sokol has advanced the idea that the coin should be separated out as a new “variant” for which he proposed the name “Kuzelin” (Sokol 2001: 10). Indeed, there are no quite identical coins among the similar coins of the Zickzackgruppe, i.e., those with a more stylised obverse head to the left, which might support Sokol’s proposal (Pink 1939: nos. 459–461; TKN 459–461; Allen 1988: 59, Pl. XXIV: S132; Dembski 1998: 112, nos. 1385–1386; Kostial 1997: no. 738; Torbágy 2000: 35, no. 90; Ziegeus 2010: nos. 568–569). The Kuzelin piece is unique in that the original reverse rider is completely removed, with an enlarged dot within a circle above the horse’s back (the circle appears on OTA 459–460, the dot within a circle on OTA 461, but always behind the – stylised and reduced – rider). Also, the obverse portrait’s eye is depicted as a similar dot within a circle, which is not documented on other coins of the type. But otherwise, it clearly belongs to the *Zickzackgruppe* coins, and – since it certainly was not produced at Kuzelin – there do not appear to be sufficient reasons why this particular coin should be separated out as a named variant. Indeed, almost every LIA coin is a variant of some other coin in some way.

The earlier date of production for the *Zickzackgruppe* (Sztálinváros/Dunaújváros) tetradrachm from Kuzelin does not necessarily indicate it arrived at the site at such an early date, i.e., prior to ca. 150 BC. Indeed, a curious variant of the *Zickzackgruppe* coins (OTA 462) was thus found in the rather eclectic Lemberg hoard (southern Styria, Slovenia, near the Croatian border), together with several Boian staters, a small number of “Eastern Celtic” tetradrachms (Vogelreiter OTA 441, Slowakischer Typ OTA 478), a single Norican tetradrachm and a significant number of later Tauriscan tetradrachms (Frontalgesicht, Brezelohr A, Augentyp-Stamm, Wuschelkopf-Gruppe, Unscharfer Typ-Gruppe, SC 23), several of which were overstruck (KNS 15/1–58 (KNS 53, 75)). This hoard was certainly not deposited prior to ca. 150 BC,⁷ which means that the *Zickzackgruppe* coin that ended up at Kuzelin might belong to this particular temporal horizon as well, thus corresponding to the rest of the numismatic assemblage, as well as archaeological assemblage as a whole, from the site.

⁷ Indeed, two 1/3 “Boian” staters from the Lemberg hoard (subtype E/VI, KNS 15/2–3) belong to the latest horizon of the production of such staters and can be dated to Lt D1b–D2, i.e., after the 70s BC (Militký 2015: 53–54, 57).

prema sjeveroistoku. Sokol je predložio izdvajanje ove kovanice kao zasebne varijante *Zickzackgruppe* te ju je imenovao prema lokalitetu (Sokol 2001: 10). Uistinu, među poznatim sličnim kovanicama *Zickzackgruppe*, tj. onima s jače stiliziranom glavom nalijevo na aversu nema potpuno identičnog primjerka, što daje potporu Sokolovom prijedlogu (Pink 1939: br. 459–461; TKN 459–461; Allen 1988: 59, T. XXIV: S132; Dembski 1998: 112, br. 1385–1386; Kostial 1997: br. 738; Torbágy 2000: 35, br. 90; Ziegeus 2010: br. 568–569). Kovanica s Kuzelina jedinstvena je po potpunom izostanku jahača na reversu te prisustvom povećanog motiva točke unutar kružnice iznad konjskih leđa (kružnica se pojavljuje na primjercima OTA 459–460, točka unutar kružnice na OTA 461, ali uvijek iza leđa – stiliziranog i reduciranog prikaza – jahača). Također, oko aversnog portreta prikazano je kao slična točka unutar kružnice, što se ne pojavljuje na drugim dokumentiranim kovanicama ovog tipa. No, izuzev tih osobina, kovanica s Kuzelina nedvojbeno pripada tetradrahmama tipa *Zickzackgruppe* te – obzirom da sigurno nije izrađena na Kuzelinu – čini se da ne postoje dovoljno jaki razlozi zbog kojih bi se izdvojila bi se izdvojila kao imenovana varijanta. Uistinu, gotovo svaka mlađeželjeznodobna kovanica na neki način predstavlja varijantu neke druge kovanice.

Ranije datiranje izrade tetradrahme tipa *Zickzackgruppe* (Sztálinváros/Dunaújváros) s Kuzelina ne sugerira nužno da je ona na lokalitet pristigla u tom ranijem razdoblju, tj. prije oko 150. g. pr. Kr. Zaista, neobična varijanta *Zickzackgruppe* kovanice (OTA 462) bila je dio prilično eklektične ostave iz Lemberga (južna Štajerska, Slovenija, u blizini granice s Hrvatskom), zajedno s nekoliko statera koji se pripisuju Bojima, malim brojem „istočnokeltskih” tetradrahmi (Vogelreiter OTA 441, Slowakischer Typ OTA 478), jednom noričkom tetradrahmom i značajnim brojem kasnijih taurišćanskih tetradrahmi (Frontalgesicht, Brezelohr A, Augentyp-Stamm, Wuschelkopf-Gruppe, Unscharfer Typ-Gruppe, SC 23), od kojih su neke bile prekovane (KNS 15/1–58 (KNS 53, 75)). Ova ostava sigurno nije odložena prije oko 150. g. pr. Kr.,⁷ što znači da kovanica tipa *Zickzackgruppe* s Kuzelina može pripadati ovom istom vremenskom horizontu, što bi odgovaralo ostalim numizmatičkim nalazima, kao i arheološkim nalazima u cjelini, s lokaliteta Kuzelin.

⁷ Uistinu, dva 1/3 „bojska” statera iz ostave Lemberg (podtip E/VI, KNS 15/2–3) pripadaju najkasnijem horizontu izrade takvih statera te se mogu datirati u razdoblje Lt D1b–D2, tj. nakon 70-ih g. pr. Kr. (Militký 2015: 53–54, 57).

The remaining eight coins can all be classified as Tauriscan. It is possible to group them in two main clusters: 1) a well-known group of coin types found in the Samobor–Okić hoard, and 2) a less known category of coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition. Before proceeding to analyse the latter, several observations on the Samobor-type coins from Kuzelin will indicate a significant connection between two important LIA sites in the Zagreb region, i.e., Kuzelin and Gradec near Okić.

A TKN 45-109 Samobor B coin was thus found at the Kuzelin hillfort within a Lt D1 settlement.⁸ Its deposition context – along a rampart wall – suggests a votive, perhaps apotropaic function, but what is important here is that it must have been produced on the same occasion as the bulk of the coins from the Samobor–Okić hoard. We can be certain of that because 39 coins produced by this die combination from this largest preserved hoard of Tauriscan coins are kept at the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb today. What is more, it is possible to distinguish two variants of the TKN obverse die 45: one with a clear cheek on the obverse portrait, another with a torque upon the cheek (Bilić: forthcoming). The torque is not visible on the Kuzelin coin, so it must have been struck before the torque was added to the die, together with 26 specimens from the Samobor–Okić hoard. Its weight (10.55 g) is consistent with the average weight of the coins produced with this die combination from the Samobor–Okić hoard (10.93 g). If the votive interpretation of the Kuzelin coin's function is correct, it would perhaps suggest a similar motivation for the deposition of the Samobor–Okić hoard as a whole, although other interpretations are also possible. One is reminded here of Roymans and Aarts' claim that the deposition of LIA coins might have revolved on cultic centres and festivals, either as distribution hubs or venues for cultic depositions, or both, during certain public gatherings at religious festivals (Roymans, Aarts 2009: 6–7, 20–22; cf. Kemmers 2018: 202). In this particular case, Gradec at Okić would function as both a venue for cultic deposition and a distribution hub, while the coin deposited at a rampart wall at Kuzelin – perhaps also the Samobor-type coins from the Pokupsko hoard and those from Sisak, some of the latter perhaps deposited as votive offerings

Svih preostalih osam kovanica mogu se klasificirati kao tauriščanske. Moguće ih je grupirati u dva glavna skupa: 1) među dobro poznatu grupu kovanica pronađenih u ostavi Samobor–Okić te 2) među slabije poznatu kategoriju kovanica izrađenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji. Prije analize ove potonje, nekoliko opservacija o samoborskim kovanicama s Kuzelina naznačit će značajnu povezanost dvaju važnih mladeželjnodobnih lokaliteta u zagrebačkoj regiji, Kuzelina i Gradeca kod Okića.

Kovanica tipa Samobor B TKN 45-109 tako je pronađena na Kuzelinu unutar naselja iz razdoblja Lt D1.⁸ Njezin kontekst odlaganja – uz zemljani bedem – sugerira votivnu, možda apotropejsku funkciju, ali ono što je ovdje ključno je činjenica da je kovanica morala biti izrađena u istoj prigodi kao i glavina kovanica iz ostave Samobor–Okić. U to možemo biti sigurni jer se u Arheološkom muzeju u Zagrebu (AMZ) danas čuva 39 kovanica iz te najveće sačuvane ostave tauriščanskog novca koje su izrađene upravo tim parom pečata. Štoviše, moguće je razlikovati dvije varijante aversnog pečata TKN 45: jedna s čistim obrazom aversnog portreta te druga s torkvesom na obrazu (Bilić: u tisku). Kako torkves nije vidljiv na kuzelinskom primjerku, on je morao biti iskovan prije nego što je torkves dodan na pečat, zajedno s 26 istih takvih primjeraka iz ostave Samobor–Okić. Težina kuzelinskog primjerka (10,55 g) odgovara prosječnoj težini kovanica izrađenih tom kombinacijom pečata iz ostave Samobor–Okić (10,93 g). Ako bi se votivna funkcija kuzelinske tetradrahme prihvatila kao odgovarajuća interpretacija njezinog konteksta odlaganja, možda bi to moglo sugerirati sličnu motivaciju odlaganja ostave Samobor–Okić u cjelini, iako su moguća i druga objašnjenja. Ovdje se možemo pozvati na tvrdnju Roymansa i Aartsa, koji vjeruju da se odlaganje mladeželjnodobnih kovanica moglo oslanjati na kulturna središta i svečanosti, bilo kao distribucijskih fokalnih točaka ili lokacija kulturnih odlaganja (ili oboje), tijekom određenih javnih okupljanja prigodom religijskih svečanosti (Roymans, Aarts 2009: 6–7, 20–22; usp. Kemmers 2018: 202). U ovom konkretnom slučaju, Gradec kod Okića bi predstavljao i lokaciju kulturnog odlaganja i distribucijsko središte, dok bi kovanica odložena uz bedem na Kuzelinu – možda i kovanice tipa Samobor iz ostave Pokupsko te one pronađene u Sisku, od kojih su neke možda odložene kao

8 Sokol 2001: no. 3 = MPS 168/94 (in publications) = MPS 4185 (actual inv. no.).

8 Sokol 2001: br. 3 = MPS 168/94 (u publikacijama) = MPS 4185 (stvarni inv. br.).

in the Kupa River – would have been brought from some public gathering held at a site ca. 40 km as the crow flies to the south-west (Bilić: forthcoming).⁹

In addition, another Samobor coin from Kuzelin (7.96 g) was produced with a pair of early Samobor A dies (almost certainly TKN 28a-90), thus on the same occasion as the bulk of the coins from the Samobor–Okić hoard, as well as the preceding coin from Kuzelin (Sokol 2001: 14 (referring to TKN 30-92) = MPS 7376; Bilić 2022: 137). Its low weight (the average weight of this die-combination in the Samobor–Okić hoard is 10.86 g, 16 pieces in total) can be explained either by the poor state of preservation of the coin (a chunk of the flan is missing, and it was apparently in a fire) (Sokol 2001: 14) or, less likely in this particular case, by the use of a lighter flan intended for a different recipient or for another contracting authority.

Based on this evidence, it could be claimed that there certainly existed a tangible connection between the Kuzelin Lt D1 hillfort settlement and the workshop that produced the coins from the Samobor–Okić hoard, perhaps also a more direct connection between the elites that controlled the hillfort on Medvednica and those that governed the Gradec at Okić hillfort.

The bulk of the LIA coins found at Kuzelin, however, can be classified as the coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition. This class of coins was treated in detail elsewhere (Bilić 2022), so I will here only briefly enumerate its main characteristics. The group consists of late – i.e., later than the “regular” Đurđevac coins from the eponymous hoard – locally produced debased and reduced coins (both in weight and in flan diameter) derived from the earlier “regular” Đurđevac tetradrachms. The process of debasement and reduction, which cannot be reduced to a linear gradualist or evolutionary pattern, is reflected in the numismatic record of the Bartolovec–Jalžabet site (near Varaždin), with its final phase perhaps observable in the numismatic record of the Donje Orešje–Graci site (near Sveti Ivan Zelina), both in north-western Croatia. It is also attested by several late coins issued in the Đurđevac tra-

votivni prilozi u Kupi – bila donesena na Medvednicu s nekog javnog okupljanja održanog na lokalitetu oko 40 km zračnom linijom prema jugozapadu (Bilić: u tisku).⁹

Još jedna kovanica tipa Samobor s Kuzelina (7,96 g) bila je izrađena parom ranih pečata grupe Samobor A (gotovo sigurno TKN 28a-90), dakle ponovo istom prigodom kao i glavina kovanica iz ostave Samobor–Okić te prethodno spomenuta kovanica s Kuzelina (Sokol 2001: 14 (referirajući se na TKN 30-92) = MPS 7376; Bilić 2022: 137). Njezina mala težina (prosječna težina kovanica izrađenih ovom kombinacijom pečata iz ostave Samobor–Okić je 10,86 g, ukupno 16 primjeraka) može se objasniti njezinim slabim stupnjem očuvanosti (dio kovne pločice nedostaje, a čini se i da je gorila) (Sokol 2001: 14) ili, što je manje vjerojatno u ovom specifičnom slučaju, upotrebom lakše kovne pločice namijenjene drugom primatelju ili drugom naručitelju.

Na temelju ovih dokaza može se tvrditi da su postojale opipljive veze između kuzelinskog utvrđenog visinskog naselja iz razdoblja Lt D1 i radionice koja je izradila kovanice iz ostave Samobor–Okić, a možda i izravnija veza između elita koje su kontrolirale Kuzelin na Medvednici i onih koje su upravljale visinskim naseljem na Gradecu kod Okića.

Istovremeno, glavina kovanica pronađenih na Kuzelinu može se klasificirati kao kovanice izrađene u đurđevačkoj tradiciji. Ova grupa kovanica obrađena je detaljno na drugom mjestu (Bilić 2022), tako da ćemo ovdje samo kratko navesti glavne osobine ove skupine. Ona obuhvaća kasne – tj. kasnije od „regularnih“ đurđevačkih kovanica iz eponimne ostave – lokalno izrađene devalvirane i reducirane (i u težini i u promjeru kovne pločice) kovanice izvedene iz ranijih „regularnih“ đurđevačkih tetradrahmi. Proces devalvacije i redukcije, koji se ne može reducirati na linearni postepeni ili evolucijski obrazac, odražava se u numizmatičkom zapisu s lokaliteta Bartolovec – Jalžabet (blizu Varaždina), s najkasnijom fazom možda primjetnom u numizmatičkom zapisu s lokaliteta Donje Orešje – Graci (blizu Svetog Ivana Zeline), oba u sjeverozapadnoj Hrvatskoj. Proces je primjetan i na

⁹ For Gradec at Okić see: J. Klemenc in AAMZ s.v. Samobor 222/1939; Radovčić, Škoberne 1989: 113 (caption under an unnumbered figure, cf. maps on pp. 83, 93); Škoberne 1999: 15: Fig. 2, 16, ; 2002: 54–55. It is highly likely that the coins from the Samobor–Okić hoard were produced in a coin workshop in some connection with the tellingly named hillfort of Gradec in the immediate vicinity of the place of concealment of the hoard (Bilić: forthcoming).

⁹ Za Gradec kod Okića vidjeti: J. Klemenc u AAMZ s.v. Samobor 222/1939 ; Radovčić, Škoberne 1989: 113 (potpis pod nenumeriranom ilustracijom, cf. karte na str. 83, 93); Škoberne 1999: 15: sl. 2, 16; 2002: 54–55. Izvjesno je da su kovanice iz ostave Samobor–Okić bile proizvedene u kovničarskoj radionici u nekoj vezi s visinskim lokalitetom znakovitog imena Gradec u neposrednoj blizini lokacije odlaganja ostave (Bilić: u tisku).




Fig. 2 — Distribution of Samobor coins (base map: Google Earth. Data SIO, NOAA, U.S. Navy, NGA, GEBCO. Image Landsat / Copernicus) (made by: T. Bilić)

Sl. 2 — Distribucija kovanica tipa Samobor (podloga: Google Earth. Data SIO, NOAA, U.S. Navy, NGA, GEBCO. Image Landsat / Copernicus) (izradio: T. Bilić)

dition found on both banks of the Kupa River in Sisak, prehistoric and ancient Segest(ic)a/Siscia, the most important settlement in the region. But the archaeologically excavated hillfort site of Kuzelin, it will be shown, can provide some exceptionally important information on the production of late Đurđevac coins in southwestern Pannonia.

While having in mind the caveat expressed in the preceding paragraph, the documented process of debasement and reduction in weight and size of Đurđevac tetradrachms nevertheless enables the discussion of Tauriscan coinage in developmental terms, however irregular or non-linear this development might turn out

nekoliko kasnih kovanica izrađenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji pronađenih na obje obale Kupe u Sisku, prapovijesnoj i antičkoj Segest(ic)i/Sisciji, najvažnijem naselju regije. Arheološki istraženi lokalitet Kuzelin, pokazat će se, može pružiti određene izuzetno važne informacije o produkciji kasnih đurđevačkih kovanica u jugozapadnoj Panoniji.

Imajući na umu upozorenje izneseno u prethodnom odlomku, dokumentirani proces devaluacije i redukcije u težini i promjeru kovne pločice đurđevačkih tetradrahmi ipak omogućava raspravu o tauriščanskim kovanicama u terminima razvitka, koliko god se nepravilnim ili nelinearnim taj razvitak pokaže. Kao bliska paralela,

to be. As a closely parallel case, perhaps even another facet of this particular development, a metallurgical analysis of small silver coins found on the territory of present-day Slovenia, which included several Tauriscan coin-types, detected a gradual debasement of these coins, attributing the process to inflationary movements (Šmit et al. 2020: 9–10, 12). The analogies with similar situations suggest that the changes in coin production were the result of either pressure or influence of the Roman state and its expansionist policy, but the precise details of this process in the Tauriscan societies remain unknown (Howgego 1995: 113–115).¹⁰ It should be emphasized, though, that the appearance of base-metal (namely, copper-alloy or alloyed silver) coin types in the “monetary system” of the Taurisci does not immediately signify an emerging market economy and a monetized exchange of goods. These coins were apparently not issued in large quantities and their presence in the only larger market centre of the region worthy of the name, Segest(ic)a, is hardly of any note (cf. Roymans, Aarts 2009: 20). It is possible that the appearance of these “base-metal” coin types reflects a late stage in the process of local tribal ethnogeneses or the creation of ethno-political formations under the influence of the Roman state (Roymans, Aarts 2009: 20). At the same time, a clear continuity exists with the earlier silver coin types in that the “base-metal” types were unmistakably their derivatives. Furthermore, the presence of certain quantities of silver in almost all of the dominantly base-metal coins “suggests they were not struck as low-value coins, but should be seen as continuing the old... tradition”.¹¹ Thus, a primarily non-economic explanation for the appearance of the “base-metal” coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition emerges, even though the precise stages of development of the Tauriscan political, or ethno-political, grouping – and thus their relation to Tauriscan coinage – remain unknown.

After this brief introduction, we can proceed to the analysis of late Đurđevac coins found at Kuzelin. The obverse die used to produce

možda čak i drugi aspekt istog procesa, može se navesti metalurška analiza malih srebrnih kovanica pronađenih na tlu današnje Slovenije, koja je uključila i nekoliko tauriščanskih tipova, u kojoj je primjećena postupna devalvacija tih kovanica, a proces je interpretiran inflacijskim kretanjima (Šmit et al. 2020: 9–10, 12). Analogije sa sličnim situacijama sugeriraju da su promjene u produkciji kovanica rezultat pritiska ili utjecaja rimske države i njezine ekspanzionističke politike, ali točni detalji ovog procesa u tauriščanskim društvima ostaju nepoznati (Howgego 1995: 113–115).¹⁰ Ipak, mora se naglasiti da pojava tipova kovanica izrađenih od neplemenitih metala (preciznije, slitina bakra ili slitina s manjim udjelom srebra) u „monetarnom sustavu” Tauriska ne sugerira nužno postojanje tržišne ekonomije u nastajanju te monetizirane razmjene dobara. Te kovanice očigledno nisu bile izrađivane u velikim količinama, a njihovo prisustvo u jedinom većem trgovinskom središtu u regiji, Segesti(ci), jedva da je vrijedno spomena (cf. Roymans, Aarts 2009: 20). Moguće je da pojava tih tipova kovanica izrađenih od „neplemenitih metala” odražava kasnu fazu u procesu lokalnih plemenskih etnogeneza ili formiranje etno-političkih jedinica pod utjecajem Rima (Roymans, Aarts 2009: 20). Istovremeno, postoji jasan kontinuitet s ranijim tipovima kovanica izrađivanima od srebra u tome što su tipovi od „neplemenitih metala” nepogrešivo izvedeni upravo od njih. Nadalje, prisustvo određene količine srebra u gotovo svim kovanicama izrađenima dominantno od neplemenitih metala „sugerira da one nisu kovane kao novac manje vrijednosti, već ih se treba promatrati kao nastavljače ranije... tradicije”.¹¹ Tako dolazimo do primarno ne-ekonomskog objašnjenja nastanka kovanica od „neplemenitih metala” izrađenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji, iako specifične faze u razvitku tauriščanskih političkih, ili etno-političkih, grupiranja – te njihovog odnosa s tauriščanskim kovanicama – nismo u mogućnosti definirati.

Nakon ovog kratkog uvoda, može se pristupiti analizi kasnih đurđevačkih kovanica pronađenih na Kuzelinu. Aversni pečat kojim je izrađena kovanica pronađena u podnici mlađeželjznodob-

10 See also Tapavički-Ilić 2005: 41–46 who studies the impact of the Roman monetary system upon the indigenous coinage of the neighbouring Scordisci, including its debasement and weight reduction.

11 Roymans, Aarts 2009: 20, with respect to the situation in the Lower Rhine region; cf. Wigg-Wolf 2011: 302, 311–312, who notices that this development is characteristic for peripheral regions of the “Celtic” world. Поповић (1987: 140–141) came to an identical conclusion with respect to the Scordiscan base-metal coinage of type Srem Phase C.

10 Vidjeti također Tapavički-Ilić 2005: 41–46 koja analizira utjecaj rimskog monetarnog sustava na lokalno kovanje susjednih Skordiska, uključujući procese devalvacije i težinske redukcije.

11 Roymans, Aarts 2009: 20, u kontekstu situacije u području donje Rajne (prijevod autora); usp. Wigg-Wolf 2011: 302, 311–312, koji primjećuje da je ovaj proces karakterističan za periferna područja „keltskog” svijeta. Поповић (1987: 140–141) je došao do istog zaključka u kontekstu kovanica od neplemenitog metala Skordiska u Fazi C tipa Srem.

the coin found in the flooring of a LIA house¹² is identical to the die used to produce another coin from Kuzelin,¹³ as well as the tetradrachm found in the context of a nearby late La Tène settlement at the Zagreb Upper Town.¹⁴ In addition, the same obverse die was used to produce an unprovenanced coin kept at the AMZ,¹⁵ which shares the same pair of dies with two coins found by the illegal users of metal detectors allegedly on two hillforts in modern Lika, Gradina at Bruvno¹⁶ and Obljaj.¹⁷ As always, it would not be prudent to put too much faith in the reports of what are essentially looters, especially since the sites in question are far from the core area of production and distribution of Tauriscan coins. The reverse horse of the AMZ specimen and two "Lika" pieces is more akin to the Samobor horses, but with distinctive Đurđevac horizontal crescent-shaped hooves.¹⁸ In addition, the reverse horse on these three coins has a torque on its neck (best seen on the Obljaj example, but also clearly recognizable on the AMZ piece), which otherwise rarely appears on Tauriscan coins, the exceptions represented in the coin record of the Donje Orešje–Graci and Donja Dolina sites. This group of coins (six in total), which all share the obverse die, while at the same time were produced with two or three reverse dies (it is impossible to ascertain whether the two Kuzelin pieces share the reverse die, while the reverse of the Zagreb Upper Town piece was certainly produced by a different die) might be classified as a group of late Đurđevac coins for which I propose the name "Kuzelin A", on account of the fact that two of these coins were definitely found at the Kuzelin hillfort. Their presence suggests the existence of a regional production centre or travelling workshop, active in the Zagreb region during the Lt D1 period. It seems unlikely that this issue should be understood as a product of counterfeiters, with intent to pass their debased products for "genuine" Tauriscan co-

ne kuće¹² identičan je onome koji je korišten za izradu još jedne kovanice s Kuzelina,¹³ kao i tetradrachme pronađene u kontekstu obližnjeg kasnolatenskog naselja na poziciji Zagreb – Gornji grad.¹⁴ Nadalje, isti taj aversni pečat korišten je za izradu jedne kovanice bez zabilježenog mjesta nalaza, koja se čuva u AMZ-u,¹⁵ dok ta kovanica dijeli isti par pečata s dvije kovanice pronađene ilegalnom upotrebom detektora metala, navodno na dva gradinska položaja u Lici, Gradini kod Bruvna¹⁶ i Obljaju.¹⁷ Kao i uvijek, ne bi bilo mudro previše vjerovati podacima dobivenim u ilegalnim aktivnostima, osobito stoga što se navedena dva lokaliteta nalaze daleko izvan središnjeg područja proizvodnje i distribucije taurišćanskih kovanica. Reversni prikaz konja na kovanici iz AMZ-a i dvije kovanice iz „Like“ sličniji je samoborskim prikazima, ali ipak ima specifična đurđevačka kopita u obliku polumjeseca.¹⁸ Nadalje, prikaz konja na reversu tih triju primjeraka uključuje torkves na životinjinom vratu (najbolje se vidi na primjerku iz Obljaja, ali također je jasno prikazan na primjerku iz AMZ-a), koji se inače rijetko pojavljuje na taurišćanskim kovanicama, s iznimkama u numizmatičkim zapisima s lokaliteta Donje Orešje – Graci i Donja Dolina. Ova grupa od ukupno šest kovanica, koje sve dijele aversni pečat, dok su istovremeno izrađene s dva ili tri reversna pečata (nije moguće utvrditi dijele li dva kuzelinska primjerka reversni pečat, dok je revers primjerka sa zagrebačkog Gornjeg grada sigurno izrađen drugačijim pečatom), mogu se klasificirati u tip kasnih đurđevačkih kovova za koji predlažem naziv „Kuzelin A“, na osnovu činjenice što su dva primjerka ovog tipa sigurno pronađena unutar kuzelinskog naselja. Njihovo prisustvo na lokalitetu sugerira postojanje lokalnog središta proizvodnje ili putujuće radionice, aktivne na području Zagreba tijekom razdoblja Lt D1. Čini se malo vjerojatnim da se ovo izdanje treba smatrati produktom krivotvoritelja, s namjerom da njihovi devalvirani kovovi „prođu“

12 Sokol 200: 1 no. 4 = MPS 169/94 (in publications) = MPS 4184 (actual inv. no.).
13 MPS 8338.

14 MGZ 499 A (Škoberne 1994: 32, 67–68); for the context: Majnarić-Pandžić 1994: 3, 11; 2009: 202, 205. Unfortunately, there is no information on the precise depositional context of this find. The site in question is the Zagreb City Museum – Poor Clares (Clarisse) Monastery.

15 AMZ inv. no. A919, weight 8.34 g, containing only 5.5% of silver.

16 8.02 g (unpublished). I am grateful to Mato Ilkić for bringing my attention to and providing data for this coin.

17 7.99 g (Cesarik, Kramberger 2018: 125, 138–139, no. 44).

18 Although the horizontal crescent-shaped hooves do appear on some types of coins from the Samobor hoard (Liščić type IV, Liščić 1978: 248, T. III: 23; TKN Đurđevac 48–114), the hooves on this particular coin appear quite distinctly of the Đurđevac type.

12 Sokol 2001: br. 4 = MPS 169/94 (u publikacijama) = MPS 4184 (stvarni inv. br.).
13 MPS 8338.

14 MGZ 499 A (Škoberne 1994: 32, 67–68); za kontekst: Majnarić-Pandžić 1994: 3, 11; 2009: 202, 205. Nažalost, informacije o preciznom kontekstu odlaganja ove kovanice nisu dostupne. Pozicija o kojoj se radi je Muzej grada Zagreba – Samostan Klarisa.

15 AMZ inv. br. A919, težina 8,34 g, sadrži svega 5,5 % srebra.

16 8,02 g (neobjavljeno). Zahvaljujem Mati Ilkiću što me upozorio na postojanje ove kovanice te mi pružio podatke o njoj.

17 7.99 g (Cesarik, Kramberger 2018: 125, 138–139, br. 44).

18 Iako se kopita u obliku horizontalno postavljenog polumjeseca ponekad pojavljuju na nekim tipovima kovanica iz samoborske ostave (Liščićev tip IV, Liščić 1978: 248, T. III: 23; TKN Đurđevac 48–114), kopita na ovim specifičnim kovanicama prikazana su na način osobit za đurđevački tip.

ins (attested in the large hoards and containing a larger share of silver). Since a metallurgical analysis was conducted on only a single coin of this type (AMZ A919: Cu 72%, Ag 5.5%, Sn 5.5%), it would be hasty to generalise from this insufficient data, but provisionally it could be claimed that all the known coins of this type were produced of a copper alloy containing a small share of silver. Nevertheless, it should rather be understood as an uninterrupted continuation of previous tradition of coin-production in the region attested for the Lt C2 and/or Lt C2/D1 period.

kao „izvorni“ tauriščanski novac (potvrđen u velikim ostavama, a sadržavao je veći udio srebra). Kako je metalurška analiza izvršena na samo jednoj kovanici ovog tipa (AMZ A919: Cu 72 %, Ag 5,5 %, Sn 5,5 %), bilo bi brzopleto izvlačiti generalizirane zaključke iz očito nedostatnih podataka, ali provizorno se može tvrditi da su sve poznate kovanice ovog tipa bile načinjene od slitine bakra s manjim udjelom srebra. Bez obzira na to, ova pojava mora se razumjeti kao neprekinuti nastavak ranije tradicije proizvodnje kovanica u regiji, potvrđene u razdobljima Lt C2 i/ili Lt C2/D1.



Fig. 3 — Coins of the Kuzelin A type: 1–2 Kuzelin (1 MPS 4184, photo by: I. Krajcar; 2 MPS 8338, photo by: I. Krajcar; with permission of the MPS); 3 Zagreb Upper Town (MGZ 499 A, photo by: M. Gregl; with permission of the MGZ); 4 AMZ A919 (photo by: I. Krajcar); 5 Obljaj (private collection, photo by: V. Kramberger; Cesarik, Kramberger 2018: 139, no. 44); 6 Gradina at Bruvno (private collection, photo by: M. Ilkić, reproduced with permission)

Sl. 3 — Kovanice tipa Kuzelin A: 1–2 Kuzelin (1 MPS 4184, snimio: I. Krajcar; 2 MPS 8338, snimio: I. Krajcar; s dozvolom MPS); 3 Zagreb Gornji grad (MGZ 499 A, snimio: M. Gregl; s dozvolom MGZ); 4 AMZ A919 (snimio: I. Krajcar); 5 Obljaj (privatna zbirka, snimio: V. Kramberger; Cesarik, Kramberger 2018: 139, br. 44); 6 Gradina at Bruvno (privatna zbirka, snimio: M. Ilkić, objavljeno s dozvolom)

Another copper alloy imitation belonging to the group of coins that can be subsumed under an umbrella-term “coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition” was also found at Kuzelin.¹⁹ The reverse die used to produce this piece is clearly related to the one used for another late Đurđevac coin excavated at Kuzelin,²⁰ suggesting the existence of another local variant of late Đurđevac coins perhaps produced in some connection with or at the very site. In addition, the AMZ holds another similar coin, unfortunately of unknown provenance,²¹ while another coin of unknown provenance produced by an

Na Kuzelinu je pronađena još jedna imitacija izrađena od slitine bakra koja se može podvesti pod široki termin „kovanica izrađenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji“.¹⁹ Reversni pečat iskorišten za kovanje ovog primjerka jasno je povezan s pečatom kojim je iskovana još jedna kasna đurđevačka kovanica s Kuzelina,²⁰ što sugerira postojanje još jedne lokalne varijante kasnih đurđevačkih kovanica, možda izrađenih u nekoj vezi s lokalitetom ili na samom lokalitetu. Nadalje, sličan primjerak čuva se u AMZ-u, nažalost bez zabilježenog mjesta nalaza,²¹ dok je još jedna kovanica nepoznate provenijence, koja se pojavila na

19 MPS 7377 (9,70 g).

20 Sokol 2001: no. 2 = MPS 167/94 (in publications) = MPS 4186 (actual inv. no.).

21 AMZ A14013 (8,98 g).

19 MPS 7377 (9,70 g).

20 Sokol 2001: br. 2 = MPS 167/94 (u publikacijama) = MPS 4186 (stvarni inv. br.).

21 AMZ A14013 (8,98 g).




Fig. 4 — Distribution of Kuzelin A coins: 1 Kuzelin; 2 Zagreb; 3 Obljaj; 4 Bruvno; white line: the approximate southern extension of the Mokronog group (base map: Google Earth. Data SIO, NOAA, U.S. Navy, NGA, GEBCO. Image Landsat / Copernicus) (made by: T. Bilić)

Sl. 4 — Distribucija kovanica tipa Kuzelin A: 1 Kuzelin; 2 Zagreb; 3 Obljaj; 4 Bruvno; bijela linija: približna južna granica rasprostranja mokronoške skupine (podloga: Google Earth. Data SIO, NOAA, U.S. Navy, NGA, GEBCO. Image Landsat / Copernicus) (izradio: T. Bilić)

almost identical pair of dies appeared at an auction in 2005.²² The dies used for the obverses of these coins are clearly related to the one used to produce MPS 7377 from Kuzelin, while their reverses belong to the same type with the two Kuzelin coins.²³ Even though it is not possible to ascertain the find site of these coins, it seems safe to presume that they were found,

aukciji 2005. godine, otkovana gotovo identičnim parom pečata.²² Pečati kojima su izrađeni aversi tih kovanica jasno su povezani s pečatom kojim je otkovan primjerak MPS 7377 s Kuzelina, dok njihovi reversi pripadaju istom tipu kao i oni dva-ju kuzelinskih primjeraka.²³ Iako nije moguće sa sigurnošću utvrditi mjesto nalaska tih kovanica, čini se sigurnim pretpostaviti da su pronađene,

22 H. D. Rauch, Auction 76, Lot 47, October 17, 2005 (11,32 g).
23 MPS 7377 and MPS 167/94 (in publications) = MPS 4186 (actual inv. no.).

22 H. D. Rauch, aukcija 76, br. 47, 17. listopada, 2005. (11,32 g).
23 MPS 7377 i MPS 167/94 (u publikacijama) = MPS 4186 (stvarni inv. br.).

as well as produced, somewhere in the region. This especially applies to the AMZ specimen. These four coins might be classified in a group of late Đurđevac coins for which I propose the name "Kuzelin B", on account of the fact that two out of four coins from this group were definitely found at the Kuzelin hillfort.²⁴

istovremeno i izrađene, negdje u regiji. To se osobito odnosi na primjerak iz AMZ-a. Te četiri kovanice mogu se klasificirati kao tip kasnih đurđevačkih kovova za koji predlažem naziv „Kuzelin B“, na osnovu činjenice što su dva od ukupno četiri primjerka ovog tipa sigurno pronađena unutar kuzelinskog naselja.²⁴



Fig. 5 — Coins of the Kuzelin B type: 1–2 Kuzelin (1 MPS 4186, photo by: I. Krajcar; 2 MPS 7377, photo by: I. Krajcar); 3 AMZ A14013 (photo by: I. Krajcar); 4 H. D. Rauch, Auction 76, Lot 47, October 17, 2005 (made by: T. Bilić)

Sl. 5 — Kovanice tipa Kuzelin B: 1–2 Kuzelin (1 MPS 4186, snimio: I. Krajcar; 2 MPS 7377, snimio: I. Krajcar); 3 AMZ A14013 (snimio: I. Krajcar); 4 H. D. Rauch, Aukcija 76, Lot 47, 17. listopada 2005 (izradio: T. Bilić)

In addition, the obverse of another "mostly silver" coin (8.67 g) from Kuzelin is reminiscent of Đurđevac depictions (especially the ear), although not attributable to any specific die from the eponymous hoard, but also shows some not insignificant affinity with Samobor obverses; at the same time, its reverse is somewhat similar to the atypical TKN 117 Đurđevac reverse die.²⁵ It is possible to compare the obverse of this coin with a chance find from the Osječenica hillfort in the Banija region near the village of Gorička. The latter coin was published as an "early Samobor B" on the authority of P. Kos (Bilić 2017: 242, Tab. 1: no. 35, 244, n. 1), which would correspond to the Samobor Transitional type, a series of dies representing a transitional phase of production between the Samobor and Đurđevac coins, which primarily occurs in the Samobor–Okić ho-

Dodatno, avers još jedne „uglavnom srebrne“ kovanice (8,67 g) s Kuzelina podsjeća na đurđevačke prikaze (osobito uho), iako se ne može pripisati nekom specifičnom pečatu iz eponimne ostave, ali također pokazuje neke nezanemarive sličnosti sa samoborskim aversima; istovremeno, revers ove kovanice nalik je atipičnom reversnom pečatu TKN 117 đurđevačkog tipa.²⁵ Avers ovog primjerka moguće je usporediti sa slučajnim nalazom s gradine Osječenica na Baniji, u blizini sela Gorička. Kovanica s Osječenice publicirana je kao „rani Samobor B tip“ prema determinaciji P. Kosa (Bilić 2017: 242, tab. 1: br. 35, 244, bilj. 1), što bi odgovaralo samoborskom Prijelaznom tipu, seriji pečata koji predstavljaju prijelaznu fazu produkcije između kovanica tipa Samobor i Đurđevac, a koji se primarno pojavljuju u ostavi Samobor–Okić (Bilić: u tisku). Uistinu,

24 The Kuzelin B type shows some clear similarities to the uncharacteristic TKN 52-118 die-combination, which was, naturally, not present in the Đurđevac hoard (cf. TKN p. 103).

25 Sokol 2001: 12, no. 5 (with an actual photograph of the coin on p. 13) = MPS 7374 (cf. TKN p. 103).

24 Tip kovanica Kuzelin B pokazuje određene nezanemarive sličnosti s atipičnom kombinacijom pečata TKN 52-118, koja, naravno, nije zastupljena u đurđevačkoj ostavi (usp. TKN str. 103).

25 Sokol 2001: 12, br. 5 (fotografija opisane kovanice na str. 13) = MPS 7374 (usp. TKN str. 103).

ard (Bilić: forthcoming). Indeed, both the obverse and reverse of this coin show affinities with the Samobor Transitional coins, but do not share dies with the coins of this type from the Samobor–Okić hoard. The coin was – together with another, further unspecified Tauriscan tetradrachm (Bilić 2017: 243, Tab. 1: no. 53)²⁶ – found by a local enthusiast (Ožanić 1998: 36). It appears that these two coins are the only tangible evidence for the postulated LIA settlement on the hillfort, since no other material is documented in the studies discussing the site, as opposed to the material from the Late Bronze Age, Early Iron Age and the Roman period (Durman 1992: 126–127; Ožanić 1998: 27–29). Although this is somewhat precarious, it does not seem too bold to presuppose the existence of a settlement at a site that was continuously occupied for such a long

i avers i revers ove kovanice pokazuju sličnost sa samoborskim Prijelaznim tipom, ali ipak ona ne dijeli pečate s kovanicama ovog tipa iz ostave Samobor–Okić. Kovanicu s Osječenice – zajedno s još jednom, pobliže nedefiniranom, tauriščanskom tetradrahmom (Bilić 2017: 243, tab. 1: br. 53)²⁶ – pronašao je lokalni zaljubljenik u arheologiju (Ožanić 1998: 36). Čini se da su te dvije kovanice jedini opipljivi dokaz za pretpostavljeno postojanje mlađeželjeznodobnog naselja na gradini jer drugi materijal iz tog razdoblja nije dokumentiran u studijama koje raspravljaju o lokalitetu, nasuprot nalazima iz kasnog brončanog i ranog željeznog doba te rimskog razdoblja (Durman 1992: 126–127; Ožanić 1998: 27–29). Iako je to možda donekle nesigurno, ipak se ne čini previše odvažnim pretpostaviti postojanje mlađeželjeznodobnog naselja na lokalitetu koji je



Fig. 6 — Coins from Kuzelin (1 MPS 7374, photo by: I. Krajcar) and Osječenica (2, courtesy of A. Durman)
Sl. 6 — Kovanice s Kuzelina (1 MPS 7374, snimio: I. Krajcar) i Osječenici (2, ljubaznošću A. Durmana)

period and, at the same time, to postulate that the Tauriscan coins recovered from Osječenica indeed belong to this occupational horizon.

Finally, a “mostly silver” coin (9.60 g) from Kuzelin should also most likely be classified as inspired by Đurđevac tetradrachms; it apparently cannot be matched with any of the dies used to produce the actual coins from the Đurđevac hoard (not enough diagnostic elements that would enable a more secure identification are preserved).²⁷

bio kontinuirano naseljen tako dugo vremena te, istovremeno, pretpostaviti da tauriščanske kovanice pronađene na Osječenici uistinu pripadaju tom horizontu korištenja lokaliteta.

Naposljetku, „uglavnom srebrnu” kovanicu (9,60 g) s Kuzelina najvjerojatnije treba klasificirati kao kovanicu inspiriranu đurđevačkim tetradrahmama; čini da ju se ne može povezati s bilo kojim od pečata korištenim za proizvodnju kovanica iz same đurđevačke ostave (za sigurniju identifikaciju nije sačuvano dovoljno dijagnostičkih elemenata).²⁷

26 Durman (1991: 93) and Ožanić (1998: 28, 36) classify both coins as Samobor-type tetradrachms, but I have not seen the other specimen.

27 Sokol 2001: 13 no. 6 (with an actual photograph of the coin on p. 12) = MPS 7375.

26 Durman (1991: 93) i Ožanić (1998: 28, 36) klasificiraju obje kovanice kao tetradrahe samoborskog tipa, ali taj drugi primjerak nisam imao prilike vidjeti.

27 Sokol 2001: 13 br. 6 (fotografija opisane kovanice na str. 12) = MPS 7375.

no. / br.	inv. no. / inv. br.	archaeological information / arheološki podaci	type / tip	metal / bullion (Sokol 2001)	weight / težina (g)	bibliography / literatura
1	MPS 4179 (in publications 166/94) / MPS 4179 (u publikacijama 166/94)	1991, q. 11B / 1991., kv. 11B	Zickzackgruppe OTA 459–461 var	silver / srebro	10.10	Sokol 1994a: no. 118; 1994b: no. 1; 2001: no. 1 / Sokol 1994a:br. 118; 1994b: br. 1; 2001: br. 1
2	MPS 7376		Samobor A, TKN 28a-90	alloyed silver / legura bakra i srebra	7.96	Sokol 2001: no. 7 / Sokol 2001: br. 7
3	MPS 4185 (in publications 168/94) / MPS 4185 (u publikacijama 168/94)	1983, trench 4, along a rampart wall / 1983., sonda 4, uz zemlja- ni bedem	Samobor B, TKN 45 ¹ -109	alloyed silver / legura bakra i srebra	10.55	Sokol 1994a: no. 124; 1994b: no. 3; 2001: no. 3 / Sokol 1994a: br. 124; 1994b: br. 3; 2001: br. 3
4	MPS 7375		Đurđevac (tradition?) / Đurđevac ili đurđevačka tradicija	mostly silver / uglavnom srebro	9.60	Sokol 2001: no. 6 / Sokol 2001: br. 6
5	MPS 7374		Đurđevac (tradition?) / Đurđevac ili đurđevačka tradicija	mostly silver / uglavnom srebro	8.67	Sokol 2001: no. 5 / Sokol 2001: br. 5
6	MPS 4184 (in publications 169/94) / MPS 4184 (u publikacijama 169/94)	1984, trench 6, flooring of a Late Iron Age house / 1984., sonda 6, podnica mlađeželznodobne kuće	Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin A / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin A	alloyed silver / legura bakra i srebra	8.17	Sokol 1994a: no. 123; 1994b: no. 4; 2001: no. 4 / Sokol 1994a: br. 123; 1994b: br. 4; 2001: br. 4
7	MPS 8338	2002	Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin A / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin A	alloyed silver / legura bakra i srebra	7.87	unpublished / neobjavljeno
*	AMZ A919		Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin A / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin A	Cu 72%, Ag 5.5%, Sn 5.5%	8.34	Bilić 2022: Pl. 16: 23 / Bilić 2022: T. 16: 23
*	Gradina kod Bruvna, privatna zbirka / Gradina at Bruvno, private collection		Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin A / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin A	copper alloy, alloyed silver / bakrena slitina, legura bakra i srebra	8.02	unpublished / neobjavljeno
*	Obiljaj, private collection / Obljaj, privatna zbirka		Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin A / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin A	copper alloy, alloyed silver / bakrena slitina, legura bakra i srebra	7.99	Bilić 2022: Pl. 16: 24 / Bilić 2022: T. 16: 24
*	Zagreb Upper Town, MGZ 499 A / Zagreb Gornji grad, MGZ 499 A		Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin A / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin A	copper alloy, alloyed silver / bakrena slitina, legura bakra i srebra	7.88	Bilić 2022: Pl. 16: 25 / Bilić 2022: T. 16: 25
8	MPS 7377	2015	Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin B / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin B	copper alloy, alloyed silver / bakrena slitina, legura bakra i srebra	9.70	Bilić 2022: Pl. 16: 28 / Bilić 2022: T. 16: 28

9	MPS 4186 (in publications MPS 167/94) / MPS 4186 (u publikacijama MPS 167/94)	1991, trench 1 / 1991., sonda 1	Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin B / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin B	copper alloy, alloyed silver / bakrena slitina, legura bakra i srebra	9.46	Sokol 1994a: no. 125; 1994b: no. 2; 2001: no. 2 / Sokol 1994a: br. 125; 1994b: br. 2; 2001: br. 2
*	H. D. Rauch, Auction 76, Lot 47, October 17, 2005 / H. D. Rauch, aukcija 76, br. 47, 17. listopada 2005.		Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin B / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin B	copper alloy, alloyed silver / bakrena slitina, legura bakra i srebra	11.32	
*	AMZ A14013		Đurđevac tradition – Kuzelin B / đurđevačka tradicija – Kuzelin B	copper alloy, alloyed silver / bakrena slitina, legura bakra i srebra	8.98	unpublished / neobjavljeno

Tab. 1 — Late Iron Age Tauriscan coins from Kuzelin (with comparative material marked with *). q = quadrant, AMZ = Archaeological Museum in Zagreb, MGZ = Zagreb City Museum, MPS = Museum of Prigorje (made by: T. Bilić)

Tab. 1 — Mlađeželjeznodobne kovanice Tauriska s Kuzelina (s usporednim nalazima označenima s *). kv = kvadrant, AMZ = Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, MGZ = Muzej grada Zagreba, MPS = Muzej Prigorja (izradio: T. Bilić)

THE DEPOSITION OF COINS AT KUZELIN

Since the site was excavated by a team of professional archaeologists, there is some valuable information on the depositional context for some of the coins. With respect to the deposition of Late Iron Age coins in general, modern scholars have now reached a somewhat counterintuitive conclusion positing the dominance of the ritualistic explanation of the depositional context of Late Iron Age coin finds, at the same time questioning the monetary function of coinage in Late Iron Age societies.²⁸ In this light, the finds of coin hoards attributed to the Taurisci tribal alliance should most likely be understood as primarily originating in a ritualistic context. The Ljublanica hoard, found in a riverbed, might be the clearest example of a votive deposition of Tauriscan coins. It appears that the deposition of this particular coin hoard belongs to a wider practice of votive deposition of different metal objects, in the first place those of military character, that is widely attested for precisely this part of the Ljublanica during the LIA, more precisely, during the period encompassing Lt C2

28 Wigg-Wolf 2018: 15–16: "... a number of recent studies of the contexts of Iron Age coin finds have suggested that ritual aspects played an important, perhaps even the dominant, role in the taphonomy of Iron Age coin finds and that the monetary function of the coinage has been exaggerated".

KONTEKSTI ODLAGANJA KOVANICA NA KUZELINU

Kako je lokalitet istraživala profesionalna arheološka ekipa, dostupne su važne informacije o kontekstu odlaganja nekih od pronađenih kovanica. U kontekstu odlaganja mlađeželjeznodobnih kovanica na općenitoj razini, moderni istraživači su došli do pomalo kontraintuitivnog zaključka o dominaciji ritualističkog objašnjavanja konteksta odlaganja mlađeželjeznodobnih nalaza kovanica, u isto vrijeme propitkujući monetarnu funkciju kovanica u mlađeželjeznodobnim društvima.²⁸ U tom svjetlu, ostave kovanica pripisane taurišćanskoj plemenskoj zajednici mogu se najvjerojatnije razumjeti kao nalazi nastali primarno u ritualnom kontekstu. Ostava iz Ljublanice, pronađena u koritu rijeke, mogla bi biti najjasniji primjer votivnog odlaganja taurišćanskih kovanica. Čini se da se odlaganje ove ostave naslanja na širu praksu votivnih odlaganja različitih metalnih predmeta, u prvom redu onih vojničkog karaktera, koja je obilno potvrđena upravo za ovaj dio korita Ljublanice tijekom mlađeg željeznog doba, preciznije, tijekom

28 Wigg-Wolf 2018: 15–16: "... veći broj recentnih kontekstualnih analiza željeznodobnih kovanica sugerira da je ritualni aspekt imao bitnu, možda i dominantnu, ulogu u tafonomiji željeznodobnih nalaza kovanica te da je monetarna funkcija kovanica bila prenaplašena" (prijevod autora).

and Lt D periods (Gaspari 2007: especially p. 148–149; 2009: especially p. 71; Kos, Šemrov 2003: 381, 388 interpreted the deposition of the hoard in more prosaic terms). Although this conclusion is indeed on safest ground when discussing coin hoards, single finds must also be treated individually by studying, as far as possible, their archaeological context.²⁹

Unfortunately, not many finds fall in that particular category. The LIA coins from the Kuzelin hillfort on Medvednica are thus of special importance since their depositional context can be partially studied. Indeed, one Tauriscan tetradrachm of the local Kuzelin A type was found in the flooring of a LIA house,³⁰ suggesting that it is likelier that it was ritually deposited (perhaps as a foundation deposit), rather than inadvertently lost or intentionally hidden and intended to be retrieved and (re-)used in, for example, market exchange. Another single find from Kuzelin, a coin of the Samobor B type produced by a pair of dies attested in the eponymous hoard, was deposited along a rampart wall,³¹ which also points to a ritualistic context, perhaps representing an apotropaic deposit of some kind or something similar. However, more prosaic explanations cannot be dismissed in either of these two cases.

In addition, one of the coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition from Kuzelin was chop-marked on the obverse.³² Whether its authenticity was doubted and checked during its use in some kind of transaction (here it appears that the scepticism of the receiver of the coin would be warranted) or the chop-mark represented the ritual 'killing' of the coin, in other words, its final demonetisation (van Heesch 2008: 52; Wigg-Wolf 2005: 371–376; 2018: 17–21), cannot be ascertained due to the lack of any contextual information.

The fact that both late Đurđevac copper alloy coins of local production (i.e., perhaps produced at, or in the close connection with, the very site) and the coins that were produced elsewhere in the region – on the same occasion as the coins deposited as the Samobor–Okić hoard – were indiscriminately used in what appear to be votive contexts, suggests that they were treated as objects of equal or similar status and suitable

razdoblja Lt C2 i Lt D (Gaspari 2007: osobito str. 148–149; 2009: osobito str. 71; Kos, Šemrov 2003: 381, 388 interpretiraju odlaganje ove ostave u prozaičnijim terminima). Iako je ovakva interpretacija najsigurnija kada se raspravlja o ostavama kovanica, pojedinačni nalazi se također moraju promatrati od slučaja do slučaja, uzimajući u obzir, koliko je to moguće, njihov arheološki kontekst.²⁹

Nažalost, mali broj nalaza pripada toj kategoriji. Mlađeželjeznodobne kovanice s Kuzelina na Medvednici tako dobivaju na važnosti jer se njihovi konteksti odlaganja mogu barem djelomično analizirati. Tako je jedna tetradrahma lokalnog tipa Kuzelin A pronađena u podnici mlađeželjeznodobne kuće,³⁰ što sugerira da je vjerojatnije ritualno odložena (možda kao votivni prilog prilikom gradnje) nego namjerno skrivena s namjerom da se kasnije povrati i (ponovno) koristi u, npr., tržišnoj razmjeni. Još jedan pojedinačni nalaz s Kuzelina, kovanica tipa Samobor B izrađena parom pečata koji se pojavljuju i u eponimnoj ostavi, odložena je uz zemljani bedem,³¹ što također sugerira ritualni kontekst, možda apotropejske namjene ili slično. S druge strane, u oba slučaja ne smiju se odbaciti ni prozaičnija objašnjenja.

Nadalje, jedna od kovanica s Kuzelina izrađenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji zarezana je na aversu.³² Zbog nedostatka bilo kakvih informacija o kontekstu nalaza, nije moguće utvrditi je li ovdje na djelu posljedica sumnje u autentičnost predmeta koja je bila provjerena tijekom neke transakcije (u ovom slučaju skepticizam primaatelja bio bi opravdan) ili urez predstavlja ritualno „ubijanje“ kovanice, drugim riječima, njezinu konačnu demonetizaciju (van Heesch 2008: 52; Wigg-Wolf 2005: 371–376; 2018: 17–21).

Obzirom da su i lokalne kasne đurđevačke kovanice načinjene od slitine bakra (tj. one koje su možda otkovane na samom lokalitetu ili u bliskoj vezi s njim) i kovanice proizvedene drugdje u regiji – istom prilikom kada su izrađene i kovanice koje su odložene kao ostava Samobor–Okić – bile bez diskriminacije korištene u, barem naizgled, votivnom kontekstu, izgledno je da su tretirane kao predmeti istog ili sličnog statusa, prikladni za iste ili slične namjene. Nažalost, nije moguće utvrditi kontekst

29 An earlier form of this discussion appears in Bilić 2022: 144.

30 Sokol 2001: no. 4 = MPS 169/94 (in publications) = MPS 4184 (actual inv. no.).

31 Sokol 2001: no. 3 = MPS 168/94 (in publications) = MPS 4185 (actual inv. no.).

32 MPS 7377 (9.70 g).

29 Ranija verzija ove rasprave pojavljuje se u Bilić 2022: 144.

30 Sokol 2001: br. 4 = MPS 169/94 (u publikacijama) = MPS 4184 (stvarni inv. br.).

31 Sokol 2001; br. 3 = MPS 168/94 (u publikacijama) = MPS 4185 (stvarni inv. br.).

32 MPS 7377 (9,70 g).

for identical or similar uses. It is unfortunately impossible to ascertain the depositional context of the rest of the Kuzelin numismatic assemblage, but since two out of nine specimens were deposited in a context that can be interpreted as non-utilitarian, it is possible to think in similar terms on the – at least potential – function of the remainder of the assemblage. This does not mean that votive context was the only setting in which the LIA coins at Kuzelin were used – coins can be used in different situations during their lifetime – but it is the most tangible context at our disposal. Indeed, the coins struck on the same occasion as the coins deposited as the Samobor–Okić hoard must have had a different function in the transaction between the minting authority responsible for their production and the receiver or receivers of the specific coins that ended up at Kuzelin. They might have been used as tokens of goodwill between the two parties involved in the transaction, or as a payment for some past or future service, or they could have been brought home from a public gathering held at a relatively nearby site as tokens or mementos of the – obviously important – event, whether of a unique or cyclical occurrence.

CONCLUSION

The hillfort settlement at Kuzelin near Zagreb has yielded a number of LIA coins in controlled archaeological excavations. Other objects of material culture recovered from the settlement are characteristic for the Lt D1 phase, so the coins must have been deposited, and most of them plausibly also produced, in the period ca. 150/130–70/50 BC. One of the coins was deposited at a rampart wall, while it was apparently produced ca. 40 km to the south-west, at Gradec near Okić, together with the rest of the coins in the Samobor–Okić hoard. Its deposition context strongly suggests a votive function, and the coin was perhaps intentionally brought to the site for this particular – or one very similar – purpose. Another Tauriscan coin was apparently intentionally deposited within the Kuzelin settlement: a debased and reduced tetradrachm produced in the Đurđevac tradition was thus found in a flooring of an LIA house, perhaps representing a foundation deposit, or a coin deposited on some other occasion in the building's biography. Naturally, other, more prosaic, interpretations of this type of find are always possible (Horsnæs 2018: 115, 117).

odlaganja ostalih kovanica koje pripadaju kuzelinskom numizmatičkom zapisu, ali obzirom da su dva od ukupno devet primjeraka bila odložena u kontekstu koji se može interpretirati kao neutilitaran, moguće je u sličnim terminima razmišljati i o – barem potencijalnoj – funkciji ostalih numizmatičkih nalaza. Ovo ne znači da je odlaganje u votivnom kontekstu jedini način na koji su mlađeželjeznodobne kovanice korištene na Kuzelinu – kovanice mogu biti korištene u različitim situacijama tijekom svojeg postojanja – ali je najopipljiviji kontekst kojeg možemo prepoznati. Uistinu, kovanice izrađene istom prigodom kao i one odložene kao ostava Samobor–Okić morale su imati različitu funkciju u kontekstu transakcije između kovničkog autoriteta odgovornog za njihovu izradu i primatelja specifičnih kovanica koje su dospjele na Kuzelin. One su mogle biti korištene kao zalag dobre volje između dvaju strana uključenih u transakciju ili naknada za neku prošlu ili buduću uslugu, ili su mogle biti donijete na Kuzelin s nekog javnog okupljanja održanog na lokaciji u relativnoj blizini kao zalozi ili podsjetnici na – očito bitni – događaj, bilo jedinstvene ili cikličke prirode.

ZAKLJUČAK

U kontroliranim arheološkim istraživanjima vinskog utvrđenog naselja na Kuzelinu kraj Zagreba pronađen je nezanemarivi broj mlađeželjeznodobnih kovanica. Ostali predmeti materijalne kulture pronađeni unutar naselja karakteristični su za period Lt D1, što znači da su kovanice morale biti odložene – a većina njih vjerojatno i izrađene – u razdoblju 150./130. – 70./50. g. pr. Kr. Jedna od kovanica odložena je uz zemljani bedem, nakon što je bila otkovana oko 40 km jugozapadno od Kuzelina, uz lokalitet Gradec kod Okića, zajedno s ostalim kovanicama iz ostave Samobor–Okić. Njezin kontekst odlaganja snažno sugerira votivnu funkciju, a kovanica je možda i donesena na lokalitet upravo zbog ove specifične – ili neke slične – svrhe. Još jedna taurišćanska kovanica s lokaliteta Kuzelin je vjerojatno namjerno odložena: riječ je o devalviranoj i reduciranoj tetradrahmi izrađenoj u đurđevačkoj tradiciji koja je pronađena u podnici mlađeželjeznodobne kuće, a koja možda predstavlja votivni prilog prilikom gradnje ili polog odložen prigodom nekog drugog značajnog momenta u biografiji građevine. Naravno, prozaičnije interpretacije ovakvih nalaza su uvijek moguće (Horsnæs 2018: 115, 117). Isto-

At the same time, this particular coin unequivocally proves that the coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition were already struck during the Lt D1 period. In addition, the obverse die used to produce this coin is identical to the die used to produce the Zagreb Upper Town coin found in the context of a late La Tène (i.e., Lt D) settlement and another debased and reduced tetradrachm produced in the Đurđevac tradition found at Kuzelin, while the reverses of these three coins are clearly related. I have classified these three coins as of the Kuzelin A type. Their existence suggests the presence of a regional production centre or travelling workshop, which supplied coins not only to these two hillfort sites on the slopes of Medvednica ca. 20 km apart as the crow flies, but also, apparently (that is, if we put our trust in the reports of illegal users of metal detectors), to hillfort sites in Lika more than 150 km to the south, far outside the area occupied by the Taurisci (Bilić 2022: 134).³³

Several more coins found at Kuzelin hillfort support the Lt D1 date for the coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition. Two coins in particular, judging by their weight, appear to be early imitations of standard Đurđevac tetradrachms.³⁴ Moreover, the reverse dies used to produce these coins are clearly related, testifying to the existence of another local variant of Đurđevac coins, which I have classified as Kuzelin B type, perhaps produced at the very site of Kuzelin, or at least for a minting authority in control of the hillfort.³⁵ Furthermore, one coin from Kuzelin was chop-marked on the obverse. In the light of the apparently intentional and purposeful depositions of other coins at Kuzelin it could be argued that the chop-mark here represents the ritual “killing” of the coin, but other interpretations are also possible.

It appears that no “Đurđevac-type” coins from Kuzelin show a die-relation with the coins from the eponymous hoard (as opposed to the Samobor coins from the site). Some of them clearly belong to the category of coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition (debased and reduced coins of poor workmanship), whi-

vremeno, ova kovanica nedvojbeno dokazuje da su kovanice izrađene u đurđevačkoj tradiciji bile kovane već tijekom razdoblja Lt D1. Uz to, aversni pečat kojim je ova kovanica izrađena identičan je pečatu kojim je proizveden primjerak pronađen u kontekstu kasnolatenskog (tj. Lt D) naselja na zagrebačkom Gornjem gradu te još jedna devalvirana i reducirana tetradrahma izrađena u đurđevačkoj tradiciji s Kuzelina, dok su reversi ove tri kovanice nesumnjivo povezani. Ove tri kovanice sam klasificirao kao tip Kuzelin A. Njihovo postojanje sugerira prisustvo regionalnog proizvodnog centra ili putujuće radionice, koji je kovanicama opskrbljivao ne samo ta dva visinska lokaliteta na padinama Medvednice međusobno udaljena oko 20 km zračnom linijom, već i, izgleda (tj. ako vjerujemo ilegalnim korisnicima detektora metala), gradinske lokalitete u Lici, više od 150 km južnije, daleko izvan područja koje su kontrolirali Taurisci (Bilić 2022: 134).³³

Još nekoliko kovanica pronađenih na Kuzelinu podupire dataciju kovanica proizvedenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji u razdoblje Lt D1. Dvije kovanice, sudeći prema njihovoj težini, čine se ranim imitacijama standardnih đurđevačkih tetradrahmi.³⁴ Štoviše, reversni pečati kojima su otkovani ti primjerci jasno su povezani, što svjedoči o postojanju još jedne lokalne varijante đurđevačkih kovanica, koje sam klasificirao kao tip Kuzelin B, a koji je možda bio kovan na samom lokalitetu ili barem za kovnički autoritet koji je kontrolirao ovu visinsku utvrdu.³⁵ Nadalje, jedna kovanica s Kuzelina bila je zarezana na aversu. U svjetlu izvjesno namjernih i smislenih odlaganja drugih kovanica na Kuzelinu može se tvrditi da usjek u ovom slučaju predstavlja ritualno „ubojstvo“ kovanice, iako su moguće i drugačije interpretacije.

Čini se da niti jedna kovanica „đurđevačkog tipa“ pronađena na Kuzelinu nije povezana pečatima s tetradrahmama iz eponimne ostave (za razliku od kovanica tipa Samobor pronađenih na lokalitetu). Neke od njih jasno pripadaju kategoriji kovanica izrađenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji (devalvirani i reducirani primjerci slabe izvedbe), dok se druge čine bližima izvornome tipu, ali nedovoljno da bi ih se nedvojbeno klasificiralo kao

33 This inference is further contradicted by the documented LIA preference for the use of gold in long-distance and less frequent contacts, as opposed to the more localized and habitual use of silver coins (Pudney 2019: 34, summarizing Leins 2012).

34 Sokol 2001: 10, no. 2; MPS 167/94 (in publications) = MPS 4186 (actual inv. no.) (9.46 g); MPS 7377 (9.70 g) (Bilić 2022: 137–138).

35 The proposition of Kuzelin hillfort as either the place of issue or the seat of the minting authority that commissioned these coins is admittedly highly conjectural.

33 Ovaj zaključak je dalje kontradiktoran u odnosu na dokumentirano mladeželjeznodobno preferiranje korištenja zlata u manje frekventnim kontaktima te onima ostvarivanima preko većih udaljenosti, nasuprot lokaliziranim i uobičajenijem korištenju srebrnih kovanica (Pudney 2019: 34, sumirajući Leins 2012).

34 Sokol 2001: 10, br. 2; MPS 167/94 (u publikacijama) = MPS 4186 (stvarni inv. br.) (9,46 g); MPS 7377 (9,70 g) (Bilić 2022: 137–138).

35 Prijedlozi po kojima je lokalitet Kuzelin bio proizvodno središte ili sjedište kovničkog autoriteta odgovornog za narudžbu kovanica su, naravno, uvijek samo hipotetični.

le others appear closer to the core type, but certainly not close enough to be unequivocally classified as Đurđevac type tetradrachms (that is, those that can be related to the dies used in the production of coins from the eponymous hoard). The Kuzelin assemblage might suggest that these two related groups (the Đurđevac type tetradrachms and those produced in the Đurđevac tradition) were produced and/or used simultaneously during the Lt D1 period. Alternatively, one could classify all Kuzelin Tauriscan coins under the category of coins produced in the Đurđevac tradition. Only future studies, including the metallurgical analysis of the coins from Kuzelin, will make a more informed choice between these two alternatives possible.

Thus, the numismatic record from Kuzelin testifies to both the debasement and weight reduction of Tauriscan, in the first place Đurđevac, coinage. Since it was persuasively established that the archaeological material from the site belongs exclusively to the La Tène D1 phase, in absolute dates, ca. 150/130–70/50 BC, it is likely that both debasement and weight reduction were already current in this early period, although certainly not so radically as that evidenced at, for example, the Donje Orešje–Graci site.

Finally, the chronological position of archaeological finds from Kuzelin corresponds to the absolute chronology (as understood at present) of the Late Iron Age coins found at the site. In contrast, the LIA coins from the Donje Orešje–Graci site can hardly belong to such an early period (even though this cannot be conclusively excluded), and the Late Iron Age coins on these two sites likely belong to different chronological horizons. At the same time, as already mentioned, after the LIA settlement on the Kuzelin ceased to function, probably during the late 1st century BC, there is no record of Roman presence until the second half of the 2nd century AD, which, from a numismatic perspective, partially corresponds to the situation at the Donje Orešje–Graci site, as noted above (Bilić 2022: 138). Thus, a process of coin-production that involved the use of base-metal alloys and reduction in size and weight of flans, occurring simultaneously or in succession at different sites throughout the south-western Pannonia, can be observed in the numismatic record of several sites. At present, it does not seem possible to recognize a linear development of debasement and/or reduction, which, in any case, seems improbable.

tetradrahme tipa Đurđevac (tj. one koje se mogu povezati s pečatima kojima su izrađene kovanice iz eponimne ostave). Kuzelinski nalazi možda sugeriraju da su te dvije povezane grupe (tetradrahme tipa Đurđevac i kovanice proizvedene u đurđevačkoj tradiciji) bile izrađivane i/ili korištene istovremeno tijekom razdoblja Lt D1. Alternativno, sve taurišćanske kovanice s Kuzelina mogu se svrstati u kategoriju kovanica proizvedenih u đurđevačkoj tradiciji. Samo će buduće studije, uključujući metaluršku analizu kuzelinskih nalaza, omogućiti donošenje utemeljenijeg izbora između ove dvije interpretacije.

Na ovaj način, kuzelinski numizmatički nalazi svjedoče i devalvaciji i redukciji u težini taurišćanskih, u prvom redu đurđevačkih, kovanica. Kako je uvjerljivo utvrđeno da arheološki materijal s lokaliteta pripada isključivo razdoblju La Tène D1, u apsolutnim terminima, oko 150./130. – 70-/50. g. pr. Kr., vjerojatno su i devalvacija i redukcija u težini bile aktualne već u ovom ranom razdoblju, iako sigurno ne u tako radikalnom obliku kao što se pojavljuju, npr., na lokalitetu Donje Orešje – Graci.

Konačno, kronološki položaj arheoloških nalaza s Kuzelina odgovara apsolutnoj kronologiji (kako se ona u ovom trenutku shvaća) mlađeželjeznodobnih kovanica pronađenih na lokalitetu. Nasuprot ovome, mlađeželjeznodobne kovanice s lokaliteta Donje Orešje – Graci teško mogu pripadati tako ranom razdoblju (iako se to ne može u potpunosti isključiti) te mlađeželjeznodobne kovanice s ta dva lokaliteta najvjerojatnije pripadaju dvama različitim vremenskim horizontima. Istovremeno, kao što je već spomenuto, nakon što je mlađeželjeznodobno naselje na Kuzelinu prestalo funkcionirati, vjerojatno tijekom kasnog 1. st. pr. Kr., rimsko prisustvo na lokalitetu nije zabilježeno sve do druge polovice 2. st. po Kr., što, iz numizmatičke perspektive, djelomično odgovara situaciji na lokalitetu Donje Orešje – Graci, kako je ranije primijećeno (Bilić 2022: 138). Tako je kroz numizmatičke zapise različitih lokaliteta moguće pratiti proces proizvodnje kovanica, koji uključuje upotrebu slitina ne-plemenitih metala te redukciju u promjeru i težini kovnih pločica, koji se istovremeno ili sukcesivno odvijao na različitim lokalitetima diljem jugozapadne Panonije. U ovom trenutku ne čini se mogućim prepoznati linearni razvitak devalvacije i/ili redukcije, što se, u svakom slučaju, ionako ne čini kao izgledni scenarij.

Dodatno, moguće je prepoznati mrežu lokalnih središta proizvodnje, među kojima se Kuze-

In addition, a network of local centres of production can be recognized, among which Kuzelin seems an especially prominent node. Locally produced coins were apparently used indiscriminately alongside those produced at other sites in the region and, occasionally, beyond. It seems that some echoes of peer polity interactions between Gradec at Okić and Kuzelin can be detected in their respective coin records, although it is difficult to interpret conclusively the data in these terms at the present state of our knowledge.³⁶

lin čini osobito istaknutim čvorištem. Čini se da su lokalno proizvedene kovanice korištene bez diskriminacije uz primjerke otkovane na drugim lokalitetima u regiji te, ponekad, i u udaljenijim središtima. Moguće je možda primjetiti i određene odjeke istorazinskih interakcija između zajednica s Gradeca kod Okića i Kuzelina u njihovim numizmatičkim zapisima, iako je vrlo teško sa sigurnošću interpretirati podatke u ovim terminima u kontekstu sadašnjih spoznaja.³⁶

Prijevod Translation TOMISLAV BILIĆ
Lektura Proofreading MARKO MARAS

36 For a fuller elaboration of this hypothesis see Bilić: forthcoming. For analogous use of the peer polity interaction (PPI) model in explaining the spread of coinage within ancient Greece see Renfrew 1986: 11; Howgego 1995: 16. For a suggestion that the LIA coinage spread following the same model see Champion, Champion 1986: 68. On the PPI see Renfrew 1986: especially p. 7–8. For an application of the PPI model on the communities of south-eastern Pannonia in the 2nd to 1st century BC (traditionally, the area occupied by the Scordisci), see briefly Mihajlović 2019: 245.

36 Za potpuniju raspravu o ovoj hipotezi vidjeti Bilić: u tisku. Za analognu upotrebu modela istorazinske interakcije za objašnjenje širenja novca unutar antičke Grčke vidi Renfrew 1986: 11; Howgego 1995: 16. Za prijedlog da se mladeželjeznodobni novac širio prema istom modelu vidi Champion, Champion 1986: 68. O modelu istorazinske interakcije vidi Renfrew 1986: osobito str. 7–8. Za primjenu modela istorazinske interakcije na zajednice jugoistočne Panonije u 2. i 1. st. pr. Kr. (tradicionalno, područje koje se pripisuje Skordiscima), vidjeti kratko u Mihajlović 2019: 245.

INTERNET SOURCE INTERNETSKI IZVOR

Google Earth – <http://www.earth.google.com/>

H. D. Rauch – Auktionshaus H.D. Rauch GmbH, Vienna; Auction 76, Lot 47, October 17, 2005, <https://www.acsearch.info/search.html?id=260628> (accessed December 4th, 2023 / pristupljeno 4. prosinca 2023.)

ARCHIVAL SOURCE ARHIVSKI IZVOR

AAMZ – Arhiv Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu / Archives of the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb

ABBREVIATIONS KRATICE

KNS – Kos, P. 1977, *Keltski novci Slovenije / Keltische Münzen Sloweniens*, Situla 18, Narodni muzej Slovenije, Ljubljana.

TKN – Göbl, R. 1973, *Typologie und Chronologie der keltischen Münzprägung in Noricum*, Denkschriften der philosophisch-historischen Klasse 113, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Numismatik 2, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.

BIBLIOGRAPHY LITERATURA

Allen, D. F. 1987, *Catalogue of the Celtic coins in the British Museum. With supplementary material from other British collections. I: Silver coins of the East Celts and Balkan peoples*, The British Museum, London.

Bilić, T. 2017, Coin circulation in the pre-Imperial period in north-west Croatia, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, Vol. L, 223–253.

Bilić, T. 2022, Late Iron Age coinage in southwestern Pannonia: Coins of the Đurđevac (Gjurgjevac) tradition, *Numismatic Chronicle*, Vol. 182, 119–152.

Bilić, T. forthcoming, *Mlađeznodobne kovanice iz Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu. "Keltski novac" južne Panonije / Late Iron Age Coins from the Archaeological Museum in Zagreb. A Study of "Celtic" Coinage from Southern Pannonia*, Katalozi i monografije Arheološkoga muzeja u Zagrebu, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Zagreb.

Bilić, T., Dizdar, M. 2016, A Lt C2 Tauriscan fractional coin from the Zvonimirovo – Veliko polje cemetery, in: *Suadente nummo vetere. Studi in onore di Giovanni Gorini*, Asolati M., Callegher B., Saccocci A. (eds.), Esedra editrice s.a.s., Padova, 107–125.

Bilić, T., Falileyev, A. 2021, Iron Age coinage in southwestern Pannonia: a reassessment of the Ribnjačka hoard, *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, Vol. 127, 9–39.

Božič, D. 1999, Die Erforschung der Latènezeit in Slowenien seit Jahr 1964 / Raziskovanje latenske dobe na Sloven-skem po letu 1964, *Arheološki vestnik*, Vol. 50, 189–213.

Cesarik, N., Kramberger, V. 2018, Prilog poznavanju najstarijeg optjecaja novca na području Like / Toward understanding the earliest circulation of coins in Lika, *Diadora*, Vol. 32, 105–152.

Champion, T., Champion, S. 1986, Peer polity interaction in the European Iron Age, in: *Peer Polity Interaction and Socio-Political Change*, Renfrew C., Cherry J. F. (eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 59–68.

Dembski, G. 1998, *Münzen der Kelten*, Sammlungskataloge des Kunsthistorischen Museums 1, Kunsthistorisches Museum Wien, Wien.

Dizdar, M. 2011, The La Tène culture in central Croatia: The problem of the Eastern border of the Taurisci in the Podravina region, in: *The Eastern Celts. The communities between the Alps and the Black Sea*, Guštin M., Jevtić M. (eds.), Univerza na Primorskem, Založba Annales, Filozofski fakultet Univerzitea u Beogradu, Koper – Beograd, 71–90.

Dizdar, M. 2013, *Zvonimirovo-Veliko polje. Groblje latenske kulture 1 / A Cemetery of the La Tene Culture 1*, Monografije Instituta za arheologiju 8, Institut za arheologiju, Zagreb.

Durman, A. 1991, Prilog za rekonstrukciju najranije povijesti, in: *Dvor na Uni: od prijeslavenskog doba do naših dana*, Joka M. (ed.), Skupština općine Dvor na Uni, Dvor na Uni, 89–93.

Durman, A. 1992, O geostrateškom položaju Siscije, *Opuscula archaeologica*, Vol. 16, 117–131.

Gaspari, A. 2007, The Ljubljana River. Evidence for a Late Iron Age Ritual Site in the South-eastern Alps (Slovenia), in: *Blut und Wein. Keltisch-römische Kulturpraktiken*, Groh S., Sedlmayer H. (eds.), Protohistoire Européenne 10, Éditions Monique Mergoïl, Montagnac, 141–154.

Gaspari, A. 2009, Keltski bojevnik i Ljubljana, in: *Ljubljana: kulturna dediščina reke*, Turk P., Istenič J., Knific T., Nabergoj T. (eds.), Narodni muzej Slovenije, Ljubljana, 68–73.

Horsnæs, H. W. 2018, Coins and non-coins. The use and meaning of Roman coins in religious contexts outside the Empire, in: *Divina Moneta. Coins in Religion and Ritual*, Myrberg Burström N., Tarnow Ingvardson G. (eds.), Religion and money in the Middle Ages 2, Routledge, London, 111–124.

Howgego, C. 1995, *Ancient History from Coins*, Routledge, London.

Kemmers, F. 2018, Worthless? The practice of depositing counterfeit coins in Roman votive contexts, in: *Divina Moneta. Coins in Religion and Ritual*, Myrberg Burström N., Tarnow Ingvardson G. (eds.), Religion and money in the Middle Ages 2, Routledge, London, 193–208.

Kos, P. 2007, The beginnings of the coinage of Celtic tribes in the southeastern Alps, *Slovenská numizmatika*, Vol. 18, 59–68.

Kos, P. 2012, The VES-group – the earliest Tauriscan tetradrachms, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, 3.s. Vol. XLV, 351–358.

Kos, P., Mirnik, I. 2011, Coin hoards from Croatia XVII. The Križovljan (Varaždin) hoard of Celtic tetradrachms (1843), *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, 3.s. Vol. XLIV, 77–130.

Kos, P., Šemrov, A. 2003, Skupna najdba keltskih in rimskih novcev v reki Ljubljani. Doprinos h kronologiji novcev plemena Tavriskov / A hoard of Celtic and Roman coins from the Ljubljana River. A contribution to the chronology of the coinage of the Taurisci, *Arheološki vestnik*, Vol. 54, 381–395.

- Kostial, M.** 1997, *Kelten im Osten. Gold und Silber der Kelten in Mittel- und Osteuropa. Sammlung Lanz*, Verlag der Staatlichen Münzsammlung München, München.
- Leins, I. M. R.** 2012, *Numismatic data reconsidered: coin distributions and interpretation in studies of late Iron Age Britain*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, Newcastle University, Newcastle.
- Liščić, V.** 1978, Nalazi noričkih tetradrahmi u posjedu Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, 3.s. Vol. X–XI (1977–1978), 235–259.
- Majnarić-Pandžić, N.** 1994, Prapovijesna naselja na Gradecu, in: *Zagrebački Gradec 1242–1850. U povodu 750. obljetnice zagrebačke »Zlatne bule«, Zagreb 1992*, Kampuš I. (ed.), Grad Zagreb, Zagreb, 1–12.
- Majnarić-Pandžić, N.** 2009, Zagrebački Gradec i njegova okolica u prapovijesti, *Vjesnik Arheološkog muzeja u Zagrebu*, 3.s. Vol. XLII, 199–212.
- Mihajlović, V. D.** 2019, *Skordisci između antičkih i modernih tumačenja. Pitanje identiteta u (proto)istoriji*, Filozofski fakultet Novi Sad, Novi Sad.
- Militký, J.** 2015, *Oppidum Hradiště u Stradonic. Komentovaný katalog mincovních náleží a dokladů mincovní výroby*, Abalon s.r.o., Archeologický ústav Akademie věd České republiky, Praha.
- Mirnik, I.** 1998, Der Schatzfund von Pokupsko, in: *Stephanos nomismatikos. Edith Schönert-Geiss zum 65. Geburtstag*, Peter U. (ed.), Akademie Verlag, Berlin, 485–489.
- Ožanić, I.** 1998, Gradina Osječenica – antičko razdoblje, *Opuscula archaeologica*, Vol. 22, 27–80.
- Pink, K.** 1939, *Die Münzprägung der Ostkelten und ihrer Nachbarn*, Dissertationes Pannonicae ser. II.15, Institut für Münzkunde und Archäologie der P. Pázmány-Universität, Budapest.
- Поповић, П.** 1987, Новац Скордиска. Новац и новчани промет на Централном Балкану од IV до I века пре н.е., Монографије Археолошког института 19, Археолошки институт, Матица српска, Београд, Нови Сад. [Porović, P. 1987, *Novac Skordiska. Novac i novčani promet na Centralnom Balkanu od IV do I veka pre n.e.*, Monografije Arheološkog instituta 19, Arheološki institut, Matica srpska, Beograd, Novi Sad.]
- Potrebica, H., Dizdar, M.** 2014, Changing Identities of the Iron Age Communities of Southern Pannonia, in: *Finerprinting the Iron Age. Approaches to identity in the European Iron Age. Integrating South-Eastern Europe into the debate*, Popa C. N., Stoddart S. (eds.), Oxbow Books, Oxford, 123–141.
- Pudney, C.** 2019, Coins and Cosmologies in Iron Age Western Britain, *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, Vol. 29(1), 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774318000331>
- Radovčić, J., Škoberne, Ž.** 1989, *Zagreb prije početaka. Najstarija prošlost grada i okolice*, Mladost, Zagreb.
- Renfrew, C.** 1986, Introduction: Peer polity interaction and socio-political change, in: *Peer polity interaction and socio-political change*, Renfrew C., Cherry J. F. (eds.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1–18.
- Roymans, N., Aarts, J.** 2009, Coin use in a dynamic frontier region. Late Iron Age coinages in the Lower Rhine area, *Journal of Archaeology in the Low Countries*, Vol. 1(1), 5–26.
- Schachinger, U.** 2020, *Do ut des – cultic coin deposits at the Drava River near Rosegg/Rožek in Carinthia (Austria). Analysis of the find inventory in the Museum Archeo Norico, Deutschlandsberg (Styria, Austria)*, *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology*, Vol. 7(4), 58–78. DOI: 10.14795/j.v7i4.554
- Sokol, V.** 1994a, Cat. 118, 123–125, in: *Zagreb prije Zagreba. Arheološka baština Zagreba od pretpovijesti do osnutka biskupije 1094. godine / Zagreb before Zagreb. The archaeological heritage of Zagreb from prehistory to the foundation of the bishopric in 1094*, Rendić-Miočević A. (ed.), katalog izložbe, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Muzej grada Zagreba, Muzej Prigorja, Muzej Turopolja, Zagreb, 98–99.
- Sokol, V.** 1994b, Keltski novac na području Zagreba – Sessvetskog Prigorja, *Muzejski vjesnik*, Vol. 17, 19–25.
- Sokol, V.** 1994c, Das spätantike Kastrium auf dem Kuzelin bei Donja Glavnica, *Arheološki vestnik*, Vol. 45, 199–209.
- Sokol, V.** 1997, Northwestern Croatia in the Late Roman Period, *Arheološki vestnik*, Vol. 48, 219–230.
- Sokol, V.** 1998, *Rimski metal s Kuzelina / Roman metalwork from Kuzelin*, katalog izložbe, Muzej Prigorja Sesvete, Sesvete.
- Sokol, V.** 2001, Keltski novac s Kuzelina, *Numizmatičke vijesti*, Vol. 54, 4–16.
- Sokol, V.** 2003, Arheološki lokaliteti na području sessvetskog Prigorja, in: *Sveti Ivan Zelina i zelinski kraj u prošlosti*, Gulin A. (ed.), Hrvatska Akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Grad Sveti Ivan Zelina, Zagreb, Sveti Ivan Zelina, 199–210.
- Sokol, V.** 2009, Kuzelin, in: *Stotinu hrvatskih arheoloških nalazišta*, Durman A. (ed.), Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, Zagreb, 154–155.
- Škoberne, Ž.** 1994, Željezna doba / The Iron Age, in: *Zagreb prije Zagreba. Arheološka baština Zagreba od pretpovijesti do osnutka biskupije 1094. godine / Zagreb before Zagreb. The archaeological heritage of Zagreb from prehistory to the foundation of the bishopric in 1094*, Rendić-Miočević, A. (ed.), katalog izložbe, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Muzej grada Zagreba, Muzej Prigorja, Muzej Turopolja, Zagreb, 30–32, 66–68.
- Škoberne, Ž.** 1999, *Budinjak. Kneževski tumul*, Muzej Grada Zagreba, Zagreb.
- Škoberne, Ž.** 2002, Pregled pretpovijesnih arheoloških istraživanja na Žumberku / A review of prehistoric archaeological research at Žumberak, in: *Žumberak od prapovijesti do kasne antike*, Gregl Z., Škoberne Ž. (eds.), katalog izložbe, Arheološki muzej u Zagrebu, Muzej Grada Zagreba, Zagreb, 32–81.
- Šmit, Ž., Maróti, B., Kasztovszky, Zs., Šemrov A., Kos, P.** 2020, Analysis of Celtic small silver coins from Slovenia by PIXE and PGAA, *Archaeological and Anthropological Sciences*, Vol. 12: 155. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12520-020-01124-z>
- Tapavički-Ilić, M.** 2005, Relations of Celtic minting to Roman monetary system (shown on the example of Scordisci and Treveri), *Starinar*, Vol. 55, 35–51.
- Torbágy, M.** 2000, *Monete celtiche in Ungheria*, Civiche raccolte numismatiche, Milano.

van Heesch, J. 2008, On the edge of the market economy: coins used in social transactions, as ornaments and as bullion in the Roman Empire, in: *Roman coins outside The Empire. Ways and phases, contexts and functions*, Proceedings of the ESF/SCH Exploratory Workshop, Radziwiłł Palace, Nieborów (Poland) 3–6 September 2005, Bursche A., Ciołek R., Wolters R. (eds.), Moneta, Wetteren, 49–57.

Wigg-Wolf, D. 2005, Coins and ritual in late Iron Age and early Roman sanctuaries in the territory of the *Treveri*, in: *Iron Age Coinage and Ritual Practices*, Haselgrove C., Wigg-Wolf D. (eds.), Studien zu Fundmünzen der Antike 20, Verlag Philipp von Zabern, Mainz, 361–379.

Wigg-Wolf, D. 2011, The function of Celtic coinages in Northern Gaul, in: *Barter, Money and Coinage in the Ancient Mediterranean (10th-1st centuries BC)*, García-Bellido M. P., Callegarin L., Jiménez Díez A. (eds.), Anejos de Archivo Español de Arqueología LVIII, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Madrid, 301–314.

Wigg-Wolf, D. 2018, Death by deposition? Coins and ritual in the late Iron Age and early Roman transition in northern Gaul, in: *Divina Moneta. Coins in Religion and Ritual*, Myrberg Burström N., Tarnow Ingvarsson G. (eds.), Religion and money in the Middle Ages 2, Routledge, London, 13–29.

Ziegaus, B. 2010, *Kelten Geld. Münzen der Kelten und angrenzender nichtgriechischer Völkerschaften. Sammlung Christian Flesche*, Staatliche Münzsammlung, München.

