



**TÜBINGER ARCHÄOLOGISCHE  
TASCHENBÜCHER**

**3**

**Peter F. Biehl,  
Alexander Gramsch, Arkadiusz Marciniak (Hrsg.)**

# **Archäologien Europas/ Archaeologies of Europe**

**Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien/  
History, Methods and Theories**

**WAXMANN**

Archäologien Europas /  
Archaeologies of Europe

# Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher

herausgegeben von  
Manfred K. H. Eggert  
und Ulrich Veit

Band 3



Waxmann Münster / New York  
München / Berlin

# Archäologien Europas / Archaeologies of Europe

Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien /  
History, Methods and Theories

Herausgegeben von Peter F. Biehl,  
Alexander Gramsch und Arkadiusz Marciniak



Waxmann Münster / New York  
München / Berlin

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

**Archäologien Europas** : Geschichte, Methoden und Theorien

= Archaeologies of Europe / hrsg. von Peter F. Biehl ....

– Münster ; New York ; München ; Berlin: Waxmann, 2002

(Tübinger archäologische Taschenbücher ; 3)

ISBN 3-8309-1067-3

Gedruckt mit freundlicher Unterstützung  
der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung

**Tübinger Archäologische Taschenbücher, Band 3**

ISSN 1430-0931

ISBN 3-8309-1067-3

© Waxmann Verlag GmbH, 2002

Postfach 8603, D-48046 Münster, F. R. G.

<http://www.waxmann.com>

E-Mail: [info@waxmann.com](mailto:info@waxmann.com)

Umschlaggestaltung: Pleßmann Kommunikationsdesign, Ascheberg

Umschlagzeichnung: Holger Singowitz (nach einem Motiv vom  
unteren Tor von Schloss Hohentübingen aus dem frühen 17. Jh.)

Druck: Runge GmbH, Cloppenburg

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier, DIN 6738

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

Printed in Germany

PREDRAG NOVAKOVIĆ

Archaeology in five states – A peculiarity  
or just another story at the crossroads of  
‘Mitteleuropa’ and the Balkans:  
A case study of Slovene archaeology

Introduction

Much of Slovenian archaeology's 125-year history is a story of discontinuity. In fact, the very term 'Slovenian archaeology' in the sense of a disciplinary framework can only be fully applied to the period after 1918, when large parts of the former Austrian provinces of Carniola, Styria, Carinthia and the Prekmurje region were united into one province under the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (later to be renamed the Kingdom of Yugoslavia). The archaeological institutions and services prior to this period were part of the Austrian system, organized into a network with provincial and local institutions positioned at the bottom of the structure, and with the central museum (*Naturhistorisches Museum*), heritage protection institutions (*Zentralkommission*) and scholarly societies in Vienna at the top. The period between 1918-1941 brought several radical changes. Firstly, two thirds of the Slovene ethnic territory was politically and administratively united into one province within Yugoslavia, thus rendering the Slovenes national and political recognition. For the first time, national institutions were permitted (e. g., National Museum, University, Academy of Arts and Sciences etc.), and soon they assumed leading roles in cultural and scientific affairs in Slovenia. The final unification of the Slovenes came after World War II with the annexation of the Littoral region and Istria (parts of the former Italian province of Venezia Giulia which was established after the annexation to Italy in 1918) to Yugoslavia, and the constitution of the federal unit (republic) of Slovenia. In 1991, one year after the first democratic elections, Slovenia officially declared independence and abolished socialism.

Needless to say, the history of Slovenian archaeology reveals a pattern of sharp ruptures (both in infrastructure and in concept) concomitant with major political changes. However, in order to understand the development of archaeological discipline, a set of factors and contingencies operating on a smaller scale should also be taken into consideration. The aim of this paper is not to present the history of the archaeological discipline in Slovenia, ordered according to the historical and chronological developments only<sup>1</sup>, but rather to focus on some crucial aspects and contingencies, which considerably conditioned its course in the last 150 years.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a historical overview of the history of archaeology in Slovenia, check: Gabrovec (1971), Petru (1971), Kastelic / Gabrovec / Knific (1987), Cunja (1992), Slapšak / Novaković (1996).

### The 'elusive' object of history: 'archaeology in Slovenia' or 'Slovene archaeology'?

Writing the history of a scientific discipline cannot be excluded from the actual history of the discipline itself – such an act would mark the stage at which the discipline has perceived itself as being capable of its own internal reflection into its development and social role. However, there are some potential pitfalls involved. The first and foremost is teleological. If the historian of a discipline is also an active practitioner of the discipline himself, he/she may see the actual state of art as an inevitable and logical consequence of the development. This problem is, in our opinion, particularly visible in the histories of sciences as observed from the national perspective.

The problems in Slovene archaeology include aspects crucial for understanding the discipline on a broad scale. For most historical studies about archaeology, the national perspective was obvious, logical and coherent when one considers that modern European archaeology developed under strong influence of patriotism.

How most of the history of Slovene archaeology has been written is not in itself distinguishable from such a portrait, but it does pose certain conceptual problems to those authors trying to write the history of archaeology from a different perspective. For example, let us look at historiographic science in Slovenia, which developed into a national science with the fulfillment of two conditions – when positivist analysis and critique of historical sources matured and gained overall recognition as a valid scientific procedure, and when the Slovenes (as a national group) became a "natural" unit of observation in an historical context. These two conditions formed the filters for the inclusion, exclusion and evaluation of certain processes, events, trends, personalities, institutions etc. into national history on the one hand, and on the other hand, for the construction of an understanding of the means and developments of the discipline itself. Taking the above two conditions into account, Slovene national historiography developed from the 1870s onwards.

The historian of Slovene archaeology, applying a similar national perspective, may be in a more difficult position: the 'object' of research (the peoples who lived in the territory of Slovenia) were peoples who were ethnically and culturally very different from the Slovenes. The scholars (archaeologists) themselves may not have been ethnic Slovenes, or perhaps they did not perceive their work as a contribution to the Slovene national culture. The institutional framework of the discipline was a constituent of a much larger and multi-national organization of state, in which Slovenes were either not fully recognized as a nation or were not a dominant political factor (e. g., Venice, Austrian/Austro-Hungarian Empire). And last but not least, there remains the issue of how to include and evaluate select Slovene scientists working outside Slovene territory in such a multi-national formulation. The national territory of the Slovenes may serve as a good frame of reference for certain aspects, but it may prove wrong for others. The application of linguistic criteria may also prove too limiting since most of the pre-20<sup>th</sup> century archaeological texts dealing with archaeology in the territory of Slovenia were written in German or Italian. In addition to these dilemmas, there is also the problem of a series of discontinuities in the history of Slovene archaeology. They were



caused by factors external to archaeology and prevented the use of a 'uni-linear' narrative in the history of archaeology in Slovenia.

The above problems are prominent in the first essay on the history of archaeology in Slovenia, written by R. Ložar (1941). The essay was an attempt to lay down the conceptual framework for a history of the archaeological discipline in Slovenia and for viewing it from a national perspective. Ložar was the first to incorporate earlier (Austrian provincial) antiquarian and historical traditions as a basis for the development of a disciplinary framework covering Slovene provinces in Austria during the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. He contributed the first periodization of the history of archaeology in Slovenia, which remained largely unchanged until the 1970s<sup>2</sup>.

However, the criteria according to which R. Ložar included or excluded various other developments seem relatively incoherent. His observations focused on the developments in the province of Carniola (the central Slovene province in the Austrian Empire) and in Ljubljana, its capital. The traditions from other Slovene provinces were essentially excluded from his historical impression; either because the leading scholars of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries were not ethnic Slovenes, or because the major archaeological institutions were situated beyond the Slovene borders after 1918. The former province of Littoral, annexed to Italy in 1918, presents a good example.

Throughout the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Littoral, there were a number of important regional and local institutions and scholarly societies, particularly in the towns of Trieste, Gorizia and Koper, working in the territory of modern Slovenia, but the scholars were mainly Italians (e. g., P. Kandler, C. Marchesetti). It is also surprising that Ložar ignored the work of the Slovene historian and archaeologist S. Rutar (1851-1903), who contributed some essential historical works concerning Slovenes in the province of Littoral, and who published a large number of articles about archaeological sites from this region. Furthermore, Ložar included humanistic and enlightened traditions in Carniola, and yet completely ignored the Venetian renaissance and post-renaissance antiquarian and topographic traditions in the coastal towns of Koper, Izola, and Piran.

The reasons for this are not easy to ascertain. Post-WWI Slovenia was constituted from parts of former Austrian provinces (central and eastern Carniola, southern Styria and southern Carinthia), where the presence of Italian cultural traditions was either minor or completely absent. Furthermore, since the Italian state and the fascist regime tried to assimilate Slovenes in the annexed territories by force, that is also by using history and archaeology as powerful instruments for justifying their "historical rights", the Italian regime was generally regarded as hostile and alien to the national rights of Slovenes and their national culture. Ložar also excluded the "Yugoslav" component from his essay. Though the Yugoslav disciplinary framework started to develop rather

---

2 a. The antiquarianism of the Humanistic and Renaissance period (16<sup>th</sup> and the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century).

b. Encyclopaedic and antiquarian studies of the Enlightenment period (17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> century).

c. the 19<sup>th</sup> century, a period during which archaeology in Slovene territory attained the status of a scientific discipline.

d. The 20<sup>th</sup> century (the first half), the period of Slovene archaeology.



late (after 1918), its development contributed components that differed from the Austrian system. Ložar simply ignored this<sup>3</sup>.

In spite of a series of incoherencies, Ložar's model remained largely undisputed until the early 1970s, when S. Gabrovec (1971) and J. Kastelic (1975) tried to revise Ložar's concept of the history of Slovene archaeology. Though both of them failed to include Venetian renaissance antiquarianism as one of the early components in the development of the archaeological discipline in Slovenia (mainly because it had not been studied<sup>4</sup>), they tried to expand the background of traditions by looking at the developments in Carniola as well as in other Slovene provinces. How to differentiate between Slovene archaeology and archaeology in Slovenia is a decisive issue. Kastelic tried to resolve it by putting forth S. Rutar as "the founder of Slovene archaeology" and labeling K. Dežman, the first 'archaeological' curator in the Provincial Museum of Carniola, "a pioneer of the archaeological discipline in Slovenia" (Kastelic 1975, 124-125).

It is not an easy task to understand Kastelic's criteria for this proposal, and again, some external political factors have to be taken into account. The fact that K. Dežman was the first who established modern scientific standards in archaeological research in Carniola remained undisputed, yet Slovenes did not represent the subject of his research. Furthermore, he strongly refused romantic and non-scientific views concerning the national history of Slovenes, which coquetted with autochthonism. Critiques of Dežman's stance were associated with his political decision to join the liberal (German) side in the Vienna parliament in 1861, whereas he was elected on the Slovene list. This decision made him a 'renegade' in the eyes of the Slovene conservatives and nationalists in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and ever since, the label of '*nemškutar*' (a pejorative label for a German or 'germanized' Slovene) accompanies his figure and role in most of the texts regarding modern Slovene national history. Nevertheless, both Gabrovec and Kastelic highly esteem Dežman's concept of archaeological science. They both reiterate similar arguments when speaking about Dežman's public role. On the other hand, it is true that S. Rutar is generally considered one of the founders of the national historiography and one who actually dealt with Slovene culture, history and archaeology in the province of Littoral and in Carniola. From this standpoint, Kastelic's argument seems tenable.

A further step forward towards the development of a wider conceptual framework for observing the history of archaeological science in Slovenia can be seen in the recent study of B. Slapšak and P. Novaković (Slapšak / Novaković 1996). The authors particularly stress the importance of the context and trajectories of cultural and political emancipation of the Slovene nation for understanding the development of the ar-

3 For example, the project *Archäologische Karte von Jugoslawien*, in which B. Saria (1893-1974), ancient historian and epigraphist, professor at the University of Ljubljana (1926-1941) played the leading role.

4 The first survey of Venetian antiquarian and historical traditions in Slovenia appeared very recently. In P. Simoniti's general study on humanism in Slovenia (Simoniti 1979) only select fragments of collaboration between local and Italian scholars in the field of antiquarian research are reviewed, while R. Cunja (1992) provides a much more complete overview of the renaissance and enlightened Italian antiquarian tradition in northern Istria.

archaeological discipline in Slovenia (Slapšak / Novaković 1996, 256). Their essay differs markedly from previous studies. They considered the duality of the 19<sup>th</sup> century culture among Slovene scholars (i. e. the parallel existence and symbiosis of the dominant German 'state' and cosmopolitan culture, and the growing Slovene national culture), as one of the key phenomena for understanding the fortune of archaeology in its early decades in the Slovene provinces. They also did not limit themselves to Slovene archaeologists or Carniolan traditions only, and they did not observe Slovene archaeology in isolation from their infrastructures and major social frameworks, as R. Ložar (1941) did, and as Gabrovec (1971) and Kastelic (1975) did to a certain extent as well. Although Slapšak and Novaković did not explicitly deal with the matter of *Slovene Archaeology* vs. *Archaeology in Slovenia*, they did touch upon this subject when analyzing the role of K. Dežman, whom the authors consider a paradigmatic figure of Slovene archaeology. Their view of the so called "Dežman's problem" (see below) is much closer to the view of B. Grafenauer, the leading national historian after World War II, who considered K. Dežman one of the rare Slovene scientists of his age capable of critical reasoning in historical and archaeological science. He sought to explicate Dežman's 'departure' from Slovene culture by antiliberal politics and ideology of the leading 'Old Slovenes' in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (Grafenauer 1960, 221). According to Slapšak and Novaković, Dežman's shadow pervades, in a certain sense, the course and the status of archaeology in Slovenia until World War II. Some of the dilemmas associated with his role in professional and public life are still quite actual and reflect the development of social and humanistic sciences in Slovenia in general.

A history of Slovene archaeology after World War II has yet to be written. At first glance, this seems to be a paradox. It is, after all, in this period that Slovene archaeology grew into a fully-developed scientific discipline and public service, and when national archaeology (archaeology of Slavs/Slovenes) was officially and effectively established. There are, to be sure, a number of "micro-histories" concerning individual institutions, research issues, biographies of scholars etc., presented on occasions of anniversaries or similar events. Still, a general synthesis outlining conceptual developments during this period is still lacking. The reasons for this are still to be studied, but since it is almost impossible to pursue a history of archaeology linking to the pre-war periods, an altered approach in reflecting the history of the discipline is demanded.

## A brief sketch of a history of archaeology in Slovenia

### Antiquarians, geographers and historians (15<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> century)

The beginnings of the antiquarian tradition can be traced to the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century in the coastal towns of northern Istria (Koper, Izola and Piran), which were predominantly settled by a Romance-speaking population. Pier Paolo Vergerio the Elder (1370-1444), author of the first essay on ancient Koper (*De situ urbis Iustinopolitanae*), and a famous cartographer Pietro Coppo (1469/70-1555/56), author of a topographic essay on Istria (*Del sito del Istria*, Venice 1540) were prominent figures of the

Venetian renaissance antiquarianism. Italian antiquarianism also influenced the developments throughout Slovene territory in the Austrian Empire. The central figure in Ljubljana, the capital of the province of Carniola (central Slovenia), was August Prygl (known also as Tyffernus, 1470-1535), who was the first known researcher of Roman epigraphy in Austrian lands. He produced a two-volume manuscript on Roman inscriptions from Celeia, Poetovio and other sites from the Inner Austrian Provinces, and T. Mommsen included his records in CIL.

Among the 17<sup>th</sup> century studies on ancient history, two outstanding works were produced in the field of ancient geography and topography: *De commentarii storici-geografici della provincia dell'Istria libri otto con appendice* of Giacomo Filippo Tommasini (1595-1654) and *Die Ehre des Herzogthums Crain* (1689) – a 15-volume synthesis on the geography, topography, history, ethnography and antiques of Carniola – by Janez Vajkard Valvazor (1641-1693). For almost two centuries, both works remained the most complete and influential in the field of geography and history of Slovene lands. Two other historians and antiquaries worked in Ljubljana during the same period: Janez Ludvik Schönleben (1618-1681), who published a history of Carniola from the prehistoric period to the year 1000 (*Carniola Antiqua et Nova sive annales sacroprophani*, Ljubljana 1681), and Janez Gregor Dolničar (Thalnitscher) (1615-1719), the author of the first manuscript on the history and antiquities of Ljubljana (*Antiquitates Urbis Labacensis*, Ljubljana, 1693).

The principal figure for Roman studies in Istria during the 18<sup>th</sup> century was Gian Rinaldo Carli (1720-1795), author of select influential works on the antiquities of Istria (*Delle antichità di Capodistria*, Venice 1743; *Antichità Italiane*, Venice 1788-1791), and one of the first excavators of the Roman amphitheater in Pula, Croatia.

At the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, within the context of the 'national rebirth', the first studies regarding the national history of the Slovenes appeared. By far the most influential was that of Anton Tomaž Linhart (1756-1795), *Versuch einer Geschichte von Krain und der übrigen südlichen Slaven Österreichs I, II* (Ljubljana 1788-1791), in which he defined the Slovene nation on the basis of a common language and (medieval) history after the arrival of Slavs in the SW Alps.

#### The onset of the scientific discipline of archaeology (1850-1918)

A decisive step forward in the development of the archaeological discipline was the establishment of a network of provincial museums and of heritage preservation institutions in the Austrian Empire during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The provincial museums, which covered the territory of Slovenia, were located in Graz (est. in 1811; for Styria), Ljubljana (est. in 1821; for Carniola) and in Klagenfurt (est. in 1844; for Carinthia). The province of Littoral was left without a provincial museum, but this role was later filled by the two Trieste museums – Town Museum of Natural History (1846) and Town Museum of Antiquities (1875).

Karel Dežman (Karl Deschmann), Curator of the Provincial Museum in Ljubljana, played a decisive role in establishing the scientific archaeological discipline in Carniola. His excavation of pile-dwelling sites at Ljubljansko barje (the Ljubljana moor) in 1875 and the publication of the results (Deschmann 1875) are symbolically

considered as the founding stones of scientific archaeology in Slovenia. Dežman closely collaborated with the Anthropological Society and Prehistoric Commission from Vienna and in less than 15 years, he succeeded in establishing modern disciplinary standards for prehistoric archaeology based on positivist, evolutionary and naturalist concepts. He published the first syntheses on the prehistory of Carniola (Deschmann 1880; Deschmann 1891), and succeeded in lobbying for a new museum palace (opened in 1888). The prehistoric collection, accompanied with a new museum guide (Deschmann 1888), was considered exemplary for other provincial museums in Austria.

Dežman's successors, Alfons Müllner (1840-1918) and Walter Šmid (Schmid) (1875-1951), later abandoned the concept of anthropological and evolutionary archaeology. Müllner, influenced by P. Reinecke, introduced the practice of establishing a typological and chronological classification of artifacts and rearranged Dežman's collections accordingly (Müllner 1900, curator 1889-1903), while W. Šmid (curator 1905-1909) considered archaeology as a historical science and aimed at revealing major historical events and processes in the past. Correspondingly, he particularly stressed the importance of late prehistoric and Roman settlements (e. g., Schmid 1915), to which he dedicated a large portion of his efforts. He also contributed the pioneering study of Slavic archaeology in Slovenia (Schmid 1908).

In the province of Littoral, two museums from Trieste were particularly active: the *Civico Museo di antichità* (est. in 1875 and renamed as *Museo Civico di storia ed arte* in 1909) and *Civico Museo di storia naturale* (est. in 1846). In the field of archaeology, the former was predominantly oriented toward Roman history and epigraphy, while in the latter museum, prehistoric archaeology was among the most important subjects. The leading prehistorian there was Carlo Marchesetti (1850-1926), who conducted a series of large excavations of prehistoric cemeteries (e. g., S. Lucia, Škocjan) and produced a very influential topographic study of Karst and Istrian hillforts (Marchesetti 1903).

The Central Commission (est. in 1850 in Vienna) was the second component of the institutional framework within the Austrian Empire. The Provincial Offices responsible for the territory of Slovenia were situated in Trieste, Ljubljana and Graz. Two conservators were particularly active in the archaeology of their regions: P. Kandler (1805-1872), the conservator for the province of Littoral, and S. Rutar (1851-1903), the conservator for Carniola (1889-1903)<sup>5</sup>.

#### Between the two world wars (1918-1945)

Generally, despite an improvement during the 1930s, the period between 1918-1945 is marked by a decline in archaeological research and services provided. After the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, archaeology in Slovenia was left with a very weak institutional framework inherited from the former province of Carniola, while the archaeological centers of the former provinces of Littoral, Styria and Carinthia remained outside the borders of post-WWI Yugoslavia.

<sup>5</sup> For a history of the Central Commission in Slovenia, check Baš (1953).

Nevertheless, one improvement is worthy of mention: the introduction of archaeology into the curriculum of the University of Ljubljana (est. in 1919). In 1923, Vojislav Mole (1886-1973) was appointed as Professor of Classical Archaeology, but he remained in this position only 2 years (in 1925 he moved to the University of Kraków, Poland). In 1926, Balduin Saria (1893-1974) took over the Chair for Ancient History and Epigraphy, and gradually became the central figure of Slovenian Roman studies. His major works concerned epigraphy and Roman military history (e. g., Saria 1938; Hoffiler / Saria, 1938; Saria 1939), but he was also very active in the *Archäologische Karte von Jugoslawien* project (Saria 1936; Saria / Klemenc 1938).

The appointment of Rajko Ložar (1904-1985) in 1929, meant that after almost 20 years the National Museum had again employed a professional archaeologist. Since he was the only official archaeological expert in Slovenia, he had to cover a vast array of activities; it was only from the late 1930s onward that he succeeded in publishing some important works, among them the essay on the history of Slovene archaeology (Ložar 1941) and a pioneering study on Slavic and medieval pottery production.

Apart from the major developments in Ljubljana, Srečko Brodar (1893-1987), a high school teacher in Celje, excavated at the Potočka zijalka cave in 1928, and thus laid the foundations for Paleolithic archaeology in Slovenia (Bayer / Brodar 1928). In the 1930s he broadened his research to include other sites in Slovenia and Yugoslavia.

#### New beginnings: Archaeology in Slovenia after 1945

Two major political changes appeared after WWII: the annexation of the former Austrian province of Littoral and Istria to the Yugoslav Republics of Slovenia and Croatia, and the introduction of a socialist system. These changes had an important impact on archaeology. All active archaeologists from pre-war Slovenia (R. Ložar, V. Mole and B. Saria) migrated from the country because they disagreed with the new regime or were regarded as collaborators with occupiers. On the other hand, the need for the further political and cultural emancipation of Slovenes demanded an urgent re-establishment of the archaeological science in Slovenia, and in Yugoslavia as well. Two issues were particularly accentuated: the problem of efficient Monument Service (war damage, claims for reparations), and the need for an archaeology capable of disregarding Nazi and Fascist theories about Slovenes and other peoples in Yugoslavia. Indeed, national archaeologies developed in all Yugoslav republics (with the exception of Croatia, where the tradition of national archaeology goes back to the last decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century) during the first post-WWII years.

Two new institutions were established: the Department of Archaeology (1946) at the University of Ljubljana, and the Institute for Archaeology at the Slovene Academy of Arts and Sciences (1947). The first two professors of archaeology were appointed in 1946-1947: Josip Klemenc for Classical and Roman Archaeology and Josip Korošec for Prehistoric and Slavic Archaeology. Paleolithic archaeology was also incorporated into the curriculum at the University, with the appointment of S. Brodar in 1946 as a professor at the Faculty of Mathematics and Natural History.

J. Klemenc and J. Korošec were also among the founders of the Institute of Archaeology, together with Milko Kos, historian and Chancellor of the University of Ljubljana.



jana, and France Stele, art historian and conservator. A new generation of scholars took the leading positions at the National Museum as well: classical philologist Jože Kastelic became the Director in 1945, while Stane Gabrovec, an archaeologist and classical philologist, started to work in the museum's Archaeological Department in 1948.

The period between the late 1940s and the mid 1970s can be best described as the formative years, decisive for the establishment of a modern institutional and conceptual framework for Slovene archaeology. The major archaeological project during this period was to produce the *Archaeological Map of Slovenia*. The project, in which virtually all professional archaeologists in the country participated, was coordinated by the Institute of Archaeology. It took almost 15 years to collect and revise the bibliographic data (until 1966), and another 10 years to publish it (ANSL 1975). This gazetteer of sites and monuments contains more than 3000 entries for sites ranging from the Paleolithic to the Early Mediaeval periods (nearly 10 times more than any previous archaeological map), and it provides a rudimentary basis for all further archaeological projects.

Studies regarding the individual periods in Slovenia also required modern conceptual tools. In the 1950s and 1960s, S. Brodar, J. Kastelic, J. Korošec, P. Korošec, J. Klemenc, S. Gabrovec, M. Brodar, F. Osole, together with the archaeologists from the first generations of post-war students (J. Šašel, P. Petru, T. Bregant, F. Stare, T. Knez, F. Leben, I. Curk, L. Plesničar, S. Pahič and others) invested great efforts in developing regional typologies, chronologies, catalogues of finds, and other essential conceptual tools for archaeological analysis and interpretation. After many years of intensive fieldwork and analyses of artifacts in Slovene, Italian and Austrian museums, they discussed the results in a series of national conferences in the 1960s and 1970s. They were published in *Arheološki vestnik*, the central archaeological journal (est. in 1950). Further evidence of conceptual growth are the large-scale settlement excavations which started to be carried out in the mid 1960s.

The period (from the 1980s on) following the formative three decades can be considered as a period of modernization. In the mid 1970s, the discipline had already developed to a level (in terms of concept and infrastructure) comparable to that in neighboring countries. This foundation enabled a younger generation of professional archaeologists in the 1980s to introduce some of British and American concepts. Particularly active in this endeavor was B. Slapšak, who together with his colleagues from the Department of Archaeology at the University of Ljubljana introduced a series of new concepts, methods and techniques (systematic survey, theoretical archaeology, landscape archaeology, GIS, geophysics, etc.) derived in the UK and USA, and so provided a counterpart and challenge to the mainstream cultural historical approach.

Correspondingly, a distinctive 'group' of scholars generated from S. Gabrovec's school of prehistoric archaeology (e. g., B. Teržan, M. Guštin, J. Dular). These archaeologists and their collaborators are to be credited with the development of a distinctive school of prehistoric research, well respected on an international level.

During the 1980s, other archaeological fields also gained respect on an international level. In the field of numismatics, A. Jeločnik and P. Kos – in less than four decades of systematic work – were able to present rich collections on an exemplary level. J. Šašel's work became a source of reference for epigraphy and the history of Roman

Pannonia, Noricum, Dalmatia, and Venetia and Histria. The high standards set in his endeavors are further sustained in the work of M. Šašel Kos. Last but not least, Slavic archaeology, established in its proper sense only after 1945 and in its first years coinciding with political issues from pre-WWII and post-war circumstances, matured in the last three decades to a respected discipline with a well-developed critical apparatus.

## Focal points for understanding Slovene archaeology

### Manifold beginnings

The first and foremost characteristic aspect throughout the history of Slovene archaeology is the recurring tendency toward constitutionalism. In general, three major periods are distinguishable: between 1875 and 1918 ('the Austrian period'), between 1918 and 1941 ('the Old Yugoslavia period'), and the period ranging from 1945 onwards (the periods of the 'new Yugoslavia' and of the 'Republic of Slovenia from 1991 onwards'). However, this periodization, which correlates with major changes in the political status of Slovenia, does not completely correspond to the actual changes within the discipline, and it does not include all the developments happening beyond the territories of what was 'Slovenia' during different periods.

One of the main reasons why major political changes do not provide accurate criteria for understanding the development of Slovene archaeology derives from the fact that during the period between 1875 and 1945, archaeology in Slovenia was virtually a 'science of two or three persons'. As such, it was quite unstable and vulnerable to the interplay of individual interests and pursuits, local politics and interpersonal relationships.

Three such cases are highly illustrative. The first is the so-called 'Dežman's problem'. In 1848, K. Dežman, advocating a liberal political stand, was actively involved in the movement of Slovene students in Vienna. For the ruling nationalist 'Old Slovenes', K. Dežman – being a naturalist scientist, ethnic Slovene and having a background in the national movement in 1848 – seemed the ideal candidate for Curator of the Provincial Museum of Carniola. In 1861, after the restoration of the parliament in Vienna, he was elected MP on the Slovene list. Shortly after, however, he allied with the German liberals. The Slovene nationalists, governed by pro-Habsburg national conservatives, pronounced him a 'renegade' and the most unconcealed *nemškutar* ('Germanizer').

The second case applies to Walter Šmid. He studied law and theology in Vienna and became a Benedictine priest in 1898. In 1904, he graduated in history, archaeology and geography at the University of Graz. He began his career in archaeology in 1905 as Curator of the Provincial Museum of Carniola in Ljubljana. He held this position only until 1909, when he married and converted to the Protestant faith. The conservative majority in the Provincial Parliament could not tolerate a former Benedictine priest in such a prominent position and Šmid's curatorship was not confirmed. He then moved to Graz, where he became Head of the Departments of Prehistory and Early Medieval



History and of Numismatics at the Provincial Museum of Styria in 1912, and later also a Professor for Prehistoric and Roman Provincial Archaeology at the University of Graz.

The third case regards B. Saria, R. Ložar and V. Mole, a group of archaeologists who worked in Ljubljana before and during WWII. Due to political and ideological reasons, they left Slovenia either during WWII (Saria) or immediately after. B. Saria moved to the University of Graz in 1941/1942 and replaced W. Šmid, who did not adjust well to the Nazi regime; but Saria had to leave this position in 1945 (denazification). Two other archaeologists, V. Mole and R. Ložar, were considered collaborators of the occupiers, or as Slovene Quislings, and they migrated to the USA.

Adding A. Müllner to the above named archaeologists, we have almost all the professional archaeologists who worked in Slovenia between 1875 and 1945; and each of them followed very disparate archaeological agendas. Consequently, it is more accurate to speak of the individual episodes (*fig. 1*), rather than of the conceptual development; and only from 1945 onward can we truly speak of a continual development in Slovene archaeology.

PREHISTORY AS A NATURAL SCIENCE	1875-1888	K. Dežman (Ljubljana)
	1880-1918	C. Marchesetti (Trieste)
TYPOLOGICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL ARCHAEOLOGY	1888-1903	A. Müllner (Ljubljana)
ARCHAEOLOGY AS A HISTORICAL SCIENCE	1890-1909	S. Rutar; W. Šmid (Ljubljana)
ARCHAEOLOGY AS A HISTORY OF FORMS AND STYLES	1929-1939	R. Ložar

**Fig. 1.** Major episodes in the conceptual development in the period between 1875-1945.

Of course, the 1875-1945 period cannot be observed solely from the perspective of 'Slovene archaeology' and isolated from the actual infrastructure and disciplinary frameworks, which existed in these years. The scholars from the Slovene provinces would hardly consider themselves as working within a national (Slovene) framework. K. Dežman, S. Rutar, A. Müllner, P. Kandler, W. Šmid, C. Marchesetti: they all worked in 'Austrian' institutional networks.

The situation was quite different following WWI. After the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the organizational networks also collapsed; and the new institutional framework and infrastructure was much weaker and inefficient. During the first ten years of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, archaeology persevered at the very fringes of the scientific framework. Other disciplines were perceived as much more important for the development of the Slovene nation (linguistics, history, art history, ethnography). Nonetheless, there were occasional attempts to improve the situation, however most of them failed. For instance, in the preliminary proposals for the academic curricula of the newly established University in Ljubljana (1919) there was a proposal for incorporating a curriculum in Slavic antiquities. However, due to the lack of a specialist in this field, it was only established in 1946; although by this time under completely different circumstances. Archaeology actually entered the university curriculum in 1924, but as a general humanistic course (classical archaeology and ancient art) and not as a national science. And as such, it had no impact whatsoever on archaeological practice and concepts in Slovenia.

In continuance, taking into account the effects of Dežman's political decisions and Šmid's dismissal from service in the Provincial Museum, the experiences sustained of the ruling conservatives with the most prominent archaeologist in Carniola were not particularly favorable for the development of the discipline. And in addition to this, the political climate in Yugoslavia after 1929 (the dictatorship) was far from favorable for the development of national disciplines. The 'Yugoslav' component is almost completely absent from Ložar's work; this might be explained in part by the influence of his studies in Vienna and by his strong stand against centralization of the Yugoslav Kingdom and against the 'fusion' into one, Yugoslav, nation. Interestingly enough, it was B. Saria (an ethnic German from Slovenia), Curator of the Prehistoric, Roman and Numismatic Department of the National Museum in Belgrade and professor at the Belgrade University (1922-1926), appointed Professor at the University of Ljubljana in 1926, who developed a much closer cooperation with archaeologists from other Yugoslav regions (the project of the *Archaeological Map of Yugoslavia*, where he was responsible for developing the standards, and the project on ancient epigraphic sources from Yugoslavia).

The situation again changed after 1945. The annexation of the provinces of Littoral and Istria represented the final step in the emancipation and unification of the Slovenes and Croats with their co-nationals left outside the Yugoslav borders in 1918. In addition to this, the major national (Slavic) groups in Yugoslavia (Serbs, Croats, Slovenes, Macedonians, Montenegrins; and two decades later also the Bosnian Muslims) got their own federal units and gradually gained considerable autonomy in a number of affairs regarding their economy, local policy, culture, education, science etc. On the other hand, all these reforms were controlled by the Yugoslav Communist Party, which took over the government and started the process of 'rebuilding the society' on a new, Marxist-Leninist basis.

The new political circumstances in Slovenia were decidedly far from favorable for the development of archaeology on the pre-war basis. Not only was 1945 Slovenia left without professional archaeologists, but experiences with archaeology during the war were also rather frustrating. R. Ložar was a loud political opponent of the communist-controlled Liberation Front during WWII, V. Mole returned from Poland in 1942 and

accepted professorship at the University of Ljubljana, governed by an Italian administration, and B. Saria was openly sympathetic to the German 'national cause' and worked along the lines of Hitler's claim for "making this land [Southern Styria] German again" (Hitler's speech in Maribor in 1941) (e. g., Saria 1944). The Germanization of Southern Styria meant, of course, deportations and colonization of these lands with ethnic Germans. *Ahnenerbe* archaeologists conducted archaeological excavations in northwestern Slovenia, were by in order to prove the existence of the Early Medieval Germanic colonization south of the Alps and to provide further justification for Hitler's project of ethnic cleansing (Dinklage / Unger 1943). The experiences endured by the Italian and German abuses of archaeology in Slovenia in the pre-war and war periods were also apprehended. The Italian annexation of the provinces of Littoral and Istria (1918-1943) and the occupation of western Slovenia during WWII were being justified with claims for the 'historical' borders of Roman Italy (with no reference to the actual ethnic structure), and much of the Italian institutional archaeology in Venezia Giulia was involved in providing 'scientific' evidence for such claims (see Bitelli 1999, Novaković 1999).

All these facts and experiences necessitated an urgent reform of archaeology and of its infrastructure. Indeed, only after WWII was it realized that archaeology could summon such large potential for national emancipation and ideology. Scholars from the Faculty of Arts in Ljubljana and from the Slovene Academy of Arts and Sciences played the leading role in this renewal. Similar processes were launched in other Yugoslav republics as well, and similarly, were initiated not only by experts but also by high political circles. Regarding the prevailing ideology, the renewal of archaeology had to be in accordance with two major Yugoslav ideologies: the Marxist-Leninist ideology, and the ideology of the 'brotherhood and unity of the Yugoslav nations'. The first post-war Congress of Yugoslav archaeologists was the forum which officially traced the course of 'new' archaeology in Yugoslavia (for a report, check Korošec 1950). One would expect strong intervention of the official communist (Marxist-Leninist) ideology in this reform; yet, interestingly, this was not the case. (This topic is discussed in more detail in the chapter "Marxist state and non-Marxist archaeology").

As concerns conceptual issues, the 1950s and 1960s are marked by the first clear 'division of labor' (i. e. specialization in archaeological periods) among Slovene archaeologists. This was the outcome of two processes resulting from the fact that archaeology gained the status of an autonomous discipline – the establishment of new archaeological institutions and the re-organization of the existing one, and a greater number of graduates in the field of archaeology. The archaeology of the 1950s finally 'outgrew' its more than 70 year-status as 'the science of two or three'.

#### Late formation of a national archaeology

The second 'focal point' – the late formation of a national archaeology – is for the most part associated with the 'episodic' nature of archaeological developments during the period between 1875 and 1945, and with the way the role of archaeology was per-

ceived in the early decades of formation and political emancipation of the Slovene nation.

National archaeology (i. e. the archaeology of the Slavs/Slovenes) was fully established only after 1945; that is, some 25–50 years later than in neighboring countries. Why so late, is still an open question for historians. Of the studies concerning the history of Slovene archaeology only the paper by B. Slapšak and P. Novaković (Slapšak / Novaković 1996) has approached the search for some answers. The authors argue that the leading historians and linguists, who between 1918 and 1941 invested much in establishing and institutionalizing the framework for national disciplines in Slovenia, were rather reluctant about archaeology for two reasons: a) because they were aware of a number of conceptual inconsistencies and political abuses of the discipline, and b) because they perceived archaeology mainly as an ‘assistant discipline’ to history and art history. The authors also call attention to the very small number of appointed professors (only 18 in 1919) at the University, which became the intellectual center of the Slovenes after 1918.

The above argument is consistent with the major premise that we put forth at the beginning of this chapter, that is, with the ‘episodic’ nature of the development of a discipline predominantly conditioned by a series of local trajectories deriving from the background conditions and circumstances of creating national social and humanistic sciences among the Slovenes. Medieval and modern history, linguistics, and literature were considered the most important cultural and scientific means relevant to ‘making Slovenes’, as opposed to archaeology with its tradition of prehistoric and Roman studies. However, some of the arguments still call for further elaboration.

#### The legacy of K. Dežman and W. Šmid

Dežman and Šmid, though highly esteemed for their scientific and organizational qualities, were considered as political opponents to the ruling national conservative elite in Carniola, and on the ‘wrong’ side in the so-called ‘division of the spirits’ – the greatest divide in the Slovene political and cultural life for nearly 50 years (between 1870 and 1914)<sup>6</sup>.

The two most important archaeologists in Carniola prior to WWI were thus seen as political and cultural opponents to the Slovene national culture, as national ideologists perceived them at the time. Šmid, for example, never openly expressed his national feelings. Furthermore, Dežman, proposing a scientific and positivist program of ar-

6 In the 1870s, Anton Mahnič, bishop, writer and politician, launched the ‘division of spirits’ – a political and cultural program, according to which “the principles of the Catholic faith must be the foundations of the legal development of the Slovene nation and that Catholics of all Austrian nations must create a close alliance”. His theses were acknowledged at the 1<sup>st</sup> Catholic Congress in Ljubljana in 1892, and they then became the basis for an anti-liberal policy of the conservatives. The effects of this divide were very strong and far reaching, and they were felt in Slovene national policy and history even during WWII; this is when the liberals, social-democrats and communists organized the Liberation Front, while most of the conservatives, and particularly the Church, sided with the Italian and German occupation administration and openly fought against the Liberation front.

chaeology, also openly argued against romantic autochthonous ideas regarding the origins of Slovenes; and it seems quite plausible that some of the 'renegade' stigma may have been ascribed to the archaeological science as well.

#### Trajectories in the formation of a national history

The idea of a common language is central to the concept of the Slovene nationality. The first books (liturgical text) in the Slovene language appeared during the Reformation in the mid 16<sup>th</sup> century, and these texts provided the basis for further development of the Slovene language, which was finally codified at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. At the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century, with A. T. Linhart's and the Zoiss' circle of Slovene intellectuals in Carniola, another idea – fundamental to the nationality of Slovenes – was created: that of the common (mediaeval) history of Slovenes in the Austrian provinces of Carniola, Littoral, Styria, and Carinthia.

However, it took almost a century before the national concept of historiography replaced the concept of a provincial one, and it was only from the 1870s onward that modern scientific conceptual and critical methodology was introduced to Slovene historiography. During the period between Linhart and the 1870s, national historiography was marked by romanticism, dilettantism, ethnocentrism and autochthonism, all of which were quite frequently orchestrated for the major political goal, that is, a united Slovenia. One of the rare scientists that stood against such a historiography was K. Dežman. However, due to his political stance against the 'Old Slovenes', his concept of critique and systematic historiographic research was bound to fail, and later he focused primarily on prehistoric research.

It was the generation of historians who started professional careers in the 1870s and onward that laid down the foundations for scientific national historiography (Franc Kos, Simon Rutar, Fran Šuklje, Josip Apih, Ivan Vrtovec and others). They all studied at Austrian universities and applied the correct standards in their research efforts. Their major research issues were associated with the political unification of Slovenes: the early Slovene/Slavic states of Carantania and Lower Pannonia (7<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> cent.), and the recent (18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> cent.) political and cultural history of Slovenes in the Austrian state. It was only after 1900, when the national historiography agenda incorporated a study of feudal colonization, the development of the Slovene national idea from the Reformation period onwards, and of the social and economic structures of the Slovene peasantry from the Middle Ages onward<sup>7</sup>. The initial process of establishing national historiography was concluded with the establishment of the University at Ljubljana (1919) and with the publication of 5 volumes of sources concerning the mediaeval history of Slovenes (Kos 1902-1928). Archaeology, undermanned and organized as a provincial service subject to the offices in Vienna, simply could not keep pace with national historiography. During the period between 1875-1914, only two or three short articles or reports on Slavic finds were published; far too few for national historiographers to rely on archaeology as a science contributing to the history of Slovenes.

7 For the development of Slovene national historiography, see Grafenauer 1947, Grafenauer 1960, 216-249 and Luthar 1993, 151-179.



Nevertheless, there was some potential for establishing a national archaeology in this period. S. Rutar, historian and archaeologist, conservator in the Province of Carniola, took steps toward establishing the national science of archaeology,<sup>8</sup> albeit without completing his work in this field. He maintained close contact with Croatian archaeology, which was much more patriotic. Rutar worked in Split for almost 10 years and collaborated there with Don Frane Bulić (Director of the Archaeological Museum in Split, Conservator in the Province of Dalmatia), and Rutar must have been acquainted with the Croatian historians and antiquaries who established a Museum of Croatian antiquities. Furthermore, being the Conservator of the Central Commission for Carniola, he had to have considerable executive powers, but his agenda in the national sciences sustained a course that was much more historical than archaeological. We can only speculate what course national archaeology would have taken if S. Rutar had not died at 52.

The need for national archaeology was explicitly expressed, for the first time, after WWI and within the program of the newly established University of Ljubljana. The subcommission for the Faculty of Arts Report (dated March 25<sup>th</sup>, 1919) contained the plan for the future development of the faculty, in which it was planned that archaeology (archaeology and prehistory) be granted an autonomous chair. Two other 'archaeological' chairs were planned for the curriculum in history – one for ancient history and another for Slavic history and Slavic antiquities. However, due to the lack of trained personnel, none of the chairs was established. The chair for Archaeology was established in 1923, but only for classical archaeology and ancient art history.

It took almost 25 years before the chair in Slavic archaeology was finally established (in 1946/1947), and by now the circumstances and political conditions differed greatly from the previous periods. Josip Korošec (1909-1966), who graduated in classical philology in Belgrade (1936) and specialized in archaeology in Prague (1938/1939), was a fundamental contributor to the establishment of Slavic archaeology in Slovenia. He started his professional career in the Provincial Museum of Sarajevo in 1939 and after six years, he moved to Slovenia, to the Museum in Ptuj. There, he immediately initiated field investigations at the Slavic site of the Ptuj castle (Korošec 1947), as well as analysis of the grave goods from Slavic cemeteries situated in northeastern Slovenia (1947). The primary incentive backing for such an intensive start in Slavic research was to furnish a reply to German archaeologists (e. g., Dinklage 1943), who in accordance with Hitler's program for the Germanization of southern Styria interpreted these sites as proof of early Germanic colonization. Leading scholars at the University and at the Academy of Arts and Sciences immediately acknowledged the work of Korošec, and already in 1946 he was appointed as Professor for Prehistoric and Slavic archaeology. His first years at the University were dedicated entirely to establishing a system of archaeological discipline in general, but with a particular stress on Slavic archaeology. Applying Lubor Niederle's concept of Slavic antiquities as a basis, Korošec published a 400-page synthesis on Slavic archaeology in 1952.

8 E. g., he published a short German/Slovene archaeological vocabulary (Rutar 1893) and a series of articles concerning the southern Slavs and their migrations (Rutar 1893 a; 1894; 1895), as well as an article on Great Moravia and the Slovene language (Rutar 1896).

J. Kastelic, who in 1949-1950 excavated the Slavic cemetery at Bled (Kastelic 1960; an interim report was published in 1950), contributed another important pioneering research in Slavic archaeology. It was not a coincidence that these excavations were conducted in the area where *Ahnenerbe* wanted to prove Germanic early mediaeval colonization. It is also very symptomatic for the archaeological agenda of the time that anthropological analyses were carried out on bone remains with the aim of revealing the ethnic origins of the population buried at the necropolis.

In the provinces of Littoral and Istria, which were *de facto* annexed to Yugoslavia in 1945 (*de iure* in 1954 after the end of the Trieste crisis), the situation with the borders was much more ambiguous than in northern Slovenia. The crisis ended with serious political, ethnic and demographic consequences; some hundred thousand people, predominantly Italians, opted for Italy and migrated from Istria<sup>9</sup>. During the 'Austrian' period, the majority of local archaeological institutions and societies were Italian and openly irredentist, anti-Austrian and chauvinist against 'aliens' or 'barbarians' – as they frequently referred to the Slavic speaking population. Immediately after the annexation of these lands to Italy in 1918, the Italian government launched a process of forced assimilation of Slovenes and Croats. All political, cultural and educational institutions of the Slovenes and Croats were banned, the use of non-Italian languages in public was prohibited, and people were even forced to change their names into Italian. In archaeology, the '*romanità*' dominated the scene. The periods, and particularly the non-Italian cultures, after the collapse of the Roman Empire were largely ignored, if not openly proclaimed alien<sup>10</sup>.

After the annexation to Yugoslavia, the response was almost immediate, and quite similar 'arms' were used, because negotiations concerning the Trieste territory included historic arguments. Consequently, both sides greatly intensified archaeological research efforts throughout the area: the Slovenes and Croats commenced research projects mainly within the framework of Slavic archaeology (excavations, surveys,

9 The debate between Italy, and Croatia and Slovenia – about the actual number of people who left this area – remains unresolved. There are also large differences in the very definition of their status: Italy considers them refugees (*profughi*), while Yugoslavia (now Croats and Slovenes) officially termed them as '*optanti*' who freely opted for Italy and had their property that they left in Yugoslavia refunded.

10 A highly illustrative example of such an attitude is presented by the Inaugural speech that was given on the occasion of the opening of the Royal Archaeological Museum in Pula (October 6<sup>th</sup> 1930) by Francesco Salata, local historian and senator in the Italian parliament: "... Ogni velleità di turbare l'azione benefica, fatale, di questa reintegrata unità, da cui è inseparabile la stessa vita delle popolazioni rurali d'altro ceppo, incapaci, per secolare esperienza, di ogni elevamento al di fuori della civiltà italiana, – ogni velleità, oltre che rintuzzata dalle forze vive della nazione, e confutata anche da questo nostro museo. Non preoccupati di dover rivelare inesistenti memorie di altre civiltà in questa Provincia o di dover rimuovere mai vedute testimonianze avverse al nostro diritto di reggere per il bene di tutti le sorti del paese, noi non abbiamo avuto, in verità, bisogno d'imitare quel prete carniolico calato nel centro dell'Istria, ches'immagino di cancellare il diritto di Roma infragando e sepellendo nelle fondamenta di una nuova chiesa le iscrizioni romane; e s'ebbe in fronte, con parole latine, il marchio rovente di Teodoro Mommsen" (check in *Atti e Memorie della Società Istriana di archeologia e storia patria* 42, 229).



analyses of pre-WWI excavated cemeteries, see for example Šribar 1952; 1956; Marušić 1955; 1960), while the Italians intensively published Roman studies of the provinces of Istria and Littoral (e. g., Scrinari 1951; Sticotti 1951, Degerassi 1954).

It is quite clear that the establishment of a national archaeology in Slovenia was a patriotic project, which was further catalyzed by the political situation during the immediate post-war years. Indeed, it is actually the latter, which renders the beginnings of national archaeology in Slovenia slightly different as compared to those countries that developed their national archaeologies at the turn of the century – one of the initial goals of Slavic archaeology in Slovenia was to react against the expansionist and racist theories of the WWII occupiers.

However, the enthusiasm and belief that it is possible to reveal ethno-genesis on the basis of material culture alone, a belief shared by many Yugoslav archaeologists during the immediate post-WWII period, was soon criticized by historians who demanded a more realistic, complex and historically relevant methodology for ethno-genetic investigations. Already in 1951, B. Grafenauer, the leading specialist in national and mediaeval history in Slovenia, criticized a series of archaeological premises proposed for the study of ethno-genesis. He strongly opposed the idea that certain types or groups of artifacts could be directly associated with a particular ethnic or linguistic group, and he also countered the notion that a certain type of material culture is representative for all members or strata within a particular ethnic group (Grafenauer 1951). His critique proved to be far-reaching and essential for the further development of Slavic archaeology in Slovenia and Yugoslavia as well; it aided markedly in overcoming the same Kosinnean arguments against which Slavic archaeology reacted in the first place.

#### Marxist state and non-Marxist archaeology

After WWII, Yugoslav society was marked by two major ideologies: the Marxist-Leninist ideology of a socialist society and the ideology of the 'brotherhood and unity of the Yugoslav peoples'. Both represented the cornerstones of a new society. The first was used primarily to legitimate and maintain the achievements of the socialist revolution, relationships within the political system, economy and the system of property etc. The second (not without the Marxist premise itself – the priority of class adherence over national adherence), served to maintain a balance between national and ethnic groups living in Yugoslavia, and for constructing a new identity – the Yugoslav nation – under the conditions of a socialist society, which was then projected in the 'near' future. Socialist Yugoslavia went through various phases of socialism, ranging from a very rigid communist regime and its attempt to radically transform the society in the first post-war decade, to much more liberal forms of government manifested in political, economic and inter-ethnic matters in the 1970s and 1980s. Indeed, it is not possible to treat the entire period between 1945-1990 as one homogenous period of the socialist regime.

Nevertheless, the first two decades were ultimately marked by the attempts of the Communist party to 'rebuild' society on a Marxist-Leninist basis, and in accordance with the politics of 'brotherhood and unity'. This process frequently took on the form

of 'cleansing' among the institutions and civil service branches of people who did not conform to the ideological plans of the new ruling elite or who were accused of collaboration with the occupiers and their quislings during the war. The primary task of those who remained at their positions or those appointed anew was to adapt the programs of their corresponding institutions to the newly proclaimed national and ideological goals.

The new goal within the framework of the historical sciences, and in historiography in particular, was Marxist historiography, as a response to the 'bourgeois' historiographic tradition of the pre-war period. Aligned at the top of the new agenda, there were issues from recent historical periods and from social history (19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century history, history of the labor class, history of the Communist parties, economic and social history of the Yugoslav nations, history of the Liberation movement etc.), and frequently, they were on account of the earlier historical periods. However, the official ideology and communist regime had only partial success in rebuilding the conceptual frameworks.

Some sciences, such as philosophy, sociology, economy and jurisprudence, were the subject of a much larger transformation than the humanistic disciplines; and even within the framework of historiography, where the endeavors were felt strongest, the 'rebuilding' was only partial. Nevertheless, in general, traditional humanistic disciplines remained 'suspicious', particularly because of their long tradition and ties with bourgeois society.

However, there were some episodes and services where there was a great demand for highly qualified historians and other experts in humanistic disciplines, particularly in affairs of diplomatic and foreign policy (e. g., disputes about borders, war damage and reparations, historical documents upon which the Yugoslav government claimed certain rights etc., 'competition' with neighboring and other countries in scientific fields etc.). Consequently, too rigid a selection on an ideological basis would leave the country lacking a large number of the intellectuals needed for the reconstruction of Yugoslavia.

Slovene historiography is one of the sciences that was planned to be transformed according to the new ideological and political goals. Nevertheless, although certain new professors were appointed at the University, the leading role in Slovene historiography remained in the hands of a group of professors of the 'old school' (M. Kos, F. Zwitter, B. Grafenauer, F. Gestrin), all of whom were highly esteemed for their contribution to national historiography. This group can hardly be accused of 'Marxisizing' or promoting a new socialist paradigm in Slovene historiography. On the contrary, they were constantly opposed to certain ideological aberrations of socialist historiography, and since they held important positions at the University, their influence upon the developments of historical sciences in Slovenia was determinative.

The situation in archaeology was even less 'Marxist'; although one would expect that a science established almost anew after 1945 would be much more liable to ideological influence. Actually, archaeology provides one of the best examples where official Marxist ideology was unable to provide any conceptual tools applicable and operable in an archaeological context. A new ideology emerged in the 1950s and 1960s, expressed in various resolutions, manifests and similar protocol documents on the oc-

casions of various conferences, jubilees, etc., but it bore no effect on the conceptual issues whatsoever.

On the other hand, the ideology of the 'brotherhood and unity of Yugoslav nations' had noticeably more influence. The documents from the First Congress of Yugoslav Archaeologists in Niška Banja (1950) adeptly illustrate the status of both ideologies. The congress was planned as a meeting in which the new general program for the archaeological discipline in post-war Yugoslavia was to be proposed (presented in greater detail in Korošec 1950). The conclusions that amounted during the congress established a common formula for the early years of the communist regime: e. g., that the archaeological discipline has great prospects under the conditions of the socialist development, or that there were a variety of imperfections, omissions and weaknesses of an ideological, organizational, and technical nature in the past, or that archaeology is a social-historic discipline which has to be directed toward researching the material and spiritual culture, entirely on the basis of historical materialism. But some of the conclusions were much more operable and aimed at determining the general course of archaeology in Yugoslavia: like the one identifying research of the material culture of Yugoslav nations, from the earliest Slavic tribal communities to the period of the emergence of class bourgeois society, as the main issue of archaeology. The research goals were the following: internal development and changes within Yugoslav society, relations between Yugoslav nations, and relations with neighboring and other nations. In accordance with these goals, support was given for 'strong' scientific critique of all former assumptions and theories concerning the origins and development of the Yugoslav nations, as well as for research regarding the ethno-genesis of the Yugoslav nations, and for research concerning the ethnic groups that lived in the Balkans at the time of the arrival of the Slavs, and also for the research of the social relationships among the Yugoslav nations.

The document very clearly reflects the atmosphere of 'rebuilding society' in the first post-war years. Both ideological components – the socialist (Marxist) view on history and the 'brotherhood and unity of Yugoslav nations' – are clearly stated in it; yet in reality it was only the latter that was taken seriously (due to experiences during WWII: occupation, ethnic cleansing, civil and inter-ethnic wars, racist theories etc.). The former was merely a formula of adherence to the socialist/Marxist discourse.

The need for developing national archaeologies of the respective Yugoslav nations was also discernible from the document; actually, this was seen as the most urgent task. But at this point exactly, the proposed 'Marxist' framework proved to be the weakest, almost non-existent in fact. For an investigation of the ethno-genesis of the 'Yugoslav and neighboring nations', the same instruments deriving from the arsenal of the Kossinean *Ethnographische Methode*, and which were denounced for their 'wrong theories', were proposed (Slapšak / Novaković 1996, 288). A nation (*alias* culture) was conceived as the unit of observation and applied uniformly in prehistoric, Roman provincial and in Early Mediaeval archaeology. In addition to this, the search for ties between the archaeological cultures within the territory of Yugoslavia followed, in many respects, the model of 'brotherhood and unity of Yugoslav nations'. However, select leading non-Marxist historians from the University of Ljubljana, B. Grafenauer in particular, soon criticized this early show of optimism and activism. It was Grafenauer's critique of the monograph by M. Garašanin and J. Kovačević, on the

South Slavic material culture and ethno-genesis (Garašanin / Kovačević 1950), which can be regarded as the most important theoretical and epistemological text of early post-war Yugoslav archaeology. Grafenauer rigorously dismissed major conceptual and methodological tools used in archaeological ethno-genetic studies as too weak and simplifying to be used for any realistic study of ethno-genesis. Grafenauer's ideas were shared by many leading Slovene historians, particularly by the medievalists who based their interpretations on a much more systematic analysis and critique of sources. Grafenauer's critique aided enormously in the application of a more relevant concept in archaeological research. One of its best results can be seen in the following years, when F. Stare and S. Gabrovec introduced Merhart's concept of prehistoric cultures, which demanded a separation of the archaeological culture from the ethnic group. Thus, the imposition of simplified present-day historical models upon the archaeological record was avoided.

In the 1970s and 1980s, we can hardly speak of any Marxist ideology present in archaeological studies in Slovenia and Yugoslavia, and similarly, the ideology of brotherhood and unity was also getting scarcer and bore no sound influence. In fact, it is difficult to speak of Yugoslav archaeology in these years. Aside from the Association of the Archaeological Societies of Yugoslavia, there were no other bodies or institutions on a Yugoslav level. And even the Association maintained no executive powers. Indeed, it is better to speak of republican or national archaeological disciplinary frameworks following their own national agendas. The process of the dissolution of 'Yugoslav' archaeology from the 1970s onward also has much to do with the 'confederate' constitution from 1974 and with the reforms of public services. From the mid 1970s on, an unprecedented number of working posts were opened; and due to the limited number of students in archaeology, virtually no unemployed graduates existed for a decade or more. Slovene archaeology, which in the 1960s counted some 10-15 professional archaeologists, had nearly six times more professionals in the beginning of the 1980s. The consequence was that a well-developed system of infrastructure, conceptually based on the achievements of the scholars of the 1950s and 1960s, was able to develop spontaneously.

#### Some recent transitional experiences

During the last decade, since the proclamation of independence in 1991, society in Slovenia underwent considerable changes (e. g., the introduction of a democratic political system, of a free-market economy, denationalization, privatization etc.). Since archaeology in Slovenia lacked any considerable Marxist ideological component, the abolishment of socialism did not generate any serious ideological debate, let alone any ideological 'cleansing'. The situation was somewhat different in other humanistic and social sciences, but still very far from any radical 'cleaning of the Augean stables'. Since the late 1970s, Marxist discourse in philosophy, sociology, and to a much lesser extent in modern history, was still popular but not dominant, while in the humanistic sciences it actually never succeeded in establishing firm foundations. Indeed, with the abolishment of socialism, Marxist discourse simply disappeared in the 'unfriendly'



ideological environment of the early 1990s<sup>11</sup>. The same happened with the other ideological component, 'the brotherhood and unity', only that reaction was much more hostile and nationalistic, and some of the highest ranked scientists and politicians contributed much in developing a nationalist atmosphere in the early 1990s<sup>12</sup>.

Academic historiography and archaeology in Slovenia succeeded in avoiding the major pitfalls of nationalism in the 1980s and 1990s, but the nationalist debate and quests for a new identity (a predominantly anti-Yugoslav one) did not avoid archaeology and history (Slapšak / Novaković 1996, 290). The debate then shifted to an audience of layman, where select voices loudly demanded a different (predominantly anti-Yugoslav and anti-Slavic) archaeological past<sup>13</sup>. The 'official' past, they argued, was instrumental to the communist regime and to the ideology of Yugoslav brotherhood and unity. The advocates of 'different pasts' not only gained political support of the extreme nationalist parties, but also the Slovene government coquetted with their ideas<sup>14</sup>.

In views of such a 'past', the Slovenes were proposed as an autochthonous nation of non-Slavs that are of pre-Roman origins. Indeed, this was the same 'past' as proposed by romantic spirits, zealous patriots and layman historians in the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century (e. g., V. Vodnik, D. Trstenjak) – the interpretations, which were so tenaciously dismissed already by K. Dežman and by the first generation of national historians at the turn of the 19<sup>th</sup>/20<sup>th</sup> century. Two topics became very popular anew in this

11 The situation was much more serious in other former Yugoslav republics (with the exception of Macedonia), where under the conditions of war, many institutions were 'cleansed' of people whose ideological or ethnic background was not 'appropriate' for the newly elected nationalist regimes, or they did not support the war projects of the ruling cliques.

12 The case of P. Tancig, computer scientist, Slovene Minister of Science and Technology (1990-1992), is a good illustration of the dominant nationalist attitude. In his e-mail sent to the 'scientists of the world' in June 1991 (during the 10 days of clashes of arms between Slovenia and the Yugoslav Federal Army) he stated: "... the basic reason for all the past/present 'mess' [in Yugoslavia] is the incompatibility of two main frames of reference/civilizations ... On one side, you have a typical violent and crooked Oriental-Byzantine [sic] heritage, best exemplified by Serbia and Montenegro ... On the other side (Slovenia, Croatia), there is a more humble and diligent western-catholic tradition ... Trying to keep Yugoslavia afloat ... is very bad geo-strategical thinking, as independent (and westernized) Slovenia (and Croatia) could and would act as a "cordon sanitaire" against the eastern tide of chaos." (see Hayden 1993).

13 The same trend of changing identities can be observed from the 1980s onward in all former Yugoslav republics. Regarding the role of archaeology and its orchestration in these processes in Yugoslavia, check Slapšak 1993.

14 There was also another, much stronger, force which claimed a different past – the Catholic Church and politicians and groups close to it. For decades excluded from political discourse and treated with suspicion by the socialist regime, they gained very high positions in the first democratic government and launched a sort of 'counter-revolution' and 're-evangelization' (as the actual Archbishop of Ljubljana defined his mission in Slovenia). First and foremost, they demanded a revision of the history of WWII, in which the Catholic Church sided with the Italians and Germans. The Catholic Church also wanted to participate in public education and thus be able to monopolize the discourse on religion and morale.

discourse: the Early Mediaeval statehood of Carantania (a symbolic tie with the modern independence and statehood of the Slovenes), and the autochthonal theories of the non-Slavic and pre-Roman origins of the Slovenes<sup>15</sup>.

Academic archaeology and historiography debated over the actual influence and the role of Carantania for the modern state of Slovenia, but they completely denied any scientific value of the 'Etruscan/Veneti' theories. The responses of the archaeologists, historians, linguists and ethnographers were promptly published in printed mass media, and in a special issue of *Arheo*, a Journal of the Slovene Archaeological Society (Matičevič 1990); at this point, the academics were accused of being anti-patriotic ('Dežman's syndrome'). The demands for a different 'past' did not fade away; on the contrary, even the government coquetted with them and used some symbols from the Early Iron Age<sup>16</sup>. Some academics raised their voices against the 'invention of tradition' and falsifications of history, but with no particular effect. The only case when a symbol was strongly disputed happened when the quest for symbols went beyond the actual state borders – the case of Fürstenstein<sup>17</sup>, a symbol depicted on the first bank notes issued by Slovenia in 1991. Austria reacted very strongly to what it perceived as "the theft of their own symbol", and the symbol was abolished in later issues of the Slovene bank notes<sup>18</sup>.

However, although the intensity of this debate has declined in the last few years, it has yet to be concluded. Academic archaeology and historiography argued openly against such aberrations and largely succeeded in preserving its scientific integrity in early transitional years. This holds true in particular, if compared to the situation in other former Yugoslav republics, where some professional archaeologists and historians served their extreme nationalist regimes and their political goals and actively falsified history<sup>19</sup>.

15 The number of books advocating the autochthonous (Etruscan/Venetian) origins of Slovenes is quite impressive (e. g., Berlot / Rebec 1984; Bor 1985; Šavli 1988; Šavli 1990; Tomažič 1995; Šavli / Bor / Tomažič 1996).

16 For example, the President of Slovenia gave a copy of the Iron Age situla to the UN Secretary General as a protocol present when Slovenia achieved full membership in the UN; the most recent case are the identity cards, ornamented with the motives again taken from situla art.

17 The Roman chapter, which served as a throne of the Carantanian dukes in Maria Saal near Klagenfurt, Austria; the throne is perceived as one of the most powerful symbols of the Slovene statehood in the Early Medieval period.

18 For the response from the Austrian side, check A. Ogris (1993).

19 Only select extreme cases are quoted here: the 'theory of the Iranian origins of Croats' (after F. Tudić, historian and former president of Croatia; '4000 years of Croatian culture' (after V. Jurkić Girardi, archaeologist and former minister of culture of Croatia, and Croatian ambassador at the UNESCO in Paris); excavations of some Serbian archaeologists in Krajina, Croatia during the Serbian/Croatian war, aiming at proving the Serbian Early Medieval colonization of this area; planned but not opened exhibition of 'the saved treasures of Yugoslavia/Serbia' in the Yugoslav Cultural Center in Paris 1993 (some of the 'treasures' were actually robbed from the Museum of Vukovar, Croatia). Check also Kaiser (1995).

### Identity of Slovene archaeology

Prior to WWI, the archaeology in Slovene provinces was simply a part of the 'Austrian' archaeology of the time and professed no particularly individual regional or conceptual identity. The 'Austrian' institutional framework in the provinces, which was generally constituted by the Provincial Museum and Provincial Office of *Zentralkommission*, 'covered' most of the archaeological activities in the province. While the *Zentralkommission's* offices directly depended on the central office in Vienna, the provincial museums, which were founded by provincial governments, were more autonomous. However, since the Natural History Museum from Vienna also conducted or commissioned excavations in the provinces, the conflicts between the central museum and provincial museums were rather frequent; and the central museum normally prevailed.

The 'provincial' nature of archaeology can also be seen in its conceptual development. Archaeology in the early 19<sup>th</sup> century was frequently considered one of the branches of *Landeskunde*, which was also the most frequent issue of the provincial museums. The provincial museums were aimed at covering a vast array of themes (antiquities, ethnography, history, geography, natural history etc.), and what course a particular science in the museum will follow depended very much on the individual curators and education and interests. The three curators in the Provincial Museum of Carniola (Dežman, Müllner, Šmid) and their different views on archaeology (*fig. 1*) present a good example of the radical replacements in the archaeological agenda.

Carniolan archaeology made the first step into the international arena with Dežman's excavation of pile-dwellings at the Ljubljansko barje (the Ljubljana moor) in 1875. From this year onward, he devoted much of his career to archaeological research and prehistory gained a privileged position in the museum. Dežman's links with the Anthropological Society from Vienna and with the Prehistoric Commission of the Academy of Sciences were crucial for furthering the application of scientific standards in archaeological research<sup>20</sup>. International recognition of Dežman's archaeology and his political influence in Carniola resulted in the construction of a new museum palace (the largest public building in Carniola in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century), opened in 1888. The archaeological collection there, accompanied by a modern museum guide (Deschmann 1888), was one of the best examples of provincial archaeology in the Austro-Hungarian Empire in general.

The successor curators, Müllner and Šmid, could not match Dežman's international reputation. Their archaeology was much more 'provincial'. During their service in the museum, archaeology in Carniola became somehow isolated from the international centers with which Dežman had collaborated so successfully. They both abandoned the anthropological and evolutionary concept of Dežman's archaeology, and although they tried to follow some contemporary trends (e. g., typological methods –

20 Dežman's results at Ljubljansko barje attracted the Prehistoric Commission. In 1878, they visited Carniola and their first published report was on the sites from this province. A year later (1879), Dežman hosted the annual meeting of the Anthropological Society in Ljubljana (Deschmann 1880 a).



Müllner; cultural historical approach and settlement archaeology – Šmid), the archaeology in Carniola remained a rather local issue.

The situation did not change much in the period between the two world wars. In fact, after the collapse of the 'Austrian/provincial' framework, and lacking any stronger organization or general program on a state level, the archaeological discipline reached its lowest point. R. Ložar, the only professional archaeologist after almost twenty years, simply did not have the funds, infrastructure and support in scientific circles necessary to modernize archaeology. Only at the end of this period, and with the endeavors of B. Saria, were there epigraphy and archaeological topography, both of which made considerable advances.

Post-WWII Slovene archaeology was established almost completely anew, with very few conceptual references to the previous periods. One of the major reasons for such intensive endeavors in the immediate post-war period was the recognition that the well-organized national discipline of archaeology (and public service) can indeed efficiently contribute to the national identity and politics. The context in which 'new' Slovene archaeology was established was the general context of the 'reconstruction' and modernization of the Yugoslav state on socialist principles. Archaeology in Yugoslavia (and in Slovenia) immediately entered into the realm of *Großwissenschaften*, with a full research, academic and monument service framework. Quite promptly, it developed a conceptual basis comparable to the archaeologies in other European countries (for more details see the chapter "Brief history of slovene archaeology").

The process of establishing a modern national discipline of archaeology took approximately twenty years, and it proved very successful. In a sense, the process of establishing modern scientific standards after WWII resembles Dežman's efforts in establishing scientific archaeology through collaboration with Austrian and German archaeological centers and scholarly societies; only this time, German universities (e. g., Tübingen, Marburg, Heidelberg, Munich) and the University of Prague (in the case of J. Korošec) played major roles and provided the place and means for leading Slovene prehistorians to study, specialize, or collaborate.

Consequently, it is no surprise that the 'German' type of a cultural historical approach was predominant in conceptual issues, as was the case in all central and south-eastern European countries. Chronological, typological and stylistic series, and interpretative models were all developed for the most part with reference to the studies of German scholars or scholars applying the 'German style' of archaeology (P. Reinecke, G. v. Merhart, H. Müller-Karpe, V. Miložčić, J. Werner, G. Kossack). On the other hand, 'Childean' archaeology was much less present in Slovenia, as compared, for example, to the contemporary developments in Serbian prehistoric archaeology.

From the mid 1970s onward, with the reforms of the state Monument Service and with completion of the network of regional museums (the reforms resulted in an opening of an unprecedented number of archaeological jobs in the country), Slovene archaeology grew into a stable system. In conceptual issues, this resulted in the growing specialization and the more profound development of a series of fields. One such case was the attempt to widen the conceptual horizons by introducing some issues from the Anglo-American processual and postprocessual discourse. Playing the pioneering role were some younger scholars from the Department of Archaeology, University of Ljubljana, who intensively collaborated with British and American Universities begin-

ning in the 1980s. The interest in Anglo-American archaeology is particularly visible in the shift of postgraduate grants and specializations through the last decade, that is, from traditional 'partners' (German universities) to British or American universities. This collaboration primarily resulted in the introduction of a series of new techniques and methods in field research, although it also roused some serious discussions about conceptual issues in Slovene archaeology<sup>21</sup>. The activities in this field further developed in the 1990s<sup>22</sup>.

Nevertheless, the cultural historical approach is still deeply rooted in Slovene archaeology, and processual and postprocessual issues only occasionally appear in contemporary archaeological practice and debate in Slovenia. However, processual and postprocessual themes are debated among smaller groups of archaeologists (particularly at the University of Ljubljana), and their contribution to the archaeological practice in the last years has proved essential<sup>23</sup>.

Compared to the pre-WWII period, collaboration with archaeologists and institutions from other Yugoslav republics was much stronger and effective. Indeed, as viewed from the outside, one might speak of 'Yugoslav archaeology'. Very similar, if not the same, conceptual tools and disciplinary framework were shared, joint projects were undertaken, major research issues were programmed together etc. However, the geographical diversity, which to a large extent conditioned regionalization in prehistoric and historic periods, and the differences in cultural and scientific traditions in archaeology resulted also in the development of the individual 'national' identities of the Yugoslav archaeologies, which gradually diverged one from another in the last two or three decades<sup>24</sup>.

21 One of the important turning points was the establishment of the journal *Arheo* in 1981 (a model publication for *Arheo* was *Nouvelle Archéologie*), which was aimed at discussing theoretical and conceptual issues in Yugoslav and international archaeologies. Another stimulus for the development of theoretical debate came in the academic years 1985/86, when L. Binford gave a series of lectures at the Department of Archaeology, University of Ljubljana, and in 1988/89 when J. Chapman (University of Newcastle) held a course in theoretical archaeology.

22 Since the late 1980s, the number of authors publishing theoretical and methodological articles substantially increased; a 'Slovene' session at Leicester TAG conference (1991) was organized; theory and history of archaeology entered the curriculum at the Dept. of Archaeology, University of Ljubljana in 1988/1989. In the last years, another growing trend in the conceptual debate in Slovene archaeology can be observed – critical analysis of nationalism, ideology and archaeology. The major catalysts were, of course, the wars in Yugoslavia and the rise of nationalism and chauvinism.

23 The best case is the rescue archaeology on the motorways, by far the largest national project in Slovene archaeology. The Department of Archaeology, University of Ljubljana, played a major role in developing the research concept, methodology and techniques, which included systematic survey procedures, sampling strategies, quantitative techniques, off-site and site approach, regional approach, concepts of landscape archaeology, techniques for large-scale settlement excavations etc.

24 The development of this dual nature is clearly reflected in the change of the name of the Yugoslav organization of professional archaeologists in the mid 1970s – from the Society of Yugoslav Archaeologists to the Association of the Archaeological Societies of Yugoslavia.

During the 1980s, the 'Yugoslav' identity and cohesion in general were rapidly fading. The growing discontent with the efforts of hard-core communists persisting on socialist revolutionary principles and in delaying democratic reforms, and the growing nationalism enhancing cultural, ethnic and historic differences between nations in Yugoslavia (see in Slapšak 1993), generated a series of divergent and conflicting processes in the state, which ended in inter-ethnic war.

'Yugoslav' archaeology shared the destiny of the federal state. In the early 1990s, ties between Slovene archaeology and other republics were almost completely broken. Indubitably, the war was the prime reason. The maintaining of contacts with other archaeological schools was, as has been demonstrated throughout the history of Slovene archaeology, extremely important for its development, and discontinuance in maintaining these contacts, due to the war, must inevitably be reflected in the identity of Slovene archaeology.

However, there is also another factor to be accounted for in the changing identity of Slovene archaeology (and of other national archaeologies in Yugoslavia). Since the 1980s, an image of '*mitteleuropäische*' or 'western' Slovenia has been intensively generated in the media, and opposition to the Balkan world continually stressed. In Slovene archaeology this reflected in the diminishing interests in Balkan archaeology – 'Yugoslav' archaeology was less and less the common tradition with which Slovene archaeology identified and shared in the past.

Nowadays, under the conditions of an independent state, Slovene archaeology is, again (sic!), building up its own national identity. The process resembles to a certain extent that of replacing the 'Austrian' identity with the Slovene/Yugoslav one after the First and Second World Wars, but with one major exception: this time no extra reforms or a new infrastructure are needed. For the first time, the change of a state did not provoke 'tectonic' changes, as always happened in the past 100 years. However, it seems that Slovene archaeology is destined to frequent changes of identity; future membership in the European Union and the process of globalization are already demanding steps toward another change.

## Bibliography

- ANSL 1975: Arheološka najdišča Slovenije. Ljubljana 1975.
- Baš 1953: F. Baš, Organizacija spomeniškega varstva v slovenski preteklosti. Varstvo spomenikov 5, 1953-54, 13-37.
- Bayer / Brodar 1928: J. Bayer / S. Brodar, Die Potočka Höhle, eine Hochstation der Aurignac-schwankung in den Ostalpen. Prähistorica 1, 1928.
- Berlot / Rebec 1984: A. Berlot / I. Rebec, So bili Etruščani Slovani. Nova Gorica 1984.
- Bitelli 1999: R. Bitelli, Claustra Alpium Iuliarum, il confine di rapallo e fascismo. Archeologia come esempio di continuità / Claustra Alpium Iuliarum, rapalska meja in fašizem. Arheologija kot primer kontinuitete. Koper 1999.
- Brodar 1938: S. Brodar, Das Paläolithikum in Jugoslawien. Quartär 1, 1938, 140-172.

- Cunja 1992: R. Cunja, Zgodovinski oris arheoloških raziskav na Koprskem. *Annales, Anali Koprškega Primorja in bližnjih pokrajin* 2, 67-86.
- Degrassi 1954: A. Degrassi, Il confine nord-orientale dell'Italia romana. *Dissertationes bernenses* 1, fasc. 6, Bern 1954.
- Deschmann 1875: K. Deschmann, Die Pfahlbautenfundamente auf dem Laibacher Moor. *Verhandlungen der k.k. Geologischen Reichsanstalt*. Wien 1875.
- Deschmann 1880: K. Deschmann, Prähistorische Ansiedlungen und Begrabsstätten in Krain. 1. Bericht. *Denkschriften der k.k. Akademie der Wissenschaften, Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Classe* 42, Wien 1880, 1-54.
- Deschmann 1880 a: K. Deschmann, Versammlung österreichischer Anthropologen und Urgeschichtsforscher in Laibach am 28. und 29. Juli 1879. *Mittheilungen der Anthropologischen Gesellschaft in Wien* 10, 1880, 163-164.
- Deschmann 1888: K. Deschmann, Führer durch das Krainische Landes-Museum Rudolfinum in Laibach. Ljubljana 1888.
- Deschmann 1891: K. Deschmann, Zur Vorgeschichte Krains. In: *Die österreichisch-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild, Kärnten und Krain*. Wien 1891, 305-324.
- Dinkluge 1943: K. Dinkluge, Frühdeutsche Volkskultur in Kärnten und seinen Marken. *Kleine Schriften des Instituts für Kärntner Landesforschung* 3, Laibach 1943.
- Dinkluge / Unger 1943: K. Dinkluge / R. Unger, *Kärntner Zeitung* 6, Klagenfurt 1943.
- Gabrovec 1971: S. Gabrovec, Stopetdeset let arheologije v Narodnem muzeju. *Argo* 10, 1971, 35-48.
- Garašanin / Kovačević 1950: M. Garašanin / J. Kovačević, Pregled materijalne kulture Južnih Slavena u ranom srednjem veku. Beograd 1950.
- Grafenauer 1947: B. Grafenauer, Problemi in naloge slovenskega zgodovinskega v našem času. *Zgodovinski časopis* 1, 1947, 11-30.
- Grafenauer 1951: B. Grafenauer, O arheologiji in zgodovini. *Zgodovinski časopis* 5, 1951, 163-173.
- Grafenauer 1960: B. Grafenauer, *Struktura in tehnika zgodovinske vede*. Ljubljana 1960.
- Hayden 1993: R. M. Hayden, The triumph of chauvinist nationalisms in Yugoslavia: Bleak implications for anthropology. *Anthropology of East Europe Review* 11/1-2, 1993 (in the text the WWW-edition was consulted: [http://condor.depaul.edu/~rrotenbe/aer/aer11\\_1/hayden.html](http://condor.depaul.edu/~rrotenbe/aer/aer11_1/hayden.html)).
- Hoffiler / Saria 1938: V. Hoffiler / B. Saria, *Antike Inschriften aus Jugoslawien*. 1938.
- Kaiser 1995: T. Kaiser, Archaeology and ideology in southeast Europe. In: Ph. Kohl / C. Fawcett (eds.), *Nationalism, politics and the practice of archaeology*. Cambridge 1995, 99-119.
- Kastelic 1960: J. Kastelic, Slovanska nekropola na Bledu. Poročilo o izkopavanjih leta 1949 in 1950. *Dela SAZU* 13/9, Ljubljana 1960.
- Kastelic 1975: J. Kastelic, Arheologija Slovenije in njene dileme v XIX. stoletju. 11. Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture. Ljubljana 1975, 121-125.
- Kastelic / Gabrovec / Knific 1987: J. Kastelic / S. Gabrovec / T. Knific, Arheologija. In: *Enciklopedija Slovenije* 1. Ljubljana 1987, 100-105.
- Korošec 1947: J. Korošec, Poročilo o izkopavanjih na Ptujskem gradu. Ljubljana 1947.

- Korošec 1947 a: J. Korošec, Staroslovanska grobišča v severni Sloveniji. Celje 1947.
- Korošec 1950: J. Korošec, Prvo posvetovanje jugoslovanskih arheologov. Zgodovinski časopis IV, 1950, 212-215.
- Korošec 1952: J. Korošec, Uvod v materialno kulturo Slovanov zgodnjega srednjega veka. Ljubljana 1952.
- Kos 1902-1928: F. Kos, Gradivo za zgodovino Slovencev v srednjem veku. Ljubljana 1902-1928.
- Ložar 1938: R. Ložar, Staroslovansko in srednjeveško lončarstvo v Sloveniji. Glasnik Muzejskega društva za Slovenijo 20, 1938, 180-225.
- Ložar 1941: R. Ložar, Razvoj in problemi slovenske arheološke vede. Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino 17, 1941, 107-148.
- Luthar 1993: O. Luthar, Med kronologijo in fikcijo. Ljubljana 1993.
- Marchesetti 1903: C. Marchesetti, I castellieri preistorici di Trieste e della regione Giulia. Trieste 1903.
- Marušić 1955: B. Marušić, Staroslovanske in neke zgodnesrednjeveške najdbe v Istri. Arheološki vestnik 6/1, 1955, 97-133.
- Marušić 1960: B. Marušić, Istra u ranom srednjem vijeku. Pula 1960.
- Matičetov 1990: M. Matičetov (ed.), Venetovanje. Arheo 10, Ljubljana 1990.
- Müllner 1900: A. Müllner, Typische Formen aus der Sammlungen des krainischen Landes-museums „Rudolphinum“ in Laibach. Ljubljana 1900.
- Novaković 1999: P. Novaković, O fašizmu in arheologiji na Primorskem in v Istri. Annales 9, 1999, Koper 2000, 491-511.
- Ogris 1993: A. Ogris, Fürstenstein und Herzogstuhl – Symbole der Kärntner Landesgeschichte im Widerstreit ethnischer und territorialer Tendenzen in der slowenischen Geschichtsschreibung, Publizistik und Politik. Carinthia 183/1, Klagenfurt 1993, 729-767.
- Petru 1971: P. Petru, Misli ob stopetdesetletnici Narodnega muzeja. Argo 10, 1971, 3-34.
- Rutar 1893: S. Rutar, Nemško-slovenska starinoslovna terminologija. Izvestja Muzejskega društva za Kranjsko 1893, 46ff.
- Rutar 1893 a: S. Rutar, Selitev Slovanov proti jugu. Ilustrovani narodni koledar 1893, 122-138.
- Rutar 1894: S. Rutar, Selitev Slovanov proti jugu. Ilustrovani narodni koledar 1894, 95-118;
- Rutar 1895: S. Rutar, Selitev Slovanov proti jugu. Ilustrovani narodni koledar 1895, 97-107.
- Rutar 1896: S. Rutar, Velika Moravska in staroslovanski jezik. Ilustrovani narodni koledar 1896, 127-142.
- Saria 1936: B. Saria, Archäologische Karte von Jugoslawien, Blatt Ptuj. Beograd-Zagreb 1936.
- Saria 1938: B. Saria, Antike Inschriften aus Jugoslawien. Noricum und Pannonia Superior. Zagreb 1938.
- Saria 1939: B. Saria, Doneski k vojaški zgodovini naših krajev v rimski dobi. Glasnik Muzejskega društva za Slovenijo 20, 1939, 115-151.
- Saria 1944: B. Saria, Die Harigasthelm, das älteste germanische Sprachdenkmal. Untersteirischer Kalender. Maribor 1944, 75-77.
- Saria / Klemenc 1938: B. Saria / J. Klemenc, Archäologische Karte von Jugoslawien. Blatt Rogatec. Beograd-Zagreb 1938.

- Šavli 1990: J. Šavli, Slovenska država Karantanija. Koper-Wien 1990.
- Šavli / Bor / Tomažič 1988: J. Šavli / M. Bor / I. Tomažič, Unsere Vorfahren – die Veneter. Wien 1988.
- Šavli / Bor / Tomažič 1996: J. Šavli / M. Bor / I. Tomažič, Veneti: The First Builders of European Community. Vienna 1996.
- Schmid 1908: W. Schmid, Altslovenische Gräber Krains. Carniola 1, 1908, 17-44.
- Schmid 1915: W. Schmid, Die Ringwälle des Bacherngbietes. Mittheilungen der Prähistorischen Kommission 2/3, 1915, 239-305.
- Scrinari 1951: V. Scrinari, Tergeste. Roma 1951.
- Slapšak 1993: B. Slapšak, Archaeology and the contemporary myth of the past. Journal of European Archaeology 1/2, 1993, 191-195.
- Slapšak / Novaković 1996: B. Slapšak / P. Novaković, Is there national archaeology without nationalism? Archaeological tradition in Slovenia. In: M. Díaz-Andreu / T. Champion (eds.) Nationalism and archaeology in Europe. London 1996, 256-293.
- Šribar 1952: V. Šribar, Arheološka raziskovanja v Istri. In: Slovenci na Jadranu. Koper 1952.
- Šribar 1956: V. Šribar, Arheološko delo na Koprskem. Zbornik Primorske založbe Lipa. Koper 1956, 63-68.
- Sticotti 1951: P. Sticotti, Inscriptiones Italiae 10/4: Histria septentrionalis. 1951.
- Tomažič 1995: Tomažič I. (ed.), Etruščani in Veneti: drugi venetski zbornik. Wien 1995.