

O koncu prazgodovinskih skupnosti na Krasu

Božidar SLAPŠAK

Izvleček

Prispevek obravnava arheološke in epigrafske podatke o domorodnih skupnostih v zaledju Trsta v poznem prazgodovinskem in zgodnjem rimskem obdobju. Upošteva tako prvine "dolgega trajanja" kot mehanizme sprememb v tem prostoru. Kot ključni mehanizem, ki sproži razpad družbene zgradbe domorodnih skupnosti, predlaga dodelitev latinskega pravnega statusa, kot je za skupnosti Karnov in Katalov (ali Subokrinov) izpričana s počastilnim napisom L. Fabiju Severu iz sredine 2. stol. n. š. (*I. It. X 4,31*).

Abstract

In this paper, archaeological and epigraphic evidence is scrutinized, pertaining to indigenous communities in the hinterlands of Trieste in the Late Prehistoric and Early Roman period. Not only the elements of "longue durée" of the settlement pattern, but also the mechanisms of change are considered. The key mechanism, which triggered the final collapse of the social structure of indigenous communities there, is identified in the act of granting Latin citizenship, such as documented in the mid-second century A.D. by the honorary inscription to L. Fabius Severus (*I. It. X 4,31*), involving the communities of the Carni and Catali (or Subocirini).

Kot skromen obol obletnici cenjenega profesorja in učitelja naj mi bo dovoljeno ponuditi razmislek o usodi prazgodovinskih skupnosti v kraškem zaledju Trsta pod rimsko oblastjo. Težišče znanstvenega delovanja profesorja Gabrovca gotovo ni bilo v tem delu slovenskega ozemlja; prebogata dediščina železne dobe Dolenjske je bila pač tisto privilegirano torišče, kjer je z lastnimi terenskimi raziskavami preverjal svoja metodološka izhodišča in izgrajeval vedenje o pozni prazgodovinski dobi, ki ga je - in ga bo, računamo in želimo še dolgo - s svojimi študijami, članki in odmevnimi medijskimi nastopi posredoval svojim kolegom in širšemu zainteresiranemu občinstvu. Obenem je seveda prav on tisti, ki je v sintetičnih študijah o poznejši prazgodovini slovenskega ozemlja opredelil kulturne skupine in kronologijo tudi tega prostora, s svojim ugledom

in avtoriteto v mednarodni strokovni srenji vzpostavljaj organizacijske okvire za znanstveno obdelavo gradiva starejših izkopavanj v domačih in tujih muzejih, in ki je usmerjal svoje sodelavce in učence v plodne študijske projekte, da so vključevali nova in še ne obdelana gradiva in omogočili temeljitejše vpogled v dogajanja v prvem tisočletju pr. n. š. Sam se hvaležno spominjam njegovih spodbud in še posebej njegovega kritičnega spremljanja doktorske naloge o poselitvi Krasa, pri kateri je sodeloval tudi kot član komisije za oceno in zagovor.

Pričujoči prispevek v resnici razvija nekatere ideje, ki so se porodile ob tej nalogi.¹ Uporaba analitičnih tehnik prostorske in poselitvene arheologije je ob vseh omejitvah, ki jih predstavljajo nezadostni podatki za kronološko stratifikacijo naselij in pomanjkanje sistematičnih kvantitativnih površinskih pregledov,²

¹ B. Slapšak, *Možnosti študija poselitve v arheologiji*, tipkopijska disertacija, Univerza v Ljubljani (Ljubljana 1983); id., *Možnosti študija poselitve v arheologiji*, *Arheo* 17 (Ljubljana 1995).

² Ti se v poraščenem in močno pogozdenem kraškem okolju z zelo izoliranimi obdelovalnimi površinami in močnimi erozijskimi procesi tudi sicer srečujejo s težko obvladljivimi težavami. Izkušnje na Krasu v okviru Arheološke topografije Slovenije smo predstavili na simpoziju v Atenah 1981: B. Slapšak, *The Kras (Carst) Survey*, v: P. Keller, D. Rupp (ur.), *Archaeological survey*

omogočila ugotoviti pravilnosti v distribuciji utrjenih prazgodovinskih naselij. Tu mislim predvsem na predlog klasifikacije utrjenih naselbin na podlagi lokacijskih kriterijev in na ugotovitve o hierarhiziranosti prazgodovinske poselitve.³ Da razlagalni potencial tovrstnih opažanj še zdaleč ni izčrpan, kažejo nadaljnje izpeljave, ki zadevajo organiziranost prazgodovinskih skupnosti v tem prostoru in ki so deloma že dostopne v objavah.⁴

Dva niza na videz zoperstavljenih razmislekov določata naše trenutne predstave o stanjih in procesih na Krasu v drugi polovici prvega tisočletja pr. n. š. Prvi je povezan z izrabo prostora, izhaja pa iz našega poznavanja prazgodovinske poselitve in že omenjenih prostorskih analiz.⁵ Kot lokacijska determinanta utrjenih naselij železne dobe na Krasu izstopa bližina in dostopnost kvalitetne obdelovalne zemlje. Agrarne niše s primernimi obdelovalnimi površinami so v kraškem okolju izrazito omejene in razpršene, železnodobna mreža utrjenih naselij

pa nadzoruje vse pomembnejše danes aktivne niše.⁶ Če odmislimo odstopanja zaradi nadzorne in obrambne lege kot druge pomembne lokacijske determinante, so v razmerju do naselbinskih lokacij območja poljedelske rabe vedno središčna, območja izključne pašne rabe pa vselej robna.⁷ Spremembe naselbinskih lokacij ob isti agrarni niši, tudi na črti višinsko / nižinsko, se v tej luči kažejo kot manj pomembne; že pojav dobro utrjenih železnodobnih naselij v nižini (Volčji Grad, Sveto, Skopo) v veliki meri relativizira višinsko-nižinsko dihotomijo in poudari pomen agrarnih virov kot odločilnega kriterija. Položaj sodobnih naselij v razmerju do prazgodovinskih ob isti agrarni niši se zaradi raznovrstnosti rešitev kaže kot arbitraren oz. razložljiv ne toliko z zunanjimi dejavniki in širše ali obče veljavnimi procesi, kot iz posebnih lokalnih pogojev od morfologije agrarne niše, prek dostopnosti in uporabnosti infrastrukture, do specifičnih izkušenj in preferenc lokalnih skupnosti.

in the Mediterranean area, BAR Int. Ser. 155 (1983) 201-202. Tam smo se bliže seznanili z rezultati prvih projektov sistematičnih površinskih pregledov v Sredozemlju; izkušnje smo skušali aplicirati v okviru projekta Hvar: B. Kirigin, B. Slapšak, Starigradsko polje na otoku Hvaru, *Arh. pregl.* 26, 1985 (1986) 207-208; B. Slapšak, The 1982-1986 Ager Pharensis survey. Potentials and limitations of 'wall survey' in karstic environments, v: J. C. Chapman, J. Bintliff, V. Gaffney, B. Slapšak (ur.), *Recent developments in Yugoslav archaeology*, BAR Int. Ser. 431 (1988) 145-149. Z vključitvijo angleških kolegov 1987 smo se lahko naslonili na njihove izkušnje v Grčiji: J. Bintliff, V. L. Gaffney, B. Slapšak, Kontekst in metodologija terenskega pregleda Ager Pharensis - Hvar, *Arheo* 9, 1989, 42-55; V. L. Gaffney, J. Bintliff, B. Slapšak, Site formation processes and the Hvar survey project, v: A. J. Schofield (ur.), *Interpreting artefact scatters. Contributions to ploughzone archaeology*, Oxford Monograph 4 (Oxford 1991) 59-77. Hvarska izkušnja je v marsičem olajšala formuliranje metodologije za nadaljnje aplikacije v Sloveniji, tako v raziskovalnem okviru (P. Novaković, Arheologija krajine in sistematični terenski pregled, v: M. Guštin, P. Novaković, D. Grosman, B. Mušič, M. Lubšina-Tušek, *Rimsko podeželje*, Razprave Filozofske fakultete (Ljubljana 1996) 11-42), kot tudi pri zaščitnih projektih (metodologija predhodnih raziskav SAAS). Prav na Krasu so morali biti postopki še posebej prilagojeni posebnostim arheološkega zapisa v vrtačah: P. Novaković, H. Simoni, Archaeology of the Kras dolinas, *Annales, Ser. hist. sociol.* 7/10, 1997, 19-36.

³ Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. v op. 1); prim. tudi Student seminar on spatial archaeology and GIS, Pre-GIS and GIS analysis of territory, Testing the validity of some classical archaeological tools against GIS, v: B. Slapšak (ur.), *On the good use of geographic information systems in archaeological landscape studies. (Proceedings of the COST G2 WG2 round table, Ljubljana 18 to 20 December 1998)* (European Communities 2001) 95-100.

⁴ P. Novaković, Detecting territoriality and social structure in the Bronze and Iron Ages, GIS and the hillforts in the Kras region, v: B. Slapšak (ur.), *On the good use of geographic information systems in archaeological landscape studies. (Proceedings of the COST G2 WG2 round table, Ljubljana 18 to 20 December 1998)* (European Communities 2001) 101-115.

⁵ Tu velja ponovno poudariti, da je naše poznavanje omejeno v glavnem na višinske in redke nižinske utrdbene oz. obrambne strukture in na najdbe v jamah; že v doktorski nalogi smo opozorili, da arheološka topografija, kakršno smo tudi sami izvajali v tej regiji v zgodnjih 70. letih, načeloma zgolj dopolni že znano poselitveno sliko in le izjemoma odkriva nove tipe najdišč in poselitve: Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. v op. 1) 13-15; spoznavanje nižinske prazgodovinske poselitve je omogočila šele uporaba novih postopkov sistematičnih terenskih pregledov, najbolj spektakularno pač v okviru avtocestnega projekta v zadnjih petih letih; s prilagojenimi postopki so predhodne raziskave bile uspešne tudi v kraškem odseku, vsaj kar zadeva najdbe v vrtačah kot naravnih receptorijih arheološkega zapisa v tem okolju; edina točka, kjer je arheološka topografija na Krasu ugotovila indikacijo za odprto prazgodovinsko najdišče, je Krajna vas, kjer je preveritveno sondiranje potrdilo prisotnost prazgodovinske keramike v primarni plasti, vendar brez vsakršnih strukturnih sledov: B. Slapšak, *Arheološka topografija Slovenije, Kraška planota*, tipkopisno poročilo (Ljubljana 1974) s.v. Krajna vas; N. Osmuk, Krajna vas, *Var. spom.* 21, 1977, 193-194. Danes je povsem jasno, da moramo enako kot na Štajerskem in Dolenjskem tudi v tej pokrajini računati z nižinsko poselitvijo kot delom poselitvenega sistema pozne prazgodovinske dobe: Novaković, Simoni, *Doline* (cit. v op. 2); prim. tudi novejša izkopavanja A. Bavdek; kljub temu da torej naše analize kaštelirske poselitve upoštevajo zgolj delen poselitveni vzorec in zanemarjajo tipe najdišč, ki so v posamičnih obdobjih lahko predstavljali temeljne enote gospodarske izrabe prostora, pa lahko argumentiramo, da so rezultati veljavni in uporabni, vsaj ko gre za višje hierarhične ravni poselitve oz. ugotavljanje strukture poselitve na regionalni ravni.

⁶ Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. v op. 1), 79-80; prim. tudi B. Slapšak, Slovenski Kras v poznejši prazgodovini in v rimski dobi, v: A. Kranjc (ur.), *Kras, Pokrajina, življenje, ljudje* (Ljubljana 1999) 161-163 in sl. str. 161.

⁷ Zanimiv primer predstavlja dobro utrjena nižinska naselbina Debela griža pri Hrpeljah, ki jo obravnavamo kot pašno v sklopu analize gospodarskega prostora rodiške Ajdovščine: Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. v op. 1) 22-28 in sl. 6; B. Slapšak, Defining the economic space of a typical Iron Age hillfort: Rodik, Yugoslavia, A case study, v: J. Bintliff, D. Davidson, E. Grant (ur.), *Conceptual*

Vse variante so na Krasu zastopane: od kontinuitete naselbine na višinski lokaciji (z dokumentirano rimsko fazo kot v primeru Štanjela, ali brez ustreznih podatkov o antični poselitvi kot v primeru Avbra), prek kontinuitete obrambne in sakralne (Tomaj) ali zgolj sakralne funkcije (Skopo) znotraj obrisa prazgodovinske utrdbe, diskontinuitete vseh naselbinskih funkcij znotraj obrisa prazgodovinske utrdbe (poantično naselje tik ob prazgodovinskem: Sveto), do premika vseh funkcij v neposredno bližino obdelovalne zemlje v nižini (Kazlje), ob možni obnovitvi posameznih funkcij na prazgodovinski lokaciji v novem kontekstu, in sicer obrambnih (Povir), verskih (Lipa) ali gospodarskih (pastirske kočke na rodiški Ajdovščini). Prav kontinuiteta poselitvenih prostorov (z dinamičnim in komplementarnim razmerjem med višinskimi in nižinskimi naselbinskimi lokacijami in funkcijami) kaže, da so skupnosti pozne prazgodovinske dobe v kraškem okolju vzpostavile stabilne strukture prostorske organizacije in izrabe prostora in da so razvile kulturne obrazce, ki bodo v dolgem trajanju prepoznavni kot značilni za to regijo.

Drugi niz razmislekov zadeva zgodovinske konjunktore, kot se kažejo v sicer zelo fragmentarnih podatkih pisnih virov,⁸ in katerih korelate je moč iskati v podatkih arheološkega zapisa. Zgodovinski, etnografski in geografski podatki za zadnja stoletja

1. tisočletja pr. n. š. nudijo dinamično sliko z vrsto akterjev dogajanj v tem prostoru. Najbolje so dokumentirana dogajanja v zvezi z ustanavljanjem kolonije Akvileje v 2. desetletju 2. stoletja pr. n. š. Nedvomno je, da je bilo akvilejsko območje dolgo znotraj venetske vplivne in tudi poselitvene sfere.⁹ Vzhodno od tod je toponim Tergeste morda vmestljiv v venetski jezikovni krog,¹⁰ podatek pri Strabonu o Tergestu kot utrdbi (φρούριον) na Histrski obali¹¹ bi bilo v tem primeru mogoče povezovati z emporialno dejavnostjo Venetov, katere učinke v Istri in v jugovzhodnoalpskem zaledju je v starejšeželeznodobnem arheološkem gradivu precizno ugotovil Gabrovec,¹² kaže se pa tudi v sporadični prisotnosti venetskih napisov.¹³ Na vključenost tega območja v venetsko sfero kaže tudi mitografsko izročilo, ki epizodo Antenorjeve zgodbe povezuje s Timavom.¹⁴ O emporialnem značaju lokacije ob izviri Timava in različnih skupinah, ki so bile v različnih obdobjih skupaj ali v daljšem sosledju udeležene v transakcijah na tem mestu, priča bogato mitološko in kulturno izročilo - ob Timavu kot morda lokalnem kultu¹⁵ in že omenjenem Antenorju še Diomedov kult (po nekaterih razlagah interpretatio graeca za kult Timava), pa kult ajtolske Artemide in argoške Here¹⁶ in povezovanje te točke z argonavtsko zgodbo,¹⁷ kar vse govori o grški prisotnosti, in pa kult Saturna (po nekaterih razlagah

issues in environmental archaeology (Edinburgh 1988) 95-107. Podoben interpretacijski izziv predstavlja šibko utrjeno gradišče - ograda v nižini pri Kosoveljah.

⁸ V. Vedaldi Iasbez, *La Venetia orientale e l'Histria: le fonti letterarie greche e latine fino alla caduta dell'Impero Romano d'Occidente*, Studi e ricerche sulla Gallia Cisalpina 5 (Roma 1994); P. Sticotti, *Inscriptiones Italiae X 4* (Roma 1951); C. Zaccaria, *Regio X Venetia et Histria, Tergeste - Ager tergestinus et Tergesti adtributus, Supplementa Italica n.s. 10* (Roma 1992), 139-283.

⁹ G. Fogolari, A. L. Prosdocimi, *I Veneti antichi, Lingua e cultura* (Padova 1988); predvsem pa rezultati novejših izkopavanj F. Maselli Scotti v Akvileji, ki kažejo na prevlado venetskega gradiva od 8. st. pr. n. š. dalje.

¹⁰ G. B. Pellegrini, A. L. Prosdocimi, *La lingua venetica* (Padova 1967) 396 ss; *terg(o)- kot predindoevropski koren, prevzet v venetskem jeziku in prek tega kot kulturni termin posredovan v druge jezike: A. L. Prosdocimi, *Contatti di lingue nella decima Regio, parte nordorientale, Ant. Altoadr. 28*, 1986, 15-42; A. L. Prosdocimi, *La lingua*, v: G. Fogolari, A. L. Prosdocimi, *I Veneti* (cit. v op. 9); v starejši literaturi pripisan ilirskemu jezikovnemu krogu: H. Krahe, *Die alten balkanillyrischen geographischen Namen* (Heidelberg 1925) 70 s; prim tudi R. Katičić, *Ancient languages of the Balkans, L'Aia*, 1976, 172; pregledno Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. v op. 8), 149.

¹¹ Strab. V, 1, 9.; R. F. Rossi, *Phrourion - kome karnike: qualche osservazione su Tergeste preromana e romana*, v: *Studi in onore di Albino Garzetti*. (Atti del Convegno, Brescia 1996) (Brescia 1996) 353-365 [= *Scritti di storia romana* (Trieste 1996)]; C. Zaccaria, *Tergeste e il suo territorio alle soglie della romanità*, v: *I Celti nell'Alto Adriatico*. (Atti delle tre giornate internazionali di studio, Trieste 5-7 aprile 2001) *Ant. Altoadr. 48*, 2001, 95-118.

¹² S. Gabrovec, *Halštatska kultura Slovenije, Arh. vest. 15-16*, 1964-1965, 21-63; id., *Jugoistočnoalpska regija sa zapadnom Panonijom, Dolenjska grupa*, v: A. Benac (ur.), *Praist. jug. zem. 5. Željezno doba* (Sarajevo 1987) 29-119; S. Gabrovec, K. Mihovilić, *Jadransko-zapadnobalkanska regija, Istarska grupa*, ibid. 293-338.

¹³ J. Istenič, *Zapisi v venetski pisavi na Koroškem in v Sloveniji, Zgod. čas. 39*, 1985, 313-334.

¹⁴ Verg. *Aen.* 242-246, prim. L. Braccesi, *La leggenda di Antenore* (Venezia 1997).

¹⁵ G. Cuscito, *Il Lacus Timavi dall'antichità al Medioevo*, v: *Il Timavo. Immagini, storia, ecologia di un fiume carsico* (Trieste 1989) 61-127 (Il console Tuditano e il culto al Timavo, 84-89); M. Šašel Kos, *Pre-Roman divinities of the Eastern Alps and Adriatic*, *Situla 38* (Ljubljana 1999) 18-20.

¹⁶ C. Corbato, *L'arco del Timavo negli scrittori classici*, *Ant. Altoadr. 10*, 1976, 13-21; L. A. Stella, *Miti greci dallo Ionio all'Alto Adriatico*, *Ant. Altoadr. 12*, 1977, 25; L. Braccesi, *Grecità adriatica* (Bologna 1977); F. Crsóla, *Le popolazioni preromane del Friuli nelle fonti letterarie*, *Ant. Altoadr. 15/1*, 1979, 83-112; A. Grilli, *L'arco adriatico fra preistoria e leggenda*, *Ant. Altoadr. 37*, 1991, 15-44; L. Braccesi, *Diomedes cum Gallis, Hesperia 2*, 1991, 89-102.

¹⁷ *Mart.* 4,25,5-6; 8,28,7-6.

interpretatio romana za kult Timava),¹⁸ ki morda priča o italški oz. zgodnji rimski prisotnosti. Za nadzor nad tem prostorom se v času ustanavljanja Akvileje ob Rimljanah, ki tu nastopajo kot venetski zavezniki, potegujejo še keltski doseljenci¹⁹ in sosednji Histri, ki so tu že v 20. letih 3. st. pr. n. š. ogrožali rimske interese kot pomorska sila,²⁰ in ki se rimski vojaški sili l. 179 pr. n. š. ob prvem dokumentiranem vojnem pohodu Rimljanov po ustanovitvi mesta najprej zoperstavijo prav v območju Timava.²¹ Keltsko zavezništvo na rimski strani v histrski vojni in kasnejša karnijska prisotnost na območju Tergesta²² sta bila postavljena v vzročno-posledično zvezo,²³ bržkone moramo v času po histrski vojni računati z razširitvijo karnijskega poselitvenega območja vse do kraške obale. V tem času nadzor nad kraškimi prelazi skušajo uveljaviti tudi Tavriski iz smeri Ljubljanske kotline, kar sproži konflikte in se konča z rimskim prevzemom portorija v Navportu.²⁴ Z druge strani pa na Okri na Karne mejijo Japodi,²⁵ prav tako poraženci iz l. 129 pr. n. š., ki karnijsko - rimsko zavezniško gospodstvo nad kraško regijo in obalo ogrozijo z vdorom in obleganjem Tergesta leta 52 pr. n. š.,²⁶ potem pa jih dokončno porazi Oktavijan v Ilirskih vojnah med 35-33 pr. n. š.. Dodati velja še, da območje dobi pomembno mesto v vojno-strateških kombinacijah konkurentov Rima v borbi za oblast v Sredozemlju: Demetrija Hvarskega, Antioha III (Hanibalov projekt), Filipa V, Perzeja, Mitridata VI in morda Burebiste.²⁷

Na dogodkovno-zgodovinski ravni se nam torej

kraška regija kaže kot območje izjemne dinamike, ki izhaja iz njene strateške pomembnosti, saj tod potekajo transevropske komunikacije, ključne tako z gospodarskega kot z vojnostrateškega vidika. Neprestano menjavanje akterjev, ki vstopajo v igro za izrabo komunikacijskega vozlišča kraških prelazov, bodisi kot strateškega gospodarskega vira (pri čemer je izrabo mogoče zagotoviti tudi z različnimi oblikami pogodbenih odnosov) ali vojnostrateškega vira (ki vedno daje tudi gospodarske učinke), je torej za zadnja tri stoletja pr. n. š. dobro izpričano. Stanje pa lahko s precejšnjo zanesljivostjo ekstrapoliramo tudi na starejša obdobja, za katera nimamo pisnih virov. Na drugem mestu smo predlagali takšno branje arheološkega zapisa na področju Škocjana kot lokacije, v kateri prepoznavamo centralno mesto poselitvenega sistema kraške regije²⁸ in obenem stično točko na izhodišču tovornih poti v podnožju prelazov.²⁹ Zapisali smo, da je dejstvo, da so škocjanska grobišča bolj številna kot številčna, morda posledica pogoste menjave regionalne nadoblasti in s tem skupin, ki so nadzorovale strateško in kulturno središče, pri čemer je vsaka skupina izbrala novo mesto za pogrebne rituale in kult svojih mrtvih. Različne skupine so seveda lahko tudi sobivale v regionalnem središču (pri čemer je treba upoštevati precizna kronološka razmerja med grobišči), posamična grobišča so lahko rodovna oz. družinska, pri čemer različen pogrebni ritus (plani pokopi, pokopi v jamah itn.) lahko odraža posebno identiteto in poseben družbeni položaj skupin.

¹⁸ F. Maselli Scotti, Un culto di Saturno al Timavo?, *Aquil. Nos.* 49, 1978, 9-20.

¹⁹ *Galli transalpini in Venetiam transgressi*: Liv 39,22,6; 39,45,6; prim. podatek o ustanovitvi Akvileje in *agro Gallorum*: Liv. 40,34,2, kar pa se morda nanaša le na gornji poskus naselitve na tem mestu; F.Sartori, *Galli Transalpini transgressi in Venetiam* (Liv. 39, 22, 6-7), *Aquil. Nos.* 31, 1960, 1-40.

²⁰ G. Bandelli, La guerra istrica del 221 a. C. e la spedizione alpina del 220 a. C., *Athenaeum* 59, 1981, 3-28; M. Šašel Kos, *Zgodovinska podoba prostora med Akvilejo, Jadrantom in Sirmijem pri Kasiju Dionu in Herodijanu* (Ljubljana 1986) 58s (fr. 5) in 85-87.

²¹ Liv. 41,2,1.; prim. komentar pri: A. Grilli, Livio e i Romani in Istria nel 178 a.C., *Rend Ist Lomb* 110, 1976, 142-151.

²² Tergeste kot κῶμη καρνική: Strab. VII 5, 2; atribucija Karnov (ali Subokrinov) koloniji Tergeste: *I. It.* X 4,31; prim. R. F. Rossi, Romani, Preromani, non Romani nel territorio di Tergeste, v: *I Celti nell'Alto Adriatico*, *Ant. Altoadr.* 48 (2001) 119; na str. 128 avtor predlaga dopolnitev [Subocri]ni namesto [Car]ni

²³ podrobno G. Dobesch, *Die Kelten in Österreich nach den ältesten Berichten der Antike* (Wien 1993), 106-108; prim. tudi M. Šašel Kos, The end of the Norican kingdom and the formation of the provinces Noricum and Pannonia, v: B. Djurić, I. Lazar (ur.), *Akti 4. mednarodnega kolokvija o problemih rimske provincialne umetnosti*. (Celje 8.-12. maj 1995), *Situla* 36 (Ljubljana 1997) 26.

²⁴ Kot posledica Tuditanovega pohoda 129 pr. n. š.: J. Šašel, Lineamenti dell'espansione romana nelle Alpi Orientali e nei Balcani Occidentali, v: *Aquileia e l'arco alpino orientale*, *Ant. Altoadr.* 9 (1976) 86; sicer: M. Šašel Kos, *Nauportus*: Antični literarni in epigrafski viri, v: J. Horvat, *Nauportus (Vrhniko)*, *Dela I. razr. SAZU* 33 (1990), 17-33.

²⁵ Strab. IV 6,10; R. F. Rossi, Romani e non Romani nell'Italia nordorientale, *Ant. Altoadr.* 37, 1991, 201-217 [= *Scritti di storia romana* (Trieste 1996) 279-288]; R. F. Rossi, Insediamenti e popolazioni del territorio di Tergeste e delle aree limitrofe, v: *Tipologia di insediamento e distribuzione antropica nell'area veneto-istriana dalla protostoria all'alto medioevo*. (Atti del Seminario di Studio, Asolo, 3-5 novembre 1989) (Monfalcone 1992), 161-167 [= *Scritti di storia romana* (Trieste 1996) 267-278]; R. F. Rossi, *Gentes ferae et ... latrociniis maritimis infames*, *Atti Mem. Soc. Istr. Arch. St. Pat.* 92, 1992, 7-20 [= *Scritti di storia romana* (Trieste 1996) 289-297]; R. F. Rossi, *Romani* (cit. v op. 22).

²⁶ Caes. Gall. 8,24,3; App. III. 18; R. F. Rossi, Cesare tra la Gallia e Aquileia, *Ant. Altoadr.* 19, 1981, 71-87.

²⁷ Šašel, *Lineamenti* (cit. v op. 24) 76.

²⁸ Oz. gorenjekraške: Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. v op. 1) 79-83.

²⁹ Slapšak, *Slovenski Kras* (cit. v op. 6) 153-156; 158-160.

Dva niza razmislekov vodita torej k dvema na videz povsem različnima slikama stanj in procesov v kraški regiji v 1. tisočletju pr. n. š. Če v poselitveni sliki prepoznavamo stabilne strukture prostorske organizacije in izrabe, vidimo v drugih delih arheološkega zapisa in v pisnih virih učinke zgodovinskih dogajanj, ki so pogojevali hitro menjavanje oblastnih in nadzornih funkcij in prisotnost vedno novih regionalnih hegemonov. V resnici gre za sobivanje in prepletanje dveh vrst struktur v braudelovskem smislu, struktur dolgega in kratkega trajanja. Prve zadevajo temeljne gospodarske dejavnosti in izrabo naravnih virov; nedvomno dejstvo je, da se v 1. tisočletju pr. n. š. na Krasu oblikujejo prostorske enote, teritorialne občine, kot jih poimenuje Novaković, in to tako, da omogočajo racionalno izkoriščanje zelo omejenih območij obdelovalne zemlje v regiji. Ta struktura tako temeljito opredeli meje in možnosti subsistenčne ekonomije v regiji, da se vsakršna zgodovinska sprememba vpisuje vanjo in jo obnavlja. Tudi kompletna menjava prebivalstva bo aktivirala iste agrarne niše in novi naseljenci bodo prednostno izbirali že vzpostavljene naselbinske lokacije, še posebej tiste, v katerih obrambne sisteme je bilo vložena veliko dela in pomembne lokalne izkušnje. Nekateri hegemoni bodo defavorizirali nadzorne in obrambne funkcije lokalnih skupnosti, in v takšnih okoliščinah lahko pride do ukinjanja lokalnih obrambnih struktur in do prenosa naselbinskih lokacij z utrjenih višinskih točk v nižine. To bo tem bolj verjetno, ko kot hegemon nastopi visoko organizirana državna tvorba, v kateri so nadzorne in obrambne funkcije specializirane in organizirane iz centrov zunaj regije. Zato ni nenavadno, da prenos poselitve z utrjenih višin v nižine nastopi kot ključna točka razlag procesov, povezanih z rimsko okupacijo in

vključevanjem ozemlja v rimsko državno tvorbo.³⁰ A tako kot je bila kompletna zamenjava prebivalstva skozi dolga obdobja pozne prazgodovine bržkone prej izjema kot pravilo in je nastop novega hegemonu najpogosteje zadeval zgolj nadzor nad središči in ključnimi točkami zunanjih stikov, tudi proces prenosa poselitve na nižinske lokacije, kot je domnevan ob rimski zasedbi in vzpostavitvi rimske državne oblasti, nikakor ni bil enovit in kratkotrajen in tudi v kraški regiji ni enako zadel vseh lokalnih skupnosti. Arheološki zapis, kakor koli že skromno raziskan, potrjuje takšno razumevanje.³¹

Kot značilen primer lahko navedemo skupnost Rundiktov in njihovo naselbinsko središče, ki je bilo dosti prepričljivo ugotovljeno na utrjenem višinskem naselju na rodiški Ajdovščini.³² Skupnost sredi 1. st. n. š., v času cesarja Klavdija, nastopa kot pravni subjekt v zemljiščnem sporu s senatorjem Gajem Lekanijem Basom,³³ ki je poleg posesti v Istri (Fažana, morda Brioni) imel zemljišča, najverjetneje pašna, tudi v notranjosti in je tu mejil na teritorij Rundiktov.³⁴ Omejena naselbinska izkopavanja na rodiški Ajdovščini so dala zadosti elementov, da lahko trdimo, da je prazgodovinsko gradišče na tem mestu kontinuirano živelo v času spora.³⁵ Pripadajoče grobišče Pod Jezerom z značilnim grobnim ritusom in sestavo pridatkov kaže na domorodno prebivalstvo naselbine, časovni okvir sicer skromnega vzorca 17 grobov je 1. in 1. pol. 2. st. n. š.³⁶ (ob enem prazgodovinskem in nekaj uničenih morda zgodnejših rimskodobnih grobovih na bližnjem Sedlu).³⁷ Analiza prazgodovinske poselitve tega dela Krasa je omogočila rekonstrukcijo teritorija gradišča na Ajdovščini: najdišče napisa, ki omenja spor, in za katerega je po analogiji z drugimi napisi, ki podajajo razsodbe

³⁰ V novejšem času najjasnejša formulacija pri J. Horvat, Podeželje, v: *Zakladi tisočletij, Zgodovina Slovenije od neandertalcev do Slovanov* (Ljubljana 1999) 244: "Na koncu železne dobe je večina ljudi živela v dobro zavarovanih višinskih naselbinah, rimska državna ureditev pa je poselitveno sliko korenito spremenila. ... Očitno so Rimljani zahtevali izpraznitev starih plemenskih utrd in naselitev v nižinah predvsem zato, da bi laže nadzorovali staroselce".

³¹ J. Horvat, *ibid.* za področje Istre, Krasa in Notranjske, kjer je na številnih višinskih točkah dokumentirana kontinuiteta poselitve "vsaj še do začetka 1. st. n. š.", domneva gospodarske razloge za opustitev: "dolga desetletja miru so dajala prednost naselitvi ob prometnih poteh in ugodnih obdelovalnih površinah v ravninah"; gl. J. Horvat, Notranjska na začetku rimske dobe. Parti pri Stari Sušici, Ambroževo gradišče in Baba pri Slavini, *Arh. vest.* 46, 1995, 177-216; pregledno J. Horvat, Rimska provincialna arheologija v Sloveniji po letu 1965. Poselitvena slika in drobna materialna kultura, *Arh. vest.* 50, 1999, 215-257, posebej 248 in 252.

³² Že ob prvih omembah po najdbi napisa *CIL V 698 = I. It. X 4, 376*: P. Kandler, *L'Istria* 6, 1851, 37; anon., Rodik in Ajdovščina nad Rodikom, *Novice* 31. 8. 1859; prim. B. Slapšak, Starejša zgodovina Rodika, v: *Rodik med Brkini in Krasom* (Koper 1997) 19-64.

³³ F. Tassaux, Laecanii. Recherches sur une famille sénatoriale d'Istrie, *Mél. Éc. fran. Rome* 94, 1982, 227-269; Id., Apports récents de l'épigraphie à l'histoire économique et sociale de Brioni, v: G. Paci (ur.), *Epigrafia romana in area adriatica*. (Actes de la IX^e rencontre franco-italienne sur l'épigraphie du monde romain), (Macerata 1998) 77-99; o Lekanijih: 82-86.

³⁴ B. Slapšak, Ad *CIL V, 698* (Materija): via directa - translata (in fines alicuius) - restituta, *Arh. vest.* 28, 1977, 122-128; U. Schillinger-Haefele, Noch einmal zu *CIL V, 698*, *Arh. vest.* 29, 1978, 738-739.

³⁵ V. Vidrih Perko, Rimskodobna keramika z Ajdovščine pri Rodiku, *Arh. vest.* 48, 1997, 341-358.

³⁶ J. Istenič, Rodik - grobišče Pod Jezerom, *Arh. vest.* 38, 1987, 69-135; ead., Kuhinjsko posude egejskih tipova na nalazištu Rodik - nekropola Pod Jezerom, *Diadora* 10, 1988, 99-110.

³⁷ Neobjavljeno; fibula iz prazgodovinskega groba: Slapšak, Rodik (cit. v op. 32).

o ozemeljskih sporih,³⁸ mogoče domnevati, da ustreza mestu, ki je bilo sodno ugotovljeno kot točka razmejitve, sovпада z ugotovljeno mejo prazgodovinskega teritorija gradišča.³⁹ Sklepamo torej lahko, da so Rundikti prazgodovinska skupnost s središčem na rodiški Ajdovščini, ki je vsaj do sredine 2. stoletja obdržala svoj center na predrimskodobni (višinski utrjeni) lokaciji in svoj teritorij (ali vsaj njegov za agrarno izrabo najpomembnejši del)⁴⁰ v mejah izpred rimske zasedbe.

Analiza najdb z drugih kraških gradišč bi pokazala, da rodiška Ajdovščina ni osamljena in da tovrstno kontinuiteto lahko dokumentiramo tudi na drugih najdiščih.⁴¹ Res pa je tudi, da je vrsta gradišč dokumentirano opuščeni. Klasičen primer v širši regiji je Šmihel pri Hrenovicah, centralno gradišče v Postojnski kotlini, ki je bilo uničeno najverjetneje v 2. st. pr. n. št.⁴² Na drugi strani posvetilni napis Avgustu iz Škocjana kaže, da je najdišče, ki ga razumemo kot središčno v prazgodovinskem poselitvenem sistemu, spremenilo namembnost in postalo nosilec simbolnih funkcij nove oblasti.⁴³ Redki epigrafski spomeniki s Krasa kažejo na prisotnost tako domorodnih družin, ki se na nagrobnikih predstavljajo v rimski maniri (Meicij Veturij in žena Volcia Priscilla v Volčem gradu),⁴⁴ kot naseljencev, ki pripadajo rimskim družinam (gens Plinia v Vremah).⁴⁵ Tako se nam prepričljivo zarisuje proces, v katerem je rimska državna oblast na značilen pragmatičen način intervenirala v obstoječe stanje v regiji, pri čemer je uničila točke odpora oz. konkurenčne moči (Šmihel), simbolno obvladala pomensko najpregnantnejše točke (Tuditanov spomenik ob Timavu in prenos kulta Timava v Oglej, Škocjan morda kot kultno središče

domorodnih skupnosti z lojalističnim državnim kultom), aktivirala privilegirano točko z emporialno tradicijo kot mestno središče (kolonija Tergeste), vzpostavila nadzorno in gospodarsko infrastrukturo (vojaške postojanke, javne ceste in cestne postaje, carinska postaja) in zagotovila gospodarsko stabilnost z raznimi oblikami agrarne izrabe (v okviru tradicionalnih domorodnih skupnosti, z mestno kolonizacijo, z viritarnim dodeljevanjem državnega zemljišča kolonistom za intenzivno izrabo ali z dodeljevanjem obsežnejših zemljišč privilegiranim elitam za manj intenzivno rabo) in z organizacijo izrabe drugih naravnih virov (kamnolomi v Nabrežini, termalni vreli pri Trziču/Monfalcone).

Tako se torej tako model, po katerem rimska oblast v okupacijski fazi domorodne skupnosti razseli z utrjenih višin v ravnice zaradi lažjega nadzora nad njimi, kot model, ki računa s samodejnimi učinki rimskega miru in preselitvijo v doline zaradi gospodarskih prednosti, v našem primeru kažeta kot nezadostna in neustrezna. Mehanizem, ki je pripeljal do končne opustitve tradicionalnih višinskih lokacij, je po našem razumevanju drugačen in zadeva spremembo pravnega statusa teh skupnosti in z njo povezan razpad njihove družbene zgradbe. V pomembnem delu, če že ne v celotni kraški regiji, je bil po podatkih, ki so nam na voljo, ta sprožen zelo pozno, šele sredi 2. st. n. š., z dodelitvijo latinskega državljanstva dotlej peregrinskim skupnostim.

Vir, ki o tem poroča, je dekret tržaškega mestnega sveta, ki je v prepisu ohranjen na podstavku konjeniškega kipa tržaškega senatorja Lucija Fabija Severa, danes v lapidariju Museo Civico v Trstu.⁴⁶ Dekret zadeva postavitve javnega spomenika mlademu senatorju, ki je bil tedaj kot *questor urbanus*

³⁸ Za bogat korpus razmejitvenih napisov iz Dalmacije: J. Wilkes, *Boundary stones in Roman Dalmatia I. The inscriptions*, *Arh. vest.* 25, 1974, 258-274.

³⁹ Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. v op. 1) 68-74.

⁴⁰ *Via publica* in možna izločitev pasu v dnu Matarskega podolja: Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. v op. 1) sl. 60-66.

⁴¹ Denimo Štanjel: V. Vidrih Perko, *Some Late Roman ceramic finds from the Slovenian Karst region*, *Acta Rei Cret. Rom. Faut.* 35, 1997, 249-258. za analogno situacijo globlje v notranjosti prim. Horvat, *Notranjska* (cit. v op. 31).

⁴² J. Horvat, *Roman republican weapons from Šmihel in Slovenia*, *Journal of Roman military equipment studies* 8, 1997, 105-120; obširneje s katalogom: ead., *Zaklad rimskega republikanskega orožja z Gradu pri Šmihelu pod Nanosom*, *Arh. vest.* 53, 2002, 117-192, domneva prekinitev poselitve Gradu v srednjem latenu, obenem pa dokumentira tudi mlajše najdbe od poznolatskega obdobja dalje, ki kažejo na nadaljnjo uporabo lokacije skozi celotno obdobje rimske oblasti v naših krajih (ibid., Dodatek, 160-163). Ključno je seveda vprašanje "zaklada" rimskega orožja, ki ga je avtorica uspela datirati v čas ob koncu 3. in v 1. pol. 2. st. pr. n. š. (drugače še M. Guštin, *Notranjska*, Kat. in monogr. 17 (1979) in skladno s tem tudi J. Šašel, Okra, *Kronika* 22, 1974, 9-17, ki uničenje datira v avgustejsko obdobje). Povezanost zaklada z uničenjem ni nujna, je pa verjetna. Žganinskih ruševin obzidja na podlagi Müllnerjevih podatkov (izkopavanja 1892) seveda ni mogoče datirati, je pa vsaj ena njegova najdba (iz plasti, ki je podobna tisti, v kateri je ležal zaklad) primerljiva z najdbami iz zaklada; na drugi strani pa za Klanjškove najdbe ni mogoče z gotovostjo reči, da vse izhajajo iz tiste (globoke) luknje, ki jo omenja Windischgrätz: kopal je skozi dve leti in je pač poskušal na raznih mestih. Zdi se torej, da četudi je bilo orožje morda res zbrano in zakopano, tako da je bila večina najdena v "zakladu", vendarle nastopa tudi drugod ob obzidju in je tu kot posledica obleganja naselja.

⁴³ *I. It.* X 4,337; glede možne vojaške funkcije Škocjana v okupacijski fazi gl. J. Šašel, *Zur Verteidigung der Nordostgrenze in der provincia Cisalpina*, v: *Roman Frontier Studies 1969* (Cardiff 1974) 174-177, ki upošteva tudi najdbo čelade *I. It.* X 4,338 v Mušji jami.

⁴⁴ *I. It.* X 4,313.

⁴⁵ *I. It.* X 4,333.

na začetku svoje politične kariere, in v razdelani retorični formi podaja razloge za počastitev uglednega someščana. Kot zastopnik interesa tržaškega mesta je namreč pri cesarju Antoninu Piju dosegel podelitev latinskega pravnega statusa peregrinskim skupnostim Karnov (ali Subokrinov) in Katalov, ki so bile pod cesarjem Avgustom atribuirane tržaški koloniji, s čemer je bila elitam teh skupnosti (*Carni Catalique ... qui meruissent vita atque censu*) odprta možnost pridobitve polnega rimskega državljanstva in vključitve v mestni svet prek izvolitve v mestne magistrature (*uti ... per aedilitatis gradu in curiam nostram admitterentur*: gre torej za *Latium maius*). Interes kolonije (*L. Fabium Severum ... tam grandi beneficio tam salubri ingenio tam perpetua utilitate rem publicam nostram adservisse*) je pri tem zelo precizno opredeljen: kadrovska dopolnitev mestnega sveta (*quo curiam complevit*) in okrepitev mestne skupnosti (*universam rem publicam nostram cum fromentis ampliavit*), še posebej pa utrditev mestnih financ (*aerarium nostrum ditavit*). Gre torej za integracijo v državljanski korpus (*usurpatio romanae civitatis*) in tržaško kurijo domorodnih družbenih in premoženjskih elit (*admittendo et optimum et locuplentissimum quoque*), ki so dotlej kot peregrine imele zgolj davčne obveznosti do mesta (*erant tantum in reditu pecuniario*), sedaj pa bodo k temu še prevzemale finančna bremena obubožanega in razredčenega tržaškega mestnega sveta in uprave (*sint cum quibus munera decurionatus iam ut paucis onerosa honeste de pleno compartiamur*).

Ta izjemni dokument je bil - razumljivo - predmet mnogih študij.⁴⁷ Tu nas bodo zanimali zgolj tisti podatki, ki se nanašajo na status in usodo domorodnih skupnosti. Še najbolj preseneča, da so Karni (ali Subokrini) in Katali z našega napisa tako pozno dobili privilegij omejenega državljanstva. Onkraj carinske postaje pri Šempolaju in meje na Dolenjem Krasu⁴⁸ so skupnosti Transpadane dobile *Latium* že z *lex Pompeia* l. 89 pr. n. š. Področje Trsta z

večjim delom Krasa je bilo v tem času brzkonca v Iliriku,⁴⁹ a tudi po vključitvi teritorija kolonije Tergeste v Italijo so skupnosti v kraškem zaledju ostale brez državljanstva in so bile pod Avgustom koloniji atribuirane.⁵⁰ Karni (ali Subokrini) in Katali so torej od vzpostavitve rimske oblasti v 2. stoletju pr. n. š. skozi tri stoletja zadržali status peregrinskih skupnosti, v času nastanka našega napisa pa so imeli finančno tako močne lastne družbene in premoženjske elite, da je bila njihova polna integracija v mestno skupnost s stališča dekurionalov tržaške kolonije ne le zaželena, temveč so jo v kontekstu očitne krize mestne uprave in financ videli kot odrešilno. V luči naših gornjih izvajanj lahko torej sklepamo, da so bile strukture prostorske organizacije in izrabe agrarnih virov, ki so jih v 1. tisočletju pr. n. š. vzpostavile kraške prazgodovinske skupnosti, toliko trdne in uspešne, da so omogočile ne le preživetje skupnosti pod rimsko nadoblastjo, temveč so - ob nedvomni notranji družbeni diferenciaciji - ustvarjale pogoje za kopičenje viškov in ustvarjanje bogastva. Vse to velja tem bolj, saj se je dogajalo v pogojih, ki jih zaznamuje izguba delov teritorija (kolonialni ager, Škocjan, Vremska dolina, del Matarskega podolja, morda tudi nekatere druge agrarne niše, pasovi javnih cest) in pravna hendikepiranost domorodnega prebivalstva pri izrabi virov, ki so v času samostojnosti predstavljali primerjalno strateško in gospodarsko prednost regije - denimo pri nadzoru in posredovanju v transportu in menjavi na daleč.

To navaja na temeljit premislek o razlagalnih shemah, ki jih uporabljamo za arheološke zapise zgodnjega rimskega obdobja v regiji. Prostor, ki ga velja opazovati, ko iščemo korelacije med podatki historičnih in arheoloških virov, je celotno kraško-notranjsko zaledje, glede katerega med zgodovinarji obstaja široko soglasje, da je bilo podvrženo jurisdikciji kolonije Tergeste.⁵¹ Ne glede na retorična pretiravanja so pričakovanja učinkov integracije

⁴⁶ I. It. X 4,31; R. K. Sherk, *The municipal decrees of the Roman west*, Arethusa Monogr. 2 (Buffalo 1970); Rossi, *Romani* (cit. v op. 22), 128.

⁴⁷ G. Lettich, Osservazioni sull'epigrafe di Fabio Severo, *Arch. Triest.* 82, 1973, 25-74; L. Margetić, Napomene o Augustovim granicama tergestinskog agera, *Dometi* 21, 1988, 773-788; za čitanje Catubrini gl. Rossi, *Romani* (cit. v op. 22); sicer gl. Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. v op. 8) 215-216. Napis je obravnavan v vseh pomembnih študijah o upravnih vprašanih imperija, še posebej ko gre za probleme atribucije in pa statusa domorodnih skupnosti, in vsaj omenjen v vseh študijah o zgodovini in arheologiji regije v antiki.

⁴⁸ A. Degrassi, *Il confine nord-orientale dell'Italia romana* (Bern 1954) 22-26; za območje nabrežinskih kamnolomov, gl. Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. v op. 8) 163; za vprašljivo relevantnost srednjeveških cerkvenih meja gl. M. Šašel Kos, Mejniki med Akvilejo in Emono, *Arh. vest.* 53, 2002, 382.

⁴⁹ Degrassi (cit. v op. 48) 14-17; G. Bandelli, Il governo romano nella Transpadana orientale (90-42 a.C.), *Ant. Altoadr.* 28, 1986, 43-64; cf. tudi Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. v op. 8) 152, z drugačnim mnenjem kar zadeva čas ustanovitve Tergesta; glede drugačnega mnenja o teritorialni pripadnosti gl. M. Šašel Kos, Caesar, Illyricum, and the hinterland of Aquileia, v: G. Urso (ur.), *L'ultimo Cesare* (Roma 2000) 277-304.

⁵⁰ U. Laffi, *Adtributio e contributo* (Pisa 1966) 36-41; cf. op. 47.

⁵¹ Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. v op. 8) 163-164; na novo odpira vprašanje severne meje agra v kraškem zaledju mejnik med akvilejskim

domorodnih elit v besedilu dekreta precizna in prepričljivo odslikujejo procese, ki so v tem času dobro dokumentirani in zadevajo krizo mestnih uprav v velikem delu imperija. Pričakovanja tržaških dekursionalov pa so lahko bila realistična le, če so računali z znatno populacijo lokalnih elit, v kateri bodo zajemali okrepitve za mestno kurijo, in v danih okoliščinah to pomeni tudi znaten teritorij za zajemanje. Glede na zgoraj nakazano pisano podobo kraškega zaledja, ko gre za status zemljišč in posesti, domnevamo, da etnikona Karni (oz. Subokrini) in Katali prej kot kompaktno peregrinsko etnično ozemlje pokrivata mrežo teritorialnih skupnosti v peregrinskem statusu. Njihovo arheološko podobo bomo v skladu z našimi izhodiščnimi izvajanji iskali v (razredčeni in okrnjeni) mreži mlajše kaštelirske poselitve, ob upoštevanju zaenkrat slabo poznane poselitvene hierarhije in možnih lokacijskih premikov kot posledice zgodovinskih konjunktur in družbenega strukturiranja znotraj teritorialnih enot.⁵² Edini besedilno (epigrafsko) izpričani in za naša razmišljanja paradigmatični primer so že zopet Rundikti (s toponimskim prežitkom v imenu vasi Rodik, arheološko oprijemljivi).⁵³ Na drugi strani nekateri dokumenti iz slovenske Istre, ki v interpretacijah tudi nastopa kot možno območje v napisu omenjenih Katalov, kažejo drugačne ritme in drugačne mehanizme vključevanja domačinov v državljanski korpus,⁵⁴ zato sklepamo, da je manj verjetno, da se podelitev latinskega državljanstva iz našega napisa nanaša na ta del tržaškega teritorija.

Če upoštevamo tristoletni avtonomen razvoj skupnosti Karnov (ali Subokrinov) in Katalov pod rimsko oblastjo, moramo, ko gre za poselitveno kontinuiteto znotraj njihovih teritorialnih skupnosti, predvideti naselbinske kontinuitete in diskontinuitete, ki bodo odražale specifične pogoje in izbire posamičnih skupnosti. Kot kontinuiteta naselbinske lokacije, denimo v primeru Trsta ali Škocjana, po sebi še ne pomeni kontinuirane prisotnosti domorodne populacije na teh mestih, tudi premik naselbinske lokacije, denimo z utrjene prazgodovinske na novo

nižinsko, ne pomeni nujno intervencije od zunaj in še manj naselitev od zunaj. Prazgodovinske obrambne strukture so lahko postale nepotrebne ali celo nezaželene (tudi zaradi zunanega diktata), pa so tradicionalne višinske lokacije vendarle ostale v rabi kot središča teritorialnih skupnosti, kot v primeru rodiške Ajdovščine. Na drugi strani vicinalna struktura najdišč kot sta povirsko ali lokavsko Merišče kažeta na poselitveno kontinuiteto znotraj agrarnih niš po opustitvi prazgodovinskih višinskih lokacij. Izolirano podeželsko arhitekturo z visokimi statusnimi najdbami v Vremah lahko ob upoštevanju epigrafskega podatka prepričljivo povežemo z viritarno kolonizacijo in posestjo tipa vile rustike, na drugi strani pa bomo v primerih kot je denimo Ajdovska vas pri Koprivi morda lahko domnevali posest domače elite. Za zanesljivejše primerjave in opredelitve so seveda potrebne temeljitejša terenske raziskave; celovito raziskana ni zaenkrat nobena lokacija v tej regiji.

Arheološki zapisi na višinskih zgodnjemrimskih lokacijah v regiji pa vendarle sovpadajo v eni točki. Tako novčne najdbe kot siceršnji arheološki zapisi na kontinuirano poseljenih prazgodovinskih naseljih kažejo izrazit upad ali cezuro v času do 2. pol. 2. st. n. št.⁵⁵ Ta opažanja želimo povezati z ugotovitvami, ki izhajajo iz branja tržaškega napisa, in predlagamo, da jih razlagamo kot indikatorje globoke krize, ki je doletela domorodne skupnosti v regiji in ki nastopi prav zaradi razpada družbene zgradbe teh skupnosti ob integraciji lokalnih elit v rimsko državljanstvo in v strukture mestne uprave kolonije Tergeste. Obglavljene in pavperizirane skupnosti ne morejo več vzdrževali lokalnih centrov in nova struktura poselitve odraža nadaljnji proces, v katerem elite sedaj upravljajo svoja posestva iz mestnega središča, medtem ko so preostali sloji lokalnega prebivalstva atomizirani bodisi v okvirih subsistenčne agrarne ekonomije bodisi proletarizirani kot delovna sila v službi mestnih elit.

Razpad domorodnih skupnosti v kraški regiji, strukturiranih znotraj kakorkoli že okrnjene in

in emonskim agrom, najden pri Bevkah: Šašel Kos, *Mejnik* (cit. v op. 48) 373-382.

⁵² O teritorialnih skupnostih oz. o teritorijih skupnosti njegove "mlajše kaštelirske krajine" gl. Novaković, *Detecting* (cit. v op. 4) 108-114 in sl. 10; o razmerju do rimskodobne poselitve gl. Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. v op. 1) 30-47, in Novaković, *Kras* (cit. v op. 4) 282-303.

⁵³ Cf. op. 32-40; materijski napis nedvomno kaže na pravno subjektiviteto Rundiktov, njihovo razmerje do oznake Karni (oz. Subokrini) in Katali v tržaškem napisu ostaja odprto; tu lahko samo ugotovimo sovpadanje ritmov pri arheološkem zapisu enih in spremembah pravnega statusa drugih.

⁵⁴ *I. It. X* 3,30; za diskusijo gl. Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. v op. 8) 156.

⁵⁵ P. Kos, *Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Slowenien I, II* (Berlin, Ljubljana 1988); P. Kos, A. Šemrov, *Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Slowenien III* (Berlin, Ljubljana 1995); A. Šemrov, *Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Slowenien IV* (Berlin, Ljubljana 1998); passim; Istenič, *Rodik* (cit. v op. 36) 108; Vidrih Perko, *Rodik* (cit. v op. 35) 349; Vidrih Perko, *Karst* (cit. v op. 41); trditev bi zahtevala preverbe celotnega gradiva, ocenjujemo pa, da sedanja opažanja lahko razlagamo vsaj kot zmanjšanje intenzivnosti izrabe teh lokacij, morda skrčenje naselbin, manjšo kupno moč pavperiziranih prebivalcev ipd., in da zadostujejo za oblikovanje naše hipoteze.

preoblikovane prazgodovinske poselitvene mreže, ki preživi rimsko okupacijo in skozi tri stoletja zagotavlja organizacijski okvir za njihovo preživetje, vidimo torej v integracijskem mehanizmu, ki ga rimska država uporablja v raznih oblikah od njegove vzpostavitve v zgodnji republikanski dobi, in to je institut latinskega prava. Ravnovesje med rimsko mestno in domorodnimi peregrinskimi skupnostmi

poruši šele kriza mestne uprave sredi 2. st. n. š., ki zahteva resno kadrovske obnovo in finančno utrditev z razširitvijo državlanskega korpusa na območju pod jurisdikcijo mesta in integracijo domorodnih elit v upravljalne strukture mesta, z neizbežnimi posledicami, ki jih ta sprememba fokusa in interesnega polja elit prinese domorodnim skupnostim.

The end of prehistoric communities in the Karst region

As a humble obolus to my esteemed professor and teacher, I would like to present here some considerations about the fortunes of the prehistoric communities in the Karst hinterlands of coastal Slovenia. These parts were certainly not the focus of Prof. Gabrovec's academic interest: The rich Iron Age sites of Lower Carniola were indeed the privileged area where he pursued his field research, verifying therewith his methodological credo and building up the knowledge of later prehistory, which he then formulated, and will hopefully keep doing so in the years to come, in numerous studies, papers and articles, for both his colleagues and for a wider audience. It is he, however, who, in his syntheses on the later prehistory of Slovenia, defined the cultural groups and also the chronology of this region. Furthermore, the high esteem he has enjoyed amongst the international scientific community enabled him to establish organizational frameworks for the study of earlier research, and of finds kept in Museums in Slovenia and abroad, and to orient his collaborators and students towards fruitful projects

on new and old materials, widening therewith the scope of our understanding of the prehistoric communities in the 2nd and 1st millennia B.C. I was privileged to have Prof. Gabrovec not only as an inspiringly skeptical critic of my PhD thesis throughout the process: he also agreed to act as one of the supervisors in its final phase.

The paper is in fact an attempt at elaborating some of the ideas developed in my thesis¹. Admitting to serious limitations due to poor stratigraphic data on prehistoric settlement and a lack of systematic survey², this attempt at operationalizing concepts of settlement and spatial archaeology for the study of the Karst region, permitted us to identify regularities in the distribution of sites, propose a classification of fortified sites based on locational criteria, and develop a hierarchical model of late prehistoric settlement³. This approach has left some trace among the academic community here, and has recently been put to test and further developed both conceptually and technically, including extensive application of GIS⁴.

¹ B. Slapšak, *Možnosti študija poselitve v arheologiji*, PhD thesis, University of Ljubljana (Ljubljana 1983); published as: id., *Možnosti študija poselitve v arheologiji (On the potential of settlement studies in archaeology)*, *Arheo* 17 (Ljubljana 1995).

² Archaeological survey is no easy task in carstic environments with limited agricultural lands available for inspection, and heavy erosion. Our experiences in the Slovenian Karst were presented in 1981 in Athens: B. Slapšak, The Kras (Carst) Survey, in: P. Keller, D. Rupp (eds.), *Archaeological survey in the Mediterranean area*, BAR Int. Ser. 155 (Oxford 1983) 201-202. There, we got acquainted with the results of the first systematic survey projects in the Mediterranean, which we then applied in our project in Dalmatia: B. Kirigin, B. Slapšak, Starigradsko polje na otoku Hvaru (Field survey of Ager Pharensis), *Arh. pregl.* 26, 1985 (1986) 207-208; B. Slapšak, The 1982-1986 Ager Pharensis survey, Potentials and limitations of 'wall survey' in karstic environments, in: J. C. Chapman, J. Bintliff, V. Gaffney, B. Slapšak (eds.), *Recent developments in Yugoslav archaeology*, BAR Int. Ser. 431 (1988) 145-149. Since 1987, the British colleagues brought in their experience from their project in Greece: J. Bintliff, V. L. Gaffney, B. Slapšak, Kontekst in metodologija terenskega pregleda Ager Pharensis - Hvar (The context and methodology of the Ager Pharensis - Hvar field survey), *Arheo* 9, 1989, 42-55; V. L. Gaffney, J. Bintliff, B. Slapšak, Site formation processes and the Hvar survey project, in: A. J. Schofield (ed.), *Interpreting artefact scatters. Contributions to ploughzone archaeology*, Oxford Monograph 4 (Oxford 1991) 59-77. This facilitated greatly the building up of methodology for systematic survey in Slovenia, both in a research context: M. Guštin, P. Novaković, D. Grosman, B. Mušič, M. Lubšina-Tušek, *Rimsko podeželje (Roman countryside)*, Razprave Filozofske fakultete (Ljubljana 1996) 11-42, and in rescue archaeology (methodology for preliminary research on motorways - Group for Archaeology on Motorways in Slovenia - SAAS). In the Karst region, the procedures had to be adapted further because of the specificities of the archaeological record there, notably for carstic dolinas: P. Novaković, H. Simoni, Archaeology of the Kras dolinas, *Annales, Ser. hist. sociol.* 7/10, 1997, 19-36.

³ Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. in n. 1); cf. also Student seminar on spatial archaeology and GIS, Pre-GIS and GIS analysis of territory, Testing the validity of some classical archaeological tools against GIS, in: B. Slapšak (ed.), *On the good use of geographic information systems in archaeological landscape studies. (Proceedings of the COST G2 WG2 round table, Ljubljana 18 to 20 December 1998)* (European Communities 2001) 95-100.

⁴ P. Novaković, Detecting territoriality and social structure in the Bronze and Iron Ages, GIS and the hillforts in the Kras region, in: B. Slapšak (ed.), *On the good use of geographic information systems in archaeological landscape studies. (Proceedings of the COST G2 WG2 round table, Ljubljana 18 to 20 December 1998)* (European Communities 2001) 101-115.

Two sets of contrasting arguments currently define our ideas for developments in the region in the 2nd half of the 1st millennium B.C. One is about long-term processes related to settlement pattern and land use⁵: from our locational analysis it clearly follows that (vicinity of and easy access to) good arable land is a strong locational determinant for the Iron Age hillforts there⁶. In karstic environments such as ours, good arable lands will be limited in extent, and dispersed: in our case, hillforts actually control all important niches active within the pattern of the traditional agrarian economy. Within niches, arable lands will tend to be positioned centrally (permitting for some variation, due mainly to that other important locational determinant, which is control of space / defense), while the bulk of pastoral lands will be marginal in relation to the fortified settlement site⁷. Changes in settlement location within niches, including shifts between hilltop and lowland locations, appear to be of lesser consequence, and that is further confirmed by the existence of well-fortified lowland Iron Age settlements such as Volčji grad, Sveto and Skopo. Also, the location of modern villages in relation to hillforts within their agricultural niches appears to be random: all conceivable variations are present there, from continuity of settlement on hilltop location, either within the limits of the prehistoric settlement (Gradišče pri Škocjanu, Štanjel) or adjacent to it (Avber), with possible continuity of specific community functions within the limits of the prehistoric settlement (religious - Skopo, religious and defence - Tomaj),

to transfer of all settlement functions to immediate vicinity of arable land in the plain (Kazlje), with possible re-use of the hillfort site for defense (Povir) or religious infrastructure (Lipa), or infrastructure linked to temporary and less intensive economic activity (pastoral huts on Rodik-Ajdovščina). Continuity of occupation by niches, allowing for dynamic and complementary relationship between hilltop and lowland settlement locations and functions, would suggest that the Iron Age communities on the Karst succeeded in establishing stable structures of spatial organization and land use, and developed cultural patterns, which will be recognized as typical of the region on a long-term basis.

The other set of arguments is about historical conjunctures as reflected in written sources⁸, and may hopefully be traceable also in the archaeological record. For the last centuries B.C., historical, ethnographic and geographical sources combined, offer a dynamic tableau for this region, with a number of participants involved. Much of that revolves around Aquileia, Latin colony of 181 B.C., and the Oera pass to the East. Undoubtedly, this region had long been within the impact zone of the Veneti⁹. To the East, the name of Tergeste has possible Venetic linguistic affiliations¹⁰. The reference in Strabo to Tergeste as a fort (φρούριον) on the Histrian coast¹¹ could then be linked to the emporial activities of the Veneti, the effects of which in archaeological contexts in the hinterlands have been masterfully analyzed by Prof. Gabrovec¹², and is readable also

⁵ It is important to keep in mind that our knowledge of later prehistoric settlement is limited to hilltop and a few lowland fortified sites, and to cave sites; in our PhD thesis we pointed out that archaeological topography such as we practiced in early 70s, will mainly complement the known settlement pattern, and will only exceptionally identify new types of sites: Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. in n. 1) 13-15. In Slovenia, lowland prehistoric settlement was identified only when new techniques of systematic survey were applied, most spectacularly during the last five years within the motorway archaeological survey programme. In the Karst region, adapted procedures have made it possible to detect new types of sites in dolinas, which tend to preserve the archaeological record in an otherwise most difficult, highly eroded environment. The only open site identified during our Karst survey was Krajna vas, and a trial trench excavated by the Archaeological Service confirmed the presence of prehistoric finds there, although no structural remains could be identified: B. Slapšak, *Arheološka topografija Slovenije, Kraška planota (Archaeological topography of Slovenia, The Karst plateau)* manuscript report (Ljubljana 1974) s.v. Krajna vas; N. Osmuk, *Krajna vas, Var. spom.* 21, 1977, 193-194. It is clear now that, very much as in NE Slovenia or in Lower Carniola, we have to consider open lowland settlement as an integral part of the late prehistoric settlement system also in the Karst region: Novaković, Simoni, *Doline* (cit. in n. 2); cf. also new excavations by A. Bavdek. While it is obvious that our analyses of the hillfort (castellieri) settlement account for only a part of the overall settlement system and exclude the lower satellite sites, which may have represented in some periods the basic units of land use in the region, we can arguably accept our results as meaningful when it comes to higher hierarchical levels and the settlement system on the regional scale.

⁶ Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. in n. 1), 79-80; cf. also B. Slapšak, *Slovenski Kras v poznejši prazgodovini in v rimski dobi (Slovenian Karst in later prehistory and in the Roman period)*, in: A. Kranjc (ed.), *Kras, Pokrajina, življenje, ljudje (Karst, Landscape, life and people)* (Ljubljana 1999), 161-163 and fig. p. 161.

⁷ The well defended lowland fortified site of Debela griza near Hrpelje, analysed in terms of pastoral economy within the territory of the Rodik hillfort is an interesting case in point: Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. in n. 1) 22-28 and fig. 6; B. Slapšak, *Defining the economic space of a typical Iron Age hillfort: Rodik, Yugoslavia, A case study*, in: J. Bintliff, D. Davidson, E. Grant (eds.), *Conceptual issues in environmental archaeology* (Edinburgh 1988) 95-107. The lowland fortified site / enclosure of Kosovelje is a similar challenge in terms of functional interpretation.

⁸ V. Vedaldi Iasbez, *La Venetia orientale e l'Histria: le fonti letterarie greche e latine fino alla caduta dell'Impero Romano d'Occidente*, Studi e ricerche sulla Gallia Cisalpina 5 (Roma 1994); P. Sticotti, *Inscriptiones Italiae X 4* (Roma 1951); C. Zaccaria, *Regio X Venetia et Histria, Tergeste - Ager Tergestinus et Tergesti adtributus, Supplementa Italica n.s. 10* (Roma 1992), 139-283.

⁹ G. Fogolari, A. L. Prosdocimi, *I Veneti antichi, Lingua e cultura* (Padova 1988); and most importantly, the recent excavations by F. Maselli Scotti in Aquileia, which show predominance of Venetic (Este culture) material from the 8th c. B.C. on.

¹⁰ G. B. Pellegrini, A. L. Prosdocimi, *La lingua venetica* (Padova 1967) 396 ff.; *terg(o)- as a pre-indoeuropean root, taken over in Venetic language and then borrowed as a cultural term by other languages: A. L. Prosdocimi, *Contatti di lingue nella decima Regio, parte nordorientale, Ant. Altoadr.* 28, 1986, 15-42; A.L. Prosdocimi, *La lingua*, in: G. Fogolari, A.L. Prosdocimi, *I Veneti* (cit. in n. 9); in earlier publications identified as Illyrian: H. Krahe, *Die alten balkanillyrischen geographischen Namen* (Heidelberg 1925) 70 s; cf. also: R. Katičić, *Acient languages of the Balkans, LAia*, 1976, 172; overview in: Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. in n. 8), 149.

¹¹ Strabo V, 1, 9; R. F. Rossi, *Phrourion - kome karnike: qualche osservazione su Tergeste preromana e romana*, in: *Studi in onore di Albino Garzetti*. (Atti del Convegno, Brescia 1996) (Brescia 1996) 353-365 [= *Scritti di storia romana* (Trieste 1996)]; C. Zaccaria, *Tergeste e il suo territorio alle soglie della romanità*, in: *I Celti nell'Alto Adriatico* (Atti delle tre giornate internazionali di studio, Trieste 5-7 aprile 2001), *Ant. Altoadr.* 48, 2001, 95-118.

¹² S. Gabrovec, *Halštatska kultura Slovenije (The Halstatt culture in Slovenia)*, *Arh. vest.* 15-16, 1964-1965, 21-63; id., *Jugoistočnoalpska*

in the distribution of Venetic scripts in these north-eastern parts¹³. Another hint in the same direction is given by mythographic tradition, linking as it does the river Timavus with the story of Antenor's arrival to the lands where he was to found a city and settle his Henetoi¹⁴. Further mythological traditions bear witness to the emporial character of the site by the sources of the Timavus, with a variety of groups involved at various points in time in transactions there: besides epichoric Timavus¹⁵, and Antenor on his wanderings following his escape from Troy, there is Diomedes (for some, *interpretatio Graeca* of the local Timavus), then the Aetolian Artemis and the Argive Hera¹⁶, and the Argonauts¹⁷, all distinctively Greek trade marks, but also Saturnus (for some, *interpretatio Romana* of Diomedes)¹⁸, which may point to some very early Italic / Roman presence. If we just observe data available for the 2nd c. B.C., there is a whole list of peoples and groups competing for the control of the territory of Aquileia and the Ocra pass. Besides the Veneti, ancient residents there and allies of Rome, and the Romans themselves, who will found Aquileia in 181 B.C., there are the Gauls descending from the Alps, uprooted by the Romans in their attempt to settle in the area (186-183 B.C.)¹⁹; the Histri, enemies of Rome since the 20s of the 3rd c. B.C.²⁰, who will oppose the invading Roman army in 179 B.C. precisely in the area of the Timavus²¹; the Carni, whose later appearance in

and about Trieste²² has been linked with the Gauls allied to Rome in the Histrian war of 179-178²³, and who may have settled there in the wake of the war; the Taurisci beyond the Alps, eager to control the pass of Ocra and down to the sea, and who end by being subdued, and their *portorium* in Nauportus taken over by the Romans²⁴; and the Iapodes, reported as bordering the Carni on the Ocra pass²⁵, defeated in 129, but then causing havoc around Tergeste again in 52 B.C.²⁶, and finally defeated by Octavian in the course of his Illyrian wars in 35-33 B.C. To these, we may add Hellenistic monarchs (Antiochus III, Philip V, Perseus, Mithridates VI) who contemplated the idea of engaging Italy from the East, and would to that end need to establish some kind of control over the Ocra pass²⁷.

As the playground of historical events, the Karst was demonstrably an area of considerable dynamism, due mainly to its strategic position on the crossroads of important trans-European communications. The succession of agents in play for the control and military / economic exploitation of this communication node, well documented for the last centuries B.C., can safely be extrapolated to earlier periods, where we are left without written record. Elsewhere we proposed a reading of the archaeological record in the Škocjan area along these lines²⁸. The site has been characterized both as a central place within the regional settlement system, and a gateway at the

regija sa zapadnom Panonijom, Dolenjska grupa (The SE Alpine region and Western Pannonia, The Lower Carniola group), in: A. Benac (ed.), *Praist. jug. zem. 5. Željezno doba (Prehistory of the Yugoslav lands 5: The Iron Age)* (Sarajevo 1987) 29-119; S. Gabrovec, K. Mihovilić, Jadransko-zapadnobalkanska regija, Istarska grupa (The Adriatic-Western Balkans region, The Histrian group), *ibid.* 293-338.

¹³ J. Istenič, Zapisi v venetski pisavi na Koroškem in v Sloveniji (Venetic inscriptions in Carinthia and in Slovenia). *Zgod. čas.* 39, 1985, 313-334.

¹⁴ Verg. *Aen.* 242-246, cf. L. Braccesi, *La leggenda di Antenore* (Venezia 1997).

¹⁵ G. Cuscito, Il Lacus Timavi dall'antichità al Medioevo, in: *Il Timavo. Immagini, storia, ecologia di un fiume carsico* (Trieste 1989) 61-127 (Il console Tuditano e il culto al Timavo, 84-89); M. Šašel Kos, *Pre-Roman divinities of the Eastern Alps and Adriatic*, Situla 38 (Ljubljana 1999) 18-20.

¹⁶ C. Corbato, L'arco del Timavo negli scrittori classici, *Ant. Altoadr.* 10, 1976, 13-21; L. A. Stella, Miti greci dallo Ionio all'Alto Adriatico, *Ant. Altoadr.* 12, 1977, 25; L. Braccesi, *Grecità adriatica* (Bologna 1977); F. CRSSOLA, Le popolazioni preromane del Friuli nelle fonti letterarie, *Ant. Altoadr.* 15/1, 1979, 83-112; A. Grilli, L'arco adriatico fra preistoria e leggenda, *Ant. Altoadr.* 37, 1991, 15-44; L. Braccesi, Diomedes cum Gallis, *Hesperia* 2, 1991, 89-102.

¹⁷ *Mart.* 4,25,5-6; 8,28,7-6.

¹⁸ F. Maselli Scotti, Un culto di Saturno al Timavo?, *Aquil. Nos.* 49, 1978, 9-20.

¹⁹ *Galli transalpini in Venetiam transgressi*: Liv 39,22,6; 39,45,6; cf. the mentioning of the founding of Aquileia in *agro Gallorum*: Liv. 40,34,2; however, this one may only refer to the attempt by the Gauls above; F. Sartori, Galli Transalpini transgressi in Venetiam (Liv. 39, 22, 6-7), *Aquil. Nos.* 31, 1960, 1-40.

²⁰ G. Bandelli, La guerra istrica del 221 a. C. e la spedizione alpina del 220 a. C., *Athenaeum* 59, 1981, 3-28; M. Šašel Kos, *A Historical Outline of the Region between Aquileia, the Adriatic, and Sirmium in Cassius Dio and Herodian* (Ljubljana 1986) 58-59 (fr. 5) in 85-87.

²¹ Liv. 41,2,1; cf. A. Grilli, Livio e i Romani in Istria nel 178 a.C., *Rend. Ist. Lomb.* 110, 1976, 142-151.

²² Tergeste as κάρμη καρνικῆ: Strabo VII 5, 2; cf. also the attribution of the Carni (or Subocri) to the colony of Tergeste under Augustus: *I. It.* X 4,31; cf. R. F. Rossi, Romani, Preromani, non Romani nel territorio di Tergeste, in: *I Celti nell'Alto Adriatico*, *Ant. Altoadr.* 48 (2001) 119. On p. 128 the author proposed a supplement '[Subocri]ni' instead of the '[Car]ni'.

²³ Discussion in G. Dobesch, *Die Kelten in Österreich nach den ältesten Berichten der Antike* (Wien 1993) 106-108; cf. also M. Šašel Kos, The end of the Norican kingdom and the formation of the provinces Noricum and Pannonia, in: B. Djurić, I. Lazar (ur.), *Akten der IV internationalen Kolloquiums über Probleme des provinzialrömischen Kunstschaßens*. (Celje 8.-12. Mai 1995), Situla 36 (Ljubljana 1997) 26.

²⁴ After defeat by Tuditanus 129 B.C.: J. Šašel, Lineamenti dell'espansione romana nelle Alpi Orientali e nei Balcani Occidentali, in: *Aquileia e l'arco alpino orientale*, *Ant. Altoadr.* 9, 1976, 86; otherwise: M. Šašel Kos, Nauportus: Ancient literary and epigraphic sources, in: J. Horvat, *Nauportus (Vrhnik)*, Dela 1. razr. SAZU 33 (Ljubljana 1990), 17-33.

²⁵ Strab. IV 6,10; R. F. Rossi, Romani e non Romani nell'Italia nordorientale, *Ant. Altoadr.* 37, 1991, 201-217 [= *Scritti di storia romana* (Trieste 1996) 279-288]; R. F. Rossi, Insediamenti e popolazioni del territorio di Tergeste e delle aree limitrofe, in: *Tipologia di insediamento e distribuzione antropica nell'area veneto-istriana dalla protostoria all'alto medioevo*. (Atti del Seminario di Studio, Asolo, 3-5 novembre 1989) (Monfalcone 1992) 161-167 [= *Scritti di storia romana* (Trieste 1996) 267-278]; R. F. Rossi, Gentes ferae et ... latrociniis maritimis infames, *Atti Mem. Soc. Istr. Arch. St. Pat.* 92, 1992, 7-20 [= *Scritti di storia romana* (Trieste 1996) 289-297]; Rossi, *Romani* (cit. in n. 22).

²⁶ Caes. *Bell. Gall.* 8,24,3; App. III. 18; R. F. Rossi, Cesare tra la Gallia e Aquileia, *Ant. Altoadr.* 19, 1981, 71-87.

²⁷ Šašel, *Lineamenti* (cit. in n. 24) 76.

foot of the Odra pass²⁹. We suggested that the fact that Iron Age cemeteries there were numerous rather than populous, might indeed indicate such frequent change of groups and peoples exercising regional hegemony, and control over the strategic / religious center there. While often the new dominant group would choose a new location for the cult of their dead, further complexity would result from the presence of various ethnic or power groups: both cemetery locations and distinctive grave rites may reflect specific identities and social roles for such groups.

The two sets of arguments seem to result in opposing pictures of cultural processes in the Karst region in the 1st millennium B.C. While in the settlement pattern we read stable structures of spatial organization and land use, in historical data and in the (tentatively) related archaeological record, we read frequent change, notably when it comes to phenomena linked to power and control. In fact, what we have here are cultural phenomena with contrasting temporalities, co-existing within cultures as structures of 'longue' and of 'courte durée' in Braudel terms. The former are about agrarian economy and use of natural resources: from our studies it would result that in the 1st millennium B.C., territorial communities appear in the Karst region, which optimize the exploitation of limited agricultural resources there. Since related structures define the possibilities and limitations of subsistence economy in the region, all historical change will tend to fit into this grid and work it further. Even a complete change of population would end by re-activating the same agrarian niches: new settlers would preferentially choose old settlement locations, which summarize the experience of successful adaptation to this difficult terrain, and include, in the case of hillforts, massive defence works which require intensive input of labor. If the area is taken over by a new hegemonic power, control and defense by local communities may be disfavored, and this may result in abandonment of hilltop settlement locations and defense works. This will be the more likely if states are involved, with specialized control and defense functions, organized from a remote center. Such change in settlement pattern has indeed been the key point in modelling the effects of Roman occupation

in these parts³⁰. We would argue, however, that not only complete change of population was an exception rather than the rule in later prehistory (and that the new hegemonic power would normally take control over the center and the points of external contacts only), but also the change in settlement pattern, including abandonment of hilltop locations, was a process rather than an event, and did not affect all local communities in the Kras region in the same way. The archaeological record, however meager, seems to corroborate such an understanding³¹.

The case of the community of the Rundictes can be taken as paradigmatic in this respect. Their settlement center has been convincingly identified on the hillfort of Ajdovščina above Rodik³². The Rundictes appear on an inscription of the Claudian period as a party in a territorial dispute with the senator Gaius Laecanius Bassus³³ who, besides his possessions in coastal Istria (Fažana, possibly also Brioni islands), owned land, most probably for pasture, also in the interior bordering the territory of the Rundictes³⁴. Limited excavation has yielded evidence for continuous occupation of the hillfort site in the period of the dispute³⁵. Grave rite and inventories on the related 1st-mid 2nd c. A.D. cemetery are characteristic of the indigenous population in the region³⁶; On a nearby location of Sedlo, further Early Roman graves and one prehistoric were also identified³⁷. Analysis of prehistoric settlement in this part of the Kras region and on the Brkini range, has permitted a reconstruction of the territory of the Rodik-Ajdovščina hillfort: to the south-east, the reconstructed border coincides nicely with the find spot of the inscription which, by the analogy of tens of comparable inscriptions in the wider region³⁸, was meant to mark the border such as was re-established by the decree mentioned³⁹. We can therefore conclude that the Rundictes an indigenous community who continued to occupy their prehistoric hillfort center and exploit their territory within the borders respected (in part at least⁴⁰) by the occupying power of Rome.

Analysis of finds from other hillforts in the region would show that the case of Ajdovščina above Rodik is by no means isolated⁴¹. On the other hand, a number of sites were indeed

²⁸ Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. in n. 1) 79-83.

²⁹ Slapšak, *Slovenski Kras* (cit. in n. 6) 153-156; 158-160.

³⁰ A recent statement in: J. Horvat, Podeželje (Countryside), in: *Zakladi tisočletij, Zgodovina Slovenije od neandertalcev do Slovanov (Treasures of the millennia: History of Slovenia from the Neanderthals to the Slavs)* (Ljubljana 1999), 244: "By the end of the Iron Ages, the majority of the population lived in well protected hilltop settlements, but the Roman state changed the settlement picture radically. ... Obviously, the Romans demanded the indigenous people to evacuate the old tribal forts and to settle in the lowlands, mainly to control them better".

³¹ For Istria, Karst and the Inner Carniola, where there is evidence for continuity of settlement on several hillforts till "at least the beginning of the 1st c. A.D.", J. Horvat, *ibid.*, assumes economic reasons for the final abandonment of these sites: "long decennia of peace made settling near to main communications and arable lands in the lowlands more appealing"; cf. also J. Horvat, Notranjska (Inner Carniola) at the beginning of the Roman period. Part I near Stara Sušica, Ambrožev gradščice and Baba near Slavina, *Arh. vest.* 46, 1995, 177-216; overview in: J. Horvat, Roman provincial archaeology in Slovenia following the year 1965. Settlement and small finds, *Arh. vest.* 50, 1999, 215-257, notably 218 in 224-225.

³² Since the first notices on the find of *CIL V 698 = I. It. X 4, 376*: P. Kandler, *L'Istria* 6, 1851, 37; anon., Rodik in Ajdovščina nad Rodikom (Rodik and Ajdovščina above Rodik), *Novice* 31. 8. 1859; cf. B. Slapšak, The early history of Rodik, in: *Rodik med Brkini in Krasom (Rodik between Brkini and the Karst)* (Koper 1997) 19-64.

³³ F. Tassaux, Laecanii, Recherches sur une famille sénatoriale d'Istrie, *Mél. Éc. fran. Rome* 94, 1982, 227-269; Id., Apports récents de l'épigraphie à l'histoire économique et sociale de Brioni, in: G. Paci (ed.), *Epigrafia romana in area adriatica*. (Actes de la IX^e rencontre franco-italienne sur l'épigraphie du monde romain), (Macerata 1998) 77-99; on the Laecanii: 82-86.

³⁴ B. Slapšak, Ad *CIL V, 698* (Materija): via directa - translata (in fines alicuius) - restituta, *Arh. vest.* 28, 1977, 122-128; U. Schillinger-Haeefe, Noch einmal zu *CIL V, 698*, *Arh. vest.* 29, 1978, 738-739.

³⁵ V. Vidrih Perko, Roman pottery from Ajdovščina near Rodik, *Arh. vest.* 48, 1997, 341-358.

³⁶ J. Istenič, Rodik - das Gräberfeld Pod Jezerom, *Arh. vest.* 38, 1987, 69-135; ead., Aegean type cooking pottery from the Rodik - Pod Jezerom cemetery, *Diadora* 10, 1988, 99-110.

³⁷ Unpublished; for the fibula from the prehistoric grave, see Slapšak, Rodik (cit. in n. 32).

³⁸ E.g. in Dalmatia: J. Wilkes, Boundary stones in Roman Dalmatia I. The inscriptions, *Arh. vest.* 25, 1974, 258-274.

³⁹ Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. in n. 1) 68-74.

⁴⁰ For the stretch along the *via publica*: Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. in n. 1), fig. 60-66.

⁴¹ E.g. Štanjel: V. Vidrih Perko, Some Late Roman ceramic finds from the Slovenian Karst region, *Acta Rei Cret. Rom. Faut.* 35,

abandoned. Šmihel, the central place in the Postojna-Razdrto area is a classic, destroyed as it was by the 2nd c. B.C. Roman arms⁴². A dedicatory inscription to Augustus from Škocjan would indicate that this key site of the Iron Age settlement and assumed religious center of the region was now chosen for symbolic representation of the new power of Rome⁴³. The few funerary epigraphs from the region point to the presence there of both indigenous families who present themselves in the Roman fashion (Meitius Veturius and his wife Volcia Priscilla in Volčji grad⁴⁴), and new settlers with distinctively Roman names (gens Plinia in Vreme⁴⁵). By piecing all this scanty evidence together, we can discern the outlines of the process emerging, with Rome intervening in the area under scrutiny in characteristically pragmatic manner, by combining display of its military might and destroying points of resistance and/or concurring power (Šmihel), establishing symbolic control of key locations (Tuditanus' monument at the Timavus and transfer of the cult to Aquileia, Škocjan, possibly as a center of loyalist cult for indigenous populations there), activating an old emporial center for Roman colony and urban center for the region (Tergeste), providing infrastructure and control (public roads and related infrastructure, military outposts, customs outposts), securing economic stability by a variety of frameworks for agrarian production (within indigenous communities, by colonial foundations, by viritary attribution of lands for intensive use, and by making land available to the elites for extensive use), and by enabling exploitation of other resources (the quarries of Nabrežina/Aurisina, thermal sources by Tržič/Monfalcone).

The model according to which the abandonment of hillfort sites is seen as an inevitable, albeit sometimes delayed consequence of Roman occupation, either for control or economic reasons, seems to miss the point. A number of frameworks were set by the new rulers, which permitted continuity, including continuous occupation of pre-Roman sites, and on a number of sites such continuity can indeed be demonstrated throughout the 1st c. A.D. and well into the 2nd c. A.D. To our understanding, the radical change in the life of indigenous communities in the Karst region, involving also abandonment of their surviving hillfort centers, has different causes. It was triggered by the change in their legal status, and the consequent collapse of

their social structure. For part of the region at least, such change (from peregrine to Latin status) is documented in the mid-2nd c. A.D.

Our source is the transcript of a decree by the city council of Tergeste, on the base for an equestrian statue now in the *Lapidarium* of the City Museum in Trieste⁴⁶. The council decreed to erect a public monument to the young senator L. Fabius Severus, who was *questor urbanus* at the time, at the beginning of his career. In an elaborated rhetorical form, reasons are given for the honors bestowed. As advocate for the interests of his home city, Severus achieved granting by the emperor Antoninus Pius of Latin citizenship to the communities of the Carni (or Subocrini) and Catali, which had been attributed to the colony under Augustus. Therewith, the possibility was opened for the indigenous elites (*[Car?]ni Catalique ... qui meruissent vita atque censu*) to receive full citizenship and integration into the town council through election and exercise of city magistratures (which is the formula of *Latium maius: uti ... per aedilitatis gradu in curiam nostram admitterentur*). The interest of the colony (*L. Fabium Severum ... tam grandi beneficio tam salubri ingenio tam perpetua utilitate rem publicam nostram adservisse*) is described fully and precisely: bringing in new members to fully man the city council (*quo curiam complevit*), providing for the city (*universam rem publicam nostram cum fromentis ampliavit*), and strengthening city finances (*aerarium nostrum ditavit*). The move is therefore about integration into Roman citizenship (*usurpatio Romanae civitatis*) and the city council of indigenous social and financial elites (*admittendo et optimum et locuplentissimum quoque*), which until then had obligation only to pay taxes to the city (*erant tantum in reditu pecuniario*), but will now take also financial burdens as members of the city council, and share them with remaining members to whom alone these had become unbearable (*sint cum quibus munera decurionatus iam ut paucis onerosa honeste de pleno compartiamur*).

This exceptional document has been the object of many studies⁴⁷. We will concentrate here only on those aspects, which give insight into the status and fortunes of the indigenous communities. What is striking is that the Carni (or Subocrini) and Catali of this inscription acquired the privileges of limited citizenship so late. In 89 B.C., *Latium* was granted by *lex Pompeia*

1997, 249-258. For analogous situations in the interior cf. Horvat, *Notranjska* (cit. in n. 31).

⁴² J. Horvat, Roman Republican weapons from Šmihel in Slovenia, *Journal of Roman military equipment studies* 8, 1997, 105-120; a thorough study including catalogue: ead., The hoard of Roman Republican weapons from Grad near Šmihel, *Arch. vest.* 53, 2002, 117-192. The author assumes discontinuity of occupation there in Lt C period, but lists also more recent finds, from Lt D on, which document activity on the site throughout the Roman period (*ibid.*, Addendum, 143-147). The key question is that of the weapon hoard, which she dates to the late 3rd, 1st half of the 2nd c. B.C. (different dating, admittedly without detailed analysis in M. Guštin, *Notranjska*, Kat. in monogr. 17 (1979); cf also J. Šašel, Okra, *Kronika* 22, 1974, 9-17, who dates the destruction of the hillfort to the Augustan period). While evidence for linking the hoard with the destruction is not conclusive, it is plausible. Admittedly, it is impossible to date the burnt debris of the defensive structures described by Müllner; however, one find at least from his 1892 excavation (described as found in the layer comparable to that where the hoard was discovered) is comparable to the finds in the hoard. On the other hand, the Klanjšek finds, which constitute the core of the hoard, may have come from locations other than the "deep hole" excavated on the rampart described by Windischgrätz: he was paid to excavate, and he did that during a prolonged period of two years, so he may well have tried at different places along the wall. Even if the weapons were indeed collected and hoarded, they would seem to have originated from the siege of the hillfort.

⁴³ *I. It.* X 4,337; on the possible military function of Škocjan in the occupation phase, see J. Šašel, Zur Verteidigung der Nordostgrenze in der provincia Cisalpina, in: *Roman Frontier Studies 1969* (Cardiff 1974) 174-177, who considers also the late Republican helmet *I. It.* X 4,338 from Mušja jama.

⁴⁴ *I. It.* X 4,313.

⁴⁵ *I. It.* X 4,333.

⁴⁶ *I. It.* X 4,31; R. K. Sherck, *The municipal decrees of the Roman west*, Arethusa Monogr. 2 (Buffalo 1970); Rossi, *Romani* (cit. in n. 22), 128.

⁴⁷ G. Lettich, Osservazioni sull'epigrafe di Fabio Severo, *Arch. Triest.* 82, 1973, 25-74; L. Margetić, Acceni ai confini augustei del territorio tergestino, *Atti Centro Ric. Stor. Rovigno* 10, 1979-1980, 75-101; for the reading 'Catubri' cf. Rossi, *Romani* (cit. in n. 22); for an overview cf. Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. in n. 8) 215-216. The inscription is included in all relevant studies of administrative procedure under the empire, and the status of peregrine communities; it is referred to in all studies in the history and archaeology of the region in antiquity.

to the communities in Transpadana, which then extended up to the eastern borders of Aquileia on the Lower Karst⁴⁸. The area of Tergeste was probably a part of Illyricum at the time⁴⁹, and after its inclusion into Italy, indigenous communities there were attributed to the new colony⁵⁰. It follows that throughout three centuries, since the 2nd c. B.C., and until the mid-2nd c. A.D., the Carni (or Subocrini) and Catali lived under Roman rule in peregrine status. They developed social elites, however, which in the mid-2nd c. A.D. were cultured and wealthy enough to be seen not only as a welcome reinforcement, to be integrated among ruling elites of Tergeste, but indeed as a rescue for the colony unable to sustain its urban functions. In the light of our discussion above, we will maintain that the structures of spatial organization and land use, such as established by prehistoric communities of the Kras region in the 1st millennium B.C., were stable and successful enough to enable not only survival of the communities under Roman rule, but also creation of considerable surplus and accumulation of wealth in the hands of the elites. The observation is the more relevant as important losses of territory were the price of survival for the local communities (*ager colonicus*, Škocjan, Vreme valley, possibly other favorable agrarian niches, parts of Inner Istria, stretches of public roads, etc.), and so was the loss of control over transport and exchange, a potentially powerful resource in the region.

This calls for a re-thinking of our explanatory statements about the archaeological record of the early Roman period in the region. The space to be observed when looking for correlations between historical and archaeological data is the entire hinterland commonly accepted as being under the jurisdiction of Tergeste⁵¹. Whatever the rhetoric exaggerations, the expected effects of integration of indigenous elites are presented in great detail in the text of the decree, and that is consistent with the crisis of municipal administration, well documented all over the empire. Expectations would only be realistic, however, if figures were sufficiently high - not just inasmuch as they concern the wealth of 'the best' among the indigenes, but also their numbers. Under the circumstances, that would require a rather large territorial catchment. Given the patchy picture sketched above, of the status of lands in the hinterland, we would suggest that rather than compact ethnic territories, the ethnonymes Carni (or Subocrini) and Catali of the inscription are used to denote a network of territorial communities in peregrine status. In view of our discussion above, we will search for their archaeological record in the now somewhat truncated network of late prehistoric settlement, taking into account the elusive lower echelons of settlement hierarchy and possible locational shifts due to historical conjectures and social structuring within territorial units⁵². Still, the only documented (and therefore paradigmatic) case is the

Rundictes (with Rodik as toponymic survival, and substantial archaeological record)⁵³. On the other side, documents from northern Istria point to different rhythms and mechanisms of integration of indigenous population into Roman citizenship there⁵⁴, which would speak against locating the Catali of our inscription in this part of the territory of Tergeste.

Considering the three hundred years of autonomous development under Roman rule of the communities of the Carni (or Subocrini) and Catali, which would imply some kind of continuity of settlement by their respective territories, we still have to admit for both continuities and discontinuities in settlement locations within the territories, reflecting specific conditions and choices of individual communities. While cases such as Trieste and Škocjan show clearly that continuity in settlement location cannot be taken by itself as proof of continuity of indigenous population, shifts in settlement location, say from prehistoric hilltop settlement to the lowland, will not necessarily bear witness to intervention from outside, even less so intrusive colonization. Prehistoric defenses may have become obsolete, walls may have been torn down for a number of reasons, including dictate by dominating power, but the indigenous hilltop settlement would still continue to develop on the same location, as the center of a territorial community (as in the case of Ajdovščina above Rodik). On the other hand, the structure of lowland settlements such as Merišče near Povir and Merišče near Lokev, poorly understood as they are for this early period, may speak for continuity of settlement after abandonment of hillforts there. Isolated rural architecture in Vreme, accompanied by high status finds and Roman gentilicium on funerary inscription may be interpreted as viritary colonization and a villa type rural economy. Comparable architectural remains in Ajdovska vas near Kopriva may be interpreted as landed property of indigenous elites - until better explanation or proof to the contrary. It should be noted here, that no site of the Roman period has been fully investigated in the region.

Observations concerning hilltop settlement of the early Roman period in the region do coincide, though, in one point. On all sites there is a marked drop in frequencies of datable finds in the 2nd c. A.D., many are demonstrably abandoned after mid-century⁵⁵. We would propose to read this in connection with the text of the decree above, and suggest that the archaeological record reflects precisely the crisis and the eventual collapse of the social structure of indigenous communities in the region, triggered by the integration of their elites among the *ordo decurionum* of Tergeste, through the provisions of *Latium maius*. Deprived of their elites, pauperized local communities could not sustain their central settlements any more. The emerging settlement pattern reflects further processes, with newly integrated

⁴⁸ A. Degrassi, *Il confine nord-orientale dell'Italia romana* (Bern 1954) 22-26; for the area of the quarries in Nabrežina - Aurisina, cf. Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. in n. 8) 163; for the questionable relevance of the medieval ecclesiastic boundaries on the Karst, cf. M. Šašel Kos, The boundary stone between Aquileia and Emona, *Arh. vest.* 53, 2002, 378.

⁴⁹ Degrassi (cit. in n. 48) 14-17; G. Bandelli, Il governo romano nella Transpadana orientale (90-42 a.C.), *Ant. Altoadr.* 28, 1986, 43-64; cf also Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. in n. 8) 152 for a different opinion regarding the period of the foundation of the colony of Tergeste; for a different opinion on territorial appertenance of Tergeste, cf. M. Šašel Kos, Caesar, Illyricum, and the hinterland of Aquileia, in: G. Urso (ed.), *L'ultimo Cesare* (Roma 2000) 277-304.

⁵⁰ U. Laffi, *Adtributio e contributio* (Pisa 1966) 36-41; cf. n. 47.

⁵¹ Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. in n. 8) 163-164; the northern borders of the territory of Tergeste have to be reconsidered now in the light of the boundary stone between Aquileia and Emona found recently in the river Ljubljanica near Bevke: Šašel Kos, *Boundary* (cit. in n. 41) 373-382.

⁵² On territorial communities and the territories of his "later hillfort landscape", cf. Novaković, *Detecting* (cit. in n. 4) 108-114 and fig. 10; on their relationship to the settlement in the Roman period, cf. Slapšak, *Možnosti* (cit. in n. 1) 30-47, and Novaković, *Kras* (cit. in n. 4) 282-303.

⁵³ Cf. n. 32-40; while the *I. It.* X 4, 376 shows clearly the juridical subjectivity of the Rundictes, their relation to the Carni (or Subocrini) and Catali of the *I. It.* X 4,31 remains questionable; all we can say here is that there is coincidence in temporalities between the archaeological record of the Rundictes, and the change in the legal status of the Carni (or Subocrini) and Catali.

⁵⁴ *I. It.* X 3,30; for discussion cf.. Zaccaria, *Tergeste* (cit. in n. 8) 156.

elites now managing their landed property from the city, while the rest of the indigenous population survive within the pattern of subsistence agriculture, or/and as the manpower in the service of municipal elites.

It would therefore follow that the final collapse of indigenous communities was triggered by the introduction of Latin citizenship - a powerful tool of social and political integration of exogenous populations, which Rome was applying, and with great success, since the early Republic. Under Roman subjection, the communities in the Karst region kept on for a long time along the lines of the pattern of prehistoric settlement there - somewhat reduced and transformed to be sure. Having survived Roman occupation, this pattern provided the framework for continuous existence of indigenous communities for three centuries. The balance thus established between the municipal center and the communities in peregrine status, was disrupted in the 2nd c. A.D., with the crisis of municipal organization. The solution at hand for the city was to man municipal institutions from

among the indigenous people under their jurisdiction, and therewith drain their financial resources to the benefit of the city, by extending limited citizenship to peregrines and integrating their 'best' into full citizenship and among municipal elites. Such change of the focus and field of interest by indigenous elites had devastating effects on the social coherence and sustainability of indigenous communities. This was the end of the prehistoric communities in the Kras region.

Božidar Slapšak
Filozofska fakulteta Univerze v Ljubljani
Oddelek za arheologijo
Zavetiška 5
SI-1000 Ljubljana
e-mail: bozidar.slapsak@uni-lj.si

⁵⁵ P. Kos, *Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Slowenien* I, II (Berlin, Ljubljana 1988); P. Kos, A. Šemrov, *Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Slowenien* III (Berlin, Ljubljana 1995); A. Šemrov, *Die Fundmünzen der römischen Zeit in Slowenien* IV (Berlin, Ljubljana 1998): *passim*; Istenič, *Rodik* (cit. in n. 36) 108; Vidrih Perko, *Rodik* (cit. in n. 35) 349; Vidrih Perko, *Karst* (cit. in n. 41). The statement would require detailed analysis of all finds: nevertheless, we believe that available observations permit at least to assert lower intensity of the use of these locations, and the overall pauperization of the remaining inhabitants, which should justify the hypothesis proposed.