

Late Roman Črnomelj and Bela krajina

Phil MASON

Izvleček

Črnomelj je majhno mesto, ki se nahaja v središču Bele krajine, na skrajnem jugovzhodnem delu Slovenije. Novejša zaščitna izkopavanja v zgodovinskem središču mesta so odkrila pomembne sledove poznorimske poselitve, kar je nova razsežnost v arheologiji mesta in odprla mnoga vprašanja o mestu samem ter Beli krajini kot pokrajini v poznorimskem obdobju.

Abstract

Črnomelj is a small town located at the centre of Bela krajina, the extreme southeastern part of Slovenia. Recent rescue excavation in the historic town centre has revealed important traces of Late Roman occupation, which add a new dimension to the archaeology of the town and raise a number of questions about the town and the Bela krajina region as a whole in the Late Roman period.

INTRODUCTION

The Archaeological and Historical Background

The historic town centre of Črnomelj is located on a meander, formed by the confluence of the river Dobličica with the river Lahinja, a tributary of the Kolpa. The modern town is medieval in origin and was first mentioned in 1228, when Patriarch Berthold of Aquileia issued a decree, establishing a parish centered on the modern parish church of sv. Peter (Kos 1987, 52). The town was mentioned several times as a market in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, attaining town status sometime in the fourteenth or fifteenth century (op. cit. 45-49).

The archaeological evidence indicates that it was an early focus of settlement. There are some Neolithic or Eneolithic stray finds, but the earliest evidence of occupation dates to the Late Bronze Age. The Urnfield flat cremation cemetery at Sadež on a ridge to the north of the town centre closes off the approaches to the town from this direction. It has largely been destroyed by recent housing development, but the few surviving graves are part of the Late Bronze Age Ljubljana group and date to the 9th and 8th century B.C. (Dular 1979, 65-

100). Early Iron Age barrows, excavated in the last century, were located in Loka, to the south of the historic town centre (Dular 1983, 219-244).

Roman settlement activity has been known since the 19th century in the Črnomelj area. A settlement was partly excavated on the Okljuk meander in Loka in 1900. The brief report refers to a bath complex. The associated cemetery was located to the south of the settlement, beside the Črnomelj-Vinica road (Dular 1985, 60). Resistivity survey on the Okljuk site has identified further architectural remains. It seems likely that the Okljuk site represents a small town (*vicus*) or villa complex. The numerous Roman tombstones, which were built into buildings in the historic town centre, probably derived from the above cemetery (op. cit. 56,57).

The only archaeological activity in the historic town centre itself, prior to 1989, took place in 1951. Rescue excavation during roadwork's to the east of the Parish church uncovered five Early Slavic graves (10th-11th century), which were cut into an Iron Age occupation layer (op. cit. 58). The historic town centre of Črnomelj and its immediate environs were, thus, already known as a prehistoric, Roman and Early Slavic settlement centre before the current phase of rescue excavations.




Fig. 1: Črnomelj: location of excavated areas.
 Sl. 1: Črnomelj: izkopani predeli.

THE 1988-1997 EXCAVATIONS

The historic town centre retains a basically medieval layout, although the majority of the buildings have been adapted or re-built (*Fig. 1*). Thus, the potential for the preservation of archaeological remains in the historic town centre is very high. The increased intensity of development has led to an increase in rescue excavation with surprising results. Three major excavations have been carried out since 1988 (*Fig. 2*). All have produced evidence of an important Late Roman settlement in the area of the historic town centre.

The Sv. Duh site

The site is situated on the edge of the historic town centre (*Fig. 2: 1*). It is a late 15th century

late Gothic church and the surrounding terrace on the southeastern edge of the old town, overlooking a crossing point of the river Dobljičica. Trial excavation took place in 1988. This was followed by systematic rescue excavation, which began in June 1989 and continued with short pauses until May 1991, during which time the entire terrace and the interior of the church were excavated. This is an area of circa 400 m². The excavations revealed the existence of a Late Iron Age (LIA)/ Early Roman settlement, as well as uncovering an interesting cemetery complex of the Early Modern period. However, the most surprising discovery was that of part of an hitherto unknown Late Roman settlement complex, buried under the late medieval terrace fills and beneath the late Gothic church (*Insert 1*). This settlement was well preserved and can be divided into five main phases.




Fig. 2: Plan of excavations, showing Late Roman structures at 1: Sv. Duh; 2: Pastoralni center; 3: Lahinja River Edge Complex, Cobbled surface and cemetery.

Sl. 2: Načrt izkopavanj s prikazom poznoantičnih struktur 1: Sv. Duh; 2: Pastoralni center; 3: Najdišče na bregu reke Lahinja.



Fig. 3: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: the Late Roman apse (from the east).

Sl. 3: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: poznoantična apsida (pogled z vzhoda).

The first phase is represented by a mortared stone defensive wall, 1.66 m wide, surviving to a height of 2.01 m. The wall runs for 15.75 m in a W-E direction to a round tower, structure 571, on the southeastern corner. Here the wall turns



Fig. 4: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: mosaic fragment in the southeastern corner of the Late Roman church nave. Dimensions: 1.35 x 1.10 m.

Sl. 4: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: fragment mozaika v jugovzhodnem vogalu poznoantične cerkvene ladje. Dimenzije: 1,35 x 1,10 m.

at a rightangle and runs S-N for a further 11.25 m beneath the presbytery of the standing church, finally disappearing under the adjacent house. The entrance to the tower was from the interior of the settlement, the excavated part of which lies inside the church. The tower has surviving dimensions of 5.92 x 3.40 m and in this phase had a beaten clay and gravel floor on a 0.42 m deep fill layer. An hearth was located to the east of the entrance. The ground fell off steeply to the south east of the tower. The area immediately outside the fortifications on the south was surfaced with gravel, as was the area immediately behind the walls.

A small Early Christian church was partially preserved at the western end of the site, inside the standing church, the construction of which destroyed most of it. Only the semicircular apse and the dividing wall between the apse and the nave survived (Fig. 3). The nave had been at least partially covered with a mosaic pavement, which has been dated to the early or mid 5th century



Fig. 5: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: mosaic fragment in the northeastern corner of the Late Roman church nave. Dimensions: 1.00 x 0.80 m

Sl. 5: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: fragment mozaika v severnovzhodnem vogalu poznoantične cerkvene ladje. Dimenzije: 1,00 x 0,80 m.



Fig. 6: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: the Late Roman structures inside the standing church (from the west).

Sl. 6: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: poznoantični objekti znotraj obstoječe cerkve (pogled z zahoda).



Fig. 7: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: phase 3 reconstruction in the Late Roman round tower (571) interior.

Sl. 7: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: 3. rekonstrukcijska faza v notranjosti poznoantičnega okroglega stolpa (571).

(Fig. 4, 5) (Djurić pers. com.). The area of the interior between the church and the defensive wall was consolidated with a gravel surface (0.05 m deep). An occupation or rubbish layer (0.15 m deep) began to build up on this surface.

The second phase represents continued use of the same structures. The second floor in the tower 571 was laid directly over the primary occupation deposit and the position of the hearth shifted, so that it was directly opposite the entrance. Deposition also continued on the inter-structure surface, but cannot be distinguished from the previous phase. A more complex sequence of surfaces and occupation deposits were present in the southeastern interior against the defensive wall. There were three separate surfaces and three occupation deposits, which are indicative of intensive use of the access to the corner tower.

The third phase represents a reconstruction of the site. The southeastern corner of the fortifications was reorganized. A large rectangular structure of mortared stone, 679, was built in the southeastern angle of the wall, closing off the corner behind the round tower (Fig. 6). Its internal dimensions were 6.20 x 4.30 m. Two postholes for scaffolding were cut into this layer were cut into the last pre-structure occupation layer, the compacted surface of which was used as a floor after the postholes were backfilled. A hearth was built in the centre of the structure. The entrance to this structure seems to have been in southwestern corner, against the defensive wall. The entrance to the tower was blocked, suggesting that entrance to the tower was no longer at ground level, although there is no clear evidence as to whether or not 679 had several floors. The rectangular structure seems to have been an inte-

rior tower, reinforcing the southeastern corner of the defenses.

A further residential structure, 678, was built to the north of 679, abutting both it and the defensive wall. Its internal dimensions are unclear, because it extended outside the standing church, although its dimensions were at least 4.75 x 3.95 m. The primary non-structural surface was leveled with an additional gravel layer against the defensive wall to create a single level floor with a hearth in the southeastern corner. Later, medieval activity precluded determination of the location of the entrance to the structure, which seems to have had a residential function.

The floor of the round tower 571 was also raised with a rubble and fill layer (0.33 m deep) (Fig. 7), which covered two backfilled postholes, similar to those in structure 679. This makeup layer partially covers the blocked entrance. The contemporaneity of these building activities are clearly documented by the stratigraphy and the ceramic finds. A wide range of imported ceramics was found in this phase, which will be discussed below. However, the preliminary date of this phase is the first half of the 6th century. The marginal status of this part of the site during the reconstruction phase is best illustrated by the location of two infant burials, one in the make-up layer in the round tower and the other in the new surface on the southern exterior of the wall.

The fourth phase represents the use of these new structures, the tower and the church. The first post-reconstruction floor in the tower had an associated hearth and a clearly residential function (occupation layer). The second and final floor had no associated hearth and was clean. Both structures 678 and 679 had hearths and



Fig. 8: Črnomelj - Pastoralni center: general view of the site after excavation - the Late Roman defensive wall and rectangular tower are in the foreground.

Sl. 8: Črnomelj - Pastoralni center: celovit pogled na najdišče po izkopavanjih - v ospredju sta poznoantični obrambni zid in pravokotni stolp.

occupation layers over gravel floors, but were relatively poor in finds. This absence of finds can be explained by the presence of a deep rubbish or midden deposit outside the walls, on either side of the round tower. This contained rare, but important imported ceramics, along with a wide range of local coarse wares, which are also present in the other phases of the site.

Phase five is the destruction of the site. This is clearly visible in the remains of burnt beams and charcoal layer over the mosaic in the church, on the final floor in the tower and on the exterior midden deposit. The associated fine ware gives a destruction date in the late 6th/early 7th century. A final dramatic touch is provided by a trilobate arrowhead that was found on the surface of the midden. It is associated with the destruction layer and was probably used in the final attack on the defenses.

The Pastoralni center site

The Pastoralni center (Pastoral centre) site is located 30 m to the north of the Sv. Duh site (Fig. 2: 2). The site is also situated on the edge of the historic town centre. It comprises two adjacent medieval building plots, extending from the modern street to the line of the medieval town wall, overlooking the narrow floodplain of the deeply incised river Lahinja. Systematic excavation began in advance of construction work in 1995 and continued in 1996, during which time an area of 225 m² was excavated. The site was largely occupied by late medieval structures and defensive walls,



Fig. 9: Črnomelj - Pastoralni center: the interior of the Late Roman rectangular tower.

Sl. 9: Črnomelj - Pastoralni center: notranjost poznoantičnega pravokotnega stolpa.

but a significant amount of Late Roman stratigraphy was also documented (*Insert 2*). Three main phases can be distinguished, which directly correspond to the first three phases on the Sv. Duh site.

The first phase here is distinguished by a mortared stone defensive wall, 1.80 m wide, surviving to a height of 1.00 m, in the eastern part of the site. The wall runs for 14.75 m in an S-N direction, finally disappearing under the rectory. A rectangular tower, 5.10 x 3.50 m, butts the eastern, outer front of the defensive wall (Fig. 8, 9). The internal dimensions of the tower are 3.50 x 2.80 m. It contained six distinct fill layers (total depth 0.70 m). The upper surface of the final fill was compacted and evidently served as a floor in the structure, although the lack of an occupation deposit and a hearth suggest that the tower did not serve a habitation function in this phase. The area in front of the tower and defensive wall was cobbled prior to construction and then raised to form a glacis (0.90 m). These layers contained material comparable to that in the primary fill of the round tower 571. The area immediately behind the wall was surfaced with a compact gravel layer. This represents a 6 m wide communication immediately inside the defensive wall, matching the similar surface on the Sv. Duh site.

The central part of the site was entirely destroyed by late medieval activity, but an area of Late Roman occupation deposits remained intact in the western part of the site. This area was 10 m in length and 2.50 m in width, although it reached a maximum width of 4.50 m in the southern part of the site. It was completely separated from the eastern part of the site and the Late Roman defensive wall by a late medieval cellar. The initial phase in this part of the site consists of a drainage



Fig. 10: Črnomelj - Pastoralni center: the Late Roman drainage system in the western part of the site.

Sl. 10: Črnomelj - Pastoralni center: poznoantični kanalizacijski sistem v zahodnem delu najdišča.

system, 6.00 m west of the defensive wall (Fig. 10). It is composed of two parallel channels and a number of sumps, which drained into a large sump in the southwest. The homogenous nature of the primary fill (0.24 m deep) in this sump and drainage system suggests that the drainage system was not maintained after construction. No structural remains were associated with this drainage system, but the lack of such remains between it and the wall suggests that it served structures to the west, under the modern street. Both sites give evidence of a clear zone immediately inside the walls in the first phase.

The second phase is only present in the western part of the site. The upper surface of the fill in the sump and the drainage system was compact and seems to have been used as a floor surface. An hearth was associated with this floor. This was covered by a 0.20 m deep organic-rich occupation deposit, which contained discontinuous ash lenses, limestone fragments and daub. A second hearth was located on the compacted surface of this layer. These layers indicate the presence of a structure or structures above or near the disused drainage system in the second phase. No structural remains were found and no relationship with the defensive wall or tower can be established. It is, however, broadly contemporary with the silting/occupation deposits between the defensive wall and the church on the Sv. Duh site.

The third and final Late Roman phase on the Pastoralni center site is contemporary with the reconstruction phase at Sv. Duh. Two postholes, which were later backfilled, cut the first phase floor in the rectangular tower. The presence of such features on both sites can be connected with general repairs to the defenses. The earlier floor

was then resurfaced with clean gravel. The presence of a truncated occupation deposit above this suggests that the tower may now have had a dwelling function. The putative habitation zone in the western part of the site was raised and leveled with an homogenous fill layer (0.20 m deep), which is similar in structure and finds to the fill in the round corner tower (571). This layer has also been observed in watermain trenches in the modern street. Analogies with the Sv. Duh site suggest that this layer had a similar function. It probably raised the floor level in a standing building, which has been completely destroyed by later activity. All later Late Roman occupation phases on the Pastoralni center site were destroyed by late medieval building activity, except for the truncated occupation deposit in the rectangular tower. In spite of this, the stratigraphy and associated material confirm the existence of a general planned reorganization of at least the southeastern part of the settlement.

The Lahinja River Edge Complex

The Lahinja river edge complex is located on the narrow flat riverside and slope area on the eastern side of the meander, occupied by the historic town centre (Fig. 2: 3). An archaeological evaluation was undertaken in October 1995, prior to main drainage pipeline construction. Rescue excavation began in advance of construction in May 1996 and continued until May 1997. The 305.25 m² excavated area produced evidence of medieval, Late Roman and Iron Age exploitation of the riverside, as well as a number of palaeochannels. A follow-up watching brief took place during construction from September to November 1997, providing further valuable information on occupation in this area. The material from the site has not been fully analyzed, but some preliminary information on the Late Roman phase will be given here. No attempt will be made to discuss the Iron Age and medieval phases or the palaeoenvironmental data.

The riverside area was not a settlement zone in the Late Roman period, although it was an integral part of the fortified settlement. The primary activity in this area is represented by a discontinuous cobbled surface over deliberately consolidated areas of the silted palaeochannel. This phase is difficult to date, the majority of the finds being relict Iron Age ceramics and some Early Roman material. The 0.50 m deep proluvial layer, above this surface, indicates a relatively long period of disuse, so it may in fact date to the middle Roman



Fig. 11: Črnomelj - Lahinja River Edge Complex: the Late Roman cobbled surface.

Sl. 11: Črnomelj - Najdišče na bregu reke Lahinje: poznoantična tlakovana površina.

period (3rd-4th century). It is more likely that it is connected with the foundation of the fortified settlement in the late 4th or early 5th century. The third and most intensive Late Roman phase is represented by the 0.30 m deep clay make-up layer and the 0.15 m thick cobbled surface over the flat riverside area (Fig. 11). This surface is at least 9 m wide and extends for a distance of c. 300 m. The cobbled surface evidently extended to the river edge. The finds from the make-up layer below the surface are similar or even identical to those from the third, reconstruction phase on the Sv. Duh site and the Pastoralni center (see below). The extensive cobbled surface, therefore, dates to the first half of the 6th century. It probably fulfilled a variety of functions. It may have served as an extramural communication, but the relatively limited extent suggests that it was probably a landing area for river traffic, presumably leading to an as yet undiscovered entrance in the defensive wall.

The southern part of the cobbled area was used as a cemetery (Fig. 12). It has not been completely excavated, but appears to cover a larger area, extending up the slope below the defensive wall. Twenty-seven flat inhumations were excavated, in three north-south rows, which cut the cobbled surface. The majority of the graves were oriented west-east, although three were oriented north-south and one south-north. The burials comprise both child and adult individuals, although physical anthropological analysis is not yet complete. There is no evidence of grave markers, but is likely that these existed, because of the evident care taken to avoid early burials. The anomalous orientations were probably the result of attempts to fit graves between existing rows. The graves

themselves were usually simple sub-rectangular pits, but two had partially stone-lined sides. Carbonised wooden planks were found in four graves and were found both above and below the skeletons. They seem to have been part of wooden coffins, rather than part of a pyre in the grave. The existence of wooden coffins, rather than interment in a winding sheet, is reinforced by the position of some bones, particularly skulls, fibulae in patellae, which seem to have slipped out of position after burial. Some of the deceased were clothed, when buried, as is shown by the presence of dress accoutrements and personal ornaments (armrings and glass bead necklaces) in four graves. The nature of the burials and the sparse grave goods point to a cemetery of the local romanised population associated with the settlement. It is similar in location and structure to the Kranj-Lajh cemetery (Stare 1980; Knific pers. comm.; Sagadin, pers. comm.).

The cemetery was clearly in use during phase 4 (6th century). The graves cut and therefore postdate the cobbled surface, which can be securely assigned to phase 3 on the basis of the associated ceramic assemblage (see below). The single piece of metalwork from the surface, a silver belt buckle (Pl. 5: 8), can be dated to the 6th century (Ciglencečki 1994, 247; t. 10b: 3; Knific, pers. comm.). However, the few grave goods are typologically earlier. The bronze penannular or omega fibula with iron pin (Pl. 5: 9) from grave 23 is dated to the late 4th century or first half of the 5th century in the typological chronology (Sokol 1994, 202, 203, t. 1: 4-8), whilst the bronze armrings (Pl. 5: 1-4) from grave 20 are dated to the 4th century (Budja 1979, 245). The other grave goods (three glass bead necklaces: Pl. 5: 5-7) can not be closely dated within the Late Roman period. This presents a number of problems, when one considers the fact that most of the metalwork from the occupation layers on the Sv. Duh site and the Pastoralni center site is also dated to the 3rd and 4th centuries, or even to the 1st century and the Late Iron Age. A similar problem with the coinage has also been noted (see below).

The cemetery is evidently 6th century or later, but the grave goods are typologically earlier. So far there is no evidence of so-called Germanic (Ostrogothic or Lombard) burials, such as those in Kranj-Lajh (Stare 1980) or Rifnik (Bolta 1981), although the small sample size does not preclude the existence of such burials on the site. At the very least, the available burial sample suggests that there is a strong heirloom factor in operation, a fact that may have a bearing on the dating




Fig. 12: Črnomelj - Lahinja River Edge Complex: cemetery.
Sl. 12: Črnomelj - Najdišče na bregu reke Lahinje: grobišče.

of other Late Roman cemeteries. However, it is also possible that this is a deliberate attempt by the population, using the cemetery, to emphasize their Roman identity, to the extent of employing earlier unequivocally Roman dress accessories in the burial ritual. There is no reason to suppose that they did not have knowledge of, or access to contemporary metalwork forms, because they evidently had access to imported ceramics. The frequent occurrence of bronze casting waste indicates that a contemporary bronzesmithing industry was also in operation, which suggests that ornament production was well within the capabilities of the local craftsmen at this time. Whatever the reason, the population buried in the cemetery beside the Lahinja displays a marked conservatism in the selection of metalwork for dress elements used as grave goods.

The cobbled surface and the cemetery were covered by a post Roman and pre-15th century colluvial layer (0.10-0.50 m thick) and a partially gleyed alluvial layer (0.15 m thick), which lies directly above the Late Roman cobbled surface and merges with the gleyed silty clays in the former river channel. The cobbled surface is completely destroyed medieval and post-medieval activity on the base of the slope in the west.

CATALOGUE

Abbreviations:

- D = diameter
h = height
L, l = length
th = thickness
w = width
s.f. = special find

Plate 1

1. Base of Mid Roman Amphora 1 (MRA 1).

The fabric core is reddish yellow (10YR 6/6), whilst the interior and exterior are reddish yellow (10YR 6/8). It is hard and smooth with moderate mica inclusions. There are traces of a reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) slip or coating on the exterior. D: 12.2 cm; th: 0.8 cm; h: ?

Pastoralni center 1995; Sonda 2; context: 084; quadrant: 06.

2. Rim of African amphora form Keay LVIII or LXII A.

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/6) with reddish brown (2.5YR 3/1) mottling due to secondary burning. It is rough with moderate mica and sparse white limestone inclusions. There are traces of a light reddish brown (5YR 6/3) slip or coating on the exterior. D: 13.9 cm; th: 1.9 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 177; quadrant: 201.

3. Rim of African amphora form Keay LVIII or LXII A.

The fabric is reddish yellow (5YR 6/8), hard and dusty with moderate mica, sparse limestone and black grit inclusions. There are traces of a light brown (7.5YR 6/4) slip or coating on the exterior. Traces of secondary burning present. D: 16.9 cm; th: 2.5 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 177; quadrant: 239.

4. Handle stub and shoulder of African amphora.

The fabric is yellowish red (5YR 5/6), hard and dusty with moderate mica, sparse limestone and black grit inclusions. There is a pinkish white (7.5YR 8/2) slip or coating on the exterior. Traces of secondary burning present. D: ?; th: 0.9 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1990; Profil 3 - cleaning.

5. Handle and neck of African amphora.

The fabric is reddish brown (5YR 5/4), hard and dusty with moderate mica and sparse white limestone inclusions. There is a pinkish white (7.5YR 8/2) slip or coating on the exterior. Traces of secondary burning present. D: ?; th: 0.7 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 177; quadrant: 222.

6. Handle of African amphora.

The fabric is reddish yellow (5YR 6/6), hard and rough with moderate mica and white limestone inclusions. There is a very pale brown (10YR 8/2) slip or coating over the extant handle surface. D: ?; th: 4.7 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 177; quadrant: 219.

7. Handle and neck of African amphora.

The fabric is reddish yellow (5YR 6/6) with grey (10YR 5/1) mottling from secondary burning. It is hard and dusty with moderate mica, white limestone and dark grit inclusions. There are traces of a very pale brown (10YR 8/2) slip or coating on the exterior. D (neck): 9.8 cm; th: 0.9 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 177; quadrant: 221, 222.

8. Late Roman amphora Keay form XXVI G (related).

The fabric has a dark greyish brown core (10YR 4/2), light brown (7.5YR 6/4) interior and reddish yellow (5YR 6/6) exterior. It is hard, gritty and dusty with sparse mica, white limestone and dark grit inclusions. The exterior bears traces of a very pale brown (10Y 8/2) slip or coating. D: 12.3 cm; th: 0.4 cm; h: 31.2 cm (extant)

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 160; quadrant: 265

Sv. Duh 1991; context: 732; quadrant: 412, 413, 425, 426.

Plate 2

1. Late Roman Amphora 1.

The fabric is pale yellow (5Y 8/4), hard and sandy with white limestone and black grit inclusions. D: 32 cm; th: 0.6 cm; h: 60.2 cm

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 155; quadrant: 198;
context: 159; quadrant: 198, 200, 211, 212,
222, 234, 235, 245;
context: 157; quadrant: 221.

Sv. Duh 1991; context: 724; quadrant: 479;
context: 732; quadrant: 424;
context: 733; quadrant: 441, 443.

2. Shoulder of Late Roman Amphora 2 (LRA 2).

The fabric has a reddish yellow (5YR 6/6) core and interior, whilst the exterior is pale brown (10YR 6/3) to very pale brown (10YR 7/4). It is hard, fine grained and slightly dusty with moderate fine white limestone inclusions and sparse mica and dark grit inclusions. The shoulder is decorated with deep horizontal grooving. D: 52.2 cm (extant); th: 0.4 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1991; context: 715; quadrant: 456.

3. Neck sherd of Late Roman Amphora 3.

The fabric is reddish brown (5YR 4/4), possibly as a result of secondary burning, hard and smooth with frequent

mica inclusions. Pinched applied cordon decoration. D (neck): 7.9 cm; th: 0.4 cm; h: ?

Pastoralni center; Sonda: 4; context: 063; quadrant: 02.

4. Rim, handlebase and shoulder of Late Roman Amphora 4.

The fabric is strong brown (7.5YR 5/6), hard and sandy with sparse white limestone and subangular quartzite inclusions. Clay accretions below rim, deep horizontal grooving at handle base. D: 26 cm; th: 0.8 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 004; stray find.

Sv. Duh 1991; context: 134; quadrant: 377.

Plate 3

1. Rim of glazed ware dish.

The fabric is reddish yellow (5YR 6/8), hard and smooth with sparse mica and coarse subangular quartzite inclusions. The underside of the rim and the outer face of the lip were painted yellowish red (5YR 5/6) prior to glazing. The strong brown (7.5YR 5/8) glaze covers the upper rim surface and spreads unevenly onto the outer lip face. Upper lip scalloped, upper rim surface rouletted. D: 15.7 cm; th: 0.5 cm; h: ?

Pastoralni center; Sonda: 14; context: 224; quadrant: 17.

2. Rim of imitation ARSW form 72/73/74/75/76 dish.

The fabric is reddish yellow (5YR 7/6), hard and slightly gritty with sparse white limestone, red concretion and subangular quartzite inclusions. A matt red (2.5YR 5/8) slip covers the upper rim, interior and the lip, extending unevenly and as spots onto the underside of the bowl. Two transverse notches on the upper lip edge. D: 14 cm; th: 0.4 cm; h: ?

Pastoralni center 1995; Sonda: 7; context: 084; quadrant: 2.

3. Rim of ARSW form 60/87 bowl.

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/8) hard and fine grained with sparse mica and fine white limestone inclusions (Hayes fabric D1). The interior and exterior are covered by a lustrous red (2.5YR 5/8) slip, which is somewhat unevenly applied on the rim exterior. D: 32.8 cm; th: 0.4 cm; h: ?

Pastoralni center 1995; Sonda: 7; context: 084; quadrant: 4.

4. Rim of ARSW form 76 dish.

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/8) hard and fine grained with sparse mica and fine white limestone inclusions (Hayes fabric D1). The interior and exterior are covered evenly by a lustrous red (2.5YR 5/8) slip. Traces of secondary burning on both surfaces. D: 32 cm; th: 0.7 cm; h: ?

Pastoralni center 1995; Sonda: 4; context: 064.

5. Rim of African cooking vessel (form unknown)

The fabric is yellowish red (5YR 5/8), hard, sandy and dusty with frequent subangular quartzite inclusions and sparse white limestone and mica inclusions. It is unslipped. D (rim): 20.2 cm; th: 0.5 cm; h: ?

Pastoralni center 1995, Sonda 4; context: 064.

Plate 4

1. Rim and body sherd of ARSW form 67/68 large bowl.

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/8) hard and fine grained with sparse mica and fine white limestone inclusions (Hayes fabric D1). There are traces of a lustrous red (2.5YR 5/8) slip on the interior and exterior. D (rim): 23.2 cm; th: 0.6 cm; h: ?

Lahinja River Edge Complex; Sonda: 2; context: 005; quadrant: 12.

2. Lip and rim sherd of ARSW form 73 small bowl.

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/8) hard and fine grained with sparse mica and fine white limestone inclusions (Hayes fabric D1).

There are traces of a lustrous red (2.5YR 5/8) slip on the interior and exterior. Small group of three notches on upper edge of lip. D (rim): 15.8 cm; th: 0.4 cm; h: ?

Lahinja River Edge Complex; Sonda: 6; context: 053 (eastern section).

3. Rim and body sherd of ARSW form 85 B small bowl.

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/8) medium and fine grained with sparse mica inclusions (Hayes fabric D1). There are traces of a matt red (2.5YR 5/8) slip on the interior and exterior. Feather rouletting on body, two grooves on rim. D (rim): 11.8 cm; th: 0.3 cm; h: ?

Lahinja River Edge Complex; Sonda: 5; context: 089; quadrant: 60.

4. Rim and body sherds of ARSW form 85 B small bowl.

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/8) medium and fine grained with sparse mica inclusions (Hayes fabric D1). There is a lustrous red (2.5YR 5/8) slip on the interior and exterior. Feather rouletting on body, two grooves on rim. Foot / base not extant. D (rim): 10.6 cm; th: 0.4 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 159; quadrant: 201, 245.

Sv. Duh 1991; context: 723/732; stray find;

context: 741; quadrant: 444.

5. Base of LRC form bowl (form unknown).

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/6), hard and fine grained with sparse white limestone inclusions. The interior and exterior are covered with slightly metallic red (2.5YR 5/8) slip. The interior is decorated with a triple ring of rouletting and a double ring of rouletting, framing Kantharos stamps. Stamped circles outside the outer rouletting zone (Hayes style IIA). D (extant): 21.4 cm; th: 0.5 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 155; quadrant: 224.

6. LRC form 3 F bowl / dish.

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/6), hard and fine grained with sparse white limestone inclusions. The interior and exterior are covered with a thin, slightly metallic red (2.5YR 5/8) slip. Undecorated. D: 26.8 cm; th: 0.3 cm; h: 5.6 cm

Sv. Duh 1993; context: 723/732; quadrant: 006.

7. Rim sherds of ARSW form 90 large dish.

The fabric is red (2.5YR 5/8) hard and relatively coarse grained with sparse white limestone, quartzite and mica inclusions (Hayes fabric D2). The interior and exterior are covered with a slightly metallic red (2.5YR 5/8) slip. Undecorated. D: 32.8 cm; th: 0.6 cm; h: ?

Sv. Duh 1989; context: 051; quadrant: 61;

context: 004; quadrant: 44.

Sv. Duh 1990; context: 160; quadrant: 204;

context: 004; quadrant: 265.

Plate 5

1. Penannular band arming, bronze sheet. Punched and incised decorated. Lower right arm of inhumation. D: 5.5 cm; th: 0.05 cm.

Lahinja River Edge Complex - sonda 4/5, grave 20; context: 127; s.f.: 023.

2. Penannular band arming, bronze sheet. Punched and incised decorated. Lower right arm of inhumation. D: 5.5 cm; th: 0.05 cm.

Lahinja River Edge Complex - sonda 4/5, grave 20; context: 127; s.f.: 024.

3. Penannular arming, bronze wire, sub-rectangular section. Hammered incised decorated terminals. Lower left arm of inhumation. D: 5.5 cm; th: 0.4 cm.

Lahinja River Edge Complex - sonda 4/5, grave 20; context: 127; s.f.: 025.

4. Penannular arming, bronze wire, circular section. Two transverse incised line groups close to both cast spool terminals. Lower left arm of inhumation. D: 5.5 cm; th: 0.2 cm.

Lahinja River Edge Complex - sonda 4/5, grave 20; context: 127; s.f.: 026.

5. Glass and coral (?) bead necklace. 24 blue glass beads, 14 white glass beads, 12 green glass beads, five black glass beads, two yellow glass beads, one globular reddish coral (?) bead. Neck and upper chest of inhumation. D: 0.3 - 0.8 cm.

Lahinja River Edge Complex - sonda 5, grave 26; context: 165; s.f.: 052.

6. Glass and amber bead necklace. 24 blue glass beads, two green glass beads, two black glass beads, one clear glass bead, one discoid amber bead. Neck and chest of inhumation. D: 0.4 - 1.1 cm.

Lahinja River Edge Complex - sonda 4/5, grave 20; context: 127; s.f.: 027.

7. Glass bead necklace. 20 blue glass beads, ten green glass beads, three clear glass beads, two yellow glass beads, two black glass beads. Neck and upper chest of inhumation. D: 0.3 - 0.9 cm.

Lahinja River Edge Complex - sonda 5, grave 18; context: 118; s.f.: 020.

8. Solid belt buckle, silver with bronze sheet pin. Punched dot-and-circle decoration. L: 3.2 cm; w: 1.8 cm; th: 0.3 cm.

Lahinja River Edge Complex - sonda 7; context: 353; quadrant: 01; s.f.: 039.

9. Penannular fibula, cast bronze, rhomboid section, iron pin. Hammered, rolled terminals and transverse incised line decoration on obverse apex of fibula. Left shoulder of inhumation. L: 6.3 cm; w: 6.0 cm; th: 0.6 cm; l.pin: 6.3 cm; th.pin: 0.5 cm.

Lahinja River Edge Complex - sonda 5, grave 23; context: 140; s.f.: 041.

THE CHRONOLOGY AND THE CONTEXT OF THE IMPORTED CERAMICS

The imported ceramics found in the three excavations are the key to the chronology of the different Late Roman settlement phases. Much of the assemblage is well-stratified and more reliable as a chronological indicator than the metalwork and coinage from the same contexts. The ceramic assemblage also provides invaluable data on the political and economic orientation of Late Roman Črnomelj. Unfortunately, it has only been fully quantified on the Sv. Duh site, although the rest is being processed. Thus, data from all three sites are only available for the fine wares. The amphora have been fully examined on the Sv. Duh site, but only partial data is available for the other sites (the wet-sieving and flotation of samples from the Pastoralni center and the Lahinja River Edge Complex is still in progress). No attempt will be made here to discuss the relationship of the imported ceramics to the local coarse wares, which will be individually discussed in the full publication of each site.

Examination of the contexts of the imported material gives the following chronological picture on the site (Fig. 13).

Phase 1

The initial construction phase at Sv. Duh is dated to the late 4th or early 5th century by the mosaic. However, the primary leveling deposit in the round tower contained a large quantity of North African amphora sherds (*Pl. 1: 2-7*). This material is probably derived from Key LVIII or LXII type amphorae (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 209). This material is heavily burnt with few refitable sherds and is associated with residual LIA ceramics and metalwork. The fabric differs slightly from the North African amphora sherds in the reconstruction phase in the round tower and interior contexts at Sv. Duh. 114 sherds out of a total 212 sherds on the site were found in the primary tower fill. It is likely that this material is derived from an earlier occupation deposit elsewhere in the area, possibly on the Okljuk settlement.

Identical heavily burnt and abraded Key LVIII or LXII type African amphorae sherds were found in the primary fills of the interior and external front of the rectangular tower on the Pastoralni center site. This indicates that the material used in the primary fills was derived from the same source and suggests that the fortification of the Late Roman settlement was undertaken as a unitary project. All of this production seems to belong to the late 4th to 6th centuries large cylindrical African amphorae, which were used for transport (oil). This would match the date given by the mosaic, but also falls within the putative date for the reorganisation of the site. However, the complete absence of Eastern Mediterranean fine wares and the presence of a single piece of LRA 4 amphora suggests that the foundation of the settlement probably took place before the fall off in imports of African amphorae and fine wares. This took place after the Vandal occupation of North Africa in the first half of the 5th century. When taken together with the mosaic, the presence of large numbers of African amphorae sherds in the primary contexts associated with the defenses suggests that the settlement was founded in the late 4th or early 5th century.

This can be compared with the small available ceramic assemblages from the towns of Celeia and Poetovio (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 97-119, 280,281) and the larger assemblage from the late phases in Emona (op. cit. 35-85, 276,277) (Fig. 14, 15). The 4th and 5th century material from these sites is confined to large African transport amphorae and some early Eastern Mediterranean forms. Similar material is found in the 4th-5th century phases from the settlements at Koper on the Slovenian coast




Fig. 13: Late Roman imported ceramic types by chronological phase in Late Roman Črnomelj.
 Sl. 13: Poznoantični keramični tipi po kronoloških stopnjah.




Fig. 14: The main Roman and Late Roman centres in the Caput Adria region, mentioned in the text.
 Sl. 14: Glavna rimska in poznoantična središča na območju Caput Adriae, ki so omenjena v besedilu.

(Cunja 1996, 108-111), Ajdovščina, Rodik and Križna gora in the western Slovenian Karst (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 86-96, 120-132, 159-162) (Fig. 14). Such material is completely absent from the upland defended settlements in central and northern Slovenia (Knific 1979, 732-736; 1994, 211-238; Vidrih-Perko 1994, 198-210) (Fig. 14, 15). Thus, phase 1 at Črnomelj is contemporary with the final phases of intense occupation in the major Roman towns in central and northern Slovenia and the fortresses on the *Claustra Alpium Iuliarum*, the eastern defenses of Italy. More importantly, it is

also contemporary with the new Late Roman centres on the Istrian coast.

Phase 2

African amphora sherds also appear in the primary occupation deposits on the Sv. Duh site. These may be Keay LVIII type, but are more probably the later, 5th century Keay LXII form (op. cit. 209). However, the African amphorae are joined by a few Eastern Mediterranean am-

phorae sherds, LRA 1, LRA 2 (*Pl. 2: 2*), LRA 3 and LRA 4. This material is characteristic of the 5th and 6th century in Slovenia (op. cit. 211).

The Pastoralni center site has also produced Keay LXII North African amphora sherds. A surprising discovery in the occupation deposits on the western part of the Pastoralni center site is that of MRA 1 sherds, which date to the 3rd and 4th century (Reynolds 1995, 68,69). No complete vessels are present and most are represented by medium to small individual sherds. This is not surprising, when one considers that the contexts are derived from putative dwelling structures and communications inside the defenses. The combination of this material suggests a 5th rather than a 6th century date for phase 2.

This is reinforced by the identifiable ARSW sherds from the Pastoralni center. The first is either Hayes ARSW type 60 or 87 (*Pl. 3: 3*). Form 60 dates from c. 320 to 380 (Hayes 1972, 100), whilst form 87 dates from the second half of the 5th to the early 6th century (op. cit. 136). The ARWS form 72-76 copy (*Pl. 3: 2*) in an unknown, possibly eastern fabric dates from the early 5th century to the late 5th century (op. cit. 120-125). The final ARSW form 76 (*Pl. 3: 4*) dates to the period from 425 to 475 (op. cit. 124,125). The same context also contained a fragment of African cooking ware (*Pl. 3: 5*) and a 4th century glazed vessel (*Pl. 3: 1*) (Vidrih-Perko pers. comm.).

The amphorae and fine wares are dominated by African types, but Eastern Mediterranean amphorae make their first appearance in this phase. This places the use of the structures in phase 2 firmly in the 5th century and possibly as late as the beginning of the 6th century, in spite of the fact that all the coins in the second phase occupation deposits on the Sv. Duh site are badly worn 4th century issues. Evidently the flow of coinage was interrupted prior to the foundation of the Črnomelj settlement, but older issues continued in circulation.

Phase 3

The third phase ceramic assemblage at Sv. Duh is dominated by Eastern Mediterranean amphorae forms LRA 1 and LRA 4, along with much smaller quantities of African production (Keays LXII). Two distinct LRA 1 amphorae can be identified. Both were distributed in the leveling deposits of all three structures and include large refitable sherds. This is particularly true of the example in *Pl. 2: 1*, which has a marked associa-

tion with the round tower and the large rectangular structure 679. A single sherd of the same amphora was also found in association with the cobbled surface on the Lahinja river edge. This type probably originated on the southwestern coast of Asia Minor, northern Syria or on Cyprus and has a marked concentration in the late 5th and early 6th centuries (Peacock and Williams 1986, 185-187). The LRA 4 (*Pl. 2: 4*) sherds also exhibit a marked concentration in the round tower in this phase. The presence of equal numbers of this type in the interior silting layers in phase 2 suggest that these or similar, contemporary layers were the source of the material for the make-up layer inside the round tower in phase 3. This type comes from Gaza and is dated to the period from the 4th to 6th centuries (op. cit. 198-199).

The amphorae from phase 3 on the Pastoralni center are also dominated by Eastern Mediterranean forms, although MRA 1 (*Pl. 1: 1*), Keay XXV and LVIII/LXII are also present (Vidrih-Perko pers. comm.). The Eastern Mediterranean forms are represented by a few sherds of LRA 1, LRA 2 and LRA 3 (*Pl. 2: 3*). The few sherds of LRA 2 on the site suggest that it pre-dates the mid 6th century production peak (Peacock and Williams 1986, 182-184). The same is true of LRA 3, which peaked in the Vandal period, then declined until a second production peak in the later 6th century (op. cit. 188,189). The amphora assemblage as a whole suggests a date in the late 5th and early 6th centuries.

The single identifiable ARSW form Hayes 85 B (*Pl. 4: 4*) in the phase 3 leveling deposits in the round tower at Sv. Duh is dated to the second half of the 5th century (Hayes 1972, 133). The same context and those in the interior structures also contained sherds of LR C ware. This is an Eastern Mediterranean fine ware, which probably originated in western Asia Minor. The stamped-decorated LR C base, Hayes style II A (*Pl. 4: 5*) dates to the second half of the 5th century. The LR C bowl Hayes form 3 F (*Pl. 4: 6*) dates to the 6th century (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 210). The Pastoralni center site did not produce any identifiable ARSW or LRC sherds, but did produce two sherds of an unslipped eastern fabric.

The bedding of cobbled surface associated with the cemetery on the Lahinja riverside has also produced ARSW, which can be directly linked to the material in the phase 3 reconstruction phase at Sv. Duh and the Pastoralni center. The ARSW type 67 or 68 rim sherd (*Pl. 4: 1*) dates from 360 to 470 or from 370 to the mid 5th century (Hayes 1972, 112-117), whilst the ARSW type 73 rim sherd

(*Pl. 4: 2*) dates from 420 to 475 (op. cit. 121-124). A single ARSW 85 B rim sherd (*Pl. 4: 3*) was also found, linking this cobbled surface directly with the reconstruction phase in the round tower at Sv. Duh (see above).

The phase 3 assemblage contains ARSW and African amphora types from the entire 5th century, as well as 5th to early 6th century LRC and Eastern Mediterranean amphorae. The assemblage contains material, which is otherwise only found on the Slovenian coast e.g. ARSW 85 B (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 211). However, the phase 3 assemblage is not derived from primary occupation or rubbish deposits, but from secondary fill contexts. This means that primary contexts derived from 5th and early 6th century occupation were used as deliberate fills in the unitary reconstruction of the site. It is most likely, given the phase 2 assemblage, that this assemblage and with it the reconstruction phase 3 can be dated to the early or mid 6th century.

Analogies for the assemblages from phase 2 and 3 are found in Koper and Piran in Slovenian Istria and the sites in the western Karst region (*Fig. 6*). Eastern Mediterranean amphora types LRA 2 and LRA 4 are found with the African type Keay XXV in Koper (Cunja 1996, 108-114), whilst LRA 1, LRA 2, LRA 3, LRA 4 and LRA 7 are associated with Keay LXII in the leveling layer at Sv. Jurij and the Late Roman layer at Židovski kare in Piran (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 221-223, 232). Similar material is found at Rodik, Križna gora, Sv. Pavel above Vrtovin, Predjama cave, Acijev Spodmol cave and Podmol cave (op. cit. 125, 161, 162, 167, 168, 171, 184, 215). 5th and 6th century Eastern Mediterranean amphorae are also present in Kranj and Mengeš in west-central Slovenia (op. cit. 194, 191, 192), but are virtually absent from the upland defended settlements and Roman urban centres in central and northern Slovenia (see above).

The imported fine wares are even more interesting. Once again there are similarities with the coastal sites and certain inland Karst settlements and caves (Cunja 1996, 94-96, 102; Vidrih-Perko 1994, 278-288, 290-293). Part of the Črnomelj assemblage also exhibits similarities to the later material from Emona (Vidrih-Perko 1992, 93-102) and occasional examples from central Slovenia, e.g. Vranje (Cunja 1996, 96), but with one notable difference. There are no LR C vessels present in Emona. LR C is found in Koper (Cunja 1996, 102), Piran (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 291), Rodik, Štanjel, Križna gora and Sv. Pavel (op. cit. 282, 283, 286, 290). No LR C has been recovered from the upland defended settlements and Roman urban centres in central and northern Slovenia.

The only exception is the Kučar ecclesiastical complex, which is located in the same area as Črnomelj (*Fig. 15*). No amphorae were present, but the limited range of ARSW and LR C is very similar to the material found in phases 2 and 3 at Črnomelj. These are Hayes ARSW types 61 B, 67, 73 A, 80 B and LR C type 3 E. These forms were produced in the 5th century, the latest being the LR C form, which dates to the end of 5th century and the first half of the 6th century (Dular et al. 1996, 146, 147). It must therefore be concluded that Črnomelj and to a lesser extent Kučar had access to the same types of imported ceramics as the settlements on the coast and in western Slovenia throughout the 5th and early 6th centuries.

Phase 4

Phase 4 occupation is present at Sv. Duh and to a much lesser extent in the rectangular tower on the Pastoralni center site. The cemetery on the river side and slope below the defensive wall also falls within this phase. This phase is much poorer in terms of imported ceramics, which are only present at Sv. Duh.

Limited numbers of Eastern Mediterranean amphora sherds are also found in this phase. Sherds of a single LRA 1 amphora were found in the round tower and the two dwelling structures, indicating contemporaneity in their occupation. LRA 4 sherds also occur in the two dwelling structures. There are some sherds of African amphora, Keay LVIII or LXII, in the tower occupation layers. These are unworn, refitting sherds of the same vessel, which are very different from the burnt sherds in phase 1. Further unworn examples of these types also occur in the smaller dwelling structure 678. Evidently large cylindrical African amphorae continued to be imported in this period. The phase 4 midden deposit on the exterior of the round tower produced the above large African amphorae types, but also contained part of a single small "spatheon" type amphora, Keay type XXVI G (*Pl. 1: 8*), which can be dated to the 6th century and beginning of the 7th century (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 209).

The midden deposit on either side of the tower contained an ARSW Hayes type 90 vessel (*Pl. 4: 7*), which is dated to the second half of the 6th and the beginning of the 7th centuries (Hayes 1972, 139, 140). This form is associated with the burnt material and the trilobate arrowhead on the surface of the midden deposit, giving a clear date

for the destruction of the site at the end of the 6th, or, more probably, at the beginning of the 7th century.

"Spatheon" type small amphorae and various forms of Keay type XXVI amphora are relatively widely distributed in Slovenia (Knific 1994, 219, 220, 222). Once again there is a distinct concentration in southern Slovenia, but examples are also known from Vranje, Rifnik and Kranj. However, the Rifnik and Vranje small amphorae are not accompanied by large African forms or Eastern Mediterranean amphorae (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 288, 289). The relatively low number of ARSW sherds (1 vessel) at Črnomelj is closer to the assemblages at Vranje and Rifnik (*ibid.*). The small amphorae from Vranje were found in the high status building (house A), which is part of the ecclesiastical complex and were less fragmentary than the Črnomelj example. It should be noted that the excavated area in Črnomelj is smaller than these two sites and represents a marginal, potentially lower status area, i.e. the settlement edge and mortuary zone. This contrasts with the coastal sites, where late ARSW is more common, but excavated areas are located in the centre of the Late Roman settlements (Cunja 1996, 39-45; Vidrih-Perko 1994, 218-263), or Rifnik and Vranje, where large high-status complexes could be expected to produce a larger, more diverse assemblage (Bolta 1981; Petru, Ulbert 1975). The Kranj sample is perhaps similar in this respect to the Črnomelj assemblage (Vidrih-Perko 1994, 194). However, there is a further difference between Črnomelj and the above sites in central Slovenia. All have produced Lombard ceramics, which have also been found at Tinje near Rifnik, Zidani Gaber on the northern edge of the Gorjanci hills and in Kranj (Knific 1994, 217-219) (*Fig. 15*). The absence of this material at Črnomelj has important implications for the political status of Late Roman Črnomelj, a subject which will be discussed below.

THE REGIONAL CONTEXT OF LATE ROMAN ČRNOMELJ

Bela krajina was a relative backwater in the early and middle Roman period. It lay in the border area between Pannonia and Illyricum (Dular 1985, 30). A number of possible villa sites and small cremation cemeteries are located in the relatively fertile Kolpa valley and the karsitic central lowland zone (*op. cit.* 30-32). Unfortunately, none of the settlements have been excavated, but the

material from the Metlika-Borštek, Rosalnice and Štrekljevec cremation cemeteries dates to the 1st and 2nd century (*op. cit.* 89, 95, 103, 104). The same is true of the Groblje-Kohane cemetery. The area was isolated from the main road routes, which ran west-east from Italy to Pannonia, via the Krka and Sava valleys. The nearest Roman urban centres were Nevioudunum (Drnovo near Krško) to the north and Siscia (Sisak) to the east (*Fig. 14*). However, a possible small town site is located in the vicinity of the Late Roman settlement in Črnomelj (see above).

The Roman gravestones from Črnomelj are evidence that a local school of monumental masonry, which served the needs of the local population, existed in the area (Breščak, *pers. comm.*). The inscriptions from these monuments and others in Bela krajina indicate that a number of representatives of the great merchant houses of Aquileia were present in the area (Dular 1985, 32). It seems likely that the presence of these merchants was connected with river transit in the Kolpa valley. This route was also used in the Iron Age. It ran from the Kvarner Gulf on the Adriatic across the Gorski Kotar mountains to the Kolpa valley. The route then divided, one section running through the Lahinja valley and across the Gorjanci hills to the Krka valley, whilst another followed the Kolpa and Lahinja-Kolpa river routes to Siscia. This route represents the shortest line of communications between southern Pannonia and the Adriatic (*op. cit.*). It is likely that it played an important role in the transport of amphorae and associated fine wares from the Adriatic to the inland centres of southern Pannonia (Vidrih-Perko *pers. comm.*).

The Late Roman settlement pattern differs dramatically. Only four Late Roman sites are known in Bela krajina. Two of these are Late Roman defended settlements on the upland rim, Veliki Kolečaj above Zapudje and Židovec above Miklarji (*op.cit.* 61, 62, 70, 71). Limited trial trenching has produced Late Roman coarse wares, coins and metalwork, which date both sites to the second half of the 4th century and possibly later (Dular *et al.* 1996, 162).

The ecclesiastical centre on the Kučar hill has been extensively excavated and published and so provides important comparative data (Dular 1985, 32-34, 109; Dular *et al.* 1996). The site is located on an isolated hill in the Kolpa valley lowlands (*Fig. 15*). This is an area of relatively intense Roman rural settlement (see above). It is an unusual site with two churches (24.7 x 10.8 m; 21.5 x 8 m), a baptistery (2.7 x 2.5 m), a small dwelling house




Fig. 15: Late Roman sites in east-central and southern Slovenia.

Sl. 15: Poznoantična najdišča v vzhodni osrednji in v južni Sloveniji.

- ◆ large Roman urban centre / večje antično urbano središče
- ◆ Roman small town / manjše antično mesto
- Late Roman centre / poznoantično središče
- Late Roman fortress / poznoantična utrdba
- Late Roman refugium / poznoantično pribežališče
- Late Roman ecclesiastical centre / poznoantično cerkveno središče
- + 5th - 6th century cemetery / grobišče iz 5. - 6. st. n. š.

1. Črnomelj - Okljuk
2. Črnomelj - historic town centre / Črnomelj - zgodovinsko mestno jedro
3. Židovec above Miklarji / Židovec nad Miklarji
4. Veliki Kolečaj above Zapudje / Veliki Kolečaj nad Zapudjem
5. Kučar above Podzemelj / Kučar nad Podzemljem
6. Ozalj - Stari grad
7. Grac below Sela pri Zajčjem Vrhu / Grac pod Seli pri Zajčjem Vrhu
8. Veliki Orehek
9. Zidani Gaber above Mihovo / Zidani Gaber nad Mihovim
10. Gradec above Mihovo / Gradec nad Mihovim
11. Cerov Log
12. Gorenje Vrhpolje
13. *Crucium* (Groblje pri Prekopi)
14. Levakova jama near Šutna / Levakova jama pri Šutni
15. Gradišče near Velike Malence / Gradišče pri Velikih Malenceh
16. *Nevidunum* (Drnovo)
17. Veliki Vinji vrh
18. Kicelj near Gorenja vas pri Šmarjeti / Kicelj pri Gorenji vasi pri Šmarjeti
19. Gradec below Velika Strmica / Gradec pod Veliko Strmico
20. Log near Podturn / Log pri Podturnu
21. Gorenji Mokronog
22. Sv. Ana above Vrhpeč / Sv. Ana nad Vrhpečjo
23. Kincelj above Trbine / Kincelj nad Trbincem
24. *Praetorium Latobiorum* (Trebnje)
25. Kunkel below Vrhtrebnje / Kunkel pod Vrhtrebnjem
26. Korinjski hrib above Veliki Korinj / Korinjski hrib nad Velikim Korinjem
27. Sv. Lambert below Pristava nad Stično / Sv. Lambert pod Pristavo nad Stično
28. Roje near Moravče pri Gabrovki / Roje pri Moravčah pri Gabrovki
29. Jaršč above Hom / Jaršč nad Homom
30. Gradišče near Dunaj / Gradišče pri Dunaju
31. Veliki vrh above Osredok pri Podsredi / Veliki vrh nad Osredkom pri Podsredi
32. Ajdovski gradec above Vranje / Ajdovski gradec nad Vranjem
33. Grac above Razbor / Grac nad Razborjem
34. Gradec near Prapretno / Gradec pri Prapretnem
35. Vranja peč near Lipni Dol / Vranja peč pri Lipnem Dolu
36. Torog near Velike Grahovše / Torog pri Velikih Grahovšah
37. Rudna near Rudnica / Rudna pri Rudnici
38. Tinje above Loka pri Žusmu / Tinje nad Loko pri Žusmu
39. Rifnik near Šentjur / Rifnik pri Šentjurju
40. Vipota above Pečovnik / Vipota nad Pečovnikom
41. *Celeia* (Celje)

(5.9 x 5.3 m), a large dwelling house with under-floor heating (25 x 17 m) and a poorly preserved defensive wall (0.70 m wide) with two partially extant rectangular towers (6 x 5 m; 6.2 x 4.9 m) (Dular et al. 1996, 71-134). The site is one of three complexes with double churches in Slovenia and is interpreted as an episcopal centre of the late 4th or early 5th to the beginning of the 6th centuries (op. cit. 172-186). The excavation report suggests that the structures were relatively clean, lacking occupation deposits and that there had been considerable disturbance as a result of post-depositional processes (erosion, afforestation) and earlier excavations (op. cit. 71-134). The ceramic assemblage is comparable with that in phases 2 and 3 at Črnomelj. However, the lack of phase 4 (6th-7th century) material may merely be due to the sacral nature of the site in this period, given that the range and quantities of fine wares are similar on both sites. It should be noted that the church on the Sv. Duh site in Črnomelj did not produce any ceramics and that the late 6th/early 7th century destruction layer was directly above the late 4th/early 5th century mosaic. Thus, the Kučar ecclesiastical centre and the Črnomelj fortified settlement were probably founded in the same period, the late 4th or early 5th century.

The lack of earlier material at Kučar may simply be a reflection of the lack of an earlier large settlement in the immediate vicinity. The relict, earlier material at Črnomelj probably reflects some form of continuing exploitation of the Okljuk site in the Late Roman period. It is possible that the earlier Viniška cesta cemetery, associated with the Okljuk settlement in Črnomelj, continued in use, until the creation of a new cemetery below the defensive walls in the 6th century (see above). This is reinforced by the presence in the former cemetery of an unfurnished inhumation in a cist, composed of eight earlier gravestones (Dular 1985, 60). Thus, the Črnomelj settlement may indicate a shift in settlement focus from Okljuk to the former prehistoric settlement in the historic town centre. It seems likely that Črnomelj represents the secular administrative centre of the region, whilst Kučar was the ecclesiastical centre. Unfortunately, the remainder of the settlement pattern is unknown. There is no data available for the abandonment of the putatively earlier Roman settlements in the area. The continuing presence of imported ceramics in the area offers some hope that field survey and excavation can recover the 5th and 6th century settlement pattern.

The wider position of Bela krajina is unclear. Črnomelj and Kučar were founded at a time, when

the earlier Roman settlement pattern in the south-eastern Alps was undergoing radical change. This was caused by the increasing instability in Pannonia in the late 4th century and early 5th century. The main invasion route from Pannonia into Italy ran through the Krka river valley in central Slovenia. The foundation of a fortified lowland settlement to the immediate south of this route in this period may, therefore, be linked to the period after the defeat of the Roman army by the Goths at Adrianople in 378 or the Roman attempts to re-establish control in the region after 411, when the Visigoths left the region for Gaul (Christie 1996, 77-79).

These events led to the decline and virtual abandonment of the urban centres and lowland villae in Pannonia and Noricum mediterraneum by the mid 5th century (Ciglenečki 1987, 140). It has been suggested that Bela krajina formed a refuge zone for the native Romanised population from the town of Neviodunum (Drnovo near Krško) (Fig. 14, 15) and the Krka valley (Ciglenečki 1987, 142). The Kučar centre would then represent the seat of the refugee Bishop of Neviodunum (Dular et al. 1996, 180-181). Unfortunately, the excavations on the site of Neviodunum have not been fully published and the nature of the decline of this urban centre is unknown (Petru, S., Petru, P. 1978). However, if the site followed a similar sequence to the other urban centres in central and northern Slovenia, there is a more plausible refuge area in the immediate vicinity.

Recent survey and excavation have revealed the existence of a relatively dense network of defended settlements in the upland interfluvium between the rivers Krka and Sava and in the Kozjansko hills between the river Sava and Celje (Ciglenečki 1987; 1992) (Fig. 15). These settlements are located to the north of Neviodunum and to the south of Celeia, between two major Roman routes, leading from Emona to Poetovio and from Emona to Siscia (Fig. 14). This area is generally interpreted as representing the main refuge zone for the Romanised population of these two towns and their hinterlands (Ciglenečki 1987, 140-143). The main period of occupation is from the mid 5th century, after the final collapse of the urban centres, to the end of the 6th or beginning of the 7th century (Ciglenečki 1987, 160-164). This area was part of the Ostrogothic state in the late 5th and early 6th century (Ciglenečki 1992, 11,12). It is often equated with the Polis Norikon, which was ceded to the Lombards by Justinian after the Byzantine (Eastern Roman) reconquest in the mid 6th century (Ciglenečki 1987, 142; Margetić 1992, 149-157).

A number of settlements in this zone, the majority of which represent reoccupied prehistoric hillforts, have been trial trenched and two have been more extensively excavated. The Rifnik settlement is located to the south-east of Celje and is dated from the 2nd to the 6th century, with intense occupation in the second half of the 5th century and the 6th century (Bolta 1981; Ciglencečki 1987, 56-58). A similar date is suggested for the putative episcopal centre at Vranje near Sevnica (Ciglencečki 1987, 65-67; Petru, Ulbert 1975; Ulbert 1979, 695-714) (Fig. 15). The upland settlements are dominated by central ecclesiastical complexes with a varying number of dwelling structures. The defenses, where they exist comprise rectangular towers and relatively slight masonry ramparts, i.e. the 1 m wide rampart at Rifnik. However, the ceramic assemblages from this area are quite different to the Črnomelj material (see above). The absence of Eastern Mediterranean amphorae, LR C and the limited presence of ARSW forms in the late 5th and early 6th century is particularly noteworthy (see above). Evidently this group of sites had very limited access to imported ceramics in the 5th century and early 6th century. The Lombard presence in this area is attested by the Lombard ceramics from Rifnik, Tinje, Vranje and Zidani Gaber (see above). There is also a significant Lombard metalwork component in the Rifnik cemetery and the cemeteries in the Krka valley (Dular et al. 1996, 155-165). This does not necessarily mean that these are actually Lombards. It is possible that certain elements in the local population sought to identify with the new rulers, as was the case in Italy (Halsall 1995, 60). Whatever the case, the presence of cemeteries in the Krka valley indicates continued occupation of the lowland zone. A similar situation has also been shown by the recent excavations at Mengeš, north of Ljubljana (Sagadin 1995, 217-246). This site is located in the vicinity of a small Roman town and has produced 6th century imported ceramics. This material was found in pit dwellings associated with local coarse wares. It is, therefore, possible that some form of occupation also continued in the vicinity of the earlier urban centres in the Krka valley and the Celeia area.

If Črnomelj and Bela krajina did not belong to this area, then to what political unit did they belong?

It has already been noted that the phase 2 - 4 assemblages at Črnomelj display considerable similarity to those from the major Slovenian coastal sites of the Late Roman period, Piran and Koper (see above), which were located in the province of Venetia et Histria, a part of Italy. This area

experienced an increase in population in the 5th century, probably as a result of a population influx from Pannonia (Ciglencečki 1987, 140-143; Vidrih-Perko 1994, 268). Bela krajina is geographically separate and quite distant from this region, but clearly had access to a similar range of imported ceramics and seems to have experienced a flourish at the same time. The most logical explanation is that Bela krajina formed part of an administrative unit, which was largely oriented towards the Adriatic. The only feasible alternative is the province of Liburnia, or, more precisely, Liburnia Tarsacticensis.

This province was created as the southern half of the eastern defenses of Italy, the *Claustra Alpium Iuliarum*. The capital of the province was Tarsacticum (Rijeka) on the Kvarner Gulf (Medini 1980, 363-444). The northern half of this early 5th century military administrative system was the province of Carneola or Carnium, centred on Kranj (Carnium) (Šašel 1970-1971, 33,34). Kranj has a similar location to Črnomelj and similar imported ceramic assemblages, although it has a notable Lombard element in the 6th century.

The borders of Liburnia Tarsacticensis are usually defined as running south of the upper course of the river Kolpa, that is close to the modern international border between Slovenia and Croatia. However, the river only became a border in the 13th century. Before to this, Bela krajina was part of the Hungarian-Croatian state and the border ran along the crest of the Gorjanci hills (Kos 1987, 5-7). The Gorjanci hills seem form a border zone in the Late Iron Age, between the Mokronog La Tène group in Dolenjska and the Vinica La Tène group in Bela krajina. The latter group is a northern extension of the Iapodic group in the Lika, Gorski Kotar and northwestern Bosnia (Dular 1985, 28-29).

It is, thus, feasible that Bela krajina was part of Liburnia and not Pannonia, as has hitherto been suggested. The eastern border of this area towards the major urban centre at Siscia (Sisak) may be defined by the Kolpa marshes in the vicinity of Karlovac, although additional field work will be necessary to confirm this hypothesis. Even if Bela krajina was part of Pannonia in the Roman period, there is no reason to suppose that it could not be included in the new administrative district of Liburnia Tarsacticensis in the early 5th century, particularly as a similar centre was created at the same time in the north (Kranj). Thus, Črnomelj may represent a stronghold, guarding the northern end of the route from Pannonia to the Kvarner gulf. The similarity between the phase

2 and 3 ceramic assemblages in Črnomelj and the assemblages in Kranj, Slovenian Istria and the western Karst can then be explained in terms of supply to a unitary military system in the 5th and early 6th centuries. The reconstruction of the site or more accurately the reorganisation of the defenses in the first half of the 6th century (phase 3) might, therefore, be linked to the Byzantine reconquest of the area in the 6th century.

The 6th century phase on the site is perhaps more military in character. At this stage, the number of imports apparently declines, but there was continuing contact with the coast. The low-status context of the imports in this phase (4) may be an indication that imports were more plentiful within the settlement as whole, than the actual quantity in the excavated area suggests. Črnomelj evidently lay outside the Lombard zone, the Polis Norikon and fortresses of Pannonia, which extended to the crest of the Gorjanci hills (Margetić, 1992, 149-151) (Fig. 15).

Late Roman Črnomelj was destroyed at the end of the 6th century or the beginning of the 7th century. This is probably connected with the Avar and Slavic invasions of Italy and Dalmatia in this period (op. cit. 160,161). The destruction of Črnomelj would have opened the alternative route to the coast and Avar and Slavic raiding activity has been noted in Istria at this time.

Clearly some activity continued on the site after this, but its exact nature is unclear. The hydronym Lahinja is in itself an indication of the continuing presence of a Romanised population. The cemetery on the banks of the Lahinja may also have continued in use, if the analogy with Kranj holds good (Sagadin 1988). The Early Slavic cemetery around the Parish church and the choice of the town as the centre for the 13th century ecclesiastical organisation of Bela krajina indicate that settlement was a regional centre from the latter part of the Early Medieval period onwards. However, there is as yet no clear evidence of settlement between the early 7th century and the 14th century. Indeed, the archaeological evidence suggests that the ruined Late Roman defensive walls were still visible in the late 14th century when the medieval town wall was constructed.

It is to be hoped that further excavation in the historic town centre will shed light on the Early Medieval phase of the town, as well as adding detail to our knowledge of this important Late Roman centre. This work must include field survey of the immediate hinterland of the town and the wider region of Bela krajina, if the nature of Late Roman settlement is to be fully understood.

Acknowledgements

This paper seeks to present an interpretation of a recently excavated Late Roman site in Črnomelj. It is not an excavation report, as is evident from the absence of many important aspects of the data (coarse wares, osteological remains, plant macro remains, etc.) from the discussion. These will add a new dimension to the site in its local and regional context, but will not essentially alter the hypothesis posited here.

The content of this paper has been greatly influenced by discussions with a number of colleagues, too numerous to mention, who visited the excavations, commented on the material and discussed my interpretations, although they do not necessarily agree with them. I would like to especially thank Verena Vidrih-Perko (Gorenjski muzej, Kranj) for her identification of the imported ceramics and discussions on the potential interpretations and parallels. Bojan Djurić (Oddelek za arheologijo, FF Ljubljana) identified the mosaic and the spatial organisation of the ecclesiastical structure. Timotej Knific (Narodni muzej Slovenije, Ljubljana) supplied me with invaluable information and literature on the political aspects of the 5th-7th century southeastern Alpine region. Slavko Ciglencečki (Inštitut za arheologijo ZRC SAZU) commented on the metalwork and terminology in the final draft of the paper.

The paper could not have been completed without the help of Lara Badurina and Anđelka Fortuna, who drew the material, and Ildiko Pinter, who is responsible for the text figures. Finally, I would like to thank Primož Pavlin (Inštitut za arheologijo ZRC SAZU) for the final text layout and editing for publication.

BOLTA, L. 1981, *Rifnik pri Šentjurju. Poznoantična naselbina in grobišče*. - Kat. in monogr. 19.

BUDJA, M. 1979, Kovinske zapestnice v rimskih grobovih Slovenije. - *Arh. vest.* 30, 243-253.

CHRISTIE, N. 1996, Towns and Peoples on the Middle Danube in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. - In: Christie,

N. and S. T. Loseby (eds.), *Towns in transition: urban evolution in late antiquity and the early Middle Ages*, 71-98, Aldershot.

CIGLENEČKI, S. 1987, *Höhenbefestigungen aus der Zeit vom 3. bis 6. Jh. im Ostalpenraum*. - Dela 1. razr. SAZU 31.

- CIGLENEČKI, S. 1992, *Pólis Norikón. Poznoantične višinske utrdbe med Celjem in Brežicami*. - *Podsreda*
- CIGLENEČKI, S. 1993, Arheološki sledovi zatona antične Poetovione. - In: *Ptujski arheološki zbornik*, 505-520, Ptuj.
- CIGLENEČKI, S. 1994, Höhenbefestigungen als Siedlungsgrundeinheit der Spätantike in Slowenien. - *Arh. vest.* 45, 239-266.
- CUNJA, R. 1996, *Poznorimski in zgodnjerednjeveški Koper. Arheološko izkopavanje na bivšem Kapucinskem vrtu v letih 1986-1987 v luči drobnih najdb 5. do 9. stoletja*. - Koper.
- DULAR, J. 1979, Žarno grobišče na Borštku v Metliki. - *Arh. vest.* 30, 65-100.
- DULAR, J. 1983, Gomilno grobišče v Loki pri Črnomlju. - *Arh. vest.* 34, 219-244.
- DULAR, J. 1985, *Topografsko področje XI (Bela krajina)*. - Arheološka topografija Slovenije.
- DULAR, J., S. CIGLENEČKI in A. DULAR 1996, *Kučar. Železnodobno naselje in zgodnjekrščanski stavbni kompleks na Kučarju pri Podzemlju*. - Opera Instituti archaeologici Sloveniae 1.
- HALSALL, G. 1995, *Early Medieval Cemeteries. An Introduction to Burial Archaeology in the Post-Roman West*. - New Light on the Dark Ages 1, Glasgow.
- HAYES, J. W. 1972, *Late Roman Pottery*. - London.
- HAYES, J. W. 1980, *Supplement to Late Roman Pottery*. - London.
- KNIFIC, T. 1979, Vranje pri Sevnici. Drobne najdbe z Ajdovskega gradca (leto 1974). - *Arh. vest.* 30, 732-785.
- KNIFIC, T. 1994, Vranje near Sevnica: a Late Roman settlement in the light of certain pottery finds. - *Arh. vest.* 45, 211-237.
- KOS, D. 1987, *Bela krajina v poznem srednjem veku*. - Ljubljana.
- MARGETIČ, L. 1992, Neka pitanja boravka Langobarda u Sloveniji. - *Arh. vest.* 43, 149-173.
- MEDINI, J. 1980, Provincia Liburnia. - *Diadora* 9, 363-444.
- PEACOCK, D. P. S. and D. F. WILLIAMS 1986, *Amphorae and the Roman economy. An Introductory guide*. - London.
- PETRU, S. and P. PETRU 1978, *Neviodunum (Drnovo pri Krškem)*. - Kat. in monogr. 15
- PETRU, P. and T. ULBERT 1975, *Vranje pri Sevnici. Starokrščanske cerkve na Ajdovskem gradcu*. - Kat. in monogr. 12.
- REYNOLDS, P. 1995, *Trade in the Western Mediterranean, AD 400-700: the ceramic evidence*. - BAR Int. Ser. 604.
- SAGADIN, M. 1988, *Kranj - križišče Iskra: nekropola iz časa preseljevanja ljudstev in staroslovanskega obdobja*. - Kat. in monogr. 24.
- SAGADIN, M. 1995, Mengeš v Antiki. - *Arh. vest.* 46, 217-245.
- SOKOL, V. 1994, Das spätantike Kastum auf dem Kuzelin bei Donja Glavnica. - *Arh. vest.* 45, 199-209.
- STARE, V. 1980, *Kranj: nekropola iz časa preseljevanja ljudstev*. - Kat. in monogr. 18.
- ŠAŠEL, J. 1970-1971, Alpes Iuliana. - *Arh. vest.* 21-22, 33-44.
- ULBERT, T. 1979, Vranje bei Sevnica. Siedlungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. - *Arh. vest.* 30, 695-725.
- VIDRIH-PERKO, V. 1992, Afriška sigilata v Emoni. - *Arh. vest.* 43, 93-104.
- VIDRIH-PERKO, V. 1994, *Poznoantične amfore v Sloveniji*. - Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ljubljana.

Poznoantični Črnomelj in Bela krajina

Povzetek

Članek obravnava podobo poznoantične naselbine v črnomaljskem mestnem jedru, kot jo kažejo rezultati novejših izkopavanj. Črnomelj se nahaja v Beli krajini, skrajni južnovzhodni slovenski pokrajini, ki meji s Hrvaško. Z izkopavanji, ki so potekala na treh večjih najdiščih v mestnem središču v letih od 1988 do 1997, je bila ugotovljena večja, doslej neznana poznoantična utrjena naselbina. V mestu je bila doslej znana prazgodovinska, rimska in zgodnjerednjeveška poselitve.

Pri izkopavanjih cerkve sv. Duha, ki so potekala od leta 1988 do 1991, so bile odkrite obrambne strukture. Najden je bil del obrambnega zidu in okrogli vogalni stolp s sledovi bivanja v njem. V notranjosti naselbine je bil izkopen le manjši del in sicer pod obstoječo cerkvijo. V tem delu je bila majhna zgodnjekrščanska cerkev z mozaičnim tlakom v ladji ter večjo in manjšo bivalno strukturo pravokotne oblike. Slednji sta obe naslonjeni na notranjo fasado vzhodnega obrambnega obzidja. Poznoantične plasti so bile dobro stratificirane in jasno doakazujejo obstoj petih glavnih faz: vzpostavitev naselbine (pozno 4. / zgodnje 5. stoletje), čas poselitve, obdobje obnove (zgodnje - sredina 6. stoletja), druga poselitvena faza, rušenje (zgodnje 7. stoletje).

Te faze so bile potrjene na naslednjih dveh lokacijah. Pastoralni center je bil odkrit pred in med gradbenimi deli leta 1995 in 1996. Nahaja se približno 30 m severno od cerkve sv. Duha in kaže podobno situacijo. Najdeno je bilo nadaljevanje vzhodnega dela obrambnega zidu, skupaj s pravokotnim obrambnim stolpom in depozit notranje-poselitve brez arhitekturnih ostankov. Poznoantična stratigrafija se ujema s prvimi tremi fazami pri Sv. Duhu.

Najdišče na bregu reke Lahinje je bilo izkopano pred izgradnjo glavnega kanalizacijskega sistema v letih 1996 in 1997. Poselitvene plasti prazgodovinskega obrežnega naselja pod mestnim jedrom so prekrte z naplavinjskimi plastmi, ki so bile utrjene s tlakom z začetka ali sredine 6. stoletja. Predel je bil najverjetneje v rabi kot pristanišče. Del obrežja so uporabljali kot grobišče. Na tem področju je bilo izkopanih sedemindvajset poznoantičnih skeletnih pokopov. Struktura grobišča in grobni inventar ga opredeljujejo kot pokopališče tamkajšnjega romaniziranega prebivalstva v 6. - 7. stoletju.

Omenjeno datacijo potrjuje podrobnejša analiza importirane fine keramike in amfor z vseh treh najdišč. Najdbe afriške sigilate, afriških in vzhodnosredozemskih amfor ter fine keramike kažejo, da ima Črnomelj veliko skupnega z najdišči 5. in 6. stoletja iz zaledja utrjenega obmejnega pasu Italije in istrskih obalnih mest. S sočasnimi najdišči v osrednji in severni Sloveniji podobnih povezav ni. V glavnih rimskih urbanih središčih v zaključnih fazah, ob koncu 4. in v začetku 5. stoletja, tovrstnih najdb ne zasledimo. Razlika je še posebej očitna s pojavom poznoantične keramike in različnih tipov vzhodnosredozemskih amfor iz tretje faze v Črnomlju. Te oblike se pojavljajo v zahodni Sloveniji in Istri, medtem ko jih v nekdanjih urbanih središčih in v višinskih naselbinah osrednje in severne Slovenije ni moč zaslediti, ali pa le redko (vzhodnosredozemske amfore).


Avtorjeva predpostavka je, da je bila črnomaljska naselbina administrativno središče Bele krajine. Bližnje naselje na Kučarju je bilo cerkveno središče v isti regiji. Najdbe kažejo, da v poznoantičnem obdobju ta pokrajina ni bila del

provinca Savije (južna Panonija). Nasprotno, bolj verjetno se zdi, da je pripadala poznoantični provinci Liburnia Tarsaticensis. Ta provinca je bila južni del obrambnega loka postavljenega pred nekdanjim utrjenim obmejnim pasom Italije. Severni del tega loka je bolj znan kot provinca Carniola s središčem v Kranju (Carnium). Z manjšimi izkopavanji v tem mestu so bile odkrite podobne najdbe.


Črnomelj se nahaja na severnem delu prazgodovinske in rimske poti, ki je potekala od Kvarnerskega zaliva do južne Panonije po dolini Kolpe. To daje razlago za nastanek tega najdišča in njegov propad v 7. stoletju. Nasilno rušenje je

verjetno povezano z vpadi Avarov in Slovanov v severno Italijo in zahodni Balkan v tem obdobju. Iz depositov faze uničenja izvira samo ena triroba puščična ost, ki je morda povezana s temi dogajanjmi. Mesto je obdržalo vlogo središča kontinuirano v srednji vek, kar lahko ugotovimo na podlagi zgodnjerslovanskih nekropol iz samega mestnega jedra in njegove bližine. Nadaljnji razvoj mestnega jedra in okolice bo gotovo prinesel nove ugotovitve o poznoantični in zgodnjersrednjeveški podobi najdišča. Za ugotovitev podrobnejše slike tega pomembnega najdišča je potrebno vzporedno z izkopavanji v mestu nadaljevati tudi z raziskavami v njegovem zaledju.


Phil Mason
Zavod za varstvo naravne
in kulturne dediščine
Skalickega 1
SI-6800 Novo mesto



Pl. 1: Črnomelj. 1 Pastoralni center; 2-8 Sv. Duh. All pottery. Scale = 1:3.
 T. 1: Črnomelj. 1 Pastoralni center; 2-8 Sv. Duh. Vse keramika. M. = 1:3.




Pl. 2: Črnomelj, 1,2,4 Sv. Duh; 3 Pastoralni center. All pottery. Scale = 1:3.
 T. 2: Črnomelj, 1,2,4 Sv. Duh; 3 Pastoralni center. Vse keramika. M. = 1:3.




Pl. 3: Črnomelj. Pastoralni center. All pottery. Scale = 1:3.

T. 3: Črnomelj. Pastoralni center. Vse keramika. M. = 1:3.




Pl. 4: Črnomelj. 1-3 Lahinja River Edge Complex; 4-7 Sv. Duh. All pottery. Scale = 1:3.
 T. 4: Črnomelj. 1-3 Najdišče na bregu reke Lahinje; 4-7 Sv. Duh. Vse keramika. M. = 1:3.



Pl. 5: Črnomelj. Lahinja River Edge Complex. 1-4,6 grave 20; 5 grave 26; 7 grave 18; 9 grave 23. 1-4 bronze; 5 glass and coral(?); 6 glass and amber; 7 glass; 8 silver and bronze; 9 bronze and iron. Scale = 1:2.

T. 5: Črnomelj. Najdišče na bregu reke Lahinje. 1-4,6 grob 20; 5 grob 26; 7 grob 18; 9 grob 23. 1-4 bron; 5 steklo in korala(?); 6 steklo in jantar; 7 steklo; 8 srebro in bron; 9 bron in železo. M. = 1:2.



Insert 1: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: Late Roman structures.
Pril. 1: Črnomelj - Sv. Duh: poznoantični objekti.

