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INTRODUCTION

Although fully established as an independent branch of archaeology only as recently as the 1990s, archaeological study in Slovenia of the periods following the Early Middle Ages boasts more than 110 years of history and an active development in the last two decades (Nabergoj 1995, 72). This certainly calls for a presentation and evaluation of the past development and achievements of Slovenian archaeology of later periods, as well as its problems and perspectives. And it is only right that this presentation should be published in the main Slovenian archaeological journal. Complementing the overviews published in the jubilee fiftieth issue of Arheološki vestnik more than ten years ago, this text symbolically acknowledges that archaeological study of more recent periods has a rightful place in Slovenian archaeology, along with the prehistoric, classical, Roman provincial and early medieval archaeology.

Let us take this opportunity to point out again the terminological issues encountered when naming the branch of archaeology that we are describing (cf. Nabergoj 1995, 100–102; Štular 2008, 79–80; Predovnik 2008b, 81–82). The archaeological treatment of the periods following the Early Middle Ages logically continues the established classification of the discipline that follows the periodisation scheme established by historiography. It therefore stands to reason that early medieval archaeology should be followed by high and late medieval archaeology, then by post-medieval archaeology, archaeology of the (Early) Modern Period and ultimately even by contemporary archaeology. Actually, all of these terms are in use within the various archaeolog-
With regard to the medieval period, we generally only differentiate between early medieval archaeology and late medieval archaeology, while the High Middle Ages are left out of the naming process. Actually, this dual differentiation is more in line with the development of material culture than is the historians’ triple scheme. It is supported by the great changes that occurred within the social and economic structures on the establishment of the feudal system – by the universal rise of Christianity and the Church as a key social and political force. These processes left a distinct mark on material culture, primarily in the form of changing funeral rites on the one hand and the emergence of the feudal architecture on the other. We would thus be justified in speaking of an archaeology of the feudal era that would encompass the High and the Late Middle Ages in the narrower sense, and in the broader sense also the following period up until the dissolution of feudal institutions in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Of the other current concepts, at least the archaeology of capitalism should be mentioned, which encompasses also the very roots of the system in the 16th and 17th centuries (Johnson 1996).

In German-speaking countries and environments rooted in the German archaeological tradition, the term “medieval archaeology” is used indiscriminately for archaeology of the Early, High, and Late Middle Ages, even though early medieval archaeology exists as a separate concept. Medieval archaeology is followed by archaeology of the Early Modern Period (16th to the 18th century), while the archaeological study of later periods remains unsystematic and has yet to be explicitly conceptualised. In the British and related archaeological traditions, a distinction is made between medieval – which can encompass also the Early Middle Ages – and post-medieval archaeology. However, the latter term is also problematic, since it is used as a chronologically-limited concept in spite of its semantic breadth and does not cover either the entire Modern Period or the recent past (cf. West 1999, 8–9).

The confusion increases when trying to coin an appropriate umbrella term, a group designation for the archaeologies concerning the periods following the Early Middle Ages. Should this be an “archaeology after 1000 AD”, “archaeology after the Early Middle Ages” or perhaps “historical archaeology”? The latter term has become established in certain European and particularly in non-European countries where it is understood as the study of the colonial period (Orser 1999). Historical archaeology is specific in a methodological sense, as it involves using both written and material sources. For this reason, some even speak of a documentary archaeology (Beaudry 1993).

Neither of these terms is unproblematic, nor is historical archaeology in itself an unambiguous concept. In the Old World, where writing has a history going back several millennia, the adjective “historical” could also denote the archaeology of ancient civilisations, the European medieval archaeology and many others (cf. Andrén 1998). Moreover, this “historical” aspect of archaeology could be understood in yet another way, as a special theoretical orientation of an archaeology aware of the dynamics of history and the contextual specificity of the phenomena it is studying. Historical archaeology in this sense could be seen as an antipode to processual archaeology (Predovnik 2002, 96; Predovnik 2008b, 82).

In the early 1990s, the Department of Archaeology at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, introduced a new subject into its undergraduate programme, the so-called Archaeology of Later (Historical) Periods. This designation was selected as an umbrella term for archaeology of the periods following the Early Middle Ages (Predovnik 1995, 10). The term is general enough to cover every kind of sub-discipline in terms of chronology and subject matter, as well as practical considering the Slovene grammatical rules. The syntagm itself is also known in English, German and other terminologies, though used only rarely in these linguistic environments.

Slovenian archaeologists have yet to reach a consensus regarding the proper name for the archaeology of the periods following the Early Middle Ages. The experience of our colleagues from abroad tells us that there will always be present a certain amount of terminological uncertainty and diversity, since any chosen term stands for a concept which in itself is defined by the subject

---

1 Lately, certain younger researchers have offered different views. Sören Frommer has recently published his PhD introducing the concept of historical archaeology in an explicit way into the German archaeological milieu, grounding it in terms of epistemology and methodology (Frommer 2007).
under study, and the understanding and definition of any given concept are dependent on the individual researcher’s approach. Regardless of its designation, the archaeological study of material remains from the time after 1000 AD has become thoroughly established in Slovenia over the past two decades. This is also confirmed by the new Cultural Heritage Protection Act (Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 16/2008, Article 3), which was adopted in 2008 and which grants the status of archaeological cultural heritage to all material traces of human activity that have been underground or underwater for at least one hundred years. Regarding war-related remains, the archaeological cultural heritage status is granted to those that have been underground or underwater for at least fifty years. Though somewhat arbitrary and not clearly grounded in terms of content, as we have already noted elsewhere (Predovnik 2008b, 85–86), this definition nonetheless institutes the archaeological study of material remains from the more recent past as a legal obligation. It is for this reason as well that we should take a look into the past and evaluate how Slovenian archaeology has so far dealt with the periods following the Early Middle Ages.2

FIRST STEPS

The first publications on late medieval finds and sites on the territory of Slovenia were contributed by Alfons Müllner (fig. 1) at the end of the 19th century. These were often chance discoveries and finds that had been unsystematically obtained, e.g. from the Karst caves (Nabergoj 1995, 72) or from the – supposedly prehistoric – Kosova mound in Razvanje (Müllner 1878; Predovnik 2008a). Some of the medieval remains that he had documented, studied and published, Müllner failed to interpret correctly, either in terms of dating or function. For example, he believed that the medieval forts of Atilov grad at Spodnji Kočjan (Müllner 1894b) and Repnikovo Gradišče near the hamlet of Rep at Veliko Tinje in the Pohorje mountain range (Müllner 1894c) were prehistoric “cult locations.” Müllner was also the first to conduct systematic archaeological investigations of Slovenia’s medieval sites. As curator of the Provincial Rudolfinum Museum, he performed excavations in 1892 at the old castle in Predjama (fig. 2) and in 1897–1898 in the area of the former burghe’s hospital on Špitalska ulica (now Stritarjeva) in Ljubljana. Through his small-scale excavations in Predjama, his detailed description and graphic depiction of the castle’s architecture and through his analysis of historiographic sources on “the most famous knightly castle in Carniola”, Müllner set out to “critically expose the legend of Erasmus Lueger”. He reasoned out the place and manner of how Erasmus was killed in 1484 from the ruined castle walls and the stone ball found in one of the rooms (Müllner 1892a, 1892b, and 1894a). After the 1895 earthquake, Müllner conducted archaeological excavations in Ljubljana where a new administrative building was to be

2 The most comprehensive overview and evaluation of the Slovenian medieval and post-medieval archaeology so far has been published by Tomaz Nabergoj in his paper Arheologija in gotika (Archaeology and Gothic Art) in 1995 (Nabergoj 1995). Cf. also Ložar 1939; Slabe 1980; Guštin, Predovnik 1994; Guštin, Horvat 1994, 7–10; Predovnik 1995, 78–84; Guštin 1999a; Nabergoj 2008b. The (un)satisfactory protection of post-medieval archaeological heritage and the challenges presented by the new law have recently been discussed by Barbara Nadbath and Andrej Gaspari (Nadbath 2008; Gaspari 2008).
erected on the site of the former burghers’ hospital where the Church of St. Elisabeth had also stood since the Middle Ages. After the discovery of skeletal remains and because of old reports indicating that the hero of the fight against the Turks, Herbard VIII Freiherr von Auersperg (died in 1575), was buried at St. Elisabeth’s, they “reviewed each event with particular care and collected carefully each find” (Müllner 1897, 30). They excavated the remains of older foundations pertaining to the Baroque and Gothic phase of the church building and a total of 51 graves containing only rare grave goods and dating to between the 14th and 18th centuries.3 In the hospital complex, they discovered the remains of a tanner’s workshop of unknown age (Müllner 1897, 1898, 1899, and 1900; Stare 1991). During the reconstruction that followed the earthquake, more medieval and post-medieval objects were found on the neighbouring house lots on Špitalska ulica (Müllner 1898; Ložar 1939, 188–189; cf. also Nabergoj 1999, 42–44).

Furthermore, Müllner’s research into the history of the iron industry in Carniola, in the Goriško region and in Istria, from its beginnings and up until modernity – that is, the 19th century – is also of importance for medieval and post-medieval archaeology (Müllner 1909). He studied both archaeological (material) and written sources. His work was later continued by Walter Schmid who, among other things, excavated the ruins of a smelter commonly called “the Furnace of St. Hema” in Nomenj near Bohinjska Bistrica in 1938 (fig. 3). He dated the smelter by the Plavževka stream at the foot of Jelovica Plateau and the remains of a house initially designated “the Manor of St. Hema” to the time between the 12th and the 14th centuries.4

Schmid was also interested in medieval earthen fortifications, the so-called hausbergs, which have been studied by Austrian researchers with increasing intensity since the late 19th century. Schmidt investigated or at least documented several sites, including Stari grad or Presek near Črešnjavec, the church of St. Rochus in Breg near Ptuj, Pekre, the Atilov grob mound at Spodnji Kocjan, Pameče, and Kogel near Raduše (Schmid 1915, 1922, and 1925). In 1938, he unearthed the ruins of two buildings on a moated site named Groblje at Žlan in Bohinj. He interpreted the site as a fortified farm – a hausberg (Gabrovec 1975, 165; Smolej 1938). Like most researchers of the time, Schmid also believed that hausbergs were earthen fortifications dating to the time of the Hungarian raids and thus (mistakenly) dated all of the above-mentioned sites to the 9th and 10th centuries (cf. Predovnik, Grosman 2007, 209).

There was hardly any other notable field research done until the end of World War II. Of note are the excavations carried out at Predjama Castle before and during the war (Nabergoj 1995, 32–34), and in 1938 the discovery of medieval and post-medieval fireplaces and small finds in the upper strata inside the Ajdovska jama cave near the village of Nemška vas by Srečko Brodar (Brodar, Korošec 1953, 61–62).

Interestingly, with the exception of Müllner’s excavations of the Jama (Predjama) Castle, in these early days Slovenia witnessed no expressions of that romantic interest in medieval monuments, and

---

3 Based on an incorrectly identified coin, Müllner dated the oldest graves to the 12th or the 13th century.

4 Due to its technological characteristics, the plant was later dated to the 15th or the 16th century (Smolej 1953), whereas A. Valič speculated that it could even be as late as the 19th century (Valič 1975, 165).
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particularly in the monumental architecture (castles, monasteries or churches), that in many parts of Europe represented one of the vital roots of the later academic development of medieval archaeology. The political changes that occurred after World War I resulted in no new initiatives for Slovenian medieval archaeology, while other countries that had been created after the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary) were intentionally strengthening the national awareness of their citizens through archaeological and other research into their medieval history, mostly castles and the nobility. It was in the medieval period that they sought the roots of their nations as ethnic and linguistic communities, as well as the roots of their national sovereignties, which they were basing on the succession of medieval kingdoms. The position of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and later Yugoslavia was very different in this regard: this was a new multietnic entity with no direct historical ancestors. This meant that historical events, personalities and monuments from the medieval period could have no part in the building of the new national and civil identities.

Until World War II, Slovenian medieval (and post-medieval) archaeology had no concepts, theoretical premisses or specific methodologies of its own; it was merely an offshoot of prehistoric archaeology. With discoveries mostly occurring by chance, systematic surveys were rare and modest in scale. Nevertheless, this phase in the development of Slovenia’s archaeology of later periods may be placed within the broader context of contemporary Central European archaeology, which had only just begun developing its excavating techniques and analytical tools, and in terms of interpretation was barely able to keep pace with the developments in history, anthropology and the social sciences in Europe and North America. Then, directly before the onset of World War II, Slovenian medieval archaeology gained its founder, Rajko Ložar. His theoretical insights are deemed to be high up, maybe even at the forefront of contemporary European medieval archaeology (Nabergoj 2005).

RAJKO LOŽAR AND MEDIEVAL ARCHAEOLOGY

In 1939, Rajko Ložar (fig. 4) published the article Staroslovansko in srednjeveško lončarstvo v Sloveniji (Early Slavic and Medieval Pottery in Slovenia) in the Slovenian Museum Society Bulletin (Ložar 1939). In it, he analysed the early and late medieval pottery from various sites kept by Slovenian museums at the time. The finds were poorly documented and in most cases unsystematically obtained, which is why Ložar could discuss them only typologically and base his dating on comparison with finds from other countries. As a loyal student of the Vienna School of Art History, he used the concepts of the evolution of form and style to determine the types and relative chronology of the objects (Ložar 1939, 180, 223–224; cf. Nabergoj 2005, 178; Nabergoj 1999, 39–41). His typochronological scheme remained the only tool for classification of late medieval pottery from Slovenian territory until the 1970s, when Vinko Šribar published his analyses of the pottery discovered in Otok pri Dobravi (Šribar 1974). Nowadays it is, of course, regarded as obsolete and should be noted that Ložar’s chronological definitions still apply to a certain degree.
Ložar also defined the technological features and decorative principles of Early Slavic and later medieval pottery. He explained the differences observed within the context of wider historical processes and the dissimilarities between the Early Slavic and the feudal societies (Ložar 1939, 203–224). He used a problem-orientated approach, understanding pottery as the true research potential of archaeology, which should not limit itself to mere documentation and description but should also provide autonomous interpretations of material culture (cf. Nabergoj 2005, 180).

The introduction to Ložar’s article is particularly important because it contains his theoretical grounding for the archaeological study of the entire Middle Ages. He highlighted the importance of archaeology’s contribution to studying the past, even for periods documented with written sources and especially taking into account the continuity of historical development, which dictates the equal archaeological treatment of the Early, High and Late Middle Ages, including the early Modern Period. He emphasised that the medieval, post-medieval and prehistoric archaeologies all share similar issues, and he reflected on the relations between medieval archaeology and history, art history and ethnology (Ložar 1939, 180–183). This introduction is actually a shorter version of a much longer text entitled *Prispevki k arheologiji našega srednjega veka* (*Contributions Towards the Archaeology of our Middle Ages*), which Ložar never published (fig. 5). As this manuscript was presented in detail a few years ago (Nabergoj 2005, 178–182), only some of its key arguments will be highlighted here.

In Ložar’s view, medieval archaeology is an autonomous and self-dependent discipline whose task it is to study material remains with the aim of complementing historiography’s findings. He believed that written sources were more suitable for reconstructing a comprehensive image of the past, though this was not to imply that archaeology as a discipline was subordinate to history. Every period can be studied by various scientific disciplines, every one of them working in accordance with its own research goals, epistemologies, and theoretical orientations. Archaeological studies are justified whenever the specific nature of the primary sources demands the use of archaeological methods and approaches. Archaeology can function as an ancillary discipline to history, since “general historiography cannot do without archaeological work, especially in outlining the antiquities, the cultural and artistic production, and the craftsmanship of a nation, whereas it is more independent in tracing the political and other kinds of histories. Using merely written sources with regard to all of these areas would be nonsensical, and even impossible, considering that written sources from this period are generally silent on such subjects” (Nabergoj 2005, 180). At the same time, medieval archaeology is primarily an archaeology and, as such, discusses archaeological monuments in the same way and with as much independence as prehistoric archaeology does.

Ložar’s views on the nature and meaning of medieval archaeology and its relationship with historiography can be paralleled with the discussions about the theoretical basis of medieval archaeology in other European countries. Ložar articulated his views surprisingly early, bearing in mind that similar treatises were published elsewhere only more than three decades later (e.g. Jankuhn 1973; Dymond 1974; Schlesinger 1974). In this regard as well, Ložar appears to have been an exceptional
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and isolated thinker whose opinions, however, failed to find resonance due to his personal fate (Nabergoj 2005, 182).

A NEW REALITY

At the end of World War II, Slovenian archaeology was facing “a complete collapse in terms of staff” (Novaković 2002b, 87) but it did not become paralysed. The birth of a new country brought with it an opportunity for renewal in terms of organisation and staff, and the formation of infrastructural centres and networks. Even as early as 1945, the protection of cultural monuments and natural sights was regulated by law and, three years later, Slovenia acquired its own institution competent for this field (Jogan 2008, 54–57). The study of archaeology at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, was renewed during the 1946/47 academic year (Novaković 2004, 46). 1947 saw the establishment of the Archaeological Commission at the Academy of Sciences and Arts, the predecessor of today’s Institute of Archaeology at the Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (Pleterski 1997).

The change in the social system prompted a serious contemplation of the nature of the discipline, its tasks and methods, with which Slovenian and Yugoslav archaeology of the time was almost completely unfamiliar. In 1950, the first meeting of Yugoslav archaeologists in Niška Banja saw the establishment of a new agenda and premises for the harmonious development of archaeology throughout the entire Yugoslav territory. They made it their priority to “...research the material culture of our nations starting with the period of the first Slavic lineage communities and up to the formation of bourgeois class society” (Korošec 1950b, 214).

Despite the fact that the “formation of bourgeois class society” – a truly Marxist construct – was not specifically determined and, accordingly, neither was the chronological span of archaeological research,5 the chronological limit of archaeology in Slovenia was implicitly set to the 11th century, especially in relation to art history (cf. Kastelic 1964–1965). This decision was a consequence of inter-disciplinary relations, that is, the notions of the nature of material sources, more so than of denying the existence of these sources and their relevance to medieval history. It is therefore quite illustrative that the paper on the current state of archaeological work in Yugoslavia was presented at the conference in Niška Banja by “Jože Kastelic for archaeology up to the 10th century AD and by France Stelè for later archaeology and art history” (sic) – an archaeologist and an art historian/conservator. The ensuing debate “was focused on the relation of art history to archaeology and its subjects” (Korošec 1950b, 212–213).

In that same year, Josip Korošec published a programme article entitled Arheologija in nekatere njene naloge (Archaeology and Some of its Tasks) (Korošec 1950a). In it, he touched upon the rela-

---

5 Should it extend to the rise of towns and bourgeoisie in the Late Middle Ages, or to the 18th and 19th centuries, when the bourgeoisie became the leading force in society?
Katarina PREDOVNIK, Tomaž NABERGOJ

The relationship between archaeology and historiography. He believed that socio-historical disciplines differ in their specific methodologies, which make them independent and equal, yet also that they are complementary and can help each other. Thus, archaeology and its methods are indispensable in the study of “later, e.g. medieval” issues (Korošec 1950a, 8). With this, Korošec joined Ložar’s outlook on archaeological research into the Late Middle Ages.

Korošec’s opinion incited the historian Bogo Grafenauer to respond with a polemic treatise the next year (Grafenauer 1951). He pointed out that, while archaeological sources are indeed direct witnesses of the past, they are less reliable than “the critically assessed written sources” as they are subject to the archaeologist’s interpretation. This makes material sources absolutely inferior to written sources. But most of all, Grafenauer was bothered by the fact that Korošec presumed archaeology to be independent even when discussing archaeological sources from “historical” periods. Grafenauer believed that archaeology in this case cannot provide independent interpretations of material sources; it can only assist history. Also, archaeological sources are supposedly only relevant for studying economic history and (partly) ethnogenesis. In studying other aspects of the past, they are only relevant when they are the sole source, namely in prehistory. The key issues the two disciplines were facing were thus their research competences and the boundaries of their working areas. Similar debates between archaeologists and historians also took place elsewhere in Europe and in many respects remain unresolved even now (cf. Nabergoj 1995, 82–84; Predovnik 2000, 36–45).

In Slovenia, Grafenauer’s views, which could be called “the tyranny of the historical record” (Champion 1990), prevailed – at least implicitly. Later, archaeology almost completely ceased defining its position on the matter, but in practice it followed the chronological limitation of its work to the end of the Early Slavic period. Archaeology renounced the systematic investigations of sites from later periods, and the majority of the

---

6 An attempt at a reconceptualization of the relationship between archaeology and history was made by Andrej Pleterski in his treatise on the retrograde analysis of written sources and their integration with the material sources, an innovative method that he had developed while studying the early medieval settlements in the region of Blejski kot. Pleterski advocated the necessity of an integral historical interpretation of both written and material sources. He wrote that “archaeology can only function as a science in connection with other disciplines, history in particular” (Pleterski 1979, 508). His argumentation was thoroughly analysed and problematised by Božidar Slapšak, who pointed out that understanding archaeology in terms of just “a technique with some mechanical rules for the ‘objective’ acquisition (and accumulation) of sources” is unproductive (Slapšak 1981, 53). The first in-depth reflections on the nature and role of archaeology in studying the so-called later periods of history were published as late as the mid-1990s (Predovnik 1995; Nabergoj 1995; Predovnik 2000).
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recorded discoveries were made by chance, in the framework of rescue or systematic excavations of multi-period sites whose primary objective was to study the earlier remains.

The excavation of Zgornji stolp (the Upper Tower) at Krancelj above Škofja Loka (fig. 6) is a good example. The exposed fortification on the hill overlooking the castle of Škofja Loka was probably built in the 12th century and abandoned after an earthquake in 1511. The ruins were covered by soil, which is why Stane Gabrovec began the excavation in 1954 under the assumption that he was unearthing a prehistoric burial mound. When the site he was excavating turned out to be the remains of a medieval building, the art historian Cene Avguštin took charge of the excavation (Avguštin 1954; Avguštin 1955).

At the time, remains from more recent periods – if considered and documented at all – were studied exclusively in the context of the work done on multi-period sites. For example, in the early 1950s, five storage pits containing pottery from the 11th or the 12th century were excavated in the courtyard of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts in Ljubljana, in the area of a prehistoric burial site (Korošec 1951, 164–172). On Prešernova ulica in Celje, in the course of rescue excavations which were mainly undertaken because certain remains from the Roman period were threatened, the ruins of a late medieval building with a kitchen and the pertaining inventory were discovered (Bolta 1953).

After the war, Yugoslav and Slovenian archaeology concentrated on research into the Early Slavic period in order to refute certain controversial ethnic interpretations by Italian and German archaeologists and to prove the early onset and the extent of the Slavic settlement, especially in the Primorska region (Korošec 1950b, 214; Pleterški 1997, 18). The primary interest was soon focused on older churches, where the archaeologists expected to find Early Slavic burial grounds. Excavations generally produced not only early medieval, but also later burials and the foundations of earlier phases of the church building. The excavations on Bled Island, both inside and outside the Church of the Assumption, which took place between 1962 and 1966, represent one of the first extensive research efforts of this kind (Nabergoj 1995, 10 with references; fig. 7). The excavations were performed by the Archaeological Scientific Documentation Centre of the National Museum of Slovenia under the leadership of Vinko Šribar. More than 120 inhumation graves were uncovered, three of them late medieval, as well as the remains of the predecessors to today’s church building. The archaeological finds are partly displayed in situ, but we still lack a comprehensive excavation report.

Founded in 1961, the Archaeological Scientific Documentation Centre was renamed the Centre for Early Medieval and Early Slavic Studies three years later (Stare 1993a; cf. Nabergoj 2008b, 92). Creating this special research department of the National Museum was the idea of its director, Jože Kastelic (cf. also Kastelic 1964–1965). Its task was to perform systematic research into archaeological and other sources from the Early Middle Ages on the Slovenian ethnic territory. In this, the archaeologists would cooperate with experts from the fields of history, (physical) anthropology, art history, and linguistics. The Centre was therefore supposed to research the early history of the Slovenian nation and thus to contribute towards establishing the national identity.

The dating appears to be incorrect as the published pottery is in all probability not older than the 13th century.
JOŽE KASTELIC AND THE BOUNDS OF (EARLY MEDIEVAL) ARCHAEOLOGY

The research performed on Bled Island was one of the factors that prompted the National Museum's director, Jože Kastelic, to publish a paper on the problems of early medieval archaeology in Slovenia, touching on the research into later periods (Kastelic 1964–1965). Kastelic placed the Early Middle Ages – archaeologically – between the Late Antiquity and the 11th century or the High Middle Ages. He underlined the common issues, namely, "the question of the connection between art monuments from the High Middle Ages and the objects from Early Slavic archaeological sites", as well as "the all-too-strict methodological differentiation between archaeology and art history". However, he was not entirely consistent: in his opinion, the archaeological studies of the continuity between the Late Antiquity and the Early Slavic period should include "the cult buildings and the objects of the goldsmith's trade", which are otherwise (also) studied by art history. On the other hand though, the remnants from "the period of the Slovenian Romanesque and Gothic art" – which "speaks to us mainly through its monumental remains, the architecture, sculpture and painting, and partly also through the objects of applied art" – were to be studied by art history (cf. Žvanut 1999). Kastelic defined the material remains from the later Middle Ages as being "directly a subject of art history and not archaeology" and differentiated between the two disciplines "by their methods and mutual chronological boundary" (Kastelic 1964–1965, 110–114; cf. Nabergoj 1995, 78–80). He dedicated a great deal of attention to the latter and tried to set archaeology's upper limit using a calendar date from political history that would best fit the archaeological dating of the disappearance of Early Slavic burials – around the year 1000: as a suitable historical milestone he proposed the year 1024 when the Salian Dynasty came to power in the Holy Roman Empire.

Even though Kastelic had mentioned several questions regarding the continuity between the Early and the High Middle Ages – especially "the contemporaneity of the Romanesque and possibly Pre-Romanesque architecture and Early Slavic burial sites" based on the example of the excavations on Bled Island, and about medieval castles having been built on the sites of older fortified settlements, he believed that archaeology's interest was limited to retrograde studies. With regard to churches, archaeology was interested in "finding Early Slavic burial sites and ... any ground plans of older cult buildings", while with regard to castles its efforts were directed into discovering the "early medieval", that is, Early Slavic layers of a site" (Kastelic 1964–1965, 114–116, 118). Thus, from the viewpoint of architectural history, research into sacral buildings and fortifications was left to art historians (and architects).

The views articulated by Kastelic were in accordance with the general, more or less implicitly established image of archaeology of the time and were an important determining factor in its further development. A clear-cut distinction was made between the "archaeological" and the "historical" periods of the past, denying the material sources from the latter the nature and epistemological potential that was at the same time attributed to the material sources from earlier periods. For the first time ever, the "magical" upper time limit of archaeology was set, splitting the Middle Ages into the archaeological Early and the (art) historical later Middle Ages.8

This understanding of archaeology's sphere of action has become firmly established in Slovenia. Attesting to this is the fact that the more recent periods were not systematically included in the central archaeological databases, or were even expressly disregarded (ANSI; Tecco Hvala 1993); they were not considered in multi-period projects like the Arheološka topografija Slovenije (The Archaeological Topography of Slovenia; Pahič 1962, 94–95), or even in expert and popular surveys of the field where Slovenian archaeology and its achievements persistently end at the conclusion of the Early Slavic period (Nabergoj 2008b, 90). In practice, however, archaeology has been acting in a different way for quite some time. In the field of cultural heritage management, the archaeological research of sites from periods following the Early Middle Ages has been gradually gaining in importance at least since the 1970s, and even became a standard prescribed by law in 2008.

---

8 As a consequence of these views, the excavations of certain monuments dating from the Late Middle Ages were undertaken by art historians without the assistance of archaeologists – for example Marijan Zadnikar, who directed the excavations around the church of the Cistercian monastery in Stična/Sittich (Nabergoj 1995, 38 with references), as well as the excavations and removal of rubble inside the church and the lesser cloister of the Žiče Carthusian monastery (Zadnikar 1965 and 1967).
THE FORCE AND POWER OF IDEOLOGY

Concerning the research into castles and, to a lesser degree, into monasteries and churches, we need to point out the ideological obstacles or rather, the politically-biased trends in the development of historical sciences and the general attitudes towards the remains of the past after World War II. Why was there an almost complete lack of modern historical writing providing an in-depth treatment of the aristocracy as such or at least of the development, role and significance of individual feudal families on Slovenian territory in the Middle Ages until the mid-1990s, when the younger generation of Slovenian historians contributed several very important studies that incited further research? With the exception of one book by Janko Orožen published in 1971 (Orožen 1971) and the papers by Vlado Habjan touching on specific issues (ref. in Habjan 1999), until fairly recently there were no extensive overviews written even on the history of the counts of Cilli, our best known noble family. It was the publication of the proceedings of the International Symposium held in Celje in 1998 (Fugger Germadnik 1999a) and the catalogue of the Celje Regional Museum 1999–2000 exhibition (Fugger Germadnik 1999b; cf. also Guštin 2001f) that summarized the current knowledge from the standpoint of different disciplines and offered a suitable starting point for further detailed and comprehensive study of the Counts of Cilli.10

A part of the blame for the situation can undoubt-
edly be attributed to Slovenian historiography’s programme from 1947. According to this, and based on historical materialism, “the centre of historical development” was shifted to “the economic and social system, and with it, to the general populace” (Grafenauer 1947, 22). Research into the aristocracy simply had no place in this concept of Slovenian history “that in earlier periods dealt primarily with agrarian social history, and in later periods with proletarian social history” (Štih 1999, 13). It is understandable that, within the “analysis of this great line of Slovenian national history, a line of consistent struggle for the economic and social progress of a small proletarian nation against its external and internal enemies” (Grafenauer 1947, 25, note 76), this and certain other fields of medieval studies were almost completely ignored. With the enforcement of the national or ethnic principle (instead of the state) within Slovenian historiography from Levstik onward, “the majority of the aristocracy, the users of castles and mansions” belonged to the “doubly foreign, hostile sphere, and was thus unworthy of the historian’s interest” (Šumi 1983, 10). In 1983, at the Slovenian Association of Conservators’ conference on castles, Nace Šumi wrote: “The balance of today’s level of Slovenian historiography is that the agents of feudalism, and in particular their strongholds, our castles and later mansions, are seen as a necessary evil within the Slovenian ethnical group. (...) This orientation is one of the reasons why, when examining our recent history and the historiographic presentation of this period, we are faced with the typical extreme that could no longer separate the defeated representatives of the feudal stratum from the creations this stratum brought to life and which should therefore be treated as cultural heritage” (Šumi 1983, 10).

Characteristically, in the first two decades after the war, Early Slavic burial sites from the 10th and 11th centuries were a self-evident subject of archaeological research in Slovenia while the contemporary early feudal castles were not.11 The ideological aspect

---

9 Though the influence of Marxist ideology on Yugoslav archaeology and its concepts was negligible (Novaković 2002a) it was much more pronounced in historiography. The negative attitude towards the Middle Ages and the material remains from the feudal age and the ecclesiastical art monuments that marked the broader social climate of the post-war era resulted in an inappropriate, often even openly hostile, treatment of architectural monuments. This caused many problems, especially for art historians working in the area of heritage protection.

10 The publication of a truly comprehensive collection of documents on the Counts of Cilli is still in its initial stage. The first volume was prepared by Dušan Kos (Kos D. 1996).

11 Supposedly existing as early as 895, Reichenburg Castle in Brestanica is often cited as the oldest castle in the Slovenian territory. A deed of King Arnulf from the same year mentions the Richenburch estate. The deed is only preserved as a 12th century copy and it seems that this part of the text is a later insertion, meaning that the existence of Rajhenburg at the end of the 9th century is highly questionable (cf. Štih 1996, 18, 24, note 103). Small-scale excavations were performed in the castle yard in Brestanica during renovation in 1978, yielding the remains of older walls that could not be dated precisely (Slabe 1982). The oldest castle with reliable written sources attesting to its existence in the territory of today’s Slovenia, known as castrum Bosisen in the vicinity of Škofja Loka, was first mentioned in 973 and 989, but as yet it has not been precisely located (Berčič 2001). One possible site is Kremplnov hrib above Hosta near Suha, where interesting finds were discovered several years ago by members
was obvious, and the concepts of nationality and class were politically charged to the point that they were mutually exclusive: in the new socialist reality the archaeology of elites, and foreign elites at that, was an impossibility.

Consequently, the research into medieval standing buildings was generally limited only to art historical or architectural lines of research. It would therefore be futile to expect comprehensive analyses that would view, for example, a medieval castle or cloister in their primary, material and social sense – architecture as the concrete remains of places where members of a certain social group or stratum once lived – as well as in their secondary, symbolic sense – architecture as a hallmark, a distinctive element of a certain social entity, e.g. the feudal seigneury, as the symbol of a social group or class that is deemed unquestionably exploitative under the principles of dialectical materialism and the historiography based on it. After the socialist revolution, castles and the aristocracy could not have an equal position in the new schemes of the social orders, a fact clearly demonstrated by the burning and pillage of numerous castles throughout the region of Dolenjska and in some parts of Primorska during and after World War II. "The national liberation war has radicalised the anti-feudal position of our countryside and thus caused the not so infrequent equation of the struggle against the remnants of the old social order with the fighting against its visible outposts, the symbols of that same past. In a certain sense, the part that some important castles have played as strongholds of the class enemy in this struggle, indeed supported such a position" (Šumi 1983, 10–11).

Of course, ideological considerations did not define everything. There is a curious contradiction that can be pointed out: although archaeology (by definition) studies material culture and – in a socialist reality – should, or would at least be allowed to, have an interest in the material culture of the "broadest rural populace" – the exploited class of medieval society – not a single deserted medieval village or farm in Slovenia was researched until the late 1990s.12 This was in spite of the fact that already in 1965, Jože Kastelic in his programme called attention to the "methodically very important" British Deserted Medieval Village Research Group dedicated to the archaeological research into deserted medieval settlements, especially villages (Kastelic 1964–1965, 122). And yet the agrarian settlement was the prevailing form of settlement in the Middle Ages, while at the same time it is the one that is least documented in the medieval written sources, if at all. Consequently, we now know almost nothing about the everyday life of the "silent majority" of the medieval population in Slovenia. Nothing about the types, characters and the development of their villages and dwellings, economic facilities, devices and tools. This could not have been a matter of ideological bias; the reason for completely ignoring the research into these complex issues was most likely the already mentioned conceptual limitation of archaeology to the so-called "archaeological periods" coupled with an incomprehensible lack of interest in contemporary archaeological research carried out abroad, as well as the lack of cooperation with historians (and historical geographers and ethnologists).

As early as 1940, historians had classified archaeology as one of the principal ancillary disciplines for the history of Slovenian colonisation, even though their interest at this time was only in the period preceding the arrival of the Slovenians (the Antiquity) and the "Early Slovenian period" (Kos 1940, 30; cf. also Kos 1948–1949, 137–138). It could not be said, then, that archaeology did...
not receive from the historians any initiatives for investigating later periods. Although the history of “material culture” – in the broad sense, as recognised for example by Jacques Le Goff for the purposes of research and evaluation of the medieval civilisation of Western Europe, namely a “different Middle Ages, one without texts and inscriptions”¹³ – did not attract much interest from Slovenian historians, they nevertheless emphasised the significance of archaeological research for obtaining new and specific “field sources” in the 1970 monograph on Slovenian agrarian history. In addition to archaeological finds, e.g. agricultural implements, and the organic remains of cultivated plants, domestic and wild animals from archaeological sites, the remains of buildings “could be important for researching farmhouses up to the 17th century when other sources become somewhat more exhaustive” and excavations could provide a “more accurate image of the development of farming settlements”. The archaeological methods of research into agriculture should be supplemented with new techniques and methods of the natural sciences: aerial photography (for discovering the field systems, field paths and any underground structures), pollen analysis (for the chronology of the changes in vegetation in an agrarian landscape) and the phosphate method (analysis of the phosphate levels in the soil to determine the location of abandoned settlements; Blaznik et al. 1970, 5–6, 564, 616).¹⁴ Unfortunately, historians did not go beyond these fundamental proposals, but even archaeology did not respond appropriately. There were most likely no real possibilities for work. The Slovenian archaeological community has always been small in number. In the 1970s, when the number of employed (that is, active) archaeologists began to grow, this was primarily due to the increase in staff active in the field of heritage protection. Archaeology as a whole was lacking in the institutional framework, the financial resources and staff needed to perform comprehensive systematic research of this kind. Yet the crucial problems remained, without a doubt, the theoretical premisses and the conceptual framework of Slovenian archaeology.

**THE PERIOD OF PRAGMATISM**

There were relatively few systematic archaeological studies undertaken on late medieval and later sites until the transformation of the heritage protection service in the 1970s, when a network of eight institutes for the protection of monuments was established (Jogan 2008, 84–89). With this network of regional institutions, and the direct and active cooperation from museums (Slabe 1981–1982, 98–99), it was possible to intensify and improve the documentation of monuments and the monitoring of the cultural heritage risk level within the entire Slovenian territory. Thus the profession was strengthened in terms of staff, which was quickly reflected in the amount of rescue excavations performed.

Even though the archaeology of the Late Middle Ages and later periods was not an established notion in Slovenia at the time, and the knowledge about the material culture of these periods was extremely limited, the high risk levels and the number of required rescue interventions on monuments, eventually prompted a pragmatic response from the profession. It could be said that theory was overtaken by practice. The preliminary reports on archaeological research into monuments and sites with medieval and post-medieval remains, published in *Varstvo spomenikov* (*Journal for the Protection of Monuments*) and elsewhere, clearly document this process: in the 1950–59 decade, 13 sites were researched, between 1960 and 1969 the number rose to 15, then in the 1970–1979 period as many as 48 were researched, with 55 researched in the 1980–89 decade (cf. Nabergoj 1995; fig. 8).

The rise in the number of research excavations carried out in the 1970s and the 1980s is linked to wider social changes. In the wake of the post-war reconstruction, coupled with considerable economic growth and industrialisation of the 1960s, the world was facing an environmental crisis that set off ecological movements and raised ecological awareness. Even in the then Yugoslavia, and more so in Slovenia, the first efforts were made to protect the environment against the incessant draining of natural resources, the spread of industry and the concentric expansion of cities. This was reflected in the legislation, procedures and regulations on spatial planning in the 1970s and 1980s. The preservation of fertile soil and the protection of farmland against degradation and development for construction were particularly strong concerns. Consequently, the trend of urban centre development was reversed.

---

¹³ Cf. the quotes from Le Goff’s *La civilisation de l’occident médiéval*, 1965, translated in Nabergoj 1995, 84.

¹⁴ P. Blaznik wrote on the phosphate method in 1940 without specifically mentioning archaeology (Blaznik 1940, 39).
While the decades after the war witnessed the depopulation and decay of urban historical centres, from the mid-1970s onwards, the old settlement nuclei experienced a noticeable rise in construction activity, restoration of historic buildings and infrastructure, and new building projects within already urbanised areas. The monument protection service thus faced an increasing volume of work, supervising the numerous development projects in the old settlement areas and often performing the necessary rescue archaeological research.

The “softening” of ideological views and a more liberal social climate in the late 1960s and early 1970s resulted in a more positive evaluation of the past, even of the monuments from the feudal period. The castles and mansions, deliberately neglected and hardly ever the subject of systematic and quality restoration and revitalisation efforts in the post-war period, now once again acquired a cultural value. A more appropriate attitude towards these monuments started to develop slowly, along with investments in their restoration, maintenance and revitalization. The attitude towards ecclesiastical buildings as cultural monuments developed in a similar way. Archaeology was given a place in the preventive interventions on such historic buildings, but only as a specialised (excavation) method for obtaining data on architectural development, while it generally had no important role to play in the interpretation of these monuments.

The archaeologists themselves consented to such a role. They were forced to do so for practical reasons, not due to some deeper insight arising from the realisation of the necessity and possibilities of solving general historical issues. They stressed the need for “expert knowledge” and for interdisciplinary treatment. However, due to the “wider social interest”, “researching a ‘non-archaeological’ building with an archaeological method” was only justified “for buildings or parts of buildings where achieving a complex or important conclusion can be expected, but cannot be performed through other research methods.” Found objects “that are mass-produced and were once in relatively common use”, which are “usually only interesting within the context of excavation”, must be “sensibly screened in accordance with the general principles of screening of the excavated finds, especially when dealing with material from later periods uncovered from the ground, more so than with material from ancient times. In this way, only exceptional finds from excavations of non-archaeological buildings are to be kept and taken care of by museums” (Mikl-Curk 1981, 92–93).

Marijan Slabe presented a different position, one that was more in favour of the fully-up-to-standard archaeological treatment of remains from more recent periods, while he was undertaking research in Škofja Loka (Slabe 1974; Slabe 1980a; fig. 9). Rescue excavations at Mestni trg produced the ruins of a...
Gothic building of the medieval commune and numerous objects from the Late Middle Ages and the Modern period, among them large quantities of decorated tableware from the second half of the 16th century and the early 17th century. Slabe determined these to be the products from domestic workshops made according to Italian models, and he termed the ware “loška meščanska slikana keramika” (the Loka Painted Burghers’ Ware) (Slabe 1977; cf. also Predovnik 2009). At the same time, he realised how unsuitable the prior practice had been, seeing that it primarily dictated the protection of archaeological remains “that had originated from no later than the 11th or the 12th century, simply because the cultural heritage from more recent periods was protected mainly because of its art-historical and partly ethnographic importance.” Experience has shown that “for various reasons, it is our duty to protect also the layers of soil in such areas, which are usually rich in material remains, but have so far often been neglected and discarded.” In Škofja Loka, using the appropriate archaeological approaches to research has resulted in the discovery of a great number of “small finds ranging from the remains of ceramic pots for everyday use to what is commonly called the precious parlour inventory, which on the one hand provides an insight into the material life and social standing of the population in the past, and sheds light on the well-developed trade routes with the neighbouring countries of Italy and Austria on the other...” Slabe underlined the epistemological value of this material, “which in many ways explains and illuminates the past way of life and, in combination with the written sources, completes the historical image of the town in a certain period of its late medieval and later development” (Slabe 1974, 75–76).

Experience in conservation and wide professional interests led the same author to prepare the first overview of archaeological studies of the more recent periods. The article was printed in the publication accompanying the exhibition Rešena arheološka dediščina Slovenije (The Rescued Archaeological Heritage of Slovenia) (Slabe 1980b). The achievements presented there led to the conclusion “that the archaeological method of work cannot be avoided in this historical and cultural structure”, due to the demands of science as well as those of heritage protection (Slabe 1985, 35).

The predominant (mis-)understanding of archaeology’s role within the framework of heritage protection was primarily caused by seeing archaeology as the Method – that is, excavation – which can be offered as a service to other disciplines and can therefore be separated from the appropriate interpretative tools. Another problem was that the nature and epistemological value of material sources were poorly conceptualised, if at all. The (conservation) practice separated material sources into two categories: the architectural remains held a primary position and the research was subjected to them, while the unearthed objects were generally “just” used to explain and illuminate the past way of life and to complement the historical reconstruction from written sources. More often than not, small finds were subjected to passing through the thick sieve of established art historical and archaeological criteria on what was important and worth preserving, and what was so fragmentary, unimpressive, without meaning, seemingly familiar and on the whole so uninteresting that it should just be discarded.

15 The deceptive nature of the notion that it is impossible to learn anything new about the recent past, simply because its traces are present at every step we make, is the subject of the volume The familiar past? Archaeologies of later historical Britain (Tarlow, West 1999).
Context – the spatial relations between individual structures and finds – which is the third essential category that can only be evaluated meaningfully by archaeology and its methods (especially stratigraphic excavations and appropriate documentation), was not defined as such and was thus often neglected. This meant, in practice, that unprofessional (methodologically incorrect) excavating or digging through different structures was often carried out by the art historians themselves, or else by architects without the cooperation of archaeologists. Poor documentation of the archaeological contexts has resulted in the loss of much valuable data and even finds.

We dare to conclude that, up to the second half of the 1990s, the monument protection service in Slovenia did not – in practice and even less in theory – manage to address adequately, in a sound and modern way, any of the three vital elements of research: the source, the method and the problem. Therefore, in contrast to the contemporary development of science in other countries, it could not build the conceptual framework and the theoretical foundations for autonomous, legitimate and scientifically sound archaeological research into the heritage of “non-archaeological” periods. In spite of the great progress that has been made in the last two decades, many problems still persist, especially with regard to adequate interdisciplinary research. As Marko Stokin pointed out years ago, the consequence of this problematic understanding of (medieval) archaeology and the lack of connection between the different disciplines is that we still lack the adequate analytical methods which would enable us to address in an appropriate way complex sites, such as urban settlements, or to interpret the social processes, the development of towns and architecture (Stokin 1995, 53).

THE FIRST SYSTEMATIC RESEARCH PROJECTS AND THE BEGINNINGS OF INSTITUTIONALISATION

In the 1970s, the first major shifts towards establishing the archaeology of later periods occurred also in the field of systematic research. As early as 1967, systematic archaeological investigation of the site of Otok pri Dobravi (Otok near Dobrava) in the Šentjernejsko polje plain began on the initiative of the historian Ferdo Gestrin. Otok is the location of the medieval market town of Gutenwert (also: Gutenwerth) which was deserted in the late 15th century (fig. 10). The research was conducted by archaeologists of the Centre for Medieval and Early Slavic Studies at the National Museum under the leadership of Vinko Šribar (cf. Nabergoj 1995 with references; Bartosiewicz 1999; Stare 2000). Special attention was “given to the share that the Slovenian early medieval culture had in the formation of cultural and civilising processes in the context of mature feudalism” (Šribar, Stare 1981, 7). This is why, at first, the issues of continuity, especially the supposed continuous, organic development of late medieval urban centres from earlier, Early Slavic settlements, were at the forefront. Still, the archaeological record of the site where, beside the rare remains from the Roman period and the 10th and 11th centuries, mostly the architectural remains, infrastructure, burials and, of course, objects from the Late Middle Ages were found, required an “equal” treatment of the structures and artefacts from every period. Furthermore, it eventually caused a widening and shift of research interests. Vinko Šribar and his colleagues believed that separating the Middle Ages into the archaeological early and “non-archaeological” late Middle Ages made no sense, and accordingly changed the name of the Centre for Early Medieval and Early Slavic Studies to the Centre for Medieval Archaeology in 1977. The Centre’s activities prompted the National Museum to establish a new post of museum curator for archaeology of the High Middle Ages (Stare 1993a).

Based on the data and finds obtained from Otok, Vinko Šribar and his colleague Vida Stare published a number of papers on the urban and architectural development of this medieval settlement (Šribar 1975b; Šribar, Stare 1978), on the various groups of artefacts (Šribar 1976; Stare 1983; Stare 1993b; Stare 2002), and the typochronologies of metal and ceramic finds (Šribar 1972–1973; Šribar 1983). Unfortunately, the latter two schemes, which could serve as basic dating tools for further studies of late medieval sites in Slovenia, have proven problematic. The chronological distribution of individual types follows the relative sequence of the six horizons17 at the site, which have been dated absolutely to individual centuries, in descending order from

---

16 Only a single “residential sunken building” has been published so far. It was supposedly built in the 10th century and was still in use in the 11th century (Stare 1993c).

17 Šribar initially defined eight phases of building development at the site (Šribar 1968–1969, 34).
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the late 15th century (the 1st horizon) to the early 11th or the late 10th century (the 6th horizon). It is unclear whether these “horizons” stand for the phases, that is, periods of settlement or perhaps for the horizontal “cultural” strata, or whether they are simply identical to the “plana”, the arbitrary horizontal layers of soil by which the site was excavated in accordance with the then valid methodology (cf. Šribar 1972–1973, 23–29 and Šribar 1979, 48–58). As it turns out, the “plana” method of excavation used resulted in the mixing of the cultural content of the individual stratigraphic units, e.g. two or more strata, fill deposits, and other stratigraphic units that were (partly) excavated at the same time. It is also unclear which objects were found within intact, closed contexts and which in mixed ones. For this reason, the typochronological schemes of pottery and metal objects from Otok pri Dobravi place individual early types into the latest horizons, while some very late types are attributed to older horizons. These schemes and the related dates of the appearance of individual types are therefore useful as dating tools only with certain reservations and a great deal of scepticism.

Despite this, the indisputable fact is that the excavations at Otok pri Dobravi have a special place in the history of Slovenian archaeology, and rightly so. Not only was this the first planned and systematic investigation of a site from the later periods and the first investigation of a deserted medieval settlement, but it was also one of the first open-area excavations carried out in Slovenia. The excavation director, Vinko Šribar, was developing new methods for documentation to meet the requirements of the project (Šribar 1974). However, the actual value of the discoveries from Otok is difficult to assess as we still lack a comprehensive site report. It is as yet impossible to examine critically the published definitions...
and interpretations of the individual architectural remains, of the urban development and of the small finds. The research potential remains, of course, seeing that the complete documentation and the artefacts are kept in the National Museum of Slovenia and the site is suitably protected, allowing for further archaeological research. Vida Stare recently published the results of excavations in the Church of St. Nicholas, the only standing building in the area of the former settlement. Forty-four medieval and post-medieval inhumations were excavated, along with the remains of older building phases of the existing church, the foundations of its predecessor and several foundations from the Roman period that are interpreted as the remains of a Roman river port (Stare 2000). St. Nicholas’ is thus the first of the three areas excavated at Otok between 1967 and 1984 to have a full site report published.18

Archaeologists from the Centre for Medieval Archaeology have researched several sites besides Bled Island and Otok pri Dobravi. The Centre ceased to exist with Vinko Šribar’s retirement in 1987, but the post of museum curator for archaeology of the High Middle Ages still remained at the National Museum (Stare 1993a, 31).

There is another research project that deserves mentioning – the excavations at Stari grad nad Celjem (the Old Castle above Celje; fig. 11). As with Otok pri Dobravi, the initiative came from outside archaeology. Archaeologists were invited to excavate by Ivan Stopar, an art historian and conservator at the Institute for the Protection of Monuments in Celje. The excavations were carried out by the Department of Archaeology at the Faculty of Arts in Ljubljana and were directed by Tatjana Bregant in 1972–1983 and 1986 (Bregant 1974; Stopar 1975; Bregant 1977; Bregant 1983). Archaeological excavations covered every accessible area inside the castle core and some smaller sections of the moat and the castle yard. Considering that we still have no comprehensive publication on these excavations which would include the full graphical documentation and a catalogue of small finds, again the conclusion applies that the interpretative potential of the archaeological

---

18 Beside the church, the excavations also took place at the so-called Excavation Areas 1 and 2, located on the southern and central parts of the settlement respectively.
research performed was and still is not exploited to its full extent.19

Regarding the interpretation of the structures discovered, especially with regard to the castle's architectural development from the first half of the 13th century onward, the archaeologist's opinion differed greatly from that of an art historian and an architect (Kramberger, Stopar 1987; cf. Stopar 1982), but due to the lack of published archaeological data it is difficult to judge them critically. Tatjana Bregant's thesis that the Gothic castle hall developed from the original tower is in all likelihood wrong, but this does not justify the conclusion that the "methodological starting point" of archaeological interpretations is "speculative" (Kramberger, Stopar 1987, 85). An erroneous interpretation of individual archaeological data does not deny the epistemological potential of archaeological sources or the epistemological relevance of archaeological methodology as such. This incomprehension stems from the belief that it is sufficient for different disciplines to approach an issue each from their own perspective and using their own methods, and then finally to compare the results. Such multidisciplinarity only serves to increase the disagreements and distrust between the various disciplines, when they should instead be working together in a truly interdisciplinary way to complement and understand one another better (cf. Predovnik 1995, 74–77).

The published interpretations of archaeological data from the Old Castle above Celje have turned out to be problematic in several other points as well. Ten "cultural horizons", that is, eight construction phases of stone buildings and two earlier phases of wooden buildings have been identified. The horizons were dated through small, mostly ceramic finds to the period between the mid-10th century and the 17th century and linked with the information from the written sources (Bregant 1983, 40; Bregant 1984). According to the excavator's interpretation, the rocky promontory overlooking the confluence of the Savinja and Voglajna rivers was occupied even before the construction of the feudal fortification, as the latter was sup-

19 The publications to this date include the (incomplete) reports on excavations (e.g. Bregant 1974; Bregant 1977), a selection of excavated stove tiles (Bregant 1984), a few fragments of "chronologically defined" ceramics (Sršar, Stare, Bregant 1974, 45–49), a selection of ceramic and metal items (Fugger Germadnik 1999a, passim; Gustin 2001f, passim), and the ceramic finds from sectors A and B (Brišnik 1999).

posedly built on the site of an Early Slavic hillfort. A decade ago, a revision was performed of the finds from the so-called sectors A and B where structures and pottery from the first and second "residential horizons" from the period between the 10th and 12th centuries were supposedly found. The revision showed that the preserved collection of pottery contains no fragments older than the 12th century, and the reviewer pointed out the problems encountered in establishing a pottery sequence for the site, due to the planum excavation and documentation methods used (Brišnik 1999, 269–270). This calls for further critical assessment of the finds and field documentation.

Despite these attempts at systematic research, when discussing the legacy of more recent periods, archaeology still accepted the status of a mere method and critique of sources while relinquishing the interpretation of these same sources to history or art history. In 1987, Božidar Slapšak critically summed up the state of archaeology in the period of pragmatism as we have termed it in the title of the previous chapter: "It needs to be emphasised that, regarding the interpretation of material sources from the later historical periods (after 1000 AD), archaeology still acts merely as the interpreter of vertical relationships – the sequence of construction phases or the phases of use in architectural remains: it is the only historical discipline with suitable stratigraphic and typological methods for evaluation of the stratified finds. Archaeology figures only as a supporting technical discipline, uncovering through excavations the horizontal relationships on the micro-level, the explanation of which is then relinquished to disciplines mastering the dominating sources for the period: written documents and art. This state of affairs is characteristic of a 'phase of unconceptualised practice': the archaeology of later historical periods in Slovenia as yet has no institutional backing. The attempt within the framework of the Gutenwerth project is, in our circumstances, nothing short of extraordinary" (Slapšak 1987, 145, note 3).

NEW CONCEPTS AND THE BIRTH OF A DISCIPLINE

In the 1980s, Slovenian archaeology began to open up intellectually towards the Anglo-Saxon world, from which it adopted certain initiatives for theoretical reflection and conceptual and methodological development. In 1981, the Slovenian
Fig. 12: Koper, Kapucinski vrt, the 1986 excavation. Remains of early medieval, late medieval and postmedieval stone buildings and infrastructure (Pokrajinski muzej Koper; photo: V. Šribar).


Fig. 13: Ljubljana Castle. From 1990 until 2000, the teachers and students of the Department of Archaeology, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, were involved in extensive excavations at the northern artillery platform directed by the City Museum of Ljubljana (Oddelek za arheologijo FF UL; photo: D. Grosman).

Archeological Society began publishing Arheo, a journal that featured original theoretical contributions and translated articles from other publications, thus introducing to Slovenian archaeologists the new (and the not so new) views of their American and British colleagues. New concepts, new interpretative approaches and, last but not least, new methodologies were presented by foreign visiting lecturers at the Department of Archaeology at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, and the teachers of the department were testing them in practice in their own research work at home and in international projects.

The development of the archaeology of later periods is inseparably linked to the introduction of a crucial methodological innovation that also entered Slovenian archaeology from the West: the stratigraphic excavation method. Consistent application of this method demands an equal treatment of all units of stratification regardless of their cultural content or age. The method was tried out successfully even before the original manual was translated into Slovenian (Harris 1989) in the rescue excavations at the Kapucinski vrt (Capuchin Garden) in Koper in 1986–1987 (Cunja 1989; Cunja 1996; fig. 12). It was also applied in the lengthy excavations at Ljubljana Castle which started in 1988 (Šinkovec 1991; fig. 13), then again in Koper in the excavation inside the Church of St. Clara in 1989 (Grosman 1991, 32–36) and elsewhere. Being protective in nature, all of these excavations were rescue interventions performed on complex multi-period sites with a significant or even predominant share of remains from periods after the Early Middle Ages.

The quantity of data gathered, the number of field projects conducted and artifacts acquired have gradually demanded a more appropriate treatment of the medieval and post-medieval archaeological heritage. This incited the interest of only a small number of individuals at first, but the circumstances matured in the early 1990s, when the archaeology of periods following the Early Middle Ages became established at the academic level. In 1990/91, at the incentive of professor Mitja Guštin, the archaeological curriculum at Ljubljana’s Faculty of Arts was complemented with a new course called the Archaeology of Later Historical Periods (fig. 14; Novaković et al. 2004, 97–100). Adhering to the general structure of the study programme, whose core consists of courses devoted to the various archaeological periods, this course was designed so as to include all periods after the end of the Early Middle Ages, or rather, everything from the traditional upper chronological limit of archaeology – the 11th century – onwards until modernity. The course was actually introduced in the academic year 1993/94, when the first seminars were held, complemented with occasional lectures by Slovene and foreign visiting lecturers (Guštin 1994). From 1992 to 1995, professor Guštin and his students were excavating the medieval fortress at Stari grad nad Podbočjem (the Old Castle above Podbočje; Predovnik 2003; fig. 15), discussing various topics related to the archaeology of later periods in the seminar on prehistoric archaeology of the Bronze and Iron Ages. The full implementation of the course in all four years of the undergraduate programme followed gradually and only became fully established at the onset of the new millennium.

20 The first one was Lewis Binford, who visited the Department of Archaeology in the academic year of 1985/86 (Novaković et al. 2004, 82).
21 The fact that none of these excavations have been published completely does not deny their significance for the archaeology of later periods or their historical place within the methodological development of Slovenian archaeology.
22 In Slovenia, this term was first used by Božidar Slapšak in 1982 in his article O zgodbavin in arheologiji (On History and Archaeology) published in the journal Arheo (Slapšak 1981). Slapšak pointed out that “expanding the subject of archaeology to the latest historical periods” is only possible if the differentiation between archaeology and history as scientific disciplines is based on the different nature of their sources. In the opposite case, archaeology as a “synthesising and integrative science” can be defined only through the demarcation of its field of interest in relation to history, that is, chronologically (Slapšak 1981, 52–53). This latter premise has been determining the relationship between the two disciplines ever since the discussion between Korosec and Grafenauer in the 1950s, preventing the establishment of the archaeology of later periods as an independent and legitimate scientific (sub) discipline. Due to the same consideration the academic course was renamed in 1995, when the adjective “historical” was dropped from the course title because it implicitly supported the traditional separation into archaeological and historical periods with all of the negative consequences this had on the discipline’s development.
23 Vinko Šrubar held a lecture with the title Uvod v arheologijo visokega in poznega srednjega veka (An Introduction to the Archaeology of the High and Late Middle Ages) at the Department of Archaeology on 10 May 1988, some years before the official introduction of the course.
24 This also resulted in the publication of older excavations carried out at Stari grad nad Podbočjem (Guštin et al. 1993).
In the 1993/94 seminar on the archaeology of later periods, students discussed the stove tiles unearthed at Ljubljana Castle, in cooperation with the City Museum of Ljubljana. The professor and students attending the seminar presented their work to the general public with a small exhibition at the Jakopičev Razstavišče gallery and in a published volume. The book entitled *Ljubljanski grad. Pečnice*...
Archaeological research into the periods following the Early Middle Ages in Slovenia was published as the first volume in a new series of monographs named *Archaeologia historica Slovenica*, which the Department of Archaeology started publishing with the ambition to stimulate research into the more recent periods and to create a platform for the publication of finds and research projects, thus expanding knowledge and connecting the interested researchers (Guštin, Horvat 1994).

As early as 1995, the first two graduation theses dealing with the archaeology of later periods were defended. Both of them were general surveys aiming to strengthen the emerging discipline and link it to the domestic and international research traditions. An exhaustive overview and analysis of archaeological research into the High and Late Middle Ages in Slovenia was prepared by Tomaz Nabergoj, who published his thesis in the National Museum's exhibition catalogue *Gotika na Slovenškem – svet predmetov* (*Gothic in Slovenia – the World of Objects*; Nabergoj 1995). The conceptual development of historical archaeology throughout Europe and the USA was presented by Katarina Predovnik in her thesis (Predovnik 1995; cf. Predovnik 2000). Both authors typically assumed a somewhat apologetic stance, seeing that the rigid traditional understanding of archaeology as the antipode rather than as another facet of history called for a clear definition of the significance of archaeological research into “historical” periods.

Nabergoj pointed out some specific dilemmas arising from the insufficient consideration of the archaeological potential of the material culture of the centuries following the Early Middle Ages in Slovenia. Katarina Predovnik, on the other hand, tried theoretically to define the epistemological possibilities of historical archaeology in accordance with the concepts of material culture, literacy and social theory current in the so-called post-processual archaeology.

Other seminar papers and graduation theses soon followed. In the period between 1995 and 2008, eighteen archaeology students completed their undergraduate studies at Ljubljana’s Faculty of Arts, obtaining bachelor’s degree with a thesis on the archaeology of later periods. Furthermore, two students obtained a master’s degree and one a PhD with theses on the same subject (fig. 16). In 1995, again at the initiative of Mitja Guštin, the Centre for Medieval and Post-Medieval Studies was established at the Department of Archaeology at the Faculty of Arts (Novaković et al. 2004, 99–100). In 1996 it opened a branch office in Celje, which operated until 2001 in cooperation with the Celje Regional Museum. Led by professor Guštin, the Centre was “established with the intention of speeding up the development of medieval and post-medieval archaeology in Slovenia and encouraging the analysis and publication of the finds lying forgotten in museum storage rooms” (Guštin 2001e, 7). One of the key initiatives for establishing the Centre – and its Celje office in particular – was the...
by the Slavs and the Early Middle Ages, including the 11th century”. Even though there were plans to expand the Institute’s scope of activity beyond this chronological limit as early as in 1989 (Pleterski 1997, 88), this did not happen until the beginning of the new millennium, when they finally acquired a new member of staff – a researcher for the archaeology of the Late Middle Ages and the Early Modern period.27 Finally, in the last decade the journal Arheološki vestnik, the principal Slovenian archaeological journal published by the Institute, began publishing papers on the archaeology of later periods. We could say that this was an important symbolic break from tradition and the final affirmation of the new discipline as a legitimate and meaningful segment of archaeology.

Another institute active in the fields of medieval and post-medieval archaeology was founded in 2003. Headed by Mitja Guštin, the Institute for Mediterranean Heritage was established at the Science and Research Centre of Koper, engaging in multi-period and interdisciplinary research (fig. 17). In cooperation with partners from Italy, Croatia and Austria, members of the Institute conducted research into the material heritage of the Venetian Republic on the eastern Adriatic coast in the framework of the European project called Dediščina Serenissime (The Heritage of the Serenissima), which extended over several years (cf. for example Guštin et al. 2006). The Institute is especially active in the field of publishing (Preložnik 2008): regarding the archaeology of later periods, six volumes have already been published in the Annales Mediterranea series (Guštin 2004; Lazar 2004; Mileusnić 2004; Zagarčanin 2004; Guštin et al. 2006; Lazar, Willmott 2006; Guštin et al. 2008), as well as a number of graduation theses and other papers by students of cultural heritage studies at the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Primorska.
Archaeological research into the periods following the Early Middle Ages in Slovenia presented in the new periodical Studia universitatis hereditati (Guštin 2008).

The establishment of the archaeology of later periods as an independent academic discipline went hand in hand with changes in practice. Ever more often, the research projects and small finds were presented at special permanent and temporary exhibitions, and the number of publications increased significantly (fig. 18). In the last twenty years, several comprehensive site reports including the catalogues and evaluation of small finds have been published, as well as numerous theme exhibitions of Pomurje Museum (Balažič, Kerman 1997); the exhibition on the Šaleška valley “between the Romanesque and the Baroque” (Ravnikar 1998); the exhibitions on the Counts of Celje (Fugger Germadnik 1999b), on the medieval and post-medieval ceramics from the underwater rubbish dumps at Sv. Ivan near Umag and in Piran (Guštin 2004), on research in Škofja Loka (Štukl 2004); and finally, two recent examples – the exhibitions Zakladi Narodnega muzeja Slovenije (The Treasures of the National Museum of Slovenia; Nabergoj 2006) and Ljubljanica – kulturna dediščina reke (The Ljubljanica – A River and its Past; Turk et al. 2009) at the National Museum of Slovenia.

Fig. 17: Koper, Ukmarjev trg. Rescue excavations were conducted in 2007 by the Institute for Mediterranean Heritage at the Science and Research Centre of Koper at the University of Primorska (Inštitut za dediščino Sredozemlja ZRS UP; photo: A. Ogorelec).

studies on individual groups of artefacts, treatises addressing the issues of urban archaeology (Stokin 1995; Cunja 1998; Guštin 2001a; Guštin 2001c), pottery production in the Slovenian territory (Župančič, Cunja 2000; Mileusnić 2008; Predovnik 2009) and the discipline's research history, concepts and current state (Guštin, Predovnik 1994; Nabergoj 1995; Guštin 1999a).

Theme meetings and conferences, especially the international ones, offered opportunities for the exchange of knowledge and experience. On the occasion of the exhibition Drobci nekega vsakdana (Fragments of an Ordinary Day) presented at Kromberk Castle in January 1995, the Goriški muzej Kromberk and the Department of Archaeology at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, jointly organised a discussion meeting on medieval and post-medieval archaeological heritage. In cooperation with the Archaeological Museum of Udine, Italy and the Archaeological Society of Friuli, they also organised a special section with contributions by Slovenian researchers at the conference on late medieval and renaissance ceramics in North-eastern Italy and the neighbouring regions which took place in Udine, Italy in March 1996 (Buora et al. 1999). In December 1997, it was followed by a conference on research into the high and late medieval and early modern ceramics in Slovenia organised by the National Museum of Slovenia. The symposium on the Counts of Celje, organised by the Celje Regional Museum in cooperation with the Centre for Medieval and Post-Medieval Studies in May 1998, was marked by its international and interdisciplinary character (Fugger Germadnik 1999a). Slovenian researchers began working more closely with their foreign colleagues, especially those from the neighbouring states of Italy, Austria and Croatia.

30 See for example the treatises on stove tiles (Stare 1993; Guštin, Horvat 1994, Guštin 2001a), medieval pottery (Nabergoj 1999; Kos, Nabergoj 2000; Štular 2005; Štular 2007), ceramic goblets and cups (Guštin 1999b; Guštin 2001b), pottery from highland sites in the Kamniško-Savinjske Alps (Horvat 1996; Cevc 2000; Predovnik 2006), decorated tableware (Cunja 2000; Cunja 2001; Guštin 2004; Predovnik 2009), Spanish majolica (Guštin, Gelichi 2001), glass vessels (Kos, Žvanut 1994; Lazar 2001; Petek 2004), metal objects (Stare 2002), weapons (Nabergoj 2001; Štukl 2007; Rozman 2008), and numerous other thematic contributions. For medieval monetary issues, mints and coins, see for example Kos P. 1996 and Šemrov 2001. Modern analytical methods from natural sciences have already been introduced to artefact studies: non-destructive nuclear spectroscopic methods were used in establishing the chemical composition of medieval glass vessels (Šmit, Kos 2004) and medieval coins (Šmit, Šemrov 2006).
On the whole, the approaches and research objectives of the archaeology of later periods so far do not reach beyond the traditionally established limits set by the cultural-historical and typochronological paradigms that still visibly define the greater part of Slovenian archaeological output. The attractive ambition to place the archaeology of later periods on a different footing at its very beginning, to make it more introspective and link it with modern theoretic approaches (Predovnik 1995 and 2000), unfortunately still remains almost completely unrealised. In a way, it is understandable that the protagonists of this young discipline directed most of their research efforts towards establishing the fundamental database (with the publication of site reports and artefact assemblages) and dating tools (typochronologies). Still, there have been some attempts to introduce new concepts into the medieval and post-medieval studies. They are typically in the field of spatial studies. In her analysis of the evolution of settlement in the territory of the former Carthusian monastery of Žiče/Seitz, Katarina Predovnik used the concept of landscape – and architecture – as materialisation of mental models, grounding her explanations on (implicitly) phenomenological premises (Predovnik 1997; Predovnik 1998). The concept of landscape as a field of direct sensory perception and experience-based comprehension of space was introduced in some detail by Dimitrij Mlekuž. In his case study on modelling the soundscape of the surroundings of Polhov gradec in the pre-industrial era he practically examined the possibilities of applying the GIS tools to spatial studies, where space is conceptualised not as abstract and objective, but instead as centred on the subject – the person perceiving, experiencing and interacting with this space (Mlekuž 2002a and 2002b). The GIS analytical tools were used in an innovative way by Matijaž Bizjak in his graduation thesis on the system of defence against the Turks in the area of the Pivka and Reka river valleys (Bizjak 2006). GIS tools were also applied by Benjamin Štular in his interpretation of the dynamics of human “conquest” and use of the Alpine environment based on the case of the mountains around Bled (Štular 2006) and in his analysis of the logical placement and architectural development of Mali grad (Small Castle) in Kamnik (Štular 2009). Endeavouring to extend and transcend the discipline’s limits in every aspect, Blaž Podpečan used the current approaches of the so-called archaeology of emotion in his study on post-medieval tombstones in the Spodnja Savinja Valley. He treated the tombstones as complex sources with material, artistic and verbal (written) elements forming a total system of communication. He offered a convincing explanation of the social integration and cultural determination of distinctly personal emotions and the seemingly individualised private experience manifested through the material practices of mourning and commemoration (Podpečan 2006).

In the last two decades, and especially since the second half of the 1990s, the number of archaeological field investigations documented in professional publications has been rising sharply (fig. 8). There were 55 reported in 1980–1989, 93 in 1990–1999, and as many as 126 in the eight-year period between 2000 and 2007. Of course, this general assertion of the legitimacy and necessity of field work carried out on sites containing the remains from the periods following the Early Middle Ages is partly the result of systematic education and research efforts in the academic sphere, but there are also other reasons for this high trend of growth.

As mentioned previously, since the late 1980s new fieldwork methods were being introduced into Slovenian archaeology. The role of the stratigraphical excavation method for the equal treatment of all periods has already been referred to. Similarly “chronologically” neutral are the various prospecting methods for reconnaissance and non-destructive documentation of the (sub)surface archaeological

---

33 This study nearly consistently realised the call for “analysing spatial relationships on a regional level” expressed by Božidar Šlapšak already in 1987 in his contribution on fortified churches and other fortifications (slov. tabor) established as part of the system for defence against the Turks (Šlapšak 1987, 144–145).
record and its interpretation in terms of past settlement patterns and dynamics of the uses of space (cf. Novaković 2003): field surveys, geophysical methods, specialised reconnaissance from the air and the interpretation of aerial photographs \(^{34}\) etc. \((\text{fig. 19})\). These approaches and methods became fully established in Slovenian archaeology owing to the project for the protection of archaeological heritage in the context of the construction of the Slovenian national motorway network. In 1994, a methodology was designed in this context for preliminary and rescue interventions in the field, the evaluation of archaeological potential and incorporation of archaeology into the spatial planning processes and activities that affect the physical environment (Djurić 2004b). All Slovenian archaeological institutions and almost all archaeologists working in Slovenia took part in this project, with varying degrees of intensity. The prescribed methodology soon became an established norm, not just in the motorway project but in general. The development of the so-called preventive archaeology was followed by legislation, with the new Cultural Heritage Protection Act applied in 2008.

This new way of understanding archaeology’s role in spatial planning resulted in a sharp increase in the overall archaeological work performed, and with it, a rise in the number of documented and investigated sites and other remains from the more recent periods. In the framework of the motorway project, the following sites with late medieval and early modern settlement remains must be mentioned: Gornje njive near Dolga vas (Kerman 2008), Obrežje

\(^{34}\) Substantial use of aerial photography, and especially specialised archaeological aerial prospections and recording from the air, was made possible only after the attainment of independence by Slovenia, when its airspace was opened up for civil use. For the first discoveries of previously unknown late medieval sites, see Grosman 1996, 70–73; cf. also Kerman 1999.
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(Mason 2004) and Leskovec near Celje (Brišnik et al. 2006). Further, the remains of the manor of Forsthof were excavated in Medlog (Tomažič 2004), and in Valmarin at Spodnje Škofje the outhouse of a former grange of the Koper bishopric (Cunja 2004; fig. 20). At the site of Gošča in the Dolenjska region a post-medieval brickworks was discovered (Žižek 2004), while the excavations at Mrzlo polje near Ivančna Gorica (Nabergoj 2007), Šušec near Razdrto (Svoljšak 2000–2004) and some other sites produced old infrastructure – roads and field paths, waste pits, field boundaries and similar. More often than not, the medieval and post-medieval finds recorded in the course of preliminary archaeological investigations are “merely” the scattered traces of husbandry-related activities, such as various farming practices resulting in the “littering” of the landscape.

The number of new discoveries is boosted also by the increasingly intense archaeological research of underwater sites, especially since the establishment of the Underwater Archaeology Group by the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Heritage of Slovenia (cf. for example Podvodna arh. Slov. 1, 1982; Podvodna arh. Slov. 2, 1984; Bitenc, Knific 1997; Gaspari, Erič 2008). Among the finds that have – one way or another – “ended up” in seas, rivers or lakes, there are many objects from the later periods preserved in excellent condition that – despite originating from very particular contexts – significantly complement our knowledge of the past through material sources.35

AT THE END OF A BEGINNING

The described development of archaeological research into periods following the Early Middle Ages can be evaluated in various ways. It might seem late and inappropriate when judged by the

---

35 For example, valuable data on the consumption and even production of decorated tablewares on the eastern Adriatic coast were gathered from the finds collected from underwater rubbish dumps at Piran and near Umag (Guštin 2004). The riverbed of the Ljubljanica river is an almost inexhaustible source of information that has yet to be fully evaluated (Turk et al. 2009). Certain groups of items, e.g. swords (cf. Nabergoj 2001), other larger pieces of armament and tools, eating knives with decorated handles etc. are only rarely represented in the usual archaeological contexts, if at all.
criteria of the leading research environments, such as those of the British and North American archaeologies. However, when placed within the context of the central European archaeological traditions, and taking into account the proverbial small size of Slovenian archaeology (in terms of geography, staff and financing), the results of the efforts made so far, especially over the last two decades, seem much more satisfactory.

We do not wish to present an agenda for further development here, but it is necessary to point out a few weaknesses. The lack of thorough publications on the primary data is a key obstacle that the discipline will have to overcome as soon as possible, since further progress will be difficult to achieve without a suitable empirical base. With such desiderata as Otok pri Dobravi and Stari grad nad Celjem, the already unfavourable ratio between the number of researched and the number of published sites and artefact collections is growing even worse because of the increasing intensity of field research.

The current extremely limited application of the analytical tools of natural sciences in the study of artefacts, taphonomic processes, demographic\(^{36}\) and environmental data is another pronounced weakness.\(^{37}\) Artefact studies are based exclusively on typological and comparative approaches, and the rare exceptions which do encompass such analyses lack the reflection needed for a full appreciation of the interpretative potential of the data obtained.

Overall, we can conclude that, in dealing with later periods, Slovenian archaeology has not yet managed to liberate itself from the “tyranny of the historical record” and is only rarely attempting to build independent and thoughtful interpretations based principally on material sources. Such a stance is undoubtedly a sign of “beginner’s problems”, but also of the common lack of theoretical reflection within Slovenian archaeology.

It is probably still too early for a realistic evaluation of the range and depth of the effects that the “moving of boundaries”, by establishing a new discipline, will have on the broader understanding of the nature and subject of archaeology. We do believe, however, that this development is required and can only benefit archaeology as a whole, seeing that it forces the discipline to reflect on the fundamental premises of archaeological work, its epistemological possibilities and limitations, directing archaeology towards a more complete and complex understanding of the past through direct contact and intertwining with similar disciplines.

---

\(^{36}\) So far, the anthropological analyses of skeletal remains from just two sites with burials from the more recent periods have been published: the parish church in Kranj (Leben-Seljak 1996) and the church of St. Bartholomew in Šentjernej (Leben-Seljak 1999).

\(^{37}\) The only published study of this kind is the analysis of animal bones from the Otok pri Dobravi site (Bartosiewicz 2006).

---
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Arheološke raziskave obdobj ob zgodnjem srednjem veku v Sloveniji

UVOD

Arheološko preučevanje obdobj ob zgodnjem srednjem veku, ki se je kot samostojna veja arheologije v polni meri uveljavilo šele v devetdesetih letih 20. stoletja, se lahko na Slovenskem pohvali z več kot stodesetletno zgodovino. To besedilo se pridružuje danji razvoj in dosežke, pa tudi probleme in perspektive arheološke preučevanja obdobj ob zgodnjem srednjem veku v Sloveniji.


1 Drugačne poglede v zadnjem času ponujajo nekateri mlajši raziskovalci. Soren Frommer je nedavno objavil svojo doktorsko disertacijo s katero je v nemški prostor prvič eksplicitno vpeljal pojem historiške arheologije in ga tudi epistemološko in metodološko utemeljil (Frommer 2007).


Ložarjeva stališča o naravi in smislu srednjeveške arheologije ter o njemnem razmerju do zgodovinopisja lahko primerjamo z razpravami, ki so teoretsko utemeljile arheologije ter o njenem razmerju do zgodovinopisja. Lahko primerjamo z razpravami, ki so teoretsko utemeljile arheologije ter o njenem razmerju do zgodovinopisja. Revoščan je, da je arheologija srednjega veka v drugih evropskih deželah. Presezenljivo je, da je ložar svoje pogledi arheologije srednjega veka poznaval že v tem času o takih predmetih večinoma molče" (Nabergoj 2005, 180). Hkrati pa je arheologija srednjega veka predvsem arheologijska in obravnava arheološke spomenike na enak način in enaka suvereno kot prazgodovinska arheologija.

NOVA STVARNOST

Ob koncu druge svetovne vojne se je slovenska arheologija soočala s "popolnim kadrovskim kolapsom" (Novakovič 2002b, 87), ki pa je ni ohromil. Nastanek druge države je namreč pomenil priložnosti za raziskovanje "kasnejših, recimo srednjeveških" drugih evropskih deželah. Presezenljivo je, da je Ložar svoje pogledi arheologije srednjega veka poznaval že v tem času o takih predmetih večinoma molče" (Nabergoj 2005, 180). Hkrati pa je arheologija srednjega veka predvsem arheologijska in obravnava arheološke spomenike na enak način in enaka suvereno kot prazgodovinska arheologija.


Josip Korošec je istega leta objavil programski člank na področju Arheologija in nekatere njene naloge (Korošec 1950a). V njem se je med drugim dotaknil razmerja med arheologijo in zgodovinopisem. Menil je, da se različne družbeno-zgodovinske vede med seboj ločijo po ponavadi metodahdel, zato so samostojne in enakopravne, se pa med seboj dopolnjujejo in so si lahko v pomoč. Tako je tudi arheologija s svojimi metodami lahko nenadomestljiva pri raziskovanju "kasnejših, recimo srednjeveških" vprašanj (Korošec 1950a, 8). Korošec se je z tem pridružil arheologijo, da je bila osredotočena okoli razmerja umetnostne zgodovine do arheologije in njenih področij." (Korošec 1950b, 212–213).

Korošcevo mnenje je zdobjlo zgodovinarja Boga Grafenauera, ki je naslednje leto odgovoril s polemiziranim razpravo (Grafenauer 1951). Opozoril je, da je arheološki viri sicer res neposredne prične preteklosti, a so v primerjavi "s kritično preverjenimi pisanimi viri" manj zanesljivi, saj so podvrženi arheologijski interpretacijem. Zato so materialni viri absolutno podrejeni pisanim. Najbolj pa je Grafenauerja zanjo, da je Korošec predstavil samostojnost arheologije pri obravnavi arheoloških virov tudi v "zgodovinskih" obdobjih. Grafenauer je menil, da arheologija pri interpretiranju materialnih virov v tem primeru ne more biti samostojna, marveč je lahko le v pomoč zgodovini. Poleg taj naj bi bili arheološki viri relevantni predvsem za preučevanje gospodarske zgodovine in deloma etnogeneze, za preučevanje drugih virov pri raziskovanju "kasnejših, recimo srednjeveških" vprašanj (Korošec 1950a, 8). Korošec se je z tem pridružil arheologiju, da je bila osredotočena okoli razmerja umetnostne zgodovine do arheologije in njenih področij." (Korošec 1950b, 212–213).

Pri nas je Grafenauerjev pogled, ki bi ga lahko poimenovali "tiranija zgodovinskega zapisa" (Champion 1990), vsaj implicitno obveljal. Arheologija se do njega kasneje skorajda ni več opredeljevala,8 je pa v praksi sledila krogi v cenoma močloč (Nabergoj 2005, 182).

5 Naj bi segal do voveljavitve mest in meščanstva v poznem srednjem veku ali vse do 18. in 19. stoletja, ko je buržoazija prevzela vodilno vlogo v družbi?

6 Razmerja med arheologijo in zgodovino je poskusil na novo koncepctualizirati Andréj Pleterski v razpravi, v kateri je predstavil noinativno metodo retrogradne analize.

7 Petro Pleterski je poimel "retrogradno analizo" kot "vrat” zgodovinskega zapisa" (Champion 1990), vsaj implicitno obveljal. Arheologija se do njega kasneje skorajda ni več opredeljevala,8 je pa v praksi sledila krogi v cenoma močloč (Nabergoj 2005, 182).

8 Razmerja med arheologijo in zgodovino je poskusil na novo koncepctualizirati Andréj Pleterski v razpravi, v kateri je predstavil noinativno metodo retrogradne analize.
nološki zamejstviti svojega dela s koncem staroslovanskega obdobja. Sistematicišnim raziskavam najdišč iz kasnejšega časa se je odpovedovala, do večine zabeleženih odkritij pa je prišlo naključno, v sklopu zaščitnih ali sistematičnih raziskav multiperiodnih najdišč, katerih primarni cilj je bilo preučevanje starejših ostalini.


Ostaline iz mlajšíh obdobij so bile v tem času – če so splošno upoštevane in dokumentirane – raziskovane izključno v sklopu raziskav multiperiodnih najdišč. Tako so denimo v začetku petdesetih let na dvorišču SAZU v Ljubljani na območju prazgodovinskega grobišča izkopali pet shramnih jam z ločnino in 11 ali 12. stoletja (Korošec 1951, 164–172),7 na Prešernovi ulici v Celju pa so ob zaščitnih izkopavanjih – zastavljena so bila zlasti zaradi ogroženosti antičnih ostalini – odkrili ostanke pozno-srednjeveške stavbe s kuhinjo in pripadajočim inventarjem (Bolta 1953).

Jugoslovanska in slovenska arheologija je po vojni na -

pisnih virov ter integrirani uporabe materialnih in pisnih virov, ki jo je razvil ob študiju zgodnjesrednjeveške poselitve Blejskega kota. Petlerski je zagovarjal nujnost integralne zgodnjesrednjeveške interpretacije tudi za figurino, kot materialnega in pisnega viro.

Čeprav je Kastelic navedel nekatera vprašanja kontinuitete in poljubnega zgodovinskogredneškehvež, ki so sicer (tudi) predmet raziskave, pa je bile več kot sto dvajset skeletnih pokopov, med njimi trije pozno-srednjeveški, ter ostanki predhodnic današnje cerkvene stavbe. Arheološka odkritja so delno predstavljena in situ, celovite objave izkopavanj pa še nimamo.

KASTELIČEVA ZAMEJITEV (ZGODNJSREDNJEVEŠKE) ARHEOLOGIJE

Prav raziskave na blejskem Otoku so med drugim spodbudile k razmisleku ravnatelja Narodnega muzeja, Jožeta Kastelca, ki je objavil razpravo o problemih zgodnjesrednjeveške arheologije v Sloveniji in se z njo dotaknil tudi raziskav poznejših obdobij (Kastelic 1964–1965). Kastelic je zgodnji srednji vek – v arheološkem smislu – umestil med pozno antiko in 11. stoletje oziroma visoki srednji vek. Opozoril je na problematične točke oziroma "vprašanja zveze umetnostnih spomenikov visokega srednjega veka in staroslovanskega arheologija teran understoto in staroslo-
cerkva na “iskanje staroslovaških nekropol in ... morebitnih starejših tolorisov kultnih arhitektur”, v primeru gradov pa na odkrivanje “zgodnjersednjeveške”, to je staroslovaške plasti lokalitete” (Kastelic 1964–1965, 114–116, 118).

Preučevanje sakralne in utrdbene arhitekture je bilo tako na odkrivanje “zgodnjesrednjeveške”, to je staroslovaške starejših kultnih arhitektur, v primeru gradov pa na “iskanje staroslovaških nekropol in ... morebitnih poznejših srednji vek.8

Preučevanje sakralne in utrdbene arhitekture je bilo tako na odkrivanje “zgodnjesrednjeveške”, to je staroslovaške starejših kultnih arhitektur, v primeru gradov pa na “iskanje staroslovaških nekropol in ... morebitnih poznejših srednji vek.9

Zakaj vse do srede devetdesetih let, ko mlaja generacija slovenskih zgodovinarjev prispeva prepuščeno umetnostnim zgodovinarjem (in arhitektom), seveda predvsem z vidika utrdbne zgodovine.

Stališča, ki jih je artikuliral Kastelic, so se skladala s tekočine, ki jih je povzeti v cvetanje in ki naj bi jih torej obravnavali kot zastopnikov fevdalne plasti od stvaritev, ki jih ta plast značilno skrajnostjo, ki ni znala več ločevati premaganih naseliteljev, naši gradovi in kasneje dvorci, upoštevamo v historijskih opisih slovenske zgodovine v današnjem slovenskem zgodovinskem in kulturnomu dediščini” (Šumi 1983, 10). Nace Šumi je leta 1983 ob posvetu Slovenskega konservatorskega društva zgodovinarjeva zanimanja v pokrajinskem muzeju Celje v letih 1999–2000 (Fugger Germandik 1999b; prim. tudi Guštin 2001f) dobili obsežen pregled dosedanjih spoznanj z vidika razlik varstva.

V zvezi s preučevanjem gradov, v manjši meri tudi samostanov in cerkva, je treba posebej opozoriti na ideološke prepreke oziroma politično pogojevno šmirenje v razvoju zgodovinske dediščine, izklopov, ki so nepravno izolirali v življenje in ki naj bi jih torej obravnavali kot zastopnikov fevdalne plasti od stvaritev, ki jih ta plast značilno skrajnostjo, ki ni znala več ločevati premaganih naseliteljev, naši gradovi in kasneje dvorci, upoštevamo v historijskih opisih slovenske zgodovine.

SILA IN MOČ IDEOLOGIJE

V zvezi s preučevanjem gradov, v manjši meri tudi samostanov in cerkva, je treba posebej opozoriti na ideološke prepreke oziroma politično pogojevno šmirenje v razvoju zgodovinske dediščine, izklopov, ki so nepravno izolirali v življenje in ki naj bi jih torej obravnavali kot zastopnikov fevdalne plasti od stvaritev, ki jih ta plast značilno skrajnostjo, ki ni znala več ločevati premaganih naseliteljev, naši gradovi in kasneje dvorci, upoštevamo v historijskih opisih slovenske zgodovine.
je bil tu očiten, koncepta nacionalnosti in razrednosti pa preveč politično obremenjena in zato izključujoča: arheologija elit, in še tujih vrh tega, v novi socialistični stvarnosti ni bila mogoča.


središča praznila in je stavbni fond v njih propadal, je od tem ko so se v povojnih desetletjih zgodovinska mestna Posledično se je obrnil trend razvoja urbanih središč. Medje bila izražena skrb za ohranjanje rodovitne zemlje ter postopki in predpisih za prostorsko načrtovanje. Posebej in osemdesetih let se je to odrazilo tudi v zakonodaji, nezadržnim izčrpavanjem naravnih virov, širjenjem indukoloske zavesti. Tudi v tedanji Jugoslaviji in posebno še krizo, ki je privedla do vzpona ekoloških gibanj in dviga Svet se je po obdobju povojne obnove, velike gospodarske setih let je povezan s širšimi družbenimi spremembami.


**OBDJOBNE PRAGMATIZMA**


Četudi arheologija pozega srednjeveškega veka in kasnejših obdobj teja v Sloveniji še ne bi bila uveljavljen pojem in je bilo poznavanje materialne kulture tega časa izredno skromno, sta stopnja ogroženosti in število potrebnih zaščitnih intervencij na spomenikih sčasoma privedla do pragmatičnega odziva stroka. Lahko bi rekli, da je praksa prehijerša teorijo. Objave preliminarnih poročil o arheoloških raziskavah spomenikov in najdišč z ostalinami iz obdobja srednjega in novega veka v reviji Varstvo spomenikov in raziskavah spomenikov in najdišč iz prehitela teorijo. Objave preliminarnih poročil o arheološki pragmatičnega odziva stroke. Lahko bi rekli, da je praksa zaščitnih intervencij na spomenikih sčasoma privedla do skromno, sta stopnja ogroženosti in število potrebnih zaščitnih posegih na tej stavbni dediščini dobila svoje mesto, vendar zgolj kot specializirana (izkopavalna) metoda za pridobivanje podatkov o stavbnem razvoju, medtem ko v postopku interpretacije spomenika največkrat ni igrala pomembne vloge.

Na takšno vlogo so arheologi pristajali sami. Vanjo jih je silila praksa in ne kak globlji uvid, ki bi izhajal iz zavedanja o nuji in možnosti razreševanja splošnih zgodovinskih vprašanj. Pri tem so poudarjali potrebo po "strokovnosti" in interdisciplinarni obravnavi. Vendar naj bi bil zaradi "štirjev družbenega interesa" raziskovanje 'nearheološkega' objekta z arheološko metodo' upravičeno "le na objektu ali delu objekta, kjer pričakujemo kompleksno ali pomembno spoznavanje, pa do njega z drugimi raziskovalnimi metodami ne moremo." Pri najdenih predmetih "če dokaj pogoste rabe in serijske izdelave", ki so "navadno zanimivi le v kontekstu izkopavanja", se jih je treba "treba pri obravnavi gradiva iz novejših dob, ki smo ga našli v zemlji, prej kot pri gradivu iz starih dob odločiti za pametno selekcijo v kontekstu izkopavanja" , se je zato "treba pri obravnavi objektov kot kulturnih spomenikov. Arheologija je v zaščitnih posegih na tej stavbni dediščini dobila svoje mesto, vendar zgolj kot specializirana (izkopavalna) metoda za pridobivanje podatkov o stavbnem razvoju, medtem ko v postopku interpretacije spomenika največkrat ni igrala pomembne vloge.

14 Ofosfatni metodi je že leta 1940 pisal P. Blaznik, ki pa arheologije posebej ni omenil (Blaznik 1940, 39).
Uporaba ustreznih arheoloških pristopov pri raziskavah v Škofji Loki je rezultirala v odkritju velikega števila "drobnih najdb od ostankov keramičnih posod vsakdanje uporabe do taka imenovanega žlahnega, salonskega inventarja, ki odraža na eni strani vpogled v samo materialno življenje in socialni nivo takratnega prebivalstva, na drugi pa tudi razvite trgovske vezi z bližnji deželami Italije in Avstrije". Slabe je poudaril spoznavno vrednost tega gradiva, "ki nam v meni prikazuje in osvetljuje takratni način življenja in tako ob pisnih virovih potopeljajo do sodobnosti podobna mesta v določenem obdobju njegovega predvsem pozonsrednjeveškega in tudi kasnejšega razvoja" (Slabe 1974, 75–76). Konservatorske izkušnje in široki strokovni interesi so bovvali tudi nastanku prvega pregleda arheoloških raziskav mlajših izkobbi iz pod peresa istega avtorja. Prispevek je bil objavljen v publikaciji, ki je liša ob razstavi Rešena arheološka dediščina Slovenije (Slabe 1980b). Predstavljeni dosežki so naravnost sišli k ugotovitvi, "da se v tej zgodovinsko-kulturni strukturi ni mogoče izogniti arheološkemu načinu dela", in sicer tako zaradi zahtev znanosti kot spomeniškega varstva (Slabe 1985, 35).

Prevladujoče (ne)razumevanje vloge arheologije v okviru spomeniškega varstva je izhajalo predvsem iz obravnavne arheologije kot metode, beri: izkopavanja, ki jo je mogoče preprosto ponuditi kot uslugo drugim strokam in jo ločiti od ustreznih interpretativnih orodij. Druga kletje je bila ta, da sta bili narava in spoznavna vrednost materialnih virov pomanjkljiva – če sploh – konceptualizirani. V (konservatorskem) praksi so bili materialni viri ločeni na dve kategoriji: primarni pomen so imeli arhitekturni preostanki in tem so bile podrejene raziskave, predmeti, ki so bili odkriti pri izkopu zemeljskih plasti, pa so načeloma "le" pojasnjevali in osvetljevali takratni način življenja ter dopolnjevali historično podobo, znano iz pisnih virov. Drobnob gradivo je nemalokrat šlo skozi gosto sito uveljavljenih umetnostnozgodovinskih in tudi arheoloških meril o tem, kaj je pomembno in vredno obravnavati, kaj pa to fragmentarno, neizrazito, nepovedno, navidez poznano15 in naslov takih nezanimiv, da se zavrne.

Tretja pomembna kategorija, ki jo arheologija s svojimi metodami (posebno stratigrafskimi izkopavanji in ustreznim dokumentiranjem) edina lahko relevantno obravnavala, namreč kontekst – prostorski odnosi med posameznimi strukturmami in najdbami –, ni bila posebej opredeljena in je bila pogosto zaposnivljena. V praksi je to pomenilo, da so bili zaradi nesterkovnega (metodološko nepravičnega) izkopavanja ali prekopavanja različnih struktur, ki so ga neredko opravili kar razumetnost zgodovinarji ali arheologi brez sodelovanja arheologov, in zaradi pomanjkljivega dokumentiranja najdiščelor naših kontekstov izgubili številni dragoceni podatki in tudi najdje.


**PRVE SISTEMATIČNE RAZISKAVE IN ZAMETKI INSTITUCIONALIZACIJE**


Vinko Šibar in njegova sodelavka Vida Stare sta na podlagi podatkov in gradiva, priboljbenega na Otoku, objavila več razprav o urbanističnem in arhitekturnem razvoju tega srednjeveškega naselja (Šibar 1975b; Šibar, Stare 1978), o pomembenih sklopih drobnih predmetov

---

15 O tem, kako varljiv je lahko občutek, da o bližnji preteklosti ne moremo izvedeti nič novega zgolj zato, ker nas njeni ostanki spremljajo na vsakem koraku, pišejo avtorji zbornika *The familiar past? Archaeologies of later historical Britain* (Tarlow, West 1999).

16 Objavljena je le ena "stanovanjska jama", bivalni objekt, ki naj bi bil nastal v 10. stoletju, uporabljal pa naj bi bil vsaj še v 11. stoletju (Stare 1993c).

Sodelavci Centra za arheologijo srednjega veka so poleg blejskega Otoka in Otoka pri Dobravi raziskali še več drugih najdišč. Z delovanjem je Center dokončno prenehal po upokojitvi Vinko Šribarja leta 1987, vendar je Narodni muzej ohranil delovno mesto kustosa arheologa za visoki srednji vek (Stare 1993a, 31).

Druga raziskava, ki jo velja omeniti, so izkopavanja Starega gradu nad Celjem (sl. 11). Pobuda zanj je poleg kot v primeru Otoka pri Dobravi prišla od zunanjega. K izkopavanjem je arheologe namreč povabili umetnike (Bregant 1974; Stopar 1975; Bregant 1977; Bregant 1983). Arheološko izkopavanje je zajelo vse dostopne površine v grajskem juru ter manjše predele v grajskem jarku in predgradju. Svet pa velja ugotovitev, da interpretativni potencial opravljenih arheoloških raziskav ni (bil) izkoriščen v polni meri, kajti celovite objave izkopavanj z grafično dokumentacijo in katalogom drobnega gradiva še danes nimamo.19

Pri interpretaciji odkritih struktur in predvsem stavbnega razvoja gradu od prve polovice 13. stoletja dalje je med arheologijo ter umetnostnim zgodovinarjem in arhitektom prišlo do bistvenih razhajanj (Kramberger, Stopar 1987, 85).}

19 Dolgo so bila objavljena (delna) poročila o izkopavanjih in raziskavah na Otoku (Stare 1983; Stare 1993b; Stare 1993a, 31). Poleg blejskega Otoka in Otoka pri Dobravi raziskali še več drugih najdišč. Z delovanjem je Center dokončno prenehal po upokojitvi Vinko Šribarja leta 1987, vendar je Narodni muzej ohranil delovno mesto kustosa arheologa za visoki srednji vek (Stare 1993a, 31).


18 Poleg cerkve še t. i. izkopno polje 1 na južnem in izkopno polje 2 na osrednjem delu naselja.

Klub navedenim poskusom sistematičnega raziskovalnega dela arheologija pri obravnavi zapuščini mlajših obdobij še vedno pristajala na status metode in kritike virov, katerih interpretacijo pa je prepuščala zgodovini ali umetnostni zgodovini. Stanje stroke v obdobju, ki smo ga v naslovu prejšnjega razdelka označili za obdobje pragmatizma, je Božidar Slapšak leta 1987 kritično povzeli s besedami: "Velja prejšnjega razdelka označili za obdobje pragmatizma, je delo je arheologija pri obravnavi zapuščine mlajših obdobij (po l. 1000) arheologija interpoudariti, da je pri nas k preučevanju materialnih virov za mlajša zgodovinska obdobja (po l. 1000) arheologija interpretacijsko pritegennja še vedno zgolj kot pojasnjevalka vertikalnih razmerij (sedeža gradbenih faz oz. faz uporabe pri stavbnih ostalih: za to ima pač edina med historičnimi vedami izdelano primerno stratigrafsko pa tipološko za vrednotenje gradiva v plasteh – metodo), sicer nastopa zgolj kot pomočna tehnična disciplina, z izkopavanjem razkriva horizontalna razmerja na mikro ravni, njih razlaga pa je prepuščena vedam, ki obvladujejo dominantni (pisni, umetnostni) vir za ta obdobja. Takšno stanje je značilno za 'fazo nekonceptualizirane prakse': arheologija mlajših zgodovinskih obdobij v Sloveniji še nima institucionalnega zaleža. Za naše razmere izjemen je poskus v okviru projekta "Gutenwerth" (Slapšak 1987, 145 op. 3).

NOVI KONCEPTI IN ROJSTVO DISCIPLINE

V osemdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja se je slovenska arheologija pričela intelektualno odpirati proti anglosaškemu mlajšu zgodovinska obdobja (po l. 1000) arheologija interpoudariti, da je pri nas k preučevanju materialnih virov za mlajša zgodovinska obdobja (po l. 1000) arheologija interpretacijsko pritegennja še vedno zgolj kot pojasnjevalka vertikalnih razmerij (sedeža gradbenih faz oz. faz uporabe pri stavbnih ostalih: za to ima pač edina med historičnimi vedami izdelano primerno stratigrafsko pa tipološko za vrednotenje gradiva v plasteh – metodo), sicer nastopa zgolj kot pomočna tehnična disciplina, z izkopavanjem razkriva horizontalna razmerja na mikro ravni, njih razlaga pa je prepuščena vedam, ki obvladujejo dominantni (pisni, umetnostni) vir za ta obdobja. Takšno stanje je značilno za 'fazo nekonceptualizirane prakse': arheologija mlajših zgodovinskih obdobij v Sloveniji še nima institucionalnega zaleža. Za naše razmere izjemen je poskus v okviru projekta "Gutenwerth" (Slapšak 1987, 145 op. 3).


Katarina PREDOVNIK, Tomaž NABERGOJ
stoletj po zgodnjem srednjem veku pri nas, K. Predovnik pa je poskušala teoretsko opredeliti spoznavne možnosti historične arheologije v skladu s sodobnimi koncepti materialne kulture, pismenosti in družbene teorije, značilnimi za t. i. poprocesno arheologijo.

Kmalu so sledila nova seminarska in diplomska dela. Tako je med leti 1995 in 2008 študij na ljubljanski Filozofski fakulteti z univerzitetnito diplomno iz arheologije mlajših obdobij zaključilo osemnajst arheologov in arheologij, magisterij sta pridobila dva arheologa, en arheolog in ena arheologinja pa sta pridobila tudi naziv doktorja oziroma doktorice znanos (sl. 16).
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17 Nenazadnje je v minulem desetletju z objavljivanjem člankov z področja arheologije mlajših obdobij so se pripravili raziskovalci inštituta za področje arheologije poznega srednjega vekna – raziskovalca za področje arheologije poznega srednjega vekna.27 Nenazadnje je v minulem desetletju z objavljivanjem člankov z področja arheologije mlajših obdobij so se pripravili raziskovalci inštituta za področje arheologije poznega srednjega vekna.27 Nenazadnje je v minulem desetletju z objavljivanjem člankov z področja arheologije mlajših obdobij so se pripravili raziskovalci inštituta za področje arheologije poznega srednjega vekna.27 Nenazadnje je v minulem desetletju z objavljivanjem člankov z področja arheologije mlajših obdobij so se pripravili raziskovalci inštituta za področje arheologije poznega srednjega vekna.27 Nenazadnje je v minulem desetletju z objavljivanjem člankov z področja arheologije mlajših obdobij so se pripravili raziskovalci inštituta za področje arheologije poznega srednjega vekna.


28 Če omenimo le nekatere: razstava o izkopavanjih v Narodnem muzeju (Štimberg 1997), razstava o na Štajerskem (Guštin, Predovnik 1997), stalna razstava "Venškem – svet predmetov" (Lozar Štamcar 1995), razstava "Gotika na Slo-


32 Predvsem imamo v mislih mednarodne projekte in podmenah (Predovnik 1999, 144–145).


34 Analiza terenskih in subterenskih najdišč lyksožalke posada in arheoloških poskaus da v kontekstu raziskovalnega obdobja (Grosman 1996, 70–73; prim. tudi Kerman 1999).
standard, ne le ob raziskavah na trasah avtocest, marveč tudi sicer. Razvoju t. i. preventivne arheologije je z novim Zakonom o varstvu kulturne dediščine iz leta 2008 sledila še zakonodaja.

Posledica novega razumevanja vloge arheologije v posegih v prostor je izrazito povečan obseg dela, s tem pa se je seveda povečalo tudi število evidentiranih in raziskanih najdišč in drugih ostalih iz mlajših obdobij. V sklopu avtocestnega projekta velja omeniti odkritja pozno- 


Na tem mestu ne želimo zapisovati programskih izhodišč za nadaljnj izraz, Opozorilo (le ne nekaj šibki točk. Ena ključnih ovir, ki jih bo stroka morala čimprej premestiti, je pomanjkanje kvalitetnih objav primarnih podatkov, kajti brez ustrezné empiriče baze bo težko napredovala. Vse intenzivnejša terenska raziskovana dejavnost ob starih dežeratih (Otok pri Dobravi, Stari grad nad Celjem) neugodno razmerje med številom raziskanih in številom objavljenih najdišč in artefaktnih zbirov le še poslabšuje.

Drug a izrazita pomanjkljivost je zaenkrat zares skrajno omejena uporaba analititskoh orodij naravoslovnih ved pri preučevanju artefaktov, tafonomskih procesov, demograf-

skih in okoljskih podatkov.37 Artefaktne študije temeljijo izključno na tipološkem in komparativističnem pristopu, redke izjeme, ki vključujejo naravoslovne analize, pa so premalo reflektirane, da bi se uspele v polni meri izkoristiti interpretativno potencial pridobljenih podatkov.

Končno lahko ugotovimo, da se slovenska arheologija pri obravnavi mlajših obdobij doleša je še ni osveta “gospodstva zgodbinskega vira” in se le redko loteva suverenih, pre-

mišljenih in prvenstveno na materialnih virih utemeljenih interpretacij. Takšna drža je brez dvoma znak začetniških težav in siceršnjega razumevanja teoretsko-fenomenološkega premisleka v slovenski arheologiji.

Najbrž je še prezgodaj, da bi lahko realno ovrednotili domet in globino učinkov, ki jih za širše razumevanje narave in predmeta arheologije ima in jih bo še imelo “premikanje meja” z vzpostavljanjem nove discipline. Verjamemo pa, da je ta razvoj za arheološko vedo vedno celo lahko samoreniven, ceno nujen. Sili jo namreč v razmislek o temelj-

nih podmenah arheološkega dela, njegovih spoznavnih možnosti in omejitevah ter arheologijo ob neposrednem srečevanju in prepletanju z sorodnimi disciplinami usmerja k bolj integratnemu in hkrati kompleksnemu poimovanju preteklosti.