

Slovenska zgodnj srednjeveška arheologija med preteklostjo in sedanostjo - pogled z "Zahoda"

Irena MIRNIK PREZELJ

Izvleček

Članek obravnava nejasnosti koncepta zgodnjega srednjega veka, ki ob pristajanju na "tiranijo historičnega zapisa" in neupoštevanju subjektivnosti zgodovinskih ter arheoloških virov, kroji okvir slovenski arheološki klasifikaciji in interpretaciji. Zavezanost slovenske arheologije kulturno-historični paradigmi ga opredeljuje s kronološkimi in kulturno-etničnimi študijami, odmika od sodobnih teoretskih debat, zgodnj srednjeveški arheologiji pa, kot eni "historičnih arheologij", neprestano poudarja tradicionalno privilegirano pisnih virov.

Abstract

The article discusses the vagueness of the concept of the "Early Middle Ages", which when settling for the "tyranny of the historical record" and the disregard of the subjectivity of historical and archaeological sources, moulds Slovene archaeological classifications and interpretations. The commitment of Slovene archaeology to the culture-history paradigm codifies the Early Medieval Ages with chronological and cultural-ethnic studies and deviates from the on-going modern theoretical debates. Furthermore, the Early Medieval archaeology, as "historical archaeology", incessantly emphasises traditional privileges for the written record.

If one reads a book claiming that lions are fierce and then encounters a fierce lion (I simplify, of course), the chances are that one will be encouraged to read more books by that same author, and believe them. But if, in addition, the lion book instructs one how to deal with a fierce lion, and the instructions work perfectly, then not only will the author be greatly believed, he will also be impelled to try his hand at other kinds of written performance. There is a rather complex dialectic of reinforcement by which the experiences of readers in reality are determined by what they have read, and this in turn influences writers to

*take up subjects defined in advance by readers' experiences. A book on how to handle a fierce lion might then cause a series of books to be produced on such subjects as the fierceness of lions, the origins of fierceness, and so forth. Similarly, as the focus of the text centers more narrowly on the subject - no longer lions but their fierceness - we might expect that the ways by which it is recommended that a lion's fierceness be handled will actually **increase** its fierceness, force it to be fierce since that is what it is, and that is what in essence we know or can **only** know about it.*

Edward Said, *Orientalism*¹

¹ Če človek prebere knjigo, v kateri piše, da so levi divji, in potem sreča divjega leva (poenostavljam, seveda), je zelo verjetno, da bo prebral še več knjig istega avtorja in jim verjel. Če pa knjiga o levih za povrh vsega še pouči človeka, kako ravnati z divjimi levi, in če se navodila obnesejo, potem ne le, da avtorju verjame, temveč je to za tega spodbuda, da se preskusi še v drugih vrsteh pisanja. Obstaja razmeroma zapletena dialektika krepite, s katero izkušnje bralcev v realnosti določa to, kar so brali, to pa po drugi strani vpliva na pisce, da se lotevajo tem, vnaprej določenih s pričakovanji bralcev. Knjiga o tem, kako ravnati z divjimi levi, lahko povzroči nastanek cele vrste knjig, ki bodo obravnavale, denimo, divjost levov, od kod divjost izvira in tako naprej. Podobno kot se pozornost teksta vse bolj ozko osredinja – nič več na leve, ampak na njihovo divjost – lahko pričakujemo, da bodo priporočila, kako ravnati z levovo divjostjo, dejansko povečevala njegovo divjost, ga silila v divjost, saj prav za to gre, to je tisto, kar v bistvu vemo in kar edino lahko vemo o tem. E. W. Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books (1995) 93 s; prva izd. 1978. Slovenski prevod: Lenca Bogovič, v: E. W. Said, *Orientalizem: zahodnjaški pogled na Orient*, Ljubljana: ISH Fakulteta za podiplomski študij (1996) 123.

The past is a foreign country whose features are shaped by today's predilections, its strangeness domesticated by our own preservation of its vestiges.

David Lowenthal,
*The Past is a Foreign Country*²

Za slovensko zgodnj srednjeveško arheologijo se zdi, da od takrat, ko ji je bil postavljen konceptualni okvir (Kastelic 1964 - 1965) in je dobila prestižno vlogo "zadnjega arheološkega obdobja", ne potrebuje samorefleksije. Preseneča me dejstvo, da ne kaže nikakršnega zanimanja do sodobnih tokov v arheologiji. Ne mikajo je novi metodološki pristopi, ki so se uveljavili odtlej, še manj teoretska vprašanja, celo tematizacije problemov se ne loteva in se ne sprašuje o primernosti raziskovalnih strategij. Je vzrok, da nikjer na obzorju ni videti epistemološke skepse v ortodoksnem vztrajanju pri konceptiji tradicionalne³ arheologije? Je morda kriva prezaposlenost s temeljnimi tipološkimi, kronološkimi in "etničnimi" študijami? Jo je v slepo ulico prignala zasvojenost z zgodovinar(skimi "dejstvi"? Je krivda v razklanam času "odhajajočih ideologij", ki so jo zaznamovale?

Kako razumeti zgodnj srednjeveško arheologijo?

Splošnega konsenza o tem, kaj naj bi zgodnj srednjeveška arheologija bila, ne poznamo. Poimenovanje je odraz kulturno pogojene časovne in prostorske razdelitve preteklosti (Austin 1990, 11) in je pogosto nacionalno obarvano. V njem se zrcalijo zgodovina humanističnih ved, razsežnosti družbenega in političnega dogajanja in ne nazadnje osebne okoliščine ter prepričanja avtorjev.

V nemški arheološki praksi je zgodnj srednjeveška arheologija domena *Frühgeschichte* (zgodnje zgodovine), saj je *Archäologie* (arheologija) namenjena samo klasični arheologiji (Härke 1995, 47). Pod njenim okriljem sta *Völkerwanderungs-*

zeit (obdobje preseljevanja ljudstev) in *Merowingerzeit* (merovinško obdobje) novonastalih "barbarskih" družbenih tvorb germanskih skupnosti. Spornejši je njen konec - oziroma bolje rečeno prehod - v *mittelalterliche Archäologie* (srednjeveško arheologijo). Konec zgodnj srednjeveške arheologije se namreč v zahodnoevropskem prostoru izteče z merovinško ali zgodnjekarolinško dobo, na severu ji priključujejo še otonsko, na vzhodu pa se prevesi šele z enajstim ali dvanajstim stoletjem (Jankuhn 1973, 9; Fehring 1991, 17 s). Nekdanja vzhodnonemška arheologija je bila zaradi velikega števila slovanskih najdišč tesno povezana s slovanskim Vzhodom, zato so bile raziskave usmerjene drugače kot na Zahodu.

Nasprotno je umevanje na skrajnem zahodnoevropskem robu: v Španiji. Tukaj razumejo v okviru klasičnega pojmovanja zgodnj srednjeveške arheologije starokrščansko in zahodnogotsko dobo, kronološko omejeno med 400 in 700, in *Al-Andalus* (islamsko obdobje), razpeto med 700 in 1250. V zadnjem času jima pridružujejo še arheologijo krščanskih kraljestev (1250 do 1500) in vsa tri obdobja združujejo v srednjeveško arheologijo (Valor Piechotta 1993, 105, 381 s).

Tako kot španska (z zahodnogotsko dobo) tudi nekatere druge nacionalne arheologije "skrivajo" zgodnji srednji vek pod etničnimi nalepkami, zato se srečujemo z anglosaško, vikinško in (staro)slovensko arheologijo.

Britanska anglosaška arheologija je tradicionalno umeščena med 400 in 1066 (Welch 1992, 9). Včasih je prepoznavna kar pod *Dark Ages* (temna stoletja) in razumljena kot *žalostno obdobje po civilizaciji* (Hodges 1989, 5). V zadnjem desetletju se izmika zrcalu, ki ji ga je "podtaknilo" zgodovinarstvo. Opušča namreč vlogo stezosledke zgodovinarskih stopinj, odtisnjenih v interpretacijah preteklosti. "Antietnično" razumevanje zgodnjega srednjega veka se npr. pokaže v pregledni knjižici Richarda Hodgesa, z željo po paradigmatični spremembi, ubesedeno z odmikom od ... *slikovitih knjig o Vikingih ali študij o preseljevanju, z obravnavo podatkov kot eksplisnitivnih etničnih sledi, ki dajejo*

² Preteklost je tuja dežela, katere poteze oblikujejo današnje pristranosti, nenavadnost pa je udomačena z našim ohranjanjem njenih sledi. Slovenski prevod I.M.P., povzeto iz: D. Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1993) xvii; prva izd. 1985.

³ Z oznako tradicionalna arheologija mislimo na kulturno-zgodovinski in opisni pristop do materialne preteklosti, uveljavljen vse do šestdesetih let (ponekod absolutno prevladujoč še danes), ko je prišlo do živahnega "teoretskega gibanja", katerega sadova sta v anglosaksonskem in skandinavskem prostoru procesualna (nova) in kot reakcija nanjo postprocesualna arheologija. Splošne opredelitve najdemo v: Willey, Sabloff 1980, 1993; Lamberg-Karlovsky 1989; Trigger 1989; Renfrew, Bahn 1991; Preucel, Hodder 1996, 3-20; Halsall 1997, 805-827. Debata med procesualno in postprocesualno arheologijo je razvidna predvsem v: *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 22, 1989; Preucel 1991; Yoffee, Sherratt 1993, osvetljena pa v: Hodder in sod. 1995. O teoretskih dogajanjih različnih nacionalnih arheologij je največ mogoče spoznati v: Hodder 1991.

meso etno-historičnemu skeletu ... (Hodges 1991, 10). Da je tudi v zgodnj srednjeveški arheologiji čas za odpoved etničnim stereotipom, je dokazala s kritično analizo štiristoletnih anglosaških študij in dvestoletne anglosaške arheologije Samantha Jane Lucy (1995). Novo pot pa prepričljivo nakazuje Siân Jones (1996, 1997) z izčrpno analizo etničnih konceptov v humanističnih vedah in s predlogi za drugačno konceptualizacijo.

Skandinavcem je že od Engelhardta in Worsaaeja dalje zgodnj srednjeveška arheologija vikinška doba (Klindt-Jensen 1975, 73), časovno umeščena med 750 in 1050 (Roesdahl 1993, 319), ki je zaradi odsotnosti pisnih virov (z izjemo runskih zapisov) obravnavana kot del prazgodovinske arheologije.

Naslednja arheologija z etnično nalepko je (staro)slovanska, vpeta med šesto in enajsto stoletje (Gojda 1988, 1), v Rusiji pa vse do mongolskih vpadov sredi trinajstega stoletja (Leciejewicz 1993, 78). V vseh nekdanjih socialističnih državah doživlja po odstiranju "železne zavese" korenite spremembe. Rusija ima tako poleg tradicionalno pojmovane slovanske arheologije, ki se ukvarja z etnogenezo Slovanov in njihovo razširitvijo, še arheologijo krščanskih starin, pred leti še uradno nepriznana poddisciplina, za raziskovanje ostalin ljudskega pravoslavja (Černecov 1996, 15). Pod slovansko oznako je tudi srednjeveška ruska arheologija, zadolžena za arheološki zapis srednjeveške Rus od devetega do trinajstega stoletja, kakor tudi kasnejših odvisnih kneževin (pod mongolsko zasedbo od srede 13. stoletja) in moskovskega obdobja (Makarov 1996, 21 s).

Vsem naštetim arheologijam je skupna periodizacija, za katero Julia M. H. Smith upravičeno pravi, da je *prekletstvo učenosti in prijateljica upravne ali bibliografske udobnosti*. Takšna členitev arheologij je nastala zaradi zgodovinarskega razumevanja srednjega veka kot porimskega obdobja in povzroča težave tudi historikom. Je mogoče govoriti o zgodnj srednjeveški Irski pred enajstim ali dvanajstim stoletjem? In kdaj je (zgodnje)srednjeveška Skandinavija (Smith 1997, 105 s)? Se ne konča zgodnji srednji vek vzhodnih slovanskih skupnosti s trinajstim stoletjem zaradi nemškega, francoskega in britanskega pojmovanja, da šele takrat dobi nekatere značilnosti srednjeveške zahodne Evrope?

In zgodovinopisje?

The time will arrive, when this age may also be denominated, dark: and who knows, but they may say, we were credulous?

Joseph Berington,
*History of the Lives of Abeillard and Eloisa*⁴

Kronološko je srednji vek, kakršnega prevzema arheologija, zarisal že Francesco Petrarca (1304 - 1373), ko je stoletja med petim in štirinajstim označil za "temačna" in jih kot *medium aevum* ločil od antične dobe in svojega časa (Aylmer 1997, 250 s; Smith 1997, 105). 1469. leta ga je utrdil papežev knjižničar Giovanni Andrea, v šestnajstem in sedemnajstem stoletju pa so za njegovo institucionalizacijo poskrbeli Georg Horn, Christoph Cellarius (Keller) in Charles du Fresne Du Cange. S tridelno razdelitvijo človeške zgodovine na antično, srednjeveško in novo dobo so se začeli, kot bi rekel Krzysztof Pomian, *železni okovi periodizacije*. Georg Horn je tako 1666. leta omejil *medium aevum* s 300 in 1500, a že Kellerju se je zdel primernejši začetek z ustanovitvijo Konstantinopla (330) in konec s turško osvojitvijo omenjenega mesta (1453. leta). Kasneje se je večina zgodovinopiscev odločala za začetek z letom 476, ko je Romul Avgustul odposlal svoja cesarska znamenja na Vzhod in tako zaznamoval začetek propadanja zahodnorimskega cesarstva. Pri zaključevanju dobe so bili bolj izbirčni. Odločali so se med Turki pred Bizancem (1453), Kolumbovim odkritjem Novega sveta (1492) ali italijanskimi vojnami (1494). Srednji vek, rojen iz tleče ideje o napredku s konca trinajstega stoletja in zoperstavljanja "starim" časom ter utrjevanja "modernosti" (renesanse), je postal *neke vrste temačni tunel med dvema sijajnim obdobjema, katerih blišč se odraža v znanosti, umetnosti in književnosti* (Le Goff 1993, 13, 27 s). Stisnjen med idealizirani podobi antike in renesanse si je prislužil slabšalni pomen že z Ghibertijevo členitvijo umetnosti na zlato dobo antike in barbarski srednji vek že pred letom 1450 (Malina, Vašiček 1990, 19; Llewellyn 1997, 834), razsvetljenci osemnajstega stoletja pa so ga samo še stopnjevali. Tako Montesquieujevi (1689 - 1755) opisi v *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence* (Raz-

⁴ *Prišel bo čas, ko bo morda tudi ta doba imenovana temačna; in kdo ve, morda bodo rekli, da smo bili lahkoverni?* Slovenski prevod I.M.P., iz J. Berington, *The History of the Lives of Abeillard and Eloisa*, Basel (1793) vol.1, li; tukaj povzeto iz: D. Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign ...*, 236, op. 303 in str. 417.

mišljanja o vzrokih veličine in propada Rimljanov) kot Gibbonovi (1737 - 1794) v *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (Zgodovina zatona in propada rimskega cesarstva), namenjeni zadnjim stoletjem rimskega cesarstva, so pripomogli, da je postal primitiven, privlačen kakor črnska umetnost, toda zares barbarski predmet izkrivljene naslade vračanja h koreninam (Le Goff 1993, 28). Prav politična in gospodarska zgodovina Edwarda Gibbona *Zaton in propad* (prvič izšla v šestih zvezkih med leti 1776 in 1788), oprta na ideje škotskih razsvetlencev (moralista Adama Fergusona in "očeta" ekonomije Adama Smitha), je s poglavji o Hunih in drugih "barbarskih" ljudstvih prinesla rešitev za prej nerazložljivi propad "civilizacije" (Burke 1992, 4 s). Kljub temu da Gibbonova naracija kaže, kako zanj *zaton ni bil sinonim propada* (Robertson 1997, 265), je njegovo delo pripomoglo, kot meni Arnaldo Momigliano, k začetku obsedenosti. Propad rimskega imperija je dobil vrednost arhetipa slehernega razkroja in torej simbola naših strahov (Momigliano 1989, 217). Z njim je postal mogoč še danes trajajoči mit o *temačnih stoletjih* (Renfrew 1979, 484). Zožena perspektiva je postala prepričljiva, ker sta tako Gibbon kot pozneje ruski zgodovinar Rostovcev opazovala poznorimsko in tej predhodno antoninsko dobo kontrastno. V prvi sta videla nezadržan propad, v drugi zlato dobo. Gibbon je pri tem opazoval moralno in intelektualno propadanje, krivdo zanju pa pripisal življenjskemu slogu, ki ni bil v skladu s krščanskim narekom. Rostovcevu je bil vzrok propada brutalni totalitarizem, pogojen z brezobzirnim izkoriščanjem antičnih sužnjev. Njegov pogled, utemeljen z Marxovo vzročnostjo zgodovinskih sprememb zaradi napetosti v ekonomskih in družbenih strukturah, je v bolj sofisticirani obliki mogoče prepoznati v delih današnjih zgodovinarjev in arheologov (Cameron 1993b, 8; Collins 1991, 92 s). Moderno verzijo zatona in propada srečamo v teoriji katastrof, ki z modelom kolapsa sistemov išče razlago za prehod iz antične družbe v zgodnesrednjeveške "barbarske" družbene tvorbe (Renfrew 1979, 482-485; Tainter 1988, 4 s, 11). Prav vztrajno preučevanje *Dark Ages* je prispevalo k temu, da termin počasi izginja pod nevtralnimi izrazom pozne antike: *obdobja sprememb, vrenja, kreacij* (Le Goff 1993, 14). Zadnjih trideset let so namreč zgodovinarji z uvajanjem novega termina *Late Antiquity* (*antiquité tardive* et *chrétienne*, pozna antika) premostili tradicio-

nalno delitev med koncem antične zgodovine (z dominatom) in dvema stopnjama srednjeveške zgodovine - preseljevanjem ljudstev (vpadi "barbarov" v poznem četrtem in petem stoletju na področje rimskega imperija) ter *Dark Ages* (obdobje med vpadi in vladavino Karla Velikega). Razširili so ga še na bizantinske študije (Heather 1997, 69). Kljub temu da se je pozna antika uveljavila kot zgodovinsko obdobje z lastno identiteto (Smith 1997, 107), splošnega konsenza o rabi termina ne poznamo. Tako na primer očita Edward James ozkost tistim zgodovinarjem, ki se še vedno držijo diskurza temačnih stoletij, ker da prelamljajo *konvencijo* (poud. I.M.P.) kontinentalnih historikov o srednjem veku med propadom rimskega imperija in renesanso oziroma reformacijo. S tem, ko izvemajo *Dark Ages* iz časa, ustreznega nezavednemu občutju nečesa, kar bi lahko imeli za "srednjeveški" življenjski slog, pristajajo na dva nesmisla. Prvi je v tem, da z vidika védenja⁵ ne moremo govoriti o temačnosti, saj sta npr. Galija in Britanija med šestim in devetim stoletjem mnogo bolje poznani, kot v njuni celotni rimski dobi. Drugi nesmisel je apoteoza Lotovega tipa *o desetem stoletju kot sterilnem obdobju, za katerega lahko rečemo, da bi bilo bolje, če ga sploh ne bi bilo*. Ta ohranjata svojo moč samo zaradi idealiziranja antike kot *nečesa dobrega* in poenostavljenega pogleda na zgodnesrednjeveške ljudi kot *primitivne, nasilne in praznoverne* (James 1992, 5 s).

Ne samo z *Dark Ages*, tudi sicer smo sredi nepopisne terminološke zmede. Tavamo v pravi goščavi pozne antike (ali poznorimskega cesarstva - Brown 1993, 1; Cameron 1993a, 1), bizantinskega obdobja (Whittow 1996, 96-98), preseljevanja ljudstev (Goffart 1989, 111-132)... Pojmi se pomensko in časovno prekrivajo, večkrat so regionalno obarvani, njihovi prvotni konceptualni nastavki pa so s kasnejšimi nanosi zabrisani do nerazpoznavnosti. Že bežen pogled po naključno izbrani literaturi nam pove več o njihovih avtorjih kot terminih samih. Tako se raziskovalci antične zgodovine počutijo ugodno, kadar govorijo o četrtem in petem stoletju kot poznoantični dobi, a so v težavah, ko se odločajo, kdaj podeliti vstopnico preseljujočim se ljudstvom (Goffart 1980, 3-39). Medievisti radi pišejo nekrologe antiki že s prvimi "barbari" znotraj rimskega imperija, čeprav se večinoma odločajo za zgodnji srednji vek z novonastalimi "barbarskimi državami" (Cameron 1993b, 43; McKitterick 1997, 162). Bizantinologi so pri

⁵ Do prvotnega pomena *Dark Ages* je prišlo prav zaradi nevednosti oziroma nepoznavanja obdobja, ki je nastala zaradi pomanjkanja pisnih virov.

določanju mej svojega raziskovalnega polja v precepu: naj bo začetek temeljni kamen Konstantinopla? Justinijanova vlada? Sedmo stoletje? (Kazhdan, Cutler 1982, 429-478). Z naključnim vzorcem seveda ne mislim posploševati ali morda celo govoriti o "tipičnosti", saj se zavedam, da gre za izolirane, iz kontekstov iztrgane opredelitve. Želim le opozoriti, da je (zgodnji) srednji vek v zgodovinsopisju spremenljivka in da je linearno sprejemanje v arheologijo škodljivo.

In kakšen je naključni vzorec oblikovanja predstave o pozni antiki in/ali (zgodnjem) srednjem veku?

Edward James se v svoji knjigi o *Frankih* odloči za splošno sprejeto zgodovinarsko opredelitev pozne antike med peto in sedmo stoletje (James 1991, 10). Averilu Cameronu je v knjigi *Poznorimski imperij od 284 do 430* pozna antika obdobje med koncem četrtega stoletja in arabskimi osvajanji v sedmem stoletju (Cameron 1993a, 1), v drugi, z naslovom *Sredozemski svet v pozni antiki od 395 do 600*, pa se opredeli za zgodnji srednji vek v navezi z oblikovanjem barbarskih kraljestev, a ostaja v Sredozemlju zvest antiki še ob izteka-jočem se šestem stoletju, pri čemer se opira tudi na arheološko dokazljivo kontinuiteto (Cameron 1993 b, 43). Randsborgov arheološki esej o prvem tisočletju v Evropi in Sredozemlju se med 200 in 400 gible po poznorimskem in poznoce-sarskem obdobju, dogajanje med 400 in 600 pa prepušča pozni antiki in začetkom germanskih "držav" (Randsborg 1991, 8) in tako antičarjem ter medievistom trga iz rok razliko med pozno antiko in zgodnjim srednjim vekom.

Nasprotno nas Roger Collins že z naslovi svojih knjig *Zgodnesrednjeveška Španija: enotnost v različnosti, 400 do 1000* in *Zgodnesrednjeveška Evropa, 300 do 1000* opozori, da bo na strani srednjega veka (Collins 1983, 1991). Tudi Cameron nas, opredelitvam navkljub, povabi k večji *geografski in kronološki širini* (Cameron 1993b, 8), pri čemer misli na opuščanje poznoantičnih in zgodnesrednjeveških periodizacijskih spon. Še dlje gre Jacques Le Goff, ta večni in neustavljivi borec za drugačen srednji vek, ko nas v *Srednjeveškem ima-*

ginariju popelje v srednji vek od tretjega do devetnajstega stoletja. Vajen konvencij in trdno ukoreninjenih razlikovanj nam "šok" omili s stopnjami. Pozno antiko razpne med tretje in deseto stoletje, a nam hkrati dopušča samoizbiro z zgodnesrednjeveškim osmim, devetim in desetim stoletjem. Prav zaradi tega popuščanja še sam ne zadosti napovedanemu, ko kasneje umesti zgodnji srednji vek med peto in enajsto stoletje, pri uveljavljanju zahodnoevropskega krščanstva pa se ustavi ob prehodnem obdobju četrtega stoletja, imenovanem pozna antika (*Spätantike*) ali zgodnji srednji vek (*Früchmittelalter*) - (Le Goff 1993, 16, 37, 261). In doda še: ... *zgodnji srednji vek od četrtega do devetega stoletja, hkrati pozna antika in začetek fevdalnega sistema, osrednji srednji vek od desetega do štirinajstega stoletja, čas velikega vzleta, pri čemer moramo zgostiti srednji vek v pravem pomenu besede, če želimo obdržati zoženo definicijo, visoki srednji vek ali čas kriz, ki pokriva razdobje med štirinajstim in šestnajstim stoletjem*. In v čem tiči vzrok Le Goffove odločitve za dolgotrajni srednji vek? V tem, da takšen srednji vek *razjeda nasprotje med dvema enako izkrivljenima slikama zoženega srednjeveštva: črne slike, ki ga poistoveča s temačno dobo, in pozlačene slike, ki ga prikazuje kot idilično razdobje religioznega verovanja...* (prav tam, 31).

Je "podaljšava" srednjega veka naključna? Ne. Začela se je v krogu *Annales*. Najprej v historiografiji, za tem tudi v arheologiji. *La nouvelle histoire* z novo paradigmo, katere preučevanje temelji na vprašanju, *kako funkcionira neki sistem oz. kako skozi množice časovnih, prostorskih, človeških, socialnih, kulturnih in dogodkovnih dimenzij funkcionira cela kolektiviteta* (Luthar 1993a, 148), je namreč ob naraščajočem zanimanju za vprašanja poselitvenega razvoja začutila potrebo po ukinitvi tradicionalne periodizacije, ki je ločevala antiko in srednji vek (Francovich 1993, 51).

Koncepta pozne antike in zgodnjega srednjega veka sta se spreminjala (se spreminjata) tako, da se nekateri arheologi (in zgodovinarji) tega niso zavedali (ne zavedajo). O njiju ne smemo razmišljati kot o statičnih idejah preteklosti (in sedanjosti). Že bežen pregled njunega spremenljivega kronološkega omejevanja nam pokaže, da sta nujni genealogija in arheologija⁶ obeh kon-

⁶ Nietzschejevi in Foucaultovi projekti genealogije zahtevajo razkrivanje razlike, prekinitve, raznovrstnosti tistega, kar je bilo pojmovano kot enotno in neprekinjeno (prim. Hodder in sod. 1995, 9, 237). Nietzschejev vpliv v arheologiji prim. Bapty 1990; Foucaultov vpliv prim. Miller, Tilley 1984; Tilley 1990. Genealogija se ukvarja z nastajanjem konceptov (pojmov) v zgodovinskem okviru, arheologija pa jo razširja s tem, da preučuje pravila oblikovanja različnih diskurzov, ki se odvijajo v posameznem historičnem obdobju (Tilley 1990).

ceptov. Pred nedavnim je Shaun Hides v *Genealogiji materialne kulture in kulturne identitete* poudaril, da *koncepti in načini analize, prek katerih interpretiramo preteklost, niso nevtralna, abstraktna orodja, temveč kulturni produkti* (Hides 1996, 42). Poleg njega sta to za koncept arheološke kulture dokazali tudi Margarita Díaz-Andreu v razpravi *Konstruiranje identitet prek kulture* in Siân Jones v razpravi *Diskurzi identitete v interpretaciji preteklosti* (Díaz-Andreu 1996; Jones 1996). Že pred tem se je - s foucaultovsko interpretativno analitiko (Dreyfus, Rabinow 1982, xxii) - lotil koncepta "neolitika" Julian Thomas (1993), ko je sprejel izziv Christopherja Tilleyja o uvajanju "arheologije arheologije" (prav tam, 357) in o ponovnem pisanju zgodovine arheologije (Tilley 1990, 292). Ugotovil je, da zgodovina koncepta ne pomeni postopnega rafiniranja (kot je uveljavljeno v praksi zgodovinopisja arheologije, op. I.M.P.), ampak *razpršitev, nerazumevanje, propadanje besed, ki bi ustrezno sporočale pomen* (Thomas 1993, 358). V stopetdesetletni uporabi koncepta zgodnjega srednjega veka v arheologiji - če vzamemo kot izhodišče dela Thomasa Batemana in Hjalmarja Stolpeja (Hodges 1991, 1 s) - in petstoletni rabi v zgodovinopisju je za boljše razumevanje potrebna analiza, skladna s Foucaultovimi *epistemes*⁷ (Foucault 1972). Nujna je tudi analiza koncepta pozne antike.

In kako je razumljen zgodnji srednji vek v slovenski arheologiji?

V *Enciklopediji Slovenije* je pod geslom *arheologija* veda razdeljena na tri *metodološke enote*: prazgodovinsko, rimsko provincialno in zgodnjersrednjeveško arheologijo. Rimska provincialna arheologija je kronološko omejena z Avgustovo osvojitvijo slovenskega prostora v drugi polovici prvega stoletja pr. n. št. na eni in s šestim stoletjem na drugi strani, zgodnjersrednjeveška (posebej staroslovanska) pa s šestim in enajstim stoletjem (Enciklopedija 1987, 100). Že v razdelku, namenjen-

nemu zgodnjersrednjeveški arheologiji, je napovedani ostri rez prestopljen, saj je poudarjena *dvojnost zgodnjersrednjeveškega gradiva*, arheološke najdbe pa umeščene v *kulturni in časovni okvir v obdobju preseljevanja ljudstev ... in ... staroslovansko obdobje* (prav tam, 104). Preseljevanje ljudstev dobi kasneje svoje lastno geslo, v katerem je ubesedeno kot *obdobje vdiranja barbarskih ljudstev prek utrjenih mej rimskega, perzijskega in kitajskega imperija ter ustanavljanja številnih kraljestev v osvojenih deželah* (Enciklopedija 1995, 300), s historiografskega vidika pa interpretirano tradicionalno: z začetkom hunskih vpadov, osredotočenostjo na germanska ljudstva in zaključkom s slovansko naselitvijo. Ugotovitev, da je ... v *novjšem času zgodnjersrednjeveška arheologija posvetila posebno pozornost razlikovanju najdišč na prehodu med pozno antiko in dobo preseljevanja ljudstev* (poud. I.M.P.) - (Enciklopedija 1987, 105), nas spravlja v zadrego, ki se še poglobi, ko skušamo poiskati odgovor v geslu, namenjenemu poznoantični dobi. Ta je definirana kot *obdobje od vladavine cesarja Dioklecijana (284-300) in Konstantina Velikega (324-337) do zatona antike na Slovenskem okrog leta 600*. Razumevanje pozne antike kot obdobja, ki se je v zgodovini uveljavilo ob *gr(škem) in rim(skem) obdobju kot samostojni del antike*, in stališče, da se *zaključuje s prihodom Slovanov, kar se ujema s spremembo naselitvenega stanja in razločno kaže v izkopani materialni kulturi*, je mogoče pripisati dejstvu, da se je preseljevanje ljudstev "preselilo" iz zgodnjersrednjeveške domene v antiko, z določitvijo poznoantične dobe kot *oznake, (ki) se uporablja predvsem na območju nekdanjega zahodnorimskega imperija z zgodnjekrščanskim obdobjem in časom preseljevanja ljudstev* (Enciklopedija 1995, 208 s).

Konceptualni okvir je dobila slovenska zgodnjersrednjeveška arheologija pred nekaj več kot tridesetimi leti. Dal ji ga je tedanji ravnatelj Narodnega muzeja v Ljubljani - Jože Kastelic. Od kod do kod naj bi se kronološko in problemsko raztezala, je pokazal v *razširjenem referatu z naslovom Nekaj problemov zgodnjersrednjeveške ar-*

⁷ Foucault opredeljuje *episteme* takole: *By episteme, we mean ... the total set of relations that unite, at a given period, the discursive practices that give rise to epistemological figures, sciences, and possibly formalized systems. ... The episteme is not a form of knowledge (connaissance) or type of rationality which, crossing the boundaries of the most varied sciences, manifests the sovereign unity of a subject, a spirit, or a period; it is the totality of relations that can be discovered, for a given period, between the sciences when one analyses them at the level of discursive regularities* (Foucault 1972, 191). Kot *episteme* razumemo... celoten niz odnosov, ki v določenem obdobju združujejo diskurzivne prakse, katere povzročajo epistemološke vzorce, veščine in morda določno oblikovane sisteme... *Episteme* ni oblika znanja (connaissance) ali vrsta razumnosti, ki bi, s prekoračitvijo meja najrazličnejših ved, dokazovala enotnost subjekta, duha ali dobe; je totaliteta odnosov, ki jih lahko odkrijemo v določenem obdobju med znanostmi, če jih analiziramo na ravni diskurzivnih zakonitosti. Slovenski prevod I.M.P.

heologije v Sloveniji (Kastelic 1964-1965). Na vprašanje, kako časovno omejiti arheološki zgodnji srednji vek, je odgovoril takole: *Konec Justinijanove vlade (565) in začetek saške dinastije (919) bi mogla biti s historičnega vidika pomembna mejna data.* Toda hkrati je opozoril na nejasnosti v *sinhronizaciji historičnih pojavov na zahodnem robu slovenskega sveta* in se odločil, da je zaradi številnih nekropol desetega stoletja to še *eminentno "arheološko"* ter bi bil zato primernejši zaključek dobe nastop salijske dinastije (1024). Upravičenost po vključitvi enajstega stoletja mu je poleg nekropol potrjevala še sočasna dominantnost bijelobrdske kulture v sosednji Panonski Hrvaški. Za zgodnj srednjeveško je tako prepoznava sam slovensko obdobje, a se takoj zavzel, da mora *časovna evidenca pojavov segati preko obeh mejnih datumov: "Justinijan 565" in "pacta conventa 1102" v epoho pozne antike in v visoki srednji vek* (prav tam, 110 s). Da njegovega razumevanja niso delili vsi domači arheologi, je mogoče razbrati že iz preimenovanja Arheološkega znanstvenega dokumentacijskega centra pri Narodnem muzeju v Center za zgodnj srednjeveške *in* (poud. I.M.P.) staroslovanske študije leta 1965 (prim. Stare 1993). Kako neenotno je bilo razumevanje zgodnjega srednjega veka, je očitno tudi iz delovnih nalog *dveh zveznih institucij izven republike*. Tako je Medakademijski odbor za proučevanje materialne kulture Jugoslavije pri Svetu akademij SFRJ dodelil zgodnj srednjeveški sekciji Slovenske akademije v Ljubljani posebno temo *Materialna kultura Slovanov*, drugi raziskovalni program zgodnjega srednjega veka pa Centru za balkanološka proučevanja v Sarajevu. V slednjem so se arheologi osredotočili na *Raziskovanje Ilirov v prazgodovinski dobi*, vendar so bili zaradi *kontinuitete ilirskega elementa v slovansko epoho ... izhodiščna baza za vprašanje etnogeneze jugoslovanskih narodov*. Tako so se poleg raziskovanja antike usmerili tudi v *študij fenomenov zgodnjega srednjega veka na Balkanu* in imeli v načrtu *kot osnovo teh študij tipološko karto slovanskih oziroma zgodnj srednjeveških kultur* (Kastelic 1964-1965, 119).

Deset let po Kastelčevi smeri razvoja zgodnj srednjeveške arheologije je izšla knjiga *Arheološka najdišča Slovenije*, urejena na Inštitutu za arheologijo SAZU. Poleg topografske karte in leksikona z nekaj manj kot 3200 arheološkimi najdišči od paleolitika do srednjega veka prinaša tudi sintezo Jaroslava Šašla o *kasnoantičnem in zgodnj srednjeveškem obdobju v Vzhodnih Alpah*. Že na začetku nas pisec opozori, da sta *obe obdobji heterogeni in predvsem dokaj ostro ločeni*, a tudi, *da se je arheološko proučevanje tega dokaj temne-*

ga obdobja začelo v tem stoletju in šele danes metodično dozoreva in le počasi pričanja dajati prve zrele sadove (Šašel 1975, 68). *Poznoantičnih najdb - to je najdb iz 5. in 6. stoletja - je na vzhodnoalpskem prostoru mnogo ... gotske ostaline so razmeroma redke ... nerazumljivo je, da so arheologi ... našli izredno malo za Langobarde karakterističnih izkopanin ... slovanski elementi stvarne kulture se pojavljajo šele od pričetkov 9. stoletja (morda že s konca 8.), so dokaj enotni, zanje se je uveljavil v stroki izraz ketlaška kultura ... bijelobrdska kultura, ki je opredeljena v 10. - 12. stoletje ...* (prav tam, 69-72), so drobci, ki nam ob izčrpnem zgodovinskem prikazu odkrivajo nejasno arheološko podobo.

Štiri leta po *Arheoloških najdiščih* je izšla *Zgodovina Slovencev*, obsežna sinteza več avtorjev, v kateri so bila *Arheološka obdobja v Sloveniji* zaupana Petru Petruju. O viharni polemiki (prim. Arh. vest. 30, 1979, 527-547 in Arh. vest. 31, 1981, 631-652), ki jo je sprožilo besedilo o arheologiji *od starejše kamene dobe do obdobja selitve ljudstev*, na tem mestu ne bom razpravljala, opozorila bi le, da sta pozni antiki in preseljevanju ljudstev namenjeni ločeni poglavji. Prvo (pozna antika) se ukvarja z obdobjem med 4. in 6. stoletjem (*od Dioklecijanove razdelitve rimskega imperija do naselitve Slovanov*), drugemu je namenjen *čas od pohoda Hunov v Evropo v dr(ugi) pol(ovici) 4. st(oletja) do slovanskih prišlekov, (ki) so postali politični gospodarji dežele po l(etu) 568* (*Zgodovina Slovencev* 1979, 80, 88, 91). Časovno se obdobji torej popolnoma prekrivata; v prvem je po zgodovin(ar)sko razumljenem dogajanju med 4. in 6. stoletjem poudarek na skici poznorimske obrambe današnjega slovenskega prostora, podprti z arheološkim gradivom, v drugem pa po kratki zgodovini germanskega preseljevanja teče delitev arheološke evidence na tisto, ki po Petrujevem mnenju ohranja *antično izročilo*, in ono, iz katere je mogoče ugotavljati *značilnosti preseljujočih se prišlekov* (prav tam, 80-93). O razumevanju "slovanskega" arheološkega zapisa besedilo ne spregovori. Beseda je s *prihodom Slovanov* prepuščena zgodovinarju Bogu Grafenauerju in *historiografskemu* razumevanju zgodnjega srednjega veka. Razdelitev na prihod Slovanov in naselitev, Samovo "državo" in "državo" karantanskih Slovencev, združitev Slovencev in življenje pod Franki do začetka 9. stoletja, konec samostojnosti slovenskih kneževin in uveljavljanje frankovskega fevdalnega reda je popolnoma zgodovin(ar)ska. V njej dobi arheologija samo vlogo ilustratorke (prav tam, 110-173; prim. tudi Nabergoj 1995, 81-83).

O objektivnosti in subjektivnosti zgodovinskih in arheoloških virov

V historični⁸ arheologiji je *tiranija zgodovinskega zapisa* (Champion 1990, 91) samoumevna še danes. Ugovori o tem, da arheologija ni nikakršna "dekla zgodovine" (Noël Hume 1964), so sicer pogosti in se vrstijo že od 19. stoletja, ko si je veda izborila znanstveno samostojnost (Levine 1986, 29), vendar se zdi, da ne redčijo pretirano vrst tistih arheologov, ki še delijo (zavedno ali nezavedno) prepričanje z Leslijem Alcockom o tem, kako da morajo *razumeti svojo odvisnost od zgodovinarjev* (Alcock 1983, 57). Ambicija po omejitvah disciplinarnega polja, prežeta s strahom, da arheologija ne bi (p)ostala le nekakšna pomožna pritiklina zgodovine, je bila živa tudi na Slovenskem (Korošec 1950, proti Grafenauer 1951, 1960). Konvencionalna meja, postavljena med vedama še zlasti po tem, ko je nova arheologija izrinila v pozabo kulturno-historično paradigmo, ni nikoli oslabila arheološkega *creda* "zgodovinskih obdobj" o historični dokumentaciji kot pričevalki *par excellence*. Njena dominantnost nad arheološkimi viri je bila dolgo obravnavana kot danost, o kateri se ne pomišlja, kaj šele razpravlja. Zavezanost dokumentarni zgodovini je še vedno tako močna, da velja tako rekoč za klasično ugotovitev Marka Leoneja in Parkerja Potterja, ki pravi, da sta ... *arheološki zapis in dokumentarni zapis obravnavana kot da sta povezana, odvisna drug od drugega* (Leone, Potter 1988, 12). Zato ni čudno, da se s pisnimi viri obdanih arheologov loteva "*kult avtoritete*" (McKee in sod. 1992, 161). Malikovanje pisnih virov se je na primer začelo rahljati v angleški historični arheologiji šele v zadnjem desetletju, ko so se pojavili glasovi o škodljivosti avtoritarne vloge zgodovino pisja, omogočene prav s podporo iz arheoloških vrst (Austin 1990; Austin, Thomas 1990; Champion 1990). Nasprotno pa se tudi danes le redki zgodovino pisji zavedajo tega, kar je Marc Bloch zapisal pred več kot pol stoletja: naj pri ... *zgodovinskem opazovanju* ... ne spregledajo ... *velikanske in skoraj celotne množice*

nezapisanih ... pričevanj, še zlasti arheoloških. In še: *Če najbolj znanim teoretikom naše (zgodovino pisne, op. I.M.P.) metode ne bi bilo tako presenetljivo in vzvišeno malo mar za arheološke prijeme ... nas zagotovo ne bi tako zlahka zavrgli v na veke nesamostojno opazovanje* (Bloch 1996, 76). Mnogi so tudi dandanes prepričani, da je arheologija lahko le pomožna veda zgodovine, arheološki podatki pa zanje igrajo vlogo *ilustratorjev, potrjevalcev in mašil* (Halsall 1997, 818 s; prim. tudi Renfrew 1979, 257, cit. v Moreland 1992, 113). Tako ni čudno, da je nekaterim *spontana pripomba v besedilu Plinija starejšega dragocenejša priča kot stotine strani arheoloških poročil* (Rowland 1992, 152). Da pa se arheološka lopata ne spremeni iz *instrumentum mutum* (za kar jo imajo zgodovinarji) v *instrumentum vocale* (Moreland 1992, 113, 126), smo krivi arheologi kar sami.

Kakor koli že, ob tako zakoreninjeni pokornosti pisnim virom se je historičnim arheologom pripetilo, da so začeli zelo pozno razmišljati o historiografom že dolgo sprejetem prepričanju o *subjektivnosti*⁹ pisnih virov. Ker pisni viri niso ne objektivni in tudi ne neideološki, jih ne moremo imeti za glasnike *absolutnih* resnic o družbeni preteklosti. Lahko so le nosilci delnih, fragmentarnih informacij o preteklosti, odvisnih ne le od stopnje njihove ohranjenosti, temveč tudi od družbenih vlog njihovih ustvarjalcev. Pogosto so tendenciozni in egalitarni, saj so jih ustvarjali pisci pod vplivom političnih in cerkvenih gospodarjev (Austin 1990; Champion 1990; Hedeager 1993; Yorke 1993). Še več - F. R. Ankersmit meni, da je prav presenetljivo, kako so pojem *subjektivno* v zgodovino pisju izključujoče povezali z etičnimi in političnimi vrednotami. Razlogov za *subjektivnost* je po njegovem mnenju več. Takole pravi: *Estetske preference, stilistične navade, pomanjkanje imaginacije ali simpatije do določene teme ali le gola nekompetenca lahko prav tako vplivajo na subjektivnost avtorjeve historiografije* (Ankersmit 1983, 235).

Nezaupljivost do pisnih virov je napeljala nekatere arheologe k mišljenju, da je mogoče najti objektivnost v arheoloških virih. V njihovo "neo-

⁸ Historična arheologija je tukaj razumljena v pomenu arheoloških zvrsti, ki se ukvarjajo s katero koli preteklo družbo, za katero so na voljo pisni viri. O različnih razumevanjih prim. Little 1992, 1 s; Orser, Fagan 1995, 4-22; Orser 1996, 26-28. Proti pojmovanju historične arheologije kot arheologije Novega sveta prim. Halsall 1997, 806, op. 4.

⁹ Zgodovinarji so se že v devetnajstem stoletju pogosto spraševali, ali je zgodovina lahko objektivna. Če je Leopold von Ranke še verjel, da lahko z dosledno rabo primarnih virov spoznamo preteklost *wie es eigentlich gewesen war* (kakršna je res bila), je že Marx trdil, da *takšne metode razkrivajo samo lupino, s čemer je mislil na meščanski pogled na družbo* (cit. v: Luthar 1997, 56). Mitu o objektivnosti historične predstavitve (kot bi rekel Luthar 1993b, 30) je resno spodkopaval temelje že nemški filozof Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911), ki je, kot pravi Luthar (1997, 56), *opozoril na to, da je zgodovinar neločljiv del lastnih preučevanj in kot tak neizogibno in usodno vpliva na oblikovanje svojega preučevanja*. Več o tem prim. Luthar 1993 b, 44-50. A tudi v zgodovino pisju je bilo za splošno razširjenost prepričanja o subjektivnosti potrebno še čakati.

bremenjenost" je tako na primer verjel Henry Glassie (Glassie 1972, 29; prim. kritiko v Wheeler Stone 1993, 69). S priseganjem na *objektivnost* arheološkega zapisa, a odločnim zavzemanjem za manjšo vlogo zgodovinopisja pri arheoloških interpretacijah in sumničavostjo do pisnih virov se srečamo pri Patricii Rubertone (1989, 32, 38 s). Njenemu pristopu je *lasten strah pred emskim*,¹⁰ kot imenujejo Mary C. Beaudry in njena sodelavca odmik od *subjektivnosti* (Beaudry in sod. 1991, 161), velja pa za prežitek pozitivizma. Da so arheološki viri manj obremenjeni, torej *objektivnejši* od pisnih, ki so lahko tudi namenoma izkrivljeni zaradi piščevih političnih, ekonomskih in morda celo osebnih prepričanj, meni tudi Kathleen Deagan (1991, 103-105). Vendar pa takšna, samo v pisne vire usmerjena izključujočnost, ki se izmika kritičnemu pristopu do subjektivnih predstavitev preteklosti (interesne, preferenčne, ideološke, politične...), ne rešuje ničesar. Arheologija in zgodovinopisje sta samo zamenjala vlogi; avro plemenitosti dobijo po tem prepričanju arheološki viri. Iz njih naj bi lahko črpali *objektivno preteklost*, "kakršna je res bila" (Moreland 1992, 144).¹¹

Drugačno reakcijo na klasično prevlado pisnih virov zasledimo v argumentiranju, da je potrebno obravnavati pisne in arheološke vire kot neodvisne in popolnoma ločene entitete (Carmack, Weeks 1981; Leone, Potter, Shackel 1987).¹² Arheologi jih sicer lahko komplementarno prepletajo pri analizah družbenih in ekonomskih procesov ali pa pri preučevanju skupinskih identitet in družbenih položajev. Zlasti pri slednjih velikokrat pletejo opisno mrežo s pisnimi viri in si z njimi skušajo pojasniti nejasnosti in celo nasprotja v arheoloških virih, le redko pa jih imajo za resnične dopolnjevalce (prim. Jones, v tisku). Tako Stanley South s trditvijo, da omogoča historična arheologija izjemen potencial kontroliranja ar-

heoloških spremenljivk v primerjavi s historično dokumentacijo (South 1988, 38 s), kot Mark Leone in Parker Potter (Leone, Potter 1988, 12-14) z obravnavo historičnih in arheoloških zapisov kot različnih, za medsebojno testiranje koristnih entitet, sicer zagovarjajo samostojnost obojih in ju analitsko in epistemološko ločujejo, zanemarjajo pa njihovo subjektivno naravo (Beaudry in sod. 1991, 178 s, op. 16). Zanje je arheološki zapis *objektivnejši* od historičnega, pristaše pa srečamo tudi še v devetdesetih letih (Dever 1993, 24, cit. v Finkelstein 1997, 223; Dever 1997, 307).

Da bi začeli historični arheologi razmišljati o *subjektivnosti*¹³ arheoloških virov, je bilo potrebno še počakati. V arheološko prakso prodira s počasnimi koraki šele v zadnjem času (Beaudry in sod. 1991; Hall 1994; Little 1992). Zgled subjektivnosti arheoloških in zgodovinskih virov je mogoče najti v analizi južnoafriške družbene konstrukcije Martina Halla. V svoji tekstni analizi obeh zvrsti virov pravi, oprt na poststrukturalistično semiotiko: *Z opazovanjem preteklosti kot vira kompleksnih tekstov, prepletenih v diskurz, se lahko izognemo privilegiranju pisnih dokumentov nad arheološkim zapisom ali artefaktnih skupkov nad potopisi, zapuščinskimi razpravami in slikami* (Hall 1994, 168). Še dlje gre Barbara Little, ko trdi, da je materialna kultura *strukturirana drugače kot tekst*. Verjetnost v podobnosti med njima pa vseeno izpostavi z *nejasnostjo njunih pomenov*. Tako v stvarnih virih, kakor v pisnih, pomen *ni ne fiksiran in ne univerzalen*. *Interpretacija je odvisna od družbenega konteksta in situacije, ne samo avtorja, ampak tudi bralca in poslušalca* (Little 1992, 218 s). Če se zavedamo subjektivnosti in nejasnosti obeh zvrsti virov in vanje usmerimo kritično analizo, lahko npr. v dokumentih družbene elite odkrijemo tudi doslej prezrte družbene skupine (Beaudry in sod. 1991; Hall 1994; prim. Jones, v tisku).

¹⁰ *Emsko* in *etsko* sta termina, ki ju je ameriška antropologija prevzela v šestdesetih in sedemdesetih letih iz slovnične teorije jezikoslovca Kennetha L. Pikea, znane pod imenom *tagmemika* [L. Pike, *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior* I (1954), II (1955) in III (1960)], razvite v želji po teoretskem pristopu, ki bi vključeval jezik in kulturo. *Emsko* in *etsko* (izpeljano iz fonemsko in fonetsko) označuje nasprotujoča si podatkovna nivoja ali analitski metodi. *Emski* model razlaga ideologijo ali obnašanje članov posamične kulture glede na njihovo lastno definiranje, *etski* pa je osnovan na določilih izven nje. Poglobljeno v: M. Ivič, *Pravci u lingvistici*, Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije (1983) 141-144; peta izdaja; A. Barnard, *Emic and Etic*, v: A. Barnard in J. Spencer (ur.), *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, London, New York: Routledge (1997) 180-183; prva izd. 1996.

¹¹ Moreland navaja tudi primera iz anglosaške arheologije (Arnold, Hodges), ko sta pisca presodila, da je bolje ignorirati zgodovinski zapis in konstruirati preteklost samo iz arheoloških podatkov (prav tam).

¹² Baruch Halpern govori celo o dveh različnih "kulturah" (prim. Halpern 1997, 313).

¹³ O subjektivnosti pisnih in arheoloških virov je Hans-Jürgen Eggers pisal že v petdesetih letih. Takole je mislil: *Zakaj zgodovinarji že od nekdaj vedo, da je vsak pisni vir pristranski! Toda večina sodobnih arheologov še vedno ... živi v trdnem prepričanju, da so njihova "tvarna pričevanja" resnični, "objektivni" (poud. I.M.P.) viri, ki jim je tuja vsakršna zavestna "pristranost". To pa nikakor ni res! Tudi arheološki viri lahko lažejo*. Povzeto po Klejn 1987, 98 s. Več o subjektivnosti in objektivnosti arheoloških virov prav tam, 98-101.

In slovenska arheologija?

Slovenska zgodnj srednjeveška arheologija se ni zavedala (in se tudi danes ne zaveda) *tiranije historičnega zapisa*. Ta ji (je) vseskozi strukturirala(l) interpretacije arheološke evidence. Dosledno verjame v objektivnost historiografskih izpeljav in sledi njihovim ugotovitvam o preseljevanju ljudstev (Enciklopedija 1995, 300 s; Slabe 1978), vključevanju ali izključevanju "romaniziranega starselskega prebivalstva" v slavizacijski proces (Ciglencečki 1992, 1994; Petru 1978, 1982), slavizacijo (Ciglencečki 1983; Knific 1983)... Zavezano se čuti poiskati "zgodovinska dejstva" v žganinskih plasteh naselbin (Petru 1979, 731; prim. Knific 1993, 525, 528), določati etničnost znotraj kulturno-historične paradigme (Ciglencečki 1993, 513 s; Enciklopedija 1995, 301; Jevremov in sod. 1993, 228 s)¹⁴ in se ne brani tudi "nasilnega" potiskanja arheoloških "dejstev" v historični okvir.

Arbitrarno postavljena časovna meja, ki zaradi nerazčlenjenih in nedosledno uporabljenih konceptov običajno razmejuje "antiko in zgodnji srednji vek" s preseljevanjem, postavlja tog okvir tudi razlagam kulturne oziroma etnične identitete. Prav etnična identiteta je, kljub ugovarjajočim glasovom iz tujine - resda okrepljenim šele v zadnjem času¹⁵ -, naslednje tradicionalno gibalo celo raziskovalnih strategij in ne le interpretacij. Etnične skupine oziroma plemena, ljudstva, včasih pa kar narodi, so v predstavah slovenskih arheologov zgodnjega srednjega veka še vedno monolitne skupine, ki jim meje določajo slogovne variacije. Tradicionalna kulturno-historična naracija, obremenjena z arheološkimi kategorijami, kot so "poznoantični", "starselski", "slovanski" ali "zgodnj srednjeveški", pogosto odločilnih ne le pri opisovanju, temveč celo pri razlagah tvornih zapi-

sov, je v slovenski zgodnj srednjeveški arheologiji prevladujoča. "Evolucijski determinizem" in vrednostno delovanje dihotomije civilizacijsko/barbarsko (ali vsaj "primitivno") se vrinja v klasifikacijo arheoloških artefaktov. Tako je npr. lokalna lončenina "grobega" videza pogosto pripisana "staroselcem" ali "Slovanom", "finejša" pa je dosledno rimska. Podobno se godi tudi arhitekturnim slogom. Datiranje arheološkega gradiva je največkrat pogojeno s predhodnimi idejami o kulturah ali ljudstvih, utemeljeno izključno s povezovanjem "historične" primerjave artefaktov (npr. "langobardska" lončenina in novci ali pa "slovanski" obsenčniki in historična kronologija) in relativne tipološke kronologije, medtem ko so velikokrat zanemarjene celo stratigrafske sekvence najdišč.

Prislovični skepticizem do teorije (in pogosto celo do metodologije) res ni razširjen samo pri nas. Historična arheologija tudi v anglosaksonskem svetu, znanem po živahnem teoretskem brbotanju, ubira prve krepkejšje korake in se izmika ukleščeniosti starih predstav, zgrajenih na dihotomijah naravoslovje/humanistika in antropologija/zgodovina, ki so jo dolgo ločevale od vročih teoretskih debat prazgodovinske arheologije. Čas je, da vstopimo vsaj v iniciacijsko fazo tudi pri nas.

Članek je boljši zaradi potrpežljivega branja in komentiranja Slavka Ciglenceškega, Tomaža Nabergoja, Andreja Pleterškega in Bibe Teržan. Takšen, kot je, ne bi mogel nastati brez prijaznosti Siân Jones in Samantha Jane Lucy, ki sta mi darovali še neobjavljeno razpravo in disertacijo, zaupanja Anthonyja F. Hardinga, s katerim so se mi odprla vrata univerzitetne knjižnice v Durhamu, ter naklonjenosti Johna Bintliffa, Margarite Díaz-Andreu in Anthonyja D. Smitha. Vsem iskrena hvala. Da je besedilo dobilo zeleno obliko, gre zahvala Mariji Reher za izbris jezikovnih nerodnosti.

ALCOCK, L. 1983, The archaeology of Celtic Britain, fifth to twelfth centuries A.D. - V: D. A. Hinton (ur.), *25 Years of Medieval Archaeology*, 48-66, Sheffield: University of Sheffield.
ANKERSMIT, F. R. 1983, *Narrative Logic. A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*. - The Hague: Martini Nijhoff.

AUSTIN, D. 1990, The "proper study" of medieval archaeology. - V: D. Austin in L. Alcock (ur.), *From the Baltic to the Black Sea. Studies in Medieval Archaeology*, 9-42, London: Unwin Hyman.

AUSTIN, D. in J. THOMAS 1990, The "proper study" of medieval archaeology: a case study. - V: D. Austin in L.

¹⁴ Izbrani primeri so naključni in namenoma vključujejo mlajše objave. Analiza *tiranije historičnega zapisa*, kakršno srečujemo v slovenski zgodnj srednjeveški arheologiji, je v pripravi.

¹⁵ O drugačnem pogledu na etničnost v arheologiji prim. Renfrew 1987; Shennan 1989a, 1989b, 1991; Olsen, Kobylinski 1991; Graves-Brown, Jones, Gamble 1996; Hall 1997, pogl. 2 in Jones 1997, pogl. 2,6,7; v zgodnj srednjeveškem zgodovino-pisu in arheologiji zlasti: Wenskus 1961; Geary 1983; Pohl, Wolfram 1990; Harrison 1991; Pohl 1991; Hines 1994; Christie 1995 in Heather 1996, 1997. Analiza etničnosti v slovenski zgodnj srednjeveški arheologiji je v pripravi.

- Alcock (ur.), *From the Baltic to the Black Sea. Studies in Medieval Archaeology*, 43-78, London: Unwin Hyman.
- AYLMER, G. 1997, Introductory survey: from the renaissance to the eighteenth century. - V: M. Bentley (ur.), *Companion to Historiography*, 249-279, London, New York: Routledge.
- BAPTY, I. 1990, Nietzsche, Derrida and Foucault: re-excavating the meaning of archaeology. - V: I. Bapty in T. Yates (ur.), *Archaeology after Structuralism*, 240-276, London: Routledge.
- BEAUDRY, M. C., L. J. COOK in S. A. MROZOWSKI 1991, Artifacts and active voices: material culture as social discourse. - V: R. H. McGuire in R. Paynter (ur.), *The Archaeology of Inequality*, 150-191, Oxford, Cambridge, Mass.: Basil Blackwell.
- BLOCH, M. 1996, *Apologija zgodovine in zgodovinarjev poklic: kritična izdaja Etienna Blocha*, (slovenski prevod G. Moder, spremna beseda J. Šumrada). - Ljubljana: ISH - Inštitut za humanistične vede.
- BROWN, P. 1993, *The Making of Late Antiquity*. - Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press; prva izdaja 1978.
- BURKE, P. 1992, *History and Social Theory*. - Oxford, Cambridge, Mass.: Basil Blackwell.
- CAMERON, A. 1993a, *The Later Roman Empire AD 284-430*. - London: Fontana Press.
- CAMERON, A. 1993b, *The Mediterranean World in Late Antiquity AD 395-600*. - London, New York: Routledge.
- CARMACK, R. in J. WEEKS 1981, The archaeology and ethnohistory of Uatlan: a conjunctive approach. - *American Antiquity* 46, 323-341.
- CHAMPION, T. C. 1990, Medieval archaeology and the tyranny of the historical record. - V: D. Austin in L. Alcock (ur.), *From the Baltic to the Black Sea. Studies in Medieval Archaeology*, 79-95, London: Unwin Hyman.
- CHRISTIE, N. J. 1995, *The Lombards*. - Oxford: Blackwell.
- CIGLENEČKI, S. 1983, Tinje nad Loko pri Žusmu in problem raziskovanja slovanskih naselbin v Sloveniji. - *Arh. vest.* 33, 1982, 179-188.
- CIGLENEČKI, S. 1992, *Pólis Norikón. Poznoantične višinske utrdbe med Celjem in Brežicami*. - Podsreda.
- CIGLENEČKI, S. 1993, Arheološki sledovi zatona antične Petovione. - V: *Ptuj. arh. zbor. ob 100-letnici muz. in Muz. dr.*, 505-520, Ptuj.
- CIGLENEČKI, S. 1994, Poznoantična naselbina Tonovcov grad pri Kobaridu. - *Kronika* 42/1, 1-14.
- COLLINS, R. 1983, *Early Medieval Spain: Unity in Diversity, 400-1000*. - Houndmills, London: Macmillan.
- COLLINS, R. 1991, *Early Medieval Europe 300-1000*. - Houndmills, London: Macmillan.
- ČERNECOV, A. V. 1996, Slavjano-russkaja arheologija v Rusii. Specifika sovremennoi situacii i nektorie perspektivi. - *Rossijskaja arheologija* 1996/3, 11-17.
- DÍAZ-ANDREU, M. 1996, Constructing identities through culture: the past in the forging of Europe. - V: P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones in C. Gamble (ur.), *Cultural Identity and Archaeology. The Construction of European Communities*, 48-61, London, New York: Routledge.
- DEAGAN, K. 1991, Historical archaeology's contributions to our understanding of early America. - V: L. Falk (ur.), *Historical Archaeology in Global Perspective*, 97-112, Washington, London: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- DEVER, W. G. 1997, Philology, theory, and archaeology: what kind of history of Israel do we want, and what is possible? - V: N. A. Silberman in D. Small (ur.), *The Archaeology of Israel. Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present*, Journal of the Study of the Old Testament, Suppl. Ser. 237, 290-310, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- DREYFUS, H. L. in P. RABINOW 1982, *Michel Foucault. Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. - New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Tokyo: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- ENCIKLOPEDIJA Slovenije 1987, gesli: Arheologija, 100-101, J.K. (Jože Kastelic) in Zgodnj srednjeveška arheologija, 104-105, T.Kc. (Timotej Knific), 1. zvezek (A-Ca). - Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- ENCIKLOPEDIJA Slovenije 1995, gesli: Poznoantično obdobje, 208-209, S.Ci. (Slavko Ciglenečki) in Preseljevanje ljudstev, 300-301, T.Kc. (Timotej Knific), 9. zvezek (Plo-Ps). - Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- FEHRING, G. P. 1991, *The Archaeology of Medieval Germany. An Introduction*, (prevod: R. Samson). - London, New York: Routledge.
- FINKELSTEIN, I. 1997, Pots and people revisited: ethnic boundaries in the Iron Age I. - V: N. A. Silberman in D. Small (ur.), *The Archaeology of Israel. Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present*, Journal of the Study of the Old Testament, Suppl. Ser. 237, 216-237, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- FOUCAULT, M. 1972, *The Archeology of Knowledge*, (prevod A.M. Sheridan Smith). - New York: Harper Colophon.
- FRANCOVICH, R. 1993, Some notes on medieval archaeology in Mediterranean Europe. - V: H. Andersson in J. Wienberg (ur.), *The Study of Medieval Archaeology. European Symposium for Teachers of Medieval Archaeology, Lund 11-15 June 1990*, Lund Studies in Medieval Archaeology 13, 49-62, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Int..
- GEARY, P. 1983, Ethnic identity as a situational construct in the early middle ages. - *Mitt. Anthr. Ges.* 113, 15-26.
- GLASSIE, H. 1972, Eighteenth-century cultural process in Delaware Valley folk building. - *Winterthur Portfolio* 7, 29-58.
- GOFFART, W. 1980, *Barbarians and Romans, AD 418-584. The Techniques of Accommodation*. - Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- GOFFART, W. 1989, The theme of "the barbarian invasions" in later antique and modern historiography. - V: W. Goffart, *Rome's Fall and After*, 111-132, London, Ronceverte: The Hambledon Press; ponatis; prva objava - V: E. Chrysos in A. Schwarz (ur.), *Das Reich und die Barbaren*, Veröff. Inst. Österr. Gesch. 29, 87-107.
- GOJDA, M. 1991, *The Ancient Slavs. Settlement and Society*. - Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- GRAFENAUER, B. 1951, O arheologiji in zgodovini. - *Zgod. čas.* 5, 163-174.
- GRAFENAUER, B. 1960, *Struktura in tehnika zgodovinske vede: uvod v študij zgodovine*. - Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.
- GRAVES-BROWN, P., S. JONES in C. GAMBLE (ur.) 1996, *Cultural Identity and Archaeology. The Construction of European Communities*. - London: Routledge.
- HALL, M. 1994, Lifting the veil of popular history: archaeology and politics in urban Cape Town. - V: G.C. Bond in A. Gilliam (ur.), *Social Construction of the Past. Representation as Power*, 167-184, London, New York: Routledge.
- HALL, J. M. 1997, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- HALPERN, B. 1997, Text and artefact: two monologues? - V: N.A. Silberman in D. Small (ur.), *The Archaeology of Israel. Constructing the Past, Interpreting the Present*, Journal of the Study of the Old Testament, Suppl. Ser. 237, 311-344, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- HALSALL, G. 1997, Archaeology and historiography. - V: M. Bentley (ur.), *Companion to Historiography*, 805-827, London, New York: Routledge.
- HARRISON, D. 1991, Dark age migrations and subjective ethnicity: the example of the Lombards. - *Scandia* 57, 19-36.

- HÄRKE, H. 1995, The Hun is a methodical "chap": reflections on the German tradition of pre- and proto-history. - V: P. J. Ucko (ur.), *Theory in Archaeology. A World Perspective*, 46-60, London, New York: Routledge.
- HEATHER, P. 1996, *The Goths*. - Oxford, Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- HEATHER, P. 1997, Late antiquity and the early medieval West. - V: M. Bentley (ur.), *Companion to Historiography*, 69-87, London, New York: Routledge.
- HEDEAGER, L. 1993, The creation of Germanic identity: A European origin myth. - V: P. Brun, S. van der Leeuw in C. R. Whittaker (ur.), *Frontières d'Empire. Nature et signification des frontières romaines. Actes de la Table Ronde Internationale de Nemours 1992*, Mémoires du Musée de Préhistoire d'Île-de-France No. 5, 121-131.
- HIDES, S. 1996, The genealogy of material culture and cultural identity. - V: P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones in C. Gamble (ur.), *Cultural Identity and Archaeology. The Construction of European Communities*, 25-47, London, New York: Routledge.
- HINES, J. 1994, The becoming of the English: identity, material culture and language in early Anglo-Saxon England. - *Anglo-Saxon Stud. in Archaeol. and Hist.* 7, 49-59.
- HODDER, I. (ur.) 1991, *Archaeological Theory in Europe. The Last Three Decades*. - London, New York: Routledge.
- HODDER, I., M. SHANKS, A. ALEXANDRI, V. BUCHLI, J. CARMAN, J. LAST in G. LUCAS (ur.) 1995, *Interpreting Archaeology. Finding Meaning in the Past*. - London, New York: Routledge.
- HODGES, R. 1989, *The Anglo-Saxon Achievement. Archaeology and the Beginnings of English Society*. - London: Duckworth.
- HODGES, R. 1991, *Early Medieval Archaeology in Western Europe. Its History and Development*. - Bangor: Headstart History.
- JAMES, E. 1991, *The Franks*. - London: Basil Blackwell; prva izdaja 1988; pbk. 1991.
- JAMES, E. 1992, *The Origins of France. From Clovis to the Capetians, 500 - 1000*. - Houndmills, London: Macmillan; prva izdaja 1982.
- JANKUHN, H. 1973, Umriss einer Archäologie des Mittelalters. - *Ztschr. Arch. Mittelalt.* 1, 9-19.
- JEVREMOV, B., M. TOMANIČ JEVREMOV in S. CIGLENEČKI 1993, Poznorimsko grobišče na Ptujskem gradu. - *Arh. vest.* 44, 223-233.
- JONES, S. 1996, Discourses of identity in the interpretation of the past. - V: P. Graves-Brown, S. Jones in C. Gamble (ur.), *Cultural Identity and Archaeology. The Construction of European Communities*, 62-80, London, New York: Routledge.
- JONES, S. 1997, *The Archaeology of Ethnicity. Constructing Identities in the Past and Present*. - London, New York: Routledge.
- JONES, S. (v tisku), Historical categories and the praxis of identity: the interpretation of ethnicity in historical archaeology. - V: P. Funari, M. Hall in S. Jones (ur.), *Back From the Edge. Archaeology in History*. - London: Routledge.
- KASTELIC, J. 1964-1965, Nekaj problemov zgodnjerednjeveške arheologije v Sloveniji. - *Arh. vest.* 15 -16, 109-124.
- KAZHDAN, A. in A. CUTLER 1982, Continuity and discontinuity in Byzantine history. - *Byzantion* 52, 429-478.
- KLEJN, L. S. 1987, *Arheološki viri*, (prevod. B. Djurić). - Ljubljana: ŠKUC, Filozofska fakulteta.
- KLINDT-JENSEN, O. 1975, *A History of Scandinavian Archaeology*. - London: Thames and Hudson.
- KNIFIC, T. 1983, *Bled v zgodnjem srednjem veku. Arheološko preučevanje naselitve v mikroregiji*. - Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta; neobjavljena disertacija.
- KNIFIC, T. 1993, Hunski sledovi v Sloveniji? - *Ptuj. arh. zbor. ob 100-letnici muz. in Muz. dr.*, 521-542, Ptuj.
- KOROŠEC, J. 1993, Arheologija in nekatere njene naloge. - *Zgod. čas.* 4, 5-22.
- LAMBERG-KARLOVSKY, C.C. 1989, *Archaeological Thought in America*. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LECIEJEWICZ, L. 1993, Medieval archaeology in Eastern Europe. - V: H. Andersson in J. Wieberg (ur.), *The Study of Medieval Archaeology. European Symposium for Teachers of Medieval Archaeology, Lund 11-15 June 1990*, Lund Studies in Medieval Archaeology 13, 75-83, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Int.
- LE GOFF, J. 1993, *Srednjovjekovni imaginarij: eseji*, (prevod M. Svetl). - Zagreb: Izdanja Antibarbarus.
- LEONE, M. P. in P. B. POTTER 1988, Introduction: issues in historical archaeology. - V: M.P. Leone in P. B. Potter (ur.), *The Recovery of Meaning. Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States*, 1-22, Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- LEONE, M.P., P.B. POTTER in P. SHACKEL 1987, Toward a critical archaeology. - *Current Anthropology* 28, 283-302.
- LEVINE, P. 1986, *The Amateur and the Professional. Antiquarians, Historians and Archaeologists in Victorian England*. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- LITTLE, B. J. 1992, Texts, images, material culture. - V: B. J. Little (ur.), *Text-Aided Archaeology*, 217-221, Boca Raton, Ann Arbor, London: CRC Press.
- LLEWELLYN, N. 1997, The history of western art history. - V: M. Bentley (ur.), *Companion to Historiography*, 828-848, London, New York: Routledge.
- LUCY, S. J. 1995, *The Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries of East Yorkshire*. - Cambridge: Newnham College, University of Cambridge; neobjavljena disertacija.
- LUTHAR, O. 1993a, Annales: prihodnost in preteklost, (sprema beseda). - V: P. Burke, *Revolucija v francoskem zgodovinarstvu: Anali 1929-89*, 148-162, (prevod B. Luthar). - Ljubljana: ŠKUC in Filozofska fakulteta.
- LUTHAR, O. 1993b, *Med kronologijo in fikcijo. Strategije historičnega mišljenja*. - Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče.
- LUTHAR, O. 1997, *Mojstri in muze. Kaj in zakaj je zgodovina?* - Ljubljana: Modrijan.
- MAKAROV, N. A. 1996, Drevnerusskaja arheologija: 10 let medu kievskim i novgorodskim kongressom. - *Rossijskaja arheologija* 1996/3, 18-29.
- MALINA, J. in Z. VAŠIČEK 1990, *Archaeology Yesterday and Today. The Development of Archaeology in the Sciences and Humanities*, (prevod M. Zvelebil). - Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- MCKEE, L., V. P. HOOD in S. MACPHERSON 1992, Re-interpreting the construction: history of the service area of the Hermitage mansion. - V: B. J. Little (ur.), *Text-Aided Archaeology*, 161-176, Boca Raton, Ann Arbor, London: CRC Press.
- MCKITTERICK, R. 1997, Edward Gibbon and the early middle ages in eighteenth-century Europe. - V: R. McKitterick in R. Quinault (ur.), *Edward Gibbon and Empire*, 162-189. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MILLER, D. in C. TILLEY (ur.) 1984, *Ideology, Power and Prehistory*. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MOMIGLIANO, A. 1989, *Razprave iz historiografije II*, (prevod S. Fišer). - Ljubljana: ŠKUC in Filozofska fakulteta.
- MORELAND, J. F. 1992, Restoring the dialectic: settlement patterns and documents in medieval central Italy. - V: A. B. Knapp (ur.), *Archaeology, Annales and Ethnohistory*, 112-129, Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.

- NABERGOJ, T. 1995, Arheologija in gotika. - V: M. Lozar Štamcar (ur.), *Gotika v Sloveniji - svet predmetov*, 7-119, Ljubljana: Narodni muzej.
- NOËL HUME, I. 1964, Archaeology: handmaiden to history - *The North Carolina Historical Review* 41/ 2, 215-225.
- OLSEN, B. in Z. KOBYLINSKI 1991, Ethnicity in anthropological and archaeological research: a Norwegian - Polish perspective. - *Arch. Polona* 29, 5-27.
- ORSER, C. E. Jr. in B. M. FAGAN 1995, *Historical Archaeology*. - New York: Harper Collins College Publishers.
- ORSER, C. E. Jr. 1996, *A Historical Archaeology of the Modern World*. - New York.
- PETRU, P. 1978, Kontinuiteta in diskontinuiteta naselitve v prehodnem obdobju iz kasne antike v zgodnji srednji vek. - *Zgod. čas.* 32/3, 221-232.
- PETRU, P. 1979, Stavba A (episkopij?) na Ajdovskem gradu nad Vranjem pri Sevnici. - *Arh. vest.* 30, 726-731.
- PETRU, P. 1982, Arheološki oris poznoantične poselitve Slovenije. - *Zgod. čas.* 36/4, 295-310.
- POHL, W. 1991, Conceptions of ethnicity in early medieval studies. - *Arch. Polona* 29, 39-49.
- POHL, W. in H. WOLFRAM (ur.) 1990, *Typen der Ethnogenese unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Bayern: Berichte des Symposiums der Kommission für Frühmittelalterforschung, 27. bis 30. Oktober, 1986*, Stift Zwettl, Niederösterreich. - Wien.
- PREUCCEL, R. W. (ur.) 1991, *Processual and Postprocessual Archaeology. Multiple Ways of Knowing the Past, Occasional Paper No. 10*. - Carbondale: Centre for Arch. Invest. Southern Illinois University.
- PREUCCEL, R. W. in I. HODDER 1996, Communicating present pasts. - V: R. W. Preucel in I. Hodder (ur.), *Contemporary Archaeology in Theory. A Reader*, 3-20, Oxford, Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- RANDBORG, K. 1991, *The First Millennium AD in Europe and the Mediterranean: An Archaeological Essay*. - Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- RENFREW, C. 1979, Systems collapse as social transformation: catastrophe and anastrophe in early state societies. - V: C. Renfrew in K.L. Cooke (ur.), *Transformations. Mathematical Approaches to Culture Change*, 481-506, New York, London: Academic Press.
- RENFREW, C. 1987, *Archaeology and Language. The Puzzle of the Indo-European Origins*. - London: Jonathan Cape.
- RENFREW, C. in P. BAHN 1991, *Archaeology. Theories, Methods and Practice*. - London: Thames and Hudson.
- ROBERTSON, J. 1997, Gibbon's Roman empire as a universal monarchy: the decline and fall and the imperial idea of early modern Europe. - V: R. McKitterick in R. Quinault (ur.), *Edward Gibbon and Empire*, 247-270, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ROESDAL, E. 1993, The archaeology of medieval artefacts. - V: H. Andersson in J. Wieberg (ur.), *The Study of Medieval Archaeology. European Symposium for Teachers of Medieval Archaeology, Lund 11-15 June 1990*, Lund Studies in Medieval Archaeology 13, 317-327, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Int..
- ROWLAND, R. J. Jr. 1992, Documental archaeology in Sardinia. - V: B. J. Little (ur.), *Text-Aided Archaeology*, 149-160, Boca Raton, Ann Arbor, London: CRC Press.
- RUBERTONE, P. E. 1989, Archaeology, colonialism and 17th-century native America: towards an alternative interpretation. - V: R. Layton (ur.), *Conflict in the Archaeology of Living Traditions*, 32-45, New York, London: Routledge.
- SHENNAN, S. J. (ur.) 1989a, *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*. - London: Unwin Hyman; ponatis Routledge, pbk. 1994.
- SHENNAN, S. J. 1989b, Introduction. - V: S. J. Shennan (ur.), *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*, 1-32, - London: Unwin Hyman.
- SHENNAN, S. J. 1991, Some current issues in the archaeological identification of past peoples. - *Arch. Polona* 29, 29-37.
- SLABE, M. 1978, Govorica arheoloških ostalin v času selitve ljudstev na Slovenskem. - *Arh. vest.* 29, 379-392.
- SMITH, J. M. H. 1997, Introduction: regarding medievalists: context and approaches. - V: M. Bentley (ur.), *Companion to Historiography*, 105-116, London, New York: Routledge.
- SOUTH, S. 1988, Santa Elena: threshold of conquest. - V: M. P. Leone in P. B. Potter, Jr. (ur.), *The Recovery of Meaning. Historical Archaeology in the Eastern United States*, 27-71, Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- STARE, V. 1993, Center za arheologijo srednjega veka Narodnega muzeja 1960-1987. - *Argo* 35, 27-33.
- ŠAŠEL, J. 1975, Kasnoantično in zgodnj srednjeveško obdobje v Vzhodnih Alpah in arheološke najdbe na Slovenskem. - V: *Arheološka najdišča Slovenije*, 68-73, Ljubljana: DZS.
- TAINTER, J. 1988, *The Collapse of Complex Societies*. - Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- THOMAS, J. 1993, Discourse, totalisation and žthe neolithics'. - V: C. Tilley (ur.), *Interpretative Archaeology*, 357-394, Providence, Oxford: Berg.
- TILLEY, C. 1990, Michel Foucault: towards an archaeology of archaeology. - V: C. Tilley (ur.), *Reading Material Culture. Structuralism, Hermeneutics and Post-Structuralism*, 281-317, Oxford, Cambridge, Mass.: Basil Blackwell.
- TRIGGER, B. G. 1989, *A History of Archaeological Thought*. - Cambridge, New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press.
- VALOR PIECHOTTA, M. 1993, Medieval archaeology in Spain: a short history. - V: H. Andersson in J. Wienberg (ur.), *The Study of Medieval Archaeology. European Symposium for Teachers of Medieval Archaeology, Lund 11-15 June 1990*, Lund Studies in Medieval Archaeology 13, 105-112, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Int..
- WELCH, M. 1992, *Anglo-Saxon England*. - London: B.T. Batsford Ltd..
- WENSKUS, R. 1961, *Stammesbildung und Verfassung. Das Werden der frühmittelalterlichen gentes*. - Köln, Graz: Böhlau Verlag.
- WHEELER STONE, G. 1993, Artifacts are not enough. - V: M.C. Beaudry (ur.), *Documentary Archaeology in the New World*, 68-77. - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- WHITTOW, M. 1996, *The Making of Orthodox Byzantium, 600-1025*. New Studies in Medieval History. - Houndmills, London: Macmillan.
- WILLEY, G. R. in SABLOFF, J. A. 1980, *A History of American Archaeology*. - San Francisco: W. A. Freeman.
- WILLEY, G. R. in SABLOFF, J. A. 1993, *A History of American Archaeology*. - San Francisco; druga izd.
- YOFFEE, N. in A. SHERRATT (ur.) 1993, *Archaeological Theory: Who Sets the Agenda?* - Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- YORKE, B. 1993, Facts or fiction? The written evidence for the fifth and sixth centuries AD. - *Anglo-Saxon Stud. in Hist. and Archaeology* 6, 45-50.
- ZGODOVINA Slovencev 1979. - Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.

Slovene Early Medieval Archaeology between the Past and Present - View from the West

Summary

If one reads a book claiming that lions are fierce and then encounters a fierce lion (I simplify, of course), the chances are that one will be encouraged to read more books by that same author, and believe them. But if, in addition, the lion book instructs one how to deal with a fierce lion, and the instructions work perfectly, then not only will the author be greatly believed, he will also be impelled to try his hand at other kinds of written performance. There is a rather complex dialectic of reinforcement by which the experiences of readers in reality are determined by what they have read, and this in turn influences writers to take up subjects defined in advance by readers' experiences. A book on how to handle a fierce lion might then cause a series of books to be produced on such subjects as the fierceness of lions, the origins of fierceness, and so forth. Similarly, as the focus of the text centers more narrowly on the subject - no longer lions but their fierceness - we might expect that the ways by which it is recommended that a lion's fierceness be handled will actually increase its fierceness, force it to be fierce since that is what it is, and that is what in essence we know or can only know about it.

Edward Said, *Orientalism*¹

The past is a foreign country whose features are shaped by today's predilections, its strangeness domesticated by our own preservation of its vestiges.

David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*²

Since the conceptual frame of Slovene early medieval archaeology was set (Kastelic 1964-1965) and a prestigious role of the "last archaeological period" granted it seems that the Slovene archaeology has not needed any self-reflection. The fact that it has shown no interest in the modern archaeological directions surprises me. Neither new methodological approaches that have become generally accepted nor theoretical questions have attracted it. It does not even deal with thematic problems and it does not question the suitability of research strategies. Is the reason that there is no epistemological scepticism on the horizon in the orthodox due to the persistence of the traditional³ archaeology conception? Is the over-engagement in the basic typological, chronological and "ethnic" studies to be blamed? Has the addiction with historiographical "facts" led it to a blind alley? Is the split time of "departing ideologies" that marked it to be blamed?

How to understand the archaeology of the Early Middle Ages?

There is no general consensus known about what the archaeology of the Early Middle Ages should be. Naming is the expression of culturally conditioned temporal and space division of the past (Austin 1990, 11), and it is often nationally coloured. It reflects the history of humanistic sciences, extension of social and political events and even personal circumstances and beliefs of the authors.

In the German archaeological practice the archaeology of the Early Middle Ages is the domain of *Frühgeschichte* (early history), since *Archäologie* (archaeology) is reserved only for classical archaeology (Härke 1995, 47). The *Völkerwanderungszeit* (the Migration period) and the *Merowingerzeit* (the Merovingian period) of the newly emerged "barbaric" social formations of Germanic communities are under its patronage. Its end - or better the transition to the *mittelalterliche Archäologie* (archaeology of the Middle Ages) is disputable. In the West European region the end of the early medieval archaeology runs out with the Merovingian or early Carolingian period. In the North the Ottonian period is included in it, and in the East it ends only with the 11th or 12th century (Jankuhn 1973, 9; Fehring 1991, 17-18). Due to the numerous Slavic sites the former East German archaeology was closely connected to the Slavic East and therefore research was differently directed from that of the West.

The comprehension at the extreme West European edge (in Spain) is the opposite. In the scope of the classical comprehension of the early medieval archaeology Paleochristian and the Visigothic period is chronologically limited to the period between 400 and 700 AD and *Al-Andalus* (the Islamic period) lasts from 700 to 1250 AD. Recently the archaeology of the Christian kingdoms (1250 till 1500) has joined them and all three periods form the medieval archaeology (Valor Piechotta 1993, 105, 381-382).

Like Spanish archaeology (with the Visigothic period) some other national archaeologies "hide" the Early Middle Ages under the ethnic labels and therefore Anglo-Saxon, Viking and (ancient) Slavic archaeologies could be encountered.

The British Anglo-Saxon archaeology is traditionally set to last from 400 to 1066 AD (Welch 1992, 9). Sometimes it is recognised as the *Dark Ages* and understood as *the sad period after civilisation* (Hodges 1989, 5). In the last decade it evades the mirror that has been "imputed" by the historiography. It

¹ E. W. Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1995, pp. 93-94; 1st ed. 1978.

² D. Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993, p. xvii; 1st ed. 1985.

³ The term traditional archaeology denotes the culture-history and descriptive approach to the material past. It was accepted till the 60's (and it is still prevailing in some places even nowadays) when it came a vivid "theoretical movement" whose fruits in the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian countries are processual (new) and as a reaction to it post-processual archaeologies. General definitions could be found in Willey, Sabloff 1980, 1993; Lamberg-Karlovsky 1989; Trigger 1989; Renfrew, Bahn 1991; Preucel, Hodder 1996, 3-20; Halsall 1997, 805-827. The debate between the adherents of processual and post-processual archaeologies is most evident in *Norwegian Archaeological Review* 22, 1989; Preucel 1991; Yoffee, Sherratt 1993, and highlighted in Hodder et al. 1995. Theoretical happenings in various national archaeologies could be mainly read in Hodder 1991.

gives up the role of a pathfinder, imprinted in the interpretations of the past. The "anti-ethnic" understanding of the Early Middle Ages shows for example, in a well organised booklet by Richard Hodges, a wish for paradigmatic change, with a departure from ... (p)icture books about the Vikings, or studies of the Migration period, treating the data as explicit ethnic traits giving flesh to the ethno-historical skeleton (Hodges 1991, 10). A critical analysis of four hundred years of Anglo-Saxon studies and two hundred years of Anglo-Saxon archaeology by Samantha Jane Lucy (1995), has proved it is time to denounce the ethnic stereotypes in the early medieval archaeology. Siân Jones (1996, 1997) has persuasively indicated a new way with an in-depth analysis of ethnic concepts in humanistic sciences and proposals for a different conceptualisation.

For the Scandinavians the archaeology of the Early Middle Ages has been the Viking Age since Engelhardt and Worsaae (Klindt-Jensen 1975, 73). It lasted from 750 till 1050 AD (Roesdahl 1993, 319) and due to the lack of written sources (with the exception of runic inscriptions) it is dealt with as part of the prehistoric archaeology.

The next archaeology with the ethnic label is the (ancient) Slavic one, lasting from the 6th till 11th century (Gojda 1988, 1); and for Russia, till the Mongol Invasions in the mid 13th century (Leciejewicz 1993, 78). In all former socialist countries it experiences radical changes after the lifting of the iron curtain. Beside the traditionally understood Slavic archaeology, dealing with the ethnogenesis of the Slavs, and their expansion, Russia has also the archaeology of the Christian antiquities. Years ago this archaeology was officially an unrecognised sub-discipline dedicated to the research of *national Orthodox* remains (Ěernecov 1996, 15). Under the Slavic denotation there is also the medieval Russian archaeology, responsible for the archaeological record of the medieval Rus from the 9th till 13th century, as well as the later dependent principalities (under Mongolian occupation from the mid 13th century) and the Muscovite period (Makarov 1996, 21-22).

Periodisation is common to all archaeologies for which Julia M.H. Smith justifiably claims that it is the *bane of scholarship and the friend of administrative or bibliographical convenience*. Such categorisation of archaeologies has been made because of the historiographical understanding of the Middle Ages as the post-Roman period, and also causes problems to historians. Is it possible to speak of the Early Middle Ages in Ireland prior to the 11th or 12th century, if we know that Irish historians are generally willing to accept Middle Ages that began with the Anglo-Norman conquest in 1169? And when is the early medieval Scandinavia (Smith 1997, 105-106)? Don't the Early Middle Ages of the East Slavic communities end with the 13th century, because of the German, French and British comprehension that it only then gets some characteristics of the medieval Western Europe?

And historiography?

The time will arrive, when this age may also be denominated, dark: and who knows, but they may say we were credulous?

Joseph Berington,
*History of the Lives of Abeillard and Eloisa*⁴

Chronologically the Middle Ages, such as assumed by archaeology, was marked by Francesco Petrarca (1304 - 1373), when the centuries between the 5th and 14th were indicated as "dark". As *medium aevum* (the Middle Age)⁵ they were separated from the antique period and his time (Aylmer 1997, 250-251; Smith 1997, 105). In 1469, the Pope's librarian, Giovanni Andrea consolidated it, and in the 16th and 17th centuries Georg Horn, Christoph Cellarius (Keller) and Charles du Fresne Du Cange took care of its institutionalisation. The division of the human history into three parts - into the ancient, medieval and new periods, marks the beginning of *the iron chains of periodisation*, as Krzysztof Pomian would say. In 1666 Georg Horn limited *medium aevum* between 300 and 1500, but Keller already considered the foundation of Constantinople (330 AD) a more suitable beginning and the Turkish conquest of the town already mentioned its end (1453 AD). Later on, most historians decided upon the beginning with the year 476, when Romulus Augustulus sent his imperial symbols to the East and marked the beginning of the fall of the West Roman Empire. Experts were more particular about the end of the period. They chose between the Turkish destruction of Byzantium, Columbus's discovery of the New World (1492), and the Italian wars (1494). The Middle Ages, born from the glowing idea about progress, from the end of the 13th century, opposition to the "old" times, and consolidation of "modernity" (Renaissance), became a *sort of dark tunnel between two splendid periods, whose brilliance was reflected in science, art and literature* (Le Goff 1993, 13, 27). Because it was squeezed between the idealised image of Antiquity and Renaissance it gained a derogatory meaning along with the Ghiberti's division of art into the Golden Age of Antiquity and the barbaric Middle Ages, before 1450 (Malina, Vašíček 1990, 19; Llewellyn 1997, 834). The enlighteners of the 18th century only intensified it. The descriptions of Montesquieu (1689 - 1755) in *Considérations sur les causes de la grandeur des Romains et de leur décadence* (first published in 1734) and the descriptions by Gibbon (1737 - 1794) in *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, intended for the last centuries of the Roman empire have helped, so that *they have become primitive, attractive as black art, but a really barbaric object of the distorted pleasure by returning to the roots* (Le Goff 1993, 28). Political and economic history by Edward Gibbon *Decline and Fall* (first issued in six volumes between

⁴ J. Berington, *The History of the Lives of Abeillard and Eloisa*, Basel, 1793, Vol. 1, li; quoted in *The Past is a Foreign ...* by D. Lowenthal, p. 236, note 303 and p. 417.

⁵ cf. F. Cantor, *Inventing the Middle Ages: The Lives, Works, and Ideas of the Great Medievalists of the Twentieth Century*, Cambridge: The Lutterworth Press, 1992, p. 17. Cantor wrote: *In France, Germany, and Italy (and in Slovenia too; note by I.M.P.) they still call it the Middle Age. In English-speaking countries since about 1840 it is generally referred to in the plural - the Middle Ages - signifying the several distinct suberas during one very long epoch.*

1776 and 1788), based on ideas of the Scottish enlighteners (moralist Adam Ferguson and "Father" of the economy Adam Smith), in the chapters on Huns and other "barbaric" peoples, found a solution for the inexplicable fall of "civilisation" (Burke 1992, 4-5). In spite of that Gibbon's narration points out, that *the decline was not synonymous with fall* for him (Robertson 1997, 265) his work contributed, as Arnaldo Momigliano says, to the beginning of obsession. The fall of the Roman Empire *has gained value of an arche-type for each dissolution. And thereby a symbol of our fears* (Momigliano 1989, 217).⁶ And with it, the continuous *Dark Age myth* has become possible (Renfrew 1979, 484). A narrowed perspective has become persuasive, because Gibbon and later on the Russian historian Rostovtzeff observed the late Roman and the previous so-called Age of the Antonines as contrasting ones. In the former they observed the irrepressible fall, and in the latter a Golden Age. Gibbon observed the moral and intellectual fall, and the blame was ascribed to the life style that was not in accordance with the Christian dictate. Rostovtzeff meant brutal totalitarianism was the cause of the fall, since it was conditioned by the unscrupulous exploitation of the slaves. His view, based on Marx causality of historical changes due to tensions in economic and social structures is recognisable in a more sophisticated form in the works of modern historians and archaeologists (Cameron 1993b, 8; Collins 1991, 92-93). A modern version of the decline and fall is mentioned in the Catastrophe Theory that seeks an explanation for the transition from the antique society, to the early medieval "barbaric" kingdoms, with a model of systems collapse (Renfrew 1979, 482-485; Tainter 1988, 4-5, 11). Persistent studying of the Dark Ages has contributed to the fact that the term slowly disappears under the neutral name of the Late Antiquity: *period of change, boiling and creation* (Le Goff 1993, 14). For the last thirty years the historians have used the term Late Antiquity (*antiquité tardive et chrétienne*) to bridge the traditional divide between the end of ancient history (with a Dominate), and two subsections of medieval history: the Migration period (the invasions of "Barbarians" in the late fourth- and fifth-century on the territory of the Roman Empire) and the Dark Ages (the period between these invasions and the rule of Charlemagne). It also expanded to the Byzantine studies (Heather 1997, 69). In spite of that Late Antiquity enforced as a historical period with its own identity (Smith 1997, 107) there is no known general consensus about the use of the term. For example, Edward James reproaches the limitations of those historians, who still cling to the discourse about the Dark Ages, because they disregard the *convention* (stressed by I.M.P.) of the continental historians regarding the Middle Ages, between the fall of the Roman Empire and the Renaissance viz. Reformation. When they exclude the Dark Ages from this time, suiting the subconscious idea of something that could be considered the "medieval" way of life, they agree with two incompatible ideas. The first one is that darkness from the viewpoint of knowledge⁷ could not be discussed, because Gaul and Britain are far better known to us between the 6th and 9th centuries than during the Roman period. The other unreasonable matter is the apotheosis of the Lot's type about the 10th century as a sterile period about which it could be said that it would have been better if it had not existed. It maintains the power only because of the idealisation of the Antiquity as something good and as a simplified viewpoint that early

medieval people were *primitive, aggressive and superstitious* (James 1992, 5-6).

Not only due to the Dark Ages but also other reasons the terminological mess is complete. We are wandering in a real jungle of the Late Antiquity (or Late Roman Empire, see Brown 1993, 1; Cameron 1993a, 1), the Byzantine period (Whittow 1996, 96-98), the migrations of peoples (Goffart 1989, 111-132)... The terms overlap in meaning and time, they are often regionally coloured and their original conceptual basis with later deposits are blurred beyond recognition. Only a glance at the coincidentally chosen literature tells us more about their authors than about the terms. The researchers of the antiquity are comfortable when speaking about the 4th and 5th centuries as the late antique period, but they have trouble when they decide to give a date to the migrating peoples (Goffart 1980, 3-39). The medievalists like writing necrologies about Antiquity with the first "Barbarians" within the Roman Empire, although the majority decide on the Early Middle Ages, with the newly emerged "barbaric" kingdoms (Cameron 1993b, 43; McKitterick 1997, 162). Byzantinists are in a dilemma when determining the boundaries of their research: should the beginning be marked by the foundation of Constantinople? Justinian rule? The 7th century (Kazhdan, Cutler 1982, 429-478)? With a coincidental sample I cannot generalise or even speak about the "typicality" because I am well aware that these are isolated definitions torn from their contexts. I would only like to point out that the (Early) Middle Ages is a variable in historiography and that linear acceptance in archaeology is harmful.

And what is a coincidental sample of design presentation about the Late Antiquity and/or (Early) Middle Ages?

In his books about the *Franks* Edward James decides upon the generally accepted historical definition of the Late Antiquity between the 5th and 7th century (James 1991, 10). In the book *The Later Roman Empire (AD 284 - 430)* the author Averil Cameron defines Late Antiquity as a period between the end of the 4th century and the Arabic conquest in the 7th century (Cameron 1993a, 1). In his second book *Mediterranean World in the Late Antiquity (AD 395 - 600)* he defines the Early Middle Ages in connection with the establishment of the "barbarian" kingdoms, but remains faithful to Antiquity in the Mediterranean also at the end of the 6th century, where he leans on the archaeological provable continuity (Cameron 1993b, 43). Randsborg's archaeological essay *The First Millennium AD in Europe and the Mediterranean* lasts from 200 till 400, during the late Roman and late Empire period. The events between 400 and 600 are left to the Late Antiquity and the beginnings of the Germanic successor "states" (Randsborg 1991, 8) and so the antique historians and medievalists are robbed of the difference between the Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages.

On the contrary, Roger Collins emphasises already with the titles of his books *Early Medieval Spain: University in Diversity (400 - 1000)* and *Early Medieval Europe (300 - 1000)* that he will defend the Middle Ages (Collins 1983, 1991). In spite of the definitions Cameron also invites us to *greater geographical and chronological broadness* (Cameron 1993b, 8), when he thinks about the omission of the late antique and early medieval periodisation bonds. Jacques Le Goff, the eternal

⁶ A. Momigliano, *La caduta senza rumore di un Imperio nel 476 D.C.*, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* ...1973, pp. 397-418; reprinted in *Sesto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, Roma, 1980. The translation into English was made from the Slovene translation.

⁷ The original meaning of the *Dark Ages* appeared because of ignorance or poor knowledge of the period that emerged due to the lack of written sources.

and unstoppable fighter for different Middle Ages, goes even further when he leads us, in his *Medieval Imaginary*, to the Middle Ages from the 3rd till the 19th century. Used to the conventions and deeply rooted differentiation, he gradually alleviates the shock. According to him, Late Antiquity lasts from the 3rd till the 10th century, but at the same time he leaves us the choice of the early medieval 8th, 9th and 10th centuries. Because of this indulgence he cannot satisfy himself with what he said previously when he later places the Early Middle Ages between the 5th and 11th century. When enforcing the West European Christianity he stops in the transition period of the 4th century, named Late Antiquity (*Spätantike*) or Early Middle Ages (*Frühmittelalter*) - (Le Goff 1993, 16, 37, 261). And adds: ... *the Early Middle Ages from the 4th till the 9th century, and simultaneously the Late Antiquity and the beginning of the feudal system, the Central Middle Ages from the 10th till 14th century, the time of the great rising where the Middle Ages in their real meaning are to be condensed, we want to keep the narrow definition, the High Middle Ages or time of crises covering the period between the 14th and 16th century.* And where is the cause of the Le Goff's decision for the long-lasting Middle Ages? In fact such Middle Ages "corrode" the contrast between the equally distorted pictures of the narrow Middle Ages: black pictures that are made equal to the dark period and the gilt pictures showing it as an idealistic period of religious faith... (ibid. 31).⁸

Is the "prolongation" of the Middle Ages coincidental? No. It started in the *Annales* circle. First in historiography, then also in archaeology. *La nouvelle histoire* with a new paradigm, whose studying is based on the question, how the system functions, or how the whole collectivity functions through masses of temporal, spatial, human, social, cultural and eventful dimensions (Luthar 1993a, 148), felt the need for the elimination of traditional periodisation, that divided Antiquity and the Middle Ages for the increasing interest in the questions of settlement development (Francovich 1993, 51).

The concepts of "the Late Antiquity" and "the Early Middle Ages" have changed, but some archaeologists (and historians) has not been aware of this. They are not considered static ideas of the past (or present). A quick glance at their changeable chronological limitation reveals that the genealogy and archaeology⁹ of both concepts should be done. Recently Shaun Hides has stressed in the *Genealogy of material culture and cultural identity* that the concepts and modes of analysis through which we interpret the past are not neutral, abstract tools, they are cultural products (Hides 1996, 42). Beside Shaun Hides the concept of archaeological culture has been proved by Margarita Díaz-Andreu in her article *Constructing identities through culture* and by Siân Jones in the *Discourses of identity in the interpretations of the past* (Díaz-Andreu 1996; Jones 1996). Already before that Julian Thomas (1993) studied the concept of "the Neolithic" with the Foucault's interpretative analytics (Dreyfus, Rabinow 1982, xxii), when he responded to the challenge of Christopher Tilley, about

the introduction to *Archaeology of Archaeology* (Thomas 1993, 357) and his call ... *to rewrite archaeology's history* (Tilley 1990, 292). He found out that the history of the concept ... *has not been one of gradual refinement* (as it was enforced in the practice of historiography of archaeology, note by I.M.P.), *but one of dispersal, misunderstanding, and of the failure of words to communicate meanings adequately* (Thomas 1993, 358). In the 150-year use of the concept of "the Early Middle Ages" in archaeology - if the starting point is the work of Thomas Batman and Hjalmar Stolpe (Hodges 1991, 1 s) and 500-year use in historiography, an analysis is needed for better understanding, in accordance with the Foucault's *epistemes*¹⁰ (Foucault 1972). And an analysis of the concept of "the Late Antiquity" is needed as well.

And how are the Early Middle Ages understood in Slovene archaeology?

In the *Encyclopedia of Slovenia* the entry *archaeology* as the discipline is divided into three *methodological units*: pre-historic, Roman - provincial and early medieval archaeology. Roman-provincial archaeology is chronologically limited by the Augustus's conquest of the Slovene region in the second half of 1st century BC and the 6th century AD, and the early medieval (ancient Slavic, separately) by the 6th and 11th century AD (Encyclopedia 1987, 100). In the section devoted to the early medieval archaeology the announced "clean cut" is exaggerated, because the *duality of the early medieval material* is stressed and the archaeological finds are classified as the *cultural and temporal frame of the Migration period ... and ... the ancient Slavic period* (ibid. 104). Migration period gets its own entry, where it is explained as the *period of invasion of barbaric peoples, through the fortified borders of the Roman, Persian and Chinese Empires and the foundation of numerous kingdoms in the conquered countries* (Encyclopedia 1995, 300). From the viewpoint of historiography, it is interpreted traditionally: with the beginning of Hunnic invasions concentrates on Germanic peoples and concludes with the Slavic settlements. The finding that ... *in the modern age the early medieval archaeology has paid special attention to the distinction of sites in transition from Late Antiquity to the Migration period* (Encyclopedia 1987, 105) embarrasses us. This becomes even worse when we try to find an answer in the entry devoted to the Late Antiquity. This period is defined as the *period from the rule of the emperor Diocletian (284-300) and Constantine the Great (324 - 337) until the decline of the Late Antiquity in the Slovene region about the year 600.* Understanding the Late Antiquity, as a period that enforced in history, along with the Greek and Roman periods, as an independent part of antiquity, and the viewpoint that it concludes with the arrival of the Slavs, which coincides with the change of settlement patterns and distinctly shows in the dug material culture, could be ascribed to the fact that migration of peoples "moved" from

⁸ J. Le Goff, *L'imaginaire médiéval: essais*, Paris: Gallimard, 1985. Since the source was not available at the time of writing the article the translation into English was made on the basis of the Croatian translation.

⁹ The Nietzsche's and Foucault's projects of genealogy demand revealing of differences, interruptions and versatility of that which was considered unified and uninterrupted (cf. Hodder et al. 1995, pp. 9, 237). Nietzsche's influence on archaeology cf. Bapty 1990; Foucault's influence cf. Miller, Tilley 1984; Tilley 1990. Genealogy deals with the emergence of concepts (terms) in historical frame, archaeology spreads it by studying the rules of various discourse designs, developed in a separate historical period (Tilley 1990).

¹⁰ Foucault defines *episteme* as: *By episteme, we mean ... the total set of relations that unite, at a given period, the discursive practices that give rise to epistemological figures, sciences, and possibly formalised systems. ... The episteme is not a form of knowledge (connaissance) or type of rationality which, crossing the boundaries of the most varied sciences, manifests the sovereign unity of a subject, a spirit, or a period; it is the totality of relations that can be discovered, for a given period, between the sciences when one analyses them at the level of discursive regularities* (Foucault 1972, p. 191).

the early medieval domain in the Late Antiquity with the conclusion that *Late Antiquity as a period that is mostly used for the territory of the former West Roman Empire with the early Christian period and the Migration period* (Encyclopedia 1995, 208-209).

The Slovene early medieval archaeology got its conceptual frame more than thirty years ago. The then director of the National Museum in Ljubljana - Jože Kastelic made it. The beginning and the end of the period was chronologically determined with respect to problems shown in the paper entitled: *Some problems of the early medieval archaeology in Slovenia* (Kastelic 1964-1965). He answered the question about the limitation of the archaeological early Middle Ages as follows: *the end of the Justinian's rule (565) and beginning of the Saxon dynasty (919) could be important boundaries from the historical viewpoint*. But at the same time he pointed out *the obscurity in the synchronisation of historical events at the Western edge of the Slovene region* and decided that due to numerous cemeteries of the 10th century this was *eminently "archaeological"* and therefore the beginning of the Salian dynasty (1024) would be a more appropriate end of the period. Justification of the inclusion of 11th century was confirmed also by the simultaneous culture of Bijelo Brdo in the neighbouring Croatian Pannonia. He meant that the early medieval period was only the Slavic period, but immediately claimed that *the chronological records of events should reach beyond the boundaries of "Justinian 565" and "pacta conventa 1102"* in the epoch of Late Antiquity and in the High Middle Ages (ibid. 110-111). The fact that all Slovene archaeologists did not agree with him is evident from the change of the name of the institution in 1965 - the Archaeological Scientific Documentation Centre in the National Museum was renamed the Centre for early medieval and (stressed by I.M.P.) ancient Slavic studies (cf. Stare 1993). How dissolute was the understanding of the Early Middle Ages is evident also from the working tasks of *both federal institutions outside the republic*. The inter-academic board for the research of material culture of Yugoslavia within the Council of Academies of the Socialist Federal Republic Yugoslavia assigned the early medieval section of the Slovene Academy in Ljubljana a special topic *Material culture of the Slavs*. The second research programme of the Early Middle Ages was assigned to the Centre for Balkan research in Sarajevo. In the Centre the archaeologists concentrated on the *Research of Illyrians in the prehistoric period*, but due to the continuity of the Illyrian element in the Slavic epoch ... *they were the starting point for the question of ethnogenesis of the Yugoslav nations*. Besides the research of Antiquity, they were also devoted to the study of phenomena of the Early Middle Ages in the Balkans, and as a basis of these studies, *planned a typological map of the Slavic or early medieval cultures* (Kastelic 1964-1965, 119).

Ten years after the direction of the early medieval archaeology developed by Kastelic, a book *Archaeological Sites in Slovenia*, issued by the Institute for Archaeology at Slovene Academy of Science and Art was published. Beside the typological map and lexicon with slightly less than 3200 archaeological sites from Palaeolithic to the Middle Ages, it also brings a synthesis about *the late antique and early medieval period in the Eastern Alps* by Jaroslav Šašel. At the beginning, the author points out that *both periods are heterogeneous, and above all, quite exactly divided, and that archaeological research of this rather dark period started in this century*. *Only today it ripens methodically and very slowly gives the first ripe fruits* (Šašel 1975, 68). *The late antique finds - finds*

from the 5th and 6th century - are numerous in the East Alpine region ... Gothic remains are rather rare ... it is beyond comprehension that archaeologists... found very few excavations characteristic of Lombards ... Slavic elements of material culture start appearing only from the beginning of the 9th century (perhaps already at the end of the 8th century) and are rather unified. The profession describes them as Kótlach culture ... culture of Bijelo Brdo that lasted from 10th till 12th century ... (ibid. 69-72) are fragments that reveal the unclear archaeological image during an in-depth historical presentation.

Four years after the book *Archaeological Sites the History of Slovenes* was published, as a extensive synthesis of several authors where Peter Petru was entrusted with the *Archaeological Periods in Slovenia*. I won't discuss the text about archaeology from the *Old Stone Age to the Migration period* that caused a fierce polemic here (cf. *Arheološki vestnik* 30, 1979, 527-547 and *Arheološki vestnik* 31, 1981, 631-652). I would only like to point out that Late Antiquity and the Migration period are separate chapters. The Late Antiquity deals with the period between 4th and 6th centuries (*from Diocletian division of the Roman Empire to the settlement of the Slavs*), and the period from the *Hunnish marches to Europe in the second half of 4th century till the Slavic newcomers, who became political masters of the country after the year 568* (History of Slovenes - Zgodovina Slovencev 1979, 80, 88, 91) is devoted to the Migration period. Chronologically the periods overlap completely; according to historically understood events the first period between the 4th and 6th century stresses the late Roman defence of the present Slovene region supported by the archaeological material. The second period deals after the short history of Germanic migration with the division of the archaeological records into matters that preserve *the antique tradition* (according to Petru) and matters from which *the characteristics of the migrating newcomers* (ibid. 80-93) could be established. The text does not deal with the understanding of the "Slavic" archaeological record. With the *arrival of the Slavs* the word is left to the historian Bogo Grafenauer and the *historiographic understanding* of the Early Middle Ages. The division into the arrival of Slavs and their settlement, Samo's "state" and the "state" of Carinthian Slovenes, joining Slovenes and their life under the Franks until the beginning of 9th century, ends the independence of Slovene principalities and the enforcement of the Frank feudal system is purely histori(ographi)cal. In the text archaeology plays only the role of an illustrator (ibid. 110-173; cf. Nabergoj 1995, 81-83).

On objectivity and subjectivity of the historical and archaeological sources

In historical¹¹ archaeology the "tyranny of the historical record" (Champion 1990, 91) is taken for granted, even nowadays. Objections to the fact that archaeology is not a "handmaiden to history" (Noël Hume 1964) are quite frequent and have lasted from the 19th century on, since when the discipline has fought for its scientific independence (Levine 1986, 29). But it seems that some circles of archaeologists still have (consciously or unconsciously) shared in the belief of Leslie Alcock of how the dependence on historians is to be understood (Alcock 1983, 57), have not decreased in number. The ambition for the limitation of the disciplinary field, soaked with fear that archaeology would become only an auxiliary accessory of history, was also alive in Slovenia (Korošec 1950,

¹¹ Here, "historical archaeology" has the meaning of archaeological kinds that deal with any society of the past for which written records are available. About different comprehension cf. Little 1992, 1-2; Orser, Fagan 1995, 4-22; Orser 1996, 26-28. Against comprehension of "historical archaeology" as archaeology of the New World cf. Halsall 1997, 806, note 4.

contra Grafenauer 1951, 1960). The conventional boundary set between the sciences, when the new archaeology has pushed the culture-history paradigm into oblivion, has never weakened the archaeological *credo* of "historical periods" about the historical documentation as a witness *par excellence*. Its dominance over archaeological sources has been a fact, which is neither thought about nor discussed. The obligation to the documentary history is still so strong that it is valid as a classical finding of Mark Leone and Parker Potter who say ... *the archaeological record and documentary record are treated as if they are linked, with one a dependent version of the other* (Leone, Potter 1988, 12). It is no wonder that archaeologists surrounded with written sources are overwhelmed by the "cult of authority" (McKee et al. 1992, 161). For example, the idolatry of written sources started to loosen in the English historical archaeology only in the last decade when the voices harmful to the impact of the authoritarian role of historiography were raised facilitated by the support of the archaeological circles (Austin 1990; Austin, Thomas 1990; Champion 1990). On the contrary very few historiographers nowadays are aware of the facts Marc Bloch wrote about more than fifty years ago: ... *during historical observations the enormous amount of unwritten data, mostly archaeological, should not be overlooked*. An again: *If the best known theorists of our (historiographical, note by I.M.P.) methods have cared surprisingly little about the archaeological approaches ... we would have not been so easily pushed into indirect observations for aeons* (Bloch 1996, 76).¹² Many historians nowadays believe that archaeology can only be an auxiliary discipline of history, and the archaeological data play only the role of illustrators, corroborators and stopgaps (Halsall 1997, 818-819; cf. Renfrew 1979, 257, cit. in Moreland 1992, 113). And therefore it is not odd that some historians consider *an off-the-cuff remark in the text of Pliny the Elder are more valuable witness than are hundreds of pages of archaeological reports* (Rowland 1992, 152). The archaeologists are to be blamed for the fact that archaeological spade cannot change from the *instrumentum mutum* (as considered by historians) to the *instrumentum vocale* (Moreland 1992, 113, 126).

However, due to the deeply rooted commitment to written sources, historical archaeologists started thinking very late about the written source *subjectivity*,¹³ that had been accepted by historiographers for a long time. Since written

sources are neither objective, nor non-ideological they could not be the declarers of *absolute* truths about the social past. They could only be the bearers of partial, fragmentary information about the past, dependent not only on the state of their preservations, but also on the social roles of their creators. Very often they are tendentious and egalitarian because they were created by writers under the influence of political and ecclesiastical masters (Austin 1990; Champion 1990; Hedeager 1993; Yorke 1993). Even more - F. R. Ankersmit thinks that it is very surprising how the term *subjective* has been exclusory in connection with the ethic and political values in historiography. According to his opinion there are many reasons for *subjectivity*. He says: *aesthetic preferences, stylistic habits, lack of imagination or affinity for a certain topic and not only mere incompetence can also influence the subjectivity of the author's historiography* (Ankersmit 1983, 235).

Suspicion about written sources has lead some archaeologists to the belief that objectivity can be found in archaeological sources. Henry Glassie, for example, believed in their authenticity (Glassie 1972, 29; cf. the critics in Wheeler Stone 1993, 69). Patricia Rubertone swears by the objectivity of archaeological records, but also strives for a smaller role for historiography in archaeological interpretations and questions the written record (Rubertone 1989, 32, 38-39). Her approach embodies what Mary C. Beaudry and her associates have called *a fear of the emic*¹⁴ (Beaudry et al. 1991, 161), attempting to strip away *subjectivity*, but this is a relict of positivism. Kathleen Deagan thinks that archaeological sources are less burdened and therefore more *objective* than written ones that could be intentionally distorted because of bad political, economic and perhaps even personal beliefs (Deagan 1991, 103-105). Such exclusivity directed at written sources, evades the critical approach to subjective presentations of the past (interest, preferential, ideological, political) and does not solve anything. Archaeology and historiography have only changed the roles: according to this belief the archaeological sources have an aura of distinction. Out of them, *the objective past, "as it really was" (wie es eigentlich gewesen war)*, is evident (Moreland 1992, 144).¹⁵

A different reaction to the classical predominance of written sources could be found in the arguments, that written and archaeological sources should be discussed as independent and completely separate entities (Carmack, Weeks 1981; Leone,

¹² M. Bloch, *Apologie pour l'histoire ou Métier d'historien*, Paris: Armand Colin, 1993, Ch. 2. The translation into English was made from the Slovene translation.

¹³ Already in the 19th century historians often asked if history could be objective. If Leopold von Ranke still believed that by persistent use of primary sources one could become familiar with the past - *wie es eigentlich gewesen war* -, Marx maintained that *such methods reveal only the shell by which he meant the middle class view of the society* (quoted in Luthar 1997, 56). The myth on objectivity of historical presentation (as Luthar would say 1993b, 30) was strongly undermined by the German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911) who, as Luthar says (1997, 56) *paid attention to the fact that a historian was an indivisible part of own research and as such he inevitably and fatally influenced the formation of his research*. For more information cf. Luthar 1993b, 44-50. But also in historiography the generally wide spread belief in *subjectivity* had to be waited for.

¹⁴ *Emic* and *etic* are terms that the American anthropology took over in the 60's and 70' from the grammatical theory by the linguist Kenneth L. Pike, known as *tagmemics* (see K.L. Pike, *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behaviour* I, 1954; II, 1955 and III, 1960). They were developed because of the desire for theoretical approach what would incorporate language and culture. *Emic* and *etic* (derived from *phonemic* and *phonetic*) mark the contrasting data levels or analytical methods. The *emic* model explains the ideology or behaviour of members in separate culture with respect to their own definition. The *etic* is based on the definition beyond it. In-depth studies in M. Ivič, *Directions in Linguistics*, Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1983, pp. 141-144, fifth reprint; see also A. Barnard, *Emic and Etic* in A. Barnard and J. Spencer (eds) *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*, London, New York: Routledge, 1997, pp. 180-183; first published in 1996.

¹⁵ Moreland states also examples from the Anglo-Saxon archaeology (Arnold, Hodges) when the writers thought it would have been better to ignore the historical records and construct past only from the archaeological data (*ibid.*).

Potter, Shackel 1987).¹⁶ Archaeologists could inter-relate them when analysing social and economic processes or studying collective identities and social statuses. The social statuses mainly knit a descriptive net with the written sources and try to explain the ambiguity and even contradictions in the archaeological sources, but they are rarely considered the real supplements (cf. Jones, forthcoming). Stanley South with his statement that historical archaeology has an incredible potential for controlling archaeological variables by comparison with historical documentation (South 1988, 38-39), as well as Mark Leone and Parker Potter (Leone, Potter 1988, 12-14) with the discussion of historical and archaeological records as different, they defend the independence of both through mutually testing of useful entities. They could be analytically and epistemologically divided, and simultaneously their subjective character is neglected (Beaudry et al. 1991, 178-179, note 16). For them the archaeological record is more objective than the historical one, and their adherents could also be found in the 90's (Dever 1993, 24, cit. in: Finkelstein 1997, 223; Dever 1997, 307).

The time to persuade the historical archaeologists to start thinking about *subjectivity*¹⁷ of archaeological sources has not come yet. Only recently it has slowly penetrated archaeological practice (Beaudry et al. 1991, Hall 1994; Little 1992). Martin Hall could find examples of subjectivity of archaeological and historical sources in the analysis of the South African social construction. In the textual analysis of both sources he says leaning on the post-structural semiotics: *By viewing the past as a set of complex texts, intertwined to form a discourse, we have avoided privileging written documents over archaeological record, or artefact assemblages over travellers' accounts, probate records and paintings* (Hall 1994, 168). Barbara Little goes even further when she claims that *material culture is structured differently than text*. Belief in similarities between them is pointed out by *the ambiguity of their meanings*. In material sources as well as in written ones, the meaning is *neither fixed nor universal*. *The interpretation relies on social context and situation, not only of the author, but also of the reader and the listener* (Little 1992, 218-219). If we are aware of subjectivity and ambiguity of both kinds of sources and if critical analysis is directed to them, the so far overlooked social groups could be discovered in the documents of the social elite (Beaudry et al. 1991; Hall 1994; cf. Jones, forthcoming).

And Slovene archaeology?

The Slovene early medieval archaeology has not been aware of the *"tyranny of the historical record"*. This record has always structured the interpretation of the archaeological evidence. It has consistently believed in the objectivity of historiographic derivations and followed their findings about the migration of peoples (Encyclopedia 1995, 300-301; Slabe

1978), the inclusion or exclusion of "Romanised population" in the process of Slavisation (Ciglenečki 1992, 1994; Petru 1978, 1982), Slavisation (Ciglenečki 1983, Knific 1983)... It has been obliged to find "historical facts" in the layers of settlements (Petru 1979, 731; cf. Knific 1993, 525, 528), determine ethnicity within the culture-history paradigm (Ciglenečki 1993, 513-514; Encyclopedia 1995, 301; Jevremov et al. 1993, 228-229)¹⁸ and is not immune to "aggressive" pushing of archaeological "facts" into a historical frame.

Arbitrarily determined temporal boundaries that usually divide "Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages" by the migration of peoples due to unclassified and inconsistently used concepts also sets a rigid frame for the explanations of cultural or ethnic identity. The ethnic identity has been in spite of objecting voices from abroad - strengthened only recently¹⁹ - the next prime mover even of research strategies and not only interpretations. Ethnic groups or tribes, peoples, sometimes even nations are in the minds of Slovene archaeologists of the Early Middle Ages monolith groups where style variations determine the boundaries. Traditionally culture-history narration is, burdened by archaeological categories such as "late antique", "native", "Slavic" or "early medieval" often decisive not only when describing, but also when explaining material records, prevailing in the Slovene early medieval archaeology. "Evolutionary determinism" and the dichotomy of civilisation/barbaric (or "primitive", at least) creep into the classification of archaeological artefacts. And therefore, for example local pottery of "rough" appearance is often ascribed to "natives" or Slavs, but finer pottery is consistently Roman. Similar ideas apply to architectural styles. Dating of archaeological material is very often conditioned by previous ideas about cultures or peoples, based exclusively on the connection of "historical" comparison of artefacts (for example "Lombard" pottery and coins or "Slavic" lock (ear)-rings and historical chronology) and relative typological chronology whereas even the stratigraphic sequence of sites are neglected.

Proverbial scepticism about theory (and often even about methodology) is not exclusive to Slovenia. In the Anglo-Saxon world the historical archaeology, famous for its vivid theoretical ideas, has taken the first firm steps and evades clamped old fixed theories, built on the dichotomies of natural science / humanistic science and anthropology/history that have long separated it from the hot theoretical debate of the prehistoric archaeology. It is high time we entered the initiation phase in Slovenia.

Acknowledgements

The article has got its present form after patient reading and comments of Slavko Ciglenečki, Tomaž Nabergoj, Andrej Pleterski and Biba Teržan. It could not have appeared such

¹⁶ Baruch Halpern speaks even about two different "cultures" (cf. Halpern 1997, p. 313).

¹⁷ Hans-Jürgen Eggers wrote about the subjectivity of written and archaeological sources already in the 50's. He thought: *Why have historians known for ages that each written record is prejudiced? But the majority of modern archaeologist still ... live in firm belief that their "material witnessing" is real and sources "objective" (stressed by I.M.P.) where conscious "prejudice" is completely unknown to them. But this is not true! Also archaeological sources can lie!* (Summarised according to Klejn 1987, pp. 98-99. More on subjectivity and objectivity of archaeological sources pp. 98-100. Orig. version: H.-J. Eggers, *Ur- und Frühgeschichte als historische Wissenschaft*, Heidelberg 1950, pp. 49-59).

¹⁸ Selected examples are coincidental. They include later publications on purpose. Analysis of *"the tyranny of the historical record"*, met in the Slovene early medieval archaeology, is in preparation.

¹⁹ For different view of ethnicity in archaeology cf. Renfrew 1987; Shennan 1989a, 1989b, 1991; Olsen, Kobylinski 1991; Graves-Brown, Jones, Gamble 1996; Hall 1997, Ch. 2 and Jones 1997, Ch. 2, 6, 7; in early medieval historiography and archaeology mainly by Wenskus 1961; Geary 1983; Pohl, Wolfram 1990; Harrison 1991; Hines 1994; Christie 1995 and Heather 1996, 1997. Analysis of ethnicity in Slovene early medieval archaeology is in preparation.

as it is without valuable help of Siân Jones and Samantha Jane Lucy that have given me their still unpublished article and dissertation, trust of Anthony F. Harding who have helped me open the door to the University Library in Durham and

kindness of John Bintliff, Margarita Diaz-Andreu and Anthony D. Smith. I am deeply indebted to them all. Thanks are also due to Marija Reher for her efforts that the text got the desired form and for the elimination of linguistic awkwardness.

Irena Mirnik Prezelj
Ul. Janeza Puharja 2
SI - 4000 Kranj
e-mail: mprezelj@amis.net