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AN INTRODUCTION AND SHORT HISTORY OF INVESTIGATIONS

To begin, a few preliminary premises concerning the Late Antiquity, established as an independent concept relatively late, would be favorable. Its acceptance and implementation in Slovene archaeology is also of significance, as only 35 years ago it was considered but marginally among the presentations of syntheses concerning issues on Roman and Early Medieval periods in Slovenia (P. Petru 1964-1965; Kastelic 1964-1965).

Often misunderstood and misapplied, already the denomination of the period is problematic in itself. The Early Middle Ages, the Late Roman period, the period of the Great Migration and the Early Byzantine period are diverse designations for the same period that are not entirely in accordance with the concept of Late Antiquity. They are a reflection of the complexity of the period and the diversity of emphases that can be demonstrated while discussing the issues of this time.

The Late Antiquity, the beginning of which is historically defined by the important turning points during the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, corresponds with the appearance of changes in the settlement pattern, an indirect and significant indicator of critical changes in the then political and social situation. The period comes to an end toward the end of the 6th century, corresponding well with the settlement of Slavic populations at the end of the 6th and the 7th centuries in the
region of Slovenia. Much has been written on the issue of the content and denomination of the periods, by all means the most synoptic being that by A. Demandt (1989). A more compendious review of this complicated issue, from the point of view of the Slovene author I. Mirnik Prezelj, is presented only from the viewpoint of the “western side” and it does not take into consideration the fundamental works from the European continent that constituted the Late Antiquity (Mirnik Prezelj 1998).

The Late Antiquity was established as an independent and determinative concept in the field of archaeology relatively late; this is quite understandable considering the fact that J. Burckhardt first used this term in the middle of the 19th century and that it was only by the beginning of the 20th century accepted in the historical profession (Demandt 1989, 477). At the same time, this term was accepted in archaeological research, especially following the marked emphasis admitted to it by the art historian A. Riegl, who recognized a specific concluding developmental style in the ornamentation of this time (Riegl 1901). The only archaeological author worth mentioning here, from among those who contributed to the acceptance and implementation of this concept, is R. Egger, the great researcher of the Late Antiquity who presented this issue in particular in his article “Die Ostalpen in der Spätantike” (Egger 1942).

The Late Antiquity is already implemented as an independent concept throughout most of Europe. Its acceptance is somewhat slower in English speaking regions, where it is primarily recognized as the ‘Later Roman Empire’. The impressive work on the Late Antiquity by A.H.M. Jones goes by the title “Late Roman Empire” (Jones 1964), while Cameron’s newer contribution to literature is a synoptic review that is divided into two parts: the Late Roman Empire (284-430) and the Late Antiquity (395-600) separately for the Mediterranean world (Cameron 1993a; b). Similarly, the frequent ambiguousness evidenced regarding the interchange of the terms Late Roman and Late Antiquity here in Slovenia should be emphasized. The former term refers only to the limited period incorporating the time up to the formal breakup of the Roman Empire in the year 476.

Fig. 1: Distribution of more significant Late Antiquity sites in Slovenia. Sl. 1: Razprostranjenost pomembnejših poznoantičnih najdišč v Sloveniji.
The Late Antiquity was implemented as a determinative entity relatively early in the Slovene region also. B. Saria dedicated a chapter to the Late Antiquity in his fundamental review of military history during the Roman period, despite his preoccupation at the time primarily with the alpine defensive system (Saria 1939, 142-148).

The Late Antiquity, quite characteristically, is barely mentioned in 1965 in two consequential articles presenting a synthetic examination of the then current results, as well as future courses of development. P. Petru merely mentions the investigation of the Italian defense system, and thus also the research of refuges in connection with this (P. Petru, 1964-1965, 90 and 92). J. Kastelic, who approaches also issues concerning the Late Antiquity in a synthetically conceived review of the Early Middle Ages, posts only a selection of questions and points out the main problems (Kastelic 1964-1965). Solutions have yet to be even anticipated. Consequently, J. Šašel, a full decade later, based his presentation of the Late Antiquity primarily on written sources and again posed a series of seemingly unsolvable questions (Šašel 1975a).

The concept of Late Antiquity became fully implemented in the 1970’s, following the investigations of the Late Roman defense system (Šašel, Petru 1971) and two extensive Slovene-German excavations at Hrušica and Ajdovski gradec above Vranje (Petru, Ulbert 1975; Ulbert 1981). It was a frequent and suitable designation for a period that proved to be only verified, by subsequent investigations in the Slovene region, as a significant and independent link in the chain of historical eras (Petru 1972; Šašel 1975a; Petru 1978a; Ciglenečki 1987a).

Symposiums, initially organized by the Slovene Archaeology Society, also played a consequential role in the development of Late Antiquity research. First there was the “Colloquium on the Early Middle Ages in Slovenia” (Ljubljana 1966) (contributions are published in Arh. vest. 18, 1967, 315-461), where the Late Antiquity component was partially present, and then the second “Colloquium on the Early Middle Ages” was held (Kranj 1968), where the Late Antiquity component was expressed more directly (contributions are published in Arh. vest. 21-22, 1970-1971, 5-236). The more extensive colloquium, the “Decline of Antiquity”, held in 1976 in Ljubljana, had wider repercussions (contributions are published in Arh. vest. 29, 1978, 357-707); it was accompanied by a large exhibition and a smaller publication presenting the archaeological periods and also establishing the latest archaeological discoveries in a historical framework in a popular manner (Petru 1976). “The Letter without Written Words” exhibition (Ljubljana 1991) is a more recent noteworthy exhibition: it emphasized the Early Christian component during the Late Antiquity and included a lavish catalogue of material finds and accompanying studies (Knific, Sagadin 1991). A smaller International Symposium on “Late Antiquity Hill-top Fortifications” (Regensburg 1993), discussing the most recent discoveries and presenting them synthetically in a central European framework, is also worth mentioning (contributions are published in Arh. vest. 45, 1994, 143-266). In September, 1994, at Zemona, historians and archaeologists organized an International Symposium on “Western Illyricum and Northeastern Italy during the Late Roman Period”, to commemorate the 1600th anniversary of the battle between Theodosius and Eugenius (archaeological contributions are published in Arh. vest. 48, 1977, 117-370, historical contributions in Situla 34, 1996; edited by R. Bratož).

The term Late Antiquity excellently expresses the time which is characteristically still Roman, and yet, in addition to incorporating settlement, economic and social changes, it is also defined by the emergence and propagation of Christianity as well as the partial presence of barbarian populations, especially Germanic. Its character is reflected in the altered settlement pattern, in the radically changed burial rites (inhumation graves prevail), in the predomination of Early Christian architecture and of course, in the fine material finds. Inasmuch as the changes in the settlement pattern are considered the determinative factor, the beginning of the Late Antiquity could then be set back to the time of Gallienus and Aurelian, when the changes in settlement are initiated with the revival of fortified hill-top settlements (Ciglenečki 1990a, 154-156). The end of this period can be connected with the arrival of the Slavic peoples; due to the deficient stance of investigations, this period is poorly cognized in its details and is difficult to limit chronologically. The arrival of the Slavic peoples incited renewed changes in the settlement pattern, as well as in society, the social structure, religion and - particularly evident for archaeologists - in the material culture.

Archaeology of the Late Antiquity in Slovenia, first instigated by investigations of the Italian defense system and later also investigations of hill-top settlements, accomplished its first significant steps forward in collaboration with the large majority of Slovene archaeologists; it also managed to resolve numerous questions which seemed unsolvable not so long ago.
SETTLEMENT PATTERN

Systematic investigations of the settlement pattern during the Late Antiquity were initiated relatively late, with the rare exceptions. Thus, in older phases of research, the object of more detailed investigations were the more visible remains of Late Roman strongholds situated in the vicinity of current day settlements, or even within them, and in the vicinity of roads: Ajdovščina, Hrušica, Vrhnika, Velike Malence (Saria 1939, 142-148; P. Petru 1972). The opinion prevailed that settlements continued to subsist (especially towns) despite destitution; the lack of corresponding material finds was attributed to the deficient stance of investigations and their poor chances of being discovered (later overlaying) (Klemenc 1950; M. Kos 1955, 28-29). In short, the continuation of the settlement pattern during the Roman period was envisioned, although in a highly impoverished version.

A large portion of Slovene archaeologists devoted their attention to such investigations during the past few decades thus producing extensive results (P. Petru 1982; Ciglenečki 1987a and Ciglenečki 1994a). A comparison of the current stance of results with those known from the year 1958 confers quite a large advance in our understanding of the Late Roman era in the Slovene region (Saria 1958, 81). While the Late Roman fortresses such as Hrušica and Ajdovščina were already recognised, the period of the late 5th and 6th centuries remained more of a mystery with merely a few sites indicated upon a map. In 1975 J. Šašel wrote in discourse on the subject of the Late Roman era that insight concerning the colonisation of the countryside is lacking (Šašel 1975a, 69). However, the stance of investigations began to alter dramatically precisely during the 1970’s. The era of intensive investigations of Late Roman hill-top settlements had begun and they only accumulated over the years. Numerous sites previously considered as Prehistoric hillforts were now identified as Late Roman.

The first matter to consider is the frequently mentioned, yet increasingly controversial issue concerning the existence of towns and municipalities.

Historians substantiated the existence of Celeia and Emona in the 5th and 6th centuries (Rus 1939; Kos 1955, 28-29; Grafenauer 1978, 231) on the basis of citations of bishops from Celeia and Emona dating to the late 6th century. Archaeologists, due to the poor stance of investigations, most frequently followed suit and supported these hypotheses on even the most modest of material finds. Consequently, a very warped image of the settlement pattern was established, illustrating the continued subsistence of most of the Roman towns all through to the arrival of the Slavic populations (Klemenc 1950, 80-81; Klemenc 1955, 333; Šašel 1968, 560; Kolšek 1975; Kolšek 1984; Šašel Kos 1994, 287; Plesničar Gec 1997, 368).

The fact remains that no evidence of an entire settlement layer dating to this era has yet been disclosed in any of the Roman towns and municipalities throughout current day Slovenia (Slabe 1975, 85-87; Ciglenečki 1993a, 514; Ciglenečki 1997a, 192). The majority of municipalities fail to provide any evidence at all substantiating their existence during the middle of the 5th century. Only select individual material artefacts exist, mostly older finds which lack any documentation and are thus absent of any indicative value (Klemenc 1955, 353; Slabe 1975, 84-86; Plesničar Gec 1997, 366-368).

Select reliably dated late artefacts (e.g. the fibula of a peacock from the location at Šumi in Ljubljana and the late fibula of a stag from Panorama at Ptuj) sooner indicate the short-lived presence of individuals or groups who temporarily inhabited the ruins of towns and municipalities on their way towards Italy, than upon a continuous settlement of towns through to the end of the 6th century (Plesničar, Sivec-Rajterič 1978, 61; Ciglenečki 1993a, 512).

African Red Slip Ware are an important chronological indicator. A recently executed study by Ph. Pröttel demonstrated that the latest sigillata fragments from Emona, Celeia and Poetovio can be attributed to the middle of the 5th century at the latest (Pröttel 1996, 126, 128, 129-130).

The remains of individual primitive abodes, sporadically cited although not yet published in detail (Klemenc 1955, 333; Plesničar Gec 1997, 366), can by no means substantiate the continued subsistence of a town and its institutions. The most well-founded argument advocating the discontinuity of towns, and primarily of the church centers, are the remains of Early Christian churches discovered at the three above mentioned towns revealing traces of desertion or even destruction in the first half of the 5th century. They were never again renovated, which unequivocally attests to the shift of the clerics and bishop to head elsewhere.

Furthermore, a discussion concerning the same issue is in course among archaeologists in Italy, where modest remains of wooden dwellings were uncovered in certain towns (Luni, Brescia, Verona); whether these are signs of continuous inhabitancy in the towns or not is controversial (Ward-Perkins 1997). It is of some significance that the discussion is being conducted based upon the substantial remains of building structures and the appurtenant extensive selection of material finds. This type of evidence is absent in Slovenia which leads us to the conclusion that there was a complete discontinuation of habitation in each of the four Roman towns.

The settlement pattern in the countryside during the 4th and 5th centuries is poorly cognized. Roman villas and other rare forms of settlement were abandoned during the first half of the 5th century at the latest, simultaneous with the downfall of towns (Lubšina-Tušek 1981, 183, 184-186; Guštin 1985; Breščak 1990a; Božič 1995; Strmčnik 1997).

Numerous fortified military outposts were established during the Late Roman period (considering the earlier part of the Late Antiquity); in accordance with Diocletian’s reorganization of the military, with military garrisons stationed deeply in the hinterland, their primary purpose was to guard the gateway to Italy. These outposts, due to their clear visible and partly already investigated remains, are well researched and they are indicative of the beginning of precipitated fortification of the current region of Slovenia (Saria 1939, 142-148; P. Petru 1969a; Šašel, Petru 1971; Ulbert 1981; Ciglenečki 1987a, 111-112; Pröttel 1996, 133-149; Ciglenečki 1997a, 193). The large majority are linked to the defense system known as the Clausura. Those at Ajdovščina (Osmuk 1997), Vrhnika (Horvat 1990) and Martinj hrib (Leben, Šubic 1990) are the most recently investigated and deserve special heed. The majority of these fortifications were erected on naturally protected positions, for the most part on slightly elevated posts reinforced with more durable defense mechanisms. In addition to these there are some more recently recognized fortifications that are less sufficiently investigated; however, their naturally fortified positions and the material finds of a military nature discovered within indicate that they supplemented the above

Fortified hill-top settlements represent the most significant element of the settlement pattern during the Late Antiquity; most frequently, they are situated in remote and hardly accessible regions of Slovenia. In addition to the multifarious adaptations to the topography, the typology of their general characteristics is quite variegated. They were long termed, generally, as “refuges”. Ciglenečki, already in 1979, cautioned as to the complexity of settlement in hill-top fortifications, manifested by the various types of strongholds (Ciglenečki 1979). By 1987 numerous settlement waves were evident in the chronology of hill-top fortifications. It could even be established that most fortifications bore no traces of continued settlement between the 4th and 6th centuries; this was the leading conviction among the majority of researchers (Ciglenečki 1987a, 121-127 and especially 126).

For a long time (P. Petru 1978a, 360; Ulbert 1979, 143; P. Petru 1982, 297), occasionally still today (Pröttel 1996, 152), the prevailing belief was that the first fortification and settlement of hill-top strongholds could be attributed to the second half of the 2nd century. Detailed analysis of material finds failed to confirm this and the majority of archaeologists wagered on the modest finds, or even just individual coins attributed to this period, and on the later contention presented by Egger (Ciglenečki 1987a, 121-123). Older finds were also, occasionally, indicative of this; although it is not possible to interpret them as settlement remains dating to the 2nd century, but rather as modest remains of temples, some other smaller structures or as later use of older objects.

The beginnings of settlement of hill-top strongholds can be reliably dated to the second half of the 3rd century. This also coincides well with the general political situation of the times, the construction of military outposts (e.g. Hrušica, Ajdovščina) and numerous contemporary hoards (Ciglenečki 1987a, 123-124; Ciglenečki 1990a, 154-156).

In addition to military outposts, numerous refuges, which are less sufficiently investigated, also emerge during the early period of the Late Antiquity. Better known examples are the following: Log near Podturn (Breščak 1990b), Veliki vrh near Hrenova (Ciglenečki 1987a, 36) and Ivan near Šmartno (Sagadin 1989).

The settlement pattern changed radically and decisively during the second half of the 5th and the entire 6th centuries. Inhabitants abandoned the towns, likewise also the provincial settlements. Select previously inhabited hill-top strongholds were settled permanently and additionally fortified, more permanent buildings were constructed, often built of stone. The most research has been dedicated to precisely these types of strongholds in the past few decades.

The following represent better cognized and partially investigated Late Antiquity settlements: Ajdna above Potoki (Leben, Valič 1978; Valič 1985; Sagadin 1997); Ajdovski gradec above Vranje (Petru, Ulbert 1975; Knific 1979; Knific 1994); Rifnik (Bolta 1981; Pirkmajer 1994); Tinje above Loka near Žusem (Ciglenečki 1992, 71-80); Polhograjska gora near Polhov gradec (Slabe 1980; Slabe 1982-1983); Gradec near Prapretno (Ciglenečki 1992, 35-39); Sv. Pavel above Vrtovin (Svoljšak 1985), Svete gore above Bistrica ob Sotli (P. Korošec 1974; P. Korošec 1997), Tonovcov grad near Kobarid (Ciglenečki 1994b; Ciglenečki 1998). An Early Christian church was situated in an exposed position within the settlements. The
strongholds where numerous Early Christian churches were discovered in the interior of the settlement can be classified into a separate group. Vranje and Tonovcov grad are two such examples. Kučar above Podzemelj, where the churches stood together with a larger residential structure in a well fortified although unsettled section, joins these two examples. It undoubtedly represents a more significant Christian center to where perhaps even the bishop occasionally resorted (Ciglenečki 1995, 185-186; Bratož 1996, 139-140; Tavano 1995, 6).

Numerous Prehistoric hillfort sites - upon which during the Late Roman era only the naturally steep slopes and the older, still useful Prehistoric ramparts were made use of - although poorly investigated, should also be included in the discussion concerning Late Roman hill-top settlements. Such circumstances were discovered during sample trenching of the Prehistoric hillforts at Kunkel under Vrhtrebnje, at Sv. Ana above Vrhpeč, at Veliki vrh above Osredek etc. (Dular et a. 1991, 69-76; 76-81; Ciglenečki 1990a, 147-154).

Select sites from the extensive group of hill-top fortifications dating to the late 5th and 6th centuries are of particular significance due to their strategic location and often also their ground plan. It can be assumed that smaller garrisons, together with their respective families, protected the individual crossings and passages. Already Korinjski hrib, investigated during the years 1982 and 1983, with its modest church and its stone structures as a limited means of defence, is illustrative of this type of fortification (Ciglenečki 1985). Bierbrauer questioned the existence of this type of fortification (Bierbrauer 1990, 44-48); however, newer investigations confirm its existence as well as the vulnerability and function of this type of fortification (Ciglenečki 1994a, 245-247).

Similar fortifications are located also elsewhere, primarily in the vicinity of the most important passage ways leading from the East towards Italy, which undoubtedly attests to their respective roles. Zidani gaber, with its simple apsidal church and its uniform building structures, is also of this type (Ciglenečki 1990b). The view from Zidani gaber.
illustrates the significant role played by surveillance capacities: the level tract at the intersection of the Panonian plain and the subalpine world lies in full view below and thus enables complete supervision over the entrance into Italy. That it is a distinctive type of fortification of more than just refuge-settlement significance is depicted by the fortification at Gradec near Velika Strmica; located in a shady gorge, it’s situation can be fully comprehended only in consideration of the need to supervise the river passage or the road alongside it (Božič, Ciglenečki 1995).

Viewed on a map, the large majority of Late Antiquity fortifications are situated in remote, often hilly regions, that were previously scarcely inhabited. Two important settlements positioned in the lowlands are the exception: at Kranj, and the newly discovered site at Črnomelj. Their otherwise exposed positions are understandable in view of their excellent natural defense mechanism; they are both positioned on piers above rivers and additionally protected by strong defense walls (Sagadin 1991; Sagadin 1995; Mason 1998).

Caves, although rare, also represent an aspect of settlement well worth consideration. The material evidence from Jama under the Predjama castle definitely brings it to light (P. Korošec 1982). Other caves served as places of worship as well as refuges (Tominčeva jama, Pod gričo near Godič, Jama pod hribom Žičica near Moste) (ANSI 1975, 132-133; Knific 1994-1995a; Knific 1994-1995b).

The sheltered region of Primorje has also gained in significance. More recent rescue excavations are uncovering ample Late Roman traces under various architectural buildings in Koper and Piran, both of which are proving to have been important settlement nuclei at the end of the Roman era (Cunja 1996; Snoj 1996; Snoj, Novšak 1992; Vidrih Perko 1995). The material finds originating from these sites augment precisely at the time that the hill-top settlements inland were beginning to be abandoned, that is during the 6th and reaching into the 7th centuries. Koper, as an island, and the easily defended peninsula of Piran each provided the ideal shelter for refugees from inland.

We are poorly informed as to the presence of Germanic peoples within the fortified settlements. This is partly due to their short-lived presence and partly also because their material artefacts were usually fabricated of expensive materials and are thus discovered less frequently. There are...
increasing amounts of evidence suggesting that the Ostrogoths and the Longobards resided alongside the indigenous population in certain representative outposts (Ciglenečki 1997b, 186). Concentrations of characteristic material finds, especially pottery, can be traced at these sites; these finds attest to the fact that individual Germanic families resided in the more important buildings and controlled the indigenous population inhabiting the more consequential fortifications. Smaller individual settlements also existed, which is perhaps demonstrated by the cemeteries at Dravlje and Bilje (Slabe 1975; Osmuk 1978).

Applying archaeological methodology, it is already possible to describe, at least approximately, the region as it was left to the Longobards in the middle of the 6th century by the Byzantine emperor Justinian (Pólis Norikón and ohirómata epi Pannonias). Small Lombard garrisons in the Norican region have been traced to the hinterland of Celeia and Poetovio, as already R. Egger correctly surmised, indicating that the Longobards seized control over the most important settlement cores (Ciglenečki 1992). The lack of traces of indigenous peoples in Poetovio dating to the late 5th and 6th centuries, especially of the Longobards, clearly demonstrates that the town was abandoned at this time and that the syntagma Pólis Norikón, which perhaps had only a symbolic meaning at the time, has no direct bearing on it (e.g. most recently, Šašel Kos 1994, 285-287). The fortifications mentioned by Procopius along (in) Pannonia can be located, on the basis of indigenous settlement cores and known Lombard material finds, to the region expanding from Siscia all to the Ljubljana basin, or perhaps even further to the fort Carnium. The distribution of sites is highly indicative of a defense zone that extended across the central and eastern part of current day Slovenia, perhaps reaching even further east.

Another important aspect of the Late Roman settlement pattern is the concentration of settlements in certain remote areas, removed from the important communication routes. The region in the hinterland of Celje, between the Savinja, Sava and Sotla rivers is the most representative and important communication routes. The region in the middle of the 6th century by the Byzantine emperor Justinian (Pólis Norikón and ohirómata epi Pannonias). Small Lombard garrisons in the Norican region have been traced to the hinterland of Celeia and Poetovio, as already R. Egger correctly surmised, indicating that the Longobards seized control over the most important settlement cores (Ciglenečki 1992). The lack of traces of indigenous peoples in Poetovio dating to the late 5th and 6th centuries, especially of the Longobards, clearly demonstrates that the town was abandoned at this time and that the syntagma Pólis Norikón, which perhaps had only a symbolic meaning at the time, has no direct bearing on it (e.g. most recently, Šašel Kos 1994, 285-287). The fortifications mentioned by Procopius along (in) Pannonia can be located, on the basis of indigenous settlement cores and known Lombard material finds, to the region expanding from Siscia all to the Ljubljana basin, or perhaps even further to the fort Carnium. The distribution of sites is highly indicative of a defense zone that extended across the central and eastern part of current day Slovenia, perhaps reaching even further east.

Another important aspect of the Late Roman settlement pattern is the concentration of settlements in certain remote areas, removed from the important communication routes. The region in the hinterland of Celje, between the Savinja, Sava and Sotla rivers is the most representative and most recognised such an area (Ciglenečki 1992). A large number of Late Roman settlements that sheltered refugees from the municipalities of Celeia and Poetovio and their territories were established in this forbiddingly passable hilly region. Select sites also point to other regions of refuge that have yet to be fully investigated (Posavje, Bela krajina, the upper Savinja valley etc.) (Ciglenečki 1987a, 140-143).

CEMETERIES

Late Antiquity cemeteries in Slovenia are more poorly known than settlements, and furthermore, they were rarely well investigated in earlier times. Nonetheless, due to well organized heritage preservation services, systematic excavations have been executed at certain more significant cemeteries during the past few decades.

Necropoli dating to the 4th and the first half of the 5th centuries are well known. Usually, they are represented by a group of graves within the complex of a cemetery, in continuation of the Roman traditional manner of burial, often situated along the roads leading into towns; although they have also frequently been discovered within the abandoned town areas (Ptuj, Zg. Breg, Curk 1966; Rabeljèa vas-west, Tušek 1997). It is already possible to separate individual groups from among the town populations that were buried together; examples of this are the cemetery in the garden of the National Museum in Ljubljana (Vuga 1985) and the SAZU courtyard in Ljubljana (P. Korošec 1951). Ptuj-Panorama (P. Korošec 1950), Ptuj-castle (Jevremov, Tomanič Jevremov, Ciglenečki 1993). Smaller cemeteries attributed to the hill-top settlements are also known from this time: Brinjeva gora (Pahič 1969), Javornik (ANSI 1975, 152), Ajdovski gradec above Vranje (Bachran 1975), Puščava near Stari trg (ANSI 1975, 277), Ravno brdo (Stare 1952), V brezju above Mihovo (ANSI 1975, 223). Occasionally it cannot be determined when the cemetery was abandoned, e.g. Panorama (P. Korošec 1950).

Necropoli dating to the end of the 5th and the entire 6th century are competently presented, there also exist two shorter synoptic reviews. D. Vuga, in the first review, discusses the various methods of burial during the time of the Great Migration, basing his efforts primarily on the necropoli at Roje near Moravče and Sveta gora in the Zasavje region (Vuga 1980). V. Bierbrauer also contributed a competent review, within the framework of a presentation of the Early Middle Ages in Yugoslavia, of necropoli from regions in Slovenia where concise analyses of larger cemeteries, especially at Kranj, Rifnik, Bled and Vranje, were carried out (Bierbrauer 1984, 52-58). Z. Vinski dedicated the most contributions to issues concerning cemeteries and their material finds; in more extensive analytic studies, as well as in articles concerning the individual types of material finds, he discussed the grave-goods found at Slovene necropoli and dating to the 5th and 6th centuries (more important reviews: Vinski 1971a; Vinski 1978; Vinski 1980).
Interestingly, the region of Slovenia became better known throughout Europe already at the beginning of the 20th century, long before investigations of Late Antiquity settlements were initiated, largely by merit of the cemetery at Lajh in Kranj, dating to the time of the Great Migration. Various interpretations of this site, initially emphasized for its Lombard character, later acquired varying contents. J. Werner, who, for Slovenia and the Late Antiquity, contributed a highly consequential composition on the Longobards, put things into place (Werner 1962, 121-130). He emphasized the leading role played by the indigenous substratum at this cemetery, alongside the otherwise significant, although much smaller role played by the Longobards and partly also the Ostrogoths. Z. Vinski, who was primarily concerned with the fine material culture from this cemetery, soon concurred with this interpretation in his own studies (Vinski 1971b; Vinski 1980). The monographic work on the cemetery, with an accompanying catalogue (Stare 1980), resulted and it now represents one of the basic works for comprehending the period of the Great Migration throughout the wider European region. Newer studies supplement this work, and they also demonstrate the need for a revision of all the material and especially of the entire plan of the cemetery (Knific 1995; Ibler 1991). The discovery of a smaller necropolis along the opposite bank of the Sava river, at the location termed Krizišče-Iskra (Sagadin 1988), further attests to the significance of the strategic position of Kranj during the period of the Great Migration. Graves at this site, excavated using modern methods during a rescue excavation, broach questions as to the location of the corresponding settlement. This necropolis is of particular interest due to its direct connection with the later Slavic cemetery, and it launches - similar to Bled Pristava - precious possibilities in continuity studies. In referral to the cemetery at Lajh, Margetić’s discussion concerning Longobards in Slovenia, in which he precipitately alters how the material finds are dated (based on Vinski’s study), is also worth mentioning (Margetić 1992).

The necropolis at Bled Pristava sustained a more fortunate fate, as it was excavated in 1949 and 1951, following the second World War, using modern methods (Kastelic 1960). Unfortunately, a full publication including an evaluation of the material finds and an interpretation of the
necropolis is lacking; and individually treated grave units do not enable an in depth analysis. Further excavations between the years 1975 and 1979 revealed, in addition to Slavic graves, also 38 more Late Antiquity graves; thus rendering a total of 147 currently recognized indigenous graves at Bled-Pristava I. These are also largely unknown, leaving publication of the significant necropolis at Bled Pristava a desideratum (Knific 1986). Initially the Bled-Pristava necropolis was estimated as dating to the 7th century and with a Slavic character (Kastelic 1960, 40); this dating was soon changed, or rather, supplemented (Werner 1962, 128-129). The uniform indigenous population, bearing no traces Germanic newcomers, is the basic characteristic of the Bled necropolis, quite contrary to those at Kranj, Rijnik and Dravlje.

The necropolis at Rijnik, to a large degree where the appurtenant settlement is also excavated, is known almost in its entirety (Bolta 1970-1971; Bolta 1978; Bolta 1981). The settlement together with the cemetery represents an important totality valued as one of the most reflected referential sites in the eastern Alpine region. A catalogue illustration of the necropolis with a concise evaluation of the material finds provides some insight into the riches of Rijnik; however, an in depth analysis of the material finds, especially a more precise reproduction of the excavated material finds, as well as results from anthropological investigations, are lacking. An analysis of the horizontal stratigraphy was carried out producing an interesting division of graves, interpreted by B. Vičič as the arrangement of buried members from four families (Vičič 1990). Reconfirmation of the results is rendered difficult as the cemetery is not preserved in its entirety. Further such analyses from other appurtenant sites are also lacking. V. Bierbrauer cautioned as to the autochthonous characteristics of the population buried at the cemetery at Rijnik (Bierbrauer 1984, 54-57).

The necropolis at Dravlje is indicative of a definitive cemetery dating to a limited chronological horizon; a monograph with an excellent catalogue of material finds is already published (Slabe 1975). The particular significance of this cemetery lies essentially in the brief chronological span of its duration, indicative of the existence of a garrison attributed solely to the time that the Ostrogoths were present in this region; this would be an exception from among the sites known to us as of yet. It is also suggestive of a garrison that played a special role in the vicinity of, and in the hinterland of the former Emona - it likely served as a control over communication routes or even as a crossroads. The question remains as to why the settlement ceased to be interesting during the time of the presence of the Longobards.

Remaining sites dating to this period are only intimated, or recognized with the remains of a few select inhumation burials: Korinjski hrib (Ciglenečki 1985, 258), Cerov log (Stare 1977a), Gorenje Vrhopolje (Stare 1977b), Sveta gora in Zasavje (Vuga 1974), Vinji vrh (Božič, Ciglenečki 1995, 266-267), Veliki Orehek (Pirkovič 1970-1971, 175-176), Kaplja vas (Josipovič 1988), Laška vas (J. Korošec 1947, 47-48), Roje near Moravče (Vuga 1973), Levakova jama (Slabe 1976), Kicelj near Gorenja vas near Šmarjeta (Božič, Ciglenečki 1995, 265-266), Vranja peč (Pirkmajer 1986; Ciglenečki 1992, 53-54), Podmelec (Sribar 1967).

Smaller groups of graves dating to the period of the Great Migration were discovered primarily by chance. Such a cemetery was discovered at Solkan, bearing characteristic and lavish Lombard graves from the 7th century (Knific, Svoljšak 1984), as well as the remains of a similar, yet older cemetery, at Bilje in the Vipava valley and individual graves at Sveta gora above Bistrica ob Soči (P. Korošec 1974, 486-492).

Traces of dissection were revealed, so far, only upon the skeletons at Gornje Vrhopolje (Stare 1977b) and at Roje near Moravče (Vuga 1980). A more detailed study of bone material would undoubtedly reveal more. A large number of skeletons from various cemeteries bearing deformed crania are a noteworthy particularity (Slabe 1980). M. Slabe determined that skeletons with deformed crania at the Dravlje necropolis were not linked with characteristic Germanic grave-goods, some were even without grave-goods. He thus appropriately cautioned that the possibility of barbarian burials should also be permitted at graves lacking grave-goods (Slabe 1975, 82-83).

Graves within and around churches represent a separate group: Ajdna and Tonovcovegrad bear several burials, even child burials, while e.g. Rijnik, Kucar and Korinjski hrib bear only one. Perhaps this is indicative of diversely formed groups, or of a briefer duration of select settlements, or perhaps diverse customs, etc.? Two Late Antiquity tombstones are attributed to the 6th century in the literature: the famous Gaudentius tombstone and the slab with an Early Christian inscription from Celeia (Egger 1927; Kolšek 1984, 343-344; Ciglenečki 1995, 182). Their datation to the 6th century is disputable as they can be attributed to the wider span of the Late Antiquity as opposed to only the 6th century. They represent the last...
monuments of literacy during the Late Antiquity in our region and they attest to the high level of civilization even at the decline of the empire.

**FINE MATERIAL CULTURE**

A multitude of fine material finds which are only rarely appropriately evaluated, materialized with the excavations of settlements and necropoli, as well as with the unauthorized efforts of ‘gold diggers’. The majority of reports are concurrent analyses, usually preliminary, carried out for the publication of the site. Important exceptions are the following: Kranj Lajh (Vinski 1980), Dravlje (Slabe 1975), Hrušica (Giesler 1981, 53-125), Old christian center in Emona (Plesničar-Gec 1983), Kranj-Križiče Iskra (Sagadin 1988), Kučar (Ciglenečki 1995) and Kapucinski vrt in Koper (Cunja 1996).

Metal material finds, chiefly jewelry, are the best known. The first typological study was carried out by Kastelic: an analysis of earrings with basket shaped pendants from the Bled-Pristava I necropolis (Kastelic 1956 and Kastelic 1960, 14-23). Certainly the most important study of fine material finds from Slovene Late Antiquity sites was contributed by Z. Vinski, who dealt with Germanic finds in particular (Vinski 1971a, b; Vinski 1978; Vinski 1980). Shorter studies by M. Slabe (Slabe 1982; Slabe 1986; Slabe 1990), D. Vuga (1974), I. Sivec-Rajterič (1975) and T. Knific (1993 and 1995) correspond.

Material goods dating to the period of the early barbarians’ presence were discussed only at individual sites, such as at Predjama (P. Korošec 1982), Ljubljana (Vuga 1985) and Ptuj (P. Korošec 1968; Knific 1993; Ciglenečki 1993a; Jevremov, Tomanič 1993). A rare, systematic Slovene study is dedicated to kidney shaped belt buckles dating to the beginning of the period of the Great Migration (Vuga 1985). Foreign researchers also occasionally dealt with Slovene material finds (Werner 1962; Giesler 1981; Bierbrauer 1984; Ibler 1991; Pröttel 1996). U. G. Ibler executed a synthetic examination of metal material goods of
the indigenous population in the Slovene region; unfortunately, her work is currently only accessible as a doctoral dissertation (Ibler 1991).

Initially, attention was focused primarily on material finds dating to the period of the Great Migration, instigated by J. Werner following the second World War (Werner 1962) and brilliantly supplemented by Z. Vinski with the above cited studies. Material finds of the native Roman population remained in the shadows of these - despite the cautioning of the above two - for an extended time (Mikl Curk 1972; Sivec-Rajterič 1978; Ibler 1991).

I. Sivec contributed a brief review of weapons and military accouterment (Sivec 1997), while Slabe dealt with graves bearing weapons separately (Slabe 1983), and Ciglenečki focused on iron tools (Ciglenečki 1983). Attention was drawn also by individual enticing and problematically interesting finds, such as a ring from Trojane (?) dating to the 4th century (Cvikl Zupačič 1968), two gilded fibulas from Ptuj (Jevremov 1990), objects and arrows attributed to the period of the Huns (Knific 1993) and Early Christian Christograms from Vipota (Ciglenečki 1993b). However most of these efforts are small-scale studies, attempts to classify the material finds only to clarify the stratigraphic situation in settlements, and rarely are they ambitious full-scale projects aiming to produce a synthetic review. This type of material has been impetuously accumulating lately, which only intensifies the need for monographic examinations of sites and in depth analysis of the material finds which would eventually enable a better understanding of definitive settlement and cemetery complexes. That the majority of Slovene archaeologists are concerned with investigating the archaeology of settlements is undoubtedly part of the problem, although partly also the orientation of the Department of Archaeology at the University, where these types of studies are all but neglected. Thus we are faced with the paradox of having an enormous amount of excavated material finds, as well as a satisfactory cast of trained specialists, and yet still too few research workers willing to appropriately evaluate these material finds and classify them, at least within a central European framework. In view of this, the project to compose a Synthesis of the Material Culture from the Roman Era in Slovenia, under the leadership of S. Petru, is rather commendable (see articles in Arh. vest. 30, 1978, 221-338). Despite numerous imperfections, the then treatment of material finds served merely as a starting-point for further analysis of fine material culture in the region of Slovenia.

Coarse cooking ware, discovered in mass amounts at settlement excavations, is particularly problematic material. S. Pahič (Pahič 1980), faced with enormous amounts of coarse pottery ware from the excavations at Brinjeva gora, was the first to acknowledge this. Only the rare individual had concerned themselves with this, up till then, and only within the framework of a wider discussion on Roman pottery (e.g. Petru 1969b; Mikl Curk 1972; Mikl Curk 1973). The first systematic publication of pottery from the excavations at Hrusica followed this event (Giesler 1981, 82-101), with a presentation of chiefly pottery dating to the 4th century. Discoveries and investigations of Late Antiquity settlements recurrently elicited this problem with the publication of the individual settlements (Leben, Valič 1978; Ciglenečki 1981, 423-427; Ciglenečki 1984; Svoljšak 1985; Ciglenečki 1995, 146-151; Cunja 1996, 122-128). H. Rodriguez chose to carry out methodical investigations of pottery from the eastern Alpine region, and even pottery from the region of Slovenia was included in several of her synthetic reviews (Rodriguez 1992; Rodriguez 1997). This is precisely how the demand for well dated luxury wares (primarily African Red Slip Ware and amphoras), which are of increasing value due to their greater chronological sensitivity, augmented. J. Hayes (Hayes 1972), M. Mackensen (Mackensen 1987) and especially Ph. Pröttel, who dedicated his dissertation to the eastern Alpine region (Pröttel 1996), are noteworthy foreign researchers in this field. V. Vidrih Perko also prepared several smaller such studies (Perko, Plesničar Gec 1991; Vidrih Perko 1992; Vidrih Perko 1995; Vidrih Perko 1997a, b; Perko, Bavdek, Lazar 1998). T. Knific contributed a synthetic presentation of late amphoras and pottery with stamped as well as burnished decoration (Knific 1994).

Glass was less frequently studied, usually only marginally in reports on individual sites (e.g. Leben, Šubic 1990, 329); these reviews are presented only approximately within the context of more extensively conceived syntheses on Roman glass (S. Petru 1974; Šubic 1974).

The large contribution born by numismatics, which recently greatly advanced and systematically organized all older material goods, as well as newer goods, and scrupulously published a larger portion of it, is also commendable (P. Kos 1988; Demo 1994). P. Kos also contributed a few studies that enriched our comprehension of issues concerning coins and our indirect comprehension of the Late Antiquity, especially the 4th and 5th centuries (P. Kos 1981; P. Kos 1983; P. Kos 1986). Z. Demo examined Gothic coins from the Slovene region.
in a more widely conceived synthetic investigation (Demo 1994).

**PROBLEMS, TASKS AND PERSPECTIVES**

One of the fundamental problems with the current stance of investigations is the extensive excavation activity in correspondence with the lack of a suitable response through monographic examination of individual sites. Merely partial and preliminary reports are available from the majority of sites. All three central archaeological institutions in Slovenia (the National Museum, the Department of Archaeology, the Institute of Archaeology, ZRC SAZU) have initiated research on Late Antiquity issues, although even here larger publications of select older excavations are in great delay, without which further efforts are rendered exceedingly difficult and hard to follow (especially Hrušica, Ajdovski gradec above Vranje, Bled-Pristava I, Ajdovščina above Rodik, Tinje above Loka near Žusem and Korinjski hrib). Similar publications elsewhere (to begin, let us just mention Rifnik, Predloka, Ajdna, Polhograjska gora and Brinjeva gora) can be anticipated only with the publication of these initial fundamental works, where extensive research teams worked in collaboration and where the possibilities for in depth research work are increased.

Another significant issue is instigated with the poor standard of organization in the profession, the dispersed research potential and indirectly also, financial means. Various larger and smaller investigations were carried out in the past, the majority of which were brought to a standstill halfway through or even already at the beginning. Correspondence with the heritage preservation services, who are also incapable of appropriately investigating and publishing the multitude (and ever increasing amounts of Late Antiquity) of sites, is also poor. Consequently, one of the impending tasks is to form research groups and institutional associations at the individual investigations, as only in this manner will the current stance be rectified. Better review of field investigations, a raise in the quality of field investigations, systematic instruction of the appropriate trained specialists and especially a raise in the quality of published studies are all creditable objectives. This type of correspondence would convey an elevated level of data inquiry, the application of newer and particularly nondestructive methods (e.g. Rodik, Mušič 1999) as well as a more intensive appeal to other scientific disciplines.

Much has been accomplished in the field of investigating and interpreting written sources, especially in connection with the Late Antiquity defense walls and Early Christian issues (Šašel, Petru 1971; Šašel 1980; Bratož 1986; Bratož 1990; Bratož 1994; Bratož 1996). The question of the interpretation and identification of places, landscapes, political administrative units etc., in sources (primarily that of the Anonymous geographer from Ravenna) remains open (Šašel 1970-1971; Šašel 1975b).

Meticulous examination of the archives demonstrated that the treasury of information from the time of the first delvers (especially Pečnik, Kušijan), as well as archaeologists (Mülner, Dežman, Rutar), is not yet entirely exhausted (e.g. in Božič 1995; Božič, Ciglenečki 1995). Verification of data from newer excavations, especially rescue excavations, is also deemed a necessity as erroneous interpretations are quite frequent. Insufficient cognizance of the fine material culture, pottery in particular, as a primary condition for understanding stratigraphically most often poorly visible situations in the field, presents a special issue.

All the more significant types of stronghold have undergone at least preliminary investigation within the typology of settlements. Refuges are the exception, remaining poorly known and sparingly published (e.g. Log near Podturn, Hom above the Sora, Ivank near Šmartno) so far, due to their unalluring architecture and the lack of finds. Nonetheless, they serve as an important indicator of settlement oscillation, particularly during the second half of the 3rd to the 5th centuries.

The great efforts executed during the past decades in the field of the Late Antiquity in Slovenia have, despite select deficiencies, already altered our perception till now of the decline of Antiquity and the survival of the indigenous populations. Numerous sites at the end of Antiquity demonstrate as to the more important role played by the indigenous population during the process of the Slovene ethnogenesis, they also enable an altered view as to the later settling of the Slavic population. Consequently, the search for traces in the indigenous culture during the time following the arrival of the Slavic population deems to be a particularly consequential task for improving our comprehension of Slovene ethnogenesis. Research will have to be intensified precisely for this period, when a new culture formed on the basis of the indigenous and the Slavic ones, so as to understand the acculturational process of the newcomers and better comprehend the process of ethnogenesis. Individual later sites otherwise
enable a partial reconstruction of the takeover of older indigenous elements - especially the material culture - however, this is only the beginning of our research. It is this type of research that will be determinative in the field of the Late Antiquity and which will beneficially contribute to our knowledge on issues essential to understanding the ethno genesis of Slovenes.
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IZSLEDKI IN PROBLEMI POZNOANTIČNE ARHEOLOGIJE V SLOVENJI

UVOD IN KRATKA ZGODOVINA RAZISKAV

V začetku se zdi smiselno podati nekaj osnovnih premis o poznoantičnem obdobju, ki se je kot samostojna entiteta uveljavila razmeroma pozn. Prav tako se zdi potrebno pokazati sprejemanje in uveljavitev tega obdobja v slovenski arheologiji, saj je bilo že prej 35 leti, ob predstavitvi problemskih sintez rimskega zapornega sistema in zgodnjesrednjeveškega obdobja v Sloveniji, obravnavano le obrobno (P. Petru 1964-1965; Kastelic 1964-1965).

Poznoantično obdobje je bil ujeman po zgodovinskih obdobjih (Petru 1972; Šašel 1975a; Petru 1978a; Šašel, Petru 1971) in po dveh velikih slovensko-nemških letih po veliki akciji raziskav poznorimskega sistema. To je pomembno delo A. H. M. Jonesa o pozni antični naslovano z “Later Roman Empire” (Jones 1964), v njej literaturi pa je Cameronov sintetični prikaz razdeljen že v dva dela: Late Roman Empire (284-430), v mediteranskem svetu pa je kasnejši del označen kot Late Antiquity (395-600) (Cameron 1993a; b). S tem v zvezi je umestno poudariti tudi pri nas večkrat opazno nejasnost glede zamenjave terminov poznoantično obdobje.

Pomembno vlogo v razvoju poznoantičnih raziskav so izsledki in problemi poznoantične arheologije v Sloveniji. Značilno je dejstvo, da so poznoantično obdobje leta 1965 v dveh pomembnih člankih, ki sta pregledno osvetlila dotedanje rezultate in kazala pot vnaprej, omenja silno skopo. Tako je P. Petru v daljšem odstavku omenil le raziskovanja sistema ital- slovenskih avtoric J. Šašel temeljil svojo predstavitev poznoantičnega obdobja (Saria 1959, 142-148).

Začetkom 70-ih se je poznoantično obdobje polno uveljavilo v sedemdesetih letih po veliki akciji raziskav poznorimskega zapornega sistema in v slovenskem prostoru. V začetku se zdi smiselno podati nekaj osnovnih premis o poznoantičnem obdobju, ki se je kot samostojno entiteto uveljavila razmeroma pozn. Prav tako se zdi potrebno pokazati sprejemanje in uveljavitev tega obdobja v slovenski arheologiji, saj je bilo že prej 35 leti, ob predstavitvi problemskih sintez rimskega zapornega sistema in zgodnjesrednjeveškega obdobja v Sloveniji, obravnavano le obrobno (P. Petru 1964-1965; Kastelic 1964-1965).
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Obravnava podanega članka je, da je bila poznoantična komponenta že velikokrat napačno razumljena in naporom omenjanega avtorja, ki je v okrasju tega časa prepoznal poseben zaključen razvoj poznoantične arheologije v Sloveniji.
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V pozorniškem obdobju (če s tem omejimo zgodnješki del poznoantičnega obdobja) so nastale tudi stvilne utrjene voja-
ske postojanke z osnovnim namenom čuvati vhod v Italijo in v skladu z Dioklecijano reorganizacijo vojske z globinskino namestivijo vojaških oddelkov. Te postojanke so zaradi dobro vidni in deloma že prej raziskanih ostanek dobro znani in na raziskavo začetek pospešnega utrjevanja sedanjega slo-
venskega prostora (Saria 1939, 142-148; P. Petru 1969a; Šašel, Petru 1971; Ulbert 1981; Ciglenečki 1987a, 111-112; Pröttel 1996, 133-149; Ciglenečki 1997a, 193). Velika večina jih je v navezavi z zapornim sistemom Clausera. Od novejših razi-
skav je potrebno omeniti posebej tiste v Ajdovščini (Osmuk 1997), na vhod v Italijo. Čeprav ne tako pogost, pa vendar upoštevanja vreden aspekt jih predstavljajo kar zgodnjekrščanska cerkev. V posebni skupini je mogoče uvr-
stiti postojanke, kjer je bilo v notranjosti naselbine odkritih več zgodnjekrščanskih cerkva. Tačni sti Vranje in Tonovev grad. Pridružuje se tujime še kuch nad slabo poznan - pra-
godovska gradisa, na katerih so v pozni antiiki izkoristili le naravno strmino in stabe, zelo uporabne pragodovske okope. Takšne primere so pri sondiranju pragodovskih gradis-
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O germanskih prisotnosti znotraj utrjen, povsem romana

iziranih naselb in slabo poučeni. Deloma je temu kriva kratkotrajna germanska prisotnost, deloma pa dejstvo, da so bili njihovi značilni predmeti večkrat iz dragocenih materialov in se zato toliko redkeje najdejo. Vse več znakov kaže, da so se Vzhodni Goti in Langobardi naselili poleg staroselezvčev v nekaterih pomembnejših postojankah (Ciglenceki 1997b, 186). Prav tam je bilo mogoče zazlediti tudi osredotočanje nekaterih značilnih najdb, posebej kermike, ki razločno kažejo, da so se posamezne germanske družine naselile v pomembnejših zgradbah in konglomerati staroselezvsko populacijo na večjih postojankah. Dopolniti smemo tudi obstoječi smernično samostojnih naselb, na kar bi morda kazali grobišči Dravije in Bilje (Slabe 1975; Osmuk 1978).

Z arheološko metodo je že mogoče vse okvirno orisati območja, ki ga je sredi 6. st. prepustili Langobardom bizantinski cesar Justinijan (Pola Norkin in oihromat ep Pannonias). Manjše langobardske posadke se na noriškem območju nakazujejo v zadeleju Celje in Petovione, kot je nekoč pravilno služil že R. Eggcr, in opozarjajo, da so Langobardi prevzeli nadzor nad najvažnejšimi poselitvenimi jedrijo.

V zvezi z grobiščem v Lajhu je grobiščem in odpira - podobno kot Bled Pristava - dragoceno ta nekropola zaradi neposredne povezave s kasnejšim slovanskim

vprašanje lociranja pripadajoče naselbine. Posebej zanimiva je ta nekropola zaradi neposredne povezave s kasnejšim slovanskim


Največ naših resnic iz prve polovice v 6. st. je dobro znano. Največkrat gre za skupine grobov na naselbih ob mestnih vpadnicah, ki so nadaljevala tradicijo rimskega načina pokopavanja, večkrat pa so bila odkrita tudi v opuščenih mestnih arealih (Ptuju, Zg, Breg, Curk 1966; Babeljca vas-sahod, Tuske 1997). Ločiti je že mogoče posamezne skupine znjorjev mestnega prebivalstva, ki so pokopavale ločeno, tako npr. grobišče na vrta Narodnega muzeja v Ljubljani (Vuga 1985) in na dvorišču SAVU v Ljubljani (P. Korošec 1950), na gradu v Ptuju (Jevremov, Tomanic Jevremč, Ciglenceki 1993). Poja-


Dovolj dobro smo seznanjeni z grobišči iz konca 5. v. celnega življenja.
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Nekropola v Dravljah daje slično zaključnega grobišča iz ozje omejenega časovnega horizonta in ima že svojo mono-grafsko obdelavo s kvalitetenim katalogom najdb (Slabe 1975). Poseben pomen grobišča je predvsem v krašnem časovnem razponu njegovega trajanja, ki kaže na obstoj postojanke, ki jo je smeli vezati zgolj na čas vzhodnogorske prisotnosti pri nas, kar je med dosež kraljev znamenitosti izjemno. Opozorja na neko postojanko v bližini, ki je v zaledju nekooblikovanje Emeone imel posebno nalogo - najverjetneje kontrolno komunikacijo ali celo križišča poti. Odprto ostaja vprašanje, zakaj naselbina nihla bila zanimiva v času langobardske prisotnosti?


Drevešno znanilo ohranjeno kot značilno za romanske zbiro. V tem smislu je jasno, da je ta občina znanega ohranjena kot značilna za romanske zbiro.